

COUPLED TRANSPORT EQUATIONS WITH FREEZING

KRZYSZTOF BURDZY AND JOHN SYLVESTER

ABSTRACT. We study a system of two coupled transport equations with freezing. The solutions freeze in time when they are equal. We prove existence and uniqueness of continuous solutions if the initial conditions are continuous. We discuss several qualitative and quantitative properties of the solutions. The equations arise in a model for collisions of a large number of tightly spaced balls.

1. INTRODUCTION

We will examine a system of nonlinear partial differential equations (1.1)-(1.2) below, subject to the constraint (1.3).

$$(1.1) \quad v_t = -v_x \mathbf{1}_{\{v-w>0\}},$$

$$(1.2) \quad w_t = w_x \mathbf{1}_{\{v-w>0\}},$$

$$(1.3) \quad v - w \geq 0,$$

for $v(x, t)$ and $w(x, t)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $t \geq 0$. Our main results include existence of continuous solutions for all continuous initial conditions satisfying (1.3), and uniqueness under natural extra assumptions. We will also present several qualitative and quantitative results on behavior of the solutions. In particular, we will provide information on shapes of “liquid” and “frozen” zones, and behavior of characteristics.

The equations (1.1)-(1.3) are equivalent to equations (2.1)-(2.4) which arose in analysis of “pinned balls” on a line. The general model of “pinned balls” was first introduced in [ABD21]. Evidence was presented in [BHS22] that (2.1)-(2.4) provide a reasonably accurate description of the evolution of parameters of a stochastic model for a large family of pinned balls on a line. The first steps towards solving this system of PDEs were taken in [BO23].

Besides the physical motivation, we believe that the system provides an interesting example of a nonlinear system of first order PDE’s where characteristics intersect, but solutions remain continuous. Solutions to (1.1)-(1.3) with generic initial conditions are typically nondifferentiable along some curves but they never develop the shocks that typically occur in such systems.

1.1. Pinned balls. We will briefly describe the model that motivated the PDEs studied in this paper. In a system of pinned billiard balls, introduced in [ABD21], the balls touch some other balls and have pseudo-velocities but they do not move. The balls “collide,” and their pseudo-velocities change according to the usual laws of totally elastic collisions.

Research supported in part by Simons Foundation Grants 506732 and 928958.

Consider a finite number of balls arranged on a segment of the real line, with centers one unit apart and their radii all equal to $1/2$. The spacetime for the model is discrete, i.e., the velocities $\mathbf{v}(x, t)$ are defined for $x = 1, 2, \dots, n$ and $t = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, where x is the position (i.e., number) of the x -th ball. The evolution, i.e., pseudo-collisions of the balls and transformations of the velocities, is driven by an exogenous random process because the balls do not move and hence they cannot collide in the usual way.

First consider a simplified model in which pairs of adjacent balls are chosen randomly, i.e., in a uniform way, and form an i.i.d. sequence. Every time a pair of adjacent balls is chosen, the velocities become ordered, i.e., if the chosen balls have labels x and $x + 1$ and the collision occurs at time t then

$$(1.4) \quad \mathbf{v}(x, t + 1) = \min(\mathbf{v}(x, t), \mathbf{v}(x + 1, t)),$$

$$(1.5) \quad \mathbf{v}(x + 1, t + 1) = \max(\mathbf{v}(x, t), \mathbf{v}(x + 1, t)).$$

This agrees with the usual transformation rule for velocities of moving balls of equal masses undergoing totally elastic collisions. The evolution described above has been studied under the names of “random sorting networks” in [AHRV07], “oriented swap process” in [AHR09] and “TASEP speed process” in [AAV11]. It has been also called “colored TASEP.” For a related model featuring confined (but moving) balls, see [GG08a, GG08c, GG08b].

In the model studied in [BHS22] the evolution of velocities of pinned balls consists of a sequence of two-step transformations. In the first step, energy is redistributed. In the second step a pair of velocities is reordered. It is argued in [BHS22] that the joint distribution of $\{\mathbf{v}(x, t), 1 \leq x \leq n, t \geq 0\}$ converges after appropriate rescaling to

$$\mathbf{v}(x, t) = \mu(x, t) + \sigma(x, t)W(x, t),$$

when the number n of balls goes to infinity. Here $W(x, t)$ is spacetime white noise and $\mu(x, t)$ and $\sigma(x, t)$ are deterministic functions satisfying (2.1)-(2.4) below. See [BHS22], especially Remark 4.4, for the discussion of how (2.1)-(2.4) arise in the scaling limit.

The “pinned balls” model is a variant of the “hot rods” model introduced in [DF77, BDS83]. In that model, the balls were allowed to move. For recent results on the hot rods model and a review of the related literature, see [FFGS23, FO23]. Our partial differential equations for μ and σ are essentially the same as the equations (2.1) and (2.2) for the local density and the local current in [BDSG⁺15].

1.2. Organization of the paper. Our main theorems are stated in Section 2. The same section contains also a review of properties of solutions proved later in the paper, an outline of the main ideas of proofs, and a brief review of related results in the PDE theory. Sections 3-5 review properties of solutions at the heuristic level, to help the reader follow rather technical proofs. The three sections are devoted to characteristics, freezing and thawing boundaries, and annihilation of sublevel and superlevel sets of solutions. Section 6 contains the construction of the solutions for “nice” initial conditions. This is generalized to arbitrary continuous initial conditions in Section 7. Uniqueness of solutions is proved, under extra assumptions, in Section 8. Section 9 presents several qualitative and quantitative properties of the solutions. Finally, Section 10 is devoted to examples.

2. MAIN RESULTS

The model discussed in Section 1.1 is associated with coupled nonlinear partial differential equations for $\mu(x, t)$ and $\sigma(x, t)$ with $(x, t) \in [a_1, a_2] \times [0, \infty)$ for some $-\infty < a_1 < a_2 < \infty$. However, from the mathematical point of view, it is equally natural to state and solve the problem with the space variable taking values in the whole real line. From now on, we will take $I = \mathbb{R}$ or $I = [a_1, a_2]$ and look for solutions to the following constrained boundary value problem in $I \times [0, \infty)$.

$$(2.1) \quad \sigma_t(x, t) = -\mu_x(x, t)\mathbf{1}_{\sigma(x, t) > 0},$$

$$(2.2) \quad \mu_t(x, t) = -\sigma_x(x, t)\mathbf{1}_{\sigma(x, t) > 0},$$

$$(2.3) \quad \sigma(x, t) \geq 0, \quad \text{for } x \in I, t \geq 0,$$

$$(2.4) \quad \sigma(a_1, t) = \sigma(a_2, t) = 0, \quad \text{for } t \geq 0, \text{ if } I = [a_1, a_2].$$

Remark 2.1. Suppose that $\sigma(x, 0) = 0$ for all x but $\mu(x, 0)$ is totally arbitrary (for example, discontinuous or even non-measurable). If we let $\sigma(x, t) = 0$ and $\mu(x, t) = \mu(x, 0)$ for all x and $t \geq 0$ then thus constructed $\sigma(x, t)$ and $\mu(x, t)$ solve (2.1)-(2.4) in $I \times [0, \infty)$. This is a large family of solutions that is inconsistent with the pinned balls model.

For this reason, we elaborate further on the meaning of the constraint (2.3), insisting that solutions freeze only when they must do so to avoid violating the constraint (2.3), and they thaw as soon as they can do so without violating (2.3). Here, “freezing” means transitioning from “liquid”, where σ and μ satisfy

$$(2.5) \quad \sigma_t(x, t) = -\mu_x(x, t),$$

$$(2.6) \quad \mu_t(x, t) = -\sigma_x(x, t),$$

to “frozen”, where σ and μ satisfy

$$\sigma_t(x, t) = 0,$$

$$\mu_t(x, t) = 0,$$

and “thawing” means transitioning from frozen to liquid.

It is easy to check that for the initial data $\sigma(x, 0) = 0$ and $\mu(x, 0)$ strictly decreasing, as described above, σ and μ may satisfy (2.5)-(2.6) for $t > 0$ without violating (2.3). Because $-\mu_x(x, 0)$ is positive, solutions with $\sigma(x, 0) = 0$ instantly thaw, i.e. $\sigma(x, t) > 0$ for all $t > 0$. A more precise statement is the following:

If for some $s \geq 0$ and $x_1 < x_2$, there exist functions $\mu(x, t)$ and $\sigma(x, t)$ which are continuous in the triangle $\{(x, t) : t \geq s, x_1 + (t - s) < x < x_2 - (t - s)\}$, satisfy (2.1)-(2.4) and $\sigma(x, t) > 0$ in the interior of the triangle then we will consider only solutions to (2.1)-(2.4) satisfying these conditions.

It will become clear later in the paper that the generic situation covered by the above condition is when $x \rightarrow \mu(x, s)$ is strictly decreasing and $\sigma(x, s) = 0$ for $x \in (x_1, x_2)$.

The above restriction is crucial for the uniqueness of solutions.

The extra condition agrees with the motivating “pinned balls” model because the evolution of pseudo-velocities cannot reach the stationary regime until the pseudo-velocities are (approximately) increasing.

It is natural to diagonalize equations (2.1)-(2.4) by introducing

$$(2.7) \quad v(x, t) = \frac{1}{2}(\mu(x, t) + \sigma(x, t)),$$

$$(2.8) \quad w(x, t) = \frac{1}{2}(\mu(x, t) - \sigma(x, t)).$$

Then (2.1)-(2.4) are equivalent to

$$(2.9) \quad v_t(x, t) = -v_x(x, t)\mathbf{1}_{v(x,t)-w(x,t)>0},$$

$$(2.10) \quad w_t(x, t) = w_x(x, t)\mathbf{1}_{v(x,t)-w(x,t)>0},$$

$$(2.11) \quad v(x, t) \geq w(x, t), \quad \text{for } x \in I, t \geq 0,$$

$$(2.12) \quad v(x, t) = w(x, t), \quad \text{for } x = a_1, a_2, t \geq 0, \text{ if } I = [a_1, a_2].$$

Remark 2.2. (i) We will interpret (2.9)-(2.10) in the following weak sense. We rewrite the equations in the form of directional derivatives,

$$(\partial_t + \partial_x)v(x, t) = 0, \quad (\partial_t - \partial_x)w(x, t) = 0.$$

We consider the first condition to be satisfied at (x, t) if $v(x + \delta, t + \delta) = v(x, t)$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$ and all $\delta \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$. A similar remark pertains to the second condition. More precisely, if for an open rectangle F in the space-time, $v(x, t) > w(x, t)$ for $(x, t) \in F$ then all characteristics of v have slope 1 and all characteristics of w have slope -1 in F , i.e., $v(x + \delta, t + \delta) = v(x, t)$ for all $(x, t), (x + \delta, t + \delta) \in F$ and $w(x - \delta, t + \delta) = w(x, t)$ for all $(x, t), (x - \delta, t + \delta) \in F$. If for an open rectangle F in the space-time, $v(x, t) = w(x, t)$ for $(x, t) \in F$ then all characteristics of v and w have slope 0 in F , i.e., $v(x, t + \delta) = v(x, t)$ and $w(x, t + \delta) = w(x, t)$ for all $(x, t), (x, t + \delta) \in F$.

The derivatives ∂_t and ∂_x need not exist for (2.9)-(2.10) to be satisfied. From now on, whenever we assert existence of solutions to (2.9)-(2.10), it will be in the sense of this remark.

(ii) We translate the condition stated in Remark 2.1 into the present context.

(2.13) If for some $s \geq 0$ and $x_1 < x_2$ there exist functions $\tilde{v}(x, t)$ and $\tilde{w}(x, t)$ which are continuous in the triangle

$$U := \{(x, t) : t \geq s, x_1 + (t - s) < x < x_2 - (t - s)\},$$

satisfy (2.9)-(2.12) with $\tilde{v}(x, t) > \tilde{w}(x, t)$ in the interior of U , and

$$\tilde{v}(x, s) = v(x, s) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{w}(x, s) = w(x, s) \quad \text{for } x_1 < x < x_2,$$

then $v(x, t) = \tilde{v}(x, t)$ and $w(x, t) = \tilde{w}(x, t)$ in the interior of U .

The generic situation covered by (2.13) is when $x \rightarrow v(x, s)$ is strictly decreasing and $v(x, s) = w(x, s)$ for $x \in (x_1, x_2)$.

(iii) Condition (2.12) can be interpreted as reflection of a wave at the boundary of a container.

Our main results assert existence and uniqueness of solutions to (2.9)-(2.13). We need different assumptions for the two claims. We start with the existence result.

Theorem 2.3. *Assume that the initial conditions $v(x, 0)$ and $w(x, 0)$ are continuous on I and $v(x, 0) \geq w(x, 0)$ for all $x \in I$. If $I = [a_1, a_2]$ then assume that $v(a_1, 0) = w(a_1, 0)$ and $v(a_2, 0) = w(a_2, 0)$. Then there exist jointly continuous functions $v(x, t)$ and $w(x, t)$ with $x \in I$, $t \geq 0$, such that (2.11)-(2.13) are satisfied, and for every open set $D \subset I \times (0, \infty)$, if $v(x, t) > w(x, t)$ for all $(x, t) \in D$ or $v(x, t) = w(x, t)$ for all $(x, t) \in D$ then (2.9)-(2.10) are satisfied in D .*

Remark 2.4. (i) Solutions to (2.9)-(2.13) need not be differentiable in the classical sense even if the initial conditions are smooth. For generic smooth initial conditions, v and w are smooth in most of the space-time but not everywhere. Specifically, the solutions need not be differentiable on freezing and thawing boundaries—see Section 3.

(ii) Solutions to (2.9)-(2.13) can be defined by explicit formulas (7.1)-(7.10). All we need to assume about the initial conditions $v(x, 0)$ and $w(x, 0)$ to apply these formulas is measurability. While completely arbitrary measurable initial conditions might not be interesting, it may be interesting to investigate solutions to (2.9)-(2.13) with initial conditions which have isolated jumps. We leave this case as a potential future project.

(iii) If $v(x, t) > w(x, t)$ for all (x, t) in an open set $D \subset I \times (0, \infty)$ then we will call D a “liquid zone.” If $v(x, t) = w(x, t)$ for all $(x, t) \in D$ then we will call D a “frozen zone.”

As we announced, our main uniqueness result needs assumptions stronger than the existence theorem. More accurately, we will prove uniqueness of solutions within a restricted class of functions. Before we state the uniqueness result, we will state some definitions.

For a first order quasilinear initial value problem

$$(2.14) \quad \begin{aligned} f_t + b(x, t, f)f_x &= c(x, t, f), \\ f(x, 0) &= f_0(x), \end{aligned}$$

a characteristic curve $(\chi(t, x_0, f_0(x_0)), t)$ is defined as the solutions to the system of ODE's

$$(2.15) \quad \frac{d\chi}{dt} = b(\chi, t, z),$$

$$(2.16) \quad \frac{dz}{dt} = c(\chi, t, z),$$

with initial conditions

$$\chi(x_0, 0) = x_0 \quad \text{and} \quad z(x_0, 0) = f_0(x_0).$$

If every (x, t) lies on a unique characteristic, i.e $(x, t) = (\chi(x_0, t), t)$ for a unique x_0 , then we may define $f(x, t) = z(x_0, t)$ and f will satisfy (2.14). In this way the initial value problem for the PDE is reduced to an initial value problem for a system of ODE's.

For our system, (2.9)- (2.10), the v -characteristics, $(\chi_v(x_0, t), t)$ are piecewise linear curves with $d\chi/dt$ equal to zero in the frozen region and one in the liquid region. As $c(x, t, z) = 0$, v is constant along its characteristics. Similarly, $d\chi/dt$ is equal to zero or minus one for the w -characteristics, and w is constant along its characteristics.

Our formal definition requires that a characteristic satisfy (2.15-2.16 in the open liquid and frozen regions, and be continuous across the transitions.

Definition 2.5. Suppose that $v(x, t)$ and $w(x, t)$ are defined for $x \in I$ and $s \leq t$.

(i) If $I = \mathbb{R}$ then we will call a function $\{\chi_v(u), 0 \leq u \leq t\}$ with values in I a characteristic of v if for some $x \in I$, $\chi_v(0) = x$, $v(\chi_v(u), u) = v(x, 0)$ for all $u \in [0, t]$, χ_v is continuous, and $\chi_v(u)$ satisfies (2.14) with $c \equiv 0$, $b = 1$ in the interior of the liquid region $\{(x, t) : v(x, t) > w(x, t)\}$, and $b = 0$ in the interior of the frozen region $\{(x, t) : v(x, t) = w(x, t)\}$.

If $I = [a_1, a_2]$ then we will call a function $\{\chi_v(u), s \leq u \leq t\}$ with values in I a characteristic of v if for some $x \in I$, $\chi_v(s) = x$, $v(\chi_v(u), u) = v(x, s)$ for all $u \in [s, t]$, χ_v is continuous, $s = 0$ or $\chi_v(s) = a_1$, and $\chi_v(u)$ satisfies (2.14) with $c \equiv 0$, $b = 1$ in the interior of the liquid region, and $b = 0$ in the interior of the frozen region.

Similarly, if $I = \mathbb{R}$ then we will call a function $\{\chi_w(u), 0 \leq u \leq t\}$ with values in I a characteristic of w if for some $x \in I$, $\chi_w(0) = x$, $w(\chi_w(u), u) = w(x, 0)$ for all $u \in [0, t]$, χ_w is continuous, and $\chi_w(u)$ satisfies (2.14) with $c \equiv 0$, $b = 1$ in the interior of the liquid region, and $b = 0$ in the interior of the frozen region.

If $I = [a_1, a_2]$ then we will call a function $\{\chi_w(u), s \leq u \leq t\}$ with values in I a characteristic of w if for some $x \in I$, $\chi_w(s) = x$, $w(\chi_w(u), u) = w(x, s)$ for all $u \in [s, t]$, χ_w is continuous, $s = 0$ or $\chi_w(s) = a_2$, and $\chi_w(u)$ satisfies (2.14) with $c \equiv 0$, $b = -1$ in the interior of the liquid region, and $b = 0$ in the interior of the frozen region.

Suppose that $\{\chi_v(u), s \leq u \leq t\}$ is a characteristic and $x_1 = \chi_v(u_1)$ for some $u_1 \in [s, t]$. Then we will call $\{\chi_v(u), s \leq u \leq u_1\}$ a backward characteristic (emanating from (x_1, u_1)) and $\{\chi_v(u), u_1 \leq u \leq t\}$ a forward characteristic (emanating from (x_1, u_1)). Similar terms will be applied to w -characteristics.

By abuse of terminology, we will use the term characteristic in reference to χ_v and χ_w or the graphs of $u \rightarrow (\chi_v(u), u)$ and $u \rightarrow (\chi_w(u), u)$.

(ii) We will call a (part of) characteristic $\{\chi_v(u), s \leq u \leq t\}$ subsonic if

$$(2.17) \quad 0 \leq \chi_v(u_2) - \chi_v(u_1) \leq u_2 - u_1 \quad \text{for all } s \leq u_1 \leq u_2 \leq t.$$

We will call a characteristic $\{\chi_w(u), s \leq u \leq t\}$ subsonic if

$$(2.18) \quad u_1 - u_2 \leq \chi_w(u_2) - \chi_w(u_1) \leq 0 \quad \text{for all } s \leq u_1 \leq u_2 \leq t.$$

Recall that x is called a local maximum of f if for some $\delta > 0$, we have $f(x) = \sup_{x-\delta \leq y \leq x+\delta} f(y)$. Similarly, x is called a local minimum of f if for some $\delta > 0$,

$f(x) = \inf_{x-\delta \leq y \leq x+\delta} f(y)$. A continuous function is monotone on all closed intervals that contain no local extrema in the interior. If all local extrema are isolated, the union of these closed intervals is all of I .

Theorem 2.6. *Assume that the initial conditions $v(x, 0)$ and $w(x, 0)$ are continuous on I and $v(x, 0) \geq w(x, 0)$ for all $x \in I$. If $I = [a_1, a_2]$ then assume that $v(a_1, 0) = w(a_1, 0)$ and $v(a_2, 0) = w(a_2, 0)$. Suppose that the total number of local extrema of $v(x, 0)$ and $w(x, 0)$ is finite on every finite interval. Then there exist unique jointly continuous functions $v(x, t)$ and $w(x, t)$ with $x \in I$, $t \geq 0$, such that (2.11)-(2.13) are satisfied, subsonic backward characteristics of v and w exist for all $(x, t) \in I \times [0, \infty)$, and for every open set $D \subset I \times (0, \infty)$, if $v(x, t) > w(x, t)$ for all $(x, t) \in D$ or $v(x, t) = w(x, t)$ for all $(x, t) \in D$ then (2.9)-(2.10) are satisfied in D .*

2.1. Properties of solutions. In Section 9 we will state and prove the following properties of solutions v and w to (2.9)-(2.13) under Assumption 6.1.

- (i) If $I = [a_1, a_2]$ then the system will freeze forever after $2(a_2 - a_1)$ units of time.
- (ii) If $I = \mathbb{R}$, the total variations of $v(\cdot, t)$ and $w(\cdot, t)$ cannot increase as time increases.
- (iii) If $I = [a_1, a_2]$ then momentum and energy, expressed in terms of μ and σ , are conserved.
- (iv) The difference of occupation measures for v and w is a conserved quantity.
- (v) Assuming smooth initial conditions and generic behavior at extremal points, the slopes of freezing and thawing curves at their endpoints are universal.
- (vi) The solutions depend in a monotone way on the initial conditions.
- (vii) One can solve the equations with (some) terminal rather than initial conditions.
- (viii) The solutions are not time-reversible for generic initial conditions.
- (ix) The solutions are not differentiable along some curves even if the initial conditions are smooth.
- (x) Freezing boundaries have slopes between -1 and 1 . Thawing boundaries have slopes either less than -1 or greater than 1 . (This is proved in Section 6.)

Several properties have obvious counterparts for σ and μ ; these follow easily from those for v and w .

2.2. The main ideas of proofs. We expect (and assume) that the speeds of characteristics will not exceed the propagation speed for the linear transport equation. Hence, if $y_1 < y_2$, the solutions v and w in a triangle of the form $\{(x, t) : t \geq 0, x \in (y_1 + t, y_2 - t)\}$ can depend only on the data at its base (at time $t = 0$). We first find the solutions for initial conditions $v(x, 0)$ and $w(x, 0)$ satisfying extra conditions, the chief of which is that there are only finitely many local extrema on every finite interval. This allows us to divide the space into subintervals where the initial conditions have at most two intervals of strict monotonicity. Then we can define v and w in the corresponding space-time triangles in a fairly explicit way.

To generalize our construction to arbitrary continuous initial conditions, we express the solutions using totally explicit formulas in terms of sublevel and superlevel sets of $v(x, 0)$ and $w(x, 0)$. This allows us to prove that the mapping from the initial conditions to solutions is Lipschitz in appropriate norms. The initial data satisfying the extra

conditions are dense among all continuous initial data that satisfy the constraint, so we define solutions for more general initial conditions as limits of the special ones.

2.3. Comparison to Conservation Laws and Shocks. Our system of nonlinear transport equations is similar in many ways to nonlinear systems of conservation laws [Lax84, Ser99, Smo94]. A key difference is that the appearance of shocks—curves across which solutions jump—which is unavoidable for genuinely nonlinear conservation laws, does not occur for our system.

A nonlinear system of conservation laws has the form

$$u_t = (f(u))_x = A(u)u_x$$

with $A(u) = Df(u)$, the Jacobian of f .

- (1) For general initial data, solutions are not continuous for all time, no matter how smooth the initial data. Typically, characteristics which start at points where u has different values intersect, forcing the function they would define to be discontinuous or multi-valued.
- (2) Weak (discontinuous) solutions exist for all initial data (e.g. L^∞), but they are not unique.
- (3) Addition of a “shock criterion”, restores uniqueness. For a scalar conservation law, one version of the shock criterion is that “forward characteristics impinge on the shock curve.” An alternative equivalent statement, which has a more direct analogy in our system, is that “every point (x, t) has a backward characteristic”.

2.3.1. *Transport equations with freezing.* Equations (2.9)-(2.10) can be written in the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} v \\ w \end{pmatrix}_t = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{1}_{(v>w)} & 0 \\ 0 & -\mathbf{1}_{(v>w)} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} v \\ w \end{pmatrix}_x$$

- (1) The system is not a conservation law, but similar. It is a 2×2 nonlinear hyperbolic system.
- (2) It is a conservation law in each of the liquid and frozen regions, where $A(v, w)$ is diagonal with constant eigenvalues ± 1 in the liquid region and both equal to zero in the frozen region.
- (3) The initial data, and the solutions must both satisfy the constraint $v(x, 0) \geq w(x, 0)$ for all x .
- (4) For initial data with isolated extrema, the liquid regions, where the eigenvalues are ± 1 , are separated from the frozen regions, where the eigenvalues are both zero, by continuous freezing and thawing curves.
- (5) Solutions are continuous. There are no shocks, even though forward characteristics starting at different points may intersect. The freezing process prevents v -characteristics (or w -characteristics) with the different values from intersecting. Two v -characteristics with the same value may intersect, and the constraint forces those characteristic to end, i.e. the point where the two meet has no forward characteristic.

