

# A SHARP STABILITY ESTIMATE IN TENSOR TOMOGRAPHY

PLAMEN STEFANOV

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $(M, g)$  be a compact Riemannian manifold with boundary. The geodesic ray transform  $I$  of symmetric 2-tensor fields  $f$  is given by

$$(1) \quad If(\gamma) = \int f_{ij}(\gamma(s))\dot{\gamma}^i(s)\dot{\gamma}^j(s) ds,$$

where  $\gamma$  runs over the set of all geodesics with endpoints on  $\partial M$ . All *potential fields*  $dv$  given by  $(dv)_{ij} = \frac{1}{2}(\nabla_i v_j + \nabla_j v_i)$  with  $v = 0$  on  $\partial M$  belong to the kernel of  $I$ . The ray transform  $I$  is called *s-injective* if this is the only obstruction to injectivity, i.e., if  $If = 0$  implies that  $f$  is potential. S-injectivity can only hold under certain assumptions on  $(M, g)$ . A natural conjecture is that it holds on *simple* manifolds, see the definition below. So far it is known to be true for some classes of simple manifolds only, including generic simple manifolds, see [11, 13, 4, 16].

In the cases where s-injectivity is known, there is also a stability estimate that is not sharp. In [11], it is of conditional type with a loss of a derivative, see (2) below. In [16], the estimate is not of conditional type but there is still a loss of a derivative, see (3) below. On the other hand, if  $f$  is a function, or an 1-tensor (an 1-form), there is a sharp estimate, see [15]. The purpose of this paper is to prove a sharp estimate for the ray transform of 2-tensors.

The geodesic ray transform is a linearization of the boundary distance function and plays an important role in the inverse kinematic problem (known also as boundary or lens rigidity), see e.g., [11, 15, 18, 17] and the references there. There, one wants to recover  $(M, g)$  given the distance function on  $\partial M \times \partial M$  or the scattering relation  $\sigma : (x, \xi) \mapsto (y, \eta)$  that maps a given  $x \in \partial M$  and a given incident direction  $\xi$  to the exit point  $y$  and the exit direction  $\eta$  of the geodesic issued from  $(x, \xi)$ .

## 2. MAIN RESULTS

**Definition 1.** *We say that a compact Riemannian manifold  $(M, g)$  with boundary is simple if*

- (a) *The boundary  $\partial M$  is strictly convex, i.e.,  $\langle \nabla_\xi \nu, \xi \rangle > 0$  for each  $\xi \in T_x(\partial M)$  where  $\nu$  is the unit outward normal to the boundary.*
- (b) *The map  $\exp_x : \exp_x^{-1} M \rightarrow M$  is a diffeomorphism for each  $x \in M$ .*

---

Partly supported by NSF.

Condition (b) implies that each pair of points is connected by a unique geodesic depending smoothly on the endpoints. It also implies that  $M$  is diffeomorphic to a ball, so we can work in one fixed chart only. We will fix  $M$  fixed, and choose different metrics on it. If  $(M, g)$  is simple, then we call  $g$  simple.

It is known [11], see also [16], that each symmetric 2-tensor field  $f \in L^2(M)$  admits an orthogonal decomposition

$$f = f^s + dv,$$

where  $v$  is 1-form in  $H_0^1(M)$  (vanishing on  $\partial M$ ), and  $f$  is divergence free, i.e.,  $\delta f = 0$ , where  $(\delta f)_j = \nabla^i f_{ij}$ , and  $\nabla$  is the covariant derivative. The 1-form  $v$  solves  $\delta dv = \delta f$ ,  $v|_{\partial M} = 0$ . The latter is an elliptic system and the Dirichlet boundary condition is a regular one for it, see [11, 16]. S-injectivity then is equivalent to the following:  $If = 0$  implies  $f^s = 0$ .

