QUENCHING OF COMBUSTION BY SHEAR FLOWS

ALEXANDER KISELEV AND ANDREJ ZLATOŠ

ABSTRACT. We consider a simple model describing premixed combustion in the presence of fluid flow: reaction diffusion equation with passive advection and ignition type nonlinearity. Strong advection can suppress flames - a process we call quenching. A flow is called quenching if any compactly supported initial data will become extinct provided that the amplitude of the flow is chosen sufficiently large. In this paper, we provide a sharp characterization of quenching shear flows, improving results of [4]. The efficiency of quenching depends strongly on the geometry and scaling of the flow. We discuss the cases of slowly and quickly varying flows, proving analytically behavior that has been observed earlier in numerical experiments [13]. The technique involves probabilistic and PDE estimates, in particular applications of Malliavin calculus and central limit theorem for martingales.

1. INTRODUCTION

A mathematical model that describes a chemical reaction in a fluid is a system of two equations for concentration n and temperature T of the form

$$T_t + u \cdot \nabla T = \kappa \Delta T + \frac{v_0^2}{\kappa} g(T) n \qquad (1.1)$$
$$n_t + u \cdot \nabla n = \frac{\kappa}{\text{Le}} \Delta n - \frac{v_0^2}{\kappa} g(T) n.$$

The equations (1.1) are coupled to the reactive Navier-Stokes equations for the advection velocity u(x, y, t). Two assumptions are usually made to simplify the problem: the first is a constant density approximation [3] that allows to decouple the Navier-Stokes equations from the system (1.1) and to consider u(x, y, t) as a prescribed quantity that does not depend on T and n. The second assumption is that Le = 1 (equal thermal and material diffusivities). These two assumptions reduce the above system to a single scalar equation for the temperature T. We assume in addition that the advecting flow is unidirectional. Then the system (1.1) becomes

$$T_t + Au(y)T_x = \kappa \Delta T + \frac{v_0^2}{\kappa}f(T)$$

$$T(0, x, y) = T_0(x, y)$$
(1.2)

with f(T) = g(T)(1 - T). We are interested in strong advection, and accordingly have written the velocity as a product of the amplitude Aand the profile u(y). In this paper we consider a nonlinearity $f \neq 0$ of the ignition type

(i)
$$f(0) = f(1) = 0$$
 and $f(T)$ is Lipschitz continuous on $[0, 1]$,
(ii) $\exists \theta_0 > 0$ such that $f(T) = 0$ for $T \in [0, \theta_0]$, $f(T) \ge 0$ for $T \in (\theta_0, 1)$,
(iii) $f(T) \le T$.
(1.3)

The last condition in (1.3) is just a normalization. We consider the reaction-diffusion equation (1.2) in the strip $D = \{x \in \mathbb{R}, y \in [0, h]\}$. Equation (1.2) may be considered as a simple model of flame propagation in a fluid [2], advected by a shear (unidirectional) flow. The physical literature on the subject is vast, and we refer to the recent review [15] for an extensive bibliography. The main physical effect of advection on front-like solutions is the speed-up of the flame propagation due to the large scale distortion of the front. The role of the advection term in (1.2) for the front-like initial data was also a subject of intensive mathematical scrutiny recently, see [1, 15] for the references.

Our main goal in the present paper is to consider advection effects for a different physically interesting situation, where initial data are compactly supported. In this case, two generic scenarios are possible. If the support of the initial data is large enough, then two fronts form and propagate in opposite directions. Fluid advection speeds up the propagation, accelerating the burning. However, if the support of the initial data is small, then the advection exposes the initial hot region to diffusion which cools it below the ignition temperature θ_0 , ultimately extinguishing the flame.

We take u(y) to be periodic with period h and with mean equal to zero:

$$\int_{0}^{h} u(y)dy = 0.$$
 (1.4)

A constant non-zero mean can be easily taken into account by translation. For the temperature, we impose periodic boundary conditions

$$T(t, x, y) = T(t, x, y + h)$$
 (1.5)

in y and decay in x. We will always assume that initial data $T_0(x, y)$ is such that $0 \leq T_0(x, y) \leq 1$. Then we have $0 \leq T \leq 1$ for all t > 0 and $(x, y) \in D$. For simplicity, we will usually assume that the initial data coincide with characteristic function of some set. More generally, we may assume that for some L and $\eta > 0$ we have

$$T_0(x, y) > \theta_0 + \eta \text{ for } |x| \le L/2,$$
(1.6)
$$T_0(x, y) = 0 \text{ for } |x| \ge L.$$

The main purpose of this paper is to study the possibility of quenching of flames by strong fluid advection in the model (1.2). The phenomena associated with flame quenching are of great interest for physical, astrophysical and engineering applications. The problem of extinction and flame propagation in the mathematical model (1.2) was first studied by Kanel [7] in one dimension and with no advection. He showed that, in the absence of fluid motion, there exist two length scales $L_0 < L_1$ such that the flame becomes extinct for $L < L_0$, and propagates for $L > L_1$. More precisely, he has shown that there exist L_0 and L_1 such that

$$T(t, x, y) \to 0 \text{ as } t \to \infty \text{ uniformly in } D \text{ if } L < L_0$$
(1.7)
$$T(t, x, y) \to 1 \text{ as } t \to \infty \text{ for all } (x, y) \in D \text{ if } L > L_1.$$

In the absence of advection, the flame extinction is achieved by diffusion alone, given that the support of initial data is small compared to the scale of the laminar front width $l = \kappa/v_0$. However, in many applications quenching is the result of a strong wind, intense fluid motion, and operates on larger scales. Until recently, there were few results available for such situations in the framework of the reaction-diffusion model. Kanel's result was extended to non-zero advection by shear flows by Roquejoffre [10] who has shown that (1.7) holds also for $u \neq 0$ with L_0 and L_1 depending, in particular, on A and u(y). However the interesting question about more explicit quantitative dependence of L_0 , L_1 on A and u(y) remained open until recent work [4]. The following definition was given in [4].

Definition 1.1. We say that the profile u(y) is quenching if for any L and any initial data T(0, x, y) supported inside the interval $[-L, L] \times [0, h]$, there exists A_0 such that the solution of (1.2) becomes extinct:

$$T(t, x, y) \to 0 \text{ as } t \to \infty \text{ uniformly in } D$$
 (1.8)

for all $|A| \ge A_0$. We call the profile u(y) strongly quenching if the critical amplitude of advection A_0 satisfies $A_0 \le CL$ for some constant $C = C(u, \kappa, v_0, h)$ (which has the dimension of inverse time).

The quenching property has been linked in [4] with hypoellipticity of a certain degenerate diffusion equation. In particular, one of the main results showed that u(y) is strongly quenching if there is no point y where all derivatives of u vanish. On the other hand, if u(y)has a plateau larger than a certain critical size, then u is not quenching. However hypoellipticity does not provide a precise solution of the problem at hand: a shear flow u(y) with a small plateau leads to an auxiliary equation which is not hypoelliptic, yet it is quenching. Our first goal in this paper is to prove sharp characterization of quenching shear flows. The result, Theorem 3.1, states that the shear flow is quenching if and only if it has a plateau exceeding certain critical size. This critical scale can be described in terms of existence of solutions to a nonlinear Dirichlet problem. The main new technical ingredient involves estimates of certain stochastic integrals, in particular application of Malliavin calculus to derive absolute continuity of the relevant random variables. The second goal is to study dependence of quenching on the scaling of the flow. Numerical experiments [13] suggest that there is a certain scale of the flow for which quenching is most efficient. Namely, if $u(y) = \sin \pi \alpha y$, then the size L_A of initial data that can be quenched by flow Au(y) satisfies $L_A \sim C_{\alpha}A$ with C_{α} achieving maximum for some α_0 . Moreover, the constant C_{α} satisfies $C_{\alpha} \sim \alpha^{-1}$ for large α and $C_{\alpha} \sim \alpha^2$ for small α . We prove that in the small and large α asymptotic regimes one indeed has quenching for the initial data satisfying the above scaling. Central limit-type theorem for martingales is instrumental in obtaining the large α result.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we establish some auxiliary technical estimates on stochastic integrals. In Section 3 we prove results on quenching by shear flows and provide a characterization of the critical plateau size in terms of a corresponding Dirichlet problem. In Section 4 we deal with the scaling question.

