

INVERSE PROBLEMS FOR TIME-DEPENDENT NONLINEAR TRANSPORT EQUATIONS

RU-YU LAI AND HANMING ZHOU

ABSTRACT. In this work, we investigate inverse problems of recovering the time-dependent coefficient in the nonlinear transport equation in both cases: two-dimensional Riemannian manifolds and Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^n , $n \geq 2$. Specifically, it is shown that its initial boundary value problem is well-posed for small initial and incoming data. Moreover, the time-dependent coefficient appearing in the nonlinear term can be uniquely determined from boundary measurements as well as initial and final data. To achieve this, the central techniques we utilize include the linearization technique and the construction of special geometrical optics solutions for the linear transport equation. This allows us to reduce the inverse coefficient problem to the inversion of certain weighted light ray transforms. Based on the developed methodology, the inverse source problem for the nonlinear transport equation in the scattering-free media is also studied.

1. INTRODUCTION

We study inverse problems for the transport equation with nonlinear absorption in both the Euclidean and Riemannian settings. Let M be the interior of a compact non-trapping Riemannian manifold (\bar{M}, g) , of dimension $n \geq 2$, with smooth strictly convex (with respect to the metric g) boundary ∂M . Let TM be the tangent bundle of M . We denote the unit sphere bundle of the manifold (M, g) by

$$SM := \{(x, v) \in TM : |v|_{g(x)}^2 := \langle v, v \rangle_{g(x)} = 1\},$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{g(x)}$ is the inner product on the tangent space $T_x M$. Let $\partial_+ SM$ and $\partial_- SM$ be the outgoing and incoming boundaries of SM , respectively, and they are defined by

$$\partial_{\pm} SM := \{(x, v) \in \bar{SM} : x \in \partial M, \pm \langle \nu(x), v \rangle_{g(x)} > 0\},$$

where $\nu(x)$ is the unit outer normal vector at $x \in \partial M$. For any point $x \in M$, let

$$S_x M := \{v : (x, v) \in SM\}.$$

Moreover, we denote

$$SM^2 := \{(x, v, v') : x \in M, v, v' \in S_x M\}.$$

Let $T > 0$, we also denote

$$M_T := (0, T) \times M, \quad SM_T := (0, T) \times SM \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_{\pm} SM_T := (0, T) \times \partial_{\pm} SM.$$

Let X be the geodesic vector field which generates the geodesic flow on SM . In particular, $X = v \cdot \nabla$ is the directional derivative with respect to the x -variable in the Euclidean case. We consider the following initial boundary value problem for the nonlinear transport equation with a power-type nonlinear term:

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t f + Xf + \sigma f + qf^m &= K(f) & \text{in } SM_T, \\ f &= h_0 & \text{on } \{0\} \times SM, \\ f &= h_- & \text{on } \partial_- SM_T, \end{cases}$$

Key words: Nonlinear transport equation, inverse problems, time-dependent coefficient.

where $m \geq 2$, $f \equiv f(t, x, v)$ is the solution, $\sigma \equiv \sigma(x, v)$ is the real-valued absorption coefficient, $q \equiv q(t, x)$ is the real-valued nonlinear coefficient and K is the scattering operator, defined by

$$K(f)(t, x, v) := \int_{S_x M} \mu(x, v, v') f(t, x, v') dv'$$

with the real-valued scattering coefficient μ .

We define the set

$$(1.2) \quad \Omega := \left\{ (\sigma, \mu) \in L^\infty(SM) \times L^\infty(SM^2) : 0 \leq \sigma(x, v) \leq \sigma_0, \quad 0 \leq \mu(x, v, v') \leq \mu_0, \right. \\ \left. \int_{S_x M} \mu(x, v, v') dv' \leq \sigma(x, v), \quad \int_{S_x M} \mu(x, v', v) dv' \leq \sigma(x, v) \right\}$$

for some positive constants σ_0 and μ_0 . These conditions are required in the proof of the well-posedness for the nonlinear transport equation in Section 2. More explicitly, Theorem 2.3 shows that there exists a constant $\delta > 0$ such that given any

$$(1.3) \quad (h_0, h_-) \in \mathcal{X}_\delta := \{(h_0, h_-) \in L^\infty(SM) \times L^\infty(\partial_- SM_T) : \|h_0\|_{L^\infty(SM)} \leq \delta, \quad \|h_-\|_{L^\infty(\partial_- SM_T)} \leq \delta\},$$

the problem (1.1) has a unique solution $f \in L^\infty(SM_T)$. Therefore, the measurement operator $\mathcal{A}_q : \mathcal{X}_\delta \rightarrow L^\infty(SM) \times L^\infty(\partial_+ SM_T)$, defined by

$$\mathcal{A}_q(h_0, h_-) = (f|_{t=T}, f|_{\partial_+ SM_T}),$$

is well-defined for such $(h_0, h_-) \in \mathcal{X}_\delta$.

The main goal of this paper is to recover the nonlinear coefficient q , depending on both t and x variables, from the operator \mathcal{A}_q . The choice of such measurement operator \mathcal{A}_q is based on [8], which shows that it is impossible to recover the absorption over the whole domain with trivial initial data, that is, $f(0, x, v) \equiv 0$. In other words, without the knowledge of the initial data, the coefficient in the cloaking region can not be uniquely determined by solely using boundary measurements.

Driven by its wide applications, there have been fruitful results for inverse problems for the transport type equations. We first review some relevant studies. In the absence of the nonlinear term (i.e., $q \equiv 0$), the equation (1.1) is known as the linear Boltzmann equation or radiative transfer equation (RTE). Its corresponding inverse problem is sought to recover both absorption and scattering coefficients in the RTE from the albedo operator $\mathcal{A}_{\sigma, \mu} : f|_{\partial_- SM_T} \mapsto f|_{\partial_+ SM_T}$. This setting is related to applications, such as medical imaging, remote sensing, and atmospheric science, and has been studied in different theoretical perspectives. They include unique determination of coefficients in [12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 54], stability estimates in [3, 4, 5, 6, 40, 55, 56] and the Riemannian setting in [1, 41, 42, 43, 44]. For more extensive discussions on the development of the related problems and methodologies, we refer the readers to [2, 52] and the reference therein. As for the nonlinear Boltzmann equations, with the knowledge of the albedo operator, the recovery of time-independent collision kernel were investigated in [34] for the stationary equation and in [38] for the dynamic one. Later, the setting of the time-dependent kernel was studied in [36]. A related work by using the source-to-solution map to recover the metric is addressed in [7].

The question of identifying time-dependent unknowns in the dynamic equations appears naturally from the practical applications and mathematical interests. Although most of the existing theoretical works mentioned above for the inverse transport problem concern the case when the coefficients depend only on spatial variables or velocity, it is important to understand and tackle the new challenges brought by the time t during the reconstruction process. Motivated by the studies in [8, 9] in which time-dependent absorption and scattering coefficients are stably recovered from the observations, we are interested in the questions of recovering the power type nonlinearity $q(t, x)$.

1.1. Main result. Given $(x, v) \in \overline{SM}$, let $\gamma_{x,v}(s)$ be the unique maximal geodesic satisfying the initial conditions

$$\gamma_{x,v}(0) = x, \quad \dot{\gamma}_{x,v}(0) = v,$$

and it is defined on a maximal interval of existence $[-\tau_-(x, v), \tau_+(x, v)]$, see Section 2.1 for more details. Here $\tau(x, v) := \tau_+(x, v) > 0$ is the forward exit time of the geodesic $\gamma_{x,v}$ so that $\gamma_{x,v}(\tau(x, v)) \in \partial M$. Since \overline{M} is non-trapping, any maximal geodesic will exit \overline{M} in finite time, i.e. $\tau(x, v) < \infty$ for any $(x, v) \in \overline{SM}$.

Definition 1.1. We define the attenuated X-ray transform of a function $S \in L^\infty(M)$ with attenuation $\omega \in L^\infty(SM)$ by

$$I_\omega S(x, v) := \int_0^{\tau(x, v)} S(\gamma_{x,v}(s)) e^{-\int_0^s \omega(\gamma_{x,v}(r), \dot{\gamma}_{x,v}(r)) dr} ds, \quad (x, v) \in \partial_- SM.$$

We say that I_ω is injective if $I_\omega S(x, v) = 0$ for almost everywhere (a.e.) $(x, v) \in \partial_- SM$ implies that $S \equiv 0$.

The attenuated X-ray transform has been extensively studied, see e.g. survey papers [21, 31] for the Euclidean case and [58] for the Riemannian case, and the references therein.

We are now ready to present our main theorems.

Theorem 1.1. (Euclidean setting) Let M be an open bounded and strictly convex domain in \mathbb{R}^n , $n \geq 2$, with smooth boundary. Let $(\sigma, \mu) \in \Omega$ so that the attenuated X-ray transform $I_{(m-1)\sigma}$ is injective. Assume that q_1 and q_2 are in $L^\infty(M_T)$. Then $\mathcal{A}_{q_1} = \mathcal{A}_{q_2}$ on \mathcal{X}_δ implies

$$q_1 = q_2 \quad \text{in } M_T.$$

For the Riemannian setting, we establish a similar uniqueness result in dimension 2, under an additional assumption on the scattering coefficient μ .

Theorem 1.2. (Riemannian setting) Let M be the interior of a compact non-trapping Riemannian manifold with smooth strictly convex boundary ∂M , of dimension $\dim M = 2$. Let $(\sigma, \mu) \in \mathcal{M}$, defined by (2.26) in subsection 2.4.2, so that the attenuated X-ray transform $I_{(m-1)\sigma}$ is injective. Assume that q_1 and q_2 are in $L^\infty(M_T)$. Then $\mathcal{A}_{q_1} = \mathcal{A}_{q_2}$ on \mathcal{X}_δ implies

$$q_1 = q_2 \quad \text{in } M_T.$$

Roughly speaking, the set $\mathcal{M} \subset \Omega$ imposes certain symmetry and vanishing conditions on μ , see subsection 2.4.2 for details. In particular, see Remark 2.3 for examples.

An analogous setting, motivated by the two-photon photoacoustic tomography, is investigated by the authors and Uhlmann [35] for both inverse coefficient and source problems for the nonlinear dynamic transport equation with time-independent coefficients. The main methodology is based on deriving Carleman estimates, a weighted L^2 estimate, for the linear transport equation in both Euclidean and Riemannian settings [10, 11, 24, 25, 27, 28, 32, 40]. However, by this approach, only time-independent coefficients can be identified from the measurements. Therefore, in this paper, we seek for an alternative method that is applicable to take care of the time variable in the nonlinear term.

There are two main ingredients in the proof of Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2. The first ingredient is the construction of geometric optics (GO) solutions for the linear transport equations, which was first developed in [8, 9] for the determination of time-dependent absorption coefficient and scattering coefficient for the linear Boltzmann equation. The remainder term of such GO solution decays to zero in L^2 norm with respect to some frequency parameter. In the current work, the construction is slightly different from the approach in [8, 9, 49]. A key feature of our GO solutions is that they are

defined on the infinite cylinder $\mathbb{R} \times M$, instead of the infinite slab $(0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n$. Consequently, we do not need to embed M into a larger domain or manifold. See subsection 2.4.2 for additional remarks.

Theorem 1.2 can be viewed as a generalization of Theorem 1.1 to nontrivial geometry. The proof of the decay of the remainder term of GO solutions in the Euclidean case relies essentially on the existence of global coordinates on $SM = M \times \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. Unlike the Euclidean case, there are no global coordinates on Riemannian manifolds in general. However, on two dimensional Riemannian manifolds, we can apply the global isothermal coordinates to characterize the set \mathcal{M} for the scattering coefficient μ , in order to derive similar decay property for the remainder term of GO solutions.

The second ingredient is the injectivity of certain weighted light ray transforms. With the help of the GO solutions, the determination of the nonlinear coefficients can be reduced to the study of the invertibility of the following *attenuated light ray transform* $L_\omega S$ of a function $S \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times M)$ with attenuated coefficient $\omega \in L^\infty(SM)$:

$$L_\omega S(t, x, v) := \int_0^{\tau(x, v)} S(t + s, \gamma_{x, v}(s)) e^{-\int_0^s \omega(\gamma_{x, v}(r), \dot{\gamma}_{x, v}(r)) dr} ds, \quad (t, x, v) \in \mathbb{R} \times \partial_- SM.$$

When $\omega \equiv 0$, this is the standard *light ray transform*, denoted by LS , whose injectivity was first established in [51] for Minkowski spacetime. The injectivity of L was later generalized to the cases of static [18, 20] and stationary [19] Lorentzian manifolds. By taking the Fourier transform of the light ray transform with respect to the time variable t , we further reduce the problem to the stationary case, namely, the attenuated X-ray transform. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first injectivity result for the light ray transform with non-trivial weight in the non-analytic category. Weighted light ray transforms on real-analytic Lorentzian manifolds were studied in [53]. On the other hand, most results for the light ray transform in the literature are concerned with functions or tensors with compact support, we also address the non-compact case in the Appendix A.

Under suitable geometrical conditions on the manifolds in different dimensions, the assumption of the injectivity of $I_{(m-1)\sigma}$ in Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 can be removed. Therefore, we have the following corollary that follows immediately from Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2. A compact Riemannian manifold with smooth strictly convex boundary is called *simple* if it is simply connected and free of conjugate points [47].

Corollary 1.3. *Let $(\sigma, \mu) \in \Omega$. Assume that q_1 and q_2 are in $L^\infty(M_T)$. Suppose that $\mathcal{A}_{q_1} = \mathcal{A}_{q_2}$ on \mathcal{X}_δ . Then the uniqueness results hold for the following cases:*

- (1) *For $n \geq 3$, assume that M is an open bounded and strictly convex domain in \mathbb{R}^n , and $\sigma \in C^\infty(S\bar{M})$, then $q_1 = q_2$ in M_T ;*
- (2) *For $n = 2$, assume that either*
 - (a) *M is an open bounded and strictly convex domain in \mathbb{R}^2 ; or*
 - (b) *M is the interior of a simple surface and $(\sigma, \mu) \in \mathcal{M}$.**Then if $\sigma \in C^\infty(\bar{M})$, we have $q_1 = q_2$ in M_T .*

Finally, when the system is scattering free, i.e. $\mu = 0$, Theorem 1.2 holds in any dimension.

Theorem 1.4. *Let M be the interior of a compact non-trapping Riemannian manifold with smooth strictly convex boundary ∂M , of dimension $\dim M \geq 2$. Let $(\sigma, 0) \in \Omega$ so that the attenuated X-ray transform $I_{(m-1)\sigma}$ is injective. Assume that q_1 and q_2 are in $L^\infty(M_T)$, then $\mathcal{A}_{q_1} = \mathcal{A}_{q_2}$ on \mathcal{X}_δ implies*

$$q_1 = q_2 \quad \text{in } M_T.$$

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce necessary notations and establish well-posedness theorem for the nonlinear transport equations. We also construct geometric optics (GO) solutions for the linear transport equation on Euclidean domains and two dimensional Riemannian manifolds. Section 3 is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.1 and 1.2 by the linearization

scheme and the invertibility of weighted light ray transforms. We also show determination results under the monotonicity condition $q_1 \leq q_2$. As an immediate application, we study the inverse source problem in the absence of scattering in Section 4, which is equivalent to the attenuated light ray transform. In Appendix A, we address the invertibility of the light ray transform of functions or tensor fields that are not necessarily supported in M_T .

