

**35. Sugar, we're going down swinging.**

First let  $\Omega' \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$  be an open and connected region. A function  $v : \Omega' \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is called a *sub-solution* of the heat equation if  $\dot{v} - \Delta v \leq 0$ .

- (a) *Mean value estimate for sub-solutions* Take any point  $(x, t) \in \Omega'$  and a small radius  $r > 0$  so that  $E(x, t, r) \subset \Omega'$  (refer to Definition 4.6). Modify the proof the mean value property of the heat equation to show that

$$v(x, t) \leq \frac{1}{4r^n} \int_{E(x,t,r)} v(y, s) \frac{|x - y|^2}{|t - s|^2} d^n y ds$$

holds for all sub-solutions. (2 Points)

Now let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be an open, bounded, and path connected region. We denote the parabolic cylinder of  $\Omega$  by  $\Omega_T := \Omega \times (0, T]$  as in Section 4.4. Suppose that  $v : \Omega_T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a sub-solution that extends continuously to  $\overline{\Omega_T}$ .

- (b) *Maximum principle for sub-solutions* Following on from (a), establish that if  $v$  takes the value  $\sup_{\Omega_T} v$  on  $\Omega_T$ , then it is constant. (2 Points)
- (c) *A monotonicity property* For  $j \in \{1, 2\}$  let  $f_j : \Omega \times (0, T) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $h_j : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , and  $g_j : \partial\Omega \times [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be smooth functions, and likewise let  $u_j : \Omega \times (0, T) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be smooth functions with continuous extensions to the boundary that satisfy

$$\begin{cases} \dot{u}_j - \Delta u_j = f_j & \text{on } \Omega \times (0, T) \\ u_j(x, 0) = h_j(x) & \text{on } \Omega \\ u_j = g_j & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times [0, T]. \end{cases}$$

Suppose further that  $f_1 \leq f_2$ ,  $g_1 \leq g_2$ , and  $h_1 \leq h_2$ . Show in this case that  $u_1 \leq u_2$  as well. (2 Points)

**Solution.**

- (a) This question is a combination of the idea behind sub-harmonic functions and the mean-value property for solutions of the heat equation. The proof of this part closely follows the proof of Theorem 4.7 in the lecture script. We give the proof only at the point  $(x, t) = (0, 0)$ ; it follows at other points by translation of the integral. In that proof we define

$$\phi(r) = \frac{1}{r^n} \int_{E(0,0,r)} v(y, s) \frac{|y|^2}{s^2} dy ds$$

to be weighted average of  $v$  on  $E(0, 0, r)$ , viewed as a function of  $r$ . Its derivative is shown to be

$$\phi'(r) = \frac{1}{r^{n+1}} \int_{E(0,0,r)} -4n\dot{v}\psi + 4\psi y \cdot \nabla v dy ds,$$

where  $\psi = -\frac{n}{2} \ln(-4\pi s) + \frac{|y|^2}{4s} + n \ln r$  is the level set function for  $E(0, 0, r) = \{\psi \geq 0\}$ . At this step we use the assumption that  $\dot{v} \leq \Delta v$ :

$$\phi'(r) \geq \frac{1}{r^{n+1}} \int_{E(0,0,r)} -4n(\Delta v)\psi + 4\dot{\psi}y \cdot \nabla v \, dy \, ds.$$

The proof then continues to show that the right hand side is zero, in other words that  $\phi'(r) \geq 0$ , so  $\phi$  is an increasing function of  $r$ . The script also contains a proof that  $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \phi(r) = 4v(0, 0)$ . Finally then  $v(0, 0) = \frac{1}{4}\phi(0) \leq \frac{1}{4}\phi(r)$  completes this question.

