

**LOWER BOUNDS ON THE HAUSDORFF  
MEASURE OF NODAL SETS II**

CHRISTOPHER D. SOGGE AND STEVE ZELDITCH

ABSTRACT. We give a very short argument showing how the main identity (2) from our earlier paper [12] immediately leads to the best lower bound currently known [2] for the Hausdorff measure of nodal sets in dimensions  $n \geq 3$ .

Let  $(M, g)$  be a compact smooth Riemannian manifold of dimension  $n$  and let  $e_\lambda$  be real-valued eigenfunction of the associated Laplacian, i.e.,

$$-\Delta_g e_\lambda(x) = \lambda^2 e_\lambda(x)$$

with frequency  $\lambda > 0$ . Recent papers have been concerned with lower bounds for the  $(n-1)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure,  $|Z_\lambda|$ , of the nodal set of  $e_\lambda$ ,

$$Z_\lambda = \{x \in M : e_\lambda(x) = 0\}$$

in dimensions  $n \geq 3$ . When  $n = 2$  the sharp lower bound by the frequency,  $\lambda \lesssim |Z_\lambda|$ , was obtained by Brüning in [1] and independently by Yau. For all dimensions, in the analytic case, the sharp upper and lower bounds  $|Z_\lambda| \approx \lambda$  were obtained by Donnelly and Fefferman [4], [5].

Until recently, the best known lower bound when  $n \geq 3$  seems to have been  $e^{-c\lambda} \lesssim |Z_\lambda|$  (see [6]). Using a variation (2) of an identity of Dong [3], the authors showed in [12] that this can be improved to be  $\lambda^{\frac{7}{4} - \frac{3n}{4}} \lesssim |Z_\lambda|$ . Independently Colding and Minicozzi [2] obtained the more favorable lower bound

$$(1) \quad \lambda^{1 - \frac{n-1}{2}} \lesssim |Z_\lambda|$$

by a different method. Subsequently, the first author and Hezari [7] were also able to obtain the lower bound (1) by an argument which was in the spirit of [12]. The purpose of this sequel to [12] is to show that the lower bound (1) can also be derived by a very small modification (indeed a simplification) of the original argument of [12].

The lower bounds of [12, 7] are based on the identity

$$(2) \quad \lambda^2 \int_M |e_\lambda| dV = 2 \int_{Z_\lambda} |\nabla_g e_\lambda|_g dS,$$

from [12] and the (sharp) lower bound for  $L^1$ -norms

$$(3) \quad \lambda^{-\frac{n-1}{4}} \lesssim \int_M |e_\lambda| dV,$$

which was also established in [12]. Here,  $dV$  is the volume element of  $(M, g)$ .

---

The authors were supported in part by the NSF.

The lower bound (1) is a very simple consequence of the identity (2) and the following lemma (which was implicit in [12]).

**Lemma 1.** *If  $\lambda > 0$  then*

$$(4) \quad \|\nabla_g e_\lambda\|_{L^\infty(M)} \lesssim \lambda^{1+\frac{n-1}{2}} \|e_\lambda\|_{L^1(M)}$$

Indeed if we use (2) and then apply Lemma 1, we obtain

$$(5) \quad \begin{aligned} \lambda^2 \int_M |e_\lambda| dV &= 2 \int_{Z_\lambda} |\nabla_g e_\lambda|_g dS \leq 2|Z_\lambda| \|\nabla_g e_\lambda\|_{L^\infty(M)} \\ &\lesssim 2|Z_\lambda| \lambda^{1+\frac{n-1}{2}} \|e_\lambda\|_{L^1(M)}, \end{aligned}$$

which of course implies (1).

