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Abstract. We study the geometric significance of Leinster’s notion of magnitude for a compact metric space. For a smooth, compact domain \( X \) in an odd-dimensional Euclidean space, we show that the asymptotic expansion of the function \( \mathcal{M}_X(R) = \text{Mag}(R \cdot X) \) at \( R = \infty \) determines the Willmore energy of the boundary \( \partial X \). This disproves the Leinster-Willerton conjecture for a compact convex body in all odd dimensions.

Introduction

The notion of magnitude was introduced by Leinster [5, 6] as an extension of the Euler characteristic to (finite) enriched categories. Magnitude has been shown to unify notions of “size” like the cardinality of a set, the length of an interval or the Euler characteristic of a triangulated manifold, and it even relates to measures of the diversity of a biological system. See [7] for an overview.

Viewing a metric space as a category enriched over \([0, \infty)\), Leinster and Willerton proposed and studied the magnitude of metric spaces [6, 8]: If \((X, d)\) is a finite metric space, a weight function is a function \( w : X \to \mathbb{R} \) which satisfies
\[
\sum_{y \in X} e^{-d(x,y)}w(y) = 1 \quad \text{for all} \quad x \in X.
\]
Given a weight function \( w \), we define the magnitude of \( X \) as
\[
\text{Mag}(X) := \sum_{x \in X} w(x);
\]
this definition is independent of the choice of weight function. Beyond finite metric spaces, the magnitude of a compact, positive definite metric space \((X, d)\) was made rigorous by Meckes [9]:
\[
\text{Mag}(X) := \sup \{ \text{Mag}(\Xi) : \Xi \subset X \text{ finite} \}.
\]

Instead of the magnitude of an individual space \((X, d)\), it proves fruitful to study the magnitude function \( \mathcal{M}_X(R) := \text{Mag}(X, R \cdot d) \) for \( R > 0 \).

Compact convex subsets \( X \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) provide a key example, surveyed in [7]. Motivated by properties of the Euler characteristic and computer calculations, Leinster and Willerton [8] conjectured a surprising relation to the intrinsic volumes \( V_i(X) \), which would shed light on the geometric content of the magnitude function:

\[
\mathcal{M}_X(R) = \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{1}{k!\omega_k} V_k(X) R^k + o(1), \quad \text{as} \quad R \to \infty.
\]

Here, \( \omega_k \) is the volume of the \( k \)-dimensional unit ball.

The conjectured behavior (1) was disproved by Barceló and Carbery [1] for the unit ball \( B_5 \subset \mathbb{R}^5 \). They explicitly computed the rational function \( \mathcal{M}_{B_5} \) and observed numerical disagreement of the coefficients of \( R^k \). Their results were extended to balls in odd dimensions in [10].

In spite of this negative result, the authors were able to prove a variant of (1), with modified prefactors, which confirmed the close relation between magnitude...
and intrinsic volumes \[2\]: When \(n = 2m - 1\) is odd and \(X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n\) is a compact domain with smooth boundary, there are coefficients \((c_j(X))_{j \in \mathbb{N}}\) such that
\[
\mathcal{M}_X(R) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{c_j(X)}{n!\omega_n} R^{n-j} + O(R^{-\infty}), \quad \text{as } R \to \infty,
\]
where
\[
c_0(X) = \operatorname{vol}_n(X), \quad c_1(X) = m \operatorname{vol}_{n-1}(\partial X), \quad c_2(X) = \frac{m^2}{2} (n-1) \int_{\partial X} H \, dS.
\]
Here, \(H\) denotes the mean curvature of \(\partial X\). Each coefficient \(c_j\) is an integral over \(\partial X\) computable from the second fundamental form of \(\partial X\) and its covariant derivatives. For \(j = 0, 1, 2\) and \(X\) convex, the coefficient \(c_j\) is proportional to the intrinsic volume \(V_{n-j}(X)\), for \(j = 0, 1, 2\). This proves that the Leinster-Willerton conjecture holds for modified universal coefficients up to \(O(R^{n-3})\).

