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#### Abstract

In the present article, we study the diffusion equations with fractional time derivatives. The aim of this paper is to investigate the best possible regularity for the initial value/boundary value problems with non-homogeneous Dirichlet boundary data. The main tool we use here is called the transposition method.


## 1. Introduction

Let $\Omega$ be a bounded domain of $\mathbb{R}^{d}$ with $C^{2}$ boundary $\Gamma:=\partial \Omega$ and set $Q:=\Omega \times(0, T)$ and $\Sigma:=\Gamma \times(0, T)$. We consider the following initial value/boundary value problem for a partial differential equation with the fractional derivative in time $t$ :

$$
\begin{cases}\partial_{t}^{\alpha} u+A u=0 & \text { in } Q  \tag{1.1}\\ u=g & \text { on } \Sigma \\ u(\cdot, 0)=0 & \text { in } \Omega\end{cases}
$$

with $0<\alpha<1$. Here $\partial_{t}^{\alpha}$ denotes the Caputo derivative, which is defined by

$$
\partial_{t}^{\alpha} u(x, t)=\frac{1}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)} \int_{0}^{t}(t-\tau)^{-\alpha} \frac{\partial u}{\partial \tau}(x, \tau) d \tau
$$

and $\Gamma(\cdot)$ is the Gamma function (see Podlubny [4]). The differential operator $A$ is given by

$$
A u(x)=-\sum_{i, j=1}^{d} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}}\left(a_{i j}(x) \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_{j}}(x)\right)+c(x) u(x), \quad x \in \Omega
$$

and the coefficients satisfy the following:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& a_{i j}=a_{j i} \in C^{1}(\bar{\Omega}), 1 \leq i, j \leq d, \quad \sum_{i, j=1}^{d} a_{i j}(x) \xi_{i} \xi_{j} \geq \mu|\xi|^{2}, x \in \bar{\Omega}, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^{d} \\
& c \in C(\bar{\Omega}), \quad c(x) \geq 0, x \in \bar{\Omega}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\mu>0$ is constant. The function $g$ is given on $\Sigma$.
In the present paper, we study the regularity of the solution to (1.1) in the sense of Sobolev spaces. As for this problems, Lions and Magenes [3] showed the result for the parabolic equations.
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## 2. Main Result

In this section, we prepare the notations and state our main results. We denote by $H^{s}(\Omega)$, $s \geq 0$, the Sobolev spaces. For $r, s \geq 0$, we abbreviately set

$$
H^{r, s}(Q):=L^{2}\left(0, T ; H^{r}(\Omega)\right) \cap H^{s}\left(0, T ; L^{2}(\Omega)\right)
$$

Then $H^{r, s}(Q)$ is a Hilbert space with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{H^{r, s}(Q)}$ given by

$$
\|u\|_{H^{r, s}(Q)}^{2}:=\|u\|_{L^{2}\left(0, T ; H^{r}(\Omega)\right)}^{2}+\|u\|_{H^{s}\left(0, T ; L^{2}(\Omega)\right)}^{2}
$$

In particular,

$$
H^{0,0}(Q)=L^{2}(Q)=L^{2}\left(0, T ; L^{2}(\Omega)\right)
$$

Similarly we set

$$
\begin{aligned}
H^{r, s}(\Sigma) & :=L^{2}\left(0, T ; H^{r}(\Gamma)\right) \cap H^{s}\left(0, T ; L^{2}(\Gamma)\right) \\
H_{, 0}^{r, s}(\Sigma) & :=L^{2}\left(0, T ; H^{r}(\Gamma)\right) \cap H_{0}^{s}\left(0, T ; L^{2}(\Gamma)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

with the norm defined by

$$
\|u\|_{H^{r, s}(\Sigma)}^{2}:=\|u\|_{L^{2}\left(0, T ; H^{r}(\Gamma)\right)}^{2}+\|u\|_{H^{s}\left(0, T ; L^{2}(\Gamma)\right)}^{2}
$$

We clearly have

$$
H^{0,0}(\Sigma)=L^{2}(\Sigma)=L^{2}\left(0, T ; L^{2}(\Gamma)\right)
$$

As for the spaces with negaive exponents, we define

$$
H^{-r,-s}(\Sigma):=\left(H_{, 0}^{r, s}(\Sigma)\right)^{\prime}, \quad r, s \geq 0
$$

The duality paring between $H^{-r,-s}(\Sigma)$ and $H_{, 0}^{r, s}(\Sigma)$ is denoted by $\langle\psi, u\rangle_{r, s}$ for $\psi \in H^{-r,-s}(\Sigma)$ and $u \in H_{, 0}^{r, s}(\Sigma)$.

