PUBLICATIONS MATHÉMATIQUES DE L'I.H.É.S.

ALDO ANDREOTTI
EDOARDO VESENTINI

# Erratum : Carleman estimates for the Laplace-Beltrami equation on complex manifolds

*Publications mathématiques de l'I.H.É.S.*, tome 27 (1965), p. 153-155
<http://www.numdam.org/item?id=PMIHES_1965__27__153_0>

© Publications mathématiques de l'I.H.É.S., 1965, tous droits réservés.

L'accès aux archives de la revue « Publications mathématiques de l'I.H.É.S. » (http://www.ihes.fr/IHES/Publications/Publications.html) implique l'accord avec les conditions générales d'utilisation (http://www.numdam.org/conditions). Toute utilisation commerciale ou impression systématique est constitutive d'une infraction pénale. Toute copie ou impression de ce fichier doit contenir la présente mention de copyright.

NUMDAM
*Article numérisé dans le cadre du programme*
*Numérisation de documents anciens mathématiques*
http://www.numdam.org/

# *ERRATUM TO :*

# CARLEMAN ESTIMATES FOR THE LAPLACE-BELTRAMI EQUATION ON COMPLEX MANIFOLDS

*by* ALDO ANDREOTTI *and* EDOARDO VESENTINI

(Publications Mathématiques de l'Institut des Hautes Études Scientifiques, n° 25)

**1.** We draw the attention to a mistake which appears in the above quoted paper due to an error in computation. This has to be corrected as indicated below; the rest of the paper remains unchanged.

In the formula (29) p. 102 the curvature tensor $s^{a}_{b\bar{\beta}_i\beta}$ of the metric on the bundle E should be replaced by the expression of the " covariant curvature tensor "

$$\widetilde{s}^{a}_{b\bar{\beta}_i\beta}=\nabla_{\bar{\beta}_i}l^{a}_{b\beta},$$

and this is because we use the Riemannian connection on the bundle $\overline{\Theta}^{*}$.

Accordingly in formula (31) p. 102 the curvature forms $s$ and L should respectively be substituted by the " covariant " curvature forms $\widetilde{s}$ and $\widetilde{\mathrm{L}}$.

**2.** In the following § 5 the use of covariant curvature would however be cumbersome and it is therefore better to abandon the Riemannian connection and make use exclusively of the $\partial$-connections and $\overline{\partial}$-connections (see 2 *b)* and 3 *a)*) to establish the inequality we need following the same lines. The argument we shall presently give has to be added as section 15 *c)* of the paper.

First we note that, in terms of covariant derivatives with respect to the considered connection, the operator $\overline{\partial}$ has the expression

$$\overline{\partial}=\hat{\partial}+\mathrm{S},$$

where for $\varphi\in\mathrm{C}^{pq}(\mathrm{X},\mathrm{E})$:

$$(\hat{\partial}\varphi)^{a}_{\mathrm{A}\bar{\beta}_1\ldots\bar{\beta}_{q+1}}=(-1)^{p}\sum_{r=1}^{q+1}(-1)^{r-1}\nabla_{\bar{\beta}_r}\varphi^{a}_{\mathrm{A}\bar{\beta}_1\ldots\hat{\bar{\beta}}_r\ldots\bar{\beta}_{q+1}},$$

$$(\mathrm{S}\varphi)^{a}_{\mathrm{A}\bar{\beta}_1\ldots\beta_{q+1}}=(-1)^{p}\sum_{i,r=1}^{q+1}(-1)^{r-1}\overline{\mathrm{S}^{\alpha}_{\beta_i\beta_r}}\,\varphi^{a}_{\mathrm{A}\bar{\beta}_1\ldots(\bar{\alpha})_i\ldots\hat{\bar{\beta}}_r\ldots\bar{\beta}_{q+1}},$$

$\mathrm{S}^{\alpha}_{\beta\gamma}$ being the torsion tensor as defined in n° 3 *a)*.