2. Stochastic Integrals

Results from this section will be used to obtain upper bounds on the solutions of (1.2) without the non-linear term, which can be expressed in terms of the Brownian motion. See the beginning of Section 3 for details and how this translates into estimates on the temperature T.

We call a *plateau* of a function $u \in C(\mathbb{R})$ any maximal (w.r.t. inclusion) interval on which u is constant. We start by proving

Lemma 2.1. Let $u \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$ be bounded along with its first derivative and let W^y_s denote the normalized one-dimensional Brownian motion

4

starting at y. Then for any $a \in \mathbb{R}$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}\bigg(\int_0^t u(W_s^y)ds = a\bigg) = \mathbb{P}\bigg(u(W_s^y) = \frac{a}{t} \text{ for } s \in [0, t]\bigg).$$
(2.1)

Remarks. 1. In other words, the first probability is zero unless y is an interior point of a plateau of u with $u(y) = \frac{a}{t}$, in which case it equals the probability of W_s^y staying inside this plateau for all $s \in [0, t]$.

2. This lemma for $u \in C^{\infty}$ and y not in a plateau of u follows from a probabilistic version of Hörmander's theorem (see, e.g., [8, Theorem 2.3.2]). Here we extend it to all $u \in C^1$ and all y.

3. We believe that the same result holds for $u \in C(\mathbb{R})$ but we were unable to locate an appropriate reference in the literature.

Proof. By Theorem 2.1.3 in [8] with $F(W^y) \equiv \int_0^t u(W^y_s) ds$, the law of the random variable F is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R} whenever

$$\left(\|DF\|_{2}^{2}=\right)\int_{0}^{t}\left(\int_{s}^{t}u'(W_{r}^{y})dr\right)^{2}ds>0$$
(2.2)

almost surely. We note that with the notation of [8, p.24-26], if $u \in C^1$, then $F \in \mathbb{D}^{1,1}$ is the limit of $F_n(W^y) \equiv \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n u(W^y_{tk/n})$, and $DF(s) = \int_s^t u'(W^y_r) dr$ is the limit of

$$DF_n(s) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n u'(W_{tk/n}^y) \chi_{[0,\frac{tk}{n})}(s) = \sum_{k=1}^n \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=k}^n u'(W_{tj/n}^y)\right] \chi_{[\frac{t(k-1)}{n},\frac{tk}{n})}(s).$$

Eq. (2.2) is obviously true if u' is not identically zero on an interval around y, that is, when y is not inside a plateau. In particular, for such y and all a,

$$\mathbb{P}\bigg(\int_0^t u(W_s^y)ds = a\bigg) = 0.$$
(2.3)

Now assume y to be inside a plateau I. For any open interval J with rational end points not intersecting any plateau of u, and any rational $\tau \in (0, t)$, let $B_{J,\tau}$ be the set of Brownian paths W^y such that $W^y_{\tau} \in J$. Notice that every W^y that exits I before time t, belongs to some such $B_{J,\tau}$.

We have for any a

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\int_0^t u(W_s^y)ds = a \mid W^y \in B_{J,\tau}\right) = 0.$$
(2.4)

This follows from (2.3) applied to the \int_{τ}^{t} portion of the integral. Indeed — since $U_s \equiv W_{s+\tau}^y$ (for $s \ge 0$) is just Brownian motion starting

at W^y_{τ} , given any history $\{W^y_s\}_{s \leq \tau}$, the probability of $\int_{\tau}^t u(W^y_s) ds$ (= $\int_0^{t-\tau} u(U_s) ds$) being $a - \int_0^{\tau} u(W^y_s) ds$ is zero because W^y_{τ} is not in a plateau of u if $W^y \in B_{J,\tau}$. By Fubini's theorem, (2.4) holds. Since there are only countably many sets $B_{J,\tau}$, the result follows.

The main result of this section is

Lemma 2.2. Let $u \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$ be periodic. Then for any compact interval $S \subset (0, \infty)$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\int_0^t u(W_s^y)ds \in [a, a+\varepsilon] \smallsetminus \{tu(y)\}\right) \to 0$$
(2.5)

as $\varepsilon \to 0$, uniformly in $(t, y, a) \in S \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$.

Remarks. 1. Note that non-uniform convergence is an obvious consequence of Lemma 2.1.

2. The importance of this lemma lies in the fact that for large A it gives us a uniform (in $(t, y, x) \in S \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$) estimate on the solution of (3.3),(3.4) below, using (3.8). Through (3.6),(3.7) this translates into an upper bound on the temperature T.

To prove the lemma, consider the function

$$p(t, y, a, \varepsilon) \equiv \mathbb{P}\bigg(\int_0^t u(W_s^y) ds \in [a, a + \varepsilon] \setminus \{tu(y)\}\bigg),$$

that is, the probability of $\int_0^t u(W_s^y) ds \in [a, a + \varepsilon]$ and $\{u(W_s^y)\}_{s \le t}$ not constant.

Lemma 2.3. Under the conditions of Lemma 2.2, p is jointly continuous in $\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^+_0$.

Proof. For $\delta_1 \in \mathbb{R}^+_0$ and $\delta_2, \delta_3, \delta_4 \in \mathbb{R}$ let

$$\delta \equiv ||u||_{\infty} |\delta_1| + t ||u'||_{\infty} |\delta_2| + |\delta_3| + |\delta_4|.$$

Then

$$\left| \int_{0}^{t+\delta_{1}} u(W_{s}^{y}+\delta_{2})ds - \int_{0}^{t} u(W_{s}^{y})ds \right| \leq \|u\|_{\infty}|\delta_{1}| + t\|u'\|_{\infty}|\delta_{2}|$$

and we have

$$\begin{aligned} |p(t+\delta_1, y+\delta_2, a+\delta_3, \varepsilon+\delta_4) - p(t, y, a, \varepsilon)| \\ \leq & \mathbb{P}\bigg(\int_0^t u(W_s^y) ds \in [a-\delta, a+\delta] \cup [a+\varepsilon-\delta, a+\varepsilon+\delta] \smallsetminus \{tu(y)\}\bigg) \\ & + & \mathbb{P}\big(\text{exactly one of } \{u(W_s^y)\}_{s \le t} \text{ and } \{u(W_s^y+\delta_2)\}_{s \le t+\delta_1} \text{ is constant}\big) \end{aligned}$$

As $\delta \to 0$, the first probability goes to zero because by Lemma 2.1,

$$\mathbb{P}\bigg(\int_0^t u(W_s^y)ds \in \{a, a+\varepsilon\} \smallsetminus \{tu(y)\}\bigg) = 0.$$

The second probability goes to zero because

$$\mathbb{P}(\{u(W_s^y)\}_{s\leq t} \text{ is constant})$$

is continuous in (t, y).

Proof of Lemma 2.2. By Lemma 2.1, p(t, y, a, 0) = 0. Hence by Lemma 2.3, $p(t, y, a, \varepsilon) \downarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$, for any (t, y, a). By joint continuity of p we then have $p(t, y, a, \varepsilon) \downarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$, uniformly in $(t, y, a) \in K$, for any compact $K \subset \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^2$. But p is periodic in y and $p(t, y, a, \varepsilon) = 0$ for $|a| > t ||u||_{\infty} + \varepsilon$. Thus $p(t, y, a, \varepsilon) \downarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$, uniformly in $(t, y, a) \in S \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$, for any compact $S \subset \mathbb{R}^+$.

