# Construction of a stable periodic solution to a semilinear heat equation with a prescribed profile

Fethi Mahmoudi,

*fmahmoudi@dim.uchile.cl*

*Universidad de Chile, Centro de Modelamiento Matemático,*

Nejla Nouaili,

*Nejla.Nouaili@dauphine.fr*

*CEREMADE, Université Paris Dauphine, Paris Sciences et Lettres.*

Hatem Zaag[*],

*Hatem.Zaag@univ-paris13.fr*

*Université Paris 13, Sorbonne Paris Cité,*

*LAGA, CNRS (UMR 7539), F-93430, Villetaneuse, France.*

May 22, 2015

### Abstract

We construct a periodic solution to the semilinear heat equation with power non-linearity, in one space dimension, which blows up in finite time $T$ only at one blow-up point. We also give a sharp description of its blow-up profile. The proof relies on the reduction of the problem to a finite dimensional one and the use of index theory to conclude. Thanks to the geometrical interpretation of the finite-dimensional parameters in terms of the blow-up time and blow-up point, we derive the stability of the constructed solution with respect to initial data.

**Mathematical Subject classification**: 35K57, 35K40, 35B44.
**Keywords**: Blow-up profile, periodic semilinear heat equation.

## 1 Introduction

The behavior of partial differential equations (PDEs) may depend on the space $\Omega$ where they are considered. As a matter of fact, it is classical in the litterature to compare the case of $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N$ with the case where $\Omega$ is a bounded domain, with boundary conditions.

However, in both cases, the space is "flat", which may prevent from seeing the effect of curvature, very important in many physical situations. Thus, considering the case of a new flat $\Omega$ appears to be relevant, at least for this reason, but not only. Indeed, that case appears also to be very challenging, from a mathematical point of view.

---

As a matter of fact, many authors considered this case in the literature, in recent years. Let us mention the case of the nonlinear Schrödinger equation on $\mathbb{S}^N$ by Pausader, Tzvetkov and Wang in [PTW14] and also by Burq, Gérard and Tzvetkov in [BGT02]. There is also the work of Méhats and Gérard [GM11] who consider the Schrödinger-Poisson system on $\mathbb{S}^2$. We cite also the case of the Navier-Stokes equation on the sphere $\mathbb{S}^2$ by Cao, Rammaha and Titi [CRT99].

In the case of the nonlinear heat equation, we mention on the work by Matano, Punzo and Tesei in [MPT], where they considerd front propagation on the hyperbolic space $\mathbb{H}^N$, $N \geq 2$. We cite also the work of Cao, Rammaha and Titi [CRT00], where they considered the nonlinear parabolic equation on $\mathbb{S}^2$.

In this paper, we would like to see whether the curvature may influence the blow-up behavior, by considering the following semilinear heat equation.

$$\partial_t u = \Delta_{\mathbb{S}^N} u + |u|^{p-1} u, \tag{1}$$

where $u(t) : x \in \mathbb{S}^N \to \mathbb{R}$ and $\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^N}$ denotes the Laplace-Beltrami operator on $\mathbb{S}^N \subset \mathbb{R}^{N+1}$.

By using the localization in charts, we felt that the interaction between the singular regions (where blow-up occurs) and the regular region highly challenging, and no easy solution seems to be available. For that reason, we restrict ourselves to the case where $N = 1$ which is easier, due to the one-dimensional character and the periodicity. Of course the case $N = 1$ conserves all the challenging character of the interaction question.

The Cauchy problem for system (1) can be solved in $(L^\infty(\mathbb{S}^N))$, locally in time. We say that $u(t)$ blows up in finite time $T < \infty$, if $u(t)$ exists for all $t \in [0, T)$ and $\lim_{t \to T} \|u(t)\|_{L^\infty} = +\infty$. In that case, $T$ is called the blow-up time of the solution. A point $x_0 \in \mathbb{S}^N$ is said to be a blow-up point if there is a sequence $\{(x_j, t_j)\}$, such that $x_j \to x_0$, $t_j \to T$ and $|u(x_j, t_j)| \to \infty$ as $j \to \infty$.

Two questions arise in the blow-up study:

- the classification for arbitrary blow-up solutions.

- the construction of examples obeying same prescribed behavior.

Let us first briefly mention the literature on blow-up in the case where $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N$:

$$\partial_t u = \Delta u + |u|^{p-1} u, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^N \tag{2}$$

The blow-up question for equation (2), has been studied intensively by many authors and no list can be exhaustive.

Regarding the classification question, when it comes to deriving the blow-up profile, the situation is completely understood in one space dimension (however, less is understood in higher dimensions, see Velázquez [Vel92, Vel93a, Vel93b] and Zaag [Zaa02a, Zaa02b, Zaa02c] for partial results). In one space dimension, given $a$ a blow-up point, this is the situation:

- *either*

$$\sup_{|x-a|\leq K\sqrt{(T-t)\log(T-t)}}\left|(T-t)u(x,t)-f\left(\frac{x-a}{\sqrt{(T-t)|\log(T-t)|}}\right)|\right|\to 0, \qquad (3)$$

- *or for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$, even, $m \geq 2$, and $C_m > 0$*

$$\sup_{|x-a|<K(T-t)^{1/2m}}\left|(T-t)u(x,t)-f_m\left(\frac{C_m(x-a)}{(T-t)^{1/2m}}\right)\right|\to 0, \qquad (4)$$

*as $t \to T$, for any $K > 0$, where*

$$f(z) = \left(p-1+\frac{(p-1)^2}{4p}z^2\right)^{-\frac{1}{p-1}} \quad and \quad f_m(z) = \left(p-1+|z|^2m\right)^{-\frac{1}{p-1}}. \qquad (5)$$

Let us mention that when $\Omega$ is a subdomain of $\mathbb{R}^N$ with $C^{2,\alpha}$ boundary, Giga and Kohn proved in [GK89] that no blow-up occurs at the boundary and many of the above results hold.

Regarding the construction question, from Bricmont and Kupiainen [BK94] and Herrero and Velázquez [HV93], we have examples of initial data leading to each of the abovementioned scenarios. Note that (3) corresponds to the fundamental mode of the harmonic oscillator in the leading order, whereas (4) corresponds to higher modes. Moreover, Herrero and Velázquez proved the genericity of the behavior (3) in one space dimension in [HV92] and [HV94], and only announced the result in the higher dimensional case (the result has never been published). Note also that the stability of such a profile with respect to initial data has been proved by Fermanian Kammerer, Merle and Zaag in [FKZ00] and [FKMZ00]. For more results on equation (2), see [Bal77], [GK85], [GK87], [GK89], [HV93], [HV94], [MM04], [MM09], [MZ98], [MZ00], [Miz07] and [QS07].

In this paper, we address the construction question of equation (1) when $N = 1$, and give the first example of a blow-up solution of equation (1) in $\mathbb{S}$, with a full description of its blow-up profile, obeying behavior (3) (note that our method extends with no difficulty to the construction of an analogous solution obeying the behavior (4); however, the proof should be even more technical).

Making the change of variables $x = e^{i\theta} \in \mathbb{S}$, we can write (1) as

$$\partial_t u = \partial_\theta^2 u + |u|^{p-1}u, \qquad (6)$$

where $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $u(.,t)$ is $2\pi-$periodic.
The goal of this work, as we said above, is to show that behavior (3) does occur. More precisely, this is our result:

**Theorem 1** *(**Existence of a blow-up solution for equation (6) with the description of its profile***) There exists $T > 0$ such that equation (6) has a solution $u(\theta, t)$ in $\mathbb{S} \times [0, T)$ such that:*

*(i) the solution u blows up in finite time T only in $2\pi\mathbb{Z}$;*

*(ii) there holds that for all $R > 0$,*

$$\sup_{|\theta| \leq R\sqrt{(T-t)|\log(T-t)|}, k \in \mathbb{Z}} \left| (T-t)^{\frac{1}{p-1}} u(\theta + 2k\pi, t) - f\left( \frac{\theta + 2k\pi}{\sqrt{(T-t)|\log(T-t)|}} \right) \right| \to 0 \; as \; t \to T,$$

(7)

*where f is defined by (5).*

*(iii) for all $\theta \notin 2\pi\mathbb{Z}$, $u(\theta, t) \to u(\theta, T)$ as $t \to T$, with $u(\theta, T) \sim u^*(\theta - 2k\pi)$ as $\theta \to 2k\pi$, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, where*

$$u^*(\theta) = \left[ \frac{(p-1)^2|\log\theta|}{8p\theta^2} \right]^{-\frac{1}{p-1}}.$$

(8)

Our proof uses some ideas developed by Bricmont and Kupiainen [BK94] and Merle and Zaag [MZ97b] and [MZ97a] to construct a blow-up solution for the semilinear heat equation (2) obeying the behavior (3). In [EZ11], Ebde and Zaag use the same ideas to show the persistence of the profile (3) under perturbations of equation (1) in the real case by lower order terms involving $u$ and $\nabla u$. See also [NZ15a] by Nguyen and Zaag, where the autjors consider stronger perturbation than in [EZ11].

In [MZ08], Masmoudi and Zaag adapted that method to the case of the following complex Ginzburg-Landau equation, where no gradient structure exists:

$$\partial_t u = (1 + i\beta)\Delta u + (1 + i\delta)|u|^{p-1}u, \; with \; \beta \; and \; \delta \; are \; reals,$$

(note that the case $\beta = 0$ and $\delta$ small was first studied by Zaag in [Zaa98]). We also mention the recent work of Nouaili and Zaag in [NZ15b] for a complex-valued equation with no gradient structure.

More precisely, the proof relies on the understanding of the dynamics of the selfsimilar version of (1) (see system (22) below) around the profile (3). Moreover, we proceed in two steps:

- First, we reduce the question to a finite-dimensional problem: we show that it is enough to control a $(N + 1)$-dimensional variable in order to control the solution (which is infinite dimensional) near the profile.

- Second, we proceed by contradiction to solve the finite-dimensional problem and conclude using index theory.

Surprisingly enough, we would like to mention that this kind of methods has proved to be successful in various situations including hyperbolic and parabolic PDE, in particular with energy-critical exponents. This was the case for the construction of multi-solitons for the semilinear wave equation in one space dimension by Côte and Zaag [CZ13], the wave maps by Raphaël and Rodnianski [RR12], the Schrödinger maps by Merle, Raphaël and Rodnianski [MRR11], the critical harmonic heat flow by Schweyer [Sch12] and the two-dimensional Keller-Segel equation by Raphaël and Schweyer [RS13].

The interpretation of the parameters of the finite dimensional problem in terms of the blow-up time and blow-up point allows us, as in [MZ97b] and [MZ97a] to derive the stability of the constructed solution as stated in the following:

**Proposition 1.1 (Stability of the constructed solutions)** *Denote by $\hat{u}$ the solution constructed in Theorem 1 and by $\hat{T}$ its blow-up time. Then, there exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that for any initial data $u_0 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{S})$, satisfying*

$$\|u_0 - \hat{u}(.,0)\|_{L^\infty} \leq \varepsilon_0,$$

*the solution of equation (6), with initial data $u_0$ blows up in finite time $T(u_0)$ at only one blow-up point $a(u_0) \in \mathbb{S}$.*
*Moreover, the function $u(\theta - a(u_0),.)$ satisfies the same estimates as $u$ with $\hat{T}$ replaced by $T(u_0)$.*
*Furthermore, it follows that*

$$T(u_0) \to \hat{T}, \ \ a(u_0) \to a_0 \ as \ u_0 \to \hat{u}(0).$$

The proof of this stability result follows exactly as in [MZ97b] and [MZ97a]. For that reason we skip it and refer the interested readers to those papers.

