

# A Nonlinear Singular Diffusion Equation with Source

Pan Jiaqing

Email:jqpan@jmu.edu.cn

Department of Mathematics, Jimei University,  
Xiamen 361021, P.R.China

**Abstract:** In this paper, the existence, uniqueness and dependence on initial value of solution for a singular diffusion equation with nonlinear boundary condition are discussed. It is proved that there exists a unique global smooth solution which depends on initial data continuously.

**Keywords :** singular diffusion; global solution; nonlinear boundary condition

**2000 MR Subject Classification:** 35K10,35K20,35K60

## 1 Introduction

In this paper, we consider a boundary value problem

$$\begin{cases} u_t = (u^{m-1}u_x)_x + u^p, & 0 < x < 1, t > 0, \\ u_x|_{x=0} = 0, \quad u_x|_{x=1} = -u^\alpha, & t \geq 0, \\ u|_{t=0} = u_0, & 0 \leq x \leq 1. \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

Where  $-1 < m < 0$ ,  $0 < p < 1$ ,  $2 - m < \alpha$  and  $0 \leq u_0(x) \leq M$ ,  $\int_0^1 u_0(x)dx > 0$ .

The equation in (1.1) arises in many applications in physics and chemistry . For example, it has been proposed for  $m = \frac{1}{2}$  in plasma physics ([8]), and for  $m = -1$  in the heat conduction in solid hydrogen ([7]).

Although there are many results for  $m > 0$ , the situation is completely different for  $m < 0$ , where the equation becomes singular since  $u^m$  blows up as  $u \rightarrow 0$  and  $\int_0^t \int_0^1 u^m dx d\tau$  can be unbounded. Thus there is essential singularity in (1.1) when  $u = 0$ . Some authors have discussed the similar problems with  $u_0 > 0$ . For example, for positive initial value  $u_0$ , H. Zhang ([11]) discussed the Cauchy problem for  $m \in (-1, 0]$  with the conditions

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow -\infty} u^{m-1}u_x = \lambda, \quad \lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} u = 1.$$

Where,  $\lambda > 0$ . The author also discussed the first boundary value problem for  $-1 < m < 0$  but  $u_0 \geq 0$  ([12]). In order to obtain our conclusions of the paper, we divide the range  $[0, +\infty)$  into two parts:  $[0, t_*]$  and  $[t_*, +\infty)$ . We first use Arzela's theorem to prove that there exists a function  $u^*$  which solves (1.1) on  $[0, 1] \times [0, t_*]$ . Notice that  $u^*(x, t_*) > 0$

and  $u^*(x, t_*)$  is smooth, so we use  $u^*(x, t_*)$  as a new initial value and then obtain another solution  $u^{**}$  on  $[0, 1] \times [t_*, +\infty)$ . Thus we obtain a solution

$$u(x, t) = \begin{cases} u^*(x, t), & t \in [0, t_*], \\ u^{**}(x, t), & t \in [t_*, +\infty). \end{cases}$$

Finally, with a comparison theorem, we can prove the uniqueness and the continuous dependence on initial value.

By a solution of (1.1), we mean a function  $u(x, t)$  is smooth enough and satisfies the equation in (1.1),  $u_x$  is continuous up to  $x = 0, 1$  and satisfies the boundary condition of (1.1) and  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \int_0^1 |u - u_0| dx = 0$ .

The following notations will be used throughout the paper:

$$G_T = (0, 1) \times (0, T), \quad G = (0, 1) \times (0, +\infty), \quad \bar{u}_0 = \int_0^1 u_0 dx.$$

The main results of our paper are as follows:

**Theorem** Assume

$$-1 < m < 0, \quad 0 < p < 1, \quad 2 - m < \alpha, \quad 0 \leq u_0(x) \leq M, \quad \bar{u}_0 > 0. \quad (1.2)$$

Then there exists a unique global smooth positive solution  $u(x, t)$  to the problem (1.1) such that

$$u \in C^\infty(G) \cap C([0, +\infty); L^1(0, 1)).$$

If  $u, \hat{u}$  are two solutions corresponding to  $u_0, \hat{u}_0$ , then for any  $T > 0$ , there is a positive constant  $C$  such that

$$\int_0^1 |u - \hat{u}| dx \leq C \int_0^1 |u_0 - \hat{u}_0| dx, \quad \text{for } t \in [0, T]. \quad (1.3)$$

## 2 Preliminary lemmas

**Lemma 1** Assume  $0 < u_0 \leq M$  and  $u_0$  be smooth enough. For any  $T > 0$ , if  $u(x, t)$  is a smooth positive solution to the problem (1.1) on  $G_T$ , then there exists a positive constant  $C_0 > 0$  such that

