

Generalized Solutions to Hyperbolic Systems with Nonlinear Conditions and Strongly Singular Data

I. Kmit

Institute for Applied Problems of Mechanics and Mathematics,
Ukrainian Academy of Sciences
Naukova St. 3b
79060 Lviv, Ukraine
E-mail: kmit@ov.litech.net

Abstract

Using the framework of Colombeau algebras of generalized functions, we prove the existence and uniqueness results for global generalized solvability of semilinear hyperbolic systems with nonlinear nonlocal boundary conditions. We admit strong singularities in the differential equations as well as in the initial and boundary conditions. Our analysis covers the case of non-Lipshitz nonlinearities both in the differential equations and in the boundary conditions.

1 Introduction

We study existence and uniqueness of global generalized solutions to mixed problems for semilinear hyperbolic systems with nonlinear nonlocal boundary conditions. Specifically, in the domain $\Pi = \{(x, t) \mid 0 < x < l, t > 0\}$ we study the following problem:

$$(\partial_t + \Lambda(x, t)\partial_x)U = F(x, t, U), \quad (x, t) \in \Pi \quad (1)$$

$$U(x, 0) = A(x), \quad x \in (0, l) \quad (2)$$

$$\begin{aligned} U_i(0, t) &= H_i(t, V(t)), \quad k+1 \leq i \leq n, \quad t \in (0, \infty) \\ U_i(l, t) &= H_i(t, V(t)), \quad 1 \leq i \leq k, \quad t \in (0, \infty), \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where U , F , and A are real n -vectors, $\Lambda = \text{diag}(\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_n)$ is a diagonal matrix, $\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_k < 0$, $\Lambda_{k+1}, \dots, \Lambda_n > 0$ for some $1 \leq k \leq n$, and $V(t) = (U_1(0, t), \dots, U_k(0, t), U_{k+1}(l, t), \dots, U_n(l, t))$. Due to the conditions imposed on Λ , the system (1) is non-strictly hyperbolic. Note also that the boundary of Π is not characteristic. We will denote $H = (H_1, \dots, H_n)$.

Special cases of (1)–(3) arise in laser dynamics [8, 19, 21, 22] and chemical kinetics [23].

All the data of the problem are allowed to be strongly singular, namely, they can be of any desired order of singularity. This entails nonlinear superpositions for (strongly singular) distributions in the right-hand sides of (1)–(3) (including compositions of the singular initial data and the singular characteristic curves). To tackle this complication, we use the framework of Colombeau algebra of generalized functions $\mathcal{G}(\overline{\Pi})$ [1, 2, 16]. We show that all superpositions appearing here are well defined in $\mathcal{G}(\overline{\Pi})$.

We establish a positive existence-uniqueness result in $\mathcal{G}(\overline{\Pi})$ for the problem (1)–(3) with strongly singular initial data and with nonlinearities of the following type (more detailed description is given in Section 3): The functions F and H are either Lipschitz with Colombeau generalized numbers as Lipschitz constants or non-Lipschitz with less than quadratic growth in U and V .

For different aspects of the subject we refer the reader to sources [4, 5, 9, 12, 13, 16, 17, 14]. The essential assumption made on F in papers [12, 16] is that $\text{grad}_U F$ is globally bounded uniformly over (x, t) varying in any compact set. The main complication with the non-Lipschitz nonlinearities when investigating Colombeau solutions lies in the following. The solutions in \mathcal{G} are nets of smooth functions which are classical solutions to the associated problems with smooth initial data. To guarantee the existence of such solutions, in general, one has to assume that the nonlinearities have bounded gradients. In the present paper we tackle this complication combining classical and nonclassical approaches.

Papers [14, 15] deal with Cauchy problems for semilinear hyperbolic systems (1) with F slowly increasing at infinity. The nonlinear term is replaced by a suitable regularization F_ε having a bounded gradient with respect to U for every fixed ε and converging to F as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. The regularized system is solved in $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Moreover, in [14] the components of Λ are allowed to be 1-tempered generalized functions. The authors replace Λ by its regularization (the regularization procedure is similar to the one for F) which is 1-tempered generalized function of bounded growth and solve the regularized problem.

In [4, 5] the author investigates weak limits for semilinear hyperbolic systems and nonlinear superpositions for strongly singular distributions appearing in these systems. He establishes an optimal link between the singularity of the initial data and the growth of the nonlinear term. Weak limits of strongly singular Cauchy problems for semilinear hyperbolic systems with bounded, sublinear, and superlinear growth are investigated in [3, 10, 18, 20].

Existence-uniqueness results within Colombeau algebras for two-dimensional hyperbolic problems with discontinuous coefficients Λ_i are obtained in [9, 13, 16, 17]. These papers impose an essential restriction on the coefficients, which allows one to avoid the negative effect of infinite propagation speed. Namely, the coefficients are assumed to be globally bounded in the Colombeau algebra \mathcal{G} . At the present paper we do not assume global boundedness of the Λ_i in (1), thereby allowing them to be strongly singular (this is also the case for [11]).

A novelty of the paper is that it treats (within $\mathcal{G}(\overline{\Pi})$) strongly singular initial

data of the problem (including coefficients Λ_i in (1)), nonlinear boundary conditions, and non-Lipshitz nonlinearities in (1) and (3).

The plan of our exposition is as follows. In Section 2 we compile some facts about Colombeau algebra of generalized functions. In Section 3 we state and prove our main results. We prove the existence-uniqueness result within $\mathcal{G}(\overline{\Omega})$ for Colombeau Lipshitz nonlinearities (Subsection 3.1) and extend its to the case of non-Lipshitz nonlinearities (Subsection 3.2).

2 Preliminaries

In this section we summarize the relevant material on the full version of Colombeau algebras of generalized functions.

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a domain in \mathbb{R}^n . We denote by $\mathcal{G}(\Omega)$ and $\mathcal{G}(\overline{\Omega})$ the full version of Colombeau algebra of generalized functions over Ω and $\overline{\Omega}$, respectively. To define $\mathcal{G}(\Omega)$ and $\mathcal{G}(\overline{\Omega})$, we first introduce the mollifier spaces used to parametrize the regularizing sequences of generalized functions. Given $q \in \mathbb{N}_0$ denote

$$\mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}) = \left\{ \varphi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}) \mid \int \varphi(x) dx = 1, \int x^k \varphi(x) dx = 0 \text{ for } 1 \leq k \leq q \right\},$$

$$\mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^n) = \left\{ \varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \prod_{i=1}^n \varphi_0(x_i) \mid \varphi_0 \in \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}) \right\}.$$

If $\varphi \in \mathcal{A}_0(\mathbb{R}^n)$, let

$$\varphi_\varepsilon(x) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon^n} \varphi\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right).$$

Set

$$\mathcal{E}(\overline{\Omega}) = \{u : \mathcal{A}_0 \times \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid u(\varphi, \cdot) \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega}) \quad \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{A}_0(\mathbb{R}^n)\}.$$

We define the algebra of moderate elements $\mathcal{E}_M(\overline{\Omega})$ to be the subalgebra of $\mathcal{E}(\overline{\Omega})$ consisting of the elements $u \in \mathcal{E}(\overline{\Omega})$ such that

$$\forall K \subset \overline{\Omega} \text{ compact}, \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^n, \exists N \in \mathbb{N} \text{ such that } \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{A}_N(\mathbb{R}^n)$$

$$\exists C > 0, \exists \eta > 0 \text{ with } \sup_{x \in K} |\partial^\alpha u(\varphi_\varepsilon, x)| \leq C \varepsilon^{-N}, \quad 0 < \varepsilon < \eta.$$

