

Hyperbolic relaxation of a sixth-order Cahn–Hilliard equation

PIERLUIGI COLLI^(1,2)

e-mail: pierluigi.colli@unipv.it

GIANNI GILARDI^(1,3)

e-mail: gianni.gilardi@unipv.it

⁽¹⁾ Dipartimento di Matematica “F. Casorati”, Università di Pavia
via Ferrata 5, I-27100 Pavia, Italy

⁽²⁾ Research Associate at the IMATI – C.N.R. Pavia

⁽³⁾ Istituto Lombardo, Accademia di Scienze e Lettere, Milano

*Dedicated to our friend Prof. Vittorino Pata
on the occasion of his 60th birthday*

Abstract

This work explores the solvability of a sixth-order Cahn–Hilliard equation with an inertial term, which serves as a relaxation of a higher-order variant of the classical Cahn–Hilliard equation. The equation includes a source term that disrupts the conservation of the mean value of the order parameter. The incorporation of additional spatial derivatives allows the model to account for curvature effects, leading to a more precise representation of isothermal phase separation dynamics. We establish the existence of a weak solution for the associated initial and boundary value problem under the assumption that the double-well-type nonlinearity is globally defined. Additionally, we derive uniform stability estimates, which enable us to demonstrate that any family of solutions satisfying these estimates converges in a suitable topology to the unique solution of the limiting problem as the relaxation parameter approaches zero. Furthermore, we provide an error estimate for specific norms of the difference between solutions in terms of the relaxation parameter.

Key words: Sixth-order Cahn–Hilliard equation, inertial term, partial differential equations, weak solutions, asymptotic convergence, convergence rate estimation.

AMS (MOS) Subject Classification: 35M33, 35M99, 35B20, 35B40.

1 Introduction

In a recent study [8] conducted by the authors in collaboration with A. Signori and J. Sprekels, a sixth-order partial differential equation of the Cahn–Hilliard type was examined and analyzed. Specifically, by introducing the chemical potential μ and the auxiliary

variable w associated with the phase (or order) parameter φ , the study [8] focuses on the resulting system of three equations, namely:

$$\partial_t \varphi - \Delta \mu + \sigma \varphi = g \quad \text{in } Q \quad (1.1)$$

$$-\Delta w + f'(\varphi)w + \nu w = \mu \quad \text{in } Q \quad (1.2)$$

$$-\Delta \varphi + f(\varphi) = w \quad \text{in } Q. \quad (1.3)$$

No-flux boundary conditions and an initial condition have been added to these equations to complete the system:

$$\partial_{\mathbf{n}} \mu = \partial_{\mathbf{n}} w = \partial_{\mathbf{n}} \varphi = 0 \quad \text{on } \Sigma \quad (1.4)$$

$$\varphi(0) = \varphi^0 \quad \text{in } \Omega. \quad (1.5)$$

Here and throughout the sequel, Q and Σ are defined as

$$Q := \Omega \times (0, T) \quad \text{and} \quad \Sigma := \Gamma \times (0, T) \quad (1.6)$$

where Ω is the domain in \mathbb{R}^3 where the evolution takes place, $\Gamma := \partial\Omega$ is its boundary and T stands for a given final time. In the above equations, f is the derivative of a regular double well potential F , while σ and ν are given constants. Moreover, g in (1.1) is a prescribed forcing term, $\partial_{\mathbf{n}}$ in (1.4) denotes the outward normal derivative and φ^0 in (1.5) is a given initial datum. A prototype of F is the *classical regular potential*, given by

$$F(s) = \frac{1}{4}(s^2 - 1)^2, \quad \text{and consequently } f(s) = s^3 - s, \quad \text{for } s \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (1.7)$$

The chemical potential μ in equation (1.2) corresponds to the first variation of the free energy \mathcal{E} . Similarly, w is the first variational derivative of the Ginzburg–Landau free energy \mathcal{G} . Specifically, it holds that $\mu = \delta\mathcal{E}/\delta\varphi$ and $w = \delta\mathcal{G}/\delta\varphi$, where

$$\mathcal{E}(v) = \mathcal{F}(\varphi) + \nu \mathcal{G}(\varphi) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} (-\Delta v + f(v))^2 + \nu \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{1}{2} |\nabla v|^2 + F(v) \right). \quad (1.8)$$

The system (1.1)–(1.3) can be regarded as a variant of the classical fourth-order Cahn–Hilliard equation [3] (see the recent monograph [24] for an overview) in terms of the unknowns φ , μ , and w . The original Cahn–Hilliard equation is widely used to model isothermal phase separation in binary mixtures. The variable φ represents the local proportion of one component within the binary material and serves as an order parameter. For simplicity, it is typically normalized so that the pure states correspond to $\varphi = \pm 1$, while the region $\{-1 < \varphi < 1\}$ represents the diffuse interface, which forms in a tubular neighborhood of the interface with a small thickness parameter. Unlike the classical model, the sixth-order Cahn–Hilliard equation (see [23, 25, 27]) extends it by incorporating curvature effects and higher-order variations of the order parameter. This extension enables a more accurate representation of complex material systems with intricate interface structures. Furthermore, it has potential applications in the design and optimization of materials with tailored microstructures and properties.

In the paper [8] it is proved that the initial and boundary value problem (1.1)–(1.5) has a unique solution in a proper functional framework; moreover, an optimal control problem

is investigated in terms of a distributed control, represented by g in equation (1.1), and a suitable cost functional.

In this paper, we shift our focus to exploring the solvability of a hyperbolic relaxation of problem (1.1)–(1.5). Additionally, we delve into the convergence and asymptotic behavior of solutions, examining how they align with the original problem as the relaxation parameter approaches zero. Specifically, we modify equation (1.1) by

$$\tau \partial_t^2 \varphi + \partial_t \varphi - \Delta \mu + \sigma \varphi = g \quad \text{in } Q \quad (1.9)$$

where τ is a positive coefficient. Coupling (1.9) with (1.2) and (1.3) leads to a sixth-order equation with the inertial term $\tau \partial_t^2 \varphi$.

Some remarks on systems of this type are in order. Over the past two decades, there has been a notable increase in mathematical research on hyperbolic variants of Cahn–Hilliard systems that include inertial terms. The introduction of hyperbolic relaxation terms was first proposed by Galenko [13] and later revisited by Galenko and other physicists [10, 14, 15] to model strongly non-equilibrium decompositions. These decompositions arise due to rapid solidification under supercooling into the spinodal region, a phenomenon observed in certain materials such as glasses.

Regarding the mathematical analysis of hyperbolic versions of the Cahn–Hilliard equations, we refer to [1, 16–22, 28], as well as the more recent contributions [2, 5, 6, 11, 12, 26, 29, 31]. These studies address various aspects, including the existence and regularity of solutions in 2D and 3D, the incorporation of additional mass terms in the first equation (1.1) (such as the Oono term $\sigma \varphi - g$), asymptotic behavior and attractors, approximations and discretized systems, and equations defined in unbounded domains.

A noteworthy contribution is the study by Chen and Liu [4], which investigates a sixth-order Cahn–Hilliard equation with an inertial term to model phase transition dynamics in ternary oil-water-surfactant systems. This analysis is conducted in the one-dimensional case with periodic boundary conditions. Additionally, the recent work [9] examines a hyperbolic relaxation of the viscous Cahn–Hilliard system, where the relaxation term involves the second time derivative of the chemical potential rather than the phase variable.

Returning to (1.9) coupled with (1.2)–(1.5), we note that an additional initial condition must be imposed, namely

$$\partial_t \varphi(0) = \rho^0 \quad (1.10)$$

where ρ^0 is given, to properly define a suitable initial and boundary value problem. We establish that this modified problem admits at least one solution (in a weak sense) that also satisfies precise stability estimates. Furthermore, we demonstrate that any family $\{(\varphi_\tau, \mu_\tau, w_\tau)\}$ of solutions to the relaxed problem, satisfying the stability estimates, converges in an appropriate topology to the unique solution (φ, μ, w) to problem (1.1)–(1.5) as τ tends to zero. Additionally, we derive an error estimate in weaker norms for the difference between solutions, expressed in terms of the relaxation parameter, and establish a convergence rate of order $\tau^{1/2}$.

The paper is structured as follows. In the next section, we introduce our assumptions and notations, present our main results, and compile some useful tools employed throughout the work. The proofs of our existence and asymptotic results are provided in Sections 3 and 4, respectively.

2 Notation, assumptions and results

As for the set Ω mentioned in the Introduction, we assume that it is a bounded and connected open set in \mathbb{R}^3 with smooth boundary Γ and we denote by $|\Omega|$ its Lebesgue measure. For any Banach space X the notations $\|\cdot\|_X$, X^* , and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_X$ indicate the corresponding norm, its dual space, and the related duality pairing between X^* and X , with some exceptions for the notation of the norm that are listed below. Next, we set

$$\begin{aligned} H &:= L^2(\Omega), & V &:= H^1(\Omega), & W &:= \{v \in H^2(\Omega) : \partial_n v = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma\} \\ \text{and } Z &:= \{v \in W : \Delta v \in W\}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.1)$$

The norm in the special case H is indicated by $\|\cdot\|$ (instead of $\|\cdot\|_H$) to simplify the notation. We also denote by (\cdot, \cdot) the standard inner product of H . The symbol $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ might denote the norm in each of the spaces $L^\infty(\Omega)$, $L^\infty(Q)$ (see (1.6)) and $L^\infty(0, T)$, if no confusion can arise.

Remark 2.1. Clearly, V is dense in H and W is dense in V . It turns out that Z is dense in W , as we briefly sketch. Given $u \in W$, we approximate it by the unique solution to the problem

$$-\varepsilon \Delta u_\varepsilon + u_\varepsilon = u \quad \text{in } \Omega \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_n u_\varepsilon = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma \quad (2.2)$$

where ε is a positive parameter. Clearly $u_\varepsilon \in W$, whence also $\Delta u_\varepsilon \in W$. This implies that $u_\varepsilon \in Z$ and that

$$\varepsilon \Delta^2 u_\varepsilon - \Delta u_\varepsilon = -\Delta u. \quad (2.3)$$

Then, by testing (2.2) by u_ε and $-\Delta u_\varepsilon$ and (2.3) by $-\Delta u_\varepsilon$, we easily obtain that

$$\|u_\varepsilon\| \leq \|u\|, \quad \|\nabla u_\varepsilon\| \leq \|\nabla u\| \quad \text{and} \quad \|\Delta u_\varepsilon\| \leq \|\Delta u\|.$$

Hence, u_ε has a subsequence that converges (weakly in principle) in W as ε tends to zero and one immediately sees that its limit is u . This shows the expected density. By the way, the whole family $\{u_\varepsilon\}$ converges to u and the convergence is even strong, by uniform convexity.

