

On Malyshev's method of automorphic functions in diffraction by wedges

Dedicated to the memory of Vadim Malyshev

A.I. Komech

Faculty of Mathematics, Vienna University
alexander.komech@univie.ac.at

A.E. Merzon¹

Institute of Physics and Mathematics
University of Michoacan de San Nicolas de Hidalgo, Morelia, Mexico
anatoli.merzon@umich.mx

Abstract

We describe Malyshev's method of automorphic functions in application to boundary value problems in angles and to diffraction by wedges. We give a consize survey of related results of A. Sommerfeld, S.L. Sobolev, J.B. Keller, G.E. Shilov and others.

MSC: 35J25; 30F10; 35J05; 35A30; 11F03; 35Q15; 78A45.

Keywords: elliptic equation; Helmholtz equation; boundary value problem; plane angle; Fourier transform; analytic function; Riemann surface; characteristics; covering map; automorphic function; Riemann–Hilbert problem; diffraction; wedge; limiting absorption principle; limiting amplitude principle; limiting amplitude; the Sommerfeld radiation condition.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Diffraction by wedges and radar/sonar detection	2
3	Stationary diffraction and boundary value problems in angles	3
4	Malyshev's method of automorphic functions	4
4.1	Reduction to undetermined algebraic equation on the Riemann surface	5
4.1.1	Fourier–Laplace transform	5
4.1.2	Undetermined algebraic equation on the Riemann surface	5
4.2	Method of automorphic functions	6
4.2.1	Covering maps	6
4.2.2	Shift equation	7
4.3	Reduction to the Riemann–Hilbert problem	8
5	Nonconvex angles of magnitude $\Phi > \pi$	9
6	Time-dependent diffraction by wedge	10
7	Limiting amplitude principle	10
8	The Sommerfeld diffraction theory and related results	12

¹The research supported by CONACYT-México and CIC-UMSNH, México.

1 Introduction

Vadim Malyshev was a very talented and versatile mathematician. He owns significant results in the field of probability theory and Gibbs fields, Markov processes and Euclidean quantum field theory. He also possessed outstanding organizational skills, in particular, he founded the successful and respected mathematical journal “Markov Processes and Related Fields”.

In 1970, V. Malyshev invented the method of automorphic functions [36], and applied to random walks on the lattice in the quarter of plane. Later on, he applied the method to queueing systems and analytic combinatorics [16]. In 1972–2022, the method was extended to boundary value problems for partial differential equations in angles [22, 32] and to diffraction by wedges [30]. The main steps of Malyshev’s method are as follows:

- I. Undetermined algebraic equation on the Riemann surface and analytic continuation.
- II. Elimination of one unknown function using covering automorphisms.
- III. The reduction to the Riemann–Hilbert problem.

Malyshev’s method played the crucial role in the progress in the theory of diffraction by wedges with general boundary conditions since 1972. The problem was stated by M.I. Vishik in the Summer of 1967. In 1969–1971, one of the authors (AK) tried to solve this problem while preparing his PhD Thesis. As the result of these three-year efforts, the problem has been reduced to an undetermined algebraic equation on the Riemann surface [23], though next steps remained obscure. Fortunately, at the end of 1971, AK received the impetus from his friend Alexander Shnirelman who noticed something similar in Malyshev’s book [36], which he had recently reviewed by request of M.I. Vishik. AK did not understand this book completely, but discovered two pages which could have contained a creative idea. The book, opened on these pages, lied on his desk for about two or three months, when AK pinned down two lines with the key idea of automorphicity. The remaining work took about six months...

The extension of the research to diffraction problems was done in an intensive collaboration of both authors, and took about 50 years. The main results of the collaboration were the *limiting absorption principle* [44, 45], proof of the completeness of Ursell’s trapping modes [31], the extension to the nonconvex angles [25, 30], and the Sommerfeld representation [24]. Moreover, our general methods [30] allowed us to reproduce the formulas obtained by Sommerfeld, Sobolev and Keller [28, 29, 46]. The identifications justify these formulas as the *limiting amplitudes* in diffraction.

In the present, we give a consize survey of the development of Malyshev’s method of automorphic functions since 1972 in the context of i) boundary value problems in angles for elliptic partial differential equations, and ii) theory of stationary and time-dependent diffraction by wedges. We focus on principal ideas omitting nonessential technical details. All the details can be found in [30].

2 Diffraction by wedges and radar/sonar detection

The radar or sonar emits the incident wave, which generates the reflected and diffracted waves (the latter in green color) as shown in Fig. 1. Here W denotes a conducting wedge (for example, the edge of an airplane wing), and $Q = \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus W$ is an angle of magnitude Φ . The incident wave reaches the wedge and generates the reflected and diffracted waves. The diffracted wave is defined as the total wave minus the incident and reflected waves.

The reflected wave is defined by geometric optics, and is absorbed by the ground. On the other hand, the diffracted wave spreads in all directions, and **only this part of radiation** returns to the radar which allows to detect the airplane location.




Figure 1: Incident, reflected, and diffracted waves (the latter in green color).

3 Stationary diffraction and boundary value problems in angles

The stationary diffraction by wedge is described by the boundary value problem for the Helmholtz equation in an angle $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ of magnitude $\Phi \in (0, 2\pi)$:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} (\Delta + \omega^2)u(x) = 0, \quad x \in Q \\ B_l u(x) = f_l(x), \quad x \in \Gamma_l, \quad l = 1, 2 \end{array} \right\}, \quad (3.1)$$

where Γ_1 and Γ_2 denote the sides of the angle, the functions f_l are defined by the incident wave, and $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$ is its frequency, see Fig. 1 and (7.60). The operators B_l in the boundary conditions correspond to the material properties of the wedge (conductor, insulator, ferromagnetic, etc).

The relation of stationary problem (3.1) to time-dependent diffraction is highly nontrivial. The key issue is that for $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$, the problem admits an infinite number of linearly independent solutions. We discuss this issue in detail in Section 7.

The stationary diffraction problem (3.1) with the Dirichlet and Neumann boundary conditions ($B_l = 1$ or $B_l = \frac{\partial}{\partial n}$) was solved in 1896–1912 for $\Phi = 2\pi$, by A. Sommerfeld [60]–[65] (the detailed exposition and comments can be found in [48]). The extension to all $\Phi \in (0, 2\pi)$ was obtained in 1920 by H.S. Carslaw [8], in 1932–1937 by V.I. Smirnov and S.L. Sobolev [55, 56, 57, 58, 59], and in 1951 by J.B. Keller and A. Blank [21]. In 1958, G.D. Malujinetz solved the problem for all $\Phi \in (0, 2\pi)$ with the impedance (Leontovich) boundary condition $\frac{\partial u(x)}{\partial n} + ib_l u(x) = f_l(x)$, $x \in \Gamma_l$; see [34, 35]. The detailed exposition of all these results can be found in [2] and [30].

