

ON WEAK SOLUTIONS TO THE STEFAN PROBLEM WITH GIBBS-THOMSON CORRECTION

PIOTR BOGUSŁAW MUCHA

Institute of Applied Mathematics and Mechanics, Warsaw University
ul. Banacha 2, 02-097 Warszawa, Poland

(Submitted by: Y. Giga)

Abstract. The paper investigates the well posedness of the quasi-stationary Stefan problem with the Gibbs-Thomson correction. The main result proves the existence of unique weak solutions provided the initial surface belongs to the $W_p^{2-3/p}$ -Sobolev-Slobodeckij class for $p > n + 3$, only. The proof is based on Schauder-type estimates in L_p -type spaces for a linearization of the original system in a rigid domain.

1. INTRODUCTION

The well posedness of the quasi-stationary one-phase Stefan problem with the Gibbs-Thomson correction is the subject of this paper. We investigate the following free-boundary problem in sought domain Ω_t ,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta p &= 0 && \text{in } \Omega_t, \\ p &= a\kappa && \text{on } \partial\Omega_t, \\ \frac{\partial p}{\partial \vec{n}} &= -V_{\vec{n}} && \text{on } \partial\Omega_t, \\ \Omega_t|_{t=0} &= \Omega_0, \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

where the unknown function p in the classical thermodynamical interpretation represents the temperature; $\partial\Omega_t$ is the unknown phase transition surface being the boundary of Ω_t ; κ is the mean curvature of boundary $\partial\Omega_t$, $V_{\vec{n}}$ describes the normal velocity of the free boundary; a is a given positive constant; \vec{n} is the outer normal vector to $\partial\Omega_t$ and Ω_0 is the initial domain—required to be bounded.

System (1.1) belongs to the classical phase transition theory [2, 22]. It describes the motion of interface separating two states—here $\partial\Omega_t$ is sought. In the classical theory they are solid and liquid states of the same material. Similar models may be found in mechanics, biology or medicine [2, 14, 10]. Sometimes they are called Hele-Shaw or Mullins-Sekerka systems.

Accepted for publication: April 2007.

AMS Subject Classifications: 35R35, 35K55, 35K99, 80A22, 74N20.

The issue of existence to system (1.1) was a serious challenge for mathematicians. First we had only partial results [3, 6, 16], and the general answer has been given in [4, 7]. The results are based on the parabolic character of the system and deliver classical solutions in the Hölder class. They use the fact that system (1.1) is a non-local parabolic system of the third order.

In our article we would like to consider the issue of optimal regularity of the initial surface. The question is related to finding the weakest assumptions that imply uniqueness of solutions. In [7] the authors required $\partial\Omega_0 \in C^{2+a}$. Next their result was generalized in [9] to the L_p -framework for the evolutionary version of (1.1) with $\partial\Omega_0 \in W_p^{4-3/p}$ for sufficiently large p . In [18] the initial boundary belongs to $W_p^{3-3/p}$. All these results were concerned with regular solutions; here we will investigate a weaker form of system (1.1), where boundary conditions (1.1)₃ will be studied in a distributional sense.

We shall mention other approaches to problems represented by (1.1). In [17, 21] the authors analyze a reformulation of the system given by a phase function, obtaining weak solutions. This approach, based on the variation technique, shows existence in very low class of regularity; it, however, does not guarantee the uniqueness of the obtained solutions. The geometrical interpretation is not immediate either.

Our result will be local in time, since we consider general initial domains. For some global-in-time stability results we refer to [5, 8, 11].

Since the mathematical difficulties are located on the boundary we set

$$\dim \Omega_t = n + 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \dim \partial\Omega_t = n. \quad (1.2)$$

Our main result states the well posedness of system (1.1). The initial boundary will be described in the Sobolev-Slobodeckij spaces W_p^s and the p -function in the Besov spaces B_{p1}^s (see Section 2). The main theorem reads as follows.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $p > n + 3$ and Ω_0 be a bounded subdomain of \mathbf{R}^{n+1} with $\partial\Omega_0 \in W_p^{2-3/p}$. There exists a unique solution to problem (1.1) on the time interval $(0, T)$ for $T > 0$ such that the following inclusions hold:*

$$\begin{aligned} (\bigcup_{0 < t < T} \partial\Omega_t \times \{t\}) &\in W_p^{2,2/3} \quad \text{as a submanifold in } \mathbf{R}^{n+2}, \\ p &\in L_p(0, T; B_{p1}^{1/p}(\Omega_t)) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial p}{\partial \bar{n}} \in L_p(0, T; W_p^{-1}(\partial\Omega_t)). \end{aligned} \quad (1.3)$$

Theorem 1.1 constructs unique solutions to system (1.1) assuming possible lowest regularity of the initial surface. The technique of the proof is based on analysis of a linearization of the studied system. Considering that, in

a free boundary problem, a way of linearization is not obvious. Here, we transform the domain in a rigid given set preserving the measure. Thanks to the fact that the form of the Laplacian in a new coordinate system is better for analyzing the full non-linear system, we gain “one derivative.” However, the result for the linear equations is not elementary. The method requires results for the Laplace operator in very weak regularity in Besov spaces $B_{p1}^{1/p}$, which guarantee existence of traces [24]. Basic tools are Fourier analysis and Marcinkiewicz-type theorems. They are necessary to obtain optimal estimates of solutions in L_p -type spaces. This way we are able to concentrate our investigations on the surface only.

Comparing the presented technique to the approach in [4] and [7], we obtain improved information about the regularity of solutions. The theory of semigroups applied in [7] required initial surface in the Hölder class C^{2+a} and here only $W_p^{2-3/p}$ is needed. This follows from the fact that this technique requires relatively high regularity to define suitable solutions to (1.1) and does not see the whole structure of the system. Theorem 1.1 improves the results from [18] and the approach from [9], too.

In our case we obtain weak solutions defined as follows: *a pair $\{p, \Omega_t\}$ is the solution to weak system (1.1) if and only if (p, Ω_t) fulfills conditions (1.3) and the following integral identity holds,*

$$\int_{\partial\Omega_t} V_{\vec{n}} \pi d\sigma + \int_{\partial\Omega_t} a\kappa \frac{\partial\pi}{\partial\vec{n}} d\sigma = \int_{\Omega_t} p\Delta\pi dx, \quad (1.4)$$

for each sufficiently smooth function π , e.g., $\pi \in C^\infty(\bigcup_{0 < t < T} \Omega_t)$.

Theorem 1.1 proves existence of unique solutions to problem (1.1) assuming relatively low regularity of the initial surface $\partial\Omega_0$. The parabolic character of the system helps to control non-linearities; however, the main difficulties are hidden in the geometry of (1.1). The main obstacle is to relaxing the regularity of solutions is the fact that our approach requires the Hölder continuity of the normal vector. Regularity (1.3) implies that the normal vector field $\vec{n} \in C^{a,a/3}$ as $p > n + 3$. However, lower regularity would cause the serious difficulties with the interpretation of solutions, since the trace would not be well defined. One point which is worthwhile to emphasize is that the curvature is only an L_p -function on the obtained surface and the initial curvature is a distribution only.

An interesting question is the following: Is it possible to relax regularity of the initial surface to obtain unique solutions, but without requirements of Hölder continuity of the normal vector field of $\partial\Omega_0$? A positive answer

could enable us to prove a similar result for generalizations of model (1.1) as in [12].

The paper is organized as follows. First, we transform system (1.1) to a problem in a rigid domain and state the result for the linearized system. In Section 3 we prove some important facts for the Laplace operator in Besov spaces in very low regularity. Subsequently, we show the result for the linear system in the half-space. In Section 5, we prove the theorem for the linear system in the bounded domain. Finally, we prove Theorem 1.1.

2. PRELIMINARIES

First, we transform Ω_t to a rigid domain D requiring smoothness (even C^∞) of its boundary. Moreover, we assume that $\text{dist}(\partial\Omega_t, \partial D)$ is sufficiently small in the $W_p^{2-3/p}$ -norm, which is possible since we look for local-in-time solutions and the transform

$$\Phi_t : \Omega_t \rightarrow D \quad (2.1)$$

preserves the measure; i.e., the Jacobian of Φ_t is equal to 1. Existence of such a transform is not immediate, since our domains are bounded, so in particular $|\Omega_t|$ is finite. Hence, one can find always a one-parameter deformation from D to $\partial\Omega_t$ preserving the total volume. Then, using methods based on the Lagrangian coordinates (from fluid mechanics) and properties of divergence-free vector fields (see [20] or [23]), we are able to find the sought transform with suitable regularity described by smoothness of $\partial\Omega_t$. And, in our case, $\partial\Omega_t \in W_p^{2,2/3}$, which implies $\Phi_t \in W_p^{2,2/3}$, too.

What is the basic consequence of the Jacobian being equal to 1? We have the following form of the Laplace operator in the new coordinate system:

$$\Delta_x = \Phi_t^{-1} \Delta = \text{div}_y A \nabla_y. \quad (2.2)$$

In a general case, we would have $\Delta_x = A_1 \nabla_y \cdot (A_2 \nabla_y)$, which is more complex than (2.2). To see the above relation it is enough to consider the following identity:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_D \text{div}_x \nabla_x \bar{p} \bar{q} dy &= \int_{\Omega_t} \Delta p q |J\Phi_t| dx \\ &= - \int_{\Omega_t} \nabla p \nabla q |J\Phi_t| dx = - \int_D \nabla_x \bar{p} \nabla_x \bar{q} dy, \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

for $p, q \in C_0^\infty(\Omega_t)$. Remembering that $|J\Phi_t| = 1$ we get (2.2).

Having this transform, we apply it to system (1.1); thus, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta q &= \operatorname{div}(I - A_t)\nabla q && \text{in } D \times (0, T), \\ q &= a\tilde{\kappa} && \text{on } \partial D \times (0, T), \\ \frac{\partial q}{\partial \vec{n}} &= -v + \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \vec{n}} - \frac{\partial}{\partial \vec{n}_t}\right)q && \text{on } \partial D \times (0, T), \end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

where $q = \Phi_t^* p$, $\tilde{\kappa} = \Phi_t^* \kappa$, $v = \Phi_t^* V_{\vec{n}}$ and A_t is the transform matrix described by the map Φ_t (the star $*$ means the standard pullback operator).

