OUKA
The University of Osaka
Institutional Knowledge Archive

Title	Localization of differential operators and the uniqueness of the Cauchy problem
Author(s)	Tsuno, Yoshimichi
Citation	Osaka Journal of Mathematics. 1980, 17(3), p. 751-762
Version Type	VoR
URL	https://doi.org/10.18910/7931
rights	
Note	

The University of Osaka Institutional Knowledge Archive : OUKA

https://ir.library.osaka-u.ac.jp/

The University of Osaka

Tsuno, Y.
Osaka J. Math.
17 (1980), 751-762

LOCALIZATION OF DIFFERENTIAL OPERATORS AND THE UNIQUNESS OF THE CAUCHY PROBLEM

YOSHIMICHI TSUNO

(Received June 18, 1979)

1. Introduction

Let $P(x, \partial_x)$ be a differential operator of order m with analytic coefficients in an open set U in $\boldsymbol{R}^n$ and Ω be an open subset of U with C^1 boundary $\partial\Omega$. Then the uniqueness theorem of Holmgren which is extended for distribution solutions ([3]) states that a distribution solution $u(x)$ of the equation $Pu=0$ in U vanishing in Ω must vanish in a neiborhood of $\partial\Omega$ if $\partial\Omega$ is non-characteristic. The extension of this theorem to the case near a characteristic point has been made by many authors relating to the problem of deciding the P-convexity domains. Among others Hörmander [3] showed that when the principal part is real the uniquness theorem holds if $\partial\Omega\in C^2$ and the characteristic points are simple and some convexity conditions are satisfied at these points. The refinements of this Hörmander's result are made by Treves [8], Zachmanoglou [10], [11] and Hörmander [5]. Recently Bony [2] introduced the notion of strongly characteristic and proved the uniquness theorem for degenerate equations. Bony's result is extended by Hörmander [6]. In this note we deal with a differential operator which is highly degenerated at some point p on $\partial\Omega$ and obtain the suffcient conditions to get the uniquness theorem. Though the uniquness theorem is invariant under the analytic change of coordinates, we here employ the weighted local coordinates at p such that the normal direction x_1 of $\partial\Omega$ at p is assigned the weight 2, while the tangential directions $x_2, \cdots, x_n$ are each assigned the weight 1. The motivation of this employment is that the boundary $\partial\Omega$ can be approximated by the quadratic hypersurface of the form

$$x_1 = \sum_{i,j\geq 2} a_{ij}x_ix_j \,. \tag{1.1}$$

The transformations of the coordinates in this note are limited to the ones which preserve the weights $(2, 1, \cdots, 1)$ (see the section 2 for the precise definition). In the section 3, the basic theorem is proved under some fixed local coordinates. The idea of the proof is due to Hörmander [3] and extensively used by Treves [8], Zachmanoglou [10], [11] and others. That is to construct the family of surfaces

which are non-characteristic with respect to $P(x, \partial_x)$ and cover a neighborhood of p. This basic theorem is a generalization of Hörmander's theorem [3] of the simple characteristic case. In the last section, §4, we study the geometric conditions on $P(x, \partial_x)$ and $\partial\Omega$ to insure the existence of the local coordinates in the third section. The assumptions are made in relation to the localization of $P(x, \partial_x)$ at (p, N), where N is the normal direction of $\partial\Omega$ at p. The localization of an operator is also due to Hörmander [4] to research the location of the singularities of the solutions of $Pu=0$. Our method in this note is also used to show the holomorphic continuation of the solutions of $P(z, \partial_z)u=f$ in the complex n dimensional space, which is to appear in [9].

2. Weighted coordinates

As in the introduction, we shall approximate $\partial\Omega$ by the quadratic hypersurface of the form (1.1). For this sake we here introduce the weighted coordinates. Weighted coordinates are also used by T. Bloom and I. Graham [1] to determine the type of the real submanifold in $\boldsymbol{C}^n$ which is firstly introduced by Kohn in relation to the boundary regularity for the $\bar{\partial}$-Neumann problem. In this note we use the simplest weighted coordinates.

