Reading notes

Linfan

This document contains all notes taken while reading materials (e.g., textbooks, literature) in preparation for the capstone project. Black text are information consolidated from the readings; blue text are notes (proofs, explanations); red text are questions.

Contents

1 Theory of Ordinary Differential Equations (Coddington Levinson) **2**

1.1 Chapter 11: Algebraic properties of linear boundary-value problems on a finite interval 2

1.1.1 Introduction 2

1.1.2 Boundary form formula 5

1.1.3 Homogeneous Boundary-value Problems and Adjoint Problems 10

1.1.4 Nonhomogeneous Boundary-value Problems and Green's Function 17

Todo list

Why the $(-1)^n$? 5

Does this mean that, given a boundary form, its adjoint boundary forms are related to each other by linear transformation? 9

Is the direction correct? e.g., from the existence of J, construct U^+ and U_c^+. 10

Proposition 1.1.18 poses condition on F and invokes the existence of G; what are the objects corresponding to F and G here? 10

U^+ is not uniquely determined by U but by U and U_c. But D^+ is the set of functions x satisfying $U^+x = 0$; if U^+ is not uniquely determined by U, how can D^+ be? 11

Is this understanding correct? 11

Is this by Theorem 1.1.19? But it says adjoint boundary forms are related by multiplication by nonsingular matrices, not that the multiplication of an adjoint boundary form by a nonsingular matrix is still an adjoint boundary form. 13

Given that U^+ is not uniquely determined by U, is the adjoint problem unique? 13

This is the definition of Ux in Remark 1.1.13? 15

By change of basis? 15

This is how I interpreted "uniqueness" in the next line. But why is this a problem / where is the contradiction? 16

How do I know they exist? 16

This is not the same as requiring ψ_j to be solutions to π_{2n-m}, is it? Since there is an extra $U^+\psi_j = 0$ to fulfill? 16

Proposition 1.1.21 requires that $U\varphi_i = 0$ and $U^+\psi_j = 0$; are these conditions fulfilled? 16

Does this mean we don't know $U^+\psi_j = 0$? If so, how could we use Proposition 1.1.21 above? 16

1 Theory of Ordinary Differential Equations (Coddington Levinson)

1.1 Chapter 11: Algebraic properties of linear boundary-value problems on a finite interval

1.1.1 Introduction

Definition 1.1.1. Let L be the **linear differential operator of oder** n **(**$n \geq 1$**)** defined by

$$Lx = p_0 x^{(n)} + p_1 x^{(n-1)} + \cdots + p_{n-1}x' + p_n x$$

where the p_k are complex-valued functions of class C^{n-k} on a closed bounded interval $[a, b]$ (i.e., derivatives $p_k, p_k', \ldots, p_k^{(n-k)}$ exist on $[a, b]$ and are continuous) and $p_0(t) \neq 0$ on $[a, b]$.

Definition 1.1.2. **Homogeneous boundary conditions** refer to a set of equations/constraints of the type

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n} (M_{jk} x^{(k-1)}(a) + N_{jk} x^{(k-1)}(b)) = 0 \quad (j = 1, \ldots, m) \tag{1.1.1}$$

where M_{jk}, N_{jk} are complex constants.

Definition 1.1.3. A **homogeneous boundary-value problem** concerns finding the solutions of

$$Lx = 0$$

on $[a, b]$ which satisfy some homogeneous boundary conditions defined above.

Definition 1.1.4. For any homogeneous boundary value problem, an **adjoint problem** refers to the problem of finding the solutions of

$$L^+ x := (-1)^n (\bar{p}_0 x)^{(n)} + (-1)^{n-1} (\bar{p}_1 x)^{(n-1)} + \cdots + \bar{p}_n x = 0$$

on $[a, b]$ which satisfy some homogeneous boundary conditions "complementary" to the conditions associated with the solutions of $Lx = 0$.

Theorem 1.1.5. *(Green's formula) For $u, v \in C^n$ on $[a, b]$,*

$$\int_{t_1}^{t_2} (Lu)\bar{v}\, dt - \int_{t_1}^{t_2} u(\overline{L^+ v})\, dt = [uv](t_2) - [uv](t_1) \tag{1.1.2}$$

where $a \leq t_1 < t_2 \leq b$ and $[uv](t)$ is the form in $(u, u', \ldots, u^{(n-1)})$ and $(v, v', \ldots, v^{(n-1)})$ given by

$$[uv](t) = \sum_{m=1}^{n} \sum_{j+k=m-1} (-1)^i u^{(k)}(t)(p_{n-m}\bar{v})^{(j)}(t).$$

Remark 1.1.6. Alternatively, $[uv](t)$ can be written as (checked for $n = 2$)

$$[uv](t) = \sum_{j,k=1}^{n} B_{jk}(t) u^{(k-1)}(t) \bar{v}^{(j-1)}(t) \tag{1.1.3}$$

where B_{jk} are the j, k-entry of the $n \times n$ matrix

$$B(t) = \begin{bmatrix} B_{11} & B_{12} & \cdots & \cdots & p_0(t) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \cdots & -p_0(t) & 0 \\ (-1)^{n-1} p_0(t) & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{1.1.4}$$

Since $B(t)$ is square with $\det B(t) = (p_0(t))^n$ where $p_0(t) \neq 0$ on $[a, b]$ (as in the definition of L), $B(t)$ is nonsingular/invertible for $t \in [a, b]$.

Definition 1.1.7. For vectors $f = (f_1, \dots, f_k)$, $g = (g_1, \dots, g_k)$, define the product

$$f \cdot g := \sum_{i=1}^{k} f_i \bar{g}_i.$$

Note that $f \cdot g = g^* f$.

Definition 1.1.8. A **semibilinear form** is a complex-valued function $\mathcal{S}$ defined for pairs of vectors $f = (f_1, \dots, f_k)$, $g = (g_1, \dots, g_k)$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}(\alpha f + \beta g, h) &= \alpha \mathcal{S}(f, h) + \beta \mathcal{S}(g, h) \\ \mathcal{S}(f, \alpha g + \beta h) &= \bar{\alpha} \mathcal{S}(f, g) + \bar{\beta} \mathcal{S}(f, h) \end{aligned}$$

for any complex numbers α, β and vectors f, g, h.

Note that $\mathcal{S}$ is linear in the first argument but not the second one. If $\mathcal{S}$ were bilinear, it would be linear in each argument.

