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Einstein’s general theory of relativity states that spacetime has the structure of a pseudo-Riemannian 4-manifold $\mathcal{M}$.

The theory predicts that accelerating masses produce gravitational waves of perturbations in the metric tensor.

Newtonian vs. General Relativistic pictures:

This space-time bending is governed by the *Einstein Equations*. Black-Hole merger depiction (shamelessly stolen from LIGO website):
LIGO (Laser Interferometer Gravitational-wave Observatory) is one of several recently constructed gravitational detectors.

The design of LIGO is based on measuring distance changes between objects in perpendicular directions as the ripple in the metric tensor propagates through the device.

The two L-shaped LIGO observatories (in Washington and Louisiana), with legs at 1.5m meters by 4km, have phenomenal sensitivity, on the order of $10^{-15}$ m to $10^{-18}$ m.

The LIGO arms in Louisiana and Hanford, Washington:
The Einstein Equations

Riemann (curvature) tensor $R_{abc}^{\ d}$ arises as failure of commutativity of covariant differentiation:

Flat: $V_{\ ;bc}^a - V_{\ ;cb}^a = 0$, $V_{\ ;b}^a = \frac{\partial V^a}{\partial x^b}$.

Curved: $V_{\ ;bc}^a - V_{\ ;cb}^a = R_{d\ bc}^a V^d$, $V_{\ ;b}^a = V_{\ ;b}^a + \Gamma_{bc}^a V^c$,

where

$$R_{d\ bc}^a = \Gamma_{bd\ ,c}^a - \Gamma_{cd\ ,b}^a + \Gamma_{ec}^a \Gamma_{bd\ ,c}^a - \Gamma_{eb}^a \Gamma_{cd\ ,c}^a.$$

The ten equations for the ten independent components of the symmetric spacetime metric tensor $g_{ab}$ are the **Einstein Equations:** $G_{ab} = \kappa T_{ab}$, $0 \leq a \leq b \leq 3$, $\kappa = 8\pi G / c^4$,

- $R_{abc}^{\ d}$: Riemann (curvature) tensor
- $R_{ab} = R_{acb}^c$, $R = R_a^a$: Ricci tensor; scalar curvature
- $G_{ab} = R_{ab} - \frac{1}{2} R g_{ab}$, $T_{ab}$: Einstein/stress-energy tensors

Initial-value formulations well-posed (cf. Hawking & Ellis); Various formalisms yield constrained (weakly/strongly/symmetric) hyperbolic evolution systems on space-like 3-manifolds $S(t)$ for a Riemannian $\hat{h}_{ab}$, possibly also extrinsic curvature $\hat{k}_{ab} \sim \frac{d}{dt} \hat{h}_{ab}$.
Overview of Non-CMC Analysis
Frameworks for Conformal Method

Michael Holst

Conformal Method

Einstein Equations

GR and LIGO

1973–1995: CMC
1996–2007: Near-CMC
2008 Non-CMC Result
2009 Extensions
2010 Limit Equation
2013 IFT
2014 Drift System

Some of our Group’s Results

Rough Metrics
Compact Case
AE Case
Multiplicity Results

References

UCSD Center for Computational Mathematics

Twelve-component Einstein evolution system for \((\hat{h}_{ab}, \hat{k}_{ab})\) on a foliation.

Constrained by coupled eqns on spacelike \(\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_t\), with \(\hat{\tau} = \hat{k}_{ab} \hat{h}^{ab}\),

\[
\frac{3}{2} \hat{R} + \hat{\tau}^2 - \hat{k}_{ab} \hat{k}^{ab} - 2 \kappa \hat{\rho} = 0, \quad \hat{\nabla}^a \hat{\tau} - \hat{\nabla}_b \hat{k}^{ab} - \kappa \hat{j}^a = 0.
\]

York conformal decomposition: split initial data into 8 freely specifiable pieces plus 4 determined via:

\(\hat{h}_{ab} = \phi^4 h_{ab}, \hat{\tau} = \hat{k}_{ab} \hat{h}^{ab} = \tau, \) and

\[
\hat{k}_{ab} = \phi^{-10} \left[ \sigma^{ab} + (\mathcal{L}w)^{ab} \right] + \frac{1}{4} \phi^{-4} \tau h^{ab}, \quad \hat{j}^a = \phi^{-10} j^a, \quad \hat{\rho} = \phi^{-8} \rho.
\]

Produces coupled elliptic system for conformal factor \(\phi\) and a \(w^a\):

\[
-8 \Delta \phi + R \phi + \frac{2}{3} \tau^2 \phi^5 - (\sigma_{ab} + (\mathcal{L}w)^{ab})(\sigma^{ab} + (\mathcal{L}w)^{ab}) \phi^7 - 2 \kappa \rho \phi^3 = 0,
\]

\[
-\nabla_a (\mathcal{L}w)^{ab} + \frac{2}{3} \phi^6 \nabla^b \tau + \kappa j^b = 0.
\]

Differential structure on \(\mathcal{M}\) defined through background 3-metric \(h_{ab}\):

\[
(\mathcal{L}w)^{ab} = \nabla^a w^b + \nabla^b w^a - \frac{2}{3} (\nabla_c w^c) h^{ab}, \quad \nabla_b V^a = V_{;b}^a = V^a_{,b} + \Gamma^a_{bc} V^c,
\]

\[
V^a_{,b} = \frac{\partial V^a}{\partial x^b}, \quad \Gamma^a_{bc} = \frac{1}{2} h^{ad} \left( \frac{\partial h_{db}}{\partial x^c} + \frac{\partial h_{dc}}{\partial x^b} - \frac{\partial h_{bc}}{\partial x^d} \right). \quad (\Gamma^a_{bc} = \Gamma^a_{cb})
\]
The Conformal Method

Lichnerowicz and Choquet-Bruhat Papers: 1944 and 1958
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The Conformal Method as an Elliptic System

Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a space-like Riemannian 3-manifold with (possibly empty) boundary submanifold $\partial \mathcal{M}$, split into disjoint submanifolds satisfying:

$$\partial_D \mathcal{M} \cup \partial_N \mathcal{M} = \partial \mathcal{M}, \quad \partial_D \mathcal{M} \cap \partial_N \mathcal{M} = \emptyset. \quad (\partial_D \mathcal{M} \cap \partial_N \mathcal{M} = \emptyset)$$

Metric $h_{ab}$ associated with $\mathcal{M}$ induces boundary metric $\sigma_{ab}$, giving boundary value formulation of conformal method for $\phi$ and $w^a$:

$$L \phi + F(\phi, w) = 0, \quad \text{in} \quad \mathcal{M}, \quad \text{(Hamiltonian)}$$

$$L w + F(\phi) = 0, \quad \text{in} \quad \mathcal{M}, \quad \text{(Momentum)}$$

$$(\mathcal{L} w)^{ab} \nu_b + C_a^b w^b = V^a_\phi \text{ on } \partial_N \mathcal{M}, \quad \text{and} \quad w^a = w^a_D \text{ on } \partial_D \mathcal{M},$$

$$(\nabla^a \phi) \nu_a + k_w(\phi) = g \text{ on } \partial_N \mathcal{M}, \quad \text{and} \quad \phi = \phi_D \text{ on } \partial_D \mathcal{M},$$

where:

$$L \phi = -\Delta \phi, \quad (\mathcal{L} w)^a = -\nabla_b (\mathcal{L} w)^{ab},$$

$$F(\phi, w) = a_R \phi + a_\tau \phi^5 - a_w \phi^{-7} - a_\rho \phi^{-3}, \quad F(\phi) = b^b_\tau \phi^6 + b^b_j,$$

with:

$$a_R = \frac{R}{8}, \quad a_\tau = \frac{\tau^2}{12}, \quad a_w = \frac{1}{8} [\sigma_{ab} + (\mathcal{L} w)_{ab}]^2, \quad a_\rho = \frac{\kappa \rho}{4}, \quad b^b_\tau = \frac{2}{3} \nabla^b \tau, \quad b^b_j = \kappa j^b,$$

$$(\mathcal{L} w)^{ab} = \nabla^a w^b + \nabla^b w^a - \frac{2}{3} (\nabla_c w^c) h^{ab}, \quad \nabla_b V^a = V^a_{;b} = V^a_{,b} + \Gamma^a_{bc} V^c,$$

$$V^a_{,b} = \frac{\partial V^a}{\partial x^b}, \quad \Gamma^a_{bc} = \frac{1}{2} h^{ad} \left( \frac{\partial h_{db}}{\partial x^c} + \frac{\partial h_{dc}}{\partial x^b} - \frac{\partial h_{bc}}{\partial x^d} \right). \quad (\Gamma^a_{bc} = \Gamma^a_{cb})$$
Well-posedness, estimates, approximation, ...

This problem has the form:

\[ \text{Find } u \in \bar{u} + X \text{ such that } \langle F(u), v \rangle = 0, \forall v \in Y, \]  

(1)

where \( X \) and \( Y \) are B-spaces and \( F : X \rightarrow Y^* \).

Given approximation \( u^0 \approx u \), Newton iteration for \( u \) has form:

(a) Find \( w \in X \) such that:

\[ \langle F'(u^k)w, v \rangle = -\langle F(u^k), v \rangle + r, \forall v \in Y \]

(b) Set: \( u^{k+1} = u^k + \lambda w \)

One discretizes (a)-(b) at “last moment” using your favorite method.

Many questions about the constraint (and evolution) eqns remain open:

1. Is there existence, uniqueness, stability?
2. Is there multiplicity, with folds or bifurcation phenomena?
3. How smooth is \( X \)?
4. Can one build good approximation spaces \( X_h \approx X \)?
5. Performance of linear approximation for (1)?
6. Performance of nonlinear approximation for (1)?
7. Can we produce such (linear and nonlinear) approximations with optimal (linear) space and time complexity?
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The 1973–1995 CMC Results

$\nabla^b \tau = 0$: Constant Mean Curvature (CMC): $\Rightarrow$ constraints de-couple.

There were a number of CMC results generated during 1973–1995 by exploiting the fact that the constraint equations decouple.

You can solve the momentum constraint equation once and for all, and then you solve the Hamiltonian constraint once.

The research came down to understanding under what conditions the Hamiltonian constraint was solvable.

Some Key CMC Papers: 1974–1995


\[ \nabla^b \tau \neq 0: \text{Non-CMC case: } \Rightarrow \text{constraints couple.} \]

In the Non-CMC case, the constraints couple together; through 1996 there were no results, until the Isenberg-Moncrief paper of 1996 under near-CMC conditions (to be explained). This led to several results.

**Some of the Near-CMC Papers: 1996–2007**

A Look at the 1996 Near-CMC Result

Fixed-point arguments involve composition \( G(\phi) = T(\phi, S(\phi)) \), where:

1. Given \( \phi \), solve MC for \( w \):
   \[ w = S(\phi) \]
2. Given \( w \), solve HC for \( \phi \):
   \[ \phi = T(\phi, w) \]

Map \( S : X \to \mathcal{R}(S) \subset Y \) is MC solution map;
Map \( T : X \times \mathcal{R}(S) \to X \) is some fixed-point map for HC.

**Theorem:** (Isenberg-Moncrief) For case \( R = -1 \) on a closed manifold \( (h_{ab} \in \mathcal{Y}^-) \), strong smoothness assumptions, and near-CMC conditions, Isenberg-Moncrief show this is a contraction in Hölder spaces:

\[
[\phi^{(k+1)}, w^{(k+1)}] = G([\phi^{(k)}, w^{(k)}]).
\]

**Proof Outline:** Maximum principles, barriers, Banach algebra properties, plus contraction-mapping argument.

**Theorem 1 (Contraction Mapping Theorem)**

Let \( X \) be Banach and \( U \subset X \) nonempty & closed. If \( G : X \to X \) is a \( k \)-contraction on \( U \):

\[
\|G(u) - G(v)\|_X \leq k\|u - v\|_X, \quad 0 \leq k < 1, \quad \forall u, v \in U,
\]

then there exists a (unique) fixed-point \( u \in U \subset X \) satisfying \( u = G(u) \).
Yamabe Classes: Closed, Smooth or Rough

Yamabe classification of smooth metrics: Let $u > 0$ solve:

$$-8\Delta u + Ru = R_u u^5.$$ Then:

$$R_u > 0 \Rightarrow h_{ab} \in \mathcal{Y}^+, \quad R_u < 0 \Rightarrow h_{ab} \in \mathcal{Y}^-, \quad R_u = 0 \Rightarrow h_{ab} \in \mathcal{Y}^0.$$

Yamabe classification of rough metrics: The Yamabe problem on closed manifolds for rough metrics is still open; however, one can still get the following result [HNT09] which is all we need here:

**Theorem 2 (Yamabe Classification of Rough Metrics)**

Let $(\mathcal{M}, h)$ be a smooth, closed, connected Riemannian manifold with dimension $n \geq 3$ and with a metric $h \in W^{s,p}$, where we assume $sp > n$ and $s \geq 1$. Then, the followings hold:

- $\mu_2 > 0$ iff there is a metric in $[h]$ with continuous positive scalar curvature.
- $\mu_2 = 0$ iff there is a metric in $[h]$ with vanishing scalar curvature.
- $\mu_2 < 0$ iff there is a metric in $[h]$ with continuous negative scalar curvature.

