

2D INVERSE PROBLEM WITH A FOLIATION CONDITION

QIUYE JIA

ABSTRACT. We consider the geodesic X-ray transform in two dimension under the assumption that the boundary is convex and the region has a foliation structure. For functions that are constant on each layer of the foliation, we prove invertibility and a stability estimate of the geodesic X-ray transform.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Notations and results	2
2.1. General notations	2
2.2. The foliation condition	3
2.3. The geodesic ray transform	4
2.4. The main result	5
3. Sobolev spaces and the scattering calculus	6
3.1. Sobolev spaces	6
3.2. Scattering calculus on the Euclidean space	6
3.3. Generalization to manifolds	8
3.4. Preparation for decomposing operators	8
4. Ellipticity of the normal operator	10
4.1. The fibre infinity behaviour	10
4.2. Boundary behavior, oscillatory integral approach	14
5. The proof of the main theorem	15
References	17

1. INTRODUCTION

The inverse problem on the geodesic ray transformation is a generalization of the Radon transformation, and it can be formulated as follows: On a Riemannian manifold (X, g) , the information we have are integrals like $I_\varrho f(\gamma) := \int_\gamma \varrho f(z) dz$, where γ are geodesic segment in a neighborhood O_p of $p \in X$, and ϱ is a density function on T^*X , the

cotangent bundle of X . The goal we want to achieve is to recover the function f , hence we focus on the injectivity of the ray transform. In this paper, we work on local ray transform. This problem is resolved by Uhlmann and Vasy [6] in dimension ≥ 3 under convexity assumption. And using the same framework, Paternain et al. [3] extended this result to the case with matrix weights. And resolution of the real analytic case traces back to Boman and Quinto [2]. Pestov and Uhlmann [4] considered the two dimensional compact simple case.

For the general case, Boman proved [1] the transformation is not locally injective in the 2-dimensional case with density. On the other hand, the injectivity holds under certain restrictions on the function or geometric structure. Here the additional condition we impose is that there exists a convex foliation of the manifold X as in [6] and the function is adapted to it in the sense we define below. Roughly speaking, this means that the direction that the function changes is conormal to the layer structure of the manifold. In the real world application, this can be interpreted as the situation where the data is sensitive to depth but not the position along layers.

From a microlocal perspective, the major difference between the 2-dimensional case and the higher dimensional case is that, without the extra dimension to allow for certain orthogonality, ellipticity on the entire cotangent bundle fails. However, the ellipticity still holds if we restrict the directions on the fibre part of the cotangent bundle. So we identify the directions on which our operator behaves well, and modify the symbol on other directions to obtain complete ellipticity.

In the next section, we introduce notations, the definition of the geodesic ray transform and state the main result. In Section 3 we recall some basic facts about Sobolev spaces and scattering calculus. We describe and prove important properties of the conjugated normal operator of the geodesic ray transform in Section 4. Finally in Section 5 we prove the main theorem.

2. NOTATIONS AND RESULTS

2.1. General notations. (X, g) is a Riemannian manifold. Most of our discussions are valid for general dimension, but our major results concerns only the 2 dimensional case. It is convenient to consider a larger region containing X . So suppose X is embedded as a strictly convex domain in a Riemannian manifold (\tilde{X}, g) (we have used the same notation to indicate the smooth extension of the metric). Here convexity means when a geodesic is tangent to ∂X , it is tangent and curving away from X . In terms of Hamiltonian dynamics, let G be

the dual metric function on $T^*\tilde{X}$ and let ρ be its boundary defining function. If at some $\beta \in T_p^*\tilde{X}$ we have $(H_G\rho)(\beta) = 0$, then $(H_G^2\rho)(\beta) < 0$.

We emphasize that introducing \tilde{X} is an important technique in this framework. Take a neighborhood U of $p \in \partial X$ in \tilde{X} . In the 2-dimensional case, the local coordinate on $T^*\tilde{X}$ (actually we only need T^*X part) we use is $(z, \zeta) = (x, y, \xi, \eta)$. We consider local geodesic transform near $p \in \partial X$ in a neighborhood O_p of it (more properties of this neighborhood are specified below).

Denote the boundary defining function of \tilde{X} , the closure of X , by $\rho(z)$. $\rho(z)$ vanishes on ∂X , $\rho(z) > 0$ on X , and satisfy the non-degeneracy condition $d\rho \neq 0$ when $\rho = 0$. We introduce another boundary defining function \tilde{x} satisfying $d\tilde{x}(p) = -d\rho(p)$, $\tilde{x}(p) = 0$, whose level sets are strictly convex from the sublevel sets. This allows us to introduce another artificial boundary to enforce our discussion to be local. In terms of a new parameter c , the region O_p is $\Omega_c := \{z \in X : \tilde{x}(z) \geq -c, \rho(z) \geq 0\}$ for $c \geq 0$. We can choose \tilde{x} such that $\bar{\Omega}_c$ is compact. Our proof for the local result is valid for all small c .

Shrinking the region if necessary, we can assume the neighborhood we are working on is entirely in a local coordinate patch. We take

$$(1) \quad \tilde{x}(z) = -\rho(z) - \epsilon|z - p|^2, \quad z \in O_p,$$

where $|\cdot|$ means the Euclidean norm in this coordinate patch, and this term is introduced to enforce the region characterized by \tilde{x} to be compact. If we define Ω_c using the inequality involving only $\rho(z)$, the region might be non-compact (even when c is small, it might be a long thin strip near the boundary). So we use a modification of $-\rho$ making the level sets less convex to enforce its intersection with ∂X happen in a compact region. Furthermore, the class of ‘adapted’ function is determined by the foliation given by \tilde{x} , which makes \tilde{x} even more important in two dimensional case compared with higher dimensional cases.

2.2. The foliation condition. We now turn to the foliation condition we need in the two dimensional case. Suppose there is a foliation of X by level sets of \tilde{x} . That is, a family of hypersurfaces $\{\Sigma_t = \tilde{x}^{-1}(-t), 0 \leq t \leq T\}$. In addition, we assume each Σ_t is convex in the sense that any geodesic tangent to it curves away from $\{\tilde{x} \leq -t\}$. Next we define the adapted function class.

Definition 1. *With notations above, $\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{x}}(X)$ is defined to be the function space consists of functions which are constant on each Σ_t , and*

we say such a function is ‘adapted to the foliation \tilde{x} ’. In addition, $\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{x}}^s(O_p) := \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{x}}(X) \cap H^s(O_p)$, where $H^s(O_p)$ denotes Sobolov space of order s , defined by identifying O_p with \mathbb{R}^n .

