

A model in one-dimensional thermoelasticity

Tomasz Cieřlak*, Marija Galić†, Boris Muha‡

Abstract

We study a one-dimensional nonlinear hyperbolic-parabolic initial boundary value problem occurring in the theory of thermoelasticity. We prove existence and uniqueness of the local-in-time strong solution. Also, some global-in-time weak measure valued solutions are proven to exist. To this end we introduce an auxiliary problem with artificial viscosity and prove its global-in-time well-posedness. Next, we show that solutions of the auxiliary problem converge, at some short time interval to the strong solution, and to our measure valued solution for an arbitrary time.

1 Introduction

In the thermoelasticity theory, it is assumed that a considered material is elastic and its response to an external load depends on the temperature. We consider the following system which is the simplest model of the one-dimensional thermoelasticity which takes into account the nonlinear coupling between the temperature and displacement of the elastic material (see [4, 2, 14, 18] for related 1D problems):

$$\begin{aligned} u_{tt} - u_{xx} &= -\mu\theta_x \quad \text{in } (0, \infty) \times (a, b), \\ \theta_t - \theta_{xx} + \mu\theta(u_t)_x &= 0, \quad \theta \geq 0 \quad \text{in } (0, \infty) \times (a, b), \\ u(t, a) &= u(t, b) = 0, \quad \theta_x(t, a) = \theta_x(t, b) = 0, \\ u(0, \cdot) &= u_0, \quad u_t(0, \cdot) = u_1, \\ \theta(0, \cdot) &= \theta_0 \geq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

In this system, u denotes the displacement of the elastic material, θ is the material's temperature and μ is a material's constant. We are interested in positive solutions $\theta \geq 0$. The coupling term $\mu\theta(u_t)_x$ in the temperature equation enables us to use the comparison principle at a formal level and arrive at non-negativity of the temperature, unlike in the linear approximation where the coupling term is replaced by $\mu(u_t)_x$.

Let us briefly describe the derivation of the system (1.1) from the first principles. The balance of momentum for an elastic material reads

$$\rho u_{tt} = \operatorname{div} \sigma + f \tag{1.2}$$

*Institute of Mathematics, Polish Academy of Sciences, Poland, cieslak@impan.pl

†Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science, University of Zagreb, Croatia, marija.galic@math.hr

‡Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science, University of Zagreb, Croatia, borism@math.hr

where u is the displacement of the material, ρ is the mass density, σ is the Piola-Kirchhoff stress tensor and f describes the density of external forces acting on the continuum. The linear elastic constitutive stress-strain relation is a generalization of the classical Hooke's law

$$\sigma = \mathcal{D}\text{sym}(\nabla u) - \mu(\theta - \theta_*)I, \quad (1.3)$$

where \mathcal{D} is the elasticity tensor (which is symmetric and positive definite), $\text{sym}(\nabla u) = \frac{1}{2}(\nabla u + \nabla^T u)$ is the symmetrized gradient of u and μ is a positive constant which depends on the material and is determined experimentally. The material's temperature is denoted by θ , while θ_* denotes a given, reference temperature. Assuming that there is no external load acting to the material, and by taking the elasticity tensor \mathcal{D} to be equal to the identity and the mass density ρ to be equal to 1, the system (1.2)-(1.3) in 1D reduces exactly to (1.1)₁.

In the thermoelasticity theory, the system of elastic equations (1.2)-(1.3) is coupled with the heat equation which describes the evolution of the material's temperature, and is a consequence of *the first law of thermodynamics*: the time derivative of the total energy is equal to the sum of the power of external forces and the rate of heat received by the continuum

$$\frac{dE}{dt}(t) = P_{ext}(t) + \frac{dQ}{dt}(t).$$

This principle implies the differential equation

$$\frac{de}{dt}(t) + \text{div} q = \sigma \cdot \nabla v,$$

where e is the density of the internal energy, q is the heat flux and v is the velocity of the material's displacement. Assuming that $e = c\theta + \mathcal{D}^{-1}T \cdot T$, where c is a constant depending on the material and $T = \mathcal{D}\text{sym}(\nabla u)$, and, furthermore, assuming that the heat transfer satisfies the Fourier law $q = -\kappa \nabla \theta$, with κ being the material's conductivity, we obtain the heat equation in the form

$$c\theta_t - \kappa \Delta \theta + \mu(\theta - \theta_*)\text{div} u_t = 0. \quad (1.4)$$

Assuming all the physical constants to be equal to 1, i.e. $c = \kappa = 1$, the reference temperature θ_* to be equal to zero, the equation (1.4) in 1D reduces to (1.1)₁.

We prove the existence and uniqueness, locally in time, of a strong solution, with the temperature being *non-negative*, to this hyperbolic-parabolic coupling problem by using the artificial viscosity approach. We would like to emphasize that, physically, temperature is expected to be non-negative but the models studied so far do not seem to fulfill this expectation.

To be more precise, we first introduce an auxiliary, regularized problem, and passing to the limit as regularization parameter tends to zero, we obtain a solution to the original problem (1.1). Furthermore, we also prove the existence, globally in time, of a measure valued solution to problem (1.1), as defined below. These results are summarized in the following two theorems:

Theorem 1. *Let $u_0 \in H^2(a, b) \cap H_0^1(a, b)$, $u_1 \in H_0^1(a, b)$, $\theta_0 \in H^2(a, b)$, $\theta_0 \geq 0$. Then there exists a time $T_0 > 0$ (depending on data) and a unique solution (u, θ) to problem (1.1) on $(0, T_0)$ with the following regularity:*

$$\begin{aligned} & \|u\|_{W^{2,\infty}(0,T_0;L^2(a,b))} + \|u\|_{W^{1,\infty}(0,T_0;H^1(a,b))} + \|u\|_{L^\infty(0,T_0;H^2(a,b))} \\ & + \|\theta\|_{W^{1,\infty}(0,T_0;L^2(a,b))} + \|\theta\|_{H^1(0,T_0;H^1(a,b))} \leq C. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 2. *Let $u_0 \in H_0^1(a, b)$, $u_1 \in L^2(a, b)$, $\theta_0 \in L^2(a, b)$, $\theta_0 \geq 0$. Then for every $T > 0$ there exists a measure $\gamma \in L^2(0, T; \mathcal{M}(a, b))$ and functions (u, θ) defined on $(0, T)$ satisfying the following equalities:*

$$\int_0^T \int_a^b u_{tt} v + \int_0^T \int_a^b u_x v_x + \mu \int_0^T \int_a^b \theta_x v = 0$$

and

$$\int_0^T \int_a^b \theta_t \psi + \int_0^T \int_a^b \theta_x \psi_x - \mu \int_0^T \int_a^b \theta u_t \psi_x = \mu \int_0^T \int_a^b \psi d\gamma,$$

for all test functions $(v, \psi) \in H_0^1(a, b) \times H^1(a, b)$, with (u, θ) and γ being related in the following way: there exists a sequence (u^n, θ^n) such that

$$\begin{aligned} (u_t^n, \theta_x^n) &\rightharpoonup (u_t, \theta_x) \text{ weakly in } L^2(0, T; L^2(a, b)), \\ u_t^n \theta_x^n &\rightharpoonup \gamma \text{ weakly in } L^2(0, T; \mathcal{M}(a, b)). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, there exist a constant $C > 0$, depending on the initial data, such that the solution (u, θ) satisfies the following first order estimates:

$$\|u\|_{W^{1,\infty}(0,T;L^2(a,b))} + \|u\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H^1(a,b))} + \|\theta\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^1(a,b))} \leq C \left(\|u_0\|_{H^1(a,b)}, \|u_1\|_{L^2(a,b)}, \|\theta_0\|_{L^2(a,b)} \right)$$

and

$$\|\theta\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(a,b))} + \|\theta\|_{L^2(0,T;H^1(a,b))} \leq C \left(\|u_0\|_{H^1(a,b)}, \|u_1\|_{L^2(a,b)}, \|\theta_0\|_{L^2(a,b)} \right).$$

2 Literature review

It is well known that the equations of one-dimensional nonlinear thermoelasticity in general admit smooth, classical solution; locally for any data and globally for small data. This was investigated by various authors and one of the pioneer works was Slemrod's paper [18] from 1981.

He considered the following nonlinear thermoelasticity problem

$$\begin{aligned} u_{tt} - a(u_x, \theta) u_{xx} + b(u_x, \theta) \theta_x &= 0, \\ c(u_x, \theta) \theta_t - d(u_x, \theta) \theta_{xx} + b(u_x, \theta) u_{tx} &= 0, \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

with mixed boundary conditions (Neumann for u , Dirichlet for θ and vice versa), where a, b, c, d are differentiable functions such that $a, c, d > 0$, $|b| > 0$. The author proved local existence and uniqueness of a solution. Furthermore, assuming the smallness of the initial data, he also proved global existence and uniqueness. We emphasize here that a strong assumption that b is bounded away from 0 prevents an expected non-negativity result for θ . The methodology of the proof is based on application of the contraction mapping theorem to solutions of a related linear problem.

Later on, Racke [13] proved the local existence of classical smooth solutions to the equations of one-dimensional nonlinear thermoelasticity (2.1) for the physically reasonable Dirichlet boundary conditions (the boundary of the configuration is assumed to be rigidly clamped and held at constant temperature) for both bounded and unbounded domains assuming smooth data.

Racke and Shibata dealt with the same problem in [14] where they proved a global existence of smooth solutions by using the spectral analysis to estimate the decay rates of solutions to the linearized

problem, which are then used in a standard way to obtain energy estimates. Racke and Shibata [14] as well as Racke [13] again assume $|b| > 0$. Consequently, temperature θ constructed by them does not share any comparison principle and the non-negativity result for temperature is missing. Our model is the simplest one addressing the potential non-negativity of temperature. Indeed, our solutions are proven to be non-negative.

By following the similar approach as in [14], the global existence of smooth solutions for small and smooth data in the case of Neumann boundary conditions was proved in [17].

The results of [14] were further improved by Racke, Shibata and Zheng in [15]. They prove that if the initial data are close to the equilibrium then the problem admits a unique, global, smooth solution. This is achieved without assuming additionally that b is bounded away from 0. However, this was done in the case of Dirichlet boundary data. Moreover, the required regularity of initial data $(u_0, \theta_0 \in H^3)$ is much higher than the one we need. Last, but not least, no temperature non-negativity results are presented in [15]. However, since the construction of the solution there does not require b to be bounded away from 0, one could hope for the comparison principle in the parabolic equation which would yield non-negativity of temperature. This would clearly require some additional work. Not fully trivial, due to the presence of the zeroth order term in the parabolic equation, one would have to make sure that the obtained regularity of u_{tx} is high enough.