We define the operator $\partial_{\nu_{A}}: H^{s}(\Omega) \rightarrow H^{s-3 / 2}(\Gamma), s>3 / 2$, as

$$
\partial_{\nu_{A}} u(x)=\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu_{A}}(x)=\sum_{i, j=1}^{d} a_{i j}(x) \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_{i}}(x) \nu_{j}(x),
$$

where $\nu(x)=\left(\nu_{1}(x), \ldots, \nu_{d}(x)\right)$ is the outward unit normal vector to $\Gamma$ at $x$. Then for $u \in H^{r, s}(Q)$ with $r>3 / 2$, the trace theorem (Theorem 2.1 in Chapter 4 of Lions and Magenes [3]) yields

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu_{A}} \in H^{\mu, \nu}(\Sigma), \quad \frac{\mu}{r}=\frac{\nu}{s}=\frac{r-3 / 2}{r} \quad(\nu=0 \text { if } s=0) \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu_{A}}\right\|_{H^{\mu, \nu}(\Sigma)} \leq C\|u\|_{H^{r, s}(Q)} \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

In order to define the weak solution of (1.1), we introduce the dual sytem;

$$
\begin{cases}D_{t}^{\alpha} v+A v=f & \text { in } Q  \tag{2.3}\\ v=0 & \text { on } \Sigma \\ I_{T-}^{1-\alpha} v(\cdot, T)=0 & \text { in } \Omega\end{cases}
$$

where $D_{t}^{\alpha}$ is the backward Riemann-Liouville fractional derivative, which is defined by

$$
D_{t}^{\alpha} h(t)=-\frac{1}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)} \frac{d}{d t} \int_{t}^{T}(\tau-t)^{-\alpha} h(\tau) d \tau, \quad 0<\alpha<1
$$

Moreover $I_{T-}^{\nu}$ denotes the backward integral of order $\nu$;

$$
I_{T-}^{\nu} h(t)=\frac{1}{\Gamma(\nu)} \int_{t}^{T}(\tau-t)^{\nu-1} h(\tau) d \tau, \quad \nu>0
$$

By the same argument as Chapter 4 in Bajlekova [1], for any $f \in L^{2}(Q)$ there exists a unique solution $v \in H^{2, \alpha}(Q)$ of (2.3) such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|v\|_{H^{2, \alpha}(Q)} \leq C\|f\|_{L^{2}(Q)} . \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Henceforth we will denote this solution by $v_{f}$. Now we apply (2.1) to $v_{f} \in H^{2, \alpha}(Q)$ and obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\partial v_{f}}{\partial \nu_{A}} \in H^{1 / 2, \alpha / 4}(\Sigma) \quad \text { and } \quad\left\|\frac{\partial v_{f}}{\partial \nu_{A}}\right\|_{H^{1 / 2, \alpha / 4}(\Sigma)} \leq C\left\|v_{f}\right\|_{H^{2, \alpha}(Q)} \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $0<\alpha<1$, we have

$$
H_{0}^{\alpha / 4}\left(0, T ; L^{2}(\Gamma)\right)=H^{\alpha / 4}\left(0, T ; L^{2}(\Gamma)\right)
$$

(see (B.1)). That is,

$$
\frac{\partial v_{f}}{\partial \nu_{A}} \in H^{1 / 2, \alpha / 4}(\Sigma)=H_{, 0}^{1 / 2, \alpha / 4}(\Sigma)
$$

Now we are ready to define the weak solution of (1.1);

Definition 2.1. A function $u$ is a weak solution of (1.1) if

$$
\begin{equation*}
(u, f)_{L^{2}(Q)}+\left\langle g, \partial_{\nu_{A}} v\right\rangle_{1 / 2, \alpha / 4}=0 \tag{2.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

holds for any $f \in L^{2}(Q)$.