In particular, two conformally equivalent metrics cannot have scalar curvatures with distinct signs.
Impact of the near-CMC restriction

To establish contraction properties for coupled PDE systems gives coupling restrictions; for the constraints, the restriction that results is the near-CMC condition:

$$\|\nabla \tau\|_r < C \inf_{\mathcal{M}} |\tau|, \quad (2)$$

where particular $L'$ norm depends on context. Condition appears in two distinct places:

1. Construction of the contraction $G$,
2. Construction of the set $U$ on which $G$ is a contraction.

The near-CMC condition is basically a condition that ensures the coupling between the two equations is weak.

In [HNT08, HNT09, Max09], a non-CMC analysis framework was developed by replacing contraction argument with a Schauder argument, combined with construction of *global barriers*.

The framework in [HNT08, HNT09] required the existence of matter sources to construct sub-solutions; this was extended to vacuum (no matter sources) in [Max09], which also contains other new results.

Approach places no limit on strength of equation coupling.
The 2008 Framework: Mappings $S$ and $T$

We outline the near-CMC-free fixed-point argument from [HNT09].

We first make precise the definitions of the maps $S$ and $T$.

To deal with the non-trivial kernel that exists for $L$ on closed manifolds, fix an arbitrary positive shift $s > 0$. Now write the constraints as

$$L_s \phi + F_s(\phi, w) = 0, \quad (L w)^a + F(\phi)^a = 0,$$

where $L_s : W^{2,p} \to L^p$ and $L : W^{2,p} \to L^p$ are defined as

$$L_s \phi := [-\Delta + s] \phi, \quad (L w)^a := -\nabla_b (L w)^{ab},$$

and where $F_s : [\phi_-, \phi_+] \times W^{2,p} \to L^p$ and $F : [\phi_-, \phi_+] \to L^p$ are

$$F_s(\phi, w) := [a_R - s] \phi + a_T \phi^5 - a_w \phi^{-7} - a_p \phi^{-3}, \quad F(\phi)^a := b^a_r \phi^6 + b^a_j.$$

Introduce the operators $S : [\phi_-, \phi_+] \to W^{2,p}$ and $T : [\phi_-, \phi_+] \times W^{2,p} \to W^{2,p}$ as

$$S(\phi) := -\mathbb{L}^{-1} F(\phi), \quad T(\phi, w) := -L_s^{-1} F_s(\phi, w).$$

Both maps are well-defined when $s > 0$ ($L_s$ is invertible) and when there are no conformal Killing vectors ($\mathbb{L}$ is invertible).
Schauder Approach to get at Non-CMC

Alternatives to Contraction Mapping Theorem that are more topological:

**Theorem 3 (Schauder Theorem)**

Let $X$ be a Banach space, and let $U \subset X$ be a non-empty, convex, closed, bounded subset. If $G : U \to U$ is a compact operator, then there exists a fixed-point $u \in U$ such that $u = G(u)$.

Here is a variation of Schauder tuned for the constraints.

**Theorem 4 (Coupled Schauder Theorem)**

Let $X$ and $Y$ be Banach spaces, and let $Z$ be a Banach space with compact embedding $X \hookrightarrow Z$. Let $U \subset Z$ be non-empty, convex, closed, bounded, and let $S : U \to \mathcal{R}(S) \subset Y$ and $T : U \times \mathcal{R}(S) \to U \cap X$ be continuous maps. Then, there exist $w \in \mathcal{R}(S)$ and $\phi \in U \cap X$ such that

$$\phi = T(\phi, w) \quad \text{and} \quad w = S(\phi). \quad (7)$$

**Proof Outline:** Show $G(\phi) = i \circ T(\phi, S(\phi)) : U \subset Z \to U \subset Z$ is compact and then use Schauder, where $i : X \to Z$ is (compact) canonical injection. □
Global barriers and \textit{a priori} $L^\infty$-bounds

To remove the near-CMC condition we use the following approach:

- Compactness-type fixed-point arguments (Coupled Schauder).
- Identifying the non-empty, convex, closed, bounded set $U$.
- Establishing properties of the constraint maps $S$ and $T$.

Note: Establishing continuity of maps $S$ and $T$, identifying the set $U$, and establishing convergence/optimality of numerical methods, will ALL depend on construction of compatible global barriers $\phi_-$ and $\phi_+$ that are free of the near-CMC condition. (Compatibility: $0 \leq \phi_- \leq \phi_+$)

Sub- and super-solutions, or barriers to HC satisfy:
\[
-\Delta \phi_- + a_R \phi_- + a_\tau \phi_-^5 - a_w \phi_-^7 - a_\rho \phi_-^3 \leq 0,
\]
\[
-\Delta \phi_+ + a_R \phi_+ + a_\tau \phi_+^5 - a_w \phi_+^7 - a_\rho \phi_+^3 \geq 0.
\]

Barriers related to \textit{a priori} $L^\infty$-bounds on any solution (if one exists):
\[
0 < \alpha \leq \phi \leq \beta < \infty.
\]

When nonlinearity monotone decreasing, can show barriers also \textit{a priori} $L^\infty$-bounds. (One can establish bounds directly; see [HNT09].)

Working in ordered Banach spaces; need for non-empty order-cone interval $U = [\phi_-, \phi_+]$ leads to concept of \textit{global barriers}: Barriers for HC for any $a_w$ generated from solutions $w$ to MC with source $\phi \in [\phi_-, \phi_+]$. 

Existence/estimates for momentum constraint

Assume for the moment we have global barriers (must still find them), and they give us (must verify) a non-empty, convex, closed, bounded subset $U \subset Z$ of the Banach space $Z$, and that in addition, we can show (must verify) that $T$ is invariant on $U$.

To use the Coupled Schauder Theorem to establish existence, it would remain to establish continuity properties of momentum and Hamiltonian constraint mappings $S$ and $T$. First consider $S$ (see [HNT09]).

**Theorem 5 (MC – Existence and Estimates)**

Let $(\mathcal{M}, h_{ab})$ be a 3-dimensional, closed, $C^2$, Riemannian manifold, with $h_{ab}$ having no conformal Killing vectors, and let $b^a_\tau$, $b^a_j \in L^p$ with $p \geq 2$ and $\phi \in L^\infty$; Then, equation (4) has a unique solution $w^a \in W^{2,p}$ with

$$c \|w\|_{2,p} \leq \|\phi\|_{\infty}^6 \|b_\tau\|_p + \|b_j\|_p,$$

where $c > 0$ is a constant.

**Proof Outline:** Korn inequalities (Gårding) + Riesz-Schauder theory.

Generalizations appear in [HNT09], allowing rougher metric and coefficients, giving existence down to $w^a \in W^{1,p}$, with real $p \geq 2$. 

---
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Key inequalities for momentum constraint

Under the assumption that any $\phi \in L^\infty$ appearing as the source in the momentum constraint equation (4) satisfies for some compatible barriers $0 < \phi_- \leq \phi_+ < \infty$

$$\phi \in U = [\phi_-, \phi_+] \subset L^\infty,$$

then one can establish continuity of $S$ (see [HNT09]). One can also show stronger boundedness and Lipschitz properties:

$$\|S(\phi)\|_Y \leq C_{SB}, \quad \|S(\phi_1) - S(\phi_2)\|_Y \leq C_{SL}\|\phi_1 - \phi_2\|_Z,$$

$$Y = W^{2,p}, \quad Z = L^\infty.$$

The inequality in equation (8) also gives for $p > 3$ the following estimate:

$$a_w \leq K_1 \|\phi\|_\infty^{12} + K_2,$$  \hspace{1cm} (9)

with $K_1 = (\frac{c_sc_L}{\sqrt{2c}})^2\|b_\tau\|_p^2$, $K_2 = \frac{1}{4}\|\sigma\|_\infty^2 + (\frac{c_sc_L}{\sqrt{2c}})^2\|b_j\|_p^2$, where $c_s$ is the constant in the embedding $W^{1,p} \hookrightarrow L^\infty$, and $c_L$ is a bound on the norm of $\mathcal{L} : W^{2,p} \to W^{1,p}$.

Inequality (9) will appear in a critical part of the analysis of the coupling between the two equations. Note that there is no smallness assumption on $\|b_\tau\|_p$, so the near-CMC condition is not required for these results.
Existence/estimates for Hamiltonian constraint

Turn now to Hamiltonian map $T$. From e.g. [HNT09] we have

**Theorem 6 (HC – Existence and Estimates)**

Let $(\mathcal{M}, h_{ab})$ be a 3-dimensional, $C^2$, closed Riemannian manifold. Let free data $\tau^2$, $\sigma^2$ and $\rho$ be in $L^p$, with $p \geq 2$. Let $\phi_-$ and $\phi_+$ be barriers to (3) for particular vector $w^a \in W^{1,2p}$. Then, there exists solution $\phi \in [\phi_-, \phi_+] \cap W^{2,p} = \mathcal{H} (3)$. Furthermore, if metric $h_{ab}$ in positive Yamabe class, then $\phi$ is unique.

**Proof Outline:** Barriers plus monotone increasing maps.

Generalizations appear in [HNT09], allowing rougher metric and coefficients, giving existence down to $\phi \in W^{1,p}$, with real $p \geq 2$.

This result, together MC results above and barrier results below, give required continuity properties for map $T$ (see [HNT09] for details). One can show stronger boundedness and Lipschitz conditions:

$$
\| T(\phi, w) \|_X \leq C_{TB}, \quad \| T(\phi_1, w) - T(\phi_2, w) \|_X \leq C_{TL} \| \phi_1 - \phi_2 \|_Z,
$$

$$
\| T(\phi, w_1) - T(\phi, w_2) \|_X \leq C_{TLW} \| w_1 - w_2 \|_Y,
$$

$$
X = W^{2,p}, \quad Y = W^{2,p}, \quad Z = L^\infty.
$$
Construction of the nonempty closed set $U$

Remaining assumptions for use of the Coupled Schauder Theorem are

(A) Let $U \subset Z$ be non-empty, convex, closed, and bounded (w.r.t. vector space, topological space, normed space structure of $Z$).

(B) $T$ is invariant on $U$.

We take $U = [\phi_-, \phi_+]_{t,q} \cap \overline{B}_R(0)$, for appropriate $t \geq 0$, $1 \leq q \leq \infty$, where $\overline{B}_R(0)$ is closed ball in $Z$ of radius $R$ about 0, and verify (A).

For brevity denote $[\phi_-, \phi+]_q = [\phi_-, \phi+]_{0,q}$, and $[\phi_-, \phi+] = [\phi_-, \phi+]_{0,\infty}$.

Lemma 7 (Order cone intervals in $W^{t,q}$)

For $t \geq 0$, $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, the set

$$U = [\phi_-, \phi_+]_{t,q} = \{ \phi \in W^{t,q} : \phi_- \leq \phi \leq \phi_+ \} \subset W^{t,q}$$

is convex with respect to the vector space structure of $W^{t,q}$ and closed in the topology of $W^{t,q}$. For $t = 0$, $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, the set $U$ is also bounded with respect to the metric space structure of $L^q = W^{0,q}$.

Proof Outline: Convexity straightforward; closedness follows since norm convergence in $L^q$, $1 \leq q \leq \infty$, implies pointwise subsequential convergence a.e., and from continuous embedding $W^{t,q} \hookrightarrow L^q$ for $t > 0$; boundedness when $t = 0$ since order cone $L^q_+$ is normal. □
Invariance of $T$ on $U$

"Global" property of barriers ensures $T$ invariant on $[\phi_-, \phi_+]_{\tilde{s}, \tilde{p}}$. Barrier compatibility ensures interval non-empty, convex, and closed.

