

Low-Order Conservation Law Multipliers for a Generalized Fifth-Order KP Family

Dr. Nitin Serwa

Department of Mathematics, Abu Dhabi University

nitin.serwa@adu.ac.ae

Abstract

We study local conservation law multipliers for a generalized fifth-order Kadomtsev–Petviashvili family whose one-dimensional reductions include the Lax, Sawada–Kotera, and Kaup–Kupershmidt equations. Using the direct multiplier method, we classify zeroth-order multipliers that are independent of the dependent variable within a natural polynomial subclass and construct representative conserved vectors. We then prove that every multiplier of differential order at most two is necessarily of differential order at most one. An unrestricted first-order classification is obtained when the coefficient of the cubic derivative nonlinearity is nonzero, and the same reduction is established on a generic algebraic sub-branch of the complementary case. In these regimes, all first-order multipliers reduce to the zeroth-order family. A finite list of exceptional branches remains open. The results identify the structural sources responsible for the low-order rigidity of the multiplier problem in the generic regimes treated here.

1 Introduction

The Kadomtsev–Petviashvili (KP) equation [7]

$$(u_t + \alpha uu_x + \beta u_{xxx})_x + \sigma u_{yy} = 0$$

is a standard two-dimensional dispersive model for weakly nonlinear waves with weak transverse variation. Its classical forms are integrable and possess infinitely many conservation laws; see, for example, [1, 12].

In one spatial dimension, fifth-order dispersive equations provide a natural higher-order extension of KdV-type dynamics. The classical integrable fifth-order equations—the Lax equation [14], the Sawada–Kotera equation [19], and the Kaup–Kupershmidt equation [9, 13]—can be written in the form

$$u_t + c u_{xxx} + d u_{xxxxx} + e u u_{xxx} + f u_x u_{xx} + g u^2 u_x = 0,$$

and are distinguished by specific coefficient triples (e, f, g) . After normalization $d = 1$, these triples are

$$(10, 20, 30), \quad (5, 5, 5), \quad (10, 25, 20),$$

respectively. In each case, the equation belongs to an integrable setting with an infinite conservation law hierarchy. A different fifth-order model is the Kawahara equation [10],

$$u_t + \alpha uu_x + \beta u_{xxx} + \gamma u_{xxxxx} = 0,$$

which retains the convective nonlinearity uu_x together with fifth-order dispersion. A two-dimensional KP-type extension of the Kawahara equation has been studied in [15]. Further analytical background for higher-order KP-type equations can be found in [17, 18, 11].

The present paper considers the two-dimensional family

$$\left(u_t + cu_{xxx} + du_{xxxx} + euu_{xx} + fu_xu_{xx} + gu^2u_x\right)_x + \sigma u_{yy} = 0, \quad (1.1)$$

where $u = u(x, y, t)$, the coefficients c, d, e, f, g, σ are real, and $d\sigma \neq 0$. Its y -independent reduction contains the Lax, Sawada–Kotera, and Kaup–Kupershmidt equations at the corresponding coefficient triples after normalization. In comparison with the Kawahara–KP equation, the present family replaces the lower-order convective term by the derivative-nonlinear structures

$$uu_{xxx}, \quad u_xu_{xx}, \quad u^2u_x.$$

This places the multiplier problem in a different coefficient geometry from that of the Kawahara–KP setting. For related conservation-law classifications in generalized KP-type equations, see also [5].

The purpose of the paper is to study local conservation law multipliers of (1.1) up to second differential order by the direct multiplier method of Anco and Bluman [3, 4]; see also [6, 16]. After passage to a potential $u = v_x$, the resulting potential equation is variational only on the parameter submanifold $f = 2e$. Accordingly, the direct multiplier method is the main tool for the classification, while Noether’s theorem is available only on that submanifold as an independent verification method. The paper does not address integrability of the full two-dimensional family. Its scope is the classification of low-order multipliers in the regimes treated below.

The results divide into one constructive part and three rigidity results. First, zeroth-order u -independent multipliers are classified within a natural polynomial subclass. In the generic regime, this yields a six-dimensional polynomial basis together with representative conserved vectors. Second, every multiplier of differential order at most two is shown to be of differential order at most one, for all parameter values. Third, the unrestricted first-order multiplier problem is classified completely when $g \neq 0$. Fourth, on the branch $g = 0$, the same reduction is obtained on a generic algebraic sub-branch. The exceptional branches

$$e + f = 0, \quad e = f, \quad e = 2f, \quad f = 3e, \quad 27e = 14f$$

remain open. Thus, the paper gives a generic low-order rigidity classification up to second order, rather than a complete classification over the full parameter family.

The classification identifies three structural sources that govern the determining-system reductions: the sixth-order x -jet structure, the transverse term σu_{yy} , and the cubic derivative-nonlinearity gu^2u_x . In the multiplier orders treated here, these features prevent enlargement of the surviving multiplier space beyond the zeroth-order u -independent basis in the generic regimes. The distinguished one-dimensional triples are not exceptional at these orders, since all three lie in the regime $g \neq 0$ covered by the first-order classification.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the equation, performs the equivalence reduction, identifies the variational submanifold, and sets up the multiplier framework. Section 3 treats zeroth-order u -independent multipliers within the polynomial subclass. Section 4 proves the second-order reduction theorem. Section 5 carries out the unrestricted first-order classification in the generic regimes treated here. Section 6 discusses the structural interpretation of the reductions and compares the results with standard KP-type settings. Section 7 records the remaining open directions.

2 Equation, Equivalence Reduction, and Multiplier Framework

2.1 The equation

We consider the family of fifth-order KP-type equations

$$\left(u_t + c u_{xxx} + d u_{xxxxx} + e u u_{xxx} + f u_x u_{xx} + g u^2 u_x\right)_x + \sigma u_{yy} = 0, \quad (2.1)$$

where $u = u(x, y, t)$, the coefficients c, d, e, f, g, σ are real, and

$$d\sigma \neq 0.$$

This condition ensures that the equation is genuinely fifth-order in the distinguished x -direction and genuinely two-dimensional.

