Volume 14, Number 1, June 2008
JUMADA'II 1429

ARAB JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES

Published by the Saudi Association for Mathematical Sciences, in cooperation with the Department of Mathematics at King Saud University.

INSTRUCTIONS TO AUTHORS

The Arab Journal of Mathematical Sciences (AJMS) will publish original contributions to all branches of Mathematical Sciences, including pure and applied mathematics, statistics and operations research, and computational mathematics. Each volume consists of two issues, each appearing semi-annually.

All papers submitted for publication are refereed. The manuscript should be typed in LaTeX format and should conform to the format appearing in any issue of the AJMS. The mathematics subject classification, according to the Mathematical Reviews index, should appear as a footnote on the first page. Three copies of the manuscript should be sent to:

Editor-in-Chief
Arab Journal of Mathematical Sciences
Department of Mathematics
P.O. Box 2455, Riyadh 11451, Saudi Arabia
Fax: 966 1 467-6512
E-mail: mguediri@ksu.edu.sa or ourimi@ksu.edu.sa
Website: http://sams.ksu.sa

After a paper is accepted for publication, where major revision was required, one set of galley proof will be sent to the author(s) for any corrections. Authors are then encouraged to submit the revised version of their manuscript in LaTeX format either on an IBM-compatible diskette or by e-mail.
There are no page charges on papers published in AJMS. Twenty reprints of a published paper will be provided free of charge.

Volume 14, Number 1, June 2008
JUMADA'II 1429

ARAB JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES

Published by the Saudi Association for Mathematical Sciences, in cooperation with the Department of Mathematics at King Saud University.

Arab J. Math. Sc.
Volume 14, Number 1, June 2008
pp 1-14

A NOTE ON TRANSVERSAL HYPERSURFACES OF ALMOST HYPERBOLIC CONTACT MANIFOLDS

Rajendra Prasad, Amit Kumar Rai, M. M. Tripathi, and S. S. Shukla

ABSTRACT. Transversal hypersurfaces of trans hyperbolic contact manifolds are studied. It is proved that transversal hypersurfaces of almost hyperbolic contact manifold admits an almost product structure and each transversal hypersurfaces of almost hyperbolic contact metric manifold admits an almost product semi-Riemannian structure. The fundamental 2-form on the transversal hypersurfaces of cosymplectic hyperbolic manifold and $(\alpha, 0)$ trans hyberbolic Sasakian manifold with hyperbolic (f, g, u, v, λ)-structure are closed. It is also proved that transversal hypersurfaces of trans hyperbolic contact manifold admits a product structure. Some properties of transversal hypersurfaces are proved.

1. INTRODUCTION

Almost contact metric manifold with an almost contact metric structure is very well explained by Blair [1]. In [20], S. Tanno gave a classification for connected almost contact metric manifolds whose automorphism groups have the maximum dimension. For such a manifold, the sectional curvature of plane sections containing ξ is a constant, say c. He showed that they can be divided into three classes : (1) Homogenous normal contact Riemannian manifolds with $c > 0$, (2) global Riemannian products of a line or a circle with a Kaehler manifold of constant holomorphic sectional curvature if $c = 0$ and

2000 AMS subject classification. 53C40

Key words. Almost hyperbolic contact metric manifolds, Trans hyperbolic contact manifolds, Almost product semi-Riemannian manifold structure, Transversal hypersurfaces of cosymplectic hyperbolic manifold, Transversal hypersurfaces of trans hyperbolic Sasakian manifolds.

(3) a warped product space $R \times_f C^n$ if $c < 0$. It is known that the manifolds of class (1) are characterized by some tensorial relations admitting a contact structure. Kenmotsu [10] characterized the differential geometric properties of the third case by tensor equation$(\overline{\nabla}_X \phi)Y = g(\phi X, Y)\xi - \eta(Y)\phi X$. The structure so obtained is now known as Kenmotsu structure. In general, these structures are not Sasakian [10].

Oubina studied a new class of almost contact Riemannian manifold known as trans-Sasakian manifold [8] which generalizes both α-Sasakian [8] and β-Kenmotsu [8] structure.

M. D. Upadhayay studied almost contact hyperbolic (f, g, η, ξ) – structure [21]. Bhatt and Dubey studied on CR-submanifolds of trans hyperbolic contact manifold [3]. B. Y. Chen studied Geometry of submanifolds and its applications. Sci. Univ Tokyo. Tokyo, 1981. [5]. R. Prasad, M. M. Tripathi, J. S. Kim and J-H. Cho., studied some properties of submanifolds of almost contact manifold [15], [16], [17], [18], [19].

Let $\overline{M}$ be an $2n+1$ dimensional manifold with almost hyperbolic contact metric structure (ϕ, ξ, η, g) where ϕ is a tensor field of type $(1,1)$, ξ is a vector field, η is a 1-form and g is the semi Riemannian metric on $\overline{M}$. Then the following conditions [21] are satisfied

$$\phi^2 X = X + \eta(X)\xi, \quad \phi\xi = 0, \quad \eta o \phi = 0, \quad \eta(\xi) = -1, \tag{1.1}$$

$$g(\phi X, \phi Y) = -g(X, Y) - \eta(X).\eta(Y), \tag{1.2}$$

$$g(\phi X, Y) = -g(X, \phi Y), \tag{1.3}$$

for vector fields X, Y on $\overline{M}$. An almost hyperbolic contact metric structure (ϕ, ξ, η, g) on $\overline{M}$ is called trans hyperbolic contact [3] if and only if

$$(\overline{\nabla}_X \phi)Y = \alpha\{g(X, Y)\xi - \eta(Y)X\} + \beta\{g(\phi X, Y)\xi - \eta(Y)\phi X\}, \tag{1.4}$$

for all smooth vector fields X, Y on $\overline{M}$ and α, β non zero constant, where $\overline{\nabla}$ is the Levi-civita connection with respect to g. From (1.4) it follows that

$$\overline{\nabla}_X \xi = \alpha \phi X + \beta \left(X + \eta \left(X \right) \xi \right), \tag{1.5}$$

for all smooth vector fields X, Y on $\overline{M}$.

2. Transversal hypersurface

Let M be a hypersurface of an almost hyperbolic contact manifold $\overline{M}$ equipped with an almost hyperbolic contact structure $((\phi, \xi, \eta)$. We assume that the structure vector field ξ never belongs to tangent space of the hypersurface M, such that a hypersurface is called a transversal hypersurface of an almost contact manifold. In this case the structure vector field ξ can be taken as an affine normal to the hypersurface. Vector field X on M and ξ are linearly independent, therefore we may write

$$\phi X = F \left(X \right) + \omega \left(X \right) \xi \tag{2.1}$$

where F is a $(1, 1)$ tensor field and ω is a 1-form on M.

From (2.1)

$$\phi \xi = F \xi + \omega \left(\xi \right) \xi$$

or,

$$0 = F \xi + \omega \left(\xi \right) \xi$$

$$\phi^2 X = F \left(\phi X \right) + \omega \left(\phi X \right) \xi \tag{2.2}$$

$$X + \eta \left(X \right) \xi = F \left(FX + \omega \left(X \right) \xi + \omega \left(FX + \omega \left(X \right) \xi \right) \xi \right)$$

$$X + \eta \left(X \right) \xi = F^2 X + \left(\omega \circ F \right) \left(X \right) \xi \tag{2.3}$$

Taking account of equation (2.3), we get

$$F^2X = X \tag{2.4}$$

$$F^2 = I \tag{2.5}$$

$$\eta = \omega \circ F$$

Thus we have

Theorem 2.1. Each transversal hypersurface of an almost hyperbolic contact manifold admits an almost product structure and a 1-form ω.

From (2.4) and (2.5), it follows that

$$\eta = \omega \circ F$$
$$\eta\,(FX) = (\omega \circ F)\,FX$$
$$\eta\,(FX) = \omega\left(F^2X\right)$$
$$(\omega \circ F)\,X = \omega\,(X)$$
$$\omega = \eta \circ F \tag{2.6}$$

Now, we assume that $\overline{M}$ admits an almost hyperbolic contact metric structure (ϕ, ξ, η, g). We denote by g the induced metric on M also. Then for all $X, Y \in TM$, we obtain

$$g(FX, FY) = -g(X,Y) - \eta(X).\eta(Y) + \omega\,(X)\,\omega\,(Y) \tag{2.7}$$

We define a new metric G on the transversal hypersurface given by

$$G(X,Y) = g(\phi X, \phi Y) = -g(X,Y) - \eta(X).\eta(Y). \tag{2.8}$$

So,

$$\begin{aligned}
G(FX, FY) &= -g(FX, FY) - \eta(FX).\eta(FY) \\
&= -g(X,Y) - \eta(X).\eta(Y) + \omega\,(X)\,\omega\,(Y) - (\eta \circ F)\,(X)\,(\eta \circ F)\,(Y) \\
&= -g(X,Y) - \eta(X).\eta(Y) + \omega\,(X)\,\omega\,(Y) - \omega\,(X)\,\omega\,(Y) \\
&= -g(X,Y) - \eta(X).\eta(Y) = G\,(X,Y)
\end{aligned}$$

Then, we get

$$G(FX, FY) = G\,(X,Y)\,, \tag{2.9}$$

where equation (2.4), (2.6), (2.7) and (2.8) are used.

Then G is semi Riemannian metric on M. that is (F, G) is an almost product semi-Riemannian structure on the transversal hypersurface M of $\overline{M}$. Thus, we are able to state the following.

Theorem 2.2. Each transversal hypersurface of an almost hyperbolic contact manifold admits an almost product semi-Riemannian structure. We now assume that M is orientable and choose a unit vector field N of $\overline{M}$, normal to M. Then Gauss and Weingarten formulae are given respectively by

$$\overline{\nabla}_X Y = \nabla_X Y + h(X,Y)N, \quad (X,Y \in TM) \tag{2.10}$$

$$\overline{\nabla}_X N = -HX \tag{2.11}$$

where $\overline{\nabla}$ and ∇ are respectively the Levi-civita and induced Levi-civita connections in $\overline{M}$, M and h is the second fundamental form related to H by

$$h(X,Y) = g(HX,Y), \tag{2.12}$$

for any vector field X tangent to M, defining

$$\phi X = fX + u(X)N, \tag{2.13}$$

$$\phi N = -U, \tag{2.14}$$

$$\xi = V + \lambda N, \tag{2.15}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \eta(X) &= v(X), \\ \lambda &= \eta(N) = g(\xi, N), \end{aligned} \tag{2.16}$$

for $X \in TM$ we get an induced hyperbolic (f, g, u, v, λ)-structure on the transversal hypersurface such that

$$f^2 = I + u \otimes U + v \otimes V \tag{2.17}$$

$$fU = -\lambda V, \quad fV = \lambda U \tag{2.18}$$

$$u \circ f = \lambda v, \quad v \circ f = -\lambda U \tag{2.19}$$

$$u(U) = -1 - \lambda^2, \quad u(V) = v(U) = 0, \quad v(V) = -1 - \lambda^2 \tag{2.20}$$

$$g(fX, fY) = -g(X,Y) - u(X)u(Y) - v(X)v(Y) \tag{2.21}$$

$$g(X, fY) = -g(fX, Y), \quad g(X,U) = u(X), \quad g(X,V) = v(X), \tag{2.22}$$

for all $X, Y \in TM$, where

$$\lambda = \eta(N). \tag{2.23}$$

Thus, we see that every transversal hypersurface of an almost hyperbolic contact metric manifold also admits a hyperbolic (f, g, u, v, λ)-structure. Next we find relation between the induced almost product structure (F, G) and the induced hyperbolic (f, g, u, v, λ)-structure on the transversal hypersurface of an almost hyperbolic contact metric manifold. In fact, we have the following

Theorem 2.3. Let M be a transversal hypersurface of an almost hyperbolic contact metric manifold $\overline{M}$ equipped with almost hyperbolic contact metric structure (ϕ, ξ, η, g) and induced almost product structure (F, G).

Then we have

$$\lambda w = u, \tag{2.24}$$

$$F = f - \frac{1}{\lambda} u \otimes V, \tag{2.25}$$

$$FU = \frac{1}{\lambda} V, \tag{2.26}$$

$$uoF = uof = \lambda v, \tag{2.27}$$

$$FV = fV = \lambda U, \tag{2.28}$$

$$uoF = \frac{1}{\lambda} u. \tag{2.29}$$

Proof.

$$\phi X = FX + \omega(X)\xi,$$
$$\xi = V + \lambda N,$$

$$\phi X = FX + \omega(X) V + \lambda \omega(X) N, \tag{2.30}$$

$$\phi X = fX + u(X) N. \tag{2.31}$$

From equation (2.30) and (2.31) we have

$$\lambda \omega X = u(X), \qquad \omega(X) = \frac{1}{\lambda} u(X),$$

$$FX = fX - \omega(X)V,$$
$$FX = fX - \frac{1}{\lambda}u(X)V,$$
$$F = f - \frac{1}{\lambda}u \otimes v,$$

which is equation (2.25).

$$(uoF)(X) = (uof)(X) - \frac{1}{\lambda}u(X)u(V), \qquad u\,(V) = 0,$$
$$uoF = uof = \lambda v,$$

which is equation (2.27).

$$FU = fV - \frac{1}{\lambda}u(v)V,$$
$$FU = -\lambda V - \frac{1}{\lambda}(-1-\lambda^2)V = \frac{1}{\lambda}V,$$
$$FU = \frac{1}{\lambda}V,$$

which is equation (2.26).

$$\begin{aligned}(uoF)\,(X) &= (uof)(X) - \frac{1}{\lambda}u(X)u(V) \\ &= (uof)(X) - \frac{1}{\lambda}u(X)(-1-\lambda^2) \\ &= -\lambda u(X) + \frac{1}{\lambda}u(X) + \lambda u(X) \\ &= \frac{1}{\lambda}u(X),\end{aligned}$$
$$uoF = \frac{1}{\lambda}u,$$
$$FV = fV - \frac{1}{\lambda}u(V)V = fV = \lambda U,$$

which is equation (2.28) here equations (2.18), (2.19), (2.20), (2.21), (2.22), (2.23) are used. □

Lemma 2.4. Let M be a transversal hypersurface with hyperbolic (f, g, u, v, λ)-structure of an almost hyperbolic contact metric manifold $\overline{M}$. Then

(2.32)
$$\left(\overline{\nabla}_X\phi\right)Y = \left(\left(\nabla_X f\right)Y - u\,(Y)\,HX + h\,(X,Y)\,U\right) + \left(\left(\overline{\nabla}_X u\right)Y + h\,(X, fY)\,N\right)$$

(2.33)
$$\overline{\nabla}_X\xi = \nabla_X V - \lambda HX + \left(h\,(X,V) + X\lambda\right)N$$

(2.34) $$\left(\overline{\nabla}_X \phi\right) N = \left(-\nabla_X U + fHX\right)$$

(2.35) $$\left(\overline{\nabla}_X \eta\right) Y = \nabla_X u + \lambda h\left(X, Y\right),$$

for all $X, Y \in TM$. The proof is straight forward and hence omitted.

3. TRANSVERSAL HYPERSURFACES OF COSYMPLECTIC HYPERBOLIC MANIFOLD

Trans-Sasakian structures of type $(\alpha, 0)$ are called α-Sasakian and trans-Sasakian structures of type $(0, \beta)$ are called β-Kenmotsu structures. Trans-Sasakian structures of type $(0, 0)$ are called cosymplectic structures.

Theorem 3.1. Let M be a transversal hypersurfaces with hyperbolic (f, g, u, v, λ)-structure of a hyperbolic cosymplectic manifold $\overline{M}$. Then

(3.1) $$\left(\nabla_X f\right) Y = u\left(Y\right) HX - h\left(X, Y\right) U,$$

(3.2) $$\left(\nabla_X u\right) Y = -h\left(X, fY\right),$$

(3.3) $$\nabla_X V = \lambda HX,$$

(3.4) $$h\left(X, V\right) = -X\lambda,$$

(3.5) $$\nabla_X U = fHX,$$

(3.6) $$\left(\nabla_X v\right) = \lambda h\left(X, Y\right),$$

for all $X, Y \in TM$.

Proof. Using (1.4), (2.13), (2.15) in (2.32), we obtain

$$\left(\left(\nabla_X f\right) Y - u\left(Y\right) HX + h\left(X, Y\right) U\right) + \left(\left(\nabla_X u\right) Y + h\left(X, fY\right)\right) N = 0$$

Equating tangential and normal parts in the above equation, we get (3.1) and (3.2) respectively. Using (1.5) and (2.15) in (2.33), we have

$$\left(\nabla_X V - \lambda HX\right) + \left(h\left(X, V\right) + X\lambda\right) N = 0$$

Equating tangential and normal parts we get (3.3) and (3.4) respectively. Using (1.4), (2.14) and (2.15) in (2.34) and equating tangential, we get (3.5). In the last (3.6) follows from (2.35). □

Theorem 3.2. If M be a transversal hypersurface with hyperbolic (f, g, u, v, λ)-structure of a hyperbolic cosymplectic manifold, then the 2-form Φ on M is given by

$$\Phi(X, Y) \equiv g(X, fY)$$

is closed.

Proof. From (3.1) we get

$$(\nabla_X \Phi)(Y, Z) = h(X, Y)\, u(Z) - h(X, Z)\, u(Y),$$

which gives

$$(\nabla_X \Phi)(Y, Z) + (\nabla_Y \Phi)(Z, X) + (\nabla_Z \Phi)(X, Y) = 0.$$

Hence the theorem is proved. □

Theorem 3.3. If M is a transversal hypersurface with almost product semi-Riemannian structure (F, G) of a hyperbolic cosymplectic manifold. Then the 2-form Ω on M is given by

$$\Omega(X, Y) = G(X, fY)$$

is closed.

Using (3.1), we calculate the Nijenhuis tensor

$$[F, F] = (\nabla_{FX} F)\, Y - (\nabla_{FY} F)\, X - F(\nabla_X F)\, Y + F(\nabla_Y F)\, X$$

and find that $[F, F] = 0$.

Therefore, in view of theorem (3.2), we have

Theorem 3.4. Every transversal hypersurface of a trans hyperbolic cosymplectic manifold, admits product structure.

4. TRANSVERSAL HYPERSURFACES OF TRANS HYPERBOLIC SASAKIAN MANIFOLDS

Theorem 4.1. Let M be a transversal hypersurface with hyperbolic (f,g,u,v,λ)–structure of a trans hyperbolic Sasakian manifold $\overline{M}$. Then

$$(4.1)\quad (\nabla_X f)\,Y = \alpha\,(g\,(X,Y)\,V - v\,(Y)\,X) + \beta\,(g\,(fX,Y)\,V - v\,(Y)\,fX) + u\,(Y)\,HX - h\,(X,Y)\,U$$

$$(4.2)\quad (\nabla_X u)\,Y = \alpha\lambda g\,(X,Y) + \beta\,(\lambda g\,(fX,Y) - u\,(X)\,v\,(Y)) - h\,(X,fY)\,.$$

$$(4.3)\quad \nabla_X V = \lambda HX - \alpha fX + \beta\,(X - v\,(X)\,V)\,.$$

$$(4.4)\quad h\,(X,V) = \alpha u\,(X) - \beta\lambda v\,(X) - X\lambda.$$

$$(4.5)\quad \nabla_X U = fHX - \alpha\lambda X + \beta\,(\lambda fX - u\,(X)\,V)\,.$$

$$(4.6)\quad (\nabla_X v) = \lambda h\,(X,Y) - \alpha g\,(fX,Y) + \beta\,(g\,(X,Y) - v\,(X)\,v\,(Y))\,,$$

for all $X,Y \in TM$.

