

HINGED BEAM DYNAMICS

DAVID RASKE

ABSTRACT. In this paper we prove large-time existence and uniqueness of strong solutions to some initial/boundary value problems involving a nonlinear hyperbolic partial differential equation. These sorts of problems arise naturally in the study of vibrations in hinged beams. The method used to prove large-time existence is the Galerkin approximation method.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let T be a positive real number. Let a and b be two positive real numbers such that $a < b$. Let Ω be the open interval (a, b) . Let $u = u(x, t)$, $t \in [0, T]$, denote the deflection of a beam that is subject to three forces, where the u -axis points downward. The first force is a restoring force, $F_2(u)$, which arises when the beam is imbedded in an elastic medium. The second is the constant weight per unit length of the beam, W , pushing it down. The third is an external forcing term $h(x, t)$. Let us also suppose the beam has the property that $u(a, t) = u(b, t) = 0$ for all t in the interval $[0, T]$. Let u_x denote the derivative of u with respect to the spatial variable x and so on for higher order derivatives with respect to x . If we can ignore the stretching of the beam, then the potential energy of the beam is

$$(1.1) \quad V(u) = \int_{\Omega} \left(\sigma \frac{1}{2} (u_{xx})^2 + f_2(u) - f(x, t)u \right) dx$$

where σ is a physical constant that represents the flexural rigidity of the beam, $\frac{df_2}{du} = F_2$, $f_2(0) = 0$, and where $f = W + h$. (See [2] for a detailed derivation of the first term in the above potential energy.) If the beam's mass distribution, $m(x)$, is uniformly distributed, we have that the kinetic energy is

$$(1.2) \quad K(u_t) := \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{2} m(u_t)^2 dx,$$

where u_t denotes differentiation of u with respect to the time variable t and so on for higher order derivatives with respect to t . Invoking the principle of least action, we see that the Euler-Lagrange equation is

$$(1.3) \quad mu_{tt} + \sigma u_{xxxx} + F_2(u) = f.$$

Now, if we want to include the effects of internal friction in our model of a hinged beam, we write

$$(1.4) \quad mu_{tt} + \sigma u_{xxxx} + F_1(u_t) + F_2(u) = f,$$

where F_1 is an increasing function from \mathbb{R} into \mathbb{R} with odd symmetry. Equations of this form arise in the study of vibrations in a suspension bridge. (See Chapter 1 of

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 35L35; Secondary 35Q99, 35L76.

Key words and phrases. nonlinear hyperbolic partial differential equations; Galerkin method; continuum mechanics.

[5] and references therein for more on this topic). Now suppose we are interested in the initial/boundary value problem associated with this equation. Since the beam is assumed to be hinged on both ends, we have the side conditions

$$(1.5) \quad \begin{aligned} u(a, t) = u(b, t) = 0 & \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, T], \\ u_{xx}(a, t) = u_{xx}(b, t) = 0 & \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, T]. \end{aligned}$$

Since we are interested in studying a problem that possesses a unique solution we also include initial conditions. Since we want high regularity solutions we need the initial conditions to be compatible with the boundary conditions. This motivates the following. Let $H_*^2(\Omega)$ be the intersection of $H_0^1(\Omega)$ with $H^2(\Omega)$. Let $H_*^4(\Omega)$ be the elements of $H^4(\Omega)$ that vanish on the boundary and whose second-order spatial derivatives vanish on the boundary. Now we can write our initial conditions

$$(1.6) \quad \begin{aligned} u(x, 0) = u_0(x) & \quad \text{for all } x \in (a, b), \\ u_t(x, 0) = u_1(x) & \quad \text{for all } x \in (a, b), \end{aligned}$$

where $u_0 \in H_*^4(\Omega)$ and $u_1 \in H_*^2(\Omega)$.

The goal of this paper is to establish large-time existence and uniqueness of solutions to the above initial/boundary value problem. We will choose the Galerkin method to prove this because of this problem's similarity to the one investigated in [4], where the Galerkin method is employed and because the Galerkin method can sometimes be used to establish numerical procedures for approximating solutions to initial/boundary value problems involving partial differential equations.

Before we state the main result of the paper, we need to define some quantities. We will endow $H_*^2(\Omega)$ with the inner-product

$$(u, v)_{H_*^2} = \int_{\Omega} u_{xx} v_{xx} dx,$$

and endow $H_*^4(\Omega)$ with the inner-product

$$(u, v)_{H_*^4} = \int_{\Omega} u_{xxxx} v_{xxxx} dx.$$

We will see later that these inner-products make $H_*^2(\Omega)$ and $H_*^4(\Omega)$ Hilbert spaces. We will also say that a function u is a *strong solution* of the initial/boundary problem (1.4)-(1.6) if (a) u satisfies (1.5) and (1.6); (b) u belongs to $L^\infty(0, T; H_*^4(\Omega))$, $W^{1, \infty}(0, T; H_*^2(\Omega))$, and $W^{2, \infty}(0, T; L^2(\Omega))$; and (c) u satisfies the equation

$$(1.7) \quad (mu''(t), v)_{L^2} + (\sigma u(t), v)_{H_*^2} + (F_1(u'(t)), v)_{L^2} + (F_2(u(t)), v)_{L^2} = (f, v)_{L^2}$$

for all $v \in H_*^2(\Omega)$ and for a.e. $t \in (0, T)$. (Here $(\cdot, \cdot)_{L^2}$ is the standard inner-product on $L^2(\Omega)$.) Note that (1.6) makes sense since $u \in C([0, T]; H_*^2(\Omega))$ and $u_t \in C([0, T]; L^2(\Omega))$.

We can now state the main result of the paper.

