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#### Abstract

The paper studies the validity of the equivalent formulation of a nonlinear diffusion equation with periodic data, as the minimization of a certain convex functional, by using the Legendre-Fenchel relations between two conjugated functions, $j$ and $j^{*}$. The function $j$, occurring in the equation, is proper, convex and lower semicontinuous and it represents the potential related to the diffusion coefficient. In this paper we assume that $j$ has a polynomial growth. It is proved that the diffusion equation has a unique solution if and only if this is the solution to the associated minimization problem. In fact it is shown that the dual formulation of our problem verifies the Brezis-Ekeland variational principle.


Key words and phrases : convex optimization problems, variational inequalities, Brezis-Ekeland principle, nonlinear diffusion equations, periodic solutions.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010) : 49J20, 49J40, 49J53, 35B10.

## 1. Introduction

We are concerned with the study of the existence of a periodic solution to a diffusion problem with time periodic coefficients, by verifying the application of the Brezis-Ekeland principle. We consider the problem

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{\partial y}{\partial t}-\Delta \partial j(t, x, y) & \ni f & & \text { in } \mathbb{R}_{+} \times \Omega, \\
y(t, x) & =0 & & \text { on } \mathbb{R}_{+} \times \Gamma  \tag{1.1}\\
y(t, x) & =y(t+T, x) & & \text { in } \Omega,
\end{align*}
$$

where $\Omega$ is an open bounded subset of $\mathbb{R}^{N}$, with the boundary $\Gamma$ sufficiently smooth, and $T$ is positive and finite. We assume that:
(a) $j(t, x, \cdot): \mathbb{R} \rightarrow(-\infty, \infty]$ is proper, convex and lower semicontinuous (l.s.c. for short), for $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}_{+} \times \Omega$,
(b) the function $(t, x) \rightarrow j(t, x, r)$ is measurable for $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}_{+} \times \Omega$, for any $r \in \mathbb{R}$,
(c) $f$ and $j$ are periodic with respect to $t$, with the period $T$,
$f(t, x)=f(t+T, x), j(t, x, r)=j(t+T, x, r)$, a.e. $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}_{+} \times \Omega, r \in \mathbb{R}$.
By (a) it follows that the subdifferential of $j$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\partial j(t, x, \cdot)=\beta(t, x, \cdot) \text { a.e. }(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}_{+} \times \Omega, \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

is a maximal monotone graph (possibly multivalued) on $\mathbb{R}$, (see $[3, \mathrm{p} .47]$ ). From the physical point of view $\beta$ is related to the coefficient of diffusion of the process modeled by (1.1).

Moreover we assume that
$C_{1}|r|^{m}+C_{1}^{0} \leq j(t, x, r) \leq C_{2}|r|^{m}+C_{2}^{0}$, for any $r \in \mathbb{R}$, a.e. $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}_{+} \times \Omega$,
with $C_{1}>0$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
r \rightarrow(\partial j)^{-1}(t, x, r) \text { is single valued a.e. }(t, x) \in Q \tag{1.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

and $r \rightarrow \partial j(t, x, r)$ is strongly monotone, i.e., there exists $\rho>0$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
(\eta(t, x, r)-\bar{\eta}(t, x, \bar{r}))(r-\bar{r}) \geq \rho|r-\bar{r}|^{2} \tag{1.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

$\forall r, \bar{r} \in \mathbb{R}, \eta(t, x, r) \in \partial j(t, x, r), \bar{\eta}(t, x, \bar{r}) \in \partial j(t, x, \bar{r})$ a.e. $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}_{+} \times \Omega$.
The conjugate of $j$ denoted by $j^{*}$ is defined as

$$
\begin{equation*}
j^{*}(t, x, \omega)=\sup _{r \in \mathbb{R}}(\omega r-j(t, x, r)), \text { a.e. on } \mathbb{R}_{+} \times \Omega \tag{1.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

and it is proper, convex, l.s.c. (see [3, p. 6]) and periodic. Moreover, the following two Legendre-Fenchel relations take place (see [3, p. 8]),

$$
\begin{gather*}
j(t, x, r)+j^{*}(t, x, \omega) \geq r \omega \text { for any } r, \omega \in \mathbb{R}, \text { a.e. on } \mathbb{R}_{+} \times \Omega,  \tag{1.8}\\
j(t, x, r)+j^{*}(t, x, \omega)=r \omega \text { if and only if } \omega \in \partial j(t, x, r) \text {, a.e. on } \mathbb{R}_{+} \times \Omega \text {. } \tag{1.9}
\end{gather*}
$$

Our purpose is to prove an equivalence between (1.1) and a certain minimization problem for a functional defined using $j, j^{*}$ and (1.8)-(1.9).

