

## ENERGY DECAY FOR THE NONLINEAR WAVE EQUATION IN THE WHOLE SPACE WITH SOME DISSIPATION

IL HYO JUNG

**ABSTRACT** We study decay estimates of the energy for the nonlinear wave equation in the whole space. We note that the method of proof is based on the multiplier technique and on the unique continuation, and no geometrical condition is imposed on the boundary.

### 1. Introduction

In this paper we consider the Cauchy problem for the nonlinear wave equation with a half-linear dissipation;

$$(1.1) \quad u_{tt} - \Delta u + \rho(x, u_t) = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \times (0, \infty)$$

$$(1.2) \quad u(x, 0) = u_0, \quad u_t(x, 0) = u_1 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N$$

where  $\rho(x, v)$  is some nonlinear function specified later. For the sequel, we need some notations. We set  $B_r = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N \mid |x| < r\}$  and  $\Omega_r := \mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_r$  for  $r > 0$ .

Let  $R > 0$  be arbitrary fixed positive number and  $a(x)$  be a non-negative bounded function on  $\mathbb{R}^N$  such that

$$(1.3) \quad a(x) \geq \epsilon_0 > 0 \text{ a.e. for } x \in \Omega_R.$$

---

Received May 20, 2003. Revised November 4, 2003.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification 35B35, 35B40, 35L70

Key words and phrases nonlinear wave equation, energy decay, exterior problem, localized nonlinear dissipation

This work was supported by the Korea Research Foundation Grant(KRF-2002-041-C00024) and Pusan National University Research Grant

We now make the following hypotheses on the dissipative term  $\rho(x, v)$ .

**Hyp.**  $\rho(x, v)$  is differentiable *a.e.* and nondecreasing function in  $v$  such that

$$(1.4) \quad \rho(x, v) = \tilde{\rho}(v)\chi(B_R) + a(x)v\chi(\Omega_R),$$

where  $\tilde{\rho}(v)$  satisfies

$$(1.5) \quad k_0|v|^{r+2} \leq \tilde{\rho}(v)v \leq k_1\{|v|^{r+2} + |v|^2\} \text{ for } (x, t) \in B_R \times \mathbb{R}^+$$

with  $k_0, k_1 > 0$ ,  $0 \leq r \leq 2/(N-2)$  and  $\chi(A)$  denotes the characteristic function of  $A$

For example,  $\tilde{\rho}(v)$  is a function like  $\tilde{\rho}(v) = |v|^r v$ .

Condition (1.4) means that the dissipative term  $\rho(x, u_t)$  has two character; linear and nonlinear. More precisely, the dissipative term is the linear function  $a(x)u_t$  on  $\Omega_R$ , which is effective at infinity. On the other hand, it is the nonlinear function  $\tilde{\rho}(u_t)$  on  $B_R$  satisfying (1.5). By reason of such two character, we may call the dissipation the half-linear dissipation, temporarily.

The main purpose of this paper is to investigate precise decay estimates of the energy for the problem (1.1)-(1.2).

The problem of proving decay estimates of the solutions to the wave equation with some dissipation has attracted a lot of attention in recent years. To our knowledge, these are the only results for the whole space, though the Klein-Gordon type wave equation with nonlinear dissipations like  $|u_t|^r u_t$  have been treated by Nakao [4] and [5], Nakao and Jung [6], Nakao and Ono [7], Ono [8], and Mochizuki and Motai [3]. Recently, G Todorova [10] have analyzed the global existence and nonexistence conditions in details for the Cauchy problem.

## 2. Preliminaries and Statement of the Main Result

Throughout this paper we shall use the following notations .

$$\|u\|_p \equiv \|u\|_{L^p(\Omega)}, \quad 1 \leq p < \infty;$$

$H^m(\Omega)(m \geq 0)$  denotes the usual Sobolev space with the norm

$$\|f\|_{H^m(\Omega)} = \left( \sum_{|\alpha| \leq m} \|D_x^\alpha f(x)\|_2^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} < \infty,$$

where  $\alpha$  is the multi-indices. For simplicity, we will write  $\|u\|$  for  $\|u\|_2$ .

