Université de Metz

Master 2 Recherche de Mathématiques

1er semestre

Quelques méthodes de résolution pour les équations non-linéaires

par Ralph Chill

Laboratoire de Mathématiques et Applications de Metz

Année 2007/08

Contents

Chapter 1. Introduction 5
1. * Examples of nonlinear problems 5
2. The Sobolev space $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ 7
3. * The p-Laplace operator 10

Chapter 2. Minimization of convex functions 15
1. Reflexive Banach spaces 15
2. Main theorem 20
3. * Nonlinear elliptic problems I 22
4. * The von Neumann minimax theorem 23
5. * The brachistochrone problem 25

Chapter 3. Nonconvex analysis 29
1. Ekeland's variational principle 29
2. * Nonlinear elliptic problems II 31
3. The mountain pass theorem 33
4. * Nonlinear elliptic problems III 34

Chapter 4. Iterative methods 37
1. * Newton's method 37
2. Local inverse theorem and implicit function theorem 38
3. * Parameter dependence of solutions of ordinary differential equations 41
4. * A bifurcation theorem and ordinary differential equations 42

Chapter 5. Monotone operators 45
1. Monotone operators 45
2. Surjectivity of monotone operators 48
3. * Nonlinear elliptic problems IV 50
4. Evolution equations involving monotone operators 52
5. * A nonlinear diffusion equation 56

Chapter 6. Appendix 57
1. Differentiable functions between Banach spaces 57
2. Closed linear operators 57
3. Vector-valued L^p spaces 59
4. Vector-valued Sobolev spaces 63

Bibliographie 65

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

1. * Examples of nonlinear problems

1.1. Roots of polynomials. Let $p : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C}$ be a polynomial.
Problem: Prove existence of a root of p, that is, prove that the equation

$$p(z) = 0$$

admits a solution. If possible, try to find an explicit formula for a solution, or try to locate a solution.

The same questions may be asked for polynomials $p : \mathbb{C}^n \to \mathbb{C}^n$.

1.2. Ordinary differential equations. Let $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ be a continuous function, and let $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Prove existence (and uniqueness) of a local solution of the ordinary differential equation with initial value

$$\dot{x}(t) = f(x(t)), \quad x(0) = x_0.$$

1.3. Optimization problems. Let $j : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a convex function and define the cost functional J on the space $C([0, 1])$ by

$$J(u) = \int_0^1 j(u(s))\, ds, \quad u \in C([0, 1]).$$

Prove that the cost functional J admits a global (or local) minimum.

1.4. Nonlinear diffusion. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a an open set. Let $u : [0, T] \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ be some function depending on a time variable $t \in [0, T]$ and a space variable $x \in \Omega$. For example, this function may in the applications be an energy density, a population density, or an image.

In the following, we think of u being an energy density. If $O \subset \Omega$ is a small volume (with smooth boundary ∂O), then

$$\int_O u(t, x)\, dx$$

is the total energy in the volume O at time t. The total energy in O can only change if there is an energy transport through the boundary, or if there is an energy source within O. According to Fourier's law, an energy transport is only possible in the opposite direction of the gradient ∇u; recall that the gradient ∇u points into the direction in which u increases most, in particular, into the direction in which there is a higher energy density, and energy transport is directed to regions with lower energy density.

Hence,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\int_O u\,dx = \int_{\partial O} a(|\nabla u|)\frac{\nabla u}{|\nabla u|} n\,d\sigma,$$

where $a : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$ is some given function (the diffusion coefficient function), the integral over the boundary ∂O is taken with respect to the surface measure and $n = n(x)$ is the outer normal in a point $x \in \partial O$.

By changing the order of differentiation and integration on the left-hand side, and by applying the divergence theorem to the integral on the right-hand side, we obtain

$$\int_O \frac{\partial u}{\partial t}\,dx = \int_O \operatorname{div}\big(a(|\nabla u|)\frac{\nabla u}{|\nabla u|}\big)\,dx.$$

Since this last inequality holds for every arbitrary volume $O \subset \Omega$, we obtain that the energy density u satisfies the following partial differential equation:

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} - \operatorname{div}\big(a(|\nabla u|)\frac{\nabla u}{|\nabla u|}\big) = 0. \tag{1.1}$$

This is a quite general example of a diffusion equation which appears in heat conduction, population dynamics, geometric flows, image analysis, ..., depending on the choice for the diffusion coefficient a.

For example, if we choose $a(s) = s$, then

$$\operatorname{div}\big(a(|\nabla u|)\frac{\nabla u}{|\nabla u|}\big) = \operatorname{div}\nabla u =: \Delta u$$

is the *Laplace operator*, and the equation (1.1) is the linear diffusion equation

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} - \Delta u = 0.$$

If the diffusion coefficient is nonlinear but homogeneous, for example if $a(s) = s^{p-1}$ for some $p \geq 1$, then

$$\operatorname{div}\big(a(|\nabla u|)\frac{\nabla u}{|\nabla u|}\big) = \operatorname{div}\big(|\nabla u|^{p-2}\nabla u\big) =: \Delta_p u$$

is the p-Laplace operator, and the equation (1.1) becomes the nonlinear diffusion equation

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} - \Delta_p u = 0$$

involving the p-Laplace operator. Note that the 2-Laplace operator is just the Laplace operator defined before. This equation will serve as a model problem for nonlinear diffusion.

In the applications, other diffusion coefficients appear. For example, the function $a(s) = \frac{s}{\sqrt{1+s^2}}$ leads to the nonlinear partial differential equation

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} - \operatorname{div}\Big(\frac{\nabla u}{\sqrt{1+|\nabla u|^2}}\Big) = 0$$

which is related to the mean curvature flow of surfaces, and only slightly different diffusion coefficients are also used in image analysis.

1.5. Nonlinear elliptic problems. Instead of the time dependent problems from the previous section, we may also consider the stationary (time-independent) problems

$$-\Delta_p u = f \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad u = 0 \quad \text{in } \partial\Omega,$$

or, more generally,

$$-\operatorname{div}\Big(a(|\nabla u|)\frac{\nabla u}{|\nabla u|}\Big) = f \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad u = 0 \quad \text{in } \partial\Omega.$$

Problem: Prove that for every f in a certain class of functions there exists a unique solution u.

Before solving this problem, one actually has to define the notion of *solution*; for example, one has to say in which class of functions a solution should live, and in which sense it solves the PDEs above.

2. The Sobolev space $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open set. For every function $u \in C^1(\Omega)$ we define its *support* by

$$\operatorname{supp} u := \overline{\{x \in \Omega : u(x) \neq 0\}};$$

the closure is to be taken in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Then we define the space of all compactly supported C^∞ functions, also called *test functions*:

$$\mathcal{D}(\Omega) := \{u \in C^\infty(\Omega) : \operatorname{supp} u \text{ is compact and contained in } \Omega\}.$$

Note that the support of test functions $u \in \mathcal{D}(\Omega)$ is compact (by definition) and contained in the *open* set Ω. As a consequence, for each $u \in \mathcal{D}(\Omega)$ the support does not touch (that is, has empty intersection with) the boundary of Ω. In other words, every test function $u \in \mathcal{D}(\Omega)$ vanishes in a neighbnourhood of $\partial\Omega$. For every $1 \leq p < \infty$ we define the *Sobolev space*

$$\begin{aligned} W^{1,p}(\Omega) \quad := \quad & \{u \in L^p(\Omega) : \forall 1 \leq i \leq n \,\exists v_i \in L^p(\Omega)\, \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{D}(\Omega) \\ & \int_\Omega u \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_i} = -\int_\Omega v_i \varphi\}. \end{aligned}$$

We note that the elements v_i are uniquely determined, if they exist; this has to be proved, of course, but we omit the proof. We write $\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} := v_i$ and we call $\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i}$ the *weak partial derivative* of u with respect to x_i.

We equip the space $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ with the norm

$$\|u\|_{W^{1,p}} := (\|u\|_{L^p}^p + \sum_{i=1}^n \|\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i}\|_{L^p}^p)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

Then the space $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ is a Banach space.

We further define the subspace

$$W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) := \overline{\mathcal{D}(\Omega)}^{\|\cdot\|_{W^{1,p}}}.$$

Whenever X is a Banach space, we denote by X' its dual space, which is the space

$$X' := \{x' : X \to \mathbb{R} : x' \text{ is linear and continuous}\}.$$

It is equipped with the norm

$$\|x'\|_{X'} := \sup_{\|x\|_X \leq 1} |x'(x)|.$$

Instead of $x'(x)$ we will also write $\langle x', x\rangle_{X',X}$.

The dual space of $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ is denoted by $W^{-1,p'}(\Omega)$ with $p' = \frac{p}{p-1}$, that is

$$W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)' =: W^{-1,p'}(\Omega).$$

For every $u \in L^{p'}(\Omega)$ and every $1 \leq i \leq n$ we define the *weak partial derivative* $\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i}$ as an element in $W^{-1,p'}(\Omega)$ by

$$\langle \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i}, v\rangle_{W^{-1,p'},W^{1,p}} := -\int_\Omega u \frac{\partial v}{\partial x_i}\, dx.$$

Lemma 2.1. *For every $1 \leq p < \infty$, the operators*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} : W^{1,p}(\Omega) &\to L^p(\Omega), \\ u &\mapsto \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} : L^{p'}(\Omega) &\to W^{-1,p'}(\Omega), \\ u &\mapsto \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \end{aligned}$$

are linear and continuous.

Proof. The two operators are clearly linear. For the first operator, one has

$$\|\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i}\|_{L^p} \leq \|u\|_{W^{1,p}},$$

by the definition of the norm in $W^{1,p}$. For the second operator, one calculates, using Hölder's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i}\|_{W^{-1,p'}} &= \sup_{\|v\|_{W_0^{1,p}}\le 1} |\langle \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i}, v\rangle_{W^{-1,p'},W_0^{1,p}}| \\ &= \sup_{\|v\|_{W_0^{1,p}}\le 1} |\int u\frac{\partial v}{\partial x_i}| \\ &\le \sup_{\|v\|_{W_0^{1,p}}\le 1} \|u\|_{L^{p'}}\,\|\frac{\partial v}{\partial x_i}\|_{L^p} \\ &\le \|u\|_{L^{p'}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, both operators are continuous. □

The following lemma is an immediate consequence of the preceding lemma.

Lemma 2.2. *For every $1 \le p < \infty$, the operators*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{div} : W^{1,p}(\Omega)^n &\to L^p(\Omega), \\ u = (u_i) &\mapsto \sum_i \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_i}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{div} : L^{p'}(\Omega)^n &\to W^{-1,p'}(\Omega), \\ u = (u_i) &\mapsto \sum_i \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_i} \end{aligned}$$

are linear and continuous.

The following theorem, Poincaré's inequality, will be frequently used in the sequel. We state it without proof.

Theorem 2.3 (Poincaré inequality). *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a* bounded *domain, and let $1 \le p < \infty$. Then there exists a constant $C \ge 0$ such that*

$$\int_\Omega |u|^p \le C^p \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^p \quad \textit{for every } u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega).$$

We note that the Poincaré inequality implies that

$$\|u\| := \left(\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^p\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}$$

defines an equivalent norm on $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ if $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is bounded. Clearly,

$$\|u\| \le \|u\|_{W_0^{1,p}} \quad \text{for every } u \in W_0^{1,p},$$

by the definition of the norm in $W^{1,p}$. On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{W_0^{1,p}} &\leq C\,(\|u\|_{L^p} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^p}) \\ &\leq C\,\|\nabla u\|_{L^p} = C\,\|u\|, \end{aligned}$$

by the Poincaré inequality.

We also state the following two theorems without proof.

THEOREM 2.4 (Sobolev embedding theorem). *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open set with C^1 boundary. Let $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ and define*

$$p^* := \begin{cases} \frac{np}{n-p} & \text{if } 1 \leq p < n \\ \infty & \text{if } n < p, \end{cases}$$

and if $p = n$, then $p^* \in [1, \infty)$. Then, for every $p \leq q \leq p^*$ we have

$$W^{1,p}(\Omega) \subset L^q(\Omega)$$

with continuous embedding, that is, there exists $C = C(p, q) \geq 0$ such that

$$\|u\|_{L^q} \leq C\,\|u\|_{W^{1,p}} \quad \text{for every } u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega).$$

THEOREM 2.5 (Rellich-Kondrachov). *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open and bounded set with C^1 boundary. Let $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ and define p^* as in the Sobolev embedding theorem. Then, for every $p \leq q < \infty$ the embedding*

$$W^{1,p}(\Omega) \subset L^q(\Omega)$$

is compact, that is, every bounded sequence in $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ has a subsequence which converges in $L^q(\Omega)$.

3. * The p-Laplace operator

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open set. The p-Laplace operator ($p \geq 1$) is the partial differential operator which to every function $u : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ assigns the function

$$\Delta_p u(x) := \operatorname{div}(|\nabla u(x)|^{p-2} \nabla u(x)), \quad x \in \Omega.$$

We simply write Δ instead of Δ_2 and call the 2-Laplace operator simply Laplace operator.

In the following, we will realize the p-Laplace operator as an abstract operator between two Banach spaces and use functional analytic methods in order to solve elliptic and parabolic PDEs involving the p-Laplace operator. We will see that several abstract methods will apply.

DEFINITION 3.1 (p-Laplace operator). Let $1 \leq p < \infty$, and let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open set. We define the *Dirichlet p-Laplace operator* on Ω to be the operator

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_p^\Omega : W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) &\to W^{-1,p'}(\Omega), \\ u &\mapsto \Delta_p^\Omega u := \operatorname{div}(|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u). \end{aligned}$$

LEMMA 3.2. *The Dirichlet p-Laplace operator is well defined and continuous. Moreover, there exist constants $C \geq 0$, $\eta > 0$ such that for every $u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$*

$$\|\Delta_p^\Omega u\|_{W^{-1,p'}} \leq C\,\|u\|_{W^{1,p}}^{p-1}$$

and

$$-\langle \Delta_p^\Omega u, u\rangle_{W^{-1,p'},W_0^{1,p}} \geq \eta\,\|\nabla u\|_{L^p}^p.$$

PROOF. The operator

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{div} : L^{p'}(\Omega)^n &\to W^{-1,p'}(\Omega), \\ u = (u_i) &\mapsto \operatorname{div} u := \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_i} \end{aligned}$$

is linear and continuous by Lemma 2.2, and Δ_p^Ω is the composition of the operator

$$\begin{aligned} D : W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) &\to L^{p'}(\Omega)^n, \\ u &\mapsto |\nabla u|^{p-2}\nabla u, \end{aligned}$$

and the operator div. We show that the operator D is well defined and continuous.

First of all, for every $u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$

$$\int_\Omega |Du|^{p'} = \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^{(p-1)p'} = \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^p < \infty,$$

which implies that D is well defined. So it remains to show that D is continuous.

Let $(u_n) \subset W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ be converging to some $u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$. Then $\nabla u_n \to \nabla u$ in $L^p(\Omega)^n$. For every convergent sequence in L^p, we find a subsequence which converges almost everywhere and which is dominated by some function in L^p, that is, after passing to a subsequence (!) which we denote again by (u_n), we have $\nabla u_n \to \nabla u$ almost everywhere and $|\nabla u_n| \leq g$ for some $g \in L^p(\Omega)$ and all n. Hence, $|\nabla u_n|^{p-2}\nabla u_n \to |\nabla u|^{p-2}\nabla u$ almost everywhere, and $|\nabla u_n|^{p-1} \leq g^{p-1} \in L^{\frac{p}{p-1}}(\Omega) = L^{p'}(\Omega)$ for every n. By Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem, this implies $|\nabla u_n|^{p-2}\nabla u_n \to |\nabla u|^{p-2}\nabla u$ in $L^{p'}(\Omega)$.

We have thus shown that for every convergent sequence $(u_n) \subset W^{1,p}(\Omega)$, $u_n \to u$, we find a subsequence (again denoted by (u_n)) such that $Du_n \to Du$ in $L^{p'}(\Omega)$. This implies that D is continuous, as the following short argument by contradiction shows. Assume that D is not continous. Then there exists a convergent sequence $(u_n) \subset W^{1,p}(\Omega)$, $u_n \to u$, such that (Du_n) does not converge to Du in $L^p(\Omega)$. The property that (Du_n) does not converge to Du means that there exists a subsequence of (u_n) (which we denote again by (u_n)) and some $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\|Du_n - Du\|_{L^{p'}} \geq \varepsilon \text{ for every } n.$$

But the subsequence (u_n) is still convergent to u, and by what has been said before, there exists again a subsequence (again denoted by (u_n)) such that $Du_n \to Du$ in $L^{p'}(\Omega)$, a contradition to the estimate above. Hence, the assumption that D is not continuous must be false, and therefore D is continuous.

It remains to show the two estimates. First of all,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Delta_p^\Omega u\|_{W^{-1,p'}} &= \sup_{\|v\|_{W_0^{1,p}}\le 1} |\langle \Delta_p^\Omega u, v\rangle_{W^{-1,p'},W_0^{1,p}}| \\
&= \sup_{\|v\|_{W_0^{1,p}}\le 1} \Big| \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^{p-2}\nabla u\,\nabla v\Big| \\
&\le \sup_{\|v\|_{W_0^{1,p}}\le 1} \|\nabla u\|_{L^p}^{p-1}\,\|\nabla v\|_{L^p} \\
&\le \|\nabla u\|_{L^p}^{p-1} \\
&\le \|u\|_{W^{1,p}}^{p-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Secondly,

$$-\langle \Delta_p^\Omega u, u\rangle_{W^{-1,p'},W_0^{1,p}} = \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^p,$$

and the claim is completely proved. □

The following theorem shows that the (negative) p-Laplace operator is the Fréchet derivative of a strictly convex functional on $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$.

Theorem 3.3. *Let $1 \le p < \infty$, and let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open set. Consider the function*

$$\begin{aligned}
E : W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) &\to \mathbb{R}, \\
u &\mapsto \frac{1}{p}\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^p.
\end{aligned}$$

Then $E \in C^1(W_0^{1,p}(\Omega))$ is strictly convex and

$$\begin{aligned}
E'(u)v &= \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^{p-2}\nabla u\nabla v \\
&= \langle -\Delta_p^\Omega u, v\rangle_{W^{-1,p'},W_0^{1,p}} \quad \textit{for every } u,\ v \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega).
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. We consider the function

$$\begin{aligned}
|\cdot| : W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) &\to \mathbb{R}, \\
u &\mapsto |u| := \Big(\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^p\Big)^{\frac{1}{p}},
\end{aligned}$$

which is a semi-norm on $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$. This means that it satisfies all the properties of a norm except the implication $|u| = 0 \Rightarrow u = 0$ which is not true in general.

