

## 69. On the Existence and Asymptotic Behavior of Solutions of Nonlinear Heat Flow with Memory

By Nobuyuki KATO

Department of Mathematics, School of Education, Waseda University

(Communicated by Kôzaku Yosida, M. J. A., Sept. 14, 1987)

**1. Introduction and result.** We shall consider the problem of nonlinear heat flow in materials with memory :

$$(M) \begin{cases} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left[ u(t, x) + \int_{-\infty}^t k(t-s)u(s, x)ds \right] = \sigma(u_x(t, x))_x + h(t, x), & t \in \mathbf{R}^+, x \in (0, 1), \\ u_x(t, 0) \in \beta_0(u(t, 0)), \quad -u_x(t, 1) \in \beta_1(u(t, 1)), & t \in \mathbf{R}, \\ u(t, x) = u_0(x), & t \in (-\infty, 0], x \in (0, 1). \end{cases}$$

Throughout,  $k$ ,  $\sigma$  and  $\beta_i$  ( $i=0, 1$ ) are always assumed that

- ( $k$ )  $k \in L^1(0, \infty)$ , nonnegative, nonincreasing and bounded.
- ( $\sigma$ )  $\sigma \in C^1(\mathbf{R})$ ,  $\sigma(0)=0$ ,  $\sigma(\mathbf{R})=\mathbf{R}$ , and  $\sigma$  is strictly increasing.
- ( $\beta$ )  $\beta_i$  ( $i=0, 1$ ) are maximal monotone graphs in  $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}$  satisfying  $0 \in \beta_i(0)$ .

Our purpose is to obtain the following

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $h \in L^1(0, \infty; L^p(0, 1))$  and  $u_0 \in L^p(0, 1)$ ,  $1 < p < \infty$ .*

*Assume that the one of the following conditions is satisfied :*

- (A)  $\beta_i \equiv 0$  for  $i=0$  and  $1$ .
- (B)  $\sigma$  satisfies  $\sigma' > 0$  and

$$(1.1) \quad \int_0^\infty r \cdot \min\{\sigma'(s) : |s| \leq r\} dr = \infty, \quad \text{in addition to } (\sigma),$$

and  $\beta_i$  satisfies

$$(1.2) \quad \sup\{|y| : y \in R(\beta_i)\} < \infty \quad \text{for } i=0 \text{ or } 1 \text{ (} R \text{ means a range).}$$

- (C)  $\sigma$  satisfies

$$(1.3) \quad \exists \delta > 0 : \sigma' \geq \delta, \quad \text{in addition to } (\sigma).$$

Then the unique "generalized solution"  $u(t, x)$  of (M) (defined below) exists and it converges strongly in  $L^p(0, 1)$  to some constant  $\zeta_\infty$  satisfying  $0 \in \beta_i(\zeta_\infty)$  ( $i=0, 1$ ) as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ .

**Remarks.** 1) The condition (1.1) was introduced by [11] and it states roughly that the gradient of  $\sigma$  is allowed to lie to some extent. Note that (1.3) implies (1.1).

2) In the case of (A), it is easy to see that

$$\zeta_\infty = \int_0^1 u_0(x) dx + \left(1 + \int_0^\infty k(s) ds\right)^{-1} \int_0^\infty \int_0^1 h(t, x) dx dt \quad (\text{cf. [1]}).$$

3) In the case of Dirichlet boundary condition, if (1.3) is assumed, we can obtain the estimate of decay corresponding to an exponential decay ([3], [7]) :

$$(1.4) \quad \|u(t)\|_p \leq \left(\int_t^\infty r(\tau) d\tau\right) \|u_0\|_p + \omega^{-1} \int_0^t r(t-\tau) [u(\tau), h(\tau)]_+ d\tau,$$

where  $\omega > 0$  is some constant and  $r$  is defined by  $r + \omega b * r = \omega b$ ,  $b + k * b = 1$ , and  $[x, y]_+ = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} (\|x + \lambda y\|_p - \|x\|_p) / \lambda$ ,  $\|\cdot\|_p$  is the  $L^p$ -norm.

**2. Reduction to the abstract equation.** Let  $1 < p < \infty$ . Define  $A$  by  $D(A) = \{u \in C^1[0, 1] : u'(0) \in \beta_0(u(0)), -u'(1) \in \beta_1(u(1)), \text{ and } \sigma(u') \in W^{1,p}(0, 1)\}$   
 $Au = -\sigma(u')'$  for  $u \in D(A)$ .

