

TIME-PERIODIC SOLUTIONS OF THE COMPRESSIBLE EULER EQUATIONS AND THE NONLINEAR THEORY OF SOUND

BLAKE TEMPLE AND ROBIN YOUNG

ABSTRACT. We prove the existence of “pure tone” nonlinear sound waves of all frequencies. These are smooth, time periodic, oscillatory solutions of the 3×3 compressible Euler equations satisfying periodic or acoustic boundary conditions in one space dimension. This resolves a centuries old problem in the theory of Acoustics, by establishing that the pure modes of the linearized equations are the small amplitude limits of solutions of the nonlinear equations. Riemann’s celebrated 1860 proof that compressions always form shocks is known to hold for isentropic and barotropic flows, but our proof shows that for generic entropy profiles, shock-free periodic solutions containing nontrivial compressions and rarefactions exist for every wavenumber k .

1. INTRODUCTION

The theory of Shock Waves was initiated in 1848 by Stokes in his paper “*On a Difficulty in the Theory of Sound*” [29]. Stokes confirmed an observation of Challis that oscillatory solutions of the nonlinear compressible Euler equations,

$$\partial_t \rho + \nabla \cdot (\rho u) = 0, \quad \partial_t (\rho u) + \nabla \cdot (\rho u u^\dagger + p I) = 0, \quad (1.1)$$

with pressure $p = p(\rho)$, exhibit gradient blowup. Stokes’ concern was that the nonlinear equations thus generate a qualitatively different theory of sound compared to the sinusoidal oscillations associated with the linear wave equation

$$\varrho_{tt} - c^2 \Delta \varrho = 0, \quad c^2 = p'(\bar{\rho}),$$

which is obtained by linearizing (1.1) around a constant state with density $\rho = \bar{\rho}$ and velocity $u = 0$. In this paper we prove that there is no fundamental inconsistency between the linear and nonlinear theories of sound, by resolving Stokes’ concerns for pure modes of oscillation when the entropy is non-constant. We prove that when conservation of energy is accounted for, and entropy varies generically, *all* pure modes of the linearized wave equation perturb to nearby shock-free “pure tone” oscillatory solutions of the nonlinear equations. That is, for generic entropy profiles, we prove that the fundamental oscillations of the *nonlinear equations* are well approximated by the corresponding linearized sound wave solutions.

Date: June 4, 2024 – arxiv.

Stokes proposed the use of surfaces across which solutions jump discontinuously, now familiar as shock waves. Because solutions containing shocks are discontinuous, they cannot be understood as classical solutions of the PDEs. The fundamental “difficulty” referred to by Stokes, then, is that when the pressure depends only on the density $p = p(\rho)$, nonlinear oscillations evolve away from the linear oscillations, ultimately forming shock waves, which are far from linear. This was later clarified by Riemann [26], who proved that *all* compressive plane wave (that is one-dimensional) solutions of (1.1) must *necessarily* form shocks in finite time, provided that $p''(\rho) \neq 0$. This was made definitive in the celebrated work of Glimm and Lax in 1970, in which they proved that all space periodic solutions of isentropic or barotropic genuinely nonlinear systems necessarily form shocks and decay to average at rate $1/t$ [10]. At the time, the prevailing sentiment in the field was that this result would extend to non-isentropic solutions as well.

Since then there have been several attempts to resolve the question of shock formation in oscillatory solutions of 3×3 Euler, including refinements of Riemann’s shock formation result by the analysis of characteristics [15, 13, 17, 18, 3, 4, 5], construction of periodic solutions in approximations based on weakly nonlinear geometric optics [20, 12, 23], and the theoretical and analytic study of simplified models [43, 44, 45]. Direct numerical simulations by Rosales and students indicated the existence of an attractor consisting of nonconstant long time limits of spatially periodic solutions [27, 40],

The concern of Stokes in “*Difficulty in the Theory of Sound*” was that the steepening of gradients and formation of discontinuities in solutions of the nonlinear equations, which are presumed to model the continuum more exactly, diverge qualitatively and quantitatively from the sinusoidal oscillations of the *linearized* wave equation, the classical model for sound waves. This raises the apparent paradox that the linearized equations do not provide a good model for the nonlinear equations. On the one hand, the nonlinear equations should provide a more accurate description of the physics of sound, while on the other hand, the linear wave equation, which in principle should only be an approximation, provides an apparently more accurate and time-tested way of representing actual sound waves. Indeed, only a small nonlinear steepening of a sinusoidal sound wave results in an audibly noticeable degradation of sound quality long before shock formation, which is at odds with everyday experience [46]. The paradox is thus mathematical, and can be framed as follows:

In what way can the use of the linearized equations be mathematically justified when the linear and nonlinear equations produce phenomenologically different solutions?

Our results are summarized in the following theorem, which is stated more precisely in Theorems 1.3, 1.4 and 1.5, below. We consider the problem of perturbing a “*quiet state*” to a solution of the fully nonlinear compressible Euler equations. A *quiet state* is defined to be a stationary solution of the

form

$$p(x, t) = \bar{p}, \quad u(x, t) = 0, \quad s(x, t) = s(x), \quad 0 \leq x \leq \ell, \quad (1.2)$$

where the specific entropy $s(\cdot)$ is piecewise C^1 . The density is *not* constant in a quiet state but is determined by the equations through the constitutive relation $\rho = \rho(p, s)$, and is discontinuous at entropy jumps. Nevertheless, quiet states, and the perturbed solutions constructed here with discontinuous entropy, are classical shock-free solutions in the sense that u and p remain continuous and the equations are satisfied almost everywhere. This class includes time-reversible contact discontinuities, across which s and ρ jump, while u and p remain continuous. Shock waves, across which u and p are discontinuous, are not time-reversible, and hence are inconsistent with time-periodic evolution.

The starting point of our theory is to identify a self-adjoint boundary condition in (1.20) below, which generalizes the classical acoustic boundary condition $u = 0$ at $x = 0, \ell$, such that, around any quiet state solution (1.2), the following theorem holds.

Theorem 1.1. *Solutions which satisfy the self-adjoint boundary condition (1.20) extend, by a reflection principle, to global space and time periodic solutions. This holds for the equations obtained by linearizing the compressible Euler equations about any quiet state, as well as the fully nonlinear equations themselves, both expressed in material coordinates. Moreover,*

- (1) *Pure-tone k -mode solutions of the boundary value problem for the linearized equations exist, by Sturm-Liouville theory, for a sequence of distinct frequencies ω_k , $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$, which depend on the quiet state. General solutions of the linearized equations can be expressed as infinite sums of pure-tone solutions.*
- (2) *Each non-resonant pure k -mode solution of the linearized equations perturbs to a one parameter family of “pure tone” k -mode solutions of the nonlinear compressible Euler equations, meeting the same self-adjoint boundary conditions at $x = 0, x = \ell$. A k -mode is non-resonant if ω_k is not a rational multiple of any other ω_j , $j \neq k$, of the linearized problem. Non-resonance forces the small divisors inherent in the problem to be non-zero.*
- (3) *Entropy profiles are generically “fully non-resonant”. In a fully non-resonant profile, all k -modes are non-resonant and perturb to nonlinear solutions.*

Thus, for generic quiet states, every k -mode solution of the linearized equations perturbs to a one parameter family of “pure tone” nonlinear k -mode solutions of the compressible Euler equations satisfying boundary conditions (1.20), and thus extend to shock-free space and time periodic solutions of compressible Euler.

For the proof we identify a restricted class of symmetries which are met by both linear and nonlinear solutions of the boundary value problem. Assuming these symmetries *a priori*, we deduce the existence of a new nonlinear functional which imposes our boundary conditions by projection onto symmetry, and at the same time has the property that the small divisors inherent in the problem factor uniformly out of the operator. This produces a nonlinear functional to which the Implicit Function Theorem can be directly applied when a pure mode is *non-resonant*, a condition guaranteeing the small divisors are non-zero. Remarkably, our method does not require decay estimates on the small divisors, the eigenvalues of linearized operators whose decay rates depend discontinuously on the quiet states [39]. By this our methods overcome difficult technical obstacles such as diophantine estimates, and the expunging of resonances, which are inherent in KAM and Nash-Moser problems, and which have been required for constructing periodic solutions in physically simpler settings [8, 2, 25, 21].

It has long been an open problem as to whether space and time periodic solutions of compressible Euler exist. The existence of such solutions establishes definitively that shock formation can be avoided in solutions exhibiting sustained nonlinear interactions, by which we mean solutions which *do not* decay time-asymptotically to non-interacting wave patterns. Our results also provide the first global existence result for classical solutions of the acoustic boundary value problem.

Our theorem resolves Stokes' paradox by showing that for nonresonant entropy profiles, the oscillatory solutions of the linearized system do indeed approximate pure tone solutions of the nonlinear compressible Euler equations.

Corollary 1.2. *For nonresonant entropy profiles, which are generic, all pure mode solutions of the linearized wave equation are the small amplitude limits of (scaled) solutions of the nonlinear compressible Euler system; that is, for the solutions (p, u) of (1.23), the limits*

$$P(x, t) := \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} \frac{p(x, t) - \bar{p}}{\alpha} = \cos(kt) \varphi_k(x),$$

$$U(x, t) := \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} \frac{u(x, t)}{\alpha} = \sin(kt) \psi_k(x),$$

exist globally in x and t , and satisfy the linear wave equation (1.15), or equivalently (1.12). Here φ_k and ψ_k are solutions of the associated Sturm-Liouville problem.

Most interesting to the authors, these solutions point to a new physical mechanism that attenuates shock wave formation in oscillatory solutions of compressible Euler when the entropy is non-constant. Namely, non-constant entropy breaks the coincidence of wave speeds between characteristic and phase velocities in oscillatory solutions. The physical mechanism for this is repeated nonlinear interactions, or “echoes”, with the background entropy

profile. That is, the reflection of waves by the entropy gradient deflects the speed of characteristics away from the speed of constant Riemann invariants, setting up a consistent periodic pattern which cycles characteristics through balancing regions of compression and rarefaction. The effect is that when entropy is non-constant, linear and nonlinear characteristics generically move ergodically through the periods. By this, nonlinear solutions explore balancing regions of rarefaction and compression, and this has the effect of strongly attenuating shock wave formation in oscillatory solutions when the signals are not too strong. Our work here demonstrates that this phenomenon prevents shock formation *entirely* in pure mode oscillations. The authors believe that this is an important effect in the physical propagation of nonlinear signals, which to our knowledge has not previously been definitively expressed or understood.

The results of this paper are the culmination of authors' earlier ideas, developed in [32, 35, 34, 33, 36, 37, 38, 39]. The results provide a new class of solutions of the nonlinear system (1.13) and show that *Riemann's general shock formation result holds only for the isentropic system (1.14), but not for the entropic system (1.13)*.

1.1. Statement of Results. The Euler equations (1.1) represent conservation of mass and momentum, respectively. It was realized after the work of Stokes and Riemann, that they should be augmented with the conservation of energy, expressed as

$$\partial_t(\frac{1}{2}\rho u^2 + \rho e) + \nabla \cdot (\frac{1}{2}\rho u^3 + \rho u e + u p) = 0, \quad (1.3)$$

while the system should be closed using the Second Law of Thermodynamics,

$$de = \theta ds - p dv. \quad (1.4)$$

Here the variables are velocity u , density ρ , pressure p , specific internal energy e , temperature θ , specific volume $v := 1/\rho$ and specific entropy s , and using (1.4), any two of the thermodynamic variables determine all others, and we use p and s , so the system is closed by taking

$$e = e(p, s) \quad \text{and} \quad v = v(p, s) \quad (1.5)$$

as the constitutive relations.

For *classical* solutions, the energy equation (1.3) is equivalent to the conservation of entropy,

$$\partial_t(\rho s) + \nabla \cdot (\rho s u) = 0, \quad (1.6)$$

which is structurally simpler, especially when s is used as one of the thermodynamic variables [7, 28]. On the other hand, if discontinuities are present in the solution, (1.6) is to be interpreted as the *entropy inequality*, and this serves to select admissible discontinuities, which are shock waves. In this paper, the solutions we obtain are classical in the sense that p and u are everywhere continuous, with possibly discontinuous ρ and s , and equations (1.1), (1.6) are satisfied almost everywhere.

For us it is preferable to work in the *Lagrangian frame*, which refers to the *material* coordinate \mathbf{x} , in which the (full) compressible Euler equations take on the simpler form

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t v - \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot u &= 0, \\ \partial_t u + \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} p &= 0, \\ \partial_t \left(\frac{1}{2}u^2 + e\right) + \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot (u p) &= 0,\end{aligned}\tag{1.7}$$

again augmented by (1.4), and (1.5) closes the system. The two systems (1.1), (1.3) and (1.7) are equivalent for weak and classical solutions [7, 41], and for classical solutions, the energy equation is equivalent to the (Lagrangian) entropy equation

$$\partial_t s = 0, \quad \text{so that } s(\mathbf{x}, t) = s^0(\mathbf{x}),\tag{1.8}$$

so that the entropy can be regarded as a stationary wave in the material variable \mathbf{x} .

It follows that for *classical solutions without shocks*, the full system of the compressible Euler equations can be written as

$$\partial_t v - \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot u = 0, \quad \partial_t u + \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} p = 0,\tag{1.9}$$

in which the constitutive equation can be taken to be either

$$v = v(p, s^0(\mathbf{x})) \quad \text{or} \quad p = p(v, s^0(\mathbf{x})),\tag{1.10}$$

and this in turn can be expressed as a single *nonlinear wave equation*, namely

$$\partial_t^2 v + \Delta_{\mathbf{x}} p = 0,\tag{1.11}$$

together with (1.10). We make the standard assumption that

$$\frac{\partial p}{\partial v} < 0, \quad \text{so also } \frac{\partial v}{\partial p} < 0,$$

which implies that the system is strictly hyperbolic [7]. It is now evident that linearization of (1.11) around the constant pressure \bar{p} yields the linear wave equation

$$\partial_t^2 P - c^2 \Delta_{\mathbf{x}} P = 0,\tag{1.12}$$

but now the wavespeed $c = 1/\sqrt{-\frac{\partial v}{\partial p}}$ depends also on the entropy $s = s^0(\mathbf{x})$.

We now restrict to one dimension, so we are studying plane waves in direction \mathbf{k} , say, with one-dimensional variable $x := \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x}$. In this case, provided no shocks are present, the entropy can be regarded as a standing wave, $s = s(x)$, and (1.9) becomes the 2×2 system

$$\partial_x p + \partial_t u = 0, \quad \partial_x u - \partial_t v = 0, \quad v = v(p, s(x)).\tag{1.13}$$

The Lagrangian formulation was known to Euler, and the mapping between spatial (Eulerian) coordinate and material (Lagrangian) coordinate \mathbf{x} is solution dependent, and in one dimension reduces to the map $X \rightarrow x$, given by

$$x(X, t) := x_0(t) + \int_0^X \rho(\chi, t) d\chi,$$

where $x_0(t)$ is a given particle path[7, 16, 28].

We treat the system as evolving in material coordinate x , with inhomogeneous nonlinear term $v(p, s(x))$, in which the entropy profile is regarded as fixed and known. If the entropy is constant (the isentropic case) or if specific volume v is a function of pressure alone (the barotropic case), system (1.13) reduces to the well-known p -system,

$$\partial_x p + \partial_t u = 0. \quad \partial_x u - \partial_t v(p) = 0, \quad (1.14)$$

and this is the system for which Riemann showed that *all compressions eventually lead to shocks* [26, 28], and Glimm and Lax showed that periodic solutions decay to average by shock wave dissipation at rate $1/t$.

Because sound waves are pressure variations, we treat solutions as perturbations of constant “quiet states” (\bar{p}, \bar{u}) . Without loss of generality, a Galilean transformation in the spatial variable allows us to take $\bar{u} = 0$. For a given entropy profile, a quiet state is fully described by a single constant \bar{p} , while the specific volume $v(\bar{p}, s(x))$ varies with the entropy. The linearization of (1.13) around the constant quiet state $(\bar{p}, 0)$, with stationary entropy profile $s(x)$, is the inhomogeneous linear system

$$\partial_x P + \partial_t U = 0. \quad \partial_x U + \sigma^2 \partial_t P = 0, \quad (1.15)$$

with varying linear wavespeed $\sigma = 1/c(\bar{p}, s)$ given by

$$\sigma = \sigma(x) := \sqrt{-\frac{\partial v}{\partial p}(\bar{p}, s(x))}. \quad (1.16)$$

Because the inhomogeneous linearized wave speed is not time dependent in a Lagrangian frame, one of the fundamental simplifications in our point view here is to evolve in the material coordinate x , rather than the time t , as is standard in most treatments. This has the effect of putting the inhomogeneity $s(x)$ into a Sturm-Liouville framework.

Our procedure is to first solve the linear system (1.15) by separation of variables, and then prove that generically, all pure mode solutions of (1.15) perturb to time and space periodic solutions of the fully nonlinear system (1.13). We accomplish this by solving a *periodic boundary value problem* (PBVP) on the region $(x, t) \in [0, \ell] \times [0, T]$, which we refer to as a *tile*.

To begin, we introduce the *acoustic boundary value problem* (ABVP) for time-periodic solutions, by imposing a reflection boundary condition, namely

$$\begin{aligned} u(x, 0) = u(x, T), \quad p(x, 0) = p(x, T), \quad x \in [0, \ell], \\ u(0, t) = 0, \quad u(\ell, t) = 0, \quad t \in [0, T]. \end{aligned} \quad (1.17)$$

This models pure reflections off a solid wall in acoustics. Note that we can impose time-periodicity because the inhomogeneity is isolated in the spatial variations of $s(x)$.

We will prove the existence of pure tone solutions of this ABVP, for which p is even and u is odd as functions of x . These in turn generate space

and time periodic solutions with time period T and spatial period 2ℓ by a reflection principle. This accounts for the periodic solutions for *even* modes, but to generate the *odd* modes we must generalize the boundary condition. By this we find that the odd modes generate 4ℓ spatially periodic solutions from the same tile under the same even/odd conditions, when p and u satisfy the more general *periodic* boundary conditions $u(0, t) = 0$, with

$$\frac{\mathcal{I}-\mathcal{R}}{2} \mathcal{T}^{-T/4} p(\ell, t) = \frac{\mathcal{I}-\mathcal{R}}{2} \mathcal{T}^{-T/4} u(\ell, t) = 0, \quad (1.18)$$

for $t \in [0, T]$. Here \mathcal{R} and \mathcal{T} are linear reflection and translation operators, defined respectively by

$$\mathcal{R}[f](t) := f(-t), \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{T}^\tau[f](t) := f(t - \tau).$$

The presence of the term $\frac{\mathcal{I}-\mathcal{R}}{2}$, which is a projection onto odd modes, only imposes conditions on half of the modes, which is why the two conditions in (1.18) are consistent. Moreover, it is convenient to now introduce a new variable y and write (1.18) as the single condition

$$\frac{\mathcal{I}-\mathcal{R}}{2} \mathcal{T}^{-T/4} y(\ell, t) = 0, \quad \text{where} \quad y := p + u. \quad (1.19)$$

The quantity y is dimensionally inconsistent, because it adds p and u . However, since p is even and u is odd, we can formally add these orthogonal pieces, and we use y as a convenient notational device to track the separate evolutions of p and u simultaneously. We then recover p and u and their derivatives from y and its derivatives by simply projecting y onto even or odd modes as appropriate. Formally, y solves a nonlocal nonlinear scalar balance law, which in turn simplifies the analysis of solutions by the method of characteristics, because it reduces to a single characteristic family.

To incorporate all of the above conditions into a single problem for the generating tile, it suffices to consider the following general boundary conditions:

$$\begin{aligned} u(x, 0) = u(x, T), \quad p(x, 0) = p(x, T), \quad x \in [0, \ell], \\ u(0, t) = 0, \quad \frac{\mathcal{I}-\mathcal{R}}{2} \mathcal{T}^{-T/4} (p(\ell, t) + u(\ell, t)) = 0, \quad t \in [0, T]. \end{aligned} \quad (1.20)$$

These boundary conditions are consistent with and suggested by the *critical observation* that a combination of reflections and translations extend the solution to a tiling of the whole plane in which both $p(x, t)$ and $u(x, t)$ are jointly periodic, namely

$$(p, u)(x + 4\ell, t) = (p, u)(x, t) \quad \text{and} \quad (p, u)(x, t + T) = (p, u)(x, t),$$

for all x and t , for both the linear and nonlinear systems. Moreover, these boundary conditions imply that the Sturm-Liouville operator obtained by separating variables in (1.15) is self-adjoint.

The acoustic boundary condition (1.17) is physically realizable for arbitrary entropy profiles on $[0, \ell]$. On the other hand, the general boundary condition (1.20) together with our reflections imply that the entropy is 2ℓ periodic while the solution is 4ℓ periodic in x . Periodic entropy profiles in all of space should thus be regarded as finely tuned, but the boundary

value problem that generates them is robust in both the linear and nonlinear problems. To the authors' knowledge, this is the first instance of a proof of the existence of globally defined, bounded, *classical* solutions of the acoustic boundary value problem (1.17) for the nonlinear system of compressible Euler equations. For special equations of state, Nishida and Smoller obtained globally bounded solutions in BV for a general boundary value problem [22]. These solutions are not known to be classical, and generally contain shock waves.

For our purposes it suffices to restrict to the class \mathcal{P} of piecewise C^1 entropy profiles,

$$\mathcal{P} := \left\{ s : [0, \ell] \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid s(x) \text{ piecewise } C^1 \right\}, \quad (1.21)$$

which includes both smooth and piecewise constant profiles, and is dense in L^1 . It follows that σ defined by (1.16) is also piecewise C^1 , $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}$. We adopt the standard definition of piecewise C^1 as meaning a bounded function with finitely many jumps in the interior of the interval $[0, \ell]$. For brevity we abbreviate the trigonometric functions $c := \cos$ and $s := \sin$. Within this framework, we state our main results in the following three theorems which together precisely restate Theorem 1.1:

Theorem 1.3. *For every entropy profile $s \in \mathcal{P}$, and every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the linearized system (1.15), (1.20) admits a k -mode solution*

$$P(x, t) = c(\omega_k t) \varphi_k(x), \quad U(x, t) = s(\omega_k t) \psi_k(x), \quad (1.22)$$

where (φ_k, ψ_k) is a solution of the Sturm-Liouville system (1.24) with corresponding eigenfrequency ω_k . When combined with the boundary conditions (1.20), this extends to a jointly periodic pure “ k -mode” solution with periods 4ℓ in x and time period $T = 2\pi k/\omega_k$ of the linearized system (1.15).

For a given entropy profile, we define the k -mode to be *nonresonant* provided that the equation

$$k\omega_l - j\omega_k = 0, \quad l, j \in \mathbb{N},$$

has no solutions. We then define the *set of resonant profiles* by

$$\mathcal{Z} := \left\{ s(\cdot) \in \mathcal{P} \mid k\omega_l = j\omega_k \text{ for some } (k, j, l) \in \mathbb{N}^3 \right\},$$

so that any $s \in \mathcal{Z}$ has at least one resonant mode. In particular, a sufficient condition for nonresonance is that the ratios ω_l/ω_k are irrational for each $l \neq k$. Resonance of a mode is fully determined at the level of the linearized equations. We note that in the linear homogeneous wave equation, obtained when the entropy is constant, the frequencies all take the form $\omega_k = k\bar{\omega}$, for some constant $\bar{\omega}$. In this case, all frequencies are determined by the single number $\bar{\omega}$, and in particular constant entropy profiles are *completely resonant*. In the next theorem, we show that any nonresonant k -mode solution of Theorem 1.3 perturbs to a one-parameter family of solutions of the nonlinear compressible Euler equations.

