

ZERO COMPARISON THEOREM OF STURM-LIOUVILLE TYPE FOR HARMONIC HEAT FLOW

SHI-ZHONG DU

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we will prove a zero comparison theorem of Sturm-Liouville type for linearized harmonic heat flow in form of

$$\frac{\partial v}{\partial t} = v_{rr} + \frac{m-1}{r}v_r - \frac{b(r,t)}{r^2}v, \quad 0 < r < R, t \in (t_1, t_2),$$

where $b(r, t)$ is a bounded function satisfying

$$b(0, t) \equiv m - 1, \quad b_r(0, t) \equiv 0, \quad \forall t \in (t_1, t_2)$$

in case $v(0, t) \equiv 0, \forall t \in (t_1, t_2)$.

1. INTRODUCTION

A first zero comparison theorem was investigated by Nickel [10] in 1962, and revived by Matano [8] in 1982 and later by [7], [1], [2] for one dimensional parabolic equation

$$(1.1) \quad u_t = a(x, t)u_{xx} + b(x, t)u_x + c(x, t)u, \quad \forall x \in I, t \in (T_1, T_2),$$

where I is an finite or infinite open interval in \mathbb{R} . They proved that the counting number $\mathcal{Z}(u(\cdot, t))$ of the zero set is monotone nonincreasing in time, together with some other properties. Properties of these type were later developed by Filippas-Kohn [6], Chen-Poláčik [5] and Matano-merle [9] to

$$(1.2) \quad u_t = u_{rr} + \frac{n-1}{r}u_r + c(r, t)u, \quad \forall r \in I, t \in (T_1, T_2)$$

in studying of semilinear heat equation

$$(1.3) \quad u_t = \Delta u + f(u), \quad \forall x \in \Omega, t \in (T_1, T_2)$$

of Fujita type.

Date: Jun. 2020.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 35B05, Secondary 58E20.

Key words and phrases. Harmonic heat flow, Zero comparison.

[†]Research partially supported by STU Scientific Research Foundation for Talents (SRFT-NTF16006), and partially supported by “Natural Science Foundation of Guangdong Province” (2019A1515010605).

In this paper, we are concerning the equation of the form

$$(1.4) \quad \frac{\partial v}{\partial t} = v_{rr} + \frac{m-1}{r}v_r - \frac{b(r,t)}{r^2}v, \quad 0 < r < R, t \in (t_1, t_2),$$

where $b(r, t)$ is a bounded function satisfying

$$b(0, t) \equiv m-1, \quad b_r(0, t) \equiv 0, \quad \forall t \in (t_1, t_2)$$

in case $v(0, t) \equiv 0, \forall t \in (t_1, t_2)$. Moreover, the following boundary condition

$$(1.5) \quad v(r, t) \equiv 0 \text{ or } v(r, t) \neq 0, \quad \forall r = 0, R, \quad t \in (t_1, t_2)$$

is imposed. Equation (1.4) comes from the linearization procedure of

$$(1.6) \quad \theta_t = \theta_{rr} + \frac{m-1}{r}\theta_r - \frac{m-1}{r^2}\sin\theta\cos\theta, \quad \forall r \in I, t > 0,$$

which is satisfied by rotational symmetric solution $u \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^m, \mathbb{S}^m)$, $\mathbb{S}^m \subset \mathbb{R}^{m+1}$

$$(1.7) \quad u(x, t) = (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{m+1}) = \left(\frac{x}{|x|} \sin\theta(r, t), \cos\theta(r, t) \right)$$

of harmonic heat flow

$$(1.8) \quad \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = \Delta_g u - A_u(\nabla u, \nabla u),$$

where g is the induced metric of \mathbb{S}^m and $A_u : T_u\mathbb{S}^m \times T_u\mathbb{S}^m \rightarrow (T_u\mathbb{S}^m)^\perp$ is the second fundamental form of $\mathbb{S}^m \subset \mathbb{R}^{m+1}$ at u . The readers may refer to the work of Coron-Ghidaglia [4] for the calculations. (see also [3])

The main purpose of this paper is to prove the following zero comparison theorem for (1.4).

