

Preventing Finite-Time Blowup in a Constrained Potential for Reaction-Diffusion Equations

John Ivanhoe and Michael Salins

Boston University

June 26, 2024

1 Introduction

We are interested in studying how dissipative forcing prevents explosion of mild solutions to the stochastic reaction-diffusion equation (SRDE) defined on an open bounded domain $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ with appropriately-smooth boundary. Our equation of interest is

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial u}{\partial t}(t, x) = \mathcal{A}u(t, x) + f(u(t, x)) + \sigma(u(t, x))\dot{W}(t, x) \\ u(t, x) = 0, \quad x \in \partial D, \quad u(0, x) = u_0(x) \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

Here, \mathcal{A} is a second-order elliptic differential linear operator and \dot{W} is a Gaussian noise. The function $f(u(t, x))$ represents a state-dependent external forcing and the multiplicative noise $\sigma(u(t, x))\dot{W}$ represents state-dependent stochastic forcing. We are particularly interested when f models a constrained potential force, where $\lim_{|x| \rightarrow 1} f(x)\text{sign}(x) = -\infty$. We also allow σ to be unbounded near $|x| \rightarrow 1$ and identify a sufficient condition on the relative growth rates of f and σ as $|x| \rightarrow 1$ that guarantees the existence of global solutions.

Specifically, we assume there are constants $c_0 \in (0, 1)$, $C, K, \beta > 0$, and $\gamma \geq 0$ such that for $c_0 < |w| < 1$

$$\begin{cases} |\sigma(w)| \leq C(1 - |w|)^{-\gamma} \\ f(w)\text{sign}(w) \leq -K(1 - |w|)^{-\beta} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

With $\gamma = 0$, we allow for additive noise. Analogous to [34], the stochastic forcing pushes solutions toward the endpoints with growing intensity, counteracting the dissipative force of f .

This set-up is motivated by ecological models. In population growth models, a common assumption is letting f and σ obey logistic growth. One such example is the FKPP equation on the circle [36]:

$$\partial_t u = \frac{\alpha}{2} \Delta u + \beta u(1 - u) + \sqrt{\gamma u(1 - u)} \dot{W}$$

This FKPP model has been studied by various authors [15], [14], [18], [37], [27], [28], with applications recorded in the survey [31]. The terms $u(1-u)$ assume logistic growth, where a population approaching its carrying capacity sees the forcing terms vanish. However, extreme downward forcing is also reasonable for a population nearing its upper limit (for example, if there are more elk than what a forest can sustain, many elk should die off). The stochastic forcing should also be large, reflecting the large, yet random, amount of offspring expected from a large population, as well as modeling uncertainty as we near physical limits. Together, these ideas form our assumptions in (2).

With these assumptions, the SRDE (1) is not well-defined whenever $|u(t, x)| \geq 1$, motivating our interest in preventing finite-time blowup, which we intuitively understand as any point $(t, x) \in (0, \infty) \times D$ such that $|u(t, x)| = 1$, assuming $\|u(0, x)\|_{L^\infty(D)} < 1$. We will show that, among other assumptions, the inequality

$$\gamma + 1 < \frac{(1-\eta)(\beta+1)}{2} \quad (3)$$

prevents finite-time blowup, where γ, β are our constants from (2). The constant $\eta \in [0, 1)$ was introduced by Cerrai (2003) and describes the balance between the roughness of the noise and smoothing of the elliptic operator [4]. A larger η corresponds to rougher solutions, with $\frac{1-\eta}{2}$ being the temporal Hölder continuity of the paths. This is reflected in inequality (3), where rougher solutions require larger β values to prevent blow-up for a fixed γ . For an explicit definition of η , see **Assumption 3**.

This result is analogous to the results in [34], where solutions to (1) are allowed to grow arbitrarily large under superlinear forcing. There, the key inequality preventing finite-time blowup is $\gamma - 1 < \frac{(1-\eta)(\beta-1)}{2}$. The two results are similar, differing largely due to the different exponents one gets from integrating $u^{-\beta}$ compared to u^β . However, our inequality presents a strange question in the case of additive noise. When $\gamma = 0$, our main result shows that finite-time blow-up is prevented for a strictly positive $\beta > \frac{2}{1-\eta} - 1 > 0$. It is unknown if this β is critical in general, though criticality is known in the case of space-time white noise in one spatial dimension [29]. Criticality would imply that there exist exponents $\beta > 0$ such that finite-time blow up is possible for additive noise. In Mueller's investigation of (1) with $\mathcal{A} = \Delta, f(u) = u^{-\beta}$, additive noise, and spatial dimension $d = 1$, it was shown that solutions couldn't decrease to 0 in finite time (what we refer to as blow-up) when $\beta > 3$ [25]. In Mueller's case, $\eta = \frac{1}{2}$ and $\gamma = 0$, making his result equivalent to (3). Mueller and Pardoux later showed that $\beta = 3$ was critical: for any $0 < \beta < 3$, there is a positive probability for the solution to hit 0 in finite time.

Another example where solutions can blow-up in finite time is the 1 dimensional SDE

$$dX(t) = X(t)^{-\beta} dt + X(t)^{-\gamma} dB_t$$

It can be shown (see [5]) that finite-time blowup is prevented so long as

$$\gamma + 1 < \frac{\beta + 1}{2},$$

For Brownian motion, $\eta = 0$, so this condition aligns with our inequality (3). It is currently unknown if (3) is the optimal condition for superlinear forcing terms and colored noise, and this problem is left for future work.

In the study of (1), it is known that stochastic forcing can result in solutions growing arbitrarily large with positive probability. Mueller and collaborators [24, 25, 26, 30] investigated the case where $\mathcal{A} = \Delta$, $f(u) = 0$, and the spatial dimension $d = 1$. It was found that solutions can exhibit finite-time blowup if $|\sigma(u)| > c|u|^\gamma$ for some $c > 0$ and $\gamma > \frac{3}{2}$. It was also observed that explosion is prevented if $|\sigma(u)| \leq C(1 + |u|^\gamma)$ for some $C > 0$ and $\gamma < \frac{3}{2}$. See [1, 8, 9, 16] for investigations of explosion by other authors.