In particular, for every $u, v \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$, the triangle inequality

$$|u+v| \le |u| + |v|$$

is true, and this implies the triangle inequality from above

$$|u-v| \ge \big||u| - |v|\big|.$$

This triangle inequality from above implies, that if $u_n \to u$ in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$, then

$$0 \leftarrow \|u_n - u\|_{W^{1,p}} \geq |u_n - u| \geq \Big||u_n| - |u|\Big|,$$

and hence the application $|\cdot|$ is continuous. Moreover, for every $u, v \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ and every $t \in [0,1]$ the triangle inequality implies

$$|tu + (1-t)v| \leq t|u| + (1-t)|v|,$$

so that $|\cdot|$ is also convex.

Since the function $\mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}$, $s \mapsto \frac{1}{p}s^p$ is continuous, increasing and convex, and since E is the composition of $|\cdot|$ with this latter function, we obtain that E is continuous and convex.

Next, we note that for every $u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ the operator

$$\begin{aligned} T_u : W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) &\to \mathbb{R}, \\ h &\mapsto Th = \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^{p-2}\nabla u \nabla h \end{aligned}$$

is well defined, linear and continuous. Moreover, one can show that for every $u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$

$$\lim_{\|h\|_{W_0^{1,p}} \to 0} \frac{E(u+h) - E(u) - T_u h}{\|h\|_{W_0^{1,p}}} = 0.$$

In fact, this equality is a consequence of the differentiability of the function $\mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$, $x \to |x|^p$, where now $|\cdot|$ denotes the euclidean norm, and several convergence theorems from measure and integration theory; we omit the detailed proof.

This last equality implies, by definition, that the function E is differentiable and $E'(u) = T_u$, that is,

$$E'(u)\varphi = \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^{p-2}\nabla u \nabla \varphi \quad \text{for every } u, \varphi \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega).$$

Hence, if $p \geq 2$ and if $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is bounded, then, for every $u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ one has $E'(u) = -\Delta_p^\Omega u$, or simply $E' = -\Delta_p^\Omega$. Since, by Lemma 3.2, the operator Δ_p^Ω is continuous, we obtain that the function E is C^1 in this case. In the general case, that is, for $1 \leq p < \infty$ and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ open, the continuity of E' is proved as in Lemma 3.2.

In order to prove strict convexity of E, let $u, v \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$, $u \neq v$ and let $t \in (0,1)$. Then ... □

CHAPTER 2

Minimization of convex functions

In the following, X denotes a Banach space with norm $\|\cdot\|$. The space

$$X' := \{x' : X \to \mathbb{K} : x' \text{ is linear and bounded}\}$$

is the *dual space* of X, that is, the space of all linear and bounded functionals on X. The dual space X' is a Banach space for the norm

$$\|x'\| := \sup_{\substack{x \in X \\ \|x\| \le 1}} |x'(x)|. \tag{0.1}$$

1. Reflexive Banach spaces

The following theorem, one version of the Hahn-Banach theorem, is standard in any functional analysis course and it will not be proved here.

Theorem 1.1 (Hahn-Banach; extension of bounded functionals). *Let X be a normed space and $U \subset X$ a linear subspace. Then for every bounded linear $u' : U \to \mathbb{K}$ there exists a bounded linear extension $x' : X \to \mathbb{K}$ (i.e. $x'|_U = u'$) such that $\|x'\| = \|u'\|$.*

Corollary 1.2. *If X is a normed space, then for every $x \in X \setminus \{0\}$ there exists $x' \in X'$ such that*

$$\|x'\| = 1 \text{ and } x'(x) = \|x\|.$$

Proof. By the Hahn-Banach theorem (Theorem 1.1), there exists an extension $x' \in X'$ of the functional $u' : \operatorname{span}\{x\} \to \mathbb{K}$ defined by $u'(\lambda x) = \lambda\|x\|$ such that $\|x'\| = \|u'\| = 1$. □

Corollary 1.3. *If X is a normed space, then for every $x \in X$*

$$\|x\| = \sup_{\substack{x' \in X' \\ \|x'\| \le 1}} |x'(x)|. \tag{1.1}$$

Proof. For every $x' \in X'$ with $\|x'\| \le 1$ one has

$$|x'(x)| \le \|x'\|\,\|x\| \le \|x\|,$$

which proves one of the required inequalities. The other inequality follows from Corollary 1.2. □

Remark 1.4. The equality (1.1) should be compared to the definition (0.1) of the norm of an element $x' \in X'$.

From now on, it will be convenient to use the following notation. Given a normed space X and elements $x \in X$, $x' \in X'$, we write

$$\langle x', x\rangle := \langle x', x\rangle_{X'\times X} := x'(x).$$

For the bracket $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$, we note the following properties. The function

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle : X'\times X &\to \mathbb{K}, \\ (x', x) &\mapsto \langle x', x\rangle = x'(x) \end{aligned}$$

is bilinear and for every $x' \in X'$, $x \in X$,

$$|\langle x', x\rangle| \leq \|x'\|\,\|x\|.$$

The bracket $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ thus appeals to the notion of the scalar product on inner product spaces, and the last inequality appeals to the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, but note, however, that the bracket is *not* a scalar product since it is defined on a pair of two different spaces. Moreover, even if $X = H$ is a complex Hilbert space, then the bracket differs from the scalar product in that it is bilinear instead of sesquilinear.

Corollary 1.5. *Let X be a normed space, $U \subset X$ a closed linear subspace and $x \in X \setminus U$. Then there exists $x' \in X'$ such that*

$$\langle x', x\rangle \neq 0 \text{ and } \langle x', u\rangle = 0 \text{ for every } u \in U.$$

Proof. Let $\pi : X \to X/U$ be the quotient map ($\pi(x) = x + U$). Since $x \notin U$, we have $\pi(x) \neq 0$. By Corollary 1.2, there exists $\varphi \in (X/U)'$ such that $\langle\varphi, \pi(x)\rangle \neq 0$. Then $x' := \varphi\circ\pi \in X'$ is a desired functional we are looking for. □

Corollary 1.6. *If X is a normed space such that X' is separable, then X is separable, too.*

Proof. Let $D' = \{x'_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be a dense subset of the unit sphere of X'. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we choose an element $x_n \in X$ such that $\|x_n\| \leq 1$ and $|\langle x'_n, x_n\rangle| \geq \frac{1}{2}$. We claim that $D := \operatorname{span}\{x_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is dense in X. If this was not true, i.e. if $\bar{D} \neq X$, then, by Corollary 1.5, we find an element $x' \in X' \setminus \{0\}$ such that $x'(x_n) = 0$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We may without loss of generality assume that $\|x'\| = 1$. Since D' is dense in the unit sphere of X', we find $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\|x' - x'_{n_0}\| \leq \frac{1}{4}$. But then

$$\frac{1}{2} \leq |\langle x'_{n_0}, x_{n_0}\rangle| = |\langle x'_{n_0} - x', x_{n_0}\rangle| \leq \|x'_{n_0} - x'\|\,\|x_{n_0}\| \leq \frac{1}{4},$$

which is a contradiction. Hence, $\bar{D} = X$ and X is separable. □

Given a normed space X, we call

$$X'' := (X')'$$

the *bidual* of X.

Lemma 1.7. *Let X be a normed space. Then the mapping*

$$\begin{aligned} J : X &\to X'', \\ x &\mapsto (x' \mapsto \langle x', x\rangle), \end{aligned}$$

is well defined and isometric.

Proof. The linearity of $x' \mapsto \langle x', x\rangle$ is clear, and from the inequality

$$|Jx(x')| = |\langle x', x\rangle| \leq \|x'\| \, \|x\|,$$

follows that $Jx \in X''$ (i.e. J is well defined) and $\|Jx\| \leq \|x\|$. The fact that J is isometric follows from Corollary 1.2. □

Definition 1.8. A Banach space X is called *reflexive* if the isometry J from Lemma 1.7 is surjective, i.e. if $JX = X''$. In other words: a normed space X is reflexive if for every $x'' \in X''$ there exists $x \in X$ such that

$$\langle x'', x'\rangle = \langle x', x\rangle \text{ for all } x' \in X'.$$

Remark 1.9. It may happen that the spaces X and X'' are isomorphic without X being reflexive (the example of such a Banach space is however quite involved). We emphasize that reflexivity means that the special operator J is an isomorphism.

Lemma 1.10. *Every Hilbert space is reflexive.*

Proof. By the Theorem of Riesz-Fréchet, we may identify H with its dual H' and thus also H with its bidual H''. The identification is done via the scalar product. It should be noted, however, that for complex Hilbert spaces, the identification of H with its dual H' is only antilinear, but after the second identification (H' with H'') it turns out that the identification of H with H'' is linear.

It is finally an exercise to show that this identification of H with H'' coincides with the mapping J from Lemma 1.7. □

Lemma 1.11. *Every finite dimensional Banach space is reflexive.*

Proof. It suffices to remark that if X is finite dimensional, then

$$\dim X = \dim X' = \dim X'' < \infty.$$

Surjectivity of the mapping J (which is always injective) thus follows from linear algebra. □

Theorem 1.12. *The space $L^p(\Omega)$ is reflexive if $1 < p < \infty$ ($(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$ being an arbitrary measure space).*

Lemma 1.13. *The spaces l^1, $L^1(\Omega)$ ($\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$) and $C([0,1])$ are not reflexive.*

Proof. For every $t \in [0,1]$, let $\delta_t \in C([0,1])'$ be defined by

$$\langle \delta_t, f\rangle := f(t), \qquad f \in C([0,1]).$$

Then $\|\delta_t\| = 1$ and whenever $t \neq s$, then

$$\|\delta_t - \delta_s\| = 2.$$

In particular, the uncountably many balls $B(\delta_t, \frac{1}{2})$ ($t \in [0,1]$) are mutually disjoint so that $C([0,1])'$ is not separable.

Now, if $C([0,1])$ were reflexive, then $C([0,1])'' = C([0,1])$ would be separable (since $C([0,1])$ is separable), and then, by Corollary 1.6, $C([0,1])'$ would be separable; a contradiction to what has been said before. This proves that $C([0,1])$ is not reflexive.

The cases of l^1 and $L^1(\Omega)$ are proved similarly. They are separable Banach spaces with nonseparable dual. □

THEOREM 1.14. *Every closed subspace of a reflexive Banach space is reflexive.*

PROOF. Let X be a reflexive Banach space, and let $U \subset X$ be a closed subspace. Let $u'' \in U''$. Then the mapping $x'' : X' \to \mathbb{K}$ defined by

$$\langle x'', x' \rangle = \langle u'', x'|_U \rangle, \quad x' \in X',$$

is linear and bounded, i.e. $x'' \in X''$. By reflexivity of X, there exists $x \in X$ such that

$$\langle x', x \rangle = \langle u'', x'|_U \rangle, \quad x' \in X'. \tag{1.2}$$

Assume that $x \notin U$. Then, by Corollary 1.3, there exists $x' \in X'$ such that $x'|_U = 0$ and $\langle x', x \rangle \neq 0$; a contradiction to the last equality. Hence, $x \in U$. We need to show that

$$\langle u'', u' \rangle = \langle u', x \rangle, \forall u' \in U'. \tag{1.3}$$

However, if $u' \in U'$, then, by Hahn-Banach we can choose an extension $x' \in X'$, i.e. $x'|_U = u'$. The equation (1.3) thus follows from (1.2). □

COROLLARY 1.15. *The Sobolev spaces $W^{k,p}(\Omega)$ ($\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ open) are reflexive if $1 < p < \infty$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$.*

PROOF. For example, for $k = 1$, the operator

$$\begin{aligned} T : W^{1,p}(\Omega) &\to L^p(\Omega)^{1+N}, \\ u &\mapsto (u, \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_1}, \dots, \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_N}), \end{aligned}$$

is isometric, so that we may consider $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ as a closed subspace of $L^p(\Omega)^{1+N}$ which is reflexive by Theorem 1.12. The claim follows from Theorem 1.14. □

COROLLARY 1.16. *A Banach space is reflexive if and only if its dual is reflexive.*

PROOF. Assume that the Banach space X is reflexive. Let $x''' \in X'''$ (the tridual!). Then the mapping $x' : X \to \mathbb{K}$ defined by

$$\langle x', x \rangle := \langle x''', J_X(x) \rangle, \quad x \in X,$$

is linear and bounded, i.e. $x' \in X'$ (here J_X denotes the isometry $X \to X''$). Let $x'' \in X''$ be arbitrary. Since X is reflexive, there exists $x \in X$ such that $J_X x = x''$. Hence,

$$\langle x''', x'' \rangle = \langle x''', J_X x \rangle = \langle x', x \rangle = \langle x'', x' \rangle,$$

which proves that $J_{X'} x' = x'''$, i.e. the isometry $J_{X'} : X' \to X'''$ is surjective. Hence, X' is reflexive.

On the other hand, assume that X' is reflexive. Then X'' is reflexive by the preceeding argument, and therefore X (considered as a closed subspace of X'' via the isometry J) is reflexive by Theorem 1.14. □

Definition 1.17. Let X be a normed space. We say that a sequence $(x_n) \subset X$ *converges weakly* to some $x \in X$ if

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \langle x', x_n\rangle = \langle x', x\rangle \text{ for every } x' \in X'.$$

Notations: if (x_n) converges weakly to x, then we write $x_n \rightharpoonup x$, $w - \lim_{n\to\infty} x_n = x$, $x_n \to x$ in $\sigma(X, X')$, or $x_n \to x$ weakly.

Theorem 1.18. *In a reflexive Banach space every bounded sequence admits a weakly convergent subsequence.*

Proof. Let (x_n) be a bounded sequence in a reflexive Banach space X. We first assume that X is separable. Then X'' is separable by reflexivity, and X' is separable by Corollary 1.6. Let $(x'_m) \subset X'$ be a dense sequence.

Since $(\langle x'_1, x_n\rangle)$ is bounded by the boundedness of (x_n), there exists a subsequence $(x_{\varphi_1(n)})$ of (x_n) ($\varphi_1 : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ is increasing, unbounded) such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \langle x'_1, x_{\varphi_1(n)}\rangle \text{ exists.}$$

Similarly, there exists a subsequence $(x_{\varphi_2(n)})$ of $(x_{\varphi_1(n)})$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \langle x'_2, x_{\varphi_2(n)}\rangle \text{ exists.}$$

Note that for this subsequence, we also have that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \langle x'_1, x_{\varphi_2(n)}\rangle \text{ exists.}$$

Iterating this argument, we find a subsequence $(x_{\varphi_3(n)})$ of $(x_{\varphi_2(n)})$ and finally for every $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $m \geq 2$, a subsequence $(x_{\varphi_m(n)})$ of $(x_{\varphi_{m-1}(n)})$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \langle x'_j, x_{\varphi_m(n)}\rangle \text{ exists for every } 1 \leq j \leq m.$$

Let $(y_n) := (x_{\varphi_n(n)})$ be the 'diagonal sequence'. Then (y_n) is a subsequence of (x_n) and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \langle x'_m, y_n\rangle \text{ exists for every } m \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Let $x' \in X'$ be arbitrary, and let $\varepsilon > 0$. Since $\{x'_m : m \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is dense in X', there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\|x' - x'_m\| \leq \varepsilon.$$

Then there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for every $\mu, \nu \geq n_0$

$$|\langle x'_m, y_\mu - y_\nu\rangle| \leq \varepsilon.$$

Hence, for every $\mu, \nu \geq n_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle x', y_\mu - y_\nu\rangle| &\leq |\langle x' - x'_m, y_\mu - y_\nu\rangle| + |\langle x'_m, y_\mu - y_\nu\rangle| \\ &\leq \varepsilon(2M + 1), \end{aligned}$$

where $M = \sup_n \|y_n\| < \infty$ is independent of ε, μ and ν. As a consequence,

$$\langle x'', x' \rangle := \lim_{n\to\infty} \langle x', y_n \rangle \text{ exists for every } x' \in X',$$

and x'' is a bounded linear functional on X'.

Since X is reflexive, there exists $x \in X$ such that $Jx = x''$. For this x, we have by definition of J

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \langle x', y_n \rangle = \langle x', x \rangle \text{ exists for every } x' \in X',$$

i.e. (y_n) converges weakly to x.

If X is not separable as we first assumed, then one may replace X by $\tilde{X} := \overline{\operatorname{span}}\{x_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ which is separable. By the above, there exists $x \in \tilde{X}$ and a subsequence of (x_n) (which we denote again by (x_n)) such that for every $\tilde{x}' \in \tilde{X}'$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \langle \tilde{x}', x_n \rangle = \langle \tilde{x}', x \rangle,$$

i.e. (x_n) converges weakly in $\tilde{X}$. If $x' \in X'$, then $x'|_{\tilde{X}} \in \tilde{X}'$, and it follows easily that the sequence (x_n) also converges weakly in X to the element x. □

2. Main theorem

We start by stating a second version of the Hahn-Banach theorem. We will not prove this theorem. We only recall that a subset K of a Banach space X is *convex* if for every $x, y \in K$ and every $t \in [0, 1]$ one has $tx + (1 - t)y \in K$.

Theorem 2.1 (Hahn-Banach; separation of convex sets). *Let X be a Banach space, $K \subset X$ a closed, nonempty, convex subset, and $x_0 \in X \setminus K$. Then there exists $x' \in X'$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ such that*

$$\operatorname{Re}\langle x', x \rangle + \varepsilon \le \operatorname{Re}\langle x', x_0 \rangle, \quad x \in K.$$

Corollary 2.2. *Let X be a Banach space and $K \subset X$ a closed, convex subset (closed for the norm topology). If $(x_n) \subset K$ converges weakly to some $x \in X$, then $x \in K$.*

Proof. Assume the contrary, i.e. $x \notin K$. By the Hahn-Banach theorem (Theorem 2.1), there exist $x' \in X'$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\operatorname{Re}\langle x', x_n \rangle + \varepsilon \le \operatorname{Re}\langle x', x \rangle \text{ for every } n \in \mathbb{N},$$

a contradiction to the assumption that $x_n \rightharpoonup x$. □

A function $f : K \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ on a convex subset K of a Banach space X is called *convex* if for every $x, y \in K$, and every $t \in [0, 1]$,

$$f(tx + (1 - t)y) \le t\, f(x) + (1 - t)\, f(y). \tag{2.1}$$

Let $K \subset X$ be an arbitrary subset of a Banach space. A function $f : K \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ is called *lower semicontinuous* if for every sequence $(x_n) \subset K$ and every $x \in K$ one has

$$x = \lim_{n\to\infty} x_n \quad \Rightarrow \quad f(x) \le \liminf_{n\to\infty} f(x_n).$$

Lemma 2.3. *A function* $f : K \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ *is lower semicontinuous if and only if for every* $c \in \mathbb{R}$ *the set* $\{x \in K : f(x) \le x\}$ *is closed in* K.

