ON BOUNDEDNESS OF SOLUTIONS OF REACTION-DIFFUSION EQUATIONS WITH NONLINEAR BOUNDARY CONDITIONS

JOSÉ M. ARRIETA

(Communicated by David S. Tartakoff)

ABSTRACT. We give conditions on the nonlinearities of a reaction-diffusion equation with nonlinear boundary conditions that guarantee that any solution starting at bounded initial data is bounded locally around a certain point x_0 of the boundary, uniformly for all positive time. The conditions imposed are of a local nature and need only to hold in a small neighborhood of the point x_0 .

1. INTRODUCTION

In this article we consider the following reaction-diffusion equation with nonlinear boundary conditions in a smooth domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$:

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{cases} u_t - \Delta u = f(x, u), & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0, & \text{on } \Gamma_D, \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \vec{n}} = g(x, u), & \text{on } \Gamma_N, \\ u(0, x) = u_0(x) \geq 0, & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases}$$

where $\Gamma = \partial\Omega = \Gamma_D \cup \Gamma_N$ is a disjoint partition of the boundary of Ω and f and g are suitably smooth functions of (x, u) . The subindices D and N on Γ indicate the part of the boundary with Dirichlet and Neumann type conditions, respectively. We are interested in nonnegative solutions of (1.1), so we will assume that

$$f(x, 0) \geq 0 \text{ for all } x \in \Omega, \quad g(x, 0) \geq 0 \text{ for all } x \in \Gamma_N.$$

We want to obtain local conditions on the nonlinearities f and g , which will be imposed in a neighborhood of a point $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$, that guarantee that for any initial condition $u_0 \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, the proper solution of problem (1.1) starting at u_0 (which is defined for all $t > 0$) is bounded in the neighborhood of x_0 , uniformly for all $t > 0$. See Section 2 for an appropriate definition of the concept of “proper solution”.

As a matter of fact, we will be able to prove the following result.

Received by the editors December 9, 2005 and, in revised form, September 19, 2006.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 35K57, 35B40.

Key words and phrases. Reaction-diffusion, nonlinear boundary conditions, bounded solutions, blow-up.

The author was partially supported by DGES, BFM2003-03810 DGES, Spain.

©2007 American Mathematical Society
 Reverts to public domain 28 years from publication

Theorem 1.1. *Let $x_0 \in \Gamma_N$, $p > 1$, $q \geq 1$ and let $R_0 > 0$, $M_0 > 0$ such that*

$$(1.2) \quad \begin{aligned} f(x, u) &\leq -\beta_0 u^p, & x \in B(x_0, R_0) \cap \Omega, & u \geq M_0, \\ g(x, u) &\leq u^q, & x \in B(x_0, R_0) \cap \partial\Omega, & u \geq M_0. \end{aligned}$$

If one of the two conditions

i) $p + 1 > 2q$ and $\beta_0 > 0$ or

ii) $p + 1 = 2q$ and $\beta_0 > q$

holds, then for any initial condition $0 \leq u_0 \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ the proper minimal solution of (1.1) starting at u_0 is bounded in a neighborhood of x_0 in $\bar{\Omega}$, for all $t > 0$. That is, there exist $\delta, M > 0$ such that

$$(1.3) \quad \sup_{0 \leq t < \infty, x \in B(x_0, \delta) \cap \bar{\Omega}} u(t, x, u_0) \leq M.$$

We want to stress the local nature of the result: the conditions imposed on the nonlinearities are localized around a neighborhood of $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$ and the result concludes the boundedness of the solution around the point x_0 . This boundedness around x_0 is obtained regardless of the behavior of the nonlinearities and/or the solution away from this point.

This result is, in some sense, the complementary result of [4], in which the authors proved that if the conditions are reversed, then blow-up occurs at this point of the boundary. Among other things, they were able to show (see [4]) that if the nonlinearities satisfy

$$f(x, u) \geq -\beta_0 u^p, \quad g(x, u) \geq u^q$$

locally around $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$ and for u large enough and if

i) $p + 1 < 2q$ or

ii) $p + 1 = 2q$ and $\beta_0 < q$,

then there exist smooth initial conditions with support near x_0 , such that the solution starting at this initial condition blows up in finite time in a neighborhood of $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$. Again, this blow-up is produced regardless of the behavior of the nonlinearities or the solution away from this point.