Remark 1.1.9. If

$$S = \begin{bmatrix} s_{11} & \cdots & s_{1k} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ s_{k1} & \cdots & s_{kk} \end{bmatrix},$$

then $Sf \cdot g$ is a semibilinear form

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}(f, g) &:= Sf \cdot g \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} s_{11} & \cdots & s_{1k} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ s_{k1} & \cdots & s_{kk} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} f_1 \\ \vdots \\ f_k \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} g_1 \\ \vdots \\ g_k \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \sum_{j=1}^{k} s_{1j} f_j \\ \vdots \\ \sum_{j=1}^{k} s_{kj} f_j \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} g_1 \\ \vdots \\ g_k \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{k} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{k} s_{ij} f_j \right) \bar{g}_i \\ &= \sum_{i,j=1}^{k} s_{ij} f_i \bar{g}_i. \end{aligned} \tag{1.1.5}$$

Indeed:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}(\alpha f + \beta g, h) &= \sum_{i,j=1}^{k} s_{ij} (\alpha f_j + \beta g_j) \bar{h}_i \\ &= \alpha \sum_{i,j=1}^{k} s_{ij} f_j \bar{h}_i + \beta \sum_{i,j=1}^{k} g_j \bar{h}_i \\ &= \alpha S f \cdot h + \beta S g \cdot h \\ &= \alpha \mathcal{S}(f, h) + \beta \mathcal{S}(g, h). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\mathcal{S}(f, \alpha g + \beta h) = \sum_{i,j=1}^{k} s_{ij} f_j (\alpha g_i \bar{+} \beta h_i)$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \bar{\alpha} \sum_{i,j=1}^{k} s_{ij} f_j \bar{g}_i + \bar{\beta} \sum_{i,j=1}^{k} f_j \bar{h}_i \\
&= \bar{\alpha} S f \cdot g + \bar{\beta} S f \cdot h \\
&= \bar{\alpha} \mathcal{S}(f, g) + \bar{\beta} \mathcal{S}(f, h).
\end{aligned}
$$

Remark 1.1.10. Under a similar matrix framework, we see that $[uv](t)$ is a semibilinear form with matrix $B(t)$:
Let $\vec{u} = (u, u', \ldots, u^{(n-1)})$ and $\vec{v} = (v, v', \ldots, v^{(n-1)})$. Then we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
[uv](t) &= \sum_{j,k=1}^{n} B_{jk}(t) u^{(k-1)}(t) \overline{v}^{(j-1)}(t) \quad \text{(by (1.1.3))} \\
&= \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} (B_{ij} u^{(j-1)} \overline{v}^{(i-1)})(t) \qquad (1.1.6) \\
&= (B\vec{u} \cdot \vec{v})(t) \\
&= \mathcal{S}(\vec{u}, \vec{v})(t).
\end{aligned}
$$

With this notation, we can rewrite the right hand side of Green's formula as a semibilinear form below:

$$
\begin{aligned}
[uv](t_2)-[uv](t_1) &= \sum_{j,k=1}^{n} B_{jk}(t_2)u^{(k-1)}(t_2)\bar{v}^{(j-1)}(t_2) - \sum_{j,k=1}^{n} B_{jk}(t_2)u^{(k-1)}(t_1)\bar{v}^{(j-1)}(t_1)\\
&= B(t_2)\vec{u}(t_2)\cdot\vec{v}(t_2) - B(t_1)\vec{u}(t_1)\cdot\vec{v}(t_1)\\
&= \begin{bmatrix} B_{11}(t_2) & \cdots & B_{1n}(t_2)\\ \vdots & & \vdots\\ B_{n1}(t_2) & \dots & B_{nn}(t_2)\end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} u(t_2)\\ \vdots\\ u^{(n-1)}(t_2)\end{bmatrix}\cdot\begin{bmatrix} \bar{v}(t_2)\\ \vdots\\ \bar{v}^{(n-1)}(t_2)\end{bmatrix} -\\
&\quad \begin{bmatrix} B_{11}(t_1) & \cdots & B_{1n}(t_1)\\ \vdots & & \vdots\\ B_{n1}(t_1) & \dots & B_{nn}(t_1)\end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} u(t_1)\\ \vdots\\ u^{(n-1)}(t_1)\end{bmatrix}\cdot\begin{bmatrix} \bar{v}(t_1)\\ \vdots\\ \bar{v}^{(n-1)}(t_1)\end{bmatrix}\\
&= \begin{bmatrix} -B_{11}(t_1) & \cdots & -B_{1n}(t_1)\\ \vdots & & \vdots\\ -B_{n1}(t_1) & \dots & -B_{nn}(t_1)\end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} u(t_1)\\ \vdots\\ u^{(n-1)}(t_1)\end{bmatrix}\cdot\begin{bmatrix} \bar{v}(t_1)\\ \vdots\\ \bar{v}^{(n-1)}(t_1)\end{bmatrix} +\\
&\quad \begin{bmatrix} B_{11}(t_2) & \cdots & B_{1n}(t_2)\\ \vdots & & \vdots\\ B_{n1}(t_2) & \dots & B_{nn}(t_2)\end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} u(t_2)\\ \vdots\\ u^{(n-1)}(t_2)\end{bmatrix}\cdot\begin{bmatrix} \bar{v}(t_2)\\ \vdots\\ \bar{v}^{(n-1)}(t_2)\end{bmatrix}\\
&= \begin{bmatrix} -B_{11}(t_1) & \cdots & -B_{1n}(t_1) & 0 & \cdots & 0\\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots\\ -B_{n1}(t_1) & \cdots & -B_{nn}(t_1) & 0 & \cdots & 0\\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & B_{11}(t_2) & \cdots & B_{1n}(t_2)\\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots\\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & B_{n1}(t_2) & \cdots & B_{nn}(t_2)\end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} u(t_1)\\ \vdots\\ u^{(n-1)}(t_1)\\ u(t_2)\\ \vdots\\ u^{(n-1)}(t_2)\end{bmatrix}\cdot\begin{bmatrix} \bar{v}(t_1)\\ \vdots\\ \bar{v}^{(n-1)}(t_1)\\ \bar{v}(t_2)\\ \vdots\\ \bar{v}^{(n-1)}(t_2)\end{bmatrix}\\
&= \begin{bmatrix} -B(t_1) & 0_n\\ 0_n & B(t_2)\end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} u(t_1)\\ \vdots\\ u^{(n-1)}(t_1)\\ u(t_2)\\ \vdots\\ u^{(n-1)}(t_2)\end{bmatrix}\cdot\begin{bmatrix} \bar{v}(t_1)\\ \vdots\\ \bar{v}^{(n-1)}(t_1)\\ \bar{v}(t_2)\\ \vdots\\ \bar{v}^{(n-1)}(t_2)\end{bmatrix}\\
&=: \hat{B}\begin{bmatrix}\vec{u}(t_1)\\ \vec{u}(t_2)\end{bmatrix}\cdot\begin{bmatrix}\vec{v}(t_1)\\ \vec{v}(t_2)\end{bmatrix}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{1.1.7}
$$

Since $\det\hat{B} = (-1)^n \det B(t_1)\det B(t_2)$, $\hat{B}$ is nonsingular for $t_1, t_2 \in [a,b]$ (since $B(t)$ is nonsingular for $t\in[a,b]$, as shown before).

