Asymptotic Behavior of Solutions of Parabolic Equations

AVNER FRIEDMAN*

Communicated by E. Hopf

Introduction. Consider the parabolic equation

$$(1) \quad Lu \equiv \sum_{i,j=1}^n a_{ij}(x, t) \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} + \sum_{i=1}^n b_i(x, t) \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} + c(x, t)u - \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = f(x, t)$$

in a cylinder D with a bounded n -dimensional base B ($D = \{(x, t); x \in B, t > 0\}$). Let $u(x, t)$ be a solution of (1) in D with the boundary condition

$$(2) \quad u(x, t) = h(x, t) \quad \text{for } x \in \dot{B}, \quad t > 0 \quad (\dot{B} = \text{boundary of } B).$$

It was proved in [1; Theorem 2], under very simple assumptions on L and D , that if h, f and the coefficients a_{ij}, b_i, c of L tend to limits $h^0, f^0, a_{ij}^0, b_i^0, c^0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, then $u(x, t)$ tends to a limit $u^0(x)$ which satisfies the elliptic equation

$$(3) \quad \sum a_{ij}^0(x) \frac{\partial^2 u^0(x)}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} + \sum b_i^0(x) \frac{\partial u^0(x)}{\partial x_i} + c^0(x)u^0(x) = f^0(x) \quad (x \in B)$$

and the boundary condition

$$(4) \quad u^0(x) = h^0(x) \quad (x \in \dot{B}).$$

The purpose of this paper is to use the above theorem in order to get precise information about the asymptotic behavior of the solutions $u(x, t)$, provided that precise information about the asymptotic behavior of f, h and the coefficients of L is given. Although the considerations in this paper are quite simple, the results obtained here on the asymptotic behavior of the solutions might serve as a quite useful tool in practical calculations.

This paper should be considered as a continuation of [1], and in what follows we shall make free use of the results and notations which appear in [1; Part I]. It is only because [1] is already in the process of being printed that this paper appears separately.

* Prepared under ONR Contract Nonr-222(37) (NR 041 157) with the University of California in Berkeley.

1. Statement of the theorem. In addition to the assumptions made in [1; Theorem 2] we shall need the following assumptions:

(C_m) The coefficients of L satisfy (uniformly in $x \in \bar{B}$, as $t \rightarrow \infty$)

$$a_{ii}(x, t) = a_{ii}^0(x) + \frac{1}{t} a_{ii}^1(x) + \cdots + \frac{1}{t^m} a_{ii}^m(x) + o\left(\frac{1}{t^m}\right),$$

$$b_i(x, t) = b_i^0(x) + \frac{1}{t} b_i^1(x) + \cdots + \frac{1}{t^m} b_i^m(x) + o\left(\frac{1}{t^m}\right),$$

$$c(x, t) = c^0(x) + \frac{1}{t} c^1(x) + \cdots + \frac{1}{t^m} c^m(x) + o\left(\frac{1}{t^m}\right),$$

and all the functions $a_{ii}^k(x)$, $b_i^k(x)$, $c^k(x)$ are Hölder continuous (exponent λ) in $\bar{B}$.

(F_m) $f(x, t)$ is Hölder continuous in compact subsets of $\bar{D}$,

$$f(x, t) = f^0(x) + \frac{1}{t} f^1(x) + \cdots + \frac{1}{t^m} f^m(x) + o\left(\frac{1}{t^m}\right)$$

uniformly with respect to $x \in \bar{B}$, as $t \rightarrow \infty$, and the functions $f^k(x)$ are Hölder continuous (exponent λ) in $\bar{B}$.

(H_m) $h(x, t)$ is a continuous functions on $\dot{D}$ and

$$h(x, t) = h^0(x) + \frac{1}{t} h^1(x) + \cdots + \frac{1}{t^m} h^m(x) + o\left(\frac{1}{t^m}\right)$$

uniformly with respect to $x \in \dot{B}$, as $t \rightarrow \infty$; the functions $h^k(x)$ are defined and have second Hölder continuous (exponent λ) derivatives in $\bar{B}$.

