

REGULARITY BOUNDS FOR A GEVREY CRITERION IN A KERNEL-BASED REGULARIZATION OF THE CAUCHY PROBLEM OF ELLIPTIC EQUATIONS

VO ANH KHOA AND TRAN THE HUNG

ABSTRACT. This Note derives regularity bounds for a Gevrey criterion when the Cauchy problem of elliptic equations is solved by regularization. When utilizing the regularization, one knows that checking such criterion is basically problematic, albeit its importance to engineering circumstances. Therefore, coping with that impediment helps us improve the use of some regularization methods in real-world applications. This work also consider the presence of the power-law nonlinearities.

1. BACKGROUND

Let us consider the Cauchy problem of semi-linear elliptic equations, as follows:

$$\frac{d^2 \mathbf{u}(x, y)}{dx^2} = \mathcal{A}_y \mathbf{u}(x, y) + f(x, y, \mathbf{u}(x, y)), \quad (x, y) \in \Omega := \Omega_x \times \Omega_y,$$

associated with the zero Dirichlet boundary condition in y and the initial data and nonhomogeneous initial velocity given by

$$\mathbf{u}(0, y) = \mathbf{u}_0(y), \quad \frac{d\mathbf{u}(0, y)}{dx} = \mathbf{u}_1(y), \quad y \in \Omega_y.$$

Here, $\mathbf{u} : \Omega_x \rightarrow L^2(\Omega_y)$ denotes the distribution of a body where $\Omega_x := (0, a) \subset \mathbb{R}$ and $\Omega_y \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ are open, bounded and connected domains for $n \geq 2$ and $a > 0$ with a smooth boundary, and \mathcal{A}_y is the linear second-order differential operator with variable coefficients depending on y only:

$$\mathcal{A}_y \mathbf{u}(x, y) = \sum_{i,j=1}^n \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i} \left(d_{i,j}(y) \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}(x, y)}{\partial y_j} \right) + d(y) u(y).$$

The basic requirement for the coefficients $d_{i,j}(y)$ and $d(y)$ is that \mathcal{A}_y is a positive, self-adjoint operator in the Hilbert space $L^2(\Omega_y)$. Consequently, there exists an orthonormal basis of $L^2(\Omega_y)$, denoted by $\{\phi_p\}_{p \in \mathbb{N}^*}$, satisfying

$$(1.1) \quad \phi_p \in H_0^1(\Omega_y) \cap C^\infty(\overline{\Omega_y}), \quad \mathcal{A}_y \phi_p(y) = \lambda_p \phi_p(y) \text{ for } y \in \Omega_y,$$

and the corresponding discrete spectrum $\{\lambda_p\}_{p \in \mathbb{N}^*}$ satisfies

$$(1.2) \quad 0 < \lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \dots \lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_p = \infty.$$

As a direct example, we take $\mathcal{A}_y = -\Delta_y$ with an open parallelepiped $\Omega_y = (0, a_1) \times \dots \times (0, a_n) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. For each $p \in \mathbb{N}^*$, it thus gives us that

$$(1.3) \quad \phi_p(y_1, \dots, y_n) = \prod_{j=1}^n \sqrt{\frac{2}{a_j}} \sin\left(\frac{\pi n_j}{a_j} y_j\right), \quad \lambda_p = \sum_{j=1}^n \left(\frac{\pi n_j}{a_j}\right)^2, \quad n_j \in \mathbb{N}, j \in \{1, \dots, n\},$$

which fulfill (1.1) and (1.2), respectively.

It is worth mentioning that this kind of problems is widely known and esteemed. Essentially, it includes the elliptic sine–Gordon equations in superconductivity, the Lane–Emden–Fowler type system arising in molecular biology and the Helmholtz equation together with its modified versions. For ease of presentation, we refer the above-mentioned Cauchy problem as Problem (P) . In this Note, we are interested in the mild solution for (P) where solving it can be found in [5], e.g. and then with $(\mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{u}_1) \in L^2(\Omega_y) \times L^2(\Omega_y)$ we obtain

$$(1.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbf{u}(x, y) = & \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} \left[\cosh(\sqrt{\lambda_p} x) \langle \mathbf{u}_0, \phi_p \rangle + \frac{\sinh(\sqrt{\lambda_p} x)}{\sqrt{\lambda_p}} \langle \mathbf{u}_1, \phi_p \rangle \right. \\ & \left. + \int_0^x \frac{\sinh(\sqrt{\lambda_p}(x-\xi))}{\sqrt{\lambda_p}} \langle f(\xi, \cdot, \mathbf{u}(\xi, \cdot)), \phi_p \rangle d\xi \right] \phi_p(y), \quad (x, y) \in \Omega, \end{aligned}$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes the inner product in $L^2(\Omega_y)$.

Hereby, it is not difficult to see from (1.4) that $\cosh(\sqrt{\lambda_p} x)$ and $\sinh(\sqrt{\lambda_p} x) / \sqrt{\lambda_p}$ are all unbounded terms. As a result, their catastrophic growth (as $p \rightarrow \infty$) ruins any computations on the solution $\mathbf{u}(x, y)$. In addition, one usually

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 26D15, 35J91, 47A52, 46E35.

Key words and phrases. Gevrey criterion, Regularity bounds, Kernel-based regularization, Cauchy problem, Elliptic equations, Inequalities.

meets the measurement in practice, i.e. we need to assume the presence of an approximation $(\mathbf{u}_0^\varepsilon, \mathbf{u}_1^\varepsilon) \in L^2(\Omega_y) \times L^2(\Omega_y)$ that satisfies

$$(1.5) \quad \|\mathbf{u}_0^\varepsilon - \mathbf{u}_0\|_{L^2(\Omega_y)} + \|\mathbf{u}_1^\varepsilon - \mathbf{u}_1\|_{L^2(\Omega_y)} \leq \varepsilon,$$

in which the constant $\varepsilon > 0$ represents the upper bound of the noise level in $L^2(\Omega_y)$.

In order to overcome the Hadamard-instability for this type of problems, some regularization methods have been proposed: the quasi-reversibility method [4], the quasi-boundary value method [2] and the truncation method [8]. We notice herein that when using the kernel-based regularization, the Gevrey criterion is faced. In particular, we consider the following regularized solution

$$(1.6) \quad \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon(x, y) = \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} \left[\cosh^\varepsilon(\sqrt{\lambda_p}x) \langle \mathbf{u}_0, \phi_p \rangle + \frac{\sinh^\varepsilon(\sqrt{\lambda_p}x)}{\sqrt{\lambda_p}} \langle \mathbf{u}_1, \phi_p \rangle + \int_0^x \frac{\sinh^\varepsilon(\sqrt{\lambda_p}(x-\xi))}{\sqrt{\lambda_p}} \langle f(\xi, \cdot, \mathbf{u}^\varepsilon(\xi, \cdot)), \phi_p \rangle d\xi \right] \phi_p(y), \quad (x, y) \in \Omega,$$

where for each $\varepsilon > 0$ the terms $\cosh^\varepsilon(\sqrt{\lambda_p}x)$ and $\sinh^\varepsilon(\sqrt{\lambda_p}x)/\sqrt{\lambda_p}$ can be bounded from above. This also leads to the conditional stability estimate for the regularized solution. In recent works, they are of the form

$$\cosh^\varepsilon(\sqrt{\lambda_p}x) := \Psi_{p,k}^\beta(x) + \frac{e^{-\sqrt{\lambda_p}x}}{2}, \quad \sinh^\varepsilon(\sqrt{\lambda_p}x) = \Psi_{p,k}^\beta(x) - \frac{e^{-\sqrt{\lambda_p}x}}{2},$$

in which the general kernel $\Psi_{p,k}^\beta(x) : \overline{\Omega_x} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is provided by

$$(1.7) \quad \Psi_{p,k}^\beta(x) := \frac{e^{-\sqrt{\lambda_p}(a-x)}}{2\beta\sqrt{\lambda_p^k} + 2e^{-\sqrt{\lambda_p}a}}, \quad p \in \mathbb{N}^*, \beta := \beta(\varepsilon) \in (0, 1),$$

with $k \geq 1$ inspired from [3] and [7], and $k = 0$ postulated in [5].

When doing so, the Gevrey criterion for convergence is known as the *a priori* information on the exact solution under the Gevrey¹ classes defined by

$$\mathbb{G}_\nu^s := \left\{ \mathbf{v} \in L^2(\Omega_y) : \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} \lambda_p^\nu e^{2s\sqrt{\lambda_p}} |\langle \mathbf{v}, \phi_p \rangle|^2 < \infty \right\}, \quad \nu \geq 0, s > 0,$$

endowed with the norm

$$\|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{G}_\nu^s}^2 = \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} \lambda_p^\nu e^{2s\sqrt{\lambda_p}} |\langle \mathbf{v}, \phi_p \rangle|^2 < \infty.$$

Return to our concern, from [3, Theorem 7] and [7, Theorem 2] it requires that

$$(1.8) \quad \mathbf{u} \in C(\overline{\Omega_x}; \mathbb{G}_{\nu_1}^{s_1}) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{d\mathbf{u}}{dx} \in C(\overline{\Omega_x}; \mathbb{G}_{\nu_2}^{s_2}),$$

with $\nu_1 \geq a$, $\nu_2 \geq a$, $s_1 = k$ and $s_2 = k - 1$, whilst in [5] we assume that

$$(1.9) \quad \mathbf{u} \in C(\overline{\Omega_x}; \mathbb{G}_0^{s_1}) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{d\mathbf{u}}{dx} \in C(\overline{\Omega_x}; \mathbb{G}_0^{s_2}),$$

with s_1 and s_2 being the same as above.

At present, we observe that the assumptions (1.8) and (1.9) are very hard to check if one wants to utilize this type of regularization methods and from those works mentioned above, they merely consider this information when $f \equiv 0$. Due to those reasons, this Note is to explore a natural upper bound for such criterion for $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and due to the similarity, we focus on the assumption (1.8) in the next section. Our main result thus lies in Theorem 1.

2. DERIVATION OF REGULARITY BOUNDS

For simplicity, the forcing function $f(x, y, \mathbf{u}(x, y)) = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}(x, y)) + \mathbf{F}(x, y)$ is concentrated with $\mathbf{f}(0) \equiv 0$. Furthermore, we assume a modulus of continuity $\omega : [0, \infty] \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ on $\mathbf{f} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, i.e.

$$(2.1) \quad |\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{v})| \leq \omega(|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}|) \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}.$$

In this part, we mostly take into consideration the modulus $\omega(\mathbf{u}) := L\mathbf{u}$ which indicates the globally L -Lipschitz function, whilst the Hölder-type continuity $\omega(\mathbf{u}) := L\mathbf{u}^\alpha$, $\alpha \geq 1$ resembling the power-law nonlinearities (e.g. logistic and von Bertalanffy) shall be investigated in a few words as a consequence.

¹Here, we employ this terminology from Cao et al. [1].

From here on, we recall from the proofs of [3, Theorem 7] and [7, Theorem 2] the actual assumption that leads to (1.8). It has the following form:

$$(2.2) \quad \mathbf{A} := \sup_{x \in \Omega_x} \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} \lambda_p^k e^{2\sqrt{\lambda_p}(a-x)} \left(\langle \mathbf{u}(x, \cdot), \phi_p \rangle + \frac{\langle \mathbf{u}_x(x, \cdot), \phi_p \rangle}{\sqrt{\lambda_p}} \right)^2 < \infty.$$

From (1.4), we take the derivative of $\mathbf{u}(x, y)$ with respect to x and obtain that

$$(2.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{\langle \mathbf{u}_x(x, \cdot), \phi_p \rangle}{\sqrt{\lambda_p}} &= \sinh(\sqrt{\lambda_p}x) \langle \mathbf{u}_0, \phi_p \rangle + \frac{\cosh(\sqrt{\lambda_p}x)}{\sqrt{\lambda_p}} \langle \mathbf{u}_1, \phi_p \rangle \\ &+ \int_0^x \frac{\cosh(\sqrt{\lambda_p}(x-\xi))}{\sqrt{\lambda_p}} \langle f(\xi, \cdot, \mathbf{u}(\xi, \cdot)), \phi_p \rangle d\xi, \quad p \in \mathbb{N}^*. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, combining (2.3) with (1.4), we arrive at

$$(2.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle \mathbf{u}(x, \cdot), \phi_p \rangle + \frac{\langle \mathbf{u}_x(x, \cdot), \phi_p \rangle}{\sqrt{\lambda_p}} &= e^{\sqrt{\lambda_p}x} \left(\langle \mathbf{u}_0, \phi_p \rangle + \frac{1}{\lambda_p} \langle \mathbf{u}_1, \phi_p \rangle \right. \\ &\left. + \int_0^x \frac{e^{-\sqrt{\lambda_p}\xi}}{\sqrt{\lambda_p}} \langle f(\xi, \cdot, \mathbf{u}(\xi, \cdot)), \phi_p \rangle d\xi \right), \quad p \in \mathbb{N}^*. \end{aligned}$$

Taking now $x = a$ in (2.4), we can write that

$$(2.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle \mathbf{u}(a, \cdot), \phi_p \rangle + \frac{\langle \mathbf{u}_x(a, \cdot), \phi_p \rangle}{\sqrt{\lambda_p}} &= e^{\sqrt{\lambda_p}a} \left(\langle \mathbf{u}_0, \phi_p \rangle + \frac{1}{\lambda_p} \langle \mathbf{u}_1, \phi_p \rangle \right. \\ &\left. + \int_0^a \frac{e^{-\sqrt{\lambda_p}\xi}}{\sqrt{\lambda_p}} \langle f(\xi, \cdot, \mathbf{u}(\xi, \cdot)), \phi_p \rangle d\xi \right), \quad p \in \mathbb{N}^*. \end{aligned}$$

Henceforward, combining (2.4) and (2.5) we gain the following equality after some arrangements

$$\begin{aligned} e^{\sqrt{\lambda_p}(a-x)} \left(\langle \mathbf{u}(x, \cdot), \phi_p \rangle + \frac{\langle \mathbf{u}_x(x, \cdot), \phi_p \rangle}{\sqrt{\lambda_p}} \right) &= \langle \mathbf{u}(a, \cdot), \phi_p \rangle + \frac{\langle \mathbf{u}_x(a, \cdot), \phi_p \rangle}{\sqrt{\lambda_p}} \\ &- \int_x^a \frac{e^{\sqrt{\lambda_p}(a-\xi)}}{\sqrt{\lambda_p}} \langle f(\xi, \cdot, \mathbf{u}(\xi, \cdot)), \phi_p \rangle d\xi, \quad p \in \mathbb{N}^*. \end{aligned}$$

Hereby, we bound \mathbf{A} from above by

$$(2.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbf{A} &\leq \sup_{x \in \Omega_x} \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} \lambda_p^k \left(\langle \mathbf{u}(a, \cdot), \phi_p \rangle + \frac{\langle \mathbf{u}_x(a, \cdot), \phi_p \rangle}{\sqrt{\lambda_p}} - \int_x^a \frac{e^{\sqrt{\lambda_p}(a-\xi)}}{\sqrt{\lambda_p}} \langle f(\xi, \cdot, \mathbf{u}(\xi, \cdot)), \phi_p \rangle d\xi \right)^2 \\ &\leq 3 \sup_{x \in \Omega_x} \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} \left[\lambda_p^k |\langle \mathbf{u}(a, \cdot), \phi_p \rangle|^2 + \lambda_p^{k-1} \left(|\langle \mathbf{u}_x(a, \cdot), \phi_p \rangle|^2 + \left| \int_x^a e^{\sqrt{\lambda_p}(a-\xi)} \langle f(\xi, \cdot, \mathbf{u}(\xi, \cdot)), \phi_p \rangle d\xi \right|^2 \right) \right], \end{aligned}$$

where we use the elementary inequality $(a_1 + a_2 + a_3)^2 \leq 3(a_1^2 + a_2^2 + a_3^2)$.

At this point, we observe the norm of the Hilbert space $H^r(\Omega_y)$ with $r \in \mathbb{N}$, which can be naturally defined in terms of Fourier series whose coefficients that decay rapidly; namely

$$H^r(\Omega_y) := \left\{ \mathbf{v} \in L^2(\Omega_y) : \|\mathbf{v}\|_{H^r(\Omega_y)} < \infty \right\},$$

equipped with the norm

$$\|\mathbf{v}\|_{H^r(\Omega_y)}^2 = \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} (1 + \lambda_p)^r |\langle \mathbf{v}, \phi_p \rangle|^2.$$

It then sufficient to bound the criterion \mathbf{A} from above. Indeed, we get that

$$(2.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{1}{3} \mathbf{A} &\leq \|\mathbf{u}(a, \cdot)\|_{H^k(\Omega_y)}^2 + \|\mathbf{u}_x(a, \cdot)\|_{H^{k-1}(\Omega_y)}^2 + \sup_{x \in \Omega_x} \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} \lambda_p^{k-1} \left| \int_x^a e^{\sqrt{\lambda_p}(a-\xi)} \langle f(\xi, \cdot, \mathbf{u}(\xi, \cdot)), \phi_p \rangle d\xi \right|^2 \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{u}(a, \cdot)\|_{H^k(\Omega_y)}^2 + \|\mathbf{u}_x(a, \cdot)\|_{H^{k-1}(\Omega_y)}^2 + \sup_{x \in \Omega_x} \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} \lambda_p^{k-1} \int_x^a e^{2\sqrt{\lambda_p}(a-\xi)} d\xi \int_x^a |\langle f(\xi, \cdot, \mathbf{u}(\xi, \cdot)), \phi_p \rangle|^2 d\xi \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{u}(a, \cdot)\|_{H^k(\Omega_y)}^2 + \|\mathbf{u}_x(a, \cdot)\|_{H^{k-1}(\Omega_y)}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} \lambda_p^{k-\frac{3}{2}} \left(e^{2\sqrt{\lambda_p}a} - 1 \right) \int_0^a |\langle f(\xi, \cdot, \mathbf{u}(\xi, \cdot)), \phi_p \rangle|^2 d\xi, \end{aligned}$$

in which we apply the fundamental inequalities $\lambda_p^k \leq (1 + \lambda_p)^k$, $\lambda_p^{k-1} \leq (1 + \lambda_p)^{k-1}$ for all $p \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$ in combination with the Hölder inequality.

Consequently, (2.7) yields

$$(2.8) \quad \mathbf{A} \leq 3 \|\mathbf{u}(a, \cdot)\|_{H^k(\Omega_y)}^2 + 3 \|\mathbf{u}_x(a, \cdot)\|_{H^{k-1}(\Omega_y)}^2 + \begin{cases} \frac{3}{2} \|f(\mathbf{u})\|_{L^1(\Omega_x; \mathbb{G}_{k-\frac{3}{2}}^a)}^2, & k > 1, \\ \frac{3}{2} \lambda_1^{k-\frac{3}{2}} \|f(\mathbf{u})\|_{L^1(\Omega_x; \mathbb{G}_0^a)}^2, & k = 1. \end{cases}$$

Accordingly, the estimate (2.8) completes a general regularity bound for the Gevrey-type criterion \mathbf{A} defined in (2.2). In other words, the assumption that we have constructed facilitates very much the previously used information (1.8) since the Gevrey class just imposes on the forcing function f . In the context of reconstructing the temperature of a body from interior measurement in linear cases ($\mathbf{f} \equiv 0$), we only need to verify the distribution and its velocity on the surface $x = a$ in $H^k(\Omega_y)$ and $H^{k-1}(\Omega_y)$, respectively, together with the source function \mathbf{F} that substitutes f in (2.8). Furthermore, if $f \equiv 0$, one obtains the following equivalence relation

$$\|\mathbf{u}\|_{C(\overline{\Omega_x}; H^k(\Omega_y))}^2 + \|\mathbf{u}_x\|_{C(\overline{\Omega_x}; H^{k-1}(\Omega_y))}^2 \leq \|\mathbf{u}\|_{C(\overline{\Omega_x}; \mathbb{G}_k^a)}^2 + \|\mathbf{u}_x\|_{C(\overline{\Omega_x}; \mathbb{G}_{k-1}^a)}^2 \leq 3 \left(\|\mathbf{u}\|_{C(\overline{\Omega_x}; H^k(\Omega_y))}^2 + \|\mathbf{u}_x\|_{C(\overline{\Omega_x}; H^{k-1}(\Omega_y))}^2 \right).$$

The regularity bound (2.8) is very helpful but we can derive a more rigorous bound by considering the forcing term f . Suppose $\mathbf{F} \equiv 0$, it is straightforward to deduce from (2.1) that

$$\mathbf{A} \leq 3 \left(\|\mathbf{u}(a, \cdot)\|_{H^k(\Omega_y)}^2 + \|\mathbf{u}_x(a, \cdot)\|_{H^{k-1}(\Omega_y)}^2 \right) + \begin{cases} \frac{3L^2}{2} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^1(\Omega_x; \mathbb{G}_{k-\frac{3}{2}}^a)}^2, & k > 1, \\ \frac{3}{2} \lambda_1^{k-\frac{3}{2}} L^2 \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^1(\Omega_x; \mathbb{G}_0^a)}^2, & k = 1. \end{cases},$$

if the modulus ω is the globally L -Lipschitz function (e.g. $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}) = \sin(\mathbf{u})$ with $L = 1$ and $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{u}(1 + \mathbf{u}^2)^{-1}$ with $L = 25/16$). This means that we can assume $\mathbf{u} \in C^1(\overline{\Omega_x}; H^k(\Omega_y)) \cap L^1(\Omega_x; \mathbb{G}_{k-\frac{3}{2}}^a)$ if $k \geq 2$ and $\mathbf{u} \in C^1(\overline{\Omega_x}; H^k(\Omega_y)) \cap L^1(\Omega_x; \mathbb{G}_0^a)$ if $k = 1$. On the other side, if $\omega(\mathbf{u}) = L\mathbf{u}^\alpha$ with $\alpha \geq 1$ and we know that \mathbf{u} is positive and bounded, then one can prove ω is still globally Lipschitz.

All in all, we now state the following theorem.

Theorem 1. *Consider the general kernel-based regularization with kernel $\Psi_{p,k}^\beta$ defined in (1.7) in accordance with $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and $\beta := \beta(\varepsilon) \in (0, 1)$. Then, the Gevrey-type criterion (2.2) on the exact solution \mathbf{u} of Problem (P), which are required for the convergence rate of the regularized solution \mathbf{u}^ε defined in (1.6) are accepted by the regularity bound*

$$\mathbf{A} \leq 3 \left(\|\mathbf{u}(a, \cdot)\|_{H^k(\Omega_y)}^2 + \|\mathbf{u}_x(a, \cdot)\|_{H^{k-1}(\Omega_y)}^2 \right) + \begin{cases} \frac{3}{2} \|f(\mathbf{u})\|_{L^1(\Omega_x; \mathbb{G}_{k-\frac{3}{2}}^a)}^2, & k \geq 2, \\ \frac{3}{2} \lambda_1^{k-\frac{3}{2}} \|f(\mathbf{u})\|_{L^1(\Omega_x; \mathbb{G}_0^a)}^2, & k = 1. \end{cases}$$

Furthermore, if consider $f(x, y, \mathbf{u}(x, y)) = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}(x, y))$ with $\mathbf{f}(0) \equiv 0$ and the modulus of continuity ω satisfying (2.1) is globally Lipschitz, the criterion becomes $\mathbf{u} \in C^1(\overline{\Omega_x}; H^k(\Omega_y)) \cap L^1(\Omega_x; \mathbb{G}_{k-\frac{3}{2}}^a)$ if $k \geq 2$ and $\mathbf{u} \in C^1(\overline{\Omega_x}; H^k(\Omega_y)) \cap L^1(\Omega_x; \mathbb{G}_0^a)$ if $k = 1$.

Remark 2. We define another criterion \mathbf{A}^γ with an index $\gamma > 0$, provided by

$$\mathbf{A}^\gamma := \sup_{x \in \overline{\Omega_x}} \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} \lambda_p^k e^{2\gamma \sqrt{\lambda_p}(a-x)} \left(\langle \mathbf{u}(x, \cdot), \phi_p \rangle + \frac{\langle \mathbf{u}_x(x, \cdot), \phi_p \rangle}{\sqrt{\lambda_p}} \right)^{2\gamma} < \infty.$$

Obviously, this criterion is considered as a special case of \mathbf{A} . Consider the case $\mathbf{f} \equiv 0$, we proceed the same way as estimated in (2.6) and (2.7). We know that there always exists a positive constant $C > 0$ such that for any countably infinite set $\{a_p\}_{p \in \mathbb{N}^*}$, whose elements are all nonnegative, satisfying $\sum_{p=1}^{\infty} a_p < \infty$, the following inequality holds

$$\sum_{p=1}^{\infty} a_p^\gamma \leq C \left(\sum_{p=1}^{\infty} a_p \right)^\gamma \quad \text{for } \gamma > 0.$$

Therefore, it enables us to estimate \mathbf{A}^γ from above by

$$(2.9) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2^\gamma} \mathbf{A}^\gamma &\leq \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} \left(\lambda_p^{\frac{k}{\gamma}} |\langle \mathbf{u}(a, \cdot), \phi_p \rangle|^2 + \lambda_p^{\frac{k}{\gamma}-1} |\langle \mathbf{u}_x(a, \cdot), \phi_p \rangle|^2 \right)^\gamma \\ &\leq C \left(\sum_{p=1}^{\infty} \lambda_p^{\frac{k}{\gamma}} |\langle \mathbf{u}(a, \cdot), \phi_p \rangle|^2 + \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} \lambda_p^{\frac{k}{\gamma}-1} |\langle \mathbf{u}_x(a, \cdot), \phi_p \rangle|^2 \right)^\gamma. \end{aligned}$$

At present, we need to argue the relation between k and γ . In fact, if $k > \gamma$ then using the inequality

$$(a + b)^\gamma \leq \max \{2^{\gamma-1}, 1\} (a^\gamma + b^\gamma) \quad \text{for all } a, b \geq 0, \gamma > 0,$$

we continue to estimate (2.9) by

$$(2.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2^\gamma} \mathbf{A}^\gamma &\leq C \left(\left\| \mathcal{A}_y^{\frac{k}{\gamma}} \mathbf{u}(a, \cdot) \right\|_{L^2(\Omega_y)}^2 + \left\| \mathcal{A}_y^{\frac{k}{\gamma}-1} \mathbf{u}_x(a, \cdot) \right\|_{L^2(\Omega_y)}^2 \right)^\gamma \\ &\leq C \max \{2^{\gamma-1}, 1\} \left(\left\| \mathcal{A}_y^{\frac{k}{\gamma}} \mathbf{u}(a, \cdot) \right\|_{L^2(\Omega_y)}^{2\gamma} + \left\| \mathcal{A}_y^{\frac{k}{\gamma}-1} \mathbf{u}_x(a, \cdot) \right\|_{L^2(\Omega_y)}^{2\gamma} \right). \end{aligned}$$

In case $k \equiv 0 \pmod{\gamma}$, the regularity bound in (2.10) reduces to

$$\mathbf{A}^\gamma \leq 2^{2\gamma} C \left(\left\| \mathbf{u}(a, \cdot) \right\|_{H^{\frac{k}{\gamma}}(\Omega_y)}^{2\gamma} + \left\| \mathbf{u}(a, \cdot) \right\|_{H^{\frac{k}{\gamma}-1}(\Omega_y)}^{2\gamma} \right).$$

Similar to the case $k \leq \gamma$, we deduce from (2.9) that

$$\mathbf{A}^\gamma \leq 2^{2\gamma} C \left(\left\| \mathcal{A}_y^{\frac{k}{\gamma}} \mathbf{u}(a, \cdot) \right\|_{L^2(\Omega_y)}^{2\gamma} + \lambda_1^{\frac{k}{\gamma}-1} \left\| \mathbf{u}_x(a, \cdot) \right\|_{L^2(\Omega_y)}^{2\gamma} \right).$$

Notice that when $k = 0$ investigated in [5], (2.9) gives us directly the natural criterion $\mathbf{u} \in C^1(\overline{\Omega_x}; L^2(\Omega_y))$.

