

# QUANTITATIVE STRONG UNIQUE CONTINUATION FOR THE SCHRÖDINGER OPERATOR WITH UNBOUNDED POTENTIAL

MOURAD CHOULLI

ABSTRACT. We revisit [2, Theorem 6.3]. By following the main ideas used to prove that theorem, we establish a quantitative version of strong unique continuation for the Schrödinger operator with an unbounded potential. We also show that combining this result with a global quantitative unique continuation from arbitrary interior data yields a global quantitative strong unique continuation.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $n \geq 3$  be an integer,  $p := \frac{2n}{n+2}$  and  $p' := \frac{p}{p-1} = \frac{2n}{n-2}$  its conjugate. The open ball centered at 0 with radius  $r > 0$  will be denoted by  $B_r$ , and we set  $B := B_1$ .

We say that  $w \in L^2(B)$  vanishes of infinite order at 0 if there exists  $0 < \gamma < 1$  such that for all integer  $m > 0$  we have

$$r^{-m} \int_{B_r} |w|^2 dx \leq c_m, \quad 0 < r < \gamma,$$

where  $c_m > 0$  is a constant.

Let  $q \in L^{\frac{n}{2}}(B)$  and  $P \in L^n(B, \mathbb{C}^n)$ . We say that the Schrödinger operator  $\Delta + q$  (resp. the differential inequality  $|\Delta u| \leq |qu| + |P \cdot \nabla u|$ ) admits the strong unique continuation property (hereinafter abbreviated as SUCP) in the class  $W^{2,p}(B)$  if any  $u \in W^{2,p}(B)$  such that  $(\Delta + q)u = 0$  (resp.  $|\Delta u| \leq |qu| + |P \cdot \nabla u|$ ) in  $B$  and  $u$  vanishes of infinite order at 0 must vanish in a neighborhood of 0.

To our best knowledge, the first result establishing that the differential inequality  $|\Delta u| \leq |qu|$  has the SUCP in the class  $W^{2,p}(B)$  with potential  $q \in L^{\frac{n}{2}}(B)$  is due to Jerison and Kenig [2]. The SUCP for the differential inequality  $|\Delta u| \leq |P \cdot \nabla u|$  when  $P \in L^{\frac{7n-2}{6}}(B, \mathbb{C}^n)$  was obtained by Regbaoui [5]. While Wolff [8] proved that the SUCP holds for the differential inequality  $|\Delta u| \leq |qu| + |P \cdot \nabla u|$  with  $q \in L^{\frac{n}{2}}(B)$  and  $P \in L^{\max(n, \frac{3n}{2}-2)}(B, \mathbb{C}^n)$ . Sogge [6] considered the case where  $\Delta$  is replaced by a second order elliptic operator with smooth coefficients. He showed that the SUCP holds for the differential inequality  $|\Delta u| \leq |qu| + |P \cdot \nabla u|$  with  $q \in L^{\frac{n}{2}}(B)$  and  $P \in L^\infty(B, \mathbb{C}^n)$ . The result of Sogge [6] was extended by Koch and Tataru [3] with the “best possible conditions”, that is  $q \in L^{\frac{n}{2}}(B)$  and  $P \in L^n(B, \mathbb{R}^n)$  (in fact they considered an operator with an additional term of the form  $\operatorname{div}(uR)$  with  $R \in L^n(B, \mathbb{C}^n)$ ). By a counterexample, Jerison and Kenig showed in [2, Remark 6.5] that  $L^{\frac{n}{2}}(B)$  is the best possible space for the potential  $q$ . Reference [3] contains

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35J10, 35B35.

*Key words and phrases.* Schrödinger operator, unbounded potential, quantitative strong unique continuation, global quantitative strong unique continuation.

a brief history of the SUCP. Other references dealing with the SUCP for elliptic operators can found in [3, 6].

We aim in this article to quantify the SUCP for both the Schrödinger operator  $\Delta + q$  and the differential inequality  $|\Delta u| \leq |qu| + |P \cdot \nabla u|$ . For sake of clarity, we limited ourselves to the case where the Schrödinger operator  $\Delta + q$  acts on the unit ball  $B$ . In a final section, we briefly outline the modifications required to obtain a variant of Theorem 1.1, as well as a quantitative SUCP for the differential inequality  $|\Delta u| \leq |qu| + |P \cdot \nabla u|$ . We also present a quantitative SUCP and a global quantitative SUCP for the operator  $\Delta + q$  acting on an arbitrary bounded domain in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

Before stating our main result precisely, we introduce some definitions and notations. As usual, the set of positive integers is denoted  $\mathbb{N}$ . For all  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , define  $O_m$  as the set of functions  $w \in L^2(B)$  satisfying

$$\varrho_m(w) := \sup \{ \eta^{-m} \|w\|_{L^2(B_\eta)}; 0 < \eta < 1 \} < \infty.$$

It is clear that  $\varrho_m(w) < \infty$  if and only if there exists  $0 < \gamma < 1$  so that

$$\varrho_m^\gamma(w) := \sup \{ \eta^{-m} \|w\|_{L^2(B_\eta)}; 0 < \eta < \gamma \} < \infty.$$

Futhermore,  $u$  vanishes of infinite order at 0 if and only if  $u \in \bigcap_{m \in \mathbb{N}} O_m$ .

Let

$$\Lambda := \left\{ \lambda > 0; \text{dist} \left( \lambda, \mathbb{N} + \frac{n-2}{2} \right) = \frac{1}{2} \right\}$$

and  $\dot{B} := B \setminus \{0\}$ . It follows from [2, (3.4)] that

$$(1.1) \quad \| |x|^{-\lambda} u \|_{L^{p'}(B)} \leq \kappa \| |x|^{-\lambda} \Delta u \|_{L^p(B)}, \quad u \in C_0^\infty(\dot{B}), \quad \lambda \in \Lambda.$$

Here and henceforth,  $\kappa = \kappa(n)$  is a constant.