Theorem 1.1. *Let v be a classical solution of (1.4) on $[0, R] \times (t_1, t_2)$ which is not identical to zero and satisfies (1.5) for some $0 < R < +\infty$. We define*

$$\mathcal{Z}(v(\cdot, t)) \equiv \#\{r \in [0, R] \mid v(r, t) = 0\}$$

to be the zero number of $v(\cdot, t)$ counting multiplicity. Then

- (i) $\mathcal{Z}(v(\cdot, t)) < \infty$ for any $t_1 < t < t_2$,
- (ii) $\mathcal{Z}(v(\cdot, t))$ is a monotone non-increasing function in time t ,
- (iii) if $v(r_0, t_0) = v_r(r_0, t_0) = 0$ for some $0 \leq r_0 \leq R$ and $t_1 < t_0 < t_2$, then

$$\mathcal{Z}(v(\cdot, t)) > \mathcal{Z}(v(\cdot, s)) \quad \text{for any } t_1 < t < t_0 < s < t_2.$$

We will firstly present some crucial lemmas in Section 2 and then complete the proof of the main theorem in Section 3.

2. CRUCIAL LEMMAS

Comparing to equation in form of (1.1) or (1.2), there is an extra singular term $\frac{b(r,t)}{r^2}v$ in (1.4). However, due to our assumption on

$$b(0, t) \equiv m - 1, \quad b_r(0, t) \equiv 0, \quad \forall t \in (t_1, t_2),$$

the singular terms

$$\frac{m-1}{r}v_r - \frac{b(r,t)}{r^2}v$$

are regular in family of functions

$$v \in C^\infty([0, R]), \quad v(0) = 0.$$

So, we surely can prove a similar zero comparison theorem of Sturm-Liouville type. To show the main result, we need several crucial lemmas. The first one is the following.

Lemma 2.1. *Let v be a solution to (1.4) under boundary condition (1.5) for*

$$v(0, t) \equiv 0, \quad \forall t \in (t_1, t_2).$$

If v is not identical to zero, then

(i) for any $t_0 \in (t_1, t_2)$, there exist nonnegative interger k and a solution $\psi(r)$ of

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{cases} \psi_{rr} + \frac{m-1}{r}\psi_r - \frac{m-1}{r^2}\psi - \frac{1}{2}r\psi_r + \frac{k}{2}\psi = 0, & \forall r > 0 \\ \psi(0) = 0, \psi_r(0) \neq 0, \end{cases}$$

such that $\varepsilon^{-k}v(\varepsilon r, t_0 - \varepsilon^2)$ tends to $\psi(r)$ local uniformly in $C_{loc}^{2+\alpha}([0, +\infty))$, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$, and

(ii) for any $t_0 \in (t_1, t_2)$ and $r_0 \neq 0$, there exist nonnegative interger k and a solution $\psi(r)$ of

$$(2.2) \quad \begin{cases} \psi_{rr} - \frac{1}{2}r\psi_r + \frac{k}{2}\psi = 0, & \forall r > 0 \\ \psi(0) = 0, \psi_r(0) \neq 0, \end{cases}$$

such that $\varepsilon^{-k}v(r_0 + \varepsilon r, t_0 - \varepsilon^2)$ tends to $\psi(r)$ local uniformly in $C_{loc}^{2+\alpha}([0, +\infty))$, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$.

Proof. Away from origin, $\frac{b(r,t)}{r^2}$ is a bounded function. So, part (ii) is inferred from part (ii) of Lemma 2.5 in [5]. We remain to show that part (i) holds. In fact, by Lemma 2.2 below, there exists a nonnegative integer k , such that for some nonnegative integers α_0 and β_0 satisfying

$$\alpha_0 + 2\beta_0 = k,$$

the following condition

$$\frac{\partial^{\alpha_0+\beta_0}}{\partial^{\alpha_0} r \partial^{\beta_0} t} v(0, t_0) \neq 0, \quad \frac{\partial^{\alpha+\beta}}{\partial^{\alpha} r \partial^{\beta} t} v(0, t_0) = 0$$

holds for all nonnegative integers α, β fulfilling $\alpha + 2\beta < k$.