2.3. The geodesic ray transform. By ‘a geodesic’, we mean a geodesic determined by the metric g . Define $\Omega_c := \{p \in X : \tilde{x}(p) \geq -c\}$ for $c > 0$. We replace \tilde{x} by $x = \tilde{x} + c$, so that x itself becomes the defining function of the artificial boundary. In an open set $O \subset \bar{X}$, for a geodesic segment $\gamma \subset O$, we call it *O-local geodesic* if its endpoints are on ∂X , and **all geodesic segments we consider below are assumed to be O_p -local**. Next we introduce strictly positive density functions, which is needed in the discussion of geodesic ray transform. We use TX to denote the tangent bundle of X , and notice that each point on it (i.e., a point with a tangent vector living at that point) determines a geodesic. Before defining the function class, we define $G_X := \{(s, z) | s \in TX, z \in X \text{ lies on the geodesic determined by } s\}$. G_X is a submanifold of $TX \times X$.

Definition 2. $\varrho \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(G_X)$ is called a O_p -strictly positive density function if:

- (1) For $s_1, s_2 \in TX$, if they determine the same O_p -local geodesic γ , then $\varrho(s_1, z) = \varrho(s_2, z)$ for $z \in \gamma$.
- (2) $C_1 \geq \varrho \geq C_0 > 0$ on $(TX|_{O_p} \times O_p) \cap G_X$ for some constants C_0, C_1 .

The upper bound condition, which is assumed to ensure integrability, can be weakened. As we mentioned in the introduction, *the geodesic ray transform weighted by ϱ* of a function f is defined by:

$$I_\varrho f(s) := \int_\gamma \varrho(s, z) f(z) dz,$$

where ϱ is an O_p -strictly positive density function, $s \in TX$, γ is the geodesic determined by s . So our geodesic ray transform is a function on TX . Condition 1. above implies that for s_1, s_2 projecting to the same point on X and has parallel nonzero fibre part, they determine the same function $\varrho(s_1, \cdot) = \varrho(s_2, \cdot)$ of z .

Our injectivity result for the geodesic ray transform implies the injectivity for the unweighted case. To reduce to the unweighted case, we take $\varrho \equiv 1$. The purpose of adding this notion of density function is to make our theorem more general, and ϱ here should be considered as ‘known’ and our injectivity claim is for f only. For density functions without condition 1 of Definition 2, i.e., for density functions may also depend on the choice of the starting point of the geodesic, we have

more information since our given information in the injectivity problem is the vanishing of these geodesic ray transforms. In that case, we have many integrals for a single geodesic. This means our formulation is the case where we need the ‘least information’.

2.4. The main result. We use exponentially weighted Sobolev spaces: $H_F^s(O_p) := e^{\frac{F}{x}} H^s(O_p) = \{f \in H_{loc}^s(O_p) : e^{-\frac{F}{x}} f \in H^s(O_p)\}$, where the additional subscript constant F indicates the exponential conjugation. For exponentially weighted Sobolev spaces on other manifolds, we use the same notation with O_p replaced by that manifold. Furthermore, $SX|_{O_p}$ is the restriction of the sphere bundle to O_p . With all these preparations, the main theorem is:

Theorem. *For $p \in \partial X$, with density ϱ as above, we can choose $O_p = \{\tilde{x} > -c\} \cap \bar{X}$, so that the local geodesic transform is injective on $\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{x}}^s(O_p) := \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{x}}(X) \cap H^s(O_p)$, $s \geq 0$. And there exists $C > 0$ such that for all $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{x}}^s(O_p)$,*

$$\|f\|_{H_F^{s-1}(O_p)} \leq C \|I_{\varrho} f\|_{H_F^s(SX|_{O_p})}.$$

In the corollary below, X, Σ_t are defined as above, and in addition we assume that \bar{X} is compact.

Corollary. *If $K_T := X \setminus \cup_{t \in [0, T)} \Sigma_t$ has measure zero, the global geodesic X -ray transform is injective on $\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{x}}^0(X) := \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{x}}(X) \cap L^2(X)$. If K_T has empty interior, the global geodesic transform is injective on $\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{x}}^s(X) := \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{x}}(X) \cap H^s(X)$ for $s > \frac{n}{2}$.*

Remark. *We added ‘global’ because the function are not restricted to O_p anymore. The geodesic X -ray transform appears in this paper is weighted.*

Proof. Assuming the theorem holds, we prove the corollary. For nonzero $f \in L^2(X)$ and K_T has measure zero case, $\text{supp} f$ has non-zero measure by the definition of $L^2(X)$. Consider $\tau := \inf_{\text{supp} f} (-\tilde{x})$. If $\tau \geq T$, then $\text{supp} f \subset K_T$, which has measure zero, contradiction. So $\tau < T$ and by definition $f \equiv 0$ on Σ_t with $t < \tau$. By the definition of τ , closedness of $\text{supp} f$ and compactness of \bar{X} , we know there exists $q \in \Sigma_{\tau} \cap \text{supp} f$. However, consider the manifold given by $\{\tilde{x} < -\tau\}$, to which we can apply our theorem. Since we have local injectivity near q , we conclude that q has a neighborhood disjoint with $\text{supp} f$, contradiction.

If $f \in H^s(X)$, $s > \frac{n}{2}$, $f \neq 0$, then f is continuous by the Sobolev embedding theorem and consequently $\text{supp} f$ has non-empty interior since .Then apply local result to a fixed point in $\text{supp} f$ gives the contradiction. \square

3. SOBOLEV SPACES AND THE SCATTERING CALCULUS

In this section, we recall some basic facts of pseudodifferential operators, their symbols, and the process of quantization, and also some basic facts about Sobolev spaces.

3.1. Sobolev spaces. We state some inclusion relationship between weighted Sobolev spaces. Suppose \bar{M} is a compact manifold with boundary whose interior is M . Let $\mathcal{V}_b(\bar{M})$ be the collection of all smooth vector fields tangent to ∂M . Suppose x is a global boundary defining function, we set $\mathcal{V}_{sc}(\bar{M}) = x\mathcal{V}_b(\bar{M})$.

Then the L^2 -integrability with respect to the scattering density $x^{-(n+1)}dx dy$ gives $L_{sc}^2(\bar{M})$. Here the density comes from the identification through $x = r_1^{-1}$, and the ordinary volume form in the polar coordinate is $r_1^{n-1}dr_1 dy$, where y denotes the spherical variables and r_1 denotes the radial variable. The corresponding polynomially weighted Sobolev space $H_{sc}^{s,r}(\bar{M})$ consists of functions u such that $x^{-r}V_1V_2\dots V_k u \in L_{sc}^2(\bar{M})$ for $k \leq s$ (when $k = 0$, it's u itself), and $V_j \in \mathcal{V}_{sc}(\bar{M})$.

With these definitions, we know

$$\begin{aligned} H^s(\bar{M}) &\subset H_{sc}^{s,r}(\bar{M}), \quad r \leq -\frac{n+1}{2} \\ H_{sc}^{s,r'}(\bar{M}) &\subset H^s(\bar{M}), \quad r' \geq -\frac{n+1}{2} + 2s. \end{aligned}$$

See Section 2.3 of [6] for more details.