We proceed in 3 sections to prove Theorem 1. We first give in Section 2 an equivalent formulation of the problem in the scale of the well-known similarity variables. Section 3 is devoted to the proof of the similarity variables formulation (this is a central part in our argument). In the last section, we prove Theorem 1.

## 2 Formulation of the problem

We would like to find initial data $u_0$ such that the solution $u$ of equation (1) blows up in time $T$ with

$$\sup_{|\theta| \leq R\sqrt{(T-t)|\log(T-t)|}, k \in \mathbb{Z}} \left| (T-t)^{\frac{1}{p-1}} u(\theta + 2k\pi, t) - f\left( \frac{\theta + 2k\pi}{\sqrt{(T-t)|\log(T-t)|}} \right) \right| \to 0 \ as \ t \to T, \tag{9}$$

This is the main estimate and the other results of Theorem 1 will appear as by-products of the proof (see Section 4 for the proof of all the estimates of Theorem 1). From periodicity, we will consider $\theta$ in one period, which depends on the region we consider (see below in the definitions of the regular and the blow-up region).
First, we introduce the following cut-off function $\chi_0 \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}, [0, 1])$, defined by:

$$\chi_0(\xi) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if} \quad |\xi| \leq 1, \\ 0 & \text{if} \quad |\xi| \geq 2. \end{cases} \tag{10}$$

In the following, we will divide our work in two parts; the blow-up region and the regular region.
**Remark: We can define $\bar{u}$ and $\tilde{u}$ later, after introducing $q$**

- In the regular region, we will study $\bar{u}$ defined by:

$$\bar{u}(\theta) = \begin{cases} u(\theta)\bar{\chi}(\theta) & \text{if} \quad \theta \in [0, 2\pi], \\ 0 & \text{if} \quad \theta \in \mathbb{R} \setminus [0, 2\pi], \end{cases} \tag{11}$$

5

where the function $\bar{\chi}$ is $2\pi-$periodic and defined for all $\xi \in [-\pi, \pi]$ by $\bar{\chi}(\xi) = 1 - \chi_0\left(\frac{4\xi}{\varepsilon_0}\right)$, where $\varepsilon_0$ will be fixed small enough later.

Then for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$, $\bar{u}(\theta)$ satisfies the following equation

$$\partial_t \bar{u} = \partial_\theta^2 \bar{u} + |u|^{p-1}\bar{u} - 2\bar{\chi}'\partial_\theta u - \bar{\chi}''u. \tag{12}$$

We control $\bar{u}$ using classical parabolic estimates on $u$ as we will see in ??, below.

- In the blow-up region, we will study $\tilde{u}$ defined by:

In the blow-up region of $u(\theta, t)$, we make the following self-similar transformation of problem (6):

$$
\begin{aligned}
W(y, s) &= (T - t)^{\frac{1}{p-1}} u(\theta, t), \\
y &= \frac{\theta}{\sqrt{T-t}}, \quad s = -\log(T - t),
\end{aligned} \tag{13}
$$

then $W(y, s)$, for $y \in \mathbb{R}$, satisfy the following:

$$\partial_s W = \partial_y^2 W - \frac{1}{2}y\partial_y W - \frac{1}{p-1}W + |W|^{p-1}W. \tag{14}$$

We note that for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$, $W$ is $2\pi e^{s/2}$ periodic.

Let us define

$$w(y, s) = \begin{cases} W(y, s)\chi(y, s) & \text{if } |y| \le \pi e^{s/2} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \tag{15}$$

where

$$\chi(y, s) = \chi_0\left(\frac{ye^{-s/2}}{\varepsilon_0}\right), \tag{16}$$

$\chi_0$ is defined by (10) and $\varepsilon_0$ will be fixed small enough later in the proof.

Then we multiply equation (14) by $\chi(y, s)$ and we get

$$\chi\partial_s W = \chi\partial_y^2 W - \frac{1}{2}y\chi\partial_y W - \frac{1}{p-1}w + |W|^{p-1}w,$$

therefore

$$\partial_s w = \partial_y^2 w - \frac{1}{2}y\partial_y w - \frac{1}{p-1}w + |w|^{p-1}w + F(y, s), \tag{17}$$

where

$$F(y, s) = \begin{cases} W\partial_s\chi - 2\partial_y\chi\partial_y W - W\partial_y^2\chi + \frac{1}{2}yW\partial_y\chi + |W|^{p-1}W\left(\chi - \chi^p\right) & \text{if } |y| \le \pi e^{s/2}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \tag{18}$$

**Remark**: We note that $\tilde{w}$ is not periodic, and that equation (17) is valid for all $y \in \mathbb{R}$.

Now, let us Introduce

$$w = \varphi + q, \tag{19}$$

with

$$\varphi = f\left(\frac{y}{\sqrt{s}}\right) + \frac{\kappa}{4ps}, \tag{20}$$

6

where
$$f(z) = \left(p - 1 + bz^2\right)^{-\frac{1}{p-1}}, \ \kappa = (p-1)^{-\frac{1}{p-1}} \text{ and } b = \frac{(p-1)^2}{4p}. \tag{21}$$

The problem is then reduced to constructing a function $q$ such that

$$\lim_{s \to \infty} \|q(y,s)\|_{L^\infty} = 0,$$

and $q$ is a solution of the following equation for all $(y,s) \in \mathbb{R} \times [s_0, \infty)$,

$$\partial_s q = (\mathcal{L} + V)q + B(y,s) + R(y,s) + F(y,s), \tag{22}$$

where
$$\mathcal{L} = \partial_y^2 - \frac{1}{2} y \partial_y + 1, \ V(y,s) = p\varphi(y,s)^{p-1} - \frac{p}{p-1}, \tag{23}$$

$$B(y,s) = |\varphi + q|^{p-1}(\varphi + q) - \varphi^p - p\varphi^{p-1}q, \, , \tag{24}$$

and
$$\begin{aligned} R(y,s) &= \partial_y^2 \varphi - \frac{1}{2} y \partial_y \varphi - \frac{\varphi}{p-1} + \varphi^{p-1} - \partial_s \varphi, \\ F(y,s) &= H(y,s) + \partial_y G(y,s) \text{ with}, \\ H(y,s) &= W\left(\partial_s \chi + \partial_y^2 \chi + \frac{1}{2} y \partial_y \chi\right) + |W|^{p-1}W(\chi - \chi^p) \\ G(y,s) &= -2\partial_y \chi W \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

The control of $q$ and near 0 obeys two facts:

- Localization: the fact that our profile $\varphi(y,s)$ dramatically changes its value from $1 + \frac{1}{4s}$ in the region near 0 to $\frac{1}{4s}$ in the region near infinity, according to a free boundary moving at the speed $\sqrt{s}$. This will require different treatments in the regions $|y| < 2K_0\sqrt{s}$ and $2K_0\sqrt{s} < |y| < \frac{\pi}{2}e^{s/2}$ for some $K_0$ to be chosen.

- Spectral information: the fact that the operator $\mathcal{L}$ is selfadjoint, $b$ is quadratic in $q$ and that
$$\|R(s)\|_{L^\infty} + \|V(s)\|_{L_\rho^2} \to 0 \text{ as } s \to \infty$$

from (19) and (23), which shows that the dynamics of equation (22) near 0 are driven by the spectral properties of $\mathcal{L}$. This will require a decomposition of the solution according to the spectrum of $\mathcal{L}$. Note that the operator $\mathcal{L}$ is self-adjoint in the Hilbert space

$$L_\rho^2 = \{g \in L_{loc}^2(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}), \|g\|_{L_\rho^2}^2 \equiv \int_{\mathbb{R}} |g|^2 e^{-\frac{|y|^2}{4}} dy < +\infty\} \text{ where } \rho(y) = \frac{e^{-\frac{|y|^2}{4}}}{(4\pi)^{1/2}}.$$

The spectrum of $\mathcal{L}$ is explicitly given by

$$spec(\mathcal{L}) = \{1 - \frac{m}{2}, \ m \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

All the eigenvalues are simple, the eigenfunctions are dilations of Hermite's polynomial and given by

$$h_m(y) = \sum_{n=0}^{[\frac{m}{2}]} \frac{m!}{n!(m-2n)!}(-1)^n y^{m-2n}. \tag{26}$$

7

Note that $\mathcal{L}$ has two positive (or expanding) directions ($\lambda = 1$ and $\lambda = \frac{1}{2}$), and a zero direction ($\lambda = 0$). Complying with the localization and spectral information facts, we will decompose $q$ accordingly as stated above:

- First, let us introduce

$$\chi_1(y, s) = \chi_0 \left( \frac{|y|}{K_0 \sqrt{s}} \right), \tag{27}$$

where $\chi_0$ is defined in (10), $K_0 \geq 1$ will be chosen large enough so that various technical estimates hold. Then, we write $q = q_b + q_e$, where the inner parts and the outer parts are given by

$$q_b = q\chi_1, \ q_e = q(1 - \chi_1). \tag{28}$$

Let us remark that

$$supp(q_b(s)) \subset B(0, 2K_0\sqrt{s}) \text{ and } supp(q_e(s)) \subset \mathbb{R} \setminus B(0, K_0\sqrt{s}).$$

- Second, we study $q_b$ using the structure of $\mathcal{L}$, isolating the nonnegative directions. More precisely we decompose $q_b$ as follows

$$q_b(y, s) = \sum_0^2 q_m(s)h_m(y) + q_-(y, s), \tag{29}$$

where $q_m$ is the projection of $q_b$ on $h_m$, $q_-(y, s) = P_-(q_b)$ and $P_-$ is the projection on $\{h_i, \ i \geq 3\}$ the negative subspace of the $\mathcal{L}$.

In summary, we can decompose $q$ in 5 components as follows:

$$q(y, s) = \sum_{m=0}^2 q_m(s)h_m(y) + q_-(y, s) + q_e(y, s). \tag{30}$$

Here and throughout the paper, we call $q_-(y, s)$ the negative part of $q$ and $q_2$, the null mode of $q$.

# 3 The construction method in selfsimilar variables

This section is devoted to the proof of the existence of a solution $u$ of equation (1) satisfying $\|q(s)\|_{L^\infty} \to 0$. This is a central argument in our proof. Though we refer to the earlier work by Merle and Zaag [MZ97b] for purely technical details, we insist on the fact that we can completely split from that paper as long as ideas and arguments are considered. We hope that the explanation of the strategy we give in this section will be more reader friendly.

We proceed in 3 subsections:

- In the first subsection, we give all the arguments of the proof without the details, which are left for the following subsection (readers not interested in technical details may stop here).

- In the second subsection, we give various estimates concerning initial data.

- In the third subsection, we give the dynamics of system (22) near the zero solution, in accordance with the decomposition (30).

