

CONSTRAINED SEMILINEAR ELLIPTIC SYSTEMS ON \mathbb{R}^N

WOJCIECH KRYSZEWSKI AND JAKUB SIEMIANOWSKI

ABSTRACT. The existence of solutions u in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^N, \mathbb{R}^M) \cap H_{loc}^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \mathbb{R}^M)$ of the coupled semilinear system of second order elliptic partial differential equations on \mathbb{R}^N of the form

$$\mathcal{P}[u] = f(x, u, \partial u), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^N,$$

under pointwise constraints is considered. The problem is studied via the constructed suitable topological invariant, the so-called constrained topological degree, which allows to get the existence of solutions of abstract problems considered as L^2 -realizations of the approximating sequence of systems obtained by the truncation of the initial system to bounded subdomains. The key step of the proof consists in showing the relative H^1 -compactness of the sequence of solutions to the truncated systems by the use of the so-called tail estimates. The constructions rely on the semigroup approach combined with topological methods, as well as invariance/viability techniques.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the paper we discuss the existence of solutions $u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N, \mathbb{R}^M)$ to a strongly coupled system of semilinear elliptic partial differential equations

$$(1) \quad \mathcal{P}[u] = f(x, u, \partial u), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^N,$$

where ∂u is the Jacobian matrix of the unknown function $u : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^M$. Here, $f : \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^M \times \mathbb{R}^{M \times N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^M$ is a vector-valued function and \mathcal{P} is a linear second-order elliptic partial differential operator of the form $\mathcal{P}[u] = -\sum_{i,j=1}^N \partial_i(A^{ij} \partial_j u) + \sum_{i=1}^N B^i \partial_i u + Cu$ with the coefficients A^{ij} , B^i and C being functions from \mathbb{R}^N into $\mathbb{R}^{M \times M}$, the space of $M \times M$ matrices. In applications such systems describe steady states of evolution processes involving M unknown species or quantities subject to diffusion \mathcal{P} and the forcing term f including the advection or drift effects. The form of \mathcal{P} allows interactions between species occur on the diffusion level, too (see e.g. [11] and more recent [31]). We look for solutions u to (1) satisfying *pointwise constraints* of the form $u(x) \in K(x)$ for a.a. $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$, where the set $K(x) \subset \mathbb{R}^M$ is closed and convex.

Constrained problems of this form arise in various applications, where natural bounds for the unknown quantities are present. For instance, experimentally obtained lower and upper threshold values σ_k, τ_k (depending on x) are often given and solutions $u = (u_1, \dots, u_M)$ satisfying $\sigma_k(x) \leq u_k(x) \leq \tau_k(x)$ a.e. for $1 \leq k \leq M$ are sought-after. As it also seems, constrained solutions appear sometimes *a posteriori* as a by-product consequence of assumptions relaxing the standard growth condition. This is the case when the method of sub- and supersolutions is applied, e.g., if $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ is bounded, $f : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is sufficiently regular and there are constants $\alpha \leq 0 \leq \beta$ such that

$$(M) \quad f(x, \alpha) \geq 0, \quad f(x, \beta) \leq 0 \quad \text{for } x \in \Omega,$$

then there is $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that $-\Delta u(x) = f(x, u(x))$ and $\alpha \leq u(x) \leq \beta$ for a.a. $x \in \Omega$ (see also [30], [37] and [38]). The technique relying on the so-called „invariant regions” or „rectangles” is often used to

Date: November 11, 2021.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 35J47, 35J61, 47B12, 47D06, 47H11, 55M20.

Key words and phrases. system of elliptic PDEs, strongly coupled, sectorial operator, semigroup of linear operators, coincidence, topological degree, constraints, semigroup invariance, viability, tail estimates.

show the global existence in time of parabolic evolution problems as well as the related stationary problems. The mentioned method is related to the method of upper and lower solutions and akin to arguments started apparently almost 90 years ago by Max Müller [39], [40]; conditions like (M) (and their relatives) are sometimes called the *Müller conditions* (see [49], [50, §12.IV, §32.V]).

There is a vast bibliography on invariant sets (or the so-called *viability* theory – the term used mainly by French and Romanian mathematicians) for nonlinear parabolic systems of the form $u_t + \mathcal{P}[u] = f(u)$ on a bounded Ω and their elliptic counterparts (2). In the elliptic case we prefer to talk about *constraints* since no evolution takes place. The reader is referred especially to the seminal work of Amann [3], the books [35] of Martin and [48, Theorem 14.7, p. 200] of Smoller. These and other authors deal mainly with a bounded Ω and a closed convex bounded set $K(\cdot) = K$ (i.e., $K(\cdot)$ is *independent* of $x \in \Omega$) containing the origin. For instance the case $A^{ij} = a_{ij}I$, $B^i = b_iI$ and $C = cI$ for $i, j = 1, \dots, N$, where $a_{ij}, b_i, c \in \mathbb{R}$ and I stands for the $M \times M$ identity matrix, and K is an arbitrary convex set is studied in [7, 44, 45, 51]. The case $A^{ij} = \delta_{ij}D$, where δ_{ij} is the Kronecker delta, $D = \text{diag}(d_1, \dots, d_M)$, $B^i = C = 0$, and $K = \{u \in \mathbb{R}^M \mid G(u) \leq c\}$, where $G: \mathbb{R}^M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a quasi-convex function was studied, e.g., in [2, 43]. A different situation was considered in [11] and [48]; the authors deal with $A^{ij} = \delta_{ij}D$, where D is an $M \times M$ not necessarily diagonal matrix and $B^i = C = 0$. In [3, 28, 29], matrices A^{ij} , B^i and C are diagonal and K is a rectangle (or the Cartesian product of closed convex and bounded sets), while in [28, 29] K is no longer constant but $K(x) = \{u \in \mathbb{R}^M \mid \sigma_k(x) \leq u_k \leq \tau_k(x), k = 1, \dots, M\}$, where $\sigma, \tau: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^M$. In all of these papers the forcing term $f(x, u, \cdot)$ is, roughly speaking, assumed to be directed inward the set K for $x \in \Omega$ and $u \in \partial K$.

As it appears, the form of coefficients A^{ij} , B^i and C , $i, j = 1, \dots, N$, along with the shape of the constraining sets implicitly imply their invariance with respect to homogeneous problem $u_t + \mathcal{P}[u] = 0$. This actually follows from an appropriately used version of the maximum principle, since the componentwise or the norm maximum principle for parabolic or elliptic systems can be interpreted as the invariance of an orthant or a ball, respectively.

The above-mentioned „inwardness” condition is subsumed by the *tangency* expressed in the language of convex analysis. This has already been observed in [35] and thoroughly discussed in [10], where a part of the theory development (not reflected elsewhere) is presented with a detailed bibliography. A variety of the so-called Nagumo, Pavel’s and other conditions are formulated and studied there.

In the present paper we deal with a general elliptic operator \mathcal{P} and a general convex constraint $K(x) \subset \mathbb{R}^M$, $x \in \Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^N$ (see Sections 1.2.2 and 4.3); conditions implying the invariance of constraints under the flow induced by \mathcal{P} are imposed in assumption 2.1 and studied in Subsections 4.3 and 4.4. The nonlinearity f in (1) satisfies relaxed regularity conditions and is subject to the tangency condition (see assumption 1.2).

Due to the lack of compactness general fixed point methods are not readily applicable to solve (1) directly. In this case, we establish the existence of a solution by solving a sequence of the approximating Dirichlet boundary value problems truncated to Ω_n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, where $\Omega_n = B(0, R_n)$ is the open ball with $R_n \rightarrow \infty$. Roughly speaking, a solution is obtained then as a limit of those approximate solutions. For that reason along with (1) we study problems of the form

$$(2) \quad \mathcal{P}[u] = f(x, u, \partial u), \quad u|_{\partial\Omega} = 0, \quad u(x) \in K(x), \quad x \in \Omega,$$

where Ω is an open bounded subset of \mathbb{R}^N .

For a bounded Ω our results follow from more general abstract results concerning a problem

$$(3) \quad \mathbf{A}(u) = \mathbf{F}(u), \quad u \in \mathbf{K},$$

where \mathbf{K} is a closed convex subset of a Banach space X , $\mathbf{A} : D(\mathbf{A}) \rightarrow X$ is a sectorial operator in X , $\mathbf{F} : U \rightarrow X$ is a continuous map defined on an open subset U of $\mathbf{K}^\alpha := \mathbf{K} \cap X^\alpha$ with X^α being the fractional space corresponding to \mathbf{A} , $\alpha \in [0, 1)$. Such a framework creates a convenient abstract scheme for (2), where \mathbf{A} corresponds to the L^p -realization of \mathcal{P} , \mathbf{F} is the superposition operator generated by f and $\mathbf{K} = \{u \in L^p \mid u(x) \in K(x) \text{ a.e.}\}$. Even though \mathbf{A} is resolvent compact, the existence of solutions to (3) can hardly be obtained via a direct use of the Leray–Schauder theory. There are two difficulties: firstly, in general \mathbf{F} is only locally bounded and \mathbf{K}^α is unbounded, secondly, \mathbf{K} and \mathbf{K}^α have empty interiors. Moreover, neither \mathbf{A} nor \mathbf{F} maps \mathbf{K} (or \mathbf{K}^α) into \mathbf{K} so the Leray–Schauder fixed point index of maps on absolute neighborhood retracts cannot be employed, too. We propose instead to apply a topological invariant responsible for the existence of solutions of (3). The construction of the so-called *constrained topological degree* is the next subject of the paper, see Subsection 4.5. It relies on the assumption of the so-called *tangency* of \mathbf{F} and the *invariance* of \mathbf{K} with respect to the semigroup generated by $-\mathbf{A}$.

A similar abstract scheme has also been considered in [26], where \mathbf{K} and $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{K}^\alpha)$ are assumed to be bounded. Roughly speaking, the existence results obtained in [26] were based on approximations similar to (4.19) but based on the Schauder fixed-point theorem rather. However, the boundedness assumptions do restrict the applications significantly.

The paper is organized as follows. We recall some standard notation and introduce the problem below. In the case of a bounded domain, the existence of constrained solutions to the problem is established in Section 2 (see Theorem 2.5). The case $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N$ is studied and the main result (Theorem 3.4) is proved in the third section. In the last section we recall some relevant information about sectorial operators, we discuss the invariance of closed convex sets (see, e.g., Propositions 4.4, 4.5), we study some examples of the sets of constraints and, in Subsection 4.5, we provide the construction of the constrained topological degree and its properties.

1.1. Preliminaries. Throughout the paper \mathbb{R}^N denotes the standard N -dimensional real Euclidean space and $\mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$ the space of $M \times N$ real matrices. The norm in \mathbb{R}^N or $\mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$ is denoted by $|\cdot|$; the scalar product in \mathbb{R}^M (resp. the Frobenius product in $\mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$) is denoted by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$. For example if $\xi, \zeta \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$, then $\langle \xi, \zeta \rangle := \sum_{k=1}^M \sum_{l=1}^N \xi_{kl} \zeta_{kl}$ and $|\xi|^2 := \langle \xi, \xi \rangle$. By ${}^t A$ we denote the transpose of a matrix A .

By $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^N$ we usually denote a bounded domain of class C^2 . Given a locally integrable map $u = (u_1, \dots, u_M)$ from Ω to \mathbb{R}^M , ∂u is the distributional Jacobian matrix of u , i.e., $\partial u := [\partial_i u_k(\cdot)]_{i=1, \dots, N}^{k=1, \dots, M} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$, where $\partial_i u_k := \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} u_k$ is the i -th partial derivative understood in the sense of distributions; $\partial_i u := [\partial_i u_k]_{k=1}^M$ is the i -th column of ∂u . Given a multi-index $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_+^N$, $\partial^\alpha := \partial_1^{\alpha_1} \dots \partial_N^{\alpha_N}$ and $|\alpha| = \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_i$.

$L^p(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$, $1 \leq p < \infty$, denotes the space of measurable functions $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^M$ such that $|u|^p$ is Lebesgue integrable with the standard norm $\|u\|_{L^p(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)} := (\int_\Omega |u(x)|^p dx)^{1/p}$; $L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$ is the space of measurable functions $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^M$ with $\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)} := \text{ess sup}_{x \in \Omega} |u(x)| < \infty$.

$W^{k,p}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$ (resp. $W_0^{k,p}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$), $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, stands for the Sobolev space of functions $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^M$ having weak partial derivatives up to order k in $L^p(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$ (resp. and vanish at the boundary, in the sense of the trace) with the standard norm

$$\|u\|_{W^{k,p}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)} := \left(\sum_{|\alpha| \leq k} \|\partial^\alpha u\|_{L^p}^p \right)^{1/p} \quad \text{if } p < \infty, \quad \text{and } \|u\|_{W^{k,\infty}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)} = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq k} \text{ess sup}_{x \in \Omega} |\partial^\alpha u(x)|.$$

We write H^k (resp. H_0^k) instead of $W^{k,2}$ (resp. $W_0^{k,2}$); clearly $H_0^1(\mathbb{R}^N, \mathbb{R}^M) = H^1(\mathbb{R}^N, \mathbb{R}^M)$. By $H^{-1}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$ we denote the dual of $H_0^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$.

It is convenient to consider the seminorms $|\cdot|_{j,p,\Omega}$, where $0 \leq j \leq k$, in $W^{k,p}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$ putting

$$|u|_{j,p,\Omega} := \left(\sum_{|\alpha|=j} \|\partial^\alpha u\|_{L^p}^p \right)^{1/p}.$$

If $M = 1$, then symbol \mathbb{R}^M will be suppressed from the notation concerning spaces.

1.2. The problem and general assumptions. We study the existence of solutions to the following system of elliptic equations

$$(1.1) \quad \mathcal{P}[u] = f(x, u, \partial u), \quad x \in \Omega,$$

where either $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N$ or Ω is a bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^N and $u = (u_1, \dots, u_M) : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^M$. If Ω is bounded, then (1.1) is studied *subject to the Dirichlet boundary condition* $u|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$. In both cases we are interested in the existence of solutions u to (1.1) such that

$$(1.2) \quad u(x) \in K(x) \text{ for a.a. } x \in \Omega,$$

where $K(x) \subset \mathbb{R}^M$ for each $x \in \Omega$. General assumptions 1.1 concerning $K(\cdot)$, 1.2 concerning f and 1.3 concerning \mathcal{P} are presented below. These assumptions will be discussed, illustrated and appropriately complemented in the following subsections.

Assumption 1.1. We assume that:

- (1) for each $x \in \Omega$, $K(x)$ is nonempty *closed and convex* subset of \mathbb{R}^M ;
- (2) for any open $U \subset \mathbb{R}^M$, the set $\{x \in \Omega \mid K(x) \cap U \neq \emptyset\}$ is (Lebesgue) *measurable* ⁽¹⁾;
- (3) there is $m \in L^2(\Omega)$ such that $\sup_{u \in K(x)} |u| \leq m(x)$ for a.a. $x \in \Omega$.

For $x \in \Omega$, let $r(x, \cdot)$ be the metric projection of \mathbb{R}^M onto $K(x)$:

$$(1.3) \quad |u - r(x, u)| = d(u, K(x)) := \inf_{w \in K(x)} |u - w|, \quad u \in \mathbb{R}^M.$$

Then $r : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^M$ is well-defined; for any $x \in \Omega$, $r(x, \cdot)$ is nonexpansive and, hence,

$$|r(x, u)| \leq d(0, K(x)) + |u| \leq m(x) + |u|$$

for all $u \in \mathbb{R}^M$ and a.a. $x \in \Omega$. By (2) and [6, Cor. 8.2.13], for any $u \in \mathbb{R}^M$, $r(\cdot, u)$ is measurable. Therefore, in view of the Krasnosel'skii theorem on superpositions, the Nemytski operator $u \mapsto r(\cdot, u(\cdot))$ maps $L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$ continuously into itself. Given $u \in L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$, $r(\cdot, u(\cdot))$ is an L^2 -selection of $K(\cdot)$, i.e., $r(x, u(x)) \in K(x)$ for a.a. $x \in \Omega$.

In Subsection 4.4 we present some examples of $K(\cdot)$ satisfying the above conditions.

Assumption 1.2. Let $f : \text{Gr}(K) \times \mathbb{R}^{M \times N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^M$, where $\text{Gr}(K) := \{(x, u) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^M \mid u \in K(x)\}$ is the *graph* of $K(\cdot)$. We assume that

- (1) f is a *Carathéodory map*, i.e., for a.a. $x \in \Omega$, $f(x, \cdot) : K(x) \times \mathbb{R}^{M \times N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^M$ is continuous and for all $u \in \mathbb{R}^M$, $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$ the map $f(\cdot, u, \xi)$ defined on $\{x \in \Omega \mid u \in K(x)\}$ is measurable ⁽²⁾;
- (2) there are $\beta \in L^2(\Omega)$, $c > 0$, $1 \leq s < \frac{N+4}{N}$ and $1 \leq q < \frac{N+4}{N+2}$ such that

$$(1.4) \quad |f(x, u, \xi)| \leq \beta(x) + c(|u|^s + |\xi|^q), \quad x \in \Omega, \quad u \in K(x), \quad \xi \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N};$$

¹This means that the set-valued map $\Omega \ni x \mapsto K(x) \subset \mathbb{R}^M$ is *measurable*; see [6] for details.

²Observe that in view of assumption 1.1 (2) the set $\{x \in \Omega \mid u \in K(x)\}$ is measurable for any $u \in \mathbb{R}^M$, so the condition makes sense.