Before stating our main result, let us recall the following well-posedness result, which is given by Lions and Strauss [2] and Nakao [4]

**THEOREM 2.1.** *Let  $(u_0, u_1) \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^N) \times H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ . Then, under Hyp., the problem (1.1)-(1.2) admits a unique solution*

$u(t) \in W^{2,\infty}([0, T]; L^2(\mathbb{R}^N)) \cap W^{1,\infty}([0, T], H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)) \cap L^\infty([0, T], H^2(\mathbb{R}^N))$  for any  $T > 0$ .

Moreover, for the solution  $u(t)$  to the problem (1.1)-(1.2), there exists a finite constant  $K > 0$  such that for any  $T > 0$ ,

$$(2.1) \quad \|\nabla u_t\| + \|u_t\| \leq K \text{ for } t \in [0, T].$$

The main result of this paper is as follows

**THEOREM 2.2.** *Let  $(u_0, u_1) \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^N) \times H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$  and  $N \geq 3$ . Assume that Hyp. is satisfied and  $N \geq 3$ . Then the energy  $E(t)$  for the problem (1.1)-(1.2) satisfy the following decay properties*

(i) *If  $0 < r < 2/3(N - 2)$ , then*

$$E(t) \leq C_1(1 + t)^{-\gamma_1}$$

with

$$\gamma_1 = \min \left\{ \frac{(2 - N)r^2 + 4(2 - N)r + 8}{2(r + 2)(4 - (N - 2)r)}, \frac{3(2 - N)r^2 + 2(8 - 3N)r + 8}{2(r + 2)} \right\}.$$

(ii) *If  $r = 2/3(N - 2)$  and  $0 < r < -2 + 2\sqrt{N(N - 2)}/(N - 2)$ , then*

$$E(t) \leq C_1(\log(2 + t))^{-\gamma_2}$$

with

$$\gamma_2 = \frac{2 - (N - 2)r}{2}$$

The proof of Theorem 2.2 relies on the the following lemmas.

First, we need the following well-known lemma without proof here

LEMMA 2.1. (Gagliardo-Nirenberg) Let  $1 \leq r < p \leq \infty$ ,  $1 \leq q \leq p$  and  $0 \leq k \leq m$ . Then we have the inequality

$$\|v\|_{W^{k,p}} \leq c \|v\|_{W^{m,q}}^\theta \|v\|_{L^r}^{1-\theta} \text{ for } v \in W^{m,p} \cap L^r$$

with some  $c > 0$  and

$$\theta = \left(\frac{k}{N} + \frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{p}\right) \left(\frac{m}{N} + \frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{q}\right)^{-1}$$

provided that  $0 < \theta \leq 1$  ( $0 < \theta < 1$  if  $p = \infty$  and  $mq = N$ ).

LEMMA 2.2. ([5]) Let  $\phi(t)$  be a nonnegative function on  $[0, \infty)$  satisfying the inequality

$$\sup_{t \leq s \leq t+T} \phi(s) \leq C \sum_{i=1}^2 (1+t)^{\theta_i} (\phi(t) - \phi(t+1))^{\epsilon_i}, \quad t \geq 0$$

with some  $T > 0$ ,  $C > 0$ ,  $0 < \epsilon_i \leq 1$  and  $\theta_i \leq \epsilon_i, i = 1, 2$ . Then  $\phi(t)$  has the following decay property

(1) If  $0 < \epsilon_i \leq 1$  and  $\theta_i < \epsilon_i, i = 1, 2$ , then

$$\phi(t) \leq C_0(1+t)^{-\alpha}$$

with  $\alpha = \min_{i=1,2} \{(\epsilon_i - \theta_i)/(1 - \epsilon_i)\}$

(2) If  $\theta_1 = \epsilon_1 < 1$  and  $\theta_2 < \epsilon_2 \leq 1$ , then

$$\phi(t) \leq C_0(\log(2+t))^{-\frac{\epsilon_1}{1-\epsilon_1}}.$$

### 3. Some Useful Inequalities

Throughout the remainder of this paper,  $C$  denotes different positive generic constants, independent of the initial data, in various occurrences.