The expanded form of (2.1) is

$$u_{tx} + c u_{xxxx} + d u_{xxxxx} + (e + f) u_x u_{xxx} + e u u_{xxx} + f u_{xx}^2 + 2g u u_x^2 + g u^2 u_{xx} + \sigma u_{yy} = 0. \quad (2.2)$$

This form is used in the Euler-operator computations throughout the paper.

The y -independent reduction of (2.1) is

$$u_t + c u_{xxx} + d u_{xxxxx} + e u u_{xxx} + f u_x u_{xx} + g u^2 u_x = 0. \quad (2.3)$$

After normalizing $d = 1$, the distinguished one-dimensional triples are

$$(e, f, g) = (10, 20, 30), \quad (5, 5, 5), \quad (10, 25, 20),$$

corresponding respectively to the Lax, Sawada–Kotera, and Kaup–Kupershmidt equations [14, 19, 9, 13].

2.2 Equivalence reduction

We first determine the coefficient freedom that can be removed by scaling.

Proposition 2.1. *Under the scaling transformation*

$$x = \lambda \tilde{x}, \quad y = \mu \tilde{y}, \quad t = \nu \tilde{t}, \quad u = \rho \tilde{u}, \quad (2.4)$$

with $\lambda, \mu, \nu, \rho \neq 0$, equation (2.1) retains its form and the coefficients transform according to

$$\tilde{c} = \frac{c\nu}{\lambda^3}, \quad \tilde{d} = \frac{d\nu}{\lambda^5}, \quad \tilde{e} = \frac{e\nu\rho}{\lambda^3}, \quad \tilde{f} = \frac{f\nu\rho}{\lambda^3}, \quad \tilde{g} = \frac{g\nu\rho^2}{\lambda}, \quad \tilde{\sigma} = \frac{\sigma\nu\lambda}{\mu^2}. \quad (2.5)$$

Hence, under the standing assumption $d\sigma \neq 0$, one may normalize

$$d = 1, \quad \sigma = \pm 1. \quad (2.6)$$

Proof. Substituting (2.4) into (2.1), using

$$\partial_x = \lambda^{-1} \partial_{\tilde{x}}, \quad \partial_y = \mu^{-1} \partial_{\tilde{y}}, \quad \partial_t = \nu^{-1} \partial_{\tilde{t}},$$

and dividing the transformed equation by $\nu\lambda/\rho$ yields the coefficient relations (2.5). The normalization (2.6) follows by choosing

$$\nu = \frac{\lambda^5}{d}$$

to obtain $\tilde{d} = 1$, and then choosing μ so that

$$\mu^2 = \frac{\sigma\nu\lambda}{\varepsilon}, \quad \varepsilon = \text{sign}(\sigma d),$$

which gives $\tilde{\sigma} = \varepsilon = \pm 1$. □

Further normalizations are available on special parameter branches, for example when $g \neq 0$ or $c \neq 0$. They are not uniform across the full family, however, and would obscure the comparison between generic and special parameter regimes. For the multiplier classification it is therefore preferable to retain c, e, f , and g as free parameters and normalize only d and σ .

From now on we work with the normalized family

$$\left(u_t + c u_{xxx} + u_{xxxxx} + e u u_{xxx} + f u_x u_{xx} + g u^2 u_x \right)_x + \sigma u_{yy} = 0, \quad \sigma = \pm 1. \quad (2.7)$$

2.3 Potential form and variational submanifold

To identify the parameter regime on which Noether's theorem is available, we introduce a potential

$$u = v_x.$$

Integrating (2.7) once with respect to x , under the usual decay assumptions, yields the local potential equation

$$v_{tx} + c v_{xxxx} + v_{xxxxx} + e v_x v_{xxx} + f v_{xx} v_{xx} + g v_x^2 v_{xx} + \sigma v_{yy} = 0. \quad (2.8)$$

Proposition 2.2. *The potential equation (2.8) is an Euler–Lagrange equation if and only if*

$$f = 2e.$$

Proof. The only nontrivial compatibility condition comes from the pair of terms $v_x v_{xxxx}$ and $v_{xx} v_{xxx}$. A Lagrangian term of the form

$$A v_x v_{xx}^2$$

contributes, under the Euler operator, the combination

$$2A v_x v_{xxxx} + 4A v_{xx} v_{xxx}.$$

Matching this with the nonlinear part of (2.8) requires

$$2A = e, \quad 4A = f,$$

and hence $f = 2e$.

Conversely, when $f = 2e$, the Lagrangian density

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{2} v_t v_x + \frac{1}{2} c v_{xx}^2 - \frac{1}{2} v_{xxx}^2 + \frac{1}{2} e v_x v_{xx}^2 - \frac{g}{12} v_x^4 - \frac{1}{2} \sigma v_y^2 \quad (2.9)$$

satisfies

$$E_v(\mathcal{L}) = 0$$

if and only if (2.8) holds. □

Remark 2.3. The condition $f = 2e$ is satisfied by the Lax triple, but not by the Sawada–Kotera or Kaup–Kupershmidt triples. More precisely, the Lax triple satisfies $f = 2e$, the Sawada–Kotera triple satisfies $f = e$, and the Kaup–Kupershmidt triple satisfies $f = 5e/2$.

Remark 2.4. For generic parameters $f \neq 2e$, the normalized family (2.7) is nonvariational. Accordingly, the direct multiplier method is the primary tool in the present paper. On the submanifold $f = 2e$, Noether's theorem provides an independent verification method.

2.4 Multiplier framework

A local conservation law of (2.7) is a continuity equation

$$D_t T + D_x X + D_y Y = 0 \quad (2.10)$$

holding for all solutions $u(x, y, t)$, where T is the conserved density and (X, Y) is the flux; see [3, 4, 6, 16].

