

Werk

Label: Article **Jahr:** 1977

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?316342866_0018|log74

Kontakt/Contact

<u>Digizeitschriften e.V.</u> SUB Göttingen Platz der Göttinger Sieben 1 37073 Göttingen

COMMENTATIONES MATHEMATICAE UNIVERSITATIS CAROLINAE

18,4 (1977)

NOTE TO PERIODIC SOLVABILITY OF THE BOUNDARY VALUE PROBLEM FOR NONLINEAR HEAT EQUATION

Věnceslava ŠŤASTNOVÁ and Svatopluk FUČÍK, Praha

Abstract: There is proved the existence of an ω -periodic solution of the boundary value problem for nonlinear heat equation. The proof is based on the Kazdan-Warner method (introduced for the solvability of boundary value problems for nonlinear partial differential equations of elliptic type) and on the theorem of Kolesov (where the existence of an ω -periodic solution of quasilinear parabolic equation follows from the existence of ω -periodic sub- and super-solutions).

Key words: Periodic solutions, nonlinear heat equation.

AMS: 35K05, 35K55 Ref. Z.: 7.956

Let $\omega > 0$. Suppose that f(t,x) is ω -periodic function in t. Let $\psi: \mathbb{R}^1 \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^1$ be a given real valued function defined on the real line \mathbb{R}^1 . This note is devoted to the stu-

dy of the existence of a solution of the problem

$$u_{\mathbf{t}}(t,\mathbf{x}) - u_{\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}}(t,\mathbf{x}) - u(t,\mathbf{x}) + \psi(u(t,\mathbf{x})) = \mathbf{f}(t,\mathbf{x}),$$

$$(t,\mathbf{x}) \in Q = \mathbb{R}^{1} \times (0,\pi),$$

$$u(t,0) = u(t,\pi) = 0, \ t \in \mathbb{R}^{1}$$

$$u(t+\omega,\mathbf{x}) = u(t,\mathbf{x}), \ (t,\mathbf{x}) \in Q.$$

In contrast to the previous results obtained for (1) by various authors (for an extensive bibliography see the prepared book of 0. Vejvoda and Comp. [51) our result will not

be restricted to small nonlinearities although ψ will have to satisfy the monotonicity condition and certain one-side growth condition. The obtained result is in the spirit of a recent work by Kazdan-Warner [2] on boundary value problems for elliptic partial differential equations and may be generalized for higher dimensional analogue of the problem (1). The result is very close to Theorem V.1 from Brézis-Nirenberg [1], where the generalized solutions are considered and where also different one-side growth condition is supposed.

In the sequel we shall suppose:

- (2) f(t,x) is ω -periodic in the variable t and satisfies on $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ the Hölder condition with some exponent $\infty \in (0,1]$;
- (3) the function $\psi: \mathbb{R}^1 \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^1$ satisfies on arbitrary compact subinterval of \mathbb{R}^1 the Hölder condition;
- (4) the function ψ is nondecreasing on \mathbb{R}^1 and there exists $\mathbf{c} \ge 0$ such that

$$\psi(\xi) \ge -c (1 + \xi^2)$$

for arbitrary § e R1;

(5)
$$\lim_{\xi \to -\infty} \psi(\xi) < \psi(0) < \lim_{\xi \to \infty} \psi(\xi).$$

The continuous function $u^*(t,x)$ on \overline{Q} is said to be a solution of (1) if it is ω -periodic in t, satisfies the boundary conditions (1_2) , has the derivatives u_t^*, u_{xx}^* on Q and verifies the equation (1_1) .

The main goal of this note is the following theorem.

Theorem. Suppose (2) - (5). Then the problem (1) has at least one solution if and only if

(6)
$$2\omega \lim_{\xi \to -\infty} \psi(\xi) < \int_0^{\infty} \int_0^{\pi} f(t,x) \sin x \, dx \, dt < 2\omega \lim_{\xi \to \infty} \psi(\xi).$$

The proof of Theorem

(i) Let (1) have a solution u* (t,x). Then

$$\int_0^{\omega} \int_0^{\pi} f(t,x) \sin x \, dx \, dt = \int_0^{\omega} \int_0^{\pi} \psi(u^*(t,x)) \sin x \, dx \, dt$$

and from the assumption (5) it follows the necessity of (6). (Note that for the using of the integration by parts we apply the regularity result that u^* is Hölder-continuous - see e.g. [4, Chap. 5, Thm. 1.1].)

