**THE TRANSIENT SEMICONDUCTOR PROBLEM
WITH GENERATION TERMS, II**

By

Thomas I. Seidman

IMA Preprint Series # 375

December 1987

THE TRANSIENT SEMICONDUCTOR PROBLEM WITH GENERATION TERMS, II*

THOMAS I. SEIDMAN†

Abstract. We consider a modified time-dependent van Roosbroeck system with saturating velocities and a source term subject to assumptions designed to permit a standard generation term corresponding to impact ionization. This is then a nonlinear parabolic system with a right hand side of the form $S = S(., \mathbf{u}, \nabla \mathbf{u}, \mathcal{E})$, coupled with the map $\mathbf{L} : \mathbf{u} \mapsto \mathcal{E}$ defined by the Poisson equation at each t . The analysis leads to existence of solutions for all time as well as uniqueness (and continuous dependence on data) under stronger conditions.

Key words. Semiconductors, device modeling, transient, van Roosbroeck, impact ionization, nonlinear, partial differential equations, system, parabolic, existence, uniqueness.

AMS(MOS) subject classifications. 35K60, 35Q20, 78A35

1. Introduction. We wish here to consider basic issues of existence and uniqueness for the ‘drift/diffusion’ model of semiconductor device physics. The model treated is a version of the standard van Roosbroeck model [15], [13] permitting the consideration of generation terms corresponding to, e.g., impact ionization. From a mathematical viewpoint, the essential feature of this consideration is that it precludes the use of maximum principle arguments which formed an essential part of previous work; compare, e.g., the approaches of [6], [8], [12], [5], [3], involving more restricted models without generation terms. While specifically motivated by the semiconductor setting, the model is general enough to be applicable to a wide variety of physical situations involving reaction/diffusion systems of charged particles for which convection is determined by the electrostatic field, e.g., electrophoresis.

The results presented here represent an improved version of [10] in that we now have an existence proof without the geometric restriction imposed there and with the possibility of field-dependent diffusion. Additionally, under the same hypotheses as were used in [10] we can now show uniqueness by a somewhat more constructive version of the argument in [10].

The relevant variables, then, are $\mathbf{u} = [u_1, \dots, u_K]$ (*concentrations* for K species of charged particles) and $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_{tot} - \mathcal{E}_0$ (interactive contribution to the *electrostatic field*). The *drift/diffusion model* for semiconductor device physics consists of two parts: (1) the

*This research was partially supported by the Air Force Office of Scientific Research under grants #AFOSR-82-0271 and #AFOSR-87-0190. Thanks also are due to the Institute for Mathematics and its Applications for its hospitality and stimulating atmosphere during the Workshop on Computational Aspects of VLSI Design and Semiconductor Device Simulation (April-May, 1987).

†Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Maryland Baltimore County, Baltimore, MD 21228, USA. (BITNET: seidman@umbc, arpanet: seidman@umbc3. umd.edu)

Poisson equation for the electrostatic potential ψ_{tot} (giving the field $\mathcal{E}_{tot}$ as $-\nabla\psi_{tot}$; we actually work with the *linear* map $\mathbf{L} : \mathbf{u} \mapsto \mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_{tot} - \mathcal{E}_0$ defined by the Poisson equation after subtracting the known inhomogeneities) and (2) the conservation laws governing the set $\mathbf{u}$ of concentrations.

In Section 3 we obtain existence of solutions for this system under a quite mild set of hypotheses **(H-1)**, using an approach based on the Schauder Fixpoint Theorem. Then, in Section 4, it is shown under a somewhat stronger set of hypotheses **(H-2)** that a related Picard map is contractive with respect to a suitably constructed metric, giving uniqueness as well by the Banach Contractive Mapping Principle. The next section presents the basic formulation to be used and the sets of hypotheses **(H-1)**, **(H-2)**; the final section discusses briefly the relation of the present results to the physical setting and hopes for the future.

Notation: Spatially, we will be working with $\mathbf{u}$ on a fixed bounded region Ω in $\mathbb{R}^d$ whose boundary $\partial\Omega$ is partitioned into $\Gamma = \Gamma_D$ (at which we prescribe Dirichlet conditions) and $\Gamma_N = \partial\Omega \setminus \Gamma$ (at which we impose flux conditions). The evolution problem will be considered on a fixed bounded interval $[0, T]$ — but with $T > 0$ arbitrarily large so our results are actually global; we set $\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{Q}_T := [0, T] \times \Omega$ and $\Sigma := [0, T] \times \partial\Omega$. We use $\|\cdot\|_p$ for the $L^p(\Omega)$ -norm ($p = 2$ if the subscript is omitted). We abbreviate $L^\infty([0, T] \rightarrow L^p(\Omega))$, for example, by $L^\infty(\rightarrow L^p)$ and do not distinguish notationally between this as a space of $\mathbb{R}$ -valued functions and as a space of $\mathbb{R}^K$ -valued functions. We also permit the useful confusion between $\mathbf{L} : \mathbf{u} \mapsto \mathcal{E}$ as a map between functions on Ω (with t appearing only parametrically) and the induced map between functions on $\mathcal{Q}$. We assume that Ω is connected and Γ_D is a suitably large part of $\partial\Omega$ so we can simply take $\|\nabla u\|$ as the norm $\|u\|_{(1)}$ on the space $\mathcal{H}_\Gamma^1 := \{v \in H^1(\Omega) : v|_\Gamma = 0\}$, i.e., the $H^1(\Omega)$ -closure of $\{v \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega}) : \text{supp}\{v\} \cap \Gamma = \emptyset\}$. Finally, we introduce the space $\mathcal{X}_2 := L^\infty(\rightarrow L^2) \cap L^2(\rightarrow H^1)$ with the norm

$$(1.1) \quad \|v\|_{\mathcal{X}} := \left(\sup_{[0, T]} \{e^{-rt} \int_{\Omega} |v(t)|^2\} + \int_{\mathcal{Q}} e^{-rt} |\nabla v|^2 \right)^{1/2}$$

where r is to be specified later (large enough).

Acknowledgments: Apart from thanks to T. Gill and W. Zachary as organizers of this conference and to the AFOSR for its support, a number of other acknowledgments are in order: to P. Markowich for the original stimulation to this work during a visit to T. U. Wien, to the IMA for its hospitality and stimulating atmosphere during the Workshop on Computational Aspects of VLSI Design and Semiconductor Device Simulation (Minneapolis, April-May, 1987), to Jan Klika for his aid in the writing of this report, to Marjorie for undisclosed contributions.

2. Formulation and Hypotheses. In this section we present the formalism within which we will be working and state two sets of hypotheses: a weaker set **(H-1)** which will

suffice for the existence result in Section 3 and a stronger set **(H-2)** under which we can prove uniqueness in Section 4.

The electrostatic field $\mathcal{E}_{tot}$ is determined as $\mathcal{E}_{tot} = -\nabla\psi_{tot}$ where the potential ψ_{tot} satisfies the Poisson equation

$$(2.1) \quad -\nabla \cdot \underline{\epsilon} \nabla \psi_{tot} = N + \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{u} = N + \sum q_k u_k$$

and the associated boundary conditions; here, N is the net charge distribution due to the ‘doping’ which defines the device. Note that it may be appropriate to consider (2.1) as holding for a spatial region Ω' other than the Ω considered for the concentrations. This region Ω' should then contain Ω and we assume that $\mathbf{u}$, as it appears on the right of (2.1), is given *a priori* on $\Omega' \setminus \Omega$. The boundary conditions for ψ are, of course, to be imposed at $\partial\Omega'$ and might include ‘conditions at infinity’.

If we let ψ_0 be the solution of (2.1) corresponding to $\mathbf{u} = 0$ and set $\mathcal{E}_0 = -\nabla\psi_0$ then $\mathcal{E}_0$ contains all the relevant information given by N and the inhomogeneous boundary data. Setting $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_{tot} - \mathcal{E}_0$, we now have $\mathcal{E} = -\nabla\psi$ (restricted to Ω , if necessary) where ψ is the solution of the Poisson equation

$$(2.2) \quad -\nabla \cdot \underline{\epsilon} \nabla \psi = \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{u}$$

with *homogeneous* boundary conditions of the same form as those used for (2.1). Clearly the map $\mathbf{L} : \mathbf{u} \mapsto \mathcal{E}$ defined in this way is *linear*.

For the concentration vector $\mathbf{u} = [u_1, \dots, u_K]$, we assume a coupled system of conservation laws of the usual general form:

$$(2.3) \quad \dot{u}_k - \nabla \cdot [D_k \nabla u_k + u_k \mathcal{V}_k] = S_k$$

for $k = 1, \dots, K$. Here, suppressing the index k as we will do in general, $\mathcal{J} := D \nabla u + u \mathcal{V}$ is the particle flux, S is the (net) *source*, D is the *diffusion coefficient*, and $\mathcal{V}$ is the *drift velocity*.

We also have *constitutive relations*

$$(2.4) \quad D = D_k(\cdot, \mathcal{E}), \quad \mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V}_k(\cdot, \mathcal{E}), \quad S = S_k(\cdot, \mathbf{u}, \nabla \mathbf{u}, \mathcal{E}).$$

We will not distinguish notationally between, e.g., the *given* constitutive relation, $S = S_k$ as a function: $\mathcal{Q} \times \mathbb{R}^K \times \mathbb{R}^{Kd} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and the derived ‘substituted function’ — $S(\cdot, \mathbf{u}(\cdot), \nabla \mathbf{u}(\cdot), \mathcal{E}(\cdot)) : \mathcal{Q} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Note also that in writing the dependence of D_k in terms of $\mathcal{E}$ (rather than $\mathcal{E}_{tot}$), etc., we are taking advantage of the fact that $\mathcal{E}_0$ is known *a priori*. The relevant hypotheses about N , Ω' (in relation to Ω), the boundary conditions and data for (2.1) are subsumed in our hypotheses on $\mathbf{L}$ and the functions of (2.4). (Recall that

we omitted temperature coupling for expository simplicity — else $D_k, \mathcal{V}_k, S_k$ would also depend on the temperature.)

We next state the set of hypotheses **(H-1)**, under which we will show existence in the next section. The generic constant γ need not be the same at each appearance.

(H-1.i) We have:

- Ω is bounded and connected in $\mathbb{R}^d$; $\partial\Omega$ is ‘smooth enough’ for the relevant Sobolev spaces and embeddings to make sense (e.g., satisfying a ‘cone condition’).
- All the functions $D_k(\cdots)$, $\mathcal{V}_k(\cdots)$, $S_k(\cdots)$ are measurable on $\mathcal{Q}$ and are continuous with respect to all other variables.

(H-1.ii) There is a constant $\delta > 0$ such that $\delta \leq D_k \leq \gamma$.

(H-1.iii) $\mathcal{V}_k$ is bounded: $|\mathcal{V}_k| \leq \gamma$.

(H-1.iv) One has $|S_k(\cdot, r, \xi, \eta)| \leq S^0(\cdot) + \gamma[|r| + |\xi|]$ for all η with some $S^0 \in L^2(\mathcal{Q})$.

(H-1.v) For fixed $\mathcal{E}(\cdot)$, S_k is (uniformly) Lipschitz continuous:

$$|S_k(\cdot, r, \xi, \eta) - S_k(\cdot, r', \xi', \eta)| \leq \gamma[|r - r'| + |\xi - \xi'|].$$

(H-1.vi) The linear operator $\mathbf{L}$, defined by (2.2) with the homogeneous boundary conditions, is continuous from $L^2(\Omega)$ to $L^2(\Omega)$ (equivalently, from $L^2(\mathcal{Q})$ to $L^2(\mathcal{Q})$).

(H-1.vii) The data $\hat{u}_k$ are in $L^2(\rightarrow H^1) \cap H^1(\rightarrow H^{-1})$.

Under the stronger set of hypotheses **(H-2)** it will be possible to show, in Section 4, that a Picard iteration is contractive (with respect to a suitably chosen metric), giving uniqueness as well.

(H-2.i) = **(H-1.i)** with $d = 3$ so $H^1(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^6(\Omega)$.

(H-2.ii) D_k is independent of $\mathcal{E}$ and $0 < \delta \leq D_k \leq \gamma$.

(H-2.iii) $\mathcal{V}_k$ is Lipschitzian: $|\mathcal{V}_k(\cdot, \eta) - \mathcal{V}_k(\cdot, \eta')| \leq \gamma|\eta - \eta'|$ as well as bounded: $|\mathcal{V}_k| \leq \gamma$.

(H-2.iv) = **(H-1.iv)**.

(H-2.v) S_k satisfies a Lipschitz condition of the form:

$$|S_k(\cdot, r, \xi, \eta) - S_k(\cdot, r', \xi', \eta')| \leq \gamma(|r - r'| + |\xi - \xi'| + (1 + |r| + |\xi|)|\eta - \eta'|).$$

(H-2.vi) For some $p \leq 6$, the operator $\mathbf{L}$ is compact from $L^p(\Omega)$ to $\mathcal{C}(\bar{\Omega})$.

(H-2.vii) With $2 \leq p \leq 6$ as in **(H-2.vi)**, one has $\hat{u}_k, \nabla \hat{u}_k \in L^p(\mathcal{Q})$ and also $\hat{u}_k \in L^p(\rightarrow L^{3p/(2p+1)})$.

We say that u is a (weak) solution of (2.3) if one has:

$$(2.5) \quad (u - \hat{u}) \in \mathcal{Z}_0 := \{v \in L^2(\rightarrow \mathcal{H}_T^1) \cap H^1(\rightarrow H^{-1}) : v|_{t=0} = 0\},$$

$$(2.6) \quad \int_{\mathcal{Q}} \dot{u}v + \int_{\mathcal{Q}} D \nabla u \cdot \nabla v = \int_{\mathcal{Q}} S v - \int_{\mathcal{Q}} u \mathcal{V} \cdot \nabla v \quad \forall v \in \mathcal{Z}_0.$$

Implicit in (2.5) are the initial conditions: $u = \hat{u}$ at $t = 0$ and the Dirichlet conditions: $u = \hat{u}$ at $\Gamma = \Gamma_D$; implicit in (2.6) are the homogeneous flux conditions: $\mathcal{J} \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0$ on $\partial\Omega \setminus \Gamma_D = \Gamma_N$.

3. Existence. In this section we prove, under **(H-1)**, the existence of a solution of the coupled system: (2.3) ($k = 1, \dots, K$) with $\mathcal{E} = \mathbf{L}\mathbf{u}$ and (2.4). Our approach here is to define the map $\mathbf{T} : \mathcal{E} \mapsto \mathbf{u}$ by solving (2.3) with $\mathcal{E}$ taken as *given* and then to apply the Schauder Fixpoint Theorem to

$$(3.1) \quad \mathbf{L} \circ \mathbf{T} : \mathcal{E} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{T}} \mathbf{u} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{L}} \mathcal{E} : L^2(\mathcal{Q}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{X} \longrightarrow L^2(\mathcal{Q})$$

with $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}_2 := L^\infty(\rightarrow L^2) \cap L^2(\rightarrow H^1)$.

Theorem 1: Under the hypotheses **(H-1)**, the system (2.3) for $k = 1, \dots, K$ has a weak solution $[\mathcal{E}^*, \mathbf{u}^*]$ in $L^2(\mathcal{Q}) \times \mathcal{Z}$ with $\mathcal{E}^* = \mathbf{L}\mathbf{u}^*$ and the constitutive relations (2.4).

Proof: We divide the proof into the following five steps:

- [1] $\mathbf{T}$ is well-defined; set $\mathcal{K}_1 := \{\mathbf{T}(\mathcal{E}) : \mathcal{E} \in L^2(\mathcal{Q})\} \subset \mathcal{X}$;
- [2] $\mathcal{K}_1$ is bounded in $\mathcal{X}$;
- [3] $\mathcal{K}_2 := \{\mathbf{L}\mathbf{u} : \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{K}_1\}$ is precompact in $L^2(\mathcal{Q})$; set $\mathcal{K} := \overline{\text{co}}\mathcal{K}_2$;
- [4] $\mathbf{T} : L^2(\mathcal{Q}) \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is continuous;
- [5] $\mathbf{L} \circ \mathbf{T}$ has a fixpoint $\mathcal{E}^* \in \mathcal{K}$.

The desired solution pair is $[\mathcal{E}^*, \mathbf{u}^*]$ with $\mathbf{u}^* := \mathbf{T}(\mathcal{E}^*)$. Step [1] is fairly standard (detailed proof omitted); [3] and [5] are quick. The principal efforts are for [2] (the original estimate — exactly as in [10]) and the new argument for [4].

- [1] We are defining $\mathbf{T}(\bar{\mathcal{E}})$ as the (unique) weak solution $\mathbf{u} \in [\bar{\mathbf{u}} + \mathcal{Z}_0]$ of

$$(3.2) \quad \dot{u}_k - \nabla \cdot [\bar{D}_k \nabla u_k + u_k \bar{\mathcal{V}}_k] = \bar{S}_k(\cdot, \mathbf{u}, \nabla \mathbf{u}) \quad (k = 1, \dots, K)$$

where $\bar{D}$, $\bar{\mathcal{V}}$, $\bar{S}$ are defined by fixing $\mathcal{E} = \bar{\mathcal{E}}$ in (2.4). That such a solution exists is fairly standard in view of the assumed Lipschitz condition **(H-1.v)** with **(H-1.iv)** — one considers the Picard map: $\bar{\mathbf{u}} \mapsto \mathbf{u}$ defined by the *linear equation* obtained on replacing $\bar{S}(\cdot, \mathbf{u}, \nabla \mathbf{u})$ in (3.2) by $\bar{S}(\cdot, \bar{\mathbf{u}}, \nabla \bar{\mathbf{u}})$ (still with $\mathcal{E}$ fixed as $\bar{\mathcal{E}}$ so $\bar{D}$, $\bar{\mathcal{V}}$ are now fixed) and shows contractivity with respect to an exponentially weighted norm (1.1), using the estimate

$$\|\bar{S}(\cdot, \bar{\mathbf{u}}, \nabla \bar{\mathbf{u}}) - \bar{S}(\cdot, \bar{\mathbf{u}}', \nabla \bar{\mathbf{u}}')\| \leq M \|\bar{\mathbf{u}} - \bar{\mathbf{u}}'\|_{(1)}.$$

- [2] Set $z = z_k = u_k - \hat{u}_k$ so, formally,

$$(3.3) \quad \dot{z} = \nabla \cdot [D \nabla z + z \mathcal{V}] + (\bar{S} - \nabla \cdot [D \hat{u} + \hat{u} \mathcal{V}] + \hat{u}')$$

with a weak formulation corresponding to (2.6). We take $v = 2e^{-rt}z|_{[0,\tau]}$ as test function in this weak formulation. Note that $v\dot{z} = ([e^{-rt}z^2] + re^{-rt}z^2)$ on $(0, \tau)$ and that **(H-1.iv)** gives:

$$(3.4) \quad \|S(\cdot, \mathbf{u}, \nabla \mathbf{u})\| \leq M[1 + \|\mathbf{z}\|_{(1)}].$$

We will also estimate: $\|\mathbf{z}\|_{(1)}\|v\| \leq \frac{\delta}{MK}e^{-rt}\|\mathbf{z}\|_{(1)}^2 + \frac{MK}{\delta}e^{-rt}\|z\|^2$, etc. Here and henceforth, M , etc., are generic ‘constants’ which may depend only on Ω , norm bounds on $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$ as in **(H-1.vii)**, the modulus of ellipticity δ , and the generic ‘constant’ γ of **(H-1)**; specifically, M will *not* depend on r — nor, of course, on $\mathcal{E}$ or $\mathbf{u}$. It follows that (replacing τ by t):

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-rt}\|z(t)\|^2 + r \int_0^t e^{-rs}\|z\|^2 + 2\delta \int_0^t e^{-rs}\|z\|_{(1)}^2 \\ \leq \delta \int_0^t e^{-rs}\|z\|_{(1)}^2 + \frac{\delta}{2K} \int_0^t e^{-rs}\|\mathbf{z}\|_{(1)}^2 + \int_0^t e^{-rs}[M + M'\|z\|^2] \end{aligned}$$

for each k . Taking $r > M'$, this gives

$$e^{-rt}\|z_k(t)\|^2 + \delta \int_0^t e^{-rs}\|z_k\|_{(1)}^2 \leq M + \frac{\delta}{2K} \int_0^t e^{-rs}\|\mathbf{z}\|_{(1)}^2$$

whence, summing over k , we obtain the ‘final’ estimate

$$(3.5) \quad e^{-rt}\|\mathbf{z}(t)\|^2 + \frac{\delta}{2} \int_0^t e^{-rs}\|\mathbf{z}\|_{(1)}^2 \leq KM$$

which clearly bounds $\mathbf{z}$ (and so $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{T}(\mathcal{E}) = [\mathbf{z} + \hat{\mathbf{u}}]$) in $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}_2$. Note that the bound we have obtained is independent of $\mathcal{E} \in L^2(\mathcal{Q})$ so $\mathcal{K}_1$ is a bounded set in $\mathcal{X}$. (Note that, while we have only obtained such a bound when $r > M'$, these $\mathcal{X}_2$ -norms are equivalent so the *fact* that $\mathcal{K}_1$ is a bounded set is independent of r ; we will be free to choose r independently in any subsequent calculation.)

[3] Given the bound above on $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{T}(\mathcal{E})$ in $L^2(\rightarrow H^1)$, we have bounds on each S_k and $\mathcal{J}_k$ in the space $L^2(\mathcal{Q})$ and so a bound on $\dot{u}_k = S_k + \nabla \cdot \mathcal{J}_k$ in $L^2(\rightarrow H^{-1})$. Since the embedding $H^1(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^2(\Omega)$ is compact, application of the Aubin Compactness Theorem [1] gives precompactness of $\mathcal{K}_1$ in $L^2([0, T] \rightarrow L^2(\Omega)) = L^2(\mathcal{Q})$. Since, by **(H-1.vi)**, $\mathbf{L}$ is continuous from $L^2(\mathcal{Q})$ to $L^2(\mathcal{Q})$, it follows that the image $\mathcal{K}_2 = \mathbf{L}\mathcal{K}_1$ must be precompact. The set $\mathcal{K} = \overline{\text{co}}\mathcal{K}_2$ is then compact and convex in $L^2(\mathcal{Q})$. Note that $\mathbf{LT}(\mathcal{K}) \subset \mathcal{K}_2 \subset \mathcal{K}$ so $\mathcal{K}$ is invariant.

[4] Now suppose we have a sequence $\{\mathcal{E}^\nu\}$ in $L^2(\mathcal{Q})$ converging in $L^2(\mathcal{Q})$ to some $\mathcal{E}^0$; we write $\mathbf{u}^\nu := \mathbf{T}(\mathcal{E}^\nu)$, etc. We wish to show that $\mathbf{u}^\nu \rightarrow \mathbf{u}^0 = \mathbf{T}(\mathcal{E}^0)$ in the sense of $\mathcal{X}_2$.

The key to the argument is to assume, first, that $\mathcal{E}^\nu \rightarrow \mathcal{E}^0$ *pointwise* ae on $\mathcal{Q}$. This implies convergence ae on $\mathcal{Q}$ for $D, \mathcal{V}$ as well. It is not difficult to see that

$$\| [D(\cdot, \mathcal{E}^\nu) - D(\cdot, \mathcal{E}^0)] \nabla u^0 \|^2 = \int_{\mathcal{Q}} | [D(\cdot, \mathcal{E}^\nu) - D(\cdot, \mathcal{E}^0)] \nabla u^0 |^2 \rightarrow 0$$

since we have convergence to 0 ae on $\mathcal{Q}$ for the integrand and, with $\nabla \mathbf{u}^0$ fixed in $L^2(\mathcal{Q})$, (H-1.ii) gives the dominating bound $2\gamma^2 |\nabla \mathbf{u}^0|^2$. Similarly, using (H-1.iii) and (H-1.iv) for domination, one obtains $L^2(\mathcal{Q})$ convergence:

$$u^0 \mathcal{V}(\cdot, \mathcal{E}^\nu) \rightarrow u^0 \mathcal{V}(\cdot, \mathcal{E}^0) \quad S(\cdot, \mathbf{u}^0, \nabla \mathbf{u}^0, \mathcal{E}^\nu) \rightarrow S(\cdot, \mathbf{u}^0, \nabla \mathbf{u}^0, \mathcal{E}^0).$$

We also recall that (H-1.v) gives

$$\| S(\cdot, \mathbf{u}^\nu, \nabla \mathbf{u}^\nu, \mathcal{E}^\nu) - S(\cdot, \mathbf{u}^0, \nabla \mathbf{u}^0, \mathcal{E}^\nu) \| \leq M \|\mathbf{z}^\nu\|_{(1)}.$$

Let M_ν be a bound for $\| [D(\mathcal{E}^\nu) - D(\mathcal{E}^0)] \nabla u^0 \|^2$, etc.; note that we have just shown $M_\nu \rightarrow 0$.

Set $z = z^\nu = u^\nu - u^0$ much as in (3.3) and similarly take $v = 2e^{-rt}z|_{[0, \tau]}$ in the weak formulations (2.6) for u^ν, u^0 ; then subtract and estimate much as in [2] above. One obtains

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{aligned} & e^{-rt} \|z(t)\|^2 + r \int_0^t e^{-rs} \|z\|^2 + 2\delta \int_0^t e^{-rs} \|z\|_{(1)}^2 \\ & \leq \delta \int_0^t e^{-rs} \|z\|_{(1)}^2 + \frac{\delta}{2K} \int_0^t e^{-rs} \|\mathbf{z}\|_{(1)}^2 + M_\nu + M' \int_0^t e^{-rs} \|z\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

from which, again choosing $r > M'$ and summing over k , one obtains a bound on $\|\mathbf{z}^\nu\|_{\mathcal{X}}$ which goes to 0 as $M_\nu \rightarrow 0$. Thus, $\mathcal{E}^\nu \rightarrow \mathcal{E}^0$ pointwise ae on $\mathcal{Q}$ implies $\mathbf{u}^\nu = \mathbf{T}(\mathcal{E}^\nu) \rightarrow \mathbf{u}^0 = \mathbf{T}(\mathcal{E}^0)$ in $\mathcal{X}$.

For arbitrary L^2 convergence: $\mathcal{E}^\nu \rightarrow \mathcal{E}^0$, we note that one can always find *subsequences* which converge ae on $\mathcal{Q}$. Since the limit is specified uniquely, one has the desired convergence for the full sequence: $\mathbf{T}(\mathcal{E}^\nu) \rightarrow \mathbf{T}(\mathcal{E}^0)$ in $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}_2$, proving the continuity of $\mathbf{T} : L^2(\mathcal{Q}) \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_2$. *A fortiori*, noting (H-1.vi), one has continuity of $\mathbf{L} \circ \mathbf{T}$ from $L^2(\mathcal{Q})$ to $\mathcal{K}_2 \subset L^2(\mathcal{Q})$.

Since $\mathcal{K}$ is compact and $\mathbf{T}$ is continuous, we note that $\mathcal{K}_3 := \{\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{T}(\mathcal{E}) : \mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{K}\}$ is compact in $\mathcal{X}_2$. For future reference, observe that $\{\nabla \mathbf{u} : \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{K}_3\}$ is then compact in $L^2(\mathcal{Q})$ whence, setting $\sigma^2(t) = \sigma^2(t; \mathbf{u}) := 1 + \|\mathbf{u}(t, \cdot)\|_{(1)}^2$, we have σ in a compact subset of $L^2(0, T)$; thus, $\int_0^t e^{-\mu s} \sigma^2(s; \mathbf{u}) ds \rightarrow 0$ uniformly in $[t, \mathbf{u}] \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{K}_3$ as $\mu \rightarrow \infty$. We have shown that, for any $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$(3.7) \quad 0 \leq \int_0^t e^{-\mu s} [1 + \sigma^2(s; \mathbf{u})] ds < \varepsilon \quad 0 \leq t \leq T, \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{K}_3$$

for a suitably chosen $\mu = \mu(\varepsilon)$.

[5] Restricting, $\mathbf{L} \circ \mathbf{T}$ to the compact, convex, invariant set $\mathcal{K}$, the Schauder Theorem applies to give existence of a fixpoint $\mathcal{E}^* \in \mathcal{K}$. This completes the existence proof on setting $\mathbf{u}^* := \mathbf{T}(\mathcal{E}^*)$. $\square$

Theorem 2: Let $\{\hat{\mathbf{u}}^\nu\}$ be as in (H-1.vii) with $\hat{\mathbf{u}}^\nu \rightarrow \hat{\mathbf{u}}^0$ and let $\{\mathbf{u}^\nu\}$ be corresponding solutions of the coupled system. Then (for a subsequence) we have $[\mathcal{E}^\nu, \mathbf{u}^\nu] \rightarrow [\mathcal{E}^0, \mathbf{u}^0]$ where $[\mathcal{E}^0, \mathbf{u}^0]$ is some solution corresponding to $\hat{\mathbf{u}}^0$.

Proof: From [4], above, we know $\mathcal{K} \times \mathcal{K}_3$ is compact so we can find a convergent subsequence $[\mathcal{E}^\nu, \mathbf{u}^\nu] \rightarrow [\mathcal{E}^0, \mathbf{u}^0]$ (for some $[\mathcal{E}^0, \mathbf{u}^0]$) with, in addition, pointwise convergence ae on $\mathcal{Q}$ for $\mathcal{E}^\nu, \nabla \mathbf{u}^\nu$. Essentially the same argument as in Step [4] of the proof for Theorem 1 shows that $\mathbf{u}^0$ is a solution of (2.3) corresponding to $\mathcal{E}^0, \hat{\mathbf{u}}^0$. Clearly we also have $\mathcal{E}^0 = \lim \mathbf{L} \mathbf{u}^\nu = \mathbf{L} \mathbf{u}^0$, completing the proof. $\square$

4. Uniqueness. In this section we prove, under essentially the same set of hypotheses (H-2) used in [10], that the solution of the coupled system whose existence was shown in Section 3 is actually unique. Answering a question raised by Hans Weinberger at the original conference presentation of [10], our present approach, somewhat more constructive than there, applies the Contractive Mapping Theorem to the map

$$(4.1) \quad \mathbf{L} \circ \mathbf{T}: \quad \mathcal{E} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{T}} \mathbf{u} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{L}} \mathcal{E}: \mathcal{C}(\bar{\mathcal{Q}}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{X}_p \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}(\bar{\mathcal{Q}})$$

where $\mathcal{X}_p := L^\infty(\rightarrow L^p) \cap \mathcal{X}_2$ with p as in (H-2.vi). Note that the big difference in this setting from that of (3.1) is that we now wish to consider $\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{C}(\bar{\mathcal{Q}})$ and so will need an estimate for $\mathbf{u}$ in $L^\infty(\rightarrow L^p(\Omega))$ to apply (H-2.vi).

Theorem 3: Under the hypotheses (H-2), the system (2.3) for $k = 1, \dots, K$ has a unique weak solution $[\mathcal{E}^*, \mathbf{u}^*] \in L^2(\mathcal{Q}) \times \mathcal{Z}$ with $\mathcal{E}^* = \mathbf{L} \mathbf{u}^*$ and the constitutive relations (2.4). This solution is obtainable by iterating the map $\mathbf{L} \circ \mathbf{T}$, starting with any measurable $\mathcal{E}$.

Proof: We divide the proof into the following five steps, using notation from the proof of Theorem 1:

- [1] $\mathcal{K}_1$ is bounded in $L^\infty(\rightarrow L^p)$, hence in $\mathcal{X}_p$;
- [2] $\mathcal{K}$ is compact in $\mathcal{C}(\bar{\mathcal{Q}})$; after 2 iterations of $\mathbf{L} \circ \mathbf{T}$, starting with any measurable initial $\mathcal{E}$, the iterates are in $\mathcal{K}$;
- [3] principal estimates for differences;
- [4] $\mathbf{L} \circ \mathbf{T}$ is contractive on $\mathcal{K}$ with respect to a suitably chosen metric for $\mathcal{C}(\bar{\mathcal{Q}})$;
- [5] There is a unique solution $[\mathcal{E}^*, \mathbf{u}^*]$, continuously dependent on the data $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$.

Here, [2] and [5] are quick; [1] is as in [10]; the interesting steps are [3] and [4]. For [1] and [3] we have somewhat similar estimation arguments, involving $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{u} - \hat{\mathbf{u}}$ or $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{u}' - \mathbf{u}''$, and will use a common notation. Setting

$$(4.1) \quad y = y_k := |z|^{p/2}, \quad w := |z|^{p-1} \operatorname{sgn} z = z|z|^{p-2},$$

it follows that

$$(4.2) \quad \begin{aligned} zy &= |z|^p = w^2, & |z| &= y^\vartheta, \\ \nabla w &= (2 - \vartheta)y^{1-\vartheta}\nabla y, & w\nabla z &= \vartheta y \nabla y, \\ p|\nabla w \cdot \nabla z| &= \delta' |\nabla w|^2 \text{ with } \delta' = 2(2 - \vartheta)\delta, \\ v\dot{z} &= [e^{-rt}w^2]^\cdot + re^{-rt}w^2 \text{ for } v := pe^{-rt}w|_{[0, \tau]} \end{aligned}$$

where, for convenience, we have set $\vartheta := 2/p \leq 1$.

[1] Let $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{u} - \hat{\mathbf{u}}$ as in (3.3) and take v as in (4.2) for the weak formulation. This gives

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-rt} \|y(t)\|^2 + r \int_0^t e^{-rs} \|y\|^2 + \delta' \int_0^t e^{-rs} \|y\|_{(1)}^2 \\ \leq p \int_0^t e^{-rs} \int_{\Omega} [Sw + \gamma|z| |\nabla w| + |\hat{\mathcal{J}}| |\nabla w| + \hat{u} \cdot w] \end{aligned}$$

and, as in obtaining (3.5), one gets the desired bound on suitably estimating the terms on the right. For example, since (3.4), (3.5) bound S in $L^2(\mathcal{Q})$, we estimate w in L^2 by $\|w\| \leq \|y\|_p \|y\|^{1-\vartheta}$ and then observe that $H^1(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^p(\Omega)$ (since we have assumed $d = 3$ and $p \leq 6$) so $\|y\|_p \leq M \|y\|_{(1)}$. The same estimate would have treated the term $\hat{u} \cdot w$ had we assumed $\hat{u} \in L^2(\mathcal{Q})$ in **(H-2.vii)**; for the hypothesis actually imposed we observe that $y^6 = |w|^{3p/(p-1)}$ so

$$\int_0^t e^{-rs} \int_{\Omega} \hat{u} \cdot w \leq \varepsilon \int_0^t e^{-rs} \|y\|_{(1)}^2 + C_{\varepsilon} \int_0^t e^{-rs} \|\hat{u}\|_{3p/(2p+1)}^p$$

(note that still another mode of estimation would work if we were to assume $\hat{u} \in L^1(\rightarrow L^p)$ instead and these could be combined for alternate possibilities). One similarly treats the term $|\hat{\mathcal{J}}| |\nabla w|$ by using **(H-2.vii)** to estimate $|\hat{\mathcal{J}}| y^{1-\vartheta}$ in L^2 . As in (3.5) one thus bounds y in $\mathcal{X}_2$; clearly, $\|y(t)\|^2 = \|z\|_p^p$ so this bounds $\mathbf{z}$ in $L^\infty(\rightarrow L^p)$ and therefore, recalling the bound on $\|\mathbf{u}\|_{(1)}$ from the proof of Theorem 1, bounds $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{T}(\mathcal{E})$ in $\mathcal{X}_p$, independently of $\mathcal{E}$.

[2] From **(H-2.vi)** it follows that one can introduce a space Y such that the embedding $L^p(\Omega) \hookrightarrow Y$ is compact and $\mathbf{L} : Y \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(\bar{\Omega})$ continuous; we may take $Y \hookrightarrow H^{-1}(\Omega)$. Since, for $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{K}_1$, we have bounds on $\mathbf{u}$ in $L^\infty(\rightarrow L^p)$ and on $\dot{\mathbf{u}}$ in $L^2(\rightarrow H^{-1})$, it follows that $\mathcal{K}_1$ is contained in a compact subset of $\mathcal{C}([0, T] \rightarrow Y)$ [14]¹ so $\mathcal{E} = \mathbf{L}\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{K}_2$ is in a compact subset of $\mathcal{C}(\rightarrow \mathcal{C}(\bar{\Omega})) = \mathcal{C}(\bar{\mathcal{Q}})$ whence $\mathcal{K} := \overline{\text{co}}\mathcal{K}_2$ is also compact in $\mathcal{C}(\bar{\mathcal{Q}})$.

[3] Suppose we have $\bar{\mathcal{E}}', \bar{\mathcal{E}}'' \in \mathcal{K}$ and, correspondingly, $\mathbf{u}' = \mathbf{T}(\bar{\mathcal{E}}')$, etc.; we set $\mathbf{z} := \mathbf{u}' - \mathbf{u}''$. It is also convenient to set

$$\begin{aligned} \eta(t) = \eta_k(t) &= \|z_k\|_p = \|y_k\|^\vartheta \text{ so } \eta^p = \|y\|^2, \\ \zeta(t) &= \|\mathbf{z}\|_p = (\sum_k \eta_k^p)^{1/p}, \\ \bar{\zeta}(t) &= \|\bar{\mathcal{E}}' - \bar{\mathcal{E}}''\|_\infty, \quad \hat{\zeta}(\tau) = \sup\{\zeta(t) : 0 \leq t \leq \tau\}. \end{aligned}$$

¹Consider the embedding map $\phi : \mathcal{Y} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{Y}'$ where $\mathcal{Y}$ is the Y -closure of the image of the M -ball of $L^p(\Omega)$ and $\mathcal{Y}'$ the corresponding image in $H^{-1}(\Omega)$. $\mathcal{Y}$ is compact and ϕ is a continuous bijection, so ϕ^{-1} is continuous. The bounds give $\mathbf{u}$ in a compact subset of $\mathcal{C}([0, T] \rightarrow H^{-1})$ by Arzela-Ascoli and ‘lifting’ by ϕ^{-1} gives compactness where desired.

We also let $\tilde{\sigma} \geq 1$ bound pointwise *each* of the (finitely many functions $|u_k|, |\nabla u_k|$, etc.; then set $\sigma^2(t) = 1 + \|\tilde{\sigma}(t, \cdot)\|$. Note that the bound $\|\mathbf{L}\mathbf{u}\|_\infty \leq \gamma_* \|\mathbf{u}\|_p$ given by **(H-2.vi)** will give

$$(4.3) \quad \|\mathcal{E}' - \mathcal{E}''\|_\infty \leq \gamma_* \hat{\zeta}(t)$$

for each t . One then has

$$\begin{aligned} |u'\mathcal{V}' - u''\mathcal{V}''| &\leq M[|z| + \sigma\bar{\zeta}] \\ |S' - S''| &\leq M[|\mathbf{z}, \nabla \mathbf{z}| + \sigma\bar{\zeta}]. \end{aligned}$$

from the Lipschitz conditions **(H-2.iii,v)**.