With this  $A$ , (M) can be interpreted as an abstract equation in  $L^p(0, 1)$ :

$$(E) \begin{cases} (d/dt)u(t) + Au(t) + G(u)(t) \ni h(t) + k(t)u_0, & t \in \mathbf{R}^+, \\ u(0) = u_0, \end{cases}$$

where  $G(u)(t) = k(0)u(t) + \int_0^t u(t-s)dk(s)$ . A function  $u \in C(\mathbf{R}^+; \overline{D(A)})$  is called simply a solution of (E) if it is an "integral solution" of (E) considering  $h(t) + k(t)u_0 - G(u)(t)$  as an inhomogeneous term ([4]). Then we define the "generalized solution" of (M) by  $u(t, x) = [u(t)](x)$ , where  $u(t)$  is the solution of (E).

To obtain Theorem 1.1, we will apply the following abstract results concerning (E):

**Theorem 2.1** ([4, 6, 10]). *Let  $h \in L^1(0, \infty; X)$  and  $u_0 \in \overline{D(A)}$ . Assume that  $A$  is  $m$ -accretive,  $A^{-1}0 \neq \emptyset$ , and  $A$  satisfies the convergence condition (see below). If  $(I + A)^{-1}$  is compact, then the unique solution  $u(t)$  of (E) exists and converges strongly to an element of  $A^{-1}0$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ .*

If  $A$  is  $m$ -accretive in  $X = L^p(0, 1)$  and  $A^{-1}0 \neq \emptyset$ , the nearest point mapping  $P$  onto  $A^{-1}0$  is well-defined and continuous since  $A^{-1}0$  is a closed convex subset of  $L^p(0, 1)$ . Denote by  $J$  the single-valued duality mapping in  $X$ . For the definition of the convergence condition, we refer to [9] and here we recall the sufficient condition for  $A$  to satisfy it:

**Proposition 2.2** ([9]). *Let  $A$  be  $m$ -accretive with  $A^{-1}0 \neq \emptyset$ . If  $\langle y, J(x - Px) \rangle > 0$  for every  $[x, y] \in A$  with  $x \notin A^{-1}0$ , and the resolvent  $(I + A)^{-1}$  is compact, then  $A$  satisfies the convergence condition.*

Now, we have only to prove that:

**Proposition 2.3.** *Assume that the one of the conditions (A), (B) and (C) is satisfied. Then  $A$  is  $m$ -accretive in  $L^p(0, 1)$ , the resolvent  $(I + A)^{-1}$  is a compact operator, and  $A$  satisfies the convergence condition.*

**3. Sketch of proof of Proposition 2.3.** It is easy to see that  $A$  is accretive in  $L^p(0, 1)$  from the form of tangent function  $[\cdot, \cdot]_+$  in  $L^p(0, 1)$ . In the case of (A), we make use of the results of [Z] and obtain  $W^{1,1}(0, 1) \subset R(I + A)$ , whereas in the cases of (B) and (C), we have  $C[0, 1] \subset R(I + A)$  by [11]. Therefore in order to show that  $A$  is  $m$ -accretive, it suffices to show that  $A$  is closed in  $L^p(0, 1)$ . Let  $u_n \in D(A)$  be such that  $u_n \rightarrow u$  and  $-\sigma(u'_n)' \rightarrow v$  in  $L^p(0, 1)$ . In the cases of (A) and (B), it follows from

$$(3.1) \quad \sigma(u'_n(x)) - \sigma(u'_n(0)) = \int_0^x \sigma(u'_n(\tau))' d\tau$$

$$\left( \text{or } \sigma(u'_n(1)) - \sigma(u'_n(x)) = \int_x^1 \sigma(u'_n(\tau))' d\tau \right)$$

that  $\|u'_n(x)\| \leq C$ . (Hereafter  $C$  denotes a universal constant.) From this,

we can get  $u \in W^{2,p}(0,1) \subset C^1[0,1]$ ,  $\sigma(u') \in W^{1,p}(0,1)$ , and  $v = -\sigma(u)'$ . In the case of (A), the desired boundary condition of  $u$  is easily checked. On the other hand in the case of (B), we further show the estimate  $\|u_n''\|_p \leq C$ , so that

$$(3.2) \quad \|u_n\|_{W^{2,p}(0,1)} \leq C.$$

Then we obtain  $u_n \rightarrow u$  in  $W^{2,p}(0,1) \subset C^1[0,1]$ , and by the closedness of  $\beta_i$  ( $i=0,1$ ), the boundary condition of  $u$  is satisfied, and so  $A$  is closed.