The closed ball of  $L^{\frac{n}{2}}(B)$  centered at 0 with radius  $r > 0$  will be denoted by  $\mathbf{B}_r$ .

To define the assumptions regarding the potential  $q$ , we need the following lemma, proved in Appendix A.

**Lemma 1.1.** *There exists a constant  $r_* = r_*(n) > 0$  with the property that for all  $0 < r_0 < r_*$ , there exists  $\kappa_0 = \kappa_0(n, r_0) > 0$  such that we have*

$$(1.2) \quad \| |x|^{-\lambda} u \|_{L^{p'}(B)} \leq \kappa_0 \| |x|^{-\lambda} (\Delta + q) u \|_{L^p(B)}, \quad u \in C_0^\infty(\dot{B}), \quad q \in \mathbf{B}_{r_0}, \quad \lambda \in \Lambda.$$

For convenience, recall that  $W^{2,p}(B)$  embeds continuously into  $H^1(B)$  and that  $H^1(B)$  embeds continuously into  $L^{p'}(B)$ . Let

$$\sigma := \sup \left\{ \|w\|_{L^{p'}(B)}; w \in H_0^1(B), \|\nabla w\|_{L^2(B)} = 1 \right\},$$

We fix  $0 < r_0 < r_*$ , where  $r_*$  is as in Lemma 1.1, and  $\vartheta > 0$  satisfying  $2\vartheta\sigma^2 < 1$ . Then, let  $\varsigma := \inf(r_0, \vartheta)$ , and  $Q := \mathbf{B}_\varsigma$ .

Throughout this text, we arbitrarily fix  $0 < \rho < \frac{1}{2}$  and  $\phi \in C_0^\infty(B)$  such that  $\phi = 1$  in  $B_{\frac{1}{2}}$  and  $0 \leq \phi \leq 1$ . Our main result is the following theorem

**Theorem 1.1.** *There exists a constant  $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{c}(n, r_0, \sigma, \vartheta) > 0$  such that for all  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\lambda \in \Lambda$ ,  $q \in Q$ ,  $u \in W^{2,p}(B) \cap O_m$  and  $0 < \eta < \frac{\rho}{4}$  we have*

$$(1.3) \quad \mathbf{c} \|u\|_{L^2(B_{\frac{\rho}{2}})} \leq \eta^{-\lambda} \|(\Delta + q)u\|_{L^p(B)} \\ + 2^{-(\lambda+1)} \|(\Delta + q)(\phi u)\|_{L^p(B)} + 3^m \eta^{m-(\lambda+3)} \varrho_m(u).$$

Let's explain why Theorem 1.1 quantifies the SUCP for the operator  $\Delta + q$ ,  $q \in Q$ , in the class  $W^{2,p}(B)$ . Let  $u \in W^{2,p}(B)$  such that  $(\Delta + q)u = 0$  in  $B$  and  $u$  vanishes of infinite order at 0. For all  $\lambda \in \Lambda$ ,  $0 < \eta < \frac{\rho}{4}$  and  $m = [\lambda] + 4$ , where  $[\lambda]$  is the entire part of  $\lambda$ , (1.3) yields

$$\mathbf{c} \|u\|_{L^2(B_{\frac{\rho}{2}})} \leq 2^{-(\lambda+1)} \|(\Delta + q)(\phi u)\|_{L^p(B)} + 3^{[\lambda]+4} \eta^{[\lambda]+1-\lambda} \varrho_{[\lambda]+4}(u).$$

Taking the limit when  $\eta$  tends to zero in this inequality, we find

$$\mathbf{c} \|u\|_{L^2(B_{\rho/2})} \leq 2^{-(\lambda+1)} \|(\Delta + q)(\phi u)\|_{L^p(B)}.$$

Let  $(\lambda_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence of  $\Lambda$  tending to  $\infty$  when  $j$  goes to  $\infty$ . From the preceding inequality, we have

$$\mathbf{c} \|u\|_{L^2(B_{\rho/2})} \leq 2^{-(\lambda_j+1)} \|(\Delta + q)(\phi u)\|_{L^p(B)}, \quad j \in \mathbb{N},$$

from which we obtain that  $u = 0$  in  $B_{\frac{\rho}{2}}$ . Hence,  $u = 0$  in  $\bigcup_{0 < \rho < \frac{1}{2}} B_{\frac{\rho}{2}} = B_{\frac{1}{4}}$ . In other words, we proved the following result.

**Corollary 1.1.** *For  $q \in Q$ , let  $u \in W^{2,p}(B)$  such that  $(\Delta + q)u = 0$  in  $B$  and  $u$  vanishes of infinite order at 0. Then  $u = 0$  in  $B_{\frac{1}{4}}$ .*

The key ingredient in the proof of Theorem 1.1 is the Carleman inequality (1.1) due to Jerison and Kenig [2]. For elliptic operators with variable leading coefficients, a Carleman inequality is indeed available [3]. However, this Carleman estimate is less flexible to use than (1.1), and we do not believe it is the appropriate tool for establishing a SUCP for operators with variable leading coefficients. We note the paper by Malinnikova and Vessella [4], in which the authors-relying on the Carleman inequality of Koch and Tataru [3]-proved a quantitative strong unique continuation result from a set of positive measure.