### 3.1 The proof without technical details

Given $T > 0$, we consider initial data for equation (1) $2\pi-$periodic defined for all $\theta \in [-\pi, \pi]$ by:

$$u_0(\theta, d_0, d_1) = T^{-\frac{1}{p-1}} \left\{ \varphi(y, s_0)\chi(8y, s_0) + \frac{A}{s_0^2}(d_0 + d_1 y)\chi_1(2y, s_0) \right\}, \text{ where } s_0 = -\log T, \ y = \frac{\theta}{\sqrt{T}} \tag{31}$$

$\chi$ is defined in (16) and $\chi_1$ is defined in (27). Note that $u_0$ depends also on $K_0$, $\varepsilon_0$, $A$ and $T$, but we omit that dependence in (31) for simplicity.

Note also that the transition at $-\pi + 2k\pi$ in $u_0$ is smooth, since $u_0 \equiv 0$ is some open interval around that number.

Thanks to section 2, in order to control $u(s)$ near $\varphi$, it is enough to control it in some shrinking set defined as follows:

**Definition 3.1 (Definition of a shrinking set for the components of $q$)** *For all $K_0 > 0$, $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, $A > 0$, $0 < \eta_0 \leq 1$ and $T > 0$, we define for all $t \in [0, T)$ the set $S^*(K_0, \varepsilon_0, A, \eta_0, T, t)$ as being the set of all functions $u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ satisfying:*

*i)**Estimates in $\mathcal{R}_1$:** $q(s) \in V_{K_0,A}(s)$ where $s = -\log(T - t)$, $q(s)$ is defined in (13), (15), (19) and (20) and $V_{K_0,A}(s)$ is the set of all functions $r \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ such that*

$$\begin{cases} |r_m(s)| \leq As^{-2}(m = 0, 1), & |r_2(s)| \leq A^2 s^{-2} \log s, \\ |r_-(y, s)| \leq As^{-2}(1 + |y|^3), & |r_e(y, s)| \leq As^{-1/2}, \end{cases} \tag{32}$$

*where*

$$\begin{cases} r_e(y, s) = (1 - \chi_1(y, s))r(y, s), & r_-(s) = P_-(\chi_1(s)r), \\ \text{for } m \in \mathbb{N}, \ r_m(y, s) = \int d\rho k_m(y)\chi_1(y, s)r(y), \end{cases} \tag{33}$$

*$\chi_1$ is defined in (27), $P_-$ is the $L_\rho^2$ projector on $Vect\{h_m|m \geq 3\}$.*

*ii)**Estimates in $\mathcal{R}_2$:** For all $\frac{\varepsilon_0}{2} \leq |\theta| \leq \pi$, $|u(\theta, t)| \leq \eta_0$.*

**Remark:** For simplicity, we may write $S^*(t)$ instead of $S^*(K_0, \varepsilon_0, A, \eta_0, T, t)$. Note also that our arguments work with $\eta_0 = 1$.

Thus, our aim become the following:

**Proposition 3.2 (Existence of a solution of (22) trapped in $S^*(t)$)** *There exists $K_{01} > 0$ such that for each $K_0 \geq K_{01}$, there exists $\delta_1(K_0)$, such that for any $\varepsilon_0 \leq \delta_1(K_0)$, there exists $A_1(K_0, \varepsilon_0)$, such that for any $A \geq A_1$ and $0 < \eta_0 \leq 1$, there exists $s_{0,0}(K_0, \varepsilon_0, A, \eta_0)$ such that for all $T \leq e^{-s_{0,0}}$, there exists $(d_0, d_1) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, such that: if $u$ is a solution of (6) with initial data given by (31), then*

$$\forall t \in [0, T), \ u(t) \in S^*(K_0, \varepsilon_0, A, \eta_0, T, t).$$

The aim of this section is to prove this proposition.
**REMARQUE**: Attention il faut fixer les autres paramètres.

In the following lemma, we find a set $D_{A,T} = D_T$ such that $u(0) \in S^*(0)$, whenever $(d_0, d_1) \in D_T$. More precisely, we claim the following:

**Lemma 3.3 (Choice of parameters $d_0, d_1$ to have initial data in $S^*(0)$)** *There exists $K_{02} > 0$ such that for each $K_0 \geq K_{02}$ there exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, $A \geq 1$, there exists $s_{0,1}(K_0, \varepsilon_0, A) \geq 0$ such that for all $s \geq s_{0,1}$:*
*If initial data for equation (1) are given by (31): then, there exists a rectangle*

$$D_{K_0, \varepsilon_0, A, T} = D_T \subset [-2, 2]^2, \tag{34}$$

*such that, for all $(d_0, d_1) \in D_T$, we have*

$$u(K_0, T, A, d_0, d_1) \in S^*(0).$$

*Proof*: The proof is purely technical and follows as the analogous step in [MZ97b], for that reason we refer the reader to Lemma 3.5 page 156 and Lemma 3.9 page 160 in [MZ97b]. ∎

Let us consider $(d_0, d_1) \in D_{s_0}$ and $s_0 \geq s_{0,1}$ defined in Lemma 3.3. Since $u_0$ is $2\pi-$periodic, from the local Cauchy theory, we define a maximal $2\pi-$periodic solution $u$ to equation (1) with initial data (31), and a maximal time $t_*(d_0, d_1) \in [0, T)$ such that,

$$\text{for all } t \in [0, t_*), \ u(t) \in S^*(t), \tag{35}$$

- either $t_* = T$,

- or $t_* < T$ and from continuity,

$$u(t_*) \in \partial S^*(t_*), \tag{36}$$

  in the sense that when $t = t_*$, one '$\leq$' symbol in the definition of $S^*(t_*)$ is replaced by the symbol '$=$'.

Our aim is to show that for all $A$ and $T$ small enough, one can find a parameter $(d_0, d_1)$ in $D_T$ such that

$$t_*(d_0, d_1) = T. \tag{37}$$

We argue by contradiction, and assume that for all $(d_0, d_1) \in D_T$, $t_*(d_0, d_1) < T$. As we have just stated, one of the symbols '$\leq$' in the definition of $S^*(t)$ should be replaced by '$=$' symbols when $t = t_*$.
In fact, no $' ='$ sign occurs for $q_2$, $q_-$, $q_e$ and the estimate in $\mathcal{R}_2$, as one sees in the following:

**Lemma 3.4 Reduction to a finite dimensional problem** *For any $K_0 > 0$, there exists, $\delta_2(K_0) > 0$ such that for any $\varepsilon_0 \leq \delta_2(K_0)$, there exists $A_2(K_0, \varepsilon_0)$, such that for $A \geq A_2$ and $0 < \eta_0 \leq 1$, there exists $s_{0,2}(K_0, \varepsilon_0, A, \eta_0)$ such that for any $s \geq s_{0,2}$, we have*

$$(q_0(s_*), q_1(s_*)) \in \partial \left( \left[ -\frac{A}{s_*^2}, \frac{A}{s_*^2} \right]^2 \right), \text{ where } s_* = -\log(T - t_*).$$

**Remark:** The choice of parameters cited below is particularly intricate. We explain that at conclusion of Part 1 and Part 2 in pages 13 and 17 below.
*Proof*: This is a direct consequence of the dynamics of equation (22), as we will show in

Subsection 3.3 below.

Just to give a flavor of the argument, we invite the reader to look at Proposition 3.8 below, where we project equation (22) on the different components of $q$ introduced in (30). There, one can see that the components $q_2$, $q_-$ and $q_e$ correspond to decreasing directions of the flow and since they are "small" at $s = s_0 = -\log T$ (see Lemma 3.7 below), they remain small for $s \in [s_0, s_*]$, and can not touch the boundary of the intervals imposed by the definition of $S^*(t)$ in (32). Thus, only $q_0$ or $q_1$ may touch the boundary of the intervals in (32) at $s = s_*$.

For more details on the arguments, see Subsection 3.3 below. This ends the proof of Lemma 3.4.∎

From Lemma 3.4, we may define the rescaled flow $\Phi$ at $s = s_*$ for the two expanding directions, namely $q_0$ and $q_1$, as follows:

$$\Phi : \quad D_T \quad \to \quad \partial([-1,1]^2)$$
$$(d_0, d_1) \quad \to \quad \left(\frac{s_*^2 q_0}{A}, \frac{s_*^2 q_1}{A}\right)_{d_0, d_1} (s_*). \tag{38}$$

In particular,

$$\text{either } \omega q_m(s_*) = \frac{A}{s_*^2}, \tag{39}$$

for some $m \in \{0, 1\}$ and $\omega \in \{-1, 1\}$, both depending on $(d_0, d_1)$. In the following lemma, we show that $q_m$ actually crosses its boundary at $s = s_*$, resulting in the continuity of $s_*$ and $\Phi$. More precisely, we have the following:

**Lemma 3.5 (Transverse crossing)** *For each $K_0 > 0$, $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, there exists $A_3(K_0, \varepsilon_0) > 0$ such that for all $A \geq A_3$, there exists $s_{0,3}(K_0, \varepsilon_0, A)$ such that if $s_0 \geq s_{0,3}$, $0 < \eta_0 \leq 1$ and (39) holds, then*

$$\omega \frac{dq_m}{ds}(s_*) > 0 \tag{40}$$

Clearly, from the transverse crossing, we see that

$$(d_0, d_1) \mapsto s_*(d_0, d_1) \text{ is continuous,}$$

hence by definition (38), $\Phi$ is continuous. In order to find a contradiction and conclude, we crucially use the particular form we choose for initial data in (31). More precisely, we have the following:

**Lemma 3.6 (Degree 1 on the boundary)** *There exists $K_{05} > 0$ such that for each $K_0 \geq K_{05}$, $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ and $A \geq 1$, there exists $s_{0,4}(K_0, \varepsilon_0, A)$ such that if $s_0 \geq s_{0,4}$, then the mapping $(d_0, d_1) \to (q_0(s_0), q_1(s_0))$ maps $\partial D_T$ into $\partial\left([-\frac{A}{s_0^2}, \frac{A}{s_0^2}]^2\right)$, and has degree one on the boundary.*

Indeed, from this lemma and the transverse crossing property of Lemma 3.5, we see that if $(d_0, d_1) \in \partial D_T$, then $s_*(d_0, d_1) = s_0$,

$\Phi(s_*(s, d_0, d_1), d_0, d_1) = \left(\frac{s_*^2 q_0}{A}, \frac{s_*^2 q_1}{A}\right)(s_0)$ and $\Phi$ defined in (38) is a continuous function from the rectangle $D_T \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ to $\partial[-1,1]^2$, whose restriction to $\partial D_T$ is of degree 1. This is

11

a contradiction.

Thus, there exists $d_0, d_1 \in D_T$ such that

$$t_*(d_0, d_1) = T \text{ and } \forall t \in [0, T), \ u(t) \in S^*(t), \tag{41}$$

and Proposition 3.2 follows.

Thus, Proposition 3.2 is proved, and from (i) of Definition 3.1, we have constructed a solution $q$ to system (22), such that

$$\|q(s)\|_{L^\infty} \to 0 \text{ as } s \to \infty.$$

In the following subsections, we give the proofs of the technical steps of the current subsection (namely Lemmas 3.3, 3.4, 3.5 and 3.6), referring to earlier work when the proof is the same.