- (b) Suppose that  $M = v(x_0, t_0)$  is the maximum of  $v$  on  $\Omega_T$ . For any  $r$  such that  $E(x_0, t_0, r)$  is contained in  $\Omega_T$ , the mean value property implies

$$M \leq \frac{1}{4r^n} \int_{E(x,t,r)} v(y, s) \frac{|x-y|^2}{|t-s|^2} \, d^n y \, ds \leq M.$$

By an argument that we've seen before, if there were any point of  $E(x_0, t_0, r)$  where  $v \neq M$  then (because of the continuity of  $v$ ) we could take a small ball  $B \subset E$  around this point where  $v < M - \delta$  for some  $\delta > 0$ . It would then follow that

$$\begin{aligned} M &= \frac{1}{4r^n} \int_{E(0,0,r)} v(y, s) \frac{|y|^2}{s^2} \, dy \, ds \\ &= \frac{1}{4r^n} \left( \int_{E \setminus B} + \int_B \right) v(y, s) \frac{|y|^2}{s^2} \, dy \, ds \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4r^n} \int_{E \setminus B} M \frac{|y|^2}{s^2} \, dy \, ds + \frac{1}{4r^n} \int_B (M - \delta) \frac{|y|^2}{s^2} \, dy \, ds \\ &= M \frac{1}{4r^n} \int_E \frac{|y|^2}{s^2} \, dy \, ds - \delta \frac{1}{4r^n} \int_B \frac{|y|^2}{s^2} \, dy \, ds \\ &= M - \delta \frac{1}{4r^n} \int_B \frac{|y|^2}{s^2} \, dy \, ds < M, \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. Thus it must be that  $v$  is constant on  $E(x_0, t_0, r)$ . This can be extended to any other points in  $\Omega_T$  by taking a path between the maximum and any point, covering the path by (finitely many) sets of the form  $E(x, t, r)$  and applying the argument on each set.

There is a small detail here that we should note, namely that  $(x_0, t_0)$  is on the boundary of  $E(x_0, t_0, r)$ . In particular every other point lies in the past: if  $(y, s) \in E(x_0, t_0, r)$  and  $s \geq t_0$  then  $(y, s) = (x_0, t_0)$ . Therefore this argument also applies to points in  $\Omega \times \{T\}$ , which is part of the boundary of  $\Omega_T$ . This is different than for sub-harmonic functions and motivates the definition of  $\Omega_T$  which includes the points  $(x, T)$ . The argument does not apply to other points of the boundary, because there is no  $r$  such that  $E(x, t, r)$  is contained in the domain.

- (c) This is also very familiar. Set  $v = u_1 - u_2$ . Because  $(\partial_t - \Delta)v = f_1 - f_2 \leq 0$ , we know that  $v$  is a sub-solution. From the boundary data, we also know that  $v$  is non-positive on  $\Omega$  and  $\partial\Omega \times [0, T]$ . We know that if maximum of  $v$  occurs on  $\Omega_T$ , then  $v$  is constant and so evaluation at a known boundary point shows that it is a non-positive constant. If it is non-constant, then the maximum of  $v$  on  $\overline{\Omega_T}$  occurs on  $\Omega$  or  $\partial\Omega \times [0, T]$  by part (b). Hence the function is bounded from above by a non-positive number.

### 36. Heat death of the universe.

First a corollary to Theorem 4.3:

- (a) Suppose that  $h \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$  and  $u$  is defined as in Theorem 4.3. Show

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} |u(x, t)| \leq \frac{1}{(4\pi t)^{n/2}} \|h\|_{L^1}.$$

(2 Points)

The above corollary shows how solutions to the heat equation on  $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^+$  with such initial conditions behave: they tend to zero as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . Physically this is because if  $h \in L^1$  then there is a finite amount of total heat, which over time becomes evenly spread across the plane.

On open and bounded domains  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  we can have different behaviour, due to the boundary conditions holding the temperature steady. In this question we determine the long time behaviour of solutions  $u$  to the heat equation on open and bounded sets  $\Omega$  with  $u(x, t) = g(x)$  on  $\partial\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^+$  and  $u(x, 0) = h(x)$ . Assume that there is a steady state solution, i.e. a solution to the Dirichlet problem for the Laplace equation  $\Delta v = 0$  and  $v|_{\partial\Omega} = g$ . We claim  $u \rightarrow v$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . Let  $w(x, t) = u(x, t) - v(x)$ . The claim is equivalent to  $w \rightarrow 0$ .

