



---

Soviet-era science, translated into English

# Reports of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR

1963

SovietRxiv

---

View the original and related papers at <https://sovietrxiv.org/items/ru-196301.13868>

Source: Math-Net.Ru and CyberLeninka. Machine translation. Verify with the original.

**Abstract**

**Full Text**

**Reports of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR**

1963. Volume 148, No. 5

**MATHEMATICS**

**S. M. NIKOLSKII**

**UNIQUENESS OF THE SOLUTION OF A  
BOUNDARY-VALUE PROBLEM FOR A CON-  
VEX DOMAIN**

*(Presented by Academician I. N. Vekua on 15 VIII 1962)*

The present article continues my preceding notes <sup>(1,2)</sup>. In <sup>(1)</sup> a regular domain  $G \subset R_n$  was defined. For it (in particular for  $p = 2$ ) stable (more precisely, locally stable) boundary values were studied for a function  $\Phi$  with finite integral

$$D_G(\Phi) = \int_G \sum_1^N |\Phi^{(k)}|^2 dG, \tag{1}$$

where

$$\mathbf{k}^1, \dots, \mathbf{k}^N \tag{2}$$

are given nonnegative vectors. Let the smallest convex body of the (integer) vectors spanned by the system (2), to which the vector 0 is adjoined, be  $\mathcal{E}$ . Together with  $\mathbf{k}$ , let  $\mathcal{E}$  contain the projections of  $\mathbf{k}$  onto coordinate subspaces of arbitrary dimensions. To a function  $\Phi$  there is associated a definite set of boundary functions. This made it possible to speak of classes  $\mathfrak{M} = \mathfrak{M}(G; \Phi)$  and  $\mathfrak{M}_0 = \mathfrak{M}_0(G)$  of functions  $f$  with  $D_G(f) < \infty$ , possessing respectively the same sets as  $\Phi$  and 0.

In <sup>(2)</sup> the following differential equation was considered in  $G$ :

$$Lu = \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l} \in \mathcal{E}} (-1)^{(\mathbf{k})} D^{(\mathbf{k})} (\alpha_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{l}}(\bar{x}) u^{(\mathbf{l})}) = 0, \tag{3}$$

$$(\alpha_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{l}}(\bar{x}) = \alpha_{\mathbf{l}\mathbf{k}}(\bar{x}), |\alpha_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{l}}(\bar{x})| \leq M, x \in G),$$

for which, for example, it was assumed that

$$\sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l} \in \mathcal{E}} \alpha_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{l}}(\bar{x}) i^{|k|-|l|} \xi^{(k+l)} \geq \chi \sum_1^N (\xi^{(k^s)})^2, \tag{4}$$

$$\xi^{(k)} = \xi_1^{k_1} \dots \xi_n^{k_n}, \quad \mathbf{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_n), \quad |k| = \sum_1^n k_j,$$

where  $\chi > 0$  does not depend on  $\bar{x}$  and  $\xi$ . It was shown that for equation (3) there exists a unique generalized solution, and conditions were studied under which the existence of a classical solution of (3) is guaranteed. Equation (3) covers a broad class of equations of hypoelliptic (in particular elliptic) type, but in general goes beyond the limits of the hypoelliptic type.

The question arises of the uniqueness of a classical solution of (3). It is solved here in the case of a bounded convex domain  $G$ .

Let  $\alpha_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{l}}$  be continuously differentiable in the domain  $G$  (open)  $\mathbf{k}$  times,  $\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{E}$ .

We shall say, for example, that  $u$  is a classical solution of (3) if  $u$  has in  $G$  continuous partial derivatives of orders  $\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{l}$  ( $\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l} \in \mathcal{E}$ ) and satisfies (3).

**Theorem 1.** A bounded convex domain  $G$  is regular. Consequently (see (2)), in  $\mathfrak{M}$  there exists, and moreover is unique, a generalized solution  $u$  of equation (3).

**Theorem 2.** Let  $\Phi$  have a finite integral and, for every  $\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{E}$  for which  $\alpha_{k_1}(x) \neq 0$ , let  $\Phi^{(\mathbf{k})} \in L_2(G)$ , where  $G$  is a bounded convex domain. Then in the class  $\mathfrak{M} = \mathfrak{M}(G; \Phi)$  there can exist one classical solution of equation (3).