Let Δ denote the left-hand side of the expanded normalized equation:

$$\Delta = u_{tx} + c u_{xxxx} + u_{xxxxx} + (e + f) u_x u_{xxx} + e u u_{xxx} + f u_{xx}^2 + 2g u u_x^2 + g u^2 u_{xx} + \sigma u_{yy}. \quad (2.11)$$

The equation $\Delta = 0$ is solved for the mixed derivative u_{tx} . Accordingly, the normal jet variables are all partial derivatives of u except u_{tx} and its differential consequences. All multiplier ansatz classes and all splittings of the determining system in this paper are formulated in terms of these normal jet variables.

A function Q of the independent variables and normal jet variables is called a multiplier if

$$Q \Delta = D_t T + D_x X + D_y Y \quad (2.12)$$

holds as an identity for all functions $u(x, y, t)$. Multipliers are characterized by the Euler condition

$$E_u(Q \Delta) = 0, \quad (2.13)$$

where E_u denotes the Euler operator with respect to u [3, 4]. For every admitted multiplier, a representative conserved vector is reconstructed from (2.12) by integration by parts.

2.5 Scope

Equation (2.7), together with the normal-jet multiplier framework above, defines the analytical setting for the remainder of the paper.

Section 3 studies zeroth-order multipliers of the form $Q = Q(x, y, t)$. In the generic regime, the resulting determining system reduces to

$$Q_{xx} = 0, \quad Q_{xt} + \sigma Q_{yy} = 0.$$

Within the polynomial subclass, this yields a six-dimensional basis. On the branch $g = 0$, $f = 3e$, the zeroth-order determining system enlarges; that branch is recorded but not analyzed further in the present paper.

Section 4 proves that every multiplier of differential order at most two is in fact of differential order at most one, for all parameter values. Section 5 then classifies the unrestricted first-order multiplier problem in the generic regimes treated here. The classification is complete for $g \neq 0$, and the same reduction is obtained on a generic algebraic sub-branch of $g = 0$. The exceptional $g = 0$ branches are deferred and listed explicitly in Section 5.

Section 6 interprets the reductions through three structural sources: the sixth-order x -jet structure, the transverse term σu_{yy} , and the cubic derivative-nonlinearity $g u^2 u_x$. Section 7 records the remaining open directions.

3 Zeroth-Order u -Independent Multipliers

In this section we classify local multipliers of the form

$$Q = Q(x, y, t),$$

depending only on the independent variables. The classification is unrestricted at this stage with respect to the independent variables, but the final basis result will be stated only within the polynomial subclass.

3.1 Determining equations

Substituting the ansatz $Q = Q(x, y, t)$ into the Euler condition

$$E_u(Q \Delta) = 0,$$

where Δ is given by (2.11), and splitting with respect to the jet variables yields the relations

$$g Q_{xx} = 0, \quad (3e - f) Q_{xx} = 0, \quad (3e - f) Q_{xxx} = 0, \quad e Q_{xxxx} = 0,$$

together with

$$Q_{xt} + c Q_{xxxx} + Q_{xxxxx} + \sigma Q_{yy} = 0. \quad (3.1)$$

Hence, whenever

$$g \neq 0 \quad \text{or} \quad f \neq 3e,$$

the first two relations force

$$Q_{xx} = 0,$$

and (3.1) reduces to

$$Q_{xx} = 0, \quad Q_{xt} + \sigma Q_{yy} = 0. \quad (3.2)$$

Thus, in the generic regime, the zeroth-order u -independent multiplier problem is governed entirely by the linear system (3.2).

On the branch

$$g = 0, \quad f = 3e,$$

the condition $Q_{xx} = 0$ is no longer forced. In this case the determining system enlarges, with $Q_{xxxx} = 0$ replacing the generic second- x -derivative condition. This branch is recorded for later reference but is not studied further in the present paper.

3.2 General solution and polynomial subclass

The general solution of (3.2) is

$$Q(x, y, t) = x(A_0(t) + A_1(t)y) + B_0(t) + B_1(t)y - \frac{A'_0(t)y^2}{2\sigma} - \frac{A'_1(t)y^3}{6\sigma}, \quad (3.3)$$

where A_0 , A_1 , B_0 , and B_1 are arbitrary functions of t . Accordingly, the full solution space of (3.2) is infinite-dimensional.

For the purposes of the present paper, we restrict attention to the polynomial subclass in which A_0 and A_1 are affine functions of t and B_0 , B_1 are constant. This yields a six-dimensional space with basis

$$Q_0 = 1, \quad Q_1 = y, \quad Q_2 = x, \quad Q_3 = xy, \quad Q_4 = xt - \frac{y^2}{2\sigma}, \quad Q_5 = xyt - \frac{y^3}{6\sigma}. \quad (3.4)$$

Theorem 3.1. *Assume that $g \neq 0$ or $f \neq 3e$. Within the polynomial subclass of solutions of (3.2), the space of zeroth-order u -independent local multipliers for the normalized family (2.7) is six-dimensional and is spanned by*

$$1, \quad y, \quad x, \quad xy, \quad xt - \frac{y^2}{2\sigma}, \quad xyt - \frac{y^3}{6\sigma}.$$

Proof. Under the stated parameter assumptions, the determining system reduces to (3.2). Solving that system gives (3.3). Restricting to the polynomial subclass described above yields the basis (3.4). This basis is linearly independent, and every multiplier in the subclass is a linear combination of its elements. \square

3.3 Representative conserved vectors

To write the conserved vectors compactly, define

$$F = c u_{xxx} + u_{xxxxx} + e u u_{xxx} + f u_x u_{xx} + g u^2 u_x, \quad (3.5)$$

so that the normalized equation (2.7) takes the form

$$D_t(u_x) + D_x(F) + D_y(\sigma u_y) = 0. \quad (3.6)$$

Also define

$$J = -c u_{xx} - u_{xxxx} - e u u_{xx} + \frac{e-f}{2} u_x^2 - \frac{g}{3} u^3. \quad (3.7)$$

Then

$$D_x J = -F. \quad (3.8)$$

The next result gives a representative conserved vector for every zeroth-order multiplier satisfying (3.2).

