

Time-asymptotics of a heated string

Piotr Michał Bies*¹ and Tomasz Cieślak^{†2,1}

¹Faculty of Mathematics and Information Sciences, Warsaw University of Technology, Ul.

Koszykowa 75, 00-662 Warsaw, Poland

²Institute of Mathematics, Polish Academy of Sciences, 00-656 Warsaw, Poland

June 7, 2024

Abstract

In the present paper, we study a model of a thermoelastic string that is initially heated. We classify all the possible asymptotic states when time tends to infinity of such a model. Actually, we show that whatever the initial data is, a heated string must converge to a flat, steady string with uniformly distributed heat. The latter distribution is calculated from the energy conservation. In order to obtain the result, we need to take a few steps. In the first two steps, time-independent bounds from above and from below (by a positive constant) of the temperature are obtained. This is done via the Moser-like iteration. The lower bound is obtained via the Moser iteration on the negative part of the logarithm of temperature. In the third step, we obtain a time-independent higher-order estimate, which yields compactness of a sequence of the values of the solution when time tends to infinity. Here, an estimate involving the Fisher information of temperature, together with a recent functional inequality from [5] and an $L^2(L^2)$ estimate of the gradient of entropy, enable us to arrive at a tricky Grönwall type inequality. Finally, in the last steps, we define the dynamical system on a proper functional phase space and study its ω -limit set. To this end, we use, in particular, the quantitative version of the second principle of thermodynamics. Also, the entropy dissipation term and the bound of the entropy from below are useful when identifying the structure of the ω -limit set.

Keywords: 1D thermoelasticity, time-independent estimates, convergence to steady states, second principle of thermodynamics

Mathematics Subject Classification (2020): 35B35, 35B40, 35Q74

*piotr.bies@pw.edu.pl

†cieslak@impan.pl

1 Introduction

This article is devoted to the study of the asymptotic behavior of a heated string. We consider a string with fixed ends. The function $u : (0, T) \times (a, b) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ denotes the position of the string, and a positive function $\theta : (0, T) \times (a, b) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ denotes its temperature. The following system of equations is satisfied by a couple (u, θ) .

$$\begin{cases} u_{tt} - u_{xx} = \mu\theta_x, & \text{in } (0, \infty) \times (a, b), \\ \theta_t - \theta_{xx} = \mu\theta u_{tx}, & \text{in } (0, \infty) \times (a, b), \\ u(\cdot, a) = u(\cdot, b) = \theta_x(\cdot, a) = \theta_x(\cdot, b) = 0, & \text{on } (0, \infty), \\ u(0, \cdot) = u_0, \quad u_t(0, \cdot) = v_0, \quad \theta(0, \cdot) = \theta_0 > 0, \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where v_0 is the initial velocity, μ is a material constant. The above system is a particular example of the $1d$ thermoelasticity model for the details of the physical derivation, we refer to [7, 22]. Let us only mention here that (1) corresponds to the choice of the Helmholtz free energy function $\Psi(\theta, u_x) := \theta \log \theta - \theta + \mu\theta u_x + \frac{1}{2}u_x^2$ in [22] (Fick's law for the spread of the temperature is also assumed).

The local-in-time existence and uniqueness of regular solutions to even more general $1d$ thermoelasticity systems have already been established in [22]. Similarly, the global existence of solutions starting in the neighborhood of the steady states. Further results concerning local-in-time solutions or solutions in the neighborhood of the steady states (including refinements like proving the positivity of the temperature) have been established in [6, 15, 18, 20, 21]. The convergence of the solutions of the thermoviscoelastic system to the solutions to (1), when viscosity goes to 0, has been established by [8]. Finally, the weak solutions in the higher-dimensional case (together with weak-strong uniqueness) are the purpose of [7, 12]. The existence (and uniqueness) results for the general thermoelasticity problems and the state of the art in the linear approximation of the latter are presented in the notes of Racke ([19]).

Dafermos and Hsiao have shown finite-time blowup of solutions to some thermoelasticity $1d$ problem with a nonlinear term $(p(u)u_x)_x$ instead of u_{xx} in the upper equation of (1), see [9]. A similar refined result (in terms of physical relevance) has been obtained, using similar methods, in [14]. Recently, a global existence of unique solutions in the case of (1) has been obtained in [3]. There, we utilized a Fisher information-based functional to reach the result. Having defined the unique global solutions, a natural question of asymptotic behavior occurs. On the one hand, it has been known that solutions starting next to the steady states converge towards them, see, for instance, [21] or [19] for a wider picture. In the linear approximation, a $1d$ case was also well understood, see, for instance, [13]. Here, we study the asymptotic behavior for general initial data. We show that whatever the data is, weak solutions constructed in [3] (we shall recall the definition in the next section) converge with time to the particular steady state, namely a flat string with uniformly distributed temperature.

Indeed, the following theorem is the main result of the present article.

Theorem 1.1. *Let us assume u and θ are a weak solution of (1) starting from initial data u_0 and*

$\theta_0 > 0$, respectively. Then, the following convergences

$$\begin{aligned} u(t, \cdot) &\rightarrow 0 \text{ in } H_0^1(a, b) \text{ when } t \rightarrow \infty, \\ u_t(t, \cdot) &\rightarrow 0 \text{ in } L^2(a, b) \text{ when } t \rightarrow \infty, \\ \theta(t, \cdot) &\rightarrow \theta_\infty \text{ in } L^2(a, b) \text{ when } t \rightarrow \infty, \end{aligned}$$

hold, where $\theta_\infty := \left(\frac{1}{2} \int_a^b v_0^2 dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_a^b u_{0,x}^2 dx + \int_a^b \theta_0 dx \right) / (b - a)$.

Our theorem has a clear physical meaning. It shows that the damping effect of the heat propagation itself is so stabilizing that natural oscillations appearing in the string equation decay when coupled with heat. It is even more interesting in light of the recent result in [2], where it is pointed out that the given right-hand side in the heat equation generically cannot enforce the decay of oscillations. Let us discuss methods of the proof, emphasizing the role of physics-related estimates.

At first, we need to get the time-independent bounds of temperature. Both bounds are obtained using the Alikakos variation ([1]) on the Moser method, see [17]. This is a delicate iterative method used in the case of upper-temperature bounds in thermoelasticity already in [9]. A similar use was done in [14]. More interesting and novel is our iterative time-independent bound from below (by a positive constant) of the temperature. It is essential in the identification of the limits of the solutions when time goes to infinity. This is done via the Moser iteration on the negative part of the logarithm of temperature. Both Moser's iterations are presented in Section 3. Next, we obtain a time-independent higher-order estimate, which is necessary for the compactness estimates when time tends to infinity. Here, we use a functional from [3] involving the Fisher information of the temperature. However, since (unlike in [3]) we need a time-independent estimate, we need to treat the functional in a different way. On the one hand, we utilize a recent functional inequality from [5]. On the other hand, an $L^2(L^2)$ estimate of the gradient of entropy together with the L^∞ estimate obtained via the Moser method, enable us to find a tricky Grönwall type inequality, which allows us to conclude a required compactness estimate. The latter is contained in Section 4. Finally, in the last section, we define the dynamical system on a properly chosen functional phase space. This can be done thanks to the uniqueness of solutions obtained in [3]. Then, the ω -limit set of such a dynamical system is found for every initial data. For each initial data it turns out to contain only one point, a flat string with the uniformly distributed heat that can be identified knowing the initial data. Our method is a delicate reasoning making use of the quantitative version of the second principle of thermodynamics, including the entropy dissipation. The lower bound of the entropy is also very useful when identifying the asymptotic state.

2 Preliminaries

This section is devoted to recalling important information concerning the properties of solutions to (1), which we need in the sequel. Most of it is known, we state it in details for further reference.

First of all, on multiplying the upper equation in (1) by u_t and then integrating both equations of (1), one obtains the following energy identity.

Proposition 2.1. *Regular solutions θ, u of (1) satisfy*

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_a^b u_t^2 dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_a^b u_x^2 dx + \int_a^b \theta dx = \frac{1}{2} \int_a^b v_0^2 dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_a^b u_{0,x}^2 dx + \int_a^b \theta_0 dx. \quad (2)$$

Next, we recall the essential identity in [3], which led to the global existence result there.

Lemma 2.2. *Let us assume that u and θ , $\theta > 0$ are regular enough solutions of (1). Then, the following identity holds*

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \left(\int_a^b \frac{\theta_x^2}{\theta} dx + \int_a^b u_{tx}^2 dx + \int_a^b u_{xx}^2 dx \right) = - \int_a^b \theta [(\log \theta)_{xx}]^2 dx + \frac{\mu}{2} \int_a^b \frac{\theta_x^2}{\theta} u_{tx} dx.$$

Next, let us recall the precise notion of solutions to (1) constructed in [3].

Definition 2.3. We say that (u, θ) is a solution to (1) if:

- The initial data is of regularity

$$u_0 \in H^2(a, b) \cap H_0^1(a, b), \quad v_0 \in H_0^1(a, b), \quad \theta_0 \in H^1(a, b).$$

We also require that there exists $\tilde{\theta} > 0$ such that $\theta_0(x) \geq \tilde{\theta}$ for all $x \in [a, b]$.

- Solutions θ and u satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} u &\in L_{\text{loc}}^\infty(0, \infty; H^2(a, b)) \cap W_{\text{loc}}^{1, \infty}(0, \infty; H_0^1(a, b)) \cap W_{\text{loc}}^{2, \infty}(0, \infty; L^2(a, b)), \\ \theta &\in L_{\text{loc}}^\infty(0, \infty; H^1(a, b)) \cap H_{\text{loc}}^1(0, \infty; L^2(a, b)). \end{aligned}$$

- The momentum equation

$$u_{tt} - u_{xx} = \mu \theta_x$$

is satisfied for almost all $(t, x) \in (0, \infty) \times (a, b)$.

- The entropy equation

$$\int_a^b \theta_t \psi dx + \int_a^b \theta_x \psi_x dx = \mu \int_a^b \theta u_{tx} \psi dx$$

holds for all $\psi \in C^\infty[a, b]$ and for almost all $t \in (0, \infty)$.

- Initial conditions are attained in the following sense:

$$\theta \in C([0, \infty); L^2(a, b)),$$

$$u \in C([0, \infty); H_0^1(a, b)), \quad u_t \in C([0, \infty); L^2(a, b)).$$

Remark 2.4. Let us emphasize that squaring the lower equation in (1) and next integrating, one increases the regularity of solutions, obtaining that $\theta \in L_{\text{loc}}^2(0, \infty; H^2(a, b))$, $\theta_t \in L_{\text{loc}}^2(0, \infty; L^2(a, b))$. This way, we see that both θ_t and θ_{xx} are defined a.e. in $(0, T) \times (a, b)$ and that actually the entropy equation is satisfied for almost all $(t, x) \in (0, \infty) \times (a, b)$. Moreover, by the Gelfand triple (see, for instance, [4]), we notice that $\theta \in C([0, \infty); H^1(a, b))$.

In [3], the following existence and uniqueness result for solutions of (1) is proven.

Theorem 2.5. *For any constant $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$, there exists a unique global-in-time solution of (1) in the sense of Definition 2.3 with a positive temperature.*

The theorem is proven via the approximation with the half-Galerkin method. The estimates of an approximation sequence are strong enough to show that in the limit (1) is satisfied. We shall need the approximation sequence again, so we recall its definition below. The existence of the solutions to the following approximating problem is given in [7]. Let $\{\varphi_i\}$ be a smooth basis of $H_0^1(a, b)$ and let us denote $V_n = \text{span}\{\varphi_k\}_{1 \leq k \leq n}$.

Definition 2.6. We say that $u_n \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1, \infty}(0, \infty; V_n)$ and $\theta_n \in L_{\text{loc}}^2(0, \infty; H^1(a, b))$ are solutions of an approximate problem if for all $\varphi \in V_n$ and $\psi \in H^1(a, b)$ the following equations are satisfied in $\mathcal{D}'(0, \infty)$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \int_a^b u_n \varphi dx + \int_a^b u_{n,x} \varphi_x dx &= -\mu \int_a^b \theta_n \varphi_x dx, \\ \frac{d}{dt} \int_a^b \theta_n \psi dx + \int_a^b \theta_{n,x} \psi_x dx &= \mu \int_a^b \theta_n u_{n,t} \psi dx. \end{aligned}$$

The initial identities

$$\theta_n(0) = \theta_0, \quad u_n(0) = P_{V_n} u_0, \quad u_{n,t}(0) = P_{V_n} v_0$$

hold, where P_{V_n} is an orthogonal projection of the corresponding spaces onto V_n .

[7, Proposition 1 and Lemma 4.2] states the following.

Proposition 2.7. *For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a solution (u_n, θ_n) of the approximate problem in the sense of Definition 2.6. Moreover, one has $\theta_n \in L_{\text{loc}}^2(0, \infty; H^2(a, b)) \cap H_{\text{loc}}^1(0, \infty; L^2(a, b))$ and $\theta_n(x, t) > 0$ for almost all $(t, x) \in [0, \infty) \times [a, b]$.*

Due to the regularity of Galerkin bases, we have that $u_n \in C^{3, \infty}([0, T] \times [a, b])$ (see [10]). Similarly, by standard regularity theory of parabolic equations, we have $\theta_n \in C^{1, 2}([0, T] \times [a, b])$ (see [16, Chapter VII] or [11, Chapter 5]).

Next, we introduce a notation $\tau := \log \theta$. The following observation related to τ will be crucial both in the compactness estimates as well as the asymptotic studies. The part (3) can be found already in [7]. For the reader's convenience, we present the details.

Proposition 2.8. *Let θ be a weak solution of the problem (1) in the sense of Definition 2.6. Then, the following equation*

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_a^b \tau dx = \int_a^b \tau_x^2 dx$$

is satisfied for almost all $t \in (0, \infty)$. Moreover, we have that

$$\tau_x \in L^2((0, \infty) \times (a, b)). \tag{3}$$

Proof. By Remark 2.4 the second equation in (1) is satisfied pointwise. Hence, we obtain

$$\tau_t - \tau_{xx} - \tau_x^2 = \mu u_{tx}. \quad (4)$$

We integrate it over $[a, b]$ to get

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_a^b \tau dx = \int_a^b \tau_x^2 dx.$$

Next, we integrate over $[0, t]$ for an arbitrary $t > 0$. We have

$$\int_a^b \tau dx = \int_0^t \int_a^b \tau_x^2 dx ds + \int_a^b \tau_0 dx$$

where $\tau_0 := \log \theta_0$. Adding the latter to (2), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \int_a^b u_t^2 dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_a^b u_x^2 dx + \int_a^b \theta dx - \int_a^b \tau dx + \int_0^t \int_a^b \tau_x^2 dx ds \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_a^b v_0^2 dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_a^b u_{0,x}^2 dx + \int_a^b \theta_0 dx - \int_a^b \tau_0 dx < \infty \end{aligned}$$

since

$$\int_a^b \theta dx - \int_a^b \tau dx > 0.$$

The proof is finished. \square

Notice that the first claim of Proposition 2.8 is a quantitative version of the second principle of thermodynamics. It will be particularly useful in studying the asymptotic behavior of solutions. On the other hand, (4) turns out to be crucial in obtaining the compactness estimates. Finally, notice that the proof of Proposition 2.8 and (2) imply that there exists $C > 0$ such that independently of time

$$\int_a^b |\tau| dx < C. \quad (5)$$

The same proposition applies to the approximation sequence $\tau_n := \log \theta_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Finally, we recall an identity from [5].

Lemma 2.9. *Let us consider a positive function $\psi \in C^2([a, b])$, $\psi_x(a) = \psi_x(b) = 0$, then the following inequality*

$$\int_a^b \left[\left(\psi^{1/2} \right)_{xx} \right]^2 dx \leq \frac{13}{8} \int_a^b \psi [(\log \psi)_{xx}]^2 dx$$

holds.

3 Time-independent estimates

The present section is devoted to the time-independent estimates of the temperature. On the one hand, the bound of the L^∞ norm of θ is obtained via the Moser type ([17]) iteration in the spirit of Alikakos

([1]). The latter is a delicate iterative procedure, but it is not fully new in the thermoelasticity. It has already been used in this context in [9]. Still, it is a crucial part of our reasoning. In particular, in the following corollary, we shall utilize the L^∞ bound to estimate the $L^2(L^2)$ norm of the gradient of $\theta^{1/2}$ independently on time. The content of the corollary will be essential in the compactness argument in Section 4. Last but not least, the last estimate of the present section is a time-independent bound from below of the temperature. Again, it is achieved via the Moser-type iteration. This time, however, the iteration is developed on the negative part of the entropy (the logarithm of temperature), requires the precise utilization of (4), and seems a novel step in the field. The claim of the last theorem will be essential in identifying the asymptotic states of a heated string.