Under the additional assumption  $q \in L^n(B)$ , we combine (1.3) with [1, Theorem 1.2 and comments in Section 1.3] to obtain a global quantitative SUCP. Precisely, we have the following result, where

$$\mathbf{Q} := \left\{ q \in L^n(B); \|q\|_{L^n(B)} \leq |B|^{-\frac{1}{n}} \zeta \right\} (\subset Q).$$

**Theorem 1.2.** *Let  $0 < s, t < \frac{1}{2}$ . For all  $0 < r < 1$ ,  $0 < \eta < \frac{\rho}{4}$ ,  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\lambda \in \Lambda$ ,  $q \in \mathbf{Q}$  and  $u \in H^2(B) \cap O_m$  we have*

$$\mathbf{c} \|u\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}+t}(B)} \leq r^\zeta \|u\|_{H^2(B)} \\ + e^{\mathbf{b}r^{-\nu}} \left( \eta^{-\lambda} \|(\Delta + q)u\|_{L^2(B)} \right. \\ \left. + 2^{-(\lambda+1)} \|(\Delta + q)(\phi u)\|_{L^p(B)} + 3^m \eta^{m-(\lambda+3)} \varrho_m(u) \right),$$

where  $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{c}(n, s, t, r_0, \sigma, \vartheta) > 0$ ,  $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{b}(n, s, t, r_0, \sigma, \vartheta) > 0$ ,  $\nu = \nu(n) > 0$  are constants and  $\zeta = \min\left(\frac{\frac{1}{2}-t}{1+t}, \frac{s}{4}\right)$ .

Proceeding as for Corollary 1.1, we deduce the following global SUCP from Theorem 1.2.

**Corollary 1.2.** *Let  $q \in \mathbf{Q}$ . If  $u \in H^2(B)$  is such that  $(\Delta + q)u = 0$  in  $B$  and  $u$  vanishes of infinite order at 0, then  $u = 0$  in  $B$ .*

Let  $E \subset B$  be a set of positive measure. Proceeding as in [1, Section 3], we obtain the following consequence of Corollary 1.2.

**Corollary 1.3.** *Let  $q \in \mathbf{Q}$  and  $u \in H^2(B)$  such that  $(\Delta + q)u = 0$  in  $B$  and  $u = 0$  in  $E$ . Then,  $u = 0$  in  $B$ .*

## 2. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

### 2.1. Caccioppoli's inequality.

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $0 < r, h < 1$  such that  $0 < r + h < 1$ . There exists a constant  $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{c}(n, \sigma, \vartheta) > 0$  with the property that for all  $u \in W^{2,p}(B)$  and  $q \in \mathbf{Q}$  we have*

$$(2.1) \quad \mathbf{c} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_r)} \leq \|(\Delta + q)u\|_{L^p(B)} + h^{-1} \|u\|_{L^2(B_{r+h})}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $\chi \in C_0^\infty(B_{r+h})$  such that  $0 \leq \chi \leq 1$ ,  $\chi = 1$  in a neighborhood of  $B_r$  and  $|\partial^\alpha \chi| \leq c_0 h^{-1}$  for all  $|\alpha| = 1$ , where  $c_0 > 0$  is a universal constant.

Let  $u \in W^{2,p}(B)$  and  $\epsilon > 0$ . Applying Hölder's inequality, we obtain

$$\left| \int_B \chi^2 u (\Delta + q) u dx \right| \leq \|(\Delta + q)u\|_{L^p(B)} \|\chi u\|_{L^{p'}(B)}$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_B \chi^2 u (\Delta + q) u dx \right| &\leq (2\epsilon)^{-1} \|(\Delta + q)u\|_{L^p(B)}^2 + 2^{-1} \epsilon \|\chi u\|_{L^{p'}(B)}^2 \\ &\leq (2\epsilon)^{-1} \|(\Delta + q)u\|_{L^p(B)}^2 + 2^{-1} \epsilon \sigma^2 \|\nabla(\chi u)\|_{L^2(B)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

That is we have

$$(2.2) \quad \left| \int_B \chi^2 u (\Delta + q) u dx \right| \leq (2\epsilon)^{-1} \|(\Delta + q)u\|_{L^p(B)}^2 + \epsilon \sigma^2 \left( \|u \nabla \chi\|_{L^2(B)}^2 + \|\chi \nabla u\|_{L^2(B)}^2 \right).$$

On the other hand, performing an integration by parts, we get

$$\int_B \chi^2 u \Delta u dx = - \int_B \chi^2 |\nabla u|^2 dx - \int_B u \nabla \chi^2 \cdot \nabla u dx.$$

Thus,

$$\|\chi \nabla u\|_{L^2(B)}^2 \leq \left| \int_B \chi^2 u \Delta u dx \right| + 2 \left| \int_B u \nabla \chi \cdot \nabla u dx \right|.$$

By applying Cauchy-Schwarz's inequality and then a convexity inequality to the second term of the right hand side of inequality above, we get

$$\|\chi \nabla u\|_{L^2(B)}^2 \leq \left| \int_B \chi^2 u \Delta u dx \right| + \epsilon^{-1} \|u \nabla \chi\|_{L^2(B)}^2 + \epsilon \|\chi \nabla u\|_{L^2(B)}^2.$$

Hence,

$$(1 - \epsilon) \|\chi \nabla u\|_{L^2(B)}^2 \leq \left| \int_B \chi^2 u \Delta u dx \right| + \epsilon^{-1} \|u \nabla \chi\|_{L^2(B)}^2,$$

from which we obtain

$$(2.3) \quad (1 - \epsilon) \|\chi \nabla u\|_{L^2(B)}^2 \leq \left| \int_B \chi^2 u (\Delta + q) u dx \right| + \left| \int_B q \chi^2 u^2 dx \right| + \epsilon^{-1} \|u \nabla \chi\|_{L^2(B)}^2.$$

By applying twice Hölder's inequality, we obtain

$$\left| \int_B q \chi^2 u^2 dx \right| \leq \|q \chi u\|_{L^p(B)} \|\chi u\|_{L^{p'}(B)} \leq \|q\|_{L^{\frac{n}{2}}(B)} \|\chi u\|_{L^{p'}(B)}^2$$

Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_B q \chi^2 u^2 dx \right| &\leq \|q\|_{L^{\frac{n}{2}}(B)} \sigma^2 \|\nabla(\chi u)\|_{L^2(B)}^2 \\ &\leq 2\|q\|_{L^{n/2}(B)} \sigma^2 \left( \|u \nabla \chi\|_{L^2(B)}^2 + \|\chi \nabla u\|_{L^2(B)}^2 \right) \\ &\leq 2\vartheta \sigma^2 \left( \|u \nabla \chi\|_{L^2(B)}^2 + \|\chi \nabla u\|_{L^2(B)}^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

This inequality in (2.3) gives

$$(2.4) \quad (1 - \epsilon - 2\vartheta \sigma^2) \|\chi \nabla u\|_{L^2(B)}^2 \leq \left| \int_B \chi^2 u (\Delta + q) u dx \right| + (\epsilon^{-1} + 2\vartheta \sigma^2) \|u \nabla \chi\|_{L^2(B)}^2.$$

Putting (2.2) in (2.4), we end up getting

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - 2\vartheta \sigma^2 - \epsilon(1 + \sigma^2)) \|\chi \nabla u\|_{L^2(B)}^2 &\leq (2\epsilon)^{-1} \|(\Delta + q)u\|_{L^p(B)}^2 \\ &\quad + (\epsilon^{-1} + \epsilon \sigma^2 + 2\vartheta \sigma^2) \|u \nabla \chi\|_{L^2(B)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

The expected inequality follows by taking  $\epsilon = \frac{1 - 2\vartheta \sigma^2}{2 + 2\sigma^2}$ .  $\square$

**2.2. Proof of Theorem 1.1.** Let  $(\psi_\eta)_{0 < \eta < \frac{\rho}{4}}$  be a family of  $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$  such that  $0 \leq \psi_\eta \leq 1$ ,  $\psi_\eta(x) = 0$  if  $|x| \leq \eta$ ,  $\psi_\eta(x) = 1$  if  $|x| \geq 2\eta$  and

$$|\partial^\alpha \psi_\eta| \leq c \eta^{-|\alpha|}, \quad |\alpha| \leq 2, \quad 0 < \eta < \frac{\rho}{4},$$

where  $c > 0$  is a universal constant.

Let  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $q \in Q$ ,  $u \in W^{2,p}(B) \cap O_m$  and  $v := \phi u$ . Let  $0 < \eta < \frac{\rho}{4}$  be arbitrarily fixed. By density, we get from (1.2) the following inequality

$$(2.5) \quad \| |x|^{-\lambda} \psi_\eta v \|_{L^{p'}(B)} \leq \kappa_0 \| |x|^{-\lambda} (\Delta + q)(\psi_\eta v) \|_{L^p(B)},$$

where  $\kappa_0$  is the constant in (1.2). Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \| |x|^{-\lambda} \psi_\eta u \|_{L^{p'}(B_{\frac{\rho}{2}})} &\leq \kappa_0 \| |x|^{-\lambda} (\Delta + q)(\psi_\eta v) \|_{L^p(B_\rho)} \\ &\quad + \kappa_0 \| |x|^{-\lambda} (\Delta + q)(\psi_\eta v) \|_{L^p(\{\rho < |x| < 1\})}, \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$(2.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \| |x|^{-\lambda} \psi_\eta u \|_{L^{p'}(B_{\frac{\rho}{2}})} &\leq \kappa_0 \| |x|^{-\lambda} (\Delta + q)(\psi_\eta u) \|_{L^p(B_\rho)} \\ &\quad + \kappa_0 \rho^{-\lambda} \| (\Delta + q)v \|_{L^p(B)}. \end{aligned}$$

In consequence, we have

$$(2.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \| |x|^{-\lambda} u \|_{L^{p'}(\{2\eta < |x| < \frac{\rho}{2}\})} &\leq \kappa_0 \| |x|^{-\lambda} (\Delta + q)(\psi_\eta u) \|_{L^p(B_\rho)} \\ &\quad + \kappa_0 \rho^{-\lambda} \| (\Delta + q)v \|_{L^p(B)}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, applying Hölder's inequality, we obtain

$$\|u\|_{L^2(\{2\eta < |x| < \frac{\rho}{2}\})} \leq \| |x|^\lambda \|_{L^n(\{2\eta < |x| < \frac{\rho}{2}\})} \| |x|^{-\lambda} u \|_{L^{p'}(\{2\eta < |x| < \frac{\rho}{2}\})}.$$

Since

$$\| |x|^\lambda \|_{L^n(\{2\eta < |x| < \frac{\rho}{2}\})} \leq \| |x|^\lambda \|_{L^n(B_{\frac{\rho}{2}})} = \left[ \frac{\omega_n}{n(\lambda+1)} \right]^{1/n} \left( \frac{\rho}{2} \right)^{\lambda+1},$$

where  $\omega_n = |\mathbb{S}^{n-1}|$ , we get

$$(2.8) \quad \|u\|_{L^2(\{2\eta < |x| < \frac{\rho}{2}\})} \leq \left[ \frac{\omega_n}{n(\lambda+1)} \right]^{\frac{1}{n}} \left( \frac{\rho}{2} \right)^{\lambda+1} \| |x|^{-\lambda} u \|_{L^{p'}(\{2\eta < |x| < \frac{\rho}{2}\})}.$$

By putting together (2.7) and (2.8), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{L^2(B_{\frac{\rho}{2}})} &\leq \kappa_1 (1+\lambda)^{-\frac{1}{n}} \left( \frac{\rho}{2} \right)^{\lambda+1} \| |x|^{-\lambda} (\Delta + q)(\psi_\eta u) \|_{L^p(B_\rho)} \\ &\quad + \kappa_1 \rho 2^{-(\lambda+1)} \|(\Delta + q)v\|_{L^p(B)} + \|u\|_{L^2(B_{2\eta})}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\kappa_1 = \kappa_0 \left( \frac{\omega_n}{n} \right)^{\frac{1}{n}}$ . Hence, the following inequality holds

$$(2.9) \quad \|u\|_{L^2(B_{\frac{\rho}{2}})} \leq \kappa_1 \| |x|^{-\lambda} (\Delta + q)(\psi_\eta u) \|_{L^p(B_\rho)} + \kappa_1 2^{-(\lambda+1)} \|(\Delta + q)v\|_{L^p(B)} + \|u\|_{L^2(B_{2\eta})}.$$