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty(G_T)} \leq C_0,$$

where,

$$C_0 = [(1 - p)T + M^{1-p}]^{\frac{1}{1-p}}.$$

**Proof:** For any  $q \geq 0$ , we have

$$u^q u_t = u^q (u^{m-1} u_x)_x + u^{p+q}.$$

By Holder's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{1+q} \frac{d}{dt} \int_0^1 u^{q+1} dx &\leq \int_0^1 u^{p+q} dx \\ &\leq \left( \int_0^1 u^{1+q} dx \right)^{\frac{p+q}{1+q}}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.1)$$

So,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \left( \int_0^1 u^{1+q} dx \right)^{\frac{1-p}{1+q}} &\leq 1-p \\ \|u\|_{L^{1+q}(0,1)} &\leq [(1-p)t + \|u_0\|_{L^{1+q}(0,1)}^{\frac{1-p}{1+q}}]^{\frac{1}{1-p}} \\ &\leq C_0, \quad \text{for } t \in [0, T], \quad q \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

By [10](Th 2.8, p.25),  $\|u\|_{L^\infty(G_T)} \leq C_0$ .

**Lemma 2** Assume  $u_0$  and  $u(x, t)$  be as lemma 1, then

$$\left| (u^{\frac{m}{q}})_x \right| \leq C_T (1 + t^{-\frac{1}{2}}), \quad \text{for } (x, t) \in [0, 1] \times (0, T).$$

Where,  $q = \frac{3m-1}{2(m-1)}$ ,  $C_T$  depends on  $T, m, M, p$  and  $\alpha$ .

**Proof:** Set  $u^m = V^q$ , then

$$V_t = V^{q-\frac{q}{m}} V_{xx} + (q-1) V^{q-1-\frac{q}{m}} (V_x)^2 + \frac{m}{q} V^{1+\frac{pq-q}{m}}.$$

Differentiating this equation with respect to  $x$  and then multiplying through by  $V_x$ , letting  $V_x = h$ , yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} (h^2)_t - V^{q-\frac{q}{m}} h h_{xx} &= (3q-2-\frac{q}{m}) V^{q-1-\frac{q}{m}} h^2 h_x + \frac{m}{q} (1+\frac{pq-q}{m}) V^{\frac{pq-q}{m}} h^2 \\ &\quad + (q-1)(q-1-\frac{q}{m}) V^{q-2-\frac{q}{m}} h^4. \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

For any  $0 < \tau < T$ , let  $\phi(t)$  be a smooth function and

$$\phi(t) = \begin{cases} 0, & t \leq 0, \\ \text{monotone}, & 0 < t < \tau, \\ 1, & t \geq \tau. \end{cases}$$

Thus there is a positive constant  $C_* > 0$  such that  $0 \leq \frac{d\phi}{dt} \leq \frac{C_*}{\tau}$ . Set  $Z = (\phi h)^2$ . By [1](Th.6, p.65), we have  $Z \in C(\overline{G_T})$ . Clearly,  $Z|_{t=0} = Z|_{x=0} = 0$  and (since  $\frac{m}{q} - 1 + \alpha > 0$ )

$$Z|_{x=1} \leq \left(\frac{m}{q}\right)^2 C_0^{2(\frac{m}{q}-1+\alpha)}. \quad (2.4)$$

Let

$$Z(x_0, t_0) = \max_{(x,t) \in \overline{G_T}} Z(x, t),$$

if  $0 < x_0 < 1$  and  $t_0 > 0$ , then

$$Z_t \geq 0, \quad Z_x = 0, \quad Z_t - V^{q-\frac{q}{m}} Z_{xx} \geq 0, \quad \text{at } (x_0, t_0).$$

Hence,

$$-\phi\phi_t h^2 \leq \phi^2 \left[ \frac{1}{2} (h^2)_t - V^{q-\frac{q}{m}} h h_{xx} \right], \quad \text{at } (x_0, t_0).$$

Multiplying (2.3) by  $\phi^2$ , we have

$$(1-q)\left(q-1-\frac{q}{m}\right)Z \leq \frac{m}{q}\left(1+\frac{pq-q}{m}\right)u^{p-m+\frac{2m}{q}}\phi^2 + \frac{C_*}{\tau}u^{\frac{2m}{q}+1-m}, \quad \text{at } (x_0, t_0).$$

Since  $p < 1$ ,  $m \in (-1, 0)$  and  $q > 0$ , thus  $\frac{m}{q}\left(1+\frac{pq-q}{m}\right) < 0$ . Thus we have

$$(1-q)\left(q-1-\frac{q}{m}\right)Z \leq \frac{C_*}{\tau}u^{\frac{2m}{q}+1-m}, \quad \text{at } (x_0, t_0).$$

