

Jozef Kačur

A generalized maximum principle and estimates of  $\max$  vrai  $u$  for nonlinear parabolic boundary value problems

*Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal*, Vol. 26 (1976), No. 4, 507–526

Persistent URL: <http://dml.cz/dmlcz/101425>

## Terms of use:

© Institute of Mathematics AS CR, 1976

Institute of Mathematics of the Czech Academy of Sciences provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use. Each copy of any part of this document must contain these *Terms of use*.



This document has been digitized, optimized for electronic delivery and stamped with digital signature within the project *DML-CZ: The Czech Digital Mathematics Library* <http://dml.cz>

A GENERALIZED MAXIMUM PRINCIPLE AND ESTIMATES  
OF  $\max \text{vrai } u$  FOR NONLINEAR PARABOLIC BOUNDARY  
VALUE PROBLEMS

JOZEF KAČUR, Bratislava

(Received August 9, 1973)

In this paper we investigate estimates of  $\max \text{vrai } u(x, t)$  and  $\min \text{vrai } u(x, t)$  for the weak solution of nonlinear parabolic equations of the form

$$(1) \quad \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} a_i \left( t, x, \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} \right) + a_0(t, x, u) = f(x, t)$$

in the domain  $Q \equiv \Omega \times (0, T)$ , where  $\Omega \subset E^N$  ( $N$ -dimensional Euclidean space) is a bounded domain with a Lipschitzian boundary  $\partial\Omega$ . The initial-boundary conditions are given by a sufficiently smooth function  $u_0(x, t)$  in  $Q$ :

$$(2) \quad u(x, 0) = u_0(x, 0), \quad u(x, t)|_{\partial\Omega \times (0, T)} = u_0(x, t)|_{\partial\Omega \times (0, T)}.$$

The growth of  $a_i(t, x, \xi)$  in  $\xi \in E^N$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, N$  and  $a_0(t, x, s)$  in  $s$  is asufficiently general and is given below by th the relation (3) or (3'). The weak solution of the problem (1), (2) is an element of a space of the Orlicz-Sobolev type – see [1]. The estimate for  $\max \text{vrai } u(x, t)$  and  $\min \text{vrai } u(x, t)$  imply, in a special case ( $f(x, t) \equiv 0$ ,  $\text{sgn } a_0(t, x, s) = \text{sgn } s$ ), the maximum principle for the weak solution  $u(x, t)$  even in a stronger form (Theorem 4). The estimates obtained allow us to investigate the order of convergence  $u(x, t) \rightarrow 0$  for  $t \rightarrow \infty$  in dependence on the order of convergence  $u_0(x, t) \rightarrow 0$  and  $f(x, t) \rightarrow 0$  for  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . In some special cases (see Theorem 8) we prove that the initial state (given by  $u_0(x, t) \equiv u_0(x)$  in (2)) damps in a finite time, i.e., there exists a  $t_0$  ( $t_0 \equiv t_0(u_0)$ ) such that  $u(x, t) \equiv 0$  for  $t \geq t_0$ .

In § 1 a generalized maximum principle is proved (Theorem 1). In § 2 the stabilization  $u(x, t) \rightarrow 0$  for  $t \rightarrow \infty$  is studied. In § 3 we prove some estimates for  $\max \text{vrai } u(x, t)$ ,  $\min \text{vrai } u(x, t)$  and the maximum principle also for more general equations of the form (1) with members  $a_i(t, x, u, \partial u/\partial x)$  for  $i = 0, 1, \dots, N$ .

The estimates obtained for  $\max \text{vrai } u(x, t)$  and  $\min \text{vrai } u(x, t)$  substantially depend on the behaviour of the member  $a_0(t, x, s)$ . If  $a_0(t, x, s) \equiv 0$ , then the estimates (in the case  $f(x, t) \equiv 0$ ) are reduced to the maximum principle.

The results have been obtained by means of the direct variational methods for parabolic boundary value problems. When solving parabolic boundary value problems, the direct variational methods have been used by many authors, e.g., by O. A. LADYŽENSKAJA [5, 10], K. REKTORYS [6], P. P. MOSOLOV [4], author [1, 2] and others. In order that we may use the direct variational methods we must suppose the elliptic operator in (1) to be potential which is a restrictive assumption, but it lies in the substance of the method.

**Notation and definitions.** We suppose that  $a_i(t, x, \xi)$ ,  $i = 0, 1, \dots, N$ ,  $\xi \in E^N$  (for  $i = 0$ ,  $\xi \in E^1$ ) are continuous functions in all variables  $x \in \Omega$ ,  $t \in \langle 0, T \rangle$  and  $|\xi| < \infty$ . The growth of  $a_i(t, x, \xi)$  ( $i = 0, 1, \dots, N$ ) in  $\xi$  will be described by means of the functions of a certain class  $\mathfrak{M}_3$  which is substantially larger than the class of polynomials  $|u|^p$  — see [11].

$\mathfrak{M}_3$  is the set of all real functions  $g(s)$  satisfying

I  $s g(s)$  is even and convex for  $s \geq s_1$  and  $\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} (s g(s))' = \infty$ .

II There exists a constant  $c$  such that

$$g(2s) \leq c g(s) \quad \text{for each } s \geq s_1.$$

III There exists  $l > 1$  such that

$$g(s) < \frac{1}{2} g(ls) \quad \text{for each } s \geq s_1,$$

where  $s_1$  is a sufficiently big positive number.

We assume that with respect to the equation (1) it is possible to find  $g_i(s) \in \mathfrak{M}_3$  ( $i = 0, 1, \dots, N$ ) satisfying  $g_i(s) \geq g_j(s)$  (or  $g_i(s) \leq g_j(s)$ ) for all  $i, j = 1, \dots, N$ ,  $s \geq s_1$  such that

$$(3) \quad |a_i(t, x, \xi)| \leq C \left( 1 + \sum_{j=1}^N \min(|g_i(\xi_j)|, |g_j(\xi_j)|) \right)$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, N$ . If  $i = 0$ , then the right hand side in (3) consists of a single member  $g_0(\xi_0)$  instead of the sum.

Other more general conditions (without the assumption  $g_i \geq g_j$  or  $g_i \leq g_j$ ) are of the form

$$(3') \quad |a_i(t, x, \xi)| \leq C \left( 1 + \sum_{j=1}^N g_i(G_i^{-1} G_j(|\xi_j|)) \right)$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, N$  where  $G_i(s) = s g_i(s)$  and  $G_i^{-1}$  is its inverse function for  $s \geq 0$ . (More exactly see in [6]). If  $i = 0$ , then the right hand side in (3') consists of a single member  $g_0(G_0^{-1} G_0(|\xi_0|))$  instead of the sum.

To ensure the ellipticity (monotonicity) we shall suppose

$$(4) \quad \sum_{i=0}^N (\xi_i - \eta_i) [a_i(t, x, \xi) - a_i(t, x, \eta)] \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } \xi, \eta \in E^N.$$

The coerciveness of the elliptic operator in (1) will be guaranteed by

$$(5) \quad \sum_{i=0}^N \xi_i a_i(t, x, \xi) \geq C_1 \sum_{i=0}^N \xi_i g_i(\xi_i) + C_2 \xi_0 g_0(\xi_0) - C_3,$$

where  $C_1 > 0$ ,  $C_3 \geq 0$  and  $C_2 > 0$ . If  $a_0(t, x, s) \equiv 0$ , then  $C_2 = 0$  and we put  $g_0(s) = s$ .

The potentiality of the elliptic operator in (1) will be guaranteed by the symmetry

$$(6) \quad \frac{\partial a_i(t, x, \xi)}{\partial \xi_j} = \frac{\partial a_j(t, x, \xi)}{\partial \xi_i} \quad \text{for } i, j = 1, \dots, N.$$

The existence of the weak solution (for the definition see [1]) of the problem (1), (2) is proved in [1]. The solution is an element of the space  $W(Q)$ :

$$W(Q) \equiv \left\{ v \in L_{G_0}(Q) \cap L_2(Q); \frac{\partial v}{\partial x_i} \in L_{G_i}(Q), i = 1, \dots, N \right\},$$

where  $\partial v / \partial x_i$  are derivatives in the sense of distributions and  $L_{G_i}(Q)$  is the Orlicz's space generated by the function  $G_i(s) = s g_i(s)$ .

The basic means which allows us to use the variational methods is Rothe's method (method of lines) which we apply in the following way.