The following variant of the Leinster-Willerton conjecture therefore remained plausible. It would confirm the relation between magnitude and intrinsic volumes and, in particular, show that \(c_n\) is proportional to the Euler characteristic \(V_0\):

**Conjecture 1.** For \(n > 0\), there are universal constants \(\gamma_{0,n}, \gamma_{1,n}, \ldots, \gamma_{n,n}\) such that for any compact convex subset \(X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n\),
\[
\mathcal{M}_X(R) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} \gamma_{k,n} V_k(X) R^k + o(1), \quad \text{as } R \to \infty.
\]

In this paper we prove that Conjecture 1 fails in all odd dimensions \(n \geq 3\) and find unexpected geometric content in \(c_3\). While the conjecture holds true for the terms of order \(R^n, R^{n-1}\) and \(R^{n-2}\), the \(R^{n-3}\)-term is not proportional to an intrinsic volume:

**Theorem 2.** Assume that \(n \geq 3\) is odd and that \(X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n\) is a compact domain with smooth boundary. Then there is a dimensional constant \(\lambda_n \neq 0\) such that
\[
c_3(X) = \lambda_n \mathcal{W}(\partial X),
\]
where \(\mathcal{W}(\partial X) := \int_{\partial X} H^2 \, dS\) is the Willmore energy of the boundary of the hypersurface \(\partial X\).

To see that Theorem 2 disproves Conjecture 1 in the fourth term, we observe that the Willmore energy is not an intrinsic volume: The only intrinsic volume with the same scaling property as the Willmore energy is \(V_{n-3}\). For instance, if \(n = 3\) then \(V_{n-3}\) is the Euler characteristic while \(\int_{\partial X} H^2 \, dS\) can be non-zero even when \(\partial X\) has vanishing Euler characteristic (e.g. for a torus). In general dimension, for \(a > 0\) the ellipsoid
\[
X_a := \left\{ (x', x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R} : |x'|^2 + \frac{|x_n|^2}{a^2} = 1 \right\},
\]
satisfies that \(\mathcal{W}(\partial X_a) \to \infty\) as \(a \to 0\). On the other hand, Hausdorff continuity of intrinsic volumes shows that \(V_{n-3}(\partial X_a)\) converges to a finite number, namely the \(n-3\)rd intrinsic volume of the \(n-1\)-dimensional unit ball. Therefore Theorem 2 implies the following.

**Corollary 3.** Assume that \(n \geq 3\) is odd and that \(X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n\) is a compact convex domain with smooth boundary. There are universal constants \(\gamma_{n-2,n}, \gamma_{n-1,n}, \gamma_{n,n}\)
such that
\[ M_X(R) = \sum_{k=n-2}^{n} R^k + O(R^{n-3}), \quad \text{as } R \to \infty. \]

However, there is no constant \( \gamma_{n-3,n} \) such that \( M_X(R) = \sum_{k=n-3}^{n} \gamma_{k,n} R^k + O(R^{n-4}) \) as \( R \to \infty \). In particular, the Leinster-Willerton conjecture fails even with modified universal coefficients.

This article relies on the set-up and notation introduced in [2], to which we refer for background and motivation.

**Background and notation**

We assume that \( X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \) is a compact domain with \( C^\infty \)-boundary, where \( n = 2m - 1 \) odd. Denote by \( \Omega := \mathbb{R}^n \setminus X \) the exterior domain. We use the Sobolev spaces \( H^s(\mathbb{R}^n) := (1 - \Delta)^{-s/2} L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \) of exponent \( s \geq 0 \). Here, the Laplacian \( \Delta \) is given by \( \Delta = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_j^2} \). The spaces \( H^s(\Omega) \) and \( H^s(\Omega) \) are defined using restrictions. The Sobolev spaces \( H^s(\partial X) \) can be defined using local charts or as \( (1 - \Delta_{\partial X})^{-s/2} L^2(\partial X) \).

We use \( \partial_{\nu} \) to denote the Neumann trace of a function \( u \in \Omega \). The operator \( \partial_{\nu} \) extends to a continuous operator \( H^s(\Omega) \to H^{s-3/2}(\partial X) \) for \( s > 3/2 \). Similarly, \( \gamma_0 : H^s(\Omega) \to H^{s-1/2}(\partial X) \) denotes the trace operator defined for \( s > 1/2 \).