By the above remark, we can adopt the usual framework of Hilbert triplets obtained by standard identifications. Namely, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle z, v \rangle_V &= (z, v), & \langle z, v \rangle_W &= \langle z, v \rangle_V, & \text{and} & \quad \langle z, v \rangle_Z = \langle z, v \rangle_W, \\ & \text{for every } z \in H, V^*, W^* \text{ and } v \in V, W, Z, \text{ respectively.} \end{aligned}$$

This allows us to use the simpler symbol $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ without any subscript for the above duality pairings whenever no confusion can arise. In conclusion, we have that

$$Z \hookrightarrow W \hookrightarrow V \hookrightarrow H \hookrightarrow V^* \hookrightarrow W^* \hookrightarrow Z^* \quad (2.4)$$

with dense and compact embeddings.

Now, we list our assumptions on the structure of the system to be analyzed. As in [8], we assume:

$$\sigma, \lambda \in (0, +\infty) \quad \text{and} \quad \nu \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (2.5)$$

$$F \in C^4(\mathbb{R}) \text{ can be written as } F(s) = \widehat{\beta}(s) - \frac{\lambda}{2} s^2, \quad s \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \text{with } \widehat{\beta} \text{ convex.} \quad (2.6)$$

We set

$$f := F' \quad \text{and} \quad \beta := \widehat{\beta}' \quad (2.7)$$

so that

$$f(s) = F'(s) = \beta(s) - \lambda s \quad \text{and} \quad f'(s) = \beta'(s) - \lambda, \quad \text{for every } s \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (2.8)$$

Concerning β we follow exactly the same framework as in [8, assumptions (2.6)–(2.8)] and require that

$$\beta(0) = \beta''(0) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \beta'''(s) \geq 0 \quad \text{for every } s \in \mathbb{R} \quad (2.9)$$

$$\lim_{|s| \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\beta'(s)}{|s|} = +\infty \quad (2.10)$$

$$|\beta''(s)| \leq C_\beta(|\beta'(s)| + 1) \quad \text{for some } C_\beta > 0 \text{ and every } s \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (2.11)$$

Finally

$$\tau \in (0, 1) \quad (2.12)$$

is the relaxation parameter.

Remark 2.2. Let us observe that our structural assumptions imply that β and β'' are (maximal) monotone, β' and β''' are nonnegative and that the estimates

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq \beta'(r) &= \beta'(0) + \int_0^r \beta''(s) ds \\ &\leq \beta'(0) + C_\beta \left| \int_0^r (\beta'(s) + 1) ds \right| = C_\beta |\beta(r) + r| + C'_\beta \end{aligned} \quad (2.13)$$

and

$$|\widehat{\beta}(r)| \leq |\widehat{\beta}(0)| + \int_0^r \beta(s) ds \leq C''_\beta + |r| |\beta(r)| \quad (2.14)$$

hold true for every $r \in \mathbb{R}$ with an obvious meaning of C'_β and C''_β . Moreover, we remark that our assumptions are satisfied by a wide class of smooth potentials with either polynomial or exponential growth. In particular, they are met in the case of the classical potential (1.7).

As for the forcing term and the initial data, we assume that

$$g \in L^2(0, T; H), \quad \varphi^0 \in W \quad \text{and} \quad \rho^0 \in H. \quad (2.15)$$

At this point, we are ready to make the notion of solution to the relaxed problem precise and to state our existence result. The variational equation we are going to write can be formally obtained by standard integration by parts on account of the homogeneous Neumann boundary conditions starting from equations (1.9), (1.2) and (1.3) tested by the arbitrary test function v . Indeed, the solution we are looking for is a triplet (φ, μ, w) with the regularity

$$\varphi \in H^2(0, T; Z^*) \cap W^{1, \infty}(0, T; V^*) \cap L^\infty(0, T; W) \quad (2.16)$$

$$\mu \in L^\infty(0, T; W^*) \quad (2.17)$$

$$w \in L^\infty(0, T; H) \quad (2.18)$$

that solves the equations

$$\begin{aligned} \tau \langle \partial_t^2 \varphi, v \rangle + \langle \partial_t \varphi, v \rangle + \sigma \int_{\Omega} \varphi v - \langle \mu, \Delta v \rangle &= \int_{\Omega} g v \\ \text{for every } v \in Z \text{ and a.e. in } (0, T) & \end{aligned} \quad (2.19)$$

$$\begin{aligned} - \int_{\Omega} w \Delta v + \int_{\Omega} \beta'(\varphi) w v + (\nu - \lambda) \int_{\Omega} w v &= \langle \mu, v \rangle \\ \text{for every } v \in W \text{ and a.e. in } (0, T) & \end{aligned} \quad (2.20)$$

$$- \Delta \varphi + \beta(\varphi) - \lambda \varphi = w \quad \text{a.e. in } Q \quad (2.21)$$

and satisfies the initial conditions

$$\varphi(0) = \varphi^0 \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_t \varphi(0) = \rho^0. \quad (2.22)$$

Notice that φ takes values in W (see (2.16)) so that it satisfies the homogeneous Neumann boundary condition as well (see (2.1)). On the contrary, due to the very low level of regularity we are requiring, equations (2.20) and (2.21) represent only a very weak formulation of their counterparts (1.9) and (1.2) with the boundary conditions for μ and w . Consequently, this lack of regularity leaves the uniqueness of the solution as an open question. We now present our existence result.

Theorem 2.3. *Assume (2.5)–(2.11) on the structure of the system and (2.15) on the data. Then, for every $\tau \in (0, 1)$, there exists at least one triplet (φ, μ, w) with the regularity specified by (2.16)–(2.18) that solves Problem (2.19)–(2.22) and satisfies the estimates*

$$\|\varphi\|_{H^1(0, T; V^*) \cap L^\infty(0, T; W)} + \|\mu\|_{L^\infty(0, T; W^*)} + \|w\|_{L^\infty(0, T; H)} \leq C \quad (2.23)$$

$$\tau \|\partial_t^2 \varphi\|_{L^2(0, T; Z^*)} + \tau^{1/2} \|\partial_t \varphi\|_{L^\infty(0, T; V^*)} \leq C \quad (2.24)$$

with a constant C that depends only on Ω , T , the structure of the system and the norms of the data corresponding to (2.15). In particular, C does not depend on τ .

Remark 2.4. We notice that $H^1(0, T; V^*) \cap L^\infty(0, T; W)$ is continuously embedded in $C^0(\overline{Q})$ (see, e.g., [30, Sect. 8, Cor. 4]). Therefore, φ is continuous on \overline{Q} as well as $\beta(\varphi)$ and $\beta'(\varphi)$ and the maximum norm of these functions are bounded by a constant that has the same dependence as the above C has. Moreover, by a time integration in (2.19), one could prove one more estimate, namely,

$$\|1 * \mu\|_{L^\infty(0, T; V)} \leq C'$$

with a constant C' similar to C , where $1 * \mu$ is the function defined by

$$(1 * \mu)(t) := \int_0^t \mu(s) ds \quad \text{for every } t \in [0, T].$$

However, we do not give a detailed proof of this since we do not use it in the sequel.

Now, we present our next result concerning the limit of solutions to problem (2.19)–(2.22) as τ tends to zero. To this end, we consider the problem with $\tau = 0$ as formulated and solved in [8]. Specifically, it involves finding a triplet (φ, μ, w) with the regularity

$$\varphi \in H^1(0, T; V^*) \cap L^\infty(0, T; W) \quad (2.25)$$

$$\mu \in L^2(0, T; V) \quad (2.26)$$

$$w \in L^2(0, T; W) \quad (2.27)$$

that solves the equations

$$\langle \partial_t \varphi, v \rangle + \int_{\Omega} \nabla \mu \cdot \nabla v + \sigma \int_{\Omega} \varphi v = \int_{\Omega} g v \quad \text{for every } v \in V \text{ and a.e. in } (0, T) \quad (2.28)$$

$$- \Delta w + \beta'(\varphi)w + (\nu - \lambda)w = \mu \quad \text{a.e. in } Q \quad (2.29)$$

$$- \Delta \varphi + \beta(\varphi) - \lambda \varphi = w \quad \text{a.e. in } Q \quad (2.30)$$

and satisfies the initial condition

$$\varphi(0) = \varphi^0. \quad (2.31)$$

Under our assumptions on the structure of the system and the given data, this problem admits a unique solution, primarily due to [8, Thm. 2.2]. In that work, the forcing term g (denoted as u therein) is assumed to be bounded, as the authors focus on a control problem. However, a closer examination of the proof reveals that our assumption on g is sufficient to ensure well-posedness.

We now present our result.

Theorem 2.5. *Under the assumption of Theorem 2.3, let $\{(\varphi_\tau, \mu_\tau, w_\tau)\}$ be any family of solutions to problem (2.19)–(2.22) that satisfies the estimates (2.23)–(2.24). Then, this family converges to the unique solution (φ, μ, w) to Problem (2.28)–(2.31) as τ tends to zero in the following sense*

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_\tau \rightarrow \varphi & \quad \text{weakly star in } H^1(0, T; V^*) \cap L^\infty(0, T; W) \\ & \quad \text{and uniformly in } \overline{Q} \end{aligned} \quad (2.32)$$

$$\mu_\tau \rightarrow \mu \quad \text{weakly star in } L^\infty(0, T; W^*) \quad (2.33)$$

$$w_\tau \rightarrow w \quad \text{weakly star in } L^\infty(0, T; H). \quad (2.34)$$

We can also prove an error estimate in weaker norms for the difference between $(\varphi_\tau, \mu_\tau, w_\tau)$ and the limit (φ, μ, w) in terms of the parameter τ .

Theorem 2.6. *Under the same assumption and notation as in Theorem 2.5, the following estimate*

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\varphi_\tau - \varphi\|_{C^0([0, T]; V^*) \cap L^2(0, T; W)} + \|\mu_\tau - \mu\|_{L^2(0, T; W^*)} \\ & + \|w_\tau - w\|_{L^2(0, T; H)} \leq C \tau^{1/2} \end{aligned} \quad (2.35)$$

holds true for every $\tau \in (0, 1)$ with a constant C that depends only on Ω , T , the structure of the system and the norms of the data corresponding to (2.15).

The rest of the section is devoted to the collection of some useful tools. First of all, besides the Hölder and Cauchy–Schwarz inequalities, we often account for the Young and Poincaré inequalities

$$ab \leq \delta a^2 + \frac{1}{4\delta} b^2 \quad \text{for every } a, b \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } \delta > 0 \quad (2.36)$$

$$\|v\|_V \leq C_\Omega (\|\nabla v\| + |v_\Omega|) \quad \text{for every } v \in V \quad (2.37)$$

where v_Ω denotes the mean value of v and the constant C_Ω depends only on Ω . We generally define the generalized mean value v_Ω of any element $v \in Z^*$ by setting

$$v_\Omega := \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \langle v, 1 \rangle \quad (2.38)$$

where 1 stands for the constant function that takes the value 1 everywhere in Ω . In the sequel, for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$, the same symbol s denotes the corresponding constant functions in Ω and Q . Notice that the above definition (2.38) is meaningful, since 1 actually belongs to Z , and that v_Ω reduces to the usual mean value when $v \in H$. The same notation v_Ω is also used if v is a time-dependent function.

