

Towards the theory of integrable hyperbolic equations of third order

V.E. Adler, A.B. Shabat

19 June 2012

Abstract. The examples are considered of integrable hyperbolic equations of third order with two independent variables. In particular, an equation is found which admits as evolutionary symmetries the Krichever–Novikov equation and the modified Landau–Lifshitz system. The problem of choice of dynamical variables for the hyperbolic equations is discussed.

Keywords: hyperbolic pair, evolutionary symmetry, integrable hierarchy, Bäcklund variables, Korteweg–de Vries equation, Kaup equation, Krichever–Novikov equation

MSC: 35L75, 35Q53, 37K10, 37K35

1 Introduction

An important class of nonlinear integrable equations consists of the hyperbolic ones

$$u_{xy} = h(x, y, u, u_x, u_y).$$

Historically, this is the type of equations which contains the very first integrable examples, the Liouville and the sine-Gordon equations. The modern concept of integrability based on the notion of the Lax pair arose first in the study of evolutionary equations of the KdV type, but its applicability to the hyperbolic equations was established very soon. Indeed, both classes of equations are in close relation and existence of a hierarchy of evolutionary symmetries serves as the most convenient test (or a definition) of integrability of hyperbolic equations. In particular, some important classification results were obtained within the symmetry approach [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6], although the problem of description of the integrable case is not completely solved so far (see its review in [7]).

The development of the theory shows, on the other hand, that in some cases the class of equations under consideration should be extended at least

to the third order hyperbolic equations

$$u_{xxy} = f(x, y, u, u_x, u_y, u_{xy}, u_{xx}).$$

For instance, the hyperbolic symmetry for the KdV equation itself is of this form. This is the class of equations which we consider in this paper. Since it is not very well studied, hence we are not aimed to obtain any classification result or to derive the necessary integrability conditions. We restrict ourself by consideration of several interesting examples and discuss the problem of choice of dynamical variables for the equation.

Let us explain briefly the content of the article. Section 2 contains the main definitions, in particular, the notion of consistent pair of third order hyperbolic equations is introduced. These systems belong to an intermediate class between the second and the third order equations. Its consideration is necessary, since the presented examples demonstrate that systems of this type appears from third order equations under parametric degeneration.

Sections 3, 4 are devoted to the examples related to the KdV and the Kaup equations. These examples are not new, since the respective hyperbolic equations are equivalent to the Camassa–Holm and the Degasperis–Procesi [8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13] equations, up to the introducing potential and hodograph type transformations. However, our treatment contains some new features since the y -symmetries are considered as well. We also hope that it is of some methodological value providing an uniform approach to these examples.

Section 5 is a continuation of section 2. Here, we analyze the consistency condition for a pair of third order hyperbolic equations and introduce the notion of the Bäcklund variables. This provides an alternative and more convenient set of dynamical variables, not only for the consistent pair, but also for a single third order equation.

The main example is considered in section 6, completely in the Bäcklund variables. It is related to the Krichever–Novikov equation and seems to be new, since it hardly could be obtained by use of the standard set of dynamical variables.

2 Types of hyperbolic equations

As it was already said in Introduction, the second order hyperbolic equations in the light-cone variables

$$u_{xy} = h(x, y, u, u_x, u_y) \tag{1}$$

belong to the simplest and most well studied class of hyperbolic equations. The notion of higher order hyperbolic equations can be introduced in many ways which we do not discuss here, see e.g. [14]. The main object in this




Figure 1. Standard sets of dynamical variables for a hyperbolic second order equation, for a consistent pair and for a third order equation

paper is a particular class of third order hyperbolic equations with multiple characteristics, namely of the form

$$u_{xxy} = f(x, y, u, u_x, u_y, u_{xy}, u_{xx}). \quad (2)$$

For short, we refer to the above types of equations just as to the second and the third order hyperbolic equations. Another class of equations studied in the paper consists of the systems of the following type.

Definition 1. The pair of third order hyperbolic equations

$$\begin{aligned} u_{xxy} &= f(x, y, u, u_x, u_y, u_{xy}, u_{xx}), \\ u_{xyy} &= g(x, y, u, u_x, u_y, u_{xy}, u_{yy}) \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

is called consistent if the identity holds

$$(D_y(f) - D_x(g)) \Big|_{\substack{u_{xxy}=f \\ u_{xyy}=g}} = 0. \quad (4)$$

Definition 2. A consistent pair (3) is called reducible if its general solution solves some one-parametric family of hyperbolic equations

$$u_{xy} = h(\alpha; x, y, u, u_x, u_y),$$

otherwise the pair is called irreducible.

Consistent systems of type (3) are rather delicate generalization of second order equations. This is clear from comparing the initial data for the Goursat problem. The role of the Goursat data for equation (1) can be played by a pair of functions $u(x, 0) = a(x)$, $u(0, y) = b(y)$ such that the consistency condition $a(0) = b(0)$ is fulfilled. In the case of system (3) just one additional value should be given, the mixed derivative in the origin: $u_{xy}(0, 0) = \text{const}$,

while in the case of equation (2) an additional function $u_x(0, y) = c(y)$ is required. The black disks on fig. 1 mark the dynamical variables for different types of equations under consideration, that is the set of derivatives in a point $\partial_x^m \partial_y^n(u)$ which can be chosen independently. We will call such sets the standard dynamical variables.

Definition 3. An equation of any type (1) or (2) or (3) is called integrable if it is compatible with an infinite hierarchy of evolutionary symmetries, that is equations of the form

$$u_t = f(x, y, [u]),$$

where the right hand side depends on an arbitrarily large finite number of dynamical variables for the hyperbolic equation under consideration.

This definition of integrability is standard enough. More formal definitions of the evolutionary symmetry and applications of this notion to the classification of the hyperbolic equations are discussed in details in the references cited and many other sources, so we will not stop here. We only recall two facts. First, even the existence of just one symmetry of high order with respect to derivatives is a very strong condition which seems to be equivalent to the existence of the whole hierarchy (no example of nontrivial equation is known which possesses only one higher symmetry). By this reason, we consider only few higher symmetries in the examples, omitting the proof that there are infinitely many. Second, in all known examples, the symmetry algebra is decomposed into two subalgebras containing derivatives with respect to x or y only. Each evolutionary symmetry is itself an integrable equation. This property is similar for all classes of equations under consideration, however one should bear in mind that y -symmetries for equations of type (2) correspond to the coupled systems with two dependent variables, for instance, u and $v = u_x$ (see examples in the remaining sections).

