

## On the Dirichlet Problem for the Nonlinear Diffusion Equation in Non-smooth Domains

Ugur G. Abdulla<sup>1</sup>

*Baku State University, Baku 370148, Azerbaijan*

E-mail: Ugur.Abdulla@mis.mpg.de

*Submitted by J. Lavery*

Received August 8, 2000

We study the Dirichlet problem for the parabolic equation  $u_t = \Delta u^m$ ,  $m > 0$ , in a bounded, non-cylindrical and non-smooth domain  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{N+1}$ ,  $N \geq 2$ . Existence and boundary regularity results are established. We introduce a notion of parabolic modulus of left-lower (or left-upper) semicontinuity at the points of the lateral boundary manifold and show that the upper (or lower) Hölder condition on it plays a crucial role for the boundary continuity of the constructed solution. The Hölder exponent  $\frac{1}{2}$  is critical as in the classical theory of the one-dimensional heat equation  $u_t = u_{xx}$ . © 2001 Academic Press

**Key Words:** Dirichlet problem; non-smooth domains; nonlinear diffusion; degenerate and singular parabolic equations; boundary regularity.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Consider the equation

$$u_t = \Delta u^m, \quad (1.1)$$

where  $u = u(x, t)$ ,  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_N) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ ,  $N \geq 2$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ ,  $\Delta = \sum_{i=1}^N \partial^2 / \partial x_i^2$ ,  $m > 0$ . We study the Dirichlet problem (DP) for Equation (1.1) in a bounded domain  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{N+1}$ . It can be stated as follows: given any continuous function on the parabolic boundary  $\mathcal{P}\Omega$  of  $\Omega$ , find a continuous extension of this function to the closure of  $\Omega$  which satisfies (1.1) in  $\overline{\Omega} \setminus \mathcal{P}\Omega$ .

<sup>1</sup>Corresponding address: Max-Planck Institute for Mathematics in the Sciences, Inselstraße 22, Leipzig 04103, Germany.



The classical DP for the heat equation ( $m = 1$  in (1.1)) is included in our problem. Another direction this work fits in with is in the modern theory of nonlinear degenerate and singular parabolic equations. If  $m > 1$ , Eq. (1.1) is a well-known porous medium equation, describing the flow of a compressible Newtonian fluid through a porous medium [24], while the singular case ( $0 < m < 1$ ) arises (for example) in plasma physics [8]. A particular motivation for this work arises from the problem about the evolution of interfaces in problems for porous medium equation. Special interest concerns the cases when support of the initial data contains a corner or cusp singularity at some points. What about the movement of these kinds of singularities along the interface? To solve this problem, it is important, at the first stage, to develop general theory of boundary-value problems in non-cylindrical domains with boundary surfaces which have the same kind of behaviour as the interface. In many cases this may be non-smooth and characteristic (see, e.g., [1–3]).

We make now precise the meaning of solution to DP. Let  $\Omega$  be a bounded open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^{N+1}$ ,  $N \geq 2$ . Let the boundary  $\partial\Omega$  of  $\Omega$  consist of the closure of a domain  $B\Omega$  lying on  $t = 0$ , a domain  $D\Omega$  lying on  $t = T \in (0, \infty)$ , and a (not necessarily connected) manifold  $S\Omega$  lying in the strip  $0 < t \leq T$ . Denote

$$\Omega(\tau) = \{(x, t) \in \Omega: t = \tau\}$$

and assume that  $\Omega(t) \neq \emptyset$  for  $t \in (0, T)$ . The set  $\mathcal{P}\Omega = \overline{B\Omega} \cup S\Omega$  is called a parabolic boundary of  $\Omega$ . Furthermore, the class of domains with described structure will be denoted by  $\mathcal{D}_{0,T}$ .

Let  $\Omega \in \mathcal{D}_{0,T}$  be given and  $\psi$  be an arbitrary continuous nonnegative function defined on  $\mathcal{P}\Omega$ . DP consists in finding a solution to Eq. (1.1) in  $\Omega \cup D\Omega$  satisfying initial-boundary condition

$$u = \psi \quad \text{on } \mathcal{P}\Omega. \quad (1.2)$$

Obviously, in general Eq. (1.1) degenerates at points  $(x, t)$ , where  $u = 0$  and we cannot expect the considered problem to have a classical solution. If  $m \neq 1$ , we shall follow the following notion of weak solution:

**DEFINITION 1.1.** We shall say that the function  $u(x, t)$  is a solution of DP (1.1), (1.2), if

(a)  $u$  is nonnegative and continuous in  $\overline{\Omega}$ , satisfying (1.2).

(b) For any  $t_0, t_1$  such that  $0 < t_0 < t_1 \leq T$  and for any domain  $\Omega_1 \in \mathcal{D}_{t_0, t_1}$  such that  $\overline{\Omega}_1 \subseteq \Omega \cup D\Omega$  and  $\partial B\Omega_1, \partial D\Omega_1, S\Omega_1$  being sufficiently smooth manifolds, the following integral identity holds

$$\int_{D\Omega_1} u f dx = \int_{B\Omega_1} u f dx + \int_{\Omega_1} (u f_t + u^m \Delta f) dx dt - \int_{S\Omega_1} u^m \frac{\partial f}{\partial \nu} dx dt, \quad (1.3)$$

where  $f \in C_{x,t}^{2,1}(\overline{\Omega}_1)$  is an arbitrary function that equals zero on  $S\Omega_1$  and  $\nu$  is the outward-directed normal vector to  $\Omega_1(t)$  at  $(x, t) \in S\Omega_1$ . If  $m = 1$ , however, the solution is understood in the classical sense.

After Wiener published his famous work [27], where he accomplished the long line investigations on the DP for the Laplace equation in general domains, the DP for the heat equation was continuously under the interest of many mathematicians in this century. In [20], a necessary and sufficient condition for the regularity of a boundary point in the Dirichlet problem for the heat equation in an arbitrary spatial dimension was announced. The analog of Wiener's condition, namely the necessary and sufficient condition which is a quasigeometric characterization for a boundary point of an arbitrary bounded open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^{N+1}$  to be regular for the heat equation, was established in [12], necessity being established earlier in [19]. A similar criterion for the linear parabolic equation with smooth, variable coefficient was established in [15]. The Wiener type sufficient conditions for boundary regularity in the case of general quasilinear uniformly parabolic equations were proved in [14, 28]. Another sufficient condition, the so-called exterior tusk condition which is an analog of the exterior cone condition for elliptic equations, was established in [11] for the linear heat equation and later in [22] for the linear uniformly parabolic equations.

However, it should be mentioned that Wiener's criterion does not explicitly resolve the natural analytic question, which we impose in this paper for the more general nonlinear equation (1.1). Namely, what about the relation between the solvability of the DP or regularity of the boundary points and local modulus of continuity of the boundary manifolds? The importance of this question arises in view of applications which we mentioned earlier. An almost complete answer to this question was given by Petrowsky [25] in the case of the one-dimensional linear heat equation  $u_t = u_{xx}$ . Results concerning the one-dimensional reaction-diffusion equation  $u_t = a(u^m)_{xx} + bu^\beta$ ,  $a > 0$ ,  $m > 0$ ,  $b \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\beta > 0$  were presented in recent papers by the author [4, 5]. By primarily applying the results of [4], a full description of the evolution of interfaces and of the local solution near the interface for all relevant values of parameters was presented in another recent paper [3].

The DP for the porous medium equation in cylindrical domain with smooth boundary was investigated in [7, 16]. At the moment there is a complete well established theory of the boundary value problems in cylindrical domains for general second order nonlinear degenerate parabolic equations (which includes as a particular case (1.1) and (1.4) below) due to [6, 7, 9, 10, 16, 26, 29], etc. (see the review article [17]). It seems that this paper is the first one which addresses the DP for the high-dimensional nonlinear degenerate or singular parabolic equations in non-cylindrical domains with non-smooth boundaries.