Next, we recall an important tool which is often used in connection with the Cahn–Hilliard systems. Namely, for a given $\zeta \in V^*$, we consider the generalized Neumann problem of finding

$$z \in V \quad \text{such that} \quad \int_{\Omega} \nabla z \cdot \nabla v = \langle \zeta, v \rangle \quad \text{for every } v \in V. \quad (2.39)$$

Since Ω is connected and smooth, it is well known that the above problem admits solutions z if and only if ζ has zero mean value. Hence, we can introduce the following solution operator \mathcal{N} by setting

$$\mathcal{N} : \text{dom}(\mathcal{N}) := \{\zeta \in V^* : \zeta_\Omega = 0\} \rightarrow \{z \in V : z_\Omega = 0\}, \quad \mathcal{N} : \zeta \mapsto z, \quad (2.40)$$

where z is the unique solution to (2.39) that also satisfies $z_\Omega = 0$. It turns out that \mathcal{N} is an isomorphism between the above spaces and that the formula

$$\|\zeta\|_*^2 := \|\nabla \mathcal{N}(\zeta - \zeta_\Omega)\|^2 + |\zeta_\Omega|^2 \quad \text{for every } \zeta \in V^* \quad (2.41)$$

defines a Hilbert norm in V^* that is equivalent to the standard dual norm of V^* . From the above properties, one can obtain the following identities:

$$\int_{\Omega} \nabla \mathcal{N}\zeta \cdot \nabla v = \langle \zeta, v \rangle \quad \text{for every } \zeta \in \text{dom}(\mathcal{N}) \text{ and } v \in V \quad (2.42)$$

$$\mathcal{N}\zeta \in W \quad \text{and} \quad -\Delta \mathcal{N}\zeta = \zeta \quad \text{for every } \zeta \in \text{dom}(\mathcal{N}) \cap H \quad (2.43)$$

$$\langle \zeta, \mathcal{N}\zeta \rangle = \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \mathcal{N}\zeta|^2 = \|\zeta\|_*^2 \quad \text{for every } \zeta \in \text{dom}(\mathcal{N}). \quad (2.44)$$

We also point out that

$$\langle \partial_t \zeta(t), \mathcal{N}\zeta(t) \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\zeta(t)\|_*^2 \quad \text{for a.e. } t \in (0, T) \quad (2.45)$$

which holds true for every $\zeta \in H^1(0, T; V^*)$ satisfying $\zeta_\Omega = 0$ a.e. in $(0, T)$.

Moreover, we introduce another useful inequality for the sequel. Recalling the compact embeddings $W \hookrightarrow V$ and $W \hookrightarrow C^0(\overline{Q})$, and using elliptic regularity theory, one can easily derive the inequality

$$\|v\|_V \leq \delta \|\Delta v\| + C_{\Omega, \delta} \|v\|_* \quad \text{for every } v \in W \text{ and } \delta > 0 \quad (2.46)$$

where $\|\cdot\|_*$ is the norm in V^* defined in (2.41) and $C_{\Omega,\delta}$ depends on Ω and δ .

We conclude this section by introducing the following convention: the lowercase symbol c denotes a generic constant that depends only on Ω , T , the structure of the system, and the data given in (2.15). In particular, c is independent of τ and the parameter n introduced in the next section. Clearly, since c stands for a generic constant, its value may change from line to line and even within the same line. Furthermore, whenever a positive constant δ appears in a computation, we use the notation c_δ instead of a general c , indicating that these constants also depend on δ . This convention does not apply to specific constants referenced explicitly, such as in (2.23), where a capital letter is used instead of the generic c .

3 Existence

In this section, we prove Theorem 2.3. To this end, similarly to [8], we give an alternative formulation of (2.19)–(2.22) and we solve the new problem by introducing a Faedo–Galerkin scheme. Here is the new formulation:

Equivalent problem: *Find a pair (φ, μ) with the regularity (2.16)–(2.17) that solves (2.19) and the variational equation*

$$\begin{aligned} & - \int_{\Omega} (-\Delta\varphi + \beta(\varphi) - \lambda\varphi)\Delta v + \int_{\Omega} \beta'(\varphi)(-\Delta\varphi + \beta(\varphi) - \lambda\varphi)v \\ & + (\nu - \lambda) \int_{\Omega} (-\Delta\varphi + \beta(\varphi) - \lambda\varphi)v \\ & = \langle \mu, v \rangle \quad \text{for every } v \in W \text{ and a.e. in } (0, T) \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

and satisfies the initial conditions (2.22).

Clearly, if (φ, μ, w) is a solution to (2.19)–(2.22), then (3.1) follows for (φ, μ) by just replacing w given by (2.21) in (2.20). Conversely, if (φ, μ) solves the new problem, by taking (2.21) as a definition of w , (2.18) and (2.20) immediately follow from (2.16) and (3.1) (see also [8, Prop 3.1] for more details in a similar situation).

As just said, we solve the new problem by a Faedo–Galerkin scheme. To this end, we introduce the sequence $\{\lambda_j\}_{j \geq 1}$ of the eigenvalues and an orthonormal system $\{e_j\}_{j \geq 1}$ of corresponding eigenfunctions of the Neumann problem for the Laplace equation, i.e.

$$0 = \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 \leq \lambda_3 \leq \dots \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_j = +\infty \quad (3.2)$$

$$e_j \in V \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\Omega} \nabla e_j \cdot \nabla v = \lambda_j \int_{\Omega} e_j v \quad \text{for every } v \in V \text{ and } j = 1, 2, \dots \quad (3.3)$$

$$\int_{\Omega} e_i e_j = \delta_{ij} \quad \text{for } i, j = 1, 2, \dots \quad \text{and} \quad \{e_j\}_{j \geq 1} \text{ is a complete system in } H \quad (3.4)$$

where δ_{ij} is the Kronecker symbol. We set

$$V_n := \text{span}\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}, \quad \text{for } n = 1, 2, \dots \quad (3.5)$$

and observe that each V_n is included in Z and that the union of these spaces is dense in both V and H . We also notice that $V_1 = \text{span}\{e_1\}$ consists of the space of constant functions since Ω is connected.

Remark 3.1. Let us make some observations regarding the orthogonal projection operator $\mathbb{P}_n : H \rightarrow V_n$ (orthogonality being understood with respect to the standard inner product of H). Let Y be any of the spaces H, V, W and Z . Then, for every $v \in Y$, we have that

$$\|\mathbb{P}_n v\|_Y \leq C_\Omega \|v\|_Y \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{P}_n v \rightarrow v \quad \text{strongly in } Y \quad (3.6)$$

where the constant C_Ω depends only on Ω . Notice that the convergence in (3.6) actually is strong by uniform convexity if we can take $C_\Omega = 1$ by carefully choosing the norm of Y . Clearly, this is the case if $Y = H$ with its natural norm. The same is true if $Y = V$ with its standard Hilbert norm (see [7, Rem 3.3] for details). It follows from the former observation that we can take $C_\Omega = 1$ if either $Y = W$ or $Y = Z$ as well, provided that their norms are the graph norms defined by

$$\|v\|_W^2 = \|v\|^2 + \|\Delta v\|^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \|v\|_Z^2 = \|v\|_W^2 + \|\Delta v\|_W^2$$

for $v \in W$ and $v \in Z$, respectively. This immediately follows from the formula $\Delta \mathbb{P}_n v = \mathbb{P}_n \Delta v$ for $v \in W$, which we prove at once.

Let $v \in W$. Then $\Delta \mathbb{P}_n v \in V_n$ since $\mathbb{P}_n v \in V_n$. On the other hand,

$$(\Delta \mathbb{P}_n v, z) = (\mathbb{P}_n v, \Delta z) = (v, \Delta z) = (\Delta v, z) \quad \text{for every } z \in W$$

since $\mathbb{P}_n v \in W$. As W is dense in H , it follows that $(\Delta \mathbb{P}_n v, z) = (\Delta v, z)$ for every $z \in H$, that is, $\Delta \mathbb{P}_n v = \mathbb{P}_n \Delta v$.

Next, if $v \in L^2(0, T; Y)$ and v_n is defined by $v_n(t) := \mathbb{P}_n(v(t))$ for a.e. $t \in (0, T)$ (and we simply write $v_n = \mathbb{P}_n v$ in the sequel), then

$$\|v_n\|_{L^2(0, T; Y)} \leq C_\Omega \|v\|_{L^2(0, T; Y)}, \quad \text{and} \quad v_n \rightarrow v \quad \text{strongly in } L^2(0, T; Y) \quad (3.7)$$

where one can take $C_\Omega = 1$ if the norm in Y is well chosen as said before.

At this point, we are ready to introduce the Faedo–Galerkin scheme mentioned above. It is the following

Problem \mathbf{P}_n : *Look for a pair*

$$(\varphi, \mu) \in H^2(0, T; V_n) \times L^2(0, T; V_n) \quad (3.8)$$

that solves the variational equations (2.19) and (3.1) just for test functions $v \in V_n$ and satisfies the initial conditions

$$\varphi(0) = \mathbb{P}_n \varphi^0 \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi'(0) = \mathbb{P}_n \rho^0. \quad (3.9)$$

Solution to the discrete problem. The discrete problem just introduced is equivalent to a second order Cauchy problem for a system of ordinary differential equations, as we briefly see. We expand the unknown φ and μ in terms of the eigenfunction e_j as follows

$$\varphi(t) = \sum_{j=1}^n \varphi_{n,j}(t) e_j \quad \text{and} \quad \mu(t) = \sum_{j=1}^n \mu_{n,j}(t) e_j.$$

Then, the new unknowns are the functions

$$\boldsymbol{\varphi} := (\varphi_{n,j})_{j=1}^n \in H^2(0, T; \mathbb{R}^n) \quad \text{and} \quad \boldsymbol{\mu} := (\mu_{n,j})_{j=1}^n \in L^2(0, T; \mathbb{R}^n)$$

and we can rewrite the variational equations (2.19) and (3.1) (which have to be satisfied for every $v \in V_n$) in terms of them. Since we can just take $v = e_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ instead of every $v \in V_n$, we have for $i = 1, \dots, n$

$$\tau \varphi_{n,i}'' + \varphi_{n,i}' + \sigma \varphi_{n,i} + \lambda_i \mu_{n,i} = \int_{\Omega} g e_i \quad (3.10)$$

$$\int_{\Omega} \omega \lambda_i e_i + \int_{\Omega} \gamma \omega \lambda_i e_i + (\nu - \lambda) \int_{\Omega} \omega e_i = \mu_{n,i} \quad (3.11)$$

where we have set for brevity

$$\omega := \sum_{j=1}^n (\lambda_j - \lambda) \varphi_{n,j} e_j + \beta \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \varphi_{n,j} e_j \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma := \beta' \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \varphi_{n,j} e_j \right).$$

Clearly, we can replace $\mu_{n,i}$ in (3.10) by using the expression in (3.11). Therefore, the system to be solved takes the form

$$\tau \boldsymbol{\varphi}'' + \boldsymbol{\varphi}' + \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\varphi}) = \mathbf{g}$$

where $\mathcal{F} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is of class C^2 and $\mathbf{g} \in L^2(0, T; \mathbb{R}^n)$. Moreover, the initial conditions (3.9) provide prescribed values for $\boldsymbol{\varphi}(0)$ and $\boldsymbol{\varphi}'(0)$ and we obtain a well posed Cauchy problem. Therefore, it has a unique maximal solution $\boldsymbol{\varphi}$ that is defined in the interval $[0, T_n)$ for some $T_n \in (0, T]$. Consequently, the discrete problem under investigation has a unique maximal solution (φ_n, μ_n) defined in $[0, T_n)$.