Let  $\{t_j\}_{j=0}^m$  be a partition of the interval  $\langle 0, T \rangle$ ,  $\Delta t_j = t_j - t_{j-1}$  and  $u_0 \equiv u_0(x, 0)$ . Successively for  $j = 1, \dots, m$  we solve the nonlinear elliptic equations

$$(1') \quad \frac{u_j - u_{j-1}}{\Delta t_j} - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} a_i \left( t_j, x, \frac{\partial u_j}{\partial x} \right) + a_0(t_j, x, u_j) = f(t_j, x)$$

with Dirichlet boundary conditions

$$(2') \quad u_j(s)|_{\partial \Omega} = u_0(t_j, s)|_{\partial \Omega}$$

$u_j, j = 1, \dots, m$  being elements of the space  $W(\Omega)$ :

$$W(\Omega) \equiv \left\{ v \in L_{G_0}(\Omega) \cap L_2(\Omega); \frac{\partial v}{\partial x_i} \in L_{G_i}(\Omega), i = 1, \dots, N \right\}$$

with the norm

$$\|v\|_W = \sum_{i=1}^N \left\| \frac{\partial v}{\partial x_i} \right\|_{G_i} + \|v\|_{L_2} + \|v\|_{G_0},$$

where  $\|\cdot\|_{G_i}$  is the corresponding Orlicz's norm in the space  $L_{G_i}$ .

We denote  $\hat{W}(\Omega) = \overline{C_0^\infty(\Omega)}$ , where the closure is in the norm of  $W(\Omega)$ . ( $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$  is the set of infinitely differentiable functions with support in  $\Omega$ .)

By means of the functions  $u_j, j = 1, \dots, m$  we construct Rothe's function  $u^{(m)}(x, t)$  in  $Q$ :

$$u^{(m)}(x, t) = u_{j-1} + \frac{t - t_{j-1}}{\Delta t_j} (u_j - u_{j-1}), \text{ for } t_{j-1} \leq t \leq t_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, m.$$

We suppose

$$(7) \quad u_0(x, t) \in C^2(\bar{Q}),$$

$$(8) \quad f(x, t) \in L_2(Q) \quad \text{and} \quad \left\| \frac{\partial f}{\partial t} \right\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \leq C \quad \text{for a.e. } t \in (0, T).$$

The results of the present paper are based on the following result proved in [1].

**Theorem A.** *Let the conditions (4)–(8) be fulfilled. Suppose that  $a_i(t, x, \xi)$  and the derivatives  $\partial a_i / \partial t, \partial^2 a_i / \partial t^2, \partial^2 a_i / \partial t \partial \xi_\alpha, \partial^2 a_i / \partial \xi_\alpha \partial \xi_\beta$  ( $i = 0, \dots, N, \alpha, \beta = 1, \dots, N$ ) are continuous functions in all variables and satisfy (3) (or (3')). Then there exists a unique weak solution  $u(x, t)$  of (1), (2) and the estimates*

$$\|u^{(m)} - u\|_{C(\langle 0, T \rangle, L_2(\Omega))} \leq C \cdot \max_{j=1, \dots, m} \sqrt{\Delta t_j}$$

hold. Moreover, we have  $u \in L_\infty(\langle 0, T \rangle, W(\Omega))$  and  $\partial u / \partial t \in L_\infty(\langle 0, T \rangle, L_2(\Omega))$ .

If a stationary parabolic boundary value problem (1), (2) is considered, i.e., if  $a_i(t, x, \xi) \equiv a_i(x, \xi)$  and  $u_0(x, t) \equiv u_0(x)$ , then Theorem A holds without the assumption that the derivatives  $\partial a_i / \partial t, \partial^2 a_i / \partial t^2, \partial^2 a_i / \partial t \partial \xi_\alpha$  and  $\partial^2 a_i / \partial \xi_\alpha \partial \xi_\beta$  satisfy (3) (or (3')).

## 1.

In this section we prove a generalized maximum principle for the weak solution  $u(x, t)$  of (1), (2).

We shall suppose

$$(9) \quad \sum_{i=1}^N \xi_i a_i(t, x, \xi) \geq 0,$$

$$(10) \quad f(x, t) \in L_\infty(Q) \quad \text{and} \quad \max_{x \in \Omega} \text{vrai } f(x, t), \quad \min_{x \in \Omega} \text{vrai } f(x, t)$$

are integrable over  $\langle 0, T \rangle$  in the sense of Riemann.

Let us denote by  $S_\tau(S_\tau^*)$  the set of all continuous functions  $\gamma(t)$  ( $\gamma^*(t)$ ) in  $\langle \tau, T \rangle$  satisfying

$$\gamma(t) \geq \max_{x \in \partial \Omega} u_0(x, t) \quad (\gamma^*(t) \leq \min_{x \in \partial \Omega} u_0(x, t)) \quad \text{for } t \in \langle \tau, T \rangle.$$

**Lemma 1.** *Let the assumptions of Theorem A and the conditions (9), (10) be satisfied. Let  $\{u_j\}_{j=1}^m$  be weak solutions of the problem (1'), (2') with  $u_0 = u_0(x, 0)$ . Then, for  $i = 1, \dots, m$ ,*

$$(11) \quad \max_{x \in \Omega} \text{vrai } u_i \leq \max \{ \gamma(t_i); \max_{x \in \Omega} \text{vrai } u_{i-1} + \\ + \max_{x \in \Omega} \text{vrai } f(x, t_i) \Delta t_i - \min_{\substack{x \in \bar{\Omega} \\ s \geq \gamma(t_i)}} a_0(t_i, x, s) \Delta t_i \}$$

and

$$(12) \quad \min_{x \in \Omega} \text{vrai } u_i \geq \min \{ \gamma^*(t_i); \min_{x \in \Omega} \text{vrai } u_{i-1} + \\ + \min_{x \in \Omega} \text{vrai } f(x, t_i) \Delta t_i - \max_{\substack{x \in \bar{\Omega} \\ s \leq \gamma^*(t_i)}} a_0(t_i, x, s) \Delta t_i \},$$

where  $\gamma \in S_0$  and  $\gamma^* \in S_0^*$  are arbitrary.

*Proof.* Let us construct the functional

$$\Phi(t, v) = \int_0^1 d\tau \int_{\Omega} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\partial v}{\partial x_i} a_i \left( t, x, \tau \frac{\partial v}{\partial x} \right) dx$$

for  $v \in W(\Omega)$  and the functionals

$$\Psi(t_i, v, u_{i-1}) = \Phi(t_i, v) + \frac{1}{2 \Delta t_i} \|v - u_{i-1}\|_{L_2}^2 + \\ + \int_0^1 d\tau \int_{\Omega} v a_0(t_i, x, v) dx - \int_{\Omega} v f(x, t_i) dx$$

for  $v \in W(\Omega)$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, m$  ( $f(x, t_i)$  is the trace of  $f(x, t)$  for  $t = t_i$ , which exists due to the condition (8) – see [8]). From the assumptions of Theorem A it follows that  $u_i$  is the unique point of the minimum of  $\Psi(t_i, v, u_{i-1})$  on the set  $u_0(x, t_i) + \hat{W}(\Omega)$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, m$ . First we prove the estimate (11). We denote  $M_i = \max_{x \in \Omega} \text{vrai } u_i$  and

$$u_i|^r = \begin{cases} u(x), & \text{if } u(x) \leq r \\ r, & \text{if } u(x) > r. \end{cases}$$

$u_i|^r \in W(\Omega)$  for each real  $r$  (for proof see [8] or [11] (Lemma 1)). Let us assume that  $M_{i-1} < \infty$ . We shall consider the functions  $u_i|^r$ , where  $r \geq \gamma(t_i) \geq \max_{x \in \partial \Omega} u_0(x, t_i)$ .