2. PRELIMINARIES AND FORWARD PROBLEM

In this section, we introduce necessary notations first and then study the well-posedness problem for the initial boundary value problem for the nonlinear transport equation (1.1). Moreover, we also construct the special solutions, called geometric optics (GO) solutions, for the linear transport equation. This will be one of key ingredients in solving the inverse coefficient problems later.

2.1. Notations. Recall that we denote the forward exit time from $(x, v) \in \overline{SM}$ by $\tau(x, v)$, which is defined as follows:

$$\tau(x, v) := \sup\{\tilde{s} : \gamma_{x,v}(s) \in M \text{ for } 0 \leq s < \tilde{s}\} < \infty.$$

Recall the assumption that M is non-trapping. Similarly, we also define the backward exit time by

$$\tau_-(x, v) := \sup\{\tilde{s} : \gamma_{x,v}(-s) \in M \text{ for } 0 \leq s < \tilde{s}\} < \infty.$$

Thus, $\gamma_{x,v}(\tau(x, v)) \in \partial M$ and $\gamma_{x,v}(-\tau_-(x, v)) \in \partial M$. In particular, they satisfy $\tau(x, v) = \tau_-(x, -v)$ for all $(x, v) \in \overline{SM}$ and $\tau_-(x, v)|_{\partial_- SM} = \tau(x, v)|_{\partial_+ SM} = 0$.

Denote the geodesic flow through $(x, v) \in \overline{SM}$ by

$$\rho_{x,v}(t) := (\gamma_{x,v}(t), \dot{\gamma}_{x,v}(t)), \quad \rho_{x,v}(0) = (x, v).$$

Let X be the generating vector field of the geodesic flow $\rho_{x,v}(t)$, that is, for a given function f on SM , $Xf(x, v) = \frac{d}{dt}f(\rho_{x,v}(t))|_{t=0}$. Notice that in the Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^n , $\rho_{x,v}(t) = (x + tv, v)$ and $X = v \cdot \nabla_x$, where v is independent of x .

We define the spaces $L^p(SM)$ and $L^p(SM_T)$, $1 \leq p < \infty$, with the norm

$$\|f\|_{L^p(SM)} = \left(\int_{SM} |f|^p d\Sigma \right)^{1/p} \quad \text{and} \quad \|f\|_{L^p(SM_T)} = \left(\int_0^T \int_{SM} |f|^p d\Sigma dt \right)^{1/p},$$

with $d\Sigma = d\Sigma(x, v)$ the volume form of SM . Moreover, for the spaces $L^p(\partial_{\pm} SM_T)$, we define their norm to be

$$\|f\|_{L^p(\partial_{\pm} SM_T)} := \|f\|_{L^p(\partial_{\pm} SM_T; d\xi)} = \left(\int_0^T \int_{\partial_{\pm} SM} |f|^p d\xi dt \right)^{1/p},$$

where $d\xi(x, v) := \langle \nu(x), v \rangle_{g(x)} |d\tilde{\xi}(x, v)|$ with $d\tilde{\xi}$ the standard volume form of ∂SM . Hereafter, we will drop the subindex $g(x)$ in $\langle \nu(x), v \rangle_{g(x)}$ if no confusion arises. When $p = \infty$, $L^\infty(SM)$, $L^\infty(SM_T)$ and $L^\infty(\partial_{\pm} SM_T)$ are the standard vector spaces consisting of all functions that are essentially bounded.

2.2. The forward problems. The following well-posedness results for the linear transport equation was proven in [35].

Proposition 2.1 (Well-posedness for linear transport equation). *Suppose that $(\sigma, \mu) \in \Omega$. Let $S \in L^\infty(SM_T)$, $h_0 \in L^\infty(SM)$ and $h_- \in L^\infty(\partial_- SM_T)$. We consider the following problem:*

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t f + Xf + \sigma f &= K(f) + S & \text{in } SM_T, \\ f &= h_0 & \text{on } \{0\} \times SM, \\ f &= h_- & \text{on } \partial_- SM_T. \end{cases}$$

Then (2.1) has a unique solution f in $L^\infty(SM_T)$ satisfying

$$(2.2) \quad \|f\|_{L^\infty(SM_T)} \leq C (\|h_0\|_{L^\infty(SM)} + \|h_-\|_{L^\infty(\partial_- SM_T)} + \|S\|_{L^\infty(SM_T)}),$$

where the constant C depends on σ and T .

Remark 2.1. Note that the coefficients σ and μ are assumed to be real-valued functions. Hence, for complex-valued h_0 , h_- and S , by splitting the real and imaginary parts, the unique existence of the solution f to (2.1) still holds.

In addition, as shown below, the solution f also satisfies the estimate in L^p norm. This property will be applied to prove the existence of the GO solutions later where we only apply the case $p = 2$.

Corollary 2.2. Let $p \in [1, \infty)$. Under the same hypothesis of Proposition 2.1, there exists a constant $C > 0$, independent of S , h_0 and h_- , such that the solution f satisfies

$$(2.3) \quad \|f\|_{L^p(SM_T)} + \|f\|_{L^p(\partial_+ SM_T; d\xi)} \leq C (\|h_0\|_{L^p(SM)} + \|h_-\|_{L^p(\partial_- SM_T; d\xi)} + \|S\|_{L^p(SM_T)}).$$

Proof. Let $f = f_R + if_I$, where f_R and f_I denote the real and imaginary parts of f . From Proposition 2.1, we get $f \in L^p(SM_T)$ and thus $|f|^{p-2}\bar{f} \in L^q(SM_T)$ for $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_t + X)(|f|^p) &= p|f|^{p-1}(\partial_t + X)(|f|) \\ &= p|f|^{p-2}(f_R(\partial_t + X)(f_R) + f_I(\partial_t + X)(f_I)) \\ &= \operatorname{Re}(p|f|^{p-2}\bar{f}(\partial_t + X)(f)), \end{aligned}$$

where $\operatorname{Re}(u)$ represents the real part of a complex-valued function u . See [39, Theorem 6.17] for the derivative of the absolute value of a function. Hence, for any fixed $t \in (0, T)$, multiplying (2.1) with $|f|^{p-2}\bar{f}$ and integrating over SM . Taking the real part leads to

$$(2.4) \quad \int_{SM} \left(\frac{1}{p}(\partial_t + X)|f|^p(t) + \sigma|f|^p(t) \right) d\Sigma = \operatorname{Re} \left(\int_{SM} K(f)|f|^{p-2}\bar{f}(t) d\Sigma + \int_{SM} S|f|^{p-2}\bar{f}(t) d\Sigma \right).$$

Here we denote $f(t) := f(t, \cdot, \cdot)$ to simply the expression.

We first deal with the first term on the right-hand side of (2.4). Following the arguments in [17, Chapter XXI, Lemma 1], one can show that K is a linear and continuous operator mapping from $L^p(SM)$ into itself for $p \in [1, \infty]$ and satisfies $\|K(f)(t)\|_{L^p(SM)} \leq \sigma_0 \|f(t)\|_{L^p(SM)}$ for any $t \in (0, T)$. Applying Hölder's inequality, (1.2), and $p = (p-1)q$ to derive the following estimate:

$$(2.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \left| \int_{SM} K(f)|f|^{p-2}\bar{f}(t) d\Sigma \right| &\leq \|K(f)(t)\|_{L^p(SM)} \left(\int_{SM} |f|^{q(p-1)}(t) d\Sigma \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \\ &\leq \sigma_0 \|f(t)\|_{L^p(SM)} \left(\int_{SM} |f|^p(t) d\Sigma \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \\ &\leq \sigma_0 \|f(t)\|_{L^p(SM)} \|f(t)\|_{L^p(SM)}^{p-1} \\ &\leq \sigma_0 \|f(t)\|_{L^p(SM)}^p. \end{aligned}$$

For the second term on the right-hand side of (2.4), Young's inequality yields that

$$(2.6) \quad \int_{SM} S|f|^{p-2}\bar{f}(t) d\Sigma \leq \frac{1}{p} \int_{SM} |S|^p(t) d\Sigma + \frac{1}{q} \int_{SM} |f|^p(t) d\Sigma.$$

Moreover, we deduce from Green's formula [47, Proposition 3.5.12 and Lemma 3.6.7] that

$$(2.7) \quad \int_{SM} X|f|^p(t) d\Sigma = \int_{\partial SM} |f|^p(t) \langle \nu(x), v \rangle d\tilde{\xi} = \int_{\partial_+ SM} |f|^p(t) d\xi - \int_{\partial_- SM} |f|^p(t) d\xi.$$

Denote

$$E(t) = \int_{SM} |f|^p(t) d\Sigma, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T.$$

Combining (2.4) - (2.7) together yields

$$(2.8) \quad \begin{aligned} & E'(t) + \int_{\partial_+ SM} |f|^p(t) d\xi + p \int_{SM} \sigma |f|^p(t) d\Sigma \\ & \leq \int_{\partial_- SM} |f|^p(t) d\xi + \int_{SM} |S|^p(t) d\Sigma + \left(\frac{p}{q} + p\sigma_0 \right) E(t). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we integrate over the time interval $(0, t)$ and obtain

$$(2.9) \quad E(t) \leq C \int_0^t E(s) ds + \|f\|_{L^p(\partial_- SM_T)}^p + \|S\|_{L^p(SM_T)}^p + \|f(0)\|_{L^p(SM)}^p,$$

where C depends on p , q and σ_0 . The Gronwall's inequality implies that

$$E(t) \leq C \left(\|f\|_{L^p(\partial_- SM_T)}^p + \|S\|_{L^p(SM_T)}^p + \|f(0)\|_{L^p(SM)}^p \right),$$

for $0 \leq t \leq T$, where the constant $C > 0$ depends on p , q , σ_0 and t . This then gives

$$(2.10) \quad \|f\|_{L^p(SM_T)}^p \leq C \left(\|f\|_{L^p(\partial_- SM_T)}^p + \|S\|_{L^p(SM_T)}^p + \|f(0)\|_{L^p(SM)}^p \right),$$

by integrating with respect to the time variable again over $(0, T)$.

Finally, back to (2.8), we integrate both sides over $(0, T)$ and utilize (2.10) to derive

$$\|f(T)\|_{L^p(SM)}^p + \|f\|_{L^p(\partial_+ SM_T)}^p \leq C \left(\|f\|_{L^p(\partial_- SM_T)}^p + \|S\|_{L^p(SM_T)}^p + \|f(0)\|_{L^p(SM)}^p \right).$$

This further yields

$$(2.11) \quad \|f\|_{L^p(\partial_+ SM_T)}^p \leq C \left(\|f\|_{L^p(\partial_- SM_T)}^p + \|S\|_{L^p(SM_T)}^p + \|f(0)\|_{L^p(SM)}^p \right).$$

The proof is complete by combining both estimates (2.10) and (2.11). \square

The forward problem for the nonlinear transport equation can be established for small data.

Theorem 2.3 (Well-posedness for nonlinear transport equation). *Let $q \in L^\infty(M_T)$. Suppose that $(\sigma, \mu) \in \Omega$. Then there exists a small parameter $0 < \delta < 1$ such that for any*

$$(2.12) \quad (h_0, h_-) \in \mathcal{X}_\delta := \{(h_0, h_-) \in L^\infty(SM) \times L^\infty(\partial_- SM_T) : \|h_0\|_{L^\infty(SM)} \leq \delta, \|h_-\|_{L^\infty(\partial_- SM_T)} \leq \delta\},$$

the problem (1.1) has a unique solution $f \in L^\infty(SM_T)$ satisfying

$$\|f\|_{L^\infty(SM_T)} \leq C (\|h_0\|_{L^\infty(SM)} + \|h_-\|_{L^\infty(\partial_- SM_T)}),$$

where the positive constant C is independent of f , h_0 and h_- .

Proof. The unique existence of solution for (1.1) follows immediately by adapting the proof of Theorem 2.6 in [35] with the nonlinear term $q(t, x)u^m$. \square

Based on the above well-posedness result, for any $(h_0, h_-) \in \mathcal{X}_\delta$ with sufficiently small δ , the problem (1.1) has a small unique solution $f \in L^\infty(SM_T)$. Hence, the measurement map $\mathcal{A}_q : \mathcal{X}_\delta \rightarrow L^\infty(SM) \times L^\infty(\partial_+ SM_T)$ is well-defined.

2.3. The adjoint problem. In order to achieve the derivation of the integral identity in the next section, we will study the existence of solution for the adjoint problem:

$$(2.13) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t \tilde{f} + X\tilde{f} - \tilde{\sigma}\tilde{f} = -K^*(\tilde{f}) - \tilde{S} & \text{in } SM_T, \\ \tilde{f} = \tilde{h}_0 & \text{on } \{T\} \times SM, \\ \tilde{f} = \tilde{h}_- & \text{on } \partial_+ SM_T, \end{cases}$$

where $K^*(\tilde{f})(t, x, v) := \int_{S_x M} \tilde{\mu}(x, v', v) \tilde{f}(t, x, v') dv'$.

Suppose that $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\mu}) \in \Omega$ and $\tilde{S} \in L^\infty(SM_T)$. Here $\tilde{\sigma}$ and $\tilde{\mu}$ are real-valued functions and \tilde{S} can be a complex-valued function. Let $\tilde{h}_0 \in L^\infty(SM)$ and $\tilde{h}_- \in L^\infty(\partial_+ SM_T)$. We denote

$$\sigma(x, v) := \tilde{\sigma}(x, -v), \quad \mu(x, v', v) := \tilde{\mu}(x, -v, -v'), \quad S(t, x, v) := \overline{\tilde{S}(T-t, x, -v)}.$$

Thus $(\sigma, \mu) \in \Omega$ and $S \in L^\infty(SM_T)$. By Proposition 2.1, there exists a unique solution $f \in L^\infty(SM_T)$ to the problem

$$(2.14) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t f + Xf + \sigma f = K(f) + S & \text{in } SM_T, \\ f = h_0 & \text{on } \{0\} \times SM, \\ f = h_- & \text{on } \partial_- SM_T, \end{cases}$$

where $h_0(x, v) := \overline{\tilde{h}_0(x, -v)} \in L^\infty(SM)$ and $h_-(t, x, v) := \overline{\tilde{h}_-(T-t, x, -v)} \in L^\infty(\partial_- SM_T)$.

