

A PHRAGMÉN-LINDELÖF THEOREM

X. T. LIANG AND Y. W. LU

Let Ω be an unbounded and connected domain in E^n . Consider on $\Omega \times (0, \infty)$ the parabolic equation

$$u_t - \operatorname{div} \mathbf{A}(x, t, u, \nabla u) = B(x, t, u, \nabla u).$$

Under proper conditions a theorem of Phragmén-Lindelöf type is proved for generalized solutions of the equation.

Introduction. The classical Phragmén-Lindelöf principle gives an important property of harmonic functions defined on a plane sector domain. That has been generalized not only to generalized solutions of quasi-linear elliptic equations in more general unbounded and connected domains (see [1]–[5]), but also to the ones of quasi-linear parabolic equations in divergence form which have their principal parts only [6]. In this paper the result is extended to generalized solutions of the equation (1). We prove the result by an argument based on the technique of Moser [7] and Ladyženskaja-Ural'ceva [8]. We have not seen any reference discussing such behavior for solutions of parabolic equations except [6] where the simpler situation of the equation (1), namely $B \equiv 0$, is considered.

The paper is organized as follows. In §1 the main result is mentioned and in §2 several lemmata are given as preliminaries. Finally, a full proof of our theorem is stated in §3.

1. Main result. Let Ω be an unbounded and connected domain in the n -dimensional Euclidean space E^n . Denote by $\partial\Omega$ the boundary of Ω . On $\Omega \times (0, \infty)$ we consider the following equation:

$$(1) \quad u_t - \operatorname{div} \mathbf{A}(x, t, u, \nabla u) = B(x, t, u, \nabla u)$$

where $A(x, t, u, \xi)$ and $B(x, t, u, \xi)$ are defined on $\Omega \times (0, \infty) \times E^1 \times E^n$, continuous with respect to u and ξ for fixed x and t , measurable with respect to x and t for fixed u and ξ , and satisfying the following structural conditions:

$$(2) \quad \begin{aligned} \xi \cdot \mathbf{A}(x, t, u, \xi) &\geq \kappa_0 |\xi|^2, \\ |\mathbf{A}(x, t, u, \xi)| &\leq \kappa_1 |\xi|, \\ |B(x, t, u, \xi)| &\leq b(x, t) |\xi|, \end{aligned}$$

where $\kappa_1 \geq \kappa_0 > 0$, $b(x, t) \in L_\infty(\Omega \times (0, \infty))$ and

$$(3) \quad |b(x, t)| = O(|x|^{-1}) \text{ (uniformly for } t) \text{ as } |x| \rightarrow \infty.$$

We need the supposition on Ω : there exist some $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$ and a $\theta \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$(4) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{meas}(\Omega \cap \{B(x_0, \rho_0) \setminus B(x_0, \rho_1)\}) \\ \leq \theta \text{ meas}\{B(x_0, \rho_0) \setminus B(x_0, \rho_1)\} \end{aligned}$$

for any $\rho_0 > \rho_1 > 0$, where $\text{meas } e$ denotes the Lebesgue measure of the set e in E^n and

$$B(x_0, \rho) = \{x \in E^n, |x - x_0| < \rho\}.$$

For $G \subset E^n$, $W_2^1(G)$ and $\overset{\circ}{W}_2^1(G)$ stand for the usual Sobolev spaces. Let X be a Banach space formed by measurable functions defined on G with respect to the norm $\|\cdot\|_X$. Denote $L_p(0, T, X)$ the Banach space formed by the mapping from $[0, T]$ into X with norm $\|u\|_{L_p(0, T, X)}$ defined by

$$\|u\|_{L_p(0, T, X)} = \left(\int_0^T \|u\|_X^p dx \right)^{1/p} \quad \left(= \text{ess sup}_{t \in (0, T)} \|u\|_X \text{ if } p = \infty \right).$$

Similarly, the space $C(0, T, X)$ etc. can also be defined.