Theorem 1.4. *Let any entropy profile $s(\cdot) \in \mathcal{P}$ and Sobolev index $b > 5/2$ be given. If the k -mode is nonresonant, $\omega_j/\omega_k \notin \mathbb{Q}$ for all $j \neq k$, then there is some $\bar{\alpha}_k > 0$, such that the nonlinear system (1.13), (1.20) admits a 1-parameter family of continuous and piecewise H^b solutions of the form*

$$\begin{aligned} p(x, t) &= \bar{p} + \alpha c(\omega_k t) \varphi_k(x) + O(\alpha^2), \\ u(x, t) &= \alpha s(\omega_k t) \psi_k(x) + O(\alpha^2), \end{aligned} \tag{1.23}$$

for $|\alpha| < \bar{\alpha}_k$. These in turn extend by reflection to jointly periodic pure tone solutions of the nonlinear compressible Euler equations with periods 4ℓ in x , and time period $T = 2\pi k/\omega_k$.

Finally, for the third theorem, we regard \mathcal{P} as a dense subspace of $L^1(0, \ell)$. We give a sense in which the *fully nonresonant* entropy profiles are generic.

Theorem 1.5. *Given any piecewise constant approximation to an L^1 entropy profile, the probability of that approximation having any resonant linearized modes is zero, within the class of all piecewise constant profiles with the same number of jumps. In this sense, for generic piecewise C^1 entropy profiles, every linearized k -mode perturbs to a one-parameter family of nonlinear pure tone solutions of the form (1.23) of the compressible Euler equations.*

1.2. Discussion of Results. The linearized profiles (φ_k, ψ_k) in (1.23) are the eigenfunctions, corresponding to eigenvalue ω_k^2 , of the Sturm-Liouville (SL) system

$$\dot{\varphi}_k + \omega_k \psi_k = 0, \quad \dot{\psi}_k - \sigma^2 \omega_k \varphi_k = 0, \tag{1.24}$$

which is obtained by separating variables using the ansatz (1.22) in the linearization (1.15). It is known that the SL system (1.24) has continuous solutions provided σ is piecewise continuous, as long as continuity of the solution (φ_k, ψ_k) is imposed at any jump in the SL coefficient σ [24, 47, 1]. In the linear problem continuity of (φ_k, ψ_k) is equivalent to continuity of p and u . In the nonlinear problem, imposing continuity in p and u forces a time-reversible contact discontinuity in $\rho = 1/v$ [28, 7]. The linearized evolution through a piecewise C^1 entropy field can then be realized as a series of non-commuting compositions of evolutions on C^1 fields. The concatenation of these smooth evolutions together with continuity of p and u at entropy jumps yields a bounded evolution operator in Sobolev spaces H^b for arbitrary $b > 5/2$. In particular, if the entropy profile is piecewise constant, the full evolution is a non-commuting composition of *isentropic* evolutions and entropy jumps.

For the isentropic system, linearization around a constant state gives the linear wave equation (1.12), so all frequencies have the form $k\bar{\omega}$. In this case, all pairs of modes are resonant, so that no modes can be perturbed by our methods. Thus Corollary 1 *fails* for isentropic profiles, consistent with the observations of Stokes and Riemann. Since the seminal work of Glimm and Lax [10], experts have generally thought that shocks would always form

and solutions would decay to average in space periodic solutions of the full compressible Euler equations. In the context of [10], our results are thus surprising and provide the first definitive proof that shock formation and decay to average *fails* when a full system of Riemann invariants is not available.

In this paper we prove that the fundamental modes of the linear theory, from which all solutions of (1.12) are obtained by superposition, perturb to nonlinear solutions. Although we do not have a nonlinear superposition principle, and nonlinear solutions may shock, stability of the fundamental modes strongly indicates that generic solutions with or without shocks will not decay to average. Thus, if there exists a Glimm-Lax decay theory for 3×3 Euler, we cannot expect decay to average as in the 2×2 case. Indeed, solutions constructed here have the property that nonlinear rarefaction and compression are in balance on average along every characteristic, because characteristics move ergodically through the entire entropy profile as a consequence of the nonresonance condition. This identifies a new mechanism that attenuates shock wave formation in oscillatory solutions of compressible Euler when the entropy is non-constant, and suggests that long-time limits are much richer than constant states.

Regarding stability, by continuity, perturbations of our nonlinear periodic solutions will balance rarefaction and compression in the limit of small perturbation. This has the effect of sending the time of shock formation to infinity as a perturbation tends to zero, an aspect of stability. A complete stability analysis would require knowledge of all solutions which similarly balance rarefaction and compression on average along characteristics and the effect of this averaging process under perturbation. If strong perturbations of these solutions do form shocks, they will decay by entropy dissipation, but we cannot expect the long-time limits of such decaying solutions to be restricted to just “quiet” constant states; rather, they would decay to any solution which balances rarefaction and compression like the pure tone nonlinear solutions constructed here. The simulations of [40, 27] can be interpreted as a numerical indication of stability. Prior to the results of this paper, the question of stability of such solutions could not be formulated mathematically.

The authors began this project in [32, 35, 33, 34] by identifying the physical phenomenon of “echoing” which can prevent a single compression from forming a shock in finite time by interaction with the entropy profile. We conjectured that space and time periodic solutions to Euler exist, and clarified the difficult technical issues that arose [37, 36], including issues of small divisors and KAM-type behavior [38, 39]. A valid Nash-Moser procedure was set out in a scalar setting in [39], but the difficult technical issues described there were bypassed in this paper by the discovery and use of symmetries. With the results of this paper, our initial conjectures, and much more, are confirmed.

In our previous treatments, we framed the problem by imposing periodicity by “periodic return”, namely

$$\mathcal{F}_1(U) = \mathcal{E}^L(U) - U = 0. \quad (1.25)$$

In this framework, and other Nash-Moser treatments, some expunging of resonant parameters is required because there are no uniform bounds on the decay rates of small divisors [8, 2].

The key breakthrough in this paper is to identify fully, and leverage, the *symmetries* that are respected by *both the linear and nonlinear* evolutions of the systems (1.15) and (1.13). These symmetries, identified only in material coordinates, are p even, u odd, in both x and t separately. That is, if the data is preserved by the transformations

$$\begin{aligned} (p(x, t), u(x, t)) &\mapsto (p(-x, t), -u(-x, t)), \\ (p(x, t), u(x, t)) &\mapsto (p(x, -t), -u(x, -t)), \end{aligned} \quad (1.26)$$

then solutions of systems (1.15) and (1.13) also respect (1.26). This in turn means that the *periodicity constraint* (1.25) can be replaced by a *projection constraint* through the boundary conditions (1.20) on a smaller tile, while simultaneously reducing the domain of the nonlinear operators to symmetric data. This has the effect of essentially halving the (infinite) number of “degrees of freedom” while retaining all essential nonlinear effects.

Utilizing the symmetries, we construct a new nonlinear functional \mathcal{F} which imposes periodicity by projection onto symmetry, such that the nonlinear operator can be factored into two parts, $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{A}\mathcal{N}$. The nonlinear piece \mathcal{N} is regular and has “base linearization” $D\mathcal{N}(\bar{p}) = \mathcal{I}$, so we can apply the implicit function theorem directly to \mathcal{N} without need of Nash-Moser. The prefactor \mathcal{A} is a *fixed, diagonal, constant* linear operator which is bounded, and whose inverse \mathcal{A}^{-1} , although unbounded $H^b \rightarrow H^b$, exists and is closed for each \bar{p} so long as the entropy profile is nonresonant. This operator \mathcal{A} encodes all the small divisors, and acts as a fixed, constant preconditioner for the nonlinear problem, which can then be inverted by the implicit function theorem. To get uniform estimates, it suffices to adjust the H^b norm on the target space via scaling by the fixed small divisors, and this has the effect of turning \mathcal{A} into an isometry. We then invert \mathcal{A} explicitly, so that the nonlinear problem becomes essentially: find y^0 such that $\mathcal{N}(y^0) = 0$, with $D\mathcal{N}(\bar{p}) = \mathcal{I}$, where \mathcal{N} is regarded as a map $\mathcal{N} : H^b \rightarrow H^b$. Once this factorization is in place, the problem can be treated as a standard bifurcation problem.

In summary, the symmetries (1.26) enabled us to discover a nonlinear operator \mathcal{F} which both encodes periodicity and serendipitously factors. This allows us to bypass Nash-Moser and the inherent problem of controlling the small divisors in “nearby linearized operators”. To obtain periodic solutions it suffices to invert the nonlinear operator \mathcal{N} using the standard implicit function theorem. It is remarkable that for nonresonant profiles, we get a fixed decay rate for small divisors of $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}(\bar{p})$ at each \bar{p} , but this decay

rate is not uniformly continuous in \bar{p} . In the bifurcation argument, it is essential that the average value of p be perturbed, because that is precisely our bifurcation parameter. In this way our perturbed nonlinear solutions have a *different* background pressure from the fixed base pressure \bar{p} which determines the small divisors.

The paper is laid out as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the symmetry and reflection principles which generate periodic solutions, and derive the self-adjoint boundary conditions (1.20) and the nonlinear operator \mathcal{F} . In Section 3, we linearize the problem and derive the corresponding Sturm-Liouville system. We then solve this SL system and develop the resonance conditions. In Section 4, we develop the bifurcation argument and prove existence of nonlinear pure tone solutions of the boundary value problem, assuming technical lemmas which are proved in later sections. This involves rescaling of the target Hilbert space by the small divisors, and produces periodic solutions using the reflection principle. In Section 5 we carry out a detailed analysis of the SL problem and estimate the growth rate of the eigenfrequencies. In Section 6 we show that the evolution operator is twice differentiable and detail the role of genuine nonlinearity. In Section 7, we restrict to piecewise constant entropy profiles, for which explicit formulae can be developed, and use these to establish density of resonant profiles in L^1 , and genericity of non-resonant profiles. Finally in Section 8, we provide historical, scientific and mathematical context for our results.

2. STRUCTURE OF PERIODIC SOLUTIONS

Our starting point is the one-dimensional compressible Euler equations in a material frame (1.7), which is the 3×3 system in conservative form,

$$v_t - u_x = 0, \quad u_t + p_x = 0, \quad \left(\frac{1}{2}u^2 + e\right)_t + (up)_x = 0, \quad (2.1)$$

see [7, 28]. Here x is the material coordinate and u is the Eulerian velocity, and the thermodynamic variables are specific volume v , pressure p and specific internal energy e . The system is closed by a *constitutive relation* which satisfies the Second Law of Thermodynamics,

$$de = \theta ds - p dv,$$

so that

$$\theta = e_s(s, v) \quad \text{and} \quad p = -e_v(s, v),$$

where θ is the temperature and s the specific entropy. It follows that for classical smooth solutions, the third (energy) equation can be replaced by the simpler *entropy equation*,

$$e_t + p v_t = 0, \quad \text{or} \quad s_t = 0,$$

see [7, 28]. Throughout this paper, we consider classical solutions, so we regard the entropy $s(x)$ as a fixed, known, stationary field.

This means that our general constitutive law becomes the inhomogeneous condition

$$p = p(v, s(x)) \quad \text{or} \quad v = v(p, s(x)),$$

and the entropy s is no longer regarded as a dynamical variable. In this point of view, we treat the pressure p and velocity u as dependent variables, with general constitutive law $v = v(p, s)$.

For classical solutions, in a Lagrangian frame, we write the system (2.1) as

$$p_x + u_t = 0, \quad u_x - v(p, s)_t = 0, \quad (2.2)$$

or, in quasilinear form,

$$p_x + u_t = 0, \quad u_x - v_p(p, s) p_t = 0,$$

where we are again evolving in x , and since $s_t = 0$, we regard the entropy as a given fixed function $s(x)$. Because we consider *classical* solutions, with possibly discontinuous entropy, we *require* that p and u be continuous throughout the evolution. This is consistent with the Rankine-Hugoniot jump conditions for contact discontinuities, which are stationary in the material frame [7, 28].

2.1. Symmetries and Boundary Conditions. We construct periodic solutions within the restricted class of solutions which admit the following essential symmetries respected by the nonlinear system (2.2). This represents a discovery more than a loss of generality because the linearized sound wave solutions which we perturb respect the same symmetries.

The first of the critical symmetries is *even/odd symmetry in time*, namely that the transformation

$$p(x, t) \rightarrow p(x, -t), \quad u(x, t) \rightarrow -u(x, -t), \quad (2.3)$$

is respected by the system, so that any data $(p(x_0, \cdot), u(x_0, \cdot))$ which satisfies (2.3) evolves in x to a solution which also satisfies (2.3).

Solutions (p, u) in this symmetry class can be described by the equivalent scalar quantity (1.19), namely

$$y(x, t) := p(x, t) + u(x, t),$$

which satisfies the nonlinear, nonlocal, scalar conservation law

$$y_x + g(y)_t = 0, \quad (2.4)$$

in which the nonlocal scalar flux is given by

$$g(y) := u + v(p, s) = \frac{\mathcal{I}-\mathcal{R}}{2}y + v\left(\frac{\mathcal{I}+\mathcal{R}}{2}y, s\right). \quad (2.5)$$

Here \mathcal{R} denotes the linear time reflection operator,

$$[\mathcal{R}v](t) := v(-t), \quad (2.6)$$

so that $\frac{\mathcal{I}+\mathcal{R}}{2}$ and $\frac{\mathcal{I}-\mathcal{R}}{2}$ are the projections onto even and odd parts of a function, respectively. Although the system (2.2) and scalar equation (2.4) are equivalent in the symmetry class (2.3), solutions of (2.4) are easier to analyze because it has a single characteristic family.

The second symmetry condition is *even/odd symmetry in material coordinate* x , namely that the transformation

$$p(x, t) \rightarrow p(-x, t), \quad u(x, t) \rightarrow -u(-x, t), \quad (2.7)$$

is also respected by system (2.2), provided the entropy $s(x)$ is also even in x . Because x is the evolution variable, we impose (2.7) at the boundaries and use reflections to generate a periodic tile. Doing so imposes constraints on the data $y^0(\cdot)$ and on the solution $y(\ell, \cdot)$ which lead to our reformulation of the nonlinear problem.

Recall that we are looking for continuous, classical solutions of the system (2.2). Imposition of the material symmetry (2.7) together with continuity requires $u(0, \cdot) = 0$, or equivalently $y(0, \cdot)$ even. We thus *restrict the domain* of data y^0 for the scalar equation (2.4) to the “half-space” of even functions. We evolve this even data forward in material space to $x = \ell$. This in turn yields the solution on the entire entropy level $-\ell \leq x \leq \ell$ by reflection through

$$y(-x, t) := \mathcal{R}y(x, t) = y(x, -t), \quad (2.8)$$

which yields

$$\frac{\mathcal{I}+\mathcal{R}}{2}y(-x, t) = \frac{\mathcal{I}+\mathcal{R}}{2}y(x, t) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\mathcal{I}-\mathcal{R}}{2}y(-x, t) = -\frac{\mathcal{I}+\mathcal{R}}{2}y(x, t),$$

which in turn is (2.7). Note that our boundary condition is the natural physical “acoustic boundary reflection condition” $u = 0$ at $x = 0$, and if this condition is imposed, the solution necessarily satisfies (2.8) by uniqueness.

It remains to impose a periodicity condition at the end of the evolution. For this we use the following principle: an even or odd periodic function admits *two* axes of symmetry, at both the endpoint 0 and midpoint $T/2$ of the interval, so that even or odd periodic functions remain even or odd after a half-period shift, respectively. That is, if we set $\tilde{f}(s) := f(s - T/2)$, then

$$\tilde{f}(-s) = f(-s - T/2) = \pm f(s + T/2) = \pm f(s - T/2) = \pm \tilde{f}(s). \quad (2.9)$$

For periodicity, it thus suffices to impose the additional *shifted* reflection symmetry at the end of the evolution $x = \ell$, which becomes the shifted symmetry axis. This shifted reflection is

$$\begin{aligned} p(\ell + x', t) &= p(\ell - x', t - T/2), \\ u(\ell + x', t) &= -u(\ell - x', t - T/2), \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

and setting $x' = 0$, continuity of the solution at ℓ requires

$$p(\ell, t - T/2) = p(\ell, t), \quad u(\ell, t - T/2) = -u(\ell, t). \quad (2.11)$$

In other words, if $p(x, \cdot)$ and $u(x, \cdot)$ are defined for say $0 < x \leq \ell$, and satisfy the symmetry condition (2.11) at $x = \ell$, then use of (2.10) allows us to extend the solution to the interval $0 < x < 2\ell$. Assuming these symmetries, it follows that we can generate a 4ℓ -periodic solution from a single tile defined over $0 \leq x \leq \ell$ via the reflections (2.8) around $x = 0$ and (2.10) around $x = \ell$, respectively..

In order to fully express our nonlinear equation as a nonlinear functional in the scalar field y , we must write condition (2.11) in terms of y . This is easiest done by introducing the constant shift operator

$$\mathcal{T}^\tau[f](t) := f(t - \tau). \quad (2.12)$$

Using a *quarter-period* shift, we write (2.11) as

$$(\mathcal{T}^{T/4})^2 p(\ell, \cdot) = p(\ell, \cdot), \quad (\mathcal{T}^{T/4})^2 u(\ell, \cdot) = -u(\ell, \cdot).$$

Since p is even in t , u is odd in t , and $y = p + u$, this is

$$(\mathcal{T}^{T/4})^2 y(\ell, \cdot) = \mathcal{R}y(\ell, \cdot),$$

and since $\mathcal{T}^{-T/4} \mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R} \mathcal{T}^{T/4}$, this results in the *shifted reflection* condition

$$\frac{\mathcal{I} - \mathcal{R}}{2} \mathcal{T}^{T/4} y(\ell, \cdot) = 0. \quad (2.13)$$

We thus impose (2.13) as the nonlinear tiling condition that we must solve: any even data y^0 whose evolution through $x = \ell$ satisfies (2.13) generates a periodic tile.

We illustrate the repeated reflections of the generating tile in Figure 1. Recalling that two orthogonal reflections of the plane yields a rotation of π around the intersection point, the standard reflection at $x = 0$ is labelled ‘1’, and the shifted reflection at $x = \ell$ is labeled ‘2’. The composition of these two reflections is then translated periodically by 4ℓ and 2π to give the wave pattern on the plane. A sketch of the perturbed tile, showing the perturbed characteristics to leading order, is also shown. The density of sketched characteristics indicates the presence of nonlinear rarefaction and compression. Only the forward characteristics are shown; the backward characteristics are obtained by applying the time reflection \mathcal{R} .

2.2. The Reduced Nonlinear Problem. We now precisely set up the nonlinear operator whose solutions provide a tile which generates periodic solutions of compressible Euler. To do this we express the scalar evolution in x by the nonlocal conservation law (2.4) as the operator \mathcal{E}^x , defined by

$$\mathcal{E}^x(y^0) := y(x, \cdot), \quad \text{for } x \in [0, \ell].$$

By classical energy estimates, we have that $\mathcal{E}^x : H^b \rightarrow H^b$ for any $b > 5/2$ while the entropy $s(x)$ remains C^1 , so that $\|\frac{ds}{dx}\|_\infty < \infty$. At any point x at which the entropy $s(x)$ has a jump, that is at any contact discontinuity, we impose the continuity condition

$$p(x+, \cdot) = p(x-, \cdot), \quad u(x+, \cdot) = u(x-, \cdot),$$

which is equivalent to

$$y(x+, \cdot) = y(x-, \cdot), \quad (2.14)$$

and which implies that the H^b norm is exactly preserved at any contact. Because our entropy profile is assumed piecewise C^1 , the evolution over the full interval can be regarded as a non-commuting composition of partial




FIGURE 1. Reflections of the generating tile.

evolutions, each of which is over a subinterval in which the entropy is C^1 . It follows that we can write

$$y(\ell, \cdot) = \mathcal{E}^\ell(y^0),$$

where by classical energy estimates, $\mathcal{E}^\ell : H^b \rightarrow H^b$ for any $b > 5/2$ [19, 30]; note that the larger b is, the smoother our nonlinear solutions are known to be.

If we adjust the shifted periodic boundary condition (2.13) to the simpler even condition

$$\frac{\mathcal{I}-\mathcal{R}}{2} y(\ell, \cdot) = 0,$$

we obtain a smaller class of problems which satisfy the physically important acoustic reflection boundary condition (1.17), namely $u(\ell, \cdot) = 0$, global solutions of which have been an open problem since the time of Euler.

The reflection principles outlined above reduce the problem of doubly periodic solutions of compressible Euler to that of producing a single tile. To generate such a tile, we pose either of the following two problems:

- The *periodic tile problem*, namely

$$\mathcal{F}_P(y^0) := \frac{\mathcal{I}-\mathcal{R}}{2} \mathcal{T}^{-T/4} \mathcal{E}^\ell y^0 = 0; \quad (2.15)$$

- The *acoustic boundary value problem*, namely

$$\mathcal{F}_A(y^0) := \frac{\mathcal{I}-\mathcal{R}}{2} \mathcal{E}^\ell y^0 = 0. \quad (2.16)$$

In both of these problems, as above, \mathcal{E}^ℓ denotes nonlinear evolution through the varying entropy profile from $x = 0$ to $x = \ell$, and the data $y^0 = y^0(t)$ is again assumed to be even and T -periodic. We use the following notation which incorporates both problems (2.15) and (2.16). Denote the “boundary shift operator” by

$$\mathcal{S} := \frac{\mathcal{I}-\mathcal{R}}{2} \mathcal{T}^{-\chi T/4}, \quad \chi = 1 \quad \text{or} \quad 0, \quad (2.17)$$

for the periodic or acoustic boundary, respectively, where χ is an indicator of which boundary condition is being used. Again, the symmetry imposed by choosing y^0 even encodes the reflection at $x = 0$, and \mathcal{S} imposes a self-adjoint boundary condition at $x = \ell$. Thus both equations (2.15) and (2.16) take the form

$$\mathcal{F}(y^0) := \mathcal{S} \mathcal{E}^\ell y^0 = 0. \quad (2.18)$$

Given a fixed entropy profile, denoting \mathcal{L} as the linearization of \mathcal{E} about the quiet state $p = \bar{p}$, the composition $\mathcal{S} \mathcal{L} = D\mathcal{F}(\bar{p})$ becomes a classical Sturm-Liouville operator.

Theorem 2.1. *Any solution of the scalar equation (2.15) with even data y^0 provides a tile which generates by reflections and translations, a solution of the compressible Euler equations which is 4ℓ -periodic in space and T -periodic in time. A solution of (2.16) similarly produces a solution which is 2ℓ -periodic in space and T -periodic in time.*

Proof. Given a solution $y(x, t)$ defined on $[0, \ell] \times [0, T]$ and satisfying the stated conditions, we extend this to a full periodic solution of the system (1.13), illustrated in Figure 1, as follows. Recalling that y satisfies a scalar equation, we generate the state (p, u) from y , and then reflect this 2×2 state using the boundary conditions.

