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Abstract. We introduce a method of solving inverse boundary value problems for wave equations on Lorentzian manifolds, and show that zeroth order coefficients can be recovered under certain curvature bounds. The set of Lorentzian metrics satisfying the curvature bounds has a non-empty interior in the sense of arbitrary, smooth perturbations of the metric, whereas all previous results on this problem impose conditions on the metric that force it to be real analytic with respect to a suitably defined time variable. The analogous problem on Riemannian manifolds is called the Calderón problem, and in this case the known results require the metric to be independent of one of the variables. Our approach is based on a new unique continuation result in the exterior of the double null cone emanating from a point. The approach shares features with the classical Boundary Control method, and can be viewed as a generalization of this method to cases where no real analyticity is assumed.

1. Introduction

Let $(\mathcal{M}, g)$ be a connected, smooth Lorentzian manifold with timelike boundary. We write $1 + n$ for the dimension and $\mathcal{M}^{\text{int}}, \partial \mathcal{M}$ for the interior and boundary of $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}^{\text{int}} \cup \partial \mathcal{M}$. Let $V \in C^\infty(\mathcal{M})$ and consider the Cauchy data set

$$\mathcal{C}(V) = \{(u, \partial_\nu u)|_{\partial \mathcal{M}} : u \in C^\infty(\mathcal{M}) \text{ and } \Box u + Vu = 0 \text{ on } \mathcal{M}\},$$

where $\Box$ is the canonical wave operator on $(\mathcal{M}, g)$ and $\nu$ is the exterior unit normal vector field on $\partial \mathcal{M}$. We call the problem to find $V$ given $\mathcal{C}(V)$ the Lorentzian Calderón problem. The classical Calderón problem has the same formulation except that $(\mathcal{M}, g)$ is a smooth Riemannian manifold with boundary and $\Box$ is replaced by the Laplacian on $(\mathcal{M}, g)$.

Another version of the Calderón problem is to find $g$ up to an isometry given the Cauchy data set

$$\{(u, \partial_\nu u)|_{\partial \mathcal{M}} : u \in C^\infty(\mathcal{M}) \text{ and } \Box u = 0 \text{ on } \mathcal{M}\}.$$

If $n > 1$, then in a fixed conformal class, the latter problem reduces to the former one by using a gauge transformation. Writing $\Box_c$ for the wave
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operator with respect to the conformally scaled metric $cg$, the function
\[ w = c^{(n-1)/4}u \]
satisfies the equation $\Box w + Vw = 0$, with $V = c^{-(n-1)/4}\Box c^{(n-1)/4}$, if the function $u$ satisfies the equation $\Box c u = 0$.

Without any further assumptions on $(M, g)$ the Calderón problem is wide open, in both the Lorentzian and Riemannian cases, and regardless whether $g$ or $V$ is to be determined. We will now formulate the geometric assumptions under which we show that $C(V)$ determines $V$ in the Lorentzian case.

In order to be able to solve the wave equation on $M$, and thus guarantee that $C(V)$ has a rich structure, we assume that

(H1) There is a smooth, proper, surjective time function $\tau : M \to \mathbb{R}$.

By $\tau$ being a time function we mean that its differential $d\tau$ is timelike. (Terminology in the literature varies, for example, [44] would call $\tau$ a temporal function, see Section 11.3 there.) Proper is used in the topological sense, that is, inverse images of compact subsets are compact under $\tau$.

Hypothesis (H1), together with $\partial M$ being timelike, implies that the wave equation can be solved on $M$, see [28, Theorem 24.1.1]. This theorem does not require $\tau$ to be surjective. However, surjectivity guarantees that $M$ is diffeomorphic to a cylinder, a natural feature in view of the previous results discussed in Section 1.2 below. This assumption avoids some technical complications.

When wave equations are considered on a Lorentzian manifold without boundary $(\tilde{M}, g)$, it is typically assumed that the manifold is globally hyperbolic. In this case $\tilde{M}$ is isometric to a cylinder $\mathbb{R} \times \tilde{M}_0$ with a metric of the form
\[ c(t, x)(-dt^2 + g_0(t, x)), \]
where $\tilde{M}_0$ is a smooth manifold, $c$ is a smooth positive function, and $g_0(t, \cdot)$ is a family of smooth Riemannian metrics on $\tilde{M}_0$ that depend smoothly on the variable $t \in \mathbb{R}$, see [14]. Observe that (H1) is satisfied for $\tau = t$ on $M = \mathbb{R} \times M_0$ with $M_0 \subset \tilde{M}_0$ an open, bounded set with smooth boundary. In general, we will show that (H1), together with $\partial M$ being timelike, implies that $M$ is diffeomorphic to a cylinder $\mathbb{R} \times M_0$ where $M_0$ is a compact smooth manifold with boundary and that over compact subsets of $M$, the metric is isometric to a metric of the form (1.2).

Let us now turn to our main assumption on the curvature of $(M, g)$. We fix the signature convention $(-, +, \ldots, +)$, let $R$ stand for the curvature tensor on $(M, g)$, and recall the following definition from [4].

**Definition 1.1.** For $K \in \mathbb{R}$, we write $R \leq K$ if
\[ g(R(X, Y)X, Y) \leq K \left( g(X, X)g(Y, Y) - g(X, Y)^2 \right) \]
for all $X, Y \in T_pM$ and $p \in M$. 
In the Riemannian case the curvature bound $R \leq K$ is equivalent with $\text{Sec}(X,Y) \leq K$ for all linearly independent $X,Y \in T_pM$ and $p \in \mathcal{M}$, where $\text{Sec}$ is the sectional curvature,

$$\text{Sec}(X,Y) = \frac{g(R(X,Y)X,Y)}{g(X,X)g(Y,Y) - g(X,Y)^2}.$$ 

In the Lorentzian case, these two formulations are no longer equivalent, and the latter one leads to an uninteresting theory. If $\text{Sec}(X,Y) \leq K$ whenever $\text{Sec}(X,Y)$ is well-defined, then the Lorentzian manifold is of constant sectional curvature [34].

A Lorentzian manifold of constant sectional curvature satisfies $R \leq K$ with $K$ the constant value of the sectional curvature, but a small perturbation of a manifold with constant curvature might not satisfy $R \leq K$ for any $K \in \mathbb{R}$. However, there are manifolds satisfying $R \leq K$ such that their small perturbations satisfy the same curvature bound, see [2]. These examples will be discussed in more detail in Section 1.1 below. We mention that there is also an equivalent description of the curvature bound $R \leq K$ in terms of local triangle comparisons of the signed lengths of geodesics, [2].

In order to state our main hypothesis on $(\mathcal{M},g)$, we recall that the spatial diameter of $\mathcal{M}$, denoted by $\text{Diam}(\mathcal{M})$, is the supremum of the length of inextendible spacelike geodesics on $\mathcal{M}$. We assume that

(H2) $R \leq K$ for some $K \in \mathbb{R}$, and if $K > 0$ then $\text{Diam}(\mathcal{M}) < \frac{\pi}{2\sqrt{K}}$.

In addition to (H1)–(H2) we will make some technical assumptions. Given any $p \in \mathcal{M}$, let $J^\pm(p)$ denote the causal future and past of the point $p$ respectively, and define

(1.3) $\mathcal{E}_p = \mathcal{M} \setminus (J^-(p) \cup J^+(p))$.

We assume that

(H3) The null cut locus of $\mathcal{M}$ is empty. Moreover, given each $p \in \mathcal{M}$ and any $q \in \mathcal{E}_p$, there exists a unique geodesic connecting $q$ to $p$.

For the definition of null cut locus we refer the reader to [9, Section 5]. We remark that (H2) has certain common features with (H3). For instance, following the proof of [10, Proposition 11.13], we see that $R \leq 0$ implies that null geodesics do not have any conjugate points at all, while given any spacelike geodesic $\gamma$ there is no Jacobi field with a spacelike covariant derivative along $\gamma$ that vanishes at two distinct points.

We say that a geodesic on $(\mathcal{M},g)$ is non-trapped if its maximal domain of definition is a bounded interval. Here the geodesic is allowed to intersect $\partial \mathcal{M}$ in the interior points of its domain of definition. Put differently, if $(\mathcal{M},g)$ is extended to a slightly larger manifold without boundary, then both ends of any maximally extended non-trapped geodesic must intersect the complement of $\mathcal{M}$. We assume

(H4) All null geodesics are non-trapped.
This assumption is independent from (H1)–(H3) as can be seen for example by taking $\partial M$ to be the timelike hyperboloid $-t^2 + |x|^2 = 1$ in the Minkowski spacetime $\mathbb{R}^{1+n}$.

Finally, we assume

(H5) All null geodesics have finite order of contact with the boundary.

This technical condition is related to the geometric characterization of exact controllability of the wave equation on $\mathcal{M}$, see [7, 8].

We are now ready to state our main theorem.

**Theorem 1.2.** Let $(\mathcal{M}, g)$ be a connected, smooth Lorentzian manifold with timelike boundary, and suppose that (H1)–(H5) hold. Let $V_1, V_2 \in C^\infty(\mathcal{M})$. If $\mathcal{C}(V_1) = \mathcal{C}(V_2)$ then $V_1 = V_2$.

In fact, we prove a slightly stronger result that is, roughly speaking, localized in the preimage $\{p \in \mathcal{M} : \tau(p) \in [-T, T]\}$ for large enough $T > 0$, see Theorem 2.4 below for the precise statement.

### 1.1. On the curvature bound.

Examples of non-constant curvature manifolds satisfying $R \leq K$ can be constructed by considering Robertson–Walker type spaces $(\mathcal{M}, g)$ where $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{R} \times M_0$ and $g$ has the warped product form

$$-dt^2 + f(t)g_0(x), \quad (t,x) \in \mathbb{R} \times M_0.$$ 

Here the warping factor $f$ is smooth and strictly positive, and $(M_0, g_0)$ is a Riemannian manifold with boundary. If the sectional curvature of $(M_0, g_0)$ is bounded from above by a constant $C \in \mathbb{R}$, then, in view of [2, Corollary 7.2], the manifold $(\mathcal{M}, g)$ satisfies the bound $R \leq K$ for any number $K$ in the interval

$$\left[ \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{C + f'(t)^2}{f(t)^2}, \inf_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{f''(t)}{f(t)} \right].$$

To see that there are manifolds satisfying (H1)–(H5) such that their small perturbations satisfy the same conditions, we can simply take $f = 1$ and $(M_0, g_0)$ a Riemannian manifold with a sectional curvature that is bounded from above by $C < 0$ and a strictly convex boundary.

### 1.2. Previous literature.

Most of the previous results on the problem to find $V$ given $\mathcal{C}(V)$ are confined to the case of ultra-static cylinders, that is, $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{R} \times M_0$ and $g$ is of the form (1.2) with $c = 1$ and $g_0$ independent from the time coordinate $t \in \mathbb{R}$. If also $V$ is assumed to be independent from $t$, then the problem is completely solved, without any further assumptions on $g_0$. The proof is based on the Boundary Control method that was introduced by Belishev in [11]. A geometric generalization to the case of ultrastatic cylinders is by Belishev and Kurylev in [13]. For later developments see the monograph [32], the review article [12], and the references in the recent paper [36].

The Boundary Control method relies on the local unique continuation theorem by Tataru [52]. This result was subsequently generalized in [46],
and its important precursors include the works of Hörmander [30] and Robbiano [45]. Tataru’s result allows for local unique continuation across any non-characteristic surface but requires that all the coefficients in the wave equation are real analytic with respect to the time variable. There is a broad class of counter examples due to Alinhac [3] showing that local unique continuation across non-pseudoconvex surfaces fails if smooth time-dependent coefficients are allowed. When both $g$ and $V$ are real analytic in the time coordinate, the result of Eskin [18, 19] solves the Lorentzian Calderón problem using ideas from the Boundary Control method.

Let us now discuss results that allow for an arbitrary $V \in C^\infty(M)$. Due to the gauge transformation (1.1), there is no essential difference between the ultrastatic case and the case where $g$ is of the form (1.2) with $g_0$ independent from the time coordinate and with arbitrary $c$. The first result with time-dependent $V$ is due to Stefanov in [49] in the case that $(M, g)$ is the Minkowski spacetime. We also refer the reader to the work of Ramm and Sjöstrand [43] and Isakov [31] for similar results. The ultrastatic case was solved in [22] under additional convexity conditions on the Riemannian factor $(M_0, g_0)$. The known results [16, 17] on the Riemannian Calderón problem assume that $g$ is of the form $dt^2 + g_0(x)$. This can be viewed as the Riemannian analogue of the ultrastatic case.

The results [49, 43, 31, 22] are based on a reduction of the Lorentzian Calderón problem to the study of injectivity of the light ray transform $\mathcal{L}V$. Here $\mathcal{L}V(\gamma)$ is the integral of $V$ over $\gamma$, for inextendible null geodesics $\gamma$ on $M$. As explained in [51] this reduction works for a very broad class of Lorentzian manifolds, however, inversion results for the light ray transform are scarce outside the ultrastatic case. Stefanov inverted $\mathcal{L}$ in the case that $(M, g)$ is real analytic and satisfies a certain convexity condition [50]. Recently $\mathcal{L}$ was inverted also in the case that $(M, g)$ is stationary, assuming additional convexity [23]. While stationary metrics need not be the form (1.2), they have time-independent coefficients.

To summarize, in all the previous results $g$ has real analytic features. Most typically it is simply independent of the time variable, whereas in [50] it is real analytic, and in [18, 19] real analytic in the time variable. The main novelty of our result is that it requires no real analytic features. In fact, as shown in the previous section, the set of Lorentzian metrics satisfying (H1)–(H5) has a non-empty interior in the sense of arbitrary, smooth perturbations of the metric. We achieve this by introducing a novel controllability method, inspired by the Boundary Control method, that relies on a new unique continuation theorem in the exterior of the double null cone (Theorem 2.1). A similar unique continuation theorem was previously known to hold in the Minkowski spacetime [1, 48].

