



UNIVERSITÀ
DEGLI STUDI
FIRENZE

FLORE

Repository istituzionale dell'Università degli Studi di Firenze

Quantitative estimates of strong unique continuation for wave equations

Questa è la Versione finale referata (Post print/Accepted manuscript) della seguente pubblicazione:

Original Citation:

Quantitative estimates of strong unique continuation for wave equations / Sergio Vessella. - In: MATHEMATISCHE ANNALEN. - ISSN 0025-5831. - STAMPA. - 364:(2017), pp. 135-164. [10.1007/s00208-016-1383-4]

Availability:

The webpage <https://hdl.handle.net/2158/906407> of the repository was last updated on 2021-03-17T20:26:21Z

Published version:

DOI: 10.1007/s00208-016-1383-4

Terms of use:

Open Access

La pubblicazione è resa disponibile sotto le norme e i termini della licenza di deposito, secondo quanto stabilito dalla Policy per l'accesso aperto dell'Università degli Studi di Firenze (<https://www.sba.unifi.it/upload/policy-oa-2016-1.pdf>)

Publisher copyright claim:

La data sopra indicata si riferisce all'ultimo aggiornamento della scheda del Repository FloRe - The above-mentioned date refers to the last update of the record in the Institutional Repository FloRe

(Article begins on next page)

Mathematische Annalen

Quantitative estimates of strong unique continuation for wave equations

--Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	
Full Title:	Quantitative estimates of strong unique continuation for wave equations
Article Type:	Original Paper
Funding Information:	
Corresponding Author:	Sergio Vessella ITALY
Corresponding Author Secondary Information:	
Corresponding Author's Institution:	
Corresponding Author's Secondary Institution:	
First Author:	Sergio Vessella
First Author Secondary Information:	
Order of Authors:	Sergio Vessella
Order of Authors Secondary Information:	
Author Comments:	

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Quantitative estimates of strong unique continuation for wave equations

S. Vessella*

Abstract

The main results of the present paper consist in some quantitative estimates for solutions to the wave equation $\partial_t^2 u - \operatorname{div}(A(x)\nabla_x u) = 0$.

Such estimates imply the following strong unique continuation properties: (a) if u is a solution to the the wave equation and u is flat on a segment $\{x_0\} \times J$ on the t axis, then u vanishes in a neighborhood of $\{x_0\} \times J$. (b) Let u be a solution of the above wave equation in $\Omega \times J$ that vanishes on a a portion $Z \times J$ where Z is a portion of $\partial\Omega$ and u is flat on a segment $\{x_0\} \times J$, $x_0 \in Z$, then u vanishes in a neighborhood of $\{x_0\} \times J$. The property (a) has been proved by G. Lebeau, *Comm. Part. Diff. Equat.* 24 (1999), 777-783.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010) Primary 35R25, 35L; Secondary 35B60 ,35R30.

Keywords Stability Estimates, Unique Continuation Property, Hyperbolic Equations, Inverse Problems.

1 Introduction

The strong unique continuation properties and the related quantitative estimates have been well understood for second order equations of elliptic ([AE], [A-K-S], [Hö1], [Ko-Ta1]) and parabolic type ([Al-Ve], [Es-Fe], [Ko-Ta2]). The three sphere inequalities [La], doubling inequalities [Ga-Li], or two-sphere one cylinder inequality [Es-Fe-Ve] are the typical form in which such quantitative estimates of unique continuation occur in the elliptic or in the parabolic context. We refer to [Al-R-Ro-Ve] and [Ve1] for a more extensive literature on these subjects. On the contrary, the strong properties of unique

*Università degli Studi di Firenze, Italy, E-mail: sergio.vessella@unifi.it

continuation are much less studied in the context of hyperbolic equations, [Le], [Ma], [Ba-Za].

To the author knowledge there exists no result in the literature concerning quantitative estimates of unique continuation in the framework of hyperbolic equations. In this paper we study this issue for the wave equation

$$(1.1) \quad \partial_t^2 u - \operatorname{div}(A(x)\nabla_x u) = 0,$$

($\operatorname{div} := \sum_{j=1}^n \partial_{x_j}$) where $A(x)$ is a real-valued symmetric $n \times n$, $n \geq 2$, matrix whose entries are functions of Lipschitz class and satisfying uniform ellipticity condition.

The quantitative estimates of unique continuation for the equation (1.1) represent the quantitative counterparts of the following strong unique continuation property. Let u be a weak solution to (1.1) and assume that

$$\sup_{t \in J} \|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(B_r)} = C_N r^N, \quad \forall N \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \forall r < 1,$$

where C_N is arbitrary and independent on r , $J = (-T, T)$ is an interval of \mathbb{R} . Then we have

$$u = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{U},$$

where \mathcal{U} is a neighborhood of $\{0\} \times J$. The above property was proved by Lebeau in [Le]. As a consequence of such a result and using the weak unique continuation property proved in [Hö2], [Ro-Zu] and [Ta], see also [Is1], we have that, if the entries of A are function in $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ then $u = 0$ in the domain of dependence of a cylinder $B_\delta \times J$, where B_δ is the ball of \mathbb{R}^n , $n \geq 2$, centered at 0 with a small radius δ . Previously the strong unique continuation property was proved by Masuda [Ma] whenever $J = \mathbb{R}$ and the entries of the matrix A are functions of C^2 class and by Baouendi-Zachmanoglou [Ba-Za] whenever the entries of A are analytic functions. In both [Ma] and [Ba-Za], the above property was proved also for first order perturbation of operator $\partial_t^2 u - \operatorname{div}(A(x)\nabla u)$. Also, we recall here the papers [Che-D-Y], [Che-Y-Z] and [Ra]. In such papers unique continuation properties are proved along and across lower dimensional manifolds for the wave equation.

The quantitative estimate of strong unique continuation (in the interior) that we prove is, roughly speaking, the following one (for the precise statement see Theorem 2.1). Let u be a solution to (1.1) in the cylinder $B_1 \times J$ and let $r \in (0, 1)$. Assume that

$$\sup_{t \in J} \|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(B_r)} \leq \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \|u(\cdot, 0)\|_{H^2(B_1)} \leq 1,$$

where $\varepsilon < 1$. Then

$$(1.2) \quad \|u(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^2(B_{s_0})} \leq C |\log(\varepsilon^\theta)|^{-1/6},$$

where $s_0 \in (0, 1)$, $C \geq 1$ are constants independent of u and r and

$$(1.3) \quad \theta = |\log r|^{-1}.$$

The estimate (1.2) are sharp estimate from two points of view:

- (i) The logarithmic character of the estimate cannot be improved as it is shown by a well-known counterexample of John for the wave equation, [Jo];
- (ii) The sharp dependence of θ by r . Indeed it is easy to check that the estimate (1.2) implies the strong unique continuation for the equation (1.1) (see Remark 2.2 for more details).

As a consequence of estimate (1.2) and some reflection transformation introduced in [AE] we derive a quantitative estimate of unique continuation at the boundary (Theorem 2.3). Also, we extend (1.2) to a first order perturbation of the wave operator (Section 4).

One of the main purposes that led us to derive the above estimates is their applications in the framework of stability for inverse hyperbolic problems with time independent unknown boundaries from transient data with a finite time of observation. Some uniqueness results has been proved in [Is2]. In the paper [Ve2] the most important tools that are used to prove a sharp stability estimate are precisely the strong unique continuation (at the interior and at the boundary) for the equation (1.1). The quantitative estimate of strong unique continuation was applied for the first time to the elliptic inverse problems with unknown boundaries in [Al-B-Ro-Ve]. Concerning the parabolic inverse problems with unknown boundaries such estimates were applied in [C-Ro-Ve], [CRoVe2], [Dc-R-Ve], [Ve1]. In both the cases, elliptic and parabolic, the stability estimates that were proved are optimal [Dc-R] and [Al] (elliptic case), [Dc-R-Ve] (parabolic case).

The proof of (1.2) follows a similar strategy and ingredients as the one used in [Le]. In particular, in order to perform a suitable transformation of the wave equation in a nonhomogeneous second order elliptic equation we use the Boman transformation [Bo], then, to the obtained elliptic equation, we use the Carleman estimate with singular weight, [A-K-S], [Hö1], [Es-Ve] and the stability estimates for the Cauchy problem. The main difference between our proof and the one of [Le] relies in the different nature of the results; in our case the results are quantitative while in [Le] the results are only qualitative. More precisely, in [Le] the parameter ε has the particular form

1
2
3
4
5 $\varepsilon = C_N r^N$ while in the present paper ε is a free parameter. An important
6 consequence of this fact is that we need to control very accurately how much
7 the error ε affects the growth of the solution to (1.1) in order to reach the
8 above sharpness character (i) and (ii).
9

10 The plan of the paper is as follows. In Section 2 we state the main results
11 of this paper, in Section 3 we prove the theorems of Section 2, in Section 4
12 we consider the case of the more general equation $q(x)\partial_t^2 u - \operatorname{div}(A(x)\nabla_x u) =$
13 $b(x) \cdot \nabla_x u + c(x)u$.
14
15

17 2 The main results

20 2.1 Notation and Definition

21 Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \geq 2$. For any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we will denote $x = (x', x_n)$, where
22 $x' = (x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$, $x_n \in \mathbb{R}$ and $|x| = \left(\sum_{j=1}^n x_j^2\right)^{1/2}$. Given $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$,
23 $r > 0$, we will denote by B_r, B'_r, \tilde{B}_r the ball of $\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ and \mathbb{R}^{n+1} of radius r
24 centered at 0. For any open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and any function (smooth enough)
25 u we denote by $\nabla_x u = (\partial_{x_1} u, \dots, \partial_{x_n} u)$ the gradient of u . Also, for the
26 gradient of u we use the notation $D_x u$. If $j = 0, 1, 2$ we denote by $D_x^j u$ the
27 set of the derivatives of u of order j , so $D_x^0 u = u$, $D_x^1 u = \nabla_x u$ and $D_x^2 u$ is
28 the hessian matrix $\{\partial_{x_i x_j} u\}_{i,j=1}^n$. Similar notation are used whenever other
29 variables occur and Ω is an open subset of \mathbb{R}^{n-1} or a subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1} . By $H^\ell(\Omega)$,
30 $\ell = 0, 1, 2$ we denote the usual Sobolev spaces of order ℓ , in particular we
31 have $H^0(\Omega) = L^2(\Omega)$.
32

33 For any interval $J \subset \mathbb{R}$ and Ω as above we denote by
34

$$35 \mathcal{W}(J; \Omega) = \{u \in C^0(J; H^2(\Omega)) : \partial_t^\ell u \in C^0(J; H^{2-\ell}(\Omega)), \ell = 1, 2\}.$$

36 We shall use the letters C, C_0, C_1, \dots to denote constants. The value
37 of the constants may change from line to line, but we shall specified their
38 dependence everywhere they appear.
39