Remark 1.2. i) With an appropriate rescaling, it is not difficult to see that if the local conditions of the nonlinearities f and g in Theorem 1.1 are of the type $f(x, u) \leq -\beta_0 u^p$, $g(x, u) \leq \alpha_0 u^q$, for $x \in B(x_0, R_0) \cap \partial\Omega$, $u \geq M_0$, then the condition $\beta_0 > q$ in ii) should be changed to $\beta_0 > q\alpha_0^2$.

ii) Similarly, if in [4] the nonlinearity at the boundary satisfy $g(x, u) \geq \alpha_0 u^q$, then blow-up is obtained under the condition $p + 1 < 2q$, $\alpha_0 > 0$ or $p + 1 = 2q$ and $\beta_0 < q\alpha_0^2$.

iii) It is interesting to note that the relations obtained are independent of the domain and of the dimension.

iv) From the control theory point of view, Theorem 1.1 means that it is impossible to produce blow-up in a neighborhood of a point of the boundary of the domain by controlling the equation somehow away from this point. Similarly, the result from [4] means that it is also impossible to prevent blow-up with a similar mechanism.

As an example, consider for instance the problem

$$(1.4) \quad \begin{cases} u_t - \Delta u = -\beta(x)u^p, & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \vec{n}} = \alpha(x)u^q, & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \\ u(0, x) = u_0(x) \geq 0, & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases}$$

FIGURE 1.

with β and α continuous functions, $\beta(x) > 0$ in $\bar{\Omega}$ and $\alpha(x) > 0$ in $\partial\Omega$. Then, if $p + 1 = 2q > 2$ and $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$ with $\frac{\beta(x_0)}{\alpha(x_0)^2} < q$, from [4], there are initial conditions where blow-up is produced near x_0 , while if $\frac{\beta(x_0)}{\alpha(x_0)^2} > q$, then, from Theorem 1.1, for any initial condition $u_0 \in L^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ the proper minimal solution is bounded near x_0 . Hence, we have the situation as in Figure 1.

Nowadays, there exists an extensive literature dealing with the dynamic behavior of the solutions of problem (1.1) and the characterization of blow-up or boundedness of solutions according to the behavior of the nonlinearities for large u . In the pioneer work of [7] the authors treated the one dimensional case, say $\Omega = (0, 1)$, with $f(x, u) = -\beta u^p$, $g(x, u) = u^q$ and $\Gamma_D = \emptyset$. They already obtained that the critical relations are $p + 1$ vs. $2q$ and if $p + 1 = 2q$, then β vs. q in the sense that if $p + 1 < 2q$ or $p + 1 = 2q$ and $\beta < q$, then blow-up is produced and if $p + 1 > 2q$ or $p + 1 = 2q$ and $\beta > q$, the solutions are globally bounded. They also treated the very delicate case where $p + 1 = 2q$ and $\beta = q$. They actually showed that the solutions were defined for all times $t > 0$, but the solutions blow up in infinite time.

Later on, in [13, 14], they treated the case of arbitrary dimension and obtained that if $\Gamma_D = \emptyset$ and the nonlinearities f and g behave for u large as $f \sim -\beta u^p$ and $g \sim u^q$, then blow-up is produced if $p + 1 < 2q$ or if $p + 1 = 2q$ and $\beta < q$. Also, they showed that if $p + 1 > 2q$ or if $p + 1 = 2q$ and β is large enough, then the solutions are globally bounded. Also, in [1], the authors studied the porous medium equation in arbitrary dimension and as a particular case they considered the equation (1.1) with $\Gamma_D = \emptyset$, $f(x, u) = -\beta u^p$ and $g(x, u) = u^q$. They showed that if $p + 1 < 2q$ or $p + 1 = 2q$ and $\beta < q$, then blow-up is produced and if $p + 1 > 2q$ or $p + 1 = 2q$ and $\beta > q$, the solutions are globally bounded.