The *mixed boundary value problems* of type

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} Au(x) = 0, \quad x \in Q \\ B_l u(x) = f_l(x), \quad x \in \Gamma_l, \quad l = 1, 2 \end{array} \right\}, \quad A = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq m} a_\alpha \partial^\alpha, \quad B_l = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq n_l} b_{l\alpha} \partial^\alpha \quad (3.2)$$

were considered in 1958 by S.L. Sobolev [59] and in 1960–1961 by G.E. Shilov [53, 54] in the quadrant $x_1 > 0$, $x_2 > 0$ for the case of hyperbolic operator A in the variable x_2 and with the Cauchy initial conditions at $x_2 = 0$.

For strongly-elliptic second order operators A and general differential boundary operators B_l , the problem (3.2) was solved in 1972 in **convex angles** Q of magnitude $\Phi \in (0, \pi)$, see [22, 23]. Strong ellipticity means that

$$|\hat{A}(z)| \geq \varkappa(|z|^2 + 1), \quad z \in \mathbb{R}^2, \quad (3.3)$$

where **the symbol** $\hat{A}(z) := \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2} a_\alpha (-iz)^\alpha$ and $\varkappa > 0$. In particular, the operator $A = -\Delta + 1$ with the symbol $\hat{A}(z) = z^2 + 1$ is strongly elliptic, and also the Helmholtz operator $H = \Delta + \omega^2$ from (3.1) is strongly elliptic for $\text{Im } \omega \neq 0$. The method [22, 23] relies on the Malyshev ideas of automorphic functions [36] which is presented in the next section.

The extension of this result to nonconvex angles of magnitudes $\Phi \in (\pi, 2\pi)$, was done in 1992 by the authors [25].

Let us note that the Helmholtz operator $A = \Delta + \omega^2$ is not strongly elliptic if $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$ since its symbol has the form $\hat{A}(z) = -z^2 + \omega^2$. Problem (3.2) for the Helmholtz operator in **convex angles** was solved in 1972–1977 by A.E. Merzon [44, 45], who proved that *for real* $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$, the problem admits only a finite number of solutions satisfying the **limiting absorption principle**:

$$u_\omega(x) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} u_{\omega+i\varepsilon}(x), \quad x \in Q, \quad (3.4)$$

where $u_{\omega+i\varepsilon}$ denotes suitable solution to (3.1) with $\omega + i\varepsilon$ instead of ω .

The application of these results to time-dependent diffraction by wedges was done in 2006–2019 by the authors [26, 27, 30], where, in particular, the **limiting amplitude principle** (7.54) was established as well as (3.4).

Another approach to the construction of solutions to (3.2) has been suggested by Maz'ya and Plamenevskii [37, 38]. However, this approach is applicable only to equations with real coefficients that is not sufficient for application to the diffraction problems.

Many works published since 1980' concern a wide spectrum of properties of solutions to the boundary problems of type (3.2) in different regions with angles, see Grisvard [18], Costabel and Stephan [10], Dauge [12], Bernard [3, 4], Nazarov and Plamenevskii [49], Bonnet-Ben Dhia and Joly [6], Bonnet-Ben Dhia, Dauge and Ramdani [5], Meister with collaborators [39]–[43], Penzel and Teixeira [50], Castro and Kapanadze [9], and others. The detailed survey can be found in [30].

Note that Malyshev's method plays an important role in the theory of Queueing Systems and Analytic Combinatorics [16]. Another important area of application of Malyshev's method is the linear theory of water waves. In particular, the method was applied in 1996–2002 by the authors together with P.N. Zhevandrov to trapped modes on a sloping beach. As the result, the long-standing problem of the completeness of the Ursell's modes has been solved [31, 32, 47]. This progress is due to the fact that the method allows one to obtain *all* solutions of the boundary value problems in angles.

We expect that the method can give a valuable progress in diffraction by ferromagnetic wedges which is a challenging open problem of radar detection. In this case, the operators B_l in (3.2) are nonlocal pseudodifferential operators.

4 Malyshev's method of automorphic functions

In this section, we present basic steps of the method [22] which relies on Malyshev's ideas of automorphic functions [36].

Note that in the case of rational angles $\Phi = \pi/n$ and the Dirichlet and Neumann boundary conditions, the boundary value problem (3.1) can be easily solved by reflections in the sides of the angle. This method was well known at least since the Gauss theory of electrostatics [17]. For $\Phi \neq \pi/n$ the reflections do not give a solution, and for irrational Φ/π , the method suggested the reflections on a "Riemann surface" formed by the reflected angles. This was the original step of the Sommerfeld approach which led him to the famous "Sommerfeld integral representation" for solutions [60]. The reflection on the Riemann surface and the theory of branching solutions to the wave equation have been developed later by Sobolev [57] and [58, Chapter XII].

Very surprisingly, the method of automorphic functions [22, 36] also relies on the reflections on a suitable Riemann surface V . However, in this approach, V is the surface in the Fourier space, contrary to the original ideas of Sommerfeld. Namely, V is the Riemann surface of complex characteristics of the elliptic operator A :

$$V = \{z \in \mathbb{C}^2 : \hat{A}(z) = 0\}. \quad (4.5)$$

Remark 4.1. The main idea of the Malyshev approach is the invariance of the Cauchy data of solutions under covering maps of the Riemann surface V , see Remark 4.7.

In [22], the problem (3.2) with strongly-elliptic operators A in **convex angles** Q is solved in the following steps:

1. Reduction to an undetermined algebraic equation with two unknown functions on the Riemann surface V .
2. Elimination of one unknown function using its invariance with respect to the covering map of the Riemann surface.
3. Reduction of the obtained equation with one unknown function to the Riemann–Hilbert problem on V .

Below in this section, we describe some details.

4.1 Reduction to undetermined algebraic equation on the Riemann surface

As an example, we consider the Dirichlet boundary value problem in the quadrant $Q = \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+$:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} Au(x_1, x_2) = 0 \\ u(x_1, 0) = f_1(x_1), u(0, x_2) = f_2(x_2) \end{array} \right|, \quad x_1 > 0, x_2 > 0. \quad (4.6)$$

4.1.1 Fourier–Laplace transform

We assume that the solution $u(x) \in C^2(\overline{Q})$ and is bounded by a polynomial:

$$|u(x)| + |\nabla u(x)| \leq C(1 + |x|)^p, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^2. \quad (4.7)$$

Denote $\mathbb{C}^+ = \{\zeta \in \mathbb{C} : \text{Im } \zeta > 0\}$ and $Z^+ = \mathbb{C}^+ \times \mathbb{C}^+$, and consider the complex Fourier–Laplace transform of solution

$$\hat{u}(z) = \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty e^{izx} u(x) dx_1 dx_2, \quad z = (z_1, z_2) \in Z^+. \quad (4.8)$$