In this section, we will derive some useful inequalities to prove Theorem

LEMMA 3.1. Let  $q(x) = (q_1(x), q_2(x), \dots, q_N(x)) \in (W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^N))^N$  be a vector field on  $\mathbb{R}^N$  and  $\varphi(x)$  a proper function on  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . Then for a solution  $u(t)$  to the problem (1.1)-(1.2), we have the following identities :

$$(3.1) \quad 0 = \frac{d}{dt} E(t) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho(x, u_t) u_t dx$$

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 = & \frac{d}{dt} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \varphi(x) u_t u dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_R} \varphi(x) a(x) |u|^2 dx \right\} \\ & - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \varphi(x) |u_t|^2 dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \nabla u \cdot \nabla(\varphi u) dx \\ & + \int_{B_R} \varphi(x) \tilde{\rho}(u_t) u dx \end{aligned}$$

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 = & \frac{d}{dt} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_t q(x) \cdot \nabla u dx \right\} + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \nabla \cdot q(x) |u_t|^2 dx \\ & - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \nabla \cdot q(x) |\nabla u|^2 dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} Q_{N \times N} \nabla u \cdot \nabla u dx \\ & + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho(x, u_t) q(x) \cdot \nabla u dx, \end{aligned}$$

where  $Q_{N \times N} = (a_{ij})$  is the  $N \times N$  matrix with  $a_{ij} = \partial q_i / \partial x_j$ ,  $i, j = 1, 2, \dots, N$  as its components

The proof of Lemma 3.1 is based on standard multiplier technique, using  $u_t$ ,  $\varphi(x)u$  and  $q(x) \cdot \nabla u$  as multipliers, and the interested reader should refer to Komornik[1] or Nakao[5]

In order to obtain some estimate, we prepare the following Proposition.

PROPOSITION 3.1. There exists  $T_0 > 0$ , independent of  $u$ , such that if  $T > T_0$ , then the inequality

$$(3.4) \quad \int_0^T \int_{B_R} |u|^2 dx dt \leq C(T) \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho(x, u_t) u_t dx dt + \epsilon \int_0^T E(t) dt$$

holds for any  $\epsilon > 0$ .

*Proof.* We shall use a contradiction method(cf. Nakao[5]). Assume that (3.4) does not hold. Then, there exists a sequence of solutions  $\{u_n\}$  of the problem (1.1)-(1.3) such that

$$(3.5) \quad \int_0^T \int_{B_R} |u_n|^2 dx dt \geq n \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho(x, u_{nt}) u_{nt} dx dt + \epsilon \int_0^T E_{u_n}(t) dt,$$

where  $E_{u_n}(t)$  is defined by  $E(t)$  with  $u_n$  instead of  $u$ .

Setting

$$\lambda_n^2 \equiv \int_0^T \int_{B_R} |u_n|^2 dx dt \text{ and } v_n(t) \equiv \frac{u_n(t)}{\lambda_n},$$

we get by (3.5),

$$n \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{\rho(x, u_{nt})}{\lambda_n} v_{nt} dx dt + \epsilon \int_0^T E_{v_n}(t) dt \leq 1,$$

where  $E_{v_n}(t)$  is defined by  $E(t)$  with  $u$  replaced by  $v_n$ .

Thus we obtain

$$(3.6) \quad \int_0^T \int_{B_R} |v_n|^2 dx dt = 1 \text{ for all } n \geq 1,$$

$$(3.7) \quad \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{\rho(x, u_{nt})}{\lambda_n} v_{nt} dx dt \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

and

$$(3.8) \quad \int_0^T E_{v_n}(t) dt = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (|v_{nt}|^2 + |\nabla v_n|^2) dx dt \leq \frac{2}{\epsilon} < \infty.$$

