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#### Abstract

We prove a theorem on differential-functional inequalities in the Carathéodory sense. The proof is based on the fact that we can solve a linear differential equation with first-order partial derivatives. We use also an integral Volterra-type inequality. We obtain a theorem on the uniqueness of generalized entropy solutions to the initial-value problem for non-linear partial differential-functional equations of the first order.
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## 0. Introduction

Let $b>, R_{+}=[0, \infty), \tau_{0} \in R_{+}, \tau=\left(\tau_{1}, \ldots, \tau_{n}\right) \in R_{+}^{n}$ and denote

$$
E_{b}=\left[-\tau_{0}, b\right] \times R^{n}, \quad E_{(b)}=[0, b] \times R^{n}, \quad D=\left[-\tau_{0}, 0\right] \times[-\tau, \tau] .
$$

Further, for arbitrary metric spaces $X$ and $Y$ denote by $C(X, Y)$ the set of all continuous functions defined on $X$ and taking values in $Y$. For $z: E_{b} \rightarrow R$ and $(x, y) \in E_{(b)}$ we define a function $z_{(x, y)}: D \rightarrow R$ by

$$
z_{(x, y)}(\xi, \eta)=z(x+\xi, y+\eta) \quad \text { for } \quad(\xi, \eta) \in D
$$

At last, let

$$
\Omega=E_{(b)} \times R \times C(D, R) \times R^{n}
$$

Assume that $f: \Omega \rightarrow R$ and $\varphi: E_{0} \rightarrow R$. If $z \in C\left(E_{(b)}, R\right)$ is a function of variables $(x, y)=\left(x, y_{1}, \ldots, y_{n}\right)$ and if there exist derivatives $D_{y_{j}} z(j=1, \ldots, n)$ on $E_{(b)}$, then we denote

$$
D_{y} z(x, y)=\left(D_{y_{1}} z(x, y), \ldots, D_{y_{\mathrm{n}}} z(x, y)\right) \quad \text { for }(x, y) \in E_{(b)}
$$
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We consider the differential-functional equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
D_{x} z(x, y)=f\left(x, y, z(x, y), z(x, y), D_{y} z(x, y)\right) \tag{0.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

with the initial condition

$$
\begin{equation*}
z(x, y)=\varphi(x, y) \quad \text { for }(x, y) \in E_{0} . \tag{0.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $\mathcal{M}[k, l]$ denote the class of all $k \times l$ real matrices. If $U=\left[u_{i, j}\right] \in \mathcal{M}[k, l]$, then $\|U\|=\max _{i}\left\{\sum_{j}\left|u_{i j}\right|\right\}$. Let $\mathcal{N}$ be the set of all natural numbers. For every $k \in \mathcal{N}$ and $\eta=\left(\eta_{1}, \ldots, \eta_{k}\right) \in R^{k}$ we define $\|\eta\|=\max _{i}\left|\eta_{i}\right|$. Throughout the paper we will denote norms of matrices and vectors by the same symbols. At last, if $I=\left[a_{1}, a_{2}\right]$ is an interval, then $\mathcal{L}(I, R)$ denotes the set of all functions $\Lambda: I \rightarrow R$ for which $\int_{a_{1}}^{a_{2}}|\Lambda(t)| d t$ exists.

Numerous problems in the theory of differential equations have been solved by means of the differential inequalities methods. Let us mention only the most important problems: an estimation of the domain of the existence of solutions, establishing some uniqueness criteria, the research of stability conditions, finding some estimations of solutions, continuous dependence on initial data and on right-hand-side functions, error estimations for approximate solutions. Some inequalities in a Haar piramid or in an unbounded domain are considered there. For some more reference connected with the subject we send the reader to the papers $[1,3,6]$. The classical theory of differential inequalities with its applications is founded in the monographs [ 9,15 ].

The subject of the uniqueness of solutions to initial or initial-boundary value problems is mostly connected with differential inequalities. Consider the initial value problem

$$
\begin{align*}
D_{x} z(x, y) & =F\left(x, y, z(x, y), D_{y} z(x, y)\right) & & \text { for }(x, y) \in E  \tag{0.3}\\
z(0, y) & =\Phi(y) & & \text { for } y \in[-b, b]
\end{align*}
$$

where

$$
E=\left\{(x, y)\left|x \in[0, a], y=\left(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{n}\right),\left|y_{i}\right| \leq b_{i}-M_{i} x_{i} \text { for all } i\right\}\right.
$$

$b=\left(b_{1}, \ldots, b_{n}\right)$ and $D_{y} z=\left(D_{y_{1}} z, \ldots, D_{y_{n}} z\right)$. Assume that $F: E \times R \times R^{n} \rightarrow R$ and that for some function $\sigma:[0, a] \times R_{+} \rightarrow R_{+}$we have the estimate

$$
|F(x, y, p, q)-F(x, y, \bar{p}, \bar{q})| \leq \sigma(x,|p-\bar{p}|)+\sum_{i=1}^{n} M_{i}\left|q_{i}-\bar{q}_{i}\right|
$$

If $\sigma$ is a Perron type comparison function, then there exists at most one classical solution of problem ( 0.3 ) that is continuous, possesses first-order partial derivatives in $E$ and total differential in $\partial E \cap\left([0, a) \times R^{n}\right)$. If we assume that $\sigma$ is a comparison function of the Kamke type, then a solution of problem (0.3) is unique in the class of functions satisfying the above condition and possessing a continuous partial derivative with respect to $x$ for $x=0$, see $[9,15]$.