Early work showed that (1) has unique solutions if f and σ are globally Lipschitz continuous with at most linear growth [11, 12, 13, 33, 20, 32, 35, 38, 39]. However, in the case of superlinearly growing σ , a linearly growing f is no longer sufficient to prevent explosive growth. Cerrai demonstrated the existence of global solutions for when σ is locally Lipschitz continuous with linear growth and f is strongly dissipative with polynomial growth [4]. Assuming polynomial growth for f is common [2, 6, 19, 21], but Da Prato and Röckner [10] and Marinelli and Röckner [23] proved that this polynomial growth restriction can be relaxed, such that existence and uniqueness of solutions is implied by a monotonicity condition on f . See also [7, 17, 22, 23]. Recently, it was shown that superlinearly-growing dissipative forcing f can prevent blow-up of solutions in the case of superlinearly-growing σ [34]. All of these references consider the case where $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $u(t, x)$ can take any value in \mathbb{R} .

Since we assume our constraining force f is of the form $f(w) = -\text{sign}(w)(1 - |w|)^{-\beta}$ for some $\beta > 0$, we naturally assume $\|u_0\|_{L^\infty(D)} < 1$. In the absence of stochastic forcing, f restricts $u(t, x)$ to remain in $(-1, 1)$. Since equation (1) breaks down whenever $|u(t, x)| = 1$, this motivates the following definition of explosion: for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we define the stopping times

$$T_n = \inf \left\{ t > 0 : \|u(t)\|_{L^\infty(D)} > 1 - \frac{1}{3^n} \right\} \quad (4)$$

Under **Assumption 2**, which can be found in Section 2, below, the realization A of \mathcal{A} in $L^2(D)$ generates a C_0 -semigroup $S(t)$.

Definition 1.1. A $C_0(\overline{D})$ -valued process $u(t)$ is a local mild solution to (1) if

$$u(t) = S(t)u_0 + \int_0^t S(t-s)f(u(s))ds + \int_0^t S(t-s)\sigma(u(s))dW(s) \quad (5)$$

for all $t \in [0, T_n]$ for any n .

Definition 1.2. A mild solution u is global if $u(t)$ solves (5) for all $t > 0$ with probability 1.

Local mild solutions u are continuous by definition, so $T_n \leq T_{n+1}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore, a local mild solution u solves (5) on the time interval $[0, \sup_n T_n)$ with probability 1. Thus, a local mild solution u is a global solution if and only

if $\sup_n T_n = \infty$ with probability 1. We define the explosion time as $\sup_n T_n$, as mild solutions to (1) do not make sense after $\sup_n T_n$, and can now state our key result:

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\frac{1-\eta}{2}$ be the time Hölder continuity of our solution to (1), with η defined in Section 2. If Assumptions 1-4 are satisfied and $\gamma + 1 < \frac{(1-\eta)(\beta+1)}{2}$, then any local mild solution is a global solution.*

In Section 2, we describe our notation, main assumptions, and main result. In Section 3, we highlight some crucial estimates and prove Lemma (3.1), which is central to limiting the growth of our solutions. In Section 4, we prove our main theorem.

2 Assumptions and Main Result

Let $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ denote an open, bounded domain. For $p \in [1, \infty)$, define $L^p(D)$ to be the Banach space of functions $v : D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that the norm

$$|v|_{L^p(D)} = \left(\int_D |v(x)|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}$$

is finite. When $p = \infty$, the $L^\infty(D)$ norm is

$$|v|_{L^\infty(D)} = \sup_{x \in D} |v(x)|$$

Define $C_0(\overline{D})$ to be the subset of $L^\infty(D)$ of continuous functions $v : \overline{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $v(x) = 0$ for $x \in \partial D$. Define $C_0([0, T] \times \overline{D})$ to be the set of continuous functions $v : [0, T] \times \overline{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $v(t, x) = 0$ for $x \in \partial D$, endowed with the supremum norm

$$|v|_{C_0([0, T] \times \overline{D})} = \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \sup_{x \in \overline{D}} |v(t, x)|$$

We make the following assumptions about the differential operator \mathcal{A} , the noise \dot{W} , and the forcing terms f and σ .

Assumption 1 The initial data $u_0 \in C_0(\overline{D})$ and $\|u_0\|_\infty < 1$

Assumption 2 \mathcal{A} is a self-adjoint second-order elliptic differential operator

$$\mathcal{A}\phi(x) = \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \left(a_{ij}(x) \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x_j}(x) \right)$$

where a_{ij} are continuously differentiable on \overline{D} , symmetric, and elliptic. Let A be the realization of \mathcal{A} in $L^2(D)$ with Dirichlet boundary conditions. Then there exists a sequence of eigenvalues $0 \leq \alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2 \leq \dots$ and eigenfunctions $e_k \in L^2(D) \cap C_0(D)$ such that

$$Ae_k = -\alpha_k e_k \quad |e_k|_{L^2(D)} = 1$$

We believe our results hold for more general second-order elliptic differential operators. However, for convenience, we assume self-adjoint operators. Using **Assumption 2** and estimates similar to those in Cerrai 2003 [4], we have an elliptic contraction semigroup $S(t)$ generated by this operator A , where $S(t)$ acts on functions $u(t, x)$ through the spatial integral

$$(S(t)u(s))(x) = \int_D K(t, x, y)u(s, y)dy \quad (6)$$

where $K(t, x, y)$ is the kernel of this contraction semigroup described by

$$K(t, x, y) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} e^{-\alpha_k t} e_k(x) e_k(y) \quad (7)$$

Assumption 3 (See [4], [5]) There exists a sequence of numbers $\lambda_j \geq 0$ and a sequence of i.i.d one-dimensional Brownian motions $\{B_j(t)\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that, formally,

$$\dot{W}(t, x) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j e_j(x) dB_j(t)$$

Furthermore, there exist exponents $\theta > 0$ and $\rho \in [2, \infty)$ such that

$$\begin{cases} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j^{\rho} |e_j|_{L^{\infty}(D)}^2 \right)^{\frac{2}{\rho}} < \infty & \text{if } \rho \in [2, \infty) \\ \sup_j \lambda_j < \infty & \text{if } \rho = \infty \end{cases}$$

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \alpha_k^{-\theta} |e_k|_{L^{\infty}(D)}^2 < \infty$$

and

$$\eta := \frac{\theta(\rho - 2)}{\rho} < 1$$

This constant $\eta < 1$ represents how the noise \dot{W} and elliptic operator \mathcal{A} relate to each other, where $\eta < 1$ represents the smoothing of our elliptic operator being strong enough to counteract the irregularity of the noise so that solutions are function-valued. A trace-class noise $\eta = 0$ corresponds to $\rho = 2$. For space-time white noise on a one-dimensional spatial interval, it is known that $\alpha_k \sim k^2$, so we can take $\rho = \infty$ and $\eta = \theta$ can be any number larger than $\frac{1}{2}$.