3. The Quenching Flows

Let $u(y) \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$ be a periodic function and let f(T) be an ignitiontype non-linearity satisfying (i)-(iii) of (1.3). Let T(t, x, y), $\Phi(t, x, y)$, and $\Psi(t, x, y)$ be the solutions of

$$T_t = \kappa \triangle T - Au(y)T_x + \frac{v_0^2}{\kappa}f(T)$$
(3.1)

$$\Phi_t = \kappa \triangle \Phi - Au(y)\Phi_x \tag{3.2}$$

$$\Psi_t = \kappa \Psi_{yy} - Au(y)\Psi_x \tag{3.3}$$

with $(t, x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^+_0 \times \mathbb{R}^2$ and initial conditions

$$T(0, x, y) = \Phi(0, x, y) = \Psi(0, x, y) = \chi_{[-L, L]}(x).$$
(3.4)

Notice that to prove quenching, one only needs to show

$$\|T(\tau,\cdot,\cdot)\|_{\infty} \le \theta_0 \tag{3.5}$$

for some $\tau > 0$. Indeed, the maximum principle then implies $T(t, x, y) \leq \theta_0$ for all $t \geq \tau$. Hence we have

$$T_t = \kappa \triangle T - Au(y)T_x$$

for $t \geq \tau$, and (1.8) follows.

The functions Φ , Ψ can be used to estimate the non-linear evolution:

$$T(t, x, y) \le \Phi(t, x, y) e^{v_0^2 t/\kappa}$$
(3.6)

$$\|\Phi(t,\cdot,y)\|_{L^{\infty}_{x}} \le \|\Psi(t,\cdot,y)\|_{L^{\infty}_{x}}.$$
(3.7)

The first bound is achieved by replacing f(T) with T in (3.1), while the second bound follows from the equality

$$\Phi(x, y, t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} G(x - x', t) \Psi(x', y, t) \, dx'$$

where G is the fundamental solution of the one-dimensional heat equation.

Since Φ and Ψ satisfy the above linear equations, we can apply the results from the previous section to obtain the following estimates. Let (W^x, W^y) be the normalized 2-dimensional Brownian motion starting at (x, y) and let (X_t^x, Y_t^y) be the random process starting at (x, y) and given by

$$\begin{split} dX_t^x &= \sqrt{2\kappa} \, dW_t^x - Au(Y_t^y) dt, \\ dY_t^y &= \sqrt{2\kappa} \, dW_t^y. \end{split}$$

Thus, $Y_t^y = y + \sqrt{2\kappa}(W_t^y - y) = W_{2\kappa t}^y$ and

$$X_t^x = x + \sqrt{2\kappa}(W_t^x - x) - \int_0^t Au(Y_s^y) ds = W_{2\kappa t}^x - \frac{A}{2\kappa} \int_0^{2\kappa t} u(W_s^y) ds.$$

Then we have by (3.2), (3.4), and Lemma 7.8 in [9],

$$\Phi(t, x, y) = \mathbb{E}\left(\Phi(0, X_t^x, Y_t^y)\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(W_{2\kappa t}^x - \frac{A}{2\kappa} \int_0^{2\kappa t} u(W_s^y) ds \in [-L, L]\right).$$

Similarly,

$$\Psi(t,x,y) = \mathbb{P}\bigg(x - \frac{A}{2\kappa} \int_0^{2\kappa t} u(W_s^y) ds \in [-L,L]\bigg).$$
(3.8)

Theorem 3.1. With the above notation, there exists $0 < \ell < \infty$, depending only on v_0 , κ , and f, such that the following hold.

- (i) If the longest plateau of u is shorter than ℓ , then there exists C (depending on u) such that for every L and $|A| \ge CL$ we have $T(t, x, y) \to 0$ as $t \to \infty$, uniformly in $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$.
- (ii) If the longest plateau of u is longer than ℓ , then there is L_0 such that if $L \ge L_0$, then for any A the temperature T(t, x, y) does not go uniformly to zero as $t \to \infty$.

Moreover, this ℓ is the infimum of all l such that the equation

$$\phi_t = \kappa \triangle \phi + \frac{v_0^2}{\kappa} f(\phi) \tag{3.9}$$

on $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0, l]$ with Dirichlet boundary conditions at y = 0, l, has a solution ϕ with $\phi(0, \cdot, \cdot)$ compactly supported (and taking values in [0, 1]) such that ϕ does not go uniformly to zero as $t \to \infty$. *Remarks.* 1. The fact that $\ell < \infty$, follows from results of [4]. Proposition 3.4 below shows that $\ell > 0$.

2. Notice that by comparison theorems (see e.g. [12, Chapter 10]), a solution ϕ described above exists for any $l > \ell$ and does not exist for $l < \ell$. The case $l = \ell$ will be treated separately.

Proof. Let ℓ be defined as above and let l be the length of some plateau of u. Without loss of generality we can assume that this plateau is I = [0, l]. Also without loss of generality, let u(0) = 0. Indeed — if $u(0) \neq 0$ and \tilde{T} is the solution of (3.1) with u(y) replaced by $\tilde{u}(y) = u(y) - u(0)$, then $T(t, x, y) = \tilde{T}(t, x - Au(0)t, y)$ and the result for \tilde{T} translates directly to T.

Consider first the case where $l > \ell$. By the definition of ℓ , there exists $\phi(t, x, y)$ defined on $\mathbb{R}_0^+ \times \mathbb{R} \times I$, satisfying (3.9) with Dirichlet boundary conditions at y = 0, l, such that $\phi(0, \cdot, \cdot)$ is compactly supported (in some $[-L_0, L_0] \times I$) and $\phi(t, x, y)$ does not go uniformly to zero as $t \to \infty$. Take initial data for T with $L > L_0$; then by comparison theorems we have $T(x, y, t) \ge \phi(x, y, t)$ for all times, proving the statement (ii) of the theorem.

Now we prove (i), so let $l < \ell$ and fix L. Take $\tilde{\delta} < (\ell - l)/2$. Consider a function $\eta(t, x, y)$ defined on $\mathbb{R}_0^+ \times \mathbb{R} \times [-\tilde{\delta}, l + \tilde{\delta}]$, taking values in [0, 1] and satisfying (3.9) with Dirichlet boundary conditions at $y = -\tilde{\delta}$ and $y = l + \tilde{\delta}$ and initial data $\eta(0, x, y) \ge \chi_{[-L-\tilde{\delta}, L+\tilde{\delta}]}(x)\chi_I(y)$. Let $\tau_2 > 1$ be such that for $t \ge \tau_2 - 1$ we have $\eta(t, x, y) \le \theta_0/2$. With d such that $|f(a) - f(b)| \le d|a - b|$ define $c \equiv \max\{\frac{v_0^2}{\kappa}d, 2\kappa\}$. We set $\delta_1, \delta_2 > 0$ to be maximal such that $(-\delta_1, 0) \cup (l, l + \delta_2)$ does not intersect a plateau of size larger than γ , where $\gamma > 0$ is defined by the condition

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|W_{2\kappa\tau_2}^0| \le \gamma\right) = \frac{\theta_0}{4e^{c\tau_2}}.$$
(3.10)

Let $\delta = \min\{\tilde{\delta}, \delta_1, \delta_2\}$ and let $\tilde{\phi}(t, x, y)$ be some function defined on $\mathbb{R}^+_0 \times \mathbb{R} \times [-\delta, l+\delta]$, taking values in [0, 1], satisfying (3.9) with Dirichlet boundary conditions at $y = -\delta$ and $y = l+\delta$, and such that $\tilde{\phi}(0, x, y) \geq \chi_{[-L-\delta, L+\delta]}(x)\chi_I(y)$. Note that since $\tilde{\delta} \geq \delta$, we can pick $\tilde{\phi}(0, x, y) \leq \eta(0, x, y)$ so that by comparison principles $\tilde{\phi}(t, x, y) \leq \eta(t, x, y)$ for all t. Then we have also $\tilde{\phi}(t, x, y) \leq \theta_0/2$ for $t \geq \tau_2 - 1$.