Theorem 1.1. *Let a , b , and T be three positive real numbers with $a < b$. Let Ω be the open interval (a, b) . Let f be a C^1 map from $[0, T]$ into $L^2(\Omega)$. Let F_1 be a monotonically increasing C^1 map from \mathbb{R} into \mathbb{R} such that $F(a)$ is non-negative (non-positive) if a is non-negative (non-positive), for all real numbers a . Let F_2 be the derivative of a C^2 map f_2 from \mathbb{R} into \mathbb{R} with the property that there exists a real number C such that $f_2(a) \geq C$ for all $a \in \mathbb{R}$. Furthermore, let u_0 be an element of $H_*^4(\Omega)$ and let u_1 be an element of $H_*^2(\Omega)$. Then there exists a unique strong solution of the initial/boundary value problem (1.4)-(1.6) with $m = 1$ and $\sigma = 1$.*

An immediate consequence of the above theorem is the following

Corollary 1.2. *Let a, b, m, σ , and T be five positive real numbers with $a < b$. Let Ω be the open interval (a, b) . Let f be a C^1 map from $[0, T]$ into $L^2(\Omega)$. Let F_1 be a monotonically increasing C^1 map from \mathbb{R} into \mathbb{R} such that $F(a)$ is non-negative (non-positive) if a is non-negative (non-positive), for all real numbers a . Let F_2 be the derivative of a C^2 map f_2 from \mathbb{R} into \mathbb{R} with the property that there exists a real number C such that $f_2(a) \geq C$ for all $a \in \mathbb{R}$. Furthermore, let u_0 be an element of $H_*^4(\Omega)$ and let u_1 be an element of $H_*^2(\Omega)$. Then there exists a unique strong solution of the initial/boundary value problem (1.4)-(1.6).*

The main difficulty in proving Theorem 1.1 is that weak convergence inside a nonlinear function is problematic. We bypass this problem in this paper by improving the uniform bounds on the Galerkin sequence so that the convergence is strong enough to overcome the problem of weak convergence inside of a nonlinear function. This is accomplished by differentiating the equations that the Galerkin sequence satisfy, and then employing the structural assumptions on the equation to improve the bounds obtained *via* methods used in [4]. This strategy is borrowed from the *linear* theory of hyperbolic equations as is presented in section 7.2 of [3]. The proof of uniqueness of strong solutions, on the other hand, is pretty straight forward. This is in large part due to the high amount of regularity of a strong solution.

Finally, we should note that the restrictions imposed on F_1 and F_2 are much more mild than the ones encountered in the literature of nonlinear hyperbolic equations. This could prevent well-posedness of the initial/boundary value problem. In particular, the weakness of the restriction on F_2 could lead to stability problems. We should have well-posedness, on the other hand, if we assume f_2 is convex. Luckily, this would be the case for most applied problems.

2. PRELIMINARY MATERIAL

2.1. Higher order Hilbert spaces. Let a and b be two real numbers such that $a < b$. Let Ω be the open interval (a, b) . Let $\{\lambda_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ be the set of eigenvalues for the eigenvalue problem

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{aligned} -u_{xx} &= \lambda u & \text{on } \Omega \\ u(a) &= 0 \\ u(b) &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

ordered in the usual manner. Note that all of the eigenvalues are positive. Let $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ be the corresponding set of eigenfunctions. We will assume that they are normalized with respect to the $L^2(\Omega)$ norm, $\|\cdot\|_{L^2}$. Due to the spectral theory of symmetric, compact operators, we can assume that e_i is orthogonal with respect to the $L^2(\Omega)$ inner-product to e_j if $i \neq j$. Note as well that all of the eigenfunctions belong to $H_*^2(\Omega)$ and $H_*^4(\Omega)$. As we'll now see we can say a lot more about $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$, $H_*^2(\Omega)$, and $H_*^4(\Omega)$.

First, we need the following

Definition 2.1. Let u be an integrable function on the open interval Ω . Then we will let $(u)_\Omega$ denote the average of u on Ω .

Lemma 2.2. *Let a and b be two real numbers with $a < b$. Let Ω be the open interval (a, b) . Then (i) there exists a positive real number C such that for all $u \in H_*^2(\Omega)$ we have that $\|u\|_{H_*^2}^2 \geq C\|u\|_{L^2}^2$. We also have that (ii) there exists a positive real number C such that for all $u \in H_*^4(\Omega)$, $\|u\|_{H_*^4}^2 \geq C\|u\|_{L^2}^2$.*

Proof. First let us prove assertion (i). Invoking the Poincaré inequality, we have the existence of a positive real number C such that

$$(2.2) \quad \int_{\Omega} (u_{xx})^2 dx \geq C \int_{\Omega} (u_x - (u_x)_{\Omega})^2 dx$$

for all $u \in H_*^2(\Omega)$. Since u vanishes on the boundary of Ω the above inequality is equivalent to the existence of a positive real number C such that

$$(2.3) \quad \int_{\Omega} (u_{xx})^2 dx \geq C \int_{\Omega} (u_x)^2 dx$$

for all $u \in H_*^2(\Omega)$. Invoking the Poincaré inequality again, we have the existence of a positive real number C such that

$$(2.4) \quad \int_{\Omega} (u_x)^2 dx \geq C \int_{\Omega} u^2 dx$$

for all $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$. Combining (2.3) with (2.4), we obtain assertion (i).

Now let us prove assertion (ii). Invoking the Poincaré inequality we have the existence of a positive real number C such that

$$(2.5) \quad \int_{\Omega} (u_{xxxx})^2 dx \geq C \int_{\Omega} (u_{xxx} - (u_{xxx})_{\Omega})^2 dx$$

for all $u \in H_*^4(\Omega)$. Since u_{xx} vanishes on the boundary of Ω the above inequality is equivalent to the existence of a positive real number C such that

$$(2.6) \quad \int_{\Omega} (u_{xxxx})^2 dx \geq C \int_{\Omega} (u_{xxx})^2 dx$$

for all $u \in H_*^4(\Omega)$. Invoking the Poincaré inequality again, we have the existence of a positive real number C such that

$$(2.7) \quad \int_{\Omega} (u_{xxx})^2 dx \geq C \int_{\Omega} (u_{xx})^2 dx$$

for all $u \in H_*^4(\Omega)$. Combining (2.6) with (2.7) we have the existence of a positive real number C such that

$$(2.8) \quad \int_{\Omega} (u_{xxxx})^2 dx \geq C \int_{\Omega} (u_{xx})^2 dx$$

for all $u \in H_*^4(\Omega)$. Recalling assertion (i), we have assertion (ii). □

Remark 2.3. Due to the intermediate derivatives theorem (see Theorem 4.15 of [1]), Lemma 2.2 implies that the $H_*^2(\Omega)$ norm is equivalent to the usual $H^2(\Omega)$ norm provided we restrict the latter norm to the linear subspace $H_*^2(\Omega)$. Lemma 2.2 also implies that the $H_*^4(\Omega)$ norm is equivalent to the usual $H^4(\Omega)$ norm provided that we restrict the latter norm to the linear subspace $H_*^4(\Omega)$. In both cases we have completeness of the inner product spaces.