Let $(x_1, \cdots, x_n)$ be a local coordinates in U of $\boldsymbol{R}^n$. Then we say that $(x_1, \cdots, x_n)$ is the weighted coordinates system of the weights $(2, 1, \cdots, 1)$ if the coordinate function x_1 has the weight 2 and x_j $(j=2, \cdots, n)$ has the weight 1. The weight of a monomial x^α is determined by $2\alpha_1+\alpha_2+\cdots+\alpha_n$. An analytic function $f(x)$ at 0 has the weight l if l is the lowest weight among the monomials in the Taylor expansion of $f(x)$ at 0. For convenience, the weight of $f=0$ is assigned $+\infty$. The weight of a differential operator is defined by the corresponding negative weight. For a differential monomial $(\partial/\partial x)^\alpha$, its weight is defined by $-2\alpha_1-\alpha_2-\cdots-\alpha_n$. The weight of $a(x)(\partial/\partial x)^\alpha$ is equal to $\text{weight}(a(x))+\text{weight}((\partial/\partial x)^\alpha)$ and the weight of a linear partial differential operator $P(x, \partial_x)=\sum a_\alpha(x)(\partial/\partial x)^\alpha$ is determined by $\min \text{weight}(a_\alpha(x)(\partial/\partial x)^\alpha)$.

Let $(x_1, \cdots, x_n)$ and $(u_1, \cdots, u_n)$ be two local coordinates with the same origin. We say that these coordinates are equivalent as the weighted coordinates if u_j has the same weight as x_j as an analytic function of x_j, and the converse is also true. In this note the weights are always equal to $(2, 1, \cdots, 1)$. Therefore $(x_1, \cdots, x_n)$ and $(u_1, \cdots, u_n)$ are equivalent if and only if

$$\frac{\partial(u_1, \cdots, u_n)}{\partial(x_1, \cdots, x_n)}(0) = \begin{vmatrix} c & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ a_2 & c_{22} & \cdots & c_{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ a_n & c_{n2} & \cdots & c_{nn} \end{vmatrix} \neq 0 .$$

It is easily derived that the weights of functions or differential operators are invariant under the equivalent transformation of the weighted coordinates.

We also remark that if the weights of covectors $(\xi_1, \cdots, \xi_n)$ are each assigned the $(-2, -1, \cdots, -1)$, then the weight of $P_m(x, \xi)$, the principal part of P, is invariant.

3. The basic theorem

The differential operator studied in this section is the following one:

$$P(x, \partial_x) = \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}\right)^{m-l}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_2}\right)^{l} + \sum a_\alpha(x)\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\right)^{\alpha} \tag{3.1}$$

where $a_\alpha(x)$ are analytic in some neighborhood U of 0 and the summation is taken over the multi-indices α such that $|\alpha| \leqq m$. The domain Ω is given by

$$\Omega = \{x \in U \mid \rho(x) < 0\} \tag{3.2}$$

where ρ is a real-valued C^2 function such that

$$(\Omega.1) \qquad \rho(0) = 0\,, \quad \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial x_1}(0) = 1\,, \quad \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial x_j}(0) = 0 \qquad j = 2, \cdots, n\,.$$

We consider this local coordinates as the weighted coordinates with the weights $(2, 1, \cdots, 1)$. Then we make the following conditions on the principal part $P_m(x, \partial_x)$ of the operator (3.1).

(P.1) *Every weight of* $a_\alpha(x)(\partial/\partial x)^\alpha$ *in* $P_m(x, \partial_x)$ *is larger than or equal to* $l-2m$*=the weight of* $(\partial/\partial x_1)^{m-l}(\partial/\partial x_2)^l$.

(P.2) *For the term in* P_m *with the weight* $l-2m$, *its coefficient does not vanish at* 0, *that is*

$$\text{weight}[(a_\alpha(x) - a_\alpha(0))(\partial/\partial x)^\alpha] \geqq l - 2m + 1\,,$$

when $|\alpha| = m$ *and especially* $a_\alpha(0) = 0$ *if* $\alpha = (m-l, l, 0, \cdots, 0)$ *in the second terms of the right hand side of* (3.1).

(P.3) *There exists an integer* μ $(2 \leqq \mu \leqq n)$ *such that the term in* P_m *with the weight* $l-2m$ *is generated only by* $\partial/\partial x_1, \cdots, \partial/\partial x_\mu$.