Furthermore, let $0 < \tau_1 < 1$ be such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|W_{2\kappa\tau_1}^0| \ge \frac{\delta}{2}\right) \le \frac{\theta_0}{4e^{c\tau_2}} \tag{3.11}$$

and let $\phi(t, x, y) \equiv \tilde{\phi}(t - \tau_1, x, y)$ be defined for $t \ge \tau_1$. Hence $\phi \ge 0$,

$$\phi(t, x, y) \le \frac{\theta_0}{2} \tag{3.12}$$

for $t \geq \tau_2$, and

$$\phi(\tau_1, x, y) \ge \chi_{[-L-\delta, L+\delta]}(x)\chi_I(y). \tag{3.13}$$

We will show that for $t \in [\tau_1, \tau_2]$, the difference $T - \phi$ cannot be large for $y \in [-\delta_1, l + \delta_2]$ (with $\phi(t, x, y) \equiv 0$ for $y \notin [-\delta, l + \delta]$), and, in particular, $T(\tau_2, x, y) - \phi(\tau_2, x, y) \leq \theta_0/2$, that is, $T(\tau_2, x, y) \leq \theta_0$ for such y. One can apply this argument to all plateaux of u with a uniform τ_2 (even in the presence of an infinite number of plateaux within one period of u because if some τ_2 works for a plateau of length l, it will also work for any shorter plateau), and obtain $||T(\tau_2, \cdot, \cdot)||_{\infty} \leq \theta_0$ (nonplateaux of u are included by the definition of δ_1, δ_2). This is (3.5) and so (1.8) will follow.

Let C be such that for any $|\tilde{C}| \ge C$ and $A \equiv \tilde{C}L$

$$\mathbb{P}\left(x - \frac{A}{2\kappa} \int_0^{2\kappa\tau_1} u(W_s^y) ds \in \left[-L - \frac{\delta}{2}, L + \frac{\delta}{2}\right]\right) \le \frac{\theta_0}{4e^{c\tau_2}}$$

whenever $y \in I$ and $|x| \ge L + \delta$. Such C exists (and is independent of L) because by Lemma 2.2,

$$\mathbb{P}\bigg(\int_0^{2\kappa\tau_1} u(W_s^y)ds \in \frac{1}{\tilde{C}L}\bigg[-L - \frac{\delta}{2} + x, L + \frac{\delta}{2} + x\bigg]\bigg) \to 0$$

as $|\tilde{C}| \to \infty$, uniformly in $y \in I$, L > 0, and $x \notin [-L - \frac{\delta}{2}, L + \frac{\delta}{2}]$. (To be correct also in the "uninteresting" case of small L, we should require $\delta \leq L$ as well.) Using (3.11), it follows that for $y \in I$ and $|x| \geq L + \delta$,

$$T(\tau_{1}, x, y) \leq e^{2\kappa\tau_{1}} \Phi(\tau_{1}, x, y)$$

$$= e^{2\kappa\tau_{1}} \mathbb{P}\left(W_{2\kappa\tau_{1}}^{x} - \frac{A}{2\kappa} \int_{0}^{2\kappa\tau_{1}} u(W_{s}^{y}) ds \in [-L, L]\right)$$

$$\leq e^{2\kappa\tau_{1}} \mathbb{P}\left(x - \frac{A}{2\kappa} \int_{0}^{2\kappa\tau_{1}} u(W_{s}^{y}) ds \in \left[-L - \frac{\delta}{2}, L + \frac{\delta}{2}\right]\right) + e^{2\kappa\tau_{1}} \frac{\theta_{0}}{4e^{c\tau_{2}}}$$

$$\leq \frac{\theta_{0}}{2e^{c(\tau_{2} - \tau_{1})}}$$

$$(3.14)$$

Next, increase C (if necessary) so that for $|A| \ge CL$ and all $t \in [\tau_1, \tau_2], x \in \mathbb{R}$, and $y \in [-\delta_1, 0] \cup [l, l + \delta_2]$,

$$\Psi(t,x,y) = \mathbb{P}\left(x - \frac{A}{2\kappa} \int_0^{2\kappa t} u(W_s^y) ds \in [-L,L]\right) \le \frac{\theta_0}{2e^{2c\tau_2}}.$$

This is again possible by Lemma 2.2, since by Lemma 2.1 and the definition of δ_1, δ_2 ,

$$\mathbb{P}\bigg(\int_0^{2\kappa t} u(W_s^y) ds = 2\kappa t u(y)\bigg) \le \frac{\theta_0}{4e^{2c\tau_2}}$$

for these y. Then by (3.7), for $t \in [\tau_1, \tau_2]$ and $y \in [-\delta_1, 0] \cup [l, l + \delta_2]$

$$\sup_{x} T(t, x, y) \le e^{2\kappa t} \sup_{x} \Psi(t, x, y) \le e^{2\kappa t} \frac{\theta_0}{2e^{2c\tau_2}} \le \frac{\theta_0}{2e^{c\tau_2}}.$$
 (3.15)

Now define $\omega \equiv T - \phi$ for $t \geq \tau_1$ and $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R} \times I$. Then

$$\omega_t = \Delta \omega + f(T) - f(\phi) \le \Delta \omega + c|\omega| \tag{3.16}$$

By (3.13) and (3.14),

$$\omega(\tau_1, x, y) \le \frac{\theta_0}{2e^{c(\tau_2 - \tau_1)}} \tag{3.17}$$

and by (3.15),

$$\sup_{x} \{ \omega(t, x, 0), \omega(t, x, l) \} \le \frac{\theta_0}{2e^{c(\tau_2 - \tau_1)}}$$
(3.18)

for $t \in [\tau_1, \tau_2]$. Now for $\tilde{\omega} \equiv e^{-ct}\omega$ we have

$$\tilde{\omega}_t \leq \Delta \tilde{\omega} + c(|\tilde{\omega}| - \tilde{\omega}).$$

Thus by (3.17), (3.18), and the maximum principle,

$$\tilde{\omega}(t, x, y) \le \frac{\theta_0}{2e^{c\tau_2}},$$

for $t \in [\tau_1, \tau_2]$. Thus $\omega(\tau_2, x, y) \leq \theta_0/2$ whenever $y \in I$. So by (3.12), $T(\tau_2, x, y) \leq \theta_0$ for $y \in I$. Together with (3.15) this gives $T(\tau_2, x, y) \leq \theta_0$ for $y \in [-\delta_1, l + \delta_2]$, thereby finishing the proof of (i).

Whether quenching happens in the case $l = \ell$ depends not only on whether solutions of (3.9) with Dirichlet boundary conditions at $y = 0, \ell$, initially compactly supported, go uniformly to 0, but on this decay being uniform in all $\phi(0, \cdot, \cdot)$ supported in $[-L, L] \times [0, \ell]$ (for each L).

Theorem 3.2. With the notation of Theorem 3.1, assume the longest plateau of u has length ℓ (with ℓ defined in that theorem).

