

# A SUFFICIENT CONDITION FOR BLOWUP OF THE NONLINEAR KLEIN-GORDON EQUATION WITH POSITIVE INITIAL ENERGY IN FLRW SPACETIMES

Jonathon McCollum <sup>1,\*</sup>, Gregory Mwamba <sup>2,#</sup>, and Jesús Oliver <sup>3,†</sup>

*\*Oregon State University,  
Department of Mathematics,  
Kidder Hall 368,  
Corvallis, Oregon, USA, 97331-4605*

*#University of California, Merced,  
Department of Applied Mathematics,  
5200 North Lake Road,  
Merced, California, USA, 95343*

*†California State University East Bay,  
Department of Mathematics,  
25800 Carlos Bee Boulevard,  
Hayward, California, USA, 94542*

ABSTRACT. In this paper we demonstrate a sufficient condition for blowup of the nonlinear Klein-Gordon equation with arbitrarily positive initial energy in Friedmann-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker spacetimes. This is accomplished using an established concavity method that has been employed for similar PDEs in Minkowski space. This proof relies on the energy inequality associated with this equation,  $E(t_0) \geq E(t)$ , also proved herein using a geometric method.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The nonlinear Klein-Gordon equations are a class of important evolution equations that describe the movement of spinless relativistic particles, which can lend understanding in many physical applications (see [8] and references therein). In this paper we consider the question of finite time blow up for a nonlinear class of Klein-Gordon equations propagating on a fixed cosmological spacetime. We have adapted the methods of Yang & Xu in [8] and Wang in [7], both of which prove blowup results for solutions to the Klein-Gordon equation in a non-expanding spacetime. The result from [7] was the first to show a condition for blowup using this general method, and this work was expanded upon in [8] to broaden the conditions that reliably lead to blowup. Both of these were done under the assumption of a Minkowski background metric – for which energy conservation for Klein-Gordon is readily available. On the other hand, our work focuses on adapting this method of proof to backgrounds that include expanding spacetimes – for which only an energy inequality is available. Due to the accelerating nature of the expansion of the observable universe, such cosmological spacetimes are of general interest. The results in this paper also supplement those in [2]. In that work, the authors establish small data global existence for a class of semilinear Klein-Gordon

---

<sup>1</sup>email address: mcolluj@oregonstate.edu

<sup>2</sup>email address: gmwamba@ucmerced.edu

<sup>3</sup>email address: jesus.oliver@csueastbay.edu

equations propagating in a family of expanding cosmological backgrounds which include the de Sitter spacetime. On the other hand, in this paper we are considering **large** initial data satisfying a specific set of conditions that ensure  $L^2$  blow up in finite time.

The general concavity method employed to prove the blowup result in this paper, along with in [7] and [8], is based on the work of Levine in [3] and [4], which has been a common wellspring for such results. This method relies on identifying time invariant spaces, then proving that solutions in this invariant space must blowup based on consistent negative concavity and slope of a functional based on this solution. As mentioned, we employ this method to classes of solutions of the Klein-Gordon equation, though in more generality than [8] and [7] by considering all metrics that have a certain restriction on the expanding factor. The fact that there must be restrictions on the expanding factor should satisfy intuition that aggressively expanding spacetimes would create problems with local existence for fluids and would smooth out initial data too quickly to allow for blowup. Furthermore, this method requires some assumptions on the initial data relative to the initial energy which is necessary for the concavity argument and can be broken down into cases (listed in Table 1 below). This table is adapted from Yang & Xu in [8] to illustrate our results as well as the remaining unsolved problems in the context of cosmological spacetimes. Note that our assumption (2.13) follows directly from Cases II & III.

Table 1: Obtained results and unsolved problems.

Initial data leading to high energy blowup of problem (2.4)				
Case I	$I(u_0) < 0$	$\ u_0\ ^2 \geq \frac{3(\epsilon+2)}{\tilde{m}^2\epsilon} E(t_0)$	$\frac{3(\epsilon+2)}{\tilde{m}^2\epsilon} E(t_0) > (u_0, u_1) > 0$	Still open
Case II	$I(u_0) < 0$	$\ u_0\ ^2 \geq \frac{3(\epsilon+2)}{\tilde{m}^2\epsilon} E(t_0)$	$(u_0, u_1) \geq \frac{3(\epsilon+2)}{\tilde{m}^2\epsilon} E(t_0) > 0$	Solved in this paper
Case III	$I(u_0) < 0$	$\frac{3(\epsilon+2)}{\tilde{m}^2\epsilon} E(t_0) > \ u_0\ ^2$	$(u_0, u_1) \geq \frac{3(\epsilon+2)}{\tilde{m}^2\epsilon} E(t_0) > 0$	Solved in this paper
Case IV	$I(u_0) < 0$	$\frac{3(\epsilon+2)}{\tilde{m}^2\epsilon} E(t_0) > \ u_0\ ^2$	$\frac{3(\epsilon+2)}{\tilde{m}^2\epsilon} E(t_0) > (u_0, u_1) > 0$	Still open

As our work follows directly from the method in [8], we do not have any specific conditions on the  $\|u_0\|^2$  term. Their process removed specific consideration of this term that had been present in [7], and so covered the Case II and Case III with this value having no specific relationship to the bounding constant. So while a lower bound on this quantity was required for [7], our method has no such requirement and therefore covers the two cases.

## 2. SETUP AND MAIN THEOREM

Let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $(\mathcal{M}, \mathbf{g})$  be a Friedmann-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker (FLRW) spacetime with topology  $\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^n$  and metric

$$(2.1) \quad \mathbf{g} := -dt^2 + a(t)^2(dx_1^2 + dx_2^2 + \dots + dx_n^2).$$

Let  $m \neq 0$  and  $\square_{\mathbf{g}}$  be the covariant wave operator associated to  $\mathbf{g}$  defined by

$$(2.2) \quad \square_{\mathbf{g}} u := \frac{1}{\sqrt{|\mathbf{g}|}} \partial_{\alpha} \left( \mathbf{g}^{\alpha\beta} \sqrt{|\mathbf{g}|} \partial_{\beta} u \right),$$

where  $|\mathbf{g}| = -\det(\mathbf{g}_{\alpha\beta})$ ,  $\mathbf{g}^{\alpha\beta}$  are the components of the inverse of  $\mathbf{g}_{\alpha\beta}$ , and greek indices run from 0 to  $n$ . For the FLRW metric (2.1), we have