It is evident that  $u_i|^r|_{\partial \Omega} = u_i|_{\partial \Omega}$  holds in the sense of the traces. We prove that

$$(13) \quad \Psi(t_i, u_i|^r, u_{i-1}) \leq \Psi(t_i, u_i, u_{i-1})$$

holds for  $r > M_{i-1} + \max_{x \in \Omega} \text{vrai } f(x, t_i) \Delta t_i - \min_{\substack{x \in \bar{\Omega} \\ s \geq \gamma(t_i)}} a_0(t_i, x, s) \Delta t_i$  and hence with respect to the uniqueness of the minimum we have  $u_i|_r \equiv u_i$  which implies the estimate (11). Let us investigate  $r \geq \gamma(t_i)$  such that (13) is true. From (9) we deduce  $\Phi(t_i, u_i|_r) \leq \Phi(t_i, u_i)$  for  $i = 1, \dots, m$ . Using the mean value theorem for integrals we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^1 \int_{\Omega} u_i a_0(t_i, x, \tau u_i) dx d\tau - \int_0^1 \int_{\Omega} u_i|_r a_0(t_i, x, \tau u_i|_r) dx d\tau = \\ & = \int_{\Omega} (u_i - u_i|_r) a_0(t_i, x, u_i|_r + \vartheta_i(x) (u_i - u_i|_r)) dx. \end{aligned}$$

The function  $\vartheta_i(x)$  satisfying  $0 \leq \vartheta_i(x) \leq 1$  can be chosen to be measurable – see [12] (footnote to Lemma 5,1). The inequality (13) is fulfilled provided

$$\begin{aligned} (14) \quad & \int_0^1 \int_{\Omega} u_i|_r a_i(t_i, x, u_i|_r) dx + \frac{1}{2 \Delta t_i} \|u_i|_r - u_{i-1}\|_{L_2}^2 - \int_{\Omega} u_i|_r f(x, t_i) dx \leq \\ & \leq \int_0^1 \int_{\Omega} u_i a_0(t_i, x, u_i) dx + \frac{1}{2 \Delta t_i} \|u_i - u_{i-1}\|_{L_2}^2 - \int_{\Omega} u_i f(x, t_i) dx. \end{aligned}$$

With respect to the above we can write (14) in the form

$$\begin{aligned} (15) \quad & \int_{A_i^r} (u_i - u_i|_r) (u_i + u_i|_r - 2 u_{i-1} - 2 \Delta t_i f(x, t_i) + \\ & + 2 \Delta t_i a_0(t_i, x, u_i|_r + \vartheta_i(x) (u_i - u_i|_r))) dx \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where  $A_i^r \equiv \{x \in \Omega; u_i(x) > r\}$ .

If  $\text{mes } A_i^r = 0$  for  $r = \gamma(t_i)$ , then the estimate (11) is proved. If  $\text{mes } A_i^r > 0$  for  $r \geq \gamma(t_i)$  then we have  $u_i - u_i|_r \geq 0$  and  $u_i + u_i|_r \geq 2r$  on the set  $A_i^r$ . Thus, the inequality (15) holds for

$$(16) \quad r \geq \max_{x \in A_i^r} \text{vrai } u_{i-1} + \Delta t_i \max_{x \in A_i^r} \text{vrai } f(x, t_i) - \min_{\substack{x \in \bar{\Omega} \\ s \geq \gamma(t_i)}} a_0(t_i, x, s) \Delta t_i$$

and hence the estimate (11) is proved under the assumption  $M_{i-1} < \infty$ . In (16) the evident inequality

$$\inf_{x \in A_i^r} a_0(t_i, x, u_i|_r + \vartheta_i(x) (u_i - u_i|_r)) \geq \min_{\substack{x \in \bar{\Omega} \\ s \geq \gamma(t_i)}} a_0(t, x, s)$$

has been used, since  $r \geq \gamma(t_i)$ . From  $\max_{x \in \Omega} u_0(x, 0) = M_0 < \infty$  we obtain that the estimate (11) holds for  $i = 1, \dots, m$ .

Analogously we prove the estimate (12). For this purpose we consider the functions  $u_i|_r$ , where

$$u_i|_r = \begin{cases} u_i(x), & \text{if } u_i(x) \geq r \\ r, & \text{if } u_i(x) < r \end{cases}$$

and  $r \leq \gamma^*(t_i)$ .

For simplicity let us denote

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(\tau) &= \max_{x \in \Omega} \text{vrai } f(x, \tau), & \varphi^*(\tau) &= \min_{x \in \Omega} \text{vrai } f(x, \tau), \\ a_\gamma(\tau) &= \min_{\substack{x \in \bar{\Omega} \\ s \geq \gamma(\tau)}} a_0(\tau, x, s) & \text{and} & \quad a_{\gamma^*}^*(\tau) = \max_{\substack{x \in \bar{\Omega} \\ s \leq \gamma^*(\tau)}} a_0(\tau, x, s), \end{aligned}$$

where  $0 \leq \tau \leq T$ .

The main result is the following generalized maximum principle.

**Theorem 1.** *If the assumptions of Theorem A, (9) and (10) are satisfied, then the estimates*

$$(17) \quad u(x, t) \leq \inf_{\gamma \in S} \max \left\{ \max_{0 \leq \xi \leq t} (\gamma(\xi) + \int_{\xi}^t \varphi(\tau) d\tau - \int_{\xi}^t a_\gamma(\tau) d\tau ; \right. \\ \left. \max_{x \in \bar{\Omega}} u_0(x, 0) + \int_0^t \varphi(\tau) d\tau - \int_0^t a_\gamma(\tau) d\tau \right\},$$

$$(18) \quad u(x, t) \geq \sup_{\gamma^* \in S^*} \min \left\{ \min_{0 \leq \xi \leq t} (\gamma^*(\xi) + \int_{\xi}^t \varphi^*(\tau) d\tau - \int_{\xi}^t a_{\gamma^*}^*(\tau) d\tau ; \right. \\ \left. \min_{x \in \bar{\Omega}} u_0(x, 0) + \int_0^t \varphi^*(\tau) d\tau - \int_0^t a_{\gamma^*}^*(\tau) d\tau \right\}$$

hold for a.e.  $x \in \Omega$ , where  $u(x, t)$  is the weak solution of the problem (1), (2).

*Proof.* Let us consider  $\gamma(t) \in S_0$  and  $\gamma^*(t) \in S_0^*$ . The estimates (11) and (12) in Lemma 1 are recurrent. Using Lemma 1 let us estimate  $\max \text{vrai } u_{i-1}$  in (11). Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \max \text{vrai } u_i &\leq \max \{ \gamma(t_i); \gamma(t_{i-1}) + \varphi(t_i) \Delta t_i - a_\gamma(t_i) \Delta t_i ; \\ &\max \text{vrai } u_{i-2} + \sum_{l=i-1}^i \varphi(t_l) \Delta t_l - \sum_{l=i-1}^i a_\gamma(t_l) \Delta t_l \} \end{aligned}$$



and successively we obtain

$$(19) \quad \max \text{vrai } u_i \leq \max \left\{ \max_{j=1, \dots, i} \left( \gamma(t_j) + \sum_{l=j+1}^i \varphi(t_l) \Delta t_l - \sum_{l=j+1}^i a_\gamma(t_l) \Delta t_l \right); \right. \\ \left. \max_{x \in \bar{\Omega}} u_0(x, 0) + \sum_{l=1}^i \varphi(t_l) \Delta t_l - \sum_{l=1}^i a_\gamma(t_l) \Delta t_l \right\}$$

where  $i = 1, \dots, m$ .

Similarly, using Lemma 1 in the estimate (12) successively we have

$$(20) \quad \min \text{vrai } u_i \geq \min \left\{ \min_{j=1, \dots, i} \left( \gamma^*(t_j) + \sum_{l=j+1}^i \varphi^*(t_l) \Delta t_l - \sum_{l=j+1}^i a_{\gamma^*}^*(t_l) \Delta t_l \right); \right. \\ \left. \min_{x \in \bar{\Omega}} u_0(x, 0) + \sum_{l=1}^i \varphi^*(t_l) \Delta t_l - \sum_{l=1}^i a_{\gamma^*}^*(t_l) \Delta t_l \right\}.$$

In the estimates (19) and (20) a fixed partition  $D$  of the interval  $\langle 0, T \rangle$  is considered. Now, let us consider a sequence  $\{D_n\}$  of partitions  $D_n$  of the interval  $\langle 0, T \rangle$  such that  $v(D_n) \rightarrow 0$  with  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $v(D_n)$  is the norm of  $D_n$ . We suppose that a fixed point  $t_0 \in \langle 0, T \rangle$  is in  $D_n$  for all  $n$ . Let  $\{t_j^n\}_{j=1}^{m_n}$  be the points of the partition  $D_n$  and let  $\{u_j^n\}_{j=1}^{m_n}$  be the weak solutions of (1'), (2') corresponding to the partition  $D_n$ . Let us consider the sequence  $\{u_{r_n}^n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  of the weak solutions  $u_{r_n}^n$  of (1'), (2'), where  $t_{r_n}^n = t_0$  for each  $n$  ( $u_{r_n}^n$  is the weak solution of (1'), (2') on the section  $t = t_0$  with respect to  $D_n$ ).