Proof. Using (1.4), (2.13), (2.15) in (2.32), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &((\nabla_X f)\,Y - u\,(Y)\,HX + h\,(X,Y)\,U) + ((\nabla_X u)\,Y + h\,(X,fY))\,N \\ = \;& \alpha\,(g\,(X,Y)\,V - v\,(Y)\,X) + \beta\,(g\,(fX,Y)\,V - v\,(Y)\,fX) \\ & +\alpha\lambda g\,(X,Y) + \beta\lambda g\,(fX,Y) - u\,(X)\,v\,(Y)\,. \end{aligned}$$

Equating tangential and normal parts in the above equation, we get (4.1) and (4.2) respectively. Using (1.5) and (2.15) in (2.33), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &(\nabla_X V - \lambda HX) + (h\,(X,V) + X\lambda)\,N \\ = \;& -\alpha fX + \beta\,(X - v\,(X)\,V) - (\alpha u\,(X) + \beta\lambda v\,(X))\,N. \end{aligned}$$

Equating tangential and normal parts we get (4.3) and (4.4) respectively. Using (1.4), (2.14) and (2.15) in (2.34) and equating tangential parts, we get (4.5) in the last (4.6) follows from (2.35). □

Theorem 4.2. If M be a transversal hypersurface with hyperbolic (f, g, u, v, λ)–structure of a $(\alpha, 0)$ trans hyperbolic Sasakian manifold, then the 2-form Φ on M is given by

$$\Phi(X, Y) = g(X, fY)$$

is closed.

Proof. From (4.1) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
(\nabla_X \Phi)(Y, Z) &= -\alpha (g(X, Y) v(Z) - g(X, Z) v(Y)) \\
&\quad -\beta (g(fX, Y) v(Z) - g(fX, Z) v(Y)) \\
&\quad +h(X, Y) u(Z) - h(X, Z) u(Y),
\end{aligned}$$

which gives

$$\begin{aligned}
&(\nabla_X \Phi)(Y, Z) + (\nabla_Y \Phi)(Z, X) + (\nabla_Z \Phi)(X, Z) \\
= \; &2\beta (\Phi(X, Y) \eta(Z) + \Phi(Y, Z) \eta(X) + \Phi(Z, X) \eta(Y))
\end{aligned}$$

If $\beta = 0$, then

$$(\nabla_X \Phi)(Y, Z) + (\nabla_Y \Phi)(Z, X) + (\nabla_Z \Phi)(X, Z) = 0,$$

that is

$$d\Phi = 0.$$

Hence the theorem is proved. □

Theorem 4.3. If M is a transversal hypersurface with almost product semi-Riemannian structure (F, G) of a $(\alpha, 0)$ trans hyperbolic Sasakian manifold. Then 2-form Ω on M is given by

$$\Omega(X, Y) = G(X, FY)$$

is closed.

Using (4.1), we calculate the Nijenhuis tensor

$$[F, F] = (\nabla_{FX} F) Y - (\nabla_{FY} F) X - F(\nabla_X F) Y + F(\nabla_Y F) X$$

and find that

$$[F, F] = 0$$

Therefore, in view of theorem 4.2, we have

Theorem 4.4. Every transversal hypersurface of a trans hyperbolic Sasakian manifold admits a product structure.

References

[1] D. E. Blair, Contact manifolds in Riemannian geometry, Lecture Notes in math. 509. springer verlag, 1976.

[2] D.E. Blair and J.A. Oubina, Conformal and related changes of metric on the product of two almost contact metric manifolds, Publications Matematiques 34 (1990) 199-207.

[3] L. Bhatt and K.K. Dubey, On CR-submanifold of trans hyperbolic Contact manifold, Acta Cieme. Indica 29 No. 1, (2003), 91-96.

[4] D. Chinea, P.S. Perestelo, Invariant submnifolds of a trans-Contact manifold, Publ. Math. Debrecen 38 (1991), 103-109, MR 92g:53025.

[5] B. Y. Chen, Geometry of submanifolds and its applications. Sci. Univ Tokyo. Tokyo, 1981.

[6] S. Dragomir, L. Ornea, Locally conformal Kaehler geometry, Progress in Mathematics 155, Birkhauser 1998.

[7] A. Gray and L. M. Hervella, The sixteen classes of almost Hermitian manifolds and their liner invariants, Ann, Mat. Pura Appl., (4) 123 (1980) 35-58.

[8] D. Janssens, L. Vanhecke, Almost contact strucures and curvature tensors, Kodai Math. J. 4 (1981), 1-27.

[9] S. Kanemaki, On quasi-Contact manifolds, Diff. Geometry Banach Center Publications, 12 (1984), 95-125.

[10] K. Kenmotsu, A class of almost contact Riemannian manifolds, Tohoku Math. J. 24 (1972) 93-103.

[11] U.H.Ki, J. S. Pak, H. B. Suh, On $(f, g, u(k), a(k))$-structures, Kodai Math. Sem. Rep, 26 (1975), 160-175.

[12] J.C. Marrero, The local structure of trans-Contact manifolds. Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4) 162 (1992), 77-86, MR 93j:53044.

[13] R. S. Mishra, Almost contact metric manifolds, Monograph 1, Tensor society of India, Lucknow, 1991.

[14] J.A. Oubina, New classes of almost contact metic structures, Publ. Math. Debrecen 32 (1985) 187-193.

[15] R.Prasad, M.M. Tripathi and Jeong-Sik Kim, on generalized recci-recurrent trans-contact manifolds, J. Korean Math. Soc. 39(2002), No. 6, pp. 953-961.

[16] R.Prasad, M.M. Tripathi and Jeong-Sik Kim, J-H Cho, On automorphism groups of an $\in$ framed manifold. Commun. Korean Math. Soc. 17(2002), No. 4, pp. 635-645.

[17] R.Prasad and M. M. Tripathi, ξ-horizontal hyper surfaces of Kemmotsu manifolds Bull. Cal. Math. Soc. 95,(2) 121-126 (2003).

[18] R.Prasad and M.M. Tripathi, On non-invariant hyper surface of Trans-Contact manifolds. J. Int. Acad. Physical. Sci. Vol. 6(2002), No. 1, pp. 33-40.

[19] R.Prasad and M.M. Tripathi, Transversal hyper surface of Kenmotsu manifold Indian J. pure appl. Math. 34 (3) : 443-452, March 2003.

[20] S. Tanno, The automorphism groups of almost contact Riemannian manifolds, Tohoku Math. J. 21 (1969), 21-38.

[21] M.D. Upadhyay and K.K. Dubey, Almost Contact hyperbolic (f, g, η, ξ) - structure, Acta Math. Acad. Scient Hung. 28 (1976), 13-15.

Rajendra Prasad
Department of Mathematics and Astronomy
University of Lucknow, Lucknow-226007 (India).

Amit Kumar Rai*
Department of Mathematics
University of Allahabad, Allahabad-211 002 (India).
amit_patwadh@rediffmail.com

M. M. Tripathi
Department of Mathematics and Astronomy
University of Lucknow, Lucknow-226007 (India).

S. S. Shukla
Department of Mathematics
University of Allahabad, Allahabad-211 002 (India).

Date received: September 9, 2007

Arab J. Math. Sc.
Volume 14, Number 1, June 2008
pp.15-20

A CONSEQUENCE OF THE LAURENT DECOMPOSITION

Ibtesam Bajunaid

Abstract. Given an analytic function f outside a compact set in the complex plane, there exists a unique entire function g such that $g - f$ tends to 0 at the point at infinity.

In the complex plane, consider $f(z) = \frac{z^4+2}{z^2-1}$ which is analytic in $\mid z \mid > 1$. Let $g(z) = z^2 + 1$ which is an entire function. Remark that $\mid f(z) - g(z) \mid = \frac{3}{|z^2-1|} \to 0$ when $\mid z \mid \to \infty$. Another such example is $\frac{e^z}{z}$ which is analytic outside the origin. If $g(z) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{z^{n-1}}{n!}$, then $g(z)$ is an entire function such that $\mid f(z) - g(z) \mid = \frac{1}{|z|} \to 0$ when $\mid z \mid \to \infty$. These examples prompt the question: for any analytic function $f(z)$ defined outside a compact set in the complex plane, can we construct an entire function $g(z)$ such that $\mid f(z) - g(z) \mid \to 0$ when $\mid z \mid \to \infty$? We show that the answer is yes by making use of the following generalized version of the Laurent theorem. For the classical representation of this series development in an annular region, see for example [3, Section 2.4].

Theorem 0.1. *In the complex plane, let K be a compact set and ω be an open set such that $K \subset \omega$. Assume that there is an open disc D such that $K \subset D \subset \overline{D} \subset \omega$. Suppose f is analytic on $\omega \setminus K$. Then $f = f_1 + f_2$ on $\omega \setminus K$, where f_1 is analytic on ω and f_2 is analytic on K^c tending to 0 at the point at infinity. This decomposition is unique.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, let us assume that the disc $D = \{z : \mid z \mid < r\}$. Let r_1 and r_2 be numbers such that $r_2 < r < r_1$, $K \subset \{z : \mid z \mid < r_2\}$ and $\{z : \mid z \mid < r_1\} \subset \omega$. By Laurent series expansion, $f(z) = s_1(z) + s_2(z)$ for $r_2 < \mid z \mid < r_1$, where s_1 is analytic on $\mid z \mid < r_1$ and s_2 is analytic on $\mid z \mid > r_2$

2000 AMS Subject Classification: 30C 45.
Key words: Analytic, meromorphic, close to convex, differential subordination, differential operator.

with a removable singularity at the point at infinity. Let $\lim_{z\to\infty} s_2(z) = \alpha$. Write $t_1 = s_1 + \alpha$ and $t_2 = s_2 - \alpha$. Then $f = t_1 + t_2$ for $r_2 <| z |< r_1$ and t_2 tends to 0 at the point at infinity.

Define

$$f_1 = \begin{cases} f - t_2 & \text{if } \mid z \mid > r_2 \text{ and } z \in \omega \\ t_1 & \text{if } \mid z \mid < r_1. \end{cases}$$

Then f_1 is a well-defined analytic function on ω.

Define

$$f_2 = \begin{cases} f - t_1 & \text{if } \mid z \mid < r_1 \text{ and } z \notin K \\ t_2 & \text{if } \mid z \mid > r_2. \end{cases}$$

Then f_2 is analytic on K^c, tending to 0 at the point at infinity, Moreover, $f = f_1 + f_2$ on $\omega \setminus K$.

For the uniqueness, note that if $f = h_1 + h_2$ is another such decomposition, then

$$\varphi = \begin{cases} f_1 - h_1 & \text{on } \omega \\ h_2 - f_2 & \text{on } K^c \end{cases}$$

is an entire function tending to 0 at the point at infinity. Hence $\varphi \equiv 0$. $\square$

A consequence: Let f be and analytic function defined outside a compact set in the complex plane. Then there exists a unique entire function g such that $g - f$ tends to 0 at the point at infinity.

Proof. The uniqueness of g is easy to see. For, if g_1 and g_2 are two entire functions such that $g_1 - f$ and $g_2 - f$ tend to 0 at the point at infinity, then $g_1 - g_2$ tends to 0 at the point at infinity and hence $g_1 - g_2 \equiv 0$.

To prove the existence of g, let f be defined as an analytic function outside a compact set K. Let D be an open disc containing K. Then, by the above theorem, $f = f_1 + f_2$ on $D \setminus K$, where f_1 is analytic on D and f_2 is analytic on K^c tending to 0 at the point at infinity.

Define

$$g = \begin{cases} f - f_2 & \text{if } z \notin K \\ f_1 & \text{if } z \in D. \end{cases}$$

Then, g is a well-defined entire function such that $g - f$ tends to 0 at the point at infinity. $\square$

However, an attempt to generalize the above result in the following form turns futile: Given a (real -valued) harmonic function u outside a compact set in the complex plane, is it possible to find a harmonic function v on the whole plane such that $\mid u(z) - v(z) \mid \to 0$ when $\mid z \mid \to \infty$? For example, consider $u(z) = \log \mid z \mid$ which is harmonic outside the origin. Assume that there is some harmonic function v on the whole plane such that $\mid u(z) - v(z) \mid \to 0$ when $\mid z \mid \to \infty$. Then, this assumption leads to a contradiction. For, if such a function v were to exist, then v should be lower bounded on the plane and hence by the maximum principle it should be a constant α. This means that $\alpha - \log \mid z \mid \to 0$ when $\mid z \mid \to \infty$. This is not possible.

Let ω be a bounded open set in $\mathbb{R}^2$ and Ω be an open set containing ω. Let f be a C^2 (continuously twice differentiable) function on Ω. If $\frac{\partial g}{\partial n^+}(s)$ denotes the outer normal derivative at a point s on $\partial\omega$, then $\int\limits_{\partial\omega} \frac{\partial g}{\partial n^+}(s)\, ds$ is defined as the outward flux of g on ω. As a particular case of the Green's Formula, we see that $\iint\limits_{\omega} \Delta g(x) = \int\limits_{\partial\omega} \frac{\partial g}{\partial n^+}(s)\, ds$.

Suppose $h(z)$ is a harmonic function defined on $\mid z \mid > R$. Let a, b be two positive numbers larger than R. Since $\Delta h(z) = 0$ when $\mid z \mid > R$, we obtain from the Green's Formula on the annulus $\omega = \{z : a < \mid z \mid < b\}$, $\int\limits_{|s|=a} \frac{\partial h}{\partial n^-}(s)\, ds + \int\limits_{|s|=b} \frac{\partial h}{\partial n^+}(s)\, ds = 0$. This implies that $\int\limits_{|s|=a} \frac{\partial h}{\partial n^+}(s)\, ds = \int\limits_{|s|=b} \frac{\partial h}{\partial n^+}(s)\, ds$. Since a and b are arbitrary, the constant $\lambda = \int\limits_{|s|=r} \frac{\partial h}{\partial n^+}(s)\, ds$ is independent of $r\,(> R)$. We define λ as the flux at infinity of h.

Suppose H is a harmonic function on $\mathbb{R}^2$. Then $\int\limits_{|s|=r} \frac{\partial H}{\partial n^+}(s)\, ds = 0$ for any $r > 0$. Hence, the flux at infinity of H is 0. Suppose b is a bounded harmonic function defined outside a compact set in $\mathbb{R}^2$. Then, $b(z)$ tends to a finite limit when $\mid z \mid\to\infty$. Hence, using the inversion which preserves the harmonicity, $b\,(z)$ can be considered as a function harmonic at the point at infinity also (Brelot [4, p.195]) so that the flux at infinity of b is 0.

Let $u\,(z)$ be a harmonic function outside a compact set in the plane, then we can find a harmonic function $f\,(z)$ on the whole plane, a unique real number λ and a bounded harmonic function $b\,(z)$ outside a compact set such that $u\,(z) = \lambda \log \mid z \mid + f\,(z) + b\,(z)$ outside a compact set. The constant λ is the flux at infinity of the function u. (Brelot [4, p.194] has proved this result, by using a power series expansion of harmonic functions on the plane; in Anandam [1], this result is deduced from a general result in a locally compact space. See also, Axler [2, p.173])

Actually we can prove the following: Let $u\,(z)$ be a harmonic function defined outside a compact set in the plane. Then there exists a harmonic function $v\,(z)$ in the plane such that $\mid u\,(z) - v\,(z) \mid\to 0$ when $\mid z \mid\to\infty$ if and only if the flux at infinity of u is 0.

For, if u is harmonic off some compact set and α is its flux, then u is of the form $u\,(z) = \lambda \log \mid z \mid + f\,(z) + b\,(z)$. Since $b\,(z)$ is a bounded harmonic function outside a compact set, $b\,(z) \to \beta$, a finite value, when $\mid z \mid\to\infty$. Consequently, if the flux $\alpha = 0$, then the harmonic function $v\,(z) = f\,(z) + \beta$ defined on the whole plane is such that $\mid u\,(z) - v\,(z) \mid\to 0$ when $\mid z \mid\to\infty$. Clearly $v\,(z)$ is unique, from the minimum principle.

Conversely, suppose there exists a harmonic function $v\,(z)$ on the complex plane such that $\mid u\,(z) - v\,(z) \mid\to 0$ when $\mid z \mid\to\infty$. Then, by using the representation of $u\,(z)$, we see that $\mid \lambda \log \mid z \mid + [f\,(z) - v\,(z) + \beta] + [b\,(z) - \beta] \mid\to 0$ when $\mid z \mid\to\infty$. If $\lambda \neq 0$, this will mean that $\mid \log \mid z \mid + \frac{1}{\lambda}[f\,(z) - v\,(z) + \beta] \mid\to 0$ when $\mid z \mid\to\infty$, which we have just seen is not possible. Hence, the flux $\lambda = 0$.

Recall that when g is an entire function, the quantity $M\,(r, g)$ denotes $\max\limits_{|z|=r} \mid g\,(z) \mid$, and $ordg$ equals $\limsup\limits_{r\to\infty} \frac{\log\log M(r,g)}{\log r}$ (see, Hille [6, p.182] or Copson [5, p.165]).

The above mentioned consequence permits us to define the order of an analytic function even when it is defined only outside a compact set, thus bringing out the fact that the notion of order of an entire function is introduced essentially to study the behavior of entire functions near the point at infinity. For, if $f(z)$ is an analytic function defined outside a compact set, then $f(z) = g(z) + b(z)$ in a neighborhood of the point at infinity, where $b(z)$ is bounded analytic outside a compact set tending to 0 at the point at infinity and $g(z)$ is a uniquely determined entire function. Hence, without ambiguity, we can define the order of $f(z)$ as $ordf = ordg$. When $ordf$ is finite, we can use the Hadamard's factorization (Copson [5, $p.174$]) for $g(z)$ to obtain a representation for $f(z)$ outside a compact set up to an additive bounded analytic function. As a simple example, we prove the following result.

Proposition 0.1. *Let $f(z)$ be an analytic function defined outside a compact set and $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then there exists a polynomial $p(z)$ of degree $n \leq k$ such that $\mid f(z) - p(z) \mid \to 0$ when $\mid z \mid \to \infty$ if and only if $\mid f(z) \mid \leq A \mid z \mid^k$ for $\mid z \mid \geq R, R$ large.*

Proof. Write as before $f(z) = g(z) + b(z)$ outside a compact set. If $\mid f(z) \mid \leq A \mid z \mid^k$, then $\mid g(z) \mid \leq B \mid z \mid^k$. Then by Cauchy inequalities, $g(z)$ is a polynomial of degree $n \leq k$.

Conversely, if $p(z)$ is a polynomial of degree $n \leq k$, such that $\mid f(z) - p(z) \mid \to 0$ when $\mid z \mid \to \infty$, then $\mid f(z) \mid \leq \mid p(z) \mid$ +a constant outside a compact set. Hence $\mid f(z) \mid \leq A \mid z \mid^n \leq A \mid z \mid^k$ for $\mid z \mid \geq R$, for large R. □

It is known (see, for example Titchmarsh [7, $p.284a$]) that if an entire function $g(z)$ does not take the value a, then a is an asymptotic value of g. (That is, there is a continuous curve from a given point to the point at infinity along which $g(z) \to a$ when $\mid z \mid \to \infty$). Consequently, the following proposition is easy to establish.

