

ON A NONUNIFORM PARABOLIC EQUATION  
 WITH MIXED BOUNDARY CONDITION

C. V. PAO

ABSTRACT. This paper discusses the existence of weak solutions for an initial boundary-value problem of a nonuniform second order parabolic equation in which the coefficient  $b(t, x)$  of  $u_t$  is nonnegative and the coefficient matrix  $(a_{ij}(t, x))$  of the elliptic part is not necessarily positive definite. When  $b(t, x) \equiv 0$ , this problem is reduced to a degenerate elliptic system. A discussion of the existence of weak solutions for the degenerate elliptic boundary-value problem from the parabolic system is included.

1. **Introduction.** Let  $\Omega$  be a bounded domain in  $R^n$  and let  $\Gamma \equiv \Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2$  be the boundary of  $\Omega$ . We consider the initial boundary-value problem:

$$(1.1) \quad Lu \equiv b(t, x)u_t - \sum_{i,j=1}^n (a_{ij}(t, x)u_{x_j})_{x_i} + c(t, x)u = f(t, x) \quad (t \in (0, T], x \in \Omega),$$

$$(1.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \partial u / \partial \nu + \beta(t, x)u &= 0 & (t \in (0, T], x \in \Gamma_1), \\ u(t, x) &= 0 & (t \in (0, T], x \in \Gamma_2), \end{aligned}$$

$$(1.3) \quad u(0, x) = u_0(x) \quad (x \in \Omega),$$

where  $\beta(t, x) \geq 0$  and  $\partial / \partial \nu$  denotes the conormal derivative on  $\Gamma_1$ , that is,

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} \equiv \sum_{i,j=1}^n n_i(t, x)a_{ij}(t, x) \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_j} \quad (t \in (0, T], x \in \Gamma_1),$$

with  $(n_1, \dots, n_n)$  being the outer unit normal vector on  $\Gamma_1$ . It is assumed that  $a_{ij} = a_{ji}$  which together with  $b, b_t, c, f$  are bounded measurable real

---

Presented to the Society, January 23, 1975; received by the editors February 25, 1974.

AMS (MOS) subject classifications (1970). Primary 35K20, 35D05; Secondary 35J25, 35J70.

Key words and phrases. Nonuniform parabolic equations, degenerate elliptic equations, weak solutions, initial boundary-value problems.

functions in  $D \equiv (0, T] \times \Omega$ . The functions  $\beta, u_0$  are assumed bounded measurable in  $(0, T] \times \Gamma_1$  and  $\Omega$ , respectively. The operator  $L$  is uniformly parabolic if the function  $b$  is positive and the matrix  $A \equiv (a_{ij})$  is positive definite on  $\bar{D}$ , the closure of  $D$ . In this paper, we study a nonuniform parabolic operator in the sense that  $b$  is nonnegative and  $A$  is positive semi-definite on  $\bar{D}$ . Specifically, we study the existence of weak solutions for the system (1.1)–(1.3) for the case where

$$(1.4) \quad b(t, x) \geq 0, \quad \sum_{i,j=1}^n a_{ij}(t, x) \xi_i \xi_j \geq 0, \\ ((t, x) \in \bar{D}, \xi = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) \in R^n).$$

Thus either  $b$  or  $a_{ij}$  (or both) may assure zero values inside the domain  $D$ . In addition, we allow either  $\Gamma_1$  or  $\Gamma_2$  of the boundary surface  $\Gamma$  to be empty. In this situation, only one of the conditions in (1.2) appears.

When  $b(t, x) \equiv 0$  in  $D$  the system (1.1)–(1.3) is reduced to the boundary-value problem:

$$(1.5) \quad - \sum_{i,j=1}^n (a_{ij}(x) u_{x_j} x_i) + c(x)u = f(x) \quad (x \in \Omega),$$

$$\partial u / \partial \nu + \beta(x)u = 0 \quad (x \in \Gamma_1),$$

$$(1.6) \quad u(x) = 0 \quad (x \in \Gamma_2).$$

By considering the above nonuniform elliptic system as a degenerate case of the parabolic system (1.1)–(1.3), we deduce a similar result for the problem (1.5), (1.6).