(3) $f(x, \cdot, \cdot)$ is *tangent* to $K(x)$, i.e., for a.a. $x \in \Omega$ and for all $u \in K(x)$, $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$

$$(1.5) \quad f(x, u, \xi) \in T_{K(x)}(u),$$

where $T_{K(x)}(u)$ is the tangent cone to the set $K(x)$ at u (see Section 4.1 for the definition of the tangent cone).

Condition (3) means that for all $x \in \Omega$, $u \in K(x)$ the forcing vector field driven by $f(x, u, \cdot)$ with its tain at u is directed *inward* the set $K(x)$. It will be illustrated and discussed below (see Sections 4.2 and 4.3). Note that the growth condition (2) is considered on $\text{Gr}(K)$ only. If, for instance Ω is bounded, $K(\cdot) = K$, where $K \subset \mathbb{R}^M$ is convex and compact, f is continuous and depends only on u , then no growth condition is necessary at all.

Assumption 1.3. By \mathcal{P} we denote a linear differential operator in the divergence form

$$(1.6) \quad \mathcal{P}[u] := - \sum_{i,j=1}^N \partial_i (A^{ij}(x) \partial_j u) + \sum_{i=1}^N B^i(x) \partial_i u + C(x)u,$$

where the coefficients $A^{ij} = [A_{kl}^{ij}]_{k,l=1}^M$, $B^i = [B_{kl}^i]_{k,l=1}^M$ and $C = [C_{kl}]_{k,l=1}^M$ are functions from Ω into $\mathbb{R}^{M \times M}$ such that $A_{kl}^{ij} \in C^{0,1}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$, $B_{kl}^i, C_{kl} \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ for $1 \leq i, j \leq N$, $1 \leq k, l \leq M$.

The operator \mathcal{P} acts on a column vector-valued function $u = {}^T(u_1, \dots, u_M)$ in the sense of distributions returning the vector-valued function $\mathcal{P}[u] : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^M$ with components

$$\mathcal{P}[u]_k = - \sum_{i,j=1}^N \sum_{l=1}^M \partial_i (A_{kl}^{ij} \partial_j u_l) + \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{l=1}^M B_{kl}^i \partial_i u_l + \sum_{l=1}^M C_{kl} u_l, \quad k = 1, \dots, M.$$

With \mathcal{P} we associate a bilinear form \mathcal{B} on $H_0^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$ given by

$$(1.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}[u, v] &:= \int_{\Omega} \left(\sum_{i,j=1}^N \langle A^{ij} \partial_j u, \partial_i v \rangle + \sum_{i=1}^N \langle B^i \partial_i u, v \rangle + \langle Cu, v \rangle \right) dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \left(\sum_{i,j=1}^N \sum_{k,l=1}^M A_{kl}^{ij} \partial_j u_l \partial_i v_k + \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{k,l=1}^M B_{kl}^i \partial_i u_l v_k + \sum_{k,l=1}^M C_{kl} u_l v_k \right) dx \end{aligned}$$

for $u, v \in H_0^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$. Clearly \mathcal{B} is bounded

$$|\mathcal{B}[u, v]| \leq c \|u\|_{H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)} \|v\|_{H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)} \quad (3),$$

where the constant depends on the $L^\infty(\Omega)$ -norms of A_{kl}^{ij} , B_{kl}^i and C_{kl} . Observe that for $u \in H_{loc}^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$ the expression $\mathcal{P}[u](x)$ makes sense for a.a. $x \in \Omega$ and $\mathcal{P}[u] \in L_{loc}^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$; if $u \in H^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M) \cap H_0^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$, then, by the Green identity, $\mathcal{B}[u, v] = \langle \mathcal{P}[u], v \rangle_{L^2}$ for any $v \in H_0^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$.

Definition 1.4. We say that $u \in H_0^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$ is a *weak solution* of (1.1) if for any $v \in H_0^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$

$$\mathcal{B}[u, v] = \int_{\Omega} \langle f(x, u, \partial u), v \rangle dx.$$

If $u \in H_0^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M) \cap H^2(\omega; \mathbb{R}^M)$ for any bounded open $\omega \subset \Omega$ and $\mathcal{P}[u] = f(\cdot, u, \partial u)$ a.e. in Ω , then u is called a *strong solution*.

³We adopt the usual convention to denote by c a *general* positive constant, that may vary from line to line. Peculiar dependence on parameters will be emphasized in parantheses when needed.

Remark 1.5. (i) Note that the definition of a weak solution makes sense since, for any $u, v \in H_0^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$, $\langle f(\cdot, u, \partial u), v \rangle \in L^1(\Omega)$. Indeed, in view of (f_2) ,

$$(1.8) \quad \int_{\Omega} \langle f(x, u, \partial u), v \rangle dx \leq \int_{\Omega} |f(x, u, \partial u)| |v| dx \leq c(I_1 + I_2 + I_3),$$

where

$$I_1 := \int_{\Omega} \beta |v| dx \leq \|\beta\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|v\|_{L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)}, \quad I_2 := \int_{\Omega} |u|^s |v| dx, \quad I_3 := \int_{\Omega} |\partial u|^q |v| dx.$$

In order to estimate I_3 , let $p := 2q^{-1}$. Then $p > 1$ and let $p' := p(p-1)^{-1} = 2(2-q)^{-1}$. It is easy to see that $p' \in [2, 2^*)$ ⁽⁴⁾. Since $H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M) \subset L^{p'}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$, by the Hölder inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_3 &\leq \left(\int_{\Omega} |\partial u|^{pq} dx \right)^{1/p} \left(\int_{\Omega} |v|^{p'} dx \right)^{1/p'} \leq c \|\partial u\|_{L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)}^q \|v\|_{H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)} \\ &\leq c \|u\|_{H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)}^q \|v\|_{H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)}. \end{aligned}$$

Now suppose that $1 \leq s < \frac{N+2}{N}$ and let $t := 2s^{-1} > 1$ and $t' := t(t-1)^{-1}$. It is easy to see that $t' \in [2, 2^*)$. Hence $v \in H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M) \subset L^{t'}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$ and, by the Hölder inequality

$$I_2 \leq c \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)}^s \|v\|_{H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)}.$$

For $\frac{N+2}{N} \leq s < \frac{N+4}{N}$ we let $t := 2^*(2^*-1)^{-1}$ and $t' := 2^*$. Then $ts \in [2, 2^*)$ so, by the Hölder inequality

$$I_2 \leq \left(\int_{\Omega} |u|^{ts} dx \right)^{1/t} \left(\int_{\Omega} |v|^{t'} dx \right)^{1/t'} \leq c \|u\|_{H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)}^s \|v\|_{H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)}.$$

Summing up, (1.8) implies that given $u \in H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$, a mapping $H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M) \ni v \mapsto \ell(v) := \langle f(\cdot, u, \partial u), v \rangle_{L^2}$ is a well defined linear functional and $|\ell(v)| \leq c \|v\|_{H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)}$. Thus, $u \in H_0^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$ is a weak solution if and only if

$$\mathcal{B}[u, \varphi] = \int_{\Omega} \langle f(x, u, \partial u), \varphi \rangle dx$$

for any $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$.

(ii) The definition of a strong solution also makes sense since, arguing as above, if $u \in H_{loc}^2(\omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$ for some $\omega \subset \Omega$, then $f(\cdot, u, \partial u) \in L^2(\omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$. Clearly strong solutions are weak. If a weak solution u belongs to $H^2(\omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$ for any bounded open $\omega \subset \Omega$, then u is a strong solution. In particular if Ω is bounded, then a weak solution $u \in H_0^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$ is strong if and only if $u \in H^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$.

2. BOUNDED DOMAIN

In this section Ω is a *smooth bounded* domain in \mathbb{R}^N . We are going to establish the existence of strong solutions to (1.1), (1.2), i.e.,

$$(2.1) \quad \mathcal{P}[u] = f(x, u, \partial u), \quad u|_{\partial\Omega} = 0,$$

such that

$$(2.2) \quad u(x) \in K(x) \text{ for a.a } x \in \Omega,$$

where $K(\cdot)$, f and \mathcal{P} satisfy assumptions 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3, respectively.

Assumption 2.1. We make the following additional assumptions

⁴Given $1 \leq p < N$, p^* stands for the Sobolev critical exponent, i.e., $\frac{1}{p^*} = \frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{N}$, in particular $2^* = \frac{2N}{N-2}$.

- (1) the operator (1.6) is *elliptic* in the sense of the *Legendre-Hadamard condition*, i.e., there is an *ellipticity constant* $\theta > 0$ such that for any $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $p \in \mathbb{R}^M$

$$(2.3) \quad \sum_{i,j=1}^N \langle A^{ij} \zeta_j p, \zeta_i p \rangle = \sum_{i,j=1}^N \sum_{k,l=1}^M A_{kl}^{ij}(x) p_k p_l \zeta_i \zeta_j \geq \theta |p|^2 |\zeta|^2.$$

- (2) the graph $\text{Gr}(K)$ is *viable* (or *invariant*) with respect to the ‘diffusion’ flow; this means that, for fixed $T > 0$ given $u_0 \in L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$ such that $u_0(x) \in K(x)$ for a.a. $x \in \Omega$, the weak solution $u : [0, T] \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^M$ to the corresponding *linear parabolic* Cauchy problem

$$(2.4) \quad u_t + \mathcal{P}[u] = 0, \quad u(0, \cdot) = u_0, \quad u|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$$

stays in $\text{Gr}(K)$, i.e., $u(t, x) \in K(x)$ for all $t > 0$ and a.a. $x \in \Omega$.

Recall that a function $u \in L^2(0, T; H_0^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M))$ such that $u' \in L^2(0, T; H^{-1}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M))$ is a *weak solution* to (2.4) if $u(0) = u_0$ and $[u'(t), v] + \mathcal{B}[u(t), v] = 0$ for a.a. $t \in [0, T]$ and any $v \in H_0^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$, where $[\cdot, \cdot]$ is the duality pairing between $H^{-1}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$ and $H_0^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$.

Remark 2.2. (i) The flow invariance granted by the above condition (2) is a strong assumption. In Corollary 4.6 we shall show that it holds if and only if

$$r(\cdot, u(\cdot)) \in H_0^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{B}[r(\cdot, u(\cdot)), u - r(\cdot, u(\cdot))] \geq 0$$

for every $u \in H_0^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$ (see (1.3)). The flow invariance will be illustrated and carefully discussed from different points of view below; see Subsection 4.3, Propositions 4.4, 4.5, 4.9 and 4.10 for details.

(ii) The Legendre-Hadamard condition and its stronger form, the Legendre condition or *strong ellipticity*, is discussed in, e.g., [19] or [36]. Let us recall the following important consequence of ellipticity, the so-called Gårding inequality (see [19, Theorem 3.42], [36, Theorem 4.6] and [22]).

If the operator \mathcal{P} is elliptic, then the form \mathcal{B} is weakly coercive, i.e., there are $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\alpha > 0$ such that $\mathcal{B}[u, u] + \omega \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)} \geq \alpha \|u\|_{H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)}$ for $u \in H_0^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$.

In order to proceed we first establish *a priori* bounds for solutions to (2.1), (2.2). As in many other situations the existence of *a priori* bounds along with an appropriate continuation procedure will guarantee the existence.

Lemma 2.3. *There is $C_1 > 0$ (depending on Ω , the ellipticity constant and the $C^{0,1}$ -norms of A^{ij} , $1 \leq i, j \leq N$) such that $\|u\|_{H^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)} \leq C_1$ for every strong solution u of (2.1) satisfying (2.2).*

Proof. Let $u \in H_0^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M) \cap H^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$ be a solution of (2.1) satisfying (2.2). By (K_3)

$$(2.5) \quad \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)} \leq M_0 := \|m\|_{L^2}.$$

Assumption (f_2) shows that $f(\cdot, u, \partial u) \in L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$. Indeed

$$(2.6) \quad \|f(\cdot, u, \partial u)\|_{L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)} \leq c(\|\beta\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + I_1 + I_2)$$

for some constant $c > 0$, where

$$I_1 := \left(\int_{\Omega} |u|^{2s} dx \right)^{1/2}, \quad I_2 := \left(\int_{\Omega} |\partial u|^{2q} dx \right)^{1/2}.$$

To estimate I_1 we consider two cases $3 \leq N \leq 4$ and $N \geq 5$ separately. If $3 \leq N \leq 4$, then

$$2s < \frac{2N+8}{N} \leq 2^*,$$

and the interpolation inequality with exponents $2s \in [2, 2^*)$, $\theta_1 \in [0, 1]$

$$(2.7) \quad \frac{1}{2s} = \frac{1-\theta_1}{2} + \frac{\theta_1}{2^*} \iff \frac{s}{2}\theta_1 = \frac{N}{4}(s-1)$$

shows

$$I_1 = \|u\|_{L^{2s}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)}^s \leq \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)}^{s(1-\theta_1)} \|u\|_{L^{2^*}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)}^{s\theta_1}.$$

By (2.5) and by the continuity of the embedding $H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M) \hookrightarrow L^{2^*}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$

$$I_1 \leq cM_0^{s(1-\theta_1)} \|u\|_{H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)}^{s\theta_1}.$$

The Ehrling–Browder inequality (see [1, Thm 4.17]) implies that

$$\|u\|_{H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)}^{s\theta_1} \leq c \|u\|_{H^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)}^{\frac{s}{2}\theta_1} \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)}^{\frac{s}{2}\theta_1}.$$

Hence and again from (2.5)

$$(2.8) \quad I_1 \leq c \|u\|_{H^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)}^{\gamma_1},$$

where $\gamma_1 := \frac{s}{2}\theta_1 < 1$, since (2.7) and $s < \frac{N+4}{N}$.

If $N \geq 5$, then we use the interpolation inequality with exponents $2s \in [2, 2^{**})$ ⁽⁵⁾, $\tilde{\theta}_1 \in [0, 1]$ satisfying

$$(2.9) \quad \frac{1}{2s} = \frac{1-\tilde{\theta}_1}{2} + \frac{\tilde{\theta}_1}{2^{**}} \iff s\tilde{\theta}_1 = \frac{N}{4}(s-1)$$

to get that

$$I_1 = \|u\|_{L^{2s}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)}^s \leq \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)}^{s(1-\tilde{\theta}_1)} \|u\|_{L^{2^{**}}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)}^{s\tilde{\theta}_1}.$$

The continuity of the embedding $H^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M) \hookrightarrow L^{2^{**}}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$ and (2.5) yield

$$(2.10) \quad I_1 \leq c \|u\|_{H^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)}^{\tilde{\gamma}_1},$$

where $\tilde{\gamma}_1 := s\tilde{\theta}_1 < 1$ since (2.9) and $s < \frac{N+4}{N}$.

We now estimate I_2 : the interpolation inequality with exponents $2q \in [2, 2^*)$, $\theta_2 \in [0, 1]$ such that

$$(2.11) \quad \frac{1}{2q} = \frac{1-\theta_2}{2} + \frac{\theta_2}{2^*} \iff \frac{q}{2}\theta_2 = \frac{N}{4}(q-1)$$

shows that

$$I_2 = \|\partial u\|_{L^{2q}(\Omega)}^q \leq \|\partial u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{q(1-\theta_2)} \|\partial u\|_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)}^{q\theta_2}.$$

Both right hand side factors are estimated separately. We have

$$\|\partial u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{q(1-\theta_2)} = \|\partial u\|_{L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)}^{q(1-\theta_2)} \leq \|u\|_{H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)}^{q(1-\theta_2)}$$

We use the Ehrling–Browder inequality

$$\|u\|_{H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)} \leq c \|u\|_{H^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)}^{1/2} \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)}^{1/2}$$

and (2.5) to deduce

$$\|\partial u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{q(1-\theta_2)} \leq c \|u\|_{H^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)}^{\frac{q}{2}(1-\theta_2)} M_0^{\frac{q}{2}(1-\theta_2)}.$$

By [5, Cor. 4.6], $|\partial u| \in H^1(\Omega)$ and $\|\partial u\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq \|\partial u\|_{H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)} \leq c \|u\|_{H^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)}$. Therefore and by the continuity of the embedding $H^1(\Omega) \subset L^{2^*}(\Omega)$

$$\|\partial u\|_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)}^{q\theta_2} \leq c \|\partial u\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^{q\theta_2} \leq c \|u\|_{H^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)}^{q\theta_2}.$$

⁵The symbol 2^{**} stands for $(2^*)^*$, i.e., $2^{**} = \frac{2N}{N-4}$.

Summing up

$$(2.12) \quad I_2 \leq c \|u\|_{H^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)}^{\gamma_2}, \text{ where } \gamma_2 := \frac{q}{2}(1 + \theta_2).$$

The inequality $q < \frac{N+4}{N+2}$ together with (2.11) yield $\gamma_2 < 1$.

Using the regularity theory (see [19, Theorem 4.14] and [18, Thm 8.12], cf. Lemma 3.3)

$$\|u\|_{H^2} \leq c(\|f(\cdot, u, \partial u)\|_{L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)} + \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)}),$$

where the constant depends on Ω , the ellipticity constant and $C^{0,1}$ -norms of the coefficients of \mathcal{P}_0 . Therefore, in view of (2.5), (2.6), (2.8), (2.10) and (2.12), we see that there is $c > 0$ and $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ such that every strong solution u of (2.1) and (2.2) satisfies $\|u\|_{H^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)} \leq c \left(1 + \|u\|_{H^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)}^\gamma\right)$ and the assertion follows. \square

Again by (2.6) along with (2.8), (2.10), (2.12), and Lemma 2.3 we have

Corollary 2.4. *There is $C_2 > 0$ such that $\|f(\cdot, u, \partial u)\|_{L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)} \leq C_2$ for every strong solution u of (2.1) satisfying (2.2).* \square

Theorem 2.5. *There is a strong solution to the system (2.1) satisfying the constraints (2.2).*

Proof. The proof relies on an abstract approach using the topological tools provided in Section 4.