Lemma 2.4. *(i) $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ forms an orthogonal basis for $H_*^2(\Omega)$, and (ii) $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ forms an orthogonal basis for $H_*^4(\Omega)$.*

Proof. First let us show that e_i is orthogonal to e_j if $i \neq j$ with respect to the $H_*^2(\Omega)$ inner product. Recalling the definition of the sequence $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$, we have that $-(e_i)_{xx} = \lambda_i e_i$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} (e_i, e_j)_{H_*^2} &= ((e_i)_{xx}, (e_j)_{xx})_{L^2} \\ &= \lambda_i \lambda_j (e_i, e_j)_{L^2} \\ &= \lambda_i \lambda_j \delta_{ij}, \end{aligned}$$

where δ_{ij} is the Kronecker delta. Thus we have the desired orthogonality property for $H_*^2(\Omega)$.

We will now show that the sequence, $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ forms a complete basis for $H_*^2(\Omega)$. Towards this end it suffices to show that if there exists an element of $H_*^2(\Omega)$ such that $(u, e_i)_{H_*^2} = 0$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, then $u \equiv 0$. So let us suppose that there exists a function $u \in H_*^2(\Omega)$ such that $(u, e_i)_{H_*^2} = 0$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that this is equivalent to $(u_{xx}, (e_i)_{xx})_{L^2} = 0$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Recalling the definition of e_i , we can also write $-\lambda_i (u_{xx}, e_i)_{L^2} = 0$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. It follows that u vanishes on the boundary of Ω and $-u_{xx} = 0$ on Ω . Calculus then gives us that $u \equiv 0$. The completeness of the collection follows.

Now let us turn our attention to the sequence $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ with relation to the $H_*^4(\Omega)$ inner-product. We will now see that this sequence is orthogonal with respect to this inner product. First note that $(e_i)_{xxxx} = \lambda_i^2 e_i$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. It follows that $((e_i)_{xxxx}, (e_j)_{xxxx})_{L^2} = \lambda_i^2 \lambda_j^2 (e_i, e_j)_{L^2}$, for all $(i, j) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$. The orthogonality of this sequence with respect to the $L^2(\Omega)$ norm then gives us our desired result.

It remains then to show that this sequence forms a complete basis for $H_*^4(\Omega)$. Again, it suffices to show that if there exists an element $u \in H_*^4(\Omega)$ such that $(u, e_i)_{H_*^4} = 0$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ then $u \equiv 0$. So let us suppose that such a function exists. We then have $(u_{xxxx}, (e_i)_{xxxx})_{L^2} = 0$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. This in turn allows us to write $\lambda_i^2 (u_{xxxx}, e_i) = 0$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. It follows that u and u_{xx} vanish on the boundary of Ω and $u_{xxxx} = 0$ on Ω . From this we can conclude that $u \equiv 0$. The completeness of $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ follows. \square

2.2. Spaces involving time.

Lemma 2.5. *Let X be a connected, compact topological space. Let $\{u_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of continuous functions from X into \mathbb{R} . Let F be a continuous function from \mathbb{R} into \mathbb{R} . Suppose that there exists a positive real number C such that $\|u_k\|_{C(X)} \leq C$ for all $k \geq 1$. Then there exists a positive real number D such that $\|F(u_k)\|_{C(X)} \leq D$ for all $k \geq 1$.*

Proof. Let C be a positive real number such that $\|u_k\|_{C(X)} \leq C$ for all $k \geq 1$. Fix $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then there exists a positive real number D that can be chosen independent of k such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|F(u_k)\|_{C(X)} &= \max_{z \in [\min \text{ of } u_k \text{ on } X, \max \text{ of } u_k \text{ on } X]} |F(z)| \\ &\leq \max_{z \in [-\|u_k\|_{C(X)}, \|u_k\|_{C(X)}]} |F(z)| \\ (2.9) \quad &\leq \max_{z \in [-C, C]} |F(z)| \\ &\leq D, \end{aligned}$$

for all $k \geq 1$. The lemma follows. \square

Remark 2.6. Let T be a positive real number, and let X be a compact topological space. Let $\{u_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of elements of $C([0, T]; C(X))$. Then the elements of this sequence are also elements of $C(X \times [0, T])$. Furthermore, the property that $\{u_k\}_{i=1}^\infty$ is bounded with respect to the $C([0, T]; C(X))$ norm is equivalent to the property that $\{u_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is bounded with respect to the $C(X \times [0, T])$ norm.

Another result that will be useful in the next section of this paper is the following

Lemma 2.7. *Let F be a C^1 map from \mathbb{R} into \mathbb{R} , and let a and b be two positive real numbers such that $a < b$. Let Ω be the open interval (a, b) , and let $\{u_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ be a bounded sequence of elements of $C([0, T]; C(\overline{\Omega}))$. Suppose as well that this sequence converges with respect to the $C([0, T]; L^2(\Omega))$ norm to a function u as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Then we have $F(u_k(t)) \rightarrow F(u(t))$ with respect to the $C([0, T]; L^2(\Omega))$ norm as $k \rightarrow \infty$.*

Proof. Recalling Remark 2.6, we put

$$(2.10) \quad M := \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \|u_k\|_{C(\overline{\Omega} \times [0, T])} < \infty.$$

On the other hand, we know that F is a C^1 function, and in particular it is locally Lipschitz continuous. Hence there exists a positive real number L_F such that

$$(2.11) \quad |F(s_1) - F(s_2)| \leq L_F |s_1 - s_2| \quad \text{for any } s_1, s_2 \in [-M, M].$$

We can now combine $u_k \rightarrow u$ in $C([0, T]; L^2(\Omega))$ with (2.10) and (2.11) to see that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$(2.12) \quad |F(u_k(t)) - F(u(t))| \leq L_F |u_k(t) - u(t)|$$

almost everywhere on Ω for all $t \in [0, T]$. It follows that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$(2.13) \quad \begin{aligned} \|F(u_k(t)) - F(u(t))\|_{L^2} &\leq L_F \|u_k(t) - u(t)\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq L_F \max_{t \in [0, T]} \|u_k(t) - u(t)\|_{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in [0, T]$ and hence

$$(2.14) \quad \max_{t \in [0, T]} \|F(u_k(t)) - F(u(t))\|_{L^2} \leq L_F \max_{t \in [0, T]} \|u_k(t) - u(t)\|_{L^2}$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Since the right hand side of the above inequality vanishes as $k \rightarrow \infty$, we have that

$$(2.15) \quad F(u_k(t)) \rightarrow F(u(t)) \quad \text{in } C([0, T]; L^2(\Omega)).$$