The main result of this paper is as follows;

Theorem 2.1. Let $g \in L^{2}(\Sigma)$, then (1.1) has a unique weak solution $u \in H^{1 / 2, \alpha / 4}(Q)$ satisfying

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|u\|_{H^{1 / 2, \alpha / 4}(Q)} \leq C\|g\|_{L^{2}(\Sigma)} . \tag{2.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now we roughly describe the strategy of the proof. It is not difficult to show the unique existence of the weak solution of (1.1) for $g \in L^{2}(\Sigma)$, but the regularity of $H^{1 / 2, \alpha / 4}(Q)$ cannot be directly deduced. Therefore we first show the follwoing two results;
(i) Regularity of the solution for $g \in H^{-1 / 2,-\alpha / 4}(\Sigma)$.
(ii) Regularity of the solution for $g \in H^{3 / 2,3 \alpha / 4}(\Sigma)$.

After showing (i) and (ii), we obtain the regularity for $g \in L^{2}(\Sigma)$ by interpolating the above results.

The result for (i) can be easily shown. Indeed, from this definition, we can immediately deduce the following proposition;

Proposition 2.2. Let $g \in H^{-1 / 2,-\alpha / 4}(\Sigma)$, then (1.1) has a unique weak solution $u \in L^{2}(Q)$ satisfying

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|u\|_{L^{2}(Q)} \leq C\|g\|_{H^{-1 / 2,-\alpha / 4}(\Sigma)} . \tag{2.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. Combining (2.4) and (2.5), we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|\frac{\partial v_{f}}{\partial \nu_{A}}\right\|_{H^{1 / 2, \alpha / 4}(\Sigma)} \leq C\|f\|_{L^{2}(Q)} . \tag{2.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus the mapping

$$
L^{2}(Q) \ni f \mapsto \frac{\partial v_{f}}{\partial \nu_{A}} \in H^{1 / 2, \alpha / 4}(\Sigma)
$$

is bounded, and so is

$$
L^{2}(Q) \ni f \mapsto-\left\langle g, \partial_{\nu_{A}} v_{f}\right\rangle \in \mathbb{C}
$$

Therefore the Riesz's representation theorem yields the unique existence of $u \in L^{2}(Q)$ such that

$$
(u, f)_{L^{2}(Q)}=-\left\langle g, \partial_{\nu_{A}} v_{f}\right\rangle
$$

holds for any $f \in L^{2}(Q)$. Thus we have proven the unique existence of weak solution.
Moreover for any $f \in L^{2}(Q)$ we have

$$
\left|(u, f)_{L^{2}(Q)}\right|=\left|\left\langle g, \partial_{\nu_{A}} v_{f}\right\rangle\right| \leq\|g\|_{H^{-1 / 2,-\alpha / 4}(\Sigma)}\left\|\partial_{\nu_{A}} v_{f}\right\|_{H^{1 / 2, \alpha / 4}(\Sigma)} \leq C\|g\|_{H^{-1 / 2,-\alpha / 4}(\Sigma)}\|f\|_{L^{2}(Q)},
$$

where we have used (2.9) in the last inequality. Therefore we have (2.8).

Thus we have proved part (i). In the next section, therefore, we will consider case (ii).

## 3. Regular solution

We first formulate the functions in $H^{s}(0, T)$ vanishing at $t=0$. Following (2.10.3.1b) in Triebel [6], for $\mathbb{R}_{+}:=(0, \infty)$ we denote by $\widetilde{H}^{s}\left(\mathbb{R}_{+}\right)$the functions in $H^{s}(\mathbb{R})$ which are identically zero outside $\mathbb{R}_{+}$;

$$
\widetilde{H}^{s}\left(\mathbb{R}_{+}\right):=\left\{u \in H^{s}(\mathbb{R}) ; \operatorname{supp} u \subset \overline{\mathbb{R}}_{+}\right\}
$$

Moreover we set

$$
\widetilde{H}_{0+}^{s}(0, T):=\left\{\left.u\right|_{(0, T)} ; \widetilde{H}^{s}\left(\mathbb{R}_{+}\right)\right\}
$$

Then similarly to (B.6), we can see that such function spaces have a good property for interpolation;

$$
\left[\widetilde{H}_{0+}^{s_{1}}(0, T), \widetilde{H}_{0+}^{s_{2}}(0, T)\right]_{\theta}=\widetilde{H}_{0+}^{(1-\theta) s_{1}+\theta s_{2}}(0, T), \quad 0 \leq s_{1}<s_{2}<\infty, 0 \leq \theta \leq 1 .
$$