Nonuniform parabolic equations in the form of (1.1)–(1.3) have been studied by Ford [1] for the case where  $A$  is a strictly positive scalar function and by Ivanov [2] for the case  $b(t, x) \equiv 1$  in  $D$ . In both papers, the boundary condition is of Dirichlet type. On the other hand, much work has been done on the degenerate elliptic system (1.5), (1.6). To list a few we refer to the work in [3]–[7]. In most cases, however, the matrix  $A$  is assumed to satisfy the condition

$$\nu(x)|\xi|^2 \leq \sum_{i,j=1}^n a_{ij}(x) \xi_i \xi_j \leq \mu(x)|\xi|^2 \quad (\xi \in R^n),$$

where  $\nu, \mu$  are positive in  $\Omega$  and can be zero only on the boundary of  $\Omega$ . Our assumption allows  $\nu, \mu$  to be zero inside  $\Omega$ . In fact, our treatment

includes the trivial case where  $A$  is the zero matrix, that is,  $a_{ij}(x) \equiv 0$  in  $D$ .

2. **The main results.** Let  $H = \{\phi \in C^2(\bar{D}); \phi(t, x) = 0 \text{ on } (0, T] \times C_2 \text{ and } \phi(T, x) = 0 \text{ in } \bar{\Omega}\}$ , where  $C^2(\bar{D})$  denotes the set of twice continuously differentiable real functions on  $\bar{D}$ . For any  $\phi, \psi \in H$  we set

$$\langle \phi, \psi \rangle = \int_D \phi(t, x)\psi(t, x) dz, \quad \|\phi\| = \langle \phi, \phi \rangle^{1/2},$$

$$\langle \phi, \psi \rangle_A = \int_D \sum_{i,j=1}^n a_{ij}(t, x)\phi_{x_i}(t, x)\psi_{x_j}(t, x) dz, \quad \|\phi\|_A = \langle \phi, \phi \rangle_A^{1/2},$$

$$\langle \phi, \psi \rangle_\Gamma = \int_0^T \int_{\Gamma_1} \beta(t, x)\phi(t, x)\psi(t, x) dz, \quad \|\phi\|_\Gamma = \langle \phi, \phi \rangle_\Gamma^{1/2},$$

$$\langle \phi, \psi \rangle_b = \int_\Omega b(0, x)\phi(0, x)\psi(0, x) dx, \quad \|\phi\|_b = \langle \phi, \phi \rangle_b^{1/2},$$

where  $dz = dt dx$ . For  $\phi, \psi \in C^2(\bar{\Omega})$ , the set of twice differentiable functions which vanish on  $C_2$ , we write

$$\langle \phi, \psi \rangle' = \int_\Omega \phi(x)\psi(x) dx, \quad \|\phi\|' = (\langle \phi, \phi \rangle')^{1/2},$$

and similar definitions for  $\langle \phi, \psi \rangle'_A, \langle \phi, \psi \rangle'_\Gamma$ . Define

$$(2.1) \quad \langle \phi, \psi \rangle_H = \langle \phi, \psi \rangle_A + \langle \phi, \psi \rangle_\Gamma + \langle (c - b_t/2)\phi, \psi \rangle + \frac{1}{2}\langle \phi, \psi \rangle_b \quad (\phi, \psi \in H).$$

Then  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_H$  is a symmetric bilinear functional on  $H \times H$ . Assume, for some constant  $\delta > 0$ ,

$$(2.2) \quad \langle \phi, \phi \rangle_H \geq \delta \langle \phi, \phi \rangle \quad (\phi \in H).$$

Then  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_H$  defines an inner product in  $H$ . We denote the completion of  $H$  with respect to the norm  $\|\phi\|_H = \langle \phi, \phi \rangle_H^{1/2}$  by  $H^*$ .