The notion of the consistent pair is the only thing from the above which may seem unusual and in order to illustrate it we conclude the section with several examples.

First, let us discuss the question about irreducibility. It is clear that a consistent pair can be obtained by differentiating an equation (1) and disguising the result with some identical transformation, for instance, the following equations are consistent:

$$u_{xxy} = D_x(h) + A(u_{xy} - h), \quad u_{xyy} = D_y(h) + A(u_{xy} - h)$$

where $h = h(x, y, u, u_x, u_y)$ and $A(z)$ is an arbitrary function. However, examples of such sort are reducible and therefore uninteresting. It is not clear at once how to construct an irreducible pair, and after several attempts one may suspect their existence. The following example shows that irreducible pairs exist indeed.

Example 1. Let us consider equations

$$u_{xxy} = \frac{u_{xy}u_{xx}}{u_x} + \frac{u_{xy}^2}{2u_y} + u_y, \quad u_{xyy} = \frac{u_{xy}u_{yy}}{u_y} + \frac{u_{xy}^2}{2u_x} + u_x. \quad (5)$$

It can be proved directly that identity (4) holds (a simple program for such kind of computations is presented in [Appendix](#)).

In order to determine whether this pair is reducible, let us replace the derivatives in virtue of an equation $u_{xy} = h(x, y, u, u_x, u_y)$ and see whether the obtained equations can hold identically with respect to the dynamical variables $u, u_x, u_{xx}, u_y, u_{yy}$. Collecting coefficients at u_{xx} in the first equation and at u_{yy} in the second one brings to relations

$$u_x h_{u_x} = h, \quad u_y h_{u_y} = h$$

which imply that function h must be of the form $h = u_x u_y H(x, y, u)$. Then, the first equation of the system turns into

$$u_x^2 (H^2 + 2H_u) + 2u_x H_x = 2.$$

Obviously, this equation cannot be satisfied by any function $H(x, y, u)$ (let alone one-parametric family), therefore pair (5) is irreducible.

This pair is integrable as well, being compatible with the Schwarz–KdV equation, for both characteristic directions:

$$u_t = u_{xxx} - \frac{3u_{xx}^2}{2u_x}, \quad u_\tau = u_{yyy} - \frac{3u_{yy}^2}{2u_y}.$$

It should be remarked that the Schwarz–KdV equation serves as the evolutionary symmetry not only for the pair (5), but also for the second order equation

$$u_{xy} = \frac{2uu_x u_y}{u^2 + 1}, \quad (6)$$

and also for few other hyperbolic equations, see e.g. [15]. In general, the correspondence between (integrable) hyperbolic and evolutionary equations is not one-to-one: a given hyperbolic equation correspond to one at most evolutionary symmetry of a given order, but one and the same symmetry may correspond to different hyperbolic equations which are not point equivalent. \square

One should not think as well that the compatibility condition (4) is related somehow with the integrability in the sense of Definition 3. We will see in section 5 that there are “approximately as much” consistent pairs as the usual hyperbolic equations and, apparently, the integrable cases for two classes are equally rare. In the next example we consider a family of consistent pairs which contains an arbitrary function and is not in general

integrable. This example illustrates also the simplest type of differential substitutions, introducing of the potential. In general, the question about the substitutions admissible by a given equation is difficult and its consideration is beyond the scope of this paper. In particular, we do not know an algorithm which allows to check the irreducibility of a consistent pair not only in the sense of Definition 1, but also modulo differential substitutions. Presumably, such an example is provided by the pair (35) belonging to the hierarchy of Krichever–Novikov equation which is not related via differential substitutions to other KdV type equations [16].

Example 2. Klein–Gordon equation

$$q_{xy} = f'(q) \quad (7)$$

admits the conservation law

$$D_x(f(q)) = D_y(\tfrac{1}{2}q_x^2)$$

which can be used for introducing a new variable (the potential) according to the equations

$$u_x = \tfrac{1}{2}q_x^2, \quad u_y = f(q).$$

Solving the second equation with respect to q and substituting into the first one brings to the equation

$$u_{xy} = \frac{\sqrt{2u_x}}{a'(u_y)}, \quad a(f(q)) = q.$$

The potential can be introduced also in another way, according to the relations

$$u = q_x, \quad u_y = f'(q)$$

which bring to the equation

$$u_{xy} = u/a'(u_y), \quad a(f'(q)) = q.$$

Finally, both substitutions can be mixed by adding the *trivial* conservation law to the above one:

$$D_x(f(q) + kf'(q)) = D_y(\tfrac{1}{2}q_x^2 + kq_{xx}).$$

This gives rise to the substitution

$$u_x = \tfrac{1}{2}q_x^2 + kq_{xx}, \quad u_y = f(q) + kf'(q)$$

and eliminating of q (as before, the latter equation is assumed to be solvable with respect to q) brings to the following third order equation:

$$u_{xxy} = \frac{1}{ka'(u_y)}(u_x - (ka''(u_y) + \tfrac{1}{2}a'(u_y)^2)u_{xy}^2), \quad a(f(q) + kf'(q)) = q.$$

However, in this case the conservation law is not exactly equivalent to the original equation and substituting q intermediately into (7) provides one more third order equation

$$u_{xyy} = -\frac{a''(u_y)}{a'(u_y)}u_{xy}u_{yy} + \frac{f'(a(u_y))}{a'(u_y)}.$$

The consistency of the obtained hyperbolic pair follows from its construction and a check along the lines of the previous example shows that it is irreducible. What about integrability property, one can prove that it occurs exactly in the cases when original equation (7) is integrable, that is, if the function f is equal to e^q , $e^q + e^{-q}$ or $e^q + e^{-2q}$ (up to linear changes of q, x, y) corresponding to the Liouville, the sine-Gordon or the Tzitzeica equations [1]. \square

The concluding example demonstrates a further extension of the classes of equations under consideration.

