L^p estimate of the heat equation on a bounded domain

Yoshinori Furuto^{*}, Tsukasa Iwabuchi^{**} and Ryusei Kohama

Mathematical Institute, Tohoku University Sendai 980-8578 Japan

Abstract. We consider the linear heat equation on a bounded domain. We study estimates of the derivatives, up to the second order, of the solution locally in time in the Lebesgue spaces. We give a self-contained proof of the estimates in the end-point cases $p = 1, \infty$.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $d \geq 2$. Suppose that Ω be a bounded domain of \mathbb{R}^d . We consider the heat equation with the Dirichlet boundary condition.

(1.1)
$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u - \Delta u = 0 & \text{in } (0, T) \times \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } (0, T) \times \partial \Omega, \\ u(0, \cdot) = u_0(\cdot) & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases}$$

Our aim is to obtain L^p estimates of second-order derivatives.

Let us recall some classical results. If Ω is a sufficiently smooth bounded domain and $p \in (1, \infty)$, then there exists the heat semigroup $\{S_p(t)\}_{t\geq 0}$ on $L^p(\Omega)$ and the solution $u(t) := S_p(t)u_0$, defined by the semigroup, satisfies the following L^p-L^p estimates.

(1.2a)
$$||u(t)||_{L^p} \le C ||u_0||_{L^p}$$

(1.2b)
$$\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^p} \le Ct^{-1/2} \|u_0\|_{L^p}, \quad \text{for } t > 0$$

(1.2c)
$$\|\nabla^2 u(t)\|_{L^p} \le Ct^{-1} \|u_0\|_{L^p}$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{L^p}$ is the norm of $L^p(\Omega)$. We notice that u(t) decays exponentially in $L^p(\Omega)$ for large t. Our aim is to consider it locally in time.

In what follows, we suppose $u_0 \in C_c^{\infty}(\Omega)$, which implies $S_2(t)u_0 = S_p(t)u_0$ for any $p \in (1,\infty)$. We then abbreviate p, and often use the following notation

$$S(t)u_0 = S_p(t)u_0.$$

Mathematics Subject Classification: 35K05; 35K08

Keywords: heat equation, derivative estimates, smooth bounded domain

E-mail: *yoshinori.furuto.p3@dc.tohoku.ac.jp, **t-iwabuchi@tohoku.ac.jp

Theorem 1.1. Let $d \geq 2$. Suppose that Ω be a bounded domain of \mathbb{R}^d with C^3 boundary, $u_0 \in C_c^{\infty}(\Omega)$, and $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. Then $u(t) := S(t)u_0$ satisfies that

(1.3)
$$\begin{aligned} \|u(t)\|_{L^{p}} \leq C \|u_{0}\|_{L^{p}},\\ \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^{p}} \leq Ct^{-1/2} \|u_{0}\|_{L^{p}},\\ \|\nabla^{2}u(t)\|_{L^{p}} \leq Ct^{-1} \|u_{0}\|_{L^{p}},\end{aligned}$$

for all t > 0.

Remark. The smoothness of the boundary of Ω is needed for the L^{∞} estimate, where we follow the argument of the paper by Abe-Giga [1]. We do not impose any assumption for the L^1 estimate. We will prove it by modifying the argument in [3].

We refer to some existing literature on derivative estimates. In the case when Ω is a smooth bounded domain, the estimate of the solution itself is obvious from the property of the semigroup. For the first derivatives, (1.2b) holds for $p \in [1, \infty]$ (see [2], [6] and [1]). For the second derivatives, if $p \in (1, \infty)$, then (1.2c) can be obtained by using L^p elliptic estimate and basic property of analytic semigroup (see [10] and [7]). In addition, (1.2c) holds for $p = \infty$ (see [1]).

We give a few comments on our proof. We prove only the case $p = 1, \infty$. The boundedness of without derivatives is due to the basic property of the C_0 semigroup. For p = 1, we argue similarly to the paper [3] who considered the first derivative. As for $p = \infty$, we apply the contradiction argument by [1] for the Stokes equations. Although not used in this paper, there is a possibility to show this theorem by direct estimate of the heat kernel using the method in [5].

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we prepare a lemma and a proposition to prove the theorem for $p = \infty$. In Sections 3 and 4, we prove the theorem for $p = 1, \infty$. In the Appendix, we show some lemmas for the paper to be self-contained.

