

## A RUNGE THEOREM FOR SOLUTIONS OF THE HEAT EQUATION

R. DIAZ

**ABSTRACT.** Let  $\Omega_1$  and  $\Omega_2$  be open sets in  $R^n$  such that  $\Omega_1 \subset \Omega_2$ . Every solution of the heat equation on  $\Omega_1$  admits approximation on the compact subsets of  $\Omega_1$  by functions which satisfy the heat equation throughout  $\Omega_2$  if and only if this topological condition is met: For every hyperplane  $\pi$  in  $R^n$  orthogonal to the time axis, every compact component of  $\pi \setminus \Omega_1$  contains a compact component of  $\pi \setminus \Omega_2$ .

**1. Introduction.** If  $P$  is a linear partial differential operator on  $R^n$  and if  $\Omega$  is an open set in  $R^n$ , let  $P(\Omega)$  denote the kernel of the map  $C^\infty(\Omega) \ni f \rightarrow Pf \in C^\infty(\Omega)$ . Observe that if  $\Omega'$  is an open subset of  $\Omega$  then the restriction map  $r: C^\infty(\Omega) \rightarrow C^\infty(\Omega')$  carries  $P(\Omega)$  to a subspace of  $P(\Omega')$ . If  $r(P(\Omega))$  is dense in  $P(\Omega')$  when  $P(\Omega')$  carries the topology induced by  $C^\infty(\Omega')$ , then the pair  $(\Omega', \Omega)$  is called a  $P$ -Runge pair and  $\Omega'$  is called a relative  $P$ -Runge domain of  $\Omega$ ; cf. [5]. For a large class of elliptic operators Malgrange has proved that  $(\Omega', \Omega)$  is a  $P$ -Runge pair if and only if every compact component of  $R^n \setminus \Omega'$  contains a compact component of  $R^n \setminus \Omega$  [4]. No general topological characterization of  $P$ -Runge pairs has been given for nonelliptic operators; however, B. F. Jones has proved recently that for the parabolic operator  $H$ , the heat operator on  $R^n$ , the pair  $(\Omega, R^n)$  is an  $H$ -Runge pair if and only if each hyperplane in  $R^n$  orthogonal to the time axis intersects  $R^n \setminus \Omega$  to form a set that is free of compact components [3]. We shall generalize the theorem of Jones by characterizing all  $H$ -Runge pairs.

**2. Statement of results.** Let  $H$  denote the heat operator on  $R^n$ ,  $n > 2$ , and let  $\Omega_1$  and  $\Omega_2$  be open sets in  $R^n$  such that  $\Omega_1 \subset \Omega_2$ . Our main result is

**THEOREM 1.** *If, for each hyperplane  $\pi$  in  $R^n$  orthogonal to the time axis, every compact component of  $\pi \setminus \Omega_1$  contains a compact component of  $\pi \setminus \Omega_2$ , then  $(\Omega_1, \Omega_2)$  is an  $H$ -Runge pair.*

Modifying the work of Jones in a straightforward fashion, we also prove the converse.

**THEOREM 2.** *If  $(\Omega_1, \Omega_2)$  is an  $H$ -Runge pair then, for each hyperplane  $\pi$  orthogonal to the time axis, every compact component of  $\pi \setminus \Omega_1$  contains a compact component of  $\pi \setminus \Omega_2$ .*

---

Received by the editors June 25, 1979.

AMS (MOS) subject classifications (1970). Primary 35K05, 35A35; Secondary 35E10.

Key words and phrases. Relative  $P$ -Runge domains, parabolic operators,  $H$ -Runge pairs, nonuniqueness for the initial value problem.

**3. Proof of the main theorem.** The Hahn-Banach theorem implies that  $(\Omega_1, \Omega_2)$  is an  $H$ -Runge pair if and only if each distribution  $\mu \in \mathcal{E}'(\Omega_1)$  that annihilates  $H(\Omega_2)$  also annihilates  $H(\Omega_1)$ . If  $\mu$  does annihilate  $H(\Omega_2)$ ,  $\mu$  annihilates in particular the exponential-polynomial members of  $H(R^n)$ , and a theorem of Malgrange implies that  $\mu = {}^{\dagger}H\nu$  for some  $\nu \in \mathcal{E}'(R^n)$  where  ${}^{\dagger}H$  denotes the operator formally adjoint to  $H$  [4]. If  $\nu$  is supported in  $\Omega_1$  there exists a cut-off function  $\varphi$  such that for each  $f \in H(\Omega_1)$  the function  $\varphi f$  agrees with  $f$  on a neighborhood of  $\text{supp } \nu$  and  $\varphi f \in \mathcal{E}(R^n)$ ; consequently,  $\text{supp } \nu \cap \text{supp } H(\varphi f) = \emptyset$  and

$$\langle \mu, f \rangle = \langle {}^{\dagger}H\nu, f \rangle = \langle {}^{\dagger}H\nu, \varphi f \rangle = \langle \nu, H(\varphi f) \rangle = 0. \tag{3.1}$$

