

**ASYMPTOTIC BEHAVIOUR OF ONE-DIMENSIONAL FLOWS
THROUGH POROUS MEDIA**

BY

TADEUSZ ŚLIWA (WROCLAW)

Let $Q = \{(x, t): 0 \leq x \leq 1, t \geq 0\}$ and let Γ be the boundary of Q .

Consider the boundary value problem of the first type for the equation

$$(1) \quad \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial^2 \varphi(u)}{\partial x^2},$$

where φ is a given function satisfying certain condition to be specified in the sequel, with the following initial and boundary data:

$$(2) \quad \begin{aligned} u(x, 0) &= u_0(x) & \text{for } 0 \leq x \leq 1, \\ u(0, t) &= m, \quad u(1, t) = M & \text{for } t \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

m and M being non-negative constants.

We assume that

(i) u_0 is continuous and non-negative in the interval $\langle 0, 1 \rangle$, and $u_0(0) = m$, $u_0(1) = M$;

(ii) $\varphi \in C^5((0, +\infty))$, $\varphi(u) > 0$, $\varphi'(u) > 0$, $\varphi''(u) > 0$ for $u > 0$, $\varphi(0) = \varphi'(0) = 0$, $\varphi^{(5)}$ satisfies the Lipschitz condition on every interval $\langle a, b \rangle$, $0 < a < b < \infty$;

(iii) $\varphi(u_0(x))$ is Lipschitz continuous on $\langle 0, 1 \rangle$;

(iv) $[\varphi'(u)]^2/\varphi''(u)$ is bounded for bounded u .

Definition. Let u be a non-negative continuous function defined on Q and satisfying (2). The function u is called a *weak solution* of problem (1), (2) if

(1) $\varphi(u(x, t))$ has a strong derivative with respect to x which is locally square-integrable in Q ;

(2) for each function $f \in C_0^1(Q)$ which vanishes at $x = 0$ and $x = 1$ we have

$$\iint_Q \left[\frac{\partial f}{\partial t} u - \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \frac{\partial \varphi(u)}{\partial x} \right] dx dt + \int_0^1 f(x, 0) u_0(x) dx = 0.$$

Oleñnik et al. [1] have shown that if conditions (i)-(iv) hold, then problem (1), (2) has a unique weak solution u . Furthermore, in a neighbourhood of each point in $Q \setminus \Gamma$ at which u is positive, all derivatives which appear in the equation are continuous and satisfy this equation in the classical sense (Theorems 3 and 4 in [1]).

Now observe that the function

$$u(x, t) = \varphi^{-1}((1-x)\varphi(m) + x\varphi(M))$$

is a solution of (1), independent of t , for which $u(0, t) = m$ and $u(1, t) = M$.

The following problem arises ⁽¹⁾: do the conditions $u(0, t) = m$ and $u(1, t) = M$ imply

$$(3) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} u(x, t) = \varphi^{-1}((1-x)\varphi(m) + x\varphi(M))?$$

A positive answer to this question gives the following

THEOREM. *Assume (i)-(iv) and let $u(x, t)$ be a weak solution of problem (1), (2). Then (3) holds for $x \in \langle 0, 1 \rangle$.*

Proof. We consider separately two cases:

(A) $u_0 > 0$ on $\langle 0, 1 \rangle$,

(B) $u_0 \geq 0$ on $\langle 0, 1 \rangle$.

Case (A). Since $u_0 > 0$, it follows from Theorem 11 in [1] that $u(x, t) > 0$ in Q . Consequently, all derivatives in $Q \setminus \Gamma$ which appear in (1) are continuous and the equation is satisfied in the classical sense.

The substitutions $\bar{u}_0 = \varphi(u_0)$ and $\bar{u} = \varphi(u)$ transform (1), (2) into

$$(4) \quad \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial t} = \varphi'(\varphi^{-1}(\bar{u})) \frac{\partial^2 \bar{u}}{\partial x^2},$$

$$(5) \quad \begin{aligned} \bar{u}(x, 0) &= \bar{u}_0(x) \quad \text{for } x \in \langle 0, 1 \rangle, \\ \bar{u}(0, t) &= \varphi(m), \quad \bar{u}(1, t) = \varphi(M) \quad \text{for } t \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

From the inequality $\varphi'(u) > 0$ valid for $u > 0$ we infer that the transformation $u \rightarrow \bar{u}$ is one-to-one. Thus, instead of (3) it suffices to prove that

$$(6) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \bar{u}(x, t) = (1-x)\varphi(m) + x\varphi(M) \quad \text{for } x \in \langle 0, 1 \rangle.$$

⁽¹⁾ For the asymptotic behaviour of similar though different problems see [2] and [3].