For \( R > 0 \) we shall need the operators
\[
D_R^j := \begin{cases} 
\partial_{\nu} \circ (R^2 - \Delta)^{(j-1)/2}, & \text{when } j \text{ is odd,} \\
\gamma_0 \circ (R^2 - \Delta)^{j/2}, & \text{when } j \text{ is even.}
\end{cases}
\]

By the trace theorem, \( D_R^j \) is continuous as an operator \( D_R^j : H^s(\Omega) \to H^{s-j-1/2}(\partial X) \) for \( s > j + 1/2 \).

We recall a key observation from [1], in the reformulation presented in [2]:

**Proposition 4.** [2, Proposition 9] Suppose that \( h_R \in H^{2m}(\Omega) \) is the unique weak solution to the boundary value problem
\[
\begin{cases} 
(R^2 - \Delta)^m h_R = 0 & \text{in } \Omega \\
D_R^j h_R = \begin{cases} 
R^j, & j \text{ even, } j = 0, \ldots, m - 1, \\
0, & j \text{ odd.}
\end{cases}
\end{cases}
\]

Then the following identity holds
\[
M_X(R) = \frac{\text{vol}_n(X)}{n! \omega_n} R^m - \frac{1}{m! \omega_n} \sum_{0 < j \leq m} R^{n-2j} \int_{\partial X} D_R^{2j-1} h_R dS.
\]

The operators \( D_R^{2j-1} \) define a matrix-valued Dirichlet-Neumann operator \( \Lambda(\cdot) : \mathcal{H}_+ \to \mathcal{H}_- \) in the Hilbert space
\[
\mathcal{H} := \bigoplus_{j=0}^{m-1} H^{2m-j-1/2}(\partial X) \oplus \bigoplus_{j=m}^{n} H^{2m-j-1/2}(\partial X)
\]
as follows: \( \Lambda(R)(u_j)_{j=0}^{m-1} := (D^j_R u)_{j=m} \), where \( u \in H^{2m}(\Omega) \) is the unique weak solution to

\[
\begin{align*}
(R^2 - \Delta)^m u &= 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \\
D^j_R u &= u_j, \ j = 0, \ldots, m - 1.
\end{align*}
\]

The operator \( \Lambda(R) \) is a parameter-dependent pseudodifferential operator on \( \partial X \).

From Proposition 4 we deduce a formula for the expansion coefficients \( c_k \):

\[
c_k(X) := \frac{1}{n!\omega_n} \sum_{m} \sum_{j \leq m} \int_{\partial X} \sigma_{2j-2l-k}(\Lambda_{2j-1,2l})(x,0,1) \, dS,
\]

for \( k > 0 \) where \( \Lambda = (\Lambda_{j+m,l})_{j,l=0}^{m-1} \) and \( \sigma_{2j-2l-k}(\Lambda_{2j-1,2l}) \) the homogeneous part of order \( 2j - 2l - k \) in its symbol (with parameter). See [2, Proposition 20].

Adapting standard techniques in semiclassical analysis [4], the symbol of \( \Lambda \) is computed using boundary layer potentials. To define these, we consider the function

\[
K(R; z) := \frac{\kappa_n}{R} e^{-R|z|}, \quad z \in \mathbb{R}^n.
\]

The constant \( \kappa_n > 0 \) is chosen such that

\[
(R^2 - \Delta)^m K = \delta_0
\]

in the sense of distributions on \( \mathbb{R}^n \). For \( l = 0, \ldots, n \), we define the functions

\[
K_l(R; x, y) := (-1)^l D^{n-l}_R K(R; x-y), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \ y \in \partial X.
\]

Here \( D^l_R \) denotes \( D^l \) acting in the \( y \)-variable. We also consider the distributions

\[
K_{j,k}(R; x, y) := D^l_R K_{j,k}(R; x, y), \quad x \in \partial X.
\]

The \( K_{j,k} \) define operators \( A_{j,k}(R) : C^\infty(\partial X) \to C^\infty(\partial X) \),

\[
A_{j,k}(R)f(x) := \int_{\partial X} K_{j,k}(R; x, y)f(y) \, dS(y), \quad x \in \partial X.
\]

The integral defining \( A_{j,k}(R) \) is understood in the sense of an exterior limit. These operators combine into a \( 2m \times 2m \)-matrix of operators \( \mathbb{A} := (A_{j,l})_{j,l=0}^{m} : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H} \).

