Hindawi Publishing Corporation
Boundary Value Problems
Volume 2009, Article ID 563767, 17 pages
doi:10.1155/2009/563767

Research Article

Existence of Global Attractors in L^p for m-Laplacian Parabolic Equation in R^N

Caisheng Chen,[1] Lanfang Shi,[1, 2] and Hui Wang[1, 3]

[1] *Department of Mathematics, Hohai University, Nanjing 210098, Jiangsu, China*
[2] *College of Mathematics and Physics, Nanjing University of Information Science and Technology, Nanjing 210044, Jiangsu, China*
[3] *Department of Mathematics, Ili Normal University, Yining 835000, Xinjiang, China*

Correspondence should be addressed to Caisheng Chen, cshengchen@hhu.edu.cn

Received 4 April 2009; Revised 9 July 2009; Accepted 24 July 2009

Recommended by Zhitao Zhang

We study the long-time behavior of solution for the m-Laplacian equation $u_t - \operatorname{div}(|\nabla u|^{m-2}\nabla u) + \lambda|u|^{m-2}u + f(x,u) = g(x)$ in $R^N \times R^+$, in which the nonlinear term $f(x,u)$ is a function like $f(x,u) = -h(x)|u|^{q-2}u$ with $h(x) \geq 0$, $2 \leq q < m$, or $f(x,u) = a(x)|u|^{\alpha-2}u - h(x)|u|^{\beta-2}u$ with $a(x) \geq h(x) \geq 0$ and $\alpha > \beta \geq m$. We prove the existence of a global $(L^2(R^N), L^p(R^N))$-attractor for any $p > m$.

1. Introduction

In this paper we are interested in the existence of a global $(L^2(R^N), L^p(R^N))$-attractor for the m-Laplacian equation

$$u_t - \Delta_m u + \lambda|u|^{m-2}u + f(x,u) = g(x), \quad x \in R^N, \ t \in R^+, \tag{1.1}$$

with initial data condition

$$u(x,0) = u_0(x), \quad x \in R^N, \tag{1.2}$$

where the m-Laplacian operator $\Delta_m u = \operatorname{div}(|\nabla u|^{m-2}\nabla u)$, $2 \leq m < N$, $\lambda > 0$.

For the case $m = 2$, the existence of global $(L^2(R^N), L^2(R^N))$-attractor for (1.1)-(1.2) is proved by Wang in [1] under appropriate assumptions on f and g. Recently, Khanmamedov [2] studied the existence of global $(L^2(R^N), L^{m^*}(R^N))$-attractor for (1.1)-(1.2) with $m^* = mN/(N-m)$. Yang et al. in [3] investigated the global $(L^2(R^N), L^p(R^N)\cap W^{1,m}(R^N))$-attractor

$\mathcal{A}_p$ under the assumptions $f(x,u)u \geq a_1|u|^p - a_2|u|^m - a_3(x)$ and $f_u(x,u) \geq a_4(x)$ with the constants $a_1, a_2 > 0$ and the functions $a_3, a_4 \in L^1(R^N) \cap L^\infty(R^N)$. We note that the global attractor $\mathcal{A}_p$ in [3] is related to the p-order polynomial of u on $f(x,u)$. In [4], we consider the existence of global $(L^2(R^N), L^p(R^N))$-attractor for (1.1)-(1.2), which the term $\lambda|u|^{m-2}u$ is replaced by λu. We derive L^∞ estimate of solutions by Moser's technique as in [5–7], and due to this, we need not to make the assumption like $f_u(x,u) \geq a_4(x)$ to show the uniqueness. For a typical example is $f(x,u) = a(x)|u|^{\alpha-2}u - h(x)|u|^{\beta-2}u$ with $a(x) \geq h(x) \geq 0$, $\alpha > \beta \geq 2$, $h(x) \in L^2(R^N) \cap L^\infty(R^N)$. In [4], we assume that $f(x,u)$ satisfies

$$0 \leq \int_0^u f(x,\eta)d\eta + L(x)|u| \leq k_2\big(f(x,u)u + L(x)|u|\big) \tag{1.3}$$

with some $k_2 > 0$ and $L(x) \in L^2(R^N) \cap L^\infty(R^N)$.

Obviously, the nonlinear function $f(x,u) = -h(x)|u|^{q-2}u$ with $h(x) \geq 0$, $q \geq 1$ does not satisfy the assumption (1.3).

In this paper, motivated by [2–4], we are interested in the global $(L^2(R^N), L^p(R^N))$-attractor $\mathcal{A}_p$ for the problem (1.1)-(1.2) with any $p > m$, in which p is independent of the order of polynomial for u on $f(x,u)$.

Our assumptions on $f(x,u)$ is different from that in [2–4]. To obtain the continuity of solution of (1.1)-(1.2) in $L^p(R^N)$, $p \geq 2$, we derive L^∞ estimate of solutions by Moser's technique as in [4, 6, 7]. We will prove that the existence of the global attractor $\mathcal{A}_p$ in $L^p(R^N)$ under weaker conditions.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we derive some estimates and prove some lemmas for the solution of (1.1)-(1.2). By the a priori estimates in Section 2, the existence of global $(L^2(R^N), L^p(R^N))$-attractor for (1.1)-(1.2) is established in Section 3.

2. Preliminaries

We denote by L^p and $W^{1,m}$ the space $L^p(R^N)$ and $W^{1,m}(R^N)$, and the relevant norms by $\|\cdot\|_p$ and $\|\cdot\|_{1,m}$, respectively. It is well known that $W^{1,m}(R^N) = W_0^{1,m}(R^N)$. In general, $\|\cdot\|_E$ denotes the norm of the Banach space E.

For the proof of our results, we will use the following lemmas.

Lemma 2.1 ([8–10] (Gagliardo-Nirenberg)). *Let $\beta \geq 0$, $1 \leq r \leq q \leq m(1+\beta)N/(N-m)$ when $N > m$ and $1 \leq r \leq q \leq \infty$ when $N \leq m$. Suppose $u \in L^r$ and $|u|^\beta u \in W^{1,m}$. Then there exists C_0 such that*

$$\|u\|_q \leq C_0^{1/(\beta+1)} \|u\|_r^{1-\theta} \left\|\nabla(|u|^\beta u)\right\|_m^{\theta/(\beta+1)} \tag{2.1}$$

with $\theta = (1+\beta)(r^{-1} - q^{-1})/(N^{-1} - m^{-1} + (1+\beta)r^{-1})$, where C_0 is a constant independent of q, r, β, and θ if $N \neq m$ and a constant depending on $q/(1+\beta)$ if $N = m$.

Lemma 2.2 ([7]). *Let $y(t)$ be a nonnegative differentiable function on $(0,T]$ satisfying*

$$y'(t) + At^{\lambda\theta-1}y^{1+\theta}(t) \leq Bt^{-k}y(t) + Ct^{-\delta}, \quad 0 < t \leq T, \tag{2.2}$$

with $A, \theta > 0$, $\lambda\theta \geq 1$, $B, C \geq 0$, $k \leq 1$, *and* $0 \leq \delta < 1$. *Then one has*

$$y(t) \leq A^{-1/\theta}\left(2\lambda + 2BT^{1-k}\right)^{1/\theta} t^{-\lambda} + 2C\left(\lambda + BT^{1-k}\right)^{-1} t^{1-\delta}, \quad 0 < t \leq T. \tag{2.3}$$

Lemma 2.3 ([11]). *Let* $y(t)$ *be a nonnegative differential function on* $(0, \infty)$ *satisfying*

$$y'(t) + Ay^{1+\mu}(t) \leq B, \quad t > 0 \tag{2.4}$$

with A, $\mu > 0$, $B \geq 0$. *Then one has*

$$y(t) \leq \left(BA^{-1}\right)^{1/(1+\mu)} + (A\mu t)^{-1/\mu}, \quad t > 0. \tag{2.5}$$

First, the following assumptions are listed.