In the proof of the theorems one introduces  $\tilde{G}_s^j$ —the projection of  $G$  onto some (with number  $s$ ) coordinate plane  $R_{n-j}^{(s)}$  of dimension  $n - j$  ( $j = 0, 1, \dots, n - 1$ );  $\tilde{G}_{s,\delta}^j$  is the set of  $\bar{x} \in \tilde{G}_s^j$  lying at a distance greater than  $\delta > 0$  from the boundary of  $\tilde{G}_s^j$ ;  $G_{s,\delta}^j$  is the cylindrical body constructed on  $\tilde{G}_{s,\delta}^j$  with generators belonging to  $R_j^{(s)}$ , where  $R_n = R_j^{(s)} \times R_{n-j}^{(s)}$ . Here  $\tilde{G}_1^0 = G_1^0 = G$ ,  $\tilde{G}_{1,\delta}^0 = G_{1,\delta}^0 = G_\delta$ —the set of  $\bar{x} \in G$  lying at a distance greater than  $\delta$  from the boundary  $\Gamma$  of the domain  $G$ . The corresponding cylinder constructed on  $G_\delta$  coincides with  $G_\delta$  (here only  $s = 1$  is possible).

Theorem 1 follows for  $n = 3$  from the following facts. Let  $\Gamma_s^1$  and  $\Gamma_s^2$  ( $s = 1, 2, 3$ ) be the intersections of  $\Gamma$ , respectively, with the boundary of  $G_s^1, G_s^2$ . The points  $\Gamma - \bigcup_{s=1}^3 \Gamma_s^1$  and the interior (with respect to  $\Gamma_s^1, \Gamma_s^2$ ) points of  $\Gamma_s^1, \Gamma_s^2$  are regular. For any  $s = 1, 2, 3$  the edge (boundary of a two-dimensional surface)  $\Gamma_s^1, \Gamma_s^2$  has projection onto any plane  $x_j = 0$  of two-dimensional measure zero.

Lines passing through the points  $\bar{x} \in G_s^1$  intersect  $\Gamma$  in two points—the upper and the lower (since  $G$  is open, so are  $\tilde{G}_s^j, G_s^j$ ). The upper points form the set  $\Gamma_s^1$ , the lower the set  $\Gamma_s^0$ . Assign positive numbers  $\delta, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n$  and put  $\omega_s^0 = \Gamma_s^0 G_{s,\sigma_s}^{0*}$ ,

$\omega_s^1 = \Gamma_s^1 G_{s,\sigma_s}^{1*}$  ( $2\sigma_s^* = \sigma_s$ ). The sets  $\omega_s^0, \omega_s^1$  are at a distance greater than some positive number. Let  $\Omega_s = (G - G_{s,[\delta]}) G_{s,\sigma_s}^1$ . For sufficiently small  $\delta_0$ , depending on  $\sigma_s$ ,  $\Omega_s$  for  $0 < \delta < \delta_0$  decomposes into two nonintersecting sets  $\Omega_s = \Omega_s^0 + \Omega_s^1$ , adjacent respectively to  $\omega_s^0, \omega_s^1$ . Introduce the sets  $\omega_{i_1, \dots, i_n} = \omega_1^{i_1} \dots \omega_n^{i_n}$ ,  $\Omega_{i_1, \dots, i_n} = \Omega_1^{i_1} \dots \Omega_n^{i_n}$ , where  $i_s = 0, 1$ . There are decompositions into sums of pairwise nonintersecting sets

$$\omega = \Gamma G'_{1,\sigma_1} \dots G'_{n,\sigma_n} = \sum_{i_s=0,1} \omega_{i_1, \dots, i_n}$$

and, for sufficiently small  $\delta_0$ , depending on  $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n$ ,

$$\Omega^0 = (G^0 - G_{3\delta}^0) G'_{1,\sigma_1} \dots G'_{n,\sigma_n} = \sum \Omega_{i_1, \dots, i_n} \quad (0 < \delta < \delta_0). \quad (5)$$

$$G - G_{3\delta} = G_1^0 - G_{1\delta}^0.$$

For a function  $v \in \mathfrak{M}_0(G)$  and  $\mathbf{k} \ll 1 \in \mathcal{E}$ , the basic inequality is proved:

$$\begin{aligned} \left( \int_{\Omega_0} |v^{(1-\mathbf{k})}|^2 dG \right)^{1/2} &\leq \sum_{\Omega_{i_1, \dots, i_n}} \left( \int |v^{(1-\mathbf{k})}|^2 dG \right)^{1/2} \leq \\ &\leq c \delta^{|\mathbf{k}|} \left( \int_G |v^{(1)}|^2 dG \right)^{1/2} \quad (0 < \delta < \delta_0), \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where  $c$  does not depend on  $\delta$  and  $v$ .