Notation. We denote by A the Dirichlet Laplacian, which is defined by

$$\begin{cases} D(A) = \{ f \in H^1_0(\Omega) \mid \Delta f \in L^2(\Omega) \}, \\ Af = -\sum_{j=1}^d \partial^2_{x_j} f, \quad f \in D(A). \end{cases}$$

We notice that A is a self-adjoint operator on $L^2(\Omega)$ and by the argument in the paper [2], e^{-tA} can be defined in more generalized distribution spaces based on the spectral multiplier. If $u_0 \in C_c^{\infty}(\Omega)$, then $S(t)u_0 = e^{-tA}u_0$, which is used in the proof for p = 1.

2. Preliminaries

We prepare a lemma and a proposition for the proof when $p = \infty$. We consider the estimate for the following quantity.

$$N[u](t,x) := |u(t,x)| + t^{1/2} |\nabla u(t,x)| + t |\nabla^2 u(t,x)| + t |\partial_t u(t,x)|.$$

The first lemma considers an estimate of N[u], and that for the Stokes equations is known (see [1]).

Lemma 2.1. Suppose that Ω is a bounded domain with C^3 boundary. Let $d < r < \infty$. Assume that $u_0 \in D(A_r)$, where $-A_r$ is the generator of the heat semigroup in $L^r(\Omega)$, and define $u(t) := S_r(t)u_0$. Then, $u(t, \cdot) \in C^2(\Omega)$ for all t > 0 and

$$\sup_{0 < t < 1} \|N[u](t)\|_{L^{\infty}} < \infty.$$

Proof. We will show that there exists $C = C(\Omega, r) > 0$ such that

(2.4)
$$\sup_{0 < t < 1} (\|u(t)\|_{W^{1,r}} + t^{1/2} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{W^{1,r}} + t \|\nabla^2 u(t)\|_{W^{1,r}} + t \|\partial_t u(t)\|_{W^{1,r}}) \le C \|u_0\|_{D(A_r)},$$

where $||u_0||_{D(A_r)} := ||u_0||_{L^r} + ||A_r u_0||_{L^r}$.

By the property of the analytic semigroup $S_r(t) = e^{-tA_r}$, we have

$$\sup_{0 < t < 1} \|u(t)\|_{D(A_r)} + \sup_{0 < t < 1} t \|\partial_t u(t)\|_{D(A_r)} \le C \|u_0\|_{D(A_r)}$$

where $C = C(\Omega, r)$. Thus we have proved

$$\sup_{0 < t < 1} \left(\|u(t)\|_{W^{1,r}} + \|\nabla u(t)\|_{W^{1,r}} + t \|\partial_t u(t)\|_{W^{2,r}} \right) \le C \|u_0\|_{D(A_r)}$$

as the $D(A_r)$ norm and the $W^{2,r}(\Omega)$ norm are equivalent by the elliptic estimate. The terms

$$\|u(t)\|_{W^{1,r}}, \quad t^{1/2} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{W^{1,r}}, \quad t\|\nabla^2 u(t)\|_{L^r}, \quad t\|\partial_t u(t)\|_{W^{1,r}}$$

are less than or equal to the left hand side above.

It remains to prove that

$$\sup_{0 < t < 1} t \| \nabla^3 u(t) \|_{L^r} \le C \| u_0 \|_{D(A_r)}.$$

Applying the estimate in a nonhomogeneous elliptic equation (Theorem A.1 for k = 1 and $f = \partial_t u$), we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla^3 u(t)\|_{L^r} &\leq C(\|u(t)\|_{L^r} + \|\partial_t u(t)\|_{W^{1,r}}) \\ &\leq C\|u_0\|_{D(A_r)}, \quad t > 0, \end{aligned}$$

which proves the above inequality. Here the assumption that Ω is a C^3 domain is needed for Theorem A.1.

Proposition 2.2. Let $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^d_+$. Suppose that u satisfies

$$\int_0^T \int_\Omega u(\partial_t \phi + \Delta \phi) dx dt = 0$$

for any $\phi \in C([0,T]; W_0^{1,1}(\Omega) \cap W^{2,1}(\Omega) \cap C(\Omega)) \cap C^1([0,T]; L^1(\Omega))$ with $|\nabla \phi(x)| \leq C(1+|x|^2)^{-d/2}$. Then u is 0 almost everywhere.