This idea originates in the papers of Brezis and Ekeland from 1976 (see [4] and [5]) where a minimum principle for certain evolution equations (in particular for the classical heat equation) was formulated. More exactly, they considered the evolution equation with a potential operator

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{d u}{d t}(t)+\partial \varphi(u(t)) & \ni f(t) \text { a.e. } t \in(0, T),  \tag{1.10}\\
u(0) & =u_{0}
\end{align*}
$$

where $\varphi$ is proper, convex, l.s.c. on $H$ a Hilbert space, $u_{0} \in D(\varphi), f \in$ $L^{2}(0, T ; H)$. One defines

$$
K=\left\{\begin{array}{c}
v \in C([0, T] ; H) ; \frac{d v}{d t} \in L^{2}(0, T ; H), \varphi(v) \in L^{1}(0, T), \\
\varphi^{*}\left(f-\frac{d v}{d t}\right) \in L^{1}(0, T), v(0)=u_{0}
\end{array}\right\}
$$

and

$$
J(v)=\int_{0}^{T}\left\{\varphi(v)+\varphi^{*}\left(f-\frac{d v}{d t}\right)-(f, v)\right\} d t+\frac{1}{2}\|v(T)\|_{H}^{2}
$$

It was stated that the solution to (1.10) is the solution to the minimization problem

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { Minimize } J(v) \text { for all } v \in K \tag{1.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

and viceversa. The necessary implication is rather obvious due to (1.8)-(1.9), written for $\varphi$. The proof of the sufficient implication was possible due the fact that it was known (by a semigroup approach) that (1.10) has a solution.

Otherwise, the implication $(1.11) \Longrightarrow(1.10)$ can be hardly proved and this has been a challenge for many researchers in the past decades. We cite a few results on this subject, in which the study of $(1.11) \Longrightarrow(1.10)$ has been approached for particular assumptions on $\varphi:[1],[2],[6][7],[8],[9],[10]$.

Our approach investigates the existence of a periodic solution and it is based on the Legendre-Fenchel relations between $j$ and $j^{*}$ (and not using $\varphi$ and $\varphi^{*}$ ). We shall introduce a minimization problem $(P)$ for a functional defined on the basis of $j$ and $j^{*}$ and we shall show that (1.1) has a solution if and only if $(P)$ has a solution.

### 1.1. Functional setting

First, we specify the functional setting of the abstract formulation.
Let $m$ and $m^{\prime}$ such that $\frac{1}{m^{\prime}}+\frac{1}{m}=1$. For any $m \geq 2$, we denote by $X_{m}$ the space

$$
X_{m}:=\left\{\psi \in W^{2, m}(\Omega), \psi=0 \text { on } \Gamma\right\}
$$

and let

$$
B_{0, m} \psi=-\Delta \psi, B_{0, m}: D\left(B_{0, m}\right)=X_{m} \subset L^{m}(\Omega) \rightarrow L^{m}(\Omega) .
$$

We extend the operator $B_{0, m}$ from $L^{m}(\Omega)$ to the dual of $X_{m}$ by the relation

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\langle B_{m} y, \psi\right\rangle_{X_{m}^{\prime}, X_{m^{\prime}}}=\left(y, B_{0, m^{\prime}} \psi\right) \text { for } y \in L^{m}(\Omega) \text { and any } \psi \in X_{m^{\prime}}, \tag{1.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
B_{m}: D\left(B_{m}\right)=L^{m}(\Omega) \subset X_{m}^{\prime} \rightarrow X_{m}^{\prime},
$$

and

$$
(y, z):=\int_{\Omega} y(x) z(x) d x, \text { for } y \in L^{m}(\Omega), z \in L^{m^{\prime}}(\Omega)
$$

The dual $X_{m}^{\prime}$ is the completion of $L^{m}(\Omega)$ in the norm

$$
|\|y\||=\left\|B_{0, m}^{-1} y\right\|_{L^{m}(\Omega)}, \text { for } y \in L^{m}(\Omega)
$$

and the norm in $X_{m}^{\prime}$ is defined by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|y\|_{X_{m}^{\prime}}=\|\phi\|_{L^{m}(\Omega)} \tag{1.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\phi$ is the unique solution to $B_{m} \phi=y$.
Also, we consider the Hilbert space $V=H_{0}^{1}(\Omega)$ endowed with the standard Hilbertian norm, $\|\phi\|_{V}=\|\nabla \phi\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}$. The scalar product on its dual $V^{\prime}$ is defined as

$$
(y, \bar{y})_{V^{\prime}}=\left\langle y, B_{0,2}^{-1} \bar{y}\right\rangle_{V^{\prime}, V}, \text { for } \theta, \bar{\theta} \in V^{\prime}
$$

The results will be proved in the cases

$$
\begin{align*}
& N=1 \text { for all } m \geq 2  \tag{1.14}\\
& N \geq 2 \text { for } 2 \leq m \leq \frac{2 N}{N-1},
\end{align*}
$$

which ensure the Sobolev inequality $W^{1, m^{\prime}}(\Omega) \subset L^{m}(\Omega)$.

