

VANISHING TIME BEHAVIOR OF SOLUTIONS TO THE FAST DIFFUSION EQUATION

KIN MING HUI AND SOOJUNG KIM

ABSTRACT. Let $n \geq 3$, $0 < m < \frac{n-2}{n}$ and $T > 0$. We construct positive solutions to the fast diffusion equation $u_t = \Delta u^m$ in $\mathbb{R}^n \times (0, T)$, which vanish at time T . By introducing a scaling parameter β inspired by [DKS], we study the second-order asymptotics of the self-similar solutions associated with β at spatial infinity. We also investigate the asymptotic behavior of the solutions to the fast diffusion equation near the vanishing time T , provided that the initial value of the solution is close to the initial value of some self-similar solution and satisfies some proper decay condition at infinity. Depending on the range of the parameter β , we prove that the rescaled solution converges either to a self-similar profile or to zero as $t \nearrow T$. The former implies asymptotic stabilization towards a self-similar solution, and the latter is a new vanishing phenomenon even for the case $n \geq 3$ and $m = \frac{n-2}{n+2}$ which corresponds to the Yamabe flow on \mathbb{R}^n with metric $g = u^{\frac{4}{n+2}} dx^2$.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Second-order asymptotics of self-similar profiles	8
3. Existence of solutions to the fast diffusion equation	20
4. Vanishing behavior near the extinction time	21
Acknowledgment	29
Appendix A. Strong comparison principle	29
References	31

1. INTRODUCTION

The equation

$$\begin{cases} u_t = \Delta u^m & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times (0, T) \\ u(x, 0) = u_0(x) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

appears in many physical models. When $m = 1$, (1.1) is the classical heat equation. When $m > 1$, (1.1) is the porous medium equation which models the flow of gases or liquid through porous media. When $0 < m < 1$, (1.1) is the fast diffusion equation appearing in plasma physics. The fast diffusion equation also arises in the study of Yamabe flow in geometry. Let $g = u^{\frac{4}{n+2}} dx^2$ be a conformally flat metric on \mathbb{R}^n

Date: Nov 11, 2018.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 35B40, 35K65 Secondary 35J70.

Key words and phrases. existence, fast diffusion equation, profile near extinction time, second order asymptotics, self-similar solution.

($n \geq 3$), which satisfies the Yamabe flow

$$\frac{\partial g}{\partial t} = -Rg \quad \text{for } 0 < t < T. \quad (1.2)$$

Here R is the scalar curvature with respect to the metric g . Since

$$R = -\frac{4(n-1)}{n-2} u^{-1} \Delta u^{\frac{n-2}{n+2}}$$

(see [SY]), by (1.2) u satisfies

$$u_t = \frac{n-1}{m} \Delta u^m \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times (0, T)$$

with $m = \frac{n-2}{n+2}$; [DKS, dPS, Y]. After a rescaling, this is equivalent to

$$u_t = \Delta u^m \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times (0, T). \quad (1.3)$$

It is well-known that there is a big difference in the behavior of the solutions to (1.1) for the cases $m > 1$, $0 < m < \frac{(n-2)_+}{n}$ and $\frac{(n-2)_+}{n} < m < 1$. When $m > 1$ and the initial value u_0 is non-negative and has compact support, the solution u of (1.1) will have compact support for all time of the existence of solution [A]. On the other hand, as proved by M.A. Herrero and M. Pierre [HP] when $(n-2)_+/n < m < 1$, (1.1) has a unique global positive smooth solution in $\mathbb{R}^n \times (0, \infty)$ for any initial value $0 \leq u_0 \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

In the subcritical case when $n \geq 3$ and $0 < m < \frac{n-2}{n}$, the Barenblatt solution (cf. [DS])

$$\mathcal{B}_k(x, t) = (T-t)^\alpha \left(\frac{C_*}{k^2 + |(T-t)^{\beta_1} x|^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-m}} \quad \forall (x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times (0, T) \quad (1.4)$$

with $k > 0$ and $T > 0$, is a self-similar solution of (1.1) which vanishes identically at time T . Here

$$\beta_1 = \beta_1(m) = \frac{1}{n-2-nm}, \quad \alpha = \frac{2\beta_1 + 1}{1-m}, \quad (1.5)$$

and

$$C_* = C_*(m) = \frac{2m(n-2-nm)}{1-m}. \quad (1.6)$$

Putting $k = 0$ in (1.4), we obtain a singular solution

$$C(x, t) = \left(\frac{C_*(T-t)}{|x|^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-m}} \quad \forall (x, t) \in (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}) \times (0, T) \quad (1.7)$$

of (1.3).

When $n \geq 3$ and $0 < m < \frac{n-2}{n}$, it is shown that there exist initial values such that the corresponding positive smooth solutions of (1.1) vanish at time T in [DS, DKS, GP], while there exist initial values such that (1.1) has unique global positive smooth solutions in $\mathbb{R}^n \times (0, \infty)$ in [Hsu2]. In this case when $n \geq 3$ and $0 < m < \frac{n-2}{n}$, the asymptotic extinction behaviors of the vanishing solutions to (1.1) with initial values satisfying some decay condition have been studied by V.A. Galaktionov, L.A. Peletier [GP], M. del Pino, M. Sáez [dPS], P. Daskalopoulos, J. King, N. Sesum, [DS, DKS], K.M. Hui [Hui], A. Blanchet, M. Bonforte, J. Dolbeault, G. Grillo, J.L. Vazquez [BBDGV, BDGV], M. Fila, J.L. Vazquez, M. Winkler, E. Yanagida [FKW, FVW, FVWY, FW], etc.

Asymptotic stabilization to Barenblatt solutions when $n \geq 3$ and $0 < m < \frac{n-2}{n}$ was investigated in [DS], [BBDGV] and [FW]. It was proved that some rescaled function of the solution to (1.1) converges to the rescaled Barenblatt solution as t approaches the extinction time T , provided that the initial value of the solution is close to the initial value of some Barenblatt solution.

Let $n \geq 3$, $0 < m < \frac{n-2}{n}$ and α, β satisfy

$$\beta \geq \beta_e(m) := \frac{m}{n-2-nm}, \quad \alpha = \frac{2\beta+1}{1-m}. \quad (1.8)$$

By Theorem 1.1 of [Hsu1], for any $\lambda > 0$, there exists a unique radially symmetric solution f_λ to the elliptic problem

$$\begin{cases} \Delta f^m + \alpha f + \beta y \cdot \nabla f = 0, & f > 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \\ f(0) = \lambda^{\frac{2}{1-m}}. \end{cases} \quad (1.9)$$

Then

$$U_\lambda(x, t) := (T-t)^\alpha f_\lambda((T-t)^\beta x) \quad \forall (x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times (0, T) \quad (1.10)$$

is a self-similar solution to (1.3). In particular, if $\beta = \beta_1(m) = \frac{1}{n-2-nm}$, then $\alpha = n\beta$ and for any $\lambda > 0$,

$$f_\lambda(y) = \left(\frac{C_*}{k^2 + |y|^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-m}} =: \mathcal{B}_k(y) \quad \text{with } k = \sqrt{C_*}/\lambda, \quad (1.11)$$

and then the corresponding self-similar solution U_λ coincides with the Barenblatt solution \mathcal{B}_k in (1.4) with $k = \sqrt{C_*}/\lambda$. Similarly, the singular Barenblatt solution $C(x, t)$ in (1.7) satisfies

$$C(x, t) = (T-t)^\alpha \mathcal{C}((T-t)^\beta x) \quad \forall (x, t) \in (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}) \times (0, T)$$

with

$$\mathcal{C}(y) := \left(\frac{C_*}{|y|^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-m}} \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\} \quad (1.12)$$

for any $\beta > 0$, $\alpha = \frac{2\beta+1}{1-m}$ and $0 < m < 1$.

In [DKS], the authors studied vanishing solutions to (1.1) including self-similar solutions in (1.10) for the case $n \geq 3$ and $m = \frac{n-2}{n+2}$ which concerns the Yamabe flow of a conformally flat metric $g = u^{\frac{4}{n+2}} dx^2$ on \mathbb{R}^n . So the singularity formation of conformally flat solutions to the Yamabe flow at a singular time can be described by the extinction profiles of solutions to the fast diffusion equation (1.1).

In this paper we will extend the results of P. Daskalopoulos, K.M. Hui, J. King and N. Sesum in [DS, DKS, Hui], and investigate various asymptotic behavior of solutions to (1.1) near the extinction time, provided that $n \geq 3$, $0 < m < \frac{n-2}{n}$, and the initial value u_0 is close to the initial value of some self-similar solution U_λ with

$$u_0(x) = \left(\frac{C_*}{|x|^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-m}} (1 + o(1)) \quad \text{as } |x| \rightarrow \infty.$$

Unless stated otherwise, we will now let $n \geq 3$, $0 < m < \frac{n-2}{n}$ and α, β satisfy (1.8) throughout the paper. In light of (1.10), for any solution u to (1.1) we define the rescaled function \tilde{u} of u as

$$\tilde{u}(y, \tau) := (T-t)^{-\alpha} u((T-t)^{-\beta} y, T(1-e^{-\tau})) \quad \forall (y, \tau) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [0, \infty) \quad (1.13)$$

with new variables

$$y = (T-t)^\beta x \quad \text{and} \quad \tau = -\log\{(T-t)/T\}.$$

Then \tilde{u} satisfies

$$\tilde{u}_\tau = \Delta \tilde{u}^m + \alpha \tilde{u} + \beta y \cdot \nabla \tilde{u} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times (0, \infty). \quad (1.14)$$

The asymptotic analysis of the solution u near the extinction time $T > 0$ then is equivalent to understand the long-time asymptotics of the rescaled solution \tilde{u} as $\tau \rightarrow \infty$. Note that the solution f_λ of (1.9) is a stationary solution to (1.14) for any $\lambda > 0$.

In the first part of this paper, we will establish the second-order asymptotics of $f_\lambda(r)$ as $r = |y| \rightarrow \infty$ and study the comparison properties of f_λ . By Theorem 1.1 of [Hsu3], f_λ satisfies

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} r^2 f_\lambda^{1-m}(r) = C_* > 0 \quad (1.15)$$

where $r = |y|$ and C_* is given by (1.6). As observed in Subsection 2.2, in light of (1.15), the second-order asymptotics of f_λ can be deduced from the study of the linearization problem of (1.9) around the function $\mathcal{C}(y)$ given by (1.12), which leads to the characteristic equation

$$\gamma^2 - \frac{A_0(m, \beta)}{1-m} \gamma + \frac{2(n-2-nm)}{1-m} = 0. \quad (1.16)$$

Here

$$A_0(m, \beta) = n - 2 - (n+2)m + 2\beta(n-2-nm). \quad (1.17)$$

Let

$$\beta_2 = \beta_2(m) = \sqrt{\frac{2(1-m)}{n-2-nm} + \frac{(n+2)m - (n-2)}{2(n-2-nm)}}$$

and

$$\beta_0 = \beta_0(m) = \max(\beta_2(m), \beta_e(m)). \quad (1.18)$$

Note that

$$A_0(m, \beta) \geq A_0(m, \beta_2(m)) = \sqrt{8(n-2-nm)(1-m)} > 0 \quad \forall \beta \geq \beta_0(m). \quad (1.19)$$

Hence if $\beta \geq \beta_0(m)$, the two positive roots $\gamma_2 = \gamma_2(m, \beta) \geq \gamma_1 = \gamma_1(m, \beta) > 0$ of (1.16) are given by

$$\gamma_j(m, \beta) = \frac{1}{2(1-m)} \left\{ A_0(m, \beta) + (-1)^j \sqrt{A_0(m, \beta)^2 - 8(n-2-nm)(1-m)} \right\} \quad \forall j = 1, 2. \quad (1.20)$$

Under the assumption that $\beta \geq \beta_0(m)$, the positivity of the two roots γ_1, γ_2 implies a non-oscillatory behavior of the second-order term in the asymptotic expansion of f_λ at $r = \infty$. Unless stated otherwise, we will restrict ourselves to the case $\beta > \beta_0(m)$ with the two positive roots $\gamma_2 > \gamma_1 > 0$ of (1.16) throughout the paper. We will also assume that $\beta_1(m), \beta_e(m)$ and $\beta_0(m)$ are given by (1.5), (1.8) and (1.18), respectively.

Now we are ready to state our first theorem.

Theorem 1.1 (Second-order asymptotics of self-similar profile at infinity). *Let $n \geq 3$, $0 < m < \frac{n-2}{n}$, $\beta > \beta_0(m)$ and α be given by (1.8). For any $\lambda > 0$, let f_λ be the unique radially symmetric solution of (1.9). Then the following holds.*

(a) If

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{either (i) } n \geq 3, 0 < m < \frac{n-2}{n} \text{ and } \beta > \beta_1(m) \\ & \text{or (ii) } n > 4, 0 < m < \frac{n-4}{n-2} \text{ and } \beta_0(m) < \beta \leq \beta_1(m) \end{aligned} \quad (C1)$$

holds, then there exists a constant $B > 0$ such that for any $\lambda > 0$,

$$f_\lambda(r) = \left(\frac{C_*}{r^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-m}} \left\{ 1 - B_\lambda r^{-\gamma} + o(r^{-\gamma}) \right\} \quad \text{as } r \rightarrow \infty$$

with $\gamma = \gamma_1(m, \beta)$ and $B_\lambda = B\lambda^{-\gamma}$.

(b) If

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{either (i) } 3 \leq n \leq 4, 0 < m < \frac{n-2}{n} \text{ and } \beta_0(m) < \beta < \beta_1(m), \\ & \text{or (ii) } n > 4, \frac{n-4}{n-2} < m < \frac{n-2}{n} \text{ and } \beta_0(m) < \beta < \beta_1(m) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C2})$$

holds, then there exists a constant $B > 0$ such that for any $\lambda > 0$,

$$f_\lambda(r) = \left(\frac{C_*}{r^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-m}} \left\{ 1 + B_\lambda r^{-\gamma} + o(r^{-\gamma}) \right\} \quad \text{as } r \rightarrow \infty$$

with $\gamma = \gamma_1(m, \beta)$ and $B_\lambda = B\lambda^{-\gamma}$.

(c) If

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{either (i) } 3 \leq n \leq 4, 0 < m < \frac{n-2}{n} \text{ and } \beta = \beta_1(m), \\ & \text{or (ii) } n > 4, \frac{n-4}{n-2} < m < \frac{n-2}{n} \text{ and } \beta = \beta_1(m) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C3})$$

holds, then there exists a constant $B > 0$ such that for any $\lambda > 0$,

$$f_\lambda(r) = \left(\frac{C_*}{r^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-m}} \left\{ 1 - B_\lambda r^{-\gamma} + o(r^{-\gamma}) \right\} \quad \text{as } r \rightarrow \infty$$

with $\gamma = \gamma_2(m, \beta_1(m)) = 2$ and $B_\lambda = B\lambda^{-2}$. In this case, the self-similar profile f_λ satisfies (1.11).