Take two functions $u_{0,1}, u_{0,2} \in C^3(\langle 0, 1 \rangle)$ which satisfy the conditions

- (7) $0 < u_{0,1}(x) \leq u_0(x) \leq u_{0,2}(x) \quad \text{for } x \in \langle 0, 1 \rangle,$
- (8) $u_{0,i}(0) = m, \quad u_{0,i}(1) = M \quad (i = 1, 2),$
- (9) $\bar{u}_{0,i}''(0) = \bar{u}_{0,i}''(1) = 0 \quad (\bar{u}_{0,i} = \varphi(u_{0,i}), \quad i = 1, 2),$
- (10) $\bar{u}_{0,1}(x) \leq (1-x)\varphi(m) + x\varphi(M) \leq \bar{u}_{0,2}(x) \quad \text{for } x \in \langle 0, 1 \rangle,$
- (11) $\bar{u}_{0,1}''(x) \geq 0 \quad \text{for } x \in \langle 0, 1 \rangle,$
- (12) $\bar{u}_{0,2}(x) \leq A, \quad |\bar{u}_{0,2}'(x)| \leq 2B \quad \text{for } x \in \langle 0, 1 \rangle,$

where

$$A = \sup_{x \in \langle 0, 1 \rangle} \bar{u}_0(x),$$

and B is a Lipschitz constant for \bar{u}_0 .

Let u_i ($i = 1, 2$) be the weak solutions of (1) corresponding to the initial data $u_{0,i}$ and having boundary values $u_i(0, t) = m, u_i(1, t) = M, t \geq 0$.

Inequalities (7), (10) and Theorem 17 in [1] imply

$$u_1(x, t) \leq \varphi^{-1}((1-x)\varphi(m) + x\varphi(M)) \leq u_2(x, t) \quad \text{for } (x, t) \in Q.$$

Thus, putting $\bar{u}_i = \varphi(u_i), i = 1, 2$, we have

$$\bar{u}_1(x, t) \leq (1-x)\varphi(m) + x\varphi(M) \leq \bar{u}_2(x, t) \quad \text{for } (x, t) \in Q.$$

Therefore, it is enough to show (6) for \bar{u}_1 and \bar{u}_2 .

By (8), (9) and Lemma 1 in [1], the functions $\bar{u}_i, \partial\bar{u}_i/\partial t, \partial\bar{u}_i/\partial x, \partial^2\bar{u}_i/\partial x^2$ are continuous on Q . Furthermore, in the domain Q all derivatives of \bar{u} which appear in the equations obtained by differentiating (4), with $\bar{u} = \bar{u}_i$, four times with respect to x and once with respect to t , are continuous.

To prove (6) for $\bar{u} = \bar{u}_1$ we need the following

LEMMA 1. *The function \bar{u}_1 defined as above has the following properties:*

$$(13) \quad \frac{\partial\bar{u}_1(x, t)}{\partial t} \geq 0, \quad \frac{\partial^2\bar{u}_1(x, t)}{\partial x^2} \geq 0 \quad \text{for } (x, t) \in Q.$$

(14) *The functions $\partial\bar{u}_1(0, t)/\partial x$ and $-\partial\bar{u}_1(1, t)/\partial x$ are non-decreasing for $t \geq 0$.*

(15) *For $x \in \langle 0, 1 \rangle$ and $T > 0$,*

$$\left| \frac{\partial\bar{u}_1(x, T)}{\partial x} + \varphi(m) - \varphi(M) \right| \leq \frac{K}{T},$$

$$\text{where } K = \int_0^1 \varphi^{-1}((1-x)\varphi(m) + x\varphi(M)) dx.$$

Proof of (13). Differentiating both sides of equation (4), with $\bar{u} = \bar{u}_1$, with respect to t and substituting

$$v(x, t) = \frac{\partial \bar{u}_1(x, t)}{\partial t},$$

we obtain

$$(16) \quad \frac{\partial v}{\partial t} = \frac{\varphi''(\varphi^{-1}(\bar{u}_1))}{[\varphi'(\varphi^{-1}(\bar{u}_1))]^2} v^2 + \varphi'(\varphi^{-1}(\bar{u}_1)) \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial x^2}.$$

It follows from (8), (11) and (4) that $v|_r \geq 0$. Now, applying the minimum principle to (16), we obtain $v(x, t) \geq 0$ for $(x, t) \in Q$, which gives

$$\frac{\partial^2 \bar{u}_1(x, t)}{\partial x^2} \geq 0.$$

Proof of (14). It follows from (13) that $\bar{u}_1(x, t)$ is non-decreasing with respect to t for each $x \in \langle 0, 1 \rangle$. Hence, for $t > t' > 0$ and $x \in \langle 0, 1 \rangle$ we have the inequalities

$$\frac{\bar{u}_1(x, t) - \bar{u}_1(0, t)}{x} \geq \frac{\bar{u}_1(x, t') - \bar{u}_1(0, t')}{x}$$

and

$$\frac{\bar{u}_1(1, t) - \bar{u}_1(x, t)}{1-x} \leq \frac{\bar{u}_1(1, t') - \bar{u}_1(x, t')}{1-x}$$

which prove (14).