First, we require the entropy $s(x)$ to be even and 2ℓ -periodic, so set

$$s(x) := \begin{cases} s(2\ell - x), & \ell \leq x \leq 2\ell, \\ s(x - 2\ell), & 2\ell \leq x \leq 3\ell, \\ s(4\ell - x), & 3\ell \leq x \leq 4\ell, \end{cases}$$

Next, recalling (1.19), we set

$$\begin{aligned} p(x, t) &:= \frac{\mathcal{I}+\mathcal{R}}{2} y(x, t) = \frac{y(x, t) + y(x, -t)}{2}, \\ u(x, t) &:= \frac{\mathcal{I}-\mathcal{R}}{2} y(x, t) = \frac{y(x, t) - y(x, -t)}{2}, \end{aligned}$$

for $(x, t) \in [0, \ell] \times [0, T]$. Recalling that $\chi = 1$ or $\chi = 0$, we extend p using (2.8) and (2.10) as

$$p(x, t) := \begin{cases} p(2\ell - x, t + \chi T/2), & \ell \leq x \leq 2\ell, \\ p(x - 2\ell, t + \chi T/2), & 2\ell \leq x \leq 3\ell, \\ p(4\ell - x, t), & 3\ell \leq x \leq 4\ell, \end{cases}$$

and similarly extend u as

$$u(x, t) := \begin{cases} -u(2\ell - x, t + \chi T/2), & \ell \leq x \leq 2\ell, \\ u(x - 2\ell, t + \chi T/2), & 2\ell \leq x \leq 3\ell, \\ -u(4\ell - x, t), & 3\ell \leq x \leq 4\ell. \end{cases}$$

By construction, the solution so given is periodic and continuous at all boundaries $x = j\ell$, $j = 0, \dots, 4$. This uses the fact that an even or odd that is T -periodic has two symmetry axes, $t = 0$ and $t = T/2$, as in (2.9). In the case of the acoustic boundary condition, we have $\chi = 0$ and the functions p and u are 2ℓ -periodic. \square

For a given entropy profile $s(x)$, each solution of (2.15) generates a space and time periodic solution, generated by a reflection at the left boundary and a shifted reflection on the right, so the space period of the solution is 4ℓ . On the other hand, a solution of (2.16) generates a periodic solution by just one reflection in x , so has space period 2ℓ . We will show that the two problems are related as follows: any k -mode solution of the linearization of (2.15) with k even is also a solution of that of (2.16), and conversely an even $2j$ -mode linearized solution of (2.16) can also be realized as a solution of the linearization of (2.15). Moreover, if these linearized solutions perturb, then by uniqueness they will coincide as solutions of the corresponding nonlinear problems.

It appears that (2.15) generates more solutions than (2.16), but we regard (2.16) as a more physically relevant problem. This is because the acoustic boundary condition (2.16) is simply a reflection off a wall, so the system models sound waves bouncing between two walls which bound an unrestricted varying entropy profile on $[0, \ell]$. On the other hand, the velocity u need not vanish at $x = \ell$ with (2.15), and it is hard to ascribe (2.15) to a physical condition, because we expect that controlling an entropy profile to be perfectly symmetric between two walls (at $x = 0$ and $x = 2\ell$) is practically infeasible. However, we regard periodic solutions in which compression and rarefaction are in perfect balance as being of fundamental importance.

In fact, the reflection symmetry imposed by the periodic boundary condition implies that even mode solutions of the periodic boundary value problem (BVP) automatically satisfy the acoustic BVP $u = 0$ at $x = \ell$ for both the linear and nonlinear solutions. Thus it suffices to consider only the periodic BVP, even mode solutions of which are automatically the even mode solutions of the acoustic BVP.

2.3. Factorization of the Nonlinear Operator. Our use of symmetry replaces the *periodic return problem* (1.25), namely

$$(\mathcal{F}_1 - \mathcal{I})(p^0, u^0) = 0, \quad (2.19)$$

with the *tiling projection problems* (2.15) or (2.16), respectively. The major difficulty in solving (2.19) by Nash-Moser is the problem of controlling the decay rate of the small divisors in the perturbed linearized operators at each iterate.

The authors breakthrough revelation was that, after fully understanding the symmetries (1.26), periodicity could be imposed by the tiling projection operator (2.15) or (2.16), respectively. Surprisingly, the operator then factors into a product of a nonlinear, nonsingular operator \mathcal{N} , followed by a *fixed, constant, diagonal* linear operator \mathcal{A} which uniformly encodes the small divisors, even as the constant state is perturbed in the iteration. In this sense, by exploiting symmetry and restricting to the smaller domain of even functions, we have “shrink-wrapped” the problem by reducing the solution space while retaining the fundamental nonlinear structure of periodic solutions, namely the balance of compression and rarefaction along each characteristic.

For fixed time period T , denote the nonlinear evolution operator by

$$\mathcal{E}^x : H^b \rightarrow H^b, \quad \mathcal{E}^x(y^0) := y(x, \cdot), \quad (2.20)$$

where $y(x, t)$ is the solution of the nonlinear equation (2.4), and H^b denotes the Sobolev space of T -periodic functions with norm

$$\|y\| = \sum y_j^2 j^{2b}, \quad \text{where } y = \sum y_j e^{ij2\pi/T},$$

so that y^j are the Fourier series coefficients of y .

We restate the local existence theory for classical solutions in the following theorem which will be established in Theorem 6.1 in Section 6 below. This holds as long as the data y^0 or evolution interval $[0, X]$ is small enough that shocks do not form, so the classical theory applies.

Theorem 2.2. *The nonlinear evolution operator $\mathcal{E}^X : U \subset H^b \rightarrow H^b$ is twice Frechet differentiable, with first and second Frechet derivatives around $y^0 \in H^b$ denoted by*

$$D\mathcal{E}^X(y^0)[\cdot] : H^b \rightarrow H^{b-1}, \quad \text{and} \quad D^2\mathcal{E}^X(y^0)[\cdot, \cdot] : H^b \times H^b \rightarrow H^{b-2},$$

and these are bounded linear and bilinear operators, respectively.

The reduction of differentiability in the ranges of these operators reflects the principle that *when differentiating, a derivative is lost*.

Note that before shock formation, \mathcal{E}^x is regular and invertible, its inverse being backwards evolution. The linearization of \mathcal{E}^x as an operator is the Frechet derivative

$$D\mathcal{E}^x(y^0) : H^b \rightarrow H^b, \quad \mathcal{E}^x(y^0)[Y^0] := Y(x, \cdot), \quad (2.21)$$

where $Y(x, t)$ is the solution of the linearized equation

$$\partial_x Y + (Dg(y)[Y])_t = 0, \quad Y(0, \cdot) = Y^0, \quad (2.22)$$

where, differentiating (2.5), we get

$$Dg(y)[Y] = \frac{\mathcal{I}-\mathcal{R}}{2} Y + \frac{\partial v}{\partial p} \left(\frac{\mathcal{I}+\mathcal{R}}{2} y, s \right) \frac{\mathcal{I}+\mathcal{R}}{2} Y.$$

We further denote the linearized evolution operator around the quiet base state \bar{p} , by

$$\mathcal{L}^x := D\mathcal{E}^x(\bar{p}), \quad (2.23)$$

and note that this is again invertible by backwards evolution.

It follows that the linearizations of the nonlinear operators \mathcal{F}_P and \mathcal{F}_A , around y^0 are

$$\begin{aligned} D\mathcal{F}_P(y^0) &= \frac{\mathcal{I}-\mathcal{R}}{2} \mathcal{T}^{-T/4} D\mathcal{E}^\ell(y^0) \quad \text{and} \\ D\mathcal{F}_A(y^0) &= \frac{\mathcal{I}-\mathcal{R}}{2} D\mathcal{E}^\ell(y^0), \end{aligned}$$

respectively. Note that using the notation (2.17), these can be unified as the single equation

$$D\mathcal{F}(y^0) = \frac{\mathcal{I}-\mathcal{R}}{2} \mathcal{T}^{-\chi T/4} D\mathcal{E}^\ell(y^0).$$

Theorem 2.3. *For fixed period T , the nonlinear operators \mathcal{F}_P and \mathcal{F}_A given in (2.15), (2.16), respectively can be factored as*

$$\mathcal{F}(y^0) = \mathcal{A}\mathcal{N}(y^0), \quad \text{where } \mathcal{N} := (\mathcal{L}^\ell)^{-1} \mathcal{E}^\ell(y^0), \quad (2.24)$$

and $\mathcal{A} := D\mathcal{F}(\bar{p})$ is given by

$$\mathcal{A} := \mathcal{S} \mathcal{L}^\ell, \quad (2.25)$$

where \mathcal{S} is given by (2.17). Here \mathcal{A} is a fixed, constant linear operator, and \mathcal{N} is a regular nonlinear operator satisfying

$$D\mathcal{N}(\bar{p}) = \mathcal{I},$$

the identity map. It follows that

$$\mathcal{F}(y^0) = 0 \quad \text{iff} \quad \mathcal{N}(y^0) \in \ker \mathcal{A}. \quad (2.26)$$

Proof. Because \mathcal{L}^ℓ is invertible by backwards linearized evolution around \bar{p} , the operator \mathcal{N} is well defined. The conclusion now follows by direct substitution. \square

The upshot of this factorization is that we will invert the nonlinear part \mathcal{N} of the operator by an application of the *standard* implicit function theorem on Hilbert spaces. This effectively reduces the problem of finding nonlinear periodic solutions to that of finding those entropy profiles for which the fixed operator \mathcal{A} is invertible on the complement of a two-dimensional kernel, one dimension being the 0-mode constant states, and the other providing linearized modes which we will perturb. Our purpose is to use Sturm-Liouville theory to find appropriate time periods and obtain conditions under which \mathcal{A} has this property. By this, we solve (2.26) without having to resort to a

more technical Nash-Moser iteration and without the need for estimates on the decay rates of the small divisors.

3. LINEARIZATION AND STURM-LIOUVILLE

We construct solutions of (2.2) by perturbing solutions of the linearized equations. In order to carry this out we require a detailed analysis of this linearized system. We begin by noting that the quiet state $(\bar{p}, 0)$ is a solution of the Euler equations satisfying the boundary conditions; although it is a constant solution of (2.2), it is part of a non-constant standing wave solution of (2.1). Denoting nonlinear evolution through x according to (2.4) by \mathcal{E}^x , we denote the linearization of this around the constant quiet state $(\bar{p}, 0)$ by $\mathcal{L}^x := D\mathcal{E}^x(\bar{p}, 0)$. That is, \mathcal{L}^x denotes evolution according to the system

$$\begin{aligned} P_x + U_t &= 0, & U_x + \sigma^2 P_t &= 0, \\ \text{where } \sigma &= \sigma(x) := \sqrt{-v_p(\bar{p}, s)}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

in which we use the convention that (P, U) solve linearized equations, while (p, u) solve the nonlinear system. By restricting to our symmetry class, we equivalently obtain the nonlocal scalar linearization of (2.4), (2.5), namely, setting $Y := P + U$, the linearization is

$$Y_x + \left(\frac{\mathcal{I}-\mathcal{R}}{2} Y + \sigma^2 \frac{\mathcal{I}+\mathcal{R}}{2} Y \right)_t = 0. \quad (3.2)$$

Here we regard the entropy field $s(x)$ as a given piecewise smooth function on the interval $x \in [0, \ell]$, continuous at the endpoints. The authors do not know of previous analyses of this linearized system when the entropy is piecewise smooth.

3.1. Sturm-Liouville Evolution. We solve (3.1) using separation of variables, in which we look for T -periodic solutions in which P and U are even and odd, respectively. To do so, we set

$$\begin{aligned} P(x, t) &:= \sum_{n \geq 0} \varphi_n(x) c(n \frac{2\pi}{T} t), \\ U(x, t) &:= \sum_{n > 0} \psi_n(x) s(n \frac{2\pi}{T} t). \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

Plugging in to (3.1) and simplifying, we get the *Sturm-Liouville* (SL) system

$$\dot{\varphi}_n + \omega \psi_n = 0, \quad \dot{\psi}_n - \sigma^2 \omega \varphi_n = 0, \quad \omega := n \frac{2\pi}{T}, \quad (3.4)$$

where $\dot{\square}$ denotes $\frac{d}{dx} \square$.

We use the following convenient notation: for a given (reference) time period T , denote the basis k -mode by the 1×2 matrix

$$\mathcal{B}_k = \mathcal{B}_k(T) := \left(c(k \frac{2\pi}{T} t) \quad s(k \frac{2\pi}{T} t) \right), \quad (3.5)$$

where c/s abbreviate the trigonometric functions \cos/\sin . It then follows that any T -periodic function can be represented as

$$f(t) = \sum_{k \geq 0} \mathcal{B}_k \begin{pmatrix} a_k \\ b_k \end{pmatrix} = \sum a_k c(k \frac{2\pi}{T} t) + b_k s(k \frac{2\pi}{T} t),$$

uniquely with $b_0 = 0$. In this notation, (3.3) can be written

$$Y(x, t) = P + U = \sum_{n \geq 0} \mathcal{B}_n \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_n(x) \\ \psi_n(x) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.6)$$

and we obtain the following Lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *The linearized evolution operator $\mathcal{L}^x = D\mathcal{E}^x(\bar{p})$ acts on the k -mode basis vector $\mathcal{B}_k = \mathcal{B}_k(T)$ given by (3.5), by*

$$\mathcal{L}^x \mathcal{B}_k = \mathcal{B}_k \Psi(x; k \frac{2\pi}{T}), \quad \text{so} \quad \mathcal{L}^x \mathcal{B}_k \begin{pmatrix} a \\ b \end{pmatrix} = \mathcal{B}_k \Psi \begin{pmatrix} a \\ b \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\Psi = \Psi(x; \omega)$ is the fundamental solution of (3.4), so satisfies

$$\dot{\Psi}(x; \omega) = \omega \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ \sigma^2(x) & 0 \end{pmatrix} \Psi(x; \omega), \quad \Psi(0; \omega) = I. \quad (3.7)$$

Proof. Equation (3.7) follows by substitution of (3.6) into (3.1) and applying standard separation of variables. \square

Alternatively, we can express the linearized system (3.1) as a wave equation with varying speed, namely

$$P_{xx} - \sigma^2 P_{tt} = 0, \quad (3.8)$$

and after use of (3.3), by separation of variables, we get the second-order linear system

$$\ddot{\varphi}_n + (n \frac{2\pi}{T})^2 \sigma^2 \varphi_n = 0, \quad (3.9)$$

which is the expression of the SL system (3.4) expressed as a second-order linear equation.

We now consider boundary values for this SL system. In both (2.15) and (2.16), the data y^0 (and so also Y^0) posed at $x = 0$ is even, so using (3.6), this becomes the condition

$$U(0, \cdot) = 0, \quad \text{equivalently} \quad \psi_n(0) = \dot{\varphi}_n(0) = 0. \quad (3.10)$$

If we are solving (2.16), we get the same condition at $x = \ell$, namely

$$U(\ell, \cdot) = 0, \quad \text{equivalently} \quad \psi_n(\ell) = \dot{\varphi}_n(\ell) = 0. \quad (3.11)$$

On the other hand, if we are solving (2.15), the boundary condition is

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \frac{\mathcal{I}-\mathcal{R}}{2} \mathcal{T}^{-T/4} (P(\ell, \cdot) + U(\ell, \cdot)) \\ &= \frac{\mathcal{I}-\mathcal{R}}{2} \sum \left(\varphi_n(\ell) c(n \frac{2\pi}{T} t - n \frac{\pi}{2}) + \psi_n(\ell) s(n \frac{2\pi}{T} t - n \frac{\pi}{2}) \right), \end{aligned}$$

which yields the conditions

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\varphi}_n(\ell) = \psi_n(\ell) = 0, & \quad n \text{ even}, \\ \varphi_n(\ell) = \dot{\psi}_n(\ell) = 0, & \quad n \text{ odd}.\end{aligned}\tag{3.12}$$

Our boundary conditions for the linearized evolution can now be expressed succinctly using the fundamental solution (3.7) as follows. Recall that our domain is the set of even periodic functions.

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose that constant ambient pressure \bar{p} , entropy profile $s(x)$ and reference period T are given. Then the linearized operator \mathcal{A} given by (2.25) is diagonal on Fourier k -modes and is given by*

$$\mathcal{A}\left[c\left(k\frac{2\pi}{T}t\right)\right] = \delta_k(T) s\left(k\frac{2\pi}{T}t\right),$$

where the k -th divisor is defined by

$$\delta_k(T) := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} R(k\chi\frac{\pi}{2}) \Psi(\ell; k\frac{2\pi}{T}) \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix},\tag{3.13}$$

where $\chi = 1$ or $\chi = 0$ for the periodic or acoustic boundary conditions, respectively. In particular, all divisors are bounded, that is, there exists a constant C_δ depending only on the entropy profile, such that

$$|\delta_k(T)| < C_\delta, \quad \text{uniformly for } T \in [1/C, C].\tag{3.14}$$

Proof. By (3.5), we have $c(k\frac{2\pi}{T}t) = \mathcal{B}_k \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$, and we calculate

$$\frac{\mathcal{I}-\mathcal{R}}{2} \mathcal{B}_k = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} s\left(k\frac{2\pi}{T}t\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{T}^{T/4} \mathcal{B}_k = \mathcal{B}_k R\left(k\frac{\pi}{2}\right).$$

The result follows by using these and Lemma 3.1 in (2.25). Since SL evolution is linear, the bound (3.14) follows by continuity on compact intervals. \square

It follows that the single mode $c(k\frac{2\pi}{T}t)$ provides a solution given by $\mathcal{B}_k \Psi(x; k\frac{2\pi}{T})$ of the linearized problem satisfying the boundary conditions if and only if

$$\delta_k(T) = 0,$$

respectively. In this case, $\Psi(x; k\frac{2\pi}{T}) \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$ solves (3.4), and since it satisfies the boundary conditions, it is an eigenfunction of the Sturm-Liouville problem (3.9), corresponding to eigenvalue $\lambda_k := (k\frac{2\pi}{T})^2$. We will show that if this k -mode is nonresonant, then this perturbs to a nonlinear pure tone solution of (2.2).

We are thus led to introduce the Sturm-Liouville (SL) operator

$$\mathcal{L} := -\frac{1}{\sigma^2} \frac{d^2}{dx^2}, \quad \text{so that} \quad \mathcal{L}\phi = -\frac{1}{\sigma^2} \ddot{\phi},\tag{3.15}$$

and to introduce the associated SL eigenvalue problem,

$$\mathcal{L}\varphi = \lambda\varphi, \quad \text{which is} \quad -\ddot{\varphi} = \lambda\sigma^2\varphi, \quad \text{on } 0 < x < \ell,\tag{3.16}$$

and subject to the boundary conditions (3.10) at $x = 0$ and either (3.12) or (3.11) at $x = \ell$. We note that the boundary conditions imply self-adjointness, implying that this is a *regular SL problem* as long as the weight $\sigma^2(x) = -v_p(\bar{p}, s(x))$ is a positive, bounded piecewise continuous function [24, 1, 6]. Moreover, because the corresponding ODEs are linear, the solutions can be analyzed as integral equations, and we expect our methods to extend to BV entropy profiles with only minor technical changes.

We collect some classical results for regular SL eigenvalue problems in the following lemma; see [24, 6] for details. Many of the statements in this lemma will be explicitly verified below.

Lemma 3.3. *Assume that the entropy profile is piecewise C^1 . The Sturm-Liouville system (3.16), with initial condition (3.10) and target end condition (3.12) or (3.11), has infinitely many eigenvalues λ_k . These are positive, simple, monotone increasing and isolated, and satisfy the growth condition $\lambda_k = O(k^2)$. The corresponding eigenfunctions form an orthogonal L^2 basis in the Hilbert space with weight function σ^2 .*

We label the eigenvalues λ_k and corresponding eigenfunctions φ_k , scaled so that $\varphi_k(0) = 1$, so that (3.16) and (3.4) hold for each $k \geq 1$, and the λ_k 's are increasing with k . Because we prefer to work with the frequencies, we define the k -th *eigenfrequency* ω_k and corresponding *reference period* T_k by

$$\omega_k := \sqrt{\lambda_k}, \quad \text{and} \quad T_k := k \frac{2\pi}{\omega_k} = k \frac{2\pi}{\sqrt{\lambda_k}}, \quad (3.17)$$

respectively. It follows that the k -modes

$$Y_k(x, t) := \mathcal{B}_k(T_k) \Psi(x; k \frac{2\pi}{T_k} t) \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{or}$$

$$P_k(x, t) := \varphi_k(x) c(k \frac{2\pi}{T_k} t) = \varphi_k(x) c(\omega_k t),$$

defined for $x \in [0, \ell]$, solve (3.2) or (3.8), respectively, while also satisfying the appropriate boundary conditions. These k -modes lie in the kernel of the linearized operator $\mathcal{A} = D\mathcal{F}(\bar{p})$, and we will investigate the conditions under which they perturb to pure tone solutions of the nonlinear problem. We note that for given k , the frequency ω_k is determined by the entropy profile, and this in turn yields the reference period. Consideration of other resonant and nonresonant modes then refers to this fixed period T_k .

3.2. Nonresonant modes. Identifying a mode as a k -mode requires us to fix the reference period T : clearly $\mathcal{B}_{jk}(jT) = \mathcal{B}_k(T)$ for any $j \geq 1$.

Our goal is to perturb the linearized solution Y_k (or P_k) to a time periodic solution of the corresponding nonlinear equation. Following (4.1), and having identified the reference period, we consider perturbations of the initial data of the form

$$y^0(0) = p^0(t) := \bar{p} + \alpha c(k \frac{2\pi}{T_k} t) + z + \sum_{j \geq 1, j \neq k} a_j c(j \frac{2\pi}{T_k} t), \quad (3.18)$$

in which the reference period T_k is determined by the choice of SL eigenfrequency ω_k (or eigenvalue $\lambda_k = \omega_k^2$) in (3.17), and we now regard this as fixed.

We declare the k -mode to be *nonresonant* if no other j -modes satisfy the boundary condition, that is

$$\delta_j(T_k) \neq 0 \quad \text{for all } j \neq k, \quad (3.19)$$

respectively for the appropriate boundary conditions (2.15) or (2.16). Here δ_j is defined by (3.13) with $\chi = 1$ or 0 , respectively, where the reference period T_k is fixed by our choice of mode k . The collection of j -mode basis elements

$$\{\mathcal{B}_j(T_k) \mid j \geq 1\} = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} c(j\frac{2\pi}{T_k}t) & s(j\frac{2\pi}{T_k}t) \end{pmatrix} \mid j \geq 1 \right\}$$

span the even and odd functions of period T_k , respectively.

Lemma 3.4. *Fix the k -mode, which fixes the time period $T = T_k$. The j -mode, defined by this time period, $c(j\frac{2\pi}{T_k}t)$, is resonant with the fixed k -mode if and only if two distinct SL frequencies are related by the condition*

$$\delta_j(T_k) = 0 \quad \text{iff} \quad k\omega_l = j\omega_k,$$

for some index $l = l(j) \neq k$.

Proof. By construction, we have

$$\delta_k(T_k) = 0, \quad \text{with} \quad T_k := k \frac{2\pi}{\omega_k}.$$

If $\delta_j(T_k) = 0$, then $j\frac{2\pi}{T_k}$ also corresponds to some SL frequency ω_l , so that

$$\omega_l = j \frac{2\pi}{T_k} = \frac{j}{k} \omega_k,$$

and since $j \neq k$, we have $\omega_l \neq \omega_k$, which implies $l \neq k$. \square

The resonance or nonresonance of modes corresponding to SL eigenvalues depends on the entropy profile and constitutive law. Moreover, because the SL eigenvalues, and hence also frequencies, vary continuously with the entropy profile, one should expect that the set of profiles with resonant modes should be small in the appropriate sense, so that generically, all modes are nonresonant. We state the following theorem which collects the results we need to complete the bifurcation argument that nonresonant k -mode solutions of the linearized evolution perturb to pure tone solutions of the fully nonlinear problem. The proof of this theorem, which relies on the introduction of an angle variable, is postponed to Section 5, and proof that nonresonance is generic is carried out in Section 7.