Assumption 4 The functions $f : (-1, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\sigma : (-1, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are locally Lipschitz continuous functions. There exist powers $\beta > 0$, $\gamma \geq 0$ and constants $c_0, C, K > 0$ such that for $|u| \in (c_0, 1)$

$$|\sigma(u)| \leq C(1 - |u|)^{-\gamma}$$

$$f(u)\text{sign}(u) \leq -K(1 - |u|)^{-\beta}$$

Our main goal is in showing that local mild solutions can be global solutions, but this is only meaningful if local mild solutions exist. To show this, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, define functions $f_n, \sigma_n : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$f_n(w) = \begin{cases} f(-1 + \frac{1}{3^n}) & \text{if } w < -1 + \frac{1}{3^n} \\ f(w) & \text{if } |w| < 1 - \frac{1}{3^n} \\ f(1 - \frac{1}{3^n}) & \text{if } w > 1 - \frac{1}{3^n} \end{cases}$$

$$\sigma_n(w) = \begin{cases} \sigma(-1 + \frac{1}{3^n}) & \text{if } w < -1 + \frac{1}{3^n} \\ \sigma(w) & \text{if } |w| < 1 - \frac{1}{3^n} \\ \sigma(1 - \frac{1}{3^n}) & \text{if } w > 1 - \frac{1}{3^n} \end{cases}$$

These functions f_n, σ_n are globally Lipschitz continuous functions. Thus, the SRDE

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial u_n}{\partial t}(t, x) = \mathcal{A}u_n(t, x) + f_n(u_n(t, x)) + \sigma_n(u_n(t, x))\dot{W}(t, x) \\ u_n(t, x) = 0, \quad x \in \partial D, \quad u_n(0, x) = u_0(x) \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

has a unique solution by the usual existence and uniqueness theorems [11]. Since u_n solves (8), it solves (1) up to T_n due to our definitions of f_n, σ_n . Since u_n uniquely solves (8), it is a unique local solution. Furthermore, by this uniqueness and our construction of f_n, σ_n , the solutions u_n are consistent, where $u_n = u_m$ until T_n whenever $n < m$.

Let us recall the definition of a mild solution:

Definition 2.1. A $C_0(\bar{D})$ -valued process $u(t)$ is a local mild solution to (1) if

$$u(t) = S(t)u_0 + \int_0^t S(t-s)f(u(s))ds + \int_0^t S(t-s)\sigma(u(s))dW(s)$$

for all $t \in [0, T_n]$ for any n , where

$$T_n = \inf \left\{ t > 0 : \|u(t)\|_{L^\infty(D)} > 1 - \frac{1}{3^n} \right\}$$

Under our assumptions, these stopping times are well-defined and we can state our final result

Theorem 2.1. Under Assumptions 1-4, there exists a unique, global solution to (1).

3 Estimates

Using the factorization method of Da Prato and Zabczyk [Chapter 5.3.1], see also Cerrai (2003), the stochastic integral

$$Z(t) = \int_0^t S(t-s)\sigma(u(s))dW(s), \quad (9)$$

where $S(t)$ is the elliptic semigroup defined in (6), can be written as

$$Z(t) = \frac{\sin(\pi\alpha)}{\pi} \int_0^t (t-s)^{\alpha-1} S(t-s) Z_\alpha(y) dy \quad (10)$$

for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and

$$Z_\alpha(s) = \int_0^s (t-s)^{-\alpha} S(t-s) \sigma(u(s)) dW(s) \quad (11)$$

It is then possible to write $Z(t \wedge \tau)$, where τ is any stopping time with respect to the natural filtration of $W(t)$, as

$$\begin{aligned} Z(t \wedge \tau) &= \frac{\sin(\pi\alpha)}{\pi} \int_0^{t \wedge \tau} (t \wedge \tau - s)^{\alpha-1} S(t \wedge \tau - s) Z_\alpha(s) ds \\ &= \frac{\sin(\pi\alpha)}{\pi} \int_0^{t \wedge \tau} (t \wedge \tau - s)^{\alpha-1} S(t \wedge \tau - s) \tilde{Z}_\alpha(s) ds \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where

$$\tilde{Z}_\alpha(t) = \int_0^t (t-s)^{-\alpha} S(t-s) \sigma(u(s)) 1_{\{s \leq \tau\}} dW(s) \quad (13)$$

We will make use of the following propositions

Proposition 1. *Let $\alpha \in (0, \frac{1-\eta}{2})$ and $p \geq 2$. For any $t > 0$,*

$$\mathbb{E} |\tilde{Z}_\alpha(t)|_{L^p(D)}^p \leq C_{\alpha,p} \mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^t (t-s)^{-\eta-2\alpha} |\sigma(u(s))|_{L^\infty(D)}^2 1_{\{s \leq \tau\}} ds \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \quad (14)$$

Proposition 1 and its proof can be found in [34] under Proposition (3.1), with its proof in that paper's Appendix.

Proposition 2. *For p, α, β such that $p(\alpha - \frac{1}{\beta+1}) - \frac{d}{2} - 1 > 0$, we have*

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \sup_{x \in D} \frac{|Z(t, x)|^p}{t^{\frac{p}{\beta+1}}} \right) \leq C_{\alpha,p,d} T^{p(\alpha - \frac{1}{\beta+1}) - \frac{d}{2} - 1} \int_0^T \mathbb{E} |\tilde{Z}_\alpha(s)|_{L^p(D)}^p ds \quad (15)$$

Proof of Proposition 2 Consider the factorized form of our stochastic convolution,

$$Z(t, x) = \frac{\sin(\pi\alpha)}{\pi} \int_0^t \int_D (t-s)^{\alpha-1} K(t-s, x, y) \tilde{Z}_\alpha(s, y) dy ds \quad (16)$$

where $K(t, x, y)$ is the kernel of the semigroup $S(t)$ defined in (7). Applying