We also note that we have the representation of $\widetilde{H}_{0+}^{s}(0, T)$ as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\widetilde{H}_{0+}^{s}(0, T)=\left\{u \in H^{s}(0, T) ; \int_{0}^{T}|u(t)|^{2} \frac{d t}{t^{2 s}}<\infty\right\}, \quad 0 \leq s \leq 1 \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

In particular, for $0 \leq s \leq 1, s \neq 1 / 2$, we also have

$$
\widetilde{H}_{0+}^{s}(0, T)= \begin{cases}H^{s}(0, T), & 0 \leq s<\frac{1}{2}  \tag{3.2}\\ \left\{u \in H^{s}(0, T) ; u(0)=0\right\}, & \frac{1}{2}<s \leq 1\end{cases}
$$

(see (B.1) and (B.5)). For simplicity, we set

$$
H_{0+}^{r, s}(Q):=L^{2}\left(0, T ; H^{r}(\Omega)\right) \cap \widetilde{H}_{0+}^{s}\left(0, T ; L^{2}(\Omega)\right)
$$

and

$$
H_{0+}^{r, s}(\Sigma):=L^{2}\left(0, T ; H^{r}(\Gamma)\right) \cap \widetilde{H}_{0+}^{s}\left(0, T ; L^{2}(\Gamma)\right)
$$

As for these spaces, we have the following properties for trace;

Proposition 3.1. Let $u \in H_{0+}^{2, \alpha}(Q), 0<\alpha<1$, then we have

$$
\left.u\right|_{\Sigma} \in H_{0+}^{3 / 2,3 \alpha / 4}(\Sigma)
$$

Moreover the mapping

$$
\left.H_{0+}^{2, \alpha}(Q) \ni u \mapsto u\right|_{\Sigma} \in H_{0+}^{3 / 2,3 \alpha / 4}(\Sigma)
$$

is a continuous surjection.

For the proof of this proposition, we prepare the following lemma;

Lemma 3.2 (Trace Theorem). Let $X$ and $Y$ be Hilbert spaces such that $X$ is embedded to $Y$ densely and continuously. If $u \in L^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}_{+} ; X\right) \cap H^{r}\left(\mathbb{R}_{+} ; Y\right)$ with $r>1 / 2$, then

$$
u^{(j)}(0) \in[Y, X]_{1-(j+1 / 2) / r}, \quad 0 \leq j<r-1 / 2
$$

Moreover, the mapping

$$
L^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}_{+} ; X\right) \cap H^{r}\left(\mathbb{R}_{+} ; Y\right) \ni u \mapsto u^{(j)}(0) \in[Y, X]_{1-(j+1 / 2) / r}
$$

is a continuous surjection.

For this lemma, see Theorem 4.2 in Chapter 1 of [3].

Proof of Proposition 3.1. Without loss of generality, we may consider the case of

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \Omega=\mathbb{R}_{+}^{d}=\left\{\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{d-1}, x_{d}\right) ; x_{1}, \ldots, x_{d-1} \in \mathbb{R}, x_{d}>0\right\} \\
& \Gamma=\mathbb{R}^{d-1}=\left\{\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{d-1}\right) ; x_{1}, \ldots, x_{d-1} \in \mathbb{R}\right\} .
\end{aligned}
$$

We abbreviately write $x^{\prime}:=\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{d-1}\right)$. Then we have

$$
u \in H_{0+}^{2, \alpha}(Q)=L^{2}\left(0, T ; H^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}_{+}^{d}\right)\right) \cap \widetilde{H}_{0+}^{\alpha}\left(0, T ; L^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}_{+}^{d}\right)\right)
$$

if and only if

$$
\begin{aligned}
u & \in L^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}_{+, x_{d}} ; H_{0+}^{2, \alpha}\left(\mathbb{R}_{x^{\prime}}^{d-1} \times(0, T)\right)\right) \cap H^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}_{+, x_{d}} ; L^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}_{x^{\prime}}^{d-1} \times(0, T)\right)\right) \\
& =L^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}_{+}, H_{0+}^{2, \alpha}(\Sigma)\right) \cap H^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}_{+}, L^{2}(\Sigma)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

We apply Lemma 3.2 as $X=H_{0+}^{2, \alpha}(\Sigma)$ and $Y=L^{2}(\Sigma)$. Then we have

$$
\left.u\right|_{\Sigma}=u(0) \in\left[L^{2}(\Sigma), H_{0+}^{2, \alpha}(\Sigma)\right]_{3 / 4}=H_{0+}^{3 / 2,3 \alpha / 4}(\Sigma)
$$

The surjectivity also follows from Lemma 3.2.