We shall use the notation

$$M^k v = \sum a_{ii}^k(x) \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial x_i \partial x_i} + \sum b_i^k(x) \frac{\partial v}{\partial x_i} + c^k(x) v.$$

Theorem. Assume that L satisfies (A), (B), (C_m) and that $c^0(x) \leq 0$. Assume further that $\dot{B}$ satisfies (D'), that f satisfies (F_m) and that h satisfies (H_m). If $u(x, t)$ is a solution in D of (1) and if it satisfies the boundary condition (2), then

$$(5) \quad u(x, t) = u^0(x) + \frac{1}{t} u^1(x) + \cdots + \frac{1}{t^m} u^m(x) + o\left(\frac{1}{t^m}\right)$$

uniformly with respect to $x \in \bar{B}$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. The functions $u^k(x)$ are defined successively as solutions of the elliptic Dirichlet systems

$$(6) \quad M^0 u^k(x) = f^k(x) - (k-1)u^{k-1}(x) - \sum_{i=1}^k M^i u^{k-i}(x) \quad (x \in B),$$

$$(7) \quad u^k(x) = h^k(x) \quad (x \in \dot{B})$$

(if $k = 0$, the right side of (6) is replaced by $f^0(x)$).

2. A lemma. To prove the theorem we shall need the following lemma.

Lemma. Assume that L , defined by (1), is uniformly parabolic and with bounded continuous coefficients in $\bar{D}$ and that $\limsup c(x, t) \leq 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ (uniformly in $x \in \bar{B}$). Then the following maximum-principle type estimates hold:

(a) If $\psi(x, t)$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} L\psi &= F(x, t) \quad \text{in } D - D_\sigma, \\ \psi &= 0 \quad \text{on } B_\sigma \quad \text{and on } \dot{D} - \dot{D}_\sigma, \end{aligned}$$

then

$$\text{l.u.b.}_{D-D_\sigma} |\psi| \leq K_1 \text{l.u.b.}_{D-D_\sigma} |F|$$

where K_1 depends only on M, M' and the diameter of B , provided σ is sufficiently large (independently of ψ).

(b) If $\psi(x, t)$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} L\psi &= 0 \quad \text{in } D - D_\sigma, \\ |\psi| &< \epsilon \quad \text{on } B_\sigma \quad \text{and on } \dot{D} - \dot{D}_\sigma, \end{aligned}$$

then

$$\text{l.u.b.}_{D-D_\sigma} |\psi| \leq K_2 \epsilon$$

where K_2 depends only on M, M' and the diameter of B , provided σ is sufficiently large (independently of ψ).

(c) If $\psi(x, t)$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} L\psi &= 0 \quad \text{in } D - D_\sigma, \\ \psi &= 0 \quad \text{on } \dot{D} - \dot{D}_\sigma \end{aligned}$$

and if σ is sufficiently large (independently of ψ), then for any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists T depending on ϵ, M, M' , the diameter of B and on $\text{l.u.b. } |\psi(x, \sigma)|$ ($x \in B$) such that

$$|\psi(x, t)| < \epsilon \quad \text{in } D - D_T.$$

Proof of (a). Without loss of generality we may assume that all the points $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ of $\bar{B}$ satisfy $0 \leq x_1 < R$. Consider the function

$$v(x) = e^{\alpha R} - e^{\alpha x_1}$$

used also in [3]. If α is sufficiently large then

$$Lv(x) < 0 \quad \text{in } \bar{D}$$

provided $c(x, t) \leq \delta$ and δ is a sufficiently small positive number depending on M, M' and R . Take σ such that $c(x, t) \leq \delta$ in $D - D_\sigma$. Then the function

$$w(x) = C_1 (\text{l.u.b.}_{D-D_\sigma} |F|) v(x)$$

(where C_1 is such that $C_1Lv < -1$) satisfies

$$Lw < -\text{l.u.b.}_{D-D_\sigma} |F|$$

(since, as we may assume, $\text{l.u.b.}_{D-D_\sigma} |F| > 0$) and

$$w > 0 \geq \psi \quad \text{on } B_\sigma \quad \text{and on } \dot{D} - \dot{D}_\sigma.$$

Since $L\psi \geq -\text{l.u.b.} |F|$, we can apply a lemma of WESTPHAL-PRODI [6], [4] (see also [2]) and thus conclude that $\psi < w$ in $D - D_\sigma$. Similarly $-\psi < w$, and the proof of (a) follows.