Notice that  $q = \frac{3m-1}{2(m-1)}$ , hence

$$(1-q)\left(q-1-\frac{q}{m}\right) > 0, \quad \frac{2m}{q} + 1 - m > 0.$$

Let

$$C^{**} = \frac{C_* C_0^{\frac{2m}{q}+1-q}}{(1-q)\left(q-1-\frac{q}{m}\right)}.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} Z(x_0, t_0) &\leq \frac{C_* C_0^{\frac{2m}{q}+1-q}}{\tau(1-q)\left(q-1-\frac{q}{m}\right)} \\ &= \frac{C^{**}}{\tau}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

Recall from  $Z(x_0, t_0)$  that (2.5) holds for all  $(x, t) \in (0, 1) \times (0, T)$ , specially, for  $0 < x < 1$ ,  $t = \tau$  (here,  $\phi = 1, Z = h^2(x, \tau)$ ), thus

$$|h(x, \tau)| \leq \left(\frac{C^{**}}{\tau}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \text{for } (x, \tau) \in (0, 1) \times (0, T).$$

By (2.4), there is another positive constant  $C_T$  which depends on  $T, m, M, p$  and  $\alpha$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} |h(x, \tau)| &\leq \left|\frac{m}{q} C_0^{\left(\frac{m}{q}-1+\alpha\right)} + \left(\frac{C^{**}}{\tau}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right| \\ &\leq C_T(1 + \tau^{-\frac{1}{2}}), \quad \text{for } (x, \tau) \in [0, 1] \times (0, T). \end{aligned}$$

The proof is complete.

We notice that  $C_T$  increases with respect to  $C_0$  by (2.5) and  $C_0$  increases with respect to  $T$  by lemma 1. So we have

**Corollary** If  $T_1 \leq T_2$ , then  $C_{T_1} \leq C_{T_2}$ .

**Lemma 3** Assume  $u_0(x)$  and  $u(x, t)$  be as lemma 1, then

$$\int_0^1 u(x, t) dx \geq [(\alpha + m - 2)t + \int_0^1 u_0^{2-m-\alpha} dx]^{\frac{1}{1-m-\alpha}}, \quad \text{for } t \in [0, T].$$

**Proof:** Multiplying  $u^{1-m-\alpha}$  to the equation in (1.1) yields

$$\frac{1}{2-m-\alpha} (u^{2-m-\alpha})_t = \frac{1}{m} u^{1-m-\alpha} (u^m)_{xx} + u^{p+1-m-\alpha}.$$

Because of  $2-m < \alpha$  and  $u(x, t) > 0$ , thus

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \int_0^1 u^{2-m-\alpha} dx &= (2-m-\alpha)[(m-1+\alpha) \int_0^1 u^{-1-\alpha} (u_x)^2 dx \\ &\quad + \int_0^1 u^{p+1-m-\alpha} dx - 1] \\ &\leq \alpha + m - 2, \end{aligned}$$

so

$$\int_0^1 u^{2-m-\alpha} dx \leq \int_0^1 u_0^{2-m-\alpha} dx + (\alpha + m - 2)t. \quad (2.6)$$

By Hölder's inverse-inequality([10], Ch.2, Th.2.6), we have

$$\left(\int_0^1 u dx\right)^{2-m-\alpha} \leq \int_0^1 u^{2-m-\alpha} dx.$$

Hence by (2.6), we have

$$\int_0^1 u(x, t) dx \geq [(\alpha + m - 2)t + \int_0^1 u_0^{2-m-\alpha} dx]^{\frac{1}{2-m-\alpha}}.$$

**Lemma 4** Assume  $u_1, u_2 \in C([0, T], L^1(0, 1))$  be two solutions corresponding to  $u_{10}$  and  $u_{20}$ , then

$$\int_0^1 |u_2 - u_1| dx \leq \int_0^1 |u_{20} - u_{10}| dx + \int_0^1 \int_0^t |u_2^p - u_1^p| dx d\tau, \quad \text{for } t \in [0, T].$$

**Proof:** Take a function  $p(x) \in C^\infty(R)$  such that

$$p(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & x \leq 0, \\ \exp[\frac{-1}{x^2} \exp \frac{-1}{(x-1)^2}], & 0 < x < 1, \\ 1, & x \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

