arXiv:2201.07957v1 [math.AP] 20 Jan 2022

Vacuum and singularity formation for compressible Euler equations with time-dependent damping *

Ying Sui [a†] Weiqiang Wang [b‡] Huimin Yu [c§]

[a,c] School of Mathematics and Statistics, Shandong Normal University, Jinan 250014, China.

[b] Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China.

Abstract: In this paper, vacuum and singularity formation are considered for compressible Euler equations with time-dependent damping. For $1 < \gamma \leq 3$, by constructing some new control functions ingeniously, we obtain the lower bounds estimates on density for arbitrary classical solutions. Basing on these lower estimates, we succeed in proving the singular formation theorem for all λ, which was open in [1] for some cases. Moreover, the singularity formation of the compressible Euler equations when $\gamma = 3$ is investigated, too.

Keywords: Singularity formation, compressible Euler equations, time-dependent damping, shock wave.

1 Introduction

We consider the one dimensional compressible Euler equations with time-dependent damping in Lagrangian coordinates:

$$\begin{cases} \tau_t - u_x = 0, \\ u_t + p_x = -\dfrac{\alpha}{(1+t)^\lambda} u, \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

with the initial data

$$\tau(x,0) = \tau_0(x),\ u(x,0) = u_0(x), \tag{1.2}$$

where $\tau(x,t)$ and $u(x,t)$ are the specific volume and velocity of the flow respectively at location $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and time $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$. For simplicity, we assume the gas is deal polytropic and the gas pressure

$$p = K\tau^{-\gamma}, \quad \text{for } K > 0 \text{ and } \gamma > 1, \tag{1.3}$$

where γ is called adiabatic index. Besides, $\alpha \geq 0,\ \lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ are two constants, and the term $-\frac{\alpha}{(1+t)^\lambda} u$ is the so-called damping effect on the fluid when $\alpha > 0$.

*This work is supported in part by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 11671237)

†Email: suiying4320@163.com

‡Email: wangweiqiang@amss.ac.cn

§Corresponding author, Email: hmyu@sdnu.edu.cn

For $\alpha = 0$, the system (1.1) is the classical compressible Euler equation, which are the most basic model of hyperbolic conservation law equations and can be used to describe many physical phenomena. It is well known that, due to nonlinearity, classical solutions of hyperbolic conservation laws, may form gradient blowup in finite time, even when initial data is smooth and small. The study on breakdown of classical solutions for hyperbolic conservation laws has a long history [2]. One can trace back to Stokes in [3] for a breakdown example for some scalar equation. In 1964, Lax [4] studied the formation of singularities in finite time for 2×2 general systems of strictly hyperbolic conservation laws when initial data is small and contains some compression, then followed by John, Li and Liu in [5–7] and etc., for more general systems of conservation laws. For $\alpha > 0$, the system (1.1) can be used to describe the flow of fluids through porous media. However, the time-dependent damping makes some fantastic variety of the dynamic system. Therefore, the study on this problem is full of challenges and quite incomplete. Due to the practicability and strong relation with Euler equation, it has attracted extensive attention of many scholars in recent years, see [8–17] for example.

In this paper, we study the vacuum and singularity formation of compressible Euler equations with time-dependent damping. In particular, we extend the results and give the proofs of some unsolved cases in [1]. That is, we consider the cases of $\lambda \in \left(\min\{1, \frac{\alpha(\gamma-1)}{\gamma-3}\}, \max\{1, \frac{\alpha(\gamma-1)}{\gamma-3}\}\right)$ when $\gamma > 3$ and $\lambda < \frac{\alpha(\gamma-1)}{\gamma-3}$ when $1 < \gamma < 3$, which are all open in [1]. We also investigate the case of $\gamma = 3$ and give the corresponding breakdown results. Here, we still use the idea of constructing decoupled Riccati type equations

$$y' = a_0 - a_2 y^2$$

for smooth solutions of compressible Euler equations. The difference between the two papers is that a_0 can change sign in this paper, while a_0 must be positive or negative in [1]. Exactly speaking, for the unsolved case in [1], there exists a $t_0 > 0$ such that $a_0 < 0$ for $t > t_0$, while $a_0 > 0$ for $0 < t < t_0$. To overcome this difficulty, we firstly show the time-dependent lower bound on density for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ by constructing some new functions. The lower bound on density implies that a_0 is uniformly bounded for $0 < t < t_0$. Then using the uniform bound on a_0, we succeed in obtaining the singularity formation on the derivatives of velocity or specific volume if the initial compression reaches a certain level. Especially, our main results indicate that, for $1 < \gamma \leq 3$, vacuum never occurs at any finite time provided the initial data away from vacuum, while the singularity must appear once the initial compression reaches a certain level, even for the over-damping case $\lambda < 0$.

2 The main Theorems

For convenience, let's first introduce some variables and notations which have been used in [1]. Denote

$$\phi := \int_\tau^\infty c(\tau) d\tau = \frac{2\sqrt{K\gamma}}{\gamma - 1} \tau^{-\frac{\gamma-1}{2}} > 0, \tag{2.1}$$

where the nonlinear Lagrangian sound speed c is defined as

$$c := \sqrt{-p_\tau} = \sqrt{K\gamma} \tau^{-\frac{\gamma+1}{2}}. \tag{2.2}$$

It follows from (2.1)-(2.2) that

$$\tau = K_\tau \phi^{-\frac{2}{\gamma-1}}, \quad p = K_p \phi^{\frac{2\gamma}{\gamma-1}}, \quad c = K_c \phi^{\frac{\gamma+1}{\gamma-1}},$$

where K_τ, K_p and K_c are positive constants given by

$$K_\tau := \left(\frac{2\sqrt{K\gamma}}{\gamma-1}\right)^{\frac{2}{\gamma-1}}, \quad K_p := KK^{-\gamma}, \quad \text{and} \quad K_c := \sqrt{K\gamma} K_\tau^{-\frac{\gamma+1}{2}}.$$

A direct calculation shows that the system (1.1) has two characteristic speeds

$$\lambda_1 = -\lambda_2 = c.$$

The forward and backward characteristic lines are described by

$$\frac{dx_+(t)}{dt} = c \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{dx_-(t)}{dt} = -c,$$

and we denote the corresponding directional derivatives along them by

$$\prime = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + c\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \quad \text{and} \quad \backprime = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} - c\frac{\partial}{\partial x}$$

respectively. Furthermore, we denote the Riemann invariants by

$$w := u + \phi \quad \text{and} \quad z := u - \phi. \tag{2.3}$$

By a direct calculation, we have

$$w' = -\frac{\alpha}{2(1+t)^\lambda}(z+w), \qquad z^\backprime = -\frac{\alpha}{2(1+t)^\lambda}(z+w). \tag{2.4}$$

In [1], the authors have proved the following theorems.

Theorem 2.1 ([1, Theorem 3.2]). *Suppose the initial data $(\tau_0, u_0)(x) \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$ and there exists a positive constant C_0 such that*

$$\|u_0(x)\|_{C^1} \le C_0, \ \|\tau_0(x)\|_{C^1} \le C_0, \ C_0^{-1} < \tau_0(x). \tag{2.5}$$

Let $1 < \gamma < 3$, $\lambda \ge \frac{\alpha(\gamma-1)}{\gamma-3}$ and (τ, u) is a C^1 solution of (1.1)-(1.2). Assume there exists one point x_0 such that

$$u_x(x_0,0) + \phi_x(x_0,0) < -\frac{\alpha(\gamma-1)}{K_c(3-\gamma)}(\phi(x_0,0))^{\frac{-2}{\gamma-1}} \tag{2.6}$$

or

$$u_x(x_0,0) - \phi_x(x_0,0) < -\frac{\alpha(\gamma-1)}{K_c(3-\gamma)}(\phi(x_0,0))^{\frac{-2}{\gamma-1}}. \tag{2.7}$$

Then $\|(\tau_x, u_x)\|_{L^\infty}$ must blow up in finite time.

Theorem 2.2 ([1, Theorem 3.1]). *Suppose the initial data* $(\tau_0, u_0)(x) \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$ *and there exists a positive constant* C_0 *such that*

$$|u_0(x)| \le C_0, \quad C_0^{-1} < \tau_0(x). \tag{2.8}$$

Let $\gamma > 3, \lambda < \min\{1, \frac{\alpha(\gamma-1)}{\gamma-3}\}$ *or* $\lambda > \max\{1, \frac{\alpha(\gamma-1)}{\gamma-3}\}$, *and* (τ, u) *is a* C^1 *solution of* (1.1)-(1.2). *Assume there exists one point* x_0 *such that*

$$u_x(x_0,0) + \phi_x(x_0,0) < K_1(\phi(x_0,0))^{-\frac{2}{\gamma-1}} - K_2(\phi(x_0,0))^{-\frac{\gamma+1}{2(\gamma-1)}} \tag{2.9}$$

or

$$u_x(x_0,0) - \phi_x(x_0,0) < K_1(\phi(x_0,0))^{-\frac{2}{\gamma-1}} - K_2(\phi(x_0,0))^{-\frac{\gamma+1}{2(\gamma-1)}}, \tag{2.10}$$

where K_1, K_2 *are positive constants which depend only on* C_0, γ, K, λ *and* α. *Then* $\|(\tau_x, u_x)\|_{L^\infty}$ *must blow up in finite time.*

For the rest cases, that is,

$$\lambda < \frac{\alpha(\gamma-1)}{\gamma-3} \text{ when } 1 < \gamma < 3, \tag{2.11}$$

and

$$\lambda \in \left(\min\{1, \frac{\alpha(\gamma-1)}{\gamma-3}\}, \max\{1, \frac{\alpha(\gamma-1)}{\gamma-3}\}\right) \text{ when } \gamma > 3, \tag{2.12}$$

the authors assert that this is just a technical problem and the Riemann invariants may blow up for some certain initial data, too. Indeed, we consider the rest cases in this paper and have obtained the following theorems.