Proof of (b). Let C_2 be a constant which satisfies $C_2v(x) > 1$ for all $x \in \bar{B}$ and define $w(x) = C_2v(x)$. Comparing, as in the previous proof, $\pm\psi$ with w by means of the lemma of WESTPHAL-PRODI, the proof of (b) is easily completed.

Proof of (c). The function

$$z(x, t) = (N - e^{\beta x_1}) \exp \{-\delta(t - \sigma)\},$$

introduced by NARASIMHAN [2] and used also in [1], satisfies (for appropriate N, β, δ), as one can easily prove, $Lz < 0$ provided $c(x, t) \leq \gamma$ and γ is positive and sufficiently small. Hence if σ is sufficiently large then $Lz < 0$ in $D - D_\sigma$. Taking C_3 to be such that $C_3z(x, \sigma) > |\psi(x, \sigma)|$ for $x \in \bar{B}$ and applying the lemma of WESTPHAL-PRODI, the proof of (c) is easily completed.

3. Proof of the theorem. We first remark that [1; Theorem 1] (about the convergence to zero of solutions of (1), (2), with $f \rightarrow 0, h \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$) remains true if the assumption $c(x, t) \leq 0$ made in that theorem is replaced by the weaker assumption $\limsup c(x, t) \leq 0$. Indeed, reviewing the proof of [1; Theorem 1] we see that the functions w_0, w' and w'' can be estimated as in [1] under the present weaker assumption on $c(x, t)$ with the aid of the parts (a), (b) and (c), respectively, of the lemma.

Using the above remark we next observe that the proof of [1; Theorem 2] also remains valid if the assumption $c(x, t) \leq 0$ is replaced by the assumption $\lim c(x, t) = c^0(x) \leq 0$. This last fact will be used in what follows.

We immediately use it to conclude that $u(x, t) = u^0(x) + o(1)$. Proceeding to prove (5) by induction we assume that

$$(8) \quad u(x, t) = u^0(x) + \frac{1}{t}u^1(x) + \cdots + \frac{1}{t^{m-1}}u^{m-1}(x) + o\left(\frac{1}{t^{m-1}}\right)$$

where the u^k satisfy (6), (7), and we shall prove (5) with $u^m(x)$ satisfying the system (6), (7) with $k = m$; this will complete the proof of the theorem.

Using the definition of M^k and writing

$$(9) \quad u(x, t) = u^0(x) + \frac{1}{t}u^1(x) + \cdots + \frac{1}{t^{m-1}}u^{m-1}(x) + \frac{1}{t^m}v(x, t),$$

equation (1) can be written in the form

$$\begin{aligned}
 (10) \quad & \left[\left(M^0 - \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right) + \sum_{k=1}^m \frac{1}{t^k} M^k + \sum o\left(\frac{1}{t^m}\right) \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i \partial x_i} + \sum o\left(\frac{1}{t^m}\right) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} + o\left(\frac{1}{t^m}\right) \right] \\
 & \cdot \left[u^0(x) + \frac{1}{t} u^1(x) + \cdots + \frac{1}{t^{m-1}} u^{m-1}(x) + \frac{1}{t^m} v(x, t) \right] \\
 & = f^0(x) + \frac{1}{t} f^1(x) + \cdots + \frac{1}{t^m} f^m(x) + o\left(\frac{1}{t^m}\right).
 \end{aligned}$$

Using (6) we find that $f^k(x)$ ($0 \leq k \leq m-1$) is equal to the coefficient of t^{-k} on the left side of (10) which is (not counting a possible contribution from $v(x, t)$)

$$M^0 u^k(x) + (k-1) u^{k-1}(x) + \sum_{i=1}^k M^i u^{k-i}(x).$$

Thus $v(x, t)$ satisfies the equation

$$\begin{aligned}
 (11) \quad & \left(M^0 - \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right) v + \sum o(1) \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial x_i \partial x_i} + \sum o(1) \frac{\partial v}{\partial x_i} + o(1) v \\
 & - f^m(x) - (m-1) u^{m-1}(x) - \sum_{k=1}^m M^k u^{m-k} + o(1).
 \end{aligned}$$

Here we made use of the fact that for each $k \leq m-1$

$$(12) \quad \left| \frac{\partial u^k(x)}{\partial x_i} \right| \leq \text{const.}, \quad \left| \frac{\partial^2 u^k(x)}{\partial x_i \partial x_i} \right| \leq \text{const.} \quad (x \in \bar{B}).$$

The truth of (12) follows from the Schauder theory [5] (see also [3]); one can prove by induction on k that each $u^k(x)$ has second Hölder continuous (exponent λ) derivatives in $\bar{B}$. Here we make use of the regularity assumptions on the $h^k(x)$.