Why the $(-1)^n$?

1.1.2 Boundary form formula

Definition 1.1.11. Given any set of $2mn$ complex constants M_{ij}, N_{ij} $(i=1,\dots,m;\ j=1,\dots,n)$, define m **boundary operators (boundary forms)** $U_1,\dots,U_m$ for functions x on $[a,b]$, for which $x^{(j)}$ $(j=1,\dots,n-1)$ exists at a and b, by

$$U_i x = \sum_{j=1}^{n}(M_{ij}x^{(j-1)}(a) + N_{ij}x^{(j-1)}(b)) \quad (i=1,\dots,m) \tag{1.1.8}$$

U_i are **linearly independent** if the only set of complex constants $c_1, \dots, c_m$ for which

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} c_i U_i x = 0$$

for all $x \in C^{n-1}$ on $[a,b]$ is $c_1 = c_2 = \cdots = c_m = 0$.

Remark 1.1.12. Note that for $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$ and $x_1, x_2 \in C^{n-1}$ on $[a,b]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
U_i(\alpha x_1 + \beta x_2) &= \sum_{j=1}^{n} (M_{ij}(\alpha x_1 + \beta x_2)^{(j-1)}(a) + N_{ij}(\alpha x_1 + \beta x_2)^{(j-1)}(b)) \\
&= \alpha \sum_{j=1}^{n} (M_{ij} x_1^{(j-1)}(a) + N_{ij} x_1^{(j-1)}(b)) + \beta \sum_{j=1}^{n} (M_{ij} x_2^{(j-1)}(a) + N_{ij} x_2^{(j-1)}(b)) \quad \text{(by linearity of derivatives)} \\
&= \alpha U_i x_1 + \beta U_i x_2.
\end{aligned}$$

So U_i are linear operators.

Remark 1.1.13. To describe (1.1.8) with matrices, define

$$\xi := \begin{bmatrix} x \\ x' \\ \vdots \\ x^{(n-1)} \end{bmatrix}; \quad U := \begin{bmatrix} U_1 \\ U_2 \\ \vdots \\ U_m \end{bmatrix}; \quad M := \begin{bmatrix} M_{11} & \cdots & M_{1n} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ M_{m1} & \cdots & M_{mn} \end{bmatrix}; \quad N := \begin{bmatrix} N_{11} & \cdots & N_{1n} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ N_{m1} & \cdots & N_{mn} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then (1.1.8) can be written as

$$Ux = M\xi(a) + N\xi(b).$$

Indeed:

$$\begin{aligned}
M\xi(a) + N\xi(b) &= \begin{bmatrix} M_{11} & \cdots & M_{1n} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ M_{m1} & \cdots & M_{mn} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x(a) \\ x'(a) \\ \vdots \\ x^{(n-1)}(a) \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} N_{11} & \cdots & N_{1n} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ N_{m1} & \cdots & N_{mn} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x(b) \\ x'(b) \\ \vdots \\ x^{(n-1)}(b) \end{bmatrix} \\
&= \begin{bmatrix} \sum_{j=1}^{n} M_{1j} x^{(j-1)}(a) \\ \vdots \\ \sum_{j=1}^{n} M_{mj} x^{(j-1)}(a) \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \sum_{j=1}^{n} N_{1j} x^{(j-1)}(b) \\ \vdots \\ \sum_{j=1}^{n} N_{mj} x^{(j-1)}(b) \end{bmatrix} \\
&= \begin{bmatrix} \sum_{j=1}^{n} (M_{1j} x^{(j-1)}(a) + N_{1j} x^{(j-1)}(b)) \\ \vdots \\ \sum_{j=1}^{n} (M_{mj} x^{(j-1)}(a) + N_{mj} x^{(j-1)}(b)) \end{bmatrix} \\
&= \begin{bmatrix} U_1 x \\ \vdots \\ U_m x \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} U_1 \\ U_2 \\ \vdots \\ U_m \end{bmatrix} x = Ux.
\end{aligned}$$

Define the $m \times 2n$ matrix

$$(M : N) := \begin{bmatrix} M_{11} & \cdots & M_{1n} & N_{11} & \cdots & N_{1n} \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ M_{m1} & \cdots & M_{mn} & N_{m1} & \cdots & N_{mn} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then $U_1, \dots, U_m$ are linearly independent if and only if $\text{rank}(M : N) = m$, or equivalently, $\text{rank}(U) = m$. Recall that the rank of a matrix is the largest number of linearly independent rows or columns in it. For a matrix $A_{m\times n}$, $\text{rank}(A) \leq \min\{m, n\}$ and $\text{rank}(A) = \text{rank}(A^T)$.

Ux can be written as

$$
\begin{aligned}
Ux &= \begin{bmatrix} \sum_{j=1}^{n}(M_{1j}x^{(j-1)}(a) + N_{1j}x^{(j-1)}(b)) \\ \vdots \\ \sum_{j=1}^{n}(M_{mj}x^{(j-1)}(a) + N_{mj}x^{(j-1)}(b)) \end{bmatrix} \\
&= \begin{bmatrix} M_{11} & \cdots & M_{1n} & N_{11} & \cdots & N_{1n} \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ M_{m1} & \cdots & M_{mn} & N_{m1} & \cdots & N_{mn} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x(a) \\ \vdots \\ x^{(n-1)}(a) \\ x(b) \\ \vdots \\ x^{(n-1)}(b) \end{bmatrix} \\
&= (M : N) \begin{bmatrix} \xi(a) \\ \xi(b) \end{bmatrix}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Definition 1.1.14. If $U = (U_1, \dots, U_m)$ is any boundary form with $\text{rank}(U) = m$ and $U_c = (U_{m+1}, \dots, U_{2n})$ any form with $\text{rank}(U_c) = 2n - m$ such that $(U_1, \dots, U_{2n})$ has rank $2n$, then U and U_c are **complementary boundary forms**. "Adjoining" $U_{m+1}, \dots, U_{2n}$ to $U_1, \dots, U_m$ is equivalent to imbedding the matrix $(M : N)$ in a $2n \times 2n$ nonsingular matrix (recall that for square matrices, nonsingular $\iff$ full rank).

We wish to describe the right hand side of Green's formula (1.1.2) as a linear combination of a boundary form U and a complementary form U_c. To do so, we consider the following results about the semibilinear form (1.1.5).