Owing to Theorem A we have  $u_{r_n}^n \rightarrow u(x, t_0)$  in the norm of the space  $L_2(\Omega)$ , where  $u(x, t_0)$  is the trace of  $u(x, t)$  for  $t = t_0$  (see [1, 8]). Regarding this fact we deduce

$$(21) \quad \max_{x \in \bar{\Omega}} \text{vrai } u(x, t_0) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max_{x \in \bar{\Omega}} \text{vrai } u_{r_n}^n.$$

In the following we prove (17), (18) by the limiting proces in (19) and (20).

Let us denote by  $t_{j_M}^n$  the point in  $D_n$  (next to 0) satisfying

$$(22) \quad \max_{j=1, \dots, r_n} \left( \gamma(t_j^n) + \sum_{l=j+1}^{r_n} \varphi(t_l^n) \Delta t_l^n - \sum_{l=j+1}^{r_n} a_\gamma(t_l^n) \Delta t_l^n \right) = \\ = \gamma(t_{j_M}^n) + \sum_{l=j_M+1}^{r_n} \varphi(t_l^n) \Delta t_l^n - \sum_{l=j_M+1}^{r_n} a_\gamma(t_l^n) \Delta t_l^n.$$

From  $t_{j_M}^n$  it is possible to choose a subsequence (we denote it again by  $\{t_{j_M}^n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ ) such that  $t_{j_M}^n \rightarrow \xi_0 \in \langle 0, T \rangle$  with  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Now, we estimate

$$R_n = \left| \gamma(\xi_0) + \int_{\xi_0}^t \varphi(\tau) d\tau - \int_{\xi_0}^t a_\gamma(\tau) d\tau - (\gamma(t_{j_M}^n) + \right. \\ \left. + \sum_{l=j_M+1}^{r_n} \varphi(t_l^n) \Delta t_l^n - \sum_{l=j_M+1}^{r_n} a_\gamma(t_l^n) \Delta t_l^n \right|.$$

The function  $\varphi(\tau)$  is bounded and measurable in  $\langle 0, T \rangle$ .  $\gamma(t)$  is uniformly continuous in  $\langle 0, T \rangle$ . From (5) and with respect to the definition of the class  $\mathfrak{M}_3$  (the condition I), we find easily that  $a_0(t, x, s) \rightarrow \infty$  for  $s \rightarrow \infty$  and  $a_0(t, x, s) \rightarrow -\infty$  for  $s \rightarrow -\infty$  and hence the function  $a_\gamma(\tau)$  is bounded and continuous in  $\langle 0, T \rangle$ . Hence we conclude  $R_n \rightarrow 0$  with  $n \rightarrow \infty$  which implies

$$(23) \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max \left\{ \max_{j=1, \dots, r_n} (\gamma(t_j^n) + \sum_{l=j+1}^{r_n} \varphi(t_l^n) \Delta t_l^n - \sum_{l=j+1}^{r_n} a_\gamma(t_l^n) \Delta t_l^n); \right. \\ \left. \max_{x \in \bar{\Omega}} u_0(x, 0) + \sum_{l=1}^{r_n} \varphi(t_l^n) \Delta t_l^n - \sum_{l=1}^{r_n} a_\gamma(t_l^n) \Delta t_l^n \right\} \leq \\ \leq \max \left\{ \max_{0 \leq \xi \leq t} (\gamma(\xi) + \int_\xi^t \varphi(\tau) d\tau - \int_\xi^t a_\gamma(\tau) d\tau); \right. \\ \left. \max_{x \in \bar{\Omega}} u_0(x, 0) + \int_0^t \varphi(\tau) d\tau - \int_0^t a_\gamma(\tau) d\tau \right\}.$$

Thus, (21) and (23) imply (17). Analogously, using (20) we prove (18) and the proof is complete.

In the following theorem we prove that the assumption (9) is not substantial in Theorem 1.

**Theorem 2.** *Let the assumptions of Theorem A, (8) and (10) be fulfilled. Then the estimates (17), (18) hold with*

$$\varphi(\tau) = \max_{x \in \Omega} \text{vrai} \left( f(x, \tau) - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\partial a_i(\tau, x, 0)}{\partial x_i} \right), \\ a_\gamma(\tau) = \min_{\substack{x \in \bar{\Omega} \\ s \geq \gamma(\tau)}} (a_0(\tau, x, s) - a_0(\tau, x, 0)), \\ \varphi^*(\tau) = \min_{x \in \Omega} \text{vrai} \left( f(x, \tau) - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\partial a_i(\tau, x, 0)}{\partial x_i} \right), \\ a_{\gamma^*}^*(\tau) = \max_{\substack{x \in \bar{\Omega} \\ s \leq \gamma^*(\tau)}} (a_0(\tau, x, s) - a_0(\tau, x, 0)).$$

**Proof.** The assumptions of Theorem A imply  $\partial a_i(t, x, 0)/\partial x_i \in L_\infty(\Omega)$  for  $i = 1, \dots, N$ . Let us consider the problem (1), (2) with  $a_i^*(t, x, \xi) = a_i(t, x, \xi) - a_i(t, x, 0)$  for  $i = 1, \dots, N$  and  $f^*(x, t) = f(x, t) - \sum_{i=1}^N (\partial a_i(t, x, 0)/\partial x_i)$ .

$a_i^*(t, x, \xi)$ ,  $i = 0, 1, \dots, N$  and  $f^*(x, t)$  satisfy all the conditions of Theorem 1. Indeed, (4) for  $a_i(t, x, \xi)$  yields (9) for  $a_i^*(t, x, \xi)$ . Further, from (5) we deduce

$$(24) \quad \sum_{i=0}^N a_i^*(t, x, \xi) \xi_i \geq C_1 \sum_{i=0}^N \xi_i g_i(\xi_i) - C_2(\varepsilon) \sum_{i=0}^N \xi_i g_i(\xi_i) - C_3(\varepsilon)$$

where  $C_2(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$  with  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ . Indeed, using Young's inequality (see [7], proof of Theorem 7) we obtain

$$\sum_{i=0}^N \zeta_i a_i(t, x, 0) = \sum_{i=0}^N \varepsilon \zeta_i \frac{a_i(t, x, 0)}{\varepsilon} \leq \sum_{i=0}^N \left( G_i(\varepsilon \zeta_i) + P_i \left( \frac{a_i(t, x, 0)}{\varepsilon} \right) \right),$$

where  $G_i(s) = s g_i(s)$  (for sufficiently big  $s$ ) and  $G_i(s) \leq s g_i(s) + C$  for all  $s \in E^1$  with  $C$  independent of  $s$ .  $P_i(s)$  is the conjugate function to  $G_i(s)$  ( $P_i(s) = \max_r |rs - G(r)|$ ). Convexity of  $G_i(s)$  implies  $G_i(\varepsilon s) \leq \varepsilon G_i(s)$  for  $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq 1$  and hence from (24) and (3) (or (3')) we obtain the condition (5) for  $a_i^*(t, x, \xi)$ ,  $i = 0, \dots, N$ . The other conditions of Theorem 1 are evidently fulfilled. By virtue of Green's theorem we find easily that the weak solution  $u(x, t)$  of (1), (2) with  $a_i^*(t, x, \xi)$  and  $f^*(x, t)$  is at the same time the weak solution of (1), (2) with  $a_i(t, x, \xi)$  and  $f(x, t)$  and hence Theorem 2 is a consequence of Theorem 1.