Theorem 3.1. *Let θ be a weak solution of the problem (1) in the sense of Definition 2.6. Then*

$$\theta \in L^\infty((0, \infty) \times (a, b)).$$

Proof. In the first step, we show that

$$\theta \in L^\infty(0, \infty; L^2(a, b)).$$

This step seems redundant since all the reasoning is contained in the iteration step, and iteration might be started at the level of the first norm of θ (estimated time-independently in Proposition 2.1). It is, however, illustrative, and the reader sees precisely what comes next. Let us multiply the lower equation in (1) by θ and integrate over (a, b) . Then

$$\int_a^b \theta_t \theta dx - \int_a^b \theta_{xx} \theta dx = \mu \int_a^b u_{tx} \theta^2 dx.$$

It leads to the identity

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_a^b \theta^2 dx + \int_a^b \theta_x^2 dx = \mu \int_a^b u_{tx} \theta^2 dx. \quad (6)$$

We shall estimate the right-hand side of the above equality.

$$\mu \int_a^b u_{tx} \theta^2 dx = -2\mu \int_a^b u_t \theta_x \theta dx \leq C \|u_t\|_{L^2(a,b)} \|\theta\|_{L^\infty(a,b)} \|\theta_x\|_{L^2(a,b)}.$$

By (2), we know that $\|u_t\|_{L^2(a,b)}$ is bounded independently of time. Next, the norm $\|\theta\|_{L^\infty(a,b)}$ is bounded via the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality.

$$\|\theta\|_{L^\infty(a,b)} \leq C_1 \|\theta_x\|_{L^2(a,b)}^{\frac{2}{3}} \|\theta\|_{L^1(a,b)}^{\frac{1}{3}} + C_2 \|\theta\|_{L^1(a,b)}$$

Again, by (2), we know that $\|\theta\|_{L^1(a,b)}$ is bounded independently of time. Therefore, we have

$$\mu \int_a^b u_{tx} \theta^2 dx = -2\mu \int_a^b u_t \theta_x \theta dx \leq C_1 \|\theta_x\|_{L^2(a,b)}^{\frac{5}{3}} + C_2 \|\theta_x\|_{L^2(a,b)}.$$

Now, we use the Young inequality to deduce

$$\mu \int_a^b u_{tx} \theta^2 dx \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\theta_x\|_{L^2(a,b)}^2 + C.$$

Plugging it into (6) yields

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|\theta\|_{L^2(a,b)}^2 + \|\theta_x\|_{L^2(a,b)}^2 \leq C. \quad (7)$$

Next use of the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality gives

$$\|\theta\|_{L^2(a,b)} \leq C_1 \|\theta_x\|_{L^2(a,b)}^{\frac{1}{3}} \|\theta\|_{L^1(a,b)}^{\frac{2}{3}} + C_2 \|\theta\|_{L^1(a,b)}.$$

Hence,

$$\|\theta\|_{L^2(a,b)}^2 \leq C_1 \|\theta_x\|_{L^2(a,b)}^2 + C_2.$$

Plugging the above inequality into (7), we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|\theta\|_{L^2(a,b)}^2 + C_1 \|\theta\|_{L^2(a,b)}^2 \leq C_2,$$

where C_1, C_2 do not depend on time. Now, we immediately get

$$\|\theta\|_{L^2(a,b)}^2 \leq \|\theta_0\|_{L^2(a,b)}^2 + \frac{C_2}{C_1}.$$

Hence,

$$\|\theta\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(a,b))} \leq C.$$

Since C is time-independent, we obtain

$$\|\theta\|_{L^\infty(0,\infty;L^2(a,b))} \leq C.$$

Now, we will estimate the norm $\|\theta\|_{L^\infty(0,\infty;L^{2n+1}(a,b))}$ for an arbitrary $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let us multiply the heat equation in (1) by θ^{2n+1-1} and integrate over (a, b) . After integration by parts, we have

$$\frac{1}{2^{n+1}} \frac{d}{dt} \int_a^b \theta^{2n+1} dx + \left(\frac{1}{2^{n-1}} - \frac{1}{4^n} \right) \int_a^b [(\theta^{2n})_x]^2 dx = \mu \int_a^b u_{tx} \theta^{2n+1} dx. \quad (8)$$

We estimate the right-hand side of the above equality

$$\begin{aligned} \mu \int_a^b u_{tx} \theta^{2n+1} dx &= -\mu 2^{n+1} \int_a^b u_t \theta_x \theta^{2n+1-1} dx = -2\mu \int_a^b u_t \theta^{2n} (\theta^{2n})_x dx \\ &\leq C \|u_t\|_{L^2(a,b)} \|(\theta^{2n})_x\|_{L^2(a,b)} \|\theta^{2n}\|_{L^\infty(a,b)}. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

The Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality yields

$$\|\theta^{2n}\|_{L^\infty(a,b)} \leq C_1 \|(\theta^{2n})_x\|_{L^2(a,b)}^{\frac{2}{3}} \|\theta^{2n}\|_{L^1(a,b)}^{\frac{1}{3}} + C_2 \|\theta^{2n}\|_{L^1(a,b)}.$$

Plugging in the above inequality into (9) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mu \int_a^b u_{tx} \theta^{2n+1} dx &\leq C \left(\|(\theta^{2n})_x\|_{L^2(a,b)}^{\frac{5}{3}} \|\theta^{2n}\|_{L^1(a,b)}^{\frac{1}{3}} + \|(\theta^{2n})_x\|_{L^2(a,b)} \|\theta^{2n}\|_{L^1(a,b)} \right) \\ &\leq \varepsilon \|(\theta^{2n})_x\|_{L^2(a,b)}^2 + C(\varepsilon^{-1} + \varepsilon^{-5}) \|\theta^{2n}\|_{L^1(a,b)}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where ε is a positive number and will be defined soon. Using (8), we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2^{n+1}} \frac{d}{dt} \int_a^b \theta^{2^{n+1}} dx + a_n \|(\theta^{2^n})_x\|_{L^2(a,b)}^2 \leq \varepsilon \|(\theta^{2^n})_x\|_{L^2(a,b)}^2 + C(\varepsilon^{-1} + \varepsilon^{-5}) \|\theta^{2^n}\|_{L^1(a,b)}^2,$$

where we denoted $a_n := \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} - \frac{1}{4^n}$. Let us take $\varepsilon := \frac{a_n}{2}$. Then, we have

$$\frac{1}{2^{n+1}} \frac{d}{dt} \int_a^b \theta^{2^{n+1}} dx + \frac{a_n}{2} \|(\theta^{2^n})_x\|_{L^2(a,b)}^2 \leq C(a_n^{-1} + a_n^{-5}) \|\theta^{2^n}\|_{L^1(a,b)}^2.$$

We again use the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality and the Young inequality. We obtain

$$\frac{1}{2^{n+1}} \frac{d}{dt} \int_a^b \theta^{2^{n+1}} dx + \frac{a_n}{2} \|\theta^{2^n}\|_{L^2(a,b)}^2 \leq C(a_n^{-1} + a_n^{-5} + 1) \|\theta^{2^n}\|_{L^1(a,b)}^2.$$

We rewrite the above inequality as follows

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\theta\|_{L^{2^{n+1}}(a,b)}^{2^{n+1}} + \|\theta\|_{L^{2^{n+1}}(a,b)}^{2^{n+1}} \leq C_1 \|\theta\|_{L^{2^n}(a,b)}^{2^{n+1}},$$

where $C(a_n^{-1} + a_n^{-5} + 1)2^{n+1} \leq C2^{6n} = C_1$. Consequently,

$$\|\theta\|_{L^{2^{n+1}}(a,b)}^{2^{n+1}} \leq (b-a) \|\theta_0\|_{L^\infty(a,b)}^{2^{n+1}} + C2^{6n} \|\theta\|_{L^\infty(0,\infty;L^{2^n}(a,b))}^{2^{n+1}},$$

which gives

$$\|\theta\|_{L^\infty(0,\infty;L^{2^{n+1}}(a,b))} \leq \left(\tilde{c} \|\theta_0\|_{L^\infty(a,b)}^{2^{n+1}} + C2^{6n} \|\theta\|_{L^\infty(0,\infty;L^{2^n}(a,b))}^{2^{n+1}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2^{n+1}}}, \quad (10)$$

where $\tilde{c} := \max\{1, b-a\}$. Let us introduce a notation

$$m_n := \max\{\|\theta_0\|_{L^\infty(a,b)}, \|\theta\|_{L^\infty(0,\infty;L^{2^n}(a,b))}\}.$$