3. L^1 estimate

We follow the argument as in the paper [3]. Instead of $S(t)u_0$, we consider more general problem, which is the boundedness of the spectral multiplier $\varphi(tA)$, where $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ with $\sup \varphi \subset [0, \infty)$.

Following the proof of Theorem 2.1 in [3], we decompose Ω by using cubes whose side length is $t^{\frac{1}{2}}$, and apply the Hölder inequality to have that

(3.5)
$$\|\nabla^2 \varphi(tA) f\|_{L^1} \le t^{\frac{d}{4}} \|\nabla^2 \varphi(tA) f\|_{\ell^1(L^2)_t},$$

where

$$\|\nabla^{2}\varphi(tA)f\|_{\ell^{1}(L^{2})_{t}} := \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^{d}} \|\nabla^{2}\varphi(tA)f\|_{L^{2}(C_{t}(n))}$$

 $C_t(n)$ is a cube with side $t^{1/2}$ centered $t^{1/2}n \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Introduce $\widetilde{\varphi} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ such that

$$\widetilde{\varphi}(\lambda) = (1+\lambda)^{\beta} \varphi(\lambda), \quad \beta > 0.$$

We can write

$$\begin{split} \|\nabla^{2}\varphi(tA)f\|_{\ell^{1}(L^{2})_{t}} \\ = \|\nabla^{2}\widetilde{\varphi}(tA)(1+tA)^{-\beta}f\|_{\ell^{1}(L^{2})_{t}} \\ \leq C\Big(\|\nabla^{2}\widetilde{\varphi}(tA)\|_{L^{2}\to L^{2}} + t^{-\frac{d}{4}}|||\nabla^{2}\widetilde{\varphi}(tA)|||_{\alpha}^{\frac{d}{2\alpha}}\|\nabla^{2}\widetilde{\varphi}(tA)\|_{L^{2}\to L^{2}}^{1-\frac{d}{2\alpha}}\Big)\|(1+tA)^{-\beta}f\|_{\ell^{1}(L^{2})_{t}} \end{split}$$

for any $\alpha > d/2$, where

$$|||\nabla^2 \widetilde{\varphi}(tA)|||_{\alpha} := \sup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \left\||\cdot - t^{1/2} n|^{\alpha} \nabla^2 \widetilde{\varphi}(tA) \chi_{C_t(n)}\right\|_{L^2 \to L^2}.$$

The elliptic estimate in $L^2(\Omega)$ shows that

$$\|\nabla^2 \widetilde{\varphi}(tA)\|_{L^2 \to L^2} \le C \|A \widetilde{\varphi}(tA)\|_{L^2 \to L^2} \le C t^{-1}.$$

As for $|||\nabla^2 \tilde{\varphi}(tA)|||_{\alpha}$, by following the proof of Lemma 7.1 in [3], $\nabla^2 \tilde{\varphi}(tA)$ can be written with the following

$$abla^2 (1+tA)^{-1}, \quad \nabla (1+tA)^{-1}, \quad (1+tA)^{-1}, \quad e^{is(1+tA)^{-1}},$$

integrals of Fourier transform of $\widetilde{\varphi}$,

and we conclude that

$$|||\nabla^2 \widetilde{\varphi}(tA)|||_{\alpha} \le Ct^{\frac{\alpha-2}{2}}.$$

The above two inequlities show that

(3.6)
$$\|\nabla^2 \varphi(tA) f\|_{\ell^1(L^2)_t} \leq C(t^{-1} + t^{-\frac{d}{4}}(t^{\frac{\alpha-2}{2}})^{\frac{d}{2\alpha}}(t^{-1})^{1-\frac{d}{2\alpha}})\|(1+tA)^{-\beta}f\|_{\ell^1(L^2)_t}$$
$$= Ct^{-1}\|(1+tA)^{-\beta}f\|_{\ell^1(L^2)_t}.$$

Finally, it follows by Proposition 7.1 in [3] that

$$\|(1+tA)^{-\beta}f\|_{\ell^1(L^2)_t} \le Ct^{-\frac{a}{4}}\|f\|_{L^1}.$$

We then obtain by (3.5) that

$$t^{\frac{d}{4}} \|\nabla^2 \varphi(tA) f\|_{\ell^1(L^2)_t} \le C t^{\frac{d}{4}} t^{-1} \|(1+tA)^{-\beta} f\|_{\ell^1(L^2)_t} \le C t^{-1} \|f\|_{L^1}.$$

4. L^{∞} estimate

Theorem 4.1. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded domain with C^3 boundary. Then, there exists C > 0 and T > 0 such that

$$\sup_{0 < t < T} \|N[u](t)\|_{L^{\infty}} < C \|u_0\|_{L^{\infty}}$$

holds for any solution u(t) of (1.1) with $u_0 \in C_c^{\infty}(\Omega)$.

