

BLOW-UP SEMIDISCRETIZATIONS IN TIME OF SOME
 NONLOCAL PARABOLIC PROBLEMS WITH NEUMANN
 BOUNDARY CONDITION

Théodore K. Boni* Thibaut K. Kouakou †

Abstract. In this paper, we address the following initial value problem

$$\begin{aligned} u_t &= \int_{\Omega} J(x-y)(u(y,t) - u(x,t))dy + f(u(x,t)) \quad \text{in } \bar{\Omega} \times (0, T), \\ u(x,0) &= \varphi(x) \geq 0 \quad \text{in } \bar{\Omega}, \end{aligned}$$

where $f : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is a C^1 nondecreasing function, $\int_{\alpha}^{\infty} \frac{d\sigma}{f(\sigma)} < \infty$ for any positive real α , $\int_0^{\infty} \frac{d\sigma}{f(\sigma)} < \infty$ if $f(0) > 0$, Ω is a bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^N with smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$, $J : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a kernel which is nonnegative and bounded in \mathbb{R}^N . Under some conditions, we show that the solution of a semidiscrete form of the above problem blows up in a finite time and estimate its semidiscrete blow-up time. We also prove that the semidiscrete blow-up time converges to the real one when the mesh size goes to zero. Finally, we give some numerical results to illustrate our analysis.

AMS subject classification(2000) : 35B40, 45A07, 45G10, 65M06.

Key words and phrases : *Nonlocal diffusion, blow-up, numerical blow-up time.*

1 Introduction

Let Ω be a bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^N with smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$. Consider the following initial value problem

$$u_t(x,t) = \int_{\Omega} J(x-y)(u(y,t) - u(x,t))dy + f(u(x,t)) \quad \text{in } \bar{\Omega} \times (0, T), \quad (1)$$

$$u(x,0) = \varphi(x) \geq 0 \quad \text{in } \bar{\Omega}, \quad (2)$$

where $f : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is a C^1 nondecreasing function, $\int_{\alpha}^{\infty} \frac{d\sigma}{f(\sigma)} < \infty$ for any positive real α , $\int_0^{\infty} \frac{d\sigma}{f(\sigma)} < \infty$ if $f(0) > 0$, $J : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a kernel which is nonnegative and bounded in \mathbb{R}^N . In addition, J is symmetric ($J(z) = J(-z)$) and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} J(z)dz = 1$. The initial datum $\varphi(x)$ is nonnegative and continuous in $\bar{\Omega}$.

Here, $(0, T)$ is the maximal time interval on which the solution u exists, and by a solution, we mean the following.

*Institut National Polytechnique Houphouët-Boigny de Yamoussoukro, BP 1093 Yamoussoukro, (Côte d'Ivoire), E-mail :theokboni@yahoo.fr.

†Université d'Abobo-Adjamé, UFR-SFA, Département de Mathématiques et Informatiques, 16 BP 372 Abidjan 16, (Côte d'Ivoire), E-mail :kkthibaut@yahoo.fr

Definition 1.1 *A solution of (1)–(2) is a function $u(x, t)$ continuous in $\bar{\Omega} \times [0, T)$, and once continuously differentiable in t in $\bar{\Omega} \times (0, T)$.*

The time T may be finite or infinite. When T is infinite, then we say that the solution u exists globally. When T is finite, then the solution u develops a singularity in a finite time, namely,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow T} \|u(\cdot, t)\|_{\infty} = \infty,$$

where $\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{\infty} = \sup_{x \in \bar{\Omega}} |u(x, t)|$. In this last case, we say that the solution u blows up in a finite time, and the time T is called the blow-up time of the solution u . Recently, nonlocal diffusion has been the subject of investigation of many authors (see, [1]–[7], [11]–[13], [15]–[20], [26], [30], and the references cited therein). Nonlocal evolution equations of the form

$$u_t = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} J(x-y)(u(y, t) - u(x, t))dy,$$

and variations of it, have been used by several authors to model diffusion processes (see, [3], [4], [18], [19]). It is worth noting that certain processes in probability like birth-death processes have been modeled with the help of some variations of the above equation (see, [31]). The solution $u(x, t)$ can be interpreted as the density of a single population at the point x , at the time t , and $J(x-y)$ as the probability distribution of jumping from location y to location x . Then, the convolution $(J * u)(x, t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} J(x-y)u(y, t)dy$ is the rate at which individuals are arriving to position x from all other places, and $-u(x, t) = -\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} J(x-y)u(x, t)dy$ is the rate at which they are leaving location x to travel to any other site (see, [18]). Let us notice that the reaction term $f(u)$ in equation (1) can be rewritten as follows

$$f(u(x, t)) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} J(x-y)f(u(x, t))dy.$$

Therefore, in view of the above equality, the reaction term $f(u)$ can be interpreted as a force that increases the rate at which individuals are arriving to location x from all other places. Due to the presence of the term $f(u(x, t))$, we shall see later the blow-up of the density $u(x, t)$. The equation considered in (1) shares many properties with the classical semilinear heat equation $u_t = \Delta u + f(u)$ (see, for instance [30]). In addition, since the diffusion of the density u at a point x and a time t does not depend only on $u(x, t)$, but on all the values of u in a neighborhood of x through the convolution term, the equation defined in (1) is called a nonlocal parabolic equation. On the other hand, the integral in (1) is taken over Ω . Thus there is no individuals that enter or leave the domain Ω . It is the reason why in the title of the paper, we have added Neumann boundary condition. In order to avoid confusions, it is worth noting that there exist some problems called nonlocal parabolic problems which are different from those considered in our paper. This type of nonlocal problems is, for instance, considered in [21] by Kavallaris and Tzanetis. It is important to point out that these problems are real parabolic problems. One says that they are nonlocal problems because the reaction is driven by the temperature at some local sites. For the problem described in (1)–(2), the local in time existence and uniqueness