Setting

$$u(\varepsilon, r) \equiv v(\varepsilon r, t_0 - \varepsilon^2),$$

by Taylor's expansion, we have

$$\begin{aligned} u(\varepsilon, r) &= \sum_{\alpha+2\beta=k} \frac{C_k^\alpha (-2)^\beta \beta! \frac{\partial^{\alpha+\beta}}{\partial r^\alpha \partial t^\beta} v(0, t_0)}{k!} r^\alpha \varepsilon^k \\ &\quad + \sum_{\alpha+\beta+\gamma=k+1} \frac{C_k^\alpha (-2)^\beta}{k!} r^\alpha \frac{\partial^\gamma}{\partial \varepsilon^\gamma} (\varepsilon^\beta) \int_0^\varepsilon (\varepsilon - \tau)^k \frac{\partial^{\alpha+\beta}}{\partial r^\alpha \partial t^\beta} v(\tau r, t_0 - \tau^2) d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

When we denote

$$\eta(r, \varepsilon) \equiv \varepsilon^{-k} v(\varepsilon r, t_0 - \varepsilon^2),$$

there holds

$$\left(\left| \frac{\partial^\beta \eta}{\partial \varepsilon^\beta} \right| + \left| \frac{\partial^\beta \eta}{\partial r^\beta} \right| \right) (r, \varepsilon) \leq C_\beta R^{k+1+\beta}, \quad \forall r \in (0, R], \varepsilon \in (0, 1]$$

for any $\beta \geq 0$, as long as $R \geq 1$. Moreover,

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} |\eta(r, \varepsilon)| \neq 0.$$

Therefore, if one writes v into self-similar variables

$$V(r, s) \equiv e^{\frac{k}{2}s} v(e^{-\frac{s}{2}} r, t_0 - e^{-s}),$$

there hold

$$(2.3) \quad \left(\left| \frac{\partial^\beta V}{\partial s^\beta} \right| + \left| \frac{\partial^\beta V}{\partial r^\beta} \right| \right) (r, \varepsilon) \leq C_\beta R^{k+\beta}, \quad \forall r \in (0, R], s \geq -\log t_0$$

and

$$(2.4) \quad \lim_{s \rightarrow +\infty} V(r, s) \neq 0.$$

Furthermore, V satisfies

$$(2.5) \quad V_s - \left(V_{rr} + \frac{m-1}{r} V_r \right) + \frac{1}{2} r V_r - \frac{k}{2} V = -\frac{B(r, s)}{r^2} V,$$

where

$$B(r, s) \equiv b(e^{-\frac{s}{2}} r, t_0 - e^{-s}).$$

So, there exists a limiting function $V_\infty(r, s)$, $r \in [0, \infty)$, $s \geq 0$ which is not identical to zero, such that

$$V(r, s+l) \rightarrow V_\infty(r, s) \quad \text{uniformly in } C_{loc}^{2+\alpha}([0, \infty) \times [0, +\infty))$$

holds as $l \rightarrow +\infty$. In order to show that $V_\infty(r, s)$ equals to a solution ψ of (2.1), we need the following decaying estimation:

For any $R \geq 1$, let's take a cutoff function $\phi \in C^\infty([0, 2R])$, such that

$$\phi(r) = \begin{cases} 1, & r \in [0, R/2], \\ 0, & r > R \end{cases}$$

and

$$0 \leq \phi(r) \leq 1, \quad |\phi'(r)| + |\phi''(r)| \leq 1, \quad \forall r \geq 0.$$

Setting

$$\varphi(r, s) = \phi(e^{-\frac{s}{2}}r)$$

for $0 \leq r \leq R_s \equiv Re^{\frac{s}{2}}R$, we have

$$(2.6) \quad \begin{aligned} |\varphi_r|(r, s) &\leq e^{-\frac{s}{2}}\chi_{[R_s/2, R_s]}, & |\varphi_{rr}|(r, s) &\leq e^{-s}\chi_{[R_s/2, R_s]}, \\ |\varphi_s|(r, s) &\leq \chi_{[R_s/2, R_s]}, & \forall r \in [0, R_s], s &\geq -\log t_0. \end{aligned}$$

Multiplying (2.5) by $\rho r^{m-1}V_s\varphi^2$, $\rho(r) \equiv e^{-\frac{r^2}{4}}$ and integrating over $[0, R_s]$, one gets

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{R_s} \rho r^{m-1} V_s^2 \varphi^2 &= - \int_0^{R_s} \rho V_r (V_s r^{m-1} \varphi^2)_r + (m-1) \int_0^{R_s} \rho r^{m-1} V_r V_s \varphi^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{k}{2} \int_0^{R_s} \rho r^{m-1} V V_s \varphi^2 - \int_0^{R_s} \rho r^{m-3} B(r, s) V V_s \varphi^2 \end{aligned}$$

after integration by parts. Using (2.6) and

$$\left| \frac{\partial B}{\partial s} \right| = \left| -\frac{1}{2} e^{-\frac{s}{2}} r b_r + e^{-s} b_t \right| \leq C e^{-\frac{s}{2}},$$

we have

$$(2.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{d}{ds} \int_0^{R_s} \rho r^{m-1} \left(\frac{1}{2} V_r^2 - \frac{k}{4} V^2 + \frac{B(r, s)}{2r^2} V^2 \right) \varphi^2 &= - \int_0^{R_s} \rho r^{m-1} V_s^2 \varphi^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{R_s} \rho r^{m-3} \frac{\partial B}{\partial s} V^2 \varphi^2 - 2 \int_0^{R_s} \rho r^{m-1} V_r V_s \varphi \varphi_r \\ &\quad + 2 \int_0^{R_s} \rho r^{m-1} \left(\frac{1}{2} V_r^2 - \frac{k}{4} V^2 + \frac{B(r, s)}{2r^2} V^2 \right) \varphi \varphi_s \\ &\leq - \int_0^{R_s} \rho r^{m-1} V_s^2 \varphi^2 + C e^{-\frac{s}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Noting that

$$\int_0^{R_s} \rho r^{m-1} \left(\frac{1}{2} V_r^2 - \frac{k}{4} V^2 + \frac{B(r, s)}{2r^2} V^2 \right) \varphi^2$$

is bounded from below by (2.3), it's infer from (2.7) that

$$(2.8) \quad \int_{-\log t_0}^{\infty} \int_0^R \rho r^{m-1} V_s^2 < +\infty$$

for any $R > 0$. Consequently,

$$\int_0^\infty \int_0^R \rho r^{m-1} |\partial_s V_\infty|^2 \leq \liminf_{l \rightarrow +\infty} \int_l^\infty \int_0^R \rho r^{m-1} V_s^2 = 0,$$

and thus V_∞ is a steady state of (2.5). Because of

$$B(r, s) \rightarrow b(0, t_0) = m - 1 \quad \text{as } s \rightarrow +\infty,$$

to show that V_∞ fulfils (2.1), we need only to verify that

$$(2.9) \quad V'_\infty(0) \neq 0.$$

Suppose on the contrary, then

$$V_\infty(0) = V'_\infty(0) = 0.$$

Integrating (2.1) over $[0, R]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} V'_\infty(R) &= -(m-1) \int_0^R \frac{V'_\infty(r)}{r} dt + (m-1) \int_0^R \frac{V_\infty(r)}{r^2} dr \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^R r V'_\infty(r) dr + \frac{k}{2} \int_0^R V_\infty(r) dr \\ &= -(m-1) \frac{V_\infty(R)}{R} + \frac{1}{2} R V_\infty(R) + \frac{k-1}{2} \int_0^R V_\infty(r) dr. \end{aligned}$$

So,

$$\left(r^{m-1} V_\infty(r) \right)' - \frac{1}{2} r^m V_\infty(r) - \frac{k-1}{2} r^{m-1} \int_0^r V_\infty(r') dr' = 0$$

for all $r > 0$. Integrating again over $[0, R]$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} R^{m-1} V_\infty(R) &= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^R r^m V_\infty(r) dr + \frac{k-1}{2} \int_0^R r^{m-1} \int_0^r V_\infty(r') dr' dr \\ (2.10) \quad &= \int_0^R \left(\frac{1}{2} r^m + \frac{k-1}{2m} (R^m - r^m) \right) V_\infty(r) dr. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we show that $V_\infty \equiv 0$. If not, letting any $R_0 \in \left(0, \sqrt{\frac{m}{m+k-1}} \right]$ such that

$$|V_\infty(R_0)| = \max_{r \in [0, R_0]} |V_\infty(r)|,$$

it's deduced from (2.10) that

$$\begin{aligned} R_0^{m-1} |V_\infty(R_0)| &\leq |V_\infty(R_0)| \int_0^{R_0} \left| \frac{1}{2} r^m + \frac{k-1}{2m} (R_0^m - r^m) \right| dr \\ &\leq \frac{m+k-1}{2m} R_0^{m+1} |V_\infty(R_0)| \leq \frac{1}{2} R_0^{m-1} |V_\infty(R_0)|. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, one can conclude that $V_\infty(r) \equiv 0$ in $[0, \sqrt{\frac{m}{m+k-1}}]$. And thus V_∞ must be identical to zero on $[0, +\infty)$ by uniqueness of ordinary differential equation, which is contradicting with the non-triviality of V_∞ mentioned above. So, (2.9) holds and the lemma was now proven. \square

