

# THERMOACOUSTIC TOMOGRAPHY WITH VARIABLE SOUND SPEED

PLAMEN STEFANOV AND GUNTHER UHLMANN

**ABSTRACT.** We study the mathematical model of thermoacoustic tomography in media with a variable speed for a fixed time interval, greater than the diameter of the domain. In case of measurements on the whole boundary, we give an explicit solution in terms of a Neumann series expansion. We give necessary and sufficient conditions for uniqueness and stability when the measurements are taken on a part of the boundary.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In thermoacoustic tomography, a short electro-magnetic pulse is sent through a patient's body. The tissue reacts and emits an ultrasound wave from any point, that is measured away from the body. Then one tries to reconstruct the internal structure of a patient's body from those measurements. For more detail, an extensive list of references, and the recent progress in the mathematical understanding of this problem, we refer to [1, 4, 6, 7, 8]. Both constant and non-constant sound speed have been studied and naturally, the results are more complete in the constant speed case.

The purpose of this work is to study this problem under the assumption of a variable speed. We will actually formulate the problem in anisotropic media. Let  $g$  be a Riemannian metric in  $\mathbf{R}^n$ , let  $a$  be a vector field, and let  $c > 0$ ,  $q$  be functions, all smooth and real valued. Let  $P$  be the differential operator

$$(1) \quad P = c^2 \frac{1}{\sqrt{\det g}} \left( \frac{1}{i} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} + a_i \right) g^{ij} \sqrt{\det g} \left( \frac{1}{i} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j} + a_j \right) + q.$$

Let  $u$  solve the problem

$$(2) \quad \begin{cases} (\partial_t^2 + P)u = 0 & \text{in } (0, T) \times \mathbf{R}^n, \\ u|_{t=0} = f, \\ \partial_t u|_{t=0} = 0, \end{cases}$$

where  $T > 0$  is fixed.

Assume that  $f$  is supported in  $\bar{\Omega}$ , where  $\Omega \subset \mathbf{R}^n$  is some smooth bounded domain. The measurements are modeled by the operator

$$(3) \quad \Lambda f := u|_{[0, T] \times \partial\Omega}.$$

The problem is to reconstruct the unknown  $f$ .

The presence of the magnetic field  $\{a_j\}$  is perhaps of no interest for applications but it does not cause any additional difficulties.

If  $T = \infty$ , then one can solve a problem with Cauchy data 0 at  $t = \infty$  (as a limit), and boundary data  $h = \Lambda f$ . The zero Cauchy data are justified by local energy decay that holds for non-trapping

---

*Date:* November 7, 2018.

First author partly supported by a NSF Grant DMS-0800428.

Second author partly supported by a NSF FRG grant No. 0554571 and a Walker Family Endowed Professorship.

geometry, for example (actually, it is always true but much weaker and not uniform in general). Then solving the resulting problem backwards recovers  $f$ . Now, based on that, one can show that for a fixed  $T$ , one can still do the same thing with an error  $\epsilon(T) \rightarrow 0$ , as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ . In the non-trapping case, the error is uniform and  $\epsilon(T) = O(e^{-t/C})$ . There is no good control over  $C$  though. Error estimates based on local energy decay can be found in [7].

In this paper, we want to study what happens when  $T$  is fixed, greater than the diameter of  $\Omega$  (thus the metric  $c^{-2}g$  is assumed to be non-trapping). In case of measurements on the whole boundary, our main result is that the problem is Fredholm, uniquely solvable, and can be solved explicitly with a Neumann series expansion. In case of partial data, in Section 3 we give a necessary and sufficient condition for uniqueness, and another necessary and sufficient condition for stability. In Proposition 2 we show that  $\Lambda$  is a sum of two Fourier Integral Operators with canonical relations of graph type.

## 2. COMPLETE DATA

Notice first that  $P$  is formally self-adjoint w.r.t. the measure  $c^{-2}d\text{Vol}$ . Given a domain  $U$ , and a function  $u(t, x)$ , define the energy

$$E_U(t, u) = \int_U (|Du|^2 + c^{-2}q|u|^2 + c^{-2}|u_t|^2) d\text{Vol},$$

where  $D_j = -i\partial/\partial x^j + a_j$ ,  $D = (D_1, \dots, D_n)$ ,  $|Du|^2 = g^{ij}(D_i u)(D_j u)$ , and  $d\text{Vol}(x) = (\det g)^{1/2}dx$ . In particular, we define the space  $H_D(U)$  to be the completion of  $C_0^\infty(U)$  under the Dirichlet norm

$$(4) \quad \|f\|_{H_D}^2 = \int_U (|Du|^2 + c^{-2}q|u|^2) d\text{Vol}.$$

It is easy to see that  $H_D(U) \subset H^1(U)$ , if  $U$  is bounded with smooth boundary. If  $U = \mathbf{R}^n$ , this is true for  $n \geq 3$  only. By the finite speed of propagation, the solution with compactly supported Cauchy data always stays in  $H^1$  even when  $n = 2$ . The energy norm for the Cauchy data  $(f, \psi)$ , that we denote by  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}}$  is then defined by

$$\|(f, \psi)\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 = \int_U (|Df|^2 + c^{-2}q|f|^2 + c^{-2}|\psi|^2) d\text{Vol}.$$

This defines the energy space

$$\mathcal{H}(U) = H_D(U) \oplus L^2(U).$$

Here and below,  $L^2(U) = L^2(U; c^{-2}d\text{Vol})$ . The wave equation then can be written down as the system

$$(5) \quad \mathbf{u}_t = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{u}, \quad \mathbf{P} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & I \\ P & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $\mathbf{u} = (u, u_t)$  belongs to the energy space  $\mathcal{H}$ . The operator  $\mathbf{P}$  then extends naturally to a skew-selfadjoint operator on  $\mathcal{H}$ . In this paper, we will deal with either  $U = \mathbf{R}^n$  or  $U = \Omega$ . In the latter case, the definition of  $H_D(U)$  reflects Dirichlet boundary conditions.

A common method to get an approximate solution of the thermoacoustic problem is the following. Given  $h$ , let  $v_0$  solve

$$(6) \quad \begin{cases} (\partial_t^2 + P)v_0 = 0 & \text{in } (0, T) \times \Omega, \\ v_0|_{[0, T] \times \partial\Omega} = h, \\ v_0|_{t=T} = 0, \\ \partial_t v_0|_{t=T} = 0. \end{cases}$$

Then we define the following ‘‘approximate inverse’’

$$A_0 h := v_0(0, \cdot) \quad \text{in } \bar{\Omega}.$$

Then  $A_0 \Lambda f$  is viewed as an approximation to  $f$ . As we mentioned above, that is actually true asymptotically, as  $T \rightarrow \infty$  (see [6]) but  $T$  is fixed in our analysis.