Remark 1.2.

- (i) [DKS, Theorem 1.1] can be regarded as a special case of Theorem 1.1 with $m = \frac{n-2}{n+2}$ and $n \geq 3$. We also mention that the asymptotic result of [DKS, Theorem 1.2] for self-similar profiles with a singularity at the origin in the case $m = \frac{n-2}{n+2}$ was extended by K.M. Hui in [Hui] to the subcritical range $0 < m < \frac{n-2}{n}$, $n \geq 3$.
- (ii) For $n > 4$, the critical exponent $m = \frac{n-4}{n-2}$ appears in Theorem 1.1. In fact, Lemma 2.3 shows that the parameters $\beta_0(m)$ and $\beta_1(m)$ are equal to each other if and only if $m = \frac{n-4}{n-2}$ and $n > 4$. As observed by P. Daskalopoulos and N. Sesum [DS] when $\beta = \beta_1(m)$ and $n \geq 3$, the condition $\frac{n-4}{n-2} < m < \frac{n-2}{n}$ implies that the difference of two Barenblatt profiles \mathcal{B}_k is integrable. This result will be generalized in Lemma 2.13 using the results obtained in Theorem 1.1.

In the following theorem, we examine the monotonicity of f_λ with respect to $\lambda > 0$ and the integrability of $f_{\lambda_1} - f_{\lambda_2}$ for any $\lambda_2 > \lambda_1 > 0$.

Theorem 1.3. Let $n \geq 3$, $0 < m < \frac{n-2}{n}$, $\beta > \beta_0(m)$ and α be given by (1.8). For any $\lambda > 0$, let f_λ be the unique radially symmetric solution of (1.9). Then the following holds.

(a) (Monotone increasing case) If (C1) holds, then

$$f_{\lambda_1}(r) < f_{\lambda_2}(r) \quad \forall r \geq 0, \lambda_2 > \lambda_1 > 0. \quad (1.21)$$

Moreover

$$f_{\lambda_1} - f_{\lambda_2} \notin L^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \quad \forall \lambda_2 > \lambda_1 > 0.$$

(b) (Non-monotone increasing case) If (C2) holds, there exists a constant $R_0 > 0$ such that

$$f_{\lambda_1}(r) > f_{\lambda_2}(r) \quad \forall r \geq R_0/\lambda_1, \lambda_2 > \lambda_1 > 0. \quad (1.22)$$

Moreover

$$f_{\lambda_1} - f_{\lambda_2} \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \quad \forall \lambda_2 > \lambda_1 > 0. \quad (1.23)$$

(c) (*Monotone increasing and integrable case*) If (C3) holds, then both (1.21) and (1.23) hold.

Now we establish the existence of solutions to (1.1) which vanish at time T when the initial value u_0 is close to the initial value of a self-similar solution U_λ given by (1.10). Moreover by using the properties of f_λ in Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.3, we address the vanishing asymptotics of such solutions near the extinction time. We will let $T > 0$ and U_λ be given by (1.10) for the rest of the paper.

Theorem 1.4 (Existence). *Let $n \geq 3$, $0 < m < \frac{n-2}{n}$, $\beta > \beta_e(m)$ and α be given by (1.8). Suppose u_0 satisfies*

$$0 \leq u_0 \leq U_{\lambda_2}(\cdot, 0) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \quad (1.24)$$

and

$$u_0 - U_{\lambda_0}(\cdot, 0) \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \quad (1.25)$$

for some constants $\lambda_2 > 0$, $\lambda_0 > 0$. Then there exists a unique solution u to the Cauchy problem (1.1) which satisfies

$$u_t \leq \frac{u}{(1-m)t} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times (0, T). \quad (1.26)$$

Moreover the following holds.

(i)

$$0 < u(x, t) \leq U_{\lambda_2}(x, t) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times (0, T). \quad (1.27)$$

(ii) For any $0 < t < T$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |u(x, t) - U_{\lambda_0}(x, t)| dx \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |u_0(x) - U_{\lambda_0}(x, 0)| dx. \quad (1.28)$$

(iii) In addition, if u_0 also satisfies

$$u_0 \geq U_{\lambda_1}(\cdot, 0) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \quad (1.29)$$

for some constant $\lambda_1 > 0$, then

$$u(x, t) \geq U_{\lambda_1}(x, t) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times (0, T). \quad (1.30)$$

In Theorem 1.4, we assume that u_0 is a L^1 -perturbation of $U_{\lambda_0}(\cdot, 0)$ and is bounded from above by $U_{\lambda_2}(\cdot, 0)$. It is worth noting that the upper bound of $U_{\lambda_2}(\cdot, 0)$ is responsible for the solution u of (1.1) to have the same extinction time T as the self-similar solution U_{λ_2} (cf. Theorem 1.6 of [DKS]).

Next, we will study the extinction profiles of the solutions to (1.1) given in Theorem 1.4 under the condition (C1), (C2) or (C3) using results of Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.3. As mentioned before, asymptotic stabilization to the Barenblatt profiles \mathcal{B}_k in the rescaled variables (for the case $\beta = \beta_1(m)$) was established in [DS, BBDGV], which corresponds to the case (C3). Henceforth in this paper we restrict our attention to cases (C1) and (C2).

In the monotone increasing case (C1), we obtain asymptotic stability of the solutions to (1.1) in rescaled variables as t approaches the extinction time T . That is, the rescaled solution \tilde{u} converges to a self-similar profile f_λ locally uniformly in \mathbb{R}^n as the rescaled time $\tau \rightarrow \infty$.

Theorem 1.5 (Convergence to a self-similar profile). *Suppose (C1) holds and u_0 satisfies (1.25) and*

$$U_{\lambda_1}(\cdot, 0) \leq u_0 \leq U_{\lambda_2}(\cdot, 0) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \quad (1.31)$$

for some constants $\lambda_2 \geq \lambda_0 \geq \lambda_1 > 0$. Let u be the unique solution of (1.1) given by Theorem 1.4. Then the rescaled solution $\tilde{u}(\cdot, \tau)$ given by (1.13) converges to f_{λ_0} uniformly in $C^2(K)$ as $\tau \rightarrow \infty$ for any compact subset $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. Moreover, if (i) of (C1) holds, then

$$\|\tilde{u}(\cdot, \tau) - f_{\lambda_0}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq T^{n\beta - \alpha} e^{-(n\beta - \alpha)\tau} \|u_0 - U_{\lambda_0}(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} \quad \forall \tau > 0 \quad (1.32)$$

with $n\beta - \alpha = \frac{1}{1-m} \left(\frac{\beta}{\beta_1(m)} - 1 \right) > 0$.

Remark 1.6.

- (i) The weighted L^1 -contraction principle for the rescaled solution \tilde{u} in Proposition 4.1 is a key ingredient in the study of convergence to a self-similar solution in Theorem 1.5. Here the weighted L^1 -space, $L^1(\mathcal{C}^{p_0}; \mathbb{R}^n)$, involves the weight function $\mathcal{C}^{p_0}(y)$, where $\mathcal{C}(y)$ is given by (1.12) and p_0 is given by (4.1). Moreover the L^1 -integrability in (1.25) implies that $u_0 - U_{\lambda_0}(\cdot, 0) \in L^1(\mathcal{C}^{p_0}; \mathbb{R}^n)$ since \mathcal{C}^{p_0} is integrable near the origin.
- (ii) [DS, Theorem 1.2] can be regarded as a special case of Theorem 1.5 with $n > 4$, $0 < m < \frac{n-4}{n-2}$ and $\beta = \beta_1(m)$. In [DS], the self-similar profiles f_λ are explicitly given by the rescaled Barenblatt profiles \mathcal{B}_k in (1.11) as mentioned before. Theorem 1.1 of [DS] dealt with the convergence of \tilde{u} to a rescaled profile \mathcal{B}_k in the case of (C3), where the integrability of the difference of two rescaled profiles (cf. (c) of Theorem 1.3) plays a critical role in the proof.
- (iii) In the proof of [DS, Theorem 1.2] when $n > 4$, $0 < m < \frac{n-4}{n-2}$ and $\beta = \beta_1(m)$, the authors used the Osher–Ralston approach [OR] in order to establish the convergence in a suitable weighted L^1 -space. But, it seems difficult to apply the Osher–Ralston approach in our case (C1) with $\beta < \beta_1(m)$. In fact, when $\beta = \beta_1(m)$ (i.e., $\alpha = n\beta$) in [DS, Theorem 1.2], the L^1 -contraction principle for the solutions u of (1.1) yields the L^1 -contraction principle for the rescaled solutions \tilde{u} since

$$\|\tilde{u}(\cdot, \tau) - f_{\lambda_0}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} = \|u(\cdot, t) - U_{\lambda_0}(\cdot, t)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)}$$

with $\tau = -\log\{(T-t)/T\} > 0$. The L^1 -contraction principle for \tilde{u} was crucial to proceed with the argument of Osher–Ralston in [DS, Theorem 1.2].

In the non-monotone increasing case (C2), we obtain a new asymptotic result of the rescaled solution \tilde{u} as $\tau \rightarrow \infty$. More precisely we obtain the following result.

Theorem 1.7 (Convergence to zero). *Suppose (C2) holds and u_0 satisfies (1.25) and*

$$0 \leq u_0 \leq \min \{U_{\lambda_1}(\cdot, 0), U_{\lambda_2}(\cdot, 0)\} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \quad (1.33)$$

for some constants $\lambda_2 > \lambda_1 > 0$, $\lambda_0 > 0$. Let u be the unique solution of (1.1) given by Theorem 1.4. Then the rescaled solution $\tilde{u}(\cdot, \tau)$ given by (1.13) converges to zero uniformly on any compact subset of \mathbb{R}^n as $\tau \rightarrow \infty$.

Remark 1.8.

- (i) In the case of (C2), we conclude from Theorem 1.7 that asymptotic stabilization of the rescaled solution to the self-similar profile f_λ does not occur, which differs from Theorem 1.5. In fact, if we fix $\lambda > 0$ and consider the rescaled solution \tilde{u}_ε with the initial value $\tilde{u}_{0,\varepsilon} = \min\{f_\lambda, f_{\lambda-\varepsilon}\}$ for $0 < \varepsilon < \lambda$, then by (1.22) there exists some constant $R > 0$ such that $\tilde{u}_{0,\varepsilon} \equiv f_\lambda$ on $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_R$ for small $0 < \varepsilon < \lambda/2$. Then such $\tilde{u}_{0,\varepsilon}$ is a small perturbation of f_λ , and by Theorem 1.7, the rescaled solution \tilde{u}_ε converges to zero as $\tau \rightarrow \infty$. This implies that f_λ is not asymptotically stable with respect to small perturbations.
- (ii) Theorem 1.7 is a new phenomenon of the vanishing behavior of the rescaled solutions even in the particular case $3 \leq n < 6$, $m = \frac{n-2}{n+2}$ and $\beta_0(m) < \beta < \beta_1(m)$, which is related the conformally flat Yamabe flow; see [DKS].
- (iii) In light of the integrability result (1.23) for the case (C2), the condition (1.25) is equivalent to $u_0 - U_\lambda \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for any $\lambda > 0$.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 is devoted to the proofs of Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.3. In Section 3, we establish the existence of solution to (1.1) in Theorem 1.4. In Section 4, we prove Theorem 1.5 and Theorem 1.7 regarding asymptotic results near the extinction time.

Notation. Let us summarize the definitions and notations that are used in the paper.

- For any $0 \leq u_0 \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we say that u is a solution to the Cauchy problem (1.1) in $\mathbb{R}^n \times (0, T)$ if $u > 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n \times (0, T)$ and u is a classical solution of (1.3) satisfying

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \|u(\cdot, t) - u_0\|_{L^1(K)} = 0$$

for any compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$.

- For $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $R > 0$, we let $B_R(x_0) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |x - x_0| < R\}$ and $B_R = B_R(0)$.
- When there is no ambiguity, we will drop the dependence on m and write β_0, β_1 for $\beta_0(m), \beta_1(m)$, etc.

2. SECOND-ORDER ASYMPTOTICS OF SELF-SIMILAR PROFILES

In this section, we will study the self-similar profile f_λ which is the radially symmetric solution of (1.9) for any $\lambda > 0$. In particular we will prove the second-order asymptotics of the self-similar profile $f_\lambda(r)$ as $r = |y| \rightarrow \infty$.

2.1. Existence of self-similar profiles. Firstly we recall some results of [Hsu1, Hsu3] on the existence, uniqueness and the first-order asymptotics of the self-similar profiles which are radially symmetric solutions to the nonlinear elliptic problem (1.9).

Theorem 2.1 ([Hsu1, Hsu3]). *Let $n \geq 3$, $0 < m < \frac{n-2}{n}$ and let α, β satisfy (1.8). For any $\lambda > 0$, there exists a unique solution f_λ to the second-order ordinary differential equation*

$$\begin{cases} (f^m)'' + \frac{n-1}{r}(f^m)' + \alpha f + \beta r f' = 0, & f > 0 \quad \text{in } (0, \infty), \\ f(0) = \lambda^{\frac{2}{1-m}}, \quad f'(0) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

Moreover f_λ satisfies (1.15) and

$$\begin{aligned} f'(r) &< 0 & \forall r > 0; \\ \alpha f(r) + \beta r f'(r) &> 0 & \forall r \geq 0; \\ (r^{n-1}(f^m)')' &< 0 & \forall r \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 2.2 (Scaling property). *Let $n \geq 3$, $0 < m < \frac{n-2}{n}$, $\lambda > 0$ and let α, β satisfy (1.8). Let f_λ be the unique solution to (2.1). Then*

$$f_\lambda(r) = \lambda^{\frac{2}{1-m}} f_1(\lambda r) \quad \forall r \geq 0, \quad (2.2)$$

where f_1 is the unique solution to (2.1) with $\lambda = 1$.

Proof. Let

$$\tilde{f}(r) = \lambda^{\frac{2}{1-m}} f_1(\lambda r) \quad \forall r \geq 0.$$

Then \tilde{f} satisfies (2.1). Since f_λ is also a solution of (2.1), by uniqueness of solutions to (2.1) in Theorem 2.1 the lemma follows. \square

2.2. Second-order asymptotics of self-similar profiles. In this subsection we will use a modification of the proof of [DKS, Theorem 1.1] and Section 3 of [Hui] to study the second-order asymptotics of the self-similar profile f_λ .