of solutions have been proved by Perez-LLanos and Rossi in [30], where one may also find some results about blow-up solutions. For more results regarding blow-up of nonlocal problems, we refer the reader to the paper of Nabongo and Boni in [26]. Within the framework of local diffusions, it is important to point out that the phenomenon of blow-up has been actively investigated from theoretical and numerical point of view (see, [9], [27], [28], to cite only a few). In the current paper, we are interested in the numerical study of the phenomenon of blow-up using a semidiscrete form of (1)-(2). We start by the construction of an explicit adaptive scheme as follows. Approximate the solution u of (1)-(2) by the solution U_n of the following semidiscrete equations

$$\delta_t U_n(x) = \int_{\Omega} J(x-y)(U_n(y) - U_n(x))dy + f(U_n(x)) \quad \text{in } \bar{\Omega}, \quad (3)$$

$$U_n(0) = \varphi(x) \geq 0 \quad \text{in } \bar{\Omega}, \quad (4)$$

where $n \geq 0$, and

$$\delta_t U_n(x) = \frac{U_{n+1}(x) - U_n(x)}{\Delta t_n},$$

with $t_0 = 0 < t_1 < t_2 < t_3 < \dots < t_n < t_{n+1} < \dots$, $\Delta t_n = t_{n+1} - t_n$. In practice since $t_0 = 0$, for $n \geq 0$, one chooses Δt_n depending on n and evaluates t_{n+1} which is equal to $t_n + \Delta t_n$. In order to permit the semidiscrete solution to reproduce the properties of the continuous one when the time t approaches the blow-up time T , we need to adapt the size of the time step so that we take

$$\Delta t_n = \min \left\{ \Delta t, \frac{\tau}{f(\|U_n\|_{\infty})} \right\},$$

where $\|U_n\|_{\infty} = \sup_{x \in \bar{\Omega}} |U_n(x)|$, $\tau \in (0, 1)$ and $\Delta t \in (0, 1)$ is a parameter. Let us notice that the restriction on the time step ensures the nonnegativity of the discrete solution.

To facilitate our discussion, let us define the notion of semidiscrete blow-up time.

Definition 1.2 *We say that the semidiscrete solution U_n of (3)-(4) blows up in a finite time if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|U_n\|_{\infty} = \infty$, and the series $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \Delta t_n$ converges. The quantity $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \Delta t_n$ is called the semidiscrete blow-up time of the semidiscrete solution U_n .*

In the present paper, under some conditions, we show that the semidiscrete solution blows up in a finite time and estimate its semidiscrete blow-up time. We also show that the semidiscrete blow-up time converges to the real one when the mesh size goes to zero. A similar result has been obtained by Le Roux in [22], [23], and the same author and Mainge in [24] within the framework of local parabolic problems. One may also consult the papers [27] and [28] for numerical studies of the phenomenon of blow-up where semidiscretizations in space have been utilized. It is also important to recall that semidiscretizations in time are very interesting in the study of many initial value problems. In fact, most of the times, the techniques utilized to handle problems semidiscretized in time and those used for problems completely discretized are practically the same.

For an illustration, one may look at a recent paper of Belahmidi in [8]. In the same order of ideas, for our problem, using certain techniques of finite element methods as for instance those utilized in [25], one may obtain a full discrete scheme which will be treated with the same techniques that will be developed in the current paper. The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In the next section, we give some results about the semidiscrete maximum principle for nonlocal problems. In the third and fourth sections, we prove our main results, and finally, in the last section, we show some numerical experiments to illustrate our analysis.

2 Properties of the semidiscrete scheme

In the case of local diffusions, one knows that the results about maximum principles (see, [29], [32]) constitute an important tool. Thus, in the same manner, in this section, we gather some results about the semidiscrete maximum principle of nonlocal problems for our subsequent use.

The following result is a version of the maximum principle for semidiscrete non-local problems.

Lemma 2.1 For $n \geq 0$, let $U_n, a_n \in C^0(\bar{\Omega})$ be such that

$$\delta_t U_n(x) \geq \int_{\Omega} J(x-y)(U_n(y) - U_n(x))dy + a_n(x)U_n(x) \quad \text{in } \bar{\Omega}, \quad n \geq 0,$$

$$U_0(x) \geq 0 \quad \text{in } \bar{\Omega}.$$

Then, we have $U_n(x) \geq 0$ in $\bar{\Omega}$, $n > 0$ when $\Delta t_n \leq \frac{1}{1+\|a_n\|_{\infty}}$.

Proof. If $U_n(x) \geq 0$ in $\bar{\Omega}$, then a straightforward computation reveals that

$$U_{n+1}(x) \geq U_n(x)(1 - \Delta t_n - \|a_n\|_{\infty}\Delta t_n) \quad \text{in } \bar{\Omega}, \quad n \geq 0. \quad (5)$$

To obtain the above inequality, we have used the fact that

$$\int_{\Omega} J(x-y)U_n(y)dy \geq 0 \quad \text{in } \bar{\Omega}, \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\Omega} J(x-y)dy \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} J(x-y)dy = 1.$$

Making use of (5) and an argument of recursion, we easily check that $U_{n+1}(x) \geq 0$ in $\bar{\Omega}$, $n \geq 0$. This finishes the proof. \square

An immediate consequence of the above result is the following comparison lemma. Its proof is straightforward.

