

Jozef Takács  
Positivity theorem

*Acta Mathematica et Informatica Universitatis Ostraviensis*, Vol. 3 (1995), No. 1, 67--(70)

Persistent URL: <http://dml.cz/dmlcz/120496>

**Terms of use:**

© University of Ostrava, 1995

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



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

## Positivity Theorem

JOZEF TAKÁCS

**Abstract.** In this paper we show the positivity of the solution of continuity equation of Navier-Stokes system, with boundary conditions considered in [1]. From this result it follows the uniqueness of these solution. This enables us to simplify the solving of whole nonlinear Navier-Stokes system of equations, also in weak formulation (cf. [2]).

**1991 Mathematics Subject Classification:** 35

We suppose that  $\Omega$  is a domain in  $\mathbf{R}^N$ , whose boundary fulfils the Lipschitz condition, where  $N$  is a positive integer and  $\partial\Omega = \Gamma^+ + \Gamma^-$ . In this paper, we will use the terms "integral", "measurable" and "measure" instead of "Lebesgue integral", "Lebesgue measurable" and "complete measure".

Let  $T$  is a positive real number. We define function  $\gamma$  by conditions

$$\gamma = \begin{cases} \gamma^+ & (t, x) \in [0; T] \times \Gamma^- \\ \gamma^- & (t, x) \in [0; T] \times \Gamma^+ \end{cases}$$

where

$$\vec{u} \cdot \vec{n} = \gamma \quad \text{in} \quad [0; T] \times \partial\Omega$$

The function  $\gamma$  meets the condition:

$$\begin{cases} \gamma^+ & \text{is a nonnegative function} \\ \gamma^- & \text{is a nonpositive function} \end{cases}$$

We consider an equation

$$\frac{d\varrho(t)(x)}{dt} + \operatorname{div} \varrho \vec{u}(t)(x) = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad [0; t] \times \Omega \quad (\text{B3})$$

with the initial condition

$$\varrho(0) = \varrho^0 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega \quad (\text{B3})$$

and with the boundary condition

$$\varrho(t)(x) = \varrho^1(t)(x) \quad \text{in} \quad [0; t] \times \Gamma^+. \quad (\text{B3})$$

We suppose, that the solution of the problem (1), (2), (3) is a continuous function on the set  $[0; T] \times \Omega^*$ .

In the following we define the solution on the corresponding space:

---

\*Sufficient condition of continuity is:  $\varrho \in C([0; T], W_p^1(\Omega))$ , for  $p > N$ .

Definition. An abstract function  $g \in C([0;T],X) \times C^n((0;T; X^1))$  we call the solution of the problem (1), (2), (3) if and only if, when the following conditions hold:

1. The condition (1) holds in  $X^1$  for all  $t \in (0;T)$ .
2. The equation (2) holds in  $X$ .
3. For all  $t \in [0;T]$  and a. e.  $z \in T^+$  (3) holds.

For all fixed  $t \in [0; T]$  we define the set

$$O^-(t) = \{x \in X; g(t)(x) < 0\}.$$

**Lemma 1.** Let  $g$  be a solution of the problem (1), (2), (3). Then

$$\int_{O^-(t)} g(t)(x) dx > 0 \quad (B3)$$

for all  $t \in [0;T]$ .

PROOF: After integrating equation (1) on the set  $O^-(t)$ , we get

$$\int_{O^-(t)} -g(t)(x) dx + \int_{O^-(t)} (g(\dot{U}-n))(t)(x) dx = 0. \quad (B3)$$

But  $an^-(t) = (r^+) \int_{O^-(t)} g(t)(x) dx + (r^-) \int_{O^-(t)} g(t)(x) dx + (ii) \int_{O^-(t)} g(t)(x) dx$ . From conditions for  $7$  a  $\mathbb{R}^x$  the integrál over the first and the second domain is nonpositive and the integrál over the third domain is a zero.