3.2. Scattering calculus on the Euclidean space. $a(z, \zeta) \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}_z^n \times \mathbb{R}_\zeta^n)$ is said to be a scattering symbol of order (m, l) if and only if:

$$|D_z^\alpha D_\zeta^\beta a(z, \zeta)| \leq C_{\alpha\beta} \langle z \rangle^{l-|\alpha|} \langle \zeta \rangle^{m-|\beta|},$$

where $\langle z \rangle = (1 + |z|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, with $|z|$ being the Euclidean norm, and similarly for $\langle \zeta \rangle$. The space consists of such symbols is denoted by $S^{m,l}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n)$, or $S^{m,l}$ for short. Then the space of pseudodifferential operators $\Psi_{sc}^{m,l}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is defined as ‘left quantizations’ of such symbols. Explicitly, they are operators of the form:

$$(2) \quad Au(z) = (2\pi)^{-n} \int e^{i(z-z') \cdot \zeta} a(z, \zeta) u(z') dz' d\zeta.$$

And right quantization could be defined in the same way by replacing $a(z, \zeta)$ by $a(z', \zeta)$, and the space of operators we obtain is unchanged. Both the space of symbols and that of pseudodifferential operators increase with respect to m, l . This family of spaces $\Psi_{sc}^{*,*}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ forms a filtered $*$ -algebra under the composition and taking adjoints relative to the Euclidean metric, i.e.

$$A \in \Psi_{sc}^{m,l}(\mathbb{R}^n), B \in \Psi_{sc}^{m',l'}(\mathbb{R}^n) \implies AB \in \Psi_{sc}^{m+m',l+l'}(\mathbb{R}^n),$$

and

$$A \in \Psi_{sc}^{m,l}(\mathbb{R}^n) \implies A^* \in \Psi_{sc}^{m,l}(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

The next important notion is the principal symbol. For $A \in \Psi_{sc}^{m,l}$, its principal symbol is the equivalence class of a in $S^{m,l}/S^{m-1,l-1}$ where a is the symbol whose left quantization is A . This equivalence class captures the behaviour and properties of A modulo lower order operators. We say $A \in \Psi_{sc}^{m,l}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is elliptic if its principal symbol is invertible in the sense that there exists $b \in S^{-m,-l}$ such that $ab - 1 \in S^{-1,-1}$. Whether b exists or not does not depend on the choice of representative of a in that class. When A is elliptic, the standard parametrix construction gives us $B \in \Psi_{sc}^{-m,-l}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $AB - \text{Id} \in \Psi_{sc}^{-\infty,-\infty}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, which means the error term operator has a Schwartz function on \mathbb{R}^{2n} as its Schwartz kernel. Hence $R := AB - \text{Id}$ mapping $H^{s,r}$ to $H^{s-m,r-l}$ is compact for any s, r, m, l , with $H^{s,r}$ defined in the Sobolev space section. Compactness and parametrix construction together gives Fredholm property of elliptic operator A . That is, it has closed range, finite dimensional kernel and cokernel, with following estimate for any N :

$$\|u\|_{H^{s,r}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C(\|Au\|_{H^{s-m,r-l}(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|\tilde{F}u\|_{H^{-N,-N}(\mathbb{R}^n)}),$$

where \tilde{F} can be taken as a finite rank operator in $\Psi_{sc}^{-\infty,-\infty}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

In order to facilitate the generalization to general manifolds with boundary, we compactify the \mathbb{R}^n in both base and phase factors. Concretely, we compactify \mathbb{R}^n to a closed ball $\bar{\mathbb{R}}^n$ by adding the ‘sphere at infinity’ \mathbb{S}^{n-1} . Using r_1 to denote the radial variable, we first identify $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ with $(0, +\infty)_{r_1} \times \mathbb{S}_\theta^{n-1}$ through polar coordinates $(r_1, \theta) \rightarrow r_1 \theta$. Then let $x = r_1^{-1}$, then $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ becomes $(0, +\infty)_x \times \mathbb{S}_\theta^{n-1}$. And now glueing a sphere to $x = 0$, or extending the range of x to $[0, \infty)$ is equivalent to attaching a sphere at infinity in the original coordinates. So formally $\bar{\mathbb{R}}^n$ is obtained by taking disjoint union of \mathbb{R}^n and $[0, +\infty)_x \times \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ modulo the identification given above. Now $x = r_1^{-1}$ is a boundary defining function near $\partial \bar{\mathbb{R}}^n$. By modifying it in the ‘large x small r_1 ’ part, this gives us a global boundary defining function ρ . Decay properties can be rephrased as regularity on this compactified space: Schwartz functions on \mathbb{R}^n are exactly restrictions to $\bar{\mathbb{R}}^n$ of \mathcal{C}^∞ functions on $\bar{\mathbb{R}}^n$.

As we have mentioned, we can compactify both factors of $\mathbb{R}_z^n \times \mathbb{R}_\zeta^n$ to define the scattering symbols of $\bar{\mathbb{R}}_z^n \times \bar{\mathbb{R}}_\zeta^n$. We denote the defining function of $\bar{\mathbb{R}}_z^n$ (‘the position factor’) by ρ_∂ , and that of $\bar{\mathbb{R}}_\zeta^n$ (‘the momentum factor’) by ρ_∞ . We also define $\Psi_{sc}^{m,l}(\bar{\mathbb{R}}^n) := \Psi_{sc}^{m,l}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. And the

ellipticity of $A \in \Psi_{sc}^{m,l}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is equivalent to the non-vanishing property of $\rho_\partial^l \rho_\infty^m a$, where a is a left symbol (whose left quantization is that operator) of A . In particular, by the compactness of the boundary sphere, there exists $C > 0$ such that $|a| \geq C \rho_\partial^{-l} \rho_\infty^{-m}$, which is convenient to use in practice.

3.3. Generalization to manifolds. Let \bar{M} be a manifold with boundary and denote its interior by M . Then the scattering pseudodifferential operators $\Psi_{sc}^{m,l}(\bar{M})$ is obtained by locally identifying the manifold with $\bar{\mathbb{R}}^n$. And on such charts $U \times U$, the Schwartz kernel of the operator has the same property as the case of $\bar{\mathbb{R}}^n$, and we also allow additional globally Schwartz terms in the Schwartz kernel. And all those algebraic properties of $\Psi_{sc}^{m,l}(\bar{\mathbb{R}}^n)$ generalize to the manifold case. In addition, the weighted Sobolev spaces $H_{sc}^{s,r}(\bar{M})$ are also obtained by locally identifying \bar{M} with $\bar{\mathbb{R}}^n$. A clarification on how we define $L_{sc}^2(\bar{M})$ might be useful. After locally identify \bar{M} with $\bar{\mathbb{R}}^n$, we use the scattering density $r_1^{n-1} dr_1 dy = x^{-n-1} dx dy$ to

3.4. Preparation for decomposing operators. Our approach is to construct an elliptic pseudodifferential operator $A = A_0 + A_1$ to obtain an elliptic type estimate, then shrink the region to obtain invertibility. The two summands are specified below. The first lemma points out that operators whose left symbols are supported away from (or outside a conic neighborhood of) the ‘(1,0) direction’ annihilate functions adapted to the foliation. And the second lemma tells us that when an operator is elliptic near ‘(1,0) direction’, we can add another operator satisfying conditions in Lemma 1 to it and make the sum elliptic in every direction. Recall that in our setting, (X, g) is a Riemannian manifold with boundary, and O_p is a neighborhood of $p \in \partial X$.