Clearly,  $0 \leq p(x) \leq 1$  and  $p'(x) \geq 0$ . For any given  $\varepsilon > 0$ , let  $p_\varepsilon(x) = p(\frac{x}{\varepsilon})$ . Set

$$w = \frac{1}{m}(u_2^m - u_1^m).$$

Then  $w > 0$  iff  $u_2 > u_1$ . Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 (u_2 - u_1)_t p_\varepsilon(w) dx &= \int_0^1 w_{xx} p_\varepsilon(w) dx + \int_0^1 (u_2^p - u_1^p) p_\varepsilon(w) dx \\ &\leq (u_1^{m-1+\alpha} - u_2^{m-1+\alpha}) p_\varepsilon(w)|_{x=1} + \int_0^1 (u_2^p - u_1^p) p_\varepsilon(w) dx. \end{aligned}$$

If  $u_2(1, t) > u_1(1, t)$ , then  $(u_1^{m-1+\alpha} - u_2^{m-1+\alpha}) p_\varepsilon(w)|_{x=1} < 0$  (owing to  $\alpha > 2 - m$ ). If  $u_2(1, t) \leq u_1(1, t)$ , then  $w|_{x=1} \leq 0$  and therefore,  $p_\varepsilon(w)|_{x=1} = 0$ . Thus we always have  $(u_1^{m-1+\alpha} - u_2^{m-1+\alpha}) p_\varepsilon(w)|_{x=1} \leq 0$  and

$$\int_0^1 (u_2 - u_1)_t p_\varepsilon(w) dx \leq \int_0^1 (u_2^p - u_1^p) p_\varepsilon(w) dx. \quad (2.7)$$

Since lemma 3.1 of [9] shows

$$\int_0^1 (u - \hat{u})_t p_\varepsilon(w) dx \longrightarrow \frac{d}{dt} \int_0^1 [u - \hat{u}]_+ dx, \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \longrightarrow 0,$$

thus,

$$\int_0^1 [u_2 - u_1]_+ dx \leq \int_0^1 [u_{20} - u_{10}]_+ dx + \int_0^1 \int_0^t [u_2^p - u_1^p]_+ dx d\tau, \quad \text{for } t \in [0, T],$$

(2.8)

in which,  $[u - \hat{u}]_+ = \max(u - \hat{u}, 0)$ . Similarly,

$$\int_0^1 [u_2 - u_1]_- dx \leq \int_0^1 [u_{20} - u_{10}]_- dx + \int_0^1 \int_0^t [u_2^p - u_1^p]_- dx d\tau, \quad \text{for } t \in [0, T], \quad (2.9)$$

where,  $[u - \hat{u}]_- = -\min(u - \hat{u}, 0)$ . By (2.8) and (2.9), we know that the lemma is true.

### 3 Proof of the Theorem

We prove our theorem by two steps.

**STEP 1** In this step, we assume that  $0 < u_0 \leq M$  and  $u_0$  is smooth enough,  $u_{0x}|_{x=0} = 0$ ,  $(u_{0x} + u_0^\alpha)|_{x=1} = 0$ . We will prove that there exists a unique global smooth solution of (1.1).

For any given  $T > 0$ , we consider the problem (1.1) on  $\overline{G}_T$ . Make two smooth functions as the following ([9], p.997):

$$h(r) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}(2\overline{M})^{m-1}, & r \geq 2\overline{M}, \\ \text{monotone}, & \overline{M} < r < 2\overline{M}, \\ r^{m-1}, & \delta \leq r \leq \overline{M}, \\ \text{monotone}, & 0 \leq r < \delta, \\ 2\delta^{m-1}, & r < 0. \end{cases}$$

$$g(r) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}(2\overline{M})^{m-2}, & r \geq 2\overline{M}, \\ \text{monotone}, & \overline{M} < r < 2\overline{M}, \\ r^{m-2}, & \delta \leq r \leq \overline{M}, \\ \text{monotone} & 0 \leq r < \delta, \\ 2\delta^{m-2}f(r), & r < 0. \end{cases}$$

Where,  $0 < \delta < \min_{x \in [0,1]} u_0(x)$ ,  $\overline{M} > M$ .  $\overline{M}$  and  $\delta$  are to be determined.  $f(r) \in C_0^\infty(R)$ ,  $0 \leq f(r) \leq 1$  and

$$f(r) = \begin{cases} 1, & |r| \leq 1, \\ 0, & |r| \geq 2. \end{cases}$$

Consider the following problem

$$\begin{cases} w_t = h(w)w_{xx} + (m-1)g(w)(w_x)^2 + w^p, & 0 < x < 1, t > 0, \\ w_x|_{x=0} = 0, & w_x|_{x=1} = -|w|^{\alpha-1}w, & t \geq 0, \\ w|_{t=0} = u_0, & & 0 \leq x \leq 1. \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

We first set

$$\delta = \delta_0 = \frac{1}{2} \min_{x \in [0,1]} u_0(x), \quad \overline{M} = \overline{M}_0 = 2M.$$