By (4.7), this integral is absolutely convergent and hence it is an analytic function of two complex variables (this is a particular case of the Paley–Wiener Theorem). Let us denote the Neumann data of the solution as

$$\varphi_1(x_1) = \partial_2 u(x_1, 0), \quad x_1 \geq 0; \quad \varphi_2(x_2) = \partial_1 u(0, x_2), \quad x_2 \geq 0. \quad (4.9)$$

It is well known that the solution $u(x)$ can be expressed via the Dirichlet and Neumann data $f_1, f_2, \varphi_1, \varphi_2$ by the Green integral formula [11]. In our case, it is useful to obtain this formula in the Fourier transform. For this purpose, multiply the first equation in (3.2) by e^{izx} and integrate over Q . Integrating by parts, we immediately obtain

$$0 = \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty e^{izx} Au(x) dx_1 dx_2 = \hat{A}(z)\hat{u}(z) + F(z), \quad z \in Z^+, \quad (4.10)$$

where

$$F(z) = P_1(z)\hat{f}_1(z_1) + P_2(z)\hat{f}_2(z_2) + S_1(z)\hat{\varphi}_1(z_1) + S_2(z)\hat{\varphi}_2(z_2), \quad z \in Z^+, \quad (4.11)$$

and the functions P_l and S_l are polynomials.

4.1.2 Undetermined algebraic equation on the Riemann surface

Rewrite (4.10) as

$$\hat{A}(z)\hat{u}(z) = -F(z), \quad z \in Z^+. \quad (4.12)$$

Now (4.5) implies the identity

$$F(z) = 0, \quad z \in V^+ := V \cap Z^+ \quad (4.13)$$

since all the functions $\hat{A}(z), \hat{u}(z), F(z)$ are **analytic** in the domain Z^+ !

Remark 4.2. Note that the set of complex characteristics V is nonempty even for strongly elliptic operators (3.3), though its intersection with the real plane \mathbb{R}^2 is empty; see Example 4.5 below.

The identity (4.13) can be rewritten as **undetermined linear algebraic equation**

$$S_1(z)\varphi_1(z_1) + S_2(z)\varphi_2(z_2) = G(z), \quad z \in V^+ \quad (4.14)$$

with **two unknown functions** $\varphi_1(z_1)$, $\varphi_2(z_2)$, and with known right-hand side:

$$G(z) := -P_1(z)\hat{f}_1(z_1) - P_2(z)\hat{f}_2(z_2), \quad z \in V^+. \quad (4.15)$$

Remark 4.3. The identity (4.12) implies the formula for the solution

$$u(x) = -\left[\mathcal{F}^{-1}\frac{F(z)}{\hat{A}(z)}\right](x), \quad x \in Q, \quad (4.16)$$

where \mathcal{F}^{-1} denotes the inverse to the Fourier–Laplace transform (4.8), and the right hand side is well defined due to (3.3). The formula (4.16) can be transformed into the well known Green formula which expresses the solution $u(x)$ via its Cauchy data.

4.2 Method of automorphic functions

4.2.1 Covering maps

Denote

$$\psi_1(z) = \varphi_1(z_1), \quad \psi_2(z) = \varphi_2(z_2), \quad \hat{g}_1(z) = \hat{f}_1(z_1), \quad \hat{g}_2(z) = \hat{f}_2(z_2). \quad (4.17)$$

Now (4.14) becomes

$$S_1(z)\psi_1(z) + S_2(z)\psi_2(z) = G(z), \quad z \in V^+, \quad (4.18)$$

where

$$G(z) := -P_1(z)\hat{g}_1(z) - P_2(z)\hat{g}_2(z). \quad (4.19)$$

Of course, this equation is not equivalent to (4.14). To keep the equivalence, we need an additional characterisation of the functions $\psi_l(z)$. This is the key observation of Malyshev that the functions are automorphic with respect to an appropriate groups of transformation of the Riemann surface V .

First, consider the coordinate projections $p_l : V \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ defined by

$$p_1(z_1, z_2) = z_1, \quad p_2(z_1, z_2) = z_2. \quad (4.20)$$

These projections are two-sheeted since, for example, $p_1(z_1, z_2) = z_1$ means that z_2 is the root of the quadratic equation $\hat{A}(z_1, z_2) = 0$. Accordingly, the inverse maps $p_l^{-1} : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow V$ are double-valued: for $z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{C}$,

$$p_1^{-1}(z_1) = \{\zeta_1^-, \zeta_1^+\}, \quad p_2^{-1}(z_2) = \{\zeta_2^-, \zeta_2^+\}, \quad (4.21)$$

and at the branching points of p_l^{-1} , the two points $\zeta_l^\pm \in V$ coincide.

Definition 4.4. *Covering maps* $h_1, h_2 : V \rightarrow V$ are defined as follows: for any $z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{C}$,

$$h_1\zeta_1^\pm = \zeta_1^\mp, \quad h_2\zeta_2^\pm = \zeta_2^\mp. \quad (4.22)$$

Example 4.5. For the strongly-elliptic operator $A = -\Delta + 1$, the corresponding Riemann surface $V: z_1^2 + z_2^2 + 1 = 0$ is shown in Fig. 2 in projection onto the plane $\text{Im } z_1, \text{Im } z_2$. It is easy to see that this projection does not cover the circle $|\text{Im } z_1|^2 + |\text{Im } z_2|^2 < 1$, and it covers twice each point with $|\text{Im } z_1|^2 + |\text{Im } z_2|^2 > 1$. The surface consists of two sheets shown in Fig. 2, and glued along the cuts.

Thus, h_1 permutes the points $\zeta_1^\pm \in V$ with the identical projections $z_1 = p_1\zeta_1^\pm$, and similarly, h_2 permutes the points $\zeta_2^\pm \in V$ with the identical projections $z_2 = p_2\zeta_2^\pm$ (see Fig. 2):

$$p_1h_1\zeta_1^\pm = p_1\zeta_1^\mp = z_1, \quad p_2h_2\zeta_2^\pm = p_2\zeta_2^\mp = z_2. \quad (4.23)$$

The maps $h_l : V \rightarrow V$ with $l = 1, 2$ define the corresponding automorphisms of the ring of (meromorphic) functions $\psi(z)$ on the Riemann surface V :

$$\psi^{h_l}(z) := \psi(h_l z), \quad z \in V. \quad (4.24)$$




Figure 2: Riemann surface $V: z_1^2 + z_2^2 + 1 = 0$ in projection onto the plane $\text{Im } z_1, \text{Im } z_2$.