With all these works, it is clear that the critical relations that mark the line between blow-up and boundedness are given by $p + 1$ vs. $2q$ and in case $p + 1 = 2q$, β vs. q . These works have common characteristics which are that the nonlinear boundary condition is imposed in the entire boundary, $\Gamma_D = \emptyset$ and the construction

of sub- or supersolutions is done for the whole domain. Hence, the relations between p , q and β need to hold throughout the domain to obtain the result and either the blow-up result or the boundedness result obtained is global in space. In particular, none of them can treat the case as in (1.4) where $p + 1 = 2q$, but in some part of the boundary the relation is $\beta > q$ and in another part the relation is $\beta < q$.

In this direction, the work [4] shows that the relations between p , q and β that produce blow-up are local. That is, if the relations $p + 1 < 2q$ or $p + 1 = 2q$ and $\beta < q$ hold in a neighborhood of a point $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$, then blow-up is produced at that point of the boundary and actually the blow-up is obtained in $B(x_0, \delta) \cap \partial\Omega$ for some δ small enough.

In this work we show that if the relations between p , q and β that guarantee boundedness of solutions hold just in a small neighborhood of a point of the boundary, then the solution remains bounded in a small neighborhood of x_0 .

2. A COMMENT ON PROPER SOLUTIONS

Observe that Theorem 1.1 concludes that the solution of problem (1.1) is bounded near a point $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$ uniformly for all $t > 0$. In order to prove this result, we will need first a definition of the solution of (1.1) which is defined for all $t > 0$. An appropriate way to accomplish this is with the concept of “proper solution” which goes back to [6] and it has been further developed in [8, 9], mainly for homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions. See also [12]. This concept of “proper solution” has been proved to be an appropriate way to extend a solution beyond the time of explosion (in case it blows up) and, therefore, of being able to say something about the solution beyond this time.

The idea behind this concept is to approximate the nonlinearities f and g monotonically from below with a sequence f_n , g_n so that the solution, $u_n(x, t, u_0)$, of the approximant problem

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{cases} u_t - \Delta u = f_n(x, u), & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0, & \text{on } \Gamma_D, \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \vec{n}} = g_n(x, u), & \text{on } \Gamma_N, \\ u(0, x) = u_0(x) \geq 0, & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases}$$

is globally defined in time. Using monotonicity arguments, we have that for fixed x, t the sequence $\{u_n(x, t, u_0)\}_n$ is monotone increasing. Hence, it will converge to $u(x, t, u_0) \in [0, +\infty]$ (notice that we do not exclude the fact that u may be $+\infty$). This function is, by definition, the proper solution.

For equation (1.1), we define these solutions as follow: let

$$f_n(x, u) = \min\{f(x, u), n\}$$

and

$$g_n(x, u) = \min\{g(x, u), n\}.$$

Notice that if f and g are locally Lipschitz functions in u , uniformly in x , that is, for each $R > 0$, we have the existence of $L(R)$, such that

$$(2.2) \quad |f(x, u) - f(x, v)| \leq L(R)|u - v|, \quad |u|, |v| \leq R, \quad x \in \bar{\Omega},$$

and similarly for g , then f_n and g_n satisfy also the same Lipschitz relation (2.2). This condition and the fact that the functions f_n and g_n are bounded above by n imply (see [2, 3]) that the solutions of (2.1) are defined for all $t > 0$.

Now, it is not difficult to see by monotonicity arguments again that, since $f_n \leq f_{n+1}$ and $g_n \leq g_{n+1}$, we have $0 \leq u_n(x, t, u_0) \leq u_{n+1}(x, t, u_0)$ and therefore $u_n(x, t, u_0) \nearrow u(x, t, u_0)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, if $u(x, t, u_0) < \infty$ for $(x, t) \in \bar{\Omega} \times [0, T]$, then it coincides with the classical solution for $t \in [0, T]$. Also, it is not difficult to see that the function u is independent of the monotone sequences f_n and g_n chosen to approximate f and g .