Proposition 3.2. *Let $Q = Q(x, y, t)$ satisfy (3.2). Then*

$$D_t T + D_x X + D_y Y = Q \Delta \quad (3.9)$$

holds with

$$T = Q u_x, \quad X = Q F + Q_x J - Q_t u, \quad Y = \sigma Q u_y - \sigma Q_y u. \quad (3.10)$$

Hence (T, X, Y) is a representative conserved vector for the multiplier Q .

Proof. Starting from (3.6), multiplication by Q gives

$$Q \Delta = Q D_t(u_x) + Q D_x(F) + Q D_y(\sigma u_y).$$

Integrating by parts with respect to t , x , and y yields

$$Q \Delta = D_t(Q u_x) + D_x(Q F) + D_y(\sigma Q u_y) - Q_t u_x - Q_x F - \sigma Q_y u_y.$$

Using (3.8), the identity

$$-Q_x F = D_x(Q_x J) - Q_{xx} J,$$

and then integrating the remaining two terms by parts gives

$$-Q_t u_x = -D_x(Q_t u) + Q_{tx} u, \quad -\sigma Q_y u_y = -D_y(\sigma Q_y u) + \sigma Q_{yy} u.$$

Since Q satisfies (3.2), we have $Q_{xx} = 0$ and

$$Q_{tx} + \sigma Q_{yy} = 0.$$

Substituting these relations shows that all non-divergence terms cancel, and (3.9) follows with (3.10). \square

Applying Proposition 3.2 to the basis (3.4) yields the following representative conserved vectors.

Proposition 3.3. *For the basis multipliers in (3.4), representative conserved vectors are as follows.*

For $Q_0 = 1$,

$$T_0 = u_x, \quad X_0 = F, \quad Y_0 = \sigma u_y. \quad (3.11)$$

For $Q_1 = y$,

$$T_1 = y u_x, \quad X_1 = y F, \quad Y_1 = \sigma(y u_y - u). \quad (3.12)$$

For $Q_2 = x$,

$$T_2 = x u_x, \quad X_2 = x F + J, \quad Y_2 = \sigma x u_y. \quad (3.13)$$

For $Q_3 = xy$,

$$T_3 = xy u_x, \quad X_3 = y(x F + J), \quad Y_3 = \sigma x(y u_y - u). \quad (3.14)$$

For $Q_4 = xt - \frac{y^2}{2\sigma}$,

$$T_4 = \left(xt - \frac{y^2}{2\sigma} \right) u_x, \quad (3.15)$$

$$X_4 = t(x F + J) - x u - \frac{y^2}{2\sigma} F, \quad (3.16)$$

$$Y_4 = \sigma xt u_y - \frac{y^2}{2} u_y + y u. \quad (3.17)$$

For $Q_5 = xyt - \frac{y^3}{6\sigma}$,

$$T_5 = \left(xyt - \frac{y^3}{6\sigma} \right) u_x, \quad (3.18)$$

$$X_5 = yt(x F + J) - xy u - \frac{y^3}{6\sigma} F, \quad (3.19)$$

$$Y_5 = \sigma xyt u_y - \frac{y^3}{6} u_y + \frac{y^2}{2} u - \sigma xt u. \quad (3.20)$$

Proof. These formulas follow by substituting the basis multipliers (3.4) into the general expressions (3.10). \square

Remark 3.4. Within the polynomial subclass, the six basis elements in (3.4) occur in three pairs:

$$(Q_0, Q_1), \quad (Q_2, Q_3), \quad (Q_4, Q_5).$$

In each pair, the second multiplier is obtained from the first by multiplication by y . The x -dependent pairs arise from the two coefficient functions $A_0(t)$ and $A_1(t)$ in the general solution (3.3).

Theorem 3.1 classifies the zeroth-order u -independent multipliers within the polynomial subclass in the generic regime. The enlarged branch $g = 0$, $f = 3e$ is excluded from that classification and remains separate in the later discussion.

4 Second-Order Reduction Theorem

Theorem 4.1. *For the normalized family (2.7), every local multiplier of differential order at most two is of differential order at most one. That is, if*

$$Q = Q(x, y, t, u, u_x, u_y, u_t, u_{xx}, u_{xy}, u_{yy}, u_{yt}, u_{tt}),$$

then

$$Q_{u_{xx}} = Q_{u_{xy}} = Q_{u_{yy}} = Q_{u_{yt}} = Q_{u_{tt}} = 0.$$

This holds for all values of the parameters c , e , f , and g .

Proof. Let J be any second-order normal jet index, so that

$$u_J \in \{u_{xx}, u_{xy}, u_{yy}, u_{yt}, u_{tt}\}.$$

Consider the jet monomial

$$u_{J+(6,0,0)}$$

in the determining equation

$$E_u(Q\Delta) = 0,$$

where Δ is given by (2.11). Since $|J| = 2$, this monomial has total order

$$|J| + 6 = 8.$$

The first contribution to its coefficient comes from the Euler-operator term

$$(-1)^{|J|} D_J \left(\frac{\partial(Q\Delta)}{\partial u_J} \right).$$

Because the leading term u_{xxxxxx} appears in Δ with coefficient 1, the quantity

$$\frac{\partial(Q\Delta)}{\partial u_J}$$

contains the term

$$Q_{u_J} u_{xxxxxx}.$$

Applying D_J produces

$$Q_{u_J} u_{J+(6,0,0)}$$

as the leading contribution. Since $|J| = 2$, the sign is

$$(-1)^{|J|} = (-1)^2 = +1.$$

The second contribution comes from the Euler-operator term

$$(-1)^6 D_x^6 \left(\frac{\partial(Q\Delta)}{\partial u_{xxxxxx}} \right).$$

Because

$$\frac{\partial(Q\Delta)}{\partial u_{xxxxxx}} = Q,$$

and Q depends on the second-order jet u_J , the leading part of $D_x^6(Q)$ contains

$$Q_{u_J} u_{J+(6,0,0)}.$$

Since 6 is even, this contribution also carries sign

$$(-1)^6 = +1.$$

No other Euler-operator term can produce the jet $u_{J+(6,0,0)}$. Indeed, apart from u_{xxxxxx} , every jet appearing in Δ has x -order at most 4. If D_K is applied to a function depending on jets of order at most 2, then the resulting x -order is at most

$$4 + 2 = 6 < 8.$$

Hence there is no competing contribution to the coefficient of $u_{J+(6,0,0)}$.