$$(2.3) \quad \square_{\mathbf{g}} u = -u_{tt} - n \frac{\dot{a}}{a} u_t + \frac{1}{a^2} \Delta u,$$

with  $\Delta$  denoting the Laplacian operator on the  $n$ -dimensional flat metric

$$\Delta := \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i^2}.$$

Let  $0 < t_0 < T$ ,  $t \in [t_0, T)$ , and  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . In this work we study solutions to the Cauchy problem for the nonlinear Klein-Gordon equation

$$(2.4) \quad \begin{cases} -\square_{\mathbf{g}} u + m^2 u = f(u) \\ u(t_0, x) = u_0(x), \quad u_t(t_0, x) = u_1(x). \end{cases}$$

where  $u_0 \in H_0^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$  and  $u_1 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ . This Cauchy problem describes a local self-interaction for a massive scalar field. In quantum field theory the matter fields are described by a function  $u : [t_0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  that must satisfy equations of motion. In the case of a massive scalar field, the equation of motion is the semilinear Klein-Gordon equation in (2.4).

We now specify the assumptions in our work.

**2.1. Admissible nonlinearities.** For the function  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we will assume that there exists  $\epsilon > 0$  such that

$$(2.5) \quad f(s)s \geq (2 + \epsilon)F(s) \quad \text{and} \quad F(s) := \int_0^s f(\xi) d\xi.$$

Let us consider an example of a type of nonlinearity that satisfies condition (2.5): Take  $f(u) = u^p$  with  $p > 1$ ; it follows that

$$s^p s \geq (2 + \epsilon) \frac{s^{p+1}}{p+1} \quad \Rightarrow \quad p+1 \geq (2 + \epsilon).$$

Hence power nonlinearities with  $p \geq 1 + \epsilon$  will satisfy Eq.(2.5). Another example of an admissible nonlinearity is the case of a *focusing* power nonlinearity  $f(u) = |u|^{p-1}u$ . The *defocusing* power nonlinearity  $f(u) = -|u|^{p-1}u$  is a *non-example* of an admissible nonlinearity.

Next we describe assumptions on the admissible nonlinearities that are needed to ensure local wellposedness for problem (2.4).

**Definition:** A function  $h := h(x, s)$ ,  $h : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is said to be *Lipshitz continuous in  $s$  with exponent  $\alpha$* , if there exist  $\alpha \geq 0$  and  $C > 0$  such that

$$|h(x, s) - h(x, v)| \leq C|s - v|(|s|^\alpha + |v|^\alpha) \quad \text{for all } s, v \in \mathbb{R}, x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

In our work we will assume that  $f(s)$  satisfies the following two assumptions:

- 1)  $f(0) = 0$ ,
- 2)  $f$  is Lipshitz continuous with exponent  $0 \leq \alpha \leq \frac{2}{n-2}$ .

The restriction on the exponent  $\alpha$  is needed for local wellposedness for problem (2.4) to hold. We discuss this in more detail in Section 3.

**2.2. Assumptions on the expanding factor  $a(t)$ .** We consider cosmologies undergoing an accelerated expansion in the direction of positive time  $t$ . This expansion corresponds to

$$(2.6) \quad a(t) > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \dot{a}(t) := \frac{da}{dt} > 0,$$

for all  $t > 0$ . Let  $a_0 := a(t_0)$ ,  $\dot{a}_0 := \dot{a}(t_0)$ ; we assume that there exists a  $t_0 > 0$  such that

$$(2.7) \quad \frac{\dot{a}(t)}{a(t)} \leq \frac{\dot{a}_0}{a_0} \leq \frac{\epsilon}{6n},$$

holds for all  $t \geq t_0$ . This assumption is essential in order to treat the effect of the accelerated expansion perturbatively.

Next we codify an assumption on the mass  $m$  and the expanding factor  $a(t)$  that is needed for local wellposedness for problem (2.4) to hold. Define the *curved mass*  $M(t)$  (see [2]) to be

$$(2.8) \quad M^2(t) := m^2 + \left(\frac{n}{2} - \frac{n^2}{4}\right) \left(\frac{\dot{a}(t)}{a(t)}\right)^2 - \frac{n}{2} \frac{\ddot{a}(t)}{a(t)}.$$

We make the following assumption on  $M(t)$ : there exists a  $c_0 > 0$  such that

$$(2.9) \quad M(t) > c_0 > 0, \quad \dot{M}(t) \leq 0, \quad \text{for all } t \in [t_0, \infty).$$

This assumption will be satisfied by the FLRW and de Sitter metrics under suitable conditions on the parameters. See Section 2.4 for more details.

**2.3. Norms, energy, and modified Nehari functional.** We denote the  $L^2$  norm and inner product by

$$\|u\| := \|u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} := \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} u^2 dx \right)^{1/2}, \quad (u, v) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (uv) dx.$$

We define the functional spaces

$$H^1 := H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) := \left\{ u \in L^2 \mid \|u\|_{H^1} = \|(1 - \Delta)^{1/2} u\| < +\infty \right\},$$

$$H_0^1 := H_0^1(\mathbb{R}^n) := \left\{ u \in H^1 \mid \text{supp}(u) \text{ is compact in } \mathbb{R}^n \right\}.$$

The energy for this problem is defined to be

$$(2.10) \quad E(t) := \frac{1}{2} \left( \|u_t\|^2 + m^2 \|u\|^2 + \frac{1}{a^2} \|\nabla u\|^2 - 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F(u) dx \right),$$

where  $\nabla u$  denotes the spatial gradient of  $u$ . We also define the *modified Nehari functional*

$$(2.11) \quad I(u) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left( m^2 u^2 + \frac{1}{a^2} (\nabla u)^2 + n \frac{\dot{a}}{a} \tilde{m}^2 u u_t - u f(u) \right) dx.$$

Note that because of  $u_t$ , the modified Nehari functional  $I(u)$  is defined on functions that depend on time. Since  $I(u)$  is a function of time  $t$ , we will use the notation  $I(u(t))$  when we wish to emphasize this fact. Now we define the *unstable set for the Nehari functional*

$$(2.12) \quad \mathcal{B} := \{u \in C([t_0, T]; H_0^1(\mathbb{R}^n)) \cap C^1([t_0, T]; L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)) \mid I(u) < 0\}.$$

The functional space in this definition comes directly from the regularity given by local wellposedness theorem in section 3. The key here is that our assumptions guarantee that the sign condition  $I(u(t)) < 0$  will be preserved by the flow. This fact is proved in section 6.1.