Let us now take as the initial set, instead of  $G$ , a certain  $\tilde{G}_s^j$ . It belongs to some  $R_{n-j}^{(s)}$  (depending on  $s$ ). We shall denote its projections onto the coordinate  $(n-j-1)$ -dimensional subspaces  $R_{n-j}^{(s)}$  by  $\tilde{G}_{s,j+1}^{j+1}, \dots, \tilde{G}_{s,n}^{j+1}$  (with indices  $j+1, \dots, n$ ). Let

$$\Omega_s^j = (G_s^j - G_{s,3\delta}^j) G_{(s,j+1),\sigma_{j+1}}^{j+1} \dots G_{(s,n),\sigma_n}^{j+1},$$

$$R_n = R_j^{(s)} \times R_{n-j}^{(s)}$$

and let  $\mathbf{k} \leq \mathbf{1} \in \mathcal{E}$ , and all projections  $k_i$  of the vector  $\mathbf{k}$  onto  $R_j^{(s)}$  be equal to zero. Then, if  $v \in \mathfrak{M}_0(G)$ , the following estimate, more general than (6), holds:

$$\int_{\Omega_s^j} |v^{(1-\mathbf{k})}|^2 dG \leq c \delta^{|\mathbf{k}|} \int_G |v^{(1)}|^2 dG \quad (0 < \delta < \delta_0; j = 0, 1, \dots, n-1), \quad (7)$$

where  $c$  does not depend on  $\delta$  or  $v$ .

Let now  $u \in \mathfrak{M}$  be a classical solution of equation (3) in  $G$ . If it is proved that  $u$  is a generalized solution of (3), i.e. that  $E_G(u, v) = 0$  (see (2)) for all  $v \in \mathfrak{M}_0$ , then this will prove uniqueness, since the generalized solution is unique.

Restricting ourselves to the three-dimensional case, introduce the positive numbers  $\sigma_0, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3, \sigma_1^2, \sigma_2^2, \sigma_3^2$  and the functions  $\alpha_{\sigma_0}^0, \alpha'_{1, \sigma_1}, \alpha'_{2, \sigma_2}, \alpha'_{3, \sigma_3}, \alpha_{1, \sigma_1^2}^2, \alpha_{2, \sigma_2^2}^2, \alpha_{3, \sigma_3^2}^2$ , depending on  $\bar{x}$ , equal respectively to 1 on  $G_{2\sigma_0}, G'_{2\sigma_1}, \dots, G_{2\sigma_3}^2$  and to 0 outside these sets. Let the functions of  $\bar{x}$   $\eta = \eta_{\sigma_0}^0, \eta_1 = \eta_{\sigma_1}, \dots, \eta_{3, \sigma_3^2}^2$  be respectively their  $\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_3^2$ -Sobolev averages (see (3)). Let  $v \in \mathfrak{M}_0$  and

$$v_0 = \eta \eta_1 \eta_2 \eta_3 \eta_1^2 \eta_2^2 \eta_3^2 = \eta v_1 = \eta \eta_1 v_2 = \dots$$

not only belong to  $\mathfrak{M}_0$ , but also be equal to zero along the strip in  $G$  adjacent to  $\Gamma$ . Therefore  $E_G(u, v_0) = 0$ , and, taking into account that  $\eta = \eta_1 = \dots = \eta_3^2 = 1$  on

$$Q_0 = G_{3\sigma_0} G_{1, 3\sigma_1} \dots G_{3, 3\sigma_3}^2 = G_{3\sigma_0} Q_1 = G_{3\sigma_0} G_{1, 3\sigma_1} Q_2 = \dots,$$

one may easily conclude that uniqueness will be proved if it is proved that

$$\overline{\lim}_{\sigma_3^2 \rightarrow 0} \overline{\lim}_{\sigma_2^2 \rightarrow 0} \dots \overline{\lim}_{\sigma_0 \rightarrow 0} E_{G-Q_0}(u, v_0) = 0.$$

This method, in the simplest case, when  $v_0 = \eta_\delta v$ , was applied by S. L. Sobolev (3) to prove uniqueness of the solution of the polyharmonic problem. In the present complicated case one has to pass to the limit successively  $n + 1$  times. Directly, by a single passage to the limit, the desired property cannot be detected.

