

# ON A WAVE EQUATION WITH SINGULAR DISSIPATION

MOHAMMED ELAMINE SEBIH AND JENS WIRTH\*

**ABSTRACT.** In this paper we consider a singular wave equation with distributional and more singular non-distributional coefficients and develop tools and techniques for the phase-space analysis of such problems. In particular we provide a detailed analysis for the interaction of singularities of solutions with strong singularities of the coefficient in a model problem of recent interest.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In a recent paper, Munoz, Ruzhansky and Tokmagambetov [9] investigated a particular wave model with singular dissipation arising from acoustic problems. They considered the Cauchy problem

$$u_{tt} - \Delta u + \frac{b'(t)}{b(t)}u_t = 0, \quad u(0, x) = u_0(x), \quad u_t(0, x) = u_1(x),$$

where  $b$  is a piecewise continuous and positive function allowing in particular for jumps and in consequence a non-distributional singular coefficient in this Cauchy problem. They considered the notion of very weak solutions for this singular problem and showed that this problem is well-posed in this very weak sense. Moreover, they numerically observed in one space dimension a very interesting phenomenon, namely the appearance of a new wave after the singular time travelling in the opposite direction to the main one.

The aim of this paper is two-fold. On one hand we consider this model and carry out a detailed phase space analysis for families of regularised problems in order to describe the behaviour of the very weak solution in the vicinity of the singular time. This will allow us to show that the numerically observed partial reflection of wave packets at the singular time is really appearing and to calculate the partial reflection indices in terms of the jump of the coefficient. On the other hand this is a model study to develop tools and techniques to treat more general singular hyperbolic problems within the framework of very weak solutions and to provide a symbolic calculus framework for analysing singularities of such solutions.

## 2. THE NOTION OF VERY WEAK SOLUTIONS

We will recall some basic concepts on the notion of very weak solutions for singular problems and comment on their relation to other solution concepts like weak solutions and Colombeau solutions. The concept was introduced by Garetto and Ruzhansky in [6] and further developed in a series of papers with different co-authors, [12], [13], [9], [11], [8] in order to show a wide applicability. The basic idea is as follows. Instead of considering the singular equation itself, one considers a family of regularised equations depending on a regularisation parameter and investigates the behaviour of the family of solutions as the regularisation parameter tends to zero.

Treating distributions and more singular objects as families of regularised objects has a long history. In order to provide a neat solution for the multiplication problem for distributions (on the background of Schwartz's famous impossibility result in [15]) Colombeau [2] proposed to consider more general algebras of nets of regularised objects modulo negligible nets

$$(2.1) \quad \mathcal{E}^\infty(\Omega)/\mathcal{N}^\infty(\Omega),$$

where  $\mathcal{E}^\infty(\Omega)$  denotes all functions  $(0, 1] \ni \epsilon \mapsto f_\epsilon \in C^\infty(\Omega)$  being moderate in the sense that

$$(2.2) \quad \sup_{x \in K} |\partial^\alpha f_\epsilon(x)| = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{N-|\alpha|})$$

for some  $N \in \mathbb{R}$  depending on  $K \Subset \Omega$  and the multi-index  $\alpha$  and similarly  $\mathcal{N}^\infty(\Omega)$  the space of negligible nets satisfying the estimate (2.2) for any number  $N \in \mathbb{R}$ . Convolution with Friedrichs mollifiers yields

an embedding of both smooth functions  $C^\infty(\Omega)$  and distributions  $\mathcal{D}'(\Omega)$  into this algebra extending in particular multiplication of smooth functions. For more details, see Oberguggenberger [10].

This approach has a serious drawback as the multiplication in these algebras is only consistent with the multiplication of smooth functions, and hence, in general not consistent with the algebra structure of continuous or measurable functions. This is in particular problematic when applying this concept to well-posedness issues of singular partial differential equations, where the natural spaces are usually of lower regularity than  $C^\infty$ . To overcome consistency issues, in [6] and later in [12], [13] Ruzhansky and his co-authors introduced a different concept of moderateness and negligibility based on natural norms associated to the problem under consideration.

For hyperbolic partial differential equations it seems natural to consider solutions of finite energy and the modification in the approach would be to call a family of solutions moderate if the energy satisfies a polynomial bound with respect to the regularisation parameter, while negligible nets are such that the energy is smaller than any power of the regularisation parameter. Thus the notion of very weak solutions depends on the equation under consideration (in contrast to distributional and Colombeau solutions, but similar to weak or mild solutions).

To make this precise, let us define the notion of very weak solutions for wave equations with singular time-dependent coefficients

$$(2.3) \quad \partial_t^2 u - a(t)\Delta u + 2b(t)\partial_t u + m^2(t)u = f$$

for a given singular right-hand side  $f$  and singular coefficients  $a, b, m$ . We say that a net  $\epsilon \mapsto u_\epsilon \in C^\infty([0, T]; H^1)$  is a *very weak solution of (finite) energy type*, if there are moderate regularisations  $a_\epsilon, b_\epsilon, m_\epsilon \in \mathcal{E}^\infty([0, T])$  of the coefficients and a  $C^\infty([0, T]; L^2)$ -moderate regularisation of the right-hand side  $f$  in the sense that

$$(2.4) \quad \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\partial_t^k f_\epsilon(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2} = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{N-k})$$

for some number  $N \in \mathbb{R}$ , such that  $\partial_t^2 u_\epsilon - a_\epsilon(t)\Delta u_\epsilon + 2b_\epsilon(t)\partial_t u_\epsilon + m_\epsilon^2(t)u_\epsilon = f_\epsilon$  holds for any  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $u_\epsilon$  itself is  $C^\infty([0, T]; H^1)$ -moderate in the sense that

$$(2.5) \quad \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\partial_t^k u_\epsilon(t, \cdot)\|_{H^1} = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{N-k})$$

holds for some  $N \in \mathbb{R}$ .

Based on results from [16] and [17], it was shown in [9] that the model example we will consider later is well-posed in this very weak sense and that the very weak solution is independent of the choice of the regularising family. For the general singular wave model with singular speed and mass term see [1].

### 3. OUR MODEL PROBLEM AND GENERAL STRATEGY

We consider the Cauchy problem

$$(3.1) \quad u_{tt} - \Delta u + \frac{b'(t)}{b(t)}u_t = 0, \quad u(0, x) = u_0(x), \quad u_t(0, x) = u_1(x),$$

where  $b$  is a piecewise smooth and piecewise continuous function. We are interested in solutions close to a singularity of the coefficient and hence, without loss of generality, we assume that  $b$  has exactly one jump at  $t = 1$ . In particular, we require that the limits

$$(3.2) \quad b(1_{\pm 0}) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 1_{\pm 0}} b(t)$$

exist for the function itself and also its derivatives. Thus, we ask for  $b$  to satisfy the following two assumptions:

**(H1):** There exists a strictly positive number  $b_0$  such that  $b(t) \geq b_0 > 0$ .

**(H2):**  $b \in C_b^\infty(-\infty, 1] \cap C_b^\infty[1, +\infty)$ , having a jump at  $t = 1$ .

In contrast to [9] we do *not* require  $b$  to be monotonically increasing. Thus, we will not make use of any sign properties of the coefficient later.

**3.1. Notation.** Throughout this paper we will use the following conventions and symbols:

- We denote the height of the jump of  $b$  at  $t = 1$  by  $h = b(1_{+0}) - b(1_{-0})$  and denote  $H = \frac{b(1_{-0})}{b(1_{+1})}$ .
- We write  $f \lesssim g$  for two functions  $f$  and  $g$  on the same domain if there exists a positive constant  $C$  such that  $f \leq Cg$ .
- We denote by  $\Phi \in C_0(\mathbb{R})$  a fixed non-negative, continuous and symmetric function, such that

$$(3.3) \quad \Phi(-t) = \Phi(t) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{supp } \Phi = [-K', K']$$

holds. We further assume that  $\Phi$  is differentiable outside the origin and that

$$(3.4) \quad \Phi^2(t) \lesssim \begin{cases} \Phi'(t), & t < 0, \\ -\Phi'(t), & t > 0, \end{cases}$$

holds. This function will play an important role in the definition of zones and symbol classes and will be referred to as the shape function.

- We denote by  $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$  a fixed non-negative and symmetric mollifier such that

$$(3.5) \quad \psi(-t) = \psi(t), \quad \text{supp } \psi = [-K, K], \quad \text{and} \quad \int \psi(t) dt = 1$$

with  $0 < K \leq K'$  describing the size of its support. We further require that derivatives of  $\psi$  be bounded by powers of the shape function  $\Phi$ , i.e.

$$(3.6) \quad |\partial_t^k \psi(t)| \lesssim \Phi^k(t)$$

for any number  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .

- The identity matrix will be denoted by  $I$ . Furthermore for any matrix  $A$  we denote by  $\|A\|$  its Euclidean matrix norm.

**3.2. Regularisation of the problem.** In order to consider very weak solutions of our model problem, we solve families of regularised problems using the regularisations

$$(3.7) \quad b_\epsilon(t) = b * \psi_\epsilon(t) \quad \text{and} \quad b'_\epsilon(t) = b' * \psi_\epsilon(t) = b * \psi'_\epsilon(t)$$

in terms of the mollifier  $\psi_\epsilon(t) = \epsilon^{-1} \psi(\epsilon^{-1}t)$  and with  $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$ . This gives rise to the family of Cauchy problems

$$(3.8) \quad u_{tt} - \Delta u + \frac{b'_\epsilon(t)}{b_\epsilon(t)} u_t = 0, \quad u(0, x) = u_0(x), \quad u_t(0, x) = u_1(x)$$

parameterised by  $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$ . Our approach is based on a detailed phase space analysis for this family of problems treating  $\epsilon$  as an additional variable of the extended phase space. For this, we will introduce two zones and apply a diagonalisation based technique to extract leading order terms in each of them. For details on the diagonalisation procedure and its use in a related singular context we refer to [5] or [18], and for a broader discussion of the techniques used see [14].

As the coefficients of (3.8) depend on  $t$  only, we apply a partial Fourier transform with respect to the spatial variables and, thus, reduce consideration to the ordinary differential equation

$$(3.9) \quad \hat{u}_{tt} + |\xi|^2 \hat{u} + \frac{b'_\epsilon(t)}{b_\epsilon(t)} \hat{u}_t = 0, \quad \hat{u}(0, \xi) = \hat{u}_0(\xi), \quad \hat{u}_t(0, \xi) = \hat{u}_1(\xi)$$

parameterised by both  $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$  and  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . We construct its solutions for  $t \in [0, 2]$  and investigate the limiting behaviour of solutions as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ . To write the equation in system form, we introduce the micro-energy

$$(3.10) \quad U(t, \xi, \epsilon) = \begin{pmatrix} |\xi| \hat{u} \\ D_t \hat{u} \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $D_t = -i\partial_t$  denotes the Fourier derivative. Then (3.9) can be rewritten as

$$(3.11) \quad D_t U(t, \xi, \epsilon) = \left[ \begin{pmatrix} 0 & |\xi| \\ |\xi| & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & i\partial_\epsilon(t) \end{pmatrix} \right] U(t, \xi, \epsilon),$$

where we used the notation  $\mathfrak{d}_\epsilon(t) = \frac{b'_\epsilon(t)}{b_\epsilon(t)}$  for the net of dissipation coefficients. Denoting the coefficient matrices arising in this system by

$$(3.12) \quad A(\xi) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & |\xi| \\ |\xi| & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad B(t, \epsilon) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & i\mathfrak{d}_\epsilon(t) \end{pmatrix},$$

we see that depending on the values  $|\xi|$ ,  $\epsilon$  and  $t$  either the matrix  $A(\xi)$  or the matrix  $B(t, \epsilon)$  is dominant. If  $A(\xi)$  is dominant, we apply a standard hyperbolic approach and diagonalise the system. If  $B(t, \epsilon)$  is dominant, we use a transformation of variables to reduce consideration to a model equation describing the behaviour close to the singularity.