In the following, we will work as if  $u$  is smooth and supported away from spatial infinity. This assumption can be removed by a standard approximation argument.

**2.4. Statement of main theorem.** We are now ready to state our main result.

**Theorem 1.** *Suppose that there exists  $\epsilon > 0$  such that Eq. (2.5) is satisfied. Assume that  $f(0) = 0$  and that  $f(s)$  is Lipschitz continuous with exponent  $0 \leq \alpha \leq \frac{2}{n-2}$ . Suppose that the expanding factor  $a(t)$  satisfies Eq. (2.6) and that the initial time  $t_0$  satisfies Eq. (2.7). Assume that  $m > 0$ , and let  $\tilde{m} = \min\{1, m\}$ . Further, assume that there is a positive number  $c_0$  such that the curved mass  $M(t)$  satisfies (2.9). Let  $u_0(x) \in H_0^1$  and  $u_1(x) \in L^2$ . Suppose that  $u_0, u_1$  are such that  $I(u(t_0)) < 0$  and that*

$$(2.13) \quad (u_0, u_1) \geq \frac{2(\epsilon + 2)}{\tilde{m}^2(\epsilon - 2n(\frac{\dot{a}_0}{a_0}))} E(t_0) = \frac{3(\epsilon + 2)}{\tilde{m}^2 \epsilon} E(t_0) > 0,$$

holds for the initial data. Then the corresponding local solution to (2.4) blows up in finite time. Furthermore, the maximal time of existence  $T_{max}$  has the explicit upper bound

$$T_{max} < t_0 + \frac{B(t_0)}{\epsilon B'(t_0)},$$

with

$$B(t) := \|mu\|^2, \quad B'(t) := 2(m^2 u, u_t).$$

One of the advantages of this result is the simple, explicit form for the upper bound  $T_{max}$ ; from this form one can readily infer how each parameter affects the time of existence. For instance, larger  $\epsilon$  results in shorter time of existence. Similarly, larger inner product  $B'(t_0) := 2(m^2 u(t_0), u_t(t_0))$  also results in shorter time of existence. From our main theorem we can also read off how some commonly referenced cosmological backgrounds affect  $T_{max}$ : For example, for FLRW with power expansion  $a(t) = t^k$ , we have

$$\frac{\dot{a}(t)}{a(t)} = \frac{k}{t}$$

and therefore  $t_0 = 6nk/\epsilon$ . Patching this together with the local existence result means that as  $k$  increases, we have a larger and larger region of safety. So in this case, the faster the expansion, the longer it takes for the nonlinear effects to kick in. By contrast, in the cases of Minkowski spacetime  $a(t) = 1$  or de Sitter  $a(t) = e^{Ht}$ , the choice of initial time  $t_0 > 0$  has no effect on the upper bound  $T_{max}$ .

As mentioned in the introduction, this result is complementary to the result in [2]. In that work, the authors prove small data global existence for a class of semilinear Klein-Gordon equations propagating in a family of expanding cosmological backgrounds which include de Sitter. The main point of departure from that work is the fact that here we are considering **large** initial data in  $H_0^1 \times L^2$ . This comes from the fact that our initial condition (2.13) excludes the possibility of small initial data in these functional spaces. In particular, our initial conditions imply that the norm of initial data cannot be too small due to the existence of a positive lower bound for the  $H^1$  norm at the initial time  $t_0$ . For the interested reader, we prove this fact in an Appendix at the end of this manuscript.

**2.5. Applicable cosmology examples.** Two of the most commonly referenced cosmological backgrounds have expanding factors that allow the use of our method. For certain combinations of parameters, FLRW space with expanding factor  $a(t) = t^k$ ,  $k > 0$  works as long as our initial time is spaced far enough forward from the singularity at  $t = 0$ . De Sitter space works as long as the Hubble constant  $H > 0$  is suitably low. We present the relevant computations here.

2.5.1. *De Sitter.* For the de Sitter metric, we have  $a(t) = e^{Ht}$ , with  $H > 0$ . In this case we get

$$\frac{\dot{a}(t)}{a(t)} = H.$$

Thus we require that  $H < \frac{\epsilon}{6n}$  for our method to be applicable. Next we compute the curved mass

$$M^2(t) = m^2 + \left(\frac{n}{2} - \frac{n^2}{4}\right)H^2 - \frac{n}{2}H^2 = \left(m - \frac{n}{2}H\right)\left(m + \frac{n}{2}H\right),$$

$$\dot{M}(t) = 0,$$

so that condition (2.9) is satisfied if

$$m - \frac{n}{2}H > 0.$$

In particular, our method is applicable if  $H$  is sufficiently small and  $m$  is sufficiently large.

2.5.2. *FLRW*. For the Friedmann–Lemaître–Robertson–Walker metric with power expansion we have  $a(t) = t^k$ ,  $k > 0$ . Thus

$$\frac{\dot{a}(t)}{a(t)} = \frac{k}{t}.$$

So to satisfy condition (2.7) we choose

$$(2.14) \quad t_0 = \frac{6kn}{\epsilon}.$$

Next we compute the curved mass

$$M^2(t) = m^2 + \left(\frac{n}{2} - \frac{n^2}{4}\right) \left(\frac{k}{t}\right)^2 - \frac{n}{2} \frac{k(k-1)}{t^2} = m^2 + \frac{nk}{2t^2} \left(1 - \frac{nk}{2}\right)$$

from which we can see that condition (2.9) is satisfied if  $0 < k \leq \frac{2}{n}$ , for example.

### 3. LOCAL WELLPOSEDNESS

In this section we make use of the local wellposedness result in [2, Section 1]. We state the theorem, hypotheses, and (readjusted) notation for the reader's convenience here.

**Theorem 2** (Galstian and Yagdjian, 2014). *Suppose that the expanding factor  $a(t)$  satisfies assumptions (2.6) and (2.7). Suppose that  $m > 0$  and that there is a positive number  $c_0$  such that the curved mass  $M(t)$  satisfies (2.9). Consider the Cauchy problem for the equation*

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{cases} u_{tt} + n \frac{\dot{a}}{a} u_t - a^{-2} \Delta u + m^2 u - V'_u(x, t, u) = 0 \\ u(t_0, x) = u_0(x), \quad u_t(t_0, x) = u_1(x). \end{cases}$$

where  $V'_u(x, t, u) = -\Gamma(t)f(u)$  with  $\Gamma \in C([t_0, \infty))$ ,  $f$  Lipschitz continuous with exponent  $0 \leq \alpha \leq \frac{2}{n-2}$  and  $f(0) = 0$ . Then for every  $u_0(x) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$  and  $u_1(x) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$  there exists  $T_1 > t_0$  such that the problem (3.1) has a unique solution  $u \in C([t_0, T_1]; H_0^1(\mathbb{R}^n)) \cap C^1([t_0, T_1]; L^2(\mathbb{R}^n))$

The statement of this theorem, combined with our assumptions in Section 2 and with the fact that  $H_0^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \subset H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$  immediately implies that the Cauchy problem (2.4) satisfies the conditions of this theorem with  $\Gamma(t) = 1$ .

