

A mass-lumping finite element method for radially symmetric solution of a multidimensional semilinear heat equation with blow-up

Toru Nakanishi* Norikazu Saito†

December 14, 2020

This study presents a new mass-lumping finite element method for computing the radially symmetric solution of a semilinear heat equation in an N dimensional ball ($N \geq 2$). We provide two schemes, (ML-1) and (ML-2), and derive their error estimates through the discrete maximum principle. In the weighted L^2 norm, the convergence of (ML-1) was at the optimal order but that of (ML-2) was only at sub-optimal order. Nevertheless, scheme (ML-2) reproduces a blow-up of the solution of the original equation. In fact, in scheme (ML-2), we could accurately approximate the blow-up time. Our theoretical results were validated in numerical experiments.

Key words: finite element method, blow-up, radially symmetric solution

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 65M60, 35K58,

1. Introduction

This paper applies the finite element method (FEM) to a semilinear parabolic equation with a singular convection term:

$$u_t = u_{xx} + \frac{N-1}{x}u_x + f(u), \quad x \in I = (0, 1), \quad t > 0, \quad (1a)$$

$$u_x(0, t) = u(1, t) = 0, \quad t > 0, \quad (1b)$$

$$u(x, 0) = u^0(x), \quad x \in I. \quad (1c)$$

Here, $u = u(x, t)$, $x \in \bar{I} = [0, 1]$, $t \geq 0$ denotes the function to be found, f is a given locally Lipschitz continuous function, and u^0 is a given continuous function. Throughout this paper, we assume that

$$N \text{ is an integer } \geq 2. \quad (2)$$

*Graduate School of Mathematical Sciences, The University of Tokyo, Komaba 3-8-1, Meguro-ku, Tokyo 153-8914, Japan. *E-mail:* nakanish@ms.u-tokyo.ac.jp

†Graduate School of Mathematical Sciences, The University of Tokyo, Komaba 3-8-1, Meguro-ku, Tokyo 153-8914, Japan. *E-mail:* norikazu@g.ecc.u-tokyo.ac.jp

To compute the blow-up solution of (1), we apply Nakagawa’s time-increment control strategy (see [29] and Section 6 of the present paper), a powerful technique for approximating blow-up times. As recalled below, the standard finite element approximation is unuseful for achieving this purpose. We thus propose a new mass-lumping finite element approximation, prove its convergence, and apply it to a blow-up analysis.

We first clarify the motivation of this study. In many engineering problems, the spatial dimension of a mathematical model is at most three. Solving partial differential equations (PDEs) in more than three spatial dimensions is usually motivated by mathematical interests. Mathematicians understand that solving problems in a general setting can reveal the hidden natures of PDEs. One successful result is the discovery of Fujita’s blow-up exponent for the semilinear heat equation of $U = U(\mathbf{x}, t)$ given as

$$U_t = \Delta U + f(U) \quad (\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N, t > 0), \quad (3)$$

where N and $f(U)$ are defined above. Assuming $f(U) = U|U|^\alpha$ with $\alpha > 0$, Fujita showed that any positive solution blows up in finite time if $1 + \alpha < 1 + 2/N$, but a solution remains smooth at any time if the small initial value is small and $1 + \alpha > 1 + 2/N$. The quantity $p_c = 1 + 2/N$ is known as Fujita’s critical exponent, and Eq.(3) is called Fujita’s equation. Since Fujita’s work, a huge number of studies have been devoted to critical phenomena in nonlinear PDEs of several kinds (see [14, 28, 33] for details.) The knowledge gained by these studies has been applied to problems with spatial dimensions of three or fewer. However, many problems related to stochastic analysis are formulated as higher-dimensional PDEs. These problems have attracted much interest, but are beyond the scope of the present study.

Non-stationary problems in four dimensional space are difficult to solve by numerical methods, even on modern computers. Consequently, numerical analyses of the blow-up solutions of nonlinear PDEs have been restricted to two-dimensional space (see for example [1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 17, 20, 22, 21, 23, 25, 30, 32]). Although Nakagawa’s time-increment control strategy is applied to various nonlinear PDEs including the nonlinear heat, wave and Schrödinger equations, these equations are considered only in the one-space dimension; see [6, 8, 9, 12, 23, 34, 35]. We know two notably exceptions; the one is [30] where the finite element method to a semilinear heat equation in a two dimensional polygonal domain was considered, and the other is [7] where the finite difference method to the radially symmetric solution of the semilinear heat equation in an N dimensional ball was studied.

Following [7], the present paper investigates radially symmetric solutions to Eq.(3). Assuming radial symmetry of the solution and the given data, the N -dimensional equation reduces to a one-dimensional equation. More specifically, considering (3) in an N -dimensional unit ball $B = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N \mid |\mathbf{x}|_{\mathbb{R}^N} < 1\}$ with the homogeneous Dirichlet boundary condition on the boundary and assuming U is expressed as $u(x) = U(\mathbf{x})$ for $\mathbf{x} \in B$ and $x = |\mathbf{x}|_{\mathbb{R}^N}$, we came to consider the problem (1).

After completing the present work, we learned that Cho and Okamoto [13] extended the work in [7]. The time dimension was discretized by the semi-implicit Euler method in [7], but Cho and Okamoto [13] explored the explicit scheme, then proved optimal-order convergence with Nakagawa’s strategy. Because their schemes use special approximations around the origin to maintain some analytical properties of the solution, they should be performed on a uniform spatial mesh. Conversely, when seeking the blow up solution, non-uniform partitions of the space variable are useful for examining highly concentrated solutions at the origin. For this purpose, we developed the FEM scheme.

FEM analyses of the linear case, in which $f(u) = 0$ in Eq.(1) is replaced by a given function $f(x, t)$, are not new. Eriksson and Thomée [16] and Thomée [37] studied the convergence

property of the elliptic equation, and proposed two schemes: the symmetric scheme, in which the optimal-order error is estimated in the weighted L^2 norm, and the nonsymmetric scheme, in which the L^∞ error is estimated. However, their finite element schemes are not easily adaptable to the semilinear equation (1), as reported in our earlier study [31]. Our earlier results are briefly summarized below:

- If f is *globally* Lipschitz continuous, the solution of the symmetric scheme converges to the solution of (1) in the weighted L^2 norm in space and in the L^∞ norm in time. Moreover, the convergence is at the optimal order (see Theorem 4.1 in [31]).
- If f is *locally* Lipschitz continuous and $N \leq 3$, the same conclusion holds (see Theorem 4.3 in [31]). However, if $N \geq 4$, the convergence properties are not guaranteed. For this reason, interest in radially symmetric problems has diminished.
- If $f(u) = u|u|^\alpha$ with $\alpha \geq 1$ and the time partition is uniform, the solution of the non-symmetric scheme converges to the solution of (1) in the $L^\infty(0, T; L^\infty(I))$ norm. Optimal-order convergence holds up to the logarithmic factor (see Theorem 4.6 in [31]). Nakagawa's time-increment control strategy is difficult to apply in such cases.

As the non-symmetric scheme seems to be incompatible with Nakagawa's time-increment control strategy, we pose the following question: Can the restriction $N \leq 3$ be removed from the symmetric scheme? In fact, this restriction is imposed by the inverse inequality Lemma 4.8 in [31] and the necessity of finding the boundedness of the finite element solution (see the proof of Theorem 4.3 in [31]). To surmount this difficulty, the L^∞ estimates for the FEM can be directly derived using the discrete maximum principle (DMP). As the DMP is based largely on the nonnegativity of the finite element solution, the time derivative term should be approximated by the mass-lumping approximation. Unfortunately, we tried but failed to prove the convergence property of the finite element solution by this approximation (see (8) below). Therefore, we propose a new mass-lumping approximation (9) in this paper. Using the new approximation, we prove the DMP and the convergence property of the finite element solution, and perform the blow up analysis for any $N \geq 2$.

Our typical results are summarized below. Here, our schemes are denoted as (ML-1) and (ML-2).

- The solution of (ML-1) is non-negative if f and u^0 satisfy some conditions (Theorem 2.2). Furthermore, if the time increment satisfies condition (12), the solution of (ML-2) is also non-negative (Theorem 2.2). Theorem 2.3 gives a useful sufficient condition of (12).
- The solution of (ML-1) converges to the solution of (1) in the weighted L^2 norm in space and in the L^∞ norm in time. Moreover, the convergence is at the optimal order (Theorem 2.4). The proof is based on a sub-optimal estimate in the $L^\infty(0, T; L^\infty(I))$ norm (Theorem 2.5).
- If condition (12) is satisfied, then the solution of (ML-2) converges to the solution of (1) in the $L^\infty(0, T; L^\infty(I))$ norm (Theorem 2.6). Unfortunately, the order of the convergence is sub-optimal.
- The solution of (ML-2) reproduces the blow up property of the solution of (1) (Theorems 5.6 and 5.7).

This paper comprises six sections and an Appendix. Section 2 presents our finite element schemes and the convergence theorems (Theorems 2.4–2.6). After describing our preliminary results in Section 3, we prove our convergence theorems in Section 4. Section 5 reports the results of our blow-up analysis, and Section 6 validates our theoretical results with numerical examples. Appendix A presents the proofs of some auxiliary results on the eigenvalue problems.

2. The schemes and their convergence results

Throughout this paper, f is assumed as a locally Lipschitz continuous function of $\mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

For some arbitrary $\chi \in \dot{H}^1 = \{v \in H^1(I) \mid v(1) = 0\}$, we multiply both sides of (1a) by $x^{N-1}\chi$ and integrate by parts over I . We thus obtain

$$\int_I x^{N-1} u_t \chi \, dx + \int_I x^{N-1} u_x \chi_x \, dx = \int_I x^{N-1} f(u) \chi \, dx. \quad (4)$$

Therefore a weak formulation of (1) is stated as follows. For $t > 0$, find $u(\cdot, t) \in \dot{H}^1$ such that

$$(u_t, \chi) + A(u, \chi) = (f(u), \chi) \quad (\forall \chi \in \dot{H}^1), \quad (5)$$

where

$$(w, v) = \int_I x^{N-1} w v \, dx, \quad A(w, v) = \int_I x^{N-1} w_x v_x \, dx. \quad (6)$$

We now introduce the finite element method. For a positive integer m , we introduce node points

$$0 = x_0 < x_1 < \cdots < x_{j-1} < x_j < \cdots < x_{m-1} < x_m = 1,$$

and set $I_j = (x_{j-1}, x_j)$ and $h_j = x_j - x_{j-1}$, where $j = 1, \dots, m$. The granularity parameter is defined as $h = \max_{1 \leq j \leq m} h_j$. Let $\mathcal{P}_k(J)$ be the set of all polynomials in an interval J of degree $\leq k$. The \mathcal{P}_1 finite element space is defined as

$$S_h = \{v \in H^1(I) \mid v \in \mathcal{P}_1(I_j) \ (j = 1, \dots, m), \ v(1) = 0\}. \quad (7)$$

The standard basis function $\phi_j \in S_h$, $j = 0, 1, \dots, m$ is defined as

$$\phi_j(x_i) = \delta_{ij},$$

where δ_{ij} denotes Kronecker's delta. We note that $S_h \subset \dot{H}^1$ and that any function of \dot{H}^1 is identified with a continuous function. The Lagrange interpolation operator Π_h of $C(\bar{I}) \rightarrow S_h$

is defined as $\Pi_h w = \sum_{j=0}^m w(x_j) \phi_j$ for $w \in C(\bar{I})$, where $C(\bar{I})$ denotes the set of all continuous functions in \bar{I} .