Next, as

$$\Delta(\psi_\eta u) = \psi_\eta \Delta u + 2\nabla \psi_\eta \cdot \nabla u + \Delta \psi_\eta u$$

and  $\text{supp}(2\nabla \psi_\eta \cdot \nabla u + \Delta \psi_\eta u) \subset \{\eta < |x| < 2\eta\}$ , we get

$$(2.10) \quad \| |x|^{-\lambda} (\Delta + q)(\psi_\eta u) \|_{L^p(B_\rho)} \leq \eta^{-\lambda} \|(\Delta + q)u\|_{L^p(B)} + c_0 \eta^{-(\lambda+2)} (\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_{2\eta})} + \|u\|_{L^2(B_{2\eta})}),$$

for some constant  $c_0 = c_0(n) > 0$ .

In the remaining part of this proof,  $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{c}(n, r_0, \vartheta) > 0$  will denote a generic constant.

From inequality (2.1), we obtain

$$\mathbf{c} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_{2\eta})} \leq \|(\Delta + q)u\|_{L^p(B)} + \eta^{-1} \|u\|_{L^2(B_{3\eta})}.$$

This inequality in (2.10) yields

$$(2.11) \quad \mathbf{c} \| |x|^{-\lambda} (\Delta + q)(\psi_\eta u) \|_{L^p(B_\rho)} \leq \eta^{-\lambda} \|(\Delta + q)u\|_{L^p(B)} + \eta^{-(\lambda+3)} \|u\|_{L^2(B_{3\eta})}.$$

Therefore, it follows from (2.9) and (2.11)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{c} \|u\|_{L^2(B_{\frac{\rho}{2}})} &\leq \eta^{-\lambda} \|(\Delta + q)u\|_{L^p(B)} + 2^{-(\lambda+1)} \|(\Delta + q)v\|_{L^p(B)} \\ &\quad + \eta^{-(\lambda+3)} \|u\|_{L^2(B_{3\eta})}. \end{aligned}$$

We end up getting

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{c} \|u\|_{L^2(B_{\frac{\rho}{2}})} &\leq \eta^{-\lambda} \|(\Delta + q)u\|_{L^p(B)} + 2^{-(\lambda+1)} \|(\Delta + q)(\phi u)\|_{L^p(B)} \\ &\quad + 3^m \eta^{m-(\lambda+3)} \varrho_m(u). \end{aligned}$$

This is the expected inequality.

## 3. OTHER RESULTS

**3.1. Quantitative SUCP around a fixed potential.** Let  $q_0 \in L^{\frac{n}{2}}(B)$  and  $0 < \underline{\rho} < \frac{1}{2}$  such that  $\sigma^2 \|q_0\|_{L^{\frac{n}{2}}(B_{\underline{\rho}})} < \frac{1}{4}$ . Let

$$\underline{Q} := \left\{ q \in L^{\frac{n}{2}}(B); \sigma^2 \|q - q_0\|_{L^{\frac{n}{2}}(B_{\underline{\rho}})} < \frac{1}{4} \right\}.$$

The following inequality will be useful later on.

$$(3.1) \quad \sigma^2 \|q\|_{L^{\frac{n}{2}}(B_{\underline{\rho}})} < \frac{1}{2}, \quad q \in \underline{Q}.$$

Under the definitions and the notations of the proof of Theorem 1.1 with  $\rho = \underline{\rho}$ , instead of (2.6) we have

$$\| |x|^{-\lambda} \psi_{\eta} u \|_{L^{p'}(B_{\underline{\rho}})} \leq \kappa_0 \| |x|^{-\lambda} \Delta(\psi_{\eta} u) \|_{L^p(B_{\underline{\rho}})} + \kappa_0 \rho^{-\lambda} \| \Delta v \|_{L^p(B)}.$$

In light of (3.1), this inequality implies for all  $q \in \underline{Q}$

$$\| |x|^{-\lambda} \psi_{\eta} u \|_{L^{p'}(B_{\underline{\rho}})} \leq 2\kappa_0 \| |x|^{-\lambda} (\Delta + q)(\psi_{\eta} u) \|_{L^p(B_{\underline{\rho}})} + 2\kappa_0 \rho^{-\lambda} \| \Delta v \|_{L^p(B)},$$

In particular, we have for all  $q \in \underline{Q}$

$$\| |x|^{-\lambda} \psi_{\eta} u \|_{L^{p'}(B_{\frac{\underline{\rho}}{2}})} \leq 2\kappa_0 \| |x|^{-\lambda} (\Delta + q)(\psi_{\eta} u) \|_{L^p(B_{\underline{\rho}})} + 2\kappa_0 \rho^{-\lambda} \| \Delta v \|_{L^p(B)},$$

As the Caccioppoli's inequality (2.1) remains valid when  $q \in \underline{Q}$  is replaced by  $q \in \underline{Q}$  and  $0 < r + h < 1$  is replaced by  $0 < r + h < \underline{\rho}$ , by modifying slightly the proof of Theorem 1.1, we get the following result.

