

# A Calderón Problem for Beltrami Fields

Alberto Enciso and Carlos Valero

November 20, 2024

## Abstract

On a 3-dimensional Riemannian manifold with boundary, we define an analogue of the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map for Beltrami fields, which are the eigenvectors of the curl operator and play a major role in fluid mechanics. This map sends the normal component of a Beltrami field to its tangential component on the boundary. In this paper we establish two results showing how this normal-to-tangential map encodes geometric information on the underlying manifold. First, we show that the normal-to-tangential map is a pseudodifferential operator of order zero on the boundary whose total symbol determines the Taylor series of the metric at the boundary. Second, we go on to show that a real-analytic simply connected 3-manifold can be reconstructed from its normal-to-tangential map. Interestingly, since Green's functions do not exist for the Beltrami field equation, a key idea of the proof is to find an appropriate substitute, which turn out to have a natural physical interpretation as the magnetic fields generated by small current loops.

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1	The anisotropic Calderón problem . . . . .	2
1.2	A Calderón problem for Beltrami fields . . . . .	4
1.3	Main results . . . . .	7
<b>2</b>	<b>Boundary determination for the Beltrami normal-to-tangential map</b>	<b>9</b>
2.1	Deriving a relation between the Hodge DN map and the Beltrami NT map . . . . .	9
2.2	Computing the symbol of Hodge DN map . . . . .	13
2.3	Determining the Taylor series of the metric at the boundary . . . . .	16
<b>3</b>	<b>Recovering a real-analytic simply connected manifold from the Beltrami normal-to-tangential map</b>	
3.1	The $b$ -fields . . . . .	23
3.2	Embedding $\tilde{M}_i^\xi$ into a Sobolev space and constructing the isometry . . . . .	27

arXiv:2411.12511v1 [math.AP] 19 Nov 2024

# 1 Introduction

A fundamental question in the field of inverse problems is the Calderón problem, which was first introduced by Alberto Calderón in [Cal80], where he considers the problem of recovering the electrical conductivity  $\gamma$  of a material from measurements of electric potential and induced currents on the boundary. By allowing the conductivity to be anisotropic, and thus replacing the scalar function  $\gamma$  with a positive symmetric 2-tensor  $\gamma^{ij}$ , one can recast this problem in the language of differential geometry as follows: can a Riemannian manifold  $(M, g)$  with boundary  $\partial M$  be recovered up to isometry from the set of Cauchy data of harmonic functions at the boundary? The Riemannian metric thus corresponds physically to the conductivity, and the Cauchy data of harmonic functions corresponds to the measurements of potential and current on the boundary. More generally, one can replace harmonic functions by solutions to the Helmholtz equation with frequency  $\lambda$ , with the original Calderón problem corresponding to the case  $\lambda = 0$ . The Cauchy data is conveniently captured by the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map at frequency  $\lambda$ ,  $\Lambda_{g,\lambda} : C^\infty(\partial M) \rightarrow C^\infty(\partial M)$ , which sends a function  $f \in C^\infty(\partial M)$  on the boundary to  $\partial_n \varphi|_{\partial M}$ , where  $\varphi \in C^\infty(M)$  is the only solution to the equation  $\Delta_g \varphi + \lambda \varphi = 0$  in  $M$  with Dirichlet datum  $\varphi|_{\partial M} = f$ .

The purpose of the present paper is to first introduce and study an analogue of the Calderón inverse boundary problem for Beltrami fields. Beltrami fields have been a focus of research since the 19th century. Known as force-free fields in magnetohydrodynamics, these fields represent configurations where the magnetic field is aligned with its own curl, resulting in no net force. In fluid mechanics, Beltrami fields are especially significant as they constitute a fundamental class of stationary solutions to the three-dimensional incompressible Euler equations. Their distinguished role in non-laminar steady fluid flows is laid bare in the celebrated structure theorem of Arnold [Arn66]. Beltrami fields on Riemannian manifolds have also received much attention [TdL22, CMPSP23, Tao18], partly due to the fact that nonvanishing Beltrami fields are related to Reeb fields of contact structures.

On an oriented 3-dimensional Riemannian manifold  $M$  with or without boundary, the equation for a Beltrami field of frequency  $\lambda$  is the following system of first-order partial differential equations:

$$\operatorname{curl}_g v - \lambda v = 0. \tag{1}$$

For concreteness, let us assume that  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ . As we shall see below, there is a natural boundary value problem for the Beltrami field equation, and thus a corresponding analogue  $\Sigma_\lambda$  of the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map that conveniently captures the Cauchy data of Beltrami fields on the boundary. Physically,  $\Sigma_\lambda$  maps the normal component of the fluid velocity field  $u$  on the boundary to its tangential component. Our main result is that this normal-to-tangential map determines all normal derivatives of the metric at the boundary, and enables us to reconstruct a real-analytic Riemannian manifold from the given boundary data under suitable hypotheses.

## 1.1 The anisotropic Calderón problem

There is an abundant literature on the Calderón problem, which remains a key model for many other interesting inverse boundary problems both in differential geometry and in more applied settings such as tomography.

In dimension 2, on compact, connected surfaces, the anisotropic Calderón conjecture in the smooth case has been proven [LU89, LU01]. Although we will not elaborate on this point, this is true even with only local data.

In higher dimensions  $n \geq 3$ , the problem is still open, and a full answer is only known in the real-analytic category. Specifically, the first important result for the Calderón problem, derived by Lee and Uhlmann in the classical work [LU89], is that the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map is a pseudodifferential operator of order 1 whose symbol determines the Taylor series of a smooth metric at the boundary. Building on this, Lassas and Uhlmann proved in the early 2000s that a complete real-analytic Riemannian manifold of any dimension  $n \geq 3$  can be recovered from its Dirichlet-to-Neumann map [LU01, LTU03].

Since we will need to revisit their proof, let us briefly comment on the proof of this metric determination result. In [LU01], the authors use the results of [LU89] to show that the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map determines the Green's functions in an extended manifold. They then use the Green's functions to construct a sheaf, from which the manifold may be obtained as a suitable quotient. This approach is motivated by the idea that the Green's functions provide an atlas of real-analytic coordinates for the manifold as one of their arguments varies. In [LTU03], a different approach is used, still based on the real-analyticity of the Green's functions, to extend the reconstruction result to complete manifolds with boundary. Here, the authors use the Green's functions to first embed an extended manifold into a suitable Sobolev space, and thence recover the manifold.

This latter approach seems easier to adapt to systems and other settings than that of [LU01], and indeed has been used in [KLU11] to recover a complete Riemannian manifold from the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map of its Hodge Laplacian acting on differential forms; in [GK24] to recover a real-analytic Riemannian manifold, vector bundle, and connection from the Cauchy data of the connection Laplacian acting on sections; and in [LLS22] to recover the conformal class of a real-analytic Riemannian manifold from the Cauchy data of its conformal Laplacian. In fact, the Green's function approach of [LTU03, KLU11, GK24] allows one to recover a real-analytic metric from knowledge of the corresponding Dirichlet-to-Neumann map on a proper open subset  $\Gamma$  of the boundary only; this is sometimes known as the Calderón problem with local data. Positive results have also been established for compact connected Einstein manifolds [GSB09].

With smooth metrics, the anisotropic Calderón conjecture remains an open problem. Notable uniqueness results exist for conformally transversally anisotropic manifolds [DSFKSU09, DSFKLS16, KS13]. Building on previous results on local problems [DKN18, DKN19, DKN20, DKN21], Daudé, Helffer, Kamran and Nicoleau [DHKN24] have recently shown that the anisotropic Calderón problem at nonzero frequency admits pairs of non-isometric  $C^k$  metrics which give rise to the same Dirichlet-to-Neumann map.

Several significant studies address the Calderón problem for singular conductivities. In dimension  $n = 2$ , Astala and Päiväranta demonstrated [ALP05, AP06, ALP16] that an elliptic isotropic conductivity in  $L^\infty(\Omega)$  is uniquely determined by the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map. In dimension  $n \geq 3$ , Caro and Rogers [CR16] proved uniqueness in the global Calderón problem for elliptic Lipschitz isotropic conductivities. For local data, Krupchyk and Uhlmann [KU16] showed that an isotropic conductivity with three derivatives is uniquely determined by a Dirichlet-to-Neumann map measured on even a very small boundary subset. There are also counterexamples to unique-

ness, such as those by Greenleaf, Kurylev, Lassas, and Uhlmann [GLU03, GKL09] for metrics that become degenerate along a closed hypersurface.

## 1.2 A Calderón problem for Beltrami fields

Let us now present a Calderón-type problem for Beltrami fields, corresponding to Equation (1). As above, let  $(M, g)$  be an oriented 3-dimensional Riemannian manifold with boundary  $\partial M$ . By the canonical isomorphism  $TM \rightarrow T^*M$  induced by the metric, we may also view vector fields on  $M$  as 1-forms, for which the Beltrami field equation (1) becomes

$$*du - \lambda u = 0, \tag{2}$$

where  $*$  is the Hodge star operator (which maps  $k$ -forms on the 3-manifold  $M$  to  $(3-k)$ -forms) and  $d$  is the exterior derivative. We shall often make use of this identification throughout the paper.

To formulate the problem, it is convenient to start by recalling some fundamental properties and results concerning differential forms on a manifold with boundary. First, let us recall that the metric induces a decomposition of the tangent bundle on the boundary,

$$TM|_{\partial M} = T(\partial M) \oplus NM,$$

where  $T(\partial M)$  is the tangent bundle to the boundary, and  $NM$  is a trivial bundle of rank 1 consisting of vector fields normal to the boundary. An analogous decomposition holds for the cotangent bundle,

$$T^*M|_{\partial M} = T^*(\partial M) \oplus N^*M.$$

The inward unit normal  $\nu$  defines a global frame for  $NM$ , while the 1-form  $\nu^\flat$  corresponding to  $\nu$  under the canonical isomorphism defines a global frame for the conormal bundle  $N^*M$ . Hence, the restriction of any  $u \in \Omega^1(M)$  to the boundary can be decomposed into a component tangential to  $\partial M$ , and a component normal to  $\partial M$ . We may therefore write

$$u|_{\partial M} = u_t + f\nu^\flat, \tag{3}$$

where  $u_t$  is a 1-form tangent to the boundary. We shall write  $\nu \lrcorner u|_{\partial M}$  for the evaluation of  $u|_{\partial M}$  on the unit normal  $\nu$ . Thus, if  $u|_{\partial M}$  decomposes as in (3), then we have  $\nu \lrcorner u|_{\partial M} = f$ .

Next, we want to recall the Hodge decomposition for a Riemannian manifold  $M$  with boundary  $\partial M$ . To this end, we make the following definitions:

$$\Omega_{\mathbb{D}}^k(M) := \{u \in \Omega^k(M) \mid u_t = 0 \text{ on } \partial M\},$$

$$\Omega_{\mathbb{N}}^k(M) := \{u \in \Omega^k(M) \mid \nu \lrcorner u = 0 \text{ on } \partial M\}.$$

We also recall [CDGM06] that a *harmonic field*  $h$  is a  $k$ -form satisfying  $dh = 0$  and  $d^*h = 0$ . Observe that this is in contrast with *harmonic forms*, which satisfy  $\Delta_d h = 0$ . Every harmonic field is a harmonic form, but the converse is not true on manifolds with boundary.

We define  $\mathcal{H}^k(M)$  to be the space of harmonic  $k$ -fields on  $M$ , and  $\mathcal{H}^{t,k}(M) \subseteq \mathcal{H}^k(M)$  to be the space of harmonic  $k$ -fields that are tangent to the boundary. We then have the following Hodge

decomposition theorem for  $k$ -forms on a manifold with boundary [Sch06, §2.4]:

**Theorem 1.1** (Hodge decomposition). *Let  $M$  be a Riemannian manifold with boundary  $\partial M$  as above. Then we have the following  $L^2$ -orthogonal decomposition:*

$$\Omega^k(M) = d\Omega_D^{k-1}(M) \oplus \mathcal{H}^k(M) \oplus d^*\Omega_N^{k+1}(M).$$

Moreover,  $\mathcal{H}^k(M)$  itself decomposes orthogonally into

$$\mathcal{H}^k(M) = \mathcal{H}^{t,k}(M) \oplus [\text{Im } d \cap \mathcal{H}^k(M)]. \quad (4)$$

In the case that interests us,  $k = 1$ , and so we shall often drop the index  $k$ . For  $u \in \Omega^1(M)$ , we shall let  $\mathcal{H}_M(u)$  and  $\mathcal{H}_M^t(u)$  denote its projection onto the spaces  $\mathcal{H}(M)$  and  $\mathcal{H}^t(M)$ , which we call the *harmonic part of  $u$* , and the *harmonic part of  $u$  tangent to the boundary*, respectively.

We are now ready to introduce the boundary value problem for Beltrami fields that will concern us. We shall let  $C_*^\infty(\partial M)$  denote the space of all zero-mean smooth functions:

$$C_*^\infty(\partial M) := \left\{ f \in C^\infty(\partial M) \mid \int_{\partial M} f = 0 \right\}.$$

We define the zero-mean Sobolev spaces  $H_*^s(\partial M)$  in an analogous way. Then we have the following theorem, which is a consequence of known existence results in the literature on Beltrami fields, such as [EPS15, Proposition 6.1], and standard elliptic estimates, see e.g. [Tay11, §5.11].

**Theorem 1.2.** *Let  $w$  be an  $H^k$  1-form over  $M$  that is divergence-free. For any  $\lambda$  which is not in certain countable subset  $T$  of the real line without accumulation points, the problem*

$$\begin{cases} *du - \lambda u = w, \\ \nu \lrcorner u|_{\partial M} = 0, \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

has a unique  $H^{k+1}$  solution  $u$  with zero harmonic part tangent to the boundary for any  $H^k$  1-form over  $M$  that is divergence-free.

We shall call  $T$  the set of *Beltrami singular values*<sup>1</sup>. As a corollary of Theorem 1.2, we have the following:

**Theorem 1.3.** *For any real constant  $\lambda$  that is not a Beltrami singular value, the boundary value problem*

$$\begin{cases} *du - \lambda u = 0, \\ \nu \lrcorner u|_{\partial M} = f, \\ \mathcal{H}_M^t(u) = 0, \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

---

<sup>1</sup>The set of Beltrami singular values is the union of the spectrum of the self-adjoint operator defined by the curl operator  $*d$  with the tangency boundary condition [YG90], whose domain is dense in the space of  $L^2$  co-closed 1-forms, and of the (positive and negative) square roots of the Dirichlet eigenvalues of the Hodge Laplacian. For the purposes of Theorems 1.2 and 1.3, one could just take the former spectrum, but later on we will use that  $\lambda^2$  is not in the Dirichlet Hodge spectrum either.

has a unique  $H^{k+1}$  solution  $u$  for all  $f \in H_*^{k+\frac{1}{2}}(\partial M)$ . If  $f$  is a smooth function, then the solution  $u$  is smooth as well.

