

## On the representation of non-negative solutions of linear parabolic systems of partial differential equations

by J. CHABROWSKI (Katowice)

**Abstract.** This article is a continuation of the author's investigations author (Ann. Polon. Math. 19 (1967), p. 193—197, and 22 (1970), p. 323—331) showing that if  $\{u^i(t, x)\}$  ( $i = 1, \dots, N$ ) is a non-negative solution of the parabolic system

$$\frac{\partial u^k}{\partial t} = \sum_{i=1}^n a_{ij}^k(t, x) u_{x_i x_j}^k + \sum_{i=1}^n b_i^k(t, x) u_{x_i}^k + \sum_{l=1}^N a_l^k(t, x) u^l$$

in  $(0, T] \times R_n$ , then there exist non-negative Borel measures  $\{\gamma^j\}$  such that

$$u^i(t, x) = \int_{R_n} \sum_{j=1}^N \Gamma_{ij}(t, x; 0, y) \gamma^j(dy).$$

The purpose of this paper is to prove the uniqueness of the measures  $\gamma_j$ .

Subject classifications. Primary 35 65; Secondary 35 01. Key words and phrases. Representation theorems, fundamental solution.

Consider the system of equations

$$(1) \quad L^k(u^1, \dots, u^N) = \sum_{i,j=1}^n a_{ij}^k(t, x) u_{x_i x_j}^k + \sum_{i=1}^n b_i^k(t, x) u_{x_i}^k + \sum_{i=1}^N c_i^k(t, x) u^i - u_t^k = 0 \quad (k = 1, \dots, N),$$

where the coefficients  $a_{ij}^k$ ,  $b_i^k$  and  $c_i^k$  are defined and bounded in a strip  $(0, T] \times R_n$ . We take  $(a_{ij}^k(t, x))$  to be a symmetric matrix, i.e.,  $a_{ij}^k = a_{ji}^k$  for  $k = 1, \dots, N$ .

Throughout this paper we shall assume that

(a)  $a_{ij}^k$ ,  $\frac{\partial a_{ij}^k}{\partial x_j}$ ,  $\frac{\partial^2 a_{ij}^k}{\partial x_i \partial x_j}$ ,  $b_i^k$ ,  $\frac{\partial b_i^k}{\partial x_i}$  and  $c_i^k$  are Hölder-continuous with respect to  $(t, x)$  in  $(0, T] \times R_n$ ;

(b) there exists a positive constant  $\alpha$  such that for any real vector  $\xi \in R_n$

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^n a_{ij}^k(t, x) \xi_i \xi_j \geq \alpha |\xi|^2 \quad (k = 1, \dots, N)$$

for all  $(t, x) \in (0, T] \times R_n$ ;

(c)  $a_i^k(t, x) \geq 0$  for all  $(t, x) \in (0, T] \times R_n$  and  $i \neq k$  ( $i, k = 1, \dots, N$ ).

Under assumptions (a) and (b), it is well known that there exists a fundamental matrix  $\{\Gamma_{ij}(t, x; \tau, y)\}$  ( $i, j = 1, \dots, N$ ) of functions defined for  $(t, x), (\tau, y) \in (0, T] \times R_n$ ,  $\tau < t$  (see [4], Chapter 9). It follows from (c) that  $\Gamma_{ij}(t, x; \tau, y) \geq 0$  ( $i, j = 1, \dots, N$ ) for all  $(t, x), (\tau, y) \in (0, T] \times R_n$  ( $\tau < t$ ) (see [2]).

In [3] it is shown that if  $\{u^j(t, x)\}$  ( $j = 1, \dots, N$ ) is a non-negative solution of (1) in  $(0, T] \times R_n$ , then there exist non-negative Borel measures  $\gamma^j$  and a number  $T_1 > 0$  such that

$$(2) \quad u^i(t, x) = \int_{R_n} \sum_{j=1}^N \Gamma_{ij}(t, x; 0, y) \gamma^j(dy) \quad (i = 1, \dots, N)$$

for all  $(t, x) \in (0, T_1] \times R_n$ . The purpose of this paper is to prove the uniqueness of the measures  $\gamma^j$ . We also obtain a necessary and sufficient condition for a system of functions defined by a formula such as (2) to be a non-negative solution of (1).