Definition 1.1.15. For a matrix $A = (a_{ij})$, its **adjoint** is defined as the conjugate transpose $A^* = (\bar{a}_{ij})$.

Proposition 1.1.16. *In the context of the semibilinear form* (1.1.5)*, we have*

$$Sf \cdot g = f \cdot S^* g. \tag{1.1.9}$$

Proof.

$$
\begin{aligned}
Sf \cdot g &= \sum_{i,j=1}^{k} s_{ij} f_j \bar{g}_i \quad \text{(by (1.1.5))}; \\
f \cdot S^* g &= \begin{bmatrix} f_1 \\ \vdots \\ f_k \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} \bar{s}_{11} & \cdots & \bar{s}_{k1} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ \bar{s}_{1k} & \cdots & \bar{s}_{kk} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} g_1 \\ \vdots \\ g_k \end{bmatrix} \\
&= \begin{bmatrix} f_1 \\ \vdots \\ f_k \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} \sum_{j=1}^{k} \bar{s}_{j1} g_j \\ \vdots \\ \sum_{j=1}^{k} \bar{s}_{jk} g_j \end{bmatrix} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{k} f_i \cdot \overline{\left(\sum_{j=1}^{k} \bar{s}_{ji} g_j \right)}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{k} f_i \cdot \left(\sum_{j=1}^{k} s_{ji} \bar{g}_j \right)$$
$$= \sum_{i,j=1}^{k} s_{ji} f_i \bar{g}_j = Sf \cdot g.$$

$\square$

Proposition 1.1.17. *Let $\mathcal{S}$ be the semibilinear form associated with a nonsingular matrix S. Suppose $\bar{f} := Ff$ where F is a nonsingular matrix. Then there exists a unique nonsingular matrix G such that if $\bar{g} = Gg$, then $\mathcal{S}(f, g) = \bar{f} \cdot \bar{g}$ for all f, g.*

Proof. Let $G := (SF^{-1})^*$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{S}(f, g) &= Sf \cdot g \\
&= S(F^{-1}F)f \cdot g \\
&= SF^{-1}(Ff) \cdot g \\
&= SF^{-1}\bar{f} \cdot g \\
&= \bar{f} \cdot (SF^{-1})^* g \quad \text{(by (1.1.9))} \\
&= \bar{f} \cdot G * g \\
&= \bar{f} \cdot \bar{g}.
\end{aligned}$$

To see that G is nonsingular, note that $\det G = \det((\overline{SF^{-1}})^T) = \det(\overline{SF^{-1}}) = \overline{\det(SF^{-1})} = \overline{\det(S)\det(F)^{-1}} \neq 0$ since S, F are nonsingular. $\square$

Proposition 1.1.18. *Suppose $\mathcal{S}$ is associated with the unit matrix E, i.e., $\mathcal{S}(f, g) = f \cdot g$. Let F be a nonsingular matrix such that the first j $(1 \leq j < k)$ components of $\bar{f} = Ff$ are the same as those of f. Then the unique nonsingular matrix G such that $\bar{g} = Gg$ and $\bar{f} \cdot \bar{g} = f \cdot g$ (as in Proposition 1.1.17) is such that the last $k - j$ components of $\bar{g}$ are linear combinations of the last $k - j$ components of g with nonsingular coefficient matrix.*

Proof. We note that for the condition on F to hold, F must have the form

$$\begin{bmatrix} E_j & 0_+ \\ F_+ & F_{k-j} \end{bmatrix}_{k \times k}$$

where E_j is the $j \times j$ identity matrix, 0_+ is the $j \times (k - j)$ zero matrix, F_+ is a $(k - j) \times j$ matrix, and F_{k-j} a $(k - j) \times (k - j)$ matrix. Let G be the unique nonsingular matrix in Proposition 1.1.17. Write G as

$$\begin{bmatrix} G_j & G_- \\ G_= & G_{k-j} \end{bmatrix}_{k \times k}$$

where $G_j, G_-, G_=, G_{k-j}$ are $j \times j, j \times (k-j), (k-j) \times j, (k-j) \times (k-j)$ matrices, respectively. By the definition of G,

$$f \cdot g = Ff \cdot Gg = \bar{f} \cdot Gg = G^* \bar{f} \cdot g = G^* Ff \cdot g,$$

(where the third equality follows from a reverse application of (1.1.9) with $\bar{f}$ as f, G^* as S) which implies

$$G^* F = E_k.$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} G^*F &= \begin{bmatrix} G_j^* & G_=^* \\ G_-^* & G_{k-j}^* \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} E_j & 0_+ \\ F_+ & F_{k-j} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} G_j^* + G_=^* F_+ & G_=^* F_{k-j} \\ G_-^* + G_{k-j}^* F_+ & G_{k-j}^* F_{k-j} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} E_j & 0_{j\times(k-j)} \\ 0_{(k-j)\times j} & E_{k-j} \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $G_=^* F_{k-j} = 0_+$, the $j \times (k-j)$ zero matrix. But $\det F = \det(E_j) \cdot \det(F_{k-j}) \neq 0$, so $\det F_{k-j} \neq 0$ and we must have $G_=^* = 0_+$, i.e., $G_= = 0_{(k-j)\times j}$. Thus, G is upper-triangular, and so $\det G = \det G_j \cdot \det G_{k-j} \neq 0$, which implies $\det G_{k-j} \neq 0$ and G_{k-j} is nonsingular. Hence,

$$\bar{g} = Gg = \begin{bmatrix} G_j & G_- \\ 0_{(k-j)\times j} & G_{k-j} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} g_1 \\ \vdots \\ g_k \end{bmatrix}$$

where G_{k-j} is the nonsingular coefficient matrix such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} \bar{g}_{j-1} \\ \vdots \\ \bar{g}_k \end{bmatrix} = G_{k-j} \begin{bmatrix} g_{j-1} \\ \vdots \\ g_k \end{bmatrix}.$$

□

Theorem 1.1.19. *(Boundary-form formula) Given any boundary form U of rank m (Definition 1.1.11), and any complementary form U_c (Definition 1.1.14), there exist unique boundary forms U_c^+, U^+ of rank m and $2n-m$, respectively, such that*

$$[xy](b) - [xy](a) = Ux \cdot U_c^+ y + U_{cx} \cdot U^+ y. \tag{1.1.10}$$

If $\tilde{U}_c$ is any other complementary form to U, and $\tilde{U}_c^+, \tilde{U}^+$ the corresponding forms of rank m and $2n-m$, then

$$\tilde{U}^+ y = C^* U^+ y$$

for some nonsingular matrix C.

Does this mean that, given a boundary form, its adjoint boundary forms are related to each other by linear transformation?