Substituting in the boundary condition (2) the function $u(x, t)$ in its form (9) and using (7) for $k = 0, 1, \dots, m-1$, we conclude that $v(x, t)$ satisfies

$$(13) \quad v(x, t) = h^m(x) + o(1) \quad \text{for } x \in \bar{B}.$$

We now apply to the function $v(x, t)$ [2; Theorem 2] in its strong version, namely, [2; Theorem 2] for Lv such that the coefficient of v in Lv is not necessarily non-positive, but tends to a non-positive limit as $t \rightarrow \infty$. We then conclude

$$u^m(x) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} v(x, t) \quad \text{exists uniformly in } x \in \bar{B}$$

and $u^m(x)$ satisfies (6), (7) with $k = m$. Substituting $v(x, t) = u^m(x) + o(1)$ in (9), the proof is completed.

Added in proof. Using the remark "Added in proof" of [1] it follows that the theorem holds also in case $f(x, t)$ is not assumed to be Hölder continuous in compact subsets of $\bar{D}$ but merely continuous.

4. Remark 1. In the case $m = 0$ we assumed only that $h^0(x)$ is continuous [1]. For $m > 0$ it is not enough to assume merely the continuity (or even exist-

ence of second continuous derivatives) of the $h^k(x)$, since this will not ensure the existence of solutions $u^k(x)$ of the system (6), (7). *The theorem, however, will remain true if we weaken the assumption (H_m) by assuming that $h^m(x)$ is merely continuous on $\bar{B}$.* Indeed, the proof for $k < m$ remains the same. For $k = m$ we first approximate $h^m(x)$ by a polynomial $\tilde{h}^m(x)$ and then conclude (as in [1]) that the corresponding solution $\tilde{u}^m(x)$ ($\tilde{u}^m(x)$ satisfies (6) with $k = m$ in $\bar{B}$ and is equal to $\tilde{h}^m(x)$ on $\bar{B}$) approximates $v(x, t)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Since $\tilde{u}^m(x)$ also approximates $u^m(x)$ (by the maximum principle), we conclude that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} v(x, t) = u^m(x)$.

Remark 2. Clearly, the theorem remains true also for $m = \infty$. In that case we obtain for $u(x, t)$ the asymptotic expansion

$$u(x, t) \sim \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} u^k(x) t^{-k}$$

which, however, need not converge.

Remark 3. Consider the equation $Lu = f(x, t, u)$ where f is nonlinear in u . Assume that for large t

$$f(x, t, u) = f^0(x, u) + \frac{1}{t} f^1(x, u) + \cdots + \frac{1}{t^m} f^m(x, u) + o\left(\frac{1}{t^m}\right)$$

uniformly with respect to $x \in \bar{B}$ and $|u| < A$ (for any fixed A). Under certain conditions on the functions $f^k(x, u)$ one can extend [1; Theorem 4] (which is the analogue of [1; Theorem 2] for the equation $Lu = f(x, t, u)$) and obtain an asymptotic expansion for $u(x, t)$.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. FRIEDMAN, Convergence of solutions of parabolic equations to a steady state, *J. Math. and Mech.*, **8** (1959), pp. 57-76.
- [2] R. NARASIMHAN, On the asymptotic stability of solutions of parabolic differential equations, *J. Rational Mech. and Anal.*, **3** (1954), pp. 303-319.
- [3] L. NIRENBERG, *Existence Theorems in Partial Differential Equations*, New York University.
- [4] G. PRODI, Questioni di stabilità per equazioni non lineari alle derivate parziali di tipo parabolico, *Accad. Nazion. dei Lincei, Rend.*, **10** (8) (1951), pp. 365-370.
- [5] J. SCHAUDER, Über lineare elliptische Differentialgleichungen zweiter Ordnung, *Math. Zeit.*, **38** (1933-34), pp. 257-282.
- [6] H. WESTPHAL, Zur Abschätzung der Lösungen nichtlinearer parabolischer Differentialgleichungen, *Math. Zeit.*, **51** (1949), pp. 690-695.

University of California
Berkeley, California
and
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana