UGO GIANAZZA - GIUSEPPE SAVARÉ (*)

Some Results on Minimizing Movements (**) (***)

SUMMARY. — In the framework of minimizing movements, recently suggested by E. De Giorgi, we consider a «gradient flow type» problem associated to an abstract functional and prove existence, uniqueness and convergence results for the related variational evolution inequalities. These results properly extend and confirm some conjectures presented in [DG].

Alcuni risultati sui movimenti minimizzanti

SOMMARIO. — Nell'ambito dei «Movimenti Minimizzanti», recentemente proposti da E. De Giorgi, consideriamo un problema di evoluzione associato ad un funzionale astratto e dimostriamo alcuni risultati di esistenza, unicità e regolarità per le relative disequazioni variazionali. Questi teoremi estendono e confermano alcune congetture presentate in [DG].

0. · INTRODUCTION

In a recent paper (see [DG]) E. De Giorgi has proposed the idea of *minimizing movements* as a useful tool to unify many different problems in Calculus of Variations, Differential Equations and Geometric Measure Theory. By combining minimization and iteration a lot of interesting examples receive a variational formulation which allows to get faster to the solution.

In particular he poses some conjectures, which very naturally lead to approximation problems for variational inequalities of evolution; we study them in an abstract

(*) Indirizzi degli Autori: U. Gianazza: Dipartimento di Matematica, Università degli Studi di Pavia; G. Savaré: Istituto di Analisi Numerica del CNR, Pavia.

formulation of the type

$$(0.1) \quad a(u(t), u'(t) - v) + b(u(t), u'(t) - v) + \varphi(u'(t)) - \varphi(v) \leq 0 ,$$

$$\forall v \in V, \quad u(0) = u_0 \in V$$

where V is a Hilbert space, $\varphi : V \mapsto]-\infty, +\infty]$ is a proper, convex, lower semicontinuous function, a, $b : V \times V \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ are continuous bilinear forms, and a is symmetric and positive but in general not coercive.

De Giorgi's approach to this equation is to choose a time step $\tau = 1/\lambda > 0$ and to look for a step function $u_\tau(t)$, constant on each interval $[k\tau, (k+1)\tau[, k \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $u_\tau(0) = u_0$ and $u_\tau((k+1)\tau)$ solves the minimum problem:

$$(0.2) \quad \min_{v \in V} \left[\frac{1}{2} a(v, v) + b(u_\tau(k\tau), v) + \tau \varphi\left(\frac{v - u_\tau(k\tau)}{\tau} \right) \right].$$

If

$$(0.3) \quad \exists \lim_{\tau \to 0} u_\tau(t) = u(t), \quad \text{in } V, \quad \forall t \in [0, +\infty[$$

we call u a minimizing movement associated to the functional (0.2) and the equation (0.1).

Under suitable hypotheses on V, a, φ we prove some existence, uniqueness and convergence results from which De Giorgi's conjectures can be obtained as a special case.

Equations of this kind have been largely studied in these last years; just to quote a few examples, in [DL] and [Br2] a non zero datum $f(t)$ is considered while in [CV] and [Co] a double nonlinearity is studied and a fairly complete list of works on the argument is given.

It doesn't seem, however, that anything like we did already exists in the literature, due to the lack of coerciveness of the bilinear form a, to the unboundedness of φ and above all to the strong pointwise estimate required by (0.2).

We mainly use maximal monotone operators theory and convex analysis, whose techniques are developed for example in [Bar], [Br1] and [ET] and to which we refer for additional related material. On the other hand the stability and convergence estimates are typical of the abstract numerical analysis of parabolic variational inequalities and they are developed for a different problem in [Ba].

All these results have been previously announced in a first note with M. Gobbino [GGS], where further bibliographical references on the subject can be found.

In the first paragraph we discuss the problem and present our results in Theorems 1-3; the proofs are given in the following sections.

1. · GENERAL DEFINITIONS AND STATEMENT OF THE RESULTS

In the following $\bar{\mathbb{R}}$ will be the extended real line ($\bar{\mathbb{R}} = \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, +\infty\}$). Let S be a topological space. In [DG] De Giorgi proposed the following

1.1. DEFINITION: *Let* $F:]1, +\infty[\times \mathbb{Z} \times S \times S \to \bar{\mathbb{R}}$ *and* $u: \mathbb{R} \to S$; *we say that* u *is a minimizing movement associated to* F *and* S *and we write* $u \in MM(F, S)$ *if there exists* $w:]1, +\infty[\times \mathbb{Z} \to S$ *such that for any* $t \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\lim_{\lambda \to \infty} w(\lambda, [\lambda t]) = u(t)$$ (1.1)

and for any $\lambda \in]1, +\infty[$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$

$$F(\lambda, k, w(\lambda, k+1), w(\lambda, k)) = \min_{s \in S} F(\lambda, k, s, w(\lambda, k)).$$ (1.2) ∎

Let us now suppose that $S = H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$, u_0 is a given function in this space and F is an integral functional as follows; in this case we deal with *gradient flow* type problems and De Giorgi [DG] suggested the following

CONJECTURE 1: *Let* $\beta \in]1, 2[$ *be given; if we set*

$$F(\lambda, k, f, g) = \begin{cases} \displaystyle\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |f - u_0|^2 \, dx & \text{if } k \leq 0, \\ \displaystyle\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \lambda |\nabla f|^2 + (\lambda |f - g|)^\beta \, dx & \text{if } k > 0, \end{cases}$$ (1.3)

then $u \in MM(F, S)$ *if and only if* $u: \mathbb{R} \to S$ *is continuous,* $u(t) = u_0$ *for any* $t \leq 0$ *and, setting* $v(x, t) = u(t)(x)$, v *solves*

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \frac{\partial v}{\partial t} = \left| \frac{\partial v}{\partial t} \right|^{2-\beta} \Delta_x v \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times]0, +\infty[.$$ (1.4)

CONJECTURE 2: *Let* $a_1, \ldots, a_n \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ *be given; if we define*

$$F(\lambda, k, f, g) = \begin{cases} \displaystyle\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |f - u_0|^2 \, dx & \text{if } k \leq 0, \\ \displaystyle\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\nabla f|^2 - 2 \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i} + \lambda |f - g|^2 \, dx & \text{if } k > 0, \end{cases}$$ (1.5)

then $u \in MM(F, S)$ *if and only if* $u: \mathbb{R} \to S$ *is continuous,* $u(t) = u_0$ *for any* $t \leq 0$ *and, setting* $v(x, t) = u(t)(x)$, v *solves*

$$\frac{\partial v}{\partial t} = \Delta_x v + \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \frac{\partial v}{\partial x_i} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times]0, +\infty[.$$ (1.6)

CONJECTURE 3: *If we put*

$$(1.7) \quad F(\lambda, k, f, g) = \begin{cases} \displaystyle\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |f - u_0|^2 \, dx & \text{if } k \leq 0, \\ \displaystyle\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\nabla f|^2 + \lambda |f - g|^2 \, dx & \text{if } k > 0, \ f \geq g, \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases}$$

then $u \in MM(F, S)$ *if and only if* $u: \mathbb{R} \to S$ *is continuous,* $u(t) = u_0$ *for any* $t \leq 0$ *and, setting* $v(x, t) = u(t)(x)$, v *solves*

$$(1.8) \quad \frac{\partial v}{\partial t} = (\Delta_x v)^+ \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times]0, +\infty[.$$

1.2. REMARK: In the above stated conjectures it must be explained what is the weak sense in which equations (1.4) and (1.8) have to be understood. ∎

1.3. REMARK: The above written (1.3), (1.5), (1.7) can all be seen as generalization of the basic functional

$$(1.9) \quad F(\lambda, k, f, g) = \begin{cases} \displaystyle\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |f - u_0|^2 \, dx & \text{if } k \leq 0, \\ \displaystyle\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\nabla f|^2 + \lambda |f - g|^2 \, dx & \text{if } k > 0. \end{cases}$$

Let us observe that in these cases it is sufficient to study the limit (1.1) for $t \geq 0$.

