

Equadiff 2015
Lyon, France, 6-10 July 2015

**A simplified approach to the regularising
effect of nonlinear semigroups**

A joint work with Prof Thierry Coulhon (PSL/ANU)

Daniel Hauer



THE UNIVERSITY OF
SYDNEY

The framework of this talk



The framework of this talk

Let (Σ, μ) be a σ -finite measure space,



The framework of this talk

Let (Σ, μ) be a σ -finite measure space,

$X = L^q(\Sigma, \mu)$ for some $1 \leq q \leq \infty$,



The framework of this talk

Let (Σ, μ) be a σ -finite measure space,

$X = L^q(\Sigma, \mu)$ for some $1 \leq q \leq \infty$,

A an operator on X with domain $D(A)$.



The framework of this talk

Let (Σ, μ) be a σ -finite measure space,

$X = L^q(\Sigma, \mu)$ for some $1 \leq q \leq \infty$,

A an operator on X with domain $D(A)$.

For given $u_0 \in X$ let $u: [0, \infty) \rightarrow X$ be a solution of
(in some sense)

$$(EP) \begin{cases} \frac{du(t)}{dt} + Au(t) \ni 0 & \text{for } t > 0, \\ u(0) = u_0. \end{cases}$$



The framework of this talk

Suppose A is m -accretive in X , that is,



The framework of this talk

Suppose A is m -accretive in X , that is,

(Accretive) for every $\lambda > 0$ the resolvent oper. $J_\lambda := (1 + \lambda A)^{-1}$ is X -contractive,

$$\|J_\lambda u - J_\lambda \hat{u}\|_X \leq \|u - \hat{u}\|_X \quad \forall u, \hat{u} \in \text{Rg}(1 + \lambda A)$$

(Rg-cond.) this is (for all) $\lambda > 0$. $\text{Rg}(1 + \lambda A) = X$.



The framework of this talk

Suppose A is m -accretive in X , that is,

(Accretive) for every $\lambda > 0$ the resolvent oper. $J_\lambda := (1 + \lambda A)^{-1}$ is X -contractive,

$$\|J_\lambda u - J_\lambda \hat{u}\|_X \leq \|u - \hat{u}\|_X \quad \forall u, \hat{u} \in \text{Rg}(1 + \lambda A)$$

(Rg-cond.) this is (for all) $\lambda > 0$, $\text{Rg}(1 + \lambda A) = X$.

Then by Crandall-Liggett '71,

$$(GP) \begin{cases} \frac{du}{dt}(t) + Au(t) \ni 0 & \text{for } t > 0, \\ u(0) = u_0 \in \overline{D(A)} \end{cases}$$

is well-posed in the sense of mild solutions.



The framework of this talk

For given $u_0 \in \overline{D(A)}$, let $u: [0, \infty) \rightarrow X$ be the
the mild solution of (EP), then set

$$\overline{T_t u_0} := u(t) \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$



The framework of this talk

For given $u_0 \in \overline{D(A)}$, let $u: [0, \infty) \rightarrow X$ be the mild solution of (EP), then set

$$\overline{T}_t u_0 := u(t) \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

Then the family $\{\overline{T}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ of mappings $\overline{T}_t: \overline{D(A)} \rightarrow \overline{D(A)}$ satisfies:

- ▷ $\overline{T}_t \circ \overline{T}_s = \overline{T}_{t+s} \quad \forall t, s \geq 0$ (semi-group)
- ▷ $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \|\overline{T}_t u - u\|_X = 0 \quad \forall u \in \overline{D(A)}$ (Strong Cont.)
- ▷ $\|\overline{T}_t u - \overline{T}_t \hat{u}\|_X \leq \|u - \hat{u}\|_X \quad \forall u, \hat{u} \in \overline{D(A)}$ (X-contractive)



The framework of this talk

The abstract framework

$$(EP) \begin{cases} \frac{du(t)}{dt} + Au(t) \ni 0 & \text{for } t > 0, \\ u(0) = u_0 \in \overline{D(A)} \end{cases}$$

allows to establish existence, uniqueness & cont. dependence on u_0 of many important parabolic bdy-value problems:



The framework of this talk

The abstract framework

$$(EP) \begin{cases} \frac{du}{dt}(t) + Au(t) \ni 0 & \text{for } t > 0, \\ u(0) = u_0 \in \overline{D(A)} \end{cases}$$

allows to establish existence, uniqueness & cont. dependence on u_0 of many important parabolic bdy-value problems:

$$\triangleright X = L^2(\Omega) : \quad A = -\operatorname{div}(a(x) \nabla u) \\ \Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d \text{ domain} \quad \text{or} \quad A = -\operatorname{div} \left(\frac{\nabla u}{|\nabla u|} \right)$$