($\mathbf{A_1}$) *Let* $f(x,u) \in C^1(R^{N+1})$, $f(x,0) = 0$ *and there exist the nontrivial nonnegative functions* $h(x) \in L^{q_1} \cap L^\infty$ *and* $h_1(x) \in L^1$, *such that* $F(x,u) \leq k_1 f(x,u)u$ *and*

$$-h(x)|u|^q \leq f(x,u)u \leq h(x)|u|^q + h_1(x), \tag{2.6}$$

$$(f(x,u) - f(x,v))(u - v) \geq -k_2\left(1 + |u|^{q-2} + |v|^{q-2}\right)|u - v|^2, \tag{2.7}$$

where $F(x,u) = \int_0^u f(x,s)ds$, $2 \leq q < m$, $q_1 = m/(m-q)$ *and some constants* $k_1, k_2 \geq 0$.

($\mathbf{A_2}$) *Let* $f(x,u) \in C^1(R^{N+1})$, $f(x,0) = 0$ *and there exists the nontrivial nonnegative function* $h_1(x) \in L^1$, *such that* $F(x,u) \leq k_1 f(x,u)u$ *and*

$$\begin{gathered} a_1|u|^\alpha - a_2|u|^m \leq f(x,u)u \leq b_1|u|^\alpha + b_2|u|^m + h_1(x), \\ (f(x,u) - f(x,v))(u - v) \geq -k_4\left(1 + |u|^{\alpha-2} + |v|^{\alpha-2}\right)|u - v|^2, \end{gathered} \tag{2.8}$$

where $a_2 < \lambda$, $m < \alpha < m + 2m/N$, *and* $a_1, b_1, b_2 > 0$, $k_1, k_2 \geq 0$.

A typical example is $f(x,u) = a(x)|u|^{\alpha-2}u - h(x)|u|^{\beta-2}u$ *with* $a(x), h(x) \geq 0$, *and* $\alpha > \beta \geq m$. *The assumption* ($\mathbf{A_2}$) *is similar to [3, (1.3)–(1.7)].*

Remark 2.4. If $f(x,u) = -h(x)|u|^{q-2}u$, $q > m$, the problem (1.1)-(1.2) has no nontrivial solution for some $h(x) \geq 0$, see [12].

We first establish the following theorem.

Theorem 2.5. *Let* $g \in L^{m'} \cap L^\infty$ *and* $u_0 \in L^2$. *If* ($\mathbf{A_1}$) *holds, then the problem* (1.1)-(1.2) *admits a unique solution* $u(t)$ *satisfying*

$$\begin{gathered} u(t) \in \mathbf{X} \equiv \mathbf{C}\left([0,\infty), L^2\right) \cap L^m_{\text{loc}}\left([0,\infty), W^{1,m}\right) \cap L^\infty_{\text{loc}}\left([0,\infty), L^2\right), \\ u_t \in L^m_{\text{loc}}\left([0,\infty), W^{-1,m'}\right), \end{gathered} \tag{2.9}$$

and the following estimates:

$$\|u(t)\|_2^2 \le C_0\Big(\|g\|_{m'}^{m'} + \|h\|_{q_1}^{q_1}\Big)t + \|u_0\|_2^2, \quad t \ge 0, \tag{2.10}$$

$$\|\nabla u(t)\|_m^m + \lambda\|u(t)\|_m^m \le C_0\Big(\|g\|_{m'}^{m'} + \|h\|_{q_1}^{q_1} + \|h_1\|_1\Big) + t^{-1}\|u_0\|_2^2, \quad t > 0, \tag{2.11}$$

$$\int_s^t \|u_t(\tau)\|_2^2 d\tau \le C_0\Big(\|g\|_{m'}^{m'} + \|h\|_{q_1}^{q_1} + \|h_1\|_1\Big) + s^{-1}\|u_0\|_2^2, \quad 0 < s \le t, \tag{2.12}$$

$$\|u(t)\|_\infty \le C_1 t^{-s_0}, \qquad s_0 = N(2m + (m-2)N)^{-1}, \quad 0 < t \le T \tag{2.13}$$

with $m' = m/(m-1)$. The constant C_0 depends only on m, N, q, λ, and C_1 depends on h, g, u_0, and T.

Proof. For any $T > 0$, the existence and uniqueness of solution $u(t)$ for (1.1)-(1.2) in the class

$$\mathbf{X}_T \equiv \mathbf{C}\Big([0,T], L^2\Big) \cap L^m\Big([0,T], W^{1,m}\Big) \cap L^\infty\Big([0,T], L^2\Big) \tag{2.14}$$

can be obtained by the standard Faedo-Galerkin method, see, for example, [10, Theorem 7.1, page 232], or by the pseudomonotone operator method in [2]. Further, we extend the solution $u(t)$ for all $t \ge 0$ by continuity and bounded over L^2 such that $u(t) \in \mathbf{X}$.

In the following, we will derive the estimates (2.10)–(2.13). The solution is in fact given as limits of smooth solutions of approximate equations (see [5, 6]), we may assume for our estimates that the solutions under consideration are appropriately smooth. We begin with the estimate of $\|u(t)\|_2$.

We multiply (1.1) by u and integrate by parts to get

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\|u(t)\|_2^2 + \|\nabla u(t)\|_m^m + \lambda\|u(t)\|_m^m = \int_{R^N} (g(x) - f(x,u))u\,dx. \tag{2.15}$$

Since

$$\begin{gathered} -\int_{R^N} f(x,u(t))u(t)dx \le \int_{R^N} h(x)|u(t)|^q dx \le \lambda_0\|u(t)\|_m^m + C_0\|h\|_{q_1}^{q_1}, \\ \int_{R^N} g(x)u(t)dx \le \lambda_0\|u(t)\|_m^m + C_0\|g\|_{m'}^{m'} \end{gathered} \tag{2.16}$$

with $\lambda_0 = \lambda/4$. We have from (2.15) that

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\|u(t)\|_2^2 + \|\nabla u(t)\|_m^m + 2\lambda_0\|u(t)\|_m^m \le C_0\Big(\|g\|_{m'}^{m'} + \|h\|_{q_1}^{q_1}\Big). \tag{2.17}$$

Integrating (2.17) with respect to t, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2}\|u(t)\|_2^2 + \int_0^t (\|\nabla u(\tau)\|_m^m + 2\lambda_0\|u(\tau)\|_m^m)d\tau \le C_0\Big(\|g\|_{m'}^{m'} + \|h\|_{q_1}^{q_1}\Big)t + \frac{1}{2}\|u_0\|_2^2. \tag{2.18}$$

This implies (2.10) and the existence of $t^* \in (0,t)$ such that

$$\|\nabla u(t^*)\|_m^m + 2\lambda_0 \|u(t^*)\|_m^m \le C_0\left(\|g\|_{m'}^{m'} + \|h\|_{q_1}^{q_1}\right) + t^{-1}\|u_0\|_2^2, \quad t > 0. \tag{2.19}$$

On the other hand, multiplying (1.1) by u_t and integrating on $(s,t) \times R^N$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\int_s^t \|u_t(\tau)\|_2^2 d\tau + \frac{1}{m}\|\nabla u(t)\|_m^m + \frac{\lambda}{m}\|u(t)\|_m^m + \int_{R^N} (F(x,u(t)) - g(x)u(t))dx \\ = \frac{1}{m}\|\nabla u(s)\|_m^m + \frac{\lambda}{m}\|u(s)\|_m^m + \int_{R^N} (F(x,u(s)) - g(x)u(s))dx.\end{aligned} \tag{2.20}$$