The function u is called a generalized solution of the equation (1) if for any $T > 0$ and for arbitrary $G \subset \Omega$ and $G \subset\subset E^n$,

$$(5) \quad u \in C(0, T, L_2(G)) \cap L_2(0, T, W_2^1(G))$$

and the following holds:

$$(1)' \quad \int_0^t \int_G \{-v_t u + \nabla v \cdot A(x, t, u, \nabla u) - v B(x, t, u, \nabla u)\} dx dt + \int_G v(x, t) u(x, t) \Big|_{t=0}^{t=t} dx = 0,$$

$$\forall t \in (0, T), \quad v \in W_2^1(0, T, L_2(G)) \cap L_2(0, T, \overset{\circ}{W}_2^1(G))$$

where $u(x, 0)$ is a given initial value of u .

As the main result we have

THEOREM. *Suppose that the conditions (2)–(4) are satisfied and the generalized solution u of the equation (1) satisfies*

$$(6) \quad u^+ = \max(u, 0) = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega \times (0, \infty) \text{ and } u^+|_{t=0} = 0.$$

If there exists an $R > 0$ such that $M(R) > 0$, then

$$M(\rho) \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{as } \rho \rightarrow \infty$$

where

$$M(\rho) = \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{Q(\rho)} u(x, t), \quad Q(\rho) = \{\Omega \cap B(x_0, \rho)\} \times (0, \rho^2).$$

As an immediate consequence we have

COROLLARY. *If the u in the theorem is bounded from above, then $u \leq 0$ on $\Omega \times (0, \infty)$.*

REMARK. The results of the theorem and corollary and the proof given in §3 below are also true for subsolutions of the equation (1). As the definition u is a subsolution if besides (5) it satisfies the following:

$$\int_{t'}^{t''} \int_G \{-v_t u + \nabla v \cdot \mathbf{A}(x, t, u, \nabla u) - v B(x, t, u, \nabla u)\} dx dt + \int_G v(x, t) u(x, t) \Big|_{t=t'}^{t=t''} dx \leq 0, \\ \forall (t', t'') \subset (0, T), \quad v \in W_2^1(0, T, L_2(G)) \cap L_2(0, T, \mathring{W}_2^1(G)) \\ \text{and } v \geq 0.$$

2. Preliminaries.

LEMMA 1. *Suppose G is a bounded domain in E^n , $T > 0$ is a definite value and u satisfies (5) and (1)'. If there exists a constant $M > 0$ such that*

$$(7) \quad (u - M)^+ \in L_2(0, T, \mathring{W}_2^1(G)) \quad \text{and} \quad (u - M)^+|_{t=0} = 0$$

then

$$(8) \quad \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{G \times (0, T)} u(x, t) \leq M.$$

Proof. If the statement were not true, there would be a

$$M' = \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{G \times (0, T)} u > M \quad (M' = \infty \text{ is not exclusive}).$$

By (7), we have for any $k \in (M, M')$

$$(u - k)^+ \in L_2(0, T, \mathring{W}_2^1(G)) \quad \text{and} \quad (u - k)^+|_{t=0} = 0.$$

Hence it follows by the imbedding inequality in $L_2(0, T, \mathring{W}_2^1(G))$ that

$$\left(\int_0^T \int_G |(u - k)^+|^q dx dt \right)^{2/q} \leq C(n) \| |(u - k)^+ \| \|_{G \times (0, T)}$$

where $q = 2(1 + 2/n)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \| |(u - k)^+ \| \|_{G \times (0, T)} &= \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{G \times (0, T)} \int_G |(u - k)^+|^2 dx \\ &\quad + \int_0^T \int_G |\nabla(u - k)^+|^2 dx dt. \end{aligned}$$

We assume temporarily that $(u - k)^+ \in W_2^1(0, T, L_2(G))$; then $v = (u - k)^+$ can be taken as a test function. Substituting v into (1)' and integrating by parts with respect to t , we have by the use of (2) that

$$\begin{aligned} (9) \quad &\int_G |(u - k)^+|^2 dx + \int_0^t \int_G |\nabla(u - k)^+|^2 dx dt \\ &\leq C \int_0^t \int_G b(x, t) (u - k)^+ |\nabla(u - k)^+| dx dt, \end{aligned}$$

where the constant $C > 0$ depends only on n and κ_0 . However, we cannot guarantee $(u - k)^+ \in W_2^1(0, T, L_2(G))$ when u is the function in Lemma 1. What we have to do now is to extend $(u - k)^+$ to $G \times (-\infty, 0)$ by letting $(u - k)^+ = 0$ and instead of v we take

$$v' = \frac{1}{h} \int_t^{t+h} (u - k)^+ d\tau$$

as the test function. Repeating the above process again we obtain (9) by letting $h \rightarrow 0$ in the last result.

Since the two terms on the left-hand side of (9) are all non-negative, each of them does not exceed that on the right-hand side. Taking their supremums for $t \in (0, T)$, we have

$$(10) \quad \| |(u - k)^+ \| \|_{G \times (0, T)} \leq C \int_0^T \int_G (u - k)^+ |\nabla(u - k)^+| dx dt,$$

where we absorb the $\|b(x, t)\|_{L_\infty}$ into the constant C . Considering that the effective integral domain in (10) is only $\{G \times (0, T)\} \cap$

$\{k < u < M'\}$, we then have by Hölder inequality that

$$\begin{aligned}
 (11) \quad & \int_0^T \int_G (u - k)^+ |\nabla(u - k)^+| dx dt \\
 & \leq \varepsilon(k, M') \left(\int_0^T \int_G |(u - k)^+|^q dx dt \right)^{1/q} \\
 & \quad \cdot \left(\int_0^T \int_G |\nabla(u - k)^+|^2 dx dt \right)^{1/2} \\
 & \leq C(n) \varepsilon(k, M') \| (u - k)^+ \|_{G \times (0, T)}
 \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\varepsilon(k, M') = \left(\int_0^T \int_{G \cap \{k < u < M'\}} dx dt \right)^{1/(n+2)}.$$

Combining (10) with (11) we get

$$(12) \quad 1 \leq C(n) \varepsilon(k, M'),$$

where the constant $C(n) > 0$ is independent of k . So, we have $\varepsilon(k, M') \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow M'$ because

$$\iint_{\{G \times (0, T)\} \cap \{k < u < M'\}} dx dt \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow M'.$$

Hence, the contradiction is obtained by (12). □

For simplicity we write $B(\rho) = B(0, \rho)$.

LEMMA 2. *Suppose $\rho_0 > \rho_1 > 0$, $S \subset B(\rho_0) \setminus B(\rho_1)$ and*

$$\text{meas } S \geq \theta \text{ meas}\{B(\rho_0) \setminus B(\rho_1)\}, \quad \theta \in (0, 1).$$

Suppose $u \in W_p^1(B(\rho_0) \setminus B(\rho_1))$, $p \geq 1$ and $u = 0$ on S . Then

$$\int_{B(\rho_0) \setminus B(\rho_1)} |u|^p dx \leq C \left(n, p, \theta, \frac{\rho_0}{\rho_1} \right) \rho_0^p \int_{B(\rho_0) \setminus B(\rho_1)} |\nabla u|^p dx.$$

Lemma 2 is a variety of Theorem 3.6.5, in Morrey [9] and it can be proved by the same method.

LEMMA 3 [10]. *Let $f(t)$ be a non-negative bounded function defined for $0 \leq r' \leq t \leq r$. If*

$$f(t) \leq A(s - t)^{-\alpha} + B + \theta f(s), \quad \forall r' \leq t < s \leq r$$

where A, B, α, θ are non-negative constants and $\theta \in (0, 1)$, then there exists a constant C depending only on α and θ such that

$$f(\rho) \leq C(A(R - \rho)^{-\alpha} + B), \quad \forall r' \leq \rho < R \leq r.$$

3. Proof of the theorem. Without loss of generality, let x_0 be the origin. We can rewrite the condition (3) as

$$(3)' \quad |b(x, t)| \leq K|x|^{-1} \quad \text{as } |x| \geq 1,$$

where K is a positive constant.