### 4. ENERGY FORMALISM

In this section we develop the framework needed to prove our energy estimate. We largely follow the setup of [5] and [6]. Define the *energy-momentum tensor* to be

$$(4.1) \quad T_{\alpha\beta} := \partial_\alpha u \partial_\beta u - \frac{1}{2} g_{\alpha\beta} \left( \partial^\mu u \partial_\mu u + m^2 u^2 - 2F(u) \right).$$

Let  $D$  be the covariant derivative corresponding to the metric  $g$ . The energy momentum tensor is divergence free

$$D^\alpha T_{\alpha\beta} = 0.$$

Given a (smooth) vector field  $X$  we define the 1-form

$${}^{(X)}P_\alpha := T_{\alpha\beta} X^\beta.$$

Taking the divergence yields

$$(4.2) \quad D^\alpha ({}^{(X)}P_\alpha) = \frac{1}{2} {}^{(X)}\pi^{\alpha\beta} T_{\alpha\beta}$$

where the symmetric 2-tensor  ${}^{(X)}\pi$  is the *deformation tensor* of  $g$  with respect to  $X$ . Integrating this divergence over the spacetime region

$$\{(t, x) \mid t_0 \leq t \leq t_1\}$$

and using Stokes' theorem we get the following *multiplier identity*

$$(4.3) \quad \int_{t=t_0}^{t=t_1} (X)P_\alpha N^\alpha |\mathbf{g}|^{\frac{1}{2}} dx - \int_{t=t_1}^{t=t_0} (X)P_\alpha N^\alpha |\mathbf{g}|^{\frac{1}{2}} dx = \int_{t_0}^{t_1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left(\frac{1}{2} (X)\pi^{\alpha\beta} T_{\alpha\beta}\right) dV_g$$

where

$$dV_g := |\mathbf{g}|^{\frac{1}{2}} dt dx$$

and  $N$  is the vector field defined below:

$$(4.4) \quad N^\alpha := \frac{-g^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\beta t}{(-g^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\alpha t \partial_\beta t)^{\frac{1}{2}}} = -g^{\alpha 0}.$$

The integrand on the left hand side of Eq. (4.3) is the *energy density* associated to  $X$  through the foliation by the spacelike hypersurfaces  $t = \text{const}$ .

Given a vector field  $X$  we define the *normalized deformation tensor* of  $X$  to be

$$(4.5) \quad (X)\hat{\pi} = (X)\pi - \frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{g}| \cdot \text{trace}((X)\pi)$$

which can be computed using the following identity (see [5]):

$$(4.6) \quad (X)\hat{\pi}^{\alpha\beta} = -|\mathbf{g}|^{-\frac{1}{2}} X(|\mathbf{g}|^{\frac{1}{2}} g^{\alpha\beta}) - g^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\gamma X^\gamma + g^{\alpha\gamma} \partial_\gamma X^\beta + g^{\beta\gamma} \partial_\gamma X^\alpha.$$

In combination with Eq. (4.2), we get

$$(4.7) \quad D^\alpha((X)P_\alpha) = \frac{1}{2} (X)\hat{\pi}^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\alpha u \partial_\beta u.$$

Combining (4.7) and (4.3) yields

$$(4.8) \quad \int_{t=t_0}^{t=t_1} (X)P_\alpha N^\alpha |\mathbf{g}|^{\frac{1}{2}} dx - \int_{t=t_1}^{t=t_0} (X)P_\alpha N^\alpha |\mathbf{g}|^{\frac{1}{2}} dx = \int_{t_0}^{t_1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{1}{2} \left( (X)\hat{\pi}^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\alpha u \partial_\beta u \right) |\mathbf{g}|^{\frac{1}{2}} dt dx$$

## 5. PROOF OF ENERGY INEQUALITY

In this section we will prove the energy nonincreasing property as stated below:

**Lemma 3.** *Let  $u(t, x)$  be a solution to problem (2.4). Then*

$$E(t_0) \geq E(t) \quad \forall t \geq t_0$$

**Proof:** Let  $X = a^{-n} \partial_t$ . We can compute the normalized deformation tensor of  $X$  using Eq. (4.6). This yields

$$\begin{aligned} (X)\hat{\pi}^{00} &= 2na^{-n-1}\dot{a} \geq 0, & (X)\hat{\pi}^{0j} &= 0, \\ (X)\hat{\pi}^{ij} &= (2-n)(a^{-n-3}\dot{a})\delta^{ij} + na^{-n-3}\dot{a}\delta^{ij} = 2a^{-n-3}\dot{a}\delta^{ij} \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$(5.1) \quad \frac{1}{2} \left( (X)\hat{\pi}^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\alpha u \partial_\beta u \right) |\mathbf{g}|^{\frac{1}{2}} = n \frac{\dot{a}}{a} |u_t|^2 + n \frac{\dot{a}}{a^3} |\nabla u|^2 \geq 0.$$

From Eq. (4.8) it follows that:

$$(5.2) \quad \int_{t=t_0}^{t=t_1} (X)P_\alpha N^\alpha |\mathbf{g}|^{\frac{1}{2}} dx - \int_{t=t_1}^{t=t_0} (X)P_\alpha N^\alpha |\mathbf{g}|^{\frac{1}{2}} dx \geq 0.$$

Expanding the integrand yields

$$(X)P_\alpha N^\alpha |\mathbf{g}|^{\frac{1}{2}} = -g^{\alpha 0} T_{\alpha 0} a^{-n} a^n = T_{00} = \frac{1}{2} \left( |u_t|^2 + a^{-2} |\nabla u|^2 + m^2 u^2 - 2F(u) \right)$$

Combining this with Eq. (5.2) gives us

$$(5.3) \quad E(t_0) \geq E(t) \quad \forall t \geq t_0. \quad \square$$

## 6. PROOF OF BLOW UP IN FINITE TIME

In this section we will prove that the set  $\mathcal{B}$  defined in Eq. (2.12) is invariant for the Cauchy problem when the assumptions in the main theorem are satisfied.

