

# GLOBAL EXISTENCE OF A NONLINEAR WAVE EQUATION ARISING FROM NORDSTRÖM'S THEORY OF GRAVITATION

UWE BRAUER AND LAVI KARP

ABSTRACT. We show global existence of classical solutions for the nonlinear Nordström theory with a source term and a cosmological constant under the assumption that the source term is small in an appropriate norm, with periodic initial data. That is why we study these equations on the three-dimensional torus  $\mathbb{T}^3$  in the Sobolev spaces  $H^m(\mathbb{T}^3)$ . In some cases, the initial data have to be small in an appropriate norm. In order to achieve that the solutions decay asymptotically to zero, we are forced to use also the homogeneous Sobolev spaces  $\dot{H}^m(\mathbb{T}^3)$ . Moreover, we provide a blow-up result if the conditions of our global existence theorem are not met. We use Fourier series techniques and the theory of symmetric hyperbolic systems to achieve our results.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Mathematical Preliminaries	5
3. The Cauchy problem for a semi-linear wave equation using Fourier series	8
4. The wave equation as a modified symmetric hyperbolic system	14
5. Blowup of solutions for large $a(t, x)$	22
References	27

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the work presented here is to prove global existence and uniqueness of classical solutions and its asymptotic behavior of a semi-linear wave equation with dumping terms. This wave equation arises in the context of the nonlinear Nordström theory of gravity, which we shall describe in what follows.

The first fully relativistic, consistent, theory of gravitation was a scalar theory developed by Nordström [Nor13], where the gravitational field is described by a nonlinear hyperbolic equation for the

---

UWE BRAUER DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICA APLICADA, UNIVERSIDAD COMPLUTENSE MADRID 28040 MADRID, SPAIN

LAVI KARP DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, ORT BRAUDE COLLEGE, P.O. BOX 78, 21982 KARMIEL, ISRAEL  
*E-mail addresses:* `oub@mat.ucm.es`, `karp@braude.ac.il`.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35Q31 (35B30 35L45 35L60).

*Key words and phrases.* Global existence, Nordström theory, semi-linear wave equation, homogeneous Sobolev spaces, hyperbolic symmetric systems, energy estimates.

U. B. gratefully acknowledges support from Grant MTM2016-75465 by MINECO, Spain and UCM-GR17-920894.

scalar field  $\phi$ . Although the theory is not in agreement with observations it provides, due to its nonlinearity, some interesting mathematical challenges. Surprisingly, this theory has never been mathematically investigated, although its linear version coupled to the Euler equations has been studied by Speck [Spe09] and coupled to the Vlasov equation by Calogero [Cal03].

We follow here the geometric reformulation provided by Einstein-Fokker [EF14] and will use the Euler equations as a matter model. See also Straumann [Str86, Chap. 2.] for a modern representation of that theory. The basic idea of this theory is that the physical metric  $g_{\alpha\beta}$  is related to the Minkowski metric  $\eta_{\alpha\beta}$  by the following conformal transformation.

$$g_{\alpha\beta} = \phi^2 \eta_{\alpha\beta}, \quad (1.1)$$

where  $\eta_{\alpha\beta} = \text{diag}(-1, 1, 1, 1)$ . The matter is described by an energy-momentum tensor, which in the case of a perfect fluid takes the form.

$$T^{\alpha\beta} = (\epsilon + p) u^\alpha u^\beta + p g^{\alpha\beta},$$

where  $\epsilon$  denotes the energy density,  $p$  the pressure and  $u^\alpha$  is the unit timelike vector which satisfies

$$g_{\alpha\beta} u^\alpha u^\beta = -1.$$

The field equations, as proposed by Einstein and Fokker takes the following form

$$R = T, \quad (1.2)$$

here we set the relevant constants to one, the Ricci scalar is denoted by  $R$  and the trace of the fundamental energy tensor by  $T = g_{\alpha\beta} T^{\alpha\beta}$ . Using equation (1.1), the Ricci scalar takes the form

$$R = -6 \frac{\square \phi}{\phi^3}, \quad \square \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \eta^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\alpha \partial_\beta. \quad (1.3)$$

While the Euler equations take the form

$$\nabla_\alpha T^{\alpha\beta} = 0, \quad (1.4)$$

where  $\nabla_\alpha$  is the covariant derivative associated with  $g_{\alpha\beta}$ . Combining equations (1.2), (1.3) and (1.4), the Euler-Nordström system takes the following form

$$\begin{aligned} \square \phi &= -\frac{1}{6} T \phi^3 \\ \nabla_\alpha T^{\alpha\beta} &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (1.5a)$$

**Remark 1** (Different form of the field equation). We want to point out that it is possible to consider a slightly different conformal transformation (see for example [Cal03] or [Spe09]), namely

$$g_{\alpha\beta} = e^{2\psi} \eta_{\alpha\beta},$$

which leads to an equivalent nonlinear wave equation

$$\square \psi + (\nabla \psi)^2 = -\frac{1}{6} e^{2\psi} T.$$

**1.1. The field equations with cosmological constant and background solutions.** In what follows we modify the field equation (1.5a) by adding a term which corresponds to the cosmological constant  $\Lambda$  in General Relativity in the following way,

$$\square\phi = -\frac{1}{6}T\phi^3 - \Lambda\phi. \quad (1.6)$$

This choice is motivated by the properties of explicit solutions which are homogeneous and isotropic, namely that these properties are very similar to the ones of Euler-Einstein (see e.g. [CB09, Chap. V], [Ren08, Chap. 10]), and Euler-Poisson ([BRR94]), which we will discuss below.

We denote an isotropic and homogeneous vacuum background solution by  $\mathring{\phi}$ , and for convenience we set  $\varkappa^2 = \Lambda > 0$ . Homogeneity implies that the function  $\mathring{\phi}$  depends just on  $t$ , while the fact that the solution describes vacuum leads to the conclusion that  $T \equiv 0$ . Therefore equation (1.6) reduces to

$$-\frac{d^2}{dt^2}\mathring{\phi} = -\varkappa^2\mathring{\phi}.$$

This differential equation has a general solution of the form  $\mathring{\phi} = Ae^{\varkappa t} + Be^{-\varkappa t}$ . Since we want that our solution has similar behavior to the so-called flat de Sitter solution in general relativity (see for example [CB09, Chap. V]), namely, that  $\mathring{\phi}$  and  $\frac{d}{dt}\mathring{\phi}$  are positive, we chose

$$\mathring{\phi}(t) = e^{\varkappa t}$$

as the background solution. Considering also the part  $Be^{-\varkappa t}$  would complicate the analysis but should not change the global behavior of the solutions, that is why we are neglecting this term.

We now study small deviations from the background solution  $\mathring{\phi}$ . So we make the following Ansatz

$$\phi = \mathring{\phi} + \Psi = e^{\varkappa t} + \Psi, \quad (1.7)$$

where  $\Psi$  denotes the deviation from the background. Then  $\Psi$  satisfies the following equation

$$\square\phi = \square(e^{\varkappa t} + \Psi) = -\varkappa^2 e^{\varkappa t} + \square\Psi = -\frac{1}{6}T(e^{\varkappa t} + \Psi)^3 - \varkappa^2(e^{\varkappa t} + \Psi).$$

Thus  $\Psi$  satisfies the initial value problem

$$\begin{cases} \square\Psi = -\frac{1}{6}T(e^{\varkappa t} + \Psi)^3 - \varkappa^2\Psi \\ \Psi(0, x) = \Psi_0(x), \quad \partial_t\Psi(0, x) = \Psi_1(x) \end{cases} \quad (1.8)$$

Our goal is:

- To show global existence of classical solutions for equation (1.8) demanding a small source term  $T$  and small initial data.
- To show that for large  $t$ , the metric  $\phi^2\eta_{\alpha\beta}$  approaches the background metric  $e^{2\varkappa t}\eta_{\alpha\beta}$ , or in other words

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\phi(t)}{\mathring{\phi}(t)} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{e^{\varkappa t} + \Psi(t)}{e^{\varkappa t}} = 1. \quad (1.9)$$

Note that if  $\Psi$  is small, then  $(e^{\varkappa t} + \Psi)^3 \sim e^{3\varkappa t}$ , and this term grows very rapidly and might prevent that the solution exists for all time. So in order to achieve the desired asymptotic behavior of  $\Psi$ , expressed by equation (1.9), we multiply  $\phi$  by  $e^{-\varkappa t}$ , then from equation (1.7) we conclude that  $e^{-\varkappa t}\phi = 1 + e^{-\varkappa t}\Psi$ , and therefore we set

$$\Omega \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} e^{-\varkappa t}\Psi.$$

for which we derive the following equation

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t \Omega &= \partial_t(e^{-\varkappa t} \Psi) = e^{-\varkappa t} \partial_t \Psi - \varkappa e^{-\varkappa t} \Psi = e^{-\varkappa t} \partial_t \Psi - \varkappa \Omega, \\ \partial_t^2 \Omega &= e^{-\varkappa t} \partial_t^2 \Psi - 2\varkappa e^{-\varkappa t} \partial_t \Psi + \varkappa^2 e^{-\varkappa t} \Psi = e^{-\varkappa t} \partial_t^2 \Psi - 2\varkappa(\partial_t \Omega + \varkappa \Omega) + \varkappa^2 \Omega \\ &= e^{-\varkappa t} \partial_t^2 \Psi - 2\varkappa \partial_t \Omega - \varkappa^2 \Omega,\end{aligned}$$

or

$$-e^{-\varkappa t} \partial_t^2 \Psi = -\partial_t^2 \Omega - 2\varkappa \partial_t \Omega - \varkappa^2 \Omega.$$

Thus we have obtained

$$e^{-\varkappa t} \square \Psi = \square \Omega - 2\varkappa \partial_t \Omega - \varkappa^2 \Omega = -\frac{1}{6} \widehat{T} e^{-\varkappa t} (e^{\varkappa t} + \Psi)^3 - \varkappa^2 \Omega,$$

or

$$\square \Omega - 2\varkappa \partial_t \Omega = -\frac{1}{6} T(t, x) e^{2\varkappa t} (1 + \Omega)^3. \quad (1.10)$$

We wish to show the existence of global classical solutions for system (1.10) demanding a small source term  $T(t, x)$ . On the one hand, the term  $e^{2\varkappa t}$  seems to hamper the proof of the desired global existence, but on the other hand, we have obtained a good dissipative term of the form  $-2\varkappa \partial_t \Omega$ . This is why we perform the transformation  $\widetilde{T} = \widetilde{g}_{\alpha\beta} \widetilde{T}^{\alpha\beta} = e^{3\varkappa t} T$ , which also implies that the right-hand of the wave equation (1.10) takes the form  $-\frac{1}{6} e^{-\varkappa t} \widetilde{T} (1 + \Omega)^3$ . If  $\Omega$  remains bounded then the right-hand side will tend to zero. That is why, we, finally, consider the following system

$$-\partial_t^2 \Omega - 2\varkappa \partial_t \Omega + \Delta \Omega = -e^{-\varkappa t} a(t, x) (1 + \Omega)^3 \quad (1.11a)$$

$$(\Omega(0, x), \partial_t \Omega(0, x)) = (f(x), g(x)). \quad (1.11b)$$

where we have denoted  $\frac{1}{6} \widetilde{T}$  by  $a(t, x)$ .

**Remark 2** (The scaling and the Euler equations). The above scaling of the trace of the energy-momentum tensor will change the Euler equations. That is why this scaling has to be taken into account for the coupled Euler-Nordström system, which we want to treat in a forthcoming paper. Moreover, it turns out that we also need to scale the metric and the velocity as follows:  $\widetilde{g}_{\alpha\beta} = e^{-2\varkappa t} g_{\alpha\beta} = e^{-2\varkappa t} \phi^2 \eta_{\alpha\beta}$ , and the  $\widetilde{u}^\alpha = e^{\varkappa t} u^\alpha$ , which is compatible with the scaling  $\widetilde{T} = e^{3\varkappa t} T$ .

In what follows we will not consider the Euler-Nordström system but instead consider the fluid as a given source of the field equations, and therefore we will consider the right-hand side of equation (1.2) as a given function of  $(t, x)$ . A similar setting was considered by H. Friedrich for the Einstein vacuum equations with positive cosmological constant, in which he proved global existence of classical solutions for small initial data [Fri86].

If we can show that  $\Omega(t) \rightarrow 0$  for  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , then this will imply that for large  $t$   $\phi(t, x) \sim e^{\varkappa t} = \mathring{\phi}(t)$ , in other words,  $\phi$  converges to the background solution. We also point out that we require the deviation  $e^{\varkappa t} \Omega = \Psi$  to be spatially periodic, and that is why we consider it on the torus  $\mathbb{T}^3$ . Since the background solution is not empty, we consider these deviations to have vanishing mean value, that is,

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \Omega dx = 0.$$

That is why, we study the Cauchy problem (1.11a)–(1.11b) in the homogeneous Sobolev spaces  $\dot{H}^m(\mathbb{T}^3)$ . Having set up the problem, we outline the structure of our paper and summarize our main results.