Example 3. The system

$$\begin{aligned} 4 \det \begin{pmatrix} u_{yy} & u_{xyy} & u_{xxyy} \\ u_y & u_{xy} & u_{xxy} \\ u & u_x & u_{xx} \end{pmatrix} &= u^3, \\ 3(u_{xy}u_{xx} - u_x u_{xxy}) &= u_y u_{xxx} - u u_{xxyy}, \\ 3(u_{xy}u_{yy} - u_y u_{xyy}) &= u_x u_{yyy} - u u_{xyyy} \end{aligned}$$

defines a *consistent triple* of fourth order hyperbolic equations, that is, the cross-derivatives are equal identically,

$$D_x(u_{xxyy}) = D_y(u_{xxxy}), \quad D_y(u_{xxyy}) = D_x(u_{xyyy})$$

in virtue of the system itself. Comparing with the consistent pair (3), the set of dynamical variables for such a triple contains additionally the derivatives u_{xxy} and u_{xyy} . It can be proved that the above system is irreducible, that is, it cannot be obtained from some consistent pair by differentiating. However, it is related via the substitution $v = -2(\log u)_{xy}$ to the Tzitzeica equation in algebraic form

$$vv_{xy} - v_x v_y = v^3 - 1.$$

More precisely, this equation gives rise to the first, trilinear equation of the system (see e.g. [17]), while two bilinear ones are consequences of the conservation laws

$$\left(\frac{v_{xx}}{v}\right)_y = 3v_x, \quad \left(\frac{v_{yy}}{v}\right)_x = 3v_y.$$

Indeed, the latter relations can be integrated after the substitution:

$$\frac{v_{xx}}{v} = -6(\log u)_{xx} + a(x), \quad \frac{v_{yy}}{v} = -6(\log u)_{yy} + b(y),$$

moreover one can assume $a = b = 0$ without loss of generality, since the function u is defined by substitution up to arbitrary factors depending on x and on y . Now, replacing v in the left hand sides yields two last equations of the system. \square

3 Potential Korteweg–de Vries equation

It is known [15] that the pot-KdV equation

$$u_t = u_{xxx} - 3u_x^2 \quad (8)$$

does not admit compatible second order equations (1). However, it is compatible with the following third order equation:

$$u_{xxy} = \frac{u_{xy}^2 - c}{2u_y} + 2u_x u_y. \quad (9)$$

One can prove by straightforward computation that this is the general form of equation (2) compatible with the pot-KdV, up to the transformation $u \rightarrow u + \alpha x + \beta y$. The parameter c can be scaled either into 0 or 1 by scaling y and we will see that properties of the equation in two cases are quite different (in regard of the real solutions, one should distinguish also $c = 1$ and $c = -1$, but this is not important in what follows). Equation (9) is well known, although in the different variables: this is the potential form of the associated Camassa–Holm equation [9, 10].

The full algebra of evolutionary symmetries for (9) joins two hierarchies, as in the case of equations (1). One of them, pot-KdV hierarchy, contains equations with derivatives $u_x, u_{xx}, u_{xxx}, \dots$ in right hand side only, while equations belonging to the other hierarchy contain beside u_y, u_{yy}, \dots also the mixed derivatives $u_x, u_{xy}, u_{xyy}, \dots$. The first two members of this hierarchy are the following, in the generic case $c \neq 0$:

$$u_{\tau_2} = u_{xy}u_{yy} - u_y u_{xyy} + u_y^3, \quad (10)$$

$$u_{\tau_3} = u_{yyy} - \frac{3u_{yy}^2}{2u_y} + \frac{3}{2cu_y}(u_{xy}u_{yy} - u_y u_{xyy} + u_y^3)^2. \quad (11)$$

Differentiating these equations with respect to x and replacing u_{xxy}, u_{xxyy} in virtue of (9) gives rise to the coupled evolutionary systems with respect to u and u_x . The commutativity of the corresponding flows holds without taking equations (9) into account. These systems looks rather awkward, in particular, in the case (10) the matrix at the leading derivatives u_{yy}, u_{xyy} is not constant and not diagonal. However, a differential substitution $(u, u_x) \rightarrow (u, v)$ exists,

$$v = \frac{k - u_{xy}}{ku_y} + \frac{u}{k}, \quad k^2 = c,$$

which brings the equations to more compact form:

$$\begin{aligned} k^{-1}u_{\tau_2} &= u_{yy} + u_y^2 v_y, & k^{-1}v_{\tau_2} &= -v_{yy} + u_y v_y^2, \\ u_{\tau_3} &= u_{yyy} + 3u_y v_y u_{yy} + \frac{3}{2}u_y^3 v_y^2, & v_{\tau_3} &= v_{yyy} - 3u_y v_y v_{yy} + \frac{3}{2}u_y^2 v_y^3. \end{aligned}$$

This is the potential form of the Kaup–Newell system, or the derivative nonlinear Schrödinger equation [18]. Up to our knowledge, its relation to equation (9) and, therefore, to pot-KdV equation (8) was not remarked before.

Now, let us consider the case $c = 0$. First of all, notice that equation (9) acquires in this (and only this) case the first integral

$$D_x \left(u_{xyy} - \frac{u_{yy}u_{xy}}{u_y} - u_y^2 \right) = 0$$

which we rewrite in the form

$$u_{xyy} = \frac{u_{yy}u_{xy}}{u_y} + u_y^2 + \gamma. \quad (12)$$

The integration constant γ will be assumed independent on y , without loss of generality: at $c = 0$, the original equation (9) becomes invariant with respect to the changes $y \rightarrow \varphi(y)$ and it is possible to set $\gamma = \text{const}$ by use of an appropriate transformation.

Equations (9) _{$c=0$} , (12) constitute a consistent pair. It is irreducible in the sense of Definition 1; this can be easily proved by a direct check along the lines of Example 1. Nevertheless, this pair is very simply related to a hyperbolic equation, since the substitution $u_y = e^q$ lowers the order of equation (12) and brings it to the sinh-Gordon equation (or to the Liouville equation at the special value $\gamma = 0$ of the first integral)

$$q_{xy} = e^q + \gamma e^{-q}.$$

This is a particular case of the substitution from Example 2. It is well known that an evolutionary symmetry for this equation is the pot-mKdV equation

$$q_\tau = q_{yyy} - \frac{1}{2}q_y^3. \quad (13)$$

Returning to the variable u , we obtain from here the symmetry for equation (12), namely, the Schwarz–KdV equation

$$u_\tau = u_{yyy} - \frac{3u_{yy}^2}{2u_y} \quad (14)$$

which we have already meet in Example 1. It is directly proved that this symmetry is compatible, in virtue of (12), also with equations (9) _{$c=0$} and (8).