**3.3. Zones.** To make use of different leading terms, we use the following definition of zones. For a zone constant  $N$  to be fixed later we define the *hyperbolic zone*

$$(3.13) \quad Z_{\text{hyp}}(N) = \{(t, \xi, \epsilon) \in [0, 2] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times (0, 1] \mid |\xi| \geq N(\Phi_\epsilon(t-1) + 1)\},$$

where  $\Phi_\epsilon(t) = \epsilon^{-1}\Phi(\epsilon^{-1}t)$  is defined in terms of the function  $\Phi$  from Section 3.1. The *singular zone*

$$(3.14) \quad Z_{\text{sing}}(N) = \{(t, \xi, \epsilon) \in [0, 2] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times (0, 1] \mid N < |\xi| \leq N(\Phi_\epsilon(t-1) + 1)\}$$

is used to investigate the vicinity of the jump of the coefficient, while the remaining *bounded frequencies*

$$(3.15) \quad Z_{\text{bd}}(N) = \{(t, \xi, \epsilon) \in [0, 2] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times (0, 1] \mid |\xi| \leq N\}$$

will be dealt with later by a simple argument. The common boundary of the hyperbolic and the singular zone will be denoted by  $(t_{\xi_i}(\epsilon))_{i=1,2}$  and is defined implicitly by the equation

$$(3.16) \quad |\xi| = N(\Phi_\epsilon(t_{\xi_i} - 1) + 1)$$

for  $\xi$  satisfying  $N < |\xi| \leq N(\epsilon^{-1}\Phi(0) + 1)$  and with the convention that  $t_{\xi_1}$  is the solution branch for  $t < 1$  and  $t_{\xi_2}$  when  $t > 1$ . The zones are depicted in Figure 1 for fixed  $\epsilon > 0$ .

The singular zone  $Z_{\text{sing}}(N)$  is better understood in the variables  $\Lambda = \epsilon|\xi|$  and  $\tau = \epsilon^{-1}(t-1)$ . Then the definition of the singular zone can be rewritten as

$$(3.17) \quad Z_{\text{sing}}(N) = \{(\tau, \Lambda, \epsilon) \mid N\epsilon < \Lambda \leq N\Phi(\tau) + N\epsilon\}$$

and stabilises as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ . We will use these singular variables when discussing the solutions of the regularised problem in the singular zone. For convenience, the zone is depicted in Figure 2 using these variables. We will also use a notation for the zone-boundary and denote it by  $\tau_{\Lambda_1}(\epsilon)$  and  $\tau_{\Lambda_2}(\epsilon)$ .

Our strategy is as follows. Within the hyperbolic zone we will apply a diagonalisation procedure taking care of the  $\epsilon$ -dependence of the transformation matrices and all appearing symbols in an appropriate way. This allows to construct the fundamental solution of the parameter-dependent family (3.8) within the





FIGURE 1. Zones in coordinates  $(t, \xi)$  for fixed  $\epsilon > 0$

FIGURE 2. Zones in coordinates  $(\tau, \Lambda)$  again for a fixed  $\epsilon > 0$ 

hyperbolic zone and to investigate its limiting behaviour as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ . Within the singular zone, we transform the problem to the singular variables and construct its fundamental solution as power series in  $\Lambda$  with  $\tau, \epsilon$ -dependent coefficients and again study the limiting behaviour of this solution as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ .

*Remark 3.1.* We note that in coordinates  $(t, \xi)$  the point  $C(\epsilon)$  tends to  $\infty$  when  $\epsilon$  tends to 0 and that  $t_{\min}$  and  $t_{\max}$  depend on  $\epsilon$  and tend to  $1_{-0}$  and  $1_{+0}$  when  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ , respectively.

*Remark 3.2.* The interval  $[1 - \epsilon K, 1 + \epsilon K]$  is the support of  $\psi_\epsilon(t-1)$ . The lines  $t = 1 - \epsilon K$  and  $t = 1 + \epsilon K$  divide the hyperbolic zone into two parts, one with  $|t - 1| > \epsilon K$  and the other one with  $|t - 1| < \epsilon K$ . The last one is of minor interest since the points  $A(\epsilon) = N\epsilon^{-1}\Phi(K) + N$  and  $B(\epsilon)$  tend to infinity when  $\epsilon$  tends to 0.

**3.4. Regular faces of the zones.** The hyperbolic zone  $Z_{\text{hyp}}(N)$  and the zone of bounded frequencies  $Z_{\text{bd}}(N)$  have a boundary on which  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ . This will be of importance later when relating our representation of very weak solutions to the standard theory for smooth coefficients for  $t \neq 1$ . We refer to the two parts  $\{(t, \xi, 0) \mid |\xi| > N, t \neq 1\}$  as the *regular face* of  $Z_{\text{hyp}}(N)$  and the set  $\{(t, \xi, 0) \mid |\xi| \leq N\}$  as the *regular face* of  $Z_{\text{bd}}(N)$ . The singular zone does not have a regular face.

#### 4. REPRESENTATION OF SOLUTIONS

**4.1. Some useful lemmata.** The nets  $\mathfrak{d}_\epsilon(t) = b'_\epsilon(t)/b_\epsilon(t)$ ,  $b_\epsilon(t)$  and its derivatives  $b_\epsilon^{(k)}(t)$  defined in terms of (3.7) satisfy the following inequalities.

**Lemma 4.1.** *The estimates*

$$(4.1) \quad |\partial_t^k b_\epsilon(t)| \leq C_{1,k} (\Phi_\epsilon(t-1) + 1)^k \quad \text{and} \quad |\partial_t^k \mathfrak{d}_\epsilon(t)| \leq C_{2,k} (\Phi_\epsilon(t-1) + 1)^{k+1}$$

hold for all  $k \geq 0$  and all  $t \in [0, 2]$  and  $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$ .

*Proof.* The second estimate will follow from the first one, so we only concentrate on the first. For  $k = 0$  we have by that by Assumptions **(H1)** and **(H2)** and the positivity of the mollifier  $\psi$

$$(4.2) \quad 0 < b_0 \leq b_\epsilon(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} b(t - \epsilon s) \psi(s) ds \leq \max_{s \in [-K, 1+K]} b(s).$$

For  $k = 1$  we apply integration by parts. As

$$(4.3) \quad \begin{aligned} b'_\epsilon(t) &= \epsilon^{-2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} b(s) \psi'(\epsilon^{-1}(t-s)) ds = \epsilon^{-2} \left[ \int_{-\infty}^1 b(s) \psi'(\epsilon^{-1}(t-s)) ds + \int_1^{\infty} b(s) \psi'(\epsilon^{-1}(t-s)) ds \right] \\ &= \epsilon^{-1} \psi(\epsilon^{-1}(t-1)) [b(1_{-0}) - b(1_{+0})] - \epsilon^{-1} \left[ \int_{-\infty}^1 b'(s) \psi(\epsilon^{-1}(t-s)) ds + \int_1^{\infty} b'(s) \psi(\epsilon^{-1}(t-s)) ds \right], \end{aligned}$$

we obtain

$$(4.4) \quad |b'_\epsilon(t)| \leq |h| \psi_\epsilon(t-1) + \sup_{s \in [-K, 1) \cup (1, 1+K]} |b'(s)| \leq C_1 (\Phi_\epsilon(t-1) + 1)$$

using the bound  $\psi \lesssim \Phi$ . For higher  $k$  we need to apply several steps of integration by parts. For  $k \geq 2$  we obtain by induction

$$(4.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \partial_t^k b_\epsilon(t) &= \sum_{\ell=0}^{k-1} (-1)^{k-\ell-1} [b^{(k-\ell-1)}(1_{-0}) - b^{(k-\ell-1)}(1_{+0})] \partial_t^\ell \psi_\epsilon(t-1) \\ &\quad + (-1)^k \left[ \int_{-\infty}^1 b^{(k)}(s) \psi_\epsilon(t-s) ds + \int_1^{\infty} b^{(k)}(s) \psi_\epsilon(t-s) ds \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Again, the remaining integrals can be estimated by uniform bounds on the derivatives of  $b$  outside the singularity, and the statement follows from

$$(4.6) \quad \begin{aligned} |\partial_t^k b_\epsilon(t)| &\leq \sum_{\ell=0}^{k-1} |b^{(k-\ell-1)}(1_{-0}) - b^{(k-\ell-1)}(1_{+0})| |\partial_t^\ell \psi_\epsilon(t)| + \sup_{s \in [-K, 1) \cup (1, 1+K]} |b^{(k)}(s)| \\ &\leq C_k (\Phi_\epsilon(t) + 1)^k \end{aligned}$$

by the estimate  $|\partial_t^k \psi(t)| \leq C \Phi^k(t)$ . Finally, the estimate for derivatives of  $\mathfrak{d}_\epsilon(t)$  follow from applying the quotient rule and using the uniform lower bound  $b_0 \leq b_\epsilon(t)$  when estimating the denominator.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.2.** *The estimates*

$$(4.7) \quad |\partial_t^k b_\epsilon(t) - \partial_t^k b(t)| \lesssim \epsilon$$

hold for all  $k \geq 0$  uniformly in  $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$  and  $t$  satisfying  $|t-1| > \epsilon K$ .

*Proof.* Let  $|t-1| > \epsilon K$ . For  $k = 0$  we have

$$(4.8) \quad b_\epsilon(t) - b(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} b(s) \psi_\epsilon(t-s) ds - b(t) = \int_{[t-\epsilon K, t+\epsilon K]} (b(s) - b(t)) \psi_\epsilon(t-s) ds$$

seeing that  $\int \psi(s) ds = 1$  and that  $\text{supp } \psi_\epsilon = [-\epsilon K, \epsilon K]$ . Hence,

$$(4.9) \quad |b_\epsilon(t) - b(t)| \leq \int_{[t-\epsilon K, t+\epsilon K]} |b(s) - b(t)| \psi_\epsilon(t-s) ds.$$

As the range of integration does not contain 1 we can use the differentiability of  $b$  to estimate

$$(4.10) \quad |b(s) - b(t)| \leq |s-t| \sup_{\theta \in [t-\epsilon K, t+\epsilon K]} |b'(\theta)| = M |s-t|$$

for  $s \in [t-\epsilon K, t+\epsilon K]$ . Therefore

$$(4.11) \quad |b_\epsilon(t) - b(t)| \leq \epsilon M K.$$

For  $k \geq 1$  the argumentation is similar using

$$(4.12) \quad \partial_t^k b_\epsilon(t) - \partial_t^k b(t) = \int_{[t-\epsilon K, t+\epsilon K]} (\partial_s^k b(s) - \partial_t^k b(t)) \psi_\epsilon(t-s) ds$$

together with the corresponding bound on the derivatives of  $b$  on the interval of integration.  $\square$

These two technical lemmas are the model behaviours for our symbol classes and the key estimates for the boundary behaviour at regular faces of the zones.

## 4.2. Treatment in the hyperbolic zone.

4.2.1. *Symbol classes and their properties.* For the treatment within the hyperbolic zone, symbol classes and their basic calculus properties are used.

**Definition 4.3** (Symbol classes). Let  $N > 0$  be fixed and  $\Phi$  as in Section 3.1.

(i) We say that a function

$$(4.13) \quad a \in C^\infty([0, 2] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times (0, 1])$$

belongs to the hyperbolic symbol class  $\mathcal{S}_{N,\Phi}\{m_1, m_2\}$  if it satisfies the estimates

$$(4.14) \quad |\partial_t^k \partial_\xi^\alpha a(t, \xi, \epsilon)| \leq C_{k,\alpha} (\Phi_\epsilon(t-1) + 1)^{m_2+k} |\xi|^{m_1-|\alpha|}$$

uniformly within  $Z_{\text{hyp}}(N)$  for all non-negative integers  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$  and all multi-indices  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$  together with the existence of the limits

$$(4.15) \quad a(t, \xi, 0) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} a(t, \xi, \epsilon), \quad t \neq 1,$$

at the regular face of the zone satisfying the estimates

$$(4.16) \quad |\xi|^{|\alpha|-m_1} |\partial_t^k \partial_\xi^\alpha a(t, \xi, 0)| \leq C'_{k,\alpha},$$

$$(4.17) \quad |\xi|^{|\alpha|-m_1} |\partial_t^k \partial_\xi^\alpha (a(t, \xi, \epsilon) - a(t, \xi, 0))| \leq C''_{k,\alpha} \epsilon$$

with the latter one uniformly on  $|t-1| \geq \epsilon K$ .