- (6) The solutions need not be unique until we specify the analog of shock conditions. One version is: “Every point has at least one backward v -characteristic and one backward w -characteristic.” This is automatic in the frozen and liquid regions, and on the freezing curves, but not on the thawing curves.

3. PHENOMENA: CHARACTERISTICS

The proofs of our main results are rather technical. This and the next two sections provide an informal but accurate description of the phenomena associated with the solutions to the system (2.9)-(2.13) of PDEs. We hope that this heuristic discussion will help the reader follow the rigorous proofs. This section will focus on the shape of characteristics.

In all figures, if time is one of the coordinates, the horizontal axis represents space and the vertical axis represents time.

According to Remark 2.2 (i), if $v > w$ in an open set (“liquid” region) then within this region v -characteristics have to be straight line segments with slope 1 and w -characteristics have to be straight line segments with slope -1 . If $v = w$ in an open set (“frozen” region) then within this region characteristics for both v and w have slope 0. See Fig. 1.

The main, and perhaps only, interesting aspect of characteristics of v and w is their behavior at the boundary between liquid and frozen zones. In the rest of this section, all characteristics represent the same single value for v and w . The two most common phenomena at the boundary are (i) transition from sloped to vertical characteristics at a meeting location in space-time (freezing point) of a characteristic of v and a characteristic of w , and (ii) transition from overlapping vertical characteristics of v and w at a thawing point, where another sloped characteristic of either v or w meets the first




FIGURE 1. A family of characteristics of v (blue) and w (red). The region within the curve on the left is “liquid,” i.e., $v > w$ inside the region. Slopes of v characteristics (blue) are 1, and -1 for w (red) in the liquid region. The region within the curve on the right is “frozen,” i.e., $v = w$ inside the region. Characteristics of v (blue) and w (red) are vertical in the frozen region. Black lines are used to mark subsets of liquid and frozen regions. Their shapes are not typical for freezing and thawing boundaries.




FIGURE 2. A family of characteristics of v (blue) and w (red) with the same value. Characteristics are vertical in the frozen region. Their slopes are 1 for v or -1 for w in the liquid region.

two. In case (ii), if the sloped characteristic that hits the vertical ones represents v , a new sloped characteristic representing w is emanating from the meeting location, and vice versa. See the seven lowest transition points in Fig. 2.

Another non-trivial transition is when four characteristics meet at the same point, two representing v and two representing w . For each of the functions v and w , one of the characteristics is sloped and one is vertical. Two sloped characteristics, for v and w , emanate from the meeting point. See the transition point on the right in Fig. 2.

It is also possible for the sloped characteristics of v and w to pass through each other without any interaction. This occurs when the v -characteristic carries a local minimum for v and the w -characteristic carries a local maximum for w . For example, if $v(x, 0) = x^2$ and $w(x, 0) = -(x - 1)^2$ then the characteristics corresponding to the value 0 will pass through each other without any interaction.

4. PHENOMENA: FREEZING AND THAWING

This section will discuss the shape of frozen and liquid regions, and freezing and thawing boundaries when the initial conditions satisfy Assumption 6.1 (iv)-(v), saying that the initial conditions have only finitely many local extrema on every finite interval and they are strictly monotone between local extrema.

The boundary between liquid and frozen regions consists of freezing curves and thawing curves. A freezing curve occurs if the value of v increases along a family of characteristics, the value of w increases along a family of characteristics, the values for v and w span the same intervals, and the two families of characteristics meet. More precisely, wherever a characteristic of v meets a characteristic of w with the same value, the meeting point belongs to the boundary between liquid and frozen zones. The liquid zone is below and the frozen zone is above the boundary. See Fig. 3.




FIGURE 3. Blue curve represents a part of the freezing boundary. v is increasing between x_1 and x_3 . w is increasing between y_1 and y_3 . $v(x_k, 0) = w(y_k, 0)$ for $k = 1, 2, 3$. Black slanted lines represent characteristics of v (with slope 1) and w (with slope -1). The liquid zone is below the blue line and the frozen zone is above the blue line.




FIGURE 4. Blue curve represents a part of freezing boundary. Red curve represents a part of thawing boundary. v is increasing between x_1 and x_3 . w is increasing between y_1 and y_3 , and decreasing between y_3 and y_5 . $v(x_k, 0) = w(y_k, 0)$ for $k = 1, 2, 3$. Black slanted lines represent characteristics of v (with slope 1) and w (with slope -1). The liquid zone is to the right of the red curve and below the blue curve. The frozen zone is to the left of the red curve and above the blue curve.

A thawing piece of the boundary occurs if the value of v increases along a family of characteristics, the value of w decreases along a family of characteristics, the values for v and w span the same intervals, and the two families of characteristics meet. Wherever a characteristic of v meets a characteristic of w with the same value, the meeting point belongs to the boundary between liquid and frozen zones. The liquid zone is to the right and the frozen zone is to the left of the boundary. See Fig. 4. The roles of v and w can be interchanged. See, for example, Fig. 5.




FIGURE 5. The regions within curvilinear “triangles” are frozen. The region outside the triangles is liquid. Blue lines represent freezing boundaries. Their slopes are between -1 and 1 . Red lines represent thawing boundaries. The slopes of the left sides of the triangles are between 1 and ∞ . The slopes of the right sides of the triangles are between $-\infty$ and -1 . A characteristic emanating from a vertex of a frozen triangle cannot intersect a curvilinear side of another triangle between its vertices.

The simplest bounded frozen region is a curvilinear triangle. See Fig. 5. Its lower side is a freezing part of the boundary. Its left and right sides are thawing parts of the boundary. Frozen regions may have boundaries consisting of many freezing and thawing parts, as in Fig. 6.

The freezing boundary has slopes between -1 and 1 . A thawing piece of the boundary has slopes between 1 and ∞ , or it has slopes between $-\infty$ and -1 .

Fig. 7 illustrates interaction between a frozen region and characteristics of v and w . Characteristics are vertical in the frozen region and sloped in the liquid region.

See also Example 10.3 (ii) with the accompanying Fig. 27.

4.1. Freezing Prevents Shocks. It is typical for solutions to nonlinear transport equations to develop shocks (discontinuities). The sequence of graphs in Figs. 8-14 illustrate why v -characteristics with different values cannot meet to cause a shock. Characteristics of v are green and those of w are red.




FIGURE 6. The region within curvilinear "Christmas tree" is frozen. Blue curves represent freezing parts of the boundary. Their slopes are between -1 and 1 . Red curves represent thawing parts of the boundary. Their slopes are either greater than 1 or smaller than -1 .




FIGURE 7. Interaction between a frozen region (interior of the curvilinear black triangle) and characteristics of v (blue) and w (red). Characteristics are vertical in the frozen region and sloped in the liquid region.




FIGURE 8. Suppose that $v(x_1) < v(x_2)$. Parallel characteristic can't meet to cause a shock.




FIGURE 9. But if the v -characteristic from $(x_2, 0)$ meets a w -characteristic and freezes, the v -characteristic from $(x_1, 0)$ might catch up.




FIGURE 10. However, as $w(x_1, 0) < v(x_1, 0)$, and $w(x_3, 0) = v(x_2, 0) > v(x_1, 0)$, there exists $x_1 < x_4 < x_3$ with $w(x_4, 0) = v(x_1, 0)$.




FIGURE 11. And the w -characteristic starting from $(x_4, 0)$ freezes the v -characteristic starting from $(x_1, 0)$ before the shock can occur.




FIGURE 12. If $v(x_1, 0) > v(x_2, 0)$, we need slightly different argument. Parallel characteristic can't meet to cause a shock, so assume that the v -characteristic emanating from $(x_2, 0)$ freezes.




FIGURE 13. As $v(x, 0)$ is increasing to the left of x_2 and $v(x_1, 0) > v(x_2, 0)$, there must be an x_4 between x_1 and x_2 satisfying $v(x_4, 0) = v(x_2, 0)$.




FIGURE 14. The decreasing v -characteristic emanating from $(x_4, 0)$ doesn't freeze, and is parallel to the v -characteristic emanating from $(x_1, 0)$, so that characteristic cannot intersect the v -characteristic emanating from $(x_2, 0)$. The v -characteristics from $(x_2, 0)$ and $(x_4, 0)$ may (but need not) meet and thaw, as they do in the figure.

5. PHENOMENA: ANNIHILATION OF SUBLEVEL AND SUPERLEVEL SETS

A function can be recovered from knowledge of its sublevel or superlevel sets. As we will see in Section 7, when the initial conditions satisfy Assumption 6.1, the evolution of the sublevel sets of v and the superlevel sets of w is surprisingly simple. Moreover, the description of the evolution of these sets persists even without Assumption 6.1. We illustrate this below, leaving the details for Section 7.

The sets $A(v, b, t) = \{x : v(x, t) \leq b\}$ represent sublevel sets of v at a fixed t and the sets $A(w, b, t) = \{x : w(x, t) \geq b\}$ represent superlevels of w at t . See Figs. 15-18.




FIGURE 15. Blue intervals represent the sublevel set of $v(x, 0)$ and red intervals represent the superlevel set of $w(x, 0)$, both corresponding to value b . With time, the blue set is moving to the right and the red set is moving to the left. When they meet, the sets annihilate each other at the same rate. The vertical axis represents the values of v and w , not time.




FIGURE 16. Blue intervals represent the sublevel set of $v(x, t)$ and red intervals represent the superlevel set of $w(x, t)$, both corresponding to value b , at times $t = t_1, t_2$, with $t_1 < t_2$. Until they meet, blue intervals move to the right with speed 1 and red intervals move left with the same speed. When a blue interval meets a red interval, the endpoints that meet stop moving, while the other endpoints continue to move. Thus both intervals shorten at the same rate until the shorter interval becomes empty. Then the interval that remains resumes its translation.




FIGURE 17. Blue intervals represent the sublevel set of $v(x, 0)$ and red intervals represent the superlevel set of $w(x, 0)$, both corresponding to value b . Slanted lines represent rays emanating from x and y and containing points in space-time which belong to the sublevel set of v and superlevel set of w corresponding to value b . The total length of the blue intervals between x and y is equal to the total length of red intervals between x and y . The slanted lines are *not* characteristics of v and w ; in particular, their slopes are always 1 for v and -1 for w .




FIGURE 18. Interaction between a frozen region within curvilinear triangle and sublevels of v (light blue region on the left) and superlevels of w (light red region on the right), both corresponding to the same value of b . The value of b is chosen so that the sublevels and superlevels reduce to a single point (x, t) at the top of the frozen region. The v -sublevels and w -superlevels meet for the first time at (x, s) , a point in space time with the same first coordinate as (x, t) that belongs to the freezing part of the boundary of the triangle. Blue curve represents the freezing boundary. Red curves represent thawing boundaries.

6. CONSTRUCTION AND EXISTENCE OF SOLUTIONS

In this section we will prove one of our main results under the following rather strong assumption.

Assumption 6.1. (i) $v(x, 0) \geq w(x, 0)$ for $x \in I$.

(ii) If $I = [a_1, a_2]$ then $v(a_1, 0) = w(a_1, 0)$ and $v(a_2, 0) = w(a_2, 0)$.

(iii) The functions $v(x, 0)$ and $w(x, 0)$ are Lipschitz with a constant $\lambda < \infty$, i.e., for all x and y ,

$$(6.1) \quad |v(x, 0) - v(y, 0)| \leq \lambda|x - y|, \quad |w(x, 0) - w(y, 0)| \leq \lambda|x - y|.$$

(iv) The total number of local extrema of $v(x, 0)$ and $w(x, 0)$ is finite on every finite interval.

We will define “freezing curves” \mathcal{F} and a “thawing curves” \mathcal{T} in the statement of the next lemma.

The idea of the freezing curve \mathcal{F} is that $v > w$ below the curve (so this is the liquid zone) and $v = w$ on \mathcal{F} , hence the name the “freezing curve.” For the thawing curve \mathcal{T} , $v > w$ above the curve (so this is the liquid zone) and $v = w$ on \mathcal{T} .

Lemma 6.2. (i) Suppose that $y_1 < y_2$, $[y_1, y_2] \in I$ and let

$$(6.2) \quad \widehat{U} = \{(x, t) : t \geq 0, x \in (y_1 + t, y_2 - t)\},$$

$$(6.3) \quad \mathcal{F} = \{(x, t) \in \widehat{U} : v(x - t, 0) = w(x + t, 0)\}.$$

If the functions $v(x, 0)$ and $w(x, 0)$ are continuous and strictly increasing on $[y_1, y_2]$, then the set \mathcal{F} is connected, possibly empty. If it is non-empty then for some $z_1, z_2 \in [y_1, y_2]$, \mathcal{F} is the graph of a function $h_{\mathcal{F}} : [z_1, z_2] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ (from space to time) such that

$$(6.4) \quad |h_{\mathcal{F}}(x_1) - h_{\mathcal{F}}(x_2)| < |x_1 - x_2|,$$

for all $x_1, x_2 \in [z_1, z_2]$. If \mathcal{F} is non-empty then $\widehat{U} \setminus \mathcal{F}$ has two connected components, one below \mathcal{F} (say, \widehat{U}^-), and the other above \mathcal{F} (say, \widehat{U}^+). One of the sets \widehat{U}^- and \widehat{U}^+ may be empty.

(ii) Suppose that $\varepsilon > 0$, $[z - \varepsilon, z + \varepsilon] \in I$, and let

$$(6.5) \quad U = U_{z, \varepsilon} = \{(x, t) : t \geq 0, x \in (z - \varepsilon + t, z + \varepsilon - t)\},$$

$$U_r = \{(x, t) \in U : x \geq z - t\},$$

$$(6.6) \quad \mathcal{T} = \{(x, t) \in U_r : x \leq z, x + t \geq z, v(x, z - x) = w(x + t, 0)\}.$$

Suppose that the function $x \rightarrow w(x, 0)$ is continuous and strictly decreasing on $[z, z + \varepsilon]$, the functions $x \rightarrow v(x, z - x)$ and $x \rightarrow w(x, z - x)$ are (defined and) continuous and strictly increasing on $[z - \varepsilon/2, z]$, $v(x, z - x) = w(x, z - x)$ for $x \in [z - \varepsilon/2, z]$ (i.e. this set is frozen), and $v(z, 0) = w(z, 0)$. Then the set \mathcal{T} is non-empty, connected and for some $z_3 \in [z - \varepsilon/2, z]$, \mathcal{T} is the graph of a function $h_{\mathcal{T}} : [z_3, z] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ (from space to time) such that

$$(6.7) \quad h_{\mathcal{T}}(x_1) - h_{\mathcal{T}}(x_2) > x_2 - x_1,$$

for all $z_3 \leq x_1 < x_2 \leq z$. The set $U_r \setminus \mathcal{T}$ has two connected components, one below \mathcal{T} (say, U_r^-), and the other above \mathcal{T} (say, U_r^+).

The strange looking assumptions in part (ii) of Lemma 6.2 that the function $x \rightarrow v(x, z - x)$ is defined and increasing, and the set is frozen are needed in case (iv) in the proof of Lemma 6.3. In that proof we show that the assumptions in part (i) of Lemma 6.2 imply those in part (ii). See Fig. 19.

Proof. (i) Suppose that \mathcal{F} is non-empty, $(x_1, t_1), (x_2, t_2) \in \mathcal{F}$ and $(x_1, t_1) \neq (x_2, t_2)$.

We will argue that $x_1 - t_1 \neq x_2 - t_2$. Suppose otherwise. If $t_1 = t_2$ then $x_1 = x_2$, a contradiction. Assume without loss of generality that $t_1 < t_2$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} x_1 + t_1 &= x_1 - t_1 + 2t_1 = x_2 - t_2 + 2t_1 < x_2 - t_2 + 2t_2 = x_2 + t_2, \\ w(x_1 + t_1, 0) &= v(x_1 - t_1, 0) = v(x_2 - t_2, 0) = w(x_2 + t_2, 0). \end{aligned}$$

But we cannot have $w(x_1 + t_1, 0) = w(x_2 + t_2, 0)$ because $x_1 + t_1 < x_2 + t_2$ and $w(x, 0)$ is strictly increasing. Hence $x_1 - t_1 \neq x_2 - t_2$ and for a similar reason $x_1 + t_1 \neq x_2 + t_2$.

We will assume without loss of generality that $x_1 - t_1 < x_2 - t_2$. The definition of \mathcal{F} and the fact that $v(x, 0)$ and $w(x, 0)$ are strictly increasing imply that $x_1 + t_1 < x_2 + t_2$. Adding the two inequalities together, we obtain $x_1 < x_2$. Hence, \mathcal{F} is the graph of a function $h_{\mathcal{F}}$.

The functions $v(x, 0)$ and $w(x, 0)$ are continuous and strictly increasing, $v(x_1 - t_1, 0) = w(x_1 + t_1, 0)$ and $v(x_2 - t_2, 0) = w(x_2 + t_2, 0)$, so for every $z_1 \in (x_1 - t_1, x_2 - t_2)$ there exists $f(z_1) := z_2 \in (x_1 + t_1, x_2 + t_2)$ such that $v(z_1, 0) = w(z_2, 0)$. Let $x_3 = (z_1 + z_2)/2$ and $t_3 = (z_2 - z_1)/2$. Then $(x_3, t_3) \in \mathcal{F}$. The function f is continuous and maps $(x_1 - t_1, x_2 - t_2)$ onto $(x_1 + t_1, x_2 + t_2)$. This implies that $z_1 \rightarrow w(f(z_1), 0)$ is continuous and, therefore, $z_1 \rightarrow (x_3, t_3)$ is continuous. Thus \mathcal{F} is a connected set.

Suppose that \mathcal{F} does not satisfy (6.4). Then there exist $(x_1, t_1), (x_2, t_2) \in \mathcal{F}$ with $x_1 - t_1 < x_2 - t_2$ and $|t_1 - t_2| > x_2 - x_1$. If $t_1 > t_2 + x_2 - x_1$ then $x_1 + t_1 > x_2 + t_2$ and

$$w(x_1 + t_1, 0) = v(x_1 - t_1, 0) < v(x_2 - t_2, 0) = w(x_2 - t_2, 0),$$

a contradiction with the assumption that $w(x, 0)$ is strictly increasing. If $t_2 > t_1 + x_2 - x_1$ then $x_1 - t_1 > x_2 - t_2$, a contradiction with the assumption that $x_1 - t_1 < x_2 - t_2$. This proves (6.4).

If \mathcal{F} is non-empty then there exist $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 > 0$ such that the range of $v(\cdot, 0)$ over $[y_1, y_1 + \varepsilon_1]$ is the same as the range of $w(\cdot, 0)$ over $[y_2 - \varepsilon_2, y_2]$. Hence, for every $x \in [y_1, y_1 + \varepsilon_1]$ there is $y \in [y_2 - \varepsilon_2, y_2]$ such that $v(x, 0) = w(y, 0)$, and for every $y \in [y_2 - \varepsilon_2, y_2]$ there is $x \in [y_1, y_1 + \varepsilon_1]$ such that $v(x, 0) = w(y, 0)$. Therefore, \mathcal{F} must extend from the left hand side boundary of \widehat{U} to the right hand side boundary of \widehat{U} . As a consequence, $\widehat{U} \setminus \mathcal{F}$ has two connected components, \widehat{U}^- below \mathcal{F} , and \widehat{U}^+ above \mathcal{F} .

This completes the proof of (i).

(ii) Recall that $v(z, 0) = w(z, 0)$, the function $x \rightarrow w(x, 0)$ is continuous and strictly decreasing on $[z, z + \varepsilon]$, and the function $x \rightarrow v(x, z - x)$ is continuous and strictly increasing on $[z - \varepsilon/2, z]$. Hence there exist $x_1 \in [z - \varepsilon/2, z]$ and $y_1 \in [z, z + \varepsilon]$ such that $v(x_1, z - x_1) = w(y_1, 0)$. Then $x_1 + (y_1 - x_1) \geq z$ and

$$v(x_1, z - x_1) = w(y_1, 0) = w(x_1 + (y_1 - x_1), 0),$$

thus showing that $(x_1, y_1 - x_1) \in \mathcal{T}$ and, therefore, \mathcal{T} is non-empty.

Suppose that $(x_1, t_1), (x_2, t_2) \in \mathcal{T}$ and $(x_1, t_1) \neq (x_2, t_2)$.

We will argue that $x_1 \neq x_2$. Suppose otherwise. Assume without loss of generality that $t_1 < t_2$. Then

$$(6.8) \quad \begin{aligned} x_1 + t_1 &< x_2 + t_2, \\ w(x_1 + t_1, 0) &= v(x_1, z - x_1) = v(x_2, z - x_2) = w(x_2 + t_2, 0). \end{aligned}$$

But we cannot have $w(x_1 + t_1, 0) = w(x_2 + t_2, 0)$ because $x_1 + t_1 < x_2 + t_2$ and $w(x, 0)$ is strictly decreasing. Hence $x_1 \neq x_2$ and, therefore, \mathcal{J} is the graph of a function $h_{\mathcal{J}}$.

Assume without loss of generality that $x_1 < x_2$. Since $v(z, 0) = w(z, 0)$, the function $x \rightarrow w(x, 0)$ is continuous and strictly decreasing on $[z, z + \varepsilon]$, and the function $x \rightarrow v(x, z - x)$ is continuous and strictly increasing on $[z - \varepsilon/2, z]$, we have $x_1 + t_1 > x_2 + t_2$.

By continuity of $x \rightarrow v(x, z - x)$ and $x \rightarrow w(x, 0)$, for every $z_1 \in (x_1, x_2)$ there exists $g(z_1) := z_2 \in (x_1 + t_1, x_2 + t_2)$ such that $v(z_1, z - z_1) = w(z_2, 0)$. Let $x_3 = z_1$ and $t_3 = z_2 - z_1$. Then $(x_3, t_3) \in \mathcal{J}$. The function g is continuous and maps (x_1, x_2) onto $(x_2 + t_2, x_1 + t_1)$. This implies that $z_1 \rightarrow w(g(z_1), 0)$ is continuous and, therefore, $z_1 \rightarrow (x_3, t_3)$ is continuous. We conclude that \mathcal{J} is a connected set.

Suppose that \mathcal{J} does not satisfy (6.7). Then there exist $(x_1, t_1), (x_2, t_2) \in \mathcal{F}$ with $x_1 < x_2 \leq z$ and $h_{\mathcal{J}}(x_1) - h_{\mathcal{J}}(x_2) \leq x_2 - x_1$. Since $x \rightarrow w(x, 0)$ is decreasing,

$$\begin{aligned} t_1 - t_2 &= h_{\mathcal{J}}(x_1) - h_{\mathcal{J}}(x_2) \leq x_2 - x_1, \\ x_1 + t_1 &\leq x_2 + t_2, \\ v(x_1, z - x_1) &= w(x_1 + t_1, 0) \geq w(x_2 + t_2, 0) = v(x_2, z - x_2). \end{aligned}$$

This is a contradiction with the assumption that $x \rightarrow v(x, z - x)$ is strictly increasing. We conclude that (6.7) holds true.

Since \mathcal{J} is connected, $h_{\mathcal{J}}$ is defined on an interval $[z_3, z]$ for some $z_3 \in [z - \varepsilon/2, z]$. We will argue that $h_{\mathcal{J}}(z_3) = \varepsilon - (z - z_3)$, i.e., \mathcal{J} touches the boundary of U_r at the point $(z_3, h_{\mathcal{J}}(z_3)) = (z_3, \varepsilon - (z - z_3))$. Suppose that $h_{\mathcal{J}}(z_3) < \varepsilon - (z - z_3)$. Then $z_3 > z - \varepsilon/2$. If $y_1 = z_3 + h_{\mathcal{J}}(z_3)$ then

$$y_1 = z_3 + h_{\mathcal{J}}(z_3) = z_3 + \varepsilon - (z - z_3) < z + \varepsilon.$$

Let $\delta > 0$ be the distance from $(z_3, h_{\mathcal{J}}(z_3)) = (z_3, y_1 - z_3)$ to the boundary of U_r . By continuity and strict monotonicity of $x \rightarrow w(x, 0)$ and $x \rightarrow v(x, z - x)$ we can find $z_4 \in (z - \varepsilon/2, z_3)$ and $y_2 \in (y_1, z + \varepsilon)$ such that $v(z_4, z - z_4) = w(y_2, 0) = w(z_4 + (y_2 - z_4), 0)$ and the distance from $(z_4, y_2 - z_4)$ to the boundary of U_r is greater than $\delta/2$. Therefore, $(z_4, y_2 - z_4) \in \mathcal{J}$, a contradiction with the assumption that z_3 is the left endpoint of the domain of $h_{\mathcal{J}}$. We see that \mathcal{J} extends from the left hand side of the upper boundary of U_r to $(z, 0)$. As a consequence, $U_r \setminus \mathcal{J}$ has two connected components, U_r^- below \mathcal{J} , and U_r^+ above \mathcal{J} . \square

Lemma 6.3. *Suppose that Assumption 6.1 holds. Then*

(a) *For every $z \in I$ there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that either $[z - \varepsilon, z + \varepsilon] \in I$ or $I = [a_1, a_2]$ and $z = a_1$ or a_2 , and*

(1) *both $v(x, 0)$ and $w(x, 0)$ are strictly monotone on $[z - \varepsilon, z] \cap I$ and they are strictly monotone on $[z, z + \varepsilon] \cap I$, and*

(2) *either $\inf_{x \in [z - \varepsilon, z + \varepsilon] \cap I} v(x, 0) \geq \sup_{x \in [z - \varepsilon, z + \varepsilon] \cap I} w(x, 0)$ or $v(z, 0) = w(z, 0)$.*

(b) Suppose z and ε satisfy (1) and (2) and let

$$U = \{(x, t) : t \geq 0, x \in (z - \varepsilon + t, z + \varepsilon - t) \cap I\}.$$

Then there exists a continuous solution to (2.9)-(2.13) in U in the sense of Theorem 2.3 satisfying (2.13).