Thus, the existence of compatible equation (12) in the case $c = 0$ brings to a conversion of the hierarchy of y -symmetries: it simplifies and becomes one-component. The first symmetry (11) turns, in virtue of (12), just into the classical symmetry $u_{\tau_2} = -\gamma u_y$. Equation (11) (as well as the next equations of the hierarchy) contains the parameter c in the denominator, but this does not lead to the loss of this symmetry, since the division by c can be compensated by scaling γ in the numerator. As the result, the fractional term in equation (11) also becomes proportional to u_y and can be neglected. Of course, this is just a heuristic argument, since actually we cannot make use of the relation (12) until the parameter c turns into 0. However, as we have already said, the direct check shows that equation (14) defines the y -symmetry indeed.

4 Potential Kaup equation

The potential Kaup equation

$$u_t = u_{xxxxx} + 5u_x u_{xxx} + \frac{15}{4}u_{xx}^2 + \frac{5}{3}u_x^3 \quad (15)$$

is compatible with the hyperbolic third order equation

$$u_{xxy} = \frac{3u_{xy}^2}{4u_y} - u_x u_y - c. \quad (16)$$

This is the general form of such equation, up to the change $u \rightarrow u + \beta y$, and no compatible equation of second order exists. The parameter c can be scaled into 0 or 1 (the sign is not important, in contrast to the KdV equation). Equation (16) is related to the Degasperis-Procesi equation [12, 13].

In order to write down the y -symmetries denote

$$S = \frac{u_{yyy}}{u_y} - \frac{3u_{yy}^2}{2u_y^2}, \quad P = u_y^{-3/2} \left(u_y u_{xyy} - u_{xy} u_{yy} + \frac{2}{3}u_y^3 \right),$$

then first two higher symmetries take the form, at $c \neq 0$:

$$u_{\tau_3} = u_y \left(S + \frac{3}{4c} P^2 \right), \quad (17)$$

$$u_{\tau_5} = u_y \left(S_{yy} + \frac{3}{2} S^2 + \frac{5}{4c} (2SP^2 + P_y^2 + 2PP_{yy}) + \frac{15}{16c^2} P^4 \right). \quad (18)$$

There equations can be written as two-component evolutionary systems with respect to u and u_x , but their form is rather bulky.

The value $c = 0$ is distinguished, since the first integral appears in this case: $D_x(P) = 0$. This yields equation

$$u_{xyy} = \frac{u_{yy} u_{xy}}{u_y} - \frac{2}{3}u_y^2 + \gamma u_y^{1/2} \quad (19)$$

which constitutes together with (16) a consistent pair. One can assume without loss of generality, due to the changes $y \rightarrow \varphi(y)$, that γ does not depend on y .

At $c = 0$, the hierarchy of y -symmetries becomes one-component, but, in contrast to the previous section, its structure depends on the value of the first integral. At the special value $\gamma = 0$, the flow (17) survives and turns into the Schwarz–KdV equation (14). If $\gamma \neq 0$ then the third order symmetry does not exist, while the flow (17) turns into equation

$$u_{\tau_5} = u_{yyyyy} - 5 \frac{u_{yy} u_{yyyy}}{u_y} - \frac{15 u_{yy}^2}{4 u_y} + \frac{65 u_{yy}^2 u_{yyy}}{4 u_y^2} - \frac{135 u_{yy}^4}{16 u_y^3}$$

which is compatible, in virtue of (19), with equations (16) _{$c=0$} and (15). The dependence of the answer on γ becomes clear after the substitution $u_y = e^q$ which turns equation (19) into the Tzitzeica equation

$$q_{xy} = -\frac{2}{3} e^q + \gamma e^{-q/2}.$$

If $\gamma = 0$ then we obtain the Liouville equation again, with the symmetry (13).

5 Passage to the Bäcklund variables

Till now, we used the standard dynamical variables, that is the set of derivatives with respect to x, y which cannot be eliminated in virtue of the equation (see fig. 1). At a first glance, this set is the only reasonable one. However, it turns out to be unfit in more complicated examples like the Krichever–Novikov equation from the next section, bringing to catastrophic computations and answers. The key to their simplification is given by the problem of description of the consistent pairs of equations (3). We restrict ourselves by the case of equations which are linear with respect to the derivatives u_{xx}, u_{yy} . The analysis below demonstrates that such pairs can be conveniently represented by equations with two independent variables u, v . In this analysis, the pair is not assumed to be integrable in the sense of existence of evolutionary symmetries.

So, let us consider the pair of equations

$$u_{xxy} = au_{xx} + b, \quad u_{xyy} = cu_{yy} + d \quad (20)$$

where a, b, c, d are functions on $x, y, u, u_x, u_y, u_{xy}$. The consistency condition is

$$D_y(au_{xx} + b) = D_x(cu_{yy} + d) \quad (21)$$

and after replacing u_{xxy} and u_{xyy} in virtue of (20) this equation must hold identically on x, y, u and derivatives of u .

Theorem 1. *If system (20) is consistent and irreducible then it is of the form*

$$\begin{aligned} u_{xxy} &= \frac{1}{h_{u_{xy}}} (F(x, y, u, u_x, h) - h_x - h_u u_x - h_{u_x} u_{xx} - h_{u_y} u_{xy}), \\ u_{xyy} &= \frac{1}{h_{u_{xy}}} (G(x, y, u, u_y, h) - h_y - h_u u_y - h_{u_x} u_{xy} - h_{u_y} u_{yy}) \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where function $h = h(x, y, u, u_x, u_y, u_{xy})$ is implicitly defined by equation

$$F_h G - F G_h + u_{xy}(F_{u_x} - G_{u_y}) + u_y F_u - u_x G_u + F_y - G_x = 0. \quad (23)$$

Proof. Collecting terms with $u_{xx}u_{yy}$ in equation (21) yields the relation

$$a_{u_y} - c_{u_x} = a c_{u_{xy}} - c a_{u_{xy}}$$

which serves as the compatibility condition for the system of equations

$$h_{u_x} = -a h_{u_{xy}}, \quad h_{u_y} = -c h_{u_{xy}}$$

with respect to an unknown function h . Therefore, if the pair is consistent then a function $h(x, y, u, u_x, u_y, u_{xy})$ exists such that it is represented as follows:

$$u_{xxy} = f_0 - \frac{h_{u_x}}{h_{u_{xy}}} u_{xx}, \quad u_{xyy} = g_0 - \frac{h_{u_y}}{h_{u_{xy}}} u_{yy}.$$