In smooth case can take $s = 0$, then $U = [\phi_-, \phi_+]_{0, \tilde{p}}$ bounded, since order cone structure on $L^{\tilde{p}}$ is normal.

In weak metric case $h_{ab} \in W^{s,p}$, $S$ and $T$ not continuous for $Z = L^{\infty}$, and must take $Z = W^{\tilde{s}, \tilde{p}}$ to get continuity of $S$ and $T$, then deal with non-normal order structure on $Z$. (closed intervals not bounded).

For $\tilde{s} > 0$, must then take $U = [\phi_-, \phi_+]_{\tilde{s}, \tilde{p}} \cap \overline{B}_R$ to ensure $U$ is bounded, where $\overline{B}_R$ is the closed ball in $Z$ of radius $R$.

It remains then only to establish invariance of $T$ on $\overline{B}_R$.

**Lemma 8 (Invariance of $T$ on $\overline{B}_R$.)**

Assume $p \in (\frac{3}{2}, \infty)$, $s \in (\frac{3}{p}, \infty)$, that $a_w \in W^{s-2,p}$, and that "suitable conditions" on the other data hold. Then, for any $\tilde{s} \in (\frac{3}{p}, s]$ and for some $t \in (\frac{3}{p}, \tilde{s})$ there exists a closed ball $\overline{B}_R \subset W^{\tilde{s},p}$ of radius $R = O \left( [1 + \|a_w\|_{s-2,p}]^{\tilde{s}/(\tilde{s}-t)} \right)$, such that $\phi \in [\phi_-, \phi_+]_{\tilde{s}, \tilde{p}} \cap \overline{B}_M \Rightarrow T^s(\phi, a_w) \in \overline{B}_M.$
Main 2008 Result: Non-CMC $W^{2,p}$ solutions

Except barrier construction (must still find them), all results in place for applying Coupled Schauder Theorem to constraints. Next (smooth) result from [HNT08]; more general result from [HNT09] after.

Theorem 9 (Non-CMC existence without near-CMC)

Let $(\mathcal{M}, h_{ab})$ be a 3-dimensional, smooth, closed Riemannian manifold with metric $h_{ab}$ in positive Yamabe class with no conformal Killing vectors. Let $\tau \in W^{1,p}$, with $\sigma^2$, $j^a$ and $\rho$ in $L^p$, with $p > 3$ and small enough norms as given in Global Super-Solution Lemma so global barriers $\phi_-$ and $\phi_+$ exist for HC (3), with $\rho \neq 0$. Then, there exists $\phi \in [\phi_-, \phi_+] \cap W^{2,p}$ and $w^a \in W^{2,p}$ solving constraint equations (3)-(4).

Proof Outline: We have the operators $S : [\phi_-, \phi_+] \to W^{2,p}$ and $T : [\phi_-, \phi_+] \times W^{2,p} \to W^{2,p}$ which are again given by

$$S(\phi) := -\mathbb{L}^{-1}F(\phi), \quad T(\phi, w) := -L_s^{-1}F_s(\phi, w).$$

Note the mapping $S$ is well-defined due to absence of conformal Killing vectors, ensuring $\mathbb{L}$ is invertible. Mapping $T$ well-defined by use of positive shift $s > 0$, ensuring $L_s$ also invertible (see [HNT09]).
The constraint equations in (3)–(4) thus have precisely the form (7) for use of the Coupled Schauder Theorem.

We have the reflexive Banach spaces $X = W^{2,p}$ and $Y = W^{2,p}$, and ordered Banach space $Z = L^\infty$ with normal order cone and compact embedding $W^{2,p} \hookrightarrow L^\infty$.

With our compatible barriers forming the $L^\infty$-interval $U = [\phi_-, \phi_+]$, we have by construction that $U$ is non-empty as a subset of $L^p$, for $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. As noted earlier, the interval $[\phi_-, \phi_+] \subset L^p$ is convex with respect to the vector space structure of $L^p$, closed in the topology of $L^p$, and bounded in the norm on $L^p$, for $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ (see [HNT09]).

It remains to show that $S$ and $T$ are continuous maps from their respective domains to their respective ranges, and that $T$ is invariant on $U$. These properties follow from equation (8) and from the Hamiltonian constraint theorem, with global barriers from the Global barriers theorem, using standard inequalities. The result now follows from the Coupled Schauder Theorem.
Sub-/super-solutions and \( a \text{ priori } L^\infty \)-bounds

Proofs of the results existence results were based on:

- Compactness-type fixed-point arguments (Coupled Schauder).
- Identifying a non-empty, convex, closed, bounded set \( U \).
- Establishing continuity properties of constraint maps \( S \) and \( T \).

Establishing continuity of maps \( S \) and \( T \), identifying the set \( U \), and establishing convergence/optimality of numerical methods, all depend on construction of compatible global barriers \( \phi_- \) and \( \phi_+ \) that are free of the near-CMC condition. (Compatibility: \( 0 \leq \phi_- \leq \phi_+ \))

Sub- and super-solutions, or barriers to HC satisfy:

\[
-\Delta \phi_- + a_R \phi_- + a_\tau \phi_-^5 - a_w \phi_-^7 - a_\rho \phi_-^3 \leq 0,
\]
\[
-\Delta \phi_+ + a_R \phi_+ + a_\tau \phi_+^5 - a_w \phi_+^7 - a_\rho \phi_+^3 \geq 0.
\]

Barriers related to \( a \text{ priori } L^\infty \)-bounds on any solution (if one exists):

\[ 0 < \alpha \leq \phi \leq \beta < \infty. \]

When nonlinearity monotone decreasing, can show barriers also \( a \text{ priori } L^\infty \)-bounds. (One can establish bounds directly; see [HNT09].)

Working in ordered Banach spaces; need for non-empty order-cone interval \( U = [\phi_- , \phi_+] \) leads to concept of global barriers: Barriers for HC for any \( a_w \) generated from solutions \( w \) to MC with source \( \phi \in [\phi_- , \phi_+] \).
Can one build Non-CMC barriers without Near-CMC conditions?

**Lemma 10 (Near-CMC-Free Global Super-Solution)**

Let \((M, h_{ab})\) be a 3-dimensional, smooth, closed Riemannian manifold with metric \(h_{ab}\) in the positive Yamabe class with no conformal Killing vectors. Let \(u\) be a smooth positive solution of the Yamabe problem

\[- \Delta u + a_R u - u^5 = 0, \quad (10)\]

and define the Harnack-type constant \(k = u^\wedge / u^\vee\). If the function \(\tau\) is non-constant and the rescaled matter sources \(j^a, \rho,\) and traceless transverse tensor \(\sigma^{ab}\) are sufficiently small, then

\[\phi_+ = \epsilon u, \quad \epsilon = \left[ \frac{1}{2 K_1 k^{12}} \right]^{1/4} \quad (11)\]

is a global super-solution of the Hamiltonian constraint.

**Proof Outline:** Using the notation

\[E(\phi_+) = -\Delta \phi_+ + a_R \phi_+ + a_\tau \phi_+^5 - a_w \phi_+^{-7} - a_\rho \phi_+^{-3},\]

we have to show \(E(\phi_+) \geq 0\). The definition of \(\phi_+ = \epsilon u\) implies

\[-\Delta \phi_+ + a_R \phi_+ = \epsilon u^5.\]
Using an estimate for $a_w$ (see [HNT09]), we have then

$$E(\phi_+) \geq -\Delta \phi_+ + a_R \phi_+ - \frac{K_1 (\phi^\wedge_+)^{12} + K_2}{\phi_+^7} - \frac{\rho}{\phi_+^3}$$

$$\geq \epsilon u^5 - K_1 \left[ \frac{\phi_+^\wedge}{\phi_+^\vee} \right]^{12} \phi_+^5 - \frac{K_2}{\phi_+^7} - \frac{\rho}{\phi_+^3}.$$

Notice that $\phi_+^\wedge / \phi_+^\vee = u^\wedge / u^\vee = k$, therefore we have

$$E(\phi_+) \geq \epsilon u^5 \left[ 1 - K_1 k^{12} \epsilon^4 - \frac{K_2}{\epsilon^8 u^{12}} - \frac{\rho}{\epsilon^4 u^8} \right].$$

Choice of $\epsilon$ made in (11) is equivalent to condition $1/2 = 1 - K_1 k^{12} \epsilon^4$. For this $\epsilon$, impose on the free data $\sigma^{ab}$, $\rho$ and $j^a$ the condition

$$\frac{1}{2} - \frac{K_2}{\epsilon^8 (u^\vee)^{12}} - \frac{\rho^\wedge}{\epsilon^4 (u^\vee)^8} \geq 0.$$

Thus for any $K_1 > 0$, we can guarantee $E(\phi_+) \geq 0$. □

Remarks:

Thus global super-solutions can be built by rescaling solutions to (10). Existence of $k$ related to Harnack inequality for Yamabe. Compatible global sub-solutions available so that $0 < \phi_- \leq \phi_+$. 
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Main Result 1: Non-CMC $W^{s,p}$ weak solutions

In [Max09] Maxwell extends Theorem 9 to the vacuum case.

In [HNT09] we extend Theorem 9 to rough solutions; the main results are the following three theorems.

### Theorem 11 (Non-CMC $W^{s,p}$ solutions)

Let $(\mathcal{M}, h_{ab})$ be a 3-dimensional closed Riemannian manifold. Let $h_{ab} \in W^{s,p}$ admit no conformal Killing field and be in $\mathcal{Y}^+(\mathcal{M})$, where $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $s \in (1 + \frac{3}{p}, \infty)$ are given. Select $q$ and $e$ to satisfy:

- $\frac{1}{q} \in (0, 1) \cap (0, \frac{s-1}{3}) \cap \left[\frac{3-p}{3p}, \frac{3+p}{3p}\right],$
- $e \in (1 + \frac{3}{q}, \infty) \cap [s - 1, s] \cap \left[\frac{3}{q} + s - \frac{3}{p} - 1, \frac{3}{q} + s - \frac{3}{p}\right].$

Assume that the data satisfies:

- $\tau \in W^{e-1,q}$ if $e \geq 2$, and $\tau \in W^{1,z}$ otherwise, with $z = \frac{3q}{3 + \max\{0, 2-e\}q},$
- $\sigma \in W^{e-1,q}$, with $\|\sigma^2\|_{\infty}$ sufficiently small,
- $\rho \in W^{s-2,p} \cap L^\infty \setminus \{0\}$, with $\|\rho\|_{\infty}$ sufficiently small,
- $j \in W^{e-2,q}$, with $\|j\|_{e-2,q}$ sufficiently small.

Then there exists $\phi \in W^{s,p}$ with $\phi > 0$ and $w \in W^{e,q}$ solving the constraints.

Remark: Weak metric $h_{ab} \in W^{s,p}$ requires verifying usual relationships for $W^{s,p}$ available; gives conditions on exponents $s$ and $p$ to ensure e.g. Laplace-Beltrami bilinear form is continuous. (Discussed at length in [HNT09, BH14].)
Main Result 2: Near-CMC $W^{s,p}$ weak solutions

**Theorem 12 (Near-CMC $W^{s,p}$ solutions)**

Let $(\mathcal{M}, h_{ab})$ be a 3-dimensional closed Riemannian manifold. Let $h_{ab} \in W^{s,p}$ admit no conformal Killing field, where $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $s \in (1 + \frac{3}{p}, \infty)$ are given. Select $q$, $e$ and $z$ to satisfy:

- $\frac{1}{q} \in (0, 1) \cap (0, \frac{s-1}{3}) \cap \left[ \frac{3-p}{3p}, \frac{3+p}{3p} \right]$,
- $e \in (1 + \frac{3}{q}, \infty) \cap [s - 1, s] \cap \left[ \frac{3}{q} + s - \frac{3}{p} - 1, \frac{3}{q} + s - \frac{3}{p} \right]$,
- $z = \frac{3q}{3 + \max\{0, 2-e\}q}$.

Assume $\tau$ satisfies near-CMC condition (2) with $z$ above, and data satisfies:

- $\tau \in W^{e-1, q}$ if $e > 2$, and $\tau \in W^{1, z}$ if $e \leq 2$,
- $\sigma \in W^{e-1, q}$,
- $\rho \in W^{s-2, p}$,
- $j \in W^{e-2, q}$.