This method has the following downside:  $h$  may not vanish on  $\{T\} \times \partial\Omega$ , therefore the mixed problem above have boundary data with a possible jump type of singularity at  $\{T\} \times \partial\Omega$  (the compatibility conditions might be violated). That singularity will propagate back to  $t = 0$  and will affect  $v_0$ , and then  $v_0$  may not be in the energy space. The operator  $A_0 \Lambda$  may fail to be Fredholm or even bounded then, and in particular  $A_0 \Lambda f$  might be more singular than  $f$ . For this reason,  $h$  is often cut off smoothly near  $t = T$ .

We will modify this approach in a way that would make the problem Fredholm, and will make the error operator a contraction. To this end, we proceed as follows. Given  $h$  (that eventually be replaced by  $\Lambda f$ ), solve

$$(7) \quad \begin{cases} (\partial_t^2 + P)v = 0 & \text{in } (0, T) \times \Omega, \\ v|_{[0, T] \times \partial\Omega} = h, \\ v|_{t=T} = \phi, \\ \partial_t v|_{t=T} = 0, \end{cases}$$

where  $\phi$  solves the elliptic boundary value problem

$$(8) \quad P\phi = 0, \quad \phi|_{\partial\Omega} = h(T, \cdot).$$

We will always assume in this paper that 0 is not a Dirichlet eigenvalue of  $P$  in  $\Omega$ . This is always the case when  $q \geq 0$ , and in the applications,  $q = 0$  actually. Note that the initial data at  $t = T$  satisfies compatibility conditions of first order (no jump at  $\{T\} \times \partial\Omega$ ). Then we define the following pseudo-inverse

$$(9) \quad Ah := v(0, \cdot) \quad \text{in } \bar{\Omega}.$$

The operator  $A$  maps continuously the closed subspace of  $H^1([0, T] \times \partial\Omega)$  consisting of functions that vanish at  $t = T$  (compatibility condition) to  $H^1(\Omega)$ , see [9]. It also sends the range of  $\Lambda$  to  $H_0^1(\Omega) \cong H_D(\Omega)$ , as the proof below indicates.

In the next theorem and everywhere below,  $\text{diam}(\Omega)$  is the supremum of the lengths of all geodesics of the metric  $c^{-2}g$  in  $\Omega$ . Also,  $\text{dist}(x, y)$  denotes the distance function in that metric. For non-trapping  $c^{-2}g$  that we study,  $\text{diam}(\Omega) < \infty$ .

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $T > \text{diam}(\Omega)$ . Then  $A\Lambda = \text{Id} - K$ , where  $K$  is compact in  $H_D(\Omega)$ , and  $\|K\|_{H_D(\Omega)} < 1$ . In particular,  $\text{Id} - K$  is invertible on  $H_D(\Omega)$ , and the inverse thermoacoustic problem has an explicit solution of the form*

$$(10) \quad f = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} K^m Ah.$$

*Proof.* Let  $w$  solve

$$(11) \quad \begin{cases} (\partial_t^2 + P)w = 0 & \text{in } (0, T) \times \Omega, \\ w|_{[0, T] \times \partial\Omega} = 0, \\ w|_{t=T} = u|_{t=T} - \phi, \\ w_t|_{t=T} = u_t|_{t=T}, \end{cases}$$

where  $u$  solves (2) with a given  $f \in H_D$ . Let  $v$  be the solution of (7) with  $h = \Lambda f$ . Then  $v + w$  solves the same initial boundary value problem in  $[0, T] \times \Omega$  that  $u$  does (with initial conditions at  $t = T$ ), therefore  $u = v + w$ . Restrict this to  $t = 0$  to get

$$f = A\Lambda f + w(0, \cdot).$$

Therefore,

$$Kf = w(0, \cdot).$$

In what follows,  $(\cdot, \cdot)_{H_D(\Omega)}$  is the inner product in  $H_D(\Omega)$ , see (4), applied to functions that belong to  $H^1(\Omega)$  but maybe not to  $H_D(\Omega)$  (because they may not vanish on  $\partial\Omega$ ). Set  $u^T := u(T, \cdot)$ . Integrate by parts using the fact that  $u^T = \phi$  on  $\partial\Omega$  to get

$$(u^T - \phi, \phi)_{H_D(\Omega)} = 0.$$

Then

$$\|u^T - \phi\|_{H_D(\Omega)}^2 = \|u^T\|_{H_D(\Omega)}^2 - \|\phi\|_{H_D(\Omega)}^2 \leq \|u^T\|_{H_D(\Omega)}^2.$$

Therefore, the energy of the initial conditions in (11) satisfies the inequality

$$(12) \quad E_\Omega(w, T) = \|u^T - \phi\|_{H_D(\Omega)}^2 + \|u_t^T\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq E_\Omega(u, T).$$

Since the Dirichlet boundary condition is energy preserving, we get that

$$E_\Omega(w, 0) = E_\Omega(w, T) \leq E_\Omega(u, T) \leq E_{\mathbf{R}^n}(u, T) = E_\Omega(u, 0) = \|f\|_{H_D(\Omega)}.$$

In particular,

$$(13) \quad \|Kf\|_{H_D(\Omega)} \leq E_\Omega(w, 0) \leq \|f\|_{H_D(\Omega)}.$$

We show next that actually the inequality above is strict, i.e.,

$$(14) \quad \|Kf\|_{H_D(\Omega)} < \|f\|_{H_D(\Omega)}, \quad f \neq 0.$$

Assume the opposite. Then for some  $f \neq 0$ , all inequalities leading to (13) are equalities. In particular,  $E_\Omega(w, T) = E_{\mathbf{R}^n}(u, T)$ . Then

$$u(T, x) = 0, \quad \text{for } x \notin \Omega.$$

By the finite domain of dependence then

$$(15) \quad u(t, x) = 0 \quad \text{when } \text{dist}(x, \Omega) > |T - t|.$$

One the other hand, we also have

$$(16) \quad u(t, x) = 0 \quad \text{when } \text{dist}(x, \Omega) > |t|.$$

Therefore,

$$(17) \quad u(t, x) = 0 \quad \text{when } \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) > T/2, \quad -T/2 \leq t \leq 3T/2.$$

Since  $u$  extends to an even function of  $t$  that is still a solution of the wave equation, we get that (17) actually holds for  $|t| < 3T/2$ . Then one concludes by Tataru's theorem, see Theorem 4, that  $u = 0$  on  $[0, T] \times \Omega$ , therefore,  $f = 0$ . We refer to [4] for a similar argument. Note that the time interval here is actually larger than what we need for the uniqueness argument, see also Theorem 2 and Corollary 1 below.