The ideal $\mathcal{N}(\overline{\Omega})$ consists of all $u \in \mathcal{E}_M(\overline{\Omega})$ such that

$$\forall K \subset \overline{\Omega} \text{ compact}, \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^n, \exists N \in \mathbb{N} \text{ such that } \forall q \geq N, \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^n)$$

$$\exists C > 0, \exists \eta > 0 \text{ with } \sup_{x \in K} |\partial^\alpha u(\varphi_\varepsilon, x)| \leq C \varepsilon^{q-N}, \quad 0 < \varepsilon < \eta.$$

Finally,

$$\mathcal{G}(\overline{\Omega}) = \mathcal{E}_M(\overline{\Omega}) / \mathcal{N}(\overline{\Omega}).$$

This is an associative and commutative differential algebra. The algebra $\mathcal{G}(\Omega)$ on open set is constructed in the same manner, with Ω in place of $\overline{\Omega}$. Note that

$\mathcal{G}(\Omega)$ admits a canonical embedding of $\mathcal{D}'(\Omega)$. We will use the notation $U = [(u(\varphi, x))_{\varphi \in \mathcal{A}_0(\mathbb{R}^n)}]$ for the elements U of $\mathcal{G}(\Omega)$ with representative $u(\varphi, x)$.

One of the advantages of using Colombeau algebra of generalized functions \mathcal{G} lies in the fact that in a variety of important cases the division by generalized functions, in particular the division by discontinuous functions and measures, is defined in \mathcal{G} . Complete description of the cases when the division is possible in the full version of Colombeau algebras is given by the following criterion of invertibility [11] (the criterion of invertibility for special version of Colombeau algebras $\mathcal{G}_s(\Omega)$ is proved in [7]):

Theorem 1 *Let $U \in \mathcal{G}(\Omega)$ ($U \in \mathcal{G}(\overline{\Omega})$). Then the following two conditions are equivalent:*

- (i) *U is invertible in $\mathcal{G}(\Omega)$ (in $\mathcal{G}(\overline{\Omega})$), i.e., there exists $V \in \mathcal{G}(\Omega)$ ($V \in \mathcal{G}(\overline{\Omega})$) such that $UV = 1$ in $\mathcal{G}(\Omega)$ (in $\mathcal{G}(\overline{\Omega})$).*
- (ii) *For each representative $(u(\varphi, x))_{\varphi \in \mathcal{A}_0(\mathbb{R}^n)}$ of U and each compact set $K \subset \Omega$ ($K \subset \overline{\Omega}$) there exists $p \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{A}_p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ there is $\eta > 0$ with $\inf_K |u(\varphi_\varepsilon, x)| \geq \varepsilon^p$ for all $0 < \varepsilon < \eta$.*

3 Existence-uniqueness results in the Colombeau algebra of generalized functions

3.1 Colombeau Lipschitz nonlinearities

We here develop some results of [11] and [12] to the case of nonlinear nonlocal boundary conditions and Colombeau Lipschitz nonlinearities in (1) and (3) (with Lipschitz constants as Colombeau generalized numbers). We will need a notion of a generalized function whose growth is more restrictive than the $1/\varepsilon$ -growth (as in the definition of \mathcal{E}_M).

Definition 2 ([11]) *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a domain in \mathbb{R}^n . Suppose we have a function $\gamma : (0, 1) \mapsto (0, \infty)$. We say that an element $U \in \mathcal{G}(\Omega)$ ($U \in \mathcal{G}(\overline{\Omega})$) is locally of γ -growth, if it has a representative $u \in \mathcal{E}_M(\Omega)$ ($u \in \mathcal{E}_M(\overline{\Omega})$) with the following property:*

For every compact set $K \subset \Omega$ ($K \subset \overline{\Omega}$) there is $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for every $\varphi \in \mathcal{A}_N(\mathbb{R}^n)$ there exist $C > 0$ and $\eta > 0$ with $\sup_{x \in K} |u(\varphi_\varepsilon, x)| \leq C\gamma^N(\varepsilon)$ for $0 < \varepsilon < \eta$.

We now make assumptions on the initial data of the problem (1)–(3). Let $\gamma(\varepsilon)$ and $\gamma_1(\varepsilon)$ be functions from $(0, 1)$ to $(0, \infty)$ such that

$$\gamma(\varepsilon)^{\gamma^N(\varepsilon)} = O\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right), \quad \gamma(\varepsilon)^{\gamma_1^N(\varepsilon)} = O\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right) \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0 \quad (4)$$

for each $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Assume that

1. $\Lambda(x, t) \in (\mathcal{G}(\overline{\Pi}))^n$, $A(x) \in (\mathcal{G}[0, l])^n$.

2. Λ_i for $i \leq n$ are locally of γ -growth on $\overline{\Pi}$ and invertible on $\overline{\Pi}$.
3. $\partial_x \Lambda_i$ for $i \leq n$ are locally of γ_1 -growth on $\overline{\Pi}$.
4. $F(x, t, y) \in (\mathcal{G}(\overline{\Pi} \times \mathbb{R}^n))^n$, $H(t, z) \in (\mathcal{G}([0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^n))^n$.
5. For every compact set $K \subset \overline{\Pi}$ and $i \leq n$ the mapping $y \mapsto F_i(x, t, y)$ and all its derivatives are polynomially bounded for all $(x, t) \in K$ with coefficients in $\mathcal{G}(K)$.
6. For every compact set $K \subset [0, \infty)$ and $i \leq n$ the mapping $z \mapsto H_i(t, z)$ and all its derivatives are polynomially bounded for all $t \in K$ with coefficients in $\mathcal{G}(K)$.
7. For every compact set $K \subset \overline{\Pi}$ there exists a nonnegative generalized function $L_F(x, t) \in \mathcal{G}(K)$ such that for all $(x, t) \in K$, $i \leq n$, and $y^1, y^2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we have

$$|F_i(x, t, y^1) - F_i(x, t, y^2)| \leq L_F(x, t) \sum_{j=1}^n |y_j^1 - y_j^2|.$$

8. For every compact set $K \subset [0, \infty)$ there exists a nonnegative generalized function $L_H(x, t) \in \mathcal{G}(K)$ such that for all $t \in K$, $i \leq n$, and $z^1, z^2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we have

$$|H_i(t, z^1) - H_i(t, z^2)| \leq L_H(t) \sum_{j=1}^n |z_j^1 - z_j^2|.$$

9. $L_F(x, t)$ and $L_H(t)$ are locally of γ -growth on $\overline{\Pi}$ and $[0, \infty)$, respectively.
10. $\text{supp } A_i(x) \subset (0, l)$ and $\text{supp } H_i(t, 0) \subset (0, \infty)$ for $i \leq n$.

Assumptions imposed on Λ_i allow them to be strongly singular and, even more, to have any desired order of singularity. Assumptions 4–6 state that, given $U \in (\mathcal{G}(\overline{\Pi}))^n$ and $V \in (\mathcal{G}[0, \infty))^n$, $F(x, t, U)$ and $H(t, V)$ are well defined in Colombeau algebra \mathcal{G} . We can interpret Assumptions 7 and 8 as the Lipschitz conditions in Colombeau sense imposed on generalized functions F and H . Assumption 9 allows L_F and L_H to be strongly singular. The last assumption ensures the compatibility of (2) and (3) of any desired order.

We now state the main result of this subsection.

