

THE STUDY OF A CRITICAL POINT IN AN EQUATION
OF TRANSFER THEORY

R. S. Levitin

UDC 536.24:517.9

An investigation was carried out to establish the conditions for the appearance and disappearance of a compressed bundle of trajectories, leaving from a critical point of an equation in the self-similar case under the presence of nonsmooth perturbing forces.

1°. Some problems of transfer theory (heat-transfer diffusion) in the presence of self-similarity are reduced to ordinary differential equations of the form

$$\alpha(x) \frac{dz}{dx} = F(x, z), \quad (1)$$

for which it is necessary to elucidate the existence and the behavior of O-curves near the origin (0, 0) which is a singular point. First we give the following theorem, from which follows the formulation of the problem.

The Hartman–Wintner Theorem [1]. Assume that in Eq. (1):

- 1) the function $F(x, z)$ is defined and continuous with respect to x, z in the domain

$$0 < x \leq x_0, \quad -z_0 \leq z \leq z_0, \quad (2)$$

where x_0 and z_0 are positive numbers; $1/F(x, z)$ is bounded for $0 < x \leq \varepsilon$, $\tau \leq |z| \leq z_0$, where $\tau > 0$ is an arbitrarily small; ε is a sufficiently small number;

- 2) $F(x, -z_0) > 0$, $F(x, z_0) < 0$ for $0 < x \leq x_0$;
3) the function $\alpha(x)$ is defined, continuous and positive for $0 < x \leq x_0$,

$$\int_0^{x_0} \frac{dx}{\alpha(x)} = +\infty.$$

Then there exists at least one solution $z = z(x)$ of Eq. (1), which is defined in the interval $0 < x \leq x_0$, and every such solution has the property: $z(x) \rightarrow 0$ for $x \rightarrow 0$ (i.e., represents an O-curve of Eq. (1)).

Thus, under the conditions of the above given theorem for Eq. (1), there exists in the domain (2) either one O-curve or an uncountable set of O-curves, i.e., there arises the problem of distinguishing the O-curves.

Below we give uniqueness and nonuniqueness theorems for the O-curves.

In [2], Andreev establishes a uniqueness theorem for O-curves if the conditions of the Hartman–Wintner theorem are satisfied. To this end he gives the following lemma.

LEMMA. We assume that for Eq. (1):

- 1) the conditions of the Hartman–Wintner theorem hold;
2) in the domain (2) (or any subdomain of the same form) for

$$F(x, z_1) - F(x, z_2) \leq \lambda(x)(z_1 - z_2),$$

Institute of Heat and Mass Transfer, Academy of Sciences of the Belorussian SSR, Minsk. Translated from *Inzhenerno-Fizicheskii Zhurnal*, Vol. 17, No. 3, pp. 565-569, September, 1969. Original article submitted October 25, 1968.

© 1972 Consultants Bureau, a division of Plenum Publishing Corporation, 227 West 17th Street, New York, N. Y. 10011. All rights reserved. This article cannot be reproduced for any purpose whatsoever without permission of the publisher. A copy of this article is available from the publisher for \$15.00.

where $\lambda(x)$ is continuous for $x \in (0, x_0]$, we have

$$\int_x^{x_0} \frac{\lambda(x)}{\alpha(x)} dx \leq M < +\infty, \quad (3)$$

M being a constant and x any number from $(0, x_0)$.

Then, Eq. (1) has a unique O-curve in the domain (2).

This lemma is an immediate generalization of Lohn's lemma ([3], p. 115) and can be proved by the same simple method.

In order to obtain a stronger statement about the uniqueness of the O-curve, Andreev makes, naturally, additional assumptions relative to the structure of the right-hand side of (1) (for example, its representability in the form $F(x, z) = \Phi(x, z) + \eta(x, z)$ and the Lipschitz condition with respect to z). His uniqueness theorem establishes a relation between the Lipschitz coefficient, depending on x , the comparison introduced by him, which characterizes the smallness of the perturbation $\eta(x, z)$, and the function $\alpha(x)$.

If we seek the conditions for the uniqueness of the O-curve for (1) in the case when $F(x, z)$ is from the Osgood class, which will be defined below in a precise manner, then, apparently, the following theorem which generalizes Lohn's lemma will be useful.

THEOREM 1. Assume that for Eq. (1):

- 1) the Hartman–Wintner conditions hold;
- 2) in the domain (2) (or any subdomain of the same form) for $z_1 > z_2$ we have

$$F(x, z_1) - F(x, z_2) \leq \lambda(x) \omega_3(z_1 - z_2),$$

where

$$\int_x^{x_0} \frac{\lambda(x)}{\alpha(x)} dx \leq M < +\infty,$$

$\omega_3(\tau)$ is a continuous function, $\omega_3(0) = 0$, $\omega_3(\tau) > 0$ for $\tau > 0$,

$$\int_0^v \frac{d\tau}{\omega_3(\tau)} < \infty \quad (v > 0).$$

Then Eq. (1) has in the domain (2) a unique O-curve.