We would like to emphasize that the curvature condition (H2) is used only in the proof of the unique continuation theorem. If unique continuation in the exterior of the double null cone is proven under weaker assumptions,
then our controllability method will give stronger results on the Lorentzian Calderón problem. We conjecture that the unique continuation theorem should hold under (H3)–(H4) only, and leave this as a direction for future research.

Finally, we mention that the Lorentzian Calderón problem has been solved for non-linear wave equations in great geometric generality. The version to determine a metric tensor $g$ was solved, up to a conformal factor, in [37] for globally hyperbolic manifolds, with data given on a small set in the interior rather than on boundary. A similar approach was used in [24] to determine a zeroth order perturbation $V$, and the case with data on the boundary was considered in [27]. However, all these works use non-linear terms in the wave equation in an essential way, and their techniques do not generalize for the linear wave equation considered in the present paper.

1.3. Outline of the key ideas. The key new ideas in this paper are outlined as follows. First, we introduce a novel optimal unique continuation result (Theorem 2.1) for the wave equation in the exterior of the double null cone $E_p$ from the point of view of the region where vanishing of the wave is assumed and where vanishing is derived. This optimality of the unique continuation result is absolutely essential in the proof of Theorem 1.2, in the same way that the optimal unique continuation result of Tataru was essential in the earlier works on wave equations with time-independent coefficients based on the Boundary Control method.

Once Theorem 2.1 is proved, we use the result to obtain a novel controllability method from boundary, in the same spirit as that of Belishev, but with important differences. For instance, we do not possess here the typical boundary integral identities used in the Boundary Control method, namely the Blagovestchenskii identity [15]. We use our unique continuation theorem together with an exact controllability result for the wave equation in rough Sobolev spaces to construct distributional solutions that, when restricted to a Cauchy surface, are supported at a point. Finally, using these focused solutions together with special solutions (Gaussian beams), we are able to recover point values of the potential $V$ everywhere.

2. Strengthened main result

Let $(\mathcal{M}, g)$ be a connected, smooth Lorentzian manifold with signature $(-, +, \ldots, +)$ and a timelike boundary. Suppose that (H1) holds and let $T > 0$. As we show in Appendix A, the manifold admits an isometric embedding $\Phi : M \to \mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{M}$ with \( \{q \in \mathcal{M} : \tau(q) \in [-T, T]\} \subset \mathcal{U} \), and

\begin{equation}
M = [-T, T] \times M_0
\end{equation}

for some smooth, compact, connected manifold $M_0$ with smooth boundary and with the metric $g := \Phi^*g$ satisfying

\begin{equation}
g(t, x) = c(t, x) \left(-dt^2 + g_0(t, x)\right), \quad \forall (t, x) \in M.
\end{equation}
Here, \( c \) is a smooth strictly positive function on \( M \) and \( g_0(t, \cdot) \) is a family of smooth Riemannian metrics on \( M_0 \) that depend smoothly on the variable \( t \in [-T, T] \). As usual, \( M_0 = M_0^{\text{int}} \cup \partial M_0 \).

In this section, we will formulate our unique continuation result and a stronger version of Theorem 1.2 that are both stated on manifolds \((M, g)\) of the form (2.1)–(2.2). We note that the assumptions (H2)–(H3) and (H5) on \((M, g)\) can also be formulated on \((M, g)\) in the natural way.

2.1. Optimal unique continuation result. We prove the following theorem in Section 4.

**Theorem 2.1.** Let \( M = [-T, T] \times M_0 \) be a Lorentzian manifold with a metric \( g \) of the form (2.2) and where \( M_0 \) is a smooth, compact, connected manifold with a smooth boundary. Suppose that \((M, g)\) satisfies (H2)–(H3) and (H5). Let \( p \in M^{\text{int}} \) be such that \( E_p \subset (-T, T) \times M_0 \), where \( E_p \) is defined by (1.3) with \( M = M \). Let \( V \in C^\infty(M) \), \( u \in H^{-s}(M) \) for some \( s \geq 0 \) and suppose that \((\Box + V)u = 0 \) on \( M \) and also that the traces \( u, \partial_\nu u \) both vanish on the set \( \Sigma \cap E_p \), where \( \Sigma = (-T, T) \times \partial M_0 \). Then, \( u = 0 \) on \( E_p \).

Note that since \( \Sigma \) is a non-characteristic hypersurface for the wave operator, given any distributional solution to \((\Box + V)u = 0 \) on \( M \), the traces of the distribution and all its derivatives on \( \Sigma \) always exist. This property is called *partial hypoellipticity* (see for example, [20, Proposition 7.6]). Similarly, the traces will be well-defined on \( \{t\} \times M_0 \) for any \( t \in [-T, T] \). This will be discussed further in Lemma 5.3. We remark also that the notation \( H^{-s}(M) \) stands for the topological dual of \( H^s_0(M) \) which itself is defined as the completion of smooth compactly supported functions in the interior of \( M \), with respect to the standard \( H^s(M) \)-norm.

Our proof of Theorem 2.1 is based on combining the principle of propagation of singularities for the wave equation (Lemma 4.2), a layer stripping argument and a Carleman estimate with a degenerate weight, see equation (4.23). We remark that the unique continuation result here does goes beyond the observability estimates of Bardos, Lebeau and Rauch in [8] and the unique continuation result of Hörmander (for example [29, Theorem 28.4.3]) in two key respects: Firstly, as opposed to [29] where strict pseudoconvexity must be assumed to derive a uniqueness result, here a geometric condition on the curvature is identified which ensures that the (Lorenzian, space-like) distance function from a point satisfies a spacetime convexity property. The distance function is not strictly pseudoconvex, however. Secondly and as discussed before, contrary to both of these earlier results, our unique continuation result is optimal in terms of where vanishing of the wave is assumed and where it is derived.

We emphasize also that our unique continuation result does not follow from Tataru’s unique continuation result, [52] as the wave operator here has general time-dependent coefficients.
2.2. Reduction from \( \mathcal{C}(V) \) to the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map on compact time intervals. We will show in this section that the Cauchy data set \( \mathcal{C}(V) \) determines the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map for the wave equation on compact subsets \( \{ q \in \mathcal{M} : \tau(q) \in [-T, T] \} \) for all \( T > 0 \).

To make this precise, we begin by defining the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map \( \Lambda_V \), associated to a manifold \( \mathcal{M} \) as in (2.1) with a metric \( g \) of the form (2.2) and a function \( V \in C^\infty(M) \). Consider the wave equation

\[
\begin{aligned}
\Box u + Vu &= 0 & \text{on } M, \\
u &= f & \text{on } \Sigma = (-T, T) \times \partial M_0, \\
u(-T,x) &= \partial_t \nu(-T,x) = 0 & \text{on } M_0,
\end{aligned}
\]

where the wave operator, \( \Box \), is defined in local coordinates \( (t = x^0, \ldots, x^n) \) through the expression

\[
\Box u = -\sum_{j,k=0}^n |\text{det } g|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j} \left( |\text{det } g|^\frac{1}{2} g^{jk} \frac{\partial u}{\partial x^k} \right).
\]

Given each \( f \in H^1_0(\Sigma) \), equation (2.3) admits a unique solution \( u \) in the energy space

\[
C(-T, T; H^1(M_0)) \cap C^1(-T, T; L^2(M_0)).
\]

Moreover, \( \partial_\nu u|_\Sigma \in L^2(\Sigma) \) where \( \nu \) is the outward unit normal vector field on \( \Sigma \), see for example [38, Theorem 4.1].

We define the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map, \( \Lambda_V : H^1_0(\Sigma) \to L^2(\Sigma) \), by

\[
\Lambda_V f = \partial_\nu u|_\Sigma,
\]

where \( u \) is the unique solution to (2.3) subject to the boundary value \( f \) on \( \Sigma \). We remark that the definition of \( \Lambda_V \) implicitly depends on the geometry \((M, g)\). We will however hide this dependence when no confusion arises.

Let us now consider a smooth, connected Lorentzian manifold \((\mathcal{M}, g)\) with a timelike boundary and suppose that it satisfies (H1)–(H5). We aim to show that \( \mathcal{C}(V) \) determines the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map corresponding to certain subsets of \( \mathcal{M} \). We start with a lemma.

**Lemma 2.2.** Let \((\mathcal{M}, g)\) be a smooth connected Lorentzian manifold satisfying (H1) and (H4). Then, given any compact set \( \mathcal{K} \subset \mathcal{M} \), there exists \( T_\mathcal{K} > 0 \) such that

\[
\bigcup_{p \in \mathcal{K}} \overline{\mathcal{E}_p} \subset \{ q \in \mathcal{M} : \tau(q) \in (-T_\mathcal{K}, T_\mathcal{K}) \}.
\]

**Proof.** We write \( L^\pm \mathcal{M} \) for the bundle of future and past pointing null vectors on \( T\mathcal{M} \) respectively and write \( L\mathcal{M} = L^+ \mathcal{M} \cup L^- \mathcal{M} \). Given each \( v = (q, \xi) \in L\mathcal{M} \) we define \( \gamma_v : I \to \mathcal{M} \) to be the inextendible null geodesic with initial data \( v \), that is to say,

\[
\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}_v(s)} \dot{\gamma}_v(s) = 0, \quad \forall s \in I,
\]

\[
\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}_v(s)} \dot{\gamma}_v(s) = 0, \quad \forall s \in I,
\]
subject to
\[ \gamma_v(0) = p \quad \text{and} \quad \dot{\gamma}_v(0) = \xi. \]
We write also \( \gamma_{q,\xi} = \gamma_v. \) Next, we define for each \( v \in L^+M \) the exit functions
\[ R^+(v) = \sup\{ s \in [0, \infty) : \gamma_v(s) \in M \} \quad \text{for each} \quad v \in L^+M, \]
and
\[ R^-(v) = \inf\{ s \in (-\infty, 0) : \gamma_v(s) \in M \} \quad \text{for each} \quad v \in L^+M. \]

Fixing an auxiliary Riemannian metric on \( M, \) we write \( SM \) for the unit sphere bundle with respect to the auxiliary metric. It is straightforward to show that \( R^+ \) and \( R^- \) are upper semi-continuous and lower semi-continuous respectively. We note also that \( \tau \circ \gamma_{p,\xi} \) is a continuous and increasing function and that the composition of an upper (lower) semi-continuous functions with an increasing continuous function is upper (lower) semi-continuous. Since \( SK \cap L^+K \) is compact it follows that the map \( (p, \xi) \mapsto \tau(\gamma_{p,\xi}(R^+(p, \xi))) \) has a maximum (minimum) on \( L^+K \cap SK \) respectively. \[ \square \]

We have the following proposition.

**Proposition 2.3.** Let \( (M, g) \) be a smooth, connected Lorentzian manifold with a timelike boundary and suppose that (H1)-(H5) hold. Let \( V \in C^\infty(M). \) Then, given any \( T > 0, \) the Cauchy data set \( \mathcal{C}(V) \) uniquely determines the map \( \Lambda V \circ \Phi \) on \( (M, g) \), corresponding to any fixed isometry \( \Phi : M \to U, \) with \( \{ q \in M : \tau(q) \in [-T, T] \} \subset U, \) and with \( M \) and \( g = \Phi^* g \) of forms (2.1) and (2.2) respectively.

**Proof.** Let
\[ (2.7) \quad f \in C^\infty_c(\{ q \in \partial M : \tau(q) \in (-T, T) \}). \]
We claim that there exists a unique element \( (f, h) \in \mathcal{C}(V) \) with
\[ (2.8) \quad h \in C^\infty(\partial M) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{supp} \ h \subset \{ q \in \partial M : \tau(q) \in (-T, \infty) \}. \]

First, we show uniqueness. Suppose that \( h_1, h_2 \in \mathcal{C}(V) \) satisfy (2.8). For \( j = 1, 2, \) let \( u_j \in C^\infty(M) \) solve \((\Box + V)u_j = 0\) on \( M \) subject to \((u_j, \partial u_j)|_{\partial M} = (f, h_j)\) and subsequently define \( v = u_1 - u_2. \) Observe that \( v|_{\partial M} = 0 \) and also that \( \partial_n v \) vanishes on \( \{ q \in \partial M : \tau(q) \in (-\infty, -T) \}. \)

By Lemma 2.2, there exists \( T_1 > 0 \) such that
\[ \bigcup_{q \in \tau^{-1}(-T)} \overline{d_q} \subset \{ q \in M : \tau(q) \in (-T_1, T_1) \}. \]
Let \( p \in M^{\text{int}} \) be chosen such that \( \tau(p) < -T_1 \) and observe that the set \( \overline{d_p} \) is contained in \( \{ \tau < -T_1 \}. \) Applying Lemma 2.2 again, we choose \( \tilde{T} > T \) sufficiently large so that \( \overline{d_p} \subset \{ |\tau| < \tilde{T} \}. \) Next, define an isometry
\[ \tilde{\Phi} : [-\tilde{T}, \tilde{T}] \times \tilde{M}_0 \to \tilde{U}, \]
with \( \{ |\tau| \leq \tilde{T} \} \subset \tilde{U}, \) and so that (2.2) holds.
Writing $\Phi^{-1}(p) = (T', x_0)$ and applying Theorem 2.1 on $[-\tilde{T}, \tilde{T}] \times \tilde{M}_0$ for the function $v \circ \tilde{\Phi}$, it follows that 

$$v(\tilde{\Phi}(T', x)) = \partial_{v}(\tilde{\Phi}(T', x)) = 0 \quad \text{for all } x \in \tilde{M}_0 \setminus \{x_0\},$$

and consequently, by smoothness of $v$, $v(\tilde{\Phi}(T', x)) = \partial_{v}(\tilde{\Phi}(T', x)) = 0$ for all $x \in \tilde{M}_0$. Together with the fact that $(\Box + V) v = 0$ on $\mathcal{M}$ and that $v|_{\partial \mathcal{M}} = 0$, it follows that $v$ must identically vanish everywhere in $\mathcal{M}$ and therefore $h_1 = h_2$.