However, the estimates we are going to perform show that the discrete solution is bounded, so that $T_n = T$ by maximality. For that reason, to simplify the notation, we already write T in place of T_n . We will come back to this point later on. Moreover, the estimates we prove are also sufficient to let n tend to infinity and construct a solution (φ, μ) of the new version of Problem (2.19)–(2.22), thus a solution (φ, μ, w) to (2.19)–(2.22) itself, with the desired stability estimates. In order to simplify the notation, we write (φ, μ) in place of (φ_n, μ_n) in performing the estimates and restore the notation (φ_n, μ_n) only at the end of each procedure. Moreover, for a given time dependent test function v , it is understood that the equations we consider are always written at the time t and then tested by $v(t)$ for a.e. $t \in (0, T)$ even though we avoid writing the time, for simplicity. In the sequel, we use the notation

$$Q_t := \Omega \times (0, t) \quad \text{for } t \in (0, T]. \quad (3.12)$$

First a priori estimate. We recall the notation (2.38) and that all the constant functions belong to V_1 , thus to any V_n . Hence, we can test (2.19) by $1/|\Omega|$ and obtain

$$\tau \varphi_{\Omega}'' + \varphi_{\Omega}' + \sigma \varphi_{\Omega} = g_{\Omega} \quad \text{a.e. in } (0, T). \quad (3.13)$$

Moreover, $\varphi_{\Omega}(0) = \varphi_{\Omega}^0$ and $\varphi_{\Omega}'(0) = \rho_{\Omega}^0$ for $(\mathbb{P}_n v)_{\Omega} = v_{\Omega}$ for every $v \in V_n$. Since (2.15) implies that $g_{\Omega} \in L^2(0, T)$, by testing (3.13) by φ_{Ω}' and integrating over $(0, t)$, $t \in (0, T]$, we easily obtain

$$\tau^{1/2} \|(\varphi_n)_{\Omega}'\|_{L^{\infty}(0, T)} + \|(\varphi_n)_{\Omega}\|_{H^1(0, T)} \leq c. \quad (3.14)$$

Second a priori estimate. We take the difference between (2.19) and (3.13) multiplied by $v \in V_n$ and integrated over Ω . By recalling the definitions (2.40) and (2.41) of the operator \mathcal{N} and of the norm $\|\cdot\|_*$ as well as the properties (2.42)–(2.45) of \mathcal{N} , we test the difference just constructed by $\mathcal{N}(\partial_t \bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}'_\Omega)$ and integrate with respect to time. We observe that this is correct since even $\mathcal{N}(\partial_t \bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}'_\Omega)$ takes values in V_n (see [8, Rem. 3.3] for details). We obtain for every $t \in [0, T]$

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\tau}{2} \|(\partial_t \bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}'_\Omega)(t)\|_*^2 + \int_0^t \|(\partial_t \bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}'_\Omega)(s)\|_*^2 ds + \frac{\sigma}{2} \|(\bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}_\Omega)(t)\|_*^2 \\ &= \frac{\tau}{2} \|\rho^0 - \rho_\Omega^0\|_*^2 + \frac{\sigma}{2} \|\varphi^0 - \varphi_\Omega^0\|_*^2 + \int_{Q_t} (g - g_\Omega) \mathcal{N}(\partial_t \bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}'_\Omega) \\ & \quad - \int_{Q_t} \mu (\partial_t \bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}'_\Omega). \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

Next, we consider the energy $\mathcal{E}(\varphi(t))$, i.e., (1.8) with $v = \varphi(t)$. However, we avoid writing the time t for a while. By accounting for (2.8), we have

$$\mathcal{E}(\varphi) = \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega (-\Delta \varphi + \beta(\varphi) - \lambda \varphi)^2 + \nu \int_\Omega \left(\frac{1}{2} |\nabla \varphi|^2 + \widehat{\beta}(\varphi) - \frac{\lambda}{2} \varphi^2 \right).$$

From one side, we rewrite this by splitting the first integral into two parts and making explicit calculations in the second one. On the other hand, we compute the time derivative of the energy. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(\varphi) &= \frac{1}{4} \int_\Omega (-\Delta \varphi + \beta(\varphi) - \lambda \varphi)^2 + \frac{1}{4} \int_\Omega (|\Delta \varphi|^2 + |\beta(\varphi)|^2 + \lambda^2 |\varphi|^2) \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega (\beta'(\varphi) |\nabla \varphi|^2 - \lambda |\nabla \varphi|^2 - \lambda \beta(\varphi) \varphi) + \nu \int_\Omega \left(\frac{1}{2} |\nabla \varphi|^2 + \widehat{\beta}(\varphi) - \frac{\lambda}{2} \varphi^2 \right) \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

as well as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{E}(\varphi) &= \int_\Omega (-\Delta \varphi + \beta(\varphi) - \lambda \varphi) (-\Delta \partial_t \varphi + \beta'(\varphi) \partial_t \varphi - \lambda \partial_t \varphi) \\ & \quad + \nu \int_\Omega (\nabla \varphi \cdot \nabla \partial_t \varphi + \beta(\varphi) \partial_t \varphi - \lambda \varphi \partial_t \varphi). \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

At this point, we test (3.1) by $\partial_t \bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}'_\Omega$ and rearrange a little. We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_\Omega (-\Delta \varphi + \beta(\varphi) - \lambda \varphi) (-\Delta \partial_t \varphi) + \int_\Omega \beta'(\varphi) (-\Delta \varphi + \beta(\varphi) - \lambda \varphi) \partial_t \varphi \\ & \quad - \lambda \int_\Omega (-\Delta \varphi + \beta(\varphi) - \lambda \varphi) \partial_t \varphi + \nu \int_\Omega (-\Delta \varphi + \beta(\varphi) - \lambda \varphi) \partial_t \varphi \\ &= \int_\Omega \beta'(\varphi) (-\Delta \varphi + \beta(\varphi) - \lambda \varphi) \varphi'_\Omega + (\nu - \lambda) \int_\Omega (-\Delta \varphi + \beta(\varphi) - \lambda \varphi) \varphi'_\Omega \\ & \quad + \int_\Omega \mu (\partial_t \bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}'_\Omega) \end{aligned}$$

and we see that the left-hand side of this equality coincides with the right-hand side of (3.17). Hence, if we integrate over $(0, t)$, we obtain

$$\mathcal{E}(\varphi(t)) = \mathcal{E}(\varphi^0) + \int_0^t R(s) ds + \int_{Q_t} \mu (\partial_t \bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}'_\Omega) \quad (3.18)$$

where we have set for brevity

$$R := \int_{\Omega} (\beta'(\varphi) + \nu - \lambda)(-\Delta\varphi + \beta(\varphi) - \lambda\varphi)\varphi'_{\Omega}. \quad (3.19)$$

At this point, we add (3.15) and (3.18) to each other and notice an obvious cancellation. By using the form (3.16) of the energy, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\tau}{2} \|(\partial_t \bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}'_{\Omega})(t)\|_*^2 + \int_0^t \|(\partial_t \bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}'_{\Omega})(s)\|_*^2 ds + \frac{\sigma}{2} \|(\bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}_{\Omega})(t)\|_*^2 \\ & + \frac{1}{4} \int_{\Omega} |(-\Delta\varphi + \beta(\varphi) - \lambda\varphi)(t)|^2 + \frac{1}{4} \int_{\Omega} (|\Delta\varphi|^2 + |\beta(\varphi)|^2 + \lambda^2|\varphi|^2)(t) \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} (\beta'(\varphi)|\nabla\varphi|^2 - \lambda|\nabla\varphi|^2 - \lambda\beta(\varphi)\varphi)(t) + \nu \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{1}{2}|\nabla\varphi|^2 + \widehat{\beta}(\varphi) - \frac{\lambda}{2}\varphi^2\right)(t) \\ & = \frac{\tau}{2} \|\rho^0 - \rho_{\Omega}^0\|_*^2 + \frac{\sigma}{2} \|\varphi^0 - \varphi_{\Omega}^0\|_*^2 + \int_{Q_t} (g - g_{\Omega}) \mathcal{N}(\partial_t \bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}'_{\Omega}) \\ & + \mathcal{E}(\varphi^0) + \int_0^t R(s) ds. \end{aligned} \quad (3.20)$$

From this identity we derive our basic estimate. We keep just the nonnegative terms on the left-hand side, move the others to the right-hand side and estimate both them and those that already form the right-hand side of (3.20). What remains on the left-hand side is the following

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\tau}{2} \|(\partial_t \bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}'_{\Omega})(t)\|_*^2 + \int_0^t \|(\partial_t \bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}'_{\Omega})(s)\|_*^2 ds + \frac{\sigma}{2} \|(\bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}_{\Omega})(t)\|_*^2 \\ & + \frac{1}{4} \int_{\Omega} |(-\Delta\varphi + \beta(\varphi) - \lambda\varphi)(t)|^2 + \frac{1}{4} \int_{\Omega} (|\Delta\varphi|^2 + |\beta(\varphi)|^2 + \lambda^2|\varphi|^2)(t) \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} (\beta'(\varphi)|\nabla\varphi|^2)(t). \end{aligned} \quad (3.21)$$