Theorem 2.3 (Singularity formation for $1 < \gamma < 3$ and $\lambda \neq 1$). *Suppose the initial data* $(\tau_0, u_0)(x) \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$ *satisfying* (2.5) *and* (τ, u) *is a* C^1 *solution of* (1.1)-(1.2). *Then* $\|u\|_{L^\infty}$ *will be uniformly bounded for all time* $t > 0$ *and the density* $\rho = \tau^{-1}$ *has a time-dependent lower bound,*

$$\rho(x,t) = \tau^{-1}(x,t) \ge \begin{cases} C\,(1+t)^{\frac{4}{\gamma-3}} & \text{for } \lambda \ge 0, \\ C\left(1 + e^{\frac{-\lambda(1+t)^{1-\lambda}}{1-\lambda}} t\right)^{\frac{4}{\gamma-3}} & \text{for } \lambda < 0, \end{cases} \tag{2.13}$$

where C *is a positive constants depending only on* C_0, γ, K, λ *and* α. (2.13) *indicates that the vacuum will never occur in finite time. Moreover, assume there exists one point* x_0 *such that*

$$u_x(x_0,0) + \phi_x(x_0,0) < K_3(\phi(x_0,0))^{-\frac{2}{\gamma-1}} - K_4(\phi(x_0,0))^{-\frac{\gamma+1}{2(\gamma-1)}} \tag{2.14}$$

or

$$u_x(x_0,0) - \phi_x(x_0,0) < K_3(\phi(x_0,0))^{-\frac{2}{\gamma-1}} - K_4(\phi(x_0,0))^{-\frac{\gamma+1}{2(\gamma-1)}}, \tag{2.15}$$

where K_3, K_4 *are positive constants which depend only on* C_0, γ, K, λ *and* α. *Then* $\|(\tau_x, u_x)\|_{L^\infty}$ *must blow up in finite time.*

Theorem 2.4 (Singularity formation for $\gamma > 3$ and $\lambda \neq 1$)**.** *Suppose the initial data* $(\tau_0, u_0)(x) \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$ *satisfying* (2.8) *and* (τ, u) *be a* C^1 *solution of* (1.1)-(1.2)*. Assume there exists one point* x_0 *such that*

$$u_x(x_0,0) + \phi_x(x_0,0) < K_5(\phi(x_0,0))^{-\frac{2}{\gamma-1}} - K_6(\phi(x_0,0))^{-\frac{\gamma+1}{2(\gamma-1)}} \tag{2.16}$$

or

$$u_x(x_0,0) - \phi_x(x_0,0) < K_5(\phi(x_0,0))^{-\frac{2}{\gamma-1}} - K_6(\phi(x_0,0))^{-\frac{\gamma+1}{2(\gamma-1)}}, \tag{2.17}$$

where K_5, K_6 *are two positive constants which depend only on* C_0, γ, K, λ *and* α*. Then* $\|(\tau_x, u_x)\|_{L^\infty}$ *must blow up in finite time.*

Remark 2.5. (2.13) *holds for all* $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$*, and the condition* $\lambda \neq 1$ *in Theorem 2.3 is only used in proving the blow-up of* $\|(\tau_x, u_x)\|_{L^\infty}$*. Singularity formation for* $\lambda = 1$ *with all* $\gamma > 1$ *can be found in [1, Theorems 4.1 and 4.2], also see the Remark 3.1 below.*

Theorem 2.3 and Theorem 2.4 remove the restrictions on λ in [1] and include the cases (2.11) and (2.12). In addition, the singularity formation of the compressible Euler equations when $\gamma = 3$ is given in the following theorem.

Theorem 2.6 (Singularity formation for $\gamma = 3$)**.** *Suppose the initial data* $(\tau_0, u_0)(x) \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$ *satisfying* (2.5) *and* $(\tau, u)(x,t)$ *is a* C^1 *solution of* $(1.1) - (1.2)$ *with* $\gamma = 3$*. Then* $\|u\|_{L^\infty}$ *will be uniformly bounded for all time* $t > 0$ *and the density* $\rho = \tau^{-1}$ *has a time-dependent lower bound,*

$$\rho(x,t) = \tau^{-1}(x,t) \geq \begin{cases} C_0^{-1} e^{-\hat{M}t} & \text{for } \lambda \geq 0, \\ C_0^{-1} e^{-\hat{M}t e^{\frac{-\lambda(1+t)^{1-\lambda}}{1-\lambda}}} & \text{for } \lambda < 0, \end{cases} \tag{2.18}$$

where $\hat{M}$ *is a positive constant depending only on* C_0, K, γ, λ *and* α*.* (2.18) *indicates that the vacuum will never occur in finite time. Moreover, for any given* $t_0 > 0$*, there exists a non-decreasing (w.r.t.* t_0*) function* $\tilde{M}(t_0)$*, depending on* C_0, K, γ, λ *and* α*, such that if there exists one point* x_0 *satisfying*

$$u_x(x_0,0) + \phi_x(x_0,0) < \frac{\alpha}{2K_c}\phi^{-1}(x_0,0)\ln\phi(x_0,0) - \max\{\frac{2}{K_c t_0}, \tilde{M}(t_0)\}, \tag{2.19}$$

or

$$u_x(x_0,0) - \phi_x(x_0,0) < \frac{\alpha}{2K_c}\phi^{-1}(x_0,0)\ln\phi(x_0,0) - \max\{\frac{2}{K_c t_0}, \tilde{M}(t_0)\}. \tag{2.20}$$

Then $\|u_x, \tau_x\|_{L^\infty}$ *must blow up before* t_0*.*

Remark 2.7. *We mention that we only need* (2.5) *to obtain the time-dependent lower bound on density* (2.13) *for* $1 < \gamma < 3$*, and* (2.18) *for* $\gamma = 3$*. Therefore,* (2.13) *and* (2.18) *may be viewed as a generalization of [1, Lemma 3.3] and [17, Lemma 12], in which the authors impose some restrictions on* λ *and* α*.*

Remark 2.8. *For* $1 < \gamma \leq 3$ *and* $\lambda = 0$*, we can get the lower bound of density independent of* t*. In other words, using the proof of Theorem 2.3 and Theorem 2.6, we can respectively obtain the fixed lower bound of density for* $1 < \gamma \leq 3$ *and* $\gamma = 3$ *by simple calculation.*

Remark 2.9. *The time-dependent lower bound on density plays an important role in obtaining blow-up of $\|(\tau_x, u_x)\|_{L^\infty}$ in Theorems 2.3 and 2.6. For $\gamma > 1$, under the assumption* (2.5)*, an optimal time-dependent lower bound on density is obtained in [18,19] for compressible isentropic Euler equations and in [20] for full compressible Euler equations. However, for $\gamma \geq 3$, as stated in [17, Remark 3], it is open whether vacuum occurs in finite time or not for damped Euler equations. Theorem 2.6 give a negative answer to this open question for $\gamma = 3$, i.e., the vacuum will never occur in finite time.*

For latter use, we recall some useful lemmas, whose proof can be found in [1].

Lemma 2.10 ([1, Theorem 2.1])**.** *Let $(\tau_0, u_0)(x) \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$ satisfying* (2.8) *and (τ, u) be the C^1 solution to system (1.1)-(1.2). Then in the domain where the solution exists, $(\tau, u)(x,t)$ is uniform bounded in the following form*

$$|u(x,t)| \leq \tilde{C}_0, \quad \tau(x,t) \geq \tilde{C}_0^{-1}, \tag{2.21}$$

where $\tilde{C}_0$ can be any constant bigger than $\max\{C_0 + C_0^{\frac{\gamma-1}{2}}, (C_0 + C_0^{\frac{\gamma-1}{2}})^{\frac{2}{\gamma-1}}\}$.

Lemma 2.11 ([1, Lemma 2.2])**.** *The C^1 solutions (τ, u) of (1.1)-(1.2) satisfy*

$$A' = -\frac{\alpha}{2(1+t)^\lambda}(A+B) + K_d(AB - A^2)$$

and

$$B' = -\frac{\alpha}{2(1+t)^\lambda}(A+B) + K_d(AB - B^2),$$

where

$$A = w_x, \quad B = z_x, \quad K_d = K_c\frac{\gamma+1}{2(\gamma-1)}\phi^{\frac{2}{\gamma-1}}.$$

Lemma 2.12 ([1, Lemma 3.1])**.** *For the C^1 solutions (τ, u) of (1.1)-(1.2), denoting*

$$y := \left(\phi^{\frac{\gamma+1}{2(\gamma-1)}} w_x - \frac{\alpha(\gamma-1)}{K_c(\gamma-3)(1+t)^\lambda}\phi^{\frac{\gamma-3}{2(\gamma-1)}}\right) e^{\frac{\alpha(3\gamma-1)}{2(\gamma-3)(1-\lambda)}(1+t)^{-\lambda}}, \tag{2.22}$$

and

$$q := \left(\phi^{\frac{\gamma+1}{2(\gamma-1)}} z_x - \frac{\alpha(\gamma-1)}{K_c(\gamma-3)(1+t)^\lambda}\phi^{\frac{\gamma-3}{2(\gamma-1)}}\right) e^{\frac{\alpha(3\gamma-1)}{2(\gamma-3)(1-\lambda)}(1+t)^{-\lambda}}, \tag{2.23}$$

then y and q satisfy

$$y' = a_0 - a_2 y^2, \quad q' = a_0 - a_2 q^2, \tag{2.24}$$

where

$$a_2 = \frac{K_c(\gamma+1)}{2(\gamma-1)}\phi^{-\frac{\gamma-3}{2(\gamma-1)}} e^{-\frac{\alpha(3\gamma-1)}{2(\gamma-3)(1-\lambda)}(1+t)^{1-\lambda}} > 0, \tag{2.25}$$

$$a_0 = \frac{\lambda\alpha(\gamma-1)(\gamma-3)(1+t)^{\lambda-1} - \alpha^2(\gamma-1)^2}{K_c(\gamma-3)^2(1+t)^{2\lambda}}\phi^{\frac{\gamma-3}{2(\gamma-1)}} e^{\frac{\alpha(3\gamma-1)}{2(\gamma-3)(1-\lambda)}(1+t)^{1-\lambda}}. \tag{2.26}$$

3 Proof of the main theorems

3.1 Proof of Theorem 2.3

We divide the proof into five steps. In steps 1-4, we first give the proof of the lower bound on density, that is, the proof of (2.13). In step 5, we prove the blow-up of $\|(\tau_x, u_x)\|_{L^\infty}$.