In addition, let one of the following sets of conditions hold:

(a) $h_{ab}$ in $\mathcal{Y}^-(\mathcal{M})$; $h_{ab}$ conformally equiv to metric w/ scalar curvature $(-\tau^2)$;
(b) $h_{ab}$ in $\mathcal{Y}^0(\mathcal{M})$ or $\mathcal{Y}^+(\mathcal{M})$; either $\rho \neq 0$ and $\tau \neq 0$ or $\tau \in L^\infty$ and $\inf_{\mathcal{M}} \sigma^2$ suff. large.

Then there exists $\phi \in W^{s,p}$ with $\phi > 0$ and $w \in W^{e,q}$ solving the constraints.
Main Result 3: CMC $W^{s,p}$ weak solutions

Theorem 13 (CMC $W^{s,p}$ solutions)

Let $(\mathcal{M}, h_{ab})$ be a 3-dimensional closed Riemannian manifold. Let $h_{ab} \in W^{s,p}$ where $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $s \in (\frac{3}{p}, \infty) \cap [1, \infty)$ are given. With $d := s - \frac{3}{p}$, select $q$ and $e$ to satisfy:

- $\frac{1}{q} \in (0, 1) \cap \left[\frac{3-p}{3p}, \frac{3+p}{3p}\right] \cap \left[\frac{1-d}{3}, \frac{3+sp}{6p}\right]$,
- $e \in [1, \infty) \cap [s - 1, s] \cap \left[\frac{3}{q} + d - 1, \frac{3}{q} + d\right] \cap (\frac{3}{q} + \frac{d}{2}, \infty)$.

Assume $\tau = \text{const (CMC)}$ and that the data satisfies:

- $\sigma \in W^{e-1,q}$,
- $\rho \in W^{s-2,p}_+$,
- $j \in W^{e-2,q}$.

In addition, let one of the following sets of conditions hold:

(a) $h_{ab}$ is in $\mathcal{Y}^- (\mathcal{M})$; $\tau \neq 0$;
(b) $h_{ab}$ is in $\mathcal{Y}^0 (\mathcal{M})$; $\rho \neq 0$;
(c) $h_{ab}$ is in $\mathcal{Y}^+ (\mathcal{M})$; $\tau \neq 0$; $\rho \neq 0$.

Then there exists $\phi \in W^{s,p}$ with $\phi > 0$ and $w \in W^{e,q}$ solving the Einstein constraints.
Figure: Range of $e$ and $q$ in Main Results 1 and 2, with $d = s - \frac{3}{p} > 1$. 

$$e = \frac{3}{q} + d$$

$$e = \frac{3}{q} + 1$$
Figure: Range of $e$ and $q$ in Main Result 3. Recall that $d = s - \frac{3}{p} > 0$. 
Prospects for other Non-CMC results

The “Schauder plus global barriers” framework in [HNT08, HNT09] has now given Non-CMC results for several other cases:

- Closed manifolds in vacuum [Max09].
- Compact manifolds with (black-hole and other) boundary [HT13, HMT14, Dilt14].
- Asymptotically Euclidean (vacuum or with black-hole inner-boundaries) [DIM14, BH14].

However, non-positive Yamabe cases present obstacle (see [HNT09]):

**Lemma 14 (Near-CMC condition and \(a_W\) bounds)**

Let \((\mathcal{M}, h)\) be a 3-dimensional, smooth, closed Riemannian manifold with metric \(h \in W^{s,p}\) in a nonpositive Yamabe class, and let \(a_\tau\) be continuous. Let \(\phi_+ \in W^{s,p}\) with \(\phi_+ > 0\) be a global super-solution to HC. Assume any vector field \(w \in W^{1,2r}\) solving MC with source \(\phi \leq \phi_+\) satisfies

\[
a_w \leq \theta K_1 \|\phi_+\|^{12}_{\infty} + \theta K_2,
\]

with some positive constants \(\theta K_1\) and \(\theta K_2\). Moreover, assume this estimate is sharp in that for any \(x \in \mathcal{M}\) there exist an open neighborhood \(U \ni x\) and vector field \(w \in W^{1,2r}\) solving MC with source \(\phi \leq \phi_+\), such that

\[
a_w = \theta K_1 \|\phi_+\|^{12}_{\infty} + \theta K_2 \quad \text{in } U. \tag{12}
\]

Then, we have \(\theta K_1 \leq \sup_{\mathcal{M}} a_\tau\).
Dahl, Gicquaud, and Humbert [DGH14] study the vacuum case:

\[-2\kappa q\Delta_g \phi + R_g \phi = -\kappa \tau^2 q^{q-1} + |\sigma + \mathcal{L} w|^2 \phi^{-q-1}, \tag{13}\]
\[\Delta_{\mathcal{L}} w = \kappa \phi^q \, d\tau. \tag{14}\]

The notation here is:

\[(\Delta_{\mathcal{L}} w)^a = -\nabla_b (\mathcal{L} w)^{ab}, \quad q = \frac{2n}{n-2}, \quad \kappa = \frac{n-1}{n}. \tag{15}\]

They prove the following result:

**Theorem 15 (Limit Equation)**

Assume $\tau$ does not vanish, $(M, g)$ have no conformal Killing vectors, and $\sigma \neq 0$ if $\gamma(g) \geq 0$. Then at least one of the following is true:

1. The system (13)–(14) admits a solution $(\phi, W)$ with $\phi > 0$.
2. For some $\alpha_0 \in (0, 1]$ there exists a non-trivial solution $W$ of:

\[\Delta_{\mathcal{L}} w = \alpha_0 \kappa |\mathcal{L} w| \frac{d\tau}{\tau} \quad (\text{limit equation}) \tag{16}\]

Important (surprising) implication: If (16) has no solution for any $\alpha_0 \in (0, 1]$, then there must be a solution $(\phi, W)$ to (13)–(14) with $\phi > 0$. 

The notation here is:

\[(\Delta_{\mathcal{L}} w)^a = -\nabla_b (\mathcal{L} w)^{ab}, \quad q = \frac{2n}{n-2}, \quad \kappa = \frac{n-1}{n}. \tag{15}\]
Limit Equation Insights and Limitations

It is interesting that the proof of Theorem 15 relies on use of the non-CMC analysis framework and theorems from [HNT09, Max09], but for sub-critical exponent to avoid need for global barriers.

Limit equation seems to offer new way to find non-CMC solutions, and has led to new insight into conformal method for non-CMC situations.

But, approach has some limitations for finding non-CMC solutions:
- It appears difficult to apply the technique outside compact case.
- The only known applications to date are near-CMC examples.

Some of the key Limit Equation papers are:
Gicquaud and Ngo [GiNg14] study again the vacuum case:

\[-2\kappa q \Delta g \phi + R_g \phi = -\kappa \tau^2 \phi^{q-1} + |\sigma + \mathcal{L}w|^2 \phi^{-q-1},\]  
\[\Delta_{\mathcal{L}} w = \kappa \phi^q \, d\tau.\]  

They prove the following non-CMC result:

**Theorem 16 (Non-CMC via IFT)**

Assume \((M, g)\) have no conformal Killing vectors, \(\bar{\sigma} \neq 0\), and \(\mathcal{V}(g) > 0\). Then there exists \(\eta_0 > 0\) such that for all \(\eta \in (0, \eta_0)\), there exists \((\phi, W)\) solving (17)–(18) for \(\sigma = \eta \bar{\sigma}\).

This result appears to be the same type of general non-CMC result as those contained in the 2008 and 2009 papers [HNT08, HNT09, Max09]. The conditions are basically the same:

1. Arbitrarily prescribed mean extrinsic curvature \(\tau\).
2. No conformal Killing fields.
3. Positive Yamabe class: \(\mathcal{V}(g) > 0\).
4. Data \(\sigma\) “sufficiently small”.
What is remarkable about the Gicquaud-Ngo Theorem 16 from [GiNg14] is that their proof goes through the Implicit Function Theorem, about $\tau = 0$.

In particular, they first show: There exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that the following $\mu$-deformed system admits a solution $(\tilde{\phi}, \tilde{w})$ for any $\mu \in [0, \epsilon)$:

$$-2\kappa q \Delta g \tilde{\phi} + R_g \tilde{\phi} = -\kappa \tau^2 \mu^2 \tilde{\phi}^{q-1} + |\sigma + \mathcal{L} \tilde{w}|^2 \tilde{\phi}^{-q-1}, \quad (19)$$

$$\Delta_L \tilde{w} = \kappa \tilde{\phi}^q \mu \, d\tau. \quad (20)$$

The proof of this fact is through the Implicit Function Theorem.

They then show that $(\tilde{\phi}, \tilde{w})$ solving (19)–(20) gives a solution to (17)–(18) via the transformation:

$$\phi_\mu = \mu^{\frac{2}{q-2}} \tilde{\phi}_\mu,$$

$$w_\mu = \mu^{\frac{q+2}{q-2}} \tilde{w}_\mu,$$

$$\sigma_\mu = \mu^{\frac{q+2}{q-2}} \tilde{\sigma}_\mu,$$

$$\eta_0 = \epsilon^{\frac{q+2}{q-2}},$$

with $\eta_0$ playing its role in Theorem 16.
Conformal Method and Non-CMC: Bad News?

Does Gicquaud-Ngo Theorem 16 from [GiNg14], based on using Implicit Function Theorem about \( \tau = 0 \), mean that all “Far”-from-CMC results requiring small \( \sigma \) are effectively near-CMC after all?

**Effectively yes**, BUT they are not EXACTLY the same results.

The smallness conditions on \( \sigma \) in the 2008–2009 papers [HNT08, HNT09, Max09] are based on building global supersolutions from scaled solutions to Yamabe-type problems.

The Harnack constant for these scaled solutions, together with other constants, give specific size limits on an \( L^r \) norm of \( \sigma \). I.e., \( \sigma \) must be “small enough”, but not infinitesimally small as in the IFT arguments.

However, the distinction between these two types of “small \( \sigma \)” results is probably not important.

What is clear, is that the conformal method seems to have several serious problems for Non-CMC:

- Non-uniqueness for non-CMC as you move away from near-CMC.
- No arbitrary \( \tau \) existence results for anything but \( \mathcal{V}(g) > 0 \).
- Small \( \sigma \) is (effectively) near-CMC after all.
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Conformal method has several serious problems for Non-CMC:

- Non-uniqueness for non-CMC as you move away from near-CMC.
- No arbitrary \( \tau \) existence results for anything but \( \mathcal{Y}(g) > 0 \).
- Small \( \sigma \) is (effectively) near-CMC after all.

An alternative to the conformal method has been developed over the last several years in a sequence of papers:


These were based on insight gained from the multiplicity result in:


David will tell us about some of these ideas later this week.
Overview of Non-CMC Analysis Frameworks for Conformal Method

Michael Holst

1. Einstein Evolution and Constraint Equations
   - General Relativity, LIGO, and Gravitational Wave Science
   - The Einstein Evolution and Constraint Equations
   - The Conformal Method(s) of 1944, 1973, 1974

2. Frameworks and Results for the Conformal Method (1973–2013)
   - The 1973–1995 CMC Results
   - The 1996–2007 Near-CMC Results
   - The 2008 Analysis Framework and the Non-CMC Result
   - The 2009 Non-CMC Extensions to Rough Metrics and Vacuum
   - The 2010 Limit Equation Technique
   - The 2013 Implicit Function Theorem Technique
   - The 2014 Drift System Alternative to Conformal Method

3. Some of our Group’s Results
   - Results for Rough Metrics
   - Compact with Boundary Case
   - Asymptotically Euclidean Case
   - Warning Signs: Multiplicity Results, Analytic Bifurcation Theory

4. References
Rough Metrics


Relevant to the study of the Einstein evolution equations is the existence of solutions to the constraint equations for weak or rough background metrics $h_{ab}$. Initial results were developed for the CMC case in [yCB04, Max05a, Max06].

Requires careful examination of multiplication properties of the spaces.

We developed Non-CMC rough solution results for closed manifolds in [HNT09], for compact manifolds with boundary in [HT13, HMT14], and for AE manifolds in [BH14].
The main results for rough non-CMC solutions on compact manifolds in [HNT09] are contained in the following three theorems.