The approach used in this paper may be well expressed by the citation from the classical work [27] on the DP for the Laplace equation. As pointed out by Lebesgue and independently by Wiener, “the Dirichlet problem divides itself into two parts, the first of which is the determination of a harmonic function corresponding to certain boundary conditions, while the second is the investigation of the behaviour of this function in the neighbourhood of the boundary.” By using an approximation of both  $\Omega$  and  $\psi$ , we also construct a limit solution as a limit of a sequence of classical solutions in regular domains. We then prove a boundary regularity by using barriers and a limiting process.

The main result of this paper on the existence and boundary continuity of the solution to DP is formulated in Theorem 2.1 (see also Corollary 2.1) of Section 2. We introduce in this paper a notion of parabolic modulus of left-lower (or left-upper) semicontinuity of the lateral boundary manifold at the given point (Definition 2.1, Section 2). Our main assumption (Assumption  $\mathcal{A}$  and (2.1), Section 2) consists in the upper (or lower) Hölder condition on the parabolic modulus of left-lower (or left-upper) semicontinuity at each point of the lateral boundary manifold. Moreover, as in the classical theory of the one-dimensional heat equation, the critical Hölder exponent is equal to  $\frac{1}{2}$ . This assumption relates to the parabolic nature of Eq. (1.1) and does not depend on  $m$ . At this point, it should be mentioned that Eq. (1.1) has no essential importance for our results; rather it is a suitable model example for three different class of parabolic equations, namely singular ( $0 < m < 1$ ), degenerate ( $m > 1$ ), and uniform ( $m = 1$ ) parabolic equations. For example, by using our techniques the same results may be proved for the following reaction-diffusion-convection equation

$$u_t = a\Delta u^m + b \cdot \nabla u^\gamma + cu^\beta, \quad (1.4)$$

where  $a, m, \gamma, \beta > 0, b \in \mathbb{R}^N, c \in \mathbb{R}$  (see Remark 3.1, Section 3). We believe that the same result is true for more general second order parabolic equations. However, in this paper we restrict ourselves to Eq. (1.1), in order to make the presentation of our barrier method for proving the boundary regularity less technical. It should also be mentioned that since our main result on the boundary regularity of a weak solution to Eq. (1.1) is of the local nature, a similar result is true for an arbitrary bounded domain  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ .

It should also be mentioned that in this paper we restrict ourselves only with the existence and boundary regularity problems. We address issues regarding uniqueness of the constructed solution and related comparison theorems in a subsequent paper. The organisation of the paper is as follows: In Section 2 we outline the main result. In Section 3 we prove the main result (Theorem 2.1) from Section 2.

## 2. STATEMENT OF THE MAIN RESULT

We shall use the usual notation:  $z = (x, t) = (x_1, \dots, x_N, t) \in \mathbb{R}^{N+1}$ ,  $N \geq 2$ ,  $x = (x_1, \bar{x}) = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ ,  $\bar{x} = (x_2, \dots, x_N) \in \mathbb{R}^{N-1}$ ,  $|x|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^N |x_i|^2$ ,  $|\bar{x}|^2 = \sum_{i=2}^N |x_i|^2$ . For a point  $z = (x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^{N+1}$  we denote by  $B(z; \delta)$  an open ball in  $\mathbb{R}^{N+1}$  of radius  $\delta > 0$  and with center in  $z$ .

Let  $\Omega \in \mathcal{D}_{0,T}$  be a given domain. Assume that for an arbitrary point  $z_0 = (x^0, t_0) \in S\Omega$  (or  $z_0 = (x^0, 0) \in \overline{S\Omega}$ ) there exists  $\delta > 0$  and a continuous function  $\phi$  such that, after a suitable rotation of  $x$ -axes, we have

$$\overline{S\Omega} \cap B(z_0, \delta) = \{z \in B(z_0, \delta): x_1 = \phi(\bar{x}, t)\}.$$

Suppose also that

$$\text{sign}(x_1 - \phi(\bar{x}, t)) = \text{const} \quad \text{for } z \in B(z_0, \delta) \cap \Omega.$$

Furthermore, we denote this constant by  $d(z_0)$ . Obviously, by introducing a new variable  $x'_1 = -x_1$ , if necessary, we could have supposed that  $d(z_0) = 1$ . However, we describe the conditions for both cases  $d(z_0) = \pm 1$  separately, in order to distinguish these boundary points, which are similar to the left and right boundary points in the one-dimensional case.

Let  $z_0 = (x^0, t_0) \in S\Omega$  be a given boundary point. For an arbitrary sufficiently small  $\delta > 0$ , consider a parabolic domain

$$P(\delta) = \{(\bar{x}, t): |\bar{x} - \bar{x}^0| < \varepsilon_0(\delta + t - t_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}, t_0 - \delta < t < t_0\},$$

where  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$  is an arbitrary fixed number.

**DEFINITION 2.1.** Let

$$\omega^-(\delta) = \max(\phi(\bar{x}^0, t_0) - \phi(\bar{x}, t): (\bar{x}, t) \in \overline{P(\delta)}).$$

$$\omega^+(\delta) = \min(\phi(\bar{x}^0, t_0) - \phi(\bar{x}, t): (\bar{x}, t) \in \overline{P(\delta)}).$$

The function  $\omega^-(\delta)$  (respectively  $\omega^+(\delta)$ ) is called the parabolic modulus of left-lower (respectively left-upper) semicontinuity of the function  $\phi$  at the point  $(\bar{x}^0, t_0)$ . The word “lower semicontinuity” stresses the fact that the maximum is taken for the expression  $\phi(\bar{x}^0, t_0) - \phi(\bar{x}, t)$  without module. The word “left” stresses the fact that as in the one-dimensional case, only the part of the lateral boundary manifold which is situated below the hyperplane  $t = t_0$  is involved. Finally, the word “parabolic” expresses the parabolic size of  $P(\delta)$ .

For sufficiently small  $\delta > 0$  these functions are well-defined and converge to zero as  $\delta \downarrow 0$ . Our main assumption on the behaviour of the function  $\phi$  near  $z_0$  is as follows:

*Assumption  $\mathcal{A}$ .* There exists a function  $F(\delta)$  which is defined for all positive sufficiently small  $\delta$ ;  $F$  is positive with  $F(\delta) \downarrow 0$  as  $\delta \downarrow 0$  and if  $d(z_0) = 1$

(respectively  $d(z_0) = -1$ ) then

$$\omega^-(\delta) \leq \delta^{\frac{1}{2}} F(\delta) \quad (2.1)$$

(respectively  $\omega^+(\delta) \geq -\delta^{1/2} F(\delta)$ ).

We prove in the next section that Assumption  $\mathcal{A}$  is sufficient for the regularity of the boundary point  $z_0$ . Namely, the constructed limit solution takes the boundary value  $\psi(z_0)$  at the point  $z = z_0$  continuously in  $\overline{\Omega}$ . It is well known that in the case of the classical heat equation ( $m = 1$  in (1.1)) the boundary point  $z_0 = (x^0, 0) \in S\Omega$  is always regular (see, e.g., [21, p. 172]). Hence, in this case Assumption  $\mathcal{A}$  imposed on every boundary point  $z_0 \in S\Omega$  is sufficient for solvability of the DP (see Corollary 2.1 below). It may easily be proved that the solution in this particular case is a unique classical solution.

However, in general to provide the regularity of the boundary point  $z_0 = (x^0, 0) \in \overline{S\Omega}$  we need another assumption. Denote  $x_1 = \bar{\phi}(\bar{x}) \equiv \phi(\bar{x}, 0)$ .

DEFINITION 2.2. Let

$$\omega_0^-(\delta) = \max(\bar{\phi}(\bar{x}^0) - \bar{\phi}(\bar{x}): |\bar{x} - \bar{x}^0| \leq \delta)$$

$$\omega_0^+(\delta) = \min(\bar{\phi}(\bar{x}^0) - \bar{\phi}(\bar{x}): |\bar{x} - \bar{x}^0| \leq \delta).$$

The function  $\omega_0^-(\delta)$  (respectively  $\omega_0^+(\delta)$ ) is called the modulus of lower (respectively upper) semicontinuity of the function  $x_1 = \bar{\phi}(\bar{x})$  at the point  $\bar{x} = \bar{x}^0$ .

