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# Existence of Global (Bounded) Solutions for Some Nonlinear Evolution Equations of Second Order 

By Mitsuhiro Nakao and Tokumori Nanbu<br>(Received May 6, 1975)

## Introduction

In this paper we shall consider the following evolution equations

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\partial^{2}}{\partial t^{2}} u-\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(\left|u_{x_{i}}\right|^{p-2} u\right)_{x_{i}}-\Delta \frac{\partial u}{\partial t}+\beta(x, u)=f(x, t) \tag{0.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

in $\Omega \times(0, \infty)$ together with the initial-boundary conditions;

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.u\right|_{\partial \Omega}=0, u(x, 0)=u_{0}(x), \text { and } \frac{\partial u}{\partial t}(x, 0)=u_{1}(x) \tag{0.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\Omega$ is a bounded domain in $R^{n}$ with a smooth boundary $\partial \Omega$.
It is our purpose here to establish the existence of global (bounded) solution to the above problem (0.1)-(0.2).

In the case $\beta(x, u)=0$, problem ( 0.1 )-( 0.2 ) was studied by Greenberg [2] for $n=1$, and by Tsutsumi [6] for general $n$. On the other hand, Clement [1] and Kakita [3] have obtained the existence of weak periodic solution. (In [3] more general equations has been treated.). But in their works $\beta(x, u)=0$ was also assumed. In the case $\beta(x, u) \neq 0$, especially $\beta(x, u)$ is not monotonic in $u$, the methods of earier papers do not apply to our problem and here we shall consider such cases. Our method is related to Nakao [5], where semilinear hyperbolic equations have been considered.

## 1. Preliminaries.

We shall employ usual notations. For brevity we use the notation $\|u\|_{p}=\left(\int_{\rho}|u|^{p} d x\right)^{1 / p}$. The following lemma is well-known.
Lemma 1.1. (Sobolev)
If $u \in W_{0}^{1, p}(\Omega)$, then $u \in L^{q}(\Omega)$ and the inequality

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|u\|_{q} \leqq S_{q, p}(\Omega, n)\|\nabla u\|_{p}=S_{q . p}(\Omega, n)\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left\|\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_{i}}\right\|_{p}^{p}\right)^{1 / p} \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

## holds, where $q$ is a number satisfying

(1.2) $\quad 1 \leqq q \leqq \frac{n p}{n-p}$ if $n>p$ and $1 \leqq q<\infty$ if $n \leqq p$.

Let $p$ be a real number $\geqq 2$ and $\alpha$ a nonnegative real number.
Our hypotheses are:
H.1. $\quad \beta(x, u)$ is Lipshitz continuous in $u$ for almost all $x \in \Omega$ and satisfies
(1.3) $|\beta(x, u)| \leqq K_{0}|u|^{\alpha+1}$ for $\forall u \in R$, a.e. $x \in \Omega$,
where $K_{0}$ is a positive constant and

$$
\begin{equation*}
2 \leqq \alpha+2<\frac{n p}{n-p} \text { if } n>p \text { and } 0 \leqq \alpha<\infty \text { if } 1 \leqq n \leqq p \tag{1.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

H. 2. $\quad f \in C\left(R: L^{2}(\Omega)\right)$ and $M=\sup _{t \in R}\left(\int_{t}^{t+1}\|f(s)\|_{2}^{2} d s\right)^{1 / 2}<\infty$.

Definition 1. $u(x, t)$ is said to be a bounded solution of (0.1)-(0.2) with initial value $\left\{u_{0}(x), u_{1}(x)\right\}$ if $u \in L^{\infty}\left(R^{+}: W_{0}^{1, p}(\Omega)\right)$,
$u^{\prime} \in L^{\infty}\left(\boldsymbol{R}^{+}: L^{2}(\Omega)\right) \cap L_{\mathrm{loc}}^{2}\left(\boldsymbol{R}^{+}: W_{0}^{1,2}(\Omega)\right)$ and for $\forall \varphi \in C_{0}^{1}\left(\boldsymbol{R}^{+}: W_{0}^{1, p}(\Omega)\right)$
the variational equation