### Theorem 17 (Non-CMC $W^{s,p}$ solutions)

Let $(\mathcal{M}, h_{ab})$ be a 3-dimensional closed Riemannian manifold. Let $h_{ab} \in W^{s,p}$ admit no conformal Killing field and be in $\mathcal{Y}^+(\mathcal{M})$, where $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $s \in (1 + \frac{3}{p}, \infty)$ are given. Select $q$ and $e$ to satisfy:

- $\frac{1}{q} \in (0, 1) \cap (0, \frac{s-1}{3}) \cap \left[\frac{3-p}{3p}, \frac{3+p}{3p}\right],$
- $e \in (1 + \frac{3}{q}, \infty) \cap [s - 1, s] \cap \left[\frac{3}{q} + s - \frac{3}{p} - 1, \frac{3}{q} + s - \frac{3}{p}\right].$

Assume that the data satisfies:

- $\tau \in W^{e-1,q}$ if $e \geq 2$, and $\tau \in W^{1,z}$ otherwise, with $z = \frac{3q}{3+\max\{0,2-e\}q},$
- $\sigma \in W^{e-1,q}$, with $\|\sigma^2\|_\infty$ sufficiently small,
- $\rho \in W^{s-2,p} \cap L^\infty_+ \setminus \{0\}$, with $\|\rho\|_\infty$ sufficiently small,
- $j \in W^{e-2,q}$, with $\|j\|_{e-2,q}$ sufficiently small.

Then there exists $\phi \in W^{s,p}$ with $\phi > 0$ and $w \in W^{e,q}$ solving the constraints.
Main Result 2: Near-CMC $W^{s,p}$ weak solutions

**Theorem 18 (Near-CMC $W^{s,p}$ solutions)**

Let $(\mathcal{M}, h_{ab})$ be a 3-dimensional closed Riemannian manifold. Let $h_{ab} \in W^{s,p}$ admit no conformal Killing field, where $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $s \in (1 + \frac{3}{p}, \infty)$ are given. Select $q$, $e$ and $z$ to satisfy:

- $\frac{1}{q} \in (0, 1) \cap (0, \frac{s-1}{3}) \cap \left[\frac{3-p}{3p}, \frac{3+p}{3p}\right]$,
- $e \in (1 + \frac{3}{q}, \infty) \cap [s - 1, s] \cap \left[\frac{3}{q} + s - \frac{3}{p} - 1, \frac{3}{q} + s - \frac{3}{p}\right]$,
- $z = \frac{3q}{3+\max\{0,2-e\}q}$.

Assume $\tau$ satisfies near-CMC condition (2) with $z$ above, and data satisfies:

- $\tau \in W^{e-1,q}$ if $e > 2$, and $\tau \in W^{1,z}$ if $e \leq 2$,
- $\sigma \in W^{e-1,q}$,
- $\rho \in W^{s-2,p}$,
- $j \in W^{e-2,q}$.

In addition, let one of the following sets of conditions hold:

(a) $h_{ab}$ in $\mathcal{Y}^- (\mathcal{M})$; $h_{ab}$ conformally equiv to metric w/ scalar curvature $(-\tau^2)$;
(b) $h_{ab}$ in $\mathcal{Y}^0(\mathcal{M})$ or $\mathcal{Y}^+(\mathcal{M})$; either $\rho \not\equiv 0$ and $\tau \not\equiv 0$ or $\tau \in L^\infty$ and $\inf_{\mathcal{M}} \sigma^2$ suff. large.

Then there exists $\phi \in W^{s,p}$ with $\phi > 0$ and $w \in W^{e,q}$ solving the constraints.
Main Result 3: CMC $W^{s,p}$ weak solutions

Theorem 19 (CMC $W^{s,p}$ solutions)

Let $(\mathcal{M}, h_{ab})$ be a 3-dimensional closed Riemannian manifold. Let $h_{ab} \in W^{s,p}$ where $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $s \in (\frac{3}{p}, \infty) \cap [1, \infty)$ are given. With $d := s - \frac{3}{p}$, select $q$ and $e$ to satisfy:

- $\frac{1}{q} \in (0, 1) \cap [\frac{3-p}{3p}, \frac{3+p}{3p}] \cap \left[\frac{1-d}{3}, \frac{3+sp}{6p}\right)$,
- $e \in [1, \infty) \cap [s-1, s] \cap \left[\frac{3}{q} + d - 1, \frac{3}{q} + d\right] \cap (\frac{3}{q} + \frac{d}{2}, \infty)$.

Assume $\tau = \text{const (CMC)}$ and that the data satisfies:

- $\sigma \in W^{e-1,q}$,
- $\rho \in W^{s-2,p}_+$,
- $j \in W^{e-2,q}$.

In addition, let one of the following sets of conditions hold:

(a) $h_{ab}$ is in $\mathcal{Y}^- (\mathcal{M})$; $\tau \neq 0$;
(b) $h_{ab}$ is in $\mathcal{Y}^0 (\mathcal{M})$; $\rho \neq 0$;
(c) $h_{ab}$ is in $\mathcal{Y}^+ (\mathcal{M})$; $\tau \neq 0$; $\rho \neq 0$.

Then there exists $\phi \in W^{s,p}$ with $\phi > 0$ and $w \in W^{e,q}$ solving the Einstein constraints.
Figure: Range of $e$ and $q$ in Main Results 1 and 2, with $d = s - \frac{3}{p} > 1$. 
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**Figure**: Range of $e$ and $q$ in Main Result 3. Recall that $d = s - \frac{3}{p} > 0$. 
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One of the difficulties associated with obtaining rough solutions to the conformal formulation is that the spaces $W^{s,p}(\mathcal{M})$ are not closed under multiplication unless $s > d/p$ (where $d$ is the spatial dimension).

This restriction is a by-product of a more general problem, which is that there is no well-behaved definition of distributional multiplication that allows for the multiplication of arbitrary distributions.

Limits spaces one considers when developing weak formulation of a given elliptic partial differential equation, and places a restriction on regularity of the specified data $(g_{ab}, \tau, \sigma, \rho, j)$ of the constraint equations.

In [HM13], we extend the work of Mitrovic-Pilipovic (2006) and Pilipovic-Scarpalezos (2006) to solve problems similar to Hamiltonian constraint with distributional coefficients in Colombeau algebras.

These generalized spaces allows one to circumvent the restrictions associated with Sobolev coefficients and data, and thereby consider problems with coefficients and data of much lower regularity.

Compact Manifolds with Boundary


Compact manifolds with boundary emerge when one eliminates asymptotic ends or singularities from the manifold.

*To follow closely [HT13], we change notation slightly and refer to spatial metric as $g$ and $\hat{g}$ rather than $h$ and $\hat{h}$.*

To allow for a general discussion, assume the spatial dimension is $n \geq 3$; later we restrict to $n = 3$.

Let $M$ be a compact manifold with boundary.

Let $\phi$ be a positive scalar field on $M$.

Decompose extrinsic curvature as $\hat{K} = \hat{S} + \tau \hat{g}$.

Here $\tau = \frac{1}{n} \text{tr}_g \hat{K}$ is (averaged) trace, so $\hat{S}$ is the traceless part.

With $\bar{q} = \frac{n}{n-2}$, conformal metric $g$ and symmetric traceless $S$ come via

$$\hat{g} = \phi^{2\bar{q}-2}g, \quad \hat{S} = \phi^{-2}S.$$  (21)
Chosen powers give Lichnerowicz equation and momentum constraint:

\[- \frac{4(n-1)}{n-2} \Delta \phi + R\phi + n(n-1)\tau^2 \phi^{2\bar{q}-1} - |S|^2_g \phi^{-2\bar{q}-1} = 0, \quad (22)\]

\[\text{div}_g S - (n-1)\phi^{2\bar{q}} d\tau = 0, \quad (23)\]

where \(\Delta \equiv \Delta_g\) is the Laplace-Beltrami operator with respect to the metric \(g\), and \(R \equiv \text{scal}_g\) is the scalar curvature of \(g\).

Interpret (22)–(23) as PDE for \(\phi\) and (part of) traceless symmetric \(S\).

Metric \(g\) is considered as given.

To rephrase, given \(\phi\) and \(S\) fulfilling (22)–(23), \(\hat{g}\) and \(\hat{K}\) given by

\[\hat{g} = \phi^{2\bar{q}-2} g, \quad \hat{K} = \phi^{-2} S + \phi^{2\bar{q}-2} \tau g,\]

satisfy the Einstein constraint system.

\(\hat{g}\) = physical metric
\(g\) = conformal metric (only specifies conformal class of \(\hat{g}\), other info lost)

Assume now that traceless symmetric bilinear form \(S\) given.

Consider Lichnerowicz (22) on a compact manifold with boundary.

Boundaries emerge when one eliminates asymptotic ends or singularities from the manifold.

Need to impose appropriate boundary conditions for \(\phi\).
On asymptotically flat manifolds, one has [YP82]

\[ \phi = 1 + Ar^{2-n} + \varepsilon, \quad \text{with} \quad \varepsilon = O(r^{1-n}), \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_r \varepsilon = O(r^{-n}), \quad (24) \]

where \( A \) is multiple total energy, \( r \) is the flat-space radial coordinate.

Idea is: cut out asymptotically Euclidean end along the sphere with large radius \( r \) and impose Dirichlet condition \( \phi \equiv 1 \) at boundary.

Improvement via differentiating (24) with respect to \( r \) and eliminating \( A \):

\[ \partial_r \phi + \frac{n-2}{r} (\phi - 1) = O(r^{-n}). \quad (25) \]

Equating right hand side to zero gives inhomogeneous Robin condition known to give accurate values for total energy.
Main approach: excise region around singularities and solve in exterior. Such are ”inner”-boundaries; again need boundary conditions.

In [YP82] they introduce

$$\partial_r \phi + \frac{n-2}{2a} \phi = 0, \quad \text{for } r = a. \quad (26)$$

Means $r = a$ is a minimal surface; under appropriate data conditions minimal surface is a \textit{trapped surface}.

Trapped surface important since implies existence of event horizon outside surface.

Various trapped surface conditions more general than minimal surface in literature.

Make clear what we mean by a trapped surface.

Suppose all necessary regions (singularities, asymptotic ends) excised from initial slice,

Assume boundary $\Sigma := \partial M$ has finitely many components $\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2, \ldots$
Trapped Surfaces

Let $\hat{\nu} \in \Gamma( T\Sigma \perp )$ be outward pointing unit normal (wrt $\hat{g}$).

*Expansion scalars* corresponding to outgoing and ingoing future directed null geodesics orthogonal to $\Sigma$ are given by

$$\hat{\theta}_\pm = \mp (n - 1) \hat{H} + \text{tr}_g \hat{K} - \hat{K}(\hat{\nu}, \hat{\nu}),$$  \hspace{1cm} (27)

where $(n - 1) \hat{H} = \text{div}_g \hat{\nu}$ is the mean extrinsic curvature of $\Sigma$.

Surface $\Sigma_i$ is called *trapped surface* if $\hat{\theta}_\pm < 0$ on $\Sigma_i$.

Called *marginally trapped surface* if $\hat{\theta}_\pm \leq 0$ on $\Sigma_i$.

In terms of the conformal quantities:

$$\hat{\theta}_\pm = \mp (n - 1) \phi^{-q} \left( \frac{2}{n-2} \partial_\nu \phi + H\phi \right) + (n - 1) \tau - \phi^{-2q} S(\nu, \nu),$$  \hspace{1cm} (28)

where $\nu = \phi^{q-1} \hat{\nu}$ is the unit normal with respect to $g$, and $\partial_\nu \phi$ is the derivative of $\phi$ along $\nu$.

The mean curvature $H$ with respect to $g$ is related to $\hat{H}$ by

$$\hat{H} = \phi^{-q} \left( \frac{2}{n-2} \partial_\nu \phi + H\phi \right).$$  \hspace{1cm} (29)
Trapped Surfaces: Maxwell Approach

In [Max05b, Dai04], authors studied boundary conditions leading to trapped surfaces in the asymptotically flat and constant mean curvature ($\tau = \text{const}$) setting.

Decay condition on $\hat{K}$ gives automatically $\tau \equiv 0$.

In [Max05b], boundary conditions obtained via setting $\hat{\theta}_+ \equiv 0$.