Proof. Part (a) follows easily from our assumptions that $v(x, 0)$ and $w(x, 0)$ are continuous, have a finite number of local extrema on any finite interval, are strictly monotone between the local extrema, and $v(x, 0) \geq w(x, 0)$ for all x .

(b) We will consider different cases of monotone behavior (increasing or decreasing) of functions v and w on $[z - \varepsilon, z]$ and $[z, z + \varepsilon]$. In every case we will define $v(x, t)$ and $w(x, t)$ explicitly. It is easy to check that our definitions agree with the conditions specified in Theorem 2.3 and (2.13); we leave the verification to the reader.

In cases (i)-(vi) below, we assume that $[z - \varepsilon, z + \varepsilon] \in I$.

Recall Lemma 6.2 and its notation.

(i) Suppose that $\inf_{x \in [z - \varepsilon, z + \varepsilon]} v(x, 0) \geq \sup_{x \in [z - \varepsilon, z + \varepsilon]} w(x, 0)$. If we take $[y_1, y_2] = [z - \varepsilon, z + \varepsilon]$ in (6.2) then \mathcal{F} defined in (6.3) is empty or contains one point. For $(x, t) \in U$, we let $v(x, t) = v(x - t, 0)$ and $w(x, t) = w(x + t, 0)$.

The whole set U is a liquid zone, i.e. $v(x, t) > w(x, t)$ for all $(x, t) \in U$. The function v propagates along characteristics with the slope 1 and w 's characteristics have slope -1 .

In view of assumption (2) of the lemma, we can assume that $v(z, 0) = w(z, 0)$ in cases (ii)-(vi) below.

(ii) Suppose that $v(z, 0) = w(z, 0)$ and one of the following conditions (a)-(c) is satisfied.

(ii)(a) $x \rightarrow v(x, 0)$ is strictly decreasing on $[z - \varepsilon, z + \varepsilon]$.

(ii)(b) $y \rightarrow w(y, 0)$ is strictly decreasing on $[z - \varepsilon, z + \varepsilon]$.

(ii)(c) $x \rightarrow v(x, 0)$ is strictly decreasing on $[z - \varepsilon, z]$ and $x \rightarrow v(x, 0)$ is strictly increasing on $[z, z + \varepsilon]$ and $y \rightarrow w(y, 0)$ is strictly increasing on $[z - \varepsilon, z]$ and $y \rightarrow w(y, 0)$ is strictly decreasing on $[z, z + \varepsilon]$.

Let $[y_1, y_2] = [z - \varepsilon, z + \varepsilon]$ in (6.2). It is easy to check that in all cases (ii) (a)-(c), the freezing curve \mathcal{F} is empty or contains one point.

As in case (i), we let $v(x, t) = v(x - t, 0)$ and $w(x, t) = w(x + t, 0)$ for $(x, t) \in U$. Once again, the whole set U is a liquid zone, i.e. $v(x, t) > w(x, t)$ for all $(x, t) \in U$. The function v propagates along characteristics with the slope 1 and w 's characteristics have slope -1 .

See (2.13) in relation to the construction presented in case (ii).

(iii) Let $[y_1, y_2] = [z - \varepsilon, z + \varepsilon]$ in (6.2). Suppose that $v(z, 0) = w(z, 0)$ and the functions $x \rightarrow v(x, 0)$ and $x \rightarrow w(x, 0)$ are strictly increasing on $[z - \varepsilon, z + \varepsilon]$. These assumptions imply that \mathcal{F} is non-empty.

We let $v(x, t) = v(x - t, 0)$ and $w(x, t) = w(x + t, 0)$ for $(x, t) \in \widehat{U}^-$. The set \widehat{U}^- is a liquid zone, i.e. $v(x, t) > w(x, t)$ for all $(x, t) \in \widehat{U}^-$. The function v propagates in \widehat{U}^- along characteristics with the slope 1 and w 's characteristics have slope -1 .




FIGURE 19. Case (iv) of the proof of Lemma 6.3. The green line cuts U into a smaller triangle \widehat{U} to the left and U_r to the right. The liquid zone is orange and the frozen zone is blue. The right endpoints of the freezing curve \mathcal{F} and thawing curve \mathcal{T} are at $(z, 0)$ because $v(z, 0) = w(z, 0)$. Characteristics of v are blue while characteristics of w are red.

For $(x, t) \in \widehat{U}^+$, we find $s \leq t$ such that $(x, s) \in \mathcal{F}$ and we let $v(x, t) = w(x, t) = v(x, s) = w(x, s)$. The set \widehat{U}^+ is a frozen zone, i.e. $v(x, t) = w(x, t)$ for all $(x, t) \in \widehat{U}^+$. The functions v and w propagate in \widehat{U}^+ along characteristics with the slope 0.

(iv) Suppose that $v(z, 0) = w(z, 0)$, the functions $x \rightarrow v(x, 0)$ and $x \rightarrow w(x, 0)$ are strictly increasing on $[z - \varepsilon, z]$ and $x \rightarrow w(x, 0)$ is strictly decreasing on $[z, z + \varepsilon]$.

Let

$$\widehat{U} = \{(x, t) : t \geq 0, x \in (z - \varepsilon + t, z - t)\}.$$

We will apply Lemma 6.2 (i) to the set \widehat{U} with $[z - \varepsilon, z]$ playing the role of $[y_1, y_2]$.

Case (iv) is illustrated in Fig. 19. The triangle with the base $[z - \varepsilon, z + \varepsilon]$ is split by a line with the slope -1 passing through $(z, 0)$ into a smaller triangle \widehat{U} with the base $[z - \varepsilon, z]$ and the complementary part U_r of U . The right endpoints of the freezing curve \mathcal{F} and thawing curve \mathcal{T} are at $(z, 0)$ because $v(z, 0) = w(z, 0)$.

The functions $x \rightarrow v(x, 0)$ and $x \rightarrow w(x, 0)$ are strictly increasing on $[z - \varepsilon, z]$. These assumptions imply that \mathcal{F} is non-empty.

We let $v(x, t) = v(x - t, 0)$ and $w(x, t) = w(x + t, 0)$ for $(x, t) \in \widehat{U}^-$. The set \widehat{U}^- is a liquid zone, i.e. $v(x, t) > w(x, t)$ for all $(x, t) \in \widehat{U}^-$. The function v propagates in \widehat{U}^- along characteristics with the slope 1 and w 's characteristics have slope -1 .

For $(x, t) \in \widehat{U}^+$, we find $s \leq t$ such that $(x, s) \in \mathcal{F}$ and we let $v(x, t) = w(x, t) = v(x, s) = w(x, s)$. The set \widehat{U}^+ is a frozen zone, i.e. $v(x, t) = w(x, t)$ for all $(x, t) \in \widehat{U}^+$. The functions v and w propagate in \widehat{U}^+ along characteristics with the slope 0.

Since $v(z, 0) = w(z, 0)$, the right endpoint of the freezing curve is $(x, 0)$. Hence, the set $\{(x, z - x) : z - \varepsilon/2 \leq x \leq z\}$, the right part of the upper boundary of \widehat{U} , belongs to the frozen zone \widehat{U}^+ . Note that $x \rightarrow v(x, z - x)$ is strictly increasing on $[z - \varepsilon/2, z]$.

Recall notation and the claims made in Lemma 6.2 (ii).

For $(x, t) \in U_r^-$ we let $v(x, t) = w(x, t) = v(x, z - x) = w(x, z - x)$.

For $(x, t) \in U_r^+$ we let $w(x, t) = w(x + t, 0)$.

It follows from (6.7) that if $(x, t) \in U_r^+$ then there is a unique point $(x_1, t_1) \in \mathcal{T} \cup [z, z + \varepsilon] \times \{0\}$ such that $(x, t) = (x_1 + s, t_1 + s)$ for some $s \geq 0$. We let $v(x, t) = v(x_1, t_1)$.

The set $\widehat{U}^- \cup U_r^+$ consisting of two connected components is the liquid zone, i.e. $v(x, t) > w(x, t)$ for all $(x, t) \in \widehat{U}^- \cup U_r^+$. The function v propagates in $\widehat{U}^- \cup U_r^+$ along characteristics with the slope 1 and w 's characteristics have slope -1 .

The connected set $\widehat{U}^+ \cup U_r^-$ is a frozen zone, i.e. $v(x, t) = w(x, t)$ for all $(x, t) \in \widehat{U}^+ \cup U_r^-$. The functions v and w propagate in \widehat{U}^+ along characteristics with the slope 0.

(v) Suppose that $v(z, 0) = w(z, 0)$, the functions $x \rightarrow v(x, 0)$ and $x \rightarrow w(x, 0)$ are strictly increasing on $[z, z + \varepsilon]$ and $x \rightarrow v(x, 0)$ is strictly decreasing on $[z - \varepsilon, z]$. This case is the ‘‘mirror image’’ of (iv). The solutions v and w can be defined in a way analogous to that in (iv).

The following cases (vi) (a)-(b) cannot occur because they would violate the assumption that $v(x, 0) \geq w(x, 0)$ for all x .

(vi)(a) $v(z, 0) = w(z, 0)$, the function $x \rightarrow v(x, 0)$ is strictly increasing on $[z - \varepsilon, z]$ and $y \rightarrow w(y, 0)$ is strictly decreasing on $[z - \varepsilon, z]$;

(vi)(b) $v(z, 0) = w(z, 0)$, the function $x \rightarrow v(x, 0)$ is strictly decreasing on $[z, z + \varepsilon]$ and $y \rightarrow w(y, 0)$ is strictly increasing on $[z, z + \varepsilon]$.

In the remaining cases we assume that $I = [a_1, a_2]$ and $z = a_1$ or a_2 .

(vii) Suppose that $z = a_1$ and $v(a_1, 0) = w(a_1, 0)$. Assume that the function $x \rightarrow w(x, 0)$ is strictly decreasing on $[a_1, a_1 + \varepsilon]$.

For all $(x, t) \in U$, we let $w(x, t) = w(x + t, 0)$.

For $(x, t) \in U$ such that $x \geq a_1 + t$ we let $v(x, t) = v(x - t, 0)$.

For $(x, t) \in U$ such that $x < a_1 + t$ we let $v(x, t) = v(a_1, t - (x - a_1)) = w(a_1 + t - (x - a_1), 0)$.

The set U is a liquid zone, i.e. $v(x, t) > w(x, t)$ for all $(x, t) \in \widehat{U}$, $x > a_1$. The function v propagates in U along characteristics with the slope 1 and w 's characteristics have slope -1 .

(viii) Suppose that $z = a_1$, $v(a_1, 0) = w(a_1, 0)$ and the functions $x \rightarrow v(x, 0)$ and $x \rightarrow w(x, 0)$ are strictly increasing on $[a_1, a_1 + \varepsilon]$.

If the definition of \widehat{U} in (6.2) is replaced with

$$\widehat{U} = \{(x, t) : t \geq 0, x \in (a_1, a_1 + \varepsilon - t)\},$$

then the rest of the statement of Lemma 6.2 (i) and its proof remain valid. Hence, we have a well defined freezing curve \mathcal{F} and it follows from our current assumptions that \mathcal{F} is non-empty, it cuts U into two connected sets \widehat{U}^- and \widehat{U}^+ , and the left endpoint of \mathcal{F} is $(a_1, 0)$.

We let $v(x, t) = v(x - t, 0)$ and $w(x, t) = w(x + t, 0)$ for $(x, t) \in \widehat{U}^-$. The set \widehat{U}^- is a liquid zone, i.e. $v(x, t) > w(x, t)$ for all $(x, t) \in \widehat{U}^-$. The function v propagates in \widehat{U}^- along characteristics with the slope 1 and w 's characteristics have slope -1 .

For $(x, t) \in \widehat{U}^+$, we find $s \leq t$ such that $(x, s) \in \mathcal{F}$ and we let $v(x, t) = w(x, t) = v(x, s) = w(x, s)$. The set \widehat{U}^+ is a frozen zone, i.e. $v(x, t) = w(x, t)$ for all $(x, t) \in \widehat{U}^+$. The functions v and w propagate in \widehat{U}^+ along characteristics with the slope 0.

The following cases are symmetric to (vii)-(viii).

(ix) Suppose that $z = a_2$ and $v(a_2, 0) = w(a_2, 0)$. Assume that the function $x \rightarrow v(x, 0)$ is strictly increasing on $[a_2 - \varepsilon, a_2]$.

(x) Suppose that $z = a_2$, $v(a_2, 0) = w(a_2, 0)$ and the functions $x \rightarrow v(x, 0)$ and $x \rightarrow w(x, 0)$ are strictly decreasing on $[a_2 - \varepsilon, a_2]$.

The functions v and w can be defined in these cases in a way analogous to that in (vii)-(viii).

The above exhausts all possible cases. The proof is complete. \square

Recall the concept of a characteristic from Definition 2.5 and the notation from Lemma 6.3.

Lemma 6.4. *Suppose that $v(x, 0)$ and $w(x, 0)$ satisfy Assumption 6.1 and $v(x, t)$ and $w(x, t)$ are solutions to (2.9)-(2.13) in U constructed in Lemma 6.3. Then*

(i) *For every $(x, t) \in U$ there is one or there are two characteristics of v connecting (x, t) with a point $(y, 0)$ or points $(y_1, 0)$ and $(y_2, 0)$ for some $y, y_1, y_2 \in [z - \varepsilon, z + \varepsilon]$. The same holds for w . Every characteristic of v is a piecewise linear function consisting of at most three intervals of linearity, with the slopes 1 or 0. Every characteristic of w is a piecewise linear function consisting of at most three intervals of linearity, with the slopes -1 or 0. Different characteristics of v do not intersect except that two characteristics may share the same endpoint. The same remark applies to characteristics of w .*

(ii) *For every $t \geq 0$, the functions $x \rightarrow v(x, t)$ and $x \rightarrow w(x, t)$ are Lipschitz with the constant λ on the interval where they are defined, i.e., for all t, x and y such that $(x, t), (y, t) \in U$,*

$$(6.9) \quad |v(x, t) - v(y, t)| \leq \lambda|x - y|, \quad |w(x, t) - w(y, t)| \leq \lambda|x - y|.$$

(iii) *For every $x \in [z - \varepsilon, z + \varepsilon]$, the functions $t \rightarrow v(x, t)$ and $t \rightarrow w(x, t)$ are Lipschitz with constant λ on the interval where they are defined, i.e., for s, t and x such*

that $(x, s), (x, t) \in U$,

$$(6.10) \quad |v(x, t) - v(x, s)| \leq \lambda|s - t|, \quad |w(x, t) - w(x, s)| \leq \lambda|s - t|.$$

(iv) By assumption, $v(x, 0)$ has a local maximum at $x = z$ or no local maxima in $[z - \varepsilon, z + \varepsilon]$. If it has a local maximum at $x = z$ then for every $t \in [0, \varepsilon/2]$, $x \rightarrow v(x, t)$ has a unique local maximum at $z + t$, and for every $t \in [\varepsilon/2, \varepsilon]$, $x \rightarrow v(x, t)$ does not have a local maximum in $(z - \varepsilon + t, z + \varepsilon - t)$ (in the interior of the interval where it is defined). If $v(x, 0)$ does not have a local maximum then for every $t \in [0, \varepsilon]$, $x \rightarrow v(x, t)$ does not have a local maximum in $(z - \varepsilon + t, z + \varepsilon - t)$. An analogous claim holds for w , except that a local minimum should be substituted for a local maximum.

(v) For any $0 \leq t < \varepsilon$, $v(x, t)$ is not constant on any interval of positive length and neither is $w(x, t)$.

Proof. (i) This follows directly and easily from the construction of v and w presented in the proof of Lemma 6.3. See Fig. 19 for the illustration of the most complicated case.

(ii) We will analyze only case (iv) in the proof of Lemma 6.3. This is the most complicated case. The other cases can be treated in the same way. Fig. 19 can help follow our argument.

Suppose that $(x, t), (y, t) \in U$, assume without loss of generality that $x < y$, and consider characteristics χ_v^1 passing through (x, t) and χ_v^2 passing through (y, t) .

If $\chi_v^2(0) \geq z$ then the characteristic χ_v^2 is a linear function with slope 1. The characteristic χ_v^1 is a piecewise linear function with slopes 0 and 1 (the number of intervals of linearity can be 1, 2 or 3). Therefore, $|x - y| \geq |\chi_v^1(0) - \chi_v^2(0)|$ and, using (6.1),

$$|v(x, t) - v(y, t)| = |v(\chi_v^1(0), 0) - v(\chi_v^2(0), 0)| \leq \lambda|\chi_v^1(0) - \chi_v^2(0)| \leq \lambda|x - y|.$$

Suppose that $\chi_v^1(0) < z$ and $\chi_v^2(0) < z$. Since $x < y$, we must have $\chi_v^1(0) < \chi_v^2(0)$. There are $0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2 \leq t$ and $0 \leq s_1 \leq s_2 \leq t$ such that the slope of χ_v^1 is 1 on $(0, t_1)$, 0 on (t_1, t_2) and 1 on (t_2, t) . Similarly, the slope of χ_v^2 is 1 on $(0, s_1)$, 0 on (s_1, s_2) and 1 on (s_2, t) . Since the thawing curve \mathcal{T} satisfies (6.7), we must have $t_2 \geq s_2$.

If $t_1 \leq s_1$ then $\chi_v^2(s) - \chi_v^1(s) \geq \chi_v^2(0) - \chi_v^1(0)$ for all $s \in [0, t]$ and, using (6.1),

$$(6.11) \quad \begin{aligned} |v(x, t) - v(y, t)| &= |v(\chi_v^1(0), 0) - v(\chi_v^2(0), 0)| \leq \lambda|\chi_v^1(0) - \chi_v^2(0)| \leq \lambda|\chi_v^1(t) - \chi_v^2(t)| \\ &= \lambda|x - y|. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose that $t_1 > s_1$. Our conventions concerning naming of the times t, t_1 and s_1 imply that $t \geq t_1 > s_1$. Let $\tilde{\chi}_w^1$ and $\tilde{\chi}_w^2$ be the characteristics of w going from $\chi_v^1(t_1)$ and $\chi_v^2(s_1)$ to $[z - \varepsilon, z + \varepsilon] \times \{0\}$. These characteristics are linear functions.

Since $t_1 > s_1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\chi_v^1(s) - \chi_v^2(s)| &\geq |\chi_v^1(t_1) - \chi_v^2(t_1)| \text{ for } s \in [t_1, t], \\ |\chi_v^1(s) - \chi_v^2(s)| &\geq |\tilde{\chi}_w^1(s) - \tilde{\chi}_w^2(s)| \text{ for } s \in [s_1, t_1], \\ |\tilde{\chi}_w^1(s) - \tilde{\chi}_w^2(s)| &= |\tilde{\chi}_w^1(0) - \tilde{\chi}_w^2(0)| \text{ for } s \in [0, s_1]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$(6.12) \quad |x - y| = |\chi_v^1(t) - \chi_v^2(t)| \geq |\tilde{\chi}_w^1(0) - \tilde{\chi}_w^2(0)|.$$

The point $(\chi_v^1(t_1), t_1)$ is on the freezing curve so

$$(6.13) \quad w(\tilde{\chi}_w^1(t_1), t_1) = v(\tilde{\chi}_w^1(t_1), t_1) = v(\chi_v^1(t_1), t_1).$$

Since $\chi_v^1(0) < \chi_v^2(0) < z$ and $r \rightarrow v(r, 0)$ is increasing, $v(x, t) = v(\chi_v^1(0), 0) < v(\chi_v^2(0), 0) = v(y, t)$. Recall that, by definition, $\tilde{\chi}_w^2(s_1) = \chi_v^2(s_1)$. These remarks, (6.12) and (6.13) imply that

$$\begin{aligned} |v(x, t) - v(y, t)| &= v(y, t) - v(x, t) = v(\chi_v^2(s_1), s_1) - v(\chi_v^1(t_1), t_1) \\ &= w(\tilde{\chi}_w^2(s_1), s_1) - w(\tilde{\chi}_w^1(t_1), t_1) = w(\tilde{\chi}_w^2(0), 0) - w(\tilde{\chi}_w^1(0), 0) \\ &\leq |w(\tilde{\chi}_w^2(0), 0) - w(\tilde{\chi}_w^1(0), 0)| \leq \lambda|\tilde{\chi}_w^2(0) - \tilde{\chi}_w^1(0)| \leq \lambda|x - y|. \end{aligned}$$

This and (6.11) prove the first of the two inequalities in (6.10).

Next consider the function $x \rightarrow w(x, t)$ for a fixed t . Let x_0 be such that $(x_0, t) \in \mathcal{J}$. It will suffice to prove (6.10) for w separately on each of the two intervals: $[z - \varepsilon + t, x_0]$ and $[x_0, z + \varepsilon - t]$.

Let χ_w^1 and χ_w^2 be characteristics of w connecting (x, t) and (y, t) with $[z - \varepsilon, z + \varepsilon] \times \{0\}$.

If $x_0 \leq x < y$ then the functions χ_w^1 and χ_w^2 are linear with the slope -1 . Therefore, $|x - y| = |\chi_w^1(0) - \chi_w^2(0)|$ and

$$|w(x, t) - w(y, t)| = |w(\chi_w^1(0), 0) - w(\chi_w^2(0), 0)| \leq \lambda|\chi_w^1(0) - \chi_w^2(0)| = \lambda|x - y|.$$

If $x < y \leq x_0$ then there are $0 \leq t_1 \leq t$ and $0 \leq s_1 \leq s$ such that the slope of χ_w^1 is -1 on $(0, t_1)$ and 0 on (t_1, t) . Similarly, the slope of χ_w^2 is -1 on $(0, s_1)$ and 0 on (s_1, s) . This case can be further split into subcases when $t_1 \geq s_1$ and $t_1 < s_1$. One can now prove (6.10) for w just like it was done in the proof of (6.10) for v .

(iii) Suppose that $(x, s), (x, t) \in U$ and assume without loss of generality that $s < t$. Let χ_v be the characteristic of v connecting (x, t) with $[z - \varepsilon, z + \varepsilon] \times \{0\}$. Since the slope of χ_v is either 0 or 1 , $|\chi_v(s) - x| \leq t - s$. We use (6.10) to conclude that

$$|v(x, t) - v(x, s)| = |v(\chi_v(s), s) - v(x, s)| \leq \lambda|\chi_v(s) - x| \leq \lambda|s - t|.$$

The proof for w is analogous.

(iv) Suppose that $x \rightarrow v(x, 0)$ has no local maxima in $[z - \varepsilon, z + \varepsilon]$. The characteristics of v from different points in U either do not intersect or one of them contains the other one. This implies that for every $t \in [0, \varepsilon]$, $x \rightarrow v(x, t)$ does not have a local maximum in $(z - \varepsilon + t, z + \varepsilon - t)$.

Next suppose that $x \rightarrow v(x, 0)$ has a local maximum at z . Then we have case (iv) of the proof of Lemma 6.3 with the extra assumption that $x \rightarrow v(x, 0)$ is strictly decreasing on $[z, z + \varepsilon]$. For $t \in [0, \varepsilon/2]$ and $x \geq z + t$, $v(x, t) = v(x - t, 0)$. Hence, $x \rightarrow v(x, t)$ is strictly decreasing for $x \geq z + t$. For $x \leq z + t$, the characteristic from (x, t) has an endpoint at $(y, 0)$ with $y \leq z$. Characteristics starting at different points (x_1, t) and (x_2, t) do not intersect. Since $x \rightarrow v(x, 0)$ is strictly increasing on $[z - \varepsilon, z]$, it follows that $x \rightarrow v(x, t)$ is strictly increasing for $x \leq z + t$. We see that $v(x, t)$ has a unique local maximum at $z + t$.