*Proof.* Since  $f \in H_*^{k+\frac{1}{2}}(\partial M)$ , we can find a unique solution  $\varphi \in H^{k+2}(M)$  to the Neumann problem

$$\begin{cases} \Delta\varphi = 0, \\ \nu \lrcorner d\varphi|_{\partial M} = f, \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

by [Tay11, §5, Proposition 7.7]. Since  $d\varphi$  is an  $H^{k+1}$  divergence-free 1-form, by Theorem 1.2 we can solve the boundary value problem (5) with  $w = d\varphi$  to obtain a unique  $H^{k+2}$  solution  $v$ , which has zero harmonic part tangent to the boundary. Setting  $u = d\varphi - v$  then yields the unique  $H^{k+1}$  solution to (6) with harmonic part equal to  $d\varphi$ . By (4), we have  $\mathcal{H}^t(u) = 0$ .  $\square$

With these results in hand, we are ready to introduce the Beltrami normal-to-tangential map, which shall be our main object of interest. It encodes the Cauchy data of Beltrami fields on a manifold with boundary just like the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map does in the case of harmonic forms.

**Definition 1.4.** For real  $\lambda \neq 0$  that is not a Beltrami singular value, the Beltrami **normal-to-tangential map** at frequency  $\lambda$  is the map

$$\Sigma_\lambda : C_*^\infty(\partial M) \rightarrow \Omega^1(\partial M)$$

defined for each  $f \in C_*^\infty(\partial M)$  as

$$\Sigma_\lambda(f) := u_t,$$

where the vector field  $u \in C^\infty(M)$  is the only solution to the boundary value problem (6), and where  $u_t$  is the tangential part of  $u|_{\partial M}$ , defined in (3).

It follows from Theorem 1.3 and the standard trace theorems for Sobolev spaces that  $\Sigma_\lambda$  extends to a map from  $H_*^k(\partial M)$  to  $H^k$  1-forms on  $\partial M$ .

Note that by Equation (2), any solution to the Beltrami field equation with nonzero  $\lambda$  is divergence-free in the sense that

$$d^*u = \frac{d^*(du)}{\lambda} = \frac{*d^2u}{\lambda} = 0. \quad (8)$$

Here  $d^*$  is the formal adjoint of  $d$ , which acts on  $k$ -forms  $\alpha$  as

$$d^*\alpha = (-1)^k * d * \alpha.$$

As is well known, if  $u$  is a 1-form,  $d^*u$  coincides with the divergence of the dual vector field.

As useful consequence of this is that a Beltrami field also satisfies the first-order elliptic equation

$$(*d + d^*)u = \lambda u, \quad (9)$$

so in particular Beltrami fields with smooth boundary data are smooth (and analytic, if the domain and the boundary datum are). Acting with  $(*d + d^*)$  on both sides of Equation (9), we see that  $u$

also satisfies the second-order elliptic equation

$$\Delta_d u = \lambda^2 u, \tag{10}$$

where the differential operator  $\Delta_d := d^*d + dd^*$  is the *Hodge Laplacian*.

The observation that Beltrami fields also satisfy a Helmholtz equation for the Hodge Laplacian is a key idea that we shall take advantage of below. It is important to note, however, that once we impose boundary conditions on our Beltrami fields, the analysis of the Beltrami field equation is *not* reducible to the analysis of the Hodge Laplacian.

*Remark 1.5.* Although we focus of the case  $\lambda \neq 0$  for concreteness, this assumption is not essential, provided that we prescribe the divergence-free equation  $d^*u = 0$  by hand. With this understanding,  $\lambda = 0$  is never Beltrami singular, and we can once again solve the following boundary value problem for a harmonic field  $u \in \Omega^1(M)$  with prescribed normal component  $f \in C_*^\infty(\partial M)$ ,

$$\begin{cases} du = 0, & d^*u = 0, \\ \nu \lrcorner u|_{\partial M} = f, \end{cases} \tag{11}$$

and the solution is unique if  $M$  is simply connected (see [Sch06, Theorem 3.4.1], for example). Indeed, this problem reduces to a Neumann problem for the scalar Laplacian, and we can define a corresponding normal-to-tangential map that sends the normal derivative of the harmonic function to its gradient along the boundary. All the results we present in this paper remain valid in this case.

### 1.3 Main results

The main results we present in this paper is that, just as in the case of the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map for the Poisson or Helmholtz equation [LU89, LU01], the normal-to-tangential map for Beltrami fields determines all the normal derivatives of the metric at the boundary. Furthermore, in the class of simply connected, real-analytic Riemannian manifolds, the normal-to-tangential map determines the Riemannian manifold up to an isometry. More precisely, we shall prove the following:

**Theorem A.** *If  $\lambda$  is not a Beltrami singular value, the normal-to-tangential map at frequency  $\lambda$ ,  $\Sigma_\lambda : C^\infty(\partial M) \rightarrow \Omega^1(\partial M)$ , is a pseudodifferential operator of order 0 with principal symbol*

$$\sigma_0(\xi) := i \frac{\xi}{|\xi|}.$$

*Its total symbol determines all normal derivatives of the metric at the boundary.*

**Theorem B.** *Suppose  $(M_1, g_1)$  and  $(M_2, g_2)$  are simply connected real-analytic Riemannian 3-manifolds with boundary whose boundaries are identified, and that their Beltrami normal-to-tangential maps are equal. Then  $(M_1, g_1)$  and  $(M_2, g_2)$  are isometric.*

The proof of Theorem A is the subject of Section 2. There, we shall take advantage of the fact that every Beltrami field also satisfies the second order elliptic equation (10) to derive a relation between the Beltrami normal-to-tangential map and the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map for

the Hodge Laplacian, whose full symbol is easily computed using the methods of [LU89]. Deriving this connection is not immediate because, as discussed in the preceding subsection, the boundary problem for the Beltrami field equation does not reduce to a boundary problem for the corresponding second order operator, so further elaboration is necessary. We then use this relation and knowledge of the symbol of the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map to compute the symbol of the Beltrami normal-to-tangential map, and show that it determines the Taylor series of the metric on the boundary.

The proof of Theorem B is presented in Section 3. There, we shall adapt the approach of [LTU03] and [KLU11], based on the real-analyticity of the Green's functions, in which the manifold is recovered by embedding it in a suitable Sobolev space. However, as the source term in (5) is restricted to divergence-free fields, traditional Green's functions arising from delta functions are not available to us. As a key idea of the proof, we shall therefore introduce in Section 3.1 a class of functions, which we call the  $b$ -fields, that will play a role in the analysis of the Beltrami field equation analogous to that of Green's functions in [LU01]. These  $b$ -fields have an interesting physical interpretation: they describe the magnetic field created by a small current loop. Accordingly, they are parametrized by the location and orientation of the loop (or vortex), which one associated with a point in the unit sphere bundle of the manifold. After establishing certain useful properties of  $b$ -fields, we proceed with the proof of Theorem B in Section 3.2, adapting the proofs found in [LTU03, KLU11] and emphasizing the interesting changes made necessary by the introduction of the  $b$ -fields.

To readily see why having to deal with  $b$ -fields instead of Green's functions introduces essential new difficulties, it is useful to consider the differences between Theorem B and the kinds of uniqueness results one usually obtains for the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map for Laplacians with analytic data, such as those in [LTU03, KLU11]. First, we require that the manifolds  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  in Theorem B be simply connected. This is a direct consequence of the fact that in order for the solution of the boundary value problem (6) to be unique, we require the harmonic part to vanish. We discuss this point in greater detail in Remark 3.5, following the proof of Proposition 3.4, where the role that simple-connectedness plays in the proof of Theorem B becomes manifest.

Second, it would be reasonable to ask why we have not stated Theorem B in the case of local data, that is, when  $\Sigma_\lambda$  is known only on an open subset  $\Gamma$  of the boundary. Indeed, the arguments used in [KLU11] to reconstruct the manifold from knowledge of the Green's form for the Hodge Laplacian apply equally well in the case of local data. However, as remarked above, since there does not exist a Green's form for the Beltrami field equation, we use instead an appropriate analogue, which we call the  $b$ -fields. These  $b$ -fields have two properties that pose a difficulty in extending Theorem B to the case of local data. First, these  $b$ -fields are not generated by point sources, but by loops of small but non-zero radius; and second, unlike the Green's form, which is symmetric in its two arguments, the  $b$ -fields shall depend on a parameter that is completely distinct from its argument, and so there is no symmetry to exploit. We discuss this in greater detail in Remark 3.11, after it becomes clear how these properties enter into the proof of Theorem B.



## 2 Boundary determination for the Beltrami normal-to-tangential map

The goal of this section is to show that the Beltrami normal-to-tangential map defined in Section 1 is a pseudodifferential operator of order 0 whose total symbol in a boundary chart determines the Taylor series of the metric at the boundary. The strategy will be to use the relation between the Beltrami operator and the Hodge Laplacian for 1-forms to relate the Beltrami normal-to-tangential map to the Hodge Dirichlet-to-Neumann map, whose symbol is easily computed using methods similar to those in [LU89]. We then argue that the symbol of the Beltrami normal-to-tangential map inductively determines the Taylor series of the metric at the boundary. The fundamental results regarding pseudodifferential operators and their symbols that we shall employ in this section may be found in any good text on the subject; see [Tay81] for example.

In Section 2.1, we derive an expression in boundary normal coordinates that relates the Beltrami normal-to-tangential map to the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map of the Hodge Laplacian for 1-forms. In Section 2.2, we explicitly compute the total symbol of the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map for 1-forms. Finally, in Section 2.3 we use the relation derived in Section 2.1 and the results of Section 2.2 to show that the total symbol of the Beltrami normal-to-tangential map inductively determines all normal derivatives of the metric at the boundary.

### 2.1 Deriving a relation between the Hodge DN map and the Beltrami NT map

In this Section, we want to derive a relation between the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map for differential 1-forms and the normal-to-tangential map for Beltrami fields. As mentioned above, there are several definitions of the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map for  $k$ -forms found in the literature; see for example [JL05, BS08, SS13]. The one that shall be most convenient for our purposes is the first definition provided in [JL05]:

**Definition 2.1.** *Let  $M$  be an  $n$ -dimensional compact manifold with boundary  $\partial M$ , and let  $g$  be a Riemannian metric on  $M$ . Let  $\Lambda^k T^* M$  be the bundle of  $k$ -forms on  $M$ . For any  $\lambda^2 \notin \text{Spec}(\Delta_d)$ , we define the **Hodge Dirichlet-to-Neumann map***

$$\Lambda_{g,\lambda^2} : C^\infty(\Lambda^k T^* M|_{\partial M}) \rightarrow C^\infty(\Lambda^k T^* M|_{\partial M})$$

as follows. For  $v \in C^\infty(\Lambda^k T^* M|_{\partial M})$ , we may solve the Dirichlet problem

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_d u - \lambda^2 u = 0, \\ u|_{\partial M} = v, \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

to obtain a unique solution  $u \in C^\infty(\Lambda^k T^* M)$ . We then define  $\Lambda_{g,\lambda^2}(v) := \partial_n u|_{\partial M}$  where in boundary normal coordinates  $(x^i)$ ,  $\partial_n u|_{\partial M}$  is defined as

$$\partial_n u|_{\partial M} := \sum_I \partial_n u_I|_{\partial M} dx^I. \quad (13)$$

*Remark 2.2.* It follows from the definition of boundary normal coordinates that the right-hand-side

of (13) is simply the Lie derivative of  $u$  with respect the inward unit normal, restricted to  $\partial M$ .

We now want to prove the following relationship between the Hodge Dirichlet-to-Neumann map for 1-forms as defined above, and the Beltrami normal-to-tangential map:

**Proposition 2.3.** *Let  $\Sigma_\lambda$  be the normal-to-tangential map for Beltrami fields corresponding to  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ , such that  $\lambda$  is not a Beltrami singular value, and  $\lambda^2$  is not in the Dirichlet spectrum of the Hodge Laplacian  $\Delta_d$ . Let  $\Lambda_{\lambda^2}$  denote the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map of the Hodge Laplacian for 1-forms at frequency  $\lambda^2$ . Then in boundary normal coordinates, for all  $f \in C_*^\infty(\partial M)$ , we have*

$$\Lambda_{\lambda^2}(\Sigma_\lambda(f) + f dx^n)_\gamma = \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{|g|}} g_{\alpha\gamma} \epsilon^{\alpha\beta} \Sigma_\lambda(f)_\beta + \partial_\gamma f \quad (14)$$

$$\Lambda_{\lambda^2}(\Sigma_\lambda(f) + f dx^n)_3 = A^\beta \Sigma_\lambda(f)_\beta + C(\partial)^\beta \Sigma_\lambda(f)_\beta + \frac{1}{\lambda} \partial_n \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}} \right) \epsilon^{\alpha\gamma} \partial_\alpha \Sigma_\lambda(f)_\gamma \quad (15)$$

where

$$A^\beta := \frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}} \epsilon^{\delta\gamma} \epsilon^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\delta \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}} g_{\alpha\gamma} \right),$$

and

$$C(\partial)^\beta := \frac{1}{|g|} \epsilon^{\delta\gamma} g_{\alpha\gamma} \epsilon^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\delta.$$

*Proof.* For  $f \in C_*^\infty(\partial M)$ , let  $u$  be the Beltrami field whose normal component on the boundary is given by  $f$ . The Hodge star on the basis of 2-forms in boundary normal coordinates is given by

$$\begin{aligned} *(dx^1 \wedge dx^2) &= \sqrt{|g|} (g^{11} g^{22} - g^{12} g^{21}) dx^3 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}} dx^3, \\ *(dx^2 \wedge dx^3) &= \sqrt{|g|} (g^{22} dx^1 - g^{21} dx^2), \\ *(dx^3 \wedge dx^1) &= \sqrt{|g|} (g^{11} dx^2 - g^{12} dx^1). \end{aligned}$$

Applying this to

$$du = (\partial_1 u_2 - \partial_2 u_1) dx^1 \wedge dx^2 + (\partial_2 u_3 - \partial_3 u_2) dx^2 \wedge dx^3 + (\partial_3 u_1 - \partial_1 u_3) dx^3 \wedge dx^1$$

we can express  $*du$  as

$$\begin{aligned} *du &= \sqrt{|g|} (\partial_2 u_3 - \partial_3 u_2) (g^{22} dx^1 - g^{21} dx^2) + \sqrt{|g|} (\partial_3 u_1 - \partial_1 u_3) (g^{11} dx^2 - g^{12} dx^1) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}} (\partial_1 u_2 - \partial_2 u_1) dx^3 \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Thus, in boundary normal coordinates, the Beltrami field equations take the form

$$\sqrt{|g|} g^{22} (\partial_2 u_3 - \partial_3 u_2) - \sqrt{|g|} g^{12} (\partial_3 u_1 - \partial_1 u_3) = \lambda u_1 \quad (17)$$

$$\sqrt{|g|} g^{11} (\partial_3 u_1 - \partial_1 u_3) - \sqrt{|g|} g^{21} (\partial_2 u_3 - \partial_3 u_2) = \lambda u_2 \quad (18)$$

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}} (\partial_1 u_2 - \partial_2 u_1) = \lambda u_3. \quad (19)$$

Rearranging Equations (17)–(18) yields

$$\sqrt{|g|} (g^{11} \partial_3 u_1 + g^{21} \partial_3 u_2) = \lambda u_2 + \sqrt{|g|} (g^{11} \partial_1 + g^{21} \partial_2) u_3, \quad (20)$$

$$\sqrt{|g|} (g^{12} \partial_3 u_1 + g^{22} \partial_3 u_2) = -\lambda u_1 + \sqrt{|g|} (g^{12} \partial_1 + g^{22} \partial_2) u_3. \quad (21)$$