- (b) What PDE and boundary conditions does  $w$  obey? (2 Points)

- (c) Let  $l_m$  be the function from Theorem 4.3 that solves heat equation on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with  $l_m(x, 0) = mk(x)$  for  $m$  a constant and  $k : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow [0, 1]$  a smooth function of compact support such that  $k|_{\Omega} \equiv 1$ . Why must  $k$  exist? Why does  $l_m \rightarrow 0$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ ? What boundary conditions on  $\Omega$  does it obey? (3 Points)

- (d) Use the monotonicity property to show that  $w$  tends to zero. (2 Points)

Hint. Consider  $a = \sup_{x \in \Omega} |w(x, 0)|$ .

**Solution.**

- (a) From the formula in Theorem 4.3 and the definition of the heat kernel

$$|u(x, t)| \leq \frac{1}{(4\pi t)^{n/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-\frac{|x-y|^2}{4t}} |h(y)| dy \leq \frac{1}{(4\pi t)^{n/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |h(y)| dy = \frac{1}{(4\pi t)^{n/2}} \|h\|_{L^1}.$$

(b) As we have seen previously, harmonic functions also solve the heat equation; they are steady-state solutions. Therefore  $w$  obeys the heat equation. On the boundaries,  $w|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$  and  $w(t = 0) = h(x) - g(x)$ .

(c) Since  $\Omega$  is bounded, it is contained in a ball  $B(0, R)$ . Choose  $k$  to be a hat function that is identically 1 on  $B(0, R)$  and zero outside  $B(0, 2R)$ . We have shown how to construct such hat function in the tutorials.

$mk(x)$  is a smooth function of compact support, so it is continuous, bounded, and has finite  $L^1$  norm. Therefore Part (a) applies to it.

We can see directly from the integral that  $l_m$  is non-negative, in particular on  $\partial\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^+$ . And at time zero, we know from Theorem 4.3 that  $l_m(x, 0) = mk(x) \equiv m$  on  $x \in \Omega$ .

(d) Let  $a = \sup_{x \in \Omega} |w(x, 0)| = \sup_{x \in \Omega} |h(x) - g(x)|$ . By definition then  $l_{-a}(x, 0) \leq w(x, 0) \leq l_a(x, 0)$  on  $\Omega \times \{0\}$ . On the parabolic boundary  $(x, t) \in \partial\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^+$  we see that  $l_{-a}(x, t) \leq w(x, t) = 0 \leq l_a(x, t)$ . By the monotonicity property it follows that  $l_{-a}(x, t) \leq w(x, t) \leq l_a(x, t)$  for all points. The squeeze theorem then shows that  $w \rightarrow 0$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ .

### 37. The Fourier transform.

Recall that the Fourier transform of a function  $h(x) : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is defined in Section 4.6 to be a function  $\hat{h}(k) : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  given by

$$\hat{h}(k) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-2\pi i k \cdot y} h(y) dy.$$

Lemma 4.20 shows that it is well-defined for Schwartz functions.

(a) Give the definition of a Schwartz function. (1 Point)

(b) Argue that  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  given by  $f(x) = \exp(-x^2)$  is a Schwartz function. (1 Point)

(c) Show that the Fourier transform of  $\exp(-A^2 x^2)$  for a constant  $A > 0$  is  $\sqrt{\pi} A^{-1} \exp(-\pi^2 k^2 A^{-2})$ . You may use that  $\int_{a-i\infty}^{a+i\infty} \exp(-x^2) dx = \sqrt{\pi}$  for any  $a$ . (2 Points)

(d) Show that  $\widehat{\partial_j f}(k) = 2\pi i k_j \hat{f}(k)$  for Schwartz functions  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . (2 Points)