It decomposes into matrix blocks

\[
\mathbb{A} = \begin{pmatrix}
\mathbb{A}_{++} & \mathbb{A}_{+-} \\
\mathbb{A}_{-+} & \mathbb{A}_{--}
\end{pmatrix} : \mathcal{H}_+ \oplus \mathcal{H}_- \to \mathcal{H}_+ \oplus \mathcal{H}_-,
\]

with \( \mathbb{A}_{pq} : \mathcal{H}_q \to \mathcal{H}_p \) for \( p, q \in \{+, -\} \).

From [2, Theorem 18] we can express the Dirichlet-Neumann operator \( \Lambda \) in terms of layer potentials as

\[
\Lambda = \mathcal{B}(1 - \mathbb{A}_{++}).
\]

Here \( \mathcal{B} = (B_{j+m,l})_{j,l=0}^{m-1} \) denotes a parametrix (with parameter) of \( \mathbb{A}_{++} = (A_{j,l+m})_{j,l=0}^{m-1} \). See more in the proof of [2, Theorem 18].

The proof of Theorem 2 uses Equation (4) to compute components of the symbol of the Dirichlet-Neumann operator \( \Lambda \). The formula for \( c_3 \) then follows from (3).
Proof of Theorem 2

Let us start with some symbol computations. For \( k \geq 0 \), we use the notation

\[
\sigma_{-k}(A_{++}) := (\sigma_{j-l-k}(A_{j,l}))_{j,l=0}^{m-1},
\]

\[
\sigma_{-k}(A_{+-}) := (\sigma_{j-l-k-m}(A_{j,l+m}))_{j,l=0}^{m-1}
\]
and

\[
\sigma_{-k}(B) := (\sigma_{j+m-l-k}(B_{j+m,l}))_{j,l=0}^{m-1}.
\]

Here we write \( \sigma_{j-l-k}(A_{j,l}) \) for the degree \( j-l-k \) part of \( a_{j,l} \) written as a symbol depending on the variable \( (x', \xi', R) \in T^*\partial X \times \mathbb{R}_+ \). The reader should note the difference with the expressions appearing just after [2, Proposition 37] in that they are for symbols in the variables \( (x', y', \xi', R) \). The process of going between these two symbol expressions is one of the difficulties in the computation ahead.

The reader can note that \( \sigma_0(A_{++}), \sigma_0(A_{+-}) \) and \( \sigma_0(B) \) are the matrices of principal symbols of \( A_{++}, A_{+-} \) and \( B \), respectively. In particular,

\[
\sigma_0(B) = \sigma_0(A_{+-})^{-1}.
\]

It follows from [2, Theorem 12] that \( \sigma_0(B) \) does not depend on \( x' \in \partial X \). Define the symbol

\[
\mathbb{D} = (\delta_{j,k}(R^2 + |\xi|^2)^{j/2})_{j,k=0}^{n}.
\]

By [2, Theorem 12], there are constant \( m \times m \)-matrices \( C_0, C_1, C_2, C_3 \) such that

\[
\sigma_0(A_{++}) = \mathbb{D}C_0\mathbb{D}^{-1}, \quad \sigma_0(A_{+-}) = \mathbb{D}C_1\mathbb{D}^{-1},
\]

\[
\sigma_{-1}(A_{++}) = H\mathbb{D}C_2\mathbb{D}^{-1}, \quad \sigma_{-1}(A_{+-}) = H\mathbb{D}C_3\mathbb{D}^{-1}, \quad \text{and}
\]

\[
\sigma_{-0}(B) = \mathbb{D}C_1^{-1}\mathbb{D}^{-1},
\]

where \( H \) denotes the mean curvature of \( \partial X \) and we in each identity embed \( m \times m \)-matrices in a suitable fashion into \( 2m \times 2m \)-matrices.