Therefore the coefficient of $u_{J+(6,0,0)}$ in $E_u(Q\Delta)$ is

$$2Q_{u_J}.$$

Since the determining equation holds as an identity, this coefficient must vanish. Thus

$$Q_{u_J} = 0.$$

As J was arbitrary among the five second-order normal jets, it follows that

$$Q_{u_{xx}} = Q_{u_{xy}} = Q_{u_{yy}} = Q_{u_{yt}} = Q_{u_{tt}} = 0.$$

This proves the theorem. □

Remark 4.2. The argument above is specific to second-order jets. If $|J| = 1$, then the two leading contributions carry opposite signs, namely $(-1)^1 = -1$ and $(-1)^6 = +1$, and they cancel rather than reinforce. For this reason, the first-order problem requires the full determining-system analysis carried out in Section 5.

5 Unrestricted First-Order Classification

By Theorem 4.1, every multiplier of the normalized family (2.7) of differential order at most two is of differential order at most one. The classification problem therefore reduces to determining all multipliers of the form

$$Q = Q(x, y, t, u, u_x, u_y, u_t),$$

where the arguments are the independent variables and the normal first-order jets. No affine or polynomial restriction is imposed on Q . The determining equation is

$$E_u(Q\Delta) = 0,$$

where Δ is given by (2.11); see [3, 4]. Before splitting, the solved derivative u_{tx} and its differential consequences are expressed in terms of normal jets.

5.1 Linearity in the derivative arguments

Lemma 5.1. *For the normalized family (2.7), every first-order multiplier $Q(x, y, t, u, u_x, u_y, u_t)$ is linear in u_x , u_y , and u_t , and takes the form*

$$Q = A(x, y, t, u) + B(x, y, t)u_x + H(y, t)u_y + K(y, t)u_t, \quad (5.1)$$

where B depends only on the independent variables, and H, K depend only on y and t . This holds for all values of c, e, f , and g .

Proof. The determining expression $E_u(Q\Delta) = 0$ is computed symbolically and expanded in normal jet variables.

Step 1: the terms involving u_y and u_t . The coefficient of the order-5 normal jet u_{xxxxxy} in $E_u(Q\Delta)$ is proportional to $6D_x(Q_{u_y})$. Since u_{xxxxxy} is independent in the jet space, this gives $D_x(Q_{u_y}) = 0$. Splitting this relation with respect to the normal jets u_x, u_{xx}, u_{xy} , and the independent variables yields

$$Q_{u_y} = H(y, t).$$

The same argument applied to the coefficient of u_{xxxxxt} yields

$$Q_{u_t} = K(y, t).$$

Step 2: the u_x -dependence. The coefficient of the order-6 normal jet u_{xxxxxx} contains the contributions

$$5Q_{u_x u_x} u_{xx} \quad \text{and} \quad 5Q_{u_x u} u_x.$$

Since u_{xx} and u_x are independent in the jet space within this coefficient, splitting yields

$$Q_{u_x u_x} = 0, \quad Q_{u_x u} = 0.$$

Hence

$$Q_{u_x} = B(x, y, t).$$

Combining the two steps gives (5.1). □

5.2 Reduction of the u -dependence

Lemma 5.2. *In the representation (5.1), the function $A(x, y, t, u)$ satisfies*

$$A_{uuu} = 0$$

for all parameter values. Hence

$$A(x, y, t, u) = a_0(x, y, t) + a_1(x, y, t)u + a_2(x, y, t)u^2. \quad (5.2)$$

Proof. Substituting (5.1) into $E_u(Q\Delta) = 0$ and expanding in normal jets, the coefficient of u_{xx}^3 is

$$15A_{uuu}.$$

Since u_{xx}^3 is independent in the jet space, it follows that $A_{uuu} = 0$. □

5.3 Classification for $g \neq 0$

Theorem 5.3. *For the normalized family (2.7) with $g \neq 0$, every first-order multiplier $Q(x, y, t, u, u_x, u_y, u_t)$ reduces to*

$$Q = a_0(x, y, t),$$

where a_0 satisfies

$$a_{0,xx} = 0, \quad a_{0,xt} + \sigma a_{0,yy} = 0. \quad (5.3)$$

No conditions on c , e , or f are required.

Proof. By Lemmas 5.1 and 5.2, the multiplier has the form

$$Q = a_0 + a_1u + a_2u^2 + Bu_x + Hu_y + Ku_t.$$

The determining expression $E_u(Q\Delta) = 0$ is then recomputed. It is straightforward to set up and solve this system in Maple. After expansion, the determining expression contains 180 terms. The reduction proceeds as follows.

Step 1: $a_2 = 0$. The coefficient of u^3 contains the term $4ga_2$ as the coefficient of u_{xx} . Since u_{xx} is independent in the jet space and $g \neq 0$, this yields

$$a_2 = 0.$$

Step 2: $a_{1,xx} = 0$. After imposing $a_2 = 0$, the free part of the coefficient of u^3 reduces to

$$g a_{1,xx} = 0.$$

Hence

$$a_{1,xx} = 0.$$

Step 3: $B = 0$. The coefficient of u_x^3 is

$$-2gB.$$

Since $g \neq 0$, this gives

$$B = 0.$$

Step 4: $H = 0$, $K = 0$, and $a_1 = 0$. With $a_2 = 0$ and $B = 0$, split the coefficient of u_x^2 with respect to the remaining jets. The coefficient of u_y yields

$$-2gH = 0,$$

hence $H = 0$. The coefficient of u_t yields

$$-2gK = 0,$$

hence $K = 0$.