We can rewrite Equations (20)–(21) as

$$\sqrt{|g|} g^{\alpha\beta} \partial_3 u_\beta = \lambda \epsilon^{\alpha\beta} u_\beta + \sqrt{|g|} g^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\beta u_3, \quad (22)$$

where  $\epsilon^{\alpha\beta}$  is the usual permutation symbol on 2 indices. Dividing Equation (22) by  $\sqrt{|g|}$  and contracting with  $g_{\alpha\gamma}$ , we can rewrite it as

$$\partial_3 u_\gamma = \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{|g|}} g_{\alpha\gamma} \epsilon^{\alpha\beta} u_\beta + \partial_\gamma u_3 \quad (23)$$

It remains to compute the derivative of  $u_3$  with respect to  $x^3$ . To this end, we differentiate Equation (19) with respect to  $x^3$  to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_3 u_3 &= \frac{1}{\lambda \sqrt{|g|}} (\partial_1 \partial_3 u_2 - \partial_2 \partial_3 u_1) + \frac{1}{\lambda} \partial_3 \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}} \right) (\partial_1 u_2 - \partial_2 u_1) \\ &= \frac{1}{\lambda \sqrt{|g|}} \epsilon^{\delta\gamma} \partial_\delta \partial_3 u_\gamma + \frac{1}{\lambda} \partial_3 \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}} \right) \epsilon^{\alpha\gamma} \partial_\alpha u_\gamma. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

By substituting Equation (23) into Equation (24), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_3 u_3 &= \frac{1}{\lambda \sqrt{|g|}} \epsilon^{\delta\gamma} \partial_\delta \partial_3 u_\gamma + \frac{1}{\lambda} \partial_3 \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}} \right) \epsilon^{\alpha\gamma} \partial_\alpha u_\gamma \\ &= \frac{1}{\lambda \sqrt{|g|}} \epsilon^{\delta\gamma} \partial_\delta \left( \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{|g|}} g_{\alpha\gamma} \epsilon^{\alpha\beta} u_\beta + \partial_\gamma u_3 \right) + \frac{1}{\lambda} \partial_3 \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}} \right) \epsilon^{\alpha\gamma} \partial_\alpha u_\gamma \\ &= \frac{1}{\lambda \sqrt{|g|}} \epsilon^{\delta\gamma} \partial_\delta \left( \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{|g|}} g_{\alpha\gamma} \epsilon^{\alpha\beta} u_\beta \right) + \frac{1}{\lambda} \partial_3 \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}} \right) \epsilon^{\alpha\gamma} \partial_\alpha u_\gamma, \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

since the term  $\epsilon^{\delta\gamma} \partial_\delta \partial_\gamma u_3$  vanishes. We thus obtain

$$\partial_3 u_3 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}} \epsilon^{\delta\gamma} \epsilon^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\delta \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}} g_{\alpha\gamma} \right) u_\beta + \frac{1}{|g|} \epsilon^{\delta\gamma} g_{\alpha\gamma} \epsilon^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\delta u_\beta + \frac{1}{\lambda} \partial_3 \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}} \right) \epsilon^{\alpha\gamma} \partial_\alpha u_\gamma. \quad (26)$$

Now, since  $u_3|_{\partial M} = f$ , we have  $u_\gamma|_{\partial M} = \Sigma_\lambda(f)_\gamma$  by definition of the normal-to-tangential map. On the other hand,  $u$  is also the unique 1-form on  $M$  satisfying

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_d u = \lambda^2 u, \\ u|_{\partial M} = \Sigma_\lambda(f) + f dx^n. \end{cases}$$

Therefore, combining Equations (23) and (26), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Lambda_{\lambda^2} (\Sigma_\lambda(f) + f dx^3)_\gamma &= \partial_3 u_\gamma|_{\partial M} \\ &= \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{|g|}} g_{\alpha\gamma} \epsilon^{\alpha\beta} \Sigma_\lambda(f)_\beta + \partial_\gamma f,\end{aligned}\quad (27)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\Lambda_{\lambda^2} (\Sigma_\lambda(f) + f dx^3)_3 &= \partial_3 u_3|_{\partial M} \\ &= A^\beta \Sigma_\lambda(f)_\beta + C(\partial)^\beta \Sigma_\lambda(f)_\beta + \frac{1}{\lambda} \partial_3 \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}} \right) \epsilon^{\alpha\gamma} \partial_\alpha \Sigma_\lambda(f)_\gamma,\end{aligned}\quad (28)$$

where

$$A^\beta := \frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}} \epsilon^{\delta\gamma} \epsilon^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\delta \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}} g_{\alpha\gamma} \right),$$

and

$$C(\partial)^\beta := \frac{1}{|g|} \epsilon^{\delta\gamma} g_{\alpha\gamma} \epsilon^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\delta,$$

as defined in the statement of Proposition 2.3. This complete the proof.  $\square$

Equations (27) and (28) constitute key relation between  $\Lambda_{\lambda^2}$  and  $\Sigma_\lambda$  that we wish to exploit. We may also write Equations (27)–(28) in matrix form,

$$\begin{pmatrix} \Lambda_{\lambda^2}^{tt} & \Lambda_{\lambda^2}^{tn} \\ \Lambda_{\lambda^2}^{nt} & \Lambda_{\lambda^2}^{nn} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_\lambda(f) \\ f \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda |g|^{-\frac{1}{2}} G J \Sigma_\lambda(f) + d_{\partial M} f \\ A^\beta \Sigma_\lambda(f)_\beta + C(\partial)^\beta \Sigma_\lambda(f)_\beta + \lambda^{-1} \partial_3 \left( |g|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right) \epsilon^{\alpha\gamma} \partial_\alpha \Sigma_\lambda(f)_\gamma \end{pmatrix}, \quad (29)$$

where the blocks correspond to the splitting of  $T^*M|_{\partial M}$  into tangential and normal components, the  $2 \times 2$  matrices  $G$  and  $J$  are given by  $G_{\alpha\beta} := g_{\alpha\beta}$  and  $J^{\alpha\beta} := \epsilon^{\alpha\beta}$ , and  $d_{\partial M}$  is the exterior derivative on  $\partial M$ . We note in passing that the first term on the right-hand-side of Equation (27) is easily seen to equal  $\lambda *_{\partial M} \Sigma(f)$ , and therefore the tangential equation (27) can be written as

$$\Lambda_{\lambda^2}^{tt} \Sigma(f) + \Lambda_{\lambda^2}^{tn}(f) = \lambda *_{\partial M} \Sigma(f) + d_{\partial M} f. \quad (30)$$

**Corollary 2.4.** *The Beltrami normal-to-tangential map  $\Sigma_\lambda$  is a classical pseudodifferential operator of order 0 with principal symbol*

$$\sigma_0(x, \xi) = i \frac{\xi}{|\xi|_g}. \quad (31)$$

*Proof.* The tangential equation (30) yields

$$(\Lambda_{\lambda^2}^{tt} - \lambda *_{\partial M}) \Sigma_\lambda(f) = d_{\partial M} f - \Lambda_{\lambda^2}^{tn}(f). \quad (32)$$

Since  $\Lambda_{\lambda^2}^{tt}$  is an elliptic classical pseudodifferential operator of order 1, so is  $\Lambda_{\lambda^2}^{tt} - \lambda *_{\partial M}$ , and so it has a parametrix  $P$ , which is an elliptic classical pseudodifferential operator of order  $-1$  satisfying

$$P (\Lambda_{\lambda^2}^{tt} - \lambda *_{\partial M}) = \text{id} + \mathcal{S},$$

where  $\mathcal{S}$  is a smoothing operator. Applying  $P$  to Equation (32) yields

$$\Sigma_\lambda(f) + \mathcal{S}\Sigma_\lambda(f) = P(d_{\partial M}f - \Lambda_{\lambda^2}^{tn}(f)).$$

By the the Sobolev estimates given by Theorem 1.3,  $\mathcal{S} \circ \Sigma_\lambda$  extends to a map of distributions into smooth 1-forms, and so it is a smoothing operator. Therefore, we have that  $\Sigma_\lambda$  is a classical pseudodifferential operator of order 0. Recalling that the principal symbol of  $\Lambda_{\lambda^2}^{tt}$  is  $|\xi|_g$ , we take the degree-1 part of Equation (30) to obtain

$$|\xi|_g \sigma_0(x, \xi) = i\xi,$$

which yields Equation (31). □

## 2.2 Computing the symbol of Hodge DN map

The relation (29) between  $\Sigma_\lambda$  and  $\Lambda_{\lambda^2}$  shall be the key ingredient used in Section 2.3 to prove that the full symbol of  $\Sigma_\lambda$  determines the normal derivatives of the metric on  $\partial M$ . Since that proof requires an explicit knowledge of the total symbol of the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map for 1-forms, and since it does not appear that these computations have been done in the literature, we take some time in this Section to apply the standard recipe of [LU89] to find the explicit form of the total symbol of  $\Lambda_{\lambda^2}$ . For the remainder of this Section and the following one, we shall fix a frequency  $\lambda$  and omit the subscripts on  $\Lambda_{\lambda^2}$  and  $\Sigma_\lambda$ .

We employ the same method of Lee and Uhlmann as in [LU89] to the Hodge Laplacian to get the total symbol of the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map in asymptotic series form. So we seek a factorization of the form (where  $D = -i\partial$ )

$$\Delta_d - \lambda^2 = (D_n + iE - iB)(D_n + iB)$$

for some pseudodifferential operator  $B$ . On the other hand, for the Hodge Laplacian  $\Delta_d$  on 1-forms, we have by the Weitzenböck formula,

$$\Delta_d u = \nabla^* \nabla u + u \circ \text{Ric} \tag{33}$$

where we view  $\text{Ric}$  as an endomorphism of  $TM$ . We choose boundary normal coordinates  $(x^1, x^2, x^n)$ , and as usual, we let Latin indices run over all 3 coordinates, whereas Greek indices shall run over only the boundary coordinates. We now want to express Equation (33) in these coordinates:

$$(\Delta_d u)_\ell = -g^{ij} (\nabla_i \nabla_j u)_\ell + g^{ij} \Gamma_{ij}^k (\nabla_k u)_\ell + \text{Ric}_\ell^p u_p$$

Note that we have

$$(\nabla_k u)_\ell = \partial_k u_\ell - \Gamma_{k\ell}^p u_p$$

And therefore

$$(\nabla_i \nabla_j u)_\ell = \partial_i \partial_j u_\ell - \Gamma_{j\ell}^p \partial_i u_p - \Gamma_{i\ell}^p \partial_j u_p - \left( \partial_i \Gamma_{j\ell}^p \right) u_p + \Gamma_{i\ell}^q \Gamma_{jq}^p u_p$$

and therefore we get

$$\begin{aligned}
(\Delta_d u)_\ell &= -g^{ij} \partial_i \partial_j u_\ell + 2g^{ij} \Gamma_{i\ell}^p \partial_j u_p + g^{ij} \left( \partial_i \Gamma_{j\ell}^p \right) u_p - g^{ij} \Gamma_{i\ell}^q \Gamma_{jq}^p u_p + g^{ij} \Gamma_{ij}^k \partial_k u_\ell - g^{ij} \Gamma_{ij}^k \Gamma_{k\ell}^p u_p \\
&\quad + \text{Ric}_\ell^p u_p
\end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

The Ricci tensor is given by

$$\text{Ric}_\ell^i = g^{ij} \text{Ric}_{j\ell} = g^{ij} \partial_k \Gamma_{\ell j}^k - g^{ij} \partial_\ell \Gamma_{kj}^k + g^{ij} \Gamma_{kp}^k \Gamma_{\ell j}^p - g^{ij} \Gamma_{\ell p}^k \Gamma_{kj}^p. \tag{35}$$

We now separate out the normal derivatives and tangential derivatives:

$$\begin{aligned}
(\Delta_d u)_\ell - \lambda^2 u_\ell &= -\partial_n^2 u_\ell - g^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\alpha \partial_\beta u_\ell + 2\Gamma_{n\ell}^p \partial_n u_p + 2g^{\alpha\beta} \Gamma_{\alpha\ell}^p \partial_\beta u_p + (\partial_n \Gamma_{n\ell}^p) u_p + g^{\alpha\beta} \left( \partial_\alpha \Gamma_{\beta\ell}^p \right) u_p \\
&\quad - g^{ij} \Gamma_{i\ell}^q \Gamma_{jq}^p u_p + g^{ij} \Gamma_{ij}^n \partial_n u_\ell + g^{ij} \Gamma_{ij}^\alpha \partial_\alpha u_\ell - g^{ij} \Gamma_{ij}^k \Gamma_{k\ell}^p u_p + \text{Ric}_\ell^p u_p \\
&= D_n^2 u_\ell + i \left( 2\Gamma_{n\ell}^p + g^{\alpha\beta} \Gamma_{\alpha\beta}^n \right) D_n u_\ell + Q_2 u + Q_1 u + Q_0 u
\end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

where for  $i \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ ,  $Q_i$  is the  $i$ -th order differential operator on  $\partial M$  defined by

$$(Q_2 u)_\ell := -g^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\alpha \partial_\beta u_\ell \tag{37}$$

$$(Q_1 u)_\ell := \left( 2g^{\alpha\beta} \Gamma_{\alpha\ell}^p \partial_\beta + \delta_\ell^p g^{\gamma\lambda} \Gamma_{\gamma\lambda}^\alpha \partial_\alpha \right) u_p \tag{38}$$

$$(Q_0 u)_\ell := \left( \partial_n \Gamma_{n\ell}^p + g^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\alpha \Gamma_{\beta\ell}^p - g^{ij} \Gamma_{i\ell}^q \Gamma_{jq}^p - g^{ij} \Gamma_{ij}^k \Gamma_{k\ell}^p + \text{Ric}_\ell^p - \lambda^2 \delta_\ell^p \right) u_p. \tag{39}$$

So, letting  $(Eu)_\ell = 2\Gamma_{n\ell}^p u_p + g^{\alpha\beta} \Gamma_{\alpha\beta}^n u_\ell$ , we have

$$\Delta u = D_n^2 u + iED_n u + Q_2 u + Q_1 u + Q_0 u,$$

which upon comparing with the factorization, gives us

$$i[D_n, B] - EB + B^2 = Q_2 + Q_1 + Q_0.$$

Taking total symbols of this equation, we get

$$\partial_n b - Eb + \sum \frac{1}{\alpha!} \partial_\xi^\alpha b D_{x'}^\alpha b = q_2 + q_1 + q_0. \tag{40}$$

Writing

$$b(x, \xi) = \sum_{m \leq 1} b_m(x, \xi)$$

where each  $b_m$  is positive-homogeneous in  $\xi$  of degree  $m$ , the degree-2 part of Equation (40) gives  $b_1 = \sqrt{q_2} = |\xi|$  as expected. The degree 1 equation yields

$$\partial_n b_1 - Eb_1 + 2b_0 b_1 + \sum \partial_\xi b_1 \cdot D_{x'} b_1 = q_1. \tag{41}$$