By using the trace theorem stated above, problem (1.1) with $g \in H_{0+}^{3 / 2,3 \alpha / 4}(\Sigma)$ is directly reduced to the following problem with homogeneous boundary condition;

$$
\begin{cases}\partial_{t}^{\alpha} u+A u=F & \text { in } Q,  \tag{3.3}\\ u=0 & \text { on } \Sigma, \\ u(\cdot, 0)=0 & \text { in } \Omega\end{cases}
$$

For (3.3), Gorenflo, Luchko and Yamamoto [2] showed the $L^{2}$-maximal regularity. In their setting, the Caputo derivative $\partial_{t}^{\alpha}$ equipped with the initial value $u(0)=0$ is formulated as an operator in $L^{2}(0, T)$ with its domain given by

$$
\mathcal{D}\left(\partial_{t}^{\alpha}\right)= \begin{cases}H^{\alpha}(0, T), & 0 \leq \alpha<1 / 2  \tag{3.4}\\ \left\{u \in H^{1 / 2}(0, T) ; \int_{0}^{t}|u(t)|^{2} \frac{d t}{t}<\infty\right\}, & \alpha=1 / 2 \\ \left\{u \in H^{\alpha}(0, T) ; u(0)=0\right\}, & 1 / 2<\alpha \leq 1\end{cases}
$$

By (3.1) and (3.2), this can be rewritten as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{D}\left(\partial_{t}^{\alpha}\right)=\widetilde{H}_{0+}^{\alpha}(0, T) \tag{3.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus we can see that if (3.3) has a "solution" in $\mathcal{D}\left(\partial_{t}^{\alpha}\right)$, then the initial condition $u(\cdot, 0)=0$ is satisfied in a weaker sense. They also revealed that the above operator $\partial_{t}^{\alpha}$ is essentially equivalent to the Riemann-Liouville derivatives, which were already discussed in [1]. Anyway we obtain the following result;

Lemma 3.3. Let $0<\alpha<1$ and $F \in L^{2}(Q)$, then (3.3) has a unique solution $u \in H_{0+}^{2, \alpha}(Q)$ satisfying

$$
\|u\|_{H^{2, \alpha}(Q)} \leq C\|F\|_{L^{2}(Q)}
$$

For the proof of this lemma, see Theorem 4.3 in [2].

Proposition 3.4. Let $0<\alpha<1$ and $g \in H_{0+}^{3 / 2,3 \alpha / 4}(\Sigma)$. Then problem (1.1) has a unique solution $u \in H_{0+}^{2, \alpha}(Q)$ satisfying

$$
\|u\|_{H^{2, \alpha}(Q)} \leq C\|g\|_{H^{3 / 2,3 \alpha / 4}(\Sigma)}
$$

Proof. Since $g \in H_{0+}^{3 / 2,3 \alpha / 4}(\Sigma)$, Proposition 3.1 yields that there exists $\tilde{g} \in H_{0+}^{2, \alpha}(Q)$ such that

$$
\left.\tilde{g}\right|_{\Sigma}=g \quad \text { and } \quad\|\tilde{g}\|_{H^{2, \alpha}(Q)} \leq C\|g\|_{H^{3 / 2,3 \alpha / 4}(\Sigma)}
$$

By setting $F:=-A \tilde{g}-\partial_{t}^{\alpha} \tilde{g} \in L^{2}(Q)$ and applying Lemma 3.3, there exists a solution $w \in H_{0+}^{2, \alpha}(Q)$ of

$$
\begin{cases}\partial_{t}^{\alpha} w+A w=F & \text { in } Q \\ w=0 & \text { on } \Sigma \\ w(\cdot, 0)=0 & \text { in } \Omega\end{cases}
$$

which satisfies

$$
\|w\|_{H^{2, \alpha}(Q)} \leq C\|F\|_{L^{2}(Q)} \leq C\|\tilde{g}\|_{H^{2, \alpha}(Q)} \leq C\|g\|_{H^{3 / 2,3 \alpha / 4}(\Sigma)}
$$

Then $u:=w+\tilde{g}$ satisfies (1.1) and

$$
\|u\|_{H^{2, \alpha}(Q)} \leq\|w\|_{H^{2, \alpha}(Q)}+\|\tilde{g}\|_{H^{2, \alpha}(Q)} \leq C\|g\|_{H^{3 / 2,3 \alpha / 4}(\Sigma)} .
$$

Thus we have completed the proof.

