

Dynamic Inverse Wave Problems – Part I: Regularity for the Direct Problem

Thies Gerken*

Simon Grützner†

January 30, 2019

Abstract

For parameter identification problems the Fréchet-derivative of the parameter-to-state map is of particular interest. In many applications, e.g. in seismic tomography, the unknown quantity is modeled as a coefficient in a linear differential equation, therefore computing the derivative of this map involves solving the same equation, but with a different right-hand side. It then remains to show that this right-hand side is regular enough to ensure the existence of a solution. For second-order hyperbolic PDEs with time-dependent parameters the needed results are not as readily available as in the stationary case, especially when working in a variational framework. This complicates for example the reconstruction of a time-dependent density in the wave equation. To overcome this problem we extend the existing regularity results to the time-dependent case.

1 Introduction

One of the motivations of this work is the identification of the space- and time-dependent mass density ρ from the solution u of the wave equation

$$u'' - \operatorname{div} \frac{\nabla u}{\rho} = f \quad \text{in } [0, T] \times \Omega, \quad (1.1a)$$

$$u = 0 \quad \text{in } [0, T] \times \partial\Omega, \quad u(0) = u_0 \quad \text{and} \quad u'(0) = u_1. \quad (1.1b)$$

A common approach is to write this problem as an abstract evolution equation of the form

$$u''(t) + A(t)u(t) = f(t) \quad \text{in } V^*, \quad \text{a.e. in } I, \quad (1.2a)$$

$$u(0) = u_0 \quad \text{in } H, \quad u'(0) = u_1 \quad \text{in } V^*, \quad (1.2b)$$

where $I := (0, T)$ with $0 < T < \infty$, $V = H_0^1(\Omega)$, $H = L^2(\Omega)$ and $A(t) \in \mathcal{L}(V; V^*)$ is given via

$$\langle A(t)\varphi, \psi \rangle_{V^* \times V} = \int_{\Omega} \frac{\nabla \varphi \cdot \nabla \psi}{\rho(t)} \, dx, \quad \varphi, \psi \in V.$$

*Center for Industrial Mathematics, Universität Bremen, Germany; tgerken@math.uni-bremen.de

†Center for Industrial Mathematics, Universität Bremen, Germany; sg@math.uni-bremen.de

This abstract problem is then analyzed using semigroup theory [Paz83] or variational techniques [Zei85; LM72]. Either of these tools yield a well-defined solution $u \in L^2(I; V) \cap H^1(I; H) \cap H^2(I; V^*)$ for a strongly positive $A \in W^{1,\infty}(I; \mathcal{L}(V; V^*))$, i.e. $\rho \in W^{1,\infty}(I; L^\infty(\Omega))$ with $\rho(t, x) \geq \rho_0 > 0$ for almost all $(t, x) \in I \times \Omega$. Since our task is to reconstruct ρ from u , the parameter-to-state map reads $F : \rho \mapsto u$ and in order to apply Newton-based algorithms for the inversion of F , knowledge of its Fréchet derivative is crucial. Formal derivation of (1.2b) shows that if this derivative exists, then $u_h = \partial F(\rho)[h]$ with perturbation $h \in W^{1,\infty}(I; L^\infty(\Omega))$ would have to solve

$$u_h''(t) - \operatorname{div} \frac{\nabla u_h(t)}{\rho(t)} = - \operatorname{div} \left(h(t) \frac{\nabla u(t)}{\rho(t)^2} \right)$$

in a weak sense and satisfy homogeneous initial conditions. Without further information about u we only know that the right-hand side of this equation lies in $L^2(I; V^*)$, which (in contrast to elliptic or parabolic equations, see e.g. [GT83; Eva10; HR09; Are+07] and the references therein) is not enough to ensure existence of u_h . The equation would be solvable if the right-hand side was an element of $H^1(I; V^*)$, which requires $u \in H^1(I; V)$. This is the reason why we are interested in obtaining higher regularity of the solution u .

A prominent approach to obtain higher regularity is the formal differentiation of the abstract formulation (1.2a) with respect to time, which yields

$$u'''(t) + A'(t)u(t) + A(t)u'(t) = f'(t),$$

and then treating this (complemented by suitable initial values) as a new problem for $v := u'$, c.f. Wloka [Wlo87]. The expression $A'(t)u(t)$ is regarded as independent of v and moved to the right-hand side. The resulting equation then reads $v''(t) + A(t)v(t) = f'(t) - A'(t)u(t)$. Now, to ensure the existence of such a v , one needs that $t \mapsto A'(t)u(t)$ is an element of either $L^2(I; H)$ or $H^1(I; V^*)$. The latter would require $u \in H^1(I; V)$, which is what we are trying to show in the first place. The former can be fulfilled by assuming $A'(t) \in \mathcal{L}(V; H)$, which is clearly violated in our example due to the time dependence of ρ . Another possible approach is to first show spatial regularity for u and then use integration by parts to see that $A'(t)u(t)$ can indeed be applied to elements of H , i.e. $u(t) \in \mathcal{D}(A'(t))$. However, this is not possible without using specific knowledge about the Hilbert spaces H and V .

We overcome all of these problems by regarding u as dependent on v by writing $u(t) = u_0 + \int_0^t v(s) ds$. This results in a mixed integral and differential equation for v , which we analyze using common variational techniques. Afterwards we show that $v \in L^2(I; V) \cap H^1(I; H)$ indeed equals u' and therefore $u \in H^1(I; V) \cap H^2(I; H)$. By iterating this process we can get even higher regularity for u .

In principle one could tackle this kind of abstract problem using semigroups. However, to our knowledge, there are only two similar result in literature. One is stated by Lions [Lio61] where he uses a variational approach and transforms the time interval from $(0, T)$ to $(0, \infty)$ and then solves the weak formulation in the space-time domain using a weaker form of Lax-Milgram. The resulting assumptions regarding the smoothness of the operators are the same, but his theory only applies to homogeneous initial conditions and requires that the

first $k - 1$ derivatives of the right-hand side vanish at zero.

The other one is from [Kat85], where the author treats the abstract problem from (1.3) for C set to the identity in $\mathcal{L}(H)$ and to $B, Q = 0$. The needed compatibility condition agree with ours in this specific setting. The author also introduces some additional structure to V and H which then makes some additional abstract spatial regularity result possible.

The analysis is done on the abstract problem (1.2) and is therefore not limited to the wave equation. It can directly be applied to related phenomena like the elastic wave- or Maxwell's equations. Following this notion we want to include even more general cases of multiple unknown parameters, or a parameter that appears in more than one coefficient of the PDE. Hence we augment (1.2) even further by additional time-dependent operators B, C, Q and try to achieve higher differentiability with respect to time of the solution of

$$\frac{d}{dt} (C(t)u'(t)) + B(t)u'(t) + (A(t) + Q(t))u(t) = f(t) \text{ in } V^*, \text{ a.e. in } I. \quad (1.3)$$

The operator $Q(t) \in \mathcal{L}(V; H)$ may include asymmetric parts in the PDE that depend only on first-order spatial derivatives, e.g. a transport term $\nabla u(t) \cdot b(t)$. The operators B, C also generate time-dependent zero order terms after differentiating this equation more than once. In contrast to A these expressions can safely be moved to the right-hand side, but we aim to get a single regularity theorem that is applicable to a general equation like (1.3). An example for a parameter appearing in multiple operators would be the equation $u''/\rho - \operatorname{div}(\nabla u/\rho) = f$. This is a more realistic version of our introductory PDE, is also used in [KR13] and can be formulated as (1.3) as long as we write the left-hand side as $(u'/\rho)' + (\rho'/\rho^2)u' - \operatorname{div}(\nabla u/\rho)$.