To show existence, observe that given any $f$ as in (2.7), there exists a unique smooth solution $u$ to the equation

$$\begin{cases}
\Box u + Vu = 0 & \text{on } \mathcal{M}, \\
u = f & \text{on } \partial \mathcal{M}, \\
u = 0 & \text{on } \{\tau < -T\},
\end{cases}$$

This is classical and follows for example from [21, Chapter 7, Theorem 6]. Setting $h = \partial_{\nu} u|_{\partial \mathcal{M}}$, it follows that $(f, h) \in C_c(V)$ and that $h$ satisfies (2.8).

Now, to prove the proposition, we consider for each $f$ satisfying (2.7), the unique $(f, h) \in C_c(V)$ with $h$ satisfying (2.8). Let $\Phi$ be as in the statement of the proposition. Note that $f \circ \Phi \in C_c(\Sigma)$ and that $\Lambda_{V \circ \Phi} f = (h \circ \Phi)|_{\Sigma}$, where $\Sigma = (-T, T) \times \partial \mathcal{M}_0$. The claim follows since $C_c(V)$ is dense in $H^1_0(\Sigma)$.

2.3. Local-in-time formulation of the main result. We will prove in Section 6, the following slightly stronger version of Theorem 1.2 that uniquely recovers a coefficient $V$ based on the knowledge of the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map, $\Lambda_{V}$.

**Theorem 2.4.** Let $T > 0$ and let $\mathcal{M} = [-T, T] \times \mathcal{M}_0$ be a Lorentzian manifold with a metric $g$ of the form (2.2) and where $\mathcal{M}_0$ is a smooth, compact, connected manifold with a smooth boundary. Suppose that $(M, g)$ satisfies (H2)–(H3) and (H5). Let $|T_0| < T$ and suppose that there is $p_0 \in (-T, T_0) \times \mathcal{M}_0^{\text{int}}$ satisfying $\overline{E_{p_0}} \subset (-T, T_0) \times \mathcal{M}_0$ where $E_{p_0}$ is defined by (1.3) with $\mathcal{M} = M$. Let $V_1, V_2 \in C^\infty(M)$. Then,

$$\Lambda_{V_1} f = \Lambda_{V_2} f \quad \forall f \in H^1_0(\Sigma) \implies V_1 = V_2 \quad \text{on } \mathbb{D},$$

where

$$\mathbb{D} = \{p \in (T_0, T) \times \mathcal{M}_0^{\text{int}} : \overline{E_p} \subset (T_0, T) \times \mathcal{M}_0\}.$$

In the remainder of this section we show that the global Theorem 1.2 follows immediately from the local version, Theorem 2.4. Indeed, to uniquely recover $V$ at an arbitrary point $p \in \mathcal{M}^{\text{int}}$ from the Cauchy data set $\mathcal{C}(V)$, we consider $T_0$ to be such that

$$\overline{E_p} \subset \{q \in \mathcal{M} : \tau(q) \in (T_0, \infty)\}.$$
Note that this is possible thanks to Lemma 2.2. Next, we use the same lemma to choose $T_1 > 0$ such that

$$
\bigcup_{q \in \tau^{-1}(T_0)} \overline{\delta_q} \subset \{ q \in \mathcal{M} : \tau(q) \in (-T_1, T_1) \}.
$$

We let $p_0 \in \mathcal{M}^{\text{int}}$ with $\tau(p_0) < -T_1$ and observe that

$$
\overline{\delta_{p_0}} \subset \{ q \in \mathcal{M} : \tau(q) \in (-\infty, -T_1) \}.
$$

Finally, we let $T > 0$ be sufficiently large so that both the sets $\overline{\delta_p}$ and $\overline{\delta_{p_0}}$ are contained in $\{ q \in \mathcal{M} : \tau(q) \in (-T, T) \}$. Let $\Phi : M \to \mathcal{U}$ be an isometry where $\mathcal{U}$ contains $\{ q \in \mathcal{M} : \tau(q) \in [-T, T] \}$, and with $M$ and $g = \Phi^* g$ satisfying (2.1) and (2.2) respectively. By Proposition 2.3, $\mathscr{C}(V)$ determines the map $\Lambda_{V,\Phi}$ on $(M, g)$. By invoking Theorem 2.4 we deduce that $V(p)$ is determined from $\mathscr{C}(V)$.

2.4. Outline of the paper. The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In the preliminary Section 3, we show that under the hypotheses (H2)–(H3), there exists a well-defined smooth spacetime convex function in the exterior of the double null cone emanating from a point in $M$.

Section 4 contains the proof of the unique continuation theorem, namely Theorem 2.1. We use an interplay of the principle of propagation of singularities for the wave equation (Lemma 4.2), Carleman estimates for the wave equation (4.23), and a layer stripping argument. In Section 5 we use the unique continuation theorem together with an observability estimate and a transposition argument to obtain exact controllability in rough Sobolev spaces, see Proposition 5.1.

Finally, in Section 6 we prove Theorem 2.4 via a controllability method from the boundary. The controllability method is contained in the proof of Proposition 6.1 and shows that the Cauchy data of waves on $\mathcal{E}_p \cap \Sigma$ controls the values of waves at the point $p$.

3. A distance function and its Hessian

3.1. Notations. We start with fixing some notations for the remainder of the paper. We let $T > 0$ and consider $M$ and $g$ as in (2.1) and (2.2) respectively. We assume that the factor $M_0$ in (2.1) is a connected, compact, smooth Lorentzian manifold with a smooth boundary. We also write $\Sigma = (-T, T) \times \partial M_0$ for the timelike boundary of $M$.

Given each $q \in M$, we use the notation

$$
\langle X, Y \rangle = g(X, Y), \quad \forall X, Y \in T_q M
$$

and let $\nabla$ and $\text{div}$ denote the gradient and divergence operator on $M$ respectively. We also define the Hessian of a function $\psi : M \to \mathbb{R}$ through

$$
\text{Hess} \psi(X, Y) = \langle D_X \nabla \psi, Y \rangle \quad \forall X, Y \in T_q M,
$$

where $D_X Y$ is the Levi-Civita connection on $M$. 
For the functional spaces, given any smooth submanifold $U \subset M$ with smooth boundary, we use the notation $H^s(U)$, $s \geq 0$ to stand for the standard Sobolev spaces on $U$ and recall that $H^s_0(U)$ denotes the completion of smooth compactly supported functions in the interior of $U$, with respect to the norm $\| \cdot \|_{H^s(U)}$. We also recall, for each $s \geq 0$, the space $H^{-s}(U)$ that is defined as the topological dual of $H^s_0(U)$. Finally, we write $\mathcal{E}'(U)$ for the set of compactly supported distributions in the interior of $U$.

Given two smooth compactly supported functions $v, w$ in the interior of $U$, we write
\[(v, w)_U = \int_U v w \, dV_g,\]
where $dV_g$ is the induced volume form on the submanifold $U$. Note that the latter pairing $(\cdot, \cdot)_U$ admits a continuous extension to $H^{-s}(U) \times H^s_0(U)$ for each $s \geq 0$. When no confusion is likely to arise, we will use $(\cdot, \cdot)_U$ in this extended sense.

### 3.2. A distance function in the exterior of the double null cone.

Let $p \in M$ and let $e_0, \ldots, e_n$ be an orthonormal basis of $T_p M$ in the sense of [41, Lemma 24, p. 50], that is, for distinct $j,k = 0, \ldots, n$,
\[
\langle e_j, e_k \rangle = 0, \quad \langle e_j, e_j \rangle = \epsilon_j,
\]
where $\epsilon_0 = -1$ and $\epsilon_j = 1$ for $j = 1, \ldots, n$. We consider the function
\[
(3.1) \quad r_p(y^0, \ldots, y^n) = (\epsilon_0(y^0)^2 + \cdots + \epsilon_n(y^n)^2)^{1/2}
\]
in the corresponding normal coordinates $y^0, \ldots, y^n$ centered at the point $p$. Note that under condition (H3), the normal coordinate system is well defined on $\mathcal{E}_p$ defined by (1.3).

We will show that the function $r_p$ is a distance function on $\mathcal{E}_p$, that is to say $\langle \nabla r_p, \nabla r_p \rangle = 1$. To see this, consider the local hyperquadric
\[Q = \{ \omega \in T_p M : \langle \omega, \omega \rangle = 1 \} \]
In the region $\{r_p > 0\}$, we consider the polar coordinates $x = r_p \omega$ with $r_p > 0$ and $\omega \in Q$. The Gauss lemma, see e.g. [41, Lemma 1, p. 127], implies that in these coordinates, with $r_p$ having the index $n$, the metric tensor has the form
\[
\begin{pmatrix}
h(r_p \omega) & 0 \\
0 & 1
\end{pmatrix}.
\]
It follows that $\langle \nabla r_p, \nabla r_p \rangle = 1$. We also state the following lemma on distance functions in general.

**Lemma 3.1.** Let $r$ be a distance function and denote its gradient by $\partial_r$. Then $\nabla_{\partial_r} \partial_r = 0$.

**Proof.** For a vector field $Z$,
\[
0 = Z1 = Z \langle \partial_r, \partial_r \rangle = 2 \langle \nabla_Z \partial_r, \partial_r \rangle
\]
and hence
\[ 0 = \text{Hess} \, r(Z, \partial_r) = \text{Hess} \, r(\partial_r, Z) = \langle \nabla \partial_r \partial_r, Z \rangle. \]

3.3. Spacetime convex functions. In this section, we recall one of the main results of the work of Alexander and Bishop in [2] that relates the curvature bound in hypothesis (H2) with the existence of a spacetime convex function on the manifold. This function will subsequently be used in the proof of Theorem 2.1. The notion of spacetime convex functions was first introduced by Gibbons and Ishibashi in [25] purely for geometrical pursuits and not related to any unique continuation results. A function \( \psi : M \to \mathbb{R} \) is spacetime convex if it satisfies, at each point \( p \in M \), the bound
\[ \text{Hess} \, \psi(X, X) \geq \lambda g(X, X) \quad \text{for some } \lambda \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and all } X \in T_p M. \]

We remark that spacetime convexity differs from Hörmander’s strict pseudoconvexity (see [29, Chapter 28]), which requires at each point \( p \in M \) the bound
\[ \text{Hess} \, \psi(X, X) > 0, \quad \text{if } \langle X, X \rangle = \langle X, \nabla \psi \rangle = 0. \]

Due to the strict sign of the latter inequality, strict pseudoconvexity does not follow from spacetime convexity. Strict pseudoconvexity was used by Hörmander, see [29, Theorem 28.4.3], to prove unique continuation for solutions to the wave equation locally near a point across level sets of \( \psi \). We show in Section 4 that one can also derive unique continuation results using the alternative spacetime convexity.

To construct our spacetime convex function, we start with a definition.

**Definition 3.2.** Under the hypotheses (H2)–(H3) for \((M, g)\), we define for each \( p \in M \), the smooth positive function \( \psi_{K,p} \) on \( E_p \) through
\[
\psi_{K,p}(q) = \begin{cases}
\sqrt{|K|} r_p(q) \cot(\sqrt{|K|} r_p(q)), & \text{if } K > 0, \\
1, & \text{if } K = 0, \\
\sqrt{|K|} r_p(q) \coth(\sqrt{|K|} r_p(q)), & \text{if } K < 0.
\end{cases}
\]

We note that since \( r_p(q) \) is positive on \( E_p \), it follows easily that when \( K \leq 0 \), the function \( \psi_{K,p} \) is positive on \( E_p \). In the case \( K > 0 \), the assumption \( \text{Diam}(M) < \frac{\pi}{2\sqrt{|K|}} \) in (H2) implies that \( \cot(\sqrt{|K|} r_p(q)) > 0 \) on the set \( E_p \).

**Lemma 3.3.** Let \((M, g)\) satisfy (H2)–(H3) for some \( K \in \mathbb{R} \). Let \( p \in M \) and consider the function \( \psi_{K,p} \) defined by \((3.2)\). Then,
\[
\text{Hess} \, r_p(X, X) \geq \frac{\psi_{K,p}(q)}{r_p(q)} \left( \langle X, X \rangle - \langle X, \nabla r_p \rangle^2 \right),
\]
where the Hessian is computed at a point \( q \in E_p \) and \( X \in T_q E_p \).
Proof. We start by defining the function \( \tilde{\psi}_{K,p} : \mathcal{E}_p \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) by the expression

\[
\tilde{\psi}_{K,p}(q) = \begin{cases} 
\frac{1}{|K|} (1 - \cos(\sqrt{|K|} r_p(q))), & \text{if } K > 0, \\
\frac{1}{|K|} r_p(q)^2, & \text{if } K = 0, \\
\frac{1}{|K|} (-1 + \cosh(\sqrt{|K|} r_p(q))), & \text{if } K < 0.
\end{cases}
\]

Under the hypotheses (H2)–(H3) and by applying [2, Corollary 4.5–4.6] (see also [5, Theorem 4.6]), it follows that

\[
\text{Hess} \tilde{\psi}_{K,p}(X, X) \geq (1 - K \tilde{\psi}_{K,p}(q)) \langle X, X \rangle, \quad \forall X \in T_q \mathcal{E}_p.
\]

The claim follows by rewriting the above inequality in terms of the distance function. □

4. Unique continuation in the exterior of the double null cone

4.1. Smoothness away from the double null cone. We start with a purely geometric lemma.

Lemma 4.1. Let \( M = [-T,T] \times M_0 \) be a smooth Lorentzian manifold with \( M_0 \) a compact smooth manifold with smooth boundary and a Lorentzian metric \( g \) of the form (2.2). Suppose also that \( M \) has an empty null cut locus. Let \( p \in M, q \in \mathcal{E}_p \) and \( \gamma : I \rightarrow M \) to be an inextendible null geodesic passing through \( q \). Then \( \gamma \) intersects the double null cone emanating from \( p \) at most once.

Proof. We denote by \( C^\pm(p) \) the future and past null cones emanating from \( p \) and write \( C(p) = C^+(p) \cup C^-(p) \). Let us suppose for contrary that there exists \( q \in \mathcal{E}_p \) and a future pointing null geodesic \( \gamma \) passing through \( q \) that intersects \( C(p) \) at two distinct points \( q_1, q_2 \in C(p) \) with \( q_2 \) in the causal future of \( q_1 \). Without loss of generality we assume that \( \gamma : I \rightarrow M \) is future pointing.