**Theorem 3.1.** *There exists a constant  $\mathfrak{c} = \mathfrak{c}(n) > 0$  such that for all  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\lambda \in \Lambda$ ,  $q \in \underline{Q}$ ,  $u \in W^{2,p}(B) \cap O_m$  and  $0 < \eta < \frac{\underline{\rho}}{4}$  we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{c} \|u\|_{L^2(B_{\frac{\underline{\rho}}{2}})} &\leq \eta^{-\lambda} \|(\Delta + q)u\|_{L^p(B)} \\ &\quad + 2^{-(\lambda+1)} \| \Delta(\phi u) \|_{L^p(B)} + 3^m \eta^{m-(\lambda+3)} \varrho_m(u). \end{aligned}$$

An immediate consequence of this theorem is

**Corollary 3.1.** *Let  $q \in L^{\frac{n}{2}}(B)$ . If  $u \in W^{2,p}(B)$  is such that  $(\Delta + q)u = 0$  in  $B$  and  $u$  vanishes of infinite order at 0, then  $u = 0$  in a neighborhood  $V$  of 0.*

Of course,  $V$  in Corollary 3.1 depends on  $q$ .

**3.2. Quantitative SUCP for differential inequalities.** Here again, the notations are those of the proof of Theorem 1.1. As at the beginning of the proof of Theorem 1.1, we have

$$\| |x|^{-\lambda} \psi_{\eta} u \|_{L^{p'}(B_{\rho})} \leq \kappa \| |x|^{-\lambda} \Delta(\psi_{\eta} u) \|_{L^p(B_{\rho})} + \kappa \rho^{-\lambda} \| \Delta v \|_{L^p(B)},$$

where  $\kappa = \kappa(n)$  is the constant in (1.1).

Similarly to (2.10), we prove

$$\begin{aligned} \| |x|^{-\lambda} \Delta(\psi_{\eta} u) \|_{L^p(B_{\rho})} &\leq \| |x|^{-\lambda} \psi_{\eta} \Delta u \|_{L^p(B_{\rho})} \\ &\quad + c_0 \eta^{-(\lambda+2)} \left( \| \nabla u \|_{L^2(B_{2\eta})} + \| u \|_{L^2(B_{2\eta})} \right), \end{aligned}$$

for some constant  $c_0 = c_0(n) > 0$ .

This inequality in the preceding one yields

$$\begin{aligned} \| |x|^{-\lambda} \psi_\eta u \|_{L^{p'}(B_\rho)} &\leq \kappa \| |x|^{-\lambda} \psi_\eta \Delta u \|_{L^p(B_\rho)} + \kappa \rho^{-\lambda} \| \Delta v \|_{L^p(B)} \\ &\quad + \kappa c_0 \eta^{-(\lambda+2)} (\| \nabla u \|_{L^2(B_{2\eta})} + \| u \|_{L^2(B_{2\eta})}). \end{aligned}$$

Let  $P \in L^n(B, \mathbb{C}^n)$ . Then, under the assumption

$$|\Delta u| \leq |qu| + |P \cdot \nabla u| \quad \text{in } B,$$

the inequality above gives

$$\begin{aligned} \| |x|^{-\lambda} \psi_\eta u \|_{L^{p'}(B_\rho)} &\leq \kappa (\| |x|^{-\lambda} \psi_\eta qu \|_{L^p(B_\rho)} + \| |x|^{-\lambda} \psi_\eta P \cdot \nabla u \|_{L^p(B_\rho)}) \\ &\quad + \kappa \rho^{-\lambda} \| \Delta v \|_{L^p(B)} + \kappa c_0 \eta^{-(\lambda+2)} (\| \nabla u \|_{L^2(B_{2\eta})} + \| u \|_{L^2(B_{2\eta})}). \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \| |x|^{-\lambda} \psi_\eta qu \|_{L^p(B_\rho)} &\leq \| q \|_{L^{\frac{n}{2}}(B_\rho)} \| |x|^{-\lambda} \psi_\eta u \|_{L^{p'}(B_\rho)} \\ \| |x|^{-\lambda} \psi_\eta P \cdot \nabla u \|_{L^p(B_\rho)} &\leq \| P \|_{L^n(B_\rho, \mathbb{C}^n)} \| |x|^{-\lambda} \psi_\eta \nabla u \|_{L^2(B_\rho)}, \end{aligned}$$

if  $q \in \underline{Q}$  and  $\| P \|_{L^n(B_\rho, \mathbb{C}^n)} \leq \mathbf{k}$ , for some constant  $\mathbf{k} > 0$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \| |x|^{-\lambda} \psi_\eta u \|_{L^{p'}(B_\rho)} &\leq 2\kappa(c_0 + \mathbf{k})\eta^{-(\lambda+2)} \| \nabla u \|_{L^2(B_{2\eta})} \\ &\quad + 2\kappa \rho^{-\lambda} \| \Delta v \|_{L^p(B)} + 2\kappa c_0 \eta^{-(\lambda+2)} \| u \|_{L^2(B_{2\eta})}. \end{aligned}$$

Armed with this inequality, we can proceed as in the proof of Theorem 1.1 to obtain the following result.

**Theorem 3.2.** *Let  $\mathbf{k} > 0$ ,  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\lambda \in \Lambda$ ,  $q \in \underline{Q}$ ,  $P \in L^n(B, \mathbb{C}^n)$  such that  $\| P \|_{L^n(B_\rho, \mathbb{C}^n)} \leq \mathbf{k}$ . For all  $u \in W^{2,p}(B) \cap O_m$  satisfying  $|\Delta u| \leq |qu| + |P \cdot \nabla u|$  in  $B$  and  $0 < \eta < \frac{\rho}{4}$ , we have*

$$\mathbf{c} \| u \|_{L^2(B_{\frac{\rho}{2}})} \leq 2^{-(\lambda+1)} \| \Delta(\phi u) \|_{L^p(B)} + 3^m \eta^{m-(\lambda+3)} \varrho_m(u),$$

where  $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{c}(n, \mathbf{k}, q_0, \rho) > 0$  is a constant.