In this paper, whenever we refer to the proper solution of problem (1.1), we refer to the solution constructed in this way.

3. PROOF OF THE MAIN RESULT

In this section we will provide a proof of our main result, Theorem 1.1. To accomplish this, we will construct appropriate supersolutions locally around the point $x_0 \in \Gamma_N$. As a matter of fact, we will extensively use the singular solutions of the elliptic problem

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta z + \beta z^p = 0, & B(0, R), \\ z = +\infty, & \partial B(0, R), \end{cases}$$

and the fact that the asymptotics of this radial solution as $r \rightarrow R$ is very well understood; see [5, 11].

This solution, and more exactly an appropriate approximation of it, will be used as a supersolution near the boundary.

Before we begin proving the main result, we need some preliminary lemmas.

Lemma 3.1. *Let R , β and β_0 be positive numbers with $\beta < \beta_0$ and consider the function*

$$(3.2) \quad H_{R,\beta}(r) = C \frac{1}{\beta^{1/(p-1)}} (R-r)^{-\frac{2}{p-1}}$$

defined for $0 < r < R$, where $C = \left(\frac{2(p+1)}{(p-1)^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}$. Then, if $\delta \in (0, 1)$ is given by

$$\frac{1}{1-\delta} = 1 + \frac{\beta_0 - \beta}{\beta} \cdot \frac{p+1}{(p-1)(N-1)},$$

we have

$$(3.3) \quad -\Delta H_{R,\beta} + \beta_0 (H_{R,\beta})^p \geq 0, \text{ for } (1-\delta)R < r < R.$$

Proof. The proof is just a direct computation. If we denote by H the function $H_{R,\beta}$, we can see that $-\Delta H + \beta_0 H^p = -H'' - \frac{N-1}{r} H' + \beta_0 H^p$, where we use the notation $' = d/dr$.

Direct calculations show that

$$\begin{aligned} H'' &= \beta H^p, \\ \left| \frac{N-1}{r} H' \right| &= \frac{(N-1)(p-1)}{r(p+1)} \beta (R-r) H^p. \end{aligned}$$

In particular,

$$-\Delta H + \beta_0 H^p \geq \left(\beta_0 - \beta \left(1 + \frac{(N-1)(p-1)}{p+1} \cdot \frac{R-r}{r} \right) \right) H^p.$$

Hence, $\beta_0 - \beta(1 + \frac{(N-1)(p-1)}{p+1} \cdot \frac{R-r}{r}) \geq 0$ if

$$\frac{R-r}{r} \leq \frac{\beta_0 - \beta}{\beta} \cdot \frac{p+1}{(p-1)(N-1)},$$

which is equivalent to saying that $(1-\delta)R < r < R$ with

$$\frac{1}{1-\delta} = 1 + \frac{\beta_0 - \beta}{\beta} \cdot \frac{p+1}{(N-1)(p-1)}. \quad \square$$

Remark 3.2. Notice that $H_{R,\beta}(r) = \frac{1}{(R^2\beta)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}} H_{1,1}(\frac{r}{R})$, $0 < r < R$.

Lemma 3.3. For $R, \beta > 0$, define the function $z_{R,\beta}$ as the unique radial solution of the singular problem

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta z + \beta z^p = 0, & B(0, R), \\ z = +\infty, & \partial B(0, R). \end{cases}$$

Then we have

$$(3.5) \quad z_{R,\beta}(r) = \frac{1}{(R^2\beta)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}} z_{1,1}(\frac{r}{R}), \quad 0 < r < R.$$

Moreover, for each fixed $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ small, there exists $\eta > 0$, also small, such that

$$(3.6) \quad z_{1,1}(r) \leq H_{1,1-\gamma}(r), \quad 1-\eta < r < 1.$$

In particular, we have

$$(3.7) \quad z_{R,\beta}(r) \leq H_{R,(1-\gamma)\beta}(r), \quad (1-\eta)R < r < R.$$

Proof. Statement (3.5) follows from a standard scaling argument.