In section 2, we introduce the necessary mathematical tools, such as homogeneous and non-homogeneous Sobolev spaces on the torus  $\mathbb{T}^3$ . Using Fourier series, in section 3, we obtain, for small initial data and a small source term, global existence, uniqueness and asymptotic decay of these solutions in the  $\dot{H}^m(\mathbb{T}^3)$  spaces (see Theorem 1). We turn then to the non-homogeneous, ordinary, Sobolev spaces  $H^m$  and again show global existence and uniqueness for small initial data, and a small source term. However, the solutions do not decay to zero as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  (see Theorem 2). We then turn, in section 4, to the theory of symmetric hyperbolic systems. We write the wave equation in a slightly unorthodox way as a symmetric hyperbolic system (see system (4.2)) and then prove global existence, uniqueness and asymptotic decay for a small source term, but not necessarily small initial data, (see Theorem 3). The reason we consider the semi-linear wave equation (1.11a) in the framework of the theory of symmetric hyperbolic systems is that in the future we want to consider the coupled Euler-Nordström system, and we know already the Euler equations can be cast into that form (see [BK14]). Finally, in the last section, we show that if the source term is not small, then the corresponding solutions blow up in finite time. This result is proven for the solutions in the non-homogeneous Sobolev spaces. At the moment, we do not know whether solutions in the homogeneous spaces blow up for a large source term.

## 2. MATHEMATICAL PRELIMINARIES

2.1. **Sobolev spaces on the torus  $\mathbb{T}^3$ .** We consider the solutions on the torus  $\mathbb{T}^3$  using ordinary Sobolev spaces  $H^m$ , as well as homogeneous Sobolev spaces  $\dot{H}^m$ , where  $m$  is a nonnegative integer (see e.g. [Tay97a, Chap 3.1], [Rob01, Chap. 5.10]). It is natural to represent a function on the torus by Fourier series and their norms by Fourier coefficients. For a function  $f$ , its Fourier series is given by

$$f(x) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^3} \hat{f}_k e^{ix \cdot k}, \quad (2.1)$$

where

$$\hat{f}_k = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} f(x) e^{-ix \cdot k} dx, \quad (2.2)$$

and  $x \cdot k = x_1 k_1 + x_2 k_2 + x_3 k_3$ ,  $x \in \mathbb{T}^3$  and  $k \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ .

The  $H^m$  norm is given by

$$\|f\|_{H^m(\mathbb{T}^3)}^2 = \|f\|_{H^m}^2 = |\hat{f}_0|^2 + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^3} |k|^{2m} |\hat{f}_k|^2. \quad (2.3)$$

As we pointed out in the introduction, there are situations in which it might be appropriate to consider that the deviations have mean value zero, and it is, therefore, natural to consider their norms in the homogeneous  $\dot{H}^m$  space,

$$\|f\|_{\dot{H}^m(\mathbb{T}^3)}^2 = \|f\|_{\dot{H}^m}^2 = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^3} |k|^{2m} |\hat{f}_k|^2. \quad (2.4)$$

By Parseval's identity, these norms are equivalent to

$$\|f\|_{H^m(\mathbb{T}^3)}^2 \simeq \sum_{|\alpha| \leq m} \|\partial^\alpha f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)}^2,$$

and

$$\|f\|_{\dot{H}^m(\mathbb{T}^3)}^2 \simeq \sum_{|\alpha|=m} \|\partial^\alpha f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)}^2.$$

We also introduce an inner-product in the homogeneous spaces. For two vector valid function  $U$  and  $V$ , we set

$$\langle U, V \rangle_m = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^3} |k|^2 (\widehat{U}_k \cdot \widehat{V}_k).$$

The homogeneous norm  $\|u\|_{\dot{H}^m}$  vanishes if  $u$  is a constant function. Hence  $\dot{H}^s$  is a semi Banach space.

The following proposition which is a certain version of Wirtinger's inequality [DP85] is a simple consequence of the representation of the homogeneous norm (2.4).

**Proposition 1.** *Let  $\partial_x u = (\partial_1 u, \partial_2 u, \partial_3 u)^T$  and  $u \in \dot{H}^{m+1}$  and  $m \geq 0$  be an integer. Then the following holds*

$$\|u\|_{\dot{H}^{m+1}} = \|\partial_x u\|_{\dot{H}^m}.$$

*Proof.* Since  $|(\widehat{\partial_x u})_k|^2 = |k|^2 |\widehat{u}_k|^2$ , we obtain by the representation (2.4) of the norm that

$$\|\partial_x u\|_{\dot{H}^m}^2 = \sum_{0 \neq k \in \mathbb{Z}^3} |k|^{2m} |(\widehat{\partial_x u})_k|^2 = \sum_{0 \neq k \in \mathbb{Z}^3} |k|^{2m} |k|^2 |\widehat{u}_k|^2 = \|u\|_{\dot{H}^{m+1}}^2$$

which proves the proposition.  $\square$

We recall that the known properties in Sobolev spaces, defined over  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , as for example multiplication, embedding and Moser type estimates, hold also for Sobolev spaces defined over the torus  $\mathbb{T}^n$ , see e.g. [Tay97b, Chap. 13].

In the following let  $C_m$  be the constant such that  $\|fg\|_{H^m(\mathbb{T}^3)} \leq C_m \|f\|_{H^m(\mathbb{T}^3)} \|g\|_{H^m(\mathbb{T}^3)}$ . Then the following estimate holds.

**Proposition 2** (A Nonlinear estimate). *Let  $m > \frac{3}{2}$ ,  $u \in \dot{H}^m$ ,  $h \in H^m$ , then*

$$\|(1+u)^3 h\|_{\dot{H}^m} \leq C_m^3 \|h\|_{H^m} \left(1 + \|u\|_{\dot{H}^m}^2\right)^{\frac{3}{2}}. \quad (2.5)$$

*Proof.* By the multiplication property ([Tay97b, Proposition 3.7, Chap. 13]) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(1+u)^3 h\|_{\dot{H}^m} &\leq \|(1+u)^3 h\|_{H^m} \leq C_m \|h\|_{H^m} \|(1+u)^3\|_{H^m} \\ &\leq C_m^3 \|h\|_{H^m} \|(1+u)\|_{H^m}^3. \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

Since  $u$  belongs to the homogeneous Sobolev space, it is orthogonal to 1, and therefore we can conclude that  $\|(1+u)\|_{H^m}^2 = 1 + \|u\|_{\dot{H}^m}^2$ , which in combination with inequality (2.6) proves estimated (2.5).  $\square$

We shall also need the following property of solution to semi-linear symmetric hyperbolic systems. Consider a symmetric hyperbolic system

$$\partial_t U = \sum_{j=1}^3 A^j(x) \partial_j U + F(U), \quad (2.7)$$

where the matrices  $A^j(x)$  are smooth and symmetric.

**Proposition 3.** *Let  $m > \frac{3}{2}$ ,  $A^j \in C^m$ , and  $U(t) \in L^\infty([0, T]; H^m)$  be the solution to system (2.7) with initial data  $U_0 \in H^m$ . Then the following inequality holds*

$$\|U(t) - U_0\|_{H^{m-1}} \leq C_0(\|U_0\|_{H^m})t^{1/m},$$

where the constant  $C_0(\|U_0\|_{H^m})$  depends just on the norm of the initial data.

We note that this estimate holds also for the  $\dot{H}^m$  spaces.

*Proof.* Let  $t < T$ , then

$$U(t, x) - U_0(x) = \int_0^t \partial_t U(\tau, x) d\tau.$$

By the Cauchy Schwarz inequality, it follows that

$$\left| U(t, x) - U_0(x) \right|^2 \leq t \int_0^t |\partial_t U(\tau, x)|^2 d\tau.$$

Hence we conclude that

$$\|U(t, x) - U_0(x)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq t \int_0^t \int |\partial_t U(\tau, x)|^2 dx d\tau \leq t^2 \|\partial_t U\|_{L^\infty([0, T]; L^2)}^2. \quad (2.8)$$

Since  $U$  satisfies system (2.7), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_t U(t)\|_{H^{m-1}} &\leq \sum_{j=1}^3 \|A^j(x) \partial_j U(t)\|_{H^{m-1}} + \|F(U(t))\|_{H^{m-1}} \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^3 K_j \|\partial_j U(t)\|_{H^m} + \|F(U(t))\|_{H^m}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

where  $K_j = \max_{|\alpha| \leq m-1} \|A^j\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3)}$ . By the third Moser [Tay97b, Proposition 3.9, Chap. 13] estimate,  $\|F(U(t))\|_{H^m} \leq C\|U(t)\|_{H^m}$ . It is also known that  $\|U(t)\|_{H^m}$  is bounded in the existence interval by a constant depending just on  $\|U_0\|_{H^m}$ , see e.g. [BCD11]. Hence by inequalities (2.9) and by the above estimates, we can conclude that

$$\|\partial_t U\|_{L^\infty([0, T]; L^2)} \leq C \|\partial_t U\|_{L^\infty([0, T]; H^{m-1})} \leq C(\|U_0\|_{H^m}).$$

So now by an intermediate estimate (see e.g. [BCD11, Prop. 1.52]) and (2.8), it follows that

$$\|U(t) - U_0\|_{H^{m-1}} \leq \|U(t) - U_0\|_{H^m}^{(m-1)/m} \|U(t) - U_0\|_{L^2}^{1/m} \leq C_0(\|U_0\|_{H^m})t^{1/m}. \quad (2.10)$$

□

We shall use the following version of Gronwall's inequality (see e. g. [BCD11]).

**Lemma 1** (Gronwall's inequality). *Let  $g$  be a  $C^1$  function,  $f$ ,  $F$  and  $A$  continuous function in the interval  $[t_0, T]$ . Suppose that for  $t \in [t_0, T]$   $g$  obeys*

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} g^2(t) \leq A(t)g^2(t) + f(t)g(t).$$

Then for  $t \in [t_0, T]$  we have

$$g(t) \leq e^{\int_{t_0}^t A(\tau) d\tau} g(t_0) + \int_{t_0}^t e^{\int_\tau^t A(s) ds} f(\tau) d\tau.$$

### 3. THE CAUCHY PROBLEM FOR A SEMI-LINEAR WAVE EQUATION USING FOURIER SERIES

In the following we want to investigate the Cauchy problem (1.11a)–(1.11b), however, for convenience, we multiply the wave equation by  $-1$  and denote the unknown by  $u$  instead of  $\Omega$ , which results in the following semi-linear wave equation

$$\partial_t^2 u + 2\kappa \partial_t u - \Delta u = e^{-\kappa t} a(t, x)(1 + u)^3 \quad (3.1a)$$

$$(u(0, x), \partial_t u(0, x)) = (f(x), g(x)). \quad (3.1b)$$

Here  $\kappa$  is a positive constant, while  $a(t, x)$  is a smooth function as we discussed in Section 1.1.

We are interested in the following properties of the Cauchy problem (3.1a)–(3.1b):

1. Global existence for small data.
2. Decay of the solutions in the form  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} u(t, x) = 0$ .

We also note, that the Cauchy problem (3.1a)–(3.1b) has some similarities with the Cauchy problem of the damped semi-linear wave equation

$$\partial_t^2 u + 2\kappa \partial_t u - \Delta u = |u|^p, \quad (t, x) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^3. \quad (3.2a)$$

$$(u(0, x), \partial_t u(0, x)) = (f(x), g(x)). \quad (3.2b)$$

for which it is known that for  $2 \leq p \leq 3$  there exist global solutions for small initial data, for further details we refer to [ER18], [TB01] and the references therein. However, we did not find in the literature any results concerning the Cauchy problem (3.2a)–(3.2b) on the torus. There is however another difference, between these two Cauchy problems (3.2a)–(3.2b) and (3.1a)–(3.1b). In equation (3.1a), the function  $a(t, x)$  is essential, in the sense that global existence depends on the smallness of this function, while the structure of the nonlinear term is of less importance.

**3.1. Solutions in the homogeneous spaces.** We first consider the Cauchy problem (3.1a)–(3.1b) in the homogeneous Sobolev spaces, since in the nonhomogeneous Sobolev spaces the solutions do not decay to zero as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ .

**Theorem 1** (Global existence and asymptotic behavior). *Let  $m > \frac{3}{2}$ ,  $f \in \dot{H}^{m+1}$ ,  $g \in \dot{H}^m$ , and  $a \in C([0, \infty); H^m)$ . Then there is a suitable constant  $\varepsilon$  such that if the following holds*

$$\|f\|_{\dot{H}^{m+1}}, \|g\|_{\dot{H}^m}, \sup_{[0, \infty)} \|a(t, \cdot)\|_{H^m} < \varepsilon,$$

then the Cauchy problem (3.1a)–(3.1b) has a unique global solution of the form

$$u \in C([0, \infty); \dot{H}^{m+1}). \quad (3.3)$$

Moreover, there exist positive constants  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  such that

$$\|u(t, \cdot)\|_{\dot{H}^{m+1}} \leq e^{-\kappa t} \sqrt{C_1 + C_2(e\kappa)^2 t^2}. \quad (3.4)$$

**Remark 3** (The asymptotic behavior of the metric). The physical metric has the following scaling  $g_{\alpha\beta} = \phi^2 \eta_{\alpha\beta}$ , therefore the transformation  $\tilde{g}_{\alpha\beta} = e^{-2\kappa t} g_{\alpha\beta}$  results in  $(e^{-\kappa t} \phi)^2 \eta_{\alpha\beta}$ . Now recall that  $\phi = e^{\kappa t}(1 + u)$ , where  $u$  is the solution to the Cauchy problem (3.1a)–(3.1b), so we conclude that  $g_{\alpha\beta} = (1 + u)^2 \eta_{\alpha\beta}$ , and as a consequence of Theorem 1 we will obtain the desired result, namely,  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \left( \frac{g_{\alpha\beta}(t, x)}{e^{2\kappa t} \eta_{\alpha\beta}} \right) = 1$ , that is, the perturbed metric converges to the background metric, which is, as we pointed out in Section 1.1, what we want to achieve.



**Outline of the proof.** The main points and ideas of the proof of Theorem 1 can be described as follows:

1. Obtain an energy estimate for the linearized equation.
2. Use the Banach fixed pointed theorem for the linearized equation.
3. Use the estimate of the linear equation in order to estimate the asymptotic behavior.

3.1.1. *Energy estimates for the linearized system.* In this subsection, we consider the linearized version of equation (3.1a). We linearize this equation by replacing the right-hand side of  $e^{-\varkappa t} a(t, x) (1 + u)^3$  by  $e^{-\varkappa t} a(t, x) (1 + v)^3$ , for any function  $v \in \dot{H}^m$ . So we set

$$F(t, x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} a(t, x) (1 + v)^3$$

and consider the following linear initial value problem

$$\partial_t^2 u + 2\varkappa \partial_t u - \Delta u = e^{-\varkappa t} F(t, x) \quad (3.5a)$$

$$(u(0, x), \partial_t u(0, x)) = (f(x), g(x)). \quad (3.5b)$$

Since equation (3.5a) is a linear equation, the solution exists for all  $t \geq 0$ . We shall derive the following energy estimate for equation (3.5a), where for convenience we assume  $\varkappa < 1$ .

**Proposition 4** (Energy estimate for the linearised wave equation). *Let  $m \geq 0$  and  $0 < \varkappa < 1$ , and assume  $F \in C([0, \infty); \dot{H}^m)$ ,  $f \in \dot{H}^{m+1}$ , and  $g \in \dot{H}^m$ . Then there exists a unique solution  $u \in C([0, \infty); \dot{H}^{m+1})$  to equation (3.5a) with initial data (3.5b), and moreover, it obeys*

$$\|u(t, \cdot)\|_{\dot{H}^{m+1}}^2 \leq 2e^{-2\varkappa t} \left\{ 2(1 + \varkappa^2) \|f\|_{\dot{H}^{m+1}}^2 + 2\|g\|_{\dot{H}^m}^2 + t \int_0^t \|F(\tau, \cdot)\|_{\dot{H}^m}^2 d\tau \right\}. \quad (3.6)$$

*Proof.* We expand  $u$ ,  $F$  and the initial data according to equation (2.1) and (2.2) in its corresponding Fourier series, and we obtain for each  $0 \neq k \in \mathbb{Z}^3$  an ordinary differential equation

$$\widehat{u}_k''(t) + 2\varkappa \widehat{u}_k'(t) + |k|^2 \widehat{u}_k(t) = e^{-\varkappa t} \widehat{F}_k(t), \quad (3.7a)$$

$$\widehat{u}_k(0) = \widehat{f}_k, \quad \widehat{u}_k'(0) = \widehat{g}_k. \quad (3.7b)$$

The solution of the initial value problem (3.7a)- (3.7b) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{u}_k(t) &= e^{-\varkappa t} \left\{ \widehat{f}_k \cos\left(\sqrt{|k|^2 - \varkappa^2} t\right) + \frac{\widehat{g}_k + \varkappa \widehat{f}_k}{\sqrt{|k|^2 - \varkappa^2}} \sin\left(\sqrt{|k|^2 - \varkappa^2} t\right) \right\} \\ &+ \frac{1}{\sqrt{|k|^2 - \varkappa^2}} \int_0^t e^{-\varkappa(t-s)} \sin\left(\sqrt{|k|^2 - \varkappa^2}(t-s)\right) e^{-\varkappa s} \widehat{F}_k(s) ds \\ &= e^{-\varkappa t} \left\{ \widehat{f}_k \cos\left(\sqrt{|k|^2 - \varkappa^2} t\right) + \frac{\widehat{g}_k + \varkappa \widehat{f}_k}{\sqrt{|k|^2 - \varkappa^2}} \sin\left(\sqrt{|k|^2 - \varkappa^2} t\right) \right. \\ &\left. + \frac{e^{-\varkappa t}}{\sqrt{|k|^2 - \varkappa^2}} \int_0^t \sin\left(\sqrt{|k|^2 - \varkappa^2}(t-s)\right) \widehat{F}_k(s) ds \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

We shall use the following three elementary inequalities:  $(a+b+c)^2 \leq 2(a^2+b^2+c^2)$ ,  $\left(\int_0^t F(\tau)d\tau\right)^2 \leq t \int_0^t F^2(\tau)d\tau$  and for  $\varkappa < 1$ ,  $\frac{|k|^{2(m+1)}}{|k|^2-\varkappa^2} \leq |k|^{2m}$ . Then from equation (3.8) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} |k|^{2(m+1)}|\widehat{u}_n(t)|^2 &\leq 2e^{-2\varkappa t} \left\{ |k|^{2(m+1)}|\widehat{f}_k|^2 + |k|^{2m}|\widehat{g}_k + \varkappa\widehat{f}_k|^2 + |k|^{2m}t \int_0^t |\widehat{F}_k(\tau)|^2 d\tau \right\} \\ &\leq 2e^{-2\varkappa t} \left\{ 2(1 + \varkappa^2)|k|^{2(m+1)}|\widehat{f}_k|^2 + 2|k|^{2m}|\widehat{g}_k|^2 + t \int_0^t |k|^{2m}|\widehat{F}_k(\tau)|^2 d\tau \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

Summarizing equation (3.9) over all  $k \in \mathbb{Z}^3$  and by the definition of the norm (2.4), we obtain estimate (3.6).  $\square$

3.1.2. *The fixed point argument.* Based on the energy estimate (3.6) of the solution to the linear Cauchy problem (3.5a)–(3.5b), we shall show the existence to the Cauchy problem (3.1a)–(3.1b) in the interval  $[0, \infty)$  in the homogeneous space  $\dot{H}^{m+1}$  for  $m \geq \frac{3}{2}$ , under the assumption that the initial data, as well as  $a(t, x)$ , are sufficiently small. In order to achieve this, we define a linear operator

$$\mathcal{L} : C([0, \infty); \dot{H}^{m+1}) \rightarrow C([0, \infty); \dot{H}^{m+1}),$$

as follows. Let  $u = \mathcal{L}(v)$  be the solution to the linear equation

$$\partial_t^2 u + 2\varkappa \partial_t u - \Delta u = e^{-\varkappa t} a(t, x)(1 + v)^3, \quad (3.10a)$$

$$(u(0, x), \partial_t u(0, x)) = (f(x), g(x)). \quad (3.10b)$$

Next, we define a bounded set  $B \subset \dot{H}^{m+1}$  as follows

$$B = \{v(t, \cdot) \in C([0, \infty); \dot{H}^{m+1}) : \sup_{[0, \infty)} \|v(t, \cdot)\|_{\dot{H}^{m+1}} \leq \frac{1}{2}, v(0, x) = f(x), \partial_t v(0, x) = g(x)\}. \quad (3.11)$$

We shall prove that if  $\|f\|_{\dot{H}^{m+1}}$ ,  $\|g\|_{\dot{H}^m}$ , and  $\|a(t, \cdot)\|_{H^m}$  are sufficiently small, then

- a.  $\mathcal{L} : B \rightarrow B$ .
- b.  $\mathcal{L} : B \rightarrow B$  is a contraction.

We start to prove the first point. By Proposition 2, we have the following estimate

$$\|a(t, \cdot)(1 + v(t, \cdot))^3\|_{\dot{H}^m} \leq C_m^3 \|a(t, \cdot)\|_{H^m} \left(1 + \|v(t, \cdot)\|_{\dot{H}^m}^2\right)^{\frac{3}{2}} \leq C_m^3 \|a(t, \cdot)\|_{H^m} \left(\frac{5}{4}\right)^{\frac{3}{2}}. \quad (3.12)$$

In order to simplify the notation, we will denote  $v(t, \cdot)$  by  $v(t)$  from now on. Now we apply the energy estimate, Proposition 4, to  $F(t) = a(t, \cdot)(1 + v(t))^3$ , then by the above inequality we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \|u(t)\|_{\dot{H}^{m+1}}^2 &= \|\mathcal{L}(v(t))\|_{\dot{H}^{m+1}}^2 \\ &\leq 2e^{-2\varkappa t} \left\{ 2(1 + \varkappa^2)\|f\|_{\dot{H}^{m+1}}^2 + 2\|g\|_{\dot{H}^m}^2 + t^2 C_m^6 \|a(t, \cdot)\|_{H^m}^2 \left(\frac{5}{4}\right)^3 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $\max_{[0,\infty)} e^{-2\kappa t} t^2 = \left(\frac{1}{e\kappa}\right)^2$ , hence we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{t \in [0,\infty)} \|u(t)\|_{\dot{H}^{m+1}}^2 = \sup_{[0,\infty)} \|\mathcal{L}(v)(t)\|_{\dot{H}^{m+1}}^2 \\ & \leq 2 \left\{ 2(1 + \kappa^2) \|f\|_{\dot{H}^{m+1}}^2 + 2\|g\|_{\dot{H}^m}^2 + \left( \frac{\|a(t, \cdot)\|_{\dot{H}^m}^2}{e\kappa} \right)^2 C_m^6 \left(\frac{5}{4}\right)^3 \right\} \leq \frac{1}{4}, \end{aligned}$$

if

$$\left\{ (1 + \kappa^2) \|f\|_{\dot{H}^{m+1}}^2 + \|g\|_{\dot{H}^m}^2 \right\} \leq \frac{1}{32} \quad (3.13)$$

and

$$\sup_{[0,\infty)} \|a(t, \cdot)\|_{\dot{H}^m}^2 \leq \frac{(e\kappa)^2}{16C_m^6} \left(\frac{4}{5}\right)^3 = \frac{4(e\kappa)^2}{125C_m^6}. \quad (3.14)$$

We turn now to the contraction of  $\mathcal{L}$ . Let  $u_i = \mathcal{L}(v_i)$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , then  $u_1 - u_2$  satisfies equation (3.10a) with zero initial data and right-hand side of the form

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{-\kappa t} a(t, x) \left( (1 + v_1)^3 - (1 + v_2)^3 \right) \\ & = e^{-\kappa t} a(t, x) (v_1 - v_2) \left( 3 + 3(v_1 + v_2) + (v_1^2 + v_1 v_2 + v_2^2) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Using the multiplication property, we conclude that for  $v_1, v_2 \in B$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|a(t, \cdot) \left( (1 + v_1)^3 - (1 + v_2)^3 \right)\|_{\dot{H}^m} \\ & \leq C_m \|a(t, \cdot)\|_{H^m} \|v_1 - v_2\|_{\dot{H}^m} \left( 3 + 3C_m \left( \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \right) + C_m^2 \frac{3}{4} \right). \end{aligned}$$

So by the linear estimate (3.6), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \|u_1(t) - u_2(t)\|_{\dot{H}^{m+1}}^2 \\ & \leq \sup_{[0,t]} \|a(\tau, \cdot)\|_{H^m}^2 C_m^2 \left( C_m 6 + C_m^2 \frac{3}{4} \right)^2 e^{-2\kappa t} t^2 \|v_1(t) - v_2(t)\|_{\dot{H}^m}^2, \end{aligned}$$

which implies the following estimate

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{[0,\infty)} \|u_1(t) - u_2(t)\|_{\dot{H}^{m+1}}^2 \\ & \leq \sup_{[0,\infty)} \|a(\tau, \cdot)\|_{H^m} C_m \left( 6C_m + C_m^2 \frac{3}{4} \right) \left( \frac{1}{e\kappa} \right) \sup_{[0,\infty)} \|v_1(t) - v_2(t)\|_{\dot{H}^{m+1}} \\ & \leq \Upsilon \sup_{[0,\infty)} \|v_1(t) - v_2(t)\|_{\dot{H}^{m+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

We observe from the last inequality that  $\mathcal{L}$  is a contraction if  $\Upsilon < 1$ , or in other words

$$\sup_{[0,\infty)} \|a(\tau, \cdot)\|_{H^m} < \frac{e\kappa}{C_m \left( 6C_m + C_m^2 \frac{3}{4} \right)}. \quad (3.15)$$

Since the bound in inequality (3.15) is smaller than the one in inequality (3.14), we conclude by the Banach fixed point theorem that  $\mathcal{L}$  has a unique fixed point, and therefore the Cauchy problem (3.5a) and (3.5b) has a unique global solution, as specified in (3.3).