Lemma 2.2 For $n \geq 0$, let U_n, V_n and $a_n \in C^0(\bar{\Omega})$ be such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \delta_t U_n(x) - \int_{\Omega} J(x-y)(U_n(y) - U_n(x))dy + a_n(x)U_n(x) \\ & \geq \delta_t V_n(x) - \int_{\Omega} J(x-y)(V_n(y) - V_n(x))dy + a_n(x)V_n(x) \quad \text{in } \bar{\Omega}, \quad n \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

$$U_0(x) \geq V_0(x) \quad \text{in } \bar{\Omega}.$$

Then, we have $U_n(x) \geq V_n(x)$ in $\bar{\Omega}$, $n > 0$ when $\Delta t_n \leq \frac{1}{1+\|a_n\|_{\infty}}$.

3 The semidiscrete blow-up time

In this section, under some assumptions, we show that the semidiscrete solution blows up in a finite time and estimate its semidiscrete blow-up time. We need the following lemma.

Lemma 3.1 *Let b be a positive number and let a be a nonnegative number such that, if $f(0) = 0$, then $a > 0$. Then, the following estimate holds*

$$\frac{1}{b} \int_a^\infty \frac{d\sigma}{f(\sigma)} \leq \sum_{n=0}^\infty \frac{1}{f(a+nb)} \leq \frac{1}{f(a)} + \frac{1}{b} \int_a^\infty \frac{d\sigma}{f(\sigma)}.$$

Proof. We observe that

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{d\sigma}{f(a+b\sigma)} = \sum_{n=0}^\infty \int_n^{n+1} \frac{d\sigma}{f(a+b\sigma)},$$

and

$$\frac{1}{f(a+(n+1)b)} \leq \int_n^{n+1} \frac{d\sigma}{f(a+b\sigma)} \leq \frac{1}{f(a+nb)},$$

because $f(s)$ is nondecreasing for nonnegative values of s . We infer that

$$-\frac{1}{f(a)} + \sum_{n=0}^\infty \frac{1}{f(a+nb)} \leq \int_0^\infty \frac{d\sigma}{f(a+b\sigma)} \leq \sum_{n=0}^\infty \frac{1}{f(a+nb)}. \quad (6)$$

On the other hand, by a change of variables, we see that

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{d\sigma}{f(a+b\sigma)} = \frac{1}{b} \int_a^\infty \frac{d\sigma}{f(\sigma)}. \quad (7)$$

Use (6) and (7) to complete the rest of the proof. \square

Now, let us give our result about the semidiscrete blow-up time which is stated in the following theorem.

Theorem 3.1 *Suppose that, if $f(0) = 0$, then $f(s)$ is convex for positive values of s and $\varphi_{\min} = \min_{x \in \bar{\Omega}} \varphi(x) > 0$. Let*

$$A = \begin{cases} \int_0^\infty \frac{d\sigma}{f(\sigma)} & \text{if } f(0) > 0, \\ \frac{\varphi_{\min}}{f(\varphi_{\min})} & \text{if } f(0) = 0. \end{cases}$$

If $A < 1$, then the solution U_n of (3)-(4) blows up in a finite time, and its semidiscrete blow-up time $T^{\Delta t}$ is estimated as follows

$$T^{\Delta t} \leq \frac{\tau}{f(\|\varphi\|_\infty)} + \frac{\tau}{\tau'} \int_{\|\varphi\|_\infty}^\infty \frac{d\sigma}{f(\sigma)},$$

where $\tau' = (1 - A) \min\{\Delta t f(\|\varphi\|_\infty), \tau\}$.

Proof. Due to the fact that $U_n(x)$ is nonnegative in $\bar{\Omega}$, and $\int_\Omega J(x-y)dy \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} J(x-y)dy = 1$ for $x \in \bar{\Omega}$, a straightforward computation reveals that

$$\delta_t U_n(x) \geq -U_n(x) + f(U_n(x)) \quad \text{in } \bar{\Omega}, \quad n \geq 0,$$

which implies that

$$\delta_t U_n(x) \geq f(U_n(x)) \left(1 - \frac{U_n(x)}{f(U_n(x))}\right) \quad \text{in } \bar{\Omega}, \quad n \geq 0. \quad (8)$$

If $f(0) > 0$, then we observe that $\int_0^\infty \frac{d\sigma}{f(\sigma)} \geq \sup_{t \geq 0} \int_0^t \frac{d\sigma}{f(\sigma)} \geq \sup_{t \geq 0} \frac{t}{f(t)}$, because $f(s)$ is nondecreasing for nonnegative values of s . We infer that

$$\delta_t U_n(x) \geq (1 - A)f(U_n(x)) \quad \text{in } \bar{\Omega}, \quad n \geq 0. \quad (9)$$

Now, let us show by induction that the estimate (9) remains valid when $f(0) = 0$. In fact, if $f(0) = 0$, then $\frac{s}{f(s)}$ is nonincreasing for positive values of s . This implies that

$$\frac{U_0(x)}{f(U_0(x))} \leq \frac{\varphi_{\min}}{f(\varphi_{\min})} \quad \text{for } x \in \bar{\Omega}.$$

In view of the above inequality and (8), we infer that (9) is valid when $n = 0$. Suppose that (9) is satisfied until the stage n , and let us prove that (9) is valid at the stage $n + 1$. Since the estimate (9) is fulfilled until the stage n , we have $U_{n+1}(x) \geq U_n(x) \geq \varphi_{\min}$ in $\bar{\Omega}$. Besides, making use of (8), we find that $\delta_t U_{n+1}(x) \geq f(U_{n+1}(x)) \left(1 - \frac{U_{n+1}(x)}{f(U_{n+1}(x))}\right)$ in $\bar{\Omega}$. This implies that

$$\delta_t U_{n+1}(x) \geq f(U_{n+1}(x)) \left(1 - \frac{\varphi_{\min}}{f(\varphi_{\min})}\right) \quad \text{in } \bar{\Omega},$$

which leads us to (9). Consequently, in both cases, we know that the estimate (9) remains true, and it may be rewritten as follows

$$U_{n+1}(x) \geq U_n(x) + (1 - A)\Delta t_n f(U_n(x)) \quad \text{in } \bar{\Omega}, \quad n \geq 0. \quad (10)$$

Let $x_0 \in \bar{\Omega}$ be such that $U_n(x_0) = \|U_n\|_\infty$. Replacing x by x_0 in (10), we find that $U_{n+1}(x_0) \geq \|U_n\|_\infty + (1 - A)\Delta t_n f(\|U_n\|_\infty)$, $n \geq 0$. Use the fact that $\|U_{n+1}\|_\infty \geq U_{n+1}(x_0)$ to arrive at

$$\|U_{n+1}\|_\infty \geq \|U_n\|_\infty + (1 - A)\Delta t_n f(\|U_n\|_\infty), \quad n \geq 0. \quad (11)$$

It is not hard to see that

$$(1 - A)\Delta t_n f(\|U_n\|_\infty) = (1 - A) \min\{\Delta t f(\|U_n\|_\infty), \tau\}, \quad n \geq 0. \quad (12)$$

In view of (11), we note that $\|U_{n+1}\|_\infty \geq \|U_n\|_\infty$, $n \geq 0$, and by induction, we discover that $\|U_n\|_\infty \geq \|U_0\|_\infty = \|\varphi\|_\infty$, $n > 0$. It follows from (12) that

$$(1 - A)\Delta t_n f(\|U_n\|_\infty) \geq (1 - A) \min\{\Delta t f(\|\varphi\|_\infty), \tau\} = \tau', \quad n \geq 0,$$

and making use of (11), we find that

$$\|U_{n+1}\|_\infty \geq \|U_n\|_\infty + \tau', \quad n \geq 0. \quad (13)$$

Using an argument of recursion, we get

$$\|U_n\|_\infty \geq \|U_0\|_\infty + n\tau' = \|\varphi\|_\infty + n\tau', \quad n \geq 0. \quad (14)$$

Consequently, according (14), we discover that $\|U_n\|_\infty$ goes to infinity as n approaches infinity. Now, let us estimate the semidiscrete blow-up time. The

restriction on the time step and (14) render $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \Delta t_n \leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\tau}{f(\|\varphi\|_{\infty} + n\tau')}$. It follows from Lemma 3.1 that

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \Delta t_n \leq \frac{\tau}{f(\|\varphi\|_{\infty})} + \frac{\tau}{\tau'} \int_{\|\varphi\|_{\infty}}^{\infty} \frac{d\sigma}{f(\sigma)}.$$

Use the fact that the quantity on the right hand side of the above inequality is finite to complete the rest of the proof. \square

Remark 3.1 Using (13) and an argument of recursion, we discover that

$$\|U_n\|_{\infty} \geq \|U_q\|_{\infty} + (n - q)\tau', \quad n \geq q.$$

The restriction on the time step leads us to

$$\sum_{n=q}^{\infty} \Delta t_n \leq \sum_{n=q}^{\infty} \frac{\tau}{f(\|U_q\|_{\infty} + (n - q)\tau')}.$$

An application of Lemma 3.1 gives

$$\sum_{n=q}^{\infty} \Delta t_n \leq \frac{\tau}{f(\|U_q\|_{\infty})} + \frac{\tau}{\tau'} \int_{\|U_q\|_{\infty}}^{\infty} \frac{d\sigma}{f(\sigma)},$$

or equivalently

$$T^{\Delta t} - t_q \leq \frac{\tau}{f(\|U_q\|_{\infty})} + \frac{\tau}{\tau'} \int_{\|U_q\|_{\infty}}^{\infty} \frac{d\sigma}{f(\sigma)}.$$

If we take $\tau = \Delta t$, then we note that $\frac{\tau'}{\tau} = (1 - A) \min\{f(\|\varphi\|_{\infty}), 1\}$. Consequently, $\frac{\tau}{\tau'} = O(1)$ with the choice $\tau = \Delta t$.

In the sequel, we pick $\tau = \Delta t$.

In the above theorem, we have obtained an upper bound of the semidiscrete blow-up time under some conditions. In what follows, we shall establish a lower bound of the semidiscrete blow-up time. This result is stated in the theorem below.

Theorem 3.2 Under the conditions of Theorem 3.1, the solution U_n of (3)-(4) blows up in a finite time, and its semidiscrete blow-up time $T^{\Delta t}$ obeys the following estimate

$$T^{\Delta t} \geq \frac{\min\{f(\|\varphi\|_{\infty}), 1\}}{1 + A} \int_{\|\varphi\|_{\infty}}^{\infty} \frac{d\sigma}{f(\sigma)}.$$

Proof. We know from Theorem 3.1 that the solution U_n of (3)-(4) blows up in a finite time $T^{\Delta t}$. It is easy to see that

$$\int_{\Omega} J(x - y)U_n(y)dy \leq \|U_n\|_{\infty} \quad \text{for } x \in \bar{\Omega}, \quad (15)$$

because $\int_{\Omega} J(x - y)dy \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} J(x - y)dy = 1$ for $x \in \bar{\Omega}$. It follows from (3) and (15) that $\delta_t U_n(x) \leq \|U_n\|_{\infty} + f(U_n(x))$, $x \in \bar{\Omega}$, $n \geq 0$, or equivalently

$$U_{n+1}(x) \leq U_n(x) + \Delta t_n(\|U_n\|_{\infty} + f(U_n(x))), \quad x \in \bar{\Omega}, \quad n \geq 0. \quad (16)$$