Thus,  $\mu$  annihilates  $H(\Omega_1)$  if  $\nu$  is supported in  $\Omega_1$ . The remainder of this section deals with the complications which arise when  $\nu$  is not supported in  $\Omega_1$ . We shall prove that  $\text{supp } \nu \setminus \Omega_1$  is a compact subset of  $\partial\Omega_1$  on which  $\nu$  vanishes to infinite order; then, approximating  $\nu$  by functions which are supported in  $\Omega_1$ , we shall apply (3.1) to conclude that  $\mu$  does indeed annihilate  $H(\Omega_1)$ .

Let  $E$  be a fundamental solution for the operator  ${}^{\dagger}H$ . For each multi-index  $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n)$ ,

$$D^{\alpha}\nu = D^{\alpha}\nu * \delta = D^{\alpha}\nu * {}^{\dagger}HE = {}^{\dagger}HD^{\alpha}\nu * E = {}^{\dagger}H\nu * D^{\alpha}E = \mu * D^{\alpha}E.$$

The hypoellipticity of  ${}^{\dagger}H$  implies that for each  $x \in R^n \setminus \text{supp } \mu$

$$D^{\alpha}\nu(x) = \langle \mu, D^{\alpha}E(x - \cdot) \rangle \tag{3.2}$$

where  $D^{\alpha}E(x - \cdot)$  denotes the function  $y \rightarrow D^{\alpha}E(x - y)$ . Since

$$HD^{\alpha}E(x - \cdot) = {}^{\dagger}HD^{\alpha}E(x - \cdot) = D^{\alpha}{}^{\dagger}HE(x - \cdot) = D^{\alpha}\delta(x - \cdot),$$

$D^{\alpha}E(x - \cdot) \in H(\Omega_2)$  for each  $x \notin \Omega_2$ . The hypothesis that  $\mu$  annihilates  $H(\Omega_2)$  and (3.2) imply that  $\nu$  vanishes to infinite order on  $R^n \setminus \Omega_2$ .

Let  $\pi$  be any hyperplane in  $R^n$  orthogonal to the time axis. Since  $D^{\alpha}\nu$  satisfies  ${}^{\dagger}H(D^{\alpha}\nu) = 0$  on  $R^n \setminus \text{supp } \mu$ ,  $D^{\alpha}\nu$  is real-analytic in the space variables on  $R^n \setminus \text{supp } \mu$ . Thus,  $D^{\alpha}\nu$  vanishes on every component of  $\pi \setminus \text{supp } \mu$  that contains an infinite order zero of  $\nu$ . Every unbounded component of  $\pi \setminus \text{supp } \mu$  contains such a zero because  $\nu$  has compact support. Every bounded component of  $\pi \setminus \text{supp } \mu$  that contains a compact component of  $\pi \setminus \Omega_1$  must contain a compact component of  $\pi \setminus \Omega_2$  by the hypothesis of Theorem 1; consequently,  $D^{\alpha}\nu$  vanishes on every component of  $\pi \setminus \text{supp } \mu$  that contains a component of  $\pi \setminus \Omega_1$ . Since  $\pi$  and  $\alpha$  are arbitrary,  $\nu$  must vanish to infinite order throughout  $R^n \setminus \Omega_1$ . Clearly then  $\text{supp } \nu \subset \overline{\Omega_1}$ , and  $\nu$  vanishes to infinite order on  $\text{supp } \nu \setminus \Omega_1$ . The closed set  $K = \text{supp } \nu \setminus \Omega_1$  is compact because  $\nu$  has compact support.

Henceforth we shall write  $R^n$  as  $R^{n-1} \times R$  so that we may distinguish between the one time variable and the  $n - 1$  space variables on which solutions of the heat equation depend. Let  $\{D_i\}_{i=1}^m$  be a finite collection of mutually disjoint, connected open sets such that

- (i) each  $D_i$  is a product of a subset of  $R^{n-1}$  and a subinterval of  $R$ ,
- (ii)  $\overline{D_i} \cap \overline{D_j}$  is contained in a hyperplane orthogonal to the time axis and has finitely many components for  $i \neq j$ ; and

(iii)  $F = \cup_{i=1}^m \bar{D}_i$  is a compact neighborhood of  $K$  disjoint from  $\text{supp } \mu$ .