Proposition 0.2. *Let $f(z)$ be an analytic function defined outside a compact set. Then, either $\lim\limits_{z \to \infty} f(z)$ is finite or $f(z)$ has the asymptotic value ∞.*

Proof. Write $f(z) = g(z) + b(z)$ as before. If $f(z)$ is bounded, then the entire function $g(z)$ is bounded and hence a constant α. Since $\lim\limits_{z \to \infty} b(z) = 0$, we conclude $\lim\limits_{z \to \infty} f(z) = \alpha$. On the other hand, if $f(z)$ is not bounded , then $g(z)$ is a non-constant entire function and hence $\lim_{z\to\infty} g(z) = \infty$ along a continuous curve going to infinity. Consequently, $f(z)$ has the asymptotic value ∞. $\square$

References

[1] V. Anandam, Espaces harmoniques sans potentiel positif, Ann. Inst. fourier, 22(1972), 97-160.

[2] S. Axler, P. Bourdon, and W. Ramey, Harmonic function theory, 2^{nd} edition, Springer-Verlag, (Graduate Texts in Mathematics; 137), 2001.

[3] C. A. Berenstein and R. Gay, Complex Variables: An Introduction (Graduate Texts in Mathematics), Springer-Verlag, 1991.

[4] M. Brelot, Éléments de la théorie classique du potentiel, 3^e edition, CDU, Paris, 1965.

[5] E.T. Copson, Theory of functions of a complex variable, Oxford, The Clarendon Press, Reprint 1960.

[6] E. Hille, Analytic function theory, volume II, AMS Chelsea Publishing, 2006.

[7] E. C. Titchmarsh, The theory of functions, Oxford University Press, ELBS, Reprint 1961.

Department of mathematics, King Saud Unversity,

P. O. Box 60618 Riyadh 11555, Saudi Arabia.

Ibajunaid@hotmail.com

Date received: December 30, 2007

Arab J. Math. Sc.
Volume 14, Number 1, June 2008
pp.21-32

ON A NEW OPERATOR BASED ON A GRILL AND ITS ASSOCIATED TOPOLOGY

B. ROY, M. N. MUKHERJEE, AND S. K. GHOSH

ABSTRACT. In one of our earlier papers a topology $\tau_{\mathcal{G}}$ and certain associated concepts were studied, where the topology $\tau_{\mathcal{G}}$ was introduced in terms of an operator $\Phi_{\mathcal{G}}$, constructed from a grill G on a topological space (X, τ). In this article we define a new operator Γ by using the operator $\Phi_{\mathcal{G}}$, and undertake an investigation in respect of the operator Γ via-a-vis the operator $\Phi_{\mathcal{G}}$. We ultimately show that Γ induces another topology $\tau_{\Gamma(\mathcal{B})}$, constructed out of any given base B of the topology τ or $\tau_{\mathcal{G}}$ and a grill G on the ambient space X.

1. INTRODUCTION AND PREREQUISITES

In 1947, Choquet [2] initiated the idea of grills. Thereafter, in course of the last sixty years, different topological investigations have revealed that grills can be used as a highly technical appliance for manoeuvring many-a-course of study in mathematics, like the problems concerning proximity spaces and certain theories of extensions [7, 1] and so on.

In an earlier paper [4], a topology $\tau_{\mathcal{G}}$ was introduced in terms of an operator $\Phi_{\mathcal{G}}$, constructed rather naturally from a grill $\mathcal{G}$ on a topological space (X, τ). In the said paper and also in [5, 6], a detailed description of the topology along with certain other associated ideas and many results thereof are laid down.

2000 *AMS subject classification*: 30C45.
Key words: Analytic, meromorphic, close to convex, differential subordination, differential operator.

In this paper we endeavour for an investigation along a similar course with the grill-associated topology, but with a new orientation. We introduce here a new operator Γ, defined in terms of the previously introduced operator Φ, as a kind of dual of Φ. We study some basic properties of this new operator, which helps us to derive a few equivalent expressions for the operator Γ and a characterizing condition, in terms of Γ, for the suitability of a topology τ on X for a given grill $\mathcal{G}$ on X. Some equivalent criteria for $\mathcal{G}$ to contain all the non-null members of τ are also established. Finally, we show that from a given grill $\mathcal{G}$ on a space (X, τ) and a given (open) base $\mathcal{B}$ for τ, we can arrive at a new topology $\tau_{\Gamma(\mathcal{B})}$ on X, which is weaker than the given topology τ on X. The deliberation culminates with the interesting result that in terms of this method of construction, all the bases of τ and of the grill-based topology $\tau_{\mathcal{G}}$ give rise to the same topology.

We now recall a few concepts and certain result from [4], to be used in course of the deliberations that follow. We start with the definition of grill, as given by Choquet [2].

Definition 1.1. A collection $\mathcal{G}$ of nonempty subsets of a space X is called a grill on X if
(i) $A \in \mathcal{G}$ and $A \subseteq B \subseteq X \Rightarrow B \in \mathcal{G}$,
and (ii) $A, B \subseteq X$ and $A \cup B \in \mathcal{G} \Rightarrow A \in \mathcal{G}$ or $B \in \mathcal{G}$.

Henceforth by $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{P}(X)$ we shall denote a grill on a topological space (X, τ) (to be sometimes abbreviated as a 'space X') and the power set of X respectively. For any $x \in X$, the set of all open sets of (X, τ) containing x, will be denoted by $\tau(x)$. The interior and closure of a subset A in a space X are denoted, as usual, by int$A$ and cl$A$ respectively.

Definition 1.2. [4] Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a grill on a topological space (X, τ). A mapping $\Phi : \mathcal{P}(X) \to \mathcal{P}(X)$, denoted by $\Phi_{\mathcal{G}}(A, \tau)$ (for $A \in \mathcal{P}(X)$) or $\Phi_{\mathcal{G}}(A)$ or simply by $\Phi(A)$ (when there is no confusion regarding the topology τ and the grill $\mathcal{G}$, being used), is defined by $\Phi_{\mathcal{G}}(A) = \{x \in X : A \cap U \in \mathcal{G}, \text{ for all } U \in \tau(x)\}$.

Result 1.3. [4] Let (X, τ) be a topological space.
(a) If $\mathcal{G}$ is a grill on X, then
(i) $A \subseteq B \subseteq X \Rightarrow \Phi(A) \subseteq \Phi(B)$;
(ii) $A \subseteq X$ and $A \notin \mathcal{G} \Rightarrow \Phi(A) = \varnothing$;

(iii) $\Phi(A \cup B) = \Phi(A) \cup \Phi(B)$, for any $A, B \subseteq X$;
(iv) $U \in \tau$ and $\tau \setminus \{\varnothing\} \subseteq \mathcal{G} \Rightarrow U \subseteq \Phi(U)$;
(v) $\Phi(A) \setminus \Phi(B) = \Phi(A \setminus B) \setminus \Phi(B)$, for any $A, B \subseteq X$;
(vi) $\Phi(\Phi(A)) \subseteq \Phi(A) = \mathrm{cl}\Phi(A) \subseteq \mathrm{cl}A$ for any $A \subseteq X$;
(vii) $\Phi(A \cup B) = \Phi(A) = \Phi(A \setminus B)$ for any $A, B \subseteq X$ with $B \notin \mathcal{G}$
(b) If $\mathcal{G}_1$, $\mathcal{G}_2$ be two grills on X and $\mathcal{G}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{G}_2$, then $\Phi_{\mathcal{G}_1}(A) \subseteq \Phi_{\mathcal{G}_2}(A)$, for any $A \subseteq X$.

Result 1.4. [4] Given a grill on a space (X, τ), the map $\Psi : \mathcal{P}(X) \to \mathcal{P}(X)$, defined by $\Psi(A) = A \cup \Phi(A)$ (for $A \in \mathcal{P}(X)$), is a Kuratowski closure operator, giving rise to a topology $\tau_{\mathcal{G}}$ on X for which $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{G}, \tau) = \{V \setminus A : V \in \tau$ and $A \notin \mathcal{G}\}$ is an open base. Moreover, $\tau \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{G}, \tau) \subseteq \tau_{\mathcal{G}}$.

Result 1.5. [4] If $\mathcal{G}$ is a grill on a space (X, τ) and $A \subseteq X$ such that $A \subseteq \Phi(A)$, then $\mathrm{cl}A = \tau_{\mathcal{G}}\text{-}\mathrm{cl}A = \mathrm{cl}(\Phi(A)) = \Phi(A)$.

2. THE OPERATOR Γ

Here we first define the proposed operator Γ and take up some basic associated results.

Definition 2.1. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a grill on a topological space (X, τ). We define a map $\Gamma_{\mathcal{G}} : \mathcal{P}(X) \to \mathcal{P}(X)$, given by $\Gamma_{\mathcal{G}}(A) = X \setminus \Phi(X \setminus A)$ for any $A \subseteq X$. We shall simply write $\Gamma(A)$ for $\Gamma_{\mathcal{G}}(A)$, assuming that the grill $\mathcal{G}$ under consideration is understood.

Remark 2.2. It follows from Result 1.3(a)(vi) that $\Gamma(A)$ is open in (X, τ) for any subset A of X. Thus Γ can be treated as a mapping from $\mathcal{P}(X)$ to τ.

Note 2.3. In view of Result 1.3(b) it turns out that for two grills $\mathcal{G}_1$ and $\mathcal{G}_2$ on X, $(\mathcal{G}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{G}_2 \Rightarrow \Gamma_{\mathcal{G}_1}(A) \supseteq \Gamma_{\mathcal{G}_2}(A))$. But for a given grill $\mathcal{G}$ on X, $\Gamma_{\mathcal{G}}$ is increasing in the sense that whenever $A \subseteq B \subseteq X$, then $\Gamma(A) \subseteq \Gamma(B)$. This is again an immediate consequence of Note 1.3(a)(i); however it may so happen that $\Gamma(A) \subseteq \Gamma(B)$ even if $A \nsubseteq B$. The following is an example to justify our contention.

Example 2.4. Consider the topological space (X, τ), where $X = \{a, b, c\}$ and $\tau = \{\varnothing, X, \{a\}, \{b, c\}\}$ and let $\mathcal{G} = \{\{a\}, \{c\}, \{a, c\}, \{a, b\}, \{b, c\}, X\}$. Then $\mathcal{G}$ is a grill on X. Now, $\Phi(\{a\}) = \{a\}$ and $\Phi(\{b\}) = \varnothing$. Then $\Gamma(\{b, c\}) =$

$X \setminus \Phi(\{a\}) = \{b, c\}$ and $\Gamma(\{a, c\}) = X \setminus \Phi(\{b\}) = X$. Thus $\Gamma(\{b, c\}) \subseteq \Gamma(\{a, c\})$ although $\{b, c\} \nsubseteq \{a, c\}$.

Some basic properties concerning the operator Γ are now obtained.

Theorem 2.5. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a grill on a topological space (X, τ).
(a) If $U \in \tau_{\mathcal{G}}$, then $U \subseteq \Gamma(U)$.
(b) If $A, B \subseteq X$, then $\Gamma(A \cap B) = \Gamma(A) \cap \Gamma(B)$.
(c) If $A \subseteq X$ and $A \notin \mathcal{G}$, then $\Gamma(A) = X \setminus \Phi(X)$.
(d) If $A, B \subseteq X$ with $B \notin \mathcal{G}$, then $\Gamma(A) = \Gamma(A \setminus B) = \Gamma(A \cup B)$.
(e) If $A, B \subseteq X$ with $A \; \Delta \; B \notin \mathcal{G}$, then $\Gamma(A) = \Gamma(B)$ (where $A \; \Delta \; B$ denotes, as usual, the symmetric difference of A and B).

Proof. (a) In fact, $U \in \tau_{\mathcal{G}} \Rightarrow \Phi(X \setminus U) \subseteq X \setminus U$ (by Result 1.4) $\Rightarrow U \subseteq X \setminus \Phi(X \setminus U) = \Gamma(U)$.
(b) $\Gamma(A \cap B) = X \setminus \Phi(X \setminus (A \cap B)) = X \setminus \Phi[(X \setminus A) \cup \Phi(X \setminus B)]$(by Result 1.3(a)(iii)) $= [X \setminus \Phi(X \setminus A)] \cap [X \setminus \Phi(X \setminus B)] = \Gamma(A) \cap \Gamma(B)$.
(c) $\Gamma(A) = X \setminus \Phi(X \setminus A) = X \setminus [\Phi(X \setminus A) \setminus \Phi(A)]$ (by Result 1.3(a)(ii)) $= X \setminus [\Phi(X) \setminus \Phi(A)]$ (by Result 1.3(a)(v)) $= X \setminus \Phi(X)$ (by Result 1.3(a)(ii)).
(d) $\Gamma(A \setminus B) = X \setminus \Phi((X \setminus A) \cup B) = X \setminus [\Phi(X \setminus A) \cup \Phi(B)]$ (by Result 1.3(a)(iii)) $= X \setminus \Phi(X \setminus A)$ (by Result 1.3(a)(ii)) $= \Gamma(A)$.
Again, $\Gamma(A \cup B) = X \setminus \Phi(X \setminus (A \cup B)) = X \setminus \Phi((X \setminus A) \setminus B) = X \setminus \Phi(X \setminus A)$ (by Result 1.3(a)(vii)) $= \Gamma(A)$.
(e) Let $A \Delta B \notin \mathcal{G}$ so that $A \setminus B, B \setminus A \notin \mathcal{G}$. Then by using Result 1.3(a)(vii) we have, $\Gamma(A) = \Gamma((B \setminus (B \setminus A)) \cup (A \setminus B)) = \Gamma(B \setminus (B \setminus A)) = \Gamma(B)$. □

Remark 2.6. From (b) of the above theorem we see that the operator Γ is distributive over finite intersection. That this is not necessarily true for finite union is now shown below. Also, it is shown by the example following the next that for two sets A, B in X, $\Gamma(A) = \Gamma(B)$ may be true even if $A \Delta B \in \mathcal{G}$, i.e., the converse of Theorem 2.5(e) need not hold.

Example 2.7. Let $X = \{a, b, c\}$ and $\tau = \{\varnothing, \{a, b\}, X\}$. Consider $\mathcal{G} = \{\{a\}, \{b\}, \{a, b\}, \{a, c\}, \{b, c\}, X\}$ which is clearly a grill on the topological space (X, τ). Now, $\Phi(\{a, c\}) = \{a, b, c\} = X = \Phi(\{b, c\})$ and $\Phi(\{c\}) = \varnothing$.

Then $\Gamma(\{a\}) = X \setminus \Phi(\{b,c\}) = \varnothing$, $\Gamma(\{b\}) = X \setminus \Phi(\{a,c\}) = \varnothing$ and $\Gamma(\{a,b\}) = X \setminus \Phi(\{c\}) = X$. Thus $\Gamma(\{a\}) \cup \Gamma(\{b\}) \neq \Gamma(\{a,b\})$.

Example 2.8. Let X be an infinite set with the discrete topology τ (say) on X. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be the grill on X, given by $\mathcal{G} = \{A \subseteq X : A \text{ is infinite}\}$. Then $\Phi(\varnothing) = \Phi(X) = \varnothing$. Thus $\Gamma(X) = \Gamma(\varnothing) = X$, but $X \Delta \varnothing = X \in \mathcal{G}$.

We now derive two equivalent expressions for $\Gamma(A)$, where A is any subset of a space X.

Theorem 2.9. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a grill on a topological space (X, τ). Then for any $A \subseteq X$,
(a) $\Gamma(A) = \{x \in X : \exists\, U_x \in \tau(x) \text{ such that } U_x \setminus A \notin \mathcal{G}\}$; (b) $\Gamma(A) = \bigcup\{U \in \tau : U \setminus A \notin \mathcal{G}\}$.

Proof. (a) $x \in \Gamma(A) \Leftrightarrow x \notin \Phi(X \setminus A) \Leftrightarrow \exists\, U_x \in \tau(x)$ such that $U_x \setminus A$ $(= U_x \cap (X \setminus A)) \notin \mathcal{G} \Leftrightarrow x \in R.H.S.$
(b) Let $A^* = \bigcup\{U \in \tau : U \setminus A \notin \mathcal{G}\}$. Now, $x \in A^* \Rightarrow \exists\, U \in \tau$ with $x \in U$ such that $U \setminus A \notin \mathcal{G} \Rightarrow \exists\, U \in \tau(x)$ such that $U \setminus A \notin \mathcal{G}$. Thus by (a) above, $x \in \Gamma(A)$.
From the expression of $\Gamma(A)$ in (a), it is clear that $\Gamma(A) \subseteq A^*$. $\square$

Remark 2.10. Let $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{P}(X) \setminus \{\varnothing\}$, then by Theorem 2.9(b),
$\Gamma(A) = \bigcup\{U \in \tau : U \setminus A = \varnothing\} = \bigcup\{U \in \tau : U \subseteq A\} = \mathrm{int}A$, for any space (X, τ).

Corollary 2.11. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a grill on a topological space (X, τ). Then for any $A \subseteq X$, $A \cap \Gamma(A) = \tau_{\mathcal{G}}\text{-int}A$.

Proof. We have, $x \in A \cap \Gamma(A) \Rightarrow x \in A$ and $x \in \Gamma(A) \Rightarrow x \in A$ and $\exists\, U_x \in \tau(x)$ such that $U_x \setminus A \notin \mathcal{G}$ (by Theorem 2.9(a)) $\Rightarrow U_x \setminus (U_x \setminus A)$ is a basic $\tau_{\mathcal{G}}$-open neighbourhood of x such that $U_x \setminus (U_x \setminus A) \subseteq A \Rightarrow x \in \tau_{\mathcal{G}}\text{-int}A$.
Now, $x \in \tau_{\mathcal{G}}\text{-int}A \Rightarrow x \in A$. Again, $x \in \tau_{\mathcal{G}}\text{-int } A \Rightarrow \exists$ a basic $\tau_{\mathcal{G}}$-open neighbourhood $V_x \setminus B$ of x, where $V_x \in \tau$ and $B \notin \mathcal{G}$, such that $x \in V_x \setminus B \subseteq A$ $\Rightarrow V_x \setminus A \subseteq B$ and $V_x \setminus A \notin \mathcal{G}$ (as $B \notin \mathcal{G}$). So by Theorem 2.9(a), $x \in \Gamma(A)$. Thus $x \in A \cap \Gamma(A)$. So $A \cap \Gamma(A) = \tau_{\mathcal{G}}\text{-int}A$. $\square$

As a consequence of Theorem 2.9, we can have yet another expression for $\Gamma(A)$ when A is an open set.

Theorem 2.12. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a grill on a space (X,τ). Then for any open set A of X, $\Gamma(A) = \bigcup\{U \in \tau : U\Delta A \notin \mathcal{G}\}$.

Proof. Let $A^* = \bigcup\{U \in \tau : U\Delta A \notin \mathcal{G}\}$. Then by Theorem 2.9(b), $A^* \subseteq \Gamma(A)$. Now, $x \in \Gamma(A) \Rightarrow \exists\, U \in \tau(x)$ such that $U \setminus A \notin \mathcal{G}$ (by Theorem 2.9(a)). Let $V = U \cup A \in \tau$. Then $V\Delta A = U \setminus A \notin \mathcal{G}$ and $x \in V \in \tau$. Thus $x \in A^*$. □

From the results so far, we arrive at the following simple and alternative description of the topology $\tau_{\mathcal{G}}$ in terms of our introduced operator.