(e) If  $u : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^+$  is a solution to the heat equation, we can apply a Fourier transform in the space coordinate to get a function  $\hat{u}(k, t)$ . Show that this function obeys

$$\frac{\partial \hat{u}}{\partial t} + 4\pi^2 k^2 \hat{u} = 0.$$

Solve this ODE in the time variable. (2 Points)

(f) Suppose that we have the initial condition  $u(x, 0) = h(x)$  for  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  for a Schwartz function  $h$ . Then  $\hat{u}(k, 0) = \hat{h}(k)$ . Apply the inverse Fourier transformation to rederive the solution given in Theorem 4.3. (2 Points)

**Solution.**

- (a) A Schwartz function is a smooth functions whose partial derivatives (of all orders) decay faster than the reciprocal of any polynomial. For such functions, for all multi-indices  $\alpha$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} |x|^k \partial^\alpha f(x) = 0.$$

Clearly because this decays to zero,  $\sup |x|^k |\partial^\alpha f(x)|$  exists. Conversely, if this supremum exists, then

$$\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} |x|^k |\partial^\alpha f(x)| = \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} |x|^{-1} |x|^{k+1} |\partial^\alpha f(x)| \leq \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} |x|^{-1} \sup |x|^{k+1} |\partial^\alpha f(x)| = 0.$$

Therefore these two conditions are equivalent. The second version,  $\sup |x|^k |\partial^\alpha f(x)| < \infty$ , is often more useful.

- (b) This is a function of one variable, so we do not need to use multi-indices.

$$\begin{aligned} f &= e^{-x^2}, \\ f' &= -2xe^{-x^2} \\ f'' &= -2e^{-x^2} + 4x^2e^{-x^2}. \end{aligned}$$

It is clear that higher derivatives derivative have the form  $P(x)e^{-x^2}$  where  $P(x)$  is a polynomial. The exponential terms are dominant for large  $|x|$ , so  $f^{(n)}$  decays faster than any polynomial. Thus  $f$  is Schwartz.

- (c) We could just proceed by direct computation:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{f}(k) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp(-2\pi iky) \exp(-A^2y^2) dy \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp(-2\pi iky - A^2y^2) dy \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp -A^2 \left( [\pi i k A^{-2}]^2 + 2\pi i k A^{-2}y + y^2 - [\pi i k A^{-2}]^2 \right) dy \\ &= \exp -[\pi k A^{-1}]^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp -[\pi i k A^{-1} + Ay]^2 dy \\ &= \exp -[\pi k A^{-1}]^2 \int_{\pi i k A^{-1} + \mathbb{R}} \exp(-z^2) A^{-1} dz \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{A} \exp(-\pi^2 k^2 A^{-2}). \end{aligned}$$

In the last step we used the result allowed by the question that  $\int_{ai+\mathbb{R}} \exp(-x^2) dx = \sqrt{\pi}$  for any  $a$ . This was covered in the lecture more or less, but let us present two additional arguments for it.

First however, we should address the real case  $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp(-x^2) dx = \sqrt{\pi}$ . As best as I can tell, de Moivre was the first to prove something equivalent to this calculation. In 1733 he showed that the binomial distribution in probability theory could be approximated by an exponential term

$$\binom{n}{\frac{n}{2} + d} 0.5^n \approx C e^{-2d^2/n}$$

and gave a numerical value for the constant. This is equivalent an approximation for the factorial, to which Stirling is given credit for calculating exact constant

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n!}{n^{n+0.5} e^{-n}} = \sqrt{2\pi}$$

using the Wallis product for  $\pi$  (1656)

$$\frac{\pi}{2} = \left(\frac{2}{1} \cdot \frac{2}{3}\right) \left(\frac{4}{3} \cdot \frac{4}{5}\right) \left(\frac{6}{5} \cdot \frac{6}{7}\right) \cdots$$

De Moivre and Stirling were contemporaries, Stirling had just written a big book on infinite series, and de Moivre (according to a quote I've seen) gives Stirling credit, but it's not entirely clear to me how involved Stirling actually was. Perhaps de Moivre was just being modest. My sources for these historical remarks are Lee, Pearson, 1924, and Stahl, 2006.