A function  $u \in H^*$  is said to be a weak solution of the problem (1.1)–(1.3) if

$$(2.3) \quad \langle u, \phi \rangle_A + \langle u, \phi \rangle_\Gamma + \langle u, c\phi \rangle - \langle u, (b\phi)_t \rangle - \langle u_0, \phi \rangle_b = \langle f, \phi \rangle \quad \text{for all } \phi \in H.$$

Our main result for the existence problem of (1.1)–(1.3) is the following:

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $b(t, x) \geq 0$  and the matrix  $A \equiv (a_{ij})$  be positive semi-definite in  $\bar{D}$ . If the condition (2.2) holds, then the problem (1.1)–(1.3) has a weak solution  $u \in H^*$ .*

**Remarks.** (i) The condition (2.2) is fulfilled if there exists a constant  $b_0 > 0$  such that

$$(2.4) \quad 2c(t, x) - b_t(t, x) \geq b_0 \quad ((t, x) \in D, \text{ a.e.}).$$

Furthermore, if we transform the problem (1.1)–(1.3) by  $u \rightarrow e^{-\lambda t}u$ , where  $\lambda$  is a constant, then (2.4) may be replaced by the weaker condition:

$2(c + \lambda b) - b_t \geq b_0$  a.e. in  $D$  for some  $\lambda$ . In particular, if  $b(t, x) \geq b_1 > 0$  in  $D$  for some constant  $b_1 > 0$ , then (2.4) (and thus (2.2)) is satisfied by choosing a sufficiently large  $\lambda$ .

(ii) In case the matrix  $A$  is positive definite in  $\bar{D}$  then

$$\langle \phi, \phi \rangle_A = \int_D \sum_{i,j=1}^n a_{ij} \phi_{x_j} \phi_{x_i} dz \geq d_0 \int \sum_{i=1}^n |\phi_{x_i}|^2 dz$$

for some constant  $d_0 > 0$ . Using the inequality

$$\int_D \sum_{i=1}^n |\phi_{x_i}|^2 dz \geq \gamma \int_D |\phi|^2 dz \quad (\gamma > 0)$$

for functions  $\phi$  satisfying  $\phi(t, x) = 0$  on  $(0, T] \times \Gamma$ , we obtain  $\langle \phi, \phi \rangle_A \geq d_0 \gamma \|\phi\|^2$ , where  $\gamma > 0$  is a constant depending only on  $\Omega$  ( $\gamma = \pi^2/l^2$  for  $\Omega = (0, l)$ ). Thus (2.2) is satisfied if

$$(2.5) \quad 2(c + d_0 \gamma) - b_t \geq b_0 \quad \text{in } D \text{ a.e.}$$

In this situation, the problem (1.1)–(1.3) (with  $\Gamma = \Gamma_2$ ) has a weak solution which is a direct extension of the result given in [1]. We remark that since  $b$  depends on  $t$ , a change of scale in  $t$  does not always insure the condition (2.5).

It will be shown in the following section that if we let

$$(2.6) \quad B[u, \phi] = \langle u, \phi \rangle_A + \langle u, \phi \rangle_\Gamma + \langle u, c\phi - (b\phi)_t \rangle \quad (\phi \in H),$$

then there is a unique closable linear operator  $S: H \rightarrow H^*$  such that

$$(2.7) \quad B[u, \phi] = \langle u, S\phi \rangle_H \quad \text{for all } u \in H^*, \phi \in H.$$

Denote the closure of  $S$  by  $\bar{S}$  and the range of  $\bar{S}$  by  $R(\bar{S})$ ; then we have

**Theorem 2.** *Let the conditions in Theorem 1 be satisfied and let  $u, v$  be any two weak solutions of the problem (1.1)–(1.3). Then there is a  $v_0 \in R^\perp(\bar{S})$  such that  $u = v + v_0$ , where  $R^\perp(\bar{S}) = \{\psi \in H^*; \langle \psi, \phi \rangle = 0 \text{ for all } \phi \in R(\bar{S})\}$ .*

When  $b(t, x) \equiv 0$  the last two terms in the bilinear form (2.1) are reduced to  $\langle c\phi, \psi \rangle$ . This leads to the definition of an inner product on  $C^2(\bar{\Omega})$  for the boundary-value problem (1.5), (1.6) by the relation

$$(2.8) \quad \langle \phi, \psi \rangle'_H = \langle \phi, \psi \rangle'_A + \langle \phi, \psi \rangle'_\Gamma + \langle c\phi, \psi \rangle' \quad (\phi, \psi \in C^2(\bar{\Omega})).$$

The condition (2.2) is reduced to

$$(2.9) \quad \langle \phi, \phi \rangle'_H \geq \delta \langle \phi, \phi \rangle' \quad (\phi \in C^2(\bar{\Omega})),$$

and the equation (2.6) becomes

$$B_1[u, \phi] = \langle u, \phi \rangle'_H \quad (\phi \in C^2(\bar{\Omega})).$$