To prove (3.6), notice that from [5, 11] the function $z_{1,1}$ has the expression

$$z_{1,1}(r) = C(1-r)^{-2/(p-1)}(1 + O(1-r)).$$

Hence, if we fix $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, we have that

$$\frac{z_{1,1}(r)}{H_{1,1-\gamma}(r)} = \frac{C(1-r)^{-2/(p-1)}(1 + O(1-r))}{C(1-\gamma)^{\frac{1}{1-p}}(1-r)^{-2/(p-1)}} = \frac{1 + O(1-r)}{(1-\gamma)^{\frac{1}{1-p}}},$$

which implies that $z_{1,1}(r) \leq H_{1,1-\gamma}(r)$, for r near 1. This shows (3.6). To show (3.7), we just use (3.5) and the fact that we also have $H_{R,\beta}(r) = \frac{1}{(R^2\beta)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}} H_{1,1}(\frac{r}{R})$ for $0 < r < R$; see Remark 3.2. $\square$

We are in a position now to prove the main result.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Let $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$ and assume the hypotheses of the theorem. In order to write a proof that will work for both cases, i) and ii), define $\hat{q} = 0$ if we are in case i) or $\hat{q} = q$ if we are in case ii), so that we have that $\beta_0 > \hat{q}$.

Consider now $R^* < R_0/2$ small enough such that, for all $R \leq R^*$, we have $B(y_R, R) \subset \Omega$ and $\partial\Omega \cap \bar{B}(y_R, R) = \{x_0\}$, where $y_R = x_0 - R\vec{n}(x_0)$ and $\vec{n}(x)$ is the unit exterior normal vector at the point $x \in \partial\Omega$; see Figure 2. $\square$

We have the following result.

Lemma 3.4. If $u_0 \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ and if $u(t, x, u_0)$ is the proper solution of (1.1), then there exists $0 < R_1 \leq R^*$ such that for all $R < R_1$ we have

$$(3.8) \quad 0 \leq u(t, x, u_0) \leq z_{R,\beta_0}(|x - y_R|), \text{ for } (t, x) \in [0, \infty) \times B(y_R, R).$$

FIGURE 2.

Proof. It is very easy to see that $z_{R,\beta_0}(r) \geq z_{R,\beta_0}(0) = \frac{1}{(R^2\beta_0)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}} z_{1,1}(0) \rightarrow +\infty$ as $R \rightarrow 0$. Let us choose $0 < R_1 \leq R^*$ small enough, such that for all $0 < R \leq R_1$ we have

$$u_0(x) + 1 \leq z_{R,\beta_0}(|x - y_R|), \text{ for } |x - y_R| \leq R.$$

Notice that, since the function $z_{R,\beta}$ is obtained as the limit as $n \rightarrow +\infty$ of the functions z_{R,β_0}^n , which is the unique radial solution of

$$(3.9) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta z + \beta_0 z^p = 0, & B(0, R), \\ z = n, & \partial B(0, R), \end{cases}$$

then we can choose n_0 , such that for all $n \geq n_0$, we have

$$u_0(x) + 1/2 \leq z_{R,\beta_0}^n(|x - y_R|), \text{ for } |x - y_R| \leq R, \quad n \geq n_0.$$

Let us fix $T > 0$, let $u_m(t, x, u_0)$ be an approximant of the proper solution $u(t, x, u_0)$, as constructed in Section 2, and let

$$c(m, T) = \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|u_m(t, \cdot, u_0)\|_{L^\infty(\bar{\Omega})} < \infty.$$

If we choose $n \geq \max\{c(m, T), n_0\}$, then we have $u_m(t, x, u_0) \leq c(m, T) < n \leq z_{R,\beta_0}^n(|x - y_R|)$ for $|x - y_R| = R$. Using comparison arguments, it is easy to see that we have

$$u_m(t, x, u_0) \leq z_{R,\beta_0}^n(|x - y_R|), \quad 0 \leq t \leq T, \quad x \in B(y_R, R), \quad n \geq \max\{c(m, T), n_0\}.$$

