

MAXIMUM PRINCIPLE FOR NON-LINEAR DEGENERATE EQUATIONS OF THE PARABOLIC TYPE

JAN CHABROWSKI AND RUDOLF VÝBORNÝ

This paper establishes a weak maximum principle for the difference $u - v$ of solutions to nonlinear degenerate parabolic differential inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(t, x)u_t - f(t, x, u(t, x), Du(t, x), D^2u(t, x)) \\ \leq \alpha(t, x)v_t - f(t, x, v(t, x), Dv(t, x), D^2v(t, x)) . \end{aligned}$$

The function α is non-negative and f is assumed to be parabolic with respect to u in the sense that there exists a non-negative function κ such that

$$\begin{aligned} f(t, x, u(t, x), Du(t, x), r_1) - f(t, x, Du(t, x), r_2) \\ \geq \kappa(t, x)\text{Tr}(r_1 - r_2) , \end{aligned}$$

whenever r_1 and r_2 are symmetric matrices and $r_1 \geq r_2$.

The crucial assumption is that $\alpha + \kappa$ is bounded away from zero.

The results are then applied to the uniqueness of the Cauchy problem for the degenerate parabolic equation

$$\alpha(t, x)u_t = f(t, x, u, Du, D^2u)$$

under various growth conditions similar to those used in uniqueness theorems for parabolic (non-degenerate) equations.

Received 20 October 1981.

The main purpose of this note is to prove a weak maximum principle for non-linear degenerate equations of the parabolic type. There is an extensive literature on the maximum principle for parabolic and elliptic equations (see [8] and [10]). In recent years the maximum principle was extended to degenerate elliptic parabolic equations and has been studied by several authors [1], [4], [5], [6], [9], [12], [13], [14]. We begin in Section 1 by considering a maximum principle for non-linear degenerate equations of parabolic type in a bounded domain. Theorem 1 is an extension to non-linear equations of the weak maximum principle proved by Ippolito [5]. In Section 2 we extend these results to an infinite strip by using the method of growth damping factors (see [2] and [7]). As an application we obtain the uniqueness of the first initial-boundary value problem in a bounded cylinder and that of the Cauchy problem on a half space.

1.

We consider a differential inequality of the form

$$(1) \quad \alpha(t, x)u_t - f(t, x, u(t, x), Du(t, x), D^2u(t, x)) \\ \leq \alpha(t, x)v_t - f(t, x, v(t, x), Dv(t, x), D^2v(t, x))$$

in $(0, T] \times \Omega$, where Ω is an open set in R_n . Du denotes the gradient of u with respect to x , D^2u is the Hessian matrix of the second order derivatives (also with respect to the variable x), D_i denotes the derivative with respect to x_i , $\alpha(t, x)$ is a non-negative function on $(0, T] \times R_n$. Let $Q = (0, T] \times \Omega$. We denote by $\partial_p Q$ the parabolic boundary of Q ; that is, $\partial_p Q = \bar{Q} - Q$.

We assume that $f(t, x, u, p, r)$ is defined for $(t, x) \in Q$, $u \in R$, $p \in R_n$ and $r \in R_n^2$.

A function $u(t, x)$ is said to be regular on Q if it is continuous on \bar{Q} and Du , D^2u and u_t are continuous on Q (at $t = T$ the derivative u_t is understood as the left-hand derivative).

Given a regular function u , the function f is said to be weakly

parabolic with respect to u if there exists a non-negative function $\kappa = \kappa(t, x)$ such that

$$f(t, x, u(t, x), Du(t, x), r_1) - f(t, x, u(t, x), Du(t, x), r_2) \geq \kappa(t, x) \text{Tr}(r_1 - r_2)$$

holds for $(t, x) \in Q$, whenever r_1 and r_2 are symmetric matrices and

$r_1 \geq r_2$ (that is, the quadratic form $\sum_{j,k=1}^n (r_{1jk} - r_{2jk}) \lambda_j \lambda_k$ is positive semidefinite).

This definition has been introduced by Besala [2] (see also Szarski [10] and [11]).