Proof. Recall from (1.1.7) that the left hand side of (1.1.10) can be considered as a semibilinear form $\mathcal{S}(f, g) = \hat{B}f \cdot g$ for vectors

$$f = \begin{bmatrix} x(a) \\ \vdots \\ x^{(n-1)}(a) \\ x(b) \\ \vdots \\ x^{(n-1)}(b) \end{bmatrix}, \quad g = \begin{bmatrix} y(a) \\ \vdots \\ y^{(n-1)}(a) \\ y(b) \\ \vdots \\ y^{(n-1)}(b) \end{bmatrix}$$

with the nonsingular matrix

$$\hat{B} = \begin{bmatrix} -B(a) & 0_n \\ 0_n & B(b) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Recall from Remark 1.1.13 that

$$Ux = M\xi(a) + N\xi(b) = (M : N)\begin{bmatrix}\xi(a)\\ \xi(b)\end{bmatrix}$$

for M, N, ξ are as defined there. With the definition of f, we have $f = \begin{bmatrix}\xi(a)\\ \xi(b)\end{bmatrix}$ and thus

$$Ux = (M : N)f.$$

By Definition 1.1.14, $U_c x = (\tilde{M} : \tilde{N})f$ for two appropriate matrices $\tilde{M}, \tilde{N}$ for which

$$H = \begin{bmatrix}M & N\\ \tilde{M} & \tilde{N}\end{bmatrix}_{2n\times 2n}$$

has rank $2n$. Thus,

$$\begin{bmatrix}Ux\\ U_c x\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}(M : N)f\\ (\tilde{M} : \tilde{N})f\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}M & N\\ \tilde{M} & \tilde{N}\end{bmatrix} f = Hf.$$

By Proposition 1.1.17, there exists a unique $2n \times 2n$ nonsingular matrix J such that $\mathcal{S}(f, g) = Hf \cdot Jg$. Let U^+, U_c^+ be such that

Is the direction correct? e.g., from the existence of J, construct U^+ and U_c^+.

$$Jg = \begin{bmatrix}U_c^+ y\\ U^+ y\end{bmatrix},$$

then (1.1.10) holds since

$$[xy](b) - [xy](a) = \mathcal{S}(f, g) = Hf \cdot Jg = \begin{bmatrix}Ux\\ U_c x\end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix}U_c^+ y\\ U^+ y\end{bmatrix} = Ux \cdot U_c^+ y + U_c x \cdot U^+ y.$$

The second statement in the theorem follows from Proposition 1.1.18 with Hf and Jg corresponding to f and g

Proposition 1.1.18 poses condition on F and invokes the existence of G; what are the objects corresponding to F and G here?

. □

1.1.3 Homogeneous Boundary-value Problems and Adjoint Problems

Definition 1.1.20. For any boundary form U of rank m there is associated the **homogeneous boundary condition**

$$Ux = 0 \tag{1.1.11}$$

for functions $x \in C^{n-1}$ on $[a, b]$. If U^+ is any boundary form of rank $2n - m$ determined as in Theorem 1.1.19, then the homogeneous boundary condition

$$U^+ x = 0 \tag{1.1.12}$$

is an **adjoint boundary condition** to 1.1.11.

Proposition 1.1.21. *By Green's formula* (1.1.2) *and the boundary-form formula* (1.1.10)*, for* $(u, v) := \int_a^b u\bar{v}\, dt$*,*

$$(Lu, v) = (u, L^+ v)$$

for all $u \in C^n$ *on* $[a, b]$ *satisfying* (1.1.11) *and all* $v \in C^n$ *on* $[a, b]$ *satisfying* (1.1.12).

Proof.

$$
\begin{aligned}
(Lu, v) - (u, L^+ v) &= \int_a^b Lu\bar{v}\,dt - \int_a^b u(\overline{L^+ v})\,dt \\
&= [uv](a) - [uv](b) \quad \text{(by Green's formula (1.1.2))} \\
&= Uu \cdot U_c^+ v + U_c u \cdot U^+ v \quad \text{(by boundary-form formula (1.1.10))} \\
&= 0 \cdot U_c^+ v + U_c u \cdot 0 \quad \text{(by (1.1.11) and (1.1.12))} \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{1.1.13}
$$

□

Remark 1.1.22. Let D, D^+ be the set of functions $u \in C^n$ satisfying (1.1.11) and (1.1.12), respectively. Then Theorem 1.1.19 shows that D^+ is uniquely determined by U, although U^+ is not (because U^+ is uniquely determined by U and U_c?).

U^+ is not uniquely determined by U but by U and U_c. But D^+ is the set of functions x satisfying $U^+x = 0$; if U^+ is not uniquely determined by U, how can D^+ be?

Just like how U is associated with two $m \times n$ matrices M, N (Remark 1.1.13), U^+ is associated with two $n \times (2n - m)$ matrices P, Q such that $(P^* : Q^*)$ has rank $2n - m$ and

$$U^+ x = P^* \xi(a) + Q^* \xi(b) \tag{1.1.14}$$

Note that imbedding M, N, P^*, Q^* in the same matrix gives

$$\begin{bmatrix} (M : N)_{m \times 2n} \\ (P^* : Q^*)_{(2n-m) \times 2n} \end{bmatrix}_{2n \times 2n} = \begin{bmatrix} M & N \\ P^* & Q^* \end{bmatrix}$$

is an $2n \times 2n$ matrix of full rank.

We want to characterize the adjoint condition (1.1.12) in terms of the matrices M, N, P, Q.

Theorem 1.1.23. *The boundary condition $U^+x = 0$ is adjoint to $Ux = 0$ if and only if*

$$MB^{-1}(a)P = NB^{-1}(b)Q \tag{1.1.15}$$

where $B(t)$ is the $n \times n$ matrix associated with the form $[xy](t)$ ((1.1.4)).

Proof. Let $\eta := (y, y', \ldots, y^{(n-1)})$, then $[xy](t) = B(t)\xi(t) \cdot \eta(t)$ by (1.1.6).

Suppose $U^+x = 0$ is adjoint to $Ux = 0$. By definition of adjoint boundary condition 1.1.12, U^+ is determined as in Theorem 1.1.19. But by Theorem 1.1.19, in determining U^+, there exist boundary forms U_c, U_c^+ of rank $2n - m$ and m, respectively, such that 1.1.10 holds.