*Assumption  $\mathcal{B}$ .* There exists a function  $F_1(\delta)$  which is defined for all positive sufficiently small  $\delta$ ;  $F_1$  is positive with  $F_1(\delta) \downarrow 0$  as  $\delta \downarrow 0$  and if  $d(z_0) = 1$  (respectively  $d(z_0) = -1$ ) then

$$\omega_0^-(\delta) \leq \delta F_1(\delta) \quad (2.2)$$

(respectively  $\omega_0^+(\delta) \geq -\delta F_1(\delta)$ ).

It may easily be verified that if we redefine  $\bar{\phi}$  as  $x_1 = \bar{\phi}(\bar{x}) \equiv \phi(\bar{x}, t_0)$  then Assumption  $\mathcal{B}$  is a consequence of Assumption  $\mathcal{A}$  at the boundary point  $z_0 = (x^0, t_0) \in S\Omega$ . However, Assumption  $\mathcal{B}$  has a sense for the boundary points  $z_0 = (x^0, 0) \in \overline{S\Omega}$  on the bottom of the lateral boundary manifold.

We prove in the next section that Assumption  $\mathcal{B}$  is sufficient for the regularity of the boundary point  $z_0 = (x^0, 0) \in \overline{S\Omega}$ . Namely, the constructed limit solution takes the boundary value  $\psi(z_0)$  at the point  $z = z_0$  continuously in  $\overline{\Omega}$ .

Thus our main theorem reads:

**THEOREM 2.1.** *The DP (1.1), (1.2) is solvable in a domain  $\Omega$  which satisfies Assumption  $\mathcal{A}$  at every point  $z_0 \in S\Omega$  and Assumption  $\mathcal{B}$  at every point  $z_0 = (x^0, 0) \in \overline{S\Omega}$ .*

**COROLLARY 2.1.** *There exists a unique classical solution to DP (1.1), (1.2) with  $m = 1$ , in a domain  $\Omega$  which satisfies Assumption  $\mathcal{A}$  at every point  $z_0 \in S\Omega$ .*

It should be noted that our main result about the boundary regularity is of a local nature and, consequently, the existence of a different function  $F(\delta)$  (or  $F_1(\delta)$ ) for each boundary point in its respective Assumption  $\mathcal{A}$  (or  $\mathcal{B}$ ) is allowed. It may be easily observed that Assumptions  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  coincide in the case of cylindrical domain  $\Omega$ .

### 3. PROOF OF THE MAIN RESULT

*Step 1.* Construction of the limit solution. Consider a sequence of domains  $\Omega_n \in \mathcal{D}_{0,T}$ ,  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ , with  $S\Omega_n$ ,  $\partial B\Omega_n$ , and  $\partial D\Omega_n$  being sufficiently smooth manifolds. Assume that  $\{S\Omega_n\}$ ,  $\{\partial B\Omega_n\}$ , and  $\{\partial D\Omega_n\}$  approximate  $S\Omega$ ,  $\partial B\Omega$ , and  $\partial D\Omega$ , respectively. Moreover, let  $\overline{S\Omega}_n$  at some neighbourhood of its every point after suitable rotation of  $x$ -axes have a representation via the sufficiently smooth function  $x_1 = \phi_n(\bar{x}, t)$ . More precisely, assume that  $S\Omega$  in some neighbourhood of its point  $z_0$  is represented by the function  $x_1 = \phi(\bar{x}, t)$ ,  $(\bar{x}, t) \in P(\mu_0^{-2})$  with some  $\mu_0 > 0$ , where  $\phi$  satisfies Assumption  $\mathcal{A}$  from Section 2. Then we also assume that  $S\Omega_n$  in some neighbourhood of its point  $z_n = (x_1^{(n)}, \bar{x}^0, T)$  is represented by the function  $x_1 = \phi_n(\bar{x}, t)$ ,  $(\bar{x}, t) \in P(\mu_0^{-2})$ , where  $\{\phi_n\}$  is a sequence of sufficiently smooth functions and  $\phi_n \rightarrow \phi$  as  $n \rightarrow +\infty$ , uniformly in  $P(\mu_0^{-2})$ . We can also assume that  $\phi_n$  satisfies Assumption  $\mathcal{A}$  from Section 2 uniformly with respect to  $n$ . Namely, the parabolic modulus of left-lower semicontinuity of the function  $\phi_n$  at the point  $(\bar{x}^0, t_0)$  satisfies (2.1) uniformly with respect to  $n$ . We make a similar assumption also regarding the points  $z_n = (x^{(n)}, 0) \in \overline{S\Omega}_n$  on the bottom of the lateral boundary manifold. For arbitrary  $\mu > 0$ ,  $\delta > 0$  consider a cylinder

$$R(\mu, \delta) = \{(\bar{x}, t): |\bar{x} - \bar{x}^0| < \mu^{-1}, 0 < t < \delta\}.$$

Assume that  $\overline{S\Omega}$  in some neighbourhood of its point  $z_0 = (x^0, 0)$  is represented by the continuous function  $x_1 = \phi(\bar{x}, t)$ ,  $(\bar{x}, t) \in R(\mu_0, \delta_0)$  with some  $\mu_0 > 0$ ,  $\delta_0 > 0$ , where  $\bar{\phi}(\bar{x}) \equiv \phi(\bar{x}, 0)$  satisfies Assumption  $\mathcal{B}$  (see (2.2)) from Section 2. Then we also assume that  $\overline{S\Omega}_n$  in some neighbourhood of its point  $A_n = (x_1^{(n)}, \bar{x}^0, 0)$  is represented by the function

$x_1 = \phi_n(\bar{x}, t)$ ,  $(\bar{x}, t) \in \overline{R(\mu_0, \delta_0)}$ , where  $\{\phi_n\}$  is a sequence of sufficiently smooth functions and  $\phi_n \rightarrow \phi$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , uniformly in  $\overline{R(\mu_0, \delta_0)}$ . We suppose that  $\phi_n$  satisfies (2.2) uniformly with respect to  $n$ . Assume also that for arbitrary compact subset  $\Omega^{(0)}$  of  $\Omega \cup D\Omega$ , there exists a number  $n_0$  which depends on the distance between  $\Omega^{(0)}$  and  $\mathcal{P}\Omega$ , such that  $\Omega^{(0)} \subseteq \Omega_n \cup D\Omega_n$  for  $n \geq n_0$ . Let  $\Psi$  be a nonnegative and continuous function in  $\mathbb{R}^{N+1}$  which coincides with  $\psi$  on  $\mathcal{P}\Omega$ . This continuation is always possible. Next we take  $\psi_n = \Psi + n^{-1}$ ,  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ , and consider a Dirichlet problem (1.1), (1.2), in  $\Omega_n$ , with  $\psi$  replaced by  $\psi_n$ . This is a nondegenerate parabolic problem and classical theory [13, 18, 23] implies the existence of a unique  $C_{2+\alpha}$  solution. From the maximum principle it follows that

$$n^{-1} \leq u_n(x, t) \leq M \quad \text{in } \overline{\Omega}_n, n = 1, 2, \dots, \quad (3.1)$$

where  $M$  is an upper bound for  $\Psi$  and  $\psi_n$ ,  $n = 1, 2, \dots$  in some compact which contains  $\overline{\Omega}$  and  $\overline{\Omega}_n$ ,  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ . Next we take a sequence of compact subsets  $\Omega^{(k)}$  of  $\Omega \cup D\Omega$  such that

$$\Omega = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \Omega^{(k)}, \quad \Omega^{(k)} \subseteq \Omega^{(k+1)}, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots \quad (3.2)$$