□

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

Proof. Step one. Following [4], we proceed as follows. For any $k \geq 1$ let us write $W_k = \text{span}\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}$, where $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ is defined in section two of this paper. Let $\{\lambda_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ be the set of real numbers defined in section two. For any $k \geq 1$ let

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{aligned} u_0^k &:= \sum_{i=1}^k (u_0, e_i)_{L^2} e_i \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{(u_0, e_i)_{H^2}}{\|e_i\|_{H^2}^2} e_i \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{(u_0, e_i)_{H^4}}{\|e_i\|_{H^4}^2} e_i \end{aligned}$$

Let us also write

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{aligned} u_1^k &:= \sum_{i=1}^k (u_1, e_i)_{L^2} e_i \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{(u_1, e_i)_{H_*^2}}{\|e_i\|_{H_*^2}^2} e_i. \end{aligned}$$

The goal of this step is to establish that for any $k \geq 1$ there exists a unique solution $u \in C^3([0, T]; W_k)$ to the variational problem

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{aligned} (u''(t), v)_{L^2} + (u(t), v)_{H_*^2} + (F_1(u'(t)), v)_{L^2} + (F_2(u(t)), v)_{L^2} &= (f(t), v)_{L^2} \\ u(0) = u_0^k, u'(0) = u_1^k. \end{aligned}$$

for any $v \in W_k$ and $t \in (0, T)$.

Towards this end, let us fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and make the ansatz

$$u_k(t) = \sum_{i=1}^k g_i^k(t) e_i.$$

Let us also write

$$g^k(t) := (g_1^k(t), \dots, g_k^k(t))^T.$$

We want u_k to solve (3.3). It follows that vector-valued function g^k must solve

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{aligned} (g^k(t))'' + \Lambda_k g^k(t) + \Gamma_k^1((g^k(t))') + \Gamma_k^2(g^k(t)) &= G_k(t) \\ g^k(0) = u_0^k, (g^k)'(0) = u_1^k. \end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in (0, T)$. Here

$$\Lambda_k := \text{diag}(\lambda_1^2, \dots, \lambda_k^2),$$

Γ_k^i is a map from \mathbb{R}^k into \mathbb{R}^k for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$ defined by

$$\Gamma_k^i(y_1, \dots, y_k) := ((F_i(\sum_{j=1}^k y_j e_j), e_1)_{L^2}, \dots, (F_i(\sum_{j=1}^k y_j e_j), e_k)_{L^2})^T,$$

and

$$G_k(t) := ((f(t), e_1)_{L^2}, \dots, (f(t), e_k)_{L^2})^T$$

is a C^1 map from $[0, T]$ into \mathbb{R}^k .

Since F_i is a C^1 map from \mathbb{R} into \mathbb{R} for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$, it follows that Γ_k^i is a C^1 map from \mathbb{R}^k into \mathbb{R}^k for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$. This implies that (3.4) admits a unique local solution. This, in turn, allows us to conclude that $u_k(t)$ is a local solution in some maximal interval of continuation $[0, t_k)$, $t_k \in (0, T)$, of the problem

$$(3.5) \quad \begin{aligned} u_k''(t) + \Delta^2(u_k(t)) + P_k F_1(u_k'(t)) + P_k F_2(u_k(t)) &= P_k f(t) \text{ for any } t \in [0, t_k) \\ u_k(0) = u_0^k, u_k'(0) = u_1^k. \end{aligned}$$

where $P_k : L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow W_k$ is the orthogonal projection onto W_k . Since each element of the sequence $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ is in the intersection of $C^\infty(\Omega)$ and $H_*^4(\Omega)$, we have that $u_k(t)$ is in the intersection of $C^\infty(\Omega)$ and $H_*^4(\Omega)$ for all $t \in [0, t_k)$. It follows that we can integrate by parts and write

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{aligned} (u_k''(t), e_i)_{L^2} + (u_k(t), e_i)_{H_*^2} + (F_1(u_k'(t)), e_i)_{L^2} + (F_2(u_k(t)), e_i)_{L^2} &= (f(t), e_i)_{L^2} \\ u(0) = u_0^k, u'(0) = u_1^k. \end{aligned}$$

for any $i \in \{1, 2, 3, \dots, k\}$. An immediate consequence of the above is that

$$(3.7) \quad \begin{aligned} (u_k''(t), v)_{L^2} + (u_k(t), v)_{H_*^2} + (F_1(u_k'(t)), v)_{L^2} + (F_2(u_k(t)), v)_{L^2} &= (f(t), v)_{L^2} \\ u(0) = u_0^k, u'(0) = u_1^k. \end{aligned}$$

for all $v \in W_k$ and $t \in (0, t_k)$.

Step two. The goal of this step is to obtain a uniform bound on the sequence $\{u_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$. Since $u'_k(t) \in W_k$ for all $t \in [0, t_k)$ we can use (3.6) to show that

$$(3.8) \quad \begin{aligned} & (u''_k(t), u'_k(t))_{L^2} + (u_k(t), u'_k(t))_{H_*^2} + (F_1(u'_k(t)), u'_k(t))_{L^2} + (F_2(u_k(t)), u'_k(t))_{L^2} \\ & = (f(t), u'_k(t))_{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

for any $t \in [0, t_k)$. This in turn allows us to write

$$(3.9) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} (u'_k(t), u'_k(t))_{L^2} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} (u_k(t), u_k(t))_{H_*^2} + \frac{d}{dt} V(u_k(t)) \\ & + (F_1(u'_k(t)), u'_k(t))_{L^2} = (f(t), u'_k(t))_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