Proof. Assume first that f is lower semicontinuous. Let $c \in \mathbb{R}$ and let $K_c := \{x \in K : f(x) \le c\}$. Let $(x_n) \subset K_c$ be a convergent sequence such that $x = \lim_{n\to\infty} x_n \in K$. Then, by lower semicontinuity,

$$f(x) \le \liminf_{n\to\infty} f(x_n) \le c,$$

so that $x \in K_c$. Hence, K_c is closed in K.

Assume now that $K_c := \{x \in K : f(x) \le c\}$ is closed for every $c \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $(x_n) \subset K$ be a convergent sequence such that $x = \lim_{n\to\infty} x_n \in K$. We have to show that $f(x) \le \liminf_{n\to\infty} f(x_n) =: c$. If this inequality was not true then there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$f(x) \ge \liminf_{n\to\infty} f(x_n) + \varepsilon = c + \varepsilon.$$

In addition, there exists a subsequence (x_{n_k}) of (x_n) such that $\lim_{k\to\infty} f(x_{n_k}) = c$. This means that $x_{n_k} \in K_{c+\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}$ for all k large enough. Since $x_{n_k} \to x$ and since $K_{c+\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}$ is closed in K, this implies $x \in K_{c+\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}$, or, equivalently,

$$f(x) \le c + \frac{\varepsilon}{2},$$

which is a contradiction to the above inequality. Hence, we have shown that f is lower semicontinuous. □

Corollary 2.4. *Let X be a Banach space, $K \subset X$ a closed, convex subset, and $f : K \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ a lower semicontinuous, convex function. If $(x_n) \subset K$ converges weakly to $x \in K$, then*

$$f(x) \le \liminf_{n\to\infty} f(x_n).$$

Proof. For every $c \in \mathbb{R}$, the set $K_c := \{x \in K : f(x) \le c\}$ is closed (by lower semicontinuity of f and by Lemma 2.3) and convex (by convexity of f). After extracting a subsequence, if necessary, we may assume that $c := \liminf_{n\to\infty} f(x_n) = \lim_{n\to\infty} f(x_n)$. Then for every $\varepsilon > 0$ the sequence (x_n) is eventually in $K_{c+\varepsilon}$, i.e. except for finitely many x_n, the sequence (x_n) lies in $K_{c+\varepsilon}$. Hence, by Corollary 2.2, $x \in K_{c+\varepsilon}$, which means that $f(x) \le c + \varepsilon$. Since $\varepsilon > 0$ was arbitrary, the claim follows. □

Theorem 2.5. *Let X be a reflexive Banach space, $K \subset X$ a closed, convex, nonempty subset, and $f : K \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ a lower semicontinuous, convex function such that*

$$\lim_{\substack{\|x\|\to\infty \\ x\in K}} f(x) = +\infty \qquad \textit{(weak coercivity)}.$$

Then there exists $x_0 \in K$ such that

$$f(x_0) = \inf\{f(x) : x \in K\} > -\infty.$$

Proof. Let $(x_n) \subset K$ be such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} f(x_n) = \inf\{f(x) : x \in K\}$. By the coercivity assumption on f, the sequence (x_n) is bounded. Since X is reflexive, there exists a weakly convergent subsequence (Theorem 1.18); we denote by x_0 the limit. By Corollary 2.2, $x_0 \in K$. By Corollary 2.4,

$$f(x_0) \leq \lim_{n\to\infty} f(x_n) = \inf\{f(x) : x \in K\}.$$

The claim is proved. □

3. * Nonlinear elliptic problems I

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded open set and let $p \geq 2$. Let $f : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ be some function in $L^2(\Omega)$. We consider the nonlinear elliptic boundary value problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p u(x) = f(x), & x \in \Omega, \\ u(x) = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \tag{3.1}$$

We call a function $u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ a *weak solution* of this problem if

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^{p-2}\nabla u \nabla\varphi = \int_\Omega f\varphi \quad \text{for every } \varphi \in C_c^1(\Omega). \tag{3.2}$$

Note that $u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ is a weak solution of (3.1) if and only if $-\Delta_p^\Omega u = f$, where Δ_p^Ω is the p-Laplace operator defined in Chapter 1, Section 3.

In the following lemma, we give another characterization and we will see that $u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ is a weak solution of (3.1) if and only if u is a critical point of some real valued *energy function*.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open set, $1 \leq p < \infty$, and define*

$$\begin{aligned} E : W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) &\to \mathbb{R}, \\ u &\mapsto E(u) := \frac{1}{p}\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^p - \int_\Omega fu. \end{aligned}$$

Then the function $E \in C^1$, and $u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ is a weak solution of (3.1) *if and only if $E'(u) = 0$.*

Proof. We have already proved in Theorem 3.3 (Chapter 1), that the function $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \to \mathbb{R}$, $u \mapsto \frac{1}{p}\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^p$ is continuously differentiable. Moreover, the function $u \mapsto \int_\Omega fu$ is bounded and linear, and therefore continuously differentiable. By Theorem 3.3 in Chapter 1, we have

$$E'(u)\varphi = \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^{p-2}\nabla u\nabla\varphi - \int_\Omega f\varphi \quad \text{for every } u,\, \varphi \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega),$$

so that $u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ is a weak solution of (3.1) if and only if $E'(u) = 0$. □

Theorem 3.2. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be bounded and open, and let $p \geq 2$. Then for every $f \in L^2(\Omega)$ there exists a unique weak solution $u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ of the problem* (3.1).

Proof. *Existence:* By Lemma 3.1, it suffices to prove that the function $E \in C^1$ defined in Lemma 3.1 is convex and weakly coercive. In fact, then E has a global minimum u by Theorem 2.5. For this global minimum one has $E'(u) = 0$ and therefore u is a weak solution of (3.1) by Lemma 3.1.

Since every linear function is convex, convexity of E follows from Theorem 3.3 in Chapter 1.

By the Poincaré inequality, and by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} E(u) &\geq \frac{1}{2p}\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^p + \frac{1}{2pC^p}\int_\Omega |u|^p - \|f\|_2\,\|u\|_2 \\ &\geq \eta\,\|u\|^p_{W_0^{1,p}} - \|f\|_2\|u\|_{W_0^{1,p}} \\ &= \|u\|_{W_0^{1,p}}\,(\eta\,\|u\|^{p-1}_{W_0^{1,p}} - \|f\|_2). \end{aligned}$$

Since $p > 1$, this implies

$$\lim_{\|u\|_{W_0^{1,p}}\to\infty} E(u) = \infty,$$

that is, E is weakly coercive. Since the space $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ is reflexive, by Theorem 2.5 about the minimization of convex functions, there exists $u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ such that

$$u = \inf_{W_0^{1,p}} E,$$

that is, u is a global minimum. Since every local (or global) minimum of E is a critical point of E, we have thus proved existence of a weak solution of (3.1).

Uniqueness: Assume that $v \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ is a second weak solution. Then $E'(v) = E'(u) = 0$. Since E is in addition convex, we obtain that the function $f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$, $f(t) = E(tu + (1-t)u)$ is convex and $f'(0) = f'(1) = 0$. Hence, $f'(t) = 0$ for every $t \in [0,1]$ (the derivative of a convex function is increasing), so that f is constant. Hence, v is also a global minimum of E. If $u \neq v$, then the strict convexity of E (!!) implies

$$E(\frac{u+v}{2}) < \frac{E(u)+E(v)}{2} = \inf E,$$

which is a contradiction. Hence, we must have $u = v$. □

4. * The von Neumann minimax theorem

In the following theorem, we call a function $f : K \to \mathbb{R}$ on a convex subset K of a Banach space X *concave* if $-f$ is convex, or, equivalently, if for every $x, y \in K$ and every $t \in [0,1]$,

$$f(tx + (1-t)y) \geq t\,f(x) + (1-t)\,f(y). \tag{4.1}$$

A function $f : K \to \mathbb{R}$ is called *strictly convex* (resp. *strictly concave*) if for every x, $y \in K$, $x \neq y$, $f(x) = f(y)$ the inequality in (2.1) (resp. (4.1)) is strict for $t \in (0,1)$.

THEOREM 4.1 (von Neumann). *Let K and L be two closed, bounded, nonempty, convex subsets of reflexive Banach spaces X and Y, respectively. Let $f : K \times L \to \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function such that*

$$x \mapsto f(x,y) \text{ is strictly convex for every } y \in L, \text{ and}$$
$$y \mapsto f(x,y) \text{ is concave for every } x \in K.$$

Then there exists $(\overline{x},\overline{y}) \in K \times L$ such that

$$f(\overline{x},y) \leq f(\overline{x},\overline{y}) \leq f(x,\overline{y}) \text{ for every } x \in K,\ y \in L. \tag{4.2}$$

REMARK 4.2. A point $(\overline{x},\overline{y}) \in K \times L$ satisfying (4.2) is called a *saddle point* of f.

A saddle point is a point of *equilibrium* in a two-person zero-sum game in the following sense: If the player controlling the strategy x modifies his strategy when the second player plays $\overline{y}$, he increases his loss; hence, it is his interest to play $\overline{x}$. Similarly, if the player controlling the strategy y modifies his strategy when the first player plays $\overline{x}$, he diminishes his gain; thus it is in his interest to play $\overline{y}$. This property of equilibrium of saddle points justifies their use as a (reasonable) solution in a two-person zero-sum game ([**3**]).

PROOF. Define the function $F : L \to \mathbb{R}$ by $F(y) := \inf_{x\in K} f(x,y)$ $(y \in L)$. By Theorem 2.5, for every $y \in L$ there exists $x \in K$ such that $F(y) = f(x,y)$. By strict convexity, this element x is uniquely determined. We denote $x := \Phi(y)$ and thus obtain

$$F(y) = \inf_{x\in K} f(x,y) = f(\Phi(y),y), \quad y \in L. \tag{4.3}$$

By concavity of the function $y \mapsto f(x,y)$ and by the definition of F, for every y_1, $y_2 \in L$ and every $t \in [0,1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} F(ty_1 + (1-t)y_2) &= f(\Phi(ty_1 + (1-t)y_2), ty_1 + (1-t)y_2) \\ &\geq t\, f(\Phi(ty_1 + (1-t)y_2), y_1) + (1-t)\, f(\Phi(ty_1 + (1-t)y_2), y_2) \\ &\geq t\, F(y_1) + (1-t)\, F(y_2), \end{aligned}$$

so that F is concave. Moreover, F is upper semicontinuous: let $(y_n) \subset L$ be convergent to $y \in L$. For every $x \in K$ and every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ one has $F(y_n) \leq f(x,y_n)$, and taking the limes superior on both sides, we obtain, by continuity of f,

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} F(y_n) \leq \limsup_{n\to\infty} f(x,y_n) = f(x,y).$$

Since $x \in K$ was arbitrary, this inequality implies $\limsup_{n\to\infty} F(y_n) \leq F(y)$, i.e. F is upper semicontinuous.

By Theorem 2.5 (applied to $-F$), there exists $\overline{y} \in L$ such that

$$f(\Phi(\overline{y}),\overline{y}) = F(\overline{y}) = \sup_{y\in L} F(y).$$

We put $\overline{x} = \Phi(\overline{y})$ and show that $(\overline{x},\overline{y})$ is a saddle point. Clearly, for every $x \in K$,

$$f(\overline{x},\overline{y}) \leq f(x,\overline{y}). \tag{4.4}$$

Therefore it remains to show that for every $y \in L$,

$$f(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \geq f(\bar{x}, y). \tag{4.5}$$

Let $y \in L$ be arbitrary and put $y_n := (1 - \frac{1}{n})\bar{y} + \frac{1}{n}y$ and $x_n = \Phi(y_n)$. Then, by concavity,

$$\begin{aligned} F(\bar{y}) \geq F(y_n) &= f(x_n, y_n) \\ &\geq (1 - \frac{1}{n}) f(x_n, \bar{y}) + \frac{1}{n} f(x_n, y) \\ &\geq (1 - \frac{1}{n}) F(\bar{y}) + \frac{1}{n} f(x_n, y), \end{aligned}$$

or

$$F(\bar{y}) \geq f(x_n, y) \text{ for every } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Since K is bounded and closed, the sequence $(x_n) \subset K$ has a weakly convergent subsequence which converges to some element $x_0 \in K$ (Theorem 1.18 and Corollary 2.2). By the preceeding inequality and Corollary 2.4,

$$F(\bar{y}) \geq f(x_0, y).$$

This is just the remaining inequality (4.5) if we can prove that $x_0 = \bar{x}$. By concavity, for every $x \in K$ and every $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} f(x, y_n) &\geq f(x_n, y_n) \\ &\geq (1 - \frac{1}{n}) f(x_n, \bar{y}) + \frac{1}{n} f(x_n, y) \\ &\geq (1 - \frac{1}{n}) f(x_n, \bar{y}) + \frac{1}{n} F(y). \end{aligned}$$

Letting $n \to \infty$ in this inequality and using Corollary 2.4 again, we obtain that for every $x \in K$,

$$f(x, \bar{y}) \geq f(x_0, \bar{y}).$$

Hence, $x_0 = \Phi(\bar{y}) = \bar{x}$ and the theorem is proved. □

5. * The brachistochrone problem

The following problem was asked by Johann Bernoulli in 1696:

> For given two points A and B in a vertical plane, find a curve connecting A and B which is optimal among all other such curves in the following sense. The point P of unit mass which starts from A with zero velocity and moves along this curve only due to the gravitational force will reach the point B in a minimal time.

Without loss of generality, we may assume that in the xy-plane we have $A = (0, a)$ and $B = (b, 0)$ for some a, $b > 0$. We will look for a curve connecting A and B and which is in addition a graph of a continuously differentiable function $y : [0, b] \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $y(0) = a$ and $y(b) = 0$.

The principle of conservation of energy implies that

$$\frac{1}{2}v(t)^2 = g\,y(x(t)),$$

where v is the velocity of the point P, g is the gravitational constant and $x(t)$ is the x-coordinate of the point P at time t (and $y(x(t))$ is the height of the point P). Note that

$$v(t) = \sqrt{1 + y'(x(t))^2}\,\dot{x}(t),$$

and therefore

$$\dot{x}(t) = \frac{dx}{dt}(t) = \sqrt{\frac{2gy(x(t))}{1 + y'(x(t))^2}}.$$

Hence, the time T at which the point P reaches the point B is given by

$$T = \int_0^T dt = \int_0^b \sqrt{\frac{1 + y'(x)^2}{a - 2gy(x)}}\,dx.$$

The problem is therefore to minimize the functional T given by

$$T(y) = \int_0^b \sqrt{\frac{1 + y'(x)^2}{a - 2gy(x)}}\,dx,$$

where y varies in the convex set

$$K := \{y \in W^{1,p}(0,b) : y(0) = a \text{ and } y(b) = 0\}$$

and $p \geq 1$ is to be fixed. It is easy to check that the functional T is convex and that for every $p \geq 1$ the set K is closed in $W^{1,p}(0,1)$. However, the space $W^{1,p}(0,1)$ is reflexive only if $p > 1$. On the other hand, the functional T is coercive only if $p = 1$.

Hence, we can *not* apply the main theorem of this section on minimization of convex functionals (Theorem 2.5), unless we replace the set K by a bounded convex subset which is likely to contain the global minimum of T!

In this section, we will proceed differently, that is, we will solve the problem of finding a global minimum by solving the corresponding Euler-Lagrange equation which is in this case an ordinary differential equation. Note that in the preceding examples (especially the nonlinear elliptic problems) we proved directly existence of global minima and thus proved existence of solutions of the corresponding Euler-Lagrange equations.

In order to find the Euler-Lagrange equation for the functional T, let $y \in K$ and let $z \in \mathcal{D}(0, b)$ be a test function. Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
T'(y)z &= \lim_{t\to\infty} \frac{1}{t}\,(T(y+tz) - T(y)) \\
&= \int_0^b \frac{1}{\sqrt{a-2gy}}\,\frac{y'z'}{\sqrt{1+(y')^2}} + \int_0^b \sqrt{1+(y')^2}\,\frac{gz}{\sqrt{a-2gy}^3} \\
&= -\int_0^b \Big(\frac{1}{\sqrt{a-2gy}}\,\frac{y'}{\sqrt{1+(y')^2}}\Big)'\,z + \int_0^b \sqrt{1+(y')^2}\,\frac{gz}{(\sqrt{a-2gy})^3}.
\end{aligned}
$$

If y is a global minimum of T, then $T'(y) = 0$ which means that $T'(y)z = 0$ for every test funtion $z \in \mathcal{D}(0, b)$. Hence, if y is a global minimum of T, then

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sqrt{1+(y')^2}\,\frac{g}{(\sqrt{a-2gy})^3} &= \frac{y''}{\sqrt{a-2gy}\,\sqrt{1+(y')^2}} + \frac{g(y')^2}{(\sqrt{a-2gy})^3\,\sqrt{1+(y')^2}} - \\
&\qquad + \frac{(y')^2 y''}{\sqrt{a-2gy}\,(\sqrt{1+(y')^2})^3} \\
&= \frac{y''}{\sqrt{a-2gy}\,(\sqrt{1+(y')^2})^3} - \frac{g(y')^2}{(\sqrt{a-2gy})^3\,\sqrt{1+(y')^2}},
\end{aligned}
$$

or, if we simplify,

$$
y''\,(a-2gy) - g\,(1+(y')^2) = 0 \quad \text{on } (0,b), \quad y(0) = a,\ y(b) = 0.
$$

By substituting $z(x) := a - 2gy(x)$, and by assuming (for simplicity) that $2g = 1$, this differential equation is equivalent to the following problem:

$$
2z\,z'' + (z')^2 + 1 = 0 \quad \text{on } (0,b), \quad z(0) = 0,\ z(b) = a. \tag{5.1}
$$

CHAPTER 3

Nonconvex analysis

We follow the monographs by Struwe [**17**] and Drábek & Milota [**8**].

