

MAMEDOV I.T., GUSEYNOV S.T.

**ON WEAK SOLVABILITY OF THE FIRST BOUNDARY VALUE
PROBLEM FOR SECOND ORDER NON-UNIFORMLY DEGENERATE
PARABOLIC EQUATIONS IN DIVERGENCE FORM**

Abstract

In paper the class of second order divergent parabolic equations with non-uniform power degeneration is considered. Unique weak solvability of the first boundary value problem for such equations in weighted Sobolev spaces is proved.

Let E_n and R_{n+1} be the Euclidean spaces of the points $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and $(x, t) = (x_1, \dots, x_n, t)$ respectively, $\Omega \subset E_n$ be a bounded domain with boundary $\partial\Omega$, $0 \in \Omega$, T_0 and T be positive numbers, Q_T be cylinder $\Omega \times (-T_0, T)$, $S_T = \partial\Omega \times [-T_0, T]$, $Q_0 = \{(x, t) : x \in \Omega, t = -T_0\}$. Consider in Q_T the first boundary value problem

$$\mathcal{L}u = \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} - \sum_{i,j=1}^n \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \left(a_{ij}(x, t) \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_j} \right) = f(x, t), \quad (1)$$

$$u|_{S_T} = 0, \quad u|_{Q_0} = 0, \quad (2)$$

in assumption that $f(x, t) \in L_2(Q_T)$, $\|a_{ij}(x, t)\|$ is a real symmetrical matrix with measurable elements in Q_T , for $(x, t) \in Q_T$ and $\xi \in E_n$ the condition

$$\mu \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i(x, t) \xi_i^2 \leq \sum_{i,j=1}^n a_{ij}(x, t) \xi_i \xi_j \leq \mu^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i(x, t) \xi_i^2 \quad (3)$$

is satisfied.

Here $\mu \in (0, 1]$ is a constant, $\lambda_i(x, t) = (|x|_\alpha + \sqrt{|t|})^{\alpha_i}$,

$$|x|_\alpha = \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i|^{\bar{\alpha}_i}, \quad \bar{\alpha}_i = \frac{2}{2 + \alpha_i}, \quad \alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n), \quad \alpha_i \geq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

The aim of present paper is a proof of unique weak solvability of the boundary value problem (1)-(2). Note that in case of uniformly parabolic equations analogous result is established in [1]. As to parabolic equation with weak logarithmic degeneration we'll indicate the work [2]. Regarding to question of apriori estimation of solutions of degenerate parabolic equations we'll note the works [3-6]. In addition with weak solvability of boundary equations we'll refer the works [7-8]. The more complete review of investigations by theory of boundary value problems for parabolic equations it is possible to find in monographs [1] and [9].

Now we'll note some denotations and definitions.

Let $\alpha^- = \min\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}$, $\alpha^+ = \max\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}$. Denote by $A(Q_T)$ the set of all functions $u(x, t) \in C^\infty(\bar{Q}_T)$, such that for any from them there can be found the domain $\Omega(u)$, $\bar{\Omega}(u) \subset \Omega$ and $\text{supp } u \subset \Omega(u) \times [-T_0, T]$. Let further $\dot{W}_{2,\alpha}^{1,0}(Q_T)$ and $\dot{W}_{2,\alpha}^{1,1}(Q_T)$ be completions of $A(Q_T)$ by norms

$$\|u\|_{\dot{W}_{2,\alpha}^{1,0}(Q_T)} = \left[\operatorname{vrai\,max}_{t \in [-T_0, T]} \int_{\Omega} u^2 dx + \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{Q_T} \lambda_i(x, t) \left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \right)^2 dx dt \right]^{1/2}$$

and

$$\|u\|_{\dot{W}_{2,\alpha}^{1,1}(Q_T)} = \left(\int_{Q_T} \left[u^2 + \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{Q_T} \lambda_i(x, t) \left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} \right)^2 \right] dx dt \right)^{1/2}$$

respectively. Everywhere further we'll keep the denotations $u_i = \frac{\partial u}{\partial t}$, $u_i = \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i}$; $i = 1, \dots, n$.