Holder's Inequality with p and $\frac{p}{p-1}$ in both space and time implies

$$\begin{aligned}
|Z(t, x)| &\leq \frac{\sin(\pi\alpha)}{\pi} \left(\int_0^t \int_D (t-s)^{\frac{(\alpha-1)p}{p-1}} |K(t-s, x, y)|^{\frac{p}{p-1}} dy ds \right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}} \\
&\quad \cdot \left(\int_0^t \int_D |\tilde{Z}_\alpha(s, y)|^p dy ds \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\
&= \frac{\sin(\pi\alpha)}{\pi} \left(\int_0^t (t-s)^{\frac{(\alpha-1)p}{p-1}} \|K(t-s, x, \cdot)\|_{L^{\frac{p}{p-1}}(D)}^{\frac{p}{p-1}} ds \right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}} \\
&\quad \cdot \left(\int_0^t \int_D |\tilde{Z}_\alpha(s, y)|^p dy ds \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \tag{17}
\end{aligned}$$

Using Holder's Inequality with the semigroup norm implies

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \frac{\sin(\pi\alpha)}{\pi} \left(\int_0^t (t-s)^{\frac{(\alpha-1)p}{p-1}} \|K(t-s, x, \cdot)\|_{L^1(D)} \|K(t-s, x, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty(D)}^{\frac{1}{p-1}} ds \right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}} \\
&\quad \cdot \left(\int_0^t \int_D |\tilde{Z}_\alpha(s, y)|^p dy ds \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \tag{18}
\end{aligned}$$

Properties of the semigroup kernel norm imply for any $t > 0$ and $x \in D$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \frac{\sin(\pi\alpha)}{\pi} \left(\int_0^t (t-s)^{\frac{(\alpha-1)p}{p-1}} \cdot 1 \cdot (t-s)^{-\frac{d}{2(p-1)}} ds \right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}} \\
&\quad \cdot \left(\int_0^t \int_D |\tilde{Z}_\alpha(s, y)|^p dy ds \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\
&= \frac{\sin(\pi\alpha)}{\pi} \left(\int_0^t s^{\frac{(\alpha-1)p-d}{p-1}} ds \right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}} \cdot \left(\int_0^t \int_D |\tilde{Z}_\alpha(s, y)|^p dy ds \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\
&= C_{\alpha, p, d} t^{\frac{p\alpha - \frac{d}{2} - 1}{p}} \left(\int_0^t \int_D |\tilde{Z}_\alpha(s, y)|^p dy ds \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\
|Z(t, x)|^p &\leq C_{\alpha, p, d} t^{p\alpha - \frac{d}{2} - 1} \int_0^t |\tilde{Z}_\alpha(s)|_{L^p(D)}^p ds \tag{19}
\end{aligned}$$

Since (19) holds for any $t > 0$ and $x \in D$, we can divide both sides by $t^{\frac{p}{\beta+1}}$ to see that, for any $t > 0$,

$$\frac{|Z(t, x)|^p}{t^{\frac{p}{\beta+1}}} \leq C_{\alpha, p, d} t^{p(\alpha - \frac{1}{\beta+1}) - \frac{d}{2} - 1} \int_0^t |\tilde{Z}_\alpha(s)|_{L^p(D)}^p ds$$

Since supremums preserve inequalities, we can take expectations to get

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \sup_{x \in D} \frac{|Z(t, x)|^p}{t^{\frac{p}{\beta+1}}} \right) \leq C_{\alpha, p, d} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left(t^{p(\alpha - \frac{1}{\beta+1}) - \frac{d}{2} - 1} \int_0^t \mathbb{E} |\tilde{Z}_\alpha(s)|_{L^p(D)}^p ds \right) \quad (20)$$

$$= C_{\alpha, p, d} T^{p(\alpha - \frac{1}{\beta+1}) - \frac{d}{2} - 1} \int_0^T \mathbb{E} |\tilde{Z}_\alpha(s)|_{L^p(D)}^p ds \quad (21)$$

so long as we choose β, p such that $p(\alpha - \frac{1}{\beta+1}) > 1 + \frac{d}{2}$, causing the right-hand side to be increasing in t . \square

3.1 Uniform Bounds

To analyze the mild solution to the SPDE, we first demonstrate how the growth of the mild solution can be controlled by a deterministic function. Consider our mild solution to the integral equation

$$u(t) = S(t)u_0 + \int_0^t S(t-s)f(u(s))ds + Z(t) \quad (22)$$

where we have suppressed the spatial variable for convenience. Here, $Z \in C_0([0, T] \times \overline{D})$ is the continuous stochastic convolution integral from (9). For notational convenience, we also define

$$e(t) := 1 - |u(t)|_{L^\infty(D)}, \quad (23)$$

so that $e(0) = 1 - |u_0|_{L^\infty(D)}$. Under this notation, explosion occurs if $e(t)$ ever hits 0.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $T > 0$ and assume that $Z, u \in C_0([0, T] \times D)$ solves (22) such that, for all $t \in [0, T]$,*

$$|Z(t)|_{L^\infty(D)} \leq \frac{1}{3}e(t) \quad (24)$$

$$e(t) \in \left(0, \frac{1}{3^N} \right] \quad (25)$$

Then for all $t \in [0, T]$,

$$e(t) \geq \frac{3}{4} \left(e(0)^{\beta+1} + K \left(\frac{2}{5} \right)^\beta (1 + \beta)t \right)^{\frac{1}{\beta+1}} > K_\beta t^{\frac{1}{\beta+1}} \quad (26)$$

where $K_\beta > 0$ is a constant depending solely on β and $N \in \mathbb{N}$ is the minimal integer such that $\frac{2}{3^N} < 1 - c_0$, where c_0 is from Assumption 4.

Proof. If we define $v(t, x) = u(t, x) - Z(t, x)$ for $u, Z \in C_0([0, T] \times D)$, then v is weakly differentiable and weakly solves the PDE

$$\frac{\partial v}{\partial t}(t, x) = \mathcal{A}v(t, x) + f(v(t, x) + Z(t, x))$$

By a Yosida approximation (via Proposition 6.2.2 of [3] or Theorem 7.7 of [11]), we can assume that v is a strong solution. By Proposition D.4 in the appendix of [11], $t \mapsto |v(t)|_{L^\infty(D)}$ is left-differentiable such that

$$\frac{d^-}{dt}|v(t)|_{L^\infty(D)} \leq \mathcal{A}v(t, x_t)\text{sign}(v(t, x_t)) + f(v(t, x_t) + Z(t, x_t))\text{sign}(v(t, x_t)) \quad (27)$$

where $x_t \in D$ is a maximizer satisfying

$$|v(t)|_{L^\infty(D)} = |v(t, x_t)| = v(t, x_t)\text{sign}(v(t, x_t)) \quad (28)$$