$$
\begin{align*}
& \int_{0}^{\infty}-\left(u^{\prime}(t), \varphi^{\prime}(t)\right) d t+\int_{0}^{\infty}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left|u_{x_{i}}\right|^{p-2} u_{x_{i}}, \varphi_{x_{i}}\right) d t+\int_{0}^{\infty}\left(u_{x_{i}}^{\prime}, \varphi_{x_{i}}\right) d t  \tag{1.5}\\
& \quad+\int_{0}^{\infty}(\beta(, u), \varphi) d t=\int_{0}^{\infty}(f, \varphi) d t+\left(u_{1}, \varphi(x, 0)\right)
\end{align*}
$$

is valid, where $R^{+}=[0, \infty)$ and $(u, v)=\int_{g} u(x) v(x) d x .^{1)}$

## 2. Approximate Solutions

In this section, we shall prove an existence theorem concerning approximate solutions.
For this purpose, we employ the Galerkin's approximation procedure.
Let $\left\{w_{j}\right\}, j=1,2, \ldots \ldots, m, \ldots$ be the basis of $W_{0}^{1, p}(\Omega)$ and consider the system of ordinary differential equations:

$$
\begin{gather*}
\left(u_{m}^{\prime \prime}(t), w_{j}\right)+<A u_{m}(t), w_{j}>+\left(\left(u_{m}^{\prime}(t), w_{j}\right)\right)+\left(\beta\left(., u_{m}\right), w_{j}\right)  \tag{2.1}\\
=\left(f(t), w_{j}\right), j=1,2, \ldots \ldots, m
\end{gather*}
$$

with initial values

[^0](2.2) $\quad u_{m}(0)=\sum_{j=1}^{m} \lambda_{m, f}(0) w_{s} \rightarrow u_{0}$ strongly in $W_{0}^{1 . p}$
(2.3) $u^{\prime}{ }_{m}(0)=\sum_{j=1}^{m} \lambda_{m, j}(0) w_{j} \rightarrow u_{1}$ strongly in $L^{2}$,
where $u_{m}(x, t)=\sum_{j=1}^{m} \lambda_{m, j}(t) w_{j}(x),((u, v))=\int_{\Omega} \nabla u(x) \cdot \nabla v(x) d x$ and $A$ is the operator from $W_{0}^{1, p}(\Omega)$, to $W^{-1, p / p-1}(\Omega)$ defined by
$$
<A u, v>=\int_{\Omega} \sum_{i=1}^{n}\left|u_{x_{i}}\right|^{p-2} u_{x_{i}} v_{x_{i}} d x \text { for any } u, v \in W_{0}^{1, p}(\Omega) .
$$

The solution $\left\{\lambda_{m, j}(\mathrm{t})\right\}_{j=1}^{m}$, and consequently $u_{m}(t)$ exists on an interval, say, $\left[0, t_{m}\right]$ by the standard theory of ordinary differential equations. We must give a priori estimates for approximate solutions $u_{m}(x, t)$. First we shall consider the case where $p<\alpha+2$.

Now we introduce some functionals on $W_{0}^{1, p}(\Omega)$ as follows;

$$
\begin{equation*}
J_{0}(u)=(1 / p)\|\nabla u\|_{p}+\int_{\Omega} \int_{0}^{u(x, t)} \beta(x, s) d s d x \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

(2.5) $\quad J_{0}(\tilde{u})=(1 / p)\|\nabla u\|_{p}^{p}-\left(K_{0} S_{\alpha+2, p}^{\alpha+2} / \alpha+2\right)\|\nabla u\|_{p}^{\alpha+2}$
(2.6) $J_{1}(u)=\|\nabla u\|_{p}^{p}+\int_{a} \beta(x, u) u d x$
(2.7) $\quad \tilde{J}_{1}(u)=\|\nabla u\|_{p}^{p}-K_{0} S_{\alpha+2 . p}^{\alpha+2}\|\nabla u\|_{p}^{\alpha+2}$.

By the assumption (1.3) and Lemma 1. 1, we have
(2.8) $\quad \tilde{J_{0}}(u) \leqq J_{0}(u)$ and $\tilde{J_{1}}(u) \leqq J_{1}(u)$ for $\forall u \in W_{0}^{1, p}(\Omega)$.