It is convenient to redefine f_0, g_0 and to rewrite this in the form

$$D_x(h) = \tilde{f}(x, y, u, u_x, u_y, u_{xy}), \quad D_y(h) = \tilde{g}(x, y, u, u_x, u_y, u_{xy}).$$

Now, collecting the terms with u_{xx} and u_{yy} in equation (21) yields

$$\tilde{f}_{u_y} h_{u_{xy}} = \tilde{f}_{u_{xy}} h_{u_y}, \quad \tilde{g}_{u_x} h_{u_{xy}} = \tilde{g}_{u_{xy}} h_{u_x}.$$

Solving these equation proves that functions \tilde{f}, \tilde{g} are of the form

$$\tilde{f} = F(x, y, u, u_x, h), \quad \tilde{g} = G(x, y, u, u_y, h),$$

that is the pair (20) is of the form (22). Moreover, the consistency condition now takes the form (23).

Now let us prove that if the pair is irreducible then equation (23) must be (locally) solvable with respect to h . Assume that this is not the case, that is, the functions F and G are such that equation (23) holds identically on h . Then the coefficient at u_{xy} must vanish: $F_{u_x} - G_{u_y} = 0$, because F and G do not depend on u_{xy} intermediately. This implies that F is linear with respect to u_x , G is linear with respect to u_y and further analysis of equation (23) shows easily that these functions are of the form

$$F = -\frac{s_u u_x + s_x}{s_h}, \quad G = -\frac{s_u u_y + s_y}{s_h}, \quad s = s(x, y, u, h).$$

However, in such a case the pair (22) is reducible because its equations are obtained by differentiating of the one-parametric family of second order equations $s(x, y, u, h(x, y, u, u_x, u_y, u_{xy})) = \alpha$. \square

Equation (23) can be effectively solved with respect to h only for very special functions F, G , for example, linear or quadratic with respect to h . As a particular example, if we chose

$$F = \frac{(u-h)^2}{u_x}, \quad G = \frac{(u-h)^2}{u_y}$$

then equation (23) is linear with respect to h and we find

$$h = u - 2\frac{u_x u_y}{u_{xy}}.$$

Now, substitution into equations (22) brings to pair (5) from Example 1.

If functions F, G are of more general form then representation (22) is practically useless. However, it brings to the idea that the “proper” dynamical variable is not the mixed derivative u_{xy} , but the function h itself. Indeed, if we introduce the new variable $v = h(x, y, u, u_x, u_y, u_{xy})$ then u_{xy} is defined explicitly as the inverse function of v , since it enters into (23) linearly. It is easy to see that the result of this transformation is that equations (22) are written in the form

$$v_x = F(x, y, u, u_x, v), \quad v_y = G(x, y, u, u_y, v), \quad (24)$$

while equation (23) follows from here after eliminating of the cross derivatives and provides an equation for u_{xy} :

$$u_{xy} = H(x, y, u, u_x, u_y, v). \quad (25)$$

These equations give the desired representation of the consistent pair. In order to return to the standard set of dynamical variables, one has to differentiate (25) with respect to x and y and to eliminate v from the obtained equations, using equations (24), (25) again.

Notice that the roles of the variables u and v in system (24) are completely equal (for generic functions F, G) and eliminating of u instead of v yields a consistent pair of hyperbolic equations with respect to the variable v . Exactly the same idea is used in the definition of Bäcklund transformation (see e.g. [19]), this is why we call u, v the Bäcklund variables.

Definition 4. We say that equations (24) define the representation of the pair (20) in the Bäcklund variables if equations (20) follows from (24) as a result of eliminating of the variable v .

Let us stress that pair (20) which admits a representation (24) is automatically consistent.

In the above proof, we have seen that equation (23) may lose the dependence on h or u_{xy} under some special choices of F, G . Such functions are unfit for the definition of pair (22). However, one can waive these restrictions

and consider systems (24) with arbitrary F and G as a basic object. From this point of view, degenerations of different types are admissible. In particular, equations (24) may define indeed a Bäcklund transformation between hyperbolic equations of second order. This correspond to the situation when equation (25) does not contain v and analogous equation for v_{xy} does not contain u . Thus, the class of systems (24) is rather general and significant. Functions F, G depend on 5 arguments, that is the functional dimension of this class is the same as for the class of second order equations (1).

It should be remarked that representation in the Bäcklund variables is not unique, in contrast to the representation in the standard dynamical variables. Indeed, variable v can be replaced by any variable of the form

$$\tilde{v} = \varphi(x, y, u, v), \quad \varphi_v \neq 0 \quad (26)$$

without changing the general form of equations (24). Certainly, eliminating \tilde{v} results in the same equations for u as before. This arbitrariness should be taken into account when bringing a given system (24) to a simpler form.

A remarkable feature is that Bäcklund variables may turn convenient even in consideration of a single third order equation rather than a pair (20). In such a case, one equation of system (24) is replaced with an equation of the form (25). As an example, let us rewrite in the Bäcklund variables some equations corresponding to the pot-KdV equation (8). The consistent pair (9)_{|c=0}, (12) can be represented as the system

$$v_x + u_x = \frac{1}{2}(u - v)^2, \quad v_y u_y = -\gamma.$$

Notice that its first equation defines the x -part of the Bäcklund transformation (with zero spectral parameter) for equation (8). At $c \neq 0$, the third order equation (9) is equivalent to the system

$$v_x + u_x = \frac{1}{2}(u - v)^2, \quad u_{xy} = u_y(u - v) + k, \quad k^2 = c.$$

This result is in a close relation with the representation of the associated Camassa–Holm equation by compatible differential-difference equations, the dressing chain and a Volterra-type lattice [20, 21].

Analogously, the consistent pair (16)_{|c=0}, (19) corresponding to the Kaup equation (15) can be represented as the system

$$v_x = \frac{1}{4}(u + v)^2, \quad v_y = -\frac{1}{3}u_y - \gamma u_y^{-1/2},$$

while single equation (16) is equivalent to the system

$$v_x = \frac{1}{4}(u + v)^2, \quad u_{xy} = -u_y(u + v) + k u_y^{1/2}, \quad k^2 = 4c.$$

A more complicated example of using the Bäcklund variables is presented in the next section.