Now $a_{1,xx} = 0$, so

$$a_1 = \alpha(y, t) + \beta(y, t)x.$$

Within the coefficient of $u u_x^2$, the part proportional to x yields

$$2g\beta = 0,$$

so $\beta = 0$, while the x -independent part yields

$$2g\alpha = 0,$$

so $\alpha = 0$. Therefore

$$a_1 = 0.$$

Step 5: $a_{0,xx} = 0$. The coefficient of u^2 reduces to

$$g a_{0,xx} = 0,$$

hence

$$a_{0,xx} = 0.$$

Step 6: residual system. With all u -dependent and derivative-dependent coefficients eliminated, the remaining determining expression reduces to

$$a_{0,xxxxxx} + c a_{0,xxxx} + a_{0,xt} + \sigma a_{0,yy} = 0.$$

Since $a_{0,xx} = 0$, this collapses to

$$a_{0,xt} + \sigma a_{0,yy} = 0.$$

Thus (5.3) holds. □

5.4 Generic branch of $g = 0$

Proposition 5.4. *For the normalized family (2.7) with $g = 0$ and under the nondegeneracy conditions*

$$e + f \neq 0, \quad e \neq f, \quad e \neq 2f, \quad f \neq 3e, \quad 27e \neq 14f, \quad (5.4)$$

every first-order multiplier $Q(x, y, t, u, u_x, u_y, u_t)$ reduces to

$$Q = a_0(x, y, t),$$

where a_0 satisfies (5.3).

Proof. On the branch $g = 0$, substitute the reduced ansatz from Lemmas 5.1 and 5.2 into $E_u(Q\Delta) = 0$ with $g = 0$. After expansion, the determining expression has 156 terms, with u_x appearing to power at most 3, u to power at most 3, and u_{xx} to power at most 2. The reduction proceeds as follows.

Step 1: $a_2 = 0$. The coefficient of u_{yy} contains the term $4\sigma a_2$ as the coefficient of u . Since $\sigma \neq 0$ and u is independent in the jet space within this coefficient,

$$a_2 = 0.$$

Step 2: $K = K(t)$. The coefficient of u_{yt} yields

$$2\sigma K_y = 0,$$

hence

$$K_y = 0.$$

Step 3: $K = 0$ and a_1 independent of x . The coefficient of u_{xt} contains the jet u_{xxx} with coefficient

$$(e + f)K.$$

Under the condition $e + f \neq 0$, this yields

$$K = 0.$$

The remaining free part gives

$$2a_1 - H_y = 0,$$

so

$$a_1 = \frac{1}{2}H_y.$$

In particular, a_1 is independent of x .

Step 4a: $B_x = 4a_1$. The coefficient of u_{yy} gives

$$2\sigma a_1 + \sigma H_y - \sigma B_x = 0.$$

Using $H_y = 2a_1$ from Step 3, this becomes

$$B_x = 4a_1.$$

Step 4b: $a_1 = 0$. Substituting $B_x = 4a_1$, $H_y = 2a_1$, and $K = 0$ into the coefficient of u_{xx}^2 , which is

$$3ea_1 + 3(2e - f)B_x - fH_y,$$

yields

$$(27e - 14f)a_1 = 0.$$

Under the condition $27e \neq 14f$, this gives

$$a_1 = 0.$$

Hence

$$H_y = 0, \quad B_x = 0.$$

Step 5: $B = 0$ and $H = 0$. Since $B_x = 0$, write

$$B = b_0(y, t).$$

The coefficient of $u_x u_{xxxx}$ yields

$$(e - 2f)b_0 = 0.$$

Under the condition $e \neq 2f$, this gives

$$b_0 = 0,$$

hence $B = 0$.

The coefficient of $u_x u_{xxxxy}$ yields

$$2(e - f)H = 0.$$

Under the condition $e \neq f$, this gives

$$H = 0.$$

Step 6: $a_{0,xx} = 0$ and residual system. The coefficient of u_{xx} in the remaining determining expression gives

$$(3e - f)a_{0,xx} = 0.$$

Under the condition $f \neq 3e$, this yields

$$a_{0,xx} = 0.$$

The residual equation then reduces to

$$a_{0,xt} + \sigma a_{0,yy} = 0.$$

Thus (5.3) holds. □

Remark 5.5. On the branch $g = 0$, the reductions no longer come from the cubic derivative-nonlinearity. The transverse term σu_{yy} yields the first reductions, and the remaining steps proceed through the algebraic factors

$$e + f, \quad 27e - 14f, \quad e - 2f, \quad e - f, \quad 3e - f.$$

Each vanishing factor produces a deferred exceptional sub-branch.

5.5 Deferred exceptional sub-branches on $g = 0$

The nondegeneracy conditions (5.4) exclude the five algebraic relations

$$e + f = 0, \quad e = f, \quad e = 2f, \quad f = 3e, \quad 27e = 14f.$$

On any of these sub-branches, one or more steps in the proof of Proposition 5.4 do not apply, and the multiplier space may be larger. These sub-branches are not studied further in the present paper.

The branch

$$g = 0, \quad f = 3e,$$

is the most immediate one to isolate. On this branch, the zeroth-order u -independent determining system already enlarges in Section 3: the condition $Q_{xx} = 0$ is replaced by $Q_{xxxx} = 0$. Whether the first-order multiplier space also enlarges on this branch remains open.

5.6 Summary

The results of this section are collected in Table 1.