Many articles on parameter identification in hyperbolic PDEs focus on equations with time-independent principal part, e.g. [KR13], [LS17], [BSS13] and [KR16]. Our results give the means to treat these problems in a setting where the parameters are time-dependent. Thus it is now possible to tackle the corresponding dynamic inverse problems, such as waves propagating with a time-dependent wave speed or density. These results also benefit some of today's other applications like optimization, see e.g. [Trö10] or [NT94], or solving quasi-linear PDEs with Newton-like methods, where knowledge of the Fréchet derivative is important as well.

This article is organized as follows: We begin by stating an existence and uniqueness result for equation (1.3) and our regularity theorem, which we then aim to prove. For this, we need solvability of an auxiliary problem, which we analyze in section 3. This then allows for a compact proof of our main theorem in section 4.

2 Preliminaries and Main Theorem

Let V, H denote real Hilbert spaces where V is separable and the embedding $V \hookrightarrow H$ is dense, so that $V \hookrightarrow H \hookrightarrow V^*$ establishes a *Gelfand triple*. The dual space of V is denoted by V^* . Without loss of generality we assume that $\|\cdot\|_H \leq \|\cdot\|_V$. For a Banach space X we denote by $W^{k,p}(I; X)$ the usual Bochner space of X -valued time-dependent functions (see

e.g. [Zei85]). Furthermore, $\mathcal{L}(X; Y)$ is the space of linear and continuous operators from X to Y , and in the case $X = Y$ we just write $\mathcal{L}(X)$. The inner product of H is denoted by (\cdot, \cdot) , and the duality pairing between V^* and V by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$.

Taking (1.3) complemented by suitable initial conditions then reads

$$\frac{d}{dt} (C(t)u'(t)) + B(t)u'(t) + (A(t) + Q(t))u(t) = f(t) \text{ in } V^*, \text{ a.e. in } I, \quad (2.1a)$$

$$u(0) = u_0 \text{ in } H, \quad (C(\cdot)u'(\cdot))(0) = C(0)u_1 \text{ in } V^*, \quad (2.1b)$$

where $A \in L^\infty(I; \mathcal{L}(V; V^*))$, $B, C \in L^\infty(I; \mathcal{L}(H))$ and $Q \in L^\infty(I; \mathcal{L}(V; H))$. The operators A and C are assumed to be pointwise self-adjoint and strongly positive, i.e. $(C(t)\varphi, \varphi) \geq c_0 \|\varphi\|_H^2$ and $\langle A(t)\varphi, \varphi \rangle \geq a_0 \|\varphi\|_V^2$ with $a_0 > 0$ and $c_0 > 0$. In the case that A only fullfills the weaker Gårding-inequality $\langle A(t)\varphi, \varphi \rangle \geq a_0 \|\varphi\|_V^2 - \lambda \|\varphi\|_H^2$ with $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ one may remedy this by replacing A with $A + \lambda I$ and Q with $Q - \lambda I$. For notational simplicity we define the operator

$$C : L^2(I; H) \rightarrow L^2(I; H), \quad (Cu)(t) = C(t)u(t),$$

and analogously \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} and \mathcal{Q} . This allows us to write $(Cu')'(t)$ instead of $(C(\cdot)u'(\cdot))'(t)$ and equation (2.1a) becomes $(Cu')' + \mathcal{B}u' + (\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{Q})u = f$ (in the $L^2(I; V^*)$ sense). We start by stating suitable conditions for the solvability of this problem.

Lemma 2.1 (Well-posedness). *Provided that $A \in W^{1,\infty}(I; \mathcal{L}(V; V^*))$, $B, C \in W^{1,\infty}(I; \mathcal{L}(H))$, $Q \in W^{1,\infty}(I; \mathcal{L}(V; H))$, $f \in L^2(I; H)$ or $f \in H^1(I; V^*)$, $u_0 \in V$, and $u_1 \in H$ there exists a uniquely determined $u \in L^2(I; V) \cap H^1(I; H)$ with $(Cu')' \in L^2(I; V^*)$ solving (2.1).*

Proof. The proof for the case where the operators are continuously differentiable in time can be found in [DL00], but the assertion also holds for $W^{1,\infty}$ because all assumptions on the operators only have to be satisfied up to a set of measure zero. The existence of a solution can also be deduced from the following Corollary 3.4 by setting $k = 0$ in the corresponding proof, which is correct without any differentiability assumptions on B and Q . They arise when showing uniqueness of the solution. If $Q \in L^\infty(I; \mathcal{L}(H))$ then this regularity of Q would not be needed. \square

We will make frequent use of the following lemma, which can be seen as a generalization of the product rule.

Lemma 2.2. *Let X, Y be separable Banach spaces and $G \in W^{1,\infty}(I; \mathcal{L}(X; Y^*))$. Given any $u \in H^1(I; X)$, $v \in H^1(I; Y)$ the map $t \mapsto \langle G(t)u(t), v(t) \rangle$ belongs to $W^{1,1}(I)$ and we have*

$$\frac{d}{dt} \langle G(t)u(t), v(t) \rangle_{Y^* \times Y} = \langle G'(t)u(t), v(t) \rangle_{Y^* \times Y} + \langle G(t)u'(t), v(t) \rangle_{Y^* \times Y} + \langle G(t)u(t), v'(t) \rangle_{Y^* \times Y}, \quad (2.2)$$

which holds for almost all $t \in I$.

Proof. We only need to show that the assertion holds for $G \in C^1(I; \mathcal{L}(X; Y^*))$. It is clear that both the right-hand side of (2.2) and the mapping $t \mapsto \langle G(t)u(t), v(t) \rangle_{Y^* \times Y}$ belong to $L^1(I)$. Due to dense embeddings there exist $u^\varepsilon \in C^\infty(I; X)$, $v^\varepsilon \in C^\infty(I; Y)$ such that $u^\varepsilon \rightarrow u$ in $H^1(I; X)$ and $v^\varepsilon \rightarrow v$ in $H^1(I; Y)$ when $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Due to the chain rule we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} \langle G(t)u^\varepsilon(t), v^\varepsilon(t) \rangle = \langle G'(t)u^\varepsilon(t), v^\varepsilon(t) \rangle + \langle G(t)(u^\varepsilon)'(t), v^\varepsilon(t) \rangle + \langle G(t)u^\varepsilon(t), (v^\varepsilon)'(t) \rangle$$

in the classical sense. In particular,

$$\begin{aligned} & - \int_0^T \varphi'(t) \langle G(t)u^\varepsilon(t), v^\varepsilon(t) \rangle dt \\ & = \int_0^T \varphi(t) \left[\langle G'(t)u^\varepsilon(t), v^\varepsilon(t) \rangle + \langle G(t)(u^\varepsilon)'(t), v^\varepsilon(t) \rangle + \langle G(t)u^\varepsilon(t), (v^\varepsilon)'(t) \rangle \right] dt. \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

Both sides of this equation converge to the respective terms evaluated at u and v when $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. \square