Theorem 2.13. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a grill on a topological space (X,τ). Then $\tau_{\mathcal{G}} = \{A \subseteq X : A \subseteq \Gamma(A)\}$.

Proof. Let $\sigma = \{A \subseteq X : A \subseteq \Gamma(A)\}$. We shall first show that σ is a topology on X. In fact, $\varnothing \subseteq \Gamma(\varnothing) \Rightarrow \varnothing \in \sigma$. $\Gamma(X) = X \setminus \Phi(X \setminus X) = X \setminus \Phi(\varnothing) = X \setminus \varnothing = X \Rightarrow X \in \sigma$.
Now, $A_1, A_2 \in \sigma \Rightarrow A_1 \subseteq \Gamma(A_1)$ and $A_2 \subseteq \Gamma(A_2) \Rightarrow A_1 \cap A_2 \subseteq \Gamma(A_1) \cap \Gamma(A_2)$ $= \Gamma(A_1 \cap A_2)$ (by Theorem 2.5(b)). Again, $\{A_\alpha : \alpha \in \Lambda\} \in \sigma \Rightarrow A_\alpha \subseteq \Gamma(A_\alpha)$ for each $\alpha \in \Lambda \Rightarrow A_\alpha \subseteq \Gamma(\cup_{\alpha\in\Lambda} A_\alpha)$ for each $\alpha \in \Lambda$ (by Note 2.3) $\Rightarrow \cup_{\alpha\in\Lambda} A_\alpha \subseteq \Gamma(\cup_{\alpha\in\Lambda} A_\alpha) \Rightarrow \cup_{\alpha\in\Lambda} A_\alpha \in \sigma$.
We shall now show that $\sigma = \tau_{\mathcal{G}}$. Indeed, $U \in \tau_{\mathcal{G}} \Rightarrow U \subseteq \Gamma(U)$ (by Theorem 2.5(a))$\Rightarrow U \in \sigma$.
Conversely, $A \in \sigma \Rightarrow A \subseteq \Gamma(A) \Rightarrow A = A \cap \Gamma(A) = \tau_{\mathcal{G}}$-int$A$ (by Corollary 2.11) $\Rightarrow A \in \tau_{\mathcal{G}}$. □

3. CERTAIN CONDITIONS IN TERMS OF THE OPERATOR Γ

In [4] a condition, in terms of the topology of a space X and a grill thereon, was formulated. It was observed that such a condition, when imposed on a grill $\mathcal{G}$, makes it in some sense more compatible with the topology of the space and the induced topology $\tau_{\mathcal{G}}$ more well behaved and suitable for application. In fact, an important topological result was also achieved by application of this so called suitability condition. The said condition, as proposed in [4], goes as follows.

Definition 3.1. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a grill on a topological space (X, τ). Then τ is said to be suitable for the grill $\mathcal{G}$ if for all $A \subseteq X$, $A \setminus \Phi(A) \notin \mathcal{G}$.

To facilitate our intended deliberation, let us recall the following equivalent descriptions of the above concept as found in [4]:

Theorem 3.2. For a grill $\mathcal{G}$ on a space (X, τ), the following are equivalent:
(a) τ is suitable for the grill $\mathcal{G}$.
(b) For any $\tau_{\mathcal{G}}$-closed subset A of X, $A \setminus \Phi(A) \notin \mathcal{G}$.
(c) Whenever for any $A \subseteq X$ and each $x \in A$ there corresponds some $U_x \in \tau(x)$ with $U_x \cap A \notin \mathcal{G}$, it follows that $A \notin \mathcal{G}$.
(d) $A \subseteq X$ and $A \cap \Phi(A) = \varnothing \;\Rightarrow\; A \notin \mathcal{G}$.

It is now our turn to derive, in terms of the operator Γ, a characterizing condition for a topology τ to be suitable for a grill $\mathcal{G}$ on a space X.

Theorem 3.3. Let (X, τ) be a topological space and $\mathcal{G}$ a grill on X. Then τ is suitable for $\mathcal{G}$ iff $\Gamma(A) \setminus A \notin \mathcal{G}$ for any $A \subseteq X$.

Proof. Let τ be suitable for $\mathcal{G}$ and $A \subseteq X$. We first observe that $x \in \Gamma(A) \setminus A$ iff $x \in \Gamma(A)$ and $x \notin A$ iff there exists $U_x \in \tau(x)$ such that $x \in U_x \setminus A \notin \mathcal{G}$. Thus to each $x \in \Gamma(A) \setminus A$, $\exists\, U_x \in \tau(x)$ such that $U_x \cap (\Gamma(A) \setminus A) \notin \mathcal{G}$ (as $\Gamma(A) \setminus A \subseteq X \setminus A$). As τ is suitable for $\mathcal{G}$, we have $\Gamma(A) \setminus A \notin \mathcal{G}$ (by Theorem 3.2).Conversely, let $A \subseteq X$ and further suppose that to each $x \in A$ there corresponds some $U_x \in \tau(x)$ with $U_x \cap A \notin \mathcal{G}$. We need to show by virtue of Theorem 3.2 that $A \notin \mathcal{G}$. Now, by Theorem 2.9(a) we have, $\Gamma(X \setminus A) = \{x \in X : \exists\, U_x \in \tau(x) \text{ such that } U_x \setminus (X \setminus A) \notin \mathcal{G}\} = \{x \in X : \exists\, U_x \in \tau(x) \text{ such that } U_x \cap A \notin \mathcal{G}\}$. Thus $A \subseteq \Gamma(X \setminus A)$ and hence $A = \Gamma(X \setminus A) \cap A = \Gamma(X \setminus A) \setminus (X \setminus A) \notin \mathcal{G}$ (by hypothesis). $\square$

Corollary 3.4. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a grill on a topological space (X, τ) such that τ is suitable for $\mathcal{G}$. Then Γ is an idempotent operator i.e., for any $A \subseteq X$, $\Gamma(\Gamma(A)) = \Gamma(A)$.

Proof. By Remark 2.2, $\Gamma(A) \in \tau$ for any $A \subseteq X$, and so $\Gamma(A) \in \tau_{\mathcal{G}}$ (by Theorem 1.4). Hence by Theorem 2.5(a), $\Gamma(A) \subseteq \Gamma(\Gamma(A))$ for any $A \subseteq X$. Again τ is suitable for $\mathcal{G}$, so $\Gamma(A) \subseteq (A \cup B)$ for some $B \notin \mathcal{G}$ (by Theorem 3.3). Thus $\Gamma(\Gamma(A)) \subseteq \Gamma(A \cup B)$ (by Note 2.3) $= \Gamma(A)$ (by Theorem 2.5(d)). $\square$

The converse of the above corollary is false as is shown by the next example.

Example 3.5. Consider X to be an infinite set with the discrete topology τ (say). Let $\mathcal{G} = \{A \subseteq X : A \text{ is infinite}\}$. Then for any $A \subseteq X$, $\Phi(A) = \varnothing$ and hence $\Gamma(A) = X \setminus \Phi(X \setminus A) = X$. Thus $\Gamma(\Gamma(A)) = \Gamma(A)$, for all $A \subseteq X$. But τ is not suitable for $\mathcal{G}$. For, $X \cap \Phi(X) = X \cap \varnothing = \varnothing$ but $X \in \mathcal{G}$ (see Theorem 3.2).

Corollary 3.6. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a grill on a space on a space (X, τ) such that τ is suitable for $\mathcal{G}$. Let $A \subseteq X$ and U be a non-null open set such that $U \subseteq \Phi(A) \cap \Gamma(A)$. Then $U \setminus A \notin \mathcal{G}$ and $U \cap A \in \mathcal{G}$.

Proof. $U \subseteq \Phi(A) \cap \Gamma(A) \Rightarrow U \subseteq \Gamma(A) \Rightarrow U \setminus A \subseteq \Gamma(A) \setminus A \notin \mathcal{G}$ (by Theorem 3.3) $\Rightarrow U \setminus A \notin \mathcal{G}$.
Again, $U \subseteq \Phi(A)$ and $U \neq \varnothing \Rightarrow U \cap A \in \mathcal{G}$ (using the definition of $\Phi(A)$). $\square$

In certain results in [4, 5, 6] (and also in Theorem 4.2 later), it is assumed that the condition that the given grill contains all the non-null open sets. We now obtain several necessary and sufficient conditions for such an assertion to hold.

Theorem 3.7. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a grill on a topological space (X, τ). Then the following are equivalent:
(a) $\tau \setminus \{\varnothing\} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$.
(b) $\Gamma(\varnothing) = \varnothing$.
(c) If $A (\subseteq X)$ is closed, then $\Gamma(A) \setminus A = \varnothing$.
(d) If $A \subseteq X$, then $\text{intcl}A = \Gamma(\text{intcl}A)$.
(e) If A is regular open in X, then $A = \Gamma(A)$.
(f) If $U \in \tau$, then $\Gamma(U) \subseteq \text{intcl}U \subseteq \Phi(U)$.

Proof. **(a) $\Rightarrow$ (b):** $\Gamma(\varnothing) = \bigcup\{U \in \tau : U \setminus \varnothing \notin \mathcal{G}\}$ (by Theorem 2.9(b)) $= \bigcup\{U \in \tau : U \notin \mathcal{G}\} = \varnothing$ (by hypothesis).

(b) $\Rightarrow$ (c): $x \in \Gamma(A)\setminus A \Rightarrow \exists\, U_x \in \tau(x)$ such that $x \in U_x\setminus A \notin \mathcal{G}$. Thus noting that A is closed, we obtain $x \in U_x \setminus A \in \{U \in \tau : U \notin \mathcal{G}\}$, a contradiction to $\Gamma(\varnothing) = \varnothing$.
(c) $\Rightarrow$ (d): Since (intcl$A$) is open, we have by Theorem 2.5(a) that intcl$A \subseteq \Gamma(\text{intcl}A)$. Again, $\Gamma(\text{cl}A) \subseteq \text{cl}A$ (by (c)) $\Rightarrow \Gamma(\text{cl}A) = \text{int}(\Gamma(\text{cl}A))$(by Remark 2.2) $\subseteq$ intcl$A \Rightarrow \Gamma$ (intcl$A$) $\subseteq \Gamma$ (cl$A$) (see Note 2.3) $\subseteq$ intcl$A$.
Thus intcl$A = \Gamma(\text{intcl}A)$.
(d) $\Rightarrow$ (e): It is trivial.
(e) $\Rightarrow$ (f): Let $U \in \tau$. Now $\varnothing = \Gamma(\varnothing)$ (by (e)) $= \bigcup\{V \in \tau : V \notin \mathcal{G}\}$ (by Theorem 2.9(b)) and we obtain, $\tau \setminus \{\varnothing\} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$. Then by Result 1.3(a)(iv), $U \subseteq \Phi(U)$ and hence by Result 1.5 we have, $\Phi(U) = \text{cl}U$. Now, $U \subseteq \text{intcl}U \subseteq \text{cl}U = \Phi(U) \Rightarrow \Gamma(U) \subseteq \Gamma(\text{intcl}U) = \text{intcl}U$ (by (e), as intcl$U$ is regular open) $\subseteq \Phi(U)$.
(f) $\Rightarrow$ (a): If $U \in \tau \setminus \mathcal{G}$, then by Theorem 2.5(a), $U \subseteq \Gamma(U) \subseteq \Phi(U)$ (by (f)) $= \varnothing$ (by Result 1.3(a)(ii)), i.e., $U = \varnothing$. □

Theorem 3.8. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a grill on a topological space (X, τ) and $\mathcal{G}_\delta$ be the grill on X, given by $\mathcal{G}_\delta = \{A \subseteq X : \text{intcl}A \neq \varnothing\}$.
(a) Let $\mathcal{G}_\delta \supseteq \mathcal{G}$. Then $A = \Gamma(A) \Rightarrow A$ is regular open.
(b) Let $\mathcal{G}_\delta \supseteq \mathcal{G}$ and $\tau \setminus \{\varnothing\} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$. Then $A \subseteq X \Rightarrow \Gamma(A)$ is regular open.
(c) Let $\mathcal{G}_\delta \supseteq \mathcal{G}$ and τ be suitable for $\mathcal{G}$. Then $A \subseteq X \Rightarrow \Gamma(A)$ is regular open.

Proof. (a) Let $A \subseteq X$ be such that $A = \Gamma(A)$. Then A is open (by Remark 2.2) and so $A \subseteq$ intcl$A$. Again, $x \in \text{intcl}A \Rightarrow \exists\, U_x \in \tau(x)$ such that $U_x \subseteq \text{cl}A \Rightarrow U_x\setminus A \subseteq \text{cl}A\setminus A \notin \mathcal{G}_\delta$ (as $\text{intcl}(\text{cl}A\setminus A) = \text{int}(\text{cl}A\setminus A) = \varnothing \Rightarrow U_x\setminus A \notin \mathcal{G}$ where $U_x \in \tau(x) \Rightarrow x \in \Gamma(A)$ (by Theorem 2.9(a)). So intcl$A \subseteq \Gamma(A) = A$. Thus A is regular open.
(b) Follows from (a) and Theorem 3.7(e).

(c) Follows from (a) and Corollary 3.4. □

4. TOPOLOGY INDUCED BY Γ

We show now that the operator Γ induces yet another topology $\tau_{\Gamma(\mathcal{B})}$, constructed rather naturally out of any given base $\mathcal{B}$ of the topology τ or $\tau_{\mathcal{G}}$ and a grill $\mathcal{G}$ on the ambient space X. Also it is seen that the topology $\tau_{\Gamma(\mathcal{B})}$ is weaker than the topology τ on the given space X, whereas the topology $\tau_{\mathcal{G}}$ is known [4] to be finer than τ.

We observe in view of in view of Theorem 2.5 and Remark 2.2 that if $\mathcal{B}$ is base for some topology τ on X, then $\Gamma(\mathcal{B}) = \{\Gamma(B) : B \in \mathcal{B}\}$ is also base for some topology on X, which is weaker than the given topology. Let us denote this topology by $\tau_{\Gamma(\mathcal{B})}$ and call it the Γ-topology determined by $\mathcal{B}$.

We first show that starting from any base $\mathcal{B}$ of the topology τ on X (and hence from τ, in particular) we arrive at the same topology $\tau_{\Gamma(\mathcal{B})}$, i.e., the latter topology is unique irrespective of the chosen base of a topology τ.

Theorem 4.1. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a grill on a topological space (X, τ). Suppose that $\mathcal{B}$ is a base for τ. Then $\tau_{\Gamma(\tau)} = \tau_{\Gamma(\mathcal{B})}$.

Proof. We shall first show that $\tau_{\Gamma(\tau)} \subseteq \tau_{\Gamma(\mathcal{B})}$. Let $U \in \tau$ and $x \in \Gamma(U)$. Then $U = \cup_\alpha B_\alpha$ where $B_\alpha \in \mathcal{B}$ for each α.
Case-(i): $x \in U$. Then $\exists\ B_\beta \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $x \in B_\beta \subseteq U$. Hence $x \in \Gamma(B_\beta) \subseteq \Gamma(U)$.
Case-(ii): $x \notin U$. Then $\exists$ some $B_x \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $x \in B_x \setminus U \notin \mathcal{G}$ (as $x \in \Gamma(U)$). Also, $x \in B_x \subseteq \Gamma(U)$. In fact, $(U \cup B_x)\ \Delta\ U \notin \mathcal{G}$, so by Theorem 2.5((a),(e)) and Note 2.3, $x \in B_x \subseteq \Gamma(B_x) \subseteq \Gamma(U \cup B_x) = \Gamma(U)$. Thus in either of the cases, there exists some $B \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $x \in \Gamma(B) \subseteq \Gamma(U)$, and hence $\tau_{\Gamma(\tau)} \subseteq \tau_{\Gamma(\mathcal{B})}$.
Now, $\tau_{\Gamma(\mathcal{B})} \subseteq \tau_{\Gamma(\tau)}$ follows from the fact that $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \tau$. $\square$

In is known [3] that the set of all regular open sets in a space (X, τ) forms a base for a topology τ_s, called the semiregularization topology on X, such that $\tau_s \subseteq \tau$. Noting the fact that $\tau_{\Gamma(\tau)} \subseteq \tau$ also holds, we now try to associate the topologies τ_s and $\tau_{\Gamma(\tau)}$ by choosing the grill $\mathcal{G}$ suitably.

Theorem 4.2. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a grill on a topological space (X, τ) and $\mathcal{G}_\delta$ be the grill on X given by $\mathcal{G}_\delta = \{\ A \subseteq X : \operatorname{intcl} A \neq \varnothing\}$. Then
(a) $\tau \setminus \{\varnothing\} \subseteq \mathcal{G} \Rightarrow \tau_s \subseteq \tau_{\Gamma(\tau)} \subseteq \tau$;

(b) $\tau \setminus \{\varnothing\} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{G}_\delta \Rightarrow \tau_s = \tau_{\Gamma(\tau)}$;
(c) τ is suitable for $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{G}_\delta \Rightarrow \tau_{\Gamma(\mathcal{P}(X))} \subseteq \tau_s$.

Proof. (a) Follows from Theorem 3.7(e).

(b) $\tau_s \subseteq \tau_{\Gamma(\tau)}$ follows from (a).Conversely, let $U \in \tau$. Then by Theorems 3.7(f) and 2.5(a), it follows that $U \subseteq \Gamma(U) \subseteq \text{intcl } U \subseteq \Phi(U) = \text{cl}U$. Then $\Gamma(U) \setminus U \subseteq \text{cl}U \setminus U \notin \mathcal{G}_\delta$. Thus $\Gamma(U) \setminus U \notin \mathcal{G}$. Let $V = \Gamma(U) \setminus U$, then $\Gamma(U) = V \cup U$ (as $U \subseteq \Gamma(U)$), where $V \notin \mathcal{G}$. So $\Gamma(\Gamma(U)) = \Gamma(V \cup U) = \Gamma(U)$ (by Theorem 2.5(c)). Thus $\Gamma(U)$ is regular open (By Theorem 3.8(c)). Hence $\tau_{\Gamma(\tau)} \subseteq \tau_s$.

(c) Follows from Theorem 3.8(c). □

As the final result of the present discussion, we show (in Corollary 4.4) that even any base of the larger topology $\tau_{\mathcal{G}}$ induces the same topology as induced by any base of τ. The following theorem leads us half the way towards our contention.

Theorem 4.3. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a grill on a topological space (X, τ), and let $\mathcal{B}^* = \{U \setminus A\colon U \in \tau \text{ and } A \notin \mathcal{G}\}$. Then $\tau_{\Gamma(\mathcal{B}^*)} = \tau_{\Gamma(\tau)}$.

Proof. We first note that $\mathcal{B}^*$ is a base for $\tau_{\mathcal{G}}$ (see Result 1.4). Now, $\tau \subseteq \mathcal{B}^* \Rightarrow \tau_{\Gamma(\tau)} \subseteq \tau_{\Gamma(\mathcal{B}^*)}$. Let $U \setminus A \in \mathcal{B}^*$, where $U \in \tau$ and $A \notin \mathcal{G}$. then $\Gamma(U \setminus A) = \Gamma(U)$ (by Theorem 2.5(d)), where $\Gamma(U)$ is a basic open set of $\tau_{\Gamma(\tau)}$. Thus $\tau_{\Gamma(\mathcal{B}^*)} \subseteq \tau_{\Gamma(\tau)}$. □

In view of Theorems 4.1 and 4.3, it ultimately follows

Corollary 4.4. For any grill $\mathcal{G}$ on a space (X, τ), $\tau_{\Gamma(\tau)} = \tau_{\Gamma(\tau_{\mathcal{G}})} = \tau_{\Gamma(\mathcal{B})}$, where $\mathcal{B}$ is any base for τ or $\tau_{\mathcal{G}}$.