Theorem 3 *Under Assumptions 1–10 where the functions γ and γ_1 are specified by (4), the problem (1)–(3) has a unique solution $U \in \mathcal{G}(\overline{\Pi})$.*

Proof. We will first prove the existence of a classical smooth solution to the problem (1)–(3) where the initial data are smooth, satisfy Assumption 10, and the functions F and H have bounded gradients with respect to U and V , respectively, uniformly over (x, t) varying in compact subsets of $\overline{\Pi}$. In parallel, we will obtain a priori estimates for classical smooth solutions and their derivatives of any desired order. Therewith we will obtain the existence of a prospective representative u of

the solution U in $\mathcal{G}(\bar{\Pi})$. To finish the existence part of the proof, we will show the moderateness of u . The uniqueness of the constructed generalized solution will be proved by the same scheme.

We first reduce the problem (1)–(3) with smooth initial data to an equivalent integral-operator form. Denote by $\omega_i(\tau; x, t)$ the i -th characteristic of (1) passing through a point $(x, t) \in \bar{\Pi}$. From the assumptions imposed on Λ it follows that such characteristic exists, is smooth in τ, x, t , and can be continued up to the boundary of Π . The smallest value of $\tau \geq 0$ at which the characteristic $\xi = \omega_i(\tau; x, t)$ intersects $\partial\Pi$ will be denoted by $t_i(x, t)$. Integrating each equation of (1) along the corresponding characteristic curve, we obtain the following equivalent integral-operator form of (1)–(3):

$$U_i(x, t) = (R_i U)(x, t) + \int_{t_i(x, t)}^t \left[U(\omega_i(\tau; x, t), \tau) \int_0^1 \nabla_U F_i(\omega_i(\tau; x, t), \tau, \sigma U) d\sigma + F_i(\omega_i(\tau; x, t), \tau, 0) \right] d\tau, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n, \quad (5)$$

where

$$(R_i U)(x, t) = \begin{cases} V_i(t_i(x, t)) \int_0^1 \nabla_V H_i(t_i(x, t), \sigma V) d\sigma + H_i(t_i(x, t), 0) & \text{if } t_i(x, t) > 0, \\ A_i(\omega_i(0; x, t)) & \text{if } t_i(x, t) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Given $T > 0$, denote

$$\Pi^T = \{(x, t) \mid 0 < x < l, 0 < t < T\}.$$

Set

$$\begin{aligned} E_U(\alpha_1, \alpha_2; T) &= \max\left\{ |\partial_x^{\alpha_1} \partial_t^{\alpha_2} U_i(x, t)| \mid (x, t) \in \bar{\Pi}^T, 1 \leq i \leq n \right\}, \\ E_F(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) &= \max\left\{ |\partial_x^{\alpha_1} \partial_t^{\alpha_2} F_i(x, t, y)| \mid (x, t, y) \in \bar{\Pi}^T \times \{y : |y| \leq E_U(0, 0; T)\}, 1 \leq i \leq n \right\}, \\ E_H(\alpha) &= \max\left\{ |\partial_t^\alpha H_i(t, z)| \mid (t, z) \in [0, T] \times \{z : |z| \leq E_U(0, 0; T)\}, 1 \leq i \leq n \right\}, \\ L_F^{\max} &= \max\{L_F(x, t) \mid (x, t) \in \bar{\Pi}^T\}, \quad L_H^{\max} = \max\{L_H(t) \mid t \in [0, T]\}. \end{aligned}$$

Simplifying the notation, we drop the dependence of $E_F(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$, $E_H(\alpha)$, L_F^{\max} , and L_H^{\max} on T . Note that we will use these parameters for a fixed $T > 0$.

Assume that the initial data Λ , F , A , and H of our problem are smooth with respect to all their arguments, satisfy Assumption 10, and the functions F and H have bounded gradients with respect to U and V , uniformly over (x, t) varying in compact subsets of $\bar{\Pi}$. Fix an arbitrary $T > 0$. If $(x, t) \in \bar{\Pi}^T$, then L_F^{\max} and L_H^{\max} are Lipschitz constants of F and H with respect to U and V , respectively. We now prove that the problem (5) has a smooth solution in $\bar{\Pi}^T$. In parallel, we obtain global a priori estimates for smooth solutions, we will make use of for construction of a Colombeau solution. We obtain the global a priori estimates by iterating the a priori estimates for local smooth solutions in a number of steps. The proof is split in four claims.

Claim 1. The problem (5) has a unique continuous solution in $\overline{\Pi}^T$. We start from the local continuous solution to (5), namely, we state that there exists a unique solution $U \in (C(\overline{\Pi}^{t_0}))^n$ to the problem (5) for some $t_0 > 0$. To prove this, choose t_0 satisfying the condition

$$\omega_n(t; 0, \tau) < \omega_1(t; l, \tau) \quad \forall \tau \geq 0, \forall t \in [\tau, \tau + t_m] \quad (6)$$

with $m = 0$. For $t \in [0, t_0]$ we can express $V(t)$ in the form

$$\begin{aligned} V_i(t) &= A_i(\omega_i(0; 0, t)) + \int_0^t \left[U(\omega_i(\tau; 0, t), \tau) \int_0^1 \nabla_U F_i(\omega_i(\tau; 0, t), \tau, \sigma U) d\sigma \right. \\ &\quad \left. + F_i(\omega_i(\tau; 0, t), \tau, 0) \right] d\tau, \quad 1 \leq i \leq k, \\ V_i(t) &= A_i(\omega_i(0; l, t)) + \int_0^t \left[U(\omega_i(\tau; l, t), \tau) \int_0^1 \nabla_U F_i(\omega_i(\tau; l, t), \tau, \sigma U) d\sigma \right. \\ &\quad \left. + F_i(\omega_i(\tau; l, t), \tau, 0) \right] d\tau, \quad k+1 \leq i \leq n. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Since (5) is a system of Volterra integral equations of the second kind in $\overline{\Pi}^{t_0}$, we can apply the contraction mapping principle. We apply the operator defined by the right hand side of (5) to two continuous functions U^1 and U^2 . Note that these functions have the same initial and boundary values. We consider their difference in $\overline{\Pi}^{t_0}$. Notice the estimate

$$E_{U^1-U^2}(0, 0; t_0) \leq t_0 q_0 E_{U^1-U^2}(0, 0; t_0),$$

where

$$q_0 = nL_F^{\max}(1 + nL_H^{\max}).$$

We are able to choose t_0 so that the additional condition $t_0 < 1/q_0$ is obeyed. Then the contraction property of the operator defined by the right hand side of (5) holds with respect to $\overline{\Pi}^{t_0}$. We have thus proved existence and uniqueness of a continuous solution U to the problem (5) in $\overline{\Pi}^{t_0}$. Furthermore, we have the following local a priori estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} E_U(0, 0; t_0) &\leq \frac{1}{1 - q_0 t_0} \left[\left(\max_{x \in [0, l], 1 \leq i \leq n} |A_i(x)| \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + T \max_{(x, t) \in \overline{\Pi}^T, 1 \leq i \leq n} |F_i(x, t, 0)| \right) (1 + nL_H^{\max}) + \max_{t \in [0, T], 1 \leq i \leq n} |H_i(t, 0)| \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Note that the value of q_0 depends on T and does not depend on t_0 . This allows us to complete the proof of the claim in $\lceil T/t_0 \rceil$ steps, iterating local existence-uniqueness result in domains

$$(\Pi^{jt_0} \cap \Pi^T) \setminus \overline{\Pi}^{(j-1)t_0}, \quad 1 \leq j \leq \lceil T/t_0 \rceil.$$

Moreover, using the estimate (8) $\lceil T/t_0 \rceil$ times and each time starting with the final value of U from the previous step, we derive the following global a priori estimate:

$$E_U(0, 0; T) \leq P_{1,0} \left(\frac{1}{1 - q_0 t_0}, n, L_H^{\max} \right) \times P_{2,0} \left(\max_{x \in [0, l], 1 \leq i \leq n} |A_i(x)|, \max_{(x,t) \in \bar{\Pi}^T, 1 \leq i \leq n} |F_i(x, t, 0)|, \max_{t \in [0, T], 1 \leq i \leq n} |H_i(t, 0)| \right), \quad (9)$$

where $P_{1,0}$ is a polynomial of degree $3\lceil T/t_0 \rceil$ with all coefficients identically equal to 1 and $P_{2,0}$ is a polynomial of the first degree with positive constant coefficients depending only on T .