We follow the usual technique of showing that derivatives of u are themselves solutions of evolution equations. Formally differentiating (2.1) k times with respect to t leads to

$$\begin{aligned} f^{(k)} &= (Cu^{(k+1)})' + (kC' + B)u^{(k+1)} + \left(A + Q + kB' + \frac{k(k+1)}{2}C'' \right) u^{(k)} \\ &+ \sum_{j=1}^k \left[\binom{k}{j} (A^{(j)} + Q^{(j)}) + \binom{k}{j+1} B^{(j+1)} + \binom{k+1}{j+2} C^{(j+2)} \right] u^{(k-j)}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.4a)$$

in the sense of $L^2(I; V^*)$, together with initial values

$$u^{(k)}(0) = u_k \text{ in } H, \quad (Cu^{(k+1)})(0) = C(0)u_{k+1} \text{ in } V^*, \quad (2.4b)$$

which are given recursively for $k \geq 0$ through

$$\begin{aligned} C(0)u_{k+2} &= f^{(k)}(0) - ((k+1)C'(0) + B(0))u_{k+1} \\ &- \sum_{j=0}^k \left[\binom{k}{j} (A^{(j)}(0) + Q^{(j)}(0)) + \binom{k}{j+1} B^{(j+1)}(0) + \binom{k+1}{j+2} C^{(j+2)}(0) \right] u_{k-j}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

starting from already given u_0 and u_1 . Note that these compatibility conditions resemble those from Theorem 30.1 in [Wlo87] if we were to choose C to be the identity in $\mathcal{L}(H)$, $B, Q = 0$, and A as time-independent.

Our intention is to interpret (2.4a) as a second-order evolution equation for $u^{(k)}$ without moving lower order derivatives of u to the right-hand side. To this end, for some Banach space X and $g \in X$ we introduce the operator $R_{X,g}: L^2(I; X) \rightarrow H^1(I; X)$ via

$$(R_{X,g}v)(t) := g + \int_0^t v(s) ds. \quad (2.6)$$

In view of an efficient notation, we abbreviate the operator $R_{V,g}$ by R_g if not explicitly stated otherwise. We also agree on the definition and notation of the following operator, which denotes the consecutive composition of R_{X,u_l} for $l = m, \dots, n$, i.e.,

$$\bigcirc_{l=m}^n R_{X,u_l} v := \begin{cases} (R_{X,u_m} \circ \dots \circ R_{X,u_n})v, & m \leq n \\ v, & \text{else.} \end{cases} \quad (2.7)$$

Writing $v := u^{(k)}$ now leads to the auxiliary problem

$$f^{(k)} = (\mathcal{C}v)' + (k\mathcal{C}' + \mathcal{B})v' + (\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{Q})v + \left(k\mathcal{B}' + \frac{k(k+1)}{2}\mathcal{C}''\right)v \quad (2.8a)$$

$$+ \sum_{j=1}^k \left[\binom{k}{j} (\mathcal{A}^{(j)} + \mathcal{Q}^{(j)}) + \binom{k}{j+1} \mathcal{B}^{(j+1)} + \binom{k+1}{j+2} \mathcal{C}^{(j+2)} \right] \bigcirc_{l=k-j}^{k-1} R_{u_l} v,$$

equipped with initial values

$$v(0) = u_k \text{ in } H, \quad (\mathcal{C}v')(0) = C(0)u_{k+1} \text{ in } V^*. \quad (2.8b)$$

Note that the left-hand side of (2.8a) is nonlinear in v because R_g is affine linear for $g \neq 0$. Also, the dependence of (2.8a) and (2.5) on $C^{(k+2)}$ and $B^{(k+1)}$ is merely notational, because the coefficients in front of them vanish. It is also worth mentioning that we explicitly wrote the zeroth index of the sum in (2.8a) since we need strong positivity properties from \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{C} .

The main assertion of this article is the following regularity result, which we are going to prove by showing that solutions to (2.8) exist and that they have to be equal to $u^{(k)}$.

Theorem 2.3. *Let $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, $l = \max\{1, k\}$ and suppose that $A \in W^{k+1, \infty}(I; \mathcal{L}(V; V^*))$, $Q \in W^{l, \infty}(I; \mathcal{L}(V; H))$, $B \in W^{l, \infty}(I; \mathcal{L}(H))$, $C \in W^{k+1, \infty}(I; \mathcal{L}(H))$, as well as $f \in H^k(I; H)$ or $f \in H^{k+1}(I; V^*)$, and $u_j \in V$ for $j = 0, \dots, k$, $u_{k+1} \in H$. Then the unique solution u of problem (2.1) lies in $H^k(I; V) \cap H^{k+1}(I; H)$ with $(Cu^{(k+1)})' \in L^2(I; V^*)$ and satisfies the energy estimate*

$$\|u\|_{W^{k, \infty}(I; V)}^2 + \|u^{(k+1)}\|_{L^\infty(I; H)}^2 \leq \Lambda \left(\sum_{j=0}^k \|u_j\|_V^2 + \|u_{k+1}\|_H^2 + \|f\|^2 \right), \quad (2.9)$$

where f is measured in either the $H^k(I; H)$ - or the $H^{k+1}(I; V^*)$ norm and $\Lambda = \Lambda(k)$ is a constant depending continuously on $1/c_0$, $1/a_0$, T and the operators A, B, C, Q , measured in the spaces above.

We would like to give an example for the application of this regularity result to a partial differential equation. In particular, we are interested in showing what the conditions for the u_i entail in practice. For simplicity we use the wave equation with a time- and space-dependent coefficient in the divergence term.

Example 2.4. Suppose $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a bounded domain. The problem

$$u''(t, x) - \operatorname{div}(a(t, x)\nabla u(t, x)) = f(t, x) \text{ for all } (t, x) \in I \times \Omega,$$

$$u = 0 \text{ on } I \times \partial\Omega, \quad u(0, \cdot) = u_0, \quad u'(0, \cdot) = u_1,$$

possesses a unique weak solution $u \in L^2(I; H_0^1(\Omega)) \cap H^1(I; L^2(\Omega)) \cap H^2(I; H^{-1}(\Omega))$ (according to Lemma 2.1) if $u_0 \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, $u_1 \in L^2(\Omega)$, $f \in L^2(I; L^2(\Omega))$ and $a \in W^{1, \infty}(I; L^\infty(\Omega))$, provided that $a(t, x) \geq a_0 > 0$ almost everywhere in $I \times \Omega$. Applying Theorem 2.3 to this problem yields $u \in H^k(I; H_0^1(\Omega)) \cap H^{k+1}(I; L^2(\Omega)) \cap H^{k+2}(I; H^{-1}(\Omega))$ if $f \in H^k(I; L^2(\Omega))$ and $a \in W^{k+1, \infty}(I; L^\infty(\Omega))$. Additionally the initial values defined in (2.5) have to satisfy $u_i \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ ($i = 0, \dots, k$) and $u_{k+1} \in L^2(\Omega)$. These can be seen as *compatibility conditions* and can be fulfilled by either one of the following assumptions:

- (i) Homogeneous initial data $u_0 = u_1 = 0$ and $f^{(i)}(0) = 0$ for $i = 0, \dots, k-1$. In this case the regularity result is the same as obtained by Lions [Lio61].
- (ii) $f^{(k-j)}(0) \in H_0^{j-1}(\Omega)$, $a^{(k-j)}(0) \in W^{j,\infty}(\Omega)$ for $j = 1, \dots, k$ and smooth initial values $u_0 \in H_0^{k+1}(\Omega)$ and $u_1 \in H_0^k(\Omega)$.