Set

$$\partial_{\pm} SM := \{(x, \omega) \in TM; x \in \partial M, |\omega| = 1, \pm \langle \omega, \nu \rangle > 0\},$$

where  $\nu(x)$  is the outer unit normal to  $\partial M$  (normal w.r.t.  $g$ , of course). Here and in what follows, we denote by  $\langle \omega, \nu \rangle$  the inner product of the vectors  $\omega, \nu$ , and  $|\omega|$  is meant w.r.t.  $g$ . Let  $\gamma_{x, \omega}(t)$  be the (unit speed) geodesic through  $(x, \omega)$ , defined on its maximal interval contained in  $[0, \infty)$ . One can then parametrize all maximal (directed) geodesics in  $M$  by points on  $\partial_{-} SM$ , and with some abuse of notation we denote  $If(x, \omega) = If(\gamma_{x, \omega})$ .

One of the methods to study s-injectivity of  $I$  is the energy estimates method that goes back to Mukhometov [8, 6, 7], see also [2], where, for simple manifolds, injectivity of  $I$  acting on functions  $f$  is proved. S-injectivity (injectivity up to  $d\phi$ , where  $\phi = 0$  on  $\partial M$ ) for 1-forms  $f$  is established in [1] by a modification of the same method. The case of 2-tensors is harder. Using the so-called Pestov identity, Sharafutdinov [11] showed that  $I$  is s-injective under an explicit a priori bound on the positive part of the curvature of  $g$ , that in particular implies simplicity of  $g$  but it is not equivalent to it. This generalized earlier results on negatively curved manifolds [9]. The Pestov-Sharafutdinov approach implies the following stability estimate [11] under the small curvature assumption:

$$(2) \quad \|f^s\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq C \left( \|j_{\nu} f|_{\partial M}\|_{L^2(\partial M)} \|If\|_{L^2(\partial_{-} SM)} + \|If\|_{H^1(\partial_{-} SM)}^2 \right), \quad \forall f \in H^1(M),$$

where  $(j_{\nu} f)_i = f_{ij} \nu^j$ . The Sobolev spaces on the r.h.s. are taken with respect to the induced measure  $d\sigma(x, \omega)$ . In semigeodesic local coordinates  $x = (x', x^n)$ , the latter is given by  $d\sigma(x, \omega) = (\det g)^{1/2} dx^1 \dots dx^{n-1} (\det g)^{1/2} d\sigma_x(\omega)$ , where  $d\sigma_x(\omega) = \frac{1}{|\xi|} \left| \sum_{j=1}^n (-1)^{j-1} \xi^j d\xi^1 \wedge \dots \wedge \widehat{d\xi^j} \wedge \dots \wedge d\xi^n \right|$ .

This estimate is of conditional type — while it implies s-injectivity (under the curvature condition), it says that  $f^s$  is small if  $If$  is small *and* we have an a priori bound on  $f$ . Moreover, there is a loss of one derivative: the r.h.s. is finite under the condition that  $f \in H^1$ , while in the l.h.s., we have only the  $L^2$  norm of  $f^s$ .

In [15, 16, 18], the author and G. Uhlmann studied this problem from microlocal point of view. Introduce the following measure  $d\mu(x, \omega) = |\langle \nu, \omega \rangle| d\sigma(x, \omega)$  on  $\partial_{-} SM$ . It is easy to show that  $I : L^2(M) \rightarrow L^2(\partial_{-} SM, d\mu)$  is bounded [11] (the first space is a space of tensors, actually). The *normal operator*  $N = I^* I$  is well defined on  $L^2(M)$  then. We extend slightly  $M$  to a larger manifold with boundary  $M_1$  that is still simple so that  $M_1 \ni M$ . We extend tensors defined in  $M$  as zero to  $M_1$ . Then  $I : L^2(M_1) \rightarrow L^2(\partial_{-} SM_1, d\mu)$ , and one can define

$I^*I$  related to  $M_1$  that a priori is different from  $N$ . On the other hand, it is easy to see that when restricted to tensors supported in  $M$ , it coincides with  $N$ . Then  $N : L^2(M) \rightarrow L^2(M_1)$  is s-injective if and only if  $I$  is s-injective.