Let us also mention [11], where the authors prove a local existence theorem for quasilinear system of thermoelasticity in 3D with Dirichlet boundary conditions. Again, b is not assumed to be bounded away from 0, but the regularity requirement concerning initial data is much higher than in our case. Again, one could address the positivity of the temperature in that case via comparison principle for the parabolic equation. Similarly as in [15], it is not straightforward. Handling the presence of the zeroth order term would again need quite high regularity of u_{tx} , hence additional work.

Some more general models were also considered. For instance, global existence of solutions for small initial data and decay of classical solutions for the equations of one-dimensional nonlinear thermoelasticity was also considered by Hrusa and Tarabek [7], Jiang [9] and Zheng and Shen [19].

In their paper [8], Hu and Wang investigated the global solvability of smooth small solutions to the one-dimensional thermoelasticity problem with second sound in the half line. Their work was motivated by Jiang's paper [10] where the author obtained the global existence of smooth solutions to the system of classical thermoelasticity under Dirichlet boundary conditions in the half line by directly using energy estimates.

Regarding singularities, Dafermos and Hsiao in [4] considered a special one-dimensional model taking into account the whole real line as a reference configuration. They proved that for large data a smooth solution blows up in a finite time. Similar problem was also considered by Hrusa and Messaoudi [6]. They showed the existence of smooth initial data for which the solution will develop singularities in finite time.

Comparing our work to the existing literature, we see that we assume less regularity on the initial data which leads to a different functional framework. Moreover, we do not assume that $b(u_x, \theta)$ is bounded away from zero, which is the case in e.g. [13, 14, 18]. Furthermore, none of the works mentioned above dealt with the non-negativity of the temperature, which is, besides the proof of existence and uniqueness of the solution, one of the main novelties of our paper.

3 Preliminaries

In the paper, we will repeatedly use the following interpolation inequality (often called *Agmon's inequality*), stated and proven below (in one-dimensional framework) for completeness.

Proposition 1. *For any $f \in H_0^1(a, b)$ the following inequality holds*

$$\|f\|_{L^\infty} \leq \sqrt{\|f\|_{L^2}\|f_x\|_{L^2}}, \quad (3.1)$$

while if only $f \in H^1(a, b)$, then

$$\|f\|_{L^\infty} \leq \sqrt{2\|f\|_{L^2}\|f_x\|_{L^2}} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{b-a} \int_a^b f^2(s) ds}. \quad (3.2)$$

Proof. First we notice that for any $f \in C^1[a, b]$ and $x_0 < x$ one has

$$f^2(x) = \int_{x_0}^x (f^2)'(s) ds + f^2(x_0), \quad (3.3)$$

hence for x_0 such that the value of f^2 at x_0 is smaller than the average

$$f^2(x) \leq 2 \int_{x_0}^x f(s)f'(s) ds + f^2(x_0) \leq 2\|f\|_{L^2}\|f_x\|_{L^2} + \frac{1}{b-a} \int_a^b f^2(s) ds$$

where we used the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. Next, the usual density argument allows us to state (3.2) for any $f \in H^1(a, b)$. In order to arrive at (3.1) we pick up first x_0 being a in (3.3) to arrive at

$$f^2(x) = \int_a^x (f^2(s))' ds,$$

next for x_0 being b in (3.3) we have

$$f^2(x) = \int_b^x (f^2(s))' ds.$$

Hence, for smooth functions f supported in (a, b) one has

$$2f^2(x) \leq 2 \left(\int_a^x |f(s)||f'(s)| ds + \int_x^b |f(s)||f'(s)| ds \right) = 2 \int_a^b |f(s)||f'(s)| ds.$$

By applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality to the right-hand side we obtain

$$f^2(x) \leq \|f\|_{L^2}\|f_x\|_{L^2},$$

and using the density of compactly supported smooth functions in $H_0^1(a, b)$ we arrive at (3.1). \square

Moreover, in Section 4 we shall need a version of the Schaefer's theorem for the subspace of nonnegative functions. Since we could not find a proper reference we attach a version of this theorem (together with the proof) which is applicable in our case.

Proposition 2. *Let \bar{X} be the Banach space of real-valued functions, by X we denote its subset $\bar{X} \cap \{f \geq 0\}$. Let $A : X \rightarrow X$ be compact and continuous mapping, assume moreover that the set of all points for which there exists $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ so that*

$$B := \{x \in X : x = \lambda Ax\} \quad (3.4)$$

is bounded. Assume next that the topology in \bar{X} is order preserving (closure of the set of non-negative functions consists of non-negative functions). Then A has a fixed point $x \in X$.

Proof. The proof follows the lines of the original proof of Schaefer (see [16] or compare to [5]). We only have to ensure that the fixed point is a non-negative function. After choosing a constant M in such a way that

$$\|u\| < M \text{ for all } u \in B \text{ (the definition of } B \text{ is given in (3.4))},$$

one can define $A_M(u) := \frac{MA(u)}{\|A(u)\|}$ for u such that $\|A(u)\| \geq M$, while $A_M = A$ for u such that $\|A(u)\| \leq M$. We observe that $A_M : B(0, M) \cap X \rightarrow B(0, M) \cap X$, A_M inherits continuity and compactness from A . Hence

$$A_M : \overline{\text{conv}(B(0, M) \cap X)} \rightarrow \overline{\text{conv}(B(0, M) \cap X)}.$$

We are in a position to use classical Schauder's fixed point theorem and say that A_M has a fixed point in $\overline{\text{conv}(B(0, M) \cap X)}$. On the one hand the latter set consists of non-negative functions only. Indeed, a convexification of the set of non-negative functions consists of non-negative functions only. Non-negativity is also preserved by the closure, as assumed in the statement of the proposition. Finally, we show that a fixed point of A_M is also a fixed point of A in a standard way. □

4 Auxiliary problem

In this section we introduce an auxiliary problem which we shall utilize in order to construct solutions of (1.1). More precisely, we follow the *artificial viscosity approach* (see e.g. [1]), i.e. we find a global solution to the regularized system:

$$\begin{aligned} u_{tt} - u_{xx} - \nu u_{txx} &= -\mu \theta_x \quad \text{in } (0, T) \times (a, b), \\ \theta_t - \theta_{xx} + \mu \theta (u_t)_x &= 0, \quad \theta \geq 0 \quad \text{in } (0, T) \times (a, b), \\ u(t, a) &= u(t, b) = 0, \quad \theta_x(t, a) = \theta_x(t, b) = 0, \\ u(0, \cdot) &= u_0, \quad u_t(0, \cdot) = u_1, \\ \theta(0, \cdot) &= \theta_0 \geq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

and then construct a solution to the system (1.1) as a limit of solutions to (4.1) when $\nu \rightarrow 0$, $\nu > 0$ being a regularization parameter (artificial structural viscoelasticity). The initial conditions θ_0, u_0 and u_1 belong to the following function spaces:

$$u_0 \in H_0^1(a, b), \quad u_1 \in L^2(a, b), \quad \theta_0 \in L^2(a, b). \quad (4.2)$$

Remark 1. Full thermoviscoelastic system has also an additional term in the temperature equation (see e.g. [3]). Equation (4.1)₂ with physical viscosity would be:

$$\theta_t - \theta_{xx} + \mu\theta(u_t)_x = \nu(u_{tx})^2.$$

Definition 1. We say that (u, θ) is a weak solution to problem (4.1) if the following conditions are satisfied:

1.

$$u \in W^{1,\infty}(0, T; L^2(a, b)) \cap H^1(0, T; H_0^1(a, b)), \quad u_{tt} \in L^2(0, T; H^{-1}(a, b))$$

2.

$$\theta \in H^1(0, T; L^2(a, b)) \cap L^2(0, T; H^2(a, b)), \quad \theta \geq 0.$$

3. (u, θ) satisfies the following variational equation:

$$H^{-1}\langle u_{tt}, v \rangle_{H^1} + \int_a^b u_x v_x + \nu \int_a^b u_{tx} v_x + \mu \int_a^b \theta_x v = 0, \quad (4.3)$$

$$\int_a^b \theta_t \psi + \int_a^b \theta_x \psi_x + \mu \int_a^b \theta u_{tx} \psi = 0, \quad (4.4)$$

where $(v, \psi) \in H_0^1(a, b) \times H^1(a, b)$.

4. Initial conditions (4.1)_{5,6} are satisfied.

Remark 2. Due to required regularity of the temperature $\theta \in L^2(0, T; H^1(a, b))$ as well as $\theta_t \in L^2(0, T; L^2(a, b))$, we have that

$$\theta \in C([0, T]; L^2(a, b))$$

(see e.g. [5]). Similarly, from the regularity of the displacement u , we get that:

$$u \in C([0, T]; H^1(a, b)) \text{ and } u_t \in C([0, T]; L^2(a, b)).$$

Therefore solutions belong to a regularity class in which initial conditions (4.1)_{5,6} can be understood in the strong sense.

We will prove the existence of global-in-time solution (u, θ) of (4.1) by using the second order energy estimate and the Schaefer's fixed point theorem as introduced in Section 3. Let us choose an arbitrary (but fixed) $T > 0$ and first define suitable function space:

$$\mathcal{H}(0, T) = \{\theta \in L^2(0, T; H_0^1(a, b)) : \theta \geq 0\}. \quad (4.5)$$

The strong topology in \mathcal{H} satisfies the order-preserving assumption in Proposition 2.

Next we define operator $F : \mathcal{H}(0, T) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(0, T)$ in the following way. Take $\tilde{\theta} \in \mathcal{H}(0, T)$ and define \tilde{u} as a solution of the following initial-boundary value problem:

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{u}_{tt} - \tilde{u}_{xx} - \nu \tilde{u}_{txx} = -\mu \tilde{\theta}_x & \text{in } (0, T) \times (a, b), \\ \tilde{u}(\cdot, a) = \tilde{u}(\cdot, b) = 0 & \text{on } (0, T), \\ \tilde{u}(0, \cdot) = u_0, \quad \tilde{u}_t(0, \cdot) = u_1 & \text{on } (a, b). \end{cases} \quad (4.6)$$

Now, with given \tilde{u} , we define θ as a solution of the following initial-boundary value problem:

$$\begin{cases} \theta_t - \theta_{xx} = -\mu\theta\tilde{u}_{tx} & \text{in } (0, T) \times (a, b), \\ \theta_x(\cdot, a) = \theta_x(\cdot, b) = 0 & \text{on } (0, T), \\ \theta(0, \cdot) = \theta_0 \geq 0 & \text{on } (a, b). \end{cases} \quad (4.7)$$

We define $F(\tilde{\theta}) := \theta$.