Now, before proceeding, we remark that for the proof of Theorem 2.5 in Section 2.3, we shall only need to know the explicit dependence of  $b_0$  on  $\partial_n g^{\alpha\beta}|_{\partial M}$  modulo terms involving  $g_{\alpha\beta}|_{\partial M}$  and

tangential derivatives thereof. In fact, for  $m \leq 0$ , we shall only need the explicit dependence of  $b_m$  on  $\partial_n^{|m|+1} g^{\alpha\beta}|_{\partial M}$  modulo terms involving lower-order normal derivatives of  $g$  and their tangential derivatives on  $\partial M$ . For convenience, therefore, we introduce the following notation. Let  $\mathcal{O}_m$  denote any quantity on  $\partial M$  which depends on normal derivatives of  $g$  up to order  $|m|$ , and tangential derivatives thereof. Thus, letting  $\omega = |\xi|^{-1}\xi$  in Equation (41), we have

$$\begin{aligned} b_0 &= \frac{1}{2b_1} (q_1 + Eb_1 - \partial_n b_1) + \mathcal{O}_0 \\ &= \frac{1}{2|\xi|} \left( 2ig^{\alpha\beta}\Gamma_{\alpha\ell}^p \xi_\beta + i\delta_\ell^p g^{\gamma\lambda}\Gamma_{\gamma\lambda}^\alpha \xi_\alpha + 2|\xi|\Gamma_{n\ell}^p + |\xi|\delta_\ell^p g^{\alpha\beta}\Gamma_{\alpha\beta}^n - \frac{1}{2|\xi|} \left( \partial_n g^{\alpha\beta} \right) \xi_\alpha \xi_\beta \right) + \mathcal{O}_0 \\ &= i\omega_\alpha \left( g^{\alpha\beta}\Gamma_{\beta\ell}^p + \frac{1}{2}\delta_\ell^p g^{\gamma\lambda}\Gamma_{\gamma\lambda}^\alpha \right) + \omega_\alpha \omega_\beta \left( g^{\alpha\beta}\Gamma_{n\ell}^p + \frac{1}{2}g^{\alpha\beta}\delta_\ell^p g^{\gamma\lambda}\Gamma_{\gamma\lambda}^n - \frac{1}{4}\delta_\ell^p \partial_n g^{\alpha\beta} \right) + \mathcal{O}_0 \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

For later use, we decompose  $b_0$  into its tangential and normal components, modulo  $\mathcal{O}_0$ :

$$b_0^{nn} = \omega_\alpha \omega_\beta \left( \frac{1}{2}g^{\alpha\beta} g^{\gamma\lambda}\Gamma_{\gamma\lambda}^n - \frac{1}{4}\partial_n g^{\alpha\beta} \right) + \mathcal{O}_0 \quad (43)$$

$$(b_0^{tn})_\nu = i\omega_\alpha g^{\alpha\beta}\Gamma_{\beta\nu}^n + \mathcal{O}_0 \quad (44)$$

$$(b_0^{nt})^\mu = i\omega_\alpha g^{\alpha\beta}\Gamma_{n\beta}^\mu + \mathcal{O}_0 \quad (45)$$

$$(b_0^{tt})^\mu_\nu = \omega_\alpha \omega_\beta \left( g^{\alpha\beta}\Gamma_{n\nu}^\mu + \frac{1}{2}g^{\alpha\beta}\delta_\nu^\mu g^{\gamma\lambda}\Gamma_{\gamma\lambda}^n - \frac{1}{4}\delta_\nu^\mu \partial_n g^{\alpha\beta} \right) + \mathcal{O}_0. \quad (46)$$

We also want to derive expressions for  $b_{-1}$  modulo terms in  $\mathcal{O}_1$ . For this, note that the degree 0 part of Equation (40) gives us

$$b_{-1} = \frac{1}{2|\xi|} (q_0 - \partial_n b_0) + \mathcal{O}_1.$$

Here we introduce yet another notation that shall be very convenient for us in Section 2.3. Let  $\mathcal{D}$  denote any one of the following equivalent quantities,

$$\mathcal{D} := g^{\alpha\beta}\Gamma_{\alpha\beta}^n = -\Gamma_{n\alpha}^\alpha = -\frac{1}{2}g^{\alpha\beta}\partial_n g_{\alpha\beta} = \frac{1}{2}g_{\alpha\beta}\partial_n g^{\alpha\beta} = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}}\partial_n \left( \sqrt{|g|} \right), \quad (47)$$

where  $|g|$  denotes  $\det g$  in these coordinates. Then using Equation (42), we obtain

$$\partial_n (b_0)^p_\ell = i\omega_\alpha g^{\alpha\beta}\partial_n \Gamma_{\beta\ell}^p + \omega_\alpha \omega_\beta \left( g^{\alpha\beta}\partial_n \Gamma_{n\ell}^p + \frac{1}{2}g^{\alpha\beta}\delta_\ell^p \partial_n \mathcal{D} - \frac{1}{4}\delta_\ell^p \partial_n^2 g^{\alpha\beta} \right) + \mathcal{O}_1.$$

Using Equations (39) and (35), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (q_0)^p_\ell &= \partial_n \Gamma_{n\ell}^p + \text{Ric}^p_\ell + \mathcal{O}_1 \\ &= \partial_n \Gamma_{n\ell}^p + g^{pj}\partial_n \Gamma_{\ell j}^n - g^{pj}\partial_\ell \Gamma_{j\alpha}^\alpha + \mathcal{O}_1. \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

Therefore, we have

$$(b_{-1})^p{}_\ell = i\omega_\alpha g^{\alpha\beta} \partial_n \Gamma_{\beta\ell}^p + \frac{1}{2|\xi|} \omega_\alpha \omega_\beta \left( g^{\alpha\beta} \partial_n \Gamma_{n\ell}^p + g^{\alpha\beta} g^{pj} \partial_n \Gamma_{\ell j}^n - g^{\alpha\beta} g^{pj} \partial_\ell \Gamma_{j\alpha}^\alpha + g^{\alpha\beta} \partial_n \Gamma_{n\ell}^p + \frac{1}{2} g^{\alpha\beta} \delta_\ell^p \partial_n \mathcal{D} - \frac{1}{4} \delta_\ell^p \partial_n^2 g^{\alpha\beta} \right) + \mathcal{O}_1. \quad (49)$$

As with  $b_0$ , we separate out the tangential and normal blocks of  $b_{-1}$ ,

$$(b_{-1}^{tt})^\mu{}_\nu = \frac{1}{2|\xi|} \omega_\alpha \omega_\beta \left( g^{\alpha\beta} \partial_n \Gamma_{n\nu}^\mu + g^{\alpha\beta} g^{\mu\gamma} \partial_n \Gamma_{\nu\gamma}^n + g^{\alpha\beta} \partial_n \Gamma_{n\nu}^\mu + \frac{1}{2} g^{\alpha\beta} \delta_\nu^\mu \partial_n \mathcal{D} - \frac{1}{4} \delta_\nu^\mu \partial_n^2 g^{\alpha\beta} \right) + \mathcal{O}_1, \quad (50)$$

$$(b_{-1}^{tn}){}_\nu = \frac{i}{2|\xi|} \omega_\alpha g^{\alpha\beta} \partial_n \Gamma_{\beta\nu}^n + \mathcal{O}_1, \quad (51)$$

$$(b_{-1}^{nt})^\mu = \frac{i}{2|\xi|} \omega_\alpha g^{\alpha\beta} \partial_n \Gamma_{\beta n}^\mu + \mathcal{O}_1, \quad (52)$$

$$b_{-1}^{nn} = \frac{1}{2|\xi|} \omega_\alpha \omega_\beta \left( -g^{\alpha\beta} \partial_n \Gamma_{n\gamma}^\gamma + \frac{1}{2} g^{\alpha\beta} \partial_n \mathcal{D} - \frac{1}{4} \partial_n^2 g^{\alpha\beta} \right) + \mathcal{O}_1. \quad (53)$$

For  $m \leq -2$ , the degree  $m$  part of Equation (40) yields

$$b_m = -\frac{1}{2|\xi|} \partial_n b_{m+1} + \mathcal{O}_{|m|}.$$

From Equations (50)–(53), it is clear that by induction, we obtain

$$(b_m^{tt})^\mu{}_\nu = \frac{(-1)^{|m|+1}}{2^{|m|} |\xi|^{|m|}} \omega_\alpha \omega_\beta \left( g^{\alpha\beta} \partial_n^{|m|} \Gamma_{n\nu}^\mu + g^{\alpha\beta} g^{\mu\gamma} \partial_n^{|m|} \Gamma_{\nu\gamma}^n + g^{\alpha\beta} \partial_n^{|m|} \Gamma_{n\nu}^\mu + \frac{1}{2} g^{\alpha\beta} \delta_\nu^\mu \partial_n^{|m|} \mathcal{D} - \frac{1}{4} \delta_\nu^\mu \partial_n^{|m|+1} g^{\alpha\beta} \right) + \mathcal{O}_{|m|}, \quad (54)$$

$$(b_m^{tn}){}_\nu = \frac{i(-1)^{|m|+1}}{2^{|m|} |\xi|^{|m|}} \omega_\alpha g^{\alpha\beta} \partial_n^{|m|} \Gamma_{\beta\nu}^n + \mathcal{O}_{|m|}, \quad (55)$$

$$(b_m^{nt})^\mu = \frac{i(-1)^{|m|+1}}{2^{|m|} |\xi|^{|m|}} \omega_\alpha g^{\alpha\beta} \partial_n^{|m|} \Gamma_{\beta n}^\mu + \mathcal{O}_{|m|}, \quad (56)$$

$$b_m^{nn} = \frac{(-1)^{|m|+1}}{2^{|m|} |\xi|^{|m|}} \omega_\alpha \omega_\beta \left( -g^{\alpha\beta} \partial_n^{|m|} \Gamma_{n\gamma}^\gamma + \frac{1}{2} g^{\alpha\beta} \partial_n^{|m|} \mathcal{D} - \frac{1}{4} \partial_n^{|m|+1} g^{\alpha\beta} \right) + \mathcal{O}_{|m|}. \quad (57)$$

### 2.3 Determining the Taylor series of the metric at the boundary

In this section, we use our knowledge of the total symbol of  $\Lambda$  computed in Section 2.2, as well as Equation (29), to prove the following:

**Theorem 2.5.** *The full symbol of the Beltrami normal-to-tangential map  $\Sigma$  determines all normal derivatives of the metric  $g$  at the boundary.*



*Proof.* We consider the tangential and normal parts of Equation (29) separately,

$$(\Lambda^{tt})^\mu{}_\nu \Sigma(f)_\mu + (\Lambda^{tn})_\nu f = \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{|g|}} g_{\nu\alpha} \epsilon^{\alpha\beta} \Sigma(f)_\beta + \partial_\nu f, \quad (58)$$

$$(\Lambda^{nt})^\mu \Sigma(f)_\mu + (\Lambda^{nn}) f = A^\beta \Sigma(f)_\beta + C(\partial)^\beta \Sigma(f)_\beta + \frac{1}{\lambda} \partial_3 \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}} \right) \epsilon^{\alpha\gamma} \partial_\alpha \Sigma(f)_\gamma. \quad (59)$$

We take symbols of Equations (60) and (59) to obtain

$$(b^{tt})^\mu{}_\nu \# \sigma_\mu + (b^{tn})_\nu = \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{|g|}} g_{\nu\alpha} \epsilon^{\alpha\beta} \sigma_\beta + i\xi_\nu, \quad (60)$$

$$(b^{nt})^\mu \# \sigma_\mu + b^{nn} = A^\beta \sigma_\beta + C(i\xi)^\beta \# \sigma_\beta + \frac{i}{\lambda} \partial_3 \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}} \right) \epsilon^{\alpha\gamma} \xi_\alpha \# \sigma_\gamma, \quad (61)$$

where we have denoted the total symbol of  $\Lambda$  by  $b$  as in Section 2.2, the total symbol of  $\Sigma$  by  $\sigma$ , and the composition of symbols by  $\#$ .

In this Section, we shall use the notation  $\mathcal{O}_m$  as in Section 2.2 to denote any known quantity depending on normal derivatives of the metric up to order  $m$ , and tangential derivatives thereof. Here, we also include in  $\mathcal{O}_m$  any quantity depending on the symbol of  $\Sigma$ .

Observe first that from the principal symbol  $\sigma_0$  of  $\Sigma$ , we can determine the metric at the boundary. Therefore, since  $A^\beta$  and  $C(i\xi)^\beta$  are  $\mathcal{O}_0$ , and since

$$\xi_\alpha \# \sigma_\gamma = \xi_\alpha \sigma_\gamma - i \partial_\alpha \sigma_\gamma,$$

we can re-write Equations (60)–(61) as

$$(b^{tt})^\mu{}_\nu \# \sigma_\mu + (b^{tn})_\nu = \mathcal{O}_0, \quad (62)$$

$$(b^{nt})^\mu \# \sigma_\mu + b^{nn} = \mathcal{O}_0 + \frac{i}{\lambda} \partial_3 \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}} \right) \xi_\alpha \epsilon^{\alpha\gamma} \sigma_\gamma + \frac{1}{\lambda} \partial_3 \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}} \right) \epsilon^{\alpha\gamma} \partial_\alpha \sigma_\gamma. \quad (63)$$

Note that by the definition of  $\mathcal{D}$  (47), we have

$$\partial_3 \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}} \right) = \frac{1}{2|g|} \mathcal{D}.$$

Now, the degree 0 part of Equations (62)–(63) can be written as

$$(b_1^{tt})^\mu{}_\nu (\sigma_{-1})_\mu + (b_0^{tt})^\mu{}_\nu (\sigma_0)_\mu + (b_0^{tn})_\nu = \mathcal{O}_0, \quad (64)$$

$$(b_0^{nt})^\mu (\sigma_0)_\mu + b_0^{nn} = \frac{i}{2\lambda|g|} \mathcal{D} \xi_\alpha \epsilon^{\alpha\gamma} (\sigma_{-1})_\gamma + \frac{1}{2\lambda|g|} \mathcal{D} \epsilon^{\alpha\gamma} \partial_\alpha (\sigma_0)_\gamma + \mathcal{O}_0. \quad (65)$$

Note that in Equation (64), we have explicitly written the term  $b_1^{tt} \cdot \sigma_{-1}$ , even though it is  $\mathcal{O}_0$ . This

is so that we can solve for  $\sigma_{-1}$ ,

$$(\sigma_{-1})_\nu = -\frac{1}{|\xi|} \left( (b_0^{tt})^\mu (\sigma_0)_\mu + (b_0^{tn})_\nu \right) + \mathcal{O}_0. \quad (66)$$

From Equation (46), we see that

$$(b_0^{tt})^\mu = \omega_\alpha \omega_\beta \left( g^{\alpha\beta} \Gamma_{n\nu}^\mu + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{D} g^{\alpha\beta} \delta_\nu^\mu - \frac{1}{4} \delta_\nu^\mu \partial_n g^{\alpha\beta} \right) + \mathcal{O}_0. \quad (67)$$

where we recall that we have set  $\omega = |\xi|^{-1} \xi$ . So using Equations (67) and (44), we compute the first term on the right-hand-side of Equation (65) to be

