

152. The Space of Bounded Solutions and Removable Singularities of the Equation $\Delta u + au_x + bu_y + cu = 0$ ($c \leq 0$)

By Yoshio KATÔ

Mathematical Institute, Nagoya University
(Comm. by K. KUNUGI, M.J.A., Dec. 12, 1960)

1. Let D be a bounded domain in the complex z -plane. We consider a triple (a, b, c) where a and b are twice continuously differentiable functions and c is a non-positive, continuously differentiable function defined in a domain containing the closure of D .¹⁾ We say that such a triple is *admissible*. Consider the partial differential equation of elliptic type:

$$(1) \quad \Delta u + au_x + bu_y + cu = 0,$$

where $\Delta = \partial^2/\partial x^2 + \partial^2/\partial y^2$, $u_x = \partial u/\partial x$ and $u_y = \partial u/\partial y$. Using notations of exterior differentials, (1) can be written as follows:

$$Lu = d^*du + du \wedge \alpha + u\beta = 0,$$

where $\alpha = -bdx + ady$ and $\beta = cdxdy$.

We denote by $B(a, b, c; D)$ the totality of bounded solutions of the equation (1) in D . Here a solution of (1) is always assumed to be twice continuously differentiable. Then $B(a, b, c; D)$ is a Banach space with the norm $\|u\| = \sup_D |u|$ (see [1]). Take another admissible triple $(\bar{a}, \bar{b}, \bar{c})$. In this note, we shall prove that $B(a, b, c; D)$ is isomorphic with $B(\bar{a}, \bar{b}, \bar{c}; D)$ as Banach spaces. In Nakai [5], this comparison problem was considered for triples $(0, 0, c)$ on a Riemann surface under some condition for c . Finally we shall characterize sets of removable singularities for bounded solutions of (1).²⁾

2. Let $\{D_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be an exhaustion of D , i.e. D_n is a subdomain of D whose closure \bar{D}_n is contained in D and whose boundary ∂D_n consists of a finite number of closed smooth Jordan curves and moreover $\{D_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ satisfies

$$\bar{D}_n \subset D_{n+1} \quad \text{and} \quad D = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} D_n.$$

Let $G_n(\zeta, z)$ be the Green function of (1) with respect to D_n with pole at ζ . It is well known that $G_n(\zeta, z)$ is the Green function of the adjoint equation of (1)

$$(1^*) \quad L^*u = d^*du - du \wedge \alpha + (\beta - d\alpha)u = 0$$

with respect to D_n with pole at z and, for each pair (ζ, z) in D , the sequence $\{G_n(\zeta, z)\}$ converges non-decreasingly to $G(\zeta, z)$ which is a

1) Functions considered in this note are all assumed to be real-valued.

2) The author extends his hearty thanks to Mr. Nakai for his kind suggestions.

solution of (1) in z and a solution of (1*) in ζ (see [3] and [4]). Moreover $G(\zeta, z)$ is bounded outside a neighbourhood of z as a function of ζ . We shall call $G(\zeta, z)$ the *Green function* with respect to D .

Let S be a closed disk with center z in D . Then we can prove

Lemma 1. *There exists a positive constant K for each point z in D such that*

$$\iint_{D_n-S} \left[\left(\frac{\partial G_n(\zeta, z)}{\partial \xi} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{\partial G_n(\zeta, z)}{\partial \eta} \right)^2 \right] d\xi d\eta < K$$

for all n satisfying $D_n \supset S$, where $\zeta = \xi + i\eta$.

Proof. Fix a point z in D . Let u be a solution of (1*) in $D_n - \{z\}$ and vanishing on ∂D_n . For such a function u , we obtain

$$(2) \quad du \wedge *du = d \left(u^* du - \frac{1}{2} u^2 \alpha \right) + u^2 \left(\beta - \frac{1}{2} d\alpha \right).$$

Integrating (2) on $D_n - S$, we have

$$(3) \quad \iint_{D_n-S} du \wedge *du = \int_{\partial S} \left(u^* du - \frac{1}{2} u^2 \alpha \right) + \iint_{D_n-S} u^2 \left(\beta - \frac{1}{2} d\alpha \right),$$

since u vanishes on ∂D_n . Applying (3) to $G_n(\zeta, z)$, we get the assertion of Lemma 1 from the boundedness of $a, b, \partial a/\partial \xi, \partial b/\partial \eta$, and c in D and from the uniform boundedness of $G_n(\zeta, z), \partial G_n(\zeta, z)/\partial \xi$ and $\partial G_n(\zeta, z)/\partial \eta$ on ∂S .