Let us first consider the case that \( q_1 \in C^-(p) \) and \( q_2 \in C^+(p) \). Then the points \( q_1 \) and \( q_2 \) can be connected through the concatenation of the future pointing null geodesic that connects \( q_1 \) to \( p \) on \( C^-(p) \) and the future pointing null geodesic on \( C^+(p) \) that connects \( p \) to \( q_2 \). Applying [41, Proposition 10.46], we deduce that the null geodesic segment of \( \gamma \) that connects \( q_1 \) to \( q_2 \) is not optimizing and in particular there exists a cut point along \( \gamma \), which is a contradiction since the null cut locus of \( M \) is empty.

Next, we consider the case that \( q_1, q_2 \in C^+(p) \). Then the points \( p \) and \( q_2 \) can be connected through the concatenation of future pointing null geodesic that connects \( p \) to \( q_1 \) on \( C^+(p) \) and the segment of \( \gamma \) that connects \( q_1 \) to \( q_2 \). Again applying [41, Proposition 10.46] we deduce that the null geodesic that connects \( p \) to \( q_2 \) on \( C^+(p) \) is not optimizing which is a contradiction to the hypothesis that the null cut locus is empty. Finally, the remaining case that \( q_1, q_2 \in C^-(p) \) can be treated in a similar manner. □
The above lemma can be used together with the principle of propagation of singularities for solutions to the wave equation to deduce that solutions to the wave equation with vanishing Cauchy data in $E_p \cap \Sigma$ must be smooth in $E_p$. More precisely,

**Lemma 4.2.** Let the Lorentzian manifold $(M, g)$ and the distribution $u$ be as in the hypothesis of Theorem 2.1. Then,

$$u \in C^\infty(E_p).$$

**Proof.** Note that the traces $u$ and $\partial_\nu u$ both vanish on the timelike hypersurface $E_p \cap \Sigma$. Let $q \in E_p$, $\xi \in L_q M$ and write $v = (q, \xi)$. Recall that $\gamma_v$ denotes the inextendible null geodesic in $M$ with initial data $v$. In view of Lemma 4.1 and since $E_p \subset (-T, T) \times M_0$, it follows that $\gamma_v$ must intersect $E_p \cap \Sigma$ at one of its end points either to the future or past of $q$. Applying [28, Theorem 24.5.3] it follows that the wave front set of $u$ (in the sense of a distribution on a manifold with boundary) does not contain any point $(x, \xi)$ with $x \in E_p$. Now, [28, Theorem 18.3.27] implies that $u \in C^\infty(E_p)$. □

### 4.2. The conjugated wave operator.

In this section, we show the following pointwise identity. This lemma will in fact be true over general semi-Riemannian manifolds.

**Lemma 4.3.** Let $U \subseteq M$ and let $v, \sigma \in C^2(U)$ and $\ell \in C^3(U)$. Then

$$(e^{\ell} \Box (e^{-\ell} v))^2 / 2 = S^2 / 2 + 2 \langle \nabla \ell, \nabla v \rangle^2 + P + R + \text{div} B$$

where the squared part is

$$S = \Box v + qv, \quad q = -\langle \nabla \ell, \nabla \ell \rangle - \Box \ell - \sigma,$$

writing $\tilde{\sigma} = \sigma + \Box \ell$, the leading part is

$$P = \tilde{\sigma} \langle \nabla v, \nabla v \rangle + 2 \text{Hess} \ell(\nabla v, \nabla v) + (-\tilde{\sigma} \langle \nabla \ell, \nabla \ell \rangle + 2 \text{Hess} \ell(\nabla \ell, \nabla \ell)) v^2,$$

and the remainder and divergence parts are

$$R = \left(\text{div}(\Box \ell \nabla \ell) - \sigma \tilde{\sigma} + \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2 + \frac{1}{2} \Box \sigma \right) v^2,$$

and

$$B = -(2 \langle \nabla \ell, \nabla v \rangle + \sigma v) \nabla v + \frac{1}{2} v^2 \nabla \sigma$$

$$+ (\langle \nabla v, \nabla v \rangle - (\Box \ell + \langle \nabla \ell, \nabla \ell \rangle) v^2) \nabla \ell.$$

**Proof.** We have

$$e^{\ell} \Box (e^{-\ell} v) = \Box v - \Box \ell v + 2 \langle \nabla \ell, \nabla v \rangle - \langle \nabla \ell, \nabla \ell \rangle v = S + A,$$

where $A = 2 \langle \nabla \ell, \nabla v \rangle + \sigma v$. Thus,

$$(e^{\ell} \Box (e^{-\ell} v))^2 / 2 = S^2 / 2 + A^2 / 2 + SA.$$
Moreover,

\[ A^2/2 = 2 \langle \nabla \ell, \nabla v \rangle^2 + \sigma^2 v^2/2 + 2 \langle \nabla \ell, \nabla v \rangle \sigma v. \quad (4.2) \]

The last term on the right-hand side of (4.2) can be rewritten as

\[ 2 \langle \nabla \ell, \nabla v \rangle \sigma v = \langle \sigma \nabla \ell, \nabla v^2 \rangle = \text{div}(v^2 \sigma \nabla \ell) - \text{div}(\sigma \nabla \ell) v^2. \quad (4.3) \]

Let us now study

\[ SA = A \Box v + Aqv = -\text{div}(A \nabla v) + \langle \nabla A, \nabla v \rangle + Aqv. \quad (4.4) \]

Here,

\[ \langle \nabla A, \nabla v \rangle = 2 \langle \nabla (\nabla \ell), \nabla v \rangle = \text{Hess} \ell(\nabla v, \nabla v) + \text{Hess} v(\nabla \ell, \nabla \ell). \quad (4.5) \]

We begin with the first term on the right-hand side of (4.5). Viewing \( \nabla v \) as a vector field acting on a function,

\[ \langle \nabla (\nabla \ell), \nabla v \rangle = Hess \ell(\nabla v, \nabla v) + Hess v(\nabla \ell, \nabla \ell). \]

On the other hand,

\[ 2 \text{Hess} v(\nabla v, \nabla \ell) = \text{div}(\langle \nabla v, \nabla v \rangle \nabla \ell) + \Box \ell \langle \nabla v, \nabla v \rangle. \]

We turn now to the second term on the right-hand side of (4.5),

\[ \langle \nabla (\sigma v), \nabla v \rangle = \sigma \langle \nabla v, \nabla v \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle \nabla \sigma, \nabla v^2 \rangle = \sigma \langle \nabla v, \nabla v \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \text{div}(v^2 \nabla \sigma) + \frac{1}{2}(\Box \sigma) v^2. \]

Combining the above gives

\[ A \Box v = \tilde{\sigma} \langle \nabla v, \nabla v \rangle + 2 \text{Hess} \ell(\nabla v, \nabla v) + \frac{1}{2}(\Box \sigma) v^2 + \text{div}(\tilde{\sigma} \nabla \ell) v^2 - \sigma \tilde{\sigma} v^2 + \text{div}(qv^2 \nabla \ell). \quad (4.6) \]

Let us now consider the term

\[ Aqv = 2 \langle \nabla \ell, \nabla v \rangle qv + \sigma qv^2, \]

where the first term on the right-hand side satisfies,

\[ 2 \langle \nabla \ell, \nabla v \rangle qv = \langle q \nabla \ell, \nabla v^2 \rangle = \text{div}(v^2 q \nabla \ell) - \text{div}(q \nabla \ell) v^2. \]

Recall that \( q = -\langle \nabla \ell, \nabla \ell \rangle - \tilde{\sigma} \) and that

\[ \text{div}(\langle \nabla \ell, \nabla \ell \rangle \nabla \ell) = -\langle \nabla \ell, \nabla \ell \rangle \Box \ell + \langle \nabla \ell, \nabla \langle \nabla \ell, \nabla \ell \rangle \rangle = -\langle \nabla \ell, \nabla \ell \rangle \Box \ell + 2 \text{Hess} \ell(\nabla \ell, \nabla \ell). \]

Therefore, by combining the above identities we obtain

\[ Aqv = (-\tilde{\sigma} \langle \nabla \ell, \nabla \ell \rangle + 2 \text{Hess} \ell(\nabla \ell, \nabla \ell) v^2 + \text{div}(\tilde{\sigma} \nabla \ell) v^2 - \sigma \tilde{\sigma} v^2 + \text{div}(qv^2 \nabla \ell). \quad (4.7) \]

The claim follows by combining (4.1)–(4.4), (4.6) and (4.7).
4.3. Proof of Theorem 2.1. We assume that the Lorentzian manifold $(M, g)$, the point $p$ and the distribution $u$ are as in Theorem 2.1. We begin by fixing a small number $\rho > 0$ and define the bounded open set
\[(4.8) \quad \Omega_\rho = \{ q \in \delta_p : r_p(q) > \rho \},\]
where $r_p$ is the distance function defined by (3.1). Recall from Lemma 4.2 that $u \in C^\infty(\Omega_\rho)$. Recall also that $r_p$ is smooth on $\Omega_\rho$.

For each $\epsilon \in (0, \rho)$, we let $F_{\rho, \epsilon} : (\rho, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ be defined by
\[F_{\rho, \epsilon}(t) = 4 \log(t - \rho) + \tau_{\rho, \epsilon}(t - \rho)^2,\]
where $\tau_{\rho, \epsilon} > \epsilon^{-1}$ is a large constant depending on $\epsilon$ and $\rho$ that will be fixed later in the proof of Theorem 2.1 (see (4.21)). Next, we consider the smooth weight function $\ell_{\rho, \epsilon}$ on $\Omega_\rho$ that is defined by
\[(4.9) \quad \ell_{\rho, \epsilon}(q) = (F_{\rho, \epsilon} \circ r_p)(q) = 4 \log(r_p(q) - \rho) + \tau_{\rho, \epsilon}(r_p(q) - \rho)^2, \quad \forall q \in \Omega_\rho.\]

We will apply Lemma 4.3 twice on the set
\[(4.10) \quad U_{\rho, \epsilon} = \Omega_{\rho + 2 \sqrt{\tau}, \epsilon},\]
with the weight function $\ell_{\rho, \epsilon}$ above and with the function $v$ equal to
\[v_1 = e^{\ell_{\rho, \epsilon}} \Re u, \quad \text{or} \quad v_2 = e^{\ell_{\rho, \epsilon}} \Im u,\]
where $\Re u$, $\Im u$ denote the real and imaginary parts of $u$ respectively. By taking a limit as $\epsilon$ approaches zero, we will show that the function $u$ vanishes identically on the set $\Omega_\rho$. Finally, by letting $\rho$ approach zero, we conclude the proof of the theorem.

In the remainder of this section and for the sake of brevity, we use the abbreviated notations $r$, $F$, $\ell$, $\tau$, $U$ and $\psi$ in place of $r_p$, $F_{\rho, \epsilon}$, $\ell_{\rho, \epsilon}$, $\tau_{\rho, \epsilon}$, $U_{\rho, \epsilon}$ and $\psi_{K, p}$ respectively. We will also hide the evaluation at a point $q$, writing for example $F(r)$ in place of $F_{\rho, \epsilon}(r(q))$. Finally, for $j = 1, 2$, we use the notations $S_j$, $P_j$, $R_j$ and $B_j$ for the terms on the right hand side of Lemma 4.3 with $v$ replaced by $v_j$. We also write $u_1 = \Re u$ and $u_2 = \Im u$.

We record that
\[(4.11) \quad F'(r) = 4(r - \rho)^{-1} + 2\tau(r - \rho), \quad F''(r) = -4(r - \rho)^{-2} + 2\tau.\]
Since $r - \rho > 2\sqrt{\tau}$ on $U$ and $\tau > \epsilon^{-1}$, it follows that
\[(4.12) \quad F''(r) > \tau \quad \text{on} \quad U.\]
We will also record the following simple calculation:
\[(4.13) \quad \text{Hess} \ell(X, X) = F''(r) (\nabla r, X)^2 + F'(r) \text{Hess} r(X, X).\]
Using Lemma 3.1 it follows that
\[(4.14) \quad \text{Hess} \ell(\nabla \ell, \nabla \ell) = F'(r)^2 (F''(r) (\nabla r, \nabla r)^2 + F'(r) \text{Hess} r(\nabla r, \nabla r)) = F'(r)^2 F''(r).\]
We let $j = 1, 2$, fix a small $\rho > 0$ and let $\epsilon \in (0, \rho)$. Recall from Lemma 4.2 that the function $v_j$ is smooth over $\overline{\Omega_\rho}$ that contains $U_{\rho, \epsilon}$. Next, in view of the right hand side of Lemma 4.3, we proceed to find a lower bound for the expression

$$P_j + 2\langle \nabla \ell, \nabla v_j \rangle^2 \quad \text{on } U.$$  

Applying (4.13), we write

$$2\langle \nabla \ell, \nabla v_j \rangle^2 + \bar{\sigma} \langle \nabla v_j, \nabla v_j \rangle + 2 \text{Hess } \ell(\nabla v_j, \nabla v_j)$$

$$= 2F'(r) \text{Hess } r(\nabla v_j, \nabla v_j) + \bar{\sigma} \langle \nabla v_j, \nabla v_j \rangle + 2((F'(r))^2 + F''(r)) \langle \nabla r, \nabla v_j \rangle^2$$

$$\geq (2 \frac{F'(r)}{r} \psi + \bar{\sigma}) \langle \nabla v_j, \nabla v_j \rangle + 2(F'(r))^2 + F''(r) - \frac{F'(r)}{r} \psi \langle \nabla r, \nabla v_j \rangle^2,$$

where we are using Lemma 3.3 in the last step, together with the fact that $F'(r(q)) > 0$ on $\Omega_\rho$. Next, we take

$$\bar{\sigma}(q) = -2 \frac{F'(r(q))}{r(q)} \psi(q), \quad \forall q \in \Omega_\rho.$$  