The free boundary $\partial\Omega_t$ is described by a function ψ defined on ∂D as follows:

$$\partial\Omega_t \ni x(y, t) = y + \psi(y, t)\vec{n}, \quad \text{where } y \in \partial D. \tag{2.5}$$

In particular, $\partial\Omega_0 = \{x(y) = y + \psi_0(y)\vec{n} \text{ for } y \in D\}$.

We remember that the choice of domain D guarantees

$$\|\psi_0\|_{W_p^{2-3/p}} + \|\vec{n} - \vec{n}_0\|_{C^\alpha(\partial D)} \leq \epsilon, \tag{2.6}$$

for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$ and $0 < a < \frac{p-(n+3)}{p-3}$.

In the above parameterization system (1.1) (or (2.4)) reads

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta q &= \operatorname{div}(Id - A_t(\psi))\nabla q && \text{in } D \times (0, T), \\ q &= a\tilde{\kappa} && \text{on } \partial D \times (0, T), \\ \frac{\partial q}{\partial \vec{n}} &= -\partial_t \psi \vec{n} \cdot \vec{n}_t + \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \vec{n}} - \frac{\partial}{\partial \vec{n}_t}\right)q && \text{on } \partial D \times (0, T), \\ \psi|_{t=0} &= \psi_0 && \text{on } \partial D. \end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

The mean curvature $\tilde{\kappa}$ (the right-hand side of (2.7)₂) can be described in a local coordinate system by inducted metric $\{g_{ij}\}$ as follows

$$\tilde{\kappa} = g^{-1/2} \frac{\partial}{\partial y^i} (g^{1/2} g^{ij} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial y^j}) + K(\psi, \nabla \psi),$$

where $K(\cdot, \cdot)$ is a smooth function.

By the properties of map Φ_t , we deduce that

$$\|Id - A_t(\psi)\|_{L_\infty(\partial D \times (0, T))} \leq c \|\nabla \psi\|_{L_\infty(\partial D \times (0, T))}. \tag{2.8}$$

Our analysis requires special coverings of the domain D . We take two collections of open sets: $\{\omega^k\}$ and $\{\Omega^k\}$ such that $\overline{\omega^k} \subset \Omega^k \subset D$, $\bigcup_k \omega^k = \bigcup_k \Omega^k = D$ with $k \in \mathcal{M} \cup \mathcal{N}$. The index k belongs to one of two sets: $k \in \mathcal{M}$ if $\overline{\Omega^k} \cap \partial D = \emptyset$ and $k \in \mathcal{N}$ if $\overline{\omega^k} \cap \partial D \neq \emptyset$. Moreover,

$$\sup_k \operatorname{diam} \Omega^k \leq 2\lambda, \tag{2.9}$$

for a small number λ which will be specified later. The magnitude of λ will be chosen sufficiently small, comparing to the curvature of ∂D . The Lebesgue covering number for collections $\{\omega^k\}$ and $\{\Omega^k\}$ is independent of the smallness of λ . These coverings define us a partition of unity for the domain D . Let $\zeta^k : D \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a smooth function such that

$$\zeta^k(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } x \in \omega^k \\ \in [0, 1] & \text{for } x \in \Omega^k \setminus \omega^k \\ 0 & \text{for } x \in D \setminus \Omega^k, \end{cases} \tag{2.10}$$

and $|\nabla^\alpha \zeta^k| \leq c/\lambda^{|\alpha|}$, $1 \leq \sum_k (\zeta^k)^2 \leq N_0$. With the help of the functions ζ^k we define

$$\pi^k = \frac{\zeta^k}{\sum_l (\zeta^l)^2}, \quad \text{then} \quad \sum_{k \in \mathcal{M} \cup \mathcal{N}} \pi^k \zeta^k = 1. \tag{2.11}$$

By the definition of ζ^k , the functions π^k vanish for $x \in D \setminus \Omega^k$ as well as $|\nabla^\alpha \pi^k| \leq c/\lambda^{|\alpha|}$. The functions $\pi^k \zeta^k$ define the partition of unity.

Next, we introduce local coordinate systems related to each ω^k for $k \in \mathcal{N}$. We find maps $Z_k : \mathbf{R}_+^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ such that $Z_k^{-1}(\Omega^k) \subset \mathbf{R}_+^{n+1}$, $Z_k^{-1}(\Omega^k \cap \partial D) \subset \mathbf{R}^n$. The regularity of the diffeomorphism Z_k is controlled by the smoothness of ψ . Considering the truncations $Z_k|_{\mathbf{R}^n}$ we obtain an atlas of maps for ∂D .

To analyze the non-linear system (2.7) we investigate the following linear system:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta p &= \operatorname{div} A \nabla q && \text{in } D \times (0, T), \\ p &= a \Lambda \phi + G && \text{on } \partial D \times (0, T), \\ \frac{\partial p}{\partial \bar{n}} &= -\partial_t \phi + H && \text{on } \partial D \times (0, T), \\ \phi|_{t=0} &= \phi_0 && \text{on } \partial D, \end{aligned} \tag{2.12}$$

where

$$\Lambda \phi = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}} Z_k^* [\Delta' Z_k^{-1*} (\pi^k \zeta^k \phi)] \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta' = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z_1^2} + \dots + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z_n^2}, \tag{2.13}$$

q , G and H are given functions, and A is a fixed metric $(n + 1) \times (n + 1)$. The above setting of the elliptic operator defined on ∂D will be suitable to our approach, since it is given directly on maps of ∂D .

Let us introduce the basic notation of function spaces. As a background we take the books [1, 24]. By $L_p(\Omega)$ we denote the standard space of functions integrable with the p -th power, and for $m \in \mathbf{N}$ the space $W_p^m(\Omega)$ denotes the standard Sobolev space. However, our approach requires the fractional

spaces. For this purpose we introduce the Slobodeckij isotropic space on a domain $Q \subset \mathbf{R}^d$ given by the norm for $m \in \mathbf{R}_+$:

$$\|u\|_{W_p^m(Q)} = \|u\|_{W_p^{[m]_-(Q)}}^p + \langle u \rangle_{W_p^m(Q)}^p, \tag{2.14}$$

where $[t]_-$ is the biggest integer number less than t and $\langle \cdot \rangle$ denotes the main seminorm of the W_p^m -norm, i.e.,

$$\langle u \rangle_{W_p^m(Q)}^p = \sum_{|\alpha|=[m]_-} \int_Q dx \int_Q dx' \frac{|\partial^\alpha u(x) - \partial^\alpha u(x')|^p}{|x - x'|^{d+p(m-[m]_-)}}. \tag{2.15}$$

The evolutionary character of our problem requires function spaces defined on the set $Q \times (0, T)$ with the distinguished time direction. That is the reason we define the anisotropic spaces $W_p^{m,n}$ for $m, n \in \mathbf{R}_+$ given by the norm

$$\begin{aligned} & \|u\|_{W_p^{m,n}(Q \times (0,T))}^p \\ &= \|u\|_{W_p^{[m]_-,[n]_-}}^p + \int_0^T \langle u(\cdot, t) \rangle_{W_p^m}^p dt + \int_Q \langle u(x, \cdot) \rangle_{W_p^n(0,T)}^p dx. \end{aligned} \tag{2.16}$$

The W_p^m -spaces are not sufficient in our approach; we need B_{p1}^s -spaces. To define Besov spaces $B_{p1}^s(Q)$, we first introduce them for $Q = \mathbf{R}^n$ with help of the Paley-Littlewood decomposition [24]; i.e., we find a sequence of functions $\phi_k : \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ such that $\phi_k \geq 0$ and $\sum_{k=0}^\infty \phi_k = 1$. Additionally we require $\text{supp } \phi_k \subset \{2^{k-n} \leq |\xi| \leq 2^{k+n}\}$. Then we define the norm of the B_{p1}^s -space as follows:

$$\|u\|_{B_{p1}^s(\mathbf{R}^n)} = \sum_{k=0}^\infty 2^{ks} \|u_k\|_{L_p(\mathbf{R}^n)}, \quad \text{where } u_k = \mathcal{F}_x^{-1}[\phi_k \mathcal{F}_x[u]], \tag{2.17}$$

and $\mathcal{F}_x[\cdot]$ denotes the Fourier transform on \mathbf{R}^n . To obtain the space defined on Q we apply the localization or extension techniques. The main advantage of the above spaces is that the trace theorem holds in the critical case; i.e., $u|_{\partial Q} \in L_p(\partial Q)$ as $u \in B_{p1}^{1/p}(Q)$ —for details see [24, Chapter 2.9].

Dual spaces to Besov and Slobodeckij spaces are denoted by negative derivatives.

The basic result of our paper is the following theorem for linear system (2.12).