We will show now that  $K$  is compact. Since  $T > \text{diam}(\Omega)$ , all singularities starting from  $\Omega$  leave  $\Omega$  at  $t = T$ . Therefore,  $u(T, \cdot)$  and  $u_t(T, \cdot)$ , restricted to  $\bar{\Omega}$ , are  $C^\infty$ . Then so is  $\phi$ , see (8), by elliptic regularity. Therefore, the map  $H_D(\Omega) \ni f \mapsto u(T, \cdot) - \phi \in H_D(\Omega)$  is compact. Next, the map  $H_D(\Omega) \ni f \mapsto u_t(T, \cdot) \in H_D(\Omega)$  is compact as well. Since the solution operator of (11) from

$t = T$  to  $t = 0$  is unitary in  $H_D(\Omega) \oplus L^2(\Omega)$ , we get that the map  $H_D(\Omega) \ni f \mapsto w(0, \cdot) \in H_D(\Omega)$  is compact, too.

Now, one has

$$(18) \quad \|Kf\|_{H_D(\Omega)} \leq \sqrt{\lambda_1} \|f\|_{H_D(\Omega)}, \quad f \neq 0,$$

where  $\lambda_1$  is the largest eigenvalue of  $K^*K$ . Then  $\lambda_1 < 1$  by (14).  $\square$

*Remark 1.* Although we proved that  $K$  is compact, we did not show that  $K$  is smoothing of at least 1 degree. Actually, we showed that  $K$  is a composition of a smoothing operator and a bounded one. To make  $K$  smoothing, we need to modify the initial condition for  $w_t(T, \cdot)$  in (11), as we did it for  $w(T, \cdot)$ , so that it would satisfy the compatibility at  $\{T\} \times \partial\Omega$  (no jump there, i.e.,  $w_t(T, \cdot) \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ ). That will put  $(w(T, \cdot), w_T(T, \cdot))$  in the domain of the generator of the solution group, in other words,  $(w_t, Pw(T, \cdot))$  would be in the energy space. Then the same would be true for  $Pw(0, \cdot) = -PKf$ , hence  $Kf \in H^2(\Omega)$ . Then we get a Fredholm problem again but the norm of  $K$  may not be less than 1 (that still might be true in a suitable norm). In any case,  $\text{Id} - K$  will be invertible. One can also modify the initial data at  $t = T$  in (11) to satisfy even higher order compatibility condition, and that will increase the smoothing properties of  $K$ .

### 3. INCOMPLETE DATA

The case of partial measurements has been discussed in the literature as well. One of the motivations is that in breast imaging, for example, measurements are possible only on part of the boundary. For simplicity, we assume in this section that  $P = -\Delta$  outside  $\Omega$ ; in particular  $c = 1$  and  $g$  is Euclidean outside  $\Omega$ :

$$(19) \quad c(x) = 1, \quad g_{ij}(x) = \delta_{ij}, \quad \text{for } x \notin \Omega.$$

All geodesics below are related to the metric  $c^{-2}g$ .

Let  $\Gamma \subset \partial\Omega$  be a relatively open subset of  $\partial\Omega$ . Set

$$(20) \quad \mathcal{G} := \{(t, x); x \in \Gamma, 0 < t < s(x)\},$$

where  $s$  is a fixed continuous function on  $\Gamma$ . This corresponds to measurements taken at each  $x \in \Gamma$  for the time interval  $0 < t < s(x)$ . The special case studied so far is  $s(x) \equiv T$ , for some  $T > 0$ ; then  $\mathcal{G} = [0, T] \times \Gamma$ .

We assume now that the observations are made on  $\mathcal{G}$  only, i.e., we assume we are given

$$(21) \quad \Lambda f|_{\mathcal{G}},$$

where, with some abuse of notation, we denote by  $\Lambda$  the operator in (3), with  $T = \infty$  (that actually can be replaced by any upper bound of the function  $s$ ). Then we are want to know under what conditions one can recover  $f$ , and when that recovery is stable.

Uniqueness and reconstruction results in the constant coefficients case based on spherical means were known for a while, see e.g., the review paper [8]. If  $P = -c^2(x)\Delta$ , and  $\mathcal{G} = [0, T] \times \partial\Omega$ , Finch and Rakesh [4] have proved that  $\Lambda f$  recovers  $f$  uniquely as long as  $T > \text{diam}(\Omega)$ . A uniqueness result when  $\Gamma$  is a part of  $\partial\Omega$  in the constant coefficients case is given in [3], and we follow the ideas of that proof below. The Holmgren's uniqueness theorem for constant coefficients and its analogue for variable ones, see Theorem 4 below, play a central role in the proofs that suggests possible instability without further assumptions, see also the remark following Theorem 3 below. Stability of the reconstruction when  $P = -\Delta$  and  $T = \infty$  follows from the known reconstruction formulas, see e.g., [8]. In the variable coefficients case, stability estimates as  $T \rightarrow \infty$  based on local energy decay have been established recently in [7]. When  $T$  is fixed, there is the general feeling that if one

can recover “stably” all singularities, and if there is uniqueness, there must be stability (although this has been viewed from the point of view of integral geometry, see also Section 4). We prove this to be the case in Theorem 3, and we use analysis in [11], as well.

We present some heuristic arguments for our main assumption below. We will restrict  $f$  below to a class of functions with support in some fixed compact  $\mathcal{K} \subset \Omega$ . Intuitively, to be able to recover all  $f$  supported in  $\mathcal{K}$ , we want for any  $x \in \mathcal{K}$ , at least one signal from  $x$  to reach  $\mathcal{G}$ , i.e., we want to have a signal that reaches some  $z \in \Gamma$  for  $t < s(z)$ . In other words, we should at least require that

$$(22) \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{K}, \exists z \in \Gamma \text{ so that } \text{dist}(x, z) < s(z).$$

In Theorem 4 below, we show that this necessary condition is sufficient, as well.