Claim 2. The problem (1)–(3) has a unique C^1 -solution in $\bar{\Pi}^T$. The proof is similar to the proof of Claim 1. Let us consider the initial-boundary problem for $\partial_x U$:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_x U_i(x, t) = (R'_{ix} U)(x, t) + \int_{t_i(x, t)}^t \left[\nabla_U F_i(\xi, \tau, U) \cdot \partial_x U \right. \\ \left. - (\partial_x \Lambda_i)(\xi, \tau) \partial_x U_i + (\partial_x F_i)(\xi, \tau, U) \right] \Big|_{\xi=\omega_i(\tau; x, t)} d\tau, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n, \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where

$$(R'_{ix} U)(x, t) = \begin{cases} \Lambda_i^{-1}(0, \tau) [F_i(0, \tau, U) - \nabla_V H_i(\tau, V) \cdot V'(\tau) - (\partial_t H_i)(\tau, V)] \Big|_{\tau=t_i(x, t)} & \text{if } t_i(x, t) > 0, k+1 \leq i \leq n, \\ \Lambda_i^{-1}(l, \tau) [F_i(l, \tau, U) - \nabla_V H_i(\tau, V) \cdot V'(\tau) - (\partial_t H_i)(\tau, V)] \Big|_{\tau=t_i(x, t)} & \text{if } t_i(x, t) > 0, 1 \leq i \leq k, \\ A'_i(\omega_i(0; x, t)) & \text{if } t_i(x, t) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Choose t_1 satisfying the condition (6) with $m = 1$. Combining (1) with (10), we get

$$\begin{aligned} V'_i(t) &= F_i(0, t, U) - \Lambda_i(0, t) (\partial_x U_i)(0, t) \\ &= F_i(0, t, U) - \Lambda_i(0, t) \left[A'_i(\omega_i(0; 0, t)) + \int_0^t \left[\nabla_U F_i(\xi, \tau, U) \cdot \partial_x U \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. - (\partial_x \Lambda_i)(\xi, \tau) \partial_x U_i + (\partial_x F_i)(\xi, \tau, U) \right] \Big|_{\xi=\omega_i(\tau; 0, t)} d\tau \right], \quad 1 \leq i \leq k, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where $t \in [0, t_1]$. The functions $V'_i(t)$ for $k+1 \leq i \leq n$ can be expressed in the same form. Using the fact that U is a known continuous function (see Claim 1), we now apply the operator defined by the right hand side of (10) to two continuous functions $\partial_x U^1$ and $\partial_x U^2$. Note that these functions have the same initial and boundary values. We consider their difference in $\bar{\Pi}^{t_1}$. Notice the estimate

$$E_{U^1 - U^2}(1, 0; t_1) \leq t_1 q_1 E_{U^1 - U^2}(1, 0; t_1),$$

where

$$q_1 = (n L_F^{\max} + E_\Lambda(1, 0; T))(1 + n L_H^{\max}).$$

We are able to choose t_1 so that the additional condition $t_1 < 1/q_1$ is obeyed. This shows that the operator defined by the right hand side of (10) has the contraction property with respect to the domain $\overline{\Pi}^{t_1}$. Thus, we have proved the existence and the uniqueness of a solution $U \in C_{x,t}^{1,0}(\overline{\Pi}^{t(1)})$ to the problem (5). Furthermore, we have the following local a priori estimate:

$$E_U(1, 0; t_1) \leq \frac{1}{1 - q_1 t_1} \left[\left(\max_{x \in [0, l], 1 \leq i \leq n} |A'_i(x)| + T E_F(1, 0) \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + E_{\Lambda^{-1}}(0, 0; T) E_F(0, 0) \right) (1 + n L_H^{\max}) + E_{\Lambda^{-1}}(0, 0; T) E_H(1) \right]. \quad (12)$$

Using the fact that the value of q_1 depends on T and does not depend on t_1 and iterating the local existence-uniqueness result in domains

$$(\Pi^{j t_1} \cap \Pi^T) \setminus \overline{\Pi}^{(j-1)t_1}, \quad 1 \leq j \leq \lceil T/t_1 \rceil,$$

we obtain the global a priori estimate:

$$E_U(1, 0; T) \leq P_{1,1} \left(\frac{1}{1 - q_1 t_1}, n, L_H^{\max} \right) \\ \times P_{2,1} \left(\max_{x \in [0, l], 1 \leq i \leq n} |A'_i(x)|, \max_{0 \leq \alpha \leq 1} E_F(\alpha, 0), E_{\Lambda^{-1}}(0, 0; T), E_H(1) \right), \quad (13)$$

where $P_{1,1}$ is a polynomial of degree $3\lceil T/t_1 \rceil$ with all coefficients identically equal to 1 and $P_{2,1}$ is a polynomial of the second degree with positive constant coefficients depending only on T .

The a priori estimate for $E_U(0, 1; T)$ now follows from the system (1):

$$E_U(0, 1; T) \leq E_F(0, 0) + E_{\Lambda}(0, 0; T) E_U(1, 0; T),$$

where $E_U(1, 0; T)$ satisfies the estimate (13). This finishes the proof of the claim.

Claim 3. The problem (1)–(3) has a unique C^2 -solution in $\overline{\Pi}^T$. Following the proof of Claims 1 and 2, let us consider the following problem for $\partial_x^2 U$:

$$\partial_x^2 U_i(x, t) = (R''_{i,xx} U)(x, t) + \int_{t_i(x, t)}^t \left[\nabla_U F_i(\xi, \tau, U) \cdot \partial_x^2 U \right. \\ \left. - 2(\partial_x \Lambda_i)(\xi, \tau) \partial_x^2 U_i - (\partial_x^2 \Lambda_i)(\xi, \tau) \partial_x U_i + (\partial_x^2 F_i)(\xi, \tau, U) + 2 \nabla_U (\partial_x F_i)(\xi, \tau, U) \cdot \partial_x U \right. \\ \left. + \nabla_U (\nabla_U F_i(\xi, \tau, U) \cdot \partial_x U) \cdot \partial_x U \right] \Big|_{\xi = \omega_i(\tau; x, t)} d\tau, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n, \quad (14)$$

where

$$(R''_{i,xx} U)(x, t) = A''_i(\omega_i(0; x, t)) \quad \text{if } t_i(x, t) = 0$$

and

$$(R''_{i,xx} U)(x, t) = -(\partial_t \Lambda_i^{-1})(0, \tau) (\partial_x U_i)(0, \tau) - \Lambda_i^{-2}(0, \tau) \left[(\partial_t F_i)(0, \tau, U) \right.$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \nabla_U F_i(0, \tau, U) \cdot (\partial_t U)(0, \tau) - \nabla_V H_i(\tau, V) \cdot V''(\tau) - V'(\tau) \cdot \left(\nabla_V (\partial_t H_i)(\tau, V) \right. \\
& \quad \left. - (\partial_t^2 H_i)(\tau, V) - \nabla_V (\partial_t H_i)(\tau, V) + \nabla_V (\nabla_V H_i(\tau, V) \cdot V'(\tau)) \right) \\
& \quad + \Lambda_i^{-1}(0, \tau) \left[-(\partial_x \Lambda_i)(0, \tau) (\partial_x U_i)(0, \tau) + (\partial_x F_i)(0, \tau, U) \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \nabla_U F_i(0, \tau, U) \cdot (\partial_x U)(0, \tau) \right] \Big|_{\tau=t_i(x, t)} \quad \text{if } t_i(x, t) > 0, 1 \leq i \leq k.
\end{aligned}$$