Step I: We introduce an abstract setting of the problem. Let $V := H_0^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$, $X := L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$; both V and X are Hilbert spaces. Let $\mathbf{K} \subset X$ be the collection of all L^2 -selections of $K(\cdot)$, i.e.,

$$(2.13) \quad \mathbf{K} := \{u \in X \mid u(x) \in K(x) \text{ for a.a. } x \in \Omega\}.$$

It has been already shown that $\mathbf{K} \neq \emptyset$ (comp. also [6, Theorem 8.1.3]); \mathbf{K} is closed and convex.

Clearly V is a dense subset of the space X and V is continuously embedded into X , i.e., $\|v\|_X \leq c\|v\|_V$, $v \in V$. The bilinear form $\mathcal{B} : V \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by (1.7) is continuous and weakly coercive (see Remark 2.2 (ii)). Therefore, in view of the general construction in Subsection 4.2.1 the sectorial operator $\mathbf{A} : D(\mathbf{A}) \rightarrow X$ such that $\langle \mathbf{A}u, v \rangle_X = \mathcal{B}[u, v]$ for any $u \in D(\mathbf{A})$ and $v \in V$ is well-defined.

Let us collect some properties of \mathbf{A} .

(a) In view of the regularity results (see, e.g., [19, Section 4.3]), the domain $D(\mathbf{A}) = H^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M) \cap H_0^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$ and $\mathbf{A}(u) = \mathcal{P}[u]$ for $u \in D(\mathbf{A})$, i.e., \mathbf{A} is the L^2 -realization of \mathcal{P} .

(b) \mathbf{A} is closed, densely defined, the resolvent set $\rho(-\mathbf{A})$ contains the set $\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \mid \operatorname{Re} \lambda > \omega\}$ and $\|(\lambda I + \mathbf{A})^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(X)} \leq (\lambda - \omega)^{-1}$ for $\lambda > \omega$, where I is the identity on X . Given $h > 0$, $h\omega < 1$, the resolvent $J_h = J_h^{-\mathbf{A}} := (I + h\mathbf{A})^{-1} \in \mathcal{L}(X)$ is well-defined and $J_h(X) \subset D(\mathbf{A})$; see Lemma 4.3 for some additional properties of J_h .

(c) $-\mathbf{A}$ generates a analytic semigroup $\{e^{-t\mathbf{A}}\}_{t \geq 0}$ of linear bounded operators on X such that $\|e^{-t\mathbf{A}}\|_{\mathcal{L}(X)} \leq e^{\omega t}$ for $t \geq 0$. Observe that assumption 2.1 is equivalent to the semigroup invariance of \mathbf{K} , i.e.,

$$(2.14) \quad e^{-t\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{K}) \subset \mathbf{K}, \quad t \geq 0,$$

or the resolvent invariance of \mathbf{K} , i.e.,

$$(2.15) \quad J_h(\mathbf{K}) \subset \mathbf{K}, \text{ where } h > 0, \quad h\omega < 1.$$

For the equivalence of the assumption 2.1 (2) and (2.14), it is sufficient to show that $u(t) := e^{-t\mathbf{A}}u_0$, $t \geq 0$, where $u_0 \in \mathbf{K}$, is the unique weak solution to (2.4). The semigroup $\{e^{-t\mathbf{A}}\}$ is analytic, hence $u(t) \in D(\mathbf{A})$, for $t > 0$. Thus, $u \in C^1((0, +\infty), X)$ and $u'(t) = \mathbf{A}u(t)$ for $t > 0$. If $v \in V$, then by [47, Cor. III.1.1], for every $t > 0$,

$$[u'(t), v] = \frac{d}{dt} \langle u(t), v \rangle_X = \langle \mathbf{A}u(t), v \rangle_X = \mathcal{B}[u(t), v].$$

For the equivalence of (2.14) and (2.15) see the proof Proposition 4.4; compare Section 4.3 for some other invariance issues.

(d) The compactness of the embedding $H_0^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M) \hookrightarrow L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$ implies that the semigroup $\{e^{-t\mathbf{A}}\}_{t \geq 0}$ is compact and so is the resolvent $J_h^{-\mathbf{A}}$, where $h > 0$, $h\omega < 1$ ⁽⁶⁾.

Now recall assumption 1.2 and set

$$(2.16) \quad p := \max \left\{ 2q, \left(\frac{1}{2s} + \frac{1}{N} \right)^{-1} \right\}.$$

Then assumptions $s < \frac{N+4}{N}$ and $q < \frac{N+4}{N+2}$ imply that $2 \leq p < \min\{2^*, N\}$. The L^2 -realization $\mathbf{A} : D(\mathbf{A}) \rightarrow L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$ of \mathcal{P} is sectorial, so, by inspection of the proof of [24, Theorem 1.6.1] there is $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$X^\alpha \subset W^{1,p}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M),$$

where X^α is the fractional space associated with \mathbf{A} (see Section 4.1). The definition of p and the Sobolev embeddings yield

$$(2.17) \quad X^\alpha \subset W^{1,p}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M) \subset L^{2s}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M) \cap W^{1,2q}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M).$$

Recall (2.13) and define

$$\mathbf{K}^\alpha := \mathbf{K} \cap X^\alpha.$$

By (2.15), $J_h(\mathbf{K}) \subset \mathbf{K} \cap D(\mathbf{A})$ for sufficiently small $h > 0$, so, in particular, $\mathbf{K}^\alpha \neq \emptyset$. Let $\mathbf{F} : \mathbf{K}^\alpha \rightarrow X$ be the superposition operator determined by f , i.e., for a.e. $x \in \Omega$ and $u \in X^\alpha$

$$\mathbf{F}(u)(x) = f(x, u(x), \partial u(x)).$$

The growth assumption (f_2) and (2.17) show that, for $u \in \mathbf{K}^\alpha$,

$$(2.18) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{F}(u)\|_{L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)} &\leq c \left(\|\beta\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \left(\int_\Omega |u|^{2s} dx \right)^{1/2} + \left(\int_\Omega |\partial u|^{2q} dx \right)^{1/2} \right) \\ &\leq c(\|\beta\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|u\|_{L^{2s}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)}^s + \|u\|_{W^{1,2q}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)}^q) \leq c(1 + \|u\|_\alpha^{\max\{s, q\}}). \end{aligned}$$

This proves that \mathbf{F} is well-defined. The standard argument using the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem shows that \mathbf{F} is continuous. The tangency condition (1.5) implies that

$$(2.19) \quad \mathbf{F}(u) \in T_{\mathbf{K}}(u) \text{ for all } u \in \mathbf{K}^\alpha,$$

where $T_{\mathbf{K}}(u)$ is the tangent cone to \mathbf{K} at u (see Section 4.1 and Example 4.1).

Remark 2.6. Clearly a function u is a strong solution to (2.1) satisfying (2.2) if and only if $u \in \mathbf{K} \cap D(\mathbf{A})$ and $\mathbf{A}u = \mathbf{F}(u)$.

Step II: Taking into account issues collected above we are in a position to apply the constrained degree theory developed in Section 4.5. Namely:

- (a) a sectorial operator $\mathbf{A} : D(\mathbf{A}) \rightarrow X$ with compact resolvent, $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ and the fractional space $(X^\alpha, \|\cdot\|_\alpha)$ associated with \mathbf{A} are given;
- (b) $\mathbf{K} \subset X$ is closed convex bounded and $J_h(\mathbf{K}) \subset \mathbf{K}$ for all $h > 0$ with $h\omega < 1$;
- (c) $\mathbf{F} : \mathbf{K}^\alpha \rightarrow X$ is continuous and tangent to \mathbf{K} , i.e., condition (2.19) holds.

⁶Let us add that if $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N$, then the above construction is valid, too, i.e., \mathcal{P} determines the sectorial operator \mathbf{A} (see [27]), but the semigroup $\{e^{-t\mathbf{A}}\}$ is not compact in general.

Let $C := \{u \in \mathbf{K}^\alpha \cap D(A) \mid \mathbf{A}u = t\mathbf{F}(u), t \in [0, 1]\}$. By Remark 2.6, (2.5) and Corollary 2.4, the sets C and $\mathbf{F}(C)$ are bounded in X . C is also closed in \mathbf{K}^α (see Remark 4.11 (2)). In view of Corollary 4.16 we have the conclusion of Theorem 2.5. \square

3. THE PROBLEM ON \mathbb{R}^N

In this section we study the problem (1.1), (1.2), where $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N$. We will apply the approximation-truncation approach sketched in Introduction. For that reason we enhance assumption 2.1.

Assumption 3.1.

- (1) The coefficients $A^{ij} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times M}$, $1 \leq i, j \leq N$, of \mathcal{P} are constant and \mathcal{P} is *strongly elliptic* in the sense of the *Legendre condition*, i.e., there is $\theta > 0$ such that for any $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^N \sum_{k,l=1}^M A_{kl}^{ij} \xi_{lj} \xi_{ki} \geq \theta |\xi|^2;$$

- (2) there is a sequence $(R_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ with $R_n \nearrow \infty$ such that, for any $n \geq 1$, the graph $\text{Gr}(K|_{B_n})$ is invariant with respect to (2.4) (with Ω replaced with B_n); here $B_n := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N \mid |x| < R_n\}$ is the ball around 0 of radius R_n ; in what follows, we assume that $R_n = n$, $n \geq 1$, for short.

We start with some auxiliary lemmata.

Lemma 3.2. (i) For every $1 \leq p < N$, there is a constant $c_0 = c_0(p)$ depending on p only, such that for any $R \geq 1$ and $v \in W^{1,p}(B_R, \mathbb{R}^M)$

$$(3.1) \quad \|v\|_{L^{p^*}(B_R, \mathbb{R}^M)} \leq c_0(p) \|v\|_{W^{1,p}(B_R, \mathbb{R}^M)}.$$

- (ii) There is a constant $c_1 > 0$ such that for any $R \geq 1$ and $v \in H^2(B_R, \mathbb{R}^M)$,

$$(3.2) \quad |v|_{1,2,B_R}^2 \leq c_1^2 (\|v\|_{L^2(B_R, \mathbb{R}^M)} |v|_{2,2,B_R} + \|v\|_{L^2(B_R, \mathbb{R}^M)}^2).$$

Proof. These seem to be folklore results — for the sake of completeness we give the proofs.

- (i) By the Sobolev inequality there is $c_0 = c_0(p)$ such that

$$\|u\|_{L^{p^*}(B_1)} \leq c_0 \|u\|_{W^{1,p}(B_1)},$$

for any $u \in W^{1,p}(B_1)$. Take $R \geq 1$, $v \in W^{1,p}(B_R)$ and let $u(x) := v(Rx)$ for $x \in B_1$. Clearly, $u \in W^{1,p}(B_1)$ and, after the change of variables, we get

$$\|u\|_{L^{p^*}(B_1)} = R^{-N/p^*} \|v\|_{L^{p^*}(B_R)}, \quad \|u\|_{L^p(B_1)}^p = R^{-N} \|v\|_{L^p(B_R)}^p \quad \text{and} \quad \|\partial_j u\|_{L^p(B_1)} = R^{p-N} \|\partial_j v\|_{L^p(B_R)},$$

for any $j = 1, \dots, N$. Hence and taking into account that $Np/p^* = N - p$, we obtain

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \|v\|_{L^{p^*}(B_R)} &\leq c_0 \left(R^{Np/p^*-N} \|v\|_{L^p(B_R)}^p + R^{Np/p^*+p-N} \sum_{j=1}^N \|\partial_j v\|_{L^p(B_R)}^p \right)^{1/p} \\ &\leq c_0 \|v\|_{W^{1,p}(B_R)}. \end{aligned}$$

If $v \in W^{1,p}(B_R, \mathbb{R}^M)$, then $w := |v| \in W^{1,p}(B_R)$ and $\|w\|_{W^{1,p}(B_R)} \leq \|v\|_{W^{1,p}(B_R, \mathbb{R}^M)}$, in view of [5, Cor 4.6]. Hence and by the above

$$\|v\|_{L^{p^*}(B_R, \mathbb{R}^M)} = \|w\|_{L^{p^*}(B_R)} \leq c_0 \|w\|_{W^{1,p}(B_R)} \leq c_0 \|v\|_{W^{1,p}(B_R, \mathbb{R}^M)}.$$

- (ii) By the Ehrling-Browder inequalities (see [1, Corollary 4.16, Theorem 4.17]), for $u \in H^2(B_1, \mathbb{R}^M)$

$$\|u\|_{H^2(B_1, \mathbb{R}^M)}^2 \leq c(|u|_{2,2,B_1}^2 + \|u\|_{L^2(B_1, \mathbb{R}^M)}^2) \quad \text{and} \quad |u|_{1,2}^2 \leq c\|u\|_{H^2(B_1, \mathbb{R}^M)} \|u\|_{L^2(B_1, \mathbb{R}^M)}.$$

Combining the above inequalities, there is $c_1 > 0$ such that for any $u \in H^2(B_1, \mathbb{R}^M)$

$$(3.4) \quad |u|_{1,2,B_1}^2 \leq c_1^2 (|u|_{2,2,B_1} \|u\|_{L^2(B_1, \mathbb{R}^M)} + \|u\|_{L^2(B_1, \mathbb{R}^M)}^2).$$

Fix $R \geq 1$ and $v \in H^2(B_R, \mathbb{R}^M)$. Again we define $u(x) := v(Rx)$ for $x \in B_1$. Then $u \in H^2(B_1, \mathbb{R}^M)$ and, after the change of variables,

$$|u|_{1,2,B_1}^2 = R^{2-N} |v|_{1,2,B_R}^2, \quad |u|_{2,2,B_1} = R^{2-N/2} |v|_{2,2,B_R}, \quad \|u\|_{L^2(B_1, \mathbb{R}^M)} = R^{-N/2} \|v\|_{L^2(B_R, \mathbb{R}^M)}.$$

Therefore and by (3.4)

$$|v|_{1,2,B_R}^2 \leq c_1^2 (|v|_{2,2,B_R} \|v\|_{L^2(B_R, \mathbb{R}^M)} + R^{-2} \|v\|_{L^2(B_R, \mathbb{R}^M)}^2). \quad \square$$

Lemma 3.3. *There is $c_2 > 0$ such that for all $R \geq 1$ and $g \in L^2(B_R, \mathbb{R}^M)$ if $v \in H_0^1(B_R, \mathbb{R}^M)$ is a weak solution of $\mathcal{P}[v] = g$, then $v \in H^2(B_R, \mathbb{R}^M)$ and*

$$(3.5) \quad \|v\|_{H^2(B_R, \mathbb{R}^M)} \leq c_2 (\|g\|_{L^2(B_R, \mathbb{R}^M)} + \|v\|_{L^2(B_R, \mathbb{R}^M)}).$$

Proof. Take $R \geq 1$, $g \in L^2(B_R, \mathbb{R}^M)$, $v \in H^2(B_R, \mathbb{R}^M)$ and let $\mathcal{B}[v, \varphi] = \int_{B_R} \langle g, \varphi \rangle dx$ for any test function $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(B_R, \mathbb{R}^M)$. Define $f(x) := g(Rx)$, $u(x) := v(Rx)$ for $x \in B_1$ and take a test function $\psi \in C_0^\infty(B_1, \mathbb{R}^M)$. Let $\varphi(x) := \psi(R^{-1}x)$, for $x \in B_R$. We see that $f \in L^2(B_1, \mathbb{R}^M)$, $u \in H_0^1(B_1, \mathbb{R}^M)$ and $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(B_R, \mathbb{R}^M)$. After the change of variables

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_R} \langle g, \varphi \rangle dx &= R^N \int_{B_1} \langle f, \psi \rangle dx, \\ \mathcal{B}[v, \varphi] &= R^{N-2} \int_{B_1} \sum_{i,j=1}^N \langle A^{ij} \partial_j u, \partial_i \psi \rangle dx + R^{N-1} \int_{B_1} \sum_{i=1}^N \langle B_R^i \partial_i u, \psi \rangle dx + R^N \int \langle C_R u, \psi \rangle dx, \end{aligned}$$

where $B_R^i(x) := B^i(Rx)$, $C_R(x) := C(Rx)$ for $x \in B_1$ ($i = 1, \dots, N$). This shows that u weakly solves the problem

$$\mathcal{P}_0[u] = R^2 f + T[u], \quad \text{where } \mathcal{P}_0[u] := - \sum_{i,j=1}^N \partial_i (A^{ij} \partial_j u) \quad \text{and} \quad T[u] := R \sum_{i=1}^N B_R^i \partial_i u + R^2 C_R u.$$

It is clear that $T[u] \in L^2(B_1, \mathbb{R}^M)$ and

$$(3.6) \quad \|T[u]\|_{L^2(B_1, \mathbb{R}^M)} \leq RN \max_{i=1, \dots, N} \|B^i\|_{L^\infty} |u|_{1,2,B_1} + R^2 \|C\|_{L^\infty} \|u\|_{L^2(B_1, \mathbb{R}^M)}.$$