We shall need the following lemma:

LEMMA. Let  $f(x)$  be a continuous and bounded function in  $R_n$ . Then

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \int_{R_n} \Gamma_{ij}(t, x; 0, y) f(x) dx = \delta_{ij} f(y) \quad (i, j = 1, \dots, N).$$

Proof. Using the decomposition of  $\Gamma_{ij}$ , we get ([5], p. 252)

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{ij}(t, x; \tau, y) &= Z_{ij}(t, x; \tau, y) + \sum_{j=1}^N \int_{\tau}^t d\sigma \int_{R_n} Z_{ik}(t, x; \sigma, z) \Phi_{kj}(\sigma, z; \tau, y) dy \\ &= Z_{ij}(t, x; \tau, y) + R_{ij}(t, x; \tau, y), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$Z_{ij}(t, x; \tau, y) = C_i(\tau, y) \exp \left\{ - \frac{\sum_{r,s=1}^n A_{rs}^i(\tau, y) (x_s - y_s)(x_r - y_r)}{4(t - \tau)} \right\} \delta_{ij},$$

$$C_i(\tau, y) = (2\sqrt{\pi})^n \{\det[A_{rs}^i(\tau, y)]\}^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

$\{A_{rs}^i(\tau, y)\}$  denotes the inverse matrix to  $\{a_{rs}^i(\tau, y)\}$ ,  $\Phi_{kj}(\sigma, z; \tau, y)$  ( $k, j = 1, \dots, N$ ) are continuous functions for  $(\sigma, z), (\tau, y) \in [0, T] \times R_n$  ( $\sigma > \tau$ ) such that

$$|\Phi_{kj}(\sigma, z; \tau, y)| \leq C(\sigma - \tau)^{-(n+2-\alpha)/2} \exp \left( -c \frac{|x - y|^2}{\sigma - \tau} \right),$$

where  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ . It follows from the last inequality (for details see [5], p. 20)

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \int_{R_n} R_{ij}(t, x; 0, y) f(x) dx = 0 \quad (i, j = 1, \dots, N).$$

It is clear that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \int_{R_n} \Gamma_{ii}(t, x; 0, y) f(x) dx = f(y) \quad (i = 1, \dots, N).$$

**THEOREM 1.** *If  $\{u^i(t, x)\}$  ( $i = 1, \dots, N$ ) is a non-negative solution of (1) in  $(0, T] \times R_n$ , then exist unique non-negative Borel measures  $\{\gamma^j\}$  ( $j = 1, \dots, N$ ) such that formula (2) is satisfied.*

**Proof.** The existence part of this theorem was proved in [3]. The uniqueness proof is similar to that of Aronson's [1]. Suppose that there are two systems of measures  $\{\gamma_1^j\}$  and  $\{\gamma_2^j\}$  ( $j = 1, \dots, N$ ), each giving a representation of  $\{u^i\}$  in the form (2) and such that  $\gamma_1^{j_0} = \gamma_2^{j_0}$  for certain  $j_0$ . By Theorem 2.3 of [2], it follows that  $\Gamma_{kk}(t, x; \tau, y)$  satisfies

$$\Gamma_k(t, x; \tau, y) \leq \Gamma_{kk}(t, x; \tau, y)$$

for  $(t, x), (\tau, y) \in (0, T] \times R_n$  ( $\tau < t$ ), where  $\Gamma_k$  is a fundamental solution of the equation

$$\mathcal{L}v = \sum_{i,j=1}^n a_{ij}^k(t, x) v_{x_i x_j} + \sum_{i=1}^n b_i^k(t, x) v_{x_i} + c_k^k(t, x) v - v_t = 0.$$

It is known that there exist positive constants  $C_1$  and  $C_2$

$$C_1(t - \tau)^{-n/2} \exp \left\{ -C_2 \frac{|x - y|^2}{t - \tau} \right\} \leq \Gamma_k(t, x; \tau, y)$$

for  $(t, x), (\tau, y) \in (0, T] \times R_n$  ( $\tau < t$ ) (see [1], Theorem 7). This estimate implies that there exist positive constants  $\beta$  and  $M$  such that

$$(3) \quad \int_{R_n} e^{-\beta|y|^2} \gamma_i^j(dy) \leq M \quad (j = 1, \dots, N, i = 1, 2).$$