Then, using (4.11)–(4.12) the previous bound reduces as follows:

$$2\langle \nabla \ell, \nabla v_j \rangle^2 + \bar{\sigma} \langle \nabla v_j, \nabla v_j \rangle + 2 \text{Hess } \ell(\nabla v_j, \nabla v_j)$$

$$\geq 2(F'(r))^2 + F''(r) - \frac{F'(r)}{r} \psi \langle \nabla r, \nabla v_j \rangle^2$$

$$\geq 2F'(r)(F'(r) - \frac{1}{r} \psi) \langle \nabla r, \nabla v_j \rangle^2$$

$$\geq 2F'(r)(r^{-\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{1}{r} \psi) \langle \nabla r, \nabla v_j \rangle^2 \geq 0, \quad \text{on } U,$$

where the latter inequality holds for all $\epsilon$ sufficiently smaller than $\rho$, since $\frac{\psi}{r}$ is a bounded smooth function on $\overline{\Omega_\rho}$. Using this bound together with (4.14) we obtain

$$P_j + 2\langle \nabla \ell, \nabla v_j \rangle^2 \geq (-\bar{\sigma} \langle \nabla \ell, \nabla \ell \rangle + 2 \text{Hess } \ell(\nabla \ell, \nabla \ell)) v_j^2$$

$$\geq 2F'(r)^2 (F'(r)\psi r^{-1} + F''(r)) v_j^2 \geq 2F'(r)^2 F''(r) v_j^2 \quad \text{on } U,$$

where in the last step we used the fact that $\psi$, $r$ and $F'(r)$ are positive functions on $U$. Thus,

$$P_j + 2\langle \nabla \ell, \nabla v_j \rangle^2 \geq 2\tau(r - \rho)^2 \lambda^2 v_j^2, \quad \text{on } U,$$

where

$$\lambda = \lambda(r) = \tau + (r - \rho)^{-2}.$$  

Next and for $j = 1, 2$, we consider the terms of the expression $R_j$ in Lemma 4.3. We claim that the following bound holds:

$$|R_j| \leq c_{\rho} \lambda^2 v_j^2 \quad \text{on } U,$$

where $c_{\rho} > 1$ is a constant only depending on $\rho$. 


In order to prove (4.17), we will first record some bounds. First, note that
\[ (4.18) \quad |F'(r)| + |F''(r)| \leq C\lambda, \quad \text{on } \Omega_\rho \]
for some constant \( C > 0 \) independent of \( \rho \) and \( \epsilon \). Next, note that
\[ \Box \ell = - \text{div}(F'(r) \nabla r) = -F''(r) + F'(r)\Box r. \]
Recalling also that \( \sigma = \tilde{\sigma} - \Box \ell \), it follows that
\[ (4.20) \quad |\Box \ell| + |\sigma| \leq C_\rho \lambda, \quad \text{on } \Omega_\rho, \]
for some \( C_\rho > 0 \) that depends only on \( \rho \).

We return to the claim (4.17) and start with the term \( \text{div}((\Box \ell) \nabla \ell) \sigma_j^2 \) in \( R_j \). There holds
\[ \text{div}((\Box \ell) \nabla \ell) = \langle \nabla \Box \ell, \nabla \ell \rangle - (\Box \ell)^2. \]
To simplify notation we will write \( F = F(r) \). Using (4.19) we write
\[ \text{div}((\Box \ell) \nabla \ell) = -F''( \Box \ell + F'' \Box r + F'' \langle \nabla \Box r, \nabla r \rangle - (\Box \ell)^2. \]
Next, using (4.11) and noting that \( r \) is a smooth bounded function on \( U \), it is clear that the claimed estimate (4.17) holds for the first term in \( R \) with \( c_\rho \) sufficiently large depending on \( \rho \). We move on to analyze the term \( (-\sigma \tilde{\sigma} + \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2)\sigma_j^2 \) in the expression for \( R_j \). There holds
\[ -\sigma \tilde{\sigma} + \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 = -\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 + \frac{1}{2}(\Box \ell)^2 = -\frac{1}{2}F' \frac{\psi^2}{r^2} + \frac{1}{2}(-F'' + F' \Box r)^2. \]
Again, it is clear that the claimed bound (4.17) holds for this term with \( c_\rho \) sufficiently large depending on \( \rho \). It remains to analyze the term \( (\Box \sigma)\sigma_j^2 \):
\[ \Box \sigma = \Box \tilde{\sigma} - \Box (\Box \ell) \]
\[ = -F'' - 2F' \Box \left( \frac{\psi}{\sqrt{r}} \right) + 2(F'' - F' \Box r) \frac{\psi}{\sqrt{r}} - F' \Box (\Box r) + 2F''' \Box r \]
\[ + 4F'' \langle \nabla r, \nabla \left( \frac{\psi}{\sqrt{r}} \right) \rangle - F'' \langle \Box r \rangle^2 + 2F''' \langle \nabla r, \nabla \Box r \rangle. \]
The claim follows again by using the expression (4.11) and choosing \( c_\rho \) sufficiently large depending on \( \rho \). This completes the proof of the bound (4.17).

We are ready to fix the choice of \( \tau > \epsilon^{-1} \). We set,
\[ (4.21) \quad \tau = a_\rho \epsilon^{-1}, \]
where \( a_\rho = \max\{\|V\|_{L^\infty}(M), c_\rho\} \) and \( c_\rho \) as in (4.17). Using the bounds (4.15) and (4.17) together with the fact that \( r - \rho > 2\sqrt{\tau} \) on \( U \), it follows for \( j = 1, 2 \), that
\[ (4.22) \quad P_j + 2\langle \nabla \ell, \nabla v_j \rangle^2 + R_j \geq 2a_\rho v_j^2, \quad \text{on } U. \]

Next, recalling that \( (\Box + V)(u_1 + iv_2) = 0 \) and that \( v_j = e^{-\ell} u_j \) for \( j = 1, 2 \), we have
\[ \frac{1}{2}|V(v_1 + iv_2)|^2 = \frac{1}{2}|e^{-\ell} \Box (e^{\ell} v_1)|^2 + \frac{1}{2}|e^{-\ell} \Box (e^{\ell} v_1)|^2. \]
Integrating the latter expression over $U$, applying Lemma 4.3 twice with $v = v_1$ and $v = v_2$ and finally using the estimate (4.22), we deduce that:

$$2a_\rho \int_U e^{2\ell}|u|^2 \, dV_g \leq \left| \int_U \text{div} \, B_1 \, dV_g \right| + \left| \int_U \text{div} \, B_2 \, dV_g \right| + \frac{1}{2} \int_U |V|^2 e^{2\ell}|u|^2 \, dV_g.$$  

Since $a_\rho > \|V\|_{L^\infty(M)}^2$, this reduces to

$$a_\rho \int_U e^{2\ell}|u|^2 \, dV_g \leq \left| \int_U \text{div} \, B_1 \, dV_g \right| + \left| \int_U \text{div} \, B_2 \, dV_g \right|. \tag{4.23}$$

Using the divergence theorem together with the fact that both $u$ and $\partial_\nu u$ vanish identically on the set $\mathcal{E}_\rho \cap \Sigma$, we write for $j = 1, 2$,

$$\int_U \text{div} \, B_j \, dV_g = \int_\Gamma \langle B_j, \nu \rangle \, dV_g, \tag{4.24}$$

where $\Gamma = \Gamma_{\rho=\tau} = \{ r - \rho = 2\sqrt{\tau} \} \cap \overline{\Omega_\rho}$ and $\nu$ is the unit space-like normal vector to $\Gamma$. Next, noting that

$$(r - \rho)|_\Gamma = 2\frac{\rho}{\tau}, \tag{4.25}$$

we write

$$e^{2\ell}|_\Gamma = (r - \rho)^8 e^{2\tau(r - \rho)^2}|_\Gamma = 2^8 e^{4\frac{\rho}{\tau}}. \tag{4.26}$$

We claim that the following bound holds:

$$|\langle B_j, \nu \rangle| \leq C_\rho \lambda^3 e^{2\ell}(u_j^2 + |\nabla u_j|^2), \quad \text{pointwise on } \Gamma, \tag{4.27}$$

where $|\nabla u_j|$ is the norm of $\nabla u_j$ with respect to some auxiliary Riemannian metric and $C_\rho$ is a generic positive constant only depending on $\rho$.

To this end, let us first observe that

$$|\nabla v_j| = |e^\ell(u_j \nabla \ell + \nabla u_j)| = |e^\ell(F' u_j \nabla r + \nabla u_j)| \leq C_\rho e^\ell F' (|u_j| + |\nabla u_j|),$$

pointwise on $\Gamma$, for a positive constant $C_\rho$ only depending on $\rho$. Using this expression and recalling the bound (4.20) we obtain the following bounds for the terms in the definition of $B$:

$$|\langle \nabla \ell, \nabla v_j \rangle | + |\sigma v_j \nabla v_j| + |\langle \nabla v_j, \nabla v_j \rangle \nabla \ell| \leq C_\rho e^{2\ell} \lambda^3 (|u_j|^2 + |\nabla u_j|^2),$$

$$|\Box v_j^2 \nabla \ell| + |\langle \nabla \ell, \nabla v_j \rangle v_j^2 \nabla \ell| + |v_j^2 \nabla \sigma| \leq C_\rho e^{2\ell} \lambda^3 |u_j|^2,$$

for some constant $C_\rho$ that only depends on $\rho$. This completes proof of the bound (4.27). Combining (4.27) with equations (4.21), (4.25) and (4.26) we write

$$\left| \int_\Gamma \langle B_j, \nu \rangle \, dV_g \right| \leq C_\rho \int_\Gamma ((r - \rho)^{-2} + \tau)^3 e^{2\ell}(u_j^2 + |\nabla u_j|^2) \, dV_g \leq C_\rho \epsilon,$$

for some positive constant $C_\rho$ only depending on $\rho$. 

Next, combining the latter estimate with the Carleman estimate (4.23) and equation (4.24) it follows that
\[ \int_U (r - \rho)^8 |u|^2 \, dV_g \leq C_{\rho} \epsilon. \]
Therefore, taking the limit as \( \epsilon \) tends to zero and noting that \( U = U_{\rho, \epsilon} \to \Omega_{\rho} \) as \( \epsilon \) approaches zero, we conclude that
\[ \int_{\Omega_{\rho}} (r - \rho)^8 |u|^2 \, dV_g = 0. \]
Hence \( u = 0 \) on the set \( \Omega_{\rho} \). Finally, letting \( \rho \to 0 \), we conclude that \( u = 0 \) on \( \mathcal{E}_p \) as claimed.

5. Exact controllability in rough Sobolev spaces

Our main goal in this section is to prove the following proposition.

**Proposition 5.1** (Exact controllability). Let \((M, g), T_0 \) and \( p_0 \) be as in Theorem 2.4. Let \( s \geq 0, V \in C^\infty(M) \) and suppose that \( w_0 \) and \( w_1 \) are compactly supported distributions in the interior of \( M_0 \) such that
\[ (w_0, w_1) \in H^{-s}(M_0) \times H^{-s-1}(M_0). \]
Then, given any \( T_1 \in [T_0, T] \), there exists a compactly supported distribution
\[ f \in H^{-s}(\Sigma) \cap C((T_0, T) \times \partial M_0), \]
such that the solution \( u \in H^{-s}(M) \) to the equation (2.3) with boundary value \( f \) satisfies
\[ (u|_{t=T_1}, \partial_t u|_{t=T_1}) = (w_0, w_1) \quad \text{on } M_0. \]

5.1. Direct problem in \( H^{-s} \)-spaces with \( s \geq 0 \). We first study the direct problem (2.3) with data in smooth Sobolev spaces, and then proceed to study rougher data via transposition.

**Lemma 5.2.** Let \( s \geq 0 \) and \( V \in C^\infty(M) \). Consider the initial boundary value problem
\[
\begin{aligned}
\Box u + Vu &= F &\quad &\text{on } M, \\
u &= f &\quad &\text{on } \Sigma, \\
(u|_{t=T}, \partial_t u|_{t=T}) &= (\phi_0, \phi_1) &\quad &\text{on } M_0.
\end{aligned}
\]
Given any \( F \in H^0_0(M) \), \( u_0 \in H^{s+1}_0(M_0) \), \( u_1 \in H^1_0(M_0) \) and \( f \in H^{s+1}_0(\Sigma) \), there exists a unique solution \( u \) in the energy space
\[ H^{s+1}(M) \cap C^1((-T,T; H^s(M_0)) \cap C((-T,T; H^{s+1}(M_0)), \]
and the dependence on the data is continuous. Moreover, \( \partial_\nu u \in H^s(\Sigma) \).
This lemma follows from [38, Theorem 4.1] by using standard techniques of obtaining higher regularity for solutions to the wave equation, see for example [38, Remark 2.10] or [21, Chapter 7, Theorem 6]. Next, we state a lemma on solving the wave equation in rough Sobolev scales via a standard transposition argument. For the convenience of the reader we have included the proof.

**Lemma 5.3.** Let \( s \geq 0, \, V \in C^\infty(M) \) and let
\[
f \in H^{-s}(\Sigma) \cap \mathcal{E}'((-T,T_0) \times \partial M_0),
\]
for some \(|T_0| < T\). Then, there exists a unique solution \( u \in H^{-s}(M) \) to the equation
\[
\begin{align*}
\Box u + Vu &= 0 & \text{on } M, \\
u &= f & \text{on } \Sigma, \\
(u|_{t=-T}, \partial_t u|_{t=-T}) &= 0 & \text{on } M_0.
\end{align*}
\]
There holds
\[
\partial_\nu u|_{\Sigma} \in H^{-s-1}(\Sigma).
\]
Moreover, for any \( t_0 \in [T_0, T] \), there holds
\[
(u|_{t=t_0}, \partial_t u|_{t=t_0}) \in H^{-s}(M_0) \times H^{-s-1}(M_0),
\]
Proof. Uniqueness follows by using propagation of singularities [28, Theorem 24.5.3] and the fact \( u = 0 \) is the only smooth solution to (5.3) subject to \( f = 0 \).