If we want that recovery to be stable, we need to be able to recover all singularities of  $f$  “in a stable way.” By the zero initial velocity condition, each singularity  $(x, \xi)$  splits into two parts, see Proposition 2 below: one that starts propagating in the direction  $\xi$ ; and another one propagates in the direction  $-\xi$ . Moreover, neither one of those singularities vanishes at  $t = 0$  (and therefore never vanishes), they actually start with equal amplitudes. For a stable recovery, we need to be able to detect at least one of them, in the spirit of [11], i.e., at least one of them should reach  $\mathcal{G}$ . This in particular allows us to reduce  $T$  by half in the full boundary data case, i.e., when  $\mathcal{G} = (0, T) \times \partial\Omega$ , namely to

$$(23) \quad T > \text{diam}(\Omega)/2,$$

and still to hope that a stable recovery is possible. In the general case, define  $\tau_{\pm}(x, \xi)$  by the condition

$$\tau_{\pm}(x, \xi) = \max(\tau \geq 0; \gamma_{x, \xi}(\pm\tau) \in \bar{\Omega}).$$

Based on the arguments above, for stable recovery we should assume that  $\mathcal{G}$  satisfies the following condition

$$(24) \quad \forall (x, \xi) \in S^*\mathcal{K}, (\tau_{\sigma}(x, \xi), \gamma_{x, \xi}(\tau_{\sigma}(x, \xi))) \in \mathcal{G} \text{ for either } \sigma = + \text{ or } \sigma = - \text{ (or both)}.$$

Compared to condition (22), this means that for each  $x \in \mathcal{K}$  and each unit direction  $\xi$ , at least one of the signals from  $(x, \xi)$  and  $(x, -\xi)$  reaches  $\mathcal{G}$ . In Theorem 3 below, we show that this necessary condition, see Remark 3, is also sufficient.

**3.1. Uniqueness.** We have the following uniqueness result, that in particular generalizes the result in [3] to the variable coefficients case.

*Remark 2.* Note that we do not need the geodesic flow to be non-trapping in this theorem since (22) is a condition on a subset of the geodesics only.

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $P = -\Delta$  outside  $\Omega$ , and let  $\partial\Omega$  be strictly convex. Then under the assumption (22), if  $\Lambda f = 0$  on  $\mathcal{G}$  for  $f \in H_D(\Omega)$  with  $\text{supp } f \subset \mathcal{K}$ , then  $f = 0$ .*

*Proof.* We follow the proof in [3], where  $g$  is Euclidean everywhere, and  $T = \infty$  (actually, it is easy to see there that  $T$  can be any number larger than  $\text{diam}(\Omega)$ ). We preserve the notation on [3] as much as possible.

Recall that  $\text{dist}(x, y)$  is the distance in the metric  $c^{-2}g$ . Let  $d(x, y)$  be the (Euclidean) distance in  $\mathbf{R}^n \setminus \Omega$  defined as the infimum of the Euclidean length of all smooth curves in  $\mathbf{R}^n \setminus \Omega$  joining  $x$  and  $y$ . The function  $d$  is Lipschitz continuous, see [3]. Let  $E_r(x)$  be the ball with center  $x$  and radius  $r > 0$  in that metric. Then in [3, Proposition 2], Finch et al. formulated a domain of dependence results for solutions vanishing on a part of  $\partial\Omega$ , that we will use below.

Let  $\Lambda f = 0$ , with  $f$  as in the theorem. Fix a point  $x_0 \in \mathcal{K}$ . We will show that  $f = 0$  near  $x_0$ . By (22), there is  $p \in \partial\Omega$  so that  $\text{dist}(x_0, p) < s(p)$ ; then  $(s(p), p) \in \mathcal{G}$ . Let  $0 < \rho \ll 1$  be such that

$[0, s(p) - \rho] \times (E_\rho(p) \cap \partial\Omega) \subset \mathcal{G}$ , and  $\text{dist}(x_0, q) < s(q) - \rho, \forall q \in E_\rho(p) \cap \partial\Omega$ . We can therefore assume that

$$(25) \quad \mathcal{G} = [0, T] \times \Gamma, \quad \text{where } \Gamma = E_\rho(p) \cap \partial\Omega,$$

and

$$(26) \quad \text{dist}(x_0, q) < T \quad \forall q \in \Gamma.$$

The first step of the proof is to show that

$$(27) \quad f = 0 \quad \text{in } B_\rho(p),$$

where  $B_\rho(p)$  is the ball in the metric  $g$  with center  $p$  and radius  $\rho$ . The proof of (27) is the same as in [3] with taking extra care about the range of the  $t$  variable. Indeed, notice first that  $u$  solves the wave equation in  $\mathbf{R}^n \setminus \Omega$  with zero Cauchy data there, and boundary data  $h$  vanishing on  $\mathcal{G}$ , see (25). Fix a small neighborhood  $U$  of  $p$  outside  $\Omega$ . By (26) and the finite domain of dependence result [3, Proposition 2], we get that  $u = 0$  on  $(-\rho + \varepsilon, \rho - \varepsilon) \times U$ , where  $0 < \varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ , when the size of  $U$  tends to 0.

Next,  $u$  solves the wave equation in the whole space, and can be extended (as a solution) as an even function of  $t$ . Therefore, by the unique continuation principle, see Theorem 4, we get (27).

The next step is to iterate this argument and to prove that  $f = 0$  everywhere. This would follow from the following property that we prove next: For some  $\sigma > 0$  independent of  $\rho$ , we have

$$(28) \quad f = 0 \quad \text{in } B_r(p), r \geq \rho \implies f = 0 \quad \text{in } B_{\min\{\rho+\sigma, T\}}(p).$$

The reason we did not just replace the minimum above with  $\rho + \sigma$  is that we apply (28) consecutively several times; at each step we gain  $\sigma$ , and we would like to make the radius equal to  $T$ . The last step needed for that might be smaller than  $\sigma$  though, and (25), (26) pose a restriction on how far we can go.

Relation (28) follows from the following.

**Lemma 1.** *Assume that  $\text{supp } f \subset K = \bar{\Omega} \setminus B_r(p)$  with some  $r \geq \rho$ . Let  $\delta = \text{dist}(E_\rho(p), K)$ . Then  $f = 0$  in  $B_{\min\{\rho+\delta, T\}}(p)$ .*

We prove Lemma 1 below. Let  $\alpha$  be the supremum of the distance  $\text{dist}(p, q)$ ,  $q \in \Gamma$ . Since  $\partial\Omega$  is strictly convex,  $\alpha < \rho$ . Indeed,  $\alpha$  is actually the maximum of those distances, if we replace  $\Gamma$  by the compact  $\bar{\Gamma}$ . Then  $\alpha = \text{dist}(p, q_0)$  for some  $q_0 \in \bar{\Gamma}$ . Because of the strict convexity the latter is the length of the shortest geodesics on  $\partial\Omega$  connecting  $p$  and  $q_0$ . If we assume that  $\alpha = \rho$ , then that geodesic will be a minimizing curve for  $c^{-2}g$  as well, therefore it will be a geodesic for that metric. That is impossible because for  $\rho \ll 1$ , there is unique minimizing geodesic connecting  $p$  and  $q_0$ , and that geodesic cannot be on  $\partial\Omega$ .

The following lemma generalizes [3, Proposition 5] to the current setting. We refer to Fig. 2.5 there for better understanding of the lemma and its proof.