Proof (Sketch). Use integration by parts to see that e.g.

$$A(0)g = v \mapsto \int_{\Omega} a(0, x) \nabla v(x) \nabla g(x) \, dx = -\operatorname{div}(a(0, \cdot) \nabla g)$$

(where the last equality is to be understood in the distributional sense) is not only an element of $H^{-1}(\Omega)$, but also lies in $H_0^k(\Omega)$ if $a(0) \in W^{k+1,\infty}(\Omega)$ and $g \in H_0^{k+2}(\Omega)$. From this we conclude that u_k lies in $H_0^l(\Omega)$ if $f^{(k-2)}(0) \in H_0^l(\Omega)$, $a^{(j)}(0) \in W^{l+1,\infty}(\Omega)$ and $u_j \in H_0^{l+2}(\Omega)$ for all $j = 0, \dots, k-2$. This is satisfied for $k \geq 2$ if $f^{(k-j)}(0) \in H_0^{l+j-2}(\Omega)$, $a^{(k-j)}(0) \in W^{l+j-1,\infty}(\Omega)$ $u_j \in H_0^{l+2}(\Omega)$, $u_0 \in H_0^{l+k}(\Omega)$ and $u_1 \in H_0^{l+k-1}(\Omega)$ by induction over $k \geq 2$, because the assumptions for k imply the assumptions for all $j = 0, \dots, k-2$ with smoothness $l+2$. Therefore $u_j \in H_0^{l+2}(\Omega)$ for $j = 0, \dots, k-2$ holds. The assertion follows by applying this to $u_k \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, $u_{k+1} \in L^2(\Omega)$. \square

3 Well-posedness of the auxiliary problems

We need solvability of the auxiliary problems (2.8) for $k \in \mathbb{N}$. They can be written in the form

$$(\mathcal{C}v')' + \mathcal{B}v' + (\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{Q})v + \sum_{i=1}^k (\mathcal{D}_i + \mathcal{E}_i)(R_0^i v) = f \text{ in } L^2(I; V^*), \quad (3.1a)$$

$$v(0) = v_0 \text{ in } H, \quad (\mathcal{C}v')(0) = v_1 \text{ in } V^*, \quad (3.1b)$$

with different B , Q , f and suitably defined D_i, E_i , where $D_i(t) \in \mathcal{L}(V; V^*)$ while $E_i(t) \in \mathcal{L}(V; H)$. We analyze this equation and then transfer the results to (2.8). To this end, we start by discretizing (3.1) in space by taking an orthogonal basis $(\varphi_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subset V$ of V which is also an orthonormal basis in H and introduce the finite-dimensional subspaces $V_m := \operatorname{span}\{\varphi_i; i = 1, \dots, m\}$. We set $v_m := \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i(t) \varphi_i$ where $\alpha_i \in W^{2,1}(I)$, so that $v_m \in W^{2,1}(I; V)$. We want v_m to solve (3.1a) in $L^2(I; V_m^*)$. Testing this equation with φ_i shows that this is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} \langle f(t), \varphi_i \rangle &= \sum_{j=1}^m \left(\left(\alpha_j'(t) (\mathcal{C}(t) \varphi_j, \varphi_i) \right)' \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \alpha_j'(t) (B(t) \varphi_j, \varphi_i) + \alpha_j(t) (\langle A(t) \varphi_j, \varphi_i \rangle + (Q(t) \varphi_j, \varphi_i)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{l=1}^k (R_{\mathbb{R},0}^l \alpha_j)(t) (\langle D_l(t) \varphi_j, \varphi_i \rangle + (E_l(t) \varphi_j, \varphi_i)) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (3.2a)$$

being satisfied for all $i = 1, \dots, m$. This $m \times m$ -system is complemented by the projected initial values from (3.1b), that is

$$(v_m(0), \varphi_i) = (v_0, \varphi_i), \quad (\mathcal{C}(0)v_m'(0), \varphi_i) = (v_1, \varphi_i), \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, m. \quad (3.2b)$$

These ordinary differential equations are commonly referred to as *Galerkin equations* and their solvability is the subject of the following lemma.

Lemma 3.1 (Galerkin solutions). *Provided that $A \in W^{1,\infty}(I; \mathcal{L}(V; V^*))$, $C \in W^{1,\infty}(I; \mathcal{L}(H))$, $B \in L^\infty(I; \mathcal{L}(H))$, $Q \in L^\infty(I; \mathcal{L}(V; H))$, $D_i \in W^{1,\infty}(I; \mathcal{L}(V; V^*))$, $E_i \in L^\infty(I; \mathcal{L}(V; H))$ ($i = 1, \dots, k$), $f \in L^2(I; H)$ or $f \in H^1(I; V^*)$, $v_0 \in V$ and $v_1 \in H$ the Galerkin equations (3.2a), (3.2b) admit one unique solution v_m .*

Proof. The idea is to transform eq. (3.2a) into a system of linear differential equations in the sense of Caratheodory (see [CL55], Chapter 2, Theorem 1.1, e.g.). To this end, we apply the generalized product rule from Lemma 2.2 to (3.2a) to get

$$\begin{aligned} \langle f(t), \varphi_i \rangle = & \sum_{j=1}^m \left(\alpha_j''(t) (C(t)\varphi_j, \varphi_i) + \alpha_j'(t) ((B(t) + C'(t))\varphi_j, \varphi_i) + \alpha_j(t) (\langle A(t)\varphi_j, \varphi_i \rangle \right. \\ & \left. + (Q(t)\varphi_j, \varphi_i)) + \sum_{l=1}^k (R_{\mathbb{R},0}^l \alpha_j)(t) (\langle D_l(t)\varphi_j, \varphi_i \rangle + (E_l(t)\varphi_j, \varphi_i)) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

and then introduce the following matrix-valued functions $M_l \in L^\infty(I; \mathbb{R}^{m \times m})$ for $l = -2, \dots, k$ component-wise via

$$\begin{aligned} (M_{-2}(t))_{ij} &:= (C(t)\varphi_j, \varphi_i), & (M_{-1}(t))_{ij} &:= ((C'(t) + B(t))\varphi_j, \varphi_i), \\ (M_0(t))_{ij} &:= \langle A(t)\varphi_j, \varphi_i \rangle + (Q(t)\varphi_j, \varphi_i), & (M_l(t))_{ij} &:= \langle D_l(t)\varphi_j, \varphi_i \rangle + (E_l(t)\varphi_j, \varphi_i) \end{aligned}$$

for $i, j = 1, \dots, m$ as well as for $l \geq 2$

$$(M(t))_{l-2+i, l-2+j} := (M_l(t))_{ij}$$

for $i, j = 1, \dots, m$. We also introduce the vector-valued function $F \in W^{1,\infty}(I; \mathbb{R}^m)$ via $F_i(t) := \langle f(t), \varphi_i \rangle$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$ and agree on a new set of variables $\gamma^l := R_{\mathbb{R},0}^l \alpha$ for $l = 0, \dots, k$, $\gamma = (\gamma^l)_{l=0, \dots, k}$ and $\beta = \alpha'$. This allows rewriting (3.3) as a $(k+2)m \times (k+2)m$ system of first-order differential equations, i.e

$$\begin{pmatrix} M_{-2}(t) & 0 \\ 0 & I_{(k+1)m} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \beta \\ \gamma \end{pmatrix}' = \begin{pmatrix} M_{-1}(t) & M(t) \\ I_m & 0 \\ 0 & I_{km} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \beta \\ \gamma \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} F(t) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

which is complemented by initial values

$$M_{-2}(0)\beta(0) = ((v_1, \varphi_i))_{i=1, \dots, m}, \quad \gamma^0(0) = ((v_0, \varphi_i))_{i=1, \dots, m}, \quad \gamma^l(0) = 0 \quad \text{for } l = 1, \dots, k.$$