By (2.6), we have $F(x,u) \ge -h(x)|u|^q$ and

$$-\int_{R^N} F(x,u(t))dx \le \int_{R^N} h(x)|u(t)|^q dx \le \varepsilon\|u(t)\|_m^m + C_0\|h\|_{q_1}^{q_1} \tag{2.21}$$

with $0 < \varepsilon \le \lambda/2m$. Similarly, we have the following estimates by Young's inequality:

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{R^N} \left|g(x)u(t)\right| dx &\le \varepsilon\|u(t)\|_m^m + C_0\|g\|_{m'}^{m'}, \\ \int_{R^N} \left|g(x)u(S)\right| dx &\le \|u(s)\|_m^m + \|g\|_{m'}^{m'}, \\ \int_{R^N} F(x,u(s))dx &\le k_1\int_{R^N} (h(x)|u(s)|^q + h_1(x))dx \\ &\le C_0\left(\|u(s)\|_m^m + \|h\|_{q_1}^{q_1} + \|h_1\|_1\right).\end{aligned} \tag{2.22}$$

Then, we have from (2.20) that

$$\int_s^t \|u_t(\tau)\|_2^2 d\tau + \frac{1}{m}\|\nabla u(t)\|_m^m + \frac{\lambda}{2m}\|u(t)\|_m^m \le C_0(\|\nabla u(s)\|_m^m + \|u(s)\|_m^m + M_1), \tag{2.23}$$

where

$$M_1 = \|g\|_{m'}^{m'} + \|h\|_{q_1}^{q_1} + \|h_1\|_1. \tag{2.24}$$

Further, we let $s = t^*$ in (2.23) and obtain from (2.19) that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla u(t)\|_m^m + \lambda\|u(t)\|_m^m &\le C_0\left(M_1 + t^{-1}\|u_0\|_2^2\right), \quad t > 0, \\ \int_s^t \|u_t(\tau)\|_2^2 d\tau &\le C_0\left(M_1 + s^{-1}\|u_0\|_2^2\right), \quad 0 < s < t.\end{aligned} \tag{2.25}$$

Thus, the solution $u(t)$ satisfies (2.10)–(2.12). We now derive (2.13) by Moser's technique as in [5, 6]. In the sequel, we will write u^p instead of $|u|^{p-1}u$ when $p \geq 1$. Also, let C and C_j be the generic constants independent of p changeable from line to line.

Multiplying (1.1) by $|u|^{p-2}u$, $(p \geq 2)$, we get

$$\frac{1}{p}\frac{d}{dt}\|u(t)\|_p^p + C_1 p^{1-m}\left\|\nabla u^{(p+m-2)/m}\right\|_m^m + \lambda\|u(t)\|_{p+m-2}^{p+m-2} \leq \int_{R^N}(g(x) - f(x,u))|u|^{p-2}u\,dx. \tag{2.26}$$

It follows from Young's inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{R^N}\left|g(x)\right||u|^{p-1}dx &\leq \lambda_0\|u\|_{p+m-2}^{p+m-2} + \lambda_0^{(1-p)/(m-1)}\left\|g\right\|_{\alpha_p}^{\alpha_p} \\ -\int_{R^N} f(x,u)|u|^{p-2}u\,dx &\leq \lambda_0\|u\|_{p+m-2}^{p+m-2} + \lambda_0^{(2-p-q)/(m-q)}\|h\|_{\beta_p}^{\beta_p} \end{aligned} \tag{2.27}$$

with $\lambda_0 = \lambda/4$, $\alpha_p = (p+m-2)/(m-1)$, $\beta_p = (p+m-2)/(m-q)$. Then, (2.26) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{p}\frac{d}{dt}\|u(t)\|_p^p + C_1 p^{1-m}\left\|\nabla u^{(p+m-2)/m}\right\|_m^m + 2\lambda_0\|u(t)\|_{p+m-2}^{p+m-2} \\ &\quad\leq \lambda_0^{(1-p)/(m-1)}\left\|g\right\|_{\alpha_p}^{\alpha_p} + \lambda_0^{(2-p-q)/(m-q)}\|h\|_{\beta_p}^{\beta_p}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.28}$$

Let $R > m/2$, $p_1 = 2$, $p_n = Rp_{n-1} - (m-2)$, $n = 2, 3, \ldots$. Then, by Lemma 2.1, we see

$$\left\|\nabla u^{(p_n+m-2)/m}\right\|_m^m \geq C_0^{-m/\theta_n}\|u\|_{p_{n-1}}^{(p_n+m-2)(1-\theta_n^{-1})}\|u\|_{p_n}^{(p_n+m-2)\theta_n^{-1}}, \tag{2.29}$$

where

$$\theta_n = \frac{p_n+m-2}{m}\left(\frac{1}{p_{n-1}} - \frac{1}{p_n}\right)\left(\frac{1}{N} - \frac{1}{m} + \frac{p_n+m-2}{mp_{n-1}}\right)^{-1} = \frac{NR(1-p_{n-1}p_n^{-1})}{m+N(R-1)}. \tag{2.30}$$

Inserting (2.29) into (2.28) $(p = p_n)$, we find

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|u(t)\|_{p_n}^{p_n} + C_1C_0^{-m/\theta_n}p_n^{2-m}\|u\|_{p_n}^{p_n+r_n}\|u\|_{p_{n-1}}^{m-2-r_n} \leq p_nA_n, \tag{2.31}$$

where $r_n = (p_n+m-2)\theta_n^{-1} - p_n$ and

$$A_n = \lambda_0^{(2-p_n-q)/(m-q)}\|h\|_{\mu_n}^{\mu_n} + \lambda_0^{(1-p_n)/(m-1)}\left\|g\right\|_{\lambda_n}^{\lambda_n} \tag{2.32}$$

with $\lambda_n = (p_n+m-2)/(m-1)$, $\mu_n = (p_n+m-2)/(m-q)$, $n = 1, 2, \ldots$.

We claim that there exist the bounded sequences $\{\xi_n\}$ and $\{s_n\}$ such that

$$\|u(t)\|_{p_n} \le \xi_n t^{-s_n}, \quad 0 < t \le T. \tag{2.33}$$

Indeed, by (2.10), this holds for $n = 1$ if we take $s_1 = 0$, $\xi_1 = M_1 T^{1/2} + \|u_0\|_2$. If (2.33) is true for $n - 1$, then we have from (2.31) that

$$y'(t) + A t^{\tau_n \theta - 1} y^{1+\theta}(t) \le p_n A_n, \quad 0 < t \le T, \tag{2.34}$$

where $y(t) = \|u(t)\|_{p_n}^{p_n}$, $\tau_n = s_n p_n$ and

$$\theta = r_n p_n^{-1}, \qquad s_n = (1 + s_{n-1}(r_n - m + 2)) r_n^{-1}, \qquad A = C_1 C_0^{-m/\theta_n} p_n^{2-m} \xi_{n-1}^{m-2-r_n}. \tag{2.35}$$

Applying Lemma 2.2 to (2.34), we have (2.33) for n with

$$\xi_n = \xi_{n-1} \left(C_1^{-1} C_0^{m/\theta_n} p_n^{m-1} s_n^{-1} \right)^{1/r_n} + \left(2 A_n s_n^{-1} \right)^{1/p_n} T^{1+s_n} \tag{2.36}$$

for $n = 2, 3, \ldots$.