THEOREM 1. *Suppose that*

- (i) Ω is bounded,
- (ii) f is decreasing with respect to u ,
- (iii) there exists a positive constant L such that

$$|f(t, x, u, p, r) - f(t, x, u, \bar{p}, \bar{r})| \leq L(|p - \bar{p}| + |r - \bar{r}|)$$

holds for all $(t, x) \in Q$ and arbitrary u, p, \bar{p}, r and \bar{r} ,

- (iv) there exists a positive constant k such that

$$\alpha(t, x) + \kappa(t, x) \geq k$$

for $(t, x) \in Q$,

- (v) u and v are solutions to (1) regular in Q ,
- (vi) f is weakly parabolic with respect to u or v .

Then, if $u - v$ has a positive maximum on \bar{Q} , this maximum is attained at some point of $\partial_p Q$.

Proof. We prove the theorem with the assumption that f is weakly parabolic with respect to u . If f is weakly parabolic with respect to v the proof is similar. We set

$$M = \max\{u(t, x) - v(t, x); (t, x) \in \bar{Q}\},$$

$$m = \sup\{0, u(t, x) - v(t, x); (t, x) \in \partial_p Q\}.$$

Assume, contrary to what we want to prove, that $M > m$. Choose

$x^0 \in R_n - \bar{\Omega}$, we may assume that $1 \leq |x - x^0| \leq C$ for all $x \in \bar{\Omega}$ and some positive constant C . Let $t_0 < 0$ and γ a positive number satisfying

$$\gamma > 2L(n+C)/k .$$

We define an auxiliary function ϕ by

$$\phi(t, x) = \exp \left[-\gamma |x - x^0|^2 - \gamma^2 (t - t_0) \right] ,$$

and choose $\varepsilon > 0$ in such a way that

$$(2) \quad \varepsilon \phi(t, x) < M - m ,$$

for all $(t, x) \in \bar{Q}$. Let

$$w(t, x) = u(t, x) - v(t, x) + \varepsilon \phi(t, x) .$$

It follows from (2) that $w < M$ on $\partial_p Q$. Hence w attains its maximum (which is greater than M) over \bar{Q} at a point $(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) \in Q$. Obviously

$$w_t \geq 0 , \quad D_i u - D_i v = 2\varepsilon \gamma \left(\bar{x}_i - x_i^0 \right) \phi \quad (i = 1, \dots, n) ,$$

$$D^2 w \leq 0 ,$$

at (\bar{t}, \bar{x}) . By assumption (vi) we have

$$\begin{aligned} (3) \quad 0 &\leq \alpha(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) w_t(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) \\ &= \alpha(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) (u_t(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) - v_t(\bar{t}, \bar{x})) - \varepsilon \gamma^2 \alpha(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) \phi(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) \\ &\leq f(\bar{t}, \bar{x}, u(\bar{t}, \bar{x}), Du(\bar{t}, \bar{x}), D^2 u(\bar{t}, \bar{x})) \\ &\quad - f(\bar{t}, \bar{x}, v(\bar{t}, \bar{x}), Dv(\bar{t}, \bar{x}), D^2 v(\bar{t}, \bar{x})) - \varepsilon \gamma^2 \alpha(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) \phi(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) \\ &= J - \varepsilon \gamma^2 \alpha(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) \phi(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) . \end{aligned}$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} D^2 u(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) &= [D^2 w(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) - 4\varepsilon \gamma^2 r \phi(\bar{t}, \bar{x})] + [2\gamma \varepsilon I \phi(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) + D^2 v(\bar{t}, \bar{x})] \\ &= A + B , \end{aligned}$$

where r is the matrix with the entries

$$\left(\bar{x}_i - x_i^0 \right) \left(\bar{x}_j - x_j^0 \right)$$

and I is the identity matrix. Now

(4)

$$\begin{aligned}
 J &= [f(\bar{t}, \bar{x}, u(\bar{t}, \bar{x}), Du(\bar{t}, \bar{x}), A+B) - f(\bar{t}, \bar{x}, u(\bar{t}, \bar{x}), Du(\bar{t}, \bar{x}), B)] \\
 &\quad + [f(\bar{t}, \bar{x}, u(\bar{t}, \bar{x}), Du(\bar{t}, \bar{x}), B) - f(\bar{t}, \bar{x}, v(\bar{t}, \bar{x}), Du(\bar{t}, \bar{x}), B)] \\
 &\quad + [f(\bar{t}, \bar{x}, v(\bar{t}, \bar{x}), Du(\bar{t}, \bar{x}), B) - f(\bar{t}, \bar{x}, v(\bar{t}, \bar{x}), Dv(\bar{t}, \bar{x}), D^2v(\bar{t}, \bar{x}))] \\
 &= J_1 + J_2 + J_3 .
 \end{aligned}$$