Also we put

$$
\begin{equation*}
D_{1}=\operatorname{Max}_{x \geq 0}\left\{x^{p}-K_{0} S_{\alpha+2, p}^{\alpha+2} x^{\alpha+2}\right\}=x_{0}^{p}-K_{0} S_{\alpha, 2, p, p}^{\alpha+2} x_{0}^{\alpha+2} \tag{2.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
x_{0}=\left(p / K_{0} S_{\alpha+2, p}^{\alpha+2}(2+\alpha)\right)^{1 / \alpha+2-p},
$$

and put

$$
\begin{equation*}
D_{0}=(1 / p) x_{0}^{p}-\left(K_{0} S_{\alpha+2, p}^{\alpha+2} / \alpha+2\right) x_{0}^{\alpha+2} . \tag{2.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

We define the stable set $W$ by

$$
\begin{gather*}
W \equiv\left\{\left(u_{0}, u_{1}\right) \in W_{0}^{1, p} \times L^{2} ;\left\|\nabla u_{0}\right\|_{p}<x_{0},\left\|\left(u_{0}, u_{1}\right)\right\|_{W}\right.  \tag{2.11}\\
\left.\equiv \frac{1}{2}\left\|u_{1}\right\|_{2}^{2}+J_{0}\left(u_{0}\right)<D_{0}\right\} .
\end{gather*}
$$

Lemma. 2.1. In addition to the hypotheses H. 1 and H.2, we assume that ( $u_{0}$, $\left.u_{1}\right) \in W$ and $p<\alpha+2$. Then there exists a positive number $M_{0}=M_{0}\left(\left\|\left(u_{0}, u_{1}\right)\right\|_{W}\right)$
such that if $M<M_{0}$, approximate solution $u_{m}(t)$ exists on $[0, \infty)$ and satisfy

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|u_{m}^{\prime}(t)\right\|_{2}^{2} \leqq 2 D_{0} \text { and }\left\|\nabla u_{m}(t)\right\|_{p} \leqq x_{0} \text { for } \forall t \in[0, \infty) \tag{2.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

and
(2.13) $\int_{T}^{T+1}\left\|\nabla u^{\prime}{ }_{m}(t)\right\|_{2}^{2} d t \leq D_{0}+M \sqrt{2 D_{0}}<\infty \quad$ for $V T>0$,
where $m$ is a sufficiently large positive integer.
Proof. We shall show that $\left(u_{m}(t), u^{\prime}{ }_{m}(t)\right)$ stays in the stable set $W$ for all time as long as they exist. Then (2.12) will follow easily from the inequality

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{2}\left\|u^{\prime}{ }_{m}(t)\right\|_{2}^{2}+\tilde{J}_{0}\left(u_{m}(t)\right)<D_{0}<\operatorname{Max}_{x \geq 0}\left\{\frac{1}{p} x^{p}-\left(K_{0} S_{\alpha+2, p}^{\alpha+2} /+2\right) x^{\alpha+2}\right\} \tag{2.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $\left(u_{0}, u_{1}\right) \in W$, we have by the definition of $W$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varepsilon_{0}=D_{0}-\left(\frac{1}{2}\left\|u_{1}\right\|_{2}^{2}+J_{0}\left(u_{0}\right)\right)>0 \tag{2.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

Also since $\left(u_{m}(0), u^{\prime}{ }_{m}(0)\right) \rightarrow\left(u_{0}, u_{1}\right)$ in $W_{0}^{1, p} \times L^{2}$, we may assume

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.\frac{1}{2}\left\|u_{m}^{\prime}(0)\right\|_{2}^{2}+J_{0}\left(u_{m} 0\right)\right) \leqq D_{0}-\varepsilon, 0<V \varepsilon<\varepsilon_{0} \tag{2.16}
\end{equation*}
$$

## for large $m$.

Suppose that our assertion was false. There would then exist the smallest time $\bar{t} \in\left[0, t_{m}\right]$ at which

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{2}\left\|u_{m}^{\prime}(\bar{t})\right\|_{2}^{2}+J_{0}\left(u_{m}(\bar{t})\right)=D_{0} \tag{2.17}
\end{equation*}
$$

We shall derive a contradiction. First of all we note that
(2.18)

$$
\tilde{J}_{0}\left(u_{m}(t)\right) \leqq J_{0}\left(u_{m}(t)\right) \leqq D_{0} \text { for } t \in[0, \bar{t}]
$$

and the continuity of $\tilde{J_{0}}\left(u_{m}\right)$, with respect to $\left\|\nabla u_{m}\right\|_{\rho}$, implies