Figure 2 shows that

$$\begin{aligned} p_1 \zeta_1^+ = z_1 = p_1 \zeta_1^-, \quad \text{so } \psi_1(\zeta_1^+) = \phi_1(z_1) = \psi_1(\zeta_1^-), \\ p_2 \zeta_2^+ = z_2 = p_2 \zeta_2^-, \quad \text{so } \psi_2(\zeta_2^+) = \phi_2(z_2) = \psi_2(\zeta_2^-). \end{aligned}$$

Now it is clear that the functions $\psi_l(z) := \phi_l(z_l)$ with $l = 1, 2$ are invariant with respect to the automorphisms

h_l :

$$\psi_l^{h_l}(z) = \psi_l(z), \quad z \in V^+. \quad (4.25)$$

In other words, the functions ψ_l are **automorphic**, and the automorphisms defined by h_l belong to the corresponding **Galois groups** of extensions of the ring of functions of z_l .

4.2.2 Shift equation

Applying **formally** h_1 to (4.18), and using (4.25) with $l = 1$, we get **a new equation** for the same unknown functions:

$$S_1^{h_1}(z)\psi_1(z) + S_2^{h_1}(z)\psi_2^{h_1}(z) = G^{h_1}(z). \quad (4.26)$$

The problem is that $\psi_2^{h_1}(z) = \psi_2(h_1 z)$ and $G^{h_1}(z) = G(h_1 z)$ are not defined generally for $z \in V^+$ since V^+ is not invariant with respect to the covering map h_1 . In particular, we have by (4.19),

$$G^{h_1}(z) := -P_1^{h_1}(z)\hat{g}_1(z) - P_2^{h_1}(z)\hat{g}_2^{h_1}(z), \quad (4.27)$$

where $\hat{g}_2^{h_1}(z) = \hat{g}_2(h_1 z)$ is not defined generally for $z \in V^+$. To save the situation, consider the case $f_2 = 0$. Then $\hat{g}_2 = 0$, and now the right hand side of equation (4.26) is well defined for $z \in V^+$. It is important that in this case $\psi_2^{h_1}(z)$ is also well defined [30, Ch. 14]. The case $f_1 = 0$ can be considered similarly.

Remark 4.6. The function $\psi_2(z)$ admits an analytic continuation outside the region $V_l^+ := \{z \in V : \text{Im } z_2 > 0\}$ on the Riemann surface V , see [30, Ch. 14]. Let us stress that this is analytic continuation *along the surface* V .

Now we can **eliminate** the function ψ_1 from (4.18) and (4.26). As a result, we obtain an algebraic equation with a shift for **one unknown function**

$$R_1(z)\psi_2^{h_1}(z) - R_2(z)\psi_2(z) = H(z), \quad z \in V^+. \quad (4.28)$$

Finally, using (4.25) *with $l=2$* , we get

$$R_1(z)\psi_2^h(z) - R_2(z)\psi_2(z) = H(z), \quad z \in V^+; \quad h = h_2h_1. \quad (4.29)$$

Remark 4.7. The elimination of unknown functions using their invariance with respect to suitable “reflections” is the main idea of Malyshev’s method.

4.3 Reduction to the Riemann–Hilbert problem

Let us illustrate the reduction of equation (4.28) to the Riemann–Hilbert problem for a particular case of strongly-elliptic operator $A = -\Delta + 1$. Its symbol is $\hat{A}(z) = z^2 + 1$, so $V = \{(z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : z_1^2 + z_2^2 = -1\}$ and the covering maps are

$$h_1(z_1, z_2) = (z_1, -z_2), \quad h_2(z_1, z_2) = (-z_1, z_2). \quad (4.30)$$

Introduce the coordinate w on the universal covering $\hat{V} = \mathbb{C}$ of the surface V by

$$z_1 = i \cos w, \quad z_2 = i \sin w. \quad (4.31)$$

The maps (4.30) can be lifted to \hat{V} as

$$\hat{h}_1 w = -w, \quad \hat{h}_2 w = -w + \pi. \quad (4.32)$$

Now $h = w + \pi$, so (4.29) becomes

$$\tilde{R}_1(w)\tilde{\psi}_2(w + \pi) - \tilde{R}_2(w)\tilde{\psi}_2(w) = \tilde{H}(w). \quad (4.33)$$

where \tilde{R}_1 , etc, denote the liftings of the corresponding functions to the universal covering. The equation (4.33) holds for an appropriate region of $w \in \mathbb{C}$. Restricted to the strip $\operatorname{Re} w \in [0, \pi]$, this equation is the Riemann–Hilbert problem which can be solved in quadratures [30, Chs 17 and 18]. Let us recall some details.

The function $z = e^{2iw}$ analytically transforms the strip to the plane with the cut $[0, \infty)$. Denote the function $\check{\psi}_2(t) = \tilde{\psi}_2(w)$, $\check{H}(t) = \tilde{H}(w)$ and $\check{R}_k(t) = \tilde{R}_k(w)$ for $k = 1, 2$. Then relation (4.33) becomes

$$\check{R}_1(t)\check{\psi}_2(t - i0) - \check{R}_2(t)\check{\psi}_2(t + i0) = \check{H}(t), \quad t > 0. \quad (4.34)$$

As the first step of the Riemann–Hilbert method, one must solve the corresponding homogeneous problem:

$$\check{R}_1(t)T(t - i0) - \check{R}_2(t)\check{T}(t + i0) = 0, \quad t > 0. \quad (4.35)$$

Equivalently,

$$\frac{T(t + i0)}{T(t - i0)} = q(t) := \frac{\check{R}_1(t)}{\check{R}_2(t)}, \quad t > 0. \quad (4.36)$$

The solution to this equation depends on zeros of the functions $\check{R}_1(t)$ and $\check{R}_2(t)$ for $t > 0$. Let us consider the simplest case when such zeros do not exist, and moreover,

$$q(0) = q(\infty) = 1. \quad (4.37)$$

Then the equation is equivalent to

$$\log T(t + i0) - \log T(t - i0) = \log q(t), \quad t > 0. \quad (4.38)$$

The solution is given by the Cauchy-type integral

$$\log T(t) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_0^\infty \frac{\log q(s)}{t - s} ds, \quad t \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [0, \infty). \quad (4.39)$$

It is important that $T(t)$ is analytic and nonvanishing in the region $\mathbb{C} \setminus [0, \infty)$. Now the nonhomogeneous problem (4.34) can be solved as follows. First, (4.34) and (4.35) imply

$$\frac{\check{\psi}_2(t - i0)}{T(t - i0)} - \frac{\check{\psi}_2(t + i0)}{T(t + i0)} = \frac{\check{H}(t)}{\check{R}_1(t)T(t - i0)}, \quad t > 0. \quad (4.40)$$

Therefore, similarly to (4.38),

$$\frac{\check{\Psi}_2(t)}{T(t)} = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_0^\infty \frac{\check{H}(s)}{\check{R}_1(s)T(s-i0)(t-s)} ds, \quad t \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [0, \infty) \quad (4.41)$$

since the function $\frac{\check{\Psi}_2(t)}{T(t)}$ is analytic in $\mathbb{C} \setminus [0, \infty)$.