The above results can be extended on the differential-functional problems

$$
\begin{align*}
D_{x} z(x, y) & =F\left(x, y, z(\cdot), D_{y} z(x, y)\right) & & ((x, y) \in E)  \tag{0.4}\\
z(x, y) & =\Phi(x, y) & & \left((x, y) \in E_{0}\right)
\end{align*}
$$

where $E_{0}=\left[-\tau_{0}, 0\right] \times[-b, b]$ and $F: E \times C(E, R) \times R^{n} \rightarrow R$. A comparison problem for problem (0.4) is of the form

$$
\begin{align*}
\eta^{\prime}(x) & =\tilde{\sigma}(x, \eta(\cdot)) & & (x \in[0, a])  \tag{0.5}\\
\eta(x) & =0 & & \left(x \in\left[-\tau_{0}, 0\right]\right)
\end{align*}
$$

where $\tilde{\sigma}:[0, a] \times C\left(\left[-\tau_{0}, a\right], R_{+}\right) \rightarrow R_{+}$. The essential fact in these considerations' is that operators $F$ and $\tilde{\sigma}$ satisfy the Volterra condition, see [1].

If we consider problem (0.3) in an unbounded zone $E=[0, a] \times R^{n}$, then we can omit the assumption that solutions of the Cauchy problem have the total differential in some points of the domain. In this case we assume that the comparison function is linear with respect to the second variable, which means that $F$ satisfies a Lipschitz condition. The proof of the uniqueness result is based on the fact that we can solve a linear differential inequality with first-order partial derivatives.

An interesting result for the global uniqueness of the Cauchy problem when $F$ satisfies the Hölder condition with respect to the last variable can be found in [2]. In [11] we proved some uniqueness results for differential-functional equations considered on $[0, a] \times R^{n}$ with the Cauchy data given on $\left[-\tau_{0}, 0\right] \times R^{n}$. The method of differentialfunctional inequalities is used.

Non-linear equations with partial derivatives have the following property: any classical solution to initial-value problems exists locally with respect to $x$. This leads to definitions of solutions in the sense "almost everywhere" or Carathéodory solutions. The class of weak (Carathéodory) solutions consists of all functions which are continuous, have their derivatives almost everywhere in some domain, and the set of all points where the differential equation is not fulfilled is of Lebesgue measure zero. The main existence and uniqueness results for initial-value problems in the class of generalized solutions can be found in $[8,12]$ (see also $[13,14]$ ).

Generalized solutions of non-linear equations are also investigated in the case that assumptions for the given functions are extended. A function $z \in C\left(E_{b}, R\right)$ is called a $C C$-solution of equation ( 0.1 ) if it is a solution in the Caratheodory sense, $z(\cdot, y)$ is absolutely continuous for $y \in R^{n}$, the derivative $D_{y} z$ exists on $E_{(b)}$, and for every $y \in R^{n}$ equation (0.1) is satisfied almost everywhere on $[0, b]$. CC-solutions to problem (0.1), (0.2) are obtained as solutions of suitable systems of integro-functional equations, see [4], 10], 13]. Theorems on the uniqueness of CC-solutions with non-linear comparison functions are proved by means of integro-functional inequalities of the Volterra type. The papers $[4,10]$ deal with the existence and uniqueness of CC-solutions. This class of generalized solutions seems to be important if we look for classical solutions because the assumptions that right-hand side of equations is continuous is sufficient to prove that every CC-solution to it is a classical solution. This observation is known in the literature (see $[4,10]$ ).

Solutions of equation (0.1) in the Caratheodory sense are not unique. That is the reason why in the literature two natural subclasses of the set of all solutions in the Carathéodory sense are considered - CC-solutions and generalized entropy solutions, which are the subject of our investigations in the paper. It is easy to construct examples of generalized entropy solutions which are not CC-solutions and vice versa.

Our Theorems 1.1 and 2.1 are some extensions of Kružkov's results on the case of differential-functional equations. Essentially, roots of our proof methods, similarly as in [8], are related to the Holmgren principle: "uniqueness of the solutions to some linear problems follows from existence for the adjoint problem". The proof of Theorem 1.1 (like proofs in [8], 11, 14]) is a non-linear realization of this principle with the Cauchy problem (1.7) as the "adjoint problem".

The existence of generalized entropy solutions is proved in [8] for differential equations and in [7] for equations with deviated variables. We cite the existence theorem for generalized entropy solutions of differential-functional equations from the paper [5]. In this part of the paper we put $n=1$ and $\tau_{0}>0$. Denote by $C_{0+L}(D, R)$ the class of all functions $\dot{w} \in C(D, R)$ which satisfy the Lipschitz condition on $D$. Define

$$
C_{0+L}(\dot{D}, \bar{R}, t)=\left\{w \in C_{0+L}(D, R) \mid\|w\|_{0}+\|w\|_{L} \leq t\right\}
$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{0}$ is the supremum norm in $C(D, R)$ and

$$
\|w\|_{L}=\sup \left\{|w(t, s)-w(\bar{t}, \bar{s})|(|t-\bar{t}|+|s-\bar{s}|)^{-1} \mid(t, s),(\bar{t}, \bar{s}) \in D\right\}
$$

In a similar way we define $C(D, R, t)$.
Theorem 0.1 [5]: Suppose that the following conditions are true.

1. $\varphi \in \mathscr{C}\left(E_{0}, R\right)$ and there exist constants $\tilde{M}, \tilde{L} \in R_{+}$such that

$$
|\varphi(x, y)| \leq \tilde{M} \quad \text { and } \quad|\varphi(x, y)-\varphi(x, \bar{y})| \leq \tilde{L}|y-\bar{y}| \quad \text { on } E_{0} .
$$

2. There exists $\tilde{K} \in R_{+}$such that for $l \in R \backslash\{0\}$ we have

$$
(\varphi(x, y+l)-2 \varphi(x, y)+\varphi(x, y-l)) l^{-2} \leq \tilde{K} \text { on } E_{0} .
$$

3. $f \in C^{2}(\Omega, R)$ and there exist a constant $N \geq \tilde{M}$ and a non-decreasing function $V \in C\left([\tilde{M}, N], R_{+}\right)$such that for $t \in R_{+}$we have $\int_{\tilde{M}}^{N} V(t)^{-1} d t \geq b$ and

$$
|f(x, y, p, w, q)| \leq V(t) \quad \text { on } \quad[0, b] \times R \times[-t, t] \times C(D, R, t) \times R .
$$

4. There exist $N_{1} \geq L, A>0$ and a non-decreasing function $W \in C\left(\left[\tilde{L}, N_{1}\right], R_{+}\right)$ such that $\int_{\tilde{L}}^{N_{1}}[(2 t+1) W(N+3 t)]^{-1} d t \geq b$, and for $t \in R_{+}, P=(x, y, p, w, q) \in$ $[0, b] \times R \times[-N, N] \times C_{0+L}(D, R, t) \times R$ we have

$$
\left|D_{q} f(P)\right| \leq A \quad \text { and } \quad\left|D_{y} f(P)\right|,\left|D_{p} f(P)\right|,\left\|D_{w} f(P)\right\| \leq W(t)
$$

where $D_{w} f$ is the Frechet derivative of $f$ with respect to $w$.
5. For $\bar{w} \in D\left(D, R_{+}\right.$we have $D_{w} f(P)(\bar{w}) \geq 0$ on

$$
\tilde{\Omega}=[0, b] \times R \times[-N, N] \times C_{0+L}\left(D, R, N+3 N_{1}\right) \times\left[-N_{1}, N_{1}\right] .
$$

6. The second order derivatives of $f$ are bounded on $\tilde{\Omega}$ and $D_{q q}^{2} f(P) \leq 0$ on $\tilde{\Omega}$.

Then there is a function $u \in C\left(E_{b}, R\right)$ which is a generalized entropy solution to problem (0.1), (0.2).

The proof of the theorem is based on the difference method. Assumptions of existence theorems are by far more restrictive than assumptions of uniqueness theorems, which is typical for this class of problems.

Now, we give an example of the Cauchy problem for which there are at least two Caratheodory solutions. For $X \subset[0,1] \times R$ we denote by $\chi_{x}$ the characteristic function of $X$. Put

$$
\begin{aligned}
X_{1} & =\{(x, y) \mid x \in[0,1], 2 \leq y<x+2\} \\
X_{2} & =\{(x, y) \mid x \in[0,1],-x+2 \leq y<2\} \\
X_{3} & =\{(x, y) \mid x \in[0,1], x-2 \leq y<-x+2\} \\
X_{4} & =\{(x, y) \mid x \in[0,1],-2 \leq y<x-2\} \\
X_{5} & =\{(x, y) \mid x \in[0,1],-x-2 \leq y<-2\}
\end{aligned}
$$

We define $g:[0,1] \times R \rightarrow R$ by

$$
\begin{aligned}
g(x, y)=- & \frac{1}{2}(x-y+2)^{2} \chi_{x_{1}}(x, y)+\left[\frac{1}{2}(y-2+x)^{2}-x^{2}\right] \chi_{x_{2}}(x, y) \\
& -x^{2} \chi_{x_{3}}(x, y)+\left[\frac{1}{2}(x-y-2)^{2}-x^{2}\right] \chi_{x_{4}}(x, y) \\
& -\frac{1}{2}(y+2+x)^{2} \chi_{x_{5}}(x, y) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Then $g \in C([0,1] \times R, R)$. Consider the differential-functional equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
D_{x} z(x, y)=\left[\int_{-2}^{2} z(x, y+s) d s-g(x, y)\right] \sin z(x, y)-\left(D_{y} z(x, y)\right)^{2} \tag{0.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

on $[0,1] \times R$ with the initial condition

$$
\begin{equation*}
z(0, y)=0 \quad \text { for } y \in R \tag{0.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then functions $u(x, y)=0$ for $(x, y) \in[0,1] \times R$ and $v:[0,1] \times R \rightarrow R$ given by

$$
v(x, y)= \begin{cases}0 & \text { for } x \in[0,1], y<-x \text { or } y>x \\ y-x & \text { for } x \in[0,1], 0 \leq y \leq x \\ -y-x & \text { for } x \in[0,1],-x \leq y<0\end{cases}
$$

are Carathéodory solutions to problem (0.6), (0.7).

## 1. Differential-functional inequalities in Carathéodory sense

We shall prove a theorem on differential-functional inequalities. As a consequence of this theorem we get a uniqueness criterion for generalized entropy solutions to the Cauchy problem.

If $G:[a, \bar{a}] \times R^{n} \rightarrow R\left(a, \bar{a} \in R_{+}\right.$and $\left.a \leq \bar{a}\right)$, then let supp $G$ denote the support of function $G$. Given any normed spaces $X$ and $Y$ let $C^{1}(X, Y)$ stand for the set of all continuously differentiable functions defined on $X$ and taking values in $Y$. For $a, \varepsilon \in R_{+}$ such that $a, a+\varepsilon \in[0, b]$ we shall denote

$$
\mathcal{P}_{a, e}^{1,0}=\left\{\begin{array}{l|l}
G \in C^{1}\left([a, a+\varepsilon] \times R^{n}, R^{+}\right) & \begin{array}{l}
G(a+\varepsilon, y)=0 \text { for } y \in R^{n} \\
\operatorname{supp} G \text { is a compact set }
\end{array}
\end{array}\right\}
$$

and

$$
\mathcal{P}_{a, \varepsilon}=\left\{\phi \in C\left([a, a+\varepsilon] \times R^{n}, R_{+}\right) \mid \operatorname{supp} \phi \subset E_{b} \backslash E_{0} \text { is a compact set }\right\}
$$

Let $K_{2}\left(0, M_{1}\right)=\left\{y \in R^{n}:\|y\|_{2} \leq M_{1}\right\}$, where $M_{1} \in R_{+}$. The symbol $\|\cdot\|_{2}$ denotes here the Euclidean norm. If $M_{0}, M_{1} \in R_{+}$then let

$$
\Omega\left(M_{0}, M_{1}\right)=E_{(b)} \times\left[-M_{0}, M_{0}\right] \times C\left(D,\left[-M_{0}, M_{0}\right]\right) \times K_{2}\left(0, M_{1}\right)
$$

If X is a non-empty compact normed space and $T: C(X, R) \rightarrow R$ is a continuous linear functional, then

$$
\|T\|_{*}=\sup \{\|T \phi\| \mid \phi \in C(X, R),\|\phi\| \leq 1\}
$$

Assumption $H_{1}$. Suppose the following.

1. $f: \Omega \rightarrow R$ and for all $P=(x, y, p, w, q) \in \Omega$ there exist the derivatives

$$
\begin{array}{llll}
D_{y} f(P), & D_{q} f(P), & D_{w} f(P), & D_{p} f(P) \\
D_{y q} f(P), & D_{q q} f(P), & D_{q w} f(P), & D_{q p} f(P)
\end{array}
$$

2. There exist constants $M_{0}, M_{1}>0$ such that the functions

$$
D_{y} f, \quad D_{q} f, \quad D_{w} f, \quad D_{p} f, \quad D_{y q} f, \quad D_{q q} f, \quad D_{q w} f
$$

are continuous on $\Omega\left(M_{0}, M_{1}\right)$.
3. There exist constants $c_{1}, c_{2} \in R_{+}$such that

$$
\begin{array}{r}
\left\|D_{y} f(P)\right\|,\left\|D_{q} f(P)\right\|,\left\|D_{w} f(P)\right\|_{*}, \quad D_{p} f(P) \leq c_{1} \\
\left\|D_{q p} f(P)\right\|,\left\|D_{y q} f(P)\right\|,\left\|D_{q w} f(P)\right\|_{*} \leq c_{2}
\end{array}
$$

for every $P=(x, y, p, w, q) \in \Omega\left(M_{0}, M_{1}\right)$.
4. For every $(x, y, p, w, q) \in \Omega\left(M_{0}, M_{1}\right)$ and $\tilde{w} \in C\left(D,\left[-M_{0}, M_{0}\right]\right)$ with $\tilde{w} \geq w$ the inequality

$$
0 \leq f(x, y, p, \tilde{w}, q)-f(x, y, p, w, q)
$$

is true.
5. There exist non-negative constants $c_{3}$ and $c_{4}$ with $c_{3}>c_{4}$ such that, for all $(x, y, p, w, q) \in \Omega\left(M_{0}, M_{1}\right)$, we have the estimates

$$
c_{3}\|\eta\|_{2}^{2} \geq \sum_{j, l=1}^{n}\left(-D_{q_{j} q_{1}} f_{i}(x, y, p, w, q)\right) \eta_{j} \eta_{l} \geq c_{4}\|\eta\|_{2}^{2}
$$

for arbitrary $\eta=\left(\eta_{1}, \ldots, \eta_{n}\right) \in R^{n}$.
Let $\lambda:[0, b] \rightarrow R_{+}$be a bounded function on $[\delta, b]$ for every $\delta \in(0, b]$. A function $z$ is said to be of class $C\left(E_{b}, R ; M_{0}, M_{1}, \lambda\right)$ if the following conditions are satisfied:
(i) $z \in C\left(E_{b}, R\right)$ and $\|z(x, y)\| \leq M_{0}$ for $(x, y) \in E_{b}$.
(ii) $D_{x} z, D_{y} z$ exist a. e. on $E_{(b)}$ and $D_{x} z \in L_{l o c}^{2}\left(E_{(b)}, R\right), D_{y} z \in L_{l o c}^{2}\left(E_{(b)}, R^{n}\right)$;
(iii) $\left\|D_{y} z(x, y)\right\|_{2} \leq M_{1}$ for almost all $(x, y) \in E_{(b)}$.
(iv) $z(x, y+\eta)-2 z(x, y)+z(x, y-\eta) \leq \lambda(x)\|\eta\|_{2}^{2}$ for every $\eta \in R^{n},(x, y) \in E_{(b)}$.

Now we are in positions to formulate the following theorem on differential-functional inequalities.

Theorem 1.1. Suppose that the following conditions are true.

1. Assumption $H_{1}$ is satisfied and $u, v \in C\left(E_{b}, R\right)$.
2. There are constants $M_{0}, M_{1} \in R_{+}$and a function $\lambda:[0, b] \rightarrow R_{+}$, bounded on $[\delta, b]$ for every $\delta \in(0, b]$, such that $u, v \in C\left(E_{b}, R ; M_{0}, M_{1}, \lambda\right)$.
3. The differential-functional inequalities

$$
\begin{align*}
& D_{x} u(x, y) \leq f\left(x, y, u(x, y), u_{(x, y)}, D_{y} u(x, y)\right)  \tag{1.1}\\
& D_{x} v(x, y) \geq f\left(x, y, v(x, y), v_{(x, y)}, D_{y} v(x, y)\right) \tag{1.2}
\end{align*}
$$

are satisfied almost everywhere on $E_{(b)}$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
u(x, y) \leq v(x, y) \quad \text { for all }(x, y) \in E_{0} \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then for every $(x, y) \in E_{b}$ we have the inequality

$$
\begin{equation*}
u(x, y) \leq v(x, y) \tag{1.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

provided either $D_{w} f(x, y, p, w, q)=0$ for $(x, y, p, w, q) \in \Omega\left(M_{0}, M_{1}\right)$ or the function $\lambda:[0, b] \rightarrow R_{+}$is integrable on the interval $[0, b]$.

Proof. Let $\left\{u^{(\nu)}\right\}_{\nu \geq 1}$ and $\left\{v^{(\nu)}\right\}_{\nu \geq 1}$ be two fixed sequences of functions satisfying the following conditions:
(i) For every $\nu$ the functions $u^{(\nu)}, \dot{v}^{(\nu)}: E_{b} \rightarrow R$ are of class $C^{2}$.
(ii) For arbitrary compact subset $X \subset E_{b}$ we have the limits

$$
\begin{gathered}
\left.\lim _{\nu \rightarrow \infty} u^{(\nu)}\right|_{X}=\left.u\right|_{X} \quad \text { and }\left.\quad \lim _{\nu \rightarrow \infty} v^{(\nu)}\right|_{X}=\left.v\right|_{X} \quad \text { (uniformly) } \\
\lim _{\nu \rightarrow \infty}\left\|\left.D_{y} u^{(\nu)}\right|_{X}-\left.D_{y} v\right|_{X}\right\|_{L^{2}(X, R)}=0=\lim _{\nu \rightarrow \infty}\left\|\left.D_{y} v^{(\nu)}\right|_{X}-\left.D_{y} v\right|_{X}\right\|_{L^{2}(X, R)}
\end{gathered}
$$

(iii) For every $(x, y) \in E_{(b)}$ and $\eta \in R^{n}$ we have the estimates

$$
D_{\eta \eta} u^{(\nu)}(x, y) \leq \lambda(x) \quad \text { and } \quad D_{\eta \eta} v^{(\nu)}(x, y) \leq \lambda(x)
$$

where $D_{\eta \eta} z$ denotes the second order derivative of the function $z$ in the direction of the vector $\eta$ (note that sequences $\left\{u^{(\nu)}\right\}$ and $\left\{v^{(\nu)}\right\}$ can be constructed by the regularization method, see [8]). Denote $\omega=v-u$ and $\omega^{(\nu)}=v^{(\nu)}-u^{(\nu)}$ for $\nu \geq 1$. Then from inequality (1.3) it follows that $\omega(x, y) \geq 0$ for $(x, y) \in E_{0}$. Suppose that condition (1.4) is satisfied on $E_{a}$ for some $a \in[0, b)$. We shall show that it is satisfied on $E_{\bar{a}}$ for some $\bar{a} \in(a, b]$.

Let $\varepsilon>0$ such that $a+\varepsilon \in[0, b]$. Suppose $G \in \mathcal{P}_{a, c}^{1,0}$. Then from inequalities (1.1), (1.2) we get the inequality

$$
\begin{align*}
\int_{R^{n}}^{\int_{a}^{a+e} G(x, y)} & \left\{D_{x} \omega^{(\nu)}(x, y)\right. \\
& -\left[f\left(x, y, v^{(\nu)}(x, y), v_{(x, y)}^{(\nu)}, D_{y} \dot{v}^{(\nu)}(x, y)\right)\right.  \tag{1.5}\\
& \left.\left.-f\left(x, y, u^{(\nu)}(x, y), u_{(x, y)}^{(\nu)}, D_{y} u^{(\nu)}(x, y)\right)\right]\right\} d x d y \\
\geq & \int_{R^{n}}^{a+e} \int_{a}^{a+e} G(x, y) \Gamma^{(\nu)}(x, y) d x d y
\end{align*}
$$

for $\nu \geq 1$, where the function $\Gamma^{(\nu)}$ is defined by

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Gamma^{(\nu)}(x, y)= & D_{x} v^{(\nu)}(x, y)-f\left(x, y, v^{(\nu)}(x, y), v_{(x, y)}^{(\nu)}, D_{y} v^{(\nu)}(x, y)\right) \\
& -\left(D_{x} v(x, y)-f\left(x, y, v(x, y), v_{(x, y)}, D_{y} v(x, y)\right)\right) \\
& -\left(D_{x} u^{(\nu)}(x, y)-f\left(x, y, u^{(\nu)}(x, y), u_{(x, y)}^{(\nu)}, D_{y} u^{(\nu)}(x, y)\right)\right) \\
& +\left(D_{x} u(x, y)-f\left(x, y, u(x, y), u_{(x, y)}, D_{y} u(x, y)\right)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

It follows from assumptions (i) - (iii) and Assumption $H_{1}$ that $\lim _{\nu \rightarrow \infty}\left\|\left.\Gamma^{(\nu)}\right|_{X}\right\|_{L^{2}(X, R)}$ $=0$ for arbitrary compact subset $X \subset E_{(b)}$. Define

$$
\begin{aligned}
& P^{(\nu)}(x, y, \theta) \\
& \quad=\left(x, y, u^{(\nu)}(x, y)+\theta \omega^{(\nu)}(x, y),\left(u^{(\nu)}+\theta \omega^{(\nu)}\right)_{(x, y)}, D_{y}\left(u^{(\nu)}+\theta \omega^{(\nu)}\right)(x, y)\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Applying the Hadamard mean-value theorem and integrating by parts in (1.5) we obtain the inequality

$$
\begin{align*}
& \int_{R^{n}}^{a+e} \int_{a}^{a+e}\left\{-\omega^{(\nu)}(x, y)\left\{D_{x} G(x, y)+G(x, y) \int_{0}^{1} D_{p} f\left(P^{(\nu)}(x, y, \theta)\right) d \theta\right.\right. \\
&\left.\quad-\sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_{j}}\left\{G(x, y) \int_{0}^{1} D_{q j} f\left(P^{(\nu)}(x, y, \theta)\right) d \theta\right\}\right\}  \tag{1.6}\\
&\left.\quad-G(x, y) \int_{0}^{1} D_{w} f\left(P^{(\nu)}(x, y, \theta)\right) d \theta\left(\omega^{(\nu)}\right)_{(x, y)}\right\} d x d y \\
& \geq \int_{R^{n}} \int_{a}^{a+\varepsilon} G(x, y) \Gamma(\nu)(x, y) d x d y+\int_{R^{n}} G(a, y) \omega(a, y) d y
\end{align*}
$$

for $\nu \geq 1$. Take arbitrary $\phi \in \mathcal{P}_{a, \varepsilon}$ and consider the Cauchy problem

$$
\begin{gather*}
D_{x} z(x, y)+z(x, y) \int_{0}^{1} D_{p} f\left(P^{(\nu)}(x, y, \theta)\right) d \theta \\
\quad-\sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{\partial}{\partial y j}\left\{z(x, y) \int_{0}^{1} D_{q_{j}} f\left(P^{(\nu)}(x, y, \theta)\right) d \theta\right\}=-\phi(x, y)  \tag{1.7}\\
z(a+\varepsilon, y)=0 .
\end{gather*}
$$

Let

$$
g^{(\nu)}(\cdot ; x, y):[a, a+\varepsilon] \rightarrow R^{n} \quad \text { for } \quad(x, y) \in E_{(a+e)} \backslash E_{(a)}
$$

be solutions of the characteristic initial-value problem corresponding to problem (1.7):

$$
\begin{equation*}
\eta^{\prime}(t)=-\int_{0}^{1} D_{q} f\left(P^{(\nu)}(t, \eta(t), \theta)\right) d \theta \quad \text { and } \quad \eta(x)=y . \tag{1.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

For $(x, y) \in E_{(a+\varepsilon)} \backslash E_{(a)}$ we denote

$$
\begin{align*}
H^{(\nu)}(x, y)= & \int_{0}^{1} D_{p} f\left(P^{(\nu)}(x, y, \theta)\right) d \theta  \tag{1.9}\\
& -\sum_{j=1}^{n} \int_{0}^{1} A_{j j}\left(P^{(\nu)}(x, y, \theta) ; u^{(\nu)}+\theta \omega^{(\nu)}\right) d \theta
\end{align*}
$$

where the matrix $A(P ; z)=\left[A_{j l}(P ; z)\right]_{j, l=1}^{n}$ is defined by

$$
\begin{align*}
A_{j l}(P ; z)= & D_{q_{j} y_{l}} f(P)+D_{q_{j} p_{k}} f(P) D_{y_{1}} z(x, y) \\
& +D_{q_{j} w_{k}} f(P)\left(D_{y_{1}} z\right)_{(x, y)}+\sum_{\mu=1}^{n} D_{q_{\mu} q_{j}} f(P) D_{y_{\mu} y_{l}} z(x, y) \tag{1.10}
\end{align*}
$$

for $z \in C\left(E_{b}, R ; M_{0}, M_{1}, \lambda\right)$ and $P=(x, y, p, w, q) \in \Omega\left(M_{0}, M_{1}\right)$. Consider inequality (1.6) with $G^{(\nu)}$ satisfying problem (1.7). Then we have the inequality

$$
\begin{align*}
& \int_{R^{n}}^{a+e} \int_{a}^{a+e}\left\{\omega^{(\nu)}(x, y) \phi(x, y)\right. \\
& \left.\quad-G^{(\nu)}(x, y) \int_{0}^{1} D_{w} f\left(P^{(\nu)}(x, y, \theta)\right) d \theta\left(\omega^{(\nu)}\right)_{(x, y)}\right\} d x d y  \tag{1.11}\\
& \quad \geq \int_{R^{n}} \int_{a}^{a+e} G^{(\nu)}(x, y) \Gamma^{(\nu)}(x, y) d x d y+\int_{R^{n}} G(a, y) \omega(a, y) d y
\end{align*}
$$

for $\nu \geq 1$, where

$$
\begin{equation*}
G^{(\nu)}(x, y)=\int_{x}^{a+\varepsilon} \phi\left(t, g^{(\nu)}(t ; x, y)\right) \exp \left(\int_{x}^{t} H^{(\nu)}\left(s, g^{(\nu)}(s ; x, y)\right) d s\right) d t \tag{1.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

Formula (1.12) defines a transformation of the set $\mathcal{P}_{a, e}$ onto $\mathcal{P}_{a, c}^{1,0}$. For $(x, y) \in E_{a+e} \backslash E_{a}$ the matrix $D_{y} g^{(\nu)}(\cdot ; x, y)=\left[D_{y_{1}} g_{j}^{(\nu)}(\cdot ; x, y)\right]_{j, l=1}^{n}$ satisfies the equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left[\frac{d}{d t} \zeta_{j l}\right]_{j, l=1}^{n}=-A\left(P^{(\nu)}\left(t, g^{(\nu)}(t ; x, y), \theta\right) ; u^{(\nu)}+\theta \omega^{(\nu)}\right)[\zeta j l]_{j, l=1}^{n} \tag{1.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

with the initial condition

$$
\begin{equation*}
\zeta_{j l}(x)=\delta_{j l} \quad(j, l=1, \ldots, n) \tag{1.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\delta_{j l}$ is the Kronecker symbol. Denote

$$
J^{(\nu)}(t ; x, y)=\operatorname{det}\left[D_{y} g^{(\nu)}(t ; x, y)\right] \quad \text { for }(x, y) \in E_{a+\varepsilon} \backslash E_{a}, t \in[a, a+\varepsilon] .
$$

Observe that $J^{(\nu)}(t ; x, y)>0$, moreover we have the equality

$$
\begin{equation*}
J^{(\nu)}(t ; x, y)=\exp \left(\int_{t}^{x} \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{j j}\left(P^{(\nu)}\left(s, g^{(\nu)}(s ; x, y), \theta\right) ; u^{(\nu)}+\theta \omega^{(\nu)}\right) d s\right) . \tag{1.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now we use the change of variables

$$
E_{a+e} \backslash E_{a} \ni(x, y) \longrightarrow(x, \eta)=\left(x, g^{(\nu)}(t ; x, y)\right) \in E_{a+e} \backslash E_{a}
$$

and obtain the equality

$$
\begin{align*}
& \int_{R^{n}} \int_{a}^{t} \phi\left(t, g^{(\nu)}(t ; x, y)\right) \exp \left(\int_{x}^{t} H^{(\nu)}\left(s, g^{(\nu)}(s ; x, y)\right) d s\right) \\
& \times \int_{0}^{1} D_{w} f\left(P^{(\nu)}(x, y, \theta)\right) d \theta\left(\omega^{(\nu)}\right)_{(x, y)} d x d y \\
&=\int_{R^{n}} \int_{a}^{t} \phi(t, \eta) J^{(\nu)}\left(t ; x, g^{(\nu)}(x ; t, \eta)\right)  \tag{1.16}\\
& \times \exp \left(\int_{x}^{t} H^{(\nu)}\left(s, g^{(\nu)}\left(s ; x, g^{(\nu)}(x ; t, \eta)\right) d s\right)\right. \\
& \times \int_{0}^{1} D_{w} f\left(P^{(\nu)}\left(x, g^{(\nu)}(x ; t, \eta), \theta\right)\right) d \theta\left(\omega^{(\nu)}\right)_{\left(x, g^{(\nu)}(x ; t, \eta)\right)} d x d \eta
\end{align*}
$$