3.1.3. *The asymptotic behavior at infinity.* We turn now to the estimate (3.4). The essential tool, to prove this estimate, is the energy estimate (3.6), which results in

$$\|u(t)\|_{\dot{H}^{m+1}}^2 \leq 2e^{-2\kappa t} \left\{ 2(1 + \kappa^2) \|f\|_{\dot{H}^{m+1}}^2 + 2\|g\|_{\dot{H}^m}^2 + t \int_0^t \|F(\tau, \cdot)\|_{\dot{H}^m}^2 d\tau \right\}.$$

Since  $u$  belongs to the ball (3.11) we may apply inequality (3.12) and obtain that

$$\|u(t)\|_{\dot{H}^{m+1}}^2 \leq 2e^{-2\kappa t} \left\{ 2(1 + \kappa^2) \|f\|_{\dot{H}^{m+1}}^2 + 2\|g\|_{\dot{H}^m}^2 + t^2 \sup_{[0, \infty)} \|a(\tau, \cdot)\|_{H^m}^2 C_m^6 \left(\frac{5}{4}\right)^3 \right\}. \quad (3.16)$$

We now insert conditions (3.13) and (3.14) into inequality (3.16) and obtain

$$\|u(t)\|_{\dot{H}^{m+1}}^2 \leq \frac{e^{-2\kappa t}}{16} (1 + (e\kappa)^2 t^2). \quad (3.17)$$

Note that conditions (3.13) and (3.14) depends on the ball chosen (3.11), a different choice would result in conditions which are different to (3.13) and (3.14) and hence the estimate (3.17) would also look differently. This completes the proof of the asymptotic behavior.

**Remark 4.** We see from condition (3.13) that the smallness condition for the initial data does not depend on the cosmological constant  $\kappa$ , while it appears in the smallness assumption for  $a(t, x)$ , in (3.14). In particular, if the cosmological constant is zero, then this implies  $a(t, x) \equiv 0$  and consequently, the density and the pressure must also be identically zero. So it is not entirely clear whether condition (3.14) is indeed necessary for the conclusion of Theorem 1. Or, in other words, suppose we abandon condition (3.14), does this imply that the local solution blows up in a finite time? Or does it imply that if there exists a global solution, it might not decay for  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty}$ .

**3.2. Solutions in the nonhomogeneous Sobolev spaces.** We turn now to the nonhomogeneous Sobolev spaces and we shall study the question of global solutions and decay properties of these solutions. The result can be stated in the following theorem:

**Theorem 2** (Global existence in the non-homogeneous spaces). *Let  $m > \frac{3}{2}$ ,  $0 < \kappa < 1$ ,  $f \in H^{m+1}$ ,  $g \in H^m$ , and  $a \in C([0, \infty); H^m)$ .*

1. *Then there is a suitable constant  $\varepsilon$  such that if*

$$\|f\|_{H^{m+1}}, \|g\|_{H^m}, \sup_{[0, \infty)} \|a(t, \cdot)\|_{H^m} < \varepsilon,$$

*then the Cauchy problem (3.1a)–(3.1b) has a unique solution*

$$u \in C([0, \infty); H^{m+1}).$$

2. *Assume that  $a(t, x) \geq a_0 > 0$  and  $\widehat{f}_0, \widehat{g}_0 \geq 0$ , then*

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|u(t, \cdot)\|_{H^{m+1}} \geq \widehat{f}_0 + \frac{\widehat{g}_0}{2\kappa} + \frac{a_0}{2^3} \frac{1}{\kappa}.$$

*Consequently, the solution does not tend to zero even if the initial data are zero.*

*Proof.* For a function  $v \in H^m(\mathbb{T}^3)$  we use the decomposition  $v = \widehat{v}_0 + v_{\text{hom}}$ , where

$$\widehat{v}_0 = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} v dx.$$

So by the definition of the norm (2.3),  $\|v\|_{H^m}^2 = |\widehat{v}_0|^2 + \|v_{\text{hom}}\|_{\dot{H}^m}^2$

In order to solve the linear Cauchy problem (3.5a)–(3.5b) in the nonhomogeneous space we need the equation for the zero terms to equations (3.7a)–(3.7b), that results in

$$\widehat{u}_0''(t) + 2\kappa\widehat{u}_0'(t) + = e^{-\kappa t}\widehat{F}_0(t) \quad (3.18a)$$

$$\widehat{u}_0(0) = \widehat{f}_0, \quad \widehat{u}_0'(0) = \widehat{g}_0. \quad (3.18b)$$

Thus by elementary integration methods we obtain from equations (3.18a)–(3.18b)

$$\widehat{u}_0(t) = \widehat{f}_0 + \frac{\widehat{g}_0}{2\kappa} (1 - e^{-\kappa t}) + \frac{1}{2\kappa} \int_0^t (1 - e^{-2\kappa(t-s)}) e^{-\kappa s} \widehat{F}_0(s) ds, \quad (3.19)$$

and the corresponding energy estimate is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \|u(t, \cdot)\|_{H^{m+1}}^2 &\leq 2e^{-2\kappa t} \left\{ 2(1 + \kappa^2) \|f_{\text{hom}}\|_{\dot{H}^{m+1}}^2 + 2\|g_{\text{hom}}\|_{\dot{H}^m}^2 + t \int_0^t \|F_{\text{hom}}(\tau, \cdot)\|_{\dot{H}^m}^2 d\tau \right\} \\ &\quad + 2 \left\{ |\widehat{f}_0|^2 + \frac{|\widehat{g}_0|^2}{4\kappa^2} (1 - e^{-\kappa t})^2 + \frac{1}{4\kappa^2} \left( \int_0^t (1 - e^{-2\kappa(t-s)}) e^{-\kappa s} \widehat{F}_0(s) ds \right)^2 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

We can estimate the second integral as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_0^t (1 - e^{-2\kappa(t-s)}) e^{-\kappa s} \widehat{F}_0(s) ds \right| &\leq \sup_{[0,t]} |\widehat{F}_0(\tau)| \int_0^t (1 - e^{-2\kappa(t-s)}) e^{-\kappa s} ds \\ &= \sup_{[0,t]} |\widehat{F}_0(\tau)| \frac{1}{\kappa} (1 - e^{-\kappa t})^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus if we set

$$B_{\text{non}} = \{v(t, \cdot) \in C([0, \infty); H^{m+1}) : \sup_{[0, \infty)} \|v(t, \cdot)\|_{H^{m+1}} \leq \frac{1}{2}, v(0, x) = f(x), \partial_t v(0, x) = g(x)\},$$

then in a similar manner as in Subsection 3.1 we obtain that the linear operator  $u = \mathcal{L}(v)$ , the solution to the linear Cauchy problem (3.10a)–(3.10b) is a contraction on  $B_{\text{non}}$ . Thus we conclude that the Cauchy problem (3.1a)–(3.1b) has a global solution in the  $H^{m+1}$  spaces. As for the second part of Theorem 2, let  $u(t)$  be the global solution of the Cauchy problem (3.1a)–(3.1b), we then write  $\|u(t)\|_{H^{m+1}}^2 = |\widehat{u}_0(t)|^2 + \|u_{\text{hom}}(t)\|_{\dot{H}^{m+1}}^2$ . By the estimate (3.16),  $\|u_{\text{hom}}(t)\|_{\dot{H}^{m+1}}$  tends to zero as  $t$  tends to infinity. Hence it suffices to show that

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} |\widehat{u}_0(t)| \geq \widehat{f}_0 + \frac{\widehat{g}_0}{2\kappa} + \frac{a_0}{2^3} \frac{1}{\kappa}.$$

Now,  $\widehat{u}_0(t)$  is given by equations (3.19), where  $\widehat{F}_0(s)$  is the zero coefficient of  $F(u(t, x)) = a(t, x)(1 + u(t, x))^3$ . The Fourier series expansion of  $F$  is computed by the convolution

$$\widehat{F}_k = \sum_{|l| \leq |k|} \widehat{a}_{k-l} \widehat{b}_l, \quad (3.20)$$

where  $\widehat{b}_l$  is the Fourier coefficient of  $(1 + u(t, \cdot))^3$  and  $\widehat{a}_{k-l}$  the Fourier coefficient of  $a(t, x)$ . In particular, we have that  $\widehat{F}_0 = \widehat{a}_0 \widehat{b}_0$ . While  $a(t, x)$  is a scalar function,  $\widehat{a}_0$  is just the mean value of  $a(t, x)$ , the term  $\widehat{b}_0$  is calculated as follows. Expanding  $(1 + u(t, x))^3$  in its corresponding Fourier series, we obtain that

$$(1 + u(t, x))^3 = (1 + \widehat{u}_0(t))^3 + \sum_{0 \neq k \in \mathbb{Z}^3} p_k(\widehat{u}(t)_l) e^{ix \cdot k}, \quad (3.21)$$

where  $p_k(\widehat{u}_l(t))$  is a polynomial of the coefficients of  $u(t)$ . Hence we conclude that

$$\widehat{b}_0 = (1 + \widehat{u}_0(t))^3$$

Since  $u \in B_{\text{non}}$ ,

$$\|u(t)\|_{H^{m+1}}^2 = |\widehat{u}_0(t)|^2 + \|u_{\text{hom}}(t)\|_{H^{m+1}}^2 \leq \frac{1}{4}.$$

That is why we conclude that  $|\widehat{u}_0(t)| \leq \frac{1}{2}$  and consequently  $\widehat{b}_0 \geq (1 - \frac{1}{2})^3 \geq \frac{1}{2^3}$ . Thus by Assumption 2. of Theorem 2, we observe from (3.19) that

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{u}_0(t) &= \widehat{f}_0 + \frac{\widehat{g}_0}{2\kappa} (1 - e^{-\kappa t}) + \int_0^t (1 - e^{-2\kappa(t-s)}) e^{-\kappa s} \widehat{a}_0(s) \widehat{b}_0(s) ds \\ &\geq \widehat{f}_0 + \frac{\widehat{g}_0}{2\kappa} (1 - e^{-\kappa t}) + \frac{a_0}{2^3} \int_0^t (1 - e^{-2\kappa(t-s)}) e^{-\kappa s} ds \\ &= \widehat{f}_0 + \frac{\widehat{g}_0}{2\kappa} (1 - e^{-\kappa t}) + \frac{a_0}{2^3} \frac{1}{\kappa} (1 - e^{-\kappa t})^2. \end{aligned}$$

From which we conclude

$$\liminf \widehat{u}_0(t) \geq \widehat{f}_0 + \frac{\widehat{g}_0}{2\kappa} + \frac{a_0}{2^3} \frac{1}{\kappa}$$

which completes the proof of the second part of the theorem.  $\square$

#### 4. THE WAVE EQUATION AS A MODIFIED SYMMETRIC HYPERBOLIC SYSTEM

In this section, we investigate the questions of global existence and asymptotic decay of classical solutions to the Cauchy problem (3.1a)–(3.1b) by using the theory of symmetric hyperbolic systems and the corresponding energy estimates. Since the relativistic Euler equations can be written as a symmetric hyperbolic system (see [BK14]), it will enable us, in the future, to couple the semi-linear equation (3.1a) to the Euler equations (1.4).

It is a well-known fact that wave equations can be cast into symmetric hyperbolic form. It turns out, however, that we need a modification of this standard procedure, which we will outline in the next subsection. With this new system at hand, we are able to prove results similar to those in Section 3. There are, however, some important differences between the results in both sections which we have to point out. First, it turns out that we only obtain results for solutions in the homogeneous  $\dot{H}^m$  spaces, but not in the non-homogeneous (ordinary) Sobolev spaces  $H^m$ . But on the other hand, we do not require that the initial data have to be small, and we can, even, drop the term  $e^{-\kappa t}$  and yet obtain global existence.