To show existence of a solution, we suppose for the moment that \( f \in C_\infty((-T,T_0) \times M_0) \) and let \( u \) be the solution to (5.3) with the boundary value \( f \). Next, let \( u^F \) denote the unique solution to (5.1) with source \( F \) and zero boundary and final data. We have
\[
\int_M u(t,x) F(t,x) \, dV_g = - \int_\Sigma \partial_\nu u^F(t,x) f(t,x) \, dV_g.
\]
Thus, the transpose of the map \( F \mapsto \partial_\nu u^F|_{\Sigma} \) is \( f \mapsto u \). By Lemma 5.1, the former map is continuous from \( H^s_0(M) \) to \( H^s(\Sigma) \). Hence, the latter is continuous from \( H^{-s}(\Sigma) \cap \mathcal{E}'(\Sigma) \) to \( H^{-s}(M) \) for any compact set \( \tilde{\Sigma} \) in \((-T,T_0) \times \partial M_0\).

To show the claim about the trace on \( \Sigma \), we let \( f \) and \( u \) be as above and given any \( h \in H^{s+1}_0(\Sigma) \), we write \( u^h \) for the unique solution to (5.1) subject to the boundary value \( h \) and zero source and final data. Then,
\[
\int_\Sigma \partial_\nu u^h(t,x) f(t,x) \, dV_g = \int_\Sigma \partial_\nu u(t,x) h(t,x) \, dV_g.
\]
Hence, the transpose of the map \( h \mapsto \partial_\nu u^h|_{\Sigma} \) is \( f \mapsto \partial_\nu u|_{\Sigma} \). By Lemma 5.1, the former map is continuous from \( H^{s+1}_0(\Sigma) \) to \( H^s(\Sigma) \). Hence, the latter is continuous from \( H^{-s}(\Sigma) \cap \mathcal{E}'(\Sigma) \) to \( H^{-s-1}(\Sigma) \) for any compact set \( \tilde{\Sigma} \) in \((-T,T_0) \times \partial M_0\).
Finally, we consider the last claim and only consider the case \( t_0 = T \). The case \( t_0 \in [T_0, T) \) is analogous. Let \( \phi = (\phi_0, \phi_1) \in H^{s+1}_0(M_0) \times H^s(M_0) \) and denote by \( u^s \in H^{s+1}(M) \), the unique solution to (5.1) with \( F = f = 0 \) and final data \( \phi \). We have

\[
\int_{\Sigma} f(t, x) \partial_x u^s(t, x) \, dV = \int_{M_0} u(T, x) \phi_1(x) \, dV_g - \int_{M_0} \partial_t u(T, x) \phi_0(x) \, dV_g.
\]

Thus, the transpose of the map \( \phi \mapsto \partial_x u^s|_{\Sigma} \) is \( f \mapsto (u|_{t=T}, \partial_t u|_{t=T}) \). By Lemma 5.1 the former map is continuous from \( H^{s+1}_0(M_0) \times H^s(M_0) \) to \( H^s(\Sigma) \). Hence, the latter is continuous from \( H^{-s}(\Sigma) \cap \mathcal{E}'(\Sigma) \) to \( H^{-s}(M_0) \times H^{-s-1}(M_0) \) for any compact set \( \overline{\Sigma} \) in \( (-T, T_0) \times \partial M_0 \). \( \square \)

5.2. **Proof of exact controllability.** The aim of this section is to prove Proposition 5.1. The proof is based on the following observability estimate.

**Lemma 5.4** (Observability estimate). Let \((M, g), T_0 \) and \( p_0 \) be as in Theorem 2.4. Let \( V \in C^\infty(M) \), let \( \delta > 0 \) be sufficiently small and let \( \chi \in C_\infty((\partial T, T_0) \times \partial M_0) \) satisfy \( \chi = 1 \) on \((-T + \delta, T_0 - \delta) \times \partial M_0 \). Then, given any \( s \geq 0 \) there holds:

\[
\|\phi_0\|_{H^{s+1}_0(M_0)} + \|\phi_1\|_{H^s(M_0)} \leq C_{\text{obs}} \|\chi u\|_{H^{s}(\Sigma)},
\]

where \( u \) denotes the unique solution to the wave equation (5.1) on \( M \), subject to the source \( F = 0 \), boundary value \( f = 0 \) and final data

\[
(\phi_0, \phi_1) \in H^{s+1}_0(M_0) \times H^s(M_0).
\]

Before presenting the proof we note that in the following discussion the term *compressed generalized bicharacteristic* is as defined in [8]. We write \( \iota : \Sigma \to M \) for the natural inclusion and write \( \iota^* : T^*M \to T^*\Sigma \) by its pullback. We also recall from [8] that a pair \((y, \eta) \in T^*\Sigma\) is said to be *nondiffractive* if the preimage \((\iota^*)^{-1}(y, \eta)\) contains two distinct null vectors, or if it contains a unique null vector \((y, \bar{\eta})\) and \( \gamma_{y, \bar{\eta}}(s) \notin M \) for arbitrary small values of \( s \), when \( M \) is extended to a slightly larger manifold without boundary.

**Proof.** We begin by choosing \( \delta > 0 \) to be sufficiently small so that

\[
\overline{E_{p_0}} \subset (-T + \delta, T_0 - \delta) \times M_0.
\]

We claim that that every compressed generalized bicharacteristic in \( T^*\Sigma \) must hit \( T^*\Gamma \) in a nondiffractive point, where

\[
\Gamma = (-T + \delta, T_0 - \delta) \times \partial M_0.
\]

Due to the nontrapping assumption (H4), it suffices to show that given any \( q \in \mathcal{E}_p \) and any null \( \xi \in T^*_qM \), the bicharacteristic \( (\gamma_{q, \xi}(s), \bar{\gamma}_{q, \xi}(s)) \) intersects \( T^*\Gamma \) in a nondiffractive point. Here and in the remainder of this proof we are identifying vectors and covectors using \( g \) and use the same notation for both of them.
To show the latter claim, we begin by recalling that $\gamma_{q,\xi}$ is non-trapped and write $I = [a, b]$ for its maximal domain of definition. By Lemma 4.1, $\gamma_{q,\xi}$ can not intersect $C(p)$ twice. Thus one end of $\gamma_{q,\xi}$ must stay in $\mathcal{E}_p$. We consider only the case that $\gamma_{q,\xi}(s) \in \mathcal{E}_p$ for all $0 \leq s \leq b$, the other case being analogous. We write

$$\gamma = \gamma_{q,\xi}(b), \gamma_{q,\xi}(b) \in T^*\Sigma.$$ 

It is enough to show that $(y, \eta)$ is nondiffractive. To make the discussion explicit, let us consider boundary normal coordinates $(x', r) \in \Sigma \times (-r_0, r_0)$ such that

$$g(x', r) = \begin{pmatrix} h(x', r) & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

and $r \geq 0$ for $(x', r) \in M$. In these coordinates, $\gamma_{q,\xi}(b) = (\eta, \rho)$ for some $\rho \leq 0$.

Case $\rho < 0$. As $(\eta, \rho)$ is a null vector, so is $(\eta, -\rho)$. Thus $(\iota^*)^{-1}(y, \eta)$ contains two distinct null vectors.

Case $\rho = 0$. Then $(y, \bar{\eta}) = (y, 0; \eta, 0)$ is the only point in $(\iota^*)^{-1}(y, \eta)$. But $(\eta, 0) = \gamma_{q,\xi}(b)$ and there are $s > b$ arbitrarily close to $b$ such that $\gamma_{q,\xi}(s) \notin M$.

We have shown that every compressed generalized bicharacteristic in $T^* M$ must hit $T^* T$ in a nondiffractive point. Thus, the claim follows by invoking [8, Theorem 3.3–Corollary 3.7], if given any $v \in C^\infty(M)$ satisfying $(\Box + V)v = 0$ on $M$ and $v|_{\Sigma} = \partial_v v|_{\Gamma} = 0$, there holds $v = 0$ everywhere on $M$.

To verify this claim, we write $p_0 = (t_0, x_0)$ and note that since $E_{p_0} \subset (-T + \delta, T_0 - \delta) \times M_0$ and since $v|_{\Gamma} = \partial_v v|_{\Gamma} = 0$, we can apply Theorem 2.1 to deduce that $(v|_{t=t_0}, \partial_t v|_{t=t_0}) = 0$ on $M_0 \setminus \{x_0\}$. By smoothness of $v$ in $M$ it follows that $(v|_{t=t_0}, \partial_t v|_{t=t_0}) = 0$ on $M_0$. Since $(\Box + V)v = 0$ on $M$ and $v|_{\Sigma} = 0$ we conclude that $v = 0$ everywhere on $M$. \hfill \Box

It is well known that observability estimates imply exact controllability. We will give a proof for the convenience of the reader.

**Proof of Proposition 5.1.** We choose $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small as in the proof of Lemma 5.4 and define the smooth non-negative function

$$\chi \in C^\infty_c((-T, T_0) \times \partial M_0)$$

such that $\chi = 1$ on $(-T + \delta, T_0 - \delta) \times M_0$. Given any $F \in H^{-s}(\Sigma)$, we write $u \in H^{-s}(M)$ for the solution to (5.3) with the boundary value $f = \chi F$. Thus, we can view $\chi F$ as an element in

$$(5.5) \quad H^{-s}(\Sigma) \cap \mathcal{E}'((-T, T_0) \times \partial M_0).$$

By Lemma 5.3 we obtain that

$$(u|_{t=T_1}, \partial_t u|_{t=T_1}) \in H^{-s}(M_0) \times H^{-s-1}(M_0).$$
Then, if \( f \) it follows that given any \( \phi \) subject to the potential \( \phi \),

\[
\begin{align*}
\Box u^\phi + Vu^\phi &= 0 & \text{on } M, \\
u^\phi &= 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\
(u^\phi(T_1, x), \partial_t u^\phi(T_1, x)) &= (\phi_0, \phi_1) & \text{on } M_0.
\end{align*}
\]

We define the continuous linear map

\[
\mathcal{T} : H_0^{s+1}(M_0) \times H_0^s(M_0) \rightarrow H_0^s(\Sigma),
\]

through \( \mathcal{T}\phi = \chi \partial_n u^\phi |_{\Sigma} \). Note that \( \mathcal{T}\phi \) is compactly supported on the set \((-T, T_0) \times \partial M_0\). We write

\[
(\mathcal{T}\phi, F)_{(-T, T_1) \times \partial M_0} = (\phi_0, \partial_t u)_{\{T_1\} \times M_0} - (\phi_1, u)_{\{T_1\} \times M_0},
\]

where the pairings \((\cdot, \cdot)_{(-T, T_1) \times \partial M_0}\) and \((\cdot, \cdot)_{\{T_1\} \times M_0}\) are as defined in Section 3.1, that is, the pairing on the left hand side is in the generalized sense

\[
H_0^s((-T, T_1) \times \partial M_0) \times H^{-s}((-T, T_1) \times \partial M_0),
\]

while the ones on the right hand side are in the generalized sense

\[
H_0^{s+1}(M_0) \times H^{-s-1}(M_0) \quad \text{and} \quad H_0^s(M_0) \times H^{-s}(M_0)
\]

respectively. It follows from the latter identity that the transpose

\[
\mathcal{T}^* : H^{-s}(\Sigma) \rightarrow H^{-s}(M_0) \times H^{-s-1}(M_0),
\]

defined by

\[
\mathcal{T}^* F = (u|_{\{T_1\} \times M_0}, \partial_t u|_{\{T_1\} \times M_0}),
\]

is a continuous linear map. To conclude the proof, it suffices to show that \( \mathcal{T}^* \) is surjective. This is true, since \( \mathcal{T} \) is injective and has closed range, thanks to Lemma 5.4. We emphasize that since \( F \in H^{-s}(\Sigma) \) and since \( \chi \) is compactly supported on \((-T, T_0) \times \partial M_0\), it follows that the boundary data \( f = \chi F \) that drives the solution \( u \) to the target state \((w_0, w_1)\) is indeed in the right space \((5.5)\).

6. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.4

This section is concerned with the proof of Theorem 2.4. We start with a proposition.

**Proposition 6.1.** Let the hypotheses of Theorem 2.4 be satisfied. Let \( p = (T_1, x_0) \) for some \( T_1 \in (T_0, T) \) and \( x_0 \in M_0^\text{int} \) be such that \( \mathcal{E}_p \subset (T_0, T) \times M_0 \). Then, if

\[
\Lambda_{V_1} = \Lambda_{V_2}, \quad \text{for some } V_1, V_2 \in C^\infty(M),
\]

it follows that given any \( f \in H_0^{\frac{s+1}{2}}((-T, T_1) \times \partial M_0) \), there holds:

\[
u_{f}^{(1)}(p) = \omega \nu_{f}^{(2)}(p) \quad \text{for some constant } \omega \text{ that is independent of } f,
\]

where for each \( j = 1, 2 \), the notation \( u_f^{(j)} \) stands for the unique solution to (2.3) subject to the potential \( V_j \) and the Dirichlet data \( f \).
Let us emphasize that we are identifying \( H^{\frac{n+1}{2}}_0((-T, T_1) \times \partial M_0) \) as a subspace of \( H^{\frac{n+1}{2}}_0(\Sigma) \), by extending its elements by zero on the set \((T_1, T) \times \partial M_0\).

In the following proof, in order to avoid confusion, we will systematically use the notation \( h \) for rougher Dirichlet data on the boundary, while \( f \) is reserved for smoother Dirichlet data on the boundary as in the statement of the proposition.