In light of the first-order asymptotics (1.15), we define a normalized function g_λ by

$$g_\lambda(s) := \left[C_*^{-\frac{1}{1-m}} r^{\frac{2}{1-m}} f_\lambda(r) \right]^m \quad \forall s = \log r, \quad r > 0.$$

Then by (2.1), (1.15), and the computation in Section 3 of [Hsu1] and Section 3 of [Hui], g_λ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} g'' + \left(\frac{n-2-(n+2)m}{1-m} + \frac{\beta C_*}{m} g^{\frac{1}{m}-1} \right) g' + \frac{2m(n-2-nm)}{(1-m)^2} \left(g^{\frac{1}{m}} - g \right) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}; \\ \lim_{s \rightarrow -\infty} g(s) = 0 & \text{and} \quad \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} g(s) = 1. \end{cases} \quad (2.3)$$

We now linearize (2.3) around the constant 1 by setting $g_\lambda = 1 + w_\lambda$. Then w_λ satisfies ((3.3) of [Hui])

$$\begin{cases} w'' + \left(\frac{n-2-(n+2)m}{1-m} + \frac{\beta C_*}{m} (1+w)^{\frac{1}{m}-1} \right) w' \\ \quad + \frac{2m(n-2-nm)}{(1-m)^2} \left((1+w)^{\frac{1}{m}} - 1 - w \right) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}; \\ \lim_{s \rightarrow -\infty} w(s) = -1, & \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} w(s) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (2.4)$$

Here we note that $w_\lambda > -1$ in \mathbb{R} since $g_\lambda > 0$ in \mathbb{R} .

We next define the linearized operator L for the above equation (2.4) around the zero solution $w \equiv 0$, as

$$L[v] := v'' + \frac{A_0(m, \beta)}{1-m} v' + \frac{2(n-2-nm)}{1-m} v$$

where $A_0(m, \beta)$ is given by (1.17). Let

$$\phi(z) := (1+z)^{\frac{1}{m}} - 1 - \frac{z}{m} \quad \forall z > -1, \quad (2.5)$$

$w = w_\lambda$, and

$$\Phi(s) := \phi(w(s)) \quad \text{for } s \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Then (2.4) can be written as

$$L[w] = h \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R} \quad (2.6)$$

where

$$h(s) := -C_* \left(\beta \Phi'(s) + \frac{1}{1-m} \Phi(s) \right).$$

The characteristic equation associated with the linearized operator L is given by (1.16) with characteristic roots $\gamma_1(m, \beta)$, $\gamma_2(m, \beta)$ given by (1.20). We now assume that $\beta > \beta_0(m)$. Then by (1.19),

$$A_0(m, \beta) > \sqrt{8(n-2-nm)(1-m)} > 0 \quad \forall \beta > \beta_0(m), \quad (2.7)$$

and hence the two positive roots of (1.20) satisfy $\gamma_2(m, \beta) > \gamma_1(m, \beta) > 0$.

By the computation in [Hui, Section 3], it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} w(s) &= \frac{1}{\gamma_2(m, \beta) - \gamma_1(m, \beta)} \left(e^{-\gamma_1 s} \int_{-\infty}^s e^{\gamma_1 t} h(t) dt - e^{-\gamma_2 s} \int_{-\infty}^s e^{\gamma_2 t} h(t) dt \right) \\ &= -C_0(m, \beta) \int_{-\infty}^s \left(A_1(m, \beta) e^{-\gamma_1(s-t)} - A_2(m, \beta) e^{-\gamma_2(s-t)} \right) \Phi(t) dt \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{R}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

where

$$C_0(m, \beta) := \frac{C_*}{\gamma_2(m, \beta) - \gamma_1(m, \beta)} > 0$$

and

$$A_j(m, \beta) := \frac{1}{1-m} - \beta \gamma_j(m, \beta) \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2. \quad (2.9)$$

Here for simplicity, we denote $\gamma_j = \gamma_j(m, \beta)$ for $j = 1, 2$. Since $\gamma_2(m, \beta) > \gamma_1(m, \beta) > 0$, we have

$$A_1(m, \beta) > A_2(m, \beta) \quad \forall \beta > \beta_0(m). \quad (2.10)$$

Observe that the function ϕ given by (2.5) is a strictly convex non-negative function on $(-1, \infty)$ and $\phi(0) = \phi'(0) = 0$. Hence there exist constants $0 < \delta_1 < 1$ and $c_2 > c_1 > 0$ such that

$$c_1 t^2 \leq \phi(t) \leq c_2 t^2 \quad \forall |t| \leq \delta_1. \quad (2.11)$$

Then $\Phi(t) \geq 0$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ since $w_\lambda > -1$ in \mathbb{R} , and $\Phi(t) = 0$ if and only if $w(t) = 0$. Let

$$\delta_2 = \min \left(\delta_1, \frac{\gamma_2 - \gamma_1}{2c_2 C_* \beta} \right). \quad (2.12)$$

Since $\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} w(s) = 0$, there exists a constant $s_0 > 0$ such that

$$|w(s)| \leq \delta_2 \quad \forall s \geq s_0. \quad (2.13)$$

By (2.11) and (2.13), we have

$$c_1 w^2(s) \leq \Phi(s) \leq c_2 w^2(s) \quad \forall s \geq s_0. \quad (2.14)$$

In order to study the asymptotic behavior of w given by (2.8), we first investigate the relation between $\beta_0(m)$ and $\beta_1(m)$, and the sign of $A_1(m, \beta)$ and $A_2(m, \beta)$.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $n \geq 3$ and $0 < m < \frac{n-2}{n}$. Then $\beta_1(m) \geq \beta_0(m)$ where the equality $\beta_1(m) = \beta_0(m)$ holds if and only if $m = \frac{n-4}{n-2}$ and $n > 4$.*

Proof. By direct computation, we have

$$2(n-2-nm)(\beta_1(m) - \beta_2(m)) = (n-nm-2m) - \sqrt{8(1-m)(n-2-nm)}.$$

Since

$$(n-nm-2m)^2 - 8(1-m)(n-2-nm) = [n-4-(n-2)m]^2 \geq 0, \quad (2.15)$$

it follows that $\beta_1(m) \geq \beta_2(m)$, and the equality holds if and only if $m = \frac{n-4}{n-2}$ and $n > 4$. Since $\beta_1(m) > \beta_e(m)$ and $\beta_0(m) = \max(\beta_2(m), \beta_e(m))$, the lemma follows. \square

Lemma 2.4. *Let $n \geq 3$ and $0 < m < \frac{n-2}{n}$. Then the following holds.*

(a) *If*

$$A_1(m, \beta) = 0 \quad \text{for some } \beta \geq \beta_0(m), \quad (2.16)$$

then $\beta = \beta_1(m)$ and $m \geq \frac{n-4}{n-2}$.

(b) *$A_1(m, \beta_1(m)) > 0$ and $A_2(m, \beta_1(m)) = 0$ if $0 < m < \frac{n-4}{n-2}$ and $n > 4$.*

(c) *$A_1(m, \beta_1(m)) = 0$ and $A_2(m, \beta_1(m)) = 0$ if $m = \frac{n-4}{n-2}$ and $n > 4$.*

(d) *$A_1(m, \beta_1(m)) = 0$ and $A_2(m, \beta_1(m)) < 0$ if $\max\left(\frac{n-4}{n-2}, 0\right) < m < \frac{n-2}{n}$.*

Proof. Firstly, we show the statement (a). Note that by (1.20) and (2.9), (2.16) is equivalent to

$$A_0(m, \beta) - \frac{2}{\beta} = \sqrt{A_0(m, \beta)^2 - 8(n-2-nm)(1-m)} \geq 0. \quad (2.17)$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(A_0(m, \beta) - \frac{2}{\beta}\right)^2 - A_0(m, \beta)^2 + 8(n-2-nm)(1-m) \\ &= 4 \left(\frac{1}{\beta} - (n-2-nm)\right) \left(\frac{1}{\beta} + 2m\right), \end{aligned}$$

(2.17) implies that $\beta = \beta_1(m)$. In light of (2.17), we have

$$A_0(m, \beta_1(m)) - \frac{2}{\beta_1(m)} = (n-2)m - (n-4) \geq 0,$$

and hence $m \geq \frac{n-4}{n-2}$. Thus (a) follows.

Since $A_0(m, \beta_1(m)) = n - nm - 2m$, by (1.20), (2.9), (2.15), and a direct computation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2(1-m)A_j(m, \beta_1(m))}{\beta_1(m)} &= 2(n-2-nm) - (n-nm-2m) \\ &\quad - (-1)^j \sqrt{(n-nm-2m)^2 - 8(n-2-nm)(1-m)} \\ &= n-4 - (n-2)m - (-1)^j |n-4 - (n-2)m| \quad \forall j = 1, 2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\frac{2(1-m)A_1(m, \beta_1(m))}{\beta_1(m)} = \begin{cases} 2\{(n-4) - (n-2)m\} > 0 & \text{if } 0 < m < \frac{n-4}{n-2} \text{ and } n > 4, \\ 0 & \text{if } \frac{n-4}{n-2} \leq m < \frac{n-2}{n}, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\frac{2(1-m)A_2(m, \beta_1(m))}{\beta_1(m)} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } 0 < m \leq \frac{n-4}{n-2} \text{ and } n > 4, \\ 2\{(n-4) - (n-2)m\} < 0 & \text{if } \frac{n-4}{n-2} < m < \frac{n-2}{n}. \end{cases}$$

Therefore (b), (c) and (d) follow. \square

Lemma 2.5. *Let $n \geq 3$ and $0 < m < \frac{n-2}{n}$. Then the following holds.*

- (a) $A_1(m, \beta)$ is strictly increasing with respect to $\beta > \beta_0(m)$ if $\frac{n-2}{n+2} \leq m < \frac{n-2}{n}$.
- (b) $A_2(m, \beta)$ is strictly decreasing with respect to $\beta > \beta_0(m)$ if $\frac{n-2}{n+2} \leq m < \frac{n-2}{n}$.
- (c) $A_1(m, \beta) > 0$ if $\frac{n-2}{n+2} \leq m < \frac{n-2}{n}$ and $\beta > \beta_1(m)$.
- (d) $A_1(m, \beta) < 0$ if $\max\left(\frac{n-4}{n-2}, \frac{n-2}{n+2}\right) \leq m < \frac{n-2}{n}$ and $\beta_0(m) < \beta < \beta_1(m)$.

Proof. By direct computation for any $i = 1, 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} & 2(1-m) \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} A_i(m, \beta) \\ &= -2(1-m) \gamma_i(m, \beta) - 2(1-m) \beta \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \gamma_i(m, \beta) \\ &= -2(1-m) \gamma_i(m, \beta) - \beta \left(1 + \frac{(-1)^i A_0(m, \beta)}{\sqrt{A_0(m, \beta)^2 - 8(n-2-nm)(1-m)}} \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} A_0(m, \beta) \\ &= \left(\sqrt{A_0(m, \beta)^2 - 8(n-2-nm)(1-m)} + (-1)^i A_0(m, \beta) \right) \\ & \quad \cdot \left((-1)^{i+1} - \frac{\beta \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} A_0(m, \beta)}{\sqrt{A_0(m, \beta)^2 - 8(n-2-nm)(1-m)}} \right) \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{A_0(m, \beta)^2 - 8(n-2-nm)(1-m)} + (-1)^i A_0(m, \beta)}{\sqrt{A_0(m, \beta)^2 - 8(n-2-nm)(1-m)}} \\ & \quad \cdot \left((-1)^{i+1} \sqrt{A_0(m, \beta)^2 - 8(n-2-nm)(1-m)} - 2\beta(n-2-nm) \right) \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{A_0(m, \beta)^2 - 8(n-2-nm)(1-m)} + (-1)^i A_0(m, \beta)}{\sqrt{A_0(m, \beta)^2 - 8(n-2-nm)(1-m)}} \\ & \quad \cdot \left((-1)^{i+1} \sqrt{A_0(m, \beta)^2 - 8(n-2-nm)(1-m)} - A_0(m, \beta) + (n-2) - (n+2)m \right). \quad (2.18) \end{aligned}$$

Hence if $\frac{n-2}{n+2} \leq m < \frac{n-2}{n}$, then by (2.7) and (2.18),

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} A_1(m, \beta) > 0 > \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} A_2(m, \beta) \quad \forall \beta > \beta_0(m).$$

Thus (a) and (b) follow. Utilizing Lemma 2.4 and (a), we get (c) and (d) and the lemma follows. \square

Based on Lemmas 2.4 and 2.5, we summarize the sign of $A_1 = A_1(m, \beta)$ with respect to $0 < m < \frac{n-2}{n}$, $\beta > \beta_0(m)$, as follows, which plays a key role in the asymptotic analysis of $w = w_\lambda$ near $s = \infty$.

Corollary 2.6. *Let $n \geq 3$ and $0 < m < \frac{n-2}{n}$. Then the following holds.*

- (a) $A_1(m, \beta) > 0$ if (C1) holds.

(b) $A_1(m, \beta) < 0$ if (C2) holds.

(c) $A_1(m, \beta) = 0$ and $A_2(m, \beta) < 0$ if (C3) holds.

Proof. By Lemmas 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5, the continuity of $A_1(m, \beta)$ on the connected domain

$$\left\{ (m, \beta) : 0 < m < \frac{n-2}{n}, \beta > \beta_0(m) \right\}$$

and the intermediate value theorem, we deduce that

$$A_1(m, \beta) > 0 \quad \text{for any} \quad \begin{cases} 0 < m < \frac{n-2}{n} \\ \beta > \beta_1(m) \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{cases} 0 < m < \frac{n-4}{n-2}, n > 4 \\ \beta_0(m) < \beta \leq \beta_1(m), \end{cases} \quad (2.19)$$

and

$$A_1(m, \beta) < 0 \quad \text{for any} \quad \max\left(0, \frac{n-4}{n-2}\right) < m < \frac{n-2}{n}, \beta_0(m) < \beta < \beta_1(m). \quad (2.20)$$

By (d) of Lemma 2.4, (2.19) and (2.20), the corollary follows. \square

By (2.8), Corollary 2.6, and an argument similar to the proof of Lemma 3.2 of [DKS] and Section 3 of [Hui], we have the following lemma.

Lemma 2.7. *Let $n \geq 3$, $0 < m < \frac{n-2}{n}$, $\beta > \beta_0(m)$ and $\gamma_2 = \gamma_2(m, \beta) > \gamma_1 = \gamma_1(m, \beta) > 0$ be the two positive roots of (1.16) given by (1.20). Let $w = w_\lambda$ be the solution of (2.4) which is given by (2.8) and let*

$$\mathbf{I}_i := \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{\gamma_i t} \Phi(t) dt \quad \forall i = 1, 2. \quad (2.21)$$

Then there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$|w(s)| \leq C e^{-\gamma_1 s} \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (2.22)$$

Moreover the following holds.

(a) *If $A_1 = A_1(m, \beta) > 0$, then*

$$w(s) < 0 \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (2.23)$$

(b) *If $A_1 = A_1(m, \beta) < 0$, then there exists a constant $s_* > s_0$ such that*

$$w(s) > 0 \quad \forall s \geq s_*. \quad (2.24)$$

(c) *If $A_1(m, \beta) \neq 0$, then*

$$0 < \mathbf{I}_1 < \infty. \quad (2.25)$$

(d) *If $A_1 = A_1(m, \beta) = 0$ and $A_2 = A_2(m, \beta) < 0$, then (2.23) holds and*

$$0 < \mathbf{I}_2 < \infty. \quad (2.26)$$

Here $s_0 > 0$ is the constant appearing in (2.13).