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{i\mathcal{D}}{2\lambda|g|} \xi_\mu \epsilon^{\mu\nu} (\sigma_{-1})_\nu &= -\frac{i\mathcal{D}}{2\lambda|g|} \frac{\xi_\mu}{|\xi|} \epsilon^{\mu\gamma} \left( (b_0^{tt})^\rho (\sigma_0)_\rho + (b_0^{tn})_\nu \right) + \mathcal{O}_0 \\ &= \frac{\mathcal{D}}{2\lambda|g|} \omega_\mu \omega_\alpha \omega_\beta \omega_\rho \epsilon^{\mu\nu} \left( g^{\alpha\beta} \Gamma_{n\nu}^\rho + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{D} g^{\alpha\beta} \delta_\nu^\rho - \frac{1}{4} \delta_\nu^\rho \partial_n g^{\alpha\beta} + g^{\rho\beta} g^{\alpha\gamma} \Gamma_{\gamma\nu}^n \right) + \mathcal{O}_0 \\ &= \frac{\mathcal{D}}{2\lambda|g|} \omega_\mu \omega_\alpha \omega_\beta \omega_\rho \left( \epsilon^{\mu\nu} g^{\alpha\beta} \Gamma_{n\nu}^\rho + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{D} g^{\alpha\beta} \epsilon^{\mu\rho} - \frac{1}{4} \epsilon^{\mu\rho} \partial_n g^{\alpha\beta} + \epsilon^{\mu\nu} g^{\rho\beta} g^{\alpha\gamma} \Gamma_{\gamma\nu}^n \right) + \mathcal{O}_0 \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

where in obtaining the last line, we have re-written Equation (44) as

$$(b_0^{tn})_\nu = i\omega_\alpha g^{\alpha\gamma} \Gamma_{\gamma\nu}^n = i\omega_\alpha \omega_\mu \omega_\beta g^{\mu\beta} g^{\alpha\gamma} \Gamma_{\gamma\nu}^n$$

since  $g^{\mu\beta} \omega_\mu \omega_\beta = 1$ . Now, since

$$\partial_\alpha (\sigma_0)_\gamma = \partial_\alpha \left( \frac{i\xi_\gamma}{|\xi|} \right) = -\frac{i}{2} \frac{1}{|\xi|^3} \partial_\alpha g^{\beta\rho} \xi_\beta \xi_\rho \xi_\gamma,$$

the second-term on the right-hand side of Equation (65) is equal to

$$\Omega^{\beta\rho\gamma} \omega_\beta \omega_\rho \omega_\gamma := -\frac{i}{4\lambda|g|} \mathcal{D} \epsilon^{\alpha\gamma} \partial_\alpha g^{\beta\rho} \omega_\beta \omega_\rho \omega_\gamma. \quad (69)$$

Finally, we compute the left-hand-side of Equation (65) using Equations (43) and (45), which yields

$$\begin{aligned} (b_0^{nt})^\beta (\sigma_0)_\beta + b_0^{nn} &= \omega_\alpha \omega_\beta \left( -g^{\alpha\gamma} \Gamma_{n\gamma}^\beta + \frac{1}{2} g^{\alpha\beta} \mathcal{D} - \frac{1}{4} \partial_n g^{\alpha\beta} \right) + \mathcal{O}_0 \\ &= \omega_\alpha \omega_\beta \omega_\mu \omega_\rho \left( -g^{\mu\rho} g^{\alpha\gamma} \Gamma_{n\gamma}^\beta + \frac{1}{2} g^{\mu\rho} g^{\alpha\beta} \mathcal{D} - \frac{1}{4} g^{\mu\rho} \partial_n g^{\alpha\beta} \right) + \mathcal{O}_0, \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

where in obtaining the last line, we have again inserted  $g^{\mu\rho} \omega_\mu \omega_\rho = 1$ . Therefore, upon combining

Equations (68), (69), and (70), we can rewrite Equation (65) as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}_0 = & \omega_\alpha \omega_\beta \omega_\mu \omega_\rho \left( -g^{\mu\rho} g^{\alpha\gamma} \Gamma_{n\gamma}^\beta + \frac{1}{2} g^{\mu\rho} g^{\alpha\beta} \mathcal{D} - \frac{1}{4} g^{\mu\rho} \partial_n g^{\alpha\beta} - \frac{\mathcal{D}}{2\lambda|g|} \epsilon^{\mu\nu} g^{\alpha\beta} \Gamma_{n\nu}^\rho - \frac{\mathcal{D}^2}{4\lambda|g|} g^{\alpha\beta} \epsilon^{\mu\rho} \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{\mathcal{D}}{8\lambda|g|} \epsilon^{\mu\rho} \partial_n g^{\alpha\beta} - \frac{\mathcal{D}}{2\lambda|g|} \epsilon^{\mu\nu} g^{\rho\beta} g^{\alpha\gamma} \Gamma_{\gamma\nu}^n \right) - \Omega^{\beta\rho\gamma} \omega_\beta \omega_\rho \omega_\gamma. \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

By parity, we can recover the coefficients of  $\omega_\alpha \omega_\beta \omega_\mu \omega_\rho$ , and thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}_0 = & -g^{\mu\rho} g^{\alpha\gamma} \Gamma_{n\gamma}^\beta + \frac{1}{2} g^{\mu\rho} g^{\alpha\beta} \mathcal{D} - \frac{1}{4} g^{\mu\rho} \partial_n g^{\alpha\beta} - \frac{\mathcal{D}}{2\lambda|g|} \epsilon^{\mu\nu} g^{\alpha\beta} \Gamma_{n\nu}^\rho - \frac{\mathcal{D}^2}{4\lambda|g|} g^{\alpha\beta} \epsilon^{\mu\rho} \\ & + \frac{\mathcal{D}}{8\lambda|g|} \epsilon^{\mu\rho} \partial_n g^{\alpha\beta} - \frac{\mathcal{D}}{2\lambda|g|} \epsilon^{\mu\nu} g^{\rho\beta} g^{\alpha\gamma} \Gamma_{\gamma\nu}^n. \end{aligned} \quad (72)$$

Contracting this expression with  $g_{\mu\rho}$ , and using  $g_{\mu\rho} g^{\mu\rho} = 2$ ,  $g_{\mu\rho} \epsilon^{\mu\rho} = 0$ , and  $g_{\mu\rho} g^{\rho\beta} = \delta_\mu^\beta$ , we obtain

$$-2g^{\alpha\gamma} \Gamma_{n\gamma}^\beta + g^{\alpha\beta} \mathcal{D} - \frac{1}{2} \partial_n g^{\alpha\beta} - \frac{\mathcal{D}}{2\lambda|g|} g_{\mu\rho} \epsilon^{\mu\nu} g^{\alpha\beta} \Gamma_{n\nu}^\rho - \frac{\mathcal{D}}{2\lambda|g|} \epsilon^{\beta\nu} g^{\alpha\gamma} \Gamma_{\gamma\nu}^n = \mathcal{O}_0.$$

For the first of the terms involving  $\lambda$ , we find

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{\mathcal{D}}{2\lambda|g|} g_{\mu\rho} \epsilon^{\mu\nu} g^{\alpha\beta} \Gamma_{n\nu}^\rho &= -\frac{\mathcal{D}}{4\lambda|g|} g^{\alpha\beta} \epsilon^{\mu\nu} g_{\mu\rho} g^{\rho\gamma} \partial_n g_{\gamma\nu} \\ &= -\frac{\mathcal{D}}{4\lambda|g|} g^{\alpha\beta} \epsilon^{\mu\nu} \delta_\mu^\gamma \partial_n g_{\gamma\nu} \\ &= -\frac{\mathcal{D}}{4\lambda|g|} g^{\alpha\beta} \epsilon^{\gamma\nu} \partial_n g_{\gamma\nu} = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (73)$$

owing to the symmetry of  $\partial_n g_{\gamma\nu}$ . We are thus left with

$$-2g^{\alpha\gamma} \Gamma_{n\gamma}^\beta + g^{\alpha\beta} \mathcal{D} - \frac{1}{2} \partial_n g^{\alpha\beta} - \frac{\mathcal{D}}{2\lambda|g|} \epsilon^{\beta\nu} g^{\alpha\gamma} \Gamma_{\gamma\nu}^n = \mathcal{O}_0.$$

We now contract with  $g_{\alpha\beta}$  to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}_0 &= -2\delta_\beta^\gamma \Gamma_{n\gamma}^\beta + 2\mathcal{D} - \frac{1}{2} g_{\alpha\beta} \partial_n g^{\alpha\beta} - \frac{\mathcal{D}}{2\lambda|g|} \epsilon^{\beta\nu} \delta_\beta^\gamma \Gamma_{\gamma\nu}^n \\ &= -2\Gamma_{n\gamma}^\gamma + 2\mathcal{D} - \frac{1}{2} g_{\alpha\beta} \partial_n g^{\alpha\beta} - \frac{\mathcal{D}}{2\lambda|g|} \epsilon^{\gamma\nu} \Gamma_{\gamma\nu}^n \\ &= -2\Gamma_{n\gamma}^\gamma + 2\mathcal{D} - \frac{1}{2} g_{\alpha\beta} \partial_n g^{\alpha\beta}, \end{aligned} \quad (74)$$

owing to the symmetry of  $\Gamma_{\gamma\nu}^n$  in its lower indices. Recalling the various expressions for  $\mathcal{D}$ , Equation (74) reduces to

$$\mathcal{O}_0 = 3\mathcal{D},$$

so that the quantity  $\mathcal{D}$  is known in terms of  $\mathcal{O}_0$ . Once this is the case, the right-hand-side of

Equation (65) is known, and thus we may write

$$(b_0^{nt})^\mu (\sigma_0)_\mu + b_0^{nn} = \mathcal{O}_0. \quad (75)$$

Equation (70) then gives us

$$-g^{\alpha\gamma}\Gamma_{n\gamma}^\beta - \frac{1}{4}\partial_n g^{\alpha\beta} = \mathcal{O}_0. \quad (76)$$

Armed with knowledge of  $\mathcal{D}$ , we now want to recover  $\partial_n g^{\alpha\beta}$ . To this end, we return to the tangential equation (64), which we can write as

$$(b_0^{tt})^\mu{}_\nu (\sigma_0)_\mu + (b_0^{tn})_\nu = \mathcal{O}_0. \quad (77)$$

Using Equations (46) and (44), Equation (77) becomes

$$i\omega_\alpha\omega_\beta\omega_\mu \left( g^{\alpha\beta}\Gamma_{n\nu}^\mu + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{D}g^{\alpha\beta}\delta_\nu^\mu - \frac{1}{4}\delta_\nu^\mu\partial_n g^{\alpha\beta} \right) + i\omega_\alpha g^{\alpha\gamma}\Gamma_{\gamma\nu}^n = \mathcal{O}_0.$$

Since  $\mathcal{D}$  is now known in terms of  $\mathcal{O}_0$ , we can move it to the right-hand-side. We then combine terms using  $g^{\alpha\beta}\omega_\alpha\omega_\beta = 1$  to get

$$i\omega_\alpha\omega_\beta\omega_\mu \left( g^{\alpha\beta}\Gamma_{n\nu}^\mu - \frac{1}{4}\delta_\nu^\mu\partial_n g^{\alpha\beta} + g^{\beta\mu}g^{\alpha\gamma}\Gamma_{\gamma\nu}^n \right) = \mathcal{O}_0,$$

whence we can recover

$$g^{\alpha\beta}\Gamma_{n\nu}^\mu - \frac{1}{4}\delta_\nu^\mu\partial_n g^{\alpha\beta} + g^{\beta\mu}g^{\alpha\gamma}\Gamma_{\gamma\nu}^n = \mathcal{O}_0.$$

Taking a trace over  $(\mu, \nu)$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}_0 &= g^{\alpha\beta}\Gamma_{n\mu}^\mu - \frac{1}{2}\partial_n g^{\alpha\beta} + g^{\beta\mu}g^{\alpha\gamma}\Gamma_{\gamma\mu}^n \\ &= -g^{\alpha\beta}\mathcal{D} - \frac{1}{2}\partial_n g^{\alpha\beta} + g^{\beta\mu}g^{\alpha\gamma}\Gamma_{\gamma\mu}^n. \end{aligned} \quad (78)$$

Again, since  $\mathcal{D}$  is known, we arrive at

$$-\frac{1}{2}\partial_n g^{\alpha\beta} + g^{\beta\mu}g^{\alpha\gamma}\Gamma_{\gamma\mu}^n = \mathcal{O}_0. \quad (79)$$

In order to recover  $\partial_n g^{\alpha\beta}$ , we want to compare Equation (79) with (76). Observe that

$$g^{\beta\mu}g^{\alpha\gamma}\Gamma_{\gamma\mu}^n = -\frac{1}{2}g^{\beta\mu}g^{\alpha\gamma}\partial_n g_{\gamma\mu} \quad (80)$$

$$-g^{\alpha\gamma}\Gamma_{n\gamma}^\beta = -\frac{1}{2}g^{\alpha\gamma}g^{\beta\mu}\partial_n g_{\mu\gamma} \quad (81)$$

So that the left-hand-sides of Equations (80) and (81) are equal. Therefore, we can subtract Equation (79) from Equation (76), to obtain

$$\frac{1}{4}\partial_n g^{\alpha\beta} = \mathcal{O}_0.$$

This completes the first step, in which we recover the first normal derivative of the metric at the boundary. We can hence obtain all expressions in  $\mathcal{O}_1$ . We now consider the degree  $-1$  part of Equations (60) and (61), which become

$$(b_{-1}^{tt})^\mu (\sigma_0)_\mu + (b_{-1}^{tn})_\nu = \mathcal{O}_1, \quad (82)$$

$$(b_{-1}^{nt})^\mu (\sigma_0)_\mu + b_{-1}^{nn} = \mathcal{O}_1. \quad (83)$$

Using the expression we derived for  $b_{-1}$  modulo  $\mathcal{O}_1$ , (50)–(53), Equations (82) and (83) become

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}_1 = \frac{1}{2|\xi|} i\omega_\alpha \omega_\beta \omega_\mu \left( g^{\alpha\beta} \partial_n \Gamma_{n\nu}^\mu + g^{\alpha\beta} g^{\mu\gamma} \partial_n \Gamma_{\nu\gamma}^n + g^{\alpha\beta} \partial_n \Gamma_{n\nu}^\mu + \frac{1}{2} g^{\alpha\beta} \delta_\nu^\mu \partial_n \mathcal{D} - \frac{1}{4} \delta_\nu^\mu \partial_n^2 g^{\alpha\beta} \right. \\ \left. + g^{\beta\mu} g^{\alpha\gamma} \partial_n \Gamma_{\gamma\nu}^n \right) \end{aligned} \quad (84)$$

$$\mathcal{O}_1 = \frac{1}{2|\xi|} \omega_\alpha \omega_\beta \left( -g^{\alpha\beta} \partial_n \Gamma_{n\gamma}^\gamma + \frac{1}{2} g^{\alpha\beta} \partial_n \mathcal{D} - \frac{1}{4} \partial_n^2 g^{\alpha\beta} - g^{\alpha\gamma} \partial_n \Gamma_{\gamma n}^\beta \right). \quad (85)$$

By contracting the coefficient of Equation (85) with  $g_{\alpha\beta}$ , we obtain

$$4\partial_n \mathcal{D} - \frac{1}{4} g_{\alpha\beta} \partial_n^2 g^{\alpha\beta} = \mathcal{O}_1. \quad (86)$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\frac{1}{2} g_{\alpha\beta} \partial_n^2 g^{\alpha\beta} = \frac{1}{2} \partial_n (g_{\alpha\beta} \partial_n g^{\alpha\beta}) + \mathcal{O}_1 = \partial_n \mathcal{D} + \mathcal{O}_1,$$

and therefore, Equation (86) reduces to

$$\partial_n \mathcal{D} = \mathcal{O}_1.$$

Now that  $\partial_n \mathcal{D}$  is known in terms of  $\mathcal{O}_1$ , the normal equation (85) reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}_1 &= -\frac{1}{4} \partial_n^2 g^{\alpha\beta} - g^{\alpha\gamma} \partial_n \Gamma_{n\gamma}^\beta \\ &= -\frac{1}{4} \partial_n^2 g^{\alpha\beta} - \partial_n \left( g^{\alpha\gamma} \Gamma_{n\gamma}^\beta \right) + \mathcal{O}_1 \end{aligned} \quad (87)$$