Lemma 2. (i) *If f is a bounded continuous function in D , then, for each point z in D ,*

$$\lim_n \iint_{D_n} G_n(\zeta, z) f(\zeta) d\xi d\eta = \iint_D G(\zeta, z) f(\zeta) d\xi d\eta < \infty$$

and

$$\lim_n \iint_{D_n} \frac{\partial G_n}{\partial \xi}(\zeta, z) f(\zeta) d\xi d\eta = \iint_D \frac{\partial G}{\partial \xi}(\zeta, z) f(\zeta) d\xi d\eta < \infty.$$

(ii) *If a uniformly bounded sequence $\{f_n\}$ of continuous functions in D converges to a function f defined in D uniformly on every compact subset of D , then for each point z in D*

$$\lim_n \iint_{D_n} G_n(\zeta, z) (f_n(\zeta) - f(\zeta)) d\xi d\eta = 0$$

and

$$\lim_n \iint_{D_n} \frac{\partial G_n}{\partial \xi}(\zeta, z) (f_n(\zeta) - f(\zeta)) d\xi d\eta = 0.$$

Proof of (i). We prove the second identity since the first is trivial. Fix a point z in D . By Lemma 1 and Fatou's lemma, we can see easily

$$(4) \quad \iint_{D-S} \left[\left(\frac{\partial G}{\partial \xi}(\zeta, z) \right)^2 + \left(\frac{\partial G}{\partial \eta}(\zeta, z) \right)^2 \right] d\xi d\eta \leq K.$$

For a compact set A of D which contains S , the Schwarz inequality and Lemma 1 imply

$$\begin{aligned}
 (5) \quad \left| \iint_{D_n-A} \frac{\partial G_n}{\partial \xi}(\zeta, z) f(\zeta) d\xi d\eta \right|^2 &\leq \iint_{D_n-A} \left(\frac{\partial G_n}{\partial \xi} \right)^2 d\xi d\eta \\
 &\times \iint_{D_n-A} |f|^2 d\xi d\eta \\
 &\leq K \cdot \sup_D |f|^2 \cdot (\text{Area of } (D_n - A))
 \end{aligned}$$

for sufficiently large n . By the same argument as above, we get, using (4),

$$(6) \quad \left| \iint_{D-A} \frac{\partial G}{\partial \xi}(\zeta, z) f(\zeta) d\xi d\eta \right|^2 \leq K \cdot \sup_D |f|^2 \cdot (\text{Area of } (D - A)).$$

On the other hand $\frac{\partial G_n}{\partial \xi}(\zeta, z)$ converges to $\frac{\partial G}{\partial \xi}(\zeta, z)$ uniformly on each compact set of D as n tends to infinity. Hence we get

$$(7) \quad \iint_A \left(\frac{\partial G}{\partial \xi} - \frac{\partial G_n}{\partial \xi} \right) f(\zeta) d\xi d\eta \rightarrow 0 \quad (n \rightarrow \infty).$$

From (5), (6) and (7), we can conclude (i) of Lemma 2.

Proof of (ii). By our assumption there exists a constant M independent of n such that $|f_n(\zeta)| < M$ in D . If we apply (5) with $f = f_n - f$, we obtain

$$\left| \iint_{D_n-A} \frac{\partial G_n}{\partial \xi}(\zeta, z) (f_n(\zeta) - f(\zeta)) d\xi d\zeta \right|^2 \leq 4KM^2 \cdot (\text{Area of } (D_n - A)).$$

On A , the sequence $\partial G_n / \partial \xi \cdot (f_n - f)$ converges to 0 uniformly. Thus we get the second equality. The first identity is obvious. Therefore, we can conclude (ii) of Lemma 2.

3. Theorem 1. *For any two admissible triples (a, b, c) and $(\bar{a}, \bar{b}, \bar{c})$, Banach spaces $B(a, b, c; D)$ and $B(\bar{a}, \bar{b}, \bar{c}; D)$ are isomorphic.*

Proof. Let $\bar{G}_n(\zeta, z)$ and $\bar{G}(\zeta, z)$ be Green functions with respect to D_n and D corresponding to the triple $(\bar{a}, \bar{b}, \bar{c})$ respectively. For a bounded continuous function f in D , we define transformations Tf and tf as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 Tf(z) = f(z) + \frac{1}{2\pi} \iint_D [(c(\zeta) - \bar{c}(\zeta)) \bar{G}(\zeta, z) + \{(a(\zeta) - \bar{a}(\zeta)) \\
 \times \bar{G}(\zeta, z)\}_\xi + \{(b(\zeta) - \bar{b}(\zeta)) \bar{G}(\zeta, z)\}_\eta] f(\zeta) d\xi d\eta
 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
 tf(z) = f(z) + \frac{1}{2\pi} \iint_D [(\bar{c}(\zeta) - c(\zeta)) G(\zeta, z) + \{(\bar{a}(\zeta) - a(\zeta)) \\
 \times G(\zeta, z)\}_\xi + \{(\bar{b}(\zeta) - b(\zeta)) G(\zeta, z)\}_\eta] f(\zeta) d\xi d\eta.
 \end{aligned}$$