By our construction, for each fixed  $k$ , there exists a number  $n_k$  such that  $\Omega^{(k)} \subseteq \Omega_n \cup D\Omega_n$  for  $n \geq n_k$ . It is a well-known result of the modern theory of degenerate parabolic equations (which includes (1.1) as a model example) that the sequence of uniformly bounded solutions  $u_n$ ,  $n \geq n_k$  to Eq. (1) is uniformly equicontinuous in a fixed compact  $\Omega^{(k)}$  (see, e.g., [10, Theorem 1, Proposition 1, and Theorem 7.1]). From (3.2), by the diagonalization argument and the Arzela–Ascoli theorem, we may find a subsequence  $n'$  and a limit function  $\tilde{u} \in C(\Omega \cup D\Omega)$  such that  $u_{n'} \rightarrow \tilde{u}$  as  $n' \rightarrow +\infty$ , pointwise in  $\Omega \cup D\Omega$  and the convergence is uniform on compact subsets of  $\Omega \cup D\Omega$ . Now consider a function  $u(x, t)$  such that  $u(x, t) = \tilde{u}(x, t)$  for  $(x, t) \in \Omega \cup D\Omega$ ,  $u(x, t) = \psi$  for  $(x, t) \in \mathcal{P}\Omega$ . Obviously the function  $u$  satisfies the integral identity (1.3). It is also continuous in  $B\Omega$ , since the above mentioned result on the equicontinuity of the sequence  $u_n$  is true up to some neighbourhood of every point  $z \in B\Omega$  [10, Theorem 6.1]. Hence, the constructed function  $u$  is a solution of the Dirichlet problem (1.1), (1.2), if it is continuous in  $\mathcal{P}\Omega \setminus B\Omega$ .

*Step 2. Boundary regularity.* Let  $z_0 = (x^0, t_0) \in S\Omega$ . We shall prove that  $z_0$  is regular, namely that

$$\lim u(z) = \psi(z_0) \quad \text{as } z \rightarrow z_0, z \in \Omega \cup D\Omega. \quad (3.3)$$

Without loss of generality assume that  $d(z_0) = 1$ . First, assume that  $t_0 = T$ . If  $0 < \psi(z_0) < M$ , we shall prove that for arbitrary sufficiently small



$\varepsilon > 0$  the following two inequalities are valid

$$\liminf u(z) \geq \psi(z_0) - \varepsilon \quad \text{as } z \rightarrow z_0, z \in \Omega \cup D\Omega \quad (3.4)$$

$$\limsup u(z) \leq \psi(z_0) + \varepsilon \quad \text{as } z \rightarrow z_0, z \in \Omega \cup D\Omega \quad (3.5)$$

Since  $\varepsilon > 0$  is arbitrary, from (3.4) and (3.5), (3.3) follows. If  $\psi(z_0) = 0$  (or respectively  $\psi(z_0) = M$ ), however, then it is sufficient to prove (3.5) (respectively (3.4)), since (3.4) (respectively (3.5)) follows directly from the fact that  $0 \leq u \leq M$  in  $\bar{\Omega}$ . Let  $\psi(z_0) > 0$ . Take an arbitrary  $\varepsilon \in (0, \psi(z_0))$  and prove (3.4). For arbitrary  $\mu > 0$ , consider a function

$$w_n(x, t) = f(\xi) \equiv M_1(\xi/h(\mu))^\alpha,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \xi &= h(\mu) + \phi_n(\bar{x}^0, T) - x_1 - \mu[T - t + \varepsilon_0^{-2}|\bar{x} - \bar{x}^0|^2], \\ M_1 &= \psi(z_0) - \varepsilon, h(\mu) = M_3\mu^{-1}F(\mu^{-2}), \\ M_3 &= [(M_2/M_1)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} - 1]^{-1}, M_2 = \psi(z_0) - \varepsilon/2, \end{aligned}$$

and  $\alpha$  is an arbitrary number such that  $\alpha > m^{-1}$ . If  $m > 1$ , then we assume also that  $\alpha \leq (m-1)^{-1}$ . Then we set

$$\begin{aligned} V_n &= \{(x, t): \phi_n(\bar{x}, t) < x_1 < \phi_{1n}(\bar{x}, t), (\bar{x}, t) \in P(\mu^{-2})\}, \\ \phi_{1n}(\bar{x}, t) &= \phi_n(\bar{x}, t) + (1 + M_3)\mu^{-1}F(\mu^{-2}) - \mu[T - t + \varepsilon_0^{-2}|\bar{x} - \bar{x}^0|^2]. \end{aligned}$$

In the next lemma we clear the structure of  $V_n$ .

**LEMMA 3.1.** *If  $\mu > 0$  is chosen such that  $F(\mu^{-2}) \leq (1 + M_3)^{-1}$  then the parabolic boundary of  $V_n$  consists of two boundary surfaces  $x_1 = \phi_n(\bar{x}, t)$  and  $x_1 = \phi_{1n}(\bar{x}, t)$  (see Fig. 1).*

*Proof.* We have

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{1n}(\bar{x}, t) - \phi_n(\bar{x}, t) &= \mu[\delta_* + t - T - \varepsilon_0^{-2}|\bar{x} - \bar{x}^0|^2], \\ \delta_* &= (1 + M_3)\mu^{-2}F(\mu^{-2}) \end{aligned}$$

and  $\delta_* \in (0, \mu^{-2}]$  if  $\mu$  is chosen as in Lemma 3.1. Then it easily follows that  $V_n = V_n^*$ , where

$$V_n^* = \{(x, t): \phi_n(\bar{x}, t) < x_1 < \phi_{1n}(\bar{x}, t), (\bar{x}, t) \in P(\delta_*)\}.$$

Obviously, the assertion of lemma is true for  $V_n^*$ . The lemma is proved.




FIG. 1. The domain  $V_n$  in a particular case when  $\phi_n = 0$ ,  $N = 2$ ,  $x_2^0 = 0$ .

In Fig. 1 the domain  $V_n$  is described in the particular case when  $\phi_n(\bar{x}, t) \equiv 0$ ,  $N = 2$ ,  $x_2^0 = 0$ .

In general, the structure of the domain  $V_n$  coincides with that given in Fig. 1 if we change the variable  $x_1$  with the new one  $x'_1 = x_1 - \phi_n(\bar{x}, t)$ . More precisely,  $V_n$  is a domain in  $\mathbb{R}^{N+1}$ , lying in the strip  $T - \delta_* < t < T$ ; its boundary consists of a single point lying on  $\{t = T - \delta_*\}$ , a domain  $DV_n$  lying on  $\{t = T\}$ , and a connected manifold  $SV_n$  lying in the strip  $\{T - \delta_* < t \leq T\}$ . The boundary manifold  $SV_n$  consists of two boundary surfaces  $x_1 = \phi_n(\bar{x}, t)$  and  $x_1 = \phi_{1n}(\bar{x}, t)$ .

Our purpose is to estimate  $u_n$  in  $V_n$  via the barrier function

$$\tilde{w}_n = \max(w_n; (2n)^{-1}).$$

Obviously,

$$\tilde{w}_n = (2n)^{-1} \text{ for } x_1 \geq \theta_n(\bar{x}, t); \quad \tilde{w}_n = w_n \quad \text{for } x_1 < \theta_n(\bar{x}, t),$$

where

$$\theta_n(\bar{x}, t) = (1 - (2M_1 n)^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}})h(\mu) + \phi_n(\bar{x}^0, T) - \mu[T - t + \varepsilon_0^{-2}|\bar{x} - \bar{x}^0|^2].$$

In the next lemma we estimate  $u_n$  via the barrier function  $\tilde{w}_n$  on the parabolic boundary of  $V_n$ . For that the special structure of  $V_n$  plays an

important role. Namely, our barrier function takes the value  $(2n)^{-1}$ , which is less than a minimal value of  $u_n$ , on the part of the parabolic boundary of  $V_n$  which lies in  $\Omega_n$ . Hence it is enough to compare  $u_n$  and  $\tilde{w}_n$  on the part of the lateral boundary of  $\Omega_n$ , which may easily be done in view of boundary condition for  $u_n$ .