Lemma 1. *Suppose $A_1 \in \Psi_{sc}^{m,l}(X)$ has vanishing left symbol, i.e. $a_1(x, y, \lambda, 0) = 0$. For $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\bar{x}}(X)$, we have $A_1 f(z) = 0, z \in O_p$.*

Proof. As we mentioned before, we are working inside a coordinate patch, hence although the condition on a_1 is formulated using a specific coordinate system, it is well defined because we can multiply a localizer to make a_1 supported in the coordinate patch, say $T_{O_p}^* X$. We use $f(x')$ to denote $f(x', y')$ since it only depends on the first variable by the

definition of $\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{x}}(X)$.

$$\begin{aligned}
A_1 f(z) &= (2\pi)^{-2} \int_{x', y', \eta, \lambda} e^{i(\lambda \frac{x-x'}{x^2} + \eta \frac{y-y'}{x})} f(x') a_1(x, y, \lambda, \eta) dx' dy' d\eta d\lambda \\
&= (2\pi)^{-2} \int_{x', \eta, \lambda} e^{i\lambda \frac{x-x'}{x^2}} f(x') a_1(x, y, \lambda, \eta) \left(\int_{y'} e^{i\eta \frac{y-y'}{x}} dy' \right) dx' d\eta d\lambda \\
&= (2\pi)^{-2} \int_{x', \eta, \lambda} e^{i\lambda \frac{x-x'}{x^2}} f(x') a_1(x, y, \lambda, \eta) \times 2\pi x e^{i\eta y/x} \delta_0(\eta) dx' d\eta d\lambda \\
&= (2\pi)^{-1} \int_{x', \lambda} e^{i\lambda \frac{x-x'}{x^2}} f(x') a_1(x, y, \lambda, 0) dx' d\lambda \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 2. Suppose $A_0 \in \Psi_{sc}^{-1,0}(\bar{M})$ has left symbol $a_0(x, y, \zeta)$ satisfying $|a_0(x, y, \zeta)| \geq C|\zeta|^{-1}$, where $\zeta = (\lambda, \eta)$, in a cone \mathcal{C}_0 independent of (x, y) containing $(\pm 1, 0)$, then we can construct $A_1 \in \Psi_{sc}^{-1,0}(\bar{M})$ satisfying the condition of Lemma 1 such that $A = A_0 + A_1 \in \Psi_{sc}^{-1,0}(\bar{M})$ is elliptic.

Proof. In the proof below, we only consider the region $R_1 := \{(x, y, \zeta) \mid |\zeta| > 1\}$ because we can extend the resulting symbol into R_1^c , keeping smoothness.

The complex argument of $a_0(x, y, \zeta)$ is well-defined up to integral multiples of $2\pi i$. So there exist real valued function $\theta(x, y, \zeta)$, firstly defined and being smooth in \mathcal{C}_0 and $r(x, y, \zeta) = |a_0(x, y, \zeta)|$ being smooth on the entire plane, except for that θ might have $2\pi i$ jumps, such that $a_0(x, y, \zeta) = e^{i\theta(x, y, \zeta)} r(x, y, \zeta)$ in \mathcal{C}_0 . Smoothness of θ in \mathcal{C}_0 is because $a_0(x, y, \zeta)$ does not vanish, which is guaranteed by the given lower bound $|a_0(x, y, \zeta)| \geq C|\zeta|^{-1}$, hence it is smooth since $a_0(x, y, \zeta)$ to be smooth. And we can extend θ to the entire plane keeping the smoothness. Consequently, $e^{-i\theta(x, y, \zeta)}$ is a smooth function, since $2\pi i$ jumps become 1 after exponentiating. By multiplying $e^{-i\theta(x, y, \zeta)}$ to adjust the phase, we assume $\operatorname{Re}(a_0(x, y, \zeta)) \geq C|\zeta|^{-1}$ in a cone containing $(\pm 1, 0)$ and $|\zeta|$ large. We construct A_1 by constructing its left symbol $a_1(x, y, \zeta)$, which is real. $|a_0 + a_1| \geq |\operatorname{Re} a_0 + a_1|$ since a_1 is real, and we only need to require a_1 to satisfy

$$a_1(x, y, \lambda, 0) = 0; \quad |\operatorname{Re}(a_0(x, y, \lambda, \eta)) + a_1(x, y, \lambda, \eta)| \geq C_1 |\zeta|^{-1}, \quad C_1 > 0.$$

Introduce $b_0(z, \zeta) := |\zeta| \operatorname{Re}(a_0(z, \zeta))$, $b_1(z, \zeta) := |\zeta| a_1(z, \zeta)$, above conditions can be written as

$$b_1(z, \lambda, 0) = 0; \quad |b_0(z, \zeta) + b_1(z, \zeta)| \geq C_1, \quad C_1 > 0.$$

We consider a smooth χ satisfying: (1) $\text{supp}\chi \subset (-\infty, C]$; (2) $\frac{C}{2} \leq |\chi(t) + t| \leq 2C$ for $t \leq C$; (3) Its derivatives of any order is bounded. This can be achieved by taking $\chi(t) = -t + C\chi_1(t)$ where χ_1 is a non-decreasing smooth function with uniformly bounded derivatives of any order, being $\frac{1}{2}$ on $(-\infty, \frac{C}{2}]$, and is $\frac{t}{C}$ on $[C, \infty)$. Consequently $\chi(t) = 0$ on $[C, \infty)$. Then the first two properties follows by definition, and notice that for $\zeta = (\xi, 0)$, $b_0 \geq C$. The last condition follows by the observation that χ_1 has trivial derivatives on $(-\infty, \frac{C}{2}]$, and it coincide with $\frac{t}{C}$ for $t \geq C$. So the boundedness essentially concerns $[\frac{C}{2}, C]$, which is compact, and the result follows by the smoothness of χ_1 .

Then we set $b_1(z, \zeta) = \chi(b_0)$. The desired properties of b_1 is included in the construction of χ . The fact that b_1 is again a symbol of at most the order that of b_0 follows from the boundedness of derivatives of χ and the symbolic property of $|\zeta|_{a_0}$. And since we are in the region where $|\zeta| \geq 1$, so $a_i = |\zeta|^{-1}b_i$, $i = 0, 1$ are well defined. \square

4. ELLIPTICITY OF THE NORMAL OPERATOR

In this section we prove the ellipticity of the exponentially conjugated microlocalized normal operator. The exponential conjugation is needed because although the Schwartz kernel of A in the previous section behaves well when $X = \frac{x'-x}{x^2}$, $Y = \frac{y'-y}{x}$ are bounded, it is not so when $(X, Y) \rightarrow \infty$. This conjugation gives additional exponential decay to resolve this issue.