for any $t \in [0, t_k)$. Here $V : H_*^2(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined by the rule $u \rightarrow \int_\Omega f_2(u(x)) dx$. Now, invoking the hypotheses of Theorem 1.1, we see that $F_1(a)a \geq 0$ for all $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and that there exists a non-positive real number c such that for all $a \in \mathbb{R}$, $f_2(a) \geq c$. It follows that $V(u_k(t)) - (b-a)c$ is non-negative for all $t \in [0, t_k)$. Note as well that $(v, v)_{H_*^2} \geq 0$ for all $v \in H_*^2(\Omega)$. Given these observations, we can now conclude that for all $t \in [0, t_k)$

$$(3.10) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} (u'_k(t), u'_k(t))_{L^2} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} (u_k(t), u_k(t))_{H_*^2} + \frac{d}{dt} (V(u_k(t)) - (b-a)c) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} (f(t), f(t))_{L^2} + \left(\frac{1}{2} (u'_k(t), u'_k(t))_{L^2} + \frac{1}{2} (u_k(t), u_k(t))_{H_*^2} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + (V(u_k(t)) - (b-a)c) \right) \end{aligned}$$

We can now invoke Gronwall's inequality and conclude that for all $t \in [0, T)$

$$(3.11) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} (u'_k(t), u'_k(t))_{L^2} + \frac{1}{2} (u_k(t), u_k(t))_{H_*^2} + (V(u_k(t)) - (b-a)c) \\ & \leq e^t \left(\frac{1}{2} (u'_k(0), u'_k(0))_{L^2} + \frac{1}{2} (u_k(0), u_k(0))_{H_*^2} + (V(u_k(0)) - (b-a)c) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t (f(s), f(s))_{L^2} ds \right) \\ & \leq e^T \left(\frac{1}{2} (u'_k(0), u'_k(0))_{L^2} + \frac{1}{2} (u_k(0), u_k(0))_{H_*^2} + (V(u_k(0)) - (b-a)c) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T (f(s), f(s))_{L^2} ds \right) \\ & \leq e^T \left(\frac{1}{2} (u_1^k, u_1^k)_{L^2} + \frac{1}{2} (u_0^k, u_0^k)_{H_*^2} + (V(u_0^k) - (b-a)c) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T (f(s), f(s))_{L^2} ds \right) \end{aligned}$$

Due to equations (3.1) and (3.2) we have that $(u_1^k, u_1^k)_{L^2} \leq (u_1, u_1)_{L^2}$ and

$$(3.12) \quad (u_0^k, u_0^k)_{H_*^2} \leq (u_0, u_0)_{H_*^2}.$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Now recall that there exists a continuous embedding of $H_*^2(\Omega)$ into $C(\overline{\Omega})$. We can then use (3.12) to conclude that $\|u_0^k\|_{C(\overline{\Omega})}$ is bounded with respect to k . Invoking Lemma 2.5, we have that $\|f_2(u_0^k)\|_{C(\overline{\Omega})}$ is bounded with respect to

k , and hence $|V(u_0^k)|$ is bounded with respect to k . It follows that we can use (3.11) to conclude that there exists a positive real number C such that

$$(u'_k(t), u'_k(t))_{L^2} + (u_k(t), u_k(t))_{H_*^2} \leq C.$$

for any $t \in [0, t_k]$ and $k \geq 1$. This uniform bound allows us to conclude that $u_k(t)$ is globally defined on $[0, T]$ and the sequence $\{u_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is bounded in $C([0, T]; H_*^2(\Omega)) \cap C^1([0, T]; L^2(\Omega))$.

Step three. The goal of this step is to improve upon the uniform bounds on $\{u_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ obtained in step two, Since

$$f(t) \in C^1([0, T]; L^2(\Omega)),$$

and F_i is a C^1 map from \mathbb{R} into \mathbb{R} for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$, we can differentiate (3.6) with respect to time. Then, since $u_k''(t) \in W_k$ for all $t \in [0, T]$ we have

$$(3.13) \quad \begin{aligned} & (u_k'''(t), u_k''(t))_{L^2} + (u'_k(t), u_k''(t))_{H_*^2} + \left(\frac{dF_1}{du'_k} u_k''(t), u_k''(t)\right)_{L^2} \\ & + \left(\frac{dF_2}{du_k} u'_k(t), u_k''(t)\right)_{L^2} = (f'(t), u_k''(t))_{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

for any $t \in [0, T]$. Since we are assuming that F_1 is a monotonically increasing function, we have

$$\frac{dF_1}{du'_k} \geq 0,$$

for all values of its argument. Thus, we have

$$(3.14) \quad \begin{aligned} & (u_k'''(t), u_k''(t))_{L^2} + (u'_k(t), u_k''(t))_{H_*^2} + \left(\frac{dF_2}{du_k} u'_k(t), u_k''(t)\right)_{L^2} \\ & \leq (f'(t), u_k''(t))_{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

This, in turn, allows us to write

$$(3.15) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} (u_k''(t), u_k''(t))_{L^2} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} (u'_k(t), u'_k(t))_{H_*^2} \\ & \leq \left| \left(\frac{dF_2}{du_k} u'_k(t), u_k''(t)\right)_{L^2} \right| + \frac{1}{2} (f'(t), f'(t))_{L^2} + \frac{1}{2} (u_k''(t), u_k''(t))_{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

for any $t \in [0, T]$.

In step two we showed that $\|u_k\|_{C([0, T]; H_*^2(\Omega))}$ is bounded with respect to k . It follows that $\|u_k\|_{C([0, T]; C(\bar{\Omega}))}$ is bounded with respect to k . Applying Lemma 2.5 and Remark 2.6 to $\frac{dF_2}{du_k}$, we see that $\left\| \frac{dF_2}{du_k} \right\|_{C([0, T]; C(\bar{\Omega}))}$ is bounded with respect to k . It follows that

$$(3.16) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} (u_k''(t), u_k''(t))_{L^2} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} (u'_k(t), u'_k(t))_{H_*^2} \\ & \leq C \left(\frac{1}{2} \|u'_k(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|u_k''(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \right) + \frac{1}{2} \|f'(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|u_k''(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \end{aligned}$$

for any $t \in [0, T]$ and $k \geq 1$ for some constant C independent of $k \geq 1$ and $t \in [0, T]$.

