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1 Introduction and the main results

There are many researches about smoothing effects for dispersive equations. We can find many results about smoothing effects for the Schödinger equation. However the study for general class of dispersive operators is not enough when we compare the results for a general class of dispersive operators with that of Schödinger operators. One of our aim is to know the dependence of the order of operators. Our class of operators we define later include not only Schödinger operators but also linearized KdV operators.

First let us describe our problem.

Let $m$ be an integer greater than or equal to 2. Let $P(y, D_y)$ be a linear differential operator of order $m$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$,

\[(1. 1) \quad P(y, D_y) = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq m} c_\alpha(y) D_y^\alpha.\]

We assume that $P(y, D_y)$ has analytic coefficients in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and a real principal symbol. And we assume that $P(y, D_y)$ is the real principal type (in strong sense). That is, for all $(y, \eta) \in T^*\mathbb{R}^n \setminus 0$ there exists an integer $j$ with $1 \leq j \leq n$ such that we have $\partial_{\eta_j} p(y, \eta) \neq 0$, where $p(y, \eta) = \sum_{|\alpha| = m} c_\alpha(y) \eta^\alpha$ be the principal symbol of $P(y, D_y)$.

Let us consider the initial value problem

\[(1. 2) \quad \begin{cases} D_t u + P(y, D_y) u = 0, \\ u|_{t=0} = u_0(y). \end{cases}\]

We can study more general situations, however we consider the simpler case that the space dimension $n$ equals to 1 in this note.

\[(1. 3) \quad P(y, D_y) u = \sum_{0 \leq l \leq m} c_l(y) D_y^l,\]
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where $c_m(y) = 1$ and $c_l(y)$ are analytic in $\mathbb{R}$, that is, the coefficient of the principal part i constant.

Moreover we shall make the following assumption.

One can find positive $C_0 > 0, R_0 > 0, K_0 > 0$, and $\sigma_0 \in (0, 1)$ such that for $y \in \mathbb{R}$ with $|y| > R$ and $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\},$

$$\sum_{0 \leq l \leq m-1} |D^l_y c_l(y)| \leq C_0 \frac{K_0^k k!}{|y|^{1+\sigma_0+k}}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (1.4)

Let $\rho = (y, \eta) \in T^*\mathbb{R}\setminus 0$, and let $(Y(s; y, \eta), \Theta(s; y, \eta))$ be the solution to the equation,

$$\begin{cases}
\frac{\partial}{\partial s} Y(s) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta}(Y(s), \Theta(s)), & Y(0) = y, \\
\frac{\partial}{\partial s} \Theta(s) = -\frac{\partial}{\partial \eta}(Y(s), \Theta(s)), & \Theta(0) = \eta.
\end{cases}$$  \hspace{1cm} (1.5)

In our case $p(y, \eta) = p(\eta) = \eta^m$. Therefore

$$\begin{cases}
Y(s) = y + m\eta s^{m-1} \\
\Theta(s) = \Theta(0) = \eta.
\end{cases}$$  \hspace{1cm} (1.6)

We remark that for $\eta \neq 0$,

$$\lim_{s \to \infty} |Y(s, y, \eta)| = +\infty.$$  \hspace{1cm} (1.7)

The nontrapping condition is satisfied.

Let $u(t, \cdot) \in C(\mathbb{R}, L^2(\mathbb{R}))$ be the solution of the initial value problem (1.2).

Let us introduce a space of the initial data,

$$\Gamma^+_{\rho_0} = \{Y(s; y_0, \eta_0) \in \mathbb{R}; s \geq 0\}$$  \hspace{1cm} (1.7)

$$X^+_{\rho_0} = \{v \in L^2(\mathbb{R}); \exists \varepsilon_0 > 0, \exists \delta_0 > 0, e^{\delta_0 |t|^{m-1}} v(y) \in L^2(\Gamma^+_{\rho_0})\}. $$  \hspace{1cm} (1.8)

The next theorem is the main result of this paper. This is one of the expression for the microlocal smoothing effect.

Theorem 1.1 Let $P(y, D_y)$ be defined in (1.3) satisfying (1.4) and $\rho_0 = (y_0, \eta_0) \in T^*\mathbb{R}\setminus 0$. Let $u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ be in $X^+_{\rho_0}$. Then for all $t < 0 \rho_0$ does not belong to the analytic wave front set $WF_A[u(t, \cdot)]$ of the solution $u(t, \cdot)$ for (1.2).

We give a simple application of this theorem.

Let $u(t, y)$ be the solution to the next initial value problem,

$$\begin{cases}
D_t u + D^m_y u = 0, \\
u|_{t=0} = u_0(y).
\end{cases}$$  \hspace{1cm} (1.9)
Corollary 1.1 Let the initial data $u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ satisfy that there exists a positive constant $\delta_0$ such that

\[(1.10) \quad \int_0^{\infty} e^{2\delta_0 |y|^{\frac{2}{m-1}}} |u_0(y)|^2 dy < \infty,\]

in the case $m$ is odd, or

\[(1.11) \quad \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{\frac{2\delta_0}{m-1}} |u_0(y)|^2 dy < \infty,\]

in the case $m$ is odd.