The framework of this talk

The abstract framework

$$(EP) \begin{cases} \frac{du(t)}{dt} + Au(t) \ni 0 & \text{for } t > 0, \\ u(0) = u_0 \in \overline{D(A)} \end{cases}$$

allows to establish existence, uniqueness & cont. dependence on u_0 of many important parabolic bdy-value problems:

$$\triangleright X = L^1(\Omega) : \quad A = -\Delta_p u^m, \quad u^m := |u|^{m-1} u, \quad m > 1$$



Main subject of this talk



Main subject of this talk

To investigate the "regularising effect":

For given $u \in L^q(\Sigma, \mu)$ for some $q \geq 1$,

$T_t u \in L^r(\Sigma, \mu) \quad \forall t > 0$ & some $q < r \leq \infty$
+ uniform bdds/decay rates as $t \rightarrow \infty$.



Main subject of this talk

To investigate the "regularising effect":

For given $u \in L^q(\Sigma, \mu)$ for some $q \geq 1$,

$T_t u \in L^r(\Sigma, \mu) \quad \forall t > 0$ & some $q < r \leq \infty$
+ uniform bdds/decay rates as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

▷ $X = L^2(\Sigma)$: $A = -\operatorname{div}(a(x) \nabla u)$
 $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ domain or $A = -\operatorname{div}\left(\frac{\nabla u}{|\nabla u|}\right)$



Main subject of this talk

To investigate the "regularising effect":

For given $u \in L^q(\Sigma, \mu)$ for some $q \geq 1$,

$T_t u \in L^r(\Sigma, \mu) \forall t > 0$ & some $q < r \leq \infty$
+ uniform bdds/decay rates as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

$$\triangleright X = L^1(\Sigma) : \quad A = -\Delta_p u^m, \quad u := |u|^{m-1} u, \quad m > 1$$



Outline of this talk

- ① Log-Sobolev is not always the direct & simplest way
- ② Other results to this subject
- ③ Our motivation / AIM
- ④ Main theorems
- ⑤ Applications



① Log-Sobolev is not always the direct
& simplest way



① Log-Sobolev is not always the direct & simplest way

The approach:

1. By using a *known* Sobolev inequality, one derives a Log-Sobolev inequality.



① Log-Sobolev is not always the direct & simplest way

The approach:

1. By using a *known* Sobolev inequality, one derives a Log-Sobolev inequality.
2. When $\tau: [0, \infty) \rightarrow [p, \infty)$ is non-decreasing & C^1 , one shows by using the Log-Sobolev inequality that
$$s \mapsto y(s) := \log \|u(s)\|_{L^{\tau(s)}}^2$$
 satisfies a differential inequality.



① Log-Sobolev is not always the direct & simplest way

The approach:

1. By using a **known** Sobolev inequality, one derives a Log-Sobolev inequality.
2. When $\tau: [0, \infty) \rightarrow [p, \infty)$ is nondecreasing & C^1 , then one shows by using the Log-Sobolev inequality that

$s \mapsto y(s) := \log \|u(s)\|_{L^{\tau(s)}}$
satisfies a differential inequality.

$\Rightarrow L^q \rightarrow L^{\infty}$ -regularising effect of $u(0) \mapsto u(t), t > 0$.



① Log-Sobolev is not always the direct
& simplest way

This approach comes from an idea by Gross '75:



① Log-Sobolev is not always the direct
& simplest way

This approach comes from an idea by Gross '75:

Let $\{T_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ be a semigroup of bounded
linear operators T_t acting on $L^q(\Sigma, \mu)$ for all $1 \leq q \leq \infty$,
of a measure space (Σ, μ) , with infinitesimal gen. $-A$.



① Log-Sobolev is not always the direct & simplest way

This approach comes from an idea by Gross '75:

Let $\{T_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ be a semigroup of bounded linear operators T_t acting on $L^q(\Sigma, \mu)$ for all $1 \leq q \leq \infty$, of a measure space (Σ, μ) , with infinitesimal gen. $-A$.

$\{T_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ is hypercontractive, iff Log-Sobolev holds for the generator $-A$ of $\{T_t\}_{t \geq 0}$.
i.e., for some (all) $1 < q < r < \infty$

$\exists t = t(q, r) > 0$ s.t.