Using the weak parabolicity we estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
 (5) \quad J_1 &\leq \kappa(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) \left[\sum_{i=1}^n D_i^2 w(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) - 4\epsilon\gamma^2 |\bar{x} - x_0|^2 \phi(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) \right] \\
 &\leq -4\epsilon\gamma^2 \kappa(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) \phi(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) .
 \end{aligned}$$

The inequality $w(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) \geq M$ implies

$$u(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) - v(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) \geq M - \epsilon\phi(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) \geq m \geq 0$$

and since f is decreasing

$$(6) \quad J_2 \leq 0 .$$

Finally, in view of assumption (iii), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 (7) \quad J_3 &\leq L\{|Du(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) - Dv(\bar{t}, \bar{x})| + 2\gamma\epsilon n\phi\} \\
 &= 2L\gamma\epsilon\{|\bar{x} - \bar{x}_0| + n\}\phi(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) \\
 &\leq 2\gamma\epsilon L(C+n)\phi(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) .
 \end{aligned}$$

Combining (3), (4), (5), (6) and (7) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 0 &\leq \alpha(\bar{t}, \bar{x})\omega_{\bar{t}}(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) \\
 &\leq \gamma\epsilon\phi(\bar{t}, \bar{x})[-\gamma\alpha(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) - 4\gamma H(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) + 2L(C+n)] \\
 &\leq \gamma\epsilon\phi(\bar{t}, \bar{x})[-\gamma k + 2L(C+n)] < 0 .
 \end{aligned}$$

This contradiction completes the proof.

As an immediate consequence of Theorem 1 we obtain the uniqueness of the first initial-boundary value problem

$$(8) \quad \alpha(t, x)u_t = f(t, x, u, Du, D^2u) \quad \text{for } (t, x) \in Q ,$$

$$(9) \quad u(t, x) = g(t, x) \quad \text{for } (t, x) \in \partial_p Q ,$$

while g is a given continuous function on $\partial_p Q$.

COROLLARY 1. *Assume that conditions (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv) of Theorem 1 hold. Let u and v be regular solutions to the problems (8) and (9). If f is weakly parabolic with respect to u or v then $u \equiv v$ on \bar{Q} .*

2.

In this section we shall investigate the uniqueness of the Cauchy problem for non-linear equation (8). The method of Section 1 can be used to prove the following extension of Corollary 1 to the infinite strip $(0, T] \times R_n$. Put $S = (0, T] \times R_n$.

THEOREM 2. *Assume that conditions (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv) of Theorem 1 hold for $(t, x) \in S$. Let u and v be regular solutions of (8) such that $u(x, 0) = v(x, 0)$ for $x \in R_n$ and*

$\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} [u(t, x) - v(t, x)] = 0$ *uniformly in $[0, T]$. If f is weakly parabolic with respect to u or v , then $u \equiv v$ on \bar{S} .*

In general, we cannot expect uniqueness even in the class of bounded functions. Indeed, the function

$$u(t, x) \equiv t$$

satisfies the equation

$$\Delta u - 0 \cdot u_t = 0$$

and vanishes at $t = 0$. In the above example $\alpha \equiv 0$; however, if there exist positive constants β and R such that $\alpha(t, x) \geq \beta$ for $|x| \geq R$ and $t \in [0, T]$, then we can formulate a uniqueness theorem in the class of functions growing not faster than $e^{k|x|^2}$, where $k > 0$.

We shall need the following condition on f :

(A) *there exist positive constants L_0, L_1 and L_2 such that*

$$\begin{aligned} & |f(t, x, \alpha, p, r) - f(t, x, \bar{u}, \bar{p}, \bar{r})| \\ & \leq L_0 |r - \bar{r}| + L_1 (1 + |x|) |p - \bar{p}| + L_2 (1 + |x|^2) |u - \bar{u}| \end{aligned}$$

for all $(t, x) \in S$ and arbitrary $u, \bar{u}, p, \bar{p}, r$ and \bar{r} .