**Proof of Proposition 6.1.** We recall that by Lemma 5.3, the equality \( \Lambda V_1 = \Lambda V_2 \) on \( H^1_0(\Sigma) \) extends by continuity to \( H^{-s}(\Sigma) \) for all \( s \geq 0 \). Let \( p = (T_1, x_0) \) be as in the statement of the proposition and consider

\[
\delta_{x_0} \in H^{-\frac{n+1}{2}}(M_0)
\]

defined by

\[
(\delta_{x_0}, v)_{(T_1) \times M_0} = v(T_1, x_0) \quad \text{for all } v \in C_c^\infty(\{T_1\} \times M_0^{\text{int}}),
\]

where the pairing above is with respect to the natural volume form on the hypersurface \( \{T_1\} \times M_0 \), as defined in Section 3. Applying Proposition 5.1, we deduce that there exists a distribution \( h \) in the space

\[
H^{-\frac{n+1}{2}}(\Sigma) \cap \mathcal{E}'((-T, T_0) \times \partial M_0),
\]

such that \( u_h^{(1)} \) satisfies

\[
(u_h^{(1)}|_{t=T_1}, \partial_t u_h^{(1)}|_{t=T_1}) = (0, \delta_{x_0}), \quad \text{on } M_0,
\]

where we recall that the traces are well defined by Lemma 5.3.

Next, we denote by \( \mathcal{T}^{(1)} \) the set of distributions \( h \) in the space (6.1) such that the solution \( u_h^{(1)} \) satisfies

\[
(\partial_h^{(1)}|_{t=T_1}, \partial_t u_h^{(1)}|_{t=T_1}) \in \text{span}\{(0, \delta_{x_0})\}, \quad \text{on } M_0.
\]

By the above discussion, the set \( \mathcal{T}^{(1)} \) has a non-zero element. We also define the set \( \mathcal{T}^{(2)} \) analogously with \( V_1 \) replaced by \( V_2 \), and note that it must also contain a non-zero element. We claim that the two sets \( \mathcal{T}^{(1)} \) and \( \mathcal{T}^{(2)} \) are identical.

We show the inclusion \( \mathcal{T}^{(1)} \subset \mathcal{T}^{(2)} \), and the opposite inclusion follows by symmetry. Let \( h \in \mathcal{T}^{(1)} \) and recall that equation (6.2) holds. Since \( h \) belongs to the space (6.1), it follows from Lemma 5.3 that \( u_h^{(1)} \in H^{-\frac{n+1}{2}}(M) \).

Noting that \( \mathcal{E}_p \) is disjoint from the set \( \{T_0, T\} \times M_0 \) and that \( h \) is compactly supported in \((-T, T_0) \times \partial M_0\), it follows that \( u_h^{(1)}|_\Sigma \) is vanishing on the (open) set \( \mathcal{E}_p \cap \Sigma \). Since \( u_h^{(1)}|_{t=T_1}, \partial_t u_h^{(1)}|_{t=T_1} \) is supported at the point \( x_0 \) and since \( u_h^{(1)}|_{\Sigma} \) is vanishing on \( \Sigma \cap \mathcal{E}_p \), it follows by the finite speed of propagation for wave equation that \( \partial_t u_h^{(1)}|_\Sigma \) must also vanish on the set \( \mathcal{E}_p \cap \Sigma \).

Since \( \Lambda V_1 h = \Lambda V_2 h \), it follows that the Cauchy data of the distribution \( u_h^{(2)} \in H^{-\frac{n+1}{2}}(M) \) must also vanish on the set \( \mathcal{E}_p \cap \Sigma \). Applying our unique
continuation result, Theorem 2.1, it follows that \( u^{(2)}_h|_{e^p} = 0 \). Thus, we conclude that the traces \( (u^{(2)}_h|_{t=T_1}, \partial_t u^{(2)}_h|_{t=T_1}) \in H^{-\frac{n+1}{2}}(M_0) \times H^{-\frac{n+1}{2}}(M_0) \) are supported at the point \( \{x_0\} \). Consequently, the traces must be equal to a linear combination of \( \delta_{x_0} \) and its derivatives on \( M_0 \). Since \( \delta_{x_0} \in H^{-\frac{n+1}{2}}(M_0) \) while its derivatives are not in this space, it follows that \( u^{(2)}_h|_{t=T_1} = 0 \) and that \( \partial_t u^{(2)}_h|_{t=T_1} \in \text{span}\{\delta_{x_0}\} \). We have shown that \( \mathscr{T}^{(1)} = \mathscr{T}^{(2)} \).

We are now ready to prove the claim in the proposition. Let \( f \in H^\frac{n+1}{2}_0((-T,T_1) \times \partial M_0) \) and let \( h \in \mathcal{F}^{(1)} \) be such that

\[
(u^{(1)}_h|_{t=T_1}, \partial_t u^{(1)}_h|_{t=T_1}) = (0, \delta_{x_0}) \quad \text{on} \ M_0.
\]

Recall that such \( h \) exists thanks to Proposition 5.1. In view of the equality \( \mathscr{T}^{(1)} = \mathscr{T}^{(2)} \), we must also have:

\[
(u^{(2)}_h|_{t=T_1}, \partial_t u^{(2)}_h|_{t=T_1}) = (0, \omega \delta_{x_0}), \quad \text{on} \ M_0,
\]

for some constant \( \omega \) that is independent of \( f \).

Using Lemma 5.2, Lemma 5.3 and recalling that the distribution \( h \) is compactly supported in \((-T,T_0) \times \partial M_0\), we write, for each \( j = 1, 2 \),

\[
(\Lambda_{V_1} h, f)_{(-T,T_1) \times \partial M_0} - (h, \Lambda_{V_2} f)_{(-T,T_1) \times \partial M_0} = (\partial_t u^{(j)}_h, u^{(j)}_h)_{\{T_1\} \times M_0} - (u^{(j)}_h, \partial_t u^{(j)}_h)_{\{T_1\} \times M_0} = c_j u^{(j)}_f(p),
\]

where \( c_1 = 1 \) and \( c_2 = \omega \) is the constant in (6.3). We emphasize here that the former two pairings are in the generalized sense \( H^{-\frac{n+1}{2}} \times H^\frac{n+1}{2}_0 \) and \( H^{-\frac{n+1}{2}} \times H^\frac{n+1}{2}_0 \) on \((-T,T_1) \times \partial M_0\) while the latter two pairings are in the generalized sense \( H^{-\frac{n+1}{2}} \times H^\frac{n+1}{2}_0 \) and \( H^{-\frac{n+1}{2}} \times H^\frac{n+1}{2}_0 \) on \( \{T_1\} \times M_0 \).

Finally, we use equality of the Dirichlet-to-Neumann maps \( \Lambda_{V_1} = \Lambda_{V_2} \) with (6.4) to conclude that

\[
u^{(1)}_f(p) = \omega u^{(2)}_f(p).
\]

\[\square\]

We are now ready to prove the main theorem, but first we state a lemma about point values of solutions to the wave equation that will be proved in Appendix A. We recall that given each \( v = (p, \xi) \in L^+M \) with \( L^+M \) denoting the bundle of future pointing null vectors on \( M \), the notation \( \gamma_v : I \to M \) stands for the inextendible null geodesic in \( M \) with initial data \( v \), as in (2.6).

**Lemma 6.2.** Let \( V \in C^\infty(M) \), \( p = (T_1, x_0) \in M^{\text{int}} \), \( v = (p, \xi) \in L^+M \) and suppose that the inextendible null geodesic \( \gamma_v \) intersects \( \Sigma = (-T, T) \times \partial M_0 \).
where we used the fact that (6.6) 0 = \{f_j}\_{j=1}^{\infty} \subset C_c^\infty((-T, T_1 - \epsilon) \times \partial M_0),

such that the solution \( u_{f_j} \) to (2.3) with boundary data \( f_j \) satisfies:

(i) \(|u_{f_j}(p) - 1| \leq \frac{C}{f_j} \) for all \( j \in \mathbb{N} \), where \( C \) is a constant that is independent of \( j \).

(ii) \(|\langle \omega, \nabla u_{f_j}(p) \rangle - i \cdot j \langle \omega, \xi \rangle| \leq C \) for all \( j \in \mathbb{N} \) and all \( \omega \in \mathbb{T}_pM \). Here, \( \omega \) is the imaginary unit and the constant \( C \) is independent of \( j \).

Proof of Theorem 2.4. Let \( p = (T_1, x_0) \in \mathbb{D} \), where \( \mathbb{D} \) is as defined in (2.10) and let \( U \) be a small neighborhood of \( p \) in \( \mathbb{D} \). Denote by \( C^{-}(q) \) the past null cone emanating from the point \( q \) and also define \( \pi : M \to \mathbb{R} \) as the time projection given by \( \pi(t, x) = t \). We fix \( \epsilon > T_1 - \inf_{q \in U} \pi(q) \) such that each \( \nu \in L^+U \), the null geodesic \( \gamma_\nu \) is disjoint from \([T_1 - \epsilon, T_1 + \epsilon] \times \partial M_0\). This can always be achieved for \( U \) sufficiently small.

Invoking Proposition 6.1, we observe that given each point \( q \in U \) and each \( f \in H^2_0 \left((-T, T_1 - \epsilon) \times \partial M_0\right) \), there holds:

\[
(6.5) \quad u^{(1)}_f(q) = \omega(q) u^{(2)}_f(q), \quad \text{on} \; U,
\]

where \( \omega(q) \) is independent of \( f \) and only depends on the point \( q \), the geometry \( (M, g) \) and the potential \( V_2 \).

We claim that \( \omega \in C^\infty(U) \). To see this, we write \( \widetilde{T}_1 = T_1 - \epsilon \) and let \( q \in U \) be arbitrary. Let \( \xi \in L^+\nu M \) and note that \( \gamma_\nu \xi(s) \) hits the boundary \( \Sigma \) at some end point \( s_0 < 0 \). Noting that \( \gamma_\nu \) is disjoint from \( \Sigma \) for any \( t \in [T_1 - \epsilon, T_1 + \epsilon] \) independent of \( q \in U \), we can apply Lemma 6.2. Thus, there exists \( f \in C^\infty_c((-T, \widetilde{T}_1) \times \partial M_0) \) such that \( u^{(2)}_f \neq 0 \) in a sufficiently small neighborhood \( \tilde{U} \subset U \) of the point \( q \). Since \( \omega = \frac{u^{(1)}_f}{u^{(2)}_f} \) on \( \tilde{U} \), and since both expressions are smooth and the denominator is non-vanishing on \( \tilde{U} \), we conclude that the function \( \omega \) is smooth at \( q \). Since \( q \in U \) was arbitrary, we conclude that \( \omega \in C^\infty(U) \).

Next, fixing \( q \in U \), we let \( f \in C^\infty_c((-T, \widetilde{T}_1) \times \partial M_0) \) be arbitrary. Noting that \( u^{(1)}_f = \omega u^{(2)}_f \) on \( U \), we write

\[
(6.6) \quad 0 = (\Box + V_1)u^{(1)}_h = u^{(2)}_f \Box \omega - 2\langle \nabla \omega, \nabla u^{(2)}_f \rangle + (V_1 - V_2) \omega u^{(2)}_f \quad \text{on} \; U,
\]

where we used the fact that \( (\Box + V_j)u^{(j)}_f = 0 \), \( j = 1, 2 \). Let \( \xi \in L^+\nu M \) be an arbitrary future pointing null vector. Let \( v = (q, \xi) \) and note again that the end points of the null geodesic \( \gamma_\nu \) lie on \( \Sigma \). Thus, in view of Lemma 6.2, there exists a family of Dirichlet data \( \{f_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \subset C^\infty_c((-T, \widetilde{T}_1) \times \partial M_0) \) such that (i)-(ii) hold. Using these identities, substituting \( f_j \) into (6.6), dividing
by $j$ and taking the limit $j \to \infty$, we deduce that
\[ \langle \nabla \omega(q), \xi \rangle = 0. \]
Finally, since $\xi \in L^+ M$ is an arbitrary future pointing null vector, we deduce that $\nabla \omega(q) = 0$. As $q \in U$ is arbitrary, we conclude that $\omega$ is a non-zero constant function on $U$. That $\omega$ can not be identically zero follows from the fact that there are boundary data $f \in C^\infty((-T, \tilde{T}_1) \times \partial M_0)$ such that $u_f^{(1)}(p)$ is non-zero, thanks to (i) in Lemma 6.2. Thus, equation (6.6) reduces to
\[ (V_1 - V_2) u_f^{(2)} = 0 \quad \text{on } U, \]
and therefore $V_1(p) = V_2(p)$. Here we are using (i) in Lemma 6.2 again to guarantee that there are boundary data $f \in C^\infty((-T, \tilde{T}_1) \times \partial M_0)$ such that $u_f^{(2)}(p)$ is non-zero. Finally, since $p \in \mathbb{D}$ was arbitrary, we conclude that $V_1 = V_2$ on the set $\mathbb{D}$. \hfill \Box

**Appendix A.**

In this appendix, we prove that a connected smooth Lorentzian manifold $(M, g)$ satisfying the assumption (H1) and with a timelike boundary, admits an isometric embedding
\[ \Phi : [-T, T] \times M_0 \to U \subset M, \]
where $U$ contains the set $\{q \in M : \tau(q) \in [-T, T]\}$ and the metric $g = \Phi^* g$ is of the form (2.2).

We start by considering $\tau : M \to \mathbb{R}$, a proper, smooth, surjective function such that $\nabla \tau$ is timelike. Using [26, Lemma 2.1] it follows that $M$ is diffeomorphic to $\mathbb{R} \times M_0$ where $M_0 = \{q \in M : \tau(q) = 0\}$. To conclude the proof we need to show the existence of a smooth function $\phi : U \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $\nabla \phi$ is timelike and tangential to $\partial M$ for some $U$ containing $\{q \in M : \tau(q) \in [-T, T]\}$.