T_t maps $L^q(\Sigma, \mu)$ to $L^r(\Sigma, \mu)$



① Log-Sobolev is not always the direct & simplest way

▷ log-Sobolev inequality: Take $d\mu := (2\pi)^{-d/2} e^{-x^2/2} dx$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |f|^2 \ln |f| d\mu \leq C \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla f|^2 d\mu + \|f\|_2^2 \ln \|f\|_2$$



① Log-Sobolev is not always the direct & simplest way

▷ log-Sobolev inequality: Take $d\mu := (2\pi)^{-d/2} e^{-x^2/2} dx$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |f|^2 \ln |f| d\mu \leq C \cdot \underbrace{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla f|^2 d\mu}_{= (-A f, f)_2} + \|f\|_2^2 \cdot \ln \|f\|_2$$



① Log-Sobolev is not always the direct & simplest way

▷ log-Sobolev inequality: Take $d\mu := (2\pi)^{-d/2} e^{-x^2/2} dx$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |f|^2 \ln |f| d\mu \leq C \cdot \underbrace{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla f|^2 d\mu}_{= (-A f, f)_2} + \|f\|_2^2 \cdot \ln \|f\|_2$$

The semigroup $\{T_t\}_{t \geq 0} \sim -A$ is the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck semigroup.



① Log-Sobolev is not always the direct
& simplest way

In the 80's, the focus shifted towards a
the stronger property called **ultracontractivity**:

for all $t > 0$, T_t maps $L^1(\Sigma, \mu)$ to $L^\infty(\Sigma, \mu)$

& of particular interest:

$$(UC) \quad \|T_t\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^1, L^\infty)} \lesssim t^{-d/2} \quad \text{for all } t > 0.$$



① Log-Sobolev is not always the direct & simplest way

In 1985, Varopoulos proved:

For a given (Σ, μ) , one has:

$\{T_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ satisfies (14) \Leftrightarrow

The generator $-A$ of $\{T_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ satisfies a d -dim Sobolev inequality

$$\|f\|_{p \frac{d}{d-2}}^p \leq C \cdot (A f)_p$$



① Log-Sobolev is not always the direct
& simplest way

In 1973, Nelson proved that the 0-2 semigroup
is "not" ultracontractive.



① Log-Sobolev is not always the direct & simplest way

In 1973, Nelson proved that the O-U semigroup is "not" ultracontractive.

by Varopoulos \iff The generator $-A$ of the O-U semigroup does not satisfy a d -dim. Sobolev ineq.

In other words, for the measure $d\mu = \left(\frac{1}{\pi^{d/2}}\right)^{1/2} e^{-x^2/2} dx$ a d -dim Sobolev inequality is not valid.





THE UNIVERSITY OF
SYDNEY

Daniel Hauer

② Other results to this subject



② Other results to this subject

▷ Benilan '1978 (Truncation & Moser-iter.)



② Other results to this subject

- ▷ Bénéilan '1978 (Truncation & Moser-iter.)
- ▷ Véron '1979 (more general Moser simplified)



② Other results to this subject

- ▷ Bénéilan '1978 (Truncation & Moser-iter.)
- ▷ Véron '1979 (Moser ^{more general} simplified)
- ▷ Porzio '2009 (for Leray-Lions)



② Other results to this subject

- ▷ Bénéilan '1978 (Truncation & Moser-iter.)
- ▷ Véron '1979 (Moser ^{more general} simplified)
- ▷ Porzio '2009 (for Leray-Lions)
- ▷
- ▷ Many others but for more specific situations.
- ▷



② Other results to this subject

Main tool in all these approaches
(including log-Sobolev appr.):



② Other results to this subject

Main tool in all these approaches
(including log-Sobolev appr.):

$$q \geq p$$
$$\langle -\Delta_p u, |u|^{q-p} u \rangle = (q-p+1) \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p |u|^{q-p} dx$$



② Other results to this subject

Main tool in all these approaches
(including log-Sobolev appr.):

$$\begin{aligned} q \geq p \\ \langle -\Delta_p u, |u|^{q-p} u \rangle &= (q-p+1) \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p |u|^{q-p} dx \\ &= (q-p+1) \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u \cdot |u|^{\frac{q-p}{p}}|^p dx \end{aligned}$$