From [2, Lemma 22, part a] and the \( x' \)-independence of \( \sigma_0(B) \) we can deduce that

\[
\sigma_{-1}(B) = -\sigma_0(B)\sigma_{-1}(A_{+-})\sigma_0(B) = H\mathbb{D}C_1^{-1}C_3\mathbb{D}^{-1},
\]

as well as

\[
\sigma_{-2}(B) = -\sigma_0(B)\left(\sigma_{-2}(A_{+-}) + \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \partial_{\xi_j} \sigma_0(A_{+-}) \sigma_0(B) \partial_{x_j} \sigma_{-1}(A_{+-}) - \sigma_{-1}(A_{+-}) \sigma_0(B) \sigma_{-1}(A_{+-})\right) \sigma_0(B).
\]
Using [2, Lemma 22, part b], we write
\[
\sigma_2(Λ) = \sigma_2(\mathbb{B})(1 − σ_0(Λ^{++})) − σ_1(\mathbb{B})σ_1(Λ^{++}) − σ_0(\mathbb{B})σ_2(Λ^{++}) +
\]
\[
+ i \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \partial_{ξ_j} σ_{−1}(\mathbb{B}) \partial_{x_j} σ_{−1}(Λ^{++}) = \]
\[
= − σ_0(\mathbb{B}) \left( σ_2(Λ^{++}) + \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \partial_{ξ_j} σ_0(Λ^{−}) σ_0(\mathbb{B}) \partial_{x_j} σ_{−1}(Λ^{−}) − \right.
\]
\[
− σ_1(Λ^{−}) σ_0(\mathbb{B}) σ_{−1}(Λ^{−}) \right) σ_0(\mathbb{B})(1 − σ_0(Λ^{++})) +
\]
\[
+ σ_0(\mathbb{B}) σ_{−1}(Λ^{−}) σ_0(\mathbb{B}) σ_{−1}(Λ^{−}) − σ_0(\mathbb{B}) σ_2(Λ^{++}) −
\]
\[
− i \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \partial_{ξ_j} (σ_0(\mathbb{B}) σ_{−1}(Λ^{−}) σ_0(\mathbb{B})) \partial_{x_j} σ_{−1}(Λ^{++})
\]

Since all σ₀-occurrences only depend on \( R^2 + |ξ|^2 \), all its ξ-derivatives will vanish at ξ = 0, and therefore,
\[
\sigma_2(Λ)(x', 0, R) =
\]
\[
= \left[ − σ_0(\mathbb{B}) \left( σ_2(Λ^{−}) − σ_1(Λ^{−}) σ_0(\mathbb{B}) σ_{−1}(Λ^{−}) \right) σ_0(\mathbb{B})(1 − σ_0(Λ^{++})) + \right.
\]
\[
+ σ_0(\mathbb{B}) σ_{−1}(Λ^{−}) σ_0(\mathbb{B}) σ_{−1}(Λ^{−}) − σ_0(\mathbb{B}) σ_2(Λ^{++}) \right]_{ξ=0} =
\]
\[
= \left[ − Δ C_{−1}^{−1} \mathbb{B}^{−1} (σ_2(Λ^{−})) Δ C_{−1}^{−1}(1 − C_0) Δ^{−1} + σ_2(Λ^{−})) + \right.
\]
\[
+ H^2 Δ C_{−1}^{−1} C_1^{−1} C_3^{−1}(1 − C_0) Δ^{−1} + H^2 Δ C_{−1}^{−1} C_3^{−1} C_3^{−1} C_0 Δ^{−1} \right]_{ξ=0}.
\]

Assume for now that \( σ_2(Λ^{−})(x', 0, R) = σ_2(Λ^{++})(x', 0, R) = 0 \). Then this computation shows that indeed, there are universal constants \((d_{j_{m,l}})_{j,l=0}^{m-1}\) (independent of X) such that for \( \frac{m}{2} < j \leq m \) and \( 0 \leq l \leq m/2 \),
\[
\sigma_{2j−2l−2}(Λ_{2j−1,2l})(x, 0, 1) = d_{2j−1,2l} H(x)^2.
\]

In particular, we have shown that for a dimensional constant \( λ_n \), we have that
\[
c_3(X) = λ_n \int_∞ H^2 dS. \quad \text{It follows from [10] that} \quad λ_n ≠ 0 \quad \text{for any } n ≥ 3\text{ odd.}
\]