40 2.2 Statements of the main results

41 Let $A(x) = \{a^{ij}(x)\}_{i,j=1}^n$ be a real-valued symmetric $n \times n$ matrix whose
42 entries are measurable functions and they satisfy the following conditions for
43 given constants $\rho_0 > 0$, $\lambda \in (0, 1]$ and $\Lambda > 0$,
44

$$45 (2.1a) \quad \lambda |\xi|^2 \leq A(x)\xi \cdot \xi \leq \lambda^{-1} |\xi|^2, \quad \text{for every } x, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

$$(2.1b) \quad |A(x) - A(y)| \leq \frac{\Lambda}{\rho_0} |x - y|, \quad \text{for every } x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Let $q = q(x)$ be a real-valued measurable function that satisfies

$$(2.2a) \quad \lambda \leq q(x) \leq \lambda^{-1}, \quad \text{for every } x \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

$$(2.2b) \quad |q(x) - q(y)| \leq \frac{\Lambda}{\rho_0} |x - y|, \quad \text{for every } x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Let $u \in \mathcal{W}([-\lambda\rho_0, \lambda\rho_0]; B_{\rho_0})$ be a weak solution to

$$(2.3) \quad q(x)\partial_t^2 u - \operatorname{div}(A(x)\nabla_x u) = 0, \quad \text{in } B_{\rho_0} \times (-\lambda\rho_0, \lambda\rho_0).$$

Let $r_0 \in (0, \rho_0]$ and denote by

$$(2.4) \quad \varepsilon := \sup_{t \in (-\lambda\rho_0, \lambda\rho_0)} \left(\rho_0^{-n} \int_{B_{r_0}} u^2(x, t) dx \right)^{1/2}$$

and

$$(2.5) \quad H := \left(\sum_{j=0}^2 \rho_0^{j-n} \int_{B_{\rho_0}} |D_x^j u(x, 0)|^2 dx \right)^{1/2}.$$

Theorem 2.1 (estimate at the interior). *Let $u \in \mathcal{W}([-\lambda\rho_0, \lambda\rho_0]; B_{\rho_0})$ be a weak solution to (2.3) and let (2.1) and (2.2) be satisfied. There exist constants $s_0 \in (0, 1)$ and $C \geq 1$ depending on λ and Λ only such that for every $0 < r_0 \leq \rho \leq s_0\rho_0$ the following inequality holds true*

$$(2.6) \quad \|u(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^2(B_\rho)} \leq \frac{C(\rho_0\rho^{-1})^C (H + e\varepsilon)}{(\theta \log(\frac{H+e\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}))^{1/6}},$$

where

$$(2.7) \quad \theta = \frac{\log(\rho_0/C\rho)}{\log(\rho_0/r_0)}.$$

The proof of Theorem 2.1 is given in section 3.

1
2
3
4
5 *Remark 2.2.* Observe that estimate (2.6) implies the following property of
6 strong unique continuation. Let $u \in \mathcal{W}([-\lambda\rho_0, \lambda\rho_0]; B_{\rho_0})$ be a weak solution
7 to (2.3) and assume that
8

$$9 \sup_{t \in (-\lambda\rho_0, \lambda\rho_0)} \left(\rho_0^{-n} \int_{B_{r_0}} u^2(x, t) dx \right)^{1/2} = O(r_0^N), \forall N \in \mathbb{N}, \text{ as } r_0 \rightarrow 0,$$

10
11
12
13 then

$$14 (2.8) \quad u(\cdot, t) = 0, \text{ for } |x| + \lambda^{-1}s_0|t| \leq s_0\rho_0.$$

15
16 It is enough to consider the case $t = 0$. If $\|u(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^2(B_{s_0\rho_0})} = 0$ there is
17 nothing to prove, otherwise if

$$18 (2.9) \quad \|u(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^2(B_{s_0\rho_0})} > 0,$$

19 we argue by contradiction. By (2.9) it is not restrictive to assume that
20 $H = \|u(\cdot, 0)\|_{H^2(B_{\rho_0})} = 1$. Now we apply inequality (2.6) with $\varepsilon_0 = C_N r_0^N$,
21 $N \in \mathbb{N}$, and passing to the limit as $r_0 \rightarrow 0$ we have that (2.6) implies

$$22 \|u(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^2(B_{s_0\rho_0})} \leq C s_0^{-C} N^{-1/6}, \forall N \in \mathbb{N},$$

23
24 by passing again to the limit as $N \rightarrow 0$ we get, by (2.9), $\|u(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^2(B_{\rho_0})} = 0$
25 that contradicts (2.9).
26
27
28

29 In order to state Theorem 2.3 below let us introduce some notation. Let
30 ϕ be a function belonging to $C^{1,1}(B'_{\rho_0})$ that satisfies

$$31 (2.10) \quad \phi(0) = |\nabla_{x'}\phi(0)| = 0$$

32 and

$$33 (2.11) \quad \|\phi\|_{C^{1,1}(B'_{\rho_0})} \leq E\rho_0,$$

34 where

$$35 \|\phi\|_{C^{1,1}(B'_{\rho_0})} = \|\phi\|_{L^\infty(B'_{\rho_0})} + \rho_0 \|\nabla_{x'}\phi\|_{L^\infty(B'_{\rho_0})} + \rho_0^2 \|D_{x'}^2\phi\|_{L^\infty(B'_{\rho_0})}.$$

36 For any $r \in (0, \rho_0]$ denote by

$$37 K_r := \{(x', x_n) \in B_r : x_n > \phi(x')\}$$

and

$$Z := \{(x', \phi(x')) : x' \in B'_{\rho_0}\}.$$

Let $u \in \mathcal{W}([-\lambda\rho_0, \lambda\rho_0]; K_{\rho_0})$ be a solution to

$$(2.12) \quad \partial_t^2 u - \operatorname{div}(A(x)\nabla_x u) = 0, \quad \text{in } K_{\rho_0} \times (-\lambda\rho_0, \lambda\rho_0),$$

satisfying one of the following conditions

$$(2.13) \quad u = 0, \quad \text{on } Z \times (-\lambda\rho_0, \lambda\rho_0)$$

or

$$(2.14) \quad A\nabla_x u \cdot \nu = 0, \quad \text{on } Z \times (-\lambda\rho_0, \lambda\rho_0),$$

where ν denotes the outer unit normal to Z .

Let $r_0 \in (0, \rho_0]$ and denote by

$$(2.15) \quad \varepsilon = \sup_{t \in (-\lambda\rho_0, \lambda\rho_0)} \left(\rho_0^{-n} \int_{K_{r_0}} u^2(x, t) dx \right)^{1/2}$$

and

$$(2.16) \quad H = \left(\sum_{j=0}^2 \rho_0^{j-n} \int_{K_{\rho_0}} |D_x^j u(x, 0)|^2 dx \right)^{1/2}.$$

Theorem 2.3 (estimate at the boundary). *Let (2.1) be satisfied. Let $u \in \mathcal{W}([-\lambda\rho_0, \lambda\rho_0]; K_{\rho_0})$ be a solution to (2.12) satisfying (2.15) and (2.16). Assume that u satisfies either (2.13) or (2.14). There exist constants $\bar{s}_0 \in (0, 1)$ and $C \geq 1$ depending on λ , Λ and E only such that for every $0 < r_0 \leq \rho \leq \bar{s}_0\rho_0$ the following inequality holds true*

$$(2.17) \quad \|u(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^2(K_\rho)} \leq \frac{C(\rho_0\rho^{-1})^C (H + e\varepsilon)}{\left(\tilde{\theta} \log\left(\frac{H + e\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}\right)\right)^{1/6}},$$

where

$$(2.18) \quad \tilde{\theta} = \frac{\log(\rho_0/C\rho)}{\log(\rho_0/r_0)}.$$

The proof of Theorem 2.3 is given in section 3.2.

Remark 2.4. By arguing similarly to Remark 2.2 we have that estimate (2.17) implies the following property of strong unique continuation at the boundary. Let $u \in \mathcal{W}([-\lambda\rho_0, \lambda\rho_0]; K_{\rho_0})$ be a solution to (2.12) satisfying either (2.13) or (2.14) and assume that

$$\sup_{t \in (-\lambda\rho_0, \lambda\rho_0)} \left(\rho_0^{-n} \int_{K_{r_0}} u^2(x, t) dx \right)^{1/2} = O(r_0^N), \quad \forall N \in \mathbb{N}, \text{ as } r_0 \rightarrow 0,$$

then

$$u(x, t) = 0, \text{ for } x \in K_{\rho(t)}, t \in (-\lambda\rho_0, \lambda\rho_0),$$

where $\rho(t) = \bar{s}_0 (\rho_0 - \lambda^{-1}|t|)$.

3 Proof of Theorems 2.1 and 2.3

3.1 Proof of Theorem 2.1

Observe that to prove Theorem 2.1 we can assume that $u(x, t)$ is even with respect to the variable t . Indeed defining

$$u_+(x, t) = \frac{u(x, t) + u(x, -t)}{2},$$

we see that u_+ satisfies all the hypotheses of Theorem 2.1 and, in particular, we have

$$u_+(x, 0) = u(x, 0),$$

$$\sup_{t \in (-\lambda\rho_0, \lambda\rho_0)} \left(\rho_0^{-n} \int_{B_{r_0}} u_+^2(x, t) dx \right)^{1/2} \leq \varepsilon,$$

and

$$\left(\sum_{j=0}^2 \rho_0^{j-n} \int_{B_{\rho_0}} |D_x^j u_+(x, 0)|^2 dx \right)^{1/2} = H,$$

also, notice that the function of ε at the right hand side of (2.6) is not decreasing. Hence, from now on we assume that $u(x, t)$ is even with respect to the variable t . Moreover it is not restrictive to assume $\rho_0 = 1$.

In order to prove Theorem 2.1 we proceed in the following way.

1
2
3
4
5 **First step.** After a standard extension of $u(\cdot, 0)$ in $H^2(B_2) \cap H_0^1(B_2)$ we
6 will construct, similarly to [Le], a sequence of function $\{v_k(x, y)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, with
7 the following properties:
8

- 9 (i) for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ the function v_k belongs to $H^2(B_2) \cap H_0^1(B_2)$, in addition
10 $v_k(x, y)$ is even with respect to the variable $y \in \mathbb{R}$,
11 (ii) the sequence $\{v_k(\cdot, 0)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ approximates $u(\cdot, 0)$ in $L^2(B_1)$, more precisely
12 we have
13

$$14 \quad \|u(\cdot, 0) - v_k\|_{L^2(B_1)} \leq CHk^{-1/6}.$$

15 Moreover, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ the function $v_k(x, y)$ is a solution to the elliptic
16 problem,
17

$$18 \quad \begin{cases} q(x)\partial_y^2 v_k + \operatorname{div}(A(x)\nabla_x v_k) = f_k(x, y), & \text{in } B_2 \times \mathbb{R}, \\ \|v_k(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^2(B_{r_0})} \leq \varepsilon, \end{cases}$$

19 where f_k satisfies
20

$$21 \quad \|f_k(\cdot, y)\|_{L^2(B_2)} \leq (C|y|)^{2k} \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

22
23
24
25 **Second step.** Here we derive some stability estimates of Cauchy problem
26 for the above elliptic equation getting estimates v_k in the ball of \mathbb{R}^{n+1} centered
27 at 0 with radius $r_0/4$, (Proposition 3.6). Then we use Carleman estimates
28 with singular weight (Theorem 3.7) for the elliptic equation and the above
29 estimate of $\|u(\cdot, 0) - v_k\|_{L^2(B_1)}$. Finally, we choose the parameter k and we
30 get the estimate (2.6).
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 **FIRST STEP.**