From (1.6), (1.7), (1.11), (1.16) it follows that for every $\phi \in \mathcal{P}_{a, e}$ we have the inequality

$$
\begin{align*}
\int_{R^{n}}^{a+e} \int_{a}^{a} \phi(x, y) & \left\{\omega^{(\nu)}(x, y)-\int_{0}^{x} J^{(\nu)}\left(x ; t, g^{(\nu)}(t ; x, y)\right)\right. \\
& \times \exp \left(\int_{t}^{x} H^{(\nu)}\left(s, g^{(\nu)}\left(s ; t, g^{(\nu)}(t ; x, y)\right) d s\right)\right.  \tag{1.17}\\
& \left.\times \int_{0}^{1} D_{w} f\left(P^{(\nu)}\left(t, g^{(\nu)}(t ; x, y), \theta\right)\right)\left(\omega^{(\nu)}\right)_{\left(t, g^{(\nu)}(t ; x, y)\right)} d \theta d t\right\} d x d y \\
\geq & \int_{R^{n}}^{a+e} \int_{a}^{a+e} G(x, y) \Gamma^{(\nu)}(x, y) d x d y+\int_{R^{n}} G(a, y) \omega(a, y) d y
\end{align*}
$$

for $\nu \geq 1$.
For $P(\nu)(x, y, \theta)$ there are orthonormal vectors $\tilde{\eta}^{(j)}=\eta^{(\nu, j)}(x, \dot{y}, \theta) \in R^{n}(j=$ $1, \ldots, n$ ) and eigenvalues $\lambda^{(\nu, j)}(x, y, \theta) \in R_{+}$such that $c_{3} \geq \lambda^{(\nu, j)}(x, y, \theta) \geq c_{4} \geq 0$ and

$$
\begin{align*}
-\sum_{j, l=1}^{n} D_{q_{j} q_{l}} f & \left(P^{(\nu)}(x, y, \theta)\right) D_{y_{j} y_{l}} z^{(\nu)}(x, y)  \tag{1.18}\\
& =\sum_{j=1}^{n} \lambda^{(\nu, j)}(x, y, \theta) D_{\tilde{\eta}^{(j)} \bar{\eta}^{(j)}} z^{(\nu)}(x, y)
\end{align*}
$$

Thus from Assumption $H_{1}$ and (1.18) combined with (1.9) it follows that the function $H^{(\nu)}$ is upper-bounded by a measurable function independent of $\nu \geq 1$. The same property for the function $J^{(\nu)}$ can be stated.

Let $\delta \in(0, \varepsilon)$ be an arbitrary number. Since for $\phi \in \mathcal{P}_{a, \varepsilon}$ with $\operatorname{supp} \phi \in E_{a+\varepsilon} \backslash E_{a+\delta}$ the right-hand side of inequality (1.17) tends to 0 as $\nu \rightarrow \infty$, we have the inequality

$$
\begin{align*}
& \int_{R^{n}}^{a+e} \int_{a}^{a+} \phi(x, y)\left\{\omega(x, y)-\liminf _{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \int_{0}^{x} J^{(\nu)}\left(x ; t, g^{(\nu)}(t ; x, y)\right)\right. \\
& \quad \times \exp \left(\int_{t}^{x} H^{(\nu)}\left(s, g^{(\nu)}\left(s ; t, g^{(\nu)}(t ; x, y)\right)\right) d s\right)  \tag{1.19}\\
& \left.\quad \times \int_{0}^{1} D_{w} f\left(P^{(\nu)}\left(t, g^{(\nu)}(t ; x, y), \theta\right)\right)\left(\omega^{(\nu)}\right)_{\left(t, g^{(\nu)}(t ; x, y)\right)} d \theta d t\right\} d x d y \geq 0 .
\end{align*}
$$

If $D_{w} f=0$, then we get what was to be proved (compare [8]). If $D_{w} f \neq 0$, then from inequality (1.19) we get the Volterra integral inequality

$$
\begin{align*}
\omega(x, y) \geq & \liminf _{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \int_{0}^{x} J^{(\nu)}\left(x ; t, g^{(\nu)}(t ; x, y)\right) \\
& \times \exp \left(\int_{t}^{x} H^{(\nu)}\left(s, g^{(\nu)}\left(s ; t, g^{(\nu)}(t ; x, y)\right)\right) d s\right)  \tag{1.20}\\
& \times \int_{0}^{1} D_{w} f\left(P^{(\nu)}\left(t, g^{(\nu)}(t ; x, y), \theta\right)\right)\left(\omega^{(\nu)}\right)_{\left(t, g^{(\nu)}(t ; x, y)\right)} d \theta d t
\end{align*}
$$

for $(x, y) \in E_{a+e} \backslash E_{a+\delta}$, where $\delta \in(0, \varepsilon)$. Denote by $\omega^{-}$and $\left(\omega^{(\nu)}\right)^{-}$for $\nu \geq 1$ the functions that are given by equality

$$
\begin{equation*}
\omega^{-}(x, y)=\min \{0, \omega(x, y)\} \quad \text { and } \quad\left(\omega^{(\nu)}\right)^{-}(x, y)=\min \left\{0, \omega^{(\nu)}(x, y)\right\} \tag{1.21}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $(x, y) \in E_{b}$. From inequality (1.20) it is easy to see that

$$
\begin{align*}
\omega^{-}(x, y) \geq & \liminf _{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \int_{0}^{x} J^{(\nu)}\left(x ; t, g^{(\nu)}(t ; x, y)\right) \\
& \times \exp \left(\int_{t}^{x} H^{(\nu)}\left(s, g^{(\nu)}\left(s ; t, g^{(\nu)}(t ; x, y)\right)\right) d s\right)  \tag{1.22}\\
& \times \int_{0}^{1} D_{w} f\left(P^{(\nu)}\left(t, g^{(\nu)}(t ; x, y), \theta\right)\right)\left(\left(\omega^{(\nu)}\right)^{-}\right)_{\left(t, g^{(\nu)(t ; x, y))}\right.} d \theta d t
\end{align*}
$$