## 3.2 Preparation of initial data

In this subsection, we study initial data given by (31). More precisely, we state a lemma which directly implies Lemmas 3.3 and 3.6. It also shows the (relative) smallness of the components $q_2$, $q_-$ and $q_e$, an information which will be useful for the next subsection, dedicated to the dynamics of equation (22), crucial for the proofs of the reduction to a finite dimensional problem (Lemma 3.4) and the transverse crossing property (Lemma 3.5). More precisely, we claim the following:

**Lemma 3.7 (Decomposition of initial data in different components)** *There exists $K_{06} > 0$ such that for each $K_0 \geq K_{06}$, $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, $A \geq 1$, there exists $s_{0,5}(K_0, \varepsilon_0 A) \geq e$ such that for all $s_0 \geq s_{0,5}$:*
*(i) there exists a rectangle*

$$D_{K_0, \varepsilon_0, A, T} = D_T \subset [-2, 2]^2, \tag{42}$$

*such that the mapping $(d_0, d_1) \to (q_0(s_0), q_1(s_0))$ is linear and one to one from $D_T$ onto $[-\frac{A}{s_0^2}, \frac{A}{s_0^2}]^2$ and maps the boundary $\partial D_T$ into the boundary $\partial\left([-\frac{A}{s_0^2}, \frac{A}{s_0^2}]^2\right)$. Moreover, it is of degree one on the boundary.*
*(ii) For all $(d_0, d_1) \in D_T$, we have:*

$$|q_2(s_0)| \leq CAe^{-s_0}, \ |q_-(y, s_0)| \leq \frac{c}{s_0^2}(1 + |y|^3) \text{ and } q_e(y, s_0) = 0, \tag{43}$$
$$|d_0| + |d_1| \leq 1.$$

*(iii) For all $(d_0, d_1) \in D_T$ and $\frac{\varepsilon_0}{4} \leq |\theta| \leq \pi$, we have $u(\theta, d_0, d_1) = 0$.*

*Proof*: (i) and (ii) Since we have almost the same definition of the set $V_{K_0, A}$, and almost the same expression of initial data as in [MZ97b], we refer the reader to Lemma 3.5 page 156 and Lemma 3.9 page 160 from [MZ97b].
(iii)This follows by definition (31) of initial data for $s_0$ large enough. ∎

## 3.3 Details on the dynamics of equation (22)

This subsection is dedicated to the proof of Lemmas 3.4 and 3.5. They both follow from the understanding of the flow of equation (6) in the set $S^*(t)$.
We proceed in two sections: We first prove Lemma 3.4, then Lemma 3.5.

### 3.3.1 Reduction to a finite-dimensional problem

Here we prove Lemma 3.4. Since the definition of $S^*(t)$ shows two different types of estimates, in the region $\mathcal{R}_1$ and $\mathcal{R}_2$, accordingly, we need two different approaches to handle those estimates:

- In $\mathcal{R}_1$, we work in similarity variables (13), in particular we crucially use the projection of equation (22) with respect to the decomposition given in (30).

- In, $\mathcal{R}_2$, we directly work in the variables $u(x,t)$, using standard parabolic estimates.

**Part 1: Estimates in $\mathcal{R}_1$.**

In this part, we will show that

$$
\begin{aligned}
|q_2(s_*)| &\leq A^2 s_*^{-2} \log s_* - s_*^3, \quad |q_-(y, s_*)| \leq \tfrac{A}{2} s_*^{-2}(1 + |y|^3) \\
|q_e(y, s_*)| &\leq \tfrac{A^2}{2} s_*^{-2},
\end{aligned}
\tag{44}
$$

where $s_* = -\log(T - t_*)$, $q$ is defined in (19) and the notation is given in (30), for a good choice of the parameters. In fact, this will follow from the projection of equation (22) on the components $q_2$, $q_-$ and $q_e$ as we will see at the end of Part 1. Let us first give the behavior of those components in the following.

**Proposition 3.8 (Control of the null, negative and outer mode of equation (22))**
*For all $K_0 >, \varepsilon_0 > 0$, there exists $A_4 \geq 1$ such that for all $A \geq A_4$ and $\varsigma > 0$, there exists $s_{0,6}(K_0, \varepsilon_0, A, \eta)$ such that the following holds for all $s_0 \geq s_{0,6}$:*
*Assume that for some $\tau \geq s_0$ and for all $s \in [\tau, \tau + \varsigma]$,*

$$
u(t) \in S^*(t), \text{ with } t = T - e^{-s}.
$$

*Then, the following holds for all $s \in [\tau, \tau + \varsigma]$:*

$$
|q_2(s)| \leq \frac{\tau^2}{s^2}|q_2(\tau)| + \frac{CA(s - \tau)}{s^3},
$$

$$
\left\| \frac{q_-(s)}{1 + |y|^3} \right\|_{L^\infty} \leq Ce^{-\frac{(s-\tau)}{2}} \left\| \frac{q_-(\tau)}{1 + |y|^3} \right\|_{L^\infty} + C\frac{e^{-(s-\tau)^2}\|q_e(\tau)\|_{L^\infty}}{s^{3/2}} + \frac{C(1 + s - \tau)}{s^2},
$$

$$
\|q_e(s)\|_{L^\infty} \leq Ce^{-\frac{(s-\tau)}{2}}\|q_e(\tau)\|_{L^\infty} + C\frac{e^{s-\tau}}{s^{3/2}} \left\| \frac{q_-(\tau)}{1 + |y|^3} \right\|_{L^\infty} + \frac{C(1 + s - \tau)}{s^{1/2}}.
$$

Let us first insist on the fact that the derivation of (44) follows from Proposition 3.8, exactly as in the real case treated in [MZ97b] (see pages 163 to 166 and 158 to 159 in [MZ97b] ). For that reason, we only focus in the following on the proof of Proposition 3.8.

   *Proof of Proposition 3.8*:

The proof of Proposition 3.8 consists in the projection of the equation (22) on the different components of $q$ defined in (30).
We note that the proof is already available from Lemma 3.13 pages 167 and Lemma 3.8 page 158 from [MZ97b], in the case of the standard heat equation in $\mathbb{R}^N$ without truncation terms.

Since the equation satisfied by $q$ in (22) shares the same linear part as the corresponding equation in [MZ97b] , the proof is similar to the argument in [MZ97b], and the only novelty concerns the truncature term $F$ in (22). For that reason, we only give the ideas here, focusing only on the new term $F$ and kindly ask the interested reader to look at Lemma 3.13 page 167 and Lemma 3.8 page 158 in [MZ97b] for the technical details.

Let us first write equation (22) satisfied by $q$ in its Duhamel formulation,

$$q(s) \;=\; K(s,\tau)q(\tau) + \int_\tau^s d\sigma K(s,\sigma)B(q(\sigma)) + \int_\tau^s d\sigma K(s,\sigma)R(\sigma) + \int_\tau^s d\sigma K(s,\sigma)(H + \partial_y G)(\sigma),$$

(45)

where $K$ is the fundamental solution of the operator $\mathcal{L} + V$. We write $q = \alpha + \beta + \gamma + \delta + \tilde{\delta}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\alpha(s) = K(s,\tau)q(\tau), \quad \beta(s) = \int_\tau^s d\sigma K(s,\sigma)B(q(\sigma)), \\
&\gamma(s) = \int_\tau^s d\sigma K(s,\sigma)R(\sigma), \quad \delta(s) = \int_\tau^s d\sigma K(s,\sigma)H(\sigma) \\
&\tilde{\delta}(s) = \int_\tau^s d\sigma K(s,\sigma)\partial_y G(\sigma).
\end{aligned}$$

(46)

where, for a function $F(y,\sigma)$, $K(s,\sigma)F(\sigma)$ is defined by:

$$K(s,\sigma)F(\sigma) = \int_\tau^s d\sigma \int dx K(s,\sigma,y,x)F(x,\sigma).$$

We assume that $q(s) \in V_A(s)$ for each $s \in [\tau, \tau + \varsigma]$. Clearly, proceeding as the derivation of Lemma 3.13 page 167 in [MZ97b], Proposition 3.8 follows from the following:

**Lemma 3.9 (Projection of the Duhamel formulation)** *For all $K_0 > 0$, $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, there exists $A_5 \geq 1$ such that for all $A \geq A_5$ and $\varsigma > 0$ there exists $s_{0,7}(K_0, \varepsilon_0, A, \varsigma)$, such that for all $s_0 \geq s_{0,7}$, if $0 < \eta_0 \leq 1$ and we assume that for some $\tau \geq s_0$ and for all $s \in [\tau, \tau + \varsigma]$, $u(t) \in S^*(t)$ with $t = T - e^{-s}$, then*
*(i) (Linear terms)*

$$\begin{aligned}
|\alpha_2(s)| &\leq \frac{\tau^2}{s^2}|q_2(\tau)| + \frac{CA(s-\tau)}{s^3}, \\
\left\| \frac{\alpha_-(s)}{1+|y|^3} \right\|_{L^\infty} &\leq Ce^{-\frac{(s-\tau)}{2}} \left\| \frac{q_-(\tau)}{1+|y|^3} \right\|_{L^\infty} + C\frac{e^{-(s-\tau)^2}\|q_e(\tau)\|_{L^\infty}}{s^{3/2}} + \frac{C}{s^2}, \\
\|\alpha_e(s)\|_{L^\infty} &\leq Ce^{-\frac{(s-\tau)}{2}}\|q_e(\tau)\|_{L^\infty} + Ce^{s-\tau}s^{3/2} \left\| \frac{q_-(\tau)}{1+|y|^3} \right\|_{L^\infty} + \frac{C}{\sqrt{s}},
\end{aligned}$$

(47)

*(ii) (Nonlinear terms)*

$$|\beta_2(s)| \leq \frac{(s-\tau)}{s^3}, \qquad |\beta_-(y,s)| \leq \frac{(s-\tau)}{s^2}(1+|y|^3), \qquad \|\beta_e(s)\|_{L^\infty} \leq \frac{(s-\tau)}{\sqrt{s}},$$

$$|\delta_2(s)| \leq C\frac{(s-\tau)}{s^3}, \qquad |\delta_-(y,s)| \leq C\frac{(s-\tau)}{s^2}(1+|y|^3), \qquad \|\delta_e(s)\|_{L^\infty} \leq C\frac{(s-\tau)}{\sqrt{s}},$$

$$|\tilde{\delta}_2(s)| \leq C\frac{(s-\tau)}{s^3}, \qquad |\tilde{\delta}_-(y,s)| \leq C\frac{(s-\tau)}{s^2}(1+|y|^3), \qquad \|\tilde{\delta}_e(s)\|_{L^\infty} \leq C\frac{(s-\tau)}{\sqrt{s}}.$$

*(iii) (Source term)*

$$|\gamma_2(s)| \leq C(s-\tau)s^{-3}, \quad |\gamma_-(y,s)| \leq C(s-\tau)(1+|y|^3)s^{-2}, \quad \|\gamma_e(s)\|_{L^\infty} \leq (s-\tau)s^{-1/2}.$$

*Proof:* We consider, $A \geq 1$, $\varsigma > 0$, and $s_0 \geq \varsigma$. The terms $\alpha$, $\beta$ and $\gamma$ are already present in the case of the real-valued semilinear heat equation, so we refer to Lemma 3.13 page 167 in [MZ97b] for the estimates involving them. Thus, we only focus on the new terms $\delta(y, s)$ and $\tilde{\delta}(y, s)$. Note that since $s_0 \geq \varsigma$, if we take $\tau \geq s_0$, then $\tau + \varsigma \leq 2\tau$ and if $\tau \leq \sigma \leq s \leq \tau + \varsigma$, then

$$\frac{1}{2\tau} \leq \frac{1}{s} \leq \frac{1}{\sigma} \leq \frac{1}{\tau}. \tag{48}$$