Theorem 3. *Let $u_0 \in H_0^1(a, b)$, $u_1 \in L^2(a, b)$, $\theta_0 \in H^1(a, b)$, $\theta_0 \geq 0$. Then $F : \mathcal{H}(0, T) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(0, T)$ is continuous. Moreover, we have the following estimates for $\theta = F(\tilde{\theta})$*

$$\|\theta\|_{H^1(0, T; L^2(a, b))} + \|\theta\|_{L^2(0, T; H^2(a, b))} \leq C\|\tilde{\theta}\|_{\mathcal{H}(0, T)}, \quad (4.8)$$

where C depends only on initial data and T .

Proof. We will prove the theorem in series of lemmas.

Lemma 1. *There exists a unique solution to problem (4.6) with the following properties:*

$$\|\tilde{u}\|_{L^\infty(0, T; H^1(a, b))} + \|\tilde{u}\|_{W^{1, \infty}(0, T; L^2(a, b))} + \nu\|\tilde{u}\|_{H^1(0, T; H^1(a, b))} \leq C\|\tilde{\theta}\|_{\mathcal{H}(0, T)}.$$

Proof. Since (4.6) has a fixed right-hand side, it is a linear equation. Moreover, it is a linear damped wave equation (for \tilde{u}). The construction of a solution can be done in a standard way by using the Galerkin approximations (see e.g. [5]), and therefore here we just derive the formal energy estimate. We take \tilde{u}_t as a test function to obtain:

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} (\|\tilde{u}_t\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\tilde{u}_x\|_{L^2}^2) + \nu\|\tilde{u}_{tx}\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} (\|\tilde{u}_t\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\tilde{\theta}_x\|_{L^2}^2).$$

Now the uniqueness and the required estimates follow directly from Gronwall's inequality. \square

Remark 3. *Throughout the rest of the manuscript we will use $\|\cdot\|_{L^2}$ to denote L^2 -norm in space (and analogously for any other norm). For the norms in space and time, the shortened notation $\|\cdot\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2}$ will be used (and analogously for any other norm).*

Lemma 2. *There exists a unique solution to problem (4.7) with the following properties:*

$$\|\theta\|_{H^1(0, T; L^2(a, b))} + \|\theta\|_{L^2(0, T; H^2(a, b))} \leq C\|\tilde{\theta}\|_{\mathcal{H}(0, T)}.$$

Proof. This lemma follows the classical results in parabolic equations (see [12], Chapter III). More precisely, since $\tilde{u}_{tx} \in L_t^2(L_x^2)$, the existence and uniqueness of a weak solution is a consequence of Theorem 3.1 (p. 145) and Theorem 4.1 (p. 153). Moreover, Theorem 7.1 (p. 181) and Corollary 7.1 (p. 186) imply that $\theta \in L_t^\infty(L_x^\infty)$ and therefore $\theta u_{tx} \in L_t^2(L_x^2)$. Now, the statement of the lemma follows from Theorem 6.1 (p. 178). \square

Lemma 3 (Positivity). $\theta \geq 0$ on $(0, T) \times (a, b)$.

Proof. Let us consider the following problem

$$\theta_t - \theta_{xx} = -\mu\theta_+\tilde{u}_{tx},$$

where $\theta_+ = \max\{\theta, 0\}$ is a positive part of θ . By taking $\theta_- = \max\{-\theta, 0\}$ as a test function we obtain:

$$-\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\|\theta_-\|_{L^2}^2 - \|(\theta_-)_x\|_{L^2}^2 = 0.$$

Since $\theta_-(0, \cdot) = 0$, we obtain that $\theta_- = 0$. Positivity of θ now follows from Lemma 2 which guarantees the uniqueness of the solution of (4.7). \square

Lemma 4 (Continuity). *$F : \mathcal{H}(0, T) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(0, T)$ is continuous.*

Proof. The continuity follows from Lemma 1 and Lemma 2. Let us take sequence $\tilde{\theta}_n \rightarrow \tilde{\theta}$ in $\mathcal{H}(0, T)$ and denote by \tilde{u}_n, \tilde{u} the solutions of (4.6) corresponding to $\tilde{\theta}_n, \tilde{\theta}$. Set $\theta_n = F(\tilde{\theta}_n)$, $\theta = F(\tilde{\theta})$. Since problem (4.6) is linear, functions $v_n = \tilde{u}_n - \tilde{u}$ satisfy the following equation with zero initial and boundary conditions:

$$(v_n)_{tt} - (v_n)_{xx} - \nu(v_n)_{txx} = -\mu(\tilde{\theta}_n - \tilde{\theta})_x \quad \text{in } (0, T) \times (a, b).$$

By taking $(v_n)_t$ as a test function, similarly as in Lemma 1, we conclude $(\tilde{u}_n)_{tx} \rightarrow \tilde{u}_{tx}$ in $L^2(0, T; L^2(a, b))$. Now, let $\psi_n = \theta_n - \theta$. Then functions ψ_n satisfy the following equation with zero initial and boundary data:

$$(\psi_n)_t - (\psi_n)_{xx} + \mu\psi_n\tilde{u}_{tx} = -\mu\theta((\tilde{u}_n)_{tx} - \tilde{u}_{tx}).$$

From Lemma 2 it follows that θ is bounded and therefore the right-hand side of the last equation converges to zero in $L^2(0, T; L^2(a, b))$. The statement of the lemma follows from the stability of a weak solution (see e.g. [12], Theorem 4.5 (p. 166)). \square

By summing up all the results obtained in the previous lemmas, we see that Theorem 3 is proved.

Theorem 4. *Let $u_0 \in H_0^1(a, b)$, $u_1 \in L^2(a, b)$, $\theta_0 \in H^1(a, b)$, $\theta_0 \geq 0$. Then for any $T > 0$ there exists a solution (u, θ) to problem (4.1) on $(0, T)$ satisfying the following estimate:*

$$\|u\|_{W^{1,\infty}(0,T;L^2(a,b))} + \|u\|_{H^1(0,T;H^1(a,b))} + \|\theta\|_{H^1(0,T;L^2(a,b))} + \|\theta\|_{L^2(0,T;H^2(a,b))} \leq C(\nu, \text{data}). \quad (4.9)$$

Proof. We use Schaefer's fixed point theorem (Proposition 2). From Theorem 3 we conclude that F is a continuous and compact mapping. This follows from the fact that the set

$$\{f \in \mathcal{H}(0, T) : \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}(0,T)} + \|f\|_{H^1(0,T;L^2(a,b))} + \|f\|_{L^2(0,T;H^2(a,b))} \leq C\}$$

is compact in $\mathcal{H}(0, T)$ as a consequence of Aubin-Lions lemma for the triplet

$$H^2(a, b) \subset\subset H^1(a, b) \subset L^2(a, b).$$

It remains to prove the boundedness of the following set:

$$\{f \in \mathcal{H}(0, T) : f = \lambda F(f), \lambda \in [0, 1]\}.$$

Let $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ and $\theta = \lambda F(\theta)$. Then θ is a solution to system (4.1). Because of Lemma 2, equation is satisfied in strong sense and therefore we can integrate equation (4.1)₂ over (a, b) . Furthermore, we take u_t as a test function in (4.1)₁ and sum the resulting equations to obtain the following estimate:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{1}{2} \|u_t\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|u_x\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\theta\|_{L^1} \right) + \nu \|u_{tx}\|_{L^2}^2 = 0.$$

Therefore, we conclude that $\|u_{tx}\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2(a,b))} \leq C$, where C depends only on the initial data. Now, the bound for θ can be obtained by using the standard results for parabolic equation [12] analogously as in Lemma 2. □

Proposition 3. *Weak solution of the regularized problem (4.1) obtained in Theorem 4 is unique.*

Proof. We start a proof by recalling that due to (4.9), there exists a constant $C > 0$, which depends on ν and data, such that

$$\|\theta_x\|_{L^2(0,T;H^1(a,b))} < C, \quad (4.10)$$

and

$$\|\theta_t\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2(a,b))} < C.$$

From the last inequality we infer

$$\|\theta_{tx}\|_{L^2(0,T;H^{-1}(a,b))} \leq C \|\theta_t\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2(a,b))} < C. \quad (4.11)$$

In view of (4.10) and (4.11), we arrive at (see [5])

$$\theta_x \in C([0, T]; L^2(a, b)). \quad (4.12)$$

Let (u_1, θ_1) , (u_2, θ_2) be two weak solutions of problem (4.1) and set $u = u_1 - u_2$, $\theta = \theta_1 - \theta_2$. By subtracting (4.1)₁ for (u_1, θ_1) and (u_2, θ_2) we get that u satisfies the following differential equation with zero initial and boundary conditions:

$$u_{tt} - u_{xx} - \nu u_{txx} = -\mu \theta_x.$$

By multiplying the above equation by u_t , integrating over space and time interval, and using Young's and Gronwall's inequalities, we get:

$$\|u_t\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} + \|u_x\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} + \nu \|u_{tx}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2} \leq C \|\theta_x\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2}.$$