The regularity result (see, e.g., [19, Thm 4.14]) implies that there is a constant $c_3 > 0$ such that given $h \in L^2(B_1, \mathbb{R}^M)$ if $w \in H_0^1(B_1, \mathbb{R}^M)$ is a weak solution to $\mathcal{P}_0[w] = h$, then

$$|w|_{2,2,B_1} \leq c_3 \|h\|_{L^2(B_1, \mathbb{R}^M)}.$$

This implies that $u \in H^2(B_1, \mathbb{R}^M)$, in consequence $v \in H^2(B_R, \mathbb{R}^M)$, and

$$|u|_{2,2,B_1} \leq c_3 (R^2 \|f\|_{L^2(B_1, \mathbb{R}^M)} + \|T[u]\|_{L^2(B_1, \mathbb{R}^M)}).$$

Hence and by (3.6), there is a constant c_4 (depending on \mathcal{P} only) such that

$$(3.7) \quad |u|_{2,2,B_1} \leq c_4 (R^2 \|f\|_{L^2(B_1, \mathbb{R}^M)} + R^2 \|u\|_{L^2(B_1, \mathbb{R}^M)} + R |u|_{1,2,B_1}).$$

As before, after the change of variables we find

$$\begin{aligned} |u|_{2,2,B_1} &= R^{2-N/2} |v|_{2,2,B_R}, \quad \|f\|_{L^2(B_1, \mathbb{R}^M)} = R^{-N/2} \|g\|_{L^2(B_R, \mathbb{R}^M)}, \\ \|u\|_{L^2(B_1, \mathbb{R}^M)} &= R^{-N/2} \|v\|_{L^2(B_R, \mathbb{R}^M)} \quad \text{and} \quad |u|_{1,2,B_1} = R^{1-N/2} |v|_{1,2,B_R}, \end{aligned}$$

so (3.7) becomes

$$(3.8) \quad |v|_{2,2,B_R} \leq c_4(\|g\|_{L^2(B_R, \mathbb{R}^M)} + |v|_{1,2,B_R} + \|v\|_{L^2(B_R, \mathbb{R}^M)}).$$

We use Lemma 3.2 (ii) and the inequality $ab \leq \varepsilon a^2 + b^2/\varepsilon$, for $a, b \geq 0$, to deduce

$$|v|_{1,2,B_R} \leq c_1(\varepsilon |v|_{2,2,B_R} + (1 + \varepsilon^{-1})\|v\|_{L^2(B_R, \mathbb{R}^M)}).$$

Taking ε so that $c_1 c_4 \varepsilon = 1/2$ and returning to (3.8), we conclude

$$(3.9) \quad |v|_{2,2,B_R} \leq c(\|g\|_{L^2(B_R, \mathbb{R}^M)} + \|v\|_{L^2(B_R, \mathbb{R}^M)})$$

for some c independent of the choice of R . Now, combining (3.9) with (3.2), we get the assertion (3.5). \square

Theorem 3.4. *Problem (1.1), (1.2), where $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N$, has a strong solution.*

Proof. We consider the family of truncated problems

$$(3.10) \quad \begin{cases} \mathcal{P}[u] = f(x, u, \partial u) & \text{on } B_n, u|_{\partial B_n} = 0, \\ u(x) \in K(x) & \text{for a.e. } x \in B_n, \end{cases}$$

where $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By Theorem 2.5, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there is a solution $u_n \in H^2(B_n, \mathbb{R}^M) \cap H_0^1(B_n, \mathbb{R}^M)$ such that $u_n(x) \in K(x)$ a.e. on B_n since assumption 3.1 entails assumption 2.1 with Ω replaced by B_n .

Step I: We claim that the sequence $(\|u_n\|_{H^2(B_n, \mathbb{R}^M)})_{n=1}^\infty$ is bounded. Indeed, in view of (K_3) ,

$$(3.11) \quad |u_n(x)| \leq m(x) \text{ a.e. and thus } \|u_n\|_{L^2(B_n, \mathbb{R}^M)} \leq M_0 := \|m\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^N)}.$$

Now we are going to establish the uniform H^2 -estimate. By Lemma 3.3 and (3.11), there is c_2 such that for all $n \geq 1$

$$(3.12) \quad \|u_n\|_{H^2(B_n, \mathbb{R}^M)} \leq c_2(\|f(\cdot, u_n, \partial u_n)\|_{L^2(B_n, \mathbb{R}^M)} + M_0).$$

As in (2.6), condition (f_2) yields, for $n \geq 1$,

$$(3.13) \quad \|f(\cdot, u_n, \partial u_n)\|_{L^2(B_n, \mathbb{R}^M)} \leq c(\|\beta\|_{L^2} + I_1^{(n)} + I_2^{(n)}),$$

where

$$I_1^{(n)} = \left(\int_{B_n} |u_n|^{2s} dx \right)^{1/2} = \|u_n\|_{L^{2s}(B_n, \mathbb{R}^M)}^s, \quad I_2^{(n)} = \left(\int_{B_n} |\partial u_n|^{2q} dx \right)^{1/2} = \|\partial u_n\|_{L^{2q}(B_n, \mathbb{R}^M)}^q.$$

We now proceed similarly as in the proof of Lemma 2.3 to estimate $I_1^{(n)}$ and $I_2^{(n)}$ but, to get constants independent of $n \geq 1$, we apply Lemmata 3.2 and 3.3. Obvious modifications of arguments used to get (2.8), (2.10) and (2.12) show that

$$I_1^{(n)} \leq c(1 + \|u_n\|_{H^2(B_n, \mathbb{R}^M)}^{\gamma_1}) \text{ and } I_2^{(n)} \leq c(1 + \|u_n\|_{H^2(B_n, \mathbb{R}^M)}^{\gamma_2}),$$

for some constants $c > 0$, $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in (0, 1)$ independent of $n \geq 1$. Combine this with (3.13), to find

$$(3.14) \quad \|f(\cdot, u_n, \partial u_n)\|_{L^2(B_n, \mathbb{R}^M)} \leq c(1 + \|u_n\|_{H^2(B_n, \mathbb{R}^M)}^\gamma),$$

where constants $c > 0$ and $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ do not depend on $n \geq 1$. Hence, and by (3.12), there is $M_1 > 0$ such that

$$(3.15) \quad \sup_{n \geq 1} \|u_n\|_{H^2(B_n, \mathbb{R}^M)} \leq M_1.$$

Step II: From now on let us think of each u_n as being extended to zero outside B_n . Since $u_n \in H_0^1(B_n, \mathbb{R}^M)$, we may assume that $u_n \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N, \mathbb{R}^M)$ and $\|u_n\|_{H^1(B_n, \mathbb{R}^M)} = \|u_n\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^N, \mathbb{R}^M)}$ ⁽⁷⁾. We will show that the set

⁷Note that in general $u_n \notin H^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \mathbb{R}^M)$ and this is the reason for some technical difficulties in what follows.

$\{u_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ is relatively compact in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^N, \mathbb{R}^M)$.

The idea is to decompose $\{u_n\} \subset \{\chi_{B_R} u_n\} + \{(1 - \chi_{B_R})u_n\}$, where $R > 0$ is large enough and χ_{B_R} stands for the indicator function of B_R , and show that the first set, being bounded in H^2 , is compact in the $H^1(B_R, \mathbb{R}^M)$ due to the Rellich–Kondrachov theorem, while the second one is contained in the arbitrarily small ball. In general, however, $\chi_{B_R} u_n \notin H^1(\mathbb{R}^N, \mathbb{R}^M)$, so we introduce a smooth function $\varphi_R : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow [0, 1]$ having properties similar to those of $(1 - \chi_{B_R})$.

To this end consider a function $\varphi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ such that $0 \leq \varphi \leq 1$, $\varphi(t) = 0$ for $t \leq 1$ and $\varphi(t) = 1$ for $t \geq 4$. For $R > 0$, let $\varphi_R : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be given by

$$\varphi_R(x) := \varphi(R^{-2}|x|^2), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^N.$$

Then $\varphi_R \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$, $0 \leq \varphi_R \leq 1$, $\varphi_R(x) = 0$ for $x \in B_R$ and $\varphi_R(x) = 1$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_{2R}$.

For any $R > 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\varphi_R u_n \in H_0^1(B_n, \mathbb{R}^M)$ so test (3.10) with $\varphi_R u_n$ and get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}[u_n, \varphi_R u_n] &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left(\varphi_R \sum_{i,j=1}^N \langle A^{ij} \partial_j u_n, \partial_i u_n \rangle + \sum_{i,j=1}^N \partial_i \varphi_R \langle A^{ij} \partial_j u_n, u_n \rangle + \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{i=1}^N \varphi_R \langle B^i \partial_i u_n, u_n \rangle + \varphi_R \langle C u_n, u_n \rangle \right) dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \varphi_R \langle f(x, u_n, \partial u_n), u_n \rangle dx, \end{aligned}$$

where we integrate over \mathbb{R}^N since $\text{supp } \varphi_R u_n \subset \overline{B_n}$. The strong ellipticity (\mathcal{P}'_2) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \theta \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \varphi_R |\partial u_n|^2 dx &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \varphi_R \sum_{i,j=1}^N \langle A^{ij} \partial_j u_n, \partial_i u_n \rangle dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \varphi_R \langle f(x, u_n, \partial u_n), u_n \rangle dx + \\ &\quad - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \sum_{i,j=1}^N \partial_i \varphi_R \langle A^{ij} \partial_j u_n, u_n \rangle dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \varphi_R \langle B^i \partial_i u_n, u_n \rangle - \varphi_R \langle C u_n, u_n \rangle \right) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently

$$(3.16) \quad \theta \int_{|x| \geq 2R} |\partial u_n|^2 dx \leq \theta \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \varphi_R |\partial u_n|^2 dx \leq I_0(n, R) + I_1(n, R) + I_2(n, R),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I_0(n, R) &:= \int_{|x| \geq R} |f(x, u_n, \partial u_n)| |u_n| dx, \quad I_1(n, R) := \int_{R \leq |x| \leq 2R} |u_n| \sum_{i,j=1}^N |A^{ij}| |\partial_j u_n| |\partial_i \varphi_R| dx, \\ I_2(n, R) &:= \int_{|x| \geq R} |u_n| \sum_{i=1}^N |B^i| |\partial_i u_n| + |C| |u_n|^2 dx. \end{aligned}$$

We estimate the right hand side summands. Firstly, we use (3.11) and get

$$\begin{aligned} I_0(n, R) &= \int_{|x| \geq R} |f(x, u_n, \partial u_n)| |u_n| dx = \int_{B_n \setminus B_R} |f(x, u_n, \partial u_n)| |u_n| dx \leq \\ (3.17) \quad &\leq \|f(\cdot, u_n, \partial u_n)\|_{L^2(B_n, \mathbb{R}^M)} \left(\int_{|x| \geq R} m^2(x) dx \right)^{1/2} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } R \rightarrow \infty, \end{aligned}$$

since, in view of (3.14) and (3.15), the first factor above is bounded.

Using the properties of φ_R , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} I_1(n, R) &\leq \max_{1 \leq i, j \leq N} |A^{ij}| \int_{R \leq |x| \leq 2R} \left(\sum_{j=1}^N |u_n| |\partial_j u_n| \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^N |\partial_i \varphi_R| \right) dx \leq \\ &\leq N \max_{i,j} |A^{ij}| \int_{R \leq |x| \leq 2R} |u_n| |\partial u_n| |\partial \varphi_R| dx \leq N \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} |\varphi'(t)| \max_{i,j} |A^{ij}| \int_{R \leq |x| \leq 2R} |u_n| |\partial u_n| \frac{2|x|}{R^2} dx \\ &\leq \frac{4N}{R} \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} |\varphi'(t)| \max_{i,j} |A^{ij}| \|u_n\|_{L^2} \|u_n\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^N, \mathbb{R}^M)} \leq \frac{4N}{R} \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} |\varphi'(t)| \max_{i,j} |A^{ij}| M_0 M_1, \end{aligned}$$

since, on account of (3.15), $\|u_n\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^N, \mathbb{R}^M)} = \|u_n\|_{H^1(B_n, \mathbb{R}^M)} \leq \|u_n\|_{H^2(B_n, \mathbb{R}^M)} \leq M_1$. Hence

$$(3.18) \quad I_1(n, R) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } R \rightarrow \infty \text{ for } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Finally

$$\begin{aligned} I_2(n, R) &\leq \max_i \|B^i\|_{L^\infty} \int_{|x| \geq R} |u_n| \sum_{i=1}^N |\partial_i u_n| dx + \|C\|_{L^\infty} \int_{|x| \geq R} |u_n|^2 dx \leq \\ &\leq \sqrt{N} \max_i \|B^i\|_{L^\infty} \int_{|x| \geq R} m(x) |\partial u| dx + \|C\|_{L^\infty} \int_{|x| \geq R} m^2(x) dx \leq \\ (3.19) \quad &\leq \left(\sqrt{N} \max_i \|B^i\|_{L^\infty} M_1 + \|C\|_{L^\infty} \right) \int_{|x| \geq R} m^2(x) dx \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } R \rightarrow \infty \end{aligned}$$

uniformly for $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

By (3.16), (3.17), (3.18) and (3.19), we find that $\sup_{n \geq 1} |u_n|_{1,2, \mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_{2R}} \rightarrow 0$ as $R \rightarrow \infty$. Hence and again by (3.11)

$$(3.20) \quad \sup_{n \geq 1} \|u_n\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_R, \mathbb{R}^M)} \leq \sup_{n \geq 1} \left(\|m\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \setminus B_R)}^2 + |u_n|_{1,2, \mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_R}^2 \right) \xrightarrow{R \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

Take an arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$ and $R_0 > 0$ such that for $R \geq R_0$

$$\sup_{n \geq 1} \|u_n\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_R, \mathbb{R}^M)} < \varepsilon.$$

Then, for any $n \geq 1$ and some constant $c > 0$ independent of n we have,

$$(3.21) \quad \|\varphi_{R_0} u_n\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^N, \mathbb{R}^M)} \leq c \|\varphi_{R_0}\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R})} \|u_n\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_{R_0}, \mathbb{R}^M)} < \varepsilon c (1 + \|\partial \varphi_{R_0}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}).$$

For $n \geq 2R_0$, we have $(1 - \varphi_{R_0})u_n \in H^2(B_{2R_0}, \mathbb{R}^M)$ and

$$\|(1 - \varphi_{R_0})u_n\|_{H^2(B_{2R_0}, \mathbb{R}^M)} \leq c \|\varphi_{R_0}\|_{W^{2,\infty}(\mathbb{R})} \|u_n\|_{H^2(B_n, \mathbb{R}^M)} \leq c \|\varphi_{R_0}\|_{W^{2,\infty}(\mathbb{R})} M_1.$$

This shows that the set $\{(1 - \varphi_{R_0})u_n\}_{n \geq 2R_0}$ is bounded in $H^2(B_{2R_0}, \mathbb{R}^M)$. In view of the Rellich–Kondrachov theorem it is relatively compact in $H^1(B_{2R_0}, \mathbb{R}^M)$. At the same time this set is contained in $H_0^1(B_{2R_0}, \mathbb{R}^M)$; the latter space (if we think of its elements as being extended onto \mathbb{R}^N) is closed in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^N, \mathbb{R}^M)$. Therefore $\{(1 - \varphi_{R_0})u_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ is relatively compact in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^N, \mathbb{R}^M)$. Summing up, for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there is $R_0 > 0$ such that

$$\{u_n\}_{n \geq 1} \subset \{(1 - \varphi_{R_0})u_n\}_{n \geq 1} + \{\varphi_{R_0} u_n\}_{n \geq 1},$$

where the first set is relatively compact in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^N, \mathbb{R}^M)$ while the second one the ball $B_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^N, \mathbb{R}^M)}(0, \varepsilon)$. This proves the claim.

Step III: If u_0 is a cluster point of $\{u_n\}$, then u_0 is a strong solution to (1.1), (1.2). Indeed, without loss of generality we may assume that $u_n \rightarrow u_0$ in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^N, \mathbb{R}^M)$ and in $L^{2^*}(\mathbb{R}^N, \mathbb{R}^M)$. Therefore $u_n(x) \rightarrow u_0(x)$ and $\partial u_n(x) \rightarrow \partial u_0(x)$ for a.a. $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$; moreover there are $h_0 \in L^{2^*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and $h_1 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N)$ such that $|u_n|, |u_0| \leq h_0$

and $|\partial u_n|, |\partial u_0| \leq h_1$ a.e. on \mathbb{R}^N .

It is clear that $u_0(x) \in K(x)$ for a.a. $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$. To see that u_0 is a weak solution take an arbitrary $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N, \mathbb{R}^M)$. The H^1 -continuity of \mathcal{B} implies that

$$(3.22) \quad \mathcal{B}[u_n, \psi] \rightarrow \mathcal{B}[u_0, \psi] \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

The continuity of $f(x, \cdot, \cdot)$ for a.a. $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ implies that

$$f(x, u_n(x), \partial u_n(x)) \rightarrow f(x, u_0(x), \partial u_0(x)) \text{ a.e. as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

and, due to the growth conditions, for some $c > 0$,

$$|f(x, u_n(x), \partial u_n(x)) - f(x, u_0(x), \partial u_0(x))| \leq c\gamma(x)$$

for a.a. $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$, where $\gamma(x) := \beta(x) + h_0^s(x) + h_1^q(x)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$. Hölder's inequality with suitable exponents (see, e.g., Remark 1.5) shows that $\gamma(\cdot)|\psi| \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Then, by the Lebesgue theorem

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \langle f(x, u_n, \partial u_n), \psi \rangle dx \rightarrow \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \langle f(x, u_0, \partial u_0), \psi \rangle dx \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Therefore u_0 is a weak solution to (1.1), (1.2).