In any case, since the sum of probabilities must add to 1, and the sum can be approximated by an integral, this implies the result. The first person to explicitly state the result was Laplace in 1774. Gauss' name seems be attached to this integral because of his role in popularising  $e^{-x^2}$  as a model of measurement errors in astronomy and other sciences. The modern, most common, proof is due to Poisson, simplifying a method of his PhD advisor Laplace. It's 'one from the book':

**Poisson's argument in the real case:** Consider the square of the integral and apply the Fubini theorem to turn it into an area integral

$$I^2 = \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp(-x^2) dx\right) \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp(-y^2) dy\right) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \exp(-x^2 - y^2) dx dy.$$

Now make a substitution into polar coordinates

$$I^2 = \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{\infty} \exp(-r^2) r dr d\theta = \int_0^{2\pi} \left[-\frac{1}{2} \exp(-r^2)\right]_0^{\infty} d\theta = \pi.$$

Voilà!

**Argument from complex analysis:** For the integral along a line in the complex plane, it is of course natural to use a result of complex analysis. Consider

$$g(k) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp -[\pi i k A^{-1} + Ay]^2 dy.$$

This is an analytic function in the variable  $k \in \mathbb{C}$ . For all  $k \in i\mathbb{R}$ , the transformation  $z = \pi i k A^{-1} + Ay$  is a real transformation, so it does indeed reduce to  $g(k) = A^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp(-z^2) dz = A^{-1} \sqrt{\pi}$ . The unique continuation property says that two (in this case complex) analytic functions that agree on a sequence and its limit must agree everywhere. Think of the right hand side as the constant function  $A^{-1} \sqrt{\pi}$ , which is analytic. Hence  $g(k) = A^{-1} \sqrt{\pi}$  for all  $k$ , not just imaginary  $k$ .

**Argument from lecture notes:** In the lecture notes, Prof Schmidt gave an very concrete argument using power series. We begin with the observation from our working above that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-(\pi i k A^{-1} + Ay)^2 + (\pi i k A^{-1})^2} dy = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-2\pi i k y - A^2 y^2} dy.$$

Let us then investigate the following integral for real values of  $\omega$ . By the same algebraic manipulations, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-(\omega+Ay)^2+\omega^2} dy = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-2\omega Ay-A^2y^2} dy.$$

The left hand side is easy to manipulate

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-(\omega+Ay)^2+\omega^2} dy = e^{\omega^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-(\omega+Ay)^2} dy = e^{\omega^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-z^2} A^{-1} dz = A^{-1} \sqrt{\pi} e^{\omega^2} = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \frac{A^{-1} \sqrt{\pi}}{l!} \omega^{2l}$$

On the right hand side, we expand this into a power series in  $\omega$ :

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-2\omega Ay-A^2y^2} dy = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-A^2y^2} \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-2\omega Ay)^l}{l!} dy = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-A^2y^2} \frac{(-2Ay)^l}{l!} dy \right) \omega^l$$

These two power series are equal, so their coefficients must be equal. In other words

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-A^2y^2} \frac{(-2Ay)^l}{l!} dy = \begin{cases} \frac{A^{-1} \sqrt{\pi}}{(l/2)!} & l \text{ even} \\ 0 & l \text{ odd} \end{cases}$$

We can now return to the imaginary case. Again, making the power series expansion in  $k$

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-2\pi iky-A^2y^2} dy &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-A^2y^2} \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-2\pi ikA^{-1}Ay)^l}{l!} dy \\ &= \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-A^2y^2} \frac{(-2Ay)^l}{l!} dy \right) (\pi ikA^{-1})^l \\ &= \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \frac{A^{-1} \sqrt{\pi}}{l!} (\pi ikA^{-1})^{2l} \\ &= A^{-1} \sqrt{\pi} \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-\pi^2 k^2 A^{-2})^l}{l!} \\ &= A^{-1} \sqrt{\pi} \exp(-\pi^2 k^2 A^{-2}). \end{aligned}$$

This also gives the result. Note here that at the core of the argument was “two equal power series have equal coefficients”. This is how one proves that analytic functions have the unique continuation property. So the above two proofs are not as different as they first appear.