Actually all these conjectures naturally fit into a more general and abstract framework. Precisely we consider

$$(1.10) \quad \begin{cases} V \text{ Hilbert space with norm } \|\cdot\|, \\ V' \text{ its dual, } \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle \text{ the duality pairing,} \end{cases}$$

$$(1.11) \quad \begin{cases} \varphi: V \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\} \text{ proper, lower semicontinuous, convex} \\ D(\varphi) \text{ its domain, } \partial\varphi \text{ its subdifferential, } \varphi^* \text{ its conjugate } (^1). \end{cases}$$

$(^1)$ Let us recall that $D(\varphi) = \{v \in V : \varphi(v) < +\infty\} \neq \emptyset$ and that $\forall v \in V, \ w \in V'$

$$w \in \partial\varphi(v) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \langle w, z - v \rangle \leq \varphi(z) - \varphi(v) \quad \forall z \in V$$

and $\varphi^*: V' \mapsto \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ is a proper l.s.c. convex function defined by

$$\varphi^*(w) = \sup_{v \in V} \langle w, v \rangle - \varphi(v), \quad \forall w \in V'.$$

$$(1.12) \quad \begin{cases} a(\cdot,\cdot), \quad b(\cdot,\cdot) \colon V \times V \to \mathbb{R} \text{ continuous bilinear forms} \\ \text{to which the linear continuous operators } A, B \colon V \to V' \text{ are associated } (^2), \end{cases}$$

Moreover, $a(\cdot,\cdot)$ is symmetric and the associated quadratic form, which we denote by $a(\cdot)$, is positive:

$$a(u, v) = a(v, u); \qquad a(u) = a(u, u) \geqslant 0 \qquad \forall u, v \in V.$$

We can then think to the following problem

PROBLEM P: *Let* $u_0 \in V$ *be given and consider*

$$(1.13) \quad F(\lambda, k, v, w) = \begin{cases} \|v - u_0\| & \text{if } k \leqslant 0, \\ \dfrac{1}{2} a(v, v) + b(v, w) + \dfrac{1}{\lambda} [\lambda(v - w)] & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases}$$

We want to find conditions on a, b, φ, u_0 *such that there exists a unique* $u \colon \mathbb{R} \to V$ *with* $u \in \mathrm{MM}(\mathrm{F}, V)$ *and*

$$(1.14) \quad \begin{cases} u \in C^0(\mathbb{R}, V) \cap AC_{loc}(]0, +\infty[; V), \\ u(t) = u_0 \quad \forall t \leqslant 0, \\ 0 \in Au + Bu + \partial \varphi(u') \quad a.e. \text{ in }]0, +\infty[. \end{cases}$$

Let us start and consider the case with

$$(1.15) \quad b = 0.$$

If the form $a(\cdot,\cdot)$ is coercive on V, that is, if it satisfies

$$(1.16) \quad \exists \alpha > 0 \colon \quad \forall u \in V \quad a(u, u) \geqslant \alpha \|u\|^2,$$

then Problem P has a very general answer. As a matter of fact we have the following

THEOREM 1: *Under hypotheses* (1.15) *and* (1.16), *if* (^3)

$$(1.17) \quad -Au_0 \in \overline{D(\varphi^*)'}$$

(^2) As it is usual, $\forall u, v \in V$

$$\langle Au, v \rangle = a(u, v) \leqslant M_a \|u\| \|v\|; \qquad \langle Bu, v \rangle = b(u, v).$$

(^3) $\exists u \in \mathrm{MM}(\mathrm{F}, V)$ even if this condition is not satisfied; the solution is still verifies the differential inclusion but it is not continuous at $t = 0$; in fact we have $\lim_{t \to 0^+} u(t) = u_0^*$ and $-u_0^*$ is the projection of u_0 on the convex set $A^{-1}(\overline{D(\varphi^*)})$ with respect to the scalar product defined by $a(\cdot,\cdot)$.

Problem P admits a solution u that satisfies (1.14) *and*

$$(1.18) \qquad u \in W^{1, \infty}_{loc}(]0, +\infty[; V).$$

Moreover, if we define $\hat\varphi$ as the function $v \mapsto \varphi(-v)$, u is the solution to

$$(1.19) \qquad \begin{cases} u(0) = u_0, \\ u' + \partial\hat\varphi^*(Au) \ni 0 \quad a.e. \text{ in }]0, +\infty[\end{cases}$$

and belongs to $MM(F^*, V)$, where

$$(1.20) \qquad F^*(\lambda, k, v, w) = \begin{cases} \|v - u_0\| & \text{if } k \le 0 \\ \dfrac{\lambda}{2} a(v - w, v - w) + \hat\varphi^*(Au) & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases}$$

1.4. REMARK: The minimization of functionals F, F^* given by (1.13) and (1.20) leads to backward Euler scheme for the approximation of (1.14) and (1.19) respectively; this last case, in particular, is deeply developped in [Br 2] in a slightly different framework and our proof is an easy consequence of that theory. On the other hand, using the same procedures as in section 3 and 4 we could give a direct proof of this result, which would be more related to the minimizing movement idea; we restricted ourselves to the results which seem to be new. ∎

1.5. REMARK: Let us substitute $\mathbb{R}^+$ with a bounded domain Ω and choose $S = V = H^1_0(\Omega)$ in conjecture 1. We define

$$(1.21) \qquad a(u, v) = \int_\Omega \langle \nabla u, \nabla v \rangle \, dx, \qquad \varphi(u) = \frac{1}{\beta} \int_\Omega |u|^\beta \, dx, \qquad \beta \in]1, +\infty[.$$

Then

$$Au = -\Delta u, \qquad \partial\varphi(u) = \frac{\beta}{2} |u|^{\beta - 2} u$$

and

$$D(\varphi^*) = L^{\beta'}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow H^{-1}(\Omega), \qquad \frac{1}{\beta} + \frac{1}{\beta'} = 1$$

where the inclusion is dense. It is easy to see that condition (1.17) is satisfied for any choice of u_0. ∎

1.6. REMARK: An analogous work can be done with conjecture 3 once we put

$$(1.22) \qquad \varphi(u) = \frac{1}{2} \int |u|^2 \, dx + I_{(u \ge 0)}, \qquad I_{(u \ge 0)} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } u \ge 0 \text{ a.e.} \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases}$$

Under these hypotheses u satisfies the variational inequality

$$\int_\Omega \frac{\partial u}{\partial t}\left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} - v\right) + \int_\Omega \left(\nabla u, \nabla\left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} - v\right)\right) \leq 0,$$

$$\forall v \in H_0^1(\Omega), \quad v \geq 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \quad \text{a.e. in }]0, +\infty[. \quad \blacksquare$$

If $a(\cdot, \cdot)$ is not coercive (which is the case of our conjectures), the situation is more complicated. We will suppose that a *uniformly convex* Banach space W is given, which is compatible with V in the sense that

$$(1.23) \quad \begin{cases} V \text{ and } W \text{ are both continuously embedded} \\ \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad \text{in a Hausdorff topological vector space } \mathcal{T}, \\ V \cap W \text{ is dense in } V \text{ and in } W\,(^4). \end{cases}$$

Moreover we assume that $(^5)$

$$(1.24) \quad \exists l, \ \alpha_1 > 0: \quad \sqrt{a(u, u)} + l\|u\|_W \geq \alpha_1 \|u\|_V, \quad \forall u \in V \cap W.$$

φ is linked to W in the following sense:

$$(1.25) \quad \begin{cases} \exists \psi \in]1, +\infty[, \ \exists \psi\colon V \cap W \twoheadrightarrow R \cup \{+\infty\} \text{ proper, convex, l.s.c.,} \\ \varphi(u) = \|u\|_W^p + \psi(u), \quad \forall u \in V \cap W. \end{cases}$$

We have now

THEOREM 2: *Under the preceding hypotheses (1.15), (1.23)-(1.25), $\forall u_0 \in V$ Problem P has a unique solution u. Moreover, $\forall T > 0$,*

$$(1.26) \quad \begin{cases} u \in W_{loc}^{1,2}(]0, +\infty[; V), \quad u' \in L^2(0, T; W), \\ \varphi'(-Au), \quad \psi(u') \in L^1(0, T), \end{cases}$$

and u satisfies also (1.19).