**4.1. A semi-linear wave equation written as a symmetric hyperbolic system.** The most common way to write the wave equation as a symmetric hyperbolic system is to consider either the vector valued function

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} \partial_t u \\ \partial_x u \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{or} \quad U = \begin{pmatrix} \partial_t u \\ \partial_x u \\ u \end{pmatrix}$$

as an unknown (here  $\partial_x u \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\partial_1 u, \partial_2 u, \partial_3 u)^T$ ). However, in both cases, for a system with damping terms, the energy estimates obtained are not appropriate to show global existence.

We, therefore, introduce a different unknown by setting

$$U \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{pmatrix} \partial_t u + \varkappa u \\ \partial_x u \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4.1)$$

Then equation (3.1a) can be written as a symmetric hyperbolic system as follows

$$\partial_t U = \sum_{k=1}^3 B^k \partial_k U - \varkappa U + \varkappa^2 \begin{pmatrix} u \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + e^{-\varkappa t} \begin{pmatrix} a(t, x)(1+u)^3 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4.2)$$

where  $B^k$  are constant symmetric matrices,

$$B^k = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \delta_1^k & \delta_2^k & \delta_3^k \\ \delta_1^k & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \delta_2^k & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \delta_3^k & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

**4.2. Energy estimates.** The energy functional for equation (4.1) is

$$E(t) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \langle U(t), U(t) \rangle_m = \|\partial_t u + \varkappa u\|_{\dot{H}^m}^2 + \|\partial_x u\|_{\dot{H}^m}^2. \quad (4.3)$$

Proceeding in the usual way, we differentiate the energy with respect to time and obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} E(t) &= \langle \partial_t U(t), U(t) \rangle_m = \sum_{k=1}^3 \langle B^k \partial_k U, U \rangle_m - \varkappa \|U\|_{\dot{H}^m}^2 + \varkappa^2 \langle \partial_t u + \varkappa u, u \rangle_m \\ &\quad + e^{-\varkappa t} \langle \partial_t u + \varkappa u, a(t, \cdot)(1+u)^3 \rangle_m. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $B^k$  are symmetric and constant, it follows by integration by parts that  $\langle B^k \partial_k U, U \rangle_m = 0$ . By the Cauchy Schwarz inequality we obtain

$$|\langle \partial_t u + \varkappa u, u \rangle_m| \leq \|\partial_t u + \varkappa u\|_{\dot{H}^m} \|u\|_{\dot{H}^m} \leq \|U\|_{\dot{H}^m} \|u\|_{\dot{H}^m}.$$

By Proposition 2 and the estimate (2.5), we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-\varkappa t} |\langle \partial_t u + \varkappa u, a(t, \cdot)(1+u)^3 \rangle_m| &\leq e^{-\varkappa t} \|\partial_t u + \varkappa u\|_{\dot{H}^m} \|a(t, \cdot)(1+u)^3\|_{\dot{H}^m} \\ &\leq e^{-\varkappa t} \|U\|_{\dot{H}^m} \|a(t, \cdot)\|_{H^m} C_m^3 \left(1 + \|u\|_{\dot{H}^m}^2\right)^{\frac{3}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

We now set

$$F(t) = \varkappa^2 \|u(t)\|_{\dot{H}^m} + e^{-\varkappa t} \|a(t, \cdot)\|_{H^m} C_m^3 \left(1 + \|u(t)\|_{\dot{H}^m}^2\right)^{\frac{3}{2}},$$

which allows us to conclude, using the definition of the energy (4.3), that

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} E(t) \leq -\varkappa E(t) + F(t) \sqrt{E(t)} \quad (4.4)$$

We now apply Gronwall's inequality, Lemma 1, in the interval  $[t_0, t]$  and with  $A(t) = -\varkappa$ , then we obtain

$$\sqrt{E(t)} \leq e^{-\varkappa(t-t_0)} \sqrt{E(t_0)} + \int_{t_0}^t e^{-\varkappa(t-\tau)} F(\tau) d\tau. \quad (4.5)$$

We shall now estimate the second term of inequality (4.5). Using the notation

$$P(u(t)) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left(1 + \|u(t)\|_{\dot{H}^m}^2\right)^{\frac{3}{2}}, \quad (4.6)$$

then we see that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{t_0}^t e^{-\varkappa(t-\tau)} e^{-\varkappa\tau} \|a(\tau, \cdot)\|_{\dot{H}^m} P(u(\tau)) d\tau = e^{-\varkappa t} \int_{t_0}^t \|a(\tau, \cdot)\|_{\dot{H}^m} P(u(\tau)) d\tau \\ & \leq e^{-\varkappa t} (t - t_0) \sup_{[t_0, t]} \{\|a(\tau, \cdot)\|_{H^m} P(u(\tau))\}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

Moreover, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & \varkappa^2 \int_{t_0}^t e^{-\varkappa(t-\tau)} \|u(\tau)\|_{\dot{H}^m} d\tau \leq \sup_{[t_0, t]} \|u(\tau)\|_{\dot{H}^m} \varkappa^2 \int_{t_0}^t e^{-\varkappa(t-\tau)} d\tau \\ & = \varkappa \left(1 - e^{-\varkappa(t-t_0)}\right) \sup_{[t_0, t]} \|u(\tau)\|_{\dot{H}^m}, \end{aligned}$$

So by the inequalities (4.5)–(4.7), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{E(t)} & \leq e^{-\varkappa(t-t_0)} \sqrt{E(t_0)} + \varkappa \left(1 - e^{-\varkappa(t-t_0)}\right) \sup_{[t_0, t]} \|u(\tau)\|_{\dot{H}^m} \\ & \quad + e^{-\varkappa t} (t - t_0) \sup_{[t_0, t]} \{\|a(\tau, \cdot)\|_{H^m} P(u(\tau))\}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

We are now in a position to apply this energy estimate to show global existence by a bootstrap argument, which is done in the next section.

**4.3. Global existence by a bootstrap argument.** We first fix the initial data:

$$U_0(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\partial_t u(0, x) + \varkappa u(0, x), \partial_x u(0, x))^T = (g_0(x) + \varkappa f_0(x), \partial_x f_0(x))^T. \quad (4.9)$$

The following theorem is the main result of this section.

**Theorem 3** (Global existence in the  $\dot{H}^m$  spaces). *Let  $0 < \varkappa < 1$  and  $m > \frac{3}{2}$ . Let  $U_0 \in \dot{H}^m$  be the initial data as specified by (4.9), and  $a \in C([0, \infty); H^m)$ . There exists a suitable constant  $\varepsilon$  such that if*

$$\sup_{[0, \infty)} \|a(t, \cdot)\|_{H^m} < \varepsilon,$$

*then equation (4.2) with initial data  $U_0$  has a unique solution  $U \in C([0, \infty); \dot{H}^m)$ . Moreover, the initial value problem (3.1a)–(3.1b) has a solution  $u \in C([0, \infty); \dot{H}^{m+1})$  which decays to zero in the following sense*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|u(t)\|_{\dot{H}^{m+1}} = 0. \quad (4.10)$$

**Remark 5** (Comparison with theorem 2). We emphasise that, contrary to Theorem 2, in Theorem 3, the initial data have not to be small.

The proof of Theorem 3 is based on the following propositions which we present together with their corresponding proofs.

**Proposition 5.** *Let  $0 < \varkappa < 1$ ,  $U = (\partial_t u + \varkappa u, \partial_x u)^T$  be a solution to system (4.2) in an interval  $[0, T^*]$  with initial data  $U(0, x) = U_0(x)$ . Let  $\alpha = \|U_0\|_{\dot{H}^m}$  and  $1 < \beta < \frac{1}{\varkappa}$ , if  $\|a(t, \cdot)\|_{\dot{H}^m}$  is sufficiently small, then there exists a  $T$ ,  $0 < T \leq T^*$ , such that*

$$\sup_{[0, T]} \|u(t)\|_{\dot{H}^m} \leq \beta \alpha$$



and

$$E(T) \leq E(0). \quad (4.11)$$

*Proof.* Let

$$\delta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{[0, T]} \|u(t)\|_{\dot{H}^m},$$

then by Propositions 1 and 3, and the estimate (2.10), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|u(t)\|_{\dot{H}^m} &= \|\partial_x u(t)\|_{\dot{H}^{m-1}} \leq \|U(t)\|_{\dot{H}^{m-1}} \leq \|U(t) - U_0\|_{\dot{H}^{m-1}} + \|U_0\|_{\dot{H}^{m-1}} \\ &\leq C_0(\alpha) \frac{m-1}{m} t^{1/m} + \alpha. \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

where  $C_0(\alpha)$  is the constant of inequality (2.10). Hence

$$\delta = \sup_{[0, T]} \|u(t)\|_{\dot{H}^m} \leq \alpha\beta,$$

provided that  $0 < T \leq \left( \frac{\alpha(\beta-1)}{C_0(\alpha) \frac{m-1}{m}} \right)^m = \frac{(\alpha(\beta-1))^m}{C_0(\alpha)^{m-1}}$ .

We turn now to show inequality (4.11). By inequality (4.8) we obtain

$$\sqrt{E(T)} \leq e^{-\varkappa T} \sqrt{E(0)} + \varkappa\delta (1 - e^{-\varkappa T}) + e^{-\varkappa T} T \sup_{[0, T]} \|a(t, \cdot)\|_{H^m} P(\alpha\beta),$$

where  $P(\alpha\beta)$  is defined by equation (4.6). We observe that the desired inequality  $E(T) \leq E(0)$  will hold if

$$e^{-\varkappa T} \sqrt{E(0)} + \varkappa\delta (1 - e^{-\varkappa T}) + e^{-\varkappa T} T \sup_{[0, T]} \|a(t, \cdot)\|_{H^m} P(\alpha\beta) \leq \sqrt{E(0)},$$

which implies, in a slightly rewritten form

$$\sqrt{E(0)} + \varkappa\delta (e^{\varkappa T} - 1) + T \sup_{[0, T]} \|a(t, \cdot)\|_{H^m} P(\alpha\beta) \leq e^{\varkappa T} \sqrt{E(0)},$$

which can be expressed as

$$T \sup_{[0, T]} \|a(t, \cdot)\|_{H^m} P(\alpha\beta) \leq (e^{\varkappa T} - 1) \left( \sqrt{E(0)} - \varkappa\delta \right). \quad (4.13)$$

Now, by inequality (4.12) we conclude that

$$\sqrt{E(0)} - \varkappa\delta = \alpha - \varkappa\delta \geq \alpha - \varkappa(\alpha\beta) = \alpha(1 - \varkappa\beta) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \varepsilon_0 > 0. \quad (4.14)$$

Now we require the smallness condition on  $a(t, \cdot)$ , namely

$$\sup_{[0, \infty)} \|a(t, \cdot)\|_{H^m} \leq \frac{\varkappa\varepsilon_0}{P(\alpha\beta)}. \quad (4.15)$$

Using the elementary inequality  $x \leq e^x - 1$ , we obtain

$$T \sup_{[0, T]} \|a(t, \cdot)\|_{H^m} P(\alpha\beta) \leq \varepsilon_0 \varkappa T \leq (e^{\varkappa T} - 1) \varepsilon_0 \leq (e^{\varkappa T} - 1) \left( \sqrt{E(0)} - \varkappa\delta \right).$$

Hence, under condition (4.15) inequality (4.13) holds and that completes the proof of inequality (4.11).  $\square$

**Proposition 6.** *We set*

$$T^* = \sup \left\{ T : \sup_{[0,T]} \|u(t)\|_{\dot{H}^m} \leq \alpha\beta \text{ and } E(T) \leq E(0) \right\}, \quad (4.16)$$

where  $1 < \beta < \frac{1}{\varkappa}$  as in Proposition 5. Then

$$T^* = \infty.$$

*Proof.* We prove Proposition 6 by a contradiction. So assume that  $T^*$  is finite. We then show that there exists a  $T > T^*$  such that

$$\sup_{[0,T]} \|u(t)\|_{\dot{H}^m} \leq \alpha\beta \text{ and } E(T) \leq E(0), \quad (4.17)$$

which contradicts the definition of  $T^*$ . Therefore  $T^* = \infty$ .

In order to do that let  $\tilde{U} = (\partial_t \tilde{u} + \varkappa \tilde{u}, \partial_x \tilde{u})^T$  be a solution to system (4.2) with initial data  $\tilde{U}_0(x) = U(T^*, x)$ . Since  $E(T^*) \leq E(0)$ , then  $\|\tilde{U}_0\|_{\dot{H}^m} \leq \alpha$ . Let  $t \in (T^*, T)$ , then by Propositions 1, 3, and the estimate (2.10), we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{u}(t)\|_{\dot{H}^m} &\leq \|\partial_x \tilde{u}(t)\|_{H^{m-1}} \leq \|\tilde{U}(t)\|_{H^{m-1}} \leq \|\tilde{U}(t) - \tilde{U}_0\|_{H^{m-1}} + \|\tilde{U}_0\|_{H^{m-1}} \\ &\leq C_0(\alpha)^{\frac{m-1}{m}} (t - T^*)^{1/m} + \alpha. \end{aligned}$$

Thus there exists a  $T$  such that  $T^* < T$  and  $C_0(\alpha)^{\frac{m-1}{m}} (T - T^*)^{1/m} + \alpha \leq \alpha\beta$ . Hence we conclude that

$$\tilde{\delta} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{[T^*, T]} \|\tilde{u}(t)\|_{\dot{H}^m} \leq \alpha\beta,$$

which shows that the first property of inequality (4.17) is satisfied.

