



# RENORMALIZED SOLUTIONS OF ELLIPTIC EQUATIONS WITH ROBIN BOUNDARY CONDITIONS\*

Olivier GUIBÉ<sup>1†</sup> Alip OROPEZA<sup>1,2</sup>

1. Laboratoire de Mathématiques Raphaël Salem, CNRS, UMR 6085, Université de Rouen, Avenue de l'Université, BP 12, 76801 Saint-Étienne du Rouvray cedex, France

2. University of the Philippines Diliman, Institute of Mathematics, 1101 Diliman, Quezon City, Philippines

E-mail: [olivier.guibe@univ-rouen.fr](mailto:olivier.guibe@univ-rouen.fr); [Alip.Oropeza@etu.univ-rouen.fr](mailto:Alip.Oropeza@etu.univ-rouen.fr); [aaoropeza@math.upd.edu.ph](mailto:aaoropeza@math.upd.edu.ph)

**Abstract** In the present paper, we consider elliptic equations with nonlinear and nonhomogeneous Robin boundary conditions of the type

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(B(x, u)\nabla u) = f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma_0, \\ B(x, u)\nabla u \cdot \vec{n} + \gamma(x)h(u) = g & \text{on } \Gamma_1, \end{cases}$$

where  $f$  and  $g$  are the element of  $L^1(\Omega)$  and  $L^1(\Gamma_1)$ , respectively. We define a notion of renormalized solution and we prove the existence of a solution. Under additional assumptions on the matrix field  $B$  we show that the renormalized solution is unique.

**Key words** elliptic equations; renormalized solution; uniqueness; Robin boundary conditions;  $L^1$  data

**2010 MR Subject Classification** 35J66; 35A01; 35A02; 35R05

## 1 Introduction

This paper is devoted to the class of nonlinear equations of the type

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(B(x, u)\nabla u) = f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma_0, \\ B(x, u)\nabla u \cdot \vec{n} + \gamma(x)h(u) = g & \text{on } \Gamma_1. \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

Here  $\Omega$  is a perforated domain of  $\mathbb{R}^N$  ( $N \geq 2$ ), the matrix field  $B(x, s)$  is coercive but does not verify any growth condition with respect to the second variable and  $f$  belongs to  $L^1(\Omega)$ . We impose Dirichlet boundary conditions on  $\Gamma_0$  which is the outside boundary of  $\Omega$  and nonlinear and nonhomogeneous Robin conditions on  $\Gamma_1$  which is the boundary of the holes. Moreover the

\*Received December 28, 2015; revised October 26, 2016.

†Corresponding Author: Olivier GUIBÉ

function  $g$  belongs to  $L^1(\Gamma_1)$ ,  $\gamma$  is a nonnegative function lying in  $L^\infty(\Gamma_1)$ ,  $h$  is a nondecreasing continuous function such that  $h(0) = 0$  and  $\vec{n}$  is the outer unit normal to  $\partial\Omega$ .

The main difficulties in dealing with the existence and the uniqueness of the solution to (1.1) are due to the  $L^1$  data  $f$  and  $g$ , the fact that  $B(x, s)$  and  $h(s)$  do not verify any growth condition with respect to  $s$  and the Robin boundary condition on  $\Gamma_1$  that requires a specific notion of trace on  $\Gamma_1$ . Problem (1.1) is motivated by the homogenization in a periodically perforated domain.

When  $f$  belongs to  $L^2(\Omega)$ ,  $g$  belongs to  $L^2(\Gamma_1)$  and under some growth conditions on the function  $h$ , the existence and uniqueness of a weak solution to (1.1) were studied in [9] and the homogenization of (1.1) with oscillating coefficients in a periodically perforated domain was performed in [10].

When the data  $f$  and  $g$  belong to  $L^1(\Omega)$  and  $L^1(\Gamma_1)$ , respectively, it is well known that we cannot use the notion of weak solution. Indeed if  $B(x, s)$  and  $h(s)$  are bounded functions we can expect to have a solution in the sense of distribution by adapting the method of [6] but we do not have in general the uniqueness of such a solution (see the counterexample in [24]). Without any growth condition on  $B$  and  $h$  we cannot expect to have a solution in the sense of distribution, the field  $B(x, u)$  could not belong to  $L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$  for example. In the present paper we use the framework of renormalized solutions. This notion was introduced by DiPerna and Lions in [16] for the first order equations and has been developed for elliptic problems with Dirichlet boundary conditions (i.e.,  $\Gamma_1 = \emptyset$ ) and with  $L^1(\Omega)$  data in [20] (see also [19]). In [13] the authors gave a definition of a renormalized solution for elliptic problems with general measure data and proved the existence of such a solution. Observe that for elliptic equations with boundary Dirichlet conditions and  $L^1$  data, this notion is equivalent to the notion of entropy solutions (see [4]) and to the notion of solutions obtained as limit of approximations (see [14]). As far as elliptic equations with  $L^1$  data and Dirichlet boundary conditions are concerned we refer to [4, 6, 13, 14, 19, 20] among a wide literature.

Similar equations to (1.1) with Neumann boundary conditions or Robin boundary conditions were studied in [1, 2, 8, 21, 23] using the framework of entropy solution while in [17] the author used a duality method for linear problems with Neumann and Robin boundary conditions. In particular in [1] (see also [2]) the authors studied the equation

$$\begin{cases} u - \operatorname{div}(a(x, \nabla u)) = f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ -a(x, \nabla u) \cdot \vec{n} \in \beta(u) & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where  $f$  belongs to  $L^1(\Omega)$  and where  $\beta$  is a maximal monotone graph. Using the notion of entropy solution and by defining an appropriate notion of trace (since we cannot expect to have  $u$  in a Sobolev space), they prove the existence and the uniqueness of the entropy solution.

In the present paper we give a definition of renormalized solution for equation (1.1) (see Definition 2.6). Since Robin condition requires the trace of  $u$  on the boundary  $\Gamma_1$  in same spirit than [1], we define a notion of trace for functions whose truncates belong to  $H^1_{\Gamma_0}$  and verify an additional property. We prove the existence of a renormalized solution of problem (1.1) in Theorem 3.1 under general assumption on  $B$  and  $h$ . Another interesting question is the uniqueness of such a renormalized solution. Here the operator  $u \mapsto -\operatorname{div}(B(x, u)\nabla u)$  is not monotone and it is worth noting that equation (1.1) does not contain any local term in  $u$

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/8904503>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/8904503>

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