Proof. Prove by contradiction. Assume that there exist a sequence $\{u_m\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$ of solution to (1.1) and a sequence $\{\tau_m\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that

$$\|N[u](\tau_m)\|_{L^{\infty}} > m\|u_{0,m}\|_{L^{\infty}},$$

$$\tau_m \searrow 0 \ (m \to \infty)$$

where $u_{0,m} \in C_c^{\infty}(\Omega)$ is an initial data of u_m .

Now we introduce a function v_m as follows. It holds that $M_m := \sup_{t \in (0,\tau_m)} ||N[u_m](t)||_{L^{\infty}} < \infty$

by Lemma 2.1, and we define $\tilde{u}_m := u_m/M_m$. Then, there exists some point $(t_m, x_m) \in (0, \tau_m) \times \Omega$ satisfying $N[\tilde{u}_m](t_m, x_m) \ge 1/2$. We therefore define v_m by translating and scaling where the point (t_m, x_m) corresponds to the point (1, 0).

$$v_m(t,x) := \tilde{u}_m(t_m t, x_m + t_m^{1/2} x) \quad \text{for } (t,x) \in (0,1) \times \Omega_m,$$

where $\Omega_m := \left\{ y \in \mathbb{R}^d \, \middle| \, y = \frac{x - x_m}{t_m^{1/2}}, x \in \Omega \right\}.$

Here v_m satisfies the heat equation and the following inequities.

$$N[v_m](1,0) = N[\tilde{u}_m](t_m, x_m) \ge \frac{1}{2},$$

$$\sup_{t \in (0,1)} \|N[v_m](t)\|_{L^{\infty}} = \sup_{t \in (0,t_m)} \|N[\tilde{u}_m](t)\|_{L^{\infty}} \le 1,$$

$$\|v_{0,m}\|_{L^{\infty}} = \|\tilde{u}_{0,m}\|_{L^{\infty}} < \frac{1}{m}.$$

The situation depends on whether the limit of

$$c_m := \frac{d(\Omega, x_m)}{t_m^{1/2}} = d(\Omega_m, 0)$$

goes infinity or not.

Case 1. $\limsup_{m \to \infty} c_m = \infty$

Take the subsequence so that $\lim_{m\to\infty} c_m = \infty$. We denote \tilde{v}_m as an extension of v_m to \mathbb{R}^d . By a compact embedding $W^{3,r}(\Omega) \subset W^{2,\infty}(\Omega)$, there exist a subsequence $\{\tilde{v}_{m(k)}\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ and \tilde{v} such that $\tilde{v}_{m(k)}$ converges to \tilde{v} locally uniformly in $\mathbb{R}^d \times (0, 1]$.

For any $\phi \in C_c^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d \times [0, 1))$, it follows

$$\int_0^1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \tilde{v}_{m(k)} \cdot (\partial_t \phi + \Delta \phi) dx dt = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \tilde{v}_{m(k)}(x, 0) \cdot \phi(x, 0) dx,$$

and by taking the limit as $k \to \infty$, we obtain

$$\int_0^1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \tilde{v} \cdot (\partial_t \phi + \Delta \phi) dx dt = 0.$$

Therefore the limit \tilde{v} is the weak solution of heat equation and it follows $\tilde{v} \equiv 0$ by the uniqueness of the heat equation (see section 4.4.2 in [9]). However, it contradicts $N[\tilde{v}](1,0) \geq 1/2$.

Case 2. $\limsup c_m < \infty$

By taking a subsequence, we assume that $\lim_{m\to\infty} c_m = c_0 < \infty$ and x_m converges to $\hat{x} \in \partial\Omega$. In addition, by rotation and translation, we also assume $\hat{x} = 0$.