The mass-lumping approximation of the weighted L^2 norm (\cdot, \cdot) can be naturally defined as

$$(w, v) \approx w(x_0)v(x_0) \int_0^{x_{1/2}} x^{N-1} \, dx + \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} w(x_i)v(x_i) \int_{x_{i-1/2}}^{x_{i+1/2}} x^{N-1} \, dx, \quad (8)$$

where $x_{i-1/2} = (x_i + x_{i-1})/2$. As mentioned in the Introduction, this standard formulation is useless for our purpose. Instead, we define

$$\langle w, v \rangle = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} w(x_i)v(x_i)(1, \phi_i) \quad (w, v \in \dot{H}^1). \quad (9)$$

This definition leads to the following result, which can be verified by direct calculation.

Lemma 2.1. *We have $\langle 1, w \rangle = (1, \Pi_h w)$ for any $w \in C(\bar{I})$.*

The associated norms with (\cdot, \cdot) and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ are respectively given by

$$\|v\| = (v, v)^{1/2} \quad \text{and} \quad \|v\| = \langle v, v \rangle^{1/2}.$$

These norms are equivalent in S_h as mentioned in Lemma 3.4.

The time discretization is non-uniformly partitioned as

$$t_0 = 0, \quad t_n = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \tau_j \quad (n \geq 1),$$

where $\tau_j > 0$ denotes the time increment. Furthermore, we set

$$\tau = \sup_{j \geq 0} \tau_j.$$

In general, we write $\partial_{\tau_n} u_h^{n+1} = (u_h^{n+1} - u_h^n) / \tau_n$.

The finite element schemes are then stated as follows.

(ML-1) Find $u_h^{n+1} \in S_h$, $n = 0, 1, \dots$, such that

$$\langle \partial_{\tau_n} u_h^{n+1}, \chi \rangle + A(u_h^{n+1}, \chi) = (f(u_h^n), \chi) \quad (\chi \in S_h), \quad (10)$$

where $u_h^0 \in S_h$ is assumed to be given.

(ML-2) Find $u_h^{n+1} \in S_h$, $n = 0, 1, \dots$, such that

$$\langle \partial_{\tau_n} u_h^{n+1}, \chi \rangle + A(u_h^n, \chi) = \langle f(u_h^n), \chi \rangle \quad (\chi \in S_h). \quad (11)$$

Below, we will show the optimal order error estimate in the weighted L^2 norm for the solution of (ML-1). On the other hand, we are able to show only a sub-optimal order error estimate in the L^∞ norm for the solution of (ML-2). Nevertheless, we consider (ML-2) because it is suitable for the blow-up analysis (see Section 5).

We also summarize the well-posedness of our schemes. The proof is omitted because it is identical to Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 in [31].

Theorem 2.2. *Suppose that $n \geq 0$ and $u_h^n \in S_h$ are given.*

- (i) *Schemes (ML-1) and (ML-2) admit unique solutions $u_h^{n+1} \in S_h$.*
- (ii) *In addition to the basic assumption on f , assume that f is a non-decreasing function with $f(0) \geq 0$. If $u_h^n \geq 0$, then the solution u_h^{n+1} of (ML-1) satisfies $u_h^{n+1} \geq 0$.*
- (iii) *Under the assumptions of (ii) above, further assume that*

$$\tau \leq \min_{0 \leq i \leq m-1} \frac{(1, \phi_i)}{A(\phi_i, \phi_i)}. \quad (12)$$

Then the solution u_h^{n+1} of (ML-2) satisfies $u_h^{n+1} \geq 0$.

To provide a useful sufficient condition under which (12) holds, we assume that the partition $\{x_i\}_{i=0}^m$ of $\bar{I} = [0, 1]$ is quasi-uniform, that is,

$$h \leq \beta \min_{1 \leq j \leq m} h_j, \quad (13)$$

where β is a positive constant independent of h .

Theorem 2.3. *Inequality (12) holds if*

$$\tau \leq \frac{\beta^2}{N+1} h^2. \quad (14)$$

Proof. A direct calculation gives

$$\frac{(1, \phi_i)}{A(\phi_i, \phi_i)} \geq \frac{1}{N+1} h_i^2 \geq \frac{\beta^2}{N+1} h^2$$

for any i . Therefore, (14) implies (12). \square

We now proceed to the convergence analysis. Our results for (ML-1) and (ML-2) assume a smooth solution u of (1): given $T > 0$ and setting $Q_T = [0, 1] \times [0, T]$, we assume that u is sufficiently smooth such that

$$\kappa(u) = \sum_{k=0}^2 \|\partial_x^k u\|_{L^\infty(Q_T)} + \sum_{l=1}^2 \|\partial_t^l u\|_{L^\infty(Q_T)} + \sum_{k=1}^2 \|\partial_t \partial_x^k u\|_{L^\infty(Q_T)} < \infty. \quad (15)$$

Here, we have used the conventional $\|v\|_{L^\infty(\omega)} = \max_{\bar{\omega}} |v|$ for a continuous function v defined in a bounded set ω in \mathbb{R}^p , $p \geq 1$.

Moreover, the approximate initial value u_h^0 is chosen as

$$\|u_h^0 - u^0\|_{L^\infty(I)} \leq C_0 h^2 \quad (16)$$

for a positive constant C_0 .

We now express positive constants $C = C(\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots)$ depending only on the parameters $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots$. Particularly, C is independent of h and τ .

Theorem 2.4 (Optimal L^2 error estimate for (ML-1)). *Assume that, for $T > 0$, the solution u of (1) is sufficiently smooth that (15) holds. Moreover, assume that (13) and (16) are satisfied. Then, for sufficiently small h and τ , we have*

$$\sup_{0 \leq t_n \leq T} \|u_h^n - u(\cdot, t_n)\| \leq C(h^2 + \tau), \quad (17)$$

where $C = C(T, f, \kappa(u), C_0, N, \beta)$ and u_h^n is the solution of (ML-1).

The following result, which is worth a separate mention, gives only a sub-optimal error estimate but is useful for proving Theorem 2.4.

Theorem 2.5 (Sub-optimal L^∞ error estimate for (ML-1)). *Under the assumptions of Theorem 2.4 and for sufficiently small h and τ , we have*

$$\sup_{0 \leq t_n \leq T} \|u_h^n - u(\cdot, t_n)\|_{L^\infty(I)} \leq C(h + \tau), \quad (18)$$

where $C = C(T, f, \kappa(u), C_0, N, \beta)$ and u_h^n is the solution of (ML-1).

Theorem 2.6 (Sub-optimal L^∞ error estimate for (ML-2)). *Also under the assumptions of Theorem 2.4, assume that (12) is satisfied. Then, for sufficiently small h and τ , we have*

$$\sup_{0 \leq t_n \leq T} \|u_h^n - u(\cdot, t_n)\|_{L^\infty(I)} \leq C(h + \tau), \quad (19)$$

where $C = C(T, f, \kappa(u), C_0, N, \beta)$ and u_h^n is the solution of (ML-2).

Remark 2.7. Other schemes based on the mass-lumping $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ are possible. For example, the scheme

$$\langle \partial_{\tau_n} u_h^{n+1}, \chi \rangle + A(u_h^{n+1}, \chi) = \langle f(u_h^n), \chi \rangle \quad (\chi \in S_h) \quad (20)$$

and

$$\langle \partial_{\tau_n} u_h^{n+1}, \chi \rangle + A(u_h^n, \chi) = \langle f(u_h^n), \chi \rangle \quad (\chi \in S_h). \quad (21)$$

have very similar properties to those of (ML-1) and (ML-2). We omit the details because the modifications are easily performed.

3. Preliminaries

This section gives some preliminary results of the theorem proofs. The quasi-uniformity condition (13) is always assumed.

For some $w \in \dot{H}^1$, the projection operator P_A of $\dot{H}^1 \rightarrow S_h$ associated with $A(\cdot, \cdot)$ is defined as

$$P_A w \in S_h, \quad A(P_A w - w, \chi) = 0 \quad (\chi \in S_h). \quad (22)$$

The following error estimates are proved in [16] and [26].

Lemma 3.1. *Letting $w \in C^2(\bar{I}) \cap \dot{H}^1$, and h be sufficient small, we obtain*

$$\|P_A w - w\| \leq Ch^2 \|w_{xx}\|, \quad (23a)$$

$$\|P_A w - w\|_{L^\infty(I)} \leq C \left(\log \frac{1}{h} \right) h^2 \|w_{xx}\|_{L^\infty(I)}, \quad (23b)$$

where $C = C(\beta, N) > 0$.

Lemma 3.2 (Inverse estimate). *There exists a constant $C = C(\beta, N) > 0$ such that*

$$\|w_x\| \leq Ch^{-1} \|w\| \quad (w \in S_h).$$

Proof. The proof is identical to that of the standard inverse estimate. \square

Lemma 3.3. *Let $w \in C(\bar{I})$ be a piecewise quadratic function in I , that is, $w|_{I_j} \in \mathcal{P}_2(I_j)$ ($j = 1, \dots, m$). Then, we have*

$$\int_I x^{N-1} |\Pi_h w - w| dx \leq Ch^2 \|x^{N-1} w_{xx}\|_{L^1(I)}, \quad (24)$$

where $C = C(\beta, N) > 0$.