Now take an arbitrary bounded $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ and $R > 0$ such that $\Omega \subset B_R$. If $n \geq R$, then the restriction w_n of u_n to Ω belongs to $H^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$. By (3.15), $\sup_{n \geq R} \|w_n\|_{H^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)} < \infty$, thus (up to a subsequence) (w_n) converges weakly to $w_0 \in H^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$ and $w_n \rightarrow w_0$ in $H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$. This implies that w_0 is the restriction of u_0 to Ω . We have shown that the weak solution $u_0 \in H^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$, i.e., u_0 is a strong solution. \square

4. SECTORIAL OPERATORS AND CONSTRAINED DEGREE

Here we collect some relevant facts used throughout the paper. We discuss assumptions and provide some examples as well as we present the construction of the coincidence degree.

4.1. Tangent cones (see e.g. [6, Chapter 4]). Let \mathbf{K} be a closed subset of a Banach space $(X, \|\cdot\|)$ and $x \in \mathbf{K}$. The *Clarke* (or *circatangent*) *cone* to the set K at u is defined by

$$T_{\mathbf{K}}(u) := \{v \in X \mid \lim_{h \rightarrow 0^+, y \rightarrow u, y \in \mathbf{K}} h^{-1} d(y + hv, \mathbf{K}) = 0\},$$

where $d(x, \mathbf{K}) = \inf_{v \in \mathbf{K}} \|x - v\|$ for $x \in X$. Obviously, $T_{\mathbf{K}}(u)$ is a convex cone. If \mathbf{K} is convex, then

$$T_{\mathbf{K}}(u) = \overline{\bigcup_{h>0} h^{-1}(\mathbf{K} - u)}$$

is the cone *tangent* to \mathbf{K} in the sense of convex analysis and $v \in T_{\mathbf{K}}(u)$ if and only if $p(v) \leq 0$ for any $p \in X^*$ such that $p(w - u) \leq 0$ for all $w \in \mathbf{K}$. Observe that if $u \in \text{Int } \mathbf{K}$, then $T_{\mathbf{K}}(u) = X$.

Example 4.1. Let $K(\cdot)$ satisfy assumption 1.1. If $\mathbf{K} \subset X = L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$ is defined by (2.13), then, given $u \in \mathbf{K}$,

$$v \in T_{\mathbf{K}}(u) \iff v(x) \in T_{K(x)}(u(x)) \text{ for a.a. } x \in \Omega,$$

in view of [6, Corollary 8.5.2].

4.2. Sectorial operators (see, e.g., [12, Chapter 1.3]). Let $(X, \|\cdot\|)$ be a (real) Banach space. A closed densely defined linear operator $\mathbf{A} : X \supset D(\mathbf{A}) \rightarrow X$ is a *sectorial* (of angle $< \pi/2$) if there are $0 < \phi < \pi/2$, $M \geq 1$ and $a \in \mathbb{R}$ such that the spectrum $\sigma(\mathbf{A})$ of \mathbf{A} is contained in the sector $S_{\phi,a} := \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \mid \lambda = a + re^{i\theta}, r > 0, |\theta| < \phi\} \cup \{a\}$ and for $\lambda \notin S_{\phi,a}$

$$\|(\lambda I - \mathbf{A})^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(X)} \leq M|\lambda - a|^{-1} \text{ (8)}.$$

It is well-known that \mathbf{A} is a sectorial operator if and only if $-\mathbf{A}$ generates the *holomorphic semigroup* $\{e^{-t\mathbf{A}}\}_{t \geq 0}$ and one has $\|e^{-t\mathbf{A}}\| \leq M'e^{-at}$ for $t \geq 0$ and some $M' \geq 1$.

If a sectorial operator \mathbf{A} is *positive*, i.e., $\operatorname{Re} \lambda > 0$ for $\lambda \in \sigma(\mathbf{A})$, then for any $\alpha > 0$ the improper integral

$$\mathbf{A}^{-\alpha} := \frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_0^\infty t^{\alpha-1} e^{-t\mathbf{A}} dt$$

converges in the norm topology in $\mathcal{L}(X)$ and $\mathbf{A}^{-\alpha}$ is injective. Let $\mathbf{A}^\alpha := (\mathbf{A}^{-\alpha})^{-1} : X^\alpha \rightarrow X$, where $X^\alpha := \mathbf{A}^{-\alpha}(X)$ is the *fractional space* associated with \mathbf{A} . X^α is a Banach space endowed with the norm $\|x\|_\alpha := \|\mathbf{A}^\alpha x\|$, $x \in X^\alpha$. We also put $X^0 := X$ and $\mathbf{A}^0 := I$, the identity on X . For each $\alpha \geq 0$, \mathbf{A}^α is a densely defined closed linear operator; for all $0 \leq \alpha \leq \beta$, the embedding $X^\beta \hookrightarrow X^\alpha$ is dense and continuous; it is compact provided \mathbf{A} has *compact* resolvents. Observe that $X^1 = D(\mathbf{A})$; the norm $\|\cdot\|_1$ is equivalent to the graph norm in $D(\mathbf{A})$.

If \mathbf{A} is a sectorial operator, then there is $d \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\mathbf{A}_d := \mathbf{A} + dI$ is positive (e.g. $d > -a$). Hence, given $\alpha \geq 0$, we may consider the fractional space X_d^α associated with \mathbf{A}_d endowed with the norm $\|x\|_\alpha = \|\mathbf{A}_d^\alpha x\|$, $x \in X^\alpha$.

Remark 4.2. Different choices of d give the same fractional space and equivalent norms on it (see [24, Theorem 1.4.6]). This implies that for a sectorial operator \mathbf{A} the fractional space X^α is uniquely defined as a topological vector space: regardless the choice of the norm there is no ambiguity in topological terminology. When speaking of its norm $\|\cdot\|_\alpha$, however, one has to specify a suitable d .

Let $\omega := -a$. If $\mathbf{A} : D(\mathbf{A}) \rightarrow X$ is a sectorial operator, then $\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \mid \operatorname{Re} \lambda > -\omega\}$ is contained in the resolvent set $\rho(-\mathbf{A})$. Given $h > 0$ with $h\omega < 1$,

$$(4.1) \quad J_h = J_h^{-\mathbf{A}} = (I + h\mathbf{A})^{-1} : X \rightarrow X$$

is well-defined and

$$(4.2) \quad J_h(X) \subset D(\mathbf{A}).$$

Let us collect several well-known properties of J_h .

Lemma 4.3. *If $h > 0$ and $h\omega < 1$, then:*

- (i) *if $h' > 0$ and $h'\omega < 1$, then $J_h = J_{h'} \left(\frac{h'}{h} I + \left(1 - \frac{h'}{h}\right) J_h \right)$;*
- (ii) *$\|J_h\|_{\mathcal{L}(X^\alpha)} \leq M(1 - h\omega)^{-1}$ for every $\alpha \geq 0$;*

moreover for all $\alpha \in [0, 1)$:

- (j) *$\|J_h\|_{\mathcal{L}(X, X^\alpha)} \leq ch^{-\alpha}(1 - h\omega)^{\alpha-1}$ for some $c > 0$;*
- (jj) *if \mathbf{A} has compact resolvent, then $J_h \in \mathcal{L}(X, X^\alpha)$ is compact;*
- (jjj) *$\|J_h x - x\|_\alpha \rightarrow 0$ as $h \rightarrow 0^+$, for every $x \in X^\alpha$;*
- (jv) *the map $X \times (0, \omega_0) \ni (x, t) \mapsto J_h x \in X^\alpha$ is continuous, where $\omega_0 := \infty$ if $\omega \leq 0$ and $\omega_0 := \omega^{-1}$ if $\omega > 0$.* □

⁸ $\mathcal{L}(X)$ denotes the space of bounded linear operators on X .

4.2.1. Sectorial operators in Hilbert spaces are generated in the following way; see [23, Section 7.3.2, Corollary 7.3.5] or [52, Theorem 2.18] for details. Let a Hilbert space V be a dense subset of a Hilbert space X and assume that the embedding $V \hookrightarrow X$ is continuous. Let a bilinear form $\mathcal{B} : V \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be continuous, i.e., $\mathcal{B}[u, v] \leq c \|u\|_V \|v\|_V$, $u, v \in V$, and weakly coercive, i.e., there are $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\alpha > 0$ such that

$$(4.3) \quad \mathcal{B}[v, v] + \omega \|v\|_X^2 \geq \alpha \|v\|_V^2 \text{ for } v \in V.$$

If $\mathcal{A} : V \rightarrow V^*$ is given by $[\mathcal{A}u](v) := \mathcal{B}(u, v)$, $u, v \in V$, then the part $\mathbf{A} := \mathcal{A}|_X$ of \mathcal{A} in $X = X^*$, given by $\mathbf{A}u := \mathcal{A}u$ for $u \in D(\mathbf{A}) := \{u \in V \mid \mathcal{A}u \in X^*\}$ is a sectorial operator (with $a = -\omega$). Clearly, for $u \in D(\mathbf{A})$ and $v \in V$, $\langle \mathbf{A}u, v \rangle_X = \mathcal{B}[u, v]$.

4.3. **Semigroup invariance.** Let $\mathbf{K} \subset X$, where X is a Banach space, be closed and convex and let $\mathbf{A} : D(\mathbf{A}) \rightarrow X$ be a sectorial operator.

Proposition 4.4. *The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i) \mathbf{K} is semigroup invariant, i.e., $e^{-t\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{K}) \subset \mathbf{K}$ for all $t \geq 0$;
- (ii) \mathbf{K} is resolvent invariant, i.e., $J_h(\mathbf{K}) \subset \mathbf{K}$ for $h > 0$ with $h\omega < 1$;
- (iii) $\mathbf{K} \cap D(\mathbf{A})$ is dense in \mathbf{K} and for every $u \in \mathbf{K} \cap D(\mathbf{A})$, $-\mathbf{A}u \in T_{\mathbf{K}}(u)$.

Proof. The equivalence (i) \Leftrightarrow (ii) follows in view of the so-called Post-Widder formula [17, Cor. III.5.5] and the integral representation of resolvents of $-\mathbf{A}$ in terms of the semigroup (see equality (1.13) in [17, §II]); see also [17, Thm VI.1.8].

Assume (i), take $u \in \mathbf{K}$ and let $t_n \searrow 0$. Then $e^{-t_n\mathbf{A}}u \in \mathbf{K} \cap D(\mathbf{A})$ since the semigroup is analytic. Evidently, $e^{-t_n\mathbf{A}}u \rightarrow u$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, i.e., $\mathbf{K} \cap D(\mathbf{A})$ is dense in \mathbf{K} . Now let $u \in \mathbf{K} \cap D(\mathbf{A})$, then

$$-\mathbf{A}u = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{e^{-t_n\mathbf{A}}u - u}{t_n} \in \overline{\bigcup_{t>0} \frac{\mathbf{K} - u}{t}} = T_{\mathbf{K}}(u).$$

Assume (iii) and let $u \in \mathbf{K} \cap D(\mathbf{A})$. By the assumption $-\mathbf{A}u \in T_{\mathbf{K}}(u)$. Hence there are sequences $h_n \searrow 0$ and $v_n \rightarrow -\mathbf{A}u$ such that $u + h_nv_n \in \mathbf{K}$. Thus

$$h_n^{-1}d(e^{-h_n\mathbf{A}}u, \mathbf{K}) \leq h_n^{-1}\|e^{-h_n\mathbf{A}}u - (u + h_nv_n)\| = \|h_n^{-1}(e^{-h_n\mathbf{A}}u - u) - v_n\| \rightarrow 0.$$

This shows that $0 \in T_{\mathbf{K}}^{-\mathbf{A}}(u)$, where $T_{\mathbf{K}}^{-\mathbf{A}}(u)$ is the so-called *Pavel cone* (see [10, Def. 8.1.3]) defined as

$$T_{\mathbf{K}}^{-\mathbf{A}}(u) := \{v \in X \mid \liminf_{t \rightarrow 0^+} t^{-1}d(e^{-t\mathbf{A}}u + tv, \mathbf{K}) = 0\}.$$

Due to [10, Theorem 8.5.5], $e^{-t\mathbf{A}}u \in \mathbf{K}$ for all $t \geq 0$. If $u \in \mathbf{K}$, then $u = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} u_n$, where $u_n \in \mathbf{K} \cap D(\mathbf{A})$ and then, for $t \geq 0$,

$$e^{t\mathbf{A}}u = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} e^{-t\mathbf{A}}u_n \in \mathbf{K}. \quad \square$$

A result similar to the equivalence (i) \Leftrightarrow (iii) has been established in [9, Proposition 4.5] by using different methods.

If X is a Hilbert space and \mathbf{A} is generated by a bilinear form \mathcal{B} as in subsection 4.2.1, then we get the following results. Let $\pi_{\mathbf{K}} : X \rightarrow \mathbf{K}$ be the metric projection onto \mathbf{K} , i.e., for $u \in X$, $\|u - \pi_{\mathbf{K}}(u)\|_X = d(u, \mathbf{K}) = \inf_{w \in \mathbf{K}} \|u - w\|_X$. The projection $v = \pi_{\mathbf{K}}(u)$ is uniquely characterized by

$$(4.4) \quad \langle u - v, w - v \rangle_X \leq 0 \text{ for any } w \in \mathbf{K}.$$

Proposition 4.5. *The set \mathbf{K} is resolvent invariant if and only if*

$$(4.5) \quad \pi_{\mathbf{K}}(V) \subset V \text{ and } \mathcal{B}[\pi_{\mathbf{K}}(u), u - \pi_{\mathbf{K}}(u)] \geq 0, \text{ for every } u \in V.$$

Proof. Assume that \mathbf{K} is resolvent invariant, take $u \in V$ and let $v := \pi_{\mathbf{K}}(u)$. For any $h > 0$, $h\omega < 1$, $J_h v \in D(\mathbf{A}) \cap \mathbf{K}$ and $\mathbf{A}J_h v = h^{-1}(v - J_h v)$. By (4.4), $\langle v - J_h v, v - u \rangle_X \leq 0$. Therefore

$$\mathcal{B}[J_h v, J_h v - u] = \langle \mathbf{A}J_h v, J_h v - u \rangle_X = h^{-1} (\langle v - J_h v, v - u \rangle - \|v - J_h v\|_X^2) \leq 0.$$

Thus $\mathcal{B}[J_h v, J_h v] \leq \mathcal{B}[J_h v, u]$ and by (4.3) and

$$(4.6) \quad \alpha \|J_h v\|_V^2 \leq \mathcal{B}[J_h v, J_h v] + \omega \|J_h v\|_X^2 \leq \mathcal{B}[J_h v, u] + \omega \|J_h v\|_X^2 \leq c \|J_h v\|_V \|u\|_V + \|J_h v\|_X^2.$$

Take a sequence $h_n \rightarrow 0^+$. By Lemma 4.3 (jjj), $J_{h_n} v \rightarrow v$ in X . Hence, and in view of (4.6), the sequence $(J_{h_n} v)$ is bounded in V and, up to a subsequence, weakly convergent in V to some $w \in V$. The continuity $V \hookrightarrow X$ implies that $v = w$. This shows that $v = \pi_{\mathbf{K}}(u) \in V$. Next, in view of (4.4) and since $J_{h_n} v \in \mathbf{K}$ we have that for any $n \geq 1$

$$\mathcal{B}[J_{h_n} v, u - v] = \langle \mathbf{A}J_{h_n} v, u - v \rangle_X = h_n^{-1} \langle v - J_{h_n} v, u - v \rangle_X \geq 0.$$

The weak continuity of $\mathcal{B}[\cdot, u - v]$ implies $\mathcal{B}[v, u - v] = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{B}[J_{h_n} v, u - v] \geq 0$.

Conversely, assume (4.5), take $h > 0$, $h\omega < 1$ and $u \in \mathbf{K}$. Let $y = J_h u$. Then, on account of (4.5), (4.2), $\pi_{\mathbf{K}}(y) \in \mathbf{K} \cap V$ and $u = y + h\mathbf{A}y$. In view of (4.4), (4.5) and (4.3)

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq \langle u - \pi_{\mathbf{K}}(y), y - \pi_{\mathbf{K}}(y) \rangle_X = \langle y - \pi_{\mathbf{K}}(y) + h\mathbf{A}y, y - \pi_{\mathbf{K}}(y) \rangle_X \\ &= \|y - \pi_{\mathbf{K}}(y)\|_X^2 + h \langle \mathbf{A}y, y - \pi_{\mathbf{K}}(y) \rangle_X = \|y - \pi_{\mathbf{K}}(y)\|_X^2 + h\mathcal{B}[y, y - \pi_{\mathbf{K}}(y)] \\ &= \|y - \pi_{\mathbf{K}}(y)\|_X^2 + h\mathcal{B}[y - \pi_{\mathbf{K}}(y), y - \pi_{\mathbf{K}}(y)] + h\mathcal{B}[\pi_{\mathbf{K}}(y), y - \pi_{\mathbf{K}}(y)] \\ &\geq (1 - h\omega) \|y - \pi_{\mathbf{K}}(y)\|_X^2 + h\alpha \|y - \pi_{\mathbf{K}}(y)\|_V^2 \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that $y = \pi_{\mathbf{K}}(y) \in K$. □

4.3.1. Recall (1.3), (2.13) and the setting in Step I of the proof of Theorem 2.5. If $u \in X = L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$ and $w \in \mathbf{K}$, then $r(x, u(x)) \in \mathbf{K}$ and $|u(x) - r(x, u(x))| \leq |u(x) - w(x)|$ for a.a. $x \in \Omega$; hence $\|u - r(\cdot, u(\cdot))\|_X \leq \|u - w\|_X$. This shows that $\pi_{\mathbf{K}} : X \rightarrow \mathbf{K}$ given by

$$(4.7) \quad \pi_{\mathbf{K}}(u) = r(\cdot, u(\cdot)), \quad u \in X,$$

is the metric projection of X onto \mathbf{K} . By Proposition 4.5 and (4.7) we get a characterization of assumption 2.1 (2) announced in Remark 2.2 (i).