Step 1. It follows from (2.4) and the fact $c_w = -c_z$ that

$$\begin{aligned}(w_x)' &= (w')_x - c_x w_x \\ &= -\frac{\alpha}{2(1+t)^\lambda}(z+w)_x - (c_w w_x^2 + c_z z_x w_x) \\ &= -\frac{\alpha}{2(1+t)^\lambda}(z+w)_x - c_w w_x^2 + c_w z_x w_x,\end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}(z_x)' &= (z')_x + c_x z_x \\ &= -\frac{\alpha}{2(1+t)^\lambda}(z+w)_x + (c_w w_x z_x + c_z z_x^2) \\ &= -\frac{\alpha}{2(1+t)^\lambda}(z+w)_x - c_w z_x^2 + c_w z_x w_x.\end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

Noticing from (2.1)-(2.2), it holds

$$\phi_\tau = -c,$$

which together with (1.1), yields

$$\begin{aligned}\phi' &= \phi_t + c\phi_x = -c\tau_t + c\phi_x = -cu_x + c\phi_x = -c(u-\phi)_x = -cz_x, \\ \phi' &= \phi_t - c\phi_x = -c\tau_t - c\phi_x = -cu_x - c\phi_x = -c(u+\phi)_x = -cw_x.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have

$$z_x = -\frac{1}{c}\phi' = -\frac{1}{c}\phi_\tau \tau' = \tau', \qquad w_x = -\frac{1}{c}\phi' = -\frac{1}{c}\phi_\tau \tau' = \tau'. \tag{3.3}$$

Moreover, using (3.3), a direct calculation shows that

$$\frac{1}{2}c^{-\frac{1}{2}}c' w_x = \frac{1}{2}c^{-\frac{1}{2}}(c_w w_\tau \tau' + c_z z_\tau \tau')w_x = c^{-\frac{1}{2}}c_w w_\tau \tau' w_x = -c^{\frac{1}{2}}c_w z_x w_x, \tag{3.4}$$

where we have used $c_w = -c_z$, $w_\tau = -z_\tau$ and $w_\tau = \phi_\tau = -c$.

Hence it follows form (3.1)-(3.2), (3.4) that

$$\begin{aligned}(c^{\frac{1}{2}}w_x)' &= c^{\frac{1}{2}}(w_x)' + \frac{1}{2}c^{-\frac{1}{2}}c' w_x \\ &= -\frac{\alpha c^{\frac{1}{2}}}{2(1+t)^\lambda}(z+w)_x - c^{\frac{1}{2}}c_w w_x^2 + c^{\frac{1}{2}}c_w z_x w_x + \frac{1}{2}c^{-\frac{1}{2}}c' w_x. \\ &= -\frac{\alpha c^{\frac{1}{2}}}{2(1+t)^\lambda}(z+w)_x - c^{\frac{1}{2}}c_w w_x^2,\end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}(c^{\frac{1}{2}}z_x)\backprime &= c^{\frac{1}{2}}(z_x)\backprime + \frac{1}{2}c^{-\frac{1}{2}}c\backprime z_x \\ &= -\frac{\alpha c^{\frac{1}{2}}}{2(1+t)^{\lambda}}(z+w)_x - c^{\frac{1}{2}}c_w z_x^2 + c^{\frac{1}{2}}c_w z_x w_x + \frac{1}{2}c^{-\frac{1}{2}}c\backprime z_x \\ &= -\frac{\alpha c^{\frac{1}{2}}}{2(1+t)^{\lambda}}(z+w)_x - c^{\frac{1}{2}}c_w z_x^2.\end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

Step 2. For $\lambda \geq 0$ and $\lambda \neq 1$, we introduce two new variables

$$G(t,x) = c^{\frac{1}{2}}w_x + \frac{\alpha}{(1+t)^{\lambda}}h(\tau), \tag{3.7}$$

$$H(t,x) = c^{\frac{1}{2}}z_x + \frac{\alpha}{(1+t)^{\lambda}}h(\tau), \tag{3.8}$$

where

$$h(\tau) = \int_0^{\tau} c(s)^{\frac{1}{2}}ds = \frac{4(K\gamma)^{\frac{1}{4}}}{3-\gamma}\tau^{\frac{3-\gamma}{4}}. \tag{3.9}$$

Using (3.3), (3.5)-(3.6), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}G' &= (c^{\frac{1}{2}}w_x)' + \frac{\alpha}{(1+t)^{\lambda}}h'(\tau) - \frac{\lambda\alpha}{(1+t)^{\lambda+1}}h(\tau) \\ &= -\frac{\alpha c^{\frac{1}{2}}}{2(1+t)^{\lambda}}(z+w)_x - c^{\frac{1}{2}}c_w w_x^2 + \frac{\alpha}{(1+t)^{\lambda}}c^{\frac{1}{2}}z_x - \frac{\lambda\alpha}{(1+t)^{\lambda+1}}h(\tau) \\ &= \frac{\alpha}{2(1+t)^{\lambda}}(H-G) - c^{\frac{1}{2}}c_w w_x^2 - \frac{\lambda\alpha}{(1+t)^{\lambda+1}}h(\tau) \\ &:= -\frac{\alpha}{2(1+t)^{\lambda}}(G-H) + R_1,\end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}H\backprime &= (c^{\frac{1}{2}}z_x)\backprime + \frac{\alpha}{(1+t)^{\lambda}}h\backprime(\tau) - \frac{\lambda\alpha}{(1+t)^{\lambda+1}}h(\tau) \\ &= -\frac{\alpha c^{\frac{1}{2}}}{2(1+t)^{\lambda}}(z+w)_x - c^{\frac{1}{2}}c_w z_x^2 + \frac{\alpha}{(1+t)^{\lambda}}c^{\frac{1}{2}}w_x - \frac{\lambda\alpha}{(1+t)^{\lambda+1}}h(\tau) \\ &= \frac{\alpha}{2(1+t)^{\lambda}}(G-H) - c^{\frac{1}{2}}c_w z_x^2 - \frac{\lambda\alpha}{(1+t)^{\lambda+1}}h(\tau) \\ &:= -\frac{\alpha}{2(1+t)^{\lambda}}(H-G) + R_2.\end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

Noticing from (2.2) and (2.3) that $c_w = \frac{\gamma+1}{2(\gamma-1)}K_c\phi^{\frac{2}{\gamma-1}} \geq 0$, then

$$R_1 := -c^{\frac{1}{2}}c_w w_x^2 - \frac{\alpha\lambda}{(1+t)^{\lambda+1}}h(\tau) \leq 0,$$

$$R_2 := -c^{\frac{1}{2}}c_w z_x^2 - \frac{\alpha\lambda}{(1+t)^{\lambda+1}}h(\tau) \leq 0,$$

which together with (3.10)-(3.11), yields

$$G' \le -\frac{\alpha}{2(1+t)^\lambda}(G-H),$$

$$H' \le -\frac{\alpha}{2(1+t)^\lambda}(H-G).$$

It follows from (2.1), (2.3), (2.5) and (3.7)-(3.9) that there exists a positive constant M depending only on C_0, K, γ, λ and α such that $\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} |(G(0,x), H(0,x))| \le M$. Now let

$$G_1(t,x) = G(t,x) - M, \quad H_1(t,x) = H(t,x) - M, \tag{3.12}$$

then $G_1(0,x) \le 0, H_1(0,x) \le 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} G_1' = G' &\le -\frac{\alpha}{2(1+t)^\lambda}(G-H) = -\frac{\alpha}{2(1+t)^\lambda}G_1 + \frac{\alpha}{2(1+t)^\lambda}H_1, \\ H_1' = H' &\le -\frac{\alpha}{2(1+t)^\lambda}(H-G) = -\frac{\alpha}{2(1+t)^\lambda}H_1 + \frac{\alpha}{2(1+t)^\lambda}G_1. \end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

Since $\lambda \neq 1$, we denote $A(t) = e^{\frac{\alpha(1+t)^{1-\lambda}}{2(1-\lambda)}}$ and

$$G_2(t,x) = A(t)G_1(t,x), \quad H_2(t,x) = A(t)H_1(t,x),$$

then $G_2(0,x) \le 0, H_2(0,x) \le 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} G_2' &= A(t)G_1' + \frac{\alpha}{2(1+t)^\lambda}A(t)G_1 \le \frac{\alpha}{2(1+t)^\lambda}A(t)H_1 = \frac{\alpha}{2(1+t)^\lambda}H_2, \\ H_2' &= A(t)H_1' + \frac{\alpha}{2(1+t)^\lambda}A(t)H_1 \le \frac{\alpha}{2(1+t)^\lambda}A(t)G_1 = \frac{\alpha}{2(1+t)^\lambda}G_2. \end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

Using a continuity argument, it is directly from (3.14) to see

$$G_2(x_+(t),t) \le 0, \quad H_2(x_-(t),t) \le 0, \quad \text{for all } t \ge 0.$$

Therefore,

$$G_1(x_+(t),t) \le 0, \quad H_1(x_-(t),t) \le 0, \quad \text{for all } t \ge 0,$$

which together with (3.12) yields that

$$G(t,x) \le M, \quad H(t,x) \le M, \quad \text{for all } (t,x) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}. \tag{3.15}$$

Hence by (3.7), (3.8) and (3.15), we obtain

$$G(t,x) + H(t,x) = c^{\frac{1}{2}}(w+z)_x + \frac{2\alpha}{(1+t)^\lambda}h(\tau) \le 2M,$$

which together with $(1.1)_1$ implies that

$$c^{\frac{1}{2}}\tau_t + \frac{\alpha}{(1+t)^\lambda}h(\tau) \le M. \tag{3.16}$$

Combing (2.2), (3.9) with (3.16), we have

$$(K\gamma)^{\frac{1}{4}}\tau^{-\frac{\gamma+1}{4}}\tau_t+\frac{\alpha}{(1+t)^{\lambda}}\frac{4(K\gamma)^{\frac{1}{4}}}{3-\gamma}\tau^{\frac{3-\gamma}{4}}\le M,$$

which implies that

$$\left(e^{\frac{\alpha(1+t)^{1-\lambda}}{1-\lambda}}\tau^{\frac{3-\gamma}{4}}\right)_t\le\left(\frac{3-\gamma}{4}(K\gamma)^{-\frac{1}{4}}M\right)e^{\frac{\alpha(1+t)^{1-\lambda}}{1-\lambda}}. \tag{3.17}$$