### 6.1. Proof that $\mathcal{B}$ is an invariant set.

**Lemma 4.** *Let  $u_0(x) \in H_0^1$  and  $u_1(x) \in L^2$  and  $a_0 = a(t_0)$  and  $\tilde{m} = \min\{1, m\}$ . Then  $u, u_t$  of the corresponding local solution to (2.4) satisfy  $I(u(t)) < 0$  for all  $t \leq T_{max}$  provided that  $I(u(t_0)) < 0$  initially and*

$$(6.1) \quad (u_0, u_1) \geq \frac{2(\epsilon + 2)}{\tilde{m}^2(\epsilon - 2n\frac{a_0}{a})} E(t_0) = \frac{2(\epsilon + 2)}{\frac{2}{3}\tilde{m}^2\epsilon} E(t_0) = \frac{3(\epsilon + 2)}{\tilde{m}^2\epsilon} E(t_0) > 0.$$

**Proof:** For the purpose of a contradiction, we assume  $\exists t^* \in (t_0, T_{max})$  where  $t^*$  is the least positive value such that:

$$(6.2) \quad I(u(t^*)) = 0$$

And we therefore have:

$$(6.3) \quad I(u(t)) < 0 \quad \forall t \in [t_0, t^*)$$

We define the auxiliary function:

$$(6.4) \quad B(t) := \|mu\|^2$$

and therefore

$$(6.5) \quad B'(t) = 2(m^2u, u_t)$$

and we therefore arrive at the fact:

$$(6.6) \quad B'(t_0) = 2m^2(u_0, u_1) \geq \frac{6(\epsilon + 2)}{\epsilon} E(t_0) > 0$$

and from (2.4)

$$(6.7) \quad \begin{aligned} B''(t) &= 2m^2(u, u_{tt}) + 2m^2\|u_t\|^2 \\ &= 2m^2\|u_t\|^2 + 2m^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} u(a^{-2}\Delta u - n\frac{\dot{a}}{a}u_t + f(u) - m^2u)dx \\ &= 2m^2\|u_t\|^2 + 2m^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (-a^{-2}(\nabla u)^2 - n\frac{\dot{a}}{a}uu_t + uf(u) - m^2u^2)dx \\ &\geq 2m^2\|u_t\|^2 - 2m^2I(u) \end{aligned}$$

So from (6.3) and (6.7) we can establish:

$$(6.8) \quad B''(t) > 0 \quad \forall t \in [t_0, t^*)$$

So from (6.6) and (6.8) we can conclude:

$$(6.9) \quad B'(t) > B'(t_0) = 2m^2(u_0, u_1) \geq \frac{6(\epsilon + 2)}{\epsilon} E(t_0) > 0$$

With this we have established that  $B(t)$  and  $(u, u_t)$  are positive and monotonic increasing on  $[t_0, t^*)$ , i.e.

$$(6.10) \quad (u(t), u_t(t)) \geq (u_0, u_1) \geq \frac{3(\epsilon + 2)}{\tilde{m}^2\epsilon} E(t_0) > 0, \quad \forall t \in (t_0, t^*)$$



From this result we have  $(u(t^*), u_t(t^*)) \geq \frac{3(\epsilon+2)}{\tilde{m}^2\epsilon} E(t^*)$ , but now we proceed using (2.10) along the same lines as [8], but with our modified energy inequality (5.3):

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.11) \quad E(t_0) &\geq E(t) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \|u_t\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} m^2 \|u\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} a^{-2} \|\nabla u\|^2 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F(u) dx \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2} \|u_t\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} m^2 \|u\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} a^{-2} \|\nabla u\|^2 - \frac{1}{\epsilon+2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} u f(u) dx \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \|u_t\|^2 + \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{\epsilon+2}\right) (m^2 \|u\|^2 + a^{-2} \|\nabla u\|^2) + \frac{1}{\epsilon+2} I(u) \\
&\quad - \frac{n\dot{a}}{a(\epsilon+2)} (\tilde{m}^2 u_0, u_1)
\end{aligned}$$

Let  $a_* = a(t^*)$ . Therefore, as we know  $I(u(t^*)) = 0$  from our assumption, we arrive at:

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.12) \quad E(t_0) &\geq \frac{1}{2} \|u_t(t^*)\|^2 + \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{\epsilon+2}\right) (m^2 \|u(t^*)\|^2 + a^{-2} \|\nabla u(t^*)\|^2) \\
&\quad - \frac{n\dot{a}_*}{a_*(\epsilon+2)} (\tilde{m}^2 u(t^*), u_t(t^*)) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \|u_t(t^*)\|^2 + \left(\frac{\epsilon}{2(\epsilon+2)}\right) (m^2 \|u(t^*)\|^2 + a^{-2} \|\nabla u(t^*)\|^2) \\
&\quad - \frac{n\dot{a}_*}{a_*(\epsilon+2)} (\tilde{m}^2 u(t^*), u_t(t^*)) \\
&\geq \frac{\epsilon}{2(\epsilon+2)} (\|u_t(t^*)\|^2 + \|m u(t^*)\|^2 + a^{-2} \|\nabla u(t^*)\|^2) \\
&\quad - \frac{n\dot{a}_*}{a_*(\epsilon+2)} (\tilde{m}^2 u(t^*), u_t(t^*)) \\
&\geq \frac{\epsilon}{2(\epsilon+2)} (2(m^2 u(t^*), u_t(t^*)) + a^{-2} \|\nabla u(t^*)\|^2) \\
&\quad - \frac{n\dot{a}_*}{a_*(\epsilon+2)} (\tilde{m}^2 u(t^*), u_t(t^*)) \\
&\geq \frac{\epsilon}{2(\epsilon+2)} (2(\tilde{m}^2 u(t^*), u_t(t^*)) - \frac{n\dot{a}_*}{a_*(\epsilon+2)} (\tilde{m}^2 u(t^*), u_t(t^*))) \\
&= \frac{a_*\epsilon - n\dot{a}_*}{a_*(\epsilon+2)} (\tilde{m}^2 u(t^*), u_t(t^*)) \\
&= \frac{\epsilon - n\frac{\dot{a}_*}{a_*}}{\epsilon+2} (\tilde{m}^2 u(t^*), u_t(t^*))
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.13) \quad & E(t_0) > \frac{\epsilon - n \frac{\dot{a}_*}{a_*}}{\epsilon + 2} (\tilde{m}^2 u(t^*), u_t(t^*)) \\
& \therefore (\tilde{m}^2 u(t^*), u_t(t^*)) < \frac{\epsilon + 2}{\epsilon - n \frac{\dot{a}_*}{a_*}} E(t_0) \\
& \therefore (\tilde{m}^2 u(t^*), u_t(t^*)) < \frac{\epsilon + 2}{\epsilon - n \frac{\dot{a}_0}{a_0}} E(t_0) \\
& \therefore (\tilde{m}^2 u(t^*), u_t(t^*)) < \frac{\epsilon + 2}{\epsilon - \frac{1}{6}\epsilon} E(t_0) \\
& \therefore (u(t^*), u_t(t^*)) < \frac{6(\epsilon + 2)}{5\tilde{m}^2\epsilon} E(t_0)
\end{aligned}$$