The ellipticity of \mathcal{A} and convexity at a maximizer implies

$$\mathcal{A}v(t, x_t)\text{sign}(v(t, x_t)) \leq 0$$

Thus we need only examine

$$\frac{d^-}{dt}|v(t)|_{L^\infty(D)} \leq f(v(t, x_t) + Z(t, x_t))\text{sign}(v(t, x_t)) \quad (29)$$

Since $v(t) = u(t) - Z(t)$, using both versions of the triangle inequality combined with (24) implies

$$\begin{aligned} |u(t)|_{L^\infty(D)} - |Z(t)|_{L^\infty(D)} &\leq |v(t)|_{L^\infty(D)} \leq |u(t)|_{L^\infty(D)} + |Z(t)|_{L^\infty(D)} \\ 1 - |u(t)|_{L^\infty(D)} - |Z(t)|_{L^\infty(D)} &\leq 1 - |v(t)|_{L^\infty(D)} \leq 1 - |u(t)|_{L^\infty(D)} + |Z(t)|_{L^\infty(D)} \\ e(t) - |Z(t)|_{L^\infty(D)} &\leq 1 - |v(t)|_{L^\infty(D)} \leq e(t) + |Z(t)|_{L^\infty(D)} \end{aligned}$$

By Assumption (24), this implies

$$1 - |v(t)|_{L^\infty(D)} \leq \frac{4}{3}e(t) \quad (30)$$

$$1 - |v(t)|_{L^\infty(D)} \geq \frac{2}{3}e(t) \quad (31)$$

Using the fact that $|Z(t, x_t)| \leq |Z(t)|_{L^\infty(D)}$ by definition of supremum, and $|v(t, x_t)| = |v(t)|_{L^\infty(D)}$, we similarly find that

$$\begin{aligned} |v(t)|_{L^\infty(D)} - |Z(t)|_{L^\infty(D)} &\leq |v(t, x_t) + Z(t, x_t)| \leq |v(t)|_{L^\infty(D)} + |Z(t)|_{L^\infty(D)} \\ 1 - |v(t)|_{L^\infty(D)} - |Z(t)|_{L^\infty(D)} &\leq 1 - |v(t, x_t) + Z(t, x_t)| \leq 1 - |v(t)|_{L^\infty(D)} + |Z(t)|_{L^\infty(D)} \\ 1 - |v(t)|_{L^\infty(D)} - \frac{1}{3}e(t) &\leq 1 - |v(t, x_t) + Z(t, x_t)| \leq 1 - |v(t)|_{L^\infty(D)} + \frac{1}{3}e(t) \end{aligned}$$

Using inequalities (30) and (31) on the last series of inequalities implies

$$1 - |v(t, x_t) + Z(t, x_t)| \leq \frac{5}{3}e(t) \quad (32)$$

$$1 - |v(t, x_t) + Z(t, x_t)| \geq \frac{1}{3}e(t) \quad (33)$$

Since $0 < e(t) \leq \frac{1}{3^N}$ by (25), inequality (30) implies $1 - |v(t)|_{L^\infty(D)} \leq \frac{4}{3^{N+1}}$ and (31) implies $1 - |v(t)|_{L^\infty(D)} > 0$. Furthermore,

$$|v(t)|_{L^\infty(D)} > c_0 \iff 1 - |v(t)|_{L^\infty(D)} < 1 - c_0$$

Since $\frac{2}{3^N} < 1 - c_0$, this implies

$$1 - |v(t)|_{L^\infty(D)} \leq \frac{4}{3^{N+1}} = \frac{2}{3} \frac{2}{3^N} < \frac{2}{3}(1 - c_0)$$

Thus, $|v(t)|_{L^\infty(D)} \in (c_0, 1)$ for $t \in [0, T]$. A similar argument implies $|v(t, x_t) + z(t, x_t)| \in (c_0, 1)$ for $t \in [0, T]$. Furthermore,

$$\text{sign}(v(t, x_t)) = \text{sign}(v(t, x_t) + z(t, x_t)),$$

as $|z(t)|_{L^\infty(D)}$ is sufficiently small relative to $|u(t)|_{L^\infty(D)}$ and $|v(t)|_{L^\infty(D)}$. By (31) and (32), we get

$$1 - |v(t, x_t) + z(t, x_t)| \leq \frac{5}{2}(1 - |v(t)|_{L^\infty(D)}) \quad (34)$$

Applying (34) to (29) implies

$$\frac{d^-}{dt}|v(t)|_{L^\infty(D)} \leq -K \left(\frac{2}{5}\right)^\beta (1 - |v(t)|_{L^\infty(D)})^{-\beta} \quad (35)$$

Letting $F(x) = \frac{1}{1+\beta}(1-x)^{\beta+1}$ and $F'(x) = -(1-x)^\beta$, this implies

$$\frac{d^-}{dt}F(|v(t)|_{L^\infty(D)}) \geq K \left(\frac{2}{5}\right)^\beta \quad (36)$$

Therefore,

$$F(|v(t)|_{L^\infty(D)}) \geq F(|u_0|_{L^\infty(D)}) + K \left(\frac{2}{5}\right)^\beta t \quad (37)$$

and

$$|v(t)|_{L^\infty(D)} \leq 1 - \left(e(0)^{\beta+1} + K \left(\frac{2}{5}\right)^\beta (1+\beta)t \right)^{\frac{1}{\beta+1}} \quad (38)$$

with (38) implying $|v(t)|_{L^\infty(D)} \leq |u_0|_{L^\infty(D)}$ for $t \in [0, T]$. Combining this result with (30) yields our conclusion (26):

$$e(t) \geq \frac{3}{4} \left(e(0)^{\beta+1} + K \left(\frac{2}{5}\right)^\beta (1+\beta)t \right)^{\frac{1}{\beta+1}}$$

□

Inequality (26) implies $|u(t)|_{L^\infty(D)} \in (0, 1)$ for $t \in [0, T]$. In addition, if we assume $1 - |u_0|_{L^\infty(D)} = \frac{1}{3^n}$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then

$$1 - |u(t)|_{L^\infty(D)} \geq \frac{1}{4 \cdot 3^{n-1}} > \frac{1}{3^{n+1}} \quad (39)$$

Thus, $e(t) > \frac{1}{3^{n+1}}$ for $t \in [0, T]$, meaning the distance between 1 and $|u(t)|_{L^\infty(D)}$ can't decrease below $\frac{1}{3^{n+1}}$ so long as conditions (24) and (25) hold.