For $j = 1, 2$, we define $U_j = \{q \in M : \tau(q) \in [-T - j, T + j]\}$. Since $\partial M$ is timelike, there exists a nontangential future pointing timelike vector field $Z$ on $\Gamma = U_2 \cap \partial M$. For $\epsilon > 0$ small, we define the map $F : [0, \epsilon] \times \Gamma \to M$ by
\[ F(y^0, y') = \exp_{y'}(y^0 Z(y')). \]
It is straightforward to see that when $\epsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small, $F$ is a diffeomorphism onto its image in $M$. Moreover, since $Z$ is timelike and future pointing, it follows that $\nabla y^0$ is timelike and future pointing for small enough $\epsilon > 0$ (Here the gradient is computed with respect to $F^* g$). We define the smooth function $\phi$ on the set $U_1$ by
\[ \phi = \tau \quad \text{on } U_1 \setminus F([0, \epsilon] \times \Gamma) \]
and
\[ \phi = \psi \circ F^{-1} \quad \text{on } F([0, \epsilon] \times \Gamma) \cap U_1. \]
Here,

\[
\psi(y^0, y') = \chi(\epsilon^{-1}y^0) \left( \tau(F(0, y')) - a \right) + (1 - \chi(\epsilon^{-1}y^0))\tau(F(y^0, y')) ,
\]

where \(a\) is a positive number and \(\chi : [0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}\) is a smooth decreasing function satisfying \(\chi(t) = 1\) for \(t < \frac{1}{2}\) and \(\chi(t) = 0\) for \(t > \frac{1}{2}\). Since \(\chi\) is decreasing and since \(\nabla y^0\) and \(\nabla \tau\) are timelike and future pointing, it follows that \(\nabla \phi\) is timelike and future pointing for all large enough \(a > 0\). It is also straightforward to see that \(\nabla \phi\) is tangential to the boundary.

**Appendix B.**

This appendix is concerned with proving Lemma 6.2. We will in fact prove the lemma for quite general Lorentzian manifolds assuming only that \(M\) is of the form (2.1) and that the metric \(g\) is of the form (2.2). We begin by briefly recalling the classical Gaussian beam construction for the wave equation that was introduced in [6, 42]. The presentation here follows that of [24]. Here, by Gaussian beams we refer to approximate solutions to the equation

\[
(\Box + V)u = 0, \quad \text{on } M = [-T, T] \times M_0,
\]

that concentrate on an inextendible null geodesic \(\gamma_v : (a_0, b_0) \to M\) where \(v = (p, \xi) \in L^+M\) is such that the end point \(\gamma_v(s_0)\) with \(s_0 < 0\) lies on \(\Sigma\).

We begin by extending the manifold \(M_0\) into a slightly larger manifold \(\hat{M}_0\) and define \(\hat{M} = (-T, T) \times \hat{M}_0\). We also extend the metric \(g\) smoothly to \(\hat{M}\) such that (2.2) holds over the extended manifold \(\hat{M}\). Note that the null geodesic \(\gamma_v\) also extends into \(\hat{M}\) with end points on \((-T, T) \times \partial \hat{M}_0\). We write \(\gamma_v : (a, b) \to \hat{M}\) for this extended null geodesic.

In order to recall the expression of Gaussian beams in local coordinates, we first briefly recall the well-known Fermi coordinates near a null geodesic. We refer the reader to [24, Section 4.1, Lemma 1] for the proof.

**Lemma B.1** (Fermi coordinates). Let \(\gamma_v : (a, b) \to \hat{M}\) be a null geodesic on \(\hat{M}\) parametrized as given by (2.6) and whose end points lie on \((-T, T) \times \partial \hat{M}_0\).

Given each \(\hat{a} \in (a, a_0)\) and \(\hat{b} \in (b_0, b)\), there exists a coordinate neighborhood \((U, \psi)\) of \(\gamma([\hat{a}, \hat{b}])\), with the coordinates denoted by \((y^0 := s, y^1, \ldots, y^n) = (s, y')\), such that:

(i) \(\psi(U) = (\hat{a}, \hat{b}) \times B(0, \delta')\) where \(B(0, \delta')\) is the ball in \(\mathbb{R}^n\) centered at the origin with a small radius \(\delta' > 0\).

(ii) \(\psi(\gamma(s)) = (s, 0, \ldots, 0)\), \(n\) times.

Moreover, the metric tensor \(g\) written in this coordinate system satisfies

\[
g|_{\gamma} = 2ds \otimes dy^1 + \sum_{\alpha=2}^{n} dy^\alpha \otimes dy^\alpha,
\]
and \( \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} g_{jk} \mid \gamma = 0 \) for \( i, j, k = 0, \ldots, n \). Here, \( \mid \gamma \) denotes the restriction on the curve \( \gamma \).

In Fermi coordinate, Gaussian beams can be defined via the ansatz,

\begin{equation}
U_\lambda(y) = e^{i\lambda \phi(y)} A_\lambda(y) \quad \text{for } \lambda > 0
\end{equation}

and

\begin{equation}
U_\lambda(y) = e^{-i\lambda \phi(y)} \tilde{A}_\lambda(y) \quad \text{for } \lambda < 0,
\end{equation}

where the phase and amplitude functions \( \phi \) and \( A_\lambda \) are defined by

\begin{equation}
\phi(s, y') = \sum_{j=0}^{N} \phi_j(s, y') \quad \text{and} \quad A_\lambda(s, y') = \chi(\frac{|y'|}{\delta}) \sum_{j=0}^{N} \lambda^{-j} a_j(s, y'),
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
a_j(s, y') = \sum_{k=0}^{N} a_{j,k}(s, y').
\end{equation}

Here, given each \( j, k = 0, \ldots, N \), the term \( \phi_j \) is a complex-valued homogeneous polynomial of degree \( j \) in the variables \( y^1, \ldots, y^n \) and \( a_{j,k} \) is a complex valued homogeneous polynomials of degree \( k \) with respect to the variables \( y^1, \ldots, y^n \). Finally, the function \( \chi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}) \) is a non-negative function that satisfies \( \chi(t) = 1 \) for \( |t| \leq \frac{1}{4} \) and \( \chi(t) = 0 \) for \( |t| \geq \frac{1}{2} \).

The phase terms \( \phi_j \) and the amplitudes \( a_j \) with \( j = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, N \) are determined iteratively by solving ODEs along the null geodesic. This comes as a result of a WKB analysis for the conjugated wave operator in the semi-classical parameter \( \lambda \), that enforces

\begin{equation}
\frac{\partial |\alpha|}{\partial y_{\alpha}} (d\phi, d\phi) = 0 \quad \text{on } (\hat{a}, \hat{b}) \times \{y' = 0\},
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\frac{\partial |\alpha|}{\partial y_{\alpha}} (2(d\phi, da_j) - (\square + V)a_j + i(\square + V)a_{j-1}) = 0 \quad \text{on } (\hat{a}, \hat{b}) \times \{y' = 0\},
\end{equation}

for all \( j = 0, 1, \ldots, N \) and all multi-indices \( \alpha = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n) \in \{0, 1, \ldots\}^n \) with \( |\alpha| = \alpha_1 + \cdots + \alpha_n \leq N \).

We do not proceed to solve these equations here as this can be found in all the works mentioned above, but instead summarize the main properties of Gaussian beams as follows:

\begin{enumerate}
\item \( \phi(s, 0) = 0 \).
\item \( \Im(\phi)(s, y') \geq C|y'|^2 \) for all points \( y \in (\hat{a}, \hat{b}) \times B(0, \delta') \).
\item \( \| (\square + V)U_\lambda \|_{H^k(M)} \lesssim |\lambda|^{-N'} \), where \( N' = \frac{N+1}{2} + \frac{n}{4} - k - 2 \).
\end{enumerate}

Here, \( \Im \) stands for the imaginary part of a complex number. We will need explicit expressions for the phase terms \( \phi_0, \phi_1, \phi_2 \) and the principal amplitude \( a_{0,0} \). The phase terms are given by the expressions

\begin{equation}
\phi_0(s, y') = 0, \quad \phi_1(s, y') = y^1, \quad \phi_2(s, y') = \sum_{j,k=1}^{n} H_{jk}(s)y^j y^k,
\end{equation}
where the symmetric complex valued matrix $H$ solves the Riccati equation
\begin{equation}
\frac{d}{ds} H + HCH + D = 0, \quad \forall s \in (\hat{a}, \hat{b}), \quad H(0) = H_0, \quad \Im H_0 > 0.
\end{equation}
where $C$ and $D$ are the matrices defined through
\begin{equation}
\begin{cases}
C_{11} = 0 \\
C_{jj} = 2 & j = 2, \ldots, n, \\
C_{jk} = 0 & \text{otherwise}, \\
\end{cases}
\quad \text{where } D_{jk} = \frac{1}{4} \partial^2 g^{11} \partial y^j \partial y^k.
\end{equation}

We recall the following result from [32, Section 8] regarding solvability of the Riccati equation.

**Lemma B.2.** Let $H_0 = Z_0 Y^{-1}$ be a symmetric matrix with $\Im H_0 > 0$. The Riccati equation (B.6), together with the initial condition $H(0) = H_0$, admits a unique solution $H(s)$ for all $s \in [\hat{a}, \hat{b}]$. We have $\Im H(s) > 0$ for all $s \in [\hat{a}, \hat{b}]$ and $H(s) = Z(s) Y^{-1}(s)$, where the matrix valued functions $Z(s), Y(s)$ solve the first order linear system
\begin{equation}
\frac{d}{ds} Y = CZ \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{d}{ds} Z = -DY, \quad \text{subject to } Y(0) = Y_0, \quad Z(0) = H_0.
\end{equation}
Moreover, the matrix $Y(s)$ is non-degenerate on $[\hat{a}, \hat{b}]$, and there holds
\begin{equation}
\det(\Im H(s)) \cdot |\det(Y(s))|^2 = \det(\Im(H_0)).
\end{equation}

The principal part of the amplitude, that is the function $a_{0,0}$ is given by the expression:
\begin{equation}
a_{0,0}(s) = (\det Y(s))^{-\frac{1}{4}},
\end{equation}
where $Y(s)$ is as described above, by Lemma B.2.

As for the remainder of the terms $\phi_j$ with $j \geq 3$ and the rest of the amplitude terms $a_{j,k}$ with $j, k$ not both simultaneously zero, we recall from [24] that they solve first order ODEs along the null geodesic $\gamma$ and can be determined uniquely by fixing their initial values to be zero at the point $s = s_0$.

We emphasize that in the above construction, we have made the choice of setting the initial data for all the ODEs governing the phase and amplitude terms to vanish at the point $q = \gamma_\epsilon(0)$.

Next, let us consider $v = (p, \xi) \in L^+ M$ with the property that $\gamma_\epsilon(s)$ hits the piece of boundary $\Sigma$ at some end point $\gamma(s_0)$ with $s_0 < 0$. We assume as in the statement of Lemma 6.2 that $\epsilon > 0$ is small enough so that $\gamma_\epsilon$ is disjoint from $[T_1 - \epsilon, T_1 + \epsilon] \times \partial M_0$. We show that it is possible to choose $f \in C^\infty((-T, T_1 + \epsilon) \times \partial M_0)$, such that the solution $u$ to (2.3) with Dirichlet data $f$ is asymptotically close to the Gaussian beams $U_\lambda$ on the subset $(-T, T_1 + \epsilon) \times M_0$. To this end, we consider for each $\lambda > 0$, the Gaussian beam construction $U_\lambda$ described above with
\begin{equation}
N = \left\lfloor \frac{3n}{2} \right\rfloor + 10,
\end{equation}
where \( \lceil x \rceil \) stands for the smallest integer that is greater than or equal to \( x \) and we recall that the order \( N \) is related to the Taylor series approximations of the phase and amplitude terms, see (B.4). Let \( \eta : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \) be a smooth function such that \( \eta(t) = 1 \) for \( t < T_1 + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \) and \( \eta(t) = 0 \) for \( t > T_1 + \epsilon \). Next, let \( u_\lambda \) be the solution to the wave equation

\[
\begin{aligned}
\Box u_\lambda + Vu_\lambda &= 0 & \text{on } M, \\
u_\lambda &= f_\lambda = \eta U_\lambda & \text{on } \Sigma = (T, T_1), \\
u_\lambda(-T, x) &= \partial_t u_\lambda(-T, x) = 0 & \text{on } M_0.
\end{aligned}
\]

Observe that given \( \delta' \) sufficiently small, there holds

\[
\text{supp } f_\lambda \subset (-T, T_1 - \epsilon) \times \partial M_0.
\]

In view of property (3) in the construction of the Gaussian beam and the Sobolev embedding

\[
C^1((-T, T_1 + \frac{\epsilon}{2}) \times M_0) \subset H^{\frac{n+3}{2}}((-T, T_1 + \frac{\epsilon}{2}) \times M_0),
\]

we conclude that

\[
\|u_\lambda - U_\lambda\|_{C^1((-T, T_1 + \frac{\epsilon}{2}) \times M_0)} \leq \|\Box + V\| U_\lambda\|_{H^{\frac{n+3}{2}}(M)} \leq \frac{C}{\lambda},
\]

for some constant \( C > 0 \) that is independent of \( \lambda \). We are now ready to prove Lemma 6.2.

**Proof of Lemma 6.2.** Note that by the hypothesis of the lemma, the end point \( \gamma(s_0) \) of the null geodesic \( \gamma_0 \) with \( s_0 < 0 \), lies on \( \Sigma \). For \( \lambda > 0 \), we consider the above Gaussian beams \( U_\lambda \) with \( N \) satisfying (B.9) and \( \delta' \) sufficiently small so that \( \text{supp } (\eta U_\lambda)|_{\Sigma} \subset (-T, T_1 - \epsilon) \times \partial M_0 \). Let

\[
f_\lambda = \eta U_\lambda|_{\Sigma} \in C^\infty((-T, T_1 - \epsilon) \times \partial M_0),
\]

and denote by \( u_\lambda \), the unique solution to (2.3) subject to the Dirichlet data \( f_\lambda \). In view of the explicit expressions (B.4), (B.5) and (B.8), there holds

\[
U_\lambda(p) = e^{i\lambda \phi(0)}A_\lambda(0) = a_{0,0}(0) = (\det Y(0))^{-\frac{1}{2}},
\]

and

\[
\nabla U_\lambda(p) = i\gamma_\nu(0)A_\lambda(0) = i\gamma_\nu(0)(\det Y(0))^{-\frac{1}{2}}.
\]

The claim follows trivially from the latter two identities together with the error bound (B.11). \( \square \)
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