Now recalling Lemma 2.2, we know that there exists a positive real number C such that

$$(w, w)_{L^2} \leq C(w, w)_{H_*^2}$$

for all $w \in H_*^2(\Omega)$. It follows that

$$(3.17) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|u_k''(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|u_k'(t)\|_{H_*^2}^2 \\ & \leq C \left(\frac{1}{2} \|u_k''(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|u_k'(t)\|_{H_*^2}^2 \right) + \frac{1}{2} \|f'(t)\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

for any $t \in [0, T]$ and $k \geq 1$ for some constant C independent of $k \geq 1$ and $t \in [0, T]$. Invoking Gronwall's inequality, we see that there exists a positive real number C such that for all $t \in [0, T]$ and $k \geq 1$

$$(3.18) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \|u_k''(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|u_k'(t)\|_{H_*^2}^2 \\ & \leq e^{Ct} \left(\frac{1}{2} \|u_k''(0)\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|u_k'(0)\|_{H_*^2}^2 + \int_0^t \|f'(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds \right) \\ & \leq e^{CT} \left(\frac{1}{2} \|u_k''(0)\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|u_1^k\|_{H_*^2}^2 + \int_0^T \|f'(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds \right) \\ & \leq e^{CT} \left(\frac{1}{2} \|u_k''(0)\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|u_1\|_{H_*^2}^2 + \int_0^T \|f'(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds \right). \end{aligned}$$

An immediate consequence of (3.18) is that there exists a positive real number C such that for all $t \in [0, T]$ and $k \geq 1$

$$(3.19) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \|u_k''(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|u_k'(t)\|_{H_*^2}^2 \\ & \leq C e^{CT} + e^{CT} \left(\frac{1}{2} \|u_k''(0)\|_{L^2}^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

(3.19) tells us that all we need to do to obtain uniform bounds on $\|u_k''(t)\|_{L^2}$ and $\|u_k'(t)\|_{H_*^2}$ is to show that $\|u_k''(0)\|_{L^2}$ is bounded with respect to k . Towards this end let us recall (3.5) and write

$$(3.20) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|u_k''(0)\|_{L^2}^2 = \| -\Delta^2(u_k(0)) - P_k F_1(u_1^k) - P_k F_2(u_0^k) - P_k f(0) \|_{L^2}^2 \\ & \leq 2(\|\Delta^2(u_k(0))\|_{L^2}^2 + \|P_k F_1(u_1^k)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|P_k F_2(u_0^k)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|P_k f(0)\|_{L^2}^2), \\ & \leq 2(\|\Delta^2(u_k(0))\|_{L^2}^2 + \|F_1(u_1^k)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|F_2(u_0^k)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|f(0)\|_{L^2}^2), \\ & \leq 2(\|u_k(0)\|_{H_*^4}^2 + \|F_1(u_1^k)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|F_2(u_0^k)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|f(0)\|_{L^2}^2), \\ & \leq 2(\|u_0^k\|_{H_*^4}^2 + \|F_1(u_1^k)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|F_2(u_0^k)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|f(0)\|_{L^2}^2), \\ & \leq 2(\|u_0\|_{H_*^4}^2 + \|F_1(u_1^k)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|F_2(u_0^k)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|f(0)\|_{L^2}^2), \\ & \leq C + 2\|F_1(u_1^k)\|_{L^2}^2 + 2\|F_2(u_0^k)\|_{L^2}^2, \end{aligned}$$

for any $k \geq 1$, where C is a positive real number that does not depend on $k \geq 1$. Here we used (3.1) to establish the next to last inequality in the above string of inequalities. It follows that all we need to do is to show that the second and third term in the last line in the above string of inequalities are bounded with respect to k . To show that this is the case, let us recall again (3.1) and (3.2). They imply that there exists a positive real number C such that for all $k \geq 1$, $\|u_0^k\|_{H_*^4} + \|u_1^k\|_{H_*^2} \leq C$. Since there exists a continuous embedding of $H_*^4(\Omega)$ and $H_*^2(\Omega)$ into $C(\overline{\Omega})$, we know that $\|u_0^k\|_{C(\overline{\Omega})} + \|u_1^k\|_{C(\overline{\Omega})}$ is bounded with respect to k . Then Lemma 2.5 gives us that there exists a positive real number C such that for all $k \geq 1$

$$(3.21) \quad \|F_1^2(u_1^k)\|_{C(\overline{\Omega})} + \|F_2^2(u_0^k)\|_{C(\overline{\Omega})} \leq C,$$

Combining (3.20) and (3.21), we see that there exists a positive real number C such that for all $k \geq 1$

$$(3.22) \quad \|u_k''(0)\|_{L^2} \leq C.$$

Recalling inequality (3.19), we can conclude that

$$(3.23) \quad \|u_k''(t)\|_{L^2} + \|u_k'(t)\|_{H_*^2} \leq C$$

for any $t \in [0, T]$ and $k \geq 1$, where C is a positive real number that does not depend on $t \in [0, T]$ or $k \geq 1$.

Step four. The goal of this step is to obtain a bound on

$$(u_k(t), u_k(t))_{H_*^4}$$

that is independent of $t \in [0, T]$ and k . Since $\Delta^2(u_k(t))$ is in W_k for all $t \in [0, T]$ and $k \geq 1$, we can invoke (3.6) and write

$$(3.24) \quad (u_k(t), \Delta^2(u_k(t)))_{H_*^2} = (f(t) - F_1(u_k'(t)) - F_2(u_k(t)) - u_k''(t), \Delta^2(u_k(t)))_{L^2},$$

for all $t \in [0, T]$. Now recall (2.1). It implies that all of the elements of the sequence $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ have the property that their second and fourth derivatives vanish on the boundary of Ω . Since u_k is in W_k for all $t \in [0, T]$ and for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, it follows that it has the same property for all $t \in [0, T]$ and for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. We can now integrate by parts and obtain the following equation:

$$(3.25) \quad (u_k(t), u_k(t))_{H_*^4} = (f(t) - F_1(u_k'(t)) - F_2(u_k(t)) - u_k''(t), \Delta^2(u_k(t)))_{L^2},$$

for all $t \in [0, T]$. Applying the Hölder inequality to the right-hand side of the above equation, we have

$$(3.26) \quad \|u_k(t)\|_{H_*^4} \leq \|f(t) - F_1(u_k'(t)) - F_2(u_k(t)) - u_k''(t)\|_{L^2},$$

for all $t \in [0, T]$ and $k \geq 1$. Now we can conclude that

$$(3.27) \quad \|u_k(t)\|_{H_*^4}^2 \leq 2(\|f(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|F_1(u_k'(t))\|_{L^2}^2 + \|F_2(u_k(t))\|_{L^2}^2 + \|u_k''(t)\|_{L^2}^2),$$

for all $t \in [0, T]$ and $k \geq 1$.