4.1. The fibre infinity behaviour. Using the notation $(z, \zeta) = (x, y, \xi, \eta) \in T^*X$, $\zeta \neq 0$, we define

$$(Lv)(z) := x^{-2} \int \chi\left(\frac{\lambda}{x}\right) v(\gamma_{x,y,\lambda,\omega}) d\lambda d\omega,$$

where $\gamma_{x,y,\lambda,\omega}(t)$ is the geodesic starting at (x, y) with initial tangent vector (λ, ω) , $\omega = \pm 1$. By the compactness of $\bar{\Omega}_c$ discussed after 1 and $|(\lambda, \pm 1)| \geq 1$, there exists a uniform bound T_g of the escape time of \bar{O}_p . Thus $|t| \leq T_g$ below. v is a function defined on the space of O_p -local geodesic segments, whose prototype is the geodesic ray transform

$$v(\gamma) = I_\varrho f(\gamma) = \int_\gamma f(\gamma(t)) \varrho((x, y, \lambda, \omega), \gamma_{x,y,\lambda,\omega}(t)) dt,$$

in which $f(\gamma(t))$ can be replaced by higher order tensors, coupling with $\dot{\gamma}(t)$ in all of its slots in more general situations. I_ϱ is the original X-ray transform operator and L is its adjoint if we ignore χ and assume good decay conditions on integrands. So their composition is the model of

the normal operator. We define

$$(3) \quad A_F f(z) := x^{-2} \int e^{-\frac{F}{x} + \frac{F}{x(\gamma_{x,y,\lambda,\omega}(t))}} \chi\left(\frac{\lambda}{x}\right) f(\gamma_{x,y,\lambda,\omega}(t)) \varrho((x, y, \lambda, \omega), \gamma_{x,y,\lambda,\omega}(t)) dt |d\nu|,$$

with $|d\nu| = |d\lambda d\omega|$ a smooth density.

Proposition 1. $A_F \in \Psi_{sc}^{-1,0}$ for $F > 0$. And if we choose $\chi \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ appropriately with $\chi \geq 0, \chi(0) = 1$, its principal symbol, including the boundary symbol, is elliptic on $\{|\xi| \geq C|\eta|\}$ for constant C .

Proof. For the derivation of the decay property of A_F 's Schwartz kernel and consequently the membership $A_F \in \Psi_{sc}^{-1,0}$, we refer readers to Section 3.5 of [6] or Section 5 of [5]. We focus on ellipticity here.

The Schwartz kernel of A_F is given by:

$$K_{A_F}(z, z') = (2\pi)^{-2} \int e^{i(z-z') \cdot \zeta} a_F(z, \zeta) d\zeta,$$

where a_F is the left symbol of A_F . From the definition of A_F , we know

$$\begin{aligned} K_{A_F}(z, z') &= \int e^{-\frac{F}{x} + \frac{F}{x(\gamma_{x,y,\lambda,\omega}(t))}} x^{-2} \chi\left(\frac{\lambda}{x}\right) \delta(z' - \gamma_{x,y,\lambda,\omega}(t)) \varrho((x, y, \lambda, \omega), \gamma_{x,y,\lambda,\omega}(t)) dt |d\nu| \\ &= (2\pi)^{-n} \int e^{-\frac{F}{x} + \frac{F}{x(\gamma_{x,y,\lambda,\omega}(t))}} x^{-2} \chi\left(\frac{\lambda}{x}\right) e^{-i\zeta' \cdot (z' - \gamma_{x,y,\lambda,\omega}(t))} \varrho((x, y, \lambda, \omega), \gamma_{x,y,\lambda,\omega}(t)) dt |d\nu| |d\zeta| \end{aligned}$$

Taking inverse Fourier transform in z' and then evaluate at ζ , which turns out to be a factor $\delta_0(\zeta - \zeta')$, we know:

$$\begin{aligned} a_F(z, \zeta) &= (2\pi)^n e^{-iz \cdot \zeta} \mathcal{F}_{z' \rightarrow \zeta}^{-1} K_{A_F}(z, z') \\ &= \int e^{-\frac{F}{x} + \frac{F}{x(\gamma_{x,y,\lambda,\omega}(t))}} x^{-2} \chi\left(\frac{\lambda}{x}\right) e^{-iz \cdot \zeta} e^{i\zeta \cdot \gamma_{x,y,\lambda,\omega}(t)} \varrho((x, y, \lambda, \omega), \gamma_{x,y,\lambda,\omega}(t)) dt |d\nu|. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose we use the coordinate in the scattering cotangent vectors: $\zeta = \xi \frac{dx}{x^2} + \eta \frac{dy}{x}$ and use the coordinate $\gamma_{x,y,\lambda,\omega}(t) = (\gamma_{x,y,\lambda,\omega}^{(1)}(t), \gamma_{x,y,\lambda,\omega}^{(2)}(t))$. In our context, all of them are scalars. While in the general n -dimensional case, the first component is of dimension one, and the second component has dimension $n - 1$. The expression above become, with ϱ standing for $\varrho((x, y, \lambda, \omega), \gamma_{x,y,\lambda,\omega}(t))$,

$$(4) \quad a_F(z, \zeta) = \int e^{-\frac{F}{x} + \frac{F}{x(\gamma_{x,y,\lambda,\omega}(t))}} x^{-2} \chi\left(\frac{\lambda}{x}\right) e^{i(\frac{\xi}{x^2}, \frac{\eta}{x}) \cdot (\gamma_{x,y,\lambda,\omega}^{(1)}(t) - x, \gamma_{x,y,\lambda,\omega}^{(2)}(t) - y)} \varrho dt |d\nu|.$$

Next we investigate the phase function of this oscillatory integral and then apply the stationary phase lemma. We denote components

of $\gamma_{z,\nu}(t)$ and its derivatives by

$$(5) \quad \begin{aligned} \gamma_{x,y,\lambda,\omega}(0) &= (x, y), \quad \dot{\gamma}_{x,y,\lambda,\omega}(0) = (\lambda, \omega), \\ \ddot{\gamma}_{x,y,\lambda,\omega}(t) &= 2(\alpha(x, y, \lambda, \omega, t), \beta(x, y, \lambda, \omega, t)), \end{aligned}$$

We have

$$\gamma_{x,y,\lambda,\omega}(t) = (x + \lambda t + \alpha t^2 + \Gamma^{(1)}(x, y, \lambda, \omega, t)t^3, y + \omega t + \Gamma^{(2)}(x, y, \lambda, \omega, t)t^2).$$