REMARK 3.1 If P is simple characteristic at $(0, N)$ with $N = (1, 0, \cdots, 0)$, then it is possible to choose the local coordinates such that P is in the form (3.1) with $l = 1$ and $\alpha_1 < m-1$ in the sum of the second terms. In this case all conditions (P.1,2,3) with $\mu = 2$ are automatically fulfilled.

REMARK 3.2 In P_m the condition (P.1) is only restrictive on the terms of the order larger than $m-l$ with respect to $\partial/\partial x_1$. Because by (P.1),

$$\text{weight}(a_\alpha(x)) \geqq \max\{0,\ l - 2m + 2\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \cdots + \alpha_n = l - m + \alpha_1\}\,.$$

REMARK 3.3 The conditions (P.1) and (P.2) imply that the term of the weight $l-2m$ in P_m is essentially of the form $a_\alpha(0)(\partial/\partial x)^\alpha$ with $\alpha_1=m-l$.

Concerning the boundary function $\rho(x)$ of $\partial\Omega$, we set

$$H=\left(\frac{\partial^2\rho}{\partial x_i\partial x_j}(0)\right) \qquad (2\leqq i,j\leqq n),$$

which is the tangential Hessian of ρ at 0. Then the following conditions are made in addition to (Ω.1).

(Ω.2) *H can be written as*

$$H=\begin{matrix}\\ \mu-1\end{matrix}\overbrace{\begin{matrix}\\ \lambda\end{matrix}}^{\mu-1}\left\{\begin{matrix}\lambda\\ \\ \mu-1\end{matrix}\right.\overbrace{\left\{\begin{matrix}\left(\begin{array}{c|c|c} A & 0 & * \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline * & 0 & * \end{array}\right)\end{matrix}\right.}^{\lambda}$$

where A is strictly negative definite ($0<\lambda\leqq\mu-1$).

We remark that if $\mu=2$ in (P.3), then (Ω.2) means only that $\partial^2\rho/\partial x_2^2(0)<0$. Such a case is happened when P is simple characteristic at $(0, N)$.

REMARK 3.4 It is easy to show that this condition (Ω.2) is independent of the choice of the defining function $\rho(x)$.

Now the basic theorem is as follows:

Theorem 3.1 *Let $P(x, \partial_x)$ be a differential operator of the form* (3.1) *which satisfies the conditions* (P. 1, 2, 3), *and Ω be an open set given by* (3.2) *with the conditions* (Ω.1, 2). *If $u(x)$ is a distribution solution of $Pu=0$ in U vanishing in Ω, then $u(x)$ must vanish in a neiborhood of* 0.

For the rest of this section, we devote ourselves to prove this theorem.

Lemma 3.1 *Let $\rho(x)$ be an defining function of Ω with the conditions* (Ω.1, 2). *Then by changing the defining function $\rho(x)$ if necessarily we may assume that*

(Ω.3) $$\frac{\partial^2\rho}{\partial x_1\partial x_j}(0)=0 \qquad j=1, 2, \cdots, n.$$

in addition to (Ω.1, 2).

Proof. If we expand $\rho(x)$ to the second order, we have

$$\rho(x) = x_1+(\sum_{j=1}^{n} a_j x_j)x_1+\sum_{i,j\geqq 2} a_{ij}x_i x_j+o(|x|^2)$$

where $(a_{ij})=\frac{1}{2}H$. Then $r(x)=\rho(x)\exp[-\sum_{j=1}^{n} a_j x_j]$ becomes the desired boundary function, which completes the proof.

Lemma 3.2 *If a real-valued C^2 function ρ satisfies the conditions* (Ω.1, 2 *and* 3), *then there exist positive constants α and M such that for any $\varepsilon>0$ the following inequality holds in a sufficiently small neiborhood V of* 0.

$$\rho(x)\leqq x_1-\alpha x_2^2+\varepsilon(x_1^2+x_3^2+\cdots+x_\mu^2)+M(x_{\mu+1}^2+\cdots+x_n^2)\,. \tag{3.3}$$

Proof. We expand ρ in the Taylor series up to the second order. Then by (Ω.1 and 3),

$$\rho(x) = x_1+\sum_{i,j\geqq 2} a_{ij}x_i x_j+o(|x|^2)$$

where $(a_{ij})=\frac{1}{2}H$ satisfies (Ω.2). From (Ω.2), it is easy to derive the inequality (3.3). The details are omitted.