Theorem 2.1. *Let $p > n + 3$, $\phi_0 \in W_p^{2-3/p}(\partial D)$, and*

$$q \in L_p(0, T; B_{p1}^{1/p}(D)), \quad \frac{\partial q}{\partial \bar{n}}|_{\partial D} \in L_p(0, T; W_p^{-1}(\partial D)),$$

$A \in L_\infty(0, T; W_p^1(D))$, $A|_{\partial D} \in L_\infty(0, T; W_p^1(\partial D))$, $G \in L_p(\partial D \times (0, T))$, $H \in L_p(0, T; W_p^{-1}(\partial D))$. Then there exists a unique solution to system (2.12) such that $\phi \in W_p^{2,2/3}(\partial D \times (0, T))$ and $p \in L_p(0, T; B_{p_1}^{1/p}(D))$ with $\partial_t \phi$, $\frac{\partial p}{\partial \vec{n}}|_{\partial D} \in L_p(0, T; W_p^{-1}(\partial D))$; moreover, the following estimate is valid:

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\phi\|_{W_p^{2,2/3}(\partial D \times (0, T))} + \|p\|_{L_p(0, T; B_{p_1}^{1/p}(D))} \\ & + \left\| \frac{\partial p}{\partial \vec{n}} \Big|_{\partial D} \right\|_{L_p(0, T; W_p^{-1}(\partial D))} + \|\partial_t \phi\|_{L_p(0, T; W_p^{-1}(\partial D))} \\ & \leq c(\|A\|_{L_\infty(0, T; W_p^1(D))} + \|A|_{\partial D}\|_{L_\infty(0, T; W_p^1(\partial D))}) \\ & \times (\|q\|_{L_p(0, T; B_{p_1}^{1/p}(D))} + \left\| \frac{\partial q}{\partial \vec{n}} \Big|_{\partial D} \right\|_{L_p(0, T; W_p^{-1}(\partial D))}) \\ & + c(\|G\|_{L_p(\partial D \times (0, T))} + \|H\|_{L_p(0, T; W_p^{-1}(\partial D))} + \|\phi_0\|_{W_p^{2-3/p}(\partial D)}). \end{aligned} \quad (2.18)$$

Theorem 2.1 delivers solutions in the following sense: a pair (p, ϕ) is a weak solution to problem (2.12) if and only if (p, ϕ) fulfills the regularity prescribed in Theorem 2.1 and the following integral identity holds:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\partial D} \left(\partial_t \phi \pi + a \Lambda \phi \frac{\partial \pi}{\partial \vec{n}} \right) d\sigma - \int_D p \Delta \pi \, dx \\ & = \int_{\partial D} (H \pi - G \frac{\partial \pi}{\partial \vec{n}}) d\sigma + \int_D \operatorname{div}(A \nabla q) \pi \, dx, \end{aligned} \quad (2.19)$$

for each $\pi \in C^\infty(D \times (0, T))$.

3. THE LAPLACE OPERATOR

The aim of this section is to establish some results for the Laplace operator for very weak solutions. We study the following system in a smooth domain $\Omega \subset \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta p &= \operatorname{div} A \nabla q & \text{in } & \Omega, & \int_{\Omega} p \, dx &= 0, \\ \frac{\partial p}{\partial \vec{n}} &= \vec{n} \cdot A \nabla q & \text{on } & \partial \Omega, \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

where A is a given $(n+1) \times (n+1)$ matrix. The compatibility condition is fulfilled by the form of the right-hand side of (3.1).

Our purpose in this section is to prove the following theorem.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $p > n + 3$, $A \in W_p^1(\Omega)$, $A|_{\partial \Omega} \in W_p^1(\partial \Omega)$, $q \in B_{p_1}^{1/p}(\Omega)$, and $\nabla q|_{\partial \Omega} \in W_p^{-1}(\partial \Omega)$; then there exists a weak solution to problem (3.1)*

such that $p \in B_{p_1}^{1/p}(\Omega)$ and $\frac{\partial p}{\partial \vec{n}}|_{\partial\Omega} \in W_p^{-1}(\partial\Omega)$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|p\|_{B_{p_1}^{1/p}(\Omega)} + \|\frac{\partial p}{\partial \vec{n}}|_{\partial\Omega}\|_{W_p^{-1}(\partial\Omega)} \\ & \leq c(\|A\|_{W_p^1(\Omega)} + \|A|_{\partial\Omega}\|_{W_q^1(\partial\Omega)}) \cdot (\|q\|_{B_{p_1}^{1/p}(\Omega)} + \|\frac{\partial q}{\partial \vec{n}}|_{\partial\Omega}\|_{W_p^{-1}(\partial\Omega)}). \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

Proof. First, we show existence of very weak solutions in $L_2(\Omega)$. By the standard method we deduce the following existence:

We say that $p \in L_2(\Omega)$ is a very weak solution to problem (3.1) if and only if the following identity,

$$\int_{\Omega} p \Delta \phi \, dx = \int_{\Omega} q \operatorname{div} (A^T \nabla \phi) \, dx - \int_{\partial\Omega} (\vec{n} \cdot A \nabla q) \phi \, d\sigma, \tag{3.3}$$

holds for every $\phi \in W_2^2(\Omega) \cap \{\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \vec{n}}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0 \text{ and } \int_{\Omega} \phi \, dx = 0\}$.

Inserting a test function $\phi = \phi_0$ such that $\Delta \phi_0 = p$ in Ω and $\frac{\partial \phi_0}{\partial \vec{n}}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, and remembering that $p_* > 2$, we calculate the following basic estimate:

$$\|p\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \leq c(\|A\|_{W_p^1(\Omega)} + \|A|_{\partial\Omega}\|_{W_p^1(\partial\Omega)}) (\|q\|_{B_{p_1}^{1/p}(\Omega)} + \|\frac{\partial q}{\partial \vec{n}}|_{\partial\Omega}\|_{W_p^{-1}(\partial\Omega)}). \tag{3.4}$$

Then, a tool such as the Galerkin method implies the existence of a distributional solution to system (3.1) in the sense of the definition given by (3.3).

Now, to prove Theorem 3.1, it is enough to improve the regularity by the localization of the problem. Using the partition of unity from Section 2 we get two cases. Let us choose $k \in \mathcal{N}$, at first. Then we consider the localized problem in the halfspace,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta Z_k^*(\zeta^k p) &= (\Delta - \Delta_x) Z_k^*(\zeta^k p) + \operatorname{div} \tilde{A} \nabla Z_k^*(\zeta^k q) + S_1 \quad \text{in } \mathbf{R}_+^{n+1}, \\ Z_k^*(\zeta^k p)_{,z_{n+1}}|_{z_{n+1}=0} &= (\tilde{A} \nabla Z_k^*(\zeta^k q))^{(n+1)} \quad \text{on } \mathbf{R}^n, \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

where S_1 is a more regular part, being a consequence of the localization, belonging at least to $B_{p_1}^{1/p-1}$. To get the suitable form of the right-hand side of (3.5) we assumed that each transformation Z_k preserves the normal vector. Since in our case the boundary is smooth this choice does not restrict our examination. Elementary calculations lead to the following form of term S_1 :

$$S_1 = \operatorname{div}(B_0(\lambda) \nabla Z_k^*(\zeta^k p)) + \operatorname{div}(B_1 p) + \operatorname{div}(B_2 q) + p B_3 + q B_4. \tag{3.6}$$

The transformation into the half-space guarantees that $(B_0)^{(n+1)} \equiv 0$ and $B_1^{(n+1)} = B_2^{(n+1)} = 0$; additionally, properties of the map Z_k imply $|B_0(\lambda)| \leq c\lambda$ on $\text{supp } \bar{\zeta}^k$ —see (2.9). The coefficients B_1 and B_3 are smooth, and B_2 and B_4 depend on the matrix A .

To obtain all information about the regularity of solutions to problem (3.5) we need the following lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\bar{A} \in W_p^1(\mathbf{R}_+^{n+1})$, $\bar{A}|_{z_{n+1}=0} \in W_p^{-1}(\mathbf{R}^n)$, $\bar{q} \in B_{p1}^{1/p}(\mathbf{R}_+^{n+1})$ and $\bar{q}|_{z_{n+1}=0} \in W_p^1(\mathbf{R}^n)$; then the solutions to the problem*

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \bar{p} &= \text{div } \bar{A} \nabla \bar{q} && \text{in } \mathbf{R}_+^{n+1}, \\ \bar{p}|_{z_{n+1}=0} &= (\bar{A} \nabla \bar{q})^{(n+1)} && \text{on } \mathbf{R}^n, \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

satisfy $\bar{p} \in B_{p1}^{1/p}(\mathbf{R}_+^{n+1})$ and $\bar{p}|_{z_{n+1}=0} \in W_p^{-1}(\mathbf{R}^n)$ with the following estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\bar{p}\|_{B_{p1}^{1/p}(\mathbf{R}_+^{n+1})} + \|\bar{p}|_{z_{n+1}=0}\|_{W_p^{-1}(\mathbf{R}^n)} \\ &\leq c(\|\bar{A}\|_{W_p^1(\mathbf{R}_+^{n+1})} + \|\bar{A}|_{z_{n+1}=0}\|_{W_p^1(\mathbf{R}^n)}) \\ &\times (\|\bar{q}\|_{B_{p1}^{1/p}(\mathbf{R}_+^{n+1})} + \|\bar{q}|_{z_{n+1}=0}\|_{W_p^{-1}(\mathbf{R}^n)}). \end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

Proof. Our first task is to remove inhomogeneity from the right-hand side of boundary condition (3.7)₂. Thanks to the structure of the boundary data it can be viewed in the following form:

$$(\bar{A} \nabla q)^{(n+1)} = \sum_{k=1}^{n+1} (\bar{A}_k^{n+1} q)_{,z_k} - q \sum_{k=1}^{n+1} \bar{A}_{k,z_k}^{n+1}.$$

The last term on the right-hand side is of better regularity. It belongs to $L_{p/2}$; hence, we will omit considerations for it.

We want to construct a function from $B_{p1}^{1/p}(\mathbf{R}_+^{n+1})$ fulfilling condition (3.7)₂.

First, introduce a function $Q_{n+1} = A_{n+1}^{n+1} q$. It belongs to $B_{p1}^{1/p}(\mathbf{R}_+^{n+1})$, and by the definition it satisfies the following boundary condition:

$$Q_{n+1,z_{n+1}}|_{z_{n+1}=0} = (A_{n+1}^{n+1} q)_{,z_{n+1}}|_{z_{n+1}=0}.$$

Next, let us consider problems for $k = 1, \dots, n$:

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta Q_k + Q_k &= 0 && \text{in } \mathbf{R}_+^{n+1}, \\ Q_k &= -\mathcal{F}_z^{-1}\left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{1+|\xi|^2}} \mathcal{F}_z[(\bar{A}_k^{n+1} \cdot \bar{q})_{,z_k}]\right] && \text{on } \mathbf{R}^n. \end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

The definition of the dual space $W_p^{-1}(\mathbf{R}^n)$ implies that the right-hand side of (3.9)₂ belongs to L_p .