The function $u(x, t) \in \dot{W}_{2,\alpha}^{1,0}(Q_T)$ is called a weak solution of the boundary value problem (1)-(2), if for any function $\eta(x, t) \in \dot{W}_{2,\alpha}^{1,1}(Q_T)$ and for any $t_1 \in (-T_0, T]$ the integral identity

$$\int_{\Omega} u(x, t_1) \eta(x, t_1) dx - \int_{Q_{t_1}} u \eta_t dx dt + \int_{Q_{t_1}} \sum_{i,j=1}^n a_{ij}(x, t) u_i \eta_j dx dt = \int_{Q_{t_1}} f \eta dx dt, \quad (4)$$

where $Q_{t_1} = \Omega \times (-T_0, t_1)$, is satisfied.

$C(\dots)$ means that the positive constant C depends only on content of brackets.

Lemma. If $\alpha^- < 2$, then for any function $u(x, t) \in \dot{W}_{2,\alpha}^{1,0}(Q_T)$ and for any $t_1 \in (-T_0, T]$ the estimation

$$\int_{Q_{t_1}} u^2 dx dt \leq C_1(\alpha, \Omega) \int_{Q_{t_1}} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i(x, t) u_i^2 dx dt. \quad (5)$$

is true.

Proof. It is sufficient to establish (5) for functions $u(x, t) \in A(Q_T)$. By virtue of boundedness of domain Ω there can be found $R = R(\Omega)$ such that $\bar{\Omega} \subset B_R = \{x : |x_i| < R, i = 1, \dots, n\}$.

Let's fix arbitrary $t' \in (-T_0, t_1)$, extend the function $u(x, t')$ by zero in $B_R \setminus \Omega$ and denote obtained extension again by $u(x, t')$.

Without loss of generality, we can take $\alpha^- = \alpha_1$. Let $(x_2, \dots, x_n) = x'$. We have for $x_1 \in (-R, R)$

$$u(x_1, x', t') = \int_{-R}^{x_1} u_1(\tau, x', t') d\tau \leq \left(\int_{-R}^{x_1} \frac{d\tau}{\lambda_1(\tau, x', t')} \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_{-R}^{x_1} \lambda_1(\tau, x', t') u_1^2(\tau, x', t') d\tau \right)^{1/2}. \quad (6)$$

On the other hand

$$\int_{-R}^{x_1} \frac{d\tau}{\lambda_1(\tau, x', t')} \leq \int_{-R}^R \frac{d\tau}{\left(|\tau|^{\alpha_1} + \sum_{i=2}^n |x_i|^{\alpha_i} + \sqrt{|t'|} \right)^{\alpha_1}} \leq \int_{-R}^R \frac{d\tau}{|\tau|^{\frac{2\alpha_1}{2+\alpha_1}}}.$$

Since $\alpha_1 < 2$, then $\frac{2\alpha_1}{2+\alpha_1} < 1$ and so

$$\int_{-R}^{x_1} \frac{d\tau}{\lambda_1(\tau, x', t')} \leq C_2(\alpha, R). \quad (7)$$

Taking into account (7) in (6) we obtain:

$$u^2(x_1, x', t') \leq C_2 \int_{-R}^R \lambda_1(\tau, x', t') u_1^2(\tau, x', t') d\tau.$$

Integrate the last inequality by B_R and take into account that $u = 0$ in $B_R \setminus \Omega$. We have

$$\int_{\Omega} u^2(x, t') dx \leq 2C_2 R \int_{\Omega} \lambda_1(x, t') u_1^2(x, t') dx \leq 2C_2 R \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i(x, t') u_i^2(x, t') dx. \quad (8)$$

Now it is sufficient to integrate (8) with respect to t' from $-T_0$ to t_1 and we obtain the required estimation (5) with $C_1 = 2C_2 R$.

The lemma is proved.

Theorem. Let relative to coefficients of the operator \mathcal{L} the condition (3) is satisfied. Then, if $\alpha^+ < 2$, then the first boundary value problem (1)-(2) is uniquely weak solvable in the space $\dot{W}_{2,\alpha}^{1,0}(Q_T)$ for any $f(x, t) \in L_2(Q_T)$. Thus for the solution $u(x, t)$ of this problem the estimate

$$\|u\|_{\dot{W}_{2,\alpha}^{1,0}(Q_T)} \leq C_3(\mu, \alpha, \Omega) \|f\|_{L_2(Q_T)} \quad (9)$$

is true.