More generally, if one specifies scaled expansion scalar $\theta_+ := \phi^{\bar{q} - e} \hat{\theta}_+$ for some $e \in \mathbb{R}$, and poses no restriction on $\tau$, then the (inner) boundary condition for the Lichnerowicz equation (22) can be given by

$$\frac{2(n-1)}{n-2} \partial_{\nu} \phi + (n-1) H\phi - (n-1) \tau \phi^{\bar{q}} + S(\nu, \nu) \phi^{-\bar{q}} + \theta_+ \phi^e = 0. \quad (30)$$
In [Dai04], boundary conditions obtained via specifying $\hat{\theta}_-$. Similarly to Maxwell case, if generalize approach so that $\theta_- := \phi \bar{q} - e \hat{\theta}_-$ is specified, then we get the (inner) boundary condition

$$\frac{2(n-1)}{n-2} \partial_\nu \phi + (n - 1) H \phi + (n - 1) \tau \phi \bar{q} - S(\nu, \nu) \phi^{-\bar{q}} - \theta_- \phi^e = 0. \quad (31)$$

Note that in above, one of $\theta_\pm$ remains unspecified, so in order to guarantee that both $\theta_\pm \leq 0$, one has to impose some conditions on the data, e.g., on $\tau$ or on $S$.

Another option: rigidly specify both $\theta_\pm$; can eliminate $S$ from (28) and get boundary condition

$$\frac{4(n-1)}{n-2} \partial_\nu \phi + 2(n - 1) H \phi + (\theta_+ - \theta_-) \phi^e = 0. \quad (32)$$

At the same time, eliminating the term involving $\partial_\nu \phi$ from (28) we get a boundary condition on $S$ that reads as

$$2S(\nu, \nu) = 2(n - 1) \tau \phi^{2\bar{q}} - (\theta_+ + \theta_-) \phi^{e+\bar{q}}. \quad (33)$$
We see something interesting: the Lichnerowicz equation couples to the momentum constraint (23) through the boundary conditions.

Even in constant mean curvature setting (where \( \tau = \text{const} \)), constraint equations (22)–(23) generally do not decouple.

The only reasonable way to decouple the constraints is to consider \( \tau = 0 \) and \( e = -\bar{q} \).

Note that all boundary conditions considered above (except Dirichlet) are of form:

\[
\partial_\nu \phi + b_H \phi + b_\theta \phi^e + b_\tau \phi^{\bar{q}} + b_w \phi^{-\bar{q}} = 0.
\] (34)

Eg., in (30) and (31), one has \( b_H = \frac{n-2}{2} H \), \( b_\theta = \pm \frac{n-2}{2(n-1)} \theta \pm \), \( b_\tau = \mp \frac{n-2}{2} \tau \), and \( b_w = \pm \frac{n-2}{2(n-1)} S(\nu, \nu) \).

Minimal surface condition (26) corresponds to the choice \( b_\theta = b_\tau = b_w = 0 \), and \( b_H = \frac{n-2}{2} H \).

The outer Robin condition (25) is \( b_H = (n - 2) H \), \( b_\theta = -(n - 2) H \) with \( e = 0 \), and \( b_\tau = b_w = 0 \).
Here we suppose each boundary component $\Sigma_i$ has either Dirichlet condition $\phi \equiv 1$ or the Robin condition (34) enforced.

In particular, we allow the situation where no Dirichlet condition is imposed anywhere.

Also, to allow linear Robin condition (25) and a nonlinear condition like (30) at same time, must allow exponent $e$ in (34) to be only locally constant.

Main tools used in paper are order-preserving maps iteration together with maximum principles and some results from conformal geometry.

These techniques sensitive to signs of coefficients in (34).

Defocusing case (preferred signs): $(e - 1)b_\theta \geq 0$, $b_r \geq 0$, and $b_w \leq 0$.

Non-Defocusing case: Otherwise.

Results for defocusing case (terminology motivated by dispersive equations) more or less complete (see below).
The main results and supporting tools appearing in [HT13] are:

- Justification of Yamabe classification of rough metrics on compact manifolds with boundary.
- Basic result on conformal invariance of Lichnerowicz equation.
- A uniqueness result for the Lichnerowicz equation.
- An order-preserving maps theorem for manifolds with boundary.
- Construction of upper and lower barriers that respect the trapped surface conditions.
- Combination of the results above to produce a fairly complete existence and uniqueness theory for the defocusing case.
- Combination of the results above to produce some partial results for the non-defocusing case.
- Some perturbation results (looking ahead to the asymptotically Euclidean case).
- All of the results are developed for rough (and smooth) metrics.
Yamabe classification of rough metrics: The Yamabe problem for rough metrics on compact manifolds with boundary is again still open; the work [Esc92, Esc96] was for smooth metrics. However, as in the closed case, one can still get the following result [HT13] which is all we need:

**Theorem 20 (Yamabe Classification of Rough Metrics)**

Let \((M, g)\) be a smooth, compact, connected Riemannian manifold with boundary, where we assume that the components of the metric \(g\) are (locally) in \(W^{s,p}\), with \(sp > n\) and \(s \geq 1\). Let the dimension of \(M\) be \(n \geq 3\). Then, the following are equivalent:

a) \(\mathcal{Y}_g > 0\) (\(\mathcal{Y}_g = 0\) or \(\mathcal{Y}_g < 0\)).

b) \(\mathcal{Y}_g(q, r, b) > 0\) (resp. \(\mathcal{Y}_g(q, r, b) = 0\) or \(\mathcal{Y}_g(q, r, b) < 0\)) for any \(q \in [2, 2\bar{q})\), \(r \in [2, \bar{q} + 1)\) with \(q > r\), and any \(b \in \mathbb{R}\).

c) There is a metric in \([g]\) whose scalar curvature is continuous and positive (resp. zero or negative), and boundary mean curvature is continuous and has any given sign (resp. is identically zero, has any given sign).

In particular, two conformally equivalent metrics cannot have scalar curvatures with distinct signs.
Conformal Invariance

Let $M$ be smooth, compact, connected $n$-dimensional manifold with boundary, equipped with a Riemannian metric $g \in W^{s,p}$, $n \geq 3$, $p \in (1, \infty)$, and that $s \in \left( \frac{n}{p}, \infty \right) \cap [1, \infty)$.

We consider following model for Lichnerowicz problem

$$F(\phi) := \left( \begin{array}{c} -\Delta \phi + \frac{n-2}{4(n-1)} R \phi + a \phi^t \\ \gamma_N \partial \nu \phi + \frac{n-2}{2} H \gamma_N \phi + b (\gamma_N \phi)^e \\ \gamma_D \phi - c \end{array} \right) = 0,$$

where $t, e \in \mathbb{R}$ constants, $R \in W^{s-2,p}(M)$ and $H \in W^{s-1-\frac{1}{p},p}(\Sigma)$ are scalar and mean curvatures of metric $g$, and other coefficients satisfy $a \in W^{s-2,p}(M)$, $b \in W^{s-1-\frac{1}{p},p}(\Sigma_N)$, and $c \in W^{s-\frac{1}{p},p}(\Sigma_D)$.

Setting $\bar{q} = \frac{n}{n-2}$, interested in transformation properties of $F$ under conformal change $\tilde{g} = \theta^{2\bar{q}-2} g$ with factor $\theta \in W^{s,p}(M)$ satisfying $\theta > 0$. 

Conformal Invariance

To this end, we consider

\[
\tilde{F}(\psi) := \begin{pmatrix}
-\tilde{\Delta} \psi + \frac{n-2}{4(n-1)} \tilde{R} \psi + \tilde{a} \psi^t \\
\gamma_N \partial_D \psi + \frac{n-2}{2} \tilde{H} \gamma_N \psi + \tilde{b}(\gamma_N \psi) e \\
\gamma_D \psi - \tilde{c}
\end{pmatrix} = 0,
\]

where \( \tilde{\Delta} \) is Laplace-Beltrami operator associated to metric \( \tilde{g} \), \( \tilde{\nu} \) is the outer normal to \( \Sigma \) with respect to \( \tilde{g} \), \( \tilde{R} \in W^{s-2, p}(M) \) and \( \tilde{H} \in W^{s-1-\frac{1}{p}, p}(\Sigma) \) are respectively the scalar and mean curvatures of \( \tilde{g} \), and \( \tilde{a} \in W^{s-2, p}(M) \), \( \tilde{b} \in W^{s-1-\frac{1}{p}, p}(\Sigma_N) \), and \( \tilde{c} \in W^{s-1-\frac{1}{p}, p}(\Sigma_D) \).

The result we need in this direction is the following [HT13].

**Lemma 21 (Conformal Invariance)**

Let \( \tilde{a} = \theta^{t+1-2q} a \), \( \tilde{b} = \theta^{e-q} b \), and \( \tilde{c} = \theta^{-1} c \). Then we have

\[
\tilde{F}(\psi) = 0 \iff F(\theta \psi) = 0,
\]

\[
\tilde{F}(\psi) \geq 0 \iff F(\theta \psi) \geq 0,
\]

\[
\tilde{F}(\psi) \leq 0 \iff F(\theta \psi) \leq 0.
\]
Uniqueness Results

The conformal invariance result implies the following uniqueness result for the model Lichnerowicz problem [HT13].

**Lemma 22 (Uniqueness 1)**

*Let the coefficients of the model Lichnerowicz problem satisfy* \((t - 1)a \geq 0, (e - 1)b \geq 0, \text{ and } c > 0\).* *If the positive functions* \(\theta, \phi \in W^{s,p}(M)\) *are distinct solutions of the constraint, i.e.,* \(F(\theta) = F(\phi) = 0, \text{ and } \theta \neq \phi\), *then* \((t - 1)a = 0, (e - 1)b = 0, \Sigma_D = \emptyset, \text{ and the ratio } \theta/\phi \text{ is constant}.* *If in addition, } t \neq 1, \text{ then } \mathcal{V}_g = 0.\)

The following theorem essentially says that in order to have multiple positive solutions the Lichnerowicz problem must be a linear pure Robin boundary value problem on a conformally flat manifold [HT13].

**Theorem 23 (Uniqueness 2)**

*Let the coefficients of the Lichnerowicz problem satisfy* \(a_\tau \geq 0, a_w \geq 0, (e - 1)b_\theta \geq 0, b_\tau \geq 0, b_w \leq 0, \text{ and } \phi_D > 0.\)* *Let the positive functions* \(\theta, \phi \in W^{s,p}(M)\) *be solutions of the Lichnerowicz problem, with* \(\theta \neq \phi.\)* *Then* \(a_\tau = a_w = 0, (e - 1)b_\theta = b_\tau = b_w = 0, \Sigma_D = \emptyset, \text{ the ratio } \theta/\phi \text{ is constant}, \text{ and } \mathcal{V}_g = 0.\)
Let us write our problem in the form:

\[
F(\phi) := \begin{pmatrix}
\Delta \phi + f(\phi) \\
\gamma_N \partial_\nu \phi + h(\phi) \\
\gamma_D \phi - \phi_D
\end{pmatrix} = 0.
\]

Say \( \psi \) is super-solution if \( F(\psi) \geq 0 \), and sub-solution if \( F(\psi) \leq 0 \), component-wise.

The following theorem from [HT13] extends the standard argument used for closed manifolds (cf. [Ise95, Max05a]) to manifolds with boundary; note that the required sub- and super-solutions need only satisfy inequalities in both the interior and on the boundary.

**Theorem 24 (Order-Preserving Maps w/ Boundaries)**

Suppose that the signs of the coefficients \( a_\tau, a_w, b_\theta, b_\tau, b_w, \) and \( b_H - \frac{n-2}{2} H \) are locally constant, and let \( \phi_D > 0 \). Let \( \phi_-, \phi_+ \in W^{s,p}(M) \) be respectively sub- and super-solutions satisfying \( 0 < \phi_- \leq \phi_+ \). Then there exists a positive solution \( \phi \in [\phi_-, \phi_+]_{s,p} \) to the Lichnerowicz problem.
We start with metrics with nonnegative Yamabe invariant. In the following theorem from [HT13], the symbol $\lor$ denotes the logical disjunction (or logical OR).