By (i) of Lemma 2, we see that $Tf(z) < \infty$ and $tf(z) < \infty$ for each point z in D . We also define auxiliary transformations $T_n f$ and $t_n f$ of a bounded continuous function f defined in D_n as follows:

$$T_n f(z) = f(z) + \frac{1}{2\pi} \iint_{D_n} [(c(\zeta) - \bar{c}(\zeta)) \bar{G}_n(\zeta, z) + \{(a(\zeta) - \bar{a}(\zeta)) \bar{G}_n(\zeta, z)\}_\varepsilon + \{(b(\zeta) - \bar{b}(\zeta)) \bar{G}_n(\zeta, z)\}_\eta] f(\zeta) d\xi d\eta$$

and

$$t_n f(z) = f(z) + \frac{1}{2\pi} \iint_{D_n} [(\bar{c}(\zeta) - c(\zeta)) G_n(\zeta, z) + \{(\bar{a}(\zeta) - a(\zeta)) G_n(\zeta, z)\}_\varepsilon + \{(\bar{b}(\zeta) - b(\zeta)) G_n(\zeta, z)\}_\eta] f(\zeta) d\xi d\eta.$$

If h is continuous on \bar{D}_n and is a solution of $Lu=0$ (or $\bar{L}u=d^*du + du_\wedge \bar{\alpha} + u\bar{\beta}=0$; $\bar{\alpha} = -\bar{b}dx + \bar{a}dy$, $\bar{\beta} = \bar{c}dxdy$) in D_n , then $T_n h$ (or $t_n h$) is continuous on \bar{D}_n and satisfies the equation $\bar{L}u=0$ (or $Lu=0$) in D_n and also $T_n h=h$ (or $t_n h=h$) on ∂D_n . Consequently we obtain

$$(8) \quad \begin{aligned} \|T_n h\|_{D_n} &= \|h\|_{D_n} \quad (\text{or } \|t_n h\|_{D_n} = \|h\|_{D_n}), \\ t_n(T_n h) &= h \quad (\text{or } T_n(t_n h) = h). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, if a uniformly bounded sequence $\{f_n\}$ of continuous function f_n in D converges to a function f defined in D uniformly on every compact subset of D , then for each point z in D

$$(9) \quad Tf(z) = \lim_n T_n f_n(z) \quad (\text{or } tf(z) = \lim_n t_n f_n(z)).$$

In fact, setting

$$\begin{aligned} a_n(z) &= |Tf(z) - T_n f(z)|, \\ b_n(z) &= |T_n f(z) - f(z) - T_n f_n(z) + f_n(z)|, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$c_n(z) = |f_n(z) - f(z)|,$$

we have

$$\lim_n a_n(z) = 0$$

from (i) of Lemma 2 and

$$\lim_n b_n(z) = 0$$

from (ii) of Lemma 2. Thus, using $\lim_n c_n(z) = 0$ and

$$|Tf(z) - T_n f_n(z)| \leq a_n(z) + b_n(z) + c_n(z),$$

we have (9).

Now take a function u in $B(a, b, c; D)$ (or $B(\bar{a}, \bar{b}, \bar{c}; D)$). From (8), the sequence $\{T_n u\}$ (or $\{t_n u\}$) is bounded by $\|u\|$ in the absolute value and $T_n u$ (or $t_n u$) is a solution of $\bar{L}u=0$ (or $Lu=0$). Hence by (9), $T_n u$ (or $t_n u$) converges uniformly to Tu (or tu) on each compact subset of D which is a solution of $\bar{L}u=0$ (or $Lu=0$).

From (8) we have

$$(10) \quad t_n(T_n u) = u \quad (\text{or } T_n(t_n u) = u).$$

If we apply (9) to (10) with $f_n = T_n u$, we see

$$\begin{aligned} t(Tu) &= u \quad (\text{or } T(tu) = u), \\ \|tu\| &\leq \|u\| \quad (\text{or } \|Tu\| \leq \|u\|). \end{aligned}$$

This shows that T (or t) is a one-to-one mapping of $B(a, b, c; D)$ (or $B(\bar{a}, \bar{b}, \bar{c}; D)$) onto $B(\bar{a}, \bar{b}, \bar{c}; D)$ (or $B(a, b, c; D)$) and that $T=t^{-1}$. It is also obvious that both T and t are isometric. Thus Banach spaces $B(a, b, c; D)$ and $B(\bar{a}, \bar{b}, \bar{c}; D)$ are isomorphic. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.