Proof. Let for natural m Ω_m be extending sequence of domains, approximating domain Ω from within, i.e. $\Omega_m \rightarrow \Omega$ when $m \rightarrow \infty$ and for any m $\partial\Omega_m \in C^2$. Denote $\Omega_m \times (-T_0, T)$, $\partial\Omega_m \times [-T_0, T]$ and $\{(x, t): x \in \Omega_m, t = -T_0\}$ by Q_T^m , S_T^m and Q_0^m , respectively. Let further for natural p and $(x, t) \in Q_T$ $\lambda_i^p(x, t) = \max\{p^{-\alpha_i}, \lambda_i(x, t)\}$; $i = 1, \dots, n$. It is easy to see that for any natural p for functions $\lambda_i(x, t)$ the uniform Hölder condition in Q_T is satisfied. Let $\|a_{ij}^p(x, t)\|$ be symmetrical matrix with measurable elements in Q_T , such that $a_{ij}^p(x, t) \rightarrow a_{ij}(x, t)$ when $p \rightarrow \infty$, almost everywhere in Q_T and for $(x, t) \in Q_T$, $\xi \in \mathbf{E}_n$

$$\mu \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i^p(x, t) \xi_i^2 \leq \sum_{i,j=1}^n a_{ij}^p(x, t) \xi_i \xi_j \leq \mu^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i^p(x, t) \xi_i^2. \quad (10)$$

Finally for fixed p and natural k $a_{ij}^{p,k}(x, t)$ and $f^k(x, t)$ be averages by Friedrichs with parameter $\frac{1}{k}$ of the functions $a_{ij}^p(x, t)$ and $f(x, t)$ respectively ($i, j = 1, \dots, n$). We assume that the function $a_{ij}^p(x, t)$ is extended in \mathbf{R}_{n+1} with preservation of condition (10) (for example, $a_{ij}^p(x, t) = \delta_{ij} \lambda_i^p(x, t)$ for $(x, t) \in \mathbf{R}_{n+1} \setminus Q_T$; $i, j = 1, \dots, n$, where δ_{ij} is Cronecker's symbol) and the function $f(x, t)$ is extended by zero in $\mathbf{R}_{n+1} \setminus Q_T$. It is easy to see that according to (10) for $(x, t) \in Q_T$, $\xi \in \mathbf{E}_n$

$$\mu \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i^p(x, t) \xi_i^2 \leq \sum_{i,j=1}^n a_{ij}^{p,k}(x, t) \xi_i \xi_j \leq \mu^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i^p(x, t) \xi_i^2. \quad (11)$$

Let

$$\mathcal{L}^{p,k} = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} - \sum_{i,j=1}^n \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \left(a_{ij}^{p,k}(x, t) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \right).$$

Let's fix arbitrary natural p and k and for natural m consider the sequence of the auxiliary boundary value problems

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \Delta^{p,k} u^{p,k,m} &= f^k; \quad (x,t) \in Q_T^m, \\ u^{p,k,m}|_{S_T^m} &= 0, \quad u^{p,k,m}|_{Q_0^m} = 0. \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (12)$$

It is clear that for any fixed natural p, k and m the boundary value problem (12) has the unique classical solution $u^{p,k,m}(x,t) \in C^{2,1}(\overline{Q_T^m})$. Then for any function $\vartheta(x,t) \in C^{2,1}(\overline{Q_T^m})$, vanishing on $S_T^m \cup Q_0^m$ the equality

$$\int_{Q_T^m} u_i^{p,k,m} \vartheta \, dxdt + \int_{Q_T^m} \sum_{i,j=1}^n a_{ij}^{p,k}(x,t) u_i^{p,k,m} \vartheta_j \, dxdt = \int_{Q_T^m} f^k \vartheta \, dxdt \quad (13)$$

is true.