Let $x_0 \in \bar{\Omega}$ be such that $U_{n+1}(x_0) = \|U_{n+1}\|_\infty$. Replacing x by x_0 in (16), we find that $\|U_{n+1}\|_\infty \leq U_n(x_0) + \Delta t_n(\|U_n\|_\infty + f(U_n(x_0)))$, $x \in \bar{\Omega}$, $n \geq 0$, which implies that

$$\|U_{n+1}\|_\infty \leq \|U_n\|_\infty + \Delta t_n(\|U_n\|_\infty + f(\|U_n\|_\infty)), \quad n \geq 0. \quad (17)$$

Reasoning as in the proof of Theorem 3.1, it is not hard to see

$$\|U_n\|_\infty \leq Af(\|U_n\|_\infty), \quad n \geq 0. \quad (18)$$

We infer from (17) and (18) that

$$\|U_{n+1}\|_\infty \leq \|U_n\|_\infty + (1+A)\Delta t_n f(\|U_n\|_\infty), \quad n \geq 0.$$

Making use of the restriction on the time step, we arrive at

$$\|U_{n+1}\|_\infty \leq \|U_n\|_\infty + (1+A)\Delta t, \quad n \geq 0.$$

By induction, we discover that

$$\|U_n\|_\infty \leq \|U_0\|_\infty + n(1+A)\Delta t = \|\varphi\|_\infty + n(1+A)\Delta t, \quad n \geq 0. \quad (19)$$

Now, let us estimate the semidiscrete blow-up time. In view of (19), a straightforward computation reveals that

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \Delta t_n \geq \Delta t \min\{f(\|\varphi\|_\infty), 1\} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{f(\|\varphi\|_\infty + n(1+A)\Delta t)}.$$

By an application of Lemma 3.1, we arrive at

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \Delta t_n \geq \frac{\min\{f(\|\varphi\|_\infty), 1\}}{1+A} \int_{\|\varphi\|_\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\sigma}{f(\sigma)}.$$

This completes the proof. \square

4 Convergence of the semidiscrete blow-up time

In this section, under some hypotheses, we show that the semidiscrete solution blows up in a finite time, and its semidiscrete blow-up time converges to the real one when the mesh size goes to zero. To do this, we firstly show that the semidiscrete solution approaches the real one in any interval $\bar{\Omega} \times [0, T - \tau]$ with $\tau \in (0, T)$. This result is stated in the following theorem.

Theorem 4.1 *Assume that the problem (1)-(2) admits a solution $u \in C^{0,2}(\bar{\Omega} \times [0, T - \tau])$ with $\tau \in (0, T)$. Then, the problem (3)-(4) admits a unique solution $U_n \in C^0(\bar{\Omega})$ for Δt small enough, $n \leq J$, and the following relation holds*

$$\sup_{0 \leq n \leq J} \|U_n - u(\cdot, t_n)\|_\infty = O(\Delta t) \quad \text{as} \quad \Delta t \rightarrow 0, \quad (20)$$

where J is a positive integer such that $\sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \Delta t_j \leq T - \tau$, and $t_n = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \Delta t_j$.

Proof. The problem (3)-(4) admits for each $n \geq 0$, a unique solution $U_n \in C^0(\bar{\Omega})$. Let $N \leq J$ be the greatest integer such that

$$\|U_n - u(\cdot, t_n)\|_\infty < 1 \quad \text{for } n < N. \quad (21)$$

Making use of the fact that (21) holds when $n = 0$, we note that $N \geq 1$. Since $u \in C^{0,2}$, then there exists a positive constant M such that $\|u(\cdot, t_n)\|_\infty \leq M$ for $n < N$. An application of the triangle inequality gives

$$\|U_n\|_\infty \leq \|u(\cdot, t_n)\|_\infty + \|U_n - u(\cdot, t_n)\|_\infty \leq 1 + M \quad \text{for } n < N. \quad (22)$$

Apply Taylor's expansion to obtain

$$\delta_t u(x, t_n) = u_t(x, t_n) + \frac{\Delta t_n}{2} u_{tt}(x, \tilde{t}_n) \quad \text{in } \bar{\Omega}, \quad n < N,$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_t u(x, t_n) &= \int_{\Omega} J(x-y)(u(y, t_n) - u(x, t_n)) dy + f(u(x, t_n)) \\ &\quad + \frac{\Delta t_n}{2} u_{tt}(x, \tilde{t}_n) \quad \text{in } \bar{\Omega}, \quad n < N. \end{aligned}$$

Introduce the error e_n defined as follows

$$e_n(x) = U_n(x) - u(x, t_n) \quad \text{in } \bar{\Omega}, \quad n < N.$$

Invoking the mean value theorem, it is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_t e_n(x) &= \int_{\Omega} J(x-y)(e_n(y) - e_n(x)) dy + f'(\xi_n(x))e_n(x) \\ &\quad - \frac{\Delta t_n}{2} u_{tt}(x, \tilde{t}_n) \quad \text{in } \bar{\Omega}, \quad n < N, \end{aligned}$$

where $\xi_n(x)$ is an intermediate value between $u(x, t_n)$ and $U_n(x)$. We infer that there exists a positive constant K such that