Integrating (3.17) from 0 to t, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned}e^{\frac{\alpha(1+t)^{1-\lambda}}{1-\lambda}}\tau^{\frac{3-\gamma}{4}}-e^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\lambda}}\tau_0^{\frac{3-\gamma}{4}}&\le\frac{3-\gamma}{4}(K\gamma)^{-\frac{1}{4}}M\int_0^t e^{\frac{\alpha(1+s)^{1-\lambda}}{1-\lambda}}ds\\&\le\frac{3-\gamma}{4}(K\gamma)^{-\frac{1}{4}}Me^{\frac{\alpha(1+t)^{1-\lambda}}{1-\lambda}}t,\end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\tau^{\frac{3-\gamma}{4}}&\le\left[e^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\lambda}}\tau_0^{\frac{3-\gamma}{4}}+\frac{3-\gamma}{4}(K\gamma)^{-\frac{1}{4}}Me^{\frac{\alpha(1+t)^{1-\lambda}}{1-\lambda}}t\right]e^{-\frac{\alpha(1+t)^{1-\lambda}}{1-\lambda}}\\&=e^{\frac{\alpha(1-(1+t)^{1-\lambda})}{1-\lambda}}\tau_0^{\frac{3-\gamma}{4}}+\frac{3-\gamma}{4}(K\gamma)^{-\frac{1}{4}}Mt,\end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned}\rho&\ge\left[\tau_0^{\frac{3-\gamma}{4}}+\frac{3-\gamma}{4}(K\gamma)^{-\frac{1}{4}}Mt\right]^{\frac{4}{\gamma-3}}\\&\ge\left[C_0^{\frac{3-\gamma}{4}}+\frac{3-\gamma}{4}(K\gamma)^{-\frac{1}{4}}Mt\right]^{\frac{4}{\gamma-3}}\\&\ge C(1+t)^{\frac{4}{\gamma-3}},\end{aligned} \tag{3.20}$$

where we have used $1<\gamma<3$, (2.5) and

$$C:=\left(\max\{C_0^{\frac{3-\gamma}{4}},\frac{3-\gamma}{4}(K\gamma)^{-\frac{1}{4}}M\}\right)^{\frac{4}{\gamma-3}}. \tag{3.21}$$

Step 3. For $\lambda=1$, we denote $A_1(t)=(1+t)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}$ and

$$G_3(t,x)=A_1(t)G_1(t,x),\quad H_3(t,x)=A_1(t)H_1(t,x),$$

then it follows from (3.13) that $G_3(0,x)\le 0, H_3(0,x)\le 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned}G_3'&=A_1(t)G_1'+\frac{\alpha}{2(1+t)}A_1(t)G_1\le\frac{\alpha}{2(1+t)}A_1(t)H_1=\frac{\alpha}{2(1+t)}H_3,\\H_3^{\backprime}&=A_1(t)H_1^{\backprime}+\frac{\alpha}{2(1+t)}A_1(t)H_1\le\frac{\alpha}{2(1+t)}A_1(t)G_1=\frac{\alpha}{2(1+t)}G_3.\end{aligned} \tag{3.22}$$

Hence, by a similar argument in Step 2, we obtain

$$G(t,x)\le M,\quad H(t,x)\le M,\quad \text{for all } (t,x)\in\mathbb{R}_+\times\mathbb{R},$$

which implies that

$$G(t,x)+H(t,x)=c^{\frac{1}{2}}(w+z)_x+\frac{2\alpha}{(1+t)}h(\tau)\le 2M. \tag{3.23}$$

Using $(1.1)_1$, (2.2) and (3.9), then (3.23) becomes

$$(\tau^{\frac{3-\gamma}{4}})_t+\frac{\alpha}{(1+t)}\tau^{\frac{3-\gamma}{4}}\le\frac{3-\gamma}{4}(K\gamma)^{-\frac{1}{4}}M, \tag{3.24}$$

and a direct calculation shows that

$$\big((1+t)^{\alpha}\tau^{\frac{3-\gamma}{4}}\big)_t\le\frac{3-\gamma}{4}(K\gamma)^{-\frac{1}{4}}M(1+t)^{\alpha}. \tag{3.25}$$

Integrating (3.25) from 0 to t, we have

$$\begin{aligned}(1+t)^{\alpha}\tau^{\frac{3-\gamma}{4}}-\tau_0^{\frac{3-\gamma}{4}}&\le\frac{3-\gamma}{4}(K\gamma)^{-\frac{1}{4}}M\int_0^t(1+s)^{\alpha}ds\\&\le\frac{3-\gamma}{4}(K\gamma)^{-\frac{1}{4}}M(1+t)^{\alpha}t,\end{aligned}$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\rho&\ge\left[(1+t)^{-\alpha}\tau_0^{\frac{3-\gamma}{4}}+\frac{3-\gamma}{4}(K\gamma)^{-\frac{1}{4}}Mt\right]^{\frac{4}{\gamma-3}}\\&\ge\left[\tau_0^{\frac{3-\gamma}{4}}+\frac{3-\gamma}{4}(K\gamma)^{-\frac{1}{4}}Mt\right]^{\frac{4}{\gamma-3}}\\&\ge C(1+t)^{\frac{4}{\gamma-3}},\end{aligned} \tag{3.26}$$

where we have used $1<\gamma<3$, (2.5) and (3.21).

Step 4. For $\lambda<0$, we introduce two new variables

$$\hat{G}(t,x)=c^{\frac{1}{2}}w_x+\frac{\alpha-\lambda}{(1+t)^{\lambda}}h(\tau), \tag{3.27}$$

$$\hat{H}(t,x)=c^{\frac{1}{2}}z_x+\frac{\alpha-\lambda}{(1+t)^{\lambda}}h(\tau), \tag{3.28}$$

where $h(\tau)$ is defined (3.9). By a similar calculation in (3.10)-(3.11), one has

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{G}'&=\frac{\alpha-2\lambda}{2(1+t)^{\lambda}}\hat{H}-\frac{\alpha}{2(1+t)^{\lambda}}\hat{G}-c^{\frac{1}{2}}c_w w_x^2+\frac{\lambda(\alpha-\lambda)(1-(1+t)^{\lambda-1})}{(1+t)^{2\lambda}}h(\tau),\\&:=\frac{\alpha-2\lambda}{2(1+t)^{\lambda}}\hat{H}-\frac{\alpha}{2(1+t)^{\lambda}}\hat{G}+V_1,\\\hat{H}'&=-\frac{\alpha}{2(1+t)^{\lambda}}\hat{H}+\frac{\alpha-2\lambda}{2(1+t)^{\lambda}}\hat{G}-c^{\frac{1}{2}}c_w z_x^2+\frac{\lambda(\alpha-\lambda)(1-(1+t)^{\lambda-1})}{(1+t)^{2\lambda}}h(\tau)\\&:=-\frac{\alpha}{2(1+t)^{\lambda}}\hat{H}+\frac{\alpha-2\lambda}{2(1+t)^{\lambda}}\hat{G}+V_2,\end{aligned} \tag{3.29}$$

where

$$V_1 := -c^{\frac{1}{2}}c_w w_x^2 + \frac{\lambda(\alpha-\lambda)(1-(1+t)^{\lambda-1})}{(1+t)^{2\lambda}}h(\tau) \le 0,$$

$$V_2 := -c^{\frac{1}{2}}c_w z_x^2 + \frac{\lambda(\alpha-\lambda)(1-(1+t)^{\lambda-1})}{(1+t)^{2\lambda}}h(\tau) \le 0,$$

for $\lambda < 0$.

Let

$$\hat{G}_1(t,x) = \hat{G}(t,x) - e^{-\frac{\lambda(1+t)^{1-\lambda}}{1-\lambda}}M, \quad \hat{H}_1(t,x) = \hat{H}(t,x) - e^{-\frac{\lambda(1+t)^{1-\lambda}}{1-\lambda}}M,$$

where M, like the constant M defined in (3.12), is a big enough constant determined by the initial data, such that

$$\hat{G}_1(0,x) = \hat{G}(0) - e^{-\frac{\lambda}{1-\lambda}}M \le 0, \quad \hat{H}_1(0,x) = \hat{H}(0) - e^{-\frac{\lambda}{1-\lambda}}M \le 0. \tag{3.30}$$

A direct calculation by using (3.29) shows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{G}_1' &= \hat{G}' + \lambda(1+t)^{-\lambda}e^{-\frac{\lambda(1+t)^{1-\lambda}}{1-\lambda}}M \\
&\le \frac{\alpha-2\lambda}{2(1+t)^{\lambda}}\left(\hat{H}_1 + e^{-\frac{\lambda(1+t)^{1-\lambda}}{1-\lambda}}M\right) - \frac{\alpha}{2(1+t)^{\lambda}}\left(\hat{G}_1 + e^{-\frac{\lambda(1+t)^{1-\lambda}}{1-\lambda}}M\right) + \frac{\lambda e^{-\frac{\lambda(1+t)^{1-\lambda}}{1-\lambda}}M}{(1+t)^{\lambda}} \\
&= -\frac{\alpha}{2(1+t)^{\lambda}}\hat{G}_1 + \frac{\alpha-2\lambda}{2(1+t)^{\lambda}}\hat{H}_1 + \left(\frac{\alpha-2\lambda}{2(1+t)^{\lambda}} - \frac{\alpha}{2(1+t)^{\lambda}} + \frac{\lambda}{(1+t)^{\lambda}}\right)e^{-\frac{\lambda(1+t)^{1-\lambda}}{1-\lambda}}M \\
&= -\frac{\alpha}{2(1+t)^{\lambda}}\hat{G}_1 + \frac{\alpha-2\lambda}{2(1+t)^{\lambda}}\hat{H}_1,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.31}$$

and similarly

$$\hat{H}_1' \le -\frac{\alpha}{2(1+t)^{\lambda}}\hat{H}_1 + \frac{\alpha-2\lambda}{2(1+t)^{\lambda}}\hat{G}_1. \tag{3.32}$$

Since $\lambda < 0$, denoting $A(t) = e^{\frac{\alpha(1+t)^{1-\lambda}}{2(1-\lambda)}}$ and

$$\hat{G}_2(t,x) = A(t)\hat{G}_1(t,x), \quad \hat{H}_2(t,x) = A(t)\hat{H}_1(t,x),$$

then it follows from (3.29)-(3.30), (3.31)-(3.32) that

$$\hat{G}_2(0,x) \le 0, \quad \hat{H}_2(0,x) \le 0,$$

and

$$\hat{G}_2' \le \frac{\alpha-2\lambda}{2(1+t)^{\lambda}}\hat{H}_2, \quad \hat{H}_2' \le \frac{\alpha-2\lambda}{2(1+t)^{\lambda}}\hat{G}_2.$$