1. Ekeland's variational principle

THEOREM 1.1. *Let (M, d) be a complete metric space. Let $E : M \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ be lower semicontinuous, bounded from below and $\not\equiv \infty$. Then for every $\varepsilon > 0$, $\delta > 0$ and $u \in M$ with $E(u) \le \inf_M E + \varepsilon$ there exists $v \in M$ which is the unique minimizer of the function $E_v : M \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ given by*

$$E_v(w) = E(w) + \frac{\varepsilon}{\delta} d(v, w).$$

Moreover,

$$E(v) \le E(u) \quad \textit{and} \quad d(u, v) \le \delta.$$

PROOF. Put $\alpha := \frac{\varepsilon}{\delta}$. We define inductively a sequence $(v_n) \subset M$ as follows:

First, we put $v_1 := u$.

Next, assume that v_n is already constructed for some $n \ge 1$. Then we define the set

$$S_n := \{v \in M : E(v) \le E(v_n) - \alpha\, d(v, v_n)\}$$

and

$$\mu_n := \inf_{S_n} E.$$

Clearly, S_n is non-empty since $v_n \in S_n$. Moreover, $\mu_n \ge \inf_M E$. We choose $v_{n+1} \in S_n$ such that

$$E(v_n) - E(v_{n+1}) \ge \frac{1}{2}\,(E(v_n) - \mu_n).$$

Such an element v_{n+1} exists by the definition of the infimum.

Having thus constructed the sequence (v_n) and also the sequences (S_n) and (μ_n) we first remark that $S_{n+1} \subset S_n$. In fact, if $v \in S_{n+1}$, then, by definition of S_{n+1}, by the triangle inequality and since $v_{n+1} \in S_n$,

$$\begin{aligned} E(v) &\le E(v_{n+1}) - \alpha\, d(v, v_{n+1}) \\ &\le E(v_n) - \alpha\, d(v_{n+1}, v_n) - \alpha\, d(v, v_{n+1}) \\ &\le E(v_n) - \alpha\, d(v, v_n). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $v \in S_n$, which proves the inclusion $S_{n+1} \subset S_n$. As a consequence, the sequence (μ_n) is increasing. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} E(v_{n+1}) - \mu_{n+1} &\leq E(v_{n+1}) - \mu_n \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}(E(v_n) - \mu_n), \end{aligned}$$

which, by iteration, implies

$$E(v_{n+1}) - \mu_{n+1} \leq (\frac{1}{2})^n (E(\mu_1) - \mu_1).$$

Hence, for every $v \in S_n$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} d(v_n, v) &\leq \frac{1}{\alpha}(E(v_n) - E(v)) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\alpha}(E(v_n) - \mu_n) \\ &\leq \frac{C}{\alpha}(\frac{1}{2})^n. \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

In particular, if $m \geq n$, then $v_m \in S_n$ and

$$d(v_n, v_m) \leq \frac{C}{\alpha}(\frac{1}{2})^n.$$

This means that (v_n) is a Cauchy sequence. Since M is complete, there exists $v \in M$ such that $v = \lim_{n\to\infty} v_n$. Since S_n is closed by lower semicontinuity of E, we have $v \in S_n$ for every n. In particular, $v \in S_1$ which means that

$$E(v) \leq E(v_1) - \alpha\, d(v_1, v) \leq E(v_1) = E(u)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} d(u, v) &\leq \frac{1}{\alpha}(E(u) - E(v)) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\alpha}(\inf_M E + \varepsilon - \inf_M E) \\ &= \frac{1}{\alpha}\varepsilon = \delta. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, let $w \in M$ be such that

$$E_v(w) = E(w) + \alpha\, d(w, v) \leq E_v(v) = E(v).$$

Then, since $v \in S_n$ for every n,

$$\begin{aligned} E(w) &\leq E(v) - \alpha\, d(w, v) \\ &\leq E(v_n) - \alpha\, d(v_n, v) - \alpha\, d(w, v) \\ &\leq E(v_n) - \alpha\, d(v_n, w), \end{aligned}$$

that is, $w \in S_n$ for every n. By (1.1), this implies $d(v_n, w) \leq \frac{C}{\alpha}(\frac{1}{2})^n$. Hence, $w = \lim_{n\to\infty} v_n = v$, which proves that v is the only global minimizer of the function E_v. □

Corollary 1.2. *Let V be a Banach space and $E \in C^1(V)$. If E is bounded from below then there exists a sequence $(u_n) \subset V$ such that*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} E(u_n) = \inf_V E \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n\to\infty} \|E'(u)\|_{V'} = 0.$$

Proof. Choose a sequence $(\varepsilon_n) \subset \mathbb{R}$ such that $\varepsilon_n > 0$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty} \varepsilon_n = 0$. Choose a minimizing sequence $(u_n) \subset V$ such that $E(u_n) \le \inf_V E + \varepsilon_n^2$. Applying Ekeland's variational principle with $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_n^2$, $\delta = \varepsilon_n$ and $u = u_n$, we find a sequence $(v_n) \subset V$ such that $E(v_n) \le E(u_n)$ and for every $w \in V$ one has

$$\begin{aligned} E(v_n) &\le E(v_n + w) + \varepsilon_n \|w\|_V \\ &= E(v_n) + E'(v_n)w + o(w) + \varepsilon_n \|w\|_V . \end{aligned}$$

This inequality implies that for every $\delta > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \|E'(v_n)\|_{V'} &= \sup_{\|w\|_V \le \delta} |E'(v_n)\frac{w}{\|w\|_V}| \\ &\le \sup_{\|w\|_V \le \delta} \frac{|o(w)|}{\|w\|_V} + \varepsilon_n . \end{aligned}$$

Letting $\delta \to 0$, one obtains

$$\|E'(v_n)\|_{V'} \le \varepsilon_n,$$

so that (v_n) is a sequence we are looking for. □

Definition 1.3. Let V be a Banach space and let $E \in C^1(V)$. A sequence $(u_n) \subset V$ is called a *Palais-Smale sequence* if there exists a constant $C \ge 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} &E(u_n) \le C \text{ for every } n, \text{ and} \\ &\lim_{n\to\infty} \|E'(u_n)\|_{V'} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 1.4. The Corollary 1.2 says that every function $E \in C^1(V)$ which is bounded from below admits a minimizing Palais-Smale sequence.

Definition 1.5. Let V be a Banach space and let $E \in C^1(V)$. We say that E satisfies the *Palais-Smale condition* if every Palais-Smale sequence admits a strongly convergent subsequence.

Remark 1.6. If E satisfies the Palais-Smale condition *and* if E admits a Palais-Smale sequence, then E has a critical point. This is immediate from the definition and the continuity of E'.

2. * Nonlinear elliptic problems II

We consider the problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + f(u) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{in } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a bounded open set and the function $f \in C(\mathbb{R})$ satisfies the growth condition

$$|f(s)| \leq C\,(1 + |s|^{p-1}) \quad \text{for some } C \geq 0,\ 0 \leq p < \frac{2n}{n-2} \text{ and all } s \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{2.2}$$

We put $F(s) := \int_0^s f(r)\,dr$ and we define the energy $E : H_0^1(\Omega) \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$E(u) := \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^2 + \int_\Omega F(u), \quad u \in H_0^1(\Omega). \tag{2.3}$$

Theorem 2.1. *Assume that there exists $C \geq 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ such that*

$$F(s) \geq (-\frac{\lambda_1}{2} + \varepsilon)\,s^2 - C \quad \textit{for every } s \in \mathbb{R},$$

where $\lambda_1 > 0$ is the first eigenvalue of the Dirichlet-Laplace operator on $L^2(\Omega)$. Then the problem (2.1) *admits a weak solution $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$.*

Lemma 2.2. *Assume that f satisfies the growth condition* (2.2)*. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be open and bounded, and let $E : H_0^1(\Omega) \to \mathbb{R}$ be defined as in* (2.3)*. Then every* bounded *Palais-Smale sequence admits a subsequence which converges in $H_0^1(\Omega)$.*

Proof. Let $(u_n) \subset H_0^1(\Omega)$ be a bounded Palais-Smale sequence. This means that there exists a constant $C \geq 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} &E(u_n) \leq C \text{ for every } n, \\ &\lim_{n\to\infty} \|E'(u_n)\|_{H^{-1}} = 0, \text{ and} \\ &\|u_n\|_{H_0^1} \leq C \text{ for every } n. \end{aligned}$$

Since (u_n) is bounded, since $H_0^1(\Omega)$ is reflexive and by the Rellich-Kondrachov theorem, there exists a subsequence (which will be again denoted by (u_n)) and $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} &u_n \rightharpoonup u \text{ in } H_0^1(\Omega) \text{ and} \\ &u_n \to u \text{ in } L^2(\Omega). \end{aligned}$$

Since (u_n) is bounded in $H_0^1(\Omega)$, by the Sobolev embedding theorem and by the growth condition on f, the sequence $(f(u_n))$ is bounded in $L^p(\Omega)$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_n - u\|_{H_0^1}^2 &= \int_\Omega |\nabla(u_n - u)|^2 \\ &= \int_\Omega \nabla(u_n - u)\nabla u_n + \int_\Omega f(u_n)(u_n - u) - \\ &\quad - \int_\Omega f(u_n)(u_n - u) - \int_\Omega \nabla(u_n - u)\nabla u \\ &\leq \|E'(u_n)\|_{H^{-1}}\,\|u_n - u\|_{H_0^1} + \|f(u_n)\|_{L^q}\,\|u_n - u\|_{L^{q'}} - \int_\Omega \nabla(u_n - u)\nabla u. \end{aligned}$$

Each term on the right-hand side of this inequality converges to 0 as $n \to \infty$: the first term since (u_n) is bounded and Palais-Smale, the second term because $(f(u_n))$ is bounded and $u_n \to u$ in L^q, and the third term because of the weak convergence of (u_n). $\square$

3. The mountain pass theorem

Let V be a real Hilbert space and let $E \in C^1(V)$. Assume the following *mountain pass geometry*:

(M1) there exists $u_0 \in V$ such that $E'(u_0) = 0$,

(M2) there exists $r > 0$ such that

$$\inf_{\|u-u_0\|=r} E(u) > E(u_0),$$

and

(M3) there exists $u_1 \in V$ with $\|u_1 - u_0\| > r$ such that $E(u_1) \leq E(u_0)$.

In fact, it is not essential that u_0 is a critical point and the first condition may be dropped. In this section, however, we ask whether E admits a critical point which is not equal to u_0. In general, assuming only the mountain pass geometry above is not enough to prove existence of a second critical point.

Example 3.1 (Brézis-Nirenberg). Consider the function $E : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ given by $E(x, y) = x^2 + (1 - x)^3 y^2$. Then

$$E'(x, y) = (2x - 3(1 - x)^2 y^2, 2(1 - x)^3 y) = (0, 0)$$

if and only if $(x, y) = (0, 0)$, that is, the origin is the only critical point of E. On the other hand

$$\begin{aligned} &E(0, 0) = 0, \\ &E(2, 2) = 0, \text{ and} \\ &\inf_{x^2+y^2=\frac{1}{4}} E(x, y) > 0, \end{aligned}$$

that is, E satisfies the mountain pass geometry.

Theorem 3.2. *Let $E \in C^1(V)$ satisfy the mountain pass geometry (M1)-(M3). Let*

$$c := \inf_{\gamma\in\Gamma} \max_{t\in[0,1]} E(\gamma(t)), \tag{3.1}$$

where

$$\Gamma := \{\gamma \in C([0, 1]; V) : \gamma(0) = u_0 \text{ and } \gamma(1) = u_1\}.$$

Assume that E satisfies the Palais-Smale condition. Then c is a critical value of E, that is, there exists $u \in V$ such that $E(u) = c$ and $E'(u) = 0$.

4. * Nonlinear elliptic problems III

In this section we consider again the problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + f(u) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{in } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{4.1}$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a bounded open set and the function $f \in C(\mathbb{R})$ satisfies the growth condition (2.2).

THEOREM 4.1. *Assume in addition that*

(i) $\liminf_{s\to 0} \frac{f(s)}{s} \geq 0$ *and*
(ii) *there exist* $q > 2$ *and* $R > 0$ *such that* $0 > q\,F(s) \geq f(s)s$ *for every* $s \in \mathbb{R}$ *with* $|s| \geq R$.

Then the problem (4.1) *admits a nonzero weak solution* $u \in H^1_0(\Omega)$.

PROOF. We apply the Mountain Pass Theorem (Theorem 3.2).

We note first that $E(0) = 0$, since $F(0) = 0$.

Next, by assumption (i), for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for every $s \in \mathbb{R}$ with $|s| \leq \delta$ one has $\frac{f(s)}{s} \geq -\varepsilon$. This inequality implies that

$$F(s) \geq -\varepsilon\, s^2 \quad \text{for every } s \in \mathbb{R} \text{ with } |s| \leq \delta.$$

On the other hand, the growth condition (2.2) implies that

$$F(s) \geq -C(\varepsilon)\,|s|^p \quad \text{for every } s \in \mathbb{R} \text{ with } |s| \geq \delta.$$

As a consequence,

$$F(s) \geq -\varepsilon\, s^2 - C(\varepsilon)\,|s|^p \quad \text{for every } s \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Using Poincaré's inequality $\lambda_1\, \|u\|^2_{L^2} \leq \|\nabla u\|^2_{L^2}$ and the continuity of the embedding $H^1_0(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^p(\Omega)$ (Sobolev), we obtain for every $u \in H^1_0(\Omega)$

$$\begin{aligned} E(u) &\geq \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^2 - \varepsilon \int_\Omega u^2 - C(\varepsilon)\int_\Omega |u|^p \\ &\geq \Big(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\varepsilon}{\lambda_1}\Big)\, \|u\|^2_{H^1_0(\Omega)} - \tilde{C}(\varepsilon)\, \|u\|^p_{H^1_0(\Omega)} \\ &= \Big(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\varepsilon}{\lambda_1} - \tilde{C}(\varepsilon)\|u\|^{p-2}_{H^1_0(\Omega)}\Big)\, \|u\|^2_{H^1_0(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, if $\varepsilon > 0$ and $r > 0$ are small enough, then

$$\inf_{\|u\|_{H^1_0} = r} E(u) = \Big(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\varepsilon}{\lambda_1} - \tilde{C}(\varepsilon) r^{p-2}\Big)\, r^2 > 0.$$

Hence, we have proved that E satisfies condition (M2).

In order to prove condition (M3), we note that hypothesis (iii) says that

$$0 > q\,F(s) \geq F'(s)s \quad \text{for every } s \in \mathbb{R} \text{ with } |s| \geq R.$$

Integrating this differential inequality implies that there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that

$$F(s) \le c\,|s|^q \quad \text{for every } s \in \mathbb{R} \text{ with } |s| \ge R.$$

From this inequality we deduce that for every $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ and every $\lambda > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} E(\lambda u) &= \lambda^2 \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^2 + \int_{\{|\lambda u| \le R\}} F(\lambda u) + \int_{\{|\lambda u| > R\}} F(\lambda u) \\ &\le \lambda^2 \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^2 + |\Omega| \sup_{|s| \le R} F(s) - |\lambda|^q\, c \int_{\{|\lambda u| > R\}} |u|^p. \end{aligned}$$

Since $c > 0$ and $q > 2$, we see that for every nonzero $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ there exists $\lambda > 0$ such that $\|\lambda u\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)} \ge r$ and $E(\lambda u) \le 0$; in fact, we have $\lim_{\lambda\to\infty} E(\lambda u) = -\infty$. In particular, E satisfies the condition (M3).

It remains to show that E satisfies the Palais-Smale condition. Let (u_n) be a Palais-Smale sequence. This means that there exists $C \ge 0$ such that $E(u_n) \le C$ for every n and $\lim_{n\to\infty} \|E'(u_n)\| = 0$. By choosing C large enough, we may also assume that $\|E'(u_n)\| \le C$ for every n. Then we obtain, using also hypothesis (ii), that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned} qC + C\,\|u_n\|_{H_0^1} &\ge q\,E(u_n) - E'(u_n)u_n \\ &= \frac{q-2}{2} \int_\Omega |\nabla u_n|^2 + \int_\Omega (q\,F(u_n) - f(u_n)u_n) \\ &\ge \frac{q-2}{2}\,\|u_n\|_{H_0^1}^2. \end{aligned}$$

This inequality implies that the sequence (u_n) is bounded. It follows from Lemma 2.2 that (u_n) has a convergent subsequence. Since (u_n) was an arbitrary Palais-Smale sequence, it therefore follows that E satisfies the Palais-Smale condition.

By the Mountain Pass Theorem (Theorem 3.2), there exists a critical point $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that $E(u) = c > 0$, where c is defined as in Theorem 3.2. Since $E(0) = 0$, it follows that u is nonzero. □

CHAPTER 4

Iterative methods

1. * Newton's method

THEOREM 1.1 (Newton's method). *Let X and Y be two Banach spaces, $U \subset X$ an open set. Let $f \in C^1(U;Y)$ and assume that there exists $\bar{x} \in U$ such that (i) $f(\bar{x}) = 0$ and (ii) $f'(\bar{x}) \in \mathcal{L}(X,Y)$ is an isomorphism. Then for every $L \in (0,1)$ there exists a neighbourhood $V \subset U$ of $\bar{x}$ such that for every $x_0 \in V$ the operator $f'(x_0)$ is an isomorphism, the sequence (x_n) defined iteratively by*

$$x_{n+1} = x_n - f'(x_n)^{-1} f(x_n), \quad n \geq 0, \tag{1.1}$$

remains in V and $\|x_n - \bar{x}\| \leq L^n \|x_0 - \bar{x}\|$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. In particular, $\lim_{n\to\infty} x_n = \bar{x}$.

REMARK 1.2. The iteration given by (1.1) is called *Newton iteration*.

PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1. By continuity, there exists a neighbourhood $\tilde{V} \subset U$ of $\bar{x}$ such that $f'(x)$ is an isomorphism for all $x \in \tilde{V}$. It will be useful to define the auxiliary function $\varphi : \tilde{V} \to X$ by

$$\varphi(x) := x - f'(x)^{-1} f(x), \quad x \in \tilde{V}.$$

Since $f(\bar{x}) = 0$, we find that for every $x \in \tilde{V}$

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(x) - \varphi(\bar{x}) &= x - f'(x)^{-1}(f(x) - f(\bar{x})) - \bar{x} \\ &= x - \bar{x} - f'(x)^{-1}(f'(\bar{x})(x - \bar{x}) + o(x - \bar{x})), \end{aligned}$$

so that by the continuity of $f'(\cdot)^{-1}$

$$\lim_{x\to\bar{x}} \frac{\|\varphi(x) - \varphi(\bar{x})\|}{\|x - \bar{x}\|} = 0.$$

In particular, for every $L \in (0,1)$ there exists $r > 0$ such that $V := B(\bar{x}, r) \subset \tilde{V} \subset U$ and such that for every $x \in V$

$$\|\varphi(x) - \bar{x}\| = \|\varphi(x) - \varphi(\bar{x})\| \leq L \|x - \bar{x}\|.$$

This implies that for every $x_0 \in V$ one has $\varphi(x_0) \in V$ and if we define iteratively $x_{n+1} = \varphi(x_n) = \varphi^{n+1}(x_0)$, then

$$\|x_n - \bar{x}\| \leq L^n \|x_0 - \bar{x}\| \to 0 \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$

□

2. Local inverse theorem and implicit function theorem

Let X and Y be two Banach spaces and let U be an open subset of X. The following are two classical theorems in differential calculus.

THEOREM 2.1 (Local inverse theorem). *Let $f : U \to Y$ be continuously differentiable and $\bar{x} \in U$ such that $f'(\bar{x}) : X \to Y$ is an isomorphism, that is, bounded, bijective and the inverse is also bounded. Then there exist neighbourhoods $V \subset U$ of $\bar{x}$ and $W \subset Y$ of $f(\bar{x})$ such that $f : V \to W$ is a C^1 diffeomorphism, that is f is continuously differentiable, bijective and the inverse $f^{-1} : W \to V$ is continuously differentiable.*

THEOREM 2.2 (Implicit function theorem). *Assume that $X = X_1 \times X_2$ for two Banach spaces, and let $f : X \supset U \to Y$ be continuously differentiable and $\bar{x} = (\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2) \in U$ such that $\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_2}(\bar{x}) : X_2 \to Y$ is an isomorphism. Then there exist neighbourhoods $U_1 \subset X_1$ of $\bar{x}_1$ and $U_2 \subset X_2$ of $\bar{x}_2$, $U_1 \times U_2 \subset U$, and a continuously differentiable function $g : U_1 \to U_2$ such that*

$$\{x \in U_1 \times U_2 : f(x) = f(\bar{x})\} = \{(x_1, g(x_1)) : x_1 \in U_1\}.$$

For the proof of the local inverse theorem, we need the following lemma.

LEMMA 2.3. *Let $f : U \to Y$ be continuously differentiable such that $f : U \to f(U)$ is a homeomorphism, that is, continuous, bijective and with continuous inverse. Then f is a C^1 diffeomorphism if and only if for every $x \in U$ the derivative $f'(x) : X \to Y$ is an isomorphism.*

PROOF. Assume first that f is a C^1 diffeomorphism. When we differentiate the identities $x = f^{-1}(f(x))$ and $y = f(f^{-1}(y))$, which are true for every $x \in U$ and every $y \in f(U)$, then we find

$$\begin{aligned} I_X &= (f^{-1})'(f(x))f'(x) \quad \text{for every } x \in U \text{ and} \\ I_Y &= f'(f^{-1}(y))(f^{-1})'(y) \\ &= f'(x)(f^{-1})'(f(x)) \quad \text{for every } x = f^{-1}(y) \in U. \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, $f'(x)$ is an isomorphism for every $x \in U$.

For the converse, assume that $f'(x)$ is an isomorphism for every $x \in U$. For every $x_1, x_2 \in U$ one has, by differentiability,

$$f(x_2) = f(x_1) + f'(x_1)(x_2 - x_1) + o(x_2 - x_1),$$

where o depends on x_1 and $\lim_{x_2 \to x_1} \frac{o(x_2 - x_1)}{\|x_2 - x_1\|} = 0$. We have $x_1 = f^{-1}(y_1)$ and $x_2 = f^{-1}(y_2)$ if we put $y_i := f(x_i)$. Hence, the above identity becomes

$$y_2 = y_1 + f'(f^{-1}(y_1))(f^{-1}(y_2) - f^{-1}(y_1)) + o(f^{-1}(y_2) - f^{-1}(y_1)).$$

To this identity, we apply the inverse operator $(f'(f^{-1}(y_1)))^{-1}$ and we obtain

$$f^{-1}(y_2) = f^{-1}(y_1) + (f'(f^{-1}(y_1)))^{-1}(y_2 - y_1) - (f'(f^{-1}(y_1)))^{-1}o(f^{-1}(y_2) - f^{-1}(y_1)).$$

Since f^{-1} is continuous, the last term on the right-hand side of the last equality is sublinear. Hence, f^{-1} is differentiable and

$$(f^{-1})'(y_1) = (f'(f^{-1}(y_1)))^{-1}.$$

From this identity (using that f^{-1} and f' are continuous) we obtain that f^{-1} is continuously differentiable. The claim is proved. □

Proof of the local inverse theorem. Consider the function

$$\begin{aligned} g : U &\to X, \\ x &\mapsto f'(\bar{x})^{-1} f(x). \end{aligned}$$

It suffices to show that $g : V \to W$ is a C^1 diffeomorphism for appropriate neighbourhoods V of $\bar{x}$ and W of $g(\bar{x})$.

Consider also the function

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi : U &\to X, \\ x &\mapsto x - g(x). \end{aligned}$$

This function φ is continuously differentiable and $\varphi'(x) = I - f'(\bar{x})^{-1} f'(x)$ for every $x \in U$. In particular, $\varphi'(\bar{x}) = 0$. By continuity of φ', there exists $r > 0$ and $L < 1$ such that $\|\varphi'(x)\| \leq L$ for every $x \in \bar{B}(\bar{x}, r) \subset U$. Hence,

$$\|\varphi(x_1) - \varphi(x_2)\| \leq L\,\|x_1 - x_2\| \quad \text{for every } x_1,\ x_2 \in \bar{B}(\bar{x}, r).$$

By the definition of φ, this implies

$$\begin{aligned} \|g(x_1) - g(x_2)\| &= \|x_1 - x_2 - (\varphi(x_1) - \varphi(x_2))\| \\ &\geq \|x_1 - x_2\| - L\,\|x_1 - x_2\| \\ &= (1 - L)\,\|x_1 - x_2\|. \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

We claim that for every $y \in \bar{B}(g(\bar{x}), (1 - L)r)$ there exists a unique $x \in \bar{B}(\bar{x}, r)$ such that $g(x) = y$.

The uniqueness follows from (2.1).

In order to prove existence, let $x_0 = \bar{x}$, and then define recursively $x_{n+1} = y + \varphi(x_n) = y + x_n - f'(\bar{x})^{-1} f(x_n)$ for every $n \geq 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_n - \bar{x}\| &= \|\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} x_{k+1} - x_k\| \\ &\leq \|x_1 - x_0\| + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \|\varphi(x_k) - \varphi(x_{k-1})\| \\ &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} L^k\,\|x_1 - x_0\| \\ &= \frac{1 - L^n}{1 - L}\,\|y - g(\bar{x})\| \\ &\leq (1 - L^n)\,r \quad \leq \quad r, \end{aligned}$$

which implies $x_n \in \bar{B}(\bar{x}, r)$ for every $n \geq 0$. Similarly, for every $n \geq m \geq 0$,

$$\|x_n - x_m\| \;\leq\; \sum_{k=m}^{n-1} L^k \, \|y - g(\bar{x})\|,$$

so that the sequence (x_n) is a Cauchy sequence in $\bar{B}(\bar{x}, r)$. Since $\bar{B}(\bar{x}, r)$ is complete, there exists $\lim_{n\to\infty} x_n =: x \in \bar{B}(\bar{x}, r)$. By continuity,

$$x = y + \varphi(x) = y + x - g(x),$$

or

$$g(x) = y.$$

This proves the above claim, that is, g is locally invertible. It remains to show that g^{-1} is continuous (then g is a homeomorphism, and therefore a C^1 diffeomorphism by Lemma 2.3). Contiunity of the inverse function, however, is a direct consequence of (2.1) (which even implies Lipschitz continuity). □

REMARK 2.4. The iteration formula

$$x_{n+1} = y + x_n - f'(\bar{x})^{-1} f(x_n)$$

used in the proof of the local inverse theorem in order to find a solution of $g(x) = f'(\bar{x})^{-1} f(x) = y$ should be compared to the Newton iteration

$$x_{n+1} = y + x_n - f'(x_n)^{-1} f(x_n).$$

PROOF OF THE IMPLICIT FUNCTION THEOREM. Consider the function

$$\begin{aligned} F : U &\;\to\; X_1 \times Y, \\ (x_1, x_2) &\;\mapsto\; (x_1, f(x_1, x_2)). \end{aligned}$$

Then F is continuously differentiable and

$$F'(\bar{x})(h_1, h_2) = (h_1, \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1}(\bar{x})h_1 + \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_2}(\bar{x})h_2).$$

In particular, by the assumption, $F'(\bar{x})$ is locally invertible with inverse

$$F'(\bar{x})^{-1}(y_1, y_2) = (y_1, (\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_2}(\bar{x}))^{-1}(y_2 - \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1}(\bar{x})y_1)).$$

By the local inverse theorem (Theorem 2.1), there exists a neighbourhood U_1 of $\bar{x}_1$, a neighbourhood U_2 of $\bar{x}_2$ and a neighbourhood V of $(\bar{x}_1, f(\bar{x})) = F(\bar{x})$ such that $F : U_1 \times U_2 \to V$ is a C^1 diffeomorphism. The inverse is of the form

$$F^{-1}(y_1, y_2) = (y_1, h_2(y_1, y_2)),$$

where h_2 is a function such that $f(y_1, h_2(y_1, y_2)) = y_2$. Let

$$\tilde{U}_1 := \{x_1 \in U_1 : (x_1, f(\bar{x})) \in V\}.$$

Then $\tilde{U}_1$ is open by continuity of the function $x_1 \mapsto (x_1, f(\bar{x}))$, and $\bar{x}_1 \in \tilde{U}_1$. We restrict F to $\tilde{U}_1 \times U_2$, and we define

$$\begin{aligned} g : \tilde{U}_1 &\;\to\; X_2, \\ x_1 &\;\mapsto\; g(x_1) = F^{-1}(x_1, f(\bar{x}))_2, \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

where $F^{-1}(\cdot)_2$ denotes the second component of $F^{-1}(\cdot)$. Then g is continuously differentiable, $g(\tilde{U}_1) \subset U_2$ and g satisfies the required property of the implicit function. $\square$

Lemma 2.5 (Higher regularity of the local inverse). *Let $f \in C^k(U;Y)$ for some $k \geq 1$ and assum that $f : U \to f(U)$ is a C^1 diffeomorphism. Then f is a C^k diffeomorphism, that is, f^{-1} is k times continuously differentiable.*

Proof. For every $y \in f(U)$ we have

$$(f^{-1})'(y) = f'(f^{-1}(y))^{-1}.$$

The proof therefore follows by induction on k. $\square$

Lemma 2.6 (Higher regularity of the implicit function). *If, in the implicit function theorem (Theorem 2.2), the function f is k times continuously differentiable, then the implicit function g is also k times continuously differentiable.*

Proof. This follows from the previous lemma (Lemma 2.5) and the definition of the implicit function in the proof of the implicit function theorem. $\square$

3. * Parameter dependence of solutions of ordinary differential equations

Let P and X be two Banach spaces and let $f \in C^k(P \times X; X)$. Consider the ordinary differential equation

$$\dot{x}(t) = f(p, x(t)), \quad x(0) = 0, \tag{3.1}$$

where p is a parameter. Fix a parameter $p_0 \in P$, let $I_0 \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a compact intervall such that $0 \in I_0$, and let a solution $x_0 \in C^1(I_0; X)$ be a solution of the above problem for the parameter $p = p_0$.

Theorem 3.1. *Then there exists a neighbourhood $U_0 \subset P$ of p_0 and a k times continuously differentiable function $g : U_0 \to C^1(I_0; X)$ such that for every $p \in U_0$ the function $x_p = g(p)$ is the unique solution of* (3.1) *for the parameter p. All solutions of* (3.1) *in a neighbourhood of* (p_0, x_0) *are of this form.*

Proof. Let $C_0^1(I_0; X) = \{x \in C^1(I_0; X) : x(0) = 0\}$ be equipped with the norm $\|x\|_{C^1} = \|x\|_\infty + \|\dot{x}\|_\infty$, so that C_0^1 is a Banach space. Consider the function

$$\begin{aligned} F : P \times C_0^1(I_0; X) &\to C(I_0; X), \\ (p, x) &\mapsto \dot{x} - f(p, x). \end{aligned}$$

Then, by definition of F, $F(p_0, x_0) = 0$. Moreover, the function F is k times continuously differentiable and $\frac{\partial F}{\partial x}(p_0, x_0)$ is an isomorphism from $C_0^1(I_0; X)$ onto $C(I_0; X)$ (!!).

By the implicit function theorem (Theorem 2.2), there exists a neighbourhood U_0 of p_0 and k times continuously differentiable function $g : U_0 \to C_0^1(I_0; X)$ (we use also Lemma 2.6) such that for every $p \in U_0$ one has $F(p, g(p)) = 0$, that is, $g(p)$ is the solution of (3.1) for the parameter p, and it also follows from the implicit function theorem, that every solution of (3.1) is of this form. $\square$

4. * A bifurcation theorem and ordinary differential equations

We follow [**8**, Section 4.3].

Theorem 4.1 (Crandall-Rabinowitz). *Let X and Y be two Banach spaces, $U \subset \mathbb{R} \times X$ be an open set, let $f \in C^2(U; Y)$ and $(\overline{\lambda}, \overline{x}) \in U$. Assume that*
(i) $f(\lambda, \overline{x}) = 0$ for all λ in a neighbourhood of $\overline{\lambda}$,
(ii) $\dim \operatorname{Ker} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(\overline{\lambda}, \overline{x}) = \operatorname{codim} \operatorname{Rg} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(\overline{\lambda}, \overline{x}) = 1$, and
(iii) if $x_0 \in \operatorname{Ker} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(\overline{\lambda}, \overline{x}) \setminus \{0\}$, then $\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial \lambda \partial x}(\overline{\lambda}, \overline{x})(1, x_0) \notin \operatorname{Rg} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(\overline{\lambda}, \overline{x})$.

Denote by X_1 the topological complement of $\operatorname{Ker} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(\overline{\lambda}, \overline{x})$ in X.

Then there exists a continuously differentiable curve $(\lambda, x) : (-\delta, \delta) \to \mathbb{R} \times X_1$ such that

$$(\lambda(0), x(0)) = (\overline{\lambda}, \overline{x}) \quad \text{and} \quad f(\lambda(t), tx_0 + tx(t)) = 0 \quad \text{for every } t \in (-\delta, \delta).$$

Moreover, there is a neighbourhood $V \subset U$ of $(\overline{\lambda}, \overline{x})$ such that

$$f(\lambda, x) = 0 \quad \text{for } (\lambda, x) \in V$$

if and only if

$$\text{either} \quad x = 0 \quad \text{or} \quad \lambda = \lambda(t),\ x = tx_0 + tx(t).$$

Proof. For simplicity, we assume that $(\overline{\lambda}, \overline{x}) = (0, 0)$. Fix

$$x_0 \in \operatorname{Ker} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(\overline{\lambda}, \overline{x}), \quad x_0 \neq 0,$$

and consider the function $F : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times X_1 \to Y$ which is given by

$$F(t, \lambda, x) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{t} f(\lambda, t(x_0 + x_1)) & \text{for } t \neq 0, \\ \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(\lambda, 0)(x_0 + x_1) & \text{for } t = 0. \end{cases}$$

Then

$$F(0, 0, 0) = 0$$

and the operator

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{R} \times X_1 &\to Y, \\ (\lambda, x_1) &\mapsto \frac{\partial F}{\partial \lambda}(0, 0, 0)\lambda + \frac{\partial F}{\partial x}(0, 0, 0)x_1 \end{aligned}$$

is an isomorphism by assumptions (ii) and (iii). The claim follows from the implicit function theorem (Theorem 2.2). □

Example 4.2. We study the periodic boundary value problem

$$\begin{cases} \ddot{x}(t) + \lambda x(t) + g(\lambda, t, x(t), \dot{x}(t)) = 0, & t \in [0, 2\pi], \\ x(0) = x(2\pi), \\ \dot{x}(0) = \dot{x}(2\pi). \end{cases} \tag{4.1}$$

The function $g : \mathbb{R} \times [0, 2\pi] \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, $g = g(\lambda, t, x, p)$ satisfies the following assumptions:
(i) g is k times continuously differentiable for some $k \geq 2$, and 2π-periodic with

respect to t,
(ii) $g(\lambda, t, 0, 0) = 0$, and
(iii) $\frac{\partial g}{\partial x}(\lambda, t, 0, 0) = \frac{\partial g}{\partial p}(\lambda, t, 0, 0) = 0$.

We will study the above problem near the point $\lambda = 0$ which is a simple eigenvalue of the associated eigenvalue problem

$$\begin{cases} \ddot{x}(t) + \lambda x(t) = 0, & t \in [0, 2\pi], \\ x(0) = x(2\pi), \\ \dot{x}(0) = \dot{x}(2\pi). \end{cases} \tag{4.2}$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned} X &= \{x \in C^2([0, 2\pi]) : x(0) = x(2\pi), \dot{x}(0) = \dot{x}(1) \text{ and } \ddot{x}(0) = \ddot{x}(2\pi)\} \quad \text{and} \\ Y &= \{y \in C([0, 2\pi]) : y(0) = y(2\pi)\}. \end{aligned}$$

The spaces X and Y are Banach spaces when they are equipped with the norms

$$\begin{aligned} \|x\|_X &= \|x\|_\infty + \|\dot{x}\|_\infty + \|\ddot{x}\|_\infty \quad \text{and} \\ \|y\|_Y &= \|y\|_\infty, \end{aligned}$$

respectively. Let us define $f : \mathbb{R} \times X \to Y$ by

$$f(\lambda, x) = \ddot{x} + \lambda x + g(\lambda, \cdot, x, \dot{x}).$$

It follows from (i) that f is well-defined and k times continuously differentiable. Moreover, by hypothesis (iii), we have

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(\lambda, 0)w = \ddot{w} + \lambda w,$$

which implies

$$\dim \operatorname{Ker} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(0, 0) = 1;$$

in fact, the only functions lying in X and satisfying $\ddot{x} = 0$ are the constant functions.