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_t e_n(x) &\leq \int_{\Omega} J(x-y)(e_n(y) - e_n(x)) dy + f'(\xi_n(x))e_n(x) \\ &\quad + K\Delta t \quad \text{in } \bar{\Omega}, \quad n < N, \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

because $u \in C^{0,2}$ and $\Delta t_n = O(\Delta t)$. Introduce the function Z_n defined as follows

$$Z_n(x) = K\Delta t e^{(L+1)t_n} \quad \text{in } \bar{\Omega}, \quad n < N,$$

where $L = f'(M+1)$. A straightforward computation reveals that

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_t Z_n &\geq \int_{\Omega} J(x-y)(Z_n(y) - Z_n(x)) dy + f'(\xi_n(x))Z_n(x) \\ &\quad + K\Delta t \quad \text{in } \bar{\Omega}, \quad n < N, \end{aligned}$$

$$Z_0(x) \geq e_0(x) \quad \text{in } \bar{\Omega}.$$

We deduce from Lemma 2.2 that $Z_n(x) \geq e_n(x)$ in $\bar{\Omega}$, $n < N$. In the same way, we also show that $Z_n(x) \geq -e_n(x)$ in $\bar{\Omega}$, $n < N$, which implies that $|e_n(x)| \leq Z_n(x)$ in $\bar{\Omega}$, $n < N$, or equivalently

$$\|U_n - u(\cdot, t_n)\|_\infty \leq K\Delta t e^{(L+1)t_n}, \quad n < N. \quad (24)$$

Now, let us reveal that $N = J$. To prove this result, we argue by contradiction. Assume that $N < J$. Replacing n by N in (24), and using (21), we discover that

$$1 \leq \|U_N - u(\cdot, t_N)\|_\infty \leq K\Delta t e^{(L+1)T}.$$

Since the term on the right hand side of the second inequality goes to zero as Δt tends to zero, we deduce that $1 \leq 0$, which is impossible. Consequently, $N = J$, and the proof is complete. \square

Now, we are in a position to prove the main result of this section

Theorem 4.2 *Assume that the problem (1)-(2) has a solution u which blows up in a finite time T such that $u \in C^{0,2}(\bar{\Omega} \times [0, T))$. Then, under the hypotheses of Theorem 3.1, the solution U_n of (3)-(4) blows up in a finite time, and its semidiscrete blow-up time $T^{\Delta t}$ obeys the following relation*

$$\lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow 0} T^{\Delta t} = T.$$

Proof : Let $0 < \varepsilon < T/2$. In view of Remark 3.1, we know that $\frac{\tau}{\tau'}$ is bounded. Thus, there exists a positive constant R such that

$$\frac{\tau}{f(R)} + \frac{\tau}{\tau'} \int_R^\infty \frac{d\sigma}{f(\sigma)} < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. \quad (25)$$

Since u blows up at the time T , there exists a time $T_0 \in (T - \varepsilon/2, T)$ such that $\|u(\cdot, t)\|_\infty \geq 2R$ for $t \in [T_0, T)$. Let q be a positive integer such that $t_q = \sum_{n=0}^{q-1} \Delta t_n \in [T_0, T)$. Invoking Theorem 4.1, we know that the problem (3)-(4) admits a unique solution $U_n \in C^0(\bar{\Omega})$ such that $\|U_q - u(\cdot, t_q)\|_\infty \leq R$. An application of the triangle inequality gives

$$\|U_q\|_\infty \geq \|u(\cdot, t_q)\|_\infty - \|U_q - u(\cdot, t_q)\|_\infty,$$

which implies that $\|U_q\|_\infty \geq 2R - R = R$. Invoking Theorem 3.1, we know that the solution U_n blows up in a finite time $T^{\Delta t}$. It follows from Remark 3.1 and (25) that

$$|T^{\Delta t} - T| \leq |T^{\Delta t} - t_q| + |t_q - T| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} = \varepsilon.$$

This finishes the proof. \square

5 Numerical results

In this section, we give some computational experiments to illustrate the theory given in the previous section. The simulations are performed on a PC Pentium at 1.5 GHz with 1 GB of RAM. Our programming tool is MATLAB version 7.4. We consider the problem (1)-(2) in the case where $\Omega = (-1, 1)$,

$$J(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{3}{2}x^2 & \text{if } |x| < 1, \\ 0 & \text{if } |x| \geq 1, \end{cases}$$

$u_0(x) = \frac{2+\varepsilon \cos(\pi x)}{4}$ with $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$. We start by the construction of some adaptive schemes as follows. Let I be a positive integer and let $h = 2/I$. Define the grid $x_i = -1 + ih$, $0 \leq i \leq I$, and approximate the solution u of (1)-(2) by the solution $U_h^{(n)} = (U_0^{(n)}, \dots, U_I^{(n)})^T$ of the following explicit scheme

$$\frac{U_i^{(n+1)} - U_i^{(n)}}{\Delta t_n} = \sum_{j=0}^{I-1} hJ(x_i - x_j)(U_j^{(n)} - U_i^{(n)}) + f(U_i^{(n)}), \quad 0 \leq i \leq I,$$

$$U_i^{(0)} = \varphi_i, \quad 0 \leq i \leq I,$$

where $\varphi_i = \frac{2+\varepsilon \cos(\pi x_i)}{4}$. In order to permit the discrete solution to reproduce the properties of the continuous one when the time t approaches the blow-up time T , we need to adapt the size of the time step so that we take

$$\Delta t_n = \min \left\{ h^2, \frac{h^2}{f(\|U_h^{(n)}\|_\infty)} \right\}$$

with $\|U_h^{(n)}\|_\infty = \max_{0 \leq i \leq I} |U_i^{(n)}|$. Let us notice that the restriction on the time step ensures the nonnegativity of the discrete solution. We also approximate the solution u of (1)-(2) by the solution $U_h^{(n)}$ of the implicit scheme below

$$\frac{U_i^{(n+1)} - U_i^{(n)}}{\Delta t_n} = \sum_{j=0}^{I-1} hJ(x_i - x_j)(U_j^{(n+1)} - U_i^{(n+1)}) + f(U_i^{(n)}), \quad 0 \leq i \leq I,$$

$$U_i^{(0)} = \varphi_i, \quad 0 \leq i \leq I.$$

As in the case of the explicit scheme, here, we also choose

$$\Delta t_n = \frac{h^2}{f(\|U_h^{(n)}\|_\infty)}.$$

Let us again remark that for the above implicit scheme, existence and nonnegativity of the discrete solution are also guaranteed using standard methods (see, for instance [10]).