**Lemma 2.**  *$\text{dist}(K, \bar{E}_\rho(r))$  is the length of some geodesic segment joining a point  $A \in \partial\Omega \cap \partial B_r(p)$  and a point  $B \in \Gamma$ .*

The proof is provided below, and we continue with the proof of Theorem 2. By Lemma 2,  $\delta$  is the length of the geodesic segment connecting  $A$  and  $B$ , as in the lemma. Then

$$(29) \quad \begin{aligned} \rho + \delta &= \rho + \text{dist}(A, B) = \text{dist}(A, B) + \text{dist}(B, p) + (\rho - \text{dist}(B, p)) \\ &\geq \text{dist}(p, A) + (\rho - \text{dist}(B, p)) \geq r + (\rho - \alpha). \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $\sigma := \rho - \alpha > 0$  is independent of  $r$ . This proves the property (28), and therefore, the theorem.  $\square$

It remains to prove the two lemmas above.

*Proof of Lemma 2.* We will provide a proof that is different and shorter than that in [3]. Since  $\text{dist}(K, \bar{E}_\rho(r))$  is the distance between two compact sets, there is  $A \in K$  and  $B \in \bar{E}_\rho(r)$  so that  $\text{dist}(K, \bar{E}_\rho(r)) = \text{dist}(A, B)$ . By the Hopf-Rynow theorem, there is a geodesic  $\gamma$  connecting  $A, B$  so that  $\text{dist}(A, B)$  is the length of  $\gamma$ . Clearly,  $B$  belongs to  $\partial E_\rho(p)$  that consists of two parts: the first one that we denote by  $\partial E_\rho^1(p)$ , that is outside  $\bar{\Omega}$ ; and another one,  $\partial E_\rho^2(p)$ , that is part of  $\partial\Omega$ . We will show first that  $B$  must belong to the second one. Assume that it belongs to the first one. Consider the curve  $c$  connecting  $A$  and  $p$  that consists of  $\gamma$ , connecting  $A$  and  $B \in \partial E_\rho^1(p)$ , and the minimizing curve  $c'$  for the metric  $d$ , lying outside  $\bar{\Omega}$  that connects  $B$  and  $p$ . It is easy to see that  $c'$  exists and consists of a straight line segment  $c_1$  and a geodesic  $c_2$  on  $\partial\Omega$ , tangent to each other at their common point. Note that  $\partial E_\rho^1(p)$  is an open surface, and the straight line segment above is non-empty. Then the curve  $c$  locally minimizes the lengths of all curves connecting  $A$  and  $p$  with the property that they consist of a curve connecting  $A$  and some  $P \in \partial E_\rho^1(p)$  close to  $B$ ; and then another curve, this time outside  $\Omega$ , connecting  $B$  to  $p$ . Then  $\gamma \cup c_1$  must be a geodesic; otherwise we can make it shorter by an arbitrary small perturbation, and that would contradict the minimizing property above. So we get that  $c = (\gamma \cup c_1) \cup c_2$ , where  $\gamma \cup c_1$  is a geodesic tangent to  $\partial\Omega$ , and therefore to  $c_2$  at its common point with  $c_2$ . By the strict convexity of  $\Omega$ , such a geodesic (connecting points in  $\bar{\Omega}$ ) cannot exist — indeed, any geodesic tangent to  $\partial\Omega$  at some boundary point is a straight line that never hits  $\partial\Omega$  again. This contradiction shows that  $B \in \partial E_\rho^2(p)$ , and this proves the second statement of the lemma.

To prove the first statement, note that  $A$  must be on the boundary of  $\Omega \setminus B_r(p)$ . If  $A$  is not on  $\partial B_r(p)$  (that may not be smooth due to possible caustics), then it must be on  $\partial\Omega \setminus \partial B_r(p)$ . In this case,  $\gamma$ , connecting  $A$  and  $B$  and minimizing the distance, must lie in  $\bar{\Omega}$  because if it has a segment outside it, then the whole  $\gamma$  would be a straight line segment lying entirely outside  $\bar{\Omega}$ . Consider the function  $x \mapsto \text{dist}(x, p)$  restricted to  $\gamma$ . When  $x = A$ , its value is strictly greater than  $r$ . Therefore there is an interior point  $X$  between  $A$  and  $p$ , where this function takes value  $r$ , i.e., that point on  $\gamma$  is also on  $\partial B_r(p)$ . That however means that the segment  $Xp$  is shorter than  $\gamma$  and contradicts the minimizing property of  $\gamma$ . Therefore,  $B \in \partial B_r(p)$ , and the proof of the lemma is complete. Note that for our purpose, see (29), proving that statement was not necessary; it is enough in (29) to know that  $A \in K$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 1.* Roughly speaking, the idea of the proof is that we can apply the arguments at the beginning of the proof of the theorem by shifting the initial moment from  $t = 0$  to  $t = \delta$ .

First, by the definition of  $\delta$  and the standard domain of dependence argument,

$$(30) \quad u = u_t = 0 \quad \text{on } [-\delta, \delta] \times E_\rho(p).$$

Let  $U$  be a small enough neighborhood of  $p$  in  $E_\rho(p)$ . If  $\delta + \rho \leq T$ , by the domain of dependence argument for the exterior problem [3, Proposition 2], in view of (25), (26),  $u = 0$  on  $[\delta, \delta + \rho - o(1)] \times U$ , where by  $o(1)$  we denote terms tending to 0 when the size of  $U$  tends to 0. If  $\delta + \rho > T$ , then we can prove that only in the time interval  $[\delta, T - o(1)]$ . Therefore, in both cases, the time interval is  $[\delta, \min\{\delta + \rho, T\} - o(1)]$ . Since  $u$  extends as an even solution in the  $t$  variable, we get that  $u = 0$  for  $|t| \leq \min\{\delta + \rho, T\} - o(1)$ ,  $x \in U$ . Then from the unique continuation result in Theorem 4,  $u|_{t=0}$ , and therefore  $f$  vanishes in  $B_{\min\{\delta+\rho, T\}-o(1)}(p)$ . Letting  $U$  tend to  $p$ , we get that  $f = 0$  in  $B_{\min\{\delta+\rho, T\}}(p)$ .  $\square$

It is probably worth mentioning that we actually proved the following result about partial recovery given insufficient information.