Hence by a similar argument in Step 2, we obtain

$$\hat{G}(t,x) + \hat{H}(t,x) = c^{\frac{1}{2}}(w+z)_x + \frac{2(\alpha-\lambda)}{(1+t)^{\lambda}}h(\tau) \le 2e^{-\frac{\lambda(1+t)^{1-\lambda}}{1-\lambda}}M,$$

which together with $(1.1)_1$, yields

$$c^{\frac{1}{2}}\tau_t + \frac{\alpha-\lambda}{(1+t)^{\lambda}}h(\tau) \le e^{-\frac{\lambda(1+t)^{1-\lambda}}{1-\lambda}}M. \tag{3.33}$$

Thus using a similar calculation in (3.16)-(3.20), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\tau^{\frac{3-\gamma}{4}} &\le \left[e^{\frac{\alpha-\lambda}{1-\lambda}}\tau_0^{\frac{3-\gamma}{4}} + \frac{3-\gamma}{4}(K\gamma)^{-\frac{1}{4}}Me^{\frac{(\alpha-2\lambda)(1+t)^{1-\lambda}}{1-\lambda}}t\right]e^{-\frac{(\alpha-\lambda)(1+t)^{1-\lambda}}{1-\lambda}}\\ &= e^{\frac{(\alpha-\lambda)(1-(1+t)^{1-\lambda})}{1-\lambda}}\tau_0^{\frac{3-\gamma}{4}} + \frac{3-\gamma}{4}(K\gamma)^{-\frac{1}{4}}Me^{\frac{-\lambda(1+t)^{1-\lambda}}{1-\lambda}}t,\end{aligned}$$

i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned}\rho &\ge \left[e^{\frac{(\alpha-\lambda)(1-(1+t)^{1-\lambda})}{1-\lambda}}\tau_0^{\frac{3-\gamma}{4}} + \frac{3-\gamma}{4}(K\gamma)^{-\frac{1}{4}}Me^{\frac{-\lambda(1+t)^{1-\lambda}}{1-\lambda}}t\right]^{\frac{4}{\gamma-3}}\\ &\ge \left[\tau_0^{\frac{3-\gamma}{4}} + \frac{3-\gamma}{4}(K\gamma)^{-\frac{1}{4}}Me^{\frac{-\lambda(1+t)^{1-\lambda}}{1-\lambda}}t\right]^{\frac{4}{\gamma-3}}\\ &\ge C\left[1+e^{\frac{-\lambda(1+t)^{1-\lambda}}{1-\lambda}}t\right]^{\frac{4}{\gamma-3}},\end{aligned} \tag{3.34}$$

where we have used $1<\gamma<3$, (2.5) and (3.21).

Step 5. Now we are going to prove the blow-up of $\|(\tau_x, u_x)\|_{L^\infty}$. Since the case $\lambda \ge \frac{\alpha(\gamma-1)}{\gamma-3}$ is solved in Theorem 2.1, then we only need to prove the rest case $\lambda < \frac{\alpha(\gamma-1)}{\gamma-3}$. Noticing that $\lambda < \frac{\alpha(\gamma-1)}{\gamma-3} < 0$ for $1<\gamma<3$, it follows from (2.26) that there exists $t_0 > 0$ such that

$$(1+t_0)^{\lambda-1} = \frac{\alpha(\gamma-1)}{\lambda(\gamma-3)}$$

and

$$a_0 \ge 0, \quad \forall\ 0 < t \le t_0; \quad a_0 < 0, \quad \forall\ t > t_0.$$

Using (2.1), (2.25)-(2.26) and Lemma 2.10, there exist two constants $\tilde{K}_3$ and $\tilde{K}_4$, depending only on C_0, γ, K, λ and α, such that

$$0 \le a_0 \le \tilde{K}_3, \quad a_2 \ge \tilde{K}_4 > 0, \quad \forall\ 0 < t \le t_0. \tag{3.35}$$

When $t \geq t_0$, using (3.34) and a direct calculation shows that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\int_{t_0}^{\infty} a_2(x,s)ds \\
=&\frac{K_c(\gamma+1)}{2(\gamma-1)}\left(\frac{2\sqrt{K\gamma}}{\gamma-1}\right)^{-\frac{\gamma-3}{2(\gamma-1)}}\int_{t_0}^{+\infty}\rho^{\frac{3-\gamma}{4}}e^{-\frac{\alpha(3\gamma-1)}{2(\gamma-3)(1-\lambda)}(1+s)^{1-\lambda}}ds \\
\geq&\frac{K_c(\gamma+1)}{2(\gamma-1)}\left(\frac{2\sqrt{K\gamma}}{\gamma-1}\right)^{-\frac{\gamma-3}{2(\gamma-1)}}C^{\frac{3-\gamma}{4}}\int_{t_0}^{+\infty}\left[1+e^{\frac{-\lambda(1+s)^{1-\lambda}}{1-\lambda}}s\right]^{-1}e^{-\frac{\alpha(3\gamma-1)}{2(\gamma-3)(1-\lambda)}(1+s)^{1-\lambda}}ds \\
\geq&\begin{cases}
\frac{K_c(\gamma+1)}{2(\gamma-1)}\left(\frac{2\sqrt{K\gamma}}{\gamma-1}\right)^{-\frac{\gamma-3}{2(\gamma-1)}}C^{\frac{3-\gamma}{4}}\int_{t_0}^{+\infty}\left[e^{\frac{\lambda(1+s)^{1-\lambda}}{1-\lambda}}+s\right]^{-1}e^{\left(\frac{\alpha(3\gamma-1)}{2(3-\gamma)}+\lambda\right)\frac{(1+s)^{1-\lambda}}{1-\lambda}}ds \\
\text{for } \frac{\alpha(3\gamma-1)}{2(3-\gamma)}+\lambda<0 \\
\frac{K_c(\gamma+1)}{2(\gamma-1)}\left(\frac{2\sqrt{K\gamma}}{\gamma-1}\right)^{-\frac{\gamma-3}{2(\gamma-1)}}C^{\frac{3-\gamma}{4}}e^{\left(\frac{\alpha(3\gamma-1)}{2(3-\gamma)(1-\lambda)}+\frac{\lambda}{1-\lambda}\right)}\int_{t_0}^{+\infty}\left[e^{\frac{\lambda(1+s)^{1-\lambda}}{1-\lambda}}+s\right]^{-1}ds \\
\text{for } \frac{\alpha(3\gamma-1)}{2(3-\gamma)}+\lambda\geq 0
\end{cases} \\
\geq&\begin{cases}
\tilde{N}_1>0, & \text{for } \frac{\alpha(3\gamma-1)}{2(3-\gamma)}+\lambda<0 \\
+\infty, & \text{for } \frac{\alpha(3\gamma-1)}{2(3-\gamma)}+\lambda\geq 0.
\end{cases}
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.36}
$$

Assume there exists one point x_0 such that

$$
y(x_0,0) < -\max\Big\{\frac{1}{\tilde{N}_1},\sqrt{\frac{\tilde{K}_3}{\tilde{K}_4}}\Big\} := -N_1,
$$

which means (2.14) holds with

$$
K_3 := \frac{\alpha(\gamma-1)}{K_c(\gamma-3)}, \quad K_4 := N_1 e^{-\frac{\alpha(3\gamma-1)}{2(\gamma-3)(1-\lambda)}}.
$$

Noticing from (2.24) and (3.35), along the forward characteristic starting form x_0, we have

$$
y' < 0 \quad \text{and} \quad y(x_+(t),t) < -N_1, \quad \forall\ 0<t\leq t_0. \tag{3.37}
$$

If $y(x_+(t),t)$ does not blow up before t_0, then

$$
y' = a_0 - a_2y^2 < -a_2y^2, \quad \forall\ t\geq t_0,
$$

which implies that

$$
0 > y^{-1}(x_+(t),t) \geq y^{-1}(x_+(t_0),t_0) + \int_{t_0}^{t} a_2(x_+(s),s)ds. \tag{3.38}
$$

Since it follows from (3.37) that $-\frac{1}{N_1} < y^{-1}(x_+(t_0),t_0) < 0$, then using (3.36) and (3.38), we obtain that $y(x_+(t),t)$ must blow up in finite time. This holds for q if (2.15) holds.

On the other hand, it follows from (2.1) and (3.34) that $\phi^{\frac{\gamma-3}{2(\gamma-1)}}$ will remain bounded for any finite time, then recalling (2.22)-(2.23), we obtain that $y(x_+(t),t)$ or $q(x_-(t),t)$ blows up in finite time means $\|(\tau_x,u_x)\|_{L^\infty}$ blows up in finite time. Therefore the proof of Theorem 2.3 is completed. □

3.2 Proof of Theorem 2.4

We divide the proof into two cases: $\lambda > 1$ and $\lambda < 1$.

Case 1. For $\gamma > 3$ and $\lambda > 1$, it follows from Lemma 2.10 and (2.25)-(2.26) that there exist two positive constants $\tilde{K}_5, \tilde{K}_6$, which depends only on C_0, K, γ, λ and α, such that

$$|a_0| \le \tilde{K}_5, \quad a_2 \ge \tilde{K}_6, \quad \text{for all } t \ge 0.$$

Assume there exists one point x_0 such that

$$y(x_0, 0) < -\sqrt{\frac{\tilde{K}_5}{\tilde{K}_6}} := -N_2, \tag{3.39}$$

which means (2.16) holds with

$$K_5 := \frac{\alpha(\gamma-1)}{K_c(\gamma-3)}, \quad K_6 := N_2 e^{-\frac{\alpha(3\gamma-1)}{2(\gamma-3)(1-\lambda)}}.$$

Noticing from (3.39), there exists a $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$y(x_0, 0) < -(1+\varepsilon)N_2.$$

Recalling (2.24), along the forward characteristic lines $x_+(t)$ starting from x_0, we have

$$y'(x_+(t), t) < 0 \quad \text{and} \quad y(x_+(t), t) < -(1+\varepsilon)N_2, \quad \forall\ t \ge 0,$$

which together with the definition of N_2 implies that

$$a_0 - a_2 \frac{y^2(x_+(t), t)}{(1+\varepsilon)^2} < 0, \quad \forall\ t \ge 0.$$

Hence, using (2.24) and $a_2 > 0$, we have

$$y'(x_+(t), t) < \left(-1 + \frac{1}{(1+\varepsilon)^2}\right) a_2 y^2, \quad \forall\ t \ge 0.$$

Integrating both sides of the above inequality with respect to t along the forward characteristic $x_+(t)$ starting form x_0, we obtain

$$0 > y^{-1}(x_+(t), t) \ge y^{-1}(x_0, 0) + \left(1 - \frac{1}{(1+\varepsilon)^2}\right) \int_0^t a_2(x_+(s), s) ds. \tag{3.40}$$

Noticing that

$$\int_0^{+\infty} a_2(x_+(s), s) ds \ge \int_0^{+\infty} \tilde{K}_6 ds = +\infty,$$

which shows that the right hand side of (3.40) will be positive in finite time, then $y(x_+(t), t)$ must blow up in finite time. Similarly, if (2.17) holds, we will obtain that $q(x_-(t), t)$ blows up in finite time. Moreover, it follows from (2.1) and Lemma 2.10 that $\phi^{\frac{\gamma+1}{2(\gamma-1)}}$ and $\phi^{\frac{\gamma-3}{2(\gamma-1)}}$

remain bounded for all time when $\gamma > 3$. Hence $y(x_+(t),t)$ or $q(x_-(t),t)$ blows up means $\|(\tau_x, u_x)\|_{L^\infty}$ blows up.