3. CONCLUSIONS

In general, solving the Cauchy problems of elliptic equations is doable by regularization methods. In the context of kernel-based regularization, this has been done in [5] and [3], working with hardly checked criteria for convergence. In this Note, we have alleviated such conditions, as informed in (1.8)-(1.9) and (2.2), by the accepted regularity bound in Theorem 1. The ‘‘accepted’’ means that instead of testing the Gevrey-type criteria on the exact solution, it now reduces to working with the forcing function f . It therefore yields qualitatively better information than previously developed assumptions. Interestingly, the Gevrey-type criteria on f can be ignored in computational environments by the truncated Fourier series with the cut-off constant N dependent of the noise ε assumed in (1.5). Moreover, the choice of N can follow the work [6]. Therefore, one only needs $\mathbf{u} \in C^1(\overline{\Omega_x}; H^k(\Omega_y)) \cap L^1(\Omega_x; L^2(\Omega_y))$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$ to solve the problem under consideration.

As analyzed numerically in [3], this type of problems is extremely sensitive to the noise level and the convergence is greatly influenced by the boundedness of involved coefficients. It is worth mentioning that the upper bound of the new criterion in Theorem 1 still varies when doing with the truncated Fourier series on $f(\mathbf{u})$. Consequently, it may impact ugly on the theoretically desired convergence of the proposed approximation. This unsolved issue will thus be our next aim of study in the near future.

Acknowledgement. This work is dedicated to the memory of V.A.K’s father. The authors desire to thank the handling editor and anonymous referee for their helpful comments on this research.

REFERENCES

- [1] C. Cao, M. A. Rammaha, and E. S. Titi. The Navier-Stokes equations on the rotating 2-D sphere: Gevrey regularity and asymptotic degrees of freedom. *Zeitschrift für angewandte Mathematik und Physik*, 50(3):341–360, 1999.
- [2] D. N. Hào, N. V. Duc, and D. Lesnic. A non-local boundary value problem method for the Cauchy problem for elliptic equations. *Inverse Problems*, 25:055002, 2009.
- [3] V. A. Khoa, M. T. N. Truong, N. H. M. Duy, and N. H. Tuan. The Cauchy problem of coupled elliptic sine–Gordon equations with noise: Analysis of a general kernel-based regularization and reliable tools of computing. *Computers and Mathematics with Applications*, 73:141–162, 2017.
- [4] Z. Qian, C. L. Fu, and Z. P. Li. Two regularization methods for a Cauchy problem for the Laplace equation. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 338:479–489, 2008.
- [5] N. H. Tuan, L. D. Thang, and V. A. Khoa. A modified integral equation method of the nonlinear elliptic equation with globally and locally lipschitz source. *Applied Mathematics and Computation*, 265:245–265, 2015.
- [6] N. H. Tuan, L. D. Thang, V. A. Khoa, and T. Tran. On an inverse boundary value problem of a nonlinear elliptic equation in three dimensions. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 426:1232–1261, 2015.
- [7] N. H. Tuan, L. D. Thang, D. D. Trong, and V. A. Khoa. Approximation of mild solutions of the linear and nonlinear elliptic equations. *Inverse Problems in Science and Engineering*, 2015.
- [8] N. H. Tuan, D. D. Trong, and P. H. Quan. A note on a Cauchy problem for the Laplace equation: Regularization and error estimates. *Applied Mathematics and Computation*, 217:2913–2922, 2010.

MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE DIVISION, GRAN SASSO SCIENCE INSTITUTE, L’AQUILA, ITALY.
E-mail address: khoa.vo@gssi.infn.it, vakhoa.hcmus@gmail.com

FACULTY OF APPLIED PHYSICS AND MATHEMATICS, GDASNK UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, GDASNK, POLAND.
E-mail address: thehung.tran@mathmods.eu