Put in (13) $\vartheta(x,t) = u^{p,k,m}(x,t)$. We obtain

$$\int_{Q_T^m} u_i^{p,k,m} u^{p,k,m} \, dxdt + \int_{Q_T^m} \sum_{i,j=1}^n a_{ij}^{p,k}(x,t) u_i^{p,k,m} u_j^{p,k,m} \, dxdt = \int_{Q_T^m} f^k u^{p,k,m} \, dxdt. \quad (14)$$

From (14) and condition (11) follows that

$$\mu \int_{Q_T^m} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i^p(x,t) (u_i^{p,k,m})^2 \, dxdt \leq \int_{Q_T^m} f^k u^{p,k,m} \, dxdt.$$

Since for any natural p $\lambda_i(x,t) \leq \lambda_i^p(x,t)$, $i=1, \dots, n$, then from the last inequality we obtain that

$$\int_{Q_T^m} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i(x,t) (u_i^{p,k,m})^2 \, dxdt \leq \frac{1}{\mu} \int_{Q_T^m} f^k u^{p,k,m} \, dxdt. \quad (15)$$

For any $\beta > 0$ from (15) with regard to lemma we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{Q_T^m} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i(x,t) (u_i^{p,k,m})^2 \, dxdt &\leq \frac{\beta}{2\mu} \int_{Q_T^m} (u^{p,k,m})^2 \, dxdt + \frac{1}{2\beta\mu} \int_{Q_T^m} (f^k)^2 \, dxdt \leq \\ &\leq \frac{C_1\beta}{2\mu} \int_{Q_T^m} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i(x,t) (u_i^{p,k,m})^2 \, dxdt + \frac{1}{2\beta\mu} \int_{Q_T^m} (f^k)^2 \, dxdt. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Put now in (16) $\beta = \frac{\mu}{C_1}$. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{Q_T^m} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i(x,t) (u_i^{p,k,m})^2 \, dxdt &\leq \frac{C_1}{\mu^2} \int_{Q_T^m} (f^k)^2 \, dxdt \leq \frac{C_1}{\mu^2} \int_{Q_T} (f^k)^2 \, dxdt \leq \\ &\leq \frac{2C_1}{\mu^2} \int_{Q_T} f^2 \, dxdt + \frac{2C_1}{\mu^2} \int_{Q_T} (f^k - f)^2 \, dxdt. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

In the beginning suppose that the function $f(x,t)$ doesn't coincide with identical zero a.e. in Q_T . Then from (17) follows existence of natural $k_0 = k_0(f)$ such that for $k \geq k_0$ and any natural p and m the estimate

$$\int_{Q_T^m} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i(x,t) (u_i^{p,k,m})^2 \, dxdt \leq \frac{4C_1}{\mu^2} \int_{Q_T} f^2 \, dxdt \quad (18)$$

holds.

Let's fix an arbitrary $t_1 \in (-T_0, T]$ and let $Q_{t_1}^m = \Omega_m \times (-T_0, t_1)$. It is easy to see that the equality (4) is true in cylinder $Q_{t_1}^m$, too. Then from (14) and (18) with regard to lemma we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_m} (u^{p,k,m}(x, t_1))^2 dx &\leq \int_{Q_{t_1}^m} f^k u^{p,k,m} dx dt \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{Q_{t_1}^m} [(f^k)^2 + (u^{p,k,m})^2] dx dt \leq \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{Q_{t_1}^m} (f^k)^2 dx dt + \frac{C_1}{2} \int_{Q_{t_1}^m} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i(x, t) (u_i^{p,k,m})^2 dx dt \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{Q_T} (f^k)^2 dx dt + \\ &+ \frac{2C_1^2}{\mu^2} \int_{Q_T} f^2 dx dt \leq \int_{Q_T} (f^k - f)^2 dx dt + \left(\frac{2C_1^2}{\mu^2} + 1 \right) \int_{Q_T} f^2 dx dt \leq \left(\frac{2C_1^2}{\mu^2} + 1 \right) \int_{Q_T} f^2 dx dt \quad (19) \end{aligned}$$

if only $k \geq k_0$. From (18)-(19) follows that

$$\|u^{p,k,m}\|_{W_{2,\alpha}^{1,0}(Q_T^m)} \leq C_3 \|f\|_{L_2(Q_T)}, \quad (20)$$

where $C_3 = \left(\frac{4C_1}{\mu^2} + \frac{4C_1^2}{\mu^2} + 4 \right)^{1/2}$. Note that if $f(x, t) = 0$ a.e. in Q_T , then $u^{p,k,m}(x, t) \equiv 0$ in Q_T^m and the inequality (20) is fulfilled obviously. We extend the function $u^{p,k,m}(x, t)$ by zero in $Q_T \setminus Q_T^m$ and denote the extended function again by $u^{p,k,m}(x, t)$. It is clear that $u^{p,k,m}(x, t) \in \dot{W}_{2,\alpha}^{1,0}(Q_T)$, and from (20) it follows that

$$\|u^{p,k,m}\|_{\dot{W}_{2,\alpha}^{1,0}(Q_T)} \leq C_3 \|f\|_{L_2(Q_T)}. \quad (21)$$