We observe that the inequality  $|\Delta u| \leq |qu| + |P \cdot \nabla u|$  in  $B$ , from Theorem 3.2, can be replaced by the following:

$$c |\Delta u| \leq |x|^{-2+\alpha_0} |u| + |x|^{-1+\alpha_1} |\nabla u| \quad \text{in } B,$$

where  $c > 0$ ,  $\alpha_j > 0$ ,  $j = 0, 1$ , are constants. This follows easily by observing that  $|x|^{-2+\alpha_0} \in L^{\frac{n}{2}}(B)$  and  $|x|^{-1+\alpha_1} \in L^n(B)$ .

The corollary below follows from Theorem 3.2.

**Corollary 3.2.** *Let  $q \in L^{\frac{n}{2}}(B)$  and  $P \in L^n(B, \mathbb{C}^n)$ . If  $u \in W^{2,p}(B)$  is such that  $|\Delta u| \leq |qu| + |P \cdot \nabla u|$  in  $B$  and  $u$  vanishes of infinite order at 0, then  $u = 0$  in a neighborhood  $V$  of 0.*

Corollary 3.2 with  $P = 0$  corresponds to [2, Theorem 6.3]. We also note that Corollary 3.2 does not hold in general when  $n = 2$  (see [7, Theorem 2]).

**3.3. Quantitative SUCP for an arbitrary bounded domain.** Let  $\Omega$  be a bounded domain of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $x_0 \in \Omega$ , and  $d := \text{dist}(x_0, \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega)$ . Let  $B_r(x_0)$  denote the open ball centered at  $x_0$  with radius  $r > 0$ , and set

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{Q} &:= \{\tilde{q} \in L^{\frac{n}{2}}(\Omega); \|\tilde{q}\|_{L^2(B_d(x_0))} \leq \varsigma\}, \\ \tilde{\varrho}_m(\tilde{u}) &:= \sup\{\eta^{-m}\|\tilde{u}\|_{L^2(B_\eta(x_0))}; 0 < \eta < d\}, \quad \tilde{u} \in L^2(\Omega), m \in \mathbb{N}, \\ \tilde{O}_m &:= \{\tilde{u} \in L^2(\Omega); \tilde{\varrho}_m(\tilde{u}) < \infty\}.\end{aligned}$$

For  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\tilde{u} \in W^{2,p}(\Omega) \cap \tilde{O}_m$  and  $\tilde{q} \in \tilde{Q}$ , define

$$u(x) = \tilde{u}(x_0 + dx), \quad q(x) = d^2\tilde{q}(x_0 + dx), \quad x \in B.$$

We verify that  $u \in W^{2,p}(B) \cap O_m$ ,  $q \in Q$ , with

$$\|q\|_{L^{\frac{n}{2}}(B)} = \|\tilde{q}\|_{L^{\frac{n}{2}}(B_d(x_0))}, \quad \varrho_m(u) = d^{m-n/2}\tilde{\varrho}_m(\tilde{u})$$

and

$$(\Delta + q)u = d^2(\Delta + \tilde{q}(x_0 + d\cdot))\tilde{u}(x_0 + d\cdot) \quad \text{in } B.$$

Let  $0 < \eta < \frac{\rho}{4}$ . Applying Theorem 1.1, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{c}\|u\|_{L^2(B_{\frac{\rho}{2}})} &\leq \eta^{-\lambda}\|(\Delta + q)u\|_{L^p(B)} \\ &\quad + 2^{-(\lambda+1)}\|(\Delta + q)(\phi u)\|_{L^p(B)} + 3^m\eta^{m-(\lambda+3)}\varrho_m(u).\end{aligned}$$

Here and henceforth,  $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{c}(n, r_0, \vartheta) > 0$  denotes a generic constant. Therefore, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{c}d^{-\frac{n}{2}}\|\tilde{u}\|_{L^2(B_{\frac{d\rho}{2}})} &\leq d^{2-\frac{n}{p}}\eta^{-\lambda}\|(\Delta + q)\tilde{u}\|_{L^p(B_d(x_0))} \\ &\quad + 2^{-(\lambda+1)}d^{2-\frac{n}{p}}\|(\Delta + \tilde{q})(\tilde{\phi}\tilde{u})\|_{L^p(B_d(x_0))} + 3^m d^{m-\frac{n}{2}}\eta^{m-(\lambda+3)}\tilde{\varrho}_m(\tilde{u}),\end{aligned}$$

where  $\tilde{\phi}(y) = \phi(\frac{y-x_0}{d})$ ,  $y \in B_d(x_0)$ . In summary, we have proved the following theorem.

**Theorem 3.3.** *There exists a constant  $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{c}(n, r_0, \vartheta, d) > 0$  such that for all  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\lambda \in \Lambda$ ,  $\tilde{q} \in \tilde{Q}$ ,  $\tilde{u} \in W^{2,p}(\Omega) \cap \tilde{O}_m$  and  $0 < \eta < \frac{\rho}{4}$ , we have*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{c}\|\tilde{u}\|_{L^2(B_{\frac{d\rho}{2}}(x_0))} &\leq \eta^{-\lambda}\|(\Delta + \tilde{q})\tilde{u}\|_{L^p(B_d(x_0))} \\ &\quad + 2^{-(\lambda+1)}\|(\Delta + \tilde{q})(\tilde{\phi}\tilde{u})\|_{L^p(B_d(x_0))} + (3d)^m\eta^{m-(\lambda+3)}\tilde{\varrho}_m(\tilde{u}).\end{aligned}$$

Theorem 3.3 together with [1, Theorem 1.2 and comments in Section 1.3] yield the following global quantitative SUCP, where

$$\tilde{\mathbf{Q}} := \left\{ \tilde{q} \in L^n(\Omega); \|\tilde{q}\|_{L^n(B_d(x_0))} \leq |B_d(x_0)|^{-\frac{1}{n}\varsigma} \right\} \quad (\subset \tilde{Q}).$$