Moreover, let $\tilde{f}(t, x, v) = \overline{f(T-t, x, -v)}$, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_t + X)\tilde{f}(t, x, v) &= -\left(\overline{(\partial_t f)(T-t, x, -v)} + \overline{(Xf)(T-t, x, -v)}\right) \\ &= \sigma(x, -v)\overline{f(T-t, x, -v)} - \int \mu(x, -v, -v')\overline{f(T-t, x, -v')} dv' - \overline{S(T-t, x, -v)} \\ &= \tilde{\sigma}(x, v)\tilde{f}(t, x, v) - \int \tilde{\mu}(x, v', v)\tilde{f}(t, x, v') dv' - \tilde{S}(t, x, v). \end{aligned}$$

This implies $\tilde{f} \in L^\infty(SM_T)$ is the solution to

$$\partial_t \tilde{f} + X\tilde{f} - \tilde{\sigma}\tilde{f} = -K^*(\tilde{f}) - \tilde{S},$$

and, moreover, it satisfies $\tilde{f}(T, x, v) = \overline{f(0, x, -v)} = \overline{h_0(x, -v)} = \tilde{h}_0(x, v)$ and $\tilde{f}|_{\partial_+ SM_T} = \tilde{h}_-$. Also it satisfies the estimate

$$(2.15) \quad \|\tilde{f}\|_{L^\infty(SM_T)} \leq C \left(\|\tilde{h}_0\|_{L^\infty(SM)} + \|\tilde{h}_-\|_{L^\infty(\partial_+ SM_T)} + \|\tilde{S}\|_{L^\infty(SM_T)} \right).$$

2.4. Construction of GO solutions. The main goal here is to find a category of special solutions to the linear transport equations in both Euclidean and Riemannian settings. We will start by constructing such solutions for the Euclidean case in $\mathbb{R} \times M \times \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. On the other hand, due to the dependence of variables x and v in the Riemannian case, the choice of the leading terms of the GO solutions will be different from the former case, see also Remark 2.5 for more discussions.

2.4.1. Construction of GO solutions in the Euclidean space. In the Euclidean space, let M be an open and bounded strictly convex domain in \mathbb{R}^n and let $g = e$ be the Euclidean metric. Then

$$S_x M = \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \quad \text{and} \quad SM = M \times \mathbb{S}^{n-1}.$$

The geodesic vector field acting on functions $f = f(x, v)$ on SM will be

$$Xf(x, v) = \left. \frac{d}{dt} f(x + tv, v) \right|_{t=0} = v \cdot \nabla f(x, v).$$

We consider the following linear transport equation in the Euclidean space:

$$\partial_t f + v \cdot \nabla f + \sigma f = K(f).$$

First, we find special solutions to the equation $\partial_t f + v \cdot \nabla f + \sigma f = 0$. To this end, given a real-valued function $\phi(t, x, v) \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}, C_0^\infty(\partial_- SM))$, let

$$(2.16) \quad \varphi(t, x, v) := \phi(t - \tau_-(x, v), x - \tau_-(x, v)v, v).$$

Since $\tau_-(x + tv, v) = \tau_-(x, v) + t$, we have

$$(2.17) \quad v \cdot \nabla \tau_-(x, v) = \frac{d}{dt} \tau_-(x + tv, v) \Big|_{t=0} = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\tau_-(x + tv, v) - \tau_-(x, v)}{t} = 1,$$

In addition, the flow $\rho_{x,v}(-\tau_-(x, v)) = (x - \tau_-(x, v)v, v)$ is invariant along the line so that $v \cdot \nabla \rho_{x,v}(-\tau_-(x, v)) = 0$. Thus, φ satisfies the following boundary value problem:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \varphi + v \cdot \nabla \varphi = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R} \times SM, \\ \varphi|_{\partial_- SM} = \phi & \text{on } \mathbb{R} \times \partial_- SM. \end{cases}$$

For $\lambda \neq 0$, we define the complex-valued functions φ_λ by

$$\varphi_\lambda(t, x, v) := \varphi(t, x, v) e^{i\lambda(t-x \cdot v)},$$

where the subindex λ is used to emphasize the dependence on λ . From direct computations, it is clear that φ_λ are also solutions to $\partial_t f + v \cdot \nabla f = 0$.

We next define the function

$$\Theta_\sigma(x, v) := e^{-\int_0^{\tau_-(x,v)} \sigma(x - (\tau_-(x,v) - s)v, v) ds}.$$

Since $\sigma(x - (\tau_-(x, v) - s)v, v)$ is also invariant along the line such that

$$(v \cdot \nabla) \sigma(x - (\tau_-(x, v) - s)v, v) = 0.$$

Combining with (2.17), we get that Θ_σ satisfies $(\partial_t + v \cdot \nabla + \sigma)\Theta_\sigma(x, v) = 0$. Therefore, we deduce that the function $\varphi_\lambda \Theta_\sigma(t, x, v)$ is a solution to $(\partial_t + v \cdot \nabla + \sigma)f = 0$ in $\mathbb{R} \times SM$.

Standing on these facts, we are now ready to prove the existence of the GO solutions.

Proposition 2.4 (GO solutions in Euclidean setting). *Let M be a bounded strictly convex domain in \mathbb{R}^n , $n \geq 2$. Let $(\sigma, \mu) \in \Omega$. For any $\lambda \neq 0$ and $\phi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}, C_0^\infty(\partial_- SM))$, the linear transport equation*

$$\partial_t u + v \cdot \nabla u + \sigma u = K(u)$$

has solutions of the form

$$(2.18) \quad u_\lambda(t, x, v) = \varphi_\lambda(t, x, v) \Theta_\sigma(x, v) + r_\lambda(t, x, v)$$

in the space $L^\infty(SM_T)$. Moreover, the remainder term r_λ satisfies the estimate

$$(2.19) \quad \|r_\lambda\|_{L^\infty(SM_T)} \leq C \sigma_0 \|\phi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times \partial_- SM)}.$$

In particular, the remainder r_λ satisfies the following decay property:

$$(2.20) \quad \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \pm\infty} \|r_\lambda\|_{L^2(SM_T)} = 0.$$

Here the constant $C > 0$ depends only on σ and T .

Proof. We start by showing the existence of r_λ . By the definitions of φ_λ and Θ_σ , we deduce from $(\sigma, \mu) \in \Omega$ that

$$|K(\varphi_\lambda \Theta_\sigma)(t, x, v)| \leq \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \mu(x, v, v') |\varphi(t, x, v')| dv' \leq \sigma_0 \|\phi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times \partial_- SM)}, \quad \text{for } (t, x, v) \in SM_T,$$

which implies $K(\varphi_\lambda \Theta_\sigma) \in L^\infty(SM_T)$. With this, based on Proposition 2.1, for a fixed $\lambda \neq 0$, there exists a unique solution $r_\lambda \in L^\infty(SM_T)$ to the problem

$$(2.21) \quad \begin{cases} (\partial_t + X + \sigma)r_\lambda = K(r_\lambda) + K(\varphi_\lambda \Theta_\sigma) & \text{in } SM_T, \\ r_\lambda = 0 & \text{on } \{0\} \times SM, \\ r_\lambda = 0 & \text{on } \partial_- SM_T, \end{cases}$$

satisfying

$$\|r_\lambda\|_{L^\infty(SM_T)} \leq C \|K(\varphi_\lambda \Theta_\sigma)\|_{L^\infty(SM_T)} \leq C \sigma_0 \|\phi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times \partial_- SM)}.$$

To show (2.20), we first note that by (2.3) with $p = 2$, the remainder r_λ also satisfies

$$(2.22) \quad \|r_\lambda\|_{L^2(SM_T)} \leq C \|K(\varphi_\lambda \Theta_\sigma)\|_{L^2(SM_T)}.$$

Next we write $K(\varphi_\lambda \Theta_\sigma)(t, x, v) = e^{i\lambda t} \mathcal{K}_{\Phi, \lambda}(t, x, v)$, where we denote

$$\mathcal{K}_{\Phi, \lambda}(t, x, v) := \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} e^{-i\lambda x \cdot v'} \Phi(t, x, v, v') dv',$$

and

$$\Phi(t, x, v, v') := \mu(x, v, v') \varphi(t, x, v') e^{-\int_0^{\tau_-(x, v')} \sigma(x - (\tau_-(x, v') - s)v', v') ds}.$$

For any $t \in (0, T)$, $v \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ and $x \in M \setminus \{0\}$, one can see that $e^{-i\lambda x \cdot v'}$ is weakly convergent in $L^2(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ (see also [8]). This implies that the function $\mathcal{K}_{\Phi, \lambda}(t, x, v)$ converges to zero as $\lambda \rightarrow \pm\infty$. Hence, by dominated convergence theorem, we deduce that

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \pm\infty} \|\mathcal{K}_{\Phi, \lambda}\|_{L^2(SM_T)} = 0.$$

Finally, combining with the facts that $\|K(\varphi_\lambda \Theta_\sigma)\|_{L^2(SM_T)} = \|\mathcal{K}_{\Phi, \lambda}\|_{L^2(SM_T)}$ and (2.22), we complete the proof. \square

We also have GO solutions for the adjoint problem in the following theorem, which can be shown similarly.

Proposition 2.5. *Suppose all hypothesis in Proposition 2.4 hold. The linear transport equation*

$$\partial_t u + v \cdot \nabla u - \sigma u = -K^*(u)$$

has solutions of the form

$$(2.23) \quad u_\lambda(t, x, v) = \varphi_\lambda(t, x, v) \Theta_{-\sigma}(t, x, v) + r_\lambda(t, x, v)$$

in the space $L^\infty(SM_T)$. Here $K^(f)(t, x, v) := \int_{S_x M} \mu(x, v', v) f(t, x, v') dv'$. Moreover, the remainder term r_λ satisfies the estimate*

$$\|r_\lambda\|_{L^\infty(SM_T)} \leq C \sigma_0 \|\phi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times \partial_- SM)}$$

and has the decay property

$$(2.24) \quad \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \pm\infty} \|r_\lambda\|_{L^2(SM_T)} = 0.$$

Here the constant $C > 0$ depends on σ and T .

2.4.2. *Construction of GO solutions in the Riemannian manifold (M, g) .* In a similar spirit to the Euclidean setting above, we will construct GO solutions to the linear transport equation on a manifold M :

$$\partial_t f + Xf + \sigma f = K(f).$$

Given a real-valued function $\phi(t, x, v) \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}, C_0^\infty(\partial_- SM))$, let

$$\varphi(t, x, v) := \phi(t - \tau_-(x, v), \rho_{x,v}(-\tau_-(x, v))),$$

with the geodesic flow $\rho_{x,v}(t) = (\gamma_{x,v}(t), \dot{\gamma}_{x,v}(t))$. The definition of $\rho_{x,v}$ implies that $\rho_{x,v}(-\tau_-(x, v))$ is invariant along the geodesic flow. With $X\tau_-(x, v) = 1$ on SM , we get that φ is a solution to the following boundary value problem:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \varphi + X\varphi = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R} \times SM, \\ \varphi|_{\partial_- SM} = \phi & \text{on } \mathbb{R} \times \partial_- SM. \end{cases}$$

For each $\lambda \neq 0$, we define the complex-valued functions φ_λ by

$$(2.25) \quad \varphi_\lambda(t, x, v) := \varphi(t, x, v)e^{i\lambda(t - \tau_-(x, v))}.$$

Notice that the choice of the phase function $t - \tau_-(x, v)$ is different from the Euclidean case, since in general the inner product $x \cdot v$ does not make sense on Riemannian manifolds. Clearly, φ_λ are also solutions to $\partial_t f + Xf = 0$.

We next define the function

$$\Theta_\sigma(x, v) := e^{-\int_0^{\tau_-(x, v)} \sigma(\gamma_{x,v}(-\tau_-(x, v) + s), \dot{\gamma}_{x,v}(-\tau_-(x, v) + s)) ds},$$

which satisfies $(\partial_t + X + \sigma)\Theta_\sigma(x, v) = 0$. To see this, notice that the function $\sigma(\rho_{x,v}(-\tau_-(x, v) + s))$ is also invariant along the geodesic flow, i.e.

$$X\sigma(\rho_{x,v}(-\tau_-(x, v) + s)) = 0,$$

thus applying $X\tau_-(x, v) = 1$ again gives

$$X\Theta_\sigma(x, v) = -\sigma(x, v)\Theta_\sigma(x, v).$$

Summing up, the function $\varphi_\lambda \Theta_\sigma(t, x, v)$ is a solution to the scattering-free linear transport equation $(\partial_t + X + \sigma)f = 0$ in $\mathbb{R} \times SM$.

When \overline{M} is a two-dimensional compact non-trapping Riemannian manifold with smooth strictly convex boundary, it is well-known that there are global isothermal coordinates (x_1, x_2) on M so that in these coordinates the metric g has the form

$$g_{jk}(x) = e^{2c(x)} \delta_{jk},$$

where $c = c(x)$ is a smooth real-valued function in \overline{M} and δ_{jk} is the Kronecker delta function, see [47, Chapter 3] for reference. Under the isothermal coordinates, the unit tangent bundle SM has local coordinates (x_1, x_2, θ) so that $v \in S_x M$ is given by

$$v(x, \theta) = e^{-c(x)} \left(\cos \theta \frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} + \sin \theta \frac{\partial}{\partial x_2} \right),$$

where θ is the angle between a unit vector v and $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}$. The vertical vector field $V : C^\infty(SM) \rightarrow C^\infty(SM)$ is defined by

$$Vu(x, \theta) := \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} u(x, \theta).$$

Let $\Phi(t, x, v, v') := \mu(x, v, v')\varphi(t, x, v')\Theta_\sigma(x, v')$. We denote a set \mathcal{M} by

$$(2.26) \quad \mathcal{M} := \left\{ (\sigma, \mu) \in \Omega : \mu(x, v, v') = \mu(x, v', v) \text{ and } V \left(\frac{\Phi(t, x, v, v')}{V\tau_-(x, v')} \right) \in L^2(S_x M) \right. \\ \left. \text{for all } \phi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}, C_0^\infty(\partial_- SM)) \text{ and for a.e. } x \in M \right\}.$$

Proposition 2.6 (GO solutions in Riemannian setting). *Let (M, g) be the interior of a compact non-trapping Riemannian manifold with smooth strictly convex boundary ∂M , of dimension $\dim M = 2$. Let $(\sigma, \mu) \in \mathcal{M}$. For any $\lambda \neq 0$ and $\phi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}, C_0^\infty(\partial_- SM))$, the linear transport equation*

$$\partial_t u + Xu + \sigma u = K(u)$$

has solutions of the form

$$(2.27) \quad u_\lambda(t, x, v) = \varphi_\lambda(t, x, v)\Theta_\sigma(x, v) + r_\lambda(t, x, v)$$

in the space $L^\infty(SM_T)$. Moreover, the remainder term r_λ satisfies the estimate

$$(2.28) \quad \|r_\lambda\|_{L^\infty(SM_T)} \leq C\sigma_0\|\phi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times \partial_- SM)}.$$

In particular, the remainder r_λ satisfies the following decay property:

$$(2.29) \quad \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \pm\infty} \|r_\lambda\|_{L^2(SM_T)} = 0.$$

Here the constant $C > 0$ depends only on σ and T .

