

GLOBAL SOLUTIONS FOR THE KURAMOTO-SIVASHINSKY EQUATION POSED ON UNBOUNDED 3D GROOVES

N. A. LARKIN

ABSTRACT. Initial boundary value problems for the three dimensional Kuramoto-Sivashinsky equation posed on unbounded 3D grooves were considered. The existence and uniqueness of global strong solutions as well as their exponential decay have been established.

1. INTRODUCTION

This work concerns the existence and uniqueness of global strong solutions as well as exponential decay rates of solutions to initial-boundary value problems for the three dimensional Kuramoto-Sivashinsky equation (K-S):

$$\phi_t + \Delta^2 \phi + \Delta \phi + \frac{1}{2} |\nabla \phi|^2 = 0. \quad (1.1)$$

Here Δ and ∇ are the Laplacian and the gradient in \mathbb{R}^3 . In [12], Kuramoto studied the turbulent phase waves and Sivashinsky in [18] obtained an asymptotic equation which modeled the evolution of a disturbed plane flame front. See also [8, 9]. In [3, 6, 7, 10, 14, 16, 21, 22], mathematical results on initial and initial boundary value problems for one dimensional (1.1) are presented, see references there for more information. Multidimensional problems for various types of (1.1) can be found in [2, 4, 6, 15, 16, 17, 21] with some results on existence, regularity and nonlinear stability of solutions.

For three dimensions, (1.1) can be rewritten in the form of the following system:

Departamento de Matemática, Universidade Estadual de Maringá, Av. Colombo 5790, 87020-900, Maringá, Parana, Brazil; email: nlarkine@uem.br
MSC 2010:35B35;35K91;35Q53.

Keywords: Kuramoto-Sivashinsky equation, Global solutions; Decay in Bounded and Unbounded Domains .

$$(u_j)_t + \Delta^2 u_j + \Delta u_j + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^3 (u_i^2)_{x_j} = 0, \quad (1.2)$$

$$(u_j)_{x_i} = (u_i)_{x_j}, \quad i \neq j; \quad i, j, = 1, 2, 3, \quad (1.3)$$

where $u_j = \phi_{x_j}$. First essential problem that arises while one studies either (1.1) or (1.2)-(1.3) is a destabilizing effect of Δu_j that may be damped by a dissipative term $\Delta^2 u_j$ provided a domain has some specific properties. Naturally, so called "thin domains" here appear where some dimensions are small while the others may be arbitrarily large. Second essential problem is presence of semilinear interconnected terms in (1.2). This does not allow to obtain first estimate independent of solutions and leads to a connection between geometric properties of a domain and initial data.

Our work has the following structure: Chapter I is Introduction. Chapter 2 contains notations and auxiliary facts. In Chapter 3, formulation of an initial boundary value problem for (1.2)-(1.3) posed on a unbounded groove is given. The existence of a global strong solution, exponential decay of the L^2 -norm have been established. Chapter 4 contains conclusions.

2. NOTATIONS AND AUXILIARY FACTS

Let Ω be a domain in \mathbb{R}^3 and $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \Omega$. We use the standard notations of Sobolev spaces $W^{k,p}$, L^p and H^k for functions and the following notations for the norms [1, 5]: for scalar functions $f(x, t)$

$$\mathbb{R}^+ = \{t \in \mathbb{R}^1; t \geq 0\}, \quad \|f\|^2 = \int_{\Omega} |f|^2 d\Omega, \quad \|f\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^p = \int_{\Omega} |f|^p d\Omega,$$

$$\|f\|_{W^{k,p}(\Omega)}^p = \sum_{0 \leq \alpha \leq k} \|D^\alpha f\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^p, \quad \|f\|_{H^k(\Omega)} = \|f\|_{W^{k,2}(\Omega)}.$$

When $p = 2$, $W^{k,p}(\Omega) = H^k(\Omega)$ is a Hilbert space with the scalar product

$$((u, v))_{H^k(\Omega)} = \sum_{|j| \leq k} (D^j u, D^j v), \quad \|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} = \text{ess sup}_\Omega |u(x)|.$$

We use a notation $H_0^k(\Omega)$ to represent the closure of $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$, the set of all C^∞ functions with compact support in Ω , with respect to the norm of $H^k(\Omega)$.