Moreover, there exist positive constants R and L_3 such that

$$f(t, x, u, p, r) - f(t, x, \bar{u}, p, r) \leq -L_3(u - \bar{u})$$

for all $|x| < R$, $t \in [0, T]$, $u \geq \bar{u}$ and arbitrary p and r .

Here $|r - \bar{r}|$ is defined by

$$|r - \bar{r}| = \sum_{i,j=1}^n |r_{ij} - \bar{r}_{ij}|.$$

Let β be a fixed positive number and define

$$F_\beta(x, k, \rho) = \begin{cases} L_2 + 4L_0kn + 4nL_1|x| + \left(16L_0k^2n^2 + 4nkL_1 + L_2\right)|x|^2 & \text{for } |x| \geq R, \\ -2\beta k\rho(1 + |x|^2) & \\ L_0kn + 4nkL_1|x| + \left(16k^2n^2L_0 + 4nkL_1\right)|x|^2 & \text{for } |x| < R, \\ -L_3 - 2\alpha k\rho(1 + |x|^2) & \end{cases}$$

There exists a k such that $F_\beta(x, k, 0) < 0$ for all $|x| < R$, to every such k there exists a $\rho(k)$ such that $F_\beta(x, k, \rho) < 0$ for all $x \in R_n$ and all $\rho > \rho(k)$. Put

$$k_0 = \sup\{k > 0; \text{there exists } \rho(k) > 0 \text{ such that } F_\beta(x, k, \rho) < 0 \text{ for all } \rho \geq \rho(k) \text{ and } x \in R_n\}.$$

We are now in a position to define a class of functions in which we shall investigate the uniqueness of the Cauchy problem.

We shall say that a function $u(t, x)$ defined on \bar{S} belongs to $E_+(k_0)$ ($E_-(k_0)$) if there exist positive constants M and $k < k_0$ such that

$$u(t, x) \leq Me^{k|x|^2} \quad (u(t, x) \geq -Me^{k|x|^2})$$

for all $(t, x) \in \bar{S}$.

Put

$$E(k_0) = E_+(k_0) \cap E_-(k_0).$$

THEOREM 3. Suppose that $f(t, x, u, p, r)$ satisfies condition (A)

and moreover

(i) there exists a positive constant β such that

$$\alpha(t, x) \geq \beta \text{ for } t \in [0, T] \text{ and } |x| \geq R$$

and

$$\alpha(t, x) \geq 0 \text{ for } t \in [0, T] \text{ and } |x| < R,$$

(ii) u and v are regular solutions to (1) in S such that

$$u \in E_+(k_0) \text{ and } v \in E_-(k_0),$$

(iii) f is weakly parabolic with respect to u or v with parabolicity function $H \equiv 0$.

If $u(0, x) \leq v(0, x)$ for $x \in R_n$, then

$$u(t, x) \leq v(t, x) \text{ for } \bar{S}.$$

Proof. Since $u \in E_+(k_0)$ and $v \in E_-(k_0)$ there exist positive constants M and $k_1 < k_0$ such that

$$(10) \quad u(t, x) - v(t, x) \leq Me^{k_1|x|^2}$$

for all $(t, x) \in \bar{S}$. Let $k_1 < k < k_0$ and

$$H(t, x) = \exp\left[\frac{2k(1+|x|^2)}{1-\rho t}\right]$$

for $(t, x) \in [0, 1/2\rho] \times R_n$, where $\rho = \rho(k)$ (see the definition of $E_+(k_0)$ and $E_-(k_0)$).