### 1.2. Statement of the problem

As usually, the problem will be studied first on a time period $(0, T)$, and then extended to all $\mathbb{R}_{+}$, so that we consider (1.1) on $Q=(0, T) \times \Omega$, i.e.,

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{\partial y}{\partial t}-\Delta \partial j(t, x, y) & \ni f & & \text { in } Q=(0, T) \times \Omega \\
y(t, x) & =0 & & \text { on } \Sigma=(0, T) \times \Gamma  \tag{1.15}\\
y(0, x) & =y(T, x) & & \text { in } \Omega .
\end{align*}
$$

Definition 1.1. Let $T>0$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
f \in L^{m^{\prime}}\left(0, T ; X_{m^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right) \tag{1.16}
\end{equation*}
$$

We call a periodic weak solution to (1.15) a pair $(y, \eta)$, such that

$$
\begin{gathered}
y \in L^{m}(Q) \cap W^{1, m^{\prime}}\left([0, T] ; X_{m^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right) \\
\eta \in L^{m^{\prime}}(Q), \eta(t, x) \in \partial j(t, x, y(t, x)) \text { a.e. }(t, x) \in Q
\end{gathered}
$$

which satisfies the equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{0}^{T}\left\langle\frac{d y}{d t}(t), \psi(t)\right\rangle_{X_{m^{\prime}}^{\prime}, X_{m}} d t+\int_{Q} \eta B_{0, m}^{-1} \psi d x d t=\int_{0}^{T}\langle f(t), \psi(t)\rangle_{X_{m^{\prime}}^{\prime}, X_{m}} d t \tag{1.17}
\end{equation*}
$$

for any $\psi \in L^{m}\left(0, T ; X_{m}\right)$, and the condition $y(0, x)=y(T, x)$, a.e. $(t, x) \in$ $Q$.

We consider the abstract Cauchy problem

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{d y}{d t}(t)+B_{m^{\prime}} \partial j(t, x, y(t)) & \ni f(t), \text { a.e. } t \in(0, T)  \tag{1.18}\\
y(0) & =y(T),
\end{align*}
$$

and we introduce the functional

$$
\begin{gather*}
J: L^{m}(Q) \times L^{m^{\prime}}(Q) \rightarrow(-\infty, \infty] \\
J(y, w)= \begin{cases}\int_{Q}\left(j(t, x, y(t, x))+j^{*}(t, x, w(t, x))-w(t, x) y(t, x)\right) d x d t \\
& \text { if }(y, w) \in U \\
+\infty, & \text { otherwise },\end{cases} \tag{1.19}
\end{gather*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{align*}
& U=\left\{\begin{aligned}
(y, w) \mid y \in L^{m}(Q) \cap W^{1, m^{\prime}}\left([0, T] ; X_{m^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right), y(0)=y(T) \in V^{\prime}, \\
w \in L^{m^{\prime}}(Q), j(\cdot, \cdot, y), j^{*}(\cdot, \cdot, w) \in L^{1}(Q),(y, w) \text { satisfies }(1.20)
\end{aligned}\right\}, \\
& \frac{d y}{d t}(t)+B_{m^{\prime}} w(t)=f(t) \text { a.e. } t \in(0, T),  \tag{1.20}\\
& y(0)=y(T) .
\end{align*}
$$

The set $U$ is not empty, since it contains any constant in time function $y$ and $w(t)=B_{m^{\prime}}^{-1} f(t)$, a.e. $t \in(0, T)$.

A solution to (1.20) is a pair $(y, w), y \in L^{m}(Q) \cap W^{1, m^{\prime}}\left([0, T] ; X_{m^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right)$, $w \in L^{m^{\prime}}(Q)$, which satisfies

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{0}^{T}\left\langle\frac{d y}{d t}(t), \psi(t)\right\rangle_{X_{m^{\prime}}^{\prime}, X_{m}} d t+\int_{0}^{T} \int_{\Omega} w B_{0, m} \psi d x d t=\int_{0}^{T}\langle f(t), \psi(t)\rangle_{X_{m^{\prime}}^{\prime}, X_{m}} d t \tag{1.21}
\end{equation*}
$$

for all $\psi \in L^{m}\left(0, T ; X_{m}\right)$ and $y(0)=y(T)$.
Finally, the minimization problem to be studied is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { Minimize } J(y, w) \text { for all }(y, w) \in U \text {. } \tag{P}
\end{equation*}
$$

It can be easily seen that if $(y, \eta)$ is the unique periodic weak solution to (1.15) (equivalently the strong solution to (1.18)) then the minimum in $(P)$ exists and it is zero, due to (1.8) and (1.9). We shall focus on the converse assertion meaning that $(P)$ has a null minimizer (at which $J$ is zero) and it is the unique weak solution to (1.15).