Hartman and Wintner apply their theorem to the generalized Briot–Bouquet equation

$$x^q z' = -pz + f(x, z), \quad (4)$$

where $q \geq 1$; $f(x, z)$ is a real single-valued function, continuous in the rectangle

$$0 \leq x \leq x_0, \quad -z_0 \leq z \leq z_0;$$

finally, p is an arbitrary positive number.

They have obtained the following corollary.

COROLLARY. If

$$f(0, z) = o(z) \quad \text{for } z \rightarrow 0$$

(in fact it is sufficient if $|f(0, z)| \leq p|z|$ for small $|z|$, $0 < |z| \leq z_0$), then Eq. (4) has at least one solution $z = z(x)$, which exists for all small $x > 0$, and all these solutions are O-curves.

Then, the authors of [1] make the following remark: if the conditions of the corollary hold, then in order to guarantee the uniqueness of the O-curve it is sufficient to require the growth of $f(x, z)$ with z .

For our part we obtain the following corollary.

COROLLARY. For the uniqueness of the O-curve it is sufficient to require that

$$f(x, z_1) - f(x, z_2) \leq \lambda(x) \omega_3(z_1 - z_2) \quad (z_1 > z_2),$$

where $\lambda(x)$ and $\omega_3(x)$ are defined as in Theorem 1.

2°. We consider the "algebroid" differential equation

$$y' = \frac{P_n(x, y) + f_n(x, y)}{Q_n(x, y) + g_n(x, y)}, \quad (5)$$

where P_n, Q_n are homogeneous polynomials of integer exponent $n > 1$:

$$P_n = a_{n-1}yx^{n-1} + \sum_{k=2}^n a_{n-k}y^kx^{n-k}, \quad (6)$$

$$Q_n = b_nx^n + \sum_{k=2}^n b_{n-k}y^kx^{n-k}, \quad (7)$$

while $f_n(x, y), g_n(x, y)$ are continuous in the domain $R_1: |x| \leq a, |y| \leq b$ and

$$f_n, g_n = o(r^n) \quad \text{for } r = |x| + |y| \rightarrow 0. \quad (8)$$

In the formulas (6), (7) in the case $n = 1$, the empty sums are considered to be equal to zero.

We assume that

$$(a_{n-1} - b_n)b_n < 0.$$

Then for (5) there arises Frommer's first discernment problem (see [3], p. 108: $G(0) = b_n, C = a_{n-1} - b_n$, i.e., $CG(0) = (a_{n-1} - b_n)b_n < 0$), i.e., it is necessary to clarify whether one or several integral curves (K-curves) tend to the point $(0, 0)$ along simple exceptional directions which are semiaxes of the x-axis.

A survey and criticism of the papers dealing with the indicated problem is given by Andreev [4].

We give a nonuniqueness theorem and a uniqueness theorem for the perturbations f_n, g_n from the Osgood and Tamarkine classes which are defined below. We note that, as a rule, the authors usually assume that f_n and g_n are from the Lipschitz class.

For our purposes it is sufficient to consider the domain

$$R: 0 \leq x \leq a, |y| \leq b \quad (9)$$

and, without loss of generality, to assume

$$\mu < b_n = 1, \quad \mu \frac{df}{dx} a_{n-1}.$$

Definition 1. We consider the family $\{f(x, y)\}$ of functions, Lebesgue measurable with respect to x for each fixed y and continuous with respect to y for each fixed x from the domain R . This family will be called a Tamarkine class if there exist measurable nonnegative functions $s(x)$ and $\omega(t)$, $s(x) > 0$ for $x > 0$, $\omega(t) > 0$ for $t > 0$,

$$\int_0^t \frac{dy}{\omega(y)} < \infty \quad (t > 0),$$

such that in R we have

$$|f(x, y) - f(x, y(x))| \geq s(x) \omega(|y - y(x)|),^*$$

where $y = y(x)$ is some continuous curve from the domain R .

The family $\{f(x, y)\}$ will be called an Osgood class if there exist measurable nonnegative functions $s_1(x)$ and $\omega_1(t)$

* For some subclass of such functions $f \in C, J$. Tamarkine [5] has proved a nonuniqueness theorem for the solution of the Cauchy problem of $y' = f(x, y)$.

$$\int_0^t \frac{dt}{\omega_1(t)} = +\infty^* \quad (t > 0), \quad (10)$$

such that in R we have

$$|f(x, y_1) - f(x, y_2)| \leq s_1(x) \omega_1(|y_1 - y_2|).$$

Definition 2. A continuous curve $y = y(x)$ from the domain R will be called a K-curve if $y(x)/x \rightarrow 0$ for $x \rightarrow 0$, and will be called a K-solution if it also satisfies (5).

Two K-solutions $y = y_1(x)$ and $y = y_2(x)$ are said to be essentially distinct, if $\exists x_0 \in (0, a]$ such that $\forall x \in (0, x_0) y_1(x) \neq y_2(x)$.