Proof. To prove (24), it suffices to replace $I = I_j$ with $j = 1, \dots, m$. First, let $j \geq 2$. By Taylor's theorem, we can write

$$|\Pi_h w(x) - w(x)| \leq Ch_j \int_{I_j} |w_{xx}(\xi)| d\xi \quad (x \in I_j). \quad (25)$$

Referring to (13), we see that

$$\frac{x}{x_{j-1}} = 1 + \frac{x - x_{j-1}}{x_{j-1}} \leq 1 + \frac{h_j}{h_{j-1}} \leq 1 + \beta \quad (x \in \bar{I}_j). \quad (26)$$

Combining (25) and (26), we deduce that

$$x^{N-1}|\Pi_h w(x) - w(x)| \leq C(1 + \beta)^{N-1} h_j \int_{I_j} x^{N-1} |w_{xx}(\xi)| d\xi \quad (x \in I_j).$$

Integrating both sides, we obtain (24) for $I = I_j$ and $j \geq 2$. We now proceed to the case $m = 1$. Setting $w(x) = ax^2 + bx + c$ for $x \in I_1$, where a, b and c are constants, we express $\Pi_h w(x) - w(x) = ax(h_1 - x)$ for $x \in I_1$. Therefore, we directly obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{I_1} x^{N-1} |\Pi_h w(x) - w(x)| dx &= \frac{|a|}{(N+1)(N+2)} h_1^{N+2}, \\ h_1^2 \|x^{N-1} w_{xx}\|_{L^1(I_1)} &= \frac{2}{N} |a| h_1^{N+2}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies (24) for $I = I_1$. □

Lemma 3.4. *There exist constants $C = C(\beta, N)$ and $C' = C'(\beta, N)$ such that*

$$C' \| \|w\| \| \leq \|w\| \leq C \| \|w\| \quad (w \in S_h).$$

Proof. Let $w \in S_h$. To prove the first inequality, we note that w^2 is a piecewise quadratic function and $(w^2)_{xx} = 2(w_x)^2$. By Lemmas 3.3 and 3.2, we get

$$\begin{aligned} | \langle w, w \rangle - (w, w) | &\leq Ch^2 \|x^{N-1} (w^2)_{xx}\|_{L^1(I)} \\ &\leq Ch^2 \|w_x\|^2 \\ &\leq C \|w\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

which implies the first inequality.

To prove the second inequality, we estimate $\| \|w\|$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \|w\|^2 &\leq \sum_{j=1}^m \left[w(x_{j-1})^2 \int_{x_{j-1}}^{x_j} x^{N-1} dx + w(x_j)^2 \int_{x_{j-1}}^{x_j} x^{N-1} dx \right] \\ &= w(x_0)^2 \int_{x_0}^{x_1} x^{N-1} dx + \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} w(x_j)^2 \int_{x_{j-1}}^{x_{j+1}} x^{N-1} dx. \end{aligned}$$

We also express $\| \|w\|$ as

$$\| \|w\|^2 = w(x_0)^2 \int_{x_0}^{x_1} x^{N-1} \phi_0(x) dx + \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} w(x_j)^2 \int_{x_{j-1}}^{x_{j+1}} x^{N-1} \phi_j(x) dx.$$

Therefore, it suffices to show that

$$\int_{x_0}^{x_1} x^{N-1} dx \leq C_1 \int_{x_0}^{x_1} x^{N-1} \phi_0 dx, \tag{27a}$$

$$\int_{x_{j-1}}^{x_{j+1}} x^{N-1} dx \leq C_2 \int_{x_{j-1}}^{x_{j+1}} x^{N-1} \phi_j dx \quad (j = 1, \dots, m), \tag{27b}$$

where $C_1 = C_1(N) > 0$ and $C_2 = C_2(N) > 0$.

Equation (27b) is directly verified using (26). Equation (27a) is obtained by the change-of-variables technique, setting $\xi = x/h_1$. □

We here introduce two auxiliary problems. Given $n \geq 0$, $g_h^n \in S_h$ and $u_h^n \in S_h$, we seek $u_h^{n+1} \in S_h$ such that

$$\langle \partial_{\tau_n} u_h^{n+1}, \chi \rangle + A(u_h^{n+1}, \chi) = \langle g_h^n, \chi \rangle \quad (\chi \in S_h), \quad (28)$$

and

$$\langle \partial_{\tau_n} u_h^{n+1}, \chi \rangle + A(u_h^n, \chi) = \langle g_h^n, \chi \rangle \quad (\chi \in S_h). \quad (29)$$

Lemma 3.5. *Suppose that $n \geq 0$ and $u_h^n, g_h^n \in S_h$ are given. Then, problem (28) admits a unique solution $u_h^{n+1} \in S_h$ and it satisfies*

$$\|u_h^{n+1}\|_{L^\infty(I)} \leq \|u_h^n\|_{L^\infty(I)} + \tau_n \|g_h^n\|_{L^\infty(I)}. \quad (30)$$

Problem (29) also admits a unique solution $u_h^{n+1} \in S_h$ that satisfies (30) under condition (12).

Proof. The unique existence of the solution of (28) can be verified by a standard approach (see Theorems 3.1, 3.2 in [31]). Substituting $\chi = \phi_i$, $i = 0, \dots, m-1$, in (28), we have

$$\frac{\tau_n a_{i,i-1}}{m_i} u_{i-1}^{n+1} + \left(1 + \frac{\tau_n a_{i,i}}{m_i}\right) u_i^{n+1} + \frac{\tau_n a_{i,i+1}}{m_i} u_{i+1}^{n+1} = u_i^n + \tau_n g_i^n,$$

where $u_i^n = u_h^n(x_i)$, $g_i^n = g_h^n(x_i)$, $a_{i,j} = A(\phi_j, \phi_i)$ and $m_i = (1, \phi_i)$. Therein, we should understand that $a_{0,-1} = 0$, $m_0 = 1$ and $u_{-1}^{n+1} = 1$. Moreover, substituting $\chi = \phi_i$ in (29), we get

$$u_i^{n+1} = -\frac{\tau_n a_{i,i-1}}{m_i} u_{i-1}^n + \left(1 - \frac{\tau_n a_{i,i}}{m_i}\right) u_i^n - \frac{\tau_n a_{i,i+1}}{m_i} u_{i+1}^n + \tau_n g_i^n.$$

From these expressions, (30) is deduced by a standard argument. \square

4. Proofs of Theorems 2.4, 2.5 and 2.6

Proof of Theorem 2.4 using Theorem 2.5. This proof is divided into the following two steps: *Step 1.* We prove Theorem 2.4 under an additional assumption: f is a globally Lipschitz function. That is, we assume

$$M = \sup_{\substack{s, s' \in \mathbb{R} \\ s \neq s'}} \frac{|f(s) - f(s')|}{|s - s'|} < \infty. \quad (31)$$

Using $P_A u$, we divide the error into the form

$$u_h^n - u(\cdot, t_n) = \underbrace{(u_h^n - P_A u(\cdot, t_n))}_{=v_h^n} + \underbrace{(P_A u(\cdot, t_n) - u(\cdot, t_n))}_{=w^n}. \quad (32)$$

From (23a), we know that

$$\|w^n\| \leq Ch^2 \|u_{xx}(t_n)\| \leq Ch^2 \|u_{xx}\|_{L^\infty(Q_T)} \quad (33)$$

and that $\partial_{\tau_n} P_A v = P_A \partial_{\tau_n} v$ for $v \in C(\bar{I})$.

We now estimate v_h^n . Using the weak form (5) at $t = t_{n+1}$, scheme (ML-1), and the property of P_A , we obtain

$$\langle \partial_{\tau_n} v_h^{n+1}, \chi \rangle + A(v_h^{n+1}, \chi) = (\text{I} + \text{II} + \text{III} + \text{IV} + \text{V})(\chi) \quad (\chi \in S_h), \quad (34)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{I}(\chi) &= (f(u_h^n), \chi) - (f(u(\cdot, t_n)), \chi), \\
\text{II}(\chi) &= (u_t(t_{n+1}), \chi) - (\partial_{\tau_n} u(\cdot, t_{n+1}), \chi), \\
\text{III}(\chi) &= (f(u(\cdot, t_n)), \chi) - (f(u(\cdot, t_{n+1})), \chi), \\
\text{IV}(\chi) &= (\partial_{\tau_n} u(\cdot, t_{n+1}), \chi) - (P_A \partial_{\tau_n} u(\cdot, t_{n+1}), \chi) = (\partial_{\tau_n} w^{n+1}, \chi), \\
\text{V}(\chi) &= (\partial_{\tau_n} P_A u(\cdot, t_{n+1}), \chi) - \langle \partial_{\tau_n} P_A u(\cdot, t_{n+1}), \chi \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

The estimations of I–IV are straightforward. That is, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|\text{I}(\chi)| &\leq M(\|w^n\| + \|v_h^n\|) \cdot \|\chi\|, \\
|\text{II}(\chi)| &\leq \tau_n \|u_{tt}\|_{L^\infty(Q_T)} \|\chi\|, \\
|\text{III}(\chi)| &\leq \tau_n M \|u_t\|_{L^\infty(Q_T)} \|\chi\|, \\
|\text{IV}(\chi)| &\leq Ch^2 \|u_{txx}\|_{L^\infty(Q_T)} \|\chi\|.
\end{aligned}$$

To estimate V, we use Lemmas 2.1 and 3.3. Lemma 3.3 is applicable because $\partial_{\tau_n} P_A u(\cdot, t_{n+1})\chi$ is a piecewise quadratic function. That is,

$$\begin{aligned}
|\text{V}(\chi)| &= (1, \Pi_h(\partial_{\tau_n} P_A u(\cdot, t_{n+1})\chi) - \partial_{\tau_n} P_A u(\cdot, t_{n+1})\chi) \\
&\leq Ch^2 \|x^{N-1} \{\partial_{\tau_n} P_A u(\cdot, t_{n+1})\chi\}_{xx}\|_{L^1(I)} \\
&\leq Ch^2 \|x^{N-1} (P_A \partial_{\tau_n} u(\cdot, t_{n+1}))_x \cdot \chi_x\|_{L^1(I)} \\
&\leq Ch^2 \|(P_A \partial_{\tau_n} u(\cdot, t_{n+1}))_x\| \cdot \|\chi_x\| \\
&\leq Ch^2 \|(\partial_{\tau_n} u(\cdot, t_{n+1}))_x\| \cdot \|\chi_x\| \\
&\leq Ch^2 \|u_{tx}\|_{L^\infty(Q_T)} \|\chi_x\|.
\end{aligned}$$

Substituting $\chi = v_h^{n+1}$ in (34) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2\tau_n} (\|v_h^{n+1}\|^2 - \|v_h^n\|^2) + \|(v_h^{n+1})_x\|^2 &\leq \\
&C \|v_h^n\| \cdot \|(v_h^{n+1})_x\| + C(h^2 + \tau_n) \kappa(u) \|(v_h^{n+1})_x\|.
\end{aligned}$$

Herein, we have used Lemma 3.4 and the Poincaré inequality (Lemma 18.1 in [37]). By Young's inequality, we then deduce that

$$\frac{1}{\tau_n} (\|v_h^{n+1}\|^2 - \|v_h^n\|^2) \leq C \|v_h^n\|^2 + C(h^2 + \tau_n)^2 \kappa(u)^2.$$

Therefore,

$$\|v_h^n\|^2 \leq e^{CT} \|v_h^0\|^2 + C(\exp(CT) - 1)(h^2 + \tau_n)^2 \kappa(u)^2,$$

which completes the proof.