Passing to the limit, first as $n \rightarrow +\infty$ and second as $m \rightarrow \infty$, we get

$$u(t, x, u_0) \leq z_{R,\beta_0}(|x - y_R|), \quad 0 \leq t \leq T, \quad x \in B(y_R, R).$$

Since $T > 0$ is arbitrary, we have the above inequality for all $t > 0$. This concludes the result. $\square$

Now, if we consider β_1 with $\hat{q} < \beta_1 < \beta_0$ and if we consider $\gamma = 1 - \frac{\beta_1}{\beta_0}$, we obtain from (3.7) and (3.8) that

$$(3.10) \quad u(t, x, u_0) \leq z_{R,\beta_0}(|x - y_R|) \leq H_{R,\beta_1}(|x - y_R|), \text{ for } r_0 < |x - y_R| < R,$$

where $r_0 = (1 - \eta)R$ and η is defined in Lemma 3.3.

FIGURE 3.

Moreover, if we consider now β_2 with $\hat{q} < \beta_2 < \beta_1 < \beta_0$, we have

$$(3.11) \quad H_{R,\beta_1}(|x - y_R|) < H_{R,\beta_2}(|x - y_R|), \quad 0 < |x - y_R| < R.$$

Consider now the value of δ obtained in Lemma 3.1 for $\beta = \beta_2 < \beta_0$. Let $\epsilon_0 > 0$ small be such that $(1 - \delta)(R + \epsilon_0) < R$. Choose ρ such that $r_0 < \rho < R$ and $(1 - \delta)(R + \epsilon_0) < \rho < R$ are satisfied (see Figure 3). For this fixed value of ρ , consider $0 < \epsilon_1 \leq \epsilon_0$ such that

$$(3.12) \quad H_{R,\beta_1}(\rho) < H_{R+\epsilon,\beta_2}(\rho), \quad \text{for all } 0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon_1.$$

Observe that this can be accomplished from (3.11) and the continuity of the function $R \rightarrow H_{R,\beta_2}(\rho)$.

Putting together now (3.10) and (3.12), we get

$$(3.13) \quad u(t, x, u_0) < H_{R+\epsilon,\beta_2}(|x - y_R|), \quad |x - y_R| = \rho, \quad 0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon_1.$$

We want to show now that for ϵ small enough we have

$$(3.14) \quad \frac{\partial v_\epsilon}{\partial n} \geq v_\epsilon^q \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \cap \{|x - y_R| \leq R + \epsilon\}.$$

To show this, observe that if $x \in \partial\Omega \cap \{|x - y_R| \leq R + \epsilon\}$ and if $r = |x - y_R|$, then

$$\frac{\partial v_\epsilon}{\partial n} = \nabla v_\epsilon(x) \cdot \vec{n}(x) = H'_{R+\epsilon,\beta_2}(r) \frac{x - y_R}{|x - y_R|} \cdot \vec{n}(x).$$

But, from the smoothness of the boundary we have that the scalar product $\frac{x - y_R}{|x - y_R|} \cdot \vec{n}(x)$ is very close to 1 if ϵ is small. Moreover, direct computations show that

$$H'_{R+\epsilon,\beta_2}(r) = \sqrt{\frac{2\beta_2}{p+1}} (H_{R+\epsilon,\beta_2}(r))^{\frac{p+1}{2}}.$$

Hence,

$$(3.15) \quad \frac{\partial v_\epsilon}{\partial n} \geq \sqrt{\frac{2\beta_2}{p+1}} \frac{x - y_R}{|x - y_R|} \cdot \vec{n}(x) v_\epsilon^{\frac{p+1}{2}}, \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \cap B(y_R, R + \epsilon).$$

We distinguish now the two possible cases.