1.7. REMARK: If ψ satisfies:

$$(1.27) \quad 0 \in D(\psi), \quad \psi(v) \geq 0, \quad \forall v \in D(\psi)$$

the previous result holds for $T = +\infty$ and the proof is slightly easier. In this case $\frac{\cdot}{p}^*$ satisfies (1.27), too. $\quad \blacksquare$

$(^4)$ This in particular implies that V' and W'' can be continuously and densely imbedded into $(V \cap W)'$, which will coincide with their sum.

$(^5)$ As $a(\cdot, \cdot)$ is positive, this is the same as

$$\forall x > 0 \quad \exists \alpha_2 > 0: \quad \sqrt{a(u, u)} + c\|u\|_W \geq \alpha_2 \|u\|_V, \quad \forall u \in V \cap W.$$

1.8. REMARK: Let us choose $W = L^\beta(\mathbb{R}^n)$, with $\beta \in]1, 2]$, $\psi = 0$ and consequently

$$a(u, v) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\nabla_u, \nabla_v) \, dx, \qquad \varphi(u) = \frac{1}{\beta} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |u|^\beta \, dx.$$

We are dealing with Conjecture 1 and our hypotheses are trivially satisfied. In this case

$$-\Delta u \in L^{\beta'}(\mathbb{R}^n \times]0, +\infty[), \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} \in L^\beta(\mathbb{R}^n \times]0, +\infty[). \quad \blacksquare$$

1.9. REMARK: As in the previous case, let us choose

$$W = L^\beta(\mathbb{R}^n), \quad \psi = I_K, \quad K = \{u \geq 0\}, \quad \varphi(u) = \frac{1}{\beta} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |u|^\beta \, dx + \psi(u)$$

then Conjecture 3 follows from the abstract theory for $\beta = 2$; moreover, denoting by $\mathfrak{M}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ the topological vector space of Radon measures on $\mathbb{R}^n$, we have

$$D(\bar{\varphi}^*) = \{v \in H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap \mathfrak{M}(\mathbb{R}^n) : v^- \in L^{\beta'}(\mathbb{R}^n)\},$$

$$\bar{\varphi}^*(u) = \frac{1}{\beta'} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |u^-|^{\beta'} \, dx, \quad \partial \bar{\varphi}^*(u) = -(u^-)^{\beta'-1}.$$

For a.e. t, Δu is a measure whose positive part is in $L^{\beta'}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and u satisfies

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = [(\Delta u)^+]^{\beta'-1}. \quad \blacksquare$$

1.10. REMARK (Neumann's problem): As in Remark 1.5 we choose $V = H^1(\Omega)$ and u is the solution to

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{\beta}{2} |u'|^{\beta-2} u' = \Delta u & \text{in } \Omega \times]0, +\infty[, \\ \dfrac{\partial u}{\partial n} = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times]0, +\infty[, \\ u = u_0 & \text{on } \Omega \times \{0\}. \end{cases}$$

As Δu belongs to $L^{\beta'}(\Omega)$ the Neumann condition makes sense. $\blacksquare$

Finally, let us consider $b \not\equiv 0$; we will suppose that

$$(1.28) \quad \begin{cases} V = H \text{ is a Hilbert space and } V \text{ is continuously densely imbedded in } H, \\ b \text{ can be extended to a continuous bilinear form on } V \times H \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \text{ that is} \\ \exists M_b > 0: \ b(u, v) \leq M_b \|u\|_V \|v\|_H, \quad \forall u, v \in V, \quad \varphi(u) = \frac{1}{2} \|u\|_H^2 + \psi(u), \end{cases}$$

THEOREM 3: *Problem P admits a unique solution u, which belongs also to* $H^1(0, T; H)$ $\forall T > 0$.

1.11. REMARK: We end up with Conjecture 2 if we suppose that $\psi \equiv 0$, $H = L^2(R^n)$ and

$$b(u, v) = \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{R^n} a_i \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} v \, dx.$$ ∎

2. - PROOF OF THEOREM 1

2.1. LEMMA: *For any* $v \in V$ *there exists a unique* $w = \sigma(\lambda, v) \in V$ *such that*

$$(2.1) \qquad \frac{1}{2} a(w, w) + \frac{1}{\lambda} \varphi(\lambda(w - v)) = \min_{z \in V} \left[\frac{1}{2} a(z, z) + \frac{1}{\lambda} \varphi(\lambda(z - v)) \right]$$

and w *solves the following variational inequality*

$$(2.2) \qquad a(w, w - z) + \frac{1}{\lambda} \varphi(\lambda(w - v)) - \frac{1}{\lambda} \varphi(\lambda(z - v)) \leqslant 0 \qquad \forall z \in V.$$

Moreover w *also solves*

$$(2.3) \qquad \lambda a(w - v, w - z) + \hat{\varphi}^*(Aw) - \hat{\varphi}^*(Az) \leqslant 0 \qquad \forall z \in V$$

and the dual problem

$$(2.4) \qquad \frac{\lambda}{2} a(w - v, w - v) + \hat{\varphi}^*(Aw) = \min_{z \in V} \left[\frac{\lambda}{2} a(z - v, z - v) + \hat{\varphi}^*(Az) \right].$$

PROOF: The first two relations are obvious since we are looking for the minimum of the sum of convex functions, one of which is coercive and Frechet-differentiable (see [V], [L]). If we define $\bar{z} = \lambda(z - v)$ we can rewrite (2.2) in this way

$$(2.5) \qquad a(w, \lambda(w - v) - \bar{z}) + \varphi(\lambda(w - v)) - \varphi(\bar{z}) \leqslant 0 \qquad \forall \bar{z} \in V;$$

that is:

$$-Aw \in \partial \varphi(\lambda(w - v)).$$

Recalling that $\partial \varphi^*$ is the inverse operator of $\partial \varphi$ (see [Br2], [Bar]) we get:

$$(2.6) \qquad \lambda(w - v) \in \partial \varphi^*(-Aw) = -\partial \hat{\varphi}^*(Aw)$$

that is (2.3) and (2.4). ∎

2.2. REMARK: By (2.6) the function $w = \sigma(\lambda, v)$ satisfies:

$$(2.7) \qquad w + \frac{1}{\lambda} \, \partial\hat{\varphi}^* \circ (Aw) \ni v \, ;$$

the multivalued operator $V \ni v \mapsto \partial\hat{\varphi}^* \circ A \in V$ is then maximal and monotone, when V is endowed with the scalar product $a(\cdot, \cdot)$. It is also easy to verify that we are dealing with the subdifferential of the conjugate function of φ once we identify V and V^* through a. Its resolvent is given by

$$(2.8) \qquad J_\nu v = \sigma\left(\frac{1}{\nu}, v\right), \qquad V \mapsto V. \qquad \blacksquare$$