Since Ω is of C^3 , there exisits a C^3 function h such that

$$\begin{aligned} (\Omega_m)_{\text{loc}} &:= \{ (y', y_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid h(x'_m + t_m^{1/2} y') < (x_m)_d + t_m^{1/2} y_d \\ &< h(x'_m + t_m^{1/2} y') + \beta, |t_m^{1/2} y'| < \alpha \} \subset \Omega_m, \\ \nabla h(0) &= 0, h(0) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

where α, β are the constants independent of $\hat{x} \in \partial \Omega$.

Since $d(\Omega_m, x_m)/(x_m)_d \to 1$ as $m \to \infty$, the domain $(\Omega_m)_{\rm loc}$ approaches to

$$\mathbb{R}^{d}_{+,-c_0} := \{ (x', x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^{d} \mid x_d > -c_0 \}.$$

Fix R > 0 and let $B_R^+ = B_R(0, \ldots, 0, -c_0) \cap \mathbb{R}^d_{+, -c_0}$. Define $\tilde{v}_m \in W^{3,r}(\mathbb{R}^d \times (0, 1])$ as an extension of v_m and there exists $\tilde{v} \in W^{2,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d_{+, -c_0} \times \mathbb{R}^d)$. (0,1]) and C > 0 such that

$$\tilde{v}_{m(k)} \to \tilde{v}$$

 $\nabla \tilde{v}_{m(k)} \to \nabla \tilde{v}$ locally uniformly in $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^d_{+,-c_0} \times (0,1],$
 $\nabla^2 \tilde{v}_{m(k)} \to \nabla^2 \tilde{v}$

$$\|\tilde{v}_m\|_{W^{2,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d_{+,-c_0}\times(0,1))} \le C \|v_m\|_{W^{2,\infty}(B^+_R\times(0,1))}$$
 for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$

where $\tilde{v}_{m(k)}$ is a subsequence of $\{\tilde{v}_m\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$. For simplicity, we denote the subsequence by $\{\tilde{v}_m\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}.$

Fix a test funciton

$$\phi \in C\Big([0,1]; W_0^{1,1}(R_{+,-c_0}^d) \cap W^{2,1}(R_{+,-c_0}^d) \cap C(R_{+,-c_0}^d)\Big) \cap C^1\Big([0,1]; L^1(R_{+,-c_0}^d)\Big)$$

with $|\nabla \phi(x)| \le C(1+|x|^2)^{-d/2}$.

Since v_m satisfies (1.1) in $\Omega_m \times (0, 1]$, it follows

$$0 = \int_0^1 \int_{\Omega_m \cap B_R^+} \Delta \tilde{v}_m \phi dx dt - \int_0^1 \int_{\Omega_m \cap B_R^+} (\partial_t \tilde{v}_m) \phi dx dt$$

$$= -\int_0^1 \int_{\Omega_m \cap B_R^+} \nabla \tilde{v}_m \cdot \nabla \phi dx dt + \int_0^1 \int_{\partial (\Omega_m \cap B_R^+)} (\nabla \tilde{v}_m \cdot \boldsymbol{n}) \phi dx dt$$

$$-\int_0^1 \int_{\Omega_m \cap B_R^+} * \partial_t \tilde{v}_m) \phi dx dt.$$

For the second term, divide the integral domain into $\partial(\Omega_m \cap B_R^+) \cap \partial B_R^+$ and $\partial(\Omega_m \cap B_R^+) \setminus \partial B_R^+$. Then, by the decay of $|\phi|$, the continuity of ϕ and $\phi \in W_0^{1,1}$, it holds

$$\sup_{m\in\mathbb{N}} \left| \int_{0}^{1} \int_{\partial(\Omega_{m}\cap B_{R}^{+})\cap\partial B_{R}^{+}} (\nabla \tilde{v}_{m} \cdot \boldsymbol{n})\phi dx dt \right| \to 0 \quad \text{as } R \to \infty,$$
$$\left| \int_{0}^{1} \int_{\partial(\Omega_{m}\cap B_{R}^{+})\setminus\partial B_{R}^{+}} (\nabla \tilde{v}_{m} \cdot \boldsymbol{n})\phi dx dt \right| \to 0 \quad \text{as } m \to \infty.$$