Let's fix arbitrary natural p and $k \geq k_0$. Then from (21) follows weak compactness of the sequence $\{u^{p,k,m}(x, t)\}$ by m . In other words there exist a subsequence of natural numbers $m_s \rightarrow \infty$ when $s \rightarrow \infty$ and the function $z^{p,k}(x, t) \in \dot{W}_{2,\alpha}^{1,0}(Q_T)$ such that $u^{p,k,m_s}(x, t) \rightarrow z^{p,k}(x, t)$ when $s \rightarrow \infty$ weakly in $\dot{W}_{2,\alpha}^{1,0}(Q_T)$.

It is easy to see that the function $z^{p,k}(x, t)$ is a weak solution of the first boundary value problem

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \Delta^{p,k} z^{p,k} &= f^k; \quad (x, t) \in Q_T, \\ z^{p,k}|_{S_T} &= 0, \quad z^{p,k}|_{Q_0} = 0. \end{aligned} \right\}$$

In addition according to (21)

$$\|z^{p,k}\|_{\dot{W}_{2,\alpha}^{1,0}(Q_T)} \leq C_3 \|f\|_{L_2(Q_T)}. \quad (22)$$

Let now p be arbitrary fixed natural number, and $k \geq k_0$ be any natural number. From the estimation (2) we conclude existence of subsequence of natural numbers $k_s \rightarrow \infty$ when $s \rightarrow \infty$ and the function $w^p(x, t) \in \dot{W}_{2,\alpha}^{1,0}(Q_T)$ such that $z^{p,k_s}(x, t) \rightarrow w^p(x, t)$ when $s \rightarrow \infty$ weakly in $\dot{W}_{2,\alpha}^{1,0}(Q_T)$. In addition the function $w^p(x, t)$ is a weak solution of the first boundary value problem

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}^p w^p &= f; \quad (x, t) \in Q_T, \\ w^p|_{S_T} &= 0, \quad w^p|_{Q_0} = 0, \end{aligned} \right\}$$

where $\mathcal{L}^p = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} - \sum_{i,j=1}^n \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \left(a_{ij}^p(x, t) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \right)$. Besides

$$\|w^p\|_{\dot{W}_{2,\alpha}^{1,0}(Q_T)} \leq C_3 \|f\|_{L_2(Q_T)}. \quad (23)$$

Now from (23) follows existence of sequence of natural numbers $p_s \rightarrow \infty$ for $s \rightarrow \infty$ and the function $u(x, t) \in \dot{W}_{2,\alpha}^{1,0}(Q_T)$ such that $w^{p_s}(x, t) \rightarrow u(x, t)$ when $s \rightarrow \infty$ weakly in $\dot{W}_{2,\alpha}^{1,0}(Q_T)$. In addition according to (23)

$$\|u\|_{\dot{W}_{2,\alpha}^{1,0}(Q_T)} \leq C_3 \|f\|_{L_2(Q_T)}. \quad (24)$$

Prove that the function $u(x, t)$ is a weak solution of the first boundary value problem (1)-

(2). For any function $\eta(x, t) \in \dot{W}_{2,\alpha}^{1,1}(Q_T)$ for any $t_1 \in (-T_0, T]$ we have

$$\int_{\Omega} w^{p_s}(x, t_1) \eta(x, t_1) dx - \int_{Q_{t_1}} w^{p_s} \eta_t dx dt + \int_{Q_{t_1}} \sum_{i,j=1}^n a_{ij}^{p_s}(x, t) w_i^{p_s} \eta_j dx dt = \int_{Q_{t_1}} f \eta dx dt.$$

It is clear that

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} w^{p_s}(x, t_1) \eta(x, t_1) dx = \int_{\Omega} u(x, t_1) \eta(x, t_1) dx; \quad \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \int_{Q_{t_1}} w^{p_s} \eta_t dx dt = \int_{Q_{t_1}} u \eta_t dx dt.$$