Set $\psi(x)$ as

$$\psi(x) = x_1-\alpha x_2^2+\varepsilon(x_1^2+x_3^2+\cdots+x_\mu^2)+M(x_{\mu+1}^2+\cdots+x_n^2)\,. \tag{3.4}$$

Then the above lemma showes that in some neiborhood V of 0, the open set $\{\psi(x)<0\}$ is contained in Ω. Thus it is sufficient for the proof of the theorem 3.1 to obtain the uniqueness theorem across the surface $\psi(x)=0$. For this purpose we construct the family of surfaces. Define $\phi(x)$ as

$$\phi(x) = x_1-\frac{1}{2}\alpha r x_2+2\varepsilon(x_1^2+x_3^2+\cdots+x_\mu^2)+2M(x_{\mu+1}^2+\cdots+x_n^2)\,, \tag{3.5}$$

where $r>0$ is a parameter and determined later.

Lemma 3.3 *If s is real and $s\leqq\alpha r^2$, then the set $\{\psi(x)\geqq 0\}\cap\{\phi(x)\leqq s\}$ is compact and contained in $U(r)$, where*

$$\begin{aligned} U(r) = \{x\,|\,&|x_1|<2\alpha r^2,\ |x_2|<2r\,,\\ &|x_j|<(2\alpha/\varepsilon)^{1/2}r \qquad j=3,\cdots,\mu\\ &|x_k|<(2\alpha/M)^{1/2}r \qquad k=\mu+1,\cdots,n\} \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Set $R_\mu^2=x_1^2+x_3^2+\cdots+x_\mu^2$ and $R_n^2=x_{\mu+1}^2+\cdots+x_n^2$. For any $x\in\{\psi(x)\geqq 0\}\cap\{\phi(x)\leqq s\}$ we have

$$2\alpha x_2^2-2x_1\leqq 2\varepsilon R_\mu^2+2MR_n^2\leqq s+\frac{1}{2}\alpha r x_2-x_1\,,$$

which imply the next two inequalities:

$$x_1 \geqq 2\alpha x_2^2 - \frac{1}{2}\alpha r x_2 - s$$

$$s + \frac{1}{2}\alpha r x_2 - x_1 \geqq 0 .$$

Then it easily derived that $|x_1| < 2\alpha r^2$ and $|x_2| < 2r$ provided that $s \leqq \alpha r^2$. Using these estimates we have

$$0 \leqq \varepsilon R_\mu^2 + M R_n^2 < 2\alpha r^2 .$$

Thus the lemma is proved.

Now we determine the parameters ε and r so that the surface $\phi(x)=s$ is non-characteristic with respect to $P(x, \partial_x)$ in some neiborhood of 0. Let $Q(\partial_x)$ be the sum of the terms in P_m with the weight exactly $l-2m$. By the remark 3.3 and the condition (P.3), $Q(\partial_x)$ is expressed as followes:

$$Q(\partial_x) = \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}\right)^{m-l}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_2}\right)^{l} + \sum a_\alpha \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\right)^{\alpha} \tag{3.6}$$

where the summation is taken over the multi-indices α such that $\alpha_1 = m-l$, $\alpha_2 + \cdots \alpha_\mu = l$, $\alpha_2 < l$ and $\alpha_{\mu+1} = \cdots = \alpha_n = 0$. In (3.6) every a_α is a constant. If we set $\xi_j = \partial\phi/\partial x_j$ $(j=1, \cdots, n)$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_1 &= 1 + 4\varepsilon x_1 \\ \xi_2 &= -\frac{1}{2}\alpha r \\ \xi_j &= 4\varepsilon x_j \qquad j = 3, \cdots, \mu \\ \xi_k &= 4M x_k \qquad k = \mu+1, \cdots, n . \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we have the next estimates on $U(r)$:

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{1}{2} \leqq |\xi_1| \leqq 2 & \text{if } \varepsilon\alpha r^2 \leqq 4^{-2} \\ |\xi_2| = \dfrac{1}{2}\alpha r & \\ |\xi_j| \leqq 4(2\alpha\varepsilon)^{1/2} r & j = 3, \cdots, \mu \\ |\xi_k| \leqq 4(2\alpha M)^{1/2} r & k = \mu+1, \cdots, n . \end{cases} \tag{3.7}$$