**Remark 1.** Theorem 1 can be formulated in a more general form.

**Theorem 1'.** *Let the assumptions of Theorem A, (9) and (10) be satisfied. Then, for  $t \geq t_1$  we have*

$$(17') \quad u(x, t) \leq \inf_{\gamma \in S_{t_1}} \max \left\{ \max_{t_1 \leq \xi \leq t} \left( \gamma(\xi) + \int_{\xi}^t \varphi(\tau) d\tau - \int_{\xi}^t a_{\gamma}(\tau) d\tau \right); \right. \\ \left. \max_{x \in \Omega} \text{vrai } u(x, t_1) + \int_{t_1}^t \varphi(\tau) d\tau - \int_{t_1}^t a_{\gamma}(\tau) d\tau \right\}$$

and

$$(18') \quad u(x, t) \geq \sup_{\gamma^* \in S_{t_1}^*} \min \left\{ \min_{t_1 \leq \xi \leq t} \left( \gamma^*(\xi) + \int_{\xi}^t \varphi^*(\tau) d\tau - \int_{\xi}^t a_{\gamma^*}^*(\tau) d\tau \right); \right. \\ \left. \min_{x \in \Omega} \text{vrai } u(x, t_1) + \int_{t_1}^t \varphi^*(\tau) d\tau - \int_{t_1}^t a_{\gamma^*}^*(\tau) d\tau \right\}.$$

## 2.

In this section we present some consequences of Theorem 1 (or Theorem 1'). Let us denote  $Q_t = \Omega \times \langle 0, t \rangle$  and  $\Gamma_t = \partial\Omega \times \langle 0, t \rangle \cup \Omega \times \{0\}$ .

For the weak solution of (1), (2), the following maximum principle holds.

**Theorem 3.** *Let the assumptions of Theorem A be satisfied and suppose  $f(x, t) \equiv 0$ ,  $\text{sgn } s = \text{sgn } a_0(t, x, s)$ . If  $0 \leq \max_{Q_T} \text{vrai } u(x, t)$  ( $\min_{Q_T} \text{vrai } u(x, t) \leq 0$ ), then  $\max_{Q_T} \text{vrai } u(x, t) \leq \max_{\Gamma_T} \text{vrai } u(x, t)$  ( $\min_{Q_T} \text{vrai } u(x, t) \geq \min_{\Gamma_T} \text{vrai } u(x, t)$ ).*

**Proof.** Consider the functions  $\gamma(s) = \max_{x \in \partial\Omega} \{0, \max u_0(x, s)\}$  and  $\gamma^*(s) = \min_{x \in \partial\Omega} \{0, \min u_0(x, s)\}$  for  $s \in \langle 0, T \rangle$ . It is clear that  $\gamma \in S_0$  and  $\gamma^* \in S_0^*$ . Owing

to the assumptions we have  $a_\gamma(\tau) \geq 0$  and  $a_{\gamma^*}(\tau) \leq 0$ . Hence due to the estimates (17) and (18) of Theorem 1 we conclude

$$(25) \quad \min \{0; \min_{\Gamma_t} u_0(x, t)\} \leq u(x, t) \leq \max \{0; \max_{\Gamma_t} u_0(x, t)\}$$

a.e. in  $Q_T$ . With regard to the fact that  $u(x, t) = u_0(x, t)$  on  $\Gamma_t$  (in the sense of traces — see [8]) the proof of Theorem 3 is complete.

Formulation of Theorem 3 is analogous to the maximum principle for the smooth solution of linear equations (see [9]): The nonnegative maximum (nonpositive minimum) of  $u(x, t)$  is attained on the boundary  $\Gamma_T$ . A stronger formulation is: The solution  $u(x, t)$  cannot attain its nonnegative maximum (nonpositive minimum) in the interior of the domain  $Q_T$ . Now, we present a strengthened form of Theorem 3.

**Theorem 4.** *Let the assumptions of Theorem 3 be fulfilled. If  $0 < \max_{x \in \partial \Omega} u_0(x, t_0) < \max_{\Gamma_{t_0}} u_0(x, t) < \min_{x \in \partial \Omega} u_0(x, t_0) > \min_{\Gamma_{t_0}} u_0(x, t)$ , then  $\max_{x \in \Omega} \text{vrai } u(x, t_0) < \max_{\Gamma_{t_0}} \text{vrai } u(x, t) < \min_{x \in \Omega} \text{vrai } u(x, t_0) > \min_{\Gamma_{t_0}} \text{vrai } u(x, t)$ , where  $u(x, t_0)$  is the trace of  $u(x, t)$  for  $t = t_0 \in \langle 0, T \rangle$ .*

*Proof.* Let us consider  $\gamma \in S_0$  and  $\gamma^* \in S_0^*$  defined in Theorem 3. It follows from (4) and  $\text{sgn } a_0(t, x, s) = \text{sgn } s$  that  $a_0(t, x, s) > 0$  for  $s > 0$  and also  $a_\gamma(\tau) > 0$  for  $\gamma(\tau) > 0$ . Hence the continuity of  $a_\gamma(\tau)$  in  $\tau$  implies

$$\int_{\xi}^{t_0} a_\gamma(\tau) d\tau > 0 \quad \text{for all } \xi, \quad 0 \leq \xi < t_0.$$

If  $\gamma(t_0) = \max_{0 \leq \xi \leq t_0} \gamma(\xi)$ , then

$$\max_{0 \leq \xi \leq t_0} \left( \gamma(\xi) - \int_{\xi}^{t_0} a_\gamma(\tau) d\tau \right) = \gamma(t_0)$$

and due to the assumption there exists  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that

$$\max \left\{ \gamma(t_0); \max_{\Gamma_{t_0}} u_0(x, 0) - \int_0^{t_0} a_\gamma(\tau) d\tau < \max_{\Gamma_{t_0}} u_0(x, t) - \varepsilon \right.$$

which implies the assertion.

If  $\gamma(t_0) < \max_{0 \leq \xi \leq t_0} \gamma(\xi)$ , then there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that

$$\gamma(\xi) < \max_{0 \leq \xi \leq t_0} \gamma(\xi) - \varepsilon \quad \text{for } t_0 - \delta < \xi \leq t_0,$$

where  $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{1}{2} (\max_{0 \leq \xi \leq t_0} \gamma(\xi) - \gamma(t_0))$ .

Let us denote  $\int_{t_0-\delta}^{t_0} a_\gamma(\tau) d\tau = \delta_1 > 0$ . Then we have

$$\max_{0 \leq \xi \leq t_0} \left( \gamma(\xi) - \int_{\xi}^{t_0} a_\gamma(\tau) d\tau \right) \leq \max_{0 \leq \xi \leq t_0} \gamma(\xi) - \min(\varepsilon, \delta_1) \leq \max_{\Gamma_{t_0}} u_0(x, t) - \min(\varepsilon, \delta_1).$$

Further, we obtain

$$\max u_0(x, 0) - \int_0^{t_0} a_\gamma(\tau) d\tau \leq \max_{\Gamma_{t_0}} u_0(x, t) - \min(\varepsilon, \delta_1).$$

Hence with regard to the previous inequality, Theorem 1 implies Theorem 4.

In the following, using Theorem 1 (or Theorem 1') we shall estimate  $\max_{x \in \Omega} \text{vrai } u(x, t)$  and  $\min_{x \in \Omega} \text{vrai } u(x, t)$  for  $t > 0$ . If we are interested in the estimate of  $u(x, t)$  in a neighbourhood of the point  $t = \infty$ , then we assume that  $u_0(x, t)$ ,  $f(x, t)$  and  $a_i(t, x, \xi)$   $i = 0, 1, \dots, N$  are defined for  $t \in \langle 0, \infty \rangle$  and the assumptions of Theorem 1 are satisfied on every interval  $\langle 0, T \rangle$  ( $T < \infty$ ).

For simplicity we suppose that there exist continuous functions  $a_i(t, y)$   $i = 1, 2$  (in the variables  $t, y$ ) defined for  $t \in \langle 0, T \rangle$  and  $|y| < \infty$  such that

$$(26) \quad a_0(t, x, s) \geq a_1(t, s) \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega \quad \text{and } t \geq 0,$$

$$(26') \quad a_0(t, x, s) \leq a_2(t, s) \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega, \quad t \geq 0.$$

Further we assume

$$(27) \quad \max_{x \in \Omega} \text{vrai } f(x, t) \leq f_1(t),$$

$$(27') \quad \min_{x \in \Omega} \text{vrai } f(x, t) \geq f_2(t)$$

where  $f_1, f_2$  are continuous functions for  $t \in \langle 0, T \rangle$ .

Remark 2. From 4 we deduce that  $a_0(t, x, s)$  is nondecreasing in  $s$  and hence

$$a_\gamma(\tau) = \min_{\substack{x \in \Omega \\ s \geq \gamma(t)}} a_0(t, x, s) = \min_{x \in \bar{\Omega}} a_0(t, x, \gamma(t)) \geq a_1(t, \gamma(t)).$$

Similarly we obtain  $a_{\gamma^*}^*(t) \leq a_2(t, \gamma^*(t))$ .