Proof. Since the proof of this lemma is similar to the proof of Lemma 3.2 of [DKS] and Section 3 of [Hui], we will only sketch the proof here. Multiplying (2.6) by $e^{\gamma_1 t}$ and $e^{\gamma_2 t}$ respectively and integrating over $(-\infty, s)$,

$$w' + \gamma_2 w = -C_* A_1 e^{-\gamma_1 s} \int_{-\infty}^s e^{\gamma_1 t} \Phi(t) dt - C_* \beta \Phi(s) \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{R} \quad (2.27)$$

and

$$w' + \gamma_1 w = -C_* A_2 e^{-\gamma_2 s} \int_{-\infty}^s e^{\gamma_2 t} \Phi(t) dt - C_* \beta \Phi(s) \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (2.28)$$

Note that since $\gamma_2 > \gamma_1 > 0$, we have

$$e^{-\gamma_1(s-t)} > e^{-\gamma_2(s-t)} \quad \forall s > t. \quad (2.29)$$

We now divide the proof into two cases.

Case 1: $A_1 \neq 0$.

Case 1a: $A_1 > 0$.

By (2.8), (2.10) and (2.29), we get (2.23) and

$$|w(s)| = -w(s) \leq C_0 (A_1 + |A_2|) e^{-\gamma_1 s} \int_{-\infty}^s e^{\gamma_1 t} \Phi(t) dt \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (2.30)$$

Case 1b: $A_1 < 0$.

Let $C_3 = C_* |A_1| \int_{-\infty}^{s_0} e^{\gamma_1 t} \Phi(t) dt$. Then $C_3 > 0$. By (2.12), (2.13), (2.14) and (2.27),

$$\begin{aligned} w' + \gamma_2 w &\geq C_3 e^{-\gamma_1 s} - c_2 C_* \beta w^2 \quad \forall s \geq s_0 \\ \Rightarrow \frac{d}{ds} \left(e^{\gamma_2 s + c_2 C_* \beta \int_{s_0}^s w(t) dt} w(s) \right) &\geq C_3 e^{(\gamma_2 - \gamma_1)s + c_2 C_* \beta \int_{s_0}^s w(t) dt} \geq C_3 e^{\frac{(\gamma_2 - \gamma_1)}{2}s} \quad \forall s \geq s_0 \\ \Rightarrow e^{\gamma_2 s + C_4 \int_{s_0}^s w(t) dt} w(s) &\geq \frac{2C_3}{\gamma_2 - \gamma_1} \left(e^{\frac{(\gamma_2 - \gamma_1)}{2}s} - e^{\frac{(\gamma_2 - \gamma_1)}{2}s_0} \right) + e^{\gamma_2 s_0} w(s_0) \quad \forall s \geq s_0 \end{aligned} \quad (2.31)$$

where $C_4 = c_2 C_* \beta$. Since $\gamma_2 > \gamma_1 > 0$, by (2.31) there exists $s_* > s_0$ such that (2.24) holds. Since $A_2 < A_1 < 0$, by (2.8), it follows that

$$0 < w(s) \leq C_0 |A_1| e^{-\gamma_1 s} \int_{-\infty}^s e^{\gamma_1 t} \Phi(t) dt \quad \forall s \geq s_*. \quad (2.32)$$

Hence when $A_1 \neq 0$, by (2.30) and (2.32) there exist constants $s_* > s_0$ and $C > 0$ such that

$$|w(s)| \leq C e^{-\gamma_1 s} \int_{-\infty}^s e^{\gamma_1 t} \Phi(t) dt \quad \forall s \geq s_*, \quad (2.33)$$

and $w(s) > 0$ for any $s \geq s_*$ if $A_1 < 0$.

Now we claim that (2.25) holds. Suppose to the contrary that

$$\mathbf{I}_1 = \infty. \quad (2.34)$$

Let

$$v(s) = \begin{cases} -w(s) & \forall s \in \mathbb{R} \quad \text{if } A_1 > 0, \\ w(s) & \forall s \in \mathbb{R} \quad \text{if } A_1 < 0, \end{cases}$$

and

$$J_1(s) = \int_{s_0}^s e^{\gamma_1 t} \Phi(t) dt,$$

where s_0 is as given by (2.14). Then by (2.14), (2.33), (2.34) and an argument similar to the proof of Lemma 3.2 of [DKS] there exists constants $s_1 > s_*$, and $c_3 > 0$ such that

$$J_1(s) \geq c_3 e^{\gamma_1 s} \quad \forall s \geq s_1. \quad (2.35)$$

By (2.14), (2.27) and (2.35), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} v' + \gamma_2 v &\geq C_* |A_1| e^{-\gamma_1 s} J_1(s) - c_2 C_* \beta w^2 \quad \forall s \geq s_1 \\ \Rightarrow v' + \gamma_2 v &\geq c_3 C_* |A_1| - c_2 C_* \beta w^2 \quad \forall s \geq s_1. \end{aligned} \quad (2.36)$$

Since $\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} w(s) = 0$, there exists $s_2 > s_1$ such that

$$|w(s)| \leq \min \left(\frac{c_3 C_* |A_1|}{4\gamma_2}, \sqrt{\frac{c_3 |A_1|}{4c_2 \beta}} \right) \quad \forall s \geq s_2. \quad (2.37)$$

By using (2.36) and (2.37), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} v'(s) &\geq \frac{c_3 C_* |A_1|}{2} \quad \forall s \geq s_2 \\ \Rightarrow v(s) &= |w(s)| \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{as } s \rightarrow \infty, \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts the fact that $\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} w(s) = 0$. Hence (2.34) does not hold and (2.25) follows.

Case 2: $A_1 = 0$ and $A_2 < 0$.

By (2.8), we have

$$w(s) = -C_0 |A_2| e^{-\gamma_2 s} \int_{-\infty}^s e^{\gamma_2 t} \Phi(t) dt < 0 \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{R} \quad (2.38)$$

and (2.23) follows. Utilizing (2.28), (2.38) and an argument similar to the proof of (2.25) in Case 1, we get (2.26).

Finally by (2.25), (2.26), (2.33) and (2.38), we get (2.22) and the lemma follows. \square

Lemma 2.8. *Let $n \geq 3$, $0 < m < \frac{n-2}{n}$, $\beta > \beta_0(m)$ and $\gamma_2 = \gamma_2(m, \beta) > \gamma_1 = \gamma_1(m, \beta) > 0$ be the two positive roots of (1.16) given by (1.20). Let $w = w_\lambda$ be the solution of (2.4) which is given by (2.8) and $\mathbf{I}_1, \mathbf{I}_2$ be given by (2.21). Then the following holds.*

(a) *If $A_1 = A_1(m, \beta) \neq 0$, then*

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} e^{\gamma_1 s} w(s) = -C_0 A_1 \mathbf{I}_1.$$

(b) *If $A_1 = A_1(m, \beta) = 0$ and $A_2 = A_2(m, \beta) < 0$, then*

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} e^{\gamma_2 s} w(s) = C_0 A_2 \mathbf{I}_2 < 0.$$

Proof. We first observe that (b) follows immediately from (2.38) and (d) of Lemma 2.7. Hence it remains to prove (a). Suppose now that $A_1(m, \beta) \neq 0$. By (2.8) and (c) of Lemma 2.7, it suffices to prove that

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} e^{-(\gamma_2 - \gamma_1)s} \int_{-\infty}^s e^{\gamma_2 t} \Phi(t) dt = 0. \quad (2.39)$$

By (2.14) and (2.22), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-(\gamma_2 - \gamma_1)s} \int_{s_0}^s e^{\gamma_2 t} \Phi(t) dt &\leq C_1 e^{-(\gamma_2 - \gamma_1)s} \int_{s_0}^s e^{(\gamma_2 - 2\gamma_1)t} dt \quad \forall s \geq s_0 \\ &\leq C'_1 e^{-(\gamma_2 - \gamma_1)s} \left(s + e^{(\gamma_2 - 2\gamma_1)s} \right) \quad \forall s \geq s_0 \\ &= C'_1 \left(s e^{-(\gamma_2 - \gamma_1)s} + e^{-\gamma_1 s} \right) \quad \forall s \geq s_0 \\ &\rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } s \rightarrow \infty \end{aligned}$$

for some constants $C_1 > 0$, $C'_1 > 0$, and (2.39) follows. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.1. By Corollary 2.6, Lemma 2.8 and the relation between $w = w_\lambda$ and f_λ , for any given (m, β) there exists a constant $B_\lambda > 0$ such that

$$\begin{cases} \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} r^\gamma \left\{ \left[(r^2/C_*)^{\frac{1}{1-m}} f_\lambda(r) \right]^m - 1 \right\} = -mB_\lambda & \text{if (C1) holds;} \\ \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} r^\gamma \left\{ \left[(r^2/C_*)^{\frac{1}{1-m}} f_\lambda(r) \right]^m - 1 \right\} = mB_\lambda & \text{if (C2) holds;} \end{cases} \quad (2.40)$$

with $\gamma = \gamma_1(m, \beta)$, and

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} r^\gamma \left\{ \left[(r^2/C_*)^{\frac{1}{1-m}} f_\lambda(r) \right]^m - 1 \right\} = -mB_\lambda \quad \text{if (C3) holds} \quad (2.41)$$

with $\gamma = \gamma_2(m, \beta)$. Moreover by Lemma 2.2 for any $\lambda > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} r^\gamma \left\{ \left[(r^2/C_*)^{\frac{1}{1-m}} f_\lambda(r) \right]^m - 1 \right\} &= \lambda^{-\gamma} \lim_{\rho \rightarrow \infty} \rho^\gamma \left\{ \left[(\rho^2/C_*)^{\frac{1}{1-m}} f_1(\rho) \right]^m - 1 \right\} \\ \Rightarrow B_\lambda &= B_1 \lambda^{-\gamma}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.42)$$

Letting $B = B_1$, by (2.40) and (2.42), (a) and (b) follow. In light of (2.41) and (2.42), we will prove that $\gamma = \gamma_2(m, \beta) = 2$ in case (c) to complete the proof.

Suppose now (C3) holds. Then $A_0(m, \beta_1(m)) = n - 2m - nm$, and (1.16) is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma^2 - \frac{n - 2m - nm}{1 - m} \gamma + \frac{2(n - 2 - nm)}{1 - m} &= 0 \\ \Rightarrow \gamma_2 = 2 > \gamma_1 = \frac{n - 2 - nm}{1 - m}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore (c) follows. \square

Corollary 2.9. Let $n \geq 3$, $0 < m < \frac{n-2}{n}$ and $\beta > \beta_0(m)$. Suppose either (C1) or (C3) holds. Then for any $\lambda > 0$,

$$f_\lambda(r) < \mathcal{C}(r) = \left(\frac{C_*}{r^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-m}} \quad \forall r > 0. \quad (2.43)$$

Proof. By Corollary 2.6 and Lemma 2.7, it holds that $w_\lambda(s) < 0$ for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$. Hence

$$(r^2/C_*)^{\frac{1}{1-m}} f_\lambda(r) = g_\lambda^{1/m}(s) = \{1 + w_\lambda(s)\}^{1/m} < 1 \quad \forall r = e^s > 0$$

and (2.43) follows. \square

2.3. Properties of the self-similar profile f_λ . Next we study properties of self-similar profiles f_λ in the cases of (C1), (C2) and (C3). Here and below f_λ is the unique radially symmetric smooth solution to (1.9) given by Theorem 2.1.

Lemma 2.10 (Monotonicity). *Suppose either (C1) or (C3) holds. Then*

$$\frac{df_\lambda}{d\lambda}(r) > 0 \quad \forall r \geq 0, \lambda > 0, \quad (2.44)$$

and (1.21) holds.

Proof. By Corollary 2.6 and Lemma 2.7, we have

$$g_\lambda(s) = (e^{2s}/C_*)^{\frac{m}{1-m}} f_\lambda^m(e^s) = 1 + w_\lambda(s) < 1 \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{R} \quad (2.45)$$

$$\Rightarrow g'_\lambda(s) = mC_*^{-\frac{m}{1-m}} e^{\frac{2ms}{1-m}} f_\lambda^{m-1}(e^s) \left(\frac{2}{1-m} f_\lambda(e^s) + e^s f'_\lambda(e^s) \right) \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (2.46)$$

Hence $g'_\lambda(s) > 0$ for sufficiently small $s \ll -1$ since $f_\lambda(0) = \lambda^{\frac{2}{1-m}}$ and $f'_\lambda(0) = 0$. Now we claim that for $g = g_\lambda$,

$$g'(s) > 0 \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (2.47)$$

Suppose the claim (2.47) does not hold. Then there exists a constant $s'_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $g'(s'_0) \leq 0$. Hence by the intermediate value theorem there exists a constant $s_1 \leq s'_0$ such that $g'(s_1) = 0$. Let

$$s_2 := \sup \{s' \in \mathbb{R} : g'(s) > 0 \quad \forall s < s'\}.$$

Then $-\infty < s_2 \leq s_1$, $g'(s_2) = 0$ and $g''(s_2) \leq 0$. Hence the equation (2.3) for $g = g_\lambda$ evaluated at s_2 yields that

$$0 \geq g'' + \left\{ \frac{n-2-(n+2)m}{1-m} + \frac{\beta C_*}{m} g^{\frac{1}{m}-1} \right\} g' = \frac{2m(n-2-nm)}{(1-m)^2} (g - g^{\frac{1}{m}}).$$

However by (2.45) the right hand side of the above equation is positive and a contradiction arises. Thus the claim (2.47) holds.

By (2.46) and (2.47), it holds that

$$\frac{2}{1-m} f_\lambda(r) + r f'_\lambda(r) > 0 \quad \forall r \geq 0$$

since $f_\lambda(0) = \lambda^{\frac{2}{1-m}}$ and $f'_\lambda(0) = 0$. Therefore, it follows from Lemma 2.2 that for any $\lambda > 0$,

$$\frac{df_\lambda}{d\lambda}(r) = \frac{d}{d\lambda} \left\{ \lambda^{\frac{2}{1-m}} f_1(\lambda r) \right\} = \lambda^{\frac{2}{1-m}-1} \left\{ \frac{2}{1-m} f_1(\lambda r) + \lambda r \cdot f'_1(\lambda r) \right\} > 0 \quad \forall r \geq 0,$$

and (2.44) follows. Integrating (2.44) over $\lambda \in (\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$, we deduce (1.21) finishing the proof. \square

With the non-monotone condition (C2), we have a reverse monotonicity of $f_\lambda(r)$ with respect to $\lambda > 0$ for sufficiently large $r \gg 1$.