② Other results to this subject

Main tool in all these approaches
(including log-Sobolev appr.):

$$\begin{aligned} q \geq p \\ \langle -\Delta_p u, |u|^{q-p} u \rangle &= (q-p+1) \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p |u|^{q-p} dx \\ &= (q-p+1) \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u \cdot |u|^{\frac{q-p}{p}}|^p dx \\ &= \frac{(q-p+1)}{\left(\frac{q-p}{p}+1\right)^p} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla (|u|^{\frac{q-p}{p}} u)|^p dx \end{aligned}$$



② Other results to this subject

Main tool in all these approaches
(including log-Sobolev appr.):

$$\begin{aligned} q \geq p \\ \langle -\Delta_p u, |u|^{q-p} u \rangle &= (q-p+1) \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p |u|^{q-p} dx \\ &= (q-p+1) \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u \cdot |u|^{\frac{q-p}{p}}|^p dx \\ &= \frac{(q-p+1)}{\left(\frac{q-p}{p}+1\right)^p} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla (|u|^{\frac{q-p}{p}} u)|^p dx \\ &\geq C_{q,p} \left(\int_{\Omega} | |u|^{\frac{q-p}{p}} u |^{p^*} dx \right)^{\frac{p}{p^*}} \end{aligned}$$



② Other results to this subject

Main tool in all these approaches
(including log-Sobolev appr.):

One builds a "one parameter family" of
(log-) Sobolev inequalities.



③ Our motivation / AIM

To develop a unified machinery,



③ Our motivation / AIM

To develop a unified machinery,
Which avoids :

▷ the construction of one-parameter families of (log-) Sobolev ineq.



③ Our motivation / AIM

To develop a unified machinery,
Which avoids :

- ▷ the construction of one-parameter families of (log-) Sobolev ineq.
- ▷ too much regularity.



③ Our motivation / AIM

To develop a unified machinery,
which concerns

▷ completely accretive operators A ,
i.e., $\forall \lambda > 0$ the resolvent J_λ is L^q -contractive
+ order preserving $\forall 1 \leq q \leq \infty$



③ Our motivation / AIM

To develop a unified machinery,
which concerns

▷ completely accretive operators A ,
i.e., $\forall \lambda > 0$ the resolvent J_λ is L^q -contractive
+ order preserving $\forall 1 \leq q \leq \infty$

▷ accretive operators A
non-increasing resolvent J_λ in L^q
(i.e. $\|J_\lambda\|_q \leq \|u\|_q$) $\forall 1 \leq q \leq \infty$



④ Main theorems

1 Theorem [Coulhon, H. '15] Sobolev $\Rightarrow L^2$ - L^r -reg

Let A be m -completely accretive in $L^2(\Sigma, \mu)$ with dense domain & $0 \in A_0$.

If there are $2 \leq r \leq \infty$, $\delta > 0$ & $C > 0$ s.t.

(Sob) $\|u - \hat{u}\|_r^\delta \leq C \langle u - \hat{u}, v - \hat{v} \rangle_2$
for all $(u, v), (u, \hat{u}) \in A$, then $\{T_t\}_{t \geq 0} \sim -A$ satisfies

$$\|T_t u - T_t \hat{u}\|_r \leq \left(\frac{C}{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{\delta}} t^{-\frac{1}{\delta}} \|u - \hat{u}\|_2^{\frac{2}{\delta}} \quad \forall u, \hat{u} \in L^2.$$



④ Main theorems

* Theorem [Eouphou, H. '15] Sobolev $\Rightarrow L^2$ - L^r -reg

Let A be m -accretive in $L^1(\Sigma, \mu)$ with non-increasing resolvent in all L^q & dense domain.

If there are $2 \leq r \leq \infty$, $\delta > 0$ & $C > 0$ s.t.

(Sob) $\|u\|_r^\delta \leq C \langle u, v \rangle_2$
for all $(u, v) \in A_n(L^2 \times L^2)$, then $\{T_t\}_{t \geq 0} \sim -A$ satisfies

$$\|T_t u\|_r \leq \left(\frac{C}{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{\delta}} t^{-\frac{1}{\delta}} \|u\|_2^{\frac{2}{\delta}} \quad \forall u \in L^2.$$



④ Main theorems

2 Theorem [Eouphon, H.'15] Sobolev $\Rightarrow L^q$ - L^∞ -reg.

Let A be m -completely accretive in $L^2(\Sigma, \mu)$ with dense domain & $0 \in A_0$.