Case 2. For $\gamma > 3$ and $\lambda < 1$, a_0 may not be uniformly bounded for all $t > 0$ and a_2 may not have a positive lower bound. However, if $\lambda \le \min\{\frac{\alpha(\gamma-1)}{\gamma-3}, 1\}$ or $\alpha = 0$, we will have $a_0 \le 0$ for all $t > 0$ and hence using (2.24), we have

$$y' = a_0 - a_2 y^2 < -a_2 y^2.$$

This is the case in Theorem 2.2 and is solved in [1, Theorem 3.1].

If $\alpha > 0$ and $0 < \frac{\alpha(\gamma-1)}{\gamma-3} < \lambda < 1$, there exists $t_0 > 0$ satisfying

$$(1+t_0)^{\lambda-1} = \frac{\alpha(\gamma-1)}{\lambda(\gamma-3)}$$

such that

$$a_0 \ge 0, \quad \forall\ 0 < t \le t_0 \ \text{ and } \ a_0 < 0, \quad \forall\ t > t_0.$$

When $0 < t \le t_0$, using Lemma 2.10, there exists two constants $\hat{K}_5$ and $\hat{K}_6$, which are dependent only on C_0, γ, K, λ and α, such that

$$0 \le a_0 \le \hat{K}_5, \quad a_2 \ge \hat{K}_6, \quad \forall\ 0 < t \le t_0.$$

When $t \ge t_0$, using Lemma 2.10, a direct calculation shows that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{t_0}^{+\infty} a_2(x(s),s)ds \\
&= \int_{t_0}^{+\infty} \frac{K_c(\gamma+1)}{2(\gamma-1)} \phi^{-\frac{\gamma-3}{2(\gamma-1)}} e^{-\frac{\alpha(3\gamma-1)}{2(\gamma-3)(1-\lambda)}(1+s)^{1-\lambda}} ds \\
&= \int_{t_0}^{+\infty} \frac{K_c(\gamma+1)}{2(\gamma-1)} \left(\frac{2\sqrt{K\gamma}}{\gamma-1}\tau^{-\frac{\gamma-1}{2}}\right)^{-\frac{\gamma-3}{2(\gamma-1)}} e^{-\frac{\alpha(3\gamma-1)}{2(\gamma-3)(1-\lambda)}(1+s)^{1-\lambda}} ds \\
&\ge \frac{K_c(\gamma+1)}{2(\gamma-1)} \left(\frac{2\sqrt{K\gamma}}{\gamma-1}\right)^{-\frac{\gamma-3}{2(\gamma-1)}} \tilde{C}_0^{-\frac{\gamma-3}{4}} \int_{t_0}^{+\infty} e^{-\frac{\alpha(3\gamma-1)}{2(\gamma-3)(1-\lambda)}(1+s)^{1-\lambda}} ds \\
&\ge \frac{K_c(\gamma+1)}{2(\gamma-1)} \left(\frac{2\sqrt{K\gamma}}{\gamma-1}\right)^{-\frac{\gamma-3}{2(\gamma-1)}} \tilde{C}_0^{-\frac{\gamma-3}{4}} \int_{t_0}^{+\infty} (1+s)^{-\lambda} e^{-\frac{\alpha(3\gamma-1)}{2(\gamma-3)(1-\lambda)}(1+s)^{1-\lambda}} ds \\
&\ge \frac{K_c(\gamma+1)}{2(\gamma-1)} \left(\frac{2\sqrt{K\gamma}}{\gamma-1}\right)^{-\frac{\gamma-3}{2(\gamma-1)}} \tilde{C}_0^{-\frac{\gamma-3}{4}} \frac{2(\gamma-3)}{\alpha(3\gamma-1)} e^{-\frac{\alpha(3\gamma-1)}{2(\gamma-3)(1-\lambda)}} := \tilde{N}_3.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.41}$$

If there exists a point x_0 such that

$$y(x_0,0) < -\max\{\frac{1}{\tilde{N}_3}, \sqrt{\frac{\hat{K}_5}{\hat{K}_6}}\} := -N_3,$$

which is equivalent to (2.16) with

$$K_5 := \frac{\alpha(\gamma-1)}{K_c(\gamma-3)}, \quad K_6 := N_3 e^{-\frac{\alpha(3\gamma-1)}{2(\gamma-3)(1-\lambda)}}. \tag{3.42}$$

Then following the same discussion in (3.37)-(3.38), we obtain $y(x_+(t),t)$ must blow up in finite time. This holds for q if (2.17) holds. Hence $\|(\tau_x,u_x)\|_{L^\infty}$ must blow up in finite time. This completes the proof of Theorem 2.4.

□

Remark 3.1. *When $\lambda=1$, the authors in [1] have also proved similar blow up results for $\gamma>3$, $\alpha\geq\frac{\gamma-3}{\gamma-1}$ and $1<\gamma<3,\alpha\geq 0$. In fact, when $\gamma>3$ and $\lambda=1$, following the same idea in the proofs of Theorem 2.3 and Theorem 2.4, the similar blow up phenomenon can be proved for $0\leq\alpha\leq\frac{2(\gamma-3)}{3\gamma-1}$. However, for the rest case $\alpha\in\left(\frac{2(\gamma-3)}{3\gamma-1},\frac{\gamma-3}{\gamma-1}\right)$, there is no blow up results yet now. The main reason is that we can not get the upper bound of $|\frac{b_0}{b_1}|$ in (4.3) and (4.4) of [1].*

3.3 Proof of Theorem 2.6

We divide the proof into four steps. In steps 1-3, we first give the proof of the lower bound on density, that is, the proof of (2.18). In step 4, we prove the blow-up of $\|(\tau_x,u_x)\|_{L^\infty}$.

Step 1. For $\gamma=3$, the previous notations given in (2.1)-(2.2) becomes

$$\phi:=\int_\tau^\infty cd\tau=\sqrt{3K}\tau^{-1}>0, \tag{3.43}$$

and

$$c:=\sqrt{-p_\tau}=\sqrt{3K}\tau^{-2}:=K_c\phi^2. \tag{3.44}$$

where $K_c=1/\sqrt{3K}$.

We introduce two gradient variables

$$y_1:=\phi A-\frac{\alpha}{2K_c(1+t)^\lambda}\ln\phi, \tag{3.45}$$

and

$$q_1:=\phi B-\frac{\alpha}{2K_c(1+t)^\lambda}\ln\phi, \tag{3.46}$$

where A and B are given in Lemma 2.11 and satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} A'&=-\frac{\alpha}{2(1+t)^\lambda}(A+B)+K_d(AB-A^2),\\ B'&=-\frac{\alpha}{2(1+t)^\lambda}(A+B)+K_d(AB-B^2). \end{aligned} \tag{3.47}$$

For $\gamma=3$, $K_d=K_c\phi$ from Lemma 2.11.

Lemma 3.2. *For C^1 solutions of (1.1)-(1.2), y_1 and q_1 satisfy the following Riccati equations:*

$$y_1'=-a_2y_1^2-a_1y_1+a_0, \tag{3.48}$$

$$q_1'=-a_2q_1^2-a_1q_1+a_0, \tag{3.49}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} a_2 &= K_c > 0, \\ a_1 &= \frac{\alpha(1+2\ln\phi)}{2(1+t)^{\lambda}}, \\ a_0 &= \alpha\ln\phi\frac{2\lambda(1+t)^{\lambda-1}-\alpha(1+\ln\phi)}{4K_c(1+t)^{2\lambda}}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.50}$$

Proof of Lemma 3.2. It follows from (3.43), (1.1) and (2.3) that

$$\begin{aligned} \phi' &= \phi_t + c\phi_x = \left(\sqrt{3K}\tau^{-1}\right)_t + c\phi_x \\ &= -\sqrt{3K}\tau^{-2}\tau_t + c\phi_x = -cu_x + c\phi_x \\ &= -c(z+\phi)_x + c\phi_x = -cz_x - c\phi_x + c\phi_x \\ &= -cB, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$B = -\frac{1}{c}\phi'. \tag{3.51}$$

Substituting (3.51) into (3.47), we get

$$A' = -\frac{\alpha}{2(1+t)^{\lambda}}(A - \frac{1}{c}\phi') + K_d(-\frac{1}{c}\phi' A - A^2). \tag{3.52}$$

Multiplying (3.52) by ϕ to see

$$A'\phi - \frac{\alpha}{2c(1+t)^{\lambda}}\phi'\phi + \frac{K_d}{c}\phi' A\phi = -\frac{\alpha}{2(1+t)^{\lambda}}A\phi - K_d A^2\phi. \tag{3.53}$$

For the left hand side of (3.53), a direct calculation shows that

$$\begin{aligned} &A'\phi - \frac{\alpha}{2c(1+t)^{\lambda}}\phi'\phi + \frac{K_d}{c}\phi' A\phi \\ =&A'\phi - \frac{\alpha}{2(1+t)^{\lambda}K_c\phi^2}\phi'\phi + \frac{K_c\phi}{K_c\phi^2}\phi' A\phi \\ =&A'\phi - \frac{\alpha}{2K_c(1+t)^{\lambda}}\phi'\phi^{-1} + \phi' A \\ =&\left(A\phi - \frac{\alpha}{2K_c(1+t)^{\lambda}}\ln\phi\right)' - \frac{\lambda\alpha\ln\phi}{2K_c}(1+t)^{-\lambda-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.54}$$