**Theorem 5.** Let  $u(x, t)$  be a solution of (1), (2) and let the assumptions of Theorem A, (9) and (10) be fulfilled.

i) If (26), (27) hold and if  $\gamma \in S_{t_1}$  is an arbitrary absolutely continuous function in  $\langle t_1, T \rangle$  ( $t_1 < T \leq \infty$ ) satisfying the differential inequality

$$(28) \quad \gamma'(t) \geq f_1(t) - a_1(t, \gamma(t)) \quad \text{for } t_1 \leq t < T \quad \text{with } \gamma(t_1) \geq \max_{x \in \Omega} \text{vrai } u(x, t_1)$$

then  $u(x, t) \leq \gamma(t)$  for a.e.  $x \in \Omega$  and  $t_1 \leq t < T$ .

ii) If (26'), (27') hold and if  $\gamma^* \in S_{t_1}^*$  is an arbitrary absolutely continuous function in  $\langle t_1, T \rangle$  ( $t_1 < T \leq \infty$ ) satisfying the differential inequality

$$(29) \quad \gamma^{*\prime}(t) \leq f_2(t) - a_2(t, \gamma^*(t)) \quad \text{for } t_1 \leq t < T \quad \text{with}$$

$$\gamma^*(t_1) \leq \min_{x \in \Omega} \text{vrai } u(x, t_1),$$

then  $\gamma^*(t) \leq u(x, t)$  for a.e.  $x \in \Omega$ ,  $t_1 \leq t < T$ .

Proof. i) From (26), (27) we obtain

$$\gamma(\xi) + \int_{\xi}^t \varphi(\tau) \, d\tau - \int_{\xi}^t a_{\gamma}(\tau) \, d\tau \leq \gamma(\xi) + \int_{\xi}^t f_1(\tau) \, d\tau - \int_{\xi}^t a_1(\tau, \gamma(\tau)) \, d\tau$$

where  $t_1 \leq \xi \leq t < T$ . The inequality (28) implies

$$\max_{t_1 \leq \xi \leq t} \left( \gamma(\xi) + \int_{\xi}^t f_1(\tau) \, d\tau - \int_{\xi}^t a_1(\tau, \gamma(\tau)) \, d\tau \right) = \gamma(t)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{x \in \Omega} \text{vrai } u(x, t_1) + \int_{t_1}^t f_1(\tau) \, d\tau - \int_{t_1}^t a_{\gamma}(\tau) \, d\tau &\leq \\ &\leq \max_{x \in \Omega} \text{vrai } u(x, t_1) + \int_{t_1}^t \gamma'(\tau) \, d\tau \leq \gamma(t). \end{aligned}$$

Hence due to Theorem 1' we obtain  $u(x, t) \leq \gamma(t)$  for  $t \in \langle t_1, T \rangle$  and a. e.  $x \in \Omega$ .

Assertion ii) can be proved analogously as Assertion i).

**Theorem 6.** Let the assumptions of Theorem A, (9) and (10) be fulfilled.

i) If (26'), (27') are satisfied and if  $\gamma \in S_{t_1}$  is an arbitrary absolutely continuous function in  $\langle t_1, T \rangle$  ( $t_1 < T \leq \infty$ ) satisfying the differential inequality

$$(30) \quad \gamma(t) \leq f_2(t) - a_2(t, \gamma(t)) \quad \text{for } t_1 \leq t < T \quad \text{with}$$

$$\gamma(t_1) \geq \max_{x \in \Omega} \text{vrai } u(x, t_1)$$

then

$$u(x, t) \leq \gamma(t_1) - \int_{t_1}^t a_{\gamma}(s) \, ds + \int_{t_1}^t \varphi(s) \, ds$$

for a.e.  $x \in \Omega$  and  $t_1 \leq t < T$ .

ii) If (26), (27) are satisfied and if  $\gamma^* \in S_{t_1}^*$  is an arbitrary absolutely continuous function in  $\langle t_1, T \rangle$  ( $t_1 < T \leq \infty$ ) satisfying the differential inequality

$$(31) \quad \gamma^{*\prime}(t) \geq f_1(t) - a_1(t, \gamma^*(t)) \quad \text{for } t_1 \leq t < T \quad \text{with} \\ \gamma^*(t_1) \leq \min_{x \in \Omega} \text{vrai } u(x, t_1)$$

then

$$u(x, t) \geq \gamma^*(t_1) - \int_{t_1}^t a_{\gamma^*}^*(s) \, ds + \int_{t_1}^t \varphi^*(s) \, ds$$

for a.e.  $x \in \Omega$  and  $t_1 \leq t < T$ .

Proof. i) From (30) we deduce

$$\max_{t_1 \leq \xi \leq t} \left( \gamma(\xi) + \int_{\xi}^t f_2(\tau) \, d\tau - \int_{\xi}^t a_2(\tau, \gamma(\tau)) \, d\tau \right) = \\ = \gamma(t_1) - \int_{t_1}^t a_2(\tau, \gamma(\tau)) \, d\tau + \int_{t_1}^t f_2(\tau) \, d\tau \leq \gamma(t_1) - \int_{t_1}^t a_{\gamma}(\tau) \, d\tau + \int_{t_1}^t \varphi(\tau) \, d\tau.$$

Hence Assertion i) is a consequence of Theorem 1'. Assertion ii) can be proved analogously as Assertion i).

Remark 3. In general we combine Theorem 5 and Theorem 6 applying then to certain parts of the half line  $t \geq 0$ . The possibility of such a combination follows from Theorem 1'.

Remark 4. Let the assumptions of Theorem 1 be fulfilled. If  $u_0(x, t) \equiv u_0(t)$ ,  $f(x, t) \equiv f(t)$  and  $a_0(t, x, s) = a_0(t, s)$  and if  $u_0(t)$  is a solution of the differential equation

$$y'(t) + a_0(t, y(t)) = f(t), \quad y(0) = u_0(0)$$

then the estimates (17) and (18) imply  $u(x, t) \equiv u_0(t)$ , where  $u(x, t)$  is a solution of (1), (2).

**Theorem 7.** Let the assumptions of Theorem A, (9), (10) and  $\text{sgn } a_0(t, x, s) = \text{sgn } s$  be fulfilled. If

$$|u_0(x, t)| + |f(x, t)| \leq \Phi(t) \quad \text{for } t \geq t_1 \geq 0,$$

where  $\Phi(t)$  is a continuous non-increasing function satisfying  $\Phi(t) \rightarrow 0$  with  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , then

$$\max_{x \in \Omega} \text{vrai } |u(x, t)| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{with } t \rightarrow \infty,$$

where  $u(x, t)$  is the solution of (1), (2).

Proof. From the definition of the class  $\mathfrak{M}_3$  (the condition I) and from 5 we deduce

$$s a_0(t, x, s) \geq \frac{C_1}{2} s g_0(s) \quad \text{for } s \geq s_1 > 0.$$

Let us define the function

$$g_0^*(s) = \inf_{x \in \bar{\Omega}, t \geq 0} a_0(t, x, s) \quad \text{for } 0 \leq s \leq s_1.$$

From (4) it follows (see Remark 4) that  $g_0^*(s)$  is an increasing function. Further, the assumption on  $a_0(t, x, s)$  implies that  $g_0^*(s)$  is continuous for  $0 \leq s \leq s_1$ . Now, we continuously extend the function  $g_0^*(s)$  for  $s \geq s_1$  such that

$$g_0^*(s) \leq \frac{C_1}{2} g_0(s) \quad \text{for } s_1 \leq s \leq s_2,$$

$$g_0^*(s) = \frac{C_1}{2} g_0(s) \quad \text{for } s \geq s_2 \quad \text{and} \quad g_0^*(s)$$

is increasing for  $s \geq 0$ . Let us put

$$g_0^*(s) = -g_0^*(-s) \quad \text{for } s < 0.$$

It is obvious that

$$s a_0(t, x, s) \geq s g_0^*(s) \quad \text{for } s \in E^1.$$

Now, let us consider the differential inequality

$$(32) \quad \gamma'(\xi) + g_0^*(\gamma(\xi)) \geq \Phi(\xi) \quad \text{for } \xi \geq t_1.$$

Owing to the properties of  $\Phi(\xi)$  and  $g_0^*(s)$  we conclude that for each  $K > 0$  there exists a non-increasing function  $0 < \gamma_K(\xi) \in S_{t_1}$  (absolutely continuous, e.g. broken half line) such that  $\gamma_K(t_1) \geq K$ ,  $\gamma_K(\xi) \rightarrow 0$  with  $\xi \rightarrow \infty$  and (32) is satisfied. Now, let us put  $a_1(t, y) = g_0^*(y)$  for  $y \geq 0$ ,  $t > 0$ . (In this case it suffices to consider  $a_1(t, y)$  for  $y \geq 0$ .) In virtue of Theorem 1 we deduce that  $\max \text{vrai} |u(x, t_1)| < \infty$ . Thus, Theorem 5 yields

$$(33) \quad \max \text{vrai} u(x, t) \leq \gamma_{K_0}(t) \quad \text{for } t \geq t_1 \quad \text{and a.e. } x \in \Omega,$$

where  $K_0 \geq \max \text{vrai} u(x, t_1)$ .