Next, let $y \in \operatorname{Rg} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(0, 0)$. Then there exists a function $x \in X$ such that $\ddot{x} = y$. Integrating this equality over the interval $[0, 2\pi]$ implies

$$\int_0^{2\pi} y = \int_0^{2\pi} \ddot{x} = \dot{x}(1) - \dot{x}(0) = 0,$$

so that

$$\operatorname{Rg} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(0, 0) \subset \{y \in Y : \int_0^{2\pi} y = 0\}.$$

On the other hand, let $y \in Y$ be such that $\int_0^{2\pi} y = 0$. Define

$$x(t) := \int_0^t (t - s)y(s)\, ds - t \int_0^{2\pi} (2\pi - s)y(s)\, ds.$$

Then $x \in X$ and $\ddot{x} = y$. We have therefore proved the equality

$$\operatorname{Rg} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(0, 0) = \{y \in Y : \int_0^{2\pi} y = 0\}.$$

From this we deduce

$$\operatorname{codim} \operatorname{Rg} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(0,0) = 1.$$

Note that $\operatorname{Ker} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(0,0)$ is the space of constant functions and that a topological complement is given by

$$X_1 = \{x \in X : \int_0^{2\pi} x(t)\, dt\}.$$

Since

$$\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial \lambda\, \partial x}(0,0)1 = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad 1 \notin \operatorname{Rg} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(0,0),$$

the condition (iii) of Theorem 4.1 is satisfied. It follows from the Crandall-Rabinowitz theorem (Theorem 4.1) that $\lambda = 0$ is a point of bifurcation of (4.1).

In particular, the point $(0,0) \in \mathbb{R} \times X$ belongs to the branch of trivial solutions $(\lambda, 0)$, but also to the branch

$$\Gamma = \{(\lambda(s), s + sx(s)) : s \in (-\delta, \delta)\}$$

where $(\lambda, x) : (-\delta, \delta) \to \mathbb{R} \times X$ is a curve satisfying

$$x(0) = 0, \ \frac{d}{ds}x(0) = 0, \quad \lambda(0) = 0.$$

Hence, for any $s \in (-\delta, \delta)$, $s \neq 0$, the nontrivial solution $s + sx(s)$ (sum of the constant function s and the perturbation $sx(s)$) belongs to X_1.

CHAPTER 5

Monotone operators

1. Monotone operators

Definition 1.1. Let v be a real Banach space, and let V' be its dual space. An operator $A : V \to V'$ is *monotone* if for every $u, v \in V$ one has

$$\langle Au - Av, u - v\rangle_{V',V} \geq 0.$$

Example 1.2. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be open and bounded. For every $p \geq 2$ and every $1 \leq i \leq n$, the linear operator

$$\begin{aligned} B_i : W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) &\to W^{-1,p'}(\Omega), \\ u &\mapsto \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i}, \end{aligned}$$

is monotone. In fact, for every $u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$, by an integration by parts,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle B_i u, u\rangle &= \int_\Omega \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i}\, u \\ &= -\int_\Omega u\, \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \\ &= -\langle B_i u, u\rangle, \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\langle B_i u, u\rangle = 0.$$

By linearity, B_i is hence monotone.

Example 1.3. The negative p-Laplace operator $-\Delta_p : W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \to W^{-1,p'}(\Omega)$ is monotone. In fact, for every $u, v \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$,

$$\begin{aligned} -\langle \Delta_p u - \Delta_p v, u - v\rangle_{W^{-1,p'},W_0^{1,p}} &= \int_\Omega (|\nabla u|^{p-2}\nabla u - |\nabla v|^{p-2}\nabla v)(\nabla u - \nabla v) \\ &\geq \int_\Omega (|\nabla u|^p + |\nabla v|^p - |\nabla u|^{p-1}\,|\nabla v| - |\nabla u|\,|\nabla v|^{p-1}) \\ &= \int_\Omega (|\nabla u|^{p-1} - |\nabla v|^{p-1})\,(|\nabla u| - |\nabla v|) \\ &\geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

The fact, that $-\Delta_p$ is a monotone operator, can also be deduced from the following simple lemma.

Lemma 1.4. *Let $\varphi : V \to \mathbb{R}$ be a continuously differentiable, convex function. Then $\varphi' : V \to V'$ is monotone.*

Proof. For every $u, v \in V$, the function $t \mapsto \varphi(tu + (1-t)v)$ is convex which means that its derivative is increasing. In particular,

$$\frac{d}{dt}\varphi(tu + (1-t)v)|_{t=1} \geq \frac{d}{dt}\varphi(tu + (1-t)v)|_{t=0},$$

which means

$$\langle \varphi'(u), u - v\rangle \geq \langle \varphi'(v), u - v\rangle.$$

Hence, φ' is monotone. □

Since the negative p-Laplace operator $-\Delta_p$ is the derivative of the continuously differentiable and convex function $\varphi : W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \to \mathbb{R}$ given by $\varphi(u) = \frac{1}{p}\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^p$, the preceding lemma provides another proof of the monotonicity of $-\Delta_p$.

Definition 1.5. Let V be a Banach space. An operator $A : V \to V'$ is
(i) *hemi-continuous* if for every $u, v, w \in V$ the function $t \mapsto \langle A(u + tv), w\rangle$ is continous,
(ii) *bounded* if it maps bounded sets into bounded sets, and
(iii) *pseudo-monotone* if A is bounded and if

$$\left.\begin{array}{l} u_n \rightharpoonup u \text{ in } V \text{ and} \\ \limsup_{n\to\infty}\langle Au_n, u_n - u\rangle \leq 0 \end{array}\right\} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \liminf_{n\to\infty}\langle Au_n, u_n - v\rangle \geq \langle Au, u - v\rangle.$$

Lemma 1.6. *Let V be a Banach space and $A : V \to V'$ be an operator. Consider the following properties:*
(i) A is monotone, bounded and hemicontinuous,
(ii) A is pseudo-monotone,
(iii) A satisfies

$$\left.\begin{array}{l} u_n \rightharpoonup u \textit{ in } V, \\ Au_n \rightharpoonup \chi \textit{ in } V' \textit{ and} \\ \limsup_{n\to\infty}\langle Au_n, u_n\rangle \leq \langle \chi, u\rangle \end{array}\right\} \quad \Rightarrow \quad Au = \chi.$$

Then (i)⇒(ii)⇒(iii).

Proof. (i)⇒(ii) Assume that A is monotone, bounded and hemicontinuous, and let $(u_n) \subset V$ be a sequence satisfying

$$u_n \rightharpoonup u \text{ in } V \text{ and } \limsup_{n\to\infty}\langle Au_n, u_n - u\rangle \leq 0.$$

By monotonicity of A, we have

$$\langle Au_n, u_n - u\rangle \geq \langle Au, u_n - u\rangle.$$

The weak convergence of (u_n) implies

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty}\langle Au_n, u_n - u\rangle \geq 0.$$

Together with the assumption above, this implies

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\langle Au_n, u_n - u\rangle = 0. \tag{1.1}$$

Let $v \in V$ and define $w := (1-\lambda)u + \lambda v$ ($\lambda \in (0,1)$). By monotonicity,

$$\langle Au_n - Aw, u_n - w\rangle \geq 0.$$

Together with the definition of w, this implies

$$\begin{aligned}\langle Au_n, u_n - w\rangle &= \langle Au_n, u_n - u\rangle + \langle Au_n, u - w\rangle \\ &= \langle Au_n, u_n - u\rangle + \lambda\,\langle Au_n, u - v\rangle \\ &\geq \langle Aw, u_n - w\rangle \\ &= \langle Aw, u_n - u\rangle + \lambda\,\langle Aw, u - v\rangle.\end{aligned}$$

Since $u_n \rightharpoonup u$ and by (1.1), we obtain

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty}\langle Au_n, u - v\rangle \geq \langle A((1-\lambda)u + \lambda v), u - v\rangle.$$

Letting $\lambda \searrow 0$ and using the hemi-continuity of A, we finally obtain

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty}\langle Au_n, u - v\rangle \geq \langle Au, u - v\rangle.$$

Hence, A is pseudo-monotone.

(ii)⇒(iii) Assume that A is pseudo-monotone, and let $(u_n) \subset V$ be a sequence such that $u_n \rightharpoonup u$, $Au_n \rightharpoonup \chi$ and $\limsup_{n\to\infty}\langle Au_n, u_n\rangle \leq \langle \chi, u\rangle$. Then

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}\langle Au_n, u_n - u\rangle \leq 0$$

which together with the pseudo-monotonicity implies

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty}\langle Au_n, u_n - v\rangle \geq \langle Au, u - v\rangle \quad \text{for every } v \in V.$$

Together with the assumption above, this implies

$$\langle \chi, u\rangle - \langle \chi, v\rangle \geq \langle Au, u - v\rangle,$$

or

$$\langle \chi - Au, u - v\rangle \geq 0 \quad \text{for every } v \in V.$$

This is equivalent to

$$\langle \chi - Au, v\rangle \geq 0 \quad \text{for every } v \in V,$$

which in turn implies (the inequality is true for v and $-v$)

$$\langle \chi - Au, v\rangle = 0 \quad \text{for every } v \in V.$$

Hence, $Au = \chi$. □

Corollary 1.7. *Let V be a reflexive Banach space, and let $A : V \to V'$ be a monotone, bounded, hemicontinuous operator. Then*

$$u_n \to u \text{ in } V \quad \Rightarrow \quad Au_n \rightharpoonup Au \text{ in } V'.$$

Proof. Assume that $u_n \to u$ in V. Since A is bounded, the sequence (Au_n) is bounded in V'. Since V is reflexive, and after passing to a subsequence, there exists $\chi \in V'$ such that $Au_n \rightharpoonup \chi$ in V'.

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}\langle Au_n, u_n\rangle &= \langle Au_n, u_n - u\rangle + \langle Au_n, u\rangle \\ &\leq \|Au_n\|\,\|u_n - u\| + \langle Au_n, u\rangle.\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \langle Au_n, u_n\rangle \leq \langle \chi, u\rangle.$$

By Lemma 1.6 (implication (i)⇒(iii)), we obtain $Au = \chi$. □

2. Surjectivity of monotone operators

In this section we give a sufficient condition for the surjectivity of a monotone operator $A : V \to V'$. Before, however, we recall Brouwer's fixed point theorem, without proof.

Theorem 2.1 (Brouwer's fixed point theorem). *Let $C \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a nonempty, compact, convex set, and let $f : C \to C$ be a continuous function. Then f has a fixed point, that is, there exists $x \in C$ such that $f(x) = x$.*

Corollary 2.2. *Let $f \in C(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R}^n)$. Assume that there exists $\varrho > 0$ such that $\langle f(x), x\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^n} \geq 0$ whenever $\|x\| = \varrho$. Then there exists $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\|x\| \leq \varrho$ and $f(x) = 0$.*

Proof. Assume, on the contrary, that $f(x) \neq 0$ whenever $\|x\| \leq \varrho$, and let $C := \bar{B}(0, \varrho)$. Then the function $g : C \to C$ given by $g(x) = -\varrho \frac{f(x)}{\|f(x)\|}$ is well defined and continuous. By Brouwer's fixed point theorem, there exists $x \in C$ such that $x = g(x) = -\varrho \frac{f(x)}{\|f(x)\|}$. Since $\|g(x)\| = \varrho$, this implies $\|x\| = \varrho$. Therefore,

$$\varrho^2 = \langle x, x\rangle = -\varrho \langle \frac{f(x)}{\|f(x)\|}, x\rangle \leq 0,$$

using also the assumption on f. This is a contradiction to $\varrho > 0$, and therefore, there exists $x \in C$ such that $f(x) = 0$. □

Theorem 2.3. *Let V be a separable, reflexive Banach space. Let $A : V \to V'$ be a monotone, bounded, hemicontinuous operator and assume that A is also* coercive, *that is,*

$$\lim_{\|v\|\to\infty} \frac{\langle Av, v\rangle}{\|v\|} = \infty.$$

Then A is surjective, that is, for every $f \in V'$ there exists $u \in V$ such that $Au = f$.

Proof. Let $f \in V'$. We have to solve the equation $Au = f$.

Let (w_m) be a total sequence, that is, a sequence such that span $\{w_m : m\}$ is dense in V; the existence of such a sequence is guaranteed by the assumption that V is separable.

Let $V_m := \text{span}\,\{w_k : 1 \leq k \leq m\}$.

We first prove that for every m there exists $u_m \in V_m$ such that

$$\langle Au_m, w_k \rangle = \langle f, w_k \rangle \quad \text{for every } 1 \le k \le m. \tag{2.1}$$

For every $u \in V_m$ we restrict the linear functional $Au \in V' = \mathcal{L}(V, \mathbb{R})$ to the closed subspace V_m, and we thus obtain a linear functional on V_m. In other words, we define an operator $A_m : V_m \to V'_m$ by

$$\langle A_m u, w \rangle_{V'_m, V_m} := \langle Au, w \rangle_{V', V}.$$

By coercivity, there exists $\varrho > 0$ such that for every $u \in V$, $\|u\| \ge \varrho$,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle A_m u - f, u \rangle_{V'_m, V_m} &= \langle Au - f, u \rangle_{V', V} \\ &\ge \langle Au, u \rangle - \|f\| \, \|u\| \\ &= \|u\| \, (\frac{\langle Au, u \rangle}{\|u\|} - \|f\|) \\ &\ge 0. \end{aligned}$$

The operator A_m inherits the properties of A, that is, A_m is monotone, bounded, hemicontinuous. By Corollary 1.7, it therefore maps convergent sequences in V_m into weakly convergent sequences in V'_m; more precisely, if $u_n \to u$ in V_m, then $Au_m \rightharpoonup Au$ in V'_m. However, the space V'_m being finite dimensional, weak convergence and norm convergence coincide, and hence A_m is continuous.

By the continuity of A_m, by the above inequality, and by Corollary 2.2, there exists $u_m \in V_m$ such that $A_m u_m - f = 0$. In other words, for every $w \in V_m$,

$$\langle Au_m - f, w \rangle_{V', V} = \langle A_m u_m - f, w \rangle_{V'_m, V_m} = 0,$$

so that we have proved (2.1).

By the preceding equality, for every m,

$$\langle Au_m, u_m \rangle = \langle f, u_m \rangle \le \|f\| \, \|u_m\|.$$

Therefore, the sequence $(\frac{\langle Au_m, u_m \rangle}{\|u_m\|})$ is bounded in V. By coercivity of A, this implies that the sequence (u_m) is bounded in V. Since A is bounded, also the sequence (Au_m) is bounded. Since V and V' are reflexive, and after passing to a subsequence, there exists $u \in V$, $\chi \in V'$ such that

$$u_m \rightharpoonup u \text{ in } V \quad \text{and} \quad Au_m \rightharpoonup \chi \text{ in } V'.$$

For every k we have

$$\langle \chi, w_k \rangle = \lim_{m \to \infty} \langle Au_m, w_k \rangle = \langle f, w_k \rangle.$$

Since the sequence (w_k) is total in V, this implies $\chi = f$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{m \to \infty} \langle Au_m, u_m \rangle &= \limsup_{m \to \infty} \langle f, u_m \rangle \\ &= \lim_{m \to \infty} \langle f, u_m \rangle \\ &= \langle f, u \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 1.6 (implication (i)$\Rightarrow$(iii)), $Au = f$. □

LEMMA 2.4. *Let $A : V \to V'$ be monotone and assume that one of the following conditions holds:*
(i) A is strictly monotone*, that is*

$$\langle Au - Av, u - v\rangle > 0 \quad \text{for every } u, v \in V, \ u \neq v,$$

(ii) A is hemicontinuous, V is strictly convex, and $Au = Av$ implies $\|u\| = \|v\|$.
Then A is injective.

PROOF. (i) If $Au = Av$, then $\langle Au - Av, u - v\rangle = 0$, and therefore $u = v$ by strict monotonicity.
(ii) We first prove that for every $f \in V'$

$$Au = f \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \forall v \in V : \langle Av - f, v - u\rangle \geq 0. \tag{2.2}$$

In fact, if $Au = f$, then $\langle Av - f, v - u\rangle \geq 0$ by monotonicity of A. For the converse implication, let $w \in V$, $\lambda \geq 0$ and put $v = u + \lambda w$. Then

$$\langle A(u + \lambda w) - f, \lambda w\rangle \geq 0,$$

or

$$\langle A(u + \lambda w) - f, w\rangle \geq 0.$$

Letting $\lambda \searrow 0$ and using that A is hemicontinuous, we obtain

$$\langle Au - f, w\rangle \geq 0.$$

Replacing w by $-w$, we obtain $\langle Au - f, w\rangle = 0$, and since $w \in V$ is arbitrary, $Au = f$. Hence we have proved (2.2).

Let $S := \{u \in V : Au = f\}$ be the set of all solutions of the equation $Au = f$. For every $v \in V$, the set $S_v := \{u \in V : \langle Av - f, v - u\rangle \geq 0\}$ is convex, and by (2.2), $S = \bigcap_{v \in V} S_v$ is therefore convex, too. By assumption, $S \subset \{\|u\| = \varrho\}$ for some $\varrho \geq 0$. Since V is strictly convex, the set S is therefore reduced to at most one point. As a consequence, A is injective. □

3. * Nonlinear elliptic problems IV

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded open set and let $p \geq 2$. Let $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and let $f : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ be some function in $L^2(\Omega)$. We consider the nonlinear elliptic boundary value problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p u(x) + b \cdot \nabla u(x) = f(x), & x \in \Omega, \\ u(x) = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \tag{3.1}$$

We call a function $u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ a *weak solution* of this problem if

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \nabla \varphi + \sum_{i=1}^n \int_\Omega b_i \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \varphi = \int_\Omega f \varphi \quad \text{for every } \varphi \in C_c^1(\Omega). \tag{3.2}$$

Note that $u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ is a weak solution of (3.1) if and only if $-\Delta_p^\Omega u + \sum_{i=1}^n b_i \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} = f$, where Δ_p^Ω is the p-Laplace operator defined in Chapter 1, Section 3.

THEOREM 3.1. *For every* $f \in L^2(\Omega)$ *there exists a unique weak solution* $u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ *of the problem* (3.1).

For the proof, we first prove a general result.