Put

$$
\begin{aligned}
U_c x &= M_c \xi(a) + N_c \xi(b) \quad && \operatorname{rank}(M_c : N_c) = 2n - m \\
U_c^+ y &= P_c^* \eta(a) + Q_c^* \eta(b) \quad && \operatorname{rank}(P_c^* : Q_c^*) = m.
\end{aligned}
$$

Then by the boundary-form formula,

$$B(b)\xi(b) \cdot \eta(b) - B(a)\xi(a) \cdot \eta(a) = (M\xi(a) + N\xi(b)) \cdot (P_c^* \eta(a) + Q_c^* \eta(b)) + (M_c \xi(a) + N_c \xi(b)) \cdot (P^* \eta(a) + Q^* \eta(b)).$$

But M is $m \times n$ and P_c^* is $m \times n$ (P_c is $n \times m$), so considering the matrices' dimensions, the above should be written as

Is this understandin correct?

$$B(b)\xi(b) \cdot \eta(b) - B(a)\xi(a) \cdot \eta(a) = (P_c M + P M_c)\xi(a) \cdot \eta(a) + (Q_c M + Q M_c)\xi(a) \cdot \eta(b)$$

$$(P_cN + PN_c)\xi(b)\cdot\eta(a) + (Q_cN + QN_c)\xi(b)\cdot\eta(b).$$

Thus, we have

$$P_cM + PM_c = -B(a) \qquad P_cN + PN_c = 0_n$$
$$Q_cM + QM_c = 0_n \qquad Q_cN + QN_c = B(b).$$

Since $\det B(t) \neq 0$ on $t \in [a,b]$, $B^{-1}(a)$, $B^{-1}(b)$ exist, and thus

$$\begin{bmatrix} -B^{-1}(a)P_c & -B^{-1}(a)P \\ B^{-1}(b)Q_c & B^{-1}(b)Q \end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} M & N \\ M_c & N_c \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} E_n & 0_n \\ 0_n & E_n \end{bmatrix}.$$

Recall that $\begin{bmatrix} M & N \\ M_c & N_c \end{bmatrix}$ has full rank, which means that it is nonsingular (Definition 1.1.14). Thus, the two matrices on the left are inverses of each other. So we also have

$$\begin{bmatrix} M & N \\ M_c & N_c \end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} -B^{-1}(a)P_c & -B^{-1}(a)P \\ B^{-1}(b)Q_c & B^{-1}(b)Q \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} E_m & 0_+ \\ 0_- & E_{2n-m} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Therefore,

$$-MB^{-1}(a)P + NB^{-1}(b)Q = 0_+,$$

which is (1.1.15).

Conversely, let U_1^+ is a boundary form of rank $2n-m$ such that

$$U_1^+y = P_1^*\eta(a) + Q_1^*\eta(b)$$

for appropriate P_1^*, Q_1^* with $\operatorname{rank}(P_1^* : Q_1^*) = 2n-m$. Suppose

$$MB^{-1}(a)P_1 = NB^{-1}(b)Q_1 \tag{1.1.16}$$

holds.

Recall that dim(solution space) + rank(matrix) = # of unknown variables. Let u be a $2n \times 1$ vector, then there exist exactly $2n-m$ linearly independent $2n \times 1$ vector solutions of the linear system $(M : N)_{m\times 2n}u = 0$. By (1.1.16),

$$MB^{-1}(a)P_1 - NB^{-1}(b)Q = 0,$$

and thus

$$(M : N)_{m\times 2n}\begin{bmatrix} B^{-1}(a)P_1 \\ -B^{-1}(b)Q_1 \end{bmatrix}_{2n\times(2n-m)} = 0_{m\times(2n-m)}.$$

So the $2n-m$ columns of the matrix

$$H_1 := \begin{bmatrix} B^{-1}(a)P_1 \\ -B^{-1}(b)Q_1 \end{bmatrix}$$

are solutions of this system. Since $\operatorname{rank}(P_1^* : Q_1^*) = 2n-m$,

$$\operatorname{rank}\begin{bmatrix} P_1 \\ Q_1 \end{bmatrix} = 2n-m.$$

Since $B(a)$, $B(b)$ are nonsingular, $\operatorname{rank}(H_1) = 2n-m$.

If $U^+x = P^*\xi(a) + Q^*\xi(b) = 0$ is a boundary condition adjoint to $Ux = 0$, then the matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} -B^{-1}(a)P_c & -B^{-1}(a)P \\ B^{-1}(b)Q_c & B^{-1}(b)Q \end{bmatrix}_{2n\times 2n}$$

is nonsingular (because it has inverse $\begin{bmatrix} M & N \\ M_c & N_c \end{bmatrix}$), i.e., it has full rank. Thus, if

$$H = \begin{bmatrix} -B^{-1}(a)P \\ B^{-1}(b)Q \end{bmatrix}_{n\times(2n-m)},$$

then $\operatorname{rank}(H) = 2n-m$. Therefore, by (1.1.15), the $2n-m$ columns of H also form $2n = m$ linearly independent solutions of $(M : N)u = 0$, as in the case of H_1. Hence, there exists a nonsingular $(2n-m)\times(2n-m)$ matrix A such that $H_1 = HA$ (change of basis in the solution space). Thus we have

$$\begin{bmatrix} B^{-1}(a)P_1 \\ -B^{-1}(b)Q_1 \end{bmatrix} = H_1 = HA = \begin{bmatrix} B^{-1}(a)PA \\ -B^{-1}(b)QA \end{bmatrix},$$

or $P_1 = PA$, $Q_1 = QA$. Thus,

$$U_1^+y = P_1^*\eta(a) + Q_1^*\eta(b) = A^*P^*\eta(a) + A^*Q^*\eta(b) = A^*U^+y.$$

This implies that $U_1^+y = 0$ is an adjoint boundary condition to $Ux = 0$.

Is this by Theorem 1.1.19? But it says adjoint boundary forms are related by multiplication by nonsingular matrices, not that the multiplication of an adjoint boundary form by a nonsingular matrix is still an adjoint boundary form.

□

Definition 1.1.24. If U is a boundary form of rank m, the problem of finding solutions of

$$\pi_m : Lx = 0 \quad Ux = 0$$

on $[a, b]$ is a **homogeneous boundary-value problem of rank** m. The problem

$$\pi^+_{2n-m} : L^+x = 0 \quad U^+x = 0$$

on $[a, b]$ is the **adjoint boundary-value problem to** π_m.

Given that U^+ is not uniquely determined by U, is the adjoint problem unique?

In fact, π_m and π^+_{2n-m} are adjoint problems to each other. The zero function on $[a, b]$ is a solution to both π_m and π^+_{2n-m}, known as the **trivial solution**.