We can then finally come to the *proof* of Theorem 1; if we apply the theory developped in [Br2] we can see immediately that

$$(2.9) \qquad \begin{cases} u' + \partial\hat{\varphi}^* (Au) \ni 0 & \text{a.e. in }]0, +\infty[, \\ u(0) = u_0, \end{cases}$$

has a unique solution u in $C^0([0, +\infty[; V) \cap W^{1,\infty}_{loc}[0, +\infty[; V)$ if $-Au_0 \in \overline{D(\varphi^*)}^V$. Moreover, thanks to the exponential formula we have

$$(2.10) \qquad u(t) = \lim_{n \to +\infty} \left(\cdot + \frac{t}{n} \, \partial\hat{\varphi}^* (A \cdot)\right)^{-n} u_0 = \lim_{n \to +\infty} J^n_{t/n} u_0 \qquad \forall t > 0$$

uniformly on the compact subsets of $[0, +\infty[$. If we now define $w(\lambda, k)$ as in (1.2) we have

$$(2.11) \qquad w(\lambda, k) = u_0 \qquad \text{if } k \leq 0,$$

$$(2.12) \qquad w(\lambda, k+1) = \sigma(\lambda, w(\lambda, k)) = J_{1/\lambda} w(\lambda, k) = J^{k+1}_{1/\lambda} u_0.$$

Choosing $1/\lambda = t/n$, it follows that, $\forall t > 0$,

$$(2.13) \qquad \lim_{n \to +\infty} w\left(\frac{n}{t}, n\right) = u(t) \qquad \forall t > 0$$

uniformly on the compact subsets of $]0, +\infty[$. Finally, (1.1) is a direct consequence of the following

2.3. LEMMA: Let (S, d) be a metric space and $w: [0, +\infty[\times \mathbb{N} \to S$ a function such that

$$\exists \lim_{n \to +\infty} w\left(\frac{n}{t}, n\right) = u(t)$$

uniformly on the compact subsets of $]0, +\infty[$. If $u(t)$ is continuous, then

$$\lim_{\lambda \to +\infty} w(\lambda, [\lambda t]) = u(t) \qquad \forall t > 0.$$

PROOF: It is enough to observe that

$$(2.14) \qquad \left| \frac{[\lambda t]}{\lambda} - t \right| \leq \frac{1}{\lambda}$$

and

$$(2.15) \qquad d\big(w(\lambda, [\lambda t]), u(t)\big) \leq d\bigg(w(\lambda, [\lambda t]), u\bigg(\frac{[\lambda t]}{\lambda}\bigg)\bigg) + d\bigg(u\bigg(\frac{[\lambda t]}{\lambda}\bigg), u(t)\bigg). \quad \blacksquare$$

3. - PROOF OF THEOREM 2

We make a slight change in the notation, using the same as in [Ba]. We put

$$(3.1) \qquad \tau = \frac{1}{\lambda} \in]0, 1[, \qquad u_\tau^k = w(1/\tau, k) \in V.$$

We have already seen that $\{u_\tau^k\}$ is the sequence such that

$$(3.2) \qquad u_\tau^k = u_0 \qquad \text{for } k \leq 0,$$

$$(3.3) \qquad \begin{cases} \hat{v}_\tau^k = \dfrac{u_\tau^k - u_\tau^{k-1}}{\tau} \in D(\varphi), \\ a(u_\tau^k, \hat{v}_\tau^k - v) + \varphi(\hat{v}_\tau^k) - \varphi(v) \leq 0 \quad \forall v \in V \quad k \geq 1, \end{cases}$$

$$(3.4) \qquad \begin{cases} Au_\tau^k \in D(\hat{\varphi}^*), \\ (\hat{v}_\tau^k, Au_\tau^k - v) + \hat{\varphi}^*(Au_\tau^k) - \hat{\varphi}^*(v) \leq 0 \quad \forall v \in V^* \quad k \geq 1, \end{cases}$$

where this last relation is the dual of the previous one. Let us now divide R into the intervals $I_\tau^k = [\tau(k-1), \tau k[$ and consider the function u_τ piecewise constant whose value in I_τ^k is u_τ^{k-1}. Our aim is to show that

$$(3.5) \qquad \lim_{\tau \to 0^+} u_\tau(t) = u(t) \qquad \text{in } V \quad \forall t \geq 0$$

and that $u(t)$ satisfies (1.14). It is convenient to divide the proof in different steps:

1) *Stability estimates* in suitable functional spaces on the bounded intervals $]0, T[, T > 0$.

2) *Stationary estimates* for the singular perturbation problem (3.3) when τ goes to zero.

3) *Cauchy estimate* with respect to the seminorm induced by a.

4) *Passage to the limit* for a subsequence through weak compactness and further reinforcement of the convergence thanks to the uniform reflexivity of W.

5) *Uniqueness of the solution* to (1.14) and therefore existence of the limit (3.5).

Step 1: stability estimates.

Let us fix $T > 0$ and choose $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $T \in I_\tau^N$. It is also useful to consider the piecewise linear function $\tilde{u}_\tau$ such that:

$$(3.6) \qquad \tilde{u}_\tau(k\tau) = u_\tau^k; \quad \tilde{u}_\tau(t) = (t/\tau - (k-1)) u_\tau^k + (k - t/\tau) u_\tau^{k-1}, \quad \text{on } I_\tau^k.$$

We then have

3.1. THEOREM: *There exist constants $C_0, C_1 > 0$, independent from τ, such that*

$$(3.7) \qquad \|u_\tau\|_{L^\infty(0, T; V)} \leq \|\tilde{u}_\tau\|_{L^\infty(0, T; V)} \leq C_0,$$

$$(3.8) \qquad \|\tilde{u}_\tau'\|_{L^2(0, T; W_1)} \leq C_1,$$

$$(3.9) \qquad \begin{cases} \displaystyle\int_0^T \psi(\tilde{u}_\tau'(t))\, dt \\ \displaystyle\int_0^T \dot{\varphi}^*(Au_\tau(t + \tau))\, dt \end{cases} \leq \frac{1}{2} a(u_0).$$

Moreover, if (1.27) holds true, then we can choose $C_1 = \frac{1}{2} a(u_0)$.

PROOF: Since in general

$$w \in \partial \varphi(v) \quad \Rightarrow \quad (w, v) = \varphi(v) + \varphi^*(w)$$

we observe that

$$(3.10) \qquad \langle Au_\tau^k, \partial_\tau^k \rangle + \|\partial_\tau^k\|_W^2 + \psi(\partial_\tau^k) + \ddot{\varphi}^*(Au_\tau^k) = 0.$$

Adding up for $k = 1 \dots m \leq N$ [5]

$$(3.11) \qquad \frac{1}{2} a(u_\tau^m) + \frac{\tau^2}{2} \sum_{k=1}^m a(\partial_\tau^k) + \tau \sum_{k=1}^m \left[\|\partial_\tau^k\|_W^2 + \psi(\partial_\tau^k) + \ddot{\varphi}^*(Au_\tau^k) \right] = \frac{1}{2} a(u_0).$$

Recalling that $\tilde{u}_\tau'(t) = \partial_\tau^k$ on I_τ^k, (3.9) follows immediately.

[5] We often use the elementary equality:
$$a(v, v - w) = \frac{1}{2} [a(v) + a(v - w) - a(w)].$$

We already observed that (1.27) implies

$$(3.12) \qquad \dot{\tilde{\varphi}}^*(v) \geqslant 0, \qquad \forall v \in V'$$

and consequently (3.8); since

$$(3.13) \qquad \tau \sum_{k=1}^{n} \|\partial_\tau^k\|_{V'}^2 \geqslant \frac{1}{(T+\tau)^{(2)}} \|u_\tau^n - u_0\|_{V'}^2$$

via (1.24) we get also (3.7).