If we are in case i), then $\frac{p+1}{2} > q$, $\beta_2 > 0$ and we can write inequality (3.15) as

$$\frac{\partial v_\epsilon}{\partial n} \geq \left[\sqrt{\frac{2\beta_2}{p+1}} \frac{x - y_R}{|x - y_R|} \cdot \vec{n}(x) v_\epsilon^{\frac{p+1}{2}-q} \right] v_\epsilon^q, \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \cap B(y_R, R + \epsilon).$$

But, if $x \in \partial\Omega \cap B(y_R, R + \epsilon)$, we have $R \leq |x - y_R| \leq R + \epsilon$. Since the function H is increasing with the distance to y_R , we have

$$v_\epsilon(x) \geq H_{R+\epsilon, \beta_2}(R) = C \frac{1}{\beta_2^{\frac{1}{p-1}}} \epsilon^{\frac{-2}{p-1}} \rightarrow +\infty \text{ as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0, \quad x \in \partial\Omega \cap B(y_R, R + \epsilon).$$

Moreover, since for ϵ small enough we have $\frac{x - y_R}{|x - y_R|} \cdot \vec{n}(x) \geq 1 - \delta(\epsilon)$ and $\delta(\epsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, we get

$$\frac{\partial v_\epsilon}{\partial n} \geq \left[\sqrt{\frac{2\beta_2}{p+1}} (1 - \delta(\epsilon)) \left[C \frac{1}{\beta_2^{\frac{1}{p-1}}} \epsilon^{\frac{-2}{p-1}} \right]^{\frac{p+1}{2}-q} \right] v_\epsilon^q, \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \cap B(y_R, R + \epsilon).$$

Choosing ϵ small enough, we can guarantee that

$$\sqrt{\frac{2\beta_2}{p+1}} (1 - \delta(\epsilon)) \left[C \frac{1}{\beta_2^{\frac{1}{p-1}}} \epsilon^{\frac{-2}{p-1}} \right]^{\frac{p+1}{2}-q} \geq 1$$

and this implies that $\frac{\partial v_\epsilon}{\partial n} \geq v_\epsilon^q$ for $x \in \partial\Omega \cap B(y_R, R + \epsilon)$. This shows the result for the first case.

If we are in case ii), then $\frac{p+1}{2} = q$, $\beta_2 > q$ and we can write (3.15) as

$$\frac{\partial v_\epsilon}{\partial n} \geq \left[\sqrt{\frac{\beta_2}{q}} \frac{x - y_R}{|x - y_R|} \cdot \vec{n}(x) \right] v_\epsilon^q, \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \cap B(y_R, R + \epsilon).$$

But as in case i), we have $\frac{x - y_R}{|x - y_R|} \cdot \vec{n}(x) \geq 1 - \delta(\epsilon)$ and $\delta(\epsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. In particular, since $\beta_2 > q$, for ϵ small enough we have

$$\frac{\partial v_\epsilon}{\partial n} \geq \left[\sqrt{\frac{\beta_2}{q}} (1 - \delta(\epsilon)) \right] v_\epsilon^q \geq v_\epsilon^q, \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \cap B(y_R, R + \epsilon),$$

which shows (3.14).

Therefore, taking into account that $v_\epsilon = +\infty$ for $|x - y_R| = R + \epsilon$ and putting together (3.13), (3.14) as well as the equation satisfied by v_ϵ , we see that for ϵ small enough we have

$$(3.16) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta v_\epsilon + \beta_0 v_\epsilon^p \geq 0, & \Omega \cap \{\rho < |x - y_R| < R + \epsilon\}, \\ v_\epsilon(x) \geq u(t, x, u_0), & \text{for } |x - y_R| = \rho, \quad t \geq 0, \\ v_\epsilon(x) = +\infty \geq u(t, x, u_0), & \Omega \cap \{|x - y_R| = R + \epsilon\}, \quad t \geq 0, \\ \frac{\partial v_\epsilon}{\partial n} \geq v_\epsilon^q, & \partial\Omega \cap B(y_R, R + \epsilon), \end{cases}$$

which implies, using comparison arguments, that $v_\epsilon(x) \geq u(t, x, u_0)$ for $x \in \Omega \cap \{\rho < |x - y_R| < R + \epsilon\}$. The fact that the function v_ϵ is bounded in a small neighborhood of x_0 proves the result. This concludes the proof of Theorem 1.1. $\square$

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I would like to thank R. Ferreira for his comments and suggestions that led to better exposition of the results.