Regime	Conditions	Result
$g \neq 0$	all c, e, f	$Q = a_0(x, y, t)$ satisfying (5.3)
$g = 0$, generic	(5.4)	$Q = a_0(x, y, t)$ satisfying (5.3)
$g = 0$, exceptional	any condition in (5.4) fails	open

Table 1: Unrestricted first-order classification of multipliers for the normalized family (2.7).

In both closed regimes, every first-order multiplier reduces to

$$Q = a_0(x, y, t)$$

satisfying the zeroth-order system (5.3). Combined with Theorem 3.1, the six-dimensional basis (3.4) is recovered within the polynomial subclass in both regimes. Combined with Theorem 4.1, every multiplier of order at most two reduces to the zeroth-order system (5.3) in the generic regime of the full parameter family.

6 Structural Interpretation and Comparison

6.1 Structural sources of the low-order rigidity

The reductions established in Sections 4 and 5 are governed by three distinct structural sources.

The first is the sixth-order x -jet structure. The leading term u_{xxxxxx} in (2.11), with coefficient 1, is responsible for the second-order reduction of Theorem 4.1. In the Euler condition, the two contributions to the target jet $u_{J+(6,0,0)}$ carry the same sign when $|J| = 2$, and hence force the vanishing of every second-order derivative dependence. At first order, the same sixth-order structure enters again in Lemma 5.1, where the coefficients of the highest x -jets force the multiplier to be linear in the derivative arguments.

The second is the transverse term σu_{yy} . On the branch $g = 0$, this term is the first source that forces reduction in the determining system. In Proposition 5.4, it yields the vanishing of a_2 , the relation $K_y = 0$, and the identity $B_x = 4a_1$. Thus the transverse term remains active even when the cubic derivative-nonlinearity is absent.

The third is the cubic derivative-nonlinearity $g u^2 u_x$. In the regime $g \neq 0$, this term is responsible for eliminating the u -dependent part of the multiplier, the u_x -dependence, and the u_y - and u_t -dependence in Theorem 5.3. It also forces the condition $a_{0,xx} = 0$. This source is absent on the branch $g = 0$, and the determining system then proceeds instead through the algebraic factors

$$e + f, \quad 27e - 14f, \quad e - 2f, \quad e - f, \quad 3e - f,$$

each of which produces a deferred exceptional sub-branch when it vanishes.

These three sources remain distinct in the generic regime. The sixth-order x -jet structure acts for all parameter values, the transverse term acts whenever $\sigma \neq 0$, and the cubic derivative-nonlinearity acts whenever $g \neq 0$. Their combined effect is that, in the multiplier orders treated here, no enlargement of the surviving multiplier space occurs beyond the zeroth-order system (5.3) in the generic regimes.

6.2 Comparison with simpler KP-type settings

The most natural comparators are the standard KP equation [7], the generalized KP-type equations studied in [5], and the Kawahara–KP equation studied in [15]. Both share the KP-type transverse structure and an x -direction dispersive architecture with the present family, but neither contains the derivative-nonlinearity terms

$$u u_{xxx}, \quad u_x u_{xx}, \quad u^2 u_x$$

that distinguish (2.7).

At the level of the zeroth-order problem, the determining system in the generic regime is

$$Q_{xx} = 0, \quad Q_{xt} + \sigma Q_{yy} = 0,$$

which depends only on the linear KP-type differential structure. For this reason, the same low-order polynomial pattern appears within the corresponding polynomial subclass in several KP-type models. In the present family, however, the derivative-nonlinearity terms do not produce additional low-order multipliers. Instead, when $g \neq 0$, they provide an additional obstruction through the term $g u^2 u_x$.

There is also a methodological difference. The potential form of the Kawahara–KP equation is variational, so conservation laws can be obtained there through Noether’s theorem after introducing a potential [15]. By contrast, the present family is variational only on the submanifold $f = 2e$; outside that submanifold, the direct multiplier method is required. The reductions in Section 5 therefore belong to the generic nonvariational regime of the family.

6.3 Distinguished one-dimensional triples in the two-dimensional setting

The one-dimensional reduction contains the distinguished coefficient triples

$$(10, 20, 30), \quad (5, 5, 5), \quad (10, 25, 20),$$

corresponding respectively to the Lax, Sawada–Kotera, and Kaup–Kupershmidt equations [14, 19, 9, 13]. A natural question is whether these triples produce exceptional low-order multiplier structure after passage to the two-dimensional KP-type setting.

At the multiplier orders treated here, they do not. All three triples satisfy $g \neq 0$ and are therefore covered directly by Theorem 5.3. No separate treatment is needed, and no exceptional enlargement of the multiplier space occurs.

The reason is visible in the determining-system cascade. In the two-dimensional problem, the transverse term σu_{yy} and the sixth-order x -jet structure enter before coefficient-sensitive relations associated with the one-dimensional integrable triples become relevant. Thus the distinguished one-dimensional coefficient geometry does not produce separate behavior at the multiplier orders classified in the present paper.

6.4 Interpretation of the surviving basis

In the generic regimes treated here, every first-order multiplier reduces to a function $a_0(x, y, t)$ satisfying (5.3). Within the polynomial subclass, this recovers the six-dimensional basis obtained in Section 3:

$$1, \quad y, \quad x, \quad xy, \quad xt - \frac{y^2}{2\sigma}, \quad xyt - \frac{y^3}{6\sigma}.$$

This basis is determined by the zeroth-order system (5.3) and is independent of the nonlinear coefficients c , e , f , and g . The role of the nonlinear terms in the generic low-order problem is therefore not to enlarge the multiplier space, but to restrict it. The condition $f = 2e$ does not alter the surviving basis itself; it enters only through the variational formulation discussed in Section 2.