Corollary 4.6. *Condition (2) from assumption 2.1 is satisfied if and only if*

$$(4.8) \quad r(\cdot, u(\cdot)) \in H_0^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M) \text{ and}$$

$$(4.9) \quad \mathcal{B}[r(\cdot, u(\cdot)), u - r(\cdot, u(\cdot))] \geq 0,$$

for every $u \in H_0^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$. □

Let us finally establish conditions sufficient for (4.8).

Proposition 4.7. *Suppose that, in addition to conditions stated in assumption 1.1*

$$(4.10) \quad r(\cdot, 0) \in H_0^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M) \text{ and}$$

$$(4.11) \quad r(\cdot, u) \in H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M) \text{ for any } u \in \mathbb{R}^M.$$

Then $r(\cdot, u(\cdot)) \in H_0^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$ for any $u \in H_0^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$.

Condition (4.10) means that, in a sense, $K(\cdot)$ has an extension onto $\overline{\Omega}$ and $0 \in K(x)$ if $x \in \partial\Omega$.

Proof. Let $u \in H_0^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$. In view of (4.11) and [34, Lemma 5] (see also [33]) $r(\cdot, u(\cdot)) \in H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$. If $u \in C_0^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$, i.e., u vanishes outside a compact subset C of Ω , then letting $w(x) := r(x, u(x)) - r(x, 0)$, $x \in \Omega$, we see that $w \in H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$ and $w(x) = 0$ for $x \in \Omega \setminus C$. By results of [16], $w \in H_0^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$ and, by (4.10), $r(\cdot, u(\cdot)) \in H_0^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$. In general $u \in H_0^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$ is the H^1 -limit of $u_n \in C_0^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$, so the result follows from the H^1 -continuity of the Nemytski operator generated by r (see [32]). \square

4.4. Examples of constraints. We provide some examples of a constraint $K : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^M$, where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, having the properties studied above. In each of these examples we describe tangent cones showing the nature of the tangency hypothesis.

Example 4.8. (1) (Moving rectangle) Assume that $\sigma, \tau \in H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$, $\sigma \leq \tau$ and let

$$K(x) := [\sigma(x), \tau(x)] = \{w \in \mathbb{R}^M \mid \sigma_k(x) \leq w_k \leq \tau_k(x), k = 1, \dots, M\}, x \in \Omega.$$

Such constraints has been studied, e.g., in [28, 29] in case Ω is bounded. It is immediate to see that conditions from assumption 1.1 are satisfied. For each $x \in \Omega$, the projection $r(x, \cdot)$ of \mathbb{R}^M onto $K(x)$ is given by $r(x, \cdot) = (r_1(x, \cdot), \dots, r_M(x, \cdot))$, where for $k = 1, \dots, M$ and $u = (u_1, \dots, u_m) \in \mathbb{R}^M$ and

$$(4.12) \quad r_k(x, u) = (\tau_k - \sigma_k - (u_k - \tau_k)^-)^+ + \sigma_k = \begin{cases} \sigma_k(x) & \text{if } u_k < \sigma_k(x) \\ u_k & \text{if } \sigma_k(x) \leq u_k \leq \tau_k(x) \\ \tau_k(x) & \text{if } \tau_k(x) < u_k. \end{cases}$$

In view of [18, Section 7.4], $r_k(\cdot, u) \in H^1(\Omega)$, so (4.11) is satisfied. If $\sigma_k|_{\partial\Omega} \leq 0$ and $\tau_k|_{\partial\Omega} \geq 0$ in the sense of trace ($k = 1, \dots, M$), then (4.10) holds, too. Fix $x \in \Omega$ and take $w \in K(x)$. Then $T_{K(x)}(w) = \mathbb{R}^M$ if $\sigma_k(x) < w_k < \tau_k(x)$ ($k = 1, \dots, M$) and

$$v = (v_1, \dots, v_M) \in T_{K(x)}(w) \iff \begin{cases} v_k \geq 0 & \text{if } w_k = \sigma_k(x), \\ v_k \leq 0 & \text{if } w_k = \tau_k(x). \end{cases}$$

(2) (Tube) Let $K \subset \mathbb{R}^M$ be closed convex and bounded, $b \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N, \mathbb{R}^M)$, $\alpha \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ with $\text{ess inf } \alpha > 0$ and

$$K(x) = b(x) + \alpha(x)K, x \in \Omega.$$

Similar constraints were studied in [46]. If $s : \mathbb{R}^M \rightarrow K$ is the metric projection onto K , then

$$(4.13) \quad r(x, u) = b(x) + \alpha(x)s(\alpha(x)^{-1}(u - b(x))), x \in \Omega, u \in \mathbb{R}^M.$$

Clearly $K(\cdot)$ satisfies assumption 1.1 and (4.10); condition (4.10) holds if $-\alpha^{-1}(x)b(x) \in K$ for $x \in \partial\Omega$ in the sense of trace. It is easy to see that $T_{K(x)}(w) = T_K(u)$, for a.a. $x \in \Omega$ and $w = b(x) + \alpha(x)u \in K(x)$, where $u \in K$.

(3) (Ellipsoidal funnel) Let K be the closed unit ball in \mathbb{R}^M and all entries of a matrix-valued map $E : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{M \times M}$ belong to $H^1(\Omega)$ and let $\text{ess inf}_{x \in \Omega} \det E(x) > 0$. One may show that, for $u \in \mathbb{R}^M$, the map

$$\Omega \ni x \mapsto y(x, u) = \arg \min_{y \in K} \left[\frac{1}{2} \langle {}^t E(x) E(x) y, y \rangle - \langle {}^t E(x) u, y \rangle \right],$$

is in $H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$. The funnel

$$K(x) := E(x)B, x \in \Omega,$$

where B is the closed unit ball, consists of *ellipsoids* $K(x)$ centered at the origin. It satisfies assumption 1.1 and (4.10), (4.11) in view of the explicit formula of the projection $r(x, u) = E(x)y(x, u)$, $x \in \Omega$, $u \in \mathbb{R}^M$. Moreover, $v \in T_{K(x)}(u)$ if and only if $\langle E(x)^{-1}v, E(x)^{-1}u \rangle \leq 0$, for a.a. $x \in \Omega$ and $u \in K(x)$.

(4) (Moving polyhderon) Suppose that a set $P \subset \{p \in \mathbb{R}^M \mid |p| = 1\}$ is at most countable and consider

$$(4.14) \quad K(x) := \bigcup_{p \in P} K_p(x), \quad K_p(x) := \{u \in \mathbb{R}^M \mid \langle p, u \rangle \leq \xi_p(x)\}, \quad x \in \Omega,$$

where $\xi_p \in H^1(\Omega)$ and $\xi_p|_{\partial\Omega} \geq 0$ in the sense of trace⁹. Properties (1), (2) from assumption 1.1, (4.10) and (4.11) are satisfied. For $x \in \Omega$ and $u \in K(x)$, let $P(u) = \{p \in P \mid \langle p, u \rangle = \xi_p(x)\}$. Then $T_{K(x)}(u) = \{v \in \mathbb{R}^M \mid \langle p, v \rangle \leq 0, \forall p \in P(u)\}$, for a.a. $x \in \Omega$.

We have the following result akin to criteria from [11, Theorem 4.1] and [48, Theorem 14.7].

Proposition 4.9. *Recall the operator \mathcal{P} defined by (1.6) and satisfying assumptions 1.3 and 2.1 (1). Let $K(\cdot)$ be defined as in Example 4.8 (4) above. Assumption 2.1 (2) is fulfilled if:*

(i) *for all $1 \leq i, j \leq N$, any $p \in P$ is an eigenvector of transposed matrices ${}^tA^{ij}$, ${}^tB^i$ and tC , i.e.,*

$$(4.15) \quad {}^tA^{ij}(x)p = a^{ij}(x)p, \quad {}^tB^i(x)p = b^i(x)p, \quad {}^tC(x)p = c(x)p$$

for a.a. $x \in \Omega$ and some functions $a^{ij}, b^i, c : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and

(ii) *for any $p \in P$, $\mathcal{B}[\xi_p(\cdot)p, \eta(\cdot)p] \geq 0$ for any $\eta \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, $\eta \geq 0$.*

Proof. It is clear that $\mathbf{K} = \bigcap_{p \in P} \mathbf{K}_p$, where $\mathbf{K}_p = \{u \in L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M) \mid u(x) \in K_p(x) \text{ a.e.}\}$. Hence, to show the invariance of \mathbf{K} it is sufficient to show the invariance of \mathbf{K}_p , $p \in P$. By Proposition 4.5 (or Corollary 4.6) together with Proposition 4.7, it is enough to prove that for any $u \in H_0^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M)$, $\mathcal{B}[\pi(u), u - \pi(u)] \geq 0$, where $\pi := \pi_{\mathbf{K}_p}$ is the projection onto \mathbf{K}_p . The metric projection onto $K_p(x)$ is given by

$$(4.16) \quad r(x, u) = u - (\langle u, p \rangle - \xi_p(x))^+ p, \quad u \in \mathbb{R}^M, \quad x \in \Omega, u \in \mathbb{R}^M.$$

Thus π is given by the formula

$$\pi(u) = u - (\langle p, u(\cdot) \rangle - \xi_p)^+ p, \quad u \in L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^M).$$

To simplify the notation let $v := (\langle p, u(\cdot) \rangle - \xi_p)^+$. Clearly, $v \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, $v \geq 0$ and $v = 0$ off the set $\Omega_0 := \{x \in \Omega \mid \langle p, u(\cdot) \rangle > \xi_p\}$. By [18, Section 7.4], for any $i = 1, \dots, N$, $\partial_i v = \langle p, \partial_i u(\cdot) \rangle - \partial_i \xi_p$ on Ω_0 and 0 elsewhere. Our assumptions yield the following equalities on Ω_0

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i,j=1}^N \langle A^{ij}(\partial_j u - \partial_j v(\cdot)p), \partial_i v(\cdot)p \rangle + \sum_{i=1}^N \langle B^i(\partial_i u - \partial_i v(\cdot)p), v(\cdot)p \rangle + \langle C(u - v(\cdot)p), v(\cdot)p \rangle \\ &= \sum_{i,j=1}^N \langle \partial_j u - \partial_j v(\cdot)p, \partial_i v(\cdot) {}^tA^{ij} p \rangle + \sum_{i=1}^N \langle \partial_i u - \partial_i v(\cdot)p, v(\cdot) {}^tB^i p \rangle + \langle u, v(\cdot) {}^tC p \rangle \\ &= \sum_{i,j=1}^N a^{ij} \partial_j \xi_p \partial_i v + \sum_{i=1}^N b^i \partial_i \xi_p v + c \xi_p v \\ &= \sum_{i,j=1}^N \langle A^{ij} \partial_j \xi_p(\cdot)p, \partial_i v(\cdot)p \rangle + \sum_{i=1}^N \langle B^i \partial_i \xi_p(\cdot)p, v(\cdot)p \rangle + \langle C \xi_p(\cdot)p, v(\cdot)p \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

This, in view of (ii), implies that

$$\mathcal{B}[\pi(u), u - \pi(u)] = \mathcal{B}[u - v(\cdot)p, v(\cdot)p] = \mathcal{B}[\xi_p(\cdot)p, v(\cdot)p] \geq 0. \quad \square$$

⁹Observe that this representation is fairly general, since for a proper closed convex subset K of a separable Banach space X there is a countable family P of the dual X^* such that, for any $p \in P$, $a_p := \sup_{x \in K} \langle p, x \rangle < \infty$ and $K = \{u \in X \mid \langle p, u \rangle \leq a_p \text{ for all } p \in P\}$. The set consists of all *supporting functionals* of K .

Proposition 4.9 together with Proposition 4.5 give sufficient conditions for the flow invariance of \mathcal{P} . It, however, suggests that a convex closed set having the large collection of supporting functionals (e.g. an ellipsoid) is, in general, flow invariant only when $A^{ij} = a_{ij}I$, $B^i = b_iI$ and $C = cI$ for some $a_{ij}, b_i, c \in \mathbb{R}$, for $i, j = 1, \dots, N$. This also explains the setting concerning operators and constraining sets in [3] and other papers mentioned in Introduction. As a further example we have the following immediate result corresponding to Müller's conditions.

Corollary 4.10. *Suppose $K(\cdot)$ is given by Example 4.8 (1). If the operator \mathcal{P} is diagonal, i.e., for each $1 \leq i, j \leq N$, matrices of coefficients A^{ij} , B^i and C are diagonal, $A_{kl}^{ij} = \delta_{kl}a_k^{ij}$, $B_{kl}^i = \delta_{kl}b_k^i$ and $C_{kl} = \delta_{kl}c_k$ for $1 \leq k, l \leq M$ (δ_{kl} stands for the Kronecker delta), then assumption 2.1 (2) is satisfied if*

$$\mathcal{B}_k[\sigma_k, \eta] \leq 0 \text{ and } \mathcal{B}_k[\tau_k, \eta] \geq 0 \text{ for any } \eta \in H_0^1(\Omega), \eta \geq 0,$$

where

$$\mathcal{B}_k[u, v] := \int_{\Omega} \left(\sum_{i,j=1}^N a_k^{ij} \partial_j \partial_i v + \sum_{i=1}^N b_k^i \partial_i uv + c_k uv \right) dx, \quad u, v \in H_0^1(\Omega).$$

Proof. Observe that $K(\cdot)$ has the representation (4.14)

$$K(x) = \bigcup_{p \in P} K_p(x),$$

where $P = \{e_1, \dots, e_M, -e_1, \dots, -e_M\}$, $e_k = (\delta_{1k}, \dots, \delta_{Mk})$ and $\xi_{e_k} := \tau_k$, $\xi_{-e_k} = -\sigma_k$, $k = 1, \dots, M$. It is clear that, for $k = 1, \dots, m$, e_k is an eigenvector of ${}^T A^{ij}$, ${}^T B^i$ and ${}^T C$, and, for every $\eta \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, $\eta \geq 0$, $\mathcal{B}[\xi_{e_k}(\cdot)e_k, \eta(\cdot)e_k] = \mathcal{B}_k[\tau_k, \eta_k] \geq 0$ and $\mathcal{B}[\xi_{-e_k}(\cdot)(-e_k), \eta(\cdot)(-e_k)] = -\mathcal{B}_k[\sigma_k, \eta] \geq 0$. \square

4.5. Construction of the constrained topological degree. Let X be a real Banach space. We provide the construction of a topological invariant detecting constrained coincidences of \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{F} , i.e., solutions to

$$\mathbf{A}u = \mathbf{F}(u)$$

in a set $\mathbf{K} \subset X$ of constraints, where

- (D₁) $\mathbf{A} : D(\mathbf{A}) \rightarrow X$ is a sectorial operator with compact resolvents,
- (D₂) $\mathbf{F} : U \cap \mathbf{K} \rightarrow X$ is a continuous map, where U is an open subset of the fractional space X^α associated with \mathbf{A} , where $\alpha \in [0, 1)$.

As mentioned in Introduction, in the studied situation the direct use of the Leray–Schauder theory is not possible. The approach we present has been started in [14]. Then, relying on the ideas of [25], it has been developed in [15], where \mathbf{F} was defined on an open subset of X (if $\alpha = 0$). The need to consider a more general case, when \mathbf{F} is defined on a fractional space stems from applications, e.g., those discussed in the beginning of this paper, where the right-hand side of a differential problem depends on the gradient of an unknown function. This was already observed in [26], but \mathbf{K} and \mathbf{F} are assumed to be bounded there. These assumptions are so strong that results of [26] are hardly applicable to differential systems (1.1). Therefore, it is necessary to modify the approach from [15] accordingly.

Simple examples show that in order to get meaningful results one should impose some structural assumptions. We assume that

- (D₃) $\mathbf{K} \subset X$ is an \mathcal{L} -retract ⁽¹⁰⁾.

¹⁰Even though our applications concern the convex \mathbf{K} we decided to provide the construction in a more general situation having the future reference on mind.

Recall that a closed set \mathbf{K} of a Banach space X is called an \mathcal{L} -retract (see [8]) if there is $\eta > 0$, a continuous map $r : B(\mathbf{K}, \eta) \rightarrow \mathbf{K}$, where $B(\mathbf{K}, \eta) := \{x \in X \mid d(x, \mathbf{K}) < \eta\}$, and $L \geq 1$ such that $\|r(x) - x\| \leq Ld(x, \mathbf{K})$ for any $x \in B(\mathbf{K}, \eta)$. \mathcal{L} -retracts constitute a broad subclass of neighborhood retracts containing many classes of sets considered as constraint sets; in particular *any* closed convex set $\mathbf{K} \subset E$ is an \mathcal{L} -retract; see [8] for more details and other examples of \mathcal{L} -retracts.