Remark 4.5. We have seen above that although $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \tau \subseteq \tau_{\mathcal{G}}$ (where $\mathcal{B}$ is any base of τ), the corresponding Γ-topologies are the same. As $\tau_{\mathcal{G}} \subseteq (\tau_{\mathcal{G}})_{\mathcal{G}} \subseteq ((\tau_{\mathcal{G}})_{\mathcal{G}})_{\mathcal{G}}$ etc., it may be asked whether the corresponding Γ-topologies coincide. That this is indeed the case is evident from the following theorem.

Theorem 4.6. For any grill $\mathcal{G}$ on a topological space (X, τ), $(\tau_{\mathcal{G}})_{\mathcal{G}} = (\tau_{\mathcal{G}})$.

Proof. In view of Result 1.4 we have $\tau_{\mathcal{G}} \subseteq (\tau_{\mathcal{G}})_{\mathcal{G}}$.
Conversely, let $V \setminus A$ be a $(\tau_{\mathcal{G}})_{\mathcal{G}}$ -basic open set, where $V \in \tau_{\mathcal{G}}$ and $A \notin \mathcal{G}$, and $x \in V \setminus A$. Again, $x \in V \in \tau_{\mathcal{G}} \Rightarrow$ there exist $U \in \tau$ and $B \notin \mathcal{G}$ such that $x \in U \setminus B \subseteq V$. Then $x \in (U \setminus B) \setminus A = U \setminus (B \cup A) \subseteq V \setminus A$. As $A \cup B \notin \mathcal{G}$ and $U \in \tau$, $U \setminus (A \cup B)$ is a basic open set of $\tau_{\mathcal{G}}$ (by Result 1.4). Thus $V \setminus A \in \tau_{\mathcal{G}}$. $\square$

References

[1] K. C. Chattopadhyay and W. J. Thron, *Extensions of closure spaces*, Can. J. Math. XXIX (No.6)(1977), 1277–1286.
[2] G. Choquet, *Sur les notions de Filtre et grille*, Comptes Rendus Acad. Sci. Paris 224(1947), 171-173.
[3] J. Porter and R. G. Woods, *Extensions and Absolutes of Hausdorff spaces*, Springer-Verlag, NY, 1988.
[4] B. Roy and M. N. Mukherjee, *On a typical topology induced by a grill* Soochow J. Math.33(No.4)(2007), 771-786.
[5] B. Roy and M. N. Mukherjee, *A generalization of paracompactness in terms of grills*(communicated).
[6] B. Roy and M. N. Mukherjee, *On a type of compactness via grills*, Mat. vesnik 59(No.3)(2007), 113-120.
[7] W. J. Thron, *Proximity structure and grills*, Math. Ann. 206 (1973),35-62.

Department of Pure Mathematics

University of Calcutta

35, Ballygunge Circular Road

Kolkata–700019.

INDIA

E-mail: mukherjeemn@yahoo.co.in

Date received January 12, 2008

Arab J. Math. Sc.
Volume 14, Number 1, June 2008
pp 33-63

SOME PROPERTIES CONCERNING THE INDICIAL ROOTS OF THE JACOBI OPERATOR ABOUT THE DELAUNAY HYPERSURFACE

MOHAMED JLELI [1]

Abstract. In this paper, we prove a maximum principle of the Jacobi operator of the Delaunay hypersurfaces and we study the positivity of the indicial roots about these operators. We partially generalize, in any dimension, the result of R. Kusner, R. Mazzeo and D. Pollack.

1. Introduction and statement of the results

In $\mathbb{R}^3$, all constant mean curvature surfaces of revolutions are classified by Delaunay [1]. In particular, Delaunay discovered a beautiful one-parameter family of complete noncompact surfaces of constant mean curvature one (called Delaunay surfaces). After this classification the theory of constant mean curvature surfaces in $\mathbb{R}^3$ became the object of intensive study. In the case of complete noncompact constant mean curvature surfaces, the moduli space of such surfaces is now fairly well understood (in the genus 0 case). Then, many examples of such surfaces are produced [7],[13]. However, the set of compact constant mean curvature is not so well understood. The first examples of genus 1 constant mean curvature surfaces are constructed by H. Wente [19]. For the high genus case N. Kapouleas gives examples of genus 2 by fusing Wente tori in [9] and others examples of genus is greater than or equal to 3 are obtained by connecting together large number of mutually tangent unit spheres, using small catenoid necks [8].

[1]Supported by College of Sciences (KSU) Research Center project No. Math/2008/73
1991 Mathematics Subject Classification. 35J05, 53A07.
Key words. Mean curvature, Hypersurface

Recently, in [6] the authors gave a new idea for the construction of a constant mean curvature compact surfaces of arbitrary genus (≥ 3). This construction was based on three important tools which has been developed for the understanding of complete noncompact constant mean curvature surfaces. The first is the moduli space theory which is developed in [11], the second is the end-addition result which has been developed in [14] and [15] to produce complete noncompact constant mean curvature surfaces with prescribed ends. And finally the end-to-end construction which was developed in [17] to connect two constant mean curvature surfaces along their ends. In the most of the last constructions the use of the behavior of the Delaunay surfaces is crucial. In particular, the study of the Fredholm properties (the kernel and range) of the Jacobi operator about these surfaces which known as the "Linear Decomposition Lemma" (see [13] and [16]) on some weighted Lebesgue spaces and weighted Hölder spaces is based in the behavior of the indicial roots of the Delaunay surfaces [15].

In this paper, we generalize the result of R. Mazzeo, F. Pacard and D. Pollack [15] in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, for $n > 3$. In, particular there exists a one parameter family of constant mean curvature hypersurfaces that will be denoted by $\mathcal{D}_\tau$, for $\tau \in (-\infty, 0) \cup (0, \tau_*)$. We give, in section 2, two different parameterizations of this one parameter family of hypersurfaces of revolution in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, which are immersed or embedded and have constant mean curvature normalized to be equal to 1. These hypersurfaces, which were originally studied in [10], generalize the classical constant mean curvature surfaces in $\mathbb{R}^3$ which were discovered by Delaunay in [1] in the middle of the 19-th century.

In section 3, we define the Jacobi operator (the linearized mean curvature operator) $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}_\tau}$ about a n-Delaunay hypersurface. Then, we give the expression of the geometric Jacobi fields (some solutions of the homogeneous problem $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}_\tau} w = 0$). Next, for $\tau \in (-\infty, 0) \cup (0, \tau_*)$, we define the indicial roots associated to the Jacobi operator about a n-Delaunay hypersurface

$$\Gamma(\tau) := \{\pm\gamma_j(\tau) \,:\, j \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

These reel numbers which characterize the rate of growth (or rate of decay) of the solutions of the homogeneous problem $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}_\tau} w = 0$ impose the choice of a weighted functional space to obtain a precise description of the mapping properties of the Jacobi operator. In section 4 by a maximum principle concerning $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}_\tau}$, however we need to impose a lower bound on the Delaunay parameter (τ belongs to $\in [\tau^*, 0) \cup (0, \tau_*]$) for the result to hold, since for τ tends to $-\infty$ there exists a bifurcation result concerning the hypersurface $\mathcal{D}_\tau$ (see [3]). The role played by this maximum principle will be central in the study of the positivity of the indicial roots of $\mathcal{D}_\tau$ when τ belongs to $\in [\tau^*, 0) \cup (0, \tau_*]$.

We need the following definition:

Definition 1.1. Let us denote by $\theta \mapsto e_j(\theta)$, for $j \in \mathbb{N}$ the eigenfunctions of the Laplace-Beltrami operator on S^{n-1}, which will be normalized to have L^2 norm equal to 1 and correspond to the eigenvalue λ_j. That is

$$-\Delta_{S^{n-1}}\, e_j = \lambda_j\, e_j,$$

and

$$\lambda_0 = 0, \quad \lambda_1 = \ldots = \lambda_n = n-1, \qquad \lambda_{n+1} = 2n, \ldots \qquad \text{and} \qquad \lambda_j \leq \lambda_{j+1}.$$

We also define

$$\delta_j := \left(\lambda_j + \left(\frac{n-2}{2}\right)^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{1.1}$$

Then, our main result reads

Theorem 1.1. *The indicial roots of the Jacobi operator about the Delauanay hypersurface enjoy the following properties:*
(1) For any $\tau \in (-\infty, 0) \cup (0, \tau_*)$,

$$\gamma_0(\tau) = \cdots = \gamma_n(\tau) = 0.$$

(2) There exists $\tau^* < 0$ *such that for any* $\tau \in (\tau^*, 0) \cup (0, \tau_*)$

$$\gamma_j(\tau) > 0 \qquad \textit{for all} \quad j \geq n+1.$$

(3) For all $\eta > 0$ *there exists* $\tau_0 > 0$*, such that for all* $\tau \in (-\tau_0, 0) \cup (0, \tau_0)$*, the numbers* $\gamma_j(\tau)$ *satisfy*

$$\gamma_j(\tau) \geq \sqrt{\delta_j^2 - \eta}, \quad \textit{for all} \quad j \geq n+1.$$

A similar results concerning the maximum principal hold for the Jacobi operator about the sphere S^n, the hyperplane $\mathbb{R}^n \times \{0\}$ and the catenoid.

Acknowledgements. The author is grateful for the referee's comments which improves the paper greatly.

2. Constant mean curvature hypersurfaces of revolution

We are looking for constant mean curvature hypersurfaces of revolution (say around the x_{n+1} axis). Such an hypersurface can be locally parameterized by

$$\begin{array}{rccc} X & : & (t_1, t_2) \times S^{n-1} & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \\ & & (t, \theta) & \longmapsto & (\rho(t)\,\theta, t) \end{array}$$

where the function $t \longrightarrow \rho(t)$ is a smooth positive function which is defined over some interval (t_1, t_2).

The first fundamental form g of the hypersurface parameterized by X is given by

$$g = (1 + (\partial_t \rho)^2)\, dt \otimes dt + \rho^2\, d\theta_i \otimes d\theta_j$$

where $d\theta_i \otimes d\theta_j$ denotes the first fundamental form of S^{n-1}.

Let assume that the orientation of this hypersurface is chosen so that the unit inward normal vector field is given by

$$N := \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + (\partial_t \rho)^2}}\ (-\theta, \partial_t \rho)\,.$$

With this chosen orientation, the second fundamental form b of the hypersurface parameterized by X is given by

$$b = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + (\partial_t \rho)^2}}\ \left(-\partial_t^2 \rho\, dt \otimes dt + \rho\, d\theta_i \otimes d\theta_j\right).$$

It follows at once from the above expressions that the mean curvature H of the hypersurface parameterized by X (which is the average of the trace of the shape form) is given by

$$H = \frac{n-1}{n}\,\frac{1}{\rho}\,\frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + (\partial_t \rho)^2}} - \frac{1}{n}\,\frac{1}{(1 + (\partial_t \rho)^2)^{\frac{3}{2}}}\,\partial_t^2 \rho. \tag{2.1}$$

Hence, the condition that the mean curvature of the hypersurface parameterized by X is equal to some given function H, is given by the equation

$$\partial_t^2 \rho - \frac{n-1}{\rho} \left(1 + (\partial_t \rho)^2\right) + n\, H \left(1 + (\partial_t \rho)^2\right)\right)^{\frac{3}{2}} = 0. \tag{2.2}$$

We introduce

$$\mathcal{H}(\rho, \partial_t \rho) := \frac{\rho^{n-1}}{\sqrt{1 + (\partial_t \rho)^2}} - H\, \rho^n. \tag{2.3}$$

In the case where the function H is constant, it follows from a simple computation that $\mathcal{H}(\rho, \partial_t \rho)$ is constant along solutions of (2.2). This property will be extensively used to derive *a priori* estimates for solutions of (2.2).

It will be more interesting to consider an isothermal type parameterization for which will be more convenient for analytical purposes. Hence, we looking for hypersurfaces of revolution which can be parameterized by

$$X(s, \theta) = (|\tau|\, e^{\sigma(s)}\, \theta, \kappa(s)), \tag{2.4}$$

for $(s, \theta) \in \mathbb{R} \times S^{n-1}$. The constant τ being fixed, the functions σ and κ are determined by asking that the hypersurface parameterized by X has constant mean curvature equal to H and also by asking that the metric associated to the parameterization is conformal to the product metric on $\mathbb{R} \times S^{n-1}$, namely

$$(\partial_s \kappa)^2 = \tau^2 e^{2\sigma} \left(1 - (\partial_s \sigma)^2\right). \tag{2.5}$$

We choose the orientation of the hypersurface parameterized by X so that, the unit normal vector field is given by

$$N := \left(- \frac{\partial_s \kappa}{|\tau| e^{\sigma}} \theta, \partial_s \sigma \right). \tag{2.6}$$

This time, using (2.5) the first fundamental form g of the hypersurface parameterized by X is given by

$$g = \tau^2\, e^{2\sigma}\, (ds \otimes ds + d\theta_i \otimes d\theta_j),$$

and its second fundamental form b is given by

$$b = \left(\partial_s^2 \kappa\, \partial_s \sigma - \partial_s \kappa\, (\partial_s^2 \sigma + (\partial_s \sigma)^2)\right)\, ds \otimes ds + \partial_s \kappa\, d\theta_i \otimes d\theta_j.$$

Therefore, the mean curvature H of the hypersurface parameterized by X is given by

$$H = \frac{1}{n \tau^2 e^{2\sigma}} \left((n-1)\, \partial_s \kappa - \partial_s \kappa\, (\partial_s^2 \sigma + (\partial_s \sigma)^2) + \partial_s^2 \kappa\, \partial_s \sigma\right).$$

This is a rather intricate second order ordinary differential equation in the functions σ and τ which has to be complimented by the equation (2.5). In order to simplify our analysis, we use of (2.5) to get rid of the factor $\tau^2 e^{2\sigma}$ in the above equation. This yields

$$\partial_s\sigma\, \partial_s^2\kappa = \partial_s\kappa \left(1 - n + \partial_s^2\sigma + (\partial_s\sigma)^2 + n\, H\, \partial_s\kappa \left(1 - (\partial_s\sigma)^2\right)^{-1}\right).$$

Now, we can differentiate (2.5) with respect to s, and we obtain

$$\partial_s\kappa\, \partial_s^2\kappa = \tau^2 e^{2\sigma} \partial_s\sigma \left(1 - \partial_s^2\sigma - (\partial_s\sigma)^2\right).$$

The difference between the last equation, multiplied by $\partial_s\sigma$, and the former equation, multiplied by $\partial_s\kappa$, yields

$$\partial_s^2\sigma + (1-n)(1 - (\partial_s\sigma)^2) + n\, H\, \partial_s\kappa = 0. \tag{2.7}$$

Hence, in order to find constant mean curvature hypersurfaces of revolution, we have to solve (2.5) together with(2.7).

Let use define

$$\tau_* := \frac{1}{n}(1-n)^{\frac{n-1}{n}}.$$

For all $\tau \in (-\infty, 0) \cup (0, \tau_*]$, we define σ_τ to be the unique smooth nonconstant solution of

$$(\partial_s\sigma)^2 + \tau^2 \left(e^{\sigma} + \iota\, e^{(1-n)\sigma}\right)^2 = 1, \tag{2.8}$$

with initial condition $\partial_s\sigma(0) = 0$ and $\sigma(0) < 0$. Next, we define the function κ_τ to be the unique solution of

$$\partial_s\kappa = \tau^2 \left(e^{2\sigma} + \iota\, e^{(2-n)\sigma}\right), \qquad \text{with} \qquad \kappa(0) = 0. \tag{2.9}$$

Here, ι is the sign of τ.

In particular, the hypersurface parameterized by

$$X_\tau(s,\theta) := (|\tau| e^{\sigma_\tau(s)}\theta, \kappa_\tau(s)),$$

for $(s,\theta) \in \mathbb{R} \times S^{n-1}$, is an embedded constant mean curvature hypersurface of revolution when τ belongs $(0, \tau_*]$, this hypersurface will be referred to as the "n-unduloid" of parameter τ. In the other case, if $\tau < 0$, this hypersurface is only immersed and will be referred to as the "n-nodoid" of parameter τ.

Remark 2.1. Thanks to the Hamiltonian structure of (2.8), the function $s \mapsto \sigma(s)$ being periodic. Let denote by s_τ this period. Then, it is proved in [5]

$$s_\tau = -\frac{n}{n-1} \log \tau^2 + \mathcal{O}(1) \tag{2.10}$$

as τ tends to 0.

2.1. **Compactness results.** We begin with the study of the behavior of σ_τ as τ tends to 0. We define

$$\varphi_\tau := |\tau| \, e^{\sigma_\tau}, \qquad \text{and} \qquad \eta_\tau := |\tau| \, e^{(1-n)\sigma_\tau},$$

Using (2.5) and (2.7), one can check that, according to the sign of τ, the functions φ_τ and η_τ are nonconstant solutions of

$$(\partial_s \eta)^2 = (n-1)^2 \, \eta^2 \, (1 - (\varphi \pm \eta)^2), \tag{2.11}$$

and

$$(\partial_s \varphi)^2 = \varphi^2 \, (1 - (\varphi \pm \eta)^2), \tag{2.12}$$

with a $+$ when $\tau > 0$ and a $-$ when $\tau < 0$. In addition, we have

$$\varphi_\tau^{n-1} \, \eta_\tau = |\tau|^n. \tag{2.13}$$

Our first Lemma states that the functions φ_τ and η_τ and their derivatives, are uniformly bounded with respect to τ, provided that $|\tau|$ remains bounded.

Lemma 2.1. *Assume that $\tau_0 < 0$ is fixed. Then, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a constant $c_k > 0$ which only depends on τ_0 and k, such that*

$$\|\varphi_\tau\|_{\mathcal{C}^k} + \|\eta_\tau\|_{\mathcal{C}^k} \leq c_k$$

for all $\tau \in [\tau_0, 0) \cup (0, \tau_*]$.

Proof: When $\tau > 0$, observe that (2.12) already implies that the functions φ_τ and η_τ are uniformly bounded by 1. When $\tau < 0$ is bounded from below by τ_0, (2.12) together with (2.13) imply that the functions φ_τ and η_τ are uniformly bounded by a constant only depending on τ_0.

Now that we know that the functions φ_τ and η_τ are uniformly bounded. We use (2.11) and (2.12) inductively to show that the same property is also true for the derivatives of the functions φ_τ and η_τ. $\square$

Assume that s_l is a sequence of real numbers, and that τ_l is a sequence which tends to 0. For all $l \in \mathbb{N}$, we define

$$\varphi_l := \varphi_{\tau_l}(\cdot - s_l) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \eta_l := \eta_{\tau_l}(\cdot - s_l).$$

The previous result together with Ascoli's theorem allows one to extract from the sequence $(\varphi_l, \eta_l)_l$, a subsequence which converges, as l tends to ∞, to $(\varphi_\infty, \eta_\infty)$ in $\mathcal{C}^k$ topology on any compact sets. The following Lemma classifies the possible limits $(\varphi_\infty, \eta_\infty)$.