Therefore for proof of required fact it is sufficient to show that

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \int_{Q_{t_1}} \sum_{i,j=1}^n a_{ij}^{p_s}(x, t) w_i^{p_s} \eta_j dx dt = \int_{Q_{t_1}} \sum_{i,j=1}^n a_{ij}(x, t) u_i \eta_j dx dt. \quad (25)$$

But

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{Q_{t_1}} \sum_{i,j=1}^n a_{ij}^{p_s}(x, t) w_i^{p_s} \eta_j dx dt &= \int_{Q_{t_1}} \sum_{i,j=1}^n a_{ij}(x, t) w_i^{p_s} \eta_j dx dt + \int_{Q_{t_1}} \sum_{i,j=1}^n [a_{ij}^{p_s}(x, t) - a_{ij}(x, t)] \times \\ &\times w_i^{p_s} \eta_j dx dt = I_1^s + I_2^s. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

It is easy to see that

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} I_1^s = \int_{Q_{t_1}} \sum_{i,j=1}^n a_{ij}(x, t) u_i \eta_j dx dt. \quad (27)$$

Thus according to (25)-(27) we needed to prove that

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} I_2^s = 0. \quad (28)$$

We show the correctness (28) for functions $\eta(x, t) \in A(Q_T)$. We have with regard to (29)

$$\begin{aligned} |I_2^s| &\leq C_4(n) \left(\int_{Q_{t_1}} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i(x, t) (w_i^{p_s})^2 dx dt \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_{Q_{t_1}} \sum_{i,j=1}^n \lambda_i^{-1}(x, t) |a_{ij}^{p_s}(x, t) - a_{ij}(x, t)|^2 (\eta_j)^2 dx dt \right)^{1/2} \leq \\ &\leq C_5(n) C_3 \|f\|_{L_2(Q_T)} \left(\int_{Q_{t_1}} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i^{-q}(x, t) dx dt \right)^{1/2q} \left(\int_{Q_{t_1}} \sum_{i,j=1}^n |a_{ij}^{p_s}(x, t) - a_{ij}(x, t)|^{2q'} |\eta_j|^{2q'} dx dt \right)^{1/2q'}, \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

where the number $q > 1$ will be chosen later, and $q' = \frac{q}{q-1}$. On the other side for $i = 1, \dots, n$

$$\int_{Q_T} \lambda_i^{-q}(x, t) dx dt \leq (t_1 + T_0)(2R)^{n-1} \int_{-R}^R \frac{d\tau}{|\tau|^{\frac{2\alpha_i q}{2+\alpha_i}}}, \quad (30)$$

where R has the same meaning as in proof of lemma. Since $\alpha^+ < 2$, then for $i = 1, \dots, n$ $\frac{2\alpha_i}{2+\alpha_i} < 1$. Therefore for any $i = 1, \dots, n$ there exists $q_i > 1$ such that $\frac{2\alpha_i q_i}{2+\alpha_i} < 1$. Let's fix $q = \min\{q_1, \dots, q_n\}$. Now it is sufficient to consider that for $i, j = 1, \dots, n$ $a_{ij}(x, t) \rightarrow a_{ij}(x, t)$, when $s \rightarrow \infty$ a.e. in Q_T , and from (29)-(30) follows the required limit equality (28). The existence of weak solution of the first boundary value problem (1)-(2) is proved.

Let $u^{(1)}(x, t)$ and $u^{(2)}(x, t)$ be two solutions of the boundary value problem (1)-(2), $u(x, t) = u^{(1)}(x, t) - u^{(2)}(x, t)$. Then for any function $\eta(x, t) \in \dot{W}_{2,\alpha}^{1,0}(Q_T)$ vanishing at $t = T$ (look [1]) the equality

$$-\int_{Q_T} u \eta_i dx dt + \int_{Q_T} \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}(x, t) u_i \eta_j dx dt = 0 \quad (31)$$

is hold.