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|\nabla u_{m}(t)\right\|_{p} \leqq x_{0} \quad \text { for } t \in[0, \bar{t}] \tag{2.19}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now multipling (2.1) by $\lambda_{m, s}^{\prime}(t)$, summing over $j$ from 1 to $m$ and integrating over $[a, b] \subset\left[0, t_{m}\right]$, we obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
& \frac{1}{2}\left\|u_{m}^{\prime}(b)\right\|_{2}^{2}+J_{0}\left(u_{m}(b)\right)+\int_{a}^{b}\left\|\nabla u_{m}^{\prime}(t)\right\|_{2}^{2} d t  \tag{2.20}\\
& \quad=\frac{1}{2}\left\|u_{m}^{\prime}(a)\right\|_{2}^{2}+J_{0}\left(u_{m}(a)\right)+\int_{a}^{b}\left(f(t), u_{m}^{\prime}(t)\right) d t
\end{align*}
$$

In the above we take $b=\bar{t}$ and $a=0$ to get by (2.16)
(2.21) $\quad \varepsilon+\int_{0}^{\bar{t}}\left\|\nabla u^{\prime}{ }_{m}(t)\right\|_{2}^{2} d t \leqq S_{2.2} \int_{0}^{\bar{t}}\|f(t)\|_{2}\left\|\nabla u^{\prime}{ }_{m}(t)\right\|_{2} d t$.

Hence we have

$$
\varepsilon+\int_{0}^{\bar{t}}\left\|\nabla u_{m}^{\prime}(t)\right\|_{2}^{2} d t \leqq \int_{0}^{\bar{t}}\left\|\nabla u^{\prime}{ }_{m}(t)\right\|_{2}^{2} d t+\frac{S_{2,2}^{2}}{4} \int_{0}^{\bar{t}}\|f(t)\|_{2}^{2} d t
$$

or

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{0}^{\bar{t}}\|f(t)\|_{2}^{2} d t \geqq \frac{4}{S_{2,2}^{2}} \varepsilon \tag{2.22}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now let us assume

$$
\begin{equation*}
M<M_{1}=\sqrt{\left(4 / S_{2.2}^{2}\right) \varepsilon_{0}} . \tag{2.23}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then from (2.22) and (2.23), it is easily seen that $\bar{t}>1$ for large $m$. Thus we can take $b=\bar{t}$ and $a=\bar{t}-1$ in (2.20), and we have
(2.24) $\quad \int_{\bar{t}-1}^{\bar{t}}\left\|\nabla u^{\prime}{ }_{m}(t)\right\|_{2}^{2} d t \leq \int_{\bar{t}-1}^{\bar{t}}\left|\left(f(t), u^{\prime}{ }_{m}(t)\right)\right| d t$
and hence

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{\bar{t}-1}^{\bar{t}}\left\|\nabla u^{\prime}{ }_{m}(t)\right\|_{2}^{2} d t \leqq S_{2,2}^{2} M^{2}, \int_{\bar{t}-1}^{\bar{t}}\left\|u_{m}^{\prime}(t)\right\|_{2}^{2} d t \leqq S_{2,2}^{4} M^{2} \tag{2.25}
\end{equation*}
$$

Therefore there exist numbers $\bar{t}_{1} \in\left[\bar{t}-1, \bar{t}-\frac{3}{4}\right]$ and $\bar{t}_{2} \in\left[\bar{t}-\frac{1}{4}, \bar{t}\right]$ such that
(2.26) $\quad\left\|u_{m}^{\prime}\left(\overline{t_{i}}\right)\right\|_{2} \leqq 2 S_{2,2}^{2} M, \quad i=1,2$.

Next, multipling (2.1) by $\lambda_{m, s}(t)$, summing over $j$ and integrating over [ $\left.\bar{t}_{1}, \bar{t}_{2}\right]$, we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\bar{t}_{1}}^{\bar{t}_{2}} J_{1}\left(u_{m}(t)\right) d t \leqq\left|\left(u_{m}{ }_{m}\left(t_{1}\right), u_{m}\left(t_{1}\right)\right)\right|+\left|\left(u^{\prime}{ }_{m}\left(t_{2}\right), u_{m}\left(t_{2}\right)\right)\right|+ \\
& \quad+\int_{\bar{t}_{1}}^{\bar{t}_{2}}\left\{\left\|u^{\prime}{ }_{m}(t)\right\|_{2}^{2}+\left|\left(\nabla u^{\prime}{ }_{m}(t), \nabla u_{m}(t)\right)\right|+\mid\left(f(t), u_{m}(t) \mid\right\} d t\right.
\end{aligned}
$$