Lemma 2.11 (Reverse monotonicity near infinity). *Suppose (C2) holds. Then there exists a constant $R_0 > 0$ such that*

$$\frac{df_\lambda}{d\lambda}(r) < 0 \quad \forall r \geq R_0/\lambda, \quad \lambda > 0, \quad (2.48)$$

and (1.22) holds.

Proof. Let $\lambda > 0$. We first observe that by Corollary 2.6 and Lemma 2.7 there exists a constant $s_* > s_0$ such that

$$g_\lambda(s) = 1 + w_\lambda(s) > 1 \quad \forall s > s_*. \quad (2.49)$$

Since $\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} g_\lambda(s) = 1$ by (2.3), there exists a constant $s_1 = s_1(\lambda) > s_*$ such that $g'(s_1) < 0$. We claim that $g = g_\lambda$ satisfies

$$g'(s) < 0 \quad \forall s \geq s_1. \quad (2.50)$$

Suppose to the contrary that the claim does not hold. Then there exists $s_2 > s_1$ such that $g'(s) < 0$ for any $s_1 \leq s < s_2$ and $g'(s_2) = 0$. Hence $g''(s_2) \geq 0$. Thus the equation (2.3) for $g = g_\lambda$ evaluated at s_2 implies that

$$0 \leq g'' + \left\{ \frac{n-2-(n+2)m}{1-m} + \frac{\beta C_*}{m} g^{\frac{1}{m}-1} \right\} g' = \frac{2m(n-2-nm)}{(1-m)^2} \left(g - g^{\frac{1}{m}} \right).$$

On the other hand the right hand side of the above equation is negative by (2.49). Hence a contradiction arises and the claim (2.50) follows.

By (2.2), (2.46) and (2.50), there exists a constant $s_1(1)$ for $g = g_1$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & g_1'(s) < 0 \quad \forall s \geq s_1(1) \\ \Rightarrow & \frac{2}{1-m} f_1(r) + r f_1'(r) < 0 \quad \forall r \geq R_0 := e^{s_1(1)} \\ \Rightarrow & \frac{df_\lambda}{d\lambda}(r) = \lambda^{\frac{2}{1-m}-1} \left\{ \frac{2}{1-m} f_1(\lambda r) + \lambda r \cdot f_1'(\lambda r) \right\} < 0 \quad \forall r \geq R_0/\lambda, \lambda > 0, \end{aligned}$$

and (2.48) follows. (1.22) then follows by integrating (2.48) with respect to λ over (λ_1, λ_2) . \square

Corollary 2.12. *Suppose (C2) holds. Then for any $\lambda_2 > \lambda_1 > 0$, there exist constants $r_2 > r_0 > r_1 > 0$ such that $f_{\lambda_1}(r_0) = f_{\lambda_2}(r_0)$ and*

- (i) $f_{\lambda_2}(r) > f_{\lambda_1}(r) \quad \forall 0 \leq r < r_1,$
- (ii) $f_{\lambda_2}(r) < f_{\lambda_1}(r) \quad \forall r > r_2.$

Proof. Since $f_{\lambda_2}(0) = \lambda_2^{\frac{2}{1-m}} > \lambda_1^{\frac{2}{1-m}} = f_{\lambda_1}(0)$, by continuity there exists $r_1 > 0$ such that (i) holds. By Lemma 2.11 there exists a constant $r_2 > r_1 > 0$ such that (ii) holds true. By (i), (ii) and the intermediate value theorem, there exists a constant $r_0 \in (r_1, r_2)$ such that $f_{\lambda_1}(r_0) = f_{\lambda_2}(r_0)$ and the corollary follows. \square

Lemma 2.13. *Let $\lambda_2 > \lambda_1 > 0$. Then the following holds.*

(a) *If (C1) holds, then*

$$n - \frac{2}{1-m} - \gamma_1(m, \beta) > 0 \tag{2.51}$$

and $f_{\lambda_1} - f_{\lambda_2} \notin L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

(b) *If either (C2) or (C3) holds, then $f_{\lambda_1} - f_{\lambda_2} \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$.*

Proof. Suppose (C1), (C2) or (C3) holds. By Theorem 1.1 there is a constant $B \neq 0$ such that

$$f_1(r) = \left(\frac{C_*}{r^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-m}} \left\{ 1 + Br^{-\gamma} + o(r^{-\gamma}) \right\} \quad \text{as } r = |y| \rightarrow \infty$$

where $\gamma = \gamma_1(m, \beta)$ if (C1) or (C2) holds, and $\gamma = \gamma_2(m, \beta_1(m)) = 2$ if (C3) holds. Hence for each $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, there exists a constant $R_\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\left(\frac{C_*}{r^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-m}} \left\{ 1 + (B - \varepsilon|B|)r^{-\gamma} \right\} \leq f_1(r) \leq \left(\frac{C_*}{r^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-m}} \left\{ 1 + (B + \varepsilon|B|)r^{-\gamma} \right\} \quad \forall r \geq R_\varepsilon.$$

This together with (2.2) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{C_*}{r^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-m}} \left\{1 + (B - \varepsilon|B|)\lambda^{-\gamma}r^{-\gamma}\right\} &\leq f_{\lambda}(r) \\ &\leq \left(\frac{C_*}{r^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-m}} \left\{1 + (B + \varepsilon|B|)\lambda^{-\gamma}r^{-\gamma}\right\} \quad \forall r \geq R_{\varepsilon}/\lambda, \lambda > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence by choosing a sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist constants R_1 and $C_2 > C_1 > 0$ such that

$$C_1 \int_R^{\infty} r^{n-1-\frac{2}{1-m}-\gamma} dr \leq \int_{|y| \geq R} |f_{\lambda_1} - f_{\lambda_2}| dy \leq C_2 \int_R^{\infty} r^{n-1-\frac{2}{1-m}-\gamma} dr \quad \forall R \geq R_1/\lambda_1. \quad (2.52)$$

Note that for $j = 1, 2$,

$$n - \frac{2}{1-m} - \gamma_j(m, \beta) = \frac{1}{(1-m)\beta_1(m)} - \gamma_j(m, \beta). \quad (2.53)$$

We now divide the proof into four cases.

Case 1: (i) of (C1) holds.

Note that $\gamma = \gamma_1(m, \beta)$ in (2.52) by Theorem 1.1. Then by (i) of (C1), (2.9) and Corollary 2.6, we have

$$\frac{1}{(1-m)\beta_1(m)} - \gamma_1(m, \beta) \geq \frac{1}{(1-m)\beta} - \gamma_1(m, \beta) = \frac{1}{\beta} A_1(m, \beta) > 0$$

since $\beta > \beta_1(m)$. This estimate together with (2.53) implies that (2.51) holds and the integral on the left hand side of (2.52) is infinite. Hence $f_{\lambda_1} - f_{\lambda_2} \notin L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Case 2: (ii) of (C1) holds.

By Theorem 1.1, we note that $\gamma = \gamma_1(m, \beta)$ in (2.52). By (1.17) and (ii) of (C1), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} 2(n-2-nm) - A_0(m, \beta) &= n-2 - (n-2)m - 2(n-2-nm)\beta \\ &\geq n-2 - (n-2)m - 2(n-2-nm)\beta_1(m) \\ &= n-4 - (n-2)m. \end{aligned}$$

Hence by (1.20) and (ii) of (C1), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} &n - \frac{2}{1-m} - \gamma_1(m, \beta) \\ &= \frac{1}{2(1-m)} \left\{ 2(n-2-nm) - A_0(m, \beta) + \sqrt{A_0(m, \beta)^2 - 8(n-2-nm)(1-m)} \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{2(1-m)} \left\{ n-4 - (n-2)m + \sqrt{A_0(m, \beta)^2 - 8(n-2-nm)(1-m)} \right\} \\ &> 0, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that (2.51) holds and the integral on the left hand side of (2.52) is infinite. Hence $f_{\lambda_1} - f_{\lambda_2} \notin L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Case 3: (C2) holds.

By (C2), (2.9) and Corollary 2.6, we have

$$\frac{1}{(1-m)\beta_1(m)} - \gamma_1(m, \beta) < \frac{1}{(1-m)\beta} - \gamma_1(m, \beta) = \frac{A_1(m, \beta)}{\beta} < 0.$$

This together with (2.53) implies that the integral on the right hand side of (2.52) is finite. Hence $f_{\lambda_1} - f_{\lambda_2} \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Case 4: (C3) holds.

Since $\gamma = 2$ by Theorem 1.1, (C3) implies

$$n - \frac{2}{1-m} - \gamma = \frac{n-4-(n-2)m}{1-m} < 0.$$

This yields that the integral on the right hand side of (2.52) is finite. Hence $f_{\lambda_1} - f_{\lambda_2} \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and the lemma follows. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Theorem 1.3 follows directly from Lemmas 2.10, 2.11 and 2.13. \square

3. EXISTENCE OF SOLUTIONS TO THE FAST DIFFUSION EQUATION

In this section we will establish the existence of solutions to the fast diffusion equation (1.1) based on the result of [Hsu2], provided that the initial value u_0 is close in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to the initial value of a self-similar solution to (1.1). Let $n \geq 3$, $0 < m < \frac{n-2}{n}$ and $\beta \geq \beta_e(m) = \frac{m}{n-2-nm}$ with $\alpha = \frac{2\beta+1}{1-m}$. We recall that for any $T > 0$ and $\lambda > 0$, a self-similar solution U_λ to (1.1) in $\mathbb{R}^n \times (0, T)$ is given by

$$U_\lambda(x, t) = (T-t)^\alpha f_\lambda((T-t)^\beta x) \quad \forall (x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times (0, T)$$

where f_λ is the solution of (1.9).

Proof of Theorem 1.4. Step 1. In order to prove the existence of the short time solution to (1.1) in $\mathbb{R}^n \times (0, T_0)$ for some constant $T_0 > 0$, we will apply Theorem 1.1 of [Hsu2] using the initial assumption (1.25). By (1.25), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{R^{n-\frac{2}{1-m}}} \int_{|x| \leq R} u_0(x) dx &= \liminf_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{R^{n-\frac{2}{1-m}}} \int_{|x| \leq R} U_{\lambda_0}(x, 0) dx \\ &= T^{\frac{1}{1-m}} \cdot \liminf_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{(T^\beta R)^{n-\frac{2}{1-m}}} \int_{|y| \leq T^\beta R} f_{\lambda_0}(y) dy. \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

Here we used that $0 < m < \frac{n-2}{n}$, and $\alpha = \frac{2\beta+1}{1-m}$. By (1.15) there exists a constant $c_0 > 0$ such that

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{r^{n-\frac{2}{1-m}}} \int_{|y| \leq r} f_{\lambda_0}(y) dy \geq c_0 > 0. \quad (3.2)$$

Let $C_1 > 0$ be the constant appearing in Theorem 1.1 of [Hsu2]. By (3.1) and (3.2), we have

$$\liminf_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{R^{n-\frac{2}{1-m}}} \int_{|x| \leq R} u_0(x) dx \geq c_0 T^{\frac{1}{1-m}} = C_1 T_0^{\frac{1}{1-m}}$$

with a constant $T_0 = (c_0/C_1)^{1-m} T > 0$. Therefore by [Hsu2, Theorem 1.1] there exists a unique positive solution $u \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \times (0, T_0))$ of (1.1) in $\mathbb{R}^n \times (0, T_0)$ which satisfies (1.26) in $\mathbb{R}^n \times (0, T_0)$.

Let $T_* > 0$ be the maximal existence time of the positive solution $u \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \times (0, T_*))$ to (1.1) in $\mathbb{R}^n \times (0, T_*)$ which satisfies (1.26) in $\mathbb{R}^n \times (0, T_*)$. Note that $T_* \geq T_0 > 0$. By utilizing the initial condition (1.24), the approximating procedure for the construction of the solution u in the proof of [Hsu2, Theorem 1.1] yields that (1.27) holds in $\mathbb{R}^n \times (0, T_*)$. In particular, we deduce from (1.27) that $0 < T_* \leq T$. Furthermore, if u_0 also satisfies (1.29), then by the construction of the solution of (1.1) in [Hsu2], (1.30) holds in $\mathbb{R}^n \times (0, T_*)$.

Step 2. Next we will establish the L^1 -contraction principle (1.28) for any $0 < t < T_*$. We first observe that by (1.15), for any $0 < S < T_*$ there exists a constant $c_S > 0$ such that

$$U_{\lambda_0}(x, t) \geq c_S \min\left(1, |x|^{-\frac{2}{1-m}}\right) \quad \forall (x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times (0, S).$$

Using this estimate and the initial condition (1.25), and applying Lemma 5.1 of [Hui], we deduce the L^1 -contraction principle (1.28) for any $0 < t < T_*$.

Step 3. Lastly, we will prove that $T_* = T$. Suppose to the contrary that $0 < T_* < T$. Since $|u(\cdot, t) - U_{\lambda_0}(\cdot, t)| \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for any $0 < t < T_*$ by (1.28), direct computation shows that for any $0 < t < T_*$,

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{R^{n-\frac{2}{1-m}}} \int_{|x| \leq R} u(x, t) dx &= \liminf_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{R^{n-\frac{2}{1-m}}} \int_{|x| \leq R} U_{\lambda_0}(x, t) dx \\ &= (T-t)^{\frac{1}{1-m}} \liminf_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\{(T-t)^\beta R\}^{n-\frac{2}{1-m}}} \int_{|y| \leq (T-t)^\beta R} f_{\lambda_0}(y) dy. \end{aligned}$$

This together with (3.2) implies that for any $0 < t < T_*$,

$$\liminf_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{R^{n-\frac{2}{1-m}}} \int_{|x| \leq R} u(x, t) dx \geq c_0 (T-t)^{\frac{1}{1-m}}. \quad (3.3)$$

We now choose a constant $\delta \in (0, T - T_*)$ such that

$$\delta < \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{c_0}{C_1} \right)^{1-m} (T - T_* - \delta),$$

where we recall that $C_1 > 0$ is the constant appearing in Theorem 1.1 of [Hsu2]. Then it follows from (3.3) that

$$\liminf_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{R^{n-\frac{2}{1-m}}} \int_{|x| \leq R} u(x, T_* - \delta) dx \geq c_0 (T - T_* + \delta)^{\frac{1}{1-m}} > C_1 (2\delta)^{\frac{1}{1-m}}.$$

Thus by Theorem 1.1 of [Hsu2], there exists a unique positive solution u_1 to (1.1) in $\mathbb{R}^n \times (0, 2\delta)$ with initial value $u_1(x, 0) = u(x, T_* - \delta)$. Since by (1.26),

$$u_t(x, T_* - \delta) \leq \frac{u(x, T_* - \delta)}{(1-m)(T_* - \delta)},$$

an argument similar to [Hsu2] shows that u_1 satisfies

$$u_{1,t} \leq \frac{u_1}{(1-m)(t + T_* - \delta)} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times (0, 2\delta). \quad (3.4)$$

Then we extend u to a function on $\mathbb{R}^n \times (0, T_* + \delta)$ by letting $u(x, t) = u_1(x, t - T_* + \delta)$ in $\mathbb{R}^n \times [T_*, T_* + \delta)$. The extended function u is then a solution of (1.1) in $\mathbb{R}^n \times (0, T_* + \delta)$ and u satisfies (1.26) in $\mathbb{R}^n \times (0, T_* + \delta)$ by (3.4). However this contradicts the definition of the maximal existence time T_* . Hence $T_* = T$ and the theorem follows. \square

4. VANISHING BEHAVIOR NEAR THE EXTINCTION TIME

This section is devoted to the study of vanishing behavior of solutions to the fast diffusion equation (1.1) near the extinction time when either (C1) or (C2) holds. We recall that the rescaled solution $\tilde{u} = \tilde{u}(y, \tau)$ is given by (1.13) and we are concerned with the large time asymptotics of \tilde{u} as $\tau \rightarrow \infty$.