The expressions for $(R_{i,xx}'' U)(x, t)$ if $t_i(x, t) > 0$ and $k+1 \leq i \leq n$ are similar. The expressions for V_i'' are derived from the system (1), using suitable differentiations:

$$\begin{aligned}
V_i'' &= \partial_t^2 U_i = -\partial_t \Lambda_i \partial_x U_i - \Lambda_i \partial_x \partial_t U_i + \partial_t F_i + \nabla_U F_i \cdot \partial_t U \\
&= -\partial_t \Lambda_i \partial_x U_i + \Lambda_i \left(\partial_x \Lambda_i \partial_x U_i + \Lambda_i \partial_x^2 U_i - \partial_x F_i - \nabla_U F_i \cdot \partial_x U \right) + \partial_t F_i + \nabla_U F_i \cdot \partial_t U,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\partial_x^2 U$ satisfies (14) and the right hand side is considered restricted to $x = 0$ if $1 \leq i \leq k$ and to $x = l$ if $k+1 \leq i \leq n$. Take t_2 satisfying the condition (6) with $m = 2$ and the inequality $t_2 < 1/q_2$, where

$$q_2 = (nL_F^{\max} + 2E_\Lambda(1, 0; T))(1 + nL_H^{\max}).$$

This shows that the operator defined by the right hand side of (14) has the contraction property with respect to the domain $\overline{\Pi}^{t_2}$. We therefore have the following global a priori estimate:

$$\begin{aligned}
E_U(2, 0; T) &\leq P_{1,2} \left(\frac{1}{1 - q_2 t_2}, n, L_H^{\max} \right) \\
&\times P_{2,2} \left(n, \max_{x \in [0, l], 1 \leq i \leq n} |A_i''(x)|, \max_{0 \leq \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 \leq 2} E_\Lambda(\alpha_1, \alpha_2; T), \max_{0 \leq \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 \leq 1} E_{\Lambda^{-1}}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2; T), \right. \\
&\quad \left. \max_{1 \leq |\beta| + \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 \leq 2} E_{\partial_U^{|\beta|} F}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2), \max_{1 \leq |\beta| + \alpha_1 \leq 2} E_{\partial_V^{|\beta|} H}(\alpha_1), L_F^{\max}, L_H^{\max}, \max_{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 = 1} E_U(\alpha_1, \alpha_2; T) \right), \tag{15}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n)$, $\beta_i \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $|\beta| = \beta_1 + \dots + \beta_n$, $P_{1,2}$ is a polynomial of degree $3\lceil T/t_2 \rceil$ with all coefficients identically equal to 1 and $P_{2,2}$ is a polynomial of the third degree with positive constant coefficients depending only on T .

The estimates for $E_U(1, 1; T)$ and $E_U(0, 2; T)$ now follow from system (1) and its suitable differentiations. The claim is proved.

We further proceed by induction. Assume that the problem (5) has a unique $C^{m-1}(\overline{\Pi}^T)$ -solution for an arbitrary $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

Claim 4. The problem (1)–(3) has a unique $C^m(\overline{\Pi}^T)$ -solution. Similarly to the proof of Claims 1–3, we consider the problem for $\partial_x^m U$ (using suitable differentiations and integrations of (1)–(3)). Taking into account the induction assumption, we apply the contraction mapping principle to the operator defined by the right-hand side of the problem for $\partial_x^m U$. It is not difficult to prove that the operator has the contraction property with respect to $\overline{\Pi}^{t_m}$ for some $t_m > 0$ satisfying the condition (6) and the inequality $t_m < 1/q_m$, where

$$q_m = (nL_F^{\max} + mE_\Lambda(1, 0; T))(1 + nL_H^{\max}). \tag{16}$$

This implies the existence and the uniqueness of a $C_{x,t}^{m,0}(\overline{\Pi}^{t_m})$ -solution to the problem (1)–(3). Iterating this local existence-uniqueness result in domains

$$(\Pi^{jt_m} \cap \Pi^T) \setminus \overline{\Pi}^{(j-1)t_m}, \quad 1 \leq j \leq \lceil T/t_m \rceil,$$

we complete the proof of the claim in $\lceil T/t_m \rceil$ number of steps. In parallel, we arrive at the following global estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} E_U(m, 0; T) &\leq P_{1,m} \left(\frac{1}{1 - q_m t_m}, n, L_H^{\max} \right) \\ &\times P_{2,m} \left(n, \max_{x \in [0,l], 1 \leq i \leq n} |A_i^{(m)}(x)|, \max_{0 \leq \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 \leq m-1} E_{\Lambda^{-1}}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2; T), \right. \\ &\max_{0 \leq \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 \leq m} E_{\Lambda}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2; T), \max_{1 \leq |\beta| + \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 \leq m} E_{\partial_U^{|\beta|} F}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2), \max_{1 \leq |\beta| + \alpha_1 \leq m} E_{\partial_V^{|\beta|} H}(\alpha_1), \\ &\left. L_F^{\max}, L_H^{\max}, \max_{1 \leq \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 \leq m-1} E_U(\alpha_1, \alpha_2; T) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Here $P_{1,m}$ is a polynomial of degree $3\lceil T/t_m \rceil$ with all coefficients identically equal to 1. Furthermore, $P_{2,m}$ is a polynomial whose degree depends on m but neither on T nor on t_m and whose coefficients are positive constants depending only on m and T . The existence and uniqueness of a $C_{x,t}^{\alpha_1, \alpha_2}(\overline{\Pi}^T)$ -solution where $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 = m$, now follow from the system (1) and its suitable differentiations. The respective global a priori estimates for $E_U(\alpha_1, \alpha_2; T)$ one can easily obtain from the inequality (17) and the induction assumption. The claim is proved.

The classical smooth solution to the problem (1)–(3) satisfying estimates (17) in $\overline{\Pi}^T$ for any $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ can be constructed by the sequential approximation method. We now use this solution to construct a representative of the Colombeau solution. According to the assumptions of the theorem, we consider all the initial data as elements of the corresponding Colombeau algebras. We choose representatives λ, a, f, h, L_f , and L_h of Λ, A, F, H, L_F , and L_H , respectively, with the properties required in the theorem. Let $\phi = \varphi \otimes \varphi \in \mathcal{A}_0(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Consider a prospective representative $u = u(\phi, x, t)$ of U which is the classical smooth solution to the problem (1)–(3) with the initial data $\lambda(\phi, x, t), a(\varphi, x), f(\phi, x, t, u(\phi, x, t)), h(\varphi, t, v(\varphi, t)), L_f(\phi, x, t), L_h(\varphi, t)$, where $v(\varphi, t) = (u_1(\phi, 0, t), \dots, u_k(\phi, 0, t), u_{k+1}(\phi, l, t), \dots, u_n(\phi, l, t))$. For the existence part of the proof, we have to show that $u \in \mathcal{E}_M$, i.e. to obtain moderate growth estimates of $u(\phi_\varepsilon, x, t)$ in terms of the regularization parameter ε .