Lemma 1 improves the upper bound on the integral given in Lemma 1 of [12], and its proof is almost the same as the proof of (3) in Proposition 2 of [12]:

*Proof.* For  $\rho \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$  we define the  $\lambda$ -dependent family of operators

$$(6) \quad \chi_\lambda f = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \rho(t) e^{-it\lambda} e^{it\sqrt{-\Delta_g}} f dt = \hat{\rho}(\lambda - \sqrt{-\Delta_g}) f = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \hat{\rho}(\lambda - \lambda_j) E_j f,$$

on  $L^2(M, dV)$  with  $E_j f$  denoting the projection of  $f$  onto the  $j$ -th eigenspace of  $\sqrt{-\Delta_g}$ . Here  $0 = \lambda_0 < \lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \dots$  are its eigenvalues, and if  $\{e_j\}_{j=0}^\infty$  is the associated orthonormal basis of eigenfunctions (i.e.  $\sqrt{-\Delta_g} e_j = \lambda_j e_j$ ), then

$$E_j f = \left( \int_M f \bar{e}_j dV \right) e_j.$$

We denote the kernel of  $\chi_\lambda$  by  $K_\lambda(x, y)$ , i.e.

$$\chi_\lambda f(x) = \int_M K_\lambda(x, y) f(y) dV(y), \quad (f \in C(M)).$$

If the Fourier transform of  $\rho$  satisfies  $\hat{\rho}(0) = 1$ , then  $\chi_\lambda e_\lambda = e_\lambda$ , or equivalently

$$\int_M K_\lambda(x, y) e_\lambda(y) dV(y) = e_\lambda(x).$$

Thus,  $K_\lambda$  is a reproducing kernel for  $e_\lambda$  if  $\hat{\rho}(0) = 1$ .

As in §5.1 in [10], we choose  $\rho$  so that the reproducing kernel  $K_\lambda(x, y)$  is uniformly bounded by  $\lambda^{\frac{n-1}{2}}$  on the diagonal as  $\lambda \rightarrow +\infty$ . This is essential for the proof of (4). If we assume that  $\rho(t) = 0$  for  $|t| \notin [\varepsilon/2, \varepsilon]$ , with  $\varepsilon > 0$  being a fixed number which is smaller than the injectivity radius of  $(M, g)$ , then it is proved in Lemma 5.1.3 of [10] that

$$(7) \quad K_\lambda(x, y) = \lambda^{\frac{n-1}{2}} a_\lambda(x, y) e^{i\lambda r(x, y)},$$

where  $a_\lambda(x, y)$  is bounded with bounded derivatives in  $(x, y)$  and where  $r(x, y)$  is the Riemannian distance between points. This WKB formula for  $K_\lambda(x, y)$  is known as a parametrix and may be obtained from the Hörmander parametrix for  $e^{it\sqrt{-\Delta}}$  in [8] or from the Hadamard parametrix for  $\cos t\sqrt{-\Delta}$ . We refer to [10, 11] for the background.

It follows from (7) that

$$(8) \quad |\nabla_g K_\lambda(x, y)| \leq C\lambda^{1+\frac{n-1}{2}},$$

and therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{x \in M} |\nabla_g \chi_\lambda f(x)| &= \sup_x \left| \int f(y) \nabla_g K_\lambda(x, y) dV \right| \\ &\leq \|\nabla_g K_\lambda(x, y)\|_{L^\infty(M \times M)} \|f\|_{L^1} \\ &\leq C\lambda^{1+\frac{n-1}{2}} \|f\|_{L^1}. \end{aligned}$$

To complete the proof of the Lemma, we set  $f = e_\lambda$  and use that  $\chi_\lambda e_\lambda = e_\lambda$ .  $\square$