(i) If for every L < ∞ and ε > 0 there is τ(L, ε) < ∞ such that any solution φ of (3.9) on (x, y) ∈ ℝ × [0, ℓ] with Dirichlet boundary conditions at y = 0, ℓ and φ(0, ·, ·) supported in [−L, L]×[0, ℓ] (and taking values in [0, 1]), satisfies φ(t, x, y) < ε for t ≥ τ(L, ε), then there exists C (depending on u) such that for every L and |A| ≥ CL we have T(t, x, y) → 0 as t → ∞, uniformly in (x, y) ∈ ℝ².

(ii) If the condition in (i) is not satisfied, then there is L_0 such that if $L \ge L_0$, then for any A the temperature T(t, x, y) does not go uniformly to zero as $t \to \infty$.

Proof. (i) Here we can use a version of the proof of Theorem 3.1(i). A small complication is that since $l = \ell$, we cannot enlarge the interval [0, l] by δ and still keep the property that every initially compactly supported $\tilde{\phi}$ goes uniformly to 0. However, the same argument works if we first pick $\tau_2 \equiv \tau(L + 2\delta, \theta_0/2) + 1$ (with an arbitrary $\delta > 0$), then τ_1 , A, and only then we pick $\tilde{\phi}$ so that $\tilde{\phi}(0, \cdot, \cdot)$ is supported in $[-L - 2\delta, L + 2\delta] \times [0, \ell]$ and

$$\omega(\tau_1, x, y) \equiv T(\tau_1, x, y) - \tilde{\phi}(0, x, y) \le \frac{\theta_0}{2e^{c(\tau_2 - \tau_1)}}$$

on $[-L - \delta, L + \delta] \times [0, \ell]$ (and therefore on $\mathbb{R} \times [0, \ell]$ as well). The rest of the argument is unchanged.

(ii) If for any L the temperature T (with initial condition (3.4)) went uniformly to zero, then by comparison theorems we would have $\tau(L,\varepsilon) \leq t$ where t is such that $||T(t,\cdot,\cdot)||_{\infty} < \varepsilon$.

Recalling Definition 1.1, the above proves

Corollary 3.3. Every quenching profile u is strongly quenching.

In [4] an upper bound on ℓ was provided by constructing a non-zero compactly supported $\phi(x, y)$ such that

$$\kappa \triangle \phi + \frac{v_0^2}{\kappa} f(\phi) \ge 0$$

in the sense of distributions. By comparison theorems, ℓ is at most the diameter of the support of ϕ . Here we give a lower bound on ℓ , in terms of the existence of a stationary 1D solution of (3.9).

Proposition 3.4. With the above notation, ℓ is at least the length of the shortest interval I so that there exists $\psi : I \to [0, 1]$, vanishing at the edges of I, such that inside I

$$\kappa \psi'' + \frac{v_0^2}{\kappa} f(\psi) = 0.$$
 (3.19)

Proof. Assume ϕ is a solution of (3.9) on $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0, l]$ with Dirichlet boundary conditions at y = 0, l and $\phi(0, \cdot, \cdot)$ compactly supported (and taking values in [0, 1]), such that ϕ does not go uniformly to zero as $t \to \infty$. Let $\tilde{\phi}$ be the solution of (3.9) with the same boundary conditions, but with $\tilde{\phi}(0, x, y) \equiv \sup_x \phi(0, x, y)$. By comparison theorems, $\tilde{\phi} \ge \phi$, and so $\tilde{\phi}$ also does not go uniformly to zero as $t \to \infty$.

12

Moreover, obviously $\tilde{\phi}(t, x_1, y) = \tilde{\phi}(t, x_2, y)$ for any t, y, x_1, x_2 , and so $\tilde{\psi}(t, y) \equiv \tilde{\phi}(t, x, y)$ is well-defined and solves

$$\tilde{\psi}_t = \kappa \tilde{\psi}_{yy} + \frac{v_0^2}{\kappa} f(\tilde{\psi}).$$

Since $\tilde{\psi}$ does not go uniformly to 0, Proposition 3.6 provides us ψ solving (3.19), defined on [0, l]. A simple shooting argument can be used to prove that the set of all l for which solution of (3.19) does not exist is open. Thus ℓ is the minimum of all l for which such solution exists, and the result follows.

Corollary 3.5. With the above notation (and $f(T) \leq T$), we have $\ell > \pi \kappa / v_0$.

Remark. In [4] it is proved that $\ell \leq c\kappa/v_0$ for some constant c depending on f. It follows that the critical plateau length ℓ is of the order of the *laminar front width* κ/v_0 .

Proof. By Proposition 3.4, there exists a solution ψ of (3.19) on $[0, \ell]$ vanishing at $0, \ell$. Since $f(\psi) \leq \psi$, we then have

$$\kappa\psi'' + \frac{v_0^2}{\kappa}\psi \ge 0.$$

That is, the lowest eigenvalue of $-\triangle$ on [0, l] is at most $(v_0/\kappa)^2$. Hence $l \ge \pi \kappa/v_0$. But if $l = \pi \kappa/v_0$, then necessarily $\psi(y) = c \sin(v_0 y/\kappa)$. This contradicts (3.19) because $f(\psi) = 0$ for small ψ .

The following proposition relates dynamical properties of reactiondiffusion equation with Dirichlet boundary conditions to existence of stationary solutions. Since we were not able to find this simple and natural result in the literature, we provide the proof in a slightly more general setting than needed for our application. Let Ω be a bounded domain with smooth boundary in \mathbb{R}^n . We also assume for the sake of simplicity that the reaction function is smooth. In one dimension this requirement can be removed and f only continuous is sufficient. This can be done by approximation from above with smooth f, comparison principles, and a simple ODE shooting argument.

Proposition 3.6. Assume that there is a solution ϕ of

$$\phi_t = \kappa \Delta \phi + \frac{v_0^2}{\kappa} f(\phi) \tag{3.20}$$

on $(x,t) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^+$, with Dirichlet boundary conditions at $\partial\Omega$ and $\phi(\cdot, 0)$ compactly supported (and taking values in [0,1]), such that ϕ does not

go uniformly to zero as $t \to \infty$. Then there exists a positive solution $\psi: \Omega \to [0,1]$ of

$$\kappa \triangle \psi + \frac{v_0^2}{\kappa} f(\psi) = 0 \tag{3.21}$$

satisfying Dirichlet boundary conditions on $\partial\Omega$.

Proof. For the sake of simplicity we let $\kappa = v_0 = 1$. Since by the maximum principle $\phi(x,t) \leq 1$ for any t, standard regularity estimates imply that all Sobolev norms of $\phi(x,t)$ are uniformly bounded in time: $\|\phi(x,t)\|_{H^s(\Omega)} \leq C_s$. Define $\phi_-(x,t) = \limsup_{t\to\infty} \phi(x,t)$ at every $x \in \Omega$. We claim that $\phi_-(x,t)$ is Lipshitz continuous and is moreover a weak subsolution, that is

$$\int_{\Omega} D\phi_{-}(x) Dv(x) \, dx \le \int_{\Omega} f(\phi_{-}(x)) v(x) \, dx$$

for any $v \in C_0^{\infty}(\Omega)$. To avoid certain degenerate cases, we define here Lipshitz continuity as $|\phi_-(x,t) - \phi_-(y,t)| \leq C|x-y|$ for any x, y which belong to some ball $B \subset \Omega$, with the constant C independent of x, yand B. Indeed, let C_1 be a uniform upper bound on $|\nabla \phi(x,t)|$. Assume there exist $x, y \in B \subset \Omega$ with $|\phi_-(x) - \phi_-(y)| > 2C_1|x-y|$. From the definition of ϕ_- it follows that there exist $t_n \to \infty$ such that either $\phi(y,t_n) - \phi_-(x) > 2C_1|x-y|$ or $\phi(x,t_n) - \phi_-(y) > 2C_1|x-y|$. But this implies that for any $\epsilon > 0$, for all sufficiently large n we have $|\phi(y,t_n) - \phi(x,t_n)| > 2C_1|x-y| - \epsilon$, which contradicts the bound on the gradient of ϕ .