But (3.9)₂ can be viewed as $Q_k = -\mathcal{F}_z^{-1}[\frac{i\xi_k}{\sqrt{1+|\xi|^2}}\mathcal{F}_z[\bar{A}_k^{n+1} \cdot \bar{q}]]$, too. Since $\frac{i\xi_k}{\sqrt{1+|\xi|^2}}$ is a pseudodifferential operator of order zero, we conclude that a function (defined on the whole halfspace)

$$-\mathcal{F}_z^{-1}\left[\frac{i\xi_k}{\sqrt{1+|\xi|^2}}\mathcal{F}_z[\bar{A}_k^{n+1} \cdot \bar{q}]\right] \in B_{p1}^{1/p}(\mathbf{R}_+^{n+1}),$$

gives us a good extension of boundary datum (3.9)₂. The solvability of this problem follows from the extension theorem and the method of symmetry. Then we get that

$$Q_k \in B_{p1}^{1/p}(\mathbf{R}_+^{n+1}) \text{ and } \|Q_k\|_{B_{p1}^{1/p}(\mathbf{R}_+^{n+1})} \leq c\|(\bar{A}_k^{n+1}\bar{q})_{,z_k}\|_{W_p^{-1}(\mathbf{R}^n)}. \quad (3.10)$$

Moreover, the explicit formula of the solution of system (3.9),

$$\mathcal{F}_z Q_k(\xi, z_{n+1}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+|\xi|^2}}\mathcal{F}_z[(\bar{A}_k^{n+1}\bar{q})_{,z_k}]e^{-\sqrt{1+|\xi|^2}z_{n+1}},$$

implies that $Q_{k,z_{n+1}}|_{z_{n+1}=0} = (\bar{A}_k^{n+1}\bar{q})_{,z_k}|_{z_{n+1}=0}$ on \mathbf{R}^n . So defining $u = \sum_{k=0}^{n+1} Q_k$, where Q_0 corresponds to the term $q \sum_{k=1}^{n+1} \bar{A}_{k,z_{n+1}}^{n+1}$, we get

$$u \in B_{p1}^{1/p}(\mathbf{R}_+^{n+1}) \text{ and } \|u\|_{B_{p1}^{1/p}(\mathbf{R}_+^{n+1})} \leq c\|(\bar{A}\nabla\bar{q})^{(n+1)}\|_{W_p^{-1}(\mathbf{R}^n)}. \quad (3.11)$$

Moreover, the construction implies that

$$u_{,z_{n+1}}|_{z_{n+1}=0} = (\bar{A}\nabla\bar{q})^{(n+1)}|_{z_{n+1}=0} \text{ on } \mathbf{R}^n, \quad (3.12)$$

which specifies the regularity of the left-hand side of (3.12), too.

Now, we modify the original problem (3.7). Let $w = \bar{p} - u$; then this function satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta w &= \text{div}(\bar{A}\nabla\bar{q} - \nabla u) \text{ in } \mathbf{R}_+^{n+1}, \\ w_{,z_{n+1}}|_{z_{n+1}=0} &= 0 \text{ on } \mathbf{R}^n. \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

To solve the above system we apply the method of symmetry.

Using the following symmetry,

$$\bar{\tau}(z, z_{n+1}) = \begin{cases} \cdot(z, z_{n+1}) & \text{for } z_{n+1} \geq 0 \\ \cdot(z, -z_{n+1}) & \text{for } z_{n+1} < 0, \end{cases} \quad (3.14)$$

we get the following problem in the whole space:

$$\Delta \bar{w} = \overline{\text{div}(\bar{A}\nabla\bar{q} - \nabla u)} \text{ in } \mathbf{R}^{n+1}. \quad (3.15)$$

If we prove existence in the above equation, the symmetry will imply that $w_{,z_{n+1}} = 0$ on the set $\{z_{n+1} = 0\}$ as a distribution. Moreover, one point that is unclear is whether the right-hand side of (3.15) belongs to $B_{p1}^{1/p-2}(\mathbf{R}^{n+1})$. Note that $\overline{\operatorname{div}(\bar{A}\nabla\bar{q} - \nabla u)} = \operatorname{div} \tilde{H}$, where $\tilde{H}^{(i)} = \overline{\bar{A}\nabla\bar{q} - \nabla u}^{(i)}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ and

$$\tilde{H}^{(n+1)} = \begin{cases} (\bar{A}\nabla\bar{q} - \nabla u)^{(n+1)}(z, z_{n+1}) & \text{for } z_{n+1} \geq 0 \\ -(\bar{A}\nabla\bar{q} - \nabla u)^{(n+1)}(z, -z_{n+1}) & \text{for } z_{n+1} < 0. \end{cases} \tag{3.16}$$

We can restrict our attention only to symmetric test functions, since each function can be split on two parts, symmetric and anti-symmetric, and the last part vanishes by definition (3.14). So we have

$$\int_{\mathbf{R}^{n+1}} \operatorname{div} \tilde{H} \Phi \, dz = - \int_{\mathbf{R}^{n+1}} \tilde{H} \cdot \nabla \Phi \, dz - 2 \int_{\mathbf{R}^n} (\tilde{H})^{n+1}(z', 0) \Phi(z', 0) \, dz', \tag{3.17}$$

but by construction (3.11) we have $(\tilde{H})^{(n+1)}|_{z_{n+1}=0} = 0$. Recalling that we consider only symmetric test functions—so $\Phi_{,z_{n+1}} = 0$ —we get that $\overline{\operatorname{div}(\bar{A}\nabla\bar{q} - \nabla u)} \in B_{p1}^{1/p-2}(\mathbf{R}^{n+1})$.

The Marcinkiewicz multipliers theorem [24, Chapter 2.2] together with the definition of Besov spaces implies that any solution to (3.15) belongs to $B_{p1}^{1/p}$ and the symmetry implies that $w_{,z_{n+1}}|_{z_{n+1}=0} = 0$ in the distributional sense. Summing up all the estimates we infer that the solution to problem (3.7) obeys bound (3.8). Lemma 3.1 is proved.

Applying Lemma 3.1 and the form of the right-hand side of (3.5) we conclude that the following estimates for solutions to system (3.5) are valid:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\zeta^k p\|_{B_{p1}^{1/p}(\Omega)} &\leq c(\lambda \|\zeta^k p\|_{B_{p1}^{1/p}(\Omega)} + \epsilon \|p\|_{B_{p1}^{1/p}(\operatorname{supp} \zeta^k)} \\ &\quad + c(\epsilon) \|p\|_{L_2(\operatorname{supp} \zeta^k)} + \|A\|_{W_p^1(\operatorname{supp} \zeta^k)} \|q\|_{B_{p1}^{1/p}(\operatorname{supp} \zeta^k)} \\ &\quad + \|A|_{\partial\Omega}\|_{W_p^1(\partial\Omega \cap \operatorname{supp} \zeta^k)} \left\| \frac{\partial p}{\partial n} \right\|_{W_p^{-1}(\partial\Omega \cap \operatorname{supp} \zeta^k)}). \end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

Taking suitably small λ we remove the first term of the right-hand side of (3.18).

To finish the proof of Theorem 3.1 we consider interior regularity. This case is simpler than the first one. The localization by ζ^k with $k \in \mathcal{M}$ (see Section 2) leads to the following problem:

$$\Delta(\zeta^k p) = \operatorname{div} A \nabla(\zeta^k q) + S_2 \quad \text{in } \mathbf{R}^{n+1}, \tag{3.19}$$

where the term S_2 follows from the localization procedure and its regularity of it is higher than the regularity of the first term of the right-hand side of (3.19), but with the same structure as S_1 . Applying the same methods as for (3.18) we obtain suitable estimates for $\zeta^k p$. So finally, summing over $k \in \mathcal{M} \cup \mathcal{N}$, we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \|p\|_{B_{p_1}^{1/p}(\Omega)} &\leq \epsilon \|p\|_{B_{p_1}^{1/p}(\Omega)} + c(\epsilon) \|A\|_{W_p^{1+1/p}(\Omega)} \|q\|_{B_{p_1}^{1/p}(\Omega)} \\ &\quad + \|A|_{\partial\Omega}\|_{W_p^1(\partial\Omega)} \|\frac{\partial p}{\partial \bar{n}}|_{\partial\Omega}\|_{W_p^{-1}(\partial\Omega)}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.20}$$

From (3.18), taking the sum over all possible indices and (3.20), we obtain Theorem 3.1.

As a corollary to Theorem 3.1 we prove the following result for the Dirichlet problem:

Theorem 3.2. *Let $g \in B_{p_1}^{1/p}(\Omega)$; then the solution to the following problem,*

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta p &= 0 && \text{in } \Omega, \\ p &= g && \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{aligned} \tag{3.21}$$

exists uniquely and belongs to $B_{p_1}^{1/p}(\Omega)$; moreover, $\frac{\partial p}{\partial \bar{n}}|_{\partial\Omega} \in W_p^{-1}(\partial\Omega)$. Additionally, the following estimate holds:

$$\|p\|_{B_{p_1}^{1/p}(\Omega)} + \|\frac{\partial p}{\partial \bar{n}}|_{\partial\Omega}\|_{W_p^{-1}(\partial\Omega)} \leq c \|g\|_{L_p(\partial\Omega)}. \tag{3.22}$$

Proof. First, we show existence of a distributional solution in $L_2(\Omega)$. Elementary theory guarantees us existence of a solution which satisfies the following integral identity:

$$\int_{\Omega} p \Delta \phi \, dx = \int_{\partial\Omega} g \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \bar{n}} \, d\sigma \quad \text{for each } \phi \in W_2^2(\Omega) \cap \{\phi|_{\partial\Omega} = 0\}. \tag{3.23}$$

Next, we increase the regularity of this solution as in the proof of Theorem 3.1. For each $k \in \mathcal{N}$ we consider the following problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta Z_k^*[\zeta^k p] &= (\Delta - \Delta_x) Z_k^*[\zeta^k p] + Z_k^*[2\nabla \zeta^k \nabla p + \Delta \zeta p] && \text{in } \mathbf{R}_+^{n+1}, \\ Z_k^*[\zeta^k p] &= Z_k^*[\zeta^k g] && \text{on } \mathbf{R}^n. \end{aligned} \tag{3.24}$$