In the case of (C), it follows from

$$\int_0^1 \delta^p |u_n''|^p \leq \int_0^1 |\sigma'(u_n') u_n''|^p = \int_0^1 |\sigma(u_n')'|^p$$

that  $\|u_n''\|_p \leq C/\delta$ . Then since

$$(3.3) \quad \|u_n'\|_p \leq K(\|u_n''\|_p^p + \|u_n\|_p^p), \quad K \text{ depends only on } p,$$

we have the estimate (3.2) and hence  $A$  is closed as shown above.

To prove the compactness of  $(I+A)^{-1}$ , let  $f \in L^p(0,1)$  and take  $u \in D(A)$  such that  $u + Au = f$ . In the cases of (A) and (B), by the equation (3.1) with  $u$  in place of  $u_n$  and the accretivity of  $A$  together with  $0 \in A0$ , the estimate  $\|u\|_{W^{1,p}} \leq C + C\|f\|_p$  holds. In the case of (C), we have  $\|u''\|_p \leq (C/\delta)(\|u\|_p + \|f\|_p) \leq (2C/\delta)\|f\|_p$  and by the inequality like (3.3), the estimate  $\|u\|_{W^{1,p}} \leq C\|f\|_p$  follows. Since the embedding  $W^{1,p}(0,1) \subset L^p(0,1)$  is compact, we conclude that  $(1+A)^{-1}$  is compact.

Finally, noting that  $u$  is not constant if  $u \in D(A) \setminus A^{-1}0$ , it is not difficult to see that

$$\langle Ax, J(x - Px) \rangle > 0 \quad \text{for any } x \in D(A) \text{ with } x \notin A^{-1}0.$$

Thus by Proposition 2.2,  $A$  satisfies the convergence condition. Q.E.D.

**Acknowledgements.** I would like to express my thanks to Prof. H. Serizawa of Niigata University and Prof. M. Ôtani of Tokai University for valuable discussions, and to Prof. I. Miyadera for his encouragement and advice.

## References

- [1] J. B. Baillon and Ph. Clément: Ergodic theorems for nonlinear Volterra equations in Hilbert space. *Nonlinear Anal.*, **5**, 789–801 (1981).
- [2] H. Brezis and W. A. Strauss: Semi-linear second-order elliptic equations in  $L^1$ . *J. Math. Soc. Japan*, **25**, 565–590 (1973).
- [3] Ph. Clément and J. A. Nohel: Asymptotic behavior of solutions of nonlinear Volterra equations with completely positive kernels. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, **12**, 514–535 (1981).
- [4] M. G. Crandall and J. A. Nohel: An abstract functional differential equation and a related nonlinear Volterra equation. *Israel J. Math.*, **29**, 313–328 (1978).
- [5] D. S. Hulbert and S. Reich: Asymptotic behavior of solutions to nonlinear Volterra equations. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **104**, 155–172 (1984).
- [6] N. Kato: On the asymptotic behavior of solutions of nonlinear Volterra equations and its application to nonlinear heat flow with memory. *RIMS, Kokyuroku*, vol. 604 (1987).
- [7] —: Unbounded behavior and convergence of solutions of nonlinear Volterra equations in Banach spaces (preprint).
- [8] N. Kato, K. Kobayasi, and I. Miyadera: On the asymptotic behavior of solutions of evolution equations associated with nonlinear Volterra equations. *Nonlinear*

- Anal., **9**, 419–430 (1985).
- [9] O. Nevanlinna and S. Reich: Strong convergence of contraction semigroups and of iterative methods for accretive operators in Banach spaces. *Israel J. Math.*, **32**, 44–58 (1979).
- [10] S. Reich: Nonlinear semigroups, holomorphic mappings, and integral equations. *Proc. Symposia in Pure Math.*, AMS, **45**, 307–324 (1986).
- [11] H. Serizawa: M-Browder accretiveness of a quasilinear differential operator. *Houston J. Math.*, **10**, 147–152 (1984).