LEMMA 3.2. *If  $\mu > 0$  is chosen large enough, then*

$$u_n > \tilde{w}_n \quad \text{on } \overline{SV}_n, \text{ for } n \geq n_1, \quad (3.6)$$

where  $n_1 = n_1(\epsilon)$  is some number depending on  $\epsilon$ .

*Proof* From (2.1) it follows that for  $\mu > 0$  being large enough

$$\theta_n(\bar{x}, t) - \phi_{1n}(\bar{x}, t) < 0 \quad \text{for } (\bar{x}, t) \in \overline{P(\mu^{-2})},$$

and hence

$$\tilde{w}_n = (2n)^{-1} \quad \text{for } x_1 = \phi_{1n}(\bar{x}, t), (\bar{x}, t) \in \overline{P(\mu^{-2})}. \quad (3.7)$$

Without loss of generality, assume that  $n > M_1^{-1}$ . From (2.1) it also follows that

$$\begin{aligned} w_n &= f(h(\mu) + \phi_n(\bar{x}^0, T) - \phi_n(\bar{x}, t) - \mu[T - t + \varepsilon_0^{-2}|\bar{x} - \bar{x}^0|^2]) \\ &\leq f((M_3^{-1} + 1)h(\mu)) = M_2 \text{ for } x_1 = \phi_n(\bar{x}, t), (\bar{x}, t) \in \overline{P(\mu^{-2})}, \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\tilde{w}_n \leq M_2 \quad \text{for } x_1 = \phi_n(\bar{x}, t), (\bar{x}, t) \in \overline{P(\mu^{-2})}. \quad (3.8)$$

We can also easily estimate  $u_n$  on  $SV_n$ . To estimate  $u_n|_{x_1=\phi_n(\bar{x}, t)}$ , first we choose  $n_1 = n_1(\varepsilon)$  so large that for  $n \geq n_1$

$$\Psi|_{x_1=\phi_n(\bar{x}, t)} > \Psi|_{x_1=\phi(\bar{x}, t)} - \frac{\varepsilon}{8} \quad \text{for } (\bar{x}, t) \in \overline{P(\mu_0^{-2})}.$$

This is possible in view of uniform convergence of  $\{\phi_n\}$  to  $\phi$  in  $\overline{P(\mu_0^{-2})}$ . Then we choose  $\mu > 0$  large enough in order that

$$\Psi|_{x_1=\phi(\bar{x}, t)} > \psi(z_0) - \frac{\varepsilon}{8} \quad \text{for } (\bar{x}, t) \in \overline{P(\mu^{-2})}.$$

If  $\mu$  and  $n$  are chosen like this, then we have

$$u_n|_{x_1=\phi_n(\bar{x}, t)} > \psi(z_0) - \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \quad \text{for } (\bar{x}, t) \in \overline{P(\mu^{-2})}. \quad (3.9)$$

Thus, from (3.1) and (3.7)–(3.9), (3.6) follows. The lemma is proved.

LEMMA 3.3. *If  $\mu > 0$  is chosen large enough, then at the points of  $V_n$  with  $x_1 < \theta_n(\bar{x}, t)$ , we have*

$$Lw_n \equiv w_{n_t} - \Delta w_n^m < 0. \quad (3.10)$$

*Proof.* At the points of  $V_n$  with  $x_1 < \theta_n(\bar{x}, t)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} Lw_n &= \mu h^{-1}(\mu) \alpha M_1^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} f^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}} - h^{-2}(\mu) \alpha m(\alpha m - 1) M_1^{\frac{2}{\alpha}} f^{\frac{\alpha m-2}{\alpha}} \\ &\quad \times (1 + 4\mu^2 \varepsilon_0^{-4} |\bar{x} - \bar{x}^0|^2) \\ &\quad + 2\mu h^{-1}(\mu) \alpha m \varepsilon_0^{-2} (N - 1) M_1^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} f^{\frac{\alpha m-1}{\alpha}}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

If  $m > 1$  then from (3.11) and (3.8) it follows that

$$Lw_n \leq h^{-2}(\mu) \alpha M_1^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} f^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}} S, \quad (3.12)$$

$$\begin{aligned} S &= M_3 F(\mu^{-2}) - m(\alpha m - 1) M_1^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} f^{\frac{\alpha(m-1)-1}{\alpha}} + 2M_3 m \varepsilon_0^{-2} (N - 1) F(\mu^{-2}) \\ &\quad \times f^{m-1} \leq M_3 F(\mu^{-2}) - m(\alpha m - 1) M_1^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} M_2^{m-1-\frac{1}{\alpha}} \\ &\quad + 2M_3 m \varepsilon_0^{-2} (N - 1) M_2^{m-1} F(\mu^{-2}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, if  $\mu$  is chosen large enough, from (3.12), (3.10) follows. If  $0 < m \leq 1$ , then from (3.11) and (3.8) we derive that

$$Lw_n \leq h^{-2}(\mu) \alpha M_1^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} f^{\frac{\alpha m-1}{\alpha}} S, \quad (3.13)$$

$$\begin{aligned} S &= M_3 F(\mu^{-2}) f^{1-m} - m(\alpha m - 1) M_1^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} f^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}} + 2M_3 m \varepsilon_0^{-2} (N - 1) \\ &\quad \times F(\mu^{-2}) \leq M_3 F(\mu^{-2}) M_2^{1-m} - m(\alpha m - 1) M_1^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} M_2^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}} \\ &\quad + 2M_3 m \varepsilon_0^{-2} (N - 1) F(\mu^{-2}). \end{aligned}$$

If  $\mu$  is chosen large enough, from (3.13), (3.10) again follows. The lemma is proved.

Thus  $\tilde{w}_n$  is the maximum of two smooth subsolutions of Eq. (1.1) in  $V_n$ . By the standard maximum principle, from Lemma 3.1, (3.6), and (3.10) we easily derive that

$$u_n \geq \tilde{w}_n \quad \text{in } \bar{V}_n, \text{ for } n \geq n_1.$$

In the limit as  $n' \rightarrow +\infty$ , we have

$$u \geq \tilde{w} \quad \text{in } \bar{V}, \quad (3.14)$$

where

$$\tilde{w} = \max(w; 0), \quad \text{in } \overline{V}$$

$$w(x, t) = f(h(\mu) + \phi(\bar{x}^0, T) - x_1 - \mu[T - t + \varepsilon_0^{-2}|\bar{x} - \bar{x}^0|^2]),$$

$$V = \{(x, t): \phi(\bar{x}, t) < x_1 < \phi_1(\bar{x}, t), |\bar{x} - \bar{x}^0| < \varepsilon_0[\delta_* + t - T]^{\frac{1}{2}}, T - \delta_* < t < T\},$$

$$\phi_1(\bar{x}, t) = \phi(\bar{x}, t) + (1 + M_3)\mu^{-1}F(\mu^{-2}) - \mu[T - t + \varepsilon_0^{-2}|\bar{x} - \bar{x}^0|^2].$$

Obviously, we have

$$\lim_{z \rightarrow z_0, z \in \overline{V}} \tilde{w} = \lim_{z \rightarrow z_0, z \in \overline{\Omega}} \tilde{w} = \psi(z_0) - \varepsilon.$$

Hence, from (3.14), (3.4) follows.