Moreover we assume that

- (D₄) \mathbf{K} is resolvent invariant, i.e., $J_h(\mathbf{K}) \subset \mathbf{K}$ for all $0 < h \leq h_0$, where $h_0\omega < 1$;
- (D₅) \mathbf{F} is tangent to \mathbf{K} , i.e., $\mathbf{F}(u) \in T_{\mathbf{K}}(u)$ for $u \in U \cap \mathbf{K}$.

Let

$$C = \text{Coin}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{F}; U \cap \mathbf{K}) := \{u \in U \cap \mathbf{K} \mid u \in D(\mathbf{A}) \text{ and } \mathbf{A}u = \mathbf{F}(u)\}.$$

The inclusion $C \subset D(A)$ implies that $C \subset X^\beta$ for every $\beta \in [0, 1]$. We assume that

- (D₆) C is closed in X^α , C and $\mathbf{F}(C)$ are bounded in X .

Remark 4.11. (1) Assumption (D₆) holds if and only if C is *compact* in X^β , for every $\beta \in [0, 1]$. Indeed, if C and $\mathbf{F}(C)$ are bounded, then C is relatively compact in X^α since $C \subset \{J_h(u + h\mathbf{F}(u)) \mid u \in C\} \subset X^\alpha$ and $J_h : X \rightarrow X^\alpha$ is compact by Lemma 4.3. For $\beta \in [\alpha, 1]$, C is closed in X^β , since $X^\beta \subset X^\alpha$ is continuous, and thus compact in X^β . If $\beta \in [0, \alpha]$, then C is compact in X^β due to the continuity of the embedding $X^\alpha \subset X^\beta$.

(2) Observe that C is always closed in U since \mathbf{F} is continuous and \mathbf{A} has the closed graph. Evidently if $\mathbf{K}^\alpha \subset U$, then C is closed in X^α .

(3) Suppose that \mathbf{K} is bounded. Then assumption (D₄), along with (D₁) and (D₃), implies that, for any $\beta \in [0, 1]$, the set $\mathbf{K}^\beta := \mathbf{K} \cap X^\beta$ is of *finite homological type*, i.e., for each $q \geq 0$ the vector space $H_q(\mathbf{K}^\beta)$, where $H_*(\cdot)$ stands for the singular homology functor with the rational coefficients, is finite dimensional and $H_q(\mathbf{K}^\beta) = 0$ for almost all $q \geq 0$. To see this let $O := B(\mathbf{K}, \eta)$ and let $\phi(x) := J_h \circ r(x)$, $x \in O$, where $0 < h \leq h_0$ is fixed. Then $\phi : O \rightarrow \mathbf{K}^\beta$ is a well-defined continuous compact map. Let $j : \mathbf{K}^\beta \hookrightarrow O$ be the embedding and $\bar{\phi} := j \circ \phi : O \rightarrow O$. In view of the so-called normalization property of the Leray–Schauder fixed point index $\bar{\phi}$ is a Lefschetz map (see [20, Theorem (7.1)]) and its generalized Lefschetz number $\Lambda(\bar{\phi})$ is defined. The commutativity of the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} O & \xrightarrow{\phi} & \mathbf{K}^\beta \\ \downarrow \bar{\phi} & \searrow j & \downarrow \phi|_{\mathbf{K}^\beta} \\ O & \xrightarrow{\phi} & \mathbf{K}^\beta \end{array}$$

implies that $\phi|_{\mathbf{K}^\beta}$ is a Lefschetz map (see [20, Lemma (3.1)]) and $\Lambda(\phi|_{\mathbf{K}^\beta}) = \Lambda(\bar{\phi})$. We show below that $\phi|_{\mathbf{K}^\beta}$ is homotopic to the identity $\text{id} : \mathbf{K}^\beta \rightarrow \mathbf{K}^\beta$ and, thus, the endomorphisms $H_*(\phi|_{\mathbf{K}^\beta}) = H_*(\text{id}) = \text{id}_{H_*(\mathbf{K}^\beta)}$ are the Leray endomorphisms. Hence, the graded vector space $H_*(\mathbf{K}^\beta)$ is of finite type. In particular the *Euler characteristic* $\chi(\mathbf{K}^\beta) := \sum_{q \geq 0} (-1)^q \dim_{\mathbb{Q}} H_q(\mathbf{K}^\beta)$ is a well-defined integer number. Moreover $\chi(\mathbf{K}^\beta) = \lambda(\text{id}) = \Lambda(\text{id}) = \Lambda(\bar{\phi})$, where $\lambda(\text{id})$ is the usual Lefschetz number, does not depend on $\beta \in [0, 1]$.

To show that $\phi|_{\mathbf{K}^\beta}$ is homotopic to the identity consider a map $\Phi : \mathbf{K}^\beta \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbf{K}^\beta$ given by

$$\Phi(x, t) := \begin{cases} J_{th}(x), & \text{for } x \in \mathbf{K}^\beta, t \in (0, 1], \\ x, & \text{for } x \in \mathbf{K}^\beta, t = 0. \end{cases}$$

In view of Lemma 4.3 (jv), Φ is continuous on $\mathbf{K}^\beta \times (0, 1]$, so let us consider sequences $x_n \rightarrow x_0$ in \mathbf{K}^β and $t_n \searrow 0$. By Lemma 4.3 (ii) and (jjj), we have

$$(4.17) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\Phi(x_n, t_n) - \Phi(x_0, 0)\|_\beta &= \|J_{t_n h} x_n - x_0\|_\beta \leq \|J_{t_n h} x_n - J_{t_n h} x_0\|_\beta + \|J_{t_n h} x_0 - x_0\|_\beta \\ &\leq \frac{M}{1 - t_n h \omega} \|x_n - x_0\|_\beta + \|J_{t_n h} x_0 - x_0\|_\beta \rightarrow 0, \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Evidently Φ is a homotopy joining $\phi|_{\mathbf{K}^\beta}$ to id.

Let us now present the steps of the construction.

Step 1: Let $\tilde{\mathbf{F}} : U \rightarrow X$ be a continuous extension of \mathbf{F} . Note that \mathbf{F} is defined on a closed subset of U , so $\tilde{\mathbf{F}}$ exists in view of the Dugundji extension theorem.

Step 2: Fix $\eta > 0$, $L \geq 1$ and a retraction $r : B_X(K, \eta) \rightarrow K$ such that $\|r(x) - x\| \leq Ld(x, \mathbf{K})$ for $x \in B_X(K, \eta)$.

Step 3: Since C is compact in X^α and $\tilde{\mathbf{F}}$ is continuous, one can find an open bounded subset $W \subset X^\alpha$ such that

$$(4.18) \quad C \subset W \subset \overline{W} \subset U \cap (B_X(\mathbf{K}, \eta/2) \cap X^\alpha),$$

and $\tilde{\mathbf{F}}(\overline{W})$ is bounded in X , where \overline{W} is the closure of W in X^α . Note that $B_X(\mathbf{K}, \eta/2) \cap X^\alpha$ contains C and, since the embedding $X^\alpha \hookrightarrow X$ is continuous, $B_X(\mathbf{K}, \eta/2) \cap X^\alpha$ is open in X^α .

Step 4: Since the set $\tilde{\mathbf{F}}(\overline{W})$ is bounded we may assume that $\|h\tilde{\mathbf{F}}(x)\| \leq \eta/2$ for $h \in (0, h_0]$ and $x \in \overline{W}$. By (4.18), for any $x \in W$, $d(x, \mathbf{K}) < \eta/2$ and, thus, $x + h\tilde{\mathbf{F}}(x) \in B_X(\mathbf{K}, \eta)$. Therefore and in view of (D_4) the map $\phi_h : \overline{W} \rightarrow X^\alpha$, where $h \in (0, h_0]$, given by the formula

$$\phi_h(x) = J_h \circ r(x + h\tilde{\mathbf{F}}(x)), \quad x \in \overline{W},$$

is well-defined. The map ϕ_h is compact due to the fact that \mathbf{A} has compact resolvents and r maps bounded sets into bounded ones. Moreover, if $h > 0$ is small enough, then $\text{Fix}(\phi_h) := \{x \in \overline{W} \mid \phi_h(x) = x\} \subset W$. Indeed, if $x \in \text{Fix}(\phi_h)$, then $x \in \overline{W} \cap \mathbf{K}$ since $J_h(\mathbf{K}) \subset \mathbf{K}$. Hence $\tilde{\mathbf{F}}(x) = \mathbf{F}(x)$ and $x = J_h(r(x + h\mathbf{F}(x)))$. Suppose to the contrary that there are a sequences $h_n \searrow 0$ and $(x_n) \subset \partial W \cap \text{Fix}(\phi_n)$. Hence $x_n + h_n \mathbf{A}(x_n) = r(x_n + h_n \mathbf{F}(x_n))$. Arguing as in the proof of [15, Lemma 3.3] (with obvious modifications) we gather that, after passing to a subsequence if necessary, $x_n \rightarrow x_0 \in C \cap \partial W$. This contradiction proves our assertion.

Step 5: Without loss of generality we may assume that ϕ_h is well-defined compact and $\text{Fix}(\phi_h) \subset W$ for any $h \in (0, h_0]$. This implies that for any such h , the *Leray–Schauder fixed point index* $\text{Ind}_{LS}(\phi_h, W)$ is well-defined (see [20, Sections 7, 8]). Therefore, we are in a position to define the *constrained topological degree* $\deg_{\mathbf{K}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{F}; U)$ of coincidence between \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{F} on U as follows:

$$(4.19) \quad \deg_{\mathbf{K}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{F}; U) := \lim_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \text{Ind}_{LS}(\phi_h, W).$$

We claim that the definition (4.19) is correct, i.e.,

- it stabilizes, i.e., $\text{Ind}_{LS}(\phi_{h_1}, W) = \text{Ind}(\phi_{h_2}, W)$ for sufficiently small $h_1, h_2 > 0$,
- it is independent of the choice of an \mathcal{L} -retraction r ,
- it is independent of the choice of a bounded open neighbourhood W of C ,
- it is independent of the extension $\tilde{\mathbf{F}}$.

These issues can be shown in a similar manner as in the proof of [15, Lemma 3.5 and Lemma 3.6].

The definition (4.19) also does not depend on the choice of a constant d , where d is such that $\mathbf{A}_d = \mathbf{A} + dI$ is positive and determines the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\alpha, d}$ on the fractional space X^α . Indeed, if we take another $\hat{d} > -\omega$, then the identity provides a (topological) homeomorphism between $(X^\alpha, \|\cdot\|_{\alpha, d})$ and $(X^\alpha, \|\cdot\|_{\alpha, \hat{d}})$ in view

of Remark 4.2. The claim follows now immediately from the so-called *commutativity property* of the Leray–Schauder index (see [20, Theorem (7.1)]). One gets in fact a stronger result.

Remark 4.12. The so-called contraction property of the Leray–Schauder index (see [21, Theorem (6.2), § 12]) implies that for all $h \in (0, h_0]$, $\text{Ind}_{LS}(\phi_h, W) = \text{Ind}_{LS}(\phi_h|_{W \cap X^\beta}, W \cap X^\beta)$, where $\beta \in [\alpha, 1)$. This implies that $\deg_{\mathbf{K}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{F}, U)$ does not depend on the particular choice $\alpha \in [0, 1)$, namely, if $\beta \in [\alpha, 1)$, then $\deg_{\mathbf{K}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{F}; U) = \deg_{\mathbf{K}}(\mathbf{F}|_{U \cap X^\beta \cap \mathbf{K}}; U \cap X^\beta)$.

By an *admissible homotopy* we understand a continuous map $\mathbf{H} : (U \cap \mathbf{K}) \times [0, 1] \rightarrow X$, where $U \subset X^\alpha$ is open, such that $H(u, t) \in T_{\mathbf{K}}(u)$ for all $u \in U \cap \mathbf{K}$, $t \in [0, 1]$, the sets $C = \bigcup_{t \in [0, 1]} \text{Coin}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{H}(\cdot, t); U \cap \mathbf{K})$ and $\mathbf{H}(C \times [0, 1])$ are bounded in X and C is closed in X^α .

Remark 4.13. Arguing as above we easily see C is compact in X^α and one can find an open bounded $W \subset X^\alpha$ such that $C \subset W \subset \overline{W} \subset U \cap (B_X(\mathbf{K}, \eta/2) \cap X^\alpha)$ and $H(\overline{W} \times [0, 1])$ is bounded in X . Then, for sufficiently small $h > 0$ the map $\phi_h : \overline{W} \times [0, 1] \rightarrow X^\alpha$ given by $\phi_h(x, t) := J_h \circ r(x + h\tilde{\mathbf{H}}(x, t))$ for $x \in \overline{W}$, $t \in [0, 1]$, where $\tilde{\mathbf{H}} : U \rightarrow X$ is a continuous extension of \mathbf{H} , is well-defined compact and

$$\{x \in \overline{W} \mid \exists t \in [0, 1], \phi_h(x, t) = x\} \subset W$$

provided $h > 0$ is sufficiently small, see [15].

Theorem 4.14. *The degree defined by (4.19) has the following properties:*

(Existence) *If $\deg_{\mathbf{K}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{F}; U) \neq 0$, then $\text{Coin}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{F}; U \cap \mathbf{K}) \neq \emptyset$.*

(Additivity) *If $U_1, U_2 \subset U$ are open disjoint and $\text{Coin}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{F}; U) \subset (U_1 \cup U_2) \setminus (U_1 \cap U_2)$, then*

$$\deg_{\mathbf{K}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{F}; U) = \deg_{\mathbf{K}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{F}; U_1) + \deg_{\mathbf{K}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{F}; U_2).$$

(Homotopy invariance) *If $H : U \times [0, 1] \rightarrow X$ is an admissible homotopy, then*

$$\deg_{\mathbf{K}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{H}(\cdot, 0), U) = \deg_{\mathbf{K}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{H}(\cdot, 1), U).$$

(Normalisation) *If \mathbf{K} is bounded, $\mathbf{F} : \mathbf{K}^\alpha \rightarrow X$ and $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{K}^\alpha)$ is bounded in X , then for any open $U \subset X^\alpha$ such that $\mathbf{K}^\alpha \subset U$,*

$$\deg_{\mathbf{K}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{F}, U) = \chi(\mathbf{K}).$$

Proof. (Existence) By the definition (4.19), given a sequence $h_n \searrow 0$, we have $\text{Ind}_{LS}(\phi_{h_n}, W) \neq 0$. The existence property of the Leray–Schauder index implies the existence of a sequence (x_n) in W such that $\phi_{h_n}(x_n) = x_n$, i.e., $x_n \in D(\mathbf{A}) \cap W \cap \mathbf{K}$ and $x_n + h_n \mathbf{A}x_n = r(x_n + h_n \tilde{\mathbf{F}}(x_n)) = r(x_n + h_n \mathbf{F}(x_n))$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{A}x_n - \mathbf{F}(x_n)\| &= \frac{1}{h_n} \|x_n + h_n \mathbf{A}x_n - x_n - h_n \mathbf{F}(x_n)\| \\ (4.20) \quad &= \frac{1}{h_n} \|r(x_n + h_n \mathbf{F}(x_n)) - (x_n + h_n \mathbf{F}(x_n))\| \leq L \frac{d(x_n + h_n \mathbf{F}(x_n), \mathbf{K})}{h_n}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we used the fact that r is \mathcal{L} -retraction. Since $x_n \in W \cap \mathbf{K}$, we get

$$(4.21) \quad \frac{d(x_n + h_n \mathbf{F}(x_n), \mathbf{K})}{h_n} = \frac{d(x_n + h_n \mathbf{F}(x_n), \mathbf{K}) - d(x_n, \mathbf{K})}{h_n} \leq \|\mathbf{F}(x_n)\| \leq R,$$

for a constant R such that $\sup_{x \in \overline{W}} \|F(x)\| = R$. Equation (4.20) combined with (4.21) yields $\{\|\mathbf{A}x_n\|\}_{n \geq 1}$ is bounded. For any $n \geq 1$, $x_n = J_{h_0}(x_n + h_0 \mathbf{A}x_n)$, and so, by Lemma 4.3 (jj), the set $\{x_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ is relatively compact in X^α . Passing to a subsequence if necessary, we have $x_n \rightarrow x_0$ in X^α and $x_0 \in \overline{W} \cap \mathbf{K} \subset U \cap \mathbf{K}$. By (4.20), we have

$$\|\mathbf{A}x_n - \mathbf{F}(x_n)\| \leq L \frac{d(x_n + h_n \mathbf{F}(x_0), \mathbf{K})}{h_n} + L \|\mathbf{F}(x_0) - \mathbf{F}(x_n)\|.$$

Letting $n \rightarrow \infty$, using the continuity and the tangency (D_5) of \mathbf{F} , we see that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathbf{A}x_n - \mathbf{F}(x_n)\| = 0$. Thus, $\mathbf{A}x_n \rightarrow \mathbf{F}(x_0)$ and, since \mathbf{A} is closed, $x_0 \in D(\mathbf{A})$ with $\mathbf{A}x_0 = \mathbf{F}(x_0)$. Thus, $x_0 \in D(\mathbf{A}) \cap U \cap \mathbf{K}$ satisfies $\mathbf{A}x_0 = \mathbf{F}(x_0)$.

(Additivity) follows by the definition 4.19 from the additivity property of the Leray–Schauder index.

(Homotopy invariance) is a consequence of the homotopy invariance of the Leray–Schauder index, the definition 4.19 and Remark 4.13.