Set  $\sigma^j = \gamma_1^j - \gamma_2^j$ . Then

$$(4) \quad 0 = \int_{R_n} \sum_{j=1}^N \Gamma_{ij}(t, x; 0, y) \sigma^j(dy) = \int_{R_n} \sum_{j=1}^N \Gamma_{ij}(t, x; 0, y) e^{\beta|y|^2} \lambda^j(dy)$$

( $i = 1, \dots, N$ ) for all  $(t, x) \in (0, T_1] \times R_n$ , where

$$\lambda^j(E) = \int_E e^{-\beta|x|^2} \sigma^j(dx)$$

for all Borel subsets  $E$  of  $R_n$ . By the Hahn-Jordan decomposition theorem there are Borel sets  $A_j$  ( $j = 1, \dots, N$ ) such that  $\lambda^j \geq 0$  on all Borel-measurable subsets of  $A_j$  and  $\lambda^j \leq 0$  on all Borel-measurable subsets of  $R_n - A_j = B_j$ . Set  $\lambda_+^j(E) = \lambda^j(E \cap A_j)$  and  $\lambda_-^j(E) = -\lambda^j(E \cap B_j)$ . It follows from (3) that  $\lambda_{\pm}^j(R_n) < \infty$ . Therefore the measures  $\lambda_+^j$  and  $\lambda_-^j$  are regular. Since  $\sigma^{j_0} \neq 0$ , we can assume that  $\lambda_+^{j_0}(A_{j_0}) = a > 0$ . We will show that

this leads to a contradiction. By the regularity of  $\lambda_+^{j_0}$  and  $\lambda_-^{j_0}$ , there exist a compact set  $K \subset A_{j_0}$  such that  $\lambda_+^{j_0}(K) > \frac{3}{4}a$  and a bounded open set  $E \supset K$  such that  $\lambda_+^{j_0}(E - K) < a/4$ . Let  $\varphi = \varphi(x)$  be a continuous function in  $R_n$  with  $\varphi(x) = 1$  on  $K$  and  $\varphi(x) = 0$  on  $R_n - E$  and  $0 \leq \varphi(x) \leq 1$ . Introduce the functions

$$v_{ij}(t, y) = \int_{R_n} \Gamma_{ij}(t, x; \mathbf{0}, y) \varphi(x) e^{-\beta|x|^2} dx.$$

From the lemma it follows that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} v_{ij}(t, y) = \varphi(y) e^{-\beta|y|^2} \quad \text{for } i = j$$

and

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} v_{ij}(t, y) = 0 \quad \text{for } i \neq j.$$

It is well known that

$$\Gamma_{ij}(t, x; \tau, y) \leq C_3(t - \tau)^{-n/2} \exp \left\{ -C_4 \frac{|x - y|^2}{t - \tau} \right\}$$

for  $(t, x), (\tau, y) \in (0, T] \times R_n$  ( $\tau < t$ ), where  $C_3$  and  $C_4$  are positive constants. Hence, if  $\bar{E} \subset \{x; |x| \leq r\}$ , then there exists  $C_5$  and  $T_2$  such that

$$(5) \quad 0 \leq e^{\beta|y|^2} v_{ij}(t, y) \leq C_5 e^{\beta r^2}$$

for  $0 < t < T_2$ . It follows from (3) and (5) that

$$(6) \quad \int_{R_n} v_{ij}(t, y) |\sigma^j|(dy) = \int_{R_n} e^{\beta|y|^2} v_{ij}(t, y) |\lambda^j|(dy) < \infty.$$

Therefore  $v_{ij}$  is integrable with respect to  $\sigma^j$  for each  $t \in (0, T_2)$  and

$$\int_{R_n} v_{ij}(t, y) \sigma^j(dy) = \int_{R_n} e^{\beta|y|^2} v_{ij}(t, y) \lambda^j(dy).$$

Since  $|\lambda^j|(R_n) < \infty$ , applying the dominated convergence theorem we get

$$(7) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \int_{R_n} v_{j_0 j_0}(t, y) \sigma^{j_0}(dy) = \lambda^{j_0}(K) + \int_{E-K} \varphi \lambda_+^{j_0}(dy) - \int_{E-K} \varphi \lambda_-^{j_0}(dy) > \frac{3}{4}a - a/4 = a/2 > 0$$

and

$$(8) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \int_{R_n} v_{ij}(t, y) \sigma^j(dy) = 0 \quad \text{for } i \neq j.$$