Theorem 1.1.25. *If $m = n$, the boundary condition $Ux = 0$ is adjoint to itself if and only if*

$$MB^{-1}(a)M^* = NB^{-1}(b)N^*.$$

Proof. Replace P, Q with M, N in Theorem 1.1.23. □

Theorem 1.1.26. *If $Ux = 0$ is self-adjoint and $L^+ = L$, the boundary-value problem π_m is self-adjoint, i.e., if $u, v \in C^n$ on $[a, b]$ and satisfy $Ux = 0$, then*

$$(Lu, v) = (u, Lv).$$

Proof. The equation follows as a special case of Proposition 1.1.21. □

Definition 1.1.27. Let $\varphi_1, \ldots, \varphi_n$ be a fundamental set (basis of the solution space to $Lx = 0$). Let Φ denote the nonsingular matrix

$$\Phi := \begin{bmatrix} \varphi_1 & \cdots & \varphi_n \\ \varphi_1' & \cdots & \varphi_n' \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ \varphi_1^{(n-1)} & \vdots & \varphi_n^{(n-1)} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then Φ is a **fundamental matrix associated with** $Lx = 0$. Similarly, if $\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n$ is a fundamental set fo $L^+x = 0$, then the corresponding fundamental matrix is

$$\Psi := \begin{bmatrix} \psi_1 & \cdots & \psi_n \\ \psi_1' & \cdots & \psi_n' \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ \psi_1^{(n-1)} & \vdots & \psi_n^{(n-1)} \end{bmatrix}.$$

The meanings of U, U^+ can be extended from vectors (Remark 1.1.13) to matrices as follows:

$$U\Phi := M\Phi(a) + N\Phi(b)$$
$$U^+\Psi := P^*\Psi(a) + Q^*\Psi(b).$$

Remark 1.1.28. We note that

$$\begin{aligned} U\Phi &= M\Phi(a) + N\Phi(b) \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} M_{11} & \cdots & M_{1n} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ M_{m1} & \cdots & M_{mn} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \varphi_1(a) & \cdots & \varphi_n(a) \\ \varphi_1'(a) & \cdots & \varphi_n'(a) \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ \varphi_1^{(n-1)}(a) & \vdots & \varphi_n^{(n-1)}(a) \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} N_{11} & \cdots & N_{1n} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ N_{m1} & \cdots & N_{mn} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \varphi_1(b) & \cdots & \varphi_n(b) \\ \varphi_1'(b) & \cdots & \varphi_n'(b) \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ \varphi_1^{(n-1)}(b) & \vdots & \varphi_n^{(n-1)}(b) \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \sum_{j=1}^n M_{1j}\varphi_1^{(j-1)}(a) & \cdots & \sum_{j=1}^n M_{1j}\varphi_n^{(j-1)}(a) \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ \sum_{j=1}^n M_{mj}\varphi_1^{(j-1)}(a) & \cdots & \sum_{j=1}^n M_{mj}\varphi_n^{(j-1)}(a) \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \sum_{j=1}^n N_{1j}\varphi_1^{(j-1)}(b) & \cdots & \sum_{j=1}^n N_{1j}\varphi_n^{(j-1)}(b) \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ \sum_{j=1}^n N_{mj}\varphi_1^{(j-1)}(b) & \cdots & \sum_{j=1}^n N_{mj}\varphi_n^{(j-1)}(b) \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \sum_{j=1}^n (M_{1j}\varphi_1^{(j-1)}(a) + N_{1j}\varphi_1^{(j-1)}(b)) & \cdots & (\sum_{j=1}^n M_{1j}\varphi_n^{(j-1)}(a) + N_{1j}\varphi_n^{(j-1)}(b)) \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ \sum_{j=1}^n (M_{mj}\varphi_1^{(j-1)}(a) + N_{mj}\varphi_1^{(j-1)}(b)) & \cdots & (\sum_{j=1}^n M_{mj}\varphi_n^{(j-1)}(a) + N_{mj}\varphi_n^{(j-1)}(b)) \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} U_1\varphi_1 & \cdots & U_1\varphi_n \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ U_m\varphi_1 & \cdots & U_m\varphi_n \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 1.1.29. *The problem π_m has exactly k $(0 \leq k \leq n)$ linearly independent solutions if and only if $U\Phi$ has rank $n - k$, where Φ is any fundamental matrix associated with $Lx = 0$.*

Proof. A function φ satisfies $Lx = 0$ if and only if the corresponding vector $\vec{\varphi} = (\varphi, \varphi', \ldots, \varphi^{(n-1)})$ is of the form $\vec{\varphi} = \Phi\vec{c}$, where $\vec{c} = (c_1, \ldots, c_n)$ is a constant vector.

Indeed: Suppose φ is a solution to $Lx = 0$. Then by definition of fundamental set $\varphi_1, \ldots, \varphi_n$, $\varphi = c_1\varphi_1 +$

$\cdots + c_n\varphi_n$ for some $c_1, \dots, c_n \in \mathbb{C}$. By linearity of derivatives, $\varphi^{(j)} = c_1\varphi_1^{(j)} + \cdots + c_n\varphi_n^{(j)}$. Thus,

$$\vec{\varphi} = \begin{bmatrix} \varphi \\ \varphi' \\ \vdots \\ \varphi^{(n-1)} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} c_1\varphi_1 + \cdots + v_n\varphi_n \\ c_1\varphi_1' + \cdots + v_n\varphi_n' \\ \vdots \\ c_1\varphi_1^{(n-1)} + \cdots + v_n\varphi_n^{(n-1)} \end{bmatrix}$$
$$= \begin{bmatrix} \varphi_1 & \cdots & \varphi_n \\ \varphi_1' & \cdots & \varphi_n' \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ \varphi_1^{(n-1)} & \cdots & \varphi_n^{(n-1)} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} c_1 \\ \vdots \\ c_n \end{bmatrix} = \Phi\vec{c}.$$

Thus, $U\varphi = 0$

This is the definition of Ux in Remark 1.1.13?

if and only if

$$U(\Phi c) = (U\Phi)c = 0.$$

Since dim(solution space)+rank(matrix) = # of unknown variables, the number of linearly independent vectors $\vec{c}$ satisfying $(U\Phi)c = 0$ is $n - \text{rank}(U\Phi)$. Thus, the number of solutions φ to $Lx = 0$ is $n - \text{rank}(U\Phi)$.