Let us first derive the following bounds when $u(t) \in S^*(t)$:

**Lemma 3.10** *For all $K_0 > 0$, $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, $A \geq 1$, there exists $s_0 \geq s_{0,8}(K_0, \varepsilon_0, A)$ such that if $s \geq s_{0,8}$, $0 < \eta_0 \leq 1$ and we assume that $u(t) \in S^*(t)$ defined in Definition 3.1, where $t = T - e^{-s}$. Then, we have:*

$$(i) \ for \ all \ y \in \mathbb{R}, \ |q(y, s)| \leq CA^2 \tfrac{\log s}{s^2}(1 + |y|^3),$$
$$(ii) \ \|q(s)\|_{L^\infty} \leq C \tfrac{A^2}{\sqrt{s}},$$
$$(iii) \|W(s)\|_{L^\infty} \leq \kappa + 2.$$

*Proof*: (i) and (ii): Since $u(t) \in S^*(t)$, it follows by definition that $q(s) \in V_{K_0, A}(s)$, where $s = -\log(T - t)$, therefore, the proof is the same as the corresponding part in [MZ97b]. See Proposition 3.7 page 157 in [MZ97b] for details.
(iii) From (13), (15) and (19), we see that:

- If $|y| \leq \varepsilon_0 e^{s/2}$, then $W(y, s) = w(y, s) = \varphi(y, s) + q(y, s)$. Since $\|\varphi\|_{L^\infty} \leq \kappa + 1$ from (20), using (ii), we see that $\|W\|_{L^\infty} \leq \kappa + 2$ for $s$ large enough that is for $T$ small enough.

- If $|y| \geq \varepsilon_0 e^{s/2}$, then $W(y, s) = e^{-\frac{s}{p-1}} u(\theta e^{-s/2}, t)$ with $|\theta| \geq \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2}$. By (ii) of Definition 3.1, we see that $|W(y, s)| \leq \eta_0 e^{-\frac{s}{p-1}} \leq \eta_0 T^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \leq 1$, if $\eta_0 \leq 1$ and $T \leq 1$.

This concludes the proof of Lemma 3.10.∎

Then, we recall from Bricmont and Kupiainen [BK94] the following estimates on $K(s, \sigma)$, the semigroup generated by $\mathcal{L} + V$.

**Lemma 3.11** *(Properties of $K(s, \sigma)$): For all $s \geq \tau \geq 1$, with $s \leq 2\tau$, we have the following:*
*(i) for all $y$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$, we have,*

$$|K(s, \sigma, y, x)| \leq Ce^{(s-\sigma)\mathcal{L}}(y, x),$$

*where $e^{\varrho \mathcal{L}}$ is given explicitly by the Mehler's formula [?]*

$$e^{\varrho \mathcal{L}}(y, x) = \frac{e^\varrho}{\sqrt{4\pi(1 - e^{-\varrho})}} \exp\left[-\frac{(ye^{-\varrho/2} - x)^2}{4(1 - e^{-\varrho})}\right]. \tag{49}$$

*(ii) We have*

$$\left|\int K(s, \tau, y, x)(1 + |x|^m)dx\right| \leq C\int e^{(s-\tau)\mathcal{L}}(y, x)(1 + |x|^m)dx \leq e^{s-\tau}(1 + |y|^m). \tag{50}$$

15

*(iii) For all $g \in L^\infty$, such that $xg \in L^\infty$,*

$$\|K(s,\tau)\partial_x g\|_{L^\infty} \leq Ce^{s-\tau}\left\{\frac{\|g\|_{L^\infty}}{\sqrt{1-e^{-(s-\tau)}}} + \frac{(s-\tau)}{s}(1+s-\tau)\left((1+e^{\frac{s-\tau}{2}})\|xg\|_{L^\infty} + e^{\frac{s-\tau}{2}}\|g\|_{L^\infty}\right)\right\}.$$

*Proof:*
(i) See page 181 in [MZ97b]
(ii) See Corollary 3.14 page 168 in [MZ97b].
(iii) See Appendix A. ∎
Now, with lemma 3.10 and 3.11 at hand, we are ready to finish the proof of Lemma 3.9. As we mentioned at the beginning of that proof, we only focus on the proof of the estimates on $\delta$ and $\tilde{\delta}$, and refer the readers to Lemma 3.13 page 167 in [MZ97b] for the estimate involving $\alpha$, $\beta$ and $\delta$.

*Estimates on $\delta$ defined in (46):*
Consider $s \in [\tau, \tau+\varsigma]$ and recall that $0 < \eta_0 \leq 1$. Since $u(t) \in S^*(t)$ with $t = T - e^{-s}$, we see from the definition (13) of $W$ that when

$$|y| \geq \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2}e^{s/2}, \ |W(y,s)| \leq \eta_0 e^{-\frac{s}{p-1}} \leq e^{-\frac{s}{p-1}}. \tag{51}$$

Moreover by definition (16) of $\chi$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} &|\partial_y \chi| \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon_0}e^{-s/2}, \ |y\partial_y \chi| \leq C\mathbf{I}_{\varepsilon_0 e^{s/2} < |y| < 2\varepsilon_0 s^{s/2}} \\ &\text{and } |\partial_s \chi| + (1+|y|)|\partial_y \chi| + |\partial_y^2 \chi| + (\chi - \chi^p) \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon_0^2}\mathbf{I}_{\varepsilon_0 e^{s/2} < |y| < 2\varepsilon_0 s^{s/2}} \end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

Therefore, by definition (25), we see that

$$\|H(s)\|_{L^\infty} \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon_0^2}\eta_0 e^{-\frac{s}{p-1}} \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon_0^2}e^{-\frac{s}{p-1}}$$

In particular, if $\tau \leq \sigma \leq s \leq \tau+\varsigma$, we see from (48) that $\sigma \geq s/2$, hence

$$\|H(\sigma)\|_{L^\infty} \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon_0^2}e^{-\frac{\sigma}{p-1}} \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon_0^2}e^{-\frac{s}{2(p-1)}} \tag{53}$$

Using Lemma 3.11 and the definition (46) of $\delta$, we write

$$\begin{aligned} |\delta(y,s)| &\leq \int_\tau^s d\sigma \int_{\mathbb{R}} |K(s,\sigma,y,x)H(x,\sigma)|\,dx \\ &\leq \int_\tau^s d\sigma \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{(s-\sigma)\mathcal{L}}(y,x)\frac{C}{\varepsilon_0^2}e^{-\frac{s}{2(p-1)}}\,dx \\ &\leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon_0^2}e^{-\frac{s}{2(p-1)}}\int_\tau^s d\sigma e^{(s-\sigma)} \\ &\leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon_0^2}e^{-\frac{s}{2(p-1)}}(s-\tau) \\ &\leq \frac{(s-\tau)}{s^2}, \end{aligned} \tag{54}$$

for $s$ large enough depending on $\eta_0$.

By definition of $q_m$, $q_-$ and $q_e$ for $m \leq 2$, we write

$$
\begin{aligned}
|\delta_m(s)| &\leq \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \chi(y,s)\delta(y,s)k_m(y)\rho(y)dy \right| \leq C \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\delta(y,s)|(1+|y|^2)\rho(y)dy \leq \frac{C(s-\tau)}{s^3}, \\
|\delta_-(y,s)| &= \left| \chi(y,s)\delta(y,s) - \sum_{i=0}^{2} \delta_i(s)k_i(y) \right| \leq (s-\tau)(1+|y|^3)\frac{C}{s^2}. \\
|\delta_e(y,s)| &= \left| (1-\chi(y,s))\delta(y,s) \right| \leq (s-\tau)\frac{C}{\sqrt{s}},
\end{aligned}
$$

(55)

which are the desired estimations on $\delta$ in Lemma 3.9.

*Estimates on $\tilde{\delta}$ defined in (46)*
Since for all $s \in [\tau, \tau+\varsigma]$, $u(t) \in S^*(t)$, where $t = T - e^{-s}$, by assumption, using (51) and (52), we see that when $s_0 \leq \tau \leq \sigma \leq \tau \leq \tau + \varsigma$, we have $\sigma \geq s/2$, hence

$$
\|G(\sigma)\|_{L^\infty} \leq \frac{C\eta_0}{\varepsilon_0} e^{-\frac{(p+1)\sigma}{2(p-1)}} \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon_0} e^{-\frac{(p+1)s}{4(p-1)}},
$$

(56)

$$
\|xG(\sigma)\|_{L^\infty} \leq C\eta_0 e^{-\frac{\sigma}{p-1}} \leq C e^{-\frac{s}{2(p-1)}},
$$

(57)

where $G$ is defined by (25), remember that $\eta_0 \leq 1$.
Using (iii) of Lemma 3.11, with $g = G(\sigma)$, we obtain

$$
\|K(s,\sigma)\partial_x G\|_{L^\infty} \leq Ce^{s-\sigma} \left\{ \frac{e^{-\frac{(p+1)s}{4(p-1)}}}{\sqrt{1-e^{-(s-\sigma)}}} + \frac{(s-\sigma)}{s}(1+s-\sigma)\left( e^{-\frac{s}{2(p-1)}}(1+e^{\frac{s-\sigma}{2}}) + e^{\frac{s-\sigma}{2}}e^{-\frac{(p+1)s}{4(p-1)}} \right) \right\}.
$$

Integrating in time, we get rid of the square rest term in the denominator, and see that

$$
\left| \int_\tau^s K(s,\sigma)\partial_x G(x,\sigma)d\sigma \right| \leq Ce^{s-\tau}(s-\tau)e^{-\frac{s}{2(p-1)}}\left( e^{-\frac{s}{4}} + \frac{(s-\tau)}{s}(1+s-\tau)(1+e^{(s-\tau)/2}) \right).
$$

Proceeding as for $\delta$ and using the fact that $0 \leq s - \tau \leq \varsigma$, we get

$$
\sum_{m=0}^{2} |\tilde{\delta}_m(s)| + \left\| \frac{\tilde{\delta}_m(s)}{1+|y|^3} \right\|_{L^\infty} + \|\tilde{\delta}_e(s)\|_{L^\infty} \leq \frac{C(s-\tau)}{s^3},
$$

for $s_0$ large enough, which gives the desired estimates on $\tilde{\delta}$ in Lemma 3.9. Since the estimate notes for $\alpha$, $\beta$ and $\gamma$ defined in (46) follows exactly as in Lemma 3.13 p 167 [MZ97b], this concludes the proof of Lemma 3.9.∎

*Conclusion of Part 1 and choice of parameters:* Proceeding exactly as in [MZ97b], page 157, we derive estimate (44) from Proposition 3.8. This is possible for any $K_0 > 0$, $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, $A \geq A_4$, for some $A_4(K_0, \varepsilon_0) \geq 1$ and $s_0 \geq s_{0,6}$ for some $s_{0,6}(K_0, \varepsilon_0, A)$.