Proof of (15). Let $D = \{(x, t): 0 \leq x \leq 1, 0 \leq t \leq T\}$. Then from Green's formula we get

$$\int_{\partial D} u_1 dx + \frac{\partial \bar{u}_1}{\partial x} dt = \iint_D \left(\frac{\partial u_1}{\partial t} - \frac{\partial^2 \bar{u}_1}{\partial x^2} \right) dx dt = 0.$$

Hence

$$\int_0^T \left[\frac{\partial \bar{u}_1(1, t)}{\partial x} - \frac{\partial \bar{u}_1(0, t)}{\partial x} \right] dt = \int_0^1 [u_1(x, T) - u_{0,1}(x)] dx.$$

Since $u_1(x, T) \leq \varphi^{-1}((1-x)\varphi(m) + x\varphi(M))$ and $u_{0,1} \geq 0$, we have

$$\int_0^T \left[\frac{\partial \bar{u}_1(1, t)}{\partial x} - \frac{\partial \bar{u}_1(0, t)}{\partial x} \right] dt \leq K.$$

From (13) and (14) it follows that the integrand in this inequality is non-negative and non-increasing. Thus

$$0 \leq \frac{\partial \bar{u}_1(1, T)}{\partial x} - \frac{\partial \bar{u}_1(0, T)}{\partial x} \leq \frac{K}{T}.$$

The inequality in (15) follows from the last inequality, from

$$\frac{\partial \bar{u}_1(0, T)}{\partial x} \leq \frac{\partial \bar{u}_1(x, T)}{\partial x} \leq \frac{\partial \bar{u}_1(1, T)}{\partial x}$$

which is valid for $x \in \langle 0, 1 \rangle$, and from

$$\frac{\partial \bar{u}_1(\xi, T)}{\partial x} = \bar{u}_1(1, T) - \bar{u}_1(0, T) = \varphi(M) - \varphi(m)$$

valid for some $\xi \in (0, 1)$.

Let us write the inequality from (15) in the following way:

$$\varphi(M) - \varphi(m) - \frac{K}{t} \leq \frac{\partial \bar{u}_1(x, t)}{\partial x} \leq \varphi(M) - \varphi(m) + \frac{K}{t} \quad (t > 0).$$

Now, integrating these inequalities with respect to x over $\langle 0, x \rangle$ and taking into account the condition $\bar{u}_1(0, t) = \varphi(m)$, we obtain

$$\varphi(m) + x(\varphi(M) - \varphi(m)) - \frac{K}{t} \leq \bar{u}_1(x, t) \leq \varphi(m) + x(\varphi(M) - \varphi(m)) + \frac{K}{t}$$

from which (6) follows immediately.

Now we prove (6) for $\bar{u} = \bar{u}_2$. For this purpose let us put

$$w(x, t) = \bar{u}_2(x, t) - (1 - x)\varphi(m) - x\varphi(M).$$

It follows from (4) that $w(x, t)$ satisfies the equation

$$(17) \quad \frac{\partial w}{\partial t} = p(x, t) \frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial x^2},$$

where $p(x, t) = \varphi'(\varphi^{-1}(w + (1 - x)\varphi(m) + x\varphi(M)))$.

LEMMA 2. *If the function $r(x, t)$ is a solution of the equation*

$$(18) \quad \frac{\partial r}{\partial t} = q(x) \frac{\partial^2 r}{\partial x^2}$$

with q satisfying the inequalities $p(x, t) \geq q(x)$ for $x \in \langle 0, 1 \rangle$, $t \geq 0$, and $r|_R \geq w|_R$, $\partial^2 r / \partial x^2 \leq 0$ in Q , then $w(x, t) \leq r(x, t)$ for $(x, t) \in Q$.

Proof. Put $h = r - w$. Subtracting (17) from (18), we obtain

$$\frac{\partial h}{\partial t} = p \frac{\partial^2 h}{\partial x^2} + (q - p) \frac{\partial^2 r}{\partial x^2}.$$