Now recall that in steps 2 and 3 we showed that there exists a positive real number C such that for all $k \geq 1$

$$(3.28) \quad \|u_k(t)\|_{C([0, T]; H_*^2(\Omega))} + \|u_k'(t)\|_{C([0, T]; (H_*^2(\Omega)))} \\ + \|u_k''(t)\|_{C([0, T]; L^2(\Omega))} \leq C$$

Since there exists a continuous embedding of $H_*^2(\Omega)$ into $C(\overline{\Omega})$, we also have that there exists a positive real number C such that for all $k \geq 1$

$$(3.29) \quad \|u_k(t)\|_{C([0, T]; C(\overline{\Omega}))} + \|u_k'(t)\|_{C([0, T]; C(\overline{\Omega}))} + \|u_k''(t)\|_{C([0, T]; L^2(\Omega))} \leq C.$$

We can now invoke Lemma 2.5 and Remark 2.6 and see that there exists a positive real number C such that for all $k \geq 1$

$$(3.30) \quad \|F_1^2(u_k'(t))\|_{C([0, T]; C(\overline{\Omega}))} + \|F_2^2(u_k(t))\|_{C([0, T]; C(\overline{\Omega}))} \\ + \|u_k''(t)\|_{C([0, T]; L^2(\Omega))} \leq C.$$

Combining (3.30) with (3.27), we can conclude that there exists a positive real number C such that for all $k \geq 1$

$$(3.31) \quad \|u_k(t)\|_{C([0, T]; H_*^4(\Omega))} \leq C.$$

Step five. In steps 2-4 we obtained the existence of a positive real number C such that

$$(3.32) \quad \|u_k\|_{C([0,T];H_*^4(\Omega))} + \|u'_k\|_{C([0,T];H_*^2(\Omega))} + \|u''_k\|_{C([0,T];L^2(\Omega))} \leq C.$$

for all $k \geq 1$. It follows that there exists a subsequence $\{u_{k_l}\}_{l=1}^\infty$ of $\{u_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ and a function u that is in $W^{2,\infty}(0,T;L^2(\Omega))$, $W^{1,\infty}(0,T;H_*^2(\Omega))$, and $L^\infty(0,T;H_*^4(\Omega))$ such that

$$(3.33) \quad \begin{aligned} (a) & u_{k_l} \text{ converges weakly to } u \text{ with respect to the } L^2(0,T;H_*^4(\Omega)) \text{ norm} \\ & \text{as } l \rightarrow \infty. \\ (b) & u'_{k_l} \text{ converges weakly to } u' \text{ with respect to the } L^2(0,T;H_*^2(\Omega)) \text{ norm} \\ & \text{as } l \rightarrow \infty. \\ (c) & u''_{k_l} \text{ converges weakly to } u'' \text{ with respect to the } L^2(0,T;L^2(\Omega)) \text{ norm} \\ & \text{as } l \rightarrow \infty. \\ (d) & u_{k_l} \text{ converges to } u \text{ with respect to the } C([0,T];L^2(\Omega)) \text{ norm} \\ & \text{as } l \rightarrow \infty. \\ (e) & u'_{k_l} \text{ converges to } u' \text{ with respect to the } C([0,T];L^2(\Omega)) \text{ norm} \\ & \text{as } l \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

(3.32) also implies that there exists a constant C such that for all $l \geq 1$

$$(3.34) \quad \|u_{k_l}\|_{C([0,T];C(\bar{\Omega}))} + \|u'_{k_l}\|_{C([0,T];C(\bar{\Omega}))} \leq C.$$

We can now combine (3.33) with (3.34) and Lemma 2.7 to obtain

$$(3.35) \quad \begin{aligned} (a) & F_1(u'_{k_l}) \rightarrow F_1(u') \text{ with respect to the } C([0,T];L^2(\Omega)) \text{ norm} \\ & \text{as } l \rightarrow \infty. \\ (b) & F_2(u_{k_l}) \rightarrow F_2(u) \text{ with respect to the } C([0,T];L^2(\Omega)) \text{ norm} \\ & \text{as } l \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Step six. In this step we show that the function $u(t)$, which is defined in step five, is a strong solution of (1.4)-(1.6) with $m = 1$ and $\sigma = 1$. Proceeding as in section 7.2 of [3], we fix a positive integer N and choose a function $v \in C^1([0,T];H_*^2(\Omega))$ of the form

$$(3.36) \quad v(t) = \sum_{i=1}^N d_i(t) e_i,$$

where $\{d_i\}_{i=1}^N$ are smooth functions. We select $k \geq N$, multiply (3.6) by $d_i(t)$, sum $i = 1, \dots, N$, and then integrate with respect to t , to discover

$$(3.37) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_0^T ((u''_k(t), v(t))_{L^2} + (u_k(t), v(t))_{H_*^2} + (F_1(u'_k(t)), v(t))_{L^2} \\ & + (F_2(u_k(t)), v(t))_{L^2}) dt = \int_0^T (f(t), v(t))_{L^2} dt. \end{aligned}$$

Next we set $k = k_l$ and use (3.33) and (3.35) to see that the function u defined in step five satisfies the following equation:

$$(3.38) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_0^T ((u''(t), v(t))_{L^2} + (u(t), v(t))_{H_*^2} + (F_1(u'(t)), v(t))_{L^2} + (F_2(u(t)), v(t))_{L^2}) dt \\ &= \int_0^T (f(t), v(t))_{L^2} dt. \end{aligned}$$

This equation then holds for all $v \in L^2(0, T; H_*^2)$, since functions of the form (3.36) are dense in this space. This in turn allows us to conclude that u satisfies (1.7). Finally, recalling (3.1) and (3.2), we see that $u_0^k \rightarrow u_0$ with respect to the $H_*^4(\Omega)$ norm and $u_1^k \rightarrow u_1$ with respect to the $H_*^2(\Omega)$ norm. It follows that $u(0) = u_0$ and $u'(0) = u_1$. We can now conclude that u is a strong solution of (1.4)-(1.6) with $m = 1$ and $\sigma = 1$.