Since Proposition 3.8 follows directly from Lemma 3.9, this ends the proof of Proposition 3.8, as we mentioned right before the statement of Lemma 3.9 in the same way as in Proposition 3.11 page 161 in [MZ97b].∎

**Part 2: Estimates in $\mathcal{R}_2$.**

17

The aim of this part is to show that

$$\text{if } \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2} \leq |\theta| \leq \pi, \text{ then } |u(\theta, t_*)| \leq \frac{\eta_0}{2}, \tag{58}$$

provided the parameters satisfy some conditions. We proceed in 3 steps:

- In Step 1, we derive better bounds on the solution $u(\theta, t)$ in the intermediate region

$$K_0\sqrt{(T-t)\,|\log(T-t)|} \leq |\theta| \leq \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2}. \tag{59}$$

- In Step 2, we introduce a parabolic estimate on the solution in the region $\mathcal{R}_2$.

- Finally, in Step 3, we combine the previous steps to show (58).

**Step 1: Improved estimates in the intermediate region.**
Here, we refine the estimates on the solution in the region (59). In fact, we have from item (iii) of Lemma 3.10

$$\forall t \in [0, t_*], \ \forall \theta \in \mathbb{R}, \ |u(t)| \leq C(T-t)^{-\frac{1}{p-1}}, \tag{60}$$

valid in particular in the region (59). This bound is not satisfactory, since it goes to infinity as $t \to T$. In order to refine it, given a small $\theta$, we use this bound when $t = t_0(\theta)$ defined by

$$|\theta| = K_0\sqrt{(T-t_0(\theta))|\log(T-t_0(\theta))|}, \tag{61}$$

to see that the solution is in fact flat at that time. Then, advancing the PDE (6), we see that the solution remains flat for later times. More precisely, we claim the following:

**Lemma 3.12 (Flatness of the solution in the intermediate region in (59))** *There exists $\zeta_0$ such that for all $K_0 > 0$, $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, $A \geq 1$, there exists $s_{0,9}(K_0, \varepsilon_0, A)$, such that if $s_0 \geq s_{0,9}$ and $0 < \eta_0 \leq 1$, then,*

$$\forall t_0(\theta) \leq t \leq t_*, \ \left| \frac{u(\theta, t)}{u^*(\theta)} - \frac{U_{K_0}(\theta)}{U_{K_0}(1)} \right| \leq \frac{C}{|\log \theta|^{\zeta_0}},$$

*where $u^*$ is defined in (8) and*

$$U_{K_0}(\tau) = \kappa \left( (1 - \tau) + \frac{(p-1)K_0^2}{4p} \right)^{-1/(p-1)} \tag{62}$$

*In particular, $|u(\theta, t)| \leq 2|u^*(\theta)|$.*

*Proof:* We argue as in Masmoudi and Zaag [MZ08]. If $\theta_0 \neq 0$ is small enough, we introduce for all $(\xi, \tau) \in \mathbb{R} \times [-\frac{t_0(\theta_0)}{T-t_0(\theta_0)}, \tau_*)$, where $\tau_* = \frac{t_* - t_0(\theta_0)}{T-t_0(\theta_0)}$

$$U(\theta, \xi, \tau) = (T - t_0(\theta_0))^{1/(p-1)}u(\theta, t), \tag{63}$$

$$\text{where, } \theta = \theta_0 + \xi\sqrt{T - t_0(\theta_0)}, \ t = t_0(\theta_0) + \tau(T - t_0(\theta_0)), \tag{64}$$

18

and $t_0(\theta_0)$ is defined in (61).

From the invariance of problem (6) under dilation, $U(\theta_0, \xi, \tau)$ is also a solution of (6) on its domain. Since $u(t) \in S^*(t)$, from (35), using the definition of $S^*(t)$, Lemma 3.10 together with (61) and (63), we have

$$\sup_{|\xi| < 2|\log(T - t_0(\theta_0))|^{1/4}} |U(\theta_0, \xi, 0) - f(K_0)| \leq \frac{K}{2p\tau_0} + \|q(\tau_0)\|_{L^\infty}$$
$$\leq \frac{C}{\tau_0} + \frac{CA^2}{\tau_0^{1/2}}$$
$$\leq \frac{C}{\tau_0^{1/4}},$$

with $\tau_0 = \tau_0(\theta_0) = -\log(T - t_0(\theta_0))$ and $f$ is defined by (5). Provided that $s_0$ is large enough.

Using the continuity with respect to initial data for problem (46), associated to a space-localization in the ball $B(0, |\log(T - t_0(\theta_0))|^{1/4})$, we show as in Section 4 of [Zaa98] that

$$\sup_{|\xi| \leq |\log(T - t_0(\theta_0))|^{1/4}, \, 0 \leq \tau < \tau_*} |U(\theta_0, \xi, \tau) - U_{K_0}(\tau)| \leq \frac{C}{\tau_0^{\zeta_0}}, \tag{65}$$

$U_{K_0}(\tau)$ given by (62) is the solution of the PDE (6) with constant initial data $f(K_0)$. Since $U_{K_0}(\tau) \leq U_{K_0}(1) = \kappa(\frac{(p-1)K_0^2}{4p})^{-1/(p-1)}$ and

$$\log(T - t_0(\theta_0)) \sim 2\log\theta_0 \text{ and } T - t_0(\theta_0) \sim \frac{\theta_0^2}{2K_0^2|\log(\theta_0)|} \text{ as } \theta_0 \to 0, \tag{66}$$

hence $(T - t_0(\theta_0))^{1/(p-1)} \sim \frac{U_{K_0}(1)}{u^*(\theta_0)}$, by definition (8) of $u^*$. We obtain the desired conclusion from (63) and (65). This ends the proof of Lemma 3.12.∎

**Step 2: A parabolic estimate in Region $\mathcal{R}_2$**

We recall from the definition 3.1 of $S^*(t)$ that

$$\forall \theta \in \mathbb{R} \text{ such that } \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2} \leq |\theta| \leq \pi, \ |u(\theta, t)| \leq \eta_0.$$

Here, we will obtain a parabolic estimate on the solution in $\mathcal{R}_2$. More precisely, we claim the following:

**Proposition 3.13 (A parabolic estimate in $\mathcal{R}_2$)** *For all $\varepsilon > 0$, $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, $\sigma_1 \geq 0$, $\exists T_4(\varepsilon, \varepsilon_0, \sigma_1) \geq 0$, such that for all $\bar{t} \leq T_4$, if $u$ a periodic solution of*

$$\partial_t u = \partial_\theta^2 u + |u|^{p-1}u \text{ for all } \theta \in \mathbb{S}, \ t \in [0, \bar{t}],$$

*which satisfies:*

- *(i) for $|\theta| \in [\frac{\varepsilon_0}{4}, \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2}]$, $|u(\theta, t)| \leq \sigma_1$.*

- *(ii) for $\frac{\varepsilon_0}{4} \leq |\theta| \leq \pi$, $u(\theta, 0) = 0$.*

*Then, for all $t \in [0, t_*]$, for all $\frac{\varepsilon_0}{2} \leq |\theta| \leq \pi$,*

$$|u(\theta, t)| \leq \varepsilon.$$

*Proof*: Consider $\bar{u}$ defined in (11), which satisfies equation (12), recalled here, after a trivial chain rule to transform the $\partial_\theta u$ term:

$$\forall t \in [0, \bar{t}], \ \forall \theta \in \mathbb{R}, \ \partial_t \bar{u} = \partial_\theta^2 \bar{u} + |u|^{p-1}\bar{u} - 2\partial_\theta(\bar{\chi}'u) + \bar{\chi}''u.$$

Therefore, since $\bar{u}(\theta, 0) \equiv 0$, we write

$$\|\bar{u}(t)\|_{L^\infty} \le \int_0^t \left| S(t-t') \left[ |u|^{p-1}\mathbf{I}_{|\theta| \ge \frac{\varepsilon_0}{4}} \bar{u} - 2\partial_\theta \left( \bar{\chi}'u\mathbf{I}_{|\theta| \ge \frac{\varepsilon_0}{4}} \right) + \bar{\chi}'' u(t')\mathbf{I}_{|\theta| \ge \frac{\varepsilon_0}{4}} \right] \right| dt',$$

where $S(t)$ is the heat kernel.

Since $\bar{\chi}'$ and $\bar{\chi}''$ are supported by $\{\frac{\varepsilon_0}{4} \le |\theta| \le \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2}\}$ and satisfy $|\bar{\chi}'| \le C/\varepsilon_0$, $|\bar{\chi}''| \le C/\varepsilon_0^2$, we write

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|\bar{u}(t)\|_{L^\infty} &\le \sigma_1^{p-1} \int_0^t \|\bar{u}(t')\| dt' + \frac{C\sigma_1}{\varepsilon_0} \int_0^t \frac{dt'}{\sqrt{t-t'}} + \frac{C\sigma_1}{\varepsilon_0^2} \int_0^t dt' \\
&\le \sigma_1^{p-1} \int_0^t \|\bar{u}(t')\| dt' + \frac{C\sigma_1}{\varepsilon_0} \sqrt{t} + \frac{C\sigma_1}{\varepsilon_0^2} \bar{t}.
\end{aligned}
$$

If $\bar{t} < 1$, by Gronwall estimate, this implies that

$$\|\bar{u}(t)\|_{L^\infty} \le C e^{\sigma_1^{p-1}} \left( \frac{\sigma_1}{\varepsilon_0}\sqrt{\bar{t}} + \frac{\sigma_1}{\varepsilon_0^2}\bar{t} \right).$$

Taking $\bar{t}$ small enough, we can obtain

$$\forall t \in [0, \bar{t}], \ \ \|\bar{u}(t)\|_{L^\infty} \le \varepsilon.$$

Since $u = \bar{u}$ for all $\frac{\varepsilon_0}{2} \le |\theta| \le \pi$ by definition (11), this concludes the proof of Proposition 3.13. ∎

**Step 3: Proof of the improvement in (58)**
Here, we use Step 1 and Step 2 to prove (58), for a suitable choice of parameters.
Let us consider $K_0 > 0$, and $\delta_0(K_0) > 0$ defined in Lemma 3.12. Then, we consider $\varepsilon_0 \le 2\delta_0$, $A \ge 1$, $0 < \eta_0 \le 1$, and

$$s_0 \ge s_{1,0} \equiv \max\{s_{0,9}(K_0, \varepsilon_0, A), s_{0,5}(K_0, \varepsilon_0, A), -\log\left( T\left( \frac{\eta_0}{2}, \varepsilon_0, 2|u^*(\frac{\eta_0}{4})| \right) \right)\},$$

where the different constants are defined in Lemmas 3.7 and 3.12 and Proposition 3.13. Applying Lemma 3.7, we see that

$$\forall |\theta| \le \delta_0, \ A \ge 1, \ \forall t \in [0, t_*], \ |u(\theta, t)| \le 2|u^*(\theta)|.$$

In particular,

$$\forall \frac{\varepsilon_0}{4} \le |\theta| \le \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2} \le \delta_0, \ \forall t \in [0, t_*], \ |u(\theta, t)| \le 2|u^*(\frac{\varepsilon_0}{4})|.$$

Using item (iii) of Lemma 3.7 (**A MODIFIER**).
We see that $\forall \frac{\varepsilon_0}{4} \le |\theta| \le \pi, \ u(\theta, 0) = 0$.
Therefore Proposition 3.13 applies with $\varepsilon = \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2}$ and $\sigma_1 = 2u^*(\frac{\varepsilon_0}{4})$ and we see that

$$\forall \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2} \le |\theta| \le \pi, \ \forall t \in [0, t_*], \ |u(\theta, t)| \le \frac{\eta_0}{2}. \tag{67}$$

20

and estimate (58) holds.