The properties of the transformation imply that the right-hand side of (3.24) has the following form:

$$RHS(3.24)_1 = \operatorname{div} A_0(\lambda) \nabla Z_k^*[\zeta^k p] + \operatorname{div} (A_1 p) + A_2 p, \tag{3.25}$$

where $(A_0(\lambda))^{(n+1)} \equiv 0$, $(A_1)^{(n+1)} = 0$ on $\{z_{n+1} = 0\}$ and moreover A_1 , A_2 , and A_3 are smooth and $|A_0(\lambda)| \leq c\lambda$. To simplify system (3.24) we consider two problems:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta p_1 &= \operatorname{div} A_0(\lambda) \nabla Z_k^*[\zeta^k p] + \operatorname{div} (A_1 p), & \Delta p_2 &= A_2 p & \text{in } \mathbf{R}_+^{n+1}, \\ p_{1, z_{n+1}}|_{z_{n+1}=0} &= 0, & p_2|_{z_{n+1}=0} &= 0 & \text{on } \mathbf{R}^n. \end{aligned} \quad (3.26)$$

By Lemma 3.1 and classical results we conclude that

$$\|p_1\|_{B_{p_1}^{1/p}(\Omega)} \leq c\lambda \|\zeta^k p\|_{B_{p_1}^{1/p}(\Omega)} + c\|p\|_{L_p(\Omega)} \quad \text{and} \quad \|p_2\|_{W_p^2(\Omega)} \leq c\|p\|_{L_p(\Omega)}. \quad (3.27)$$

Considering solutions to (3.21) in the form $Z_k^*[\zeta^k p] = p_0 + p_1 + p_2$, we reduce our consideration to the following problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta p_0 &= 0 & \text{in } \mathbf{R}_+^{n+1}, \\ p_0 &= Z[\zeta^k g] - p_1 - p_2 & \text{on } \mathbf{R}^n. \end{aligned} \quad (3.28)$$

By (3.27) we get

$$\|Z_k^*[\zeta^k g] - p_1 - p_2\|_{L_p(\mathbf{R}^n)} \leq c\lambda \|Z_k^*[\zeta^k p]\|_{B_{p_1}^{1/p}(\mathbf{R}_+^{n+1})} + \|p\|_{L_p(\Omega)} + \|g\|_{L_p(\partial\Omega)}. \quad (3.29)$$

Applying methods from the proof of Lemma 3.1 one can show that

$$p_{0, z_{n+1}}|_{z_{n+1}=0} \in W_p^{-1}(\mathbf{R}^n) \quad \text{and} \quad p_0 \in B_{p_1}^{1/p}(\mathbf{R}_+^{n+1}). \quad (3.30)$$

We get the same information for interior regularity (localized by ζ^k with $k \in \mathcal{M}$). Summing over $k \in \mathcal{M} \cup \mathcal{N}$, taking suitable small λ , we obtain (3.22). Theorem 3.2 is proved.

4. HALF SPACE

In this section we prove Theorem 2.1 in the half space. In this case problem (2.12) reads

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta p &= \operatorname{div} A \nabla q + S & \text{in } \mathbf{R}_+^{n+1} \times (0, \infty), \\ p &= a \Delta' \phi + g & \text{on } \mathbf{R}^n \times (0, \infty), \\ p, z_{n+1} &= -\partial_t \phi + h & \text{on } \mathbf{R}^n \times (0, \infty), \\ \phi|_{t=0} &= \phi_0 & \text{on } \mathbf{R}^n, \\ p, \phi &\rightarrow 0 & \text{as } |x| \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

The main result of this section is the following.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $q \in L_p(0, \infty; B_{p_1}^{1/p}(\mathbf{R}_+^{n+1}))$, $q, z_{n+1}|_{z_{n+1}=0} \in L_p(0, \infty; W_p^{-1}(\mathbf{R}^n))$, $A \in L_\infty(0, \infty; W_p^1(\mathbf{R}_+^{n+1}))$, $A|_{z_{n+1}=0} \in L_\infty(0, \infty; W_p^1(\mathbf{R}^n))$, $S \in$*

$L_\infty(0, \infty; B_{p_1}^{1/p-1}(\mathbf{R}_+^{n+1}))$, $g \in L_p(\mathbf{R}^n \times (0, \infty))$, $h \in W_p^{-1, -1/3}(\mathbf{R}^n \times (0, \infty))$ and $\phi_0 \in W_p^{2-3/p}(\mathbf{R}^n)$; then there exists a unique solution to (4.1) such that $\phi \in W_p^{2, 2/3}(\mathbf{R}^n \times (0, \infty))$, $p \in L_p(0, \infty; B_{p_1}^{1/p}(\mathbf{R}_+^{n+1}))$ and $p, z_{n+1}|_{z_{n+1}=0} \in L_p(0, \infty; W_p^{-1}(\mathbf{R}^n))$; moreover, the following estimate holds:

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \phi \rangle_{W_p^{2, 2/3}(\mathbf{R}^n \times (0, \infty))} + \langle p \rangle_{L_p(0, \infty; B_{p_1}^{1/p}(\mathbf{R}_+^{n+1}))} \\ & \quad + \|p, z_{n+1}|_{z_{n+1}=0}\|_{L_p(0, \infty; W_p^{-1}(\mathbf{R}^n))} \\ & \leq c(\|A\|_{L_\infty(0, \infty; W_p^1(\mathbf{R}_+^{n+1}))} + \|A|_{z_{n+1}=0}\|_{L_\infty(0, \infty; W_p^1(\mathbf{R}^n))}) \\ & \quad \times (\|q\|_{L_p(0, \infty; B_{p_1}^{1/p}(\mathbf{R}_+^{n+1}))} + \|q, z_{n+1}|_{z_{n+1}=0}\|_{L_p(0, \infty; W_p^{-1}(\mathbf{R}^n))}) \\ & + c(\|S\|_{L_\infty(0, \infty; B_{p_1}^{1/p-1}(\mathbf{R}_+^{n+1}))} + \|g\|_{L_p(\mathbf{R}^n \times (0, \infty))}) \\ & + \|h\|_{W_p^{-1, -1/3}(\mathbf{R}^n \times (0, \infty))} + \|\phi_0\|_{W_p^{2-3/p}(\mathbf{R}^n)}). \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

The considerations from the previous section and results from [18] give us the possibility of simplifying system (4.1) by removing the inhomogeneity from the right-hand side of (4.1)₁. Considering the systems

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta p_1 &= \operatorname{div} A \nabla q; & \Delta p_2 &= S \quad \text{in } \mathbf{R}_+^{n+1} \times \{t\}, \\ p_{1, z_{n+1}} &= (A \nabla q)^{(n+1)}; & p_2 &= 0 \quad \text{on } \mathbf{R}^n \times \{t\}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

we easily conclude that $p_1(\cdot, t), p_2(\cdot, t) \in B_{p_1}^{1/p}(\mathbf{R}_+^{n+1})$ and $p_{1, z_{n+1}}(\cdot, t)|_{z_{n+1}=0}, p_{2, z_{n+1}}(\cdot, t)|_{z_{n+1}=0} \in W_p^{-1}(\mathbf{R}^n)$. The regularity of p_2 is even higher ($p_2 \in B_{p_1}^{1+1/p}$); however, this information is not needed. Thus we look for solutions of (4.1) in the form $p_{old} = p_{new} + p_1 + p_2$. Then from (4.1) we get the reduced problem

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta p &= 0 & \text{in } \mathbf{R}_+^{n+1} \times (0, \infty), \\ p &= a \Delta' \phi + g & \text{on } \mathbf{R}^n \times (0, \infty), \\ p, z_{n+1} &= -\partial_t \phi + h & \text{on } \mathbf{R}^n \times (0, \infty), \\ \phi|_{t=0} &= \phi_0 & \text{on } \mathbf{R}^n, \\ p, \phi &\rightarrow 0 & \text{as } |x| \rightarrow \infty, \end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

where $g_{new} = g_{old} - p_1$ and $h_{new} = h_{old} - (p_1 + p_2)_{, z_{n+1}}$ on $\mathbf{R}^n \times (0, \infty)$. Now, we are able to solve equation (4.4)₁. The structure of system (4.4) allows us to apply the Fourier transform with respect to tangential directions. From (4.4)₁ and (4.4)₅ we obtain the form of the p-function

$$p(z, z_{n+1}, t) = \mathcal{F}_z^{-1}[e^{-|\xi|z_{n+1}} \mathcal{F}_z[P]], \tag{4.5}$$

for a certain function $P : \mathbf{R}^n \times (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$. Taking into account (4.5), the boundary relations (4.4)_{2,3} take the following form:

$$P = a\Delta' \phi + g, \quad \mathcal{F}_z^{-1}[-|\xi|\mathcal{F}_z[P]] = -\partial_t \phi + h \quad \text{on } \mathbf{R}^n \times (0, \infty). \quad (4.6)$$

Removing the function P from (4.6) we obtain the following parabolic problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \phi + \mathcal{F}_z[|\xi|^3 \mathcal{F}_z[\phi]] &= h + \mathcal{F}_z^{-1}[|\xi|\mathcal{F}_z[g]] & \text{in } \mathbf{R}^n \times (0, \infty), \\ \phi|_{t=0} &= \phi_0 & \text{on } \mathbf{R}^n. \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

The above system describes the character of problem (1.1); it shows that we deal with a parabolic system of the third order. To solve (4.7) we recall the following result.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $m \in W_p^{-1,-1/3}(\mathbf{R}^n \times (0, \infty))$ and $\phi \in W_p^{2-3/p}(\mathbf{R}^n)$; then there exists a unique solution to problem (4.7) such that $\phi \in W_{p(\text{loc})}^{2,2/3}(\mathbf{R}^n \times (0, \infty))$ and the following estimate is valid:*

$$\langle \phi \rangle_{W_p^{2,2/3}} \leq c(\|m\|_{W_p^{-1,-1/3}(\mathbf{R}^n \times (0, \infty))} + \langle \phi_0 \rangle_{W_p^{2-3/p}(\mathbf{R}^n)}). \quad (4.8)$$

We skip the proof of this lemma. It follows from the abstract theory presented in [13, Theorem 2.3]. However, it can be proved directly using methods from [18, Lemma 5.1]. To finish the proof of Theorem 4.1 we note that by Lemma 4.1 and (4.6) we see that $P \in L_p(\mathbf{R} \times (0, \infty))$, from which it follows that $p \in L_p(0, \infty; B_{p1}^{1/p}(\mathbf{R}_+^{n+1}))$; moreover, by (4.6) $p_{,z_{n+1}}|_{z_{n+1}=0} \in L_p(0, \infty; W_p^{-1}(\mathbf{R}^n))$. Theorem 4.1 is proved.