Fix $N \in \mathbb{N}$ to be so large that for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{A}_N(\mathbb{R})$ there exists ε_0 such that for all $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$ the following conditions are true:

- a) The moderate estimate (see the definition of \mathcal{E}_M) holds for $a(\varphi_\varepsilon, x), f(\phi_\varepsilon, x, t, 0), h(\varphi_\varepsilon, t, 0), L_f(\phi_\varepsilon, x, t)$, and $L_h(\varphi_\varepsilon, t)$.
- b) The invertibility estimate (see Theorem 1) holds for $\lambda(\phi_\varepsilon, x, t)$.
- c) The local- γ -growth estimate (see Definition 2) holds for $\lambda(\phi_\varepsilon, x, t), L_f(\phi_\varepsilon, x, t)$, and $L_h(\varphi_\varepsilon, t)$.
- d) The local- γ_1 -growth estimate holds for $\partial_x \lambda(\phi_\varepsilon, x, t)$.

Fix $\varphi \in \mathcal{A}_N(\mathbb{R})$. Let $p_{1,m}(\varphi), p_{2,m}(\varphi)$, and $q_m(\varphi)$ denote the value of, respectively, $P_{1,m}, P_{2,m}$, and q_m , where $U(x, t), \Lambda(x, t), A(x), F(x, t, U(x, t)), H(t, V(t)), L_F(x, t),$

and $L_H(t)$ are replaced by their representatives $u(\phi, x, t)$, $\lambda(\phi, x, t)$, $a(\varphi, x)$, $f(\phi, x, t, u(\phi, x, t))$, $h(\varphi, t, v(\varphi, t))$, $L_f(\phi, x, t)$, and $L_h(\varphi, t)$, respectively. It suffices to prove the moderate estimates for $p_{1,m}(\varphi)$ and $p_{2,m}(\varphi)$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$. The expression (16) and assumptions imposed on Λ , F , and H make it obvious now that

$$q_m(\varphi_\varepsilon) \leq \gamma^{2N+1}(\varepsilon) + \gamma_1^{2N}(\varepsilon)$$

for all sufficiently small ε . Since $t_m \leq \min\{L/E_\Lambda(0,0), 1/q_m\}$ and $E_\Lambda(0,0) \leq \gamma^{N+1}(\varepsilon)$, we can choose $t_m = 1/[2(\gamma^{2N+1}(\varepsilon) + \gamma_1^{2N}(\varepsilon))]$. Taking into account (4), for each $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and for all small enough ε we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{nL_H^{\max}}{1 - q_m t_m}\right)^{3\lceil T/t_m \rceil} &\leq \gamma(\varepsilon)^{6(N+1)\lceil T(\gamma^{2N+1}(\varepsilon) + \gamma_1^{2N}(\varepsilon)) \rceil} \\ &\leq (\gamma(\varepsilon)^{\gamma^{2N+2}(\varepsilon)}) (\gamma(\varepsilon)^{\gamma_1^{2N+1}(\varepsilon)}) = O\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}\right) \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that for each $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{A}_N(\mathbb{R})$ we have

$$P_{1,m}(\varphi_\varepsilon) = O\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}\right) \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0. \quad (18)$$

One can easily see now that for $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = 0$

$$E_{u_\varepsilon}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2; T) = O\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^N}\right) \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0 \quad (19)$$

for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{A}_N(\mathbb{R})$ with large enough $N \in \mathbb{N}$, where $u_\varepsilon = u(\phi_\varepsilon, x, t)$. To prove similar estimates for all derivatives of U , we use induction on $\alpha = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2$. Assuming (19) to hold for $\alpha \leq m-1$, let us show that (19) is true for $\alpha = m$ as well. Indeed, let $\varphi \in \mathcal{A}_N(\mathbb{R})$ with N chosen so large that for all sufficiently small ε the following conditions are true:

a) The moderate estimate holds for $\partial_x^{\alpha_1} \partial_t^{\alpha_2} u_i(\phi_\varepsilon, x, t)$ for $0 \leq \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 \leq m-1$ and $1 \leq i \leq n$ (the induction assumption).

b) The moderate estimate holds for $\max_{0 \leq \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 \leq m} E_{\lambda_\varepsilon}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2; T)$, $\max_{0 \leq \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 \leq m-1} E_{\lambda_\varepsilon^{-1}}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2; T)$, $ea^{(m)}(\varphi_\varepsilon, x)$, where $\lambda_\varepsilon = \lambda(\phi_\varepsilon, x, t)$.

c) Given $U = [(u(\phi_\varepsilon, x, t))_{\phi \in \mathcal{A}_0(\mathbb{R}^2)}] \in \mathcal{G}(\overline{\Pi}^T)$ satisfying the estimate (19) for $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = 0$, the moderate estimate holds for $\max_{1 \leq |\beta| + \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 \leq m} E_{\partial_U^{|\beta|} f_\varepsilon}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$, $\max_{1 \leq |\beta| + \alpha_1 \leq m} E_{\partial_V^{|\beta|} h_\varepsilon}(\alpha_1)$, where $f_\varepsilon = f(\phi_\varepsilon, x, t, u_\varepsilon)$, $h_\varepsilon = h(\varphi_\varepsilon, t, v(\varphi_\varepsilon, t))$

d) the invertibility estimate holds for $\lambda(\phi_\varepsilon, x, t)$.

Since $p_{2,m}(\varphi_\varepsilon)$ is a polynomial whose degree does not depend on ε , the moderateness of $p_{2,m}(\varphi)$ becomes obvious. The moderateness of $E_u(m, 0; T)$ are done by (18). The moderateness property of $E_u(\alpha_1, \alpha_2; T)$ for all other α_1 and α_2 such that $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 = m$ is a consequence of the moderateness of $E_u(m, 0; T)$, the system (1), its suitable differentiations, and the induction assumption.

Since $T > 0$ is arbitrary, the existence part of the proof is complete.

The proof of the uniqueness part follows the same scheme. The only difference is that now we consider the problem with respect to the difference $U - W$ of two

Colombeau solutions U and W . We hence have the problem (1)–(3) with the right hand sides

$$\int_0^1 \nabla_U F(x, t, \sigma U + (1 - \sigma)W) d\sigma \cdot (U - W) + M_1,$$

$$\int_0^1 \nabla_V H(t, \sigma V + (1 - \sigma)V_W) d\sigma \cdot (V - V_W) + M_3,$$

and M_2 in (1), (3), and (2), respectively. Here $M_i \in \mathcal{N}$ and V_W is equal to V , where U is replaced by W . The analysis is even simpler since, due to [6], it suffices to check the negligibility of $U - W$ at order zero. For this purpose we rewrite the estimate (9) with respect to the function $U - W$ and use Assumptions 7–9 and the fact that $[(p_{2,0}(\varphi))_{\varphi \in \mathcal{A}_0(\mathbb{R})}] \in \mathcal{N}$. This finishes the proof. \square

3.2 Non-Lipshitz nonlinearities

We here extend the above existence-uniqueness result to the case of non-Lipshitz nonlinearities in (1) and (3). Set

$$E_{\nabla F}(U) = \max \left\{ |\nabla_U F_i(x, t, U(x, t))| : (x, t) \in \overline{\Pi}^T, 1 \leq i \leq n \right\},$$

$$E_{\nabla H}(V) = \max \left\{ |\nabla_V H_i(t, V(t))| : t \in [0, T], 1 \leq i \leq n \right\}.$$

Simplifying the notation, we drop the dependence of $E_{\nabla F}(U)$ and $E_{\nabla H}(V)$ on T . Note that we will use these parameters for a fixed $T > 0$.

To state the main result of this section, we suppose that at least one of the following two assumptions holds.

Assumption 11.

a) $H(t, V)$ is smooth in t, V and the mapping $V \mapsto \nabla_V H(t, V)$ is globally bounded, uniformly over t varying in compact subsets of $[0, \infty)$;

b) Given $T > 0$, there exists C_F such that for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, $(x, t) \in \overline{\Pi}^T$, and $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we have

$$|\nabla_U F_i(x, t, y)| \leq C_F \log \log D(x, t, y),$$

where $D(x, t, y)$ with respect to y is a polynomial with coefficients in $\mathcal{G}(\overline{\Pi}^T)$.