Then the solution to the initial value problem (1.9) becomes analytic with respect to the space variable $y$ for $t < 0$.

Our approach is based on FBI transform which was used by Robbiano and Zuily in [15]. The reader can see the details about this problem and historical results in [15] and [17].

2 Analytic wave front set and FBI transform

In this section we define FBI transform and analytic wave front set. The reader had better refer to [15] and [20].

Let $\rho_0 = (y_0, \eta_0) \in T^*\mathbb{R}\setminus 0$. Let $\varphi(x, y)$ be a holomorphic function in a neighborhood $U_0 \times V_{y_0}$ of $(0, y_0)$ in $\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}$ which satisfies

\[(2.1) \quad \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial y}(0, y) = -\eta_0,\]

\[(2.2) \quad \text{Im} \frac{\partial^2 \varphi}{\partial y^2}(0, y) > 0,\]

\[(2.3) \quad \frac{\partial^2 \varphi}{\partial x \partial y}(0, y) \neq 0.\]

For above $\varphi(x, y)$ we can define,

\[(2.4) \quad \Phi(x) = \max_{y \in V_{y_0}} (-\text{Im} \varphi(x, y)),\]

for $x \in U_0$.

Let $a(x, y, \lambda) = \sum_{k \geq 0} a_k(x, y) \lambda^{-k}$ be a analytic symbol of order zero, elliptic in a neighborhood of $(0, y_0)$. Let $\chi \in C_0^\infty$ be a cutoff function with support in a neighborhood of $y_0$, $0 \leq \chi \leq 1$, and $\chi \equiv 1$ near $y_0$.

The FBI transform of a distribution $u \in \mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R})$ is defined by

\[(2.5) \quad Tu(x, \lambda) = \langle \chi(\cdot) u, e^{i\lambda \varphi(x, \cdot)} a(x, \cdot, \lambda) \rangle, \quad \lambda > 1.\]
According to [20] we can characterize the analytic wave front set of $u \in \mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R})$ by using FBI transform. Next (2.6) and (2.7) are equivalent,

(2.6) \hspace{1cm} \rho_0 \not\in WF_A[u].

(2.7) \hspace{1cm} \exists C > 0, \exists \mu > 0, \exists \lambda_0 \geq 1 \text{ such that } e^{-\lambda\Theta(x)}|Tu(x, \lambda)| \leq Ce^{-\mu\lambda}, \text{ for } \forall x \in U_0, \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_0.

Assume that $u(t, \cdot)$ is a element of a family of distribution on $\mathbb{R}$ depending of a real parameter $t$. Let $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. We shall say that a point $\rho_0 \in T^*\mathbb{R}\setminus 0$ does not belong to the locally uniform analytic wave front set $\overline{WF}_A[u(t_0, \cdot)]$ if there exist an FBI transform $T$, positive constants $C, \mu, \lambda_0, \epsilon$, and a neighborhood $U_0$ of $0$ such that

(2.8) \hspace{1cm} e^{-\lambda\Theta(x)}|Tu(t, x, \lambda)| \leq Ce^{-\mu\lambda}, \text{ for } \forall x \in U_0, \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_0, \forall t \in (t_0 - \epsilon, t_0 + \epsilon).

3 Idea of proof

We make use of FBI transform in order to make a change our operator $P(y, D_y)$ into more simpler one. This idea has already been known by Egorov's theorem in the theory of Fourier integral operators. Thanks to this theorem we can transform any first order real principal type operator into $D_x$ by Fourier integral operators.

Since our operator is of order $m \geq 2$, so we make use of FBI transform instead of Fourier integral operators in order to transform the operator of order $m$ into the first order operator $D_x$. The parameter $\lambda$ in the FBI transform means $|\xi|$ in some sense. To balance the order of two operators we introduce the parameter $\lambda$. In fact we can realize the next relationship by introducing a suitable FBI transform $F$,

(3.1) \hspace{1cm} F \frac{1}{\lambda^m}P(y, D_y) = \frac{1}{\lambda}D_xF, \text{ (mod analytic).}

This is the main idea of this approach.

Let us give a sketch of proof related to the assumption for the initial data.

We introduce a FBI type transformation.

Let $u(t, z)$ is the solution of the initial value problem,

(3.2) \hspace{1cm} \begin{cases} [D_t + P(z, D_z)]u(t, z) = 0, \\ u|_{t=0} = u_0(z). \end{cases}

Let $\chi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ with $0 \leq \chi \leq 1$ and

$$\chi(r) = \begin{cases} 1, & |r| \leq \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_0, \\ 0, & |r| \geq \epsilon_0. \end{cases}$$
We introduce

\[(3.3)\]

\[Su(t,x,\lambda) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{i\lambda \varphi(x,z)} f(x, z, \lambda) \chi(\frac{z - Y(\text{Re} x)}{1 + |x|}) u(t, z) \, dz.\]

where \(Y(s)\) is given in (1.5).