The proof of (iv) for w is similar.

(v) Once again, consider case (iv) of the proof of Lemma 6.3. Recall that $x \rightarrow v(x, 0)$ and $x \rightarrow w(x, 0)$ are strictly monotone on $[z - \varepsilon, z]$ and $[z, z + \varepsilon]$. Note that different

characteristics of v are either disjoint or one is contained in the other. Characteristics of w are either disjoint, or one is contained in the other, or they have a common endpoint in \mathcal{T} . All of this implies that for any $0 \leq t < \varepsilon$, $v(x, t)$ is not constant on any interval of positive length and neither is $w(x, t)$. \square

Lemma 6.5. *If Assumption 6.1 is satisfied then for every finite interval $[a_3, a_4] \subset I$, there exists $t_1 > 0$ such that there is a solution to (2.9)-(2.13) in $[a_3, a_4] \times [0, t_1]$.*

Proof. By compactness, there is a finite number of points $z_k \in [a_3 - 1, a_4 + 1] \cap I$ and $\varepsilon_k > 0$ satisfying Lemma 6.3 (a), such that $[a_3 - 1, a_4 + 1] \cap I \subset \bigcup_{k=1}^n (z_k - \varepsilon_k/2, z_k + \varepsilon_k/2)$. Let U_k be the triangle with parameters z_k and ε_k , defined as in Lemma 6.3 (b). Since $U(z_k)$'s are overlapping triangles, there exists $t_1 > 0$ such that $[a_3, a_4] \times [0, t_1] \subset \bigcup_{k=1}^n U_k$.

It is tedious but totally elementary to check that solutions constructed in the proof of Lemma 6.3 (b) agree on the intersections of U_k 's. \square

Theorem 6.6. *If Assumption 6.1 is satisfied then there exist jointly continuous functions $v(x, t)$ and $w(x, t)$ with $x \in I$, $t \geq 0$, such that (2.11)-(2.13) are satisfied, and for every open set $D \subset I \times (0, \infty)$, if $v(x, t) > w(x, t)$ for all $(x, t) \in D$ or $v(x, t) = w(x, t)$ for all $(x, t) \in D$ then (2.9)-(2.10) are satisfied in D .*

Proof. First we will assume that $I = \mathbb{R}$ because this case requires ‘‘localization.’’ Given initial conditions $v(x, 0)$ and $w(x, 0)$, we define modified initial conditions $v^b(x, 0)$ and $w^b(x, 0)$ for every $b > 0$ by

$$(6.14) \quad v^b(x, 0) = \begin{cases} v(x, 0) & \text{for } -b \leq x \leq b, \\ v(-b, 0) + \lambda|x - b| & \text{for } x \leq -b, \\ v(b, 0) + \lambda|x - b| & \text{for } x \geq b, \end{cases}$$

$$(6.15) \quad w^b(x, 0) = \begin{cases} w(x, 0) & \text{for } -b \leq x \leq b, \\ w(-b, 0) - \lambda|x - b| & \text{for } x \leq -b, \\ w(b, 0) - \lambda|x - b| & \text{for } x \geq b. \end{cases}$$

It is easy to see that for each $b > 0$, the initial conditions $v^b(x, 0)$ and $w^b(x, 0)$ satisfy Assumption 6.1. By Lemma 6.5, for some $t_b \in (0, b)$, there exist solutions $v^b(x, t)$ and $w^b(x, t)$ to (2.9)-(2.13) in $[-4b, 4b] \times [0, t_b]$.

By Assumption 6.1, $v(x, 0)$ and $w(x, 0)$ are Lipschitz with constant λ so

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{-b \leq x \leq b} v^b(x, 0) - \inf_{-b \leq x \leq b} v^b(x, 0) &\leq 2\lambda b, \\ \sup_{-b \leq x \leq b} w^b(x, 0) - \inf_{-b \leq x \leq b} w^b(x, 0) &\leq 2\lambda b. \end{aligned}$$

This and (6.14) imply that

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{x \leq -3b} v^b(x, 0) &= 3\lambda b + v^b(-b, 0) \geq 2\lambda b + \inf_{-b \leq x \leq b} v^b(x, 0) \geq 2\lambda b + \sup_{-b \leq x \leq b} v^b(x, 0) - 2\lambda b \\ &\geq 2\lambda b + \sup_{-b \leq x \leq b} w^b(x, 0) - 2\lambda b \geq 2\lambda b + w^b(-b, 0) - 2\lambda b \\ &= 2\lambda b + 2\lambda b + \sup_{x \leq -3b} w^b(x, 0) - 2\lambda b = \sup_{x \leq -3b} w^b(x, 0) + 2\lambda b. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $v^b(x, t) = v^b(x - t, 0) > w^b(x + t, 0) = w^b(x, t)$ for $x \leq -3b$ and $t \in [0, b]$. For a similar reason, $v^b(x, t) = v^b(x - t, 0)$ and $w^b(x, t) = w^b(x + t, 0)$ for $x \geq 3b$ and $t \in [0, b]$. Since $t_b < b$, there exist solutions $v^b(x, t)$ and $w^b(x, t)$ to (2.9)-(2.13) in $\mathbb{R} \times [0, t_b]$.

It follows from our constructions that the solutions $v^b(x, t)$ and $w^b(x, t)$ satisfy conditions in Lemma 6.4 (i)-(iii) in $\mathbb{R} \times [0, t_b]$.

Let N_t^b be the number of local maxima of $x \rightarrow v^b(x, t)$ and local minima of $x \rightarrow w^b(x, t)$. In view of our construction of $v^b(x, 0)$ and $w^b(x, 0)$, N_0^b is finite. Lemma 6.4 (iv) implies that $t \rightarrow N_t^b$ is non-increasing on $[0, t_b]$.

Let T be the supremum of u such that there exist solutions to (2.9)-(2.13) in $\mathbb{R} \times [0, u]$ satisfying conditions in Lemma 6.4 (i)-(iii) and such that $t \rightarrow N_t^b$ is non-increasing on $[0, T]$. Note that $T \geq t_b > 0$.

Suppose that $T < \infty$. For every $t < T$, the function $x \rightarrow v^b(x, t)$ is Lipschitz continuous with constant λ by Lemma 6.4 (ii). By Lemma 6.4 (ii)-(iii), the function $(x, t) \rightarrow v^b(x, t)$ is Lipschitz continuous with constant 2λ on $\mathbb{R} \times [0, T]$. This implies that $v^b(x, T) := \lim_{t \uparrow T} v^b(x, t)$ exists and is a Lipschitz function with constant λ . Similarly, $w^b(x, T) := \lim_{t \uparrow T} w^b(x, t)$ exists and is a Lipschitz function with constant λ .

We have shown that N_t^b is bounded on $[0, T]$. The limits $v^b(x, T) := \lim_{t \uparrow T} v^b(x, t)$ and $w^b(x, T) := \lim_{t \uparrow T} w^b(x, t)$ are uniform so $N_T^b \leq \lim_{t \uparrow T} N_t^b < \infty$. Since N_t^b is bounded on $[0, T]$, the total number of local maxima of $x \rightarrow v^b(x, T)$ and local minima of $x \rightarrow w^b(x, T)$ is finite. Hence, the total number of local extrema of $x \rightarrow v^b(x, T)$ and $x \rightarrow w^b(x, T)$ is finite.

By assumption, $v^b(x, 0)$ and $w^b(x, 0)$ can take a given value only at a finite number of x . Neither of the functions $x \rightarrow v^b(x, T)$ and $x \rightarrow w^b(x, T)$ is constant on any interval of positive length because otherwise we would have an arbitrarily large number of characteristics with ends at the same point of $\mathbb{R} \times [0, \infty)$.

We see that $x \rightarrow v^b(x, T)$ and $x \rightarrow w^b(x, T)$ satisfy Assumption 6.1. Hence, for some $\delta > 0$, we can find solutions $v^b(x, t)$ and $w^b(x, t)$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $t \in [T, T + \delta]$. This contradicts the definition of T so we conclude that $T = \infty$.

We have proved the theorem for the set of initial conditions $v^b(x, 0)$ and $w^b(x, 0)$ for any $b > 0$. If $0 < b < c$ then the solutions $v^b(x, t)$ and $w^b(x, t)$ agree with $v^c(x, t)$ and $w^c(x, t)$ on the triangle $\{(x, t) : -b + t < x < b - t\}$. Hence, we can define $v(x, t) = \lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} v^b(x, t)$ and $w(x, t) = \lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} w^b(x, t)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $t \geq 0$. It is easy to see that thus defined $v(x, t)$ and $w(x, t)$ satisfy the theorem.

The case when $I = [a_1, a_2]$ can be dealt with in a similar but simpler way because we do not need ‘‘localization.’’ \square

Remark 6.7. Recall remarks from Section 3 about points where four characteristics meet, illustrated by the top transition point in Fig. 2. This type of transition does not appear in Lemmas 6.2 and 6.3. One can explain its absence in the following way. A point of this type can appear at time $T < \infty$ in the proof of Theorem 6.6. But the proof shows that $x \rightarrow v^b(x, T)$ and $x \rightarrow w^b(x, T)$ satisfy Assumption 6.1 so there is no need to provide a separate discussion of points where four characteristics meet.

7. GENERAL INITIAL CONDITIONS

The goal of this section is to construct solutions to (2.9)-(2.13) for any continuous initial conditions. We will start with some definitions that apply even to arbitrary measurable initial conditions $v(x, 0)$ and $w(x, 0)$.

We will use the convention that $\inf \emptyset = -\infty$ and $\sup \emptyset = \infty$.

Suppose that $b \in \mathbb{R}$, $v(x, 0)$ and $w(x, 0)$ are measurable functions and $v(x, 0) \geq w(x, 0)$ for all x .

If $I = \mathbb{R}$ then for $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $t \geq 0$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}$, let

$$(7.1) \quad \alpha(v, b, x) = \inf \left\{ y \in I : y \geq x, \int_x^y (\mathbf{1}_{\{v(z,0) \leq b\}} - \mathbf{1}_{\{w(z,0) \geq b\}}) dz < 0 \right\},$$

$$(7.2) \quad \alpha(w, b, x) = \sup \left\{ y \in I : y \leq x, \int_y^x (\mathbf{1}_{\{v(z,0) \leq b\}} - \mathbf{1}_{\{w(z,0) \geq b\}}) dz > 0 \right\},$$

$$(7.3) \quad A(v, b, t) = \{z \in I : z = x + t, v(x, 0) \leq b, t \leq (\alpha(v, b, x) - x)/2\},$$

$$(7.4) \quad A(w, b, t) = \{z \in I : z = x - t, w(x, 0) \geq b, t \leq (x - \alpha(w, b, x))/2\}.$$

If $I = [a_1, a_2]$ then for $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $t \geq 0$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}$, let

$$(7.5) \quad \begin{aligned} & \alpha(v, b, x) \\ &= \inf \left\{ y \geq x : \int_x^y (\mathbf{1}_{\{z \in I, v(z,0) \leq b\}} + \mathbf{1}_{\{z \leq a_1\}} - \mathbf{1}_{\{z \in I, w(z,0) \geq b\}} - \mathbf{1}_{\{z \geq a_2\}}) dz < 0 \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

$$(7.6) \quad \begin{aligned} & \alpha(w, b, x) \\ &= \sup \left\{ y \leq x : \int_y^x (\mathbf{1}_{\{z \in I, v(z,0) \leq b\}} + \mathbf{1}_{\{z \leq a_1\}} - \mathbf{1}_{\{z \in I, w(z,0) \geq b\}} - \mathbf{1}_{\{z \geq a_2\}}) dz > 0 \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

$$(7.7) \quad A(v, b, t) = \{z \in I : z = x + t, t \leq (\alpha(v, b, x) - x)/2 \text{ and } (v(x, 0) \leq b \text{ or } x \leq a_1)\},$$

$$(7.8) \quad A(w, b, t) = \{z \in I : z = x - t, t \leq (x - \alpha(w, b, x))/2 \text{ and } (w(x, 0) \geq b \text{ or } x \geq a_2)\}.$$

Note that if $x, y \in I$ then $y = \alpha(v, b, x)$ if and only if $x = \alpha(w, b, y)$.

Let

$$(7.9) \quad v_*(x, t) = \inf \{b \in \mathbb{R} : x \in A(v, b, t)\}, \quad x \in I, t \geq 0,$$

$$(7.10) \quad w_*(x, t) = \sup \{b \in \mathbb{R} : x \in A(w, b, t)\}, \quad x \in I, t \geq 0.$$

Remark 7.1. (i) Formulas (7.1)-(7.10) uniquely define measurable functions $v_*(x, t)$ and $w_*(x, t)$ for any measurable $v(x, 0)$ and $w(x, 0)$.

(ii) It is easy to check that $b \rightarrow \alpha(v, b, x)$ is non-decreasing and $b \rightarrow \alpha(w, b, x)$ is non-increasing. This implies that $b \rightarrow A(v, b, t)$ is non-decreasing and $b \rightarrow A(w, b, t)$ is non-increasing.

(iii) In the case $I = [a_1, a_2]$ one can extend $v(x, 0)$ and $w(x, 0)$ to the whole real line by declaring that $v(x, 0) = w(x, 0) = -\infty$ for $x < a_1$ and $v(x, 0) = w(x, 0) = \infty$ for $x > a_2$. Then (7.1)-(7.4) applied to thus extended initial conditions yield the same formulas as in (7.5)-(7.8).

Lemma 7.2. *If v and w are the solutions to (2.9)-(2.13) in $I \times [0, \infty)$ constructed in Theorem 6.6 under Assumption 6.1 then $v_*(x, t) = v(x, t)$ and $w_*(x, t) = w(x, t)$ for all $x \in I$ and $t \geq 0$.*

Proof. Step 1. Let v and w be the solutions to (2.9)-(2.13) in $I \times [0, \infty)$ constructed in Theorem 6.6 under Assumption 6.1. We define sublevels of v and superlevels of w by

$$(7.11) \quad \mathcal{A}(v, b, t) = \{x \in I : v(x, t) \leq b\},$$

$$(7.12) \quad \mathcal{A}(w, b, t) = \{x \in I : w(x, t) \geq b\}.$$

Then

$$(7.13) \quad v(x, t) = \inf\{b \in \mathbb{R} : x \in \mathcal{A}(v, b, t)\}, \quad x \in I, t \geq 0,$$

$$(7.14) \quad w(x, t) = \sup\{b \in \mathbb{R} : x \in \mathcal{A}(w, b, t)\}, \quad x \in I, t \geq 0.$$

By comparing (7.3)-(7.4) and (7.7)-(7.10) to (7.11)-(7.14), we see that it will suffice to show that $\mathcal{A}(v, b, t) = A(v, b, t)$ and $\mathcal{A}(w, b, t) = A(w, b, t)$ for all $b \in \mathbb{R}$ and $t \geq 0$. The proof will be based on the following heuristic description of the evolution of $t \rightarrow \mathcal{A}(v, b, t)$ and $t \rightarrow \mathcal{A}(w, b, t)$. The set $\mathcal{A}(v, b, t)$ moves to the right at the speed 1, $\mathcal{A}(w, b, t)$ moves to the left at the same speed, and the two sets annihilate each other wherever they meet. We will make this precise in (I)-(VIII) below.

Assumption 6.1 and Lemma 6.4 (iv) imply that for every t , $v(x, t)$ and $w(x, t)$ have only a finite number of extrema on every finite interval. Thus the intersection of $\mathcal{A}(v, b, t)$ with any finite interval consists of a finite number of disjoint closed intervals and the same can be said about $\mathcal{A}(w, b, t)$.

Since $v(x, t) \geq w(x, t)$ for all x and t , if $x \in \mathcal{A}(v, b, t) \cap \mathcal{A}(w, b, t)$ then $v(x, t) = w(x, t)$. We claim that $\mathcal{A}(v, b, t) \cap \mathcal{A}(w, b, t)$ can contain only some endpoints of the intervals comprising $\mathcal{A}(v, b, t)$ and $\mathcal{A}(w, b, t)$. Otherwise, it would contain an interval J of strictly positive length. We would have $v(x, t) = w(x, t) = b$ for all $x \in J$. This is impossible because for a fixed t , $v(x, t)$ and $w(x, t)$ are not constant over an interval of positive length, by Lemma 6.4 (v).

Suppose that $b \in \mathbb{R}$ and z is in the interior of I . The above observations imply that there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that conditions (1)-(2) of Lemma 6.3 are satisfied on the interval $[z - \varepsilon, z + \varepsilon]$ and, moreover, one of the conditions (I)-(V) listed below holds. If $I = [a_1, a_2]$ and $z = a_1$ then one of the conditions (VI)-(VIII) holds.

We will analyze the time evolution of $\mathcal{A}(v, b, t)$ and $\mathcal{A}(w, b, t)$ on a time interval $[0, \varepsilon]$. For an interval $[z - \varepsilon, z + \varepsilon]$ and $t \geq 0$ we will write $J_t = [z - \varepsilon + t, z + \varepsilon - t]$.

Step 2. We will describe the time evolution of $\mathcal{A}(v, b, t)$ and $\mathcal{A}(w, b, t)$ depending on the form of intersections of these sets with $[z - \varepsilon, z + \varepsilon]$. We will prove that our representation is correct in the next step.

(I) Suppose that one of the following conditions holds,

$$(7.15) \quad \mathcal{A}(v, b, 0) \cap [z - \varepsilon, z + \varepsilon] = [z, z + \varepsilon], \quad \mathcal{A}(w, b, 0) \cap [z - \varepsilon, z + \varepsilon] = [z - \varepsilon, z],$$

$$(7.16) \quad \mathcal{A}(v, b, 0) \cap [z - \varepsilon, z + \varepsilon] = [z, z + \varepsilon], \quad \mathcal{A}(w, b, 0) \cap [z - \varepsilon, z + \varepsilon] = \{z\},$$

$$(7.17) \quad \mathcal{A}(w, b, 0) \cap [z - \varepsilon, z + \varepsilon] = [z - \varepsilon, z], \quad \mathcal{A}(v, b, 0) \cap [z - \varepsilon, z + \varepsilon] = \{z\}.$$

Then for $t \in (0, \varepsilon]$,

$$(7.18) \quad \mathcal{A}(v, b, t) \cap J_t = (\mathcal{A}(v, b, 0) + t) \cap J_t,$$

$$(7.19) \quad \mathcal{A}(w, b, t) \cap J_t = (\mathcal{A}(w, b, 0) - t) \cap J_t.$$

(II) Suppose that one of the following conditions holds,

$$(7.20) \quad \mathcal{A}(v, b, 0) \cap [z - \varepsilon, z + \varepsilon] = \emptyset,$$

$$(7.21) \quad \mathcal{A}(w, b, 0) \cap [z - \varepsilon, z + \varepsilon] = [z, z + \varepsilon], \quad \mathcal{A}(v, b, 0) \cap [z - \varepsilon, z + \varepsilon] = \{z\},$$

$$(7.22) \quad \mathcal{A}(w, b, 0) \cap [z - \varepsilon, z + \varepsilon] = [z - \varepsilon, z + \varepsilon], \quad \mathcal{A}(v, b, 0) \cap [z - \varepsilon, z + \varepsilon] = \{z\}.$$

Then for $t \in (0, \varepsilon]$,

$$(7.23) \quad \mathcal{A}(v, b, t) \cap J_t = \emptyset,$$

$$(7.24) \quad \mathcal{A}(w, b, t) \cap J_t = (\mathcal{A}(w, b, 0) - t) \cap J_t.$$

(III) Suppose that one of the following conditions holds,

$$(7.25) \quad \mathcal{A}(w, b, 0) \cap [z - \varepsilon, z + \varepsilon] = \emptyset,$$

$$(7.26) \quad \mathcal{A}(v, b, 0) \cap [z - \varepsilon, z + \varepsilon] = [z - \varepsilon, z], \quad \mathcal{A}(w, b, 0) \cap [z - \varepsilon, z + \varepsilon] = \{z\},$$

$$(7.27) \quad \mathcal{A}(v, b, 0) \cap [z - \varepsilon, z + \varepsilon] = [z - \varepsilon, z + \varepsilon], \quad \mathcal{A}(w, b, 0) \cap [z - \varepsilon, z + \varepsilon] = \{z\}.$$

Then for $t \in (0, \varepsilon]$,

$$(7.28) \quad \mathcal{A}(v, b, t) \cap J_t = (\mathcal{A}(v, b, 0) + t) \cap J_t,$$

$$(7.29) \quad \mathcal{A}(w, b, t) \cap J_t = \emptyset.$$

(IV) Suppose that $\mathcal{A}(v, b, 0) \cap [z - \varepsilon, z + \varepsilon] = [z - \varepsilon, z]$ and $\mathcal{A}(w, b, 0) \cap [z - \varepsilon, z + \varepsilon] = [z, z + \varepsilon]$. Then for $t \in (0, \varepsilon]$,

$$(7.30) \quad \mathcal{A}(v, b, t) \cap J_t = [z - \varepsilon, z] \cap J_t,$$

$$(7.31) \quad \mathcal{A}(w, b, t) \cap J_t = [z, z + \varepsilon] \cap J_t.$$

(V) Suppose that $\mathcal{A}(v, b, 0) \cap [z - \varepsilon, z + \varepsilon] = \mathcal{A}(w, b, 0) \cap [z - \varepsilon, z + \varepsilon] = \{z\}$. Then for $t \in (0, \varepsilon]$,

$$(7.32) \quad \mathcal{A}(v, b, t) \cap J_t = \{z + t\} \cap J_t,$$

$$(7.33) \quad \mathcal{A}(w, b, t) \cap J_t = \{z - t\} \cap J_t.$$

Recall that cases (I)-(V) apply when either $I = \mathbb{R}$ or $I = [a_1, a_2]$. The discussion in (VI)-(VIII) below is concerned with $I = [a_1, a_2]$ and the case when $[z - \varepsilon, z + \varepsilon] \cap I = [z, z + \varepsilon] = [a_1, a_1 + \varepsilon]$. We have $a_1 \in \mathcal{A}(v, b, 0) \cap [a_1, a_1 + \varepsilon]$ or $a_1 \in \mathcal{A}(w, b, 0) \cap [a_1, a_1 + \varepsilon]$ because $v(a_1, 0) = w(a_1, 0)$. Let $K_t = [a_1, a_1 + \varepsilon - t]$. For a given $b \in \mathbb{R}$ there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that one of the following cases (IV)-(VI) holds.

(VI) Suppose that $\mathcal{A}(v, b, 0) \cap [a_1, a_1 + \varepsilon] = \mathcal{A}(w, b, 0) \cap [a_1, a_1 + \varepsilon] = \{a_1\}$. Then for $t \in (0, \varepsilon]$,

$$(7.34) \quad \mathcal{A}(v, b, t) \cap K_t = [a_1, a_1 + t] \cap K_t,$$

$$(7.35) \quad \mathcal{A}(w, b, t) \cap K_t = \emptyset.$$

(VII) Suppose that $\mathcal{A}(v, b, 0) \cap [a_1, a_1 + \varepsilon] = [a_1, a_1 + \varepsilon]$ and $\mathcal{A}(w, b, 0) \cap (a_1, a_1 + \varepsilon] = \emptyset$. Then for $t \in (0, \varepsilon]$,

$$(7.36) \quad \mathcal{A}(v, b, t) \cap K_t = K_t,$$

$$(7.37) \quad \mathcal{A}(w, b, t) \cap K_t = \emptyset.$$

(VIII) Suppose that $\mathcal{A}(v, b, 0) \cap (a_1, a_1 + \varepsilon] = \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{A}(w, b, 0) \cap [a_1, a_1 + \varepsilon] = [a_1, a_1 + \varepsilon]$. Then for $t \in (0, \varepsilon]$,

$$(7.38) \quad \mathcal{A}(v, b, t) \cap K_t = \emptyset,$$

$$(7.39) \quad \mathcal{A}(w, b, t) \cap K_t = K_t.$$

The case when $[z - \varepsilon, z + \varepsilon] \cap I = [a_2 - \varepsilon, a_2]$ is symmetric to $[z - \varepsilon, z + \varepsilon] \cap I = [a_1, a_1 + \varepsilon]$ so it will be omitted.

Step 3. Now we will prove (7.18)-(7.39). First we will verify that they hold in every triangle U of the type considered in Lemma 6.3. We will refer to cases listed in part (b) of the proof of Lemma 6.3. Note that the fact that we choose $\varepsilon > 0$ so small that one of conditions (I)-(VI) is satisfied adds extra assumptions to the cases in Lemma 6.3, greatly simplifying them.