We have included the β -term in the definition of $\Gamma^{(2)}$. Then we make the change of variables

$$\hat{t} = \frac{t}{x}, \quad \hat{\lambda} = \frac{\lambda}{x}.$$

By the support condition of χ , the integrand is none-zero when $\hat{\lambda}$ is in a compact interval. However, the bound on \hat{t} is $|\hat{t}| \leq \frac{T_g}{x}$, which is not uniformly bounded, we amend this by treating it in two regions separately. Using these new variables, we rewrite our phase as

$$\phi = \xi(\hat{\lambda}\hat{t} + \alpha\hat{t}^2 + x\hat{t}^3\Gamma^{(1)}(x, y, x\hat{\lambda}, \omega, x\hat{t})) + \eta(\omega\hat{t} + x\hat{t}^2\Gamma^{(2)}(x, y, x\hat{\lambda}, \omega, x\hat{t})).$$

The damping factor coming from exponential conjugation is

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{F}{x} + \frac{F}{\gamma_{x,y,\lambda,\omega}^{(1)}(t)} &= -F(\lambda t + \alpha t^2 + t^3\Gamma^{(1)}(x, y, x\hat{\lambda}, \omega, x\hat{t})) \\ &\quad \times (x(x + \lambda t + \alpha t^2 + t^3\Gamma^{(1)}(x, y, x\hat{\lambda}, \omega, x\hat{t})))^{-1} \\ &= -F(\hat{\lambda}\hat{t} + \alpha\hat{t}^2 + \hat{t}^3x\hat{\Gamma}^{(1)}(x, y, x\hat{\lambda}, \omega, x\hat{t})), \end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{\Gamma}^{(i)}$ is introduced when we first express $\gamma_{x,y,\lambda,\omega}^{(1)}(t)$ by variables t, λ , and then invoke our change of variables, then collect the remaining terms, which is a smooth function of these normalized variables. So this amplitude is Schwartz in \hat{t} , hence we can deal with regions $|\hat{t}| \geq \epsilon_t$ and $|\hat{t}| < \epsilon_t$ separately.

We first consider the critical points of the phase at $x = 0$, where the phase becomes

$$\xi(\hat{\lambda}\hat{t} + \alpha\hat{t}^2) + \hat{t}\eta\omega.$$

When $|\hat{t}| \geq \epsilon_t$, the derivative with respect to $\hat{\lambda}$ vanishes only when $\xi = 0$. $\xi = 0$ implies $\eta \neq 0$, hence $\eta\omega$ can not vanish. So the region $|\hat{t}| \geq \epsilon_t$ gives rapid decay contribution. The case $x > 0$ can be dealt with the same method, but with more complicated computation. Notice that, $\alpha, \Gamma^{(i)}$ take $\lambda = x\hat{\lambda}, t = x\hat{t}$ as variables, and produces an extra x factor when we take partial derivatives with respect to $\hat{\lambda}, \hat{t}$. Concretely, the

derivative with respect to $\hat{\lambda}$ is:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \hat{\lambda}} &= \xi \hat{t}(1 + x \hat{t} \partial_{\lambda} \alpha + x^2 \hat{t}^2 \partial_{\lambda} \Gamma^{(1)}) + \eta x^2 \hat{t}^2 \partial_{\lambda} \Gamma^{(2)} \\ &= \xi \hat{t}(1 + t \partial_{\lambda} \alpha + t^2 \partial_{\lambda} \Gamma^{(1)}) + \eta t^2 \partial_{\lambda} \Gamma^{(2)}.\end{aligned}$$

Recall that $|t| \leq T_g$ and we can choose T_g to be small by shrinking O_p , so this can not vanish when $|\xi| \geq C|\eta|, \hat{t} \geq \epsilon_t$.

Next we consider the region $|\hat{t}| < \epsilon_t$, whose closure is compact, and consequently we can apply the stationary phase lemma. The same as before, we consider the condition that the derivative with respect to $\hat{\lambda}$ and \hat{t} vanish. First consider the $x = 0$, in which case the expression can be significantly simplified:

$$\xi \hat{t} = 0, \quad \xi \hat{\lambda} + \eta \omega = 0.$$

We exclude $\xi = 0$ case since that implies $\eta = 0$, but ξ, η can't vanish at the same time. This is the major difference between 2 dimensional case and the higher dimensional case. Then we have the condition for critical points:

$$\hat{t} = 0, \quad \xi \hat{\lambda} + \eta \omega = 0.$$

Further, since the ϵ_t in arguments above is arbitrary, we know that the condition $\hat{t} = 0$ holds for any critical point including the $x \neq 0$ case. And the second condition can be derived if we notice that (for general x):

$$\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \hat{t}} = (\xi \hat{\lambda} + \eta \omega) + O(\hat{t}),$$

where the $O(\hat{t})$ term vanishes when $\hat{t} = 0$, and can be computed explicitly:

$$(2\xi\alpha + 2x\Gamma^{(2)})\hat{t} + (3x\xi\Gamma^{(1)} + x^2\partial_t\Gamma^{(2)})\hat{t}^2 + \xi x^2\partial_t\Gamma^{(1)}\hat{t}^3.$$

So those two conditions for stationary points extends to the $x \neq 0$ case. In order to apply those conditions of critical points of the phase, we first rewrite (4) as:

$$\begin{aligned}(6) \quad a_F(z, \zeta) &= \int e^{-\frac{F}{x} + \frac{F}{x(\gamma_{x,y,\lambda,\omega}(t))}} x^{-2} \chi(\hat{\lambda}) e^{i(\frac{\xi}{x^2}, \frac{\eta}{x}) \cdot (\gamma_{x,y,\lambda,\omega}^{(1)}(t) - x, \gamma_{x,y,\lambda,\omega}^{(2)}(t) - y)} \varrho dt |d\nu| \\ &= \int e^{-F(\hat{\lambda}\hat{t} + \alpha\hat{t}^2 + \hat{t}^3 x \hat{\Gamma}^{(1)}(x, y, x\hat{\lambda}, \omega, x\hat{t}))} \chi(\hat{\lambda}) \varrho((x, y, x\hat{\lambda}, \omega), \gamma_{x,y,x\hat{\lambda},\omega}(x\hat{t})) \\ &\quad e^{i(\xi(\hat{\lambda}\hat{t} + \alpha\hat{t}^2 + \hat{t}^3 x \hat{\Gamma}^{(1)}(x, y, x\hat{\lambda}, \omega, x\hat{t})) + \eta(\omega\hat{t} + x\hat{t}^2 \Gamma^{(2)}(x, y, x\hat{\lambda}, \omega, x\hat{t})))} d\hat{t} d\hat{\lambda} d\omega,\end{aligned}$$

where integrating over ω is just summing two terms at ± 1 . By stationary phase lemma with a non-degenerate critical point, the leading contribution comes from the critical points of the phase $\{\hat{t} = 0, \xi \hat{\lambda} + \eta \omega = 0\}$. The second equation defining the critical set has two solutions $\hat{\lambda}_{\pm} = \mp \frac{\eta}{\xi}$ corresponding to $\omega = \pm 1$. The $(\hat{t}, \hat{\lambda})$ -Hessian of the phase at the critical points is:

$$\begin{pmatrix} 2\alpha\xi & \xi \\ \xi & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

which has determinant $-\xi^2$. So the asymptotic behaviour of the integral as $|\xi| \rightarrow \infty$ is the same as (up to a non-zero constant factor, and use the symmetry of ϱ with respect to the vector fiber part)

$$|\xi|^{-1}(\chi(\frac{\eta}{\xi}) + \chi(-\frac{\eta}{\xi}))\varrho((x, y, \frac{-\eta}{|(-\eta, \xi)|}, \frac{\xi}{|(-\eta, \xi)|}), x, y).$$

Choosing χ such that $\chi \geq 0$ and $\chi \geq C_0 > 0$ on $[-C^{-1}, C^{-1}]$, we get a -1 order elliptic estimate on the region $C|\eta| \leq |\xi|$.