4.1. Monotone increasing case (C1).

Let

$$L^1(\mathcal{C}^{p_0}; \mathbb{R}^n) = \left\{ f : \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |f(x)| \mathcal{C}^{p_0}(x) dx < \infty \right\}$$

where $\mathcal{C}(x)$ is given by (1.12) and

$$p_0 := \frac{1-m}{2} \left(n - \frac{2}{1-m} - \gamma_1 \right). \quad (4.1)$$

Here $\gamma_1 = \gamma_1(m, \beta) > 0$ is given by (1.20). Note that by (2.51) and (4.1),

$$0 < p_0 < \frac{(1-m)(n-2)}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad n - \frac{2p_0}{1-m} = \frac{2}{1-m} + \gamma_1. \quad (4.2)$$

Hence the weight function \mathcal{C}^{p_0} is integrable near the origin. Now we will prove the weighted L^1 -contraction principle for rescaled solutions trapped in between two self-similar profiles when the monotone increasing condition (C1) holds. The following lemma can be regarded as an extension of Lemma 5.3 of [DKS] which holds for the case $m = \frac{n-2}{n+2}$ and $n \geq 3$.

Proposition 4.1 (weighted L^1 -contraction principle). *Suppose (C1) holds. Let $\tilde{u}_0, \tilde{v}_0 \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfy*

$$f_{\lambda_1} \leq \tilde{u}_0, \tilde{v}_0 \leq f_{\lambda_2} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n$$

for some constants $\lambda_2 \geq \lambda_1 > 0$, and

$$\tilde{u}_0 - \tilde{v}_0 \in L^1(\mathcal{C}^{p_0}; \mathbb{R}^n).$$

Let \tilde{u} and \tilde{v} be the positive solutions to the rescaled equation (1.14) in $\mathbb{R}^n \times (0, \infty)$ with initial values \tilde{u}_0, \tilde{v}_0 , respectively, such that

$$f_{\lambda_1} \leq \tilde{u}, \tilde{v} \leq f_{\lambda_2} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times (0, \infty). \quad (4.3)$$

Then the following holds.

(i) For any $\tau > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| (\tilde{u} - \tilde{v})(\cdot, \tau) \right\|_{L^1(\mathcal{C}^{p_0}; \mathbb{R}^n)} + a_* \int_0^\tau \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |(\tilde{u} - \tilde{v})(y, s)| \left| \left[\frac{\mathcal{C}(y)}{f_{\lambda_2}(y)} \right]^{1-m} - 1 \right| \mathcal{C}^{p_0}(y) dy ds \\ & \leq \left\| \tilde{u}_0 - \tilde{v}_0 \right\|_{L^1(\mathcal{C}^{p_0}; \mathbb{R}^n)} \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

where

$$a_* := \frac{2m p_0}{C_*(1-m)} \left(\gamma_1 + \frac{2m}{1-m} \right) > 0.$$

(ii) In addition, if $\tilde{u}_0 - \tilde{v}_0 \not\equiv 0$, then

$$\left\| (\tilde{u} - \tilde{v})(\cdot, \tau) \right\|_{L^1(\mathcal{C}^{p_0}; \mathbb{R}^n)} < \left\| \tilde{u}_0 - \tilde{v}_0 \right\|_{L^1(\mathcal{C}^{p_0}; \mathbb{R}^n)} \quad \forall \tau > 0. \quad (4.5)$$

Proof. We will use a modification of the proof of Lemma 5.3 of [DKS] to prove this proposition.

Proof of (i): Let $q := |\tilde{u} - \tilde{v}|$. By the Kato inequality ([K] and p.89 of [DK]) and (1.14),

$$q_\tau \leq \Delta(\tilde{a}q) + \beta \operatorname{div}(yq) + (\alpha - n\beta)q \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R}^n \times (0, \infty)), \quad (4.6)$$

where

$$\tilde{a}(y, \tau) := \int_0^1 \frac{m ds}{(s\tilde{u}(y, \tau) + (1-s)\tilde{v}(y, \tau))^{1-m}} \quad \forall (y, \tau) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times (0, \infty).$$

By (1.15), (2.43) and (4.3), it holds that

$$\frac{m}{C_*} |y|^2 < m f_{\lambda_2}^{m-1}(y) \leq \tilde{a}(y, \tau) \leq m f_{\lambda_1}^{m-1}(y) \leq C (1 + |y|^2) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times (0, \infty) \quad (4.7)$$

for some constant $C > 0$. Let $\eta \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be a smooth cut-off function such that $0 \leq \eta \leq 1$, $\eta = 1$ for $|y| \leq 1$, and $\eta = 0$ for $|y| \geq 2$. For any $R > 2$ and $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, let $\eta_R(y) := \eta(y/R)$, $\eta_\varepsilon(y) := \eta(y/\varepsilon)$, and $\eta_{\varepsilon,R}(y) = \eta_R(y) - \eta_\varepsilon(y)$. Then there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that $|\nabla \eta_{\varepsilon,R}|^2 + |\Delta \eta_{\varepsilon,R}| \leq C\varepsilon^{-2}$ for any $\varepsilon \leq |y| \leq 2\varepsilon$, and $|\nabla \eta_{\varepsilon,R}|^2 + |\Delta \eta_{\varepsilon,R}| \leq CR^{-2}$ for any $R \leq |y| \leq 2R$. Choosing $\eta_{\varepsilon,R}(y)\mathcal{C}^{p_0}(y)$ as a test function in (4.6) yields that for any $\tau > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} q(y, \tau) \eta_{\varepsilon,R}(y) \mathcal{C}^{p_0}(y) dy - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} q(y, 0) \eta_{\varepsilon,R}(y) \mathcal{C}^{p_0}(y) dy \\ & \leq \int_0^\tau \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ \tilde{a} \Delta \mathcal{C}^{p_0}(y) - \beta y \cdot \nabla \mathcal{C}^{p_0}(y) + (\alpha - n\beta) \mathcal{C}^{p_0}(y) \right\} q \eta_{\varepsilon,R} dy ds \\ & \quad + \int_0^\tau \int_{B_{2R} \setminus B_R} \left\{ \tilde{a} \Delta \eta_{\varepsilon,R} \mathcal{C}^{p_0}(y) + 2\tilde{a} \nabla \eta_{\varepsilon,R} \cdot \nabla \mathcal{C}^{p_0}(y) - \beta y \cdot \nabla \eta_{\varepsilon,R} \mathcal{C}^{p_0}(y) \right\} q dy ds \\ & \quad + \int_0^\tau \int_{B_{2\varepsilon} \setminus B_\varepsilon} \left\{ \tilde{a} \Delta \eta_{\varepsilon,R} \mathcal{C}^{p_0}(y) + 2\tilde{a} \nabla \eta_{\varepsilon,R} \cdot \nabla \mathcal{C}^{p_0}(y) - \beta y \cdot \nabla \eta_{\varepsilon,R} \mathcal{C}^{p_0}(y) \right\} q dy ds. \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

Since $\gamma_1 = \gamma_1(m, \beta)$ is a root of the characteristic equation (1.16), by (4.1), (4.2) and a direct computation, we have

$$\frac{m}{C_*} |y|^2 \cdot \Delta \mathcal{C}^{p_0}(y) = -\frac{2mp_0}{C_*(1-m)} \left(n - 2 - \frac{2p_0}{1-m} \right) \mathcal{C}^{p_0}(y) = -a_* \mathcal{C}^{p_0}(y) < 0 \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}, \quad (4.9)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{m}{C_*} |y|^2 \cdot \Delta \mathcal{C}^{p_0}(y) - \beta y \cdot \nabla \mathcal{C}^{p_0}(y) + (\alpha - n\beta) \mathcal{C}^{p_0}(y) \\ & = \left\{ \frac{m}{C_*} \left(\gamma_1 - n + \frac{2}{1-m} \right) \left(\gamma_1 + \frac{2m}{1-m} \right) + \beta \left(n - \frac{2}{1-m} - \gamma_1 \right) + \alpha - n\beta \right\} \mathcal{C}^{p_0}(y) \\ & = \frac{m}{C_*} \left\{ \gamma_1^2 - \frac{A_0(m, \beta)}{1-m} \gamma_1 + \frac{2(n-2-nm)}{1-m} \right\} \mathcal{C}^{p_0}(y) = 0 \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

On the other hand by (4.3) and Theorem 1.1, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$q(y, \tau) \leq |f_{\lambda_1} - f_{\lambda_2}|(y) \leq C \min \left(1, |y|^{-\frac{2}{1-m} - \gamma_1} \right) \quad \forall (y, \tau) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times (0, \infty). \quad (4.11)$$

By (4.7), (4.8), (4.10), (4.11), and the properties of $\eta_{\varepsilon,R}$, it follows that for any $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, $R > 2$, and $\tau > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} q(y, \tau) \eta_{\varepsilon,R}(y) \mathcal{C}^{p_0}(y) dy + \int_0^\tau \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left(\frac{m}{C_*} |y|^2 - \tilde{a}(y, s) \right) \Delta \mathcal{C}^{p_0}(y) q(y, s) \eta_{\varepsilon,R}(y) dy ds \\ & \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} q(y, 0) \mathcal{C}^{p_0}(y) dy + C \int_0^\tau \int_{B_{2R} \setminus B_R} q(y, s) \mathcal{C}^{p_0}(y) dy ds + C \int_0^\tau \int_{B_{2\varepsilon} \setminus B_\varepsilon} (1 + \varepsilon^{-2}) \varepsilon^{-\frac{2p_0}{1-m}} dy ds \\ & \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} q(y, 0) \mathcal{C}^{p_0}(y) dy + C \int_0^\tau \int_{B_{2R} \setminus B_R} q(y, s) \mathcal{C}^{p_0}(y) dy ds + C \varepsilon^{n-2-\frac{2p_0}{1-m}} \tau \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

for some generic constant $C > 0$ which may vary from line to line. By (2.43), (4.7) and (4.9),

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{m}{C_*} |y|^2 - \tilde{a}(y, \tau) \right) \Delta \mathcal{E}^{p_0}(y) &= a_* \mathcal{E}^{p_0}(y) \left(\frac{1}{m} \tilde{a}(y, \tau) \mathcal{E}(y)^{1-m} - 1 \right) \\ &\geq a_* \mathcal{E}^{p_0}(y) \left(\left[\frac{\mathcal{E}(y)}{f_{\lambda_2}(y)} \right]^{1-m} - 1 \right) > 0 \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{R}^n, \tau > 0. \end{aligned} \quad (4.13)$$

Since (4.2) implies

$$n - 2 - \frac{2p_0}{1-m} = \gamma_1 + \frac{2m}{1-m} > 0,$$

letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ in (4.12), we deduce by (4.13) that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} q(y, \tau) \eta_R(y) \mathcal{E}^{p_0}(y) dy + a_* \int_0^\tau \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} q(y, s) \eta_R(y) \mathcal{E}^{p_0}(y) \left| \left[\frac{\mathcal{E}(y)}{f_{\lambda_2}(y)} \right]^{1-m} - 1 \right| dy ds \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} q(y, 0) \mathcal{E}^{p_0}(y) dy + C \int_0^\tau \int_{B_{2R} \setminus B_R} q(y, s) \mathcal{E}^{p_0}(y) dy ds \quad \forall R > 2, \tau > 0. \end{aligned} \quad (4.14)$$

This together with (4.2) and (4.11) yields that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} q(y, \tau) \eta_R(y) \mathcal{E}^{p_0}(y) dy + a_* \int_0^\tau \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} q(y, s) \eta_R(y) \mathcal{E}^{p_0}(y) \left| \left[\frac{\mathcal{E}(y)}{f_{\lambda_2}(y)} \right]^{1-m} - 1 \right| dy ds \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} q(y, 0) \mathcal{E}^{p_0}(y) dy + CR^{n - \frac{2}{1-m} - \gamma_1 - \frac{2p_0}{1-m}} \tau \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} q(y, 0) \mathcal{E}^{p_0}(y) dy + C\tau \end{aligned} \quad (4.15)$$

for some constant $C > 0$. Letting $R \rightarrow \infty$ in (4.15), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} q(y, \tau) \mathcal{E}^{p_0}(y) dy + a_* \int_0^\tau \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} q(y, s) \mathcal{E}^{p_0}(y) \left| \left[\frac{\mathcal{E}(y)}{f_{\lambda_2}(y)} \right]^{1-m} - 1 \right| dy ds \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} q(y, 0) \mathcal{E}^{p_0}(y) dy + C\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\int_0^\tau \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} q(y, s) \mathcal{E}^{p_0}(y) dy ds \leq \tau \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} q(y, 0) \mathcal{E}^{p_0}(y) dy + C\tau^2 \quad \forall \tau > 0. \quad (4.16)$$

Letting $R \rightarrow \infty$ in (4.14) with the use of (4.16), we get (4.4).

Proof of (ii): Now we also assume that $q(\cdot, 0) = |\tilde{u}_0 - \tilde{v}_0| \neq 0$. Then

$$\int_0^\tau \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} q(y, s) \mathcal{E}^{p_0}(y) \left| \left[\frac{\mathcal{E}(y)}{f_{\lambda_2}(y)} \right]^{1-m} - 1 \right| dy ds > 0 \quad \forall \tau > 0.$$

This together with (4.4) implies (4.5), and the proposition follows. \square

By using (4.2) and Theorem 1.1, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 4.2. *Suppose (C1) holds. Let $\lambda_2 > \lambda_1 > 0$ and p_0 be given by (4.1). Then $f_{\lambda_1} - f_{\lambda_2} \notin L^1(\mathcal{E}^{p_0}; \mathbb{R}^n)$.*

Based on the strong L^1 -contraction principle in Proposition 4.1, we prove the convergence of the rescaled solution $\tilde{u}(\cdot, \tau)$ to a self-similar profile as $\tau \rightarrow \infty$ in Theorem 1.5 in the monotone case.