**Proposition 1.** *Let  $P = -\Delta$  outside  $\Omega$ , and let  $\partial\Omega$  be strictly convex. Assume that  $\Lambda f = 0$  on  $\mathcal{G}$  for some  $f \in H_D(\Omega)$  with  $\text{supp } f \subset \Omega$  with  $\mathcal{G}$  as in (19) that may not satisfy (22). Then  $f = 0$  in  $W$ , where*

$$W := \{x \in \Omega; \exists z \in \Gamma \text{ so that } \text{dist}(x, z) < s(z)\}.$$

Moreover, no information about  $f$  on  $\Omega \setminus \bar{U}$  is contained in  $\Lambda f|_{\mathcal{G}}$ .

**3.2. Stability.** We now consider the situation where  $\Lambda f$  is given on a set  $\mathcal{G}$  satisfying (24). Since  $\mathcal{K}$  is compact and  $\mathcal{G}$  is closed, one can always choose  $\mathcal{G}' \Subset \mathcal{G}$  that still satisfies (24). Fix  $\chi \in C_0^\infty([0, T] \times \partial\Omega)$  so that  $\text{supp } \chi \subset \mathcal{G}$  and  $\chi = 1$  on  $\mathcal{G}'$ . The measurements are then modeled by  $\chi\Lambda f$ , which depends on  $\Lambda f$  on  $\mathcal{G}$  only.

We start with a description of the operator  $\Lambda$  that is of independent interest as well. In the next proposition, we formally choose  $T = \infty$ .

**Proposition 2.**  $\Lambda = \Lambda_+ + \Lambda_-$ , where  $\Lambda_\pm : C_0^\infty(\Omega) \rightarrow C^\infty((0, \infty) \times \partial\Omega)$  are elliptic Fourier Integral Operators of zeroth order with canonical relations given by the graphs of the maps

$$(31) \quad (y, \xi) \mapsto (\tau_\pm(y, \xi), \gamma_{y, \pm\xi}(\tau_\pm(y, \xi)), |\xi|, \dot{\gamma}'_{y, \pm\xi}(\tau_\pm(y, \xi))),$$

where  $|\xi|$  is the norm in the metric  $c^{-2}g$ , and the prime in  $\dot{\gamma}'$  stands for the tangential projection of  $\dot{\gamma}$  on  $T\partial\Omega$ .

*Proof.* We start with a standard geometric optics construction. Fix  $x_0 \in \Omega$ . In a neighborhood of  $(0, x_0)$ , the solution to (7) is given by

$$(32) \quad u(t, x) = (2\pi)^{-n} \sum_{\sigma=\pm} \int e^{i\phi_\sigma(t, x, \xi)} a_\sigma(x, \xi, t) \hat{f}(\xi) d\xi,$$

modulo smooth terms, where the phase functions  $\phi_\pm$  are positively homogeneous of order 1 in  $\xi$  and solve the eikonal equations

$$(33) \quad \mp \partial_t \phi_\pm = |d_x \phi_\pm|, \quad \phi_\pm|_{t=0} = x \cdot \xi,$$

while  $a_\pm$  solve the corresponding transport equations. In particular,  $a_\pm$  satisfy

$$a_+ + a_- = 1 \quad \text{for } t = 0.$$

Since  $\partial_t \phi_\pm = \mp \xi$  for  $t = 0$ , and  $u_t = 0$  for  $t = 0$ , we also see that

$$a_+ = a_- \quad \text{for } t = 0.$$

Therefore,  $a_+ = a_- = 1/2$  at  $t = 0$ . Note that if  $P = \Delta$ , then  $\phi_\pm = x \cdot \xi \mp t|\xi|$ , and  $a_+ \equiv a_- = 1/2$ .

By the stationary phase method, singularities starting from  $(x, \xi) \in \text{WF}(f)$  propagate along geodesics in the phase space issued from  $(x, \xi)$ , for  $\sigma = +$ . i.e., they stay on the curve  $(\gamma_{x, \xi}(t), \dot{\gamma}_{x, \xi}(t))$ ; and from  $(x, -\xi)$ , for  $\sigma = -$ , i.e., they stay on the curve  $(\gamma_{x, -\xi}(t), \dot{\gamma}_{x, -\xi}(t))$ . This is consistent with the general propagation of singularities theory for the wave equation because the principal symbol of the wave operator  $\tau^2 - c^{-2}|\xi|_g$  has two roots  $\tau = \pm c^{-1}|\xi|_g$ .

The construction is valid as long as the eikonal equations are solvable, i.e., along geodesics issued from  $(x, \pm\xi)$  that do not have conjugate points. Assume that  $\text{WF}(f)$  is supported in a small neighborhood of  $(x_0, \xi_0)$  with some  $\xi_0 \neq 0$ . Assume first that the geodesic from  $(x_0, \xi_0)$  with endpoint on  $\partial\Omega$  has no conjugate points. We will study the  $\sigma = +$  term in (32) first. Let  $\phi_b, a_b$  be the restrictions of  $\phi_+, a_+$ , respectively, on  $\mathbf{R} \times \partial\Omega$ . Then, modulo smooth terms,

$$(34) \quad (\Lambda f)_+ = u_+(t, x)|_{\mathbf{R} \times \partial\Omega} = (2\pi)^{-n} \int e^{i\phi_b(t, x, \xi)} a_b(x, \xi, t) \hat{f}(\xi) d\xi,$$

where  $u_+$  is the  $\sigma = +$  term in (32). Set  $t_0 = \tau_+(x_0, \xi_0)$ ,  $y_0 = \gamma_{x_0, \xi_0}(t_0)$ ,  $\eta_0 = \dot{\gamma}_{x_0, \xi_0}(t_0)$ ; in other words,  $(y_0, \eta_0)$  is the exit point and direction of the geodesic issued from  $(x_0, \xi_0)$  when it reaches  $\partial\Omega$ . Let  $x = (x', x^n)$  be boundary normal coordinates near  $y_0$ . Writing  $\hat{f}$  in (34) as an integral, we see that (34) is an oscillating integral with phase function  $\Phi = \phi_+(t, x', 0, \xi) - y \cdot \xi$ . Then (see [15], for example), the set  $\Sigma := \{\Phi_\xi = 0\}$  is given by the equation

$$y = \partial_\xi \phi_+(t, x', 0, \xi)$$

It is well known, see e.g., Example 2.1 in [15, VI.2], that this equation implies that  $(x', 0)$  is the endpoint of the geodesic issued from  $(y, \xi)$  until it reaches the boundary, and  $t = \tau_+(y, \xi)$ , i.e.,  $t$  is the time it takes to reach  $\partial\Omega$ . In particular,  $\Sigma$  is a manifold of dimension  $2n$ , parametrized by  $(y, \xi)$ . Next, the map

$$(35) \quad \Sigma \ni (y, t, x', \xi) \longmapsto (y, t, x', -\xi, \partial_t \phi_+, \partial_{x'} \phi_+)$$

is smooth of rank  $2n$  at any point. This shows that  $\Phi$  is a non-degenerate phase, see [15, VIII.1], and that  $f \mapsto (\Lambda f)_+$  is an FIO associated with the Lagrangian given by the r.h.s. of (35). The canonical relation is then given by

$$C := (y, \xi, t, x', \partial_t \phi_+, \partial_{x'} \phi_+), \quad (y, t, x', \xi) \in \Sigma.$$

Then (31) follows from the way  $\phi_+$  is constructed by the Hamilton-Jacobi theory. The proof in the  $\sigma = -$  case is the same.