and by virtue of (2.25), (2.26) and (2.19),

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \quad \leq 4 S_{2,2}^{2} M \operatorname{Max}_{[t-1, t]}\left\|u_{m}(t)\right\|^{2}+S_{2,2}^{4} M^{2}+S_{2,2} M(\operatorname{mes} \Omega)^{p-2 / 2 p} x_{0}+M \operatorname{Max}_{[t-1, t]}\left\|u_{m}(t)\right\|_{2} \\
& \quad \leqq S_{2,2}^{4} M^{2}+x_{0}\left(4 S_{2,2}^{2} M S_{2, p}+S_{2,2} M(\text { mes } \Omega)^{p-2 / 2 p}+M S_{2 . p}\right\} \\
& (2.27)
\end{aligned}
$$

On the other hand,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_{\bar{t}_{1}}^{\bar{t}_{2}} J_{1}\left(u_{m}(t)\right) d t & \geqq \int_{\bar{t}_{1}}^{\bar{t}_{2}} \tilde{J}_{1}\left(u_{m}(t)\right) d t \\
& =\int_{\bar{t}_{1}}^{\bar{t}_{\overline{2}}}\left\|\nabla u_{m}(t)\right\|_{p}^{p}\left(1-K_{0} S_{\alpha+2, p}^{\alpha+2}\left\|\nabla u_{m}(t)\right\|_{p}^{\alpha+2-p}\right) d t
\end{aligned}
$$

by (2.19) and the definition of $x_{0}$

$$
\geqq(1-(p / \alpha+2)) \int_{\bar{t}_{1}}^{\bar{t}_{2}}\left\|\nabla u_{m}(t)\right\|_{p}^{p} d t .
$$

From (2.27) and (2.28), we have

$$
\begin{align*}
\int_{\bar{t}_{1}}^{\bar{t}_{2}}\left\|\nabla u_{m}(t)\right\|_{p}^{p} d t & \leqq \frac{\alpha+2}{\alpha+2-p} \int_{\bar{t}_{1}}^{\overline{t_{2}}} J_{1}\left(u_{m}(t)\right) d t \\
& \leqq \frac{\alpha+2}{\alpha+2-p}\left\{C_{1}(M)+x_{0} C_{2}(M)\right\} . \tag{2.29}
\end{align*}
$$

The inequality (2.29) together with (2.25) implies that there exists a point $t^{*} \in\left[\bar{t}_{1}, \bar{t}_{2}\right]$ such that
(2.30) $\left\|u_{m}^{\prime}{ }_{m}\left(t^{*}\right)\right\|_{2}^{2}+\left\|\nabla u_{m}\left(t^{*}\right)\right\|_{t} \leqq 2 C_{3}(M)$,
where $C_{3}(M) \equiv S_{2,2}^{4} M^{2}+(\alpha+2 / \alpha+2-p)\left(C_{1}(M)+x_{0} C_{2}(M)\right)$.
In (2.20) we take $b=\bar{t}$ and $a=t^{*}$ to get by (2.30)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2}\left\|u_{m}^{\prime}(\bar{t})\right\|_{2}^{2}+J_{0}\left(u_{m}(\bar{t})\right) \\
& \quad \leqq \frac{1}{2}\left\|u_{m}\left(t^{*}\right)\right\|_{2}^{2}+J_{0}\left(u_{m}\left(t^{*}\right)\right)+\int_{\bar{t}-1}^{\bar{t}}\left|\left(f(t), u^{\prime}{ }_{m}(t)\right)\right| d t \\
& \quad \leqq C_{4}(M) \equiv C_{3}(M)+\frac{K_{0}}{\alpha+2} S_{\alpha+2, p}^{\alpha+2}\left(2 C_{3}(M)\right)^{2+\alpha / p}+S_{2,2}^{2} M^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

This contradicts (2.17) if we choose $\boldsymbol{M}<\boldsymbol{M}_{2}, M_{2}$ being the smallest number satisfying $C_{4}(M)=D_{0}$.