(ii) We say that a matrix-valued function  $A$  belongs to  $\mathcal{S}_{N,\Phi}\{m_1, m_2\}$  if all its entries belongs to the scalar-valued symbol class  $\mathcal{S}_{N,\Phi}\{m_1, m_2\}$ .

*Example 4.1.* Due to Lemma 4.1, we know that the regularising families  $b_\epsilon$  and  $\mathfrak{d}_\epsilon$  satisfy

$$(4.18) \quad (b_\epsilon) \in \mathcal{S}_{N,\Phi}\{0, 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad (\mathfrak{d}_\epsilon) \in \mathcal{S}_{N,\Phi}\{0, 1\}$$

for any zone constant  $N > 0$ . Similarly  $|\xi|$  is a symbol from  $\mathcal{S}_{N,\Phi}\{1, 0\}$  for any admissible  $\Phi$  and  $N > 0$ .

*Remark 4.2.* The boundary behaviour of symbols given by (4.16) corresponds to a characterisation of symbol classes defined on the regular face  $\{(t, \xi, 0) \mid |\xi| \geq N\}$  of  $Z_{\text{hyp}}(N)$  with symbol estimates uniform with respect to  $t$ .

Increasing the zone constant  $N$  makes the hyperbolic zone  $Z_{\text{hyp}}(N)$  smaller and thus the symbol class  $\mathcal{S}_{N,\Phi}\{m_1, m_2\}$  larger. We will make use of this fact later by choosing  $N$  sufficiently large in order to guarantee the smallness of some terms. We will omit the indices  $N$  and  $\Phi$  to simplify notation.

**Proposition 4.4** (Properties of symbol classes). *For any fixed  $N > 0$  and admissible  $\Phi$  the following statements hold:*

- (1)  $\mathcal{S}\{m_1, m_2\}$  is a vector space.
- (2)  $\mathcal{S}\{m_1, m_2\} \subset \mathcal{S}\{m_1 + \ell_1, m_2 - \ell_2\}$  for all  $\ell_1 \geq \ell_2 \geq 0$ .
- (3) If  $f \in \mathcal{S}\{m_1, m_2\}$  and  $g \in \mathcal{S}\{m'_1, m'_2\}$  then  $f \cdot g \in \mathcal{S}\{m_1 + m'_1, m_2 + m'_2\}$ .
- (4) If  $f \in \mathcal{S}\{m_1, m_2\}$  then  $\partial_t^k f \in \mathcal{S}\{m_1, m_2 + k\}$  and  $\partial_\xi^\alpha f \in \mathcal{S}\{m_1 - |\alpha|, m_2\}$ .
- (5) If  $f \in \mathcal{S}\{m_1, 0\}$  satisfies  $|f(t, \xi, \epsilon)| > c |\xi|^{m_1}$  for a positive constant  $c$ , then one has  $1/f \in \mathcal{S}\{-m_1, 0\}$ .

*Proof.* Properties (1) and (4) follow immediately from the definition of the symbol classes. For (3) we apply the product rule for derivatives to derive the symbol estimate (4.16). The boundary behaviour (4.17) follows by writing the product of two symbols  $f \in \mathcal{S}\{m_1, m_2\}$  and  $g \in \mathcal{S}\{m'_1, m'_2\}$  as

$$(4.19) \quad f(t, \xi, \epsilon)g(t, \xi, \epsilon) - f(t, \xi, 0)g(t, \xi, 0) = (f(t, \xi, \epsilon) - f(t, \xi, 0))g(t, \xi, \epsilon) + f(t, \xi, 0)(g(t, \xi, \epsilon) - g(t, \xi, 0)),$$

applying the product rule for derivatives

$$(4.20)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t^k \partial_\xi^\alpha (f(t, \xi, \epsilon)g(t, \xi, \epsilon) - f(t, \xi, 0)g(t, \xi, 0)) &= \sum_{\substack{\ell \leq k \\ \beta \leq \alpha}} \binom{k}{\ell} \binom{\alpha}{\beta} (\partial_t^{k-\ell} \partial_\xi^{\alpha-\beta} (f(t, \xi, \epsilon) - f(t, \xi, 0))) (\partial_t^\ell \partial_\alpha^\beta g(t, \xi, \epsilon)) \\ &\quad + \binom{k}{\ell} \binom{\alpha}{\beta} (\partial_t^{k-\ell} \partial_\xi^{\alpha-\beta} f(t, \xi, 0)) (\partial_t^\ell \partial_\alpha^\beta (g(t, \xi, \epsilon) - g(t, \xi, 0))), \end{aligned}$$

and estimating each resulted differences on the right by (4.17) and all the remaining factors by (4.16). To prove (2) we use the definition of the hyperbolic zone  $Z_{\text{hyp}}(N)$  in the form

$$(4.21) \quad (\Phi_\epsilon(t-1) + 1)^{-\ell_2} |\xi|^{\ell_1} \geq N^{\ell_1} (\Phi_\epsilon(t-1) + 1)^{\ell_1 - \ell_2} \geq N^{\ell_1}$$

and conclude that symbol estimates from  $\mathcal{S}\{m_1, m_2\}$  imply symbol estimates from  $\mathcal{S}\{m_1 + \ell_1, m_2 - \ell_2\}$ . It remains to prove (5). Here we use Faà di Bruno's formula (see [7], [3], [4]) and write

$$(4.22) \quad \partial_t^k \partial_\xi^\alpha \frac{1}{f(t, \xi, \epsilon)} = \sum_{\ell=1}^{k+|\alpha|} \sum_{\substack{j_1+\dots+j_\ell=k \\ |\alpha_1|+\dots+|\alpha_\ell|=|\alpha|}} C_{k,\alpha,j_i,\alpha_i} \frac{\partial_t^{j_1} \partial_\xi^{\alpha_1} f(t, \xi, \epsilon) \cdots \partial_t^{j_\ell} \partial_\xi^{\alpha_\ell} f(t, \xi, \epsilon)}{f^{\ell+1}(t, \xi, \epsilon)}$$

where  $C_{k,\alpha,j_i,\alpha_i}$  are constants depending on the order of the derivatives. Each term in the last sum can be estimated in the following way. As  $f \in \mathcal{S}\{m_1, 0\}$  property (4) implies for  $i = 1, \dots, \ell$  that

$$(4.23) \quad |\partial_t^{j_i} \partial_\xi^{\alpha_i} f| \leq C_{j_i,\alpha_i} (\Phi_\epsilon(t-1) + 1)^{j_i} |\xi|^{m_1+|\alpha_i|}.$$

Therefore,

$$(4.24) \quad |\partial_t^{j_1} \partial_\xi^{\alpha_1} f \cdots \partial_t^{j_\ell} \partial_\xi^{\alpha_\ell} f| \lesssim (\Phi_\epsilon(t-1) + 1)^{j_1+\dots+j_\ell} |\xi|^{\ell m_1+|\alpha_1|+\dots+|\alpha_\ell|}$$

and using the condition  $|f(t, \xi, \epsilon)| > c|\xi|^{m_1}$  we obtain

$$(4.25) \quad \left| \frac{\partial_t^{j_1} \partial_\xi^{\alpha_1} f \cdots \partial_t^{j_\ell} \partial_\xi^{\alpha_\ell} f}{f^{\ell+1}} \right| \lesssim \frac{(\Phi_\epsilon(t-1) + 1)^{j_1+\dots+j_\ell} |\xi|^{\ell m_1+|\alpha_1|+\dots+|\alpha_\ell|}}{|\xi|^{m_1(\ell+1)}} \lesssim \frac{(\Phi_\epsilon(t-1) + 1)^k |\xi|^{\ell m_1+|\alpha|}}{|\xi|^{m_1(\ell+1)}} \\ \lesssim (\Phi_\epsilon(t-1) + 1)^k |\xi|^{-m_1+|\alpha|}.$$

Summing all these terms yields the desired estimate. The boundary estimate follows similarly.  $\square$

These symbol classes and in particular the embeddings

$$(4.26) \quad \mathcal{S}\{-1, 2\} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{S}\{0, 1\} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{S}\{1, 0\}$$

will be of importance for the treatment within the hyperbolic zone. The gain of decay in  $|\xi|$  will be paid for by a loss of point-wise control in the  $t$ -variable near the singularity. What we gain, are integrability properties and improved limits at the regular face.

**Proposition 4.5.** *Within the hyperbolic zone  $Z_{\text{hyp}}(N)$ ,*

- (1) *symbols from  $\mathcal{S}\{0, 0\}$  are uniformly bounded;*
- (2) *symbols from  $\mathcal{S}\{0, 1\}$  are uniformly integrable with respect to  $t$ ;*
- (3) *symbols  $a \in \mathcal{S}\{-1, 2\}$  satisfy*

$$(4.27) \quad \int_0^t |a(\theta, \xi, \epsilon)| d\theta \leq C |\xi|^{-1} (\Phi_\epsilon(t-1) + 1)$$

for all  $0 < t \leq t_{\xi_1}$ , and

$$(4.28) \quad \int_t^2 |a(\theta, \xi, \epsilon)| d\theta \leq C |\xi|^{-1} (\Phi_\epsilon(t-1) + 1)$$

for all  $t_{\xi_2} \leq t \leq 2$ .

*Proof.* Statement (1) is obvious from the definition of the symbol class. Next we prove (2). If  $f \in \mathcal{S}\{0, 1\}$  then it satisfies the point-wise estimate

$$(4.29) \quad |f(t, \xi, \epsilon)| \leq C (\Phi_\epsilon(t-1) + 1),$$

and therefore after integrating over  $t \in [0, t_{\xi_1}(\epsilon)]$  (or similarly over  $t \in [t_{\xi_2}(\epsilon), 2]$ ) one has

$$(4.30) \quad \int_0^{t_{\xi_1}} |f(t, \xi, \epsilon)| ds |dt| \leq C \int_0^{t_{\xi_1}} \Phi_\epsilon(t-1) dt + C \int_0^{t_{\xi_1}} dt = C \int_{-\epsilon^{-1}}^{\epsilon^{-1}(t_{\xi_1}-1)} \Phi(\tau) d\tau + C \leq C \left[ 1 + \int_{-\infty}^0 \Phi(\tau) d\tau \right]$$



for any fixed  $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$  and  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . It remains to prove (3). If  $a \in S\{-1, 2\}$  then it satisfies the point-wise estimate

$$(4.31) \quad |a(t, \xi, \epsilon)| \leq C|\xi|^{-1}(\Phi_\epsilon(t-1) + 1)^2$$

and the only new term needing to be treated is the one arising from the square of the shape function. This can be estimated by means of (3.4) for  $t < 1$  as

$$(4.32) \quad \int_0^t \Phi_\epsilon^2(\theta) d\theta = \epsilon^{-1} \int_{-\epsilon^{-1}}^{\epsilon^{-1}(t-1)} \Phi^2(\tau) d\tau \leq C\epsilon^{-1} \int_{-\epsilon^{-1}}^{\epsilon^{-1}(t-1)} \Phi'(\tau) d\tau \leq C\epsilon^{-1} \Phi(\epsilon^{-1}(t-1)) - C\epsilon^{-1} \Phi(-\epsilon^{-1}) \leq C\Phi_\epsilon(t-1)$$

and similarly for the case  $t > 1$ .  $\square$

**4.2.2. Transformations.** Within the hyperbolic zone, we apply transformations to our system in order to extract precise information about the behaviour of its fundamental solution. Recall that (3.11) is of the form  $D_t U = (A + B)U$  with  $A \in S\{1, 0\}$  and  $B \in S\{0, 1\}$ . Using the diagonaliser of the principal part  $A$

$$(4.33) \quad M = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{with inverse} \quad M^{-1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

the matrix  $A$  can be written as

$$(4.34) \quad A(\xi) = MD(\xi)M^{-1}$$

with  $D(\xi) = \text{diag}(|\xi|, -|\xi|)$ . Hence, setting  $V(t, \xi, \epsilon) = M^{-1}U(t, \xi, \epsilon)$  system (3.11) can be rewritten as

$$(4.35) \quad D_t V(t, \xi, \epsilon) = (D(\xi) + R(t, \epsilon))V(t, \xi, \epsilon)$$

with a remainder given by

$$(4.36) \quad R(t, \epsilon) = M^{-1}B(t, \epsilon)M = \frac{i}{2}\mathfrak{d}_\epsilon(t) \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \in S\{0, 1\}.$$

Our aim is to further improve the remainder within the hyperbolic hierarchy (4.26). This allows to extract more detailed information on the propagation of singularities close to the singularity later. For this we follow [14] to construct transformation matrices  $N_k(t, \xi, \epsilon)$ , transforming the system (4.35) into a new system with an updated diagonal part and an improved remainder. The construction is done in such a way, that the operator identity

$$(4.37) \quad (D_t - D(\xi) - R(t, \epsilon))N_k(t, \xi, \epsilon) = N_k(t, \xi, \epsilon)(D_t - D_k(t, \xi, \epsilon) - R_k(t, \xi, \epsilon))$$

holds for  $k \geq 1$  and

(1) the matrix-valued symbols  $D_k(t, \xi, \epsilon)$  are given by

$$(4.38) \quad D_k(t, \xi, \epsilon) = D(\xi) + F^{(0)}(t, \xi, \epsilon) + \dots + F^{(k-1)}(t, \xi, \epsilon)$$

with diagonal  $F^{(j)}(t, \xi, \epsilon) \in S\{-j, j+1\}$ ;

(2) the transformation matrices  $N_k(t, \xi, \epsilon)$  are of the form

$$(4.39) \quad N_k(t, \xi, \epsilon) = I + N^{(1)}(t, \xi, \epsilon) + \dots + N^{(k)}(t, \xi, \epsilon)$$

with  $N^{(j)}(t, \xi, \epsilon) \in S\{-j, j\}$ ;

(3) the remainder satisfies  $R_k(t, \xi, \epsilon) \in S\{-k, k+1\}$ .