6 Krichever–Novikov equation

It is known [15] that the Krichever–Novikov equation

$$u_t = u_{xxx} - \frac{3(u_{xx}^2 - r(u))}{2u_x}, \quad r^{(5)}(u) = 0 \quad (27)$$

does not admit a consistent second order hyperbolic equation (1). In this example, the search of compatible third order equation using the standard dynamical variables runs into inextricable computational difficulties. The computations in the Bäcklund variables bring to the following answer.

Theorem 2. *Let $h = h(u, v)$ be a biquadratic polynomial and $r(u)$, $s(v)$ be its discriminants with respect to v , u , respectively:*

$$h_{uuu} = h_{vvv} = 0, \quad r(u) = h_v^2 - 2hh_{vv}, \quad s(v) = h_u^2 - 2hh_{uu}.$$

Then: 1) equation (27) defines the evolutionary symmetry for the hyperbolic system (with arbitrary parameter c)

$$u_{xy} = \frac{u_x}{h}(h_u u_y + c(hh_{uv} - h_u h_v)), \quad (28)$$

$$u_x v_x = h(u, v); \quad (29)$$

2) the following equation holds in virtue of equations (27), (28), (29):

$$v_t = v_{xxx} - \frac{3(v_{xx}^2 - s(v))}{2v_x}, \quad s^{(5)}(v) = 0; \quad (30)$$

3) the variables u and v are on equal footing: equation (28) can be replaced with

$$v_{xy} = \frac{v_x}{h}(h_v v_y - c(hh_{uv} - h_u h_v)). \quad (31)$$

Proof. In order to prove statement 1) one should verify that differentiating system (28), (29) with respect to t in virtue of (27) gives rise to an identity modulo the system. First, differentiating of equation (28) yields the equality

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(D_x D_y - \frac{h_u u_y + c\hat{h}}{h} D_x - \frac{h_u}{h} u_x D_y - \left(\frac{h_u}{h} \right)_u u_x u_y \right. \\ & \quad \left. - c \left(\frac{\hat{h}}{h} \right)_u u_x \right) \left(u_{xxx} - \frac{3(u_{xx}^2 - r(u))}{2u_x} \right) = u_x \left(\left(\frac{h_u}{h} \right)_v u_y + c \left(\frac{\hat{h}}{h} \right)_v \right) v_t \end{aligned}$$

where we denote $\hat{h} = hh_{uv} - h_u h_v$, and an explicit expression for v_t is obtained from here. It is simplified after replacing the derivatives of u in virtue of (28), (29), and equation (30) appears as a result of straightforward, although rather tedious computations (a remarkable circumstance here is

that the left hand side of the equation is divisible by the expression in the brackets from the right hand side).

Thus, statement 2) is proved and in order to complete the proof of statement 1), we have to check that differentiating equation (29) with respect to t yields an identity, that is

$$\begin{aligned} (v_x D_x - h_u) \left(u_{xxx} - \frac{3(u_{xx}^2 - r(u))}{2u_x} \right) \\ + (u_x D_x - h_v) \left(v_{xxx} - \frac{3(v_{xx}^2 - s(v))}{2v_x} \right) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

This is proved by a direct and relatively simple computation. Moreover, since the original equation (27) and the obtained equation (30) do not contain the derivatives with respect to y , hence equation (28) is not actually needed in this computation and only relation (29) is used. This is exactly equivalent to the known result [22] that this relation defines the x -part of the Bäcklund transformation between equations (27) and (30).

Statement 3) is very simple:

$$\begin{aligned} v_{xy} &= \left(\frac{h}{u_x} \right)_y = \frac{h_u u_y + h_v v_y}{u_x} - \frac{h u_{xy}}{u_x^2} \\ &= \frac{h_u u_y}{u_x} + \frac{h_v v_y v_x}{h} - \frac{1}{u_x} (h_u u_y + c(h h_{uv} - h_u h_v)) \\ &= \frac{v_x}{h} (h_v v_y - c(h h_{uv} - h_u h_v)). \end{aligned}$$

It is clear that, vice versa, (28) follows from (31). \square

Notice that equations (27)–(31) keep the form invariant under the Möbius transformations of u and v . The orbits of the group of transformations depend, in particular, on the multiplicity of the zeroes of the polynomials r, s (the proper Krichever–Novikov equation corresponds to the generic case of simple zeroes) and the detailed classification of the orbits is contained in [23].

Thus, hyperbolic system (28), (29) defines a certain extension of the Bäcklund transformation for the Krichever–Novikov equation (one can call it y -part). An important feature is that in the case of usual Bäcklund transformation the variables u and v cannot be explicitly expressed one from another, while adding the new independent variable y makes the transformation explicit. Indeed, variable v is expressed through u, u_x, u_y and u_{xy} as a solution of equation (28), and the inverse transformation is obtained from (31). In particular, this is why equation (30) is uniquely derived (27)–(29) and should not be postulated in advance.

The polynomial $\hat{h} = h h_{uv} - h_u h_v$ in the right hand side of equation (28) is biquadratic as well (moreover, an algebraic identity holds $\hat{h} \hat{h}_{uv} - \hat{h}_u \hat{h}_v =$

const h). Therefore, in order to find v , one has to solve a quadratic equation with rather cumbersome coefficients. In principle, after substituting the obtained expression into (29), one can write down a hyperbolic third order equation in the standard dynamical variables (that is, of form (2)), but it is so bulky that the inapplicability of these variables in this example becomes obvious. Moreover, the form of this equation depends on the particular choice of h . In the most degenerate case $r = 0$, $h = \frac{1}{2}(u - v)^2$ corresponding to the Schwarz–KdV equation an essential simplifications occur and one obtains the equation (cf with pair (5) and equation (12))

$$u_{xxy} = \frac{u_{xy}u_{xx}}{u_x} + \frac{u_{xy}^2 - c^2u_x^2}{2u_y} + u_y. \quad (32)$$

It is natural to use the variables u, v also for representing of y -symmetries for system (28), (29) (recall that, in the standard dynamical set, we used u_x instead of v). The two simplest higher flows presented in the following statement were found by an intermediate computation. These flows are defined just by one equation for u_τ , since equation for v_τ is derived automatically. However, for the sake of completeness, we write down both equations of the coupled system.