## 2. Main results

This section is devoted to the study of the existence of a solution to the minimization problem $(P)$, and to the equivalence between $(P)$ and (1.15), or (1.18).
We assume the hypotheses (1.16), (a)-(c), (1.4)-(1.6) replacing $\mathbb{R}_{+} \times \Omega$ by $Q$.
Theorem 2.1. Problem ( $P$ ) has at least a solution ( $y^{*}, w^{*}$ ).
Proof. First, we are going to prove that $J$ is proper, convex and l.s.c. Let $(y, w) \in U$ and test (1.20) by $B_{0, m}^{-1} y(t)$ and integrate over $(0, t)$. We get

$$
\begin{align*}
& \int_{0}^{t}\left\langle\frac{d y}{d \tau}(\tau), B_{0, m}^{-1} y(\tau)\right\rangle_{X_{m^{\prime}}^{\prime}, X_{m}} d \tau+\int_{0}^{t} \int_{\Omega} w y d x d \tau  \tag{2.1}\\
= & \int_{0}^{t}\left\langle f(\tau), B_{0, m}^{-1} y(\tau)\right\rangle_{X_{m^{\prime}}^{\prime}, X_{m}} d \tau .
\end{align*}
$$

Denoting $B_{0, m}^{-1} y(\tau)=\psi(t)$ a.e. $t$ and computing the first term we find that

$$
\int_{0}^{t}\left\langle\frac{d y}{d \tau}(\tau), B_{0, m}^{-1} y(\tau)\right\rangle_{X_{m^{\prime}}^{\prime}, X_{m}} d \tau=\frac{1}{2}\left(\|y(t)\|_{V^{\prime}}^{2}-\|y(0)\|_{V^{\prime}}^{2}\right),
$$

and we replace in (2.1)

$$
\begin{align*}
& -\int_{0}^{t} \int_{\Omega} w y d x d \tau  \tag{2.2}\\
= & \frac{1}{2}\|y(t)\|_{V^{\prime}}^{2}-\frac{1}{2}\|y(0)\|_{V^{\prime}}^{2}-\int_{0}^{t}\left\langle f(\tau), B_{0, m}^{-1} y(\tau)\right\rangle_{X_{m^{\prime}}^{\prime}, X_{m}} d \tau,
\end{align*}
$$

a.e. $t \in(0, T)$.

Since $t \rightarrow-\int_{0}^{t} \int_{\Omega} y w d x d \tau+\int_{0}^{t}\left\langle f(\tau), A_{0, m}^{-1} y(\tau)\right\rangle_{X_{m^{\prime}}^{\prime}, X_{m}} d \tau$ is continuous, the previous equality is true for $t=T$, too. Then, the first two terms on the right-hand side vanish by periodicity and resuming the expression of $J$ we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.=\int_{Q}^{J(y, w)} j(t, x, y(t, x))+j^{*}(t, x, w(t, x))\right) d x d t-\int_{0}^{T}\left\langle f(\tau), B_{0, m}^{-1} y(\tau)\right\rangle_{X_{m^{\prime}}^{\prime}, X_{m}} d \tau . \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

This shows that $J$ is convex and l.s.c. Also, it is proper because by (1.19) and (1.8) it is nonnegative. Therefore, it has an infimum denoted

$$
d:=\inf \{J(y, w) \mid(y, w) \in U\} .
$$

We take $\left(y_{n}, w_{n}\right)_{n \geq 1}$ a minimizing sequence for $(P)$, i.e.,

$$
\begin{equation*}
d \leq J\left(y_{n}, w_{n}\right) \leq d+\frac{1}{n} \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\left(y_{n}, w_{n}\right)$ is the solution to

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{d y_{n}}{d t}(t)+B_{m^{\prime}} w_{n}(t) & =f(t), \text { a.e. } t \in(0, T),  \tag{2.5}\\
y_{n}(0) & =y_{n}(T)
\end{align*}
$$

By the Young inequality we compute

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \int_{0}^{T}\left\langle f(t), B_{0, m}^{-1} y(t)\right\rangle_{X_{m^{\prime}}^{\prime}, X_{m}} d t \leq \int_{0}^{T}\|f(t)\|_{X_{m^{\prime}}^{\prime}}\|y(t)\|_{L^{m}(\Omega)} d t \\
\leq & \frac{C_{1}}{m}\|y\|_{L^{m}(Q)}^{m}+\frac{1}{m^{\prime} C_{1} m^{\prime} / m}\|f\|_{L^{m^{\prime}}\left(0, T ; X_{m^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right)}^{m^{\prime}},
\end{aligned}
$$

and using (1.4) it follows that

$$
\begin{align*}
& J(y, w)  \tag{2.6}\\
\geq & \frac{C_{1}}{m^{\prime}}\|y\|_{L^{m}(Q)}^{m}+C_{1}^{0}+C_{3}\|w\|_{L^{m^{\prime}}(Q)}^{m^{\prime}}+C_{3}^{0}-\frac{1}{m^{\prime} C_{1} m^{\prime} / m} \int_{0}^{T}\|f(t)\|_{X_{m^{\prime}}^{\prime}}^{m^{\prime}} d t .
\end{align*}
$$