4.2. Boundary behavior, oscillatory integral approach. Evaluating (6) at $x = 0$, since $\omega = \pm 1$, the boundary principal symbol of A_F is

$$\begin{aligned} a_F(0, y, \zeta) &= \int e^{-F(\hat{\lambda}\hat{t} + \alpha\hat{t}^2)} \chi(\hat{\lambda}) e^{i(\xi(\hat{\lambda}\hat{t} + \alpha\hat{t}^2) + \eta\omega\hat{t})} \varrho((0, y, 0, \omega), \gamma_{0,y,0,\omega}(0)) d\hat{t} d\hat{\lambda} d\omega \\ &= \varrho((0, y, 0, 1), (0, y)) \int e^{-F(\hat{\lambda}\hat{t} + \alpha\hat{t}^2)} \chi(\hat{\lambda}) e^{i(\xi(\hat{\lambda}\hat{t} + \alpha\hat{t}^2) + \eta\hat{t})} d\hat{t} d\hat{\lambda} \\ &\quad + \varrho((0, y, 0, -1), (0, y)) \int e^{-F(\hat{\lambda}\hat{t} + \alpha\hat{t}^2)} \chi(\hat{\lambda}) e^{i(\xi(\hat{\lambda}\hat{t} + \alpha\hat{t}^2) - \eta\hat{t})} d\hat{t} d\hat{\lambda} \end{aligned}$$

Now $\alpha(x, y, x\hat{\lambda}, \omega) = \alpha(0, y, 0, \pm 1) := \alpha(y)$, which is a constant in the integrals. Here we used the fact that $\alpha(0, y, 0, \omega)$ is a quadratic form in the fibre variable ω , hence changing the sign of ω does not change its value. Now an observation is that we can allow χ to depend on y and denote it by $\chi(s, y)$. And we first choose them to be a Gaussian density, then use approximation argument to obtain one that has compact support in s . We choose $\chi(s, y) = e^{-\frac{Fs^2}{2\alpha(y)}}$, then we have:

$$\begin{aligned} &\int e^{-F(\hat{\lambda}\hat{t} + \alpha\hat{t}^2)} \chi(\hat{\lambda}) e^{i(\xi(\hat{\lambda}\hat{t} + \alpha\hat{t}^2) + \eta\hat{t})} d\hat{t} d\hat{\lambda} \\ &= \int \left(\int e^{-F\hat{\lambda}\hat{t} - \frac{F\hat{\lambda}^2}{2\alpha} + i\xi\hat{\lambda}\hat{t}} d\hat{\lambda} \right) e^{-F\alpha\hat{t}^2 + i\eta\hat{t} + i\xi\alpha\hat{t}^2} d\hat{t} \end{aligned}$$

The integral in $\hat{\lambda}$ is a Fourier transform of Gaussian density, it is $\sqrt{\frac{2\pi\alpha}{F}} e^{\frac{\alpha F \hat{t}^2}{2} - i\xi\alpha\hat{t}^2 - \frac{\alpha}{2F}\hat{t}^2 \xi^2}$, and we can also get a similar expression for

the term with $\omega = -1$. Thus we need to compute:

$$\int e^{-\frac{\alpha}{2F}(F^2+\xi^2)\hat{t}^2+i\eta\hat{t}} d\hat{t},$$

which is again a Gaussian type integral, and it equals to a constant multiple of $\sqrt{\frac{F}{\alpha}}(F^2+\xi^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}}e^{-\frac{F\eta^2}{2\alpha(\xi^2+F^2)}}$, which is even in η . So the other term gives the same contribution. Finally, with a constant factor c , we have (again using symmetry of ϱ_{ff}):

$$a_F(0, y, \zeta) = c\varrho((0, y, 0, 1), (0, y))\left(\sqrt{\frac{F}{\alpha}}(F^2+\xi^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}}e^{-\frac{F\eta^2}{2\alpha(\xi^2+F^2)}}\right).$$

Consequently when $|\xi| \geq C|\eta|$ the variable on the exponent is uniformly bounded, therefore we have

$$a_F(0, y, \zeta) \geq \tilde{C}|\zeta|^{-1}, \quad \tilde{C} > 0,$$

which proves ellipticity of the boundary principal symbol for $|\xi| \geq C|\eta|$.

Now we amend the compact support issue. Let χ be a Gaussian as above, which generates an elliptic operator, then we pick a sequence $\chi_n \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ converges to χ in the Schwartz function space $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$. Then we can obtain the convergence of $\hat{\chi}_n$ to $\hat{\chi}$ in Schwartz function space. This gives us the convergence of X -Fourier transform in $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$. And the Y -Fourier transform step is also continuous with respect to the topology of $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$. In particular, we obtain the convergence of $|\zeta|a_{n,F}(z, \zeta)$, the symbol obtained from χ_n , in the C^0 topology, which is enough to derive an elliptic type estimate for χ_n with large enough n . \square

5. THE PROOF OF THE MAIN THEOREM

Fix c_0 small and apply results in previous sections to Ω_{c_0} , estimates above are uniform with respect to $c \in (0, c_0]$. We let c vary and take $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{x}}(X)$ such that on the region Ω_c we have $x \leq f$ and $f = 0$ when $x = 0$. Construct B_c as follows: for Ω_c , denote A_F in Section 4 constructed for Ω_c by $A_{F,c}$. By Proposition 1, we can apply Lemma 2 with $A_{F,c}$ being A_0 in Lemma 2, there exists $A_{1,c}$ such that $B_1 := A_{F,c} + A_{1,c}$ is elliptic. And $A_{1,c}f = 0$ for $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{x}}(X)$ by Lemma 1, hence estimate of B_c is equivalent estimate for $A_{F,c}$ on $\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{x}}(X)$. By the ellipticity of B_c we have its parametrix G_c such that $G_c B_c = \text{Id} + E_{0c}$, $E_{0c} \in \Psi_{sc}^{-\infty, -\infty}(\tilde{X})$.