38 Let us start by introducing some notation and by giving an outline of the
39 proof of Theorem 2.1. Let \tilde{u}_0 an extension of the function $u_0 := u(\cdot, 0)$ such
40 that $\tilde{u}_0 \in H^2(B_2) \cap H_0^1(B_2)$ and
41
42
43

$$44 \quad (3.1) \quad \|\tilde{u}_0\|_{H^2(B_2)} \leq CH,$$

45 where C is an absolute constant.
46

47 Let us denote by λ_j , with $0 < \lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_j \leq \dots$ the eigenvalues
48 associated to the Dirichlet problem
49
50

$$51 \quad (3.2) \quad \begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(A(x)\nabla_x v) + \omega q(x)v = 0, & \text{in } B_2, \\ v \in H_0^1(B_2), \end{cases}$$

52 and by $e_j(\cdot)$ the corresponding eigenfunctions normalized by
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

$$(3.3) \quad \int_{B_2} e_j^2(x)q(x)dx = 1.$$

By (2.1a), (2.2) and Poincaré inequality we have for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$

$$(3.4) \quad \lambda_j = \int_{B_2} A(x)\nabla_x e_j(x) \cdot \nabla_x e_j(x)dx \geq c\lambda^2 \int_{B_2} e_j^2(x)q(x)dx = c\lambda^2$$

where c is an absolute constant. Denote by

$$(3.5) \quad \alpha_j := \int_{B_2} \tilde{u}_0(x)e_j(x)q(x)dx,$$

and let

$$(3.6) \quad \tilde{u}(x, t) := \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \alpha_j e_j(x) \cos \sqrt{\lambda_j} t.$$

Proposition 3.1. *We have*

$$(3.7) \quad \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (1 + \lambda_j^2) \alpha_j^2 \leq CH^2,$$

where C depends on λ, Λ only. Moreover, $\tilde{u} \in \mathcal{W}(\mathbb{R}; B_2) \cap C^0(\mathbb{R}; H^2(B_2) \cap H_0^1(B_2))$ is an even function with respect to the variable t and it satisfies

$$(3.8) \quad \begin{cases} q(x)\partial_t^2 \tilde{u} - \operatorname{div}(A(x)\nabla_x \tilde{u}) = 0, & \text{in } B_2 \times \mathbb{R}, \\ \tilde{u}(\cdot, 0) = \tilde{u}_0, & \text{in } B_2, \\ \partial_t \tilde{u}(\cdot, 0) = 0, & \text{in } B_2. \end{cases}$$

Proof. By (3.2) and (3.3) we have

$$\lambda_j \alpha_j = \int_{B_2} \tilde{u}_0(x) \lambda_j q(x) e_j(x) dx = - \int_{B_2} \operatorname{div}(A(x)\nabla_x \tilde{u}_0(x)) e_j(x) dx.$$

Hence, by (2.1), (2.2) and (3.1) we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (1 + \lambda_j^2) \alpha_j^2 = \|\tilde{u}_0\|_{L^2(B_2; qdx)}^2 + \left\| \frac{1}{q} \operatorname{div}(A\nabla_x \tilde{u}_0) \right\|_{L^2(B_2; qdx)}^2 \leq CH^2,$$

where C depends on λ, Λ only and (3.7) follows. \square

1
2
3
4
5 Notice that, since $\tilde{u}(\cdot, 0) = u_+(\cdot, 0)$ and $\partial_t \tilde{u}(\cdot, 0) = 0 = \partial_t u_+(\cdot, 0)$ in B_1 ,
6 we have for the uniqueness to the Cauchy problem for equation (2.3), (see,
7 for instance, [Ev]),
8

$$(3.9) \quad \tilde{u}(x, t) = u_+(x, t), \quad \text{for } |x| + \lambda^{-1}|t| < 1.$$

9
10
11 Let us introduce the following nonnegative, even function ψ such that

$$(3.10) \quad \psi(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}(1 + \cos \pi t), & \text{for } |t| \leq 1, \\ 0, & \text{for } |t| > 1. \end{cases}$$

12
13 Notice that $\psi \in C^{1,1}$, $\text{supp } \psi = [0, 1]$ and

$$(3.11) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} \psi(t) dt = 1.$$

14
15
16
17
18
19 Let

$$(3.12) \quad \widehat{\psi}(\tau) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \psi(t) e^{-i\tau t} dt = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \psi(t) \cos \tau t dt, \quad \tau \in \mathbb{R}.$$

20
21
22
23 Since ψ has compact support, $\widehat{\psi}$ is an entire function. By (3.11) we have

$$|\widehat{\psi}(\tau)| \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} \psi(t) dt = 1, \text{ for every } \tau \in \mathbb{R},$$

24
25 and

$$|\tau^2 \widehat{\psi}(\tau)| = \left| - \int_{\mathbb{R}} \psi(t) \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \cos \tau t dt \right| = \left| - \int_{\mathbb{R}} \psi''(t) \cos \tau t dt \right| \leq \pi^2, \text{ for every } \tau \in \mathbb{R},$$

26
27
28
29 hence we have

$$(3.13) \quad |\widehat{\psi}(\tau)| \leq \min \{1, \pi^2 \tau^{-2}\}, \text{ for every } \tau \in \mathbb{R}.$$

30
31
32
33
34
35
36 Let

$$(3.14) \quad \vartheta(t) = 4\lambda^{-1}\psi(4\lambda^{-1}t), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

Proposition 3.2. *The function ϑ is an even and positive function such that $\vartheta \in C^{1,1}$, $\text{supp } \vartheta = [-\frac{\lambda}{4}, \frac{\lambda}{4}]$, $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \vartheta(t) dt = 1$, $\widehat{\vartheta}(\tau) = \widehat{\psi}(\frac{\lambda\tau}{4})$ and*

$$(3.15) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\vartheta'(t)| dt = 8\lambda^{-1},$$

$$(3.16) \quad \left| \widehat{\vartheta}(\tau) \right| \leq \min \{1, 16\pi^2(\tau\lambda)^{-2}\}, \text{ for every } \tau \in \mathbb{R},$$

$$(3.17) \quad \left| \widehat{\vartheta}(\tau) - 1 \right| \leq \left(\frac{\lambda\tau}{4} \right)^2, \text{ for } \left| \frac{\lambda\tau}{4} \right| \leq \frac{\pi}{2},$$

$$(3.18) \quad \frac{1}{2} \leq \widehat{\vartheta}(\tau), \text{ for } \left| \frac{\lambda\tau}{4} \right| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}.$$

Proof. We limit ourselves to prove property (3.17) and (3.18), since the other properties are immediate consequences of (3.12), (3.13) and (3.14). We have

$$(3.19) \quad \left| \widehat{\vartheta}(\tau) - 1 \right| \leq \int_{-1}^1 \psi(s) \left(1 - \cos \left(\frac{\lambda s \tau}{4} \right) \right) ds.$$

Now, if $s \in [-1, 1]$ and $|\frac{\lambda\tau}{4}| \leq \frac{\pi}{2}$ then

$$1 - \cos \left(\frac{\lambda s \tau}{4} \right) \leq \left(\frac{\lambda \tau}{4} \right)^2.$$

Hence by (3.19) we get (3.17). Finally (3.18) is an immediate consequence of (3.17) \square

As usual, if $f, g \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$, we denote by $(f * g)(t) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(t-s)g(s)ds$. Moreover we denote by $f^{*(k)} := f * f^{*(k-1)}$, for $k \geq 2$, where $f^{*(1)} := f$.

Let us define

$$(3.20) \quad \vartheta_k(t) := (k\vartheta(kt))^{*(k)}, \text{ for every } k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Notice that $\vartheta_k \geq 0$, $\text{supp } \vartheta_k \subset [-\frac{\lambda}{4}, \frac{\lambda}{4}]$, $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \vartheta_k(t) dt = 1$, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and

$$(3.21) \quad \widehat{\vartheta}_k(\tau) = \left(\widehat{\vartheta}(k^{-1}\tau) \right)^k, \text{ for every } k \in \mathbb{N}, \tau \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Moreover, by (3.17) we have

$$(3.22) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \widehat{\vartheta}_k(\tau) = 1, \text{ for every } \tau \in \mathbb{R}.$$

For any number $\mu \in (0, 1]$ and any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ let us set

$$(3.23) \quad \varphi_{\mu,k} = (\vartheta_k * \varphi_\mu),$$

where

$$(3.24) \quad \varphi_\mu(t) = \mu^{-1} \vartheta(\mu^{-1}t), \text{ for every } t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

We have $\text{supp } \varphi_{\mu,k} \subset \left[-\frac{\lambda(\mu+1)}{4}, \frac{\lambda(\mu+1)}{4}\right]$, $\varphi_{\mu,k} \geq 0$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \varphi_{\mu,k}(t) dt = 1$.

Now, let us define the following mollified form of the Boman transformation of $\tilde{u}(x, \cdot)$, [Bo],

$$(3.25) \quad \tilde{u}_{\mu,k}(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{u}(x, t) \varphi_{\mu,k}(t) dt, \text{ for } x \in B_2.$$

Proposition 3.3. *If $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mu = k^{-1/6}$ then the following inequality holds true*

$$(3.26) \quad \|u(\cdot, 0) - \tilde{u}_{\mu,k}\|_{L^2(B_1)} \leq CHk^{-1/6},$$

where C depends on λ only.

Proof. Let $\mu \in (0, 1]$. By applying the triangle inequality and taking into account (3.11) and (3.24) we have

$$(3.27) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|u(\cdot, 0) - \tilde{u}_{\mu,k}(\cdot)\|_{L^2(B_1)} \leq \\ & \leq \left(\int_{B_1} dx \int_{-\lambda\mu/4}^{\lambda\mu/4} |u(x, 0) - \tilde{u}(x, t)|^2 \varphi_\mu(t) dt \right)^{1/2} + \\ & + \left(\int_{B_1} dx \int_{-\lambda(\mu+1)/4}^{\lambda(\mu+1)/4} |\tilde{u}(x, t)|^2 dt \right)^{1/2} \|\varphi_\mu - \varphi_{\mu,k}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} := I_1 + I_2. \end{aligned}$$

In order to estimate I_1 from above we observe that by the energy inequality, (3.1), and taking into account that $\partial_t \tilde{u}(x, 0) = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{B_2} |\partial_t \tilde{u}(x, t)|^2 dx &\leq \int_{B_2} (|\partial_t \tilde{u}(x, t)|^2 + |\nabla_x \tilde{u}(x, t)|^2) dx \leq \\
&\leq \lambda^{-2} \int_{B_2} (|\partial_t \tilde{u}(x, 0)|^2 + |\nabla_x \tilde{u}(x, 0)|^2) dx \leq CH^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where C depends on λ only. Therefore

$$I_1^2 \leq 2 \int_{B_1} dx \left| \int_0^{\lambda\mu/4} \partial_\eta \tilde{u}(x, \eta) d\eta \right|^2 \leq \frac{\lambda\mu}{2} \int_{B_1} dx \int_0^{\lambda\mu/4} |\partial_\eta \tilde{u}(x, \eta)|^2 d\eta \leq CH^2 \mu^2.$$

Hence

$$(3.28) \quad I_1 \leq CH\mu,$$

where C depends on λ only.