By (2.4) and (2.6) we get that

$$
\left\|y_{n}\right\|_{L^{m}(Q)} \leq C, \quad\left\|w_{n}\right\|_{L^{m^{\prime}}(Q)} \leq C,
$$

with $C$ denoting various constants independent of $n$.
It follows that we can extract subsequences denoted by the same subscript $n$, such that

$$
\begin{gather*}
y_{n} \rightharpoonup y^{*} \text { in } L^{m}\left(0, T ; L^{m}(\Omega)\right), \text { as } n \rightarrow \infty,  \tag{2.7}\\
w_{n} \rightharpoonup w^{*} \text { in } L^{m^{\prime}}\left(0, T ; L^{m^{\prime}}(\Omega)\right), \text { as } n \rightarrow \infty . \tag{2.8}
\end{gather*}
$$

We denote by $\rightharpoonup$ and $\rightarrow$ the weak and strong convergence, respectively.
Next, by the definition of $B_{m^{\prime}}$ we have

$$
\int_{0}^{T}\left\langle B_{m^{\prime}}\left(w_{n}-w^{*}\right)(t), \psi(t)\right\rangle_{X_{m^{\prime}}^{\prime}, X_{m}} d t=\int_{0}^{T}\left(\left(w_{n}-w^{*}\right)(t), B_{0, m} \psi(t)\right) d t
$$

for any $\psi \in L^{m}\left(0, T ; X_{m}\right)$ and so we can deduce that

$$
\begin{equation*}
B_{m^{\prime}} w_{n} \rightharpoonup B_{m^{\prime}} w^{*} \text { in } L^{m^{\prime}}\left(0, T ; X_{m^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right), \text { as } n \rightarrow \infty \tag{2.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

By (2.5) we get that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{d y_{n}}{d t} \rightharpoonup \frac{d y^{*}}{d t} \text { in } L^{m^{\prime}}\left(0, T ; X_{m^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right), \text { as } n \rightarrow \infty \tag{2.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

and we note that

$$
\int_{0}^{T}\left\langle f(t), B_{0, m}^{-1} y_{n}(t)\right\rangle_{X_{m^{\prime}}^{\prime}, X_{m}} d t \rightarrow \int_{0}^{T}\left\langle f(t), B_{0, m}^{-1} y^{*}(t)\right\rangle_{X_{m^{\prime}}^{\prime}, X_{m}} d t
$$

Since $L^{m}(\Omega)$ is compact in $V^{\prime}$ it follows by (2.7) and (2.10) that

$$
\begin{equation*}
y_{n} \rightarrow y^{*} \text { in } L^{m}\left(0, T ; V^{\prime}\right), \text { as } n \rightarrow \infty \tag{2.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

whence

$$
\begin{equation*}
y_{n}(t) \rightarrow y^{*}(t) \text { in } V^{\prime} \text {, as } n \rightarrow \infty, \text { a.e. } t \in(0, T) \tag{2.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

Also, by (2.2) we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left\|y_{n}(t)\right\|_{V^{\prime}}^{2} \leq\|y(0)\|_{V^{\prime}}^{2}+\frac{2}{m^{\prime}} \int_{0}^{T}\left\|w_{n}(t)\right\|_{L^{m^{\prime}}(\Omega)}^{m^{\prime}} d t \\
& +\frac{2}{m} \int_{0}^{T}\left\|y_{n}(t)\right\|_{L^{m}(\Omega)}^{m} d t+2 \int_{0}^{T}\|f(t)\|_{X_{m^{\prime}}^{\prime}}\left\|y_{n}(t)\right\|_{L^{m}(Q)} d t \\
\leq & C, \text { for any } t \in(0, T) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $y_{n}(0)=y_{n}(T) \in V^{\prime}$ it follows that $\left(y_{n}(t)\right)_{n}$ is bounded in $V^{\prime}$ for any $t \in[0, T]$. Therefore, by the Ascoli-Arzelà theorem we can deduce that

$$
\begin{equation*}
y_{n}(t) \rightarrow y^{*}(t) \text { in } X_{m^{\prime}}^{\prime}, \text { as } n \rightarrow \infty, \text { uniformly in } t \in[0, T] \tag{2.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

and so, by the periodicity condition, we get $y^{*}(0)=y^{*}(T)$.
Now, we can pass to the limit in (2.4). We use the fact that the functions $\varphi\left(y_{n}\right)=\int_{Q} j\left(t, x, y_{n}\right) d x d t$ and $\varphi^{*}\left(w_{n}\right)=\int_{Q} j^{*}\left(t, x, w_{n}\right) d x d t$ are weakly l.s.c. (see [3, p. 56]) and get

$$
d \leq J\left(y^{*}, w^{*}\right) \leq \liminf _{n \rightarrow \infty} J\left(y_{n}, w_{n}\right) \leq d
$$

which shows that $\left(y^{*}, w^{*}\right)$ realizes the minimum in $(P)$. Passing to the limit in the equivalent form of (2.5)