LEMMA 3.2. *Let* $b_i \in C(\mathbb{R};\mathbb{R})$ *be a function satisfying the growth condition*

$$|b_i(s)| \leq C\,(1+|s|)^{p-2} \quad \textit{for some } C \geq 0 \textit{ and all } s \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{3.3}$$

Then the operator

$$\begin{aligned} B_i : W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) &\to W^{-1,p'}(\Omega), \\ u &\mapsto b_i(u)\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i}, \end{aligned}$$

is well defined, bounded and hemicontinuous. If b_i *is constant, then* B_i *is in addition monotone.*

PROOF. Let $u, v \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$. Then, by the growth estimate (3.3) and by Hölder's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_\Omega |B_i(u)v| &= \int_\Omega |b_i(u)\,\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i}\,v| \\ &\leq C \int_\Omega (1+|u|)^{p-2}\,|\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i}\,v| \\ &\leq C\,\Big(\int_\Omega (1+|u|)^{\frac{p(p-2)}{p-1}}\,|v|^{\frac{p}{p-1}}\Big)^{\frac{p-1}{p}}\,\|\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i}\|_p \\ &\leq C\,\Big(\int_\Omega (1+|u|)^p\Big)^{\frac{p-2}{p}}\,\|v\|_p\,\|\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i}\|_p \\ &< \infty, \end{aligned}$$

so that B_i is well-defined. From this estimate we obtain in addition for every $u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$

$$\begin{aligned} \|B_i(u)\|_{W^{-1,p'}} &= \sup_{\|v\|_{W_0^{1,p}} \leq 1} \Big|\int_\Omega B_i(u)v\Big| \\ &\leq \sup_{\|v\|_{W_0^{1,p}} \leq 1} \|1+|u|\|_p^{p-2}\,\|v\|_p\,\|\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i}\|_p \\ &\leq (C+\|u\|_p)^{p-2}\,\|u\|_{W_0^{1,p}}, \end{aligned}$$

so that B_i is bounded.

Next, let $u, v, w \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle B_i(u+tv)-B_i(u),w\rangle| \leq& \int_\Omega |b_i(u+tv)-b_i(u)|\,|\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i}|\,|w| + \\ &+ t\int_\Omega |b_i(u+tv)|\,|\frac{\partial v}{\partial x_i}|\,|w| \\ &\to 0 \quad \text{as } t \to 0, \end{aligned}$$

by Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem. As a consequence, B_i is hemicontinuous.

The monotonicity of B_i in the case of constant $b_i \in \mathbb{R}$ has been proved in Example 1.2. $\square$

PROOF OF THEOREM 3.1. $\square$

4. Evolution equations involving monotone operators

Let V be a separable reflexive Banach space and H a Hilbert space such that

$$V' \hookrightarrow H = H' \hookrightarrow V'.$$

Let $A : V \to V'$ be an operator, $f : [0,T] \to V'$ be an integrable function and $u_0 \in H$. In this section we consider the evolution problem

$$\dot{u}(t) + Au(t) = f(t), \quad t \in [0,T], \quad u(0) = u_0. \tag{4.1}$$

THEOREM 4.1. *Suppose that, for some $p > 1$,*

$$\begin{aligned} &A \textit{ is monotone and hemicontinuous}, \\ &\|Au\|_{V'} \leq C\,\|v\|_V^{p-1} \quad \textit{for some } C \geq 0 \textit{ and all } v \in V, \\ &\langle Au, u\rangle_{V',V} \geq \eta\,\|v\|_V^p \quad \textit{for some } \eta > 0 \textit{ and all } v \in V. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose in addition

$$f \in L^{p'}(0,T;V') \quad \textit{and} \quad u_0 \in H.$$

Then the problem (4.1) *admits a unique solution*

$$u \in L^p(0,T;V) \cap W^{1,p'}(0,T;V') \cap C([0,T];H).$$

PROOF. *Uniqueness:* Assume that u_1 and u_2 are two solutions. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\|u_1(t) - u_2(t)\|_H^2 &= \langle \dot{u}_1(t) - \dot{u}_2(t), u_1(t) - u_2(t)\rangle_{V',V} \\ &= -\langle Au_1(t) - Au_2(t), u_1(t) - u_2(t)\rangle_{V',V} \\ &\leq 0, \end{aligned}$$

by monotonicity of A. Moreover,

$$\|u_1(0) - u_2(0)\|_H^2 = 0.$$

Both relations imply $\|u_1(t) - u_2(t)\|_H^2 = 0$ for every $t \in [0,T]$, that is, $u_1 = u_2$.

Existence: Let (w_m) be a total sequence, that is, a sequence such that $\operatorname{span}\{w_m : m\}$ is dense in V; the existence of such a sequence is guaranteed by the assumption that V is separable.

Let $V_m := \operatorname{span}\{w_k : 1 \leq k \leq m\}$.

We first prove that for every m there exists $u_m \in C^1([0,T];V_m)$ such that

$$\langle \dot{u}_m + Au_m, w_k\rangle = \langle f, w_k\rangle \quad \text{for every } 1 \leq k \leq m,\ t \in [0,T]. \tag{4.2}$$

For every $u \in V_m$ we restrict the linear functional $Au \in V' = \mathcal{L}(V, \mathbb{R})$ to the closed subspace V_m, and we thus obtain a linear functional on V_m. In other words, we define an operator $A_m : V_m \to V_m'$ by

$$\langle A_m u, w\rangle_{V_m', V_m} := \langle Au, w\rangle_{V',V}.$$

Similarly, we restrict $f(t) \in V'$ and $u_0 \in H \subset V'$ to V_m and denote the restrictions by f_m and u_{0m}, respectively. Note that since we identify H with its dual H', and since $V_m \subset H$ is finite dimensional, we obtain $V_m = V_m'$; only the norms $\|\cdot\|_V$, $\|\cdot\|_H$ and $\|\cdot\|_{V'}$ may differ on V_m.

Recall from the proof of Theorem 2.3 that $A_m : V_m \to V_m'$ is continuous. Hence, by Peano's theorem (theory of ordinary differential equations), and by the uniqueness result obtained above, the problem

$$\dot{u}_m + A_m u_m = f_m \quad t \in [0, T], \quad u(0) = u_{0m},$$

admits a unique maximal solution $u_m \in W^{1,p'}_{loc}([0, T'); V_m)$ for some $0 < T' \le T$. Similarly as in the proof of uniqueness, we obtain by using the monotonicity of A_m,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\|u_m\|_H^2 &= \langle \dot{u}_m, u_m\rangle \\ &\le -\langle f_m, u_m\rangle \\ &\le \|f_m\|_{V'}\,\|u_m\|_V. \end{aligned}$$

Since the norms $\|\cdot\|_H$ and $\|\cdot\|_V$ are equivalent in the finite dimensional space V_m, this inequality implies,

$$\|u_m(t)\|_H^2 \le \|u_{0m}\|_H^2 + C\int_0^T \|f_m(s)\|_V'^2\, ds + \int_0^t \|u_m(s)\|_H^2\, ds.$$

Hence, by Gronwall's inequality,

$$\|u_m(t)\|_H^2 \le e^t\,(\|u_{0m}\|_H^2 + C\int_0^T \|f_m(s)\|_V'^2\, ds),$$

so that u_m remains bounded in V_m. By the differential equation for u_m, this implies $\dot{u}_m \in L^{p'}(0, T'; V_m)$, and therefore $u_m \in W^{1,p'}(0, T'; V_m)$. Since u_m is maximal, we obtain $T' = T$, and therefore this solution u_m is the function we are looking for in (4.2).

By (4.2),

$$\langle \dot{u}_m + Au_m, u_m\rangle_{V',V} = \langle f, u_m\rangle_{V',V} \quad \text{for every } t \in [0, T],$$

so that, together with assumption (iii),

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\|u_m(t)\|_H^2 + \eta\,\|u_m(t)\|_V^p \le \|f\|_{V'}\,\|u_m\|_V \quad \text{for every } t \in [0, T].$$

Integrating this inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}\,\|u_m(t)\|_H^2 + \eta\int_0^t \|u_m(s)\|_V^p\,ds &\le \int_0^t \|f(s)\|_{V'}\,\|u_m(s)\|_V\,ds + \frac{1}{2}\|u_{0m}\|_H^2 \\ &\le C_\eta\|f\|_{L^{p'}}^{p'} + \frac{\eta}{2}\int_0^t \|u_m(s)\|_V^p\,ds + \frac{1}{2}\|u_0\|_H^2.\end{aligned}$$

From this inequality we deduce that the sequence

$$(u_m) \text{ is bounded in } L^\infty(0,T;H)\cap L^p(0,T;V).$$

By assumption on A,

$$\|A_m u_m\|_{L^{p'}(0,T;V')} \le \|Au_m\|_{L^{p'}(0,T;V')} \le C^{p-1}\,\|u_m\|_{L^p(0,T;V)},$$

so that

$$(A_m u_m) \text{ and } (Au_m) \text{ are bounded in } L^{p'}(0,T;V').$$

From the differential equation $\dot u_m + A_m u_m = f_m$ we finally obtain that

$$(\dot u_m) \text{ is bounded in } L^{p'}(0,T;V).$$

Since the spaces $L^p(0,T;V)$, $L^{p'}(0,T;V')$ and H are reflexive, and *after passing to a subsequence*, we find that

$$\begin{aligned}&u_m \rightharpoonup u \quad \text{in } L^p(0,T;V),\\ &Au_m \rightharpoonup \chi \quad \text{in } L^{p'}(0,T;V'), \text{ and}\\ &u_m(T) \rightharpoonup \xi \quad \text{in } H.\end{aligned}$$

In the rest of the proof, we show that the function u is the solution we are looking for.

For every w_k and every test function $\varphi \in C_c^1(0,T)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^T \langle u, w_k\rangle_{V',V}\dot\varphi &= \lim_{m\to\infty}\int_0^T \langle u_m, w_k\rangle_{V',V}\dot\varphi \\ &= \lim_{m\to\infty} -\int_0^T \langle \dot u_m, w_k\rangle_{V',V}\varphi \\ &= \lim_{m\to\infty}\int_0^T \langle A_m u_m + f_m, w_k\rangle_{V',V}\varphi \\ &= \lim_{m\to\infty}\int_0^T \langle Au_m - f, w_k\rangle_{V',V}\varphi \\ &= \int_0^T \langle \chi - f, w_k\rangle\varphi,\end{aligned}$$

or

$$\langle \int_0^T u\dot\varphi, w_k\rangle_{V',V} = \langle \int_0^T (\chi - f)\varphi, w_k\rangle_{V',V} \quad \text{for every } k \text{ and every } \varphi \in C_c^1(0,T).$$

Since the sequence (w_k) is total in V, this implies

$$\int_0^T u\dot{\varphi} = \int_0^T (\chi - f)\varphi \quad \text{for every } \varphi \in C_c^1(0,T).$$

By definition of the Sobolev space, this implies $u \in W^{1,p'}(0,T;V')$ and

$$\dot{u} + \chi = f.$$

Moreover, for every w_k and every function $\varphi \in C^1([0,T])$ (not necessarily a test function), we have on the one hand

$$\int_0^T u\dot{\varphi} \quad = \quad u\varphi\Big|_0^T - \int_0^T \dot{u}\varphi,$$

and on the other hand

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^T \langle u, w_k\rangle_{V',V}\dot{\varphi} &= \lim_{m\to\infty}\int_0^T \langle u_m, w_k\rangle_{V',V}\dot{\varphi} \\
&= \lim_{m\to\infty}\Big[\langle u_m, w_k\rangle_{V',V}\varphi\Big|_0^T - \int_0^T \langle \dot{u}_m, w_k\rangle_{V',V}\varphi\Big] \\
&= \langle \xi, w_k\rangle_{V',V}\varphi(T) - \langle u_0, w_k\rangle_{V',V}\varphi(0) + \int_0^T \langle \chi - f, w_k\rangle_{V',V}\varphi,
\end{aligned}$$

or, since (w_k) is total in V,

$$\int_0^T u\dot{\varphi} = \xi\,\varphi(T) - u_0\,\varphi(0) + \int_0^T (\chi - f)\,\varphi.$$

Comparing both expressions, we obtain

$$u(T)\varphi(T) - u(0)\varphi(0) = \xi\,\varphi(T) - u_0\,\varphi(0)$$

for every function $\varphi \in C^1([0,T])$. Choosing $\varphi(t) = t$ and $\varphi(t) = T - t$, we obtain

$$u(0) = u_0 \quad \text{ and } u(T) = \xi.$$

In particular, u satisfies the initial condition of (4.1). It remains to show that $Au = \chi$. In order to see this, we consider the operator

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A} : L^p(0,T;V) &\to L^{p'}(0,T;V'), \\
v &\mapsto Av,
\end{aligned}$$

which is well defined by the growth condition on A and which is monotone, bounded and hemicontinuous by the monotonicity, the growth condition and the hemicontinuity of A. Recall that we have

$$u_m \rightharpoonup u \text{ in } L^p(0,T;V) \quad \text{ and } \quad \mathcal{A}u_m \rightharpoonup \chi \text{ in } L^{p'}(0,T;V').$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \mathcal{A}u_m, u_m\rangle_{L^{p'},L^p} &= \int_0^T \langle Au_m, u_m\rangle V', V \\
&= \int_0^T \langle A_m u_m, u_m\rangle_{V',V} \\
&= \int_0^T \langle f_m - \dot{u}_m, u_m\rangle_{V',V} \\
&= \int_0^T \left[\langle f, u_m\rangle_{V',V} - \frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\|u_m\|_H^2\right] \\
&= \frac{1}{2}\|u_{0m}\|_H^2 - \frac{1}{2}\|u_m(T)\|_H^2 + \int_0^T \langle f, u_m\rangle_{V',V}.
\end{aligned}$$

One has $\lim_{m\to\infty} u_{0m} = u_0 = u(0)$ in H so that

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \|u_{0m}\|_H = \|u_0\|_H = \|u(0)\|_H.$$

Moreover, since $u_m(T) \rightharpoonup \xi = u(T)$ in H and since the norm $\|\cdot\|_H$ is a convex function, we obtain from Corollary 2.4 from Chapter 2

$$\|u(T)\|_H \leq \liminf_{m\to\infty} \|u_m(T)\|_H,$$

or, equivalently,

$$\limsup_{m\to\infty}[-\|u_m(T)\|_H^2] \leq -\|u(T)\|_H^2.$$

Therefore

$$\limsup_{m\to\infty}\langle \mathcal{A}u_m, u_m\rangle_{L^{p'},L^p} \leq \frac{1}{2}\|u(0)\|_H^2 - \frac{1}{2}\|u(T)\|_H^2 + \int_0^T \langle f, u\rangle_{V',V} \tag{4.3}$$

$$= \int_0^T \langle f - \dot{u}, u\rangle_{V',V} \tag{4.4}$$

$$= \int_0^T \langle \chi, u\rangle_{V',V} \tag{4.5}$$

$$= \langle \chi, u\rangle_{L^{p'},L^p}. \tag{4.6}$$

By Lemma 1.6 applied to $\mathcal{A}$ (implication (i)⇒(iii)), we obtain $\mathcal{A}u = Au = \chi$. The claim is completely proved. □

5. * A nonlinear diffusion equation

CHAPTER 6

Appendix

1. Differentiable functions between Banach spaces

In the following, let X and Y be two Banach spaces, and let U be an open subset of X.

Definition 1.1. A function $F : U \to Y$ is *differentiable* in some point $x \in U$ if there exists a continuous, linear $T : X \to Y$ such that for every $h \in X$ with norm small enough one has

$$F(x+h) = F(x) + Th + o(h)$$

and

$$\lim_{\|h\| \to 0} \frac{\|o(h)\|}{\|h\|} = 0.$$

If F is differentiable in $x \in U$, then the operator T is uniquely determined; we call T the *derivative* of F in x and write $F'(x)$ instead of T. Hence, the derivative of a function $f : X \supset U \to Y$ is a bounded linear operator $X \to Y$.

Note furthermore that if F is differentiable in $x \in U$, then F is necessarily continuous in x. This follows from the definition of differentiability, the continuity of $F'(x)$ and the continuity of the term o in 0.

Definition 1.2. A function $F : U \to Y$ is *differentiable* if it is differentiable in every point $x \in U$. We say that F is *continuously differentiable* (or: *of class* C^1) if F is differentiable and if $F' : U \to \mathcal{L}(X, Y)$ is continuous.

2. Closed linear operators

For the following, we will have to consider a larger class of linear operators. Whenever X and Y are two Banach spaces, a *linear operator* is a linear mapping $A : D(A) \to Y$ defined on a linear subspace $D(A)$ of X. The space $D(A)$ is called *domain* of A. Note that the domain $D(A)$ need not be a closed linear subspace of X.

Definition 2.1. Let X and Y be two Banach spaces. A linear operator $A : D(A) \to Y$ is called *closed* if its graph

$$G(A) := \{(x, Ax) : x \in D(A)\} \subset X \times Y$$

is closed in the product space $X \times Y$.

LEMMA 2.2. *A linear operator $A : D(A) \to Y$ is closed if and only if the following property holds:*

$$\left.\begin{aligned} &D(A) \ni x_n \to x \text{ in } X \text{ and} \\ &Ax_n \to y \text{ in } Y \end{aligned}\right\} \Rightarrow x \in D(A) \text{ and } Ax = y.$$

PROOF. It suffices to note that $D(A) \ni x_n \to x$ in X and $Ax_n \to y$ in Y if and only if $G(A) \ni (x_n, Ax_n) \to (x, y)$ in the product space $X \times Y$, by definition of the product topology.

If A is closed and if $G(A) \ni (x_n, Ax_n) \to (x, y)$ then $(x, y) \in G(A)$ by the closedness of A and thus $x \in D(A)$ and $y = Ax$.

Conversely, if $G(A) \ni (x_n, Ax_n) \to (x, y)$ implies necessarily $x \in D(A)$ and $y = Ax$, then $(x, y) \in G(A)$, i.e. $G(A)$ is closed, and thus A is closed. □

LEMMA 2.3. *A linear operator $A : D(A) \to Y$ is closed if and only if its domain $D(A)$ equipped with the graph norm*

$$\|x\|_{D(A)} := \|x\|_X + \|Ax\|_Y, \quad x \in D(A),$$

is a Banach space.

PROOF. If A is closed, then, by definition, $G(A)$ is a closed subspace of the product space $X \times Y$. Since $X \times Y$ is a Banach space, the graph $G(A)$ is a Banach space. Now note that $D(A)$ equipped with the graph norm and $G(A)$ equipped with the product norm are isometrically isomorphic under the isometry $D(A) \to G(A)$, $x \mapsto (x, Ax)$. Hence $D(A)$ equipped with the graph norm is a Banach space.