Lemma 3.4 *If we take ε sufficiently small ($\varepsilon\alpha r^2 \leqq 4^{-2}$), then $Q(\xi)$ does not vanish on $U(r)$.*

Proof. We use the notation $C(\alpha)$ which is a different constant in each position depending only on α. By (3.7),

$$|\xi_1^{m-l}\xi_2^l| \geqq \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^m \alpha^l r^l$$

$$|a_\alpha \xi^\alpha| \leqq C(\alpha)\varepsilon^{(1/2)(\alpha_3+\cdots+\alpha_\mu)} r^l ,$$

for $|\alpha|=m$, $\alpha_1=m-l$ and $\alpha_{\mu+1}=\cdots=\alpha_n=0$. If we put these estimates into the corresponding terms in (3,6), we have that

$$|Q(\xi)| \geqq \left\{\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^m \alpha^l - C(\alpha)\varepsilon^{(1/2)(\alpha_3+\cdots+\alpha_\mu)}\right\} r^l .$$

Since $\alpha_3+\cdots+\alpha_\mu \neq 0$, $|Q(\xi)| \geqq C(\alpha) r^l$ with $C(\alpha)>0$ for a sufficiently small ε. This proves the lemma.

From now on, the constant ε is taken as in this lemma and always fixed. For the determination of the parameter r, we have the next lemma.

Lemma 3.5 *If we take r sufficiently small, then $P_m(x, \xi)$ does not vanish on $U(r)$.*

Proof. If the weight of an analytic function $a(x)$ is equal to k, then the inequality

$$\sup_{U(r)} |a(x)| \leqq \text{const. } r^k$$

holds for a sufficiently small r. Thus for a term $a(x)(\partial/\partial x)^\alpha$ in P_m with the weight larger than $l-2m$, the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \text{weight } a(x) &\geqq l-2m+1+2\alpha_1+\alpha_2+\cdots+\alpha_n \\ &= l-m+\alpha_1+1 \end{aligned}$$

implies

$$\begin{aligned} |a(x)\xi^\alpha| &\leqq \text{const. } r^{l-m+\alpha_1+1} \text{const. } r^{\alpha_2+\cdots+\alpha_n} \\ &= \text{const. } r^{l+1} \end{aligned}$$

While $|Q(\xi)| \geqq C(\alpha) r^l$ on $U(r)$. Since P_m is the sum of Q and the terms of the weight larger than $l-2m$, we can choose r sufficiently small so that P_m does not vanish on $U(r)$. This proves the lemma.

Under these preparations we now prove the basic theorem. The key lemma of this proof is the following one which is due to Hörmander [3].

Lemma 3.6 *Suppose that there exist a real-valued C^1 function $\phi(x)$ and constants s_0, s_1 such that in some neighborhood V of 0,*

(i) $P_m(x, \text{grad } \phi(x)) \neq 0$

(ii) $s_0 < \phi(0) < s_1$

(iii) $\{x \in V \mid \phi(x) \leqq s_1\} \cap \overline{\Omega^c}$ *is compact,*

(iv) $\{x \in V \mid \phi(x) \leqq s_0\} \cap \overline{\Omega^c}$ *is empty,*

(v) $\{x \in V \mid \phi(x) \leqq s_0\}$ *is not empty.*

Then every distribution solution $u(x)$ in V of the equation $Pu=0$ vanishing in Ω must vanish in $\{x\in V \mid \phi(x)<s_1\}$.

Proof of the Theorem 3.1 By the lemma 3.2 we may take Ω as the set $\{x\in V \mid \psi(x)<0\}$. Now take $U(r)$ in the lemma 3.5 as the neighborhood V of 0 in the lemma 3.6. Then the condition (i) is fulfilled. Set $s_0=-\alpha r^2$ and $s_1=\alpha r^2$. Then (ii) becomes trivial and (iii) is derived from the lemma 3.3. The other conditions (iv) and (v) are easily derived from the expression of $\phi(x)$ and $\psi(x)$, so we omitt their prooves. This ends the proof of the theorem 3.1.

4. Choice of the local coordinates in the basic theorem

Let $(x_1, \cdots, x_n)$ be the local coordinates such that the surface $x_1=0$ is tangent to $\partial\Omega$ at $x=0$. We consider this coordinates as the weighted coordinates with the weights $(2, 1, \cdots, 1)$. The other local coordinates with the same property become equivalent to this coordinates as the weighted coordinates.