Recalling (3.45), we have

$$A = y\phi^{-1} + \frac{\alpha\ln\phi}{2K_c(1+t)^{\lambda}}\phi^{-1}. \tag{3.55}$$

Then the right hand side of (3.53) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
&-\frac{\alpha}{2(1+t)^{\lambda}}A\phi - K_dA^2\phi\\
=&-\frac{\alpha}{2(1+t)^{\lambda}}\phi\left(y_1\phi^{-1}+\frac{\alpha\ln\phi}{2K_c(1+t)^{\lambda}}\phi^{-1}\right)-K_c\phi^2\left(y_1\phi^{-1}+\frac{\alpha\ln\phi}{2K_c(1+t)^{\lambda}}\phi^{-1}\right)^2\\
=&-\frac{\alpha}{2(1+t)^{\lambda}}y_1-\frac{\alpha^2\ln\phi}{4K_c(1+t)^{2\lambda}}-K_cy_1^2-\frac{\alpha^2(\ln\phi)^2}{4K_c(1+t)^{2\lambda}}-\frac{\alpha\ln\phi}{(1+t)^{\lambda}}y\\
=&-K_cy_1^2-\frac{\alpha+2\alpha\ln\phi}{2(1+t)^{\lambda}}y_1-\frac{\alpha^2\ln\phi+\alpha^2(\ln\phi)^2}{4K_c(1+t)^{2\lambda}}.
\end{aligned}\tag{3.56}$$

Substituting (3.54) and (3.56) into (3.53), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
y_1' =&\frac{\lambda\alpha\ln\phi}{2K_c}(1+t)^{-\lambda-1}-\frac{\alpha}{2(1+t)^{\lambda}}A\phi-K_dA^2\phi\\
=&-K_cy_1^2-\frac{\alpha+2\alpha\ln\phi}{2(1+t)^{\lambda}}y_1-\frac{\alpha^2\ln\phi+\alpha^2(\ln\phi)^2}{4K_c(1+t)^{2\lambda}}+\frac{\lambda\alpha\ln\phi}{2K_c}(1+t)^{-\lambda-1}\\
=&-K_cy_1^2-\frac{\alpha+2\alpha\ln\phi}{2(1+t)^{\lambda}}y_1+\frac{2\lambda\alpha\ln\phi(1+t)^{\lambda-1}-\alpha^2\ln\phi(1+\ln\phi)}{4K_c(1+t)^{2\lambda}}\\
:=&-a_2y_1^2-a_1y_1+a_0,
\end{aligned}\tag{3.57}$$

where a_0, a_1 and a_2 are defined in (3.50). This completes the proof of (3.48).

For (3.49), noticing that

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi^{\backprime} &= \phi_t - c\phi_x = \left(\sqrt{3K}\tau^{-1}\right)_t - c\phi_x\\
&= -\sqrt{3K}\tau^{-2}\tau_t - c\phi_x = -cu_x - c\phi_x\\
&= -c(w-\phi)_x - c\phi_x = -cw_x + c\phi_x - c\phi_x\\
&= -cA,
\end{aligned}$$

then using (3.47), we have

$$B^{\backprime} = -\frac{\alpha}{2(1+t)^{\lambda}}(B-\frac{1}{c}\phi^{\backprime}) + K_d(-\frac{1}{c}\phi^{\backprime}B - B^2).$$

Thus following a similar calculation in (3.53)-(3.57), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
q_1^{\backprime} =&\frac{\lambda\alpha\ln\phi}{2K_c}(1+t)^{-\lambda-1}-\frac{\alpha}{2(1+t)^{\lambda}}B\phi-K_dB^2\phi\\
=&-K_cq_1^2-\frac{\alpha+2\alpha\ln\phi}{2(1+t)^{\lambda}}q_1-\frac{\alpha^2\ln\phi+\alpha^2(\ln\phi)^2}{4K_c(1+t)^{2\lambda}}+\frac{\lambda\alpha\ln\phi}{2K_c}(1+t)^{-\lambda-1}\\
=&-K_cq_1^2-\frac{\alpha+2\alpha\ln\phi}{2(1+t)^{\lambda}}q_1+\frac{2\lambda\alpha\ln\phi(1+t)^{\lambda-1}-\alpha^2\ln\phi(1+\ln\phi)}{4K_c(1+t)^{2\lambda}}\\
:=&-a_2q_1^2-a_1q_1+a_0,
\end{aligned}\tag{3.58}$$

where a_2, a_1, a_0 are defined in (3.50). Hence the proof of Lemma 3.2 is completed.

Step 2. For $\gamma = 3$ and $\lambda \geq 0$, we define

$$h_1(\tau) = \int_{\tilde{C}_0^{-1}}^{\tau} c(s)^{\frac{1}{2}} ds,$$

where $\tilde{C}_0$ is the constant given in Lemma 2.10. It follows from (3.44) that $h_1(\tau) = (3K)^{\frac{1}{4}} \ln(\tilde{C}_0\tau)$. By replacing $h(\tau)$ with $h_1(\tau)$ and using the same calculations in the Steps 2-3 in subsection 3.1, we obtain (3.16), that is,

$$(3K)^{\frac{1}{4}} \tau^{-1} \tau_t + \frac{\alpha}{(1+t)^{\lambda}} (3K)^{\frac{1}{4}} \ln(\tilde{C}_0\tau) \leq M,$$

which implies that

$$(\ln(\tilde{C}_0\tau))_t + \frac{\alpha}{(1+t)^{\lambda}} \ln(\tilde{C}_0\tau) \leq (3K)^{-\frac{1}{4}} M.$$

Thus for $\lambda \neq 1$,

$$\left(e^{\frac{\alpha(1+t)^{1-\lambda}}{1-\lambda}} \ln(\tilde{C}_0\tau) \right)_t \leq (3K)^{-\frac{1}{4}} M e^{\frac{\alpha(1+t)^{1-\lambda}}{1-\lambda}}, \tag{3.59}$$

and for $\lambda = 1$,

$$\left((1+t)^{\alpha} \ln(\tilde{C}_0\tau) \right)_t \leq (3K)^{-\frac{1}{4}} M (1+t)^{\alpha}, \tag{3.60}$$

where M is the found given in (3.12).

Integrating (3.59)-(3.60) from 0 to t respectively to see

$$\begin{aligned} e^{\frac{\alpha(1+t)^{1-\lambda}}{1-\lambda}} \ln(\tilde{C}_0\tau) - e^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\lambda}} \ln(\tilde{C}_0\tau_0) &\leq (3K)^{-\frac{1}{4}} M \int_0^t e^{\frac{\alpha(1+s)^{1-\lambda}}{1-\lambda}} ds \\ &\leq (3K)^{-\frac{1}{4}} M e^{\frac{\alpha(1+t)^{1-\lambda}}{1-\lambda}} t, \qquad \text{for } \lambda \neq 1, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} (1+t)^{\alpha} \ln(\tilde{C}_0\tau) - \ln(\tilde{C}_0\tau_0) &\leq (3K)^{-\frac{1}{4}} M \int_0^t (1+s)^{\alpha} ds \\ &\leq (3K)^{-\frac{1}{4}} M (1+t)^{\alpha} t, \qquad \text{for } \lambda = 1. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \ln(\tilde{C}_0\tau) &\leq \left[e^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\lambda}} \ln(\tilde{C}_0\tau_0) + (3K)^{-\frac{1}{4}} M e^{\frac{\alpha(1+t)^{1-\lambda}}{1-\lambda}} t \right] e^{-\frac{\alpha(1+t)^{1-\lambda}}{1-\lambda}} \\ &= e^{\frac{\alpha(1-(1+t)^{1-\lambda})}{1-\lambda}} \ln(\tilde{C}_0\tau_0) + (3K)^{-\frac{1}{4}} M t \\ &\leq \ln(\tilde{C}_0\tau_0) + (3K)^{-\frac{1}{4}} M t, \qquad \text{for } \lambda \neq 1, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \ln(\tilde{C}_0\tau) &\leq \left[\ln(\tilde{C}_0\tau_0) + (3K)^{-\frac{1}{4}} M (1+t)^{\alpha} t \right] (1+t)^{-\alpha} \\ &= (1+t)^{-\alpha} \ln(\tilde{C}_0\tau_0) + (3K)^{-\frac{1}{4}} M t \\ &\leq \ln(\tilde{C}_0\tau_0) + (3K)^{-\frac{1}{4}} M t, \qquad \text{for } \lambda = 1. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\tau \leq \tau_0 e^{(3K)^{-\frac{1}{4}} M t}, \quad \text{for } \lambda \geq 0,$$

i.e.,

$$\rho \geq \tau_0^{-1} e^{-(3K)^{-\frac{1}{4}} Mt} \geq C_0^{-1} e^{-\hat{M}t}, \quad \text{for } \lambda \geq 0, \tag{3.61}$$

where we have used (2.5) and $\hat{M} := (3K)^{-\frac{1}{4}} M$.