Let $\rho \geq \max(R, 1)$, $0 \leq \rho_2 < \rho_1 < \rho_0 \leq \rho$ and let $\zeta(x) = \zeta(|x|)$ be a piecewise linear and continuous function of $|x|$ satisfying

$$(13) \quad \zeta(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{as } |x| \leq 2\rho - \rho_1 \text{ or } |x| \geq 4\rho + \rho_1, \\ 1, & \text{as } 2\rho - \rho_2 \leq |x| \leq 4\rho + \rho_2. \end{cases}$$

Then

$$|\nabla \zeta(x)| \leq (\rho_1 - \rho_2)^{-1}.$$

The function u in the theorem as the generalized solution satisfying (5) and (6) is locally bounded from above on $(\Omega \cup \partial\Omega) \times (0, \infty)$ [11]. Therefore

$$M(\rho) = \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{Q(\rho)} u(x, t) < \infty, \quad Q(\rho) = \{\Omega \cap B(\rho)\} \times (0, \rho^2).$$

On $Q(5\rho)$ let

$$(14) \quad \begin{aligned} w(x, t) &= \ln \frac{M(5\rho) + \varepsilon}{M(5\rho) + \varepsilon - u^+}, \quad \varepsilon > 0, \\ v(x, t) &= \frac{\zeta^2(x)(w - k)^+}{M(5\rho) + \varepsilon - u^+}, \quad k \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Because of the boundedness of u on $Q(5\rho)$, we have

$$(15) \quad \begin{aligned} w &\in L_2(0, 25\rho^2 \cdot W_2^1(\Omega \cap B(5\rho)) \cap L_\infty(Q(5\rho)), \\ w &= 0 \quad \text{on } \{\partial\Omega \cap B(5\rho)\} \times (0, 25\rho^2) \cup \{t = 0\} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$v \in L_2(0, 25\rho^2, \overset{\circ}{W}_2^1(\Omega \cap B(5\rho))) \cap L_\infty(Q(5\rho)), \quad v|_{t=0} = 0.$$

Suppose $v \in W_2^1(0, 25\rho^2, L_2(\Omega \cap B(5\rho)))$ (otherwise, we add a limit process to arrive at the same result). Such v can be taken as a test

function. Substituting it into (1)' yields

$$(16) \quad 0 = \int_0^t \int_{\Omega \cap B(5\rho)} \left\{ \zeta^2 \left(\frac{1}{2} [(w-k)^+]^2 \right) t \right. \\ \left. + \left[\frac{\zeta^2 \nabla(w-k)^+}{M(5\rho) + \varepsilon - u^+} \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + \frac{\zeta^2 (w-k)^+ \nabla u^+}{(M(5\rho) + \varepsilon - u^+)^2} + \frac{(w-k)^+ 2\zeta \nabla \zeta}{M(5\rho) + \varepsilon - u^+} \right] \cdot A \right. \\ \left. + \frac{\zeta^2 (w-k)^+ B}{M(5\rho) + \varepsilon - u^+} \right\} dx dt, \\ t \in (0, 25\rho^2).$$

By virtue of the appearance of $\zeta(x)$ and $(w-k)^+$ in (16) the effective integral domain is only

$$(17) \quad \{ \Omega \cap (B(4\rho + \rho_1) \setminus B(2\rho - \rho_1)) \times (0, t) \} \cap \{ w > k \},$$

on which $u^+ > 0$ because of (14). By the use of (2) it follows from (16) that

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega \cap B(5\rho)} \zeta^2 [(w-k)^+]^2 dx \\ + \kappa_0 \int_0^t \int_{\Omega \cap B(5\rho)} (\zeta^2 |\nabla(w-k)^+|^2 + \zeta^2 (w-k)^+ |\nabla(w-k)^+|^2) dx dt \\ \leq \int_0^t \int_{\Omega \cap B(5\rho)} (w-k)^+ [2\zeta |\nabla \zeta| \kappa_1 + \zeta^2 b(x, t)] |\nabla(w-k)^+| dx dt.$$