Theorem 3.5. *For any piecewise C^1 entropy profile $s \in \mathcal{P}$, there is a unique sequence $\{\omega_k\}$ of SL eigenfrequencies, with corresponding eigenfunctions satisfying the SL boundary conditions (3.11) or (3.12). Moreover, $\{\omega_k\}$ can be*

labeled as a monotone increasing sequence which grows like k , that is

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\omega_k}{k} \rightarrow C > 0, \quad \text{so that} \quad C' \leq \frac{\omega_k}{k} \leq C'',$$

for some constants $C, C', C'' > 0$, depending only on the entropy profile and the quiet state \bar{p} . In particular, the corresponding time periods given by (3.17) are uniformly bounded, $T_k \in [2\pi C', 2\pi C'']$. Each of these eigenfunctions determines a T_k time-periodic solution of the linearized equations on $[0, \ell]$.

4. NONLINEAR PERTURBATION OF NONRESONANT MODES

The above development reduces the problem of existence of nonlinear pure tone solutions of the compressible Euler equations to the problem of finding a solution y^0 of the nonlinear equation (2.24), namely

$$\mathcal{F}(y^0) = \mathcal{A}\mathcal{N}(y^0) = \mathcal{S}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{N}(y^0) = 0, \quad y^0 \text{ even,}$$

where the nonlinear part \mathcal{N} is bounded invertible for small regular data, and $\mathcal{S}\mathcal{L}$ is the Sturm-Liouville (SL) operator which has small divisors as described above. Our goal is to perturb a linearized k -mode solution to a pure tone solution of the nonlinear equation, assuming that the linearized k -mode is nonresonant. We thus assume that the entropy profile $s(x)$ is fixed and known and we pick k which is nonresonant, so that $\omega_j/\omega_k \notin \mathbb{Q}$ for $j \neq 0, k$. Recall that these choices fix the time period T by (3.17), namely

$$T := \frac{2\pi k}{\omega_k}.$$

By Lemma 3.4, the nonresonant case is characterized by the conditions $\delta_k(T_k) = 0$, which fixes T_k , and $\delta_j(T_k) \neq 0$ for all $j \neq k$. Recall that the use of the indicator χ allows us to treat both periodic and acoustic boundary value problems (2.15), (2.16) simultaneously.

We now introduce the Hilbert spaces which allow us to find solutions which are perturbations of the constant state $\bar{y} = 0$. To leading order, these have the form $\alpha c(\omega_k t) \in \ker\{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{L}\}$, and are parameterized by the amplitude α . Our program is to construct solutions of the form

$$y^0(t) = \bar{p} + \alpha c(\omega_k t) + z + \sum_{j \neq k} a_j c(j t \frac{2\pi}{T}), \quad (4.1)$$

where the 0-mode z (also in $\ker\{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{L}\}$), and higher mode coefficients a_j are unknowns to be found, of order $O(\alpha^2)$.

Observe first that there is one free variable and one equation corresponding to each mode because the operator (2.24) takes even modes to odd modes. That is, for each α , after nonlinear evolution, the projection $\frac{\mathcal{I}-\mathcal{R}}{2}$ leaves only the odd components of the evolved data, so we are left with one equation for each j -mode coefficient $j \neq 0$. On the other hand, the free parameters are the $a_j, j \neq k$, and 0-mode z , so each equation corresponds

uniquely to an unknown, with z parameterizing the k -mode whose amplitude is α . Thus formally we expect to get a solution of (2.24) of the form (4.1) for any α sufficiently small in the nonresonant case. The following development is an explicit version of the Liapunov-Schmidt decomposition of the nonlinear operator \mathcal{F} into the auxiliary equation and corresponding bifurcation equation in the nonresonant case, see [11].

As a roadmap, we briefly describe the elements of the abstract bifurcation problem and its solution, which we will make precise below. Consider the problem of solving equations of the form

$$F(\alpha, z, w) = 0, \quad \text{with} \quad F(0, 0, 0) = 0,$$

for solutions parameterized by the small amplitude parameter α . In general the gradient $\nabla_{(z,w)} F|_0$ is not invertible, so this cannot be done with a direct application of the implicit function theorem. For the bifurcation argument, one assumes

$$z \in \ker \left\{ \nabla_{(z,w)} F|_0 \right\}, \quad w \in \ker \left\{ \nabla_{(z,w)} F|_0 \right\}^\perp. \quad (4.2)$$

and that $\frac{\partial F}{\partial w}|_0$ is invertible. The standard argument is then to first find

$$w(\alpha, z) \quad \text{so that} \quad F(\alpha, z, w(\alpha, z)) = 0,$$

which is known as the *auxiliary equation*. This leaves the problem of solving for

$$z = z(\alpha) \quad \text{such that} \quad F(\alpha, z(\alpha), w(\alpha, z(\alpha))) = 0.$$

In our problem, $\frac{\partial F}{\partial z}|_0$ is not invertible, so F is replaced by the equivalent function

$$G(\alpha, z) := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\alpha} F(\alpha, z, w(\alpha, z)), & \alpha \neq 0, \\ \frac{\partial F}{\partial \alpha}(0, z, w(0, z)), & \alpha = 0, \end{cases}$$

and the equation $G(\alpha, z) = 0$ is known as the *bifurcation equation*. The bifurcation equation can be solved by the implicit function theorem, provided

$$\frac{\partial G}{\partial z} \Big|_{(0,0)} \equiv \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial z \partial \alpha} \Big|_{(0,0,0)} \neq 0.$$

The decomposition of the domain of the function F into a direct sum of the kernel and its orthogonal complement as in (4.2) is known as the Liapunov-Schmidt decomposition [11, 34].

In our application, the infinite dimensional analog of the gradient $\frac{\partial F}{\partial z}|_0$, required for the auxiliary equation, is invertible by unbounded inverse because of the presence of small divisors δ_k . However, the factorization (2.24) means that these small divisors are fixed, and so we can handle them by an appropriate adjustment of the associated Hilbert space norms. It is remarkable that by factoring the nonlinear operator, we are able to avoid difficult technical issues, such as diophantine estimates, which are common in Nash-Moser iterations, see [39] and references therein. When solving the bifurcation equation, we must calculate the second derivative of an infinite

dimensional nonlinear evolution operator. This section presents the complete bifurcation argument subject to the proof of Theorem 2.2 that the nonlinear evolution operator is twice Frechet differentiable. The proof of that theorem is carried out in Section 6 below.

4.1. Auxiliary Equation. Assume y^0 lies in the Sobolev space H^b , so that for small data y^0 , the evolution $\mathcal{E}^x(y^0)$ stays in H^b for $b > 5/2$, by the local existence theory, which applies as long as gradients remain finite [19, 30]. For us, the actual value of b is secondary, and the larger b is, the more regular the periodic solutions constructed, so it suffices to take b arbitrarily large.

To precisely define our bifurcation problem we must define the operator \mathcal{F} and corresponding Hilbert spaces to carry out the abstract argument above. Recall that the entropy profile and nonresonant mode k have been fixed and these determined the time period by (3.17), namely

$$T = \frac{2\pi k}{\omega_k},$$

and we are perturbing the k -mode $\alpha c(k t \frac{2\pi}{T})$ for sufficiently small amplitudes α . For given b large enough, define the Hilbert spaces for the *domain* as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_1 &:= \left\{ \bar{p} + z + \alpha c(k t \frac{2\pi}{T}) \mid z, \alpha \in \mathbb{R} \right\} \quad \text{and} \\ \mathcal{H}_2 &:= \left\{ \sum_{j \neq k, j > 0} a_j c(j t \frac{2\pi}{T}) \mid \sum a_j^2 j^{2b} < \infty \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

so that y^0 given by (4.1) is

$$y^0 = \bar{p} + \alpha c(k t \frac{2\pi}{T}) + z + \sum_{j \neq k, j > 0} a_j c(j t \frac{2\pi}{T}) \in \mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_2.$$

In the sums below, we will always implicitly take $j > 0$ because we treat the 0-mode z explicitly. Now referring to (2.24), (2.25), define the operator

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\mathcal{F}} : \mathcal{H}_1 \times \mathcal{H}_2 &\rightarrow H^b \quad \text{by} \\ \widehat{\mathcal{F}}(y_1, y_2) &:= \mathcal{F}(y_1 + y_2) = \mathcal{S}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{N}(y_1 + y_2), \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

so that $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}$ is a continuous nonlinear operator on $\mathcal{H}_1 \times \mathcal{H}_2$. Recall that $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{L}^{-1}\mathcal{E}^\ell$, and Theorem (2.3) states that $D\mathcal{N}(\bar{p}) = \mathcal{I}$. It follows that the partial Frechet derivative

$$D_{y_2} \widehat{\mathcal{F}}(\bar{p}, 0) : \mathcal{H}_2 \rightarrow H^b \quad \text{is} \quad D_{y_2} \widehat{\mathcal{F}}(\bar{p}, 0) = \mathcal{S}\mathcal{L} \Big|_{\mathcal{H}_2},$$

where \mathcal{S} projects onto the odd sine modes. According to Lemma 3.2, this acts as

$$D_{y_2} \widehat{\mathcal{F}}(\bar{p}, 0) \left[\sum_{j \neq k} a_j c(j t \frac{2\pi}{T}) \right] = \sum_{j \neq k} a_j \delta_j s(j t \frac{2\pi}{T}).$$

By our choice of parameters, we have $\delta_j \neq 0$ for $j \neq k$, so that $D_{y_2} \widehat{\mathcal{F}}(\bar{p}, 0)$ is injective, but the inverse is not bounded as a map $H^b \rightarrow H^b$ for any b ,

because of the presence of the small divisors δ_k . However, because the small divisors are fixed, we can define a new norm on the target space H^b so that $D_{y_2}\widehat{\mathcal{F}}(\bar{p}, 0)$ becomes an *isometry*, and in particular is bounded invertible on its range, as in [39]. Thus we define the scaled H^b norm on the *range* of $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \|y\|^2 &:= \beta^2 + \sum_{j \neq k} c_j^2 \delta_j^{-2} j^{2b}, \quad \text{and set} \\ \mathcal{H}_+ &:= \left\{ y = \sum_{j \neq k} c_j s(j t \frac{2\pi}{T}) \mid \|y\| < \infty \right\}, \quad \text{and} \\ \mathcal{H} &:= \left\{ \beta s(k t \frac{2\pi}{T}) \right\} \oplus \mathcal{H}_+. \end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

Here for convenience we have set $\beta = c_k k^{2b}$, which isolates the k -mode kernel. According to (3.14), each divisor δ_j is bounded, $0 < |\delta_j| \leq C_\delta$, so that

$$\|y\|_{H^b}^2 \leq C_\delta \|y\|^2, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{H} \subset H^b,$$

and it is clear that \mathcal{H} is a Hilbert space. Finally, let Π denote the projection

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi : \mathcal{H} &\rightarrow \mathcal{H}_+, \quad \text{by} \\ \Pi \left[\beta s(k t \frac{2\pi}{T}) + \sum_{j \neq k} a_j s(j t \frac{2\pi}{T}) \right] &:= \sum_{j \neq k} a_j s(j t \frac{2\pi}{T}). \end{aligned}$$

Note that we have constructed these spaces so that

$$\ker\{D_{y_2}\widehat{\mathcal{F}}(\bar{p}, 0)\} = \mathcal{H}_1, \quad \text{ran}\{D_{y_2}\widehat{\mathcal{F}}(\bar{p}, 0)\} = \mathcal{H}_+,$$

so that $\Pi D_{y_2}\widehat{\mathcal{F}}(\bar{p}, 0) = D_{y_2}\widehat{\mathcal{F}}(\bar{p}, 0)$, and moreover $D_{y_2}\widehat{\mathcal{F}}(\bar{p}, 0) : \mathcal{H}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_+$ is an isometry, and thus bounded invertible on its range \mathcal{H}_+ . The invertibility of $D_{y_2}\widehat{\mathcal{F}}(\bar{p}, 0)$ allows us to solve the auxiliary equation by a regular application of the classical implicit function theorem on Hilbert spaces.

Lemma 4.1. *There is a neighborhood $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{H}_1$ of the origin on which there is a unique solution $W(\alpha, z) \in \mathcal{H}_2$ of the auxiliary equation. That is there exists a unique C^2 map*

$$\begin{aligned} W : \mathcal{U} &\rightarrow \mathcal{H}_2, \quad \text{written} \\ W(z + \alpha c(k t \frac{2\pi}{T})) &=: W(\alpha, z) \in \mathcal{H}_2, \end{aligned}$$

such that, for all $z + \alpha c(k t \frac{2\pi}{T}) \in \mathcal{U}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi \widehat{\mathcal{F}}(\bar{p} + z + \alpha c(k t \frac{2\pi}{T}), W(\alpha, z)) &= \\ \Pi \mathcal{F}(\bar{p} + z + \alpha c(k t \frac{2\pi}{T}) + W(\alpha, z)) &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

Moreover, $W(\alpha, z)$ satisfies the estimates

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} \frac{W(\alpha, z)}{|\alpha|} = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} \frac{\partial W(\alpha, z)}{\partial \alpha} = 0, \tag{4.7}$$

uniformly for z in a neighborhood of 0.

Proof. This is a direct application of the implicit function theorem, assuming Theorem 2.2, so that \mathcal{E} is twice Frechet differentiable. This states that if \mathcal{H}_1 , \mathcal{H}_2 and \mathcal{H}_+ are Hilbert spaces, and

$$\mathcal{G} := \Pi \widehat{\mathcal{F}} : \Omega \subset \mathcal{H}_1 \times \mathcal{H}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_+$$

is a continuously differentiable map defined on an open neighborhood Ω of $(0, 0)$, and satisfying $\mathcal{G}(0, 0) = 0$, and if the linear (partial derivative) map $D_{y_2} \mathcal{G}(0, 0) : \mathcal{H}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_+$ is bounded invertible, then there is an open neighborhood $\mathcal{U}_1 \subset \mathcal{H}_1$ of 0 and a unique differentiable map $W : \mathcal{U}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_2$, such that $\mathcal{G}(x, W(x)) = 0$ for all $x \in \mathcal{U}_1$, see e.g. [14]. Because we have built our Hilbert spaces so that $D_{y_2} \mathcal{G}$ is an isometry, the existence of the C^2 solution $W(\alpha, z)$ follows immediately.

Theorem 2.2 together with the implicit function theorem imply that $W(\alpha, z)$ is twice differentiable. Since $\mathcal{F}(\bar{p} + z) = 0$, we have

$$W(\alpha, z) \in \mathcal{H}_2, \quad \text{with} \quad W(0, z) = 0,$$

and, setting $y = z + \alpha c(k t \frac{2\pi}{T}) + W(\alpha, z)$, we have by (4.6)

$$0 = \Pi \mathcal{F}(y) = \Pi \frac{\mathcal{I} - \mathcal{R}}{2} \mathcal{L}_0 \mathcal{N}(\bar{p} + z + \alpha c(k t \frac{2\pi}{T}) + W(\alpha, z)).$$

Differentiating with respect to α and setting $\alpha = 0$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \frac{\partial \Pi \mathcal{F}(y)}{\partial \alpha} \Big|_{\alpha=0} = \mathcal{S} \mathcal{L} D\mathcal{N}(\bar{p} + z) \left[c(k t \frac{2\pi}{T}) + \frac{\partial W}{\partial \alpha} \Big|_{\alpha=0} \right] \\ &= \mathcal{S} \mathcal{L} D\mathcal{N}(\bar{p} + z) \left[\frac{\partial W}{\partial \alpha} \Big|_{\alpha=0} \right], \end{aligned}$$

because, in addition to \mathcal{L} , $D\mathcal{N}(\bar{p} + z)$ respects modes, although for $z \neq 0$ the linear wavespeed is changed. Since $\mathcal{S} \mathcal{L} : \mathcal{H}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_+$ is invertible, and $D\mathcal{N}(\bar{p} + z) = \mathcal{I} + O(z)$, we have both

$$W(0, z) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial W(0, z)}{\partial \alpha} = 0.$$

Since $W(\alpha, z)$ is twice differentiable in a neighborhood of 0, the estimates (4.7) follow. \square

It is remarkable that we can solve the infinite dimensional auxiliary equation *without requiring* any estimates on the decay rate of the small divisors, because we have reframed the problem as the vanishing of a composition of operators, (2.26). Indeed, the faster the small divisors decay, the smoother the corresponding periodic solution must be, as seen by the norm (4.5). By splitting the Hilbert spaces into orthogonal complements in (4.3) and (4.5), we have explicitly carried out the Liapunov-Schmidt decomposition of the nonlinear operator \mathcal{F} around 0, as anticipated in [34]. It remains only to solve the *scalar* bifurcation equation.

4.2. Solution of the bifurcation equation. To complete the solution of equation (2.26), it remains to show that we can ensure, after use of (4.6), that the remaining component of $\mathcal{F}(y^0)$, which is the component orthogonal to the range of $D_{y_2} \widehat{\mathcal{F}}(\bar{p}, 0)$, also vanishes. From the decomposition (4.5), this is the (scalar) *bifurcation equation*,

$$\begin{aligned} f(\alpha, z) &:= \left\langle s(k t \frac{2\pi}{T}), \widehat{\mathcal{F}}(\bar{p} + z + \alpha c(k t \frac{2\pi}{T}), W(\alpha, z)) \right\rangle \\ &= \left\langle s(k t \frac{2\pi}{T}), \mathcal{S} \mathcal{L} \mathcal{N}(\bar{p} + z + \alpha c(k t \frac{2\pi}{T}) + W(\alpha, z)) \right\rangle = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

by (4.4). Here α is the amplitude of the linearized solution, and z is a 0-mode adjustment which can be regarded as bringing compression and rarefaction back into balance, as described in [39]. Although this is a scalar equation in two variables α and z , the difficulty arises because the scalar function $f(\alpha, z)$ factors through the infinite dimensional solution $W(\alpha, z)$ of the auxiliary equation. We will see presently that the existence of a solution of (4.8) is a consequence of the genuine nonlinearity of the system, which states that the nonlinear wavespeed depends monotonically on z , which in turn perturbs the quiet state pressure. Note that since \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{L} are independent of both α and z , differentiation in either of these variables commutes with both \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{L} . Similarly, because $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{L}^{-1} \mathcal{E}$, differentiation of \mathcal{N} by α or z amounts to differentiation of the nonlinear evolution \mathcal{E} . When applied to $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}(\bar{p} + z + \alpha c(k t \frac{2\pi}{T}), W(\alpha, z))$, this yields

$$\frac{\partial \widehat{\mathcal{F}}}{\partial \alpha} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \alpha} = \mathcal{S} \mathcal{L} \frac{\partial \mathcal{N}}{\partial \alpha} = \mathcal{S} \frac{\partial \mathcal{E}}{\partial \alpha}, \quad (4.9)$$

and similarly for $\frac{\partial}{\partial z}$.

The scalar function $f(\alpha, z)$ given by (4.8) is defined on the neighborhood $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{H}_1$, which with a slight abuse of notation can be regarded as $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, so we write

$$f : \mathcal{U} \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad \text{with } f(0, 0) = 0.$$

As in our description of the bifurcation argument above, we would like to apply the implicit function theorem to f , to get a curve $z = z(\alpha)$ on which $f(\alpha, z(\alpha)) = 0$. We cannot apply this directly, because $\frac{\partial f}{\partial z}|_{(0,0)} = 0$, since all 0-modes are killed by the projection \mathcal{S} . Thus we consider the second derivative $\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial z \partial \alpha}|_{(0,0)}$, and if this is nonzero, we can conclude the existence of a solution.

One way of effectively calculating the second derivative is to replace f by the function

$$\begin{aligned} g(\alpha, z) &:= \frac{1}{\alpha} f(\alpha, z), \quad \alpha \neq 0, \\ g(0, z) &:= \frac{\partial f}{\partial \alpha}(0, z), \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

which is consistently defined because $W(0, z) = 0$, and so also $f(0, z) = 0$, for all z near 0. It is then clear that

$$f(\alpha, z) = 0 \quad \text{iff} \quad g(\alpha, z) = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad \alpha \neq 0,$$

and it suffices to apply the implicit function theorem to g .

To calculate $\partial g / \partial z$ at $(0, 0)$, we first calculate $\partial \mathcal{F} / \partial \alpha$ and set $\alpha = 0$. From (4.9), and using (4.7), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left. \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}(y)}{\partial \alpha} \right|_{\alpha=0} &= \mathcal{S} D\mathcal{E}(\bar{p} + z + \alpha c(k t \frac{2\pi}{T}) + W(\alpha, z)) \left[c(k t \frac{2\pi}{T}) + \frac{\partial W}{\partial \alpha} \right] \Big|_{\alpha=0} \\ &= \mathcal{S} D\mathcal{E}(\bar{p} + z) [c(k t \frac{2\pi}{T})], \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

and recall that $DN(\bar{p}) = \mathcal{L}$ and $D\mathcal{E}(\bar{p} + z)$ are diagonal, because z parameterizes the perturbation of the background quiet state, and all linearized operators around quiet states respect modes.

Differentiating (4.11) in z , setting $z = 0$, and using (4.10) and (4.8), we get

$$\left. \frac{\partial g}{\partial z} \right|_{(0,0)} = \left\langle s(k t \frac{2\pi}{T}), \mathcal{S} D^2\mathcal{E}(\bar{p}) [1, c(k t \frac{2\pi}{T})] \right\rangle, \quad (4.12)$$

where the inputs to the bilinear operator $D^2\mathcal{E}$ correspond to the 0-mode and k -mode given by z and $\alpha c(k t \frac{2\pi}{T})$, in which we are differentiating, respectively.

The final step to complete the bifurcation argument and prove of the existence of a space and time periodic solution is to show that this derivative (4.12) is nonzero,

$$\left. \frac{\partial g}{\partial z} \right|_{(0,0)} \neq 0.$$

According to (2.17), we have

$$\mathcal{S} = \frac{\mathcal{I} - \mathcal{R}}{2} \mathcal{T}^{-\chi T/4},$$

where as usual, χ indicates the boundary condition used. For any function $Z(t)$, using the adjoints $\frac{\mathcal{I} - \mathcal{R}^\dagger}{2} = \frac{\mathcal{I} - \mathcal{R}}{2}$ and $\mathcal{T}^{\tau^\dagger} = \mathcal{T}^{-\tau}$, we calculate

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle s(k t \frac{2\pi}{T}), \mathcal{S} Z(t) \right\rangle &= \left\langle \mathcal{T}^{\chi T/4} \frac{\mathcal{I} - \mathcal{R}}{2} s(k t \frac{2\pi}{T}), Z(t) \right\rangle \\ &= \left\langle s(k(t - \chi \frac{T}{4}) \frac{2\pi}{T}), Z(t) \right\rangle \\ &= \left\langle s(k t \frac{2\pi}{T} - \chi k \frac{\pi}{2}), Z(t) \right\rangle, \end{aligned}$$

since $s(\cdot)$ is odd, and so (4.12) reduces to

$$\left. \frac{\partial g}{\partial z} \right|_{(0,0)} = \left. \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial z \partial \alpha} \right|_{(0,0)} = \left\langle s(k t \frac{2\pi}{T} - \chi k \frac{\pi}{2}), D^2\mathcal{E}(\bar{p}) [1, c(k t \frac{2\pi}{T})] \right\rangle. \quad (4.13)$$

The final estimate we need is contained in the following technical lemma, which is also proved in Section 6 below. The lemma is essentially the statement that genuine nonlinearity, which implies that the average wavespeed

varies with background quiet state, implies non-degeneracy of the bifurcation equation.

Lemma 4.2. *For a genuinely nonlinear constitutive equation, the second derivative $D^2\mathcal{E}(\bar{p})$ satisfies*

$$\left\langle s\left(k t \frac{2\pi}{T} - \chi k \frac{\pi}{2}\right), D^2\mathcal{E}(\bar{p})\left[1, c\left(k t \frac{2\pi}{T}\right)\right] \right\rangle \neq 0$$

so that the derivative

$$\frac{\partial g}{\partial z}\Big|_{(0,0)} = \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial z \partial \alpha}\Big|_{(0,0)} \neq 0. \quad (4.14)$$

The proof of Lemma 4.2 relies on a detailed analysis of the nonlinear evolution of the system and is given in Lemma 6.4 below. Assuming it for now, we complete the analysis of the bifurcation equation, which implies that nonresonant k -mode solutions of the linearized equation perturb to nonlinear pure tone solutions.