In case (i), if the inequality between the infimum and supremum is strict then either (7.20) or (7.25) holds. Then it is clear that the definition of v and w in case (i) agrees with (7.23)-(7.24) or (7.28)-(7.29).

If the infimum is equal to the supremum in case (i) then this corresponds to case (V). Once again, it is easy to check that the definition of v and w in case (i) agrees with (7.32)-(7.33).

In cases (ii) (a) and (b), one of the conditions (7.15)-(7.17) is satisfied. The definition of v and w in cases (ii) (a) and (b) agrees with (7.18)-(7.19).

Case (ii) (c) corresponds to case (V). The definition of v and w in case (ii) (c) agrees with (7.32)-(7.33).

Case (iii) corresponds to (IV). The characteristics of v and w emanating from $(z, 0)$ are identical and have slope 0. Therefore, (7.30)-(7.31) are satisfied.

In case (iv), one of the conditions (7.20), (7.25), (7.26) or (7.27) is satisfied.

If (7.20) holds then all characteristics of w where w takes the value b have to be straight lines with slope -1 so (7.23)-(7.24) is true.

If one of the conditions (7.25), (7.26) or (7.27) is satisfied then the construction in part (iv) of the proof of Lemma 6.3 shows that all characteristics of v where v takes the value b have to be straight lines with slope 1 so (7.28)-(7.29) is true.

Case (v) is a symmetric version of (iv).

Case (vii) can occur simultaneously with any of the cases (VI)-(VIII).

Consider case (vii) combined with (VI). Characteristics of v with endpoints $(x, 0)$ with $x > a_1$ will carry values greater than b . Those with endpoints (a_1, t) with $t > 0$

will carry values less than b because (a_1, t) is the endpoint of a characteristic of w starting from a point $(y, 0)$ with $y > a_1$. This agrees with (7.34)-(7.35).

Consider case (vii) combined with (VII). In this case there will be no characteristics of w with values greater than or equal to b so all characteristics of v will carry values less than or equal to b . Hence, (7.36)-(7.37) will hold.

Consider case (vii) combined with (VIII). Characteristics of v with endpoints $(x, 0)$ with $x > a_1$ will carry values greater than b . Those with an endpoint (a_1, t) with $t > 0$ will carry values greater than b because (a_1, t) is the endpoint of a characteristic of w starting from a point $(y, 0)$ with $y > a_1$. This agrees with (7.38)-(7.39).

Case (viii) can occur simultaneously with cases (VII)-(VIII).

Consider case (viii) combined with (VII). In this case there will be no characteristics of w with values greater than or equal to b so all characteristics of v will carry values less than or equal to b . Hence, (7.36)-(7.37) will hold.

Consider case (viii) combined with (VIII). Characteristics of v with endpoints $(x, 0)$ with $x > a_1$ will carry values greater than b . Those with an endpoint (a_1, t) with $t > 0$ will carry values greater than b because (a_1, t) is the endpoint of a characteristic of w starting from a point $(y, 0)$ with $y > a_1$. This agrees with (7.38)-(7.39).

Cases (ix) and (x) are symmetric with (vii) and (viii).

Step 4. Next we will prove that (I)-(VIII) hold when $\mathcal{A}(v, b, t)$ and $\mathcal{A}(w, b, t)$ are replaced with $A(v, b, t)$ and $A(w, b, t)$.

It follows from (7.3)-(7.4), (7.7)-(7.8) and (7.11)-(7.12) that $\mathcal{A}(v, b, 0) = A(v, b, 0)$ and $\mathcal{A}(w, b, 0) = A(w, b, 0)$.

For a set $C \subset \mathbb{R}$, let $\text{Leb}(C)$ denote its Lebesgue measure. Formulas (7.1)-(7.4) can be interpreted as follows. For every point $x \in A(v, b, 0)$ we try to find a matching point $y = \alpha(v, b, x) \in A(w, b, 0)$ such that $\text{Leb}(A(v, b, 0) \cap [x, y]) = \text{Leb}(A(w, b, 0) \cap [x, y])$. If such a point y exists then $x = \alpha(w, b, y)$, except for a set of x and y of measure zero consisting of some endpoints of intervals comprising $A(v, b, 0)$ and $A(w, b, 0)$. Suppose that $x, y \in I$. We let x and y travel with speed 1 towards each other until they meet and annihilate each other. At time t , we include the transported x (i.e., $x+t$) into $A(v, b, t)$ and we include the transported y (i.e., $y-t$) into $A(w, b, t)$ —this is the meaning of (7.3)-(7.4). If $I = \mathbb{R}$ and there is no y corresponding to x then x keeps moving forever and $x+t$ is included in $A(v, b, t)$ for all $t \geq 0$. It is easy to check that this interpretation agrees the description of the evolution of $\mathcal{A}(v, b, t)$ and $\mathcal{A}(w, b, t)$ given in (I)-(V).

Now suppose that $I = [a_1, a_2]$.

In case (VI) definition (7.8) implies that $A(w, b, t) \cap K_t = \emptyset$ for $t > 0$ because $A(w, b, 0) \cap (a_1, a_1 + \varepsilon] = \emptyset$.

Definition (7.5) and the assumption that $A(w, b, 0) \cap (a_1, a_1 + \varepsilon] = \{a_1\}$ imply that $\alpha(v, b, x) \geq a_1 + \varepsilon$ for $x \in (a_1, a_1 + \varepsilon]$. This, the assumption that $A(v, b, 0) \cap (a_1, a_1 + \varepsilon] = \{a_1\}$ and definition (7.7) imply that $(x, t) \notin A(v, b, t)$ for $t \in (0, x - a_1]$ and $x \in K_t$. If $t > x - a_1$ then $x = y + t < a_1 + t$ for some $y < a_1$. According to (7.7), $(x, t) \in A(v, b, t)$ for $t > x - a_1$ and $x \in K_t$. Hence (7.34)-(7.35) are satisfied by $A(v, b, t)$ and $A(w, b, t)$ in place of $\mathcal{A}(v, b, t)$ and $\mathcal{A}(w, b, t)$.

In case (VII), definition (7.8) implies that $A(w, b, t) \cap K_t = \emptyset$ for $t > 0$ because $A(w, b, 0) \cap (a_1, a_1 + \varepsilon] = \emptyset$. Definition (7.5) and the assumption that $A(w, b, 0) \cap$

$(a_1, a_1 + \varepsilon] = \emptyset$ imply that $\alpha(v, b, x) \geq a_1 + \varepsilon$ for $x \in (a_1, a_1 + \varepsilon]$. This, definition (7.7) and the assumption that $A(v, b, 0) \cap [a_1, a_1 + \varepsilon] = [a_1, a_1 + \varepsilon]$ imply that for every $x \in K_t$, $(x, t) \in A(v, b, t)$, no matter whether $x - a_1 < t$ or not. Hence (7.36)-(7.37) are satisfied by $A(v, b, t)$ and $A(w, b, t)$ in place of $\mathcal{A}(v, b, t)$ and $\mathcal{A}(w, b, t)$.

In case (VIII), definition (7.6) and the assumption that $A(w, b, 0) \cap (a_1, a_1 + \varepsilon] = (a_1, a_1 + \varepsilon]$ imply that $\alpha(w, b, x) = a_1 - (x - a_1)$ for $x \in (a_1, a_1 + \varepsilon]$. This, the assumption that $A(w, b, 0) \cap (a_1, a_1 + \varepsilon] = (a_1, a_1 + \varepsilon]$ and definition (7.8) imply that $A(w, b, t) \cap K_t = K_t$ for $t > 0$. Definition (7.5) and the assumption that $A(v, b, 0) \cap (a_1, a_1 + \varepsilon] = \emptyset$ imply that $\alpha(v, b, x) = x$ for $x \in (a_1, a_1 + \varepsilon]$. This and definition (7.7) imply that $A(v, b, t) \cap K_t = \emptyset$ for $t > 0$. Hence (7.38)-(7.39) are satisfied by $A(v, b, t)$ and $A(w, b, t)$ in place of $\mathcal{A}(v, b, t)$ and $\mathcal{A}(w, b, t)$.

Step 5. Suppose that $I = \mathbb{R}$. For any $x_1 < y_1$, the function $b \rightarrow \text{Leb}\{z \in [x_1, y_1] : v(z, 0) \leq b\}$ is non-decreasing and $b \rightarrow \text{Leb}\{z \in [x_1, y_1] : w(z, 0) \geq b\}$ is non-increasing. Hence, definition (7.1) shows that $b \rightarrow \alpha(v, b, x)$ is non-decreasing.

We will argue that if $y \in (x, \alpha(v, b, x))$ then

$$(7.40) \quad (y, \alpha(v, b, y)) \subset (x, \alpha(v, b, x)),$$

$$(7.41) \quad (\alpha(v, b, x) - x)/2 \geq (\alpha(v, b, y) - y)/2.$$

By (7.1), there are $\delta_n \downarrow 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_x^{\alpha(v, b, x) + \delta_n} (\mathbf{1}_{\{v(z, 0) \leq b\}} - \mathbf{1}_{\{w(z, 0) \geq b\}}) dz &< 0, \\ \int_x^y (\mathbf{1}_{\{v(z, 0) \leq b\}} - \mathbf{1}_{\{w(z, 0) \geq b\}}) dz &\geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

so

$$\int_y^{\alpha(v, b, x) + \delta_n} (\mathbf{1}_{\{v(z, 0) \leq b\}} - \mathbf{1}_{\{w(z, 0) \geq b\}}) dz < 0.$$

This implies that $\alpha(v, b, y) \leq \alpha(v, b, x)$, proving (7.40) and, therefore, (7.41).

Fix some $x \in I$ and for $b \in \mathbb{R}$, $y \in I$, $y \geq x$, let

$$g_b(y) = \int_x^y (\mathbf{1}_{\{v(z, 0) \leq b\}} - \mathbf{1}_{\{w(z, 0) \geq b\}}) dz.$$

The graph Γ_b of g_b is a continuous polygonal line consisting a finite line segments on each finite interval because $v(x, 0)$ and $w(x, 0)$ have a finite number of local extrema on every finite interval. The slopes of line segments in Γ_b can be $-1, 1$ or 0 .

Let $y_1 = \alpha(v, b, x)$. It follows from (7.1) that $g_b(y) \geq 0$ for $y \in [x, y_1]$ and the slope of Γ_b is -1 on an interval $[y_1, y_2]$, with $y_2 > y_1$.

When b increases, intervals where g_b is increasing expand at both ends (except at x) and intervals where g_b is decreasing are shrinking at both ends, with both types of evolution being continuous due to strict monotonicity of $v(x, 0)$ and $w(x, 0)$ between the local extrema.

We will argue that if $b_1 > b$ then one of the following holds.

(a) For some $\delta_1 > 0$, all $\delta \in (0, \delta_1)$ and all $y \in (x + \delta, y_1)$, $g_{b_1}(y) \geq g_b(x + \delta)$.

(b) $g_{b_1}(y)$ is non-decreasing for $y \in [x, y_1]$.

Suppose that $g_b(y) > 0$ for some $y \in [x, y_1]$. Then there are $x \leq x_1 \leq x_2$ such that $g'_b(y) = 0$ for $y \in (x, x_1)$ and $g'_b(y) = 1$ for $y \in (x_1, x_2)$. Suppose that x_2 is the maximum x_2 with this property. Then there are $x \leq x_3 \leq x_1$ and $x_4 > x_2$ such that $g'_{b_1}(y) = 0$ for $y \in (x, x_3)$ and $g'_{b_1}(y) = 1$ for $y \in (x_3, x_4)$. Our earlier remarks imply that $g_{b_1}(y) \geq g_b(y) + (x_4 - x_2) \geq (x_4 - x_2)$ for $y \in (x_4, y_1]$. Since $g'_{b_1}(y) \leq 1$ for $y \in (x, x_4)$, we have for $\eta_2 = \min(x_4 - x, \eta_1)$, all $\delta \in (0, \eta_2)$ and $y \in (x + \delta, y_1]$,

$$g_{b_1}(x + \delta) \leq g_{b_1}(x) + \delta = \delta \leq x_4 - x_2 \leq g_{b_1}(y).$$

This proves (a).

If $g_b(y) = 0$ for all $y \in [x, y_1]$ then $g'_{b_1}(y) \geq 0$ for $y \in [x, y_1]$ in view of our earlier remarks on the evolution of $b \rightarrow g_b$. This proves (b).

If (a) or (b) holds then for some $\delta_1 > 0$ and all $\delta \in (0, \delta_1)$,

$$\alpha(v, b_1, x + \delta) = \inf\{y \geq x + \delta : g_{b_1}(y) < g_{b_1}(x + \delta)\} \geq y_1 = \alpha(v, b, x),$$

so

$$(7.42) \quad (\alpha(v, b_1, x + \delta) - (x + \delta))/2 \geq (\alpha(v, b, x) - x)/2 - \delta.$$

Remark 7.1 (iii) implies that the claims proved in this step for $I = \mathbb{R}$ hold also when $I = [a_1, a_2]$.

Step 6. We will argue that definitions (7.1)-(7.8) are consistent under time shifts in the following sense. Suppose that $t > s > 0$. If we take $\tilde{v}(x, 0) = v(x, s)$ and $\tilde{w}(x, 0) = w(x, s)$ for all $x \in I$, and define $\tilde{A}(v, b, t - s)$ and $\tilde{A}(w, b, t - s)$ as in (7.1)-(7.8) relative to $\tilde{v}(x, 0)$ and $\tilde{w}(x, 0)$ then $\tilde{A}(v, b, t - s) = A(v, b, t)$ and $\tilde{A}(w, b, t - s) = A(w, b, t)$.

Consider the case when $I = \mathbb{R}$. We recall the following interpretation from Step 4. In (7.1)-(7.2), for every point $x \in A(v, b, 0)$ we try to find a matching point $y = \alpha(v, b, x) \in A(w, b, 0)$ such that $\text{Leb}(A(v, b, 0) \cap [x, y]) = \text{Leb}(A(w, b, 0) \cap [x, y])$. If such a y exists then $x = \alpha(w, b, y)$, except for a set of x and y of measure zero—some endpoints of intervals comprising $A(v, b, 0)$ and $A(w, b, 0)$. We let x and y travel with speed 1 towards each other until they meet and annihilate each other. At a time t before the annihilation time we include the transported x (i.e., $x + t$) into $A(v, b, t)$ and we include the transported y (i.e., $y - t$) into $A(w, b, t)$ —this is the meaning of (7.3)-(7.4). If $I = \mathbb{R}$ and there is no y corresponding to x then x keeps moving forever and $x + t$ is included in $A(v, b, t)$ for all $t \geq 0$. The above representation of (7.1)-(7.4) makes it clear why these definitions are invariant under time shifts, as stated at the beginning of this step.

Remark 7.1 (iii) implies that the assertion made at the beginning of this step holds also when $I = [a_1, a_2]$.

Step 7. Lemma 6.4 (ii)-(iii) implies that the functions $v(x, t)$ and $w(x, t)$ are jointly continuous.

We will prove that the functions $v_*(x, t)$ and $w_*(x, t)$ are left continuous in t , i.e., if $x \in I$ and $t > 0$ then for any $\delta > 0$ there is $\zeta > 0$ such that $|v_*(x, t_1) - v_*(x, t)| \leq \delta$ if $t_1 \in (t - \zeta, t)$, and an analogous statement holds for w_* .

Suppose that $I = \mathbb{R}$.

Recall from Step 5 that $b \rightarrow A(v, b, t)$ is non-decreasing.

Suppose that $t > 0$ and $v_*(r, t) = b$. By (7.9), $r \in A(v, b_1, t)$ for $b_1 > b$ and $r \notin A(v, b_1, t)$ for $b_1 < b$. In view of (7.3), $v(r-t, 0) \leq b_1$ and $t \leq (\alpha(v, b_1, r-t) - r + t)/2$ for $b_1 > b$. Thus $v(r-t, 0) \leq b$.

Consider an arbitrarily small $\delta > 0$. Since $v(x, 0)$ is continuous, we can find $\eta > 0$ so small that $|v(r-t_1, 0) - v(r-t, 0)| < \delta$ if $t_1 \in (t-\eta, t)$. It follows from $v(r-t, 0) \leq b$ that $v(r-t_1, 0) \leq b + \delta$ for $t_1 \in (t-\eta, t)$.

Recall that $t \leq (\alpha(v, b_1, r-t) - r + t)/2$ for $b_1 > b$. Fix some $b_1 \in (b, b + \delta)$ and, using (7.42), find $b_2 \in (b_1, b + \delta)$ such that for some $\eta_1 \in (0, \eta)$ and $t_1 \in (t - \eta_1, t)$,

$$\begin{aligned} t &\leq (\alpha(v, b_1, r-t) - r + t)/2 \leq (\alpha(v, b_2, r-t_1) - r + t_1)/2 + (t - t_1), \\ t_1 &\leq (\alpha(v, b_2, r-t_1) - r + t_1)/2. \end{aligned}$$

This, the fact that $v(r-t_1, 0) \leq b + \delta$ and (7.3) imply that $r \in A(v, b_2, t_1)$ for some $b_2 \in (b, b + \delta)$ and $t_1 \in (t - \eta_1, t)$. Definition (7.9) implies that $v_*(r, t_1) \leq b + \delta$ for $t_1 \in (t - \eta_1, t)$.

If $v(r-t, 0) = b$ and $t_1 \in (t - \eta, t)$ then $v(r-t_1, 0) \geq b - \delta$ and, in view of (7.3), $r \notin A(v, b_1, t_1)$ for $b_1 \leq b - \delta$. Definition (7.9) implies that $v_*(r, t_1) \geq b - \delta$ for $t_1 \in (t - \eta, t)$.

Suppose that $v(r-t, 0) = b_2 < b$. Definition (7.9) implies that $r \in A(v, b_1, t)$ for $b_1 > b$ and $r \notin A(v, b_1, t)$ for $b_1 < b$. This, definition (7.3) and the assumption that $v(r-t, 0) = b_2 < b$ imply that $t > (\alpha(v, b_1, r-t) - r + t)/2$ when $b_1 \in (b_2, b)$. Fix any $b_1 \in (b_2, b)$ and find $\eta_2 > 0$ such that if $t_1 \in (t - \eta_2, t)$ then $t_1 > (\alpha(v, b_1, r-t) - r + t)/2$. Since $r - t_1 > r - t$, (7.41) shows that

$$t_1 > (\alpha(v, b_1, r-t) - r + t)/2 \geq (\alpha(v, b_1, r-t_1) - r + t_1)/2.$$

In view of (7.3), $r \notin A(v, b_1, t_1)$ for $t_1 \in (t - \eta_2, t)$. Definition (7.9) implies that $v_*(r, t_1) \geq b - \delta$ for $t_1 \in (t - \eta_2, t)$.

The above estimates show that for any $\delta > 0$ there is $\eta_3 > 0$ such that $|v_*(r, t_1) - v_*(r, t)| = |v_*(r, t_1) - b| \leq \delta$ if $t_1 \in (t - \eta_3, t)$.

The proof for w_* is analogous.

Suppose that $I = [a_1, a_2]$. If $r \in (a_1, a_2)$ and $t > 0$ then we can apply Step 6 and consider a triangle of the form (6.2), such that (r, t) is in the interior of the triangle. Then we can apply the argument presented earlier in this step, noting that $A(v, b, s)$ and $A(w, b, s)$ are defined in the interior of the triangle using the data at its base.

Suppose that $t > 0$ and $v_*(a_1, t) = b$. Then we should take $x = a_1 - t$ in (7.7). Since $x \leq a_1$, the only condition in (7.7) that matters is $t \leq (\alpha(v, b, x) - x)/2$. Recall that $a_1 \in A(v, b_1, t)$ for $b_1 > b$ and $a_1 \notin A(v, b_1, t)$ for $b_1 < b$ so $t \leq (\alpha(v, b, a_1 - t) - a_1 + t)/2$. Since $c \rightarrow \alpha(v, c, z)$ is increasing, $t \leq (\alpha(v, b_1, a_1 - t) - a_1 + t)/2$ for $b_1 > b$.

By (7.42), we can find $b_1 \in (b, b + \delta)$ and $b_2 \in (b_1, b + \delta)$ such that for some $\eta_4 \in (0, \eta)$ and all $t_1 \in (t - \eta_4, t)$,

$$\begin{aligned} t &\leq (\alpha(v, b_1, a_1 - t) - a_1 + t)/2 \leq (\alpha(v, b_2, a_1 - t_1) - a_1 + t_1)/2 + (t - t_1), \\ t_1 &\leq (\alpha(v, b_2, a_1 - t_1) - a_1 + t_1)/2. \end{aligned}$$

This and (7.3) imply that $a_1 \in A(v, b_2, t_1)$ for some $b_2 \in (b, b + \delta)$. Definition (7.9) implies that $v_*(a_1, t_1) \leq b + \delta$ for $t_1 \in (t - \eta_4, t)$.

For $b_1 < b$, $t > (\alpha(v, b_1, a_1 - t) - a_1 + t)/2$. Let $\eta_5 > 0$ be such that $t > (\alpha(v, b_1, a_1 - t) - a_1 + t)/2 + \eta_5$. Then, using (7.41), for $\eta_6 \in (0, \eta_5)$,

$$\begin{aligned} t - \eta_6 &> (\alpha(v, b_1, a_1 - t) - a_1 + t)/2 + \eta_5 - \eta_6 > (\alpha(v, b_1, a_1 - t) - a_1 + t)/2 \\ &\geq (\alpha(v, b_1, a_1 - t + \eta_6) - a_1 + t - \eta_6)/2. \end{aligned}$$

This and (7.7) show that $a_1 \notin A(v, b_1, t - \eta_6)$ for $\eta_6 \in (0, \eta_5)$. Definition (7.9) implies that for every $b_1 < b$ there is $\eta_5 > 0$ such that for all $t_1 \in (t - \eta_5, t)$ we have $v_*(a_1, t_1) \geq b_1$. We conclude that for any $\delta > 0$ there is $\eta_7 > 0$ such that $|v_*(a_1, t_1) - v_*(a_1, t)| = |v_*(a_1, t_1) - b| \leq \delta$ if $t_1 \in (t - \eta_7, t)$.

The proof in the case when $r = a_2$, and for w_* is analogous.

Step 8. Consider the case when $I = \mathbb{R}$. Recall the localization argument based on (6.14)-(6.15). It is easy to check that $A(v^b, b, t) \setminus [-4b, 4b] = \mathcal{A}(v^b, b, t) \setminus [-4b, 4b]$ and $A(w^b, b, t) \setminus [-4b, 4b] = \mathcal{A}(w^b, b, t) \setminus [-4b, 4b]$ for $t \in [0, b]$. The argument given at the end of the proof of Theorem 6.6 shows that it is enough to prove the theorem for an arbitrary fixed $b > 0$ and then we can let $b \rightarrow \infty$.

We fix an arbitrary $b > 0$ and drop the superscript b on v and w .

We have shown that for every $z \in \mathbb{R}$ there is $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for $t \in [0, \varepsilon/2)$,

$$\begin{aligned} A(v, b, t) \cap [z - \varepsilon/2, z + \varepsilon/2] &= \mathcal{A}(v, b, t) \cap [z - \varepsilon/2, z + \varepsilon/2], \\ A(w, b, t) \cap [z - \varepsilon/2, z + \varepsilon/2] &= \mathcal{A}(w, b, t) \cap [z - \varepsilon/2, z + \varepsilon/2]. \end{aligned}$$

By compactness, there exists $t_1 > 0$ such that $A(v, b, t) = \mathcal{A}(v, b, t)$ and $A(w, b, t) = \mathcal{A}(w, b, t)$ for $t \in [0, t_1]$. Let t_2 be the supremum of s such that $A(v, b, t) = \mathcal{A}(v, b, t)$ and $A(w, b, t) = \mathcal{A}(w, b, t)$ for $t \in [0, s]$.

Since $A(v, b, t) = \mathcal{A}(v, b, t)$ and $A(w, b, t) = \mathcal{A}(w, b, t)$ for $t \in [0, t_2)$, it follows that $v_*(x, t) = v(x, t)$ and $w_*(x, t) = w(x, t)$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $t \in [0, t_2)$. If $t_2 < \infty$ then, by Step 7, $v_*(x, t) = v(x, t)$ and $w_*(x, t) = w(x, t)$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $t \in [0, t_2]$. Let $\tilde{v}(x, 0) = v(x, t_2)$ and $\tilde{w}(x, 0) = w(x, t_2)$. By Step 6, there exists $t_3 > 0$ such that $A(\tilde{v}, b, t) = \mathcal{A}(\tilde{v}, b, t)$ and $A(\tilde{w}, b, t) = \mathcal{A}(\tilde{w}, b, t)$ for $t \in [0, t_3]$. This contradicts the definition of t_2 and the assumption that $t_2 < \infty$. We conclude that $A(v, b, t) = \mathcal{A}(v, b, t)$ and $A(w, b, t) = \mathcal{A}(w, b, t)$ for all $t \geq 0$.