From the Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem and Fubini's theorem the integration respect with t, for any $\delta > 0$, there exists $M \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for $m \geq M$,

$$\left| \int_0^1 \int_{\Omega_m \cap B_R^+} \nabla \tilde{v}_m \cdot \nabla \phi dx dt - \int_0^1 \int_{B_R^+} \nabla \tilde{v}_m \cdot \nabla \phi dx dt \right| < \delta,$$
$$\left| \int_0^1 \int_{\Omega_m \cap B_R^+} (\partial_t \tilde{v}_m) \phi dx dt - \int_0^1 \int_{B_R^+} (\partial_t \tilde{v}_m) \phi dx dt \right| < \delta.$$

We consider the integral on B_R^+ . By integration by parts,

$$-\int_{0}^{1}\int_{B_{R}^{+}}\nabla \tilde{v}_{m}\cdot\nabla\phi dxdt$$
$$=\int_{0}^{1}\int_{B_{R}^{+}}\tilde{v}_{m}\Delta\phi dxdt-\int_{0}^{1}\int_{\partial B_{R}^{+}}\tilde{v}_{m}(\nabla\phi\cdot\boldsymbol{n})dxdt$$

For the second term, we again divide the integral domain into $\partial(\Omega_m \cap B_R^+) \cap \partial B_R^+$ and $\partial(\Omega_m \cap B_R^+) \setminus \partial B_R^+$. Then the decay of $|\nabla \phi|$ implies

$$\sup_{m\in\mathbb{N}} \left| \int_0^1 \int_{\{x_d\neq -c_0\}\cap\partial B_R^+} \tilde{v}_m(\nabla\phi\cdot\boldsymbol{n}) dx dt \right| \to 0 \quad \text{ as } R\to\infty.$$

Now we estimate $\tilde{v}_m(t,x)$ at $x \in \partial B_R^+$, $x_d = -c_0$. Let $w_m := \sup_{y \in \partial(\Omega_m \cap B_R^+) \setminus \partial B_R^+} |y_d|$ and notice that

that

 $w_m \to 0 \text{ as } m \to \infty,$ $dist(x, \Omega_m) < w_m \text{ for all } x \in \partial B_R^+, x_d = -c_0.$

For any points $x \in \partial B_R^+$, $x_d = -c_0$, define x_b as the point in $\partial \Omega_m$ that is closest to x, then $|\tilde{v}_m(t,x)| = |\tilde{v}_m(t,x) - \tilde{v}_m(t,x_b)|$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \leq \int_0^1 |\partial_\theta \tilde{v}_m(t, \theta x + (1 - \theta) x_b)| \, d\theta \\
& \leq |x - x_b| \times |D \tilde{v}_m(t, \theta_0 x + (1 - \theta_0) x_b| \quad \text{for some } \theta_0 \in (0, 1) \\
& \leq w_m \times C t^{-1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

By this estimate and the limit $w_m \to 0$ as $m \to \infty$, we obtain

$$\int_0^1 \int_{\{x_d = -c_0\} \cap \partial B_R^+} \tilde{v}_m(\nabla \phi \cdot \boldsymbol{n}) dx dt \to 0 \quad \text{ as } m \to \infty$$

From above, we take the limits $m \to \infty, R \to \infty$ in this order, then

$$\lim_{R \to \infty} \lim_{m \to \infty} \int_0^1 \int_{\Omega_m \cap B_R^+} \Delta \tilde{v}_m \phi dx dt = \int_0^1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d_{+,-c_0}} \tilde{v} \Delta \phi dx dt.$$

Similarly, it holds

$$\lim_{R \to \infty} \lim_{m \to \infty} \int_0^1 \int_{\Omega_m \cap B_R^+} \partial_t \tilde{v}_m \phi dx dt = -\int_0^1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d_{+,-c_0}} \tilde{v} \partial_t \phi dx dt - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d_{+,-c_0}} \tilde{v}(0,x) \phi(0,x) dx,$$

and therefore, \tilde{v} satisfies

$$\int_0^1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d_{+,-c_0}} \tilde{v}(\Delta \phi + \partial_t \phi) dx dt = -\int_{\mathbb{R}^d_{+,-c_0}} \tilde{v}(0,x) \phi(0,x) dx.$$

In other words, \tilde{v} is a weak solution of the heat equation on $\mathbb{R}^{d}_{+,-c_0}$.

By the uniqueness of the heat equation for the half space (Proposition 2.2), it follows $\tilde{v} \equiv 0$. However, it contradicts $N[\tilde{v}](1,0) \geq 1/2$.