The standard parabolic equation theory ([4], Th.7.4) assumes the existence and uniqueness of

$$w_0(x, t) \in H^{2+\beta, 1+\frac{\beta}{2}}(\overline{G}_T),$$

for some  $\beta \in (0, 1)$ , solution of (3.1). By the continuity of  $w_0(x, t)$ , there is a  $t_0 > 0$ , such that

$$\delta_0 \leq w_0 \leq \overline{M}_0, \quad \text{for } (x, t) \in \overline{G}_{t_0}.$$

Let

$$T_0 = \sup \{t_0 \mid \delta_0 \leq w_0 \leq \overline{M}_0, (x, t) \in \overline{G}_{t_0}\}.$$

Thus by the definition of  $h(r)$  and  $g(r)$ ,  $w_0$  is a solution of (1.1) on  $\overline{G}_{T_0}$ , or

$$w_0 = u, \quad \text{for } t \in [0, T_0]. \quad (3.2)$$

Moreover,  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \int_0^1 |u - u_0| dx = 0$ .

Next, we set

$$\begin{aligned} \delta = \delta_1 &= \frac{1}{2} \min\{[\eta^{\frac{m}{\alpha}} + C_T(1 + T_0^{-\frac{1}{2}})]^{\frac{\alpha}{m}}, \delta_0\}, \\ \overline{M} = \overline{M}_1 &= 2 \max(2M, C_0). \end{aligned}$$

Where,

$$\eta = [(\alpha + m - 2)T + \int_0^1 u_0^{2-m-\alpha} dx]^{\frac{1}{1-m-\alpha}}.$$

For  $\delta_1$  and  $\overline{M}$ , there also exists a unique solution of (3.1)  $w_1(x, t) \in H^{2+\beta, 1+\frac{\beta}{2}}(\overline{G}_T)$ , and a point  $t_1$  such that

$$\delta_1 \leq w_1 \leq \overline{M}_1, \quad \text{for } (x, t) \in \overline{G}_{t_1}.$$

Let

$$T_1 = \sup \{t_1 \mid \delta_1 \leq w_1 \leq \overline{M}_1, (x, t) \in \overline{G}_{t_1}\}.$$

Thus  $w_1$  is a solution of (1.1) on  $\overline{G}_{T_1}$ , or

$$w_1 = u, \quad \text{for } t \in [0, T_1]. \quad (3.3)$$

Clearly, using the lemma 2 of [6], we know  $T_0 \leq T_1$ .

We end this step by showing that  $T_1 = T$ . By the definitions of  $T_1$ ,  $\overline{M}_1$  and  $\delta_1$ , there is a point  $x_1 \in [0, 1]$  such that

$$u(x_1, T_1) = \overline{M}_1, \quad (3.4)$$



or

$$u(x_1, T_1) = \delta_1. \quad (3.5)$$

If  $T_1 < T$ , then by lemma 1, we have

$$u(x, T_1) \leq C_0, \quad \text{for } x \in [0, 1]. \quad (3.6)$$

Since  $C_0 < \overline{M}_1$ , so (3.4) contradicts (3.6). On the other hand, since  $T_1 < T$ , lemma 3 implies

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 u(x, T_1) dx &\geq [(\alpha + m - 2)T_1 + \int_0^1 u_0^{2-m-\alpha} dx]^{\frac{1}{1-m-\alpha}} \\ &> [(\alpha + m - 2)T + \int_0^1 u_0^{2-m-\alpha} dx]^{\frac{1}{1-m-\alpha}} \\ &= \eta. \end{aligned}$$

Thus there is a  $x_2 \in [0, 1]$  such that  $u(x_2, T_1) \geq \eta$ . Using lemma 2 and its Corollary we have

$$\begin{aligned} u^{\frac{m}{q}}(x, T_1) &\leq u^{\frac{m}{q}}(x_2, T_1) + C_{T_1}(1 + T_1^{-\frac{1}{2}}) \\ &\leq \eta^{\frac{m}{q}} + C_T(1 + T_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} u(x, T_1) &\geq [\eta^{\frac{m}{q}} + C_T(1 + T_0^{-\frac{1}{2}})]^{\frac{q}{m}} \\ &\geq 2\delta_1, \quad \text{for } x \in [0, 1]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

Clearly, (3.7) contradicts (3.5). Thus,  $T_1 = T$  and

$$w_1 = u(x, t), \quad \text{for } (x, t) \in G_T.$$

Therefore,  $u(x, t)$  is a solution of (1.1) on  $G_T$ . The bootstrap argument ([5]) shows that  $u \in C^\infty(G_T)$ . Recalling from the arbitrariness of  $T$ , we know that this step is complete.

