

**CORRIGENDUM AND ADDENDUM TO  
THE PAPER: EXPLICIT DECAY BOUNDS  
IN SOME QUASI-LINEAR  $N$ -DIMENSIONAL  
PARABOLIC PROBLEMS,  
IJDEA, VOLUME 7, No 3 (2003), 349-367**

L. Ragoub<sup>§</sup>

Department of Mathematics and Statistics

University of Laval

Québec, G1K 7P4, CANADA

e-mail: radhkla@hotmail.com

**AMS Subject Classification:** 35B05, 35B50, 35J25, 35J60

**Key Words:** parabolic problems, maximum principles, initial and boundary value problem

\*

In (18), the second inequality is achieved by using the fact that  $f'$  is assumed to be negative, and  $g'$  is assumed to be non-positive in  $\Omega$ . Then, the remaining proof is to show the positivity of the following expression:

$$u_t + \alpha a g(u) F(u) \text{ in } \Omega, \text{ for } t > 0$$

(we proved this result by means of maximum principles).

---

Received: December 29, 2004

© 2004 Academic Publications

<sup>§</sup>Correspondence address: 7510 Garnier, Montreal, H2E 2A5, CANADA

The condition (19) follows as:

$$af(\tilde{g})g(\tilde{g})\Delta\tilde{g} + \alpha ag(\tilde{g})F(\tilde{g}) > 0 \text{ in } \Omega. \quad (1)$$

The conditions assumed on  $\tilde{g}$  appearing in (24) – (25) correspond to negative solution of (2), which contradict the fact that  $\tilde{g}$  is positive. For this reason, (24) – (25) in Lemma 2.2 must be replaced by:

$$\Delta\tilde{g} + \alpha\frac{F}{f}(\tilde{g}) - \frac{g'}{g}(\tilde{g})|\nabla\tilde{g}|^2 \geq 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \quad (2)$$

and

$$[2\nabla\tilde{g}\nabla(\Delta\tilde{g})g^2 - ((\alpha\frac{F}{f})^2g)](\tilde{g}) \geq 0 \text{ in } \Omega. \quad (3)$$

For the proof of Lemma 2.2, the only changed expression is (32):

$$\begin{aligned} g\Delta\Phi - \frac{\Phi_{,k}[\Phi_{,k} - 4(\alpha\frac{F}{f} + \frac{g'}{g})\tilde{g}_{,k}]}{2|\nabla\tilde{g}|^2} &\geq 2(\nabla\tilde{g}\nabla(\Delta\tilde{g})g^2 - (\alpha\frac{F}{f})^2g) \\ &+ \alpha g\frac{F}{f}(\Delta\tilde{g} + \alpha\frac{F}{f} - \frac{g'}{g}|\nabla\tilde{g}|^2) \\ &+ \alpha g|\nabla\tilde{g}|^2(\frac{1-f'F}{f^2}) \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Analogously, in Lemma 4.1 we must assume that

$$af(\tilde{g})(G(\tilde{g}))_{,kk} - \frac{\alpha a}{fg'} < 0, \quad x \in \Omega, \quad (5)$$

instead of (66). Since otherwise (with the first supposition), we obtain  $\tilde{g}$  negative which is a contradiction. In Theorem 4.2, we have the new condition (66) instead (24) – (25).

To this end, we mention that the exponential term  $k_\alpha(t)$  must appear in (12), and (18) meanwhile  $m_\alpha(t)$  must appear in (64) and (65).