

# A Blow-up Dichotomy for Semilinear Fractional Heat Equations

R. Laister<sup>a</sup>, M. Sierżęga<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Department of Engineering Design and Mathematics,  
University of the West of England, Bristol BS16 1QY, UK.*

<sup>b</sup>*Faculty of Mathematics, Informatics and Mechanics, University of Warsaw,  
Banacha 2, 02-097 Warsaw, Poland.*

---

## Abstract

We derive a blow-up dichotomy for positive solutions of fractional semilinear heat equations on the whole space. That is, within a certain class of convex source terms, we establish a necessary and sufficient condition on the source for all positive solutions to become unbounded in finite time. Moreover, we show that this condition is equivalent to blow-up of all positive solutions of a closely-related scalar ordinary differential equation.

*Keywords:* fractional Laplacian, semilinear, heat equation, global existence, blow-up, dichotomy.

*2010 MSC:* 35A01, 35B44, 35K58, 35R11

---

## 1. Introduction

In this paper we investigate the local and global existence properties of positive solutions of fractional semilinear heat equations of the form

$$u_t = \Delta_\alpha u + f(u), \quad u(0) = \phi \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n), \quad (1.1)$$

where  $\Delta_\alpha = -(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}$  denotes the fractional Laplacian operator with  $0 < \alpha \leq 2$  and  $f$  satisfies the monotonicity condition

**(M)**  $f: [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  is locally Lipschitz continuous, non-decreasing and  $f(0) = 0$ .

---

*Email addresses:* Robert.Laister@uwe.ac.uk (R. Laister), M.Sierzega@mimuw.edu.pl (M. Sierżęga)

We present a new dichotomy result for convex nonlinearities  $f$  satisfying the ODE blow-up criterion

$$\mathbf{(B)} \quad \int_1^\infty \frac{1}{f(u)} du < \infty,$$

together with an additional, technical assumption  $\mathbf{(S)}$  (see Section 2). Specifically, for this class of nonlinearities, we show that all positive solutions of (1.1) blow-up in  $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$  in finite time *if and only if*

$$\int_{0^+} \frac{f(u)}{u^{2+\alpha/n}} du = \infty. \quad (1.2)$$

Furthermore, we establish an equivalence between finite time blow-up of all positive solutions of (1.1) and finite time blow-up of all positive solutions of the scalar, non-autonomous ODE

$$x' = f(x) - \left(\frac{n}{\alpha t}\right) x, \quad x(t_0) = x_0 > 0. \quad (1.3)$$

To the best of our knowledge this kind of blow-up equivalence, between the PDE (1.1) and a scalar ODE such as (1.3), has not been established before.

We will refer to the phenomenon of blow-up in finite time of all non-negative, non-trivial solutions of (1.1) simply as the ‘*blow-up property*’. We will also identify the phrase ‘non-negative, non-trivial solution’ synonymously with ‘positive solution’.

For the case of classical diffusion ( $\alpha = 2$ ) it has long been known that for  $f$  convex and sufficiently large initial data  $\phi$ , blow-up in (1.1) occurs; see [15, Theorem 17.1] for bounded domains and the whole space alike. The central question then was whether diffusion could prevent blow-up for initial data sufficiently small. For general continuous sources  $f$ , this problem is highly non-trivial and remains open. However, under further restrictions on the form of the nonlinearity there has been significant progress, for example when  $f$  is the power law nonlinearity  $f(u) = u^p$ . In [3] a threshold phenomenon was established, whereby the (Fujita) critical exponent, given by  $p_F = 1 + 2/n$ , separated two regimes: for  $1 < p < p_F$  (1.1) has the blow-up property, whereas for  $p > p_F$  it is possible to find *small* initial conditions  $\phi$  evolving into global-in-time solutions. Non-existence of positive global solutions in the delicate critical case  $p = p_F$  was later established in [6] for the case  $n \leq 2$  and subsequently by [17] for all  $n \geq 1$ . Thus was obtained the first blow-up dichotomy for (1.1): in the special

case  $f(u) = u^p$  and  $\alpha = 2$ , (1.1) has the blow-up property if and only if  $1 < p \leq p_F$ . Some slight generalisations can also be found in [4, 5].

In fact the result obtained in [17, Theorem] extended previous work on blow-up in two important ways: firstly to convex sources terms  $f$ , and secondly to *fractional* diffusion operators. Specifically, it was shown for convex  $f$  satisfying **(M)** and **(B)**, that if

$$\lim_{u \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(u)}{u^{p_\alpha}} > 0, \quad \text{where } p_\alpha := 1 + \frac{\alpha}{n}, \quad (1.4)$$

then (1.1) has the blow-up property. In fact it is easy to see from the proofs in [17] that (1.4) need only hold in the limit inferior sense. There are many other works which consider the global and blow-up solution properties of nonlinear fractional diffusion equations, all assuming either a power law nonlinearity or a convex one bounded below by a power law near zero as in (1.4); see e.g., [2, 7, 8, 12, 14].

Subsequently it was shown in [9], in the special case of classical diffusion ( $\alpha = 2$ ), that condition (1.4) is not necessary in order for (1.1) to have the blow-up property; this can be seen via the example in [9, Section 5] where a logarithmic-type correction of the critical Fujita case is considered. In that work it was shown ([9, Theorem 4.1]) that (1.1) has the blow-up property if  $f$  is continuous on  $[0, \infty)$ , positive on  $(0, \infty)$ ,  $f(0) = 0$ , **(B)** and (1.2) hold and  $f$  satisfies a further technical condition (labelled (B.3) in [9]). In particular, neither monotonicity nor convexity of  $f$  were required. On the other hand, this blow-up result is restricted to the case  $\alpha = 2$  and their technical condition (B.3) still imposes a certain logarithmic scaling bound near zero; see Section 4 later on for more details. Conversely, when (1.2) fails the authors in [9] go on to prove a global-in-time existence result for small initial data, subject to stronger regularity and monotonicity conditions on  $f$ .