Thus, we have calculated the function $\check{\Psi}_2(t)$. Now $\psi_2(z)$ can be obtained from the relation (4.26). Hence, the functions $\hat{\phi}_1(z_1)$ and $\hat{\phi}_2(z_2)$ are known. It remains to substitute the obtained functions into the formula (4.11) for the function F . Then the solution to (3.2) is expressed by (4.16), which can be reduced to the integral of Sommerfeld type [24].

Remark 4.8. Equation (4.28) is obtained using the invariance (4.25) with $l = 1$, while (4.29) uses also $l = 2$. Note that the equation (4.28) reads now

$$\tilde{T}_1(w)\check{\Psi}_2(-w) - \tilde{T}_2(w)\check{\Psi}_2(w) = \check{H}(w), \quad (4.42)$$

which provisionally cannot be reduced to a nonsingular Riemann–Hilbert problem, see [33]. Thus, both invariance conditions (4.25) are necessary for the reduction.

Remark 4.9. For the random walks studied in [36, 16], the corresponding Riemann surface and the covering maps h_l can be more complicated than for 2-nd order elliptic operators which requires more sophisticated methods of the Galois theory.

5 Nonconvex angles of magnitude $\Phi > \pi$

The extension of the theory outlined above to the case of nonconvex angle Q differs drastically from the convex one. As an example, consider the Dirichlet boundary value problem in the angle $Q = \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+$:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} Au(x) = 0, \quad x \in Q \\ u(x_1, 0) = f_1(x_1), x_1 > 0; \quad u(0, x_2) = f_2(x_2), x_2 > 0. \end{array} \right. \quad (5.43)$$

Note that the relations (4.10) and (4.12), (4.16) remain true in this case, but now the function (4.11) is changed to its negative:

$$F(z) = -P_1(z)\hat{f}_1(z_1) - P_2(z)\hat{f}_2(z_2) - S_1(z)\hat{\phi}_1(z_1) - S_2(z)\hat{\phi}_2(z_2), \quad z \in \mathbb{R}^2. \quad (5.44)$$

On the other hand, the key relation (4.13) is not well defined in contrast to the case when the support of u belongs to a convex angle. This is due to the fact that the Fourier–Laplace transform (4.8) of the function u with the support in a nonconvex angle generally does not admit an analytical continuation to a region of \mathbb{C}^2 . Nevertheless, the function (5.44) in this case is analytic in the same region $Z^+ = \mathbb{C}^+ \times \mathbb{C}^+$ as the function (4.11).

The answer to this riddle was found in [25]. First, the function (5.44) admits the splitting

$$F(z) = \gamma_1(z) + \gamma_2(z), \quad \gamma_1(z) = -P_1(z)\hat{f}_1(z_1) - S_1(z)\hat{\phi}_1(z_1), \quad \gamma_2(z) = -P_2(z)\hat{f}_2(z_2) - S_2(z)\hat{\phi}_2(z_2), \quad (5.45)$$

where the functions $\gamma_l(z)$ are analytic in the regions

$$V_l^+ = \{z \in V : \text{Im } z_l > 0\}, \quad l = 1, 2. \quad (5.46)$$

Second, as shown in [25] (see also [30, Theorem 20.1]), each function γ_l admits an analytic continuation from V_l^+ to the region $V^- := \{z \in V : \text{Im } z_1 < 0, \text{Im } z_2 < 0\}$, and the following identity holds :

$$\gamma_1(z) + \gamma_2(z) = 0, \quad z \in V^-. \quad (5.47)$$

This identity formally coincides with the undetermined equation (4.14), and it allows us to calculate both unknown functions $\hat{\phi}_l$ by methods of Sections 4.2 and 4.3.

6 Time-dependent diffraction by wedge

The time-dependent diffraction by a wedge W is described by the solution of the wave equation in the plane angle $Q = \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus W$ with appropriate boundary conditions. For example, consider the Dirichlet boundary conditions

$$\begin{cases} \ddot{u}(x,t) = \Delta u(x,t), & x \in Q \\ u(x,t) = 0, & x \in \Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2 \end{cases}, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (6.48)$$

The incident wave is defined by the initial condition

$$u(x,t) = u^{in}(x,t), \quad u^{in}(x,t) := f(kx - \omega_0 t) e^{i(kx - \omega_0 t)}, \quad t < 0, \quad (6.49)$$

where the frequency $\omega_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $k \in \mathbb{R}^2$ is the **wave vector**. The incident wave $u^{in}(x,t)$ must be a solution to (6.48) for $t < 0$:

$$\begin{cases} \ddot{u}^{in}(x,t) = \Delta u^{in}(x,t), & x \in Q \\ u^{in}(x,t) = 0, & x \in \Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2 \end{cases}, \quad t < 0. \quad (6.50)$$

The wave equation in (6.50) holds for any function $f(s)$ **for all** $t \in \mathbb{R}$ if $|k| = |\omega_0|$. The boundary condition in (6.50) can be satisfied only in the case of nonconvex angle Q of magnitude $\Phi > \pi$ and the wave vector k satisfying the inequalities $k \cdot x \geq 0$ for $x \in W = \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus Q$. Then for $\omega_0 > 0$ the boundary condition holds if

$$f(s) = 0, \quad s > 0. \quad (6.51)$$

7 Limiting amplitude principle

Let us assume that there exists the limit

$$f(-\infty) := \lim_{s \rightarrow -\infty} f(s), \quad (7.52)$$

and the convergence is sufficiently fast, for example, $f(s) = \theta(-s)$. Then the incident wave (6.49) admits the long-time asymptotics

$$u^{in}(x,t) \sim f(-\infty) e^{ikx} e^{-i\omega_0 t}, \quad t \rightarrow \infty \quad (7.53)$$

which suggests similar asymptotics of solution

$$u(x,t) \sim a_{\omega_0}(x) e^{-i\omega_0 t}, \quad t \rightarrow \infty. \quad (7.54)$$

Such asymptotics are called as **limiting amplitude principle**.

Determination of the **limiting amplitudes** $a_{\omega_0}(x)$ for different diffraction processes is the main goal of the theory of diffraction [7, 65] (see also [30]). The proof of the asymptotics is the main goal of the mathematical theory of diffraction. For diffraction by wedges, this asymptotics has been established for the first time in [26]. Formal substitution of the asymptotics (7.54) into (6.48) gives a problem of type (3.1):

$$\begin{cases} -\omega_0^2 a_{\omega_0}(x) = \Delta a_{\omega_0}(x), & x \in Q \\ a_{\omega_0}(x) = 0, & x \in \Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2 \end{cases}. \quad (7.55)$$

However, this boundary problem is **ill-posed** since it admits an infinite number of linearly independent solutions for real $\omega_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. Thus, this problem does not allow us to find the limiting amplitude. This fact is the main peculiarity of the diffraction theory. This can be easily checked in the case $\Phi = \pi$ when the angle Q is the half-plane, so all solutions can be calculated by the Fourier transform along the boundary $\partial\Omega$. For the problems of type (7.55) in **convex angles** of magnitude $\Phi < \pi$, this nonuniqueness was discovered in 1973 by one of the authors [45].