Armed with this, we extract the coefficient of the tangential equation (84) and take a trace over  $(\mu, \nu)$  to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}_1 &= -2g^{\alpha\beta} \partial_n \mathcal{D} + g^{\alpha\beta} g^{\mu\gamma} \partial_n \Gamma_{\gamma\mu}^n + g^{\alpha\beta} \partial_n \mathcal{D} - \frac{1}{2} \partial_n^2 g^{\alpha\beta} + g^{\beta\mu} g^{\alpha\gamma} \partial_n \Gamma_{\gamma\mu}^n \\ &= -2g^{\alpha\beta} \partial_n \mathcal{D} + g^{\alpha\beta} \partial_n \mathcal{D} + g^{\alpha\beta} \partial_n \mathcal{D} - \frac{1}{2} \partial_n^2 g^{\alpha\beta} + g^{\beta\mu} g^{\alpha\gamma} \partial_n \Gamma_{\gamma\mu}^n \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \partial_n^2 g^{\alpha\beta} + g^{\beta\mu} g^{\alpha\gamma} \partial_n \Gamma_{\gamma\mu}^n \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \partial_n^2 g^{\alpha\beta} + \partial_n \left( g^{\beta\mu} g^{\alpha\gamma} \Gamma_{\gamma\mu}^n \right) + \mathcal{O}_1. \end{aligned} \quad (88)$$

By Equations (80) and (81), we can once again subtract Equations (88) and (87) to get

$$\frac{1}{4}\partial_n^2 g^{\alpha\beta} = \mathcal{O}_1.$$

We have thus recovered all second-order normal derivatives of the metric at the boundary. We may now conduct the inductive step in analogy with above. Thus, suppose we have recovered  $\mathcal{O}_{|m|}$ . Taking the degree  $m$  part of Equations (60) and (61), we obtain

$$(b_m^{tt})^\mu{}_\nu (\sigma_0)_\mu + (b_m^{tn})_\nu = \mathcal{O}_{|m|}, \quad (89)$$

$$(b_m^{nt})^\mu (\sigma_0)_\mu + b_m^{nn} = \mathcal{O}_{|m|}. \quad (90)$$

Using Equations (54)–(57), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}_{|m|} = & \frac{i(-1)^{|m|+1}}{2^{|m|}|\xi|^{|m|}} \omega_\alpha \omega_\beta \omega_\mu \left( g^{\alpha\beta} \partial_n^{|m|} \Gamma_{n\nu}^\mu + g^{\alpha\beta} g^{\mu\gamma} \partial_n^{|m|} \Gamma_{\nu\gamma}^n + g^{\alpha\beta} \partial_n^{|m|} \Gamma_{n\nu}^\mu + \frac{1}{2} g^{\alpha\beta} \delta_\nu^\mu \partial_n^{|m|} \mathcal{D} \right. \\ & \left. - \frac{1}{4} \delta_\nu^\mu \partial_n^{|m|+1} g^{\alpha\beta} + g^{\alpha\gamma} g^{\beta\mu} \partial_n^{|m|} \Gamma_{\gamma\nu}^n \right) + \mathcal{O}_{|m|}, \end{aligned} \quad (91)$$

$$\mathcal{O}_{|m|} = \frac{(-1)^{|m|+1}}{2^{|m|}|\xi|^{|m|}} \omega_\alpha \omega_\beta \left( -g^{\alpha\beta} \partial_n^{|m|} \Gamma_{n\gamma}^\gamma + \frac{1}{2} g^{\alpha\beta} \partial_n^{|m|} \mathcal{D} - \frac{1}{4} \partial_n^{|m|+1} g^{\alpha\beta} - g^{\alpha\gamma} \partial_n^{|m|} \Gamma_{\gamma n}^\beta \right) + \mathcal{O}_{|m|}. \quad (92)$$

Contracting the coefficient of Equation (92) with  $g_{\alpha\beta}$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}_{|m|} &= 4\partial_n^{|m|} \mathcal{D} - \frac{1}{4} g_{\alpha\beta} \partial_n^{|m|+1} g^{\alpha\beta} \\ &= 4\partial_n^{|m|} \mathcal{D} - \frac{1}{4} \partial_n^{|m|} \left( g_{\alpha\beta} \partial_n g^{\alpha\beta} \right) + \mathcal{O}_{|m|}, \end{aligned} \quad (93)$$

and so we are left with  $\partial_n^{|m|} \mathcal{D} = \mathcal{O}_{|m|}$ . Equation (92) then reduces to

$$-\frac{1}{4} \partial_n^{|m|+1} g^{\alpha\beta} - g^{\alpha\gamma} \partial_n^{|m|} \Gamma_{\gamma n}^\beta = \mathcal{O}_{|m|}, \quad (94)$$

while after taking a trace over  $(\mu\nu)$ , Equation (89) reduces to

$$-\frac{1}{2} \partial_n^{|m|+1} g^{\alpha\beta} + g^{\alpha\gamma} g^{\beta\mu} \partial_n^{|m|} \Gamma_{\gamma\mu}^n = \mathcal{O}_{|m|}. \quad (95)$$

As before, we can add subtract Equations (94) and (95) to obtain

$$\partial_n^{|m|+1} g^{\alpha\beta} = \mathcal{O}_{|m|}.$$

This completes the inductive step, and thus also the proof that the symbol of  $\Sigma$  determines the normal derivatives of  $g$  at the boundary.  $\square$

*Remark 2.6.* Following up on Remark 1.5, we note that the above proof is easily adapted to the case of harmonic fields, for which  $\lambda = 0$  and the divergence-free equation is prescribed, rather than a consequence of the Beltrami field equation. Indeed, despite the presence of  $\lambda^{-1}$  in the second line

of Equation (29), that line is easily seen to follow from  $d^*u = 0$ ; therefore  $\lambda^{-1}$  may be eliminated and the Beltrami field equation is in fact not needed there. The rest of the proof then applies with minimal changes to the case of the normal-to-tangential map for Harmonic fields.

### 3 Recovering a real-analytic simply connected manifold from the Beltrami normal-to-tangential map

In this section, we shall recover a compact simply connected real-analytic Riemannian 3-manifold with boundary from its Beltrami normal-to-tangential map, thus proving Theorem B. For this section, we shall assume that  $(M_1, g_1)$  and  $(M_2, g_2)$  are two such manifolds, whose boundaries are identified, and that their corresponding Beltrami normal-to-tangential maps  $\Sigma_1$  and  $\Sigma_2$  are equal. As the boundaries are identified, we will sometimes denote  $\partial M_1$  and  $\partial M_2$  simply by  $\partial M$ .

By Theorem 2.5, the Taylor series of the real-analytic metrics  $g_1$  and  $g_2$  are equal on  $\partial M$ . Therefore, by attaching  $\partial M \times [-\delta_0, 0]$  to  $M_i$  along the boundary  $\partial M$  as in , we can extend the manifold  $M_i$  and the metric  $g_i$  to a larger real-analytic Riemannian manifold with boundary  $(\tilde{M}_i, \tilde{g}_i)$  such that  $\tilde{M}_1 \setminus M_1$  is identified with  $\tilde{M}_2 \setminus M_2$ , and the extended metrics  $\tilde{g}_1$  and  $\tilde{g}_2$  agree in that region. We shall assume this setup for the remainder of the paper.

#### 3.1 The $b$ -fields

To this end, drawing on the idea pursued in [LTU03] and [KLU11], we shall define an appropriate analogue of Green's forms for the boundary value problem (5), which depend analytically on a set of parameters, and which shall be used to embed our manifold into a suitable Sobolev space. Since any inhomogeneous term in the boundary value problem (5) must be divergence-free in order to guarantee the existence of solutions, we cannot simply solve the problem with delta functions, and so there does not exist a Green's functions for the Beltrami problem. In lieu of delta functions, therefore, we use small "loop sources", which we define momentarily. We call the corresponding solutions  $b$ -fields, as in the case where  $\lambda = 0$ , these correspond to magnetic fields arising from small loops of current. The parameters that these electric current loops, and hence the  $b$ -fields, depend on are therefore the location and orientation of the loops.

Let  $S\tilde{M}_i$  denote the sphere bundle of  $\tilde{M}_i$ ,

$$S\tilde{M}_i := \{\omega \in T\tilde{M}_i \mid |\omega| = 1\},$$

and let  $\pi : S\tilde{M}_i \rightarrow \tilde{M}_i$  be the canonical projection. For  $\varepsilon > 0$ , let

$$\tilde{M}_i^\varepsilon := \{x \in \tilde{M}_i \mid d(x, \partial\tilde{M}_i) \geq \varepsilon\}.$$

For any  $\omega \in S\tilde{M}_i^\varepsilon$  and  $0 < \delta < \varepsilon$ , we define the distributional current loop  $J_{\omega, \delta}^i$  generated by  $\omega$  with radius  $\delta$  as follows. Let  $\alpha_{\omega, \delta} : [0, 2\pi] \rightarrow T_{\pi(\omega)}\tilde{M}_i$  parametrize an oriented circle of radius  $\delta$  in the plane orthogonal to  $\omega$ . That is, if  $(e_1, e_2, \omega)$  form an oriented orthonormal basis for  $T_{\pi(\omega)}\tilde{M}_i$ , then

$$\alpha_{\omega, \delta}(t) := \delta((\cos t)e_1 + (\sin t)e_2).$$

Let  $\gamma_{\omega,\delta} : [0, 2\pi] \rightarrow \tilde{M}_i$  be the curve obtained by mapping  $\alpha_{\omega,\delta}$  into  $\tilde{M}_i$  via the exponential map,

$$\gamma_{\omega,\delta}(t) := \exp_{\pi(\omega)}(\alpha_{\omega,\delta}(t)).$$

We then define the distributional current loop  $J_{\omega,\delta}^i$  by its action on a smooth 1-form  $A$ ,

$$J_{\omega,\delta}^i(A) := \int_{\gamma_{\omega,\delta}} \gamma_{\omega,\delta}^* A. \quad (96)$$

We note the following properties of  $J_{\omega,\delta}^i$ . First, it does not depend on the orthonormal basis  $(e_1, e_2, \omega)$ . Second,  $J_{\omega,\delta}^i$  is a distributional vector field with support and singular support on the image of  $\gamma_{\omega,\delta}$ , which we shall also denote by  $\ell(\omega, \delta)$ . Third, the current loop  $J_{\omega,\delta}^i$  is divergence-free in the sense of distributions. And finally, as one can easily verify using equation (96), we have  $J_{\omega,\delta} \in H^s$  for  $s < -\frac{3}{2}$ , and the map  $(\omega, \delta) \mapsto J_{\omega,\delta}$  is  $C^1$  into  $H^{s'}$  for  $s' < -\frac{3}{2} - 1$ .

The existence theory for Beltrami fields given in [EPS15] generalizes to divergence-free distributions and allows us to solve the following boundary value problem, so long as  $\lambda$  is not a Beltrami singular value of  $\tilde{M}_i$ , which we can arrange in the construction of the extended manifolds  $\tilde{M}_i$  since  $\lambda$  is not a Beltrami singular value of  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  by assumption. We thus solve

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{curl}_{g_i} b_{\omega,\delta}^i - \lambda b_{\omega,\delta}^i = J_{\omega,\delta}^i \text{ in } \tilde{M}_i \\ \tilde{\nu} \cdot b_{\omega,\delta}^i|_{\partial\tilde{M}} = 0, \\ \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{M}_i}^t(b_{\omega,\delta}^i) = 0, \end{cases} \quad (97)$$

for any  $\omega \in SM_i^\varepsilon$  and  $0 < \delta < \varepsilon$ . Note that since  $M_i$  is simply connected, we can arrange that  $\tilde{M}_i$  be simply connected also, in which case the condition that the harmonic part be zero becomes superfluous. We will henceforth assume this is the case.

We note that by elliptic regularity,  $b_{\omega,\delta}^i$  has singular support equal to that of  $J_{\omega,\delta}$ , namely the circle  $\ell(\omega, \delta)$  of radius  $\delta$  generated by  $\omega$ . We also note that  $b_{\omega,\delta}^i(x)$  is real-analytic in  $x$  up to the boundary of  $\tilde{M}_i$  [ELPS23, Appendix A], and in the parameters  $(\omega, \delta)$ , whenever  $x$  is away from the singular set  $\ell(\omega, \delta)$ . We also mention here a useful representation of the  $b$ -fields in terms of an integral kernel. To this end, we refer to [EGPS18], where an integral kernel for the curl operator on a manifold with boundary is constructed, and note that the methods applied therein may be straightforwardly generalized to the case of the Beltrami operator where  $\lambda$  is non-zero. We thus obtain the following extension of [EGPS18, Theorem 1.1]:

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $(M, g)$  be as above. There exists an integral kernel  $K_\lambda(x, y) \in \operatorname{End}(T_y M, T_x M)$  that is smooth outside the diagonal and satisfies*

$$|K_\lambda(x, y)| \leq \frac{C(y)}{d(x, y)^2}, \quad (98)$$

where  $C(y)$  depends only on the distance from  $y$  to the boundary, such that for any  $H^k$  divergence-



free vector field  $v$  on  $M$ , the unique solution  $u$  to the boundary value problem

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{curl}_g u - \lambda u = v \text{ in } M, \\ \nu \cdot u|_{\partial M} = 0, \\ \mathcal{H}_M^t(u) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (99)$$

can be represented as an integral of the form

$$u(x) = \int_M K_\lambda(x, y)v(y) dy.$$

*Remark 3.2.* As observed in [EGPS18], while Theorem 3.1 yields the existence of an integral kernel with the above properties, this kernel is easily seen to be non-unique. The solution to the boundary value problem (99), however, is unique.