An important aspect of this paper is that we demonstrate (via an explicit construction) that, for all  $\alpha \in (0, 2]$ , there exist monotone, convex  $f$  for which (1.1) has the blow-up property, but for which the results in [17] and [9]) do not apply.

The remainder of the paper is organised as follows. In Section 2 we prove that, for a suitable class of sources  $f$ , (1.2) is sufficient for the ODE (1.3) to have the blow-up property. In Section 3 we show for this class that if the ODE (1.3) possesses the blow-up property

then so too does (1.1). In Section 4 we present a construction which demonstrates that our assumption **(S)** (stated below) is strictly weaker than (B.3) of [9] in the case  $\alpha = 2$ . We then establish in Section 5 the necessity of (1.2) for (1.1) to have the blow-up property and conclude with some remarks in Section 6.

## 2. Blow-up of a Related ODE

Here we consider the blow-up properties of the non-autonomous ODE

$$x' = f(x) - \left(\frac{n}{\alpha t}\right)x, \quad x(t_0) = x_0 > 0, \quad t_0 > 0. \quad (2.1)$$

**Definition 2.1.** Suppose  $f$  satisfies **(M)**. We say that the ODE (2.1) has the *blow-up property* if the solution of (2.1) blows-up in finite time for every  $x_0 > 0$  and  $t_0 > 0$ .

We now introduce some further hypotheses:

**(C)**  $f$  is convex on  $(0, \infty)$ ;

**(S)** there exist  $c_0, \mu_0 > 0$  and  $g: (\mu_0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$  such that  $\int_{\mu_0}^{\infty} 1/g(s) ds < \infty$  and

$$f(\lambda\mu) \geq g(\mu)f(\lambda) \quad \text{for all } \mu \geq \mu_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda\mu \in (0, c_0).$$

**Remark 2.1.**

- (i) If  $f(u)/u^p$  is non-decreasing near zero, on  $(0, c_0)$  say, for some  $p > 1$ , then **(S)** holds with  $g(\mu) = \mu^p$ . To see this, observe that for any choice of  $\mu_0 \geq 1$  we have, for  $\mu \geq \mu_0$  and  $\lambda\mu \in (0, c_0)$ ,

$$\frac{f(\lambda\mu)}{(\lambda\mu)^p} \geq \frac{f(\lambda)}{\lambda^p}.$$

Hence  $f(\lambda\mu) \geq \mu^p f(\lambda)$  for all  $\mu \geq \mu_0$  and  $\lambda\mu \in (0, c_0)$ .

The particular, homogeneous, Fujita-critical case where  $g(\mu) = \mu^p$  and  $p = p_F$  was considered in [9, (B.3)] on a *strictly larger*  $\lambda$ - $\mu$  region than appears in **(S)**; i.e., the condition imposed upon  $f$  in [9] is a more restrictive one than that in **(S)**.

We mention also that a condition such as  $f(u)/u^p$  being non-decreasing was used in [1], although there the condition at infinity was relevant rather than near zero.

(ii) It is easy to verify that if  $0 \neq f \in C^1$  satisfies **(M)** and **(C)** and the condition

$$\liminf_{u \rightarrow 0} \frac{uf'(u)}{f(u)} > 1, \quad (2.2)$$

then there exists a  $p > 1$  such  $f(u)/u^p$  is non-decreasing near zero. Consequently  $f$  satisfies **(S)** by (i) above. Note that for  $0 \neq f \in C^1$  satisfying **(M)** and **(C)**, we always have  $uf'(u)/f(u) \geq 1$  for all  $u > 0$ .

**Theorem 2.1.** *Suppose  $f$  satisfies **(M)**, **(C)**, **(B)** and **(S)**. If*

$$\int_{0^+} \frac{f(u)}{u^{2+\alpha/n}} du = \infty, \quad (2.3)$$

*then the ODE (2.1) has the blow-up property.*

*Proof.* Suppose, for contradiction, that there exists a global solution  $x(t)$  of (2.1). By ODE uniqueness it is clear that the solution of (2.1) is positive for all  $t \geq t_0$ . By **(M)** and (2.3),  $f > 0$  on  $(0, \infty)$  and by **(C)**,  $L(u) := f(u)/u$  is non-decreasing and positive for  $u > 0$ .

Suppose first that  $x$  is bounded away from zero, i.e., there exists  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $x(t) \geq \varepsilon$  for all  $t \geq t_0$ . By monotonicity of  $L$ ,  $L(x(t)) \geq L(\varepsilon) > 0$  for all  $t \geq t_0$ . Hence there exists  $t_1 > t_0$  such that

$$1 - \left(\frac{n}{\alpha t}\right) \frac{1}{L(x(t))} \geq 1 - \frac{n}{\alpha L(\varepsilon)t} \geq 1/2$$

for all  $t \geq t_1$ . For such  $t$  we have

$$x' = f(x) \left(1 - \left(\frac{n}{\alpha t}\right) \frac{1}{L(x(t))}\right) \geq f(x)/2,$$

and so by **(B)**  $x$  blows up in finite time, a contradiction.

Now suppose that  $x$  does not remain bounded away from zero. We then claim that  $x'(t) \leq 0$  for all  $t \geq t_0$ . For suppose this is not the case, so that there exists  $t_2 \geq t_0$  such that  $x'(t_2) > 0$ . Since  $x$  is  $C^1$  and not bounded away from zero, there exists  $t_3 > t_2$  such that  $x'(t) > 0$  for all  $t \in [t_2, t_3)$  and  $x'(t_3) = 0$ . Clearly  $x(t_2) < x(t_3)$  and so by the monotonicity of  $L$  we have

$$0 = \frac{x'(t_3)}{x(t_3)} = L(x(t_3)) - \frac{n}{\alpha t_3} > L(x(t_2)) - \frac{n}{\alpha t_2} = \frac{x'(t_2)}{x(t_2)} > 0,$$

which is clearly false. Hence  $x'(t) \leq 0$  for all  $t \geq t_0$  as claimed. It follows that  $x(t)$  is non-increasing and  $x(t) \rightarrow 0$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ .

Now set  $y(t) = t^{n/\alpha}x(t)$  so that  $y$  satisfies the ODE

$$y' = yL(yt^{-n/\alpha}), \quad y(t_0) = t_0^{n/\alpha}x_0 =: y_0 > 0. \quad (2.4)$$

By (2.4),  $y$  is clearly increasing and so

$$\begin{aligned} y(t) &= \exp\left(\int_{t_0}^t L(y(s)s^{-n/\alpha}) ds\right) \geq \exp\left(\int_{t_0}^t L(y_0s^{-n/\alpha}) ds\right) \\ &= \exp\left(\frac{\alpha y_0^{\alpha/n}}{n} \int_{y_0 t^{-n/\alpha}}^{x_0} \frac{f(u)}{u^{2+\alpha/n}} du\right) \rightarrow \infty \end{aligned}$$

as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , by (2.3). For  $\tau > t_0$  sufficiently large we can ensure that  $y(t) \geq \mu_0$  and  $t^{-n/\alpha}y(t) = x(t) \leq c_0$  for all  $t \geq \tau$ . For such  $t$  it follows from **(S)** that

$$y' = t^{n/\alpha} f(t^{-n/\alpha}y) \geq t^{n/\alpha} f(t^{-n/\alpha}) g(y)$$

and so

$$\int_{y(\tau)}^{y(t)} \frac{dy}{g(y)} \geq \int_{\tau}^t L(s^{-n/\alpha}) ds = \frac{\alpha}{n} \int_{t^{-n/\alpha}}^{\tau^{-n/\alpha}} \frac{f(u)}{u^{2+\alpha/n}} du.$$

Letting  $t \rightarrow \infty$  and using (2.3) we again obtain a contradiction, on recalling the integrability of  $1/g$  in **(S)**.  $\square$

### 3. Blow-up of the PDE

In this section we show that blow-up of the ODE (2.1) implies blow-up of the PDE (1.1). We denote by  $\{S_\alpha(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$  the fractional heat semigroup on  $L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)$  ( $q \geq 1$ ) generated by  $-\Delta_\alpha$  on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with the explicit representation formula

$$[S_\alpha(t)\phi](x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} K_\alpha(x-y, t)\phi(y) dy, \quad \phi \in L^q(\mathbb{R}^n), \quad (3.1)$$

where  $K_\alpha$  is the (positive) fractional heat kernel. As is commonplace in the study of semi-linear problems, we may then study (1.1) via the variation of constants formula

$$u(t) = \mathcal{F}(u; \phi) := S_\alpha(t)\phi + \int_0^t S_\alpha(t-s)f(u(s)) ds. \quad (3.2)$$

It is well known that for any non-negative initial condition  $\phi \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$  there is a  $T_\phi > 0$  such that (1.1) has a unique non-negative solution  $u$  which is bounded on  $\mathbb{R}^n \times [0, T]$  for any  $T \in (0, T_\phi)$ , such that if  $T_\phi < \infty$  then  $\|u(t)\|_\infty \rightarrow \infty$  as  $t \rightarrow T_\phi$ . If  $T_\phi = \infty$  then we say that  $u$  is a *global solution* of (1.1).

**Definition 3.1.** Suppose  $f$  satisfies **(M)**. We say that the PDE (1.1) has the *blow-up property* if for every non-trivial, non-negative  $\phi \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$  we have  $T_\phi < \infty$ .

**Theorem 3.1.** *Suppose that  $f$  satisfies **(M)** and **(C)**. If the ODE (2.1) has the blow-up property then the PDE (1.1) has the blow-up property.*

*Proof.* We proceed as in the proof of the main theorem in [17, Section 4]. We briefly outline the initial steps of that proof for the reader's convenience.

Suppose, for contradiction, that  $u$  is a non-negative, global solution of (1.1). Then  $u$  satisfies the integral equation

$$u(x, t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} K_\alpha(x - y, t)\phi(y) dy + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} K_\alpha(x - y, t - s)f(u(y, s)) dy ds. \quad (3.3)$$

Clearly  $u > 0$  for all  $t > 0$  and so, by translating in time if necessary, we may assume without loss of generality that  $\phi > 0$ .

Using the integral formulation (3.3), positivity of the solution and standard properties of  $K_\alpha$ , one can then show that there exist constants  $c > 0$ ,  $\tau_0 > 0$  and  $t_0 > 0$  such that  $u(x, t_0) \geq cK_\alpha(x, \tau_0)$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  (see [17, p. 48]). It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} u(x, t + t_0) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} K_\alpha(x - y, t) u(y, t_0) dy \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} K_\alpha(x - y, t - s)f(u(y, s + t_0)) dy ds \\ &\geq c K_\alpha(x, t + \tau_0) + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} K_\alpha(x - y, t - s)f(u(y, s + t_0)) dy ds. \end{aligned}$$

Setting  $v(x, t) = u(x, t + t_0)$  yields

$$v(x, t) = c K_\alpha(x, t + \tau_0) + \int_{t_0}^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} K_\alpha(x - y, t - s)f(v(y, s)) dy ds. \quad (3.4)$$

Clearly  $v(t) \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$  for all  $t > 0$  since  $u$  is assumed to be in  $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$  for all  $t > 0$ . Now set

$$z(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} K_\alpha(x, t) v(x, t) dx.$$

Evidently  $z(t)$  is positive and finite for all  $t > 0$ . Multiplying (3.4) by  $K_\alpha(x, t)$ , integrating over  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and using the semigroup property of  $K_\alpha$ , gives

$$z(t) = k(2t + \tau_0)^{-n/\alpha} + \int_{t_0}^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} K_\alpha(y, 2t - s) f(v(y, s)) dy ds.$$

where  $k = k(n, \alpha, c)$  is a positive constant. Now using the scaling property

$$K_\alpha(x, t) = t^{-n/\alpha} K_\alpha(t^{-1/\alpha} x, 1)$$

of  $K_\alpha$  (see e.g., [17, p.46-47]) and the fact that  $K_\alpha(x, t)$  is decreasing in  $|x|$ , we have for  $s \leq t$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} K_\alpha(y, 2t - s) &= (2t - s)^{-n/\alpha} K_\alpha\left((2t - s)^{-1/\alpha} y, 1\right) \\ &\geq (2t - s)^{-n/\alpha} K_\alpha\left(s^{-1/\alpha} y, 1\right) \\ &= \left(\frac{2t - s}{s}\right)^{-n/\alpha} K_\alpha(y, s) \\ &\geq 2^{-n/\alpha} (t/s)^{-n/\alpha} K_\alpha(y, s). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by Jensen's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} z(t) &\geq k(2t + \tau_0)^{-n/\alpha} + 2^{-n/\alpha} \int_{t_0}^t (t/s)^{-n/\alpha} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} K_\alpha(y, s) f(v(y, s)) dy ds \\ &\geq k(2t + \tau_0)^{-n/\alpha} + 2^{-n/\alpha} \int_{t_0}^t (t/s)^{-n/\alpha} f(z(s)) ds \\ &\geq \kappa t^{-n/\alpha} + \kappa \int_{t_0}^t (t/s)^{-n/\alpha} f(z(s)) ds \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

for all  $t \geq t_1$ ,  $\kappa < 2^{-n/\alpha} \min\{1, k\}$  and  $t_1 > t_0$  sufficiently large. Here we point out that (3.5) is a departure from the form used in [17, Equation (4.4)] and is the reason for our introduction and analysis of the auxiliary ODE (2.1).

It now follows from (3.5) that for  $t > t_1$ ,  $z$  is a supersolution of the ODE

$$w' = \kappa f(w) - \left(\frac{n}{\alpha t}\right) w.$$

By rescaling time ( $t \mapsto \kappa t$ ) we see that  $z(t) \geq x(\kappa t)$ , where  $x$  is the solution of the ODE

$$x' = f(x) - \left(\frac{n}{\alpha t}\right) x, \quad x(\kappa t_1) = z(t_1) > 0.$$

By assumption  $x$  (and hence  $z$ ) blows-up in finite time, yielding the required contradiction to our earlier statement that  $z(t)$  is finite for all  $t > 0$ .  $\square$

By Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 3.1 we obtain the following blow-up result for (1.1).

**Corollary 3.2.** *Suppose  $f$  satisfies (M), (C), (B) and (S). If*

$$\int_{0^+} \frac{f(u)}{u^{2+\alpha/n}} du = \infty,$$

*then the PDE (1.1) has the blow-up property.*

#### 4. A Distinguishing Example

In this section we present an example of a function  $f$  which satisfies the hypotheses of Corollary 3.2, but not those of [9, Theorem 4.1] (for  $\alpha = 2$ ) nor [17, Theorem]. Firstly, the  $f$  we construct below has the property

$$\liminf_{u \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(u)}{u^{p_\alpha}} = 0, \tag{4.1}$$

so that the requirement (1.4) (labelled (F.2) in [17]) does not hold.

In [9, Theorem 4.1] the authors use a similar but more restrictive version of (S) (there denoted by assumption (B3)) to establish blow-up of the PDE (1.1) when  $\alpha = 2$ . The authors assume that there exists  $c_0 \in (0, 1]$  such that

$$f(\lambda\mu) \geq c_0 \mu^{p_F} f(\lambda) \quad \text{for all } 0 < \lambda \leq \mu, \quad \lambda \in (0, c_0) \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda\mu \in (0, c_0). \tag{4.2}$$

Hence the rôle of  $g$  in (S) is played there by the power law nonlinearity  $g(\mu) = \mu^{p_F}$  (recall Remark 2.1). In fact the *homogeneity* of this power law function is crucial in the proof of [9, Theorem 2.1] (see also [9, Theorem 3.5]) on which [9, Theorem 4.1] relies. Indeed, the iterative blow-up procedure used in the proof of [9, Theorem 2.1] utilizes in an essential way certain scaling identities relating the exponential function in the Gaussian heat kernel  $K_2$

and the power law. Furthermore, **(S)** is not required to hold for arbitrarily small  $\mu$  which is an essential requirement in the proof of [9, Theorem 2.1]. On the other hand we impose the stronger convexity assumption in **(C)**, absent in [9].

Now observe, upon taking  $\lambda = \mu$ , that any  $f$  satisfying (4.2) necessarily satisfies

$$\liminf_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(\lambda^2)}{\lambda^{p_F} f(\lambda)} > 0. \quad (4.3)$$

(Note that this in turn imposes upon  $f$  a kind of logarithmic scaling bound, as emerges in the proof of [9, Lemma 3.6]). The  $f$  we construct below will satisfy the hypotheses of Corollary 3.2 (for any  $\alpha \in (0, 2]$ ), but *not* (4.3) (for  $\alpha = 2$ ).

Let  $\alpha \in (0, 2]$ .

*Step 1.* Define the monotonically decreasing sequences

$$\sigma_i := e^{-i^2}, \quad u_i := e^{-e^{i^2}}, \quad i \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (4.4)$$

Let  $I_i$  denote the interval  $I_i = [u_{i+1}, u_i)$  and define

$$\tilde{f}(u) = \sigma_i u^{p_\alpha}, \quad u \in I_i, \quad i \in \mathbb{N}$$

with  $\tilde{f}(0) = 0$ . Notice that  $\tilde{f}(u) = u^{p_\alpha} / \ln(1/u_i)$  on  $I_i$ , so that  $\tilde{f}$  models a logarithmic correction to the critical power law case on a sequence of vanishingly small intervals near zero, to be compared with the example of [9, Section 5]. It is clear that  $\tilde{f}$  is non-decreasing on  $[0, \delta]$  (where  $\delta > 0$  can be chosen as small as desired later on) with discontinuities at  $u = u_i$ .