Analogously we see that

$$\theta = \hat{\theta} + T$$

where $T = -*\#^{-1}S\#*$, and for $\varphi \in C^{pq}(X, E)$

$$(\hat{\theta}\varphi)^{a}_{A\bar{\beta}_1 \dots \bar{\beta}_{q-1}} = (-1)^{p-1} \Sigma \nabla_{\alpha} \varphi^{a\alpha}_{A\,\bar{\beta}_1 \dots \bar{\beta}_{q-1}}.$$

We now consider the vectors $\xi$ and $\eta$ introduced in 14 *b)* (the covariant derivatives being intended to be with respect to the $\partial$- and $\bar{\partial}$- connections). We have

$$\operatorname{div} \xi - \operatorname{div} \eta = \Sigma \nabla_{\beta} \xi^{\beta} - \Sigma \nabla_{\bar{\gamma}} \eta^{\bar{\gamma}} - 2\Sigma(S_{\tau}\xi^{\tau} - \bar{S}_{\tau}\eta^{\bar{\tau}}),$$

where $S_{\tau} = \Sigma S^{\beta}_{\tau\beta}$. A calculation of the same type as the one given in 14 *b)* gives:

$$\Sigma \nabla_{\beta} \xi^{\beta} - \Sigma \nabla_{\bar{\gamma}} \eta^{\bar{\gamma}} = (q-1)! \{A(\bar{\nabla}\varphi, \bar{\nabla}\varphi) + A(\hat{\mathscr{K}}\varphi, \varphi) - A(\hat{\partial}\varphi, \hat{\partial}\varphi) - A(\hat{\theta}\varphi, \hat{\theta}\varphi)\}, \tag{33'}$$

where now

$$(\hat{\mathscr{K}}\varphi)^{a}_{A\bar{B}} = \sum_{i=1}^{q} (-1)^{i} \{\Sigma S^{a}_{b\bar{\beta}_i\beta} \varphi^{b\beta}_{A\,\bar{B}_i} + \Sigma L^{\sigma}_{\beta\bar{\beta}_i\sigma} \varphi^{a\beta}_{A\,\bar{B}_i} + \Sigma(-1)^{k} \Sigma L^{\alpha}_{\alpha_k\bar{\beta}_i\beta} \varphi^{a}_{\alpha A'_k}{}^{\beta}_{\bar{B}_i}\}.$$

For $\varphi \in \mathscr{D}^{pq}(X, E)$, by Stokes formula we get

$$\|\bar{\nabla}\varphi\|^2 + (\hat{\mathscr{K}}\varphi, \varphi) = \|\hat{\partial}\varphi\|^2 + \|\hat{\theta}\varphi\|^2 + 2\int_X \Sigma(S_{\tau}\xi^{\tau} - \bar{S}_{\tau}\eta^{\bar{\tau}})dX. \tag{*}$$

We have the following estimates

$$\|\hat{\partial}\varphi\|^2 \leq 2(\|\bar{\partial}\varphi\|^2 + \|S\varphi\|^2) \leq 2\|\bar{\partial}\varphi\|^2 + c\int_X |S|^2 A(\varphi, \varphi)dX,$$

$$\|\hat{\theta}\varphi\|^2 \leq 2(\|\theta\varphi\|^2 + \|T\varphi\|^2) \leq 2\|\theta\varphi\|^2 + c\int_X |S|^2 A(\varphi, \varphi)dX,$$

$$\left|\int_X (\Sigma S_{\tau}\xi^{\tau})dX\right| \leq c\{\varepsilon \int_X |S|^2 A(\varphi, \varphi)dX + \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\int_X A(\bar{\nabla}\varphi, \bar{\nabla}\varphi)dX\},$$

$$\left|\int_X (\Sigma \bar{S}_{\tau}\eta^{\bar{\tau}})dX\right| \leq c\{\varepsilon \int_X |S|^2 A(\varphi, \varphi)dX + \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\int_X A(\hat{\theta}\varphi, \hat{\theta}\varphi)dX\},$$

where $c$ is a universal positive constant, $\varepsilon$ any positive number and $|S|^2$ is the length of the torsion tensor.