Proof. Following the same argument as the proof of Proposition 2.4, the estimate (2.28) is valid for the manifold M as well. Therefore, we will only focus on showing (2.29).

To this end, by (2.3) with $p = 2$, the remainder r_λ also satisfies

$$(2.30) \quad \|r_\lambda\|_{L^2(SM_T)} \leq C\|K(\varphi_\lambda\Theta_\sigma)\|_{L^2(SM_T)}.$$

To analyze the decay property of r_λ in L^2 norm in the manifold M , it is sufficient to study the operator K . We write $K(\varphi_\lambda\Theta_\sigma)(t, x, v) = e^{i\lambda t}\mathcal{K}_{\Phi, \lambda}^M(t, x, v)$, where $\mathcal{K}_{\Phi, \lambda}^M$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{K}_{\Phi, \lambda}^M(t, x, v) := \int_{S_x M} e^{-i\lambda\tau_-(x, v')} \Phi(t, x, v, v') dv'$$

with

$$\Phi(t, x, v, v') := \mu(x, v, v')\varphi(t, x, v')e^{-\int_0^{\tau_-(x, v')} \sigma(\gamma_{x, v'}(-\tau_-(x, v') + s), \dot{\gamma}_{x, v'}(-\tau_-(x, v') + s)) ds}.$$

Note that the volume form dv' of $(S_x M, g(x))$ is $d\theta$ [47]. With this, applying the integration by parts, we derive

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{S_x M} e^{-i\lambda\tau_-(x, v')} \Phi(t, x, v, v') dv' &= \int_0^{2\pi} e^{-i\lambda\tau_-(x, v'(x, \theta))} \Phi(t, x, v, v'(x, \theta)) d\theta \\ &= \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{1}{-i\lambda\partial_\theta\tau_-} \Phi d(e^{-i\lambda\tau_-}) \\ &= \frac{1}{i\lambda} \int_0^{2\pi} e^{-i\lambda\tau_-} \partial_\theta \left(\frac{\Phi}{\partial_\theta\tau_-} \right) d\theta \\ &= \frac{1}{i\lambda} \int_{S_x M} e^{-i\lambda\tau_-(x, v')} V \left(\frac{\Phi}{V\tau_-} \right) (t, x, v, v') dv'. \end{aligned}$$

Due to $(\sigma, \mu) \in \mathcal{M}$, we know $V(\Phi/V\tau_-) \in L^2(S_x M)$. Thus $\mathcal{K}_{\Phi, \lambda}^M \rightarrow 0$ as $\lambda \rightarrow \pm\infty$, which gives $\|\mathcal{K}_{\Phi, \lambda}^M\|_{L^2(SM_T)} \rightarrow 0$ by applying Lebesgue dominate convergence theorem. Also with (2.30) and $\|K(\varphi_\lambda\Theta_\sigma)\|_{L^2(SM_T)} = \|\mathcal{K}_{\Phi, \lambda}^M\|_{L^2(SM_T)}$, we obtain (2.29). \square

Remark 2.2. *The assumption on the decay of $V(\Phi/V\tau_-)$ is necessary. For example, let M be the Euclidean disk $D = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : |x| < 1\}$ with the polar coordinate (r, η) with $0 \leq r < 1$ and $0 \leq \eta < 2\pi$. Then for $(x, v) \in SM$, $x = (r \cos \eta, r \sin \eta)$, and let $v = (\cos \theta, \sin \theta)$. Given $(x, v) \in SM$, one can check that*

$$\tau_-(x, v) = \tau_-(r, \eta, \theta) = r \cos(\theta - \eta) + \sqrt{1 - r^2 \sin^2(\theta - \eta)},$$

thus

$$\partial_\theta \tau_- = -r \sin(\theta - \eta) \left(1 + \frac{r \cos(\theta - \eta)}{\sqrt{1 - r^2 \sin^2(\theta - \eta)}} \right).$$

It follows that

$$|\partial_\theta \tau_-| \leq (r + r^2) |\sin(\theta - \eta)|$$

since

$$\frac{r \cos(\theta - \eta)}{\sqrt{1 - r^2 \sin^2(\theta - \eta)}} \leq \frac{r \cos(\theta - \eta)}{\sqrt{\cos^2(\theta - \eta) + (1 - r^2) \sin^2(\theta - \eta)}} \leq r.$$

Notice that when θ is sufficiently close to η , $|\frac{1}{\sin(\theta - \eta)}| \sim \frac{1}{|\theta - \eta|}$, which is not in L^1 or L^2 spaces.

Remark 2.3. *One may replace the assumption $V(\Phi/V\tau_-) \in L^2(S_x M)$ by the hypothesis that σ, μ are sufficiently regular, and for any $(x, v) \in SM$, $\mu(x, v, \cdot) = 0$ near $v' \in S_x M$ such that $V\tau_-(x, v') = 0$.*

Remark 2.4. *Though the constructions of GO solutions for \mathbb{R}^n ($n \geq 2$) and a two-dimensional manifold M have the same format and share alike properties. However, unlike the Euclidean space, the x and v variables are related in the Riemannian manifold so that certain constraints are needed to be imposed on μ to ensure similar decay property of the remainder term in the construction of GO solutions.*

Similarly, the conjugate equation also has the corresponding GO solutions for the Geometric setting.

Proposition 2.7. *Suppose all hypothesis in Proposition 2.6 are satisfied. For any $\lambda \neq 0$ and $\phi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}, C_0^\infty(\partial_- SM))$, the linear transport equation*

$$\partial_t u + Xu - \sigma u = -K^*(u)$$

has solutions of the form

$$(2.31) \quad u_\lambda(t, x, v) = \varphi_\lambda(t, x, v) \Theta_{-\sigma}(t, x, v) + r_\lambda(t, x, v)$$

in the space $L^\infty(SM_T)$. Here $K^*(f)(t, x, v) := \int_{S_x M} \mu(x, v', v) f(t, x, v') dv'$. Moreover, the remainder term r_λ satisfies the estimate

$$\|r_\lambda\|_{L^\infty(SM_T)} \leq C \sigma_0 \|\phi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times \partial_- SM)}$$

and has the decay property

$$(2.32) \quad \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \pm\infty} \|r_\lambda\|_{L^2(SM_T)} = 0.$$

Here the constant $C > 0$ depends on σ and T .

We refer to [8, section 3] for the construction of GO solutions in a different space.

Remark 2.5. *As mentioned in the introduction, our construction of the GO solutions for both Euclidean and Riemannian settings is different from the one in [8]. The key feature is that we do not need to embed the manifold M into \mathbb{R}^n or a larger manifold, which makes our construction more suitable for the general Riemannian case.*

Let us discuss the difference of GO solutions in more details. Assume that M is a smooth open and bounded convex domain in \mathbb{R}^n , so $SM = M \times \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. Both approaches result in a solution to the linear transport equation $\partial_t f + Xf + \sigma f = K(f)$ of the same form

$$u_\lambda = \varphi e^{i\lambda p(t,x,v)} \Theta_\sigma + r_\lambda,$$

where φ and p solve the transport equation $\partial_t f + Xf = 0$, and Θ_σ solves the transport equation $\partial_t f + Xf + \sigma f = 0$, while r_λ being the remainder term.

The difference between our construction and [8] mainly arises from the choice of φ and Θ_σ in the leading term. In [8] they are constructed in the whole space by taking

$$\varphi(t, x, v) = \phi(x - tv, v) \quad \text{with} \quad \phi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n; C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}))$$

and

$$\Theta_\sigma(t, x, v) = e^{-\int_0^t \sigma(x - (t-s)v, v) ds}.$$

Notice that for $(t, x, v) \in SM_T$, it is possible that $x - tv \notin M$ and therefore it is necessary to embed the manifold M in a larger domain. However, in our approach, since all the constructions are restricted in the manifold \bar{M} , there is no need of such extensions. In particular, the choice of φ_λ in (2.25) suits the nature of manifold better.

3. INVERSE COEFFICIENT PROBLEMS

In this section, the focus will be recovering the nonlinear coefficient by utilizing GO solutions, constructed above in the Euclidean space and in the two-dimensional Riemannian manifold (M, g) . All results here will hold for both Euclidean and Riemannian settings, unless otherwise specified.

Before deriving the crucial integral identity, we first impose small parameters into the data in the initial boundary value problem (1.1) and perform the linearization scheme.

3.1. Linearization of the initial boundary value problem. In this section, we apply the linearization method to decompose the solution of the nonlinear transport equation. We fix $(h_0, h_-) \in \mathcal{X}_\delta$ defined in (2.12) for small $\delta > 0$. For $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, based on the well-posedness in Theorem 2.3, there exists a unique solution $f_\varepsilon \equiv f_\varepsilon(t, x, v) \in L^\infty(SM_T)$ to the problem:

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t f_\varepsilon + Xf_\varepsilon + \sigma f_\varepsilon + qf_\varepsilon^m &= K(f_\varepsilon) & \text{in } SM_T, \\ f_\varepsilon &= \varepsilon h_0 & \text{on } \{0\} \times SM, \\ f_\varepsilon &= \varepsilon h_- & \text{on } \partial_- SM_T, \end{cases}$$

with the estimate

$$(3.2) \quad \|f_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(SM_T)} \leq C\varepsilon (\|h_0\|_{L^\infty(SM)} + \|h_-\|_{L^\infty(\partial_- SM_T)}).$$

Such solution f_ε can be decomposed as follows.

Proposition 3.1. *There exists a unique solution f_ε to (3.1), which can be expanded in the following form:*

$$(3.3) \quad f_\varepsilon = \varepsilon u + \varepsilon^m w + R_\varepsilon,$$

where $m \geq 2$ and $u \in L^\infty(SM_T)$ is the solution to

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t u + Xu + \sigma u &= K(u) & \text{in } SM_T, \\ u &= h_0 & \text{on } \{0\} \times SM, \\ u &= h_- & \text{on } \partial_- SM_T, \end{cases}$$

and $w \in L^\infty(SM_T)$ is the solution to

$$(3.5) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t w + Xw + \sigma w + qu^m &= K(w) & \text{in } SM_T, \\ w &= 0 & \text{on } \{0\} \times SM, \\ w &= 0 & \text{on } \partial_- SM_T. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, the remainder term R_ε solves the problem:

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t R_\varepsilon + XR_\varepsilon + \sigma R_\varepsilon &= K(R_\varepsilon) - qf_\varepsilon^m + \varepsilon^m qu^m & \text{in } SM_T, \\ R_\varepsilon &= 0 & \text{on } \{0\} \times SM, \\ R_\varepsilon &= 0 & \text{on } \partial_- SM_T, \end{cases}$$

and satisfies

$$(3.7) \quad \|R_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(SM_T)} \leq C\varepsilon^{2m-1} (\|h_0\|_{L^\infty(SM)} + \|h_-\|_{L^\infty(\partial_- SM_T)})^{2m-1},$$

where the constant $C > 0$ depends on σ, q and T .

Proof. The unique existence of solution $u \in L^\infty(SM_T)$ to (3.4) is due to Proposition 2.1. Since one can view qu^m as a source term in the first equation in (3.5), there exists a unique solution $w \in L^\infty(SM_T)$ for the problem (3.5). Let $F = f_\varepsilon - \varepsilon u$, which then solves

$$(3.8) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t F + XF + \sigma F &= K(F) - qf_\varepsilon^m & \text{in } SM_T, \\ F &= 0 & \text{on } \{0\} \times SM, \\ F &= 0 & \text{on } \partial_- SM_T. \end{cases}$$

By Proposition 2.1 and (3.2), one has

$$(3.9) \quad \|F\|_{L^\infty(SM_T)} \leq C\|q\|_{L^\infty(SM_T)}\|f_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(SM_T)}^m \leq C\|q\|_{L^\infty(SM_T)}\varepsilon^m (\|h_0\|_{L^\infty(SM)} + \|h_-\|_{L^\infty(\partial_- SM_T)})^m.$$

It remains to show the existence of R_ε . From the hypothesis, since the source term $-qf_\varepsilon^m + \varepsilon^m qu^m$ is bounded, applying Proposition 2.1 yields the unique existence of R_ε to the linear transport equation (3.6) and also

$$\begin{aligned} \|R_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(SM_T)} &\leq C\| -qf_\varepsilon^m + \varepsilon^m qu^m \|_{L^\infty(SM_T)} \\ &\leq C\|q\|_{L^\infty(SM)} \left\| (f_\varepsilon - \varepsilon u) \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} f_\varepsilon^{m-1-k} (\varepsilon u)^k \right\|_{L^\infty(SM_T)} \\ &= C\|q\|_{L^\infty(SM)} \|F\|_{L^\infty(SM_T)} \left\| \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} f_\varepsilon^{m-1-k} (\varepsilon u)^k \right\|_{L^\infty(SM_T)} \\ &\leq C\varepsilon^{2m-1} (\|h_0\|_{L^\infty(SM)} + \|h_-\|_{L^\infty(\partial_- SM_T)})^{2m-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Here we have used (3.2) and (3.9) in the last inequality above. \square

3.2. Integral identity. Next, we derive an integral identity that relates the unknown coefficient q with the measurements provided that the coefficients σ and μ are given.

To this end, we view the function f_ε as a function of ε . Then following the notations above, we define the ℓ -th order finite differences operators at 0 by

$$\Delta_\varepsilon^\ell[f_\varepsilon] := \varepsilon^{-\ell} \sum_{k=0}^{\ell} (-1)^{\ell-k} \binom{\ell}{k} f_{k\varepsilon}, \quad \ell \geq 1,$$

whose limit satisfies

$$\partial_\varepsilon^\ell f_\varepsilon|_{\varepsilon=0} = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \Delta_\varepsilon^\ell[f_\varepsilon].$$

For instance, when $\ell = 2$,

$$\Delta_\varepsilon^2[f_\varepsilon] = \varepsilon^{-2}(f_{2\varepsilon} - 2f_\varepsilon),$$

where we used the fact that the solution $f_\varepsilon \equiv 0$ when $\varepsilon = 0$ according to the well-posedness theorem. Let the finite difference operator acting on (3.3) gives

$$\Delta_\varepsilon^m[f_\varepsilon] = (m!)w + \Delta_\varepsilon^m[R_\varepsilon].$$

Hence, together with (3.7), as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, we obtain

$$\partial_\varepsilon^m f_\varepsilon|_{\varepsilon=0} = (m!)w$$

as well as the measurement operator

$$(3.10) \quad \partial_\varepsilon^m \mathcal{A}_q(\varepsilon h_0, \varepsilon h_-)|_{\varepsilon=0} = (m!)(w|_{t=T}, w|_{\partial_+ SM_T}).$$

Indeed, $\partial_\varepsilon f_\varepsilon|_{\varepsilon=0} = u$, the solution to the linear transport equation. Similar finite difference method was also applied to solve inverse problems for nonlinear equations, see for instance, [37] for the semilinear wave equation, [33] for the nonlinear Schrödinger equation, and [36] for the Boltzmann equation.