Conversely, assume that $D(A)$ equipped with the graph norm is a Banach space. Then $G(A)$ (equipped with the product norm from $X \times Y$) is a Banach space by the same argument as before. In particular, $G(A)$ is a closed subspace of $X \times Y$. Hence, A is closed. □

LEMMA 2.4. *Every bounded linear operator $T : X \to Y$ (with domain $D(T) = X$) is closed.*

PROOF. Let $T \in \mathcal{L}(X, Y)$. The norms $\|\cdot\|_X$ and $\|\cdot\|_{D(T)}$ are equivalent norms on X which is a Banach space for the norm $\|\cdot\|_X$. Hence $X = D(T)$ is a Banach space for the norm $\|\cdot\|_{D(T)}$. By Lemma 2.3, T is closed. □

The following theorem is a fundamental theorem in functional analysis. It is a consequence of Baire's theorem, but it will not be proved here.

THEOREM 2.5 (Closed graph theorem). *Let X and Y be Banach spaces and let $T : X \to Y$ (with domain $D(T) = X$) be closed. Then T is bounded.*

EXAMPLE 2.6. Let $X = Y = C([0, 1])$ be the space of continuous functions on $[0, 1]$ with norm $\|f\|_\infty := \sup_{x \in [0,1]} |f(x)|$. Define the *derivation operator D* by

$$D(D) := C^1([0, 1]) \text{ and } Df := f' \text{ for } f \in D(D).$$

Then D is closed. In fact, the space $C^1([0, 1])$ is a Banach space for the graph norm $\|f\|_{D(D)} = \|f\|_\infty + \|f'\|_\infty$ (exercice).

Example 2.7. Let $X = Y = L^p(\mathbb{R})$ ($1 \le p \le \infty$) with norm $\|\cdot\|_p$. Define the *multiplication operator M* by

$$D(M) := \{f \in L^p(\mathbb{R}) : xf(x) \in L^p(\mathbb{R})\} \text{ and } (Mf) := xf(x) \text{ for } f \in D(M).$$

Then M is closed. In fact,

$$D(M) = L^p(\mathbb{R}; (1 + |x|^p)\, dx),$$

and the graph norm $\|\cdot\|_{D(M)}$ is equivalent to the norm

$$\|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R};(1+|x|^p)\,dx)} := \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} |f|^p (1 + |x|^p)\, dx\right)^{1/p},$$

which makes $L^p(\mathbb{R}; (1 + |x|^p)\, dx)$ a Banach space.

3. Vector-valued L^p spaces

As before X denotes a Banach space. In this section $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$ is a measure space.

Definition 3.1. (a) A function $f : \Omega \to X$ is called *step function*, if there exists a sequence $(A_n) \subset \mathcal{A}$ of mutually disjoint measurable sets and a sequence $(x_n) \subset X$ such that $f = \sum_n 1_{A_n} x_n$.
(b) A function $f : \Omega \to X$ is called *mesurable*, if there exists a sequence (f_n) of step functions $f_n : \Omega \to X$ such that $f_n \to f$ pointwise μ-almost everywhere.

Remark 3.2. Note that there may be a difference to the definition of mesurability of a scalar valued functions. Measurability of a function is here depending on the measure μ. However, if the measure space $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$ is *complete* in the sense that $\mu(A) = 0$ and $B \subset A$ implies $B \in \mathcal{A}$, then the above definition of measurability and the classical definition of measurability coincide. Note that one may always consider complete measure spaces.

Lemma 3.3. *If $f : \Omega \to X$ is measurable, then $\|f\| : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ is measurable. More generally, if $f : \Omega \to X$ is measurable and if $g : X \to Y$ is continuous, then $g \circ f : \Omega \to Y$ is measurable.*

Proof. This is an easy consequence of the definition of measurability and the continuity of g. Note that in particular the norm $\|\cdot\| : X \to \mathbb{R}$ is continous. □

Lemma 3.4. *If $f : \Omega \to X$ and $g : \Omega \to \mathbb{K}$ are measurable, then $fg : \Omega \to X$ is measurable.*

Similarly, if $f : \Omega \to X$ and $g : \Omega \to X'$ are measurable, then $\langle g, f\rangle_{X',X} : \Omega \to \mathbb{K}$ is measurable.

Theorem 3.5 (Pettis). *A function $f : \Omega \to X$ is measurable if and only if $\langle x', f\rangle$ is measurable for every $x' \in X'$ (we say that f is* weakly measurable*) and if there exists a μ-null set $N \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $f(\Omega \setminus N)$ is separable.*

For a proof of Pettis' theorem, see Hille & Phillips [**13**].

Corollary 3.6. *If (f_n) is a sequence of measurable functions $\Omega \to X$ such that $f_n \to f$ pointwise μ-almost everywhere, then f is measurable.*

Proof. We assume that this corollary is known in the scalar case, i.e. when $X = \mathbb{K}$.

By Pettis's theorem, for all n there exists a μ null set $N_n \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $f_n(\Omega \setminus N_n)$ is separable. Moreover there exists a μ null set $N_0 \in \Omega$ such that $f_n(t) \to f(t)$ for all $t \in \Omega \setminus N_0$. Let $N := \bigcup_{n\geq 0} N_n$; as a countable union of μ null sets, N is a μ null set.

Then f (restricted to $\Omega \setminus N$) is the pointwise limit everywhere of the sequence (f_n). In particular f is weakly measurable. Moreover, $f(\Omega \setminus N)$ is separable since

$$f(\Omega \setminus N) \subset \overline{\bigcup_n f_n(\Omega \setminus N)},$$

and since $f_n(\Omega \setminus N)$ is separable. The claim follows from Pettis' theorem. □

Definition 3.7. A measurable function $f : \Omega \to X$ is called *integrable* if $\int_\Omega \|f\| \, d\mu < \infty$.

Lemma 3.8. *For every integrable step function $f : \Omega \to X$, $f = \sum_n 1_{A_n} x_n$ the series $\sum_n x_n \mu(A_n)$ converges absolutely and it is independent of the representation of f.*

Proof. Let $f = \sum_n 1_{A_n} x_n$ be an integrable step function. The sets $(A_n) \subset \mathcal{A}$ are mutually disjoint and $(x_n) \subset X$. Then

$$\sum_n \|x_n\| \, \mu(A_n) = \int_\Omega \|f\| \, d\mu < \infty.$$

□

Definition 3.9 (Bochner integral for integrable step functions). Let $f : \Omega \to X$ be an integrable step function, $f = \sum_n 1_{A_n} x_n$. We define

$$\int_\Omega f \, d\mu := \sum_n x_n \, \mu(A_n).$$

Lemma 3.10. *(a) For every integrable function $f : \Omega \to X$ there exists a sequence (f_n) of integrable step functions $\Omega \to X$ such that $\|f_n\| \leq \|f\|$ and $f_n \to f$ pointwise μ-almost everywhere.*
(b) Let $f : \Omega \to X$ be integrable. Let (f_n) be a sequence of integrable step functions such that $\|f_n\| \leq \|f\|$ and $f_n \to f$ pointwise μ-almost everywhere. Then

$$x := \lim_{n\to\infty} \int_\Omega f_n \, d\mu \text{ exists}$$

and

$$\|x\| \leq \int_\Omega \|f\| \, d\mu.$$

Proof. (a) Let $f : \Omega \to X$ be integrable. Then $\|f\| : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ is integrable. Therefore there exists a sequence (g_n) of integrable step functions such that $0 \leq g_n \leq \|f\|$ and $g_n \to \|f\|$ pointwise μ-almost everywhere.

Since f is measurable, there exists a sequence $(\tilde{f}_n)$ of step functions $\Omega \to X$ such that $\tilde{f}_n \to f$ pointwise μ-almost everywhere.

Put

$$f_n := \frac{\tilde{f}_n g_n}{\|\tilde{f}_n\| + \frac{1}{n}}.$$

(b) For every integrable step function $g : \Omega \to X$ one has

$$\Big\| \int_\Omega g \, d\mu \Big\| \leq \int_\Omega \|g\| \, d\mu.$$

Hence, for every n, m

$$\Big\| \int_\Omega f_n - f_m \, d\mu \Big\| \leq \int_\Omega \|f_n - f_m\| \, d\mu,$$

and by Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem the sequence $(\int_\Omega f_n \, d\mu)$ is a Cauchy sequence. When we put $x = \lim_{n\to\infty} \int_\Omega f_n \, d\mu$ then

$$\|x\| \leq \liminf_{n\to\infty} \int_\Omega \|f_n\| \, d\mu = \int_\Omega \|f\| \, d\mu.$$

□

DEFINITION 3.11 (Bochner integral for integrable functions). Let $f : \Omega \to X$ be integrable. We define

$$\int_\Omega f \, d\mu := \lim_{n\to\infty} \int_\Omega f_n \, d\mu,$$

where (f_n) is a sequence of step functions $\Omega \to X$ such that $\|f_n\| \leq \|f\|$ and $f_n \to f$ pointwise μ-almost everywhere.

REMARK 3.12. The definition of the Bochner integral for integrable functions is independent of the choice of the sequence (f_n) of step functions, by Lemma 3.10.

REMARK 3.13. We will also use the follwing notation for the Bochner integral:

$$\int_\Omega f \text{ oder } \int_\Omega f(t) \, d\mu(t),$$

and if $\Omega = (a, b)$ is an interval in $\mathbb{R}$:

$$\int_a^b f \text{ oder } \int_a^b f(t) \, d\mu(t).$$

If $\mu = \lambda$ is the Lebesgue measure then we also write

$$\int_a^b f(t) \, dt.$$

LEMMA 3.14. *Let $f : \Omega \to X$ be integrable and $T \in \mathcal{L}(X, Y)$. Then $Tf : \Omega \to Y$ is integrable and*

$$\int_\Omega Tf \, d\mu = T \int_\Omega f \, d\mu.$$

PROOF. Exercise. □

THEOREM 3.15 (Lebesgue, dominates convergence). *Let (f_n) be a sequence of integrable functions. Suppose there exists an integrable function $g : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ and an (integrable) measurable function $f : \Omega \to X$ such that $\|f_n\| \leq g$ and $f_n \to f$ pointwise μ-almost everywhere. Then*

$$\int_\Omega f \, d\mu = \lim_{n\to\infty} \int_\Omega f_n \, d\mu.$$

PROOF. Exercise. □

DEFINITION 3.16 ($\mathcal{L}^p$ spaces). For every $1 \leq p < \infty$ we define

$$\mathcal{L}^p(\Omega; X) := \{f : \Omega \to X \text{ measurable} : \int_\Omega \|f\|^p \, d\mu < \infty\}.$$

We also define

$$\mathcal{L}^\infty(\Omega; X) := \{f : \Omega \to X \text{ measurable} : \exists C \geq 0 \text{ such that } \mu(\{\|f\| \geq C\}) = 0\}.$$

LEMMA 3.17. *For every $1 \leq p < \infty$ we put*

$$\|f\|_p := \Big(\int_\Omega \|f\|^p \, d\mu\Big)^{1/p}.$$

We also put

$$\|f\|_\infty := \inf\{C \geq 0 : \mu(\{\|f\| \geq C\}) = 0\}.$$

Then $\|\cdot\|_p$ is a seminorm on $\mathcal{L}^p(\Omega; X)$ ($1 \leq p \leq \infty$).

REMARK 3.18. A function $\|\cdot\| : X \to \mathbb{R}_+$ on a real or complex vector space is called a *seminorm* if

(i) $x = 0 \Rightarrow \|x\| = 0$,
(ii) $\|\lambda x\| = |\lambda| \, \|x\|$ for every $\lambda \in \mathbb{K}$ and all $x \in X$,
(iii) $\|x + y\| \leq \|x\| + \|y\|$ for all $x, y \in X$.

DEFINITION 3.19 (L^p spaces). For every $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ we put

$$\begin{aligned} N_p &:= \{f \in \mathcal{L}^p(\Omega; X) : \|f\|_p = 0\} \\ &= \{f \in \mathcal{L}^p(\Omega; X) : f = 0 \, \mu\text{-almost everywhere}\}. \end{aligned}$$

We define the quotient space

$$L^p(\Omega; X) := \mathcal{L}^p(\Omega; X)/N_p,$$

which is the space of all equivalence classes

$$[f] := f + N_p, \quad f \in \mathcal{L}^p(\Omega; X).$$

LEMMA 3.20. *For every $[f] \in L^p(\Omega; X)$ ($f \in \mathcal{L}^p(\Omega; X)$) the value*

$$\|[f]\|_p := \|f\|_p$$

is well defined, i.e. independent of the representant f. The function $\|\cdot\|_p$ is a norm on $L^p(\Omega; X)$. The space $L^p(\Omega; X)$ is a Banach space when equipped with this norm.

Remark 3.21. As in the scalar case we will in the following identify *functions* $f \in \mathcal{L}^p(\Omega; X)$ with their *equivalence classes* $[f] \in L^p(\Omega; X)$, and we say that L^p is a *function space* although we should be aware that it is only a space of equivalence classes of functions.

Remark 3.22. For $\Omega = (a, b)$ an interval in $\mathbb{R}$ and for $\mu = \lambda$ the Lebesgue measure we simply write

$$L^p(a, b; X) := L^p((a, b); X).$$

We can do so since the spaces $L^p([a, b]; X)$ and $L^p((a, b); X)$ coincide since the end points $\{a\}$ and $\{b\}$ have Lebesgue measure zero and there is no danger of confusion.

Lemma 3.23. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be open and bounded. Then $C(\overline{\Omega}; X) \subset L^p(\Omega; X)$ for every $1 \leq p \leq \infty$.*

Proof. Actually, for finite measure spaces, we have the more general inclusions

$$L^\infty(\Omega; X) \subset L^p(\Omega; X) \subset L^q(\Omega; X) \subset L^1(\Omega; X)$$

if $1 \leq q \leq p \leq \infty$. □

Lemma 3.24. *Let the measure space $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$ be such that $L^p(\Omega)$ is separable for $1 \leq p < \infty$ (e.g. $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open set with the Lebesgue measure). Let X be separable. Then $L^p(\Omega; X)$ is separable for $1 \leq p < \infty$.*

Proof. By assumption the spaces $L^p(\Omega)$ and X are separable. Let $(h_n) \subset L^p(\Omega; X)$ and $(x_n) \subset X$ be two dense sequences. Then the set

$$\mathcal{F} := \{f : \Omega \to X : f = h_n \, x_m\}$$

is countable. It suffices to shows that $\mathcal{F} \subset L^p(\Omega; X)$ is total, i.e. $\operatorname{span} \mathcal{F}$ is dense in $L^p(\Omega; X)$. This is an exercise. □

Theorem 3.25. *Let Ω be as in lemma 3.24. Let $1 < p < \infty$ and assume that X is reflexive. Then the space $L^p(\Omega; X)$ is reflexive and*

$$L^p(\Omega; X)' \cong L^{p'}(\Omega; X').$$

Proof. Without proof. □

4. Vector-valued Sobolev spaces

Definition 4.1 (Sobolev spaces). Let $-\infty \leq a < b \leq \infty$ and $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. We define

$$\begin{aligned} W^{1,p}(a, b; X) := \{u \in L^p(a, b; X) \quad : \quad & \exists v \in L^p(a, b; X) \, \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{D}(a, b) \\ & \int_a^b u\varphi' = -\int_a^b v\varphi\}. \end{aligned}$$

Notation: $v =: u'$.

Lemma 4.2. *For every* $-\infty \leq a < b \leq \infty$ *and every* $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ *one has* $W^{1,p}(a,b;X) \subset C^b(\overline{(a,b)};X)$. *For every* $u \in W^{1,p}(a,b;X)$ *and every* s, $t \in (a,b)$ *one has*

$$u(t) - u(s) = \int_s^t u'(r)\,dr.$$

Bibliographie

1. H. Amann, *Linear and Quasilinear Parabolic Problems: Abstract Linear Theory*, Monographs in Mathematics, vol. 89, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1995.
2. S. B. Angenent, *Nonlinear analytic semiflows*, Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh **115A** (1990), 91–107.
3. J.-P. Aubin, *Applied Functional Analysis*, Pure Applied Mathematics, John Wiley & Sons, New York, Chichester, Brisbane, Toronto, 1979.
4. H. Brézis, *Analyse fonctionnelle*, Masson, Paris, 1992.
5. R. Dautray and J.-L. Lions, *Analyse mathématique et calcul numérique pour les sciences et les techniques. Vol. I*, INSTN: Collection Enseignement, Masson, Paris, 1985.
6. ______, *Analyse mathématique et calcul numérique pour les sciences et les techniques. Vol. VIII*, INSTN: Collection Enseignement, Masson, Paris, 1987.
7. ______, *Analyse mathématique et calcul numérique pour les sciences et les techniques. Vol. VI*, INSTN: Collection Enseignement, Masson, Paris, 1988.
8. Pavel Drábek and Jaroslav Milota, *Methods of nonlinear analysis*, Birkhäuser Advanced Texts: Basler Lehrbücher. [Birkhäuser Advanced Texts: Basel Textbooks], Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2007, Applications to differential equations.
9. J. Escher, J. Prüss, and G. Simonett, *A new approach to the regularity of solutions of parabolic equations*, Evolution Equations: Proceedings in Honor of J. A. Goldstein's 60th Birthday, Marcel Dekker, New York, 2003, pp. 167–190.
10. E. Feireisl and F. Simondon, *Convergence for semilinear degenerate parabolic equations in several space dimensions*, J. Dynam. Differential Equations **12** (2000), 647–673.
11. D. Gilbarg and N. S. Trudinger, *Elliptic Partial Differential Equations of Second Order*, Springer Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, 2001.
12. A. Haraux, *Systèmes dynamiques dissipatifs et applications*, Masson, Paris, 1990.
13. E. Hille and R. S. Phillips, *Functional Analysis and Semi-Groups*, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R.I., 1957.
14. P. C. Kunstmann and L. Weis, *Maximal L^p regularity for parabolic equations, Fourier multiplier theorems and H^∞ functional calculus*, Levico Lectures, Proceedings of the Autumn School on Evolution Equations and Semigroups (M. Iannelli, R. Nagel, S. Piazzera eds.), vol. 69, Springer Verlag, Heidelberg, Berlin, 2004, pp. 65–320.
15. J.-L. Lions, *Quelques méthodes de résolution des problèmes aux limites non linéaires*, Dunod, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, 1969.
16. E. M. Ouhabaz, *Analysis of Heat Equations on Domains*, London Mathematical Society Monographs, vol. 30, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 2004.
17. M. Struwe, *Variational Methods. Applications to Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations and Hamiltonian Systems*, Springer Verlag, Heidelberg, Berlin, New York, 1990.
18. H. Triebel, *Theory of Function Spaces*, Birkhäuser, Basel, 1983.