**STEP 2** Assume  $u_0$  be as (1.2). We will prove that the conclusions of the theorem are valid.

For  $0 < \delta < \frac{1}{12}$ , let

$$u_0^* = \begin{cases} u_0, & x \in [2\delta, 1 - 2\delta], \\ 0, & x \notin [2\delta, 1 - 2\delta], \end{cases}$$

and

$$u_{0\delta} = \delta + \delta^\alpha x^2(1 - x) + \int_0^1 u_0^*(y)J(x - \delta y)dy.$$

Where,  $J$  is a smooth averaging kernel. Clearly,  $u_{0\delta}$  satisfies the conditions of STEP 1 and

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \|u_{0\delta} - u_0\|_{L^1(0,1)} = 0.$$

For any given  $T > 0$ , we consider the problem

$$\begin{cases} u_t = (u^{m-1}u_x)_x + u^p, & 0 < x < 1, 0 < t \leq T, \\ u_x|_{x=0} = 0, \quad u_x|_{x=1} = -u^\alpha, & 0 \leq t \leq T, \\ u|_{t=0} = u_{0\delta}, & 0 \leq x \leq 1. \end{cases}$$

STEP 1 assures that there is a smooth solution  $u_\delta \in C^\infty(G_T) \cap C([0, T]; L^1(0, 1))$  and

$$\int_0^1 u_\delta(x, t) dx \geq \int_0^1 u_{0\delta}(x) dx - \int_0^t u_\delta^{m-1+\alpha}(1, \tau) d\tau, \quad \text{for } t \in [0, T]. \quad (3.8)$$

Recalling from  $\int_0^1 u_{0\delta} dx \rightarrow \bar{u}_0$  as  $\delta \rightarrow 0$ , hence we know that there are  $\delta_0$  and  $t_0$  such that

$$\int_0^1 u_\delta(x, t) dx \geq \frac{1}{2}\bar{u}_0, \quad \text{for } \delta \in (0, \delta_0), t \in [0, 2t_0]. \quad (3.9)$$

For any given  $\tau \in (0, 2t_0]$ , lemma 1 and lemma 2 and Arzela's theorem assure the existence of subsequence  $\{u_{\delta_k}(x, t)\}$  and a function  $u^*(x, t)$  such that

$$\lim_{\delta_k \rightarrow 0} u_{\delta_k}(x, t) = u^*(x, t), \quad \text{uniformly on } x \in [0, 1] \quad (3.10)$$

for  $t \in [\tau, 2t_0]$ . On the other hand, (3.9) implies that for any  $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$ , there is a point  $(x_3, t)$  such that

$$u_\delta(x_3, t) \geq \frac{1}{2}\bar{u}_0, \quad \text{for } t \in [\tau, 2t_0]. \quad (3.11)$$

By lemma 2,

$$\begin{aligned} u_\delta^{\frac{m}{q}}(x, t) &\leq u_\delta^{\frac{m}{q}}(x_3, t) + C_T(1 + t^{-\frac{1}{2}}) \\ &\leq u_\delta^{\frac{m}{q}}(x_3, t) + C_T(1 + \tau^{-\frac{1}{2}}), \quad \text{for } (x, t) \in [0, 1] \times [\tau, 2t_0]. \end{aligned}$$

Using (3.11),

$$\begin{aligned} u_\delta(x, t) &\geq \left[ \left(\frac{\bar{u}_0}{2}\right)^{\frac{m}{q}} + C_T(1 + \tau^{-\frac{1}{2}}) \right]^{\frac{q}{m}} \\ &> 0, \quad \text{for } (x, t) \in [0, 1] \times [\tau, 2t_0]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

Set

$$\begin{aligned} A &= u_\delta^{m-1}, \\ B &= \frac{4(m-1)}{m^2}((u_\delta^{\frac{m}{2}})_x)^2 + u_\delta^p. \end{aligned}$$

Thus lemma 2 and (3.12) imply that there is a positive constant  $\mu$  which doesn't depend on  $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$  such that

$$0 < A < \mu, \quad |B| < \mu, \quad \text{for } (x, t) \in [0, 1] \times [\tau, 2t_0].$$

Notice that  $u_\delta$  satisfies the linear equation

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} u_\delta = A \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} u_\delta + B.$$