It is not difficult to show that $s_n \to s_0 = N(2m + (m-2)N)^{-1}$, as $n \to \infty$ and $\{\xi_n\}$ is bounded, see [6]. Then, (2.13) follows from (2.33) as $n \to \infty$.

We now consider the uniqueness and continuity of the solution for (1.1)-(1.2) in L^2. Let u_1, u_2 be two solutions of (1.1)-(1.2), which satisfy (2.10)–(2.13). Denote $u(t) = u_1(t) - u_2(t)$. Then $u(t)$ solves

$$u_t - (\Delta_m u_1 - \Delta_m u_2) + \lambda \left(|u_1|^{m-2} u_1 - |u_2|^{m-2} u_2 \right) = f(x, u_2) - f(x, u_1). \tag{2.37}$$

Multiplying (2.37) by u, we get from (2.7) and (2.13) that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|u(t)\|_2^2 + \gamma_0 \|\nabla u(t)\|_m^m + \gamma_1 \|u(t)\|_m^m &\le k_2 \int_{R^N} \left(1 + |u_1|^{q-2} + |u_2|^{q-2} \right) u^2 dx \\ &\le k_2 \int_{R^N} \left(1 + \|u_1(t)\|_\infty^{q-2} + \|u_2(t)\|_\infty^{q-2} \right) u^2 dx \le C_0 \left(1 + t^{-s_0(q-2)} \right) \|u(t)\|_2^2 \end{aligned} \tag{2.38}$$

with some $\gamma_0, \gamma_1 > 0$. Since $s_0(q-2) < 1$ and $u(0) = 0$, (2.38) implies that $\|u(t)\|_2 \equiv 0$ in $[0, T]$ and $u_1(t) = u_2(t)$ in $[0, T]$.

Further, let $t > s \ge 0$. Note that

$$\|u(t) - u(s)\|_2^2 = \int_{R^N} \left(\int_s^t u_t(\tau) d\tau \right)^2 dx \le \int_s^t \|u_t(\tau)\|_2^2 (t - s). \tag{2.39}$$

This shows that $\|u(t) - u(s)\|_2^2 \to 0$ as $t \to s$ and $u(t) \in C([0, T], L^2)$. Then the proof of Theorem 2.5 is completed. □

Remark 2.6. By (2.23), we know that if $u_0 \in W^{1,m}$, then

$$\int_0^t \|u_t(\tau)\|_2^2 d\tau + \frac{1}{m}\|\nabla u(t)\|_m^m + \frac{\lambda}{2m}\|u(t)\|_m^m \le C_0\|u_0\|_{1,m}^m + M_1, \quad t \ge 0, \tag{2.40}$$

where M_1 is given in (2.24). Hence, we have

Theorem 2.7. *Assume* $(\mathbf{A_1})$ *and* $g \in L^{m'} \cap L^\infty$*. Suppose also* $u_0(x) \in W^{1,m}$*. Then, the unique solution* $u(t)$ *in Theorem 2.5 also satisfies*

$$u(t) \in Y \equiv L^\infty\Big([0,+\infty), W^{1,m}\Big), \qquad u_t \in L^2\Big([0,+\infty), L^2\Big), \tag{2.41}$$

and the estimate (2.40).

Now consider the assumption $(\mathbf{A_2})$*. Since* $m < \alpha < m + 2m/N$*, one has* $s_0(\alpha - 2) = N(\alpha - 2)/(2m + (m-2)N) < 1$*. By a similar argument in the proof of Theorem 2.5, one can establish the following theorem.*

Theorem 2.8. *Assume* $(\mathbf{A_2})$ *and* $g \in L^{m'} \cap L^\infty$, $u_0 \in L^2$*. Then the problem* (1.1)-(1.2) *admits a unique solution* $u(t)$ *which satisfies*

$$\begin{gathered} u(t) \in \mathbf{X} \equiv \mathbf{C}\Big([0,\infty), L^2\Big) \cap L^m_{\text{loc}}\Big([0,\infty), W^{1,m}\Big) \cap L^\infty_{\text{loc}}\Big([0,\infty), L^2\Big), \\ u_t \in L^m_{\text{loc}}\Big([0,\infty), W^{-1,m'}\Big), \end{gathered} \tag{2.42}$$

and the following estimates:

$$\begin{gathered} \|u(t)\|_2^2 \le C_0 t \|g\|_{m'}^{m'} + \|u_0\|_2^2, \quad t \ge 0, \\ \|\nabla u(t)\|_m^m + \lambda\|u(t)\|_m^m + \|u(t)\|_\alpha^\alpha \le C_0\Big(\|g\|_{m'}^{m'} + \|h_1\|_1\Big) + t^{-1}\|u_0\|_2^2, \quad t > 0, \\ \int_s^t \|u_t(\tau)\|_2^2 d\tau \le C_0\Big(\|g\|_{m'}^{m'} + \|h_1\|_1\Big) + s^{-1}\|u_0\|_2^2, \quad 0 < s \le t, \\ \|u(t)\|_\infty \le C_1 t^{-s_0}, \quad s_0 = N(2m + (m-2)N)^{-1}, \quad 0 < t \le T. \end{gathered} \tag{2.43}$$

Further, if $u_0 \in W^{1,m}$*, the unique solution* $u(t) (\in Y)$ *satisfies*

$$\int_0^t \|u_t(\tau)\|_2^2 d\tau + \|\nabla u(t)\|_m^m + \|u(t)\|_m^m + \|u(t)\|_\alpha^\alpha \le C_0\Big(\|u_0\|_{1,m}^m + \|h_1\|_1 + \|g\|_{m'}^{m'}\Big), \tag{2.44}$$

where C_0 *depends only on* m, N, λ, α, *and* C_1 *on the given data* g, h_1, u_0, *and* $T > 0$.

So, by Theorems 2.5–2.8, one obtains that the solution operator $S(t)u_0 = u(t)$, $t \ge 0$ of the problem (1.1)-(1.2) generates a semigroup on L^2 or on $W^{1,m}$, which has the following properties:

(1) $S(t) : L^2 \to L^2$ for $t \geq 0$, and $S(0)u_0 = u_0$ for $u_0 \in L^2$ or $S(t) : W^{1,m} \to W^{1,m}$ for $t \geq 0$, and $S(0)u_0 = u_0$ for $u_0 \in W^{1,m}$;

(2) $S(t+s) = S(t)S(s)$ for $t, s \geq 0$;

(3) $S(t)\theta \to S(s)\theta$ in L^2 as $t \to s$ for every $\theta \in L^2$.

From Theorems 2.5–2.8, one has the following lemma.

Lemma 2.9. *Suppose* $(\mathbf{A_1})$ *(or* $(\mathbf{A_2})$*) and* $g \in L^{m'} \cap L^\infty$. *Let* $\mathcal{B}_0$ *be a bounded subset of* L^2. *Then, there exists* $T_0 = T_0(\mathcal{B}_0)$ *such that* $S(t)\mathcal{B}_0 \subset \mathfrak{D}$ *for every* $t \geq T_0$, *where*

$$\mathfrak{D} = \left\{ u \in W^{1,m} \mid \|\nabla u\|_m^m + \lambda \|u\|_m^m \leq M_1 \right\} \tag{2.45}$$

with $M_1 = \|h\|_{q_1}^{q_1} + \|h_1\|_1 + \|g\|_{m'}^{m'}$ *if* $(\mathbf{A_1})$ *holds, and* $M_1 = \|h_1\|_1 + \|g\|_{m'}^{m'}$ *if* $(\mathbf{A_2})$ *holds.*

Now it is a position of Theorem 2.5 to establish some continuity of $S(t)$ *with respect to the initial data* u_0, *which will be needed in the proof for the existence of attractor.*

Lemma 2.10. *Assume that all the assumptions in Theorem 2.5 are satisfied. Let* $S(t)\phi_n$ *and* $S(t)\phi$ *be the solutions of problem* (1.1)-(1.2) *with the initial data* ϕ_n *and* ϕ, *respectively. If* $\phi_n \to \phi$ *in* $L^p (p \geq 2)$ *as* $n \to \infty$, *then* $S(t)\phi_n$ *uniformly converges to* $S(t)\phi$ *in* L^p *for any compact interval* $[0, T]$ *as* $n \to \infty$.