Lemma 2.2. *Under the above hypothesis, the following holds :*

- *Either* $\varphi_\infty = \eta_\infty \equiv 0$,
- *or* $\varphi_\infty \equiv 0$ *and there exists* s_∞ *such that*
$$\eta_\infty = \frac{1}{\cosh((n-1)(\cdot - s_\infty))},$$
- *or* $\eta_\infty \equiv 0$ *and there exists* s_∞ *such that*
$$\varphi_\infty = \frac{1}{\cosh(\cdot - s_\infty)}.$$

Proof: Passing the limit in (2.13) we get

$$\varphi_\infty^{n-1}\, \eta_\infty \equiv 0.$$

This implies that, at least one of the functions η_∞ and φ_∞ has to be identically equal to 0. It only remains to identify the possible nontrivial limits.

If $\varphi_\infty \equiv 0$, we can pass to the limit in (2.11) and in the derivative of (2.11) with respect to s to get the equation satisfied by η_∞

$$\partial_s^2 \eta = (n-1)^2\, \eta\, \left(1 - 2\,\eta^2\right).$$

Furthermore, we have

$$(\partial_s \eta)^2 = (n-1)^2\, \eta^2\, \left(1 - \eta^2\right).$$

The nontrivial solutions of these equations are all of the form

$$s \longrightarrow \frac{1}{\cosh((n-1)(\cdot - s_0))}$$

for some $s_0 \in \mathbb{R}$.

Now, if $\eta_\infty \equiv 0$, we can pass to the limit in (2.12) and in the derivative of (2.12) to get equation satisfied by η_∞

$$\partial_s^2 \varphi = \varphi \left(1 - 2\,\varphi^2\right).$$

Furthermore, we have

$$(\partial_s \varphi)^2 = \varphi^2\,(1-\varphi^2).$$

This time the only nontrivial solutions of this equation are of the form

$$s \longrightarrow \frac{1}{\cosh(\cdot - s_0)},$$

for some $s_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. This completes the proof of the result. □

3. The Jacobi operator about a n-Delaunay

Recall that the n-Delaunay hypersurface $\mathcal{D}_\tau$ can be parameterized as

$$X_\tau = (\iota\,\tau\, e^{\sigma_\tau}\,\theta, \kappa_\tau). \tag{3.1}$$

Assume that the orientation of $\mathcal{D}_\tau$ is chosen so that the unit normal vector field is given by

$$N_\tau := \left(-\iota\,\frac{\partial_s \kappa}{\tau\, e^{\sigma_\tau}}\,\theta, \partial_s \sigma_\tau\right). \tag{3.2}$$

Any hypersurface, close enough to $\mathcal{D}_\tau$, can be parameterized (at last locally) as a normal graph over $\mathcal{D}_\tau$. Namely, by

$$X_\omega = X_\tau + \omega\, N_\tau,$$

for some (small) smooth function ω. The hypersurface parameterized by X_ω will be denoted by $\mathcal{D}_\tau(\omega)$ and we define the mean curvature operator $H(\omega)$ to be the mean curvature of $\mathcal{D}_\tau(\omega)$.

It is well known [18] that the linearized mean curvature operator about $\mathcal{D}_\tau$, which is usually referred to as the Jacobi operator, is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_\tau := \Delta_\tau + |A_\tau|^2$$

where Δ_τ is the Laplace-Beltrami operator and $|A_\tau|^2$ is the square of the norm of the shape operator A_τ on $\mathcal{D}_\tau$.

Recall that we have defined in section 2 the function $\varphi_\tau := |\tau| \, e^{\sigma_\tau}$ and, in the above parameterization, the metric on $\mathcal{D}_\tau$ is given by

$$g = \varphi_\tau^2 \, (ds \otimes ds + d\theta_i \otimes d\theta_j) \, ,$$

and the second fundamental form is given by

$$b = \varphi_\tau^2 \, \left((1 \pm (1-n) \, |\tau|^n \, \varphi_\tau^{-n}) \, ds \otimes ds + (1 \pm |\tau^n| \, \varphi_\tau^{-n}) \, d\theta_i \otimes d\theta_j \right) ,$$

with a $+$ when $\tau > 0$ and a $-$ when $\tau < 0$. Using this, we find the expression of the Jacobi operator in term of the function φ_τ

$$\mathcal{L}_\tau := \varphi_\tau^{-n} \, \partial_s (\varphi_\tau^{n-2} \, \partial_s) + \varphi_\tau^{-2} \, \Delta_{S^{n-1}} + n + n \, (n-1) \, \tau^{2n} \, \varphi_\tau^{-2n}. \tag{3.3}$$

It will be convenient to define the conjugate operator

$$L_\tau := \varphi_\tau^{\frac{n+2}{2}} \;\; \mathcal{L}_\tau \, \varphi_\tau^{\frac{2-n}{2}} \, , \tag{3.4}$$

which is explicitly given in terms of the function φ_τ by

$$L_\tau = \partial_s^2 + \Delta_{S^{n-1}} - \left(\frac{n-2}{2} \right)^2 + \frac{n(n+2)}{4} \, \varphi_\tau^2 + \frac{n(3n-2)}{4} \, \tau^{2n} \, \varphi_\tau^{2-2n}. \tag{3.5}$$

Since the operators $\mathcal{L}_\tau$ and L_τ are conjugate, the mapping properties of one of them will easily translate for the other one. With slight abuse of terminology, we shall refer to any of them as the Jacobi operator about $\mathcal{D}_\tau$.

Now, we define the operator

$$\Delta_0 := \partial_s^2 + \Delta_{S^{n-1}} - \left(\frac{n-2}{2} \right)^2 , \tag{3.6}$$

which appears in the expression of L_τ. This is conjugate to the Jacobi operator about the hyperplane $\mathbb{R}^n \times \{0\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ in polar coordinates. Indeed if $r = e^{-s}$ and $\theta \in S^{n-1}$ then

$$\Delta_0 = e^{-\frac{n+2}{2}} \, \Delta_{\mathbb{R}^n} \, e^{\frac{n-2}{2}} \, .$$

Its easy to seen that we can parameterize the sphere $S^n \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ by

$$X_1 = \left(\frac{1}{\cosh s} \theta, \tanh s \right),$$

where $(s, \theta) \in \mathbb{R} \times S^{n-1}$ and we assume that the orientation of S^n is chosen so that the unit normal vector field is given by

$$N_1 = -\left(\frac{1}{\cosh s} \theta, \tanh s \right).$$

With these definitions, the Jacobi operator about the sphere is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_1 &:= \Delta_{S^n} + n \\ &= \psi_1^{-n}\, \partial_s (\psi_1^{n-2}\, \partial_s) + \psi_1^{-2}\, \Delta_{S^{n-1}} + n, \end{aligned}$$

where we have defined

$$\psi_1(s) := \frac{1}{\cosh s}.$$

Again, we consider the conjugate operator

$$L_1 := \psi_1^{\frac{n+2}{2}}\ \mathcal{L}_1\, \psi_1^{\frac{2-n}{2}}$$

which takes the simple form

$$L_1 = \Delta_0 + \frac{n(n+2)}{4} \frac{1}{(\cosh s)^2}. \tag{3.7}$$

Finally, the n-catenoid is defined to be the unique (up to rigid motion and dilation) minimal hypersurface of revolution in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. It can be parameterized by

$$X_2(s, \theta) := (\psi_2(s)\, \theta, \kappa_2(s)),$$

for $(s, \theta) \in \mathbb{R} \times S^{n-1}$, where the functions ψ_2 and κ_2 are defined by

$$\psi_2(s) := (\cosh((n-1)s))^{\frac{1}{n-1}} \quad \text{and} \qquad \kappa_2(s) := \int_0^s (\cosh((n-1)t))^{\frac{2-n}{n-1}}\ dt.$$

Observe that the function ψ_2 is a solution of

$$(\partial_s \psi_2)^2 = \psi_2^2 - \psi_2^{4-2n} \qquad \text{and} \qquad (\partial_s \kappa_2)^2 = \kappa_2^{2-n}.$$

We assume the orientation chosen so that the unit normal vector field is given by

$$N_2 := \left(- \frac{1}{\cosh((n-1)s)} \theta, \tanh((n-1)s) \right) = \left(- \frac{\partial_s \kappa_2}{\psi_2} \theta, \frac{\partial_s \psi_2}{\psi_2} \right).$$

So, the first and the second fundamental form are given respectively by

$$I = \psi_2^2 \, \left(ds \otimes ds + d\theta_i \otimes d\theta_j \right),$$

and

$$II = \psi_2^{2-n} \, \left((1-n) \, ds \otimes ds + d\theta \otimes d\theta \right).$$

It is easy to check that X_2 parameterizes a minimal hypersurface. We refer to [2] for further details and references. Now, the Jacobi operator about the n-catenoid is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_2 := \psi_2^{-n} \, \partial_s (\psi_2^{n-2} \, \partial_s) + \psi_2^{-2} \, \Delta_{S^{n-1}} + n \, (n-1) \, \psi_2^{-2n},$$

Again, we define the conjugate operator

$$L_2 := \psi_2^{\frac{n+2}{2}} \quad \mathcal{L}_2 \, \psi_2^{\frac{2-n}{2}}$$

which is explicitly given by

$$L_2 = \Delta_0 + \frac{n \, (3n-2)}{4} \, \frac{1}{(\cosh((n-1)s))^2}. \tag{3.8}$$

Remark

- The expansions of the Jacobi operator L_1 and L_2 can be obtained as a limit of the Jacobi fields L_τ when τ tends to 0 using Lemma 2.2.

- When $n = 2$, $L_1 = L_2$.

3.1. **Geometric Jacobi fields.** We ended this section by giving only the expression of some Jacobi fields, i.e., solution of the homogeneous problem

$$\mathcal{L}_\tau \, \omega = 0$$

since these Jacobi fields follow from a rigid motion or by changing the Delaunay parameter τ. More details are given in [4].

- For $\tau \in (-\infty, 0) \cup (0, \tau_*)$, we define $\Phi_\tau^{0,+}$ to be the Jacobi field corresponding to the translation of $\mathcal{D}_\tau$ along the x_{n+1} axis
$$\Phi_\tau^{0,+} := \varphi^{\frac{n-4}{2}}\, \partial_s \varphi.$$
It is easy to check that $\Phi_\tau^{0,+}$ only depends on s and is periodic. Then, this Jacobi field is bounded.

- Since we have n directions orthogonal to x_{n+1}, there are n linearly independent Jacobi fields which are obtained by translating $\mathcal{D}_\tau$ in a direction orthogonal to its axis. We get for $j = 1, \dots, n$
$$\Phi_\tau^{j,+} := \left(\varphi^{\frac{n}{2}} \pm |\tau|^n \varphi^{-\frac{n}{2}}\right) e_j.$$
Again, we see that $\Phi_\tau^{j,+}$ is periodic (hence bounded) for all $j = 1, \dots, n$.

- For $j = 1, \dots, n$, we define
$$\Phi_\tau^{j,-}(s, \theta) := \varphi^{\frac{n-4}{2}} \Big(\varphi\, \partial_s \varphi + \kappa\, \partial_s \kappa\Big) e_j$$
to be the Jacobi field corresponding to the rotation of the axis of $\mathcal{D}_\tau$. Observe that $\Phi_\tau^{j,-}$ is not bounded, but grows linearly.
- Finally, the Jacobi field corresponding to a change of parameter $\tau \in (-\infty, 0) \cup (0, \tau_*)$ will be denoted by $\Phi_\tau^{0,-}$. It can be obtained by writing, for η small enough, the constant mean curvature hypersurface $\mathcal{D}_{\tau+\eta}$ as a normal graph over $\mathcal{D}_\tau$ for some function ω_η and differentiating ω_η with respect to η at $\eta = 0$. The corresponding Jacobi field takes the form
$$\Phi_\tau^{0,-} := \varphi^{\frac{n-2}{2}}\, \partial_\tau X_\tau . N_\tau = \varphi^{\frac{n-4}{2}} \left(\partial_\tau \kappa\, \partial_s \varphi - \partial_\tau \varphi\, \partial_s \kappa\right).$$
This Jacobi field is again linearly growing in s as $|s|$ tends to $+\infty$. Indeed, let T_τ to be the physical period of the Delaunay hypersurface which can be written as
$$T_\tau = \kappa_\tau(s_\tau).$$
Then, we have the identity
$$X_\tau(. + s_\tau, .) = X_\tau + T_\tau\, (0_{\mathbb{R}^n}, 1).$$
Differentiation with respect to τ yields
$$\partial_\tau X_\tau(. + s_\tau, .) + \partial_\tau s_\tau \partial_s X_\tau(. + s_\tau, .) = \partial_\tau X_\tau + \partial_\tau T_\tau\, (0_{\mathbb{R}^n}, 1).$$

Taking the scalar product with N_τ and using the definition of $\Phi_\tau^{0,+}$, we obtain

$$\Phi_\tau^{0,-}(. + s_\tau) = \Phi_\tau^{0,-} + \partial_\tau T_\tau \, \Phi_\tau^{0,-}.$$

which clearly shows that $\Phi_\tau^{0,-}$ grows linearly in s.

3.2. **Indicial roots associated to a n-Delaunay.** Because of the rotational invariance of the operator L_τ we can introduce the eigenfunction decomposition with respect to the cross-sectional Laplace-Beltrami operator $\Delta_{S^{n-1}}$. In this way we obtain the sequence of operators

$$L_{\tau,j} = \partial_s^2 - \lambda_j - \left(\frac{n-2}{2}\right)^2 + \frac{n(n+2)}{4}\varphi^2 + \frac{n(3n-2)}{4}\tau^{2n}\varphi^{2-2n} \tag{3.9}$$

for $j \in \mathbb{N}$. By definition, the *indicial roots* of the operator $L_{\tau,j}$ characterize the rate of growth (or rate of decay) of the solutions of the homogeneous equation

$$L_{\tau,j}\, \omega = 0$$

at infinity (see [11]). To explain this, observe that the potential in the expression of $L_{\tau,j}$ is given by

$$-\delta_j^2 + \frac{n(n+2)}{4}\varphi^2 + \frac{n(3n-2)}{4}\tau^{2n}\varphi^{2-2n}$$

where δ_j has been defined in (1.1), and hence this potential is periodic of period s_τ. We define a 2 by 2 matrix $T_j(\tau) \in M_2(\mathbb{R})$ such that, for all ω solution of $L_{\tau,j}\,\omega = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} \omega \\ \partial_s \omega \end{pmatrix}(s_\tau) = T_j(\tau) \begin{pmatrix} \omega \\ \partial_s \omega \end{pmatrix}(0).$$

Let $\lambda_-(\tau, j)$ and $\lambda_+(\tau, j)$ denote the roots of the characteristic polynomial of $T_j(\tau)$.

Assume that v_1 and v_2 are the solutions of $L_{\tau,j}\, v_i = 0$ with $v_1(0) = \partial_s v_2(0) = 1$ and $v_2(0) = \partial_s v_1(0) = 0$. We denote by W the Wronskian of v_1, v_2

$$W := v_1\, \partial_s v_2 - v_2\, \partial_s v_1$$

The Wronskian of v_1 and v_2 being constant, we evaluate it at $s = 0$ and $s = s_\tau$, and we obtain

$$\det\left(T_j(\tau)\right) = \lambda_-(\tau, j)\lambda_+(\tau, j) = 1.$$

Observe that the matrix $T_j(\tau)$ has real entries, hence

$$\mathrm{Tr}\,(T_j(\tau)) = \lambda_-(\tau, j) + \lambda_+(\tau, j) \in \mathbb{R}$$

This being understood, we can write

$$\lambda_+(\tau, j) = \mu\, e^{i\xi} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \lambda_-(\tau, j) = \frac{1}{\mu}\, e^{-i\xi} \tag{3.10}$$

where $\xi := \xi(\tau, j) \in [0, 2\pi)$ and $\mu := \mu(\tau, j) \geq 1$ satisfy

$$(\mu^2 - 1)\, \sin \xi = 0.$$

The above analysis allows one to state the :

Definition 3.1. The indicial roots of $L_{\tau,j}$ are defined by $\pm\, \gamma_j(\tau)$ where

$$\gamma_j(\tau) := \frac{1}{s_\tau} \log\, \mu(\tau, j),$$

and where $\mu(\tau, j) \geq 1$ is defined as in (3.10). The set of all indicial roots of L_τ is the union of the $\pm\, \gamma_j(\tau)$, namely

$$\Gamma(\tau) := \{\pm \gamma_j(\tau)\ :\ j \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

4. Maximum principle

This section is devoted to the proof of various forms of the maximum principle for the Jacobi operators which have been defined in the previous section.

4.1. **Maximum principle for the hyperplane $\mathbb{R}^n$.** Our first result is simply the :

Proposition 4.1. *Assume that ω is a solution of $\Delta_0\, \omega = 0$ which is defined in $(s_1, s_2) \times S^{n-1}$, with boundary data $\omega = 0$ on $\{s_i\} \times S^{n-1}$ if any of the s_i is finite. Further assume that*

$$|\omega| \leq (\cosh s)^\delta$$

for some $\delta < \frac{n-2}{2}$. Then $\omega = 0$.

Proof: Since the potential in Δ_0 is negative, the result is straightforward when both of the s_i are finite. In the general case, we consider the eigenfunction decomposition of ω as

$$\omega = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \omega_j \, e_j .$$

We see that $(\partial_s^2 - \delta_j^2)\, \omega_j = 0$, hence ω_j is a linear combination of $s \longrightarrow e^{\pm \delta_j s}$ and has to be bounded by $(\cosh s)^{\delta}$. The result follows from the fact that $\delta_j \geq \frac{n-2}{2}$ for all $j \geq 0$. □

4.2. **Maximum principle for the Jacobi operator about S^n.** Recall that the conjugate of the Jacobi operator about S^n is defined by

$$L_1 = \Delta_0 + \frac{n\,(n+1)}{4} \frac{1}{(\cosh s)^2}.$$

We prove a maximum principle for the operator L_1, when it is restricted to the set of functions whose eigenfunction decomposition does not involve $e_0, \ldots, e_n$.

Proposition 4.2. *Assume that ω is a solution of $L_1 \omega = 0$ in $(s_1, s_2) \times S^{n-1}$, with boundary data $\omega = 0$ on $\{s_i\} \times S^{n-1}$ if any of the s_i is finite. Further assume that, for all $s \in (s_1, s_2)$, the function $\omega(s, \cdot)$ is L^2-orthogonal to Span $\{e_0, \ldots, e_n\}$ and that*

$$|\omega| \leq (\cosh s)^{\delta}$$

for some $\delta < \frac{n+2}{2}$. Then $\omega = 0$.

Proof: We consider the eigenfunction decomposition of the function ω, which reads

$$\omega(s, \theta) = \sum_{j \geq n+1} \omega_j(s)\, e_j(\theta).$$

since we have assumed that the function $\omega(s, \cdot)$ is L^2-orthogonal to Span $\{e_0, \ldots, e_n\}$ for all $s \in (s_1, s_2)$.