We can now complete the proof of Lemma 2.1 by showing:

Lemma 2.2. *Under assumptions of Lemma 2.1, the solution to (1.4) can not vanish at $(0, t_0)$ with infinitely many order.*

Proof. At first, after replacing v by $r\tilde{v}$, (1.4) changes to

$$(2.11) \quad \tilde{v}_t - \tilde{v}_{rr} - \frac{m+1}{r}\tilde{v}_r = -\frac{b(r,t) - (m-1)}{r^2}\tilde{v}.$$

Suppose that \tilde{v} is not identical to zero, then there exist $\delta_0 > 0$ and $\delta_0 < R_0 < R - \delta_0$, such that

$$|\tilde{v}(r,t)| \geq \delta_0, \quad \forall R_0 - \delta_0 \leq r \leq R_0 + \delta_0, t_0 - \delta_0 < t < t_0 + \delta_0.$$

Taking a cut-off function $\zeta \in C^\infty([0, +\infty))$ such that

$$\zeta(r) = \begin{cases} 1, & 0 < r < R_0 - \delta, \\ 0, & r > R_0 + \delta \end{cases}$$

and $0 < \zeta(r) < 1, \forall r \in (R_0 - \delta, R_0 + \delta)$, we have the function $\bar{v}(r,t) \equiv \zeta\tilde{v}(r,t) + 1 - \zeta(r)$ satisfies that

$$(2.12) \quad \bar{v}_t = \bar{v}_{rr} + \frac{m+1}{r}\bar{v}_r - \bar{b}(r,t)\bar{v},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{b}(r,t) = & \frac{b(r,t) - (m-1)}{r^2} + \bar{v}^{-1} \left\{ \frac{b(r,t) - (m-1)}{r^2}(\zeta - 1) \right. \\ & \left. + 2\zeta_r\tilde{v}_r + \zeta_{rr}\tilde{v} + \frac{m-1}{r}\zeta_r\tilde{v} - \zeta_{rr} - \frac{m-1}{r}\zeta_r \right\} \end{aligned}$$

is a bounded function on $[0, +\infty) \times (t_0 - \delta_0, t_0 + \delta_0)$

Re-scaling

$$w(r,s) = \bar{v}(e^{-\frac{s}{2}}r, t_0 - e^{-s}),$$

we have w satisfies that

$$(2.13) \quad w_s + Lw = -B(r,s)w,$$

where

$$Lw \equiv -w_{rr} - \frac{m+1}{r}w_r + \frac{1}{2}rw_r = -(\rho r^{m+1})^{-1} \frac{d}{dr}(\rho r^{m+1}w_r)$$

and

$$B(r, s) = e^{-s} \bar{b}(e^{-\frac{s}{2}} r, t_0 - e^{-s}).$$

Considering the eigenvalue problem of unbounded self-adjoint operator L on Hilbert space

$$L_\rho^2([0, +\infty)) \equiv \left\{ w \in L_{loc}^2((0, +\infty)) \mid \int_0^\infty \rho(r) r^{m+1} w^2(r) dr < \infty \right\}$$

with $\rho(r) \equiv e^{-\frac{r^2}{4}}$ and inner product

$$\langle u, v \rangle_{L_\rho^2([0, +\infty))} \equiv \int_0^\infty \rho(r) r^{m+1} u(r) v(r) dr,$$

it's not hard to show that the gaps of consecutive eigenvalues are bounded from below by $1/2$ (see for example [12]). Noting also that $B(\cdot, s) \rightarrow 0$ as $s \rightarrow +\infty$, the result in [1] (Lemma 5, Page 435) guarantees the decaying rate of w can not be faster than exponential, and hence the conclusion of the lemma holds true. \square

Considering the linear parabolic equation

$$(2.14) \quad v_t = a(x, t)v_{xx} + b(x, t)v_x + c(x, t)v, \quad x \in (a, b), t \in (t_0, t_1)$$

with bounded coefficients, and imposing the boundary condition

$$(2.15) \quad v(a) \equiv 0 \text{ or } \neq 0, \quad v(b) \equiv 0 \text{ or } \neq 0, \quad \forall t \in (t_0, t_1),$$

Angenent has proven in [2] (see also Lemma 2.3 in [5]) the following lemma:

Lemma 2.3. *Letting v be a classical solution to (2.14) and (2.15), $\mathcal{Z}(v(\cdot, t))$ is finite and monotone non-increasing for any $t \in (t_0, t_1)$. Moreover, if $v_x(x_0, t^*) = 0$ at $(x_0, t^*) \in (a, b) \times (t_0, t_1)$, we have*

$$(2.16) \quad \mathcal{Z}(v(\cdot, t)) < \mathcal{Z}(v(\cdot, s)), \quad \forall t_0 < s < t^* < t < t_1.$$

As a corollary of Lemam 2.1 and 2.3, we obtain a parallel version to Lemma 2.6 in [5]:

Lemma 2.4. *Under the assumptions in Theorem 1.1. For any $t_1 < t_0 < t_2$, there exists a small $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that*

- (i) $\mathcal{Z}(v(\cdot, t)) < \infty$ for any $t \in (t_0 - \varepsilon_0, t_0)$,
- (ii) $v(\cdot, t)$ has only simple zeros for each $t \in (t_0 - \varepsilon_0, t_0)$,
- (iii) $\mathcal{Z}(v(\cdot, t))$ is constant as t varies in $(t_0 - \varepsilon_0, t_0)$.

Proof. By Lemma 2.1, $v(\cdot, t)$ has only simple zero at origin for $t \in (t_0 - \varepsilon_0, t_0)$ as long as ε_0 is chosen to be small. Being away from the origin, (1.4) becomes a linear heat equation with bounded coefficients. So, one can utilize Lemma 2.3 to yield part (i). Part (ii) is a consequence of part (i) and Hopf's boundary lemma for non-degenerate parabolic equation. Finally, part (iii) follows from (i) and (ii).

□

Secondly, we can prove a similar version of Lemma 2.7 in [5] without difficulty:

Lemma 2.5. *Under the assumptions in Theorem 1.1, for each $t_0 \in (t_1, t_2)$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ given in Lemma 2.4, we write*

$$m + 1 \equiv \lim_{t \uparrow t_0} \mathcal{Z}(v(\cdot, t)).$$

Then the followings hold true:

(i) *There are $m + 1$ continuous functions*

$$\zeta_i : (t_0 - \varepsilon_0, t_0) \rightarrow [0, 1] \quad (0 \leq i \leq m)$$

such that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\equiv \zeta_0(t) < \zeta_1(t) < \cdots < \zeta_{m-1}(t) < \zeta_m(t), \\ \{r \in [0, 1] \mid v(r, t) = 0\} &= \{\zeta_i(t) \mid 0 \leq i \leq m\}. \end{aligned}$$

(ii) *The limit $\zeta_i(t_0) \equiv \lim_{t \uparrow t_0} \zeta_i(t)$ exists for every $0 \leq i \leq m$.*

(iii) *$\mathcal{Z}(v(\cdot, t_0)) < \infty$; more precisely,*

$$\{r \in [0, 1] \mid v(r, t_0) = 0\} = \{\zeta_i(t_0) \mid 0 \leq i \leq m\}.$$

(iv) *$v(\cdot, t_0)$ has only simple zeros if and only if*

$$0 = \zeta_0(t_0) < \zeta_1(t_0) < \cdots < \zeta_m(t_0).$$

Proof. Part (i) is clear a consequence of Lemma 2.4 and implicit function theorem. Suppose that (ii) is not true for some $0 < i \leq m$, then

$$r_- \equiv \liminf_{t \uparrow t_0} \zeta_i(t) < r_+ \equiv \limsup_{t \uparrow t_0} \zeta_i(t).$$

Taking some $r_0 \in (r_-, r_+)$, by part (ii) of Lemma 2.1, there exist nonnegative integer k and a solution $\psi(r)$ of (2.3), such that $\varepsilon^{-k}v(r_0 + \varepsilon r, t_0 - \varepsilon^2)$ tends to $\psi(r)$ local uniformly as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$. Now, letting $r_1 > 0$ such that $\psi(r_1) \neq 0$, we have $v(r, t) \neq 0$ for any $r = r_0 + r_1 \sqrt{t_0 - t}$, $t \in (t_0 - \varepsilon_0, t_0)$ and small positive number ε_0 . However, by definition of r_- and r_+ , the nodal set of v intersects with the curve $r = r_0 + r_1 \sqrt{t_0 - t}$, $t \in (t_0 - \varepsilon_0, t_0)$ infinitely many times. Contradiction holds and thus gives the proof of part (ii).

