# Heat equation gradinet estimate on a ball 

## 1 generalising the proof from last time

Last time we proved a gradient estimate for functions that satisfy the heat equation on a cylinder, To do this we needed to know that the function didn't have a maximum on a boundary. We'll now generalise this proof to work on a ball $B_{r}$. To do this we will need to introduce a cutoff function. Again we will prove the case $r=1$. Take $u: B_{2} \times[0 . \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $\triangle u=\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}$. Let $\phi: B_{2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $\phi=0$ on $\partial B_{2}$ and $\phi=1$ on $B_{1}$. As before we define $f=\log u$, and $F=|\nabla f|^{2}-\frac{\partial f}{\partial t}$, and try to estimate $\left(\triangle-\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\right) \phi^{k} F$. We have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\triangle-\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\right) \phi^{k} F=\phi^{k}\left(\triangle-\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\right) F+F\left(\triangle-\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\right) \phi^{k}+2 \nabla F \cdot \nabla \phi^{k} . \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Last time we showed that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\triangle-\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\right) F \geq 2 t\left(\frac{\partial^{2} f}{\partial x_{i} \partial x_{j}}\right)^{2}-2<\nabla F, \nabla f>-\frac{F}{t} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

and we can use the trick of saying

$$
\sum \frac{\partial^{2} f}{\partial x_{i} \partial x_{j}} \geq \frac{1}{n}\left(\sum \frac{\partial^{2} f}{\partial x_{i}^{2}}\right)^{2}=\frac{(\triangle f)^{2}}{n}=\frac{F^{2}}{n t^{2}}
$$

so

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\triangle-\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\right) \phi^{k} F \geq \phi^{k}\left(\frac{F^{2}}{n t}+t\left(\frac{\partial^{2} f}{\partial x_{i} \partial x_{j}}\right)^{2}-2<\nabla F, \nabla f>-\frac{F}{t}\right)+F\left(\triangle-\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\right) \phi^{k}+2 \nabla F \cdot \nabla \phi^{k}, \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

and then I think we're meant to use the maximum principle on $\phi^{k} f$ to finish it off but neither my notes nor Yaims actually states the result we're aiming for, or goes any further in the proof. can you point out mhow I'm meant to finish it? thanks.