Otherwise we recall that convex lower semicontinuous functions are bounded from below by affine functions

$$(3.14) \qquad \begin{cases} \exists \xi_v \in V' + W'', \ \xi_{\dot{v}} \in V, \ \eta \in \mathbf{R}: \\ \dot{\varphi}(v) \geqslant -\langle \xi_v, v \rangle - \eta, \\ \dot{\tilde{\varphi}}^*(v) \geqslant -\langle \xi_{\dot{v}}, v \rangle - \eta. \end{cases}$$

Therefore

$$(3.15) \qquad \frac{1}{2} a(u_\tau^m) + \frac{\tau^2}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{m} a(\partial_\tau^k) + \tau \sum_{k=1}^{m} \|\partial_\tau^k\|_{V'}^2 \leqslant$$

$$\leqslant \frac{1}{2} a(u_0) + \langle \xi_{\dot{v}}, u_\tau^m - u_0 \rangle + \tau \sum_{k=1}^{m} a(\partial_\tau^k, Au_\tau^k) + 2(m\tau)\eta \leqslant$$

$$\leqslant \frac{1}{2} a(u_0) + \|\xi_{\dot{v}}\|_{V'} \cdot w \cdot \|u_\tau^m - u_0\|_{V' \cap W} + (T+\tau)(a(\xi_{\dot{v}}) + 2\eta) + \frac{\tau}{4} \sum_{k=1}^{m} a(u_\tau^k).$$

By (3.13) there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\frac{1}{2} a(u_\tau^m) + \tau \sum_{k=1}^{m} \|\partial_\tau^k\|_{V'}^2 \leqslant C\left[1 + \tau \sum_{k=1}^{m} a(u_\tau^k) \right].$$

From here we obtain the uniform boundedness of $a(u_\tau^m)$ (it is a discrete version of Gronwall lemma) and (3.8), (3.7). ∎

To go to the limit in the weak sense we need to control $a(\dot{\bar{u}}_\tau)$. This is done precisely by

3.2. THEOREM: $\exists C_2 > 0$ *independent of τ such that*

$$(3.16) \qquad \int_0^T t a(\dot{\bar{u}}_\tau(t)) \, dt \leqslant C_2.$$

PROOF: It is enough to choose $v = Au_k^{\ast-1}$, $k \geq 2$ in (3.4); if we multiply for $k\tau$ and sum from 2 up to N we have:

$$(3.17) \quad \tau \sum_{k=2}^{N} k\tau a(\partial_\tau^k) +$$

$$+ \tau \sum_{k=2}^{N} [k\tilde{\varphi}^\ast(Au_k^\ast) - (k-1)\tilde{\varphi}^\ast(Au_{k-1}^\ast)] - \tau \sum_{k=2}^{N} \tilde{\varphi}^\ast(Au_k^{\ast-1}) \leq 0$$

from which

$$\tau \sum_{k=2}^{N} k\tau a(\partial_\tau^k) + N\tau\tilde{\varphi}^\ast(Au_N^\ast) - \tau\tilde{\varphi}^\ast(Au_1^\ast) \leq \tau \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \tilde{\varphi}^\ast(Au_k^\ast).$$

Summing (3.11) written with $m = 1$ we have

$$\tau \sum_{k=2}^{N} k\tau a(\partial_\tau^k) \leq \tau \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \tilde{\varphi}^\ast(Au_k^\ast) + a(u_0) - \tau\tilde{\varphi}^\ast(\partial_\tau^1) - N\tau\tilde{\varphi}^\ast(Au_N^\ast) \leq C_2$$

from which we obtain (3.16). ∎

3.3. Lemma: *The sequences*

$$(3.18) \quad k \mapsto a(\partial_\tau^k); \quad k \mapsto \tilde{\varphi}^\ast(Au_k^\ast) \quad k \geq 1$$

are not increasing.

PROOF: In (3.3) we choose $v = \partial_\tau^{k-1}$ and in the one relative to the preceding step we choose $v = \partial_\tau^k$; summing up we get

$$(3.19) \quad a(\partial_\tau^k, \partial_\tau^k - \partial_\tau^{k-1}) \leq 0$$

and this is precisely the first relation; for the second one it is sufficient to choose $v = Au_\tau^{\ast-1}$ in (3.4). ∎

3.4. COROLLARY: *As a simple consequence*

$$(3.20) \quad a(\bar{u}_\tau^1(t)) \leq \frac{2C_2}{t^2}, \quad \forall t \leq T. \text{ ∎}$$

Step 2: stationary estimates.

3.5. Lemma: We have

$$(3.21) \quad \lim_{\tau \to 0} \|u_\tau^1 - u_0\|_V + a(u_\tau^1 - u_0) = 0; \quad \lim_{\tau \to 0} \tau\tilde{\varphi}^\ast(Au_\tau^1) = 0.$$

PROOF: From (3.8) we immediately obtain

$$(3.22) \quad \|u_\tau^1 - u_0\|_V^2 \leq C_1 \tau^{2-1} \to 0 \quad \text{when } \tau \to 0^+;$$

moreover, since u_τ^1 is bounded in V, compatibility requires that $u_\tau^1 \to u_0$ in V. If we write (3.11) with $m = 1$ we can see that

$$(3.23) \qquad \limsup_{\tau \to 0^+} a(u_\tau^1) \leq a(u_0)$$

and taking into account the positivity of a we have

$$\lim_{\tau \to 0^+} a(u_\tau^1 - u_0) = 0.$$

Finally, from (3.11) we have:

$$\tau \dot\phi^* (Au_\tau^1) \leq \frac{1}{2} \left[a(u_0) - a(u_\tau^1) \right] + \langle z_\tau, u_\tau^1 - u_0 \rangle + \tau \eta$$

obtaining the second of (3.21). ∎

3.6. COROLLARY: *We have*

$$(3.24) \qquad \lim_{\tau \to 0^+} a(u_\tau^{k+1} - u_\tau^k) = 0$$

uniformly with respect to k.

PROOF: It is immediate if we combine the previous result with Lemma 3.3. ∎

3.7. COROLLARY: *We find*

$$(3.25) \qquad \left. \begin{array}{l} \displaystyle \lim_{\tau \to 0^+} \sup_{t > 0} a(u_\tau(t + \tau) - u_\tau(t)) \\[2mm] \displaystyle \lim_{\tau \to 0^+} \sup_{t > 0} a(u_\tau(t) - \bar u_\tau(t)) \\[2mm] \displaystyle \lim_{\tau \to 0^+} \sup_{t > 0} a(\bar u_\tau(t + \tau) - \bar u_\tau(t)) \end{array} \right\} = 0. \qquad ∎$$

Step 3: Cauchy estimate.

3.8. THEOREM: *We have*

$$(3.26) \qquad \lim_{\tau, s \to 0^+} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} a(\bar u_\tau(t) - \bar u_s(t)) = 0$$

with $T = +\infty$ if (1.27) holds.

PROOF: It follows from the following lemma:

3.9. LEMMA: *Let $l_\tau(t)$ be the τ-periodic function that is equal to t / τ in $[0, \tau[$ and U_τ, $\bar U_\tau$ the τ-translated functions:*

$$(3.27) \qquad U_\tau(t) = u_\tau(t + \tau), \qquad \bar U_\tau(t) = \bar u_\tau(t + \tau);$$

then $\hat{U}_s$ satisfies the inequality

$$(3.28) \qquad a(\hat{U}_s^+, \hat{U}_s - v) + \hat{\varphi}^*(A\hat{U}_s) - \hat{\varphi}^*(Av) \leqslant (1 - l_s)[\hat{\varphi}^*(AU_s) - \hat{\varphi}^*(AU_s(t+\tau))].$$

We choose in (3.28) $v = \hat{U}_\rho$; changing the role of τ and ρ, summing up and integrating between 0 and t, we obtain in the left hand member the difference:

$$\frac{1}{2} a(\hat{U}_\tau(t) - \hat{U}_\rho(t)) - \frac{1}{2} a(\hat{U}_\tau(0) - \hat{U}_\rho(0))$$

while in the right hand member, due to the τ-periodicity of $l_s(t)$:

$$\int_0^t (1 - l_\tau)\left[\hat{\varphi}^*(AU_\tau(t)) - \hat{\varphi}^*(AU_\tau(T+t))\right] dt +$$

$$+ \int_0^t (1 - l_\rho)[\hat{\varphi}^*(AU_\rho(t)) - \hat{\varphi}^*(AU_\rho(T+t))] dt$$

so that:

$$a(\hat{U}_\tau(t) - \hat{U}_\rho(t)) \leqslant a(u_\tau^1 - u_\rho^1) + \tau\hat{\varphi}^*(Au_\tau^1) + \rho\,\hat{\varphi}^*(Au_\rho^1) + 2C_0(\tau + \rho)(\|At_{s^*}\|_* + \tau)$$