The equation for $\theta = \theta_1 - \theta_2$ reads:

$$\theta_t - \theta_{xx} = -\mu(\theta_1 u_{tx} + \theta(u_2)_{tx}).$$

We multiply the above equation by θ_t and integrate over (a, b) to obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\theta_t\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\theta_x\|_{L^2}^2 &= -\mu \int_a^b (\theta_1 u_{tx} \theta_t + \theta(u_2)_{tx} \theta_t) \\ &\leq C (\|\theta_1\|_{L^\infty} \|u_{tx}\|_{L^2} \|\theta_t\|_{L^2} + \|\theta\|_{L^\infty} \|(u_2)_{tx}\|_{L^2} \|\theta_t\|_{L^2}) \end{aligned}$$

for a.e. $t \in (0, T)$. From the proof of Lemma 2 we know that $\|\theta_1\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^\infty} \leq C$. Having that in mind, we use Young's inequality to bound the right-hand side of the previous inequality:

$$\|\theta_t\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\theta_x\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C\varepsilon \|\theta_t\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \|u_{tx}\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \|\theta\|_{L^2}^2 \|(u_2)_{tx}\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \|\theta_x\|_{L^2}^2 \|(u_2)_{tx}\|_{L^2}^2,$$

where we also used that $\|\theta\|_{L^\infty}^2 \leq c(\|\theta\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\theta_x\|_{L^2}^2)$. By choosing ε such that $C\varepsilon < \frac{1}{2}$, the first term on the right-hand side can be absorbed into the first term on the left-hand side, and after integrating from 0 to t we obtain:

$$\frac{1}{2} \left(\int_0^t \|\theta_t(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds + \|\theta_x(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \right) \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \|\theta\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}^2 \int_0^t \|(u_2)_{tx}\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \|u_{tx}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2}^2 + \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \int_0^t \|\theta_x\|_{L^2}^2 \|(u_2)_{tx}\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Multiplying the inequality with 2 and using the estimate $\|u_{tx}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2} \leq C\|\theta_x\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2}$ we obtain:

$$\int_0^t \|\theta_t(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds + \|\theta_x(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \|\theta_x\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2}^2 + \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \|\theta(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \int_0^t \|(u_2)_{tx}\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \int_0^t \|\theta_x\|_{L^2}^2 \|(u_2)_{tx}\|_{L^2}^2. \quad (4.13)$$

Next, using $\theta(0) = 0$, we have

$$\|\theta(t)\|_{L^2} = \left\| \int_0^t \theta_t(s) ds \right\|_{L^2} \leq \sqrt{t} \sqrt{\int_0^t \|\theta_t\|_{L^2}^2}.$$

Hence, (4.13) turns into

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^t \|\theta_t(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds + \|\theta_x(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \\ & \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \|\theta_x\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2}^2 + \frac{C}{\varepsilon} t \int_0^t \|\theta_t\|_{L^2}^2 \int_0^t \|(u_2)_{tx}\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \int_0^t \|\theta_x\|_{L^2}^2 \|(u_2)_{tx}\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.14)$$

We are now in a position to finish the proof by a variant of an argument used in the proof of Lemma 2.1 in [12, p. 140]. First we partition interval $(0, T)$ into a finite number of subintervals (t_{k-1}, t_k) , $k = 1, \dots, N$, such that

$$\frac{1}{4} \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} \|(u_2)_{tx}\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}, \quad t_k - t_{k-1} < 1, \quad k = 1, \dots, N. \quad (4.15)$$

This can be done because $\|u_{tx}\|_{L^2}$ is square integrable.

Now we proceed inductively, first we prove that $\theta_x = 0$ on $(t_0 = 0, t_1)$. Keeping in mind (4.15), from (4.14) we have

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \|\theta_t(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds + \|\theta_x(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \int_0^t \|\theta_x\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \|\theta_x\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}^2 \int_0^t \|(u_2)_{tx}\|_{L^2}^2 \quad (4.16)$$

for any $t \leq t_1$.

Let us fix $0 < t < t_1$. Due to (4.12), we notice that $f(t) := \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} \|\theta_x(s, x)\|_{L^2(a, b)}$ is bounded, in particular integrable in $(0, t)$. In view of (4.16), for $0 < s < t$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\theta_x(s)\|_{L^2}^2 &\leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \int_0^s \|\theta_x\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \sup_{0 \leq z \leq s} \|\theta_x(z, x)\|_{L^2}^2 \int_0^s \|(u_2)_{tx}\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \int_0^t \sup_{0 \leq z \leq s} \|\theta_x(z, x)\|_{L^2}^2 ds + \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} \|\theta_x(s, x)\|_{L^2}^2 \int_0^t \|(u_2)_{tx}\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we take supremum of the left-hand side over $s \leq t$

$$\sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} \|\theta_x(s)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \int_0^t \sup_{0 \leq z \leq s} \|\theta_x(z, x)\|_{L^2}^2 ds + \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} \|\theta_x(s, x)\|_{L^2}^2 \int_0^t \|(u_2)_{tx}\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Finally, utilizing (4.15), the last inequality turns into

$$\frac{1}{2} \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} \|\theta_x(s)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \int_0^t \sup_{0 \leq z \leq s} \|\theta_x(z, x)\|_{L^2}^2 ds.$$

Using Gronwall's inequality we have

$$\theta_x = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad [0, t_1]. \quad (4.17)$$

Next, Poincaré's inequality tells us that $\theta(t, x) = c(t)$. On the other hand, (4.16) shows, in view of (4.17), that $\theta = 0$ on $[0, t_1]$. In particular, $\theta(t_1) = 0$ and therefore we can further iterate the argument to prove that $\theta = 0$ on $[t_{k-1}, t_k]$, $k = 1, \dots, N$, and thus finish the uniqueness proof. \square

We shall next prove that our unique solution is actually regular provided initial data is more regular. Indeed, if we impose more restrictive assumptions on initial data, Theorem 4 still gives a unique solution. We shall give formal estimates which can be consequently used to arrive at more regular solutions via a Schaefer's theorem like in the proof of Theorem 4. This time, since we require more regularity from our solutions we search for a fixed point in the set

$$\mathcal{H}_1(0, T) = \{\theta \in H^1(0, T; H_0^1(a, b)) : \theta \geq 0\}.$$

In such a case an obtained solution overlaps with the solution constructed in Theorem 4, see the uniqueness claim in Proposition 3. The obtained solution is smoother, see a proposition below.

Proposition 4. *Let $u_0 \in H^2(a, b) \cap H_0^1(a, b)$, $u_1 \in H^2(a, b) \cap H_0^1(a, b)$, $\theta_0 \in H^3(a, b)$, $\theta_0 \geq 0$. Then the unique solution (u, θ) to problem (4.1) given by Theorem 4 satisfies the following regularity properties:*

$$\|u\|_{W^{2, \infty}(0, T; L^2(a, b))} + \|u\|_{H^2(0, T; H^1(a, b))} + \|\theta\|_{H^2(0, T; L^2(a, b))} + \|\theta\|_{L^2(0, T; H^3(a, b))} \leq C(\nu, \text{data}). \quad (4.18)$$

Proof. First of all, by Theorem 4, for any $t > 0$ we have

$$\int_0^t \int_a^b u_{tx}^2 dx < C. \quad (4.19)$$

Next, multiplying (4.1)₂ by θ_t and then integrating in space and time, using (4.19), we arrive at

$$\int_0^t \int_a^b \theta_t^2 dx dt < C \text{ for any } t > 0. \quad (4.20)$$

Next, we apply ∂_t to (4.1)₁, multiply the resulting equation by u_{tt} and integrate in both space and time to get:

$$\|u_{tt}\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} + \|u_{tx}\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} + 2\nu \|u_{ttt}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2} \leq C \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2} + \|u_{tt}(0)\|_{L^2} + \|u_{tx}(0)\|_{L^2}.$$

Since, $u_{tt} = u_{xx} + \nu u_{txx} - \mu \theta_x$, we conclude:

$$\|u_{tt}\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} + \|u_{tx}\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} + 2\nu \|u_{ttt}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2} \leq C (\|\theta_{tx}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2} + \|u_0\|_{H^2} + \|u_1\|_{H^2} + \|\theta_0\|_{H^1}). \quad (4.21)$$

Now, we apply ∂_t to both sides, multiply the resulting equation by θ_{tt} and integrate to get:

$$\|\theta_{tt}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|\theta_{tx}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 = -\mu \int_0^t \int_a^b \theta_t u_{tx} \theta_{tt} - \mu \int_0^t \int_a^b \theta u_{ttt} \theta_{tt} + \frac{1}{2} \|\theta_{tx}(0)\|_{L^2}^2 = \text{I} + \text{II} + \text{III}.$$

Let us estimate terms on the right-hand side separately. Using (3.2) and Young's inequality we get:

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{I}| &\leq \int_0^t \|u_{tx}\|_{L^2} \|\theta_t\|_{L^\infty} \|\theta_{tt}\|_{L^2} \leq \int_0^t \|u_{tx}\|_{L^2} (\|\theta_t\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L^2}^{1/2} + \|\theta_t\|_{L^2}) \|\theta_{tt}\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C\varepsilon \|\theta_{tt}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2}^2 + \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \int_0^t \|u_{tx}\|_{L^2}^2 (\|\theta_t\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L^2}^2) \\ &\leq C\varepsilon \|\theta_{tt}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2}^2 + \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \left(\sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} \|u_{tx}(s)\|_{L^2}^2 \int_0^t \|\theta_t\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^t \|u_{tx}\|_{L^2}^2 \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L^2}^2 \right) \\ &\leq C\varepsilon \|\theta_{tt}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2}^2 + \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \left(\int_0^t \|u_{tx}\|_{L^2}^2 \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L^2}^2 + \left(\int_0^t \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|u_0\|_{H^2} + \|u_1\|_{H^2} + \|\theta_0\|_{H^1} \right) \int_0^t \|\theta_t\|_{L^2}^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we used (4.21). Consequently, in view of (4.19) and (4.20)

$$|\text{I}| \leq C\varepsilon \|\theta_{tt}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2}^2 + \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \int_0^t \|u_{tx}\|_{L^2}^2 \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L^2}^2 + C(\|u_0\|_{H^2}, \|u_1\|_{H^2}, \|\theta_0\|_{H^1}) \int_0^t \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Moreover, from the proof of Lemma 2 we have $\|\theta\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^\infty} \leq C$. Therefore using (4.21) we have:

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{II}| &\leq C\varepsilon \|\theta_{tt}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2}^2 + \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \|u_{ttt}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2}^2 \\ &\leq C\varepsilon \|\theta_{tt}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2}^2 + \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \left(\|\theta_{tx}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2}^2 + \|u_0\|_{H^2} + \|u_1\|_{H^2} + \|\theta_0\|_{H^1} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Finally,

$$|\text{III}| \leq C(\|\theta_{xxx}(0)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|(\theta_x u_{tx})(0)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|(\theta u_{ttt})(0)\|_{L^2}^2) \leq C(\nu, \text{data}).$$

Picking up ε small enough and summing up the estimates of I, II and III, we arrive at

$$\|\theta_{tx}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \int_0^t \|u_{tx}\|_{L^2}^2 \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L^2}^2 + C(\varepsilon, \text{data}) \int_0^t \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L^2}^2 + C(\nu, \varepsilon, \text{data}). \quad (4.22)$$