**Argument from differentiating:** I’ve saved the simplest method until last. Consider the function  $g(k)$  again and differentiate

$$\begin{aligned} g(k) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-[\pi ikA^{-1}+Ay]^2} dy \\ g'(k) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} -2[\pi ikA^{-1} + Ay] \times \pi iA^{-1} \times e^{-[\pi ikA^{-1}+Ay]^2} dy \\ &= \pi iA^{-2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} -2[\pi ikA^{-1} + Ay] \times A \times e^{-[\pi ikA^{-1}+Ay]^2} dy \\ &= \pi iA^{-2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\partial}{\partial y} e^{-[\pi ikA^{-1}+Ay]^2} dy = \pi iA^{-2} e^{-[\pi ikA^{-1}+Ay]^2} \Big|_{y=-\infty}^{y=\infty} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $g(k)$  is a constant function, and is equal to  $g(0)$ . But this is then exactly the real integral that we know the value of.

(d) Let's do this for  $j = n$  to make the notation easier:

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\partial_n f}(k) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-2\pi i k \cdot y} \partial_n f(y) dy = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-2\pi i k_1 y_1} \dots \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-2\pi i k_n y_n} \partial_n f(y) dy_n \dots dy_1 \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-2\pi i k_1 y_1} \dots \left[ e^{-2\pi i k_n y_n} f(y) \Big|_{y_n=-\infty}^{y_n=\infty} + 2\pi i k_n \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-2\pi i k_n y_n} f(y) dy_n \right] dy_{n-1} \dots dy_1 \\ &= 2\pi i k_n \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-2\pi i k_1 y_1} \dots \left[ \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-2\pi i k_n y_n} f(y) dy_n \right] dy_{n-1} \dots dy_1 \\ &= 2\pi i k_n \hat{f}(k).\end{aligned}$$

We know that  $f$  vanishes at infinity because it is a Schwartz function.

(e) From the previous question, we know how to calculate the Fourier transform of the Laplacian

$$\sum \widehat{\partial_j^2 u} = \sum \widehat{\partial_j \partial_j u} = \sum 2\pi i k_j \widehat{\partial_j u} = \sum 4\pi^2 i^2 k_j^2 \hat{u} = -4\pi^2 |k|^2 \hat{u}.$$

In one dimension, the Laplacian is just the second derivative and the vector length simplifies too  $|k|^2 = k^2$ . On the other hand, we can pass the derivative with respect to time through the integral, so  $\widehat{\partial_t u} = \partial_t \hat{u}$ .

Now, for fixed  $k$ , we have a first-order linear ODE in  $t$ . It has the solution

$$\hat{u}(k, t) = \hat{u}(k, 0) \exp(-4\pi^2 k^2 t).$$

(f)

$$\begin{aligned}u(x, t) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{2\pi i k x} \hat{u}(k, t) dk = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{2\pi i k x} \hat{h}(k) \exp(-4\pi^2 k^2 t) dk \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{2\pi i k x} e^{-4\pi^2 k^2 t} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-2\pi i k y} h(y) dy dk \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} h(y) \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-2\pi i (y-x)k - 4\pi^2 t k^2} dk dy\end{aligned}$$

But notice that the inner integral has the exact same form as the integral in part (c). Therefore we arrive at

$$u(x, t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} h(y) \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2\pi\sqrt{t}} \exp\left(\frac{-\pi^2(y-x)^2}{4\pi^2 t}\right) dy = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} h(y) \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\pi t}} \exp\left(\frac{-(y-x)^2}{4t}\right) dy.$$

As Prof Schmidt pointed out to me, in the script we use Theorem 4.3 and the heat kernel to find the inverse Fourier transform in Lemma 4.20. If you instead begin with the inverse Fourier transform, as we do in this question, then you can derive the heat kernel.