Concerning I_2 , first we observe that by using Poincaré inequality, by energy inequality, and by (3.1) (recalling that $\mu \in (0, 1]$), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.29) \quad \int_{-\lambda(\mu+1)/4}^{\lambda(\mu+1)/4} dt \int_{B_1} |\tilde{u}(x, t)|^2 dx &\leq \int_{-\lambda/2}^{\lambda/2} dt \int_{B_2} |\tilde{u}(x, t)|^2 dx \leq \\
&\leq C \int_{-\lambda/2}^{\lambda/2} dt \int_{B_2} |\nabla_x \tilde{u}(x, t)|^2 dx \leq CH^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where C depends on λ only.

In order to estimate from above $\|\varphi_\mu - \varphi_{\mu,k}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}$ we recall that $\widehat{\varphi}_\mu(\tau) = \widehat{\vartheta}(\mu\tau)$ and $\widehat{\varphi}_{\mu,k}(\tau) = \widehat{\vartheta}(\mu\tau) \left(\widehat{\vartheta}(k^{-1}\tau) \right)^k$, hence the Parseval identity and a change of variable give

$$(3.30) \quad 2\pi \|\varphi_\mu - \varphi_{\mu,k}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2 = \frac{1}{\mu} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| \left(\widehat{\vartheta}((\mu k)^{-1}\tau) \right)^k - 1 \right|^2 \left| \widehat{\vartheta}(\tau) \right|^2 d\tau.$$

By (3.16), (3.17) and (3.18) and by using the elementary inequalities $1 - e^{-z} \leq z$, for every $z \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\log s \leq s - 1$, for every $s > 0$, we have, whenever $\left| \frac{\lambda\tau}{4\mu k} \right| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$,

$$(3.31) \quad 0 \leq 1 - \left(\widehat{\vartheta}((\mu k)^{-1}\tau) \right)^k = 1 - e^{k \log \widehat{\vartheta}((\mu k)^{-1}\tau)} \leq \frac{\lambda^2 \tau^2}{8\mu^2 k}.$$

Now let $\delta \in (0, 1]$ be a number that we shall choose later and denote $\beta = \frac{4\mu k}{\sqrt{2\lambda}}\delta$. By (3.30), (3.16) and (3.31) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.32) \quad 2\pi \|\varphi_\mu - \varphi_{\mu,k}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2 &= \frac{1}{\mu} \int_{|\tau| \leq \beta} \left| \left(\widehat{\vartheta}((\mu k)^{-1}\tau) \right)^k - 1 \right|^2 \left| \widehat{\vartheta}(\tau) \right|^2 d\tau + \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\mu} \int_{|\tau| \geq \beta} \left| \left(\widehat{\vartheta}((\mu k)^{-1}\tau) \right)^k - 1 \right|^2 \left| \widehat{\vartheta}(\tau) \right|^2 d\tau \leq \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\mu} \int_{|\tau| \leq \beta} \left(\frac{\lambda^2 \tau^2}{8\mu^2 k} \right)^2 d\tau + \frac{1}{\mu} \int_{|\tau| > \beta} \left(\frac{32\pi^2}{\lambda^2 \tau^2} \right)^2 d\tau \leq C \left(k^3 \delta^5 + \frac{1}{\delta^3 \mu^4 k^3} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where C depends on λ only. If $\mu^2 k^{3/5} \geq 1$, we choose $\delta = (\mu^2 k^3)^{-1/4}$ and by (3.32) we have

$$(3.33) \quad \|\varphi_\mu - \varphi_{\mu,k}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \leq C (k^{3/5} \mu^2)^{-5/8},$$

where C depends on λ only. Hence recalling (3.29) we have

$$(3.34) \quad I_2 \leq CH (k^{3/5} \mu^2)^{-5/8}.$$

By (3.27), (3.28) and (3.28) we obtain

$$(3.35) \quad \|u(\cdot, 0) - \tilde{u}_{\mu,k}\|_{L^2(B_1)} \leq CH \left(\mu + (k^{3/5} \mu^2)^{-5/8} \right).$$

Now, if $\mu = k^{-1/6}$, $k \geq 1$ then (3.35) implies (3.26). \square

From now on we fix $\bar{\mu} := k^{-1/6}$ for $k \geq 1$ and we denote

$$(3.36) \quad \tilde{u}_k := \tilde{u}_{\bar{\mu},k}.$$

Let us introduce now, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ an even function $g_k \in C^{1,1}(\mathbb{R})$ such that if $|z| \leq k$ then we have $g_k(z) = \cosh z$, if $|z| \geq 2k$ then we have $g_k(z) = \cosh 2k$ and such that it satisfies the condition

$$(3.37) \quad |g_k(z)| + |g'_k(z)| + |g''_k(z)| \leq ce^{2k}, \text{ for every } z \in \mathbb{R},$$

where c is an absolute constant.

The following proposition is the main result of this first step.

Proposition 3.4. *Let*

$$(3.38) \quad v_k(x, y) := \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \alpha_j \widehat{\varphi}_{\bar{\mu}, k} \left(\sqrt{\lambda_j} \right) g_k \left(y \sqrt{\lambda_j} \right) e_j(x), \text{ for } (x, y) \in B_2 \times \mathbb{R}.$$

We have that $v_k(\cdot, y)$ belongs to $H^2(B_2) \cap H_0^1(B_2)$ for every $y \in \mathbb{R}$, $v_k(x, y)$ is an even function with respect to y and it satisfies

$$(3.39) \quad \begin{cases} q(x) \partial_y^2 v_k + \operatorname{div}(A(x) \nabla_x v_k) = f_k(x, y), & \text{in } B_2 \times \mathbb{R}, \\ v_k(\cdot, 0) = \tilde{u}_k, & \text{in } B_2. \end{cases}$$

and

$$(3.40) \quad \|v_k(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^2(B_{r_0})} \leq \varepsilon.$$

where

$$(3.41) \quad f_k(x, y) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j \alpha_j \widehat{\varphi}_{\bar{\mu}, k} \left(\sqrt{\lambda_j} \right) \left(g_k'' \left(y \sqrt{\lambda_j} \right) - g_k \left(y \sqrt{\lambda_j} \right) \right) e_j(x).$$

Moreover we have

$$(3.42) \quad \sum_{j=0}^2 \|\partial_y^j v_k(\cdot, y)\|_{H^{2-j}(B_2)} \leq C H e^{2k}, \text{ for every } y \in \mathbb{R},$$

$$(3.43) \quad \|f_k(\cdot, y)\|_{L^2(B_2)} \leq C H e^{2k} \min \left\{ 1, (4\pi\lambda^{-1}|y|)^{2k} \right\}, \text{ for every } y \in \mathbb{R},$$

where C depends on λ and Λ only.

Proof. First of all observe that

$$(3.44) \quad \left| \widehat{\varphi}_{\bar{\mu}, k} \left(\sqrt{\lambda_j} \right) \right| \leq \|\varphi_{\bar{\mu}, k}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} = 1.$$

For the sake of brevity, in what follows we shall omit k from v_k .

In order to prove that $v(\cdot, y) \in H^2(B_2) \cap H_0^1(B_2)$ for $y \in \mathbb{R}$, let $M, N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $M > N$ and let us denote by

$$(3.45) \quad V_{M, N}(x, y) := \sum_{j=N+1}^M \alpha_j \widehat{\varphi}_{\bar{\mu}, k} \left(\sqrt{\lambda_j} \right) g_k \left(y \sqrt{\lambda_j} \right) e_j(x).$$

By (3.37) and (3.44) we have, for every $y \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lambda \int_{B_2} |\nabla_x V_{M,N}(x, y)|^2 dx \leq \int_{B_2} A(x) \nabla_x V_{M,N}(x, y) \cdot \nabla_x V_{M,N}(x, y) dx = \\
& = \sum_{j=N+1}^M \left(\int_{B_2} A(x) \nabla_x e_j(x) \cdot \nabla_x V_{M,N}(x, y) dx \right) \widehat{\varphi}_{\bar{\mu}, k} \left(\sqrt{\lambda_j} \right) g_k \left(y \sqrt{\lambda_j} \right) \alpha_j = \\
& = \sum_{j=N+1}^M \lambda_j \alpha_j^2 \widehat{\varphi}_{\bar{\mu}, k}^2 \left(\sqrt{\lambda_j} \right) g_k^2 \left(y \sqrt{\lambda_j} \right) \leq c e^{4k} \sum_{j=N+1}^M \lambda_j \alpha_j^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, since $V_{M,N}(\cdot, y) \in H_0^1(B_2)$ we have

$$(3.46) \quad \|V_{M,N}(\cdot, y)\|_{H_0^1(B_2)}^2 \leq c e^{4k} \sum_{j=N+1}^M \lambda_j \alpha_j^2, \text{ for every } y \in \mathbb{R}.$$

The inequality above and (3.7) gives

$$\|V_{M,N}(\cdot, y)\|_{H_0^1(B_2)} \rightarrow 0, \text{ as } M, N \rightarrow \infty, \text{ for every } y \in \mathbb{R},$$

hence $v \in H_0^1(B_2)$.

In order to prove that $v \in H^2(B_2)$, first observe that by (3.37), (3.44) and (3.45) we have

$$\|\operatorname{div}(A \nabla_x V_{M,N})\|_{L^2(B_2)}^2 \leq c \lambda^{-1} e^{4k} \sum_{j=N+1}^M \lambda_j^2 \alpha_j^2, \text{ for every } y \in \mathbb{R},$$

then by the above inequality and standard L^2 regularity estimate [G-T] we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.47) \quad & \|D_x^2 V_{M,N}(\cdot, y)\|_{L^2(B_2)}^2 \leq \\
& \leq C \|\operatorname{div}(A \nabla_x V_{M,N})\|_{L^2(B_2)}^2 \leq e^{4k} \sum_{j=N+1}^M \lambda_j^2 \alpha_j^2, \text{ for every } y \in \mathbb{R},
\end{aligned}$$

where C depends on λ and Λ only. Hence $v \in H^2(B_2)$. Moreover by (3.7), (3.46) and (3.47) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.48) \quad & \|v(\cdot, y)\|_{L^2(B_2)} + \|\nabla_x v(\cdot, y)\|_{L^2(B_2)} + \|D_x^2 v(\cdot, y)\|_{L^2(B_2)} \leq \\
& \leq C H e^{2k}, \text{ for every } y \in \mathbb{R},
\end{aligned}$$

where C depends on λ and Λ only. Similarly we have $\partial_y v(\cdot, y), \partial_y^2 v(\cdot, y), \partial_y \nabla_x v(\cdot, y) \in L^2(B_2)$ and

$$(3.49) \quad \sum_{j=1}^2 \|\partial_y^j D_x^{2-j} v(\cdot, y)\|_{L^2(B_2)} \leq C H e^{2k}, \text{ for every } y \in \mathbb{R},$$

where C depends on λ and Λ only.

By (3.38) we have immediately that the function v is an even function. Moreover by straightforward calculations it is simple to check that v satisfies (3.39) and (3.41). Inequality (3.49) and (3.48), yields (3.42). By (3.38) we have immediately that the function v is an even function and it satisfies (3.39).