Now, let us consider the differential inequality

$$(34) \quad \gamma^{*'}(\xi) + g_0^*(\gamma^*(\xi)) \leq -\Phi(\xi) \quad \text{for } \xi \geq t_1$$

with  $\gamma^*(t_1) \leq -K$ ,  $K > 0$ .



Let us put  $a_2(t, y) = g_0^*(y)$  for  $y \leq 0$ . Similarly as in the preceding, we conclude from the properties of  $g_0^*(s)$  and  $\Phi(s)$  that for each  $K > 0$  there exists  $0 > \gamma_K^*(\xi) \in S^*$  such that (33) is satisfied ( $\gamma_K^*(\xi) = -\gamma_K(\xi)$ , where  $\gamma_K(\xi)$  is from (32)). Let us put  $K_1 = \max_{x \in \Omega} \{0, \max \text{vrai} -u(x, t_1)\}$ . Due to Theorem 5 we obtain

$$(35) \quad \min_{x \in \Omega} \text{vrai} u(x, t) \geq -\gamma_{K_1}(t).$$

The proof now follows from (33) and (35).

In order to estimate the rate of the stabilization  $u(x, t) \rightarrow 0$  for  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , Theorem 5 will be applied.

**Theorem 8.** Let  $u(x, t)$  be a weak solution of (1), (2) and let the assumptions of Theorem A, (9) and (10) be satisfied. Suppose  $\text{sgn} a_0(t, x, s) = \text{sgn} s$  and

$$(36) \quad s a_0(t, x, s) \geq C|s|^\alpha \quad (\alpha > 1) \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0, \quad |s| < \infty \quad \text{and } x \in \Omega.$$

i) Let  $\alpha < 2$ . a) If  $f(x, t) \equiv u_0(x, t) \equiv 0$  for  $t \geq t_1 > 0$ , then there exists  $t_2 \geq t_1$  such that  $u(x, t) \equiv 0$  for  $t \geq t_2$ , where  $t_2$  depends on  $C, \alpha, t_1, u_0$  and  $f$ .

b) If  $\max_{x \in \Omega} \text{vrai} (|u_0(x, t)| + |f(x, t)|) = O(t^{-\beta})$  ( $\beta > 1$ ) then  $\max_{x \in \Omega} \text{vrai} |u(x, t)| = O(t^{-\beta+1})$ .

ii) Let  $\alpha = 2$ . a) If  $\max_{x \in \Omega} \text{vrai} (|u_0(x, t)| + |f(x, t)|) = O(t^{-\beta})$  ( $\beta > 1$ ) then  $\max_{x \in \Omega} \text{vrai} |u(x, t)| = O(t^{-\beta+1})$ .

b) If  $\max_{x \in \Omega} \text{vrai} (|u_0(x, t)| + |f(x, t)|) = O(e^{-\lambda t})$  ( $\lambda > 0$ ) then  $\max_{x \in \Omega} \text{vrai} |u(x, t)| = O(e^{-\delta t})$  where  $0 < \delta < \min(\lambda, C)$  and  $C$  is from (36).

iii) Let  $\alpha > 2$ . If  $\max_{x \in \Omega} \text{vrai} (|u_0(x, t)| + |f(x, t)|) = O(t^{-\beta})$  ( $\beta > 1$ ) then  $\max_{x \in \Omega} \text{vrai} |u(x, t)| = O(t^{-\delta})$  where  $0 < \delta < \min(1/(\alpha - 2), \beta/(\alpha - 1))$ .

*Proof.* i) From (36) we deduce  $a_1(t, s) = Cs^{\alpha-1}$  for  $t \geq 0, s \geq 0$  and  $a_2(t, s) = -C|s|^{\alpha-1}$  for  $t \geq 0, s < 0$ , where  $a_1(t, s), a_2(t, s)$  are from (26). Let  $\gamma(t)$  be a solution of the equation

$$(37) \quad \gamma'(t) = -C\gamma^{\alpha-1}(t) \quad \text{for } t \geq t_1, \quad \gamma(t_1) \geq \max_{x \in \Omega} \text{vrai} |u(x, t_1)|.$$

Since  $\gamma(t) \in S_{t_1}$  and  $-\gamma(t) \in S_{t_1}^*$  (for  $t \geq t_1$ ), we obtain from Theorem 5 that  $\max_{x \in \Omega} \text{vrai} |u(x, t)| \leq \gamma(t)$ . But  $\gamma(t) = 0$  for  $t \geq t_2 = \gamma(t_1)^{2-\alpha}/C(2-\alpha)$  ( $C$  is from (37)) and hence Assertion i), a) is proved.

b) Let us denote by  $\varphi(t)$  a continuous function satisfying

$$\varphi(t) \geq \max_{x \in \Omega} \text{vrai} (|u_0(x, t)| + |f(x, t)|).$$

By virtue of the differential inequality

$$(38) \quad y'(t) \geq -C y^{\alpha-1}(t) + \varphi(t) \quad \text{for } t \geq t_1,$$

where  $y(t_1) = B_1 = \max_{x \in \Omega} \text{vrai } u(x, t_1)$ , we can deduce by an elementary computation that the function

$$\gamma(t) = B_1 e^{-\varepsilon(t-t_2)} \cdot e^{-\varepsilon(t_2-t_1)} + A t^{-(\beta-1)}$$

satisfies  $\gamma(t_1) = B_1$ ,  $\gamma(t) \in S_{t_1}$ ,  $-\gamma(t) \in S_{t_1}^*$  and the differential inequality (38) for sufficiently large  $t_2 \geq t_1$  and sufficiently small  $\varepsilon > 0$ . This fact and Theorem 5 imply Assertion b).

ii) Assertion a) can be proved analogously as Assertion i), b). If  $\varphi(t) = A e^{-\lambda t}$  (for  $t \geq t_1$ ) then in the case b) we deduce easily that the function

$$\gamma(t) = B e^{-\delta(t-t_1)}, \quad \text{where } 0 < \delta < \min(C, \lambda),$$

satisfies (38) for sufficiently big  $B \geq B_1$ . Thus, Theorem 5 implies b).

iii) If  $\varphi(t) = A t^{-\beta}$  ( $\beta > 1$ ) then the function

$$\gamma(t) = B e^{-\varepsilon(t-t_2)} \cdot e^{-\varepsilon(t_2-t_1)} + A t^{-\delta}$$

where  $0 < \delta < \min(1/(\alpha-2), \beta/(\alpha-1))$  is an element of  $S_{t_1}$  and satisfies (38) for sufficiently big  $t_2 \geq t_1$ ,  $B \geq B_1$  and sufficiently small  $\varepsilon < 0$ . Hence, Assertion iii) is a consequence of Theorem 5.

### 3.

The maximum principle can be obtained for the weak solution of a more general class of the equations (1). Let us consider the nonlinear members  $a_i(t, x, u, \partial u/\partial x)$  for  $i = 0, 1, \dots, N$  in the equation (1). We assume that the conditions (3) ((3')), (4), (5), (6) and (9) are fulfilled for  $a_i(t, x, \xi)$  where  $\xi \in E^{N+1}$ ,  $i = 0, \dots, N$  and the sums are supposed to range through  $i = 0, 1, \dots, N$ . (In the condition (6)  $i, j = 0, 1, \dots, N$ .) Moreover, we shall suppose that  $a_0(t, x, u, \partial u/\partial x)$  satisfies

- i)  $s a_0(t, x, s, \eta) \geq 0$  for  $\eta \in E^N$ ,  $s \in E^1$ ,
- ii)  $|a_0(t, x, s, 0)| \leq |a_0(t, x, s, \eta)|$  for  $\eta \in E^N$ .