Now, we estimate the terms on the new right-hand side, separately. In our computation, we repeatedly owe to the Cauchy–Schwarz and Young inequalities (see (2.36)). Moreover, δ is a positive parameter whose value is chosen later on. In order to treat the first term we consider, we account for (2.46) and denote by $(\cdot, \cdot)_*$ the inner product in V^* associated with the norm $\|\cdot\|_*$ given by (2.41). We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\lambda - \nu}{2} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla\varphi(t)|^2 \leq \delta \int_{\Omega} |\Delta\varphi(t)|^2 + c_{\delta} \|\varphi(t) - \varphi_{\Omega}(t)\|_*^2 \\ & \leq \delta \int_{\Omega} |\Delta\varphi(t)|^2 + c_{\delta} \|\varphi^0 - \varphi_{\Omega}^0\|_*^2 + c_{\delta} \int_0^t (\varphi(s) - \varphi_{\Omega}(s), \partial_t\varphi(s) - \varphi'_{\Omega}(s))_* ds \\ & \leq \delta \int_{\Omega} |\Delta\varphi(t)|^2 + c_{\delta} + \delta \int_0^t \|\partial_t\varphi(s) - \varphi'_{\Omega}(s)\|_*^2 ds + c_{\delta} \int_0^t \|\varphi(s) - \varphi_{\Omega}(s)\|_*^2 ds. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we have

$$\frac{\lambda}{2} \int_{\Omega} \beta(\varphi(t))\varphi(t) \leq \delta \int_{\Omega} |\beta(\varphi(t))|^2 + c_{\delta} \int_{\Omega} |\varphi(t)|^2$$

and the last term can be dealt with as above, since the inequality (2.46) we have used there involves the full V -norm. The same integral occurs in the next estimate. With the help of (2.14) we have indeed

$$-\nu \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{1}{2} \widehat{\beta}(\varphi) - \frac{\lambda}{2} \varphi^2 \right) (t) \leq \delta \int_{\Omega} |\beta(\varphi(t))|^2 + c_{\delta} \int_{\Omega} |\varphi(t)|^2 + c_{\delta}.$$

Since the terms involving the initial data are bounded thanks to our assumptions (2.15), we consider the integral related to the forcing term. We recall the properties of \mathcal{N} already mentioned and have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{Q_t} (g - g_{\Omega}) \mathcal{N}(\partial_t \bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}'_{\Omega}) &\leq c \int_0^t \|g(s)\|_* \|\mathcal{N}(\partial_t \varphi(s) - \varphi'_{\Omega}(s))\|_V ds \\ &\leq c \int_0^t \|g(s)\| \|\partial_t \varphi(s) - \varphi'_{\Omega}(s)\|_* ds \leq \delta \int_0^t \|\partial_t \varphi(s) - \varphi'_{\Omega}(s)\|_*^2 ds + c_{\delta}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, the term involving the function R , defined in (3.19), can be handled using (2.13) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^t R(s) ds &\leq c \int_{Q_t} (1 + |\varphi| + |\beta(\varphi)|) |-\Delta \varphi + \beta(\varphi) - \lambda \varphi| |\varphi'_{\Omega}| \\ &\leq c \int_0^t |\varphi'_{\Omega}(s)| (1 + \|\varphi(s)\|^2 + \|\beta(\varphi(s))\|^2 + \|(-\Delta \varphi + \beta(\varphi) - \lambda \varphi)(s)\|^2) ds. \end{aligned}$$

We observe that the last integral above can be treated by the Gronwall lemma since the coefficient φ'_{Ω} is bounded in $L^2(0, T)$, thus in $L^1(0, T)$, due to (3.14). By comparing all these inequalities with the left-hand side given by (3.21), choosing δ small enough and applying the Gronwall lemma, we obtain an estimate involving φ'_{Ω} . However, this has been already estimated by (3.14). Therefore, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \tau^{1/2} \|\partial_t \varphi_n\|_{L^{\infty}(0, T; V^*)} + \|\varphi_n\|_{H^1(0, T; V^*) \cap L^{\infty}(0, T; H)} \\ + \|\Delta \varphi_n\|_{L^{\infty}(0, T; H)} + \|\beta(\varphi_n)\|_{L^{\infty}(0, T; H)} \leq c. \end{aligned} \quad (3.22)$$

Thus, elliptic regularity gives

$$\|\varphi_n\|_{L^{\infty}(0, T; W)} \leq c \quad \text{whence also} \quad \|\varphi_n\|_{C^0(\bar{Q})} \leq c \quad (3.23)$$

since we can apply, e.g., [30, Sect. 8, Cor. 4]). We have written T in place of T_n even though this is not correct in principle. However, (3.23) written with T_n in place of T ensures that the maximal solution of the system of ordinary differential equations equivalent to Problem P_n is bounded too, thus global. Therefore, a posteriori, all our estimates are correct as they are. In particular, (3.14), (3.22) and (3.23) are correct.

Third a priori estimate. Let $v \in W$. We test (3.1) by $v_n := \mathbb{P}_n v$. By virtue of (3.6) with $Y = W$, we easily deduce that

$$\int_{\Omega} \mu v_n \leq c (\|\varphi\|_W + \|\beta(\varphi)\|_{\infty} + \|\varphi\|_{\infty}) (1 + \|\beta'(\varphi)\|_{\infty}) \|v_n\|_W \leq c \|v\|_W$$

a.e. in $(0, T)$. But $(\mu, v_n) = (\mu, v)$ since μ takes values in V_n . Therefore, we conclude that

$$\|\mu_n\|_{L^{\infty}(0, T; W^*)} \leq c. \quad (3.24)$$

Fourth a priori estimate. Let $v \in L^2(0, T; Z)$. We test (2.19) by $v_n := \mathbb{P}_n v$. Similarly as in the above calculation we have that

$$\tau \int_{\Omega} \partial_t^2 \varphi v = \tau \int_{\Omega} \partial_t^2 \varphi v_n \leq c(\|\partial_t \varphi\|_* + \|\varphi\| + \|g\|) \|v_n\|_V + c \|\mu\|_{W^*} \|v_n\|_Z$$

a.e. in $(0, T)$. By squaring, integrating over $(0, T)$ and applying the above estimates and (3.7) with $Y = Z$, we conclude that

$$\tau \|\partial_t^2 \varphi\|_{L^2(0, T; Z^*)} \leq c. \quad (3.25)$$

Conclusion. Our aim is letting n tend to infinity. By the above estimates, well-known compactness results (for strong compactness see, e.g., [30, Sect. 8, Cor. 4]) and the smoothness of β , there exists a pair (φ, μ) such that

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_n \rightarrow \varphi & \quad \text{weakly star in } H^2(0, T; Z^*) \cap W^{1, \infty}(0, T; V^*) \cap L^\infty(0, T; W) \\ & \quad \text{and uniformly in } \overline{Q} \end{aligned} \quad (3.26)$$

$$\mu_n \rightarrow \mu \quad \text{weakly star in } L^\infty(0, T; W^*) \quad (3.27)$$

$$\beta(\varphi_n) \rightarrow \beta(\varphi) \quad \text{uniformly in } \overline{Q} \quad (3.28)$$

$$\beta'(\varphi_n) \rightarrow \beta'(\varphi) \quad \text{uniformly in } \overline{Q} \quad (3.29)$$

at least for a subsequence. We want to prove that (φ, μ) is a solution we are looking for. By combining the convergence of $\varphi_n(0)$ and $\partial_t \varphi_n(0)$ at least in Z^* with (3.6), we see that (3.9) imply (2.22). It remains to prove that (φ, μ) solves the variational equations (2.19) and (3.1). To this end, it suffices to show that (φ, μ) solves their time integrated versions, namely,

$$\begin{aligned} & \tau \langle \partial_t^2 \varphi, v \rangle_{L^2(0, T; Z)} + \langle \partial_t \varphi, v \rangle_{L^2(0, T; V)} + \sigma \int_Q \varphi v - \langle \mu, \Delta v \rangle_{L^2(0, T; W)} \\ & = \int_Q g v \quad \text{for every } v \in L^2(0, T; Z) \quad (3.30) \\ & - \int_Q (-\Delta \varphi + \beta(\varphi) - \lambda \varphi) \Delta v + \int_Q \beta'(\varphi) (-\Delta \varphi + \beta(\varphi) - \lambda \varphi) v \\ & \quad + (\nu - \lambda) \int_Q (-\Delta \varphi + \beta(\varphi) - \lambda \varphi) v \\ & = \langle \mu, v \rangle_{L^2(0, T; W)} \quad \text{for every } v \in L^2(0, T; W). \end{aligned} \quad (3.31)$$

To prove this, let us observe that the solution (φ_n, μ_n) to Problem P_n solves the integrated version of it, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} & \tau \int_Q \partial_t^2 \varphi_n v_n + \int_Q \partial_t \varphi_n v_n + \sigma \int_Q \varphi_n v_n - \int_Q \mu_n \Delta v_n \\ & = \int_Q g v_n \quad \text{for every } v_n \in L^2(0, T; V_n) \end{aligned} \quad (3.32)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \int_Q (-\Delta\varphi_n + \beta(\varphi_n) - \lambda\varphi_n)\Delta v_n + \int_Q \beta'(\varphi_n)(-\Delta\varphi_n + \beta(\varphi_n) - \lambda\varphi_n)v_n \\
& + (\nu - \lambda) \int_Q (-\Delta\varphi_n + \beta(\varphi_n) - \lambda\varphi_n)v_n \\
& = \int_Q \mu_n v_n \quad \text{for every } v_n \in L^2(0, T; V_n). \tag{3.33}
\end{aligned}$$

Then, given $v \in L^2(0, T; Z)$, we can choose $v_n = \mathbb{P}_n v$ in (3.32) and given $v \in L^2(0, T; W)$, we can choose $v_n = \mathbb{P}_n v$ in (3.33). At this point, we let n tend to infinity and derive (3.30) and (3.31), respectively. Indeed, to justify this procedure, it suffices to combine (3.26)–(3.29) with the strong convergence (3.7). Finally, the solution we have constructed satisfies the estimates that follow from (3.14), (3.22) and (3.24)–(3.25) and the weak lower semicontinuity of the norms. In particular, one can take the same values of the constants c that appear in the estimates we have established. This proves a part of (2.23) and the full (2.24). Namely, just the estimate of w is missing. However, by recovering the triplet (φ, μ, w) as said at the beginning of the present section, i.e., by taking (2.21) as a definition of w , we see that (φ, μ, w) solves Problem (2.19)–(2.22) and satisfies the estimate for w as well since

$$\|w\| \leq \|\Delta\varphi\| + \|\beta(\varphi)\| + \lambda\|\varphi\| \quad \text{a.e. in } (0, T).$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 2.3.