APPENDIX A. HIGHER-ORDER DERIVATIVE ESTIMATES

We show the following theorem for the paper to be self-contained. Proof idea can be found in the book by Gilbarg-Trudinger [7] (Theorem 9.19.).

Theorem A.1. Suppose $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded domain with C^{k+2} boundary and $p \in (1, \infty)$. If $u \in W^{2,p}(\Omega)$, $f \in W^{k,p}(\Omega)$ satisfy

(A.7)
$$\begin{cases} \Delta u = f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial \Omega, \end{cases}$$

then $u \in W^{k+2,p}(\Omega)$ and there exists C = C(n,k,p) such that

$$\|D^{k+2}u\|_{L^{p}(\Omega)} \le C(\|u\|_{L^{p}(\Omega)} + \|f\|_{W^{k,p}(\Omega)})$$

The proof is derived from an internal estimate and a boundary estimate.

Lemma A.2. Assume the same as in the Theorem A.1. Then, for any subdomain $\Omega' \subset \subset \Omega$, $u \in W^{k+2,p}(\Omega')$ and satisfies

$$\|D^{k+2}u\|_{L^{p}(\Omega')} \leq C(\|u\|_{L^{p}(\Omega)} + \|f\|_{W^{k,p}(\Omega)}).$$

Proof. We refer to Theorem 9.11. in [7] in the case when k = 0. Let $k = l \ge 1$. For any i = 1, ..., d, u and f satisfy

$$\Delta(\partial_i u) = \partial_i f \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

and

$$\|D^{l+1}(\partial_{i}u)\|_{L^{p}(\Omega')} \leq C(\|\partial_{i}u\|_{L^{p}(\Omega)} + \|\partial_{i}f\|_{W^{l-1,p}(\Omega)}).$$

by the estimate for k = l - 1.

The elliptic estimate implies

$$||Du||_{L^{p}(\Omega)} \leq C \left(||u||_{L^{p}(\Omega)} + ||f||_{L^{p}(\Omega)} \right)$$

and therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \|D^{l+2}u\|_{L^{p}(\Omega')} &\leq C(\|Du\|_{L^{p}(\Omega)} + \|Df\|_{W^{l-1,p}(\Omega)}) \\ &\leq C(\|u\|_{L^{p}(\Omega)} + \|f\|_{W^{l,p}(\Omega)}). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma A.3. Let $\Omega^+ := \Omega \cap \mathbb{R}^d_+, (\partial \Omega)^+ := \partial \Omega \cap \mathbb{R}^d_+$. If $u \in W^{1,p}_0(\Omega^+), f \in W^{k,p}(\Omega^+)$ satisfy

(A.8)
$$\begin{cases} \Delta u = f & \text{in } \Omega^+, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } (\partial \Omega)^+ \end{cases}$$

then $u \in W^{k+2,p}(\Omega^+)$ and there exists C = C(n,k,p) such that

$$||D^{k+2}u||_{L^{p}(\Omega^{+})} \leq C ||D^{k}f||_{L^{p}(\Omega^{+})}.$$

Proof. We follow the argument as Lemma 9.12 in [7].

Let $k \geq 1$. Extend u and f to \mathbb{R}^d_+ by zero-extension and then to \mathbb{R}^d by odd reflection. Then $u \in W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is a weak solution of $\Delta u = f$.

Since supp $u \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is compact, the regularization $u_h := u * \rho_h \in C_c^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d), f_h := f * \rho_h \in C_c^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ where ρ_h is a mollifier such that

supp
$$\rho_h \subset \{|x| < h\},\$$

 $\rho_h * g \to g \text{ in } L^p(\mathbb{R}^d) \quad (h \to 0)$

for any $g \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

Then, it holds that $\Delta \partial_i u_h = \partial_i f_h$ and

$$\begin{split} \|D^{k+2}u_h\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} &\leq C \|\nabla^2 D^k u_h\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} \\ &\leq C \|\Delta D^k u_h\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} \\ &= C \|D^k f_h\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)}. \end{split}$$

by Calderon-Zygmund inequality (see Theorem 9.4. in [7]). We take the limit as $h \to 0$, then $\|D^{k+2}u\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C\|D^kf\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)}$

and

$$\begin{split} \|D^{k+2}u\|_{L^{p}(\Omega)} &\leq \|D^{k+2}u\|_{L^{p}(\mathbb{R}^{d})} \\ &\leq C\|D^{k}f\|_{L^{p}(\mathbb{R}^{d})} \\ &\leq C\|D^{k}f\|_{L^{p}(\Omega)} \end{split}$$

from the definition of the extension.