Here, I_m , I_{km} and $I_{(k+1)m}$ represent identity matrices in $\mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$, $\mathbb{R}^{km \times km}$ and $\mathbb{R}^{(k+1)m \times (k+1)m}$, respectively. Since the φ_i form an orthogonal basis for V_m and $C(t)$ is invertible due to its coercivity, M_{-2} and therefore the whole matrix on the left-hand side are invertible as well. It is then straight forward to show the existence of a unique solution $(\beta, \gamma) \in W^{1,\infty}(I; \mathbb{R}^{(k+2)m})$ following [ORE97] or [CL55] and hence finding a uniquely determined $v_m := \sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_j(t) \varphi_j \in W^{2,\infty}(I; V_m)$ that solves (3.2). \square

Our goal is now to establish an upper bound for v_m independent of $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

Lemma 3.2 (A priori estimate). *Provided that $A \in W^{1,\infty}(I; \mathcal{L}(V; V^*))$, $C \in W^{1,\infty}(I; \mathcal{L}(H))$, $B \in L^\infty(I; \mathcal{L}(H))$, $Q \in L^\infty(I; \mathcal{L}(V; H))$, $D_i \in W^{1,\infty}(I; \mathcal{L}(V; V^*))$, $E_i \in L^\infty(I; \mathcal{L}(V; H))$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$, as well as $f \in L^2(I; H)$ or $f \in H^1(I; V^*)$, $v_0 \in V$ and $v_1 \in H$ the Galerkin solution v_m satisfies the energy estimate*

$$\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{t \in I} \left(\|v_m(t)\|_V^2 + \|v'_m(t)\|_H^2 \right) \leq \Lambda \left(\|v_0\|_V^2 + \|v_1\|_H^2 + \|f\|^2 \right), \quad (3.4)$$

where f is measured in either the $L^2(I; H)$ - or the $H^1(I; V^*)$ norm and $\Lambda > 0$ is some constant depending continuously on $1/c_0$, $1/a_0$, T , and the operators $A, B, C, Q, (D_i)_{i=1,\dots,k}, (E_i)_{i=1,\dots,k}$, measured in the spaces above.

Proof. We take $v_m \in W^{2,\infty}(I; V_m)$ to be the unique solution to the Galerkin equations from the previous lemma, test (3.1a) with $v'_m(t) \in V_m$ and see that

$$\begin{aligned} & ((Cv'_m)'(t), v'_m(t)) + (B(t)v'_m(t), v'_m(t)) + \langle A(t)v_m(t), v'_m(t) \rangle + (Q(t)v_m(t), v'_m(t)) \\ & + \sum_{i=0}^k \langle D_i(t)(R_0^i v_m)(t), v'_m(t) \rangle + \sum_{i=0}^k \left(E_i(t)(R_0^i v_m)(t), v'_m(t) \right) = \langle f(t), v'_m(t) \rangle \end{aligned}$$

holds for almost all $t \in I$. We make use of the product rule from Lemma 2.2 and the fact that $A(t)$ and $C(t)$ are self-adjoint to get

$$\begin{aligned} 2((Cv'_m)'(t), v'_m(t)) &= 2(C(t)v''_m(t) + C'(t)v'_m(t), v'_m(t)) = (C'(t)v'_m(t), v'_m(t)) + \left((C(t)v'_m(t), v'_m(t)) \right)', \\ 2\langle A(t)v_m(t), v'_m(t) \rangle &= \left(\langle A(t)v_m(t), v_m(t) \rangle \right)' - \langle A'(t)v_m(t), v_m(t) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Together with $\|v_m(0)\|_V \leq \|v_0\|_V$, $\|C(0)v'_m(0)\|_H \leq \|v_1\|_H$ this gives

$$\begin{aligned} & a_0 \|v_m(t)\|_V^2 + c_0 \|v'_m(t)\|_H^2 \\ & \leq \frac{1}{c_0} \|v_1\|_H^2 + \|A\|_{W^{1,\infty}(I; \mathcal{L}(V; V^*))} \|v_0\|_V^2 + \int_0^t \left((C(s)v'_m(s), v'_m(s)) + \langle A(s)v_m(s), v_m(s) \rangle \right)' ds \\ & = \frac{1}{c_0} \|v_1\|_H^2 + \|A\|_{W^{1,\infty}(I; \mathcal{L}(V; V^*))} \|v_0\|_V^2 + 2 \int_0^t \left((Cv'_m)'(s), v'_m(s) \right) + \langle A(s)v_m(s), v'_m(s) \rangle ds \\ & \quad - \int_0^t \left(C'(s)v'_m(s), v'_m(s) \right) + \langle A'(s)v_m(s), v_m(s) \rangle ds \\ & \leq \frac{1}{c_0} \|v_1\|_H^2 + \|A\|_{W^{1,\infty}(I; \mathcal{L}(V; V^*))} \|v_0\|_V^2 + 2 \int_0^t \langle f(s), v'_m(s) \rangle - (Q(s)v_m(s), v'_m(s)) ds \\ & \quad - 2 \int_0^t \left(B(s)v'_m(s), v'_m(s) \right) + \sum_{i=0}^k \langle D_i(s)(R_0^i v_m)(s), v'_m(s) \rangle + \langle E_i(s)(R_0^i v_m)(s), v'_m(s) \rangle ds \\ & \quad - \int_0^t \left(C'(s)v'_m(s), v'_m(s) \right) + \langle A'(s)v_m(s), v_m(s) \rangle ds. \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

Since we are looking to apply Grönwall's inequality, we have to modify the right-hand side so that it only depends on $\|v_m(s)\|_V^2$ and $\|v'_m(s)\|_H^2$. We perform this individually for each

summand.

If $f \in L^2(I; H)$ then $2\langle f(s), v'_m(s) \rangle \leq \|f(s)\|_H^2 + \|v'_m(s)\|_H^2$. Otherwise, i.e. $f \in H^1(I; V^*)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \int_0^t \langle f(s), v'_m(s) \rangle ds &= 2\langle f(t), v_m(t) \rangle - 2\langle f(0), v_m(0) \rangle - 2 \int_0^t \langle f'(s), v_m(s) \rangle ds \\ &\leq \varepsilon \|v_m(t)\|_V^2 + \frac{1+\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} \|f\|_{H^1(I; V^*)}^2 + \|v_0\|_V^2 + \int_0^t \|f'(s)\|_{V^*}^2 + \|v_m(s)\|_V^2 ds, \end{aligned}$$

which holds for all $\varepsilon > 0$.

For the last summand on the right-hand side we immediately see that

$$\begin{aligned} - \int_0^t (C'(s)v'_m(s), v'_m(s)) + \langle A'(s)v_m(s), v_m(s) \rangle ds \\ \leq \|C'\| \int_0^t \|v'_m(s)\|_H^2 ds + \|A'\| \int_0^t \|v_m(s)\|_V^2 ds, \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

the expression with B can be handled analogously.