For any  $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ , [3](p.104) shows that there are positive constants  $h, \nu$  and  $C$ , which don't depend on  $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$ , such that

$$|u_\delta(x, t_2) - u_\delta(x, t_1)| \leq C|t_2 - t_1|^h,$$

for  $t_1, t_2 \in [\tau, 2t_0]$ ,  $|t_1 - t_2| < \nu$ ,  $x \in [\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]$ . Certainly, we also have  $|u_{\delta_k}(x, t_2) - u_{\delta_k}(x, t_1)| \leq C|t_2 - t_1|^h$ . Letting  $\delta_k \rightarrow 0$  yields

$$|u^*(x, t_2) - u^*(x, t_1)| \leq C|t_2 - t_1|^h,$$

for  $t_1, t_2 \in [\tau, 2t_0]$ ,  $|t_1 - t_2| < \nu$ ,  $x \in [\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]$ . Thus, for any given  $x \in (0, 1)$ ,  $u^*(x, t)$  is continuous with respect to  $t \in [\tau, 2t_0]$ . On the other hand, lemma 2 implies that there is a positive constant  $K$  such that  $|u_{\delta_k}| \leq K$  on  $(x, t) \in [\tau, 2t_0] \times [0, 1]$ , so  $|u_{\delta_k}(x_2, t) - u_{\delta_k}(x_1, t)| \leq K|x_2 - x_1|$ . Letting  $\delta_k \rightarrow 0$ , we have

$$|u^*(x_2, t) - u^*(x_1, t)| \leq K|x_2 - x_1| \quad \text{uniformly on } x_1, x_2 \in [0, 1], t \in [\tau, 2t_0].$$

Now we have  $u^* \in C([0, 1] \times [\tau, 2t_0])$  and  $u^*(x, t) > 0$  for  $(x, t) \in [0, 1] \times [\tau, 2t_0]$ . By lemma 5 of [2], we know that  $u^*$  satisfies the equation and the boundary conditions of (1.1). Clearly,  $u^* \in C([\tau, 2t_0]; L^1(0, 1))$ . Because  $\tau > 0$  is arbitrary, so  $u^* \in C((0, 2t_0]; L^1(0, 1))$ .

To show that  $u^*$  is a solution of (1.1) on  $G_{2t_0}$ , we want to prove  $\|u^* - u_0\|_{L^1(0,1)} \rightarrow 0$  as  $t \rightarrow 0$ .

For any  $\delta_k, \delta_{k+j}$ , lemma 4 implies

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_{\delta_k} - u_{\delta_{k+j}}\|_{L^1(0,1)} &\leq \|u_{0\delta_k} - u_{0\delta_{k+j}}\|_{L^1(0,1)} + \int_0^t \|u_{\delta_k}^p - u_{\delta_{k+j}}^p\|_{L^1(0,1)} d\tau \\ &\leq \|u_{0\delta_k} - u_0\|_{L^1(0,1)} + \|u_{0\delta_{k+j}} - u_0\|_{L^1(0,1)} \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \|u_{\delta_k}^p - u_{\delta_{k+j}}^p\|_{L^1(0,1)} d\tau, \quad \text{for } t \in (0, 2t_0]. \end{aligned}$$

Letting  $j \rightarrow \infty$  yields

$$\|u_{\delta_k} - u^*\|_{L^1(0,1)} \leq \|u_{0\delta_k} - u_0\|_{L^1(0,1)} + \int_0^t \|u_{\delta_k}^p - u^{*p}\|_{L^1(0,1)} d\tau, \quad \text{for } t \in (0, 2t_0].$$

Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \|u^* - u_0\|_{L^1(0,1)} &\leq \|u^* - u_{\delta_k}\|_{L^1(0,1)} + \|u_{\delta_k} - u_{0\delta_k}\|_{L^1(0,1)} + \|u_{0\delta_k} - u_0\|_{L^1(0,1)} \\ &\leq 2\|u_{0\delta_k} - u_0\|_{L^1(0,1)} + \|u_{\delta_k} - u_{0\delta_k}\|_{L^1(0,1)} \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \|u_{\delta_k}^p - u^{*p}\|_{L^1(0,1)} d\tau, \quad \text{for } t \in (0, 2t_0]. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \|u^* - u_0\|_{L^1(0,1)} \leq 2\|u_{0\delta_k} - u_0\|_{L^1(0,1)}.$$

Letting  $\delta_k \rightarrow 0$  shows

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \|u^* - u_0\|_{L^1(0,1)} = 0.$$

Next, we consider the problem

$$\begin{cases} u_t = (u^{m-1}u_x)_x + u^p, & 0 < x < 1, \quad t_0 < t \leq T, \\ u_x|_{x=0} = 0, \quad u_x|_{x=1} = -u^\alpha, & t_0 \leq t \leq T, \\ u|_{t=t_0} = u^*(x, t_0), & 0 \leq x \leq 1. \end{cases} \quad (3.13)$$

Since  $u^*(x, t_0) > 0$  and  $u^*(x, t_0)$  is smooth enough for  $x \in [0, 1]$ , the conclusion of STEP 1 shows that there is a function  $u^{**}$  to solve (3.13). Now we define a function

$$u(x, t) = \begin{cases} u^*, & t \in [0, t_0], \\ u^{**}, & t \in [t_0, T]. \end{cases}$$

Clearly,  $u$  is a solution of (1.1) in  $G_T$  and the bootstrap argument ([5]) shows  $u \in C^\infty(G_T)$ .