Then, by (10), we have

$$m_{n+1} \leq m_n (\tilde{c} + C2^{6n})^{\frac{1}{2^{n+1}}} \leq m_n C^{\frac{1}{2^{n+1}}} 2^{\frac{6n}{2^{n+1}}}.$$

Thus,

$$m_n \leq m_1 \prod_{k=2}^n C^{\frac{1}{2^k}} 2^{\frac{6(k-1)}{2^k}} = m_1 C^{\sum_{k=2}^n \frac{1}{2^k}} 2^{\sum_{k=1}^n \frac{6(k-1)}{2^k}} \leq m_1 C^{\sum_{k=2}^\infty \frac{1}{2^k}} 2^{\sum_{k=1}^\infty \frac{6(k-1)}{2^k}}.$$

Both series in exponents in the above inequality are convergent, so the sequence m_n is bounded. Hence, we have

$$\|\theta\|_{L^\infty(0,\infty;L^{2^n}(a,b))} \leq C$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and the claim is shown. \square

The above theorem and Proposition 2.8 give us immediately the following result, crucial in the compactness estimates.

Corollary 3.2. *Let θ be a positive weak solution of (1) in the sense of Definition 2.6. Then,*

$$\int_0^\infty \int_a^b \frac{\theta_x^2}{\theta} dx dt < \infty.$$

Proof. We have

$$\int_0^\infty \int_a^b \frac{\theta_x^2}{\theta} dx dt = \int_0^\infty \int_a^b \theta \frac{\theta_x^2}{\theta^2} dx dt \leq \|\theta\|_{L^\infty((0,\infty) \times (a,b))} \int_0^\infty \int_a^b \tau_x^2 dx dt.$$

We conclude using Theorem 3.1 and (3). \square

By Theorem 2.5, we know that θ is positive. To be more precise, in [3], we have shown that for each $T > 0$, there exists $m_T > 0$ such that $\theta \geq m_T$ on $(0, T)$. The following theorem shows that actually, the stronger claim holds, m can be chosen independent of time, i.e., the temperature is bounded away from 0.

Theorem 3.3. *Let θ be a positive temperature solving (1) in the sense of Definition 2.6. Then,*

$$\tau := \log \theta \in L^\infty((0, \infty) \times (a, b)).$$

Proof. Theorem 3.1 gives

$$\tau \leq \log \|\theta\|_{L^\infty((0,\infty) \times (a,b))}$$

for almost all $(t, x) \in (0, \infty) \times (a, b)$. Thus, it is sufficient to show that

$$\tau^- \in L^\infty((0, \infty) \times (a, b)),$$

where $\tau^- := \max\{0, -\tau\}$.

We take the first step and estimate the L^2 norm of τ^- . We need to do it since we shall start the iteration from the L^2 norm.

Multiplying (4) by $-\tau^-$ and integrating over $[a, b]$, we arrive at

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_a^b (\tau^-)^2 dx + \int_a^b [(\tau^-)_x]^2 dx + \int_a^b \tau_x^2 \tau^- dx = -\mu \int_a^b u_{tx} \tau^- dx.$$

This gives us immediately that

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\tau^-\|_{L^2(a,b)}^2 + \|(\tau^-)_x\|_{L^2(a,b)}^2 \leq -\mu \int_a^b u_{tx} \tau^- dx. \quad (11)$$

We shall bound the right-hand side of the above inequality.

$$-\mu \int_a^b u_{tx} \tau^- dx = \mu \int_a^b u_t (\tau^-)_x dx \leq |\mu| \|u_t\|_{L^2(a,b)} \|(\tau^-)_x\|_{L^2(a,b)}$$

We put this result into (11) and use the Young inequality. This leads to

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\tau^-\|_{L^2(a,b)}^2 + \|(\tau^-)_x\|_{L^2(a,b)}^2 \leq C. \quad (12)$$

From (5) we know that $\|\tau^-\|_{L^1(a,b)}$ is bounded for almost all $t \in [0, \infty)$. By the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\tau^-\|_{L^2(a,b)} &\leq C_1 \|(\tau^-)_x\|_{L^2(a,b)}^{\frac{1}{3}} \|\tau^-\|_{L^1(a,b)}^{\frac{2}{3}} + C_2 \|\tau^-\|_{L^1(a,b)} \\ &\leq C_1 \|(\tau^-)_x\|_{L^2(a,b)} + C_2 \|\tau^-\|_{L^1(a,b)},\end{aligned}$$

where in the last step, we used the Young inequality. Now, plugging the last inequality into (12), we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\tau^-\|_{L^2(a,b)}^2 + C_1 \|\tau^-\|_{L^2(a,b)}^2 \leq C_2.$$

Thus, we get that

$$\tau^- \in L^\infty(0, \infty; L^2(a, b))$$

Next, Let us take $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We multiply equation (4) by $-(\tau^-)^{2^{n+1}-1}$ and then integrate over $[a, b]$. It yields

$$\frac{1}{2^{n+1}} \frac{d}{dt} \int_a^b (\tau^-)^{2^{n+1}} dx + \left(\frac{1}{2^{n-1}} - \frac{1}{4^n} \right) \int_a^b [((\tau^-)^{2^n})_x]^2 \leq -\mu \int_a^b (\tau^-)^{2^{n+1}-1} u_{tx} dx. \quad (13)$$

We calculate the right-hand side of the above inequality.

$$\begin{aligned}-\mu \int_a^b (\tau^-)^{2^{n+1}-1} u_{tx} dx &= \mu(2^{n+1} - 1) \int_a^b (\tau^-)_x (\tau^-)^{2^{n+1}-2} u_t dx \\ &= \mu \left(2 - \frac{1}{2^n} \right) \int_a^b [(\tau^-)^{2^n}]_x (\tau^-)^{2^n-1} u_t dx \\ &\leq |\mu| \left(2 - \frac{1}{2^n} \right) \|u_t\|_{L^2(a,b)} \|[(\tau^-)^{2^n}]_x\|_{L^2(a,b)} \|(\tau^-)^{2^n}\|_{L^\infty(a,b)}^{1-\frac{1}{2^n}} \\ &\leq |\mu| 2 \|u_t\|_{L^2(a,b)} \|[(\tau^-)^{2^n}]_x\|_{L^2(a,b)} (1 + \|(\tau^-)^{2^n}\|_{L^\infty(a,b)})\end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Now, we use the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality

$$\|(\tau^-)^{2^n}\|_{L^\infty(a,b)} \leq C_1 \|[(\tau^-)^{2^n}]_x\|_{L^2(a,b)}^{\frac{2}{3}} \|(\tau^-)^{2^n}\|_{L^1(a,b)}^{\frac{1}{3}} + C_2 \|(\tau^-)^{2^n}\|_{L^1(a,b)}.$$

Plugging the obtained inequality into (14), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}-\mu \int_a^b (\tau^-)^{2^{n+1}-1} u_{tx} dx &\leq C (\|[(\tau^-)^{2^n}]_x\|_{L^2(a,b)} + \|[(\tau^-)^{2^n}]_x\|_{L^2(a,b)}^{\frac{5}{3}} \|(\tau^-)^{2^n}\|_{L^1(a,b)}^{\frac{1}{3}} \\ &\quad + \|[(\tau^-)^{2^n}]_x\|_{L^2(a,b)} \|(\tau^-)^{2^n}\|_{L^1(a,b)}) \\ &\leq \varepsilon \|[(\tau^-)^{2^n}]_x\|_{L^2(a,b)}^2 + C\varepsilon^{-1} + C(\varepsilon^{-1} + \varepsilon^{-5}) \|(\tau^-)^{2^n}\|_{L^1(a,b)}^2.\end{aligned}$$