## 4. Proof of the main result

In this section, we complete the proof of Theorem 2.1 by interpolation.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Let $\pi$ be the operator which operates the boundary data $g$ to the weak solution $u$ of (1.1). Then, by Propositions 2.2 and 3.4 , we have

$$
\pi \in \mathcal{L}\left(H^{-1 / 2,-\alpha / 4}(\Sigma) ; L^{2}(Q)\right) \cap \mathcal{L}\left(H_{0+}^{3 / 2,3 \alpha / 4}(\Sigma) ; H^{2, \alpha}(Q)\right)
$$

where $\mathcal{L}(X, Y)$ denotes the set of linear and bounded operators from $X$ to $Y$. By Proposition A.1, the operator $\pi$ also belongs to

$$
\mathcal{L}\left(\left[H^{-1 / 2,-\alpha / 4}(\Sigma), H_{0+}^{3 / 2,3 \alpha / 4}(\Sigma)\right]_{\theta} ;\left[L^{2}(Q), H^{2, \alpha}(Q)\right]_{\theta}\right)
$$

for any $0 \leq \theta \leq 1$. In particular, if we set $\theta=1 / 4$, then

$$
\left[H^{-1 / 2,-\alpha / 4}(\Sigma), H_{0+}^{3 / 2,3 \alpha / 4}(\Sigma)\right]_{1 / 4}=L^{2}(\Sigma) \quad \text { and } \quad\left[L^{2}(Q), H^{2, \alpha}(Q)\right]_{1 / 4}=H^{1 / 2, \alpha / 4}(Q)
$$

and therefore we have

$$
\pi \in \mathcal{L}\left(L^{2}(\Sigma) ; H^{1 / 2, \alpha / 4}(Q)\right)
$$

Thus we have completed the proof.

## Appendix A. Interpolation

Throughout this article, we often use the word "interpolation" as a complex interpolation defined bellow. As for the detailed argument on this topic, we can refer to Triebel [6], Yagi [7] and the references therein. On the other hand, in some classical works such as Lions and Magenes [3], the "interpolation" of two Hilbert spaces is defined as the domain of fractional powers of positive and self-adjoint operator. We will see that these two kinds of definitions coincide with each other (see Proposition A.2). Therefore, we can refer to [3] and use some of their results (e.g., Theorem 4.2 in Chapter 1 of [3]) without any confusion. In this section, we recall the definition of complex interpolation of Banach spaces and summarize their fundamental properties.

Let $X_{i}$ be a Banach space equipped with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{X_{i}}(i=0,1)$ and suppose that $X_{1}$ is embedded in $X_{0}$ continuously and densely. Let $S$ be defined by

$$
S:=\{z \in \mathbb{C} ; 0<\operatorname{Re} z<1\}
$$

We say that a function $F: \bar{S} \rightarrow X_{0}$ belongs to $\mathcal{H}\left(X_{0}, X_{1}\right)$ if and only if the following conditions (H1)-(H3) are satisfied;
(H1) $F$ is analytic in $S$.
(H2) $F$ is bounded and continuous in $\bar{S}$.
(H3) $\mathbb{R} \ni y \mapsto F(1+i y) \in X_{1}$ is bounded and continuous.
It is known that $\mathcal{H}\left(X_{0}, X_{1}\right)$ is a Banach space with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}}$ given by

$$
\|F\|_{\mathcal{H}}:=\max \left(\sup _{y \in \mathbb{R}}\|F(i y)\|_{X_{0}}, \sup _{y \in \mathbb{R}}\|F(1+i y)\|_{X_{1}}\right), \quad F \in \mathcal{H}\left(X_{0}, X_{1}\right) .
$$

For each $0 \leq \theta \leq 1$, we define the space $\left[X_{0}, X_{1}\right]_{\theta}$ by

$$
\left[X_{0}, X_{1}\right]_{\theta}:=\left\{u \in X_{0} ; u=F(\theta) \text { for some } F \in \mathcal{H}\left(X_{0}, X_{1}\right)\right\}
$$