We turn now to show the property  $E(T) \leq E(0)$  of (4.17). Set  $\tau = T - T^*$ , then by estimate (4.8), we conclude that

$$\sqrt{E(T)} \leq e^{-\varkappa\tau} \sqrt{E(T^*)} + \varkappa \tilde{\delta} (1 - e^{-\varkappa\tau}) + e^{-\varkappa T} \tau \sup_{[T^*, T]} \|a(t, \cdot)\|_{H^m} P(\alpha\beta).$$

We observe that  $E(T) \leq E(0)$  will hold if we can show

$$e^{-\varkappa\tau} \sqrt{E(T^*)} + \varkappa \tilde{\delta} (1 - e^{-\varkappa\tau}) + e^{-\varkappa T} \tau \sup_{[T^*, T]} \|a(t, \cdot)\|_{H^m} P(\alpha\beta) \leq \sqrt{E(0)},$$

or rewritten slightly differently

$$\begin{aligned} \varkappa \tilde{\delta} (e^{\varkappa\tau} - 1) + e^{-\varkappa T^*} \tau \sup_{[T^*, T]} \|a(t, \cdot)\|_{H^m} P(\alpha\beta) &\leq e^{\varkappa\tau} \sqrt{E(0)} - \sqrt{E(T^*)} \\ &= (e^{\varkappa\tau} - 1) \sqrt{E(0)} + \sqrt{E(0)} - \sqrt{E(T^*)}. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\sqrt{E(0)} \geq \sqrt{E(T^*)}$ , it suffices to show that

$$e^{-\varkappa T^*} \tau \sup_{[T^*, T]} \|a(t, \cdot)\|_{H^m} P(\alpha\beta) \leq (e^{\varkappa T} - 1) \left( \sqrt{E(0)} - \varkappa \tilde{\delta} \right).$$

We obtain the desired estimate in a very similar manner as in Proposition 5. Since  $\tilde{\delta} \leq \alpha\beta$ , we have  $\sqrt{E(0)} - \varkappa \tilde{\delta} = \alpha - \varkappa \tilde{\delta} \geq \alpha - \varkappa(\alpha\beta) = \alpha(1 - \varkappa\beta) = \varepsilon_0$ . Hence under assumption (4.15), we obtain

$$e^{-\varkappa T^*} \tau \sup_{[T^*, T]} \|a(t, \cdot)\|_{H^m} P(\alpha\beta) \leq \varepsilon_0 \varkappa \tau \leq (e^{\varkappa\tau} - 1) \varepsilon_0 \leq (e^{\varkappa\tau} - 1) \left( \sqrt{E(0)} - \varkappa \tilde{\delta} \right).$$

which implies that  $E(T) \leq E(0)$  and therefore both conditions in expression (4.16) hold in a larger interval, and that completes the proof of the proposition.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 3.* For a given  $0 < \varkappa < 1$  and initial data (4.9), we set  $\alpha = \|U_0\|_{\dot{H}^m}$ , let  $1 < \beta < \frac{1}{\varkappa}$  and we choose  $\varepsilon = \frac{\varkappa\varepsilon_0}{P(\alpha\beta)} = \frac{\varkappa\alpha(1-\varkappa\beta)}{P(\alpha\beta)}$  as indicated in (4.14) and (4.15).

Then it follows from Proposition 6 that system (4.2) with initial data (4.9) has a unique solution  $U \in C([0, \infty); \dot{H}^m)$ . Consequently, the Cauchy problem (3.1a)–(3.1b) has a solution  $u \in C([0, \infty); \dot{H}^{m+1})$ .

We turn now to show the limit (4.10). Set

$$\mu \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|u(t)\|_{\dot{H}^{m+1}}$$

For a given  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists a  $t_0$  such that  $\sup_{[t_0, \infty)} \|u(t)\|_{\dot{H}^{m+1}} \leq \mu + \epsilon$ . So for  $t > t_0$  by inequality (4.8) and condition (4.15) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{E(t)} &\leq e^{-\varkappa(t-t_0)} \sqrt{E(t_0)} + \varkappa \left(1 - e^{-\varkappa(t-t_0)}\right) \sup_{[t_0, t]} \|u(\tau)\|_{\dot{H}^m} \\ &\quad + e^{-\varkappa t} (t - t_0) \sup_{[t_0, t]} \{ \|a(\tau, \cdot)\|_{H^m} P(u(\tau)) \} \\ &\leq e^{-\varkappa(t-t_0)} \sqrt{E(t_0)} + \varkappa \left(1 - e^{-\varkappa(t-t_0)}\right) (\mu + \epsilon) + e^{-\varkappa t} (t - t_0) \varkappa \varepsilon_0. \end{aligned} \quad (4.18)$$

Hence, we conclude that

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{E(t)} \leq \varkappa(\mu + \epsilon), \quad (4.19)$$

and

$$\mu^2 \leq \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} E(t) \leq \varkappa^2(\mu + \epsilon)^2. \quad (4.20)$$

Since  $\varkappa < 1$  there exists a  $\epsilon > 0$  such that inequality (4.20) can only hold only if  $\mu = 0$ . Hence it follows from inequality (4.19) that  $\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{E(t)} = 0$ , and that implies  $\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|U\|_{\dot{H}^m} = 0$ .  $\square$

**Remark 6.** It turned out that the proof of global existence that relies on the theory of symmetric hyperbolic systems can be achieved without the term  $e^{-\varkappa t}$ , while the smallness of  $a(t, x)$  is still needed. The reason is that we can simply replace inequality (4.8) by

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{E(t)} &\leq e^{-\varkappa(t-t_0)} \sqrt{E(t_0)} + \varkappa \left(1 - e^{-\varkappa(t-t_0)}\right) \sup_{[t_0, t]} \|u(\tau)\|_{\dot{H}^m} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\varkappa} \left(1 - e^{-\varkappa(t-t_0)}\right) \sup_{[t_0, t]} \{ \|a(\tau, \cdot)\|_{H^m} P(u(\tau)) \}, \end{aligned}$$

and then by a similar argument we obtain global existence. However, it follows from inequality (4.18) that the term  $e^{-\varkappa t}$  is indispensable to show the limit

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|u(t)\|_{\dot{H}^{m+1}} = 0.$$

**4.4. Exponential decay of the global solutions.** Theorem 3 provides global solutions that decay to zero at infinity. Here we shall improve this estimate and show that the solution decays exponentially.

**Theorem 4** (Exponential decay of the global solutions). *Let  $0 < \varkappa < 1$  and  $m > \frac{3}{2}$ . Let  $u \in C([0, \infty); \dot{H}^{m+1})$  be the global unique solution to the Cauchy problem (3.1a)–(3.1b). Then there exists a  $0 < \varkappa' < \varkappa$  such that if  $\|a(t, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty([0, \infty); H^m)}$  is sufficiently small, then*

$$\|u(t)\|_{\dot{H}^{m+1}} \leq C e^{-\varkappa' t}.$$

*Proof.* The main idea is to transform the variable  $u(t, x) = e^{\lambda t} w(t, x)$ , where  $\lambda < 0$ , and to show that  $w \in L^\infty([0, \infty); H^{m+1})$  for an appropriate choice of  $\lambda$ . In order to achieve that, we shall first derive the differential equation for  $w$  and then we will obtain an energy estimate similar to estimate (4.8).

Since  $u$  satisfies equation (3.1a),  $w$  is the solution of equation

$$\partial_t^2 w + 2(\varkappa + \lambda) \partial_t w + (2\varkappa\lambda + \lambda^2) w - \Delta w = e^{-(\varkappa + \lambda)t} a(t, x) (1 + e^{\lambda t} w(t, x))^3, \quad (4.21)$$

where the initial data are given by  $w(0, x) = u(0, x) = f(x)$  and  $\partial_t w(0, x) = \partial_t u(0, x) - \lambda u(0, x) = g(x) - \lambda f(x)$ .

We set  $\gamma = (\varkappa + \lambda)$ , and similar to the previous section we consider the vector-valued function

$$W \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{pmatrix} \partial_t w + \gamma w \\ \partial_x w \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then equation (4.21) can be written as

$$\partial_t W = \sum_{k=1}^3 B^k \partial_k W - \gamma W + (\gamma^2 - (2\varkappa\lambda + \lambda^2)) \begin{pmatrix} w \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + e^{-\gamma t} \begin{pmatrix} a(t, x) (1 + e^{\lambda t} w)^3 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let

$$E(t) = \langle W, W \rangle_m = \|\partial_t w + \gamma w\|_{\dot{H}^m}^2 + \|\partial_x w\|_{\dot{H}^m}^2$$

denote the energy. We note that  $\gamma^2 - (2\varkappa\lambda + \lambda^2) = (\varkappa + \lambda)^2 - (2\varkappa\lambda + \lambda^2) = \varkappa^2$ , which allows us to obtain

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} E(t) \leq -\gamma \|W\|_{\dot{H}^m}^2 + \varkappa^2 \|w\|_{\dot{H}^m} \|W\|_{\dot{H}^m} + e^{-\gamma t} \|a(t, \cdot) (1 + e^{\lambda t} w(t))^3\|_{\dot{H}^m} \|W\|_{\dot{H}^m}. \quad (4.22)$$

There is only a slight difference between the energy estimates (4.4) and (4.22), so we apply Gronwall's inequality, Lemma 1, and integrate from  $t_0$  to  $t$ , which allows us to obtain the following energy estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{E(t)} &\leq e^{-\gamma(t-t_0)} \sqrt{E(t_0)} + \frac{\varkappa^2}{\gamma} \sup_{[t_0, t]} \|w(\tau)\|_{\dot{H}^m} \left(1 - e^{-\gamma(t-t_0)}\right) \\ &\quad + e^{-\gamma(t-t_0)} (t-t_0) \sup_{[t_0, t]} \|a(\tau, \cdot) (1 + e^{\lambda \tau} w(\tau))^3\|_{\dot{H}^m} \end{aligned} \quad (4.23)$$

We now require the conditions

$$\frac{\varkappa^2}{\gamma} = \frac{\varkappa^2}{\varkappa + \lambda} < 1, \quad \varkappa + \lambda > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda < 0.$$

We can now proceed as in Propositions 5 and 6 and show by a bootstrap argument that for  $\|a(t, \cdot)\|_{H^m}$  sufficiently small,  $E(t) \leq E(0)$  which proves the Theorem 4. We outline the main steps.

Note that initial data for  $W$  are

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{E(0)} &= \|W(0, x)\|_{\dot{H}^m} = \sqrt{\|\partial_t w(0, x) + \gamma w(0, x)\|_{\dot{H}^m}^2 + \|\partial_x w(0)\|_{\dot{H}^m}^2} \\ &= \sqrt{\|\partial_t u(0, x) + \varkappa u(0, x)\|_{\dot{H}^m}^2 + \|\partial_x u(0)\|_{\dot{H}^m}^2} \\ &= \|U(0, x)\|_{\dot{H}^m}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence  $W$  has the same initial data as  $U$ . Let  $\alpha = \|W(0, x)\|_{\dot{H}^m}$  and chose  $1 < \beta < \frac{\gamma}{\varkappa^2}$ . Then as in the first step of the proof of Proposition 5 there exists a  $0 < T$  such that

$$\delta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{[0, T]} \|w(\tau)\|_{\dot{H}^m} \leq \alpha\beta.$$

By the energy estimate (4.23), we observe that  $E(T) \leq E(0)$  holds, provided that

$$T \sup_{[0, T]} \left\{ \left\| a(\tau, \cdot) \left(1 + e^{\lambda t} w(\tau)\right)^3 \right\|_{\dot{H}^m} \right\} \leq (e^{\gamma T} - 1) \alpha \left(1 - \frac{\varkappa^2}{\gamma} \beta\right). \quad (4.24)$$

Since  $\lambda < 0$ , we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \|(1 + e^{\lambda \tau} w(\tau))^3\|_{H^m} &\leq C_m^2 \|(1 + e^{\lambda \tau} w(\tau))\|_{H^m}^3 \\ &\leq C_m^2 \left(1 + e^{2\lambda \tau} \|w(\tau)\|_{\dot{H}^m}^2\right)^{\frac{3}{2}} \leq C_m^2 \left(1 + \|w(\tau)\|_{\dot{H}^m}^2\right)^{\frac{3}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence as in equation (4.6) we set

$$P(w(\tau)) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} C_m^3 \left(1 + \|w(\tau)\|_{\dot{H}^m}^2\right)^{\frac{3}{2}},$$

where  $C_m$  is the constant defined above Proposition 2. Therefore for  $\tau \in [0, T]$ ,

$$\left\| a(\tau, \cdot) \left(1 + e^{\lambda t} w(\tau)\right)^3 \right\|_{\dot{H}^m} \leq \|a(\tau, \cdot)\|_{\dot{H}^m} P(\alpha\beta)$$

So we set  $\varepsilon_0 = \alpha(1 - \frac{\varkappa^2}{\gamma}) > 0$  and require that

$$\sup_{[0, \infty)} \|a(t, \cdot)\|_{H^m} \leq \frac{\gamma \varepsilon_0}{P(\alpha\beta)}, \quad (4.25)$$

which allows us to conclude that

$$T \sup_{[0, T]} \left\{ \left\| a(\tau, \cdot) \left(1 + e^{\lambda t} w(\tau)\right)^3 \right\|_{\dot{H}^m} \right\} \leq \gamma T \varepsilon_0 \leq (e^{\gamma T} - 1) \varepsilon_0 \leq (e^{\gamma T} - 1) \alpha \left(1 - \frac{\varkappa^2}{\gamma} \beta\right).$$

Thus inequality (4.24) holds and consequently  $E(T) \leq E(0)$ .