Let  $\varphi$  be a cut-off function supported in the interior of  $F$  such that  $\varphi \equiv 0$  on a neighborhood of each component of  $\bar{D}_i \cap \bar{D}_j$  disjoint from  $K$  and such that  $\varphi \equiv 1$  on a neighborhood of  $K$ . Finally, let  $Z = \{x \notin \text{supp } \mu \mid \nu \text{ vanishes to infinite order at } x\}$ . Any  $\bar{D}_i \cap \bar{D}_j$  has its components contained in a copy of  $R^{n-1}$  when  $i \neq j$ ; and since  $\nu$  is real-analytic in the space variables on a neighborhood of  $\bar{D}_i \cap \bar{D}_j$ ,  $\nu$  vanishes to infinite order throughout any component of  $\bar{D}_i \cap \bar{D}_j$  meeting  $K$ . Thus  $\varphi\nu$  vanishes to infinite order throughout  $\bar{D}_i \cap \bar{D}_j$  when  $i \neq j$ . Since each boundary point of  $D_i$  is either contained in some  $\bar{D}_j$  or is a boundary point of  $F$ ,  $\varphi\nu$  vanishes to infinite order throughout the boundary of  $D_i$ . Clearly then  $\varphi\nu$  vanishes to infinite order throughout the boundary of each component of  $D_i \setminus Z$ .

Now, for each  $f \in H(\Omega_1)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mu, f \rangle &= \langle (1 - \varphi)\mu + \varphi\mu, f \rangle, \\ &= \langle {}^tH[(1 - \varphi)\nu], f \rangle + \langle {}^tH(\varphi\nu), f \rangle, \\ &= \langle {}^tH(\varphi\nu), f \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

since  $Hf \equiv 0$  on a neighborhood of  $\text{supp}(1 - \varphi)\nu$ . Recall that  $\varphi\nu$  is smooth and supported in  $F$ . Evidently, then,

$$\langle \mu, f \rangle = \int_F f {}^tH(\varphi\nu) = \sum_{i=1}^m \int_{D_i} f {}^tH(\varphi\nu) = \sum_{i=1}^m \int_{D_i \setminus Z} f {}^tH(\varphi\nu).$$

Let  $A \times (a, b)$  be an arbitrary component of some  $D_i \setminus Z$ , where  $A \subset R^{n-1}$  and  $(a, b) \subset R$ . We shall prove that  $\int_{A \times (a,b)} f {}^tH(\varphi\nu) = 0$ , from which it follows that  $\mu$  annihilates  $H(\Omega_1)$ .

Note that since  $\varphi\nu$  vanishes to infinite order throughout the boundary of  $A \times (a, b)$  the function  $\overline{\varphi\nu}$  which agrees with  $\varphi\nu$  on  $A \times (a, b)$  and which is zero outside  $A \times (a, b)$  is smooth throughout  $R^{n-1} \times R$ . Composing  $\overline{\varphi\nu}$  with a translation of  $R^{n-1} \times R$ , we may assume that  $(0, 0) \in A \times (a, b)$ . Now let  $B \times (c, d)$  be a connected open neighborhood of  $\bar{A} \times [a, b]$  such that  $\bar{B} \times [c, d]$  is a subset of  $(R^{n-1} \times R) \setminus \text{supp } \mu$ . Clearly  $B \times (a, b)$  is disjoint from  $Z$  because  $A \times (a, b)$  is disjoint from  $Z$ . For each  $t > 1$  the dilation  $T_t: R^{n-1} \times R \rightarrow R^{n-1} \times R$  defined by  $(\xi, \tau) \rightarrow T_t(\xi, \tau) = (t\xi, t^2\tau)$  is such that  $R^{n-1} \times [a, b] \subset T_t(R^{n-1} \times (a, b))$ ; thus,  $T_t^*(\overline{\varphi\nu}) = \overline{\varphi\nu} \circ T_t$  is supported in  $R^{n-1} \times (a, b)$ . For all  $t$  sufficiently close to 1,  $T_t(\text{supp } \overline{\varphi\nu})$  is contained in  $B \times (c, d)$ . For such  $t$  we have  $\text{supp } T_t^*(\overline{\varphi\nu}) = T_t^{-1}(\text{supp } \overline{\varphi\nu}) \subset B \times (c, d) \cap R^{n-1} \times (a, b) \subset B \times (a, b)$ . Thus  $\text{supp } T_t^*(\overline{\varphi\nu})$  is disjoint from  $Z$ . In particular,  $\text{supp } T_t^*(\overline{\varphi\nu})$  is disjoint from  $R^n \setminus \Omega_1$ . Since  ${}^tHT_t^*(\overline{\varphi\nu}) = t^2T_t^*({}^tH\overline{\varphi\nu})$ ,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 1^+} \langle f, {}^tHT_t^*(\overline{\varphi\nu}) \rangle = \langle f, {}^tH\overline{\varphi\nu} \rangle = \int_{A \times (a,b)} f {}^tH(\varphi\nu).$$

On the other hand, since  ${}^tHT_t^*(\overline{\varphi\nu})$  is supported in  $\Omega_1$ ,

$$\langle f, {}^tHT_t^*(\overline{\varphi\nu}) \rangle = \langle Hf, T_t^*(\overline{\varphi\nu}) \rangle = \langle 0, T_t^*(\overline{\varphi\nu}) \rangle = 0.$$

Thus,  $\int_{A \times (a,b)} f {}^tH(\overline{\varphi\nu}) = 0$  and  $\mu$  annihilates  $H(\Omega_1)$ . Q.E.D.

