Growth Rate of Eigenfunctions

Peng Shao

Sep. 25 2013

(ロ)、(型)、(E)、(E)、 E) の(の)

Eigenvalue and eigenfunctions

For a given compact smooth n-manifold M, we have the following (smooth) eigenfunctions

$$-\Delta_g e_\lambda(x) = \lambda^2 e_\lambda(x).$$

And we have a discrete set of eigenvalues

$$\{0 = \lambda_0 \leq \lambda_1 \leq \cdots \leq \lambda_n \cdots < \infty\}$$

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Two basic questions in spectral analysis

1. How the eigenvalues $\{\lambda_j\}$ are distributed on $[0, \infty)$?

2. How "large" the eigenfunctions are?

Weyl law

Eigenvalue: (classical Weyl formula, or Weyl law)

$$N(\lambda) = c_n \lambda^n + O(\lambda^{n-1}).$$

You can also recover $N(\lambda)$ by taking inverse Fourier transform on the truncated trace of half-wave operator:

$$N(\lambda) = rac{1}{2\pi} \int \widehat{\chi_{[0,\lambda]}}(t) \left\{ ext{trace of } e^{it\sqrt{-\Delta}} \right\} dt.$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

Half-wave

The half-wave $e^{it\sqrt{-\Delta}}$ is the Fourier transform of the spectral measure

$$\hat{E}(t)=\int e^{-it\lambda}dE_{\lambda}=e^{-it\sqrt{-\Delta}}$$

Here

$$e^{-it\sqrt{-\Delta}} = \sum_j e^{-it\lambda_j} e_{\lambda_j} \otimes e_{\lambda_j} = \sum_j \widehat{\delta(\cdot - \lambda_j)}(t) e_{\lambda_j} \otimes e_{\lambda_j}$$

and $e^{it\sqrt{-\Delta}}f(x)$ is also the solution to the (half)-wave Cauchy problem:

$$\begin{cases} (i\partial_t + \sqrt{-\Delta})u(t,x) = 0\\ u(0,x) = f(x). \end{cases}$$

More about Weyl law

Two things should be mentioned about Weyl law

- 1. It is sharp on spheres S^n
- 2. It is rarely sharp on other manifolds. For example: (Hlawka, 1950) On flat torus \mathbb{T}^n

$$N(\lambda) = c\lambda^n + O(\lambda^{n-1-\frac{n-1}{n+1}}).$$

This is because on torus $e_{\lambda}(x)$ is a trigonometric polynomial as follows

$$e_{\lambda}(x) = \sum_{|m|^2 = \lambda^2} \widehat{e_{\lambda}}(m) e^{im \cdot x}.$$

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

A key progress was made by Duistermaat and Guillemin in 1975, who proved that

- 1. The trace of $e^{it\sqrt{-\Delta}}$ is smooth when t is not equal to the period of any periodic geodesics (if any), or 0.
- 2. If the periodic geodesics are of zero Liouville measure, then

$$N(\lambda) = c_n \lambda^n + o(\lambda^{n-1}).$$

So to improve the remainder term in Weyl formula, a good candidate would be a manifold with very few periodic geodesics. In fact:

(Bérard, 1977) On manifolds without conjugate points, such as non-positive curvature manifolds, we have

$$N(\lambda) = c\lambda^n + O(\lambda^{n-1}/\log \lambda).$$

Weyl formula is in fact an L^{∞} type estimates for the eigenfunctions:

$$||e_{\lambda}||_{L^{\infty}} \leq C\lambda^{\frac{n-1}{2}}||e_{\lambda}||_{L^{2}}.$$

So we may ask, how about an L^p estimates with $p < +\infty$? (of course, except for those from simple interpolation)

 L^p estimates of the eigenfunctions on general manifolds (Sogge, 1987), using oscillatory integral techniques:

$$egin{aligned} ||e_{\lambda}||_{L^{p}(\mathcal{M})} &\leq C\lambda^{n(rac{1}{2}-rac{1}{p})-rac{1}{2}}||e_{\lambda}||_{L^{2}(\mathcal{M})}, & rac{2(n+1)}{n-1} \leq p \leq +\infty \ ||e_{\lambda}||_{L^{p}(\mathcal{M})} &\leq C\lambda^{rac{n-1}{2}(rac{1}{2}-rac{1}{p})}||e_{\lambda}||_{L^{2}(\mathcal{M})}, & 2 \leq p \leq rac{2(n+1)}{n-1}. \end{aligned}$$

These estimates are sharp on spheres. But lacking of explicit information the eigenfunctions makes improvement on other manifolds generally hard.

L^p improvement on non-positive manifolds

For large p, we can interpolate with Bérard's result. And by $(\log \lambda)^{\alpha} \ll \lambda^{+0}$ we may obtain a slightly better improvement with the price of losing endpoint case. (Hassell-Tacey, 2013)

$$||e_{\lambda}||_{L^{p}} \leq C rac{\lambda^{rac{n-1}{2}-rac{n}{p}}}{(\log\lambda)^{rac{1}{2}}} ||e_{\lambda}||_{L^{2}}, \quad p > rac{2(n+1)}{(n-1)}.$$

Notice the improvement over:

$$||e_{\lambda}||_{L^{p}} \leq C rac{\lambda^{rac{n-1}{2}-rac{n}{p}}}{(\log\lambda)^{rac{1}{2}-rac{n+1}{p(n-1)}}} ||e_{\lambda}||_{L^{2}}, \quad p \geq rac{2(n+1)}{(n-1)}.$$

But it seems very hard to break the log barrier.