With the integral kernel of Theorem 3.1, the  $b$ -fields defined above as the solutions to (97) can then be represented distributionally as

$$b_{\omega, \delta}^i(x) := \int_{\gamma_{\omega, \delta}} K_\lambda(x, \gamma_{\omega, \delta}(t)) \gamma'_{\omega, \delta}(t) dt, \quad (100)$$

as one can easily verify. We can now use the representation (100) to deduce the following result, which shows that like the Green's functions for the Laplacian, the  $b$ -fields have a simple asymptotic form near singularities:

**Proposition 3.3.** *As  $x \rightarrow \ell(\omega, \delta)$ , the  $b$ -fields have the asymptotic behaviour*

$$|b_{\omega, \delta}^i(x)| \sim \frac{C}{d(x, \ell(\omega, \delta))}. \quad (101)$$

*In particular, the  $b$ -fields are  $L^1_{\text{loc}}$ .*

*Proof.* We have (100) for  $x \notin \ell(\omega, \delta)$ . So, choosing a coordinate  $t$  along  $\gamma_{\omega, \delta}$  centred on the point closest to  $x$ , we have, by the asymptotics (98),

$$\begin{aligned} |b_{\omega, \delta}^i(x)| &\leq \int_{\gamma_{\omega, \delta}} |K_\lambda(x, \gamma_{\omega, \delta}(t))| dt \\ &\leq \int_{\gamma_{\omega, \delta}} \frac{C_0}{d(x, \gamma_{\omega, \delta}(t))^2} dt \\ &\leq C_1 + \int_{-\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \frac{C_2}{d(x, \ell(\omega, \delta))^2 + t^2} dt \\ &\leq \frac{C}{d(x, \ell(\omega, \delta))}, \end{aligned} \quad (102)$$

yielding the desired asymptotics (101). □

Having established the relevant properties of the  $b$ -fields, we now want to show, as in [KLU11, Lemma 3.4], that the Beltrami normal-to-tangential map determines the  $b$ -field in the outer region of the extended manifold where the two metrics were constructed to agree, which shall be an

important result in the next section. Thus, as above, fix  $\delta > 0$  such that  $\delta < \varepsilon$ , let  $U := \tilde{M}_i^\varepsilon \setminus M_i$ , and let  $U_\delta := \{p \in U \mid d(p, \partial M_i) > \delta\}$ . We have the following result:

**Proposition 3.4.** *We have  $b_{\omega, \delta}^1(x) = b_{\omega, \delta}^2(x)$  for all  $(x, \omega) \in U \times SU_\delta$  such that  $x \notin \ell(\omega, \delta)$ .*

*Proof.* Fix  $\omega \in SU_\delta$ , and let  $\beta$  be the unique vector field on  $M_2$  solving the boundary value problem

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{curl}_{g_2} \beta - \lambda \beta = 0, \\ \nu \cdot \beta|_{\partial M} = \nu \cdot b_\omega^1|_{\partial M}, \\ \mathcal{H}_{M_2}^t(\beta) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Note that since  $M_i$  is simply connected, (97) implies that  $b_{\omega, \delta}^1$  is the unique solution  $\gamma$  to

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{curl}_{g_1} \gamma - \lambda \gamma = 0, \\ \nu \cdot \gamma|_{\partial M} = \nu \cdot b_{\omega, \delta}^1|_{\partial M}, \\ \mathcal{H}_{M_1}^t(\gamma) = 0, \end{cases} \quad (103)$$

inside  $M_1$ . Therefore, since  $\Sigma_1 = \Sigma_2$ , we have

$$(\beta|_{\partial M})^t = \Sigma_2(\nu \cdot \beta|_{\partial M}) = \Sigma_2(\nu \cdot b_{\omega, \delta}^1|_{\partial M}) = \Sigma_1(\nu \cdot b_{\omega, \delta}^1|_{\partial M}) = (b_{\omega, \delta}^1|_{\partial M})^t,$$

so that in fact, we have  $\beta|_{\partial M} = b_{\omega, \delta}^1|_{\partial M}$ . We may thus define a vector field  $\tilde{\beta}$  on  $\tilde{M}_2$  by

$$\tilde{\beta} := \begin{cases} \beta & \text{in } M_2, \\ b_{\omega, \delta}^1 & \text{in } U, \end{cases}$$

which by construction satisfies the boundary value problem

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{curl}_{g_2} \tilde{\beta} - \lambda \tilde{\beta} = J_{\omega, \delta}^2, \\ \nu \cdot \tilde{\beta}|_{\partial \tilde{M}} = 0, \\ \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{M}_2}^t(\tilde{\beta}) = 0, \end{cases} \quad (104)$$

since the extended metrics  $\tilde{g}_1$  and  $\tilde{g}_2$  agree in  $U$ . Therefore, by the uniqueness of solutions to (104), it follows that  $\tilde{\beta} = b_{\omega, \delta}^2$  in  $\tilde{M}_2$ . In particular, we have that  $b_{\omega, \delta}^2$  coincides with  $b_{\omega, \delta}^1$  in  $U$ .  $\square$

*Remark 3.5.* Note that if  $\tilde{M}_1$  is not simply connected, then the vanishing of the harmonic part of  $b_{\omega, \delta}^1$  on  $\tilde{M}_1$  does not guarantee the vanishing of its harmonic part when restricted to  $M_1$ , and so we cannot conclude that  $b_{\omega, \delta}^1$  is the unique solution to (103) in that case. Similarly, if  $M_2$  is not simply connected, then the vanishing of  $\mathcal{H}_{M_2}^t(\beta)$  does not guarantee the vanishing of  $\mathcal{H}_{\tilde{M}_2}^t(\tilde{\beta})$ , and so we would not be able to conclude that  $\tilde{b}$  coincides with  $b_{\omega, \delta}^2$ . One sees therefore why we need the manifolds to be simply connected in order to match the Cauchy data, and conclude that the Beltrami normal-to-tangential map determines the  $b$ -fields in the extended region.

### 3.2 Embedding $\tilde{M}_i^\varepsilon$ into a Sobolev space and constructing the isometry

Having established the necessary properties of the  $b$ -fields, we now proceed with the approach given in [KLU11], using the  $b$ -fields in lieu of the Green's forms and emphasizing the necessary adaptations. For the remainder of this paper, we shall fix a loop radius  $\delta > 0$  with  $\delta < \varepsilon$  as above, and henceforth omit the dependence on  $\delta$  in our notation.

We begin by choosing an open set  $\tilde{U} \subset\subset U_\delta$ . For some fixed  $s < -\frac{3}{2}$ , we can define the maps

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_i : S\tilde{M}_i^\varepsilon &\rightarrow H^s(\tilde{U}, T\tilde{U}) \\ \omega &\mapsto b_\omega^i|_{\tilde{U}}. \end{aligned} \tag{105}$$

We will eventually show that  $\mathcal{B}_1$  and  $\mathcal{B}_2$  are embeddings with the same image. This will imply that  $S\tilde{M}_1^\varepsilon$  is isometric to  $S\tilde{M}_2^\varepsilon$ , from which the isometry of  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  shall follow. We have

**Proposition 3.6.** *For  $s < -\frac{3}{2}$ , the map  $\mathcal{B}_i$  is a  $C^1$ -map into  $H^s(\tilde{U}, T\tilde{U})$ .*

*Proof.* We want to show that the map  $\omega \mapsto b_\omega^i$  is  $C^1$  into  $H^s$ . To this end, note that by (97) the derivatives of the  $b$ -fields with respect to  $\omega$  satisfy the boundary value problem

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{curl}_{g_i}(\partial_\omega b_\omega^i) - \lambda(\partial_\omega b_\omega^i) = \partial_\omega J_\omega^i & \text{in } \tilde{M}_i \\ \tilde{\nu} \cdot (\partial_\omega b_\omega^i)|_{\partial\tilde{M}} = 0. \end{cases} \tag{106}$$

Since  $\partial_\omega J_\omega^i$  is easily seen to be in  $H^{s'}$  for  $s' < -\frac{5}{2}$ , it follows by elliptic regularity that  $\partial_\omega b_\omega^i \in H^s$  for  $s < -\frac{3}{2}$ . Since  $\partial_\omega J_\omega^i$  depends continuously on  $\omega$ , so does  $\partial_\omega b_\omega^i$ .  $\square$

Next we prove

**Proposition 3.7.** *The map  $\mathcal{B}_i$  is an embedding, and is real-analytic on  $\tilde{M}_i^\varepsilon \setminus V$ , where  $V$  is adequately chosen and satisfies  $\tilde{U} \subset\subset V \subset\subset U_\delta$ .*

*Proof.* The analyticity of  $\mathcal{B}_i$  away from  $\tilde{U}$  follows from the analyticity of the  $b$ -fields away from singularities. Now, since  $S\tilde{M}_i^\varepsilon$  is compact, to prove that  $\mathcal{B}_i$  is an embedding it suffices to show that it is an injective immersion. We first show that  $\mathcal{B}_i$  is injective. Indeed, suppose that  $\mathcal{B}_i(\omega) = \mathcal{B}_i(\omega')$  for  $\omega \neq \omega'$ . Then we have  $b_\omega^i(x) = b_{\omega'}^i(x)$  for all  $x \in \tilde{U}$  away from singularities. But by analyticity, this must hold for all  $x \in \tilde{M}_i^\varepsilon \setminus (\ell(\omega) \cup \ell(\omega'))$ . If the singular circles  $\ell(\omega)$  and  $\ell(\omega')$  are not equal, then this contradicts the asymptotics of the  $b$ -fields. Therefore  $\ell(\omega) = \ell(\omega')$ , from which it easily follows that we must have  $\omega = \omega'$ . Hence,  $\mathcal{B}_i$  is injective.

To show that  $\mathcal{B}_i$  is an immersion, suppose there exists  $\omega_0 \in S\tilde{M}_i^\varepsilon$  for which  $D\mathcal{B}_i(\omega_0)$  is not injective. That is, there exists  $v \in T_{\omega_0}S\tilde{M}_i^\varepsilon$  such that

$$0 = (D\mathcal{B}_i)_{\omega_0} v = v^k \partial_{\omega^k} b_\omega|_{\omega_0}$$

in local coordinates about  $\omega_0$ . But this would imply that

$$0 = v^k \partial_{\omega^k} b_\omega|_{\omega_0}(x)$$

for all  $x \in \tilde{U} \setminus \ell(\omega_0)$ . By real-analyticity, this would hold for all  $x \in \tilde{M}_i^\varepsilon \setminus \ell(\omega_0)$ , contradicting the asymptotics as  $x \mapsto \ell(\omega_0)$ . Thus,  $\mathcal{B}_i$  is an injective immersion, hence an embedding.  $\square$

We are now ready to prove the main result of this section (c.f. [KLU11, Theorem 3.7]), from which Theorem B will follow:

**Theorem 3.8.** *Suppose that the  $b$ -fields satisfy*

$$b_\omega^1(x) = b_\omega^2(x)$$

for all  $(x, \omega) \in U \times SU_\delta$  such that  $x \notin \ell(\omega, \delta)$ . Then

$$\mathcal{B}_1(S\tilde{M}_1^\varepsilon) = \mathcal{B}_2(S\tilde{M}_2^\varepsilon) \subseteq H^s(\tilde{U}, T\tilde{U}),$$

and  $\mathcal{B}_2^{-1}\mathcal{B}_1 : S\tilde{M}_1^\varepsilon \rightarrow S\tilde{M}_2^\varepsilon$  is an isometry.

*Proof.* To prove this, following [KLU11], we introduce the following sets for a small  $\epsilon_0 > 0$ :

$$N(\epsilon_0) = \{x \in \tilde{M}_1^\varepsilon : d(x, \partial\tilde{M}_1^\varepsilon) \leq \epsilon_0\},$$

$$C(\epsilon_0) = \{x \in \tilde{M}_1^\varepsilon : d(x, \partial\tilde{M}_1^\varepsilon) > \epsilon_0\},$$

and we can further assume that  $C(\epsilon_0)$  is connected. Let us then take some  $\omega_0 \in SC(\epsilon_0)$ , and let  $V_1 \subseteq SC(\epsilon_0)$  be the largest open set containing  $\omega_0$  such that  $\mathcal{B}_1(\omega) \in \mathcal{B}_2(S\tilde{M}_2^\varepsilon)$  for all  $\omega \in V_1$ . We know that  $V_1$  is non-empty because the  $b$ -fields agree in  $U \times SU_\delta$ . Since  $\mathcal{B}_2$  is injective by Proposition 3.7, we can define the map

$$\hat{\Phi} = \mathcal{B}_2^{-1}\mathcal{B}_1 : V_1 \rightarrow S\tilde{M}_2^\varepsilon.$$

Let  $D_1 \subseteq V_1$  be the largest connected open set such that  $\hat{\Phi}$  is a real-analytic local diffeomorphism and local isometry on  $D_1$ . As in [KLU11], we want to show that  $SN(\epsilon_0) \cup D_1 = S\tilde{M}_1^\varepsilon$  by contradiction. Thus, let  $\omega_1$  be the point in  $S\tilde{M}_1^\varepsilon \setminus (SN(\epsilon_0) \cup D_1)$  closest to  $\omega_0$ , so that  $\omega_1 \in \partial D_1$ . We now want to prove the following analogue of [KLU11, Lemma 3.8]:

**Lemma 3.9.** *There exist  $\omega_2$  in the interior of  $S\tilde{M}_2^\varepsilon$  such that*

$$\mathcal{B}_2(\omega_2) = \mathcal{B}_1(\omega_1) \in H^s(\tilde{U}, T\tilde{U}),$$

and a sequence  $(\omega_j) \subseteq D_1$  such that  $\omega_j \rightarrow \omega_1$  and  $\hat{\Phi}(\omega_j) \rightarrow \omega_2$ .

*Proof.* Since  $\omega_1 \in \partial D_1$ , we can take any sequence  $(\omega_j) \subseteq D_1$  such that  $\omega_j \rightarrow \omega_1$ . Since  $\hat{\Phi}$  is a local isometry on  $D_1$ , there is a sequence  $(\xi_j) \subseteq S\tilde{M}_2^\varepsilon$  such that  $\mathcal{B}_1(\omega_j) = \mathcal{B}_2(\xi_j)$ . By compactness,  $(\xi_j)$  has a convergent subsequence. If it has a convergent subsequence that converges to a point in the interior of  $S\tilde{M}_2^\varepsilon$ , then we are done. So let us suppose that every convergent subsequence of  $(\xi_j)$  converges to a point  $\xi_0 \in \partial S\tilde{M}_2^\varepsilon$ . We then would have, for fixed  $y \in \tilde{U}$ ,

$$\mathcal{B}_1(\omega_j)(y) = \mathcal{B}_2(\xi_j)(y) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_2(\xi_0)(y) = b_{\xi_0}^2(y).$$

On the other hand,

$$\mathcal{B}_1(\omega_j)(y) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_1(\omega_1)(y) = b_{\omega_1}^1(y).$$

Since  $\xi_0$  is on the boundary of  $S\tilde{M}_2^\varepsilon$ , Proposition 3.4 and the above yield

$$b_{\omega_1}^1(y) = b_{\xi_0}^2(y) = b_{\xi_0}^1(y). \quad (107)$$

This is true for any  $y \in \tilde{U}$  away from singularities, and so therefore, by analytic continuation, it must hold everywhere. But  $\omega_1$  is in the interior of  $S\tilde{M}_1^\varepsilon$ , while  $\xi_0$  is on the boundary. This contradicts the asymptotics of the  $b$ -fields. Therefore,  $(\xi_j)$  has a convergent subsequence that converges to an interior point  $\omega_2$  of  $S\tilde{M}_2^\varepsilon$ , which proves the lemma.  $\square$

Now we assume that  $\tilde{U} \subset\subset U_\delta$  is chosen so that  $\mathcal{B}_i$  is an analytic embedding in a neighbourhood of  $\omega_i$ , for  $i = 1, 2$ . We also have  $S\tilde{U} \subseteq D_1$ .