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{0}^{T}\left\langle\frac{d y_{n}}{d t}(t)+B_{m^{\prime}} w_{n}(t), \phi(t)\right\rangle_{X_{m^{\prime}}^{\prime}, X_{m}} d t=\int_{0}^{T}\langle f(t), \phi(t)\rangle_{X_{m^{\prime}}^{\prime}, X_{m}} d t \tag{2.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

for any $\phi \in L^{m}\left(0, T ; X_{m}\right)$, we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{0}^{T}\left\langle\frac{d y^{*}}{d t}(t)+B_{m^{\prime}} w^{*}(t), \phi(t)\right\rangle_{X_{m^{\prime}}^{\prime}, X_{m}} d t=\int_{0}^{T}\langle f(t), \phi(t)\rangle_{X_{m^{\prime}}^{\prime}, X_{m}} d t \tag{2.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

for any $\phi \in L^{m}\left(0, T ; X_{m}\right)$. Therefore $\left(y^{*}, w^{*}\right)$ is the solution to (1.20) and so it belongs to $U$.

In conclusion $(P)$ reaches at $\left(y^{*}, w^{*}\right)$ its minimum on $U$.

We mention that by some algebra, hypothesis (1.4) implies

$$
\begin{equation*}
C_{3}|\omega|^{m^{\prime}}+C_{3}^{0} \leq j^{*}(t, x, \omega) \leq C_{4}|\omega|^{m^{\prime}}+C_{4}^{0}, \tag{2.16}
\end{equation*}
$$

for any $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$, a.e. $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}_{+} \times \Omega$, with $C_{3}>0$,

$$
\begin{align*}
& |q(t, x)| \leq C_{5}|r|^{m-1}+C_{5}^{0}, q(t, x) \in \partial j(t, x, r) \text { a.e. on } \mathbb{R}_{+} \times \Omega,  \tag{2.17}\\
& |z(t, x)| \leq C_{6}|\omega|^{m^{\prime}-1}+C_{6}^{0}, z(t, x) \in \partial j^{*}(t, x, \omega) \text { a.e. on } \mathbb{R}_{+} \times \Omega, \tag{2.18}
\end{align*}
$$

and we recall that $\partial j^{*}(t, x, \omega)=(\partial j)^{-1}(t, x, \omega)($ see $[3, \mathrm{p} .8])$.
Moreover, by (2.17) and (2.18) we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
z \in L^{m}(Q), q \in L^{m^{\prime}}(Q) \tag{2.19}
\end{equation*}
$$

The next result shows the equivalence between (1.15) and ( $P$ ), i.e., that the minimum in $(P)$ is zero and that it is reached at the solution to (1.15).
Theorem 2.2. Let the pair $\left(y^{*}, w^{*}\right)$ be a solution to $(P)$. Then,

$$
\begin{gather*}
w^{*}(t, x) \in \partial j\left(t, x, y^{*}(t, x)\right) \text { a.e. }(t, x) \in Q,  \tag{2.20}\\
\min _{(y, w) \in U} J(y, w)=0=J\left(y^{*}, w^{*}\right), \tag{2.21}
\end{gather*}
$$

and $\left(y^{*}, w^{*}\right)$ is the unique weak solution to (1.15).
Proof. Let $\left(y^{*}, w^{*}\right)$ be a solution to $(P)$. Then $\left(y^{*}, w^{*}\right)$ satisfies (1.20),

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{d y^{*}}{d t}(t)+B_{m^{\prime}} w^{*}(t) & =f(t) \text { a.e. } t \in(0, T),  \tag{2.22}\\
y^{*}(0) & =y^{*}(T)
\end{align*}
$$

and it minimizes $J$, i.e.,

$$
\begin{equation*}
J\left(y^{*}, w^{*}\right) \leq J(y, w) \text { for any }(y, w) \in U . \tag{2.23}
\end{equation*}
$$

We introduce the variations

$$
y^{\lambda}=y^{*}+\lambda Y, w^{\lambda}=w^{*}+\lambda W, \lambda>0
$$

with $(Y, W)$ regular enough, e.g., $C^{\infty}(\bar{Q}), Y(0)=Y(T)$, such that $\left(y^{\lambda}, w^{\lambda}\right) \in$ $U$. Then, the pair $\left(y^{\lambda}, w^{\lambda}\right)$ satisfies (1.20)