**4. The converse to the main theorem.** Our proof that the topological condition on  $\Omega_1$  and  $\Omega_2$  is necessary for  $(\Omega_1, \Omega_2)$  to be an  $H$ -Runge pair is a modification of the proof given in [3] for the special case  $\Omega_2 = R^n$ . This proof requires the Tychonoff counterexample to uniqueness to the initial-value problem for the heat equation, which is a nonzero element of  $H(R^n)$  supported in a strip bounded by two hyperplanes orthogonal to the time axis. The existence of such a function is proved in [2].

We shall prove that if for some hyperplane  $\pi$  orthogonal to the time axis some compact component of  $\pi \setminus \Omega_1$  is contained in  $\Omega_2$ , then there exists a  $\mu \in \mathcal{E}'(\Omega_1)$  such that  $\mu$  annihilates  $H(\Omega_2)$  but such that  $\mu$  does not annihilate  $H(\Omega_1)$ ; the Hahn-Banach theorem then implies that  $H(\Omega_2)$  is not dense in  $H(\Omega_1)$ . We may assume that  $\pi = R^{n-1} \times \{0\}$  and identify  $\pi$  with  $R^{n-1}$ . Now, there exists an open set  $G$  in  $R^{n-1}$  contained in  $\Omega_2$  and a nonempty compact subset  $K$  of  $\pi \setminus \Omega_1$  such that  $G \setminus \Omega_1 = K$  [1]. Choose  $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(G)$  such that  $\varphi \equiv 1$  on a neighborhood of  $K$  in  $R^{n-1}$ . There exists a  $\delta > 0$  such that  $\text{supp } \varphi \times [-\delta, \delta] \subset \Omega_2$  and such that  $\text{supp} \|\nabla \varphi\| \times [-\delta, \delta] \subset \Omega_1$ , where  $\nabla$  is the  $(n-1)$ -dimensional gradient. By suitably rescaling the Tychonoff counterexample to uniqueness and reversing the sign of the time variable, we can construct a function  $g$  supported in  $R^{n-1} \times [-\delta, \delta]$  such that  ${}^\dagger Hg = 0$  throughout  $R^n$  and  $g$  is nonzero at some point  $x_0$  in  $K$ . The function  ${}^\dagger H(\varphi g)$  is supported in  $\text{supp} \|\nabla \varphi\| \times [-\delta, \delta] \subset \Omega_1$ , and  $\varphi g$  is supported in  $\text{supp } \varphi \times [-\delta, \delta] \subset \Omega_2$ . For each  $f \in H(\Omega_2)$  one has

$$\langle {}^\dagger H(\varphi g), f \rangle = \langle g, \varphi Hf \rangle = \langle g, 0 \rangle = 0.$$

However, if  $E$  is any fundamental solution for the heat equation then  $E(\cdot - x_0) \in H(\Omega_1)$ , yet

$$\langle {}^\dagger H(\varphi g), E(\cdot - x_0) \rangle = \langle \varphi g, HE(\cdot - x_0) \rangle = \langle \varphi g, \delta(\cdot - x_0) \rangle = g(x_0) \neq 0.$$

Thus  $\mu = {}^\dagger H(\varphi g)$  annihilates  $H(\Omega_2)$  but does not annihilate  $H(\Omega_1)$ ; and  $H(\Omega_2)$  is not dense in  $H(\Omega_1)$ . Q.E.D.

I wish to thank Professor B. Frank Jones, whose lectures on partial differential equations and work on the Runge problem made this paper possible.

#### REFERENCES

1. R. Harvey, J. Polking and R. O. Wells, Jr., *Complex analysis*, (in preparation).
2. G. Hellwig, *Partial differential equations: an introduction*, Blaisdell, Waltham, Mass., 1964. MR 30 #3286.
3. B. F. Jones, *An approximation theorem of Runge type for solutions of the heat equation*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 52 (1975), 289-292. MR 52 #8654.
4. B. Malgrange, *Existence et approximation des solutions des équations aux dérivées partielles et des équations de convolution*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) 6 (1955/56), 271-355. MR 19, 280.
5. F. Trèves, *Locally convex spaces and linear partial differential equations*, Die Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 146, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1967.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, RICE UNIVERSITY, HOUSTON, TEXAS 77001

*Current address:* Department of Mathematics, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey 08540