4 Proof of Theorem 1.1/ Main Result

To establish theorem 1.1, we first define a sequence of stopping times. Recalling $e(t) = 1 - |u(t)|_{L^\infty(D)}$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_0 &= \inf\{t \geq 0 : e(t) \leq \frac{1}{3^n} \text{ for some } n \in \{N, N+1, N+2, \dots\}\} \\ \tau_{k+1} &= \begin{cases} \inf\{t \geq \tau_k : e(t) \leq \frac{1}{3^{N+1}}\} & \text{if } e(\tau_k) = \frac{1}{3^N} \\ \inf\{t \geq \tau_k : e(t) \leq \frac{1}{3}e(\tau_k) \\ \text{or } e(t) \geq 3e(\tau_k)\} & \text{if } e(\tau_k) \leq \frac{1}{3^{N+1}} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

Here, N is the constant defined in Lemma 3.1. While these τ_k aren't the same as the stopping times T_k defined in (4), it is clear that $\sup_k \tau_k < \infty$ if and only if $\sup_k T_k < \infty$.

Lemma 4.1. *There exist constants $C > 0$ and $q > 1$, independent of n, k , and $\epsilon > 0$, such that for any $\epsilon > 0$, any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and any $n \in \{N+1, N+2, \dots\}$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(e(\tau_{k+1}) = \frac{1}{3}e(\tau_k) \text{ and } \tau_{k+1} - \tau_k < \epsilon \mid e(\tau_k) = \frac{1}{3^n}\right) \leq C\epsilon^q$$

where N is the constant defined in Lemma 3.1.

Proof As discussed in Lemma 4.1 from [34], we may assume $k = 0$, so $\tau_0 = 0$, without loss of generality by the Markov property. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left(e(\tau_{k+1}) = \frac{1}{3}e(\tau_k) \text{ and } \tau_{k+1} - \tau_k < \epsilon \mid e(\tau_k) = \frac{1}{3^n}\right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(e(\tau_1) = \frac{1}{3}e(0) \text{ and } \tau_1 < \epsilon \mid e(0) = \frac{1}{3^n}\right) \end{aligned}$$

Since $n \geq N+1$, by the definition of τ_1 , if $e(0) = \frac{1}{3^n}$, then $e(t) \in (\frac{1}{3^{n+1}}, \frac{1}{3^{n-1}})$ on $[0, \tau_1)$, equalling one of the endpoints at $t = \tau_1$. Since $\frac{1}{3^{n-1}} \leq \frac{1}{3^N}$, assumption (25) is satisfied on the interval $t \in [0, \tau_1]$.

Let $Z(t)$ be the stochastic integral in (22). We introduce the additional stopping time

$$\tilde{\tau} = \inf\{t > 0 : |Z(t)|_{L^\infty(D)} > \frac{1}{3}e(t)\} \quad (41)$$

By definition, $|Z(t)|_{L^\infty(D)} \leq \frac{1}{3}e(t)$ for $t \in [0, \tilde{\tau}]$. Lemma 3.1 is satisfied up to $\tilde{\tau}$, therefore if $e(0) = \frac{1}{3^n}$, then $e(t) > \frac{1}{3^{n+1}}$ on $[0, \tilde{\tau} \wedge \tau_1]$. Thus, in the event $e(\tau_1) = \frac{1}{3}e(0)$, this implies that $\tilde{\tau} \leq \tau_1$. If we were to assume $\tau_1 < \tilde{\tau}$ and $e(\tau_1) = \frac{1}{3}e(0)$, then $e(t)$ decreases to $\frac{1}{3^{n+1}}$ within the time interval $[0, \tilde{\tau}]$, which is impossible by Lemma 3.1.

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(e(\tau_1) = \frac{1}{3}e(0) \text{ and } \tau_1 < \epsilon \mid e(0) = \frac{1}{3^n}\right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\tilde{\tau} \leq \tau_1 < \epsilon \mid e(0) = \frac{1}{3^n}\right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t \in [0, \tilde{\tau} \wedge \tau_1 \wedge \epsilon]} \frac{|Z(t)|_{L^\infty(D)}}{e(t)} \geq \frac{1}{3} \mid e(0) = \frac{1}{3^n}\right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t \in [0, \tilde{\tau} \wedge \tau_1 \wedge \epsilon]} \frac{|Z(t)|_{L^\infty(D)}}{K_\beta t^{\frac{1}{\beta+1}}} \geq \frac{1}{3} \mid e(0) = \frac{1}{3^n}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

where (42) uses the fact that $e(t) \geq K_\beta t^{\frac{1}{\beta+1}}$ on $[0, \tilde{\tau} \wedge \tau_1 \wedge \epsilon]$ by Lemma 3.1. Chebyshev's Inequality yields

$$\leq \frac{\mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{t \in [0, \tilde{\tau} \wedge \tau_1 \wedge \epsilon]} \frac{|Z(t)|_{L^\infty(D)}^p}{t^{\frac{p}{\beta+1}}}\right)}{K_\beta^p \frac{1}{3^p}} \quad (43)$$

Using (15), by **Assumption 4**, the above is bounded by

$$\leq K_{\beta,p} C_{\alpha,p,d} \epsilon^{p(\alpha - \frac{1}{\beta+1}) - \frac{p}{2} - 1} \int_0^T \mathbb{E}|\tilde{Z}_\alpha(s)|_{L^p(D)}^p ds \quad (44)$$

From Lemma 3.1, on the time interval $t \in [0, \epsilon \wedge \tilde{\tau} \wedge \tau_1]$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|\tilde{Z}_\alpha(t)|_{L^p(D)}^p & \leq C \mathbb{E}\left(\int_0^t (t-s)^{-2\alpha-\eta} |\sigma(u(s))|_{L^\infty(D)}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{s \leq \tau\}} ds\right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \\ & \leq C \mathbb{E}\left(\int_0^t (t-s)^{-2\alpha-\eta} (1 - |u(s)|_{L^\infty(D)})^{-2\gamma} \mathbf{1}_{\{s \leq \tau\}} ds\right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \\ & \leq C_{\gamma,\beta} \left(\int_0^t (t-s)^{-2\alpha-\eta} s^{-\frac{2\gamma}{\beta+1}} ds\right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