The proof above was done under the assumption that there are no conjugate points on  $\gamma_{y_0, \xi_0}(t)$ ,  $0 \leq t \leq \tau_+(y_0, \xi_0)$ . To prove the theorem in the general case, let  $t_1 \in (0, \tau_+(y_0, \xi_0))$  be such that there are no conjugate points on that geodesic for  $t_1 \leq t \leq \tau_+(y_0, \xi_0)$ . Then each of the terms in (32) extends to a global elliptic FIO mapping initial data at  $t = 0$  to a solution at  $t = t_1$ , see e.g., [2]. Its canonical relation is the graph of the geodesic flow between those two moments of time (for  $\sigma = +$ , and with obvious sign changes when  $\sigma = -$ ). We can compose this with the local FIO constructed above, and the result is a well defined elliptic FIO of order 0 with canonical relation (31).  $\square$

Choose and fix  $T > \sup_\Gamma s$ , see (20). Let  $B$  be the ‘‘back-projection’’ operator defined as  $A$  but with  $\phi = 0$ , see (7) and (9).

**Theorem 3.**  *$B\chi\Lambda$  is a zero order classical  $\Psi$ DO in some neighborhood of  $\mathcal{K}$  with principal symbol*

$$\frac{1}{2} (\chi(\gamma_{x, \xi}(\tau_+(x, \xi))) + \chi(\gamma_{x, \xi}(\tau_-(x, \xi)))) .$$

If  $\mathcal{G}$  satisfies (24), then

- (a)  $B\chi\Lambda$  is elliptic,
- (b)  $B\chi\Lambda$  is a Fredholm operator on  $H_D(\mathcal{K})$ , and
- (c) there exists a constant  $C > 0$  so that

$$(36) \quad \|f\|_{H_D(\mathcal{K})} \leq C \|\Lambda f\|_{H^1(\mathcal{G})} .$$

*Remark 3.* By [11, Proposition 3], condition (24) is also a necessary condition for stability in any pair of Sobolev spaces. In particular,  $c^{-2}g$  has to be non-trapping for stability.

*Remark 4.* Note that  $\Lambda : H_D(\mathcal{K}) \rightarrow H^1([0, T] \times \partial\Omega)$  is bounded. This follows for example from Proposition 2.

*Proof.* We will use the geometric optics construction in the proof of Proposition 2, using the notation there.

To construct a parametrix for  $B\chi\Lambda f$ , we apply a geometric optic construction again, using the two characteristic roots  $\pm c^{-1}|\xi|_g$ . The boundary data  $(\Lambda f)_+$  has a wave front set in a small conic neighborhood of  $((t_0, y'_0), (1, \eta'_0))$ . Note that  $\eta'_0 \neq 0$  because geodesics issued from  $\mathcal{K}$  cannot be tangent to  $\partial\Omega$ . As above, but now with initial condition on  $\mathbf{R} \times \partial\Omega$ , the geometric optic gives us two types of singularities starting from that one. The first one propagates along the geodesics close to  $\gamma_{x_0, \xi_0}$  in the opposite direction. The second one propagates along the geodesics close to the one issued from  $((t_0, y_0), (\eta', -\eta^n))$ , that is transversal to  $\partial\Omega$ . This ray is in fact a reflected  $\gamma_{x_0, \xi_0}$ . By the propagation of singularities results, those singularities stay on those geodesics until they reach  $\partial\Omega$  again, then reflect by law of geometric optics, etc., i.e., they propagate along the broken geodesics issued from a neighborhood of that point. Near  $t = T$  however, the solution to (7), where  $\phi = 0$ , is zero because we have zero Cauchy data, and  $h = \chi\Lambda f = 0$  for  $t$  close to  $T$ . This shows that the second types of singularities do not exist; and in our parametrix construction, we need to work with the first one only.

We look for a parametrix of the solution of the wave equation with zero Cauchy data at  $t = T$  and boundary data  $\chi(\Lambda f)_+$  in the form

$$v(t, x) = (2\pi)^{-n} \int e^{i\tilde{\phi}(t, x, \xi)} b(x, \xi, t) \hat{f}(\xi) d\xi.$$

The arguments above show that  $\tilde{\phi} = \phi_+$ . Next, for  $x \in \partial\Omega$ , we have  $b = \chi a$ . We need to find  $b$  at  $t = 0$ . If we assume for a moment that  $\chi = 1$ , then we would get  $b = a$ , therefore,  $b = 1/2$  for  $t = 0$ . Since  $b$  satisfies the transport equation that is a linear homogeneous ODE along the bicharacteristic close to  $(\gamma_{x_0, \xi_0}, \dot{\gamma}_{x_0, \xi_0})$ , we get that  $b(x, \xi, 0)$  is given by the value of  $\chi/2$  at the exit point of  $\gamma_{x, \xi}$  on  $\partial\Omega$  because that value is the initial condition of the transport equation on that bicharacteristic. It is known that the solution of the transport equation produces a classical symbol.

The arguments above reveal the geometry of the singularities but some of them are not needed for the formal proof. One can define  $v$  as above, and let  $u_+$  be the solution of (7) with  $\phi = 0$  and  $h = \chi(\Lambda f)_+$ . Then one easily checks that  $u_+ - v$  solves the wave equation modulo smooth terms, with smooth boundary condition and smooth Cauchy data on  $t = T$ ; and is therefore smooth.

In the same way one treats the  $\sigma = -$  term. This proves the theorem assuming no conjugate points in  $\Omega$ .

In the general case, we can apply those arguments step by step, in intervals  $[0, t_1]$ , then  $[t_1, t_2]$ , etc., short enough so that there are no conjugate points on the corresponding geodesic segments. After the first step, we get  $(u, u_t)$  at  $t = t_1$ . Then we construct a parametrix from  $t = t_1$  to  $t = t_2$  using a new phase function. Note that now, when  $\sigma = +$ , for example,  $u_t|_{t=t_1}$  does not vanish anymore. On the other hand,  $(u, u_t)|_{t=t_1}$  is Cauchy data of a solution which singularities do not travel in two opposite directions, and we will still get one term only, that is an analogue of the  $\sigma = +$  one in (32). Then we reach the boundary and apply the result above. Next, step by step, we go back to the hyperplane  $t = 0$ . One can also apply Egorov's theorem, instead of the partition of the time interval, by noticing that the principal parts of the two terms in (32) solve the equations  $(\partial_t \mp i\sqrt{P - q})u = 0$  modulo lower order terms.