We proceed by taking $v = 2e^{-rt}z|_{[0,\tau]}$ — as in obtaining the continuity of $\mathbf{T}$ via (3.6) but here with the advantage of the Lipschitz conditions which are now imposed. Thus, we get

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-rt}\|z(t)\|^2 + r \int_0^t e^{-rs}\|z\|^2 + 2\delta \int_0^t e^{-rs}\|z\|_{(1)}^2 \\ \leq 2 \int_0^t e^{-rs} \int_\Omega (|u'\mathcal{V}' - u''\mathcal{V}''||\nabla z| + |S' - S''||z|) \\ \leq \delta \int_0^t e^{-rs}\|z\|_{(1)}^2 + \frac{\delta}{2K} \int_0^t e^{-rs}\|\mathbf{z}\|_{(1)}^2 \\ + M' \int_0^t e^{-rs}\|z\|^2 + M \int_0^t e^{-rs}\sigma^2\bar{\zeta}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Taking r large enough and summing over k , this gives the first principal estimate:

$$(4.4) \quad \int_0^t e^{-rs}\|\mathbf{z}\|_{(1)}^2 \leq M \int_0^t e^{-rs}\sigma^2\bar{\zeta}^2.$$

Next take the test function $v = pe^{-rt}w|_{[0,\tau]}$ as in (4.2) and get

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-rt}\eta^p(t) + r \int_0^t e^{-rs}\eta^p + \delta' \int_0^t e^{-rs}\|y\|_{(1)}^2 \\ \leq 2 \int_0^t e^{-rs} \int_\Omega (|u'\mathcal{V}' - u''\mathcal{V}''|y^{1-\vartheta}|\nabla y| + |S' - S''|y^{2-\vartheta}) \\ \leq M \int_0^t e^{-rs}([\eta + \sigma\bar{\zeta}]\eta^{p/2-1}\|y\|_{(1)} + [\|\mathbf{z}\|_{(1)} + \sigma\bar{\zeta}]\|w\|); \\ e^{-rt}\zeta^p(t) \leq M \int_0^t e^{-rs}(\sigma^2\bar{\zeta}^2 + \|\mathbf{z}\|_{(1)}^2)\zeta^{p-2}; \\ \zeta^p(t) \leq Me^{rt} \left(\int_0^t e^{-rs}\sigma^2\bar{\zeta}^2 \right) \hat{\zeta}^{p-2}(\tau) \quad (t \leq \tau), \end{aligned}$$

using (4.4) for the last, in which we now take the sup over $[0, \tau]$ — first on the right, then on the left. Dividing by $\hat{\zeta}^{p-2}$, one then obtains the second principal estimate:

$$(4.5) \quad e^{-rt} \hat{\zeta}^2(\tau) \leq M_* \int_0^t e^{-rs} \sigma^2 \bar{\zeta}^2 ds.$$

[4] Now choose $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough: $\gamma_* M_* \varepsilon < 1$ with γ as in (4.3) and M_* as in (4.5); set $\mu = \mu(\varepsilon)$ as in (3.7), which still applies here. Then, multiplying (4.5) by $e^{-\mu t}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} e^{(r+\mu)t} \hat{\zeta}^2(t) &\leq M_* \int_0^t e^{-\mu(t-s)} \sigma^2(s) e^{-(r+\mu)s} \bar{\zeta}^2(s) ds \\ &\leq M_* \varepsilon \sup\{e^{-(r+\mu)s} \bar{\zeta}^2(s) : 0 \leq s \leq \tau\} \end{aligned}$$

for $t \leq \tau \leq T$. Fixing r large enough to justify (4.4), (4.5) and $\mu = \mu(\varepsilon)$ as above, we now select the rather unusual norm:

$$(4.7) \quad \|f\|_* := \max_{0 \leq \tau \leq T} \{e^{-(r+\mu)\tau} \max_{0 \leq t \leq \tau} \max_{x \in \bar{\Omega}} \{|f(t, x)|\}\}$$

for $\mathcal{C}(\bar{\mathcal{Q}})$. Then, from (4.3) and (4.6) we get

$$(4.8) \quad \|\mathcal{E}' - \mathcal{E}''\|_* \leq \gamma_* M_* \varepsilon \|\bar{\mathcal{E}}' - \bar{\mathcal{E}}''\|_*$$

— which is just the desired contractivity estimate.

[5] From (4.8) and the Contractive Mapping Theorem, we obtain existence and *uniqueness* of a fixpoint $\mathcal{E}^*$ of the map $\mathbf{L} \circ \mathbf{T}$, giving a unique solution of the system. The continuous dependence on the data $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$ follows from Theorem 2. (Theorem 2 really gives continuity to $\mathcal{X}_2$ but a compactness argument lifts that to $\mathcal{X}_p$. Indeed, estimation along the lines of Step [3] shows this is actually *Lipschitz* continuity.) $\square$

5. Discussion. We conclude with a few comments on the physical relevance and some possible extensions of these results. Some of these will be treated more fully in a forthcoming paper [11].

- It has been customary in the literature to write the drift velocity $\mathcal{V}_k$ in the form $\mu_k \mathcal{E}$ initially taking the *mobility* μ_k constant but then $\mathcal{E}$ -dependent to allow for the observed *velocity saturation* (boundedness of $\mathcal{V}$ even for large fields, as in (H-1.iii)). The difficulty is that this is a phenomenological approach to finding an acceptable simplified version, fixing on the approximate average velocity, of a fuller treatment involving distributions in velocity/energy as well as position; since the velocity average at t, x cannot really be simply a function of $\mathcal{E}(t, x)$, this leads to problems which have become important in a variety of problems of current technological interest. There are various models which tinker with the

dependences of the μ_k in essentially *ad hoc* fashions, explicitly introduce averaged energies as dependent variables and take $D_k, \mathcal{V}_k, S_k$ to depend on these rather than directly on $\mathcal{E}$, etc. We fix on (2.4) as defining a class of problems of mathematical interest which covers most of the standard models. It seems likely that the methods here would handle the alternate models as well.

- Somewhat related to the consideration above is treatment of the *Einstein relation* connecting D_k to μ_k . For saturating velocities this would imply that one could not have uniform ellipticity as assumed in (H-1.ii) so the parabolic problem would become degenerate for large $|\mathcal{E}|$. (Indeed, there is some experimental indication of this for *Si* (but not for *GaAs*), although this is subject to interpretation). It seems plausible that the present results might continue to be valid in a setting permitting certain such forms of degeneracy but, for the present, we are simply imposing (H-1.ii) as a general hypothesis.

- It is the condition (H-2.vi), in particular, which is restrictive for applications since this amounts to a geometric condition on Ω , prohibiting consideration of regions with corners — (H-2.vi) is a standard result, i.e., (2.2) gives $\psi \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ [7] for the Poisson equation (and then $W^{1,p}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{C}(\bar{\Omega})$ when $p > d$) provided the boundary $\partial\Omega$ is smooth enough (and one avoids ‘change of type’ for the boundary conditions, as here for Γ_D, Γ_N) but [4] this generally fails otherwise. Some of the corners occurring in interesting geometries involve no such problems (due to symmetry considerations) but others do and this is a genuine restriction. In comparison with the argument in [10], we note that here one has at least the existence proof under the condition (H-1.vi), almost trivially satisfied for $\mathbf{L}$ given by (2.2), without needing the restrictive condition (H-2.vi). It would also be desirable to permit dependence of D_k on $\mathcal{E}$.

Such extensions of the uniqueness result should be available if one would have greater regularity (specifically, better gradient estimates) for the solution $\mathbf{u}$ than is available from the arguments presented here. It seems unlikely that the indicated regularity here can be significantly improved without strengthening the hypotheses somehow. It *does* seem plausible that useful results could be obtained by noting (for the situations of applied interest) that the material properties expressed in the dependences on t, x are actually *piecewise smooth* in $x \in \Omega$.

- The homogeneous ‘no flux’ condition used here is typical, arising from insulation or by symmetry. For expository simplicity (avoiding boundary terms) we have considered only this case here but these methods could also apply to nonlinear boundary conditions on Γ_N of the form: $\mathcal{J}_k \cdot \mathbf{n} = \phi_k(\cdot, \mathbf{u})$ — or even $\phi_k(\cdot, \mathbf{u}, \mathcal{E})$ under the hypotheses (H-2).