**Theorem 25 (Existence - Defocusing and $\mathcal{Y}_g \geq 0$)**

Let $\mathcal{Y}_g \geq 0$. Let the coefficients of the Lichnerowicz problem satisfy $a_\tau \geq 0$, $a_w \geq 0$, $b_H \geq \frac{n-2}{2} H$, $(e-1)b_\theta \geq 0$ with $e \neq 1$, $b_\tau \geq 0$, $b_w \leq 0$, and $\phi_D > 0$. Then there exists a positive solution $\phi \in W^{s,p}(M)$ of the Lichnerowicz problem if and only if one of the following conditions holds:

a) $\Sigma_D \neq \emptyset$;

b) $\Sigma_D = \emptyset$, $b_\theta = 0$, $(\mathcal{Y}_g > 0 \lor a_\tau \neq 0 \lor b_H \neq \frac{n-2}{2} H \lor b_\tau \neq 0)$, and $(a_w \neq 0 \lor b_w \neq 0)$;

c) $\Sigma_D = \emptyset$, $b_\theta \neq 0$, $b_\theta \geq 0$, and $(a_w \neq 0 \lor b_w \neq 0)$;

d) $\Sigma_D = \emptyset$, $b_\theta \neq 0$, $b_\theta \leq 0$, and $(\mathcal{Y}_g > 0 \lor a_\tau \neq 0 \lor b_H \neq \frac{n-2}{2} H \lor b_\tau \neq 0)$;

e) $\Sigma_D = \emptyset$, $b_\theta = b_\tau = b_w = 0$, $b_H = \frac{n-2}{2} H$, $a_\tau = a_w = 0$, and $\mathcal{Y}_g = 0$. 
The next theorem from [HT13] treats metrics with negative Yamabe invariant, and reduces the Lichnerowicz problem into a prescribed scalar curvature problem.

**Theorem 26 (Existence - Defocusing and $\mathcal{Y}_g < 0$)**

Let $\mathcal{Y}_g < 0$. Let the coefficients of the Lichnerowicz problem satisfy $a_\tau \geq 0$, $a_w \geq 0$, $b_H \leq \frac{n-2}{2} H$, $(e-1)b_\theta \geq 0$ with $e \neq 1$, $b_\tau \geq 0$, $b_w \leq 0$, and $\phi_D > 0$. Then there exists a positive solution $\phi \in W^{s,p}(M)$ of the Lichnerowicz problem if and only if there exists a positive solution $u \in W^{s,p}(M)$ to the following problem

\[
-\Delta u + a_R u + a_\tau u^{2q-1} = 0,
\]

\[
\gamma_N \partial_\nu u + b_H u + b_\tau u^q + b_\theta^+ u^e = 0,
\]

\[
\gamma_D u = 1,
\]

where $b_\theta^+ = \max\{0, b_\theta\}$.

There are also partial results in [HT13] for the non-defocusing case, but will not be outlined in this talk.
Non-CMC case: Main Results in [HMT14]

What about the non-CMC case?

In fact, even the CMC case was not yet discussed; this is because the CMC assumption does not actually decouple the constraints due to the boundary coupling, and we have only solved the Lichnerowicz equation.

The extension of the results in [HT13] to the non-CMC (far, near, and also CMC itself) is considered in [HMT14].

Some of the main results appearing in [HMT14] are:

- Number of necessary supporting results for momentum constraint that were not needed for pure Lichnerowicz case in [HT13].
- Construction of upper and lower barriers that respect trapped surface conditions in coupled setting (delicate boundary coupling).
- Combination of Schauder argument from [HNT09] with results for Lichnerowicz equation from [HT13] to give existence results for near-CMC and far-CMC data, analogous to known results for closed manifolds.
- CMC case comes as (still coupled) special case of near-CMC result.
Non-CMC case: The Setup

Assume compact domain $\mathcal{M}$ has boundary $\Sigma = \partial \mathcal{M} = \Sigma_I \cup \Sigma_E$, where boundary segments $\Sigma_I$ and $\Sigma_E$ decomposed further into finite segments:

$$\Sigma_I = \bigcup_{i=1}^{M} \Sigma_i, \quad \Sigma_E = \bigcup_{i=M+1}^{N} \Sigma_i, \quad (M < N), \quad \Sigma_i \cap \Sigma_j = \emptyset \text{ if } i \neq j. \quad (36)$$

We consider the following system:

$$L \phi + a_R \phi + a_\tau \phi^5 - a_w \phi^7 - a_\rho \phi^{-3} = 0, \quad (37)$$

$$\mathbb{L} w + b_\tau \phi^6 + b_j = 0, \quad (38)$$

where $L$, $\mathbb{L}$, $a_R$, $a_\tau$, $a_w$, $a_\rho$, $b_\tau$, $b_j$ as before, subject to boundary conditions:

$$\partial_\nu \phi + \frac{1}{2} H \phi + \left( \frac{1}{2} \tau - \frac{1}{4} \theta_- \right) \phi^3 - \frac{1}{4} S(\nu, \nu) \phi^{-3} = 0, \quad \text{on } \Sigma_I, \quad (39)$$

$$(\mathcal{L} w)^{ab} \nu_b = V^a, \quad \text{on } \Sigma_I, \quad (40)$$

$$\partial_\nu \phi + c \phi = g, \quad \text{on } \Sigma_E, \quad (41)$$

$$(\mathcal{L} w)^{ab} \nu_b + C_a^b w^b = 0, \quad \text{on } \Sigma_E, \quad (42)$$

where $S$, $H$, $\theta_-$ are traceless symmetric tensor, mean extrinsic boundary curvature, and incoming null geodesic expansion factor. In (39)-(42) we assume:

$$c > 0, \quad g > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad g = \delta (c + \mathcal{O}(R^{-3})), \quad \delta > 0, \quad (43)$$

$$\exists \alpha > 0 \text{ such that } \int_{\partial \mathcal{M}} C_{ab} V^a V^b \geq \alpha|V|_{L^2(\partial \mathcal{M})}, \quad \forall V \in L^2.$$
Theorem 27 (Near-CMC and CMC $W^{s,p}$ Solutions)

Let $(\mathcal{M}, h_{ab})$ be a 3-dimensional, compact Riemannian manifold with boundary satisfying (36). Let $h_{ab} \in W^{s,p}(T_2^0 \mathcal{M})$, with $p \in (1, \infty)$, $s \in (1 + \frac{3}{p}, \infty)$ given. With $d = s - \frac{3}{p}$, select $q$ and $e$ so:

- $\frac{1}{q} \in (0, 1) \cap \left[\frac{3-p}{3p}, \frac{3+p}{3p}\right] \cap \left[\frac{1-d}{3}, \frac{1+sp}{6p}\right]$,
- $e \in [1, \infty) \cap [s - 1, s] \cap \left[\frac{3}{q} + d - 1, \frac{3}{q} + d\right]$.

Let (43) hold and assume the data satisfies:

- $\theta^- \in W^{s-1, \frac{1}{p}, \frac{1}{p}}(\Sigma_I), \ c, g \in W^{s-1, \frac{1}{p}, \frac{1}{p}}(\Sigma_E), \ C^a_b \in W^{e-1, \frac{1}{q}, \frac{1}{q}}(T^1_1 \Sigma_E)$,
- $V \in W^{e-1, q}, \ V^a_{\nu a} = (2\tau + |\theta^-|/2)B^6 - \sigma(\nu, \nu)$,
- $\tau \in W^{s-1, p}$ if $e \geq 2$, and $\tau \in W^{1, z} \cap L^{\infty}$ otherwise, with $z = \frac{3p}{3+\max\{0, 2-s\}p}$,
- $(4\tau^\vee + |\theta|^\vee) > 0$ on $\Sigma_I$,
- $\sigma \in W^{e-1, q}, \ \rho \in W^{s-2, p}, \ j \in W^{e-2, q}$.

In addition, assume $a^\vee \rho > \theta k_1$ (the near-CMC condition), where $\theta k_1 = 2C^2(\|b_{\tau} \|^2_z)^2$, with $C$ is a positive constant. If at least one of the following hold:

(a) $\rho^\vee > 0$,
(b) $a^\vee_\sigma$ is sufficiently large,

then there exists a solution $\phi \in W^{s, p}$ with $\phi > 0$ and $w \in W^{e, q}$ to (37)–(42). Moreover, with an additional smallness assumption on $\tau$ on $\Sigma_I$, the marginally trapped surface boundary condition is satisfied.
Theorem 28 (Non-CMC $W^{s,p}$ solutions)

Let $(\mathcal{M}, h_{ab})$ be a 3-dimensional, compact Riemannian manifold with boundary satisfying (36). Let $h_{ab} \in W^{s,p}(T_2^0 \mathcal{M})$ and be in $\mathcal{V}^+$, $p \in (1, \infty)$, $s \in (1 + \frac{3}{p}, \infty)$ given. With $d = s - \frac{3}{p}$, select $q$ and $e$ to satisfy:

- $\frac{1}{q} \in (0, 1) \cap [\frac{3-p}{3p}, \frac{3+p}{3p}] \cap [\frac{1-d}{3}, \frac{3+sp}{6p})$,
- $e \in [1, \infty) \cap [s - 1, s] \cap [\frac{3}{q} + d - 1, \frac{3}{q} + d]$.

Let (43) hold and assume the data satisfies:

- $\theta_\cdot \in W^{s-1,1-p}_\cdot (\Sigma_I) \cap L^\infty (\Sigma_I)$, $c, g \in W^{s-1,1-p}_\cdot (\Sigma_E)$, $C^a_b \in W^{e-1,q}_\cdot (T^1_1 \Sigma_E)$,
- $V \in W^{e-1,q}_\cdot$, $V^a \nu_a = (2\tau + |\theta_\cdot |/2)B^6 - \sigma (\nu, \nu)$,
- $\tau \in W^{s-1,p}$ if $s \geq 2$, and $\tau \in W^{1,2}_\cdot \cap L^\infty$ otherwise, with $z = \frac{3p}{3+\max\{0,2-s\}p}$,
- $(4\tau^\vee + |\theta^\vee|) > 0$ on $\Sigma_I$,
- $\sigma \in W^{e-1,q}_\cdot$, $\rho \in W^{s-2,p}_- \cap L^\infty \setminus \{0\}$, $j \in W^{e-2,q}_- \cdot$, sufficiently small.

Additionally assume that at least one of the following hold:

(a) $\delta > 0$ is sufficiently small in (43);
(b) $a^-_R > 0$ is sufficiently large;
(c) $\|\theta_\cdot\|_\infty$ is sufficiently small, and $D_{\tau}$ is sufficiently small.

Then:

Case (a): The function $B$ can be chosen so the marginally trapped surface condition is satisfied, and subsequently there exists a solution $\phi \in W^{s,p}$ with $\phi > 0$ and $w \in W^{e,q}$ to equations (37)–(42).

Cases (b) and (c): There exists a solution $\phi \in W^{s,p}$ with $\phi > 0$ and $w \in W^{e,q}$ to (37)–(42). With an additional smallness assumption on $\tau$ on $\Sigma_I$, the marginally trapped surface condition may be satisfied.
The most complete mathematical model of general relativity involves the evolution and constraint equations on open, asymptotically Euclidean manifolds, with black hole interior boundary conditions. Existence results analogues to those for closed manifolds have been known since shortly after the closed results developed.

In [HMa14], we develop non-CMC existence results for asymptotically Euclidean manifolds with black hole interior boundaries. In [BH14], we extend this work to rough metrics, in some sense completing part of the research program begun in 2004/2005.

Asymptotically Euclidean Case


Theorem 29 (Non-CMC)

Suppose that \((\mathcal{M}, g)\) is asymptotically Euclidean of class \(W^{2,p}_\gamma\) with \(p > n\) and \(2 - n < \gamma < 0\). Assume that \(2 - n < \delta < \gamma/2\), and the data satisfies:

- \(g \in \mathcal{Y}^+\),
- \(\tau \in W^{1,p}_\delta\),
- \(\sigma \in W^{1,2p}_\delta\) with \(\|\sigma\|_{L^{\infty}_\delta}\) sufficiently small,
- \(\rho \in L^{\infty}_\gamma\) with \(\|\rho\|_{L^{\infty}_\delta}\) sufficiently small,
- \(J \in L^p_\delta\) with \(\|J\|_{L^p_\delta}\) sufficiently small,
- \(\theta_- \in W^{1-1/p, p}(\Sigma),\) \(\theta_- < 0\),
- \(V \in W^{1,p}_\delta,\) \(V|_\Sigma = (((n - 1)\tau + |\theta_-|/2)\psi^N - \sigma(\nu, \nu))\nu,\)
- \(((n - 1)\tau + |\theta_-|/2) > 0\) and \(\|(n - 1)\tau + |\theta_-|/2\|_{W^{1-1/p, p}_\delta(\Sigma)}\) sufficiently small.