We plug this into (13) and obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2^{n+1}} \frac{d}{dt} \int_a^b (\tau^-)^{2^{n+1}} dx + \left(\frac{1}{2^{n-1}} - \frac{1}{4^n} \right) \int_a^b [((\tau^-)^{2^n})_x]^2 \\ \leq \varepsilon \|[(\tau^-)^{2^n}]_x\|_{L^2(a,b)}^2 + C\varepsilon^{-1} + C(\varepsilon^{-1} + \varepsilon^{-5}) \|(\tau^-)^{2^n}\|_{L^1(a,b)}^2.\end{aligned}$$

We denote $a_n := \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} - \frac{1}{4^n}$ and we take $\varepsilon := \frac{a_n}{2}$. Thus, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2^{n+1}} \frac{d}{dt} \int_a^b (\tau^-)^{2^{n+1}} dx + \frac{a_n}{2} \int_a^b [((\tau^-)^{2^n})_x]^2 \\ & \leq C a_n^{-1} + C(a_n^{-1} + a_n^{-5}) \|(\tau^-)^{2^n}\|_{L^1(a,b)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we again use the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality and the Young inequality. It yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2^{n+1}} \frac{d}{dt} \int_a^b (\tau^-)^{2^{n+1}} dx + \frac{a_n}{2} \|(\tau^-)^{2^n}\|_{L^2(a,b)}^2 \\ & \leq C a_n^{-1} + C(a_n^{-1} + a_n^{-5} + 1) \|(\tau^-)^{2^n}\|_{L^1(a,b)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

We rewrite the above inequality in the following way

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\tau^-\|_{L^{2^{n+1}}(a,b)}^{2^{n+1}} + \|\tau^-\|_{L^{2^{n+1}}(a,b)}^{2^{n+1}} \leq C 2^{6n} (\|\tau^-\|_{L^{2^n}(a,b)}^{2^{n+1}} + 1).$$

It leads us to

$$\|\tau^-\|_{L^\infty(0,\infty;L^{2^{n+1}}(a,b))}^{2^{n+1}} \leq C 2^{6n} (\|\tau^-\|_{L^\infty(0,\infty;L^{2^n}(a,b))}^{2^{n+1}} + 1) + (b-a) \|\tau_0^-\|_{L^\infty(a,b)}^{2^{n+1}}$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and for almost all $t \in [0, \infty)$, where $\tau_0 := \log \theta_0$. Now, we immediately obtain

$$\|\tau^-\|_{L^\infty(0,\infty;L^{2^{n+1}}(a,b))} \leq (C 2^{6n} (\|\tau^-\|_{L^\infty(0,\infty;L^{2^n}(a,b))}^{2^{n+1}} + 1) + \tilde{c} \|\tau_0^-\|_{L^\infty(a,b)}^{\frac{1}{2^{n+1}}})^{\frac{1}{2^{n+1}}}, \quad (15)$$

where $\tilde{c} = \max\{1, b-a\}$. We can also assume that $C \geq 1$. Let us introduce a sequence

$$m_n := \max\{\|\tau^-\|_{L^\infty(0,\infty;L^{2^n}(a,b))}, \|\tau_0^-\|_{L^\infty(a,b)}, 1\}.$$

Inequality (15) gives us

$$m_{n+1} \leq (C 2^{6n} + \tilde{c})^{\frac{1}{2^{n+1}}} m_n \leq C^{\frac{1}{2^{n+1}}} 2^{\frac{6n}{2^{n+1}}} m_n.$$

It is an analogous inequality to the one appearing in the proof of Theorem 3.1. Thus, similarly, we obtain

$$\tau^- \in L^\infty((0, \infty) \times (a, b)).$$

□

The above theorem gives that for almost all $(t, x) \in (0, \infty) \times (a, b)$ we have

$$-\|\tau\|_{L^\infty((0,\infty)\times(a,b))} \leq \log \theta \leq \|\tau\|_{L^\infty((0,\infty)\times(a,b))}.$$

It yields that for almost all $(t, x) \in (0, \infty) \times (a, b)$ one has

$$0 < \exp(-\|\tau\|_{L^\infty((0,\infty)\times(a,b))}) \leq \theta \leq \|\theta\|_{L^\infty((0,\infty)\times(a,b))}.$$

4 Time-independent estimates for higher order derivatives of the displacement and the temperature

In order to pass to the limit over the time sequences, we need compactness estimates. In what follows, we present the time-independent estimates of higher-order derivatives of displacement and temperature, guaranteeing required compactness.

We derive the estimates on the approximation sequence from Proposition 2.7. Next, the passage to the limit shall yield the exactly same estimates of the solutions to (1).

Theorem 4.1. *Let (u_n, θ_n) be the solution of the approximate problem in the sense of Definition 2.6 for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, for any $t > 0$ and all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have*

$$\|\theta_{n,x}\|_{L^2(a,b)}^2 + \|u_{n,tx}\|_{L^2(a,b)}^2 + \|u_{n,xx}\|_{L^2(a,b)}^2 \leq C. \quad (16)$$

The constant C depends on $b - a$, μ , $\|\theta_0\|_{H^1(a,b)}$, $\tilde{\theta}$, $\|u_0\|_{H^2(a,b)}$ and $\|v_0\|_{H_0^1(a,b)}$.

Proof. For simplicity, we skip the subscripts in u_n and θ_n in the proof. By Proposition 2.7, we know that u and θ are regular enough to apply Lemma 2.2. Hence, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \left(\int_a^b \frac{\theta_x^2}{\theta} dx + \int_a^b u_{tx}^2 dx + \int_a^b u_{xx}^2 dx \right) = - \int_a^b \theta [(\log \theta)_{xx}]^2 dx + \frac{\mu}{2} \int_a^b \frac{\theta_x^2}{\theta} u_{tx} dx. \quad (17)$$

We estimate the second term on the right-hand side of (17).

$$\begin{aligned} \int_a^b \frac{\theta_x^2}{\theta} u_{tx} dx &= 4 \int_a^b \left(\theta^{1/2} \right)_x^2 u_{tx} dx = -8 \int_a^b \left(\theta^{1/2} \right)_x \left(\theta^{1/2} \right)_{xx} u_t dx \\ &\leq 8 \|u_t\|_{L^\infty(a,b)} \left\| \left(\theta^{1/2} \right)_{xx} \right\|_{L^2(a,b)} \left\| \left(\theta^{1/2} \right)_x \right\|_{L^2(a,b)} \\ &\leq \varepsilon \left\| \left(\theta^{1/2} \right)_{xx} \right\|_{L^2(a,b)}^2 + \frac{1}{16\varepsilon} \left\| \left(\theta^{1/2} \right)_x \right\|_{L^2(a,b)}^2 \|u_t\|_{L^\infty(a,b)}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

We apply the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality to the norm $\|u_t\|_{L^\infty(a,b)}$ and obtain

$$\|u_t\|_{L^\infty(a,b)} \leq C \|u_{tx}\|_{L^2(a,b)}^{1/2} \|u_t\|_{L^2(a,b)}^{1/2}.$$

Taking this into account in (18), together with Lemma 2.9, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_a^b \frac{\theta_x^2}{\theta} u_{tx} dx &\leq \varepsilon \frac{13}{8} \int_a^b \theta [(\log \theta)_{xx}]^2 dx + C \left\| \left(\theta^{1/2} \right)_x \right\|_{L^2(a,b)}^2 \|u_{tx}\|_{L^2(a,b)} \|u_t\|_{L^2(a,b)} \\ &\leq \varepsilon \frac{13}{8} \int_a^b \theta [(\log \theta)_{xx}]^2 dx + C \left\| \left(\theta^{1/2} \right)_x \right\|_{L^2(a,b)}^2 \|u_{tx}\|_{L^2(a,b)} \\ &\leq \varepsilon \frac{13}{8} \int_a^b \theta [(\log \theta)_{xx}]^2 dx + C_1 \left\| \left(\theta^{1/2} \right)_x \right\|_{L^2(a,b)}^2 + C_2 \left\| \left(\theta^{1/2} \right)_x \right\|_{L^2(a,b)}^2 \|u_{tx}\|_{L^2(a,b)}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where constant C contains $\|u_t\|_{L^2(a,b)}$. The last inequality might seem strange at the first sight. It is, however, crucial in order to derive the proper tricky Grönwall-type lemma yielding a time-independent estimate.