We are now in a position to finish the proof by using slightly less standard version of Gronwall's inequality. For reader's convenience, we give the details. First, we simplify the notation and rewrite (4.22) as

$$\|\theta_{tx}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(\varepsilon, \text{data}) \int_0^t (\|u_{tx}(s)\|_{L^2}^2 + 1) \|\theta_{tx}(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds + C(\nu, \varepsilon, \text{data}).$$

Taking into account (4.19), multiplying both sides by $(\|u_{tx}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + 1)e^{-\int_0^t (\|u_{tx}(s)\|_{L^2}^2 + 1) ds}$, the latter can be transformed into

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\int_0^t \|\theta_{tx}(s)\|_{L^2}^2 (\|u_{tx}(s)\|_{L^2}^2 + 1) ds e^{-\int_0^t (\|u_{tx}(s)\|_{L^2}^2 + 1) ds} \right) \leq -C(\nu, \varepsilon, \text{data}) \frac{d}{dt} e^{-\int_0^t (\|u_{tx}(s)\|_{L^2}^2 + 1) ds},$$

and consequently after integration

$$\int_0^t \|\theta_{tx}(s)\|_{L^2}^2 (\|u_{tx}(s)\|_{L^2}^2 + 1) ds \leq C(\nu, \varepsilon, \text{data}) \left(e^{\int_0^t \|u_{tx}(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds} e^t - 1 \right)$$

and hence, in view of (4.22)

$$\begin{aligned} \|\theta_{tx}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 &\leq C(\varepsilon) \int_0^t (\|u_{tx}\|_{L^2}^2 + 1) \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L^2}^2 + C(\nu, \varepsilon, \text{data}) \\ &\leq C(\nu, \varepsilon, \text{data}) \left(e^{\int_0^t \|u_{tx}(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds} e^t - 1 \right) + C(\nu, \varepsilon, \text{data}). \end{aligned}$$

□

5 Time-independent estimates

In this section we derive the time-independent estimates for the solution (u, θ) of (4.1). We will use them to construct global-in-time weak solutions to (1.1).

We first get the same estimate as in the proof of Theorem 4. We multiply $(4.1)_1$ by u_t and integrate from a to b , next integrate $(4.1)_2$, and sum the resulting expressions to obtain the basic energy equality:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{1}{2} \|u_t\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|u_x\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\theta\|_{L^1} \right) + \nu \|u_{tx}\|_{L^2}^2 = 0 \quad (5.1)$$

which yields the following estimate:

$$\|u\|_{W^{1,\infty}(0,T;L^2(a,b))} + \|u\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H^1(a,b))} + \|\theta\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^1(a,b))} \leq C(\|u_t(0)\|_{L^2}, \|u_x(0)\|_{L^2}, \|\theta(0)\|_{L^2}). \quad (5.2)$$

To derive the second estimate we multiply $(4.1)_2$ by θ and integrate:

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\theta\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\theta_x\|_{L^2}^2 = -\mu \int_a^b \theta^2 (u_t)_x = 2\mu \int_a^b \theta_x \theta u_t \leq 2\mu \|\theta\|_{L^\infty} \|\theta_x\|_{L^2} \|u_t\|_{L^2}.$$

Now, from (5.2) we conclude that $\|u_t(t)\|_{L^2}$ is bounded for a.e. $t \in [0, T]$. Next, (3.2) and Young's inequality yield

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\theta\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\theta_x\|_{L^2}^2 &\leq C_1 \|\theta\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\theta_x\|_{L^2}^{3/2} + C_2 \|\theta\|_{L^2} \|\theta_x\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq \left(\frac{C_1}{\varepsilon^3} \|\theta\|_{L^2}^2 + C_1 \varepsilon \|\theta_x\|_{L^2}^2 \right) + \left(\frac{C_2}{\varepsilon} \|\theta\|_{L^2}^2 + C_2 \varepsilon \|\theta_x\|_{L^2}^2 \right) \\ &\leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon^3} \|\theta\|_{L^2}^2 + C \varepsilon \|\theta_x\|_{L^2}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $C = 2\mu \max\{\sqrt{2}, \sqrt{\frac{1}{b-a}}\}$. We choose ε such that the last term can be absorbed into the right-hand side and use Gronwall's inequality to obtain:

$$\|\theta\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(a,b))} + \|\theta\|_{L^2(0,T;H^1(a,b))} \leq \exp(Ct) \|\theta(0)\|_{L^2}. \quad (5.3)$$

6 Time-dependent estimates

This section is devoted to higher order estimates of solutions to (4.1). Those estimates will hold only on properly short time intervals. We will need them to obtain local-in-time well-posedness of (1.1). The following theorem holds true:

Theorem 5. *Let $u_0 \in H^2(a,b) \cap H_0^1(a,b)$, $u_1 \in H^2(a,b) \cap H_0^1(a,b)$, $\theta_0 \in H^3(a,b)$. Then there exists short enough time $T_0 > 0$ and a constant $C > 0$ such that (u, θ) , solutions of (4.1) given by Proposition 4, satisfy*

$$\begin{aligned} &\|u\|_{W^{2,\infty}(0,T_0;L^2(a,b))} + \|u\|_{W^{1,\infty}(0,T_0;H^1(a,b))} + \|u\|_{L^\infty(0,T_0;H^2(a,b))} \\ &\leq C (\|u_{tt}(0)\|_{L^2(a,b)} + \|u_{tx}(0)\|_{L^2(a,b)} + \|\theta_t(0)\|_{L^2(a,b)}) \end{aligned} \quad (6.1)$$

and

$$\|\theta\|_{W^{1,\infty}(0,T_0;L^2(a,b))} + \|\theta\|_{H^1(0,T_0;H^1(a,b))} \leq C (\|u_{tt}(0)\|_{L^2(a,b)} + \|u_{tx}(0)\|_{L^2(a,b)} + \|\theta_t(0)\|_{L^2(a,b)}). \quad (6.2)$$

Proof. The proof of the theorem will consist of a few steps.

Step 1. We apply ∂_t to (4.1)₁, next multiply the outcome by u_{tt} and integrate over (a, b) to obtain:

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|u_{tt}\|_{L^2}^2 - \int_a^b u_{txx} u_{tt} - \nu \int_a^b u_{txxt} u_{tt} \leq \frac{1}{2} (\|u_{tt}\|_{L^2}^2 + \mu \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L^2}^2).$$

Next, integrating by parts the second and third term on the left-hand side and utilizing the boundary conditions $u_{tt}(a) = u_{tt}(b) = 0$, being a consequence of the fact that the value of u at those points is equal to zero (by (4.1)₃), we arrive at

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} (\|u_{tt}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|u_{tx}\|_{L^2}^2) + \nu \|u_{tx}\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} (\|u_{tt}\|_{L^2}^2 + \mu \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L^2}^2).$$

Dropping the ν -term and using Gronwall's inequality we arrive at

$$\|u_{tt}\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} + \|u_{tx}\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} \leq \exp(t) (\|u_{tt}(0)\|_{L^2} + \|u_{tx}(0)\|_{L^2} + \mu \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2}). \quad (6.3)$$

Step 2. Let us now differentiate (4.1)₂ with respect to time, multiply the resulting equation by θ_t and integrate over (a, b) to obtain:

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\theta_t\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L^2}^2 = -\mu \int_a^b (\theta_t^2 (u_t)_x + \theta \theta_t (u_{tt})_x) dx.$$

The right-hand side can be rewritten by using integration by parts and Hölder's inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\theta_t\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L^2}^2 &= -\mu \int_a^b (\theta_t^2 (u_t)_x - u_{tt} (\theta_x \theta_t + \theta \theta_{tx})) dx \\ &\leq \mu \|u_{tx}\|_{L^2} \|\theta_t\|_{L^2} \|\theta_t\|_{L^\infty} + \mu \|u_{tt}\|_{L^2} \|\theta_x\|_{L^\infty} \|\theta_t\|_{L^2} + \mu \|u_{tt}\|_{L^2} \|\theta\|_{L^\infty} \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that the boundary terms coming from integration by parts vanish due to $u_{tt}(a) = u_{tt}(b) = 0$. We integrate the resulting inequality from 0 to t , use (6.3) to estimate $\|u_{tx}\|_{L^2}$ and $\|u_{tt}\|_{L^2}$ and use Agmon's inequality (3.1), (3.2) to obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2} \|\theta_t(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2}^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \|\theta_t(0)\|_{L^2}^2 + \mu \exp(t) \left(\|u_{tt}(0)\|_{L^2} + \|u_{tx}(0)\|_{L^2} + \mu \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2} \right) \\ &\quad \int_0^t (\|\theta_t\|_{L^\infty} \|\theta_t\|_{L^2} + \|\theta_x\|_{L^\infty} \|\theta_t\|_{L^2} + \|\theta\|_{L^\infty} \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L^2}) dx \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \|\theta_t(0)\|_{L^2}^2 + c\mu \exp(t) \left(\|u_{tt}(0)\|_{L^2} + \|u_{tx}(0)\|_{L^2} + \mu \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2} \right) \\ &\quad \int_0^t \left(\|\theta_t\|_{L^2}^{3/2} \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L^2}^{1/2} + \|\theta_t\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\theta_x\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\theta_{xx}\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\theta_t\|_{L^2} + \|\theta\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\theta_x\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L^2} + \|\theta\|_{L^2} \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L^2} \right) dx. \end{aligned} \tag{6.4}$$

We set

$$A(t) := c\mu^2 \exp(t), \tag{6.5}$$

where $c = \max \left\{ \sqrt{2}, \sqrt{\frac{1}{b-a}} \right\}$, and firstly estimate the integral in (6.4) multiplied by $A(t) \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2}$. Using Hölder's and Young's inequality (with $p = 4/3$ and $q = 4$), we estimate the first term:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{I} &= A(t) \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2} \int_0^t \|\theta_t(s)\|_{L^2}^{3/2} \|\theta_{tx}(s)\|_{L^2}^{1/2} ds \\ &= A(t) \left(\int_0^t \|\theta_{tx}(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_0^t \|\theta_t(s)\|_{L^2}^{3/2} \|\theta_{tx}(s)\|_{L^2}^{1/2} ds \right) \\ &\leq A(t) \left(\int_0^t \|\theta_{tx}(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds \right)^{1/2} \left[\left(\int_0^t \|\theta_t(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds \right)^{3/4} \left(\int_0^t \|\theta_{tx}(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds \right)^{1/4} \right] \\ &= A(t) \left(\int_0^t \|\theta_{tx}(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds \right)^{3/4} \left(\int_0^t \|\theta_t(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds \right)^{3/4} \\ &\leq A(t) \varepsilon \int_0^t \|\theta_{tx}(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds + \frac{A(t)}{\varepsilon^3} \left(\int_0^t \|\theta_t(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds \right)^3 \\ &\leq A(t) \varepsilon \int_0^t \|\theta_{tx}(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds + \frac{A(t) \cdot t^2}{\varepsilon^3} \int_0^t \|\theta_t(s)\|_{L^2}^6 ds \end{aligned} \tag{6.6}$$

In the last inequality, Hölder with $p = \frac{3}{2}$ and $q = 3$ was used.