These imply, applying Rellich compactness theorem and replacing the sequence  $v_n$  with a subsequence if needed, that

$$(3.9) \quad v_n \rightarrow v \text{ weak-star in } L^\infty([0, T]; H_0^1(\mathbb{R}^N)) \cap W^{1, \infty}([0, T]; L^2(\mathbb{R}^N))$$

$$(3.10) \quad v_n \rightarrow v \text{ strongly in } L^2([0, T] \times B_R)$$

Therefore (3.6), (3.7), (3.9) and (3.10) lead to the following limit problem

$$(3.11) \quad v_{tt} - \Delta v = 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N \times [0, T]$$

with

$$(3.12) \quad \int_0^T \int_{B_R} |v|^2 dx dt = 1$$

and

$$v_t(x, t) = 0 \text{ on } \text{supp } a(\cdot) \times [0, T].$$

Since  $\Omega_R \subset \text{supp } a(\cdot)$ , by a general result of unique continuation(cf. Tataru[9]), there exists  $T_0 > 0$  such that if  $T > T_0$ ,

$$(3.13) \quad v_t(x, t) = 0 \text{ on } \mathbb{R}^N \times [0, T].$$

Noting that (3.13) means that  $v(x, t) = v(x)$ , independent of  $t$  and using (3.11), we have

$$-\Delta v(x) = 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N.$$

Since  $v \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$  and  $N \geq 3$ ,  $v(x)$  must be identically zero in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ , which is a contradiction to (3.12). This completes the proof of Proposition 3.1 □

From now on we set

$$(3.14) \quad \begin{aligned} X(t) = & \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (u_t \phi(r) x \cdot \nabla u dx + \alpha u_t u) dx \\ & + \frac{\alpha}{2} \int_{\Omega_R} a(x) |u|^2 dx + kE(t) \end{aligned}$$

Here  $\alpha$  and  $k > 0$  are some constants, and  $\phi(r)$ ,  $r = |x|$  is a Lipschitz continuous function on  $[0, \infty)$  as follows

$$\phi(r) = \begin{cases} \epsilon_0 & \text{if } r \leq R \\ \frac{\epsilon_0 R}{r} & \text{if } r \geq R, \end{cases}$$

where  $\epsilon_0$  and  $R$  are positive constants given in (1.3)

Then we obtain the following(for proof, see [6]) :

**PROPOSITION 3.2.** *For  $T > T_0$  and a large  $k > 0$ , there exists some constants  $\bar{\epsilon}_1 > 0$  and  $\bar{C} > 0$  such that the solution  $u$  of the problem (1.1)-(1.2) satisfies for any  $t \geq 0$ ,*

$$(3.15) \quad X(t+T) + k \int_t^{t+T} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho(x, u_t) u_t dx ds + \bar{\epsilon}_1 \int_t^{t+T} E(s) ds \\ \leq X(t) + \bar{C} \int_t^{t+T} \int_{B_R} \tilde{\rho}(u_t)^2 dx ds.$$

We observe that  $X(t)$  is equivalent to  $E(t) + \|u(t)\|^2$  if  $k$  is sufficiently large. Indeed, we have :

**LEMMA 3.2.** *For a large  $k > 0$ , there exist constants  $C_1 > 0$  and  $C_2 > 0$  such that for any  $t \geq 0$ ,*

$$(3.16) \quad C_1(E(t) + \|u(t)\|^2) \leq X(t) \leq C_2(E(t) + \|u(t)\|^2)$$

*Proof.* Since the second inequality of (3.16) holds trivially, it's sufficient to show the first inequality of (3.16). Simple calculations using the Young inequality show that for some constant  $C > 0$ ,

$$(3.17) \quad -CE(t) \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_t \phi(r) x \cdot \nabla u dx$$

and for any  $\epsilon > 0$  (may be small)

$$(3.18) \quad -\epsilon \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u|^2 dx - C(\epsilon) \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u_t|^2 dx \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \alpha u_t u dx.$$

Reporting (3.17) and (3.18) in (3.14) and noting that  $\int_{B_R} |u|^2 dx \leq C \{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^2 dx + \int_{\Omega_R} |u|^2 dx \}$  for some constant  $C > 0$  and noting that