For terms including D_i , we have to use integration by parts because in contrast to parabolic equations we cannot expect $\|v'_m(s)\|_V$ to be bounded during the limit process $m \rightarrow \infty$, which is already apparent on the left-hand side of (3.5). In employing Lemma 2.2 we see that

$$\begin{aligned} - \int_0^t \langle D_i(s)(R_0^i v_m)(s), v'_m(s) \rangle ds &= -\langle D_i(t)(R_0^i v_m)(t), v_m(t) \rangle \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \langle D'_i(s)(R_0^i v_m)(s), v_m(s) \rangle - \langle D_i(s)(R_0^{i-1} v_m)(s), v_m(s) \rangle ds \\ &\leq \|D_i\|_{L^\infty(I; \mathcal{L}(V; V^*))} \| (R_0^i v_m)(t) \|_V \|v_m(t)\|_V \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \|D'_i\| \| (R_0^i v_m)(s) \|_V \|v_m(s)\|_V + \|D_i\| \| (R_0^{i-1} v_m)(s) \|_V \|v_m(s)\|_V ds \\ &\leq T^{i-1} \|D_i\|_{L^\infty(I; \mathcal{L}(V; V^*))} \|v_m(t)\|_V \int_0^t \|v_m(s)\|_V ds \\ &\quad + (T^i \|D'_i\| + T^{i-1} \|D_i\|) \int_0^t \|v_m(s)\|_V^2 ds \\ &\leq \varepsilon \|v_m(t)\|_V^2 + \left(\frac{T^{2i-1} \|D_i\|^2}{4\varepsilon} + T^i \|D'_i\| + T^{i-1} \|D_i\| \right) \int_0^t \|v_m(s)\|_V^2 ds, \end{aligned}$$

holds again for some arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$. Here, we made use of

$$\int_0^t \| (R_0^i v_m)(s) \| \|v_m(s)\| ds \leq T^i \int_0^t \|v_m(s)\|^2 ds.$$

The fact that $E_i(t), Q(t) \in \mathcal{L}(V; H)$ allows for

$$-2 \int_0^t \langle Q(s)v_m(s), v'_m(s) \rangle ds \leq \|Q\|_{L^\infty(I; \mathcal{L}(V; H))} \int_0^t \|v_m(s)\|_V^2 + \|v'_m(s)\|_H^2 ds$$

for Q and

$$-2 \int_0^t \langle E_i(s)(R_0^i v_m)(s), v'_m(s) \rangle ds \leq \|E_i\|_{L^\infty(I; \mathcal{L}(V; H))} T^i \int_0^t \|v_m(s)\|_V^2 + \|v'_m(s)\|_H^2 ds$$

for E_i . If we insert all these intermediate computations into (3.5) and choose e.g. $\varepsilon = a_0/2$ we arrive at an inequality of the form

$$\|v_m(t)\|_V^2 + \|v'_m(t)\|_H^2 \leq \tilde{\Lambda} \left(\|v_0\|_V^2 + \|v_1\|_H^2 + \|f\|^2 + \int_0^t \|v_m(s)\|_V^2 + \|v'_m(s)\|_H^2 ds \right),$$

where f is measured in either the $L^2(I; H)$ - or the $H^1(I; V^*)$ norm and $\tilde{\Lambda}$ is a constant as stated in the assertion. By applying Grönwall's Lemma we conclude

$$\|v_m(t)\|_V^2 + \|v'_m(t)\|_H^2 \leq \tilde{\Lambda} \left(\|v_0\|_V^2 + \|v_1\|_H^2 + \|f\|^2 \right) \exp(\tilde{\Lambda} T)$$

for almost all $t \in I$. □

As a consequence of the previous result the norms of $v_m \in V_m$ in $L^2(I; V)$ and $H^1(I; H)$ are bounded uniformly with respect to $m \in \mathbb{N}$. This guarantees existence of a subsequence v_m (also denoted with m) converging weakly in $L^2(I; V) \cap H^1(I; H)$, whose weak limit we denote by v . The next step is to show that this weak limit solves the auxiliary problem (3.1).

Lemma 3.3. *For $A \in W^{1,\infty}(I; \mathcal{L}(V; V^*))$, $C \in W^{1,\infty}(I; \mathcal{L}(H))$, $B \in L^\infty(I; \mathcal{L}(H))$, $D_i \in W^{1,\infty}(I; \mathcal{L}(V; V^*))$, $E_i \in L^\infty(I; \mathcal{L}(V; H))$ where $i = 1, \dots, k$, $f \in L^2(I; H)$ or $f \in H^1(I; V^*)$, $v_0 \in V$ and $v_1 \in H$ exists $v \in L^2(I; V) \cap H^1(I; H)$ with $(\mathcal{C}v) \in L^2(I; V^*)$ that solves (3.1) and also satisfies the energy estimate (3.4).*

Proof. We take the weakly converging Galerkin sequence v_m from before and plug them into (3.1a). Rearranging this equation into

$$(\mathcal{C}v'_m)' = f - \mathcal{B}v'_m - (\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{Q})v_m - \sum_{i=1}^k (\mathcal{D}_i + \mathcal{E}_i)R_0^i v_m$$

shows that, according to the assumptions made beforehand, the right-hand side is in $L^2(I; V^*)$, particularly, this shows the right-hand side to be *weak-weak continuous* in v_m . Hence, v''_m converges weakly in $L^2(I; V^*)$, i.e.,

$$(\mathcal{C}v'_m)' \rightharpoonup f - \mathcal{B}v' - (\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{Q})v - \sum_{i=1}^k (\mathcal{D}_i + \mathcal{E}_i)R_0^i v.$$

Trivially, this implies $(\mathcal{C}v'_m)' \rightharpoonup (\mathcal{C}v)'$ in $L^2(I; V^*)$, too, thus proving to solve (3.1a). We are left to show that v satisfies the initial conditions (3.1b). By design of (3.2b), we have

$$v_m(0) \rightarrow v_0 \text{ in } H \text{ for } m \rightarrow \infty, \quad (\mathcal{C}v'_m)(0) \rightarrow v_1 \text{ in } H \text{ for } m \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.7)$$

Since $W^{1,2}(I; H) \subset C^0(I; H)$ as well as $g \mapsto (g(0), \psi)_H \in C^0(I; H)^*$ for all $\psi \in H$ hold, respectively, we infer

$$(v_m(0), \psi)_H \rightarrow (v(0), \psi)_H, \quad \text{for all } \psi \in H$$

showing $v_m(0) \rightharpoonup v(0) = v_0$ in H . Together with (3.7) we obtain strong convergence in H , such that $v(0) = v_0$ holds (even in V). An analogous argument then shows $(\mathcal{C}v')(0) = v_1$ in V^* when keeping $C(0) \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ in mind. This completes the proof. \square

We are now in a position to apply this existence theorem to our auxiliary problem (2.8).