Lemma 2.1 (Steklov's Inequality [19]). *Let $v \in H_0^1(0, L)$. Then*

$$\frac{\pi^2}{L^2} \|v\|^2 \leq \|v_x\|^2. \quad (2.1)$$

Lemma 2.2 (Differential form of the Gronwall Inequality). *Let $I = [t_0, t_1]$. Suppose that functions $a, b : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are integrable and a function $u(t)$ may be of any sign. Let $u : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a differentiable function satisfying*

$$u_t(t) \leq a(t)u(t) + b(t), \text{ for } t \in I \text{ and } u(t_0) = u_0, \quad (2.2)$$

then

$$u(t) \leq u_0 e^{\int_{t_0}^t a(\tau) d\tau} + \int_{t_0}^t e^{\int_{t_0}^s a(r) dr} b(s) ds$$

The next Lemmas will be used in estimates:

Lemma 2.3 (See [13], Theorem 7.1; [20], Lemma 3.5.). *Let $v \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ and $n = 3$, then*

$$\|v\|_{L^4(\Omega)} \leq 2^{1/2} \|v\|^{1/4} \|\nabla v\|^{3/4}. \quad (2.3)$$

3. K-S SYSTEM POSED ON A GROOVE

Define a groove

$$D = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3; x_1 \in \mathbb{R}^1, x_2 \in (0, B > 0), x_3 \in \mathbb{R}^+\}, \quad Q_t = (0, t) \times D.$$

Lemma 3.1. *Let $f \in H_0^2(D)$. Then*

$$a\|f\|^2 \leq \|\nabla f\|^2, \quad a^2\|f\|^2 \leq \|\Delta f\|^2, \quad a\|\nabla f\|^2 \leq \|\Delta f\|^2, \quad (3.1)$$

$$\text{where } a = \frac{\pi^2}{B^2}. \quad (3.2)$$

Proof. By definition,

$$\|\nabla f\|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^3 \|f_{x_i}\|^2.$$

Making use of Steklov's inequalities, we get

$$\|\nabla f\|^2 \geq \|f_{x_2}\|^2 \geq \frac{\pi^2}{B^2} \|f\|^2 = a\|f\|^2.$$

On the other hand,

$$a\|f\|^2 \leq \|\nabla f\|^2 = - \int_{D_h} f \Delta f dx \leq \|\Delta f\| \|f\|.$$

This implies

$$a\|f\| \leq \|\Delta f\| \text{ and } a^2\|f\|^2 \leq \|\Delta f\|^2.$$

Consequently, $a\|\nabla f\|^2 \leq \|\Delta f\|^2$. Proof of Lemma 3.1 is complete. \square

In Q_t consider the following initial boundary value problem:

$$(u_j)_t + \Delta^2 u_j + \Delta u_j + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^3 (u_i^2)_{x_j} = 0, \quad (3.3)$$

$$(u_i)_{x_j} = (u_j)_{x_i}, \quad j \neq i, \quad i, j = 1, \dots, 3; \quad (3.4)$$

$$u_j|_{\partial D_j} = \frac{\partial}{\partial N} u_j|_{\partial D_z} = 0, \quad t > 0, \quad (3.5)$$

$$u_j(x, 0) = u_{j0}(x), \quad j = 1, \dots, 3, \quad x \in D. \quad (3.6)$$

where $\frac{\partial}{\partial N}$ is an exterior normal derivative on ∂D .