For the discretization in space of the theoretical problem, we have used the rectangle rule for the sake of simplicity and also, although the rectangle rule is less accurate than other quadrature rules such as the trapezium rule, however it gives interesting results. Thus, it is clear that, if for the discretization in space one utilizes other more accurate quadrature rules than the rectangle rule, one will find more precise results.

We need the following definition.

Definition 5.1 *We say that the discrete solution $U_h^{(n)}$ of the explicit scheme or the implicit scheme blows up in a finite time if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|U_h^{(n)}\|_\infty = \infty$, and the series $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \Delta t_n$ converges. The quantity $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \Delta t_n$ is called the numerical blow-up time of the discrete solution $U_h^{(n)}$.*

In the following tables, in rows, we present the numerical blow-up times, the numbers of iterations, the CPU times and the orders of the approximations corresponding to meshes of 16, 32, 64, 128. We take for the numerical blow-up time $t_n = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \Delta t_j$ which is computed at the first time when

$$\Delta t_n = |t_{n+1} - t_n| \leq 10^{-16}.$$

The order (s) of the method is computed from

$$s = \frac{\log((T_{4h} - T_{2h})/(T_{2h} - T_h))}{\log(2)}.$$

Numerical experiments for $f(s) = s^2$

First case : $\varepsilon = 0$

Table 1 : Numerical blow-up times, numbers of iterations, CPU times (seconds) and orders of the approximations obtained with the explicit Euler method

I	t_n	n	CPU time	s
16	2.025369	2101	1	-
32	2.007079	8001	8	-
64	2.001851	30536	58	1.81
128	2.000477	116419	631	1.91

Table 2 : Numerical blow-up times, numbers of iterations, CPU times (seconds) and orders of the approximations obtained with the implicit Euler method

I	t_n	n	CPU time	s
16	2.025276	2101	2	-
32	2.007076	8001	12	-
64	2.001186	30536	113	1.63
128	2.000477	116419	2760	3.05

Second case : $\varepsilon = 1/10$

Table 3 : Numerical blow-up times, numbers of iterations, CPU times (seconds) and orders of the approximations obtained with the explicit Euler method

I	t_n	n	CPU time	s
16	1.929188	2143	0.8	-
32	1.911537	8166	8	-
64	1.906539	31196	58	1.82
128	1.905216	119059	734	1.92

Table 4 : Numerical blow-up times, numbers of iterations, CPU times (seconds) and orders of the approximations obtained with the implicit Euler method

I	t_n	n	CPU time	s
16	1.934435	1822	1.2	-
32	1.908374	7507	12	-
64	1.903592	29886	118	2.45
128	1.903413	116501	2700	4.74

Third case : $\varepsilon = 1/100$

Table 5 : Numerical blow-up times, numbers of iterations, CPU times (seconds) and orders of the approximations obtained with the explicit Euler method

I	t_n	n	CPU time	s
16	2.015320	2101	1	-
32	1.997097	8177	8	-
64	1.991902	31241	54	1.81
128	1.995052	119238	869	0.72

Table 6 : Numerical blow-up times, numbers of iterations, CPU times (seconds) and orders of the approximations obtained with the implicit Euler method

I	t_n	n	CPU time	s
16	2.030313	1905	2	-
32	2.001710	7411	11	-
64	1.992897	29977	120	1.70
128	1.990658	116702	2805	1.87

Remark 5.1 *If we consider the problem (1)-(2) in the case where $u_0(x) = 1/2$, then using standard methods, one may easily check that the blow-up time of the solution u is $T = 2$. We note from Tables 1 to 2 that the numerical blow-up time of the discrete solution is approximately equal 2. We observe in passing the continuity of the numerical blow-up time (see, Tables 3-6).*

In what follows, we also give some plots to illustrate our analysis. In Figures 1-6, we can appreciate that the discrete solution blows up in a finite time. Let us notice that when the initial datum is constant, then the discrete solution blows up globally (see, Figures 1-2).




FIG. 1 – Evolution of the discrete solution $I = 16$, $\varepsilon = 0$, $f(s) = s^2$ (explicit scheme).




FIG. 2 – Evolution of the discrete solution $I = 16$, $\varepsilon = 0$, $f(s) = s^2$ (implicit scheme).




FIG. 3 – Evolution of the discrete solution $I = 16$, $\varepsilon = 1/10$, $f(s) = s^2$ (explicit scheme).




FIG. 4 – Evolution of the discrete solution $I = 16$, $\varepsilon = 1/10$, $f(s) = s^2$ (implicit scheme).




FIG. 5 – Evolution of the discrete solution $I = 16$, $\varepsilon = 1/100$, $f(s) = s^2$ (explicit scheme).




FIG. 6 – Evolution of the discrete solution $I = 16$, $\varepsilon = 1/100$, $f(s) = s^2$ (implicit scheme).

Acknowledgments

The authors thank the reviewers for their instructive comments and bibliographic insights.