Corollary 3.4. *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose $A \in W^{k+1,\infty}(I; \mathcal{L}(V; V^*))$, $Q \in W^{k,\infty}(I; \mathcal{L}(V; H))$, $B \in W^{k,\infty}(I; \mathcal{L}(H))$, $C \in W^{k+1,\infty}(I; \mathcal{L}(H))$, $f \in H^k(I; H)$ or $f \in H^{k+1}(I; V^*)$, $u_j \in V$ for $j = 0, \dots, k$ and $u_{k+1} \in H$. Then there exists $v \in L^2(I; V) \cap H^1(I; H)$ with $(\mathcal{C}v)' \in L^2(I; V^*)$ that solves (2.8) and also satisfies the energy estimate*

$$\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{t \in I} \left(\|v(t)\|_V^2 + \|v'(t)\|_H^2 \right) \leq \Lambda \left(\sum_{j=0}^k \|u_j\|_V^2 + \|u_{k+1}\|_H^2 + \|f^{(k)}\|^2 \right) \quad (3.8)$$

where $f^{(k)}$ is measured in either the $L^2(I; H)$ - or the $H^1(I; V^*)$ norm and $\Lambda = \Lambda(k)$ is a constant depending continuously on $1/c_0, 1/a_0, T$ and the operators A, B, C, Q , measured in the spaces above.

Proof. To obtain (3.1) from (2.8), we set

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{B} &= B + C', & \tilde{Q} &= Q + kB' + \frac{k(k+1)}{2}C'', \\ D_j &= \binom{k}{j}A^{(j)}, & E_j &= \binom{k+1}{j+2}C^{(j+2)} + \binom{k}{j+1}B^{(j+1)} + \binom{k}{j}Q^{(j)}, \end{aligned}$$

for $j = 1, \dots, k$. The operators A and C are left as-is, and the initial values are u_k and u_{k+1} as defined in (2.5). The right-hand side \tilde{f} consists of $f^{(k)}$ and those parts of

$$\left(\bigcirc_{l=k-j}^{k-1} R_{u_l} v \right) (t) = (R_0^j v)(t) + \sum_{l=k-j}^{k-1} (R_0^{k-1-l} u_l)(t) = (R_0^j v)(t) + \sum_{l=k-j}^{k-1} u_l \frac{t^{k-1-l}}{(k-1-l)!}$$

that are independent of v , i.e.,

$$\tilde{f}(t) = f^{(k)}(t) - \sum_{j=1}^k (D_j(t) + E_j(t)) \sum_{l=k-j}^{k-1} u_l \frac{t^{k-1-l}}{(k-1-l)!}.$$

The assertion follows by utilizing Lemma 3.3. \square

4 Proof of the main theorem

We have seen that solutions to the auxiliary problems (2.8) exist, but have yet to show that they are linked to (2.1). As they were obtained using formal differentiation, it is somewhat intuitive to see if functions obtained by integrating these solutions with respect to time over $(0, t)$ indeed solve the previous problem. The following lemma resolves the situation.

Lemma 4.1. *Suppose v is a solution to problem (2.8) with $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $u_{k-1} \in V$. Then $R_{u_{k-1}}v$ solves problem (2.8) with k replaced by $k-1$.*

Proof. We set $w = R_{u_{k-1}}v$. Clearly w possesses the correct initial values since $w(0) = u_{k-1}$ and $w'(0) = v(0) = u_k$. By a straightforward (albeit lengthy) computation we show that

$$(\mathcal{C}w)' = f^{(k-1)} - ((k-1)\mathcal{C}' + \mathcal{B})w' - \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \left[\binom{k-1}{j} (\mathcal{A}^{(j)} + \mathcal{Q}^{(j)}) + \binom{k-1}{j+1} \mathcal{B}^{(j+1)} + \binom{k}{j+2} \mathcal{C}^{(j+2)} \right] \left(\bigcirc_{l=k-1-j}^{k-2} R_{u_l} w \right) \quad (4.1)$$

holds true in the $L^2(I; V^*)$ sense. We start by employing the fundamental theorem of calculus to the sum in the preceding equation and compute

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \left[\binom{k-1}{j} (\mathcal{A}^{(j)} + \mathcal{Q}^{(j)}) + \binom{k-1}{j+1} \mathcal{B}^{(j+1)} + \binom{k}{j+2} \mathcal{C}^{(j+2)} \right] \left(\bigcirc_{l=k-1-j}^{k-1} R_{u_l} v \right) (t) \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \left[\binom{k-1}{j} (\mathcal{A}^{(j)}(0) + \mathcal{Q}^{(j)}(0)) + \binom{k-1}{j+1} \mathcal{B}^{(j+1)}(0) + \binom{k}{j+2} \mathcal{C}^{(j+2)}(0) \right] u_{k-1-j} \\ & \quad + \int_0^t \left(\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \left[\binom{k-1}{j} (\mathcal{A}^{(j)} + \mathcal{Q}^{(j)}) + \binom{k-1}{j+1} \mathcal{B}^{(j+1)} \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. + \binom{k}{j+2} \mathcal{C}^{(j+2)} \right] \left(\bigcirc_{l=k-1-j}^{k-1} R_{u_l} v \right) (s) \right)' ds. \quad (4.2) \end{aligned}$$

Turning to (2.5) shows that the expression before the integral can be rewritten using $\mathcal{C}(0)u_{k+1}$. Using Lemma 2.2 we are able to recast the integral expression, too, and end up with

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \left[\binom{k-1}{j} (\mathcal{A}^{(j)} + \mathcal{Q}^{(j)}) + \binom{k-1}{j+1} \mathcal{B}^{(j+1)} + \binom{k}{j+2} \mathcal{C}^{(j+2)} \right] \left(\bigcirc_{l=k-1-j}^{k-1} R_{u_l} v \right) (t) \\ &= -\mathcal{C}(0)u_{k+1} + f^{(k-1)}(0) - (k\mathcal{C}'(0) + \mathcal{B}(0))u_k + \int_0^t \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \left[\binom{k-1}{j} (\mathcal{A}^{(j+1)} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \mathcal{Q}^{(j+1)}) + \binom{k-1}{j+1} \mathcal{B}^{(j+2)} + \binom{k}{j+2} \mathcal{C}^{(j+3)} \right] \left(\bigcirc_{l=k-1-j}^{k-1} R_{u_l} v \right) (s) ds \\ & \quad + \int_0^t \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \left[\binom{k-1}{j} (\mathcal{A}^{(j)} + \mathcal{Q}^{(j)}) + \binom{k-1}{j+1} \mathcal{B}^{(j+1)} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \binom{k}{j+2} \mathcal{C}^{(j+2)} \right] \left(\bigcirc_{l=k-j}^{k-1} R_{u_l} v \right) (s) ds. \quad (4.3) \end{aligned}$$

Shifting the index of the sum in the first integral on the left-hand side to $j+1$, using an

identity for binomial coefficients, and adding a zero then shows

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \left[\binom{k-1}{j} (\mathcal{A}^{(j)} + \mathcal{Q}^{(j)}) + \binom{k-1}{j+1} \mathcal{B}^{(j+1)} + \binom{k}{j+2} \mathcal{C}^{(j+2)} \right] \left(\bigcirc_{l=k-1-j}^{k-1} R_{u_l} v \right) (t) \\
&= -C(0)u_{k+1} + f^{(k-1)}(0) - (kC'(0) + B(0))u_k - \int_0^t (kC'' + \mathcal{B}') (v)(s) \, ds \\
& \quad + \int_0^t \sum_{j=0}^k \left[\binom{k}{j} (\mathcal{A}^{(j)} + \mathcal{Q}^{(j)}) + \binom{k}{j+1} \mathcal{B}^{(j+1)} + \binom{k+1}{j+2} \mathcal{C}^{(j+2)} \right] \left(\bigcirc_{l=k-j}^{k-1} R_{u_l} v \right) (s) \, ds,
\end{aligned}$$

if we combine the previous results. Adding this to the remaining parts of (4.1) lets us conclude