*Step 2.* We now modify  $\tilde{f}$  to create a function  $f$  satisfying **(M)**, **(C)** and **(B)**.

Fix  $p$  and  $\theta > 1$  such that

$$1 < p < p_\alpha, \quad \frac{p_\alpha}{p_\alpha - 1} < \theta < \frac{p}{p - 1} \quad (4.5)$$

and set  $v_i = \theta u_{i+1}$ . It is easily verified that  $\theta u_{i+1} < u_i$  for all  $i$  sufficiently large, and so for all such  $i$

$$u_{i+1} < v_i < u_i.$$

Now set  $J_i = [u_{i+1}, v_i)$  and  $M_i = [v_i, u_i)$  (so that  $I_i$  is the disjoint union of  $J_i$  and  $M_i$ ) and define

$$f(u) = \begin{cases} b_i u - a_i, & u \in J_i, \\ \sigma_i u^{p_\alpha}, & u \in M_i \end{cases}$$

for  $i$  large, with  $f(0) = 0$ . Note that  $f(v_i) = \sigma_i v_i^{p_\alpha}$  so that (4.1) holds.

We now choose  $a_i$  and  $b_i$  to ensure that  $f$  is continuous, i.e. such that the line  $y = b_i u - a_i$  passes through the points  $(u_{i+1}, \sigma_{i+1} u_{i+1}^{p_\alpha})$  and  $(v_i, \sigma_i v_i^{p_\alpha}) = (\theta u_{i+1}, \sigma_i \theta^{p_\alpha} u_{i+1}^{p_\alpha})$ . This yields

$$b_i = \frac{u_{i+1}^{p_\alpha - 1} (\theta^{p_\alpha} \sigma_i - \sigma_{i+1})}{\theta - 1} > 0, \quad a_i = \frac{u_{i+1}^{p_\alpha} (\theta^{p_\alpha} \sigma_i - \theta \sigma_{i+1})}{\theta - 1} > 0. \quad (4.6)$$

By construction  $f$  is also increasing and Lipschitz on  $[0, \delta]$ . In order that  $f$  be convex on  $[0, \delta]$  we require that

$$p_\alpha \sigma_{i+1} u_{i+1}^{p_\alpha - 1} \leq b_i \leq p_\alpha \sigma_i v_i^{p_\alpha - 1},$$

(by comparing the gradient of  $f$  at the endpoints of the intervals), or equivalently

$$\theta^{p_\alpha - 1} (\theta - p_\alpha (\theta - 1)) \leq \frac{\sigma_{i+1}}{\sigma_i} \leq \frac{\theta^{p_\alpha}}{1 + p_\alpha (\theta^{p_\alpha} - 1)}. \quad (4.7)$$

By (4.5), and since  $\sigma_{i+1}/\sigma_i \rightarrow 0$  as  $i \rightarrow \infty$ , (4.7) holds for all  $i$  sufficiently large.

Thus,  $f$  is increasing, convex and Lipschitz on  $[0, \delta]$ . It is clear that the domain of  $f$  can then be extended to  $[0, \infty)$  while still preserving monotonicity, convexity and Lipschitz continuity and also such that **(B)** holds.

*Step 3.* Next we show that  $f$  satisfies the remaining hypotheses of Corollary 3.2. By Remark 2.1(i) it suffices to show that

- (i)  $f(u)/u^p$  is non-decreasing on  $(0, \delta)$ , and
- (ii)  $\int_{0^+} \frac{f(u)}{u^{2+\alpha/n}} du = \infty$ .

For (i) let  $F(u) := f(u)/u^p$ . This *continuous*, piecewise differentiable function is given explicitly by

$$F(u) = \begin{cases} b_i u^{1-p} - a_i u^{-p}, & u \in J_i, \\ \sigma_i u^{p\alpha-p}, & u \in M_i. \end{cases}$$

Clearly  $F$  is non-decreasing on  $M_i$  for all  $i$ . On  $J_i = [u_{i+1}, v_i]$  we have that

$$F'(u) = u^{-p-1}(pa_i - (p-1)b_i u).$$

Hence  $F' \geq 0$  on  $J_i$  if and only if

$$pa_i \geq (p-1)b_i v_i. \quad (4.8)$$

Now, recalling (4.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{pa_i}{(p-1)b_i v_i} &= \frac{p(\theta^{p\alpha}\sigma_i - \theta\sigma_{i+1})}{\theta(p-1)(\theta^{p\alpha}\sigma_i - \sigma_{i+1})} \\ &= \frac{p(\theta^{p\alpha} - \theta\sigma_{i+1}/\sigma_i)}{\theta(p-1)(\theta^{p\alpha} - \sigma_{i+1}/\sigma_i)} \rightarrow \frac{p}{\theta(p-1)} \end{aligned}$$

as  $i \rightarrow \infty$ . Hence, by (4.5), (4.8) holds for all  $i$  sufficiently large. Thus  $F$  is non-decreasing on  $(0, \delta)$ .

For (ii),

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\delta \frac{f(u)}{u^{2+\alpha/n}} du &\geq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \int_{M_i} \frac{f(u)}{u^{2+\alpha/n}} du = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \int_{v_i}^{u_i} \frac{\sigma_i}{u} du \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sigma_i \log(u_i/v_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sigma_i \log(u_i/(\theta u_{i+1})) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (e^{2i+1} - 1) - \log \theta \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} e^{-i^2} \\ &= \infty, \end{aligned}$$

recalling (4.4).

*Step 4.* Finally we show that  $f$  fails to satisfy assumption [9, (B3)] when  $\alpha = 2$ . In fact we establish a more general result: for any  $\alpha \in (0, 2]$ , we find a sequence  $\lambda_i \rightarrow 0$  such that

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(\lambda_i^2)}{\lambda_i^{p\alpha} f(\lambda_i)} = 0.$$

Consequently (4.3) fails in the special case  $\alpha = 2$ .