Let us recall how to prove the asymptotics (7.54) and how to calculate the limiting amplitudes $a_{\omega_0}(x)$. First, note that for the incident wave $u^{in}(x,t)$ the asymptotics of type (7.54) holds by (7.52):

$$u^{in}(x,t) \sim f(-\infty) e^{ikx} e^{-i\omega_0 t}, \quad t \rightarrow \infty. \quad (7.56)$$

The reflected wave is defined by geometric optics, and its main properties are as follows:

$$u^r(x,t) = -u^{in}(x,t), \quad x \in \partial Q; \quad u^r(x,t) \sim a^r(x)e^{-i\omega_0 t}, \quad t \rightarrow \infty. \quad (7.57)$$

The diffracted wave $u^d(x,t)$ is defined by the splitting the total solution as

$$u(x,t) = u^{in}(x,t) + u^r(x,t) + u^d(x,t). \quad (7.58)$$

Hence, it remains to calculate the corresponding asymptotics for the diffracted wave

$$u^d(x,t) \sim a_{\omega_0}^d(x)e^{-i\omega_0 t}, \quad t \rightarrow \infty, \quad (7.59)$$

Substituting (7.58) into (6.48), using (7.57) and the fact that the wave equation in (6.50) holds for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, we get the boundary problem for the diffracted wave

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \dot{u}^d(x,t) = \Delta u^d(x,t) + F(x,t), \quad x \in Q \\ u^d(x,t) = 0, \quad x \in \Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2 \end{array} \right. \Bigg|, \quad F(x,t) := (\partial_t^2 - \Delta)u^r(x,t) \sim b(x)e^{-i\omega_0 t}, \quad t \rightarrow \infty. \quad (7.60)$$

Formal substitution of the asymptotics (7.59) into (7.60), gives the boundary problem

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} -\omega_0^2 a_{\omega_0}^d(x,t) = \Delta a_{\omega_0}^d(x) + b(x), \quad x \in Q \\ a^d(x) = 0, \quad x \in \Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2 \end{array} \right. \Bigg|. \quad (7.61)$$

For $\omega_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, this system also admits an infinite number of linearly independent solutions, as well as (7.55). Similar problem of nonuniqueness arises in every diffraction problem in unbounded regions. The problem of nonuniqueness was resolved by the discovery of additional features of the limiting amplitude $a_{\omega_0}^d(x)$.

The key discovery was the **limiting absorption principle** (3.4) for the limiting amplitude of the diffracted wave. In application to problem (7.61), we have

$$a_{\omega_0}^d(x) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} a_{\omega_0 + i\varepsilon}^d(x), \quad x \in Q, \quad (7.62)$$

where $a_{\omega_0 + i\varepsilon}^d$ denotes a solution to (7.61) with $\omega_0 + i\varepsilon$ instead of ω_0 .

Remark 7.1. The convergence (7.62) holds for the limiting amplitude $a_{\omega_0}^d(x)$ of the diffracted wave $u_{\omega_0}^d(x,t)$ (formal proof can be found in [30, Section 4.1]). However, it does not hold for the limiting amplitude $a(x)$ of the total solution $u(x,t)$ although these amplitudes satisfy quite similar equations (7.61) and (7.55). The difference is that the initial state of the diffracted wave $u_{\omega_0}^d(x,0)$ is of finite energy (in our case zero), while for the total solution the initial state $(u(x,0), \dot{u}(x,0))$ is the plane wave (6.49) and its derivative in time at $t = 0$.

The limiting absorption principle has been introduced for the first time in 1905 by W. Ignatovsky [19]. Rigorous proofs of this principle for limiting amplitudes of solutions with finite energy initial states were achieved much later. The results for the wave and Schrödinger equations in the entire space and for diffraction problems with smooth boundaries were obtained by Agmon [1], Eidus [13, 14, 15], Jensen and Kato [20], A. Ya. Povzner [51], B.R. Vainberg [66] and others.

The convergence (7.62) for **stationary diffraction problems** has been established for the first time in 1977 by one of the authors [45]: it was proven that stationary problem (7.61) and problems (3.2) with $A = \Delta + \omega^2$ and general boundary conditions in **convex angles** of magnitude $\Phi < \pi$,

i) for complex $\omega \notin \mathbb{R}$ admit only a finite number of linearly independent solutions in appropriate class of functions;

ii) for real $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$ admit an infinite number of linearly independent solutions,

iii) for real $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$ admit only a **finite number** of linearly independent solutions satisfying (7.62).

For the **time-dependent** diffraction problem (6.48), (6.49), the limiting absorption principle (7.62) and the limiting amplitude principle (7.54) were justified in 2006 by the authors [26]. The proofs rely on the analysis of the Fourier-Laplace transform in time:

$$\tilde{u}(x, \omega) = \int_0^\infty e^{i\omega t} u(x,t) dt, \quad \omega \in \mathbb{C}^+. \quad (7.63)$$

The function $\tilde{u}(x, \omega)$ satisfies a boundary value problem of type (7.61) with complex $\omega \notin \mathbb{R}$. In this case the Helmholtz operator $A = \Delta + \omega^2$ is strongly elliptic. Hence, $\tilde{u}(x, \omega)$ can be calculated and analysed by the methods described in previous sections. The limiting amplitude is calculated in [26] using the limit (7.62).

Remark 7.2. In 1912, A. Sommerfeld discovered the **Sommerfeld radiation condition** [62] (see also [52]), which provides the uniqueness of solution to the boundary problem of type (7.61) in the case when Q is the exterior of a bounded region in \mathbb{R}^3 . This condition is more practical for numerical calculation of the limiting amplitudes than (7.62).

8 The Sommerfeld diffraction theory and related results

For the angle $\Phi = 2\pi$, A. Sommerfeld constructed in 1896 a solution $a(x)$ to **stationary diffraction problem** of type (7.55) with Dirichlet and Neumann boundary conditions. In this case the wedge is the half-plane, which is represented by the semi-axis $[0, \infty)$ in the corresponding 2D problem. The main ideas were i) to treat the semi-axis as the cut on an appropriate Riemann surface, and ii) to extend the known method of reflections to Riemann surfaces. As a result, A. Sommerfeld constructed a universal integral representation of a class of **branching solutions** of the Helmholtz equation on the Riemann surface in the form of the **Sommerfeld integral** with a fixed integral kernel and a with a suitable density function. Further, A. Sommerfeld chose an appropriate densities to satisfy the boundary conditions.