4 Asymptotics

In this section, we prove the Theorems 2.5 and 2.6. We prepare two regularity results that have an independent interest. The second one, which deals with an elliptic problem in a very weak form, should be known. Nevertheless, we give a short proof for the reader's convenience.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $u \in L^2(0, T; V^*)$ satisfy*

$$\int_0^T \langle u(t), v(t) \rangle dt \leq M \|v\|_{L^2(0, T; V^*)} \quad \text{for every } v \in L^2(0, T; W) \tag{4.1}$$

where M is some positive constant. Then

$$u \in L^2(0, T; V). \tag{4.2}$$

Proof. We set for brevity

$$\mathcal{V} := L^2(0, T; V) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{W} := L^2(0, T; W)$$

so that $u \in \mathcal{V}^*$ and (4.1) becomes

$$\langle u, v \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} \leq M \|v\|_{\mathcal{V}^*} \quad \text{for every } v \in \mathcal{W}.$$

Since all the embeddings in (2.4) are dense, we have that \mathcal{W} is dense in \mathcal{V}^* and the map $\mathcal{W} \ni v \mapsto \langle u, v \rangle_{\mathcal{V}}$ can be continuously extended to the whole of \mathcal{V}^* . Thus, there exists $u^{**} \in \mathcal{V}^{**}$ such that

$$\langle u^{**}, v \rangle_{\mathcal{V}^*} = \langle u, v \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} \quad \text{for every } v \in \mathcal{W}.$$

Since \mathcal{V} is reflexive, there exists $\widehat{u} \in \mathcal{V}$ such that

$$\langle u^{**}, v \rangle_{\mathcal{V}^*} = \langle v, \widehat{u} \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} \quad \text{for every } v \in \mathcal{V}^*.$$

We thus have that

$$\langle u, v \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} = \langle v, \widehat{u} \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} \quad \text{for every } v \in \mathcal{W}.$$

On the other hand, it holds that

$$\langle v, \widehat{u} \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} = \int_Q v \widehat{u} = \langle \widehat{u}, v \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} \quad \text{for every } v \in \mathcal{V}.$$

Therefore

$$\langle u, v \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} = \langle \widehat{u}, v \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} \quad \text{for every } v \in \mathcal{W}.$$

Since both u and \widehat{u} belong to \mathcal{V}^* and \mathcal{W} is dense in \mathcal{V} , we conclude that $u = \widehat{u} \in \mathcal{V}$. \square

Lemma 4.2. *Let $h \in H$ and $u \in H$ and assume that*

$$\int_{\Omega} u(-\Delta v + v) = \int_{\Omega} h v \quad \text{for every } v \in W. \quad (4.3)$$

Then

$$u \in W, \quad -\Delta u + u = h \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega \quad \text{and} \quad \|u\|_W \leq C_{\Omega} \|h\| \quad (4.4)$$

with a constant C_{Ω} that depends only on Ω .

Proof. It is well known that the problem of finding ξ satisfying

$$\xi \in W \quad \text{and} \quad -\Delta \xi + \xi = h \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega$$

has a unique solution and that ξ satisfies the estimate $\|\xi\|_W \leq C_{\Omega} \|h\|$ with C_{Ω} as in the statement. Therefore, it suffices to prove that $u = \xi$. To this end, we observe that ξ also satisfies (4.3). Hence, the equality $u = \xi$ follows if we prove that the solution $u \in H$ to (4.3) is unique. By linearity, we assume that (4.3) holds with $h = 0$ and consider the unique function v that satisfies

$$v \in W \quad \text{and} \quad -\Delta v + v = u \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega.$$

Then, (4.3) with $h = 0$ yields

$$\int_{\Omega} |u|^2 = \int_{\Omega} u(-\Delta v + v) = 0$$

whence $u = 0$. \square

4.1 Proof of Theorem 2.5

We start the proof by picking a family $\{(\varphi_{\tau}, \mu_{\tau}, w_{\tau})\}$ as in the statement. Thanks to estimates (2.23)–(2.24) and well known weak and weak star compactness results, there exists a triplet (φ, μ, w) satisfying (2.32)–(2.34) as τ tends to zero. More precisely, this holds at least for a subsequence, in principle. However, once it is proved that (φ, μ, w)

satisfies Problem (2.28)–(2.31), the whole family $\{(\varphi_\tau, \mu_\tau, w_\tau)\}$ converges to (φ, μ, w) since the solution to this problem is unique. Furthermore, invoking strong compactness as in, e.g., [30, Sect. 8, Cor. 4] and the smoothness of β , we infer that

$$\varphi_\tau \rightarrow \varphi, \quad \beta(\varphi_\tau) \rightarrow \beta(\varphi) \quad \text{and} \quad \beta'(\varphi_\tau) \rightarrow \beta'(\varphi) \quad \text{uniformly in } \overline{Q}. \quad (4.5)$$

Finally, it is clear that (2.32) and (2.24) imply

$$\tau \partial_t^2 \varphi_\tau \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{weakly in } L^2(0, T; Z^*).$$

Therefore, it is easy to see that (φ, μ, w) solves Problem (2.28)–(2.31) in a weak form. Namely, the regularity requirements (2.26)–(2.27) of μ and w are missing and just (2.30) and (2.31) are satisfied as they are, while (2.28) and (2.29) are replaced here by

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \partial_t \varphi, v \rangle_{L^2(0, T; V)} + \sigma \int_Q \varphi v - \langle \mu, \Delta v \rangle_{L^2(0, T; W)} \\ &= \int_Q g v \quad \text{for every } v \in L^2(0, T; Z) \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & - \int_Q w \Delta v + \int_Q \beta'(\varphi) w v + (\nu - \lambda) \int_Q w v \\ &= \langle \mu, v \rangle_{L^2(0, T; W)} \quad \text{for every } v \in L^2(0, T; W) \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

respectively. However, the above variational equations are equivalent to the following ones

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \partial_t \varphi, v \rangle + \sigma \int_\Omega \varphi v - \langle \mu, \Delta v \rangle \\ &= \int_\Omega g v \quad \text{for every } v \in Z \text{ and a.e. in } (0, T) \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & - \int_\Omega w \Delta v + \int_\Omega \beta'(\varphi) w v + (\nu - \lambda) \int_\Omega w v \\ &= \langle \mu, v \rangle \quad \text{for every } v \in W \text{ and a.e. in } (0, T) \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

and we want to recover (2.28) and (2.29) by proving the regularity requirements (2.26) and (2.27) for μ and w . To this end, we observe that (2.33) implies the weak star convergence in $L^\infty(0, T)$ of the mean values, so that

$$\|\mu_\Omega\|_\infty \leq c. \quad (4.10)$$

On the other hand, (4.6) and the regularity properties already established yield

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mu, -\Delta v \rangle_{L^2(0, T; W)} &= -\langle \partial_t \varphi, v \rangle_{L^2(0, T; V)} + \int_Q (g - \sigma \varphi) v \\ &\leq c \|v\|_{L^2(0, T; V)} \quad \text{for every } v \in L^2(0, T; Z). \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

Now, for a given $v \in L^2(0, T; W)$, we solve the (time dependent) elliptic problem

$$-\Delta z = v - v_\Omega \quad \text{a.e. in } Q, \quad z_\Omega = 0 \quad \text{a.e. in } (0, T) \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_n z = 0 \quad \text{on } \Sigma.$$

This problem has a unique solution $z = \mathcal{N}(v - v_\Omega) \in L^2(0, T; W)$ (cf. (2.39) and (2.40)). Moreover, the equation itself yields $\Delta z \in L^2(0, T; W)$, so that $z \in L^2(0, T; Z)$. On the other hand

$$\int_0^T \langle \mu(t), v(t) \rangle dt = \int_0^T \langle \mu(t), v_\Omega(t) \rangle dt + \int_0^T \langle \mu(t), -\Delta z(t) \rangle dt$$

and we easily estimate the terms on the right-hand side. From (4.10) we derive that

$$\int_0^T \langle \mu(t), v_\Omega(t) \rangle dt = \int_0^T |\Omega| \mu_\Omega(t) v_\Omega(t) dt \leq c \|v_\Omega\|_{L^2(0, T)} \leq c \|v\|_{L^2(0, T; V^*)}$$

while (4.11) immediately yields

$$\int_0^T \langle \mu(t), -\Delta z(t) \rangle dt \leq c \|z\|_{L^2(0, T; V)} \leq c \|v - v_\Omega\|_{L^2(0, T; V^*)} \leq c \|v\|_{L^2(0, T; V^*)}.$$

Hence, we have that

$$\int_0^T \langle \mu(t), v(t) \rangle dt \leq c \|v\|_{L^2(0, T; V^*)}.$$

Since $v \in L^2(0, T; W)$ is arbitrary, we can apply Lemma 4.1 and conclude that μ belongs to $L^2(0, T; V)$. It remains to recover the regularity (2.27) of w and (2.29). To this end, we rewrite (4.9) in the form

$$\begin{aligned} \int_\Omega w(-\Delta v + v) &= \int_\Omega (\mu - \beta'(\varphi)w + (\lambda - \nu + 1)w)v \\ &\text{for every } v \in W \text{ and a.e. in } (0, T). \end{aligned}$$

Then, we can apply Lemma 4.2 and infer that

$$\begin{aligned} w(t) &\in W, \quad -\Delta w(t) + w(t) = (\mu - \beta'(\varphi)w + (\lambda - \nu + 1)w)(t) \\ &\text{and } \|w(t)\|_W \leq C_\Omega \|(\mu - \beta'(\varphi)w + (\lambda - \nu + 1)w)(t)\| \quad \text{for a.e. } t \in (0, T). \end{aligned}$$

Then, $w \in L^2(0, T; W)$ and (2.29) is satisfied. This completes the proof of Theorem 2.5.