The main results in [15, 16] concerning the tensor tomography problem are the following. The operator  $I$  is s-injective for real analytic simple metrics. Moreover, the set of simple  $C^k$  metrics, where  $k \gg 1$  is fixed, for which  $I$  is s-injective, is open and dense in  $C^k$ . Therefore, we get s-injectivity for a generic set of simple metrics. Next, for any simple  $g$  for which  $I$  is s-injective, one has the stability estimate

$$(3) \quad \|f^s\|_{L^2(M)} \leq C \|Nf\|_{\tilde{H}^2(M_1)}, \quad \forall f \in H^1(M).$$

Here  $\tilde{H}^2(M)$  is defined as follows. To the usual  $H^1(M_1)$  norm, we add a term of the kind

$$\sum_{\alpha < n} \|\partial_{x^\alpha} \nabla f\|_{L^2(U)} + \|x^n \partial_{x^n} \nabla f\|_{L^2(U)},$$

where  $(x', x^n)$  are semigeodesic local coordinates near  $\partial M$ , and  $U$  is any fixed neighborhood of  $\partial M$ . The constant  $C$  in (3) can be chosen locally uniform for  $g \in C^k$ .

A natural conjecture is that  $I$  is injective for all simple metrics. This is still an open problem. For any simple metric however, we have an estimate of the kind (3) plus the term  $\|Kf\|_{L^2(M)}$ , where  $K$  is a smoothing operator. In Proposition 1 below we prove a sharper estimate of this kind. It is also known that the solenoidal tensors on the kernel of  $I$  form a finitely dimensional space of smooth tensors [12, 15, 16, 3, 10]. This also follows directly from the analysis below, since the inversion problem is reduced to a Fredholm one.

Estimate (3) is not of conditional type anymore but there is still a loss of one derivative. Indeed,  $N$  is a  $\Psi$ DO of order  $-1$ , and the natural norm on the r.h.s. of (3) would be the  $H^1(M_1)$  one. Our main result shows that this is the case, indeed.

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $g \in C^k(M)$ ,  $k \gg 1$ , be a simple metric on  $M$ , and assume that  $I$  is s-injective.*

(a) *Then*

$$(4) \quad \|f^s\|_{L^2(M)}/C \leq \|Nf\|_{H^1(M_1)} \leq C \|f^s\|_{L^2(M)}$$

*with some  $C > 0$ .*

(b) *The constant  $C$  can be chosen uniformly under a small  $C^3(M)$  perturbation of  $g$ .*

As pointed out above, the s-injectivity assumption is generically true for simple metrics, and holds in particular for metrics close enough to analytic ones [16] or for metrics with an explicit bound on the curvature [11].

The new ingredient of the proof is the use of Korn's inequality [19, Collorary 5.12.3], see (13).

In [17], the author and G. Uhlmann considered manifolds that are not simple, with possible conjugate points, and studied the question of the s-injectivity on  $I$  known on a subset  $\Gamma$  of geodesics. The basic assumption is that none of the geodesics in  $\Gamma$  has conjugate points, and the conormal bundles of all  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  cover  $T^*M$ . Under that assumption, results about s-injectivity for generic simple metrics, including analytic ones are obtained. A stability estimate of the kind (3) is also proven there, where  $N$  is modified via a smooth cut-off that

restricts the geodesics to  $\Gamma$ . Without going into detail, we will only mention that Theorem 1 generalizes to that case, i.e., the stability estimate in [17] can be written in the form (4) as well.

Theorem 1 allows us to reduce the smoothness requirement in the generic result in [16].

**Corollary 1.** *There exists a dense open set of simple metrics in  $C^3(M)$  so that the corresponding ray transform  $I$  is s-injective (and (4) holds).*

Note that we are not claiming that the set of all  $C^3(M)$  simple metrics with an s-injective  $I$  is open. Our success with proving estimate (4) that implies the openness depends on our ability to show that the problem can be reduced to a Fredholm one. We do this by constructing a parametrix, and this requires certain number  $k$  of derivatives of  $g$ , at least  $k = 2n + 1$ . Once we have (4), we use the singular operator theory to perturb (4) near any  $g_0 \in C^k$  with an s-injective  $I$ , by  $C^3$  perturbations.

