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Summary. The paper deals with boundary value problems for systems of nonlinear elliptic equations in a relatively general form. Theorems based on monotone operator theory and concerning the existence of weak solutions of such a system, as well as the convergence of discretized problem solutions are presented.

As an example, the approach is applied to the stationary Van Roosbroeck's system, arising in semiconductor device modelling.

A convergent algorithm suitable for solving sets of algebraic equations generated by the discretization procedure proposed will be described in a forthcoming paper.
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1. Introduction

Very fast progress in many current technologies has also brought forth an increasing interest in mathematical modelling of the undergoing physical processes, which are often described by (usually nonlinear) systems of partial differential equations. In this paper, an approach to the analysis of a boundary value problem for a system of nonlinear, elliptic type equations in rather general form is described.

In Section 3, conditions on the problem data that are sufficient to define weak solutions of the problem and to prove their existence are given. Similar conditions can also be found in many other publications, see e.g. Fučík, Kufner [4], Nečas [14] and Francú [3], but the form of the so-called coercivity conditions presented here seems to be new.
Then, a discretization scheme based on the numerical integration of the lower
order terms only is proposed. Existence and convergence results for this procedure
are proved. Moreover, Hackbusch’s results [8] are used to show that the proposed
discretization scheme has some properties of the box integration method (Varga [20]).

In Section 4, the theory is applied to the well-known Van Roosbroeck’s system
of three coupled nonlinear partial differential equations describing the function of a
semiconductor device in stationary state.

Most theorems on the existence of (weak) solutions of this problem use directly
the Schauder fixed point theorem (Mock [13], Gajewski [5], Gröger [6]), or the theory
of variational inequalities (Jerome [9]).

The results of Section 3 are based on monotone operator theory. To be able
to apply them to the semiconductor device problem, a modified problem, solutions
of which are also solutions of the original one, is formulated. Then, using theo-
rems of Section 3, the existence of the modified problem solutions, and also exis-
tence/convergence results for the discretized problem solutions, are proved. This
procedure is similar to that of Gröger [6], the difference being in the technique used
to prove existence of the modified problem solutions. In [6], Schauder fixed point
theorem is used directly, leading to a nonlinear block Gauss-Seidel type algorithm,
but without a proof of its convergence. We shall apply Theorem 3.2, use its assertions
also in the analysis of discretization procedure and in the related paper [16] prove
the convergence of a solution algorithm, based on fully coupled Newton’s method.

The current continuity equations (4.2) and (4.3) are often discretized by the box
integration method in conjunction with the so called Scharfetter-Gummel approxima-
tion of current densities, see [18]. However, other techniques also have been developed
recently, see Markowich, Zlámal [11], Miller [12], Bürgler et al. [1], Shigyo, Wada,
Yasuda [19], Chen [2] and others. Good numerical properties of the discretization
scheme proposed in this paper should be guaranteed by the fact that it is actually a
box integration method applied to some closely related differential equation.

As far as the author knows, no similar approach to the semiconductor device
equations resulting in theoretically convergent multigrid based algorithm (see [16])
has been published yet. Moreover, some results from the more general part of the
paper also seem to be new—the form of the coercivity condition (3.10) and Theorem
3.3 on the convergence of discretized problem solutions.
2. Basic notation

We shall use the following notation:

\[ \mathbb{N} \text{ the set of non-negative integers,} \]
\[ \mathbb{R} \text{ the set of real numbers,} \]
\[ \mathbb{V} \text{ almost everywhere,} \]
\[ \vec{n} = (n_1, \ldots, n_N) \text{ vector of outward normal,} \]
\[ \rightarrow \text{ strong convergence,} \]
\[ \rightharpoonup \text{ weak convergence.} \]

Let \( X \) be a real reflexive separable Banach space, equipped with a norm \( \| \cdot \|_X \). The dual space of \( X \) will be denoted by \( X^* \) and the value of a continuous linear functional \( F \in X^* \) on an element \( v \in X \) will be denoted as

\[ \langle F, v \rangle_X. \]

Let \( N \geq 1, m \geq 1 \) be integers, \( \kappa = m(N + 1) \), and let \( \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N \) be a bounded domain with a Lipschitz boundary divided into two disjoint measurable subsets \( \Gamma_D \) and \( \Gamma_N \). Suppose that \( \mu_{N-1}(\Gamma_D) \)—the \((N - 1)\)-dimensional Lebesgue measure of \( \Gamma_D \)—is nonzero.

For a given vector function \( u = (u_1, \ldots, u_m) \) with sufficiently smooth components \( u_i : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}, 1 \leq i \leq m \), we write

\[ \nabla u = \left( \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial x_1}, \ldots, \frac{\partial u_m}{\partial x_1}, \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial x_2}, \ldots, \frac{\partial u_m}{\partial x_N} \right) \]

and

\[ D^j u_i = \begin{cases} u_i, & j = 0, \\ \partial u_i / \partial x_j, & 1 \leq j \leq N. \end{cases} \]

For \( \xi \in \mathbb{R}^\kappa \), we denote its components in the following way:

\[ \xi = (\xi_{01}, \ldots, \xi_{m0}, \xi_{11}, \ldots, \xi_{mN}), \]

so that they correspond to the components of \( (u, \nabla u) \).

We also introduce here an abstract function space \( V \), which will be referred to throughout the paper:

Let \( 1 < p < \infty \). The closure of the set

\[ \{ v \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega}) : v = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_D \} \]
in the norm of $W^{1,p}_0(\Omega)$ \(^1\) will be denoted as $V^p$. The space $V$ is defined by

\[(2.1) \quad V = \prod_{i=1}^{m} V^{p_i}, \quad 1 < p_i < \infty, \quad 1 \leq i \leq m,\]

and equipped with the norm

\[(2.2) \quad \|v\|_V = \left( \sum_{i=1}^{m} \|v_i\|_{V^{p_i}}^{p_{\text{min}}} \right)^{\frac{1}{p_{\text{min}}}} = \left( \sum_{i=1}^{m} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{N} \int_{\Omega} |D^j v_i|^{p_i} \, dx \right)^{\frac{p_{\text{min}}}{p_i}} \right)^{\frac{1}{p_{\text{min}}}},\]

where $p_{\text{min}} = \min\{p_1, \ldots, p_m\}$.

### 3. General Theory

#### 3.1. Weak formulation and existence theorem.

Let us first recall some important definitions and an abstract theorem, which plays principal role in our analysis.

**Definition 3.1.** Let $X$ be a real reflexive and separable Banach space. A mapping $A : X \to X^*$ is said to be

- **demicontinuous**, if

\[(3.1) \quad (\forall u_0 \in X)(\forall \{u_n\}_{n \geq 1} : u_n \in X)(u_n \to u_0 \text{ in } X) \Rightarrow (Au_n \to Au_0 \text{ in } X^*),\]

- **coercive**, if

\[(3.2) \quad \lim_{\|u\|_X \to \infty} \frac{\langle Av, v \rangle_X}{\|v\|_X} = \infty,\]

- **strictly monotone**, if

\[(3.3) \quad (\forall v, w \in X, v \neq w)(\langle Av - Aw, v - w \rangle_X > 0),\]

\(^1\) Recall that this norm can be defined as follows:

\[(\forall u \in W^{1,p}_0(\Omega))(\|u\|_{W^{1,p}_0(\Omega)}) = \left( \sum_{j=1}^{N} \int_{\Omega} |D^j u|^{p} \, dx \right)^{1/p}.\]
satisfying the so-called condition \((M)_0\), if
\[
(v_n \to v) \land (Av_n \rightharpoonup \varphi) \land ((Av_n, v_n)_X \to (\varphi, v)_X) \Rightarrow (Av = \varphi \text{ in } X^*).
\]

**Definition 3.2.** Let \(X\) be a real reflexive and separable Banach space, \(A : X \to X^*\), \(F \in X^*\), \(X_I\) a finite-dimensional subspace of \(X\), and let the following problem be given:

\[
(3.5) \quad \text{Find } u \in X \text{ such that } \\
(\forall v \in X)((Au, v)_X = (F, v)_X).
\]

The problem
\[
(3.6) \quad \text{Find } u_I \in X_I \text{ such that } \\
(\forall v \in X_I)((Au_I, v)_X = (F, v)_X)
\]
is called the Galerkin approximation of the problem (3.5) on the subspace \(X_I\).

**Theorem 3.1.** Let \(X\) be a real reflexive and separable Banach space and let a mapping \(A : X \to X^*\) which is demicontinuous, bounded, coercive and satisfying the condition \((M)_0\) be given. Then the problem (3.5) has a solution for all \(F \in X^*\). The problems (3.6), \(l \in N\) are also solvable and if
\[
\bigcup_{l=1}^{\infty} X_I = X,
\]
then \(u_I \to u\). Moreover, if \(A\) is strictly monotone, then the solution of (3.5) is unique.

**Proof.** See e.g. Francu [3, Th.5.2. and Th.7.2] or Pospíšek [15, Th.4.7]. \(\square\)

Let \(N\), \(m\) and \(\Omega\) be as in Section 2 and let functions
\[
\begin{align*}
a_{ij} : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^\kappa &\to \mathbb{R}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq m, \quad 0 \leq j \leq N, \\
f_i : \Omega &\to \mathbb{R}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq m, \\
d_i : \Omega \cup \Gamma_D &\to \mathbb{R}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq m, \\
h_i : \Gamma_N &\to \mathbb{R}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq m
\end{align*}
\]
be given. (Recall that \(\kappa = m(N+1)\).) We are interested in boundary value problems in the following form:

\[
(3.7) \quad \sum_{j=1}^{N} D^j a_{ij}(x; u, \nabla u) + a_{i0}(x; u, \nabla u) = f_i, \quad i = 1, \ldots, m, \quad x \in \Omega, \\
u_i = d_i, \quad i = 1, \ldots, m, \quad x \in \Gamma_D, \\
\sum_{j=1}^{N} n_j a_{ij}(x; u, \nabla u) = h_i, \quad i = 1, \ldots, m, \quad x \in \Gamma_N.
\]

Let us introduce some useful properties of the functions \(a_{ij}\):
Definition 3.3. Let functions \( a_{ij} : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^\kappa \to \mathbb{R}, 1 \leq i \leq m, 0 \leq j \leq N \), be given. We say that they satisfy Carathéodory conditions, if

\[
\forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^\kappa \quad (a_{ij} (\cdot; \xi) \text{ is measurable in } \Omega),
\]

\[
\forall x \in \Omega \quad (a_{ij} (x; \cdot) \text{ is continuous in } \mathbb{R}^\kappa),
\]

growth conditions with the coefficients \( p_1, \ldots, p_m \), if

\[
\exists p_k \geq 1, 1 \leq k \leq m \quad (\forall i, 1 \leq i \leq m) \quad (\forall j, 0 \leq j \leq N) \quad (\forall x \in \Omega) \quad (\forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^\kappa)
\]

\[
|a_{ij}(x; \xi)| \leq \sum_{k=1}^{m} \left( g_{ij}(x) + c_{ij} \sum_{l=0}^{N} |\xi_{kl}|^{p_k} \frac{P_k(p_l-1)}{p_l} \right),
\]

where \( c_{ij} \) are non-negative constants and \( g_{ij} \in L_{q_i}(\Omega), 1/p_i + 1/q_i = 1 \).

coercivity condition with the coefficients \( p_1, \ldots, p_m \), if

\[
\exists p_k \geq 1, 1 \leq k \leq m \quad (\exists C_c > 0) \quad (\forall x \in \Omega) \quad (\forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^\kappa)
\]

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=0}^{N} a_{ij}(x; \xi) \xi_{ij} \geq C_c \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{N} |\xi_{ij}|^{p_i} + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \theta_i(x) \xi_{i0},
\]

where \( C_c > 0 \) is a constant and \( \theta_i \in L_{\infty}(\Omega), 1 \leq i \leq m \).

strict monotonicity condition, if

\[
(\forall x \in \Omega) \quad (\forall \xi, \eta \in \mathbb{R}^\kappa, \xi \neq \eta)
\]

\[
\left( \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=0}^{N} [a_{ij}(x; \xi) - a_{ij}(x; \eta)](\xi_{ij} - \eta_{ij}) > 0 \right),
\]

condition of strict monotonicity in principal part, if

\[
(\forall x \in \Omega) \quad (\forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^m) \quad (\forall \eta, \nu \in \mathbb{R}^{mN}, \eta \neq \nu)
\]

\[
\left( \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{N} [a_{ij}(x; \xi, \eta) - a_{ij}(x; \xi, \nu)](\eta_{ij} - \nu_{ij}) > 0 \right).
\]

The next theorem summarizes first results. It shows conditions on boundary value problem data that are sufficient for defining weak solutions of the problem and for proving their existence.
Theorem 3.2. Let $N$, $m$ and $\Omega$ be given. Consider the boundary value problem

\begin{equation}
- \sum_{j=1}^{N} D^j a_{ij}(x; u, \nabla u) + a_{ij0}(x; u, \nabla u) = f_i, \quad i = 1, \ldots, m, \ x \in \Omega,
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
u_i = d_i, \quad i = 1, \ldots, m, \ x \in \Gamma_D,
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\sum_{j=1}^{N} n_j a_{ij}(x; u, \nabla u) = h_i, \quad i = 1, \ldots, m, \ x \in \Gamma_N,
\end{equation}

where the functions $a_{ij}: \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^\kappa \to \mathbb{R}$, $1 \leq i \leq m$, $0 \leq j \leq N$, satisfy

(A1) Carathéodory conditions,

(A2) growth conditions with some coefficients $p_i > 1$, $1 \leq i \leq m$,

(A3) coercivity condition with the same coefficients as in (A2),

(A4) condition of strict monotonicity in principal part

and

(D) $d_i \in W^{1,p_i}(\Omega)$, $f_i \in L_{q_i}(\Omega)$, $g_i \in L_{q_i}(\Gamma_N)$, $1/p_i + 1/q_i = 1$, $1 \leq i \leq m$.

Let the space $V$ be defined as in (2.1)-(2.2), with $p_i$ from (A2). Then:

The expression

\begin{equation}
(\forall u, v \in V)((Au, v)_V = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=0}^{N} \int_{\Omega} a_{ij}(x; u + d, \nabla(u + d)) D^j v_i \, dx)
\end{equation}

defines a mapping $A: V \to V^*$ which is bounded, continuous, coercive and satisfies the condition $(M)_0$.

A functional $F \in V^*$ can be defined by

\begin{equation}
(\forall v \in V) \left( (F, v)_V = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \left( \int_{\Omega} f_i v_i \, dx + \int_{\Gamma_N} h_i v_i \, dS \right) \right)
\end{equation}

and thus the weak formulation of the problem (3.13) can be obtained (with $A$ from (3.14) and $F$ from (3.15)):

\begin{equation}
\text{Find } u \in V \text{ such that } (\forall v \in V)((Au, v)_V = (F, v)_V).
\end{equation}

The problem (3.16) has a solution.

If the strict monotonicity condition is fulfilled, then the solution of (3.16) is unique.
Any solution of the problem (3.16) can be expressed as a weak limit of solutions of its Galerkin approximations on the subspaces \( V_i \), supposing that

\[
\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} V_i = V
\]

is valid.

**Proof.** For the case \( m = 1 \), i.e. single partial differential equation, the proof can be found e.g. in Fučík, Kufner [4], Nečas [14] or Franců [3]. For the case \( m \geq 1 \), only few corrections in the proof are to be made, as shown in Pospíšek [15]. Here, only these differences summarized in Lemma 3.1 will be proved. \( \Box \)

**Lemma 3.1.** Let, as in Theorem 3.2, the boundary value problem (3.13) be given. The assumptions (A1), (A2) and (D) are sufficient for the mapping \( A \) from (3.14) to be bounded. Moreover, if (A3) is also valid, then the mapping \( A \) is coercive.

**Proof of Lemma 3.1.** Boundedness. Applying the theorem on Nemyckij operators (see e.g. Franců [3, Th.8.9]) to the functions \( a_{ij} \), we see that the mappings

\[
(u(\cdot), \nabla u(\cdot)) \mapsto a_{ij}(\cdot; u(\cdot), \nabla u(\cdot))
\]

are bounded and continuous mappings from \( \prod_{i=1}^{m} \prod_{j=0}^{N} L_{p_i}(\Omega) \) to \( L_{q_i}(\Omega) \), where \( p_i \) and \( q_i \) are given by (3.9). Let \( v, w \in V \). Using the Hölder inequality, we estimate

\[
|\langle Av, w \rangle_V| = \left| \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=0}^{N} \int_{\Omega} a_{ij}(x; v + d, \nabla (v + d)) D^j w_i \, dx \right| 
\leq \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=0}^{N} \|a_{ij}(\cdot; v + d, \nabla (v + d))\|_{q_i} \|D^j w_i\|_{p_i},
\]

where \( \| \cdot \|_p, p \in \mathbb{N} \), denotes the norm in the space \( L_p(\Omega) \). The term \( \|D^j w_i\|_{p_i} \) can be estimated as follows. By the Friedrichs inequality we have

\[
(\forall i, 1 \leq i \leq m)(\exists c_i > 0)(\forall v_i \in V^{p_i})(\|v_i\|_{p_i} \leq c_i \|v_i\|_{V^{p_i}}).
\]

Denoting \( C = \max\{1, c_1, \ldots, c_m\} \), we obtain

\[
(\forall i, 1 \leq i \leq m)(\forall j, 0 \leq j \leq N)(\|D^j w_i\|_{p_i} \leq C \|w_i\|_{V^{p_i}}).
\]

Now, using the Hölder inequality, we see that

\[
\|D^j w_i\|_{p_i} \leq C \sum_{i=1}^{m} \|w_i\|_{V^{p_i}} \leq C m^{p_{\text{min}}/(p_{\text{min}} - 1)} \|w\|_V.
\]
From (3.19) and (3.21) we obtain

\[ |(Av, w)_V| \leq m(N + 1)Cm^{p_{\min}/(p_{\min} - 1)} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \sum_{j=0}^{N} \|a_{ij}(\cdot, v + d, \nabla(v + d))\|_q \|w\|_V. \]

The boundedness of \( A \) now follows from the same property of the mappings in (3.18) as above and from the fact that \( d \in \prod_{i=1}^{m} W^{1, p_i}(\Omega) \).

**Coercivity.** Integration of (3.10) yields

(3.22) \[ (\forall v \in V) \left( (Av, v)_V \geq \sum_{i=1}^{m} \left( C_{v_i} \|v_i\|_{p_i}^{p_i} + \int_{\Omega} \theta_i v_i \, dx \right) \right). \]

We shall estimate the two terms on the right-hand side of this inequality. First, note that

\[ (\forall i, 1 \leq i \leq m)(\forall v_i \in V^{p_i})(\|v_i\|_{V_i}^{p_i} \geq \|v_i\|_{V_i}^{p_{\min}} - 1) \]

holds. Thus, we have the estimate

(3.23) \[ \sum_{i=1}^{m} \|v_i\|_{V_i}^{p_i} \geq \sum_{i=1}^{m} \|v_i\|_{V_i}^{p_{\min}} - m = \|v\|_{V_i}^{p_{\min}} - m. \]

Consider now the term \( \int_{\Omega} \theta_i v_i \, dx \). We shall show that it is bounded for \( \|v\|_V \to \infty \).

Denoting \( \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} \{\|\theta_i\|_\infty\} \) as \( \theta_\infty \), we have

(3.24) \[ -\theta_\infty \int_{\Omega} |v_i| \, dx \leq \int_{\Omega} \theta_i v_i \, dx \leq \theta_\infty \int_{\Omega} |v_i| \, dx, \quad 1 \leq i \leq m, \]

hence we are interested in the integral \( \int_{\Omega} |v_i| \, dx \). By the Hörder inequality,

\[ \int_{\Omega} |v_i| \, dx \leq \mu_2(\Omega)^{1/q_i} \|v_i\|_{p_i}. \]

Combining this inequality with the Friedrichs inequality (3.20) and using the same technique as in (3.21), we obtain

(3.25) \[ \int_{\Omega} |v_i| \, dx \leq c \|v\|_V, \]

where \( c = \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} \mu_2(\Omega)^{1/q_i} Cm^{p_{\min}/(p_{\min} - 1)} \). Now, we can see from (3.22)–(3.25) that

\[ (\forall v \in V) \left( \frac{(Av, v)_V}{\|v\|_V} \geq \|v\|_{V}^{p_{\min} - 1} - \frac{m}{\|v\|_V} - h_\infty c \to \infty \right) \]

and hence \( A \) is coercive. \( \square \)
3.2. Discretization. Now, we could immediately start to look for an algorithm solving the Galerkin approximations (3.6) of the problem (3.16) on some finite-dimensional space $V_l$. In practice, however, problems defined by introducing some kind of numerical integration into (3.6) are solved. We shall consider these modified problems. Starting from this point, we restrict ourselves to the case $N = 2$ and in addition we shall suppose that $\Omega$ is a polygon.

First, let us construct a sequence $\{V_l\}_{l \geq 0}$ of finite-dimensional subspaces of the space $V$, such that (3.17) is valid:

1. Let $T_0$ be a conforming triangulation of $\Omega$, i.e. a set of triangles such that their union is $\overline{\Omega}$ and the intersection of any two distinct triangles is either a common edge or a common vertex or is empty. Assume that the points $\Gamma_D \cap \Gamma_N$ are vertices of some triangles from $T_0$. Then triangulations $T_l$, $l > 0$, are constructed by induction: For each $t \in T_{l-1}$ we generate four triangles in $T_l$ by pairwise connecting the midpoints of the edges.

2. For $l \geq 0$, $p > 1$ we define $V_l^p$ as the set of continuous and piecewise linear functions

$$\{v \in V^p: (\forall t \in T_l)(v \text{ is linear on } t)\},$$

equipped with the norm of the space $V^p$. Then, given $p_i$, $1 \leq i \leq m$, we set

$$V_l = \prod_{i=1}^m V_l^{p_i}.$$ 

(Note that the condition (3.17) is fulfilled.)

We introduce the following abbreviations:

$$\Omega_l^* = \{P \in \overline{\Omega}: P \text{ is a vertex of some } t \in T\},$$

$$\Omega_l = \{P \in \Omega - \Gamma_D: P \text{ is a vertex of some } t \in T\},$$

$$N_l = \text{card } \Omega_l.$$ 

We now construct a dual mesh $B_l$ for $T_l$: for each triangle $t \in T_l$, connect its centre of gravity by straight line segments to the edge midpoints of $t$. This subdivides $t$ into three subregions with the same area. With each vertex $P \in \Omega_l^*$ we will associate a region $\omega_P$ consisting of those triangles $t \in T_l$ which have $P$ as a vertex, and the so-called box $b_P \in B_l$, $b_P \subset \omega_P$ which consists of the union of the subregions in $\omega_P$ which again have $P$ as a vertex.

**Theorem 3.3.** Consider the problem (3.13) and suppose that, in addition to the assumptions of Theorem 3.2, the following is valid:

$N = 2$ and $\Omega$ is a polygon,
Then, in addition to the assertions of Theorem 3.2:

1. The following problem on the space $V_l, l \geq 0$, is well-defined:

\[(3.28) \quad \text{Find } u^l \in V_l \text{ such that} \quad \langle A_l u^l, v \rangle_V = \langle F, v \rangle_V, \]

where the mapping $A_l : V_l \rightarrow V_l^*$ and the functional $F_l \in V_l^*$ are defined by $(u, v \in V_l)$

\[(3.29) \quad \langle A_l u, v \rangle_V = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \int_{\Omega} a_{ij}(x; u + d, \nabla(u + d))D^j v_i \, dx + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{P \in \Omega_l} \mu_2(b_P)a_{i0}(P; (u + d)(P))v_i(P),
\]

\[\langle F_l, v \rangle_V = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{P \in \Omega_l} (\mu_2(b_P)f_i(P)v_i(P) + \mu_1(b_P \cap \Gamma_N)h_i(P)v_i(P)).\]

2. For every $l \geq 0$, the problem (3.28) has a solution.

3. The sequence $\{u^l\}_{l \geq 0}$ defined by (3.28) weakly converges to the solution of the problem (3.14)–(3.16).

Proof. 1. The assertion follows from the properties (A1), (A2) and (D), the continuity of the functions $a_{i0}, 1 \leq i \leq m$ and from Theorem 3.2.

2. This also follows from Theorem 3.2. Note that the problems are formulated in finite-dimensional spaces, hence only continuity and coercivity of mappings $A_l$ are sufficient for those problems to be solvable (see e.g. Francă [3]).

3. Consider a sequence of problems from (3.28),

\[(3.31) \quad \langle A_l u^l, v \rangle_V = \langle F_l, v \rangle_V, \quad v \in V_l, \quad l \in \mathbb{N}.\]

As discussed above, the problems (3.31) are solvable for all $l \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, there exists a constant $M_1 > 0$ such that

\[\frac{\langle A_l u^l, u^l \rangle_V}{\| u^l \|_V} \leq \| F_l \|_{V^*} \leq \| F \|_{V^*} + \| F_l - F \|_{V^*} \leq M_1.\]

Then, taking the coercivity of $A, A_l, l \geq 0$, into account, we see that the sequence $\{|u^l|_V\}_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded, i.e.

\[(3.32) \quad (\exists M_2 > 0)(\forall l \in \mathbb{N})(\| u^l \|_V \leq M_2)\]
and thus there exists a subsequence of \( \{u^l\}_{l \in \mathbb{N}} \) weakly converging to some \( u^B \in V \). Denote this sequence again by \( \{u^l\}_{l \in \mathbb{N}} \). Denote also

\[
\Phi = \prod_{i=1}^{m} \{ \varphi_i \in C^\infty(\Omega) : \varphi_i = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_D \}
\]

and let \( \varphi \in \Phi \). We have

\[
\lim_{l \to \infty} (A_l u^l - F, \varphi)_V = \lim_{l \to \infty} (F_l - F, \varphi)_V = 0.
\]

On the other hand,

\[
\lim_{l \to \infty} (A_l u^l - F, \varphi)_V = \lim_{l \to \infty} (A_l u^l - A u^l, \varphi)_V + \lim_{l \to \infty} (A u^l - F, \varphi)_V
\]

\[
= \lim_{l \to \infty} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{m} \left( \sum_{P \in \Omega_i} \mu_2(b_P) a_{i0}(P; (u^l + d)(P)) \varphi_i(P) - \int_{\Omega} a_{i0}(x; u^l + d) \varphi_i(x) \, dx \right) + \lim_{l \to \infty} (A u^l - F, \varphi)_V \right).
\]

The first limit in the last expression is zero while the second equals to

\[
(A u^B - F, \varphi)_V.
\]

Hence we have from (3.33)

\[
(\forall \varphi \in \Phi)((A u^B - F, \varphi)_V = 0).
\]

The set \( \Phi \) being dense in \( V \), we thus conclude that \( u^B \) (which is the weak limit of the subsequence \( \{u^l\}_{l \in \mathbb{N}} \)) is a solution of the problem (3.14)-(3.16).

Remark 3.1. Clearly, the set

\[
\{ \varphi_{lP} \in V_i^P : (\forall P, Q \in \Omega_i, \varphi_{lP}(Q) = \delta_{PQ}) \}
\]

(\( \delta_{PQ} \) is the Kronecker symbol) forms a basis of the space \( V_i^P \), i.e. any \( v \in V_i \) can be expressed in the form

\[
v = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{P \in \Omega_i} u_{i, lP} \varphi_{lP}.
\]

Let \( \prec \) be a complete ordering of the set \( \Omega_i \). Define a mapping \( \nu_i : \{1, 2, \ldots, N_i\} \to \Omega_i \) by

\[
(\forall k_1, k_2, 1 \leq k_1, k_2 \leq N_j)(k_1 < k_2 \iff \nu_i(k_1) < \nu_i(k_2)).
\]
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Then the coefficient vector \( v_i^H = \left( (v_{i,1,Q})_{Q \in \Omega}, \ldots, (v_{m,1,Q})_{Q \in \Omega} \right) \) can be understood as a point in a linear space \( H_l = \mathbb{R}^{mN_l} \), with its \([i-1] \cdot N_l + j\)-th component being equal to \( v_{i,ju(j)} \), \( i = 1, \ldots, m \), \( j = 1, \ldots, N_l \). The isomorphism between the space \( H_l \) and \( V_l \) is given by a mapping

\[
P_l^G : H_l \to V_l, \text{ with } P_l^G v_i^H = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{Q \in \Omega} v_{i,1,Q} \varphi_{i,Q}.
\]

If \((\cdot, \cdot)\) is the scalar product in the space \( H_l \) and \( g_l : H_l \to H_l \) and \( f_i^H \in H_l \) are defined by

\[
(\forall u, v \in H_l) (g_l(u), v) = (\langle A_i P_G u_i^H, P_G v_i^H \rangle)_v,
\]

\[
(\forall v \in H_l) (f_i^H, v) = (\langle F_i, P_G v_i^H \rangle)_v,
\]

then the problem (3.28) in the space \( V_l \) is equivalent to the problem

\[
g_l(u_i^H) = f_i^H \text{ in } H_l.
\]

**Remark 3.2.** Consider the problem (3.13) and suppose, in addition to the assumptions of Theorem 3.3, that the functions \( a_{ij}, 1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq N \), have the form

\[
a_{ij} = a_i(x; u)D^j u_i,
\]

where \( a_i \in C^1(\bar{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R}^m) \), \( 1 \leq i \leq m \), and

\[
(\exists a_0 > 0, a_0' > 0) (\forall i : i = 1, \ldots, M)(\forall x \in \Omega)(\forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^M) (a_0' \geq a_i(x; \xi) \geq a_0).
\]

Then, obviously,

\[
(\forall u, w \in V_l) \left( \int_{\Omega} a_i(x; u)D^j u_i(x)D^j w_i(x) dx = \int_{\Omega} \overline{a_i}(x; u)D^j u_i(x)D^j w_i(x) dx \right),
\]

where the functions \( \overline{a_i} : \Omega \to \mathbb{R} \) are defined by

\[
(\forall t \in T_l) \left( \overline{a_i} \right)_t = \frac{1}{\mu_2(t)} \int_t a_i(x; u) dx
\]

As shown in Hackbusch [8, Proposition 3.1.2],

\[
(\forall P \in \Omega_l)(\forall v_i \in V_i^{n_i}) \left( \int_{\Omega} D^j \varphi_{i,P}(x)D^j v_i(x) dx = \int_{b_n} \frac{\partial v_i}{\partial n_i} dS \right)
\]

and hence the system (3.39) derived from our procedure is the same as that generated by the so-called box integration method (see e.g. Varga [20]), applied to the system (3.13) with the functions \( \overline{a_i}(x; u) \) in the place of \( a_i(x; u) \). (Note that in the case \( a_i = \text{const.} \) the functions \( a_i \) and \( \overline{a_i} \) are identical.)
4. APPLICATION TO THE SEMICONDUCTOR DEVICE EQUATIONS

4.1. Model problem. In 1950, Van Roosbroeck [17] proposed a system of three coupled nonlinear partial differential equations as a basic mathematical model describing electro-physical behaviour of semiconductor devices. We shall be interested in the following, rather simplified form of these equations, ignoring complications like variable mobilities, oxide regions and avalanche generation rate. Our problem, however, captures some of the difficulties that occur in practice and its satisfactory solution still represents a great challenge to numerical analysis:

\begin{align}
(4.1) \quad - \text{div}(\text{grad} u) + e^{u-v} - e^{v-u} &= D_C, \\
(4.2) \quad - \text{div}(e^{u-v} \text{grad} v) - Q(u, v, w)(e^{u-v} - 1) &= 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\
(4.3) \quad - \text{div}(e^{v-u} \text{grad} w) + Q(u, v, w)(e^{u-v} - 1) &= 0, \\
(4.4) \quad u = u_D, \ v = v_D, \ w = w_D \quad \text{on } \Gamma_D, \\
(4.5) \quad \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} + e^{u-v} \frac{\partial v}{\partial n} = e^{v-u} \frac{\partial w}{\partial n} = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma_N.
\end{align}

where

\begin{align}
(4.6) \quad D_C \in L_\infty(\Omega), \ Q \in C(\mathbb{R}^3) \text{ and } (u_D, v_D, w_D) \in [L_\infty(\overline{\Omega}) \cap C^1(\overline{\Omega})]^3.
\end{align}

4.2. Weak formulation and existence theorem. First, we reformulate the problem (4.1)–(4.5) in terms of the so-called Slotboom variables \( u, \eta, \nu \), defined by

\[ \eta = e^{-v}, \quad \nu = e^w. \]

We obtain a boundary value problem in the form (3.13), where \( N = 2, \ m = 3 \) and (writing \( a^S_{ij} \) instead of \( a_{ij} \))

\begin{align}
(4.7) \quad a^S_{ij}(x; \xi) &= \begin{cases} e^{\xi_{10}}\xi_{20} - e^{-\xi_{10}}\xi_{30}, & j = 0, \\
\xi_{1j}, & j = 1, 2, \end{cases} \\
(4.8) \quad a^S_{2j}(x; \xi) &= \begin{cases} Q(\xi_{10}, \xi_{20}, \xi_{30})(\xi_{20}\xi_{30} - 1), & j = 0, \\
e^{\xi_{10}}\xi_{2j}, & j = 1, 2, \end{cases} \\
(4.9) \quad a^S_{3j}(x; \xi) &= \begin{cases} Q(\xi_{10}, \xi_{20}, \xi_{30})(\xi_{20}\xi_{30} - 1), & j = 0, \\
e^{-\xi_{10}}\xi_{3j}, & j = 1, 2, \end{cases} \\
(4.10) \quad f_1 = D_C, f_2 = f_3 = 0, d_1 = u_D, d_2 = e^{-v_D}, d_3 = e^{w_D}, h_1 = h_2 = h_3 = 0.
\end{align}

We refer to this problem as to the problem (S) and use the notation

\[ U_D \equiv (u_D, e^{-v_D}, e^{w_D}). \]
However, due to exponentials in (4.7)-(4.9), no $p_i$, $1 < p_i < \infty$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, satisfy the condition (A2), so direct application of Theorem 3.2 is not possible. Nevertheless, note that if $V^\infty = [V^2 \cap L_\infty(\Omega)]^3$ and $V = [V^2]^3$, then the following expressions define a mapping $A^S: V^\infty \rightarrow V^*$ and a functional $f^S \in V^*$:

\begin{align}
(\forall U \in V^\infty, U \equiv (u, \eta, \nu))(\forall \Phi \in V, \Phi \equiv (\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3))
(4.11) \quad & (\langle A^S U, \Phi \rangle) = \sum_{i=1}^{3} \sum_{j=0}^{2} \int_{\Omega} a^S_{ij}(x; U + U_D, \nabla(U + U_D)) D^j \varphi_i \, dx, \\
(4.12) \quad & (\forall \Phi \in V) \quad (\langle f^S, \Phi \rangle) = \int_{\Omega} D_C(x) \varphi_1(x) \, dx.
\end{align}

**Definition 4.1.** Let $W^\infty \equiv [W^{1,2}(\Omega) \cap L_\infty(\Omega)]^3$. We say that $U^S \in W^\infty$ is a solution of the problem (S) in the space $W^\infty$, if

\begin{equation}
(4.13) \quad U^S = U^S_D + U_D,
\end{equation}

where $U^S_D \in V^\infty$ and

\begin{equation}
(4.14) \quad A^S U^S_D = f^S \text{ in } V^*.
\end{equation}

**Theorem 4.1.** There exists at least one solution of the problem (S) in the space $W^\infty$.

**Proof.** of this theorem will be divided into two steps. First, as in Gröger [6], we shall formulate a modified problem such that its solutions are also solutions of (S). Then we shall apply Theorem 3.2 to this modified problem. \qed

**Definition 4.2.** Let $r < s$ be real numbers and $g: \mathbb{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ($\mathbb{M}$ is an arbitrary set) any real function. We define $P_{rs}g: \mathbb{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

\begin{equation}
(\forall x \in \mathbb{M})(P_{rs}g)(x) = \begin{cases} 
 r & \text{if } g(x) \leq r, \\
 g(x) & \text{if } r < g(x) < s, \\
 s & \text{if } s \leq g(x).
\end{cases}
\end{equation}

For $r = -s$ we write only $P_s$.

**Definition 4.3.** Let $F \geq \max\{|u_D|_\infty, |w_D|_\infty\}$, $G = e^{-F}$, $H = e^F$. We choose $E \geq |u_D|_\infty$ such that

\begin{equation}
e^{-F-E} + D_C \leq 0, \quad e^{E-F} - e^{E-F} + D_C \geq 0\end{equation}
and define $A^{Sr}: V \to V^*$ by

$$(\forall U \in V) (U \equiv (u, \eta, \nu))(\forall \Phi \in V, \Phi \equiv (\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3))$$

(4.15) $$\langle A^{Sr} U, \Phi \rangle_V = \sum_{i=1}^{3} \sum_{j=0}^{2} \int_{\Omega} a^{Sr}_{ij}(x; U + U_D, \nabla(U + U_D)) D^j \varphi_i \, dx,$$

where

$$(\forall x \in \Omega)(\forall i, j = 1, 2, 3)(\forall \omega, \eta, \nu) (\forall U = (u, \eta, \nu): \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^3)$$

(4.16) $$a^{Sr}_{ij}(x; U, \nabla U) = a^S_{ij}(x; P_E u, P_{GH} \eta, P_{GH} \nu, \nabla U)).$$

We say that $U \in W$ is a weak solution of the problem $(Sr)$, if

(4.17) $$U = U^* + U_D,$$

where $U^* \in V$ and

(4.18) $$A^{Sr} U^* = f^S \text{ in } V^*.$$

**Lemma 4.1.** (Gröger [6, Lemma 1]) Let $U$ be a weak solution of the problem $(Sr)$. Then $U$ is also a solution of the problem $(S)$ in the space $W^\infty$.

**Lemma 4.2.** There exists at least one weak solution of the problem $(Sr)$.

**Proof.** We shall verify the assumptions of Theorem 3.2:

(A1) is obvious.

(A2) with the coefficients $p_1 = p_2 = p_3 = 2$ can be verified easily. The only arguments of the functions $a^S_{ij}$ that can cause $a^{Sr}_{ij}$ to grow to infinity are those with $\nabla U$. But the dependence of $a^{Sr}_{ij}$ on $\nabla U$ is linear, in the worst case.

(A3). In (3.10), we can choose

$$c = \min(1, e^{-E}), \quad \theta_1 = -e^{-F}, \quad \theta_2 = \theta_3 = -\sup_{x \in \Omega, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^3} a^{Sr}_{20}(x; \xi).$$

(A4) is also easy, because of

$$(\forall x \in \Omega)(\forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^3)(\forall \eta, \nu \in \mathbb{R}^6)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{3} \sum_{j=1}^{2} (a^{Sr}_{ij}(x; \xi, \eta) - a^{Sr}_{ij}(x; \xi, \nu)) (\eta_{ij} - \nu_{ij})$$

$$\geq \sum_{j=1}^{2} (\eta_{1j} - \nu_{1j})^2 + e^{-E} (\eta_{2j} - \nu_{2j})^2 + e^{-E} (\eta_{3j} - \nu_{3j})^2.$$

(D) follows from (4.6).
The assertion of Lemma 4.2 now follows from Theorem 3.2.

Discretization.

Theorem 4.2. Consider the problem (S) with (4.10) and $D_C \in C(\bar{\Omega})$. Then the assertions of Theorem 3.3 hold.

Proof. Taking Lemma 4.2 and continuity of $D_C$ into account, the assumptions of Theorem 3.3 can be easily verified.

Remark 4.1. Note that if we formulate the problem (3.28) for some $l \geq 0$, then the integrals of the form

$$\int_t e^{P \sigma u} \, dx$$

($t \in T_l$) are to be evaluated. But this can be done easily, because $u$ is a piecewise linear function. If, for example, $|u(x)| \leq E$ for all $x \in t$, and $U_1, U_2, U_3$ ($U_1 \neq U_2 \neq U_3 \neq U_1$) denote the values of $u(x)$ at the vertices of the triangle $t \in T_l$, we obtain after some calculation

$$\int_t e^{P \sigma u} \, dx = \int_t e^u \, dx = \frac{2\mu(t)}{U_2 - U_1} \left[ \frac{e^{U_3} - e^{U_2}}{U_3 - U_2} - \frac{e^{U_3} - e^{U_1}}{U_3 - U_1} \right].$$

CONCLUSION

In this paper, we stop at the point when a system of (possibly nonlinear) algebraic equations is generated. In the forthcoming paper Pospíšek [16], a convergent algorithm suitable for solving such a system is proposed.
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