Which gives us that  $(u(t^*), u_t(t^*)) < \frac{6(\epsilon+2)}{5\tilde{m}^2\epsilon} E(t_0)$ , which obviously contradicts 6.10.

Therefore it must follow that no such  $t^*$  exists, and therefore  $I(u(t)) < 0$ ,  $\forall t > t_0$  and therefore the set  $\mathcal{B}$  is invariant.  $\square$

**6.2. Proof of the Main Theorem.** In this section we prove Theorem 1.

**Proof:** From Lemma 4 we know that  $u(x, t) \in \mathcal{B}$  implies

$$(6.14) \quad B(t) > 0 \quad \forall t \in [t_0, T_{max})$$

And from (6.6) and the Cauchy-Schwarz Inequality we arrive at

$$(6.15) \quad B'(t)^2 = 4m^4(u, u_t)^2 \leq 4m^4\|u\|^2\|u_t\|^2 = 4m^2B(t)\|u_t\|^2$$

Combining with (6.7) we get the inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.16) \quad & B''(t)B(t) - \frac{\lambda + 3}{4} B'(t)^2 \\
& \geq B(t)(B''(t) - (\lambda + 3)m^2\|u_t\|^2) \\
& \geq B(t)(-(\lambda + 1)m^2\|u_t\|^2 - 2m^2I(u))
\end{aligned}$$

From our energy inequality (6.11) we have:

$$E(t_0) \geq \frac{1}{2}\|u_t\|^2 + \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{\epsilon + 2}\right)(m^2\|u\|^2 + a^{-2}\|\nabla u\|^2) + \frac{1}{\epsilon + 2}I(u) - \frac{n\dot{a}}{a(\epsilon + 2)}\tilde{m}^2(u, u_t)$$

Therefore,

$$E(t_0) - \frac{1}{2}\|u_t\|^2 - \frac{\epsilon}{2(\epsilon + 2)}(m^2\|u\|^2 + a^{-2}\|\nabla u\|^2) + \frac{n\dot{a}}{a(\epsilon + 2)}\tilde{m}^2(u, u_t) \geq \frac{1}{\epsilon + 2}I(u)$$

Which gives us:

$$(6.17) \quad 2I(u) \leq 2(\epsilon + 2)E(t_0) - (\epsilon + 2)\|u_t\|^2 - \epsilon(m^2\|u\|^2 + a^{-2}\|\nabla u\|^2) + 2n\tilde{m}^2\frac{\dot{a}}{a}(u, u_t)$$

We now define  $\xi : \mathbb{R}_{nonneg} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

$$\xi(t) := -m^2(\lambda + 1)\|u_t\|^2 - 2m^2I(u)$$

And combining this with inequality (6.17) above we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\xi(t)}{m^2} &\geq -(\lambda + 1)\|u_t\|^2 - 2(\epsilon + 2)E(t_0) + (\epsilon + 2)\|u_t\|^2 + \epsilon(m^2\|u\|^2 + a^{-2}\|\nabla u\|^2) \\
&\quad - 2n\tilde{m}^2\frac{\dot{a}}{a}(u, u_t) \\
&= (\epsilon + 1 - \lambda)\|u_t\|^2 + \epsilon(m^2\|u\|^2 + a^{-2}\|\nabla u\|^2) - 2(\epsilon + 2)E(t_0) \\
&\quad - 2n\tilde{m}^2\frac{\dot{a}}{a}(u, u_t)
\end{aligned}$$

We now substitute  $\lambda = \frac{\epsilon}{2} + 1$  to arrive at:

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.18) \quad \frac{\xi(t)}{m^2} &\geq \frac{\epsilon}{2}\|u_t\|^2 + \epsilon(m^2\|u\|^2 + a^{-2}\|\nabla u\|^2) - 2(\epsilon + 2)E(t_0) - 2n\tilde{m}^2\frac{\dot{a}}{a}((u, u_t)) \\
&> \frac{\epsilon}{2}(\|u_t\|^2 + m^2\|u\|^2) - 2(\epsilon + 2)E(t_0) - 2n\tilde{m}^2\frac{\dot{a}}{a}(u, u_t) \\
&\geq \tilde{m}^2(\epsilon - 2n\frac{\dot{a}}{a})(u, u_t) - 2(\epsilon + 2)E(t_0) \\
&\geq \frac{2}{3}\epsilon\tilde{m}^2(u, u_t) - 2(\epsilon + 2)E(t_0)
\end{aligned}$$

And since we have

$$(6.19) \quad (u(t), u_t(t)) > (u_0, u_1) \geq \frac{3(\epsilon + 2)}{\tilde{m}^2\epsilon}E(t_0) > 0, \quad \forall t \in (t_0, T_{max})$$

We arrive at the conclusion:

$$(6.20) \quad \xi(t) > 0, \quad \forall t \in (t_0, T_{max})$$

Now, we will, using (6.20) to continue our inequality from (6.16) consider:

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.21) \quad &B''(t)B(t) - \frac{\lambda + 3}{4}B'(t)^2 \\
&\geq B(t)(B''(t) - (\lambda + 3)m^2\|u_t\|^2) \\
&\geq B(t)(-(\lambda + 1)m^2\|u_t\|^2 - 2m^2I(u)) \\
&= B(t)\xi(t) > 0 \\
&\therefore B(t) > 0 \text{ and } \xi(t) > 0, \quad \forall t \in (t_0, T_{max}] \\
&\therefore B''(t)B(t) - \frac{\lambda + 3}{4}B'(t)^2 > 0, \quad \forall t \in (t_0, T_{max})
\end{aligned}$$