- The existence theorem could easily be ‘improved’ by permitting $D_k, \mathcal{V}_k$ to depend on $\mathbf{u}$ as well as on $\mathcal{E}$. This involves negligible modification of the arguments: one takes the argument of $\mathbf{T}$ now to be the pair $[\mathcal{E}, \mathbf{u}] \in L^2(Q)$, a modification which also permits imposing Lipschitz continuity only with respect to $\nabla \mathbf{u}$ in (H-1.v). (One could even permit

a dependence on ∇u_k if this would satisfy a one-sided condition of monotonicity type.) Including a dependence on $\mathbf{u}$ would almost ‘automatically’ include temperature coupling since the heat could be considered formally as just another ‘species’, satisfying much the same sort of equation. The only difference is that the source term for this, given by ohmic heating, is essentially $[\mathcal{E} \cdot \mathcal{J}]$ which does not satisfy (H-1.iv) and so requires a certain amount of special treatment along the lines of [8] or [12].

- Physically, of course, it would be meaningless for the densities $\{u_k\}$ to be negative. Imposing appropriate structural assumptions on S_k , easy maximum principle arguments can be used to show that the $\{u_k\}$ do remain non-negative. While simple maximum principle arguments do not seem to apply here to provide $L^\infty(Q)$ bounds for $\mathbf{u}$, it seems plausible that (with some harmless modification of the hypotheses) these might be obtained for the present context by the techniques of [3]; one might then also expect $\mathcal{C}(\bar{Q})$ regularity for $\mathbf{u}$. Unfortunately, neither those techniques, nor any others presently envisioned, seem likely to lead to the kind of bounds — *uniform as $t \rightarrow \infty$* — which were obtained in [9] and which might lead to results for periodicity and/or steady states when one now includes the possibility generation terms in S . It is not clear, physically, whether such results should reasonably be expected but we do note that the present analysis has made no use of such physically important properties as charge conservation and the relation of the direction of $\mathbf{V}_k$ to $q_k \mathcal{E}$ and perhaps there remains reason to hope that including these in the hypotheses could lead, as in [9] to such results.

- The contractivity argument in the proof of Theorem 3 worked with the map $\mathbf{T}$ which assumed an ‘inner loop’ as in Step [1] in the proof of Theorem 1. It would be interesting, instead, to iterate by starting with $\mathbf{u}, \nabla \mathbf{u}$, computing $\mathcal{E} = \mathbf{L}\mathbf{u}$, substituting in (2.4), and solving a linear equation to get the new $\mathbf{u}, \nabla \mathbf{u}$. It seems possible that contractivity for such an iteration might be demonstrated along the lines of the proof of Theorem 3.1 in [2]

Of much greater interest would be the adaptation of the arguments here to show convergence of appropriate discretizations. This is not quite a routine extension of the present results but the modifications do not seem to lead to any substantial new difficulties.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. P. AUBIN, *Un théorème de compacité*, CRAS de Paris, 265 (1963), pp. 5042–5045.
- [2] S. BELBAS AND T. I. SEIDMAN, *Periodic solutions of a parabolic quasi-variational inequality from stochastic optimal control*, *Applicable Anal.* (to appear), pp..
- [3] H. GAJEWSKI AND K. GRÖGER, *On the basic equations for carrier transport in semiconductors*, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 113 (1986), pp. 12–35.
- [4] P. GRISVARD, *Elliptic Problems in Nonsmooth Domains*, Pitman APP, Boston, 1985.
- [5] J. JEROME, *Consistency of semiconductor modeling: an existence/stability analysis for the stationary van Roosbroeck system*, *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, 45 (1985), pp. 565–590.
- [6] M. MOCK, *An initial value problem from semiconductor device theory*, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 5 (1974), pp. 597–612.
- [7] C. B. MORREY, JR., *Multiple Integrals in the Calculus of Variations*, Springer Verlag, New York, 1966.

- [8] T. I. SEIDMAN, *Steady state solutions of a nonlinear diffusion-reaction system with electrostatic convection*, Nonlinear Anal.-TMA, 4 (1980), pp. 623-637.
- [9] T. I. SEIDMAN, *Time-dependent solutions of a nonlinear system arising in semiconductor theory, II: boundedness and periodicity*, Nonlinear Anal.-TMA, 10 (1986), pp. 491-502.
- [10] T. I. SEIDMAN, *The transient semiconductor problem with generation terms*, in *Computational Aspects of VLSI Design and Semiconductor Device Simulation*, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence.
- [11] T. I. SEIDMAN, *Time-dependent solutions of a diffusion-reaction system with electrostatic convection*, in preparation.
- [12] T. I. SEIDMAN AND G. M. TROIANNIELLO, *Time-dependent solutions of a nonlinear system arising in semiconductor theory*, Nonlinear Anal.-TMA, 9 (1985), pp. 1137-1157.
- [13] S. SELBEHERR, *Analysis and Simulation of Semiconductor Devices*, Springer Verlag, Wien, 1984.
- [14] J. SIMON, *Compact sets in the space $L^p(0, T; B)$* , Ann. Mat. pura appl., CXLVI (1987), pp. 65-96.
- [15] W. VAN ROOSBROECK, *Theory of flow of electrons and holes in germanium and other semiconductors*, Bell System Tech. J., 29 (1950), pp. 560-607.

Recent IMA Preprints

#	Author/s	Title
280	R. Duran,	On the Approximation of Miscible Displacement in Porous Media by a Method of Characteristics Combined with a Mixed Method
281	H. Aixiang,	The Convergence for Nodal Expansion Method Functional Integrals
282	V. Twersky,	Dispersive Bulk Parameters for Coherent Propagation in Correlated Random Distributions
283	F. den Hollander,	Mixing Properties for Random Walk in Random Scenery
284	H. R. Jauslin,	Nondifferentiable Potentials for Nonequilibrium Steady States
285	K. Meyer, G. R. Sell,	Homoclinic Orbits and Bernoulli Bundles in Almost Periodic Systems
286	J. Douglas, Jr., Y. Yuan,	Finite Difference Methods for the Transient Behavior of a Semiconductor Device
287	Li Kaitai, Yan Ningning,	The Extrapolation for Boundary Finite Elements
288	R. Durrett, R. Schonmann,	Stochastic Growth Models
289	D. Kinderlehrer,	Remarks about Equilibrium Configurations of Crystals
290	D. G. Aronson, J. L. Vazquez,	Eventual C^∞ -Regularity and Concavity for Flows in One-Dimensional Porous Media
291	L. R. Scott, J. M. Boyle, B. Bagheri,	Distributed Data Structures for Scientific Computation
292	J. Douglas, Jr., P. J. Paes Leme, T. Arbogast, T. Schmitt,	Simulation of Flow in Naturally Fractured Petroleum Reservoirs
293	D. G. Aronson, L. A. Caferelli,	Optimal Regularity for One-Dimensional Porous Medium Flow
294	Haim Brezis,	Liquid Crystals and Energy Estimates for S^2 -Valued Maps
295	T. Arbogast,	Analysis of the Simulation of Single Phase Flow through a Naturally Fractured Reservoir
296	H. Yinnian, L. Kaitai,	The Coupling Method of Finite Elements and Boundary Elements for Radiation Problems
297	T. Cazenave, A. Haraux, L. Vazquez, F. B. Weissler,	Nonlinear Effects in Wave Equation with a Cubic Restoring Force
298	M. Chipot, F. B. Weissler,	Some Blow-Up Results for a Nonlinear Parabolic Equation with a Gradient Term
299	L. Kaitai,	Perturbation Solutions of Simple and Double Bifurcation Problems for Navier-Stokes Equations
300	C. Zhangxin, L. Kaitai,	The Convergence on the Multigrid Algorithm for Navier-Stokes Equations
301	A. Gerardi, G. Nappo,	Martingale Approach for Modeling DNA Synthesis
302	D. N. Arnold, L. Ridgway, M. Vogelius,	Regular Inversion of the Divergence Operator with Dirichlet Boundary Conditions on a Polygon Divergence Operator with Dirichlet Boundary Conditions on a Polygon
303	R. G. Duran,	Error Analysis in L^p , $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, for Mixed Definite Element Methods for Linear and Quasi-Linear Elliptic Problems
304	R. Nochetto, C. Verdi,	An Efficient Linear Scheme to Approximate Parabolic Free Boundary Problems: Error Estimates and Implementation
305	K. A. Pericak-Spector, S. J. Spector,	Nonuniqueness for a Hyperbolic System: Cavitation in Nonlinear Elastodynamics
306	E. G. Kalnins, W. Miller, Jr.,	q-Series and Orthogonal Polynomials Associate with Barnes' First Lemma
307	D. N. Arnold, R. S. Falk,	A Uniformly Accurate Finite Element Method for Mindlin-Reissner Plate
308	Chi-Wang Shu,	TVD Properties of a Class of Modified Eno Schemes for Scalar Conservation Laws
309	E. Dikow, U. Hornung,	A Random Boundary Value Problem Modeling Spatial Variability in Porous Media Flow
310	J. K. Hale,	Compact Attractors and Singular Perturbations
311	A. Bourgeat, B. Cockburn,	The TVD-Projection Method for Solving Implicit Numeric Schemes for Scalar Conservation Laws: A Numerical Study of a Simple Case
312	B. Muller, A. Rizzi,	Navier-Stokes Computation of Transonic Vortices over a Round Leading Edge Delta Wing
313	J. Thomas Beale,	On the Accuracy of Vortex Methods at Large Times
314	P. Le Talle, A. Lotfi,	Decomposition Methods for Adherence Problems in Finite Elasticity
315	J. Douglas, Jr., J. E. Santos,	Approximation of Waves in Composite Media
316	T. Arbogast,	The Double Porosity Model for Single Phase Flow in Naturally Fractured Reservoirs
317	T. Arbogast, J. Douglas, Jr., J. E. Santos,	Two-Phase Immiscible Flow in Naturally Fractured Reservoirs
318	J. Douglas, Jr., Y. Yirang,	Numerical Simulation of Immiscible Flow in Porous Media Based on Combining the Method of Characteristics with Finite Element Procedures
319	R. Duran, R. H. Nochetto, J. Wang,	Sharp Maximum Norm Error Estimates for Finite Element Approximations of the Stokes Problem in 2-D
320	A. Greven,	A Phase Transition for a System of Branching Random Walks in a Random Environment
321	J. M. Harrison, R. J. Williams,	Brownian Models of Open Queueing Networks with Homogeneous Customer Populations
322	Ana Bela Cruzeiro,	Solutions ET mesures invariantes pour des equations d'evolution Stochastiques du type Navier-Stokes
323	Salah-Eldin A. Mohammed,	The Lyapunov Spectrum and Stable Manifolds for Stochastic Linear Delay Equations
324	Bao Gia Nguyen,	Typical Cluster Size for 2-DIM Percolation Processes (Revised)
325	R. Hardt, D. Kinderlehrer, F.-H. Lin,	Stable Defects of Minimizers of Constrained Variational Principles
326	M. Chipot, D. Kinderlehrer,	Equilibrium Configurations of Crystals