We denote the completion of  $C^2(\bar{\Omega})$  (open with respect to  $\|\phi\|'_H = (\langle \phi, \phi \rangle'_H)^{1/2}$ ) by  $\tilde{H}$  and say that  $u \in \tilde{H}$  is a weak solution of (1.5), (1.6) if

$$(2.10) \quad \langle u, \phi \rangle'_A + \langle u, \phi \rangle'_\Gamma + \langle u, c\phi \rangle' = \langle f, \phi \rangle' \quad (\phi \in C^2(\bar{\Omega})).$$

By considering (2.10) as a degenerate case of (2.3) we obtain

**Theorem 3.** *Let  $A \equiv (a_{ij})$  be positive semidefinite on  $\bar{\Omega}$  and let the condition (2.9) be satisfied. Then the problem (1.5), (1.6) has a unique weak solution  $u \in \tilde{H}$ .*

**Remark.** The problem (1.5), (1.6) still has a solution even when  $A$  is the zero matrix. For instance, if  $\Gamma = \Gamma_2$  then the condition (2.9) requires that  $c(t, x) \geq c_0 > 0$  in  $D$ , and thus the function  $u = f/c$  in  $D$  and  $u = 0$  on  $(0, T] \times \Gamma$  is the desired solution.

**3. Proof of the theorems.** Using the definition of  $B[u, \phi]$  defined in (2.6), equation (2.3) becomes

$$(3.1) \quad B[u, \phi] = F_{f, u_0}(\phi) \quad (\phi \in H),$$

where

$$(3.2) \quad F_{f, u_0}(\phi) = \langle f, \phi \rangle + \langle u_0, \phi \rangle_b.$$

Thus for the existence problem of (1.1)–(1.3) it suffices to show the existence of  $u \in H^*$  satisfying (3.1). For this purpose we prepare the following

**Lemma 1.** *For each  $\phi \in H$ ,  $B[\cdot, \phi]$  defines a bounded linear functional on  $H$ . Furthermore,*

$$(3.3) \quad B[\phi, \phi] = \|\phi\|_H^2 \quad (\phi \in H).$$

**Proof.** Let  $\Phi_x = (\phi_{x_1}, \dots, \phi_{x_n})$ ,  $\Psi_x = (\psi_{x_1}, \dots, \psi_{x_n})$  and let  $(\cdot, \cdot)$  denote the Euclidean inner product in  $R^n$ . Since  $A$  is symmetric, positive semidefinite there exists a unique symmetric square root  $A^{1/2}$  such that  $(A\Psi_x, \Phi_x) = (A^{1/2}\Psi_x, A^{1/2}\Phi_x)$ . By the Schwarz inequality,

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{aligned} |\langle \psi, \phi \rangle_A| &= \left| \int_D (A\Psi_x, \Phi_x) dz \right| \leq \left( \int_D |A^{1/2}\Psi_x|^2 dz \right)^{1/2} \left( \int_D |A^{1/2}\Phi_x|^2 dz \right)^{1/2} \\ &= \left( \int_D (A\Psi_x, \Psi_x) dz \right)^{1/2} \left( \int_D (A\Phi_x, \Phi_x) dz \right)^{1/2} = \|\psi\|_A \|\phi\|_A. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $|\langle \psi, \phi \rangle_\Gamma| \leq \|\phi\|_\Gamma \|\psi\|_\Gamma$  and  $|\langle \psi, c\phi - (b\phi)_t \rangle| \leq \|c\phi - (b\phi)_t\| \|\psi\|$  we see from (2.6), (3.4), (2.2) that

$$(3.5) \quad |B[\psi, \phi]| \leq k_\phi \|\psi\|_H \quad (\psi \in H),$$

where  $k_\phi$  is a constant depending only on  $\phi$  and the coefficients of  $L$ . Hence  $B[\cdot, \phi]$  is a bounded linear functional on  $H$ . Equation (3.3) follows from (2.1), (2.6) and the identity

$$(3.6) \quad \langle \phi, (b\phi)_t \rangle = \frac{1}{2}(\langle b_t \phi, \phi \rangle - \langle \phi, \phi \rangle_b) \quad (\phi \in H).$$

This proves the lemma.