Theorem 3.1. *Let*

$$B < \pi, \quad a = \frac{\pi^2}{B^2}, \quad \theta = 1 - \frac{1}{a} > 0. \quad (3.7)$$

Given $u_{j0} \in H^4(D) \cap H_0^2(D)$, $j = 1, 2, 3$ such that

$$\theta - \frac{48}{\theta a^{3/2}} \sum_{i=1}^3 \|u_{i0}\|^2 > 0. \quad (3.8)$$

Then the problem (3.3)-(3.6) has a unique strong solution

$$u_j \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+; H_0^2(D)), \quad \Delta^2 u_j \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+; L^2(D));$$

$$u_{jt} \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+; L^2(D)) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^+; H_0^2(D)), \quad j = 1, 2, 3.$$

Moreover, u_j satisfy the following inequality

$$\sum_{j=1}^3 \|u_j\|^2(t) + \frac{\theta}{2} \int_0^t \left(\sum_{j=1}^3 \|\Delta u_j\|^2(\tau) \right) d\tau \leq \sum_{j=1}^3 \|u_{j0}\|^2, \quad (3.9)$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^3 \|u_j\|^2(t) \leq \left[\sum_{j=1}^3 \|u_{j0}\|^2 \right] \exp\left\{-\frac{a^2 \theta t}{2}\right\}. \quad (3.10)$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^3 \|u_{jt}\|^2(t) \leq \left(\sum_{j=1}^3 \|u_{jt}\|^2(0) \right) \exp\left\{-\frac{a^2 \theta t}{2}\right\}, \quad (3.11)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^3 \|u_{jt}\|^2(t) + \frac{\theta}{2} \int_0^t \left(\sum_{j=1}^3 \|\Delta u_{j\tau}\|^2(\tau) \right) d\tau \\ \leq \sum_{j=1}^3 \|u_{jt}\|^2(0), \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

where,

$$\|u_{jt}\|^2(0) \leq C(\|u_{0j}\|_W), \quad j = 1, 2, 3.$$

Proof. Define the space $W = H^4(D) \cap H_0^2(D)$ and let $\{w_i(x), i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be a countable dense set in W . We can construct approximate solutions to (3.3)-(3.6) in the form

$$u_j^N(x, t) = \sum_{i=1}^N g_i^j(t) w_i(x); \quad j = 1, 2, 3.$$

Unknown functions $g_i^j(t)$ satisfy the following initial problems:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}(u_j^N, w_j)(t) + (\Delta u_j^N, \Delta w_j)(t) - (\nabla u_j^N, \nabla w_j)(t) \\ - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^3 ((u_i^N)^2, (w_j)_{x_j})(t) = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

$$g_i^j(0) = g_{i0}^j, \quad j = 1, 2, 3; \quad i = 1, 2, \dots \quad (3.14)$$

By Caratheodory's existence theorem, there exist solutions of (3.13)-(3.14) at least locally in t . All the estimates we will prove will be done on smooth solutions of (3.3)-(3.6). Naturally, the same estimates are true also for approximate solutions u_j^N .

Estimate I Multiply (3.3) by $2u_j$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \|u_j\|^2(t) + 2\|\Delta u_j\|^2(t) - 2\|\nabla u_j\|^2(t) \\ - \sum_{i=1}^3 (u_i^2, (u_j)_{x_j})(t) = 0, \quad j = 1, 2, 3. \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

Since $a\|\nabla u_j\|^2(t) \leq \|\Delta u_j\|^2(t)$, taking into account (3.7), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \|u_j\|^2(t) + \theta\|\Delta u_j\|^2(t) + \theta\|\Delta u_j\|^2(t) \\ - \sum_{i=1}^3 (u_i^2, (u_j)_{x_j})(t) \leq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