We give the construction for  $k = 1$  in full detail. In this case (4.37) simplifies modulo  $S\{-1, 2\}$  to the commutator equation

$$(4.40) \quad [D(\xi), N^{(1)}(t, \xi, \epsilon)] = F^{(0)}(t, \xi, \epsilon) - R(t, \epsilon).$$

As the diagonal part of the commutator vanishes, we set

$$(4.41) \quad F^{(0)}(t, \epsilon) = \text{diag } R(t, \epsilon) = \frac{i}{2}\mathfrak{d}_\epsilon(t) \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \in S\{0, 1\},$$

and determine the off-diagonal entries of

$$(4.42) \quad N^{(1)}(t, \xi, \epsilon) = \begin{pmatrix} n_{11} & n_{12} \\ n_{21} & n_{22} \end{pmatrix}$$

from (4.40) as  $n_{12} = -\frac{i}{4|\xi|}\mathfrak{d}_\epsilon(t)$  and  $n_{21} = \frac{i}{4|\xi|}\mathfrak{d}_\epsilon(t)$ . The diagonal entries are chosen to be zero, and hence

$$(4.43) \quad N^{(1)}(t, \xi, \epsilon) = \frac{i}{4|\xi|}\mathfrak{d}_\epsilon(t) \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in S\{-1, 1\}.$$

The transformation matrix  $N_1(t, \xi, \epsilon) = I + N^{(1)}(t, \xi, \epsilon)$  is invertible, provided that the zone constant is chosen large enough.

**Proposition 4.6.** *Assume Hypotheses (H1) and (H2) hold. Then, there exists a matrix  $N^{(1)}(t, \xi, \epsilon) \in S\{-1, 1\}$  and a diagonal matrix  $F^{(0)}(t, \epsilon) \in S\{0, 1\}$ , such that the identity (4.37) is satisfied with a remainder  $R_1(t, \xi, \epsilon) \in S\{-1, 2\}$ . Moreover, we can find a zone constant  $N$ , such that the transformation matrix  $N_1(t, \xi, \epsilon) = I + N^{(1)}(t, \xi, \epsilon)$  is invertible in  $Z_{\text{hyp}}(N)$  and  $N_1^{-1}(t, \xi, \epsilon) \in S\{0, 0\}$ .*

*Proof.* It remains to show the invertibility of  $N_1(t, \xi, \epsilon)$ . Indeed, by (4.43) it follows that

$$(4.44) \quad \det N_1 = 1 - \frac{\mathfrak{d}_\epsilon^2(t)}{16|\xi|^2}$$

and by Lemma 4.1 one has

$$(4.45) \quad \frac{\mathfrak{d}_\epsilon^2(t)}{16|\xi|^2} \leq \frac{(c_1\Phi_\epsilon(t-1) + c_2)^2}{16|\xi|^2}.$$

Hence, by choosing the zone constant  $N$  large enough such that

$$(4.46) \quad c_1\psi_\epsilon(t-1) + c_2 \leq N\psi_\epsilon(t-1) + N,$$

the invertibility follows. By the calculus rules of Proposition 4.4, we also conclude  $N_1^{-1} \in S\{0, 0\}$ .

The matrices  $N^{(1)}(t, \xi, \epsilon) \in S\{-1, 1\}$  and  $F^{(0)}(t, \epsilon) \in S\{0, 1\}$  are already constructed in such a way that (4.37) holds with the remainder

$$(4.47) \quad R_1(t, \xi, \epsilon) = N_1^{-1}(t, \xi, \epsilon)(R(t, \epsilon)N^{(1)}(t, \xi, \epsilon) - D_t N^{(1)}(t, \xi, \epsilon) - N^{(1)}(t, \xi, \epsilon)F^{(0)}(t, \epsilon)) \in S\{-1, 2\}$$

and the statement is proved.  $\square$

*Remark 4.3.* Taking the limits  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$  at the regular faces of  $Z_{\text{hyp}}(N)$  the diagonalisation procedure yields in particular the transformations needed to construct representations of solutions in the case of smooth coefficients. In particular the limit

$$(4.48) \quad N^{(1)}(t, \xi, 0) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} N^{(1)}(t, \xi, \epsilon)$$

exists for  $t \neq 1$  and  $|\xi| > N$  and satisfies

$$(4.49) \quad \|N_1(t, \xi, \epsilon) - N_1(t, \xi, 0)\| = \|N^{(1)}(t, \xi, \epsilon) - N^{(1)}(t, \xi, 0)\| \leq C\epsilon|\xi|^{-1},$$

and as the inverse  $N_1^{-1}(t, \xi, \epsilon)$  can be written as a Neumann series, we know that  $N_1^{-1}(t, \xi, \epsilon) - I \in S\{-1, 1\}$  and consequently

$$(4.50) \quad \|N_1^{-1}(t, \xi, \epsilon) - N_1^{-1}(t, \xi, 0)\| \leq C\epsilon|\xi|^{-1}.$$

Similarly the limit  $R_1(t, \xi, 0) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} R_1(t, \xi, \epsilon)$  satisfies

$$(4.51) \quad \|R_1(t, \xi, \epsilon) - R_1(t, \xi, 0)\| \leq C\epsilon|\xi|^{-1}.$$

This enables us to relate the construction of fundamental solutions for the regularised family to the fundamental solution of the original problem outside the singularity.

4.2.3. *Fundamental solution to the diagonalized system.* We now fix the zone constant  $N$  large enough to guarantee that  $N_1(t, \xi, \epsilon)$  be uniformly invertible within the hyperbolic zone  $Z_{\text{hyp}}(N)$ . Then for  $V$  solving (4.35), the transformed function

$$(4.52) \quad V_1(t, \xi, \epsilon) = N_1^{-1}(t, \xi, \epsilon)V(t, \xi, \epsilon)$$

satisfies due to (4.37)

$$(4.53) \quad D_t V_1(t, \xi) = \left( D(\xi) + F^{(0)}(t, \xi, \epsilon) + R_1(t, \xi, \epsilon) \right) V_1(t, \xi)$$

with the diagonal matrix  $F^{(0)} \in S\{0, 1\}$  given by (4.41) and the remainder  $R_1(t, \xi, \epsilon) \in S\{-1, 2\}$  specified by (4.47). We construct its fundamental solution.

**Theorem 4.7.** *Assume the Hypotheses (H1) and (H2) hold. Then the fundamental solution  $\mathcal{E}_1(t, s, \xi, \epsilon)$  to the transformed system (4.53) can be represented by*

$$(4.54) \quad \mathcal{E}_1(t, s, \xi, \epsilon) = \sqrt{\frac{b_\epsilon(s)}{b_\epsilon(t)}} \mathcal{E}_0(t, s, \xi) \mathcal{Q}(t, s, \xi, \epsilon)$$

for  $[s, t] \times \{(\xi, \epsilon)\} \subset Z_{\text{hyp}}(N)$ , where

- (1) the factor  $\sqrt{\frac{b_\epsilon(s)}{b_\epsilon(t)}}$  describes the main influence of the dissipation term;
- (2) the matrix  $\mathcal{E}_0(t, s, \xi)$  is the fundamental solution of the hyperbolic principal part  $D_t - D(\xi)$  given by

$$(4.55) \quad \mathcal{E}_0(t, s, \xi) = \begin{pmatrix} \exp(i(t-s)|\xi|) & 0 \\ 0 & \exp(-i(t-s)|\xi|) \end{pmatrix};$$

- (3) the matrix  $\mathcal{Q}(t, s, \xi, \epsilon)$  is uniformly bounded

$$(4.56) \quad \|\mathcal{Q}(t, s, \xi, \epsilon)\| \leq \exp \left( \int_s^t \|R_1(\tau, \xi, \epsilon)\| d\tau \right),$$

uniformly invertible within the hyperbolic zone due to

$$(4.57) \quad |\det \mathcal{Q}(t, s, \xi, \epsilon)| \geq \exp \left( \int_s^t \|R_1(\tau, \xi, \epsilon)\| d\tau \right),$$

and has the precise behaviour for large  $|\xi|$  determined by the identity matrix

$$(4.58) \quad \|\mathcal{Q}(t, s, \xi, \epsilon) - I\| \leq \int_s^t \|R_1(t_1, \xi, \epsilon)\| \exp \left( \int_s^{t_1} \|R_1(\tau, \xi, \epsilon)\| d\tau \right) dt_1.$$

*Proof.* We consider first  $D_t - D(\xi) - F^0$ , i.e. the main diagonal part of the transformed system (4.53). Its fundamental solution is given by

$$(4.59) \quad \mathcal{E}_0(t, s, \xi) \exp \left( -\frac{1}{2} \int_s^t \mathfrak{d}_\epsilon(\tau) d\tau \right) = \sqrt{\frac{b_\epsilon(s)}{b_\epsilon(t)}} \mathcal{E}_0(t, s, \xi, \epsilon),$$

where  $\mathcal{E}_0(t, s, \xi)$  is the fundamental solution to  $D_t - D(\xi)$  given by (4.55). For the fundamental solution to the system (4.53) we use an ansatz in the form

$$(4.60) \quad \mathcal{E}_1(t, s, \xi) = \sqrt{\frac{b_\epsilon(s)}{b_\epsilon(t)}} \mathcal{E}_0(t, s, \xi, \epsilon) \mathcal{Q}(t, s, \xi, \epsilon)$$

for a still to be determined matrix  $\mathcal{Q}(t, s, \xi, \epsilon)$ . A simple calculation shows that  $\mathcal{Q}(t, s, \xi, \epsilon)$  must solve

$$(4.61) \quad D_t \mathcal{Q}(t, s, \xi, \epsilon) = \mathcal{R}(t, s, \xi, \epsilon) \mathcal{Q}(t, s, \xi, \epsilon), \quad \mathcal{Q}(s, s, \xi, \epsilon) = I,$$

with coefficient matrix

$$(4.62) \quad \mathcal{R}(t, s, \xi, \epsilon) = \mathcal{E}_0(s, t, \xi) R_1(t, \xi, \epsilon) \mathcal{E}_0(t, s, \xi)$$

determined by the remainder  $R_1$  and the fundamental solution of the hyperbolic principal part  $\mathcal{E}_0$ . The solution  $\mathcal{Q}$  can thus be represented in terms of the Peano–Baker series

$$(4.63) \quad \mathcal{Q}(t, s, \xi, \epsilon) = \mathbf{I} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} i^k \int_s^t \mathcal{R}(t_1, s, \xi, \epsilon) \int_s^{t_1} \mathcal{R}(t_2, s, \xi, \epsilon) \int_s^{t_2} \cdots \int_s^{t_{k-1}} \mathcal{R}(t_k, s, \xi, \epsilon) dt_k \dots dt_2 dt_1,$$

and it remains to provide estimates based on this series representation. As  $\mathcal{E}_0$  is unitary, we obtain from the symbol estimate of the remainder  $R_1$

$$(4.64) \quad \|\mathcal{R}(t, s, \xi, \epsilon)\| = \|R_1(t, \xi, \epsilon)\| \leq C|\xi|^{-1} (\Phi_\epsilon(t-1) + 1)^2 \leq \frac{C}{N} (\Phi_\epsilon(t-1) + 1),$$

and thus it follows that

$$(4.65) \quad \|\mathcal{Q}(t, s, \xi, \epsilon)\| \leq \exp \left( \int_s^t \|R_1(\tau, \xi, \epsilon)\| d\tau \right) \leq \exp(C/N).$$