Statement 3. *If $c \neq 0$ then system (28), (29) admits the following symmetries:*

$$\begin{aligned} u_{\tau_2} &= u_{yy} - \frac{1}{ch}(u_y^2 - c^2r(u))(v_y + ch_u) - \frac{c^2}{2}r'(u), \\ -v_{\tau_3} &= v_{yy} + \frac{1}{ch}(v_y^2 - c^2s(v))(u_y - ch_v) - \frac{c^2}{2}s'(v); \\ u_{\tau_3} &= u_{yyy} - \frac{3u_yu_{yy}}{ch}(v_y + ch_u) + \frac{3u_y}{2c^2h^2}(u_y^2 - c^2r(u))(v_y + ch_u)^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{3c}{2h}u_yv_yr'(u) + \frac{3c^2}{2h^2}(h_u^2r(u) - \hat{h}^2)u_y, \\ v_{\tau_3} &= v_{yyy} + \frac{3v_yv_{yy}}{ch}(u_y - ch_v) + \frac{3v_y}{2c^2h^2}(v_y^2 - c^2s(v))(u_y - ch_v)^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{3c}{2h}u_yv_ys'(v) + \frac{3c^2}{2h^2}(h_v^2s(v) - \hat{h}^2)v_y. \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

These are equations from the modified Landau–Lifshitz hierarchy, written under the stereographic projection [20].

Like in examples from sections 3, 4, the parameter c can be scaled to 0 or 1 and the properties of equations are different in the two cases. It is easy to prove that if $c = 0$ then system (28), (29) admits the first integral

$$D_x \left(\frac{u_yv_y}{h} \right) = 0.$$

Up to the changes $y \rightarrow \varphi(y)$, the value of the integration constant can be chosen equal to 1, and this brings to the following hyperbolic pair written in the Bäcklund variables (see Definition 4).

Statement 4. *The system*

$$u_x v_x = h(u, v), \quad u_y v_y = h(u, v) \quad (35)$$

admits the Krichever–Novikov equation both as x - and y -symmetry, that is, it is compatible with equation (27) and equation

$$u_\tau = u_{yyy} - \frac{3(u_{yy}^2 - r(u))}{2u_y}.$$

The consistency of (27) and (35) follows from the construction and the formula for y -symmetry is obvious since the independent variables x and y are now on the equal footing. Of course, the statement can also be proven directly. However, the passage to the limit from system (34) is more complicated in this example comparing to the cases of the KdV and the Kaup equations. Indeed, the right hand side of (34) even does not contain the terms with u_{yy}^2 . It is clear that this paradox is explained by the fact that the second equation (35) is not valid until c turns into 0 and it should be replaced with a certain formal power series with respect to c , but we will not dive into this analysis. The flow (33) turns into the classical symmetry $u_\tau = u_y^2 v_y / h = u_y$ after multiplying the right hand side by c and setting $c = 0$.

It may be not clear in the above exposition, wherefrom the hyperbolic system (28), (29) appears, especially if one does not wish to employ the fact that (29) defines the x -part of the Bäcklund transformation for (27). Actually, any guess is not needed. The search of a pair (24) which is compatible with a given evolutionary equation is just a matter of computation and if we start from the Krichever–Novikov equation then it quickly leads us to system (35). The only one step which is not algorithmic here is the choice of a convenient gauge (26), but in this example it is quite obvious from the symmetry arguments. When the Bäcklund variables are chosen, we may forget about the second equation (24) and search for more general equation of the form (25) which is compatible with the t -dynamics. This leads to equation (28) with the additional parameter c .

7 Conclusion

In this paper we have considered several examples of third order hyperbolic equations possessing higher evolutionary symmetries. These examples demonstrate that equations of such type may acquire a first integral under a parametric degeneration which is interpreted as a complementary hyperbolic equation consistent with the original one. Such consistent pairs of equations are interesting objects as themselves. Their study leads us to the notion of the Bäcklund variables which provide convenient dynamical

variables for the equation. The example of the Krichever–Novikov equation suggests that introducing such variables is a natural and reasonable step if we wish to obtain a complete description of integrable hyperbolic equations. However, this classification problem seems rather difficult and it hardly can be solved in the near future. Therefore, the actual problems are the search of new examples, further study of the associated structures and construction of explicit solutions.

The discrete analogs of hyperbolic equations (1) are lattice equations of the form

$$h_{m,n}(u_{m,n}, u_{m+1,n}, u_{m,n+1}, u_{m+1,n+1}) = 0$$

(see e.g. [23]). Recall, that their theory is also closely related with the Bäcklund transformations: first, such equations define the nonlinear superposition principle for equations (1) and KdV type equations, second, they define the Bäcklund transformations for differential-difference equations of the Volterra lattice type. Like in the continuous case, some examples require consideration of more general types of equations. In particular, it is interesting to extend the obtained results to equations of the form

$$f(u_{m,n}, u_{m+1,n}, u_{m+2,n}, u_{m,n+1}, u_{m+1,n+1}, u_{m+2,n+1}) = 0$$

which play the role of discrete analogs of equations (2).

Acknowledgements

This work was partially supported by grants NSh–5377.2012.2 and RFBR 10-01-00088, 11-01-12018.

Appendix

Here we bring a sample *Mathematica* [24] program which allows to check the compatibility of the Schwarz–KdV equation

$$u_t = u_{xxx} - \frac{3u_{xx}^2}{2u_x}$$

with hyperbolic equations of different types. The computation is performed in the standard set of dynamical variables (an implementation of the Bäcklund ones requires certain modifications). The partial derivative $\partial_x^m \partial_y^n(u)$ is denoted `u[m,n]`. First, the operators of the total derivatives with respect to x, y and t are defined, as well as the equation itself:

```
vars[f_] := Union[Cases[f, _u, {0, \[Infinity]}]]
diff[f_] := Apply[Plus, Map[D[f, #] dif[#] &, vars[f]]]
dx[f_] := D[f, x] + diff[f] /. dif[u[m_, n_]] :> u[m+1, n]
```

```

dx[f_,n_] := Nest[dx, f, n]
dy[f_] := D[f, y] + diff[f] /. dif[u[m_, n_]] :> u[m, n+1]
dy[f_, n_] := Nest[dy, f, n]
dt[f_] := diff[f] /. dif[u[m_, n_]] :> dx[dy[ut, n], m]
ut = u[3, 0] - 3/2 * u[2, 0]^2 / u[1, 0];