*Conclusion of Part 2 and choice of parameters:* From (67), we see that (58) holds for any $K_0 > 0$, $\varepsilon_0 \leq 2\delta_0(K_0)$, $A \geq 1$, $0 < \eta_0 \leq 1$ and $s_0 \geq s_{1,0}(K_0, \varepsilon_0, A, \eta_0)$.

*Conclusion of the proof of Lemma 3.4:*

From the conclusion of Parts 1 and 2, $K_0 > 0$, $\varepsilon_0 \leq 2\delta_0(K_0)$, $A \geq A_7(K_0, \varepsilon_0)$, $0 < \eta_0 \leq 1$ and

$$s_0 \geq \max\{s_{0,6}(K_0, \varepsilon_0, A), s_{1,0}(K_0, \varepsilon_0, A, \eta_0)\},$$

we see that (44) and (58) holds at $t = t_*$. Recalling that $u(t_*) \in \partial S(t_*)$ by (36), we see from Definition 3.1 of $S^*$, only one of the components $q_0(s_*)$ or $q_1(s_*)$ may touch the boundary of $[-\frac{A}{s_*^2}, \frac{A}{s_*^2}]$. This concludes the proof of Lemma 3.4.∎

### 3.3.2 Transverse crossing on $V_{K_0, A}(s)$

We prove Lemma 3.5 here. The key estimate is to prove the following differential inequality on $q_m$ for $m = 0, 1$:

$$\forall s \in [s_0, s_*], \quad \left| q'_m(s) - (1 - \frac{m}{2})q_m(s) \right| \leq \frac{C}{s^2}, \tag{68}$$

provided $s_0 \geq s_{0,3}(K_0, \varepsilon_0, A)$ and $0 < \eta_0 \leq 1$, for some large enough $s_{0,3}$.

Indeed if (39) holds, say $q_m(s_*) = \frac{\omega A}{s_*^2}$ for $m = 0, 1$ and $\omega = \pm 1$, then, we see that

$$\omega q'_m(s) \geq (1 - \frac{m}{2})\frac{A}{s_*^2} - \frac{C}{s^2} \geq (1 - \frac{m}{2})\frac{A}{2s_*^2},$$

assuming that $A$ is large enough, which yields the conclusion of Lemma 3.5, assuming that (68) holds.

Let us briefly justify (68). Multiplying equation (22) by $h_m(y)\chi_1(y, s)$, defined in (27), we obtain the following estimate

$$(\partial_s q)_m = (\mathcal{L}q)_m + (Vq)_m + B_m + R_m + F_m.$$

From straightforward estimates, already used for the standard heat equation in $\mathbb{R}^N$ considered in [MZ97b] (see Lemma 3.8 page 158 there), we know that

$$\left| (\partial_s q)_m - q'_m \right| + \left| (\mathcal{L}q)_m - (1 - \frac{m}{2})q_m \right| + |(Vq)_m + B_m + R_m| \leq \frac{C}{s^2}.$$

It remains only to treat the new term $F_m$. In fact from (53) and (57), we see that

$$|F_m(s)| \leq C \left( \|H(s)\|_{L^\infty} + \|\partial_y G(s)\|_{L^\infty} \right) \leq C\eta_0 e^{-\frac{s}{2(p-1)}} \leq Ce^{-\frac{s}{2(p-1)}} \leq \frac{C}{s^2}, \text{AREVOIR}$$

for $s_0$ large enough, provided that $0 < \eta_0 \leq 1$.
This concludes the proof of (68) and Lemma 3.5 too. ∎

# 4   Proof of Theorem 1

We prove Theorem 1 in this section. We will first derive (ii) from Section 3, then we will prove (i) and (iii).

Let us fix $K_0 > 0$, $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, $A > 0$, $0 < \eta_0 \le 1$ and $T > 0$ so that Proposition 3.2 as well as all the statements of Section 3 apply hence, for some $d_0, d_1 \in \mathbb{R}^2$, equation (6) with initial data given by (31) has a solution $u(\theta, t)$ such that

$$T = t_*(d_0, d_1), \ \forall t \in [0, T), u(t) \in S^*(K_0, \varepsilon_0, A, \eta_0, T, t). \tag{69}$$

(Note the fact that $t_*(d_0, d_1) = T$ follows from the conclusion of the topology argument given by (41).)

Applying item (iii) of Lemma 3.10, we see that

$$\forall y \in \mathbb{R}, \ \forall s \ge -\log T, \ |q(y, s)| \le \frac{CA^2}{\sqrt{s}}.$$

By defintions (15), (19) and (20), we see that

$$\forall s \ge -\log T, \ \forall |y| \le \varepsilon_0 e^{s/2}, \ \left| W(y, s) - f\left(\frac{y}{\sqrt{s}}\right) \right| \le \frac{CA^2}{\sqrt{s}} + \frac{C}{s}$$

By definition (13) of $W$, we see that

$$\forall t \in [0, T), \ \forall |\theta| \le \varepsilon_0, \ \left| (T - t)^{1/(p-1)} u(\theta, t) - f\left(\frac{\theta}{\sqrt{(T-t)|\log(T-t)|}}\right) \right|.$$

Since $u$ is $2\pi-$periodic estimate (7) holds.

(i) If $\theta_0 = 2k\pi$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, then we see from (7) that $|v(0, t)| \sim \kappa(T - t)^{-1/(p-1)}$ as $t \to T$, where $\kappa$ is defined in (21). Hence $u$ blows up at time $T$ at $\theta_0 = 2k\pi$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. It remains to prove that any $\theta_0 \ne 2k\pi$ is not a blow-up point, the following result from Giga and Kohn [GK89] allows us to conclude:

From periodicity, we may assume that $0 < \theta_0 \le \pi$. Since, we know from item (ii) in the Definition 3.1, that $\frac{\varepsilon_0}{2} \le |\theta| \le \pi$, and $0 \le t \le T$, $|u(\theta, t)| \le \eta_0$, using periodicity, it follows that $\frac{\varepsilon_0}{2} < |\theta| \le \pi$.

Now, if $|\theta_0| \le \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2}$

**Proposition 4.1** *(Giga and Kohn - No blow-up under the ODE threshold) For all $C_0 > 0$, there is $\eta_0 > 0$ such that if $v(\xi, \tau)$ solves*

$$|v_t - \Delta v| \le C_0(1 + |v|^p)$$

*and satisfies*

$$|v(\xi, \tau)| \le \eta_0 (T - t)^{-1/(p-1)}$$

*for all $(\xi, \tau) \in B(a, r) \times [T - r^2, T)$ for some $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and $r > 0$, then $v$ does not blow up at $(a, T)$.*

*Proof:* See Theorem 2.1 page 850 in [GK89]. ∎

Indeed, since $|\theta_0| \le \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2}$, hence $\frac{3\varepsilon_0}{2} \le |\theta_0| \le \frac{3\varepsilon_0}{4}$, it follows from (7) that

$$\sup_{|\theta - \theta_0| \le |\theta_0|/2} (T-t)^{\frac{1}{p-1}} |u(\theta,t)| \le \left| f\left( \frac{|\theta_0|/2}{\sqrt{(T-t)|\log(T-t)|}} \right) \right| + \frac{C}{\sqrt{|\log(T-t)|}} \to 0$$

as $t \to T$. Therefore, applying Proposition 4.1, we see that b$\theta_0$ is not a blow-up point of $u$. This concludes the proof of (i) of Theorem 1.

(iii) Arguing as Merle did in [Mer92], we derive the existence of a blow-up profile $u(\theta, T) \in C^2(\mathbb{R} \setminus \{2k\pi, k \in \mathbb{Z}\})$ such that $u(\theta, t) \to u(\theta, T)$ as $t \to T$, uniformly on compact sets of $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{2k\pi, k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. The profile $u(\theta, t)$ is not defined at the origin. In the following, we would like to find its equivalent as $\theta \to 2k\pi$, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and show that it is in fact singular at $\theta_0 = 2k\pi$.

From periodicity it is enough to take $\theta_0 = 0$. Since $t_*(d_0, d_1) = T$ from (69), applying Lemma 3.12 and making $t \to T$. We see that

$$\left| \frac{u(\theta, T)}{u^*(\theta)} - 1 \right| \le \frac{C}{|\log \theta|^{\zeta_0}}.$$

Making $\theta \to 0$, we get the desired estimate in item (iii). This concludes the proof of Theorem 1. ∎

# A  Proof of (iii) of Lemma 3.11

This part relies mainly on the understanding of the behavior of the kernel $K(s, \sigma, y, x)$. This behavior follows from a perturbation method around $e^{(s-\sigma)\mathcal{L}}(y, x)$.

Since $\mathcal{L}$ is conjugated to the harmonic oscillator $e^{-x^2/8} \mathcal{L} e^{x^2/8} = \partial^2 - (x^2/16) + (1/4) + 1$, We use the definition of $K$ as the semigroup generated by $\mathcal{L} + V$ defined in (23) and give a Feynman-Kac representation for $K$:

$$K(s, \sigma, y, x) = e^{(s-\sigma)\mathcal{L}}(y, x) E(y, x), \tag{70}$$

where

$$E(y, x) = \int d\mu_{yx}^{s-\sigma}(\omega) e^{\int_0^{(s-\sigma)} V(\omega(\tau), \sigma+\tau)}, \tag{71}$$

and $d\mu_{yx}^{s-\sigma}$ is the oscillator measure on the continuous paths $\omega : [0, s - \sigma] \to \mathbb{R}$ with $\omega(0) = x$, $\omega(s - \sigma) = y$, i.e, the Gaussian probability measure with covariance kernel

$$\Gamma(\tau, \tau') = \omega_0(\tau)\omega_0(\tau') + 2\left( e^{-\frac{1}{2}|\tau-\tau'|} - e^{-\frac{1}{2}|\tau+\tau'|} + e^{-\frac{1}{2}|2(s-\sigma)+\tau-\tau'|} - e^{-\frac{1}{2}|2(s-\sigma)-\tau-\tau'|} \right),$$

which yields $\int d\mu_{yx}^{s-\sigma}\omega(\tau) = \omega_0(\tau)$ with

$$\omega_0(\tau) = \left( \sinh(\frac{s-\sigma}{2}) \right)^{-1} \left( y \sinh\frac{\tau}{2} + x \sinh\frac{s-\sigma-\tau}{2} \right).$$

Consider $1 \le \tau \le s \le 2\tau$. From Bricmont and Kupiainen [BK94], Lemma 6 page 555 and Merle and Zaag [MZ97b] pages 183-184, we have the following estimates:

**Claim A.1** *If $1 \leq \tau \leq s$ with $s \leq 2\tau$, then*

$$0 \leq E(y, x) \leq C,$$

$$|\partial_x E(y, x)| \leq \frac{C}{s}(s - \sigma)(1 + s - \sigma)(|y| + |x|).$$