**Theorem 9.** *Let the assumptions of Theorem A, (9), (10), i) and ii) be satisfied. Then the estimates*

$$u(x, t) \leq \max \left\{ \max_{0 \leq \xi \leq t} (\gamma(\xi)) + \int_{\xi}^t \max_{x \in \Omega} \text{vrai } f(x, \tau) \, d\tau ; \right. \\ \left. \max_{x \in \Omega} u_0(x, 0) + \int_0^t \max_{x \in \Omega} \text{vrai } f(x, \tau) \, d\tau \right\}$$

and

$$u(x, t) \geq \min \left\{ \min_{0 \leq \xi \leq t} \left( \gamma^*(\xi) + \int_{\xi}^t \min_{x \in \Omega} \text{vrai } f(x, \tau) \, d\tau \right); \right. \\ \left. \min_{x \in \Omega} u_0(x, 0) + \int_0^t \min_{x \in \Omega} \text{vrai } f(x, \tau) \, d\tau \right\}$$

hold for the weak solution  $u(x, t)$  of (1), (2), where  $\gamma(\xi) = \max_{x \in \partial\Omega} \{ \max_{x \in \Omega} u_0(x, \xi); 0 \}$  and  $\gamma^*(\xi) = \min_{x \in \partial\Omega} \{ \min_{x \in \Omega} u_0(x, \xi); 0 \}$ .

**Proof.** The method of the proof is the same as for Theorem 1. We put

$$\Phi^*(t, v) = \sum_{i=0}^N \int_0^1 \int_{\Omega} D^i v a_i \left( t, x, \tau v, \tau \frac{\partial v}{\partial x} \right) \, d\tau \, dx$$

for  $v \in W(\Omega)$ . Due to the conditions (9), i) and ii) we obtain

$$\Phi^*(t, v|{}^r) \leq \Phi^*(t, v) \quad \text{for } r \geq 0$$

and

$$\Phi^*(t, v|{}_r) \leq \Phi^*(t, v) \quad \text{for } r \leq 0.$$

Indeed, the condition (4) implies that  $a_0(t, x, s, 0)$  is an increasing function in  $s$  and hence from i) and ii) we conclude

$$\int_0^1 \int_{\Omega} v|{}^r a_0(t, x, \tau v|{}^r, 0) \, d\tau \, dx \leq \int_0^1 \int_{\Omega} v a_0(t, x, \tau v, 0) \, d\tau \, dx \leq \\ \leq \int_0^1 \int_{\Omega} v a_0 \left( t, x, \tau v, \tau \frac{\partial v}{\partial x} \right) \, d\tau \, dx \quad \text{for } r \geq 0.$$

Similarly we prove the other inequality. Further, we put

$$\Psi^*(t_i, v, u_{i-1}) = \Phi^*(t_i, v) + \frac{1}{2\Delta t_i} \|v - u_{i-1}\|_{L_2}^2 + \int_{\Omega} v f(x, t_i) \, dx$$

for  $v \in W(\Omega)$ . Analogously as in Lemma 1 we prove

$$\Psi^*(t_i, u_i, u_{i-1}) \geq \Psi^*(t_i, u_i|{}^r, u_{i-1})$$

for

$$r \geq \max \{ \gamma(t_i); \max_{x \in \Omega} \text{vrai } u_{i-1} + \Delta t_i \max_{x \in \Omega} \text{vrai } f(x, t_i) \}$$

and hence by the same argument as in Theorem 1 we prove Theorem 9.

**Corollary** (maximum principle). *Let the assumptions of Theorem 9 and  $f(x, t) = 0$  be fulfilled. If  $\max_{\Omega_T} \text{vrai } u(x, t) \geq 0$  ( $\min_{\Omega_T} \text{vrai } u(x, t) \leq 0$ ), then (25) takes place for the weak solution  $u(x, t)$  of (1), (2).*

The results obtained can be applied for instance in the following cases.

Examples. 1.

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \left[ l_i(t, x) g_i \left( \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \right) \right] + l_0(t, x) g_0(u) = f(x, t)$$

where  $g_i(s) \in \mathfrak{M}_3$  for  $i = 0, 1, \dots, N$  are increasing functions and  $g_i(s) \in C^2(-\infty, \infty)$ .  $l_i(t, x) \geq C > 0$  and  $\partial l_i(t, x)/\partial t, \partial l_i(t, x)/\partial t^2$  are in  $C(\bar{Q})$  for  $i = 0, \dots, N$ . (The conditions on smoothness of  $l_i(t, x)$  and  $g_i(s)$  are introduced in order that Theorem A might be applied.)

$$2. \quad \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \left[ l_i(t, x) \left( \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \right)^p \right] + a_0(t, x, u) = f(x, t)$$

where  $p = 2k - 1$ , with  $k$  positive integer.

$$3. \quad \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} a_i \left( t, x, \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} \right) + a_0(t, x, u) = f(x, t)$$

where

$$a_i \left( t, x, \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} \right) \equiv l_i(t, x) \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \left( 1 + \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \right)^2 \right)^{m/2-1}$$

$m \geq 2, i = 1, \dots, N$ .

$$4. \quad \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} a_i \left( t, x, u, \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} \right) + a_0 \left( t, x, u, \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} \right) = f(x, t)$$

where

$$a_i \left( t, x, u, \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} \right) = l_i(t, x) \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \left( 1 + u^2 + \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \right)^2 \right)^{m/2-1}$$

for  $i = 0, \dots, N, m \geq 2$ . (For  $i = 0$  we put  $\partial u/\partial x_0 \equiv u$ .)

$$5. \quad \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} - \Delta u + c u |u|^{\alpha-2} = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \subset E^N,$$

$$u(x, 0) = \varphi(x), \quad u|_{\partial\Omega} = 0 \quad \text{for } t \geq 0$$

where  $c > 0, 1 < \alpha < 2$  and  $\varphi(x) \in C_0^2(\Omega)$ . The identity  $u(x, t) \equiv 0$  holds for  $t \geq t_1$  where  $t_1 = (\max_{x \in \Omega} |\varphi(x)|)^{2-\alpha} / c(2-\alpha)$ .

### References

- [1] *J. Kačur*: Method of Rothe and nonlinear parabolic boundary value problems of arbitrary order. (I, II).
- [2] *J. Kačur*: Application of Rothe's method to nonlinear evolution equations, *Mat. Časopis Sloven. Akad. Vied*, 25, (1975), N-1, 63—81.
- [3] *П. П. Мосолов*: Вариационные методы в нестационарных задачах (Параболический случай) *Изв. АН СССР*, 34 (№ 1970), 425—457.
- [4] *K. Rektorys*: On application of direct variational methods to the solution of parabolic boundary value problems of arbitrary order in the space variables. *Czech. Math. Journal*, 21 (96) 1971, 318—339.
- [5] *О. А. Ладыженская*: Решение в целом первой краевой задачи для квазилинейных параболических уравнений, *ДАН СССР* 107, 1956, 635—639.
- [6] *J. Kačur*: On existence of the weak solution for non-linear partial differential equations of elliptic type. I. *Comment. Math. Univ. Carolinae*, 11, 1 (1970), 137—181.
- [7] *J. Kačur*: On existence of the weak solution for non-linear partial differential equations of elliptic type. II. *Comment. Math. Univ. Carolinae*, 13, 2 (1972), 211—225.
- [8] *J. Nečas*: *Les méthodes directes en théorie équations elliptiques*. Prague, 1967.
- [9] *A. Friedman*: *Partial differential equations of parabolic type*, Prentice-Hall, INC, 1964.
- [10] *О. А. Ладыженская, В. А. Солонников, Н. Н. Уральцева*: *Линейные и квазилинейные уравнения параболического типа*. „Наука“, Москва 1967.
- [11] *J. Kačur*: On boundedness of the weak solution for some class of quasilinear partial differential equations. *Časopis Pěst. Mat.*, 98 (1973), 43—55.
- [12] *М. А. Красносельский*: *Топологические методы в теории нелинейных интегральных уравнений*, Москва, 1956.

*Author's address*: 816 31 Bratislava, Mlynská dolina, ČSSR (Přírodovědecká fakulta UK).