(ii) Suppose (6). Then there exists a constant $k \in \mathbb{R}^1$ such that 2ω $\psi(k)$ is close to

$$a = \int_0^{\omega} \int_0^{\pi} f(t, x) \sin x \, dx \, dt.$$

From the absolute continuity of the Lebesgue integral it is possible to perturb the constant k onto smooth function z(x) on $[0, \sigma]$ with $z(0) = z(\pi) = 0$ and such that

$$a = \omega \int_0^{\pi} \psi(z(x)) \sin x dx.$$

(The reader is invited to sketch a picture and to make a precise proof of the above assertion.)

(iii) Put

P:
$$(t,x) \mapsto f(t,x) - \psi(z(x)), (t,x) \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$$
.

Then for arbitrary continuously differentiable function u satisfying $(l_2),(l_3)$ and

$$z(x) \leq u(t,x), (t,x) \in \overline{Q}$$

we have

(7)
$$f(t,x) = \psi(u(t,x)) \leq P(t,x), (t,x) \in \overline{Q}$$

Analogously, for arbitrary continuously differentiable function u(t,x) satisfying $(l_2),(l_3)$ and

$$u(t,x) \leq z(x), (t,x) \in \overline{Q}$$

it is

$$P(t,x) \le f(t,x) - \psi(u(t,x)), (t,x) \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}.$$

(iv) The problem

(8)
$$\begin{cases} v_t - v_{xx} - v = P \text{ on } Q \\ v(t,0) = v(t,\pi) = 0, t \in \mathbb{R}^1 \\ v(t+\omega,x) = v(t,x) \text{ on } Q \end{cases}$$

has at least one solution v*(t,x) for

$$\int_0^{\omega} \int_0^{\pi} P(t,x) \sin x \, dx \, dt = 0.$$

Choose $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^1$ such that

(9)
$$\gamma \sin x + v^*(t,x) \ge z(x), (t,x) \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}.$$

(Note that if v(t,x) has continuous partial derivatives of the first order on \overline{Q} and satisfies $(8_2),(8_3)$ then

$$\frac{|v(t)|}{\sin x} = \frac{|v(t,x) - v(t,0)|}{x} \cdot \frac{x}{\sin x} \neq \sup_{x \in (0,\frac{\pi}{2})} \frac{x}{\sin x}.$$

from which it follows (9) on $\mathbb{R}^1 \times [0, \frac{\pi}{2})$ and analogously on $\mathbb{R}^1 \times [\frac{\pi}{2}, \pi]$.)

Put

$$\overline{u}: (t,x) \longmapsto \gamma \sin x + v^*(t,x), (t,x) \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}.$$

Then obviously $\overline{u}(t,x)$ satisfies $(1_2),(1_3)$ and from (7),(9)

we have

 $\overline{u}_t(t,x) - \overline{u}_{xx}(t,x) - \overline{u}(t,x) + \psi(\overline{u}(t,x)) \ge f(t,x), (t,x) \in Q.$ Analogously, we choose $o \in \mathbb{R}^1$ such that

 \underline{u} : $(t,x) \mapsto \mathscr{O}\sin x + v * (t,x) \not\in \underline{v}$, $(t,x) \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$.

Then $\underline{u}(t,x)$ satisfies $(l_2),(l_3)$ and $\underline{u}_t(t,x) - \underline{u}_{xx}(t,x) - \underline{u}(t,x) + \psi(\underline{u}(t,x)) \not\in f(t,x), (t,x) \in \mathbb{Q}.$ Obviously

$$\underline{u}(t,x) \leq \overline{u}(t,x), (tx) \in \overline{Q}.$$

(v) The result of Kolesov (see [3]) implies that there exists at least one solution $u^*(t,x)$ of (1) which, moreover, satisfies

$$\underline{\mathbf{u}}(t,\mathbf{x}) \leq \mathbf{u}^*(t,\mathbf{x}) \leq \overline{\mathbf{u}}(t,\mathbf{x}), (t,\mathbf{x}) \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}.$$

References

- [1] H. BRÉZIS L. NIRENBERG: Characterizations of the ranges of some nonlinear operators and applications to boundary value problems, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa (to appear).
- [2] J.L. KAZDAN F.W. WARNER: Remarks on quasilinear elliptic equations, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 28 (1975), 567-597.
- [3] Ju. S. KOLESOV: Periodic solutions of quasilinear parabolic equations of the second order (Russian), Trudy Moskov. Mat. Obšč. 21(1970), 103-134.
- [4] O.A. IADYŽENSKAJA, V.A. SOLONNIKOV, N.N. URALCEVA: Linear and quasilinear equations of the parabolic type (Russian), Moscow, Nauka, 1967.

[5] O. VEJVODA and Comp.: Partial differential equations - periodic solutions (manuscript of the prepared book).

Matematicko-fyzikální fakulta Universita Karlova Sokolovská 83, 18600 Praha 8 Československo

(Oblatum 18.8. 1977)