### 3. PROOFS.

**3.1. Proof of Theorem 1(a).** We start with recalling some facts from [15, 16]. We show first that

$$(Nf)^{i'j'}(x) = 2 \int_{S_x M} \omega^{i'} \omega^{j'} \int_0^\infty f_{ij}(\gamma_{x,\omega}(t)) \dot{\gamma}_{x,\omega}^i(t) \dot{\gamma}_{x,\omega}^j(t) dt d\sigma_x(\omega),$$

where  $f$  is supported in  $M$ , and we work in  $M_1$ . Performing a change of variables, we get the integral representation

$$(5) \quad (Nf)_{kl}(x) = \frac{2}{\sqrt{\det g(x)}} \int \frac{f^{ij}(y)}{\rho(x,y)^{n-1}} \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial y^i} \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial y^j} \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial x^k} \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial x^l} \Big| \det \frac{\partial^2(\rho^2/2)}{\partial x \partial y} \Big| dy, \quad x \in M_1,$$

where  $\rho$  is the distance function. This form of  $N$  show that  $N$  is a  $\Psi$ DO of order  $-1$  on the interior of  $M_1$ . Its principal symbol is, see [16, 14],

$$(6) \quad \sigma_p(N)^{ijkl}(x, \xi) = 2\pi \int_{S_x M_1} \omega^i \omega^j \omega^k \omega^l \delta(\xi \cdot \omega) d\sigma_x(\omega),$$

where  $\xi \cdot \omega = \xi_i \omega^i$ . This formula generalizes in an obvious way to tensors of any order. It follows now easily that  $N$  is elliptic on tensors satisfying  $\xi^i f_{ij} = 0$  (solenoidal tensors in the Fourier representation), and vanishes on tensors of the type  $\frac{1}{2}(\xi_i v_j + \xi_j v_i)$  (potential tensors in the Fourier representation). This fact allows us to construct a first order  $\Psi$ DO  $Q$  so that for any  $f \in L^2(M)$ ,

$$(7) \quad QNf = f_{M_1}^s + Kf$$

in  $M_1$ , where  $f_{M_1}^s$  is the solenoidal projection of  $f$  (extended as zero outside  $M$ ) in  $M_1$ , and  $K$  is a compact operator. We can assume that the kernel of  $Q$  has a support close enough to the diagonal. The need to work in  $M_1$  is due to the fact that we can use the (standard)  $\Psi$ DO calculus in an open set only. For more details, we refer to [15, 16]. Note that this construction needs only a finitely smooth metric  $g \in C^k(M)$ ,  $k \gg 1$ , that we extend to  $M_1$ . If we want  $K$  to be infinitely smoothing, then we need  $g \in C^\infty(M)$ .

The next step is to construct  $f^s$ , given  $f_{M_1}^s$ . This can be done in an explicit way as follows. Note that

$$(8) \quad f_{M_1}^s = Ef^s - dw \quad \text{in } M_1,$$

where  $E$  is the extension as zero to  $M_1 \setminus M$ , and  $w$  solves the elliptic system

$$(9) \quad \delta dw = \delta Ef^s, \quad w|_{\partial M_1} = 0.$$

The distribution  $\delta Ef^s$  is supported on  $\partial M$ , and the solution  $w$  exists in  $H_0^1(M_1)$ , see [16] and Lemma 1 below. In particular,  $w|_{\partial M} \in H^{1/2}(\partial M)$  is well-defined. If we know  $w|_{\partial M} \in H^{1/2}(\partial M)$ , we can recover  $w$  in  $M$  because  $\delta dw = 0$  in the interior of  $M$ , by (9). If we recover  $w$  in  $M$ , we recover  $f^s$  as well, in terms of  $f_{M_1}^s$ , by (8). Our goal therefore is to recover  $w|_{\partial M}$  first.