Assume now that  $0 \leq \psi(z_0) < M$  and prove (3.5) for an arbitrary  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $\psi(z_0) + \varepsilon < M$ . For arbitrary  $\mu > 0$  consider a function

$$w_n(x, t) = f_1(\xi) \equiv [M^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} + \xi h^{-1}(\mu)(M_4^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} - M^{\frac{1}{\alpha}})]^{\alpha},$$

where  $\xi$  is defined as before and

$$h(\mu) = M_6\mu^{-1}F(\mu^{-2}), M_4 = \psi(z_0) + \varepsilon,$$

$$M_5 = \psi(z_0) + \varepsilon/2, M_6 = (M^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} - M_4^{\frac{1}{\alpha}})(M_4^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} - M_5^{\frac{1}{\alpha}})^{-1},$$

and  $\alpha$  is an arbitrary number such that  $0 < \alpha < \min(1; m^{-1})$ . Similarly, consider the domains  $V_n$  (with  $M_3$  replaced by  $M_6$  in the expression of  $\phi_{1n}(\bar{x}, t)$  and  $\delta_*$ ) and  $V_n^*$  (see Lemma 3.1). We then construct an upper barrier function as

$$\tilde{w}_n = \min(w_n; M).$$

Obviously,

$$\tilde{w}_n = M \text{ for } x_1 \geq \theta_n(\bar{x}, t); \quad \tilde{w}_n = w_n \text{ for } x_1 < \theta_n(\bar{x}, t),$$

where

$$\theta_n(\bar{x}, t) = h(\mu) + \phi_n(\bar{x}^0, T) - \mu[T - t + \varepsilon_0^{-2}|\bar{x} - \bar{x}^0|^2].$$

Next, we prove an analog of Lemma 3.2.

LEMMA 3.4. *If  $\mu > 0$  is chosen large enough, then*

$$u_n \leq \tilde{w}_n \quad \text{on } \overline{SV}_n, \text{ for } n \geq n_1, \quad (3.15)$$

where  $n_1 = n_1(\varepsilon)$  is some number depending on  $\varepsilon$ .

*Proof.* From (2.1) it follows that for  $\mu > 0$  being large enough

$$\theta_n(\bar{x}, t) - \phi_{1n}(\bar{x}, t) \leq 0 \quad \text{for } (\bar{x}, t) \in \overline{P(\mu^{-2})},$$

and hence

$$\tilde{w}_n = M \quad \text{for } x_1 = \phi_{1n}(\bar{x}, t), (\bar{x}, t) \in \overline{P(\mu^{-2})}. \quad (3.16)$$

From (2.1) it also follows that

$$\begin{aligned} w_n &= f_1(h(\mu) + \phi_n(\bar{x}^0, T) - \phi_n(\bar{x}, t) - \mu[T - t + \varepsilon_0^{-2}|\bar{x} - \bar{x}^0|^2]) \\ &\geq f_1((M_6^{-1} + 1)h(\mu)) = M_5 \quad \text{for } x_1 = \phi_n(\bar{x}, t), (\bar{x}, t) \in \overline{P(\mu^{-2})}, \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\tilde{w}_n \geq M_5 \quad \text{for } x_1 = \phi_n(\bar{x}, t), (\bar{x}, t) \in \overline{P(\mu^{-2})}. \quad (3.17)$$

Similarly, as in (3.9), we can establish that if  $\mu > 0$  is large enough and  $n \geq n_1(\varepsilon)$  then

$$u_n|_{x_1=\phi_n(\bar{x}, t)} < \psi(z_0) + \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \quad \text{for } (\bar{x}, t) \in \overline{P(\mu^{-2})}. \quad (3.18)$$

Thus, from (3.1) and (3.16)–(3.18), (3.15) follows. The lemma is proved.

The next lemma is an analog of Lemma 3.3.

**LEMMA 3.5.** *If  $\mu > 0$  is chosen large enough, then at the points of  $V_n$  with  $x_1 < \theta_n(\bar{x}, t)$ , we have*

$$Lw_n > 0. \quad (3.19)$$

*Proof.* By using (3.17), at the points of  $V_n$  with  $x_1 < \theta_n(\bar{x}, t)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} Lw_n &= -\mu h^{-1}(\mu) \alpha (M^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} - M_4^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}) f_1^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}} + m \alpha (1 - \alpha m) h^{-2}(\mu) \\ &\quad \times (M^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} - M_4^{\frac{1}{\alpha}})^2 f_1^{\frac{\alpha m-2}{\alpha}} (1 + 4\mu^2 \varepsilon_0^{-4} |\bar{x} - \bar{x}^0|^2) - 2\mu h^{-1}(\mu) \alpha m \varepsilon_0^{-2} \\ &\quad \times (N-1) (M^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} - M_4^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}) f_1^{\frac{\alpha m-1}{\alpha}} \geq h^{-2}(\mu) \alpha (M^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} - M_4^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}) S, \end{aligned} \quad (3.20)$$

$$\begin{aligned} S &= -M_6 M_5^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}} F(\mu^{-2}) + m(1 - \alpha m) (M^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} - M_4^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}) M^{\frac{\alpha m-2}{\alpha}} \\ &\quad - 2M_6 m \varepsilon_0^{-2} (N-1) M_5^{\frac{\alpha m-1}{\alpha}} F(\mu^{-2}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, if  $\mu$  is chosen large enough, from (3.20), (3.19) follows. The lemma is proved.

Thus  $\tilde{w}_n$  is the minimum of two smooth supersolutions of Eq. (1) in  $V_n$ . By the standard maximum principle, from Lemma 3.1, (3.15), and (3.19) we easily derive that

$$u_n \leq \tilde{w}_n \quad \text{in } \overline{V}_n, \text{ for } n \geq n_1.$$

In the limit as  $n' \rightarrow \infty$ , we have

$$u \leq \tilde{w} \quad \text{in } \overline{V}, \quad (3.21)$$

where

$$\tilde{w} = \min(w; M) \quad \text{in } \overline{V}$$

$$w(x, t) = f_1(h(\mu) + \phi(\bar{x}^0, T) - x_1 - \mu[T - t + \varepsilon_0^{-2}|\bar{x} - \bar{x}^0|^2])$$

and the domain  $V$  being defined as in (3.14). Obviously, we have

$$\lim_{z \rightarrow z_0, z \in \overline{V}} \tilde{w} = \lim_{z \rightarrow z_0, z \in \overline{\Omega}} \tilde{w} = \psi(z_0) + \varepsilon.$$

Hence, from (3.21), (3.5) follows. Thus we have proved (3.3) for  $z_0 = (x^0, T) \in S\Omega$  when  $d(z_0) = 1$ . The proof is similar when  $d(z_0) = -1$ .

Suppose now that  $z_0 = (x^0, t_0) \in S\Omega$  with  $t_0 < T$ . Clearly, the same proof given in the case  $t_0 = T$  implies the regularity of  $z_0$  regarding subdomain  $\Omega_- = \Omega \cap \{t < t_0\}$ . Namely, (3.3) is valid for  $z \in \overline{\Omega_-}$ . Hence, it is enough to prove (3.3) for  $z \in \Omega_+$ ,  $\Omega_+ = \Omega \cap \{t > t_0\}$ . The proof of this latter, however, is equivalent to the proof of regularity of the point  $z_0 = (x^0, 0) \in \overline{S\Omega}$  under Assumption  $\mathcal{B}$ . That easily follows from the fact that Assumption  $\mathcal{B}$  (with redefined  $\phi(\bar{x}) \equiv \phi(\bar{x}, t_0)$ ) is a consequence of Assumption  $\mathcal{A}$ . Thus, to complete the proof, it remains just to prove (3.3) for  $z_0 = (x^0, 0) \in \overline{S\Omega}$ .

The proof is similar to that given above. Without loss of generality assume again that  $d(z_0) = 1$ . Let  $\psi(z_0) > 0$ . Take an arbitrary  $\varepsilon \in (0, \psi(z_0))$  and prove (3.4). For arbitrary  $\mu > \mu_0$  consider a function

$$w_n(x, t) = f(\xi) \equiv M_1(\xi/h(\mu))^\alpha,$$

where

$$\xi = h(\mu) + \phi_n(\bar{x}^0, 0) - x_1 + \mu[t - |\bar{x} - \bar{x}^0|^2],$$

$$M_1 = \psi(z_0) - \varepsilon, h(\mu) = M_3\mu^{-1}F_1(\mu^{-1}),$$

$$M_2 = \psi(z_0) - \varepsilon/2, M_3 = 4[(M_2/M_1)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} - 1]^{-1}$$

and  $\alpha$  is an arbitrary number such that  $\alpha > m^{-1}$ . If  $m > 1$ , then we assume also that  $\alpha \leq (m-1)^{-1}$ . Then we set

$$V_n = \{(x, t): \phi_n(\bar{x}, t) < x_1 < \phi_{1n}(\bar{x}, t), (\bar{x}, t) \in R(\mu, \delta)\}$$

$$\phi_{1n}(\bar{x}, t) = \phi_n(\bar{x}^0, 0) + (1 - (2M_1n)^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}})h(\mu) + \mu[t - |\bar{x} - \bar{x}^0|^2],$$

where  $\delta = \delta(\mu) \in (0, \delta']$ ,  $\delta' = \min(\delta_1, \delta_2)$ ,  $\delta_1 = 2\mu^{-2}F_1(\mu^{-1})$ , and  $\delta_2 = \delta_2(\mu) \in (0, \delta_0]$  is chosen such that

$$\phi_n(\bar{x}, 0) - \phi_n(\bar{x}, t) \leq \mu^{-1}F_1(\mu^{-1}) \quad \text{for } (\bar{x}, t) \in \overline{R(\mu_0, \delta_2)} \quad (3.22)$$

and for  $n \geq n_2(\mu)$ . The existence of  $\delta_2$  and  $n_2$  follow from the following proposition.