Let $P(x, \partial_x)$ be a linear differential operator of order m with analytic coefficients which is characteristic at 0 in the cotangential direction $N=(1, 0, \cdots, 0)$. We set l the multiplicity of P at $(0, N)$. That is, for a cotangent vector $\zeta=(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \cdots, \zeta_n)$,

$$P_m(0, N+t\zeta) = L(\zeta)t^l + \text{higher order terms of } t \tag{4.1}$$

where P_m is the principal part of P and $L(\zeta)$ is a non-zero polynomial of ζ. This polynomial $L(\zeta)$ is called the localization of P_m at $(0, N)$, which is originally introduced by Hörmander [4]. When $N=(1, 0, \cdots, 0)$, (4.1) means that in $P_m(0, \partial_x)$ there is none of the terms of order larger than $m-l$ with respect to $\partial/\partial x_1$ and the sum of the coefficients of $(\partial/\partial x_1)^{m-l}$ is equal to $L(\partial/\partial x_2, \cdots, \partial/\partial x_n)$. Therefore $L(\zeta)$ is a homogeneous polynomial of degree l in the variables $(\zeta_2, \cdots, \zeta_n)$. Since the weight of $L(\partial/\partial x_2, \cdots, \partial/\partial x_n)(\partial/\partial x_1)^{m-l}$ is equal to $l-2m$, we make the assumption:

(P.I) *the weight of $P_m(x, \xi)$ is equal to $l-2m$, if the weight of ξ are assigned by $(-2, -1, \cdots, -1)$.*

Relating to the localization $L(\zeta)$ of P_m, we introduce some linear spaces in the tangent space T_0 and the cotangent space T_0^* of the surface $\partial\Omega$ at 0. For the polynomial $L(\zeta)$, we set

$$\Lambda^*(L) = \{\eta\in T_0^* \mid L(\xi+\eta t) = L(\xi) \quad \text{for all } t \text{ and } \xi\}\,, \tag{4.2}$$

which is a linear subspace, and we introduce the annihilator

$$\Lambda(L) = \{v\in T_0 \mid \langle v, \eta\rangle = 0 \quad \text{for any } \eta\in\Lambda^*(L)\}\,, \tag{4.3}$$

where $\langle\ ,\ \rangle$ denotes the contraction between cotangent vectors and tangent

vectors. $\Lambda(L)$ is the smallest subspace along which $L(\partial/\partial x)$ operates and is called the bicharacteristic space of P at $(0, N)$. These subspaces are introduced by Hörmander [4].

DEFINITION 4.1 An analytic function $\phi(x)$ with $\operatorname{grad}\phi(0)=N$ is said to be a weighted characteristic function of $P(x, \partial_x)$ if it satisfies the following condition:

$$\text{weight } P_m(x, t\operatorname{grad}\phi(x)) \geqq l-2m+1 , \tag{4.4}$$

where the parameter t is assigned the weight -2.

To find such a weighted characteristic function $\phi(x)$, it is sufficient that ϕ is in the form

$$\phi(x) = x_1 + \sum_{i,j\geqq 2} a_{ij}x_ix_j .$$

Assume that

(P.II) *there exists a weighted characteristic function* $\phi(x)$.

By the suitable equivalent change of the weighted coordinates we can assume that $\phi(x)=x_1$. Then the following proposition is easy to prove.

Proposition 4.1 *If* $\phi(x)=x_1$, *then* (4.4) *is equivalent to that there is none of the differential monomials of the weight* $l-2m$ *in* $P_m(x, \partial_x)$ *which is generated only by* $\partial/\partial x_1$.

We now fix some weighted characteristic function $\phi(x)$ and consider the local coordinates $(x_1, \cdots, x_n)$ as $\phi(x)=x_1$ (mod weight 3) and each x_j $(j=2, \cdots, n)$ has the weight 1. This means that the coordinates transformation considered from now on is in the following form:

$$\begin{cases} u_1 = x_1 + \text{an analytic function of the weight} \geqq 3 , \\ u_j = \sum_{k=2}^{n} c_{jk}x_k + \text{an analytic function of the weight} \geqq 2 \\ \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad j = 2, \ldots, n . \end{cases} \tag{4.5}$$

Then we make the last assumption on P_m such that

$$\text{weigh } [P_m(x, \xi)-P_m(0, \xi)] \geqq l-2m+1 . \tag{P.III}$$

Proposition 4.2 *This assumption* (P.III) *is invariant under the change of variables of form* (4.5).