7 Open Directions

The first open problem concerns the five algebraic relations excluded by the nondegeneracy conditions in Proposition 5.4:

$$e + f = 0, \quad e = f, \quad e = 2f, \quad f = 3e, \quad 27e = 14f.$$

On each of these sub-branches of $g = 0$, one or more steps in the proof of Proposition 5.4 do not apply, and the first-order multiplier space may be larger. Among them, the branch

$$g = 0, \quad f = 3e$$

is the most immediate to isolate. On this branch, the zeroth-order u -independent determining system already enlarges, since the condition $Q_{xx} = 0$ is replaced by $Q_{xxxx} = 0$ in Section 3. Whether the full first-order multiplier space also enlarges on this branch remains open. The remaining four relations arise from the algebraic factors appearing in the determining-system cascade of Proposition 5.4, and they should be checked for completeness.

A second question is whether the rigidity established here persists at higher multiplier order. The present paper classifies multipliers up to second order, and Theorem 4.1 depends on the parity structure specific to second-order jets. In that argument, the two contributions to the target order-8

jet carry the same sign and therefore reinforce. For third-order jets, the corresponding signs are opposite, so the second-order reduction argument does not extend directly. A classification at third order would therefore require a separate determining-system analysis.

A related question concerns the difference between the one-dimensional reduction and the two-dimensional KP-type setting. In one spatial dimension, the distinguished triples associated with the Lax, Sawada–Kotera, and Kaup–Kupershmidt equations produce infinite conservation law hierarchies [14, 19, 9, 13], while fifth-order solitary-wave behavior and transverse effects in related settings have also been studied for Kawahara-type models [8]. In the present two-dimensional problem, that parameter sensitivity does not appear at the multiplier orders treated here, because the transverse term σu_{yy} and the sixth-order x -jet structure enter the determining-system cascade before the coefficient-sensitive factors become relevant. This leads to a natural open question: does the parameter sensitivity visible in the one-dimensional reduction reappear at higher multiplier order in the two-dimensional setting, or is it suppressed by the transverse structure throughout the KP-type class?

A further direction is to ask whether the same fifth-order nonlinear family has a different low-order multiplier picture under a different two-dimensional extension. In the present paper, the transverse term is σu_{yy} . A different extension, for example of Zakharov–Kuznetsov type with a mixed transverse dispersive term such as σu_{xyy} , would alter the jet structure that enters the multiplier determining equations. It is therefore reasonable to ask whether such an extension admits a different low-order multiplier classification. For conservation-law calculations in ZK-type equations with higher-order dispersion, see [2].

The results of the present paper determine the low-order multiplier structure of the generalized fifth-order KP family up to second order in the generic regimes treated here. The deferred exceptional sub-branches and the higher-order multiplier problem remain the next natural steps.

References

- [1] M. J. Ablowitz and P. A. Clarkson. *Solitons, Nonlinear Evolution Equations and Inverse Scattering*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1991.
- [2] M. N. Ali, A. R. Seadawy, and S. M. Husnine. Lie point symmetries, exact solutions and conservation laws of perturbed zakharov–kuznetsov equation with higher-order dispersion term. *Modern Physics Letters A*, 34(3):1950027, 2019.
- [3] S. C. Anco and G. Bluman. Direct construction method for conservation laws of partial differential equations. part i: Examples of conservation law classifications. *European Journal of Applied Mathematics*, 13(5):545–566, 2002.
- [4] S. C. Anco and G. Bluman. Direct construction method for conservation laws of partial differential equations. part ii: General treatment. *European Journal of Applied Mathematics*, 13(5):567–585, 2002.
- [5] S. C. Anco, M. L. Gandarias, and E. Recio. Conservation laws, symmetries, and line soliton solutions of generalized kp and boussinesq equations with p-power nonlinearities in two dimensions. *Theoretical and Mathematical Physics*, 196(3):1241–1259, 2018.
- [6] G. W. Bluman, A. F. Cheviakov, and S. C. Anco. *Applications of Symmetry Methods to Partial Differential Equations*. Springer, New York, 2010.

- [7] B. B. Kadomtsev and V. I. Petviashvili. On the stability of solitary waves in weakly dispersive media. *Soviet Physics Doklady*, 15:539–541, 1970.
- [8] V. I. Karpman. Transverse stability of kawahara solitons. *Physical Review E*, 47(1):674–676, 1993.
- [9] D. J. Kaup. On the inverse scattering problem for cubic eigenvalue problems of the class $\psi_{xxx} + 6Q\psi_x + 6R\psi = \lambda\psi$. *Studies in Applied Mathematics*, 62(3):189–216, 1980.
- [10] T. Kawahara. Oscillatory solitary waves in dispersive media. *Journal of the Physical Society of Japan*, 33(1):260–264, 1972.
- [11] C. Klein and J.-C. Saut. *Nonlinear Dispersive Equations*. Springer, Cham, 2021.
- [12] B. G. Konopelchenko. *Solitons in Multidimensions: Inverse Spectral Transform Method*. World Scientific, Singapore, 1993.
- [13] B. A. Kupershmidt. Mathematics of dispersive water waves. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 99(1):51–73, 1985.
- [14] P. D. Lax. Integrals of nonlinear equations of evolution and solitary waves. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 21(5):467–490, 1968.
- [15] A. P. M’arquez Lozano, M. L. Gandarias Nu nez, and S. C. Anco. Conservation laws, symmetries, and line solitons of a kawahara-kp equation. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, 434:115412, 2023.
- [16] P. J. Olver. *Applications of Lie Groups to Differential Equations*. Springer, New York, 2 edition, 1993.
- [17] J.-C. Saut and N. Tzvetkov. The cauchy problem for higher order kp equations. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 153(1):196–222, 1999.
- [18] J.-C. Saut and N. Tzvetkov. The cauchy problem for the fifth order kadomtsev–petviashvili equations. *Journal de mathematiques pures et appliquees*, 79(4):307–338, 2000.
- [19] K. Sawada and T. Kotera. A method for finding n-soliton solutions of the kdv and kdv-like equation. *Progress of Theoretical Physics*, 51(5):1355–1367, 1974.