Concerning (3.40), we have by $\|\varphi_{\bar{\mu}, k}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} = 1$, by Schwarz inequality, by (2.4) and by (3.25),

$$\begin{aligned} \|v_k(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^2(B_{r_0})}^2 &= \int_{B_{r_0}} |\tilde{u}_k(x)|^2 dx \leq \\ &\leq \int_{-\lambda(\bar{\mu}+1)/4}^{\lambda(\bar{\mu}+1)/4} \left(\int_{B_{r_0}} |u(x, t)|^2 dx \right) \varphi_{\bar{\mu}, k}(t) dt \leq \varepsilon^2. \end{aligned}$$

Concerning (3.43), first observe that by the definition of g_k we have that $g_k''(y\sqrt{\lambda_j}) - g_k(y\sqrt{\lambda_j}) = 0$, for $|y|\sqrt{\lambda_j} \leq k$ and $|g_k''(y\sqrt{\lambda_j}) - g_k(y\sqrt{\lambda_j})| \leq ce^{2k}$, for $|y|\sqrt{\lambda_j} \geq k$. Hence, taking into account (3.16) and (3.21), we have, for every $y \in \mathbb{R}$ and for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$(3.50) \quad \begin{aligned} &\left| g_k''(y\sqrt{\lambda_j}) - g_k(y\sqrt{\lambda_j}) \right| \left| \widehat{\varphi}_{\bar{\mu}, k}(\sqrt{\lambda_j}) \right| \leq \\ &\leq ce^{2k} \left| \widehat{\vartheta}(k^{-1}\sqrt{\lambda_j}) \right|^k \chi_{\{|y|\sqrt{\lambda_j} \geq k\}} \leq \\ &\leq ce^{2k} \sup \left\{ \left| \widehat{\vartheta}(k^{-1}\sqrt{\lambda_j}) \right|^k : |y|\sqrt{\lambda_j} \geq k \right\} \leq ce^{2k} \min \left\{ 1, (4\pi\lambda^{-1}|y|)^{2k} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

By (3.42) and (3.50) we have

$$\|f_k(\cdot, y)\|_{L^2(B_2)} \leq ce^{2k} \min \left\{ 1, \left(4\sqrt{2}\pi\lambda^{-1}|y| \right)^{2k} \right\} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j^2 \alpha_j^2 \right)^{1/2}, \text{ for every } y \in \mathbb{R}.$$

By the above inequality and by (3.7) we obtain (3.43). □

SECOND STEP.

In what follows we shall denote by \tilde{B}_r the ball of \mathbb{R}^{n+1} of radius r centered at 0. In order to prove Proposition 3.6 stated below we need the following Lemma.

Lemma 3.5. *Let r be a positive number and let $w \in H^2(\tilde{B}_r)$ be a solution to the problem*

$$(3.51) \quad \begin{cases} q(x)\partial_y^2 w(x, y) + \operatorname{div}(A(x)\nabla_x w(x, y)) = 0, & \text{in } \tilde{B}_r, \\ \partial_y w(\cdot, 0) = 0, & \text{in } B_r, \end{cases}$$

where A satisfies (2.1) and q satisfies (2.2).

Then there exist $\beta \in (0, 1)$ and $C \geq 1$ depending on λ and Λ only such that

$$(3.52) \quad \int_{\tilde{B}_{r/4}} w^2 dx dy \leq C \left(\int_{\tilde{B}_r} w^2 dx dy \right)^{1-\beta} \left(r \int_{B_{r/2}} w^2(x, 0) dx \right)^\beta.$$

Proof. After scaling, we may assume $r = 1$. By [Al-R-Ro-Ve, Theorem 1.7] we have

$$(3.53) \quad \|w\|_{L^2(\tilde{B}_{1/4})} \leq C \left(\|w\|_{L^2(\tilde{B}_1)} \right)^{1-\tilde{\beta}} \left(\|w\|_{H^{1/2}(B_{1/2})} \right)^{\tilde{\beta}},$$

where C and $\tilde{\beta} \in (0, 1)$ depend on λ and Λ only. Now, by the interpolation inequality, the trace inequality and standard regularity for elliptic equation [G-T] we have

$$(3.54) \quad \begin{aligned} \|w\|_{H^{1/2}(B_{1/2})} &\leq C \|w\|_{L^2(B_{1/2})}^{2/3} \|w\|_{H^{3/2}(B_{1/2})}^{1/3} \\ &\leq C \|w\|_{L^2(B_{1/2})}^{2/3} \|w\|_{H^2(\tilde{B}_{3/4})}^{1/3} \leq C' \|w\|_{L^2(B_{1/2})}^{2/3} \|w\|_{L^2(\tilde{B}_1)}^{1/3}, \end{aligned}$$

where C' depends on λ and Λ only. By (3.53) and (3.54) we get (3.52) with $\beta = \frac{2\tilde{\beta}}{3}$. \square

Proposition 3.6. *Let v_k be defined in (3.38) and let $r_0 \leq \frac{\lambda}{8}$. Then we have*

$$(3.55) \quad \|v_k\|_{L^2(\tilde{B}_{r_0/4})} \leq C\sqrt{r_0} \left(\varepsilon + H(C_0 r_0)^{2k} \right)^\beta \left(H e^{2k} + H(C_0 r_0)^{2k} \right)^{1-\beta}.$$

where $\beta \in (0, 1)$, C depend on λ and Λ only and $C_0 = 4\pi e\lambda^{-1}$.

1
2
3
4
5 *Proof.* Let $w_k \in H^2(\tilde{B}_{r_0})$ be the solution to the following Dirichlet problem

$$6 \quad (3.56) \quad \begin{cases} q(x)\partial_y^2 w_k + \operatorname{div}(A(x)\nabla_x w_k) = f_k, & \text{in } \tilde{B}_{r_0}, \\ w_k = 0, & \text{on } \partial\tilde{B}_{r_0}. \end{cases}$$

7
8
9
10
11
12 Notice that, since f_k is an even function with respect to y , by the uniqueness
13 to the Dirichlet problem (3.56) we have that w_k is an even function with
14 respect to y .

15 By standard regularity estimates we have

$$16 \quad (3.57) \quad \|w_k\|_{L^2(\tilde{B}_{r_0})} + r_0 \|\nabla_{x,y} w_k\|_{L^2(\tilde{B}_{r_0})} \leq Cr_0^2 \|f_k\|_{L^2(\tilde{B}_{r_0})},$$

17
18
19 where C depends on λ only. By the above inequality and by the trace in-
20 equality we get

$$21 \quad (3.58) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|w_k(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^2(B_{r_0/2})} \leq \\ & \leq C \left(r_0^{-1/2} \|w_k\|_{L^2(\tilde{B}_{r_0})} + r_0^{1/2} \|\nabla_{x,y} w_k\|_{L^2(\tilde{B}_{r_0})} \right) \leq Cr_0^{3/2} \|f_k\|_{L^2(\tilde{B}_{r_0})}, \end{aligned}$$

22
23
24 where C depends on λ only.

25 Now, denoting

$$26 \quad (3.59) \quad z_k = v_k - w_k,$$

27
28 by (3.43), (3.40), (3.57) and (3.58) we have

$$29 \quad (3.60) \quad \|z_k(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^2(B_{r_0/2})} \leq \varepsilon + Cr_0^2 H (C_0 r_0)^{2k},$$

30
31 and

$$32 \quad (3.61) \quad \|z_k\|_{L^2(\tilde{B}_{r_0})} \leq Cr_0^{1/2} H \left(e^{2k} + r_0^2 (C_0 r_0)^{2k} \right),$$

33
34 where C depends on λ only.

35 Now by (3.56) we have

$$36 \quad \begin{cases} q(x)\partial_y^2 z_k + \operatorname{div}(A(x)\nabla_x z_k) = 0, & \text{in } \tilde{B}_{r_0}, \\ \partial_y z_k(\cdot, 0) = 0, & \text{on } B_{r_0}, \end{cases}$$

37
38 hence by applying Lemma 3.5 to the function z_k and by using (3.42), (3.59),
39 (3.60) and (3.61) the thesis follows. \square

In order to prove Theorem 2.1 we use a Carleman estimate with singular weight, proved for the first time by [A-K-S]. In order to control the dependence of the various constants, we use here the following version of such a Carleman estimate that was proved, in the context of parabolic operator, in [Es-Ve]. First we introduce some notation. Let P be the elliptic operator

$$(3.62) \quad P := q(x)\partial_y^2 + \operatorname{div}(A(x)\nabla_x).$$

Denote

$$(3.63) \quad \sigma(x, y) = (A^{-1}(0)x \cdot x + (q(0))^{-1}y^2)^{1/2},$$

$$(3.64) \quad \tilde{B}_r^\sigma = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : \sigma(x, y) \leq r\}, \quad r > 0,$$

Notice that

$$(3.65) \quad \tilde{B}_{\sqrt{\lambda}r}^\sigma \subset \tilde{B}_r \subset \tilde{B}_{r/\sqrt{\lambda}}^\sigma, \quad \text{for every } r > 0.$$

Theorem 3.7. *Let P be the operator (3.62) and assume that (2.1) and (2.2) are satisfied. There exists a constant $C_* > 1$ depending on λ and Λ only such that, denoting*

$$(3.66a) \quad \phi(s) = s \exp\left(\int_0^s \frac{e^{-C_*\eta} - 1}{\eta} d\eta\right),$$

$$(3.66b) \quad \delta(x, y) = \phi\left(\sigma(x, y)/2\sqrt{\lambda}\right),$$

for every $\tau \geq C_*$ and $U \in C_0^\infty\left(\tilde{B}_{2\sqrt{\lambda}/C_*}^\sigma \setminus \{0\}\right)$ we have

$$(3.67) \quad \begin{aligned} \tau \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}} \delta^{1-2\tau}(x, y) |\nabla_{x,y} U|^2 dx dy + \tau^3 \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}} \delta^{-1-2\tau}(x, y) U^2 dx dy &\leq \\ &\leq C_* \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}} \delta^{2-2\tau}(x, y) |PU|^2 dx dy. \end{aligned}$$

Conclusion of the proof of Theorem 2.1

Set

$$r_1 = \frac{\sqrt{\lambda}r_0}{16}$$

by (3.55) we have

$$(3.68) \quad \|v_k\|_{L^2(\tilde{B}_{4r_1}^\sigma)} \leq C\sqrt{r_1}S_k,$$

where C depends on λ and Λ only and

$$(3.69) \quad S_k = \left(\varepsilon + H(C_1r_1)^{2k}\right)^\beta \left(He^{2k} + H(C_1r_1)^{2k}\right)^{1-\beta},$$

where $C_1 = 16C_0/\sqrt{\lambda}$, recall that C_0 has been introduced in Proposition 3.6.

Denote

$$\delta_0(r) := \phi(r/2\sqrt{\lambda}) \quad , \text{ for every } r > 0$$

and

$$R = \frac{\sqrt{\lambda}}{C_*}.$$

Let us consider a function $h \in C_0^2(0, \delta_0(2R))$ such that $0 \leq h \leq 1$ and

$$\begin{aligned} h(s) &= 1, & \text{ for every } s \in [\delta_0(2r_1), \delta_0(R)], \\ h(s) &= 0, & \text{ for every } s \in [0, \delta_0(r_1)] \cup [\delta_0(3R/2), \delta_0(2R)], \\ r_1 |h'(s)| + r_1^2 |h''(s)| &\leq c, & \text{ for every } s \in [\delta_0(r_1), \delta_0(2r_1)], \\ |h'(s)| + |h''(s)| &\leq c, & \text{ for every } s \in [\delta_0(R), \delta_0(3R/2)], \end{aligned}$$

where c is an absolute constant.