5. THE PROBLEM IN DOMAIN D

This section proves Theorem 2.1. To simplify our considerations we remove inhomogeneity from the right-hand side of (2.12)_{1,2}. We consider two systems:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta p_0 &= \text{div} A \nabla q, & \Delta p_1 &= 0 & \text{in } D \times \{t\}, \\ \frac{\partial p_0}{\partial \vec{n}} &= \vec{n} \cdot A \nabla q, & p_1 &= G - p_0|_{\partial D} & \text{on } \partial D \times \{t\}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.1)$$

By the assumptions of Theorem 3.1, the function $p_0 \in L_p(0, T; B_{p1}^{1/p}(D))$, but by the imbedding theorem $p_0|_{\partial D} \in L_p(\partial D \times (0, T))$. Applying Theorem 3.2 to the second system we get $p_1 \in L_p(0, T; B_{p1}^{1/p}(D))$ and $\frac{\partial p_0}{\partial \vec{n}} \in L_p(0, T; W_p^{-1}(\partial D)) \subset W_p^{-1,-1/3}(\partial D \times (0, T))$. Then we consider the p -solution to problem (2.12) in the following form:

$$p_{\text{old}} = p_{\text{new}} + p_0 + p_1. \quad (5.2)$$

So the system turns into the following one:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta p &= 0 && \text{in } D \times (0, T), \\ p &= a\Lambda\phi && \text{on } \partial D \times (0, T), \\ \frac{\partial p}{\partial \bar{n}} &= -\partial_t\phi + H && \text{on } \partial D \times (0, T), \\ \phi|_{t=0} &= \phi_0 && \text{on } \partial D, \end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

where $H_{new} = H_{old} - \frac{\partial p_0}{\partial \bar{n}} - \frac{\partial p_1}{\partial \bar{n}}$ with suitable estimates.

The above system can be viewed as a local version of a nonlocal parabolic equation of third order on $\partial D \times (0, T)$, stated symbolically as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} L\phi &= H && \text{in } \partial D \times (0, T), \\ \phi|_{t=0} &= \phi_0 && \text{on } \partial D. \end{aligned} \tag{5.4}$$

Theorem 5.1. *Let $\phi_0 \in W_p^{2-3/p}(\partial D)$ and $H \in W_p^{-1,-1/3}(\partial D \times (0, T))$; then there exists a unique solution to problem (5.3) (or (5.4)) such that $\phi \in W_p^{2,2/3}(\partial D \times (0, T))$ and*

$$\|\phi\|_{W_p^{2,2/3}(\partial D \times (0, T))} \leq C(T)(\|H\|_{W_p^{-1,-1/3}(\partial D \times (0, T))} + \|\phi_0\|_{W_p^{2-3/p}(\partial D)}). \tag{5.5}$$

Corollary 5.1. *Let all the assumptions of Theorem 5.1 be fulfilled, and additionally $H \in L_p(0, T; W_p^{-1}(\partial D))$; then $\partial_t\phi \in L_p(0, T; W_p^{-1}(\partial D))$ and*

$$\|\partial_t\phi\|_{L_p(0, T; W_p^{-1}(\partial D))} \leq C(T)(\|H\|_{L_p(0, T; W_p^{-1}(\partial D))} + \|\phi_0\|_{W_p^{2-3/p}(\partial D)}).$$

To prove Theorem 5.1 we introduce the regularizer (see [15]).

Let us introduce $\phi^k = R^k(\zeta^k H, \zeta^k \phi_0)$, where $\phi^k = Z_k^{-1*}[\bar{\phi}^k]$ and $\bar{\phi}^k$ is the solution to the following problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \bar{p} &= 0 && \text{in } \mathbf{R}_+^{n+1} \times (0, T), \\ \bar{p} &= a\Delta' \bar{\phi}^k && \text{on } \mathbf{R}^n \times (0, T), \\ \bar{p}_{,z_{n+1}} + \partial_t \bar{\phi}^k &= Z_k^*[\zeta^k H] && \text{on } \mathbf{R}^n \times (0, T), \\ \bar{\phi}^k|_{t=0} &= Z_k^*[\zeta^k \phi_0] && \text{on } \mathbf{R}^n. \end{aligned} \tag{5.6}$$

Then an operator $R : W_p^{-1,-1/3}(\partial D \times (0, T)) \times W_p^{2-3/p}(\partial D) \rightarrow W_p^{2,2/3}(\partial D \times (0, T))$ given by the following formula:

$$R(H, \phi_0) = \sum_k \pi^k \phi^k \text{ we call a } \underline{\text{regularizer}}. \tag{5.8}$$

The properties of operator R will be shown only for short time, and they will be connected with the following quantity,

$$\beta = \epsilon + \lambda + c(\epsilon)T^a, \tag{5.8}$$

which will be required to be sufficiently small (a constant will be chosen such that λ is given by (2.9), $c(\epsilon) \rightarrow \infty$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ and $a > 0$). To show Theorem 5.1, two lemmas are required.

Lemma 5.1. *We have $LRH = H + \mathcal{T}H$ and $\|\mathcal{T}\| \leq c\beta$.*

Proof. First, let us note that

$$LRH = \sum_k (L(\pi^k \phi^k) - \pi^k L\phi^k) + \sum_k \pi^k L\phi^k. \tag{5.9}$$

The definition of operator L gives the following relation: $L\phi^k = \partial_t \phi^k + \frac{\partial p}{\partial \bar{n}}$, where p satisfies the following problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta p &= 0 && \text{in } D, \\ p &= a \sum_{l \in \mathcal{N}} Z_l^* [\Delta' Z_l^{-1*} (\pi^l \zeta^l \phi^k)] && \text{on } \partial D. \end{aligned} \tag{5.10}$$

The localization and transform into the halfspace lead to the following system for l such that $\text{supp } \zeta^l \cap \text{supp } \pi^k \neq \emptyset$:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(\bar{\pi}^k \bar{\pi}^l \bar{\zeta}^l \bar{p}) &= F_1^{kl} && \text{in } \mathbf{R}_+^{n+1} \times (0, T), \\ \bar{\pi}^k \bar{\pi}^l \bar{\zeta}^l \bar{p} &= a \Delta'(\bar{\pi}^k \bar{\pi}^l \bar{\zeta}^l \bar{\phi}^k) + G_1^{kl} && \text{on } \mathbf{R}^n \times (0, T), \\ (\bar{\pi}^k \bar{\pi}^l \bar{\zeta}^l \bar{p})_{,z_{n+1}} + \partial_t(\bar{\pi}^k \bar{\pi}^l \bar{\zeta}^l \bar{\phi}^k) &= \bar{\pi}^k (\Delta' \bar{\pi}^l \bar{\zeta}^l \bar{\phi}^k) && \text{on } \mathbf{R}^n \times (0, T), \\ \bar{\pi}^k \bar{\pi}^l \bar{\zeta}^l \bar{\phi}^k|_{t=0} &= \bar{\pi}^k \bar{\pi}^l \bar{\zeta}^l \zeta^k \bar{\phi}_0 && \text{on } \mathbf{R}^n. \end{aligned} \tag{5.11}$$

But functions ϕ^k are given by (5.6), so the localization of (5.6) reads

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(\bar{\pi}^k \bar{\pi}^l \bar{\zeta}^l \bar{q}) &= F_2^{kl} && \text{in } \mathbf{R}_+^{n+1} \times (0, T), \\ \bar{\pi}^k \bar{\pi}^l \bar{\zeta}^l \bar{q} &= a \Delta'(\bar{\pi}^k \bar{\pi}^l \bar{\zeta}^l \bar{\phi}^k) + G_2^{kl} && \text{on } \mathbf{R}^n \times (0, T), \\ (\bar{\pi}^k \bar{\pi}^l \bar{\zeta}^l \bar{q})_{,z_{n+1}} + \partial_t(\bar{\pi}^k \bar{\pi}^l \bar{\zeta}^l \bar{\phi}^k) &= \bar{\pi}^k \bar{\pi}^l \bar{\zeta}^l Z_k^* [\zeta^k H] && \text{on } \mathbf{R}^n \times (0, T), \\ \bar{\pi}^k \bar{\pi}^l \bar{\zeta}^l \bar{\phi}^k|_{t=0} &= \bar{\pi}^k \bar{\pi}^l \bar{\zeta}^l Z_k^* [\zeta^k \phi_0] && \text{on } \mathbf{R}^n. \end{aligned} \tag{5.12}$$

The comparison of (5.11) and (5.12) leads to the following conclusion

$$\sum_k \pi^k L\phi^k = H + \sum_k Z_k^{-1*} [\bar{\pi}^k (\bar{q} - \bar{p})_{,z_{n+1}}], \tag{5.13}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta[\bar{\pi}^k (\bar{q} - \bar{p})] &= F_2 - F_1 && \text{in } \mathbf{R}^{n+1}, \\ \bar{\pi}^k (\bar{q} - \bar{p}) &= 0 && \text{on } \mathbf{R}^n. \end{aligned} \tag{5.14}$$

Direct calculations show that

$$F_2^{kl} - F_1^{kl} \sim (\Delta - \Delta_x)(\bar{\pi}^k \bar{\pi}^l \bar{\zeta}^l \bar{p}) - Z_k^{-1*} [2\nabla(\pi^k \bar{\pi}^l \bar{\zeta}^l) \nabla p + p \Delta \pi^k]. \tag{5.15}$$