Theorem 4.3. *Assume that the k -mode is nonresonant. Then there exists a one-parameter family of solutions of the form (3.18) of equation (2.15) or (2.16), respectively, parameterized by the amplitude α in a neighborhood of 0. This in turn generates a periodic pure tone solution of the compressible Euler equations.*

Proof. Lemma 4.1 shows that the auxiliary equation has a unique solution in a neighborhood of the origin. It remains only to show that the bifurcation equation (4.8), namely $f(\alpha, z) = 0$, for the k -mode can always be solved uniquely in a neighborhood of the origin. Using (4.14) the implicit function theorem implies the existence of a unique $z(\alpha)$ such that (4.1) gives the data y^0 which solves the equation (4.8) for α in a neighborhood of the origin. \square

The proof of Theorem 4.3 will be complete once we prove Theorems 2.2 and 3.5, as well as Lemma 4.2. In the next section we carry out a detailed analysis of the SL system by introducing an angle variable, prove Theorem 3.5. In the following section we differentiate the evolution operator and prove Theorem 2.2 and Lemma 4.2. After that we further study the resonance structure and show that fully nonresonant entropy profiles are generic.

5. ANALYSIS OF STURM-LIOUVILLE OPERATOR

To proceed we need a detailed analysis of the SL operator, which includes a complete description of both the fundamental solution and the full set of eigenfrequencies. Once again we treat the general entropy profile as given, and solve for the base frequencies ω_k that yield k -mode solutions of the linearized equation. Recall that starting with the linearization (3.1), we separated variables by setting

$$P(x, t) := \varphi(x) c(\omega t), \quad U(x, t) := \psi(x) s(\omega t),$$

which yields the SL system (3.4), namely

$$\dot{\varphi} + \omega \psi = 0, \quad \dot{\psi} - \omega \sigma^2 \varphi = 0, \quad (5.1)$$

with $\sigma^2 = -v_p(\bar{p}, s) = \sigma^2(x)$. According to (3.10), we first consider initial values

$$\varphi(0) = c_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \psi(0) = 0,$$

for appropriate $c_0 \neq 0$. Those values of ω_k that meet the boundary conditions (3.11) or (3.12) will then determine the eigenfrequencies, which in turn define the reference period $T_k := k \frac{2\pi}{\omega_k}$.

5.1. Angle Variable. For fixed entropy profile $s(x)$, the SL evolution is efficiently analyzed using the angle $\theta = \theta(x) = \theta(x, \omega)$ of the vector (φ, ψ) which satisfies (5.1). This in turn can be effectively captured with the use of *modified Prüfer variables*, which are

$$\varphi(x) := r(x) \frac{1}{\rho(x)} c(\theta(x)), \quad \psi(x) := r(x) \rho(x) s(\theta(x)), \quad (5.2)$$

see [24, 6, 1]. Here we interpret $r(x)$ as the radial length or amplitude, $\rho(x)$ as the eccentricity or aspect, and $\theta(x)$ as the angle variable. This is a degenerate description in which we are free to choose the aspect $\rho(x) > 0$, and having done so, both $r(x)$ and $\theta(x)$ will be determined by the equations.

We solve equation (5.1) on an interval $[x_I, x_E]$ with the assumption that the entropy s (and so also σ) is C^1 on this interval. Plugging in (5.2) into (5.1) and simplifying, we get the system

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\dot{r}}{r} c(\theta) - \frac{\dot{\rho}}{\rho} c(\theta) - s(\theta) \dot{\theta} + \omega \rho^2 s(\theta) &= 0, \\ \frac{\dot{r}}{r} s(\theta) + \frac{\dot{\rho}}{\rho} s(\theta) + c(\theta) \dot{\theta} - \omega \frac{\sigma^2}{\rho^2} c(\theta) &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

with initial conditions

$$\theta(x_I) = \theta_I \quad \text{and} \quad r(x_I) = r_I,$$

to be determined by the initial values $\varphi(x_I)$ and $\psi(x_I)$. After use of elementary trig identities, this in turn becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\dot{r}}{r} - \frac{\dot{\rho}}{\rho} c(2\theta) + \omega \left(\rho^2 - \frac{\sigma^2}{\rho^2} \right) s(\theta) c(\theta) &= 0, \\ \dot{\theta} + \frac{\dot{\rho}}{\rho} s(2\theta) - \omega \left(\frac{\sigma^2}{\rho^2} c^2(\theta) + \rho^2 s^2(\theta) \right) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, once $\rho(x)$ is chosen, the system is reduced to a nonlinear scalar ODE for the angle $\theta(x)$, coupled with an integration for the amplitude $r(x)$. Moreover, it is now clear that we should choose ρ such that

$$\rho^2 = \frac{\sigma^2}{\rho^2}, \quad \text{that is} \quad \rho(x) := \sqrt{\sigma(x)}. \quad (5.3)$$

With this choice the equations simplify further, and we get the nonlinear scalar equation for $\theta(x)$,

$$\dot{\theta} = \omega \sigma - \frac{\dot{\sigma}}{2\sigma} s(2\theta), \quad \theta(x_I) = \theta_I, \quad (5.4)$$

coupled with a linear homogeneous equation for $r(x)$, namely

$$\frac{\dot{r}}{r} = \frac{\dot{\sigma}}{2\sigma} c(2\theta), \quad r(x_I) = r_I,$$

which immediately yields the quadrature

$$r(x) = r_I \exp \left\{ \int_{x_I}^x c(2\theta(y)) d \log \sqrt{\sigma(y)} \right\}. \quad (5.5)$$

We can now describe the fundamental solution $\Psi(x - x_I; \omega)$ of the linear system on the interval $x \in [x_I, x_E]$ by meeting the appropriate initial conditions. The idea is that the evolution is represented by a rotation in the angle variable, so can be described by first changing to that variable, rotating the appropriate amount, and then reverting to the original variables.

Lemma 5.1. *A fundamental matrix of the system (3.7) for the evolution of $\varphi(x)$ and $\psi(x)$, for $x \in [x_I, x_E]$, for which the entropy is C^1 , is*

$$\Psi(x - x_I; \omega) = \frac{r(x)}{r_I} M(\sigma(x_-)) R(\theta(x) - \theta_I) M^{-1}(\sigma(x_{I+})), \quad (5.6)$$

where $M(\cdot)$ is defined by

$$M(q) := \begin{pmatrix} 1/\sqrt{q} & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{q} \end{pmatrix}, \quad M^{-1}(q) = M(1/q), \quad (5.7)$$

$R(\theta)$ is the usual 2×2 rotation matrix, and $\theta(x)$ and $r(x)$ satisfy (5.4) and (5.5), respectively.

In this representation of the fundamental solution, the first column describes the linearized evolution of the even modes $c(\omega t)$, and the second column describes evolution of the odd modes $s(\omega t)$ in the linearized PDE system (3.1).

Proof. Writing the substitution (5.2) in matrix notation and using (5.3), we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} \varphi(x) \\ \psi(x) \end{pmatrix} = r(x) M(\sigma(x)) R(\theta(x)) \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

for any $x \in [x_I, x_E]$. It follows that

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = R(-\theta_I) M(1/\sigma(x_I)) \frac{1}{r_I} \begin{pmatrix} \varphi(x_I) \\ \psi(x_I) \end{pmatrix},$$

and substituting this back in and comparing to the defining relation

$$\begin{pmatrix} \varphi(x) \\ \psi(x) \end{pmatrix} = \Psi(x - x_I; \omega) \begin{pmatrix} \varphi(x_I) \\ \psi(x_I) \end{pmatrix}$$

completes the proof. \square

In SL theory, the fundamental solution is also referred to as a *transfer matrix* [24].

5.2. Jump Condition. Recall that we restrict to piecewise C^1 entropy profiles. The representation (5.2) of solutions implicitly assumes that σ is absolutely continuous, so does not apply at jump discontinuities. At an entropy jump the ODE (5.4) formally degenerates to $\dot{\theta} = a\delta$, a Dirac measure. Instead of looking for weak solutions, at entropy jumps we refer back to the original SL system (5.1) and impose continuity of both φ and ψ . This is consistent with taking p and u continuous at contact discontinuities in the Euler equations (2.2).

At an entropy jump, we thus update θ and r by directly using (5.2) and imposing continuity on both φ and ψ . Thus, assume that the entropy is discontinuous at x and has left and right limits $s(x_-)$ and $s(x_+)$, respectively. Using (5.2) and imposing continuity, we get the equations

$$\begin{aligned} r_- \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sigma_-}} c(\theta_-) &= r_+ \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sigma_+}} c(\theta_+), \\ r_- \sqrt{\sigma_-} s(\theta_-) &= r_+ \sqrt{\sigma_+} s(\theta_+), \end{aligned} \quad (5.8)$$

where again the subscripts \mp denote left and right limits at x , respectively. Dividing the equations, we get

$$\sigma_- \tan(\theta_-) = \sigma_+ \tan(\theta_+), \quad (5.9)$$

while we can also rewrite them as

$$\frac{r_+}{r_-} c(\theta_+) = \frac{\sqrt{\sigma_+}}{\sqrt{\sigma_-}} c(\theta_-), \quad \frac{r_+}{r_-} s(\theta_+) = \frac{\sqrt{\sigma_-}}{\sqrt{\sigma_+}} s(\theta_-). \quad (5.10)$$

To proceed we now define the *jump* J at the discontinuity at x by

$$J := \frac{\sigma_-}{\sigma_+} = \frac{\sigma(s(x_-))}{\sigma(s(x_+))}. \quad (5.11)$$

We define the function

$$h(J, z) := \begin{cases} \text{Arctan}(J \tan z) + m\pi, & -\pi/2 < z - m\pi < \pi/2, \\ z & z = m\pi \pm \pi/2, \end{cases} \quad (5.12)$$

where $\text{Arctan}(\square) \in (-\pi/2, \pi/2)$ is the principal branch. Geometrically, h gives the angle that results from a vector with angle z scaling according to (5.9); in particular, $h(J, z)$ is always in the same quadrant as z , and $h(J, z) = z$ for z on the coordinate axes.

Lemma 5.2. *For any fixed J , $h(J, \cdot)$ is a monotone real analytic function of z , and for any fixed z , $h(\cdot, z)$ is a real analytic, bounded function of J . The partial derivatives of h ,*

$$\frac{\partial h}{\partial z} = \frac{J(1 + t^2(z))}{1 + J^2 t^2(z)}, \quad \frac{\partial h}{\partial J} = \frac{t(z)}{1 + J^2 t^2(z)}, \quad (5.13)$$

where we have abbreviated $\tan(\cdot) =: t(\cdot)$, are uniformly bounded,

$$\min \left\{ \frac{1}{J}, J \right\} \leq \frac{\partial h}{\partial z} \leq \max \left\{ \frac{1}{J}, J \right\}, \quad \left| \frac{\partial h}{\partial J} \right| \leq \frac{1}{2J^2}.$$

Proof. The derivatives (5.13) are directly calculated for $z \neq (m \pm \frac{1}{2})\pi$, at which points $t(z) = \pm\infty$. The function is defined in (5.12) to be continuous at those points, and the derivatives are bounded there,

$$\lim_{t(z) \rightarrow \pm\infty} \frac{J(1+t^2(z))}{1+J^2 t^2(z)} = \frac{1}{J}, \quad \lim_{t(z) \rightarrow \pm\infty} \frac{t(z)}{1+J^2 t^2(z)} = 0.$$

Analyticity and boundedness now follow because the denominators in (5.13) never vanish. The derivative bounds follow by elementary Calculus. \square

We are now in a position to fully describe the effect of a finite entropy jump.

Lemma 5.3. *In Prüfer coordinates, the angle changes across an entropy jump as*

$$\theta_+ = h(J, \theta_-), \quad (5.14)$$

while the radius changes as

$$r_+ = r_- \rho(J, \theta_-), \quad \text{where} \quad (5.15)$$

$$\rho(J, \theta_-) := \sqrt{\frac{1}{J} c^2(\theta_-) + J s^2(\theta_-)},$$

this being uniformly bounded,

$$\min \{ \sqrt{J}, 1/\sqrt{J} \} \leq \rho(J, \cdot) \leq \max \{ \sqrt{J}, 1/\sqrt{J} \}.$$

Proof. Using the definitions (5.3) and (5.7), we write (5.2) as

$$\begin{pmatrix} \varphi(x) \\ \psi(x) \end{pmatrix} = r(x) M(\sigma(x)) \begin{pmatrix} c(\theta(x)) \\ s(\theta(x)) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (5.16)$$

so continuity of φ and ψ gives (5.8), which is in turn equivalent to (5.9), (5.10). Using (5.11), (5.12) in (5.9) yields (5.14), while eliminating θ_+ in (5.10) yields (5.15). The bound on $\rho(J, \cdot)$ is immediate. \square

For piecewise C^1 entropy profiles, we solve the ODE (5.4) on intervals of smooth entropy (with appropriate initial condition), and couple these evolutions with (5.14) at entropy jumps, to get a uniquely defined piecewise C^1 angle θ throughout the interval $[0, \ell]$. Use of (5.5) on subintervals, together with (5.10) at jumps, explicitly determines $r(x)$, and use of (5.2) finally gives φ and ψ throughout the interval $[0, \ell]$. Thus the angle variable, which solves the scalar ODE (5.4), determines the entire SL evolution.

To be specific, let the entropy field $s \in \mathcal{P}$ be piecewise C^1 on $[0, \ell]$ with jumps at the points

$$0 < x_1 < x_2 < \cdots < x_N < \ell,$$

and set $x_0 := 0$ and $x_{N+1} := \ell$. Define the jump J_j at x_j by (5.11), namely

$$J_j = \frac{\sigma(s(x_{j-}))}{\sigma(s(x_{j+}))}, \quad (5.17)$$

and for given $\omega > 0$ define the angle $\theta(x)$ inductively as follows: first set $\theta_{0+} = \theta_0$, which we assume given. On the interval (x_j, x_{j+1}) , let $\theta(x)$ be the solution of (5.4) with initial data $x_I := x_j$ and $\theta_I := \theta_{j+}$: this determines θ up to x_{j+1-} . At the j -th jump x_j , we use (5.14), that is we set

$$\theta_{j+} := h(J_j, \theta_{j-}).$$

Inductively, this determines the angle $\theta(x)$ on the entire interval $[0, \ell]$.

Lemma 5.4. *This angle function $\theta(x)$ as defined above, together with the entropy profile $s(x)$, fully determine the solution to the SL initial value problem (5.1), with arbitrary initial condition (φ_0, ψ_0) . Moreover, the radius variable $r(x)$ is uniformly bounded: that is, there exist finite positive constants \underline{r} and \bar{r} depending only on $\sigma(x)$, such that*

$$r(x) \in [\underline{r}, \bar{r}] \quad \text{for all } x \in [0, \ell].$$

Proof. First, use (5.2) to determine the initial values θ_0 and r_0 , namely

$$\tan \theta_0 := \frac{\psi_0}{\sigma_0 \varphi_0}, \quad r_0 := \sqrt{\sigma_0 \varphi_0^2 + \psi_0^2 / \sigma_0},$$

where $\sigma_0 := \sigma(s(0))$. The algorithm described above then determines $\theta(x)$ for $x \in [0, \ell]$. Now define $r(x)$ inductively using (5.5) and (5.10): this becomes explicit once $\theta(x)$ is regarded as known. Now use (5.2) to determine $\varphi(x)$ and $\psi(x)$: by construction, these satisfy (5.1) on each subinterval (x_j, x_{j+1}) , and are continuous at each x_j .

It remains to find bounds for r : on an interval in which s is continuous, this is provided by (5.5). On the other hand, at an entropy jump, by (5.15) we have

$$\min \{1/\sqrt{J}, \sqrt{J}\} \leq \frac{r_+}{r_-} \leq \max \{1/\sqrt{J}, \sqrt{J}\}, \quad (5.18)$$

and combining finitely many such changes in r yields the uniform lower and upper bounds \underline{r} and \bar{r} , respectively. \square

5.3. Eigenfrequencies. We are interested in characterizing the k -mode eigenfrequencies and corresponding periods, that yield periodic solutions of the linearized equations. That is, we seek to characterize periods $T_k = k \frac{2\pi}{\omega_k}$, such that the k -mode basis vector $\mathcal{B}_k(T_k)$, defined in (3.5), satisfies the boundary conditions (3.11) or (3.12), respectively, or equivalently

$$\delta_k(T_k) = 0,$$

respectively, these being given by (3.13). Using (5.2), we express the boundary conditions in terms of the angle variable $\theta(x)$, as follows. For the periodic boundary condition (3.12), with $\chi = 1$, we require

$$\varphi_k(\ell) = 0, \quad \text{so} \quad \theta(\ell) = \left(n + \frac{1}{2}\right)\pi, \quad (5.19)$$

for k odd, and for k even, or the acoustic boundary condition $\chi = 0$, we need

$$\psi_k(\ell) = 0, \quad \text{so} \quad \theta(\ell) = n\pi, \quad (5.20)$$

for some n . Recall that it suffices to consider only the periodic boundary condition because the even modes of that problem will automatically solve the acoustic boundary condition $u = 0$ at $x = \ell$ by our reflection principle.

We can methodically enumerate both SL boundary conditions (5.19) and (5.20) in terms of the frequency ω and angle $\theta(x) = \theta(x, \omega)$, using the *angle boundary condition* for the k -th mode,

$$\theta(\ell, \omega) = k \frac{\pi}{2}, \quad (5.21)$$

which we interpret as an implicit condition for the coefficient $\omega = \omega_k$ of (5.4).

We express (5.21) more explicitly as follows. Recall that a piecewise continuous function on a closed interval is continuous at the boundaries, and is bounded on $[0, \ell]$. For definiteness, suppose that the entropy profile has jumps J_j defined by (5.17) at points

$$0 < x_1 < x_2 < \cdots < x_N < \ell,$$

and is C^1 on each subinterval. Denote the left and right limits of θ at the entropy jump x^j by θ_{j-} and θ_{j+} , respectively. For each ω , denote the nonlinear evolution of the angle across the subinterval (x_j, x_{j+1}) by

$$\Phi(\theta_{j+}, \omega, x_j, x_{j+1}) := \theta(x_{j+1-}),$$

where $\theta(x)$ solves (5.4) in (x_j, x_{j+1}) with $x_I = x_j$ and $\theta_I = \theta_{j+}$. According to our description above, we have, inductively, $\theta_{0+} = 0$,

$$\theta_{j-} = \Phi(\theta_{j-1+}, \omega, x_{j-1}, x_j), \quad \theta_{j+} = h(J_j, \theta_{j-}). \quad (5.22)$$

Our angle boundary condition (5.21) then becomes

$$\theta(\ell, \omega) = \theta_{N+1-} = \Phi(\theta_{N+}, \omega, x_N, \ell) = k \frac{\pi}{2}, \quad (5.23)$$

which is an implicit equation for ω_k .

According to (5.4), the angle evolution across a subinterval is given implicitly by

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_{j-} &= \Phi(\theta_{j-1+}, \omega, x_{j-1}, x_j) \\ &= \theta_{j-1+} + \int_{x_{j-1}}^{x_j} \omega \sigma \, dx + \int_{x_{j-1}}^{x_j} s(2\theta(x)) \, d \log \sqrt{\sigma}(x). \end{aligned} \quad (5.24)$$

Thus, given an entropy profile, we find the base reference period T_k of the k -mode by solving (5.23) for ω_k , where $\theta(x, \omega)$ solves (5.4), and then using (3.17). Each such k -mode with reference period T_k then determines a periodic solution of the linearized equation.

Note that (5.21) is equivalent to the *periodic* boundary condition (3.12), but permits more frequencies than the *acoustic* reflection boundary condition (3.11) allows, these latter two being equivalent only for even values of k .

However, the even modes form a closed subspace, so if we start from $a_m = 0$ for all odd m , this persists when we perturb to the nonlinear problem. Thus for notational convenience, we use (5.23) to identify all frequencies, with the understanding that if we are using (3.11), all linearizations and perturbations are restricted to even modes.

Lemma 5.5. *For each integer $k \geq 1$, and any piecewise C^1 entropy profile $s = s(x) \in \mathcal{P}$, there is a unique ω_k such that $\theta(x, \omega_k)$ as defined above satisfies (5.21). Moreover, $\{\omega_k\}$ is a strictly monotone increasing sequence,*

$$\omega_{k_1} < \omega_{k_2} \quad \text{for } k_1 < k_2,$$

and the eigenfrequencies ω_k grow like k , that is

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\omega_k}{k} = \Lambda, \quad \text{where } \Lambda = \frac{\pi/2}{\int_0^\ell \sigma(y) dy}. \quad (5.25)$$

Proof. We show that for any fixed $x > 0$, the function $\theta(x, \omega)$ is a continuous, strictly monotone increasing function of ω . In particular, taking $x = \ell$ in (5.21) implies that ω_k exists for each $k \geq 1$ and is increasing.

We first consider an interval (x_I, x_E) on which $s(x)$ is C^1 . Note that σ is determined by $s(x)$, and differentiate the ODE (5.4) with respect to ω . Denoting $\frac{\partial \theta}{\partial \omega}$ by ζ , this yields

$$\dot{\zeta} = \sigma - \frac{\dot{\sigma}}{\sigma} c(2\theta) \zeta, \quad (5.26)$$

which by (5.5) can also be written

$$\dot{\zeta} = \sigma - 2 \frac{\dot{r}}{r} \zeta.$$

It follows that r^2 is an integrating factor, and we integrate to get

$$r^2(x) \zeta(x) = r^2(x_I) \zeta(x_I) + \int_{x_I}^x r(y)^2 \sigma(y) dy. \quad (5.27)$$

Note that our left boundary condition $\theta(0) = 0$ implies $\zeta(0) = 0$. Thus $\zeta(x) > 0$ for $x > x_I$ provided $\zeta(x_I) \geq 0$, and in particular $\zeta(x_E) > 0$.

On the other hand, at the entropy jump x_j , assume that

$$\theta(x_{j-}, \omega_1) \leq \theta(x_{j-}, \omega_2) \quad \text{for any } 0 \leq \omega_1 \leq \omega_2.$$

Since $\theta(x_{j+}, \omega)$ is given by (5.14), continuity and monotonicity of $h(J, \cdot)$ for any fixed $J > 0$ implies that

$$\theta(x_{j+}, \omega_1) \leq \theta(x_{j+}, \omega_2).$$

It now follows by induction on subintervals that $\theta(\ell)$ is a strictly monotone function of ω for every piecewise C^1 entropy profile. This in turn implies the existence, uniqueness and monotonicity of the eigenfrequencies ω_k .

To get the growth rate of ω_k with respect to k , it suffices to obtain global upper and lower bounds for $\zeta = \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial \omega}$, uniform for $x \in [0, \ell]$. On subintervals where s is C^1 , (5.27) immediately gives the bound as long as $r(x)$ stays

positive and finite; this in turn follows immediately from (5.5). At entropy jumps, differentiating (5.14), we have

$$\zeta(x_{j+}, \omega) = \frac{\partial \theta_{j+}}{\partial \omega} = \frac{\partial h(J, z)}{\partial z} \Big|_{z=\theta_{j-}} \zeta(x_{j-}, \omega),$$

so we need a uniform bound for $\frac{\partial h(J, z)}{\partial z}$. Referring to (5.13) and rearranging, we have

$$\frac{\partial h}{\partial z} = \frac{1}{1 + J^2 t^2} J + \frac{J^2 t^2}{1 + J^2 t^2} \frac{1}{J},$$

which is a convex combination of J and $1/J$, so that

$$\min \{J, 1/J\} \leq \frac{\zeta(x_{j+}, \omega)}{\zeta(x_{j-}, \omega)} \leq \max \{J, 1/J\},$$

which is the desired bound.