Then, the function ω_j solves

$$\partial_s^2 \omega_j - \delta_j^2\, \omega_j + \frac{n\,(n+1)}{4} \frac{1}{(\cosh s)^2}\, \omega_j = 0$$

in (s_1, s_2). Since $j \geq n+1$, we have

$$\delta_j \geq \frac{n+2}{2}.$$

Hence the potential in the above ordinary differential equation is negative. The maximum principle already implies that $\omega_j = 0$ if both s_1 and s_2 are finite. In the case where one of the s_i is not finite, say $s_2 = +\infty$, we observe that ω_j either blows up at $+\infty$ like $s \to e^{\delta_j s}$ or decays exponentially at $+\infty$ like $s \longrightarrow e^{-\delta_j s}$. Since we have assumed that $|\omega| \leq (\cosh s)^\delta$ for some $\delta < \frac{n+2}{2}$, we conclude that ω_j decays exponentially like $s \longrightarrow e^{-\delta_j s}$ at $+\infty$. The maximum principle again implies that $\omega_j = 0$. This completes the proof of the result. □

4.3. **Maximum principle for the Jacobi operator about the n-catenoid.** Recall that the conjugate of the Jacobi operator about the n-catenoid is defined by

$$L_2 = \Delta_0 + \frac{n\,(3n-2)}{4} \frac{1}{(\cosh((n-1)s)^2}.$$

The following result can be found in [2] and is the counterpart of the result of Proposition 4.2 for the operator L_2. However, this time the proof is slightly more involved. We give a simpler proof than the one in [2].

Proposition 4.3. *Assume that ω is a solution of $L_2\,\omega = 0$ in $(s_1, s_2) \times S^{n-1}$, with boundary data $\omega = 0$ on $\{s_i\} \times S^{n-1}$ if any of the s_i is finite. Further assume that, for all $s \in (s_1, s_2)$, the function $\omega(s, \cdot)$ is L^2-orthogonal to Span$\{e_0, \ldots, e_n\}$ and that*

$$|\omega| \leq (\cosh s)^\delta$$

for some $\delta < \frac{n+2}{2}$. Then $\omega = 0$.

Proof: For the time being, let us assume that both s_1 and s_2 are finite. Observe that, if ω solves $L_2\,\omega = 0$, then

$$v := \psi_2^{\frac{2-n}{2}}\,\omega$$

solves $\mathcal{L}_2\,v = 0$. We consider the eigenfunction decomposition of the function v, namely

$$v(s, \theta) = \sum_{j \geq n+1} v_j(s)\, e_j(\theta).$$

Step 1 We multiply the equation $\mathcal{L}_2\, v = 0$ by $\psi_2^n\, v_j\, e_j$ and integrate the result over (s_1, s_2). We obtain, after an integration by parts

$$\int_{s_1}^{s_2} \psi_2^{n-2}(\partial_s v_j)^2 + \lambda_j \int_{s_1}^{s_2} \psi_2^{n-2} v_j^2 - n\,(n-1) \int_{s_1}^{s_2} \psi_2^{-n} v_j^2 = 0 \tag{4.1}$$

Step 2 Recall that the function ψ_2 satisfies

$$(\partial_s \psi_2)^2 = \psi_2^2 - \psi_2^{4-2n} \tag{4.2}$$

Multiplication by $\psi_2^{n-4}\, v_j^2$ and integrating the result over (s_1, s_2) we get

$$\int_{s_1}^{s_2} \psi_2^{n-4}\,(\partial_s\psi_2)^2\, v_j^2 - \int_{s_1}^{s_2} \psi_2^{n-2}\, v_j^2 + \int_{s_1}^{s_2} \psi_2^{-n}\, v_j^2 = 0 \tag{4.3}$$

Step 3 Differentiation of (4.2) yields

$$\partial_s\,(\psi_2^{n-3}\,\partial_s\psi_2) = (n-2)\,\psi_2^{n-2} + \psi_2^{-n}.$$

We multiply this equality by v_j^2 and integrate the result over (s_1, s_2). Using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we get

$$\begin{aligned}(n-2) \int_{s_1}^{s_2} \psi_2^{n-2} v_j^2 &+ \int_{s_1}^{s_2} \psi_2^{-n}\, v_j^2 \\ &- 2 \left(\int_{s_1}^{s_2} \psi_2^{n-2}\,(\partial_s v_j)^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{s_1}^{s_2} \psi_2^{n-4}\,(\partial_s\psi_2)^2\, v_j^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq 0.\end{aligned}$$

The sum of the last inequality multiplied by $n-2$, (4.3) multiplied by $n^2 - 2n + 2$ and (4.1), yields

$$\begin{aligned}(\lambda_j - 2n + 2) \int \psi_2^{n-2} v_j^2 &+ 2n \int_{s_1}^{s_2} \psi_2^{n-4}\,(\partial_s\psi_2)^2\, v_j^2 \\ &+ \left(\left(\int_{s_1}^{s_2} \psi_2^{n-2}\,(\partial_s v_j)^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} - (n-2) \left(\int_{s_1}^{s_2} \psi_2^{n-4}\,(\partial_s\psi_2)^2\, v_j^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^2 \leq 0,\end{aligned}$$

which readily implies that $v_j = 0$ since $\lambda_j \geq 2n$ when $j \geq n+1$.

In the case where s_1 or s_2 is not finite, we argue exactly as above, being understood that we have to justify all integrations. Assume for example that $s_2 = +\infty$. Arguing as in the proof of Proposition 4.2, we can prove that

$\psi_2^{\frac{n-2}{2}} v_j$ decays exponentially like $s \longrightarrow e^{-\delta_j s}$ at $+\infty$ and this is enough to justify all the integrations by parts. □

4.4. **Maximum principle for the n-Delaunay hypersurface.** We now prove a similar maximum principle for the Jacobi operator about a n-Delaunay hypersurface. The statement and the proof are very close to the statement and proof of the corresponding result for the n-catenoid. However we need to impose a lower bound on the Delaunay parameter for the result to hold.

Proposition 4.4. *There exists $\tau^* < 0$ such that for all $\tau \in [\tau^*, 0) \cup (0, \tau_*]$, if ω is a bounded solution of $L_\tau \omega = 0$ in $(s_1, s_2) \times S^{n-1}$, with boundary data $\omega = 0$ on $\{s_i\} \times S^{n-1}$ and if, for all $s \in (s_1, s_2)$, the function $\omega(s, \cdot)$ is L^2-orthogonal to Span$\{e_0, \ldots, e_n\}$ on S^{n-1}, then $\omega = 0$.*

Proof: Again, if ω is a solution of $L_\tau \omega = 0$, then

$$v := \varphi^{\frac{2-n}{2}} \omega$$

solves $\mathcal{L}_\tau v = 0$. We consider the eigenfunction decomposition of v

$$v = \sum_{j \geq n+1} v_j \, e_j.$$

Step 1 Multiplying the equation $\mathcal{L}_\tau v = 0$ by $\varphi_\tau^n v_j e_j$ and integrating by parts over $(s_1, s_2) \times S^{n-1}$, we obtain the identity

$$\int \varphi_\tau^{n-2} (\partial_s v_j)^2 + \lambda_j \int \varphi_\tau^{n-2} v_j^2 = n \int \varphi_\tau^n v_j^2 + n(n-1)\, \tau^{2n} \int \varphi_\tau^{-n} v_j^2 \tag{4.4}$$

where all integrals are understood over (s_1, s_2).

Step 2 Recall that

$$(\partial_s \varphi_\tau)^2 = \varphi_\tau^2 - (\varphi_\tau^2 + \iota \, |\tau|^n \, \varphi_\tau^{2-n})^2, \tag{4.5}$$

where $\iota = 1$ if $\tau > 0$ and $\iota = -1$ if $\tau < 0$. Multiplying this identity by $\varphi_\tau^{n-4} v_j^2$ we get

$$\int \varphi_\tau^{n-4} (\partial_s \varphi_\tau)^2 v_j^2 = \int \varphi_\tau^{n-2} v_j^2 - \int \varphi_\tau^n v_j^2 - \tau^{2n} \int \varphi_\tau^{-n} v_j^2 - 2\, \iota \, |\tau|^n \int v_j^2. \tag{4.6}$$

Step 3 Differentiation of (4.5) yields

$$\partial_s\left(\varphi_\tau^{n-3}\,\partial_s\varphi_\tau\right)=(n-2)\,\varphi^{n-2}+(1-n)\,\varphi_\tau^n+\tau^{2n}\,\varphi_\tau^{-n}-(n-2)\,\iota\,|\tau|^n$$

We multiply this equality by v_j^2 and integrate the result over (s_1,s_2). Using Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned}(n-2)\int\varphi_\tau^{n-2}\,v_j^2+(1-n)\int\varphi_\tau^n\,v_j^2+\tau^{2n}\int\varphi_\tau^{-n}\,v_j^2-(n-2)\,\iota\,|\tau|^n\int v_j^2&\\ \leq 2\left(\int\varphi_\tau^{n-2}\,(\partial_s v_j)^2\right)^{\frac12}\left(\int\varphi_\tau^{n-4}\,(\partial_s\varphi_\tau)^2\,v_j^2\right)^{\frac12}&.\end{aligned}$$

The sum of the last equation multiplied by $n-2$, the former equation multiplied by n^2-2n+2 and (4.4), yields

$$\begin{aligned}&(\lambda_j-2n+2)\int\varphi_\tau^{n-2}\,v_j^2+n^2\,\iota\,|\tau|^n\int v_j^2+2n\int\varphi_\tau^{n-4}\,(\partial_s\varphi_\tau)^2\,v_j^2\\ &\quad+\left(\left(\int\varphi_\tau^{n-2}\,(\partial_s v_j)^2\right)^{\frac12}-(n-2)\left(\int\varphi_\tau^{n-4}\,(\partial_s\varphi_\tau)^2\,v_j^2\right)^{\frac12}\right)^2\leq 0.\end{aligned}$$

When $\tau>0$, it is enough to use the fact that $\lambda_j\geq 2n$ for all $j\geq n+1$, to conclude that $v_j=0$.

Step 4 In the case where $\tau<0$, the last inequality together with the fact that $\lambda_j\geq 2n$, imply that

$$2\int\varphi_\tau^{n-2}\,v_j^2\leq n^2\,|\tau|^n\int v_j^2.$$

If v_j were to be non zero, this would imply that

$$A:=\inf\varphi_\tau\leq\left(\frac{n^2|\tau|^n}{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{n-2}}.$$

However, it follows from (4.5) that the minimum of φ_τ is the unique positive solution of the equation

$$|\tau|^n\,A^{2-n}=A+A^2$$

Therefore, this would imply that

$$\frac{2}{n^2}\leq\left(\frac{n^2|\tau|^n}{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{n-2}}+\left(\frac{n^2|\tau|^n}{2}\right)^{\frac{2}{n-2}},$$

which is clearly not true if $|\tau|$ is chosen small enough. This completes the proof of the result. $\square$

Remark 4.1. In the forthcoming analysis, we agree, reducing $|\tau^*|$ if necessary, the constant $\tau^* < 0$ is chosen so that

$$2 \inf \varphi_\tau^{n-2} - n^2 \, |\tau|^n > 0$$

for all $\tau \in [\tau^*, 0)$.

A closer look at the proof of the previous result shows that we have also proven the :

Proposition 4.5. *Assume that $j \geq n+1$ and $\tau \in [\tau^*, 0) \cup (0, \tau_*]$ are fixed. Let ω be a solution of*

$$L_{\tau,j}\omega \geq 0$$

in (s_1, s_2), with

$$\omega(s_1) \leq 0 \quad \textit{and} \quad \omega(s_2) \leq 0$$

Then, $\omega \leq 0$ in (s_1, s_2).

Proof: We argue by contradiction and assume that the result is not true. There would exists $\bar{s}_1$ and $\bar{s}_2 \in (s_1, s_2)$ such that

$$L_{\tau,j}\, \omega \geq 0$$

and $\omega(s) > 0$ in $(\bar{s}_1, \bar{s}_2)$, and

$$\omega(\bar{s}_1) = \omega(\bar{s}_2) = 0.$$

We now apply the strategy of the proof of the previous result. The only difference being that the equality (4.4) now becomes the inequality

$$\int \varphi_\tau^{n-2} (\partial_s \omega)^2 + \lambda_j \int \varphi_\tau^{n-2} \omega^2 \leq n \int \varphi_\tau^n \omega^2 + n(n-1)\, \tau^{2n} \int \varphi_\tau^{-n} \omega^2$$

In any case, this is enough to conclude that $\omega \leq 0$ in (s_1, s_2). □

The next result mainly states that an exponentially decaying solution of the homogeneous problem $L_{\tau,j}\, \omega = 0$ does not change sign, provided $j \geq n+1$.

Proposition 4.6. *Assume that $\tau \in [\tau^*, 0) \cup (0, \tau_*]$ and $S \in \mathbb{R}$ are fixed. Let ω be a solution of $L_\tau \omega = 0$ in $(S, +\infty) \times S^{n-1}$ with $\omega = 0$ on $\{S\} \times S^{n-1}$. Further assume that ω decays exponentially at $+\infty$ and that, for each $s \geq S$, the function $\omega(s, \cdot)$ is L^2-orthogonal to Span$\{e_0, \ldots, e_n\}$ on S^{n-1}. Then $\omega = 0$.*

Proof: The proof of this result is identical to the proof of Proposition 4.4, though we now have to justify all the integrations by parts. But ω is assumed to decay exponentially at $+\infty$ and, by standard elliptic estimates, this is also the case for $\partial_s\omega$ and this is enough to justify all the integrations by part. $\square$

As a by product of the proof of Proposition 4.4 Step 3, we have the

Lemma 4.1. *If v is defined in (s_1, s_2) and is a solution of*

$$\mathcal{L}_\tau(v\, e_j) = 0$$

in $(s_1, s_2) \times S^{n-1}$, then

$$(\lambda_j - 2n + 2) \int_{s_1}^{s_2} \varphi_\tau^{n-2}\, v^2 + n^2\, \iota\, |\tau|^n \int_{s_1}^{s_2} v^2 \leq h(s_2) - h(s_1),$$

where

$$h := \varphi_\tau^{n-2}\, v\, \partial_s v + (n-2)\, \varphi_\tau^{n-3} v^2\, \partial_s \varphi_\tau,$$

and where $\iota = 1$ when $\tau > 0$ and $\iota = -1$ when $\tau < 0$.

We end this section with the :

Proposition 4.7. *Assume that $\tau \in [\tau^*, 0) \cup (0, \tau_*]$ and that ω is a bounded solution of $L_\tau\, \omega = 0$ in $\mathbb{R} \times S^{n-1}$. Further assume that, for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$, the function $\omega(s, \cdot)$ is L^2-orthogonal to Span$\{e_0, \ldots, e_n\}$ on S^{n-1}. Then $\omega = 0$.*

Proof: As usual, we consider the eigenfunction decomposition of $v := \varphi_\tau^{\frac{2-n}{2}}\, \omega$ as

$$v(s, \theta) = \sum_{j \geq n+1} v_j(s)\, e_j(\theta),$$

Let us first show that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} v_j^2(s)\; ds < +\infty$$

for $j \geq n+1$. Indeed, we apply the result of Lemma 4.1 to get

$$(\lambda_j - 2n + 2) \int_{-S}^{S} \varphi_\tau^{n-2}\, v_j^2 + n^2\, \iota\, |\tau|^n \int_{-S}^{S} v_j^2 \leq h(S) - h(-S),$$

where

$$h := \varphi_\tau^{n-2}\, v_j\, \partial_s v_j + (n-2)\, \varphi_\tau^{n-3} v_j^2\, \partial_s \varphi_\tau.$$

Thanks to the choice of τ and j, we have

$$(\lambda_j - 2n + 2)\, \inf \varphi_\tau^{n-2} + n^2\, \iota\, |\tau|^n > 0$$

Hence we conclude that

$$\int_{-S}^{S} v_j^2 \leq c\,(h(S) - h(-S)).$$

for some constant c which only depends on τ and j.

Since v_j is bounded, we also get that $\partial_s v_j$ is a bounded function. Therefore, the right hand side of the last inequality is bounded independently of S. Passing the limit as $S \to +\infty$, we conclude that $v_j \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$. In particular, there exists a sequences of real numbers $(\alpha_i)_i$ (resp.$(\beta_i)_i$) which tends to $-\infty$ (resp. $+\infty$) and for which

$$\lim_{i \to +\infty} v_j(\alpha_i) = \lim_{i \to +\infty} v_j(\beta_i) = 0$$

Again, we use the result of Lemma 4.1 to get

$$\int_{\alpha_i}^{\beta_i} v_j^2 \leq c\,(h(\beta_i) - h(\alpha_i)),$$

and we pass to the limit as $i \to +\infty$ to conclude that $v_j = 0$. This completes the proof of the result. $\square$

Observe that the explicit knowledge of some Jacobi fields yields some information about the indicial roots of the operator L_τ. Indeed, since the Jacobi fields $\Phi_\tau^{j,\pm}$, described in subsection 3.2, are at most linearly growing, the associated indicial roots are all equal to 0. Hence we conclude that

$$\gamma_j(\tau) = 0,$$

for $j = 0, \ldots, n$ and for all $\tau \in (-\infty, 0) \cup (0, \tau_*]$. The situation is completely different when $j \geq n+1$ since if $\tau \in [\tau^*, 0) \cup (0, \tau_*]$ then,

$$\gamma_j(\tau) > 0.$$

To prove these, we argue by contradiction and assume that $\gamma_j(\tau) = 0$ for some $j \geq n+1$ and some $\tau \in [\tau^*, 0) \cup (0, \tau_*]$. The discussion of section 3 shows that the homogeneous problem $L_{\tau,j}\, \omega = 0$ admits at least one nontrivial periodic solution. However, since we have assumed that $j \geq n+1$, this would contradict the result of Proposition 4.7. These prove the two first part of the Theorem.

5. The limit of the indicial roots as τ tends to 0

We show that, as τ tends to 0, the indicial roots $\gamma_j(\tau)$ remain bounded from below by any constant less than δ_j. This result relies on a precise estimate of the potential which appears in the expression of L_τ.

Lemma 5.1. *Given $\eta > 0$, there exists $\tau_0 > 0$ and $s_0 > 0$ such that for all $\tau \in (-\tau_0, 0) \cup (0, \tau_0)$, we have*

$$\frac{n(n+2)}{4}\varphi_\tau^2 + \frac{n(3n-2)}{4}\tau^{2n}\varphi_\tau^{2-2n} \leq \eta$$

in $[s_0, \frac{s_\tau}{2} - s_0] \cup [\frac{s_\tau}{2} + s_0, s_\tau - s_0]$.

Proof: It follows from the result of Lemma 2.2 that, as τ tends to 0 :

- the sequence of functions $\tau^{2n}\,\varphi_\tau^{2-2n}$ converges, uniformly on compact sets, to the function $s \longrightarrow \frac{1}{\cosh(n-1)s}$,
- the sequence of functions φ_τ converges, uniformly on compact sets, to 0,
- the sequence of functions $\tau^{2n}\,\varphi_\tau^{2-2n}(\cdot + \frac{s_\tau}{2})$ converges, uniformly on compact sets, to 0,
- the sequence of functions $\varphi_\tau(\cdot + \frac{s_\tau}{2})$ converges, uniformly on compact sets, to the function $s \longrightarrow \frac{1}{\cosh s}$.