Step 3. For $\gamma = 3$, $\lambda < 0$, By replacing $h(\tau)$ with $h_1(\tau)$ and using the same calculations in the Step 4 in subsection 3.1, we can obtain (3.33), that is,

$$(3K)^{\frac{1}{4}} \tau^{-1} \tau_t + \frac{\alpha}{(1+t)^{\lambda}} (3K)^{\frac{1}{4}} \ln(\tilde{C}_0 \tau) \leq e^{-\frac{\lambda(1+t)^{1-\lambda}}{1-\lambda}} M,$$

which implies that

$$(\ln(\tilde{C}_0 \tau))_t + \frac{\alpha}{(1+t)^{\lambda}} \ln(\tilde{C}_0 \tau) \leq (3K)^{-\frac{1}{4}} e^{-\frac{\lambda(1+t)^{1-\lambda}}{1-\lambda}} M.$$

Thus

$$\left(e^{\frac{\alpha(1+t)^{1-\lambda}}{1-\lambda}} \ln(\tilde{C}_0 \tau) \right)_t \leq \left((3K)^{-\frac{1}{4}} e^{-\frac{\lambda(1+t)^{1-\lambda}}{1-\lambda}} M \right) e^{\frac{\alpha(1+t)^{1-\lambda}}{1-\lambda}}. \tag{3.62}$$

Integrating (3.62) from 0 to t to see

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{\frac{\alpha(1+t)^{1-\lambda}}{1-\lambda}} \ln(\tilde{C}_0 \tau) - e^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\lambda}} \ln(\tilde{C}_0 \tau_0) \\ & \leq (3K)^{-\frac{1}{4}} M \int_0^t e^{\frac{(\alpha-\lambda)(1+s)^{1-\lambda}}{1-\lambda}} ds \\ & = (3K)^{-\frac{1}{4}} M e^{\frac{(\alpha-\lambda)(1+t)^{1-\lambda}}{1-\lambda}} t. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \ln(\tilde{C}_0 \tau) & \leq \left[e^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\lambda}} \ln(\tilde{C}_0 \tau_0) + (3K)^{-\frac{1}{4}} M e^{\frac{(\alpha-\lambda)(1+t)^{1-\lambda}}{1-\lambda}} t \right] e^{-\frac{\alpha(1+t)^{1-\lambda}}{1-\lambda}} \\ & = e^{\frac{\alpha(1-(1+t)^{1-\lambda})}{1-\lambda}} \ln(\tilde{C}_0 \tau_0) + (3K)^{-\frac{1}{4}} M e^{\frac{-\lambda(1+t)^{1-\lambda}}{1-\lambda}} t \\ & \leq \ln \tilde{C}_0 \tau_0 + (3K)^{-\frac{1}{4}} M e^{\frac{-\lambda(1+t)^{1-\lambda}}{1-\lambda}} t \\ & = \ln(\tilde{C}_0 \tau_0) + (3K)^{-\frac{1}{4}} M e^{\frac{-\lambda(1+t)^{1-\lambda}}{1-\lambda}} t. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\tau \leq \tau_0 e^{(3K)^{-\frac{1}{4}} Mte^{\frac{-\lambda(1+t)^{1-\lambda}}{1-\lambda}}}, \quad \text{for } \lambda < 0,$$

i.e.,

$$\rho \geq \tau_0^{-1} e^{-(3K)^{-\frac{1}{4}} Mte^{\frac{-\lambda(1+t)^{1-\lambda}}{1-\lambda}}} \geq C_0^{-1} e^{-\hat{M}te^{\frac{-\lambda(1+t)^{1-\lambda}}{1-\lambda}}}, \quad \text{for } \lambda < 0, \tag{3.63}$$

where we have used (2.5) and $\hat{M} := (3K)^{-\frac{1}{4}} M$..

Step 4. For any given $t_0 > 0$, it follows from (3.43), (3.50), (3.61) and (3.63) that

$$\begin{aligned} |a_1| &\le \left[\frac{\alpha}{2} + \alpha \ln \bar{M}(t_0)\right] \max\{(1+t_0)^{-\lambda}, 1\}, \\ |a_0| &\le \left[\frac{|\lambda|\alpha}{2K_c} \ln \bar{M}(t_0) + \frac{\alpha^2}{4K_c} \ln \bar{M}(t_0) + \frac{\alpha^2}{4K_c} (\ln \bar{M}(t_0))^2\right] \max\{(1+t_0)^{-2\lambda}, 1\}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.64}$$

where for $\lambda \ge 0$,

$$\bar{M}(t_0) := \max\left\{\sqrt{3K}\tilde{C}_0, (\sqrt{3K}\tilde{C}_0)^{-1}, \sqrt{3K}e^{-\hat{M}t_0}, (\sqrt{3K}e^{-\hat{M}t_0})^{-1}\right\} \ge 1, \tag{3.65}$$

and for $\lambda < 0$,

$$\bar{M}(t_0) := \max\left\{\sqrt{3K}\tilde{C}_0, (\sqrt{3K}\tilde{C}_0)^{-1}, \sqrt{3K}e^{-\hat{M}t_0 e^{\frac{-\lambda}{1-\lambda}(1+t_0)^{-\lambda}}}, (\sqrt{3K}e^{-\hat{M}t_0 e^{\frac{-\lambda}{1-\lambda}(1+t_0)^{-\lambda}}})^{-1}\right\} \ge 1. \tag{3.66}$$

It is directly to check that when $\bar{M}(t_0)$ is non-decreasing with respect to t_0.

Using (3.50), (3.64) and (3.65)-(3.66), there exists a function $\tilde{M}(t_0)$, which is non-decreasing with respect to t_0, such that

$$\left|\frac{a_1}{a_2}\right| + \sqrt{\left|\frac{a_1}{a_2}\right|^2 + 2\left|\frac{a_0}{a_2}\right|} \le \tilde{M}(t_0), \quad \text{for any } 0 \le t \le t_0. \tag{3.67}$$

If there exists one point x_0 such that $y_1(x_0, 0) < -\max\left\{\frac{2}{K_c t_0}, \tilde{M}(t_0)\right\}$, i.e., (2.19) holds, then using (3.67), one has

$$-\frac{1}{2}a_2 y_1(x_0,0)^2 - a_1(0)y_1(x_0,0) + a_0(0) < 0,$$

and using (3.48), we obtain

$$y_1'|_{t=0} = -\frac{1}{2}a_2 y_1(x_0,0)^2 + \left(-\frac{1}{2}a_2 y_1(x_0,0)^2 - a_1(0)y_1(x_0,0) + a_0(0)\right) < -\frac{1}{2}a_2 y_1(x_0,0)^2 \le 0.$$

Thus along the forward characteristic line starting from $(x_0, 0)$, we have

$$y_1(x_+(t), t) < y_1(x_0, 0) < -\max\left\{\frac{2}{K_c t_0}, \tilde{M}(t_0)\right\}, \quad \text{for all } 0 \le t \le t_0. \tag{3.68}$$

Turning back to (3.48) and using (3.67) and (3.68), it holds

$$y_1' = -\frac{1}{2}a_2 y_1^2 + \left(-\frac{1}{2}a_2 y^2 - a_1 y + a_0\right) < -\frac{1}{2}a_2 y_1^2, \quad \text{for all } 0 \le t \le t_0. \tag{3.69}$$

Integrating (3.69) with respect to t along the forward characteristic line starting from $(x_0, 0)$, we get

$$0 > y_1^{-1}(x_+(t), t) > y_1^{-1}(x_0, 0) + \int_0^t \frac{1}{2}a_2 ds = y_1^{-1}(x_0, 0) + \frac{1}{2}K_c t, \quad \text{for all } 0 \le t \le t_0. \tag{3.70}$$

Since $y_1^{-1}(x_0, 0) \in (-\frac{1}{2}K_c t_0, 0)$, the right hand side of (3.70) will goes to zero as $t \to t_0$, which implies that $y(x_+(t), t)$ will blow up before t_0. By similar arguments, we obtain that q_1 will blow up before t_0 if (2.20) holds.

Finally, using (3.61), (3.63) and (3.49), we see that y_1 or q_1 blows up in finite time means $\|(\tau_x, u_x)\|_{L^\infty}$ blows up in finite time. Therefore the proof of Theorem 2.6 is completed. □

References

[1] Y. Sui, H. Yu, Singularity formation for compressible Euler equations with time-dependent damping, Discrete & Continuous Dynamical Systems-A, 41 (2021) 4921–4941.

[2] C. Dafermos, Hyperbolic conservation laws in continuum physics, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences], Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 325 (2000).

[3] G. Stokes, On a difficulty in the theory of sound, Philos. Magazine, 33 (1848) 349–356.

[4] P. Lax, Development of singularities of solutions of nonlinear hyperbolic partial differential equations, J. Math. Phys., 5 (1964) 611–614.

[5] F. John, Formation of Singularities in One-Dimensional Nonlinear Wave Propagation, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 27 (1974) 377–405.

[6] T. Li, Y. Zhou, D. Kong, Global classical solutions for general quasilinear hyperbolic systems with decay initial data, Nonlinear Anal-Theor., 28 (1997) 1299–1332.

[7] T. Liu, Development of singularities in the nonlinear waves for quasilinear hyperbolic partial differential equations, J. Differ. Equations, 33 (1979) 92–111.

[8] X. Pan, Blow up of solutions to 1-d Euler equations with time-dependent damping, J. Math. Anal. Appl., 442 (2016) 435–445.

[9] K. Cheung, Blowup phenomena for the N-dimensional compressible Euler equations with damping, Z. Angew. Math. Phys., 68 (2017) 27.

[10] S. Chen, H. Li, J. Li, M. Mei, K. Zhang, Global and blow-up solutions for compressible Euler equations with time-dependent damping, J. Differ. Equations, 268 (2020) 5035–5077.

[11] X. Fang, H. Yu, Uniform boundedness in weak solutions to a specific dissipative system, J. Math. Anal. Appl., 461 (2018) 1153–1164.

[12] F. Huang, T. Li, H. Yu, D. Yuan, Large time behavior of entropy solutions to one-dimensional unipolar hydrodynamic model for semiconductor devices, Z. Angew. Math. Phys., 69 (2018) 69.

[13] Y. Sui, H. Yu, Vacuum and singularity formation problem for compressible Euler equations with general pressure law and time-dependent damping, Nonlinear Analysis: Real World Applications, 65 (2022) 103472.

[14] H. Yu, Asymptotic Behavior of the 3D Compressible Euler Equations with Nonlinear Damping and Slip Boundary Condition, J. App. Math., (2012) 1–16.

[15] H. Li, J. Li, M. Mei, K. Zhang, Convergence to nonlinear diffusion waves for solutions of p-system with time-dependent damping, J. Math. Anal. Appl., 456 (2017) 849–871.

[16] H. Li, J. Li, M. Mei, K. Zhang, Optimal convergence rate to nonlinear diffusion waves for Euler equations with critical overdamping, Appl. Math. Lett., 113 (2021) 106882.

[17] Y. Sugiyama, Singularity formation for the 1D compressible Euler equations with variable damping coefficient, Nonlinear Analysis, 170 (2018) 70–87.

[18] G. Chen, R. Pan, S. Zhu, Singularity formation for the compressible Euler equations, SIAM J. Math. Anal., 49 (2017) 2591–2614.

[19] G. Chen, Optimal time-dependent lower bound on density for classical solution of 1-D compressible Euler equations, Indiana Univ. Math. J., 66(3) (2017) 725–740.

[20] G. Chen, Optimal density lower bound on nonisentropic gas dynamics, J. Differential. Equations., 268 (2020) 4017–4028.