Since

$$h|_r \geq 0, \quad p \geq 0, \quad (q-p) \frac{\partial^2 r}{\partial x^2} \geq 0,$$

it follows from the minimum principle that

$$h(x, t) = r(x, t) - w(x, t) \geq 0 \quad \text{for } (x, t) \in Q.$$

LEMMA 3. *The inequality*

$$p(x, t) \geq C(x - x^2)$$

holds, where a positive constant C depends only on A ,

$$A = \sup_{(x,t) \in Q} \bar{u}_2(x, t).$$

Proof. Due to our assumptions on φ , we can write

$$\frac{z}{\varphi^{-1}(z)} = \frac{\varphi(\varphi^{-1}(z))}{\varphi^{-1}(z)} = \varphi'(\xi) \leq \varphi'(\varphi^{-1}(z))$$

with some ξ , $0 < \xi < \varphi^{-1}(z)$. Consequently, we have

$$\varphi'(\varphi^{-1}(z)) \geq \frac{z}{\varphi^{-1}(z)}.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} p(x, t) &= \varphi'(\varphi^{-1}(w + (1-x)\varphi(m) + x\varphi(M))) \\ &\geq \frac{w + (1-x)\varphi(m) + x\varphi(M)}{\varphi^{-1}(w + (1-x)\varphi(m) + x\varphi(M))} \geq \frac{x\varphi(M)}{\varphi^{-1}(A)} \geq \frac{\varphi(M)}{\varphi^{-1}(A)}(x - x^2). \end{aligned}$$

Let us consider a special case of Lemmas 2 and 3 in which

$$r(x, t) = E(x - x^2)e^{-2ct}.$$

The function r satisfies the equation

$$\frac{\partial r}{\partial t} = C(x - x^2) \frac{\partial^2 r}{\partial x^2}.$$

Let E be a real number so large that for $x \in \langle 0, 1 \rangle$ the inequality

$$w(x, 0) \leq E(x - x^2)$$

holds. The existence of E is guaranteed by (8), (12) and by the definition of w .

It follows from Lemmas 2 and 3 that

$$0 \leq w(x, t) \leq \frac{E}{4} e^{-2ct},$$

whence

$$|\bar{u}_2(x, t) - (1-x)\varphi(m) - x\varphi(M)| \leq \frac{E}{4} e^{-2Ct}$$

and, consequently, (6) holds for \bar{u}_2 .

Case (B). Let $\{\bar{u}_0^n(x)\}$ be any sequence of positive functions convergent on $\langle 0, 1 \rangle$ to $\bar{u}_0(x)$.

We assume that for any n ($n = 1, 2, \dots$)

$$\bar{u}_0^n \geq \bar{u}_0^{n+1}, \quad \bar{u}_0^n \in C^\infty(\langle 0, 1 \rangle), \quad |(\bar{u}_0^n)'| \leq 2B, \quad (\bar{u}_0^n)''(0) = (\bar{u}_0^n)''(1) = 0,$$

B being the Lipschitz constant for the function \bar{u}_0 .

Let $\bar{u}^n(x, t)$ ($n = 1, 2, \dots$) be a solution of equation (4) for which

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{u}^n(x, 0) &= \bar{u}_0^n(x), & \bar{u}^n(0, t) &= \bar{u}_0^n(0) = \varphi(m_n), \\ \bar{u}^n(1, t) &= \bar{u}_0^n(1) = \varphi(M_n) & \text{for } x \in \langle 0, 1 \rangle, t \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

In a way similar to that in the proof of Theorem 4 in [1] we may show that the limit

$$u(x, t) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi^{-1}(\bar{u}^n(x, t))$$

exists and that it is a weak solution of problem (1), (2).

From the proof of our theorem for case (A) it follows immediately that the convergence

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} u^n(x, t) = \varphi^{-1}((1-x)\varphi(m_n) + x\varphi(M_n)) \quad (u^n = \varphi^{-1}(\bar{u}^n))$$

is uniform with respect to n , which means that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a $T > 0$ such that

$$|u^n(x, t) - \varphi^{-1}((1-x)\varphi(m_n) + x\varphi(M_n))| < \varepsilon$$

for $x \in \langle 0, 1 \rangle$, $t > T$ and $n = 1, 2, \dots$. This inequality implies

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} u(x, t) = \varphi^{-1}((1-x)\varphi(m) + x\varphi(M)) \quad \text{for } x \in \langle 0, 1 \rangle,$$

which completes the proof of the Theorem.

REFERENCES

[1] О. А. Олейник, А. С. Калашников и Чжоу Юй-Линь, *Задача Коши и краевые задачи для уравнений типа нестационарной фильтрации*, Известия Академии наук СССР, серия математическая, 22 (5) (1958), p. 667-704.
 [2] Н. В. Хуснутдинова, *О поведении решений краевых задач и задачи Коши для уравнения типа нестационарной фильтрации при неограниченном возрастании времени*, Труды Казанского авиационного института 64 (1961), p. 47-63.

- [3] — *О проведении решений задачи Коши и краевых задач для некоторых квазилинейных уравнений при неограниченном возрастании времени*, in: Материалы 1-й конференции молодых научных работников, г. Казань, Физико-техническая и математическая секция, Казань 1959.

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS
UNIVERSITY OF WROCLAW

*Reçu par la Rédaction le 8. 6. 1977;
en version modifiée le 19. 5. 1978*