Next, we set

$$T^* = \sup \left\{ T : \sup_{[0, T]} \|w(t)\|_{\dot{H}^m} \leq \alpha\beta \text{ and } E(T) \leq E(0) \right\},$$

and in a similar manner as in Proposition 6, we show that under the smallness condition (4.25)  $T^* = \infty$  holds. □

**Remark 7** (The conditions of Theorem 3 and 4). The decay rate provided by Theorem 4 is given by  $e^{-\varkappa' t}$ , where

$$\varkappa' = -\lambda, \quad \frac{\varkappa^2}{\gamma} = \frac{\varkappa^2}{\varkappa + \lambda} < 1, \quad (\gamma = (\varkappa + \lambda)), \quad \varkappa + \lambda > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda < 0.$$

This implies, that  $\varkappa' < \varkappa(1 - \varkappa)$ . Thus for small  $\varkappa$ , the decay rate is rather close to the damping rate, but as  $\varkappa$  getting closer to one, the decay rate becomes smaller. We also note that the smallness conditions for  $a(t, \cdot)$  of Theorem 3,  $\sup_{[0, \infty)} \|a(t, \cdot)\|_{H^m} \leq \frac{\varkappa \varepsilon_0}{P(\alpha\beta)}$  and the smallness assumption of Theorem 4,  $\sup_{[0, \infty)} \|a(t, \cdot)\|_{H^m} \leq \frac{\gamma \varepsilon_0}{P(\alpha\beta)}$ , are a bit different, in the sense that the second condition for  $a(t, \cdot)$  requires a small bound than the first one.

**Remark 8** (The decay rate in Theorem 4 and in Theorem 1). As stated already in the last remark, the decay rate of Theorem 4 is given by  $e^{-\varkappa' t}$  while Theorem 1 provides the stronger decay  $e^{-\varkappa t} \sqrt{C_1 + C_2(e\varkappa)^2 t^2}$ .

## 5. BLOWUP OF SOLUTIONS FOR LARGE $a(t, x)$

In the previous sections, we proved global existence of classical solutions using the homogeneous and the non-homogeneous Sobolev spaces. In both settings, the smallness of  $a(t, x)$  played an essential role. That is why we want to investigate the question of what happens to the solutions if we drop the smallness assumption on  $a(t, x)$ .

Our main result concerns the solution in the nonhomogeneous spaces  $H^m$ .

**Theorem 5** (Blowup in finite time of solutions in the non-homogeneous spaces). *Let  $u$  be the solution to the Cauchy problem (3.1a)–(3.1b) in the interval  $[0, T)$ , where  $0 < T \leq \infty$  and  $\widehat{a}_0(t)$  denotes the zero coefficient of  $a(t, x)$ , for which we assume the following condition*

$$\widehat{a}_0(t) \geq a_0 \quad \forall t \geq 0, \quad (5.1)$$

and the initial data satisfy

$$1 + \widehat{f}_0 > 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{g}_0 > 0 \quad (5.2)$$

and

$$\widehat{g}_0^2 - \frac{a_0}{2}(1 + \widehat{f}_0)^4 \leq 0. \quad (5.3)$$

Then for sufficiently large  $a_0$   $T$  is finite, and moreover

$$\lim_{t \uparrow T} \|u(t, \cdot)\|_{H^{m+1}} = \infty.$$

We recall that  $\widehat{f}_0$ ,  $\widehat{g}_0$  and  $\widehat{a}_0(t)$  are the zero coefficients of  $f$ ,  $g$ , and  $a(t, \cdot)$  respectively.

**Remark 9.** Note that for large  $a(t, x)$  blow-up occurs in finite time even if the initial data are very small, and even if  $1 + \widehat{f}_0$  is small.

**Remark 10.** We actually can neglect condition (5.3) since most likely it holds when  $a_0$  is large.

So suppose  $u(t, \cdot) \in H^{m+1}$  is a solution to the Cauchy problem (3.1a)–(3.1b) in an interval  $[0, T)$ . We adopt an idea of Yagdjian [Yag05] that was used for a different wave equation. For  $t \in [0, T)$  we set

$$F(t) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} u(t, x) dx = \widehat{u}_0(t),$$

this is the zero Fourier coefficient of the solution. Then  $F'(t) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \partial_t u(t, x) dx = \widehat{u}'_0(t)$  and  $F''(t) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \partial_{tt} u(t, x) dx$ . Since  $\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \Delta u(t, x) dx = 0$ , we have that

$$F'' + 2\kappa F' = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} (\partial_{tt} u + 2\kappa \partial_t u - \Delta u) dx = e^{-\kappa t} \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} a(t, x) (1 + u(t, x))^3 dx.$$

We now perform a Fourier series expansion of  $u(t, x)$  and  $a(t, x)$  in a similar manner as to (3.20) and (3.21), and we see that

$$\frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} a(t, x) (1 + u(t, x))^3 dx = \widehat{a}_0(t) (1 + \widehat{u}_0(t))^3.$$

Thus  $F$  satisfies the following initial value problem

$$F'' + 2\kappa F' = e^{-\kappa t} \widehat{a}_0(t) (1 + F)^3, \quad (5.4a)$$

$$F(0) = \widehat{f}_0, \quad F'(0) = \widehat{g}_0. \quad (5.4b)$$

The question is whether the strong damping term  $e^{-\kappa t}$  prevents the blow-up of the solutions to equation (5.4a) in finite time?

**Lemma 2** (Blow up for the associated ODE). *Let  $F$  satisfy the initial value problem (5.4a)–(5.4b) in the interval  $[0, T)$ , where  $0 < T \leq \infty$ , and suppose assumptions (5.2) (5.1) and (5.3) of Theorem 5 hold. Then for sufficiently large  $a_0$ ,  $T$  is finite, and moreover*

$$\lim_{t \uparrow T} F(t) = \infty.$$

The proof of Theorem 5 follows from this lemma since

$$\|u(t)\|_{H^{m+1}} = |F(t)|^2 + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^3} |k|^{2(m+1)} |\widehat{u}_k(t)|^2 \geq |F(t)|^2.$$

*Proof.* (of Lemma 2) The proof consists of four main steps. In the first step we show that, under the assumptions made in Lemma 2,  $F'(t)$  is a positive function in the interval of existence  $[0, T)$ . This allows us, in the second step, to replace the ODE (5.4a) by a differential inequality. In the third step, we shall make a variable change in order to transform equation (5.6a) to a differential inequality without a first-order term. This will enable us to solve a differential inequality in the last step and show the desired blow-up.

**Step 1:** We claim that  $F'(t) > 0$  in the existence interval  $[0, T)$ . To see that we set

$$T^* = \sup\{T_1 : F'(t) > 0 \text{ for } t \in [0, T_1), 0 \leq T_1 \leq T\}.$$

By the assumptions of Lemma 2,  $F'(0) = \widehat{g}_0 > 0$ , hence  $T^* > 0$ . We now assume by contradiction that  $T^* < T$ , then by the continuity of  $F'(t)$ , it holds that  $F'(T^*) = 0$ , and hence we can conclude that

$$F''(T^*) + 2\kappa F'(T^*) = F''(T^*) = e^{-\kappa T^*} \widehat{a}_0(T^*) (1 + F(T^*))^3. \quad (5.5)$$

Since  $F'(t) > 0$  for  $t \in [0, T^*)$ ,  $F$  is increasing, and therefore  $1 + F(T^*) \geq 1 + F(0) = 1 + \widehat{f}_0 > 0$ . In addition, by assumption (5.1), the right-hand side of equation (5.5) is positive. Then at time  $t = T^*$ , we have  $F'(T^*) = 0$  and  $F''(T^*) > 0$ , which means that at this point  $F$  attains a local minimum. But this is impossible since  $F$  is an increasing function. Therefore we conclude that  $T^* = T$ .

**Step 2:** We have shown in Step 1 that  $1 + F(t) \geq 1 + \widehat{f}_0 > 0$ , this together with assumption (5.1) enables us to replace the differential equation (5.4a) by the differential inequality

$$F'' + 2\kappa F' \geq e^{-\kappa t} a_0 (1 + F)^3, \quad (5.6a)$$

$$F(0) = \widehat{f}_0, \quad F'(0) = \widehat{g}_0, \quad (5.6b)$$

Thus, to prove Lemma 2, it is sufficient to show that for sufficiently large constant  $a_0$  a solution to the differential inequality (5.6a)–(5.6b) blows-up in finite time.

**Step 3:** We set  $\tau = \omega(t)$ ,  $F(t) = G(\omega(t))$ . Then  $F'(t) = \frac{dG}{d\tau}(\omega(t))\omega'(t)$  and  $F''(t) = \frac{d^2G}{d\tau^2}(\omega(t))(\omega'(t))^2 + \frac{dG}{d\tau}(\omega(t))\omega''(t)$ , which leads to

$$F'' + 2\kappa F' = \frac{d^2G}{d\tau^2} (\omega')^2 + \frac{dG}{d\tau} (\omega'' + 2\kappa\omega').$$

So now we choose  $\omega$  so that it satisfies the differential  $\omega'' + 2\kappa\omega' = 0$  and we require that  $\omega' > 0$ . It is straightforward to calculate its general solution

$$\omega(t) = C_1 e^{-2\kappa t} + C_0,$$

for which we choose  $C_1 = -1$  and  $C_0 = 2$ , and finally, we obtain that

$$\tau = \omega(t) = -e^{-2\kappa t} + 2. \quad (5.7)$$

Note that  $\omega$  maps  $[0, \infty)$  onto  $[1, 2)$  in a one-to-one manner. Taking into account equation (5.7), inequality (5.6a) is equivalent to

$$\frac{d^2G}{d\tau^2} (\omega')^2 \geq e^{-\kappa t} a_0 (1 + G)^3$$

or

$$\frac{d^2G}{d\tau^2} \geq \frac{e^{-\kappa t}}{(2\kappa e^{-2\kappa t})^2} a_0 (1 + G)^3 = \frac{e^{3\kappa t}}{4\kappa^2} a_0 (1 + G)^3 \geq \frac{a_0}{4\kappa^2} (1 + G)^3.$$

In order to simplify the notation we set  $\frac{dG}{d\tau} = G'$  and  $G'' = \frac{d^2G}{d\tau^2}$ , then  $G$  satisfies the initial value inequality

$$G'' \geq \frac{a_0}{4\kappa^2} (1 + G)^3 \quad (5.8a)$$

$$G(1) = \widehat{f}_0, \quad G'(1) = \frac{\widehat{g}_0}{2\kappa}. \quad (5.8b)$$

We are now in a position to show the blow-up for  $G$  at some  $1 < \tau_0 < 2$ , and consequently,  $F$  will blow up at  $t_0 = \omega^{-1}(\tau_0)$ .