Notice also that compactness of Ω and uniform boundedness of $|\nabla \phi|$ show that ϕ_{-} is not identically zero and vanishes on $\partial \Omega$.

Define $\Delta_{\delta}\phi_{-}(x) = \delta^{-2}\sum_{j=1}^{n}(\phi_{-}(x+\delta e_{j})+\phi_{-}(x-\delta e_{j})-2\phi_{-}(x)),$ where e_{j} are unit vectors in coordinate directions. Next, we claim that for any x such that $\operatorname{dist}(x,\partial\Omega) > \delta$, we have $\Delta_{\delta}\phi_{-}(x) \geq -f(\phi_{-}(x)) - \gamma(\delta)$, where $\gamma(\delta)$ converges to zero when δ goes to zero. Indeed, by definition of $\phi_{-}(x)$, we have that for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a sequence $t_{n} \to \infty$ such that $|\phi_{-}(x) - \phi(x, t_{n})| < \epsilon$ and $\phi_{-}(y) \geq \phi(y, t_{n}) - \epsilon$ for any y. Moreover, we can choose t_{n} so that $|\phi_{t}(x, t_{n})| < \epsilon$. Now

$$\Delta_{\delta}\phi_{-}(x) = \delta^{-2} \sum_{j} (\phi_{-}(x+\delta e_{j}) + \phi_{-}(x-\delta e_{j}) - 2\phi_{-}(x))$$

$$\geq -C\epsilon\delta^{-2} + \delta^{-2} \sum_{j} (\phi(x+\delta e_{j},t_{n}) + \phi(x-\delta e_{j},t_{n}) - 2\phi(x,t_{n}))$$

Using the mean value theorem and uniform upper bounds on derivatives of ϕ , it is not hard to show that

$$\delta^{-2} \sum_{j} (\phi(x + \delta e_j, t_n) + \phi(x - \delta e_j, t_n) - 2\phi(x, t_n)) \to \phi_{x_j x_j}(x, t_n)$$

uniformly in x and t_n as $\delta \to 0$, with an error bounded by $C\delta$. Therefore,

$$\begin{split} \Delta_{\delta}\phi_{-}(x) &\geq -C\epsilon\delta^{-2} - C\delta + \Delta\phi(x,t_{n}) \\ &\geq -f(\phi(x,t_{n})) - C(\epsilon\delta^{-2} + \delta) - \epsilon \\ &\geq -f(\phi_{-}(x)) - C(\epsilon\delta^{-2} + \delta + \epsilon). \end{split}$$

Since ϵ is arbitrary, this leads to $\Delta_{\delta}\phi_{-}(x) \geq -f(\phi_{-}(x)) - C\delta$.

Given $v \in C_0^{\infty}(\Omega)$, $v \ge 0$, such that $\operatorname{dist}(\operatorname{supp}(v), \partial \Omega) \ge \delta$, we have

$$-\int_{\Omega} \Delta_{\delta} \phi_{-}(x) v(x) \, dx \leq \int_{\Omega} f(\phi_{-}(x)) v(x) \, dx + C\delta \|v\|_{L^{1}(\Omega)}$$

Carrying out discrete integration by parts on the left hand side and passing to the limit $\delta \to 0$, we get

$$\int_{\Omega} D\phi_{-}(x) Dv(x) \, dx \le \int_{\Omega} f(\phi_{-}(x)) v(x) \, dx.$$

Passage to the limit is justified since we know that $\phi_{-}(x)$ is Lipshitz and therefore belongs to the Sobolev space $W^{1,\infty}$. Thus we see that $\phi_{-}(x)$ is a weak subsolution of (3.21).

Now consider initial data $\tilde{\phi}(x,0)$ such that $\phi_{-}(x) \leq \tilde{\phi}(x,0) \leq 1$. By the maximum principle, for all t we have $\tilde{\phi}(x,t) \geq \phi_{-}(x)$. Consider $\phi_{+}(x) = \liminf_{t\to\infty} \tilde{\phi}(x,t) \geq \phi_{-}(x)$. By repeating the same arguments as above, we find that $\phi_{+}(x)$ is a weak supersolution. Then by wellknown results (see e.g. [6], Theorem 9.3.1), there exists a weak solution $\psi(x)$ of (3.21), satisfying $\phi_{-}(x) \leq \psi(x) \leq \phi_{+}(x)$. By boundary regularity results, $\psi(x)$ is regular on all of Ω .

Results in this section extend without change to higher dimensions. The proofs are identical to those above, this time using higher dimensional Brownian motion. Assume that T(t, x, y) is a solution of (3.1), (3.4) on $\mathbb{R}^+_0 \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$ with $u(y) = u(y + h_j e_j)$ for j = 1, 2, ..., n and some $h_j > 0$ ($\{e_1, \ldots, e_n\}$ being the standard basis in \mathbb{R}^n).

We say that a domain $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is (v_0, κ, f) -quenching if for every $L < \infty$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ there is $\tau(L, \varepsilon) < \infty$ such that any solution ϕ of (3.9) on $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R} \times \Omega$ with Dirichlet boundary conditions on $\partial\Omega$ and $\phi(0, \cdot, \cdot)$ supported in $[-L, L] \times \Omega$ (and taking values in [0, 1]), satisfies $\phi(t, x, y) < \varepsilon$ for $t \ge \tau(L, \varepsilon)$. A plateau of u is any maximal domain Ω on which u is constant. Then we have

Theorem 3.7. With the above notation the following hold.

- (i) If every plateau of u is (v_0, κ, f) -quenching, then there exists C(depending on u) such that for every L and $|A| \ge CL$ we have $T(t, x, y) \to 0$ as $t \to \infty$, uniformly in $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$.
- (ii) If u has a plateau that is not (v_0, κ, f) -quenching, then there is L_0 such that if $L \ge L_0$, then for any A the temperature T(t, x, y) does not go uniformly to zero as $t \to \infty$.
- (iii) Every quenching profile u is strongly quenching.
- (iv) Assume that $\partial \Omega$ and f are smooth. If there is no non-zero ψ : $\Omega \rightarrow [0,1]$ satisfying

$$\kappa \triangle \psi + \frac{v_0^2}{\kappa} f(\psi) = 0$$

and vanishing on $\partial\Omega$, then the domain Ω is (v_0, κ, f) -quenching.

Remark. Note that if $n \geq 2$, then even non-constant u can have unbounded plateaux.

Finally we note that we only considered initial conditions (3.4) for the sake of simplicity of presentation. It is obvious that our results apply also in the case of smooth initial conditions satisfying, for instance,

$$\chi_{[-L,L]}(x) \le T(0, x, y) \le \chi_{[-L-c_L, L+c_L]}(x).$$

If we wish to consider initial temperatures that are not maximal (but still above the ignition temperature θ_0) on an increasing family of regions, for example,

$$\eta \chi_{[-L,L]}(x) \le T(0,x,y) \le \eta \chi_{[-L-c_L,L+c_L]}(x).$$

for some $\eta \in (\theta_0, 1)$, then there is only one change — ℓ in Theorem 3.1 is defined in terms of Dirichlet solutions ϕ initially compactly supported and initially bounded above by η . The above method actually applies in the case of any family of compactly supported initial conditions $T_L(0, x, y)$ as long as these are such that for any L_1 and $\delta_1 > 0$ there are L_2 and $\delta_2 > 0$ so that $T_{L_2}(0, x_2, y_2) \geq T_{L_1}(0, x_1, y_1) - \delta_1$ whenever $|(x_2, y_2) - (x_1, y_1)| < \delta_2$ (in particular, $T_L(0, \cdot, \cdot)$ continuous will do). This last condition is necessary for our proof of part (i) of Theorem 3.1 because now we have

$$\Phi(t, x, y) = \mathbb{E}\bigg(T_L\bigg(0, W_{2\kappa t}^x - \frac{A}{2\kappa}\int_0^{2\kappa t} u(W_s^y)ds, W_{2\kappa t}^y\bigg)\bigg).$$

Here ℓ is defined in terms of ϕ initially bounded above by the T_L 's.