Proposition 3.2 (Integral identity). *Let $f_j = \varepsilon u_j + \varepsilon^m w_j + R_{\varepsilon,j}$ be the solution to (3.1), where u_j , w_j and $R_{\varepsilon,j}$ solve (3.4), (3.5) and (3.6), respectively, with $q = q_j \in L^\infty(SM_T)$ for $j = 1, 2$. Let \mathcal{A}_{q_1} and \mathcal{A}_{q_2} be the corresponding albedo operator of (3.1). If $\mathcal{A}_{q_1}(h_0, h_-) = \mathcal{A}_{q_2}(h_0, h_-)$ for all $(h_0, h_-) \in \mathcal{X}_\delta$, then*

$$(3.11) \quad \int_{SM_T} (q_1 - q_2)u^m \bar{u}_0 dt d\Sigma = 0,$$

where $u \in L^\infty(SM_T)$ is the solution to (3.4) and u_0 is the solution to its conjugate equation

$$\partial_t u_0 + X u_0 - \sigma u_0 + K^* u_0 = 0 \quad \text{in } SM_T.$$

Proof. Since (σ, μ) are given and the equation (3.4) is independent of q_j , by the uniqueness of the solution to the linear transport equation that

$$u := u_1 = u_2.$$

Let $\tilde{w} = w_1 - w_2$. Then \tilde{w} is the solution to

$$(3.12) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t \tilde{w} + X \tilde{w} + \sigma \tilde{w} - K \tilde{w} = -(q_1 - q_2)u^m & \text{in } SM_T, \\ \tilde{w} = 0 & \text{on } \{0\} \times SM, \\ \tilde{w} = 0 & \text{on } \partial_- SM_T. \end{cases}$$

Due to the fact that $\tilde{w}|_{t=0} = 0$ and $\tilde{w}|_{\partial_- SM_T} = 0$, the identity

$$(3.13) \quad - \int_{SM_T} (q_1 - q_2)u^m \bar{u}_0 dt d\Sigma = \int_{\partial_+ SM_T} \tilde{w} \bar{u}_0 d\xi dt + \int_{SM} \tilde{w} \bar{u}_0(T, x, v) d\Sigma,$$

follows by multiplying the first equation in (3.12) by \bar{u}_0 and applying the integration by parts. Since the albedo operators are the same, by (3.10), we get $\tilde{w}|_{t=T} = \tilde{w}|_{\partial_+ SM_T} = 0$ such that the right hand side of (3.13) vanishes. This results in the desired identity (3.11). \square

Remark 3.1. *We would like emphasize that our albedo operator \mathcal{A} consists of both initial/final data and incoming/outgoing data. This indicates the right-hand side of (3.11) is known and is equal to zero when $\mathcal{A}_{q_1} = \mathcal{A}_{q_2}$. In particular, thanks to the information of the initial and final data, the solutions u and u_0 above do not necessarily satisfy $u(0, \cdot, \cdot) = 0$ and $u_0(T, \cdot, \cdot) = 0$. As a result, freedom of choice is given to select the GO solutions below.*

In the remaining part of this section, we will take the solution u of the linear transport equation (3.4) to be the GO solutions of the form (2.18) in the Euclidean space, $n \geq 2$ (or (2.27) in a two-dimensional manifold):

$$(3.14) \quad u(t, x, v) = \varphi_\lambda(t, x, v)\Theta_\sigma(x, v) + r_\lambda(t, x, v), \quad \lambda \neq 0.$$

Let $h_0 = u|_{t=0} \in L^\infty(SM)$ and $h_- = u|_{\partial_- SM_T} \in L^\infty(\partial_- SM_T)$ be the initial and boundary data, respectively. We also take the GO solutions u_0 of the conjugate equation $\partial_t u_0 + X u_0 - \sigma u_0 + K^* u_0 = 0$, which is of the form

$$(3.15) \quad u_0(t, x, v) = \varphi_\eta(t, x, v)\Theta_{-\sigma}(x, v) + r_\eta(t, x, v), \quad \eta \neq 0$$

based on (2.23) (or (2.31)). Hence, we can further derive the following identity from (3.11), which is valid in both the Euclidean and Riemannian settings.

Lemma 3.3. *Suppose that all conditions in Proposition 2.4-2.7 and Proposition 3.2 hold. If $\mathcal{A}_{q_1} = \mathcal{A}_{q_2}$ on \mathcal{X}_δ , then*

$$(3.16) \quad \lim_{\lambda, \eta \rightarrow \infty} \int_{SM_T} (q_1 - q_2) \varphi_\lambda^m \bar{\varphi}_\eta \Theta_\sigma^{m-1} dt d\Sigma = 0.$$

Proof. It is sufficient to show the case $m = 2$ since $m > 2$ can be justified similarly. To this end, substituting u and u_0 of the form (3.14) and (3.15) into the identity (3.11) with $m = 2$ gives that

$$\int_{SM_T} (q_1 - q_2) (\varphi_\lambda)^2 \bar{\varphi}_\eta \Theta_\sigma dt d\Sigma + I_{\lambda, \eta} = 0.$$

Denote

$$\tilde{q} := q_1 - q_2.$$

Here $I_{\lambda, \eta}$ includes all the higher order terms and is defined as follows:

$$(3.17) \quad I_{\lambda, \eta} := \int_{SM_T} \tilde{q} ((\varphi_\lambda)^2 (\Theta_\sigma)^2 \bar{r}_\eta + 2\varphi_\lambda \bar{\varphi}_\eta r_\lambda + 2\varphi_\lambda \Theta_\sigma r_\lambda \bar{r}_\eta + \bar{\varphi}_\eta \Theta_{-\sigma} (r_\lambda)^2 + (r_\lambda)^2 \bar{r}_\eta) dt d\Sigma.$$

We claim that

$$\lim_{\lambda, \eta \rightarrow \infty} I_{\lambda, \eta} = 0.$$

To see this, we split the discussion into three parts. First we consider the first two terms in (3.17). Note that $|\Theta_\sigma| \leq e^{\sigma_0 \text{diam}(M)}$ since $(\sigma, \mu) \in \Omega$. Here $\text{diam}(M)$ denotes the diameter of M . By applying the Hölder's inequality, the first term of $I_{\lambda, \eta}$ then satisfies

$$\left| \int_{SM_T} \tilde{q} (\varphi_\lambda)^2 (\Theta_\sigma)^2 \bar{r}_\eta dt d\Sigma \right| \leq C \|\tilde{q}\|_{L^\infty(M_T)} \|\varphi\|_{L^\infty(SM_T)} \|\varphi\|_{L^2(SM_T)} \|r_\eta\|_{L^2(SM_T)},$$

which goes to zero when $\eta \rightarrow \infty$ by applying (2.24) (or (2.32) in the manifold), where the constant $C > 0$ depends on M and σ_0 . Similarly, the second term also goes to zero.

Next we deal with the third and fourth terms. Applying Hölder's inequality yields that

$$\left| \int_{SM_T} \tilde{q} \varphi_\lambda \Theta_\sigma r_\lambda \bar{r}_\eta dt d\Sigma \right| \leq C \|\tilde{q}\|_{L^\infty(M_T)} \|\varphi\|_{L^\infty(SM_T)} \|r_\lambda\|_{L^2(SM_T)} \|r_\eta\|_{L^2(SM_T)},$$

which goes to zero as $\lambda, \eta \rightarrow \infty$ by (2.20) and (2.24) (or (2.29), (2.32) in the manifold). The fourth term follows by using a similar argument as above.

Finally, we apply Hölder's inequality and the estimates (2.19), (2.20), (2.24) (or (2.28), (2.29), (2.32) in the manifold) to deduce that

$$\left| \int_{SM_T} \tilde{q} (r_\lambda)^2 \bar{r}_\eta dt d\Sigma \right| \leq C \|\tilde{q}\|_{L^\infty(M_T)} \|r_\lambda\|_{L^2(SM_T)} \|r_\eta\|_{L^2(SM_T)}$$

converges to zero as $\lambda, \eta \rightarrow \infty$. This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

3.3. Reduction to the light ray transform. With suitably chosen functions φ_λ and φ_η in the GO solutions, the identity (3.16) can be reduced to a weighted light ray transform.

3.3.1. Geometric setting. We will bring down the integral identity (3.16) with the following special maps.

Lemma 3.4. *For almost every $(x_0, v_0) \in \partial_- SM$, there is a family of maps $P_{\kappa, x_0, v_0} \in C_0^\infty(\partial_- SM)$ with $0 < \kappa \ll 1$ such that*

$$\|P_{\kappa, x_0, v_0}\|_{L^1(\partial_- SM)} = 1,$$

and, moreover, for any given $f \in L^\infty(\partial_- SM)$, the following holds:

$$(3.18) \quad \lim_{\kappa \rightarrow 0} \int_{\partial_- SM} P_{\kappa, x_0, v_0}(x, v) f(x, v) d\xi = f(x_0, v_0).$$

Proof. Given $(x_0, v_0) \in \partial_- SM$, let $(x, v) : U \times W \subset \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \rightarrow \partial SM$ be a coordinate chart near $(x(0), v(0)) = (x_0, v_0)$. Let $d\xi(x, v) = |\langle v, \nu(x) \rangle| \sqrt{\det g_-(x(\mathbf{u}), v(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w}))} d\mathbf{u} d\mathbf{w}$ be the local coordinate expression, where g_- is the metric on ∂SM induced by the Sasaki metric on SM [47]. Let $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n-1}; \mathbb{R})$ satisfy that $\psi \geq 0$, $\text{supp } \psi \subset B_0(1)$ the unit open ball, and $\|\psi\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^{n-1})} = 1$. For $\kappa > 0$, we denote $\psi_\kappa(\mathbf{u}) := \psi(\mathbf{u}/\kappa)/\kappa^{n-1}$. Then $\psi_\kappa \geq 0$ and $\|\psi_\kappa\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^{n-1})} = 1$. Let $0 < \kappa \ll 1$, so that the open ball $B_0(\kappa)$ with center at 0 and radius κ satisfies $B_0(\kappa) \subset U \cap W$. We define $P_{\kappa, x_0, v_0} \in C_0^\infty(\partial_- SM)$ by

$$P_{\kappa, x_0, v_0}(x, v) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{|\langle v, \nu(x) \rangle| \sqrt{\det g_-(x, v)}} \psi_\kappa(\mathbf{u}(x)) \psi_\kappa(\mathbf{w}(x, v)) & , \text{ if } (\mathbf{u}(x), \mathbf{w}(x, v)) \in U \times W, \\ 0 & , \text{ otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Given any $f \in L^\infty(\partial_- SM)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\partial_- SM} P_{\kappa, x_0, v_0}(x, v) f(x, v) d\xi(x, v) \\ &= \int_{U \times W} \psi_\kappa(\mathbf{u}) \psi_\kappa(\mathbf{w}) f(x(\mathbf{u}), v(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w})) d\mathbf{u} d\mathbf{w} \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \psi_\kappa(\mathbf{u}) \psi_\kappa(\mathbf{w}) f(x(\mathbf{u}), v(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w})) d\mathbf{u} d\mathbf{w}. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, since $\|\psi_\kappa\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^{n-1})} = 1$ for any $\kappa > 0$, by letting $f \equiv 1$, we get that

$$\|P_{\kappa, x_0, v_0}\|_{L^1(\partial_- SM)} = 1.$$

Moreover, by [22, Theorem 8.15], it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{\kappa \rightarrow 0} \int_{\partial_- SM} P_{\kappa, x_0, v_0}(x, v) f(x, v) d\xi \\ &= \lim_{\kappa \rightarrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \psi_\kappa(\mathbf{u}) \psi_\kappa(\mathbf{w}) f(x(\mathbf{u}), v(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w})) d\mathbf{u} d\mathbf{w} = f(x_0, v_0) \end{aligned}$$

for a.e. $(x_0, v_0) \in \partial_- SM$. \square

We are ready to derive the light ray transform.

Proposition 3.5. *Let the assumptions of Lemma 3.3 be fulfilled. Let $q_j \in L^\infty(M_T)$ for $j = 1, 2$. If $\mathcal{A}_{q_1}(h_0, h_-) = \mathcal{A}_{q_2}(h_0, h_-)$ for all $(h_0, h_-) \in \mathcal{X}_\delta$, then for almost every $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $(x, v) \in \partial_- SM$, we have*

$$\int_0^{\tau(x,v)} \tilde{q}(t+s, \gamma_{x,v}(s)) e^{-\int_0^s (m-1)\sigma(\gamma_{x,v}(\ell), \dot{\gamma}_{x,v}(\ell)) d\ell} ds = 0.$$

Proof. We recall the notation $\tilde{q} := q_1 - q_2$ and extend $\tilde{q}(\cdot, x)$ by zero to the whole space \mathbb{R} in the t variable. Recall that the geodesic flow is denoted by

$$\rho_{x,v}(t) := (\gamma_{x,v}(t), \dot{\gamma}_{x,v}(t)).$$

Given $(x_0, v_0) \in \partial_- SM$, now we take $\eta = m\lambda$ and the functions

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_\lambda(t, x, v) &= P_{\kappa, x_0, v_0}^{\frac{1}{m}}(\rho_{x,v}(-\tau_-(x, v))) \phi_1(t - \tau_-(x, v), \rho_{x,v}(-\tau_-(x, v))) e^{i\lambda p(t, x, v)}, \\ \varphi_\eta(t, x, v) &= \varphi_{m\lambda}(t, x, v) = \phi_2(t - \tau_-(x, v), \rho_{x,v}(-\tau_-(x, v))) e^{im\lambda p(t, x, v)} \end{aligned}$$

in (3.14)-(3.15), where $\phi_j \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}, C_0^\infty(\partial_- SM))$ for $j = 1, 2$. Here $p(t, x, v) = t - x \cdot v$ for the Euclidean setting and $p(t, x, v) = t - \tau_-(x, v)$ for the Riemannian setting. Notice that since $P_{\kappa, x_0, v_0}(\rho_{x,v}(-\tau_-(x, v)))$ is invariant along the geodesic flow, $XP_{\kappa, x_0, v_0}(\rho_{x,v}(-\tau_-(x, v))) = 0$. This implies φ_λ and φ_η are solutions to $\partial_t f + Xf = 0$.