$a(x) \geq \epsilon_0 > 0$  in  $\Omega_R$ , we get for any  $\epsilon > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} X(t) &\geq -\epsilon \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u|^2 dx - C(\epsilon) \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u_t|^2 dx \\ &\quad + \frac{\alpha\epsilon_0}{2} \int_{\Omega_R} |u|^2 dx + (k - C)E(t) \\ &\geq \left(\frac{\alpha\epsilon_0}{4C} - \epsilon\right) \int_{B_R} |u|^2 dx + \frac{\alpha\epsilon_0}{4} \int_{\Omega_R} |u|^2 dx - \frac{\alpha\epsilon_0}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^2 dx \\ &\quad - C(\epsilon) \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u_t|^2 dx + (k - C)E(t) \\ &\geq \min\left\{\left(\frac{\alpha\epsilon_0}{4C} - \epsilon\right), \frac{\alpha\epsilon_0}{4}\right\} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u|^2 dx \\ &\quad + \left(k - C - 2 \max\left\{\frac{\alpha\epsilon_0}{2}, C(\epsilon)\right\}\right) E(t). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we can always choose a proper constant  $C_1 > 0$  if  $\epsilon > 0$  is sufficiently small and  $k$  sufficiently large, which completes the proof of the Lemma.  $\square$

#### 4. Proof of Theorem 2.2

We recall that the method used to prove the Theorem essentially relies on the multiplier technique and on some difference inequalities due to Nakao

First, let us derive the estimate of  $L^2$ -norm  $\|u(t)\|$  of  $u(t)$ . To this end, we will use Proposition 3.2.

Indeed we have .

PROPOSITION 4.1. *For a solution  $u(t)$  to the problem (1.1)-(1.2), we have the estimate of  $L^2$ -norm of  $u(t)$ ,*

$$(4.1) \quad \|u(t)\| \leq C(k_1, K, E(0))(1+t)^{\frac{r(N-2)}{2(4-(N-2)r)}},$$

where  $0 \leq r \leq 2/(N-2)$ ,  $N \geq 3$ .

*Proof.* First we note from (3.1) that for any  $t > 0$

$$(4.2) \quad \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho(x, u_t) u_t dx dt \leq E(0),$$

that is,

$$\int_0^\infty \|u_t\|_{r+2}^{r+2} dt \leq CE(0) < \infty$$

Using the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality (see Lemma 2.1), the Hölder inequality, (1.5) and (2.1), we obtain, for any  $t > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} (4.3) \quad & \int_0^t \int_{B_R} \tilde{\rho}(u_t)^2 dx ds \\ & \leq k_1^2 \int_0^t \int_{B_R} |u_t|^{2(r+1)} dx ds \\ & \leq Ck_1^2 \int_0^t \|u_t\|_{r+2}^{2(r+1)(1-\theta)} \|u_t\|_{H^1(B_R)}^{2(r+1)\theta} ds \\ & \leq Ck_1^2 K^{2(r+1)\theta} \int_0^t \|u_t\|_{r+2}^{2(r+1)(1-\theta)} ds \\ & \leq Ck_1^2 K^{2(r+1)\theta} \left( \int_0^t \|u_t\|_{r+2}^{r+2} ds \right)^{\frac{2(r+1)(1-\theta)}{r+2}} \left( \int_0^t ds \right)^{\frac{2\theta(r+1)-r}{r+2}} \\ & \leq Ck_1^2 K^{2(r+1)\theta} E(0)^{\frac{2(r+1)(1-\theta)}{r+2}} (t+1)^{\frac{2\theta(r+1)-r}{r+2}} \\ & \equiv C(k_1, K, E(0))(1+t)^{\frac{r(N-2)}{4-(N-2)r}} \end{aligned}$$

with  $\theta = Nr/(r+1)(4-(N-2)r)$ , where we have used  $0 \leq r \leq 2/(N-2)$  ( $\leq 4/(N-2)$ )