It remains to show that \( σ_2(Λ^{−})(x', 0, R) = σ_2(Λ^{++})(x', 0, R) = 0 \). Note that we do not claim that \( σ_2(Λ^{−}) = σ_2(Λ^{++}) = 0 \) just that when restricting to \( ξ' = 0 \) the symbols vanish. We pick local coordinates at a point on ∂X. We can assume that this point is 0 ∈ \( \mathbb{R}^n \) and that the coordinates are of the form \((x', S(x'))\), where \( x' \) belongs to some neighborhood of \( 0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \) and \( S \) is a scalar function with \( S(0) = 0 \) and \( \nabla S(0) = 0 \). We can express \( a_{jk} \) as
\[
a_{jk}(x', y', ξ', R) = b_{0, m−p−q}(R^2 + |ξ'|^2, S(x') − S(y')), \quad \text{when } j = 2p, k = n−2q
\]
\[
a_{jk}(x', y', ξ', R) = b_{1, m−p−q}(R^2 + |ξ'|^2, S(x') − S(y')) +
\]
\[
|ξ' · ∇ S(x')| b_{0, m−p−q}(R^2 + |ξ'|^2, S(x') − S(y'))), \quad \text{when } j = 2p+1, k = n−2q
\]
\[ a_{jk}(x', y', \xi', R) = b_{1, m-p-q}(R^2 + |\xi'|^2, S(x') - S(y')) + (\xi' \cdot \nabla S(y'))b_{0, m-p-q}(R^2 + |\xi'|^2, S(x') - S(y')) \]
when \( j = 2p, k = n - 2q - 1 \)
\[ a_{jk}(x', y', \xi', R) = b_{2, m-p-q}(R^2 + |\xi'|^2, S(x') - S(y')) + ((\xi' \cdot \nabla S(y')) + (\xi' \cdot \nabla S(x')))b_{1, m-p-q}(R^2 + |\xi'|^2, S(x') - S(y')) + (\xi' \cdot \nabla S(x'))(\xi' \cdot \nabla S(y'))b_{0, m-p-q}(R^2 + |\xi'|^2, S(x') - S(y')) \]
when \( j = 2p + 1, k = n - 2q - 1 \),

where
\[ b_{r,N}(u, z) = \begin{cases} 
(-i\partial_z)^r (u - \partial_z^2)^{-N}\delta_{z=0}, & N \leq 0, \\
(-i\partial_z)^r \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \tilde{c}_{k,r,N} \frac{|z|^{k-r-N}}{|N-(k+1)r/2|}, & N > 0,
\end{cases}\]

for some coefficients \( \tilde{c}_{k,r,N} \).

We need to verify that \( \sigma_{j-k-2}(a_{j,k})(x', 0, R) = 0 \) for any \( j \) and \( k \). The symbol \( \sigma_{j-k-2}(a_{j,k}) \) in \( x' = 0 \) is given by the terms of order \( j - k - 2 \) in the expression
\[ a_{jk}(0, 0, \xi', R) - i \sum_{l=1}^{n-1} \frac{\partial^2 a_{jk}}{\partial \xi_l \partial y_l}(0, 0, \xi', R) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{l,s=1}^{n-1} \frac{\partial^4 a_{jk}}{\partial \xi_l \partial \xi_s \partial y_l \partial y_s}(0, 0, \xi', R) \]

Recall that \( S(0) = 0 \) and \( \nabla S(0) = 0 \) so there are several terms vanishing when setting \( x' = 0 \). Indeed, no term of order \( j - k - 2 \) in \( a_{jk}(0, 0, \xi', R) \) is non-zero.

All non-zero terms of order \( j - k - 2 \) in \( \sum_{l=1}^{n-1} \frac{\partial^2 a_{jk}}{\partial \xi_l \partial y_l}(0, 0, \xi', R) \) are odd functions under the reflection \( \xi' \mapsto -\xi' \), so they vanish when restricting to \( \xi' = 0 \). Similar computations show that terms of order \( j - k - 2 \) in \( \frac{1}{2} \sum_{l,s=1}^{n-1} \frac{\partial^4 a_{jk}}{\partial \xi_l \partial \xi_s \partial y_l \partial y_s} \) all contains a factor of \( \xi_l \) or \( \xi_l \xi_s \) so they vanish when restricting to \( \xi' = 0 \).
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