Because there are finitely many jumps, we thus obtain uniform lower and upper bounds for $\zeta(x, \omega)$ for any x , uniform in $\omega \geq \epsilon > 0$, and in particular for $x = \ell$. This shows that θ grows positively and linearly with ω , and since $\theta(\ell)$ grows as k , so does ω_k , so that $\omega_k/k \rightarrow \Lambda$.

We can evaluate the limit Λ by formally taking the limit $k \rightarrow \infty$: as $k \rightarrow \infty$, so does $\theta(x)$, and the integral in (5.5), which is oscillatory, tends to zero. Thus the limiting value of $r(x)$ on the interval (x_{j-1}, x_j) is a constant,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} r(x) = r_{j-}^{\infty} = r_{j-1+}^{\infty},$$

where the superscript denotes the limiting value, and (5.27) gives

$$\zeta^{\infty}(x_{j-}) = \zeta^{\infty}(x_{j-1+}) + \int_{x_{j-1}}^{x_j} \sigma(y) dy.$$

For large values of ω (or k), we have

$$\theta(x, \omega) = \omega \left(\zeta^{\infty}(x) + \frac{1}{\omega} \int_0^{\omega} (\zeta(x, w) - \zeta^{\infty}(x)) dw \right),$$

which yields

$$\lim_{\omega \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\theta(x, \omega)}{\omega} = \zeta^{\infty}(x).$$

On the other hand, (5.12), (5.14) imply that at any jump,

$$|\theta_{j+} - \theta_{j-}| < \frac{\pi}{2}, \quad \text{so that} \quad \lim_{\omega \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{\theta_{j+}}{\omega} - \frac{\theta_{j-}}{\omega} \right| = 0,$$

and we can take ζ^{∞} to be continuous at the jumps. Combining evolutions and jumps by induction, we conclude that

$$\lim_{\omega \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\theta(\ell, \omega)}{\omega} = \zeta^{\infty}(\ell) = \int_0^{\ell} \sigma(y) dy.$$

Finally, since $\theta(\ell, \omega_k) = k \frac{\pi}{2}$, we conclude that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{k}{\omega_k} = \frac{2}{\pi} \int_0^{\ell} \sigma(y) dy,$$

from which our formula for Λ follows. \square

6. DIFFERENTIATION OF THE EVOLUTION OPERATOR

In order to complete the bifurcation argument, we must differentiate the evolution operator twice. We do so for the full 2×2 system (2.2), with the assumption that $s = s(x)$ is known and C^1 , and that the derivatives p_t and u_t remain bounded. This ensures that the classical local existence theory as established in [19] holds; see also [30]. In this section we do not assume the symmetries (2.3) or (2.7), although these are preserved under differentiation. Because p and u are taken to be continuous at entropy jumps, the case of piecewise C^1 entropy profiles is handled as a finite composition of non-commuting evolutions over sub-intervals on which the entropy is C^1 .

We begin with the system (2.2) in conservative form, namely

$$p_x + u_t = 0, \quad u_x - v(p, s)_t = 0, \quad (6.1)$$

with $s = s(x) \in C^1([0, L])$. Regarding L as fixed, we consider the evolution operator from $x = 0$ to $x = L$, defined in (2.20), namely

$$\mathcal{E}^L : U \subset H^b \rightarrow H^b, \quad \mathcal{E}^L(y^0) := y(L, \cdot), \quad (6.2)$$

where $y(x, t) = (p, u)$ is the solution of (6.1), defined throughout the interval $[0, L]$. Here, we are not assuming the symmetries (2.7), so (6.2) cannot be written as a scalar equation in y . Instead, with a slight abuse of notation used in this section, we use $y(x, t)$ to denote the *vector* (p, u) , so the data is $y^0 = (p^0, u^0)$, and H^b is the space of vector functions $(p, u) \in H^b \times H^b$. The classical local existence theory then states that for $b > 3/2$, the operator \mathcal{E}^L indeed defines a solution in H^b , provided the data $y^0 = (p^0, u^0)$ or interval $[0, L]$ is chosen small enough that the derivatives p_t and u_t remain bounded throughout the interval $x \in [0, L]$, see [19, 30].

The local existence theorem for general quasilinear systems, in which the time of existence is inversely proportional to the size of the data, is based on energy estimates, for example see (5.1.33) in [30]. In general the inhomogeneous linearized evolution equation can be written in the abstract form

$$\mathcal{L} X = F, \quad X(0, \cdot) = X^0, \quad (6.3)$$

where \mathcal{L} is the linearized evolution operator and F represents linear and/or nonlinear corrections. The corresponding energy estimate takes the form

$$\|X(x, \cdot)\|_b \leq K \|X^0\|_b + \int_0^x \|F(\chi, \cdot)\|_b d\chi, \quad (6.4)$$

where we are evolving in x , and this estimate holds as long as the nonlinear solution remains C^1 . This can be extended to establish the Frechet differentiability of the nonlinear evolution operator \mathcal{E}^L , which is worked out in detail in [42], as follows.

Evaluating $\mathcal{E}^L(y^0)$ implicitly requires knowledge of the entire evolution, that is $\mathcal{E}^x(y^0)$ for $x \in [0, L]$, and the linearization will similarly implicitly

require knowledge of the entire linear and nonlinear solution across $[0, L]$, even though only the initial data (p^0, u^0) is perturbed. Recall that \mathcal{E}^L is Frechet differentiable at y^0 , with derivative

$$D\mathcal{E}^L(y^0)[\cdot] : H^b \rightarrow H^{b-1},$$

if there exists a linear and bounded operator, denoted $D\mathcal{E}^L(y^0)$, such that

$$\mathcal{E}^L(y^0 + Y^0) - \mathcal{E}^L(y^0) - D\mathcal{E}^L(y^0)[Y^0] = o(\|Y^0\|_{b-1}), \quad (6.5)$$

that is such that

$$\frac{1}{\|Y^0\|_{b-1}} \left\| \mathcal{E}^L(y^0 + Y^0) - \mathcal{E}^L(y^0) - D\mathcal{E}^L(y^0)[Y^0] \right\|_{b-1} \rightarrow 0,$$

as $\|Y^0\|_{b-1} \rightarrow 0$. We will use the convention that square brackets and upper case $[Y^0]$ denote inputs to linear or multi-linear operators, while parentheses and lower case (y^0) are inputs to nonlinear functionals.

We briefly summarize how to linearize the evolution operator; again, see [42] for details. Consider the nonlinear system for a (small) perturbation $(p + \delta p, u + \delta u)$ of (p, u) , namely

$$(p + \delta p)_x + (u + \delta u)_t = 0, \quad (u + \delta u)_x - v(p + \delta p, s)_t = 0,$$

so that $(\delta p, \delta u)$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \delta p_x + \delta u_t &= 0, & \delta u_x - \delta v_t &= 0, \\ \delta v &:= v(p + \delta p, s) - v(p, s). \end{aligned} \quad (6.6)$$

The linearization (or Frechet derivative) $D\mathcal{E}^L$ at $y^0 = (p^0, u^0)$, evaluated on data $Y^0 = (P^0, U^0)$, is now obtained by expanding δv and retaining the linear terms in (6.6), while replacing $(\delta p, \delta u)$ by (P, U) . This yields the linear system

$$P_x + U_t = 0, \quad U_x - \left(\frac{\partial v(p, s)}{\partial p} P \right)_t = 0, \quad (6.7)$$

with data $Y^0 = (P^0, U^0)$, and we have

$$D\mathcal{E}^L(y^0)[Y^0] = Y(L, \cdot). \quad (6.8)$$

Here the coefficient $\frac{\partial v(p, s)}{\partial p}$ is determined by the nonlinear solution $y = (p, u)$, but the equation is linear in $Y = (P, U)$.

The error between the perturbed and linearized evolutions,

$$(\overline{\delta P}, \overline{\delta U}) := (\delta p, \delta u) - (P, U),$$

evolves according to the system

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\delta P}_x + \overline{\delta U}_t &= 0, & \overline{\delta U}_x - \left(\frac{\partial v(p, s)}{\partial p} \overline{\delta P} \right)_t &= E_t, \\ E &:= v(p + \delta p, s) - v(p, s) - \frac{\partial v(p, s)}{\partial p} P. \end{aligned}$$

Applying the energy estimate (6.4), which is (5.1.33) in [30] and based on Gronwall's inequality, to this system for the error, gives an estimate sufficient to establish (6.5), which implies that \mathcal{E}^x is Frechet differentiable at y^0 with derivative $D\mathcal{E}^x(y^0)$ as constructed here. Because the nonlinear term $v = v(p + \delta p, s)$ is developed in a Taylor expansion, the error term is controlled by derivatives of p , which implies an essential loss of derivative in the linearization. It follows that provided the evolution $\mathcal{E}^L : H^b \rightarrow H^b$ is bounded, then for $p^0 \in H^b$, the linearization $D\mathcal{E}^L$ is a bounded linear map from H^{b-1} to H^{b-1} [42].

We can similarly define higher Frechet derivatives by an inductive process. To differentiate a second time, we evaluate the *linear map* $D\mathcal{E}^L(y^0)[\cdot]$, which is nonlinear in y^0 . That is, we perturb y^0 in an *independent direction* Y_2^0 , so we are evaluating

$$D\mathcal{E}^L(y^0 + Y_2^0)[Y_1^0] - D\mathcal{E}^L(y^0)[Y_1^0],$$

and taking the linear part to get $D^2\mathcal{E}(y^0)[Y_1^0, Y_2^0]$. This is achieved by differentiating (6.7) in the independent direction Y_2^0 . Denoting the solution of this second linearization by

$$Z = (Q, V), \quad Z(x, \cdot) = D^2\mathcal{E}^x(y^0)[Y_1^0, Y_2^0],$$

the equation for $Z = (Q, V)$ becomes

$$Q_x + V_t = 0, \quad V_x - \left(\frac{\partial v(p, s)}{\partial p} Q \right)_t = \left(\frac{\partial^2 v(p, s)}{\partial p^2} P_1 P_2 \right)_t. \quad (6.9)$$

Here $y = (p, u)$ is the result of the nonlinear evolution and $Y_1 = (P_1, U_1)$ and $Y_2 = (P_2, U_2)$ are the results of linearized evolution by (6.7), with data Y_1^0 and Y_2^0 , respectively. There is no explicit dependence on the velocity component U of Y , because the original system (6.1) is already linear in u . Since the data Y_1^0 and Y_2^0 are independent, the data for Z vanishes: that is, $Z^0 = (Q^0, V^0) = (0, 0)$. This vanishing of the data, together with Gronwall, implies that the error in the expansion is appropriately bounded with a cubic error estimate. Note that equation (6.9) for Z is linear inhomogeneous, with the same linear evolution as $D\mathcal{E}(y^0)$, and with inhomogeneous term that can be regarded as explicit once y , Y_1 and Y_2 have been calculated through the nonlinear and linear equations (6.1) and (6.7), respectively.

Repeated use of the energy estimate (6.4) yields the following theorem; see [42] for details.

Theorem 6.1. *Theorem 2.2 holds. Moreover, the nonlinear evolution operator $\mathcal{E}^L : U \subset H^b \rightarrow H^b$ is twice Frechet differentiable, with first and second Frechet derivatives around $y^0 \in H^b$ denoted by*

$$D\mathcal{E}^L(y^0)[\cdot] : H^b \rightarrow H^{b-1}, \quad \text{and} \\ D^2\mathcal{E}^L(y^0)[\cdot, \cdot] : H^b \times H^b \rightarrow H^{b-2},$$

respectively. Both operators are given by evolutions of the form (6.3), where the linearization $D\mathcal{E}^L(y^0)[Y^0]$ is homogeneous, while $D^2\mathcal{E}^L(y^0)$ is inhomogeneous.

Recall that we are working with piecewise C^1 entropy profiles. Since Theorem 6.1 applies only to classical solutions, and since x is our evolution variable, we treat entropy jumps explicitly and regard the full evolution as a non-commuting composition of C^1 evolutions, separated by entropy jumps across which p and u and their time derivatives are unchanged. Since our variables p and u are both continuous across jump discontinuities in the entropy, there is no jump operator between the C^1 evolutions. In other variables, such as Riemann invariants or angle variables, a jump operator is necessary to connect the C^1 evolutions, as in (5.9), (5.10). For our further analysis, we differentiate the composition of evolution operators twice.

Corollary 6.2. *Suppose that our evolution operator is a composition of N C^1 evolutions,*

$$\mathcal{E}^L = \mathcal{E}^{L_N} \dots \mathcal{E}^{L_2} \mathcal{E}^{L_1}. \quad (6.10)$$

Then the linearization $D\mathcal{E}^L$ is the composition of individual linearizations,

$$D\mathcal{E}^L = D\mathcal{E}^{L_N} \dots D\mathcal{E}^{L_2} D\mathcal{E}^{L_1},$$

and the second Frechet derivative is

$$D^2\mathcal{E}^L = \sum_{k=1}^N D\mathcal{E}^{L_N} \dots D\mathcal{E}^{L_{k+1}} D^2\mathcal{E}^{L_k} \circ D\mathcal{E}^{L_{k-1}} \dots D\mathcal{E}^{x_1},$$

where \circ denotes

$$D^2\mathcal{E}^{L_k} \circ \mathcal{A}[Y_1^0, Y_2^0] := D^2\mathcal{E}^{L_k}[\mathcal{A}Y_1^0, \mathcal{A}Y_2^0],$$

and each linear and bilinear map $D^i\mathcal{E}^{L_k}$ is evaluated at the appropriately evolved nonlinear state,

$$D^i\mathcal{E}^{L_k}[\cdot, \cdot] = D^i\mathcal{E}^{L_k}(\mathcal{E}^{L_{k-1}} \dots \mathcal{E}^{L_1}y^0)[\cdot, \cdot].$$

Proof. The first statement is the chain rule, which for two operators is

$$D(\mathcal{E}^{L_2} \mathcal{E}^{L_1})(y^0)[Y_1^0] = D\mathcal{E}^{L_2}(\mathcal{E}^{L_1}(y^0)) [D\mathcal{E}^{L_1}(y^0)[Y_1^0]].$$

Since the right hand side is a product, differentiating again, in direction Y_2^0 , follows from Leibniz' rule,

$$\begin{aligned} D^2(\mathcal{E}^{L_2} \mathcal{E}^{L_1})(y^0)[Y_1^0, Y_2^0] &= D\mathcal{E}^{L_2}(\mathcal{E}^{L_1}(y^0)) [D^2\mathcal{E}^{L_1}(y^0)[Y_1^0, Y_2^0]] \\ &\quad + D^2\mathcal{E}^{L_2}(\mathcal{E}^{L_1}(y^0)) [D\mathcal{E}^{L_1}(y^0)[Y_1^0], D\mathcal{E}^{L_1}(y^0)[Y_2^0]]. \end{aligned}$$

The result now follows by induction. \square

Although Theorem 6.1 and Corollary 6.2 are abstract theorems which apply for arbitrary vector inputs $y = (p, u)$ and $Y = (P, U)$, we now revert to the symmetry assumptions (1.26) made throughout the rest of the paper, which restrict consideration to data with vanishing velocity component, $u^0 =$

$U^0 = 0$. This in turn allows us to regard p as even and u as odd throughout, and to again treat $y = p + u$, $Y = P + U$ as scalar functions, as in (1.19).

Lemma 4.1 requires the abstract use of Theorem 6.1 in that it uses twice differentiability of the evolution operator \mathcal{E}^L . On the other hand, Lemma 4.2 requires explicit calculation of this second derivative $D^2\mathcal{E}^L$ at the constant state $y^0 = 0$. This is accomplished in the next subsection.

6.1. Differentiation at the Quiet State. To complete the proof that nonresonant linear modes perturb to nonlinear solutions, we must prove Lemma 4.2, which allows us to solve the bifurcation equation, and requires calculation of the second derivative (4.13), namely

$$\left\langle s\left(k t \frac{2\pi}{T} - \chi k \frac{\pi}{2}\right), D^2\mathcal{E}(\bar{p})\left[1, c\left(k t \frac{2\pi}{T}\right)\right] \right\rangle.$$

This in turn requires calculation of the second Frechet derivative in which one input is the zero-mode,

$$G(\omega) := D^2\mathcal{E}(\bar{p})\left[1, c(\omega \cdot)\right], \quad \text{where } \omega := k \frac{2\pi}{T}, \quad (6.11)$$

of the evolution operator at the constant quiet state. Here $G(\omega)$ is a function of t which depends on the frequency ω , and $c(\omega \cdot)$ denotes the input function which is a pure cosine mode of frequency ω , namely $c(\omega \cdot) : t \mapsto c(\omega t)$.

Lemma 6.3. *The second derivative (6.11) is given by the solution of the linear inhomogeneous SL system*

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\hat{\varphi}} + \omega \hat{\psi} &= 0, \\ \dot{\hat{\psi}} - \sigma^2 \omega \hat{\varphi} &= -v_{pp} \omega \varphi_k, \end{aligned} \quad (6.12)$$

with vanishing initial data $\hat{\varphi}(0) = \hat{\psi}(0) = 0$, with coefficient $\sigma^2 = -v_p(\bar{p}, s)$, and where $v_{pp} = v_{pp}(\bar{p}, s) \neq 0$. More precisely, we have

$$G(\omega) = G(\omega) : t \mapsto \hat{\varphi}(\ell) c(\omega t) + \hat{\psi}(\ell) s(\omega t), \quad (6.13)$$

where $\omega = \omega_k$ is given by (3.17), namely $\omega = k \frac{2\pi}{T}$.

Proof. The quantity $G(\omega)$ is directly obtained by evolving system (6.9) with the appropriate substitutions of the data. Because we are linearizing around the quiet state $y = \bar{p}$, the data for the nonlinear equation (6.1) is this constant state $(\bar{p}, 0)$, which is an exact solution of the nonlinear equation, and we have $y = \bar{p}$ throughout the evolution.

Next, we evolve the data $Y_1^0 = 1$ and $Y_2^0 = c(\omega \cdot)$, which are the inputs to $D^2\mathcal{E}(\bar{p})[\cdot, \cdot]$ in (6.11) by the linearized equation (6.7), evaluated on the solution we are linearizing around, namely $y = p = \bar{p}$. This becomes the linear equation

$$P_x + U_t = 0, \quad U_x + \sigma^2 P_t = 0, \quad \sigma^2 := -\frac{\partial v}{\partial p}(\bar{p}, s), \quad (6.14)$$

with initial data $(P_1^0, U_1^0) = (1, 0)$ and $(P_2^0, U_2^0) = (c(\omega \cdot), 0)$, respectively. The first of these is solved by inspection, to give $(P_1, U_1) = (1, 0)$ throughout

the evolution, and is the observation that quiet states are preserved by the evolution. The second is solved by separating variables on the corresponding linearized mode,

$$P_2 = \varphi_k(x) c(\omega t), \quad U_2 = \psi_k(x) s(\omega t).$$

Plugging this in to (6.14) gives the SL system

$$\dot{\varphi}_k + \omega \psi_k = 0, \quad \dot{\psi}_k - \omega \sigma^2 \varphi_k = 0,$$

with initial data $(\varphi_k(0), \psi_k(0)) = (1, 0)$. Note that this is exactly the previously studied SL system (3.4), (5.1).

To calculate the second derivative $G(\omega)$ of (6.11), we now solve system (6.9) at the nonlinear quiet state solution \bar{p} , and with P_1 and P_2 as above, and vanishing initial data. System (6.9) then becomes

$$\begin{aligned} Q_x + V_t = 0, \quad V_x + \sigma^2 Q_t &= (v_{pp} \varphi_k c(\omega t))_t, \\ Q(0, t) = V(0, t) &= 0, \end{aligned} \quad (6.15)$$

where

$$\sigma^2 = -\frac{\partial v}{\partial p}(\bar{p}, s), \quad \text{and} \quad v_{pp} = \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial p^2}(\bar{p}, s),$$

and these coefficients depend continuously on the C^1 entropy $s = s(x)$. We again solve by separating variables, so set

$$Q = \widehat{\varphi}_k(x) c(\omega t), \quad V = \widehat{\psi}_k(x) s(\omega t).$$

Plugging this ansatz into (6.15) gives the inhomogeneous SL system (6.12), and this completes the proof of the lemma. \square

6.2. Proof of Lemma 4.2. We solve (6.12) using Duhamel's principle with the fundamental solution $\Psi(x; \omega)$ given in (3.7): it is straight-forward to check that the solution of (6.12) is

$$\begin{pmatrix} \widehat{\varphi}(x) \\ \widehat{\psi}(x) \end{pmatrix} = -\omega \int_0^x \Psi(x - x'; \omega) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \varphi_k(x') v_{pp} dx', \quad (6.16)$$

and where $v_{pp} = v_{pp}(\bar{p}, s(x'))$. Recall that genuine nonlinearity is the condition that $v_{pp}(p, s) > 0$, and we have assumed this holds uniformly. It turns out that this condition alone is sufficiently strong to ensure that we can solve the bifurcation equation (4.8).

Lemma 6.4. *The solution of (6.12) can be written as*

$$\begin{pmatrix} \widehat{\varphi}(x) \\ \widehat{\psi}(x) \end{pmatrix} = \Psi(x; \omega) \begin{pmatrix} a(x) \\ b(x) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (6.17)$$

for appropriate functions a and b , and we have $b(x) < 0$ for all $x > 0$.

Proof. Because Ψ is a fundamental solution, using the ansatz (6.17) in (6.12) yields the simplified system

$$\begin{pmatrix} a \\ b \end{pmatrix} \dot{} = -v_{pp} \omega \varphi \Psi^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad a(0) = b(0) = 0. \quad (6.18)$$

Next, since $\det \Psi \equiv 1$, writing

$$\Psi = \begin{pmatrix} \varphi & \tilde{\varphi} \\ \psi & \tilde{\psi} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{we have} \quad \Psi^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\psi} & -\tilde{\varphi} \\ -\psi & \varphi \end{pmatrix},$$

and the second component of (6.18) simplifies to

$$\dot{b} = -v_{pp} \omega \varphi^2 < 0.$$

It follows that $b(x) < 0$ for all $x > 0$, as required. \square

In summary, Lemma 6.3 gives the second derivative of the evolution in terms of the fundamental solution, which is calculated in Lemma 5.1. Lemma 6.4 explicitly calculates a nonvanishing term due to genuine nonlinearity, as seen by the v_{pp} term in (6.18). This then allows us to solve the bifurcation equation as stated in Lemma 4.2 above. For convenience we restate the Lemma.

Lemma 6.5 (Lemma 4.2). *For a genuinely nonlinear constitutive equation, the second derivative $D^2\mathcal{E}(\bar{p})$ satisfies*

$$\left\langle s\left(k t \frac{2\pi}{T} - \chi k \frac{\pi}{2}\right), D^2\mathcal{E}(\bar{p})\left[1, c\left(k t \frac{2\pi}{T}\right)\right] \right\rangle \neq 0 \quad (6.19)$$

so that the derivative

$$\frac{\partial g}{\partial z} \Big|_{(0,0)} = \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial z \partial \alpha} \Big|_{(0,0)} \neq 0.$$

Proof of Lemma 4.2. Recall that we must show that the quantity (6.19) is nonzero, which according to (4.13) is

$$\frac{\partial g}{\partial z} \Big|_{(0,0)} = \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial z \partial \alpha} \Big|_{(0,0)} = \left\langle s\left(k t \frac{2\pi}{T} - \chi k \frac{\pi}{2}\right), D^2\mathcal{E}(\bar{p})\left[1, c\left(k t \frac{2\pi}{T}\right)\right] \right\rangle.$$

Using (6.11), we substitute (6.13) to get

$$\frac{\partial g}{\partial z} \Big|_{(0,0)} = \left\langle s\left(\omega t - \chi k \frac{\pi}{2}\right), G\left(k \frac{2\pi}{T}\right) \right\rangle = \begin{cases} \widehat{\varphi}(\ell), & k \text{ odd and } \chi = 1, \\ \widehat{\psi}(\ell), & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

respectively, where $(\widehat{\varphi}, \widehat{\psi})$ solve (6.12). Recall that χ is an indicator of which boundary condition is used: $\chi = 1$ corresponds to the periodic condition, $\chi = 0$ to the acoustic condition.