Together with

$$(4.66) \quad \det \mathcal{Q}(t, s, \xi, \epsilon) = \exp \left( \int_s^t \text{trace } R_1(\tau, \xi, \epsilon) d\tau \right)$$

the uniform invertibility of  $\mathcal{Q}$  follows. Furthermore, by using (3.4) we obtain

$$(4.67) \quad \|\mathcal{Q}(t, s, \xi, \epsilon) - \mathbf{I}\| \leq C|\xi|^{-1} (\Phi_\epsilon(t-1) + 1) \exp(C/N),$$

and the main contribution of  $\mathcal{Q}$  for large  $|\xi|$  is given by the identity matrix.  $\square$

**4.2.4. Fundamental solution to the original system.** After obtaining the fundamental solution to the transformed system (4.53), we go back to the original problem (3.11) and obtain in the hyperbolic zone the representation

$$(4.68) \quad \mathcal{E}_{\text{hyp}}(t, s, \xi, \epsilon) = \sqrt{\frac{b_\epsilon(s)}{b_\epsilon(t)}} M N_1(t, \xi, \epsilon) \mathcal{E}_0(t, s, \xi) \mathcal{Q}(t, s, \xi, \epsilon) N_1^{-1}(s, \xi, \epsilon) M^{-1}$$

for the fundamental solution. We will briefly discuss its limiting behaviour as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$  for fixed  $s < t < 1$  or  $1 < s < t$ . As  $\mathcal{E}_0(t, s, \xi)$  is independent of  $\epsilon$  and the transformation matrix  $N_1(t, \xi, \epsilon)$  is already estimated by (4.49), this boils down to considering  $\mathcal{Q}(t, s, \xi, \epsilon)$ .

**Lemma 4.8.** *The limit*

$$(4.69) \quad \mathcal{Q}(t, s, \xi, 0) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{Q}(t, s, \xi, \epsilon)$$

*exists for fixed  $s < t < 1$  or  $1 < s < t$ , is uniformly bounded and invertible, and satisfies the estimate*

$$(4.70) \quad \|\mathcal{Q}(t, s, \xi, \epsilon) - \mathcal{Q}(t, s, \xi, 0)\| \lesssim \epsilon |\xi|^{-1}$$

*holds for all  $[s, t] \times \{(\xi, \epsilon)\} \subset Z_{\text{hyp}}$  with the condition that  $\min\{|t-1|, |s-1|\} \geq \epsilon K$ .*

*Proof.* We use (4.51) in combination with (4.63) and consider

$$(4.71) \quad \mathcal{Q}(t, s, \xi, 0) = \mathbf{I} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} i^k \int_s^t \mathcal{R}(t_1, s, \xi, 0) \int_s^{t_1} \mathcal{R}(t_2, s, \xi, 0) \int_s^{t_2} \cdots \int_s^{t_{k-1}} \mathcal{R}(t_k, s, \xi, 0) dt_k \dots dt_2 dt_1$$

defined in terms of

$$(4.72) \quad \mathcal{R}(t, s, \xi, 0) = \mathcal{E}_0(s, t, \xi) R_1(t, \xi, 0) \mathcal{E}_0(t, s, \xi)$$

with

$$(4.73) \quad \|\mathcal{R}(t, s, \xi, 0)\| = \|R_1(t, \xi, 0)\| \leq C|\xi|^{-1}$$

uniformly in  $0 < s < t < 1$  or  $1 < s < t < 2$  and  $|\xi| > N$ . It thus follows that  $\mathcal{Q}(t, s, \xi, 0)$  is uniformly bounded and uniformly invertible. To estimate the difference between  $\mathcal{Q}(t, s, \xi, \epsilon)$  and  $\mathcal{Q}(t, s, \xi, 0)$ , we use a perturbation argument based on the estimate

$$(4.74) \quad \|\mathcal{R}(t, s, \xi, \epsilon) - \mathcal{R}(t, s, \xi, 0)\| = \|R_1(t, \xi, \epsilon) - R_1(t, \xi, 0)\| \leq C\epsilon |\xi|^{-1}$$

for  $|t - 1| \geq \epsilon K$  following from (4.51). Differentiating

$$(4.75) \quad \mathcal{Q}(t, s, \xi, \epsilon) = \mathcal{Q}(t, s, \xi, 0) \Xi(t, s, \xi, \epsilon)$$

yields for  $\Xi(t, s, \xi, \epsilon)$  the equation

$$(4.76) \quad D_t \Xi(t, s, \xi, \epsilon) = \mathcal{Q}(t, s, \xi, 0) (\mathcal{R}(t, s, \xi, \epsilon) - \mathcal{R}(t, s, \xi, 0)) \mathcal{Q}(s, t, \xi, 0) \Xi(t, s, \xi, \epsilon)$$

with initial condition  $\Xi(s, s, \xi, \epsilon) = I$  and coefficient matrix estimated by

$$(4.77) \quad \|\mathcal{Q}(t, s, \xi, 0) (\mathcal{R}(t, s, \xi, \epsilon) - \mathcal{R}(t, s, \xi, 0)) \mathcal{Q}(s, t, \xi, 0)\| \leq C\epsilon |\xi|^{-1}.$$

Therefore, using the representation of  $\Xi(t, s, \xi, \epsilon)$  in terms of the Peano–Baker series we obtain the estimate

$$(4.78) \quad \|\Xi(t, s, \xi, \epsilon)\| \leq \exp(C\epsilon |\xi|^{-1} |t - s|) = 1 + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon |\xi|^{-1})$$

uniform with respect to  $t$  and  $s$  for  $|t - 1|, |s - 1| \geq \epsilon K$  and thus the desired statement follows.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.9.** *The estimate*

$$(4.79) \quad \|\mathcal{E}_{\text{hyp}}(t, s, \xi, \epsilon) - \mathcal{E}_{\text{hyp}}(t, s, \xi, 0)\| \lesssim \epsilon$$

holds for all  $[s, t] \times \{(\xi, \epsilon)\} \subset Z_{\text{hyp}}$  with the condition that  $\min\{|t - 1|, |s - 1|\} \geq \epsilon K$ .

*Proof.* The proof follows directly from the representation (4.68) of  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{hyp}}(t, s, \xi, \epsilon)$  combined with an analogous formula for the limit  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{hyp}}(t, s, \xi, 0) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{E}_{\text{hyp}}(t, s, \xi, \epsilon)$ . As all terms in (4.68) are uniformly bounded within the hyperbolic zone we obtain

$$(4.80) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{E}_{\text{hyp}}(t, s, \xi, \epsilon) - \mathcal{E}_{\text{hyp}}(t, s, \xi, 0)\| &\lesssim \left| \sqrt{\frac{b_\epsilon(s)}{b_\epsilon(t)}} - \sqrt{\frac{b_\epsilon(0)}{b_\epsilon(0)}} \right| + \|N_1(t, \xi, \epsilon) - N_1(t, \xi, 0)\| \\ &\quad + \|\mathcal{Q}(t, s, \xi, \epsilon) - \mathcal{Q}(t, s, \xi, 0)\| + \|N_1^{-1}(s, \xi, \epsilon) - N_1^{-1}(s, \xi, 0)\| \end{aligned}$$

Each of the last three differences appearing on the right hand side can be controlled by  $\epsilon |\xi|^{-1}$  by estimate (4.49) for  $N_1(t, \xi, \epsilon)$  and (4.50) for  $N_1^{-1}(s, \xi, \epsilon)$ , and by estimate (4.70) for  $\mathcal{Q}(t, s, \xi, \epsilon)$ . Furthermore, by Proposition 4.2 for  $b_\epsilon(s)$  and  $b_\epsilon(t)$ , we know that the first difference is controlled by  $\epsilon$ . The desired estimate for the fundamental solution follows.  $\square$

**4.3. Treatment in the singular zone.** Now we consider equation (3.9) within the singular zone. In order to describe its fundamental solution we use the substitution  $\tau = \epsilon^{-1}(t - 1)$  and replace the parameter  $|\xi|$  by  $\Lambda = \epsilon |\xi|$ . Then the equation (3.9) can be rewritten as

$$(4.81) \quad \hat{u}_{\tau\tau} + \Lambda^2 \hat{u} + \beta_\epsilon(\tau) \hat{u}_\tau = 0,$$

where

$$(4.82) \quad \beta_\epsilon(\tau) = \epsilon \mathfrak{D}_\epsilon(1 + \epsilon\tau) = \frac{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} b(1 + \epsilon(\tau - \theta)) \psi'(\theta) d\theta}{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} b(1 + \epsilon(\tau - \theta)) \psi(\theta) d\theta}.$$

We recall here that in the new coordinates the singular zone is rewritten as

$$(4.83) \quad Z_{\text{sing}}(N) = \{(\tau, \Lambda, \epsilon) \mid \Lambda \leq N\Phi(\tau) + N\epsilon\}$$

so that the interval in which to solve our equation is given by  $[\tau_{\Lambda_1}(\epsilon), \tau_{\Lambda_2}(\epsilon)]$  with implicitly defined endpoints through

$$(4.84) \quad \Lambda = N\Phi(\tau_\Lambda) + \epsilon.$$

4.3.1. *System form.* Reformulating our equation as a system in

$$(4.85) \quad U(\tau, \Lambda, \epsilon) = \begin{pmatrix} \Lambda \hat{u} \\ \partial_\tau \hat{u} \end{pmatrix}$$

yields

$$(4.86) \quad \partial_\tau U(\tau, \Lambda, \epsilon) = \left[ \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\beta_\epsilon(\tau) \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \Lambda \\ -\Lambda & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right] U(\tau, \Lambda, \epsilon),$$

where now the first matrix  $A(\tau, \epsilon) = \text{diag}(0, -\beta_\epsilon(\tau))$  is treated as the dominant part and the second matrix

$$(4.87) \quad \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \Lambda \\ -\Lambda & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \Lambda \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \Lambda J$$

plays the role of the remainder.

**Proposition 4.10.** *Under the assumptions (H1) and (H2) for the function  $b$*

$$(4.88) \quad \beta_\epsilon(\tau) = \beta_0(\tau) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$$

*holds uniformly with respect to  $\tau$ , where  $\beta_0(\tau)$  is given by*

$$(4.89) \quad \beta_0(\tau) = \frac{h\psi(\tau)}{h \int_{-K}^{\tau} \psi(\theta) d\theta + b(1_{-0})} = \frac{h\psi(\tau)}{b(1_{+0}) - h \int_{\tau}^K \psi(\theta) d\theta}$$

*in terms of  $h = b(1_{+0}) - b(1_{-0})$  the jump of  $b$  at  $t = 1$ .*

*Remark 4.4.* In (4.89) the numerator is the derivative of the denominator with respect to  $\tau$ . We also see that  $\beta_0(\tau)$  is compactly supported with  $\text{supp } \beta_0 = \text{supp } \psi = [-K, K]$ .