4. Scaling

In this section we study the dependence of the "quenching amplitude", that is, the infimum of all A such that initial temperature distribution

$$T(0, x, y) = \chi_{[-L,L]}(x)$$
(4.1)

leads to quenching, on the scaling of the profile of the shear flow u. Hence we consider

$$T_t = \kappa \triangle T - Au(\alpha y)T_x + \frac{v_0^2}{\kappa}f(T)$$
(4.2)

with u periodic and $\alpha > 0$. The results of this section agree with numerical simulations performed in [13]. The first is

Theorem 4.1. Let $u \in C(\mathbb{R})$ be a periodic function with period h. Then there is C > 0 such that for large enough α and $|A| \geq C \alpha L$, the solution of (4.2) with initial condition (4.1) satisfies $T(t, x, y) \to 0$ as $t \to \infty$, uniformly in \mathbb{R}^2 .

Remark. The necessity of this bound can be explained by the fact that fast oscillations in the advection homogenize propagation of the flame (w.r.t. y) and so larger advection amplitudes are needed to expose the hot region to diffusion.

Proof. Notice that we have

$$\begin{split} \sup_{x} \Psi\left(\frac{1}{2\kappa}, x, y\right) &= \sup_{x} \mathbb{P}\left(x - \frac{A}{2\kappa} \int_{0}^{1} u(\alpha W_{s}^{y}) ds \in [-L, L]\right) \\ &= \sup_{a} \mathbb{P}\left(\int_{0}^{1} u(\alpha W_{s}^{y}) ds \in \left[a, a + \frac{4\kappa L}{|A|}\right]\right) \\ &= \sup_{a} \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{\alpha^{2}} \int_{0}^{\alpha^{2}} u(W_{s}^{\alpha y}) ds \in \left[a, a + \frac{4\kappa L}{|A|}\right]\right) \\ &= \sup_{a} \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{\alpha} \int_{0}^{\alpha^{2}} u(W_{s}^{\alpha y}) ds \in \left[a, a + \frac{4\kappa \alpha L}{|A|}\right]\right). \end{split}$$

Let us estimate the last integral. First, we can assume $\int_0^h u(y)dy = 0$, since, as before, changing u by a constant does not change the result. Second, let v(y) be such that v'(y) = u(y) and $\int_0^h v(y) dy = 0$, and define $z(y) \equiv \int_0^y v(s) ds$. Hence, all three functions are periodic with period h.

Now by the Itô formula (see, e.g., [8, Proposition 1.1.4]),

$$z(W_t^y) - z(y) = \int_0^t v(W_s^y) dW_s^y + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t u(W_s^y) ds$$

almost surely. Thus,

$$\frac{1}{\alpha} \int_0^{\alpha^2} u(W_s^y) ds = \frac{2}{\alpha} \left(z(W_{\alpha^2}^y) - z(y) \right) - 2M(y, \alpha, W^y)$$

with

$$M(y,\alpha,W^y) \equiv \frac{1}{\alpha} \int_0^{\alpha^2} v(W^y_s) dW^y_s.$$

Therefore with $c \equiv ||z||_{\infty}$ we have

$$\sup_{x} \Psi\left(\frac{1}{2\kappa}, x, y\right) \le \sup_{a} \mathbb{P}\left(M(\alpha y, \alpha, W^{\alpha y}) \in \left[a, a + \frac{2\kappa\alpha L}{|A|} + \frac{4c}{\alpha}\right]\right).$$

From (3.6) and (3.7) we can see that to obtain (3.5) for $\tau = (2\kappa)^{-1}$ (and hence (1.8)), we only need to prove

$$\sup_{y,a} \mathbb{P}\left(M(y,\alpha,W^y) \in \left[a,a + \frac{2\kappa}{C} + \frac{4c}{\alpha}\right]\right) \le \theta_0 e^{-v_0^2/2\kappa^2}$$

for some C and all large enough α . That is,

$$\sup_{y,a} \mathbb{P}(M(y,\alpha,W^y) \in [a,a+\varepsilon]) \le \theta_0 e^{-v_0^2/2\kappa^2}$$
(4.3)

for small ε and large α . However, for each y, the family $\alpha M(y, \alpha, W^y)$ is a martingale with respect to α . It is not difficult to check that the central limit theorem for martingales (see, e.g. [5], Theorem 7.7.3, or [11]) applies to $M(y, \alpha, W^y)$ giving convergence in distribution to the normal random variable with variance

$$\sigma^{2} = \frac{1}{h} \int_{0}^{h} \mathbb{E}\left[\int_{0}^{1} v(W_{s}^{z})^{2} ds\right] dz = \frac{1}{h} \int_{0}^{h} |v(z)|^{2} dz > 0,$$

where \mathbb{E} denotes expectation with respect to the Brownian motion starting at z. Moreover the convergence can be shown to be uniform in y since all the estimates entering the proof are uniform in y. This implies the estimate (4.3).

Next, we consider scaling in the opposite direction, that is $\alpha \to 0$.

Theorem 4.2. If $u \in C^{n+1}(\mathbb{R})$ is periodic and $|u'(y)| + |u''(y)| + \cdots + |u^{(n)}(y)| > 0$ for some n and all y, then there is C > 0 such that for small enough $\alpha > 0$ and $|A| \ge C\alpha^{-n}L$, the solution of (4.2) with initial condition (4.1) satisfies $T(t, x, y) \to 0$ as $t \to \infty$, uniformly in \mathbb{R}^2 .

Let us give a short explanation of this result. Consider first the situation as in [13], where $u(y) = \sin y$ was analyzed numerically. When there is no flow, the critical quenching size, according to results of Kanel', is of the order ℓ . Therefore one expects that to quench initial data of size L, the flow should be able to thin it down to width ℓ ,

18

given by Theorem 3.1, in time $\tau \sim \kappa/v_0^2$ (before the reaction picks up). The differential of velocities near the tip at points which are distance $\sim \ell$ apart is $A\alpha^2\ell^2$, so we get the condition for quenching $A\alpha^2\ell^2\tau \sim L$, which is consistent with our theorem. In a more general setting, assume u is smooth enough and $u'(0) = u''(0) = \cdots = u^{(n-1)}(0) = 0$ (and u' does not vanish to a higher degree elsewhere). If then A grows slower than $O(\alpha^{-n})$ as $\alpha \to 0$, the functions $Au(\alpha y)$ become very flat on intervals around 0 with increasing lengths. The reasoning from the previous section then shows that one should not expect quenching for small α 's.

To prove the theorem, we will need an auxiliary lemma. For $b \in S^{n-1}$, the unit sphere in \mathbb{R}^n , we define

$$P_b(y) \equiv b_n y^n + b_{n-1} y^{n-1} + \dots + b_1 y.$$

Lemma 4.3. Given any t > 0 and $K < \infty$ we have

$$\sup_{b\in\mathcal{S}^{n-1},a} \mathbb{P}\left(\int_0^t P_b(W^0_s) ds \in [a, a+\varepsilon] \, \middle| \, |W^0_s| \le K \text{ for } s \in [0, t]\right) \to 0$$

$$(4.4)$$

as $\varepsilon \to 0$.