Assume that a part Γ of ∂D consists of a finite number of smooth closed Jordan curves. In this case, we denote by $B^\Gamma(a, b, c; D)$ the subspace of $B(a, b, c; D)$ consisting of every function in $B(a, b, c; D)$ which vanishes continuously on Γ . With an obvious modification of the proof of Theorem 1, we can prove the following

Theorem 1'. *Banach spaces $B^\Gamma(a, b, c; D)$ and $B^\Gamma(\bar{a}, \bar{b}, \bar{c}; D)$ are isomorphic.*

4. A compact set E of D is said to be (a, b, c) -removable if, for any subdomain \mathfrak{D} of D containing E , any bounded solution u of $Lu=0$ on a component \mathfrak{D}_E of $\mathfrak{D}-E$ whose boundary contains the boundary of \mathfrak{D} can be continued to a solution of $Lu=0$ on \mathfrak{D} . In this definition we may assume without loss of generality that the boundary $\partial\mathfrak{D}$ of \mathfrak{D} consists of a finite number of smooth closed Jordan curves. As an application of our comparison theorem we prove

Theorem 2. *Let (a, b, c) be any admissible triple. Then a compact set of D is (a, b, c) -removable if and only if the logarithmic capacity of E equals zero.*

Proof. Let (a, b, c) and $(\bar{a}, \bar{b}, \bar{c})$ be any two admissible triples in D . Assume that E is (a, b, c) -removable. Let v be an arbitrary element in $B(\bar{a}, \bar{b}, \bar{c}; \mathfrak{D}_E)$. We may assume without loss of generality that v is continuous on $\partial\mathfrak{D} \cup \mathfrak{D}_E$. Let v' be continuous on $\bar{\mathfrak{D}}$ and $v'=v$ on $\partial\mathfrak{D}$ and $\bar{L}v'=0$ in \mathfrak{D} . Putting $v''=v'-v$, we see that v'' is in $B^{\partial\mathfrak{D}}(\bar{a}, \bar{b}, \bar{c}; \mathfrak{D}_E)$. On the other hand, by the maximum principle and by Theorem 1', we have

$$B^{\partial\mathfrak{D}}(a, b, c; \mathfrak{D}_E) = B^{\partial\mathfrak{D}}(\bar{a}, \bar{b}, \bar{c}; \mathfrak{D}_E) = \{0\}.$$

Hence $v''=0$ or $v'=v$ on \mathfrak{D}_E . Thus E is $(\bar{a}, \bar{b}, \bar{c})$ -removable. By the same method, we easily see that if E is $(\bar{a}, \bar{b}, \bar{c})$ -removable, then E is (a, b, c) -removable.

Taking $(\bar{a}, \bar{b}, \bar{c})=(0, 0, 0)$ and noticing that $(0, 0, 0)$ -removable set is nothing but a set of logarithmic capacity zero, we can assure our Theorem.

The sufficiency of this theorem was proved by Inoue [2]. In the case of pairs $(0, 0, c)$, this theorem was proved by Nakai [5] and Ozawa [6].

References

- [1] A. Douglis and L. Nirenberg: Interior estimates for elliptic systems of partial differential equations, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, **8**, 503-538 (1955).
- [2] M. Inoue: Positively infinite singularities of solutions of linear elliptic partial differential equations, *Jour. Osaka City Univ.*, **8**, 43-50 (1957).
- [3] L. Lichtenstein: Beiträge zur Theorie der linearen partiellen Differentialgleichungen zweiter Ordnung vom elliptischen Typus. Unendliche Folgen positiver Lösungen, *Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo*, **33**, 201-211 (1912).
- [4] L. Lichtenstein: Randwertaufgaben der Theorie der linearen partiellen Differentialgleichungen zweiter Ordnung vom elliptischen Typus. I, *Crelles Jour.*, **142**, 1-40 (1913).
- [5] M. Nakai: The space of bounded solutions of the equation $\Delta u = pu$ on a Riemann surface, *Proc. Japan Acad.*, **36**, 267-272 (1960).
- [6] M. Ozawa: A set of capacity zero and the equation $\Delta u = Pu$, *Kôdai Math. Sem. Rep.*, **12**, 76-81 (1960).