Define

$$\tilde{u} = u/H \text{ and } \tilde{v} = v/H.$$

It follows from (10) that given $\epsilon > 0$ there is a $R_\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$(11) \quad \tilde{u}(t, x) - \tilde{v}(t, x) \leq \epsilon$$

for $t \in [0, 1/2\rho]$ and $|x| \geq R_\epsilon$. We may suppose that $R \leq R_\epsilon$. In order to prove that $u \leq v$ in $[0, 1/2\rho] \times R_n$, it suffices to prove that this inequality is true in the cylinder $[0, 1/2\rho] \times (|x| \leq R_\epsilon)$. Assuming that there is a point $(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) \in (0, 1/2\rho] \times (|x| < R_\epsilon)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\tilde{u}(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) - \tilde{v}(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) \\ &= \text{Max}\{\tilde{u}(t, x) - \tilde{v}(t, x); (t, x) \in [0, 1/2\rho] \times \{|x| < R_\epsilon\}\} > \epsilon, \end{aligned}$$

we shall derive a contradiction. Note that

$$D[\tilde{u}(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) - \tilde{v}(\bar{t}, \bar{x})] = 0, \quad \tilde{u}_t(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) - \tilde{v}_t(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) \geq 0$$

and

$$D^2[\tilde{u}(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) - \tilde{v}(\bar{t}, \bar{x})] \leq 0.$$

Consequently by assumptions (A) and (iii) and by using an argument similar to [10], pp. 205-208, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\alpha(\bar{t}, \bar{x})H(\bar{t}, \bar{x})[\tilde{u}_t(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) - \tilde{v}_t(\bar{t}, \bar{x})] \\ &\leq H(\bar{t}, \bar{x})(1 - \rho\bar{t})^{-2}[\tilde{u}(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) - \tilde{v}(\bar{t}, \bar{x})]F_\beta(\bar{x}, k, \rho) < 0. \end{aligned}$$

This contradiction completes the proof if $1/2\rho = T$; otherwise the proof can be completed by a finite number of applications of the above argument on $[1/2\rho, 1/\rho] \times R_n$, $[1/\rho, 3/2\rho] \times R_n$, and so on.

COROLLARY 2. *Suppose that assumptions (A), (i) and (ii) of Theorem 3 hold. Let u and v be regular solutions of (8) in S belonging to $E(k_0)$. If f is weakly parabolic with respect to u or v and $u(x, 0) = v(x, 0)$ for $x \in R_n$ then $u \equiv v$ on S .*

We conclude by giving some variants of Theorem 3. The first variant is:

THEOREM 3'. *Theorem 3 remains true if we replace assumptions (A) and (i) by*

$$(i') \quad \alpha(t, x) \geq 0 \text{ for } (t, x) \in \bar{S},$$

(A') *there exist positive constants L_0, L_1 and L_2 such that*

$$\begin{aligned} &|f(t, x, u, p, r) - f(t, x, \bar{u}, \bar{p}, \bar{r})| \\ &\leq L_0|r - \bar{r}| + L(1 + |x|)|p - \bar{p}| - L_2(1 + |x|^2)(u - \bar{u}) \end{aligned}$$

for all $(t, x) \in \bar{S}$, $u \geq \bar{u}$ and arbitrary p, \bar{p}, r and \bar{r} .

In this case we define the corresponding functions F and H and a constant k_0 as follows:

$$F(x, k) = 4L_0kn + 4nkL_1|x| + \left(16k^2n^2L_0 + 4nkL_1\right)|x|^2 - L_2(1+|x|^2)$$

for all $x \in R_n$,

$$H(x) = \exp|2k(1+|x|^2)|,$$

$$k_0 = \sup\{k; F(x, k) < 0 \text{ for all } x \in R_n\}.$$

Note that in this variant the function H is independent of t .

In variant 2 of Theorem 3 we replace assumptions (A) and (i) by

$$(i'') \quad \alpha(t, x) \geq 0 \text{ for } (t, x) \in [0, \infty) \times R_n,$$

(A'') There exist positive constants L_0, L_1 and L_2 such that

$$[f(t, x, u, p, r) - f(t, x, \bar{u}, \bar{p}, \bar{r})] \leq L_0|r - \bar{r}| + L_1|p - \bar{p}| - L_2(u - \bar{u})$$

for $(t, x) \in [0, \infty) \times R_n, u \geq \bar{u}$ and arbitrary p, \bar{p}, r and \bar{r} .

We define

$$F(t, x, \delta) = L_0\delta^2 \sum_{i,j=1}^n tgh\delta x_i tgh\delta x_j + L_1\delta \sum_{i=1}^n tgh\delta x_i - L_2 - \delta\alpha(t, x)tgh\delta t$$

for $(t, x) \in (0, \infty) \times R_n,$

$$\delta_0 = \sup\{\delta > 0; F(t, x, \delta) < 0 \text{ for all } (t, x) \in (0, \infty) \times R_n\}.$$

With δ_0 we associate the following class of functions.