Proof. Let $u_n(t) = S(t)\phi_n$, $u(t) = S(t)\phi$, $n = 1, 2, \ldots$. Then, $w_n(t) = u_n(t) - u(t)$ solves

$$w_{nt} - (\Delta_m u_n - \Delta_m u) + \lambda \left(|u_n|^{m-2} u_n - |u|^{m-2} u \right) = f(x, u) - f(x, u_n) \tag{2.46}$$

and $w_n(x, 0) = \phi_n(x) - \phi(x)$.

Multiplying (2.46) by $|w_n|^{p-2} w_n$, we get from [8, Chapter 1, Lemma 4.4] and (2.13) that

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{p} \frac{d}{dt} \|w_n(t)\|_p^p + \gamma_0 \int_{R^N} |\nabla w_n|^m |w_n|^{p-2} dx + \lambda \|w_n(t)\|_{p+m-2}^{p+m-2} \\ &\quad \leq k_2 \int_{R^N} \left(1 + |u|^{q-2}(t) + |u_n|^{q-2}(t) \right) |w_n(t)|_p^p dx \\ &\quad \leq C_0 \left(1 + \|u_n(t)\|_\infty^{q-2} + \|u(t)\|_\infty^{q-2} \right) \|w_n(t)\|_p^p \\ &\quad \leq C_0 \left(1 + t^{-s_0(q-2)} \right) \|w_n(t)\|_p^p, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T, \end{aligned} \tag{2.47}$$

for some $\gamma_0 > 0$, depending on m, N. This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_n(t)\|_p &\leq \|w_n(0)\|_p \exp\left(C_0 \left(T + (1 - s_0(q-2))^{-1} T^{1 - s_0(q-2)} \right) \right) \\ &= \left\| \phi_n - \phi \right\|_p \exp\left(C_0 \left(T + (1 - s_0(q-2))^{-1} T^{1 - s_0(q-2)} \right) \right), \quad 0 \leq t \leq T, \end{aligned} \tag{2.48}$$

with $s_0(q-2) = N(q-2)((m-2)N+2m)^{-1} < 1$. Letting $n \to \infty$, we obtain the desired result. $\square$

Lemma 2.11. *Suppose that all the assumptions in Theorem 2.5 are satisfied. Let $u(t)$ be the solution of (1.1)-(1.2) with $u_0 \in L^2$, $\|u_0\|_2 \le M_0$. Then, $\exists T_0 > 0$, such that for any $p > m$, one has*

$$\|u(t)\|_p \le A_p + B_p(t-T_0)^{-1/p\alpha_0}, \quad t > T_0, \tag{2.49}$$

where $\alpha_0 = (m-2+m^2/N)/(p-m)$ and $A_p, B_p > 0$, which depend only on p, N, m and the given data $\|g\|_{\alpha_p}$, $\|h\|_{\beta_p}$, M_0 with $\alpha_p = (p+m-2)/(m-1)$, $\beta_p = (p+m-2)/(m-q)$.

Proof. Multiplying (1.1) by $|u|^{p-2}u$, we have

$$\frac{1}{p}\frac{d}{dt}\|u(t)\|_p^p + \gamma_p\left\|\nabla\left(|u|^{(p-2)/m}u\right)\right\|_m^m + \lambda\|u\|_{p+m-2}^{p+m-2} \le \int_{R^N}(g(x)-f(x,u))u|u|^{p-2}dx \tag{2.50}$$

with $\gamma_p = m^m(p-1)(m+p-2)^{-m}$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{R^N} g(x)|u|^{p-2}u\,dx &\le \varepsilon\|u\|_{p+m-2}^{p+m-2} + C_p\|g\|_{\alpha_p}^{\alpha_p},\\ -\int_{R^N} f(x,u)u|u|^{p-2}dx \le \int_{R^N} h(x)|u|^{p+q-2}dx &\le \varepsilon\|u\|_{p+m-2}^{p+m-2} + C_p\|h\|_{\beta_p}^{\beta_p}\end{aligned} \tag{2.51}$$

with $0 < \varepsilon < \lambda/4$. Then (2.50) becomes

$$\frac{1}{p}\frac{d}{dt}\|u(t)\|_p^p + \gamma_p\left\|\nabla\left(|u|^{(p-2)/m}u\right)\right\|_m^m + \frac{\lambda}{2}\|u\|_{p+m-2}^{p+m-2} \le C_p\left(\|h\|_{\beta_p}^{\beta_p} + \|g\|_{\alpha_p}^{\alpha_p}\right). \tag{2.52}$$

By Lemma 2.1, we get

$$\|\nabla(|u(t)|^{\tau}u(t))\|_m^m \ge C_0\|u(t)\|_p^{m(1+\tau)/\theta_1}\|u(t)\|_m^{\tau_1}, \tag{2.53}$$

with

$$\tau = \frac{p-2}{m}, \qquad \theta_1 = (1+\tau)\left(\frac{1}{m}-\frac{1}{p}\right)\left(\frac{1}{N}+\frac{\tau}{m}\right)^{-1}, \qquad \tau_1 = m\left(1-\theta_1^{-1}\right)(1+\tau) < 0. \tag{2.54}$$

By Lemma 2.9, $\exists T_0 > 0$, such that $t \ge T_0$, $\|u(t)\|_m \le M_1$. Therefore, we have from (2.52) and (2.53) that

$$\frac{1}{p}\frac{d}{dt}\|u(t)\|_p^p + C_0M_1^{\tau_1}\|u(t)\|_p^{p(1+\alpha_0)} \le A \equiv C_p\left(\|h\|_{\beta_p}^{\beta_p} + \|g\|_{\alpha_p}^{\alpha_p}\right), \quad t > T_0 \tag{2.55}$$

with

$$p(1+\alpha_0) = \frac{m(1+\tau)}{\theta_1}, \qquad \tau_1 = m-2-p\alpha_0 < 0, \qquad \alpha_0 = \frac{m-2+m^2/N}{p-m} > 0. \tag{2.56}$$

It follows from (2.55) and Lemma 2.3 that

$$\|u(t)\|_p^p \le \left(AM_1^{-\tau_1}C_0^{-1}\right)^{1/(1+\alpha_0)} + \left(C_0 M_1^{\tau_1}\alpha_0(t-T_0)\right)^{-1/\alpha_0}, \quad t > T_0. \tag{2.57}$$

This gives (2.49) and completes the proof of Lemma 2.11. □

By Lemma 2.11, we now establish

Lemma 2.12. *Assume that all the assumptions in Theorem 2.5 are satisfied. Let $\mathcal{B}_0$ be a bounded set in L^2 and $u(t)$ be a solution of* (1.1)-(1.2) *with $u_0 \in \mathcal{B}_0$. Then, for any $\eta > 0$ and $p > m$, $\exists r_0 = r_0(\eta, \mathcal{B}_0)$, $T_1 = T_1(\eta, \mathcal{B}_0)$, such that $r \ge r_0$, $t \ge T_1$,*

$$\int_{B_r^c} |u(t)|^p dx \le \eta, \quad \forall u_0 \in \mathcal{B}_0, \tag{2.58}$$

where $B_r^c = \{x \in R^N \mid |x| \ge r\}$.