Let's fix an arbitrary $\delta \in (0, T_0 + T)$ and assume that the function $\eta(x, t) \in \dot{W}_{2,\alpha}^{1,0}(Q_T)$ vanishes at $t \leq -T_0$ and $t \geq T - \delta$. Denote for $h \in (0, \delta]$ $\frac{1}{h} \int_{t-h}^t \eta(x, \tau) d\tau$ by $\eta_h(x, t)$ and substitute in (31) the function $\eta_h(x, t)$ instead of $\eta(x, t)$. We obtain

$$-\int_{Q_T} u(\eta_h)_i dx dt + \int_{Q_T} \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}(x, t) u_i (\eta_h)_j dx dt = 0. \quad (32)$$

Taking in to account that

$$(\eta_h)_i = (\eta_i)_h, \quad (\eta_h)_j = (\eta_j)_h; \quad j = 1, \dots, n$$

and the equalities

$$\begin{aligned} -\int_{Q_T} u(\eta_i)_h dx dt &= -\int_{Q_{T-\delta}} u_i \eta_i dx dt = -\int_{Q_{T-\delta}} (u_i)_h \eta_i dx dt, \\ \int_{Q_T} \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}(x, t) u_i (\eta_j)_h dx dt &= \int_{Q_{T-\delta}} \sum_{j=1}^n (a_{ij}(x, t) u_i)_h \eta_j dx dt, \end{aligned}$$

from (32) we conclude

$$\int_{Q_{T-\delta}} (u_i)_h \eta_i dx dt + \int_{Q_{T-\delta}} \sum_{j=1}^n (a_{ij}(x, t) u_i)_h \eta_j dx dt = 0. \quad (33)$$

Here $u_h(x, t) = \frac{1}{h} \int_{t-h}^{t+h} u(x, \tau) d\tau$.

It is easy to see that the equality (33) indeed is true for any function $\eta(x, t) \in \dot{W}_{2,\alpha}^{1,0}(Q_{T-\delta})$ ([1]). Therefore, assuming in (33) $\eta(x, t) = u_h(x, t)$ and tending h to zero, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} u^2(x, T - \delta) dx + \int_{Q_{T-\delta}} \sum_{i,j=1}^n a_{ij}(x, t) u_i u_j dx dt = 0.$$

According to the condition (3) from the last equality follows that

$$\int_{\Omega} u^2(x, T - \delta) dx = 0.$$

Now consider arbitrariness of δ in the interval $(0, T_0 + T)$. We obtain

$$\int_{Q_1} u^2(x, t) dx dt = 0,$$

i.e. $u(x, t) = 0$ a.e. in Q_T . The uniqueness of the solution of the problem (1)-(2) is proved. Now the estimation (9) follows from the inequality (24).

References

- [1]. Ладыженская О.А., Солонников В.А., Уралцева Н.Н. *Линейные и квазилинейные уравнения параболического типа*. М., «Наука», 1967, 736с.
- [2]. Джабилов К.А. *Первая краевая задачи для неравномерно вырождающихся дивергентных эллиптических и параболических уравнений 2-го порядка*. Канд. дисс., Баку, 1987, 126с.
- [3]. Скрыпник И.И. *Регулярность решений вырождающихся квазилинейных параболических уравнений (весовой случай)*. Укр. мат. журнал, 1996, т. 48, №7, с.972-988.
- [4]. Nobutoshi I., Yasumaro K. *The Dirichlet problem for a certain degenerate parabolic equation*. J. Fac. Sci. Shinshu Univ., 1997, v.32, №1, p.1-13.
- [5]. Brown R.M., Hu Wei, Lieberman G.M. *Weak solutions of parabolic equations on non-cylindrical domains*. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 1997, v.125, №6, p.1785-1792.
- [6]. Fabricant A., Marinov M., Rangelov Ts. *Some properties of nonlinear degenerate parabolic equations*. Math. Balkan., 1994, v.8, №1, p.59-73.
- [7]. Fernandes J.C., Franchi B. *Existence and properties of the Green function for a class of degenerate parabolic equations*. Rev. Mat. Iberoamer., 1996, v. 12, №2, p.491-525.
- [8]. Терсенов А.С. *Об одном классе вырождающихся неравномерно параболических уравнений*. Вестн. МГУ, сер.1, 1996, №6, с.94-97.
- [9]. Крылов Н.В. *Нелинейные эллиптические и параболические уравнения второго порядка*. М., «Наука», 1985, 376с.

Mamedov I.T., Guseynov S.T.

Institute of Mathematics & Mechanics AS of Azerbaijan Republic,
9, F. Agayev str., 370141, Baku, Azerbaijan.
Tel.: 39-39-27 (off.).

Received June 15, 2000; Revised September 25, 2000.

Translated by Mirzoyeva K.S.