This proves the first statement of the theorem.

Parts (a), (b) follows immediately from the ellipticity of  $B\chi\Lambda$  that is guaranteed by (24).

To prove part (c), note first that the ellipticity of  $B\chi\Lambda$  and the mapping property of  $B$ , see [9], imply the estimate

$$\|f\|_{H_D(\mathcal{K})} \leq C(\|\chi\Lambda f\|_{H^1} + \|f\|_{L^2}).$$

By Theorem 2, and (24),  $\chi\Lambda$  is injective on  $H_D(\mathcal{K})$ . By [14, Proposition V.3.1], one gets estimate (36) with a constant  $C > 0$  possibly different than the one above.  $\square$

**Corollary 1.** *Let  $g$  be Euclidean outside  $\Omega$ , and let  $\partial\Omega$  be strictly convex. Then if  $\Lambda f = 0$  on  $[0, T] \times \partial\Omega$  for some  $f \in H_D(\Omega)$ , with  $T > \text{diam}(\Omega)/2$ , then  $f = 0$ .*

#### 4. THERMOACOUSTIC TOMOGRAPHY AND INTEGRAL GEOMETRY

If  $P = -\Delta$ , and if  $n$  is odd, the solution of the wave equation can be expressed in terms of spherical means, as it is well known. Then the problem can be formulated as an integral geometry problem — recover  $f$  from integrals over spheres centered at  $\partial\Omega$ , with radii in  $[0, T]$ , and this point of view has been exploited a lot in the literature. One may attempt to apply the same approach in the variable coefficients case; then one has to integrate over geodesic spheres. This has two drawbacks. First, those integrals represent the leading order terms of the solution operator only, not the whole solution. That would still be enough for constructing a parametrix however. The second problem is that the geodesics spheres become degenerate in presence of caustics. The wave equation viewpoint that we use in this paper is not sensitive to caustics. We still have to require that the metric be non-trapping in some of our theorems. By the remark following Theorem 3 however, this is a necessary condition for stability. On the other hand, it is not needed for the uniqueness result as long as (22) is satisfied.

#### 5. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

The authors thank Peter Kuchment for his comments on a preliminary version of this work.

#### APPENDIX A. UNIQUE CONTINUATION FOR THE WAVE EQUATION

We recall here a Holmgren’s type of theorem for the wave equation  $(\partial_t^2 + P)u = 0$  due mainly to Tataru. While this theorem is well known and used, and follows directly from the results cited below, we did not find it clearly formulated in the literature.

**Theorem 4.** *Let  $P$  be the differential operator in  $\mathbf{R}^n$  as in the Introduction. Assume that  $u \in H_{\text{loc}}^1$  satisfies*

$$(\partial_t^2 + P)u = 0$$

*in a neighborhood of  $[-T, T] \times \{x_0\}$ , with some  $T > 0$ ,  $x_0 \in \mathbf{R}^n$ . Then*

$$u(t, x) = 0 \quad \text{for } |t| + \text{dist}(x_0, x) \leq T.$$

*Proof.* If  $P$  has analytic coefficients, this is Holmgren’s theorem. In the non-analytic coefficients case, a version of this theorem was proved by Robbiano [10] with  $\rho$  replaced by  $K\rho$  with an unspecified constant  $K > 0$ . It is derived there from a local unique continuation theorem across a surface that is “not too close to being characteristic”. In [5], Hörmander showed that one can choose  $K = \sqrt{27/23}$ , in both the local theorem [5, Thm 1] and the global theorem [5, Corollary 7]. Moreover, he showed that  $K$  in the global one can be chosen to be the same as the  $K$  in the local one. Finally, Tataru [12, 13] proved a unique continuation result that implies unique continuation across any non-characteristic surface. This shows that actually  $K = 1$  in Hörmander’s work, and the theorem above then follows from [5, Corollary 7].  $\square$

#### REFERENCES

- [1] M. Agranovsky, P. Kuchment, and L. Kunyansky. On reconstruction formulas and algorithms for the thermoacoustic tomography. *to appear in Photoacoustic Imaging and Spectroscopy*, CRC Press, 2009.
- [2] J. J. Duistermaat. *Fourier integral operators*, volume 130 of *Progress in Mathematics*. Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA, 1996.
- [3] D. Finch, S. K. Patch, and Rakesh. Determining a function from its mean values over a family of spheres. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 35(5):1213–1240 (electronic), 2004.

- [4] D. Finch and Rakesh. Recovering a function from its spherical mean values in two and three dimensions. *to appear in Photoacoustic Imaging and Spectroscopy*, CRC Press, 2009.
- [5] L. Hörmander. A uniqueness theorem for second order hyperbolic differential equations. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 17(5-6):699–714, 1992.
- [6] Y. Hristova. Time reversal in thermoacoustic tomography - an error estimate. *preprint*, 2008.
- [7] Y. Hristova, P. Kuchment, and L. Nguyen. Reconstruction and time reversal in thermoacoustic tomography in acoustically homogeneous and inhomogeneous media. *Inverse Problems*, 24:055006, 2008.
- [8] P. Kuchment and L. Kunyansky. Mathematics of thermoacoustic tomography. *European J. Appl. Math.*, 19(2):191–224, 2008.
- [9] I. Lasiecka, J.-L. Lions, and R. Triggiani. Nonhomogeneous boundary value problems for second order hyperbolic operators. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 65(2):149–192, 1986.
- [10] L. Robbiano. Théorème d’unicité adapté au contrôle des solutions des problèmes hyperboliques. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 16(4-5):789–800, 1991.
- [11] P. Stefanov and G. Uhlmann. Linearizing non-linear inverse problems and an application to inverse backscattering. *J. Funct. Anal.*, to appear, 2009.
- [12] D. Tataru. Unique continuation for solutions to PDE’s; between Hörmander’s theorem and Holmgren’s theorem. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 20(5-6):855–884, 1995.
- [13] D. Tataru. Unique continuation for operators with partially analytic coefficients. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 78(5):505–521, 1999.
- [14] M. E. Taylor. *Pseudodifferential operators*, volume 34 of *Princeton Mathematical Series*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1981.
- [15] F. Trèves. *Introduction to pseudodifferential and Fourier integral operators. Vol. 2*. Plenum Press, New York, 1980. Fourier integral operators, The University Series in Mathematics.

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

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON, SEATTLE, WA 98195