There may be some hope in establishing much-better-than-sphere estimates on torus due to the explicit construction of eigenfunctions.

(Zygmund, 1974) On 2-dimensional torus we have

$$||e_{\lambda}||_{L^4(\mathbb{T}^2)} \leq C||e_{\lambda}||_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)}.$$

The proof is very simple and based on the simplicity of S^1 , so no hope to generalize to higher-dimensions.

Higher dimensional L^p estimates on torus

In higher dimensions, we may have

- 1. n = 3, $||e_{\lambda}||_{L^4} \leq C_{\varepsilon} \lambda^{\varepsilon} ||e_{\lambda}||_{L^2}$, due to arithmetic observation (relatively simple).
- 2. $n \ge 4$ (Bourgain 2011), $||e_{\lambda}||_{L^{p}} \le C_{\varepsilon}\lambda^{\varepsilon} ||e_{\lambda}||_{L^{2}}, p \le 2n/(n-1)$. This is based on an earlier work (Bourgain-Guth, 2011), which improved Tomas-Stein restriction conjecture using multilinear oscillatory integral techniques.

So a conjecture:

Conjecture: Is it possible on higher-dimensional torus we have

$$||e_{\lambda}||_{L^p} \leq C||e_{\lambda}||_{L^2}, \text{ for some } p>2?$$

So far we have no idea how to break the λ^{ε} barrier (compared with neg-curved manifold case).

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

A relatively new approach

If the growth rate of eigenfunctions reflects largeness of singularity of $e^{it\sqrt{-\Delta}}$ which propagates along the geodesics, then in ideal case the global L^p estimates may be dominated by the restriction of eigenfunctions on geodesics.

Spherical harmonics are the spherical part of the solution of Laplace equation, also the eigenfunctions of $\sqrt{-\Delta_{S^n}}$. In 2-d, if we use $\theta \in [0, \pi]$ to denote the latitude, $\phi \in [0, 2\pi]$ the longitude, then the eigenfunctions associated with $\sqrt{\ell(\ell+1)}$ is

$$Y_{\ell}^{m}(heta,\phi) = c_{m,\ell}P_{\ell}^{m}(\cos heta)e^{im\phi}, \quad -\ell \leq m \leq \ell$$

in which P_{ℓ}^m is the associated Legendre polynomials of degree ℓ and order m.

Zonal and sectoral spherical harmonics

Two extremal cases:

- 1. m = 0, zonal spherical harmonics, $Y_{\ell}^0 = c_{m,\ell} P_{\ell}(\cos \theta)$.
- m = ±ℓ, sectoral spherical harmonics (some call it highest weight spherical harmonics),
 |Y_ℓ^ℓ| = |c_ℓ| · |sin^ℓ θ| = |c_ℓ| · |x₁ + ix₂|^ℓ.



(Burq-Gérard-Tzvetkov, 2006), inspired by (Reznikov, 2004) If γ is a geodesic arc on surface M

$$\begin{aligned} \|e_{\lambda}\|_{L^{p}(\gamma)} &\leq C\lambda^{\frac{1}{4}} \|e_{\lambda}\|_{L^{2}(M)}, \quad 2 \leq p \leq 4 \\ \|e_{\lambda}\|_{L^{p}(\gamma)} &\leq C\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{p}} \|e_{\lambda}\|_{L^{2}(M)}, \quad 4 \leq p \leq \infty. \end{aligned}$$

The first estimate is sharp on $M = S^2$ by sectoral spherical harmonics, and the latter is sharp by zonal spherical harmonics.

Equivalence between global and restricted L^p estimates

(Bourgain, 2009) and (Sogge, 2009): On surface M, the following are equivalent for L^2 normalized eigenfunctions:

$$\|e_\lambda\|_{L^4(M)}\in o(\lambda^{rac{1}{4}})$$

and

$$\sup_{\gamma} \|e_{\lambda}\|_{L^2(\gamma)} \in o(\lambda^{\frac{1}{4}})$$

Here $\gamma \subset M$ is a unit-length geodesic arc. And the latter (therefore both) is proved to be true by (Sogge-Zelditch,2011) on surface with non-positve curvature.

(日) (同) (三) (三) (三) (○) (○)

Improvement on torus

It is classical that (see Hardy-Wright)

$$||e_{\lambda}||_{L^{2}(\gamma)} \lesssim ||e_{\lambda}||_{L^{\infty}(\mathbb{T}^{2})} \leq C_{\varepsilon}\lambda^{\varepsilon}||e_{\lambda}||_{L^{2}(\mathbb{T}^{2})}$$

So it leaves us a question, whether it is possible (for any smooth curve or with curvature)

$$\|e_{\lambda}\|_{L^2(\gamma)} \leq C \|e_{\lambda}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)}.$$

(Bourgain-Rudnick, 2011): If γ is an analytic curved arc in \mathbb{T}^2 (also in \mathbb{T}^3), then

 $||e_{\lambda}||_{L^{2}(\gamma)} \approx ||e_{\lambda}||_{L^{2}(\mathbb{T}^{2})},$

when λ is large.

Conjecture

For a real analytic curved arc γ in \mathbb{T}^n , $n \geq 4$, do we still have

$$||e_{\lambda}||_{L^{2}(\gamma)} \approx ||e_{\lambda}||_{L^{2}(\mathbb{T}^{n})}?$$

◆□ ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 • 의 Q @</p>

Thank you!