The second term is estimated in a similar way

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi &= A(t) \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2} \int_0^t \|\theta_t(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds \\
&\leq A(t) \varepsilon \int_0^t \|\theta_{tx}(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds + \frac{A(t)}{\varepsilon} \left(\int_0^t \|\theta_t(s)\|_{L^2} ds \right)^2 \\
&\leq A(t) \varepsilon \int_0^t \|\theta_{tx}(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds + \frac{A(t) \cdot t}{\varepsilon} \int_0^t \|\theta_t(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds.
\end{aligned} \tag{6.7}$$

To estimate the third term, we must first estimate $\|\theta_{xx}\|_{L^2}$, which can be rewritten using (4.1)₂ and further estimated by (3.2), as follows:

$$\|\theta_{xx}\|_{L^2} \leq \|\theta_t\|_{L^2} + \|\theta u_{tx}\|_{L^2} \leq \|\theta_t\|_{L^2} + \|\theta\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\theta_x\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|u_{tx}\|_{L^2} + \|\theta\|_{L^2} \|u_{tx}\|_{L^2}. \tag{6.8}$$

Using (6.8) we can rewrite the third term:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{III} &= A(t) \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2} \int_0^t \|\theta_t(s)\|_{L^2} \|\theta_x(s)\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\theta_{xx}(s)\|_{L^2}^{1/2} ds \\
&\leq A(t) \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2} \int_0^t \left(\|\theta_t(s)\|_{L^2}^{3/2} \|\theta_x(s)\|_{L^2}^{1/2} + \|\theta(s)\|_{L^2}^{1/4} \|\theta_t(s)\|_{L^2} \|\theta_x(s)\|_{L^2}^{3/4} \|u_{tx}(s)\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \|\theta(s)\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\theta_t(s)\|_{L^2} \|\theta_x(s)\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|u_{tx}(s)\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \right) ds.
\end{aligned}$$

We estimate all the terms from the right-hand side separately by using Young's inequality:

$$\text{III.1} = A(t) \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2} \int_0^t \|\theta_t(s)\|_{L^2}^{3/2} \|\theta_x(s)\|_{L^2}^{1/2} ds \leq A(t) \varepsilon \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2}^2 \|\theta_x\|_{L_t^1 L_x^2} + \frac{A(t)}{\varepsilon} \int_0^t \|\theta_t(s)\|_{L^2}^3 ds,$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{III.2} &= A(t) \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2} \int_0^t \|\theta(s)\|_{L^2}^{1/4} \|\theta_t(s)\|_{L^2} \|\theta_x(s)\|_{L^2}^{3/4} \|u_{tx}(s)\|_{L^2}^{1/2} ds \\
&\leq A(t) \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2} \|u_{tx}\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}^{1/2} \int_0^t \|\theta(s)\|_{L^2}^{1/4} \|\theta_t(s)\|_{L^2} \|\theta_x(s)\|_{L^2}^{3/4} ds \\
&\leq A(t) \sqrt{\exp(t)} \|u_{tt}(0)\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2} \|\theta\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}^{1/4} \int_0^t \|\theta_t(s)\|_{L^2} \|\theta_x(s)\|_{L^2}^{3/4} ds \\
&\quad + A(t) \sqrt{\exp(t)} \|u_{tx}(0)\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2} \|\theta\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}^{1/4} \int_0^t \|\theta_t(s)\|_{L^2} \|\theta_x(s)\|_{L^2}^{3/4} ds \\
&\quad + A^{3/2}(t) \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2}^{3/2} \|\theta\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}^{1/4} \int_0^t \|\theta_t(s)\|_{L^2} \|\theta_x(s)\|_{L^2}^{3/4} ds \\
&\leq A(t) \sqrt{\exp(t)} \|u_{tt}(0)\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \varepsilon \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2}^{4/3} \|\theta\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}^{1/3} \|\theta_x\|_{L_t^1 L_x^2} + \frac{A(t) \sqrt{\exp(t)} \|u_{tt}(0)\|_{L^2}^{1/2}}{\varepsilon^3} \int_0^t \|\theta_t(s)\|_{L^2}^4 ds \\
&\quad + A(t) \sqrt{\exp(t)} \|u_{tx}(0)\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \varepsilon \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2}^{4/3} \|\theta\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}^{1/3} \|\theta_x\|_{L_t^1 L_x^2} + \frac{A(t) \sqrt{\exp(t)} \|u_{tx}(0)\|_{L^2}^{1/2}}{\varepsilon^3} \int_0^t \|\theta_t(s)\|_{L^2}^4 ds \\
&\quad + A^{3/2}(t) \varepsilon \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2}^2 \|\theta\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}^{1/3} \|\theta_x\|_{L_t^1 L_x^2} + \frac{A^{3/2}(t)}{\varepsilon^3} \int_0^t \|\theta_t(s)\|_{L^2}^4 ds,
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{III.3} &= A(t) \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2} \int_0^t \|\theta(s)\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\theta_t(s)\|_{L^2} \|\theta_x(s)\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|u_{tx}(s)\|_{L^2}^{1/2} ds \\
&\leq A(t) \sqrt{\exp(t)} \|u_{tt}(0)\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2} \|\theta\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}^{1/2} \int_0^t \|\theta_t(s)\|_{L^2} \|\theta_x(s)\|_{L^2}^{1/2} ds \\
&\quad + A(t) \sqrt{\exp(t)} \|u_{tx}(0)\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2} \|\theta\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}^{1/2} \int_0^t \|\theta_t(s)\|_{L^2} \|\theta_x(s)\|_{L^2}^{1/2} ds \\
&\quad + A^{3/2}(t) \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2}^{3/2} \|\theta\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}^{1/2} \int_0^t \|\theta_t(s)\|_{L^2} \|\theta_x(s)\|_{L^2}^{1/2} ds \\
&\leq A(t) \sqrt{\exp(t)} \|u_{tt}(0)\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \varepsilon \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2}^{4/3} \|\theta\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}^{2/3} \|\theta_x\|_{L_t^1 L_x^2}^{2/3} + \frac{A(t) \sqrt{\exp(t)} \|u_{tt}(0)\|_{L^2}^{1/2}}{\varepsilon^3} \int_0^t \|\theta_t(s)\|_{L^2}^4 ds \\
&\quad + A(t) \sqrt{\exp(t)} \|u_{tx}(0)\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \varepsilon \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2}^{4/3} \|\theta\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}^{2/3} \|\theta_x\|_{L_t^1 L_x^2}^{2/3} + \frac{A(t) \sqrt{\exp(t)} \|u_{tx}(0)\|_{L^2}^{1/2}}{\varepsilon^3} \int_0^t \|\theta_t(s)\|_{L^2}^4 ds \\
&\quad + A^{3/2}(t) \varepsilon \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2}^2 \|\theta\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}^{2/3} \|\theta_x\|_{L_t^1 L_x^2}^{2/3} + \frac{A^{3/2}(t)}{\varepsilon^3} \int_0^t \|\theta_t(s)\|_{L^2}^4 ds.
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that in III.2 and III.3 we made use of (6.3). Set

$$B(t) = \max \left\{ A(t) \sqrt{\exp(t)} \|u_{tt}(0)\|_{L^2}^{1/2}, A(t) \sqrt{\exp(t)} \|u_{tx}(0)\|_{L^2}^{1/2}, A^{3/2}(t) \right\} \quad (6.9)$$

and apply (5.3) to see that for any $t > 0$ we can estimate the term III by

$$\text{III} \leq B(t) \varepsilon \cdot C^{4/3}(t) \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2}^2 + \frac{B(t)}{\varepsilon^3} \max \left\{ \int_0^t \|\theta_t(s)\|_{L^2}^3 ds, \int_0^t \|\theta_t(s)\|_{L^2}^4 ds \right\}, \quad (6.10)$$

where

$$C(t) = \|\theta(0)\|_{L^2} \exp(2\mu c t). \quad (6.11)$$

The fourth and fifth term are estimated by using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and (5.3):

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{IV} &= A(t) \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2} \int_0^t \|\theta(s)\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\theta_x(s)\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\theta_{tx}(s)\|_{L^2} ds \\
&\leq A(t) \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2} \left(\int_0^t \|\theta(s)\|_{L^2} \|\theta_x(s)\|_{L^2} ds \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_0^t \|\theta_{tx}(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds \right)^{1/2} \\
&\leq A(t) \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2}^2 \|\theta\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}^{1/2} \left(\int_0^t \|\theta_x(s)\|_{L^2} ds \right)^{1/2} \\
&\leq A(t) \cdot \sqrt[4]{t} \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2}^2 \|\theta\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}^{1/2} \|\theta_x\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2}^{1/2} \\
&\leq A(t) \cdot \sqrt[4]{t} \cdot C(t) \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2}^2,
\end{aligned} \quad (6.12)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
V &= A(t) \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2} \int_0^t \|\theta(s)\|_{L^2} \|\theta_{tx}(s)\|_{L^2} ds \\
&\leq A(t) \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2} \left(\int_0^t \|\theta(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_0^t \|\theta_{tx}(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds \right)^{1/2} \\
&\leq A(t) \cdot \sqrt{t} \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2}^2 \|\theta\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} \\
&\leq A(t) \cdot \sqrt{t} \cdot C(t) \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2}^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{6.13}$$

The terms analogous to I-V having $c\mu \exp(t) \|u_{tt}(0)\|_{L^2}$ and $c\mu \exp(t) \|u_{tx}(0)\|_{L^2}$ instead of $A(t) \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2}$ are easier to estimate since they contain one power of the critical term $\|\theta_{tx}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2}$ less and therefore can be directly estimated by using Young's inequality and time-independent estimates.