Given $\eta > 0$, we fix $s_0 > 0$ so that

$$\frac{n(n+2)}{4}\frac{1}{\cosh s_0} \leq \eta/4 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{n(3n-2)}{4}\frac{1}{\cosh((n-1)\,s_0)} \leq \eta/4.$$

Next, we use the converge properties stated above, to fix $\tau_0 > 0$ such that

$$\frac{n(n+2)}{4}\,\varphi_\tau^2\left(\frac{s_\tau}{2} - s_0\right) \leq \frac{\eta}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{n(3n-2)}{4}\,\tau^{2n}\,\varphi_\tau^{2-2n}(s_0) \leq \frac{\eta}{2}$$

for all $\tau \in (-\tau_0, 0) \cup (0, \tau_0)$. Recall that the function $s \to \sigma_\tau(s)$ is monotone increasing in $[0, \frac{s_\tau}{2}]$. Hence, we conclude that

$$\frac{n(n+2)}{4}\varphi^2(s) \leq \eta/2 \qquad \text{for all} \quad s \in [0, \frac{s_\tau}{2} - s_0]$$

and

$$\frac{n(3n-2)}{4}\tau^{2n}\varphi^{2-2n}(s) \leq \eta/2 \qquad \text{for all} \quad s \in [s_0, \frac{s_\tau}{2}].$$

This yields the estimate in the set $[s_0, \frac{s_\tau}{2} - s_0]$. Finally, a similar analysis gives the estimate in $[\frac{s_\tau}{2} + s_0, s_\tau - s_0]$. $\square$

We now prove that, provided $j \geq n+1$, the indicial roots $\gamma_j(\tau)$ remain bounded from below by any constant less than δ_j as τ tends to 0.

Proof: The fact that $\gamma_j(\tau) > 0$ for $j \geq n+1$ and $\tau \in [\tau^*, 0) \cup (0, \tau_*]$already ensure that there exists a function v solution of

$$\mathcal{L}_\tau \left(v \, e_j \right) = 0,$$

which decays exponentially at $+\infty$. Applying the result of Proposition 4.6, we see that v does not vanish, hence we may well assumed that v is normalized so that

$$v(0) = 1.$$

Step 1 Using the result of Lemma 4.1, we see that

$$(\lambda_j - 2n + 2) \int_s^{+\infty} \varphi_\tau^{n-2} \, v^2 + n^2 \, \iota \, |\tau|^n \int_s^{+\infty} v^2 \leq -h(s),$$

for all s, where we recall that

$$h := \varphi_\tau^{n-2} \, v \, \partial_s v + (n-2) \, \varphi_\tau^{n-3} \, v^2 \, \partial_s \varphi_\tau.$$

Hence

$$h(s) < 0.$$

And this implies that

$$\partial_s \left(\varphi_\tau^{n-2} \, v \right) < 0.$$

In particular, using the fact that the function σ_τ and hence the function φ_τ are increasing on $[0, s_\tau/2]$, we conclude that the function

$$\omega := \varphi_\tau^{\frac{n-2}{2}} \, v$$

is decreasing in $[0, s_\tau/2]$. We even have

$$\partial_s \omega < 0$$

in this set. Recall that the function ω is a solution of $L_{\tau,j} \, \omega = 0$.

Step 2 Assume that $\eta > 0$ is fixed. We fix s_0 and τ_0 as in Lemma 5.1, so that

$$\frac{n(n+2)}{4} \varphi_\tau^2 + \frac{n(3n-2)}{4} \tau^{2n} \varphi_\tau^{2-2n} \leq \eta/4$$

on $[s_0, \frac{s_\tau}{2} - s_0]$, for all $\tau \in (-\tau_0, 0) \cup (0, \tau_0)$. To simplify the notations, we set

$$S_0 := \frac{s_\tau}{2} - s_0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \beta_j := \sqrt{\delta_j^2 - \eta/4}.$$

We denote

$$Q_{j,\tau} := \delta_j^2 - \frac{n(n+2)}{4}\varphi_\tau^2 - \frac{n(3n-2)}{4}\tau^{2n}\varphi_\tau^{2-2n},$$

By assumption,

$$Q_{j,\tau} > \beta_j^2$$

over $[s_0, S_0]$. We choose $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ such that the function

$$\bar{\omega} := a\, e^{\beta_j s} + b\, e^{-\beta_j s}$$

agrees with ω at $s = s_0$ and $s = S_0$. Namely

$$\bar{\omega}(S_0) = \omega(S_0) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \bar{\omega}(s_0) = \omega(s_0).$$

We find explicitly

$$a = \frac{\omega(S_0)e^{\beta_j S_0} - \omega(s_0)e^{\beta_j s_0}}{e^{2\beta_j S_0} - e^{2\beta_j s_0}} \quad \text{and} \quad b = \frac{\omega(s_0)e^{-\beta_j s_0} - \omega(S_0)e^{-\beta_j S_0}}{e^{-2\beta_j s_0} - e^{-2\beta_j S_0}}$$

Since $Q_{j,\tau} > \beta_j^2$ over $[s_0, S_0]$, we see that

$$\partial_s^2(\omega - \bar{\omega}) - \beta_j^2\,(\omega - \bar{\omega}) \leq 0$$

in $[s_0, S_0]$ and $(\omega - \bar{\omega})(s_0) = (\omega - \bar{\omega})(S_0) = 0$. The maximum principle then implies that $\omega \leq \bar{\omega}$ on $[s_0, S_0]$.

We claim that

$$\omega(S_0) \leq 2\omega(s_0)e^{-\beta_j(S_0 - s_0)}.$$

Indeed, we have shown that the function ω is strictly decreasing over $[0, s_\tau/2]$, hence $\omega(S_0) < \omega(s_0)$ and this implies that $b > 0$.

Without loss of generality, we may as well assume that

$$\omega(S_0) > \omega(s_0)\, e^{-\beta_j(S_0 - s_0)}.$$

Otherwise there is nothing to prove. Under this assumption, we have $a > 0$ and also $b \in (0, \omega(s_0)e^{\beta_j s_0})$. Still using the fact that the function ω is strictly decreasing on $[0, s_\tau/2]$, we find that

$$\omega(S_0) = \inf_{s \in [s_0, S_0]} \omega \leq \inf_{s \in [s_0, S_0]} \bar{\omega}$$

But, a and b being positive, the infinium of $\bar{\omega}$ over $\mathbb{R}$ is achieved at the point $s_m > s_0$ which satisfies $e^{2\beta_j s_m} = b/a$ (observe that $s_m > s_0$ since $\bar{\omega}(S_0) < \bar{\omega}(s_0)$). First we rule out the case $s_m < S_0$. Indeed, if this were the case then we would have $\omega(S_0) < \bar{\omega}(s_m) = 2\sqrt{ab}$. Introducing in this inequality the expression for both a and b we find that

$$(\omega(S_0)\cosh(\beta_j(S_0 - s_0)) - \omega(s_0))^2 < 0,$$

which is not possible. Therefore we always have $s_m \geq S_0$ and this implies that

$$a = b\, e^{-2\beta_j s_m} \leq b\, e^{-2\beta_j S_0}.$$

In particular we obtain

$$\omega(S_0) \leq \bar{\omega}(S_0) = a\, e^{\beta_j S_0} + b\, e^{-\beta_j S_0} \leq 2\omega(s_0)\, e^{-\beta_j (S_0 - s_0)}.$$

This completes the proof of the claim.

The function ω being decreasing on $[0, s_\tau/2]$, we conclude that

$$\omega(s_\tau/2) \leq 2\,\omega(s_0)\, e^{-\beta_j(S_0 - s_0)} \leq 2\,\omega(0)\, e^{-\beta_j(S_0 - s_0)}.$$

Since, s_τ tends to $+\infty$ as τ tends to 0, reducing $|\tau|$ if this is necessary, we can assume that

$$2\, e^{-\beta_j\,(S_0 - s_0)} \leq e^{-\tilde{\beta}_j \frac{s_\tau}{2}}$$

where

$$\tilde{\beta}_j = \sqrt{\delta_j^2 - \eta/2}.$$

Hence, we conclude that

$$\omega(s_\tau/2) \leq \omega(0)\, e^{-\tilde{\beta}_j \frac{s_\tau}{2}}. \tag{5.1}$$

provided τ is chosen small enough.

Step 3 We claim that, provided τ is chosen small enough, the function ω is decreasing in $[s_\tau/2 + s_0, s_\tau - \bar{s}_0]$, for some suitable choice of $\bar{s}_0 \geq s_0$. Recall that ω and $Q_{j,\tau}$ are strictly positive in $[s_\tau/2 + s_0, s_\tau - s_0]$. Hence

$$\partial_s^2\, \omega > 0$$

i.e. ω is strictly convex in this set. Observe that, for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\omega(s + s_\tau) = \omega(s_\tau)\, \omega(s)$$

since the difference between these two functions vanishes at $s = 0$ and is exponentially decaying, hence this difference is identically equal to 0 by Proposition 4.6. This implies that ω is strictly decreasing over $[s_\tau, 3s_\tau/2]$.

Case 1 We now rule out the case where, for some sequence of τ tending to 0, the function ω is strictly increasing in $[s_\tau/2 + s_0, s_\tau - s_0]$. Assume that this is the case. Then the function ω is increasing over $[s_\tau/2 + s_0, s_\tau - s_0]$ and is decreasing on $[s_\tau, 3s_\tau/2]$. Hence the maximum of ω on $[s_\tau/2 + s_0, 3s_\tau/2]$ is achieved at a point $s_\tau^* \in [s_\tau - s_0, s_\tau]$. We define

$$\hat{\omega}(s) := \frac{\omega(s + s_\tau^*)}{\omega(s_\tau^*)}.$$

The sequence of functions $\hat{\omega}$ is bounded on compact sets and solves an homogeneous ordinary differential equation. Hence the derivative of $\hat{\omega}$ is also bounded on compacts and by Ascoli's theorem, we can extract a subsequence which converges, as τ tends to 0, to ω_*, a nontrivial bounded solution of

$$L_1 \left(\omega_* \, e_j\right) = 0,$$

in $\mathbb{R}$. However, the result of Proposition 4.2 shows that $\omega_* \equiv 0$, which is a contradiction.

Case 2 It remains to consider the case where, for some sequence of τ tending to 0, the function ω has a local minimum in $[s_\tau/2 + s_0, s_\tau - s_0]$, say at a point s_τ^*. If $s_\tau - s_\tau^*$ tends to $+\infty$, as τ tends to 0, then, the function ω being convex on $[s_\tau/2 + s_0, s_\tau - s_0]$, this implies that ω is increasing over $[s_\tau^*, s_\tau - s_0]$ and we can argue as in Step 1 to rule out this possibility.
Therefore, the sequence $s_\tau - s_\tau^*$ tends to some positive constant, taking $\bar{s}_0$ to be the supremum of all such constants, we have shown that ω is decreasing in $[s_\tau/2 + s_0, s_\tau - \bar{s}_0]$. Which completes the proof of the claim.

Arguing as in the last Step 2, we get

$$\omega(s_\tau - s_0) \leq \omega(s_\tau/2 + s_0)\, e^{-\tilde{\beta}_j(\frac{s_\tau}{2} + s_0)}. \tag{5.2}$$

It is an easy exercise to show, using the positivity of ω, that there exists a constant $c > 0$ independent of τ such that

$$\omega(s_\tau/2 + s_0) \leq c\,\omega(s_\tau/2) \quad \text{and} \quad \omega(s_\tau) \leq c\,\omega(s_\tau - s_0). \tag{5.3}$$

Collecting (5.2), (5.3) and reducing the range of τ if this is necessary, we conclude that

$$\omega(s_\tau) \leq \omega(0)\, e^{-\hat{\beta}_j s_\tau},$$

where we have set $\hat{\beta}_j = \sqrt{\delta_j^2 - \eta}$. This inequality implies that

$$\gamma_j(\tau) \geq \hat{\beta}_j$$

for all τ small enough. □

As a by product of the previous result, we get the :

Corollary 5.1. *Assume that $j \geq n+1$ and $\tau \in (\tau^*, 0) \cup (0, \tau_*)$. There exists a unique solution of*

$$L_{\tau,j}\omega = 0$$

in $(0, +\infty)$ with $\omega(0) = 1$, which satisfies

$$\frac{1}{c} e^{-\gamma_j s} \leq \omega(s) \leq c\, e^{-\gamma_j s} \tag{5.4}$$

for some constant $c > 1$ depending on τ.

We end this chapter by proving that the indicial roots are increasing as a function of λ_j.

Corollary 5.2. *There exists $\tau_0 > 0$ such that, for all $\tau \in (-\tau_0, 0) \cup (0, \tau_0)$, we have*

$$\gamma_{j+1}(\tau) > \gamma_j(\tau).$$

if $\lambda_{j+1} > \lambda_j$ and $j \geq n+1$.

Proof: Assume that $j \geq n+1$ and that ω_j is the exponentially decreasing function defined in Corollary 5.1 for $L_{\tau,j}$. Given $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$, we compute

$$L_{\tau,j+1}\, \omega_j^{1+\delta} = (\lambda_j - \lambda_{j+1})\, \omega_j^{1+\delta} + \delta\,(1+\delta)\,(\partial_s \omega_j)^2\, \omega_j^{\delta-1} + \delta\, \omega_j^{\delta}\, \partial_s^2 \omega_j.$$

The function ω_j being positive, and a solution of $L_{\tau,j}\, \omega_j = 0$, there exists a constant $c > 0$ (independent of $|\tau|$ small enough) such that

$$|\partial_s^2 \omega_j| + |\partial_s \omega_j| \leq c\, \omega_j.$$

in $(0, +\infty)$. Choosing $\delta > 0$ small enough, we conclude that

$$L_{\tau,j+1}\, \omega_j^{1+\delta} < 0$$

in $(0, +\infty)$.

In particular, the function $\omega_j^{1+\delta}$ is a supersolution and this, together with the result of Proposition 4.5, implies that ω_{j+1} the exponentially decaying function defined in Corollary 5.1 for $L_{\tau,j+1}$, satisfies

$$\omega_{j+1} \leq \omega_j^{1+\delta}.$$

Hence

$$\gamma_{j+1}(\tau) \geq (1+\delta)\, \gamma_j(\tau),$$

and the proof of the result is complete. □

References

[1] C. Delaunay, *Sur la surface de revolution dont la courbure moyenne est constante*, Jour. de Mathématique, **6**, (1841) 309-320.

[2] S. Fakhi and F. Pacard, *Existence result for minimal hypersurfaces with prescribed finite number of planar end* , Manuscripta Mathematica, vol **103** (2000), issu **4**, 465-512.

[3] M. Jleli, *Symmetry breaking for immersed constant mean curvature hypersurfaces*, to appear in Advanced Nonlinear Studies.

[4] M. Jleli, *Moduli space theory of constant mean curvature hypersurfaces*, Advanced Nonlinear Studies **9** (2009), 29-68.

[5] M. Jleli and F. Pacard, *Construction of constant mean curvature hypersurfaces with prescribed finite number of Delaunay end*, to appear.

[6] M. Jleli and F. Pacard, *An end-to-end construction for compact constant mean curvature surface*, Pac. J. Math vol **221** (2005), No 1, 81-107.

[7] N. Kapouleas, *Complete constant mean curvature surfaces in Euclidean three-space*, Ann. of Math. (2) **131** (1990) 239-330.

[8] N. Kapouleas, *Compact constant mean curvature surfaces in Euclidean three-space*, J. Differ. Geom. 33, No. 3, (1991) 683-715.

[9] N. Kapouleas, *Constant mean curvature surfaces constructed by fusing Went tori*, Invent. Math. **119** (1995) 443-518.

[10] K. Katsuei, *Surfaces of revolution with prescribed mean curvature*. Tohoku. Math. J ser 32 (1980), 147-153.

[11] R. Kusner,R. Mazzeo and D. Pollack, *The moduli spaces of cmplete embeeded constant mean curvature surfaces* , Geom. Funct. Anal. **6** (1996) 120-137.

[12] W. Meeks, *The topology and geometry of embedded srfaces of constant mean curvature.* Journ. Differ. Geom. **27** (1988) 539-552.

[13] R. Mazzeo and F. Pacard, *Constant mean curvature surfaces with Delaunay ends*, Comm. Anal. Geom. **9** No. 1 (2001) 169-237.

[14] R. Mazzeo, F. Pacard and D. Pollack, *Connected sums of constant mean curvature surfaces in Euclidiean 3 space*, J. Reine Angew. Math. 536 (2001), 115.165. MR 2002d: 53020 Zbl 0972.53010.

[15] R. Mazzeo, F. Pacard and D. Pollack,*The conformal theory of Alexandrov embedded constant mean curvature surfaces in* $\mathbb{R}^3$, pp. 525.559 in Global theory of minimal surfaces, edited by D. Hoffman, Clay Mathematics Proceedings 2, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 2005.

[16] R. Mazzeo, D. Pollack and K. Uhlenbeck, *Moduli spaces of singular Yammabe metrics* , J. Amer. Math. **9** (1996) 303-344.

[17] J. Ratzkin, *An ened-to-end gluing construction for surfaces of constant mean curvature*, PHD Thesis, University of Washington (2001).

[18] H. Rosenberg, *Hypersurfaces of constant mean curvature in space forms,* Bull. Sc. math, série 2, 117 (1993), p. 211-239.

[19] H. Wente, *Counterxample to a conjecture of H. Hopf* , Pac. J. Math. **121** (1986), 193-243.

Department of Mathematics, College of Science, King Saud University.

P.O. Box 2455, Riyadh 11451, Saudia Arabia.

E-mail: jleli@ksu.edu.sa

Date received June 5, 2008

المجلة العربية للعلوم الرياضية

مجلة علمية محكمة تصدر نصف سنوياً عن الجمعية السعودية للعلوم الرياضية

بالتعاون مع قسم الرياضيات بجامعة الملك سعود

المجلد الرابع عشر **جمادي الآخرة ١٤٢٩هـ**

العدد الأول **يونيو ٢٠٠٨**

قواعد النشر

١) تعني المجلة العربية للعلوم الرياضية بنشر البحوث الأصيلة في جميع فروع العلوم الرياضية ، بما في ذلك الرياضيات البحته والتطبيقية ، والإحصاء وبحوث العمليات ، والرياضيات الحاسبة. يتكون كل مجلد من عددين تصدر نصف سنوياً.

٢) تخضع جميع الأبحاث التي تقدم إلى المجلة لعملية تحكيم ، ويشترط فيها أنه لم يسبق نشرها أو ليست في طريقها إلى النشر لدى أية جهة أخرى. يقدم المؤلف (المؤلفون) البحث مطبوعاً على هيئة LaTeX format بالشكل المتبع في أي عدد من أعداد المجلة ، ومذيلاً برقم التصنيف في أسفل الصفحة الأولى، ويرسل للمجلة من ثلاث نسخ على العنوان التالي:

رئيس التحرير ـــ المجلة العربية للعلوم الرياضية

قسم الرياضيات بجامعة الملك سعود

ص ب ٢٤٥٥ الرياض ١١٤٥١

المملكة العربية السعودية

E-mail: mguediri@ksu.edu.sa or ourimi@ksu.edu.sa

Website: http://sams.ksu.sa

٣) يعاد البحث بعد قبوله للنشر إلى المؤلف لإجراء التعديلات والتصويبات المطلوبة ، ويفضل أن يصل البحث إلى المجلة في صيغته الأخيرة بواسطة البريد الالكتروني على هيئة LaTeX format.

٤) لا تتقاضى المجلة أي رسوم على نشر البحوث ، وتزود الباحث (الباحثين) بعشرين نسخة من كل بحث منشور.

ARAB JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Volume 14 Number 1 June 2008

ISSN:1319-5166 : ردمد
إيداع: ١٦/٢٩١٢