Moreover, let us define

$$\zeta(x, y) = h(\delta(x, y)).$$

Notice that if $2r_1 \leq \sigma(x, y) \leq R$ then $\zeta(x, y) = 1$ and if $\sigma(x, y) \geq 2R$ or $\sigma(x, y) \leq r_1$ then $\zeta(x, y) = 0$.

For the sake of brevity, in what follows we shall omit k from v_k and f_k . By density, we can apply (3.67) to the function $U = \zeta v$ and we have, for every $\tau \geq C_*$,

$$(3.71) \quad \begin{aligned} &\tau \int_{\tilde{B}_{2R}^\sigma} \delta^{1-2\tau}(x, y) |\nabla_{x,y}(\zeta v)|^2 + \tau^3 \int_{\tilde{B}_{2R}^\sigma} \delta^{-1-2\tau}(x, y) |\zeta v|^2 \leq \\ &\leq C \int_{\tilde{B}_{2R}^\sigma} \delta^{2-2\tau}(x, y) |f|^2 \zeta^2 + C \int_{\tilde{B}_{2R}^\sigma} \delta^{2-2\tau}(x, y) |P\zeta|^2 v^2 + \\ &+ C \int_{\tilde{B}_{2R}^\sigma} \delta^{2-2\tau}(x, y) |\nabla_{x,y}v|^2 |\nabla_{x,y}\zeta|^2 := I_1 + I_2 + I_3, \end{aligned}$$

where C depends λ and Λ only.

Estimate of I_1 .

Notice that

$$(3.72) \quad \frac{\sqrt{|x|^2 + y^2}}{2C_2} \leq \delta(x, y) \leq \frac{C_2\sqrt{|x|^2 + y^2}}{2} \quad \text{for every } (x, y) \in \tilde{B}_2,$$

where $C_2 > 1$ depends on λ and Λ only.

By (3.43), (3.65) and (3.72) we have

$$(3.73) \quad \int_{\tilde{B}_{2\sqrt{\lambda}/C_*}^\sigma} \delta^{2-2\tau}(x, y) |f|^2 \zeta^2 dx dy \leq \int_{\tilde{B}_2} (2C_2|y|^{-1})^{-2+2\tau} |f|^2 dx dy \leq \\ \leq \int_{-2}^2 \left[(2C_2|y|^{-1})^{-2+2\tau} \int_{B_2} |f(x, y)|^2 dx \right] dy \leq CH^2 \int_{-2}^2 (2C_2|y|^{-1})^{-2+2\tau} (C_0|y|)^{4k} dy,$$

where C depends on λ and Λ only.

Now let k and τ satisfy the relation

$$(3.74) \quad \frac{\tau - 1}{2} \leq k.$$

By (3.73) and (3.74) we get

$$(3.75) \quad I_1 \leq CH^2 (C_3)^{4k},$$

where $C_3 = 2C_0C_2$.

Estimate of I_2

By (3.42) and (3.68) and (3.71) we have

$$I_2 \leq Cr_1^{-4} \int_{\tilde{B}_{2r_1}^\sigma \setminus \tilde{B}_{r_1}^\sigma} \delta^{2-2\tau}(x, y) v^2 dx dy + C \int_{\tilde{B}_{3R/2}^\sigma \setminus \tilde{B}_R^\sigma} \delta^{2-2\tau}(x, y) v^2 dx dy \leq \\ \leq C (r_1^{-3} \delta_0^{2-2\tau}(r_1) S_k^2 + e^{4k} H^2 \delta_0^{2-2\tau}(R)),$$

hence (3.72) gives

$$(3.76) \quad I_2 \leq C (\delta_0^{-1-2\tau}(r_1) S_k^2 + e^{4k} H^2 \delta_0^{-1-2\tau}(R)),$$

Estimate of I_3

By (3.71) we have

$$(3.77) \quad I_3 \leq Cr_1^{-2}\delta_0^{2-2\tau}(r_1) \int_{\tilde{B}_{2r_1}^\sigma \setminus \tilde{B}_{r_1}^\sigma} |\nabla_{x,y}v|^2 dx dy + \\ + C\delta_0^{2-2\tau}(R) \int_{\tilde{B}_{3R/2}^\sigma \setminus \tilde{B}_R^\sigma} |\nabla_{x,y}v|^2 dx dy.$$

Now in order to estimate from above the righthand side of (3.77) we use the Caccioppoli inequality, (3.42), (3.43) and (3.68) and we get

$$(3.78) \quad I_3 \leq C\delta_0^{2-2\tau}(r_1) \left(r_1^{-4} \int_{\tilde{B}_{4r_1}^\sigma \setminus \tilde{B}_{r_1/2}^\sigma} v^2 dx dy + \int_{\tilde{B}_{4r_1}^\sigma \setminus \tilde{B}_{r_1/2}^\sigma} f^2 dx dy \right) + \\ + C\delta_0^{2-2\tau}(R) \int_{\tilde{B}_{3R/2}^\sigma \setminus \tilde{B}_R^\sigma} |\nabla_{x,y}v|^2 dx dy \leq \\ \leq C \left(S_k^2 + H^2 (C_1 r_1)^{4k} \right) \delta_0^{-1-2\tau}(r_1) + CH^2 e^{4k} \delta_0^{1-2\tau}(R) := \tilde{I}_3$$

Now let $r_1 \leq \frac{R}{2}$ and let ρ be such that $\frac{2r_1}{\sqrt{\lambda}} \leq \rho \leq \frac{R}{\sqrt{\lambda}}$ and denote by $\tilde{\rho} = \sqrt{\lambda}\rho$. By estimating from below trivially the left hand side of (3.71) and taking into account (3.78) we have

$$(3.79) \quad \delta_0^{1-2\tau}(\tilde{\rho}) \int_{\tilde{B}_{\tilde{\rho}}^\sigma \setminus \tilde{B}_{2r_1}^\sigma} |\nabla_{x,y}v|^2 + \delta_0^{-1-2\tau}(\tilde{\rho}) \int_{\tilde{B}_{\tilde{\rho}}^\sigma \setminus \tilde{B}_{2r_1}^\sigma} |v|^2 \leq I_1 + I_2 + \tilde{I}_3.$$

Now let us add at both the side of (3.79) the quantity

$$\delta_0^{1-2\tau}(\tilde{\rho}) \int_{\tilde{B}_{2r_1}^\sigma} |\nabla_{x,y}v|^2 + \delta_0^{-1-2\tau}(\tilde{\rho}) \int_{\tilde{B}_{2r_1}^\sigma} v^2,$$

by using standard estimates for second order elliptic equations and by taking into account that $\delta_0(\tilde{\rho}) \geq \delta_0(r_1)$, we have

$$(3.80) \quad \rho^2 \int_{\tilde{B}_{\tilde{\rho}}^\sigma} |\nabla_{x,y}v|^2 + \int_{\tilde{B}_{\tilde{\rho}}^\sigma} v^2 \leq \delta_0^{1+2\tau}(\tilde{\rho}) \left(I_1 + I_2 + C\tilde{I}_3 \right),$$

where C depends on λ and Λ only.

Now by (3.72), (3.75), (3.76), (3.78) and (3.80) it is simple to derive that if (3.74) is satisfied then we have

$$(3.81) \quad \rho^2 \int_{\tilde{B}_{\lambda\rho}} |\nabla_{x,y}v|^2 + \int_{\tilde{B}_{\lambda\rho}} v^2 \leq \\ \leq C \left[S_k^2 \left(\frac{\delta_0(\tilde{\rho})}{\delta_0(r_1)} \right)^{1+2\tau} + H^2 C_4^k \left(\frac{\delta_0(\tilde{\rho})}{\delta_0(R)} \right)^{1+2\tau} \right],$$

where $C_4 > 1$ depends on λ and Λ only.

Now, by applying a standard trace inequality and by recalling that $v(\cdot, 0) = \tilde{u}_k(\cdot, 0)$ in B_2 (where \tilde{u}_k is defined by (3.36)) we have

$$(3.82) \quad \int_{B_{\lambda\rho/2}} |\tilde{u}_k(\cdot, 0)|^2 \leq \\ \leq C\rho^{-1} \left[S_k^2 \left(\frac{\delta_0(\tilde{\rho})}{\delta_0(r_1)} \right)^{1+2\tau} + H^2 C_4^k \left(\frac{\delta_0(\tilde{\rho})}{\delta_0(R)} \right)^{1+2\tau} \right].$$

By Proposition 3.3, by (3.69) and (3.82) we have, for $r_1 \leq \frac{R}{2}$

$$(3.83) \quad \rho \int_{B_{\lambda\rho/2}} |u(\cdot, 0)|^2 \leq C (H_{k,\tau} + H^2 k^{-1/3}) + \\ + C \left[C_5^k \left(\frac{\delta_0(\tilde{\rho})}{\delta_0(r_1)} \right)^{1+2\tau} H^{2(1-\beta)} \varepsilon^{2\beta} + H^2 C_4^k \left(\frac{\delta_0(\tilde{\rho})}{\delta_0(R)} \right)^{1+2\tau} \right],$$

where

$$H_{k,\tau} := H^2 \left(\frac{\delta_0(\tilde{\rho})}{\delta_0(r_1)} \right)^{1+2\tau} C_5^k r_1^{4\beta k}.$$

and C, C_5 depend on λ, Λ only.