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{d y^{\lambda}}{d t}(t)+B_{m^{\prime}} w^{\lambda}(t) & =f(t) \text { a.e. } t \in(0, T), \\
y^{\lambda}(0) & =y^{\lambda}(T)
\end{aligned}
$$

and so $(Y, W)$ is the solution to the problem

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{d Y}{d t}(t)+B_{0, m} W(t) & =0 \text { a.e. } t \in(0, T)  \tag{2.24}\\
Y(0) & =Y(T)
\end{align*}
$$

This implies that

$$
\begin{equation*}
W(t)=-B_{0, m}^{-1} \frac{d Y}{d t}(t), t \in[0, T] . \tag{2.25}
\end{equation*}
$$

We replace $(y, w)$ by $\left(y^{\lambda}, w^{\lambda}\right)$ in (2.23), and taking into account the expression (2.3) we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \int_{Q}\left(j\left(t, x, y^{\lambda}\right)-j\left(t, x, y^{*}\right)+j^{*}\left(t, x, w^{\lambda}\right)-j^{*}\left(t, x, w^{*}\right)\right) d x d t \\
& -\int_{0}^{T}\left\langle f(t), B_{0, m}^{-1}\left(y^{\lambda}(t)-y^{*}(t)\right)\right\rangle_{X_{m^{\prime}}^{\prime}, X_{m}} d t \geq 0
\end{aligned}
$$

Next we divide by $\lambda>0$ and pass to the limit as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$. We use the definition of the directional derivative

$$
\lim _{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \int_{Q} \frac{j\left(t, x, y^{*}+\lambda Y\right)-j\left(t, x, y^{*}\right)}{\lambda} d x d t=\int_{Q} j^{\prime}\left(t, x, y^{*} ; Y\right) d x d t
$$

and we obtain
$\int_{Q}\left(j^{\prime}\left(t, x, y^{*} ; Y\right)+\left(j^{*}\right)^{\prime}\left(t, x, w^{*} ; W\right)\right) d x d t-\int_{0}^{T}\left\langle f(t), B_{0, m}^{-1} Y(t)\right\rangle_{X_{m^{\prime}}^{\prime}, X_{m}} d t \geq 0$.
Passing from $\lambda$ to $-\lambda$, using the property of the directional derivative

$$
\int_{Q} j^{\prime}\left(t, x, y^{*} ; Y\right) d x d t \geq \int_{Q} \eta^{*} Y d x d t, \text { for all } \eta^{*}(t, x) \in \partial j\left(t, x, y^{*}\right)
$$

passing then from $(Y, W)$ to $(-Y,-W)$, and repeating all computations we finally obtain that

$$
\int_{0}^{T} \int_{\Omega}\left(\eta^{*} Y+\zeta^{*} W\right) d x d t-\int_{0}^{T}\left\langle f(t), B_{0, m}^{-1} Y(t)\right\rangle_{X_{m^{\prime}}^{\prime}, X_{m}} d t=0
$$

where $\zeta^{*}(t, x)=\partial j^{*}\left(t, x, w^{*}\right)=(\partial j)^{-1}\left(t, x, w^{*}\right)$.
Now, we replace $W$ by (2.25) and rewrite the first term, getting

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \int_{0}^{T}\left\langle B_{m^{\prime}} \eta^{*}(t), B_{0, m}^{-1} Y(t)\right\rangle_{X_{m^{\prime}}^{\prime}, X_{m}} d t-\int_{0}^{T}\left\langle\zeta^{*}(t), B_{0, m}^{-1} \frac{d Y}{d t}(t)\right\rangle_{X_{m^{\prime}}^{\prime}, X_{m}} d t \\
= & \int_{0}^{T}\left\langle f(t), B_{0, m}^{-1} Y(t)\right\rangle_{X_{m^{\prime}}^{\prime}, X_{m}} d t
\end{aligned}
$$

and next we compute

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \int_{0}^{T}\left\langle B_{m^{\prime}} \eta^{*}(t), B_{0, m}^{-1} Y(t)\right\rangle_{X_{m^{\prime}}^{\prime}, X_{m}} d t+\int_{0}^{T}\left\langle\frac{d \zeta^{*}}{d t}(t), B_{0, m}^{-1} Y(t)\right\rangle_{X_{m^{\prime}}^{\prime}, X_{m}} d t \\
& -\left\langle\zeta^{*}(T), B_{0, m}^{-1} Y(T)\right\rangle_{X_{m^{\prime}}^{\prime}, X_{m}}+\left\langle\zeta^{*}(0), B_{0, m}^{-1} Y(0)\right\rangle_{X_{m^{\prime}}^{\prime}, X_{m}} \\
= & \int_{0}^{T}\left\langle f(t), B_{0, m}^{-1} Y(t)\right\rangle_{X_{m^{\prime}}^{\prime}, X_{m}} d t .
\end{aligned}
$$