To achieve this we show that there is a sequence  $\lambda_i \in M_i = [v_i, u_i)$  such that  $\lambda_i^2 \in M_{i+1}$ .

It will then follow that

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(\lambda_i^2)}{\lambda_i^{p\alpha} f(\lambda_i)} = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sigma_{i+1}(\lambda_i^2)^{p\alpha}}{\lambda_i^{p\alpha} (\sigma_i \lambda_i^{p\alpha})} = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sigma_{i+1}}{\sigma_i} = 0,$$

recalling that  $\sigma_i = e^{-i^2}$ .

Fix  $1/2 < q < 1$  and let  $\lambda_i = v_i^q$ . Clearly  $\lambda_i > v_i$  since  $v_i < 1$  and  $q < 1$ . It is also easily verified that  $\lambda_i = \theta^q u_{i+1}^q < u_i$  for  $i$  sufficiently large, recalling (4.4). Hence  $\lambda_i \in M_i$  for such  $i$ . Next,

$$\lambda_i^2 = v_i^{2q} = \theta^{2q} u_{i+1}^{2q} < u_{i+1}$$

for  $i$  sufficiently large, since  $2q > 1$ . Also,  $\lambda_i^2 = v_i^{2q} > u_{i+1}^{2q}$  and  $v_{i+1} = \theta u_{i+2}$ . Hence in order to show that  $\lambda_i^2 > v_{i+1}$ , it suffices to show that  $u_{i+1}^{2q} > \theta u_{i+2}$ . This is readily verified for large  $i$ , recalling (4.4). It follows that  $\lambda_i^2 \in M_{i+1}$ , as required.

**Remark 4.1.** Consider the case  $\alpha = 2$ . By taking  $g(\mu) = \mu^{pF}$ , any function  $f$  satisfying (4.2) necessarily satisfies our condition (S). Hence any convex function  $f$  satisfying the hypotheses of [9, Theorem 4.1] also satisfies those of Corollary 3.2. Our distinguishing example therefore shows that, *within the class of convex source terms*, Corollary 3.2 is *strictly* stronger than [9, Theorem 4.1].

**Remark 4.2.** It is reasonable to speculate whether the analogous condition to (4.2), with the power law  $\mu^{pF}$  replaced by  $\mu^{p\alpha}$ , might provide the basis for similar results to those in [9] for the fractional diffusion case  $0 < \alpha < 2$ . However, the  $f$  constructed above satisfies

$$\liminf_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(\lambda^2)}{\lambda^{p\alpha} f(\lambda)} = 0$$

for any  $\alpha \in (0, 2]$ . Consequently, the  $f$  constructed above pre-empts any improvements that might possibly be obtained in this way, at least within the class of convex source terms.

## 5. Global Existence

In this section we consider the issue of global continuation of locally bounded solutions of (1.1). We set  $Q_T = \mathbb{R}^n \times (0, T)$  and write  $\|\cdot\|_q$  for the norm in  $L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)$ .

**Definition 5.1.** Let  $T > 0$ . We say that a non-negative, measurable, finite almost everywhere function  $w: Q_T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is an integral supersolution of (1.1) on  $Q_T$  if  $w$  satisfies  $\mathcal{F}(w; \phi) \leq w$  almost everywhere in  $Q_T$ , with  $\mathcal{F}$  as in (3.2).

We recall the following well-known smoothing estimate for the fractional heat semigroup for  $1 \leq q \leq r \leq \infty$  and  $\phi \in L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)$  (see e.g., [13, Lemma 3.1]):

$$\|S_\alpha(t)\phi\|_r \leq Ct^{-\frac{n}{\alpha}(\frac{1}{q}-\frac{1}{r})}\|\phi\|_q, \quad t > 0, \quad (5.1)$$

where  $C = C(n, \alpha, q, r)$ .

For  $f$  satisfying **(M)** we define the non-decreasing function  $\ell: (0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  by

$$\ell(u) = \sup_{0 < s \leq u} \frac{f(s)}{s}. \quad (5.2)$$

**Theorem 5.1.** Suppose  $\phi \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ ,  $\phi \geq 0$  and  $f$  satisfies **(M)**. Let  $u(t; \phi)$  denote the unique, non-negative solution of (1.1) with maximal interval of existence  $[0, T_\phi)$ . If

$$\int_{0^+} u^{-p_\alpha} \ell(u) \, du < \infty, \quad (5.3)$$

then there exists  $\rho > 0$  such that for all  $\phi$  satisfying  $\|\phi\|_1 + \|\phi\|_\infty \leq \rho$  we have  $T_\phi = \infty$  and

$$0 \leq u(t; \phi) \leq 2S_\alpha(t)\phi \quad (5.4)$$

for all  $t \geq 0$ . Consequently  $\|u(t; \phi)\|_\infty \leq 2Ct^{-n/\alpha}\|\phi\|_1$  for all  $t > 0$ , where  $C = C(n, \alpha, 1, \infty)$ .

*Proof.* We will show that for suitably small  $\rho > 0$ ,  $w := 2S_\alpha(t)\phi$  is an integral supersolution of (1.1) for all  $t \geq 0$ . Via the monotone iteration scheme  $u_{n+1} = \mathcal{F}(u_n; \phi)$  we then obtain a decreasing sequence of functions  $u_n$  such that  $0 \leq u_n \leq w$  and converging to a solution  $\tilde{u}(t; \phi)$  of (1.1). See, for example, [10, 16] for the case  $\alpha = 2$  and [11] for the fractional case

for general results of this kind. By standard uniqueness results we may then deduce that  $\tilde{u}(t; \phi) = u(t; \phi)$  and  $0 \leq u(t; \phi) \leq w$ , yielding (5.4). The  $L^\infty$ -bound for  $u$  then follows by  $L^1$ - $L^\infty$  smoothing.