Lemma A.4. Assume the same as in the Theorem A.1. Then, for any subdomain $\Omega' \subset \subset \Omega \cup \partial\Omega$, $u \in W^{k+2,p}(\Omega')$ and satisfies

$$\|D^{k+2}u\|_{L^{p}(\Omega')} \leq C(\|u\|_{L^{p}(\Omega)} + \|f\|_{W^{k,p}(\Omega)})$$
10

Proof. The argument is based on change of variables and Lemma A.3, and same as Theorem 9.13 in the book [7]. \Box

Appendix B. Proof of Proposition 2.2

Proof. The argument is based on the book by Giga [9]. For every $f \in C_c^{\infty}((0,T) \times \mathbb{R}^d_+)$, we consider

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \psi - \Delta \psi = f & \text{in } (0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d_+ \\ \psi(0, x) = 0 & \text{on } \{t = 0\} \times \mathbb{R}^d_+. \end{cases}$$

There exists a unique solution

$$\psi(t) := \int_0^t e^{-(t-s)A} f(s) ds,$$

where

$$e^{-(t-s)A}f = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d_+} (G_{t-s}(x'-y', x_d-y_d) - G_{t-s}(x'-y', x_d+y_d))f(s, y)dy,$$
$$G_t(x, y) = \frac{1}{(4\pi t)^{d/2}}e^{-|x-y|^2/4t}.$$

Since
$$f \in C_c^{\infty}((0,T) \times \mathbb{R}^d_+)$$
,
 $\psi = \psi_f \in C([0,T]; W_0^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^d_+) \cap W^{2,1}(\mathbb{R}^d_+) \cap C(\mathbb{R}^d_+)) \cap C^1([0,T]; L^1(\mathbb{R}^d_+)),$
 $|\nabla \psi(x)| \leq C(1+|x|^2)^{-d/2}$

(See [8]). We define $\widetilde{\psi}_f(t,x) := \psi(T-t,x)$ and then, for every $f \in C_c^{\infty}((0,T) \times \mathbb{R}^d_+)$,

$$0 = \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d_+} u(\partial_t \widetilde{\psi}_f + \Delta \widetilde{\psi}_f) dx dt$$
$$= \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d_+} u(-\partial_t \psi_f + \Delta \psi_f) dx dt$$
$$= -\int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d_+} uf dx dt,$$

which implies $u \equiv 0$.

References

- K. Abe and Y. Giga, Analyticity of the Stokes semigroup in spaces of bounded functions, Acta Math. 211 (2013), no. 1, 1–46.
- [2] T. Iwabuchi, The semigroup generated by the Dirichlet Laplacian of fractional order, Anal. PDE 11 (2018), no. 3, 683–703.

- [3] T. Iwabuchi, T. Matsuyama, and K. Taniguchi, Boundedness of spectral multipliers for Schrödinger operators on open sets, Rev. Mat. Iberoam. 34 (2018), no. 3, 1277–1322.
- [4] _____, Bilinear estimates in Besov spaces generated by the Dirichlet Laplacian, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 494 (2021), no. 2, Paper No. 124640, 29.
- [5] K. Ishige and Y. Tateishi, Decay estimates for Schrödinger heat semigroup with inverse square potential in Lorentz spaces, J. Evol. Equ. 22 (2022), no. 1, Paper No. 16, 33.
- [6] Z. Shen, Bounds of Riesz transforms on L^p spaces for second order elliptic operators, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) 55 (2005), no. 1, 173–197 (English, with English and French summaries).
- [7] 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.
- [8] T. Cazenave and A. Haraux, An introduction to semilinear evolution equations, Oxford Lecture Series in Mathematics and its Applications, vol. 13, The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 1998. Translated from the 1990 French original by Yvan Martel and revised by the authors.
- [9] M.-H. Giga, Y. Giga, and J. Saal, Nonlinear partial differential equations, Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications, vol. 79, Birkhäuser Boston, Ltd., Boston, MA, 2010. Asymptotic behavior of solutions and self-similar solutions.
- [10] A. Lunardi, Analytic semigroups and optimal regularity in parabolic problems, Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications, vol. 16, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1995.