Moreover $\left[X_{0}, X_{1}\right]_{\theta}$ is a Banach space with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\theta}$ defined by

$$
\|u\|_{\theta}:=\inf _{\substack{F \in \mathcal{H}\left(X_{0}, X_{1}\right), F(\theta)=u}}\|F\|_{\mathcal{H}}, \quad u \in\left[X_{0}, X_{1}\right]_{\theta}
$$

By the interpolation, we can show various kinds of "intermediate properties". For example, if a linear operator $T$ is bounded from $X_{0}$ into $Y_{0}$ and from $X_{1}$ into $Y_{1}$ at the same time, then we can deduce that $T$ is also a bounded operator from $\left[X_{0}, X_{1}\right]_{\theta}$ into $\left[Y_{0}, Y_{1}\right]_{\theta}$ for any $0<\theta<1$.

Proposition A.1. Let $X_{1}\left(\right.$ resp. $\left.Y_{1}\right)$ be embedded to $X_{0}$ (resp. $Y_{0}$ ) densely and continuously. Then for any $0<\theta<1$,

$$
\mathcal{L}\left(X_{0}, Y_{0}\right) \cap \mathcal{L}\left(X_{1}, Y_{1}\right) \subset \mathcal{L}\left(\left[X_{0}, X_{1}\right]_{\theta},\left[Y_{0}, Y_{1}\right]_{\theta}\right)
$$

and we have

$$
\|T\|_{\mathcal{L}\left(\left[X_{0}, X_{1}\right]_{\theta},\left[Y_{0}, Y_{1}\right]_{\theta}\right)} \leq\|T\|_{\mathcal{L}\left(X_{0}, Y_{0}\right)}^{1-\theta}\|T\|_{\mathcal{L}\left(X_{1}, Y_{1}\right)}^{\theta}, \quad T \in \mathcal{L}\left(X_{0}, Y_{0}\right) \cap \mathcal{L}\left(X_{1}, Y_{1}\right) .
$$

Moreover we can also characterize the domain of fractional power of operators;

Proposition A.2. Let $X$ be a Hilbert space and $A: X \rightarrow X$ be a positive and self-adjoint operator. Then we have

$$
\mathcal{D}\left(A^{\theta}\right)=[X, \mathcal{D}(A)]_{\theta}, \quad 0 \leq \theta \leq 1
$$

with isometry.

Here we note that $[X, \mathcal{D}(A)]_{\theta}$ stated above coincides with $[\mathcal{D}(A), X]_{1-\theta}$ in the notation by Lions and Magenes [3].

## Appendix B. Sobolev spaces

Let $\Omega$ be a domain of $\mathbb{R}^{d}$ with smooth boundary $\Gamma=\partial \Omega$. We dentoe by $H^{s}(\Omega), s \geq 0$, the space of Bessel potentials (see e.g., [6]). We can see that $H^{s}(\Omega), s \geq 0$, has a good property with respect to the interpolation;

$$
\left[H^{s_{1}}(\Omega), H^{s_{2}}(\Omega)\right]_{\theta}=H^{(1-\theta) s_{1}+\theta s_{2}}(\Omega), \quad 0 \leq s_{1}<s_{2}<\infty .
$$

As a characterization of subspaces of $H^{s}(\Omega)$ consisting of the functions vanishing on $\Gamma$, we often use $H_{0}^{s}(\Omega)$ (also denoted by $\stackrel{\circ}{H}^{s}(\Omega)$ ), the closure of $C_{0}^{\infty}(\Omega)$ in $H^{s}(\Omega)$. We note that $H_{0}^{s}(\Omega)$ for $0 \leq s \leq 1$ has the representation as

$$
H_{0}^{s}(\Omega)= \begin{cases}H^{s}(\Omega), & 0 \leq s \leq \frac{1}{2}  \tag{B.1}\\ \left\{u \in H^{s}(\Omega) ;\left.u\right|_{\Gamma}=0\right\}, & \frac{1}{2}<s \leq 1\end{cases}
$$