Then on each end \(E_i\) there exists an interval \(I_i \subset (0, \infty)\) such that if \(A_i \in I_i\) are freely specified constants and \(\omega\) is the associated harmonic function, there exists a solution \((\phi, W)\) to the conformal equations with boundary conditions \((39)-(40)\) such that \(\phi - \omega \in W^{2,p}_\gamma\) and \(W \in W^{2,p}_\delta\). Moreover, the function \(\psi\) can be chosen so that \((\phi, W)\) satisfies the marginally trapped surface boundary conditions.
Theorem 30 (Near-CMC with bounded $R$ and $H$)

Suppose that $(\mathcal{M}, g)$ is asymptotically Euclidean of class $W^{2,p}_\gamma$ with $p > n$ and $2 - n < \gamma < 0$. Assume that $2 - n < \delta < \gamma/2$, and the data satisfies:

- $\|\nabla \tau\|_{L^p_{\delta-2}}$ is sufficiently small,
- $\sigma \in W^{1,2p}_{\gamma-1}$,
- $\rho \in L^p_{\gamma-2}$,
- $J \in L^{p\delta-2}$,
- $\theta_- \in W^{1-\frac{1}{p},p}(\Sigma)$, $\theta_- < 0$,
- $bV \in W^{1,p}, \quad V|_\Sigma = (((n-1)\tau + |\theta_-|/2)\psi^N - \sigma(\nu,\nu))\nu$,
- $(2(n-1)\tau + |\theta_-|) > 0$ is sufficiently small on $\Sigma$.

Let $A_i \in [1, \infty)$ be freely specified constants on each end $E_i$ and let $\omega$ be the associated harmonic function. Then if

- $-c_n R \leq b_n \tau^2$ on $\{x \in \mathcal{M} : R(x) < 0\},$
- $-H \leq (\tau + |\theta_-|/(n-1))$ on $\{x \in \Sigma : H(x) < 0\},$

there exists a solution $(\phi, W)$ to the conformal equations with boundary conditions (39)-(40) such that $\phi - \omega \in W^{2,p}_\gamma$ and $W \in W^{2,p}_\delta$. Moreover, the function $\psi$ can be chosen so that $(\phi, W)$ satisfies the marginally trapped surface boundary conditions.
### Theorem 31 (Near-CMC with $g \in \mathcal{Y}^+$)

Suppose that $(\mathcal{M}, g)$ is asymptotically Euclidean of class $W^{2,p}_\gamma$ with $p > n$ and $2 - n < \gamma < 0$. Assume that $2 - n < \delta < \gamma/2$, and the data satisfies:

- $g \in \mathcal{Y}^+$,
- $\|\tau\|_{W^{1,p}_{\delta-1}}$ is sufficiently small, and $\tau \geq 0$ on $\Sigma$,
- $\sigma \in W^{1,2p}_{\gamma-1}$,
- $\rho \in L^p_{\gamma-2}$,
- $\|J\|_{L^p_{\delta-2}}$ is sufficiently small,
- $\theta_- = 0$,
- $V \in W^{1,p}, \quad V|_{\Sigma} = ((n - 1)\tau)\phi^N - \sigma(\nu, \nu) \nu$.

Then if $A_i \in (0, \infty)$ are freely specified constants on each end $E_i$ and $\omega$ is the associated harmonic function, there exists a unique solution $(\phi, W)$ to the conformal equations with marginally trapped surface boundary conditions such that $\phi - \omega \in W^{2,p}_\gamma$ and $W \in W^{2,p}_{\delta}$.

Note: The proof of this near-CMC result goes through the Implicit Function Theorem, which subsequently gives both existence and uniqueness in this case.
Theorem 32 (Non-CMC Rough AE Solutions)

Let \((M, h)\) be a 3-dimensional AE Riemannian manifold of class \(W^{s,p}_\delta\) where \(p \in (1, \infty), s \in (1 + \frac{3}{p}, \infty)\) and \(-1 < \delta < 0\) are given. Suppose \(h\) admits no nontrivial conformal Killing field and is in the positive Yamabe class. Let \(\beta \in (-1, \delta]\). Select \(q\) and \(e\) to satisfy:

- \(\frac{1}{q} \in (0, 1) \cap (0, \frac{s-1}{3}) \cap \left[\frac{3-p}{3p}, \frac{3+p}{3p}\right]\),
- \(e \in (1 + \frac{3}{q}, \infty) \cap [s - 1, s] \cap \left[\frac{3}{q} + s - \frac{3}{p} - 1, \frac{3}{q} + s - \frac{3}{p}\right]\).

Let \(q = p\) if \(e = s \not\in \mathbb{N}_0\). Moreover if \(s > 2\), \(s \not\in \mathbb{N}_0\), assume \(e < s\). Assume that the data satisfies:

- \(\tau \in W^{e-1,q}_{\beta-1}\) if \(e \geq 2\) and \(\tau \in W^{1,z}_{\beta-1}\) otherwise, where \(z = \frac{3q}{3 + (2 - e)q}\)
- \(\sigma \in W^{e-1,q}_{\beta-1}\)
- \(J \in W^{e-2,q}_{\beta-2}\), \(\rho \in W^{s-2,p}_{\beta-2} \cap L^{\infty}_{2\beta-2}, \rho \geq 0\) (\(\rho\) can be identically zero).

If \(\mu > 0\) is chosen to be sufficiently small and if \(\|\sigma\|_{L^{\infty}_{\beta-1}}, \|\rho\|_{L^{\infty}_{2\beta-2}}, \|J\|_{W^{e-2,q}_{\beta-2}}\) are sufficiently small, then there exists \(\phi = \psi + \mu > 0, \psi \in W^{s,p}_\delta\) and \(W \in W^{q,\rho}_\beta\) solving the constraints.
One of the features of the new non-CMC existence results in [HNT08, HNT09] (and similar results) is lack of uniqueness. In 2009, Maxwell explicitly demonstrated existence of multiple solutions for a special symmetric model [Max09b], and now also [Max14b].

Folds in solution curves observed numerically by Pfeiffer, O’Murchadha and others for non-standard formulations of the constraints; i.e., the mechanism is different from Maxwell results.

The non-standard formulation giving rise to this behavior has un-scaled matter sources:

\[
L\phi + a_R \phi + a_T \phi^5 - a_w \phi^{-7} - a_p \phi^5 = 0, \quad (44)
\]

\[
\mathbb{L} \omega + b^b \phi^6 + b_j \phi^{10} = 0, \quad (45)
\]

where as before, \(L\phi = -\Delta \phi\) and \((\mathbb{L} \omega)^a = -\nabla_b (L \omega)^{ab}\).
We wanted to examine more carefully (both numerically and mathematically) the folds that had been observed numerically in this non-standard formulation using somewhat ad-hoc methods.

To this end, in [HK11], we applied pseudo-arclength numerical continuation to numerically track the parameterized solution curve in the problem previously examined by Pfeiffer and O’Murchadha, and numerically identify a fold.

In [HM14], using tools from analytic bifurcation theory, we show the linearization of the non-standard constraint system develops a one-dimensional kernel in both the CMC and Non-CMC cases.

Through Liapunov-Schmidt reduction, we show solutions with unscaled data are non-unique by determining an explicit solution curve, and analyze its behavior in the neighborhood of a particular solution.

The technique involves the following $\lambda$-parameterization of the model:

\[
L \phi + a_R \phi + \lambda^2 a_\tau \phi^5 - a_w \phi^{-7} - e^{-\lambda} a_\rho \phi^5 = 0,
\]

\[
\mathbb{L} w + \lambda b^b_\tau \phi^6 = 0,
\]
To explain the main results, define \( a_\sigma = \frac{1}{8} \sigma^2 \), and

\[
G(\phi, \lambda) = L\phi + a_R \phi + \lambda^2 a_\tau \phi^5 - a_\sigma \phi^{-7} - e^{-\lambda} a_\rho \phi^5, \tag{48}
\]

\[
F((\phi, w), \lambda) = \begin{bmatrix}
L\phi + a_R \phi + \lambda^2 a_\tau \phi^5 - a_w \phi^{-7} - e^{-\lambda} a_\rho \phi^5 \\
\mathbb{L}w + \lambda b_\tau^b \phi^6
\end{bmatrix}. \tag{49}
\]

**Theorem 33 (CMC: Critical Values)**

Let \( D_\phi G(\phi, \lambda) \) be the Fréchet derivative of (48) with respect to \( \phi \). Then:

1. **There exists a critical value of** \( \rho = \rho_c \) **and a constant** \( \phi_c \) **such that when** \( \rho = \rho_c \), \( G(\phi, \lambda) = 0 \) **has a solution if and only if** \( \lambda \geq 0 \).

2. **Furthermore,** \( \dim \ker(D_\phi G(\phi_c, 0)) = 1 \) **and it is spanned by the constant function** \( \phi = 1 \).

3. **Moreover, we can determine explicit values of** \( \rho_c \) **and** \( \phi_c \):

\[
\rho_c = \frac{R^3}{24 \sqrt{3\pi} |\sigma|}, \quad \phi_c = \left( \frac{R}{24\pi \rho_c} \right)^{\frac{1}{4}}. \tag{50}
\]
## Multiplicity Results

### Theorem 34 (CMC: Multiplicity)

Suppose $\tau$ is constant, so that our problem is $G(\phi, \lambda) = 0$. Let $\rho = \rho_c$, with $\rho_c$ as in Theorem 33. Then:

1. There exists a neighborhood of $(\phi_c, 0)$ such that all solutions to $G(\phi, \lambda) = 0$ in this neighborhood lie on a smooth solution curve $\{\phi(s), \lambda(s)\}$ that has the form

   \[
   \phi(s) = \phi_c + s + O(s^2),
   \]

   \[
   \lambda(s) = \frac{1}{2} \ddot{\lambda}(0)s^2 + O(s^3), \quad (\ddot{\lambda}(0) \neq 0).
   \]

2. In particular, there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that for all $0 < \lambda < \delta$ there exist at least two distinct solutions $\phi_{1,\lambda} \neq \phi_{2,\lambda}$ to $G(\phi, \lambda) = 0$.

### Theorem 35 (Non-CMC: 1-dimensional nullspace)

Let $D_X F((\phi, w), \lambda)$ be the Fréchet derivative of (49) w.r.t. $X = (\phi, w)$. Let $\rho_c, \phi_c$ be as in Thm 33. If $\rho = \rho_c$, then $\dim \ker(D_X F((\phi_c, 0), 0))) = 1$ and $\ker(D_X F((\phi_c, 0), 0)))$ is spanned by constant vector $[1, 0]^T$. 

Theorem 36 (Non-CMC: Multiplicity)

Suppose $\tau \in C^{1,\alpha}(\mathcal{M})$ is non-constant and let $F((\phi, w), \lambda)$ be defined as in (49), so that our problem is: $F((\phi, w), \lambda) = 0$. Let $\rho_c$ and $\phi_c$ be defined as in Theorem 33. If $\rho = \rho_c$, then:

1. There exists a neighborhood $B$ of $((\phi_c, w), 0)$ such that all solutions to $F((\phi, w), \lambda) = 0$ in $B$ lie on a smooth curve of the form

$$
\phi(s) = \phi_c + s + \frac{1}{2}\ddot{\lambda}(0)u(x)s^2 + O(s^3),
$$

$$
w(s) = \frac{1}{2}\ddot{\lambda}(0)v(x)s^2 + O(s^3),
$$

$$
\lambda(s) = \frac{1}{2}\ddot{\lambda}(0)s^2 + O(s^3), \quad (\ddot{\lambda}(0) \neq 0),
$$

where $u(x) \in C^{2,\alpha}(\mathcal{M})$, $v(x) \in C^{2,\alpha}(TM)$ and $v(x) \neq 0$.

2. In particular, there exists a $\delta > 0$ s.t. for all $0 < \lambda < \delta$ there exist elements $(\phi_1, \lambda, w_1, \lambda), (\phi_2, \lambda, w_2, \lambda) \in C^{2,\alpha}(\mathcal{M}) \oplus C^{2,\alpha}(TM)$ s.t.

$$
F((\phi_i, \lambda, w_i, \lambda), \lambda) = 0, \text{ for } i \in \{1, 2\}, \text{ and } (\phi_1, \lambda, w_1, \lambda) \neq (\phi_2, \lambda, w_2, \lambda).
$$
Thank You for Listening!
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