4.2 Proof of Theorem 2.6

This subsection is devoted to the proof of the error estimate (2.35). Then, for $\tau \in (0, 1)$ let $(\varphi_\tau, \mu_\tau, w_\tau)$ be a solution to Problem (2.19)–(2.22) that satisfies the estimates (2.23)–(2.24), and let (φ, μ, w) denote the unique solution to Problem (2.28)–(2.31). In the sequel, we often account for the Lipschitz continuity of the nonlinearities on the range of φ_τ and φ since these functions are uniformly bounded due to (2.23) and (2.25). To this concern, we point out once and for all that the corresponding Lipschitz constants are estimated by a constant that depends only on Ω , T , the structure of the system and the norms of the data corresponding to (2.15). A similar remark holds for some uniform bounds, like the L^∞ norm of $\beta(\varphi_\tau)$. To perform our proof of (2.35), we set for convenience

$$\bar{\varphi} := \varphi_\tau - \varphi, \quad \bar{\mu} := \mu_\tau - \mu, \quad \bar{w} := w_\tau - w$$

and take the difference between (2.19), written for $(\varphi_\tau, \mu_\tau, w_\tau)$ with $v \in Z$, and (2.28), finding that

$$\tau \langle \partial_t^2 \varphi_\tau, v \rangle + \langle \partial_t \bar{\varphi}, v \rangle + \sigma \int_\Omega \bar{\varphi} v = \langle \bar{\mu}, \Delta v \rangle \quad \text{for every } v \in Z \text{ and a.e. in } (0, T). \quad (4.12)$$

First, we take $v = 1/|\Omega|$, which is feasible since the constant functions are in Z , and we obtain the identity

$$\tau(\varphi_\tau)''_\Omega + \bar{\varphi}'_\Omega + \sigma \bar{\varphi}_\Omega = 0 \quad (4.13)$$

for the mean value $\bar{\varphi}_\Omega$. Testing by $\bar{\varphi}_\Omega$ and integrating over $(0, t)$, $t \in (0, T]$, from the initial conditions $(\varphi_\tau)'_\Omega(0) = (\rho^0)_\Omega$ and $\bar{\varphi}_\Omega(0) = 0$ (cf. (2.22) and (2.31)) and Young's inequality, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} |\bar{\varphi}_\Omega(t)|^2 + \sigma \int_0^t |\bar{\varphi}_\Omega|^2 &= -\tau(\varphi_\tau)'_\Omega(t) \bar{\varphi}_\Omega(t) + \tau \int_0^t (\varphi_\tau)'_\Omega \bar{\varphi}'_\Omega \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4} |\bar{\varphi}_\Omega(t)|^2 + c\tau^2 \|\partial_t \varphi_\tau\|_{L^\infty(0, T; V^*)}^2 + c\tau \|\partial_t \varphi_\tau\|_{L^2(0, T; V^*)} \|\partial_t \bar{\varphi}\|_{L^2(0, T; V^*)} \end{aligned}$$

for a.e. $t \in (0, T)$, where we have used the norms in V^* for the mean values, which are constant in space. Hence, from (2.23)–(2.25) it follows that

$$\|\bar{\varphi}_\Omega\|_{C^0([0, T])}^2 + \|\bar{\varphi}_\Omega\|_{L^2(0, T)}^2 \leq c\tau. \quad (4.14)$$

Next, we multiply (4.13) by $v \in Z$ and integrate over Ω ; then we subtract it to (4.12). Afterwards, we choose $v = \mathcal{N}(\bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}_\Omega)$ in this difference and point out that this test function is in $L^\infty(0, T; Z)$ since $\bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}_\Omega \in L^\infty(0, T; W)$ by (2.16) and (2.25). Besides, $\mathcal{N}(\bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}_\Omega)$ has zero mean value due to (2.40). Hence, recalling the properties (2.42)–(2.45), we have a.e. in $(0, T)$ that

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}_\Omega\|_*^2 + \sigma \|\bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}_\Omega\|_*^2 = -\langle \bar{\mu}, \bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}_\Omega \rangle - \tau \langle \partial_t^2 \varphi_\tau, \mathcal{N}(\bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}_\Omega) \rangle. \quad (4.15)$$

At the same time, we write (3.1) for both φ_τ, μ_τ and φ, μ ; then, we test the difference by $\bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}_\Omega$. Upon rearranging, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_\Omega |\Delta \bar{\varphi}|^2 &= - \int_\Omega \nabla(\beta(\varphi_\tau) - \beta(\varphi)) \cdot \nabla \bar{\varphi} \\ &\quad + \int_\Omega (\beta'(\varphi_\tau) \Delta \varphi_\tau - \beta'(\varphi) \Delta \varphi) (\bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}_\Omega) + (2\lambda - \nu) \int_\Omega |\nabla \bar{\varphi}|^2 \\ &\quad - \int_\Omega (\psi(\varphi_\tau) - \psi(\varphi)) (\bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}_\Omega) + \langle \bar{\mu}, \bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}_\Omega \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (4.16)$$

where the function ψ is defined by

$$\psi(s) := \beta(s) \beta'(s) - \lambda s \beta'(s) + (\nu - \lambda) \beta(s) + (\lambda^2 - \lambda \nu) s \quad \text{for every } s \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (4.17)$$

Then, adding (4.15) and (4.16) to each other leads to the cancellation of the two terms involving $\bar{\mu}$. Moreover, the integration with respect to time with the help of initial con-

ditions (2.22) and (2.31) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \frac{1}{2} \|(\bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}_\Omega)(t)\|_*^2 + \sigma \int_0^t \|\bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}_\Omega\|_*^2 + \int_{Q_t} |\Delta \bar{\varphi}|^2 \\
 &= -\tau \langle \partial_t \varphi_\tau(t), \mathcal{N}(\bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}_\Omega)(t) \rangle + \tau \int_0^t \langle \partial_t \varphi_\tau, \partial_t \mathcal{N}(\bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}_\Omega) \rangle \\
 & \quad - \int_{Q_t} \nabla(\beta(\varphi_\tau) - \beta(\varphi)) \cdot \nabla \bar{\varphi} + \int_{Q_t} (\beta'(\varphi_\tau) \Delta \varphi_\tau - \beta'(\varphi) \Delta \varphi) (\bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}_\Omega) \\
 & \quad + (2\lambda - \nu) \int_{Q_t} |\nabla \bar{\varphi}|^2 - \int_{Q_t} (\psi(\varphi_\tau) - \psi(\varphi)) (\bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}_\Omega). \tag{4.18}
 \end{aligned}$$

Now, we can estimate the integrals on the right-hand side of (4.18) taking into account that φ_τ and φ are uniformly bounded (see (2.23) and (2.32)), so that we can make use of the Lipschitz continuity of the nonlinearities on their range. To begin with, by Young's inequality, (2.41) and (2.24) we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & -\tau \langle \partial_t \varphi_\tau(t), \mathcal{N}(\bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}_\Omega)(t) \rangle \leq c\tau \|\partial_t \varphi_\tau(t)\|_{V^*} \|(\bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}_\Omega)(t)\|_* \\
 & \leq \frac{1}{4} \|(\bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}_\Omega)(t)\|_*^2 + c\tau^2 \|\partial_t \varphi_\tau\|_{L^\infty(0,T;V^*)}^2 \leq \frac{1}{4} \|(\bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}_\Omega)(t)\|_*^2 + c\tau. \tag{4.19}
 \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, using (2.23) and (2.25) we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \tau \int_0^t \langle \partial_t \varphi_\tau, \partial_t \mathcal{N}(\bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}_\Omega) \rangle = \tau \int_0^t \langle \partial_t \varphi_\tau, \mathcal{N}(\partial_t \bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}'_\Omega) \rangle \\
 & \leq c\tau \int_0^t \|\partial_t \varphi_\tau\|_{V^*} \|\partial_t \bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}'_\Omega\|_* \leq c\tau \|\partial_t \varphi_\tau\|_{L^2(0,T;V^*)} \|\partial_t \bar{\varphi}\|_{L^2(0,T;V^*)} \leq c\tau. \tag{4.20}
 \end{aligned}$$

To deal with the next term, we observe that β' is nonnegative and recall the continuity of the embedding $W \hookrightarrow W^{1,4}(\Omega)$ and the bound (2.23) for φ_τ . In fact, by virtue of the Hölder inequality and the compactness inequality (2.46), for every $\delta > 0$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & - \int_{Q_t} \nabla(\beta(\varphi_\tau) - \beta(\varphi)) \cdot \nabla \bar{\varphi} = - \int_{Q_t} (\beta'(\varphi_\tau) \nabla \varphi_\tau - \beta'(\varphi) \nabla \varphi) \cdot \nabla \bar{\varphi} \\
 &= - \int_{Q_t} (\beta'(\varphi_\tau) - \beta'(\varphi)) \nabla \varphi_\tau \cdot \nabla \bar{\varphi} - \int_{Q_t} \beta'(\varphi) |\nabla \bar{\varphi}|^2 \leq c \int_{Q_t} |\bar{\varphi}| |\nabla \varphi_\tau| |\nabla \bar{\varphi}| \\
 & \leq c \int_0^t \|\bar{\varphi}\|_4 \|\nabla \varphi_\tau\|_4 \|\nabla \bar{\varphi}\| \leq c \int_0^t \|\varphi_\tau\|_W \|\bar{\varphi}\|_V^2 \\
 & \leq c \int_0^t \|\bar{\varphi}\|_V^2 \leq \delta \int_{Q_t} |\Delta \bar{\varphi}|^2 + c_\delta \int_0^t \|\bar{\varphi}\|_*^2
 \end{aligned}$$

and the last integral can be estimated using (4.14) as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \int_0^t \|\bar{\varphi}\|_*^2 \leq 2 \int_0^t \|\bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}_\Omega\|_*^2 + 2 \int_0^t \|\bar{\varphi}_\Omega\|_*^2 \\
 & \leq 2 \int_0^t \|\bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}_\Omega\|_*^2 + c \int_0^T |\bar{\varphi}_\Omega|^2 \leq 2 \int_0^t \|\bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}_\Omega\|_*^2 + c\tau.
 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, it turns out that

$$-\int_{Q_t} \nabla(\beta(\varphi_\tau) - \beta(\varphi)) \cdot \nabla \bar{\varphi} \leq \delta \int_{Q_t} |\Delta \bar{\varphi}|^2 + c_\delta \int_0^t \|\bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}_\Omega\|_*^2 + c_\delta \tau. \quad (4.21)$$

By proceeding and arguing as above we discuss the term

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{Q_t} (\beta'(\varphi_\tau) \Delta \varphi_\tau - \beta'(\varphi) \Delta \varphi) (\bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}_\Omega) \\ &= \int_{Q_t} (\beta'(\varphi_\tau) - \beta'(\varphi)) \Delta \varphi_\tau (\bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}_\Omega) + \int_{Q_t} \beta'(\varphi) \Delta \bar{\varphi} (\bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}_\Omega) \\ &\leq c \int_0^t \|\bar{\varphi}\|_4 \|\Delta \varphi_\tau\| \|\bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}_\Omega\|_4 + c \int_0^t \|\Delta \bar{\varphi}\| \|\bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}_\Omega\| \\ &\leq c \int_0^t \|\bar{\varphi}\|_V \|\bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}_\Omega\|_V + c \int_0^t \|\Delta \bar{\varphi}\| \|\bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}_\Omega\| \end{aligned}$$

whence, by Young's inequality, (2.46) and (4.14),

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{Q_t} (\beta'(\varphi_\tau) \Delta \varphi_\tau - \beta'(\varphi) \Delta \varphi) (\bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}_\Omega) \\ &\leq c \int_0^t \|\bar{\varphi}\|_V^2 + c \int_0^t \|\bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}_\Omega\|_V^2 + \delta \int_{Q_t} |\Delta \bar{\varphi}|^2 + c_\delta \int_0^t \|\bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}_\Omega\|^2 \\ &\leq 4\delta \int_{Q_t} |\Delta \bar{\varphi}|^2 + c_\delta \int_0^t \|\bar{\varphi}\|_*^2 + c_\delta \int_0^t \|\bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}_\Omega\|_*^2. \\ &\leq 4\delta \int_{Q_t} |\Delta \bar{\varphi}|^2 + c_\delta \int_0^t \|\bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}_\Omega\|_*^2 + c_\delta \tau. \end{aligned} \quad (4.22)$$