*Proof.* The statement follows by considering both the numerator and the denominator of the representation (4.82) separately. First,

$$(4.90) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} b(1 + \epsilon(\tau - \theta)) \psi'(\theta) d\theta &= \int_{-\infty}^{\tau} b(1 + \epsilon(\tau - \theta)) \psi'(\theta) d\theta + \int_{\tau}^{+\infty} b(1 + \epsilon(\tau - \theta)) \psi'(\theta) d\theta \\ &= h\psi(\tau) + \epsilon \int_{-\infty}^{\tau} b'(1 + \epsilon(\tau - \theta)) \psi(\theta) d\theta + \epsilon \int_{\tau}^{+\infty} b'(1 + \epsilon(\tau - \theta)) \psi(\theta) d\theta \\ &= h\psi(\tau) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon) \end{aligned}$$

using integration by parts and the fact that  $b'$  is bounded on both  $[0, 1]$  and  $[1, 2]$ . Similarly, we obtain for the denominator

$$(4.91) \quad \begin{aligned} &\left| \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} b(1 + \epsilon(\tau - \theta)) \psi(\theta) d\theta - \int_{-\infty}^{\tau} b(1_{+0}) \psi(\theta) d\theta - \int_{\tau}^{+\infty} b(1_{-0}) \psi(\theta) d\theta \right| \\ &\leq \int_{-\infty}^{\tau} |b(1 + \epsilon(\tau - \theta)) - b(1_{+0})| \psi(\theta) d\theta + \int_{\tau}^{\infty} |b(1 + \epsilon(\tau - \theta)) - b(1_{-0})| \psi(\theta) d\theta \\ &\leq \int_{-K}^{\tau} C_1 \epsilon |\tau - \theta| \psi(\theta) d\theta + \int_{\tau}^K C_2 \epsilon |\tau - \theta| \psi(\theta) d\theta, \end{aligned}$$

where for the last line we applied the mean value theorem to the function  $b$  for  $C_1 = \sup_{s \in [1, 2]} |b'(s)|$  and  $C_2 = \sup_{s \in [0, 1]} |b'(s)|$ . Hence

$$(4.92) \quad \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} b(1 + \epsilon(\tau - \theta)) \psi(\theta) d\theta = b(1_{+0}) \int_{-\infty}^{\tau} \psi(\theta) d\theta + b(1_{-0}) \int_{\tau}^{+\infty} \psi(\theta) d\theta + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon),$$

and therefore by combining (4.90) and (4.92) the desired statement follows.  $\square$

4.3.2. *Construction of the fundamental solution in the singular zone.* In the following we want to derive properties of the fundamental solution to (4.86). The strategy is again to use a perturbation argument to incorporate the remainder terms. Note, that in singular variables both  $\tau$  and  $\Lambda$  stay bounded within  $Z_{\text{sing}}(N)$  and our main interest is in the characterisation of the solution when  $\Lambda \rightarrow 0$  and  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ .

**Theorem 4.11.** *The fundamental solution to the system (4.86) can be represented by*

$$(4.93) \quad \mathcal{E}_{\text{sing}}(\tau, \theta, \Lambda, \epsilon) = \mathcal{F}(\tau, \theta, \epsilon) \mathcal{G}(\tau, \theta, \Lambda, \epsilon)$$

for  $[\theta, \tau] \times \{(\Lambda, \epsilon)\} \subset Z_{\text{sing}}(N)$  with  $\theta < \tau$ , where

(1)  $\mathcal{F}(\tau, \theta, \epsilon)$  is the fundamental solution to the main part  $\partial_\tau - \text{diag}(0, -\beta_\epsilon(\tau))$  given by

$$(4.94) \quad \mathcal{F}(\tau, \theta, \epsilon) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \exp\left(-\int_\theta^\tau \beta_\epsilon(\vartheta) d\vartheta\right) \end{pmatrix}$$

with

$$(4.95) \quad \exp\left(\int_\theta^\tau \beta_\epsilon(\vartheta) d\vartheta\right) = \frac{h\Theta(\tau) + b(1_{-0})}{h\Theta(\theta) + b(1_{-0})} (1 + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon))$$

in terms of the smoothed Heaviside function

$$(4.96) \quad \Theta(\tau) = \int_{-\infty}^\tau \psi(\vartheta) d\vartheta = 1 - \int_\tau^\infty \psi(\vartheta) d\vartheta$$

and the height of the jump  $h = b(1_{+0}) - b(1_{-0})$ ; and

(2) the matrix  $\mathcal{G}(\tau, \theta, \Lambda, \epsilon)$  is given as a power series

$$(4.97) \quad \mathcal{G}(\tau, \theta, \Lambda, \epsilon) = \mathbf{I} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \Lambda^k \mathcal{G}_k(\tau, \theta, \epsilon)$$

with coefficients  $\mathcal{G}_k$  satisfying

$$(4.98) \quad \|\mathcal{G}_k(\tau, \theta, \epsilon)\| \leq \frac{C^k |\tau - \theta|^k}{k!}$$

uniformly in  $k$  and the occurring variables.

*Proof.* The representation for  $\mathcal{F}$  follows by integrating the main diagonal part in equation (4.86). Using the explicit form of  $\beta_0(\tau)$  from (4.89) in combination with  $\beta_\epsilon(\tau) = \beta_0(\tau) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ , we obtain (4.95).

We make the ansatz

$$(4.99) \quad \mathcal{E}_{\text{sing}}(\tau, \theta, \Lambda, \epsilon) = \mathcal{F}(\tau, \theta, \epsilon) \mathcal{G}(\tau, \theta, \Lambda, \epsilon)$$

for the fundamental solution to system (4.86). Then by construction

$$(4.100) \quad \partial_\tau \mathcal{G}(\tau, \theta, \Lambda, \epsilon) = \Lambda \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\tau, \theta, \epsilon) \mathcal{G}(\tau, \theta, \Lambda, \epsilon) \quad \text{with} \quad \mathcal{G}(\theta, \theta, \Lambda, \epsilon) = \mathbf{I},$$

where the coefficient matrix satisfies

$$(4.101) \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\tau, \theta, \epsilon) &= \mathcal{F}(\tau, \theta, \epsilon) \mathbf{J} \mathcal{F}(\theta, \tau, \epsilon) \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \exp\left(-\int_\theta^\tau \beta_\epsilon(\vartheta) d\vartheta\right) \\ -\exp\left(-\int_\tau^\theta \beta_\epsilon(\vartheta) d\vartheta\right) & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \exp\left(-\int_\theta^\tau \beta_0(\vartheta) d\vartheta\right) \\ -\exp\left(-\int_\tau^\theta \beta_0(\vartheta) d\vartheta\right) & 0 \end{pmatrix} (1 + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon)). \end{aligned}$$

In particular we obtain the uniform bound

$$(4.102) \quad \|\tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\tau, \theta, \epsilon)\| \leq C$$

independent of  $\tau$ ,  $\theta$  and  $\epsilon$ . Writing the solution to (4.100) by the Peano–Baker series, we have for (4.97) that

$$(4.103) \quad \mathcal{G}(\tau, \theta, \Lambda, \epsilon) = \mathbf{I} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \Lambda^k \int_\theta^\tau \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\tau_1, \theta, \epsilon) \int_\theta^{\tau_1} \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\tau_2, \theta, \epsilon) \int_\theta^{\tau_2} \cdots \int_\theta^{\tau_{k-1}} \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\tau_k, \theta, \epsilon) d\tau_k \dots d\tau_2 d\tau_1$$

as a power series in  $\Lambda$  with coefficients

$$(4.104) \quad \mathcal{G}_k(\tau, \theta, \epsilon) = \int_{\theta}^{\tau} \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\tau_1, \theta, \epsilon) \int_{\theta}^{\tau_1} \cdots \int_{\theta}^{\tau_{k-1}} \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\tau_k, \theta, \epsilon) d\tau_k \dots d\tau_1.$$

Combining this with (4.102) concludes the proof.  $\square$

*Remark 4.5.* The asymptotic behaviour of the coefficient  $\beta_{\epsilon}$  for  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$  allows to simplify the formulas and to extract the asymptotic main contribution of the singular zone. Based on (4.88) and (4.89) we obtain

$$(4.105) \quad \exp \left( - \int_{\tau_{\Lambda_1}(\epsilon)}^{\tau_{\Lambda_2}(\epsilon)} \beta_{\epsilon}(\tau) d\tau \right) = \exp \left( - \int_{\tau_{\Lambda_1}}^{\tau_{\Lambda_2}} \beta_0(\tau) d\tau \right) (1 + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon))$$

$$= \frac{b(1_{+0}) - h \int_{\tau_{\Lambda_1}}^K \psi(\theta) d\theta}{b(1_{+0}) - h \int_{\tau_{\Lambda_2}}^K \psi(\theta) d\theta} (1 + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon)) = \frac{b(1_{-0})}{b(1_{+0})} (1 + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon))$$

with  $\tau_{\Lambda_j} = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \tau_{\Lambda_j}(\epsilon)$  and for all  $\Lambda$  small enough to guarantee  $\tau_{\Lambda_1} \leq -K$  and  $K \leq \tau_{\Lambda_2}$ . Thus for all these  $\Lambda$  we obtain

$$(4.106) \quad \mathcal{F}(\tau_{\Lambda_1}, \tau_{\Lambda_2}, \epsilon) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{b(1_{-0})}{b(1_{+0})} \end{pmatrix} (1 + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon)).$$

From (4.97) and (4.98) we conclude that  $\mathcal{G}(\tau, \theta, \Lambda, \epsilon) - \mathbf{I} = \mathcal{O}(\Lambda)$  holds uniform with respect to  $\epsilon$ ,  $\tau$  and  $\theta$  and hence

$$(4.107) \quad \mathcal{E}_{\text{sing}}(\tau_{\Lambda_2}, \tau_{\Lambda_1}, \Lambda, \epsilon) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{b(1_{-0})}{b(1_{+0})} \end{pmatrix} (1 + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon) + \mathcal{O}(\Lambda))$$

follows.

**4.3.3. Limiting behaviour of the fundamental solution in the singular zone.** We want to describe the behaviour of the fundamental solution  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{sing}}(\tau_{\Lambda_2}, \tau_{\Lambda_1}, \Lambda, \epsilon)$  as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$  for fixed  $\Lambda$ . By (4.95) we already know that the limit

$$(4.108) \quad \mathcal{F}(\tau, \theta, 0) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{F}(\tau, \theta, \epsilon)$$

exists and satisfies

$$(4.109) \quad \|\mathcal{F}(\tau, \theta, \epsilon) - \mathcal{F}(\tau, \theta, 0)\| \leq C\epsilon$$

uniform in  $\tau_{\Lambda_1} \leq \theta < \tau \leq \tau_{\Lambda_2}$ . In the next step we consider the limiting behaviour of the power series  $\mathcal{G}$  and in particular its coefficients  $\mathcal{G}_k$ .

**Lemma 4.12.** *The limit*

$$(4.110) \quad \mathcal{G}_k(\tau, \theta, 0) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{G}_k(\tau, \theta, \epsilon)$$

*exists for all  $\tau_{\Lambda_1} \leq \theta < \tau \leq \tau_{\Lambda_2}$  and satisfies*

$$(4.111) \quad \|\mathcal{G}_k(\tau, \theta, \epsilon) - \mathcal{G}_k(\tau, \theta, 0)\| \leq C\epsilon.$$

*Furthermore,*

$$(4.112) \quad \mathcal{G}_1(\tau, \theta, 0) = \int_{\theta}^{\tau} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \exp \left( \int_{\theta}^{\tau_1} \beta_0(\vartheta) d\vartheta \right) \\ -\exp \left( \int_{\tau_1}^{\theta} \beta_0(\vartheta) d\vartheta \right) & 0 \end{pmatrix} d\tau_1.$$

*Proof.* The limiting behaviour of  $\mathcal{F}$  implies that the limit

$$(4.113) \quad \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\tau, \theta, 0) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\tau, \theta, \epsilon)$$

exists and is uniformly bounded with respect to  $\tau_{\Lambda_1} \leq \theta < \tau \leq \tau_{\Lambda_2}$  and therefore the functions

$$(4.114) \quad \mathcal{G}_k(\tau, \theta, 0) = \int_{\theta}^{\tau} \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\tau_1, \theta, 0) \int_{\theta}^{\tau_1} \cdots \int_{\theta}^{\tau_{k-1}} \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\tau_k, \theta, 0) d\tau_k \dots d\tau_1$$



are good candidates to be considered for the limiting behaviour of  $\mathcal{G}_k$ . For  $k = 1$  the representation

$$(4.115) \quad \mathcal{G}_1(\tau, \theta, 0) = \int_{\theta}^{\tau} \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\tau_1, \theta, 0) d\tau_1$$

corresponds directly to (4.112) due to the formula (4.101) for  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\tau, \theta, 0)$ . Hence, using the analogue to (4.109) we obtain

$$(4.116) \quad \|\mathcal{G}_1(\tau, \theta, \epsilon) - \mathcal{G}_1(\tau, \theta, 0)\| \leq \int_{\theta}^{\tau} \|\tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\tau_1, \theta, \epsilon) - \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\tau_1, \theta, 0)\| d\tau_1 \leq C|\tau - \theta|\epsilon$$

and using  $|\tau - \theta| \leq 2K'$  the first statement follows.