We plug in (19) in (17) and choose ε such that $\varepsilon \frac{13}{8} - 1 \leq 0$, this gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \left(\int_a^b \frac{\theta_x^2}{\theta} dx + \int_a^b u_{tx}^2 dx + \int_a^b u_{xx}^2 dx \right) \\ & \leq C_1 \left\| \left(\theta^{1/2} \right)_x \right\|_{L^2(a,b)}^2 + C_2 \left\| \left(\theta^{1/2} \right)_x \right\|_{L^2(a,b)}^2 \|u_{tx}\|_{L^2(a,b)}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Introducing the notation $x(t) := \int_a^b \frac{\theta_x^2}{\theta} dx$ and $y(t) := \int_a^b u_{tx}^2 dx + \int_a^b u_{xx}^2 dx$, we rewrite (20) in the following form

$$x'(t) + y'(t) \leq C_1 x(t) + C_2 x(t)y(t) \leq C_1 x(t) + C_2 (x(t)y(t) + x(t)^2).$$

Multiplying both sides by $\exp\left(-C_2 \int_0^t x(s) ds\right)$ yields

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\exp\left(-C_2 \int_0^t x(s) ds\right) (x(t) + y(t)) \right) \leq C_1 \exp\left(-C_2 \int_0^t x(s) ds\right) x(t).$$

We integrate over $[0, t]$ for arbitrary t and get

$$\begin{aligned} \exp\left(-C_2 \int_0^t x(s) ds\right) (x(t) + y(t)) \\ \leq C_1 \int_0^t \exp\left(-C_2 \int_0^s x(u) du\right) x(s) ds + x(0) + y(0), \end{aligned}$$

which immediately gives

$$x(t) + y(t) \leq \exp\left(C_2 \int_0^t x(s) ds\right) \left(C_1 \int_0^t x(s) ds + x(0) + y(0) \right)$$

for all $t \in [0, \infty)$.

Notice that the estimate does not depend on time in light of Corollary 3.2. Hence, we have

$$x(t) + y(t) \leq \exp\left(C_2 \int_0^\infty x(s) ds\right) \left(C_1 \int_0^\infty x(s) ds + x(0) + y(0) \right)$$

for all $t \in [0, \infty)$. Next, we notice that in light of Theorem 3.1, we additionally have

$$\|\theta_x\|_{L^2(a,b)}^2 \leq \|\theta\|_{L^\infty((0,\infty) \times (a,b))} \int_a^b \frac{\theta_x^2}{\theta} dx = \|\theta\|_{L^\infty((0,\infty) \times (a,b))} x(t)$$

for all $t \in [0, \infty)$. The proof is finished. \square

In light of Theorem 4.1, in particular since C in (16) does not depend on n , we know that (u_n, θ_n) is weakly convergent (possibly on a subsequence) to (u, θ) , which is a unique weak solution of (1). Hence, (u, θ) solving (1), satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} u & \in L^\infty(0, \infty; H^2(a, b)) \cap W^{1,\infty}(0, \infty; H_0^1(a, b)), \\ \theta & \in L^\infty(0, \infty; H^1(a, b)). \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

5 Displacement and temperature at infinity

The present section is devoted to the proof of the main Theorem 1.1. We classify the asymptotic behavior of a heated string. Although the strong damping mechanisms like heat radiation and material damage due to heat or resistance of the air are not taken into account in our model, it still turns out that the heat propagation itself is a strong stabilizing effect, ensuring a string decay. It is a bit surprising since the natural behavior of a string is the oscillatory one. In our argument, we see that the second principle of thermodynamics is responsible for the vibration suppression.

Technically, our proof is based on the estimates in Sections 3 and 4. However, we still need a stability of the solution map with respect to initial conditions. This is the content of Proposition 5.1. Next, we define the dynamical system and its phase space corresponding to the evolution of solutions of (1). We are then in a position to identify the ω -limit sets. One of the main tools in our argument is a quantitative version of the second principle of thermodynamics stated in Proposition 2.8. A reader following closely our proof will notice the role of the second principle of thermodynamics in the identification of the asymptotic states of a heated string.

We start by stating the stability with respect to initial data in proper functional spaces.

Proposition 5.1. *Let us take two triples of the initial values $u_{0,1}, u_{0,2} \in H^2(a, b) \cap H_0^1(a, b)$, $v_{0,1}, v_{0,2} \in H_0^1(a, b)$ and $\theta_{0,1}, \theta_{0,2} \in H^1(a, b)$. Let us also assume that (u_1, θ_1) is a weak solution of (1) starting from $u_{0,1}, v_{0,1}, \theta_{0,1}$ and (u_2, θ_2) is a weak solution starting from $u_{0,2}, v_{0,2}, \theta_{0,2}$. Moreover, we assume that there exists $M > 0$ such that*

$$\|u_{1,tx}\|_{L^\infty(0,\infty;L^2(a,b))} + \|\theta_2\|_{L^\infty(0,\infty;H^1(a,b))} \leq M^1.$$

Then, for all $t \in (0, \infty)$ there exists the constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|u_1(t, \cdot) - u_2(t, \cdot)\|_{H_0^1(a,b)} + \|u_{1,t}(t, \cdot) - u_{2,t}(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2(a,b)} + \|\theta_1(t, \cdot) - \theta_2(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2(a,b)} \\ & \leq C \left(\|u_{0,1} - u_{0,2}\|_{H_0^1(a,b)} + \|v_{0,1} - v_{0,2}\|_{L^2(a,b)} + \|\theta_{0,1} - \theta_{0,2}\|_{L^2(a,b)} \right) \end{aligned}$$

and $C = C(t, M, |\mu|)$.

Proof. Let us denote $u := u_1 - u_2$ and $\theta := \theta_1 - \theta_2$. We subtract the equations for (u_2, θ_2) from the equations for (u_1, θ_1) and obtain

$$\begin{cases} u_{tt} - u_{xx} = \mu\theta_x, \\ \theta_t - \theta_{xx} = \mu\theta u_{1,tx} + \mu\theta_2 u_{tx}. \end{cases} \quad (22)$$

We multiply by u_t the first of the above equations and arrive at

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \left(\int_a^b u_t^2 dx + \int_a^b u_x^2 dx \right) = \mu \int_a^b u_t \theta_x \leq C \|u_t\|_{L^2(a,b)}^2 + \frac{1}{4} \|\theta_x\|_{L^2(a,b)}^2. \quad (23)$$

¹The inequality is satisfied by solutions of (1) due to (21).

Whereas, multiplying the second equation in (22) by θ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_a^b \theta^2 dx + \int_a^b \theta_x^2 dx &= \mu \int_a^b \theta^2 u_{1,tx} dx + \mu \int_a^b \theta \theta_2 u_{tx} dx \\ &= \mu \int_a^b \theta^2 u_{1,tx} dx - \mu \int_a^b \theta_x \theta_2 u_t dx - \mu \int_a^b \theta \theta_{2,x} u_t dx = I_1 + I_2 + I_3. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

We estimate integrals I_1, I_2 and I_3 .

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &\leq |\mu| \|\theta\|_{L^2(a,b)} \|\theta\|_{L^\infty(a,b)} \|u_{1,tx}\|_{L^2(a,b)} \leq |\mu| MC \|\theta\|_{L^2(a,b)} (\|\theta\|_{L^2(a,b)} + \|\theta_x\|_{L^2(a,b)}) \\ &\leq C \|\theta\|_{L^2(a,b)}^2 + \frac{1}{12} \|\theta_x\|_{L^2(a,b)}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &\leq |\mu| \|\theta_x\|_{L^2(a,b)} \|\theta_2\|_{L^\infty(a,b)} \|u_t\|_{L^2(a,b)} \leq |\mu| C \|\theta_x\|_{L^2(a,b)} \|\theta_2\|_{H^1(a,b)} \|u_t\|_{L^2(a,b)} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{12} \|\theta_x\|_{L^2(a,b)}^2 + C \|u_t\|_{L^2(a,b)}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} I_3 &\leq |\mu| \|\theta\|_{L^\infty(a,b)} \|\theta_{2,x}\|_{L^2(a,b)} \|u_t\|_{L^2(a,b)} \leq |\mu| MC (\|\theta\|_{L^2(a,b)} + \|\theta_x\|_{L^2(a,b)}) \|u_t\|_{L^2(a,b)} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{12} \|\theta_x\|_{L^2(a,b)}^2 + C (\|\theta\|_{L^2(a,b)}^2 + \|u_t\|_{L^2(a,b)}^2). \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