We first determine  $w$  in  $M_1 \setminus M$ , up to a smoothing term, by the relation

$$(10) \quad f_{M_1}^s = -dw \quad \text{in } M_1 \setminus M,$$

see (8). Since  $w = 0$  on  $\partial M_1$ , we can integrate the identity

$$(11) \quad \frac{d}{dt} w_i(\gamma) \dot{\gamma}^i = [dw(\gamma)]_{ij} \dot{\gamma}^i \dot{\gamma}^j$$

along geodesics in  $M_1 \setminus M$  connecting points on  $\partial M_1$  and  $\partial M$  to recover  $w$  on  $\partial M$ . Let  $\tau_+(x, \xi) > 0$  be characterized by  $\gamma_{x, \xi}(t) \in \partial M_1$  for  $t = \tau_+(x, \xi)$ . Then we get

$$w_i(x) \xi^i = \int_0^{\tau_+(x, \xi)} [f_{M_1}^s]_{ij}(\gamma_{x, \xi}(t)) \dot{\gamma}_{x, \xi}^i(t) \dot{\gamma}_{x, \xi}^j(t) dt,$$

for any  $(x, \xi)$  so that  $\{\gamma_{x, \xi}(t), 0 \leq t \leq \tau_+(x, \xi)\}$  does not intersect  $M$ . That also implies easily the following non-sharp estimate

$$(12) \quad \|w\|_{L^2(M_1 \setminus M)} \leq C \|dw\|_{L^2(M)} \leq C \|f_{M_1}^s\|_{L^2(M_1 \setminus M)},$$

see also [11] for the first inequality. We refer to [15, 16] for more detail. This approach provides also a constructive way to reduce the problem to a Fredholm one. For the proof of the theorem however, this is not needed. The new ingredient in this work is that we apply Korn's inequality [19, Collorary 5.12.3],

$$(13) \quad \|w\|_{H^1(M_1 \setminus M)} \leq C (\|dw\|_{L^2(M_1 \setminus M)} + \|w\|_{L^2(M_1 \setminus M)}).$$

This inequality is a consequence of the fact that the Neumann boundary conditions for  $\delta d$  are regular ones. Apply the trace theorem, (13), (12), and (10) to get

$$\|w\|_{H^{1/2}(\partial M)} \leq C \|w\|_{H^1(M_1 \setminus M)} \leq C' \|f_{M_1}^s\|_{L^2(M_1 \setminus M)}.$$

Now, since  $w$  solves the elliptic PDE  $\delta dw = 0$  in  $M_1$ , we get

$$(14) \quad \|w\|_{H^1(M)} \leq C \|f_{M_1}^s\|_{L^2(M_1 \setminus M)},$$

see Lemma 1 below. This, together with (8) yields,

$$(15) \quad \|f^s\|_{L^2(M)} \leq \|f_{M_1}^s\|_{L^2(M)} + C \|f_{M_1}^s\|_{L^2(M_1 \setminus M)} \leq C (\|Nf\|_{H^1(M_1)} + \|Kf\|_{L^2(M_1)}).$$

It is worth noting that without the a priori s-injectivity assumption, we got the following.

**Proposition 1.** *For any  $l > 0$ , there exists  $k > 0$  so that for any simple metric  $g \in C^k(M)$ ,*

$$\|f^s\|_{L^2(M)} \leq C \left( \|Nf\|_{H^1(M_1)} + \|f\|_{H^{-s}(M)} \right), \quad \forall f \in L^2(M).$$

Estimate (15) (or Proposition 1), together with [19, Proposition 5.3.1], implies that if  $I$ , and therefore,  $N$  is s-injective, then there is an estimate as above, with a different  $C$ , with the last term missing. This completes the proof of Theorem 1(a).

We return to the elliptic regularity estimate (14). If  $\delta d$  is replaced by the Laplace operator, then (14) follows from [19, Theorem 5.1.3]. If we raise the Sobolev regularity everywhere in (17) below by 1, this just follows from the fact that the Dirichlet conditions are regular for  $\delta b$ . In our case, we follow the proof of [19, Theorem 5.1.3] to get the following.

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $u \in H^{-1}(M)$ ,  $\alpha \in H^{1/2}(\partial M)$  be 1-forms. Then the boundary value problem*

$$(16) \quad \delta dw = u \quad \text{in } M, \quad w|_{\partial M} = \alpha$$

*has a unique solution  $w \in H^1(M)$ , and the following estimate holds*

$$(17) \quad \|w\|_{H^1(M)} \leq C \left( \|u\|_{H^{-1}(M)} + \|\alpha\|_{H^{1/2}(\partial M)} \right)$$

*Proof.* By a standard argument, first extend  $\alpha \in H^{1/2}(\partial M)$  to  $\tilde{\alpha} \in H^1(M)$  by means of a fixed bounded extension operator, and then study  $u - \tilde{\alpha}$  that satisfies homogeneous boundary conditions. This shows that we can assume that  $\alpha = 0$ , then the boundary condition is equivalent to  $w \in H_0^1(M)$ .