References

- [1] **F. Andreu, J. M. Mazón, J. D. Rossi and J. Toledo**, The Neumann problem for nonlocal nonlinear diffusion equations, *J. Evol. Equat.*, **8** (2008), 189-215.
- [2] **F. Andreu, J. M. Mazón, J. D. Rossi and J. Toledo**, A nonlocal p-Laplacian evolution equation with Neumann boundary conditions, *Preprint*.
- [3] **P. Bates and A. Chmaj**, An integrodifferential model for phase transitions : stationary solutions in higher dimensions, *J. Statistical Phys.*, **95**

(1999), 1119-1139.

- [4] **P. Bates and A. Chmaj**, A discrete convolution model for phase transitions, *Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal.*, **150** (1999), 281-305.
- [5] **P. Bates and J. Han**, The Dirichlet boundary problem for a nonlocal Cahn-Hilliard equation, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **311** (2005), 289-312.
- [6] **P. Bates and J. Han**, The Neumann boundary problem for a nonlocal Cahn-Hilliard equation, *J. Differential Equations*, **212** (2005), 235-277.
- [7] **P. Bates, P. Fife and X. Wang**, Travelling waves in a convolution model for phase transitions, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, **138** (1997), 105-136.
- [8] **A. Belahmidi**, Information denoising and quantization by diffusion reaction model, *Appl. Sciences*, **8** (2006), 31-39.
- [9] **T. K. Boni**, On the blow-up and asymptotic behavior of solutions to a nonlinear parabolic equations of second order, *Asymp. Anal.*, **21** (1999), 187-208.
- [10] **T. K. Boni**, Extinction for discretizations of some semilinear parabolic equations, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Sér. I, Math.*, **333** (2001), 795-800.
- [11] **C. Carrilo and P. Fife**, Spacial effects in discrete generation population models, *J. Math. Bio.*, **50** (2005), 161-188.
- [12] **E. Chasseigne, M. Chaves and J. D. Rossi**, Asymptotic behavior for nonlocal diffusion equations whose solutions develop a free boundary, *J. Math. Pures et Appl.*, **86** (2006), 271-291.
- [13] **X. Chen**, Existence, uniqueness and asymptotic stability of travelling waves in nonlocal evolution equations, *Adv. Differential Equations*, **2** (1997), 128-160.
- [14] **X. Y. Chen and H. Matano**, Convergence, asymptotic periodicity and finite point blow up in one-dimensional semilinear heat equations, *J. Diff. Equat.*, **78** (1989), 160-190.
- [15] **C. Cortazar, M. Elgueta and J. D. Rossi**, A non-local diffusion equation whose solutions develop a free boundary, *Ann. Henry Poincaré*, **6** (2005), 269-281.
- [16] **C. Cortazar, M. Elgueta and J. D. Rossi**, How to approximate the heat equation with Neumann boundary conditions by nonlocal diffusion problems, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, **187** (2008), 137-156.
- [17] **C. Cortazar, M. Elgueta, J. D. Rossi and N. Wolanski**, Boundary fluxes for non-local diffusion, *J. Differential Equations*, **234** (2007), 360-390.
- [18] **P. Fife**, Some nonclassical trends in parabolic and parabolic-like evolutions. Trends in nonlinear analysis, *Springer, Berlin*, (2003), 153-191.
- [19] **P. Fife and X. Wang**, A convolution model for interfacial motion : the generation and propagation of internal layers in higher space dimensions, *Adv. Differential Equations*, **3** (1998), 85-110.
- [20] **L. I. Ignat and J. D. Rossi**, A nonlocal convection-diffusion equation, *J. Functional Analysis*, **251** (2007), 399-437.
- [21] **N. I. Kavallaris and D. E. Tzanetis**, On the blow-up of a nonlocal parabolic problem, *App. Math. Letters*, **19** (2006), 921-925.

- [22] **M. N. Le Roux**, Semidiscretization in time of nonlinear parabolic equations with blow-up of the solution, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, **31** (1994), 170-195.
- [23] **M. N. Le Roux**, Semidiscretization in time of a fast diffusion equation, *J. Math. Anal.*, **137** (1989), 354-370.
- [24] **M. N. Le Roux and P. E. Mainge**, Numerical solution of a fast diffusion equation, *Math. Comp.*, **68** (1999), 461-485.
- [25] **A. M. Mirza and S. Iqbal**, Finite element investigations for the construction of composite solutions of even-parity transport equation, *Appl. Sciences*, **9** (2007), 121-140.
- [26] **D. Nabongo and T. K. Boni**, Blow-up time for a nonlocal diffusion problem with Dirichlet boundary conditions, *Comm. Anal. Geometry*, **16** (2008), 865-882.
- [27] **D. Nabongo and T. K. Boni**, Numerical blow-up and asymptotic behavior for a semilinear parabolic equation with nonlinear boundary condition, *Albanian J. Math.*, **2** (2008), 111-124.
- [28] **F. K. N'gohisse and T. K. Boni**, Numerical blow-up solutions for some semilinear heat equations, *Elect. Trans. Numer. Anal.*, **30** (2008), 247-257.
- [29] **M. H. Protter and H. F. Weinberger**, Maximum principle in differential equations, *Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ*, (1957)
- [30] **M. Perez-LLanos and J. D. Rossi**, Blow-up for a non-local diffusion problem with Neumann boundary conditions and a reaction term, *Nonl. Anal. TMA*, **70** (2009), 1629-1640.
- [31] **R. J. Swift**, A stochastic death pairing process, *Appl. Sciences*, **10** (2008), 235-243.
- [32] **W. Walter**, Differential-und Integral-Ungleichungen, *Springer, Berlin*, (1964).