The estimate for  $\mathcal{G}_k$  is obtained by telescoping the integral

$$(4.117) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_k(\tau, \theta, \epsilon) - \mathcal{G}_k(\tau, \theta, 0) &= \int_{\theta}^{\tau} (\tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\tau_1, \theta, \epsilon) - \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\tau_1, \theta, 0)) \int_{\theta}^{\tau_1} \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\tau_1, \theta, 0) \cdots \int_{\theta}^{\tau_{k-1}} \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\tau_k, \theta, 0) d\tau_k \dots d\tau_1 \\ &\quad + \int_{\theta}^{\tau} (\tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\tau_1, \theta, \epsilon) - \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\tau_1, \theta, 0)) \int_{\theta}^{\tau_1} (\tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\tau_1, \theta, \epsilon) - \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\tau_1, \theta, 0)) \\ &\quad \times \int_{\theta}^{\tau_2} \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\tau_3, \theta, 0) \cdots \int_{\theta}^{\tau_{k-1}} \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\tau_k, \theta, 0) d\tau_k \dots d\tau_1 \\ &\quad + \dots, \end{aligned}$$

each term containing one difference more up to having  $k$  differences as integrands. Note that this represents the difference  $\mathcal{G}_k(\tau, \theta, \epsilon) - \mathcal{G}_k(\tau, \theta, 0)$  in terms of the differences  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\tau_1, \theta, \epsilon) - \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\tau_1, \theta, 0)$  and the form  $\mathcal{G}_{k-\ell}(\tau_{\ell}, \theta, 0)$  already estimated in the previous induction step. Hence

$$(4.118) \quad \|\mathcal{G}_k(\tau, \theta, \epsilon) - \mathcal{G}_k(\tau, \theta, 0)\| \lesssim \sum_{\ell=1}^k \epsilon^{\ell} \lesssim \epsilon$$

and the lemma is proved.  $\square$

**4.4. Bounded frequencies.** We will give some remarks concerning estimates for the fundamental solution for  $|\xi| \leq N$ . Here it suffices to consider the system (3.11) in original form and to observe that its coefficient matrices have norm estimates  $\|A(\xi)\| \lesssim |\xi|$  and  $\|B(t, \epsilon)\| \lesssim 1 + \Phi_{\epsilon}(t - 1)$ .

Representing its solution directly by the Peano–Baker series yields

$$(4.119) \quad \|\mathcal{E}(t, s, \xi, \epsilon)\| \leq \exp \left( C \int_s^t (|\xi| + 1 + \Phi_{\epsilon}(\theta - 1)) d\theta \right) \leq \tilde{C}$$

using that  $\int_0^2 \Phi_{\epsilon}(t - 1) dt$  is independent of  $\epsilon$  and that both  $|\xi|$  and  $s, t$  are bounded.

*Remark 4.6.* Note that for dissipative problems the uniform boundedness of the fundamental solution follows already from the positivity of the coefficient of (3.1) in front of  $u_t$ . For more general wave models this statement needs a proof and the above reasoning seems viable for this case too.

**4.5. Combining the bits.** We collect here the estimates obtained so far. As we are interested in the influence of the point singularity on the structure of the fundamental solution we consider  $t_1, t_2 \in [0, 2]$  with  $t_1 < 1 < t_2$  and look at the fundamental solution to (3.11) for fixed  $\epsilon$  chosen sufficiently small. This is given by

$$(4.120) \quad \mathcal{E}(t_2, t_1, \xi, \epsilon) = \mathcal{E}_{\text{hyp}}(t_2, t_{\xi_2}(\epsilon), \xi, \epsilon) T^{-1}(\epsilon) \mathcal{E}_{\text{sing}}(\tau_{\xi_2}(\epsilon), \tau_{\xi_1}(\epsilon), \epsilon|\xi|, \epsilon) T(\epsilon) \mathcal{E}_{\text{hyp}}(t_{\xi_1}(\epsilon), t_1, \xi, \epsilon)$$

with  $T(\epsilon)$  the transformation matrix between the micro-energies used in the hyperbolic zone and in the singular zone, such as

$$(4.121) \quad T(\epsilon) = \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon & 0 \\ 0 & \epsilon \end{pmatrix} = \epsilon I.$$

Note that both of these matrices cancel each other and can therefore be neglected. As  $\epsilon$  tends to 0 we have  $t_{\xi_1} \rightarrow 1_{-0}$  and  $t_{\xi_2} \rightarrow 1_{+0}$ . So using the estimates (4.79) and (4.107) we obtain for fixed  $\xi$

$$(4.122) \quad \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{E}(t_2, t_1, \xi, \epsilon) = \mathcal{E}_{\text{hyp}}(t_2, 1_{+0}, \xi, 0) \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & H \end{pmatrix} \mathcal{E}_{\text{hyp}}(1_{-0}, t_1, \xi, 0),$$

where  $H = \frac{b(1-0)}{b(1+0)}$  is given in terms of the jump of  $\log b$  at  $t = 1$ .

## 5. RESULTS

**5.1. Existence of very weak solutions.** Although in our model case the existence of very weak solutions was already established in [9], we will show how to obtain this from the properties of the fundamental solution just constructed.

**Proposition 5.1.** *For  $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$ ,  $0 \leq s < t \leq 2$  and  $|\xi| \geq N$  the fundamental solution to system (3.11) is uniformly bounded, i.e.*

$$(5.1) \quad \|\mathcal{E}(t, s, \xi, \epsilon)\| \leq C.$$

*Proof.* If  $[s, t] \times \{(\xi, \epsilon)\} \subset Z_{\text{hyp}}(N)$ , the result follows directly from the construction in the hyperbolic zone. So it remains to consider only situations where the time interval intersects with the singular zone  $Z_{\text{sing}}(N)$ .

We focus on the situation where  $(s, \xi, \epsilon) \in Z_{\text{hyp}}(N)$  and  $(t, \xi, \epsilon) \in Z_{\text{sing}}(N)$ , i.e.,  $s < t_{\xi_1}(\epsilon) < 1$  and  $t_{\xi_1}(\epsilon) < t < t_{\xi_2}(\epsilon)$ . Then the fundamental solution to system (3.11) is given by

$$(5.2) \quad \mathcal{E}(t, s, \xi, \epsilon) = T^{-1}(\epsilon) \mathcal{E}_{\text{sing}}(\tau_{\xi_2}, \tau_{\xi_1}, \epsilon|\xi|, \epsilon) T(\epsilon) \mathcal{E}_{\text{hyp}}(t_{\xi_1}, t, \xi, \epsilon).$$

As the factors  $\epsilon^{-1}$  and  $\epsilon$  arising from  $T^{\pm 1}(\epsilon)$  cancel out, it suffices to show the uniform boundedness of  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{hyp}}(t, s, \xi, \epsilon)$  for  $s < t$  over the hyperbolic zone and that of  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{sing}}(\tau, \theta, \Lambda, \epsilon)$  for  $\theta < \tau$  over the singular zone (in singular variables).

Hence, it remains to collect the already proved boundedness results. For  $|\xi| \leq N$  (i.e. for  $\Lambda \leq N\epsilon$ ) the uniform bound was shown in (4.119). For  $|\xi| > N$  and within the hyperbolic zone the boundedness follows from the representation (4.68) and the boundedness of each individual factor due to Theorem 4.7, while within the singular zone the representation in Theorem 4.11 gives a uniform bound on the fundamental solution based on the uniform boundedness of  $\tau_{\Lambda_1}$  and  $\tau_{\Lambda_2}$  with respect to both  $\epsilon$  and  $\Lambda$ .  $\square$

In combination with the bound  $\epsilon^{-1} + |\xi|$  for the coefficient matrix of (3.11) we conclude the bound

$$(5.3) \quad \|\mathbf{D}_t^k \mathcal{E}(t, s, \xi, \epsilon)\| \leq C_k \epsilon^{-k} |\xi|^k$$

uniform in  $s < t$ ,  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ .

**Corollary 5.2.** *Let the net  $(u_\epsilon)_{\epsilon \in (0, 1]}$  be a solution net to the Cauchy problem (3.8) for initial data  $u_0 \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$  and  $u_1 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ . Then the estimate*

$$(5.4) \quad \|\partial_t^{1+k} u(t, \cdot)\|_{H^{-k}(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|\partial_t^k u(t, \cdot)\|_{H^{1-k}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C_k \epsilon^{-k}$$

*holds.*

*Remark 5.1.* Note that the negative power of  $\epsilon$  only appears for the solution at and after the singularity  $t = 1$ , and the estimates hold without  $\epsilon$  when  $t < 1$ .

**5.2. Exceptional propagation of singularities.** Now we want to prove the exceptional propagation of singularities already hinted by the numerical experiments from [9]. For this we consider the model problem in *one* space dimension and use specially prepared initial data in the form of wave packets

$$(5.5) \quad \begin{aligned} u_0(x) &= e^{ix\delta^{-1}\xi_0} \chi(x), \\ u_1(x) &= \partial_x u_0(x) = e^{ix\delta^{-1}\xi_0} (i\xi_0 \delta^{-1} \chi(x) + \chi'(x)) \end{aligned}$$

parameterised by a fixed frequency  $\xi_0 \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$  and for a smooth rapidly decaying function  $\chi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$  with sufficiently small Fourier support around the origin. Applying a Fourier transform we see that

$$(5.6) \quad |\xi| \widehat{u_0}(\xi) \pm i \widehat{u_1}(\xi) = |\xi| \widehat{\chi}(\xi - \delta^{-1}\xi_0) \mp \xi \widehat{\chi}(\xi - \delta^{-1}\xi_0) = \begin{cases} 0, & \pm \xi > 0, \\ \pm 2\xi \widehat{\chi}(\xi - \delta^{-1}\xi_0), & \pm \xi < 0. \end{cases}$$

Without loss of generality we can assume that  $\xi_0 > 0$  and  $\text{supp } \widehat{\chi} \subset [-\xi_0/2, \xi_0/2]$ . Hence, for such initial data the initial datum  $U_0(\xi)$  to (3.11) satisfies

$$(5.7) \quad M^{-1}U_0(\xi, \epsilon) = \sqrt{2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \xi \widehat{\chi}(\xi - \delta^{-1}\xi_0) \end{pmatrix}$$

for the diagonaliser  $M$  from (4.33). Let now  $t < 1$ . As  $\mathcal{E}_0(t, s, \xi)$  is diagonal and  $\mathcal{Q}(t, s, \xi, \epsilon) - \text{I}$  as well as  $N_1(t, s, \xi, \epsilon) - \text{I}$  are both bounded by  $|\xi|^{-1}$  uniformly in  $\epsilon > 0$  (small enough such that  $(t, \xi, \epsilon) \in Z_{\text{hyp}}(N)$ ) and  $s \in [0, t]$  we obtain that

$$(5.8) \quad V(t, \xi, \epsilon) = \sqrt{\frac{b_\epsilon(0)}{b_\epsilon(t)}} N_1(t, \xi, \epsilon) \mathcal{E}_0(t, 0, \xi) \mathcal{Q}(t, 0, \xi, \epsilon) N_1^{-1}(0, \xi, \epsilon) M^{-1}U_0(\xi, \epsilon)$$

is given by

$$(5.9) \quad V(t, \xi, \epsilon) = \sqrt{\frac{b(0)}{b(t)}} \sqrt{2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ e^{-it\xi} \xi \widehat{\chi}(\xi - \delta^{-1}\xi_0) \end{pmatrix} + \mathcal{O}(1), \quad t < 1,$$

for fixed  $t$  and with a uniformly bounded remainder independent of the choice of  $\delta$ . This corresponds to a wave traveling to the right plus remainder terms with smaller norm. Note that the first term behaves like  $\delta^{-1}$  due to the support assumption made for  $\widehat{\chi}$  and thus dominates the remainder term when choosing  $\delta$  small enough.