To show the part (iii) we claim that if $\zeta_i(t_0) < \zeta_{i+1}(t_0)$ for some $0 \leq i \leq m - 1$, then $v(r, t_0) \neq 0$ for $\zeta_i(t_0) < r < \zeta_{i+1}(t_0)$. In fact, noting that $v(r, t) = 0$ for $r = \zeta_i(t), \zeta_{i+1}(t)$ and $t \in (t_0 - \varepsilon_0, t_0]$, the claim follows from the strong maximum principle of parabolic equation. So part (iii) holds true.

Finally, the only if part of (iv) is a corollary of differential intermediate value theorem, while the if part follows from Hopf's boundary lemma for parabolic

equation. The proof of Lemma 2.5 is completed. \square

Finally, a minor change of Lemma 2.8 in [5] yields the following lemma.

Lemma 2.6. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.1 and let $t_1 < T_1 < T_2 < t_2$.*

(i) *If there are $m + 1$ points $0 = r_0 < r_1 < \dots < r_m \leq R$ such that*

$$v(r_i, T_2)v(r_{i+1}, T_2) < 0 \quad (1 \leq i \leq m),$$

then there also exist $m + 1$ points $0 = r'_0 < r'_1 < \dots < r'_m \leq R$ such that

$$v(r'_i, T_1)v(r'_{i+1}, T_1) < 0 \quad (1 \leq i \leq m).$$

(ii) *If $v(\cdot, T_2)$ has only simple zeros and $\mathcal{Z}(v(\cdot, T_2)) = m + 1$, then there are*

$$0 = \zeta_0 < \zeta_1 < \dots < \zeta_{m-1} < \zeta_m \leq R$$

such that $v(\zeta_i, T_1) = 0$. In particular, $\mathcal{Z}(v(\cdot, T_1)) \geq \mathcal{Z}(v(\cdot, T_2))$.

Proof. Letting $\Omega \subset [0, R] \times (t_1, t_2)$ be a connected component of support of v containing $(\frac{r_i+r_{i+1}}{2}, T_2)$, we claim first that for any $t \in (t_1, T_2)$, the line $[0, R] \times \{t\}$ intersects with Ω . If not, then there exists $t_* \in (t_1, T_2)$, such that Ω lies above the line $(\frac{r_i+r_{i+1}}{2}, t_*)$. Then, Ω forms a paraboloid type domain and v vanishes on its boundary. By strong maximum principle, we conclude that $v \equiv 0$ inside Ω , which contradicts with the non-triviality of v . So, part (i) holds and part (ii) follows from intermediate value theorem. \square

3. COMPLETE THE PROOF OF MAIN THEOREM

Now, we can complete the proof of Theorem 1.1 as follows.

Proof of Theorem 1.1: In case $v(0, t) \neq 0, \forall t \in (t_1, t_2)$, all zeros of v located away from $r = 0$, and hence conclusion follows from a slightly variant version of Lemma 2.2 in [1] (or Lemma 2.3 in [5]) since no singular term presence for $r \geq r_0 > 0$. In case $v(0, t) \equiv 0, \forall t \in (t_1, t_2)$, if $v_r(0, t_0)$ is also vanishing, it yields from Lemma 2.1 that there exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, such that $r = 0$ is only simple root of $v(\cdot, t)$ for $t \in (t_0 - \varepsilon_0, t_0)$. So, part (i) of theorem 1.1 was shown in Lemma 2.5 (iii). To show part (ii), fixing any $t_1 < T_1 < T_2 < t_2$, one has $\mathcal{Z}(v(\cdot, s)) \geq \mathcal{Z}(v(\cdot, T_2))$ and the zeros of $v(\cdot, s)$ are all simple for s closing sufficiently to T_2 from below by Lemma 2.4 and 2.7'. Combining with Lemma 2.6, we conclude that $\mathcal{Z}(v(\cdot, T_1)) \geq \mathcal{Z}(v(\cdot, s))$ and obtain part (ii) of Theorem 1.1. Finally, for arbitrary $t_1 < T_1 < T_0 < T_2 < t_2$, we want to show that $v(\cdot, T_0)$ has only simple zeros provided $\mathcal{Z}(v(\cdot, T_1)) = \mathcal{Z}(v(\cdot, T_2)) = m + 1$. Actually, by Lemma 2.6', if

one takes s to be closing sufficiently to T_2 from below, the zeros of $v(\cdot, s)$ are all simple. Moreover, $\mathcal{Z}(v(\cdot, s)) = m + 1$ by part (ii) of Theorem 1.1. Thus, it's inferred from Lemma 2.6 (ii) that there exist

$$0 = \zeta_0 < \zeta_1 < \cdots < \zeta_{m-1} < \zeta_m = 1$$

such that $v(\zeta_i, T_0) = 0$. So, all zeros of $v(\cdot, T_0)$ are simple and the proofs of Theorem 1.1 were completed. \square