Since \tilde{q} has support in M_T , the integral in (3.16) can be extended from $[0, T]$ to \mathbb{R} . Applying the Santalo's formula [47] to (3.16) yields that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{SM} \tilde{q}(t, x) \phi_1^m \phi_2(t - \tau_-(x, v), \rho_{x,v}(-\tau_-(x, v))) P_{\kappa, x_0, v_0}(\rho_{x,v}(-\tau_-(x, v))) \Theta_\sigma^{m-1} d\Sigma(x, v) dt \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\partial_- SM} \int_0^{\tau(y,w)} \tilde{q}(t, \gamma_{y,w}(s)) \phi_1^m \phi_2(t - s, y, w) P_{\kappa, x_0, v_0}(y, w) e^{-\int_0^s (m-1)\sigma(\rho_{y,w}(\ell)) d\ell} ds d\xi(y, w) dt. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\kappa \rightarrow 0$, we apply the change of variable $t \mapsto t' = t - s$, by (3.18) and Fubini's theorem, to get

$$(3.19) \quad 0 = \int_0^{\tau(x_0, v_0)} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{q}(t' + s, \gamma_{x_0, v_0}(s)) \phi_1^m \phi_2(t', x_0, v_0) e^{-\int_0^s (m-1)\sigma(\rho_{x_0, v_0}(\ell)) d\ell} dt' ds.$$

Finally, for any $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, since ϕ_j are arbitrary smooth functions with compact support, we let $\phi_1 \equiv 1$ in $(t_0 - 1, t_0 + 1) \times \partial_- SM$ and $\phi_2(t, x, v) = \chi(\frac{t-t_0}{\zeta})/\zeta$, $0 < \zeta < 1$, where $\chi(t) \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ satisfies $\chi(0) = 1$ and $\|\chi\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} = 1$ with support in $|t| \leq 1$. By [22, Theorem 8.15], when ζ goes to zero, we then derive from (3.19) that

$$\int_0^{\tau(x_0, v_0)} \tilde{q}(t_0 + s, \gamma_{x_0, v_0}(s)) e^{-\int_0^s (m-1)\sigma(\gamma_{x_0, v_0}(\ell), \dot{\gamma}_{x_0, v_0}(\ell)) d\ell} ds = 0,$$

for almost every t_0 , provided that $q_j \in L^\infty(M_T)$. □

Notice that the integral appearing in Proposition 3.5 defines the (weighted) light ray transform of \tilde{q} on $\mathbb{R} \times M$. More precisely, let's first introduce the definition of the standard *light ray transform* L of a function $S \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times M)$. It is defined by

$$LS(t, x, v) := \int_0^{\tau(x,v)} S(t+s, \gamma_{x,v}(s)) ds, \quad (t, x, v) \in \mathbb{R} \times \overline{SM}.$$

Let $W \in L^\infty(SM)$, we define the general *weighted light ray transform* by

$$(3.20) \quad L_W S(t, x, v) := \int_0^{\tau(x,v)} S(t+s, \gamma_{x,v}(s)) W(\gamma_{x,v}(s), \dot{\gamma}_{x,v}(s)) ds.$$

Therefore, the weight appearing in the light ray transform deduced from Proposition 3.5 is defined as

$$W(\gamma_{x,v}(s), \dot{\gamma}_{x,v}(s)) := e^{-\int_0^s (m-1)\sigma(\gamma_{x,v}(r), \dot{\gamma}_{x,v}(r)) dr}, \quad s \in (0, \tau(x, v)), \quad (x, v) \in \partial_- SM.$$

In particular, $W \in C^\infty(SM)$ if $\sigma \in C^\infty(\overline{SM})$.

3.4. Injectivity of the light ray transform. As a preparation for the proof of our main results in the next subsection, we establish the following injectivity of the light ray transform L_W , based on analyticity. In particular, it works for a general nonvanishing weight $W \in L^\infty(SM)$.

The approach has been used in earlier study of the light ray transform without weight [18, 19].

Hypothesis 3.1. *Let (M, g) be a compact connected Riemannian manifold with smooth boundary. Assume that the geodesic X -ray transform with a nonvanishing weight $W \in L^\infty(SM)$ is injective. Namely, for any $S \in L^\infty(M)$, if*

$$I_W S(x, v) := \int_0^{\tau(x, v)} S(\gamma_{x,v}(s)) W(\gamma_{x,v}(s), \dot{\gamma}_{x,v}(s)) ds = 0$$

for a.e. $(x, v) \in \partial_- SM$, then $S = 0$.

On simple manifolds, injectivity of I_W has been proven for generic weights [23], including the real-analytic ones. On the other hand, injectivity results of I_W are known on manifolds admitting strictly convex functions [46]. See [58] for additional references.

Theorem 3.6. *Suppose that Hypothesis 3.1 holds. Assume $S \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times M)$ is supported in M_T . If $L_W S(t, x, v) = 0$ for almost every $(t, x, v) \in \mathbb{R} \times \partial_- SM$ with a nonvanishing weight function $W \in L^\infty(SM)$, then $S = 0$.*

Proof. Consider

$$L_W S(t, x, v) := \int_0^{\tau(x, v)} S(t + s, \gamma_{x,v}(s)) W(\gamma_{x,v}(s), \dot{\gamma}_{x,v}(s)) ds, \quad \text{for a.e. } (t, x, v) \in \mathbb{R} \times \partial_- SM.$$

Taking the Fourier transform w.r.t. the time variable t , we get

$$\widehat{L_W S}(\eta, x, v) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-i\eta t} \int_0^{\tau(x, v)} S(t + s, \gamma_{x,v}(s)) W(\gamma_{x,v}(s), \dot{\gamma}_{x,v}(s)) ds dt.$$

By the change of variable $t' = t + s$ and the Fubini's theorem, note that $S \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times M)$, we derive

$$\widehat{L_W S}(\eta, x, v) = \int_0^{\tau(x, v)} e^{i\eta s} \hat{S}(\eta, \gamma_{x,v}(s)) W(\gamma_{x,v}(s), \dot{\gamma}_{x,v}(s)) ds.$$

When $\eta = 0$,

$$\widehat{L_W S}(0, x, v) = \int_0^{\tau(x, v)} \hat{S}(0, \gamma_{x,v}(s)) W(\gamma_{x,v}(s), \dot{\gamma}_{x,v}(s)) ds = 0 \quad \text{for a.e. } (x, v) \in \partial_- SM$$

for all geodesics γ in M . Therefore, Hypothesis 3.1 can be applied directly and it implies $\hat{S}(0, \cdot) = 0$ in M . Since the weight W is independent of η , the derivatives of $\widehat{L_W S}$ at $\eta = 0$ can be written as

$$(3.21) \quad 0 = \partial_\eta^k \widehat{L_W S}(\eta, x, v)|_{\eta=0} = \sum_{j=0}^k \binom{k}{j} \int_0^{\tau(x, v)} (is)^{k-j} \partial_\eta^j \hat{S}(0, \gamma_{x,v}(s)) W(\gamma_{x,v}(s), \dot{\gamma}_{x,v}(s)) ds.$$

We then proceed by applying the induction argument. Suppose that $\partial_\eta^j \hat{S}(0, \cdot) = 0$ for $j < k$. From (3.21), we obtain

$$0 = \int_0^{\tau(x, v)} \partial_\eta^k \hat{S}(0, \gamma_{x,v}(s)) W(\gamma_{x,v}(s), \dot{\gamma}_{x,v}(s)) ds.$$

Applying the Hypothesis 3.1 again, it yields $\partial_\eta^k \hat{S}(0, \gamma_{x,v}(s)) = 0$. Therefore, $\partial_\eta^k \hat{S}(0, \cdot) = 0$ for all k . Since S is compactly supported in t , its Fourier transform $\hat{S}(\eta, \cdot)$ is analytic with respect to η . Combining with $\partial_\eta^k \hat{S}(0, \gamma_{x,v}(s)) = 0$ for all k , we conclude $\hat{S}(\eta, \cdot) = 0$ for all $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$ and thus $S \equiv 0$. \square

Remark 3.2. *The proof of Theorem 3.6 relies essentially on the assumption that the unknown function S has compact support, so the time Fourier transform of S is analytic. Therefore it suffices to recover \hat{S} and all its derivatives at single frequency $\eta = 0$. In Appendix A, we provide an alternative approach of showing the injectivity of light ray transforms of functions and tensor fields that are not necessarily compactly supported, by imposing hypotheses regarding the injectivity of certain weight geodesic X-ray transforms with respect to any frequencies $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$.*

3.5. Proof of main results. We are now ready to prove Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 as well as Corollary 1.3. The two main theorems follow directly from the above facts.

Proof of Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2. We apply Theorem 3.6 to the light ray transform appearing in Proposition 3.5 with $S = \tilde{q}$ and $W(\gamma_{x,v}(s), \dot{\gamma}_{x,v}(s)) = e^{-\int_0^s (m-1)\sigma(\gamma_{x,v}(\ell), \dot{\gamma}_{x,v}(\ell)) d\ell}$. Thus, the injectivity, $\tilde{q} = q_1 - q_2 = 0$, holds. \square

For the geometric setting without scattering (namely, $\mu \equiv 0$ in (1.1)), the uniqueness result also holds in the manifold (M, g) for any dimensions $n \geq 3$.

Proof of Theorem 1.4. Without the presence of the scattering, that is, $\mu \equiv 0$, the remainder term r_λ is trivial so that the GO solutions have relatively simple form, that is,

$$u_\lambda(t, x, v) = \varphi_\lambda(t, x, v)\Theta_\sigma(x, v).$$

As a result, by adjusting the arguments in previous subsections with $r_\lambda = 0$, we will end up with the same weighted light ray transform in Proposition 3.5. This enables us to use Theorem 3.6 again to derive $q_1 = q_2$. \square

Finally, we replace the injectivity assumption of the attenuated X-ray transform in Theorem 1.1 and 1.2 by proper geometric conditions to establish Corollary 1.3.

Proof of Corollary 1.3. For the case (1), if M is an open bounded and strictly convex domain in \mathbb{R}^n , then \overline{M} is simple and admits a smooth strictly convex function (see e.g. [46, Lemma 2.1]). Since $\sigma \in C^\infty(S\overline{M})$, if $I_{(m-1)\sigma} S = 0$ for $S \in L^\infty(M)$, then $S \in C^\infty(\overline{M})$, see e.g. [23, Proposition 3]. Now as \overline{M} admits a smooth strictly convex function, it follows that the attenuated X-ray transform $I_{(m-1)\sigma}$ is injective on $L^\infty(M)$ by [46]. Now we can apply Theorem 1.1 to conclude that $q_1 = q_2$.

For the case (2), both assumptions (a) and (b) imply that \overline{M} is a simple surface. Since $\sigma \in C^\infty(\overline{M})$, similar to case (1), one can conclude that $\ker I_{(m-1)\sigma} \cap L^\infty(M) \subset C^\infty(\overline{M})$. Therefore the attenuated X-ray transform $I_{(m-1)\sigma}$ is injective on $L^\infty(M)$ if $\sigma \in C^\infty(\overline{M})$ by [50]. Now if M is an open bounded and strictly convex domain in \mathbb{R}^2 , we apply Theorem 1.1 to obtain that $q_1 = q_2$. On the other hand, if M is the interior of a simple surface and $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$, Theorem 1.2 implies that $q_1 = q_2$ as well. \square

3.6. Another uniqueness result based on monotonicity. Before closing Section 3, we will study the problem under the monotonicity assumption $q_1 \leq q_2$. With this new information, the uniqueness result can be proved directly from Lemma 3.3.

Theorem 3.7 (Monotonicity condition). *Suppose that all conditions in Lemma 3.3 hold. Suppose that $q_1 \leq q_2$. If $\mathcal{A}_1(h_0, h_-) = \mathcal{A}_2(h_0, h_-)$ for all $(h_0, h_-) \in \mathcal{X}_\delta$, then*

$$q_1 = q_2 \quad \text{in } (0, T) \times M.$$

Proof. We take $\eta = m\lambda$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi_\lambda(t, x, v) &= \phi(t - \tau_-(x, v), \rho_{x,v}(-\tau_-(x, v)))e^{i\lambda(t - \tau_-(x, v))}, \\ \varphi_\eta(t, x, v) &= \varphi_{m\lambda}(t, x, v) = \phi(t - \tau_-(x, v), \rho_{x,v}(-\tau_-(x, v)))e^{im\lambda(t - \tau_-(x, v))}\end{aligned}$$

in (3.14)-(3.15), where $\phi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}, C_0^\infty(\partial_- SM))$ satisfying $\phi \geq 0$.

Since $q_2 \geq q_1$, from (3.16), we have

$$\begin{aligned}0 &= \int_{SM_T} (q_2 - q_1)(t, x) \left(\phi(t - \tau_-(x, v), \rho_{x,v}(-\tau_-(x, v))) \right)^{m+1} \Theta_\sigma^{m-1} dt d\Sigma \\ &\geq e^{-(m-1)\sigma_0 \text{diam}(M)} \int_{SM_T} (q_2 - q_1)(t, x) \left(\phi(t - \tau_-(x, v), \rho_{x,v}(-\tau_-(x, v))) \right)^{m+1} dt d\Sigma \geq 0.\end{aligned}$$

Since ∂M is strictly convex, there exists $\phi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}, C_0^\infty(\partial_- SM))$ such that

$$\int_{S_{xM}} \left(\phi(t - \tau_-(x, v), \rho_{x,v}(-\tau_-(x, v))) \right)^{m+1} dv > 0$$

for all $(t, x) \in M_T$. This implies that for a.e. $(t, x) \in M_T$,

$$(q_2 - q_1)(t, x) = 0.$$

□

4. INVERSE SOURCE PROBLEM

In this section, we consider the linear transport equation in the non-scattering medium. The objective is to reconstruct the source term in the equation from the measurement. Accordingly, we will first link the expression of the transport solution in [35] and the weighted light ray transform under suitable assumptions.

4.1. A connection between different expressions of transport solutions. Assume that $S \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times M)$ is supported in M_T . From Proposition 2.2 in [35], the solution f to the following equation

$$(4.1) \quad \partial_t f + Xf + \sigma f = S(t, x)$$

with $f|_{t=0} = f|_{\partial_- SM_T} = 0$ can be written as

$$(4.2) \quad f(t, x, v) = \int_0^t e^{-\int_0^s \sigma(\rho_{x,v}(-r)) dr} S(t-s, \gamma_{x,v}(-s)) H(\tau_-(x, v) - s) ds, \quad (t, x, v) \in SM_T,$$

where H is the Heaviside function, that is, H satisfies $H(s) = 0$ if $s < 0$ and $H(s) = 1$ if $s > 0$.