Evaluating (6.17) at $x = \ell$, we get

$$\begin{pmatrix} \widehat{\varphi}(\ell) \\ \widehat{\psi}(\ell) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \varphi(\ell) & \tilde{\varphi}(\ell) \\ \psi(\ell) & \tilde{\psi}(\ell) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a(\ell) \\ b(\ell) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{with } b(\ell) < 0.$$

By our choice (5.21) of ω , for k odd and $\chi = 1$, we have (5.19), so that $\varphi(\ell) = 0$, which implies that

$$\widehat{\varphi}(\ell) = \widetilde{\varphi}(\ell) b(\ell) \neq 0,$$

and similarly for k even or $\chi = 0$, we have (5.20), which is $\psi(\ell) = 0$, so we must have

$$\widehat{\psi}(\ell) = \widetilde{\psi}(\ell) b(\ell) \neq 0,$$

and hence (6.19) holds as claimed and the proof is complete. \square

The proof of Lemma 4.2 completes the the proof of Theorem 4.3, which asserts the global existence of pure tone time-periodic solutions, which are perturbations of a nonresonant linearized mode. In the next section we show that non-resonant modes are generic.

7. PIECEWISE CONSTANT ENTROPY

In order to give a precise sense in which nonresonant modes are generic, even though resonant modes are dense, we restrict to the finite dimensional case of piecewise constant entropy profiles with a fixed number of distinct jumps. In this case we can derive explicit formulas which give the dependence of the SL eigenfrequencies on the entropy profile. We note that piecewise constant profiles are foundational because they are dense in L^1 and they form the basis of many numerical approaches to SL problems [24].

In Theorem 7.8 below, we establish that nonresonant form a set of full measure in this space of piecewise constant profiles with a finite number of jumps, even though in Lemma 7.5, we show that resonant entropy profiles are dense in L^1 . This density of resonance provides some explanation of the difficulty of such problems and why Nash-Moser methods are a technically difficult as they are.

For piecewise constant entropy profiles, we exactly solve the linearized evolution and therefore explicitly calculate the divisors $\delta_j(T)$ and eigenfrequencies ω_k defined in (3.17) and (3.13), respectively. In this case, the evolution is a non-commuting composition of *isentropic* evolution operators, and all nonlinear effects of entropy changes are encoded in the Rankine-Hugoniot jump conditions at the jumps, which are imposed by continuity of p and u . The corresponding linearization around each constant quiet state \bar{p} is again the SL system (5.1), but now with constant coefficient σ on each subinterval. This changing constant σ is reflected as a change of sound speed in the PDE.

7.1. Parameterization of the Profile. We introduce parameters for the piecewise constant entropy profile, as follows. Suppose there are N distinct entropy levels, and the jumps are located at points

$$0 =: x_0 < x_1 < x_2 < \cdots < x_{N-1} < x_N := \ell,$$

and denote the successive values of the entropy by s_i , so that

$$s(x) = s_i, \quad x_{i-1} < x < x_i. \quad (7.1)$$

We denote this class of piecewise constant entropy fields by \mathcal{P}_N .

The corresponding linearized wavespeeds are similarly denoted

$$\sigma_i := \sigma(\bar{p}, s_i), \quad x_{i-1} < x < x_i, \quad (7.2)$$

this function being given in (1.16). As in (5.11), (5.17), we define the i -th jump by

$$J_i := \frac{\sigma_i}{\sigma_{i+1}}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N-1. \quad (7.3)$$

We denote the width of the i -th subinterval on which the entropy is constant, by

$$L_i := x_i - x_{i-1}, \quad \text{so that} \quad \ell = \sum_{i=1}^N L_i. \quad (7.4)$$

In [32, 35], we found that the linearized isentropic evolution can be interpreted as a rotation in Riemann invariants, and in this paper we identify this rotation with the angle variable introduced in (5.2), (5.4). In this context we define the *evolution angle*

$$\theta_i := \sigma_i L_i. \quad (7.5)$$

The SL evolution across the entire interval $[0, \ell]$ is the composition of the distinct *isentropic* SL evolutions,

$$\Psi(\ell; \omega) = \Psi_N \circ \dots \circ \Psi_1, \quad \Psi_i := \Psi(x_i - x_{i-1}; \omega), \quad (7.6)$$

where each Ψ_i is the fundamental matrix of the evolution over the entire subinterval on which $\sigma = \sigma_i$ is constant. For each of these, the SL system (3.4) reduces to a constant coefficient system, and the corresponding angle representation (5.4), (5.5), namely

$$\varphi(x) := r(x) \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sigma_i}} c(\theta(x)), \quad \psi(x) := r(x) \sqrt{\sigma_i} s(\theta(x)),$$

reduces to the simpler system

$$\dot{\theta} = \omega \sigma_i, \quad \dot{r} = 0, \quad x_{i-1} < x < x_i. \quad (7.7)$$

Therefore Ψ_i is no more than the evolution in (φ, ψ) determined by (7.7). In the following lemma, we show that linearized isentropic evolution can be realized as rotation in Riemann invariants, which is (7.7), and transformation between physical variables (φ, ψ) and Riemann invariants $(r c\theta, r s\theta)$ is conjugation by the jump matrix (5.7). This is a restatement of the linearized structures developed by the authors in [32, 35, 34].

Lemma 7.1. *When the entropy is piecewise constant, the fundamental matrix of the SL system (5.1), satisfying*

$$\begin{pmatrix} \varphi(\ell) \\ \psi(\ell) \end{pmatrix} = \Psi(\ell; \omega) \begin{pmatrix} \varphi(0) \\ \psi(0) \end{pmatrix},$$

can be written as the 2×2 matrix product

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi(\ell; \omega) &= M(\sigma_N) R(\omega \theta_N) M(\sigma_N)^{-1} M(\sigma_{N-1}) \dots \\ &\quad \dots R(\omega \theta_2) M(\sigma_2)^{-1} M(\sigma_1) R(\omega \theta_1) M^{-1}(\sigma_1) \\ &= M(\sigma_N) R(\omega \theta_N) M(J_{N-1}) \dots \\ &\quad \dots R(\omega \theta_2) M(J_1) R(\omega \theta_1) M^{-1}(\sigma_1). \end{aligned} \quad (7.8)$$

Here $R(\cdot)$ is the usual rotation matrix and $M(\cdot)$ is the jump matrix defined in (5.7), and J_i is given by (7.3). In particular the linearized evolution of data with given angle θ^0 can be evaluated inductively as a series of rotations and jumps in Riemann invariants, as

$$\Psi(\ell; \omega) r^0 \begin{pmatrix} c(\theta^0) \\ s(\theta^0) \end{pmatrix} = r_N \begin{pmatrix} c(\gamma_N) \\ s(\gamma_N) \end{pmatrix},$$

where the intermediate angles γ_m are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_0 &:= h(1/\sigma_1, \theta^0) \\ \gamma_m &:= h(J_m, \gamma_{m-1} + \omega \theta_m), \quad m = 1, \dots, N-1, \\ \gamma_N &:= h(\sigma_N, \gamma_{N-1} + \omega \theta_N), \end{aligned} \quad (7.9)$$

and the intermediate radii are

$$\begin{aligned} r_0 &:= \rho(1/\sigma_1, r^0) \\ r_m &:= r_{m-1} \rho(J_m, \gamma_{m-1} + \omega \theta_m), \quad m = 1, \dots, N-1, \\ r_N &:= r_{N-1} \rho(\sigma_N, \gamma_{N-1} + \omega \theta_N), \end{aligned} \quad (7.10)$$

and where the functions h and ρ are defined in (5.12) and (5.15), respectively. Moreover, the change in radius r_N/r^0 is uniformly bounded above and below by a constant depending only on the entropy profile.

Proof. We constructed the general fundamental solution in Lemma 5.1. Using the simplified evolution (7.7) in (5.6), we get, for each i ,

$$\Psi(L_i; \omega) = M(\sigma_i) R(\omega \sigma_i L_i) M^{-1}(\sigma_i),$$

where $M(\cdot)$ is given by (5.7), with $\theta_i = \sigma_i L_i$ by (7.4). Since the matrix M is multiplicative, $M(q_1 q_2) = M(q_1) M(q_2)$, assertion (7.8) follows from (7.3).

The inductive formulas (7.9) and (7.10) follow directly from the observation that the angle changes linearly in linearized isentropic evolution, together with repeated application of Lemma 5.3 at each jump J_m . \square

Recall that the eigenfrequencies ω_k are defined by the implicit condition (5.21), namely

$$\theta(\ell, \omega_k) = k \frac{\pi}{2}, \quad \text{or} \quad \theta(\ell, \omega_k) = k \pi,$$

with initial angle $\theta^0 = 0$, for the indicator $\chi = 1$ or $\chi = 0$, corresponding to periodic and acoustic boundary conditions, respectively. As above, for convenience, we treat the more general periodic condition $\chi = 1$; restricting to even k then recovers the other case.

Corollary 7.2. *For a piecewise constant entropy profile, the k -th eigenfrequency is the root $\omega = \omega_k$ of the implicit equation*

$$\omega \theta_N + \gamma_{N-1} = k \frac{\pi}{2}, \quad (7.11)$$

where $\gamma_0 = 0$ and each γ_m is given inductively by (7.9), namely

$$\gamma_m := h(J_m, \gamma_{m-1} + \omega \theta_m), \quad m = 1, \dots, N-1. \quad (7.12)$$

Proof. First note that for any $J > 0$, and any integer n ,

$$h\left(J, n \frac{\pi}{2}\right) = n \frac{\pi}{2}$$

so that, because $\theta^0 = 0$, the initial and final entropy adjustments $M(1/\sigma_1)$ and $M(\sigma_N)$ do not affect the angle, and can be ignored. Similarly changes to the radii r_m play no part. Thus the closed system (7.12), (7.11) determines the eigenfrequency ω_k and the proof is complete. \square

7.2. Time Period and Frequencies. To illustrate the calculation of the eigenfrequencies, in Figure 2, we show the corresponding rotations and jumps (scaled for visibility) for the first four nonzero eigenfrequencies, in the plane of Riemann invariants $(rc\theta, rs\theta)$. Here the entropy field consists of four constant states separated by three jumps. The circular arcs represent linear evolution of the k -mode through the entropy level θ_m so are rotations by $\omega_k \theta_m$, and the vertical segments represent the action of the jumps, as encoded by the function $h(J, \theta)$, in which the second component is scaled but the first remains constant. The constraints on each eigenfrequency are that the k -th curve should start at the x -axis $\theta = 0$ and should end in the multiple $k\frac{\pi}{2}$, which is the k -th axis, counting anti-clockwise. The four curves are color coded, and some arcs are labeled: for example, $\omega_1 \theta_2$ (blue) is the evolution of the 1-mode between jumps J_1 and J_2 . Recall that according to Lemma 5.5, the eigenfrequencies ω_k are unique and grow linearly with k , as can be seen in this diagram, because the frequency, or rate of rotation, must increase in order to reach the k -th axis over the same interval $[0, \ell]$.

Recall that the time period $T = T_k$ defined in (3.17) is determined by the eigenfrequency of the linearized mode that we are perturbing. Thus, for a given entropy profile, we *first* pick the mode k , which then determines the time period by (3.17), namely

$$T = T_k = k \frac{2\pi}{\omega_k},$$

where ω_k is the k -th eigenfrequency of that entropy profile. Having fixed the time period, we can *then* calculate the small divisors corresponding to the j -th modes, $\delta_j(T)$, according to (3.13), namely

$$\delta_j(T) := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} R(j\chi\frac{\pi}{2}) \Psi(\ell; j\frac{2\pi}{T}) \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$




FIGURE 2. Rotations and jumps generating frequencies

Here the vector $\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$ represents the coefficient of the even j -mode $c(j\frac{2\pi}{T})$ at $x = 0$, $\Psi(\ell; j\frac{2\pi}{T})$ evolves this mode from $x = 0$ to $x = \ell$, $R(j\chi\frac{\pi}{2})$ shifts the result by a quarter period for the periodic boundary condition, and $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ projects onto the odd mode which vanishes when the boundary condition is met. The divisor $\delta_j(T)$ then measures the degree to which this j mode fails to satisfy the boundary condition. Note that these small divisors are now just numbers, and in general are not directly related to the other eigenfrequencies of the given entropy profile. The j -th mode is *resonant*, if the corresponding j -th divisor vanishes. According to Lemma 3.4, this occurs if and only if ω_j is rationally related to ω_k , that is

$$\delta_j(T) = 0 \quad \text{iff} \quad k\omega_l = j\omega_k,$$

which is the statement that $q\omega_k$, $q := j/k$, is another eigenfrequency of the same entropy profile.

7.3. Resonance Conditions. In order to better understand the resonance structure, we give an explicit geometric procedure for determining the k -th eigenfrequency ω_k for a given piecewise constant entropy profile. This geometric construction is based on the observation that all θ_m 's in (7.12), (7.11) are multiplied by ω , so can be replaced by another variable Z_m . It is

convenient to introduce the vector notation

$$\begin{aligned}\Theta &:= (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_N) \in \mathbb{R}_+^N, \\ J &:= (J_1, \dots, J_{N-1}) \in \mathbb{R}_+^{N-1}, \\ Z &:= (Z_1, \dots, Z_N) \in \mathbb{R}_+^N,\end{aligned}$$

and we also write $(J, \Theta) \in \mathcal{P}_N = \mathbb{R}_+^{2N-1}$.

Referring to Corollary 7.2, we define a function $\Gamma^J = \gamma_{N-1}$ on \mathbb{R}_+^{N-1} , as follows. First set $\gamma_0 = 0$, and inductively define *intermediate angle functions*

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_m &: \mathbb{R}_+^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ \quad \text{by} \\ \gamma_m(Z_1, \dots, Z_m) &:= h(J_m, Z_m + \gamma_{m-1}(Z_1, \dots, Z_{m-1})),\end{aligned}\tag{7.13}$$

for $m = 1, \dots, N-1$, and set

$$\Gamma^J(Z_1, \dots, Z_{N-1}) := \gamma_{N-1}(Z_1, \dots, Z_{N-1}).\tag{7.14}$$

Note that each γ_m also depends on the jumps (J_1, \dots, J_m) , which we treat as parameters. We calculate the derivatives of the γ_m recursively.

Lemma 7.3. *Each function γ_m depends only on the values of J_l and Z_l for $l \leq m$, and the derivatives satisfy*

$$\frac{\partial \gamma_m}{\partial J_m} = \frac{\partial h}{\partial J} \Big|_{(J_m, Z_m + \gamma_{m-1})}, \quad \frac{\partial \gamma_m}{\partial Z_m} = \frac{\partial h}{\partial Z} \Big|_{(J_m, Z_m + \gamma_{m-1})},\tag{7.15}$$

derivatives of h being given in (5.13), together with the recursive relations

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial \gamma_m}{\partial J_l} &= \frac{\partial h}{\partial Z} \Big|_{(J_m, Z_m + \gamma_{m-1})} \frac{\partial \gamma_{m-1}}{\partial J_l}, \\ \frac{\partial \gamma_m}{\partial Z_l} &= \frac{\partial h}{\partial Z} \Big|_{(J_m, Z_m + \gamma_{m-1})} \frac{\partial \gamma_{m-1}}{\partial Z_l},\end{aligned}\tag{7.16}$$

for $l < m$.

Proof. This follows immediately from the definition (7.13) together with repeated use of the chain rule. \square

Using these functions γ_m , we now rewrite the equations (7.12), (7.11), as the system

$$Z_N = k \frac{\pi}{2} - \Gamma^J(Z_1, \dots, Z_{N-1}), \quad Z = \omega \Theta,\tag{7.17}$$

where the second is a vector equation, $Z_m = \omega \theta_m$, $m = 1, \dots, N$. We interpret this system as follows: Z_N is the graph of the function $k \frac{\pi}{2} - \Gamma^J$, and $Z = \omega \Theta$ describes the ray in \mathbb{R}_+^N determined by the vector Θ , and parameterized by ω . Both equations are satisfied at the point \hat{Z} at which the graph and ray intersect, and the eigenfrequency $\omega = \omega_k$ is then the scaling parameter such that

$$\hat{Z} = \omega_k \Theta, \quad \text{that is} \quad \omega_k = \hat{Z}_m / \theta_m,$$

for any m . Note that both the ray and function Γ^J are independent of k , and as k varies; the only difference is in the height of the graph. Also note that this interpretation does *not* require that k be an integer.

For piecewise constant entropy profiles, we write the k -th eigenfrequency as the function

$$\omega_k = \omega_k(J, \Theta), \quad \omega_k : \mathcal{P}_N = \mathbb{R}_+^{2N-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+. \quad (7.18)$$

We showed in Lemma 5.5 that the k -th eigenfrequency is unique, so that ω_k is well-defined, and in the case of piecewise constant entropies, this is in fact a C^∞ function.

Lemma 7.4. *For piecewise constant entropy profiles with $N - 1$ jumps, the eigenfrequency $\omega_k(J, \Theta)$ defined in (7.18) is a C^∞ function of the parameters (J, Θ) .*

Proof. Recall that $\omega = \omega_k$ is given by (7.17), which we rewrite as

$$\omega_k \theta_N + \Gamma^J(\omega_k \theta_1, \dots, \omega_k \theta_{N-1}) = k \frac{\pi}{2}.$$

We now change perspective, allowing k to be a continuous variable, and instead regard ω as the parameter. That is, we define the function

$$\kappa : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathcal{P}_N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+, \quad \kappa := \kappa(\omega; J, \Theta),$$

by

$$\kappa(\omega; J, \Theta) := \frac{2}{\pi} [\omega \theta_N + \Gamma^J(\omega \theta_1, \dots, \omega \theta_{N-1})], \quad (7.19)$$

so that eigenfrequencies occur at integral values of κ ,

$$\omega_k(J, \Theta) = \omega \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \kappa(\omega; J, \Theta) = k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

That is, for each fixed $(J, \Theta) \in \mathcal{P}_N$, $\omega = \omega_k$ and $k = \kappa(\omega)$ are inverse functions.

It follows that κ is a C^∞ function, and we calculate

$$\frac{\pi}{2} \frac{\partial \kappa}{\partial \omega} = \theta_N + \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \frac{\partial \Gamma^J}{\partial Z_i} \theta_i > 0, \quad (7.20)$$

since each term, given recursively by (7.16), (7.15), is positive. Moreover, by Lemmas 5.2 and 7.3, it follows that this derivative is uniformly bounded, that is

$$m(J, \Theta) \leq \frac{\partial \kappa}{\partial \omega} \leq M(J, \Theta), \quad (7.21)$$

these bounds depending only on the entropy profile and independent of k , ω . The result now follows by the inverse function theorem. \square

7.4. Density of Resonant Modes. According to Lemma 3.4, the j -mode resonates with the k -mode if and only if there is some $l \neq k$ such that

$$k \omega_l(J, \Theta) = j \omega_k(J, \Theta). \quad (7.22)$$

For each fixed triple (k, j, l) , we regard this as a constraint on the entropy profile, and taking the union as the triple varies generates *all possible* resonant entropy profiles within the class of piecewise constant profiles with $N-1$ entropy jumps. We proceed by showing that each such restriction generates a codimension one C^∞ manifold in $\mathcal{P}_N = \mathbb{R}_+^{2N-1}$, and so has Lebesgue measure zero in \mathbb{R}_+^{2N-1} . Since there are countably many such restrictions, the set of all resonant entropy profiles is also of Lebesgue measure zero. This means that generically, piecewise constant entropy fields with $N-1$ jumps, are *fully nonresonant*, in that no two modes resonate with each other. This in turn implies that, within the space of piecewise constant entropy profiles, generically, *all* linear modes perturb to pure tone periodic solutions of the nonlinear compressible Euler equations.

Recall that piecewise constant functions are dense in L^1 . Because resonance requires only the existence of a single pair of eigenfrequencies satisfying (7.22), it follows that resonant profiles are dense in L^1 .

Lemma 7.5. *The set \mathcal{Z} of all piecewise constant resonant entropy profiles is dense in L^1 .*

Proof. We first reduce to a finite dimensional entropy profile. Given an arbitrary $\widehat{s} \in L^1$ and $\epsilon > 0$, choose a piecewise constant entropy profile with $N-1 \geq 1$ jumps, denoted $s(J_0, \Theta_0) \in \mathcal{P}_N$, so that

$$\|\widehat{s} - s(J_0, \Theta_0)\|_{L^1} < \frac{\epsilon}{2}.$$

Since the norm is continuous, we can find some $\delta > 0$ such that whenever

$$(J, \Theta) \in \overline{B_\delta} := \left\{ (J, \Theta) \in \mathcal{P}_N \mid \|(J, \Theta) - (J_0, \Theta_0)\|_{\mathbb{R}^{2N-1}} \leq \delta \right\},$$

then also

$$\|s(J, \Theta) - s(J_0, \Theta_0)\|_{L^1} < \frac{\epsilon}{2},$$

so it suffices to show that the resonant set \mathcal{Z}_N is relatively dense in $\overline{B_\delta}$.