With the aid of Young's inequality it follows from the inequality above that

$$(18) \quad \int_{\Omega \cap B(5\rho)} \zeta^2 [(w-k)^+]^2 dx + \int_0^t \int_{\Omega \cap B(5\rho)} \zeta^2 |\nabla(w-k)^+|^2 dx dt \\ \leq C \int_0^t \int_{\Omega \cap B(4\rho + \rho_1) \setminus B(2\rho - \rho_1)} (w-k)^+ [|\nabla \zeta|^2 + \zeta^2 |b(x, t)|^2] dx dt \\ \leq C \left(\frac{1}{(\rho_1 - \rho_2)^2} + \frac{1}{\rho^2} \right) \int_0^t \int_{\Omega \cap B(4\rho + \rho_1) \setminus B(2\rho - \rho_1)} (w-k)^+ dx dt,$$

where the last inequality in (18) is obtained by the fact that (3)' holds on the effective integral domain (17) and the constant $C > 0$ depends

only on n , κ_0 , κ_1 and K . Extend w by taking $w(x, t) = 0$ as $x \notin \Omega$. We have from (4)

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{meas}(\{B(4\rho + \rho_1) \setminus B(2\rho - \rho_1)\} \cap \{(w - k)^+ = 0\}) \\ & \geq (1 - \theta) \text{meas}\{B(4\rho + \rho_1) \setminus B(2\rho - \rho_1)\}. \end{aligned}$$

For $p = 1, 2$ applying Lemma 2 to $(w - k)^+$ on $B(4\rho + \rho_1) \setminus B(2\rho - \rho_1)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (19)' \quad & \int_{\Omega \cap B(4\rho + \rho_1) \setminus B(2\rho - \rho_1)} (w - k)^+ dx \\ & \leq C(n, \theta) \rho \int_{\Omega \cap B(4\rho + \rho_1) \setminus B(2\rho - \rho_1)} |\nabla(w - k)^+| dx \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} (19)'' \quad & \int_{\Omega \cap B(4\rho + \rho_1) \setminus B(2\rho - \rho_1)} [(w - k)^+]^2 dx \\ & \leq C(n, \theta) \rho^2 \int_{\Omega \cap B(4\rho + \rho_1) \setminus B(2\rho - \rho_1)} |\nabla(w - k)^+|^2 dx \end{aligned}$$

respectively. It follows from (18) and (19)' that

$$\begin{aligned} (20) \quad & \int_{\Omega \cap B(5\rho)} \zeta^2 [(w - k)^+]^2 dx + \int_0^t \int_{\Omega \cap B(5\rho)} \zeta^2 |\nabla(w - k)^+|^2 dx dt \\ & \leq C \left[\frac{1}{(\rho_1 - \rho_2)^2} + \frac{1}{\rho^2} \right] \rho \\ & \quad \cdot \int_{\Omega \cap B(4\rho + \rho_1) \setminus B(2\rho - \rho_1)} |\nabla(w - k)^+| dx dt \\ & \leq C \left[\frac{1}{(\rho_1 - \rho_2)^2} + \frac{1}{\rho^2} \right]^2 \rho^2 \int_{\Omega \cap B(4\rho + \rho_1) \setminus B(2\rho - \rho_1)} \chi(k) dx dt \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{4} \int_{\Omega \cap B(4\rho + \rho_1) \setminus B(2\rho - \rho_1)} |\nabla(w - k)^+|^2 dx dt \end{aligned}$$

where the constant $C > 0$ depends only on n , κ_0 , κ_1 , K and θ , and $\chi(k)$ is the characteristic function of the set $\{w > k\}$. Taking the supremum in (20) for $t \in (0, \rho^2)$ we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 (21) \quad & \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{t \in (0, \rho^2)} \int_{\Omega \cap B(5\rho)} \zeta^2 [(w - k)^+]^2 dx \\
 & + \int_0^{\rho^2} \int_{\Omega \cap B(5\rho)} \zeta^2 |\nabla(w - k)^+|^2 dx dt \\
 & \leq C \left[\frac{1}{(\rho_1 - \rho_2)^2} + \frac{1}{\rho^2} \right] \rho^2 \\
 & \quad \cdot \int_0^{\rho^2} \int_{\Omega \cap B(4\rho + \rho_1) \setminus B(2\rho - \rho_1)} \chi(k) dx dt \\
 & \quad + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{\rho^2} \int_{\Omega \cap B(4\rho + \rho_1) \setminus B(2\rho - \rho_1)} |\nabla(w - k)^+|^2 dx dt.
 \end{aligned}$$