Recent IMA Preprints (Continued)

#	Author/s	Title
327	Kiyosi Itô,	Malliavin's C^∞ functionals of a centered Gaussian system
328	T. Funaki,	Derivation of the hydrodynamical equation for one-dimensional Ginzburg-Landau model
329	Y. Masaya,	Schauder Expansion by some Quadratic Base Function
330	F. Brezzi, J. Douglas, Jr.,	Stabilized Mixed Methods for the Stokes Problem
331	J. Mallet-Paret, G. R. Sell,	Inertial Manifolds for Reaction Diffusion Equations in Higher Space Dimensions
332	San-Yih Lin, M. Luskin,	Relaxation Methods for Liquid Crystal Problems
333	H. F. Weinberger,	Some Remarks on Invariant Sets for Systems
334	E. Miersemann, H. D. Mittelmann,	On the Continuation for Variational Inequalities Depending on an Eigenvalue Parameter
335	J. Hulshof, N. Wolanski,	Monotone Flows in N-Dimensional Partially Saturated Porous Media: Lipschitz Continuity of the Interface
336	B. J. Lucier,	Regularity Through Approximation for Scalar Conservation Laws
337	B. Sturmfels,	Totally Positive Matrices and Cyclic Polytopes
338	R. G. Duran, R. H. Nochetto,	Pointwise Accuracy of a Stable Petrov-Galerkin Approximation to Stokes Problem
339	L. Gastaldi,	Sharp Maximum Norm Error Estimates for General Mixed Finite Element Approximations to Second Order Elliptic Equations
340	L. Hurwicz, H. F. Weinberger,	A Necessary Condition for Decentralizability and an Application to Intemporal Allocation
341	G. Chavent, B. Cockburn,	The Local Projection P^0P^1 -Discontinuous-Galerkin-Finite Element Method for Scalar Conservation Laws
342	I. Capuzzo-Dolcetta, P.-L. Lions,	Hamilton-Jacobi Equations and State-Constraints Problems
343	B. Sturmfels, N. White,	Gröbner Bases and Invariant Theory
344	J. L. Vazquez,	C^∞ -Regularity of Solutions and Interfaces of the Porous Medium Equation
345	C. Beattie, W. M. Greenlee,	Improved Convergence Rates for Intermediate Problems
346	H. D. Mittelmann,	Continuation Methods for Parameter-Dependent Boundary Value Problems
347	M. Chipot, G. Michaille,	Uniqueness Results and Monotonicity Properties for Strongly Nonlinear Elliptic Variational Inequalities
348	Avner Friedman,	Bei Hu The Stefan Problem for a Hyperbolic Heat Equation
349	Michel Chipot, Mitchell Luskin	Existence of Solutions to the Elastohydrodynamical Equations for Magnetic Recording Systems
350	R.H. Nochetto, C. Verdi,	The Combined Use of a Nonlinear Chernoff Formula with a Regularization Procedure for Two-Phase Stefan Problems
351	Gonzalo R. Mendieta	Two Hyperfinite Constructions of the Brownian Bridge
352	Victor Klee, Peter Kleinschmidt	Geometry of the Gass-Saaty Parametric Cost LP Algorithm
353	Joseph O'Rourke	Finding A Shortest Ladder Path: A Special Case
354	J. Gretenkort, P. Kleinschmidt, Bernd Sturmfels,	On the Existence of Certain Smooth Toric Varieties
355	You-lan Zhu	On Stability & Convergence of Difference Schemes for Quasilinear Hyperbolic Initial-Boundary-Value Problems
356	Hamid Bellout, Avner Friedman	Blow-Up Estimates for Nonlinear Hyperbolic Heat Equation
357	P. Gritzman, M. Lassak	Helly-Test for the Minimal Width of Convex Bodies
358	K.R. Meyer, G.R. Sell	Melnikov Transforms, Bernoulli Bundles, and Almost Periodic Perturbations
359	J.-P. Puel, A. Raoult	Buckling for an Elastoplastic Plate with An Increment Constitutive Relation
360	F.G. Garvan	A Beta Integral Associated with the Root System G_2
361	L. Chihara, D. Stanton	Zeros of Generalized Krawtchouk Polynomials
362	Hisashi Okamoto	$O(2)$ -Equivariant Bifurcation Equations with Two Modes Interaction
363	Joseph O'Rourke, Catherine Schevon	On the Development of Closed Convex Curves on 3-Polytopes
364	Weinan E	Analysis of Spectral Methods for Burgers' Equation
365	Weinan E	Analysis of Fourier Methods for Navier-Stokes Equation
366	Paul Lemke	A Counterexample to a Conjecture of Abbott
367	Peter Gritzmann	A Characterization of all Loglinear Inequalities for Three Quermassintegrals of Convex Bodies
368	David Kinderlehrer	Phase transitions in crystals: towards the analysis of microstructure
369	David Kraines, Vivian Kraines	Pavlov and the Prisoner's Dilemma
370	F.G. Garvan	A Proof of the MacDonald-Morris Root System Conjecture for F_4
371	Neil L. White, Tim McMillan	Cayley Factorization
372	Bernd Sturmfels	Applications of Final Polynomials and Final Syzygies
373	Avner Friedman, Michael Vogelius	Identification of Small Inhomogeneities of Extreme Conductivity by Boundary Measurements: A Continuous Dependence Result
374	Jan Kratochvíl, Mirko Křivánek	On the Computational Complexity of Codes in Graphs
375	Thomas I. Seidman	The Transient Semiconductor Problem with Generation Terms, II