Step 2. Let $r = 1 + \|u\|_{L^\infty(Q_T)}$. Consider (1) and (ML–1) with replacement $f(s)$ in:

$$\tilde{f}(s) = \begin{cases} f(r) & (s \geq r) \\ f(s) & (|s| \leq r) \\ -f(-r) & (s \leq -r). \end{cases}$$

The function \tilde{f} is a locally Lipschitz function satisfying

$$M = \sup_{\substack{s, s' \in \mathbb{R} \\ s \neq s'}} \frac{|\tilde{f}(s) - \tilde{f}(s')|}{|s - s'|} = \sup_{\substack{|s|, |s'| \leq r \\ s \neq s'}} \frac{|f(s) - f(s')|}{|s - s'|}.$$

Let \tilde{u} and \tilde{u}_h^n be the solutions of (1) and (ML-1) with \tilde{f} , respectively. Applying Step 1 and Theorem 2.5 to \tilde{u} and \tilde{u}_h^n , we obtain

$$\sup_{0 \leq t_n \leq T} \|\tilde{u}_h^n - \tilde{u}(\cdot, t_n)\| \leq C(h^2 + \tau), \quad (35a)$$

$$\sup_{0 \leq t_n \leq T} \|\tilde{u}_h^n - \tilde{u}(\cdot, t_n)\|_{L^\infty(I)} \leq C \left(h + h^2 \log \frac{1}{h} + \tau \right). \quad (35b)$$

By the definition of r and the uniqueness of the solution of (1), we know that $u = \tilde{u}$ in Q_T . For sufficiently small h and τ , we have

$$C \left(h + h^2 \log \frac{1}{h} + \tau \right) \leq 1.$$

Consequently, $\|\tilde{u}_h^n\|_{L^\infty(I)} \leq r$ for $0 \leq t_n \leq T$ and, by the uniqueness of the solution of (ML-1), we have $u_h^n = \tilde{u}_h^n$. Therefore, (35a) implies the desired result. \square

We now proceed to the proof of Theorem 2.5.

Proof of Theorem 2.5. The notation is that of the previous proof. It suffices to prove Theorem 2.5 under assumption (31), which is generalizable to an arbitrary f as demonstrate in the previous proof. By (23b), we have $\|v_h^0\|_{L^\infty(I)} \leq Ch^2 \log(1/h)\kappa(u)$ and $\|w^n\|_{L^\infty(I)} \leq Ch^2 \log(1/h)\kappa(u)$ for $0 \leq t_n \leq T$. Therefore, it remains to estimate v_h^n when $0 < t_n \leq T$. Setting

$$G_h^n = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} G_i^n \phi_i, \quad G_i^n = \frac{(\text{I} + \text{II} + \text{III} + \text{IV} + \text{V})(\phi_i)}{(1, \phi_i)},$$

we rewrite (34) as

$$\langle \partial_{\tau_n} v_h^{n+1}, \chi \rangle + A(v_h^{n+1}, \chi) = \langle G_h^n, \chi \rangle \quad (\chi \in S_h).$$

Showing that

$$\|G_h^n\|_{L^\infty(I)} \leq M \|v_h^n\|_{L^\infty(I)} + C(h + \tau)\kappa(u), \quad (36)$$

we can apply Lemma 3.5 to obtain

$$\|v_h^{n+1}\|_{L^\infty(I)} \leq (1 + M\tau_n) \|v_h^n\|_{L^\infty(I)} + \tau_n \cdot C(h + \tau)\kappa(u),$$

and, consequently,

$$\|v_h^n\|_{L^\infty(I)} \leq e^{Mt_n} \|v_h^0\|_{L^\infty(I)} + \frac{e^{Mt_n} - 1}{M} C(h + \tau)\kappa(u).$$

Thereby, we deduce the desired estimate.

Below we prove the truth of (36). Recall that we assumed global Lipschitz continuity (31) on f .

$I(\phi_i)$ – $IV(\phi_i)$ are straightforwardly estimated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} |I(\phi_i)| &\leq M[\|v_h^n\|_{L^\infty(I)} + Ch^2 \log(1/h)\kappa(u)] \cdot (1, \phi_i), \\ |\text{II}(\phi_i)| &\leq \tau_n \kappa(u)(1, \phi_i), \\ |\text{III}(\phi_i)| &\leq M\tau_n \kappa(u)(1, \phi_i), \\ |\text{IV}(\phi_i)| &\leq Ch^2 \log(1/h)\kappa(u)(1, \phi_i). \end{aligned}$$

To estimate $V(\phi_i)$, we write

$$V(\phi_i) = V_1(\phi_i) + V_2(\phi_i) + V_3(\phi_i),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} V_1(\phi_i) &= (\partial_{\tau_n} P_A u(\cdot, t_{n+1}), \phi_i) - (\partial_{\tau_n} u(\cdot, t_{n+1}), \phi_i), \\ V_2(\phi_i) &= (\partial_{\tau_n} u(\cdot, t_{n+1}), \phi_i) - \langle \partial_{\tau_n} u(\cdot, t_{n+1}), \phi_i \rangle, \\ V_3(\phi_i) &= \langle \partial_{\tau_n} u(\cdot, t_{n+1}), \phi_i \rangle - \langle \partial_{\tau_n} P_A u(\cdot, t_{n+1}), \phi_i \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

The above terms are respectively estimated as:

$$\begin{aligned} |V_1(\phi_i)| &\leq \|P_A(\partial_{\tau_n} u(\cdot, t_{n+1})) - \partial_{\tau_n} u(\cdot, t_{n+1})\|_\infty (1, \phi_i) \\ &\leq Ch^2 \log(1/h)\kappa(u)(1, \phi_i); \\ |V_2(\phi_i)| &\leq \int_I x^{N-1} |\partial_{\tau_n} u(x, t_{n+1}) - \partial_{\tau_n} u(x_i, t_{n+1})| \phi_i(x) dx \\ &\leq Ch\kappa(u)(1, \phi_i); \\ |V_3(\phi_i)| &\leq |\partial_{\tau_n} u(x_i, t_{n+1}) - P_A \partial_{\tau_n} u(x_i, t_{n+1})| (1, \phi_i) \\ &\leq Ch^2 \log(1/h)\kappa(u)(1, \phi_i). \end{aligned}$$

We thereby deduce that

$$\|G_h^n\|_{L^\infty(I)} \leq M\|v_h\|_{L^\infty(I)} + C(h + h^2 \log(1/h) + \tau)\kappa(u)$$

which implies (36). This step completes the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.6. The proof is identical to that of Theorem 2.5. \square

5. Blow-up analysis

5.1. Results

This section considers the spacial nonlinearity

$$f(s) = s|s|^\alpha, \quad \alpha > 0.$$

As we are interested in non-negative solutions, we assume that

$$u^0 \geq 0, \neq 0, \quad u_h^0 \geq 0, \neq 0. \quad (37)$$

Therefore, the solution u of (1) is non-negative and the solution u_h^n of (ML-2) is also non-negative under condition (12). Generally, the solution of (1) blows up when the initial data u_0

are sufficiently large, and the blow up is controlled by the energy functional associated with (1). Herein, we study whether or not the numerical solution behaves similarly by initially defining some properties of the solution u of (1). In particular, we see that (ML-2) is suitable for this purpose.

The energy functionals associated with (1) are defined as

$$K(v) = \frac{1}{2} \|v_x\|^2 - \frac{1}{\alpha + 2} \int_I x^{N-1} |v(x)|^{\alpha+2} dx,$$

$$I(v) = \int_I x^{N-1} v(x) \psi(x) dx,$$

where $\psi \in \dot{H}^1$ denotes the eigenfunction associated with the first eigenvalue $\mu > 0$ of the eigenvalue problem

$$A(\psi, \chi) = \mu(\psi, \chi) \quad (\chi \in \dot{H}^1). \quad (38)$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that $\psi \geq 0$ in I and $\int_I x^{N-1} \psi(x) dx = 1$.

The following propositions 5.1, 5.2, and 5.3 are often applied to the semilinear heat equation in a bounded domain. They are easily extended to the radially symmetric case.

Proposition 5.1. *$K(u(t))$ is a non-increasing function of t , where u is the solution of (1).*

Proposition 5.2. *Suppose that $u^0 \geq 0, \neq 0$ and u is the solution of (1). Then, the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) *There exists $T_\infty > 0$ such that u blows up at $t = T_\infty$ in the sense that $\lim_{t \rightarrow T_\infty} \|u(\cdot, t)\| = \infty$.*
- (ii) *There exists $t_0 \geq 0$ such that $K(u(\cdot, t_0)) < 0$.*

Proposition 5.3. *Suppose that $u^0 \geq 0, \neq 0$ and that u is the solution of (1). Then, the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) *There exists $T_\infty > 0$ such that u blows up at $t = T_\infty$ in the sense that $\lim_{t \rightarrow T_\infty} I(u(\cdot, t)) = \infty$.*
- (ii) *There exists $t_0 \geq 0$ such that $I(u(\cdot, t_0)) > \mu^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}$.*

Remark 5.4. In Propositions 5.2 and 5.3, the blow up time T_∞ is estimated respectively as

$$T_\infty \leq t_0 + \frac{\alpha + 2}{\alpha^2} N^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \|u(\cdot, t_0)\|^{-\alpha}.$$

and

$$T_\infty \leq t_0 + \int_{I(u(\cdot, t_0))}^{\infty} \frac{ds}{-\mu s + s^{1+\alpha}}.$$

We now proceed to the discrete energy functionals. To this end, we employ the finite element version of the eigenvalue problem:

$$A(\hat{\psi}_h, \chi_h) = \hat{\mu}_h \langle \hat{\psi}_h, \chi_h \rangle \quad (\chi_h \in S_h). \quad (39)$$

Let $\hat{\psi}_h \in S_h$ be the eigenfunction associated with the smallest eigenvalue $\hat{\mu}_h > 0$ of (39). For the eigenvalue problem (39), we state the following result, postponing the proof to the Appendix.

Proposition 5.5. *If the partition $\{x_j\}_{j=0}^m$ is quasi-uniform, that is, satisfies (13), we have the following:*

- (i) $\hat{\mu}_h \rightarrow \mu$ as $h \rightarrow 0$.
- (ii) *The first eigenfunction $\hat{\psi}_h$ of (39) does not change sign.*
- (iii) $\|(\hat{\psi}_h - \psi)_x\| \rightarrow 0$ as $h \rightarrow 0$.