A function $u(t, x)$ defined on $[0, \infty) \times R_n$ belongs to $A_+(\delta_0)$ ($A_-(\delta_0)$) if there exist positive constants M and $\delta < \delta_0$ such that

$$u(t, x) \leq M \exp\left[\delta\left(\sum_{i=1}^n |x_i| + t\right)\right] \left[u(t, x) \geq -M \exp\left[\delta\left(\sum_{i=1}^n |x_i| + t\right)\right] \right]$$

for all $(t, x) \in [0, \infty) \times R_n.$

Put

$$A(\delta_0) = A_+(\delta_0) \cap A_-(\delta_0) .$$

We now state the result as

THEOREM 4. *Suppose that the functions f and α satisfy assumptions (i'') and (A'') and moreover*

(ii) *u and v are regular solutions to (1) in $(0, \infty) \times R_n$ such that $u \in A_+(\delta_0)$ and $v \in A_-(\delta_0)$,*

(iii) *f is weakly parabolic with respect to u or v with parabolicity function $H \equiv 0$.*

If $u(0, x) \leq v(0, x)$ for $x \in R_n$, then

$$u(t, x) \leq v(t, x) \text{ for } (t, x) \in [0, \infty) \times R_n .$$

The proof is similar to that of Theorem 3. We only mention that the function H is defined by

$$H(t, x) = \cosh \delta t \prod_{i=1}^n \cosh \delta x_i$$

for $(t, x) \in [0, \infty) \times R_n$.

From the above variant of Theorem 3 and Theorem 4 one can derive the uniqueness criteria for the Cauchy problem for equation (8) in pretty much the same way as we derived Corollary 2 from Theorem 3.

References

- [1] Willy Bertiger and Chris Cosner, "Classical solutions to degenerate parabolic equations in unbounded domains", *Rend. Mat.* (6) 13 (1980), 447-474.
- [2] P. Besala, "An extension of the strong maximum principle for parabolic equations", *Bull. Acad. Polon. Sci. Sér. Sci. Math. Astronom. Phys.* 19 (1971), 1003-1006.

- [3] Jean-Michel Bony, "Principe du maximum, inégalité de Harnack et unicité du problème de Cauchy pour les opérateurs elliptiques dégénérés", *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)* 19 (1969), no. 1 277-304.
- [4] C. Denson Hill, "A sharp maximum principle for degenerate elliptic-parabolic equations", *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* 20 (1970-1971), 213-229.
- [5] Pauline M. Ippolito, "Maximum principles and classical solutions for degenerate parabolic equations", *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 64 (1978), 530-561.
- [6] N.V. Krylov, "The maximum principle for nonlinear parabolic and elliptic equations", *Math. USSR-Izv.* 13 (1979), 335-347.
- [7] M. Krzyżański, "Sur les solutions de l'équation linéaire du type parabolique déterminées par les conditions initiales", *Ann. Soc. Polon. Math.* 18 (1945), 145-156.
- [8] Murray H. Protter and Hans F. Weinberger, *Maximum principles in differential equations* (Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1967).
- [9] Ray Redheffer, "The sharp maximum principle for nonlinear inequalities", *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* 21 (1971), 227-248.
- [10] Jacek Szarski, *Differential inequalities* (Monografie Matematyczne, 43. PWN - Polish Scientific Publishers, Warszawa, 1965).
- [11] J. Szarski, "Strong maximum principle for non-linear parabolic differential functional inequalities in arbitrary domains", *Ann. Polon. Math.* 31 (1975-1976), 197-203.
- [12] Margaret C. Waid, "Second-order time degenerate parabolic equations", *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 170 (1972), 31-55.
- [13] Margaret C. Waid, "Strong maximum principles for time degenerate parabolic operators", *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* 26 (1974), 196-202.

- [14] Margaret C. Waid, "The first initial-boundary value problem for some nonlinear time degenerate parabolic equations", *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 42 (1974), 487-497.

Department of Mathematics,
University of Queensland,
St Lucia,
Queensland 4067,
Australia.