**Lemma 3.10.** *We have*

$$D\mathcal{B}_1(\omega_1)(T_{\omega_1}S\tilde{M}_1^\varepsilon) = D\mathcal{B}_2(\omega_2)(T_{\omega_2}S\tilde{M}_2^\varepsilon) \subseteq H^s(\tilde{U}, T\tilde{U}).$$

*Proof.* By Lemma 3.9, there is a sequence  $(\omega_j) \subseteq D_1$  with  $\omega_j \rightarrow \omega_1$  and  $\hat{\Phi}(\omega_j) \rightarrow \omega_2$ . By definition of  $D_1$ , the maps  $\mathcal{B}_1$  and  $\mathcal{B}_2 \circ \hat{\Phi}$  coincide on  $D_1$ . Hence, so do their derivatives. Therefore,

$$D\mathcal{B}_1(\omega_j)(T_{\omega_j}S\tilde{M}_1^\varepsilon) = D\mathcal{B}_2(\hat{\Phi}(\omega_j))(T_{\hat{\Phi}(\omega_j)}S\tilde{M}_2^\varepsilon).$$

By the choice of  $s$ , the derivatives  $D\mathcal{B}_i$  are continuous on  $S\tilde{M}_i^\varepsilon$ . The result follows.  $\square$

Let us now set

$$\mathcal{V} := D\mathcal{B}_1(\omega_1)(T_{\omega_1}S\tilde{M}_1^\varepsilon) = D\mathcal{B}_2(\omega_2)(T_{\omega_2}S\tilde{M}_2^\varepsilon) \subseteq H^s(\tilde{U}, T\tilde{U}).$$

Since  $D\mathcal{B}_i$  is injective, we have that  $\dim \mathcal{V} \cong \dim T_{\omega_i}S\tilde{M}_i^\varepsilon = 5$ . Let  $P : H^s(\tilde{U}, T\tilde{U}) \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$  be the orthogonal projection onto  $\mathcal{V}$ . Then

$$D(P\mathcal{B}_j)(\omega_j) = P(D\mathcal{B}_j)(\omega_j) = D\mathcal{B}_j(\omega_j),$$

which is bijective onto  $\mathcal{V}$ . So by the inverse function theorem,

$$P\mathcal{B}_i : \mathcal{N}(\omega_i, S\tilde{M}_i^\varepsilon) \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(Pu, \mathcal{V}),$$

is a real-analytic diffeomorphism, where  $\mathcal{N}(p, W)$  denotes a neighbourhood of  $p$  in  $W$ . Now, by decomposing  $H^s(\tilde{U}, T\tilde{U}) = \text{Im } P \oplus \text{Im}(1 - P)$ , it is easy to see that the sets

$$\{\mathcal{B}_i(\omega) \mid \omega \in \mathcal{N}(\omega_i, S\tilde{M}_i^\varepsilon)\}$$

are the graphs of the real-analytic functions

$$(1 - P)\mathcal{B}_i(P\mathcal{B}_i)^{-1} : \mathcal{N}(Pu, \mathcal{V}) \rightarrow \text{Im}(1 - P). \quad (108)$$

Moreover, using Lemma 3.9, the fact that  $\hat{\Phi}$  is a local isometry on  $D_1$ , and the real-analyticity of

the functions (108), one easily establishes that

$$(1 - P)\mathcal{B}_1(P\mathcal{B}_1)^{-1}(v) = (1 - P)\mathcal{B}_2(P\mathcal{B}_2)^{-1}(v) \quad (109)$$

holds for all  $v \in \mathcal{N}(Pu, \mathcal{V})$ .

We are now ready to prove that  $\omega_1$  is an interior point of  $D_1$ . We will do this by showing that for every  $\tilde{\omega}_1 \in \mathcal{N}(\omega_1, S\tilde{M}_1^\varepsilon)$ , there exists a unique  $\tilde{\omega}_2 \in \mathcal{N}(\omega_2, S\tilde{M}_2^\varepsilon)$  such that

$$\mathcal{B}_1(\tilde{\omega}_1) = \mathcal{B}_2(\tilde{\omega}_2). \quad (110)$$

Indeed, note that we may take  $\tilde{\omega}_2 = (P\mathcal{B}_2)^{-1}(P\mathcal{B}_1)(\tilde{\omega}_1)$ . Then  $P\mathcal{B}_1(\tilde{\omega}_1) = P\mathcal{B}_2(\tilde{\omega}_2)$  holds by definition, while equation (109) implies

$$(1 - P)\mathcal{B}_1(\tilde{\omega}_1) = (1 - P)\mathcal{B}_2(\tilde{\omega}_2).$$

Therefore (110) holds, and so the map  $\hat{\Phi} = \mathcal{B}_2^{-1}\mathcal{B}_1$  is real-analytic in  $\mathcal{N}(\omega_1, S\tilde{M}_1^\varepsilon)$ . Hence,

$$\hat{\Phi} : D_1 \cup \mathcal{N}(\omega_1, S\tilde{M}_1^\varepsilon) \rightarrow S\tilde{M}_2^\varepsilon$$

is real-analytic. Since  $\hat{\Phi}$  is a local isometry on  $S\tilde{U}$ , it follows by analytic continuation that it is a local isometry everywhere on  $D_1 \cup \mathcal{N}(\omega_1, S\tilde{M}_1^\varepsilon)$ . But this means that  $\omega_1$  is an interior point of  $D_1$ , contradicting the definition of  $\omega_1$ . Therefore, we must indeed have that  $SN(\epsilon_0) \cup D_1 = S\tilde{M}_1^\varepsilon$ , as desired. In particular, as we can make  $\epsilon_0$  arbitrarily small, it follows that  $\mathcal{B}_1(S\tilde{M}_1^\varepsilon) = \mathcal{B}_2(S\tilde{M}_2^\varepsilon)$ . Therefore, we have a real-analytic bijection  $\hat{\Phi} : S\tilde{M}_1^\varepsilon \rightarrow S\tilde{M}_2^\varepsilon$ , which is a local isometry everywhere. Hence it is an isometry. This complete the proof of Theorem 3.8.  $\square$

Unlike the argument used in [KLU11], we still have to show that the the isometry  $\hat{\Phi} : S\tilde{M}_1^\varepsilon \rightarrow S\tilde{M}_2^\varepsilon$  descends to an isometry of the underlying base manifolds. To this end, first note that  $\hat{\Phi}$  is fiber-preserving on  $\tilde{U}$ . That is, on  $\tilde{U}$ , it takes the form

$$\hat{\Phi}(x, \omega) = (\phi(x), \tilde{\Phi}(x, \omega)),$$

where  $\phi : \tilde{U} \rightarrow \tilde{U}$  is the real-analytic isometry that identifies  $(\tilde{U}, g_1)$  and  $(\tilde{U}, g_2)$ . We have previously identified these two sets implicitly and taken  $\phi$  to be the identity, but here we make the identifying map explicit. So, if  $\pi_i : S\tilde{M}_i \rightarrow \tilde{M}_i$  are the canonical projections, then we have

$$(\pi_2 \circ \hat{\Phi})|_{\tilde{U}} = \phi \circ \pi_1.$$

The real-analyticity of  $\hat{\Phi}$  means that  $\pi_2 \circ \hat{\Phi}$  will be constant along fibres everywhere on  $S\tilde{M}_2^\varepsilon$ , and therefore there is a well-defined real-analytic map  $\Phi : \tilde{M}_1^\varepsilon \rightarrow \tilde{M}_2^\varepsilon$  such that

$$\pi_2 \circ \hat{\Phi} = \Phi \circ \pi_1$$

everywhere on  $\tilde{M}_1^\varepsilon$ , with  $\Phi|_{\tilde{U}} = \phi$ . That  $\Phi$  is real-analytic, bijective and an isometry immediately follows from the corresponding properties of  $\hat{\Phi}$ . This proves Theorem B.

*Remark 3.11.* We can now appreciate why working with the Beltrami field equation poses a difficulty in extending the above proof of Theorem B to the case of local data. In fact, the difficulty seems to lie entirely with the proof of the important but technical Lemma 3.9. In the case of local data for the Hodge Laplacian, the analogue result [KLU11, Lemma 3.8] is proven using the vanishing of the Green’s form on the boundary of the extended manifold, in conjunction with analytic continuation. The boundary values of the  $b$ -fields, however, do not appear in our proof of Theorem B. This is for two main reasons: first, because the  $b$ -fields are generated by interior loops of radius less than  $\varepsilon$  as opposed to point singularities, we do not reconstruct the initial extended manifold  $\tilde{M}_i$  on which the  $b$ -fields are defined, but rather the slightly smaller manifold  $\tilde{M}_i^\varepsilon$ . Moreover, in the case of local data, it is the point  $\xi_0$  appearing in Equation (107) that lies on the boundary of  $S\tilde{M}_2^\varepsilon$ , rather than the evaluation point  $y$ ; we have no way, therefore, of incorporating information about the boundary data of the  $b$ -fields into the proof. Indeed, our proof of Lemma 3.9 relies instead on the  $b$ -fields agreeing *everywhere* in a neighbourhood of the boundary of  $\tilde{M}_i^\varepsilon$ .

## Acknowledgements

This work has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme through the grant agreement 862342. The authors are also partially supported by the grants CEX2023-001347-S, RED2022-134301-T and PID2022-136795NB-I00.

## References

- [ALP05] K. Astala, M. Lassas, and L. Päivärinta. Calderón’s inverse problem for anisotropic conductivities in the plane. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 30:207–224, 2005.
- [ALP16] K. Astala, M. Lassas, and L. Päivärinta. The borderlines of invisibility and visibility in Calderón’s inverse problem. *Anal. PDE*, 9(1):43–98, 2016.
- [AP06] K. Astala and L. Päivärinta. Calderón’s inverse conductivity problem in the plane. *Annals of Mathematics*, 163:265–299, 2006.
- [Arn66] V. I. Arnold. Sur la géométrie différentielle des groupes de Lie de dimension infinie et ses applications à l’hydrodynamique des fluides parfaits. *Annales de l’Institut Fourier*, 16:319–361, 1966.
- [BS08] Mikhail Belishev and Vladimir Sharafutdinov. Dirichlet to Neumann operator on differential forms. *Bulletin des sciences mathématiques*, 132(2):128–145, 2008.
- [Cal80] Alberto P Calderón. On an inverse boundary value problem. *Seminar on Numerical Analysis and its Applications to Continuum Physics, Soc. Brasileira de Matemática, Rio de Janeiro*, pages 65–73, 1980.
- [CDGM06] Sylvain Cappell, Dennis DeTurck, Herman Gluck, and Edward Y Miller. Cohomology of harmonic forms on Riemannian manifolds with boundary. *Forum Mathematicum*, 18(6):923–931, 2006.

- [CMPSP23] Robert Cardona, Eva Miranda, Daniel Peralta-Salas, and Francisco Presas. Reeb embeddings and universality of Euler flows. *Advances in Mathematics*, 428:109142, 2023.
- [CR16] P. Caro and K. M. Rogers. Global uniqueness for the Calderón problem with Lipschitz conductivities. *Forum Math. Pi*, 4:e2, 28 pages, 2016.
- [DHKN24] T. Daudé, B. Helffer, N. Kamran, and F. Nicoleau. Global counterexamples to uniqueness for a Calderón problem with  $C^k$  conductivities. [arXiv:2406.14063](https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.14063), 2024.
- [DKN18] Thierry Daudé, Niky Kamran, and François Nicoleau. A survey of non-uniqueness results for the anisotropic Calderón problem with disjoint data. In: *Nonlinear Analysis in Geometry and Applied Mathematics*, International Press, Boston, 2018.
- [DKN19] Thierry Daudé, Niky Kamran, and François Nicoleau. On the hidden mechanism behind non-uniqueness for the anisotropic Calderón problem with data on disjoint sets. *Annales Henri Poincaré*, 20(3):859–887, 2019.
- [DKN20] Thierry Daudé, Niky Kamran, and François Nicoleau. On nonuniqueness for the anisotropic Calderón problem with partial data. *Forum of Mathematics, Sigma*, 8:e7, 2020.
- [DKN21] Thierry Daudé, Niky Kamran, and François Nicoleau. The anisotropic Calderón problem on 3-dimensional conformally stäckel manifolds. *Journal of Spectral Theory*, 11(4), 2021.
- [DSFKLS16] D. Dos Santos Ferreira, Y. Kurylev, M. Lassas, and M. Salo. The Calderón problem in transversally anisotropic geometries. *J. Eur. Math. soc. (JEMS)*, 18(11):2579–2626, 2016.
- [DSFKSU09] D. Dos Santos Ferreira, C. E. Kenig, M. Salo, and G. Uhlmann. Limiting Carleman weights and anisotropic inverse problems. *Invent. Math.*, 178(1):119–171, 2009.
- [EGPS18] Alberto Enciso, M. Ángeles Garcia-Ferrero, and Daniel Peralta-Salas. The Biot-Savart operator of a bounded domain. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 119:85–113, 2018.
- [ELPS23] Alberto Enciso, Alejandro Luque, and Daniel Peralta-Salas. MHD equilibria with nonconstant pressure in nondegenerate toroidal domains. *J. Eur. Math. Soc.*, 2023.
- [EPS15] Alberto Enciso and Daniel Peralta-Salas. Existence of knotted vortex tubes in steady Euler flows. *Acta Math.*, 214:61–134, 2015.
- [GK24] Ravil Gabdurakhmanov and Gerasim Kokarev. On Calderon’s problem for the connection Laplacian. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh: Section A Mathematics*, page 1–26, 2024.
- [GKLU09] A. Greenleaf, Y. Kurylev, M. Lassas, and G. Uhlmann. Invisibility and inverse problems. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 46(1):55–97, 2009.



- [GLU03] A. Greenleaf, M. Lassas, and G. Uhlmann. On non-uniqueness for Calderón’s inverse problem. *Mathematical Research Letters*, 10(5):685–693, 2003.
- [GSB09] C. Guillarmou and A. Sá Barreto. Inverse problems for Einstein manifolds. *Inverse Probl. Imaging*, 3:1–15, 2009.
- [JL05] M. S. Joshi and W. R. B. Lionheart. An inverse boundary value problem for harmonic differential forms. *Asymptot. Anal.*, 41(2):93–106, 2005.
- [KLU11] Katsiaryna Krupchyk, Matti Lassas, and Gunther Uhlmann. Inverse problems for differential forms on Riemannian manifolds with boundary. *Communications in Partial Differential Equations*, 36(8):1475–1509, 2011.
- [KS13] C. Kenig and M. Salo. The Calderón problem with partial data on manifolds and applications. *Analysis & PDE*, 6(8):2003–2048, 2013.
- [KU16] K. Krupchyk and G. Uhlmann. The Calderón problem with partial data for conductivities with  $3/2$  derivatives. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 348(1):185–219, 2016.
- [LLS22] Matti Lassas, Tony Liimatainen, and Mikko Salo. The Calderón problem for the conformal Laplacian. *Comm. Anal. Geom.*, 30(5):1121–1184, 2022.
- [LTU03] Matti Lassas, Michael Taylor, and Gunther Uhlmann. The Dirichlet-to-Neumann map for complete Riemannian manifolds with boundary. *Communications in Analysis and Geometry*, 11(2):207–221, 2003.
- [LU89] John M. Lee and Gunther Uhlmann. Determining anisotropic real-analytic conductivities by boundary measurements. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 42(8):1097–1112, December 1989.
- [LU01] Matti Lassas and Gunther Uhlmann. On determining a Riemannian manifold from the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map. *Annales scientifiques de l’École normale supérieure*, 34(5):771–787, 2001.
- [Sch06] Günter Schwarz. *Hodge Decomposition - A method for solving boundary value problems*. Springer, 2006.
- [SS13] Vladimir Sharafutdinov and Clayton Shonkwiler. The complete Dirichlet-to-Neumann map for differential forms. *Journal of Geometric Analysis*, 23(4):2063–2080, 2013.
- [Tao18] Terence Tao. On the universality of the incompressible Euler equation on compact manifolds. *Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems*, 38(3):1553–1565, 2018.
- [Tay81] Michael E. Taylor. *Pseudodifferential operators*. Princeton University Press, 1981.
- [Tay11] Michael E. Taylor. *Partial Differential Equations I*. Springer New York, 2011.
- [TdL22] F. Torres de Lizaur. Chaos in the incompressible Euler equation on manifolds of high dimension. *Inventiones Mathematicae*, 228:687–715, 2022.

- [YG90] Z. Yoshida and Y. Giga. Remarks on spectra of operator rot. *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, 204:235–245, 1990.