Proof. If we remark that by (4.5),

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} = \frac{\partial}{\partial u_1} + \text{ terms of the weight larger than } -2$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} = \sum_{k=1}^{n} c_{kj} \frac{\partial}{\partial u_k} + \text{terms of the weight larger than } -1, \qquad j = 2, \cdots, n$$

the invariance of (P.III) is easy to prove.

Assumption (P.III) means that the terms with the lowest weight in P_m do not degenerate at 0.

Now we proceed to examine the conditions on Ω under the assumptions (P. I, II, III).

If Ω is given by $\{\rho(x)<0\}$ with a real-valued C^2 function ρ, we denote by H_ρ the tangential Hessian of ρ at 0. That is

$$H_\rho = \left(\frac{\partial^2 \rho}{\partial x_i \partial x_j}(0)\right) \qquad 2 \leqq i, j \leqq n .$$

Then it easily derived that the symmetric bilinear form $\sum_{i,j\geqq 2} \frac{\partial^2 \rho}{\partial x_i \partial x_j}(0)\, dx_i \otimes dx_j$ on $T_0 \times T_0$ is invariant under the transformation of the coordinates of the form (4.5). We set N_ρ as the kernel of the linear map H_ρ: $T_0 \to T_0^*$ defined by

$$H_\rho(v) = \sum \frac{\partial^2 \rho}{\partial x_i \partial x_j}(0) \langle dx_i, v \rangle dx_j .$$

Then H_ρ is derived to the bilinear form on the space $T_0/N_\rho \times T_0/N_\rho$. Similary if we set

$$\tilde{\Lambda}(L) = \Lambda(L)/N_\rho \cap \Lambda(L) ,$$

where $\Lambda(L)$ is the bicharacteristic space of P, H_ρ is also derived to the bilinear form on $\tilde{\Lambda}(L) \times \tilde{\Lambda}(L)$.

The first assumption on $\partial\Omega$ is as follows:

(Ω.I) $\tilde{\Lambda}(L) \neq 0$ *and* H_ρ *is strictly negative definite on* $\tilde{\Lambda}(L) \times \tilde{\Lambda}(L)$.

This condition means that Ω is concave in the direction of the bicharacteristic space at 0.

Lastly we demand that $L(\zeta)$, the localization of P, is non-characteristic at some covector ξ_0 for which Ω is strictly concave at 0. For this sake we introduce N_ρ^* the annihilator of N_ρ,

$$N_\rho^* = \{\xi \in T_0^* \mid \langle \xi, v \rangle = 0 \qquad \forall v \in N_\rho\} .$$

Then we assume

(Ω.II) *there exists a covector* ξ_0 *in* N_ρ^* *such that* $L(\xi_0) \neq 0$.

Now we construct the local coordinates $(x_1, \cdots, x_n)$ so that the operator

$P(x, \partial_x)$ is reduced to the form (3.1) and all assumptions in the basic theorem are satisfied.

First we fix the weighted characteristic function $\phi(x)$ in (P.II) and set $\phi(x)=x_1$.

Secondly we choose the tangential coordinates $(x_2, \cdots, x_n)$ such that the vectors $\partial/\partial x_2, \cdots, \partial/\partial x_\mu$ span the bicharacteristic space $\Lambda(L)$ at 0. Since $L(\zeta)$ does not vanish identically, the dimension of $\Lambda(L)$ is $\mu-1$ which becomes positive (i.e. $\mu \geqq 2$).

Thirdly under the suitable linear change of variables $(x_2, \cdots, x_\mu)$, we may assume that for some λ $(2<\lambda \leqq \mu)$, $\partial/\partial x_{\lambda+1}, \cdots, \partial/\partial x_\mu$ span the subspace $N_\rho \cap \Lambda(L)$. At this moment, the condition (Ω.1) means that the matrix

$$\left(\frac{\partial^2 \rho}{\partial x_i \partial x_j}(0)\right) \qquad 2 \leqq i, j \leqq \lambda$$

is strictly negative definite and

$$\frac{\partial^2 \rho}{\partial x_i \partial x_j}(0) = 0 \quad \text{if } \lambda+1 \leqq i \text{ or } j \leqq \mu.$$

Lastly we shall prove that $L(\zeta)$ can be non-characteristic at dx_2 by the linear change of variables $(x_2, \cdots, x_\lambda)$.