**PROPOSITION 3.1.** *For arbitrary  $\mu > \mu_0$  there exists  $\delta_2 = \delta_2(\mu) \in (0, \delta_0]$  and  $n_2 = n_2(\mu)$  such that (3.22) is valid for  $n \geq n_2$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $\{\phi_n\}$  converges to  $\phi$  uniformly in  $R(\mu_0, \delta_0)$ , for arbitrary  $\mu > \mu_0$  there exists a number  $n_2 = n_2(\mu)$  such that for  $n \geq n_2$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_n(\bar{x}, 0) - \phi_n(\bar{x}, t) &\leq \phi(\bar{x}, 0) - \phi(\bar{x}, t) + \frac{1}{2}\mu^{-1}F_1(\mu^{-1}) \\ &\quad \text{in } \overline{R(\mu_0, \delta_0)}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.23)$$

Since  $\phi$  is uniformly continuous in  $\overline{R(\mu_0, \delta_0)}$ , there also exists a number  $\delta_2 = \delta_2(\mu) \in (0, \delta_0]$  such that

$$\phi(\bar{x}, 0) - \phi(\bar{x}, t) \leq \frac{1}{2}\mu^{-1}F_1(\mu^{-1}) \quad \text{in } \overline{R(\mu_0, \delta_2)}. \quad (3.24)$$

From (3.23) and (3.24), (3.22) follows. The proposition is proved.

Furthermore we shall always suppose that  $n \geq \max(n_2; M_1^{-1})$ . If  $\mu > \mu_0$  is chosen large enough, from (2.2) and (3.22) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{1n}(\bar{x}, t) - \phi_n(\bar{x}, t) &< \phi_n(\bar{x}^0, 0) - \phi_n(\bar{x}, 0) + \phi_n(\bar{x}, 0) \\ &\quad - \phi_n(\bar{x}, t) + h(\mu) + \mu\delta_1 - \mu^{-1} \\ &\leq \mu^{-1}[(M_3 + 4)F_1(\mu^{-1}) - 1] \\ &< 0 \quad \text{for } |\bar{x} - \bar{x}^0| = \mu^{-1}, 0 \leq t \leq \delta'. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the parabolic boundary of  $V_n$  consists of two boundary surfaces  $x_1 = \phi_n(\bar{x}, t)$ ,  $x_1 = \phi_{1n}(\bar{x}, t)$ , and of the closure of a domain

$$V_n^0 = \{(x, 0): \phi_n(\bar{x}, 0) < x_1 < \phi_{1n}(\bar{x}, 0), |\bar{x} - \bar{x}^0| < \mu^{-1}\}.$$

In the next lemma, which is an analog of Lemma 3.2, we estimate  $u_n$  via the barrier function  $w_n$  on the parabolic boundary  $\mathcal{P}V_n$  of  $V_n$ .

**LEMMA 3.6.** *If  $\mu > 0$  is chosen large enough, then*

$$u_n > w_n \quad \text{on } \overline{\mathcal{P}V_n}, \text{ for } n \geq n_4, \quad (3.25)$$

where  $n_4 = n_4(\epsilon, \mu)$  is some number depending on  $\epsilon$  and  $\mu$ .



*Proof.* We have

$$w_n = (2n)^{-1} \quad \text{for } x_1 = \phi_{1n}(\bar{x}, t). \quad (3.26)$$

From (2.2) and (3.22) it also follows that if  $\mu$  is chosen large enough, then

$$\begin{aligned} w_n &= f(h(\mu) + \phi_n(\bar{x}^0, 0) - \phi_n(\bar{x}, t) + \mu t - \mu|\bar{x} - \bar{x}^0|^2) \\ &\leq f(h(\mu) + \phi_n(\bar{x}^0, 0) - \phi_n(\bar{x}, 0) + \phi_n(\bar{x}, 0) - \phi_n(\bar{x}, t) + \mu\delta_1) \\ &\leq f((4M_3^{-1} + 1)h(\mu)) \\ &= M_2 \quad \text{for } x_1 = \phi_n(\bar{x}, t), (\bar{x}, t) \in \overline{R(\mu, \delta)}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.27)$$

From (3.27) it also follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_n &= f(h(\mu) + \phi_n(\bar{x}^0, 0) - x_1 - \mu|\bar{x} - \bar{x}^0|^2) \\ &\leq f(h(\mu) + \phi_n(\bar{x}^0, 0) - \phi_n(\bar{x}, 0)) \leq M_2 \quad \text{in } \bar{V}_n^0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.28)$$

We can also easily estimate  $u_n$  on  $\mathcal{P}V_n$ . To estimate  $u_n|_{x_1=\phi_n(\bar{x}, t)}$ , first we choose  $n_3 = n_3(\varepsilon)$  so large that for  $n \geq n_3$

$$\Psi|_{x_1=\phi_n(\bar{x}, t)} > \Psi|_{x_1=\phi(\bar{x}, t)} - \frac{\varepsilon}{8} \quad \text{for } (\bar{x}, t) \in \overline{R(\mu_0, \delta_0)}.$$

This is possible in view of uniform convergence of  $\{\phi_n\}$  to  $\phi$  in  $\overline{R(\mu_0, \delta_0)}$ . Then we choose  $\mu > 0$  large enough and  $\delta = \delta(\mu) > 0$  small enough in order that

$$\Psi|_{x_1=\phi(\bar{x}, t)} > \psi(z_0) - \frac{\varepsilon}{8} \quad \text{for } (\bar{x}, t) \in \overline{R(\mu, \delta)}$$

and hence,

$$u_n|_{x_1=\phi_n(\bar{x}, t)} > \psi(z_0) - \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \quad \text{for } (\bar{x}, t) \in \overline{R(\mu, \delta)}. \quad (3.29)$$

Similarly, we can establish that if  $\mu > 0$  is chosen large enough, there exists a number  $n_3(\varepsilon)$  such that for  $n \geq n_3$  we have

$$u_n > \psi(z_0) - \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \quad \text{in } \bar{V}_n^0. \quad (3.30)$$

Thus, if we take  $n_4 = \max(n_2; n_3; M_1^{-1})$ , then from (3.1) and (3.26)–(3.30), (3.25) follows. The lemma is proved.