The proof is complete.  $\bullet$

**Lemma 2.** For sufficiently small  $h$  and for all  $t \in (0; T)$  it holds:

$$\int_{O^-(t)} g(t+h)(x) dx - \int_{O^-(t)} g(t)(x) dx > 0$$

PROOF: The proof follows from the inequality

$$0 < \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{O^-(t)} [I^{(\wedge + A)}(x) - I^{(\wedge)}(x)] dx$$

We define function  $m$  as follows

$$m^*(t) = \int_{O^-(t)} g^*(t)(x) dx$$

for  $t \in [0; T]$ .

**Lemma 3.** *The function  $m^-$  is non-decreasing on the interval  $[0; T]$ .*

PROOF: Let  $h$  is negative and sufficiently small. We have

$$\begin{aligned} m^-(t+h) - m^-(t) &= \int_{\Omega^-(t+h)} \varrho(t+h)(x)dx - \int_{\Omega^-(t)} \varrho(t+h)(x)dx + \\ &\quad + \int_{\Omega^-(t)} \{\varrho(t+h)(x)dx - \varrho(t)(x)\}dx. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B3})$$

From the previous lemma we have

$$m^-(t+h) - m^-(t) \leq \int_{\Omega^-(t+h)} \varrho(t+h)(x)dx - \int_{\Omega^-(t)} \varrho(t+h)(x)dx.$$

Thus

$$m^-(t+h) - m^-(t) \leq \int_{\Omega^-(t+h) \setminus \Omega^-(t)} \varrho(t+h)(x)dx - \int_{\Omega^-(t) \setminus \Omega^-(t+h)} \varrho(t+h)(x)dx.$$

With respect to the definition of  $\Omega^-(t)$  we have

$$\int_{\Omega^-(t) \setminus \Omega^-(t+h)} \varrho(t+h)(x)dx \geq 0,$$

$$\int_{\Omega^-(t+h) \setminus \Omega^-(t)} \varrho(t+h)(x)dx \leq 0,$$

i. e.  $m^-(t+h) - m^-(t) \leq 0$ .

The proof is complete.  $\square$

**Theorem.** *Let for every  $t \in [0; T]$  and a. e.  $x \in \Omega$ ,  $\varrho^1(t)(x) \geq 0$  and  $\varrho^0(x) \geq 0$  holds. If  $\varrho$  is a solution of the problem (1), (2), (3), then for every  $t \in [0; T]$  and a. e.  $x \in \Omega$  is  $\varrho(t)(x) \geq 0$*

PROOF: From the previous lemma  $m^-$  is non-decreasing. It is a contradiction to  $m^-(0) = 0$  and to the fact, that  $m^-$  is negative.  $\square$

**Remark 1.** *It is easy to see from the proof, that the same results we can obtain for the next two cases:*

1. *If we consider the inequality  $\geq$  instead of equality in (1).*
2. *If we assume that the right side of (1) is nonnegative instead of zero.*

**Remark 2.** *If we assume everywhere the opposite inequality, then in the proposition of the theorem we obtain the opposite inequalities.*

**Corollary** (Uniqueness theorem). *If the problem (1), (2), (3) has a continuous solution, then it is uniquely defined.*

PROOF: By the contradiction. Let  $\varrho_1, \varrho_2$  be two different solutions of the considered problem and let  $\varrho = \varrho_1 - \varrho_2 \neq 0$ . Then  $\varrho$  is the solution of the homogeneous problem. According to the remarks,  $\varrho$  is simultaneous nonpositive and nonnegative. Therefore it is zero. This is the contradiction.  $\square$

## References

- [1] Antoncev, S. N., Kazhikhov, A. V., Monakhov, V. N., *Boundary Value Problems in Nonhomogeneous Fluid Mechanics (in russian)*, Nauka, Novosibirsk, 1983.
- [2] Fučík, S., Kufner, A., *Nonlinear Differential Equations*, Elsevier Scientific Publishing Company, Amsterdam–Oxford–New York, 1980.

*Address:* Jozef Takács, Department of Mathematics of Electrotechnical and Informatics Faculty, Technical University, 040 00 Košice, Slovak Republic  
`busaj@ccsun.tuke.sk`