It's notable to remark that when the end point $r = R$ is replaced by a moving free boundary $r = R(t)$, conclusion of Theorem 1.1 still holds true. One need only using the transformation

$$\bar{v}(r, t) = v(R^{-1}(t)r, t).$$

As a consequence of the theorem, we also have the following corollary:

Corollary 3.1. *Let v be a classical solution of (1.4) on $[0, R] \times (t_1, t_2)$ or on $[0, +\infty) \times (t_1, t_2)$, which satisfies (1.5) when $0 < R < +\infty$. Suppose that for some $t_1 < t_* < t^* < t_2$ and $r^* \in [0, R]$ (or $r^* \in [0, +\infty)$ respectively), there holds*

$$(3.1) \quad v_r(r^*, t) = v(r^*, t) = 0 \quad \forall t \in [t_*, t^*],$$

then $v(r, t) \equiv 0$.

Proof. If v satisfies (1.5) for $0 < R < +\infty$, conclusion follows from Lemma 2.1 since when v not identical to zero, $z(v(\cdot, t))$ can drop only finitely many zeros and hence contradict with (3.1). In case v is a solution of (1.4) on $[0, +\infty) \times (t_1, t_2)$, a same reason can be applied to exclude the possibility of $|v|(r, t) > 0$ when (r, t) lies near some $(r_0, t_0) \in (r^*, +\infty) \times (t_*, t^*)$. In fact, if not, then v must be identical to zero in $[0, r_0) \times (t_*, t^*)$ by Theorem 1.1. This contradicts with our assumption $|v|(r, t) > 0$ near (r_0, t_0) . Therefore, $v(r, t) \equiv 0$ for $r \geq 0, t \in (t_*, t^*)$. Hence, it must be also identical to zero by Lemma 2.2, since v vanishes at some point $(0, t_0)$ with infinitely order. The proof was done. \square

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to express his deepest gratitude to Professors Kai-Seng Chou and Xu-Jia Wang for their constant encouragements and warm-hearted helps.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Angenent, *The Morse-Smale property for a semi-linear parabolic equation*, J. Diff. Equ., **62** (1986), 427-442.
- [2] S. Angenent, *The zero set of a solution of a parabolic equation*, J. reine angew. Math., **390** (1988), 79-96.
- [3] K.C. Chang, W.Y. Ding and R.G. Ye, *Finite time blow-up of the heat flow of harmonic maps from surfaces*, J. Differential Geometry, **36** (1992), 507-515.
- [4] J.M. Coron and J.M. Ghidaglia, *Explosion en temps fini pour le flot des applications harmoniques*, C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris Ser. I, **308** (1989), 339-344.
- [5] X.Y. Chen and P. Poláčik, *Asymptotic periodicity of positive solutions of reaction diffusion equations on a ball*, J. Reine Angew. Math., **472** (1996), 17-51.
- [6] S. Filippas and R.V. Kohn, *Refined asymptotics for the blowup of $u_t - \Delta u = u^p$* , Comm. Pure Appl. Math., **45** (1992), 821-869.
- [7] D. Henry, *Some infinite dimensional Morse Smale systems defined by parabolic differential equations*, Journal of Differential Equations, **59** (1985), 165-205.
- [8] H. Matano, *Non increase of the lapnumber of a solution for a one dimensional semilinear parabolic equation*, J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo IA Math., **29** (1982), 401-441.
- [9] H. Matano and F. Merle, *On nonexistence of type II blowup for a supercritical nonlinear heat equation*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., **57** (2004), 1494-1541.
- [10] K. Nickel, *Gestaltaussagen über Lösungen parabolischer Differentialgleichungen*, J. rein angew. Math., **211** (1962), 78-94.
- [11] P. Raphaël and R. Seiwid, *Stable blowup dynamics for the 1-Corotational energy critical harmonic heat flow*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., **66** (2013), 414-480.
- [12] G. Szegő, *Orthogonal Polynomials*, A.M.S. Colloquium Publications, Vol. XXIII, 1967.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SHANTOU UNIVERSITY, SHANTOU, 51506, P. R. CHINA.
E-mail address: szdu@stu.edu.cn