REFERENCES

1. F. Andreu, J. M. Mazon, J. Toledo, J. D. Rossi, *Porous medium equation with absorption and a nonlinear boundary condition*. Nonlinear Analysis TMA **49** (2002), 541-563. MR1888335 (2002k:35163)
2. J.M. Arrieta, A. Carvalho, A. Rodríguez-Bernal, *Parabolic problems with nonlinear boundary conditions and critical nonlinearities*. Journal of Differential Equations **165** (1999), 376-406. MR1705387 (2000f:35075)
3. J.M. Arrieta, A. Carvalho, A. Rodríguez-Bernal, *Attractors of parabolic problems with nonlinear boundary conditions. Uniform bounds*. Comm. in Partial Diff. Equations **25** (2000), no. 1-2, 1-37. MR1737541 (2001b:35037)
4. J.M. Arrieta, A. Rodríguez-Bernal, *Localization on the boundary of blow-up for reaction diffusion equations with Nonlinear Boundary Conditions*. Comm. in Partial Diff. Equations **29** (2004), no. 7-8, 1127-1148. MR2097578 (2005f:35159)
5. C. Bandle, M. Marcus, *On second order effects in the boundary behaviour of large solutions of semilinear elliptic problems*. Differential and Integral Equations **11** (1998), 23-34. MR1607972 (98m:35049)
6. P. Baras, L. Cohen, *Complete blow-up after $T_{\max}$ for the solution of a semilinear heat equation*. Journal of Functional Analysis **71** (1987), 142-174. MR879705 (88e:35105)
7. M. Chipot, M. Fila, P. Quittner, *Stationary solutions, blow-up and convergence to stationary solutions for semilinear parabolic equations with nonlinear boundary conditions*. Acta Math. U. Comenian **60** (1991), 35-103. MR1120596 (92h:35110)
8. V. Galaktionov, J.L. Vazquez, *Continuation of blow up solutions of nonlinear heat equations in several space dimensions*. Comm. Pure Appl. Math **50** (1997), 1-67. MR1423231 (97h:35085)
9. V. Galaktionov, J.L. Vazquez, *The problem of blow-up in nonlinear parabolic equations*. Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. **8** (2002), no. 2, 399-433. MR1897690 (2003c:35067)
10. J. García-Melián, R. Letelier-Albornoz, J. Sabina de Lis, *Uniqueness and asymptotic behaviour for solutions of semilinear problems with boundary blow-up*. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **129** (2001), no. 12, 3593-3602. MR1860492 (2002j:35117)
11. M. del Pino, R. Letelier, *The influence of domain geometry in boundary blow-up elliptic problems*. Nonlinear Analysis TMA **48** (2002), 897-904. MR1879080 (2002m:35075)
12. F. Quiros, J. D. Rossi, J. L. Vazquez, *Complete blow-up and thermal avalanche for heat equations with nonlinear boundary conditions*. Comm. in Partial Diff. Equations **27** (2002), 395-424. MR1886965 (2002k:35041)
13. A. Rodríguez-Bernal, A. Tajdine, *Nonlinear Balance for Reaction-Diffusion Equations Under Nonlinear Boundary Conditions: Dissipativity and Blow-up*. Journal of Differential Equations **169** (2001), 332-372. MR1808470 (2002c:35162)
14. A. Tajdine, *Ecuaciones de evolución con condiciones de contorno no homogéneas*, Ph. D. Thesis. Departamento de Matemática Aplicada, Universidad Complutense de Madrid (2005).

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICA APLICADA, UNIVERSIDAD COMPLUTENSE DE MADRID, 28040 MADRID, SPAIN

E-mail address: arrieta@mat.ucm.es