Next, inequalities (25), (26) and (27) are applied in (24). We have

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_a^b \theta^2 dx + \int_a^b \theta_x^2 dx \leq \frac{1}{4} \|\theta_x\|_{L^2(a,b)}^2 + C (\|\theta\|_{L^2(a,b)}^2 + \|u_t\|_{L^2(a,b)}^2).$$

We add the above inequality and (23). It yields

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \left(\int_a^b u_t^2 dx + \int_a^b u_x^2 dx + \int_a^b \theta^2 dx \right) + \int_a^b \theta_x^2 dx \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\theta_x\|_{L^2(a,b)}^2 + C (\|\theta\|_{L^2(a,b)}^2 + \|u_t\|_{L^2(a,b)}^2).$$

It immediately implies

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\int_a^b u_t^2 dx + \int_a^b u_x^2 dx + \int_a^b \theta^2 dx \right) \leq C (\|\theta\|_{L^2(a,b)}^2 + \|u_t\|_{L^2(a,b)}^2 + \|u_x\|_{L^2(a,b)}^2).$$

The Grönwall inequality finishes the proof. \square

In the next step of the proof of Theorem 1.1, we define the corresponding phase space and the dynamical system. We denote

$$\mathcal{M} := \left\{ \eta \in H^1(a,b) : \operatorname{ess\,inf}_{x \in (a,b)} \eta(x) > 0 \right\}.$$

Let us take $t \geq 0$. We define an operator

$$S(t) : (H_0^1(a,b) \cap H^2(a,b)) \times H_0^1(a,b) \times \mathcal{M} \rightarrow (H_0^1(a,b) \cap H^2(a,b)) \times H_0^1(a,b) \times \mathcal{M}$$

by formula

$$S(t)(u_0, v_0, \theta_0) = (u(t), u_t(t), \theta(t)),$$

where u and θ are weak solutions of (1) with initial values u_0, v_0 and θ_0 . Thanks to the uniqueness of weak solutions of (1), we obtain

$$S(t+h) = S(h) \circ S(t)$$

for all $t, h \in [0, \infty)$.

Proposition 5.1 implies the following important corollary.

Corollary 5.2. *Let $(u_0, v_0, \theta_0), (u_n, v_n, \theta_n) \in (H_0^1(a, b) \cap H^2(a, b)) \times H_0^1(a, b) \times \mathcal{M}$ be such that*

$$(u_n, v_n, \theta_n) \rightarrow (u_0, v_0, \theta_0) \text{ in } H_0^1(a, b) \times L^2(a, b) \times L^2(a, b).$$

Then also

$$S(t)(u_n, v_n, \theta_n) \rightarrow S(t)(u_0, v_0, \theta_0) \text{ in } H_0^1(a, b) \times L^2(a, b) \times L^2(a, b)$$

for each $t \geq 0$.

Now, we are ready to prove the paper's main theorem.

The proof of Theorem 1.1. Let us take a sequence $t_n \in [0, \infty)$ such that $t_n \rightarrow \infty$. We consider the sequences $u(t_n, \cdot)$, $u_t(t_n, \cdot)$ and $\theta(t_n, \cdot)$. By Definition 2.3 and Remark 2.4, we know that

$$\begin{aligned} u &\in C([0, \infty); H_0^1(a, b)), \quad u_t \in C([0, \infty); L^2(a, b)), \\ \theta &\in C([0, \infty); H^1(a, b)). \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

Due to (21), we see that an even stronger claim is satisfied by the sequence $\theta(t_n, \cdot)$, it is bounded in $H^1(a, b)$. However, $u(t_n, \cdot)$ and $u_t(t_n, \cdot)$ are only essentially bounded in $H^2(a, b)$ and $H_0^1(a, b)$ respectively. It makes the compactness argument presented below a bit more delicate. Indeed, we only know that

$$u \in L^\infty(0, \infty; H^2(a, b)), \quad u_t \in L^\infty(0, \infty, H_0^1(a, b)).$$

Thus, there exists a measurable set $\mathcal{T} \subset [0, \infty)$ such that $|[0, \infty) \setminus \mathcal{T}| = 0$ and $u|_{\mathcal{T}}$, $u_t|_{\mathcal{T}}$ are bounded functions with values in $H^2(a, b)$ and $H_0^1(a, b)$ respectively. However, if we show

$$\lim_{\substack{t \rightarrow \infty \\ t \in \mathcal{T}}} u(t, \cdot) = 0 \text{ in } H_0^1(a, b)$$

and

$$\lim_{\substack{t \rightarrow \infty \\ t \in \mathcal{T}}} u_t(t, \cdot) = 0 \text{ in } L^2(a, b),$$

then (28) will imply that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} u(t, \cdot) = 0 \text{ in } H_0^1(a, b),$$

and

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} u_t(t, \cdot) = 0 \text{ in } L^2(a, b).$$

The details are left to the reader.

Therefore, we assume that $u(t_n, \cdot)$ and $u_t(t_n, \cdot)$ are bounded in $H^2(a, b)$ and $H_0^1(a, b)$ respectively. We also know that $\theta(t_n, \cdot)$ is bounded in $H^1(a, b)$. Thus, we have a subsequence of t_n (still denoted as t_n) such that

$$\begin{aligned} u(t_n, \cdot) &\rightharpoonup \tilde{u} \text{ in } H^2(a, b), \\ u_t(t_n, \cdot) &\rightharpoonup \tilde{v} \text{ in } H_0^1(a, b), \\ \theta(t_n, \cdot) &\rightharpoonup \tilde{\theta} \text{ in } H^1(a, b), \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

where $\tilde{u} \in H_0^1(a, b) \cap H^2(a, b)$, $\tilde{v} \in H_0^1(a, b)$ and $\tilde{\theta} \in H^1(a, b)$ are certain functions. By compact embeddings, we know that

$$\begin{aligned} u(t_n, \cdot) &\rightarrow \tilde{u} \text{ in } H_0^1(a, b), \\ u_t(t_n, \cdot) &\rightarrow \tilde{v} \text{ in } L^2(a, b), \\ \theta(t_n, \cdot) &\rightarrow \tilde{\theta} \text{ in } L^2(a, b). \end{aligned}$$

Next, we define solutions starting from functions, which are obtained as limits of $u(t_n, \cdot), \theta(t_n, \cdot)$. We denote by \bar{u} and $\bar{\theta}$ the weak solution of (1) with the initial values \tilde{u}, \tilde{v} and $\tilde{\theta}$ (they can be defined due to the fact that the limiting objects have enough regularity to define weak solutions, see (29)).

Next, we take $h > 0$ and consider the sequences $u(t_n + h, \cdot), u_t(t_n + h, \cdot)$ and $\theta(t_n + h, \cdot)$. Similarly, as above, there exists $\hat{u} \in H_0^1(a, b) \cap H^2(a, b)$, $\hat{v} \in H_0^1(a, b)$ and $\hat{\theta} \in H^1(a, b)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} u(t_n + h, \cdot) &\rightarrow \hat{u} \text{ in } H_0^1(a, b), \\ u_t(t_n + h, \cdot) &\rightarrow \hat{v} \text{ in } L^2(a, b), \\ \theta(t_n + h, \cdot) &\rightarrow \hat{\theta} \text{ in } L^2(a, b). \end{aligned}$$

If necessary, we take the subsequence of t_n in the above convergences. By Corollary 5.2, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (\hat{u}, \hat{v}, \hat{\theta}) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (u(t_n + h, \cdot), u_t(t_n + h, \cdot), \theta(t_n + h, \cdot)) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S(h)(u(t_n, \cdot), u_t(t_n, \cdot), \theta(t_n, \cdot)) \\ &= S(h)(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}, \tilde{\theta}) = (\bar{u}(h, \cdot), \bar{u}_t(h, \cdot), \bar{\theta}(h, \cdot)). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by Proposition 2.8, we know that a function

$$t \mapsto \int_a^b \log \theta(t, x) dx$$

is non-decreasing. Thus, sequences $\int_a^b \log \theta(t_n, x) dx$ and $\int_a^b \log \theta(t_n + h, x) dx$ must be convergent to the same number. Moreover,

$$\int_a^b \log \tilde{\theta} dx = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_a^b \log \theta(t_n, x) dx = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_a^b \log \theta(t_n + h, x) dx = \int_a^b \log \bar{\theta}(h, x) dx. \quad (30)$$

Indeed, $\theta(t_n, x)$ is convergent in L^2 , so also a.e. (up to a subsequence). Next, we use Theorem 3.3 to infer that both $\bar{\theta}(h, \cdot)$ and $\tilde{\theta}$ are bounded away from 0. The latter allows us to conclude (30) via the Lebesgue theorem.