In the following, we consider  $t > 1$  and ask for the influence of the point singularity at time 1 on the behaviour of our net of solutions. If  $\epsilon > 0$  is small enough such that  $(t, \xi, \epsilon) \in Z_{\text{hyp}}(N)$  the solution is represented by

$$(5.10) \quad \begin{aligned} V(t, \xi, \epsilon) &= \sqrt{\frac{b_\epsilon(0)b_\epsilon(t_{\xi_2})}{b_\epsilon(t_{\xi_1})b_\epsilon(t)}} N_1(t, \xi, \epsilon) \mathcal{E}_0(t, t_{\xi_2}, \xi) \mathcal{Q}(t, t_{\xi_2}, \xi, \epsilon) N_1^{-1}(t_{\xi_2}, \xi, \epsilon) \\ &\quad \times M^{-1}T^{-1}(\epsilon) \mathcal{E}_{\text{sing}}(\tau_{\xi_2}, \tau_{\xi_1}, \epsilon|\xi|, \epsilon) T(\epsilon) M \\ &\quad \times N_1(t_{\xi_1}, \xi, \epsilon) \mathcal{E}_0(t_{\xi_1}, 0, \xi) \mathcal{Q}(t_{\xi_1}, 0, \xi, \epsilon) N_1^{-1}(0, \xi, \epsilon) M^{-1}U_0(\xi, \epsilon). \end{aligned}$$

We again look at the main terms and estimates for remainders. In order to get the desired estimates we choose first the zone constant  $N$  large enough to control non-diagonal terms appearing in the transformation matrices and in  $\mathcal{Q}$ . This yields based on the symbol estimate for  $N_1(t, \xi, \epsilon) - \text{I}$  and estimate (4.67) for  $\mathcal{Q}(t, s, \xi, \epsilon) - \text{I}$

$$(5.11) \quad \begin{aligned} V(t, \xi, \epsilon) &= \sqrt{\frac{b(0)b(1_+)}{b(1_-)b(t)}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} e^{i(t-1)\xi} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-i(t-1)\xi} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} H+1 & H-1 \\ H-1 & H+1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ e^{-it\xi} \xi \widehat{\chi}(\xi - \delta^{-1}\xi_0) \end{pmatrix} \\ &\quad + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon|\xi|) + \mathcal{O}(1/N) \end{aligned}$$

using in an essential way that the  $T(\epsilon)$ -terms cancel out, that  $|t_{\xi_i}(\epsilon) - 1| \leq C\epsilon$  combined with

$$(5.12) \quad \begin{aligned} \|N_1(t, \xi, \epsilon) - \text{I}\| + \|N_1^{-1}(0, \xi, \epsilon) - \text{I}\| &\leq C|\xi|^{-1}, \\ \|\mathcal{Q}(t, t_{\xi_2}, \xi, \epsilon) - \text{I}\| + \|\mathcal{Q}(t_{\xi_1}, 0, \xi, \epsilon) - \text{I}\| &\leq C/N, \\ \|N_1^{-1}(t, t_{\xi_2}, \xi, \epsilon) - \text{I}\| + \|N_1(t_{\xi_1}, \xi, \epsilon) - \text{I}\| &\leq C/N \end{aligned}$$

due to (4.43), (4.67) and (3.16) and that

$$(5.13) \quad \begin{aligned} M^{-1}\mathcal{E}_{\text{sing}}(\tau_{\xi_2}, \tau_{\xi_1}, \epsilon|\xi|, \epsilon) M &= \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & H \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon|\xi|) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} H+1 & H-1 \\ H-1 & H+1 \end{pmatrix} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon|\xi|) \end{aligned}$$

due to (4.107) with  $H = \frac{b(1_-)}{b(1_+)} \in (0, 1]$ . As for our net of initial data  $|\xi| \sim \delta^{-1}$ , the second remainder term is of order  $\epsilon\delta^{-1}$  and thus negligible for  $\epsilon$  small enough and  $\delta$  fixed.

To recover the solution  $u(t, x)$ , we have to multiply by the matrix  $M$  and apply the inverse Fourier transform. Thus we obtain the following theorem.

**Theorem 5.3.** *The very weak solution corresponding to the net of initial data (5.5) is described (up to terms small compared to the solution itself)*

- *by a wave travelling to the right for  $t < 1$ ; and*
- *by two waves travelling to the left and to the right for all  $t > 1$ .*

*Remark 5.2.* The partial reflection of rays at the singularity is characterised by the matrix

$$(5.14) \quad \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} H+1 & H-1 \\ H-1 & H+1 \end{pmatrix}$$

in terms of the jump of  $\log b$  at  $t = 1$ .

Thus, if the coefficient  $b$  has no jump and therefore  $H = 1$  this matrix becomes the identity matrix and for  $t > 1$  only one wave propagates to the right. Hence, no reflected wave occurs.

If  $b$  has a jump we can compare the amplitude of both travelling waves. For this we fix a sufficiently small  $\delta > 0$  and write down the main terms of the travelling wave as

$$(5.15) \quad u(t, x) = \sqrt{\frac{b(0)}{b(t)}} \mathbf{u}(x - t), \quad 0 < t < 1$$

and

$$(5.16) \quad u(t, x) = \frac{H+1}{2\sqrt{H}} \sqrt{\frac{b(0)}{b(t)}} \mathbf{u}(x - t) + \frac{H-1}{2\sqrt{H}} \sqrt{\frac{b(0)}{b(t)}} \mathbf{u}(x - 2 + t), \quad t > 1.$$

The first term corresponds to a wave continuing in the same direction but with amplitude multiplied by  $\frac{H+1}{2\sqrt{H}}$ , while the second term gives the reflected part with amplitude multiplied by  $\frac{H-1}{2\sqrt{H}}$ .

*Remark 5.3.* The related wave model

$$(5.17) \quad u_{tt} - \Delta u + \delta_1(t)u_t = 0$$

with coefficient given by the Delta distribution supported in  $t = 1$  appears almost as a special case of treatment here in the paper. For the choice of  $b(t) = 1/2$  for  $0 \leq t < 1$  and  $b(t) = 3/2$  for  $1 < t \leq 2$  we obtain a closely related net of coefficients leading to  $H = 1/3$  and a resulted transfer matrix at the singularity.

The true consideration of the above equation can be done on lines similar to the treatment provided here in the paper. This would lead to the (related) transfer matrix

$$(5.18) \quad \frac{1}{2e} \begin{pmatrix} 1+e & 1-e \\ 1-e & 1+e \end{pmatrix}$$

*Remark 5.4.* The arguments presented in this section for the case of one space dimension applies in a similar way to higher dimensions. The main reflected wave travels in the opposite direction to the main one, and lower order terms could propagate along cones emanating from the point of interaction of singularities.

## 6. CONCLUDING REMARKS

We will conclude this article with some comments on the tools and techniques developed so far and mention some open problems and challenges.

- (1) The symbol classes used in the treatment were adapted to one point singularity at  $t = 1$ . This can clearly be extended to treat point singularities at a finite number of times.
- (2) Using the same symbol classes one can treat other wave models with time-dependent coefficients having point singularities of suitable strength. This corresponds to the models proposed in [1] and will be considered in details in a forthcoming paper.
- (3) A related problem are singular wave models with singularities depending on space and time. Here an adapted version of a full  $\epsilon$ -dependent pseudo-differential calculus has to be used in order to describe the propagation of singularities for very weak solutions. However, this is a much harder problem and the description of a local scattering process of waves (and thus wave front sets) of very weak solutions at such singularities remains challenging.

**Acknowledgements.** Mohammed Sebih visited the Department of Mathematics of the University of Stuttgart supported by an Algerian Scholarship P.N.E. 2018/2019. He thanks University of Stuttgart for providing excellent working conditions.

## REFERENCES

- [1] A. ALTIBAY, M. RUZHANSKY, AND N. TOKMAGAMBETOV, *Wave equation with distributional propagation speed and mass term: Numerical simulations*, Applied Mathematics E-Notes, 19 (2019), pp. 552–562.
- [2] J.-F. COLOMBEAU, *New generalized functions and multiplication of distributions*, vol. 84 of North-Holland Mathematics Studies, North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1984. Notas de Matemática [Mathematical Notes], 90.
- [3] M. D’ABBICCO, S. LUCENTE, AND G. TAGLIALATELA,  *$L^p$ - $L^q$  estimates for regularly linear hyperbolic systems*, Adv. Differential Equations, 14 (2009), pp. 801–834.
- [4] ———, *Errata to “ $L^p$ - $L^q$  estimates for regularly linear hyperbolic systems”*, Adv. Differential Equations, 16 (2011), pp. 199–200.
- [5] W. N. DO NASCIMENTO AND J. WIRTH, *Wave equations with mass and dissipation*, Adv. Differential Equations, 20 (2015), pp. 661–696.
- [6] C. GARETTO AND M. RUZHANSKY, *Hyperbolic second order equations with non-regular time dependent coefficients*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., 217 (2015), pp. 113–154.
- [7] M. HARDY, *Combinatorics of partial derivatives*, Electron. J. Combin., 13 (2006), pp. Research Paper 1, 13.
- [8] K. K. MUNOS, M. V. RUZHANSKII, AND N. E. TOKMAGAMBETOV, *Acoustic and shallow-water waves with irregular dissipation*, Funktsional. Anal. i Prilozhen., 53 (2019), pp. 92–96.
- [9] J. C. MUNOZ, M. RUZHANSKY, AND N. TOKMAGAMBETOV, *Wave propagation with irregular dissipation and applications to acoustic problems and shallow waters*, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9), 123 (2019), pp. 127–147.
- [10] M. OBERGUGGENBERGER, *Multiplication of distributions and applications to partial differential equations*, vol. 259 of Pitman Research Notes in Mathematics Series, Longman Scientific & Technical, Harlow; copublished in the United States with John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1992.
- [11] M. V. RUZHANSKII AND N. E. TOKMAGAMBETOV, *On a very weak solution of the wave equation for a Hamiltonian in a singular electromagnetic field*, Mat. Zametki, 103 (2018), pp. 790–793.
- [12] M. RUZHANSKY AND N. TOKMAGAMBETOV, *Very weak solutions of wave equation for Landau Hamiltonian with irregular electromagnetic field*, Lett. Math. Phys., 107 (2017), pp. 591–618.
- [13] ———, *Wave equation for operators with discrete spectrum and irregular propagation speed*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., 226 (2017), pp. 1161–1207.
- [14] M. RUZHANSKY AND J. WIRTH, *Asymptotic behaviour of solutions to hyperbolic equations and systems*, in Variable Lebesgue spaces and hyperbolic systems, Adv. Courses Math. CRM Barcelona, Birkhäuser/Springer, Basel, 2014, pp. 91–169.
- [15] L. SCHWARTZ, *Sur l’impossibilité de la multiplication des distributions*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, 239 (1954), pp. 847–848.
- [16] J. WIRTH, *Wave equations with time-dependent dissipation. I. Non-effective dissipation*, J. Differential Equations, 222 (2006), pp. 487–514.
- [17] ———, *Wave equations with time-dependent dissipation. II. Effective dissipation*, J. Differential Equations, 232 (2007), pp. 74–103.
- [18] ———, *Regular singular problems for hyperbolic systems and their asymptotic integration*, in New trends in analysis and interdisciplinary applications, Trends Math. Res. Perspect., Birkhäuser/Springer, Cham, 2017, pp. 553–561.

MOHAMMED SEBIH, LABORATORY OF ANALYSIS AND CONTROL OF PARTIAL DIFFERENTIAL EQUATIONS, DJILLALI LIABES UNIVERSITY, 22000 SIDI BEL ABBES, ALGERIA  
*Email address:* sebihmed@gmail.com

JENS WIRTH, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF STUTTGART, PFAFFENWALDRING 57, 70569 STUTTGART, GERMANY  
*Email address:* jens.wirth@mathematik.uni-stuttgart.de