According to the definition of $\zeta(x)$ it is obvious that

$$\begin{aligned}
 (22) \quad & \int_0^{\rho^2} \int_{\Omega \cap B(4\rho + \rho_2) \setminus B(2\rho - \rho_2)} |\nabla(w - k)^+|^2 dx dt \\
 & \leq \int_0^{\rho^2} \int_{\Omega \cap B(5\rho)} \zeta^2 |\nabla(w - k)^+|^2 dx dt.
 \end{aligned}$$

On account of C being independent of ρ_1 and ρ_2 and the arbitrariness of ρ_1 and ρ_2 in $0 \leq \rho_2 < \rho_1 \leq \rho$, combining (22) with (21) and applying Lemma 3 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 (23) \quad & \int_0^{\rho^2} \int_{\Omega \cap B(4\rho + \rho_2) \setminus B(2\rho - \rho_2)} |\nabla(w - k)^+|^2 dx dt \\
 & \leq C \left[\frac{1}{(\rho_1 - \rho_2)^2} + \frac{1}{\rho^2} \right]^2 \rho^2 \\
 & \quad \cdot \int_0^{\rho^2} \int_{\Omega \cap B(4\rho + \rho_1) \setminus B(2\rho - \rho_1)} \chi(k) dx dt,
 \end{aligned}$$

where the constant $C > 0$ is independent of ρ_1 , ρ_2 and ρ . Therefore, if $0 \leq \rho_1 < \rho_0 \leq \rho$, it follows from (23) by replacing ρ_1 and ρ_2 by ρ_0 and ρ_1 respectively that

$$\begin{aligned}
 (24) \quad & \int_0^{\rho^2} \int_{\Omega \cap B(4\rho + \rho_1) \setminus B(2\rho - \rho_1)} |\nabla(w - k)^+|^2 dx dt \\
 & \leq C \left[\frac{1}{(\rho_0 - \rho_1)^2} + \frac{1}{\rho^2} \right]^2 \rho^2 \\
 & \quad \cdot \int_0^{\rho^2} \int_{\Omega \cap B(4\rho + \rho_0) \setminus B(2\rho - \rho_0)} \chi(k) dx dt.
 \end{aligned}$$

From (15) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 (25) \quad & \left(\int_0^{\rho^2} \int_{\Omega \cap B(4\rho+\rho_2) \setminus B(2\rho-\rho_2)} |(w-k)^+|^q dx dt \right)^{2/q} \\
 & \leq C(n) \|\zeta(x)(w-k)^+\|_{\{\Omega \cap B(4\rho+\rho_1) \setminus B(2\rho-\rho_1)\} \times (0, \rho^2)} \\
 & \leq C(n) \left\{ \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{t \in (0, \rho^2)} \int_{\Omega \cap B(5\rho)} \zeta^2 [(w-k)^+]^2 dx \right. \\
 & \quad + \int_0^{\rho^2} \int_{\Omega \cap B(5\rho)} \zeta^2 |\nabla(w-k)^+|^2 dx dt \\
 & \quad \left. + \int_0^{\rho^2} \int_{\Omega \cap B(4\rho+\rho_1) \setminus B(2\rho-\rho_1)} |\nabla \zeta|^2 |(w-k)^+|^2 dx dt \right\}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Collecting (19)'', (21), (24) and (25), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left(\int_0^{\rho^2} \int_{\Omega \cap B(4\rho+\rho_2) \setminus B(2\rho-\rho_2)} |(w-k)^+|^q dx dt \right)^{2/q} \\
 & \leq C \left[\frac{1}{(\rho_1 - \rho_2)^2} + \frac{1}{\rho^2} \right]^2 \rho^2 \int_0^{\rho^2} \int_{\Omega \cap B(4\rho+\rho_1) \setminus B(2\rho-\rho_1)} \chi(k) dx dt \\
 & \quad + C \left[\frac{1}{(\rho_0 - \rho_1)^2} + \frac{1}{\rho^2} \right]^2 \rho^2 \int_0^{\rho^2} \int_{\Omega \cap B(4\rho+\rho_0) \setminus B(2\rho-\rho_0)} \chi(k) dx dt,
 \end{aligned}$$