For $(x, v) \in SM$, when $t \geq \tau_-(x, v)$, it is clear that (4.2) can be expressed as

$$(4.3) \quad f(t, x, v) = \int_0^{\tau_-(x, v)} e^{-\int_0^s \sigma(\rho_{x,v}(-r)) dr} S(t-s, \gamma_{x,v}(-s)) ds.$$

On the other hand, when $t < \tau_-(x, v)$, since S is supported in M_T which implies $S(t-s, \gamma_{x,v}(-s)) = 0$ for $s \in [t, \tau_-(x, v))$, we can extend its integral region from $(0, t)$ to $(0, \tau_-(x, v))$ so that (4.2) is also of the form (4.3) for $t < \tau_-(x, v)$.

Replacing v by $-v$, we get from (4.3) that

$$(4.4) \quad \tilde{f}(t, x, v) := f(t, x, -v) = \int_0^{\tau(x, v)} e^{-\int_0^s \sigma(\rho_{x,v}(r)) dr} S(t-s, \gamma_{x,v}(s)) ds,$$

which is the weighted light ray transform satisfying

$$\partial_t \tilde{f} - X\tilde{f} + \sigma\tilde{f} = S(t, x) \quad \text{with } \tilde{f}|_{t=0} = \tilde{f}|_{\partial_+ SM} = 0.$$

4.2. Inverse source problem in the absence of the scattering. Recall that in both the well-posedness and linearization, we view the nonlinear coefficient q as part of a source term for linear transport equations. By slightly modifying the arguments in Section 3.1-3.4, we can prove the following uniqueness result for the inverse source problem for the time-dependent linear transport equation:

$$(4.5) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t f + Xf + \sigma f &= S(t, x) & \text{in } SM_T, \\ f &= 0 & \text{on } \{0\} \times SM, \\ f &= 0 & \text{on } \partial_- SM_T. \end{cases}$$

We define the measurement operator by

$$\mathcal{A} : S \in L^\infty(M_T) \rightarrow (f|_{t=T}, f|_{\partial_+ SM_T}) \in L^\infty(SM) \times L^\infty(\partial_+ SM_T),$$

which is well-defined. The aim is to determine the source S from measuring $\mathcal{A}(S)$.

Proposition 4.1. *Let f_j be the solution to (4.5) with $S = S_j \in L^\infty(M_T)$ for $j = 1, 2$. Suppose that $\tilde{S} := S_1 - S_2$. Suppose that Hypothesis 3.1 holds with $S = \tilde{S}$ and $W = e^{-\int_0^s \sigma(\gamma_{x,v}(\ell), \dot{\gamma}_{x,v}(\ell)) d\ell}$. If $\mathcal{A}(S_1) = \mathcal{A}(S_2)$, then*

$$S_1 = S_2 \quad \text{in } (0, T) \times M.$$

Proof. We extend \tilde{S} by zero to \mathbb{R} in the t variable so that $\tilde{S} \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times M)$. Due to the well-posedness, there exists a unique solution $f_j \in L^\infty(SM_T)$ to (4.5) with $S = S_j$ for $j = 1, 2$, respectively. Denote $F := f_1 - f_2$. Then F is a solution to

$$(4.6) \quad \partial_t F + XF + \sigma F = \tilde{S}(t, x)$$

and satisfies $F|_{t=0} = F|_{\partial_- SM_T} = 0$. Without the scattering term, as mentioned above, the solution F can be expressed as

$$F(t, x, v) = \int_0^{\tau_-(x,v)} e^{-\int_0^s \sigma(\rho_{x,v}(-r)) dr} \tilde{S}(t-s, \gamma_{x,v}(-s)) ds$$

and $F(t, x, -v)$ becomes a weighted light ray transform (4.4), denoted by

$$\tilde{F}(t, x, v) := F(t, x, -v) = \int_0^{\tau(x,v)} e^{-\int_0^s \sigma(\rho_{x,v}(r)) dr} \tilde{S}(t-s, \gamma_{x,v}(s)) ds.$$

Moreover, from $\mathcal{A}(S_1) = \mathcal{A}(S_2)$, we also have $F|_{\partial_+ SM_T} = F|_{t=T} = 0$, which leads to $\tilde{F}|_{t=T} = 0$ and $\tilde{F}|_{\partial_- SM_T} = F|_{\partial_+ SM_T} = 0$. Thus

$$\tilde{F}(t, x, v) = 0 \quad (t, x, v) \in (0, T) \times \partial_- SM.$$

Indeed, $\tilde{F} = 0$ in $\mathbb{R} \times \partial_- SM$. To see this, we observe that $\tilde{F}(t, \cdot, \cdot) = 0$ in $\partial_- SM$ for $t < 0$ since \tilde{S} is supported in SM_T . On the other hand, for case $t > T$, we let $t = T + t'$ with $t' > 0$. Through the

change of variable $s \mapsto s' = s - t'$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{F}(T + t', x, v) &= \int_0^{\tau(x, v)} e^{-\int_0^s \sigma(\rho_{x, v}(r)) dr} \tilde{S}(T + t' - s, \gamma_{x, v}(s)) ds \\
&= \int_{-t'}^{\tau(\rho_{x, v}(t'))} e^{-\int_0^{s'+t'} \sigma(\rho_{x, v}(r)) dr} \tilde{S}(T - s', \gamma_{\rho_{x, v}(t')}(s')) ds' \\
&= \int_{-t'}^{\tau(\rho_{x, v}(t'))} e^{-\int_{-t'}^{s'} \sigma(\rho_{\rho_{x, v}(t')}(r')) dr'} \tilde{S}(T - s', \gamma_{\rho_{x, v}(t')}(s')) ds' \\
&= e^{-\int_{-t'}^0 \sigma(\rho_{\rho_{x, v}(t')}(r')) dr'} \left(\int_0^{\tau(\rho_{x, v}(t'))} e^{-\int_0^{s'} \sigma(\rho_{\rho_{x, v}(t')}(r')) dr'} \tilde{S}(T - s', \gamma_{\rho_{x, v}(t')}(s')) ds' \right) \\
&= e^{-\int_{-t'}^0 \sigma(\rho_{\rho_{x, v}(t')}(r')) dr'} \tilde{F}(T, \rho_{x, v}(t')),
\end{aligned}$$

where we applied the change of variable $r \mapsto r' = r - t'$ and also used the fact that \tilde{S} is supported in M_T in the third and fourth identities, respectively. When $t' > \tau(x, v)$, due to the support of \tilde{S} , $\tilde{F}(T, \rho_{x, v}(t')) = 0$, which yields that $\tilde{F}(T + t', x, v) = 0$. When $0 < t' < \tau(x, v)$, the flow $\rho_{x, v}(t') \in SM$. Since the final data $\tilde{F}|_{t=T} = 0$ in SM , we also get $\tilde{F}(T, \rho_{x, v}(t')) = 0$ and thus $\tilde{F}(T + t', x, v) = 0$. Now we have showed that $\tilde{F} = 0$ in $\mathbb{R} \times \partial_- SM$ a.e..

Finally, under the hypothesis 3.1 that the attenuated ray transform is injective, performing the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 3.6 yields $\tilde{S} = 0$. \square

APPENDIX A. LIGHT RAY TRANSFORM ON INFINITE CYLINDER

In this section, we consider the light ray transform of functions or tensor fields that are not necessarily supported in M_T .

We give an alternative approach of showing the injectivity, up to natural gauge, of the light ray transform of symmetric tensor fields. It has been studied in [18, 19] for static Lorentzian manifolds using analyticity of the time Fourier transform of tensors compactly supported in time. Earlier results in Minkowski spacetime can be found in e.g. [48, 30].

Recall that M is the interior of a compact non-trapping Riemannian manifold (\overline{M}, g) , of dimension $n \geq 2$, with smooth strictly convex boundary ∂M . Let $f \in L^\infty(N; \mathcal{S}^m) \cap L^1(\mathbb{R}; C(\overline{M}); \mathcal{S}^m)$ be a symmetric tensor field of rank m on $N = \mathbb{R} \times M$, where \mathcal{S}^m denotes the space of symmetric tensor fields of rank m on N for each $m = 0, 1, \dots$. In local coordinates $z = (z^0, z^1, \dots, z^n) = (t, x^1, \dots, x^n)$,

$$f(z) = f_{i_1 \dots i_m}(z) dz^{i_1} \dots dz^{i_m},$$

where $dz^0 = dt$ and $dz^j = dx^j$ for $j = 1, \dots, n$. Equivalently, we can write f as

$$f = f_m + f_{m-1} dt + \dots + f_1 (dt)^{m-1} + f_0 (dt)^m,$$

where $f_k \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}; L^\infty(M; S^k)) \cap L^1(\mathbb{R}; C(\overline{M}; S^k))$ for $k = 0, 1, \dots, m$. Here S^k denotes the space of symmetric tensor fields of rank k on M , and $f_k (dt)^{m-k}$ denotes the symmetrized tensor product of f_k with $(dt)^{m-k}$. We denote the (static) Lorentzian metric on N by $\bar{g} = -(dt)^2 + g$.

For simplicity, we denote the space $L^\infty(N; \mathcal{S}^m) \cap L^1(\mathbb{R}; C(\overline{M}); \mathcal{S}^m)$ by $\mathcal{L}(N; \mathcal{S}^m)$, and the space $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}; L^\infty(M; S^k)) \cap L^1(\mathbb{R}; C(\overline{M}; S^k))$ by $\mathcal{D}(M; S^k)$. Note that $\mathcal{L}(N, \mathcal{S}^m) \subset L^2(N; \mathcal{S}^m)$.

Lemma A.1. *Given any $f \in \mathcal{L}(N; \mathcal{S}^m)$, there exist $p \in \mathcal{D}(M; S^m)$, $q \in \mathcal{D}(M; S^{m-1})$, $r \in \mathcal{D}(M; S^{m-2})$ and $\lambda \in \mathcal{L}(N; \mathcal{S}^{m-2})$ such that*

$$f = (p + r g) + q dt + \lambda \bar{g}.$$

Proof. We prove the above decomposition by induction. The cases $m = 0, 1$ are obvious. When $m = 2$, notice that

$$f = f_2 + f_1 dt + f_0(dt)^2 = (f_2 + f_0 g) + f_1 dt + (-f_0)(-dt)^2 + g).$$

Now assume that the decomposition holds for some $m \geq 2$, let f be a tensor of rank $m + 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned} f &= f_{m+1} + f_m dt + \cdots + f_0(dt)^{m+1} \\ &= f_{m+1} + (f_m + f_{m-1} dt + \cdots + f_0(dt)^m) dt \\ &= f_{m+1} + (p + r g + q dt + \lambda \bar{g}) dt \\ &= f_{m+1} + (p + r g) dt + q(dt)^2 + \lambda(dt)\bar{g} \\ &= (f_{m+1} + q g) + (p + r g) dt + (\lambda dt - q)\bar{g}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Consider the light ray transform of a symmetric tensor field f of rank m on $N = \mathbb{R} \times M$ defined by

$$L_m f(t, x, v) = \int_0^{\tau(x,v)} f_{i_1 \dots i_m}(\tilde{\gamma}_{t,x,v}(s)) \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}_{t,x,v}^{i_1}(s) \cdots \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}_{t,x,v}^{i_m}(s) ds, \quad (t, x, v) \in \mathbb{R} \times \overline{SM},$$

where the light ray/null geodesic $\tilde{\gamma}_{t,x,v}(s) = (t + s, \gamma_{x,v}(s))$ with $\gamma_{x,v}$ the geodesic on M . Note that $\dot{\tilde{\gamma}}_{t,x,v}^0(s) \equiv 1$ and $\dot{\tilde{\gamma}}_{t,x,v}^j(s) = \dot{\gamma}_{x,v}^j(s)$ are the j^{th} -component of $\dot{\gamma}_{x,v}(s)$ for $j = 1, \dots, n$. It's easy to see that $L_m(\lambda \bar{g}) \equiv 0$ for any $\lambda \in \mathcal{L}(N; \mathcal{S}^{m-2})$. We may simply denote the integrand of $L_m f$ by

$$f(t + s, \gamma_{x,v}(s), \dot{\gamma}_{x,v}(s)).$$

Let $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$, we define the following attenuated geodesic X-ray transform on M of $f \in L^\infty(M; S^k)$, $k \geq 0$, as

$$I_\eta f(x, v) = \int_0^{\tau(x,v)} e^{i\eta s} f_{i_1 \dots i_k}(\gamma_{x,v}(s)) \dot{\gamma}_{x,v}^{i_1}(s) \cdots \dot{\gamma}_{x,v}^{i_k}(s) ds.$$

We denote d^s the symmetric differentiation w.r.t. the Riemannian metric g .

Hypothesis A.1. *For each $m = 0, 1, \dots$, we say that I_η is s -injective for degree m if $I_\eta f|_{\partial_- SM} \equiv 0$, $f \in \bigoplus_{k=0}^m C(\overline{M}; S^k)$, implies that $f = d^s p + i\eta p$ for some $p \in \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} C^1(\overline{M}; S^k)$ with $p|_{\partial M} = 0$. When $m = 0$, this just means that $f = 0$, i.e. I_η is injective.*

Notice that the attenuation $i\eta$ is complex. When $m = 0$ and 1, injectivity results for I_η were proved on simple manifolds [50, 26, 57] and manifolds admitting strictly convex functions [46], see also recent survey [58] and the references therein. When $m \geq 2$, injectivity results are known on simple surfaces [29] and negatively curved manifolds [45].

Theorem A.2. *Assume that the attenuated X-ray transform I_η is s -injective for degree m for all $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $f \in L^\infty(N; \mathcal{S}^m) \cap L^1(\mathbb{R}; C(\overline{M}); \mathcal{S}^m)$. If $L_m f = 0$ for all $(t, x, v) \in \mathbb{R} \times \partial_- SM$, then*

- $f = 0$, if $m = 0$;
- $f = \bar{d}^s p$ for some $p \in L^\infty(N) \cap H^1(\mathbb{R}; C^1(\overline{M}))$, $p|_{\partial N} = 0$, if $m = 1$;
- $f = \bar{d}^s p + \lambda \bar{g}$ for some $p \in L^\infty(N; \mathcal{S}^{m-1}) \cap H^1(\mathbb{R}; C^1(\overline{M}); \mathcal{S}^{m-1})$, $p|_{\partial N} = 0$, and $\lambda \in \mathcal{L}(N; \mathcal{S}^{m-2})$, if $m \geq 2$.

Here \bar{d}^s is the symmetric differentiation w.r.t. the Lorentzian metric \bar{g} , i.e., $\bar{d}^s = d^s + \partial_t(\cdot) dt$.