As ψ is Lipschitz continuous on the range of the solutions under consideration, we can similarly handle the last two terms of (4.18) as follows

$$\begin{aligned} & (2\lambda - \nu) \int_{Q_t} |\nabla \bar{\varphi}|^2 - \int_{Q_t} (\psi(\varphi_\tau) - \psi(\varphi)) (\bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}_\Omega) \\ &\leq c \int_0^t \|\bar{\varphi}\|_V^2 + c \int_0^t \|\bar{\varphi}\| \|\bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}_\Omega\| \leq c \int_0^t \|\bar{\varphi}\|_V^2 + c \int_0^t \|\bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}_\Omega\|^2 \\ &\leq 2\delta \int_{Q_t} |\Delta \bar{\varphi}|^2 + c_\delta \int_0^t \|\bar{\varphi}\|_*^2 + c_\delta \int_0^t \|\bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}_\Omega\|_*^2 \\ &\leq 2\delta \int_{Q_t} |\Delta \bar{\varphi}|^2 + c_\delta \int_0^t \|\bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}_\Omega\|_*^2 + c_\delta \tau. \end{aligned} \quad (4.23)$$

Then, we collect all of the estimates (4.19)–(4.23) to control the right-hand side of (4.18); then we choose δ small enough (e.g., $\delta = 1/14$) and apply the Gronwall lemma to conclude that

$$\|\bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}_\Omega\|_{C^0([0,T];V^*)} + \|\Delta \bar{\varphi}\|_{L^2(0,T;H)} \leq c \tau^{1/2}. \quad (4.24)$$

By combining this estimate with (4.14) and applying the elliptic regularity theory, we find out that

$$\|\bar{\varphi}\|_{C^0([0,T];V^*) \cap L^2(0,T;W)} \leq c \tau^{1/2}. \quad (4.25)$$

Next, we recall (2.21) for φ_τ, w_τ and (2.30) for φ, w and take their difference obtaining

$$\bar{w} = -\Delta\bar{\varphi} + \beta(\varphi_\tau) - \beta(\varphi) - \lambda\bar{\varphi} \quad \text{a.e. in } Q.$$

Then, the Lipschitz continuity of β and (4.25) yield the additional estimate

$$\|\bar{w}\|_{L^2(0,T;H)} \leq c\tau^{1/2}. \tag{4.26}$$

Finally, arguing with (2.20) for $(\varphi_\tau, \mu_\tau, w_\tau)$ and (2.29) for (φ, μ, w) , it is easy to derive the equality

$$\int_0^T \langle \bar{\mu}, v \rangle = \int_Q \bar{w}(-\Delta v + (\nu - \lambda)v) + \int_Q (\beta'(\varphi_\tau) - \beta'(\varphi))w_\tau v + \int_Q \beta'(\varphi)\bar{w}v \tag{4.27}$$

for every $v \in L^2(0, T; W)$. Concerning the right-hand side of (4.27), with the help of Hölder’s inequality, the continuous embedding $W \hookrightarrow L^\infty(\Omega)$, the bound in (2.23) and the estimates (4.25) and (4.26) we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_Q \bar{w}(-\Delta v + (\nu - \lambda)v) + \int_Q (\beta'(\varphi_\tau) - \beta'(\varphi))w_\tau v + \int_Q \beta'(\varphi)\bar{w}v \right| \\ & \leq c \|\bar{w}\|_{L^2(0,T;H)} \|v\|_{L^2(0,T;W)} + c \|w_\tau\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H)} \int_0^T \|\bar{\varphi}\|_\infty \|v\| \\ & \quad + \|\beta'(\varphi)\|_{C^0(\bar{Q})} \int_0^t \|\bar{w}\| \|v\| \\ & \leq c\tau^{1/2} \|v\|_{L^2(0,T;W)} + c \left(\|\bar{\varphi}\|_{L^2(0,T;W)} + \|\bar{w}\|_{L^2(0,T;H)} \right) \|v\|_{L^2(0,T;H)} \\ & \leq c\tau^{1/2} \|v\|_{L^2(0,T;W)} + c\tau^{1/2} \|v\|_{L^2(0,T;H)}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.28}$$

Therefore, from (4.27) and (4.28) it is straightforward to show that

$$\|\bar{\mu}\|_{L^2(0,T;W^*)} \leq c\tau^{1/2} \tag{4.29}$$

which, along with (4.25) and (4.26), ends the proof of (2.35) and Theorem 2.6.

Acknowledgments

PC acknowledges the support of the Next Generation EU Project No.P2022Z7ZAJ (A unitary mathematical framework for modelling muscular dystrophies), the RISM (Research Institute for Mathematical Sciences, an International Joint Usage/Research Center located in Kyoto University) and the GNAMPA (Gruppo Nazionale per l’Analisi Matematica, la Probabilità e le loro Applicazioni) of INdAM (Istituto Nazionale di Alta Matematica).

References

[1] A. Bonfoh, The viscous Cahn–Hilliard equation with inertial term, *Nonlinear Anal.* **74** (2011), 946–964.

- [2] A. Bonfio, Existence and continuity of inertial manifolds for the hyperbolic relaxation of the viscous Cahn–Hilliard equation, *Appl. Math. Optim.* **84** (2021), 3339–3416.
- [3] J. W. Cahn and J. E. Hilliard, Free energy of a nonuniform system. I. Interfacial free energy, *J. Chem. Phys.* **28** (1958), 258–267.
- [4] B. Chen and C. Liu, Asymptotic dynamics of a sixth-order integro-differential equation, *Appl. Anal.* **101** (2022), 5537–5556.
- [5] H. Chen, Error estimates for the scalar auxiliary variable (SAV) schemes to the viscous Cahn–Hilliard equation with hyperbolic relaxation, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **499** (2021), Paper No. 125002, 21 pp.
- [6] X. Chen, L. Ma and X. Yang, Error analysis of second-order IEQ numerical schemes for the viscous Cahn–Hilliard equation with hyperbolic relaxation, *Comput. Math. Appl.* **152** (2023), 112–128.
- [7] P. Colli, G. Gilardi, A. Signori and J. Sprekels, Cahn-Hilliard-Brinkman model for tumor growth with possibly singular potentials, *Nonlinearity* **36** (2023), 4470–4500.
- [8] P. Colli, G. Gilardi, A. Signori and J. Sprekels, Curvature effects in pattern formation: well-posedness and optimal control of a sixth-order Cahn–Hilliard equation, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **56** (2024), 4928–4969.
- [9] P. Colli and J. Sprekels, Hyperbolic relaxation of the chemical potential in the viscous Cahn–Hilliard equation, Preprint arXiv:2408.16332 [math.AP], pp. 1–26. Accepted for publication.
- [10] M. Criado-Sancho, J. Casas-Vázquez and D. Jou, Non-equilibrium thermodynamic potential and flux fluctuation theorem, *Phys. Lett. A* **373** (2009), 3301–3303.
- [11] D. Dor, On the hyperbolic relaxation of the Cahn-Hilliard equation with a mass source, *Asymptot. Anal.* **135** (2023), 25–53.
- [12] D. Dor, A. Miranville and M. Pierre, Hyperbolic relaxation of the viscous Cahn–Hilliard equation with a symport term for biological applications, *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.* **47** (2024), 5999–6035.
- [13] P. Galenko, Local nonequilibrium phase transition model with relaxation of the diffusion flux, *Phys. Lett. A* **190** (1994), 292–294.
- [14] P. Galenko and D. Jou, Kinetic contribution to the fast spinodal decomposition controlled by diffusion, *Phys. A* **388** (2009), 3113–3123.
- [15] P. Galenko and V. Lebedev, Non-equilibrium effects in spinodal decomposition of a binary system, *Phys. Lett. A* **372** (2008), 985–989.
- [16] S. Gatti, M. Grasselli, A. Miranville and V. Pata, On the hyperbolic relaxation of the one-dimensional Cahn-Hilliard equation, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **312** (2005), 230–247.
- [17] S. Gatti, M. Grasselli, V. Pata and A. Miranville, Hyperbolic relaxation of the viscous Cahn-Hilliard equation in 3-D, *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.* **15** (2005), 165–198.
- [18] M. Grasselli and M. Pierre, A splitting method for the Cahn-Hilliard equation with inertial term, *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.* **2** (2010), 1363–1390.

- [19] M. Grasselli, H. Petzeltova and G. Schimperna, Asymptotic behavior of a nonisothermal viscous Cahn–Hilliard equation with inertial term, *J. Differential Equations* **239** (2007), 38–60.
- [20] M. Grasselli, G. Schimperna and S. Zelik, On the 2D Cahn-Hilliard equation with inertial term, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* **34** (2009), 137–170.
- [21] M. Grasselli, G. Schimperna and S. Zelik, Trajectory and smooth attractors for Cahn-Hilliard equations with inertial term, *Nonlinearity* **23** (2010), 707–737.
- [22] M. Grasselli, G. Schimperna, A. Segatti and S. Zelik, On the 3D Cahn-Hilliard equation with inertial term, *J. Evol. Equ.* **9** (2009), 371–404.
- [23] A. Miranville, Sixth-order Cahn–Hilliard equations with singular nonlinear terms, *Appl. Anal.* **94** (2015), 2133–2146.
- [24] A. Miranville, “The Cahn–Hilliard equation: recent advances and applications”, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia, PA, 2019.
- [25] I. Pawłow and W. Zajączkowski, On a class of sixth order viscous Cahn–Hilliard type equations, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. S* **6** (2013), 517–546.
- [26] A. Savostianov and S. Zelik, Global well-posedness and attractors for the hyperbolic Cahn–Hilliard–Oono equation in the whole space, *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.* **26** (2016), 1357–1384.
- [27] G. Schimperna and H. Wu, On a class of sixth-order Cahn–Hilliard-type equations with logarithmic potential, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **52** (2020), 5155–5195.
- [28] A. Segatti, On the hyperbolic relaxation of the Cahn-Hilliard equation in 3D: approximation and long time behaviour. *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.* **17** (2007), 411–437.
- [29] Z. Şen and A. Khanmamedov, The Cahn–Hilliard/Allen–Cahn equation with inertial and proliferation terms, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **530** (2024), Paper No. 127736, 20 pp.
- [30] J. Simon, Compact sets in the space $L^p(0, T; B)$, *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4)* **146** (1987), 65–96.
- [31] H. Xu and Q. Li, Global existence and L_p decay estimate of solution for Cahn-Hilliard equation with inertial term, *Appl. Math.* **66** (2021), 583–597.