Making use of Lemmas 2.3, 3.1, we estimate

$$I = \sum_{i=1}^3 (u_i^2, (u_j)_{x_j}) \leq \sum_{i=1}^3 \|u_i\| \|u_i\|_{L^4(D)} \|(u_j)_{x_j}\|_{L^4(D)}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^3 2\|u_i\| \|u_i\|^{1/4} \|\nabla u_i\|^{3/4} \|\nabla u_j\|^{1/4} \|\Delta u_j\|^{3/4} \\
&\leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^3 \frac{1}{a^{1/4}} \|u_i\| \|\nabla u_i\| \|\Delta u_j\| \leq \epsilon \|\Delta u_j\|^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\epsilon} \left(\sum_{i=1}^3 \frac{1}{a^{1/4}} \|u_i\| \|\nabla u_i\| \right)^2 \leq \epsilon \|\Delta u_j\|^2 \\
&+ \frac{4}{a^{1/2} \epsilon} \sum_{i=1}^3 \|u_i\|^2 \|\nabla u_i\|^2 \leq \epsilon \|\Delta u_j\|^2 + \frac{4}{a^{3/2} \epsilon} \sum_{i=1}^3 \|u_i\|^2 \|\Delta u_i\|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where ϵ is an arbitrary positive number. Taking $2\epsilon = \theta$, substituting I into (3.16) and summing up over $j = 1, 2, 3$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{d}{dt} \sum_{j=1}^3 \|u_j\|^2(t) + \frac{\theta}{2} \sum_{j=1}^3 \|\Delta u_j\|^2(t) \\
&+ \left[\theta - \frac{24}{\theta a^{3/2}} \sum_{i=1}^3 \|u_i\|^2(t) \right] \sum_{j=1}^3 \|\Delta u_j\|^2(t) \leq 0. \quad (3.17)
\end{aligned}$$

Condition (3.8), positivity of the second term in (3.17) and standard arguments guarantee that

$$\left[\theta - \frac{24}{\theta a_z^{3/2}} \sum_{i=1}^3 \|u_i\|^2(t) \right] > 0, \quad t > 0. \quad (3.18)$$

This transforms (3.17) into the following inequality:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \sum_{j=1}^3 \|u_j\|^2(t) + \frac{\theta}{2} \sum_{j=1}^3 \|\Delta u_j\|^2(t) \leq 0. \quad (3.19)$$

Integrating (3.19), we obtain

$$\sum_{j=1}^3 \|u_j\|^2(t) + \int_0^t \frac{\theta}{2} \sum_{j=1}^3 \|\Delta u_j\|^2(\tau) d\tau \leq \sum_{j=1}^3 \|u_{j0}\|^2. \quad (3.20)$$

On the other hand, Lemma 3.1 allows us to rewrite (3.19) in the form

$$\frac{d}{dt} \sum_{j=1}^3 \|u_j\|^2(t) + \frac{a^2 \theta}{2} \sum_{j=1}^3 \|u_j\|^2(t) \leq 0. \quad (3.21)$$

From this, (3.10) follows.

Estimate II

Differentiate (3.3) with respect to t , then multiply the results respectively by $2(u_j)_t$ to get

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} \|u_{jt}\|^2(t) + 2\|\Delta u_{jt}\|^2(t) - 2\|\nabla u_{jt}\|^2(t) \\ &= 2 \sum_{i=1}^3 (u_i u_{it}, (u_j)_{x_{jt}})(t), \quad j = 1, 2, 3. \end{aligned} \quad (3.22)$$