Consider the map $\Psi_c(\tilde{x}, y) = (\tilde{x}+c, y)$, and let $A_c = (\Psi_c^{-1})^* B_c \Psi_c^*$, $E_c = (\Psi_c^{-1})^*(E_{0c})\Psi_c^*$. This conjugation is introduced to make this family of operators to be defined on a fixed region $\tilde{M}_0 := \{\tilde{x} \geq 0\}$. We have an estimate of the error term in terms of f . To be more precise, we consider the Schwartz kernel K_{E_c} of E_c , which satisfies $|x^{-N}x'^{-N}K_{E_c}| \leq C_N$

on Ω_c . Then we insert a truncation factor ϕ_c compactly supported in Ω_c , and being identically 1 on smaller compact set K_c , such that $|\phi_c(x, y)\phi_c(x', y')K_{E_c}| \leq C'_N f(c)^{2N} x^{n+1} x'^{n+1}$ for all N . The $n+1$ power terms are introduced for the scattering density. Then we apply Schur's lemma on the integral operator bound (together with the aforementioned N -th power estimate) to conclude that $\|\phi_c E_c \phi_c\|_{L^2_{sc}(\bar{M}_0)} \leq C''_N f(c)^{2N}$. In particular, we can take c_0 so that this norm < 1 when $c \in (0, c_0]$. Since those conjugations are invertible, this guarantees that $\phi_c G_c B_c \phi_c = \text{Id} + \phi_c E_{0c} \phi_c$ is invertible. So for the functions supported on K_c , B_c is injective. And K_c can be arbitrary compact subset of Ω_c for arguments up to now. Support conditions are encoded by subscripts below. For example, $H^{s,r}_{sc}(\bar{M}_c)_{K_c}$ is the space consists of those functions in $H^{s,r}_{sc}(\bar{M}_c)$ which have support in K_c . Define $\bar{M}_c := \{\tilde{x} + c \geq 0\}$ and $K_c := \bar{M}_c \cap \{\rho \geq 0\} = \Omega_c$. K_c is compact by our choice of \tilde{x} . We have

$$\|v\|_{H^{s,r}_{sc}(\bar{M}_c)_{K_c}} \leq C \|B_c v\|_{H^{s+1,r}_{sc}(\bar{M}_c)}.$$

If we recover this expression to A , this is (with $f = e^{\frac{F}{x}} v$):

$$\|f\|_{e^{\frac{F}{x}} H^{s,r}_{sc}(\bar{M}_c)_{K_c}} \leq C \|Af\|_{e^{\frac{F}{x}} H^{s+1,r+1}_{sc}(\bar{M}_c)}.$$

Recall our inclusion relationships for polynomially weighted Sobolev spaces, we can get rid of the r -indices with the cost of increasing the power of left hand side to $e^{\frac{F+\delta}{x}}$. That is:

$$\|f\|_{e^{\frac{F+\delta}{x}} H^s_{sc}(\bar{M}_c)_{K_c}} \leq C \|Af\|_{e^{\frac{F}{x}} H^{s+1}_{sc}(\bar{M}_c)}.$$

Finally we consider the boundedness of operators involved. We consider the decomposition $A = L \circ I_\varrho$, and show that L is bounded. In order to prove this, we decompose L into $L = M_2 \circ \Pi \circ M_1$, with M_2, Π, M_1 being

$$M_1 : H^s([0, +\infty)_x \times \mathbb{R}_y \times \mathbb{R}_\lambda \times \{\pm 1\}_\omega) \rightarrow H^s([0, +\infty)_x \times \mathbb{R}_y \times \mathbb{R}_\lambda \times \{\pm 1\}_\omega),$$

$$(M_1 u)(x, y, \lambda, \omega) = x^s \chi\left(\frac{\lambda}{x}\right) u(x, y, \lambda, \omega),$$

$$\Pi : H^s([0, +\infty)_x \times \mathbb{R}_y \times \mathbb{R}_\lambda) \rightarrow H^s([0, +\infty)_x \times \mathbb{R}_y), \quad (\Pi u)(x, y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} u(x, y, \lambda, 1) d\lambda,$$

$$M_2 : H^s([0, +\infty)_x \times \mathbb{R}_y) \rightarrow x^{-(s+1)} H^s([0, +\infty)_x \times \mathbb{R}_y), \quad (M_2 f)(x, y) = x^{-(s+1)} f(x, y).$$

Consider the boundedness of M_1 when $s \in \mathbb{N}$ first. The general case follows from interpolation. Consider derivatives of $x^s \chi(\frac{\lambda}{x}) u(x, y, \lambda, \omega)$ up to order s . Each order of differentiation on χ gives an x^{-1} factor, which is cancelled by x^s and the remaining part belongs to L^2 by

smoothness of χ and $u \in H^s$. M_2 is bounded by the definition of the space on the right hand side. The operator Π is a pushforward map, integrating over $|\lambda| \leq C|x|$ (notice the support condition after we apply M_1), hence bounded.

On the other hand, I_ϱ itself is a bounded operator. This comes from the decomposition $I_\varrho = \tilde{\Pi} \circ \Phi^*$, where Φ is the geodesic coordinate representation $\Phi(z, \nu, t) = \gamma_{z,\nu}(t)$ and $\tilde{\Pi}$ is integrating against t , which is bounded as a pushforward map. Because the initial vector always has length 1 on the tangent component, the travel time is uniformly bounded. Φ is one component of Γ and the later is a diffeomorphism when we shrink the region. So Φ has surjective differential, hence the pull back is bounded. Consequently I_ϱ is bounded.

The boundedness of L gives us an estimate

$$\|Af\|_{e^{\frac{F}{x}} H_{sc}^{s+1}(\bar{M}_c)} \leq C_1 \|I_\varrho f\|_{H^{s+1}(SX|_{\bar{M}_c})},$$

where we require f to have supported in K_c , and used the fact $\mathbb{R}_\lambda \times \{\pm 1\}_\omega$ parametrizes \mathbb{S}^1 apart from two poles, and this completes the proof.

REFERENCES

- [1] Jan Boman. Local non-injectivity for weighted radon transforms. *Contemp. Math*, 559:39–47, 2011.
- [2] Jan Boman and Eric Todd Quinto. Support theorems for radon transforms on real analytic line complexes in three-space. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 335(2):877–890, 1993.
- [3] Gabriel P Paternain, Mikko Salo, Günther Uhlmann, and Hanming Zhou. The geodesic X-ray transform with matrix weights. *American Journal of Mathematics*, 141(6):1707–1750, 2019.
- [4] Leonid Pestov and Gunther Uhlmann. Two dimensional compact simple riemannian manifolds are boundary distance rigid. *Annals of mathematics*, pages 1093–1110, 2005.
- [5] Plamen Stefanov and Gunther Uhlmann. Stability estimates for the X-ray transform of tensor fields and boundary rigidity. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 123(3):445–467, 2004.
- [6] Gunther Uhlmann and András Vasy. The inverse problem for the local geodesic ray transform. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 205(1):83–120, 2016.