Proof. By Lemma A.1 and the fact that $L_m(\lambda \bar{g}) \equiv 0$, we may assume that

$$f = p + r g + q dt$$

for some $p \in \mathcal{D}(M; S^m)$, $q \in \mathcal{D}(M; S^{m-1})$ and $r \in \mathcal{D}(M; S^{m-2})$. In the meantime, f can be rewritten as

$$(A.1) \quad f = p + q dt + r(dt)^2 + r \bar{g},$$

so we only consider f of the form

$$p + q dt + r(dt)^2.$$

Following the calculation in the proof of Theorem 3.6, since $f \in \mathcal{L}(N; S^m)$, by the Fubini's theorem

$$(A.2) \quad 0 = \widehat{L_m f}(\eta, x, v) = \int_0^{\tau(x,v)} e^{i\eta s} \hat{f}(\eta, \gamma_{x,v}(s), \dot{\gamma}_{x,v}(s)) ds.$$

Note that $\hat{f} \in L^2(N; S^m) \cap C(\bar{N}; S^m)$. We denote $\hat{f}(\eta, \cdot)$ by \hat{f}_η , for each fixed $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$, we can view

$$\hat{f}_\eta = \hat{p}_\eta + \hat{q}_\eta + \hat{r}_\eta \in C(\bar{M}; S^m) \oplus C(\bar{M}; S^{m-1}) \oplus C(\bar{M}; S^{m-2}).$$

The right hand side of (A.2) corresponds to the attenuated X-ray transform $I_\eta \hat{f}_\eta$.

Now by the Hypothesis A.1, there exists $u_\eta \in \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} C^1(\bar{M}; S^k)$ such that

$$\hat{p}_\eta + \hat{q}_\eta + \hat{r}_\eta = d^s u_\eta + i\eta u_\eta$$

and $u_\eta|_{\partial M} = 0$. Balancing both sides, we conclude that for $\eta \neq 0$, $u_\eta = w_\eta + v_\eta$ with $w_\eta \in C^1(\bar{M}; S^{m-1})$ and $v_\eta \in C^1(\bar{M}; S^{m-2})$, i.e.

$$(A.3) \quad \hat{p}_\eta = d^s w_\eta, \quad \hat{q}_\eta = d^s v_\eta + i\eta w_\eta, \quad \hat{r}_\eta = i\eta v_\eta.$$

Since \hat{p}_η , \hat{q}_η and \hat{r}_η are all L^2 in η , we can derive the regularity of w_η and v_η in η from (A.3) (note that we may freely assign values for w_η and v_η at $\eta = 0$). In particular w_η , ηw_η , v_η and ηv_η are all L^2 in η . We denote the inverse Fourier transform of a function g by \check{g} . It follows that

$$(A.4) \quad p = d^s \check{w}, \quad q = d^s \check{v} + \partial_t \check{w}, \quad r = \partial_t \check{v},$$

for some $\check{w} \in H^1(\mathbb{R}; C^1(\bar{M}; S^{m-1}))$ and $\check{v} \in H^1(\mathbb{R}; C^1(\bar{M}; S^{m-2}))$ with $\check{w}|_{\partial N} = 0$, $\check{v}|_{\partial N} = 0$. Moreover, the regularity of p, q and r , together with (A.4), implies that both \check{w} and \check{v} are L^∞ in time t . Therefore by (A.1), with $\bar{d}^s = d^s + \partial_t(\cdot) dt$,

$$\begin{aligned} f &= p + q dt + r(dt)^2 + r \bar{g} \\ &= \bar{d}^s(\check{w} + \check{v} dt) + r \bar{g}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\check{w} + \check{v} dt \in L^\infty(N; S^{m-1}) \cap H^1(\mathbb{R}; C^1(\bar{M}); S^{m-1})$ vanishing on ∂N . \square

One can also consider the injectivity of the weighted light ray transform $L_W S$, defined in (3.20), for $S \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times M) \times L^1(\mathbb{R}; C(\bar{M}))$.

Theorem A.3. *Let $W \in L^\infty(SM)$ be nonvanishing, suppose that the weighted geodesic X-ray transform of $f \in C(\bar{M})$, with the weight $e^{i\eta s} W(\gamma_{x,v}(s), \dot{\gamma}_{x,v}(s))$, is injective for all $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$. Assume that $S \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times M) \cap L^1(\mathbb{R}; C(\bar{M}))$. If $L_W S = 0$ for a.e. $(t, x, v) \in \mathbb{R} \times \partial_- SM$, then $S = 0$.*

Proof. Similar to Theorem A.2, by the Fubini's theorem

$$0 = \widehat{L_W S}(\eta, x, v) = \int_0^{\tau(x,v)} e^{i\eta s} W(\gamma_{x,v}(s), \dot{\gamma}_{x,v}(s)) \hat{S}(\eta, \gamma_{x,v}(s)) ds.$$

The right hand side is the weighted X-ray transform of $\hat{S}(\eta, \cdot)$. Now by the assumption, we get that $\hat{S}(\eta, x) = 0$ for all $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x \in \bar{M}$, therefore $S = 0$. \square

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Ru-Yu Lai is partially supported by the National Science Foundation (NSF) through grants DMS-2006731 and DMS-2306221. Hanming Zhou is partly supported by the NSF grants DMS-2109116 and DMS-2408369, and Simons Foundation Travel Support for Mathematicians.

REFERENCES

- [1] Y. M. Assylbekov and Y. Yang. An inverse radiative transfer in refractive media equipped with a magnetic field. *The Journal of Geometric Analysis*, 25:2148–2184, 2015.
- [2] G. Bal. Inverse transport theory and applications. *Inverse problems*, 25:053001, 2009.
- [3] G. Bal and A. Jollivet. Stability estimates in stationary inverse transport. *Inverse problems and Imaging*, 2:427–454, 2008.
- [4] G. Bal and A. Jollivet. Stability estimates for time-dependent inverse transport. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 42(2):679–700, 2010.
- [5] G. Bal and A. Jollivet. Generalized stability estimates in inverse transport theory. *Inverse problems and Imaging*, 12(1):59–90, 2018.
- [6] G. Bal and F. Monard. Inverse transport with isotropic time-harmonic sources. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 44(1):134–161, 2012.
- [7] T. Balehowsky, A. Kujanpää, M. Lassas, and T. Liimatainen. An inverse problem for the relativistic Boltzmann equation. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, (396):983–1049, 2022.
- [8] M. Bellassoued and Y. Boughanja. An inverse problem for the linear Boltzmann equation with a time-dependent coefficient. *Inverse Problems*, 35(8):085003, 2019.
- [9] M. Bellassoued and Y. Boughanja. Recovery of coefficients in the linear Boltzmann equation. *J. Math. Phys.*, 60(11):111506, 2019.
- [10] A. Bugheim and M. Klibanov. Global uniqueness of class of multidimensional inverse problems. *Soviet Math. Dokl.*, 24:244–247, 1981.
- [11] T. Carleman. Sur un problème d’unicité pour les systèmes d’équations aux dérivées partielles à deux variables indépendentes. *Ark. Mat. Astr. Fys.*, 2 B:1–9, 1939.
- [12] I.-K. Chen and D. Kawagoe. Propagation of boundary-induced discontinuity in stationary radiative transfer and its application to the optical tomography. *Inverse Problems and Imaging*, 13(2):337–351, 2019.
- [13] M. Choulli and P. Stefanov. Scattering inverse pour l’équation du transport et relations entre les opérateurs de scattering et d’albédo. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 320:947–952, 1995.
- [14] M. Choulli and P. Stefanov. Inverse scattering and inverse boundary value problems for the linear Boltzmann equation. *Comm. P.D.E.*, 21:763–785, 1996.
- [15] M. Choulli and P. Stefanov. Reconstruction of the coefficients of the stationary transport equation from boundary measurements. *Inverse Problems*, 12:L19–L23, 1996.
- [16] M. Choulli and P. Stefanov. An inverse boundary value problem for the stationary transport equation. *Osaka J. Math.*, 36:87–104, 1998.
- [17] R. Dautray and J.-L. Lions. *Mathematical Analysis and Numerical Methods for Science and Technology*. Volume 6. Springer, 2000.
- [18] A. Feizmohammadi, J. Ilmavirta, Y. Kian, and L. Oksanen. Recovery of time dependent coefficients from boundary data for hyperbolic equations. *J. Spectral Theory*, 11(3):1107–1143, 2021.
- [19] A. Feizmohammadi, J. Ilmavirta, and L. Oksanen. The light ray transform in stationary and static Lorentzian geometries. *J. Geom. Anal.*, 31:3656–3682, 2021.
- [20] A. Feizmohammadi and Y. Kian. Recovery of nonsmooth coefficients appearing in anisotropic wave equations. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 51:4953–4976, 2019.
- [21] D. V. Finch. *The attenuated X-ray transform: recent developments, in Inside Out: Inverse Problems and Applications (edited by G. Uhlmann)*, volume 47. MSRI Publications, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003.
- [22] G. Folland. Real analysis, modern techniques and their applications. *John Wiley & Sons, New York*, 1984.
- [23] B. Frigiyik, P. Stefanov, and G. Uhlmann. The X-ray transform for a generic family of curves. *J. Geom. Anal.*, 18:81–97, 2008.
- [24] P. Gaitan and H. Ouzzane. Inverse problem for a free transport equation using Carleman estimates. *Applicable Analysis*, 93:1073–1086, 2014.
- [25] F. Göggeleyen and M. Yamamoto. Stability for some inverse problems for transport equations. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 48(4):2319–2344, 2016.

- [26] C. Guillarmou, G. Paternain, M. Salo, and G. Uhlmann. The X-ray transform for connections in negative curvature. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 343:83–127, 2016.
- [27] M. Klibanov and S. Pamyatnykh. Lipschitz stability of a non-standard problem for the nonstationary transport equation via a Carleman estimate. *Inverse Problems*, 22:881–890, 2006.
- [28] M. Klibanov and S. Pamyatnykh. Global uniqueness for a coefficient inverse problem for the non-stationary transport equation via Carleman estimate. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 343:352–365, 2008.
- [29] V. Krishnan, R. Mishra, and F. Monard. On solenoidal-injective and injective ray transforms of tensor fields on surfaces. *J. Inverse Ill-Posed Probl.*, 27:527–538, 2019.
- [30] V. Krishnan, S. Senapati, and M. Vashisth. A uniqueness result for light ray transform on symmetric 2-tensor fields. *J. Fourier Anal. Appl.*, 26, 2020.
- [31] P. Kuchment. *Generalized transforms of Radon type and their applications*, in *The Radon Transform, Inverse Problems, and Tomography* (edited by G. Olafsson and E. T. Quinto), volume 63. Proc. Symp. Appl. Math., AMS, Providence, 2006.
- [32] R.-Y. Lai and Q. Li. Parameter reconstruction for general transport equation. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 52(3):2734–2758, 2020.
- [33] R.-Y. Lai, X. Lu, and T. Zhou. Partial data inverse problems for the nonlinear Schrödinger equation. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 56(4), 2024.
- [34] R.-Y. Lai, G. Uhlmann, and Y. Yang. Reconstruction of the collision kernel in the nonlinear Boltzmann equation. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 53(1):1049–1069, 2021.
- [35] R.-Y. Lai, G. Uhlmann, and H. Zhou. Recovery of coefficients in semilinear transport equations. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 248, 2024.
- [36] R.-Y. Lai and L. Yan. Stable determination of time-dependent collision kernel in the nonlinear Boltzmann equation. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 84(5), 2024.
- [37] M. Lassas, T. Liimatainen, L. Potenciano-Machado, and T. Tyni. Uniqueness, reconstruction and stability for an inverse problem of a semi-linear wave equation. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 337:395–435, 2022.
- [38] L. Li and Z. Ouyang. Determining the collision kernel in the Boltzmann equation near the equilibrium. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 151:4855–4865, 2024.
- [39] E. H. Lieb and M. Loss. *Analysis*, volume 14. Graduate Studies in Mathematics, American Mathematical Society, 2001.
- [40] M. Machida and M. Yamamoto. Global Lipschitz stability in determining coefficients of the radiative transport equation. *Inverse Problems*, 30:035010, 2014.
- [41] S. McDowall, P. Stefanov, and A. Tamasan. Gauge equivalence in stationary radiative transport through media with varying index of refraction. *Inverse Probl. Imaging*, 4:151–167, 2010.
- [42] S. McDowall, P. Stefanov, and A. Tamasan. Stability of the gauge equivalent in stationary inverse transport. *Inverse Problems*, 26:025006, 2010.
- [43] S. McDowall, P. Stefanov, and A. Tamasan. Stability of the gauge equivalent classes in inverse stationary transport in refractive media. *Contemp. Math.*, 559:85–100, 2011.
- [44] S. R. McDowall. An inverse problem for the transport equation in the presence of a Riemannian metric. *Pacific journal of mathematics*, 216:303–326, 2004.
- [45] G. Paternain and M. Salo. Carleman estimates for geodesic X-ray transforms. *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér.*, 56:1339–1379, 2023.
- [46] G. Paternain, M. Salo, G. Uhlmann, and H. Zhou. The geodesic X-ray transform with matrix weights. *Amer. J. Math.*, 141:1707–1750, 2019.
- [47] G. P. Paternain, M. Salo, and G. Uhlmann. *Geometric Inverse Problems: With Emphasis on Two Dimensions*, volume 204. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, 2023.
- [48] S. RabienciaHaratbar. Support theorem for the light-ray transform of vector fields on Minkowski spaces. *Inverse Probl. Imaging*, 12:293–314, 2018.
- [49] Z. Rezig. An inverse problem for the time-dependent linear Boltzmann equation in a Riemannian setting. *arXiv:2305.08793*, 2023.
- [50] M. Salo and G. Uhlmann. The attenuated ray transform on simple surfaces. *J. Diff. Geom.*, 88:161–187, 2011.
- [51] P. Stefanov. Uniqueness of the multi-dimensional inverse scattering problem for time dependent potentials. *Math. Z.*, 201:541–559, 1989.
- [52] P. Stefanov. *Inverse problems in transport theory*, volume 47. Inside Out: Inverse Problems; MSRI Publications, edited by G. Uhlmann, 2003.
- [53] P. Stefanov. Support theorems for the light ray transform on analytic Lorentzian manifolds. *Proc. Am. Math. Soc.*, 145:1259–1274, 2017.
- [54] P. Stefanov and G. Uhlmann. Optical tomography in two dimensions. *Methods Appl. Anal.*, 10:1–9, 2003.

- [55] J.-N. Wang. Stability estimates of an inverse problem for the stationary transport equation. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Phys. Théor.*, 70(5):473–495, 1999.
- [56] H. Zhao and Y. Zhong. Instability of an inverse problem for the stationary radiative transport near the diffusion limit. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 51(5):3750—3768, 2019.
- [57] H. Zhou. Generic injectivity and stability of inverse problems for connections. *Comm. PDE*, 42:780–801, 2017.
- [58] H. Zhou. *The weighted X-ray transform and applications, Microlocal Analysis and Inverse Problems in Tomography and Geometry (edited by E. T. Quinto, P. D. Stefanov, G. Uhlmann)*, volume 30. Radon Series on Computational and Applied Mathematics, De Gruyter, to appear.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA, MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55455, USA
Email address: rylai@umn.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SANTA BARBARA, SANTA BARBARA, CA 93106,
USA
Email address: hzhou@math.ucsb.edu