Finally, by inserting the obtained estimates (6.6), (6.7), (6.10), (6.12), (6.13) into (6.4) we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2} \|\theta_t(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2}^2 &\leq \frac{1}{2} \|\theta_t(0)\|_{L^2}^2 + D(t) \|\theta_{tx}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2}^2 \\
&+ E(t) \max \left\{ \int_0^t \|\theta_t(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds, \int_0^t \|\theta_t(s)\|_{L^2}^3 ds, \int_0^t \|\theta_t(s)\|_{L^2}^4 ds, \int_0^t \|\theta_t(s)\|_{L^2}^6 ds \right\}
\end{aligned} \tag{6.14}$$

with

$$D(t) = \max \left\{ A(t)\varepsilon, B(t)\varepsilon \cdot C^{4/3}(t), A(t) \cdot \sqrt[4]{t} \cdot C(t), A(t) \cdot \sqrt{t} \cdot C(t) \right\}$$

and

$$E(t) := \max \left\{ \frac{A(t) \cdot t^2}{\varepsilon^3}, \frac{A(t) \cdot t}{\varepsilon}, \frac{B(t)}{\varepsilon^3} \right\},$$

where $A(t)$, $B(t)$ and $C(t)$ are given by (6.5), (6.9) and (6.11) respectively.

Step 3. In order to prove Theorem 5, we notice that choosing ε and short enough time so that $D(t) < 1/2$ enables us to absorb the second term from the right-hand side in (6.14) into the left-hand side. Next, applying Gronwall's inequality yields existence of T_0 such that the claim of Theorem 5 holds for all $t \in (t_0, T_0)$. Notice that the estimate on $\|u\|_{L^\infty(0, T_0; H^2(a, b))}$ arises as a consequence of the obtained regularity for u and θ , more precisely, since $u \in W^{2, \infty}(0, T_0; L^2(a, b))$ and $\theta \in H^1(0, T_0; H^1(a, b))$, the estimate follows immediately from (1.1)₁.

□

7 Local-in-time well-posedness

In this section we show that the sequence of solutions to system (4.1), whose existence is guaranteed by Theorem 4, converges to a solution of (1.1) as the artificial viscoelasticity parameter tends to zero. Assume that the initial data have the following regularity $u_0 \in H^2(a, b) \cap H_0^1(a, b)$, $u_1 \in H_0^1(a, b)$ and $\theta_0 \in H^2(a, b)$, $\theta_0 \geq 0$. Set $\nu = \frac{1}{n}$ and let (u^n, θ^n) be the sequence of solutions to (4.1) corresponding to initial data (u_0, u_1^n, θ_0^n) introduced by a regularization procedure described below, where u_1^n and θ_0^n are the regularized initial elastic velocity and temperature.

We claim that there exists a sequence u_1^n such that:

- (i) $u_1^n \in H^2(a, b) \cap H_0^1(a, b)$,

(ii) $u_1^n \rightarrow u_1$ in $H^1(a, b)$,

(iii) $\nu \|u_1^n\|_{H^2(a, b)} \rightarrow 0$.

Without loss of generality we firstly assume that the interval (a, b) is symmetric around zero (we can always achieve that with an appropriate composition) and extend u_1 to \mathbb{R} by 0. Set $c := \frac{b-a}{2}$ and define

$$\sigma_n = \frac{c\sqrt{n} + 1}{c\sqrt{n} - 1}.$$

Then the sequence \tilde{u}_1^n defined in the following way

$$\tilde{u}_1^n(x) = u_1(\sigma_n x).$$

satisfies $\tilde{u}_1^n = 0$ on $\mathbb{R} \setminus \left(\frac{a}{\sigma_n}, \frac{b}{\sigma_n}\right)$. Finally, set

$$u_1^n = \tilde{u}_1^n * \eta_n,$$

where η_n is the sequence of standard mollifiers (with $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$)

$$\eta_n(x) = \sqrt{n}\eta(\sqrt{n}x).$$

Since $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} < c - \frac{c}{\sigma_n}$ we see that $\text{supp } u_1^n = \left(\frac{a}{\sigma_n}, \frac{b}{\sigma_n}\right) + \left(-\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right)$ is a subset of (a, b) . Thus $u_1^n \in H_0^1(a, b)$. Statement (ii) follows from the definition of mollifiers and the fact that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_n = 1$, while statement (iii) is a direct consequence of the fact that $\|u_1^n\|_{H^2(a, b)}$ behaves like \sqrt{n} .

We next regularize the initial temperature θ_0 by using the extension operator to extend θ_0 to H^2 -function on the real line which we then compose with the mollifiers defined above.

Finally, we employ Theorem 5 to see that the solutions of (4.1) possess the following regularity for any t smaller than $T_0 > 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \|u^n\|_{W^{2,\infty}(0,T_0;L^2(a,b))} + \|u^n\|_{W^{1,\infty}(0,T_0;H^1(a,b))} + \|u^n\|_{L^\infty(0,T_0;H^2(a,b))} + \|\theta^n\|_{W^{1,\infty}(0,T_0;L^2(a,b))} \\ & + \|\theta^n\|_{H^1(0,T_0;H^1(a,b))} \leq C (\|u_{tt}^n(0)\| + \|u_{tx}^n(0)\| + \|\theta_t^n(0)\|_{L^2}). \end{aligned} \quad (7.1)$$

The right-hand side is estimated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_{tt}^n(0)\|_{L^2} & \leq \|u_{xx}^n(0)\|_{L^2} + \nu \|u_{txx}^n(0)\|_{L^2} + \mu \|\theta_x^n(0)\|_{L^2} \leq C (\|u_0\|_{H^2} + \nu \|u_1^n\|_{H^2} + \mu \|\theta_0^n\|_{H^1}) \leq C, \\ \|\theta_t^n(0)\|_{L^2} & \leq \|\theta_{xx}^n(0)\|_{L^2} + \|(\theta u_{tx}^n)(0)\|_{L^2} \leq \|\theta_0^n\|_{H^2} + \|\theta_0^n u_1^n\|_{L^2} \leq C. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, letting $n \rightarrow \infty$, (7.1) implies the following convergences:

$$\begin{aligned} u_{tx}^n & \rightharpoonup u_{tx} \quad \text{weakly in } L^2(0, T_0; L^2(a, b)), \\ \theta^n & \rightarrow \theta \quad \text{in } C([0, T_0]; C[a, b]). \end{aligned} \quad (7.2)$$

We are now in a position to pass to the limit in all the terms of the weak formulation. Notice that the convergences obtained in (7.2) enable us to pass to the limit in nonlinear term $\int_a^b \theta^n u_{tx}^n \psi$. Furthermore, the boundedness of the sequence u_{tx}^n implies vanishing of the regularization term $\nu \int_a^b u_{tx}^n v_x$. Therefore we have proved the existence part of Theorem 1 which we state again for completeness:

Theorem 1. *Let $u_0 \in H^2(a, b) \cap H_0^1(a, b)$, $u_1 \in H_0^1(a, b)$, $\theta_0 \in H^2(a, b)$, $\theta_0 \geq 0$. Then there exists a time $T_0 > 0$ (depending on data) and a unique solution (u, θ) to problem (1.1) on $(0, T_0)$ with the following regularity:*

$$\begin{aligned} & \|u\|_{W^{2,\infty}(0,T_0;L^2(a,b))} + \|u\|_{W^{1,\infty}(0,T_0;H^1(a,b))} + \|u\|_{L^\infty(0,T_0;H^2(a,b))} \\ & + \|\theta\|_{W^{1,\infty}(0,T_0;L^2(a,b))} + \|\theta\|_{H^1(0,T_0;H^1(a,b))} \leq C. \end{aligned}$$

To complete the proof of Theorem 1, we still need to show uniqueness. The below proposition is devoted to this issue.

Proposition 5. *The solution (u, θ) to problem (1.1) given by Theorem 1 is unique.*

Proof. Let (u_1, θ_1) , (u_2, θ_2) be two weak solutions of problem (1.1) and set

$$u = u_1 - u_2, \quad \theta = \theta_1 - \theta_2.$$

By subtracting (1.1)₁ for (u_1, θ_1) and (u_2, θ_2) we get that u satisfies the following differential equation with zero initial and boundary conditions:

$$u_{tt} - u_{xx} = -\mu\theta_x \text{ in } (0, T) \times (a, b).$$

By multiplying the above equation by u_t , integrating over space and time interval, and using Young's and Gronwall's inequality, we get:

$$\|u_t\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} + \|u_x\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} \leq C\|\theta_x\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2}. \quad (7.3)$$

The equation for $\theta = \theta_1 - \theta_2$ reads:

$$\theta_t - \theta_{xx} = -\mu(\theta_1 u_{tx} + \theta(u_2)_{tx}).$$

We multiply the above equation by θ and integrate over (a, b) to obtain:

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\theta\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\theta_x\|_{L^2}^2 = -\mu \int_a^b (\theta_1 u_{tx} \theta + \theta(u_2)_{tx} \theta) = -\mu \int_a^b \theta_1 u_{tx} \theta - \mu \int_a^b \theta(u_2)_{tx} \theta. \quad (7.4)$$

We integrate the previous equation with respect to time and estimate integrals on the right-hand side separately. The first integral is separated into two terms by using integration by parts. Using (3.2) we estimate the first term:

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_0^t \int_a^b (\theta_1)_x u_t \theta \right| & \leq \int_0^t \|(\theta_1)_x\|_{L^2} \|u_t\|_{L^2} \|\theta\|_{L^\infty} \leq \int_0^t \|(\theta_1)_x\|_{L^2} \|u_t\|_{L^2} \left(\|\theta\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\theta_x\|_{L^2}^{1/2} + C \|\theta\|_{L^2} \right) \\ & \leq \|(\theta_1)_x\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} \|u_t\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} \|\theta\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2}^{1/2} \|\theta_x\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2}^{1/2} + C \|(\theta_1)_x\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} \|u_t\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} \|\theta\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Since θ_1 is a solution, Theorem 1 implies that $\|(\theta_1)_x\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} \leq C$. Furthermore, from estimate (7.3) we know that $\|u_t\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} \leq C\|\theta_x\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2}$, so we can use Young's inequality (with $p = 4$ and $q = 4/3$) to see:

$$\left| \int_0^t \int_a^b (\theta_1)_x u_t \theta \right| \leq C\varepsilon \|\theta_x\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2}^2 + \frac{C}{\varepsilon^3} \|\theta\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2}^2.$$