Note first that  $\|w\|_{H^1(M)}$  and  $\|dw\|_{L^2(M)}$  are equivalent norms on  $H_0^1(M)$ , by (13) and the Poincaré type of inequality for  $dw$ , see the first inequality in (12). The existence part of the theorem in the case  $\alpha = 0$  then follows as in [[19, Proposition 5.1.1].

To prove the stability estimate, given  $w \in H_0^1(M)$ , integrate by parts to get

$$\|w\|_{H^1}^2 / C \leq \|dw\|_{L^2}^2 = -(\delta dw, w) \leq \|\delta dw\|_{H^{-1}} \|w\|_{H^1}.$$

That implies (16) when  $\alpha = 0$ , and completes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

*Remark 1.* Lemma 1 in particular justifies the solenoidal–potential decomposition of tensors  $f$  with  $L^2$  only regularity, see also [16]. Then  $f = f^s + dv$  with  $v \in H_0^1$  solving  $\delta dv = \delta f$ .

**3.2. Proof of Theorem 1(b) and Corollary 1.** To prove Corollary 1, we define the set  $\mathcal{G}$  of simple metrics as follows: near any real analytic simple  $g$ , we choose a small enough neighborhood in the  $C^3(M)$  topology, so that (4) still holds. Clearly, this set is open and dense. It remains to prove that this can be done, which is the statement of Theorem 1(b).

We will prove a bit more. Fix a simple  $g_0 \in C^3(M)$  (not necessarily real analytic) and assume that (4) holds; in particular, the corresponding ray transform  $I$  is s-injective. We will show that there exists  $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$  so that for any other  $g$  with  $\|g - g_0\|_{C^3(M)} < \epsilon$ , (4) still holds with possibly a different constant  $C > 0$ , independent on  $g_0$  and  $\epsilon$ .

We will apply first [5, Proposition 4]. There, the weighted ray transform

$$I_w f(\gamma) = \int w(\gamma(s), \dot{\gamma}(s)) f(\gamma(s)) ds$$

of functions is studied. The estimate in [5, Proposition 4] compares two such transforms with different weights and different metrics (actually, we study more general families of curves

in [5]). In our context, we apply [5, Proposition 4] to each  $f_{ij}\hat{\gamma}^i\hat{\gamma}^j$ , before summing up by treating  $\hat{\gamma}^i\hat{\gamma}^j$  as a weight. All we need to show is that the generators of the geodesic flows related to  $g_0$  and  $g$  are  $O(\epsilon)$  close in  $C^2$ . This follows from our assumption  $\|g - g_0\|_{C^3(M)} < \epsilon$ . Then we get

$$(18) \quad \|(N_g - N_{g_0})f\|_{H^1(M_1)} \leq C\epsilon\|f\|_{L^2(M)}.$$

To perturb the l.h.s. of (4), we need to compare the solenoidal projections  $f_{g_0}^s$  and  $f_g^s$  of  $f$  related to  $g_0$  and  $g$ , respectively. Recall that  $f^s = f - d(\delta d)_D^{-1}\delta f$ , where  $(\delta d)_D$  is the Dirichlet realization of the elliptic operator  $\delta d$ . By [16, Lemma 1],  $(\delta d)_D^{-1} : H^{-1}(M) \rightarrow H_0^1(M)$  depends continuously on  $g \in C^1(M)$ . The same is true for  $d$  and  $\delta$  in the corresponding spaces. Therefore,

$$(19) \quad \|f_g^s - f_{g_0}^s\|_{L^2(M)} \leq C_0\epsilon\|f\|_{L^2(M)}.$$

It is enough to prove (4) for  $f$  solenoidal, w.r.t.  $g$ , so, let us assume that. Then by (18), and our assumption that (4) holds for  $g_0$ ,

$$\|f_{g_0}^s\|_{L^2(M)} \leq C\|N_{g_0}f\|_{H^1(M_1)} \leq C\epsilon\|f\|_{L^2(M)} + C\|N_gf\|_{H^1(M_1)}.$$