The case when $I = [a_1, a_2]$ can be dealt with in a similar manner, without a need for localization. \square

If $B \subset \mathbb{R}$, $K \subset \mathbb{R} \times [0, \infty)$, $f_1, f_2 : B \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $g_1, g_2 : K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ then we let

$$\begin{aligned} \|(f_1, f_2)\|_B &= \sup_{x \in B} \max(|f_1(x)|, |f_2(x)|), \\ \|(g_1, g_2)\|_K &= \sup_{(x, t) \in K} \max(|g_1(x, t)|, |g_2(x, t)|). \end{aligned}$$

Let \mathcal{C}_1 be the space of pairs of functions $(v(\cdot, 0), w(\cdot, 0))$ mapping I^2 to \mathbb{R}^2 , equipped with the norm $\|\cdot\|_I$ and such that $v(x, 0)$ and $w(x, 0)$ are continuous on I and $v(x, 0) \geq w(x, 0)$ for all $x \in I$. If $I = [a_1, a_2]$ then we also assume that $v(a_1, 0) = w(a_1, 0)$ and $v(a_2, 0) = w(a_2, 0)$.

Let $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathcal{C}_1$ be the space of pairs of functions in addition satisfying Assumption 6.1.

Let \mathcal{C}_2 be the space of pairs of jointly continuous functions $(v(\cdot, \cdot), w(\cdot, \cdot))$ mapping $(I \times [0, \infty))^2$ to \mathbb{R}^2 , equipped with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{I \times [0, \infty)}$.

The norms $\|\cdot\|_I$ and $\|\cdot\|_{I \times [0, \infty)}$ define metrics d_1 and d_2 in \mathcal{C}_1 and \mathcal{C}_2 . A functional $\mathcal{T} : \mathcal{C}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_2$ will be called 1-Lipschitz if for all $(f_1, f_2), (f'_1, f'_2) \in \mathcal{C}_1$,

$$d_2(\mathcal{T}(f_1, f_2), \mathcal{T}(f'_1, f'_2)) \leq d_1((f_1, f_2), (f'_1, f'_2)).$$

Note that \mathcal{C}_2 is complete in the metric d_2 .

Theorem 7.3. (i) If $I = [a_1, a_2]$ then \mathcal{X} is dense in \mathcal{C}_1 . The mapping $\mathcal{T} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_2$ taking the initial conditions $(v(\cdot, 0), w(\cdot, 0)) \in \mathcal{X}$ to the solution of (2.9)-(2.13) defined in Theorem 6.6 can be extended to a 1-Lipschitz functional $\mathcal{T} : \mathcal{C}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_2$.

(ii) If $I = \mathbb{R}$ then the mapping $\mathcal{T} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_2$ taking the initial conditions to the solutions to (2.9)-(2.13) defined in Theorem 6.6 can be extended to a functional $\mathcal{T} : \mathcal{C}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_2$. For every $a > 0$, the functional \mathcal{T} is 1-Lipschitz relative to the norms $\|\cdot\|_{[-2a, 2a]}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{[-a, a] \times [0, a]}$.

(iii) In both cases, elements of $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{C}_1)$ are solutions to (2.9)-(2.13).

Proof. Comparing (7.11)-(7.14) and (7.1)-(7.10), we see that (7.1)-(7.10) define a functional $\mathcal{T} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_2$ mapping $(v(\cdot, 0), w(\cdot, 0))$ to solutions $(v(\cdot, \cdot), w(\cdot, \cdot)) \in \mathcal{C}_2$ to (2.9)-(2.13).

(i) Suppose that $I = [a_1, a_2]$. Consider $(v(\cdot, 0), w(\cdot, 0)), (v_1(\cdot, 0), w_1(\cdot, 0)) \in \mathcal{C}_1$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Assume that $|v_1(x, 0) - v(x, 0)| \leq \varepsilon$ and $|w_1(x, 0) - w(x, 0)| \leq \varepsilon$ for all $x \in I$. Consider any $x \in I$, $t \geq 0$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}$. Suppose that $x \in A(v, b, t)$. Then, using (7.7),

$$(7.43) \quad v_1(x - t, 0) \leq v(x - t, 0) + \varepsilon \leq b + \varepsilon \quad \text{or} \quad x - t \leq a_1.$$

We have

$$\mathbf{1}_{\{z \in I, v_1(z, 0) \leq b + \varepsilon\}} \geq \mathbf{1}_{\{z \in I, v(z, 0) \leq b\}}, \quad \mathbf{1}_{\{z \in I, w_1(z, 0) \geq b + \varepsilon\}} \leq \mathbf{1}_{\{z \in I, w(z, 0) \geq b\}},$$

so

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{x-t}^y \left(\mathbf{1}_{\{z \in I, v_1(z, 0) \leq b + \varepsilon\}} + \mathbf{1}_{\{z \leq a_1\}} - \mathbf{1}_{\{z \in I, w_1(z, 0) \geq b + \varepsilon\}} - \mathbf{1}_{\{z \geq a_2\}} \right) dz \\ & \geq \int_{x-t}^y \left(\mathbf{1}_{\{z \in I, v(z, 0) \leq b\}} + \mathbf{1}_{\{z \leq a_1\}} - \mathbf{1}_{\{z \in I, w(z, 0) \geq b\}} - \mathbf{1}_{\{z \geq a_2\}} \right) dz, \end{aligned}$$

and, using (7.5),

$$\begin{aligned} & \alpha(v_1, b + \varepsilon, x - t) \\ & = \inf \left\{ y \geq x - t : \int_{x-t}^y \left(\mathbf{1}_{\{z \in I, v_1(z, 0) \leq b + \varepsilon\}} + \mathbf{1}_{\{z \leq a_1\}} \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. - \mathbf{1}_{\{z \in I, w_1(z, 0) \geq b + \varepsilon\}} - \mathbf{1}_{\{z \geq a_2\}} \right) dz < 0 \right\} \\ & \geq \inf \left\{ y \geq x - t : \int_{x-t}^y \left(\mathbf{1}_{\{z \in I, v(z, 0) \leq b\}} + \mathbf{1}_{\{z \leq a_1\}} - \mathbf{1}_{\{z \in I, w(z, 0) \geq b\}} - \mathbf{1}_{\{z \geq a_2\}} \right) dz < 0 \right\} \\ & = \alpha(v, b, x - t). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, if $t \leq (\alpha(v, b, x-t) - (x-t))/2$ then $t \leq (\alpha(v_1, b+\varepsilon, x-t) - (x-t))/2$. This, (7.7) and (7.43) imply that $x \in A(v_1, b+\varepsilon, t)$. Hence, in view of (7.9), $v_1(x, t) \leq v(x, t) + \varepsilon$. By symmetry, $|v_1(x, t) - v(x, t)| \leq \varepsilon$. A similar bound for w can be derived in an analogous way. We have proved that that if $|v_1(x, 0) - v(x, 0)| \leq \varepsilon$ and $|w_1(x, 0) - w(x, 0)| \leq \varepsilon$ for all $x \in I$ then $|v_1(x, t) - v(x, t)| \leq \varepsilon$ and $|w_1(x, t) - w(x, t)| \leq \varepsilon$ for all $x \in I$ and $t \geq 0$. In other words, the functional $\mathcal{J} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_2$ is 1-Lipschitz.

Since polynomials are dense in the set of continuous functions, the set \mathcal{X} is dense in \mathcal{C}_1 when $I = [a_1, a_2]$. Thus we can extend the functional to $\mathcal{J} : \mathcal{C}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_2$ while preserving its 1-Lipschitz property.

We will now prove part (iii) of the theorem in the case discussed so far, i.e. when $I = [a_1, a_2]$. If $(v(x, t), w(x, t)) \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{C}_1)$ then there is a sequence $(v_k(x, 0), w_k(x, 0)) \in \mathcal{X}$ converging to $(v(x, 0), w(x, 0))$ in $\|\cdot\|_I$ norm. Then $(v_k(x, t), w_k(x, t)) \rightarrow (v(x, t), w(x, t))$ in $\|\cdot\|_{I \times [0, \infty)}$ norm.

Suppose that $v(x, t) > w(x, t)$ for some $(x, t) \in I \times [0, \infty)$. By continuity, the inequality holds in a neighborhood of (x, t) , so $v(y, s) > w(y, s) + \varepsilon$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$ and a neighborhood F of (x, t) . Then for some k_1 , $v_k(y, s) > w_k(y, s) + \varepsilon/2$ for $k > k_1$ and $(y, s) \in F$. Since v_k 's and w_k 's are solutions to (2.9)-(2.13), all characteristics of v_k have slope 1 and all characteristics of w_k have slope -1 in F for $k > k_1$. It follows that all characteristics of v have slope 1 and all characteristics of w have slope -1 in F . In other words, $(v(x, t), w(x, t))$ is a solution to (2.9)-(2.13) in F .

Next suppose that $v(x, t) = w(x, t)$ for

$$(x, t) \in U := \{(y, s) : s > s_1, x_1 + (s - s_1) < y < x_2 - (s - s_1)\}.$$

Without loss of generality, suppose that $s_1 = 0$ and $U = \{(y, s) : s > 0, x_1 + s < y < x_2 - s\}$. We will consider two cases.

First, suppose that $x \rightarrow v(x, 0) = w(x, 0)$ is non-decreasing on $[x_1, x_2]$. We can find strictly increasing $v_k(x, 0) = w_k(x, 0)$ satisfying Assumption 6.1 and converging uniformly to $v(x, 0) = w(x, 0)$ on $[x_1, x_2]$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. The characteristics of v_k and w_k have slope 0 inside U . Since $v(x, t)$ and $w(x, t)$ are uniform limits of $v_k(x, t)$ and $w_k(x, t)$ in U , the functions $t \rightarrow v(x, t)$ and $t \rightarrow w(x, t)$ must be constant for $x \in [x_1, x_2]$, as long as $(x, t) \in U$. We see that in this case, $v(x, t)$ and $w(x, t)$ are solution to (2.9)-(2.13) in U .

If it is not true that $x \rightarrow v(x, 0) = w(x, 0)$ is non-decreasing on $[x_1, x_2]$ then for some $x_3, x_4 \in (x_1, x_2)$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, $x_3 < x_4$, $v(x_3, 0) > v(x_4, 0) + \varepsilon$ and $v(x_3, 0) > v(x, 0) > v(x_4, 0)$ for all $x_3 < x < x_4$. Let $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ be such that $w(x, 0) < v(x_3, 0) - \varepsilon_1$ for $x \in [x_3 + (x_4 - x_3)/4, x_4]$. For $k \geq 1$, we can find $v_k(x, 0)$ and $w_k(x, 0)$ satisfying Assumption 6.1 and such that $|v_k(x, 0) - v(x, 0)| < 1/k$ and $|w_k(x, 0) - w(x, 0)| < 1/k$ for $x_3 \leq x \leq x_4$, $v_k(x_3, 0) > v(x_3, 0) + 1/(2k)$, $w_k(x, 0) < w(x_3, 0) = v(x_3, 0)$ for $x_3 \leq x \leq x_4$ and $w_k(x, 0) < v(x_3, 0) - \varepsilon_1$ for $x \in [x_3 + (x_4 - x_3)/4, x_4]$. The characteristic of v_k emanating from $(x_3, 0)$ will have slope 1, i.e. $v_k(x_3 + t, t) = v(x_3, 0)$ for $t \in [0, (x_4 - x_3)/2]$. We have $w_k(x_3 + t, t) \leq v(x_3, 0) - \varepsilon_1$ for $t \in [(x_4 - x_3)/4, (x_4 - x_3)/2]$ because the value of $w_k(x_3 + t, t)$ with t in the specified range is the value carried by a characteristic of w_k emanating from a point $(x, 0)$ with $x \in [x_3 + (x_4 - x_3)/4, x_4]$. Since ε_1 does not depend on k , passing to the limit yields $w(x_3 + t, t) \leq v(x_3, 0) - \varepsilon_1 < v(x_3, 0) = v_k(x_3 + t, t)$ for $t \in [(x_4 - x_3)/4, (x_4 - x_3)/2]$. This contradicts the assumption that $v(x, t) = w(x, t)$

for $(x, t) \in U$ and thus completes the proof that $v(x, t)$ and $w(x, t)$ are solutions to (2.9)-(2.13) in U .

(ii) Suppose that $I = \mathbb{R}$ and $a > 0$. Consider $(v(\cdot, 0), w(\cdot, 0)), (v_1(\cdot, 0), w_1(\cdot, 0)) \in \mathcal{C}_1$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Assume that $|v_1(x, 0) - v(x, 0)| \leq \varepsilon$ and $|w_1(x, 0) - w(x, 0)| \leq \varepsilon$ for all $x \in [-2a, 2a]$. Consider any $x \in [-2a, 2a]$, $t \in [0, a]$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}$. Suppose that $x \in A(v, b, t)$. Then, using (7.3),

$$(7.44) \quad v_1(x - t, 0) \leq v(x - t, 0) + \varepsilon \leq b + \varepsilon.$$

We have

$$\mathbf{1}_{\{z \in I, v_1(z, 0) \leq b + \varepsilon\}} \geq \mathbf{1}_{\{z \in I, v(z, 0) \leq b\}}, \quad \mathbf{1}_{\{z \in I, w_1(z, 0) \geq b + \varepsilon\}} \leq \mathbf{1}_{\{z \in I, w(z, 0) \geq b\}},$$

so

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{x-t}^y (\mathbf{1}_{\{z \in I, v_1(z, 0) \leq b + \varepsilon\}} - \mathbf{1}_{\{z \in I, w_1(z, 0) \geq b + \varepsilon\}}) dz \\ & \geq \int_{x-t}^y (\mathbf{1}_{\{z \in I, v(z, 0) \leq b\}} - \mathbf{1}_{\{z \in I, w(z, 0) \geq b\}}) dz, \end{aligned}$$

and, using (7.1),

$$\begin{aligned} & \alpha(v_1, b + \varepsilon, x - t) \\ & = \inf \left\{ y \geq x - t : \int_{x-t}^y (\mathbf{1}_{\{z \in I, v_1(z, 0) \leq b + \varepsilon\}} - \mathbf{1}_{\{z \in I, w_1(z, 0) \geq b + \varepsilon\}}) dz < 0 \right\} \\ & \geq \inf \left\{ y \geq x - t : \int_{x-t}^y (\mathbf{1}_{\{z \in I, v(z, 0) \leq b\}} - \mathbf{1}_{\{z \in I, w(z, 0) \geq b\}}) dz < 0 \right\} \\ & = \alpha(v, b, x - t). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, if $t \leq (\alpha(v, b, x - t) - (x - t))/2$ then $t \leq (\alpha(v_1, b + \varepsilon, x - t) - (x - t))/2$. This, (7.3) and (7.44) imply that $x \in A(v_1, b + \varepsilon, t)$. Hence, in view of (7.9), $v_1(x, t) \leq v(x, t) + \varepsilon$. By symmetry, $|v_1(x, t) - v(x, t)| \leq \varepsilon$. A similar bound for w can be derived in an analogous way. We have proved that that if $|v_1(x, 0) - v(x, 0)| \leq \varepsilon$ and $|w_1(x, 0) - w(x, 0)| \leq \varepsilon$ for all $x \in [-2a, 2a]$ then $|v_1(x, t) - v(x, t)| \leq \varepsilon$ and $|w_1(x, t) - w(x, t)| \leq \varepsilon$ for all $x \in [-a, a]$ and $t \in [0, a]$. In other words, the functional $\mathcal{T} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_2$ is 1-Lipschitz relative to the norms $\|\cdot\|_{[-2a, 2a]}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{[-a, a] \times [0, a]}$.

Since polynomials are dense in the set of continuous functions on any finite interval, the set \mathcal{X} is dense in \mathcal{C}_1 in the norm $\|\cdot\|_{[-2a, 2a]}$. Thus we can extend the functional \mathcal{T} to $\mathcal{T} : \mathcal{C}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_2$ in such a way that is 1-Lipschitz relative to the norms $\|\cdot\|_{[-2a, 2a]}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{[-a, a] \times [0, a]}$ for every $a > 0$.

The proof of (iii) when $I = \mathbb{R}$ is completely analogous to that in case when $I = [a_1, a_2]$ so it is omitted. \square

8. UNIQUENESS OF SOLUTIONS

Proof of Theorem 2.6. It will suffice to show that if v and w are solutions to (2.9)-(2.13) in $U := \{(x, t) : t \geq 0, x \in (z - \varepsilon + t, z + \varepsilon - t) \cap I\}$ and characteristics are subsonic then the solutions are unique. It will be enough to prove this in every case considered in the proof of Lemma 6.3. We will limit the present proof to the most complicated

cases (iv), (vii) and (viii). Recall Definition 2.5 and the definitions and properties of a freezing curve \mathcal{F} and a thawing curve \mathcal{T} given in Lemma 6.2.

(a) Recall case (iv) in the proof of Lemma 6.3. It is assumed that $v(z, 0) = w(z, 0)$, the functions $x \rightarrow v(x, 0)$ and $x \rightarrow w(x, 0)$ are strictly increasing on $[z - \varepsilon, z]$ and $x \rightarrow w(x, 0)$ is strictly decreasing on $[z, z + \varepsilon]$.

Let

$$\widehat{U} = \{(x, t) : t \geq 0, x \in (z - \varepsilon + t, z - t)\}.$$

Since $x \rightarrow v(x, 0)$ and $x \rightarrow w(x, 0)$ are strictly increasing on $[z - \varepsilon, z]$, the set \mathcal{F} in \widehat{U} is non-empty. The point $(z, 0)$ is in \mathcal{F} because $v(z, 0) = w(z, 0)$. Consider any (x_1, t_1) below \mathcal{F} in the sense that there exists $(x_1, t_2) \in \mathcal{F}$ with $0 \leq t_1 < t_2$. Let $b = v(x_1 - t_2, 0) = w(x_1 + t_2, 0)$. Then $v(y, 0) > b$ for all $y \in [x_1 - t_2, z]$. A subsonic characteristic from (x_1, t_1) must have an endpoint at $(y, 0)$ for some $y \in [x_1 - t_1, x_1]$. Hence, $v(x_1, t_1) > b$. A similar argument shows that $w(x_1, t_1) < b$. It follows that $v(x_1, t_1) > w(x_1, t_1)$ for all (x_1, t_1) below \mathcal{F} . Therefore, all characteristics of v in this region have slope 1 and all characteristics of w have slope -1 .

For any $(x_4, t_4), (x_5, t_5) \in \mathcal{F}$ with $x_4 < x_5$, the above discussion shows that we have $v(x_4, t_4) = w(x_4, t_4)$, $v(x_5, t_5) = w(x_5, t_5)$, $v(x_4, t_4) < v(x_5, t_5)$, and $w(x_4, t_4) < w(x_5, t_5)$.

Next consider $(x_1, t_1) \in \widehat{U}^+$, i.e. in \widehat{U} but above the freezing line. Let t_0 be such that $(x_1, t_0) \in \mathcal{F}$. A subsonic characteristic of v from (x_1, t_1) crosses \mathcal{F} at a point (x_6, t_6) with $x_6 \leq x_1$ so $v(x_1, t_1) = v(x_6, t_6) \leq v(x_1, t_0)$. A subsonic characteristic of w from (x_1, t_1) crosses \mathcal{F} at a point (x_7, t_7) with $x_7 \geq x_1$ so $w(x_1, t_1) = w(x_7, t_7) \geq w(x_1, t_0) = v(x_1, t_0)$. Hence, $v(x_1, t_1) \leq w(x_1, t_1)$. This is possible only if $v(x_1, t_1) = w(x_1, t_1)$. We conclude that all characteristics of v and w in \widehat{U}^+ have slope 0.

We will now consider points in U_r . Recall that $(z, 0) \in \mathcal{T}$. First suppose that $(x_1, t_1) \in U_r^-$. In other words, (x_1, t_1) lies below \mathcal{T} , i.e., there exists $s_1 \geq t_1$ such that $(x_1, s_1) \in \mathcal{T}$. Then $x_1 \leq z$ and $v(x_1, z - x_1) = w(x_1 + s_1, 0)$. The function $x \rightarrow v(x, z - x)$ is increasing for $x \in [z - \varepsilon, z]$ and the function $x \rightarrow w(x, 0)$ is decreasing for $x \in [z, z + \varepsilon]$. A subsonic characteristic of v from (x_1, t_1) passes through a point $(y_1, z - y_1)$ with $y_1 \leq x_1$ so $v(x_1, t_1) = v(y_1, z - y_1) \leq v(x_1, z - x_1)$. A subsonic characteristic of w from (x_1, t_1) can pass through a point $(y_2, z - y_2)$ with $x_1 \leq y_2 \leq z$ or through point $(y_3, 0)$ with $z \leq y_3 \leq x_1 + t_1$. In the first case $w(x_1, t_1) = w(y_2, z - y_2) \geq w(x_1, z - x_1) = v(x_1, z - x_1)$. In the second case $w(x_1, t_1) = w(y_3, 0) \geq w(x_1 + t_1, 0) \geq w(x_1 + s_1, 0) = v(x_1, z - x_1)$. Hence, $v(x_1, t_1) \leq w(x_1, t_1)$. This is possible only if $v(x_1, t_1) = w(x_1, t_1)$. We conclude that all characteristics of v and w must have slope 0 in U_r^- .

We will argue that the whole interior of the region U_r^+ is a liquid zone.

All characteristics of v in the triangle $\widetilde{U} := \{(x, t) : t > 0, z + t < x < z + \varepsilon - t\}$ have slope 1 and all characteristics of w have slope -1 by (2.13).

Suppose that $(x_1, t_1) \in U_r^+ \setminus \widetilde{U}$. In view of (6.7), $z < x_1 + t_1 < z + \varepsilon$. Let $z_1 = \inf\{x \in [z - \varepsilon, x_1 + t_1] : v(x, x_1 + t_1 - x) > w(x, x_1 + t_1 - x)\}$. Note that the set in the definition of z_1 is non-empty because the condition is satisfied for all $(x, x_1 + t_1 - x) \in \widetilde{U}$; for example, it is satisfied for x very close to $x_1 + t_1$. Hence, $z_1 < x_1 + t_1$.

If $(z_1, x_1 + t_1 - z_1) \in \mathcal{T}$ for every $(x_1, t_1) \in U_r^+ \setminus \tilde{U}$ then the whole interior of the region U_r^+ is a liquid zone.

Suppose that for some $(x_1, t_1) \in U_r^+ \setminus \tilde{U}$, $(z_1, x_1 + t_1 - z_1) \notin \mathcal{T}$. Then, by continuity,

$$(8.1) \quad v(z_1, x_1 + t_1 - z_1) = w(z_1, x_1 + t_1 - z_1) = w(x_1 + t_1, 0).$$

The second equality holds because $v > w$ in a neighborhood of the open line segment connecting $(z_1, x_1 + t_1 - z_1)$ and $(x_1 + t_1, 0)$ according to the definition of z_1 , and, therefore, the characteristic of w must have slope -1 in this neighborhood.

The halfline starting at $w(x_1 + t_1, 0)$ and passing through $(z_1, x_1 + t_1 - z_1)$ may cross \mathcal{T} or not, resulting in (a) or (b) below.

(a) $(z_2, x_1 + t_1 - z_2) \in \mathcal{T}$ for some $z_2 < z_1$.

(b) $v(z_3, z - z_3) > w(x_1 + t_1, 0) = w(z_3 + (x_1 + t_1 - z_3), 0)$ for all z_3 such that $(z_3, s_2) \in \mathcal{T}$ for some $s_2 \geq 0$.

In case (a), a subsonic characteristic of v from $(z_1, x_1 + t_1 - z_1)$ may intersect \mathcal{T} at (y_4, s_3) with $y_4 > z_2$. Then, in view of (8.1),

$$\begin{aligned} v(z_1, x_1 + t_1 - z_1) &= v(y_4, s_3) > v(z_2, x_1 + t_1 - z_2) \\ &= w(z_2 + (x_1 + t_1 - z_2), 0) = w(x_1 + t_1, 0) = v(z_1, x_1 + t_1 - z_1), \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction.

Another possibility is that a subsonic characteristic of v from $(z_1, x_1 + t_1 - z_1)$ has an endpoint $(z_3, 0)$ with $z_3 \in [z, z_1]$. Recall that $z_1 < x_1 + t_1$ and use (8.1) to see that $v(z_1, x_1 + t_1 - z_1) = v(z_3, 0) \geq w(z_3, 0) > w(x_1 + t_1, 0) = v(z_1, x_1 + t_1 - z_1)$, once again a contradiction.