Assumption 12.

a) Given $T > 0$, there exists C_H such that for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, $t \in [0, T]$, and $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we have

$$|\nabla_V H_i(t, z)| \leq C_H (\log \log B(t, z))^{1/4},$$

where $B(t, z)$ with respect to z is a polynomial with coefficients in $\mathcal{G}[0, T]$.

b) Assumption 3 is true with $\gamma_1(\varepsilon) = O((\log \log 1/\varepsilon)^{1/4})$;

c) Given $T > 0$, there exists C_F such that for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, $(x, t) \in \overline{\Pi}^T$, and $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we have

$$|\nabla_U F_i(x, t, y)| \leq C_F (\log \log D(x, t, y))^{1/4},$$

where $D(x, t, y)$ with respect to y is a polynomial with coefficients in $\mathcal{G}(\overline{\Pi}^T)$.

Theorem 4 *Assume that Assumption 11 or 12 is true. Under Assumptions 1–6 and 10 where the functions γ and γ_1 are specified by (4), the problem (1)–(3) has a unique solution $U \in \mathcal{G}(\overline{\Pi})$.*

Proof. In the proof we will use a modified notion of $\mathcal{E}_M(\overline{\Pi})$, namely, let $u \in \mathcal{E}_M(\overline{\Pi})$ iff $u \in \mathcal{E}(\overline{\Pi})$ and for every compact set $K \subset \overline{\Pi}$ there is $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for every $\varphi \in \mathcal{A}_N(\mathbb{R}^n)$ there exists $\eta > 0$ with $\sup_{x \in K} |u(\varphi_\varepsilon \times \varphi_\varepsilon, x, t)| \leq \gamma^N(\varepsilon)$ for all $0 < \varepsilon < \eta$.

Fix an arbitrary $T > 0$. From the proof of Theorem 3 it follows that $[(p_{2,0}(\varphi))_{\varphi \in \mathcal{A}_0(\mathbb{R})}]$ is a Colombeau generalized number and hence has the moderateness property. This means that there exists $N_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{A}_{N_1}(\mathbb{R})$ there is $\eta(\varphi) > 0$ with

$$|p_{2,0}(\varphi_\varepsilon)| \leq \varepsilon^{-N_1}, \quad 0 < \varepsilon < \eta(\varphi). \quad (20)$$

Without loss of generality we can assume that N_1 is so large that for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{A}_{N_1}(\mathbb{R})$ the zero-order moderateness property holds for the coefficients of the polynomial $D(x, t, y)$ (if Assumption 11 is fulfilled) or for the coefficients of the polynomials $D(x, t, y)$ and $B(t, z)$ (if Assumption 12 is fulfilled). To simplify notation, we can suppose that, given $\varphi \in \mathcal{A}_{N_1}(\mathbb{R})$, the value of $\eta(\varphi)$ in (20) is so small that the zero-order moderate estimates for the coefficients of D and/or B are true for all $\varepsilon < \eta(\varphi)$. Note that any $U \in \mathcal{G}(\overline{\Pi})$ has the following property: there exists $N_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{A}_{N_1+N_2}(\mathbb{R})$ there is $\varepsilon_0(\varphi) \leq \eta(\varphi)$, where the value of $\eta(\varphi)$ is the same as in (20), with

$$\sup_{\overline{\Pi}^T} |u(\varphi_\varepsilon \times \varphi_\varepsilon, x, t)| \leq \varepsilon^{-N_1-N_2}, \quad 0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0(\varphi), \quad (21)$$

with the constant N_1 being the same as in (20). Obviously, any increase of N_2 and any decrease of $\varepsilon_0(\varphi)$ will keep this property true. This will allow us to adjust the values of N_2 and $\varepsilon_0(\varphi)$ according to our purposes.

Following the proof of Theorem 3, for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{A}_{N_1+N_2}(\mathbb{R})$, we arrive at the estimates (9) and (17) with $E_{u_\varepsilon}(m, 0)$, $E_{\nabla f_\varepsilon}(u_\varepsilon)$, and $E_{\nabla h_\varepsilon}(u_\varepsilon)$ in place of $E_U(m, 0)$, L_F , and L_H , respectively, where $0 < \varepsilon < \eta(\varphi)$ and the value of $\eta(\varphi)$ is the same as in (20). Recall that u , f , and h are representatives of U , F , and H , respectively, and $u_\varepsilon(x, t) = u(\phi_\varepsilon, x, t)$. On the account of these estimates, we will obtain the existence once we prove the following assertion:

(i) the constant $N_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ can be chosen so that for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{A}_{N_1+N_2}(\mathbb{R})$ there exists $\varepsilon_0(\varphi)$ such that

$$\left[2n(1 + E_{\nabla h_\varepsilon}(u_\varepsilon))\right]^{7T(1+E_{\nabla h_\varepsilon}(u_\varepsilon))(E_{\nabla f_\varepsilon}(u_\varepsilon)+mE_\Lambda(1,0;T))} \leq \varepsilon^{-N_2}, \quad 0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0(\varphi), \quad (22)$$

whatsoever $u(\varphi \times \varphi, x, t) \in \mathcal{E}(\overline{\Pi}^T)$ satisfying the inequality (21).

Let us prove Assertion (ι) using Assumption 11. Recall that at this point N_2 is a constant whose exact value will be fixed below. Fix $\varphi \in \mathcal{A}_{N_1+N_2}(\mathbb{R})$. By (21) and Assumption 11, there exists $N_3 \in \mathbb{N}$ for which the estimate

$$E_{\nabla f_\varepsilon}(u_\varepsilon) \leq C_F \log \log d(\phi_\varepsilon, x, t, u_\varepsilon) \leq C_F \log \log \varepsilon^{-N_3}, \quad 0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0(\varphi),$$

is true, where d is a representative of D . Furthermore, there exist $C_1 > 1$, $C_2 > 0$, and $k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the left hand side of (22) is bounded from above by

$$\begin{aligned} C_1^{C_2(\log \log \varepsilon^{-N_3} + \gamma_1(\varepsilon))} &\leq e^{C_3 \log \log \varepsilon^{-N_3}} \gamma(\varepsilon)^{k_1 \gamma_1(\varepsilon)} \leq e^{\log(\log \varepsilon^{-N_3})^{C_3}} \varepsilon^{-k_2} \\ &\leq (\log \varepsilon^{-N_3})^{C_3} \varepsilon^{-k_2} \leq N_3^{\lceil C_3 \rceil} \varepsilon^{-\lceil C_3 \rceil - k_2}, \end{aligned}$$

where $C_3 = C_2 \log C_1$ and $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0(\varphi)$. It is important to note that C_3 and k_2 can be fixed so that the above estimates hold for all N_2 and all φ . This makes the values $N_2 = 2\lceil C_3 \rceil + k_2$ and $\varepsilon_0(\varphi) = \min\{\eta(\varphi), N_3^{-\lceil C_3 \rceil}\}$, which we now set up, well defined. Assertion (ι) now follows from the fact that φ is an arbitrary function from $\mathcal{A}_{N_1+N_2}(\mathbb{R})$.