If there are $2 < \tau < \infty$, $\beta > 0$ & $C > 0$ s.t.h. $\frac{\tau}{\beta} > 1$ &

(Sob) $\|u - \hat{u}\|_\tau^\beta \leq C \langle u - \hat{u}, v - \hat{v} \rangle_2$
 for all $(u, v), (u, \hat{u}), (v, \hat{v}) \in A$, then $\{T_t\}_{t \geq 0} \sim -A$ satisfies

$$\|T_t u - T_t \hat{u}\|_\infty \lesssim t^{-\delta} \|u - \hat{u}\|_{\frac{\tau}{\beta} w_0}^\delta \quad \forall u, \hat{u} \in L^{\frac{\tau}{\beta} w_0},$$

for any $w_0 > \beta$ satisfying $(\frac{\tau}{\beta} - 1)w_0 + \beta - 2 > 0$
 with

$$\delta = \frac{1}{(\frac{\tau}{\beta} - 1)w_0 + \beta - 2} \quad \gamma = \frac{(\frac{\tau}{\beta} - 1)w_0}{(\frac{\tau}{\beta} - 1)w_0 + \beta - 2}.$$

④ Main theorems

2* Theorem [Eouphon, H. '15] Sobolev $\Rightarrow L^q$ - L^∞ -reg.

Let A be m -accretive in $L^1(Z, \mu)$ with non-incr. resolvent J_λ in L^q , dense domain & $T_t \in C(L^\infty, L^\infty) \forall t > 0$

If there are $2 < \tau < \infty, \bar{\sigma} > 0$ & $c > 0$ s.t.h. $\frac{\tau}{\bar{\sigma}} > 1$ &

(Sob)

$$\|u\|_{\tau}^{\bar{\sigma}} \leq c \langle u, v \rangle_Z$$

for all $(u, v) \in A_n(L^2 \times L^2)$, then $\{T_t\}_{t \geq 0} \sim -A$ satisfies

$$\|T_t u\|_{\infty} \lesssim t^{-\bar{\sigma}} \|u\|_{\frac{\tau}{\bar{\sigma}} w_0} \quad \forall u \in L^{\frac{\tau}{\bar{\sigma}} w_0}$$

for any $w_0 > \bar{\sigma}$ satisfying $(\frac{\tau}{\bar{\sigma}} - 1)w_0 + \bar{\sigma} - 2 > 0$
with

$$\bar{\sigma} = \frac{1}{(\frac{\tau}{\bar{\sigma}} - 1)w_0 + \bar{\sigma} - 2}, \quad \delta = \frac{(\frac{\tau}{\bar{\sigma}} - 1)w_0}{(\frac{\tau}{\bar{\sigma}} - 1)w_0 + \bar{\sigma} - 2}$$



④ Main theorems

3 Theorem [Coulhon, H. '15] Extrapolation towards L^1

For $1 \leq q < r \leq \infty$. let $\{T_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ be L^1 -contractive semigroup on $L^1 \cap L^r(\Sigma, \mu)$, $T_t u \equiv 0$ & suppose,

there are $\delta, \gamma > 0$ s.t.

$$\|T_t u - T_t \hat{u}\|_r \leq C t^{-\delta} \|u - \hat{u}\|_q^\gamma \quad \forall t > 0 \text{ \& } \forall u, \hat{u} \in L^1 \cap L^r$$

For $\Theta_r := \frac{r-q}{q(r-1)} > 0$ if $r < \infty$ & $\Theta_\infty := \frac{1}{q}$ if $r = \infty$

assume that $\gamma(1 - \Theta_r) < 1$.

Then $\|T_t u - T_t \hat{u}\|_r \leq (2^\delta C)^{\frac{1}{\Theta}} t^{-\frac{\delta}{\Theta}} \|u - \hat{u}\|_q^{\frac{\gamma}{\Theta}}$
with $\Theta := 1 - \gamma(1 - \Theta)$. $\forall u, \hat{u} \in L^1(\Sigma, \mu)$





⑤ Applications



⑤ Applications

1. Total variational flow in \mathbb{R}^d

$$A := \left\{ (u, v) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \mid \begin{array}{l} u \in BV(\mathbb{R}^d) \text{ \& } \exists z \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d), \|z\|_\infty \leq 1, \\ v = -\operatorname{div} z \text{ \& } (z, Du) = |Du| \end{array} \right\}$$



⑤ Applications

1. Total variational flow in \mathbb{R}^d

$$A := \left\{ (u, v) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \mid \begin{array}{l} u \in BV(\mathbb{R}^d) \text{ \& } \exists z \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d), \|z\|_\infty \leq 1, \\ v = -\operatorname{div} z \text{ in } \mathcal{D}' \text{ \& } (z, Du) = |Du| \end{array} \right\}$$

is the total variation flow operator $-\operatorname{div} \left(\frac{\nabla u}{|\nabla u|} \right) = \Delta_1$
in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. (1-Laplace op.)