Sommerfeld's strategy of constructing the solution remains a mysterious riddle to this day. This approach is reproduced with some comments in [30, Ch. 5], see also [48]. However, the Sommerfeld integral representation turned out to be extremely fruitful, and in particular, was used by G.D. Malujinets to solve the problem with the Leontovich boundary condition [34, 35], see also [2].

For any angles $\Phi \in (0, 2\pi)$ the **stationary diffraction problem** (7.55) for the Dirichlet and Neumann boundary conditions in the angles of this magnitude was solved by other methods in 1920 by H.S. Carslaw [8], in 1932–1937 by V.I. Smirnov and S.L. Sobolev [55, 56, 57, 58, 59], and in 1951 by J.B. Keller and A. Blank [21].

Remark 8.1. i) In all the works, cited above, the limiting amplitude principle was not established, and the choice of suitable solution of the **ill-posed problem** (7.55) was not rigorously clarified. Nevertheless, as shown in [28, 29, 46], all the obtained solutions coincide with the **limiting amplitudes** calculated in [26] and admit the Sommerfeld representation.

ii) S.L. Sobolev mentions, in the articles cited above, that the functions of type (6.49) must be solutions to the wave equation even if the amplitude $a(s)$ is a discontinuous function. These remarks later inspired the theory of weak derivatives of S.L. Sobolev and the theory of distributions of L. Schwartz.

References

- [1] S. Agmon, Spectral properties of Schrödinger operator and scattering theory, *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa*, Ser. IV **2** (1975), 151–218.
- [2] V. M. Babich, M. A. Lyalinov, V. E. Grikurov, *The Sommerfeld–Malyuzhinets Technique in Diffraction Theory*, Alpha Science International, Oxford, 2007.
- [3] J.-M. L. Bernard, Diffraction by a metallic wedge covered with a dielectric material, *Wave Motion* **9** (1987), 543–561.
- [4] J.-M. L. Bernard, A spectral approach for scattering by impedance polygons, *Quarterly Journal of Mechanics and Applied Mathematics* **59** (2006), no. 4, 517–550.
- [5] A.-S., Bonnet-Bendhia, M. Dauge, K. Ramdani, Spectral analysis and singularities of a non-coercive transmission problem. *C. R. Acad. Sci., Paris, Sér. I, Math.* 1999; **328**(8): 717–720.
- [6] A.-S. Bonnet-Ben Dhia, P. Joly, Mathematical analysis of guided water waves, *SIAM. J. Appl. Math.* **53** (1993), no. 6, 1507–1550.
- [7] M. Born, E. Wolf, *Principles of Optics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1966.
- [8] H.S. Carslaw, Diffraction of waves by a wedge of any angle, *Lond. M. S. Proc. (Series 2)* **18** (1920), no. 1, 291–306.

- [9] L. P. Castro, D. Kapanadze, Wave diffraction by wedges having arbitrary aperture angle, *Mathematical Methods in the Applied Sciences* **421** (2015), no. 2, 1295–1314.
- [10] M. Costabel, E. Stephan, Boundary integral equations for mixed boundary value problems in polygonal domains and Galerkin approximation, *Banach Center Publicat.* **15** (1985), 175–251.
- [11] R. Courant, D. Hilbert, *Methods of mathematical physics*, Vol. I, Interscience Publishers, New York, 1953; Vol. II, Interscience Publishers, New York, 1962.
- [12] M. Dauge, *Elliptic Boundary Value Problems on Corner Domains. Smoothness and Asymptotics of Solutions*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics **1341**, Springer, Berlin, 1988.
- [13] D. M. Eidus, The principle of limiting absorption, *Am. Math. Soc., Transl., II. Ser.* **47** (1965), 157–191.
- [14] D. M. Eidus, The principle of limit amplitude, *Russ. Math. Surv.* **24** (1969), no. 3, 97–167.
- [15] D. M. Eidus, The limiting amplitude principle for the Schrödinger equation in domains with unbounded boundaries, *Asymptotic Anal.* **2** (1989), no. 2, 95–99.
- [16] G. Fayolle, R. Iasnogorodski, V.A. Malyshev, *Random Walks in the Quarter Plane, Applications to Queuing Systems and Analytic Combinatorics*, Springer, 2017.
- [17] C.F. Gauss, *Intensitas vis magneticae terrestres ad mensuram absolutam revocata*, Dieterich, Göttingen, 1833.
- [18] P. Grisvard, *Elliptic Problems in Nonsmooth Domains*, Pitman, Boston, 1985.
- [19] W. Ignatowsky, Reflexion elektromagnetischer Wellen an einem Drahte, *Ann. der Physik* **18** (1905), no. 13, 495–522.
- [20] A. Jensen, T. Kato, Spectral properties of Schrödinger operators and time-decay of the wave functions, *Duke Math. J.* **46** (1979), 583–611.
- [21] J. Keller, A. Blank, Diffraction and reflection of pulses by wedges and corners, *Comm. Pure and Appl. Math.* **4** (1951), no. 1, 75–95.
- [22] A. I. Komech, Elliptic boundary value problems on manifolds with piecewise smooth boundary, *Math. USSR Sbornik*, **21** (1973), no. 1, 91–135.
- [23] A. I. Komech, Elliptic differential equations with constant coefficients in a cone, *Moscow Univ. Math. Bull.* **29** (1974), no. 2, 140–145.
- [24] A. I. Komech, N. J. Mauser, A. E. Merzon, On Sommerfeld representation and uniqueness in scattering by wedges, *Math. Methods in Appl. Sci.* **28** (2005), no. 2, 147–183.
- [25] A. I. Komech, A. E. Merzon, General boundary value problems in region with corners, pp. 171–183 in *Operator Theory. Advances and Applications*, Vol. 57, Birkhauser, Basel, 1992.
- [26] A. I. Komech, A. E. Merzon, Limiting amplitude principle in the scattering by wedges, *Math. Methods in Appl. Sci.* **29** (2006), no. 10, 1147–1185.
- [27] A. I. Komech, A. E. Merzon, Relation between Cauchy data for the scattering by a wedge, *Russian J. Math. Phys.* **14** (2007), no. 3, 279–303.
- [28] A. I. Komech, A. E. Merzon, On uniqueness and stability of Sobolev’s solution in scattering by wedges, *J. Appl. Math. Phys. (ZAMP)* **66** (2015), no. 5, 2485–2498.
- [29] A. I. Komech, A. E. Merzon, A. Esquivel Navarrete, J. E. De La Paz Méndez, T. J. Villalba Vega, Sommerfeld’s solution as the limiting amplitude and asymptotics for narrow wedges, *Math. Methods in Appl. Sci.* (2018) 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mma.5075>.
- [30] A.I. Komech, A.E. Merzon, *Stationary Diffraction by Wedges. Method of Automorphic Functions on Complex Characteristics*, Springer, 2019.