Proof. We choose a suitable cut-off function for the proof. Let

$$\phi_0(s) = \begin{cases} 0, & 0 \le s \le 1; \\ (n-k)^{-1}\left(n(s-1)^k - k(s-1)^n\right), & 1 < s < 2; \\ 1, & s \ge 2; \end{cases} \tag{2.59}$$

in which $n(> k > m)$ will be determined later. It is easy to see that $\phi_0(s) \in C^1[0,\infty)$, $0 \le \phi_0(s) \le 1$, $0 \le \phi_0'(s) \le \beta_0\phi_0^{1-1/k}(s)$ for $s \ge 0$, where $\beta_0 = k(n/(n-k))^{1/k}$. For every $r > 0$, denote $\phi = \phi(r,x) = \phi_0(|x|/r)$, $x \in R^N$. Then

$$\left|\nabla_x \phi(r,x)\right| \le \frac{\beta_1}{r}\phi^{1-\frac{1}{k}}(r,x), \quad x \in R^N, \tag{2.60}$$

with $\beta_1 = N\beta_0$.

Multiplying (1.1) by $|u|^{p-2}u\phi$, $(p > m)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{p}\frac{d}{dt}\int_{R^N} |u|^p \phi\, dx + \int_{R^N} |\nabla u|^{m-2}\nabla u \nabla\left(|u|^{p-2}u\phi\right)dx + \frac{\lambda}{2}\int_{R^N} |u|^{p+m-2}\phi\, dx \\ &\quad \le C_p\left(\|h\|_{\beta_p}^{\beta_p}(B_r^c) + \|g\|_{\alpha_p}^{\alpha_p}(B_r^c)\right), \end{aligned} \tag{2.61}$$

where and in the sequel, we let $\|f\|_p^p(\Omega) = \int_\Omega |f(x)|^p dx$. Note that

$$D_1 = \int_{R^N} |\nabla u|^{m-2} \nabla u \nabla \left(|u|^{p-2} u\phi \right) dx = (p-1) \int_{R^N} |u|^{p-2} |\nabla u|^m \phi \, dx + D_2 \tag{2.62}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} D_2 &= \int_{R^N} |\nabla u|^{m-2} \nabla u \nabla \phi |u|^{p-2} u \, dx \\ &\leq \int_{R^N} |\nabla u|^{m-1} \left| \nabla \phi \right| |u|^{p-1} dx \\ &\leq \frac{\beta_1}{r} \int_{R^N} |\nabla u|^{m-1} |u|^{p-1} \phi^{1-1/k} dx \\ &\leq \frac{\beta_1}{r} \int_{R^N} \left(|\nabla u|^m |u|^{p-2} \phi + |u|^{p+m-2} \phi^{1-m/k} \right) dx. \end{aligned} \tag{2.63}$$

Therefore, if $r \geq 2\beta_1/(p-1)$,

$$D_1 \geq \frac{p-1}{2} \int_{R^N} |\nabla u|^m |u|^{p-2} \phi \, dx - \frac{\beta_1}{r} \int_{R^N} |u|^{p+m-2} \phi^{1-m/k} dx. \tag{2.64}$$

Further, we estimate the first term of the right-hand side in (2.64). Since

$$\begin{gathered} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \left(\left| u\phi^{1/p} \right|^\tau u\phi^{1/p} \right) = (\tau+1)|u|^\tau \phi^{\tau/p} \left(\phi^{1/p} \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} + \frac{u}{p} \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x_i} \phi^{1/p-1} \right), \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, N, \\ \left| \nabla \left(\left| u\phi^{1/p} \right|^\tau u\phi^{1/p} \right) \right|^2 = (\tau+1)^2 |u|^{2\tau} \phi^{2\tau/p} \left(|\nabla u|^2 \phi^{2/p} + \frac{u^2}{p^2} \left| \nabla \phi \right|^2 \phi^{2/p-2} + \frac{2u}{p} \phi^{2/p-1} \nabla u \nabla \phi \right), \end{gathered} \tag{2.65}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} D_3 &= \left| \nabla \left(\left| u\phi^{1/p} \right|^\tau u\phi^{1/p} \right) \right|^m = \left[\left| \nabla \left(\left| u\phi^{1/p} \right|^\tau u\phi^{1/p} \right) \right|^2 \right]^{m/2} \\ &\leq \lambda_0 \left(|u|^{\tau m} |\nabla u|^m \phi^{m\tau_2} + |u|^{m\tau_0} |\nabla \phi|^m \phi^{m(\tau_2-1)} + |u|^{m\tau+m/2} \left(|\nabla u| \left| \nabla \phi \right| \right)^{m/2} \phi^{m\tau_2 - m/2} \right), \end{aligned} \tag{2.66}$$

where $\tau_2 = \tau_0/p$, $\tau_0 = 1 + \tau = (p-2+m)/m$ and with some constant $\lambda_0 > 0$. The second term of (2.66) is

$$(2.66)_2 \leq \frac{\beta_1^m}{r^m} |u|^{p-2+m} \phi^{1+(m-2)/p-m/k} \leq \frac{C_1}{r} |u|^{p-2+m} \phi^{1+(m-2)/p-m/k}, \quad r \geq 1, \tag{2.67}$$

and the third term of (2.66) is

$$\begin{aligned}(2.66)_3 &\le \frac{C_1}{r}|u|^{p-2+m/2}|\nabla u|^{m/2}\phi^{1+(m-2)/p-m/2k}\\ &\le \frac{C_1}{r}\left(|u|^{p-2}|\nabla u|^m\phi + |u|^{p+m-2}\phi^{1+(2m-4)/p-m/k}\right), \quad r \ge 1\end{aligned} \tag{2.68}$$

with some $C_1 > 0$. Thus, we let $k > pm/(2m-4)$ and have

$$D_3 \le C_1\left(|u|^{p-2}|\nabla u|^m\phi + r^{-1}|u|^{p+m-2}\phi^{1+(m-2)/p-m/2k}\right) \tag{2.69}$$

or

$$|u|^{p-2}|\nabla u|^m\phi \ge C_1^{-1}\left|\nabla\left(|u\phi^{1/p}|^{\tau}u\phi^{1/p}\right)\right|^m - r^{-1}|u|^{p+m-2}\phi^{1+(m-2)/p-m/2k}. \tag{2.70}$$

This implies that

$$\int_{R^N}|u|^{p-2}|\nabla u|^m\phi\, dx \ge C_1^{-1}\left\|\nabla\left(|u\phi^{1/p}|^{\tau}u\phi^{1/p}\right)\right\|_m^m - r^{-1}\int_{R^N}|u|^{p+m-2}\phi^{1+(m-2)/p-m/2k}dx \tag{2.71}$$

and for $r \ge 1$,

$$D_1 \ge C_1^{-1}\left\|\nabla\left(|u\phi^{1/p}|^{\tau}u\phi^{1/p}\right)\right\|_m^m - C_p r^{-1}\int_{R^N}|u|^{p+m-2}\left(\phi^{1+(m-2)/p-m/2k} + \phi^{1-m/k}\right)dx. \tag{2.72}$$