**Step 4:** We know by the existence theorem for  $F$ , that  $G$  exists locally in time, and will use inequality (5.8a) to show that for  $a_0$  sufficiently large the existence interval is in fact  $[1, \tau_0)$  for some  $\tau_0 < 2$ , and moreover that

$$\lim_{\tau \uparrow \tau_0} G(\tau) = \infty.$$

Note that  $G' > 0$ , since  $F' = G' \frac{d\omega}{dt}$ ,  $\omega' > 0$  by its construction and by Step 1  $F' > 0$ . So we can multiply inequality (5.8a) by  $G'$  and obtain that

$$G'' G' \geq \frac{a_0}{4\kappa^2} (1 + G)^3 G',$$



and then we integrate the above inequality from 1 to  $\tau < \tau_0 \leq 2$ . That results in the inequality

$$\frac{1}{2} \left( (G'(\tau))^2 - (G'(1))^2 \right) \geq \frac{a_0}{16\chi^2} \left( (1 + G(\tau))^4 - (1 + G(1))^4 \right).$$

Taking into account the initial values (5.8b) we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} (G'(\tau))^2 &\geq \frac{a_0}{8\chi^2} (1 + G(\tau))^4 + \left( \frac{\widehat{g}_0}{2\chi} \right)^2 - \frac{a_0}{8\chi^2} (1 + \widehat{f}_0)^4 \\ &= \frac{a_0}{8\chi^2} (1 + G(\tau))^4 + \frac{1}{4\chi^2} \left\{ (\widehat{g}_0)^2 - \frac{a_0}{2} (1 + \widehat{f}_0)^4 \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (5.9)$$

In order to simplify the calculations, we set

$$\lambda^2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{a_0}{2} (1 + f_0)^4 - g_0^2.$$

Assumption (5.3) assures that  $\lambda \geq 0$ . Before integrating inequality (5.9), we simplify the integrand by the following estimate,

$$\left( \frac{1}{4\chi^2} \left( \frac{a_0}{2} (1 + G(\tau))^4 - \lambda^2 \right) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \geq \frac{1}{2\chi} \left( \sqrt{\frac{a_0}{2}} (1 + G(\tau))^2 - \lambda \right). \quad (5.10)$$

Note that inequality (5.10) follows from the elementary inequality:  $\sqrt{a^2 - b^2} \geq a - b$  that holds whenever  $a \geq b$ . Thus this inequality holds, provided that

$$\sqrt{\frac{a_0}{2}} (1 + G(\tau))^2 \geq \lambda = \sqrt{\frac{a_0}{2} (1 + \widehat{f}_0)^4 - \widehat{g}_0^2},$$

and the last one follows from the monotonicity of  $G$ :

$$\sqrt{\frac{a_0}{2}} (1 + G(\tau))^2 \geq \sqrt{\frac{a_0}{2}} (1 + G(1))^2 = \sqrt{\frac{a_0}{2}} (1 + \widehat{f}_0)^2 \geq \sqrt{\frac{a_0}{2} (1 + \widehat{f}_0)^4 - \widehat{g}_0^2} = \lambda.$$

So we can use inequality (5.10) and conclude from inequality (5.9) that

$$G'(\tau) \geq \frac{1}{2\chi} \left( \sqrt{\frac{a_0}{2}} (1 + G(\tau))^2 - \lambda \right),$$

which is equivalent to

$$\frac{G'(\tau)}{\sqrt{\frac{a_0}{2}} (1 + G(\tau))^2 - \lambda} \geq \frac{1}{2\chi}. \quad (5.11)$$

We set

$$\alpha \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sqrt[4]{\frac{a_0}{2}}$$

and perform the following variable change  $\alpha(1 + G(s)) = x$ , which simplifies the integration of inequality (5.11) from 1 to  $\tau < \tau_0 \leq 2$ , so we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_1^\tau \frac{G'(s)}{\sqrt{\frac{a_0}{2}} (1 + G(s))^2 - \lambda} ds &= \frac{1}{\alpha} \int_{\alpha(1+\widehat{f}_0)}^{\alpha(1+G(\tau))} \frac{1}{x^2 - \lambda} dx = \frac{1}{\alpha 2\sqrt{\lambda}} \ln \left| \frac{x - \sqrt{\lambda}}{x + \sqrt{\lambda}} \right|_{\alpha(1+\widehat{f}_0)}^{\alpha(1+G(\tau))} \\ &= \frac{1}{\alpha 2\sqrt{\lambda}} \left( \ln \left| \frac{\alpha(1 + G(\tau)) - \sqrt{\lambda}}{\alpha(1 + G(\tau)) + \sqrt{\lambda}} \right| - \ln \left| \frac{\alpha(1 + \widehat{f}_0) - \sqrt{\lambda}}{\alpha(1 + \widehat{f}_0) + \sqrt{\lambda}} \right| \right) \geq \frac{1}{2\chi} (\tau - 1). \end{aligned} \quad (5.12)$$

We set

$$\beta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\alpha(1 + \widehat{f}_0) - \sqrt{\lambda}}{\alpha(1 + \widehat{f}_0) + \sqrt{\lambda}},$$

then  $\beta < 1$  and by equation (5.12)

$$\ln \left| \frac{\alpha(1 + G(\tau)) - \sqrt{\lambda}}{\alpha(1 + G(\tau)) + \sqrt{\lambda}} \right| \geq \frac{\alpha\sqrt{\lambda}}{\varkappa}(\tau - 1) + \ln \beta,$$

or equivalently

$$\frac{\alpha(1 + G(\tau)) - \sqrt{\lambda}}{\alpha(1 + G(\tau)) + \sqrt{\lambda}} \geq \beta e^{\frac{\alpha\sqrt{\lambda}}{\varkappa}(\tau-1)}.$$

From the last expression we find that

$$\alpha(1 + G(\tau)) \geq \frac{\sqrt{\lambda} \left( \beta e^{\frac{\alpha\sqrt{\lambda}}{\varkappa}(\tau-1)} + 1 \right)}{1 - \beta e^{\frac{\alpha\sqrt{\lambda}}{\varkappa}(\tau-1)}},$$

so long that  $\beta e^{\frac{\alpha\sqrt{\lambda}}{\varkappa}(\tau-1)} < 1$ . With these inequalities at hand, we can conclude that blow-up will occur at some  $\tau_0 \leq \tau_1$ , where  $\tau_1$  satisfies the equation

$$\beta e^{\frac{\alpha\sqrt{\lambda}}{\varkappa}(\tau_1-1)} = 1.$$

So the upper bound for the life-span time is given by

$$\tau_1 = \frac{\varkappa}{\alpha\sqrt{\lambda}} \ln \frac{1}{\beta} + 1.$$

In order to assure  $\tau_1 < 2$  we have to demand that

$$\frac{\varkappa}{\alpha\sqrt{\lambda}} \ln \frac{1}{\beta} < 1 \tag{5.13}$$

for  $a_0$  sufficiently large. It remains to verify condition (5.13) which is done in the following. We start observing that

$$\frac{a_0}{2} \left( \frac{a_0}{2} (1 + \widehat{f}_0)^4 - \widehat{g}_0^2 \right) = \left( \frac{a_0}{2} \right)^2 (1 + \widehat{f}_0)^4 \left( 1 - \frac{2\widehat{g}_0^2}{a_0(1 + \widehat{f}_0)^4} \right).$$

So we set

$$z \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{2\widehat{g}_0^2}{a_0(1 + \widehat{f}_0)^4} = \frac{\widehat{g}_0^2}{\alpha^4(1 + \widehat{f}_0)^4},$$

then we conclude that

$$\alpha\sqrt{\lambda} = \sqrt[4]{\frac{a_0}{2}} \sqrt[4]{\frac{a_0}{2} (1 + \widehat{f}_0)^4 - \widehat{g}_0^2} = \alpha^2 (1 + \widehat{f}_0) (1 - z)^{\frac{1}{4}}.$$

Note that  $z$  tends to zero as  $a_0$  tends to infinity. So by a Taylor expansion  $(1 - z)^{\frac{1}{4}} = 1 - \frac{z}{4} + o(z)$ , we obtain that

$$\frac{1}{\beta} = \frac{\alpha(1 + \widehat{f}_0) + \sqrt{\lambda}}{\alpha(1 + \widehat{f}_0) - \sqrt{\lambda}} = \frac{1 + (1 - z)^{\frac{1}{4}}}{1 - (1 - z)^{\frac{1}{4}}} = \frac{2 - \frac{z}{4} + o(z)}{-\frac{z}{4} + o(z)}$$

and

$$\ln \frac{1}{\beta} = \ln \left( 2 - \frac{z}{4} + o(z) \right) - \ln \left( -\frac{z}{4} + o(z) \right) = \ln 2 + \ln \frac{4}{z} + O(z).$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\varkappa}{\alpha\sqrt{\lambda}} \ln \frac{1}{\beta} &= \frac{\varkappa}{\alpha^2(1+\widehat{f}_0)} \frac{\ln 2 + \ln \frac{4}{z} + O(z)}{1 - \frac{z}{4} + o(z)} \\ &= \frac{\varkappa}{\alpha^2(1+\widehat{f}_0)} \left( \ln 2 + \ln \left( \frac{4\alpha^2(1+\widehat{f}_0)}{\widehat{g}_0^2} \right) + O(z) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (5.14)$$

Obviously, the right-hand side of (5.14) increases to zero as  $\alpha$  becomes larger. Hence for sufficiently large  $\alpha$ , or equivalently  $a_0$  large, condition (5.13) holds, which finishes the proof of Lemma 2 and therefore Theorem 5.  $\square$

**Remark 11.** The condition for blow-up in a finite time is given by  $\frac{\varkappa}{\alpha\sqrt{\lambda}} \ln \frac{1}{\beta} < 1$ . From equation (5.14) we see the relations between  $a_0$  and  $\varkappa$ , namely, the constant  $a_0$  needs to be larger as  $\varkappa$  increases.

#### REFERENCES

- [BCD11] H. Bahouri, J. Chemin, and R. Danchin, *Fourier Analysis and Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations*, Springer, Heidelberg London New York, 2011. 2.1, 2.1
- [BK14] U. Brauer and L. Karp, *Local existence of solutions of self gravitating relativistic perfect fluids*, Comm. Math. Phys. **325** (2014), no. 1, 105–141, URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00220-013-1854-3>. MR 3182488 1.1, 4
- [BRR94] U. Brauer, A. Rendall, and O. Reula, *The cosmic no-hair theorem and the nonlinear stability of homogeneous Newtonian cosmological models*, Classical and Quantum Gravity **11** (1994), no. 9, 2283–2296, URL: <http://lanl.arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/9403050>. 1.1
- [Cal03] S. Calogero, *Spherically symmetric steady states of galactic dynamics in scalar gravity*, Class. Quant. Grav. **20** (2003), 1729–1742, URL: <https://doi.org/10.1088/0264-9381/20/9/310>, [arXiv:math-ph/0301031](https://arxiv.org/abs/math-ph/0301031). 1, 1
- [CB09] Y. Choquet-Bruhat, *General Relativity and the Einstein Equations*, Oxford Mathematical Monographs, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2009. MR 2473363 1.1
- [DP85] H. Dym and H. P. McKean, *Fourier Series and Integrals*, Academic Press, 1985. 2.1
- [EF14] A. Einstein and A. Fokker, *Die Nordströmische Gravitationstheorie vom Standpunkt des absoluten Differentialkalküls*, Annalen der Physik **44** (1914), 321–328. 1
- [ER18] M. Ebert and M. Reissig, *Methods for Partial Differential Equations*, Birkhäuser, 2018. 3
- [Fri86] H. Friedrich, *On the existence of n-geodesically complete or future complete solutions of Einstein's field equations with smooth asymptotic structure*, Comm. Math. Phys. **107** (1986), 587–609. 1.1
- [Nor13] G. Nordström, *Zur Theory der Gravitation vom Standpunkt des Relativitätsprinzips*, Annalen der Physik **43** (1913), 533–554. 1
- [Ren08] A. Rendall, *Partial Differential Equations in General Relativity*, vol. 16, Oxford University Press, 2008. 1.1
- [Rob01] J. Robinson, *Infinite Dimensional Dynamical Systems*, Cambridge University Press, 2001. 2.1
- [Spe09] J. Speck, *Well-posedness for the Euler-Nordström system with cosmological constant*, J. Hyperbolic Differ. Equ. **6** (2009), no. 2, 313–358, URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1142/S0219891609001885>. MR 2543324 (2011a:35529) 1, 1
- [Str86] N. Straumann, *General Relativity and Relativistic Astrophysics*, Texts and Monographs in Physics, vol. 265, Springer Verlag, Heidelberg, 1986. 1
- [Tay97a] M. Taylor, *Partial Differential Equations I Basic Theory*, Springer, 1997. 2.1
- [Tay97b] ———, *Partial Differential Equations III Nonlinear Equations*, Springer, 1997. 2.1, 2.1, 2.1
- [TB01] G. Todorova and Y. B., *Critical exponent for a nonlinear wave equation with damping*, J. Differential Equations **174** (2001), no. 2, 464–489. 3
- [Yag05] K. Yagdjian, *Global existence in the Cauchy problem for nonlinear wave equations with variable speed of propagation*, New Trends in the Theory of Hyperbolic Equations, Operator Theory: Advance and Applications, vol. 159, Birkhäuser, Basel, 2005, pp. 301–385, URL: [https://doi.org/10.1007/3-7643-7386-5\\_4](https://doi.org/10.1007/3-7643-7386-5_4). MR 2175919 5