Therefore, without loss of generality, we can assume that $\hat{\psi}_h \geq 0$ and $\int_I x^{N-1} \hat{\psi}_h(x) dx = 1$. For $v \in S_h$, we set

$$K_h(v) = \frac{1}{2} \|v_x\|^2 - \frac{1}{\alpha + 2} \sum_{i=0}^m |v(x_i)|^{\alpha+2} (1, \phi_i),$$

$$I_h(v) = \left\langle v, \hat{\psi}_h \right\rangle = \int_I x^{N-1} \Pi_h(v \hat{\psi}_h)(x) dx.$$

We introduce the approximate blow-up time $\hat{T}_\infty(h)$ by setting

$$\hat{T}_\infty(h) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} t_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \tau_j. \quad (40)$$

We are now in a position to mention the main theorems in this section:

Theorem 5.6. *Let (37) be satisfied. Suppose that the solution u of (1) blows up at finite time T_∞ in the sense that*

$$\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(I)} \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(I)} \rightarrow \infty \quad (t \rightarrow T_\infty - 0). \quad (41)$$

Assume that for any $T < T_\infty$, u is sufficiently smooth that (15) holds. Assuming also that (13) is satisfied, we set

$$\tau = \delta \frac{\beta^2}{N+1} h^2 \quad (42)$$

for some $\delta \in (0, 1]$. The time increment τ_n is iteratively defined as

$$\tau_n = \tau_n(h) = \tau \min \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{\| \|u_h^n\| \|^\alpha} \right\} \quad (43)$$

where we have used the solution u_h^n of (ML-2). Moreover, assume that (12) is satisfied and that

$$\forall T < T_\infty, \quad \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \sup_{0 \leq t_n \leq T} |K(u(\cdot, t_n)) - K_h(u_h^n)| = 0. \quad (44)$$

We then have

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \hat{T}_\infty(h) = T_\infty. \quad (45)$$

Theorem 5.7. *Let (37) be satisfied. Suppose that the solution u of (1) blows up at finite time T_∞ in the sense that*

$$I(u(\cdot, t)) \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(I)} \rightarrow \infty \quad (t \rightarrow T_\infty - 0). \quad (46)$$

Assume that, for any $T < T_\infty$, u is sufficiently smooth that (15) holds. Assuming also that (13) is satisfied, we set τ by (42) with some $\delta \in (0, 1]$. The time increment τ_n is iteratively defined as

$$\tau_n = \tau_n(h) = \tau \min \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{I_h(u_h^n)^\alpha} \right\} \quad (47)$$

where we have used the solution u_h^n of (ML-2) with (16). We then obtain (45).

Remark 5.8. The above theorems differ in that Theorem 5.6 requires the convergence property (44) of the discrete energy functional $K_h(u_h^n)$, whereas no convergence property of I_h is necessary in Theorem 5.7.

Remark 5.9. Unfortunately, we could not prove Theorems 5.6 and 5.7 using the solution of (ML-1). In particular, the proof of the difference inequalities (48) and (51) failed in scheme (ML-1).

5.2. Proof of Theorem 5.6

To prove Theorem 5.6, we follow Nakagawa's blow-up analysis [29]. For this purpose, we must derive the difference inequality (48) and the boundedness (49) of \hat{T}_∞ (see Lemmas 5.11 and 5.12). The original proof in [29] immediately follows from these results; see also [6], [7], and [12]. Therefore, we concentrate our efforts on proving Lemmas 5.11 and 5.12.

Throughout this subsection, we take the same assumptions of Theorem 5.6; in particular, the time-increment control (43). Note that condition (12) is satisfied by the definition of τ_n . Consequently, the solution u of (1) and the solution u_h^n of (ML-2) are non-negative.

Lemma 5.10. $K_h(u_h^n)$ is a non-increasing sequence of n .

Proof. Fixing some $n \geq 0$, we write $w = u_h^{n+1}$, $u = u_h^n$, $w_j = w(x_j)$, and $u_j = u(x_j)$. To show that $K_h(w) - K_h(u) \leq 0$, we perform the following division:

$$K_h(w) - K_h(u) = X + Y,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} X &= \frac{1}{2} \|w_x\|^2 - \frac{1}{2} \|u_x\|^2, \\ Y &= -\frac{1}{\alpha+2} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} w_j^{\alpha+2}(1, \phi_j) + \frac{1}{\alpha+2} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} u_j^{\alpha+2}(1, \phi_j). \end{aligned}$$

X is expressed as

$$X = A(u, w - u) + \frac{1}{2} A(w - u, w - u).$$

By the mean value theorem, there exists $\theta_j \in [0, 1]$ such that

$$w_j^{\alpha+2} - u_j^{\alpha+2} = (\alpha+2) \tilde{u}_j^{\alpha+1}(w_j - u_j),$$

where $\tilde{u}_j = u + \theta_j(w - u)$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} Y &= -\sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \tilde{u}_j^{\alpha+1}(1, \phi_j)(w_j - u_j) \\ &= -\sum_{j=0}^{m-1} [\tilde{u}_j^{\alpha+1} - u^{\alpha+1}](1, \phi_j)(w_j - u_j) - \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} u_j^{\alpha+1}(1, \phi_j)(w_j - u_j) = Y_1 + Y_2. \end{aligned}$$

We calculate

$$A(u, w - u) + Y_2 = - \left\langle \frac{w - u}{\tau_n}, w - u \right\rangle = -\frac{1}{\tau} \|w - u\|^2$$

and

$$Y_1 = - \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} (\alpha + 1) \theta_j (1, \phi_j) \hat{u}_j^\alpha (w_j - u_j)^2 \leq 0,$$

where $\hat{u}_j = u + \theta_j(\tilde{u}_j - u_j)$ with some $\theta_j \in [0, 1]$.

Meanwhile, for $v_h \in S_h(I)$, we write

$$\begin{aligned} A(v_h, v_h) &\leq 2 \sum_{j=1}^m \int_{I_j} x^{N-1} \cdot \frac{1}{h_j^2} dx \cdot (v_j^2 + v_{j-1}^2) \\ &= 2 \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} a_{jj} v_j^2. \end{aligned}$$

Using (12), we have

$$A(v_h, v_h) \leq 2 \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \frac{(1, \phi_j)}{\tau_n} v_j^2 = \frac{2}{\tau_n} \langle v_h, v_h \rangle = \frac{2}{\tau_n} \|v_h\|^2 \quad (v_h \in S_h).$$

We thereby deduce that

$$X + Y = -\frac{1}{\tau_n} \|w - u\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} A(w - u, w - u) + Y_1 \leq 0,$$

which implies that $K_h(u_h^n)$ is non-increasing in n . \square

Lemma 5.11. *If there exists a non-negative integer n' such that $K_h(u_h^n) \leq 0$ for all $n \geq n'$, we have*

$$\frac{1}{2} \partial_{\tau_n} \|u_h^{n+1}\|^2 \geq \frac{\alpha}{\alpha + 2} N^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \|u_h^n\|^{\alpha+2} \quad (n \geq n'). \quad (48)$$

Proof. Substituting $\chi_h = u_h^n$ in (ML-2), we obtain

$$\left\langle \frac{u_h^{n+1} - u_h^n}{\tau_n}, u_h^n \right\rangle + A(u_h^n, u_h^n) = \langle u_h^n (u_h^n)^\alpha, u_h^n \rangle.$$

We note that

$$\langle u_h^{n+1} - u_h^n, u_h^n \rangle \leq \left\langle u_h^{n+1} - u_h^n, \frac{1}{2}(u_h^{n+1} + u_h^n) \right\rangle = \frac{1}{2\tau_n} (\|u_h^{n+1}\|^2 - \|u_h^n\|^2).$$

By the decreasing property of $K_h(u_h^n)$, we have

$$\|(u_h^n)_x\|^2 \leq \frac{2}{\alpha + 2} \langle (u_h^n)^{\alpha+2}, 1 \rangle \quad (n \geq n').$$

Combining these results, we get

$$\frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{\tau_n} (\|u_h^{n+1}\|^2 - \|u_h^n\|^2) \geq \frac{\alpha}{\alpha + 2} \langle (u_h^n)^{\alpha+2}, 1 \rangle.$$

Using Hölder's inequality, we calculate

$$\|u_h^n\|^2 \leq (1/N)^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+2}} \cdot \langle (u_h^n)^{\alpha+2}, 1 \rangle^{\frac{2}{\alpha+2}}.$$

We thereby deduce (48). \square

Lemma 5.12. *If $J_h(u_h^{n_0}) \leq 0$ and $\|u_h^{n_0}\| \geq 1$ for some integer $n_0 \geq 0$, then we have*

$$\hat{T}_\infty(h) \leq t_{n_0} + \left\{ \frac{\alpha + 2}{\alpha^2} N^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}} + \tau \left(1 + \frac{2}{\alpha} \right) \right\} \|u_h^{n_0}\|^{-\alpha}. \quad (49)$$

Proof. From Lemma 5.11,

$$\|u_h^{n+1}\|^2 \geq (1 + 2\tau_n C \|u_h^n\|^\alpha) \|u_h^n\|^2 = (1 + 2\tau C) \|u_h^n\|^2,$$

where $C = \frac{\alpha}{\alpha+2} N^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}$. Therefore,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|u_h^n\| = \infty$$

and, for $n \geq n_0$,

$$t_n = t_{n_0} + \sum_{m=n_0}^{n-1} \tau_m = t_{n_0} + \sum_{m=n_0}^{n-1} \frac{\tau}{\|u_h^m\|^\alpha}.$$

The remainder is identical to that of Corollary 2.1 in [12], so the details are omitted here. \square

5.3. Proof of Theorem 5.7

To prove Theorem 5.7, we apply abstract theory by (Propositions 4.2 and 4.3) in [35]. In this subsection, we take the same assumptions of Theorem 5.7, in particular, the time-increment control (47).

Lemma 5.13. *We have $T_\infty \leq \liminf_{h \rightarrow 0} \hat{T}_\infty(h)$.*

Proof. The proof is shown by contradiction. Setting $S_\infty = \liminf_{h \rightarrow 0} \hat{T}_\infty(h)$, we assume that $S_\infty < T_\infty$. Then, there exists $h_0 > 0$ such that $\hat{T}_\infty(h) < M$ for all $h \leq h_0$, where $M = \frac{T_\infty + S_\infty}{2} < T_\infty$. That is, for some fixed $h \leq h_0$, we have $t_n \leq \hat{T}_\infty(h) < M$ and $I_h(u_h^n) \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. This implies that for some $0 \leq j(n) \leq m-1$, we have $u_h^n(x_{j(n)}) \rightarrow \infty$, and consequently $\|u_h^n\|_{L^\infty(I)} \rightarrow \infty$. However, from Theorem 2.6, we observe that

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \sup_{0 \leq t_n \leq M} \|u_h^n - u(\cdot, t_n)\|_{L^\infty(I)} = 0.$$

If this expression is true, then T_∞ cannot be the blow-up time of the solution u of (1). This contradiction completes the proof. \square

Lemma 5.14. *For any $T < T_\infty$, we have*

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \sup_{0 \leq t_n \leq T} |I_h(u_h^n) - I(u(\cdot, t_n))| = 0.$$

Proof. We derive separate estimations for $|I_h(u_h^n) - \tilde{I}_h(u_h^n)|$ and $|\tilde{I}_h(u_h^n) - I(u(\cdot, t_n))|$, where $\tilde{I}_h(v)$ denotes the auxiliary functional

$$\tilde{I}_h(v) = \int_I x^{N-1} v(x) \hat{\psi}_h(x) dx.$$

From Theorem 2.6, Lemma 3.3 and Proposition 5.5 (iii), we first derive

$$\begin{aligned}
|I_h(u_h^n) - \tilde{I}_h(u_h^n)| &\leq Ch^2 \|x^{N-1}(u_h^n \hat{\psi}_h)_{xx}\|_{L^1(I)} \\
&\leq Ch^2 \|(u_h^n)_x\| \cdot \|\hat{\psi}'_h\| \\
&\leq Ch \|u_h^n\|_{L^\infty(I)} \|\hat{\psi}'_h\| \\
&\leq Ch (\|u(\cdot, t_n)\|_{L^\infty(I)} + 1) (\|\psi'\| + 1),
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the elemental inequality $\|\psi_x\| \leq Ch^{-1}\|\psi\|_{L^\infty(I)}$ for $\psi \in S_h$. This implies that $|I_h(u_h^n) - \tilde{I}_h(u_h^n)| \rightarrow 0$ as $h \rightarrow 0$.