Apply (19), where  $f_g^s = f$  to get

$$(1 - C_0\epsilon)\|f\|_{L^2(M)} \leq C\epsilon\|f\|_{L^2(M)} + C\|N_gf\|_{H^1(M_1)}.$$

Therefore, if  $\epsilon \ll 1$ , we still have (4). This completes the proof of Theorem 1(b). Now, Corollary 1 follows immediately.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Y. E. Anikonov and V. G. Romanov. On uniqueness of determination of a form of first degree by its integrals along geodesics. *J. Inverse Ill-Posed Probl.*, 5(6):487–490 (1998), 1997.
- [2] I. N. Bernstein and M. L. Gerver. A problem of integral geometry for a family of geodesics and an inverse kinematic seismics problem. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, 243(2):302–305, 1978.
- [3] E. Chappa. On the characterization of the kernel of the geodesic X-ray transform. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 358(11):4793–4807 (electronic), 2006.
- [4] N. S. Dairbekov. Integral geometry problem for nontrapping manifolds. *Inverse Problems*, 22(2):431–445, 2006.
- [5] B. Frigyik, P. Stefanov, and G. Uhlmann. The X-ray transform for a generic family of curves and weights. *J. Geom. Anal.*, 18(1):81–97, 2008.
- [6] R. G. Muhometov. The reconstruction problem of a two-dimensional Riemannian metric, and integral geometry. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, 232(1):32–35, 1977.
- [7] R. G. Muhometov. On a problem of reconstructing Riemannian metrics. *Sibirsk. Mat. Zh.*, 22(3):119–135, 237, 1981.
- [8] R. G. Mukhometov. On the problem of integral geometry (Russian). *Math. problems of geophysics, Akad. Nauk SSSR, Sibirsk., Otdel., Vychisl., Tsentr, Novosibirsk*, 6(2):212–242, 1975.
- [9] L. N. Pestov and V. A. Sharafutdinov. Integral geometry of tensor fields on a manifold of negative curvature. *Sibirsk. Mat. Zh.*, 29(3):114–130, 221, 1988.
- [10] V. Sharafutdinov, M. Skokan, and G. Uhlmann. Regularity of ghosts in tensor tomography. *J. Geom. Anal.*, 15(3):499–542, 2005.
- [11] V. A. Sharafutdinov. *Integral geometry of tensor fields*. Inverse and Ill-posed Problems Series. VSP, Utrecht, 1994.
- [12] V. A. Sharafutdinov. A finiteness theorem for the ray transform on a Riemannian manifold. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk*, 355(2):167–169, 1997.

- [13] V. A. Sharafutdinov. Ray transform on Riemannian manifolds, lecture notes, UW–Seattle. available at: <http://www.ima.umn.edu/talks/workshops/7-16-27.2001/sharafutdinov/>, 1999.
- [14] P. Stefanov. Microlocal approach to tensor tomography and boundary and lens rigidity. *Serdica Math. J.*, 34(1):67–112, 2008.
- [15] P. Stefanov and G. Uhlmann. Stability estimates for the X-ray transform of tensor fields and boundary rigidity. *Duke Math. J.*, 123(3):445–467, 2004.
- [16] P. Stefanov and G. Uhlmann. Boundary rigidity and stability for generic simple metrics. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 18(4):975–1003 (electronic), 2005.
- [17] P. Stefanov and G. Uhlmann. Local lens rigidity with incomplete data for a class of non-simple riemannian manifolds. *submitted*, 2007.
- [18] P. Stefanov and G. Uhlmann. Integral geometry of tensor fields on a class of non-simple riemannian manifolds. *Amer. J. Math.*, 130(1):239–268, 2008.
- [19] M. E. Taylor. *Partial differential equations. I*, volume 115 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1996. Basic theory.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, PURDUE UNIVERSITY, WEST LAFAYETTE, IN 47907