We can now rejoin [7] in the concavity argument. As  $\frac{4+\epsilon}{4} > 1$ , and letting  $\alpha = \frac{\epsilon}{4}$ , we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.22) \quad &(B^{-\alpha})' = -\alpha B^{-\alpha-1}B'(t) < 0, \\
&(B^{-\alpha})'' = -\alpha B^{-\alpha-2}[B''(t)B(t) - \frac{4+\epsilon}{4}B'(t)^2] < 0 \\
&\quad \forall t \in (t_0, T_{max}).
\end{aligned}$$

And if we consider the line tangent to  $B^{-\alpha}$  at  $t = t_0$ :

$$(6.23) \quad G_{B^{-\alpha}(t_0)}(t) := -\alpha B^{-\alpha-1}(t_0)B'(t_0)(t - t_0) + B^{-\alpha}(t_0)$$

And solve for  $G_{B^{-\alpha}(t_0)}(t) = 0$ , we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
 0 &= -\alpha B^{-\alpha-1}(t_0)B'(t_0)(t - t_0) + B^{-\alpha}(t_0) \\
 \therefore B^{-\alpha}(t_0) &= \alpha B^{-\alpha-1}(t_0)B'(t_0)(t - t_0) \\
 \therefore t &= \frac{B^{-\alpha}(t_0)}{\alpha B^{-\alpha-1}(t_0)B'(t_0)} + t_0 = t_0 + \frac{4B(t_0)}{\epsilon B'(t_0)}
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{6.24}$$

Therefore it follows that  $B^{-\alpha}$  is concave down and decreasing and subsequently bounded above by  $G_{B^{-\alpha}(0)}(t)$ . And since we know  $B(t_0) > 0$  it must follow that  $\exists T_{max} < \frac{4B(t_0)}{\epsilon B'(t_0)}$  such that:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \lim_{t \rightarrow T_{max}^-} B^{-\alpha} &= 0 \\
 \therefore \lim_{t \rightarrow T_{max}^-} B(t) &= \lim_{t \rightarrow T_{max}^-} \|u(t, \cdot)\|^2 \rightarrow \infty \quad \square.
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{6.25}$$




FIGURE 1. Demonstration of the qualitative behavior that leads to the existence of  $T_{max}$

## 7. APPLICABLE COSMOLOGY EXAMPLES REVISITED

Here we will explore two specific cases for the expansion factor  $a(t)$ . The first is the de Sitter case, where  $a(t) = e^{Ht}$  for some  $H > 0$ . This case serves as a manner of “upper limit” on the rate of growth of  $a(t)$ , as we can see if we consider  $H = \frac{\epsilon}{6n}$ . We then see  $\frac{\dot{a}}{a} = \frac{\epsilon}{6n}$ , the upper limit of this ratio from our general case. Clearly for any function consistently above exponential order this ratio would result in an increasing function, which could not be bounded forward in time as we require.

The other case is the FLRW expansion factor  $a(t) = t^k$  such that  $k > 1$ . Here we see the benefit of being well under exponential order, but we find our  $\frac{\dot{a}}{a}$  ratio is undefined at  $t = 0$ . This, as we will explain, is the inspiration for our  $t_0$  requirement in the general case of our argument above. While many expansion factors will allow for  $t_0 = 0$  (Minkowski spacetime and de Sitter come to mind), extreme behavior at  $t = 0$  can require  $t_0$  to be placed adequately far in the future.

**7.1. The de Sitter Case.** Of course, in the de Sitter case, where we have  $a(t) = e^{Ht}$ , we satisfy our conditions on  $a(t)$  as well as the energy inequality with  $t_0 = 0$  with the restriction that  $H \leq \frac{\epsilon}{6n}$ . This gives us  $\frac{\dot{a}}{a} = H \leq \frac{\epsilon}{6n}$  and  $E(t_0) \geq E(t) \forall t \in [0, \infty)$ , clearly.

The argument for Lemma 4 therefore proceeds as follows in this case:

$$\begin{aligned}
(7.1) \quad E(t_0) &\geq E(t) \\
&= \frac{1}{2}\|u_t\|^2 + \frac{1}{2}m^2\|u\|^2 + \frac{1}{2}e^{-2H}\|\nabla u\|^2 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F(u)dx \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2}\|u_t\|^2 + \frac{1}{2}m^2\|u\|^2 + \frac{1}{2}e^{-2H}\|\nabla u\|^2 - \frac{1}{\epsilon + 2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} uf(u)dx \\
&= \frac{1}{2}\|u_t\|^2 + \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{\epsilon + 2}\right)(m^2\|u\|^2 + e^{-2H}\|\nabla u\|^2) + \frac{1}{\epsilon + 2}I(u) \\
&\quad - \frac{nH}{\epsilon + 2}(\tilde{m}^2 u_0, u_1)
\end{aligned}$$

And following along the same lines as the general argument, with our restriction on  $H$ , we arrive at the same contradiction arrived at with 6.13.

This particular example is enlightening not only because of the pertinence to the current assumed nature of our universe, but also for making clear that  $t_0$  is only a positive quantity in cases where our  $a(t)$  conditions cannot be satisfied over all nonnegative  $t$ , whether due to discontinuity or some other early behavior associated with the expansion factor.

This example also matches the intuition that one would have for how blow-up would be influenced by our choice of  $a$ . The limit on  $H$  serves as a limit on on the rate of expansion, which if too great might “smooth out” too quickly to allow for blowup. Furthermore, the local existence result in Theorem 1.2 of [2] also requires that  $H$  be small relative to  $m$ .

**7.2. The FLRW Case.** Here we have  $a(t) = t^k$  and the metric is therefore expressed as follows:

$$(7.2) \quad \mathbf{g} := -dt^2 + t^{2k}(dx_1^2 + dx_2^2 + \dots + dx_n^2).$$

When we consider the  $\frac{\dot{a}}{a}$  ratio we arrive at:

$$(7.3) \quad \frac{\dot{a}(t)}{a(t)} = knt^{-1}$$

Thus the discontinuity at  $t = 0$  requires that we consider our initial time  $t_0$  as follows:

$$(7.4) \quad \frac{6kn}{\epsilon} = t_0.$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(7.5) \quad E(t_0) &\geq E(t) \\
&= \frac{1}{2}\|u_t\|^2 + \frac{1}{2}m^2\|u\|^2 + \frac{1}{2}t^{-2k}\|\nabla u\|^2 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F(u)dx \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2}\|u_t\|^2 + \frac{1}{2}m^2\|u\|^2 + \frac{1}{2}t^{-2k}\|\nabla u\|^2 - \frac{1}{\epsilon + 2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} uf(u)dx \\
&= \frac{1}{2}\|u_t\|^2 + \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{\epsilon + 2}\right)(m^2\|u\|^2 + t^{-2k}\|\nabla u\|^2) + \frac{1}{\epsilon + 2}I(u) \\
&\quad - \frac{knt^{-1}}{\epsilon + 2}(\tilde{m}^2 u_0, u_1)
\end{aligned}$$

Again, following the lines of the general argument, we quickly arrive at the same contradiction of 6.10 that allows the proof to proceed. With the curtailed expansion of this polynomial case, we see that there are no restrictions reminiscent of those that had to be placed on  $H$  in the de Sitter case. Rather, here we have to contend with the discontinuity at  $t = 0$ , which is avoided by placing our start time suitably far from that initial singularity.