By Lemma 3.5 and its corollary we deduce (3.26). ∎

PROOF OF LEMMA 3.9: Let us observe that

$$(3.29) \qquad \hat{u}_s(t + \tau) = l_s(t)u_s(t + \tau) + (1 - l_s(t))\hat{u}_s(t),$$

$$(3.30) \qquad u_s(t + \tau) - \hat{u}_s(t) = \tau(1 - l_s(t))\hat{u}_s^1(t),$$

with $0 \leqslant l_s(t) \leqslant 1$. Now, thanks to (3.4) we have

$$(3.31) \qquad \langle\hat{u}_s^1(t), Au_s(t + \tau) - v\rangle + \hat{\varphi}^*(Au_s(t + \tau)) - \hat{\varphi}^*(v) \leqslant 0 \qquad \forall v \in V'$$

and consequently

$$(3.32) \qquad a(\hat{u}_s^1(t), \hat{u}_s(t) - v) + \hat{\varphi}^*(A\hat{u}_s) - \hat{\varphi}^*(Av) \leqslant$$

$$\leqslant a(\hat{u}_s^1(t), \hat{u}_s(t) - u_s(t + \tau)) + \hat{\varphi}^*(A\hat{u}_s(t)) - \hat{\varphi}^*(Au_s(t + \tau)).$$

Thanks to (3.30)

$$a(\hat{u}_s^1(t), \hat{u}_s(t) - u_s(t + \tau)) = -\tau(1 - l_s)a(\hat{u}_s^1) \leqslant 0$$

while, due to convexity,

$$(3.33) \qquad \hat{\varphi}^*(A\hat{u}_s(t)) \leqslant (1 - l_s)\hat{\varphi}^*(Au_s(t)) + l_s\,\hat{\varphi}^*(A\hat{u}_s(t + \tau)).$$

Taking into account these two inequalities in (3.32), we obtain (3.28). ∎

Step 4: passage to the limit.

The previous estimates allow us to prove

3.10. THEOREM: *There exist a subsequence* $\{\tau_n\}$ *with* $\tau_n \searrow 0$ *and a function*

$$u \in C^0([0, T]; V) \cap W^{1,2}_{loc}([0, T]; V)$$

such that

$$(3.34) \quad \tilde{u}_{\tau_n}(t) \rightharpoonup u(t) \text{ in } V, \quad \forall t \in [0, T] \quad \lim_{n \to +\infty} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} a(\tilde{u}_{\tau_n}(t) - u(t)) = 0.$$

Moreover $u'(t) \in L^2(0, T; W)$ *while* $\phi(u'(t))$ *and* $\hat{\varphi}^*(Au(t))$ *are in* $L^1(0, T)$ *and* u *satisfies*

$$(3.35) \quad u'(t) + \partial_{\varphi}^{\psi*}(Au(t)) \ni 0, \quad u(0) = u_0.$$

PROOF: The proof is standard: once we extract a subsequence $\{\tau_n\}$ such that $\tilde{u}_{\tau_n}$ weak*-converges to u in $L^\infty(0, T; V)$ and $\tilde{u}'_{\tau_n} \rightharpoonup u'$ in $L^2(0, T; W)$ and in $L^2_{loc}([0, T]; V)$, it is immediate to verify that

$$(3.36) \quad \tilde{u}_{\tau_n}(t) \rightharpoonup u(t) \text{ in } V \quad \forall t \in [0, T]$$

and that

$$(3.37) \quad \lim_{n \to +\infty} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} a(\tilde{u}_{\tau_n}(t) - u(t)) = 0$$

thanks to the lower semicontinuity of the quadratic form $a(\cdot)$.

It follows that also U_{τ_n} uniformly converges to u in the seminorm induced by a and therefore

$$(3.38) \quad Au_{\tau_n} \to Au \text{ in } L^\infty(0, T; V') \, (^7).$$

Since by (3.31)

$$(3.39) \quad \tilde{u}'_{\tau_n} + \partial_{\hat{\varphi}}^{\psi*}(Au_{\tau_n}) \ni 0 \quad \text{a.e. in }]0, T[$$

the inclusion is still true for u:

$$(3.40) \quad u'(t) + \partial_{\varphi}^{\psi*}(Au)(t) \ni 0 \quad \text{a.e. in }]0, T[.$$

We still have to check the continuity in 0; one hand it is easy to see that

$$a(u(t) - u_0) = a(u(t) - u_\tau(s)) \quad \forall \tau > s.$$

---

(7) Observe that the Schwartz inequality applied to a gives:

$$\|Av\|_* = \sup_{\|w\|=1} \langle Av, w \rangle \le \sup_{\|w\|=1} \sqrt{a(v)} \sqrt{a(w)} \le M_a \sqrt{a(v)}.$$

In fact, if we choose $n_\varepsilon = \max\{k : \tau_k > \varepsilon\}$, n_ε grows to infinity when ε goes to 0 and therefore

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0^+} a(u(\varepsilon) - u_0) = \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0^+} a(u(\varepsilon) - u_{n_\varepsilon}(t)) \leq \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0^+} \sup_{t \in [0,1]} a(u(t) - u_{n_\varepsilon}(t)) = 0.$$

On the other hand

$$\|u(\varepsilon) - u_0\|_W \leq \liminf_{n \to \infty} \|\bar{u}_{\tau_n}(\varepsilon) - u_0\|_W \leq C \varepsilon^{1/p'}$$

and we are done. ∎

As a matter of fact the convergence is actually stronger. At this regard we have

3.11. THEOREM: *Let τ_n and u be as in the previous proposition. Then*

$$(3.41) \qquad \bar{u}'_{\tau_n} \to u' \quad \text{in } L^p(0, T; W).$$

In particular

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \bar{u}_{\tau_n}(t) = u(t) \quad \text{in } V$$

uniformly with respect to t on any bounded interval.

PROOF: From (3.40) we get

$$(3.42) \qquad a(u'(t), u(t)) + \tilde{\varphi}^*(Au(t)) + \varphi(u'(t)) = 0 \quad \text{a.e. in }]0, +\infty[$$

while from (3.39) we have

$$(3.43) \qquad a(\bar{u}'_\tau(t), \bar{u}_\tau(t)) + \tilde{\varphi}^*(AU_\tau(t)) + \varphi(\bar{u}'_\tau(t)) \leq 0.$$

Let us now integrate from 0 to T (*); we find

$$(3.44) \qquad \frac{1}{2} a(u(T)) + \int_0^T \tilde{\varphi}^*(Au(t)) \, dt + \int_0^T [\|u'(t)\|_V + \varphi(u'(t))] \, dt = \frac{1}{2} a(u_0)$$

and

$$(3.45) \qquad \frac{1}{2} a(\bar{u}_{\tau_n}(T)) + \int_0^T \tilde{\varphi}^*(AU_{\tau_n}(t)) \, dt + \int_0^T [\|\bar{u}'_{\tau_n}(t)\|_V + \varphi(\bar{u}'_{\tau_n}(t))] \, dt \leq \frac{1}{2} a(u_0).$$

(*) Thanks to (3.40) we integrate from $\varepsilon > 0$ to T and then we let ε go to zero, using the continuity of u in W.