(Normalization) Obviously, $\deg_{\mathbf{K}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{F}; U)$ is well-defined and its independence of U follows immediately from the additivity property. Take an open $W \subset X^\alpha$ such that $\mathbf{K}^\alpha \subset W \subset \bar{W} \subset U \cap (B_X(\mathbf{K}^\alpha, \eta/2) \cap X^\alpha)$ and a continuous extension $\tilde{\mathbf{F}} : X^\alpha \rightarrow X$ of \mathbf{F} being bounded on \bar{W} . Let $h \in (0, h_0]$ be such that $\deg_{\mathbf{K}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{F}; U) = \text{Ind}_{LS}(\phi_h, W)$. Recall that $\phi_h(W) \subset \mathbf{K}^\alpha$. Hence, we may assume that $\phi_h : W \rightarrow \mathbf{K}^\alpha$. Denoting the embedding $\mathbf{K}^\alpha \hookrightarrow W$ by j and $\bar{\phi}_h := j \circ \phi_h : W \rightarrow W$, we see that $\bar{\phi}_h$ is a Lefschetz map and

$$(4.22) \quad \text{Ind}_{LS}(\phi_h, W) = \text{Ind}_{LS}(\bar{\phi}_h, W) = \Lambda(\bar{\phi}_h)$$

is the generalized Lefschetz number of $\bar{\phi}_h$. The argument is now similar to that from Remark 4.11 (3). We have the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} W & \xrightarrow{\phi_h} & \mathbf{K}^\alpha \\ \downarrow \bar{\phi}_h & \searrow j & \downarrow \phi_h|_{\mathbf{K}^\alpha} \\ W & \xrightarrow{\phi_h} & \mathbf{K}^\alpha. \end{array}$$

Again, by [20, Lemma (3.1)], $\phi_h|_{\mathbf{K}^\alpha}$ is a Lefschetz map and

$$(4.23) \quad \Lambda(\phi_h|_{\mathbf{K}^\alpha}) = \Lambda(\bar{\phi}_h).$$

We now show that $\phi_h|_{\mathbf{K}^\alpha}$ is homotopic to the identity $\text{id} : \mathbf{K}^\alpha \rightarrow \mathbf{K}^\alpha$. To this end, let us define $\Phi : \mathbf{K}^\alpha \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbf{K}^\alpha$ by

$$\Phi(x, t) := \begin{cases} \phi_{th}(x), & \text{for } x \in \mathbf{K}^\alpha, t \in (0, 1], \\ x, & \text{for } x \in \mathbf{K}^\alpha, t = 0. \end{cases}$$

By Lemma 4.3 (jv), Φ is continuous on $\mathbf{K}^\alpha \times (0, 1]$. Let $x_n \rightarrow x_0$ in \mathbf{K}^α and $t_n \searrow 0$. Then

$$\|\Phi(x_n, t_n) - \Phi(x_0, 0)\|_\alpha = \|\phi_{t_n h}(x_n) - x_0\|_\alpha \leq S_1(n) + S_2(n),$$

where

$$S_1(n) = \|J_{t_n h} \circ r(x_n + h_n \mathbf{F}(x_n)) - J_{t_n h}(x_n + t_n h \mathbf{F}(x_n))\|_\alpha, \quad S_2(n) = \|J_{t_n h}(x_n + t_n h \mathbf{F}(x_n)) - x_0\|_\alpha.$$

By Lemma 4.3 (j), there is $C_\alpha > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} S_1(n) &\leq \frac{C_\alpha}{(t_n h)^\alpha (1 - t_n h \omega)^{1-\alpha}} \|r(x_n + t_n h \mathbf{F}(x_n)) - (x_n + t_n h \mathbf{F}(x_n))\| \\ &\leq \frac{C_\alpha}{(t_n h)^\alpha (1 - t_n h \omega)^{1-\alpha}} L d(x_n + t_n h \mathbf{F}(x_n), \mathbf{K}) \leq \frac{C_\alpha L}{(t_n h)^\alpha (1 - t_n h \omega)^{1-\alpha}} t_n h \|\mathbf{F}(x_n)\| \\ &\leq \frac{C_\alpha L}{(1 - t_n h \omega)^{1-\alpha}} (t_n h)^{1-\alpha} \|\mathbf{F}(x_n)\| \rightarrow 0, \quad n \rightarrow \infty, \end{aligned}$$

since the sequence $(\|\mathbf{F}(x_n)\|)$ is bounded. To estimate $S_2(n)$ note that

$$S_2(n) \leq \|J_{t_n h}(x_n + t_n h \mathbf{F}(x_n)) - J_{t_n h}(x_n)\|_\alpha + \|J_{t_n h}(x_n) - x_0\|_\alpha.$$

The first summand satisfies

$$\|J_{t_n h}(x_n + t_n h \mathbf{F}(x_n)) - J_{t_n h}(x_n)\|_\alpha \leq \frac{C_\alpha}{(1 - t_n h \omega)^{1-\alpha}} (t_n h)^{1-\alpha} \|\mathbf{F}(x_n)\| \rightarrow 0, \quad n \rightarrow \infty,$$

and, as in (4.17), $\|J_{t_n h} x_n - x_0\|_\alpha \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Now it is clear that

$$(4.24) \quad \Lambda(\phi_h|_{\mathbf{K}^\alpha}) = \Lambda(\text{id}) = \lambda(\text{id}) = \chi(\mathbf{K}^\alpha) = \chi(\mathbf{K}).$$

In view of Remark 4.11 (3), (4.22), (4.23) and (4.24) we conclude the proof. \square

Remark 4.15. If assumptions $(D_1) - (D_6)$ are satisfied and \mathbf{F} is defined on \mathbf{K}^α , then $\deg_{\mathbf{K}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{F}; U)$ does not depend on open $U \subset X^\alpha$ such that $\mathbf{K}^\alpha \subset U$. Therefore we may suppress it from the notation and write $\deg_{\mathbf{K}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{F})$. The normalization property implies in particular that $\deg_{\mathbf{K}}(\mathbf{A}, 0) = \chi(\mathbf{K})$.

The following corollary is convenient to use in applications.

Corollary 4.16. Assume that $\mathbf{K} \subset X$ is closed convex and bounded, $\mathbf{F} : \mathbf{K}^\alpha \rightarrow X$ is continuous and tangent, namely $\mathbf{F}(u) \in T_{\mathbf{K}}(u)$, for every $u \in \mathbf{K}^\alpha$, and let $C := \{u \in \mathbf{K}^\alpha \mid \mathbf{A}u = t\mathbf{F}(u) \text{ for some } t \in [0, 1]\}$. If $\mathbf{F}(C)$ is bounded, then there is $u_0 \in \mathbf{K} \cap D(\mathbf{A})$ such that $\mathbf{A}u_0 = \mathbf{F}(u_0)$.

Proof. The assumptions imply that a map $\mathbf{H}(u, t) : \mathbf{K}^\alpha \rightarrow X$ given by $\mathbf{H}(u, t) := t\mathbf{F}(u)$ for $u \in \mathbf{K}^\alpha$, provide an admissible homotopy joining \mathbf{F} to the constant map 0. Then the assertion follows as an immediate consequence of the existence, homotopy and normalization properties of the degree. \square

Remark 4.17. If the operator \mathbf{A} is m -accretive, then Corollary 4.16 is true if \mathbf{K} is not bounded, but C is bounded. It is an open problem to get this result without a provisional assumption of m -accretivity.

Acknowledgement. The first author wishes to express his gratitude towards Research Centre Erwin Schrödinger International Institute for Mathematics and Physics (ESI) of the University of Vienna for support during his stay at the ESI. The second author was partially supported by the grant 346300 for IMPAN from the Simons Foundation and the matching 2015-2019 Polish MNiSW fund. The authors are grateful to Aleksander Ćwiszewski for fruitful discussions.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. A. Adams, *Sobolev spaces*, Academic Press [A subsidiary of Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers], New York-London, 1975. Pure and Applied Mathematics, Vol. 65. MR0450957
- [2] N. Alikakos, *Remarks on invariance in reaction-diffusion equations*, Nonl. Anal. Theory, Meth. & Appl. **5** (1981), 593–614.
- [3] H. Amann, *Invariant sets and existence theorems for semilinear parabolic and elliptic systems*, J. Math. Anal Appl. **65** (1978), 432–467.
- [4] W. Arendt and A. F. M. ter Elst, *From forms to semigroups*, Spectral theory, mathematical system theory, evolution equations, differential and difference equations, Oper. Theory Adv. Appl., vol. 221, Birkhäuser/Springer Basel AG, Basel, 2012, pp. 47–69. MR2953980
- [5] W. Arendt and M. Kreuter, *Mapping theorems for Sobolev spaces of vector-valued functions*, Studia Math. **240** (2018), no. 3, 275–299, DOI 10.4064/sm8757-4-2017. MR3731026
- [6] J.-P. Aubin and H. Frankowska, *Set-valued analysis*, Modern Birkhäuser Classics, Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2009. Reprint of the 1990 edition [MR1048347]. MR2458436
- [7] J. W. Bebernes and K. Schmitt, *Invariant sets and the Hukuhara-Kneser property for systems of parabolic partial differential equations*, Rocky Mountain J. Math. **7** (1977), no. 3, 557–567, DOI 10.1216/RMJ-1977-7-3-557. MR600519
- [8] H. Ben-El-Mechaiekh and W. Kryszewski, *Equilibria of set-valued maps on nonconvex domains*, Transaction of Amer. Math. Soc. **349** (1997), no. 10, 4159–4179.
- [9] P. Cannarsa, G. Da Prato, and H. Frankowska, *Invariance for quasi-dissipative systems in Banach spaces*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **457** (2018), 1173–1187.
- [10] O. Cârjă, M. Necula, and I. Vrabie, *Viability, invariance and application*, Elsevier Science B. V. Amsterdam, 2007.
- [11] K. N. Chueh, C. C. Conley, and J. A. Smoller, *Positively invariant regions for systems of nonlinear reaction-diffusion equation*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **26** (1977), 373–391.
- [12] J. W. Cholewa and T. Dłotko, *Global Attractors in Abstract Parabolic Equations*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, vol. 278, Cambridge University Press, 2000.

- [13] A. Ćwiszewski, *Topological degree methods for perturbations of operators generating compact C_0 semigroups*, J. Differential Equations **220** (2006), no. 2, 434–477.
- [14] A. Ćwiszewski and W. Kryszewski, *Homotopy invariants for tangent vector fields on closed sets*, Nonlinear Anal. **65** (2006), no. 1, 175–209, DOI 10.1016/j.na.2005.09.010. MR2226264
- [15] A. Ćwiszewski and W. Kryszewski, *Constrained topological degree and positive solutions of fully nonlinear boundary value problems*, J. Differential Equations **247** (2009), no. 8, 2235–2269, DOI 10.1016/j.jde.2009.06.025. MR2561277
- [16] M. Egert and P. Tolksdorf, *Characterization of Sobolev functions that vanish on a part of the boundary*, Disc. Cont Dynamical Systems **10** (2017), no. 4, 729–743, DOI doi:10.3934/dcdss.2017037.
- [17] K.-J. Engel and R. Nagel, *One-parameter semigroups for linear evolution equations*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 194, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2000. With contributions by S. Brendle, M. Campiti, T. Hahn, G. Metafune, G. Nickel, D. Pallara, C. Perazzoli, A. Rhandi, S. Romanelli and R. Schnaubelt. MR1721989
- [18] D. Gilbarg and N. S. Trudinger, *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*, Classics in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001. Reprint of the 1998 edition. MR1814364
- [19] M. Giaquinta and L. Martinazzi, *An introduction to the regularity theory for elliptic systems, harmonic maps and minimal graphs*, 2nd ed., Appunti. Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa (Nuova Serie) [Lecture Notes. Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa (New Series)], vol. 11, Edizioni della Normale, Pisa, 2012. MR3099262
- [20] A. Granas, *The Leray-Schauder index and the fixed point theory for arbitrary ANRs*, Bull. Soc. Math. France **100** (1972), 209–228. MR0309102
- [21] A. Granas and J. Dugundji, *Fixed point theory*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2003. MR1987179
- [22] S. Guesmia, *Garding inequality on unbounded domains*, Differential and Integral Equations **23** (2010), no. 11/12, 1091–1103.
- [23] M. Haase, *The Functional Calculus for Sectorial Operators*, Operator Theory: Advances and Applications, vol. 169, Birkhäuser, Basel, 2006.
- [24] D. Henry, *Geometric theory of semilinear parabolic equations*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 840, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1981. MR610244
- [25] A. G. Kartsatos, *Recent results involving compact perturbations and compact resolvents of accretive operators in Banach spaces*, Proceedings of the First World Congress of Nonlinear Analysts, Tampa, Florida, Walter de Gruyter, New York, 1995, 1992.
- [26] W. Kryszewski and J. Siemianowski, *The Bolzano mean-value theorem and partial differential equations*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **457** (2018), no. 2, 1452–1477, DOI 10.1016/j.jmaa.2017.01.040. MR3705363
- [27] P. Kunstmann and L. Weis, *Maximal L^p -regularity for Parabolic Equations, Fourier Multiplier Theorems and H^∞ -functional Calculus* (J.-M. Morel, F. Takens, and B. Teissier, eds.), Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1885, Springer-Verlag Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, 2004.
- [28] H. J. Kuiper, *Invariant set for nonlinear elliptic and parabolic systems*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **11** (1980), 1075–1103.
- [29] H. J. Kuiper, *Positively invariant regions for strongly coupled reaction-diffusion systems with balance law*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. (2000), 340–350.
- [30] V. K. Le and K. Schmitt, *Some general concepts of sub and supersolutions for nonlinear elliptic problems*, Topol. Methods. Nonlinear Anal. **28** (2006), no. 1, 87–103. MR2262257
- [31] A. Marciniak-Czochra and M. Kimmel, *Modelling of early lung cancer progression: influence of growth factor production and cooperation between partially transformed cells*, Math. Mod. Meth. Appl. Sci. **17** (2007), 1693–1719.
- [32] M. Marcus and V. J. Mizel, *Every superposition operator mapping one Sobolev space into another is continuous*, J. Funct. Anal. **33** (1979), no. 2, 217–229, DOI 10.1016/0022-1236(79)90113-7. MR546508
- [33] M. Marcus and V. J. Mizel, *Nemitsky operators on Sobolev spaces*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **51** (1973), 347–370.
- [34] M. Marcus and V. J. Mizel, *Complete Characterization of Functions Which Act, Via Superposition, on Sobolev Spaces*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **251** (1979), 187–218.
- [35] Jr. R. H. Martin, *Nonlinear operators and differential equations in banach spaces*, Wiley-Interscience, New York, 1976.
- [36] W. McLean, *Strongly Elliptic Systems and Boundary Integral Equations*, Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- [37] P. McKenna and W. Walter, *On the Dirichlet problem for elliptic systems*, Applicable Analysis **21** (1986), no. 3, 207–224.
- [38] E. Mitidieri and G. Sweers, *Existence of a maximal solution for quasimonotone elliptic systems*, Differential Integral Eq. **7** (1993), no. 6, 1495–1510.
- [39] M. Müller, *Über das Fundamentaltheorem in der Theorie der gewöhnlichen Differentialgleichungen*, Math. Z. **26** (1927), no. 1, 619–645.
- [40] M. Müller, *Über die Eindeutigkeit der Integrale eines Systems gewöhnlicher Differentialgleichungen und die Konvergenz einer Gattung von Verfahren zur Approximation dieser Integrale*, Walter de Gruyter, Heidelberg, 1927.
- [41] M. Necula, M. Popescu, and I. Vrabie, *Viability for differential inclusions on graphs*, Set-Valued Anal. **16** (2008), 961–981.
- [42] A. Pazy, *Semigroups of linear operators and applications to partial differential equations*, Applied Mathematical Sciences, vol. 44, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1983. MR710486
- [43] M. Plum, *Shape-invariant bounds for reaction-diffusion systems with unequal diffusion coefficients*, J. Differential Equations **73** (1988), no. 1, 82–103, DOI 10.1016/0022-0396(88)90119-2. MR938216

- [44] R. Redheffer and W. Walter, *Invariant sets for systems of partial differential equations*, Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal. **67** (1978), 41–52.
- [45] R. Redlinger, *Invariant sets for strongly coupled reaction-diffusion systems under general boundary conditions*, Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal. **108** (1989), 281–291.
- [46] J. Schröder, *Shape-invariant bounds and more general estimates for vector-valued elliptic-parabolic problems*, J. Differential Equations **45** (1982), no. 3, 431–460, DOI 10.1016/0022-0396(82)90037-7. MR672717
- [47] R. E. Showalter, *Monotone operators in Banach space and nonlinear partial differential equations*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, vol. 49, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1997. MR1422252
- [48] J. Smoller, *Shock waves and reaction-diffusion equations*, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Science], vol. 258, Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1983. MR688146
- [49] W. Walter, *Differential inequalities and maximum principles: theory, new methods and applications*, Nonlinear Anal. Theory, Meth. & Appl. **30** (1997), no. 8, 4695–4711.
- [50] W. Walter, *Differential and Integral Inequalities*, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete, vol. Band 55, Springer-Verla, Heidelberg, 1970.
- [51] H. F. Weinberger, *Invariant sets for weakly coupled parabolic and elliptic systems*, Rend. Mat. **8** (1975), 295–310.
- [52] A. Yagi, *Abstract Parabolic Evolution Equations and their Applications*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Heidelberg, 2010.

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, LODZ UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, LODZ, POLAND
E-mail address: wojciech.kryszewski@p.lodz.pl

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, POLISH ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, ŚNIADECKICH 8, WARSAW, POLAND
E-mail address: jsiem@mat.umk.pl