

Recall that a Lax pair of operators  $(L, A)$  consisted of a self-adjoint linear operator  $L$  and a linear operator  $A$  such that

$$L_t = [L, A].$$

The isospectral theorem showed us that the discrete eigenvalues of  $L$  are time independent if this equation holds. An alternative approach is to consider the linear problem

$$\begin{cases} L\psi = \lambda\psi, \\ \psi_t + A\psi = 0, \end{cases}$$

and insist that the discrete eigenvalues  $\lambda$  are time independent. By differentiating the first equation and using the second to replace  $\psi_t$  with  $-A\psi$  we find that  $\lambda_t = 0$  if

$$L_t = [L, A].$$

That is to say, the Lax equation is the *compatibility condition* between two linear problems. We will show that this approach gives rise to a zero curvature equation.

Let us now concentrate on the linear problem

$$\begin{cases} L\psi = \lambda\psi, \\ \psi_t + A\psi = 0, \end{cases}$$

where for simplicity we'll assume that  $L$  and  $A$  are scalar differential operators. These equations imply  $L_t = [L, A]$  if we enforce  $\lambda_t = 0$ . Write  $L$  and  $A$  in the general form

$$L = \partial_x^n + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} u_j(x, t) \partial_x^j, \quad A = \partial_x^m + \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} v_j(x, t) \partial_x^j.$$

The Lax equation  $L_t = [L, A]$  will give rise to a nonlinear PDE for the functions

$$(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = (u_0, \dots, u_{n-1}, v_0, \dots, v_{m-1}).$$

We make an important observation: the first equation  $L\psi = \lambda\psi$  implies that all derivatives of  $\psi$  of order  $\geq n$  can be expressed in terms of a linear combination derivatives of order  $< n$ . This follows by a simple induction argument: we claim  $\partial_x^{n+k}\psi$  is a linear combination of  $\{\psi, \dots, \partial_x^{n-1}\psi\}$  for  $k \geq 0$ . It is certainly true for  $k = 0$  since rearranging  $L\psi = \lambda\psi$  gives us

$$\partial_x^n \psi = \lambda\psi - \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} u_j(x, t) \partial_x^j \psi \equiv \sum_{j=1}^n A_j(\mathbf{u}, \lambda) \partial_x^{j-1} \psi$$

and the inductive step follows from this equation and noting  $\partial_x^{k+1+n}\psi = \partial_x(\partial_x^{k+n}\psi)$  (if this is not clear you should fill in the details of the induction argument yourself). Let us first write the  $n$ th order linear PDE (for  $\psi$ )  $L\psi = \lambda\psi$  as a first order matrix PDE for  $\Psi = (\psi, \partial_x\psi, \dots, \partial_x^{n-1}\psi)^t$

$$\partial_x \Psi = U \Psi, \quad \text{where} \quad U = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \lambda - u_0 & -u_1 & -u_2 & \cdots & -u_{n-1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Now consider the linear PDE  $\psi_t + A\psi = 0$ . Differentiating with respect to  $x$  ( $i - 1$ )-times

$$(\partial_x^{i-1}\psi)_t + \partial_x^{i-1} \left[ \partial_x^m \psi + \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} v_{j-1}(x, t) \partial_x^j \psi \right] = 0, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n.$$

Applying all the derivatives to the square bracket term and using our previous observation, the resulting derivatives of  $\psi$  of order  $\geq n$  can be expressed in terms of linear combinations of derivatives of order  $< n$ . The coefficients in this linear combination will depend on  $\lambda$ ,  $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$  and derivatives thereof. Using the fact  $\partial_x^{i-1}\psi \equiv \Psi_i$  we find

$$(\Psi_i)_t - \sum_{j=1}^n V_{ij}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \lambda)\Psi_j = 0, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n$$

for some appropriate functions  $V_{ij} = V_{ij}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \lambda)$ . In summary:

$$\begin{cases} \Psi_x = U(\lambda)\Psi, \\ \Psi_t = V(\lambda)\Psi. \end{cases}$$

Since these equations are compatible if the original linear equations were compatible (i.e.  $L_t = [L, A]$ ), we arrive at the zero curvature equations

$$U_t - V_x + [U, V] = 0.$$

**Example.** Consider  $L = -\partial_x^2 + u$  with  $u = u(x, t)$  evolving according to KdV. Then  $L\psi = \lambda\psi$  can be written in terms of  $\Psi = (\psi, \psi_x)$  as

$$(\Psi_1)_x = \Psi_2, \quad (\Psi_2)_x = (u - \lambda)\Psi_1, \quad \text{i.e. } U(\lambda) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ u - \lambda & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

These equations allow us to write derivatives of  $\Psi$  of order  $\geq 2$  as a linear combination of derivatives  $< 2$ . We will use this in what follows. Using  $A = 4\partial_x^3 - 3(u\partial_x + \partial_x u)$  and  $(\Psi_1)_x = \Psi_2$ ,  $\psi_t = -A\psi$  becomes

$$\begin{aligned} (\Psi_1)_t &= -4(\Psi_2)_{xx} + 3u\Psi_2 + 3(u\Psi_1)_x \\ &= -4((u - \lambda)\Psi_1)_x + 3u\Psi_2 + 3u_x\Psi_1 + 3u(\Psi_1)_x \\ &= -4u_x\Psi_1 - 4(u - \lambda)\Psi_2 + 3u\Psi_2 + 3u_x\Psi_1 + 3u\Psi_2 \\ &= (2u + 4\lambda)\Psi_2 - u_x\Psi_1. \end{aligned}$$

Differentiating with respect to  $x$  and again replacing  $(\Psi_2)_x$  with  $(u - \lambda)\Psi_1$  and  $(\Psi_1)_x$  with  $\Psi_2$  we find

$$(\Psi_2)_t = ((2u + 4\lambda)(u - \lambda) - u_{xx})\Psi_1 + u_x\Psi_2.$$

So the appropriate matrices  $U, V$  for the zero curvature equations are

$$U(\lambda) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ u - \lambda & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad V(\lambda) = \begin{bmatrix} -u_x & 2u + 4\lambda \\ 2u^2 - u_{xx} + 2u\lambda - 4\lambda^2 & u_x \end{bmatrix}.$$

You should check that  $U_t - V_x + [U, V] = 0$  is equivalent to KdV.