for $(x, y) \in E_{a+\varepsilon} \backslash E_{a+\delta}$, where $\delta \in(0, \varepsilon)$. In view of conditions (1.9), (1.10), (1.15), (1.18) and Assumption $H_{1}$ we have the inequality

$$
\begin{array}{r}
J^{(\nu)}\left(x ; t, g^{(\nu)}(t ; x, y)\right) \exp \left(\int_{t}^{x} H^{(\nu)}\left(s, g^{(\nu)}\left(s ; t, g^{(\nu)}(t ; x, y)\right)\right) d s\right)  \tag{1.23}\\
\leq \exp \left(\int_{t}^{x}\left(c_{1}+2 n c_{2}\left(1+2 M_{1}\right)+c_{3} \lambda(s)\right) d s\right)
\end{array}
$$

Let a function $W:[a, a+\varepsilon] \rightarrow R_{-}$be given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
W(x)=\inf _{(t, y) \in E_{x}} \omega^{-}(t, y) \quad \text { for } x \in[a, a+\varepsilon] \tag{1.24}
\end{equation*}
$$

Next, from (1.18), (1.22) - (1.23) and Assumption $H_{1}$ we obtain the inequality

$$
\begin{equation*}
W(x) \geq \int_{0}^{x} \exp \left(\int_{t}^{x}\left(c_{1}+2 n c_{2}\left(1+2 M_{1}\right)+c_{3} \lambda(s)\right) d s\right) c_{1} W(t) d t \tag{1.25}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $x \in[a, a+\varepsilon]$. From definition (1.21) we get the inequalities $\omega(x, y) \geq W(x) \geq 0$ for $(x, y) \in E_{a+e}$. As $a \in[0, b)$ was taken to be arbitrary, we have obtained inequality (1.4), which finishes the proof of Theorem 1.1

Remark 1. Let $L^{p}(X, R)(p \geq 1)$ denote the Banach space of real functions defined on a metric space $X$ that are integrable with power $p$. In the above given theorem one can replace the constants $M_{0}, M_{1}, c_{1}, c_{2}, c_{3} \in R_{+}$by measurable functions $\tilde{M}_{0}, \tilde{M}_{1}, \tilde{c}_{1}, \tilde{c}_{2}, \tilde{c}_{3}:[0, b] \rightarrow R_{+}$. It is enough to assume then that there are constants $P_{0}, P_{1}, P_{2}, P_{3} \in R_{+}$with $\frac{1}{P_{0}}+\frac{1}{P_{1}} \leq 1$ and $\frac{1}{P_{2}}+\frac{1}{P_{3}} \leq 1$ such that $\tilde{M}_{1} \in$ $L^{P_{0}}\left([0, b], R_{+}\right), \tilde{c}_{1} \in L^{1}\left([0, b], R_{+}\right), \tilde{c}_{2} \in L^{P_{1}}\left([0, b], R_{+}\right), \tilde{c}_{3} \in L^{P_{3}}\left([0, b], R_{+}\right)$and $\lambda \in$ $L^{P_{2}}\left([0, b], R_{+}\right)$.

## 2. Uniqueness result

The following theorem on the uniqueness of generalized entropy solutions to problem ( 0.1 ), ( 0.2 ) is a simple consequence of Theorem 1.1.

Theorem 2.1. Suppose that the following assumptions are true.

1. Assumption $H_{1}$ is satisfied and $u, v \in C\left(E_{b}, R\right)$.
2. There are constants $M_{0}, M_{1} \in R_{+}$and a function $\lambda:[0, b] \rightarrow R_{+}$, bounded on $[\delta, b]$ for every $\delta \in(0, b]$, such that $u, v \in C\left(E_{b}, R ; M_{0}, M_{1}, \lambda\right)$.
3. The functions $u, v$ are solutions to the Cauchy problem $(0.1),(0.2)$, where $\varphi \in$ $C\left(E_{0}, R\right)$.

Then for every $(x, y) \in E_{b}$ we have the equality

$$
\begin{equation*}
u(x, y)=v(x, y) \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

provided either $D_{w} f(x, y, p, w, q)=0$ for $(x, y, p, w, q) \in \Omega\left(M_{0}, M_{1}\right)$ or the function $\lambda:[0, b] \rightarrow R_{+}$is integrable on the interval $[0, b]$.

Proof. The functions $u, v$ satisfy assumptions of Theorem 1.1, thus from (2.1) we have $u \leq v$ for $(x, y) \in E_{b}$. The inverse inequality' is obtained in the same way.

Remark 2. If we omit condition (iv) in the definition of class $C\left(E_{b}, R ; M_{0}, M_{1}, \lambda\right)$, then Theorem 2.1 is not true, because there may exist two different solutions of problem ( 0.1 ), ( 0.2 ). An adequate example of $f$ without a functional variable is given in [8].

Remark 3. Our uniqueness result and a theorem on differential-functional inequalities remain valid if we replace problem (0.1),(0,2) by the following Cauchy problem for the weakly-coupled system of non-linear equations:

$$
\begin{gathered}
D_{x} z_{i}(x, y)=F_{i}\left(x, y, z(x, y), z_{(x, y)}, D_{y} z_{i}(x, y)\right), i=1, \ldots, m, \\
z(x, y)=\Phi(x, y) \text { on } E_{0} .
\end{gathered}
$$

We assume in this case that the function

$$
F(x, y, p, w, q)=\left(F_{1}(x, y, p, w, q), \ldots, F_{m}(x, y, p, w, q)\right)
$$

satisfies the quasi-monotonicity condition with respect to $p$. While proving a theorem on differential-functional inequalities we get a system of Volterra integral inequalities, which implies an appropriate inequality for functions.
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