The next step consists in proving that for  $\mu > 0$  being large enough

$$Lw_n < 0 \quad \text{in } V_n.$$

The proof coincides with that given above in Lemma 3.3. As before, by the standard maximum principle we then easily derive that

$$u_n \geq w_n \quad \text{in } \bar{V}_n, \text{ for } n \geq n_4.$$

In the limit as  $n' \rightarrow \infty$ , we have

$$u \geq w \quad \text{in } \bar{V}, \quad (3.31)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} w(x, t) &= f(h(\mu) + \phi(\bar{x}^0, 0) - x_1 + \mu t - \mu|\bar{x} - \bar{x}^0|^2), \\ V &= \{(x, t): \phi(\bar{x}, t) < x_1 < \phi_1(\bar{x}, t), (\bar{x}, t) \in R(\mu, \delta)\}, \\ \phi_1(\bar{x}, t) &= \phi(\bar{x}^0, 0) + h(\mu) + \mu[t - |\bar{x} - \bar{x}^0|^2]. \end{aligned}$$

Obviously, we have

$$\lim_{z \rightarrow z_0, z \in \bar{V}} w = \lim_{z \rightarrow z_0, z \in \bar{\Omega}} w = \psi(z_0) - \varepsilon.$$

Hence, from (3.31), (3.4) follows. To complete the proof it remains to prove (3.5) when  $0 \leq \psi(z_0) < M$ . To do that, we consider a barrier function

$$w_n(x, t) = f_1(\xi) \equiv [M^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} + \xi h^{-1}(\mu)(M_4^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} - M^{\frac{1}{\alpha}})]^\alpha,$$

where  $\xi$  is defined as before and

$$\begin{aligned} h(\mu) &= M_6 \mu^{-1} F_1(\mu^{-1}), \quad M_4 = \psi(z_0) + \varepsilon, \\ M_5 &= \psi(z_0) + \varepsilon/2, \quad M_6 = 4(M^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} - M_4^{\frac{1}{\alpha}})(M_4^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} - M_5^{\frac{1}{\alpha}})^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

and  $\alpha$  is an arbitrary number such that  $0 < \alpha < \min(1; m^{-1})$ . The rest of the proof of (3.5) is similar to the given proof of (3.4) and to that given above in the case when  $t_0 = T$ ; therefore we omit it. Thus we have completed the proof of the boundary continuity of the constructed limit solution. Theorem 2.1 is proved. Corollary 2.1 is immediate (see Section 2).

*Remark 3.1.* The proof of Theorem 2.1 in the case of the more general equation (1.4) almost coincides with that given above for Eq. (1.1). The main technical difference consists in choosing an exponent  $\alpha$  in respective barrier functions  $w_n$ . In this more general case it depends on the parameters  $m$ ,  $\beta$ , and  $\gamma$ . It should be also mentioned that if  $c > 0$  and  $\beta > 1$  in (1.4), we have to prevent blow up, say, imposing a restriction on the length of the time interval:  $T \in (0, T^*)$ ,  $T^* = M^{1-\beta}/c(\beta - 1)$ ,  $M = \sup \psi > 0$ . Within Step 1 for the construction of the sequence  $u_n$  we consider the following regularized equation

$$u_t = a\Delta u^m + b \cdot \nabla u^\gamma + cu^\beta - c\theta_c n^{-\beta}, \quad (3.32)$$

where  $\theta_c = (1, \text{ if } c < 0; 0, \text{ if } c \geq 0)$ . We then consider the DP in  $\Omega_n$  for Eq. (3.32) with the initial boundary data  $\psi_n = \Psi + n^{-1}$ ,  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ . As before, the classical theory implies the existence of a unique classical solution  $u_n$  which satisfies

$$n^{-1} \leq u_n(x, t) \leq \psi^1(t) \quad \text{in } \overline{\Omega}_n,$$

where

$$\psi^1(t) = \begin{cases} [M^{1-\beta} + c(1 - \theta_c)(1 - \beta)t]^{1/(1-\beta)}, & \text{if } \beta \neq 1, \\ M \exp(c(1 - \theta_c)t), & \text{if } \beta = 1. \end{cases}$$

The rest of the proof almost completely coincides with that given above for Eq. (1.1). Slight technical modifications are similar to those made in the one-dimensional case [4].

*Remark 3.2.* One may show by standard methods that the weak solution to DP is a classical solution in a neighbourhood of any interior point  $z \in \Omega$ , where  $u(z) > 0$ .

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research was done while the author was a Humboldt Research Fellow at the University of Paderborn, Germany. The author thanks Professor R. Rautmann for many valuable discussions during the preparation of this paper.

## REFERENCES

1. U. G. Abdulla, Local structure of solutions of the Dirichlet problem for  $N$ -dimensional reaction-diffusion equations in bounded domains, *Adv. Differential Equations* **2** (1999), 197–224.
2. U. G. Abdullaev, Local structure of solutions of the reaction-diffusion equations, *Nonlinear Analysis* **30** (1997), 3153–3163.
3. U. G. Abdulla and J. R. King, Interface development and local solutions to reaction-diffusion equations, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **32**, No. 2 (2000), 235–260.
4. U. G. Abdulla, Reaction-diffusion in irregular domains, *J. Differential Equations* **164** (2000), 321–354.
5. U. G. Abdulla, Reaction-diffusion in a closed domain formed by irregular curves, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **246** (2000), 480–492.
6. H. W. Alt and S. Luckhaus, Quasilinear elliptic-parabolic differential equations, *Math. Z.* **183** (1983), 311–341.
7. D. G. Aronson and L. A. Peletier, Large time behaviour of solutions of the porous medium equation in bounded domains, *J. Differential Equations* **39** (1981), 378–412.
8. J. G. Berryman, Evolution of a stable profile for a class of nonlinear diffusion equations with fixed boundaries, *J. Math. Phys.* **18** (1977), 2108–2115.

9. E. DiBenedetto, Continuity of weak solutions to certain singular parabolic equations, *Ann. Mat. Para Appl.* (4) **130** (1982), 131–176.
10. E. Dibenedetto, Continuity of weak solutions to a general porous medium equation, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **32** (1983), 83–118.
11. E. G. Effros and J. K. Kazdan, On the Dirichlet problem for the heat equation, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **20** (1971), 683–693.
12. L. C. Evans and R. F. Gariepy, Wiener's criterion for the heat equation, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **78** (1982), 293–314.
13. A. Friedman, "Partial Differential Equations of Parabolic Type," Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1964.
14. R. F. Gariepy and W. P. Ziemer, Thermal capacity and boundary regularity, *J. Differential Equations* **45** (1982), 374–388.
15. N. Garofalo and E. Lanconelli, Wiener's criterion for parabolic equations with variable coefficients and its consequences, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **308** (1988), 811–836.
16. B. H. Gilding and L. A. Peletier, Continuity of solutions of the porous media equation, *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa* **8** (1981), 659–675.
17. A. S. Kalashnikov, Some problems of the qualitative theory of nonlinear degenerate second-order parabolic equations, *Russian Math. Surveys* **42** (1987), 169–222.
18. O. A. Ladyzhenskaja, V. A. Solonnikov, and N. N. Uralceva, "Linear and Quasilinear Equations of Parabolic Type," Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 1968.
19. E. Lanconelli, Sul problema di Dirichlet per l'equazione del calore, *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl.* **97** (1973), 83–114.
20. E. M. Landis, Necessary and sufficient conditions for regularity of a boundary point in the Dirichlet problem for the heat-conduction equation, *Soviet Math.* **10** (1969), 380–384.
21. E. M. Landis, "Second Order Equations of Elliptic and Parabolic Type," Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 1998.
22. G. M. Lieberman, Intermediate Schauder theory for second order parabolic equations. III. The tusk conditions, *Appl. Anal.* **33** (1989), 25–43.
23. G. M. Lieberman, "Second Order Parabolic Differential Equations," World Scientific, Singapore, 1996.
24. M. Muskat, "The Flow of Homogeneous Fluids through Porous Media," McGraw-Hill, New York, 1937.
25. I. G. Petrowsky, Zur ersten Randwertaufgabe der Wärmeleitungsgleichung, *Compositio Math.* **1** (1935), 383–419.
26. P. E. Sacks, Continuity of solutions of a singular parabolic equation, *Nonlinear Anal.* **7** (1983), 387–409.
27. N. Wiener, The Dirichlet problem, *J. Math. Phys.* **3** (1924), 127–146.
28. W. P. Ziemer, Behaviour at the boundary of solutions of quasilinear parabolic equations, *J. Differential Equations* **35** (1980), 291–305.
29. W. P. Ziemer, Interior and boundary continuity of weak solutions of degenerate parabolic equations, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **271** (1982), 733–748.