However, we see that for these spaces, good properties concerning the interpolation fails for some "singular" cases-when $s=$ integer $+1 / 2$. Indeed, according to Theorem 11.6 in Chapter 1 of [3], the identity

$$
\left[H_{0}^{s_{1}}(\Omega), H_{0}^{s_{2}}(\Omega)\right]_{\theta}=H_{0}^{(1-\theta) s_{1}+\theta s_{2}}(\Omega)
$$

is valid for the case in which $s_{1}, s_{2},(1-\theta) s_{1}+\theta s_{2} \neq$ integer $+1 / 2$. On the other hand, by Theorem 11.7 in Chapter 1 of [3], if $(1-\theta) s_{1}+\theta s_{2}=\mu+1 / 2$ for some integer $\mu\left(s_{1}, s_{2}\right.$ are still assumed not to be integer $+1 / 2$ ), then

$$
\begin{equation*}
H_{00}^{\mu+1 / 2}(\Omega):=\left[H_{0}^{s_{1}}(\Omega), H_{0}^{s_{2}}(\Omega)\right]_{\theta} \varsubsetneqq H_{0}^{\mu+1 / 2}(\Omega) \tag{B.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

In particular, for $\mu=0$ we have

$$
\left[L^{2}(\Omega), H_{0}^{1}(\Omega)\right]_{1 / 2}=H_{00}^{1 / 2}(\Omega) \varsubsetneqq H_{0}^{1 / 2}(\Omega)=H^{1 / 2}(\Omega)
$$

We note that the space $H_{00}^{\mu+1 / 2}(\Omega)$ also can be characterized without interpolation. In fact, by (11.52) in Chapter 1 of [3], we have the repredentation as

$$
\begin{equation*}
H_{00}^{\mu+1 / 2}(\Omega)=\left\{u \in H_{0}^{\mu+1 / 2}(\Omega) ; \rho^{-1 / 2} \partial_{x}^{\alpha} u \in L^{2}(\Omega) \text { for }|\alpha|=\mu\right\} \tag{B.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\rho: \bar{\Omega} \rightarrow[0, \infty)$ is a smooth function such that

$$
\lim _{x \rightarrow x_{0}} \frac{\rho(x)}{d(x, \Gamma)}=d \neq 0, \quad x_{0} \in \Gamma
$$

Moreover by substituting $\mu=0$ in (B.3), we can rewrite (B.3) as

$$
H_{00}^{1 / 2}(\Omega)=\left\{u \in H^{1 / 2}(\Omega) ; \int_{\Omega} \frac{|u(x)|^{2}}{\rho(x)} d x<\infty\right\}
$$

Thus we see that each element in $H_{00}^{1 / 2}(\Omega)$ vanishes on $\Gamma$ in a certain sense.
In the following, therefore, we introduce another formulation of functions in $H^{s}(\Omega)$ vanishing on $\Gamma$, which includes $H_{00}^{\mu+1 / 2}(\Omega)$ as a particular case. We denote by $\widetilde{H}^{s}(\Omega)$ the subspace of $H^{s}\left(\mathbb{R}^{d}\right)$ consisting of the functions which are identically zero outside $\Omega$ (see (4.3.2.1b) in [6]). That is,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\widetilde{H}^{s}(\Omega):=\left\{u \in H^{s}\left(\mathbb{R}^{d}\right) ; \operatorname{supp} u \subset \bar{\Omega}\right\} . \tag{B.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

By regarding elements of $\widetilde{H}^{s}(\Omega)$ as functions defined on $\Omega$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\widetilde{H}^{s}(\Omega)=H_{0}^{s}(\Omega), \quad s \geq 0, s \neq \text { integer }+\frac{1}{2} \tag{B.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Moreover, we have the following good property for interpolation (see Corollary 1.6 in Chapter 3 of Strichartz [5]);

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left[\widetilde{H}^{s_{1}}(\Omega), \widetilde{H}^{s_{2}}(\Omega)\right]_{\theta}=\widetilde{H}^{(1-\theta) s_{1}+\theta s_{2}}(\Omega), \quad 0 \leq s_{1}<s_{2}<\infty, 0 \leq \theta \leq 1 \tag{B.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

By comparing (B.2) with (B.6) and noting (B.5), we have

$$
H_{00}^{\mu+1 / 2}(\Omega)=\widetilde{H}^{\mu+1 / 2}(\Omega), \quad \mu \in \mathbb{N}_{0}
$$

This identity also can be verified by comparing the representations (B.3) and (2.4.2.7) in [6] with $p=2$. Thus the subspace $\widetilde{H}^{s}(\Omega)$ introduced in (B.4) is more appropriate than $H_{0}^{s}(\Omega)$ when we deal with interpolation.
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