Conversely, as $h \rightarrow 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|\tilde{I}_h(u_h^n) - I(u(\cdot, t_n))| &= \left| \int_I x^{N-1}(u_h^n - u(\cdot, t_n)) \hat{\psi}_h \, dx \right| + \left| \int_I x^{N-1} u(\cdot, t_n) (\hat{\psi}_h - \psi) \, dx \right| \\
&\leq \|u_h^n - u(\cdot, t_n)\| \cdot \|\hat{\psi}_h\| + \|u(\cdot, t_n)\| \cdot \|\hat{\psi}_h - \psi\| \rightarrow 0.
\end{aligned}$$

This expression concludes the proof. \square

The following is a readily obtainable consequence of Lemma 5.14.

Lemma 5.15. *There exists a nonnegative integer $n_0 = n_0(h)$ such that $I_h(u_h^{n_0}) > s_0$.*

The following lemma is elementary and was originally stated as Lemma 3.1 in [12].

Lemma 5.16. *There exists $s_0 > 1$ satisfying*

$$\frac{1}{2}f(s) + (1 + \mu)s \leq f(s) \quad (s \geq s_0),$$

where $f(s) = s^{1+\alpha}$.

We can now prove Theorem 5.7.

Proof of Theorem 5.7. It remains to verify that

$$T_\infty \geq \limsup_{h \rightarrow 0} \hat{T}_\infty(h). \quad (50)$$

To this end, we apply abstract theory (Propositions 4.2 and 4.3) in [35]. Adopting the notation of [35], we respectively set X, X_h, G, H, J and J_h in [35] as

$$\begin{aligned}
X &= \dot{H}^1, \quad \|v\|_X = \|v\|_{L^\infty(I)}, \quad X_h = S_h, \\
G(s) &= \frac{1}{2}f(s) = \frac{1}{2}s^{1+\alpha}, \quad H(s) = s^\alpha \quad (s \geq 0), \\
J(t, v) &= \int_I x^{N-1} v(x) \cdot \psi(x) \, dx, \quad (t, v) \in (0, \infty) \times X, \\
J_h(t, v_h) &= I_h(v_h) = \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} v_j \hat{\psi}_h(x_j) (1, \phi_j), \quad (t, v_h) \in (0, \infty) \times X_h, \quad v_j = v_h(x_j).
\end{aligned}$$

Here, G and H are functions of class (G) and class (H), respectively.

To avoid unnecessary complexity, we assume that $n_0 = 0$ (see Lemma 5.15). Our problem setting matches problem settings (I)–(VIII) in §4 of [35].

It is readily verified that conditions (H1), (H3), (H4) and (H5) in §4 of [35] hold. We need only check that condition (H2)

$$\partial_{\tau_n} I_h(u_h^{n+1}) \geq \frac{1}{2} f(I_h(u_h^n)) \quad (n \geq 0) \quad (51)$$

also holds.

Substituting $\chi_h = \hat{\psi}_h \in S_h$ in (ML-2) and using the relation (39), we have

$$\partial_{\tau_n} I_h(v_h^{n+1}) + \hat{\mu}_h I_h(v_h^{n+1}) = \langle f(v_h^n), \hat{\psi}_h \rangle.$$

From Proposition 5.5 (i), we know that $\hat{\mu}_h < \mu + 1$. Moreover, because $\langle 1, \hat{\psi}_h \rangle = 1$, we can apply Jensen's inequality to get

$$\partial_{\tau_n} I_h(u_h^{n+1}) \geq -(\mu + 1) \cdot I_h(u_h^n) + f(I_h(u_h^n)).$$

By Lemma 5.16, $-(\mu + 1)s + f(s) \geq \frac{1}{2}f(s)$ for $s \geq s_0$. Because $I_h(u_h^0) > s_0$ by Lemma 5.15, we deduce that

$$\partial_{\tau_{n_0}} I_h(u_h^1) \geq \frac{1}{2} f(I_h(u_h^0)).$$

We thus obtain $I_h(v_h^1) > s_0$. By this process, we finally obtain

$$\partial_{\tau_n} I_h(u_h^{n+1}) \geq \frac{1}{2} f(I_h(u_h^n)), \quad I_h(u_h^n) > s_0 \quad (n \geq 0).$$

□

Remark 5.17. Theorem 5.7 remains true after replacing (47) by

$$\tau_n = \tau_n(h) = \tau \min \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{\|u_h^n\|_{L^\infty(I)}^\alpha} \right\}.$$

However, this definition increases the computational cost over that based on (47). Therefore, in the following numerical evaluation, we adopt (47).

6. Numerical examples

This section validates our theoretical results with numerical examples.

We first examine the error estimates of the solutions on a uniform spatial mesh $x_j = jh$ ($j = 0, \dots, m$) with $h = 1/m$, regarding the numerical solution with $h' = 1/480$ as the exact solution. The following quantities were compared:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_1(h) &= \|u_{h'}^n - u_h^n\|_{L^1(I)}, \\ \mathcal{E}_2(h) &= \|u_{h'}^n - u_h^n\| = \left\| x^{\frac{N-1}{2}} (u_{h'}^n - u_h^n) \right\|_{L^2(I)}, \\ \mathcal{E}_\infty(h) &= \|u_{h'}^n - u_h^n\|_{L^\infty(I)}. \end{aligned}$$

Fig. 1 shows the results for $N = 3$, $\alpha = 4$ and $u(0, x) = \cos \frac{\pi}{2}x$. The time increment was uniform ($\tau_n = \tau = \lambda h^2$, $n = 0, 1, \dots$, $\lambda = 1/2$) and the iterations were continued until $t \leq T = 0.005$. In scheme (ML-1), the theoretical convergence rate was $h^2 + \tau$ in the $\|\cdot\|$ norm (see Theorem 2.4), but was slightly deteriorated in the L^∞ norm.




Figure 1: Error convergences versus granularity: $N = 3$, $\alpha = 4$ and $u(0, x) = \cos \frac{\pi}{2}x$

In the case $N = 4$, which is not supported in the convergence property of the standard symmetric FEM [31], we chose $\alpha = 3$ and $u(0, x) = 3 \cos \frac{\pi}{2}x$. The errors were computed up to $T = 0.0033$ on the non-uniform meshes with $x_i = \sin \frac{(i-1)\pi}{2m}$ and τ_n with $\lambda = 0.11$. As shown in Fig. 2, the $\|\cdot\|$ norm showed second-order convergence in both (ML-1) and standard FEM, but the $\|\cdot\|_{L^\infty(I)}$ norm showed first-order convergence in the standard FEM.




Figure 2: Error convergences in the (ML-1) schemes (left) and the standard finite element method (right): $N = 4$, $\alpha = 3$ and $u(0, x) = 3 \cos \frac{\pi}{2}x$

Second, we confirmed the non-increasing property of the energy functional $K_h(u_h^n)$ in scheme (ML-2) with $N = 5$, $\alpha = \frac{4}{3}$, and $u(0, x) = \cos \frac{\pi}{2}x, 13 \cos \frac{\pi}{2}x$. The time increment τ_n was determined through Theorem 5.6 with $\beta = 1$ and $\delta = 1$. Simulations were performed on a uniform spatial mesh $x_j = jh$ with $h = 1/m$ and $m = 50$. The results (see Fig. 3) support Lemma 5.9. As shown in Fig. 4, the energy functional $I_h(u_h^n)$ increased exponentially after $t = 0.04$ when the initial data was large, but vanishes when the initial data was small.

For $I_h(u_h^n)$, we used the time increment in Theorem 5.7 with $\delta = 1$.




Figure 3: Temporal dynamics of the energy functional $K_h(u_h^n)$ in scheme (ML-2) with different initial conditions




Figure 4: Temporal dynamics of the energy functional $I_h(u_h^n)$ in scheme (ML-2) with small (left) and large (right) data inputs

Finally, we calculated the numerical blow-up time in scheme (ML-2). Here, we set $h = 1/m$ ($m = 16, 32, 64$). The time increments were defined as

$$(K) \tau_n = \frac{1}{N+1} \min \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{\| \|u_h^n\| \|^\alpha} \right\} \quad (\text{see Theorem 5.6}),$$

$$(I) \tau_n = \frac{1}{N+1} \min \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{I_h(u_h^n)^\alpha} \right\} \quad (\text{see Theorem 5.7}).$$

For a comparison evaluation, we executed the FDM of Chen [7] and the FDM of Cho and Okamoto [13]. Specifically, set $\tau_n = \frac{1}{2}h^2 \cdot \min \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{\|u_h^n\|_2^\alpha} \right\}$ in Chen's FDM and $\tau_n = \frac{1}{3N}h^2 \cdot \min \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{\|u_h^n\|_2^\alpha} \right\}$, $\sigma = \frac{3}{2N}$ in Cho and Hamada's FDM.

We then introduced the *truncated numerical blow-up time* $\hat{T}_M(h)$:

$$\hat{T}_M(h) = \min \{t_n \mid \|u_h^n\|_\infty > M = 10^8\}.$$

Evaluations were performed with three parameter sets:

Case 1 $N = 5$, $\alpha = 0.39$, and $u(0, x) = 800 \cos \frac{\pi}{2} x$;

Case 2 $N = 4$, $\alpha = 0.49$, and $u(0, x) = 800(1 - x^2)$;

Case 3 $N = 3$, $\alpha = 0.66$, and $u(0, x) = 1000(e^{-x^2} - e^{-1})$.

Note that if $1 > \frac{N\alpha}{2}$ holds true and $u^0 \geq 0$ is decreasing in x , then $I(u(t))$, $\|u(t)\|$ and $\|u(t)\|_{L^\infty(I)}$ blow up simultaneously; see [19]. We chose these settings so that the assumptions in Theorem 5.6 and Theorem 5.7 hold true.

Fig. 5 compares the truncated numerical blow-up times $\hat{T}_M(h)$ as functions of h in the four schemes. The solution of Chen's FDM blew up later than the other schemes, whereas that of (ML-2) with $I_h(u_h^n)$ blew up sooner than the other schemes.




Figure 5: Truncated numerical blow-up times $\hat{T}_M(h)$ in the four schemes with three parameter settings

A. Approximate eigenvalue problems

This Appendix establishes the proof of Proposition 5.5. Recall that μ and $\hat{\mu}_h$ are the smallest eigenvalues of (38) and (39), respectively. Functions ψ and $\hat{\psi}_h$ are the eigenfunctions associated with μ and $\hat{\mu}_h$, respectively.