On the other hand, we obtain by Lemma 2.9 that

$$\left\|u(t)\phi^{1/p}\right\|_m \le \|u(t)\|_m \le M_1, \quad t \ge T_0, \tag{2.73}$$

and then for $t \ge T_0$,

$$\left\|\nabla\left(|u\phi^{1/p}|^{\tau}u\phi^{1/p}\right)\right\|_m^m \ge C_0\left\|u\phi^{1/p}\right\|_p^{(m+m\tau)/\theta_1}\left\|u\phi^{1/p}\right\|_m^{\tau_1} \ge C_0M_1^{\tau_1}\left\|u\phi^{1/p}\right\|_p^{(m+m\tau)/\theta_1}, \tag{2.74}$$

where τ_1 and θ_1 are determined by (2.54). Hence we get from (2.61)–(2.74) that

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{p}\frac{d}{dt}\left\|u(t)\phi^{1/p}\right\|_p^p + C_0M_1^{\tau_1}\left\|u(t)\phi^{1/p}\right\|_p^{p(1+\alpha_0)}\\ &\quad\le C_p\left(\|h\|_{\beta_p}^{\beta_p}(B_r^c) + \|g\|_{\alpha_p}^{\alpha_p}(B_r^c) + r^{-1}\|u(t)\|_{p+m-2}^{p+m-2}(B_r^c)\right), \quad t > T_0,\ r \ge 1.\end{aligned} \tag{2.75}$$

By Lemma 2.11, we know that there exist $\exists T_1 > T_0$ and $M_{p+m-2} > 0$, such that

$$\|u(t)\|_{p+m-2} \le M_{p+m-2}, \quad \text{for } t \ge T_1. \tag{2.76}$$

Then we obtain

$$\int_{R^N} |u|^p \phi\, dx \le \left(H(r,t)\left(M_1^{T_1} C_0\right)^{-1}\right)^{1/(1+\alpha_0)} + \left(C_0 M_1^{T_1} \alpha_0 (t-T_1)\right)^{-1/\alpha_0}, \quad t > T_1, \tag{2.77}$$

where

$$H(r,t) = C_p\left(\|h\|_{\beta_p}^{\beta_p}(B_r^c) + \|g\|_{\alpha_p}^{\alpha_p}(B_r^c) + r^{-1} M_{p+m-2}^{p+m-2}\right), \quad t > T_0,\ r \ge 1, \tag{2.78}$$

and $H(r,t) \to 0$ as $r \to \infty$. Then (2.77) implies (2.58) and the proof of Lemma 2.12 is completed. □

Remark 2.13. In fact, we see from the proof of Lemma 2.12 that if (2.73) and (2.76) are satisfied, then (2.77) and (2.58) hold.

Remark 2.14. In a similar argument, we can prove Lemmas 2.10–2.12 under the assumptions in Theorem 2.8.

3. Global Attractor in R^N

In this section, we will prove the existence of the global (L^2, L^p)-attractor for problem (1.1)-(1.2). To this end, we first give the definition about the bi-spaces global attractor, then, prove the asymptotic compactness of $\{S(t)\}_{t\ge 0}$ in L^p and the existence of the global (L^2, L^p)-attractor by a priori estimates established in Section 2.

Definition 3.1 ([2, 3, 13, 14]). A set $\mathcal{A}_p \subset L^p$ is called a global (L^2, L^p)-attractor of the semigroup $\{S(t)\}_{t\ge 0}$ generated by the solution of problem (1.1)-(1.2) with initial data $u_0 \in L^2$ if it has the following properties:

(1) $\mathcal{A}_p$ is invariant in L^p, that is, $S(t)\mathcal{A}_p = \mathcal{A}_p$ for every $t \ge 0$;

(2) $\mathcal{A}_p$ is compact in L^p;

(3) $\mathcal{A}_p$ attracts every bounded subset $\mathcal{B}$ of L^2 in the topology of L^p, that is,

$$\operatorname{dist}\left(S(t)\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{A}_p\right) = \sup_{v\in\mathcal{B}} \inf_{u\in\mathcal{A}_p} \|S(t)v - u\|_p \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } t \longrightarrow +\infty. \tag{3.1}$$

Now we can prove the main result.

Theorem 3.2. *Assume that all assumptions in Theorem 2.5 (Theorem 2.7) are satisfied. Then the semigroup $\{S(t)\}_{t\ge 0}$ generated by the solutions of the problem (1.1)-(1.2) with $u_0 \in L^2$ has a global (L^2, L^p)-attractor $\mathcal{A}_p$ for any $p > m$.*

Proof. We only consider the case in Theorem 2.5 and the other is similar and omitted. Define

$$\mathcal{A}_p = \bigcap_{\tau\ge 0} \mathcal{A}(\tau), \qquad \mathcal{A}(\tau) = \left[\bigcup_{t\ge\tau} S(t)\mathfrak{D}\right]_{L^p}, \tag{3.2}$$

where $\mathfrak{D}$ is defined in (2.45) and $[\mathbf{E}]_{\mathbf{L^p}}$ is the closure of $\mathbf{E}$ in L^p.

Obviously, $\mathcal{A}(\tau)$ is closed and nonempty and $\mathcal{A}(\tau_1) \subset \mathcal{A}(\tau_2)$ if $\tau_1 \geq \tau_2$. Thus, $\mathcal{A}_p$ is nonempty. We now prove that $\mathcal{A}_p$ is a global (L^2, L^p)-attractor for (1.1)-(1.2).

We first prove $\mathcal{A}_p$ is invariant in L^p. Let $\phi \in \mathcal{A}_p$. Then, $\exists t_n \to +\infty$ and $\theta_n \in \mathfrak{D}$ such that $S(t_n)\theta_n \to \phi$ in L^p. Since $S(t)$ is continuous from $L^p \to L^p$ by Lemma 2.10, we obtain $S(t+t_n)\theta_n = S(t)(S(t_n)\theta_n) \to S(t)\phi$ in L^p. Note that

$$S(t+t_n)\theta_n \in \bigcup_{t\geq\tau} S(t)\mathfrak{D} \Longrightarrow S(t)\phi \in \mathcal{A}(\tau) \Longrightarrow S(t)\phi \in \bigcap_{\tau\geq 0}\mathcal{A}(\tau). \tag{3.3}$$

That is, $S(t)\phi \in \mathcal{A}_p$ and $S(t)\mathcal{A}_p \subset \mathcal{A}_p$.

On the other hand, let $\phi \in \mathcal{A}_p$. Suppose $t_n \to +\infty$ and $\theta_n \in \mathfrak{D}$ such that $S(t_n)\theta_n \to \phi$ in L^p. We claim that there exists $\psi \in \mathcal{A}_p$ such that $S(t)\psi = \phi$. This implies $\mathcal{A}_p \subset S(t)\mathcal{A}_p$.

First, since $\{\theta_n\}$ is bounded in $W^{1,m}$ by Lemma 2.9, so is $\{S(t_n - t)\theta_n\}$ by Theorem 2.7. That is, $\exists n_0 > 1$, $T_0 > 0$, $M_3 > 0$, such that

$$\|u_n\|_m \leq M_3, \quad \|\nabla u_n\|_m \leq M_3 \quad \text{for } n \geq n_0,\ t_n - t \geq T_0, \tag{3.4}$$

with $u_n(x) = S(t_n - t)\theta_n(x)$. Then,

$$\|u_n\|_{W^{1,m}(B_{r_0})} = \|\nabla u_n\|_m(B_{r_0}) + \|u_n\|_m(B_{r_0}) \leq h(r_0, M_3), \quad n \geq n_0, \tag{3.5}$$

where the constant $h(r_0, M_3)$ depends on r_0, M_3, and r_0 is from Lemma 2.12. By the compact embedding theorem, $\exists\{u_{n_k}\} \subset \{u_n\}$ such that $u_{n_k} \to \psi$ in $L^p(B_{r_0})$ if $2 \leq p < m^*$. We extend $\psi(x)$ as zero when $|x| > r_0$. Then $u_{n_k} \to \psi$ in L^p, and $\psi \in \mathcal{A}(\tau)$, $\psi \in \mathcal{A}_p$. By the continuity of $S(t)$ in L^p, we have

$$S(t_{n_k})\theta_{n_k} = S(t)(S(t_{n_k} - t)\theta_{n_k}) \longrightarrow S(t)\psi \Longrightarrow \phi = S(t)\psi \quad \text{in } L^p. \tag{3.6}$$

So, $\mathcal{A}_p \subset S(t)\mathcal{A}_p$ and $\mathcal{A}_p$ is invariant in L^p for every $t \geq 0$.