By operating the operator \(S\) to (3.2) we have

\[(3.4)\]

\[
\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \lambda^{m-1} \frac{\partial}{\partial x}\right) Su(t,x,\lambda) = i\lambda^{m} \left( \frac{1}{\lambda} D_{t} Su - \frac{1}{\lambda^{m}} SPu \right).
\]

We define

\[I(t,x,\lambda) = \frac{1}{\lambda} D_{x} Su - \frac{1}{\lambda^{m}} SPu\]

\[(3.5)\]

\[= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left( \frac{1}{\lambda} D_{x} - \frac{1}{\lambda^{m}} {}^{t}P(z,D_{z}) \right)(e^{i\lambda \varphi} f \chi) u(t,z) \, dz,
\]

where \( {}^{t}P(z,D_{z})w = \sum_{l=0}^{m} (-D_{z})^{l} (a_{l}(z)w(z)) = (-D_{z})^{m}w + \sum_{l=0}^{m-1} b_{l}(z) D_{z}^{l} \). The coefficients also satisfy the condition (1.4).

We define

\[(3.6)\]

\[J(x,z,\lambda) = \left( \frac{1}{\lambda} D_{x} - \frac{1}{\lambda^{m}} {}^{t}P(z,D_{z}) \right)(e^{i\lambda \varphi} f).
\]

If \(J(x,z,\lambda)\) is small enough in some sense, then we have only to consider the equation

\[(3.7)\]

\[
\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \lambda^{m-1} \frac{\partial}{\partial x}\right) Su(t,x,\lambda) = 0.
\]

This equation is easily solved

\[Su(t,x,\lambda) = Su(0,x - \lambda^{m-1}t,\lambda).
\]

Since \(x\) is near 0, we have \(|z| \geq \frac{1}{4}|\dagger n|^{m-1}|t_{0}|\lambda^{m-1}\) on the support of \(\chi\).

Then we have

\[(3.8)\]

\[|Su(0,x - \lambda^{m-1}t,\lambda)| \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{i\lambda \varphi(x, z, \lambda)} f(x - \lambda^{m-1}t, x, \lambda)
\]

\[\cdot \chi(\frac{z - Y(\text{Re} x - \lambda^{m-1}t)}{1 + |x - \lambda^{m-1}t|}) e^{\frac{t_{0}}{4} |z|^{m-1}} e^{\frac{t_{0}}{4} |\dagger n|^{m-1} t_{0} u_{0}(z)} \, dz
\]

\[\leq Ce^{\lambda \Phi(x) - \frac{t_{0}}{4} |\dagger n|^{m-1} t_{0} \lambda} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\chi(\cdots)| e^{\frac{t_{0}}{4} |z|^{m-1}} e^{\frac{t_{0}}{4} |\dagger n|^{m-1} t_{0} u_{0}(z)} \, dz
\]

\[\leq Ce^{\lambda \Phi(x) - \frac{t_{0}}{4} |\dagger n|^{m-1} t_{0} \lambda} \int |\chi(\cdots)| e^{\frac{t_{0}}{4} |z|^{m-1}} e^{\frac{t_{0}}{4} |\dagger n|^{m-1} t_{0} u_{0}(z)} \, dz
\]

This implies

\[e^{-\lambda \Phi(x)} |Su(t,x,\lambda)| \leq Ce^{-\mu t},\]

for \(\forall x \in U_{0}, \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_{0}, \forall t \in (t_{0} - \epsilon, t_{0} + \epsilon).\)
Since we can get same properties for FBI transform with a usual cutoff function as the operator $S$ introduced in (3.3), we can prove Theorem 1.1.

The smallness of $J(x, z, \lambda)$ is important for the above approach. In fact we can globally construct a parametrix along the bicharacteristics.

**Lemma 3.1** There exist $\varepsilon_1 > 0$, and a holomorphic function $\varphi(x, z)$ in the set

\[ E = \{(x, z) \in \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}; \text{Re } x \geq -\varepsilon_1, |\text{Im } x| < \varepsilon_1, |z - Y(x; y_0, \eta_0)| < \varepsilon_1(1 + |x|)\}, \]

such that

\[ \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x}(x, z) = p_m(z, -\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial z}(x, z)) \text{ in } E, \]

\[ \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial z}(0, y_0) = -\eta_0, \]

\[ \text{Im } \frac{\partial^2 \varphi}{\partial z^2}(0, y_0) > 0, \]

\[ \frac{\partial^2 \varphi}{\partial x \partial z}(0, y_0) \neq 0. \]

**Lemma 3.2** There exists an analytic symbol $f$ of order zero defined in $E$ such that

\[ |J(x, z, \lambda)| \leq C e^{\lambda \Phi(x) - \mu_0 \lambda(1 + |x|)^N_0}, \]

where $\mu_0 > 0$ and $N_0$ is an integer.

In order to prove Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 3.2 we have to solve the eikonal equation and the transport equation. Since we make $\lambda$ large, we introduce the set $E$ which is global along the bicharacteristic. The way to construct phase and amplitude functions is discussed in [17].
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