We introduce the following linear operators $T : \dot{H}^1 \rightarrow \dot{H}^1$, $T_h : S_h \rightarrow S_h$ and $\hat{T}_h : S_h \rightarrow S_h$

$$\begin{aligned} A(Tv, \chi) &= (v, \chi) & (\chi \in \dot{H}^1, v \in \dot{H}^1), \\ A(T_h v_h, \chi_h) &= (v_h, \chi_h) & (\chi_h \in S_h, v_h \in S_h), \\ A(\hat{T}_h v_h, \chi_h) &= \langle v_h, \chi_h \rangle & (\chi_h \in S_h, v_h \in S_h). \end{aligned}$$

We also write $v' = v_x$ for some function $v = v(x)$.

Lemma A.1 (Lemma 2.2 in [36], Theorems 13 and 14 in [18]). *For any $f_h \in S_h \subset \dot{H}^1$,*

$$Tf_h \in H^2(I), \quad \|(Tf_h)''\| \leq C\|f_h\|.$$

For a linear operator $B : X \subset \dot{H} \rightarrow \dot{H}$, we define

$$\|B\|_{1,X} = \sup_{v \in X, v \neq 0} \frac{\|(Bv)'\|}{\|v'\|}.$$

Lemma A.2 (Lemma 3.3 in [2]). $\|T - \hat{T}_h\|_{1,S_h} \rightarrow 0$ as $h \rightarrow 0$.

Remark A.3. Lemma A.2 does not exactly agree with Lemma 3.3 in [2], but its proof is identical to that of Lemma 3.3 in [2].

The resolvent operator $R_z(\hat{T}_h)$ for $z \in \mathbb{C}$ is defined as

$$R_z(\hat{T}_h) = (zI - \hat{T}_h)^{-1} : S_h \rightarrow S_h,$$

where $\hat{T}_h : S_h \rightarrow S_h$ and $z \in \rho(\hat{T}_h)$. Let I be the identity operator and $\rho(B)$ be the resolvent set of a linear operator B .

Lemma A.4 ([15, Lemma 1]). *For any closed set $F \subset \rho(T)$, there exists $h_0 > 0$ such that for any $h \leq h_0$, $R_z(\hat{T}_h)$ exists and*

$$\|R_z(\hat{T}_h)\|_{1,S_h} \leq C \quad (\forall z \in F),$$

where C is independent of h .

We now define spectral projections of T and \hat{T}_h . Let $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{C}$ be a circle centered at $\frac{1}{\mu}$ enclosing no other points of $\sigma(T)$ which stands for the spectral set of T . Let $E = E(\frac{1}{\mu}) : \dot{H}^1 \rightarrow \dot{H}^1$ and $\hat{E}_h = \hat{E}_h(\frac{1}{\mu}) : S_h \rightarrow S_h$ be the spectral projection operators associated with T and \hat{T}_h and the parts of the corresponding spectrum enclosed by Γ , respectively:

$$E = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma} R_z(T) dz, \quad \hat{E}_h = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma} R_z(\hat{T}_h) dz.$$

Remark A.5. By Lemma A.4, when h is sufficiently small, $\Gamma \subset \rho(\hat{T}_h)$ holds and $\|R_z(\hat{T}_h)\|_{1,S_h}$ is bounded for all $z \in \Gamma$. Thus the integral of \hat{E}_h exists.

To examine the convergence property of \hat{E}_h , we use the following lemma.

Lemma A.6 (Lemma 2 in [15]). $\|E - \hat{E}_h\|_{1,S_h} \rightarrow 0$ as $h \rightarrow 0$.

We use the following symbols.

- $\text{dist}(w, A) = \inf_{y \in A} \|w' - y'\| \quad (w \in \dot{H}^1, A \subset \dot{H}^1),$
- $\delta(\hat{E}_h(S_h), E(\dot{H}^1)) = \sup_{v_h \in \hat{E}_h(S_h), \|v_h'\|=1} \text{dist}(v_h, E(\dot{H}^1)),$
- $\delta(E(\dot{H}^1), \hat{E}_h(S_h)) = \sup_{v \in E(\dot{H}^1), \|v'\|=1} \text{dist}(v, \hat{E}_h(S_h)),$

- $\hat{\delta}(E(\dot{H}^1), \hat{E}_h(S_h)) = \max\{\delta(\hat{E}_h(S_h), E(\dot{H}^1)), \delta(E(\dot{H}^1), \hat{E}_h(S_h))\}$.

The next result follows from the property of the spectral projection operator.

Corollary A.7. $\delta(\hat{E}_h(S_h), E(\dot{H}^1)) \rightarrow 0$ as $h \rightarrow 0$.

Lemma A.8 (Theorem 2 in [15]).

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \inf_{\chi_h \in S_h} \|(u - \chi_h)'\| = 0 \quad (u \in \dot{H}^1).$$

Corollary A.9 (Theorem 3 in [15]). $\delta(E(\dot{H}^1), \hat{E}_h(S_h)) \rightarrow 0$ as $h \rightarrow 0$.

Lemma A.10 (Corollary 2.6 in [27]). *If $\hat{\delta}(E(\dot{H}^1), \hat{E}_h(S_h)) < 1$, then $\dim E(\dot{H}^1) = \dim \hat{E}_h(S_h)$.*

For sufficiently small h , we observe that $\hat{\delta}(E(\dot{H}^1), \hat{E}_h(S_h)) < 1$; that is, $\dim E(\dot{H}^1) = \dim \hat{E}_h(S_h)$.

Therefore, $\dim E(\dot{H}^1) = 1$, because $E(\dot{H}^1)$ is the eigenspace of the smallest eigenvalue of (38). Then, the unique eigenvalue of \hat{T}_h (denoted by $\frac{1}{\hat{\nu}_h}$) is located inside Γ . Then, there exists $\hat{\xi}_h (\neq 0) \in S_h$ such that

$$A(\hat{\xi}_h, \chi_h) = \hat{\nu}_h \langle \hat{\xi}_h, \chi_h \rangle, \quad \chi_h \in S_h.$$

Corollary A.11. $\hat{\nu}_h \rightarrow \mu$ as $h \rightarrow 0$.

Proof. For some arbitrary $\epsilon > 0$, we set $\Gamma_\epsilon = B_{\frac{1}{\mu}}(\epsilon) = \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid |z - \frac{1}{\mu}| = \epsilon\}$. As stated above, there exists $h_\epsilon > 0$ such that the eigenvalue $\frac{1}{\hat{\nu}_h}$ of \hat{T}_h is inside Γ_ϵ for all $h < h_\epsilon$. Therefore,

$$\left| \frac{1}{\hat{\nu}_h} - \frac{1}{\mu} \right| \leq \epsilon.$$

Because μ is positive, the proof is complete. \square

Remark A.12. Similarly, we find that a unique eigenvalue $\frac{1}{\nu_h}$ of T_h exists inside Γ , and that $\nu_h \rightarrow \mu$ as $h \rightarrow 0$.

Let $\mu_h > 0$ be the smallest eigenvalue of

$$A(\psi_h, \chi_h) = \mu_h(\psi_h, \chi_h), \quad \chi \in S_h, \tag{52}$$

where $\psi_h \in S_h$.

Lemma A.13. *For sufficiently small $h > 0$, we have $\nu_h = \mu_h$. In particular, $\mu_h \rightarrow \mu$ as $h \rightarrow 0$.*

Proof. We know that $\dim E(\dot{H}^1) = 1$. By variational characterization, we obtain

$$\mu = \inf_{v \in \dot{H}^1, v \neq 0} \frac{\|v'\|^2}{\|v\|^2} \leq \inf_{v_h \in S_h, v_h \neq 0} \frac{\|v_h'\|^2}{\|v_h\|^2}.$$

Here μ_h is the smallest eigenvalue of (52), that is,

$$\mu_h = \inf_{v_h \in S_h, v_h \neq 0} \frac{\|v_h'\|^2}{\|v_h\|^2}.$$

All eigenvalues of (52) are greater than or equal to μ . As the eigenvalue of T_h enclosed by Γ is unique, we obtain $\nu_h = \mu_h$ for sufficiently small $h > 0$, and $\mu_h \rightarrow \mu$ as $h \rightarrow 0$. \square

We now state the following proof.

Proof of Proposition 5.5 (i). By variational characterization, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\mu}_h &= \inf_{v_h \in S_h, v_h \neq 0} \frac{\|v'_h\|^2}{\|v_h\|^2} = \left(\sup_{v_h \in S_h, v_h \neq 0} \frac{A(\hat{T}_h v_h, v_h)}{\|v'_h\|^2} \right)^{-1}, \\ \mu_h &= \inf_{v_h \in S_h, v_h \neq 0} \frac{\|v'_h\|^2}{\|v_h\|^2} = \left(\sup_{v_h \in S_h, v_h \neq 0} \frac{A(T_h v_h, v_h)}{\|v'_h\|^2} \right)^{-1}.\end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{v_h \in S_h, v_h \neq 0} \frac{A(\hat{T}_h v_h, v_h)}{\|v'_h\|^2} &= \sup_{v_h \in S_h, v_h \neq 0} \left(\frac{A(T_h v_h, v_h)}{\|v'_h\|^2} + \frac{A((\hat{T}_h - T_h)v_h, v_h)}{\|v'_h\|^2} \right) \\ &\leq \sup_{v_h \in S_h, v_h \neq 0} \frac{A(T_h v_h, v_h)}{\|v'_h\|^2} + \|\hat{T}_h - T_h\|_{1, S_h}.\end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\sup_{v_h \in S_h, v_h \neq 0} \frac{A(T_h v_h, v_h)}{\|v'_h\|^2} \leq \sup_{v_h \in S_h, v_h \neq 0} \frac{A(\hat{T}_h v_h, v_h)}{\|v'_h\|^2} + \|\hat{T}_h - T_h\|_{1, S_h}.$$

Applying Lemma A.2, we obtain $\hat{\mu}_h = \mu$ as $h \rightarrow 0$. \square

Remark A.14. As the eigenvalue of \hat{T}_h enclosed by Γ is unique, we conclude that $\hat{\nu}_h = \hat{\mu}_h$ for sufficiently small $h > 0$.

Proof of Proposition 5.5 (ii). We write (39) in matrix form:

$$\mathcal{A}\psi = \hat{\mu}_h \mathcal{M}\psi,$$

where $\mathcal{M} = \text{diag}(\mu_i)_{0 \leq i \leq m-1}$ and $\mathcal{A} = (a_{i,j})_{0 \leq i,j \leq m-1}$ are defined as $m_i = (1, \phi_i)$ and $a_{i,j} = A(\phi_j, \phi_i)$, respectively. Moreover, $\psi = (\psi_i)_{0 \leq i \leq m-1} \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $\psi_i = \hat{\psi}_h(x_i)$. We thus express (39) as

$$\mathcal{M}^{-1}\mathcal{A}\psi = \hat{\mu}_h \psi.$$

Because \mathcal{M} is a diagonal matrix, the diagonal components $a_{i,i}/\mu_{i,i}$ of $\mathcal{M}^{-1}\mathcal{A}$ are all positive and the non-diagonal components are all non-positive.