The K-solutions $y = Y_1(x)$ and $y = Y_2(x)$ will be called respectively the upper and the lower K-solutions of (5), if for every K-solution $y = y(x)$ of (5) we have: $Y_2(x) \leq y(x) \leq Y_1(x)$. It is easy to prove the existence and the uniqueness of such solutions.

We consider the class of pairs of functions f_n, g_n , formed by functions f_n from the Tamarkine class and by functions g_n from the Osgood class, such that the following conditions hold in R. For f_n :

$$|\hat{f}_n(x, y) - \hat{f}_n(x, \theta(x))| \geq s(x) x^{\alpha-1} \omega(|y - \theta(x)|), \quad (11)$$

where $y = \theta(x)$ is some fixed K-solution of (5); $s(x)$ and $\omega(t)$ are measurable and nonnegative; $s(x) > 0$ for $x > 0$, $\omega(t) > 0$ for $t > 0$,

$$\int_0^v \frac{dt}{\omega(t)} < \infty \quad (v > 0), \quad (12)$$

and for g_n at least one of the following two inequalities holds

$$|g_n(x, y_1) - g_n(x, y_2)| \leq L x^{\alpha-1} |y_1 - y_2|, \quad (L \geq 0), \quad (13)$$

$$|g_n(x, y_1) - g_n(x, y_2)| \leq s(x) x^{\alpha-1} \omega(|y_1 - y_2|). \dagger \quad (14)$$

We denote

$$h_n = \hat{f}_n(x, y) - \hat{f}_n(x, \theta(x)).$$

It follows from (11) that we can have only the following possibilities for the sign of h_n in $R \setminus \{x, \theta(x)\}$ for $0 < x \leq a$:

a) h_n preserves the sign; b) $h_n > 0$ for $y > \theta(x)$ and $h_n < 0$ for $y < \theta(x)$; c) $h_n < 0$ for $y > \theta(x)$ and $h_n > 0$ for $y < \theta(x)$.

For the pair of functions mentioned we have the following theorem.

THEOREM 2. Equation (5) for $0 < \mu < 1$ has at least two essentially distinct K-solutions (hence, infinitely many) in the cases a) and b). In the case c), $y = \theta(x)$ is the unique K-solution. In the case a) for $h > 0$ ($h < 0$) $Y_2(x) \equiv \theta(x)$ ($Y_1(x) \equiv \theta(x)$), and in the case b) $Y_2(x) < \theta(x) < Y_1(x)$ for $x > 0$.

Now we give a uniqueness theorem for the K-solutions.

THEOREM 3. Assume that for Eq. (5) we have the domain R

$$|\hat{f}_n(x, y_1) - \hat{f}_n(x, y_2)| \leq H(x) x^{\alpha-1} \omega(|y_1 - y_2|),$$

where $H(x)$ is continuous for $x > 0$ and

$$\int_0^v \frac{H(x)}{x} dx < \infty, \quad (15)$$

* Naturally, condition (10) is assumed only in the case when the function $\omega_1(t)$ is not equivalent to zero.

† In the inequality (14) the functions $s(x)$ and $\omega(x)$ are the same as in (11).

$\omega(t)$ is continuous for $t \geq 0$, $\omega(0) = 0$, $\omega(t) > 0$ for $t > 0$ and

$$\int_0^v \frac{dt}{\omega(t)} = +\infty \quad (v > 0),$$

and for g_n at least one of the following two conditions holds: 1) (13) is satisfied; 2) g_n is from the same class as f_n . Then (5) has a unique K-solution.

We note that one cannot replace condition (15) by one of the two conditions

$$1) \int_0^v \frac{H(x)}{x} dx = \infty \quad (v > 0);$$

$$2) \int_0^v \frac{H(x)}{x^{1-\delta}} dx < \infty \quad (\delta > 0 \text{ is arbitrary}),$$

since a bundle of distinct K-solutions can appear.

Theorems 2 and 3 for Osgood and Tamarkine classes form a result close to the criterion.

An important fact recently established experimentally is the discontinuance of the diffusion in the critical domain of stratification [6]. By this, the nonlinear character of the diffusion equation is established. In the determination of the self-similar solutions of the nonlinear parabolic equation of the isothermal diffusion, there arises the problem of distinguishing the O-curves.

LITERATURE CITED

1. P. Hartman and A. Wintner, Amer. J. Math., 68, No. 2, 301-308 (1946).
2. A. F. Andreev, Differents. Uravnen., No. 1 (1965).
3. V. V. Nemytskii and V. V. Stepanov, Qualitative Theory of Differential Equations [in Russian], Moscow (1949).
4. A. F. Andreev, Proc. of the Fourth All-Union Mathematical Congress [in Russian], Vol. 2, Leningrad (1964).
5. J. Tamarkine, Math. Zeitschr., 16, 207-213 (1923).
6. I. R. Krichevskii and Yu. V. Tsekanskaya, Zh. Fiz. Khim., 30, 2315 (1956).