Now let us choose $\tau = \frac{4\beta k - 1}{2}$. We have that (3.74) is satisfied and by (3.72), (3.83) we have that there exist constants $C_6 > 1$ and k_0 depending on λ and Λ only such that for every $k \geq k_0$ we have

$$(3.84) \quad \rho \int_{B_{\lambda\rho/2}} |u(\cdot, 0)|^2 \leq C_6 H_1^2 \left[(C_6 \rho r_1^{-1})^{4\beta k} \varepsilon_1^{2\beta} + (C_6 \rho)^{4\beta k} + k^{-1/3} \right],$$

where

$$H_1 := H + e\varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon_1 := \frac{\varepsilon}{H + e\varepsilon}.$$

Now, let us denote by

$$\bar{k} := \left\lceil \frac{\log \varepsilon_1}{2 \log r_1} \right\rceil + 1,$$

where, for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$, we set $[s] := \max \{p \in \mathbb{Z} : p \leq s\}$. If $\bar{k} \leq k_0$ we choose $k = \bar{k}$ so that by (3.84) we have, for $\rho \leq 1/C_6$,

$$(3.85) \quad \rho \int_{B_{\lambda\rho/2}} |u(\cdot, 0)|^2 \leq C_2 H_1^2 \left(\varepsilon_1^{2\beta\theta_0} + \left(\frac{2 \log(1/r_1)}{\log(1/\varepsilon_1)} \right)^{1/3} \right),$$

where

$$(3.86) \quad \theta_0 = \frac{\log(1/C_6\rho)}{2\log(1/r_1)}.$$

Otherwise, if $\bar{k} < k_0$ then multiplying both the side of such an inequality by $\log(1/C_6\rho)$ and by (3.86) we get $\theta_0 \log(1/\varepsilon_1) \leq k_0 \log(1/C_6\rho)$. Hence

$$(H + e\varepsilon)^{2\beta\theta_0} \leq (C_6\rho)^{-2\beta k_0} \varepsilon^{2\beta\theta_0}.$$

By this inequality and by (2.5) we have trivially

$$(3.87) \quad \int_{B_{\lambda\rho/2}} |u(\cdot, 0)|^2 \leq (H + e\varepsilon)^2 = (H + e\varepsilon)^{2(1-\beta\theta_0)} \varepsilon^{2\beta\theta_0} \leq (H + e\varepsilon)^{2(1-\beta\theta_0)} (C_6\rho)^{-2\beta k_0} \varepsilon^{2\beta\theta_0}.$$

Finally by (3.85) and (3.87) we obtain (2.6). \square

3.2 Proof of Theorem 2.3

First, let us assume $A(0) = I$ where I is the identity matrix $n \times n$. Following the arguments of [AE] or [Al-B-Ro-Ve] we have there exist $\rho_1, \rho_2 \in (0, \rho_0]$ such that $\frac{\rho_1}{\rho_0}, \frac{\rho_2}{\rho_0}$ depend on λ, Λ, E only and we can construct a function $\Phi \in C^{1,1}(\bar{B}_{\rho_2}(0), \mathbb{R}^n)$ such that

$$(3.88a) \quad \Phi(B_{\rho_2}) \subset B_{\rho_1},$$

$$(3.88b) \quad \Phi(y', 0) = (y', \phi(y')), \quad \text{for every } y' \in B'_{\rho_2},$$

$$(3.88c) \quad \Phi(B_{\rho_2}^+) \subset K_{\rho_1},$$

$$(3.88d) \quad C_1^{-1}|y - z| \leq |\Phi(x) - \Phi(z)| \leq C_1|y - z|, \quad \text{for every } y, z \in B_{\rho_2},$$

$$(3.88e) \quad C_2^{-1} \leq |\det D\Phi(y)| \leq C_2, \quad \text{for every } y \in B_{\rho_2},$$

$$(3.88f) \quad |\det D\Phi(y) - \det D\Phi(z)| \leq C_3|y - z|, \quad \text{for every } y, z \in B_{\rho_2},$$

where $C_1, C_2, C_3 \geq 1$ depend on λ, Λ, E only.

Denoting

$$\bar{A}(y) = |\det D\Phi(y)|(D\Phi^{-1})(\Phi(y))A(\Phi(y))(D\Phi^{-1})^*(\Phi(y)),$$

$$(3.89) \quad v(y, t) = u(\Phi(y), t),$$

we have

$$(3.90a) \quad \bar{A}(0) = I$$

$$(3.90b) \quad \bar{a}^{nk}(y', 0) = \bar{a}^{kn}(y', 0) = 0, k = 1, \dots, n-1.$$

Moreover, we have that the ellipticity and Lipschitz constants of \bar{A} depend on λ, Λ, E only. For every $y \in B_{\rho_2}(0)$, let us denote by $\tilde{A}(y) = \{\tilde{a}_{ij}(y)\}_{i,j=1}^n$ the matrix with entries given by

$$\tilde{a}^{ij}(y', |y_n|) = \bar{a}^{ij}(y', |y_n|), \quad \text{if either } i, j \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}, \text{ or } i = j = n,$$

$$\tilde{a}^{nj}(y', y_n) = \tilde{a}^{jn}(y', y_n) = \text{sgn}(y_n)\bar{a}^{nj}(y', |y_n|), \quad \text{if } 1 \leq j \leq n-1.$$

We have that \tilde{A} satisfies the same ellipticity and Lipschitz continuity conditions as \bar{A} .

Now, if u satisfies the boundary condition (2.13) then we define

$$U(y, t) = \text{sgn}(y_n)v(y', |y_n|, t), \quad \text{for } (y, t) \in B_{\rho_2} \times (-\lambda\rho_2, \lambda\rho_2),$$

$$\tilde{q}(y) = |\det D\Phi(y', |y_n|)|, \quad \text{for } y \in B_{\rho_2},$$

we have that $U \in \mathcal{W}((-\lambda\rho_2, \lambda\rho_2); B_{\rho_2})$ is a solution to

$$(3.91) \quad \tilde{q}(y)\partial_t^2 U - \text{div}(\tilde{A}(y)\nabla U) = 0, \quad \text{in } B_{\rho_2} \times (-\lambda\rho_2, \lambda\rho_2).$$

Moreover, by (3.88d) we have that

$$K_{r/C_1} \subset \Phi(B_r^+) \subset K_{C_1 r}, \quad \text{for every } r \leq \rho_2.$$

Now we can apply Theorem 2.1 to the function U and then by simple changes of variables in the integrals we obtain (2.17). In the general case $A(0) \neq I$ we can consider a linear transformation $G : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ such that setting $A'(Gx) = \frac{GA(x)G^*}{\det G}$ we have $A'(0) = I$. Therefore, noticing that

$$B_{\sqrt{\lambda}r} \subset G(B_r) \subset B_{\sqrt{\lambda^{-1}}r}, \quad \text{for every } r > 0,$$

it is a simple matter to get (2.17) in the general case.

If u satisfies the boundary condition (2.14) then we define

$$V(y, t) = v(y', |y_n|, t), \quad \text{for } (y, t) \in B_{\rho_2} \times (-\lambda\rho_2, \lambda\rho_2),$$

and we get that V is a solution to (2.12). Therefore, arguing as before we obtain again (2.17). \square

4 Concluding Remark - A first order perturbation

In this subsection we outline the proof of an extension of Theorems 2.1, 2.3 for solution to the equation

$$(4.1) \quad q(x)\partial_t^2 u - Lu = 0, \quad \text{in } B_{\rho_0} \times (-\lambda\rho_0, \lambda\rho_0).$$

where

$$(4.2) \quad Lu = \operatorname{div}(A(x)\nabla_x u) + b(x) \cdot \nabla_x u + c(x)u,$$

and A, q satisfy (2.1), (2.2), $b = (b^1, \dots, b^n)$ $b^j \in C^{0,1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $c \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Moreover we assume

$$(4.3a) \quad |b(x)| \leq \lambda^{-1}\rho_0^{-1}, \quad \text{for every } x \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

$$(4.3b) \quad |b(x) - b(y)| \leq \frac{\Lambda}{\rho_0^2} |x - y|, \quad \text{for every } x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

and

$$(4.4) \quad |c(x)| \leq \lambda^{-1}\rho_0^{-2}, \quad \text{for every } x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

In what follows we assume $\rho_0 = 1$.

First of all we consider the case in which

$$(4.5) \quad b \equiv 0$$

and we set

$$(4.6) \quad L_0 u = \operatorname{div}(A(x)\nabla_x u) + c(x)u,$$

Let us denote by λ_j , with $\lambda_1 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_m \leq 0 < \lambda_{m+1} \leq \dots \leq \lambda_j \leq \dots$ the eigenvalues associated to the problem

$$(4.7) \quad \begin{cases} L_0 v + \omega q(x)v = 0, & \text{in } B_2, \\ v \in H^1(B_2), \end{cases}$$

and by $e_j(\cdot)$ the corresponding eigenfunctions normalized by

$$(4.8) \quad \int_{B_2} e_j^2(x)q(x)dx = 1.$$

In this case the main difference with respect to the case considered above is the presence of non positive eigenvalues $\lambda_1 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_m$. In what follows we indicate the simple changes in the proof of Theorem 2.1 in order to get the same estimate (2.6) (with maybe different constants s_0 and C). Let ε and H be the same of (2.4) and (2.5)

Likewise the case $c \equiv 0$, the proof can be reduced to the even part u_+ with respect to t of solution u of equation (4.1). Moreover denoting again by

$$(4.9) \quad \tilde{u}(x, t) := \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \alpha_j e_j(x) \cos \sqrt{\lambda_j} t,$$

it is easy to check that instead of Proposition 3.1 we have

Proposition 4.1. *We have*

$$(4.10) \quad \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (1 + |\lambda_j| + \lambda_j^2) \alpha_j^2 \leq CH^2,$$

where C depends on λ, Λ only. Moreover, $\tilde{u} \in \mathcal{W}(\mathbb{R}; B_2) \cap C^0(\mathbb{R}; H^2(B_2) \cap H_0^1(B_2))$ is an even function with respect to variable t and it satisfies

$$(4.11) \quad \begin{cases} q(x)\partial_t^2 \tilde{u} - L_0 \tilde{u} = 0, & \text{in } B_2 \times \mathbb{R}, \\ \tilde{u}(\cdot, 0) = \tilde{u}_0, & \text{in } B_2, \\ \partial_t \tilde{u}(\cdot, 0) = 0, & \text{in } B_2. \end{cases}$$

Similarly to (3.9), the uniqueness to the Cauchy problem for the equation $q(x)\partial_t^2 u - L_0 u = 0$ implies

$$\tilde{u}(x, t) = u_+(x, t), \quad \text{for } |x| + \lambda^{-1}|t| < 1.$$

Likewise the Section 3 we set

$$\tilde{u}_k := \tilde{u}_{\bar{\mu}, k},$$

where $\bar{\mu} := k^{-\frac{1}{6}}$, $k \geq 1$ and $\tilde{u}_{\mu, k}$ is defined by (3.25). In the present case we set, instead of (3.38),

$$(4.12) \quad v_k(x, y) := v_k^{(1)}(x, y) + v_k^{(2)}(x, y),$$

where

(4.13a)

$$v_k^{(1)}(x, y) = \sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_j \widehat{\varphi}_{\bar{\mu}, k} \left(i\sqrt{|\lambda_j|} \right) \cos \left(\sqrt{|\lambda_j|} |y| \right) e_j(x), \text{ for } (x, y) \in B_2 \times \mathbb{R}$$

(4.13b)

$$v_k^{(2)}(x, y) = \sum_{j=m+1}^{\infty} \alpha_j \widehat{\varphi}_{\bar{\mu}, k} \left(\sqrt{\lambda_j} \right) g_k \left(y\sqrt{\lambda_j} \right) e_j(x), \text{ for } (x, y) \in B_2 \times \mathbb{R}.$$

and $g_k(z)$ is the same function introduced in Section 3, in particular it satisfies (3.37).

Instead of Proposition 3.4 we have

Proposition 4.2. *Let v_k be defined by (4.12). We have that $v_k(\cdot, y)$ belongs to $H^1(B_2) \cap H_0^1(B_2)$ for every $y \in \mathbb{R}$, $v_k(x, y)$ is an even function with respect to y and it satisfies*

$$(4.14) \quad \begin{cases} q(x)\partial_y^2 v_k + \operatorname{div}(A(x)\nabla_x v_k) = f_k(x, y), & \text{in } B_2 \times \mathbb{R}, \\ v_k(\cdot, 0) = \tilde{u}_k, & \text{in } B_2. \end{cases}$$

and

$$(4.15) \quad \|v_k(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^2(B_{r_0})} \leq \varepsilon.$$

where

$$(4.16) \quad f_k(x, y) = \sum_{j=m+1}^{\infty} \lambda_j \alpha_j \widehat{\varphi}_{\bar{\mu}, k} \left(\sqrt{\lambda_j} \right) \left(g_k'' \left(y\sqrt{\lambda_j} \right) - g_k \left(y\sqrt{\lambda_j} \right) \right) e_j(x).$$

Moreover we have

$$(4.17) \quad \sum_{j=0}^2 \|\partial_y^j v_k(\cdot, y)\|_{H^{2-j}(B_2)} \leq C e^{\lambda\sqrt{|\lambda_1|}} H e^{2k}, \text{ for every } y \in \mathbb{R},$$

$$(4.18) \quad \|f_k(\cdot, y)\|_{L^2(B_2)} \leq C H e^{2k} \min \left\{ 1, (4\pi\lambda^{-1}|y|)^{2k} \right\}, \text{ for every } y \in \mathbb{R},$$

where C depends on λ and Λ only.