Making use of Lemmas 2.4 and 3.1, we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} I &= 2 \sum_{i=1}^3 (u_i u_{it}, (u_j)_{x_{jt}})(t) \leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^3 \|u_i\|(t) \|u_{it}\|_{L^4(D)}(t) \|\nabla u_{jt}\|_{L^4(D)}(t) \\ &\leq 4 \sum_{i=1}^3 \|u_i\| \|u_{it}\|^{1/4} \|\nabla u_{it}\|^{3/4} \|\nabla u_{it}\|^{1/4} \|\Delta u_{it}\|^{3/4} \\ &\leq 4 \sum_{i=1}^3 \frac{1}{a^{1/4}} \|u_i\| \|\nabla u_{it}\| \|\Delta u_{it}\| \leq \epsilon \|\Delta u_{it}\|^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{4}{\epsilon} \left(\sum_{i=1}^3 \frac{1}{a^{1/4}} \|u_i\| \|\nabla u_{it}\| \right)^2 \leq \epsilon \|\Delta u_{it}\|^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{16}{a^{1/2} \epsilon} \sum_{i=1}^3 \|u_i\|^2 \|\nabla u_{it}\|^2 \leq \epsilon \|\Delta u_{it}\|^2 + \frac{16}{a^{3/2} \epsilon} \sum_{i=1}^3 \|u_i\|^2 \|\Delta u_{it}\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Taking $2\epsilon = \theta$, substituting I into (3.22) and summing up over $j = 1, 2, 3$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} \sum_{j=1}^3 \|u_{jt}\|^2(t) + \frac{\theta}{2} \sum_{j=1}^3 \|\Delta u_{jt}\|^2(t) \\ &+ \left[\theta - \frac{48}{\theta a^{3/2}} \sum_{i=1}^3 \|u_i\|^2(t) \right] \sum_{j=1}^3 \|\Delta u_{jt}\|^2(t) \leq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.23)$$

Taking into account (3.7), rewrite (3.23) in the form

$$\frac{d}{dt} \sum_{j=1}^3 \|u_{jt}\|^2(t) + \frac{\theta}{2} \sum_{j=1}^3 \|\Delta u_{jt}\|^2(t) \leq 0. \quad (3.24)$$

This implies

$$\sum_{j=1}^3 \|u_{jt}\|^2(t) + \frac{\theta}{2} \int_0^t \left(\sum_{j=1}^3 \|\Delta u_{j\tau}\|^2(\tau) \right) d\tau \leq \sum_{j=1}^3 \|u_{jt}\|^2(0), \quad (3.25)$$

where $\|u_{jt}\|^2(0) \leq C(\|u_{0j}\|_W)$. Making use of Lemma 3.1, rewrite (3.24) as

$$\frac{d}{dt} \sum_{j=1}^3 \|u_{jt}\|^2(t) + \frac{a^2\theta}{2} \sum_{j=1}^3 \|u_{jt}\|^2(t) \leq 0. \quad (3.26)$$

Integrating this, we find

$$\sum_{j=1}^3 \|u_{jt}\|^2(t) \leq \left(\sum_{j=1}^3 \|u_{jt}\|^2(0) \right) \exp\left\{-\frac{a^2\theta}{2}t\right\}. \quad (3.27)$$

Estimates (3.20) and (3.25) imply that $u_j \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+; H_0^2(D))$,

$$u_{jt} \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+; L^2(D)) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^+; H_0^2(D)), \quad j = 1, 2, 3.$$

These inequalities guarantee the existence of strong solutions to (3.3)-(3.6) $\{u_j(x, t)\}$ satisfying the following integral identities:

$$\begin{aligned} & ((u_j)_t, \phi)(t) + (\Delta u_j, \Delta \phi)(t) + (\Delta u_j, \phi)(t) \\ & - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^3 (u_i)^2, \phi_{x_j}(t) = 0, \quad t > 0, \end{aligned} \quad (3.28)$$

where $\phi(x, y)$ is an arbitrary function from $H_0^2(D)$.

We can rewrite (3.28) in the form

$$(\Delta u_j, \Delta \phi)(t) = -\left([(u_j)_t + \Delta u_j - \sum_{i=1}^3 u_i(u_i)_{x_j}], \phi \right)(t).$$

It follows from here and estimates above that

$$\Delta^2 u_j \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+; L^2(D)), \quad j = 1, 2, 3.$$

This proves the existence part of Theorem 3.1.