From the condition imposed in Theorem 2 on  $\Phi$  it follows that  $u$  also possesses this property. This leads to the fact that, for uniqueness, it is sufficient to prove that

$$\overline{\lim}_{\sigma_3^2 \rightarrow 0} \dots \overline{\lim}_{\sigma_0 \rightarrow 0} \int_{G-Q_0} |v_0^{(1)}|^2 dG = A < \infty.$$

We have

$$\left( \int_{G-Q_0} |v_0^{(1)}|^2 dG \right)^{1/2} \leq c \sum_{k \leq 1} \left( \int_{(G-G_{3\sigma_0})_{G_1, \sigma_1} G_{2, \sigma_2} G_{3, \sigma_3}} |\eta^{(\mathbf{k})} v_1^{(1-\mathbf{k})}|^2 dG \right)^{1/2} +$$

$$+ \left( \int_{(G-Q_0)G_{3\sigma_0}} |v_1^{(1)}|^2 dG \right)^{1/2},$$

and since  $|\eta^{(k)}| \ll c\sigma_0^{-|k|}$ , it follows from (7), for  $j = 0$ , that the sum  $\sum_{k \leq l}$  is bounded, whence

$$\overline{\lim}_{\sigma_0 \rightarrow 0} \int_{G-Q_0} |v_0^{(1)}|^2 dG = \int_{G-Q_1} |v_1^{(1)}|^2 dG + B_1, \quad B_1 < \infty.$$

Further,

$$\int_{G-Q_1} |v_1^{(1)}|^2 dG \ll c \sum_{k \leq l} \left( \int_{(G-G_{1,3\sigma_1})G_{1,\sigma_1}^2 G_{2,\sigma_2}^2 G_{3,\sigma_3}^2} |\eta_1^{(k)} v_2^{(1-k)}|^2 dG \right)^{1/2} + \left( \int_{(G-Q_1)G_{1,3\sigma_1}} |v_2^{(1)}|^2 dG \right)^{1/2}. \tag{8}$$

The function  $\eta_1$  does not depend on  $x_1$ ; therefore, if  $k = (k_1, \dots, k_n)$  and  $k_1 > 0$ , then  $\eta_1^{(k)} \equiv 0$ ; but if  $k_1 = 0$ , then, taking into account that

$$(G - G_{1,3\sigma_1})G_{1,\sigma_1}^2 G_{2,\sigma_2}^2 G_{3,\sigma_3}^2 \subset (G'_1 - G'_{1,3\sigma_1})\tilde{G}_{2,\sigma_2}^2 \tilde{G}_{3,\sigma_3}^2$$

( $G_2^2, G_3^2$  are cylinders constructed on  $\tilde{G}_2^2, \tilde{G}_3^2$ , the projections of  $\tilde{G}_1$  onto the axes  $x_2, x_3$ ), then, by virtue of the inequality  $|\eta_1^{(k)}| \ll c\sigma_1^{|k|}$  and (7) for  $j = 1$ , we conclude that the sum  $\sum_{k \leq l}$  is bounded, while the second term on the right-hand side of (8), as  $\sigma_1 \rightarrow 0$ , tends to

$$\left( \int_{G-Q_2} |v_2^{(1)}|^2 dG \right)^{1/2}.$$

We reason in the same spirit in the cases where  $\sigma_2, \sigma_3, \dots$  tend to zero. Here one must take into account that each of the functions  $\eta_1^2, \eta_2^2, \eta_3^2$  does not depend on two variables, and in the corresponding place (7) is applied with  $j = 2$ .

Mathematical Institute named after V. A. Steklov  
Academy of Sciences of the USSR

Received  
7 VIII 1962

## CITED LITERATURE

<sup>1</sup> S. M. Nikol' skii, DAN, **146**, No. 3 (1962).

<sup>2</sup> S. M. Nikol' skii, DAN, **146**, No. 4 (1962).

<sup>3</sup> S. M. Sobolev, *Some Applications of Functional Analysis in Mathematical Physics*, Leningrad, 1950.

*Note: Figure translations are in progress. See original paper for figures.*

*Source: Math-Net.Ru and CyberLeninka. Machine translation. Verify with the original.*