Instead of Proposition 3.6 we have

Proposition 4.3. *Let v_k be defined in (4.12). Then there exists a constant c , $0 < c < 1$, depending on λ only such that if $r_0 \leq c$, we have*

$$(4.19) \quad \|v_k\|_{L^2(\tilde{B}_{r_0/4})} \leq C\sqrt{r_0}e^{\lambda\sqrt{|\lambda_1|}} \left(\varepsilon + H(C_0r_0)^{2k}\right)^\beta \left(He^{2k} + H(C_0r_0)^{2k}\right)^{1-\beta}.$$

where $\beta \in (0, 1)$, C depend on λ and Λ only and $C_0 = 4\pi e\lambda^{-1}$.

With propositions 4.1, 4.2, 4.3 at hand and by using Carleman estimate (3.67), the proofs of estimates (2.6) and (2.17) are straightforward, whenever (4.5) is satisfied.

In the more general case we use a well known trick, see for instance [La-O], to transform the equation (4.1) in a self-adjoint equation. Let z be a new variable and denote by $A_0(x, z) = \{a_0^{ij}(x, z)\}_{i,j=1}^{(n+1)}$ the real-valued symmetric $(n+1) \times (n+1)$ matrix whose entries are defined as follows. Let $\eta \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$ be a function such that $\eta(z) = z$, for $z \in (-1, 1)$, and $|\eta(z)| + |\eta'(z)| \leq 2\lambda^{-1}$

$$\begin{aligned} a_0^{ij}(x, z) &= a_0^{ij}(x), \quad \text{if } i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}, \\ a_0^{(n+1)j}(x, z) &= a_0^{j(n+1)}(x, z) = \eta(z)b^j(x), \quad \text{if } 1 \leq j \leq n, \\ a_0^{(n+1)(n+1)}(x, z) &= K_0 \end{aligned}$$

where $K_0 = 8\lambda^{-3} + 1$. We have that A_0 satisfies

$$\lambda_0|\zeta|^2 \leq A_0(x, z)\zeta \cdot \zeta \leq \lambda_0^{-1}|\zeta|^2, \quad \text{for every } \zeta \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$$

and

$$|A_0(x, z) - A_0(y, w)| \leq \Lambda_0(|x - y| + |z - w|), \quad \text{for every } (x, z), (y, w) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$$

where λ_0 depends on λ only and Λ_0 depends on λ, Λ only. Denote

$$\mathcal{L}U := \operatorname{div}_{x,z}(A_0(x, z)\nabla_{x,z}U) + c(x)U$$

It is easy to check that if $u(x, t)$ is a solution of (4.1) ($\rho_0 = 1$) then $U(x, z, t) := u(x, t)$ is solution to

$$q(x)\partial_t^2U - \mathcal{L}U = 0, \quad \text{in } \tilde{B}_1 \times (-\lambda, \lambda).$$

Therefore we are reduced to the case considered previously in this subsection and again the proofs of estimates (2.6) and (2.17) are now straightforward.

References

- [AE] V. Adolfsson, L. Escauriaza, $C^{1,\alpha}$ domains and unique continuation at the boundary, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 50 (1997), 935-969.
- [Al] G. Alessandrini, Examples of instability in inverse boundary-value problems, *Inverse Problems* 13, (1997), 887897.
- [Al-B-Ro-Ve] G. Alessandrini, E. Beretta, E. Rosset, S. Vessella, Optimal stability for inverse elliptic boundary value problems with unknown boundaries, *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci.* 29, (4), (2000), 755-806.
- [Al-R-Ro-Ve] G. Alessandrini, L. Rondi, E. Rosset, S. Vessella, The stability for the Cauchy problem for elliptic equations, *Inverse Problems* 25 (2009), 1-47.
- [Al-Ve] G. Alessandrini, S. Vessella, Remark on the strong unique continuation property for parabolic operators *Proc. AMS* 132, (2004), 499501
- [A-K-S] N. Aronszajn, A. Krzywicki and J. Szarski, *A unique continuation theorem for exterior differential forms on riemannian manifolds*, *Ark. for Matematik*, 4, (34), (1962), 417-453.
- [Ba-Za] M. S. Baouendi and E. C. Zachmanoglou, Unique continuation of solutions of partial differential equations and inequalities from manifolds of any dimension. *Duke Math. Journal*, 45, (1), (1978), 1-13.
- [Bo] J. Boman, A local vanishing theorem for distribution, *CRAS Paris*, 315, series I, (1992), 1231-1234.
- [C-Ro-Ve] B. Canuto, E. Rosset, S. Vessella, Quantitative estimates of unique continuation for parabolic equations and inverse initial-boundary value problems with unknown boundaries, *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.* 354, (2), (2002), 491-535.
- [CRoVe2] B. Canuto, E. Rosset, S. Vessella, A stability result in the localization of cavities in a thermic conducting medium, *ESAIM: Control Optimization and Calculus of Variations.* 7, 2002, 521-565.
- [Che-Y-Z] J. Cheng, M. Yamamoto, Q. Zhou, Unique continuation on a hyperplane for wave equation. *Chinese Ann. Math. Ser. B* 20 (1999), no. 4, 385392.

- 1
2
3
4
5 [Che-D-Y] J. Cheng, G. Ding, M. Yamamoto, Uniqueness along a line for
6 an inverse wave source problem. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* 27
7 (2002), no. 9-10, 2055-2069.
8
9
10 [Dc-R] Di Cristo, M., Rondi, L.: Examples of exponential instability for
11 inverse inclusion and scattering problems. *Inverse Problems* 19, 685701
12 (2003) 8. Engl, H.W., Langthaler, T., Manselli, P.: On an inverse problem
13 for a nonlinear heat
14
15 [Dc-R-Ve] M. Di Cristo, L. Rondi, S. Vessella, Stability properties of an in-
16 verse parabolic problem with unknown boundaries, *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl.*
17 (4) 185 (2) (2006) 223-255.
18
19 [Es-Fe] L. Escauriaza, J. Fernandez, Unique continuation for parabolic op-
20 erator *Ark. Mat.* 41, (2003) 3560
21
22 [Es-Fe-Ve] L. Escauriaza, F. J. Fernandez, S. Vessella, Doubling properties
23 of caloric functions *Appl. Anal.* vol 85, (2006) (Special issue dedicated to
24 the memory of Carlo Pucci ed R Magnanini and G Talenti
25
26
27 [Es-Ve] L. Escauriaza, S. Vessella, Optimal three cylinder inequalities for
28 solutions to parabolic equations with Lipschitz leading coefficients, in G.
29 Alessandrini and G. Uhlmann eds, "Inverse Problems: Theory and Appli-
30 cations" *Contemporary Mathematics* 333, (2003), American Mathematical
31 Society, Providence R. I. , 79-87.
32
33
34 [Ev] L. C. Evans, *Partial differential equations*, *American Mathematical So-*
35 *ciety, Providence 1998.*
36
37
38 [Ga-Li] N. Garofalo, F. H. Lin, Monotonicity properties of variational in-
39 tegrals Ap-weights and unique continuation *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* 35,
40 (1986), 24567
41
42
43 [G-T] D. Gilbarg, N. S. Trudinger, *Elliptic partial differential equations of*
44 *second order*, Springer, New York, 1983.
45
46
47 [Hö1] L. Hörmander, Uniqueness Theorem for Second Order Elliptic Differ-
48 ential Equations, *Comm. Part. Diff. Equations*, 8 (1),1983, 21-64.
49
50 [Hö2] L. Hörmander, On the uniqueness of the Cauchy problem under partial
51 analyticity assumption. *Geometrical Optics and related Topics PNLDE*
52 (32) Birkhäuser (1997). Editors: Colombini-Lerner.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4
5 [Is1] V. Isakov, Inverse problems for partial differential equations, volume
6 12 of Applied Mathematical Sciences, Springer, New York, second edition,
7 2006.
8
9
10 [Is2] V. Isakov, On uniqueness of obstacles and boundary conditions from
11 restricted dynamical and scattering data, *Inverse Probl. Imaging* 2 (2008),
12 no. 1, 151165.
13
14 [Jo] F. John, Continuous dependence on data for solutions of partial differ-
15 ential equations with a prescribed bound, *Comm. Pure and Appl. Math.*,
16 VOL. XIII, (1960), 551-586
17
18 [Ko-Ta1] H. Koch, D. Tataru, Carleman estimates and unique continuation
19 for second-order elliptic equations with nonsmooth coefficients. *Comm.*
20 *Pure Appl. Math.* 54 (2001), no. 3, 339360.
21
22 [Ko-Ta2] H. Koch, D. Tataru, Carleman estimates and unique continuation
23 for second order parabolic equations with nonsmooth coefficients. *Comm.*
24 *Partial Differential Equations* 34 (2009), no. 4-6, 305366.
25
26 [La-O] E. M. Landis, O. A. Oleinik, Generalized analyticity and some related
27 properties of solutions of elliptic and parabolic equations *Russ. Math. Surv.*
28 29, (1974), 195212.
29
30 [La] E. M. Landis, A three sphere theorem *Soviet Math. Dokl.* 4, (1963), 768
31 (Engl. Transl.)
32
33 [Le] G. Lebeau, Un problem d'unicité forte pour l'équation des ondes, *Comm.*
34 *Part. Diff. Equat.* 24 (1999), 777-783.
35
36 [Ma] K. Masuda, A unique continuation theorem for solutions of wave equa-
37 tion with variable coefficients, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 21, 369-376 (1968)
38
39 [Ra] Rakesh, A remark on unique continuation along and across lower dimen-
40 sional planes for the wave equation. *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.* 32 (2009),2,
41 246-252.
42
43 [Ro-Zu] L. Robbiano and C. Zuily, Uniqueness in the Cauchy problem for
44 operators with with partial holomorphic coefficients. *Inventiones Math.*,
45 131, 3, 1998, 493-539.
46
47 [Ta] D. Tataru, Unique continuation for solutions to PDE's; between
48 Hörmander theorem and Holmgren theorem, *Comm. Part. Diff. Equat.*,
49 20, (1995), 855-884
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

[Ve1] S. Vessella Quantitative estimates of unique continuation for parabolic equations, determination of unknown time-varying boundaries and optimal stability estimates, *Inverse Problems* 24, (2008), pp. 1–81.

[Ve2] S. Vessella, Stability estimates for an inverse hyperbolic initial boundary value problem with unknown boundaries, in print on *SIAM J.Math. Anal.*