Proof of Theorem 1.5. Let $\{\tau_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ be a sequence such that $\tau_i \rightarrow \infty$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$ and let

$$\tilde{u}_i(y, \tau) := \tilde{u}(y, \tau_i + \tau) \quad \forall (y, \tau) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [-\tau_i, \infty). \quad (4.17)$$

By (1.31) and Theorem 1.4, we have

$$\begin{aligned} U_{\lambda_1} &\leq u \leq U_{\lambda_2} && \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times (0, T) \\ \Rightarrow f_{\lambda_1} &\leq \tilde{u}_i \leq f_{\lambda_2} && \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times (-\tau_i, \infty), \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{Z}^+. \end{aligned} \quad (4.18)$$

For any $N > 0$, we choose $i_N \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $\tau_i > N$ for any $i \geq i_N$. Then by (4.18), the equation (1.14) for $\{\tilde{u}_i\}_{i=i_N}^\infty$ is uniformly parabolic in $B_R \times (-N, \infty)$ for any $R > 1$. Thus utilizing the parabolic Schauder estimates [LSU], the sequence $\{\tilde{u}_i\}_{i=i_N}^\infty$ is equi-Hölder continuous in $C^{2,1}(K)$ for any compact subset $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times (-N, \infty)$. By the Ascoli Theorem and a diagonalization argument, there exist a subsequence of the sequence $\{\tilde{u}_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$, which we still denote by $\{\tilde{u}_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$, and a function $\tilde{v} \in C^{2,1}(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R})$ such that \tilde{u}_i converges to \tilde{v} in $C^{2,1}(K)$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$ for any compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$. Then the limit \tilde{v} is an eternal solution to (1.14) in $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$ and satisfies

$$f_{\lambda_1} \leq \tilde{v} \leq f_{\lambda_2} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$$

in view of (4.18). Let p_0 be given by (4.1). By (1.25), (1.31) and the fact that \mathcal{E}^{p_0} is integrable near the origin, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} u_0 - U_{\lambda_0}(\cdot, 0) &\in L^1(\mathcal{E}^{p_0}; \mathbb{R}^n) \\ \Rightarrow \tilde{u}_0 - f_{\lambda_0} &\in L^1(\mathcal{E}^{p_0}; \mathbb{R}^n). \end{aligned}$$

Hence by Proposition 4.1, we have

$$a_* \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |(\tilde{u} - f_{\lambda_0})(y, s)| \left| \left[\frac{\mathcal{E}(y)}{f_{\lambda_2}(y)} \right]^{1-m} - 1 \right| \mathcal{E}^{p_0}(y) dy ds \leq \|\tilde{u}_0 - f_{\lambda_0}\|_{L^1(\mathcal{E}^{p_0}; \mathbb{R}^n)} < \infty. \quad (4.19)$$

Since for any $N > 0$ and $i \geq i_N$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{-N}^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |(\tilde{u}_i - f_{\lambda_0})(y, s)| \left| \left[\frac{\mathcal{E}(y)}{f_{\lambda_2}(y)} \right]^{1-m} - 1 \right| \mathcal{E}^{p_0}(y) dy ds \\ &= \int_{\tau_i - N}^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |(\tilde{u} - f_{\lambda_0})(y, s)| \left| \left[\frac{\mathcal{E}(y)}{f_{\lambda_2}(y)} \right]^{1-m} - 1 \right| \mathcal{E}^{p_0}(y) dy ds, \end{aligned} \quad (4.20)$$

letting $i \rightarrow \infty$ in (4.20), we deduce from (4.19) and the Fatou lemma that

$$\int_{-N}^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |(\tilde{v} - f_{\lambda_0})(y, s)| \left| \left[\frac{\mathcal{E}(y)}{f_{\lambda_2}(y)} \right]^{1-m} - 1 \right| \mathcal{E}^{p_0}(y) dy ds = 0 \quad \forall N > 0.$$

This yields that

$$\tilde{v} \equiv f_{\lambda_0} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}.$$

Hence we conclude that $\tilde{u}(\cdot, \tau_i) = \tilde{u}_i(\cdot, 0)$ converges to f_{λ_0} uniformly in $C^2(K)$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$ for any compact subset $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. Since the sequence $\{\tau_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ is arbitrary, $\tilde{u}(\cdot, \tau)$ converges to f_{λ_0} uniformly in $C^2(K)$ as $\tau \rightarrow \infty$ for any compact subset $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$.

Lastly we assume that (i) of (C1) holds. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\tilde{u}(y, \tau) - f_{\lambda_0}(y)| dy &= (T-t)^{n\beta-\alpha} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |u(x, t) - U_{\lambda_0}(x, t)| dx \\ &= T^{n\beta-\alpha} e^{-(n\beta-\alpha)\tau} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |u(x, t) - U_{\lambda_0}(x, t)| dx \end{aligned} \quad (4.21)$$

where $\tau = -\log\{(T-t)/T\} > 0$. Then by (1.28) and (4.21), we get (1.32) and the theorem follows. \square

4.2. Non-monotone case (C2). In this subsection, we will prove Theorem 1.7 regarding the asymptotic behavior near the extinction time in the non-monotone case of (C2). In this case we employ a different approach from the monotone case of (C1) in order to provide a convergence result of the rescaled solution $\tilde{u}(\cdot, \tau)$ to zero as $\tau \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof of Theorem 1.7. Let $\{\tau_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence such that $\tau_i \rightarrow \infty$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$ and let \tilde{u}_i be given by (4.17). By (1.33) and Theorem 1.4, u satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq u \leq \min(U_{\lambda_1}, U_{\lambda_2}) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times (0, T) \\ \Rightarrow 0 &\leq \tilde{u} \leq \min(f_{\lambda_1}, f_{\lambda_2}) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times (0, \infty) \end{aligned} \quad (4.22)$$

$$\Rightarrow 0 \leq \tilde{u}_i \leq \min(f_{\lambda_1}, f_{\lambda_2}) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times (-\tau_i, \infty), \quad i \in \mathbb{Z}^+. \quad (4.23)$$

For any $N > 0$, we choose $i_N \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $\tau_i > N$ for any $i \geq i_N$. Then by (4.23) and Theorem 1.1 of [Sa], the sequence $\{\tilde{u}_i\}_{i=i_N}^{\infty}$ is equi-Hölder continuous on any compact subset K of $\mathbb{R}^n \times (-N, \infty)$. Hence by the Ascoli Theorem and a diagonalization argument, there exist a subsequence of the sequence $\{\tilde{u}_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$, still denoted by $\{\tilde{u}_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$, and a function $\tilde{u}_{\infty} \in C(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R})$ such that \tilde{u}_i converges to \tilde{u}_{∞} uniformly in K as $i \rightarrow \infty$ for any compact subset $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$. Then the limit function \tilde{u}_{∞} solves (1.14) in $\mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R})$. Letting $i \rightarrow \infty$ in (4.23),

$$0 \leq \tilde{u}_{\infty} \leq \min(f_{\lambda_1}, f_{\lambda_2}) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}. \quad (4.24)$$

Now we will show that $\tilde{u}_{\infty} \equiv 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$. In order to prove this, we let

$$\lambda(\tau) := \inf \{ \lambda > 0 : \tilde{u}(y, \tau) \leq f_{\lambda}(y) \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{R}^n \} \quad \forall \tau > 0. \quad (4.25)$$

By (4.22) and (4.25), $\lambda(\tau)$ is well-defined,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{u}(y, \tau) &\leq f_{\lambda(\tau)}(y) \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{R}^n, \tau > 0 \\ \Rightarrow 0 &< \tilde{u}(0, \tau) \leq f_{\lambda(\tau)}(0) = \lambda(\tau)^{\frac{2}{1-m}} \quad \forall \tau > 0, \end{aligned} \quad (4.26)$$

and

$$0 < \lambda(\tau) \leq \lambda_1 \quad \forall \tau > 0. \quad (4.27)$$

By (4.22) and Lemma 2.11, there exists a constant $R_* > 0$ such that

$$0 < \tilde{u}(y, \tau) \leq f_{\lambda_2}(y) < f_{\lambda}(y) \quad \forall 0 < \lambda \leq \lambda_1, |y| \geq R_*/\lambda, \tau > 0. \quad (4.28)$$

Claim 4.3. For each $\tau > 0$, $f_{\lambda(\tau)}$ touches $\tilde{u}(\cdot, \tau)$ from above in $B_{2R_*/\lambda(\tau)}$.

Proof of Claim 4.3: Suppose there exists $\tau_1 > 0$ such that the claim does not hold. Then by (4.26),

$$\tilde{u}(y, \tau_1) < f_{\lambda(\tau_1)}(y) \quad \text{in } B_{2R_*/\lambda(\tau_1)}. \quad (4.29)$$

By (4.29) and the continuity of $\tilde{u}(\cdot, \tau_1)$ and f_λ , there exists a constant $0 < \delta < \lambda(\tau_1)$ such that

$$\tilde{u}(\cdot, \tau_1) < f_\lambda \quad \text{in } \overline{B_{R_*/\lambda}} \quad \forall \lambda(\tau_1) - \delta < \lambda < \lambda(\tau_1).$$

This together with (4.27) and (4.28) yields that

$$\tilde{u}(\cdot, \tau_1) < f_\lambda \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \quad \forall \lambda(\tau_1) - \delta < \lambda < \lambda(\tau_1).$$

This contradicts the definition of $\lambda(\tau_1)$ in (4.25). Thus no such τ_1 exists and Claim 4.3 follows.

Claim 4.4. $\lambda(\tau)$ is a strictly decreasing function of $\tau > 0$.

Proof of Claim 4.4: We fix $\tau_1 > 0$ and let $t_1 := T(1 - e^{-\tau_1})$. By (4.26) with $\tau = \tau_1$, we have

$$u(x, t_1) \leq U_{\lambda(\tau_1)}(x, t_1) \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (4.30)$$

Then arguing similarly as for (1.27) with the use of (4.30), we have

$$\begin{aligned} u(x, t) &\leq U_{\lambda(\tau_1)}(x, t) \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad t_1 < t < T \\ \Rightarrow \tilde{u}(y, \tau) &\leq f_{\lambda(\tau_1)}(y) \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad \tau > \tau_1 \\ \Rightarrow \lambda(\tau) &\leq \lambda(\tau_1) \quad \forall \tau > \tau_1. \end{aligned} \quad (4.31)$$

Hence $\lambda(\tau)$ is a decreasing function of $\tau > 0$.

By (4.27) and (4.28) with $\tau = \tau_1$,

$$u(x, t_1) < U_{\lambda(\tau_1)}(x, t_1) \quad \forall |x| \geq R_* / [(Te^{-\tau_1})^\beta \lambda(\tau_1)]. \quad (4.32)$$

Then by the continuity of u and $U_{\lambda(\tau_1)}$ and (4.32), there exist constants $R_1 > R_* / [(Te^{-\tau_1})^\beta \lambda(\tau_1)]$ and $t_2 \in (t_1, T)$ such that

$$u(x, t) < U_{\lambda(\tau_1)}(x, t) \quad \forall |x| = R_1, \quad t_1 \leq t \leq t_2. \quad (4.33)$$

Since by (1.15),

$$U_{\lambda(\tau_1)}(x, t) \geq c_0 \min \left(1, |x|^{-\frac{2}{1-m}} \right) \quad \forall (x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [t_1, t_2]$$

for some constant $c_0 > 0$, using (4.31), (4.32), (4.33), and the strong comparison principle for an exterior domain in Lemma A.1 implies that

$$u(x, t) < U_{\lambda(\tau_1)}(x, t) \quad \forall |x| \geq R_1, \quad t_1 < t < t_2. \quad (4.34)$$

On the other hand, by (4.30), (4.33) and the strong comparison principle for a bounded domain in Lemma A.2, it follows that

$$u(x, t) < U_{\lambda(\tau_1)}(x, t) \quad \forall |x| < R_1, \quad t_1 < t < t_2. \quad (4.35)$$

Let $\tau_2 = -\log\{(T - t_2)/T\}$. Then by (4.34) and (4.35),

$$\tilde{u}(y, \tau) < f_{\lambda(\tau_1)}(y) \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad \tau_1 < \tau < \tau_2. \quad (4.36)$$

Since $\lambda(\tau) \leq \lambda(\tau_1)$ for any $\tau > \tau_1$, employing (4.36) and Claim 4.3 yields that $\lambda(\tau) < \lambda(\tau_1)$ for any $\tau \in (\tau_1, \tau_2)$. Hence $\lambda(\tau)$ is a strictly decreasing function of $\tau > 0$ finishing the proof of Claim 4.4.

By (4.27) and Claim 4.4, the limit

$$\lambda_\infty := \lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \lambda(\tau) \in [0, \lambda_1)$$

exists. Then by (4.26), we have

$$\tilde{u}_\infty(y, \tau) = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{u}(y, \tau_i + \tau) \leq \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} f_{\lambda(\tau_i + \tau)}(y) = f_{\lambda_\infty}(y) \quad \forall (y, \tau) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}. \quad (4.37)$$

Moreover, it follows from (4.24) and (4.37) that

$$0 \leq \tilde{u}_\infty \leq \min(f_{\lambda_\infty}, f_{\lambda_1}) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}. \quad (4.38)$$

Claim 4.5. $\tilde{u}_\infty \equiv 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$.

Note that once we have proved Claim 4.5, $\tilde{u}(\cdot, \tau_i)$ converges to zero uniformly on any compact subset of \mathbb{R}^n as $i \rightarrow \infty$. Since the sequence $\{\tau_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ is arbitrary, we can then conclude that $\tilde{u}(\cdot, \tau)$ converges to zero uniformly on any compact subset of \mathbb{R}^n as $\tau \rightarrow \infty$, completing the proof of Theorem 1.7. So it remains to prove Claim 4.5.