Proof. We define

$$q(b, a, \varepsilon) \equiv \mathbb{P}\bigg(\int_0^t P_b(W_s^0) ds \in [a, a + \varepsilon] \, \bigg| \, |W_s^0| \le K \text{ for } s \in [0, t]\bigg),$$

and we let $M \equiv K^n + K^{n-1} + \cdots + K$ so that $|P_{b+\delta}(y) - P_b(y)| \leq M|\delta|$ whenever $|y| \leq K$. Hence we need to show that, just as p in Section 2, $q \to 0$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$, uniformly in $(b, a) \in S^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}$. Notice that we do not need to exclude the value $tP_b(0) = 0$ in the above probability because the P_b 's have no plateaux.

The proof is identical to that of Lemma 2.2. First, the absence of plateaux in the P_b 's gives q(b, a, 0) = 0. Then with $\delta \equiv tM|\delta_1| + |\delta_2| + |\delta_3|$ we have

$$|q(b+\delta_1, a+\delta_2, \varepsilon+\delta_3) - q(b, a, \varepsilon)| \le \mathbb{P}\left(\int_0^t P_b(W_s^0) ds \in [a-\delta, a+\delta] \cup [a+\varepsilon-\delta, a+\varepsilon+\delta] \ \Big| \ |W_s^0| \le K \text{ for } s \in [0, t]\right)$$

which goes to zero as $\delta \to 0$ because $q(b, a, 0) = q(b, a + \varepsilon, 0) = 0$. Thus, q is jointly continuous in (b, a, ε) . This means that $q(b, a, \varepsilon) \to 0$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$, uniformly in any compact subset of $S^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}$. Finally, $q(b, a, \varepsilon) = 0$ for $|a| > tM + \varepsilon$, finishing the proof. \Box Proof of Theorem 4.2. Since $u \in C^{n+1}(\mathbb{R})$ and is periodic, $|u'(y)| + |u''(y)| + \cdots + |u^{(n)}(y)| > \rho$ for some $\rho > 0$ and all y. Let K be such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|W_s^0| \le K \text{ for } s \in [0,1]\right) \ge 1 - \frac{\theta_0}{2} e^{-v_0^2/2\kappa^2}$$

Let C > 0, $|A| \ge C\alpha^{-n}L$, and $c \equiv ||u^{(n+1)}||_{\infty}/(n+1)!$. Then if $b_k \equiv u^{(k)}(\alpha y)/k!$ for $k = 1, \ldots, n$, Taylor's theorem gives us

$$u(\alpha(y+\delta)) = u(\alpha y) + P_b(\alpha \delta) + \tilde{c}\alpha^{n+1}|\delta|^{n+1}$$

for some $|\tilde{c}| \leq c$. Notice that b need not be a unit vector here.

With all the following probabilities conditioned by $|W_s^0| \leq K$ for $s \in [0, 1]$, we have

$$\begin{split} \sup_{x,y} \Psi\left(\frac{1}{2\kappa}, x, y\right) \\ &\leq \sup_{x,y} \mathbb{P}\left(x - \frac{A}{2\kappa} \int_0^1 u(\alpha(y + W_s^0)) ds \in [-L, L]\right) + \frac{\theta_0}{2} e^{-v_0^2/2\kappa^2} \\ &\leq \sup_{a,y} \mathbb{P}\left(\int_0^1 \alpha^{-n} u(\alpha(y + W_s^0)) ds \in \left[a, a + \frac{4\kappa}{C}\right]\right) + \frac{\theta_0}{2} e^{-v_0^2/2\kappa^2} \\ &\leq \sup_{a,y} \mathbb{P}\left(\int_0^1 \alpha^{-n} P_b(\alpha W_s^0) ds \in \left[a, a + \frac{4\kappa}{C} + 2c\alpha K^{n+1}\right]\right) + \frac{\theta_0}{2} e^{-v_0^2/2\kappa^2} \\ &= \sup_{a,y} \mathbb{P}\left(\int_0^1 P_d(W_s^0) ds \in \left[a, a + \frac{4\kappa}{C} + M\alpha\right]\right) + \frac{\theta_0}{2} e^{-v_0^2/2\kappa^2} \end{split}$$
(4.5)

with $d_k \equiv b_k \alpha^{k-n}$ and $M \equiv 2cK^{n+1}$. If we take $\alpha < 1$, then $|d| \ge |b| \ge \rho/(n+1)!$ and so there are $e \in S^{n-1}$ and $r \ge \rho/(n+1)!$ such that d = re. The last expression in (4.5) is then at most

$$\sup_{e \in \mathcal{S}^{n-1}, a} \mathbb{P}\bigg(\int_0^1 P_e(W_s^0) ds \in \bigg[a, a + \frac{(n+1)!}{\rho} \bigg(\frac{4\kappa}{C} + M\alpha\bigg)\bigg]\bigg) + \frac{\theta_0}{2} e^{-v_0^2/2\kappa^2}$$

Lemma 4.3 ensures that for some $C < \infty$ and all small α the supremum is smaller than $\theta_0 e^{-v_0^2/2\kappa^2}/2$, and then (3.6) and (3.7) give (3.5) for $\tau = (2\kappa)^{-1}$. The result follows.

Acknowledgement. We thank Peter Constantin, Tom Kurtz, David Nualart, and Lenya Ryzhik for useful communications. AK has been supported in part by NSF grants DMS-0321952 and DMS-0314129, and Alfred P. Sloan fellowship. AZ has been supported in part by NSF grant DMS-0314129. AK thanks for hospitality the Institute of Advanced Study, Princeton, where part of this work has been carried out.

References

- H. Berestycki, The influence of advection on the propagation of fronts in reaction-diffusion equations, Nonlinear PDEs in Condensed Matter and Reactive Flows, NATO Science Series C, 569, H. Berestycki and Y. Pomeau eds, Kluwer, Doordrecht, 2003.
- [2] H. Berestycki, B. Larrouturou and P.-L. Lions, Multi-dimensional travelling wave solutions of a flame propagation model, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. 111 (1990), 33–49.
- [3] P. Clavin and F.A. Williams, Theory of pre-mixed flame propagation in largescale turbulence, J. Fluid Mech. 90 (1979), 589–604.
- [4] P. Constantin, A. Kiselev, L. Ryzhik, Quenching of flames by fluid advection, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 54 (2001), 1320–1342.
- [5] R. Durrett, *Probability: Theory and Examples*, Duxbury Press, 1996.
- [6] L.C. Evans, *Partial Differential Equations*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, 19, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1998.
- [7] Ja.I. Kanel', Stabilization of solutions of the Cauchy problem for equations encountered in combustion theory, Mat. Sb. (N.S.) 59 (101) 1962 suppl., 245– 288.
- [8] D. Nualart, The Malliavin Calculus and related topics, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995.
- [9] B. Oksendal, Stochastic Differential Equations, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1995.
- [10] J.-M. Roquejoffre, Eventual monotonicity and convergence to travelling fronts for the solutions of parabolic equations in cylinders, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire 14 (1997), 499–552.
- [11] A.N. Shiryayev, *Probability*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1984.
- [12] J. Smoller, Shock Waves and Reaction-Diffusion Equations, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1994.
- [13] N. Vladimirova, P. Constantin, A. Kiselev, O. Ruchayskiy and L. Ryzhik, *Flame enhancement and quenching in fluid flows*, Combustion Theory and Modelling 7 (2003), 487–508.
- [14] J. Xin, Existence and nonexistence of travelling waves and reaction-diffusion front propagation in periodic media, J. Stat. Phys. 73 (1993), 893–926.
- [15] J. Xin, Front propagation in heterogeneous media, SIAM Rev. 42 (2000), 161– 230.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN, MADISON, WI 53706, USA, EMAIL: KISELEV@MATH.WISC.EDU, ZLATOS@MATH.WISC.EDU