where $C > 0$ depends only on n, κ_0, κ_1, K and θ . In particular, let $0 \leq \rho'' = \rho_2 < \rho_0 = \rho' < \rho$ and $\rho_1 = \frac{1}{2}(\rho' + \rho'')$. The inequality above can be rewritten as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (26) \quad & \left(\int_0^{\rho^2} \int_{\Omega \cap B(4\rho+\rho'') \setminus B(2\rho-\rho'')} |(w-k)^+|^q dx dt \right)^{2/q} \\
 & \leq C \left[\frac{1}{(\rho' - \rho'')^2} + \frac{1}{\rho^2} \right]^2 \rho^2 \\
 & \quad \cdot \int_0^{\rho^2} \int_{\Omega \cap B(4\rho+\rho') \setminus B(2\rho-\rho')} \chi(k) dx dt.
 \end{aligned}$$

Take for $\nu = 0, 1, 2, \dots$

$$\rho_\nu = \rho/2^\nu, \quad k_\nu = H - H/2^\nu \quad (H > 0 \text{ will be special}),$$

$$A_\nu = \int_0^{\rho^2} \int_{\Omega \cap B(4\rho+\rho_\nu) \setminus B(2\rho-\rho_\nu)} \chi(k_\nu) dx dt.$$

Since the constant C in (26) is independent of ρ' , ρ'' and k , replace ρ' , ρ'' by ρ_ν , $\rho_{\nu+1}$, and k by k_ν , it follows from (26) that

$$\begin{aligned} & (k_{\nu+1} - k_\nu)^2 A_{\nu+1}^{2/q} \\ & \leq \left(\int_0^{\rho^2} \int_{\Omega \cap B(4\rho + \rho_{\nu+1}) \setminus B(2\rho - \rho_{\nu+1})} |(w - k_\nu)^+|^q dx dt \right)^{2/q} \\ & \leq C \left[\frac{1}{(\rho_\nu - \rho_{\nu+1})^2} + \frac{1}{\rho^2} \right]^2 \rho^2 A_\nu, \quad \nu = 0, 1, 2, \dots, \end{aligned}$$

namely,

$$\begin{aligned} (27) \quad A_{\nu+1}^{2/q} & \leq C \left(\frac{2^{\nu+1}}{H} \right)^2 \left[\left(\frac{2^{\nu+1}}{\rho} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{\rho^2} \right]^2 \rho^2 A_\nu \\ & \leq C 2^{8\nu} \cdot 2^{6\nu} (H\rho)^{-2} A_\nu, \quad \nu = 0, 1, 2, \dots \end{aligned}$$

For $\nu = 0$ we have

$$(28) \quad A_0 = \int_0^{\rho^2} \int_{\Omega \cap B(5\rho) \setminus B(\rho)} \chi(0) dx dt \leq \text{meas } B(5)\rho^{n+2}.$$

As long as we assume $H > 0$ so large that

$$(29) \quad \left(\frac{C \cdot 2^8}{H} \right)^{1+2/(n+2)} [\text{meas } B(5)]^{2/(n+2)} \leq \delta, \quad 2^{6(1+2/(n+2))} \delta^{2/(n+2)} = 1,$$

from (27), (28) and (29) it can be shown by induction that

$$A_\nu \leq \delta^\nu A_0, \quad \nu = 1, 2, \dots$$

Let $\nu \rightarrow \infty$; then

$$\int_0^{\rho^2} \int_{\Omega \cap B(4\rho) \setminus B(2\rho)} \chi(H) dx dt = 0,$$

which implies

$$\text{ess sup}_{\{\Omega \cap B(4\rho) \setminus B(2\rho)\} \times (0, \rho^2)} w \leq H.$$