- [31] A. I. Komech, A. E. Merzon, P. N. Zhevandrov, On completeness of Ursell's trapping modes, *Russian J. Math. Phys.* **4** (1996), no. 4, 55–85.
- [32] A.I. Komech, A.E. Merzon, P.N. Zhevandrov, A method of complex characteristics for elliptic problems in angles and its applications, pp 125–159 in: *Translations. Series 2. AMS 206*, Providence, RI, 2002.
- [33] G. S. Litvinchuk, *Solvability Theory of Boundary Value Problems and Singular Integral Equations with Shift*, Springer Netherlands, 2000.
- [34] G. D. Malyuzhinets, Inversion formula for the Sommerfeld integral. *Soviet Phys. Dokl.* **3** (1958), 52–56.
- [35] G. D. Malujinetz, Excitation, reflection and emission of surface waves from a wedge with given face impedances, *Soviet. Phys. Dokl.* **3** (1959), 752–755.
- [36] V.A. Malyshev, *Random Walks, Wiener–Hopf Equations in the Quadrant of Plane, Galois Automorphisms*, Moscow University, 1970.
- [37] V. G. Maz'ya, B. A. Plamenevskii, Problems with oblique derivatives in regions with piecewise smooth boundaries, *Func. Anal. Appl.* **5** (1971), 256–258.
- [38] V. G. Maz'ya, B. A. Plamenevskii, On boundary value problems for a second-order elliptic equations in a domain with wedges, *Vest. Leningr. Univ., Math.* **1** (1975), 102–108.
- [39] E. Meister, Some solved and unsolved canonical problems of diffraction theory, pp 320–336 in: *Lecture Notes in Math.* 1285, 1987.
- [40] E. Meister, A. Passow, K. Rottbrand, New results on wave diffraction by canonical obstacles, *Operator Theory: Adv. Appl.* **110** (1999), 235–256.
- [41] E. Meister, F. Penzel, F. O. Speck, F. S. Teixeira, Some interior and exterior boundary-value problems for the Helmholtz equations in a quadrant, *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A* **123** (1993), no. 2, 275–294.
- [42] E. Meister, F. Penzel, F.-O. Speck, F. S. Teixeira, Two canonical wedge problems for the Helmholtz equation, *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.* **17** (1994), 877–899.
- [43] E. Meister, F. O. Speck, F.S. Teixeira, Wiener-Hopf-Hankel operators for some wedge diffraction problems with mixed boundary conditions, *J. Integral. Equat. and Applications* **4** (1992), no. 2, 229–255.
- [44] A. E. Merzon, On the solvability of differential equations with constant coefficients in a cone, *Soviet Math. Dokl.* **14** (1973), no. 4, 1012–1015.
- [45] A. E. Merzon, General boundary value problems for the Helmholtz equations in a plane angle, *Uspekhi Math. Nauk* **32** (1977), no. 2, 219–220. [Russian]
- [46] A. E. Merzon, A. I. Komech, J. E. De la Paz Mendez, T. J. Villalba, On the Keller solution to the scattering problem of pulses by wedges, *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.* **38** (2015), no.10, 2035–2040.
- [47] A. E. Merzon, P. N. Zhevandrov, High-frequency asymptotics of edge waves on a beach of nonconstant slope, *SIAM J. Appl. Math* **59** (1998), no. 2, 529–546.
- [48] R. J. Nagem, M. Zampolli, G. Sandri, *Arnold Sommerfeld. Mathematicai Theory of Diffraction*, Progress in Mathematical Physics Volume 35. Springer Science+Business Media New York Originally published by Birkhauser Boston in 2004.
- [49] S.A. Nazarov, B.A. Plamenevskij, *Elliptic Problems in Domains with Piecewise Smooth Boundaries*, De Gruyter, Berlin, 1994.
- [50] F. Penzel, F.S. Teixeira, The Helmholtz equation in a quadrant with Robin's conditions, *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.* **22** (1999), 201–216.
- [51] A. Ya. Povzner, On the expansion of arbitrary functions in characteristic functions of the operator $-\Delta u + cu$, *Mat. Sbornik N.S.* **32(74)** (1953), 109–156 [Russian].

- [52] S.H. Schot, Eighty years of Sommerfeld's radiation condition, *Historia Mathematica* **19** (1992), no. 4, 385–401.
- [53] G. E. Shilov, On the boundary value problems in a quadrant for partial differential equations with constant coefficients, *Uspekhi Matem. Nauk* **15** (1960), no. 4, 218–220. [Russian]
- [54] G. E. Shilov, On boundary value problems in a quarter plane for partial differential equations with constant coefficients, *Sib. Math. J.* **11** (1961), no.1, 144–160 [Russian].
- [55] V. I. Smirnov, S. L. Sobolev, Sur une méthode nouvelle dans le problème plan des vibrations élastiques, *Trudy Seismological Institute, Acad. Nauk SSSR* **20** (1932), 1–37.
- [56] S. L. Sobolev, Theory of diffraction of plane waves, *Proceedings of Seismological Institute*, no. 41, Russian Academy of Science, Leningrad, 1934.
- [57] S. L. Sobolev, General theory of diffraction of waves on Riemann surfaces, *Tr. Fiz.-Mat. Inst. Steklova* **9** (1935), 39–105. [Russian] (English translation: S.L. Sobolev, General theory of diffraction of waves on Riemann surfaces, p. 201–262 in: Selected Works of S.L. Sobolev, Vol. I, Springer, New York, 2006.)
- [58] S. L. Sobolev, Some questions in the theory of propagations of oscillations, pp 468-617 in: F. Frank and P. Mizes (eds), *Differential and Integral Equations of Mathematical Physics*, Leningrad-Moscow, 1937. [Russian]
- [59] S. L. Sobolev, On mixed problem for partial differential equations with two independent variables, *Doklady Ac. Sci. USSR* **122** (1958), no.4, 555–558. [Russian]
- [60] A. Sommerfeld, Mathematische Theorie der Diffraction, *Math. Ann.* **47** (1896), 317–341.
- [61] A. Sommerfeld, Theoretisches ueber die Beugung der Roentgenstrahlen (German), *Z. Math. Phys.* **46** (1901), 11–97.
- [62] A. Sommerfeld, Die Greensche Funktion der Schwingungsgleichung, *Thematiker-Vereinigung* **21**, 309–353. Reprinted in *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. 1, pp. 272–316.
- [63] A. Sommerfeld, *Partial Differential Equations in Physics*, Academic Press, New York, New York, 1949.
- [64] A. Sommerfeld, Autobiographische Skizze. In *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. 4, pp. 673–682.
- [65] A. Sommerfeld, *Lectures on theoretical physics Vol. 4, Optics*, New York, 1954.
- [66] B. R. Vainberg, Principles of radiation, limit absorption and limit amplitude in the general theory of partial differential equations, *Russ. Math. Surv.* **21** (1966), 115–193.