Writing

$$\left(-\mathcal{M}^{-1}\mathcal{A} + \max_{0 \leq i \leq m-1} \frac{a_{i,i}}{m_{i,i}} \mathcal{I} \right) \psi = \left(-\hat{\mu}_h + \max_{0 \leq i \leq m-1} \frac{a_{i,i}}{m_{i,i}} \right) \psi, \quad (53)$$

where $\mathcal{I} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ is the identity matrix, then all components of the matrix on the left-hand side are non-negative. We now consider the following eigenvalue problem:

$$\left(-\mathcal{M}^{-1}\mathcal{A} + \max_{0 \leq i \leq m-1} \frac{a_{i,i}}{m_{i,i}} \mathcal{I} \right) \vec{x} = \tilde{\mu}_h \vec{x}. \quad (54)$$

By the Perron–Frobenius theorem, we can take a positive eigenvector for the largest eigenvalue of (54). $-\hat{\mu}_h + \max_{0 \leq i \leq m-1} \frac{a_{i,i}}{m_{i,i}}$ is the largest eigenvalue of (54), because $\hat{\mu}_h$ is the smallest eigenvalue of (39).

Consequently, the sign of the first eigenfunction of (39) is unchanged. \square

Proof of Proposition 5.5 (iii). We assume that

$$\hat{\psi}_h \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_I x^{N-1} \hat{\psi}_h(x) dx = 1.$$

Setting $\phi = \psi/\|\psi'\|$ and $\hat{\phi}_h = \hat{\psi}_h/\|\hat{\psi}'_h\|$, applying Corollary A.7 and Proposition 5.5 (i), and setting $v_h = \hat{\phi}_h$, we obtain

$$\text{dist}(\hat{\phi}_h, E(\dot{H}^1)) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as} \quad h \rightarrow 0.$$

Because $\dim E(\dot{H}^1) = 1$ and $E(\dot{H}^1)$ is a closed subspace in \dot{H}^1 , we find that

$$E(\dot{H}^1) = \{z\phi \in \dot{H}^1 \mid z \in \mathbb{C}\}$$

and

$$\text{dist}(\hat{\phi}_h, E(\dot{H}^1)) = \|\hat{\phi}'_h - c_h \phi'\|,$$

where $c_h \in \mathbb{C}$.

Therefore, $|c_h| = 1$ as $h \rightarrow 0$. Using $\hat{\phi}_h, \phi \geq 0$ and $\|\hat{\phi}_h - c_h \phi\| \leq \|\hat{\phi}'_h - c_h \phi'\|$, we find that $c_h = 1$ as $h \rightarrow 0$. That is, as $h \rightarrow 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{\phi}'_h - \phi'\| &\leq \|\hat{\phi}'_h - c_h \phi'\| + \|c_h \phi' - \phi'\| \\ &= \|\hat{\phi}'_h - c_h \phi'\| + |c_h - 1| \cdot \|\phi'\| \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\|(\psi - \hat{\psi}_h)'\| \leq \frac{1}{\int_I x^{N-1} \phi(x) dx} \|\phi' - \hat{\phi}'_h\| + \left| \frac{1}{\int_I x^{N-1} \phi(x) dx} - \frac{1}{\int_I x^{N-1} \hat{\phi}_h(x) dx} \right|.$$

This, together with

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_I x^{N-1} \phi(x) dx - \int_I x^{N-1} \hat{\phi}_h(x) dx \right| \\ \leq \left(\frac{1}{N} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot \|\phi - \hat{\phi}_h\| \leq \left(\frac{1}{N} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot \|\phi' - \hat{\phi}'_h\| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as} \quad h \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

implies that $\|(\psi - \hat{\psi}_h)'\| \rightarrow 0$ as $h \rightarrow 0$, which completes the proof. \square

Acknowledgments. This work was supported by JST CREST Grant Number JPMJCR15D1, Japan, and JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 15H03635, Japan. In addition, the first author was supported by the Program for Leading Graduate Schools, MEXT, Japan.

References

- [1] L. M. Abia, J. C. López-Marcos, and J. Martínez. The Euler method in the numerical integration of reaction-diffusion problems with blow-up. *Appl. Numer. Math.*, 38(3):287–313, 2001.
- [2] U. Banerjee and J. E. Osborn. Estimation of the effect of numerical integration in finite element eigenvalue approximation. *Numer. Math.*, 56(8):735–762, 1990.

- [3] C. Brändle, P. Groisman, and J. D. Rossi. Fully discrete adaptive methods for a blow-up problem. *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.*, 14(10):1425–1450, 2004.
- [4] C. Brändle, F. Quirós, and J. D. Rossi. An adaptive numerical method to handle blow-up in a parabolic system. *Numer. Math.*, 102(1):39–59, 2005.
- [5] A. Cangiani, E. H. Georgoulis, I. Kyza, and S. Metcalfe. Adaptivity and blow-up detection for nonlinear evolution problems. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 38(6):A3833–A3856, 2016.
- [6] Y. G. Chen. Asymptotic behaviours of blowing-up solutions for finite difference analogue of $u_t = u_{xx} + u^{1+\alpha}$. *J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo Sect. IA Math.*, 33(3):541–574, 1986.
- [7] Y. G. Chen. Blow-up solutions to a finite difference analogue of $u_t = \Delta u + u^{1+\alpha}$ in N -dimensional balls. *Hokkaido Math. J.*, 21(3):447–474, 1992.
- [8] C. H. Cho. A finite difference scheme for blow-up solutions of nonlinear wave equations. *Numer. Math. Theory Methods Appl.*, 3(4):475–498, 2010.
- [9] C. H. Cho. On the finite difference approximation for blow-up solutions of the porous medium equation with a source. *Appl. Numer. Math.*, 65:1–26, 2013.
- [10] C. H. Cho. Numerical detection of blow-up: a new sufficient condition for blow-up. *Jpn. J. Ind. Appl. Math.*, 33(1):81–98, 2016.
- [11] C. H. Cho. On the computation for blow-up solutions of the nonlinear wave equation. *Numer. Math.*, 138(3):537–556, 2018.
- [12] C. H. Cho, S. Hamada, and H. Okamoto. On the finite difference approximation for a parabolic blow-up problem. *Japan J. Indust. Appl. Math.*, 24(2):131–160, 2007.
- [13] C. H. Cho and H. Okamoto. Finite difference schemes for an axisymmetric nonlinear heat equation with blow-up. *Electron. Trans. Numer. Anal.*, 52:391–415, 2020.
- [14] K. Deng and H. A. Levine. The role of critical exponents in blow-up theorems: the sequel. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 243(1):85–126, 2000.
- [15] J. Descloux, N. Nassif, and J. Rappaz. On spectral approximation. I. The problem of convergence. *RAIRO Anal. Numér.*, 12(2):97–112, iii, 1978.
- [16] K. Eriksson and V. Thomée. Galerkin methods for singular boundary value problems in one space dimension. *Math. Comp.*, 42(166):345–367, 1984.
- [17] R. Ferreira, P. Groisman, and J. D. Rossi. Adaptive numerical schemes for a parabolic problem with blow-up. *IMA J. Numer. Anal.*, 23(3):439–463, 2003.
- [18] A. Friedman. *Partial differential equations of parabolic type*. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1964.
- [19] A. Friedman, B. McLeod. Blow-up of positive solutions of semilinear heat equations. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 34:425–447, 1985.
- [20] P. Groisman. Totally discrete explicit and semi-implicit Euler methods for a blow-up problem in several space dimensions. *Computing*, 76(3-4):325–352, 2006.

- [21] P. Groisman and J. D. Rossi. Asymptotic behaviour for a numerical approximation of a parabolic problem with blowing up solutions. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.*, 135(1):135–155, 2001.
- [22] W. Huang, J. Ma, and R. D. Russell. A study of moving mesh PDE methods for numerical simulation of blowup in reaction diffusion equations. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 227(13):6532–6552, 2008.
- [23] T. Ide, C. Hirota, and M. Okada. Generalized energy integral for $\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = \frac{\delta G}{\delta u}$, its finite difference schemes by means of the discrete variational method and an application to Fujita problem. *Adv. Math. Sci. Appl.*, 12(2):755–778, 2002.
- [24] M. Ishiwata. On the asymptotic behavior of unbounded radial solutions for semilinear parabolic problems involving critical Sobolev exponent. *J. Differential Equations*, 249(6):1466–1482, 2010.
- [25] T. Ishiwata and M. Tsutsumi. Semidiscretization in space of nonlinear degenerate parabolic equations with blow-up of the solutions. *J. Comput. Math.*, 18(6):571–586, 2000.
- [26] D. Jespersen. Ritz-Galerkin methods for singular boundary value problems. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 15(4):813–834, 1978.
- [27] T. Kato. *Perturbation theory for linear operators*. Classics in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1995. Reprint of the 1980 edition.
- [28] H. A. Levine. The role of critical exponents in blowup theorems. *SIAM Rev.*, 32(2):262–288, 1990.
- [29] T. Nakagawa. Blowing up of a finite difference solution to $u_t = u_{xx} + u^2$. *Appl. Math. Optim.*, 2(4):337–350, 1975/76.
- [30] T. Nakagawa and T. Ushijima. Finite element analysis of the semi-linear heat equation of blow-up type. In *Topics in Numerical Analysis III*, pages 275–291. Academic Press, New York, 1977.
- [31] T. Nakanishi and N. Saito. Finite element method for radially symmetric solution of a multidimensional semilinear heat equation. *Jpn. J. Ind. Appl. Math.*, 37(1):165–191, 2020.
- [32] F. K. N’Gohisse and T. K. Boni. Numerical blow-up solutions for some semilinear heat equations. *Electron. Trans. Numer. Anal.*, 30:247–257, 2008.
- [33] P. Quittner and P. Souplet. *Superlinear parabolic problems*. Birkhäuser Advanced Texts: Basler Lehrbücher. [Birkhäuser Advanced Texts: Basel Textbooks]. Birkhäuser/Springer, Cham, 2019.
- [34] N. Saito and T. Sasaki. Blow-up of finite-difference solutions to nonlinear wave equations. *J. Math. Sci. Univ. Tokyo*, 23(1):349–380, 2016.
- [35] N. Saito and T. Sasaki. Finite difference approximation for nonlinear Schrödinger equations with application to blow-up computation. *Jpn. J. Ind. Appl. Math.*, 33(2):427–470, 2016.

- [36] R. Schreiber and S. C. Eisenstat. Finite element methods for spherically symmetric elliptic equations. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 18(3):546–558, 1981.
- [37] V. Thomée. *Galerkin finite element methods for parabolic problems*. Springer Verlag, Berlin, second edition, 2006.