We substitute these four estimates, with $\varepsilon = 4c$, in (*). If we set

$$\mathscr{K} = \hat{\mathscr{K}} - (16c^2 + \frac{5}{2}c)|S|^2$$

we obtain an inequality of the type

$$\|\bar{\nabla}\varphi\|^2 + c_1(\mathscr{K}\varphi, \varphi) \leq c_2\{\|\bar{\partial}\varphi\|^2 + \|\theta\varphi\|^2\}$$

where $c_1$, $c_2$ are positive universal constants. Proposition 15 and its corollaries can thus be stated using this expression of $\mathscr{K}$.

**3.** The use of identity (33') instead of identity (33) simplifies the argument of section 17 *d)* in that that no covariant Levi form has to be introduced. What follows

replaces thus 17 *d)* from line 7 from below of p. 112 onwards. From (33′) we get (with the notations of 17 *d)*)

$$\frac{1}{(s-1)!}\int_{\partial Y}(\xi-\eta)_n dS = ||\bar{\nabla}\varphi||_Y^2 + (\hat{\mathscr{K}}\varphi, \varphi)_Y - ||\hat{\partial}\varphi||_Y^2 - ||\hat{\theta}\varphi||_Y^2 - 2\int_Y \Sigma (S_\tau \xi^\tau - \bar{S}_\tau \eta^{\bar{\tau}}) dY;$$

hence

$$||\bar{\nabla}\varphi||_Y^2 + (\hat{\mathscr{K}}\varphi, \varphi)_Y + \frac{1}{(s-1)!}\int_{\partial Y}\frac{1}{|\partial f|}\mathscr{L}(f)\{\varphi, \varphi\}dS = ||\hat{\partial}\varphi||^2 + ||\hat{\theta}\varphi||^2,$$

and thus as in section 15 *c)* we derive the inequality

$$||\bar{\nabla}\varphi||_Y^2 + c_1(\mathscr{K}\varphi, \varphi)_Y + \frac{1}{(s-1)!}\int_{\partial Y}\frac{1}{|\partial f|}\mathscr{L}(f)\{\varphi, \varphi\}dS \leq c_2\{||\bar{\partial}\varphi||^2 + ||\theta\varphi||^2\}.$$

If $\mathscr{L}(f)$ has $n-q+1$ positive eigenvalues at each point of $\partial Y$ we can choose a hermitian metric so that $l_{\mathscr{L}(f)} \geq c_0$ at each point of $\partial Y$ with $c_0 > 0$. Also we can replace the metric $h$ on the fibers of E by $e^{\tau|f|}h$. We will have

$$\frac{1}{(s-1)!}\int_{\partial Y}\frac{1}{|\partial f|}\mathscr{L}(f)\{\varphi, \varphi\}dS \geq c_3\int_{\partial Y} A(\varphi, \varphi)dS,$$

$$A_\tau(\mathscr{K}\varphi, \varphi) \geq c_4 \tau A_\tau(\varphi, \varphi),$$

with positive constants, $c_3$ and $c_4$, for any $\tau \geq \tau_0$ with a convenient $\tau_0 \geq 0$, and for any $\varphi \in B^{r,s}(Y, E)$ with $\mathrm{supp}(\varphi) \subset U$, provided $s \geq q$. From this we obtain by the same argument as the one given there (p. 113 from line 11 from below onwards) the las inequality of 17 *d)* [1].

---

[1] In the expression of $||\varphi||^{(n)}_{\tau,\nu}$ there is a misprint: $e^{\tau|f|}$ should replace $e^{\tau f}$.