Step seven. In this step, we will show that the strong solution of (1.4)-(1.6) constructed in step five is the unique strong solution of (1.4)-(1.6). Fix $t \in [0, T]$. Following arguments given in step six of this paper, we see that a strong solution u of (1.4)-(1.6) has the property that

$$(3.39) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_0^t ((u''(s), w(s))_{L^2} + (u(s), w(s))_{H_*^2} + (F_1(u'(s)), w(s))_{L^2} + \\ & (F_2(u(s)), w(s))_{L^2}) ds = \int_0^t (f(s), w(s))_{L^2} ds \end{aligned}$$

for every $w \in L^2(0, t; H_*^2(\Omega))$ and for every $t \in [0, T]$. Now, let u and v be strong solutions of (1.4)-(1.6). Then we have

$$(3.40) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_0^t ((u''(s) - v''(s), w(s))_{L^2} + (u(s) - v(s), w(s))_{H_*^2} + \\ & (F_1(u'(s)) - F_1(v'(s)), w(s))_{L^2} + (F_2(u(s)) - F_2(v(s)), w(s))_{L^2}) ds = 0, \end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in [0, T]$ and all $w \in L^2(0, t; H_*^2(\Omega))$.

We will now show that $u \equiv v$. Set $w = u' - v'$. Then we have

$$(3.41) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_0^t ((u''(s) - v''(s), u'(s) - v'(s))_{L^2} + (u(s) - v(s), u'(s) - v'(s))_{H_*^2} + \\ & (F_1(u'(s)) - F_1(v'(s)), u'(s) - v'(s))_{L^2} + \\ & (F_2(u(s)) - F_2(v(s)), u'(s) - v'(s))_{L^2}) ds = 0, \end{aligned}$$

Calculus then gives us

$$(3.42) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_0^t \left(\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{ds} \|u'(s) - v'(s)\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{ds} \|u(s) - v(s)\|_{H_*^2}^2 + \right. \\ & (F_1(u'(s)) - F_1(v'(s)), u'(s) - v'(s))_{L^2} + \\ & \left. (F_2(u(s)) - F_2(v(s)), u'(s) - v'(s))_{L^2} \right) ds = 0, \end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in [0, T]$. Now, since F_1 is a monotonically increasing function, we have

$$(3.43) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_0^t \left(\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{ds} \|u'(s) - v'(s)\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{ds} \|u(s) - v(s)\|_{H_*^2}^2 + \right. \\ & \left. (F_2(u(s)) - F_2(v(s)), u'(s) - v'(s))_{L^2} \right) ds \leq 0, \end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in [0, T]$. This in turn allows us to conclude that

$$(3.44) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_0^t \left(\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{ds} \|u'(s) - v'(s)\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{ds} \|u(s) - v(s)\|_{H_*^2}^2 \right) ds \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \|F_2(u(s)) - F_2(v(s))\|_{L^2}^2 ds + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \|u'(s) - v'(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds, \end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in [0, T]$. An immediate consequence of the above is that

$$(3.45) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \|u'(t) - v'(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|u(t) - v(t)\|_{H_*^2}^2 \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \|F_2(u(s)) - F_2(v(s))\|_{L^2}^2 ds + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \|u'(s) - v'(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds, \end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in [0, T]$. Now, applying Lemma 2.5 and Remark 2.6 to the derivative of F_2 , where we consider F_2 as a function from \mathbb{R} into \mathbb{R} , we see that there exists a positive constant C such that

$$(3.46) \quad |F(s_1) - F(s_2)| \leq C|s_1 - s_2|,$$

for all $s_1, s_2 \in [-M, M]$, where M is the maximum of the elements of the set

$$\{\|u(t)\|_{C([0, T]; C(\bar{\Omega}))}, \|v(t)\|_{C([0, T]; C(\bar{\Omega}))}\}.$$

It follows that there exists a positive real number C such that

$$(3.47) \quad \max_{t \in [0, T]} \|F_2(u(t)) - F_2(v(t))\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \max_{t \in [0, T]} C \|u(t) - v(t)\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Note that we can assume without loss of generality that $C \geq 1$, so let us assume that this is the case. We now have

$$(3.48) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \|u'(t) - v'(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|u(t) - v(t)\|_{H_*^2}^2 \\ & \leq \int_0^t \frac{1}{2} C \|u(s) - v(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds + \int_0^t \frac{1}{2} C \|u'(s) - v'(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds \end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in [0, T]$. We can now invoke Lemma 2.2 to conclude that there exists a positive constant C such that

$$(3.49) \quad \|u(t) - v(t)\|_{H_*^2}^2 \geq C \|u(t) - v(t)\|_{L^2}^2,$$

for all $t \in [0, T]$. Again, we can assume that C is greater than one, so let us do so. It follows that there exists a positive constant C such that

$$(3.50) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \|u'(t) - v'(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|u(t) - v(t)\|_{H_*^2}^2 \\ & \leq \int_0^t \frac{1}{2} C \|u'(s) - v'(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds + \int_0^t \frac{1}{2} C \|u(s) - v(s)\|_{H_*^2}^2 ds \end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in [0, T]$. We can now invoke Gronwall's inequality to conclude that $u(t) \equiv v(t)$ for all $t \in [0, T]$. Uniqueness of strong solutions of (1.4)-(1.6) follows. \square

REFERENCES

1. R.A. Adams, *Sobolev Spaces*, Academic Press, New York (1975).
2. G. Arioli and F. Gazzola, On a nonlinear nonlocal hyperbolic system modeling suspension bridges, *Milan J. Math.* 83, 2015, 211-236
3. L.C. Evans, *Partial Differential Equations*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, Volume 19, American Mathematical Society, 2002.
4. A. Ferrero and F. Gazzola, A partially hinged rectangular plate as a model for suspension bridges, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.* 35(12):5879-5908.
5. F. Gazzola *et al.* *Polyharmonic Boundary Value Problems: Positivity Preserving and Non-linear Higher Order Elliptic Equations on Bounded Domains*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 1991, Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2010.

1210 WASHTENAW, YPSILANTI, MI, 48197

E-mail address: `nonlinear.problem.solver@gmail.com`