Next, we remark that (30) states that

$$t \mapsto \int_a^b \log \bar{\theta}(t, x) dx$$

is constant. The second principle of thermodynamics has just told us that the integral of entropy is constant at the ω -limit set. Further, we make use of the knowledge of the dissipation rate of the entropy in Proposition 2.8 to obtain

$$0 = \frac{d}{dt} \int_a^b \log \bar{\theta} dx = \int_a^b \frac{\bar{\theta}_x^2}{\bar{\theta}^2} dx.$$

Hence,

$$(\log \bar{\theta})_x = 0 \text{ in } (a, b)$$

for any $t > 0$. So, for each fixed $t > 0$, $\bar{\theta}$ is constant in space. But then, applying Proposition 2.8 (II second principle of thermodynamics) again, we obtain

$$0 = \frac{d}{dt} \int_a^b \log \bar{\theta} dx = \frac{d}{dt} \log \bar{\theta}(b - a) = \frac{\bar{\theta}_t}{\bar{\theta}}(b - a).$$

It means that $\bar{\theta}$ is also constant in time. So, $\bar{\theta}(t, x)$ is constant in space and time.

So far, we identified all the trajectories of (1) starting from functions $\tilde{\theta}$. The functions $\tilde{\theta}$ are all the possible limits with time of a temperature satisfying (1). We observe now that, actually, the ω -limit set of a solution to (1) contains only one potential limit for temperature $\tilde{\theta}$. To this end, we utilize the second principle of thermodynamics once more. Assume there are two different functions $\tilde{\theta}_1$ and $\tilde{\theta}_2$, which are limits of $\theta(t_{n_k})$ and $\theta(t_{n_l})$ respectively, for different time sequences $t_{n_k}, t_{n_l} \rightarrow \infty$. But Proposition 2.8 says that

$$\int_a^b \log(\tilde{\theta}_1) dx = \int_a^b \log(\tilde{\theta}_2) dx.$$

Moreover, we already know that solutions starting from $\tilde{\theta}_1$ and $\tilde{\theta}_2$ are constant in space and time. Hence

$$\log(\tilde{\theta}_1) = \log(\tilde{\theta}_2)$$

and so $\tilde{\theta}_1 = \tilde{\theta}_2$. Thus, we have just shown that the ω -limit set of a solution to (1) contains a single function $\tilde{\theta}$, which is constant. Next, we identify all potential limits of displacements.

First, we name \tilde{u} the limit of $u(t_n, x)$ for a sequence $t_n \rightarrow \infty$. Next, we consider \bar{u} and $\bar{\theta}$ satisfying (1) with initial data $\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{u}$ respectively. Hence, since $\bar{\theta}$ is constant and positive (again, we use Theorem 3.3), we have

$$\begin{cases} \bar{u}_{tt} - \bar{u}_{xx} = 0, \\ 0 = \mu \bar{\theta} \bar{u}_{tx}, \\ \bar{u}(a) = \bar{u}(b) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (31)$$

The second equation and boundary conditions in (31) show that $\bar{u}_t(t, x) = 0$ for all $(t, x) \in [0, \infty) \times [a, b]$. Hence, $\bar{u}_t = 0$ in $[a, b]$ and so \bar{u} is constant in time for each $x \in [a, b]$, which together with the first equation in (31) states that $\bar{u}_{xx} = 0$ and this implies that $\bar{u} = 0$. Finally, the conservation of the energy (Proposition 2.1) states that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \int_a^b v_0^2 dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_a^b u_{0,x}^2 dx + \int_a^b \theta_0 dx \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{1}{2} \int_a^b u_t^2(t_n, x) dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_a^b u_x^2(t_n, x) dx + \int_a^b \theta(t_n, x) dx \right) \\ &= \int_a^b \tilde{\theta} dx = (b - a)\tilde{\theta}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Data availability Data sharing not applicable to this article as no datasets were generated or analysed during the current study.

Conflict of interest The author declares that he has no conflict of interest.

References

- [1] N. D. ALIKAKOS, *An application of the invariance principle to reaction-diffusion equations*, J. Differential Equations **33**, (1979), 201–225.
- [2] P. M. BIES, *Decay of solutions of non-homogenous hyperbolic equations*, in preparation.
- [3] P. M. BIES, T. CIEŚLAK, *Global-in-time regular unique solutions with positive temperature to the 1d thermoelasticity*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **55**, (2023), 7024–7038.
- [4] , F. BOYER, P. FABRIE, *Mathematical Tools for the Study of the Incompressible Navier-Stokes Equations and Related Models*, Applied Mathematical Sciences 183, Springer, New York, 2013.
- [5] T. CIEŚLAK, M. FUEST, K. HAJDUK, M. SIERŻĘGA, *On existence of global solutions for the 3D chemorepulsion system*, Z. Anal. Anwend. **43**, (2024), 49–65.
- [6] T. CIEŚLAK, M. GALIĆ, B. MUHA, *A model in one-dimensional thermoelasticity*, Nonlinear Anal. **216**, (2022), Paper No. 112703, 21 pp.

- [7] T. CIEŚLAK, B. MUHA, S. TRIFUNOVIĆ, *Global weak solutions in nonlinear 3D thermoelasticity*, Calc. Var. **63**, (2024), Paper No. 26, 36 pp.
- [8] C. DAFERMOS, G.-Q. CHEN, *The vanishing viscosity method in one-dimensional thermoelasticity*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **347**, (1995), 531–541.
- [9] C. M. DAFERMOS, L. HSIAO, *Development of singularities in solutions of the equations of nonlinear thermoelasticity*, Quart. Appl. Math. **44**, (1986), 463–474.
- [10] L. C. EVANS, *Partial Differential Equations*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics 19, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2020.
- [11] A. FRIEDMAN, *Partial Differential Equations of Parabolic Type*, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1964.
- [12] M. GALANOPOULOU, A. VIKELIS, M. KOUMATOS, *Weak-strong uniqueness for measure-valued solutions to the equations of quasiconvex adiabatic thermoelasticity*, Commun. Partial Differ. Equ. **47**, (2022), 1133–1175.
- [13] D. HENRY, *Topics in analysis*, Publ. Sec. Mat. Univ. Autónoma Barcelona **31**, (1987), 29–84.
- [14] W. HRUSA, S. A. MESSAOUDI, *On formation of singularities in one-dimensional nonlinear thermoelasticity*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **111**, (1990) 135–151.
- [15] W. HRUSA, M. TARABEK, *On smooth solutions of the Cauchy problem in one-dimensional nonlinear thermoelasticity*, Quart. Appl. Math. **47**, (1989), 631–644.
- [16] O.A. LADYZHENSKAYA, V.A. SOLONNIKOV, N.N. URALCEVA, *Linear and quasilinear equations of parabolic type*, Trans. Math. Monograph 23, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 1968.
- [17] J. MOSER, *On Harnack’s theorem for elliptic differential equations*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **14**, (1961), 577–591.
- [18] R. RACKE, *Initial boundary value problems in one-dimensional nonlinear thermoelasticity*, Math. Methods Appl. Sci. **10**, (1988), 517–529.
- [19] R. RACKE, *Theromelasticity*, Handbook of differential equations: evolutionary equations. Vol. V, 315–420.
- [20] R. RACKE, Y. SHIBATA, *Global smooth solutions and asymptotic stability in one-dimensional nonlinear thermoelasticity* Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **116**, (1991), 1–34.
- [21] R. RACKE, Y. SHIBATA, S. ZHENG, *Global solvability and exponential stability in one-dimensional nonlinear thermoelasticity* Q. Appl. Math. **51**, (1993), 751–763.
- [22] M. SLEMROD, *Global existence, uniqueness, and asymptotic stability of classical smooth solutions in one-dimensional non-linear thermoelasticity* Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **76**, (1981), 97–133.