Thus if we take $M_{0}=\operatorname{Min}\left(M_{1}, M_{2}\right)$, the proof of (2.12) is completed. Furthermore if we take $b=T+1$ and $a=T$ in (2.20), then we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_{T}^{T+1}\left\|\nabla u^{\prime}{ }_{m}(t)\right\|_{2}^{2} d t & \leqq \frac{1}{2}\left\|u_{m}^{\prime}(T)\right\|_{2}^{2}+J_{0}\left(u_{m}(T)\right)+\int_{T}^{T+1}\left|\left(f(t), u^{\prime}{ }_{m}(t)\right)\right| d t \\
& \leqq D_{0}+M\left(\int_{T}^{T+1}\left\|u^{\prime}{ }_{m}(t)\right\|_{2}^{2} d t\right)^{1 / 2},
\end{aligned}
$$

and hence $\int_{T}^{T+1}\left\|\nabla u^{\prime}{ }_{m}(t)\right\|_{2}^{2} d t \leqq D_{0}+M \sqrt{2 D_{0}}$,
where $T$ is any positive number.
Next we shall consider the case where $p>\alpha+2$.
Lemma 2.2. In addition to hypotheses H. 1 and H. 2., we assume that $p>\alpha+2$. Then approximate solutions of the problem (2.1)-(2.3) exist on $[0, \infty)$ and satisfy
(2.12) $\left\|u^{\prime}{ }_{m}(t)\right\|_{2}^{2}+\left\|\nabla u_{m}(t)\right\|_{p}^{P} \leqq C\left(u_{0}, u_{1}, M\right)$ for $V t \in[0, \infty)$,
(2.13)' $\quad \int_{T}^{T+1}\left\|\nabla u_{m}^{\prime}(t)\right\|_{2}^{2} d t \leqq C\left(u_{0}, u_{1}, M, T\right)$ for $V T>0$ and $V m$.

Proof. First we can obtain the estimate

$$
\frac{1}{2}\left\|u^{\prime}{ }_{m}(t)\right\|_{2}^{2}+J_{0}\left(u_{m}(t)\right) \leqq C\left(u_{0}, u_{1}, M\right) \text { for } t \in[0, \infty] \text { and large } m
$$

This is verified by the similar way of the Lemma 2.1.
Next, using Lemma 1.1 and Young's inequality, we have

$$
\frac{1}{2}\left(\left\|u^{\prime}{ }_{m}(t)\right\|_{2}^{2}+\frac{1}{p}\left\|\nabla u_{m}(t)\right\|_{p}^{p}\right) \leqq C\left(u_{0}, u_{1}, M\right),
$$

which implies (2.12)'.

## 3. Passage to the Limit

By the passage to the limit of approximate solutions, we shall obtain;
Theorem 3.1. In addition to the hypotheses H. 1 and H.2, we assume that $\alpha+2>p,\left(u_{0}, u_{1}\right) \in W$ and $M<M_{0}$. Then the problem (0.1)-(0.2) admits a bounded solution $u$ with initial data $\left(u_{0}, u_{1}\right)$ in the sense of Definition 1 . Moreover the estimates (2.12) and (2.13) hold for $u_{m}=u$.

Theorem 3.2. In addition to the hypotheses H. 1 and H.2, we assume that $\alpha+2<p$ and $\left(u_{0}, u_{1}\right) \in W_{0}^{1 . p} \times L^{2}$. Then we have the same coclusion as Theorem 3.1 without any restrictions on $M$ and ( $u_{0}, u_{1}$ ).

We shall verify Theorem 3.1 only, because Theorem 3.2 is verified in a similar way.
Proof of Theorem 3.1. We construct the approximate solutions $\left\{u_{m}(t)\right\}$ by (2.1), (2.2) and (2.3). By the Lemma 2.1 we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|A u_{m}(t)\right\|_{\mathbb{W}-1, p / p-1} \leqq x_{0}^{p-1} \text { for } v t \in[0, \infty) . \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $\left\{T_{n}\right\}$ be any positive sequence tending to $\infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then by (2.12), (2.13) and (3.1), we can use the standard compactness arguments to extract a subsequence from $u_{m}(t)$, which will be denoted also by $u_{m}(t)$, satisfying;
(3.2) $\quad u_{m}(t) \longrightarrow u(t)$ weakly star in $L^{\infty}\left(\boldsymbol{R}^{+}: W_{0}^{1 . p}(\Omega)\right)$ and a.e. in $\Omega \times \boldsymbol{R}^{+}$,
(3.3) $\left.\quad \beta \cdot, u_{m}(t)\right) \longrightarrow \beta(\cdot, u(t))$ weakly $\operatorname{star}$ in $L^{\infty}\left(\boldsymbol{R}^{+}: L^{\alpha+1}(\Omega)\right)$
(3.4) $\quad u^{\prime}{ }_{m}(t) \longrightarrow u^{\prime}(t)$ weakly star in $L^{\infty}\left(R^{+}: L^{2}(\Omega)\right)$ and a.e. in $\Omega \times R^{+}$,
(3.5) $\quad u^{\prime}{ }_{m}(t) \longrightarrow u^{\prime}(t)$ weakly in $L_{\text {ioc }}^{2}\left(R^{+}: W_{0}^{1,2}(\Omega)\right)$
(3.6) $\quad A u_{m} \longrightarrow \chi$ weakly star in $L^{\infty}\left(\boldsymbol{R}^{+}: W^{-1 . p / p-1}\right)$,
(3.7) $\quad u_{m}\left(T_{n}\right) \longrightarrow u\left(T_{n}\right)$ in $L^{2}$ strongly