In case (b), a subsonic characteristic of v from $(z_1, x_1 + t_1 - z_1)$ may intersect \mathcal{T} at (y_5, s_4) . We use the condition in (b) to choose $z_4 < y_5$ such that $v(z_4, z - z_4) > w(z_4 + (x_1 + t_1 - z_4), 0)$ and $(z_4, s_5) \in \mathcal{T}$ for some $s_5 \geq 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} v(z_1, x_1 + t_1 - z_1) &= v(y_5, s_4) > v(z_4, s_5) = v(z_4, z - z_4) \\ &> w(z_4 + (x_1 + t_1 - z_4), 0) = w(x_1 + t_1, 0) = v(z_1, x_1 + t_1 - z_1), \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction.

It may also happen that a subsonic characteristic of v from $(z_1, x_1 + t_1 - z_1)$ has an endpoint $(z_5, 0)$ with $z_5 \in [z, z_1]$. This leads to a contradiction, just like in case (a).

We have completed the proof that the whole interior of the region U_r^+ is a liquid zone. Therefore, all characteristics of v in U_r^+ have slope 1 and all characteristics of w have slope -1 .

(b) Recall case (vii) in the proof of Lemma 6.3. Let $U = \{(x, t) : t \geq 0, a_1 < x < a_1 + \varepsilon - t\}$. We assume that $I = [a_1, a_2]$, $z = a_1$, $v(a_1, t) = w(a_1, t)$ for $t \in [0, \varepsilon]$, and the function $x \rightarrow w(x, 0)$ is strictly decreasing on $[a_1, a_1 + \varepsilon]$. By (2.13) (ii), the triangle $U_1 := \{(x, t) : t \geq 0, a_1 + t < x < a_1 + \varepsilon - t\}$ is a liquid zone.

We will argue that the interior of U is a liquid zone. Suppose otherwise. Let $(x_1, t_1) \in U \setminus U_1$ be such that $v(x_1, t_1) = w(x_1, t_1)$ and $x_1 > a_1$. Let x_2 be the infimum of $y \in [x_1, a_1 + \varepsilon]$ such that $v(y, x_1 + t_1 - y) > w(y, x_1 + t_1 - y)$. Then $v(x_2, x_1 + t_1 - x_2) = w(x_2, x_1 + t_1 - x_2)$.

A subsonic characteristic of v from $(x_2, x_1 + t_1 - x_2)$ may cross the boundary of U_1 at a point $(a_1 + t_2, t_2)$ with $a_1 + t_2 \leq x_2$. Then $v(x_2, x_1 + t_1 - x_2) = v(a_1 + t_2, t_2) = v(a_1, 0) = w(a_1, 0)$. A subsonic characteristic of w from $(x_2, x_1 + t_1 - x_2)$ must cross the boundary of U_1 at a point $(a_1 + t_3, t_3)$ with $a_1 + t_3 \geq x_2 \geq x_1 > a_1$. Then $w(x_2, x_1 + t_1 - x_2) = w(a_1 + t_3, t_3) = w(a_1 + 2t_3, 0) < w(a_1, 0)$. Hence, $v(x_2, x_1 + t_1 - x_2) > w(x_2, x_1 + t_1 - x_2)$, a contradiction.

If a subsonic characteristic of v from $(x_2, x_1 + t_1 - x_2)$ does not cross the boundary of U_1 then it must end at (a_1, t_4) for some $t_4 \in [0, x_1 + t_1 - x_2)$. Then $w(x_1 + t_1, 0) = w(x_2, x_1 + t_1 - x_2) = v(x_2, x_1 + t_1 - x_2) = v(a_1, t_4) = w(a_1, t_4)$. A subsonic characteristic of w from (a_1, t_4) must have an end at $(x_3, 0)$ with $x_3 \in [a_1, a_1 + t_4]$. Thus $w(a_1, t_4) = w(x_3, 0) \geq w(a_1 + t_4, 0) > w(a_1 + x_1 + t_1 - x_2, 0)$ and, therefore, $w(x_1 + t_1, 0) > w(a_1 + x_1 + t_1 - x_2, 0)$. This is impossible because $x \rightarrow w(x, 0)$ is decreasing and $a_1 - x_2 < 0$.

We proved that the whole interior of U is a liquid zone. All characteristics of v in U have slope 1 and all characteristics of w have slope -1 .

(c) We will analyze case (viii) in the proof of Lemma 6.3. Let $U = \{(x, t) : t \geq 0, a_1 < x < a_1 + \varepsilon - t\}$. We assume that $I = [a_1, a_2]$, $z = a_1$, $v(a_1, t) = w(a_1, t)$ for $t \in [0, \varepsilon]$, and the functions $x \rightarrow v(x, 0)$ and $x \rightarrow w(x, 0)$ are strictly increasing on $[a_1, a_1 + \varepsilon]$.

If the definition of \widehat{U} in (6.2) is replaced with

$$\widehat{U} = \{(x, t) : t \geq 0, x \in (a_1, a_1 + \varepsilon - t)\},$$

then the rest of the statement of Lemma 6.2 (i) and its proof remain valid. Hence, we have a well defined freezing curve \mathcal{F} and it follows from our current assumptions that \mathcal{F} is non-empty, it cuts U into two connected sets \widehat{U}^- and \widehat{U}^+ , and the left endpoint of \mathcal{F} is $(a_1, 0)$.

Let $\widehat{U}^* = \{(x, t) \in \widehat{U}^+ : t \geq 0, a_1 + t < x < a_1 + \varepsilon - t\}$. The set \widehat{U}^* is a frozen zone and \widehat{U}^- is a liquid zone by the same argument that was applied in part (a) of this proof to show that \widehat{U}^+ was frozen.

It remains to analyze $\widehat{U}^+ \setminus \widehat{U}^*$. We will show that it is frozen. Suppose otherwise. Then there is $(x_1, t_1) \in \widehat{U}^+ \setminus \widehat{U}^*$ such that $v(x_1, t_1) > w(x_1, t_1)$ and $x_1 > a_1$. Let t_2 be the infimum of t such that for some $x \geq x_1$, $(x, t) \in \widehat{U}^+ \setminus \widehat{U}^*$ and $v(x, t) > w(x, t)$. Let $(x_2, t_3) \in \widehat{U}^+ \setminus \widehat{U}^*$ be such that $v(x_2, t_3) > w(x_2, t_3)$, $x_2 \geq x_1$ and $t_3 - t_2 < x_1 - a_1$. Let t_4 be such that $(x_2, t_4) \in \mathcal{F}$ and note that the line segment J connecting (x_2, t_4) and (x_2, t_2) is in the frozen zone so $v(x, t) = w(x, t) = v(x_2, t_4) = w(x_2, t_4)$ for all $(x, t) \in J$.

A subsonic characteristic of w from (x_2, t_3) crosses \mathcal{F} at a point (x_3, t_5) with $x_3 \geq x_2$. Hence

$$(8.2) \quad v(x_2, t_3) > w(x_2, t_3) = w(x_3, t_5) \geq w(x_2, t_4).$$

If a subsonic characteristic of v from (x_2, t_3) crosses \mathcal{F} then it crosses it at a point (x_4, t_6) with $x_4 \leq x_2$. Then $v(x_2, t_3) = v(x_4, t_6) \leq v(x_2, t_4) = w(x_2, t_4)$, contradicting (8.2).

If a subsonic characteristic of v from (x_2, t_3) does not cross \mathcal{F} then it has an endpoint (a_1, t_7) with $t_7 \leq t_3 - (x_2 - a_1) \leq t_2$. Then $v(x_2, t_3) = v(a_1, t_7) = w(a_1, t_7)$.

A characteristic of w from (a_1, t_7) either crosses \mathcal{F} at a point (x_5, t_8) with $x_5 \leq x_2$ or it crosses the line segment J at a point (x_6, t_9) . In the first case, $w(a_1, t_7) = w(x_5, t_8) \leq w(x_2, t_4)$ and, therefore, $v(x_2, t_3) \leq w(x_2, t_4)$, a contradiction with (8.2). In the second case, $v(x_2, t_3) = w(a_1, t_7) = w(x_6, t_9) = w(x_2, t_4)$, once again a contradiction with (8.2). This proves that \widehat{U}^+ is frozen. \square

9. PROPERTIES OF SOLUTIONS

9.1. Eventual freezing.

Proposition 9.1. *If $I = [a_1, a_2]$ then for all $s, t \geq 2(a_2 - a_1)$ we have $v(x, t) = v(x, s) = w(x, t) = w(x, s)$ and $x \rightarrow v(x, t)$ is non-decreasing.*

Proof. Let $a_* = a_2 - a_1$. It follows from (7.5) that for every b and $x, y \leq a_1 - a_*$, $\alpha(v, b, x) - x = \alpha(v, b, y) - y$. If $z \in I$ and $t \geq 2a_*$ then $z - t \leq a_1 - a_*$. Then (7.7) implies that for any $b \in \mathbb{R}$, $z \in I$ and $t_1, t_2 \geq 2a_*$, $A(v, b, t_1) = A(v, b, t_2)$. This and (7.9) show that $v(x, t_1) = v(x, t_2)$ for any b and $t_1, t_2 \geq a_2 - a_1$. The proof for w is analogous.

Suppose that $t \geq 2a_*$. If $v(x, t) > w(x, t)$ for some x then there is b such that $A(v, b, t) \cup A(w, b, t) \neq I$. If $v(x, t) = w(x, t)$ for all x and $x \rightarrow v(x, t)$ is not non-decreasing then for some b , the set $A(v, b, t)$ contains an interval to the left of an interval in $A(w, b, t)$, and both intervals have positive length. In either case, parts of $A(v, b, t)$ will move to the right and parts of $A(w, b, t)$ will move to the left after time t (see Step 1 of the proof of Lemma 7.2) and that will result in some annihilation and, therefore, in some changes to $A(v, b, s)$ and $A(w, b, s)$ for $s > t$, contradicting the first part of the proof. \square

9.2. Monotonicity of variation. Recall the definition of total variation of a function $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

$$\mathbf{V}(f) = \sup \sum_{k=1}^n |f(x_k) - f(x_{k-1})|,$$

where the supremum is taken over all n and all sequences x_k such that $x_0 \leq x_1 \leq \dots \leq x_n$. We say that f has finite total variation if $\mathbf{V}(f) < \infty$.

Proposition 9.2. *Suppose that $I = \mathbb{R}$ and v and w are solutions to (2.9)-(2.13) in the sense of Theorem 7.3 with arbitrary continuous initial conditions. If the initial conditions have finite total variation, then $t \rightarrow \mathbf{V}(v(\cdot, t))$ and $t \rightarrow \mathbf{V}(w(\cdot, t))$ are non-increasing.*

Proof. Since convergence in Theorem 7.3 is uniform, it will suffice to prove the claim for initial conditions satisfying Assumption 6.1. It will suffice to prove monotonicity of variation in any fixed triangle U of the type considered in Lemma 6.3. Recall that in every U , the function $v(\cdot, 0)$ is increasing, or decreasing, or has only one local extremum. In every case discussed in the proof of Lemma 6.3 (b), for every fixed $t \geq 0$, the function $x \rightarrow v(x, t)$ for x such that $(x, t) \in U$ can take only (some) values taken

by $v(x, 0)$, $(x, 0) \in U$, and the values are taken in the same order. This easily implies that $t \rightarrow \mathbf{V}(v(\cdot, t))$ is non-increasing. The argument for w is analogous. \square

9.3. Conservation of energy and momentum. We define frozen and liquid regions and the boundary between them as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} F(s, u) &= \{(x, t) : s \leq t \leq u, x \in [a_1, a_2], v(x, t) = w(x, t)\}, \\ L(s, u) &= \{(x, t) : s \leq t \leq u, x \in [a_1, a_2], v(x, t) > w(x, t)\}, \\ D(s, u) &= \partial F(s, u) \cap \partial L(s, u). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 9.3. *Suppose that the functions $v(x, 0)$ and $w(x, 0)$ satisfy Assumption 6.1 and, moreover, are continuous and piecewise linear with a finite number of intervals of linearity. Then the boundary $D(0, t)$ consists of a finite number of line segments for every $t < \infty$.*

Proof. Our assumptions imply that there is finite sequence $-\infty = b_1 < b_2 < \dots < b_n = \infty$ such that for every k , the inverse image of $[b_k, b_{k+1}]$ by $v(x, 0)$ consists of a finite number of intervals, and $v(x, 0)$ is linear on each of these intervals. Moreover, the inverse image of $[b_k, b_{k+1}]$ by $w(x, 0)$ consists of a finite number of intervals, and $w(x, 0)$ is linear on each of these intervals. This implies that $\Gamma_k := \{(x, b) : x \in \mathbb{R}, b_k \leq b \leq b_{k+1}\}$ is partitioned into a finite number of cells by the graphs of $v(x, 0)$ and $w(x, 0)$ for every k . Formula 7.5 then shows that Γ_k can be partitioned into a finite number of cells such that $(b, x) \rightarrow \alpha(v, b, x)$ is bilinear on each cell and the boundaries of cells consist of a finite number of line segments. The conditions in definition (7.7) are

$$z = x + t, t \leq (\alpha(v, b, x) - x)/2 \text{ and } (v(x, 0) \leq b \text{ or } x \leq a_1).$$

For any fixed $s > 0$, the set $\Gamma_k \times [0, s]$ is partitioned into a finite number of cells such that for every cell, the conditions are satisfied for all points in the interior of the cell or for no points in the interior of the cell. Moreover, the boundaries of the cells are subsets of a finite number of 2-dimensional planes. This, Lemma 7.2, (7.7) and (7.9) imply that $I \times [0, t]$ can be partitioned into a finite number of cells such that $(x, t) \rightarrow v(x, t)$ is bilinear on each cell and the boundaries of cells consist of a finite number of line segments. \square

Proposition 9.4. *If $I = [a_1, a_2]$ and μ and σ are solutions to (2.1)-(2.4) with continuous initial conditions then for all $t \geq 0$,*

$$(9.1) \quad \int_{a_1}^{a_2} \mu(x, t) dx = \int_{a_1}^{a_2} \mu(x, 0) dx,$$

$$(9.2) \quad \int_{a_1}^{a_2} (\mu(x, t)^2 + \sigma(x, t)^2) dx = \int_{a_1}^{a_2} (\mu(x, 0)^2 + \sigma(x, 0)^2) dx.$$

Proof. First we will prove the proposition in the case when the initial conditions satisfy the assumptions of Lemma 9.3. It follows from the lemma that there exists a finite or infinite sequence $0 = s_1 < s_2 < \dots$ without an accumulation point such that within each region $[a_1, a_2] \times [s_j, s_{j+1}]$ the solutions $\mu(x, t)$ and $\sigma(x, t)$ to (2.1)-(2.4) are bilinear functions in the interiors of liquid and frozen regions. Moreover, the boundaries of liquid and frozen regions consist of a finite number of line segments. Fix some $[a_1, a_2] \times [s_j, s_{j+1}]$

and let $\{\gamma_k(t), s_j \leq t \leq s_{j+1}\}$, $k = 0, \dots, n$ (where n depends on j) be such that $\gamma_0(t) = a_1$, $\gamma_n(t) = a_2$, $\gamma_k(t) \leq \gamma_{k+1}(t)$ for all k , $\mu(x, t)$ and $\sigma(x, t)$ are frozen on the intervals $[\gamma_k(t), \gamma_{k+1}(t)]$ for $k \in 2\mathbb{Z}$ and liquid in the interiors of the complementary intervals.

In the following calculations we use the following observations: $\sigma(\gamma_k(t), t) = 0$ for all k and t ; $\gamma'_0(t) = \gamma'_n(t) = 0$ for all t .

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \int_{a_1}^{a_2} \mu(x, t) dx &= \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \int_{\gamma_k(t)}^{\gamma_{k+1}(t)} \mu(x, t) dx \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \left(\int_{\gamma_k(t)}^{\gamma_{k+1}(t)} \mu_t(x, t) dx + \mu(\gamma_{k+1}(t), t) \gamma'_{k+1}(t) - \mu(\gamma_k(t), t) \gamma'_k(t) \right) \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \int_{\gamma_k(t)}^{\gamma_{k+1}(t)} \mu_t(x, t) dx \\
&= \sum_{k \in 2\mathbb{Z}} \int_{\gamma_k(t)}^{\gamma_{k+1}(t)} \mu_t(x, t) dx + \sum_{k \notin 2\mathbb{Z}} \int_{\gamma_k(t)}^{\gamma_{k+1}(t)} \mu_t(x, t) dx \\
&= \sum_{k \in 2\mathbb{Z}} \int_{\gamma_k(t)}^{\gamma_{k+1}(t)} 0 dx - \sum_{k \notin 2\mathbb{Z}} \int_{\gamma_k(t)}^{\gamma_{k+1}(t)} \sigma_x(x, t) dx \\
&= \sum_{k \notin 2\mathbb{Z}} (\sigma(\gamma_k(t), t) - \sigma(\gamma_{k+1}(t), t)) = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

This shows that

$$\int_{a_1}^{a_2} \mu(x, t) dx = \int_{a_1}^{a_2} \mu(x, s_j) dx,$$

for every j and $t \in [s_j, s_{j+1}]$, and, therefore, completes the proof of (9.1) under the assumptions of Lemma 9.3.

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \int_{a_1}^{a_2} (\mu(x, t)^2 + \sigma(x, t)^2) dx &= \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \int_{\gamma_k(t)}^{\gamma_{k+1}(t)} (\mu(x, t)^2 + \sigma(x, t)^2) dx \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \int_{\gamma_k(t)}^{\gamma_{k+1}(t)} (2\mu(x, t)\mu_t(x, t) + 2\sigma(x, t)\sigma_t(x, t)) dx \\
&\quad + \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} (\mu(\gamma_{k+1}(t), t)^2 + \sigma(\gamma_{k+1}(t), t)^2) \gamma'_{k+1}(t) \\
&\quad - \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} (\mu(\gamma_k(t), t)^2 + \sigma(\gamma_k(t), t)^2) \gamma'_k(t)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \int_{\gamma_k(t)}^{\gamma_{k+1}(t)} (2\mu(x, t)\mu_t(x, t) + 2\sigma(x, t)\sigma_t(x, t)) dx \\
 &= \sum_{k \in 2\mathbb{Z}} \int_{\gamma_k(t)}^{\gamma_{k+1}(t)} (2\mu(x, t)\mu_t(x, t) + 2\sigma(x, t)\sigma_t(x, t)) dx \\
 &\quad + \sum_{k \notin 2\mathbb{Z}} \int_{\gamma_k(t)}^{\gamma_{k+1}(t)} (2\mu(x, t)\mu_t(x, t) + 2\sigma(x, t)\sigma_t(x, t)) dx \\
 &= \sum_{k \in 2\mathbb{Z}} \int_{\gamma_k(t)}^{\gamma_{k+1}(t)} 0 dx - \sum_{k \notin 2\mathbb{Z}} \int_{\gamma_k(t)}^{\gamma_{k+1}(t)} (2\mu(x, t)\sigma_x(x, t) + 2\sigma(x, t)\mu_x(x, t)) dx \\
 &= 2 \sum_{k \notin 2\mathbb{Z}} (\mu(\gamma_k(t), t)\sigma(\gamma_k(t), t) - \mu(\gamma_{k+1}(t), t)\sigma(\gamma_{k+1}(t), t)) = 0.
 \end{aligned}$$

This shows that

$$\int_{a_1}^{a_2} (\mu(x, t)^2 + \sigma(x, t)^2) dx = \int_{a_1}^{a_2} (\mu(x, s_j)^2 + \sigma(x, s_j)^2) dx,$$

for every j and $t \in [s_j, s_{j+1}]$, and, therefore, completes the proof of (9.2) under the assumptions of Lemma 9.3

The general case follows from an approximation argument using Theorem 7.3. \square

Remark 9.5. The integrals in (9.1) and (9.2) represent “momentum” and “energy” in the pinned balls model discussed in Section 1.1. So (9.1)-(9.2) can be interpreted as “conservation” of momentum and energy; this agrees well with the physical interpretation of the evolution of pinned balls’ velocities.

9.4. Conservation of occupation measure. The following definitions are inspired by the concept of “local time” well known in stochastic analysis, see, e.g., [KS91, Sec. 3.6].

For a function $f : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we define occupation measure \mathcal{D} by

$$(9.3) \quad \mathcal{D}(f, B) = \int_I \mathbf{1}_{\{f(x) \in B\}} dx, \quad B \subset \mathbb{R}.$$

If the following derivative exists then it will be called the level density,

$$\mathcal{L}(f, x) = \frac{d}{dx} \mathcal{D}(f, (-\infty, x]), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Proposition 9.6. (i) For all $B \subset \mathbb{R}$ and $t \geq 0$,

$$(9.4) \quad \mathcal{D}(v(\cdot, t), B) - \mathcal{D}(w(\cdot, t), B) = \mathcal{D}(v(\cdot, 0), B) - \mathcal{D}(w(\cdot, 0), B).$$

(ii) If the following level densities exist then for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $t \geq 0$,

$$\mathcal{L}(v(\cdot, t), x) - \mathcal{L}(w(\cdot, t), x) = \mathcal{L}(v(\cdot, 0), x) - \mathcal{L}(w(\cdot, 0), x).$$

Proof. We will write Leb for Lebesgue measure.

Fist consider the case when $I = \mathbb{R}$. Suppose that $\mathcal{D}(v(\cdot, t), (b_1, b_2)) < \infty$ and $\mathcal{D}(w(\cdot, t), (b_1, b_2)) < \infty$. Then almost all points $y \in (b_1, b_2)$ are continuity points, i.e.,

$\mathcal{D}(v(\cdot, t), \{y\}) = \mathcal{D}(w(\cdot, t), \{y\}) = 0$. To show that (9.4) holds for all $B \subset (b_1, b_2)$, it will suffice to prove (9.4) for $B = [c_1, c_2]$ where $c_1, c_2 \in (b_1, b_2)$ are continuity points. It has been proved in Lemma 7.2 that $\mathcal{A}(v, b, t) = A(v, b, t)$ and $\mathcal{A}(w, b, t) = A(w, b, t)$. By (7.11)-(7.12) and (9.3),

$$\mathcal{D}(v(\cdot, t), [c_1, c_2]) = \int_I \mathbf{1}_{\{v(x,t) \in [c_1, c_2]\}} dx = \text{Leb}(A(v, c_2, t)) - \text{Leb}(A(v, c_1, t)).$$

Similarly,

$$\mathcal{D}(w(\cdot, t), [c_1, c_2]) = \int_I \mathbf{1}_{\{w(x,t) \in [c_1, c_2]\}} dx = \text{Leb}(A(w, c_1, t)) - \text{Leb}(A(w, c_2, t)),$$

so

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{D}(v(\cdot, t), [c_1, c_2]) - \mathcal{D}(w(\cdot, t), [c_1, c_2]) \\ &= \text{Leb}(A(v, c_2, t)) - \text{Leb}(A(v, c_1, t)) - \text{Leb}(A(w, c_1, t)) + \text{Leb}(A(w, c_2, t)) \\ &= [\text{Leb}(A(v, c_2, t)) + \text{Leb}(A(w, c_2, t))] - [\text{Leb}(A(w, c_1, t)) - \text{Leb}(A(v, c_1, t))]. \end{aligned}$$

Recall from the proof of Lemma 7.2 that the sets $A(v, b, t)$ and $A(w, b, t)$ annihilate each other at the same rate during the evolution in time—this was stated informally in Step 1 and proved rigorously later in the proof. Hence, $t \rightarrow \text{Leb}(A(v, c_2, t)) + \text{Leb}(A(w, c_2, t))$ is constant and so is $t \rightarrow \text{Leb}(A(w, c_1, t)) - \text{Leb}(A(v, c_1, t))$. It follows that $t \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(v(\cdot, t), [c_1, c_2]) - \mathcal{D}(w(\cdot, t), [c_1, c_2])$ is constant. This completes the proof of (9.4) when $I = \mathbb{R}$, $\mathcal{D}(v(\cdot, t), (b_1, b_2)) < \infty$ and $\mathcal{D}(w(\cdot, t), (b_1, b_2)) < \infty$. A similar argument applies when one of the sides of (9.4) is infinite.