Recall that the profile $(J, \Theta) \in \mathcal{Z}_N$ is resonant if (7.22) holds for *any* triple (k, j, l) , namely

$$k \omega_l = j \omega_k, \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{j}{l} \frac{\omega_k(J, \Theta)}{k} = \frac{\omega_l(J, \Theta)}{l}. \quad (7.23)$$

From Lemma 5.5, we have that ω_l grows linearly with l : that is, by (5.25), if we set

$$\Lambda(J, \Theta) := \frac{\pi/2}{\int_0^\ell \sigma(y) dy}, \quad \text{then} \quad \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\omega_l(J, \Theta)}{l} = \Lambda(J, \Theta).$$

For k fixed, we exhibit a curve

$$(J_\nu, \Theta_\nu) := (J(\nu), \Theta(\nu)) \in \overline{B_\delta}, \quad \nu \in (-\bar{\nu}, \bar{\nu}),$$

with $J(0) = J_0$ and $\Theta(0) = \Theta_0$, along which $\Lambda(J, \Theta)$ varies but ω_k is constant, as follows. Set $\bar{\omega}_k = \omega_k(J_0, \Theta_0)$, and let jumps $J_{i,\nu}$ and widths $\theta_{i,\nu}$ vary smoothly with ν , for $i = 1, \dots, N-1$. Then interpret (7.19), which defines ω_k , as a constraint on $\theta_{N,\nu}$, that is, take

$$\theta_{N,\nu} := \frac{k}{\bar{\omega}_k} \frac{\pi}{2} - \frac{1}{\bar{\omega}_k} \Gamma^{J_\nu}(\bar{\omega}_k \theta_{1,\nu}, \dots, \bar{\omega}_k \theta_{N-1,\nu}).$$

Now pick ν_1, ν_2 such that

$$\lambda := \Lambda(J_{\nu_2}, \Theta_{\nu_2}) - \Lambda(J_{\nu_1}, \Theta_{\nu_1}) > 0,$$

say. Since $\omega_l/l \rightarrow \Lambda$, there is some L large enough so that

$$\left| \frac{\omega_l(J_{\nu_i}, \Theta_{\nu_i})}{l} - \Lambda(J_{\nu_i}, \Theta_{\nu_i}) \right| < \frac{\lambda}{3}, \quad i = 1, 2,$$

whenever $l > L$, and in particular,

$$\frac{\omega_l(J_{\nu_2}, \Theta_{\nu_2})}{l} - \frac{\omega_l(J_{\nu_1}, \Theta_{\nu_1})}{l} > \frac{\lambda}{3},$$

whenever $l > L$. Now referring to (7.23), by density of the rationals, we can find integers j and l , with $l > L$, such that

$$\frac{\omega_l(J_{\nu_1}, \Theta_{\nu_1})}{l} < \frac{j}{l} \frac{\bar{\omega}_k}{k} < \frac{\omega_l(J_{\nu_2}, \Theta_{\nu_2})}{l}.$$

Finally, by continuity, it follows that there is some $\nu \in (\nu_1, \nu_2)$ such that

$$\frac{\omega_l(J_\nu, \Theta_\nu)}{l} = \frac{j}{l} \frac{\bar{\omega}_k}{k},$$

which is exactly the resonance condition (7.23). Since this profile $(J_\nu, \Theta_\nu) \in \bar{B}_\delta$, the proof is complete. \square

7.5. Resonant Sets as a Union of Smooth Manifolds. Piecewise constant entropy profiles consist of N entropy levels s_i separated by $N-1$ jumps, which for fixed \bar{p} and s_1 , are parameterized by the vector $(J, \Theta) \in \mathcal{P}_N$. Referring to (7.22), for each triple $(k, j, l) \in \mathbb{N}^3$, define the set

$$\mathcal{Z}_{k,j,l}^N := \left\{ (J, \Theta) \in \mathcal{P}_N \mid k \omega_l(J, \Theta) = j \omega_k(J, \Theta) \right\}, \quad (7.24)$$

where ω_k is the function (7.18). The *resonant sets* are defined to be the union of all of these,

$$\mathcal{Z}_N = \bigcup_{k,j,l} \mathcal{Z}_{k,j,l}^N, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{Z} = \bigcup_N \mathcal{Z}_N. \quad (7.25)$$

Here each $\mathcal{Z}_N \subset \mathcal{P}_N$ is the set of resonant profiles with $N-1$ jumps, and \mathcal{Z} is the set of all piecewise constant resonant profiles.

Theorem 7.6. *For fixed N , and for each triple $(k, j, l) \in \mathbb{N}^3$, the set*

$$\mathcal{Z}_{k,j,l}^N \subset \mathcal{P}_N = \mathbb{R}_+^{2N-1},$$

of piecewise constant profiles satisfying the resonance condition (7.22), forms a C^∞ submanifold of dimension $2N - 2$, that is of codimension one, in the parameter space \mathcal{P}_N of entropy profiles with $N - 1$ jumps.

Proof. The set $\mathcal{Z}_{k,j,l}^N$ is defined by (7.24), that is by the single equation

$$k \omega_l(J, \Theta) = j \omega_k(J, \Theta).$$

We rewrite this condition in terms of the function κ defined in (7.19), as follows. We set

$$\omega_k =: \omega, \quad \omega_l =: \bar{\omega}, \quad \text{and} \quad j/k =: q,$$

so the condition becomes

$$\kappa(\omega; J, \Theta) = k, \quad \kappa(\bar{\omega}; J, \Theta) = l, \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\omega} = q\omega.$$

Eliminating $\bar{\omega}$, we write this as the system

$$q \kappa(\omega; J, \Theta) = qk = j, \quad \kappa(q\omega; J, \Theta) = l,$$

and the profile $(J, \Theta) \in \mathcal{Z}_{k,j,l}^N$ if this system is satisfied for the given k and l and for $q = j/k$.

We thus regard k, l and q as fixed and having been given, and considering (7.19) define the map

$$G_q : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathcal{P}_N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+^3, \quad G_q(\omega; J, \Theta) := \begin{pmatrix} \kappa(\omega; J, \Theta) \\ q \kappa(\omega; J, \Theta) \\ \kappa(q\omega; J, \Theta) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (7.26)$$

Then the particular resonant set we are looking at is the inverse image

$$\mathcal{Z}_{k,j,l}^N = G_q^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} k \\ j \\ l \end{pmatrix},$$

and the result will follow if we prove that the derivative DG_q has rank two as a linear map $\mathbb{R}^{2N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$, the first two rows being dependent. Assuming this is so, the implicit function theorem implies $G_q^{-1}(j, l)$ is a submanifold of the stated dimension.

It remains to show that DG_q is rank two. Dropping the first row and writing \widehat{G} , we have

$$D\widehat{G}_q = \begin{pmatrix} q \frac{\partial \kappa}{\partial \omega} \Big|_{\omega} & q \nabla_{(J,\Theta)} \kappa \Big|_{\omega} \\ q \frac{\partial \kappa}{\partial \omega} \Big|_{q\omega} & \nabla_{(J,\Theta)} \kappa \Big|_{q\omega} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (7.27)$$

and we must show that this is full rank; this will certainly follow if the gradients $q \nabla_{(J,\Theta)} \kappa \Big|_{\omega}$ and $\nabla_{(J,\Theta)} \kappa \Big|_{q\omega}$ are independent. Referring to the definition (7.19), it is immediate that

$$q \frac{\partial \kappa}{\partial \theta_N} \Big|_{\omega} = \frac{2}{\pi} q \omega = \frac{\partial \kappa}{\partial \theta_N} \Big|_{q\omega},$$

and so the result will follow if we can prove that the other components of the gradient aren't equal, that is provided we can show

$$\nabla_{(J,\Theta)}(q\kappa(\omega; J, \Theta) - \kappa(q\omega; J, \Theta)) \neq 0. \quad (7.28)$$

To this end, and again referring to (7.19), we define the function

$$F : \mathbb{R}^{2N-2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad F(J, Y) := \Gamma^J(qY) - q\Gamma^J(Y), \quad (7.29)$$

where

$$Y \in \mathbb{R}^{N-1} \quad \text{is} \quad Y := (\omega\theta_1, \dots, \omega\theta_{N-1}).$$

We use the (backwards) recursive formulas for the derivatives from Lemma 7.3 to calculate the derivatives of F . First, using (7.29), (7.14), and (7.15), we get

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial Y_{N-1}} = \frac{\partial h}{\partial Z} \Big|_{(J_{N-1}, q\bar{Y}_{N-1})} - q \frac{\partial h}{\partial Z} \Big|_{(J_{N-1}, \bar{Y}_{N-1})},$$

where we use the notation

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{Y}_m &:= Y_m + \gamma_{m-1}(Y_1, \dots, Y_{m-1}), \\ q\bar{Y}_m &:= qY_m + \gamma_{m-1}(qY_1, \dots, qY_{m-1}), \end{aligned}$$

in evaluating functions at intermediate stages. Next, using (5.13), we write this as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial F}{\partial Y_{N-1}} &= \frac{qJ(1+t^2(q\bar{Y}_{N-1}))}{1+J^2t^2(q\bar{Y}_{N-1})} - \frac{qJ(1+t^2(\bar{Y}_{N-1}))}{1+J^2t^2(\bar{Y}_{N-1})} \\ &= \frac{qJ(J^2-1)(t^2(\bar{Y}_{N-1})-t^2(q\bar{Y}_{N-1}))}{(1+J^2t^2(q\bar{Y}_{N-1}))(1+J^2t^2(\bar{Y}_{N-1}))}, \end{aligned}$$

with J abbreviating J_{N-1} , and in which $t = \tan$. It follows that

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial Y_{N-1}} = 0 \quad \text{iff} \quad t(q\bar{Y}_{N-1}) = \pm t(\bar{Y}_{N-1}),$$

unless $J = J_{N-1} = 1$. Similarly, from (5.13) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial F}{\partial J_{N-1}} &= \frac{\partial h}{\partial J} \Big|_{(J_{N-1}, q\bar{Y}_{N-1})} - q \frac{\partial h}{\partial J} \Big|_{(J_{N-1}, \bar{Y}_{N-1})} \\ &= \frac{t(q\bar{Y}_{N-1})}{1+J^2t^2(q\bar{Y}_{N-1})} - q \frac{t(\bar{Y}_{N-1})}{1+J^2t^2(\bar{Y}_{N-1})}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, if we assume $J_{N-1} \neq 1$, and assume both

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial Y_{N-1}} \Big|_{(J, \bar{Y}_{N-1})} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial F}{\partial Y_{N-1}} \Big|_{(J, q\bar{Y}_{N-1})} = 0,$$

then we must have both

$$t(q\bar{Y}_{N-1}) = \pm t(\bar{Y}_{N-1}) \quad \text{and} \quad t(q\bar{Y}_{N-1}) - qt(\bar{Y}_{N-1}) = 0,$$

which in turn implies

$$t(q\bar{Y}_{N-1}) = t(\bar{Y}_{N-1}) = 0.$$

It then follows from the definitions (7.29), (7.14) and (5.12), that

$$F(J, \bar{Y}_{N-1}) = \arctan(J_N t(\bar{q}\bar{Y}_{N-1})) - q \arctan(J_N t(\bar{Y}_{N-1})) = 0.$$

On the other hand, if $J_{N-1} = 1$, which is the degenerate case in which there is no entropy jump, we carry out the same calculation for $\frac{\partial F}{\partial Y_{N-2}}$ and $\frac{\partial F}{\partial J_{N-2}}$, and continue by backward induction as necessary. If all $J_m = 1$, which is the most degenerate isentropic case, then since $h(1, \bar{Y}_{N-1}) = \bar{Y}_{N-1}$, we get $F = 0$ identically.

We have thus shown that, as long as there is at least one nontrivial jump $J_m \neq 1$, so that the flow is not everywhere isentropic, it follows that

$$\nabla_{(J, \bar{Y}_{N-1})} F = 0 \quad \text{implies} \quad F(J, \bar{Y}_{N-1}) = 0,$$

which implies (7.28). This in turn implies that DG_q has full rank, and completes the proof. \square

7.6. Genericity of Nonresonant Profiles. Even though the space of resonant profiles is dense, these should be non-generic, because each satisfies at least one, and at most countably many, constraints (7.22). However, proving this in the full set of possible L^1 entropy profiles is problematic, because we have not fully analyzed the linearized operator for general entropy profiles in L^1 . Since every L^1 function can be approximated in L^1 by piecewise constant step functions, Theorem 7.6 does however provide a rigorous sense in which the set of resonant entropy profiles is non-generic.

Corollary 7.7. *For each $N > 1$, the subset of fully nonresonant piecewise constant entropy profiles has full measure in the finite dimensional set \mathcal{P}_N . Specifically, the Lebesgue measure of the resonant set \mathcal{Z}_N given in (7.25) is zero. In this sense, the fully nonresonant entropy profiles are generic in the space of piecewise constant profiles.*

Proof. Restricting to \mathcal{P}_N , any entropy profile which has a resonant pair of linear modes must satisfy the constraint (7.22) for some triple of indices. We therefore define the resonant set to be

$$\mathcal{Z}_N = \bigcup_{j,k,l} \mathcal{Z}_{j,k,l}^N,$$

which is a countable union. Since by Theorem 7.6, each of these $\mathcal{Z}_{j,k,l}^N$ is a C^∞ manifold of codimension one, it has Lebesgue measure zero. Thus the countable union \mathcal{Z}^N , which is the set of all resonant profiles with $N - 1$ jumps, has measure zero, and the set of fully nonresonant profiles has full Lebesgue measure in \mathcal{P}_N . \square

This in turn provides a sense in which the nonresonant profiles are generic among all entropy profiles in BV or L^1 .

Theorem 7.8. *The probability that any one piecewise constant approximation of an L^1 entropy profile has resonant linearized modes is zero, in*

the following sense. Given any piecewise constant approximation to an L^1 entropy profile, the probability of that approximation having any resonant linearized modes is zero, within the class of all piecewise constant profiles with the same number of jumps.

8. CONTEXT AND CONCLUSIONS

Our results resolve a long-standing open problem in the theory of Acoustics which dates to the mid-nineteenth century. Namely, how is music possible when nonlinearities always drive oscillatory solutions into shock waves?

The modern theory of continuum mechanics arguably began in Book I of Newton's *Principia*, in which set out his famous Laws of Motion. In an effort to understand resistive forces, in Book II Newton attempted to describe both the dynamics of continuous media and the propagation of sound waves. In the 1750's, Euler developed the correct extension of Newton's laws of motion to the continuum, and then linearized the equations to produce the wave equation which D'Alembert had earlier derived to describe infinitesimal displacements of a vibrating string. By this Euler provided a *mechanical explanation for music*: vibrations of an instrument produce sinusoidal oscillations in air pressure, frequencies of which correspond to the pure tones of sound we hear when, say, a violin is played.

In the mid-19th century, mathematicians including Stokes and Riemann discovered a problem with this theory: solutions containing compressions could not be sustained, and shock formation appeared to be unavoidable, and inconsistent with the musical tones of the linear theory. Challis identified the issue in 1848, after which Stokes argued that oscillations break down in finite time [29]. Riemann's proof that compression *always* produces shock waves in *isentropic* flows was made definitive in the celebrated Glimm-Lax decay result of 1970, that periodic solutions of 2×2 systems necessarily form shocks and decay to average at rate $1/t$. These results ostensibly amplified the concerns of Stokes that the nonlinear and linearized solutions apparently produce qualitatively different phenomena for oscillatory sound waves – the nonlinear system produces shocks while the linear system does not.

The results in this paper introduce a new nonlinear physical phenomenon which has the effect of bringing the linear and nonlinear theories into alignment when the entropy profile is non-constant. Namely, characteristics move ergodically through the periods, bringing compression and rarefaction into balance and avoiding shock formation, by sampling regions of both equally, on average. Alternatively, the pattern of waves reflected by the entropy gradients, or “echoes” has the effect of attenuating compression and rarefaction in the wave family opposite the transmitted wave, on average. Instead of Riemann invariant coordinates propagating as constant along characteristics (as in 2×2 isentropic and barotropic systems [28]), in this new 3×3 regime, every characteristic cycles through, and hence samples, a

dense set of values of each Riemann invariant. This is a new point of view on shock free wave propagation in compressible Euler.

Our results raise the interesting question as to whether nonlinear shock-free evolution is the actual regime of ordinary sounds of speech and musical tones heard in nature and everyday life. Glimm-Lax theory is based on approximating smooth solutions by weak shock waves, but as far as we can tell, only strong shocks are typically observed in nature. Our results and the success of the field of Acoustics strongly indicate that this regime of nonlinear shock-free wave propagation could well be more fundamental to ordinary sounds and musical tones than formation and propagation of “weak shock waves”. Interestingly, we note that equi-temperament tuning of the piano makes frequencies irrationally related, which is precisely our *non-resonance* condition, sufficient to imply perturbation of linear pure tones to nonlinear pure tones.

The essential physical ideas in this paper were first understood by the authors within the context of the theory of nonlinear wave interactions introduced by Glimm and Lax in [9, 10]. The interaction of a nonlinear (acoustic) wave of strength γ with an entropy jump $[s]$ produces an “echo”, which is a reflected acoustic wave, whose strength is $O([s]\gamma)$, on the order of the incident acoustic wave [31]. On the other hand, the interaction of any two (weak) acoustic waves is linear, with an error which is *cubic* in wave strength. We began this project with the insight that, therefore, *the echoes produced by finite entropy jumps are at the critical order sufficient to balance rarefaction and compression*. By this we might also expect that a theory of nonlinear superposition of the “pure tone” nonlinear sound waves constructed here could also produce perturbations which provide general shock-free solutions of the nonlinear equations, although these would no longer be periodic in time. Mathematically, this raises the question as to whether, by the same mechanism, quasi-periodic mixed modes of the linearized theory also perturb to nonlinear.

We remark that the nonlinear effect of compression forming into shock waves, is strongest in one spatial dimension, because geometrical effects mitigate steepening of waves in higher dimensions. Thus the study of effects which attenuate shock formation get more to the heart of the issue in one dimension. Since the time of Stokes and Riemann, there has been a long history of study of the mechanisms which lead to shock formation. The authors suggest that the greater scientific mystery now might lie in the nonlinear mechanisms which *prevent* shock formation.

Finally, regarding mathematical methods, our results demonstrate that the problem of expunging resonances inherent in many applications, can be overcome when enough symmetries are present to impose periodicity by *projection*, rather than by *periodic return*. Compared to Nash-Moser techniques required to prove existence of periodic solutions in simpler settings, we find here that taking into account the essential symmetries has led to the discovery of a simpler method for solving a more complicated problem.

REFERENCES

- [1] Garrett Birkhoff and Gian-Carlo Rota. *Ordinary differential equations*. Wiley, fourth edition, 1989.
- [2] J. Bourgain and W. Wang. Quasi-periodic solutions of nonlinear lattice Schrodinger equations with random potential. *J. Euro. Math. Soc.*, 10:1–45, 2008.
- [3] Geng Chen. Formation of singularity and smooth wave propagation for the compressible Euler equations. *J. Hyp. Diff. Eq.*, 8:671–690, 2011.
- [4] Geng Chen, Ronghua Pan, and Shengguo Zhu. Singularity formation for compressible Euler equations. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 49:2591–2614, 2017.
- [5] Geng Chen and Robin Young. Smooth solutions and singularity formation for the inhomogeneous nonlinear wave equation. *J. Diff. Eq.*, 252:2580–2595, 2012.
- [6] Earl Coddington and Norman Levinson. *Theory of ordinary differential equations*. McGraw-Hill, 1955.
- [7] R. Courant and K.O. Friedrichs. *Supersonic Flow and Shock Waves*. Wiley, New York, 1948.
- [8] W. Craig and G. Wayne. Newton’s method and periodic solutions of nonlinear wave equations. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 46:1409–1498, 1993.
- [9] J. Glimm. Solutions in the large for nonlinear hyperbolic systems of equations. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 18:697–715, 1965.
- [10] J. Glimm and P.D. Lax. Decay of solutions of systems of nonlinear hyperbolic conservation laws. *Memoirs Amer. Math. Soc.*, 101, 1970.
- [11] M. Golubitsky and D.G. Schaeffer. *Singularities and Groups in Bifurcation Theory*. Springer-Verlag, 1985.
- [12] J. Hunter, A. Majda, and R. Rosales. Resonantly interacting weakly nonlinear hyperbolic waves II. Several space variables. *Stud. Appl. Math.*, 75:187–226, 1986.
- [13] Fritz John. Formation of singularities in one-dimensional nonlinear wave propagation. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 27:377–405, 1974.
- [14] Jürgen Jost. *Postmodern Analysis*. Springer, 2005.
- [15] Peter D. Lax. Development of singularities of solutions of nonlinear hyperbolic partial differential equations. *Jour. Math. Physics*, 5:611–613, 1964.
- [16] Peter D. Lax. *Hyperbolic Systems of Conservation Laws and the Mathematical Theory of Shock Waves*. SIAM, Philadelphia, 1973.
- [17] Tai-Ping Liu. Decay to N -waves of solutions of general systems of nonlinear hyperbolic conservation laws. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 30:585–610, 1977.
- [18] Tai-Ping Liu. Development of singularities in the nonlinear waves for quasi-linear hyperbolic partial differential equations. *J. Diff. Eqns*, 33:92–111, 1979.
- [19] A. Majda. *Compressible Fluid Flow and Systems of Conservation Laws in Several Space Variables*. Number 53 in Applied Mathematical Sciences. Springer-Verlag, 1984.
- [20] A. Majda, R. Rosales, and M. Schonbeck. A canonical system of integrodifferential equations arising in resonant nonlinear acoustics. *Stud. Appl. Math.*, 79:205–262, 1988.
- [21] Jurgen Moser. A new technique for the construction of solutions of nonlinear differential equations. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci.*, 47:1824–1831, 1961.
- [22] T. Nishida and J. Smoller. Mixed problems for nonlinear conservation laws. *Jour. Diff. Eq.*, 23(2):244–269, 1977.
- [23] R. L. Pego. Some explicit resonating waves in weakly nonlinear gas dynamics. *Studies in Appl. Math.*, 79:263–270, 1988.
- [24] John Pryce. *Numerical solution of Sturm-Liouville problems*. Clarendon Press, 1993.
- [25] P.H. Rabinowitz. Periodic solutions of nonlinear hyperbolic partial differential equations. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 20:145–205, 1967.
- [26] B. Riemann. The propagation of planar air waves of finite amplitude. In J.N. Johnson and R. Cheret, editors, *Classic Papers in Shock Compression Science*. Springer, 1998.

- [27] M. Shefter and R. Rosales. Quasiperiodic solutions in weakly nonlinear gas dynamics. *Studies in Appl. Math.*, 103:279–337, 1999.
- [28] J. Smoller. *Shock Waves and Reaction-Diffusion Equations*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1982.
- [29] G.G. Stokes. On a difficulty in the theory of sound. In J.N. Johnson and R. Cheret, editors, *Classic Papers in Shock Compression Science*. Springer, 1998.
- [30] Michael Taylor. *Pseudodifferential Operators And Nonlinear PDE*. Birkhauser, 1991.
- [31] B. Temple and R. Young. The large time stability of sound waves. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 179:417–466, 1996.
- [32] Blake Temple and Robin Young. A paradigm for time-periodic sound wave propagation in the compressible Euler equations. *Methods and Appls of Analysis*, 16(3):341–364, 2009.
- [33] Blake Temple and Robin Young. Linear waves that express the simplest possible periodic structure of the compressible Euler equations. *Acta Mathematica Scientia*, 29B(6):1749–1766, 2009.
- [34] Blake Temple and Robin Young. A Liapunov-Schmidt reduction for time-periodic solutions of the compressible Euler equations. *Methods and Appls of Analysis*, 17(3):225–262, 2010.
- [35] Blake Temple and Robin Young. Time-periodic linearized solutions of the compressible Euler equations and a problem of small divisors. *SIAM Journal of Math Anal*, 43(1):1–49, 2011.
- [36] Blake Temple and Robin Young. A canonical small divisor problem for the Nash-Moser method. *Comm. Information and Systems*, 13(4):469–485, 2013.
- [37] Blake Temple and Robin Young. A Nash-Moser framework for finding periodic solutions of the compressible Euler equations. *J. Sci. Comput.*, DOI: 10.1007/s10915-014-9851-z, 2014.
- [38] Blake Temple and Robin Young. Inversion of a non-uniform difference operator. *Methods and Appls of Analysis*, 27(1):65–86, 2020.
- [39] Blake Temple and Robin Young. Inversion of a non-uniform difference operator and a strategy for Nash-Moser. *Methods and Appls of Analysis*, 29(3):265–294, 2022.
- [40] D. Vaynblat. *The Strongly Attracting Character of Large Amplitude Nonlinear Resonant Acoustic Waves Without Shocks. A Numerical Study*. PhD thesis, M.I.T, 1996.
- [41] D. Wagner. Equivalence of the Euler and Lagrangian equations of gas dynamics for weak solutions. *Jour. Diff. Equations*, 68:118–136, 1987.
- [42] Robin Young. Differentiation of nonlinear hyperbolic evolution operators. In preparation.
- [43] Robin Young. Exact solutions to degenerate conservation laws. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 30:537–558, 1999.
- [44] Robin Young. Periodic solutions for conservation laws. *Contemp. Math.*, 255:239–256, 2000.
- [45] Robin Young. Sustained solutions for conservation laws. *Comm. PDE*, 26:1–32, 2001.
- [46] Robin Young. Distortion of sound waves. <https://people.math.umass.edu/young/sound-demo.html>, 2023.
- [47] Anton Zettl. *Sturm-Liouville theory*. AMS, 2005.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS, CA 95616
Email address: temple@math.ucdavis.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS,
AMHERST, MA 01003
Email address: rcy@umass.edu