$$
\begin{equation*}
u^{\prime}{ }_{m}\left(T_{n}\right) \longrightarrow u^{\prime}\left(T_{n}\right) \text { in } L^{2} \text { weakly } \tag{3.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

(3.9) $\quad u_{m}\left(T_{n}\right) \longrightarrow u\left(T_{n}\right)$ in $W_{0}^{1.2}$ weakly .

To show that the function $u(t)$ is a solution, it is sufficient to prove that $\chi=A u$.

From (2.1), for every $T_{n}$, we have the identity

$$
\begin{aligned}
& -\int_{0}^{T_{n}}\left(u^{\prime}{ }_{m}(t), \psi^{\prime}(t)\right) d t+\int_{0}^{T_{n}}<A u_{m}(t), \psi(t)>d t+\int_{0}^{T_{n}}\left(\left(u^{\prime}{ }_{m}(t), \psi(t)\right)\right) d t+ \\
& +\int_{0}^{T_{n}}\left(\beta\left(\cdot, u_{m}\right), \psi(t)\right) d t=\int_{0}^{T_{n}}(f(t), \psi(t)) d t+\left(u^{\prime}{ }_{m}(0), \psi(0)\right)-\left(u^{\prime}{ }_{m}\left(T_{n}\right), \psi\left(T_{n}\right)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

for all functions of the form $\psi=\sum_{k=1}^{N} d_{k}(t) w_{k}$, where $d_{k}(t)$ are smooth function on $\left[0, T_{n}\right]$.

Taking the limit as $m \rightarrow \infty$ in the above equation, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
& -\int_{0}^{T_{n}}\left(u^{\prime}(t), \psi^{\prime}(t)\right) d t+\int_{0}^{T_{n}}<\chi, \psi(t)>d t+\int_{0}^{T_{n}}\left(\left(u^{\prime}(t), \psi(t)\right)\right) d t+ \\
& +\int_{0}^{T_{n}}(\beta(\cdot, u), \psi(t)) d t=\int_{0}^{T_{n}}(f(t), \psi(t)) d t+\left(u_{1}, \psi(0)\right)-\left(u^{\prime}(T), \psi\left(T_{n}\right)\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus we can replace $\psi$ by $u$ in the above equation to obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left.-\int_{0}^{T_{n}}\left\|u^{\prime}\right\|_{2}^{2} d t+\int_{0}^{T_{n}}<\chi, u\right\rangle d t+\frac{1}{2}\left\|\nabla u\left(T_{n}\right)\right\|_{2}^{2}-\frac{1}{2}\left\|\nabla u_{0}\right\|_{2}^{2}+  \tag{3.10}\\
& +\int_{0}^{T_{n}}(\beta(\cdot, u), u) d t=\int_{0}^{T_{n}}(f(t), u(t)) d t+\left(u_{0}, u_{1}\right)-\left(u^{\prime}\left(T_{n}\right), u\left(T_{n}\right)\right) .
\end{align*}
$$