Passing to the limit for $\tau_n \to 0$ we have

$$(3.46) \quad \limsup_{n \to +\infty} \int_0^T \{\tilde{\varphi}(AU_{\tau_n}(t)) + \|\tilde{u}'_{\tau_n}(t)\|_W^p + \psi(\tilde{u}'_{\tau_n}(t))\} dt \le$$
$$\le \int_0^T \{\tilde{\varphi}^*(Au(t)) + \|u'(t)\|_W^p + \psi(u'(t))\} dt.$$

On the other hand the three functions $\tilde{\varphi}^*$, $\|\cdot\|_W^p$ and ψ are lower semicontinuous. Therefore

$$(3.47) \quad \lim_{n \to +\infty} \int_0^T \|\tilde{u}'_{\tau_n}(t)\|_W^p \, dt = \int_0^T \|u'(t)\|_W^p \, dt.$$

As $L^p(0, T; W)$ is uniformly convex (⁹)

$$\tilde{u}'_{\tau_n} \to u' \quad \text{in } L^p(0, T; W) \quad \blacksquare$$

Step 5: uniqueness of the solution.

Since $u_{\tau}(t) = \tilde{u}_{\tau}\left(-\left[\frac{t}{\tau}\right]\tau\right)$ we also have $u_{\tau_n}(t) \to u(t)$. To be sure of the convergence of the whole family $\{u_{\tau}\}$ we must prove the uniqueness of the limit.

3.12. PROPOSITION: *Let u_1, $u_2 \in C^0([0, +\infty[; V) \cap AC_{loc}([0, +\infty[; V)$ be two solutions of the Cauchy problem*

$$\begin{cases} Au + \partial \varphi(u) \ni 0, \\ u(0) = u_0. \end{cases}$$

If φ is strictly convex, then $u_1 = u_2$.

PROOF: Usually, thanks to the monotonicity, we obtain that $t \mapsto a(u_1(t) - u_2(t))$ is not increasing, so that

$$a(u_1(t) - u_2(t)) = 0$$

Moreover, if $u'_1 \neq u'_2$, then for the strict monotonicity of the subdifferential we should have

$$a((u_1(T) - u_2(T)) < a(u_1(\varepsilon) - u_2(\varepsilon)) = 0$$

for some $0 < \varepsilon < T$ which is absurd. It follows that $u'_1 = u'_2$ and, for the Cauchy condition, $u_1 = u_2$. $\blacksquare$

_____
(⁹) For the uniform convexity of $L^p(W)$ with W uniformly convex, see [D].

4. Proof of Theorem 3

We repeat faster the previuos sequence, enhancing all the changes that are to be made and underlining the specific difficulties of this case.

With regard to the notation, we will identify H and its dual so that we have the following continuous and dense inclusions:

$$V \hookrightarrow H \equiv H' \hookrightarrow V'; \tag{4.1}$$

in this way the scalar product $(\cdot, \cdot)$ of H may be extended to the duality between V and V', which we will denote with the same symbol. Finally, $|\cdot|$ will be the norm in H.

The sequence σ_τ^k satisfies now the inequalities $(k \geqslant 1)$

$$\begin{cases} \sigma_\tau^k \in D(\psi), \\ (\sigma_\tau^k + Au_\tau^k + Bu_\tau^{k-1}, \sigma_\tau^k - v) + \psi(\sigma_\tau^k) - \psi(v) \leqslant 0, \end{cases} \tag{4.2}$$

$$\begin{cases} \sigma_\tau^k + Au_\tau^k + Bu_\tau^{k-1} \in D(\psi^*), \\ (\sigma_\tau^k, \sigma_\tau^k + Au_\tau^k + Bu_\tau^{k-1} - v) + \psi^*(\sigma_\tau^k + Au_\tau^k + Bu_\tau^{k-1}) - \psi^*(v) \leqslant 0, \end{cases} \tag{4.3}$$

and also

$$(\sigma_\tau^k, \sigma_\tau^k + Au_\tau^k + Bu_\tau^{k-1}) + \psi^*(\sigma_\tau^k + Au_\tau^k + Bu_\tau^{k-1}) + \psi(\sigma_\tau^k) = 0. \tag{4.4}$$

As for the stability estimates we have

4.1. Theorem: $\exists C > 0$ independent from τ such that

$$\|u_\tau\|_{L^\infty(0, T, V)} \leqslant \|\bar{u}_\tau\|_{L^\infty(0, T, V)} \leqslant C, \tag{4.5}$$

$$\|\bar{u}_\tau'\|_{L^2(0, T, H)} \leqslant C, \tag{4.6}$$

$$\int_0^T \psi(\bar{u}_\tau'(t)) \, dt \leqslant C, \tag{4.7}$$

$$\int_0^T \dot{\psi}^*(\bar{u}_\tau'(t) + Au_\tau(t + \tau) + Bu_\tau(t)) \, dt \leqslant C, \tag{4.8}$$

$$\int_0^T t\dot{u}_\tau'(t) \, dt \leqslant C. \tag{4.9}$$

Proof: We work as in the previous paragraph and we obtain from (4.4)

$$(4.10) \quad \tau \sum_{k=1}^{n} \left(|\partial_\tau^k|_H^2 + \frac{\tau}{2} a(\partial_\tau^k) \right) + \frac{1}{2} a(u_\tau^n) \leqslant$$

$$\leqslant \frac{1}{2} a(u_0) + 2m\tau\eta + (\xi_{j^*} + \xi_{j^*}, u_\tau^n - u_0) + \sum_{k=1}^{n} b(u_\tau^{k-1}, \partial_\tau^k + \xi_{j^*}) + a(u_\tau^n, \xi_{j^*}).$$

We get to (4.5) thanks to Gronwall lemma and to the boundedness of the form b in $V \times H$ that leads to the following estimate

$$\tau \sum_{k=1}^{n} b(u_\tau^{k-1}, \partial_\tau^k + \xi_{j^*}) \leqslant \frac{1}{2} \tau \sum_{k=1}^{n} |\partial_\tau^k|^2 + \frac{m\tau}{2} |\xi_{j^*}|^2 + \frac{M_b^2}{2} \tau \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \|u_\tau^k\|^2.$$

(4.6), (4.7) and (4.8) are immediate and (4.9) comes in a similar way from Theorem 3.2. ∎

The stationary estimates are evaluated as in the case of Theorem 1.6. In fact

4.2. Lemma: *It results*

$$(4.11) \quad \lim_{\tau \to 0^+} \|u_\tau^1 - u_0\|_H = 0;$$

$$(4.12) \quad \lim_{\tau \to 0^+} \tau_p^{\frac{1}{2}} \, {}^*(\partial_\tau^1 + A u_\tau^1 + B u_0) = 0. \quad ∎$$

It is more delicate the following

4.3. Proposition: *It exists a constant* $C > 0$, *independent from* τ *such that*

$$(4.13) \quad \sup_{\tau \in [0, T]} \|u_\tau(\tau) - u_\tau(\tau + \tau)\|_V \leqslant C \|u_\tau^1 - u_0\|,$$

$$(4.14) \quad \int_0^T |\bar{u}_\tau'(t) - \bar{u}_\tau'(t + \tau)|_H^2 \, dt \leqslant C \|u_\tau^1 - u_0\|^2. \quad ∎$$

Proof: If we work as in Lemma 3.3 we have

$$(\partial_\tau^k - \partial_\tau^{k-1}, \partial_\tau^k - \partial_\tau^{k-1} + \tau A \partial_\tau^k + \tau B \partial_\tau^{k-1}) \leqslant 0;$$

summing to each member the quantity $\tau(\partial_\tau^k, \partial_\tau^k - \partial_\tau^{k-1})$ and dividing by τ we get:

$$(4.15) \quad \frac{1}{\tau}|\partial_\tau^k - \partial_\tau^{k-1}|^2 + \frac{1}{2}[a(\partial_\tau^k) + |\partial_\tau^k|^2] \leq$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{2}[a(\partial_\tau^{k-1}) + |\partial_\tau^{k-1}|^2] - b(\partial_\tau^{k-1}, \partial_\tau^k - \partial_\tau^{k-1}) + (\partial_\tau^k, \partial_\tau^k - \partial_\tau^{k-1}) \leq$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{2}[a(\partial_\tau^{k-1}) + |\partial_\tau^{k-1}|^2] + \frac{1}{2\tau}|\partial_\tau^k - \partial_\tau^{k-1}|^2 + \tau[M_\delta^2 \|\partial_\tau^{k-1}\|^2 + |\partial_\tau^k|^2].$$