Then applying Theorem 3.1 we get (recall $L_p W_p^{-1} \subset W_p^{-1, -1/3}$)

$$\|\bar{\pi}^k \bar{\pi}^l \bar{\zeta}^l (\bar{q} - \bar{p}), z_{n+1}\|_{W_p^{-1, -1/3}(\mathbf{R}^n \times (0, T))} \leq c\lambda \|\pi^k p\|_{B_{p^1}^{1/p}(D)} + c\|p\|_{L_p(D \cap \text{supp } \pi^k)}. \tag{5.16}$$

We need to find a bound on the second term of the right-hand side of (5.16). The easiest approach is to apply the interpolation inequality, i.e.,

$$\|p\|_{L_p(D)} \leq \epsilon \|p\|_{B_{p^1}^{1/p}(D)} + c(\epsilon) \|p\|_{L_2(D)}, \tag{5.17}$$

and examine the last term in (5.17). To get a good estimate for the solution to (5.3) we multiply (5.1)₁ by $r : \Delta r = p$ and $r = 0$ on ∂D , then integrating over D we conclude

$$\int_D p^2 dx \leq \left| \int_{\partial D} a \Lambda \phi^k \frac{\partial r}{\partial \bar{n}} d\sigma \right|. \tag{5.18}$$

Since $r \in W_2^2(D)$, so $\frac{\partial r}{\partial \bar{n}} \in W_2^{1/2}(\partial D)$, we deduce

$$RHS(5.18) \leq a \|\Lambda \phi^k\|_{H^{-1/2}(\partial D)} \left\| \frac{\partial r}{\partial \bar{n}} \right\|_{H^{1/2}(\partial D)}. \tag{5.19}$$

However, $\phi^k \in W_p^{2, 2/3}(\partial D \times (0, T))$, so

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Lambda \phi^k\|_{W_2^{1/2}(\partial D)} &\leq c \|\phi^k\|_{W_2^{3/2}(\partial D)} \leq c \|\phi^k\|_{W_p^{3/2}(\partial D)} \\ &\leq \epsilon \|\phi^k\|_{W_p^2(\partial D)} + c(\epsilon) \|\phi^k\|_{L_p(\partial D)}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.20}$$

but from the trace theorem we have

$$\|\phi^k\|_{L_\infty(0, T; L_p(\partial D))} \leq c(\|\phi^k\|_{W_p^{2, 2/3}(\partial D \times (0, T))} + \|\phi_0\|_{W_p^{2-3/p}(\partial D)}), \tag{5.21}$$

where the constant in (5.21) is independent of T . Summing up we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\bar{\pi}^k (\bar{q} - \bar{p}), z_{n+1}\|_{W_p^{-1, -1/3}(\partial D \times (0, T))} \\ &\leq (\epsilon + c(\epsilon)T^a) (\|H\|_{W_p^{-1, -1/3}(\partial D \times (0, T))} + \|\phi_0\|_{W_p^{2-3/p}(\partial D)}), \end{aligned} \tag{5.22}$$

for a number $a > 0$. Similarly we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| \sum_k (L(\pi^k \phi^k) - \pi^k L\phi^k) \right\|_{W_p^{-1, -1/3}(\partial D \times (0, T))} \\ &\leq c\beta (\|H\|_{W_p^{-1, -1/3}(\partial D \times (0, T))} + \|\phi_0\|_{W_p^{2-3/p}(\partial D)}). \end{aligned} \tag{5.23}$$

Relations (5.13), (5.2) and (5.23) finish the proof of Lemma 5.1.

Using similar argumentation one can prove the second lemma.

Lemma 5.2. *We have $RL\phi = \phi + \mathcal{W}\phi$ and $\|\mathcal{W}\| \leq c\beta$.*

We skip the proof since it is based on the same analysis as for Lemma 5.1.

Proof of Theorem 5.1. Lemmas 5.1 and 5.2 guarantee that for a sufficiently small T operator $(1 + \mathcal{T})^{-1}$ and $(1 + \mathcal{W})^{-1}$ are well defined and their norms are bounded. Hence we have

$$LR(1 + \mathcal{T})^{-1}H = H \quad \text{and} \quad (1 + \mathcal{W})^{-1}RL\Phi = \Phi, \tag{5.24}$$

which implies that $L^{-1} = R(1 + \mathcal{T})^{-1} = (1 + \mathcal{W})^{-1}R = L^{-1}$. Boundedness of L^{-1} follows from properties of operator R . Hence, $\phi = L^{-1}(H, \phi_0)$ is the solution (unique) to problem (5.3), but only for short time T . However, constants in lemmas are fixed (does not depend on data), so we can continue the solutions on any finite time interval step by step. As a result the constant in (5.5) depends on T . Theorem 5.1 is proved.

Theorem 2.1 is a consequence of Theorem 5.1 and considerations for system (5.1).

6. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1.

To prove the result for the nonlinear system we apply the Banach fixed-point theorem to system (2.7). First, we remove inhomogeneity from the initial condition. Take the solution to the following problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \bar{q} &= 0 && \text{in} && D \times (0, T), \\ \bar{q} &= a\Lambda \bar{\psi} && \text{on} && \partial D \times (0, T), \\ \frac{\partial \bar{q}}{\partial \bar{n}} &= -\partial_t \bar{\psi} && \text{on} && \partial D \times (0, T), \\ \bar{\psi}|_{t=0} &= \psi_0 && \text{on} && \partial D. \end{aligned} \tag{6.1}$$

Theorem 2.1 implies that $\bar{q} \in L_p(0, T; B_{p1}^{1/p}(D))$, $\frac{\partial \bar{q}}{\partial \bar{n}} \in L_p(0, T; W_p^{-1}(\partial D))$ and $\bar{\psi} \in W_p^{2,2/3}(\partial D \times (0, T))$. Properties of L_p -spaces allow us to find T_1 so small that for a given $\delta > 0$ we have

$$\|\bar{q}\|_{L_p(0, T_1; B_{p1}^{1/p}(D))} + \left\| \frac{\partial \bar{q}}{\partial \bar{n}} \right\|_{L_p(0, T_1; W_p^{-1}(\partial D))} + \langle \bar{\psi} \rangle_{W_p^{2,2/3}(\partial D \times (0, T_1))} \leq \delta_1. \tag{6.2}$$

Therefore, in the next considerations we will investigate only $T < T_1$.

The sought functions will be searched for in the following form:

$$q = u + \bar{q} \quad \text{and} \quad \psi = f + \bar{\psi}. \tag{6.3}$$

Then system (2.7) reads

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta u &= F_1 && \text{in} && D \times (0, T), \\ u &= a\Lambda f + G_1 && \text{on} && \partial D \times (0, T), \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \bar{n}} &= -\partial_t f + H_1 && \text{on} && \partial D \times (0, T), \\ f|_{t=0} &= 0 && \text{on} && \partial D, \end{aligned} \tag{6.4}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} F_1 &= \operatorname{div} (Id - A_t)u + \operatorname{div} (Id - A_t)\bar{q}, \\ G_1 &= (\Delta_{\partial\Omega_t} - \Lambda)f + (\Delta_{\partial\Omega_t} - \Lambda)\bar{\psi}, \\ H_1 &= \bar{n}(\bar{n}_t - \bar{n})\partial_t f + \bar{n}(\bar{n}_t - \bar{n})\partial_t \bar{\psi} + (\bar{n}_t - \bar{n})\nabla u + (\bar{n}_t - \bar{n})\nabla \bar{q}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.5}$$

The solution to problem (6.4) will be found as a fixed point to the map

$$\mathcal{M}(\bar{u}, \bar{f}) = (u, f), \quad \text{where } (\bar{u}, \bar{f}) \in \Xi, \tag{6.6}$$

and set Ξ is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \Xi &= \left\{ (u, f) \in L_p(0, T; B_{p_1}^{1/p}(D)) \times W_p^{2,2/3}(\partial D \times (0, T)) : \right. \\ &\quad \left. f|_{t=0} = 0, \quad \partial_t f, \frac{\partial u}{\partial \bar{n}}|_{\partial D} \in L_p(0, T; W_p^{-1}(\partial D)) \text{ and} \right. \tag{6.7} \\ &\quad \left. \|(u, f)\|_{\Xi} = \|u\|_{L_p(0, T; B_{p_1}^{1/p}(D))} + \|\partial_t f, \frac{\partial u}{\partial \bar{n}}|_{\partial D}\|_{L_p(0, T; W_p^{-1}(\partial D))} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \langle f \rangle_{W_p^{2,2/3}(\partial D \times (0, T))} < \delta \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The pair (u, f) from (6.6) is the solution to the following problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta u &= \bar{F}_1 && \text{in } D \times (0, T), \\ u &= a\Lambda f + \bar{G}_1 && \text{on } \partial D \times (0, T), \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \bar{n}} &= -\partial_t f + \bar{H}_1 && \text{on } \partial D \times (0, T), \\ f|_{t=0} &= 0 && \text{on } \partial D, \end{aligned} \tag{6.8}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{F}_1 &= \operatorname{div} (Id - \bar{A}_t)\bar{u} + \operatorname{div} (Id - \bar{A}_t)\bar{q}, \quad \bar{G}_1 = (\Delta_{\partial\bar{\Omega}_t} - \Lambda)\bar{f} + (\Delta_{\partial\bar{\Omega}_t} - \Lambda)\bar{\psi}, \\ \bar{H}_1 &= \bar{n}(\bar{n}_t - \bar{n})\partial_t \bar{f} + \bar{n}(\bar{n}_t - \bar{n})\partial_t \bar{\psi} + (\bar{n}_t - \bar{n})\nabla \bar{q} + (\bar{n}_t - \bar{n})\nabla \bar{u}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.9}$$

First, we want to find small enough δ to prove $\mathcal{M}(\Xi) \subset \Xi$. To find bounds on solutions to (6.8) we apply Theorem 2.1 and estimate the right-hand side of (6.8) as follows: the form of \bar{F}_1 , together with properties of A_t and the imbedding theorem, implies that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\bar{F}_1\|_{L_p(0, T; B_{p_1}^{1/p-2}(D))} \tag{6.10} \\ &\leq c\|\bar{\psi} + \bar{f}\|_{W_p^{2,2/3}(\partial D \times (0, T))} (\|\bar{u}\|_{L_p(0, T; B_{p_1}^{1/p}(D))} + \|\bar{q}\|_{L_p(0, T; B_{p_1}^{1/p}(D))}). \end{aligned}$$