Thus by Lemma 3.2 and (4.3), we have for  $t \geq 0$ ,

$$X(t) \leq X(0) + C(k_1, K, E(0))(t+1)^{\frac{r(N-2)}{4-(N-2)r}},$$

that is,

$$(4.4) \quad \|u(t)\| \leq C(k_1, K, E(0))(t+1)^{\frac{r(N-2)}{2(4-(N-2)r)}},$$

where  $0 \leq r \leq 2/(N-2)$  □

We are now in a position to prove Theorem 2.2

Multiplying equation (1.1) by  $u_t$  and integrating over  $[t, t+T] \times \mathbb{R}^N$ ,  $t > 0$ , and recalling the definition of  $\rho(x, u_t)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.5) \quad & \int_t^{t+T} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho(x, u_t) u_t dx ds \\
 &= \int_t^{t+T} \int_{B_R} \tilde{\rho}(u_t) u_t dx ds + \int_t^{t+T} \int_{\Omega_R} a(x) |u_t|^2 dx ds \\
 &= E(t) - E(t+T) \equiv D(t)^{r+2}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Also multiplying equation (1.1) by  $u$  and integrating we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.6) \quad & \int_t^{t+T} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (|\nabla u|^2 - |u_t|^2) dx ds \\
 &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (u_t(t)u(t) - u_t(t+T)u(t+T)) dx \\
 &\quad - \int_t^{t+T} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho(x, u_t) u dx ds.
 \end{aligned}$$

Next we note from (4.5) that

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.7) \quad & \int_t^{t+T} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u_t|^2 dx ds \\
 &= \int_t^{t+T} \int_{B_R} |u_t|^2 dx ds + \int_t^{t+T} \int_{\Omega_R} |u_t|^2 dx ds \\
 &\leq \int_t^{t+T} \int_{B_R} |u_t|^2 dx ds + \frac{1}{\epsilon_0} D(t)^{r+2}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Combining (4.6) and (4.7) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.8) \quad & \int_t^{t+T} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (|u_t|^2 + |\nabla u|^2) dx ds \\
& \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (u_t(t)u(t) - u_t(t+T)u(t+T)) dx \\
& \quad - \int_t^{t+T} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho(x, u_t) u dx ds + 2 \int_t^{t+T} \int_{B_R} |u_t|^2 dx ds + \frac{2}{\epsilon_0} D(t)^{r+2} \\
& \leq C \{ \|u_t(t)\| \|u(t)\| + \|u_t(t+T)\| \|u(t+T)\| \\
& \quad + \int_t^{t+T} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\rho(x, u_t)| |u| dx ds + \int_t^{t+T} \int_{B_R} |u_t|^2 dx ds + D(t)^{r+2} \} \\
& \equiv I_1(t) + I_2(t) + I_3(t) + I_4(t) + I_5(t).
\end{aligned}$$

Using the Hölder inequality and (4.5), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.9) \quad I_4(t) & \leq \left( \int_t^{t+T} \int_{B_R} dx ds \right)^{\frac{r}{r+2}} \left( \int_t^{t+T} \int_{B_R} |u_t|^{r+2} \right)^{\frac{2}{r+2}} \\
& \leq CD(t)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

In order to estimate terms  $I_1(t)$  and  $I_2(t)$ , first, we observe that by (4.7) and (4.9),

$$(4.10) \quad \int_t^{t+T} \|u_t\|^2 ds \leq C \{ D(t)^2 + D(t)^{r+2} \}$$

From the last inequality, we easily see that

$$(4.11) \quad \|u_t(s)\| \leq C \left\{ D(s) + D(s)^{\frac{r+2}{2}} \right\} \text{ for } t \leq s \leq t+T.$$

Accordingly, using Proposition 4.1 and (4.11), we find that

$$(4.12) \quad I_1(t) + I_2(t) \leq C(1+t)^{\frac{r(N-2)}{2(4-(N-2)r)}} \left\{ D(t) + D(t)^{\frac{r+2}{2}} \right\}.$$

Finally, let us derive the estimate of  $I_3(t)$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.13) \quad I_3(t) &\leq k_1 \int_t^{t+T} \int_{B_R} |u_t|^{r+1} |u| dx ds \\
 &\quad + \int_t^{t+T} \int_{\Omega_R} a(x) |u_t| |u| dx ds \\
 &\equiv J_1(t) + J_2(t)
 \end{aligned}$$