It is worth noting that the general argument is widely applicable, and these simple, well-studied metrics fall within the restrictions on the expanding factor required for the argument. One can also think of the exponential de Sitter case as an upper bound for this factor, as it is the most rapidly expanding expansion factor that can remain within these restrictions.

## 8. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Jesús Oliver was supported by an AMS-Simons Research Enhancement Grant for Primarily Undergraduate Institution Faculty.

## 9. APPENDIX: LOWER BOUND FOR THE INITIAL DATA

In this section we prove that the assumptions of our main theorem imply that the norm of the initial data  $u_0(x) \in H_0^1$ ,  $u_1(x) \in L^2$  has a positive uniform lower bound.

**Theorem 5.** *Suppose that all the hypotheses of Theorem 1 are satisfied. Then there exists a uniform constant  $C_{min} > 0$  such that*

$$C_{min} < \|u_0\|_{H_0^1}$$

*Proof.* By the density of  $C_c^\infty$  in  $H_0^1$ , it suffices to consider smooth, compactly supported functions. The condition  $u_0 \in \mathcal{B}$  (equivalently  $I(u(t_0)) < 0$ ) implies

$$(9.1) \quad \int_{\{t=t_0\} \times \mathbb{R}^n} \left( m^2 u^2 + \frac{1}{a^2} (\nabla u)^2 + n \frac{\dot{a}}{a} \tilde{m}^2 u u_t \right) dx < \int_{\{t=t_0\} \times \mathbb{R}^n} u f(u) dx.$$

By assumption  $m > 0$ ; by Eq. (2.6)  $a(t_0)$  and  $\dot{a}(t_0)$  are also positive. By Eq. (2.13) we also have a lower bound for the last term on the LHS of (9.1). Consequently

$$(9.2) \quad 0 < \int_{\{t=t_0\} \times \mathbb{R}^n} (u^2 + (\nabla u)^2) dx + E(t_0) < C \int_{\{t=t_0\} \times \mathbb{R}^n} u f(u) dx.$$

Since  $f$  is Lipschitz continuous with exponent  $0 \leq \alpha \leq \frac{2}{n-2}$ , we have

$$|f(u) - f(0)| = |f(u) - 0| \leq C|u|^{\alpha+1}.$$

Using this together with the triangle inequality, and  $E(t_0) > 0$  we can conclude

$$(9.3) \quad \|u_0\|_{H_0^1}^2 < C \int_{\{t=t_0\} \times \mathbb{R}^n} u f(u) dx < C \|u_0\|_{L^{\alpha+2}}^{\alpha+2}$$

Next, using the Sobolev Embedding Theorem (see for example Thm. 27.18 in [1]) we have the bound

$$\|u_0\|_{L^{q^*}} \leq C \|u_0\|_{H^1}$$

with  $q^* = \frac{4}{n-2}$ . Since  $0 \leq \alpha \leq \frac{2}{n-2}$ , we also have

$$\alpha \leq \frac{2}{n-2} < \frac{4}{n-2} = \frac{2n-2n+4}{n-2} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \alpha+2 < \frac{2n}{n-2},$$

Therefore (9.3) and the compact support of  $u$  yields

$$\|u_0\|_{H_0^1}^2 < C \|u_0\|_{L^{\alpha+2}}^{\alpha+2} \leq C \|u_0\|_{L^{q^*}}^{q^*(\alpha+2)} < C_{min} \|u_0\|_{H_0^1}^{\alpha+2}$$

where  $C_{min}$  is a uniform constant depending only on the Sobolev embedding inequality and on the inequalities assumed in Theorem 1. As a result, we have the lower bound

$$C_{min}^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}} < \|u_0\|_{H_0^1}$$

from which the theorem follows. □

## REFERENCES

- [1] Bruce Driver, *Analysis Tools With Applications*, Lecture Notes (2003). [https://mathweb.ucsd.edu/~bdriver/231-02-03/Lecture\\_Notes/Sobolev%20Inequalities.pdf](https://mathweb.ucsd.edu/~bdriver/231-02-03/Lecture_Notes/Sobolev%20Inequalities.pdf)
- [2] Anahit Galstian, Karen Yagdjian, *Global solutions for semilinear Klein–Gordon equations in FLRW spacetimes*. *Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Methods and Applications*. (2015) Vol 113, 339-356
- [3] Howard A. Levine, *Instability and Nonexistence of Global Solutions to Nonlinear Wave Equations of the Form  $Pu_{tt} = -Au + F(u)$* . *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 192 (1974) 1–21
- [4] Howard A. Levine, *Some Additional Remarks on the Nonexistence of Global Solutions to Nonlinear Wave Equations* *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* 5 (1974) 138-146
- [5] Jesús Oliver, *A Vector Field Method for Non-Trapping, Radiating Spacetimes*. *Journal of Hyperbolic Differential Equations*. 13. 10.1142/S021989161650020X. (2014)
- [6] Jesús Oliver, Jacob Sterbenz, *A Vector Field Method for Radiating Black Hole Spacetimes*. *Anal. PDE* 13 (1) 29 - 92 <https://doi.org/10.2140/apde.2020.13.29> (2020)
- [7] Yanjin Wang, *A Sufficient Condition for Finite Time Blow Up of the Nonlinear Klein-Gordon Equations with Arbitrarily Positive Initial Energy*. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* 136, no. 10 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20535570> (2008) 3477–82
- [8] Yanbing Yang, Runzhang Xu, *Finite Time Blowup for Nonlinear Klein-Gordon Equations with Arbitrarily Positive Initial Energy*. *Applied Mathematics Letters* 77 (2018) 21–26