If we define

$$x_\tau^k = a(u_\tau^k - u_\tau^{k-1}) + |u_\tau^k - u_\tau^{k-1}|^2 \geq \alpha \|u_\tau^k - u_\tau^{k-1}\|^2$$

summing up (4.15) from $k = 2$ to m we obtain

$$x_\tau^m \leq x_\tau^1 + C\tau \sum_{k=1}^m x_\tau^k$$

from which

$$x_\tau^m \leq x_\tau^1 \cdot e^{C(T+\tau)}.$$

Weak coercivity of a assures (4.13) and (4.14) consequently follows from (4.15). ∎

Before coming to the wanted convergence, let us define a new function $\bar{u}_\tau(t)$ that interpolates the sequence $\{u_\tau^k\}$ quadratically:

$$(4.16) \quad \bar{u}_\tau(t) = \frac{1}{2}u_\tau(t+\tau) + [U_\tau(t)\bar{u}_\tau(t+\tau) + (1 - l_\tau(t))\bar{u}(t)]$$

with

$$(4.17) \quad \bar{u}_\tau'(t) = \frac{\bar{u}_\tau'(t+\tau) - \bar{u}_\tau'(t)}{\tau} = l_\tau \bar{u}_\tau'(t+\tau) + (1 - l_\tau)\bar{u}_\tau'(t)$$

Thanks to proposition 4.3 we can see easily that the families $u_\tau, \bar{u}_\tau$ and $\bar{u}_\tau$ have the same limit points in $L^\infty(0, T; V) \cap H^1(0, T; H)$ just like their translated versions $U_\tau, \bar{U}_\tau$ and $\tilde{U}_\tau$ (see (3.27)).

Let us set for simplicity

$$(4.18) \quad V_\tau = \bar{U}_\tau' + AU_\tau + B a_\tau; \quad \hat{V}_\tau = \bar{U}_\tau' + A\bar{U}_\tau + B\bar{u}_\tau.$$

Argueing as in Lemma 3.9 we have:

4.4. LEMMA: *For every* $v \in D(\dot\phi^*)$ *it holds:*

$$(4.19) \quad \left(\dot U_s^\tau, U_s^\tau + AU_s + Bu_s - v\right) + \dot\phi^*(\bar V_s) - \dot\phi^*(v) \le$$

$$\le (1 - L_s)\left[\dot\phi^*(V_s) - \dot\phi^*(V_s(t + \tau))\right] + b(\bar u_s - u_s, \bar U_s^\tau) + (\bar U_s^\tau, \bar U_s^\tau - U_s^\tau).$$

4.5. LEMMA: $\forall \tau, \rho > 0, s \in [0, T]$ *we have*

$$(4.20) \quad \int_0^s |\bar U_s^\tau(t) - \bar U_\rho^s(t)|^2 \, dt + a(\bar U_s(s), \bar U_\rho(s)) \le$$

$$\le a(u_s^+ - u_\rho^+) + E_\tau^2(0, s) + E_\rho^2(0, s) + \int_0^s b(\bar u_\tau(t) - \bar u_\rho(t), \bar U_s^\tau(t) - \bar U_\rho^s(t)) \, dt$$

where:

$$\lim_{\tau \to 0^+} E_\tau(0, s) = 0 \quad \text{uniformly for } s \in [0, T].$$

PROOF: Let us choose $v = \bar V_\rho$ in (4.19); by usual calculations we obtain:

$$\int_0^s \left[(\bar U_s^\tau, \bar U_s^\tau - \bar U_\rho^s) + a(\bar U_s^\tau, \bar U_s - \bar U_\rho)\right] dt + \int_0^s \dot\phi^*(\bar V_\tau) - \dot\phi^*(\bar V_\rho) \, dt \le$$

$$\le \int_0^s \left\{ (1 - L_s)\left[\dot\phi^*(V_\tau) - \dot\phi^*(V_\tau(t + \tau))\right] + \frac{1}{2}\left[|\bar U_s^\tau|^2 - |U_s^\tau|^2\right] \right\} dt +$$

$$+ \int_0^s \left\{ M_b \|\bar u_\tau - u_\tau\| |U_s^\tau| + \frac{1}{2}|\bar U_s^\tau - U_s^\tau|^2 + \frac{1}{4}|\bar U_s^\tau - \bar U_\rho^s|^2 - b(\bar u_\tau - \bar u_\rho, \bar U_s^\tau) \right\} dt.$$

Changing the role of τ and ρ and summing up, we obtain (4.20) with:

$$E_\tau^2(0, s) = \int_0^s \left\{ |\bar U_s^\tau|^2 - 2\dot\phi^*(V_\tau) \right\} dt +$$

$$+ \int_0^s \left\{ |\bar U_s^\tau - U_s^\tau|^2 + 2M_b \|\bar u_\tau - u_\tau\| |U_s^\tau| \right\} dt + \tau\dot\phi^*(V_\tau(0)).$$

By a further application of Gronwall lemma we conclude:

4.6. COROLLARY: $\{\bar u_\tau\}$ *and* $\{\bar u_\tau\}$ *are Cauchy's families in* $C^0([0, T]; V) \cap \cap H^1(0, T; H)$, *for every* $T > 0$. ∎

REFERENCES

[Ba]   BAIOCCHI C., *Discretization of Evolution Variational Inequalities - Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications*, Birkhäuser, Boston Inc. (1988), 59-92.

[Bar] BARBU V., *Nonlinear Semigroups and Differential Equations in Banach spaces*, Noordhoff Internatioinal Publishing, Leyden (1976).

[Br1] BREZIS H., *Problèmes unilateraux*, J. Math. Pures Appl., 57 (1972), 1-168.

[Br2] BREZIS H., *Opérateurs Maximaux Monotones et semi-groupes de contractions dans les espaces de Hilbert*, North-Holland Mathematics Studies 5, North-Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam-London (1973).

[Co]   COLLI P., *On some doubly non linear evolution equations in Banachspaces*, Japan J. Indust. Appl. Math., 9 (1992), 181-203.

[CV]   COLLI P. - VISINTIN A., *On a class of doubly non linear evolution equation*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations, 15 (1990), 737-756.

[D]   DAV M. M., *Some more uniformly convex spaces*, Bull. A.M.S., 47, 6, (1941), 506-509.

[DG]   DE GIORGI E., *New problems on minimizing movements, Boundary Value Problems for PDE and Applications*, Edited C. Baiocchi and J. L. Lions, Masson (1993), 81-98.

[DL]   DUVAUT G. - LIONS J. L., *Inequalities in Mechanics and Physics*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin (1976).

[ET]   EKELAND I. - TEMAM R., *Analyse convexe et problèmes variationnels*, Dunod Gauthier-Villars, Paris (1974).

[GGS] GIANAZZA U. - GOBBINO M. - SAVARÉ G., *Evolution Problems and Minimizing Movements*, IAN Preprint 899, (1993).

[L]   LIONS J. L., *Quelques méthodes de résolution des problèmes aux limites non linéaires*, Dunod Gauthier-Villars, Paris (1969).

[V]   VAINBERG M. M., *Variational Methods for the Study of Nonlinear Operators*, Holden-Day Inc., San Francisco, London, Amsterdam (1964).