For the case $p \geq m^*$, we take $\mu \in (m, m^*]$ and $u_{n_k} \to \psi$ in L^μ as the above proof. Thus $\{u_{n_k}\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in L^μ. We claim that $\{u_{n_k}\}$ is also a Cauchy sequence in L^p.

In fact, it follows from Lemma 2.11 that $\exists M_\rho$ and n_0 such that if $n \geq n_0$, then $t_n - t \geq T_0$ and

$$\|u_n\|_\rho \leq M_\rho, \quad \rho = \frac{(p-1)\mu}{\mu - 1}. \tag{3.7}$$

Notice that

$$\int_{R^N} \left|u_{n_i} - u_{n_j}\right|^p dx \leq \left\|u_{n_i} - u_{n_j}\right\|_\mu \left\|u_{n_i} - u_{n_j}\right\|_\rho^{p-1} \leq (2M_\rho)^{p-1}\left\|u_{n_i} - u_{n_j}\right\|_\mu \tag{3.8}$$

for $i, j \geq n_0$. This gives our claim. Therefore, $\exists\psi \in L^p$ such that $u_{n_k} = S(t_{n_k} - t)\theta_{n_k} \to \psi$ in L^p and $\phi = S(t)\psi$. Hence $\mathcal{A}_p \subset S(t)\mathcal{A}_p$ and $S(t)\mathcal{A}_p = \mathcal{A}_p$.

We now consider the compactness of $\mathcal{A}_p$ in L^p. In fact, from the proof of $\mathcal{A}_p \subset S(t)\mathcal{A}_p$, we know that $[\cup_{t\geq\tau} S(t)\mathfrak{D}]_{L^p}$ is compact in L^p, so is $\mathcal{A}_p$.

For claim (3), we argue by contradiction and assume that for some bounded set $\mathcal{B}_0$ of L^2, $\text{dist}_{L^p}(S(t)\mathcal{B}_0, \mathcal{A}_p)$ does not tend to 0 as $t \to +\infty$. Thus there exists $\delta > 0$ and a sequence $t_n \to \infty$ such that

$$\text{dist}_{L^p}\left(S(t_n)\mathcal{B}_0, \mathcal{A}_p\right) \geq \frac{\delta}{2} > 0, \quad \text{for } n = 1, 2, \ldots. \tag{3.9}$$

For every $n = 1, 2, \ldots, \exists \theta_n \in \mathcal{B}_0$ such that

$$\text{dist}_{L^p}\left(S(t_n)\theta_n, \mathcal{A}_p\right) \geq \frac{\delta}{2} > 0. \tag{3.10}$$

By Lemma 2.9, $\mathfrak{D}$ is an absorbing set, and $S(t_n)\theta_n \subset \mathfrak{D}$ if $t_n \geq T_0$. By the aforementioned proof, we know that $\exists \phi \in L^p$ and a subsequence $\{S(t_{n_k})\theta_{n_k}\}$ of $\{s(t_n)\theta_n\}$ such that

$$\phi = \lim_{k \to \infty} S(t_{n_k})\theta_{n_k} = \lim_{k \to \infty} S(t_{n_k} - T_0)(S(T_0)\theta_{n_k}), \quad \text{in } L^p. \tag{3.11}$$

When $\theta_{n_k} \in \mathcal{B}_0$ and T_0 is large, we have from Lemma 2.9 that $S(T_0)\theta_{n_k} \in \mathfrak{D}$ and

$$S(t_{n_k} - T_0)(S(T_0)\theta_{n_k}) \in \bigcup_{t \geq \tau} S(t)\mathfrak{D}. \tag{3.12}$$

Thus, $\phi \in \mathcal{A}_p$ which contradicts (3.10). Then the proof of Theorem 3.2 is completed. □

Remark 3.3. Let $p = m^* = mN/(N - m)$. Theorem 3.2 gives the results in [2, Theorem 2] for the case $N > m > 2$ and improve the corresponding results in [3]. The attractor $\mathcal{A}_p$ in Theorem 3.2 is independent of the order of u on $f(x, u)$.

Acknowledgments

The authors express their sincere gratitude to the anonymous referees for a number of valuable comments and suggestions. The work was supported by Science Foundation of Hohai University (Grant no. 2008430211 and 2008408306) and partially supported by Research Program of China (Grant no. 2008CB418202).

References

[1] B. Wang, "Attractors for reaction-diffusion equations in unbounded domains," *Physica D*, vol. 128, no. 1, pp. 41–52, 1999.

[2] A. Kh. Khanmamedov, "Existence of a global attractor for the parabolic equation with nonlinear Laplacian principal part in an unbounded domain," *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, vol. 316, no. 2, pp. 601–615, 2006.

[3] M.-H. Yang, C.-Y. Sun, and C.-K. Zhong, "Existence of a global attractor for a p-Laplacian equation in R^n," *Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Methods & Applications*, vol. 66, no. 1, pp. 1–13, 2007.

[4] M. Nakao and C. Chen, "On global attractors for a nonlinear parabolic equation of m-Laplacian type in R^N," *Funkcialaj Ekvacioj*, vol. 50, no. 3, pp. 449–468, 2007.

[5] C. Chen, "On global attractor for m-Laplacian parabolic equation with local and nonlocal nonlinearity," *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, vol. 337, no. 1, pp. 318–332, 2008.

[6] M. Nakao and C. Chen, "Global existence and gradient estimates for the quasilinear parabolic equations of m-Laplacian type with a nonlinear convection term," *Journal of Differential Equations*, vol. 162, no. 1, pp. 224–250, 2000.
[7] Y. Ohara, "L^{∞}-estimates of solutions of some nonlinear degenerate parabolic equations," *Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Methods & Applications*, vol. 18, no. 5, pp. 413–426, 1992.
[8] E. DiBenedetto, *Degenerate Parabolic Equations*, Springer, New York, NY, USA, 1993.
[9] L. C. Evans, *Partial Differential Equations*, vol. 19 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, USA, 1998.
[10] J. L. Lions, *Quelques Méthodes de Résolution des Problèmes aux Limites Non Linéaires*, Dunod, Paris, France, 1969.
[11] R. Temam, *Infinite-Dimensional Dynamical Systems in Mechanics and Physics*, vol. 68 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences*, Springer, New York, NY, USA, 2nd edition, 1997.
[12] E. Mitidieri and S. I. Pohozaev, "Nonexistence of weak solutions for some degenerate elliptic and parabolic problems on R^N," *Journal of Evolution Equations*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 189–220, 2001.
[13] A. V. Babin and M. I. Vishik, "Attractors of partial differential evolution equations in an unbounded domain," *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh. Section A*, vol. 116, no. 3-4, pp. 221–243, 1990.
[14] A. V. Babin and M. I. Vishik, *Attractors of Evolution Equations*, vol. 25 of *Studies in Mathematics and Its Applications*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 1992.