Lemma 3.2. *The strong solutions of (3.3)-(3.6) is unique.*

Proof. Let u_j and v_j , $j = 1, 2, 3$, be two distinct solutions to (3.3)-(3.6). Denoting $w = u_j - v_j$, we come to the following system:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|w_j\|^2(t) + 2\|\Delta w_j\|^2(t) - 2\|\nabla w_j\|^2(t)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^4 (\{u_i + v_i\} w_i, (w_j)_{x_j})(t), \quad (3.29)$$

$$(w_i)_{x_j} = (w_j)_{x_i}, \quad i \neq j, \quad (3.30)$$

$$w_j|_{\partial D_1} = \frac{\partial}{\partial N} w_j|_{\partial D_1} = 0, \quad t > 0, \quad (3.31)$$

$$w_j(x, 0) = 0, \quad j = 1, 2, 3. \quad (3.32)$$

Making use of Lemmas 2.3, 3.1, we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} I &= (\{u_i + v_i\} w_i, (w_j)_{x_j}) \leq \| (w_j)_{x_j} \|_{L^4(D_z)} \| w_i \| \| u_i + v_i \|_{L^4(D_z)} \\ &\leq 2 \| w_i \| \| (w_j)_{x_j} \|^{1/4} \| \nabla (w_j)_{x_j} \|^{3/4} \| u_i + v_i \|^{1/4} \| \nabla (u_i + v_i) \|^{3/4} \\ &\leq \frac{2}{a^{1/4}} \| w_i \| \| \Delta (w_j) \| \| \nabla (u_i + v_i) \| \\ &\leq \epsilon \| \Delta (w_j) \|^2 + \frac{1}{\epsilon a^{3/2}} \| w_i \|^2 \| \Delta (u_i + v_i) \|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting I into (3.29), taking $2\epsilon = \theta$ and summing over $j = 1, 2, 3$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{d}{dt} \sum_{j=1}^3 \| w_j \|^2(t) + \theta \sum_{j=1}^3 \| \Delta w_j \|^2(t) \\ &\leq C \left(\sum_{i=1}^3 \{ \| \Delta u_i \|^2 + \| \Delta v_i \|^2 \} \sum_{j=1}^3 \| w_j \|^2(t) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Due to (3.20), $\| \Delta u_i \|^2(t) + \| \Delta v_i \|^2(t) \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^+)$, $i = 1, 2, 3$. Applying Lemma 2.2, we obtain that

$$\| w_j \|(t) \equiv 0, \quad t > 0, \quad j = 1, 2, 3.$$

This proves Lemma 3.2 and consequently Theorem 3.1. \square

Remark 3.1. *We can define other grooves:*

$$D_{x_3} = \{x = (x_1, x_2, x_3); x_1 \in \mathbb{R}^1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^+, x_3 \in (0, L_3 > 0), \}$$

$$D_{x_1} = \{x = (x_1, x_2, x_3); x_1 \in (0, L_1 > 0), x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^1, x_3 \in \mathbb{R}^+ \}$$

and obtain results similar to ones of Theorem 3.1.

4. CONCLUSIONS

In this work, we studied initial boundary value problems for the three dimensional Kuramoto-Sivashinsky system (1.1) posed on unbounded grooves. We defined a set of admissible domains which eliminate destabilizing effects of terms Δu_j by dissipativity of $\Delta^2 u_j$. Since these problems do not admit the first a priori estimate independent of t and solutions, in order to prove the existence of global solutions, we put conditions connecting geometrical properties of domains with initial data. We proved the existence and uniqueness of a strong solution as well as exponential decay of L^2 -norms.