If Φ_1 is any other fundamental matrix associated with $Lx = 0$, then $\Phi_1 = \Phi C$, where C is a nonsingular constant matrix. Therefore

By change of basis?

$$\text{rank}(U\Phi_1) = \text{rank}(U\Phi).$$

□

Theorem 1.1.30. *If π_m has exactly k linearly independent solutions, then π_{2n-m}^+ has exactly $k+m-n$ linearly independent solutions.*

Proof. Let $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_k$ be k linearly independent solutions of π_m. Suppose U_c where

$$U_c x = M_c\xi(a) + N_c\xi(b)$$

is a boundary form of rank $2n - m$ complementary to U. We show that the vectors $U_c\varphi_i$ $(i = 1, \dots, k)$ are linearly independent. Suppose not, then for some constants $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k \in \mathbb{C}$ not all zero,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} \alpha_i U_c \varphi_i = 0,$$

which implies

$$U_c\left(\sum_{i=1}^{k} \alpha_i \varphi_i\right) = 0.$$

But since each φ_i is a solution to π_m, they each satisfy $Ux = 0$. Thus,

$$U\left(\sum_{i=1}^{k} \alpha_i \varphi_i\right) = 0.$$

Let $\bar{\varphi} = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \alpha_i\varphi_i$. Let $\bar{\xi} = (\bar{\varphi}, \bar{\varphi}', \dots, \bar{\varphi}^{(n-1)})$. Then by Remark 1.1.13, the above equations imply

$$M\bar{\xi}(a) + N\bar{\xi}(b) = U\bar{\xi} = 0$$
$$M_c\bar{\xi}(a) + N_c\bar{\xi}(b) = U_c\bar{\xi} = 0.$$

Or

$$\begin{bmatrix} M & N \\ M_c & N_c \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\xi}(a) \\ \bar{\xi}(b) \end{bmatrix} = 0_{2n\times 1}.$$

But rank $\begin{bmatrix} M & N \\ M_c & N_c \end{bmatrix} = 2n$, which implies it is nonsingular. Thus $\bar{\xi}(a) = \bar{\xi}(b) = 0_{n\times 1}$. But since $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_k$ are solutions to $Lx = 0$, we have

$$L\bar{\varphi} = L\left(\sum_{i=1}^{k} \alpha_i \varphi_i\right) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \alpha_i L\varphi_i = 0.$$

We show that this implies $\bar{\varphi} = 0$. Indeed: If not, then L maps a nonzero function to 0, which means if two distinct functions x_1, x_2 are such that $x_1 - x_2 = \bar{\varphi}$, then $Lx_1 - Lx_2 = L(x_1 - x_2) = 0$, i.e., the pre-image of 0 under L is not unique.

This is how I interpreted "uniqueness" in the next line. But why is this a problem / where is the contradiction?

Thus by uniqueness, $\bar{\varphi}(t) = 0$ for $t \in [a, b]$. This contradicts the definition of $\bar{\varphi}$ as a nontrivial linear combination of $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi$ (i.e., not all α_i are 0). Hence

$$\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \dots = \alpha_k = 0$$

and $U_c\varphi_i$ are linearly independent.

Let $\psi_1, \dots, \psi_n$ be n linearly independent solutions of $L^+x = 0$.

How do I know they exist?

Suppose Ψ is the corresponding fundamental matrix. Since φ_i, ψ_j are solutions to π_m and $L^+x = 0$,

This is not the same as requiring ψ_j to be solutions to π_{2n-m}, is it? Since there is an extra $U^+\psi_j = 0$ to fulfill?

respectively, by Proposition 1.1.21,

Proposition 1.1.21 requires that $U\varphi_i = 0$ and $U^+\psi_j = 0$; are these conditions fulfilled?

$$(L\varphi_i, \psi_j) = (\varphi_i, L^+\psi_j).$$

By Green's formula (1.1.2),

$$0 = (L\varphi_i, \psi_j) - (\varphi_i, L^+\psi_j) = [\varphi_i\psi_j](b) - [\varphi_i\psi_j](a)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, k$, $j = 1, \dots, n$. By the boundary-form formula (1.1.10),

$$[\varphi_i\psi_j](b) - [\varphi_i\psi_j](a) = U_{\varphi_i} \cdot U_c^+\psi_j + U_{c\varphi_i} \cdot U^+\psi_j.$$

Since φ_i are solutions to π_m, we have $U\varphi_i = 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$. Thus,

$$U_{c\varphi_i} \cdot U^+\psi_j = 0.$$

Does this mean we don't know $U^+\psi_j = 0$? If so, how could we use Proposition 1.1.21 above?

By definition of $f \cdot g$1.1.7, $f \cdot g = g^* f$ for any column vectors f, g of the same dimension, so

$$(U^+\psi_j)^* U_{c\varphi_i} = 0 \quad (i = 1, \dots, k).$$

We have shown before that $U_c\varphi_i$ are linearly independent. So the system $(U^+\psi_j)^* v = 0$ has (at least) the k linearly independent $(2n - m \times 1)$ vectors $U_c\varphi_1, \dots, U_c\varphi_k$ as solutions. Therefore,

$$\text{rank}(U^+\Psi) = \text{rank}(U^+\Psi)^* \leq (2n - m) - k.$$

Suppose $\text{rank}(U^+\psi) = r < (2n-m) - k$. Then by similar reasoning it can be shown that, if Φ is any fundamental matrix associated with $Lx = 0$, $\text{rank}(U\phi) \leq m - (n-r) < n - k$. By Theorem 1.1.29, this contradicts with the assumption that π_m has exactly k linearly independent solutions. Thus, we must have

$$\text{rank}(U^+\Psi) = 2n - m - k.$$

By Theorem 1.1.29, there exist exactly $k + m - n$ linearly independent solutions of π^+_{2n-m}. $\square$

Corollary 1.1.31. *π_n and $\pi^+ n$ have the same number of independent solutions.*

Proof. Apply Theorem 1.1.30 on $m = n$. $\square$

1.1.4 Nonhomogeneous Boundary-value Problems and Green's Function

Definition 1.1.32. A **nonhomogeneous boundary-value problem** associated with π_m is a problem of the form

$$Lx = f \quad Ux = \gamma \tag{1.1.17}$$

on $t \in [a, b]$, where f is a complex-valued continuous function on $[a, b]$ and γ is a complex constant vector such that either f is not the zero function or $\gamma \neq 0$.

Remark 1.1.33. If φ and $\bar{\varphi}$ are two solutions of 1.1.17, their difference $\varphi - \bar{\varphi}$ is a solution of π_m. Hence, if π_m has k linearly independent solutions $\varphi_1, \ldots, \varphi_k$, then $\varphi = \bar{\varphi} + \sum_{i=1}^{k} c_i\varphi_i$ for some constants $c_i \in \mathbb{C}$ (since $\varphi_1, \ldots, \varphi_k$ are a basis for the solution space of π_m).

Proposition 1.1.34. *Let A be a matrix and b a vector. $Ax = b$ has a solution if and only if $b \cdot u = u^*b = 0$ for every solution u of $A^*x = 0$.*

Theorem 1.1.35. *The nonhomogeneous problem 1.1.17 has a solution if and only if*

$$(f, \psi) = \gamma \cdot U_c^+\psi \tag{1.1.18}$$