Consider $g \in L^\infty$ such that $xg \in L^\infty$. By (70), (71) and integration by parts, we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
K(s, \sigma)(\partial_x g)(y) &= \int_\mathbb{R} dx K(s, \sigma, y, x)\partial_x g(x, \sigma) = \int_\mathbb{R} dx e^{(s-\sigma)\mathcal{L}}(y, x)E(y, x)\partial_x g(x) \\
&= -\int_\mathbb{R} dx \partial_x e^{(s-\sigma)\mathcal{L}}(y, x)E(y, x)g(x) - \int_\mathbb{R} dx e^{(s-\sigma)\mathcal{L}}\partial_x E(y, x)g(x) = I_1 + I_2.
\end{aligned}
$$

$$(72)$$

By (49), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
|\partial_x e^{(s-\sigma)\mathcal{L}}(y, x)| &= \left| \frac{e^{s-\sigma}}{\sqrt{4\pi(1 - e^{-(s-\sigma)})}} \frac{-(x - ye^{-\frac{(s-\sigma)}{2}})}{2(1 - e^{-(s-\sigma)})} \exp\left[ -\frac{(x - ye^{-(s-\sigma)/2})^2}{4(1 - e^{-(s-\sigma)})} \right] \right| \\
&= C \frac{|z|e^{-z^2}}{\sqrt{1 - e^{-(s-\sigma)}}} \frac{e^{s-\sigma}}{\sqrt{1 - e^{-(s-\sigma)}}} \\
&\text{where} \quad z = \frac{x - ye^{-(s-\sigma)/2}}{\sqrt{4(1 - e^{-(s-\sigma)})}}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Using Claim A.1, we see that

$$
\begin{aligned}
|I_1| &\leq C\|g\|_{L^\infty} \int_\mathbb{R} dx \frac{|z|e^{-z^2}}{\sqrt{1 - e^{-(s-\sigma)}}} \frac{e^{(s-\sigma)}}{\sqrt{1 - e^{-(s-\sigma)}}} = C\|g\|_{L^\infty} \int_\mathbb{R} dz |z|e^{-z^2} \frac{e^{(s-\sigma)}}{\sqrt{1 - e^{-(s-\sigma)}}} \\
&\leq C\|g\|_{L^\infty} \frac{e^{(s-\sigma)}}{\sqrt{1 - e^{-(s-\sigma)}}},
\end{aligned}
$$

$$(73)$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
|I_2| &\leq \int_\mathbb{R} dx e^{(s-\sigma)\mathcal{L}}(y, x)|g(x)| \frac{C(s - \sigma)}{s}(1 + s - \sigma)(|y| + |x|), \\
&\leq \frac{C(s - \sigma)}{s}(1 + s - \sigma) \int_\mathbb{R} dx e^{(s-\sigma)\mathcal{L}}(y, x)|g(x)| \left( |z|e^{(s-\sigma)/2}\sqrt{1 - e^{-(s-\sigma)}} + |x|(1 + e^{(s-\sigma)/2}) \right), \\
&= \frac{C(s - \sigma)}{s}(1 + s - \sigma)(J_1 + J_2), \\
&\text{where} \quad z = \frac{x - ye^{-(s-\sigma)/2}}{\sqrt{4(1 - e^{-(s-\sigma)})}}.
\end{aligned}
$$

$$(74)$$

Moreover

$$
\begin{aligned}
J_1 &\leq \|g\|_{L^\infty} e^{(s-\sigma)/2}\sqrt{1 - e^{-(s-\sigma)}} \int_\mathbb{R} dx e^{(s-\sigma)\mathcal{L}}(y, x)|z|, \\
&= \|g\|_{L^\infty} e^{3(s-\sigma)/2}\left(1 - e^{-(s-\sigma)}\right) \int dz e^{-z^2}|z|, \\
&\leq Ce^{3(s-\sigma)/2}\|g\|_{L^\infty}
\end{aligned}
$$

24

Furthermore using item (i) of Lemma 3.11, we write

$$
\begin{aligned}
J_2 &= 2\int_{\mathbb{R}} dx e^{(s-\sigma)\mathcal{L}}(y,x)|xg(x)|(1+e^{(s-\sigma)/2}),\\
&\leq C\|xg\|_{L^\infty}e^{s-\sigma}(1+e^{(s-\sigma)/2}).
\end{aligned}
$$

Which gives the desired estimates thanks to item (i) of Lemma 3.11.∎

# References

[Bal77]   J. M. Ball. Remarks on blow-up and nonexistence theorems for nonlinear evolution equations. *Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser. (2)*, 28(112):473–486, 1977.

[BGT02]   N. Burq, P. Gérard, and N. Tzvetkov. An instability property of the nonlinear Schrödinger equation on $S^d$. *Math. Res. Lett.*, 9(2-3):323–335, 2002.

[BK94]   J. Bricmont and A. Kupiainen. Universality in blow-up for nonlinear heat equations. *Nonlinearity*, 7(2):539–575, 1994.

[CRT99]   C. Cao, M. A. Rammaha, and E.S. Titi. The Navier-Stokes equations on the rotating 2-D sphere: Gevrey regularity and asymptotic degrees of freedom. *Z. Angew. Math. Phys.*, 50(3):341–360, 1999.

[CRT00]   C. Cao, M.A. Rammaha, and E. S. Titi. Gevrey regularity for nonlinear analytic parabolic equations on the sphere. *J. Dynam. Differential Equations*, 12(2), 2000.

[CZ13]   R. Côte and H. Zaag. Construction of a multi-soliton blow-up solution to the semilinear wave equation in one space dimension. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 66(10):1541–1581, 2013.

[EZ11]   M. A. Ebde and H. Zaag. Construction and stability of a blow up solution for a nonlinear heat equation with a gradient term. *S̃eMA J.*, 55:5–21, 2011.

[FKMZ00]   C. Fermanian Kammerer, F. Merle, and H. Zaag. Stability of the blow-up profile of non-linear heat equations from the dynamical system point of view. math. *Math. Annalen*, 317(2):347–387, 2000.

[FKZ00]   C. Fermanian Kammerer and H. Zaag. Boundedness up to blow-up of the difference between two solutions to a semilinear heat equation. *Nonlinearity*, 13(4):1189–1216, 2000.

[GK85]   Y. Giga and R.V. Kohn. Asymptotically self-similar blow-up of semilinear heat equations. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 38(3):297–319, 1985.

[GK87]   Y. Giga and R. V. Kohn. Characterizing blowup using similarity variables. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 36(1):1–40, 1987.

[GK89]   Y. Giga and R. V. Kohn. Nondegeneracy of blowup for semilinear heat equations. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 42(6):845–884, 1989.

[GM11]     P. Gérard and F. Méhats. The Schrödinger-Poisson system on the sphere. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 43(3):1232–1268, 2011.

[HV92]     M. A. Herrero and J. J. L. Velázquez. Generic behaviour of one-dimensional blow up patterns. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4)*, 19(3):381–450, 1992.

[HV93]     M. A. Herrero and J. J. L. Velázquez. Blow-up behaviour of one-dimensional semilinear parabolic equations. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 10(2):131–189, 1993.

[HV94]     M.A. Herrero and J.J. L. Velázquez. Explosion de solutions d'équations paraboliques semilinéaires supercritiques. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.*, 319(2):141–145, 1994.

[Mer92]    F. Merle. Solution of a nonlinear heat equation with arbitrary given blow-up points. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 45(3):263–300, 1992.

[Miz07]    N. Mizoguchi. Rate of type II blowup for a semilinear heat equation. *Math. Ann.*, 339(4):839–877, 2007.

[MM04]     H. Matano and F. Merle. On nonexistence of type II blowup for a supercritical nonlinear heat equation. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 57(11):1494–1541, 2004.

[MM09]     H. Matano and F.. Merle. Classification of type I and fII behaviors for a supercritical nonlinear heat equation. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 256(4):992–1064, 2009.

[MPT]      H. Matano, F. Punzo, and A. Tesei. Front propagation for nonlinear diffusion equations on the hyperbolic space. *To appear.*

[MRR11]    F. Merle, P. Raphaël, and I. Rodnianski. Blow up dynamics for smooth equivariant solutions to the energy critical Schrödinger map. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 349(5-6):279–283, 2011.

[MZ97a]    F. Merle and H. Zaag. Reconnection of vortex with the boundary and finite time quenching. *Nonlinearity*, 10(6):1497–1550, 1997.

[MZ97b]    F. Merle and H. Zaag. Stability of the blow-up profile for equations of the type $u_t = \Delta u + |u|^{p-1}u$. *Duke Math. J.*, 86(1):143–195, 1997.

[MZ98]     F. Merle and H. Zaag. Optimal estimates for blowup rate and behavior for nonlinear heat equations. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 51(2):139–196, 1998.

[MZ00]     F. Merle and H. Zaag. A Liouville theorem for vector-valued nonlinear heat equations and applications. *Math. Ann.*, 316(1):103–137, 2000.

[MZ08]     N. Masmoudi and H. Zaag. Blow-up profile for the complex Ginzburg-Landau equation. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 225:1613–1666, 2008.

[NZ15a]    V.T. Nguyen and H. Zaag. Construction of a stable blow-up solution for a class of strongly perturbed semilinear heat equations. 2015. Submitted.

[NZ15b]  N. Nouaili and H. Zaag. Profile for a simultaneously blowing up solution to a complex valued semilinear heat equation. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 2015. to appear.

[PTW14]  B. Pausader, N. Tzvetkov, and X. Wang. Global regularity for the energy-critical NLS on $\mathbb{S}^3$. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 31(2):315–338, 2014.

[QS07]  P. Quittner and P. Souplet. *Superlinear parabolic problems*. Birkhäuser Advanced Texts: Basler Lehrbücher. [Birkhäuser Advanced Texts: Basel Textbooks]. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2007. Blow-up, global existence and steady states.

[RR12]  P. Raphaël and I. Rodnianski. Stable blow up dynamics for the critical co-rotational wave maps and equivariant Yang-Mills problems. *Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci.*, pages 1–122, 2012.

[RS13]  P. Raphaël and R. Schweyer. Stable blowup dynamics for the 1-corotational energy critical harmonic heat flow. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 66(3):414–480, 2013.

[Sch12]  R. Schweyer. Type II blow-up for the four dimensional energy critical semi linear heat equation. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 263(12):3922–3983, 2012.

[Vel92]  J. J. L. Velázquez. Higher-dimensional blow up for semilinear parabolic equations. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 17(9-10):1567–1596, 1992.

[Vel93a]  J. J. L. Velázquez. Classification of singularities for blowing up solutions in higher dimensions. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 338(1):441–464, 1993.

[Vel93b]  J. J. L. Velázquez. Estimates on the $(n-1)$-dimensional Hausdorff measure of the blow-up set for a semilinear heat equation. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 42(2):445–476, 1993.

[Zaa98]  H. Zaag. Blow-up results for vector-valued nonlinear heat equations with no gradient structure. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 15(5):581–622, 1998.

[Zaa02a]  H. Zaag. On the regularity of the blow-up set for semilinear heat equations. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 19(5):505–542, 2002.

[Zaa02b]  H. Zaag. One-dimensional behavior of singular $N$-dimensional solutions of semilinear heat equations. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 225(3):523–549, 2002.

[Zaa02c]  H. Zaag. Regularity of the blow-up set and singular behavior for semilinear heat equations. In *Mathematics & mathematics education (Bethlehem, 2000)*, pages 337–347. World Sci. Publishing, River Edge, NJ, 2002.