Proposition 4.3 *By the suitable linear change of variables* $(x_2, \cdots, x_\lambda)$, $L(\zeta)$ *is non-characteristic at the covector* dx_2.

Proof. Let $\xi_0 \in T_0^*$ be the covector in the condition (Ω.II). Since $\langle \xi_0, \partial/\partial x_j \rangle = 0$ $(j=\lambda+1, \cdots, \mu)$, ξ_0 is written as

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_0 &= c_2 dx_2 + \cdots + c_\lambda dx_\lambda + c_{\mu+1} dx_{\mu+1} + \cdots + c_n dx_n \\ &= c_2 dx_2 + \cdots + c_\lambda dx_\lambda + \xi_0' \end{aligned}$$

where $\xi_0' \in \Lambda^*(L)$ which is generated by $dx_{\mu+1}, \cdots, dx_n$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \neq L(\xi_0) &= L(c_2 dx_2 + \cdots + c_\lambda dx_\lambda + \xi_0') \\ &= L(c_2 dx_2 + \cdots + c_\lambda dx_\lambda). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore this proposition is easily derived from this relation.

From this proposition, $L(\partial/\partial x)$ is written as

$$L(\partial_x) = a\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_2}\right)^l + \sum a_\alpha \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\right)^\alpha$$

where $a \neq 0$ and the summation is taken over the multi-indices $|\alpha|=l$, $\alpha_2<l$, $\alpha_1=\alpha_{\mu+1}=\cdots=\alpha_n=0$.

Thus the operator $P(x, \partial_x)$ is expressed in the form (3.1) under this coordi-

nates. Since (P.I) implies (P.1), (P.III) implies (P.2), (P.3) follows from the fact that $\partial/\partial x_2, \cdots, \partial/\partial x_\mu$ span $\Lambda(L)$, (Ω.1) is trivial from the choice of x_1 and (Ω.2) is derived from (Ω.I), all conditions in the theorem 3.1 are satisfied under this coordinates. Summing up these results we have the final theorem:

Theorem 4.1 *Let $P(x, \partial_x)$ be a differential operator of order m with analytic coefficients in a neighborhood V of p and Ω be an open set with C^2 boundary $\partial\Omega \ni p$. We suppose that P and Ω satisfy the conditions ($P.I, II, III$) and ($\Omega.I, II$). Then every distribution solution $u(x)$ of $Pu=0$ in V vanishing in Ω must vanish in a neighborhood of p.*

References

[1] T. Bloom and I. Graham: *On 'Type' conditions for generic real submanifolds of C^n*, Invent. Math. **40** (1977), 217–243.

[2] J.M. Bony: *Une extension du théorème de Holmgren sur l'unicité du problème de Cauchy*, C.R.Acad. Sci. Paris **268** (1969), 1103–1106.

[3] L. Hörmander: Linear partial differential operators, Springer-Verlag, 1963.

[4] L. Hörmander: *On the singularities of solutions of partial differential equations*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **23** (1970), 329–358.

[5] L. Hörmander: *Uniqueness theorems and wave front sets for solutions of linear differential equations with analytic coefficients*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **24** (1971), 671–704.

[6] L. Hörmander: *A remark on Holmgren's uniqueness theorem*, J. Differential Geom. **6** (1971), 129–134.

[7] J. Perrson: *On uniqueness cones, velocity cones and P-convexity*, Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. **96** (1973), 69–87.

[8] F. Trèves: Linear partial differential equations with constant coefficients, Gordon and Breach, New York, 1966.

[9] Y. Tsuno: *Localization of differential operators and holomorphic continuation of the solutions*, Hiroshima Math. J. **10** (1980), to appear.

[10] E.C. Zachmanoglou: *Uniqueness of the Cauchy problem when the initial surface containes characteristic points*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **23** (1966), 317–326.

[11] E. C. Zachmanoglou: *Uniqueness of the Cauchy problem for linear partial dierential eqnations with valiable coefficients*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **136** (1969), 517–526.

Department of Mathematics
Okayama University
Tsushima, Okayama, 700
Japan