To end the proof of our theorem, we assume

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{u}(x, t) &= \begin{cases} u_{11}, & t \in [0, t_*], \\ u_{12}, & t \in [t_*, T], \end{cases} \\ \bar{\bar{u}}(x, t) &= \begin{cases} u_{21}, & t \in [0, t_*], \\ u_{22}, & t \in [t_*, T], \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

in which,  $\bar{u}$  and  $\bar{\bar{u}}$  are two solutions corresponding to initial values  $u_{10}$  and  $u_{20}$ . Thus lemma 4 shows

$$\|u_{21} - u_{11}\|_{L^1(0,1)} \leq \|u_{20} - u_{10}\|_{L^1(0,1)} + \int_0^t \|u_{21}^p - u_{11}^p\|_{L^1(0,1)} d\tau, \quad \text{for } t \in [0, t_*].$$

By lemma 1,  $u_{ij}$  are bounded on  $G_T$  for  $i, j = 1, 2$ . Hence we can set  $t_*$  small enough such that

$$\|u_{21} - u_{11}\|_{L^1(0,1)} \leq 2\|u_{20} - u_{10}\|_{L^1(0,1)}, \quad \text{for } t \in [0, t_*]. \quad (3.14)$$

Notice that (2.7) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \int_0^1 |u_{22} - u_{12}| dx &\leq \int_0^1 |u_{22}^p - u_{12}^p| dx \\ &\leq p\xi^{p-1} \int_0^1 |u_{22} - u_{12}|_{L^1(0,1)} dx, \quad \text{for } t \in [t_*, T], \end{aligned}$$

in which,

$$\begin{aligned} \xi &= \min_{(x,t) \in [0,1] \times [t_*, T]} (u_{12}, u_{22}) \\ &> 0. \end{aligned}$$

Using (3.14) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_{22} - u_{12}\|_{L^1(0,1)} &\leq (\|u_{22} - u_{12}\|_{L^1(0,1)})_{t=t_*} e^{p\xi^{p-1}t} \\ &\leq 2\|u_{20} - u_{10}\|_{L^1(0,1)} e^{p\xi^{p-1}t}, \quad \text{for } t \in [t_*, T]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

It follows from  $0 < p < 1$  that  $e^{p\xi^{p-1}t} \leq 1$ . Combining (3.14) and (3.15) yields (1.3), the uniqueness of the solution is followed immediately.

The author is pleased to express his gratitude to Prof. Li Ta-tsien for his valuable guidance.

## References

- [1] A. Friedman, *Partial Differential Equations of Parabolic Type*. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J. 1964.
- [2] B.H.Gilding, L.A.Peletier, *The Cauchy problem for an equation in the theory of infiltration*, Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal., 61(1976), 127-140.
- [3] B.H.Gilding, *Hölder Continuity of Solutions of Parabolic Equations*, J.London Math.Soc., 12(1976), 101-106.
- [4] O.A.Ladyshenskaya, V.A.Solounikov and N.N.Uraltseva, *Linear and quasilinear equations of parabolic type*, Transl. Math. Mono., 23, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R.I., 1968.

- [5] D.G.Arosen, *Regularity Properties of Flows through Porous Media: A Counterexample*, SIAM.J.Appl.Math. 19(1970),299-307.
- [6] C. Hongwei, *Analysis of Blowup for a Nonlinear Degenerate Parabolic Equation*, J.Math.Ana. Appl.,192(1995), 180-193.
- [7] G.Rosen, *Nonlinear heat conduction in solid H<sub>2</sub>*, Physical Review B, 19(1979),2398-2399.
- [8] J.G.Berryman,C.J.Holland, *Stability of the Separable Solution for Fast Diffusion*, Arch.Rat.Mech. Anal.,74(1980),379-388.
- [9] J.R.Esteban, A.Rodriguez and J.L.Vazquez, *A Nonlinear Heat Equation with Singular Diffusivity*, Comm. In P.D.E, 13(1988),985-1039.
- [10] R.A.Admas,*Sobolev Spaces*, Academic Press, New York,1975.
- [11] H.Zhang, *On a Nonlinear Singular Diffusion Problem: Convergence to a Traveling Wave*, Nonlinear Analysis, Theory, Methods & Applications,19(1992),1111-1120.
- [12] Jiaqing Pan, *A Boundary Value Problem for Nonlinear Parabolic Equation with Singularity*, Advances in Mathematics (in Chinese) ,33(2004),67-74.