First set  $C_1 = C(n, \alpha, \infty, \infty)$  and choose  $\rho$  such that  $\rho C_1 \leq 1$ . Then choose  $\tau > 0$  such that  $2\ell(2)\tau < 1$ . By (5.1) we have  $\|S_\alpha(t)\phi\|_\infty \leq C_1\|\phi\|_\infty \leq C_1\rho \leq 1$  for all  $t > 0$ . In particular, for all  $t \in (0, \tau]$  we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{F}(w; \phi) - w &= S_\alpha(t)\phi + \int_0^t S_\alpha(t-s)f(w(s)) \, ds - w \\
&\leq S_\alpha(t)\phi + \int_0^t S_\alpha(t-s) [\ell(w(s))w(s)] \, ds - w \\
&= \int_0^t S_\alpha(t-s) [\ell(2S_\alpha(s)\phi) 2S_\alpha(s)\phi] \, ds - S_\alpha(t)\phi \\
&\leq \int_0^t S_\alpha(t-s) [\ell(\|2S_\alpha(s)\phi\|_\infty) 2S_\alpha(s)\phi] \, ds - S_\alpha(t)\phi \\
&\leq \int_0^t S_\alpha(t-s) [2\ell(2)S_\alpha(s)\phi] \, ds - S_\alpha(t)\phi \\
&= 2\ell(2) \int_0^t S_\alpha(t-s)\phi \, ds - S_\alpha(t)\phi \\
&\leq (2\ell(2)\tau - 1) S_\alpha(t)\phi \\
&\leq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

For  $t > \tau$  we proceed as above, utilizing the  $L^1$ - $L^\infty$  smoothing estimate  $\|S_\alpha(t)\phi\|_\infty \leq C_2 t^{-n/\alpha} \|\phi\|_1 \leq C_2 \rho t^{-n/\alpha}$ , where  $C_2 := C(n, \alpha, 1, \infty)$ . Whence,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{F}(w; \phi) - w &= S_\alpha(t)\phi + \int_0^\tau S_\alpha(t-s)f(w(s)) \, ds + \int_\tau^t S_\alpha(t-s)f(w(s)) \, ds - w \\
&\leq (2\ell(2)\tau - 1) S_\alpha(t)\phi + \int_\tau^t S_\alpha(t-s) [\ell(w(s))w(s)] \, ds \\
&\leq (2\ell(2)\tau - 1) S_\alpha(t)\phi + \int_\tau^t S_\alpha(t-s) [\ell(2S_\alpha(s)\phi) 2S_\alpha(s)\phi] \, ds \\
&\leq (2\ell(2)\tau - 1) S_\alpha(t)\phi + \int_\tau^t S_\alpha(t-s) [\ell(\|2S_\alpha(s)\phi\|_\infty) 2S_\alpha(s)\phi] \, ds \\
&\leq (2\ell(2)\tau - 1) S_\alpha(t)\phi + \int_\tau^t S_\alpha(t-s) [\ell(2C_2\rho s^{-n/\alpha}) 2S_\alpha(s)\phi] \, ds \\
&= (2\ell(2)\tau - 1) S_\alpha(t)\phi + 2S_\alpha(t)\phi \int_\tau^t \ell(2C_2\rho s^{-n/\alpha}) \, ds
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \left( 2\ell(2)\tau - 1 + (\alpha/n)2^{p\alpha}(C_2\rho)^{\alpha/n} \int_{2C_2\rho t^{-n/\alpha}}^{2C_2\rho\tau^{-n/\alpha}} x^{-p\alpha}\ell(x) dx \right) S_\alpha(t)\phi \\
&\leq \left( 2\ell(2)\tau - 1 + (\alpha/n)2^{p\alpha}(C_2\rho)^{\alpha/n} \int_0^{2C_2\rho\tau^{-n/\alpha}} x^{-p\alpha}\ell(x) dx \right) S_\alpha(t)\phi \\
&\leq 0
\end{aligned}$$

for  $\rho$  sufficiently small (and independently of  $t$ ), by (5.3).  $\square$

We are now in a position to state our main result.

**Theorem 5.2** (Blow-up Dichotomy). *If  $f$  satisfies (M), (C), (B) and (S), then the following are equivalent:*

(a) *the PDE (1.1) has the blow-up property;*

(b) *the ODE (2.1) has the blow-up property;*

(c)  $\int_{0^+} \frac{f(u)}{u^{2+\alpha/n}} du = \infty$ .

*Proof.* By the contrapositive of Theorem 5.1, (a) implies (c) (noting that  $\ell(u) = f(u)/u$  for  $f$  convex). By Theorem 2.1, (c) implies (b). By Theorem 3.1, (b) implies (a).  $\square$

**Example 5.1.** In the special case of the homogeneous power law nonlinearity  $f(u) = u^p$  with  $p > 1$ , Theorem 5.2 shows that (1.1) has the blow-up property if and only if  $1 < p \leq p_\alpha$ , as is well known [3, 4, 6, 17].

**Example 5.2.** For  $\beta > 0$  take

$$f(u) = \begin{cases} u^{p_\alpha} (\log(1/u))^{-\beta}, & u \in (0, c_0), \\ \hat{f}(u), & u \geq c_0, \end{cases}$$

with  $f(0) = 0$  and  $\hat{f}$  and  $c_0 > 0$  to be specified. For sufficiently small  $c_0 > 0$ ,  $f$  can be shown to be convex (via a tedious calculation) and  $f(u)/u^p$  is non-decreasing on  $(0, c_0)$  for any  $p \in (1, p_\alpha]$ . By Remark 2.1 (i) it follows that  $f$  satisfies (S). Clearly  $\hat{f}$  can then be chosen such that (M), (B) and (C) hold. Computation of the integral in Theorem 5.2 (c) then shows that (1.1) has the blow-up property if and only if  $0 < \beta \leq 1$ . See the example in [9, Section 5] for the special case  $\alpha = 2$ .