```

In the next lines, the mixed derivatives are eliminated in virtue of second order hyperbolic equation (6) and its compatibility with the flow ∂_t is verified:

```

Clear[u]
u[n_, 1] := dx[uxy, n-1] / ; n > 0
u[1, n_] := dy[uxy, n-1] / ; n > 0
uxy = 2 * u[0, 0] * u[1, 0] * u[0, 1] / (u[0, 0]^2 + 1);
Together[dx[dy[ut]] - dt[uxy]]

```

Analogously, the following fragment handles third order equation (32):

```

Clear[u]
u[n_, 1] := dx[uxxy, n-2] / ; n > 1
u[2, n_] := dy[uxxy, n-1] / ; n > 0
uxxy = u[1, 1] * u[2, 0] / u[1, 0] +
      (u[1, 1]^2 - c^2 * u[1, 0]^2) / (2 * u[0, 1]) + u[0, 1];
Together[dx[dy[ut], 2] - dt[uxxy]]

```

Finally, consistent pair (5) is checked below. The last three lines verify consistency of the pair itself, that is identity (4), and the compatibility of each equation of the pair with the flow ∂_t :

```

Clear[u]
u[n_, 1] := dx[uxxy, n-2] / ; n > 1
u[1, n_] := dy[uxyy, n-2] / ; n > 1
uxxy = u[1, 1] * u[2, 0] / u[1, 0] + u[1, 1]^2 / (2 * u[0, 1]) + u[0, 1];
uxyy = u[1, 1] * u[0, 2] / u[0, 1] + u[1, 1]^2 / (2 * u[1, 0]) + u[1, 0];
Together[dx[uxyy] - dy[uxxy]]
Together[dx[dy[ut], 2] - dt[uxxy]]
Together[dx[dy[ut, 2]] - dt[uxyy]]

```

References

- [1] A.V. Zhiber, A.B. Shabat. Klein–Gordon equations with a nontrivial group. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* **247:5** (1979) 1103–1107.
- [2] A.V. Zhiber, N.H. Ibragimov, A.B. Shabat. Liouville type equations. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* **249:1** (1979) 26–29.

- [3] A.V. Zhiber, A.B. Shabat. The systems $u_x = p(u, v)$, $v_y = q(u, v)$ possessing symmetries. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* **277:1** (1984) 29–33.
- [4] A.V. Zhiber. Quasilinear hyperbolic equations with an infinite-dimensional symmetry algebra. *Russian Acad. Sci. Izv. Math.* **45:1** (1995) 33–54.
- [5] V.V. Sokolov, A.V. Zhiber. On the Darboux integrable hyperbolic equations. *Phys. Lett. A* **208:4–6** (1995) 303–308.
- [6] A.V. Zhiber, V.V. Sokolov. Exactly integrable hyperbolic equations of Liouville type. *Russ. Math. Surveys* **56:1** (2001) 61–101.
- [7] A.V. Mikhailov, V.V. Sokolov. Symmetries of differential equations and the problem of integrability. In: *Integrability*, ed. A.V. Mikhailov. *Lect. Notes Phys.* **767** (2009) 19–88.
- [8] B. Fuchssteiner, A.S. Fokas. Symplectic structures, their Bäcklund transformations and hereditary symmetries. *Physica D* **4:1** (1981) 47–66.
- [9] J. Schiff. The Camassa–Holm equation: a loop group approach. *Physica D* **121:1–2** (1998) 24–43.
- [10] A.N.W. Hone. The associated Camassa–Holm equation and the KdV equation. *J. Phys. A* **32:27** (1999) L307–314.
- [11] R.I. Ivanov. Extended Camassa–Holm hierarchy and conserved quantities. *Z. Naturforsch.* **61a** (2006) 133–138.
- [12] A. Degasperis, M. Procesi. Asymptotic integrability. In: *Symmetry and Perturbation Theory, Proc. 2nd Intl. Workshop, Rome, Italy, December 16–22, 1998*, eds. A. Degasperis, G. Gaeta. World Scientific, Singapore, 1999, pp. 23–37.
- [13] A. Degasperis, A.N.W. Hone, D.D. Holm. A new integrable equation with peakon solutions. *Theor. Math. Phys.* **133:2** (2002) 1463–1474.
- [14] R. Courant, D. Hilbert. *Methods of Mathematical Physics*, vol. 2. Partial differential equations. New York: Wiley, 1989.
- [15] A.G. Meshkov, V.V. Sokolov. Hyperbolic equations with third-order symmetries. *Theor. Math. Phys.* **166:1** (2011) 43–57.
- [16] S.I. Svinolupov, V.V. Sokolov, R.I. Yamilov. Bäcklund transformations for integrable evolution equations. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* **271:4** (1983) 802–805.

- [17] A.I. Bobenko, W.K. Schief. Discrete indefinite affine spheres. *In: Discrete Integrable Geometry and Physics*, eds. A. Bobenko, R. Seiler. Oxford University Press, 1999, pp. 113–138.
- [18] D.J. Kaup, A.C. Newell. An exact solution for a derivative nonlinear Schrödinger equation. *J. Math. Phys.* **19:4** (1978) [798–801](#).
- [19] M.J. Ablowitz, H. Segur. Solitons and the Inverse Scattering Transform. Philadelphia: SIAM, 1981.
- [20] A.B. Shabat, R.I. Yamilov. Symmetries of nonlinear chains. *Leningrad Math. J.* **2:2** (1991) 377–399.
- [21] V.E. Adler, A.B. Shabat. Dressing chain for the acoustic spectral problem. *Theor. Math. Phys.* **149:1** (2006) [1324–1337](#).
- [22] V.E. Adler. Bäcklund transformation for the Krichever–Novikov equation. *Int. Math. Res. Notices* **1998:1** (1998) [1–4](#).
- [23] V.E. Adler, A.I. Bobenko, Yu.B. Suris. Discrete nonlinear hyperbolic equations. Classification of integrable cases. *Funct. Anal. and Appl.* **43:1** (2009) [3–17](#).
- [24] S. Wolfram. The Mathematica Book, 5th ed., Wolfram Media, 2003.