

Available online at [www.sciencedirect.com](http://www.sciencedirect.com)



[J. Differential Equations 262 \(2017\) 3317–3342](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jde.2016.11.030)

Journal of **Differential** Equations

[www.elsevier.com/locate/jde](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/jde)

## Dynamics of wave equations with moving boundary

To Fu Ma <sup>a,∗</sup>, Pedro Marín-Rubio <sup>b</sup>, Christian Manuel Surco Chuño <sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> *Instituto de Ciências Matemáticas e de Computação, Universidade de São Paulo, 13566-590 São Carlos, SP, Brazil* <sup>b</sup> *Departamento de Ecuaciones Diferenciales y Análisis Numérico, Universidad de Sevilla, Apdo. de Correos 1160,*

*41080 Sevilla, Spain*

<sup>c</sup> *Câmpus de Curitiba, Universidade Federal Tecnológica do Paraná, 80230-901 Curitiba, PR, Brazil*

Received 9 February 2016; revised 29 September 2016

Available online 6 December 2016

## **Abstract**

This paper is concerned with long-time dynamics of weakly damped semilinear wave equations defined on domains with moving boundary. Since the boundary is a function of the time variable the problem is intrinsically non-autonomous. Under the hypothesis that the lateral boundary is time-like, the solution operator of the problem generates an evolution process  $U(t, \tau)$ :  $X_{\tau} \to X_t$ , where  $X_t$  are time-dependent Sobolev spaces. Then, by assuming the domains are expanding, we establish the existence of minimal pullback attractors with respect to a universe of tempered sets defined by the forcing terms. Our assumptions allow nonlinear perturbations with critical growth and unbounded time-dependent external forces. © 2016 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

*MSC:* 35R37; 35L70; 35B41

*Keywords:* Wave equation; Non-cylindrical domain; Non-autonomous system; Pullback attractor; Critical exponent

## **1. Introduction**

This paper is concerned with long-time dynamics of semilinear wave equations defined on moving boundary domains. The problem involves a space–time domain

Corresponding author.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jde.2016.11.030> 0022-0396/© 2016 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

*E-mail addresses:* [matofu@icmc.usp.br](mailto:matofu@icmc.usp.br) (T.F. Ma), [pmr@us.es](mailto:pmr@us.es) (P. Marín-Rubio), [christianchuno@utfpr.edu.br](mailto:christianchuno@utfpr.edu.br) (C.M. Surco Chuño).

$$
Q_{\tau} \subset \mathbb{R}^3 \times (\tau, \infty), \quad \tau \in \mathbb{R},
$$

such that its intersections with hyperplanes  $\{(x, s) \in \mathbb{R}^4 \mid s = t\}$  are bounded domains  $\Omega_t \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ with boundary  $\Gamma_t = \partial \Omega_t$ . Then  $Q_{\tau}$  and its lateral boundary  $\Sigma_{\tau}$  can be defined as

$$
Q_{\tau} = \bigcup_{t > \tau} \{ \Omega_t \times \{t\} \} \quad \text{and} \quad \Sigma_{\tau} = \bigcup_{t > \tau} \{ \Gamma_t \times \{t\} \},
$$

respectively. Since  $\Omega_t$  varies with respect to *t* we see that  $Q_\tau$  is, in general, non-cylindrical along the *t*-axis. We consider the mixed problem

$$
\partial_t^2 u - \Delta u + \partial_t u + f(u) = g \text{ in } Q_\tau,
$$
\n(1.1)

$$
u = 0 \text{ on } \Sigma_{\tau},\tag{1.2}
$$

$$
u(x,\tau) = u_\tau^0(x), \quad \partial_t u(x,t)|_{t=\tau} = u_\tau^1(x), \quad x \in \Omega_\tau,
$$
\n(1.3)

where *f* and  $g = g(x, t)$  are forcing terms and  $u_\tau^0$  and  $u_\tau^1$  are initial data. Sometimes we write simply *Q* instead of  $Q_7$ .

This kind of wave equation was studied by several authors with  $\tau = 0$ . Indeed, the existence of a global solution was proved by Cooper and Bardos [\[10\]](#page--1-0) under the assumption that there exists a one-to-one mapping transforming *Q* onto an expanding or contracting domain *Q*∗. One says that a domain *Q* is expanding if  $\Omega_s \subset \Omega_t$  whenever  $s \le t$  and contracting in the reverse case. However, uniqueness of solutions is only known under the assumption that the exterior normal to  $\Sigma$  does not belong to the corresponding light cone, as proved in [\[10\].](#page--1-0) Writing the exterior normal as  $v = (v_x, v_t)$  this implies that  $|v_t| < |v_x|$  on  $\Sigma$ , which defines  $\Sigma$  as time-like. Roughly speaking, under suitable assumptions on  $f$  and  $g$ , problem (1.1)–(1.3) has a unique global solution if  $Q$  is smooth and its lateral boundary  $\Sigma$  is time-like.

On the other hand, the study of long-time dynamics is concerned with the behavior of the solutions as  $t \to \infty$ . In this direction, it was proved by Bardos and Chen [\[2\]](#page--1-0) that the linear energy of the system increases when the domain *Q* is contracting and decreases when the domain is expanding. Therefore if we consider dissipative systems, it is natural to assume that *Q* is non-contracting. It is not clear whether a damping term can overcome the growth of energy produced by strictly contracting domains. The assumption that *Q* is expanding is used in the proof of an energy inequality (see [Lemma 2.3](#page--1-0) below).

Now, since the boundary of  $\Omega_t$  is a function of time, it follows that evolution equations on moving boundary domains are intrinsically non-autonomous, even if the external force  $g(x, t)$  = *g(x)* does not depend on *t*. In addition, given initial data  $(u_\tau^0, u_\tau^1)$  in  $H_0^1(\Omega_\tau) \times L^2(\Omega_\tau)$ , the (finite energy) solutions  $u$  of  $(1.1)$ – $(1.3)$  satisfy

$$
u(t) \in H_0^1(\Omega_t)
$$
 and  $\partial_t u(t) \in L^2(\Omega_t)$ ,  $\forall t \ge \tau$ ,

where  $u(t)$  denotes  $u(\cdot, t)$ . Therefore, the solution operator of  $(1.1)$ – $(1.3)$  generates an evolution process

$$
U(t,\tau): X_{\tau} \to X_t, \quad t \geq \tau,
$$

where

$$
X_t = H_0^1(\Omega_t) \times L^2(\Omega_t).
$$

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/5774041>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/5774041>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)