We require $\beta > 0$ to satisfy

$$\eta + \frac{2\gamma}{\beta+1} < 1 \iff \gamma < \frac{(1-\eta)(\beta+1)}{2}, \quad (46)$$

which is guaranteed by **Assumption 4**. Choose $2\alpha = 1 - \eta - \frac{2\gamma}{\beta+1}$, so the properties of the Beta Integral ensure that (45) equals a constant

$$\left(\frac{\pi}{\sin(\pi(2\alpha + \eta))} \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \quad (47)$$

Therefore, $\mathbb{E}|\tilde{Z}_\alpha(t)|_{L^p(D)}^p \leq C_{\alpha,\gamma,\eta,p,\beta}$, a constant independent of ϵ, n, k . This result gives an upper bound for (44):

$$\leq C_{\alpha,p,d,\gamma,\eta} \epsilon^{p(\frac{1-\eta}{2} - \frac{\gamma+1}{\beta+1}) - \frac{d}{2}} = \tilde{C} \epsilon^q$$

by defining $q = p(\frac{1-\eta}{2} - \frac{\gamma+1}{\beta+1}) - \frac{d}{2}$. **Assumption 4** guarantees that

$$\frac{1-\eta}{2} - \frac{\gamma+1}{\beta+1} > 0$$

Choose p sufficiently large to ensure $q > 1$. Thus,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(e(\tau_{k+1}) = \frac{1}{3}e(\tau_k) \text{ and } \tau_{k+1} - \tau_k < \epsilon \mid e(\tau_k) = \frac{1}{3^n} \right) \leq C \epsilon^q \quad (48)$$

where $C > 0, q > 1$ independent of ϵ, k, n and ϵ independent of k, n , proving Lemma 4.1. \square

Now we prove Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1 Using the stopping times τ_k defined above and Lemma (4.1), it is known that there exists $C > 0$ and $q > 1$ such that for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and small $\epsilon > 0$

$$\mathbb{P} \left(e(\tau_{k+1}) = \frac{1}{3}e(\tau_k) \text{ and } \tau_{k+1} - \tau_k < \epsilon \right) \leq C \epsilon^q$$

If we pick $\epsilon = \frac{1}{k}$ for sufficiently-large k , then

$$\mathbb{P} \left(e(\tau_{k+1}) = \frac{1}{3}e(\tau_k) \text{ and } \tau_{k+1} - \tau_k < \frac{1}{k} \right) \leq C \frac{1}{k^q}$$

Since $q > 1$,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P} \left(e(\tau_{k+1}) = \frac{1}{3}e(\tau_k) \text{ and } \tau_{k+1} - \tau_k < \epsilon \right) < \infty$$

Thus, by the Borel-Cantelli Lemma, with probability one there exists a random index $N_0(\omega) > 0$ such that for all $k \geq N_0(\omega)$, either

$$\tau_{k+1} - \tau_k \geq \frac{1}{k} \quad \text{or} \quad e(\tau_{k+1}) = 3e(\tau_k) \quad (49)$$

It is possible that $\tau_K = \infty$ for some $K \in \mathbb{N}$, which would imply $\tau_k = \infty$ for $k \geq K$ by our definition (40) of τ_k . This would imply that $e(\tau_{k+1}) = \frac{1}{3}e(\tau_k)$

finitely-many times, making it impossible for $\|u(t)\|_{L^\infty(D)}$ to hit 1. Clearly, this implies mild solutions are global. If $e(\tau_{k+1}) = 3e(\tau_k)$ for all $k \geq N_0(\omega)$, then $\|u(t)\|_{L^\infty(D)}$ is distancing from 1, again implying mild solutions are global. Thus, we are left with examining the case when $\tau_{k+1} - \tau_k \geq \frac{1}{k}$ for finite τ_k and $e(\tau_{k+1}) = \frac{1}{3}e(\tau_k)$ occurring infinitely-many times.

From the definition of our τ_k , $\max_{k \geq N_0(\omega)} e(\tau_k)$ is attained. Thus, we may choose $N_1(\omega) > N_0(\omega)$ such that for $k \geq N_1(\omega)$, we have $e(\tau_k) \leq e(\tau_{N_1(\omega)})$.

Now, for any $m \geq N_1(\omega) > N_0(\omega)$, we have

$$\sum_{k=N_1(\omega)}^m (\tau_{k+1} - \tau_k) \geq \sum_{k=N_1(\omega)}^m \frac{1}{k} 1_{\{e(\tau_{k+1}) = \frac{1}{3}e(\tau_k)\}} \quad (50)$$

By the definition of our N_1 , there must be more steps where $e(\tau_k)$ decreases than steps where it increases, such that for $m \geq N_1(\omega)$:

$$U_m(\omega) = \sum_{k=N_1(\omega)}^{m-1} 1_{\{e(\tau_{k+1}) = \frac{1}{3}e(\tau_k)\}} \geq \frac{m - N_1(\omega)}{2} \quad (51)$$

At this point, our argument follows the rest of [34], starting from equation (4.31). Using the summation by parts formula and (51), we find

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=N_1(\omega)}^m (\tau_{k+1} - \tau_k) &\geq \sum_{k=N_1(\omega)}^m \frac{1}{k} 1_{\{e(\tau_{k+1}) = \frac{1}{3}e(\tau_k)\}} \\ &= \sum_{k=N_1(\omega)}^m \frac{1}{k} (U_{k+1}(\omega) - U_k(\omega)) \\ &= \frac{U_{m+1}(\omega)}{m} - \sum_{k=N_1(\omega)+1}^m U_k(\omega) \left(\frac{1}{k} - \frac{1}{k-1} \right) \\ &= \frac{U_{m+1}(\omega)}{m} + \sum_{k=N_1(\omega)+1}^m U_k(\omega) \left(\frac{1}{k(k-1)} \right) \\ &\geq \frac{m - N_1(\omega)}{2m} + \sum_{k=N_1(\omega)+1}^m \left(\frac{k - N_1(\omega)}{2k(k-1)} \right) \end{aligned}$$