In view of (6), for each  $t \in (0, T_2)$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{R_n} v_{j_0 i}(t, y) \sigma^i(dy) &= \int_{R_n} \left[ \int_{R_n} \Gamma_{ji}(t, x; \mathbf{0}, y) \varphi(x) e^{-\beta|x|^2} dx \right] \sigma^i(dy) \\ &= \int_{R_n} \left[ \int_{R_n} \Gamma_{j_0 i}(t, x; \mathbf{0}, y) \sigma^i(dy) \right] \varphi(x) e^{-\beta|x|^2} dx. \end{aligned}$$

Summing over  $i$ , we conclude that

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \int_{R_n} v_{j_0^i}(t, y) \sigma^i(dy) = \int_{R_n} \left[ \int_{R_n} \sum_{i=1}^N \Gamma_{j_0^i}(t, x; 0, y) \sigma^i(dy) \right] \varphi(x) e^{-\beta|x|^2} dx = 0$$

and

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \sum_{j=1}^N \int_{R_n} v_{j_0^i}(t, y) \sigma^i(dy) = 0$$

in contradiction to (7) and (8).

**THEOREM 2.** *Let*

$$U^j(t, x) = \int_{R_n} \Gamma_{ji}(t, x; 0, y) \varrho(dy) \quad (j = 1, \dots, N),$$

where  $\varrho$  is a non-negative Borel measure.

Then  $U^j$  is a non-negative solution of (1) in  $(0, T_1] \times R_n$  if and only if

$$(9) \quad \int_{R_n} U^j(t, x) e^{-\mu|x|^2} dx < \infty \quad (j = 1, \dots, N)$$

for  $t \in (0, T_1]$ , where  $\mu$  is a non-negative number.

*Proof.* If  $\{U^j\}$  is a non-negative solution of (1) in  $(0, T_1] \times R_n$ , then it follows from the maximum principle that  $U^j$  satisfies (9) (for details see [3]).

To prove the converse, consider the Cauchy problem

$$\begin{aligned} L^k(u^1, \dots, u^N) &= 0 \quad \text{for } (t, x) \in (t_\nu, T_1] \times R_n, \\ u^j(t_\nu, x) &= U^j(t_\nu, x) \quad \text{for } x \in R_n \quad (j = 1, \dots, N), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\{t_\nu\}$  is a sequence of points in  $(0, T_1)$  such that  $t_\nu \rightarrow 0$ . It follows from Theorem 1.3 of [4] (p. 237) that this problem has a non-negative solution  $u^j$  which can be written in the form

$$u^j(t, x) = \sum_{k=1}^N \int_{R_n} \Gamma_{jk}(t, x; t_\nu, y) U^k(t_\nu, y) dy.$$

By the Kolmogorov identity, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} u^j(t, x) &= \sum_{k=1}^N \int_{R_n} \Gamma_{jk}(t, x; t_\nu, y) \left[ \int_{R_n} \Gamma_{ki}(t_\nu, y; 0, z) \varrho(dz) \right] dy \\ &= \int_{R_n} \left[ \int_{R_n} \sum_{k=1}^N \Gamma_{jk}(t, x; t_\nu, y) \Gamma_{ki}(t_\nu, y; 0, z) \right] \varrho(dz) \\ &= \int_{R_n} \Gamma_{ji}(t, x; 0, z) \varrho(dz) = U^j(t, x) \end{aligned}$$

for  $(t, x) \in (t_\nu, T_1] \times R_n$ . Hence  $\{U^j\}$  is a solution of (1).

## References

- [1] D. G. Aronson, *Non-negative solutions of linear parabolic equations*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa 22 (1968), p. 607–694.
- [2] J. Chabrowski, *Les solutions non négatives d'un système parabolique d'équations*, Ann. Polon. Math. 19 (1967), p. 193–197.
- [3] — *Les propriétés des solutions non négatives d'un système parabolique d'équations*, ibidem 22 (1970), p. 323–331.
- [4] S. D. Eidelman, *Parabolic systems*, Nauka, Moscow 1964 (Russian)
- [5] A. Friedman, *Partial differential equations of parabolic type*, Englewood Cliffs, 1964.

*Reçu par la Rédaction le 30. 1. 1971*

---