We note that  $K_\lambda(x, y)$  has quite a different structure from the kernels of the spectral projection operators  $E_{[\lambda, \lambda+1]} = \sum_{j: \lambda_j \in [\lambda, \lambda+1]} E_j$  and the estimate in Lemma 1 is quite different from the sup norm estimate in Lemma 4.2.4 of [10]. Indeed, in a  $\lambda^{-1}$  neighborhood of the diagonal, the spectral projections kernel  $E_{[\lambda, \lambda+1]}(x, y)$  is of size  $\lambda^{n-1}$ . For instance, in the case of the standard sphere  $S^n$ , the kernel of the orthogonal projection  $E_k$  onto the space of spherical harmonics of degree  $k \simeq \lambda$  is the constant  $E_k(x, x) = \frac{\lambda^{n-1}}{\text{Vol}(S^n)}$  on the diagonal. We are able to choose the test function  $\rho$  above so that the reproducing kernel  $K_\lambda(x, y)$  is uniformly of size  $\lambda^{\frac{n-1}{2}}$  (as in [10] §5.1 and [9]) because we only need it to reproduce eigenfunctions  $e_\lambda$  of one eigenvalue and because it does not matter how  $K_\lambda$  acts on eigenfunctions of other eigenvalues. From the viewpoint of Lagrangian distributions, the Lagrangian manifold  $\Lambda_x$  associated to both  $E_{[\lambda, \lambda+1]}(x, y)$  and  $K_\lambda(x, y)$  for fixed  $x$  is the flowout  $\Lambda_x = \bigcup_{t \in \text{supp } \rho} G^t S_x^* M \subset S^* M$  of the unit-cosphere  $S_x^* M$  under the geodesic flow  $G^t$ . The natural projection of  $\Lambda_x$  to  $M$  has a large singularity along  $S_x^* M$  which causes the  $\lambda^{n-1}$  blowup of  $E_{[\lambda, \lambda+1]}(x, y)$  at  $y = x$ , but the projection is a covering map for the part of  $\Lambda_x$  where  $t \in [\varepsilon, 2\varepsilon] = \text{supp } \rho$ . The parametrix (7) reflects the fact that the test function  $\rho$  cuts out all of  $\Lambda_x$  except where its projection to  $M$  is a covering map. For further discussion of the geometry underlying Lagrangian distributions we refer to [10, 11, 13].

Finally, we briefly compare the proof of (1) in this note with the estimates in [12]:

- Instead of Lemma 1, the estimate  $\|\nabla_g e\|_{L^\infty(M)} \lesssim \lambda^{1+\frac{n-1}{2}} \|e_\lambda\|_{L^2}$  was used in [12]. The latter estimate is a consequence of the pointwise local Weyl law for  $|\nabla e_\lambda(x)|^2$ .
- In [12] the authors proved the lower bounds (3) by showing that

$$\|e_\lambda\|_{L^\infty(M)} \lesssim \lambda^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \|e_\lambda\|_{L^1(M)},$$

by essentially the same argument as in Lemma 1. In the proof given in this note, (3) is not used in the proof of (1) since the factor  $\|e_\lambda\|_{L^1(M)}$  cancels out in the left and right sides.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] J. Brüning: *Über Knoten Eigenfunktionen des Laplace-Beltrami Operators*, Math. Z. **158** (1978), 15–21.
- [2] T. H. Colding and W. P. Minicozzi II: *Lower bounds for nodal sets of eigenfunctions*, Comm. Math. Phys. **306** (2011), 777–784.

- [3] R. T. Dong: *Nodal sets of eigenfunctions on Riemann surfaces*, J. Differential Geom. **36** (1992), 493–506.
- [4] H. Donnelly and C. Fefferman: *Nodal sets of eigenfunctions on Riemannian manifolds*, Invent. Math. **93** (1988), 161–183.
- [5] H. Donnelly and C. Fefferman: *Nodal sets for eigenfunctions of the Laplacian on surfaces*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **3** (1990), 333–353.
- [6] Q. Han and F. H. Lin: *Nodal sets of solutions of Elliptic Differential Equations*, book in preparation (online at <http://www.nd.edu/qhan/nodal.pdf>).
- [7] H. Hezari and C. D. Sogge: *A natural lower bound for the size of nodal sets*, arXiv:1107.3440, to appear in Analysis and PDE.
- [8] L. Hörmander: *The spectral function of an elliptic operator*, Acta Math., **121** (1968), 193–218.
- [9] C. D. Sogge: *Concerning the  $L^p$  norm of spectral clusters for second-order elliptic operators on compact manifolds*, J. Funct. Anal. **77** (1988), 123–138.
- [10] C. D. Sogge: *Fourier integrals in classical analysis*, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, 105, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993.
- [11] C. D. Sogge: *Hangzhou lectures on eigenfunctions of the Laplacian*, Annals of Math. Studies, Princeton University Press, to appear.
- [12] C. D. Sogge and S. Zelditch: *Lower bounds on the Hausdorff measure of nodal sets*, Math. Res. Lett. **18** (2011), 25–37.
- [13] S. Zelditch, CBMS Lectures, in preparation.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY, BALTIMORE, MD

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY, EVANSTON, IL