**Proof of Theorem 1.** In view of Lemma 1, we can extend  $B[\cdot, \phi]$  to a bounded linear functional on  $H^*$ . By the Riesz representation theorem there exists  $S\phi \in H^*$  such that

$$(3.7) \quad B[u, \phi] = \langle u, S\phi \rangle_H \quad \text{for all } u \in H^*, \phi \in H.$$

Clearly,  $S$  is a linear closable operator on  $H$  to  $H^*$ . Since by Lemma 1 and (3.7),

$$(3.8) \quad \langle S\phi, \phi \rangle_H = \langle \phi, \phi \rangle_H \quad (\phi \in D(S) = H),$$

we see from the closure property of  $\bar{S}$  that

$$(3.9) \quad \langle \bar{S}\phi, \phi \rangle_H = \langle \phi, \phi \rangle_H \quad (\phi \in D(\bar{S})).$$

This implies that  $\bar{S}$  has a continuous inverse and thus, by the closed range theorem,  $R(\bar{S}^*) = H^*$ , where  $\bar{S}^*$  is the adjoint operator on  $\bar{S}$ . On the other hand, from

$$|F_{f, u_0}(\phi)| \leq \|f\| \|\phi\| + \|u_0\|_b \|\phi\|_b \leq \gamma \|\phi\|_H \quad (\phi \in H)$$

for some  $\gamma < \infty$ , we can extend  $F_{f, u_0}$  to a continuous linear functional on  $H^*$ . Hence there exists  $v \in H^*$  such that

$$(3.10) \quad F_{f, u_0}(\phi) = \langle v, \phi \rangle_H \quad \text{for all } \phi \in H.$$

Since  $R(\bar{S}^*) = H^*$  there exists  $u \in D(\bar{S}^*)$  such that  $\bar{S}^*u = v$ . It follows from (3.7), (3.10) that for any  $\phi \in H$ ,

$$B[u, \phi] = \langle u, \bar{S}\phi \rangle_H = \langle \bar{S}^*u, \phi \rangle_H = \langle v, \phi \rangle_H = F_{f, u_0}(\phi).$$

This shows that  $u$  is the desired solution.

**Proof of Theorem 2.** Since both functions  $u, v$  satisfy (3.1) with the same  $f, u_0$  we see from (3.7) that

$$(3.11) \quad 0 = B[u - v, \phi] = \langle u - v, S\phi \rangle_H \quad (\phi \in H).$$

The above relation implies

$$(3.12) \quad \langle u - v, \bar{S}\phi \rangle_H = 0 \quad (\phi \in D(\bar{S})).$$

Hence  $(u - v) \in R^\perp(\bar{S})$ , which proves the theorem.

**Proof of Theorem 3.** The proof of existence follows from the same argument as for the problem (1.1)–(1.3) with  $b \equiv 0$ . The uniqueness problem follows from

$$0 = B_1[u - v, \phi] = \langle u - v, \phi \rangle'_H \quad (\phi \in C^2(\bar{\Omega}))$$

and the fact that  $C^2(\bar{\Omega})$  is dense in  $\tilde{H}$ .

#### REFERENCES

1. W. T. Ford, *The first initial boundary-value problem for a nonuniform parabolic equation*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **40** (1972), 131–137.
2. A. V. Ivanov, *A boundary-value problem for degenerate second order parabolic linear equations*, Zap. Naučn. Sem. Leningrad. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. (LOMI) **14** (1969), 48–88. (Russian)
3. J. J. Kohn and L. Nirenberg, *Non-coercive boundary value problems*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **18** (1965), 443–492. MR 31 #6041.
4. R. D. Meyer, *Degenerate elliptic differential systems*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **29** (1970), 436–442. MR 41 #2198.
5. M. K. V. Murthy and G. Stampacchia, *Boundary value problems for some degenerate elliptic operators*, Ann. Mat. Pure Appl. (4) **80** (1968), 1–22. MR 40 #3069.
6. E. T. Poulsen, *Boundary value properties connected with some improper Dirichlet integrals*, Math. Scand. **8** (1960), 5–14. MR 24 #A2140.
7. D. S. Tartakoff, *On the regularity of non-unique solutions of degenerate elliptic-parabolic systems of partial differential equations*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **24** (1971), 763–788. MR 45 #5543.