**Remark 5.1.** Under the assumptions of Theorem 5.2 we could rewrite the equivalences as follows:

- (a) there exist positive, global solutions of the PDE (1.1);
- (b) there exist positive, global solutions of the ODE (2.1);
- (c)  $\int_{0^+} \frac{f(u)}{u^{2+\alpha/n}} du < \infty$ .

## 6. Concluding remarks

We have established a new blow-up dichotomy for positive solutions of fractional semi-linear heat equations, extending those of [3, 6, 9, 17]. In particular, for a class of convex nonlinearities we have established an equivalence between the PDE (1.1) and the ODE (2.1) with respect to the blow-up property. Furthermore we have determined necessary and sufficient conditions on the nonlinearity  $f$ , in the form of a non-integrability condition near zero, for this blow-up property to hold.

When viewed in their integral form, there is an obvious *formal* similarity between the PDE and an auxiliary ODE: the PDE (1.1) can be cast as

$$u(t) = S_\alpha(t)\phi + \int_0^t S_\alpha(t-s)f(u(s)) ds,$$

while the ODE (2.1) can be written as

$$x(t) = (t/t_0)^{-n/\alpha}x(t_0) + \int_{t_0}^t (t/s)^{-n/\alpha} f(x(s)) ds.$$

The similarity arises when considering the decay rate of the operator norm of  $S_\alpha(t) : L^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , which is given (via the smoothing estimate (5.1)) by

$$\|S_\alpha(t)\|_{L^1 \rightarrow L^\infty} \leq Ct^{-n/\alpha}.$$

It is intriguing that this formal similarity manifests itself as an equivalence with respect to the blow-up property.

It would be interesting to know whether the technical hypothesis **(S)** can be removed in Theorem 2.1 and consequently in Theorem 5.2. This would yield a sharper and perhaps more natural result. However, recalling Remark 2.1 (i), we suspect that the stronger (but more easily verified) assumption that  $f(u)/u^p$  be non-decreasing near zero for some  $p > 1$ , will prove more useful in applications. Similarly we would like to better understand the rôle of the convexity assumption on  $f$ . It is this convexity that permits us to show, via Jensen's inequality, that blow-up of the ODE implies blow-up of the PDE. It remains open whether our blow-up equivalence result can be obtained without the convexity assumption and without assuming **(S)**.

Finally, we mention that the analysis of fractional semilinear parabolic equations such as (1.1) is intimately related to the study of symmetric  $\alpha$ -stable processes in probability theory. It seems reasonable to hope that our work might have parallels in that domain and provide new insights for such processes.

## Acknowledgements

RL was partially supported by the QJMAM Fund for Applied Mathematics. MS was partially supported by NCN grant 2017/26/D/ST1/00614.

## References

- [1] P. Baras and L. Cohen. Complete blow-up after  $T_{\max}$  for the solution of a semilinear heat equation. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 71 (1987), 142–174.
- [2] M. Birkner, J.A. López-Mimbela and A. Wakolbinger. Comparison results and steady states for the Fujita equation with fractional Laplacian. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 22 (2005), 83–97.
- [3] H. Fujita. On the blowing up of solutions of the Cauchy problem for  $u_t = \Delta u + u^{1+\alpha}$ . *J. Sci. Univ. Tokyo, Sect. I*, 13 (1966), 109–124.
- [4] H. Fujita. On some nonexistence and nonuniqueness theorems for nonlinear parabolic equations. *Proc. Symp. Pure Math.*, XVIII (1970), 105–113. *Nonlinear Functional Analysis, Part 1* (Ed. F.E. Browder). AMS.
- [5] H. Fujita and S. Watanabe. On the uniqueness and non-uniqueness of solutions of initial value problems for some quasi-linear parabolic equations. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 21 (1968), 631–652.

- [6] K. Hayakawa. On nonexistence of global solutions of some semilinear parabolic differential equations. *Proc. Japan Acad.*, 49 (1973), 503–505.
- [7] N. Hayashi, E. I. Kaikina and P. I. Naumkin. Asymptotics for fractional nonlinear heat equations. *J. London Math. Soc.* 72 (2005), 663688.
- [8] K. Ishige, T. Kawakami and K. Kobayashi. Asymptotics for a nonlinear integral equation with a generalized heat kernel. *J. Evol. Equ.*, 14 (2014), 749–777.
- [9] K. Kobayashi, T. Sirao and H. Tanaka. On the growing up problem for semilinear heat equations. *J. Math. Soc. Japan*, 29 (3) (1977), 407–425.
- [10] R. Laister, J.C. Robinson, M. Sierżęga and A. Vidal-López. A complete characterisation of local existence for semilinear parabolic equations in Lebesgue spaces. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 33 (6) (2016), 1519–1538.
- [11] K. Li. A characteristic of local existence for nonlinear fractional heat equations in Lebesgue spaces. *Comput. Math. Appl.*, 73 (2017), 653–665.
- [12] R. Meneses and A. Quaas. Fujita type exponent for fully nonlinear parabolic equations and existence results. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 376 (2011), 514–527.
- [13] C. Miao, B. Yuan and B. Zhang. Well-posedness of the Cauchy problem for the fractional power dissipative equations. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 68 (2008), 461484.
- [14] M. Nagasawa and T. Sirao. Probabilistic treatment of the blowing up of solutions for a nonlinear integral equation. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 139 (1969), 301–310.
- [15] P. Quittner and P. Souplet. *Superlinear Parabolic Problems. Blow-up, Global Existence and Steady States* (2nd Edition). Birkhäuser Advanced Texts, Basel, 2019.
- [16] J.C. Robinson and M. Sierżęga. Supersolutions for a class of semilinear heat equations. *Rev. Mat. Complut.*, 26 (2013), 341–360.
- [17] S. Sugitani. On nonexistence of global solutions for some nonlinear integral equations. *Osaka J. Math.*, 12 (1975), 45–51.