The second term is estimated in a similar way:

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_0^t \int_a^b \theta_1 u_t \theta_x \right| &\leq \int_0^t \|\theta_1\|_{L^\infty} \|u_t\|_{L^2} \|\theta_x\|_{L^2} \leq \int_0^t C\varepsilon \|\theta_x\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \|u_t\|_{L^2}^2 \|\theta_1\|_{L^\infty}^2 \\ &\leq C\varepsilon \|\theta_x\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2}^2 + \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \|u_t\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}^2 \int_0^t \|\theta_1\|_{L^\infty}^2 \leq C\varepsilon \|\theta_x\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2}^2 + \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \|\theta_x\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2}^2 \int_0^t \|\theta_1\|_{L^\infty}^2. \end{aligned}$$

What is left is to estimate the second integral in (7.4):

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_0^t \int_a^b \theta(u_2)_{tx} \theta \right| &\leq \left| \int_0^t \int_a^b \theta_x(u_2)_t \theta \right| + \left| \int_0^t \int_a^b \theta(u_2)_t \theta_x \right| \leq \int_0^t \|\theta\|_{L^2} \|(u_2)_t\|_{L^\infty} \|\theta_x\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq \|\theta\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2} \|(u_2)_t\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^\infty} \|\theta_x\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Since u_2 is a solution, we have that $\|(u_2)_t\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^\infty} \leq C$ so the second integral is estimated by using Young's inequality:

$$\left| \int_0^t \int_a^b \theta(u_2)_{tx} \theta \right| \leq C\varepsilon \|\theta_x\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2}^2 + \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \|\theta\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2}^2.$$

At last, we employ the obtained estimates into (7.4) to see that

$$\|\theta(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + 2\|\theta_x\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2}^2 \leq C\varepsilon \|\theta_x\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2}^2 + \frac{C}{\varepsilon^3} \|\theta\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2}^2 + \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \|\theta_x\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2}^2 \int_0^t \|\theta_1\|_{L^\infty}^2.$$

We choose ε small enough that the θ_x term is absorbed into the left-hand side. Next, similarly as in Proposition 3, we will use a trick from [12]. We partition time interval $(0, T_0)$ into finitely many intervals (t_{k-1}, t_k) in such a way that $\frac{C}{\varepsilon} \int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} \|\theta_1\|_{L^\infty}^2 < 1/2$. Since θ_1 is a solution,

$$\|\theta_1\|_{L^2(0, T_0; L^\infty(a, b))} < \infty.$$

We are thus in a position to proceed inductively as in the proof of Proposition 3 and absorb the term

$$\frac{C}{\varepsilon} \|\theta_x\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2}^2 \int_0^t \|\theta_1\|_{L^\infty}^2$$

into the left-hand side at each interval (t_{k-1}, t_k) . This allows us to use Gronwall's inequality at each time interval and obtain $\theta = 0$ for $t \in (t_{k-1}, t_k)$ for any k . The proof is finished. \square

8 Global-in-time measure valued solution

In order to prove the existence of a global-in-time weak solution, we would like to pass to the limit as $\nu \rightarrow 0$, i.e. $n \rightarrow \infty$, using only the first order estimates. The only difficulty lies in the nonlinear term:

$$\mu \int_a^b u_{tx}^n \theta^n \psi = -\mu \int_a^b u_t^n (\theta_x^n \psi + \theta^n \psi_x).$$

Notice that the above expression is well-defined a.e. in $(0, T)$ because of the following estimate:

$$\left| \mu \int_a^b u_t^n (\theta_x^n \psi + \theta^n \psi_x) \right| \leq C \|u_t^n\|_{L^2} \|\theta^n\|_{H^1} \|\psi\|_{H^1}.$$

Because of the uniform convergence of θ^n we have $\int_a^b u_t^n \theta^n \psi_x \rightarrow \int_a^b u_t \theta \psi_x$. However, from the uniform estimates we can only conclude that $u_t^n \theta_x^n$ is bounded in $L_t^2 L_x^1$ and therefore there exists a measure γ such that

$$\int_0^T \int_a^b u_t^n \theta_x^n \psi \rightarrow \int_0^T \int_a^b \psi d\gamma.$$

Therefore we have proved the second main theorem of the manuscript:

Theorem 2. *Let $u_0 \in H_0^1(a, b)$, $u_1 \in L^2(a, b)$, $\theta_0 \in L^2(a, b)$, $\theta_0 \geq 0$. Then for every $T > 0$ there exists a measure $\gamma \in L^2(0, T; \mathcal{M}(a, b))$ and functions (u, θ) defined on $(0, T)$ satisfying the following equalities:*

$$\int_0^T \int_a^b u_{tt} v + \int_0^T \int_a^b u_x v_x + \mu \int_0^T \int_a^b \theta_x v = 0$$

and

$$\int_0^T \int_a^b \theta_t \psi + \int_0^T \int_a^b \theta_x \psi_x - \mu \int_0^T \int_a^b \theta u_t \psi_x = \mu \int_0^T \int_a^b \psi d\gamma,$$

for all test functions $(v, \psi) \in H_0^1(a, b) \times H^1(a, b)$, with (u, θ) and γ being related in the following way: there exists a sequence (u^n, θ^n) such that

$$\begin{aligned} (u_t^n, \theta_x^n) &\rightharpoonup (u_t, \theta_x) \text{ weakly in } L^2(0, T; L^2(a, b)), \\ u_t^n \theta_x^n &\rightharpoonup \gamma \text{ weakly in } L^2(0, T; \mathcal{M}(a, b)). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, there exist a constant $C > 0$, depending on the initial data, such that the solution (u, θ) satisfies the following first order estimates:

$$\|u\|_{W^{1,\infty}(0,T;L^2(a,b))} + \|u\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H^1(a,b))} + \|\theta\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^1(a,b))} \leq C \left(\|u_0\|_{H^1(a,b)}, \|u_1\|_{L^2(a,b)}, \|\theta_0\|_{L^2(a,b)} \right)$$

and

$$\|\theta\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(a,b))} + \|\theta\|_{L^2(0,T;H^1(a,b))} \leq C \left(\|u_0\|_{H^1(a,b)}, \|u_1\|_{L^2(a,b)}, \|\theta_0\|_{L^2(a,b)} \right).$$

Acknowledgement

T.C. was partially supported by the OPUS 4 grant number 2012/07/B/ST1/03306. T.C. is grateful to K. Chelmiński from Warsaw University of Technology for stating the problem and helpful suggestions regarding mechanical foundations of the problem as well as the fixed point theorem. M.G. and B.M. were partially supported by the Croatian Science Foundation (Hrvatska Zaklada za Znanost) grant number IP-2018-01-3706. This work was partially supported by the grant 346300 for IMPAN from the Simons Foundation and the matching 2015-2019 Polish MNiSW fund.

References

- [1] Gui Q. Chen and Constantine M. Dafermos. The vanishing viscosity method in one-dimensional thermoelasticity. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 347(2):531–541, 1995.
- [2] Constantine M. Dafermos. On the existence and the asymptotic stability of solutions to the equations of linear thermoelasticity. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 29:241–271, 1968.
- [3] Constantine M. Dafermos. Global smooth solutions to the initial-boundary value problem for the equations of one-dimensional nonlinear thermoviscoelasticity. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 13(3):397–408, 1982.
- [4] Constantine M. Dafermos and L. Hsiao. Development of singularities in solutions of the equations of nonlinear thermoelasticity. *Quart. Appl. Math.*, 44(3):463–474, 1986.
- [5] Lawrence C. Evans. *Partial differential equations*, volume 19 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, second edition, 2010.
- [6] William J. Hrusa and Salim A. Messaoudi. On formation of singularities in one-dimensional nonlinear thermoelasticity. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 111(2):135–151, 1990.
- [7] William J. Hrusa and Michael A. Tarabek. On smooth solutions of the Cauchy problem in one-dimensional nonlinear thermoelasticity. *Quart. Appl. Math.*, 47(4):631–644, 1989.
- [8] Yuxi Hu and Na Wang. On global solutions in one-dimensional thermoelasticity with second sound in the half line. *Commun. Pure Appl. Anal.*, 14(5):1671–1683, 2015.
- [9] Song Jiang. Global existence of smooth solutions in one-dimensional nonlinear thermoelasticity. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A*, 115(3-4):257–274, 1990.
- [10] Song Jiang. On global smooth solutions to the one-dimensional equations of nonlinear inhomogeneous thermoelasticity. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 20(10):1245–1256, 1993.
- [11] Song Jiang and Reinhard Racke. On some quasilinear hyperbolic-parabolic initial boundary value problems. *Math. Method Appl. Sci.*, 12(4):315–339, 1990.
- [12] O. A. Ladyzhenskaya, V. A. Solonnikov, and N. N. Uraltseva. *Linear and quasilinear equations of parabolic type*. Translated from the Russian by S. Smith. Translations of Mathematical Monographs, Vol. 23. American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 1968.
- [13] Reinhard Racke. Initial boundary value problems in one-dimensional nonlinear thermoelasticity. *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.*, 10(5):517–529, 1988.
- [14] Reinhard Racke and Yoshihiro Shibata. Global smooth solutions and asymptotic stability in one-dimensional nonlinear thermoelasticity. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 116(1):1–34, 1991.
- [15] Reinhard Racke, Yoshihiro Shibata, and Shonmu Zheng. Global solvability and exponential stability in one-dimensional nonlinear thermoelasticity. *Q. Appl. Math.*, 51(4):751–763, 1993.
- [16] Helmut Schaefer. Über die methode der a priori-schranken. *Math. Ann.*, 129:415–416, 1955.

- [17] Yoshihiro Shibata. Neumann problem for one-dimensional nonlinear thermoelasticity. In *Partial differential equations, Part 1, 2 (Warsaw, 1990)*, volume 2 of *Banach Center Publ.*, 27, Part 1, pages 457–480. Polish Acad. Sci. Inst. Math., Warsaw, 1992.
- [18] Marshall Slemrod. Global existence, uniqueness, and asymptotic stability of classical smooth solutions in one-dimensional nonlinear thermoelasticity. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 76(2):97–133, 1981.
- [19] Song M. Zheng and Wei X. Shen. Global solutions to the Cauchy problem of quasilinear hyperbolic parabolic coupled systems. *Sci. Sinica Ser. A*, 30(11):1133–1149, 1987.