Let us prove Assertion (ι) using Assumption 12. Following the same scheme as above, fix $\varphi \in \mathcal{A}_{N_1+N_2}(\mathbb{R})$, where N_2 will be specified below. By (21) and Assumption 12, there exist $N_3, N_4 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the following estimates are true:

$$E_{\nabla f_\varepsilon}(u_\varepsilon) \leq C_F \log \log d(\phi_\varepsilon, x, t, u_\varepsilon) \leq C_F \log \log(\varepsilon^{-N_3}), \quad 0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0(\varphi),$$

$$E_{\nabla h_\varepsilon}(u_\varepsilon) \leq C_H \log \log b(\varphi_\varepsilon, t, u_\varepsilon) \leq C_H \log \log(\varepsilon^{-N_4}), \quad 0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0(\varphi),$$

where b is a representative of B . Furthermore, there exist $C_1 > 1$ and $C_2 > 0$ such that the left hand side of (22) is bounded from above by

$$\begin{aligned} &\left[C_1 \log \log(\varepsilon^{-N_4}) \right]^{1/2 C_2 (\log \log \varepsilon^{-N_3-N_4})^{1/2}} \\ &\leq \exp \left\{ C_2 \log(\log(\log(\varepsilon^{-N_4})))^{C_1} \right\}^{1/2} (\log \log \varepsilon^{-N_3-N_4})^{1/2} \\ &\leq \exp \left\{ C_2 \log(\log \varepsilon^{-N_3-N_4})^{C_1} \right\} = (\log \varepsilon^{-N_3-N_4})^{C_1 C_2} \\ &= \left((N_3 + N_4) \log \varepsilon^{-1} \right)^{C_1 C_2} \leq (N_3 + N_4)^{\lceil C_1 C_2 \rceil} \varepsilon^{-\lceil C_1 C_2 \rceil}, \end{aligned}$$

where $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0(\varphi)$. Note that C_1 and C_2 can be fixed so that the above estimates hold for all N_2 and all φ . We now set $N_2 = 2\lceil C_1 C_2 \rceil$ and $\varepsilon_0(\varphi) = \min\{\eta(\varphi), (N_3 + N_4)^{-\lceil C_1 C_2 \rceil}\}$ and this value is well defined. Assertion (ι) now follows from the fact that φ is an arbitrary function in $\mathcal{A}_{N_1+N_2}(\mathbb{R})$.

Since $T > 0$ is arbitrary, the existence part of the proof is complete.

The proof of the uniqueness part follows the same scheme (cf. also the proof of Theorem 3). We apply the estimate (9) to the difference of two generalized solutions to the problem (1)–(3). From the existence part of the proof we see that the first factor in the right-hand side of (9) has the moderateness property. Since the second factor is negligible, the uniqueness follows. \square

Example 5 Consider $n = 1$ and

$$F(x, t, U) = (G_1^2(x, t) + G_2^2(x, t)U^2)^{1/2} \log \log (G_3^2(x, t) + G_4^2(x, t)U^2)^{1/2},$$

where $G_i(x, t) \in \mathcal{G}(\overline{\Pi})$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_U F(x, t, U) &= \frac{G_2^2 U}{(G_1^2 + G_2^2 U^2)^{1/2}} \log \log (G_3^2 + G_4^2 U^2)^{1/2} \\ &\quad + \frac{G_4^2 U (G_1^2 + G_2^2 U^2)^{1/2}}{\log (G_3^2 + G_4^2 U^2)^{1/2} (G_3^2 + G_4^2 U^2)}. \end{aligned}$$

The function $F(x, t, U)$ is non-Lipshitz and satisfies Assumption 11(b).

Remark 6 *The theorem states that, whatsoever singularity of the initial data of our problem and whatsoever nonlinearities of F and H allowed by Assumption 11 (or 12), the problem (1)–(3) has a unique solution in the Colombeau algebra $\mathcal{G}(\overline{\Pi})$.*

References

- [1] H. Biagioni. Lecture Notes in Mathematics: A Nonlinear Theory of Generalized Functions. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York 1990.
- [2] Colombeau, J. F.: Elementary Introduction to New Generalized Functions (North-Holland Mathematics Studies: Vol. 113). Elsevier Science Publishers 1985.
- [3] Demengel, F. and Rauch, J.: Measure valued solutions of asymptotically homogeneous semilinear hyperbolic systems in one space dimension. Proc. Edinburgh Math. Soc. **33** (1990), 443–460.
- [4] Gramchev, T.: *Semilinear hyperbolic systems with singular initial data*. Monatshefte Math. **112** (1991), 99–113.
- [5] Gramchev, T.: *Nonlinear maps in spaces of distributions*. Math. Zeitschr. **209**(1992), 101 - 114.
- [6] M. Grosser, On the foundations of nonlinear generalized functions II, X-Archives: math. FA/9912215, ESI Preprint 812. To appear as a single issue of Memoirs of the AMS.
- [7] M. Grosser, M. Kunzinger, M. Oberguggenberger, R. Steinbauer. *Geometric theory of generalized functions*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 2001.
- [8] F. Jochmann, L. Recke. Well-posedness of an initial boundary value problem from laser dynamics, *Math. Models and Methods in Applied Sciences* **12** (1999), No 4, 593–606.

- [9] G. Hörmann and M. V. de Hoop. Microlocal analysis and global solutions of some hyperbolic equations with discontinuous coefficients. *Acta Appl. Math.* **67** (2001), 173–224.
- [10] I. Kmit. Delta waves for a strongly singular initial-boundary hyperbolic problem with integral boundary condition. Accepted for publication in *J. of Analysis and its Applications* (2003), 42 pages.
- [11] I. Kmit. Initial-Boundary Problems for Semilinear Hyperbolic Systems with Singular Coefficients. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Nonlinear Differential Equations. Nonlinear Boundary Value Problems* (2004) Alushta, Ukraine, to appear.
- [12] I. Kmit and G. Hörmann. Semilinear hyperbolic systems with nonlocal boundary conditions: reflection of singularities and delta waves, *J. for Analysis and its Applications* **20** (2001), No. 3, 637–659.
- [13] F. Lafon and M. Oberguggenberger. Generalized solutions to symmetric hyperbolic systems with discontinuous coefficients: the multidimensional case, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **160** (1991), 93–106.
- [14] M. Nedeljkov and S. Pilipović. A note on a semilinear hyperbolic system with generalized functions as coefficients. *Nonlin. Analysis, Theory, Methods and Appl.* **30** (1997), 41–46.
- [15] M. Nedeljkov and S. Pilipović. Generalized solution to a semilinear hyperbolic system with a non-Lipshitz nonlinearity, *Preprint*.
- [16] M. Oberguggenberger. *Multiplication of Distributions and Applications to Partial Differential Equations*, volume 259 of Pitman Research Notes in Mathematics, Longman, 1992.
- [17] M. Oberguggenberger. Hyperbolic systems with discontinuous coefficients: generalized solutions and a transmission problem in acoustics, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **142** (1989), 452–467.
- [18] Oberguggenberger, M.: Weak limits of solutions to semilinear hyperbolic systems. *Math. Ann.* **274** (1986), 599–607.
- [19] M. Radziunas, H.-J. Wünsche, B. Sartorius, O. Brox, D. Hoffmann, K. Schneider, Modelling of self-pulsating DFB lasers, *WIAS preprint* **516** (1999), 14 pages.
- [20] Rauch, J. and Reed, M.: Nonlinear superposition and absorption of delta waves in one space dimension. *Funct. Anal.* **73** (1987), 152–178.
- [21] J. Sieber, U. Bandelow, H. Wenzel, M. Eolfrum, H.-J. Wünsche, Travelling wave equations for semiconductor lasers with gain dispersion, *WIAS preprint* **459** (1998).

- [22] B. Tromborg, H. E. Lassen, H. Olesen, Travelling wave analysis of semiconductor lasers, *IEEE J. of Quant. El.* **30** (1994), No. 5, 939–956.
- [23] T. I. Zelenjak, On stationary solutions of mixed problems arising in studying of some chemical processes, *Differential Equations* **2** (1966), No. 2, 205–213.