Now assume that $I = [a_1, a_2]$. Fix $T > 0$ and let

$$\begin{aligned} A_T(v, b, t) &= A(v, b, t) \cup [a_1 - T + t, a_1], \\ A_T(w, b, t) &= A(w, b, t) \cup [a_2, a_2 + T - t]. \end{aligned}$$

For $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}(v(\cdot, t), [c_1, c_2]) &= \int_I \mathbf{1}_{\{v(x,t) \in [c_1, c_2]\}} dx = \text{Leb}(A(v, c_2, t)) - \text{Leb}(A(v, c_1, t)) \\ &= \text{Leb}(A_T(v, c_2, t)) - \text{Leb}(A_T(v, c_1, t)) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathcal{D}(w(\cdot, t), [c_1, c_2]) = \text{Leb}(A_T(w, c_2, t)) - \text{Leb}(A_T(w, c_1, t)),$$

so

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{D}(v(\cdot, t), [c_1, c_2]) - \mathcal{D}(w(\cdot, t), [c_1, c_2]) \\ &= [\text{Leb}(A_T(v, c_2, t)) + \text{Leb}(A_T(w, c_2, t))] - [\text{Leb}(A_T(w, c_1, t)) - \text{Leb}(A_T(v, c_1, t))]. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from cases (VI)-(VIII) in the proof of Lemma 7.2 that the sets $A_T(v, b, t)$ and $A_T(w, b, t)$ annihilate each other at the same rate when $t \in [0, T]$. Hence, $t \rightarrow \text{Leb}(A_T(v, c_2, t)) + \text{Leb}(A_T(w, c_2, t))$ is constant and so is $t \rightarrow \text{Leb}(A_T(w, c_1, t)) - \text{Leb}(A_T(v, c_1, t))$. It follows that $t \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(v(\cdot, t), [c_1, c_2]) - \mathcal{D}(w(\cdot, t), [c_1, c_2])$ is constant. This completes the proof of (9.4) when $I = [a_1, a_2]$, $\mathcal{D}(v(\cdot, t), (b_1, b_2)) < \infty$ and

$\mathcal{D}(w(\cdot, t), (b_1, b_2)) < \infty$. A similar argument applies when one of the sides of (9.4) is infinite.

Part (ii) of the proposition follows from part (i). \square

Corollary 9.7. *Suppose that $a > 0$, $I = [-a, a]$, $\sigma(x, 0) = 0$ for all x , and $\mu(x, 0)$ is strictly decreasing. Recall from Proposition 9.1 that $\sigma(x, t) = 0$ for all x and $t \geq 4a$. We have $\mu(x, t) = \mu(-x, 0)$ for all $t \geq 4a$ and $x \in I$.*

Proof. Suppose that $t \geq 4a$ and consider any $b \in \mathbb{R}$. We apply (9.4) to $B = (-\infty, b]$ to see that

$$(9.5) \quad \mathcal{D}(v(\cdot, t), (-\infty, b]) - \mathcal{D}(w(\cdot, t), (-\infty, b]) = \mathcal{D}(v(\cdot, 0), (-\infty, b]) - \mathcal{D}(w(\cdot, 0), (-\infty, b]).$$

Since $\mu(x, 0) = 2v(x, 0) = 2w(x, 0)$ is strictly decreasing and, by Lemma 9.1, $\mu(x, t) = 2v(x, t) = 2w(x, t)$ is strictly increasing,

$$\begin{aligned} 2a &= \mathcal{D}(v(\cdot, t), (-\infty, b]) + \mathcal{D}(w(\cdot, t), (-\infty, b]) \\ &= \mathcal{D}(v(\cdot, 0), (-\infty, b]) + \mathcal{D}(w(\cdot, 0), (-\infty, b]). \end{aligned}$$

This and (9.5) imply that

$$(9.6) \quad \mathcal{D}(v(\cdot, t), (-\infty, b]) = \mathcal{D}(v(\cdot, 0), (-\infty, b]),$$

$$(9.7) \quad \mathcal{D}(w(\cdot, t), (-\infty, b]) = \mathcal{D}(w(\cdot, 0), (-\infty, b]).$$

By Lemma 9.1, $v(x, t)$ and $w(x, t)$ are strictly increasing while $v(x, 0)$ and $w(x, 0)$ are strictly decreasing by assumption. This and (9.6)-(9.7) imply that $v(x, t) = v(-x, 0)$ and $w(x, t) = w(-x, 0)$ for $x \in I$. According to Lemma 9.1, $\sigma(x, t) = 0$ for $x \in I$. Hence $\mu(x, t) = 2v(x, t) = 2v(-x, 0) = \mu(-x, 0)$. \square

9.5. Corners for freezing and thawing curves. Recall the definitions of freezing and thawing boundaries stated in (6.3) and (6.6).

Proposition 9.8. *Assume that the initial conditions satisfy Assumption 6.1.*

(i) *Suppose that the right endpoints of a piece of the freezing boundary and a piece of the thawing boundary meet at a point D , and characteristics emanating from $v(x_1, 0)$ and $w(y_1, 0)$ also meet at D . Suppose that $v(x, 0)$ is locally C^1 at x_1 and has a strictly positive derivative at x_1 , while $w(y, 0)$ is locally C^2 at y_1 , has zero derivative at y_1 , and its second derivative is strictly negative. Then at D , the (one-sided) slope of the freezing boundary is 1 and the (one-sided) slope of the thawing boundary is -3 (see Fig. 20).*

(ii) *Suppose that the left endpoints of a piece of the thawing boundary and a piece of the freezing boundary meet at a point C , and characteristics emanating from $v(x_1, 0)$ and $w(y_1, 0)$ also meet at C . Suppose that $v(x, 0)$ is locally C^1 at x_1 and has a strictly positive derivative at x_1 , while $w(y, 0)$ is locally C^2 at y_1 , has zero derivative at y_1 , and its second derivative is strictly negative. Then at C , the (one-sided) slope of the thawing boundary is $-\infty$ and the (one-sided) slope of the freezing boundary is 0 (see Fig. 21).*




FIGURE 20. A piece of the freezing boundary BD (blue) and a piece of the thawing boundary DC (red) meet at the point D .




FIGURE 21. A piece of the freezing boundary CE (blue) and a piece of the thawing boundary DC (red) meet at the point C .

Proof. We will sketch the proof in an informal way.

(i) Please refer to Fig. 20 for notation. Note that $H = (x_1, 0)$ and $K = (y_1, 0)$. Suppose that $v(H) = v(A) = v(D) = v(E) = w(K)$, and $v(G) = v(B) = v(C) = w(J) = w(M)$. If $|GH|$ is very small then $|GH|/|JK|$ is very small because the derivative of $v(x, 0)$ is strictly positive at x_1 and the derivative of $w(y, 0)$ is zero at y_1 . Therefore,

the characteristic from H to D is tangent to the freezing boundary BD at the point D . Hence, the slope of the freezing boundary at D is 1.

Suppose that $|JK|$ is very small. Since $w(x, 0)$ is C^2 , we have $|KM| \approx |JK|$. This implies that $|AD| \approx |DE|$. The triangle ACE is almost identical to the triangle BCE , and the triangles are almost isosceles triangles with the right angle at E . Let $a = |AE|$. We have the following. $|AD| \approx a/2$. $|FD| \approx |BF| \approx \sqrt{2}a/4$. $|CB| \approx \sqrt{2}a$. $|CF| = |CB| - |BF| \approx 3\sqrt{2}a/4$. Since $|CF|/|FD| \approx (3\sqrt{2}a/4)/(\sqrt{2}a/4) = 3$, it follows that the slope of the thawing boundary at D is -3 .

The proof of (ii) is based on similar ideas. \square

9.6. Monotone dependence on initial conditions.

Proposition 9.9. *Suppose that $v_1(x, 0) \leq v_2(x, 0)$ and $w_1(x, 0) \leq w_2(x, 0)$ for all $x \in I$. Then $v_1(x, t) \leq v_2(x, t)$ and $w_1(x, t) \leq w_2(x, t)$ for all $x \in I$ and $t \geq 0$.*

Proof. It follows from (7.1) and (7.5) that $\alpha(v_1, b, x) \geq \alpha(v_2, b, x)$ for all b and x . This, (7.3) and (7.7) imply that $A(v_2, b, t) \subset A(v_1, b, t)$ for all b and t . Hence, (7.9) and Lemma 7.2 show that $v_1(x, t) \leq v_2(x, t)$ for all $x \in I$ and $t \geq 0$. The proof for w is analogous. \square

9.7. Terminal conditions. The following theorem is closely related to the results in [BO23]. It presents a construction of v and w with a given freezing line, one liquid zone and one frozen zone.

Proposition 9.10. *Suppose that $T : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ satisfies $|T(x) - T(y)| < |x - y|$ for all x and y and $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous and strictly increasing. Then there exist unique initial conditions such that the solution to (2.1)-(2.4) satisfies $\mu(x, T(x) + t) = \mu(x, T(x)) = f(x)$ and $\sigma(x, T(x) + t) = \sigma(x, T(x)) = 0$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $t \geq 0$.*

Proof. In terms of v and w , we are looking for solutions such that for all x and $t \geq 0$,

$$(9.8) \quad v(x, T(x) + t) + w(x, T(x) + t) = v(x, T(x)) + w(x, T(x)) = f(x),$$

$$(9.9) \quad v(x, T(x) + t) - w(x, T(x) + t) = v(x, T(x)) - w(x, T(x)) = 0.$$

Tracing characteristics back in time we see that (9.8)-(9.9) are satisfied if and only if for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$v(x, 0) = f(y) \text{ where } y = \inf\{z \geq x : T(z) = z - x\},$$

$$w(x, 0) = f(r) \text{ where } r = \sup\{z \leq x : T(z) = x - z\}.$$

Then we let $\mu(x, 0) = v(x, 0) + w(x, 0)$ and $\sigma(x, 0) = v(x, 0) - w(x, 0)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$. \square

9.8. Time reversibility.

Remark 9.11. Consider $I = \mathbb{R}$ or $I = [-a, a]$. Suppose that (v, w) satisfy (2.9)-(2.13). Fix some $T > 0$. Let $\tilde{v}(x, t) = v(-x, T - t)$ and $\tilde{w}(x, t) = w(-x, T - t)$ for all $x \in I$ and $t \in [0, T]$. Then (\tilde{v}, \tilde{w}) also satisfy (2.9)-(2.11) in the region $\{(x, t) : x \in I, t \in [0, T]\}$. However, frozen regions for (\tilde{v}, \tilde{w}) , if there are any, “point in the wrong direction.” For example, the triangles in Fig. 5 and the Christmas tree in Fig. 6 are upside down. The reason for the apparent contradiction is that (\tilde{v}, \tilde{w}) do not satisfy the assumptions of

Theorem 2.6, specifically, v and w must have backward characteristics starting at every point in space-time. However, some characteristics may not continue in the forward direction of time; see Fig. 2. This property is not preserved under time reversal, so even if it holds for (v, w) , it does not need to hold for (\tilde{v}, \tilde{w}) . In these examples left and right are reversed, so, we have frozen regions with v and w decreasing. For such regions, v and w must immediately thaw, but they don't, so these examples violate 2.13

9.9. Differentiability of solutions.

Remark 9.12. It is not a surprise that for generic smooth initial conditions, v and w are non-differentiable at the boundary between liquid and frozen regions (although one-sided derivatives may exist). The system (2.9)-(2.12) is hyperbolic in the liquid and frozen regions. For smooth initial data with isolated extrema, the slopes of the thawing and freezing curves are non-characteristic (slope of the curve is not a characteristic direction—characteristic directions have slope one or zero). So we expect singularities (points of non-differentiability) in the values of v and w on the freezing and thawing curves to propagate forward in time. However, if the initial data is smooth, although the derivatives of v and w jump across these curves, they remain tangentially smooth on both sides, so no new singularities propagate from the interior of these curves. New singularities do, however, propagate along forward characteristics that originate at the corners where two thawing curves meet or where a freezing curve meets a thawing curve, as illustrated in the figures (from a numerically computed example) below.




FIGURE 22. Graphs of v and w at a sequence of times. Initial conditions: $v_0(x) = x^2$ and $w_0(x) = -(x - 4)^2 + 3$.




FIGURE 23. Frozen triangle and some characteristics emanating from the corners. Initial conditions: $v_0(x) = x^2$ and $w_0(x) = -(x - 4)^2 + 3$.

Suppose that

$$\begin{aligned} v(x, 0) &= x^2, \\ w(x, 0) &= -(x - 4)^2 + 3. \end{aligned}$$

Meeting location $z = z(b)$ of characteristics corresponding to value $b = v(x_1, 0) = w(y_1, 0) \in [0, 3]$ is

$$(9.10) \quad z = \frac{1}{2}(\sqrt{b} - \sqrt{3-b} + 4).$$

The times of freezing and thawing at value b are given by

$$(9.11) \quad S_f(b) = \frac{1}{2}(4 - \sqrt{3-b} - \sqrt{b}),$$

$$(9.12) \quad S_t(b) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}(3\sqrt{b} - \sqrt{3-b} + 4) & b \leq 3/2, \\ \frac{1}{2}(-\sqrt{b} + 3\sqrt{3-b} + 4) & b \geq 3/2. \end{cases}$$

We will write the freezing times and thawing times as functions of location. To do that we solve (9.10) for b and substitute it into (9.11)-(9.12),

$$\begin{aligned} b(z) &= \frac{1}{2} \left(3 \pm 2\sqrt{2}\sqrt{-2z^4 + 16z^3 - 45z^2 + 52z - 20} \right), \quad z > 2, z < 2, \\ T_f(z) = S_f(b(z)) &= \frac{1}{4} \left(-\sqrt{4\sqrt{2}\sqrt{-(z-2)^2(2z^2-8z+5)} + 6} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \sqrt{6 - 4\sqrt{2}\sqrt{-(z-2)^2(2z^2-8z+5)} + 8} \right), \\ T_t(z) = S_t(b(z)) &= \frac{1}{4} \left(-\sqrt{4\sqrt{2}\sqrt{-(z-2)^2(2z^2-8z+5)} + 6} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 3\sqrt{6 - 4\sqrt{2}\sqrt{-(z-2)^2(2z^2-8z+5)} + 8} \right). \end{aligned}$$

The derivatives of T_f and T_t at the corners are as follows. The right derivatives of T_f and T_t at $z = (4 - \sqrt{3})/2$ are -1 and 3 . The left derivatives of T_f and T_t at $z = (4 + \sqrt{3})/2$ are 1 and -3 . See Fig. 23 for graphs of T_f and T_t .

Fig. 22 shows the graphs of v and w at a sequence of times. Fig. 23 shows the frozen triangle and some characteristics emanating from the corners. The derivatives of both v and w jump across the boundary of the (black) frozen triangle. In addition, the derivative of v jumps across the blue characteristics emanating from the two corners on the right side of the triangle and the derivative of w jumps across the red characteristics emanating from the two corners on the left side. Note that there is no forward w characteristic emanating from the lower right corner, or from any point on the thawing boundary that forms the right side of the triangle. To within the computational accuracy, the one-sided slopes at the freeze-thaw corners of the triangle are as described in Proposition 9.8.

Recall from Fig. 5 the shape of a frozen triangle. Suppose that the initial conditions $v(x, 0)$ and $w(x, 0)$ are C^2 . In the generic case, the derivatives of v and w are discontinuous along the characteristics emanating from the tip (top vertex) of the triangle, although v and w are continuous everywhere. Suppose that the characteristic of v emanating from x_1 and the characteristic of w emanating from y_1 meet at the tip of the frozen triangle at time t_1 . The values of v to the left of the characteristic for times greater than t_1 are those to the left of x_1 at time 0. The values of v to the right of the characteristic for times greater than t_1 are those of w to the left of y_1 at time 0. While we have $v(x_1, 0) = w(y_1, 0)$ by assumption, the derivatives of v at x_1 and w at y_1 do not have to be related in any way so, generically, the one-sided derivatives of v along the characteristic passing through the tip, past t_1 , will be different. The same remark applies to w .

See the explicit formulas in the slightly different Example 10.2. Example 10.3 (ii) and the accompanying Fig. 27 present some of the above ideas in a different way.

10. EXAMPLES

Example 10.1. Fig. 23 illustrates a transition from freezing to thawing at two corners of a frozen triangle. This example will illustrate transition from thawing to freezing. Let

$$v(x, 0) = x + 2,$$

$$w(x, 0) = \begin{cases} x + 2 & x < -1, \\ x^2 & -1 \leq x \leq 1, \\ x & x > 1. \end{cases}$$

Meeting locations $z = z(b)$ of characteristics corresponding to value $b = v(x_1, 0) = w(y_1, 0) \in [0, 1]$ are

$$(10.1) \quad z_1 = b - 2,$$

$$(10.2) \quad z_2 = \frac{1}{2} \left(\sqrt{b} + b - \left(-\sqrt{b} - b + 2 \right) - 2 \right).$$




FIGURE 24. Freezing (blue) and thawing (red) boundaries.

The times of thawing and freezing at value b are given by

$$(10.3) \quad S_t(b) = -\sqrt{b} - b + 2,$$

$$(10.4) \quad S_f(b) = s_f(b) + \sqrt{b} = 2 - b.$$

We will write the freezing times and thawing times as functions of location. To do that we solve (10.1)-(10.2) for b and substitute it into (10.3)-(10.4),

$$b_1(z_1) = 2 + z_1,$$

$$b_2(z_2) = \frac{1}{2} (2z_2 - \sqrt{4z_2 + 9} + 5),$$

$$T_t(z) = S_f(b_1(z)) = -z - \sqrt{z + 2},$$

$$T_f(z) = S_t(b_2(z)) = \frac{1}{2} (-2z + \sqrt{4z + 9} - 1).$$

We have

$$T_t'(z) = -\frac{1}{2\sqrt{z+2}} - 1,$$

$$T_f'(z) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{2}{\sqrt{4z+9}} - 2 \right).$$

The right derivatives of T_t and T_f at $z = -2$ are $-\infty$ and 0. See Fig. 24 for graphs of T_f and T_t .

Example 10.2. We include another example illustrating jumps of derivatives of v and w that admits very simple formulas. Let

$$v(x, 0) = |x|, \quad w(x, 0) = \frac{x}{2}.$$

Then

$$v(x, t) = \begin{cases} -(x - t) & x < \frac{3t}{5}, \\ \frac{2x}{3} & \frac{3t}{5} < x < 3t, \\ x - t & 3t < x, \end{cases}$$

$$w(x, t) = \begin{cases} \frac{x+t}{2} & x < -t, \\ \frac{x+t}{4} & -t < x < \frac{3t}{5}, \\ \frac{2x}{3} & \frac{3t}{5} < x < 3t, \\ \frac{x+t}{2} & 3t < x. \end{cases}$$

Derivatives of v jump across

- (1) Freezing boundary $x = 3t$,
- (2) Thawing boundary $x = \frac{3t}{5}$.

Derivatives of w jump across

- (1) Freezing boundary $x = 3t$,
- (2) Thawing boundary $x = \frac{3t}{5}$,
- (3) The w -characteristic propagating from $(0, 0)$, the point where the derivative of $v(x, 0)$ jumps. Note that the jump in the derivative of v at $(0, 0)$ does not propagate along a v -characteristic, as the point $(0, 0)$ is part of a thawing boundary which has no forward v characteristics.




FIGURE 25. Freezing (blue) and thawing (red) boundaries for Example 10.2.




FIGURE 26. The liquid region cannot contain a rectangle with three top vertices on its boundary (see Example 10.3 (i) for details).

Example 10.3. What shapes can the frozen region take? While we are far from being able to give a full answer to this question, we will point out some restrictions on possible shapes under Assumption 6.1. Some restrictions on the slopes of freezing and thawing curves were stated in (6.4) and (6.7). Below we present two extra restrictions.

(i) First, the liquid region cannot contain a characteristic rectangle R which has edges with slopes 1 and -1 , is contained in the liquid region except for its top three vertices, its top vertex belongs to the relative interior of the freezing boundary, the left and right vertices belong to relative interiors of the thawing curves, and the bottom vertex belongs to the interior of the liquid region (see Fig. 26).

The reason why this is impossible is that the sides of R with slopes 1 are characteristics of v , the sides with slopes -1 are characteristics of w , and the values of v and w on these characteristics are equal because they have to be equal at the three top vertices. Hence v must be equal to w at the bottom vertex, which contradicts the assumption that this vertex belongs to the interior of the liquid region.

(ii) The second restriction is related to characteristics emanating from the top vertex (y, s) of shapes such as frozen triangles or Christmas tree in Figs. 5-6. For $t > s$, in a neighborhood of s , $x \rightarrow v(x, s)$ is decreasing to the left of $y + (t - s)$ and increasing to the right of $y + (t - s)$. Hence, the characteristic $\{(y + (t - s), t) : t \geq s\}$ of v must end at a meeting point of a freezing curve and thawing curve. A similar remark applies to the characteristic of w moving in the opposite direction. The following remarks pertain to Fig. 27.

- (1) All points on thawing curves with positive slopes are minima of v and all points on thawing curves with negative slopes are maxima of w .
- (2) There can be no v or w extrema in the frozen region or the interior of the freezing boundary, and extrema in the liquid region propagate along characteristics.
- (3) Thus minima of v propagate along v characteristics until they reach a freeze/thaw corner, whence they continue as thawing boundaries. We say “freeze/thaw” to indicate that the freezing boundary is below the (positive-sloped) thawing boundary, as pictured on the bottom right corner of Fig. 26. At a “freeze/thaw” corner, a characteristic freezes, then thaws. A thaw/freeze corner is one where

the thawing curve is below the freezing curve, so that a frozen characteristic thaws, then refreezes.

- (4) Maxima of v propagate only along characteristics, and only in the liquid region. Each such characteristic continues until it meets a v -minimum at a thaw/freeze corner, where they annihilate each other.
- (5) A similar description applies to w -extrema.
- (6) An important corollary is that the number of extrema of each of v and w can only decrease with time. In the figure, each of v and w start with one minimum and one maximum point. After some time, no extremal points remain.




FIGURE 27

11. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful to Pablo Ferrari, Jean-Francois Le Gall, Jeremy Hoskins, Adam Ostaszewski and Stefan Steinerberger for the most useful advice.

REFERENCES

- [AAV11] Gideon Amir, Omer Angel, and Benedek Valkó. The TASEP speed process. *Ann. Probab.*, 39(4):1205–1242, 2011.
- [ABD21] Jayadev S. Athreya, Krzysztof Burdzy, and Mauricio Duarte. On pinned billiard balls and foldings. *Indiana U. Math. J.*, 2021. To appear, Arxiv:1807.08320.
- [AHR09] Omer Angel, Alexander Holroyd, and Dan Romik. The oriented swap process. *Ann. Probab.*, 37(5):1970–1998, 2009.
- [AHRV07] Omer Angel, Alexander E. Holroyd, Dan Romik, and Bálint Virág. Random sorting networks. *Adv. Math.*, 215(2):839–868, 2007.

- [BDS83] C. Boldrighini, R. L. Dobrushin, and Yu. M. Sukhov. One-dimensional hard rod caricature of hydrodynamics. *J. Statist. Phys.*, 31(3):577–616, 1983.
- [BDSG⁺15] Lorenzo Bertini, Alberto De Sole, Davide Gabrielli, Giovanni Jona-Lasinio, and Claudio Landim. Macroscopic fluctuation theory. *Rev. Modern Phys.*, 87(2):593–636, 2015.
- [BHS22] Krzysztof Burdzy, Jeremy G. Hoskins, and Stefan Steinerberger. From pinned billiard balls to partial differential equations, 2022. Preprint. ArXiv 2209.01503.
- [BO23] Krzysztof Burdzy and Adam J. Ostaszewski. Freezing in space-time: a functional equation linked with a PDE system. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 524(2):Paper No. 127018, 11, 2023.
- [DF77] R. L. Dobrushin and J. Fritz. Non-equilibrium dynamics of one-dimensional infinite particle systems with a hard-core interaction. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 55(3):275–292, 1977.
- [FFGS23] Pablo A. Ferrari, Chiara Franceschini, Dante G. E. Grevino, and Herbert Spohn. Hard rod hydrodynamics and the Lévy Chentsov field. *Ensaïos Matemáticos*, 38:185–222, 2023.
- [FO23] Pablo Ferrari and Stefano Olla. Macroscopic diffusive fluctuations for generalized hard rods dynamics, 2023. Preprint. ArXiv 2305.13037.
- [GG08a] P. Gaspard and T. Gilbert. Heat conduction and Fourier’s law by consecutive local mixing and thermalization. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 101:020601, Jul 2008.
- [GG08b] Pierre Gaspard and Thomas Gilbert. Heat conduction and Fourier’s law in a class of many particle dispersing billiards. *New Journal of Physics*, 10(10):103004, oct 2008.
- [GG08c] Pierre Gaspard and Thomas Gilbert. On the derivation of Fourier’s law in stochastic energy exchange systems. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, 2008(11):P11021, nov 2008.
- [KS91] Ioannis Karatzas and Steven E. Shreve. *Brownian motion and stochastic calculus*, volume 113 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 1991.
- [Lax84] Peter D. Lax. Shock waves, increase of entropy and loss of information. In *Seminar on nonlinear partial differential equations (Berkeley, Calif., 1983)*, volume 2 of *Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ.*, pages 129–171. Springer, New York, 1984.
- [Ser99] Denis Serre. *Systems of conservation laws. 1*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999. Hyperbolicity, entropies, shock waves, Translated from the 1996 French original by I. N. Sneddon.
- [Smo94] Joel Smoller. *Shock waves and reaction-diffusion equations*, volume 258 of *Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 1994.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, BOX 354350, UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON, SEATTLE, WA 98195

Email address: burdzy@uw.edu

Email address: sylvest@uw.edu