We recall that $Y(0)=Y(T),(\partial j)^{-1}$ is single valued and periodic with respect to $t$, by hypotheses, and so we deduce that $\zeta^{*}(T)=\zeta^{*}(0)$. Then, we can write

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{0}^{T}\left\langle\frac{d \zeta^{*}}{d t}(t)+B_{m^{\prime}} \eta^{*}(t)-f(t), B_{0, m}^{-1} Y(t)\right\rangle_{X_{m^{\prime}}^{\prime}, X_{m}} d t=0 \tag{2.26}
\end{equation*}
$$

which take place for any $Y \in C^{\infty}(\bar{Q})$. Therefore, we can write the equation

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{d \zeta^{*}}{d t}(t)+B_{m^{\prime}} \eta^{*}(t) & =f(t), \text { a.e. } t \in(0, T)  \tag{2.27}\\
\zeta^{*}(T) & =\zeta^{*}(0)
\end{align*}
$$

Now we make the difference between (2.27) and (2.22) and denoting

$$
p(t, x)=\zeta^{*}(t, x)-y^{*}(t, x), \quad p \in L^{m}(Q)
$$

we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
-\frac{d p}{d t}(t)+B_{m^{\prime}}\left(w^{*}-\eta^{*}\right)(t) & =0, \text { a.e. } t \in(0, T), \\
p(0) & =p(T) .
\end{aligned}
$$

We test the equation for $B_{0, m}^{-1} p(t)$ and integrate over $(0, t)$, obtaining

$$
\int_{0}^{t} \int_{\Omega}\left(\eta^{*}-w^{*}\right)\left(y^{*}-\zeta^{*}\right) d x d t=0
$$

Since $w^{*}(t, x) \in \partial j\left(t, x, \zeta^{*}(t, x)\right)$ and $\eta^{*}(t, x) \in \partial j\left(t, x, y^{*}(t, x)\right)$ a.e. on $Q$, it follows by the maximal monotony of $\partial j$ that

$$
\rho\left\|y^{*}-\zeta^{*}\right\|_{L^{2}(Q)}^{2} \leq 0
$$

which implies

$$
\begin{equation*}
y^{*}(t, x)=\zeta^{*}(t, x) \in(\partial j)^{-1}\left(t, x, w^{*}(t, x)\right), \text { a.e. }(t, x) \in Q . \tag{2.28}
\end{equation*}
$$

This turns out into (2.20), as claimed and proves that $\left(y^{*}, w^{*}\right)$ is a weak solution to (1.15), satisfying $J\left(y^{*}, w^{*}\right)=0$.

Now we prove that the solution is unique. Indeed, if there exists another solution $(\widetilde{y}, \widetilde{w})$ to (1.15) corresponding to the same data, we write the equations satisfied by their difference

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{d(y-\widetilde{y})}{d t}(t)+B_{m^{\prime}}(\eta-\widetilde{\eta})(t) & =0 \text { a.e. } t \in(0, T) \\
(y-\widetilde{y})(0) & =(y-\widetilde{y})(T)
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\eta(t, x) \in \partial j(t, x, y(t, x)), \widetilde{\eta}(t, x) \in \partial j(t, x, \widetilde{y}(t, x))$ a.e. on $Q$, and $(y, \eta)$ and $(\widetilde{y}, \widetilde{\eta})$ belong to $U$.

We multiply the equation by $B_{0, m}^{-1}(y-\widetilde{y})(t)$ and integrate over $(0, t)$ obtaining

$$
\int_{0}^{t}(\eta(t)-\widetilde{\eta}(t), y(t)-\widetilde{y}(t)) d t=0
$$

We get again $\rho\|y(t)-\widetilde{y}(t)\|_{L^{2}(Q)}^{2} \leq 0$, hence $y(t, x)=\widetilde{y}(t, x)$ a.e. on $Q$.
Corollary 2.3. Under the assumptions (a)-(c), (1.2)-(1.6) problem (1.1) has a unique periodic solution.

Proof. Problem (1.1) is reduced to (1.15) due to the periodicity of the functions $f$ and $j$. We make the transformation $t^{\prime}=t-T$ and by this variable change we denote $\widetilde{y}\left(t^{\prime}, x\right)=y(t+T, x)$ with $t^{\prime} \in[0, T]$. Using now the periodicity of the functions $f$ and $j$ we find again problem (1.18) which has a unique periodic solution $\widetilde{y}\left(t^{\prime}\right)$ belonging to $C\left([0, T] ; V^{\prime}\right)$, such that $\widetilde{y}(0)=\widetilde{y}(T)$. Coming back to the variable $t$ we obtain that (1.1) has a continuous periodic solution on $[T, 2 T]$ such that $y(T)=y(2 T)$ and the procedure is continued on each time period.
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