⑤ Applications

1. Total variational flow in \mathbb{R}^d

$$A := \left\{ (u, v) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \mid \begin{array}{l} u \in BV(\mathbb{R}^d) \text{ \& } \exists z \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d), \|z\|_\infty \leq 1 \\ v = -\operatorname{div} z \text{ in } \mathcal{D}' \text{ \& } (z, Du) = |Du| \end{array} \right\}$$

is the total variation flow operator $-\operatorname{div} \left(\frac{\nabla u}{|\nabla u|} \right) = \Delta_1$
in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. (1-Laplace op.)

$\Rightarrow A$ is m -completely accretive in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ & $0 \in A_0$.



⑤ Applications

1. Total variational flow in \mathbb{R}^d

$$A := \left\{ (u, v) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \mid \begin{array}{l} u \in BV(\mathbb{R}^d) \text{ \& } \exists z \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d), \|z\|_\infty \leq 1 \\ v = -\operatorname{div} z \text{ in } \mathcal{D}' \text{ \& } (z, Du) = |Du| \end{array} \right\}$$

is the total variation flow operator $-\operatorname{div} \left(\frac{\nabla u}{|\nabla u|} \right) = \Delta_1$
in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. (1-Laplace op.)

$\Rightarrow A$ is m -completely accretive in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ & $0 \in A_0$.

Sobolev is

$$\|u\|_{L^{\frac{d}{d-1}}} \leq C |Du|(\mathbb{R}^d)$$



⑤ Applications

1. Total variational flow in \mathbb{R}^d

$$\Rightarrow \forall (u, v) \in A, \quad \langle u, v \rangle_2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} -\operatorname{div}(z) \cdot u \, dx$$



⑤ Applications

1. Total variational flow in \mathbb{R}^d

$$\Rightarrow \forall (u, v) \in A, \quad \langle u, v \rangle_2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} -\operatorname{div}(z) \cdot u \, dx$$

Green's formula (Anzellotti) $\stackrel{z}{=} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (z, Du)$



⑤ Applications

1. Total variational flow in \mathbb{R}^d

$$\begin{aligned} \Rightarrow \forall (u, v) \in A, \quad \langle u, v \rangle_2 &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} -\operatorname{div}(z) \cdot u \, dx \\ \text{Green's formula (Anzellotti)} &\stackrel{\text{Green's formula}}{=} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (z, Du) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |Du| \end{aligned}$$



⑤ Applications

1. Total variational flow in \mathbb{R}^d

$$\begin{aligned} \Rightarrow \forall (u, v) \in A, \quad \langle u, v \rangle_Z &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} -\operatorname{div}(z) \cdot u \, dx \\ \text{Green's formula (Anzellotti)} &\quad \equiv \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (z, Du) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |Du| \\ &\geq \bar{C}^{-1} \|u\|_{L^{\frac{d}{d-1}}} \end{aligned}$$



⑤ Applications

1. Total variational flow in \mathbb{R}^d

Thm 1*

$$\implies \|\tau_t^u\|_{\frac{d}{d-1}} \leq \frac{C}{2} t^{-1} \|u\|_2^2 \quad \forall t > 0$$

$\& \forall u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$



⑤ Applications

1. Total variational flow in \mathbb{R}^d

$$\text{Thm 1}^* \implies \|T_t u\|_{\frac{d}{d-1}} \leq \frac{C}{2} t^{-1} \|u\|_2^2 \quad \forall t > 0 \\ \& \forall u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$$

Since $\frac{d}{d-1} > 1$,

$$\text{Thm 2}^* \implies \|T_t u\|_{\infty} \lesssim t^{-\frac{1}{(d/(d-1)-1)m_0-1}} \|u\|_{\frac{dm_0}{d-1}} \quad \forall u \in L^{\frac{dm_0}{d-1}}$$

for any $m_0 > 1$ s.t.
 $(\frac{d}{d-1}-1)m_0-1 > 0$



Thank You!