Using the Hölder inequality and the similar way as in the proof of Proposition 4.1 (see (cf. 4 3)), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.14) \quad J_1(t) &\leq k_1 \left( \int_t^{t+T} \int_{B_R} |u_t|^{2(r+1)} dx ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \int_t^{t+T} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u|^2 dx ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
 &\leq C(k_1, T, K, E(0)) (1+t)^{\frac{r(N-2)}{2(4-(N-2)r)}} \left( \int_t^{t+T} \|u_t\|_{r+2}^{2(r+1)(1-\theta)} ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
 &\leq C(k_1, T, K, E(0)) (1+t)^{\frac{r(N-2)}{2(4-(N-2)r)}} \left( \int_t^{t+T} \|u_t\|_{r+2}^{r+2} ds \right)^{\frac{(r+1)(1-\theta)}{r+2}} \\
 &\leq C(k_1, T, K, E(0)) (1+t)^{\frac{r(N-2)}{2(4-(N-2)r)}} D(t)^{(r+1)(1-\theta)} \\
 &= C(k_1, T, K, E(0)) (1+t)^{\frac{r(N-2)}{2(4-(N-2)r)}} D(t)^{\frac{(r+2)(2-(N-2)r)}{4-(N-2)r}}
 \end{aligned}$$

with  $\theta = Nr/(r+1)(4-(N-2)r)$ , where we have used  $0 < r \leq 2/(N-2)$  and

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.15) \quad J_2(t) &\leq C \left( \int_t^{t+T} \int_{\Omega_R} |u_t|^2 dx ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \int_t^{t+T} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u|^2 dx ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
 &\leq C(k_1, T, K, E(0)) (1+t)^{\frac{r(N-2)}{2(4-(N-2)r)}} D(t)^{\frac{r+2}{2}}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Reporting (4.14) and (4.15) in (4.13) and combining (4.8), (4.9), (4.12) and (4.13), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.16) \quad & \int_t^{t+T} E(s) ds \\
 & \leq C \left\{ (1+t)^{\frac{r(N-2)}{2(4-(N-2)r)}} D(t) + D(t)^2 + D(t)^{r+2} \right. \\
 & \quad \left. + (1+t)^{\frac{r(N-2)}{2(4-(N-2)r)}} D(t)^{(r+1)(1-\theta)} + (1+t)^{\frac{r(N-2)}{2(4-(N-2)r)}} D(t)^{\frac{r+2}{2}} \right\} \\
 & \leq C(1+t)^{\frac{r(N-2)}{2(4-(N-2)r)}} \left\{ D(t) + D(t)^{\frac{(r+2)(2-(N-2)r)}{4-(N-2)r}} \right\}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma 2.2 to the above inequality we obtain the estimates in Theorem.

**Acknowledgement** The author would like to thank the referee for kind comments on the first version

## REFERENCES

- [1] V. Komornik, *Exact Controllability and Stabilization-The Multiplier Method*, John Wiley, New York/Masson, Paris, 1994
- [2] J. L. Lions and W. A. Strauss, *Some non-linear evolution equations*, Bull Soc Math France, **93**(1965), 43–96
- [3] K. Mochizuki and T. Motai, *On energy decay-nondecay problems for the wave equations with nonlinear dissipative term in  $R^N$* , J. Math Soc Japan **47**(1995), 405–421.
- [4] M. Nakao, *Energy decay of the wave equation with a nonlinear dissipative term*, Funkcial Ekvac **26**(1983), 237–250
- [5] M. Nakao, *Decay of solutions to the Cauchy problem for the Klein-Gordon equation with a localized nonlinear dissipation*, Hokkaido Math. J. **27** (1998), 245–271
- [6] M. Nakao and I. H. Jung, *Energy decay for the wave equation in the exterior domains with some half-linear dissipation*, Differential and Integral Equations **16** (2003), 927–948
- [7] M. Nakao and K. Ono, *Global existence to the Cauchy problem of the semilinear wave equation with a nonlinear dissipation*, Funkcial Ekvac. **38** (1995), 417–431
- [8] K. Ono, *The time decay to the Cauchy problem of the semilinear dissipative wave equations*, Adv Math Sci. Appl **9** (1999), 243–262

- [9] D. Tataru, *The  $X_{\theta}^s$  spaces and unique continuation for solutions to the semilinear wave equation*, Comm Partial Differential Equations **21**(1996), 841-887.
- [10] G. Todorova, *Stable and unstable sets for the Cauchy problem for a nonlinear wave equation with nonlinear damping and source terms*, J Math Anal Appl **239**(1999), 213-226

Department of Mathematics  
Pusan National University  
Pusan 609-735, Korea  
*E-mail* 1lhjung@pusan.ac.kr