**Theorem 3.4.** *Assume that  $\Omega$  is  $C^{1,1}$ . Let  $0 < s, t < \frac{1}{2}$ . For all  $0 < r < 1$ ,  $0 < \eta < \frac{\rho}{4}$ ,  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\lambda \in \Lambda$ ,  $\tilde{q} \in \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}$  and  $u \in H^2(\Omega) \cap \tilde{O}_m$  we have*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{c}\|\tilde{u}\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}+t}(\Omega)} &\leq r^\zeta\|\tilde{u}\|_{H^2(\Omega)} \\ &\quad + e^{\mathbf{b}r^{-\nu}}\left(\eta^{-\lambda}\|(\Delta + \tilde{q})\tilde{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\right. \\ &\quad \left. + 2^{-(\lambda+1)}\|(\Delta + \tilde{q})(\tilde{\phi}\tilde{u})\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + (3d)^m\eta^{m-(\lambda+3)}\tilde{\varrho}_m(\tilde{u})\right),\end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{c}(n, s, t, r_0, \vartheta, \Omega, x_0, d) > 0$ ,  $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{b}(n, s, t, r_0, \vartheta, \Omega, x_0, d) > 0$ ,  $\nu = \nu(n, \Omega) > 0$  are constants and  $\zeta = \min\left(\frac{\frac{1}{2}-t}{1+t}, \frac{s}{4}\right)$ .

## APPENDIX A. PROOF OF LEMMA 1.1

Let  $u \in C_0^\infty(\dot{B})$ ,  $\lambda \in \Lambda$  and  $q \in L^{\frac{n}{2}}(B)$  satisfying

$$(A.1) \quad 2\kappa\|q\|_{L^{\frac{n}{2}}(B)} \leq 1.$$

According to (1.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \| |x|^{-\lambda} u \|_{L^{p'}(B)} &\leq \kappa \| |x|^{-\lambda} (\Delta + q) u \|_{L^p(B)} + \kappa \| q |x|^{-\lambda} u \|_{L^p(B)} \\ &\leq \kappa \| |x|^{-\lambda} (\Delta + q) u \|_{L^p(B)} + \kappa \| q \|_{L^{\frac{n}{2}}(B)} \| |x|^{-\lambda} u \|_{L^{p'}(B)}, \end{aligned}$$

which, combined with (A.1), gives

$$(A.2) \quad \| |x|^{-\lambda} u \|_{L^{p'}(B)} \leq 2\kappa \| |x|^{-\lambda} (\Delta + q) u \|_{L^p(B)}.$$

Let  $\mathbf{R}$  be the set consisting of the constants  $r > 0$  for which there exists  $\kappa_r > 0$  such that for all  $u \in C_0^\infty(\dot{B})$ ,  $\lambda \in \Lambda$  and  $q \in \mathbf{B}_r$ , we have

$$(A.3) \quad \| |x|^{-\lambda} u \|_{L^{p'}(B)} \leq \kappa_r \| |x|^{-\lambda} (\Delta + q) u \|_{L^p(B)}.$$

By (A.2),  $(0, (2\kappa)^{-1}] \subset \mathbf{R}$ . Furthermore, we verify that if  $0 < r' < r$  and  $r \in \mathbf{R}$ , then  $r' \in \mathbf{R}$ . That is  $\mathbf{R}$  is an interval. We now show that  $\mathbf{R} = ]0, r_*[$ , where  $r_* = \sup \mathbf{R}$ . For this, let  $r \in \mathbf{R}$  and  $r_1 = r + (2\kappa_r)^{-1}$ . For all  $u \in C_0^\infty(\dot{B})$ ,  $\lambda \in \Lambda$  and  $q \in \mathbf{B}_{r_1}$ , using

$$q = \frac{r}{r_1} q + \frac{(2\kappa_r)^{-1}}{r_1} q,$$

and proceeding as for (A.2), we obtain from (A.3)

$$\| |x|^{-\lambda} u \|_{L^{p'}(B)} \leq 2\kappa_r \| |x|^{-\lambda} (\Delta + q) u \|_{L^p(B)}.$$

That is  $r_1 \in \mathbf{R}$  and hence  $\mathbf{R}$  is an open interval. The proof is complete.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Choulli M. : Uniqueness of continuation for semilinear elliptic equations. Partial Differ. Equ. Appl. 5, 22 (2024). [3](#), [4](#), [9](#)
- [2] Jerison, D. ; Kenig, C. E. : Unique continuation and absence of positive eigenvalues for Schrödinger operators. Ann. of Math. (2) 121 (1985), no. 3, 463-494. [1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [8](#)
- [3] Koch H. ; Tataru, D. : Carleman estimates and unique continuation for second-order elliptic equations with nonsmooth coefficients. Commun. Pure Appl. Math. 54 (3) (2001), 339-360. [1](#), [2](#), [3](#)
- [4] Malinnikova E. ; Vessella S. : Quantitative uniqueness for elliptic equations with singular lower order terms. Math. Ann. 353 (4) (2012), 1157-1181. [3](#)
- [5] Regbaoui, R. : Unique continuation for differential equations of Schrödinger's type. Comm. Anal. Geom. 7 (2) (1999), 303-323. [1](#)
- [6] Sogge, C. D. : Strong uniqueness theorems for second order elliptic differential equations. Amer. J. Math. 112 (6) (1990), 943-984. [1](#), [2](#)
- [7] Wolff, T. H. : Note on counter examples in strong unique continuation problems. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 114 (2) (1992), 351-356. [8](#)
- [8] Wolff, T. H. : Recent work on sharp estimates in second order elliptic unique continuation problems. Fourier analysis and partial differential equations (Miraflores de la Sierra, 1992), 99-128. Studies in Advanced Mathematics. CRC, Boca Raton, Fla., 1995. [1](#)

UNIVERSITÉ DE LORRAINE

*Email address:* mourad.choulli@univ-lorraine.fr