According to the definition of w we have

$$\text{ess sup}_{\{\Omega \cap B(4\rho) \setminus B(2\rho)\} \times (0, \rho^2)} u^+ \leq [M(5\rho) + \varepsilon](1 - e^{-H}).$$

Let $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$; then

$$\text{ess sup}_{\{\Omega \cap B(4\rho) \setminus B(2\rho)\} \times (0, \rho^2)} u^+ \leq M(5\rho)(1 - e^{-H}).$$

It follows from Lemma 1 that

$$\begin{aligned}
 (30) \quad M(\rho) &= \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\{\Omega \cap B(\rho)\} \times (0, \rho^2)} u \leq \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\{\Omega \cap B(3\rho)\} \times (0, \rho^2)} u \\
 &\leq \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\{\Omega \cap B(4\rho) \setminus B(2\rho)\} \times (0, \rho^2)} u^+ \leq M(5\rho)(1 - e^{-H}).
 \end{aligned}$$

We see from (29) that H is determined by constants C and n ; hence, H is independent of ρ .

Now, suppose $\rho_0 = \max(R, 1)$. For any $\rho \geq \rho_0$ there exists an integer ν such that $5^\nu \rho_0 \leq \rho < 5^{\nu+1} \rho_0$. Iterating by (30) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 M(\rho) &\geq M(5^\nu \rho_0) \geq (1 - e^{-H})^{-\nu} M(\rho_0) \\
 &\geq (1 - e^{-H}) M(\rho_0) (1 - e^{-H})^{-\log_5(\rho/\rho_0)} \\
 &= (1 - e^{-H}) M(\rho_0) (\rho/\rho_0)^\lambda \geq (1 - e^{-H}) M(R) (\rho/\rho_0)^\lambda, \\
 \lambda &= \log_5(1 - e^{-H})^{-1} > 0, \quad \rho \geq \rho_0.
 \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $M(\rho) \rightarrow \infty$ as $\rho \rightarrow \infty$ whenever $M(R) > 0$. The proof of the theorem is completed.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Granlund, *A Phragmén-Lindelöf principle for subsolutions of quasi-linear equations*, Manuscripta Math., **36** (1981), 355–365.
- [2] P. Tolksdorf, *On the Dirichlet problem for quasilinear equations in domains with conical boundary points*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations, **8** (1983), 773–817.
- [3] P. Lindqvist, *On the growth of the solutions of the differential equation $\operatorname{div}(|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u) = 0$ in n -dimensional space*, J. Differential Equations, **58** (1985), 307–317.
- [4] Xi-ting Liang, *The Phragmén-Lindelöf principle for generalized solutions of quasi-linear elliptic equations*, J. Chengdu Univ. (Natur. Sci.) **5**, **1** (1986), 1–7 (in Chinese).
- [5] P. Aviles, *Phragmén-Lindelöf theorems for non-linear elliptic equations*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal., **97** (1987), 141–170.
- [6] Xi-ting Liang, *A behavior for solutions of parabolic equations*, Acta Math. Sci., **9** (1989), 147–153 (in Chinese).
- [7] J. Moser, *A new proof of de Giorgi's Theorem concerning the regularity problem for elliptic differential equations*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., **13** (1960), 457–468.
- [8] O. A. Ladyženskaja and N. N. Ural'ceva, *On the Hölder continuity of solutions and their derivatives for linear and quasilinear equations of elliptic and parabolic types*, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR, **155** (1964), 1258–1261 (in Russian).
- [9] C. B. Morrey, *Multiple Integrals in the Calculus of Variations*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1966.
- [10] M. Giaquinta and E. Giusti, *On the regularity of the minima of variational integrals*, Acta Math., **148** (1982), 31–46.

- [11] O. A. Ladyženskaja, V. A. Šolonnikov and N. N. Ural'ceva, *Linear and quasi-linear equations of parabolic type*, Transl. Math. Monographs, vol. 23, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R.I. 1968.

Received September 28, 1990.

ZHONGSHAN UNIVERSITY
GUANGZHOU, 510275
PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

AND

TIANJIN NORMAL UNIVERSITY
TIANJIN, 300073
PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