□

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

The author declares that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

REFERENCES

- [1] Adams R.A. and Fournier J.F., Sobolev Spaces. Elsevier Science Ltd; Oxford OX5 IGB UK, @003o.
- [2] Benachour S., Kukavica I., Rusin W., Ziane M., Anisotropic estimates for the two dimensional Kuramoto-Sivashinsky equation, J. of Dynamics and Differential Equations, Springer Verlag, 2014, 26, pp. 461-476. 10.1007/s10884-014-9372-3. hal-00790207.
- [3] Biagioni H.A., Bona J.L., Iorio Jr., R.J. and Scialom M., On the Korteweg de Vries-Kuramoto-Sivashinsky Equation, Adv. Diff. Eqs., 1(1) (1996),1-20.
- [4] Biagioni H.A. Gramchev T., Multidimensional Kuramoto-Sivashinsky type equations: Singular initial data and analytic regularity, Matematica Contemporanea, 15 (1998), 21-42.
- [5] Brezis H., Functional Analysis, Sobolev Spaces and Partial Differential Equations. New York: Springer, 2011.
- [6] Guo Boling, The existence and nonexistence of a global solution for the initial value problem of generalized Kuramoto-Sivashinsky type equations, J. of Mathematical Research and Exposition, vol. 11, N0 1,(1991), 57-69.
- [7] Cousin A.T. and Larkin N.A., Kuramoto-Sivashinsky equation in domains with moving boundaries, Portugaliae Mathematica, vol. 59, fasc. 3 (2002) 335-349.
- [8] Cross M.C., Pattern formation outside of equilibrium, Review of Modern Physics. 65(3) (1993), 851-1086.
- [9] Cuerno R. and Barabasi A.L., Phys. Rev. Lett., 74 (1965), 4746.
- [10] Feng Bao-Feng, Malomed B.A., Kawahara T., Stable Periodic Waves in Coupled Sivashinsky-Korteweg-de Vries Equations, arXiv:nlin/0209003 v 1 [nlin. PS] 1Sep 2002.
- [11] Iftimie D., Raugel G., Some Results on the Navier-Stokes Equations in Thin 3D Domains, Journal of Differential Equations 169, (2001), 281-331.

- [12] Kuramoto Y. and Tsuzuki T., On the formation of dissipative structures in reaction-diffusion systems, *Progr. Theor. Phys.*, 54 (1975), 687-699.
- [13] Ladyzhenskaya O.A., *The Boundary Value problems of Mathematical Physics*, Springer Verlag: New York, Berlin, Heidelberg, Tokyo, 1985.
- [14] Larkin N.A., Korteweg de Vries and Kuramoto-Sivashinsky equations in bounded domains. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 297 (2004), 169-185.
- [15] Molinet L., Local dissipativity in L^2 for the Kuramoto-Sivashinsky equation in spatial dimension 2, *J. Dynam. Diff. Eq.*, 12 (2000), N0 3, 533-556.
- [16] Nicolaenko B., Scheurer B. and Temam R., Some global dynamical properties of the Kuramoto-Sivashinsky equations: nonlinear stability and attractors, *Phys. D* 16 (1985), No 3, 155-183
- [17] Sell G.R. and Taboada M, Local dissipativity and attractors for the Kuramoto-Sivashinsky equation in thin 2D domains, *Nonlin. Anal.* 18 (1992), 671-687.
- [18] Sivashinsky G.I., Nonlinear analysis of hydrodynamic instability in laminar flames-1. Derivation of basic equations, *Acta Astronautica*, 4 (1977), 1177-1206
- [19] Steklov A.V., The problem of cooling of an heterogeneous rigid rod, *Communs. Kharkov Math. Soc.*, Ser. 2, 5 (1896) 136-181 (Russian).
- [20] R. Temam, *Navier-Stokes Equations. Theory and Numerical Analysis*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, (1977).
- [21] Temam R., *Infinite-Dimensional Dynamical Systems in Mechanics and Physics*, Springer, Berlin-Heidelberg, New York (1988).
- [22] Jing Li, Bing-Yu Zhang and Zhixiong Zhang, A nonhomogeneous boundary value problem for the Kuramoto-Sivashinsky equation in a quarter plane, arXiv:1607.00506v2 [math.AP] 14 Jul 2016.

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICA, UNIVERSIDADE ESTADUAL DE MARINGÁ,
AV. COLOMBO 5790: AGÊNCIA UEM, 87020-900, MARINGÁ, PR, BRAZIL
Email address: nlarkine@uem.br; nlarkine@yahoo.com.br