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left[f^{(k-1)} - ((k-1)C' + \mathcal{B})w' - \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \left[\binom{k-1}{j} (\mathcal{A}^{(j)} \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. + \mathcal{Q}^{(j)}) + \binom{k-1}{j+1} \mathcal{B}^{(j+1)} + \binom{k}{j+2} \mathcal{C}^{(j+2)} \right] \bigcirc_{l=k-1-j}^{k-2} R_{u_l} w \right] (t) \\
&= C(0)u_{k+1} + C'(0)u_k + \int_0^t f^{(k)}(s) + (C'v)'(s) - ((kC' + \mathcal{B})v)'(s) + ((kC'' + \mathcal{B}')v)(s) \, ds \\
& \quad - \int_0^t \sum_{j=0}^k \left[\binom{k}{j} (\mathcal{A}^{(j)}(s) + \mathcal{Q}^{(j)}(s)) + \binom{k}{j+1} \mathcal{B}^{(j+1)}(s) \right. \\
& \quad \quad \left. + \binom{k+1}{j+2} \mathcal{C}^{(j+2)}(s) \right] \left(\bigcirc_{l=k-j}^{k-1} R_{u_l} v \right) (s) \, ds \\
&= C(0)u_{k+1} + C'(0)u_k + \int_0^t (Cv)''(s) + (C'v)'(s) \, ds \\
& \quad = C(0)u_{k+1} + C'(0)u_k + \int_0^t (Cv)''(s) \, ds = (Cv)'(t) = (Cw)'(t). \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

Now to prove our main theorem we can use the results from before to make a compact induction argument.

Theorem 2.3. *Let $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, $l = \max\{1, k\}$ and suppose that $A \in W^{k+1, \infty}(I; \mathcal{L}(V; V^*))$, $Q \in W^{l, \infty}(I; \mathcal{L}(V; H))$, $B \in W^{l, \infty}(I; \mathcal{L}(H))$, $C \in W^{k+1, \infty}(I; \mathcal{L}(H))$, as well as $f \in H^k(I; H)$ or $f \in H^{k+1}(I; V^*)$, and $u_j \in V$ for $j = 0, \dots, k$ and $u_{k+1} \in H$. Then the unique solution u of problem (2.1) lies in $H^k(I; V) \cap H^{k+1}(I; H)$ with $(Cu^{(k+1)})' \in L^2(I; V^*)$ and satisfies the energy estimate*

$$\|u\|_{W^{k, \infty}(I; V)}^2 + \|u^{(k+1)}\|_{L^\infty(I; H)}^2 \leq \Lambda \left(\sum_{j=0}^k \|u_j\|_V^2 + \|u_{k+1}\|_H^2 + \|f\|^2 \right), \quad (2.9)$$

where f is measured in either the $H^k(I; H)$ - or the $H^{k+1}(I; V^*)$ norm and $\Lambda = \Lambda(k)$ is a constant depending continuously on $1/c_0, 1/a_0, T$ and the operators A, B, C, Q , measured in the spaces above.

Proof. Induction over $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, where the hypotheses is that the assertion as given in the theorem holds for k and that $u^{(k)}$ is the unique solution of (2.8).

The case $k = 0$ is covered by Lemma 2.1. We assume that the hypotheses holds for $k - 1$ and the requirements for k are met. Using Corollary 3.4 we conclude that a solution $v \in L^2(I; V) \cap H^1(I; H)$ with $(Cv)' \in L^2(I; V^*)$ to the auxiliary problem (2.8), which also fulfills the estimates from equation (3.8), exists. Due to Lemma 4.1 we know that $R_{u_{k-1}}v$ satisfies (2.8) for $k - 1$, which is uniquely solved by $u^{(k-1)}$. Therefore $v = (R_{u_{k-1}}v)' = u^{(k)}$ (which is unique) and $u^{(k)}$ satisfies the estimate (3.8), which we add to the energy estimates for the case $k - 1$ to obtain (2.9). \square

Remark 4.2. Note that in the case of $l = k = 0$ the existence of a solution to (2.1) still holds, but not its uniqueness.

Acknowledgements

The authors acknowledge funding of T. Gerken by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) – Project number 281474342/GRK2224/1.

References

- [Are+07] W. Arendt, R. Chill, S. Fornaro, and C. Poupaud. “ L^p -maximal regularity for nonautonomous evolution equations.” English. In: *J. Differ. Equations* 237.1 (2007).
- [BSS13] K. D. Blazek, C. Stolk, and W. W. Symes. “A mathematical framework for inverse wave problems in heterogeneous media”. In: *Inverse Problems* 29.6 (2013).
- [CL55] E. A. Coddington and N. Levinson. *Theory of Ordinary Differential Equations*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1955.
- [DL00] R. Dautray and J.-L. Lions. *Mathematical Analysis and Numerical Methods for Science and Technology: Evolution Problems I*. 2nd ed. Vol. 5. Berlin: Springer, 2000.
- [Eva10] L. C. Evans. *Partial differential equations*. 2nd ed. Providence: American Mathematical Society, 2010.
- [GT83] D. Gilbarg and N. S. Trudinger. *Elliptic Partial Differential Equations of Second Order*. 2nd ed. English. 2nd. Springer, 1983.
- [HR09] R. Haller-Dintelmann and J. Rehberg. “Maximal parabolic regularity for divergence operators including mixed boundary conditions.” English. In: *J. Differ. Equations* 247.5 (2009).
- [Kat85] T. Kato. *Abstract differential equations and nonlinear mixed problems (Publications of the Scuola Normale Superiore)*. Edizioni della Normale, 1985.
- [KR13] A. Kirsch and A. Rieder. “On the linearization of operators related to the full waveform inversion in seismology”. In: *Mathematical Methods in the Applied Sciences* 37.18 (2013).
- [KR16] A. Kirsch and A. Rieder. “Inverse problems for abstract evolution equations with applications in electrodynamics and elasticity”. In: *Inverse Problems* 32.8 (2016).
- [Lio61] J.-L. Lions. *Équations Différentielles Opérationnelles et Problèmes aux Limites*. French. Berlin: Springer, 1961.

- [LM72] J. L. Lions and E. Magenes. *Non-homogeneous Boundary Value Problems and Applications*. Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer, 1972.
- [LS17] A. Lechleiter and J. W. Schlasche. "Identifying Lamé parameters from time-dependent elastic wave measurements." In: *Inverse Probl. Sci. Eng.* 25.1 (2017).
- [NT94] P. Neittaanmaki and D. Tiba. *Optimal Control of Nonlinear Parabolic Systems*. Boca Raton, Fla: CRC Press, 1994.
- [ORe97] D. O'Regan. *Existence Theory for Nonlinear Ordinary Differential Equations*. Mathematics and Its Applications. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Springer, 1997.
- [Paz83] A. Pazy. *Semigroups of linear operators and applications to partial differential equations*. English. Vol. 44. Springer, New York, NY, 1983.
- [Trö10] F. Tröltzsch. *Optimal Control of Partial Differential Equations*. Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society (AMS), 2010.
- [Wlo87] J. Wloka. *Partial Differential Equations*. Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- [Zei85] E. Zeidler. *Nonlinear functional analysis and its applications*. New York: Springer, 1985.