As m tends to infinity, the sum diverges. Therefore, with probability one,

$$\sum_{k=N_1(\omega)}^{\infty} (\tau_{k+1} - \tau_k) = \infty$$

and solutions cannot explode in finite time. \square

References

- [1] Pavel Bezdek. Existence and blow-up of solutions to the fractional stochastic heat equations. *Stochastics and Partial Differential Equations: Analysis and Computations*, 6, 03 2018.
- [2] Zdzislaw Brzezniak and Szymon Peszat. Space-time continuous solutions to spde's driven by a homogeneous wiener process. *Studia Mathematica*, 137, 01 1999.
- [3] Sandra Cerrai. *Second Order PDE's in Finite and Infinite Dimension, A Probabilistic Approach*, volume 1762. Springer-Verlag, 2001.
- [4] Sandra Cerrai. Stochastic reaction-diffusion systems with multiplicative noise and non-lipschitz reaction term. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 125:271–304, 2003.
- [5] Sandra Cerrai. A khasminskii type averaging principle for stochastic reaction-diffusion equations, 2008.
- [6] Sandra Cerrai. Averaging principle for systems of reaction-diffusion equations with polynomial nonlinearities perturbed by multiplicative noise. *SIAM J. Math. Analysis*, 43:2482–2518, 11 2011.
- [7] Sandra Cerrai, Giuseppe Da Prato, and Franco Flandoli. Pathwise uniqueness for stochastic reaction-diffusion equations in banach spaces with an hölder drift component. *Stochastic Partial Differential Equations: Analysis and Computations*, 1(3):507–551, 2013.
- [8] Pao-Liu Chow. Unbounded positive solutions of nonlinear parabolic itô equations. *Communications on Stochastic Analysis*, 3, 01 2009.
- [9] Pao-Liu Chow. Explosive solutions of stochastic reaction-diffusion equations in mean L-norm. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 250(5):2567–2580, March 2011.
- [10] Giuseppe Da Prato and Michael Röckner. Singular dissipative stochastic equations in hilbert spaces. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 124:261–303, 10 2002.
- [11] Giuseppe Da Prato and Jerzy Zabczyk. *Stochastic Equations in Infinite Dimensions*. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications. Cambridge University Press, 2 edition, 2014.
- [12] R. Dalang, D. Khoshnevisan, F. Rassoul-Agha, C. Mueller, D. Nualart, and Y. Xiao. *A Minicourse on Stochastic Partial Differential Equations*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2008.
- [13] Robert C. Dalang. Extending martingale measure stochastic integral with applications to spatially homogeneous s. p. d. e's. *Electronic Journal of Probability [electronic only]*, 4:Paper No. 6, 29 p.–Paper No. 6, 29 p., 1999.

- [14] Charles R. Doering, Carl Mueller, and Peter Smereka. Interacting particles, the stochastic fisher–kolmogorov–petrovsky–piscounov equation, and duality. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, 325(1):243–259, 2003. Stochastic Systems: From Randomness to Complexity.
- [15] Wai-Tong Louis Fan and Oliver Tough. Quasi-stationary behavior of the stochastic fkpp equation on the circle, 2024.
- [16] Mohammud Foondun, Wei Liu, and Erkan Nane. Some non-existence results for a class of stochastic partial differential equations, 2019.
- [17] Maria Gordina, Michael Röckner, and Alexander Teplyaev. Ornstein-uhlenbeck processes with singular drifts: integral estimates and girsanov densities, 2020.
- [18] Tim Hobson and Rodge Tribe. On the Duality between Coalescing Brownian Particles and the Heat Equation Driven by Fisher-Wright Noise. *Electronic Communications in Probability*, 10(none):136 – 145, 2005.
- [19] Koichiro Iwata. An infinite dimensional stochastic differential equation with state space \mathbb{R} . *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 74(1):141–159, 1987.
- [20] W. Liu and M. Röckner. *Stochastic Partial Differential Equations: An Introduction*. Springer International Publishing, 2015.
- [21] Ralf Manthey and Thomas Zausinger. Stochastic evolution equations in. *Stochastics and Stochastic Reports*, 66(1-2):37–85, 1999.
- [22] Carlo Marinelli. On well-posedness of semilinear stochastic evolution equations on l_p spaces, 2018.
- [23] Carlo Marinelli and Michael Röckner. On uniqueness of mild solutions for dissipative stochastic evolution equations, 2010.
- [24] Carl Mueller. Long time existence for the heat equation with a noise term. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 90(4):505–517, 1991.
- [25] Carl Mueller. Long-time existence for signed solutions of the heat equation with a noise term. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 110:51–68, 1998.
- [26] Carl Mueller. The critical parameter for the heat equation with a noise term to blow up in finite time, 2000.
- [27] Carl Mueller. Some tools and results for parabolic stochastic partial differential equations. In Davar Khoshnevisan and Firas Rassoul-Agha, editors, *A Minicourse on Stochastic Partial Differential Equations*, pages 111–144. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2009.
- [28] Carl Mueller, Leonid Mytnik, and Jeremy Quastel. Effect of noise on front propagation in reaction-diffusion equations of kpp type, 2009.

- [29] Carl Mueller and Etienne Pardoux. The critical exponent for a stochastic pde to hit zero. In William M. McEneaney, G. George Yin, and Qing Zhang, editors, *Stochastic Analysis, Control, Optimization and Applications: A Volume in Honor of W.H. Fleming*, pages 325–338. Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 1999.
- [30] Carl Mueller and Richard Sowers. Blowup for the heat equation with a noise term. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 97(3):287–320, 1993.
- [31] Debabrata Panja. Effects of fluctuations on propagating fronts. *Physics Reports*, 393(2):87–174, March 2004.
- [32] Szymon Peszat and Jerzy Zabczyk. Nonlinear stochastic wave and heat equations. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 116(3):421–443, 2000.
- [33] Kotelenez Peter. Existence, uniqueness and smoothness for a class of function valued stochastic partial differential equations. *Stochastics and Stochastic Reports*, 41(3):177–199, 1992.
- [34] Michael Salins. Global solutions for the stochastic reaction-diffusion equation with super-linear multiplicative noise and strong dissipativity, 2021.
- [35] Marta Sanz-Solé and Mònica Sarrà. Path properties of a class of gaussian processes with applications to spde. *Canadian Mathematical Society, Conference Proceedings*, 28, 01 2000.
- [36] Tokuzo Shiga. *Stochastic Processes in Physics and Engineering*. Springer Dordrecht, 1988.
- [37] Tokuzo Shiga. Two contrasting properties of solutions for one-dimensional stochastic partial differential equations. *Canadian Journal of Mathematics*, 46(2):415–437, 1994.
- [38] Richard B. Sowers. Large Deviations for a Reaction-Diffusion Equation with Non-Gaussian Perturbations. *The Annals of Probability*, 20(1):504 – 537, 1992.
- [39] John B. Walsh. An introduction to stochastic partial differential equations. In P. L. Hennequin, editor, *École d’Été de Probabilités de Saint Flour XIV - 1984*, pages 265–439, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1986. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.