Locally on each $\Omega^k \cap \partial D$ for $k \in \mathcal{N}$ the following pointwise bound is valid:

$$|(\bar{f} + \bar{\psi})| + |\nabla(\bar{f} + \bar{\psi})| \leq \epsilon, \tag{6.11}$$

where ϵ is taken from (2.6). Thus we can write

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(\Delta_{\overline{\partial\Omega_t}} - \Lambda)\bar{f}\|_{L_p(\partial D \times (0,T))} & (6.12) \\ & \leq c(\|\nabla(\bar{f} + \bar{\psi})\nabla^2\bar{f}\|_{L_p(\partial D \times (0,T))} + \|\nabla^2(\bar{f} + \bar{\psi})\nabla\bar{f}\|_{L_p(\partial D \times (0,T))}) \\ & \leq \epsilon\|\nabla^2\bar{f}\|_{L_p(\partial D \times (0,T))} + (\delta_1 + \|\nabla^2\bar{f}\|_{L_p(\partial D \times (0,T))})\|\nabla\bar{f}\|_{L_p(\partial D \times (0,T))}, \end{aligned}$$

and in the same way we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(\Delta_{\overline{\partial\Omega_t}} - \Lambda)\bar{\psi}\|_{L_p(\partial D \times (0,T))} & (6.13) \\ & \leq \epsilon\|\nabla^2\bar{f}\|_{L_p(\partial D \times (0,T))} + (\delta_1 + \|\nabla^2\bar{f}\|_{L_p(\partial D \times (0,T))})\|\nabla\bar{f}\|_{L_p(\partial D \times (0,T))}. \end{aligned}$$

However, to estimate $\|\nabla\bar{\psi}\|_{L_\infty}$ we apply (6.11), so finally we get

$$\|\overline{G_1}\|_{L_p(\partial D \times (0,T))} \leq (\epsilon + \delta_1 + \|\bar{f}\|_{W_p^{2,2/3}(\partial D \times (0,T))})\|\bar{f}\|_{W_p^{2,2/3}(\partial D \times (0,T))}. \quad (6.14)$$

The last one is $\overline{H_1}$; we consider one term since the rest is similar:

$$\|\vec{n}(\overline{n_t} - \vec{n})\partial_t\bar{f}\|_{L_p(0,T;W_p^{-1}(\partial D))} \leq \sup \left| \int_{\partial D \times (0,T)} \vec{n}(\overline{n_t} - \vec{n})\partial_t\bar{f}\pi \, dx \, dt \right|, \quad (6.15)$$

where sup is taken over all $\pi \in W_q^{1,0}(\partial D \times (0,T))$ such that $\|\pi\| = 1$ and $q = p/(p - 1)$. Hence it is enough to show that $\vec{n}(\overline{n_t} - \vec{n})\pi \in W_q^{1,0}$, but for $p > n$ we have

$$\|\vec{n}(\overline{n_t} - \vec{n})\pi\|_{L_p(0,T;W_p^1(\partial D))} \leq c(\epsilon + \|\bar{f}\|_{W_p^{2,2/3}(\partial D \times (0,T))});$$

hence,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\vec{n}(\overline{n_t} - \vec{n})\partial_t\bar{f}\|_{L_p(0,T;W_p^{-1}(\partial D))} & (6.16) \\ & \leq c(\epsilon + \|\bar{f}\|_{W_p^{2,2/3}(\partial D \times (0,T))})\|\partial_t\bar{f}\|_{L_p(0,T;W_p^{-1}(\partial D))}. \end{aligned}$$

The rest of terms from $\overline{H_1}$ can be estimated similarly, so we conclude (see (6.2)):

$$\|\overline{H_1}\|_{L_p(0,T;W_p^{-1}(\partial D))} \leq c(\epsilon + \delta_1 + (\|(\bar{u}, \bar{f})\|_{\Xi}))\|(\bar{u}, \bar{f})\|_{\Xi}. \quad (6.17)$$

Summing over the above inequalities (6.10), (6.14) and (6.17), by Theorem 2.1 we get the estimate for the solution to (6.8) as follows:

$$\|(u, f)\|_{\Xi} \leq c[(\epsilon + \delta_1)\|(\bar{u}, \bar{f})\|_{\Xi} + \|(\bar{u}, \bar{f})\|_{\Xi}^2]. \quad (6.18)$$

So taking suitable $\delta > 0$ in definition (6.7) we obtain $\mathcal{M}(\Xi) \subset \Xi$.

Next, having specified δ in definition (6.7) we show the map $\mathcal{M} : \Xi \rightarrow \Xi$ is a contraction. For this purpose it is enough to prove that

$$\|\mathcal{M}(u_1, f_1) - \mathcal{M}(u_2, f_2)\|_{\Xi} \leq \frac{1}{2}\|(u_1 - u_2, f_1 - f_2)\|_{\Xi}. \quad (6.19)$$

To prove (6.19) it is enough to repeat all considerations as in the proof of (6.18), with possibly smaller δ —sufficiently small—and the application of all tricks as for \overline{F}_1 , \overline{G}_1 and \overline{H}_1 . Hence, we deduce that the map \mathcal{M} is a contraction on set Ξ , so the unique fixed point $(u^*, f^*) \in \Xi$ exists and describes the sought solution to the original problem in the meaning of definition (1.4). It is a consequence of definition (2.19) and properties of transform (2.1). The obtained time is relatively short. We can repeat this procedure to extend the solution, but the maximal existence time—in general—will be finite. Theorem 1.1 is proved.

Acknowledgment. The author would like to thank Piotr Rybka for useful discussions during the preparation of the paper. The work has been supported by Polish KBN grant No. 1 PO3A 037 28.

REFERENCES

- [1] O.V. Besov, V.P. Il'in, and S.M. Nikol'skij, "Integral Function Representation and Imbedding Theorem," Moscow, 1975.
- [2] B. Chalmers, "Principles of Solidification," Krieger, Huntington, New York, 1977.
- [3] X. Chen, *The Hele-Shaw problem and area-preserving curve shortening motion*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal., 123 (1993), 117–151.
- [4] X. Chen, J. Hong, and F. Yi, *Existence, uniqueness and regularity of classical solutions of the Mullins-Sekerka problem*, Comm. Partial Diff. Eqs., 21 (1996), 1705–1727.
- [5] P. Constantin and M. Pugh, *Global solutions for small data to the Hele-Shaw problem*, Nonlinearity, 6 (1993), 393–415.
- [6] J. Duchon and R. Robert, *Evolution d'une interface par capillarite et diffusion de volume I. Existence locale en temps*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincare, Analyse non lineaire, 1 (1984), 361–378.
- [7] J. Escher and G. Simonett, *Classical solutions for Hele-Shaw models with surface tension*, Adv. Differential Eqs., 2 (1997), no. 4, 619–642.
- [8] J. Escher and G. Simonett, *A center manifold analysis for the Mullins-Sekerka model*, J. Diff. Eqs., 143 (1998), 267–292.
- [9] J. Escher, J. Prüss, and G. Simonet, *Analytic solutions for a Stefan problem with Gibbs-Thomson correction*, J. Reine. Angew. Math., 563 (2003), 1–52.
- [10] A. Friedman and F. Reitich, *Analysis of a mathematical model for the growth of tumors*, J. Math. Bio., 38 (1999), 262–284.
- [11] A. Friedman and F. Reitich, *Nonlinear stability of a quasi-static Stefan problem with surface tension: a continuation approach*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa. Cl. Sci., (4) 30 (2001), no. 2, 341–403.
- [12] Y. Giga and P. Rybka, *Quasi-static evolution of 3-D crystals grown from supersaturated vapor*, Diff. Integral Eqs., 15 (2003), 1–15.
- [13] Y. Giga and H. Sohr, *Abstract L^p estimates for the Cauchy problem with applications to the Navier-Stokes equations in exterior domains*, J. Funct. Anal., 102 (1991), no. 1, 72–94.

- [14] M.G. Gurtin, “Thermodynamics of Evolving Phase Boundaries in the Plane,” Clarendon, Oxford, 1993.
- [15] O.A. Ladyhenskaya, V.A. Solonnikov, and N.N. Uralteva, *Linear and quasilinear equations of parabolic type*, Providence, R.I., Amer. Math. Soc., 1968.
- [16] S. Luckhaus, *Solutions for the two-phase Stefan problem with the Gibbs-Thomson law for melting temperature*, Europ. J. Appl. Math., 1 (1990), 101–111.
- [17] S. Luckhaus and T. Sturzenhecker, *Implicit time discretization for the mean curvature flow equation*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations, 3 (1995), 253–271.
- [18] P.B. Mucha, *On the Stefan problem with surface tension in the L_p framework*, Adv. Diff. Eqs, 10 (2005), no. 8, 861–900.
- [19] P.B. Mucha, *Stability of nontrivial solutions of the Navier-Stokes system on the three dimensional torus*, J. Diff. Eqs, 172 (2001), no. 2, 359–375.
- [20] P.B. Mucha and W.M. Zajączkowski, *On local existence of solutions of free boundary problem for incompressible viscous self-gravitating fluid motion*, Applicationes Mathematicae, 27 (2000), No. 3, 319–333.
- [21] M. Röger, *Existence of weak solutions for the Mullins-Sekerka flow*, SIAM J. Math. Anal., 37 (2005), no. 1, 291–301.
- [22] E.K.H. Salje, “Phase Transitions in Ferroelastic and co-Elastit Crystals,” Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- [23] V.A. Solonnikov, *On the nonstationary motion of isolated value of viscous incompressible fluid*, Izv. AN SSSR, 51 (1987), No. 5, 1065–1087.
- [24] H. Triebel, “Spaces of Besov-Hardy-Sobolev Type,” Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, Leipzig, 1978.