Proof of Claim 4.5: Suppose to the contrary that Claim 4.5 does not hold. Then without loss of generality we may assume that $\tilde{u}_\infty(0, 0) > 0$. By the continuity of \tilde{u}_∞ , there exists a constant $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\tilde{u}_\infty(y, \tau) > 0 \quad \forall |y| < \delta, |\tau| < \delta. \quad (4.39)$$

We now define

$$w(x, t) := (T - t)^\alpha \tilde{u}_\infty((T - t)^\beta x, \tau) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times (-\infty, T) \quad (4.40)$$

with $\tau = -\log\{(T - t)/T\}$. Since $\tilde{u}_\infty \in C(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R})$ solves (1.14) in $\mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R})$, the nonnegative function $w \in C(\mathbb{R}^n \times (-\infty, T))$ satisfies (1.3) in $\mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R}^n \times (-\infty, T))$. Thus by (4.39) and (4.40) we can apply [HuiK, Lemma 3.3] to w in order to conclude that

$$\tilde{u}_\infty > 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times (-\delta, \delta). \quad (4.41)$$

By (4.38), it follows that

$$0 < \tilde{u}_\infty(0, 0) \leq f_{\lambda_\infty}(0) = \lambda_\infty^{\frac{2}{1-m}} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \lambda_\infty > 0.$$

Let K be any compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^n \times (-\delta, \delta)$ and $\nu_K = \min_K \tilde{u}_\infty$. Then by (4.41), $\nu_K > 0$. Since \tilde{u}_i converges to \tilde{u}_∞ uniformly on K as $i \rightarrow \infty$, there exists $i_K \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that

$$\min_K \tilde{u}_i > \nu_K/2 > 0 \quad \forall i \geq i_K. \quad (4.42)$$

By (4.23) and (4.42), the equation (1.14) for the sequence $\{\tilde{u}_i\}_{i \geq i_K}$ is uniformly parabolic on K . Then by the parabolic Schauder estimates [LSU], the sequence $\{\tilde{u}_i\}_{i \geq i_K}$ is equi-Hölder continuous in $C^{2,1}(K_1)$ for any compact subset $K_1 \Subset K$. Since compact subsets $K_1 \Subset K$ of $\mathbb{R}^n \times (-\delta, \delta)$ are arbitrary, by the Ascoli Theorem and a diagonalization argument, there exists a subsequence of the sequence $\{\tilde{u}_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$, still denoted by $\{\tilde{u}_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ such that \tilde{u}_i converges to \tilde{u}_∞ uniformly in $C^{2,1}(K)$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$ for any compact set K of $\mathbb{R}^n \times (-\delta, \delta)$. Hence, $\tilde{u}_\infty \in C^{2,1}(\mathbb{R}^n \times (-\delta, \delta))$ is a classical positive solution to (1.14) in $\mathbb{R}^n \times (-\delta, \delta)$.

Now we define

$$\mu(\tau) := \inf \{ \mu > 0 : \tilde{u}_\infty(y, \tau) \leq f_\mu(y) \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{R}^n \} \quad \forall \tau \in (-\delta, \delta).$$

By (4.38), (4.41) and using the same argument as before, we deduce that

$$0 < \mu(\tau') < \mu(\tau) < \mu(0) \leq \lambda_\infty < \lambda_1 \quad \forall 0 < \tau < \tau' < \delta. \quad (4.43)$$

We fix $s_1 \in (0, \delta)$. Arguing similarly as for (4.36), there exists a constant $s_2 \in (s_1, \delta)$ such that

$$\tilde{u}_\infty(\cdot, s_2) < f_{\mu(s_1)} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (4.44)$$

Let $R_* > 0$ be the constant appearing in (4.28). Since $\tilde{u}_i(\cdot, s_2)$ converges to $\tilde{u}_\infty(\cdot, s_2)$ uniformly on $\overline{B_{R_*/\mu(s_1)}}$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$, by (4.44) there exists $i_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that

$$\tilde{u}(y, \tau_i + s_2) = \tilde{u}_i(y, s_2) < f_{\mu(s_1)}(y) \quad \forall y \in \overline{B_{R_*/\mu(s_1)}}, \quad i \geq i_0.$$

This together with (4.28) and (4.43) implies that

$$\tilde{u}(y, \tau_i + s_2) < f_{\mu(s_1)}(y) \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad i \geq i_0. \quad (4.45)$$

By Claim 4.4 and (4.45) we deduce that

$$\lambda_\infty < \lambda(\tau_i + s_2) \leq \mu(s_1) \quad \forall i \geq i_0,$$

which contradicts (4.43), and therefore Claim 4.5 follows. This finishes the proof of Theorem 1.7. \square

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The second author is supported by National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF) Grant No. NRF-2018R1C1B6003051.

APPENDIX A. STRONG COMPARISON PRINCIPLE

In this section, we will establish the comparison principle for the fast diffusion equation in exterior domains and in bounded domains. Firstly, the following lemma deals with the comparison principle on exterior domains in the range $0 < m < \frac{n-2}{n}$, $n \geq 3$. We refer to Lemma 3.4 of [HP] for the supercritical case when $\frac{(n-2)_+}{n} < m < 1$.

Lemma A.1 (Strong comparison principle in exterior domains). *Let $n \geq 3$, $0 < m < \frac{n-2}{n}$, $R_1 > 0$ and $T_1 > 0$. Let $u_1, u_2 \in C^{2,1}((\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_{R_1}}) \times (0, T_1]) \cap C((\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{R_1}) \times [0, T_1])$ be positive solutions to*

$$u_t = \Delta u^m \quad \text{in } (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_{R_1}}) \times (0, T_1]$$

such that

$$\begin{cases} u_1(x, 0) \leq u_2(x, 0) & \forall |x| \geq R_1; \\ u_1(x, t) < u_2(x, t) & \forall |x| = R_1, \quad 0 < t \leq T_1, \end{cases} \quad (A.1)$$

and

$$\min(u_1(x, t), u_2(x, t)) \geq c_0 |x|^{-\frac{2}{1-m}} \quad \forall |x| \geq R_1, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T_1 \quad (A.2)$$

for some constant $c_0 > 0$. In addition, we assume that

$$(u_1 - u_2)_+ \in L^1\left((0, T_1); L^1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_{R_1}})\right). \quad (A.3)$$

Then

$$u_1(x, t) < u_2(x, t) \quad \forall |x| > R_1, \quad 0 < t \leq T_1. \quad (A.4)$$

Proof. We will first show that

$$u_1(x, t) \leq u_2(x, t) \quad \forall |x| > R_1, \quad 0 < t \leq T_1. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

For any $R > R_1$, let η and η_R be as in the proof of Proposition 4.1. By (A.1) and the Kato inequality ([K, DK]), for any $R > R_1$ and $0 < t < T_1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{|x| \geq R_1} (u_1 - u_2)_+ \eta_R dx &\leq \int_{|x| \geq R_1} (u_1^m - u_2^m)_+ \Delta \eta_R dx \\ &\leq CR^{-2} \int_{R \leq |x| \leq 2R} (u_1^m - u_2^m)_+ dx \\ &\leq CR^{-2} \int_{R \leq |x| \leq 2R} a(x, t) (u_1 - u_2)_+ dx, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.6})$$

where

$$a(x, t) = \int_0^1 \frac{m ds}{(su_1(x, t) + (1-s)u_2(x, t))^{1-m}} \quad \forall (x, t) \in (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_{R_1}}) \times (0, T_1]. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Note that by (A.2),

$$0 < a(x, t) \leq C_0 |x|^2 \quad \forall (x, t) \in (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_{R_1}}) \times (0, T_1] \quad (\text{A.8})$$

for some constant $C_0 > 0$. Hence by (A.6) and (A.8), it follows that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{|x| \geq R_1} (u_1 - u_2)_+ \eta_R dx \leq C \int_{R \leq |x| \leq 2R} (u_1 - u_2)_+ dx \quad \forall R > R_1, \quad 0 < t < T_1.$$

This together (A.1) implies that

$$\int_{|x| \geq R_1} (u_1 - u_2)_+ \eta_R(x, t) dx \leq C \int_0^t \int_{R \leq |x| \leq 2R} (u_1 - u_2)_+(x, s) dx ds \quad \forall R > R_1, \quad 0 < t < T_1. \quad (\text{A.9})$$

Letting $R \rightarrow \infty$ in (A.9), by (A.3) and the dominated convergence theorem, we deduce

$$\int_{|x| \geq R_1} (u_1 - u_2)_+(x, t) dx = 0 \quad \forall 0 < t < T_1$$

and (A.5) follows.

We now let $w = u_2 - u_1$ and observe that the nonnegative function w satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} w_t &= \Delta(a w) && \text{in } (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_{R_1}}) \times (0, T_1] \\ \Rightarrow w_t - a \Delta w - 2 \nabla a \cdot \nabla w + |\Delta a| w &\geq 0 && \text{in } (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_{R_1}}) \times (0, T_1], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.10})$$

where $a = a(x, t)$ is given by (A.7). Since for any $R > R_1$, the function $a(x, t)$ are continuous on $(\overline{B_R} \setminus \overline{B_{R_1}}) \times [0, T_1]$, there exists a constant $C_R > 0$ such that

$$a(x, t) \geq C_R \quad \forall x \in \overline{B_R} \setminus \overline{B_{R_1}}, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T_1. \quad (\text{A.11})$$

Hence by (A.8) and (A.11), the equation (A.10) for w is uniformly parabolic in $(B_R \setminus \overline{B_{R_1}}) \times (0, T_1]$ for any $R > R_1$. Therefore by (A.1) and the strong maximum principle, we get that

$$w = u_2 - u_1 > 0 \quad \text{in } (B_R \setminus \overline{B_{R_1}}) \times (0, T_1].$$

Since $R > R_1$ is arbitrary, (A.4) follows. \square

The following lemma is concerned with the comparison principle in bounded domains, and can be proved by an argument similar to the proof of Lemma 2.3 of [DaK] and the proof of Lemma A.1. Hence we omit its proof.

Lemma A.2 (Strong comparison principle in bounded domains). *Let $n \geq 3$, $0 < m < \frac{n-2}{n}$, $R_1 > 0$ and $T_1 > 0$. Let $u_1, u_2 \in C^{2,1}(B_{R_1} \times (0, T_1]) \cap C(\overline{B_{R_1}} \times [0, T_1])$ be solutions to*

$$u_t = \Delta u^m \quad \text{in } B_{R_1} \times (0, T_1]$$

such that u_1, u_2 are positive in $\overline{B_{R_1}} \times [0, T_1]$, and

$$\begin{cases} u_1(x, 0) \leq u_2(x, 0) & \forall |x| \leq R_1; \\ u_1(x, t) < u_2(x, t) & \forall |x| = R_1, 0 < t \leq T_1. \end{cases}$$

Then we have

$$u_1(x, t) < u_2(x, t) \quad \forall |x| < R_1, 0 < t \leq T_1.$$

REFERENCES

- [A] D.G. Aronson, *The porous medium equation, Nonlinear diffusion problems*, (Montecatini Terme, 1985), 1–46, Lecture Notes in Math., 1224, Springer, Berlin, 1986.
- [BBDGV] A. Blanchet, M. Bonforte, J. Dolbeault, G. Grillo and J.L. Vazquez, *Asymptotics of the fast diffusion equation via entropy estimates*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 191 (2009), 347–385.
- [BDGV] M. Bonforte, J. Dolbeault, G. Grillo and J.L. Vazquez, *Sharp rates of decay of solutions to the nonlinear fast diffusion equation via functional inequalities*, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 107 (38) (2010), 16459–16464.
- [DaK] B.E.J. Dahlberg and C.E. Kenig, *Nonnegative solutions to the generalized porous medium equation*, Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana 2 (1986), no. 3, 267–305.
- [DK] P. Daskalopoulos and C.E. Kenig, *Degenerate diffusion-initial value problems and local regularity theory*, Tracts in Mathematics 1, European Mathematical Society, 2007.
- [DKS] P. Daskalopoulos, J. King and N. Sesum, *Extinction profile of complete non-compact solutions to the Yamabe flow*, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1306.0859>.
- [DS] P. Daskalopoulos and N. Sesum, *On the extinction profile of solutions to fast diffusion*, J. Reine Angew. Math. 622 (2008), 95–119.
- [dPS] M. del Pino and M. Sáez, *On the extinction profile for solutions of $u_t = \Delta u^{(N-2)/(N+2)}$* , Indiana Univ. Math. J. 50 (2001), no. 1, 611–628.
- [FKW] M. Fila, J.R. King and M. Winkler, *Rate of convergence to Barenblatt profiles for the fast diffusion equation with a critical exponent*, J. London Math. Soc. 90 (2014), 167–183.
- [FVW] M. Fila, J.L. Vazquez and M. Winkler, *A continuum of extinction rates for the fast diffusion equation*, Comm. Pure Appl. Anal. 10 (2011), 1129–1147.
- [FVWY] M. Fila, J.L. Vazquez, M. Winkler and E. Yanagida, *Rate of convergence to Barenblatt profiles for the fast diffusion equation*, Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal. 204 (2012), 599–625.
- [FW] M. Fila and M. Winkler, *Sharp rate of convergence to Barenblatt profiles for a critical fast diffusion equation*. Commun. Pure Appl. Anal. 14 (2015), no. 1, 107–119.
- [GP] V.A. Galaktionov and L.A. Peletier, *Asymptotic behavior near finite-time extinction for the fast diffusion equation*, Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal. 139 (1997), 83–98.
- [HP] M.A. Herrero and M. Pierre, *The Cauchy problem for $u_t = \Delta u^m$ when $0 < m < 1$* , Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 291 (1985), no. 1, 145–158.
- [Hsu1] S.Y. Hsu, *Singular limit and exact decay rate of a nonlinear elliptic equation*, Nonlinear Anal. TMA 75 (2012), 3443–3455.
- [Hsu2] S.Y. Hsu, *Existence and asymptotic behavior of solutions of the very fast diffusion equation*, Manuscripta Math. 140 (2013), nos. 3–4, 441–460.
- [Hsu3] S.Y. Hsu, *Exact decay rate of a nonlinear elliptic equation related to the Yamabe flow*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 142 (2014), 4239–4249.
- [Hui] K.M. Hui, *Asymptotic behavior of solutions of the fast diffusion equation near its extinction time*, J. Math. Anal. and Appl. 454 (2017), no. 2, 695–715.

- [HuiK] K.M. Hui and S. Kim, *Existence of Neumann and singular solutions of the fast diffusion equation*, Discrete and Contin. Dynamical Systems-Series A 35 (2015), no. 10, 4859–4887.
- [K] T. Kato, *Schrödinger operators with singular potentials*, Israel J. Math. 13 (1973), 135–148.
- [LSU] O.A. Ladyzenskaya, V.A. Solonnikov and N.N. Ural'tceva, *Linear and quasilinear equations of parabolic type*, Transl. Math. Mono. vol. 23, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R.I., U.S.A., 1968.
- [OR] S.J. Osher and J.V. Ralston, *L^1 stability of traveling waves with applications to convective porous media flow*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 35 (1982), 7371–7749.
- [Sa] P.E. Sacks, *Continuity of solutions of a singular parabolic equation*, Nonlinear Analysis, Theory, Methods and Applications 7 (1983), no. 4, 387–409.
- [SY] R. Schoen and S.T. Yau, *Lectures on differential geometry*, Cambridge, MA, USA, International Press, 1994.
- [Y] R. Ye, *Global existence and convergence of Yamabe flow*, J. Differential Geom. 39 (1994), no. 1, 35–50.

KIN MING HUI: INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, ACADEMIA SINICA, TAIPEI, TAIWAN, R.O.C.
E-mail address: kmhui@gate.sinica.edu.tw

SOOJUNG KIM: SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, KOREA INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY, SEOUL 02455, REPUBLIC OF KOREA
E-mail address: soojung26@gmail.com; soojung26@kias.re.kr