Also we have

$$
X_{m}=\int_{0}^{T_{n}}<A\left(u_{m}\right)-A(v), u_{m}-v>d t \geqq 0, \quad v \in L^{2}\left(\left(0, T_{n}\right): W_{0}^{1, p}(\Omega)\right),
$$

and, replacing $w_{j}$ by $u_{m}$ in (2.1),

$$
\begin{aligned}
X_{m}=\int_{0}^{T_{n}} & \left\|u^{\prime}{ }_{m}(t)\right\|_{2}^{2} d t-\frac{1}{2}\left\|\nabla u_{m}\left(T_{n}\right)\right\|_{2}^{2}+\frac{1}{2}\left\|\nabla u_{m}(0)\right\|_{2}^{2}+\int_{0}^{T_{n}}\left(\beta\left(\cdot, u_{m}\right), u_{m}\right) d t \\
& +\int_{0}^{T_{n}}\left(f(t), u_{m}(t)\right) d t+\left(u^{\prime}{ }_{m}(0), u_{m}(0)\right)-\left(u^{\prime}{ }_{m}\left(T_{n}\right), u_{m}\left(T_{n}\right)\right)- \\
& -\int_{0}^{T_{n}}<A v, u_{m}-v>d t-\int_{0}^{T_{n}}<A\left(u_{m}\right), v>d t .
\end{aligned}
$$

Taking the limit as $m \rightarrow \infty$ in the above equation, we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{m \rightarrow \infty} X_{m} \leq \int_{0}^{T_{n}}\left\|u^{\prime}(t)\right\|_{2}^{2} d t-\frac{1}{2}\left\|\nabla u\left(T_{n}\right)\right\|_{2}^{2}+\frac{1}{2}\left\|\nabla u_{0}\right\|_{2}^{2}+ \tag{3.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& +\int_{0}^{T_{n}}(\beta(\cdot, u), u) d t+\int_{0}^{T_{n}}(f(t), u(t)) d t=\left(u_{1}, u_{0}\right)- \\
& -\left(u^{\prime}\left(T_{n}\right), u\left(T_{n}\right)\right)-\int_{0}^{T_{n}}<A v, u-v>d t-\int_{0}^{T_{n}}\langle\chi, v>d t
\end{aligned}
$$

From (3.10) and (3.11), we have

$$
\int_{0}^{T_{n}}<\chi-A v, u-v>d t \geqq 0 \quad \text { for } v \in L^{2}\left(\left(0, T_{n}\right): W_{0}^{1 . p}\right)
$$

which gives $\chi=A u$.
The limit function $u(x, t)$ satisfies evidently the equality (1.5), and the estimates (2.12), (2.13) and (3.1) hold for $u$.

Remark 1. We note that $\beta(x, u)$ is a monotonic in $u$, then the Theorem 3.1 holds for arbitrary $f$ satisfying only the hypothesis H. 2.

Remark 2. If we choose the sequence $w_{j}$ as the basis of $W_{0}^{s .2}(\Omega)$, $\left(s>n\left(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{p}\right)+1\right)$, we can easily obtain a priori estimate of $u_{m}^{\prime \prime}$ in $\left\|\boldsymbol{u}_{m}^{\prime \prime}\right\|$ $L_{\text {ioc }}^{2}\left(R: W^{-s .2}\right)$ and consequently we have slightly better soltuions. (see [6]). Remark 3. Under additional appropriate condition, we can obtain the Theorems 3.1 for more general equation;

$$
u_{t t}-\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left\{a_{i}\left(x, u_{x i}\right)\right\}_{x i}-\Delta u_{t}+\beta\left(x, u, u_{t}\right)=f
$$

## References

[1] J. Clement; Existence Theorems for a quasilinear evolution equation, SIAM J. Appl. Math. 26 (1974), pp. 745-752.
[2] J. M. Greenberg; On the existence, uniqueness and stability of solutions of the equations $X_{t t}=E\left(X_{x}\right) X_{x x}+X_{x x t}$, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 25 (1969), pp. 575-591.
[3] T. Kakita; Time periodic solutions of some nonlinear evolution equations, Publ. RIMS. Kyoto Univ. 9 (1974) pp. 477-492.
[4] J. L. Lions and W. A. Strauss; Some nonlinear evolution equations, Bull, Soc. Math. France 93(1965), pp. 43-96.
[5] M. Nakao; Bounded, Periodic or Almost-Periodic Solutions of Nonlinear Hyperbolic Partial Differential Equations (to appear).
[6] M. Tsutsumi ; Some Evolution Equations of Second order, Proc. Jap. Acad. 47 (1970), pp. 950-955.

Department of Mathematics, Faculity of Science, Kyushu University and
Department of Mathematics, College of General Education, Kyushu University.


[^0]:    1) For the sake of simplicity, we denote by the symbol' the differentiation with respect to $t$.
