SMOKE-RING SOLUTIONS OF GIERER-MEINHARDT SYSTEM IN $\mathbb{R}^3$
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Abstract. We consider the steady states of the Gierer-Meinhardt system on all of $\mathbb{R}^3$:

$$
\varepsilon^2 \Delta a - a + \frac{a^p}{h^q} = 0,
\Delta h - h + \frac{a^m}{h^s} = 0
$$

with an additional restriction

$$
q = p - 1.
$$

In the limit $\varepsilon \to 0$, we use formal asymptotics to construct a solution whose activator component $a$ concentrates on a circle. Under additional constraints $p > 1$, $m > 0$, and $1 < m - s < 3$, we find that such a solution exists and is unique. The radius of the circle of concentration is given explicitly in terms of certain integrals. Full numerical computations are shown to support analytical results.

1. Introduction

The fascinating smoke-ring structure has been observed in many physical systems. In [13] and [14], Malevanets and Kapral have numerically observed stable links and knot structures in bistable chemical media (using particle simulation of FitzHugh-Nagumo model), including linked smoke-rings. In fluid dynamics, a vortex ring is a region of a rotating fluid where the flow pattern takes on a toroidal shape [2]. In a quantum fluid, a vortex ring is formed by a loop of poloidal quantized flow pattern. It was detected in the superfluid helium by Rayfield and Reif [25], and more recently in Bose-Einstein condensates by Anderson, et al. [1]. In block copolymers, Pochan, et al [22] produced a morphological phase of toroidal supramolecule assemblies, using a triblock copolymer.

In this paper we study the smoke-ring structure in the classical Gierer-Meinhardt system (GM system) on all of $\mathbb{R}^3$:

$$
\varepsilon^2 \Delta a - a + \frac{a^p}{h^q} = 0,
\Delta h - h + \frac{a^m}{h^s} = 0;
$$
in (1) $\varepsilon$, $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$, is a small parameter and

$$
p, q, m, s \geq 0; \quad \frac{qm}{p-1} - s - 1 > 0.
$$

The variable $a$ is the activator and $h$ is the inhibitor of the system. The goal of this paper is to construct a solution whose activator component concentrates on a circle as $\varepsilon \to 0$, schematically represented in Figure 1. More precisely there is a circle in the $xy$-plane of radius $r_0$ and a toroidal shaped neighborhood of the circle in $\mathbb{R}^3$. Each cross section of the neighborhood, perpendicular to the circle, is a small disc whose radius is of order $\varepsilon$. The $a$ variable of our solution is very
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Figure 1. Schematic representation of the smoke-ring solution in three dimensions. The gray region is a level set of the activator $a$, which is exponentially small everywhere except within an $O(\varepsilon)$ region of a circle of radius $r_0$.

small outside the toroidal neighborhood. Inside the neighborhood and on each cross section, $a$ is almost a two-dimensional radially symmetric function with its maximum at the center. In $\mathbb{R}^3$ such a solution has axisymmetry (cylindrical symmetry), so it is effectively a solution of a two-dimensional problem. We will refer to such solution as a *smoke-ring solution*.

The problem (1) has a long history. It was introduced in [8] to model the head formation of a hydra. More generally it can be used to study morphogenesis in cell development [15, 16, 19]. It is a minimal model that provides a theoretical bridge between observations on the one hand and the deduction of the underlying molecular-genetic mechanisms on the other. Mathematically, it is one of the simplest systems of PDE’s that has a very rich solution structure, and has been studied intensively over the last two decades. Let us highlight some of the results. In one dimension, there exist spike like solutions whose activator component $a$ concentrates at certain points and is exponentially small away from such points. While the solution with a single spike was shown to be stable in [29], multiple spike solutions exhibit intricate stability properties, first shown in [6] by the matched asymptotics method; see also [26] for a related approach using Floquet exponents and Evans functions. In two dimensions, spike solutions, their stability and dynamics have also been studied; see for example [30, 31, 32, 28, 12]. Similar techniques have been also used to study spike solutions in other system, such as the Gray-Scott model; see for example [3, 4, 5, 11, 18] and references therein.

On the other hand, little is known about the GM model in three or higher dimensions. For example, the existence of a single spike solution on all of $\mathbb{R}^3$ is a long-standing open problem. The only result in three dimensions so far is the existence of the so-called ring solutions; In a
ring solution the activator concentrates on a two-dimensional sphere in \( \mathbb{R}^3 \) [20, 9]. Such solutions are radially symmetric; the activator variable \( a \) is (almost) a one-dimensional spike in the radial direction (analogous solutions for the Gray-Scott model have also been studied by similar techniques in [10] and [17]). On the contrary the smoke-ring solution that we will construct concentrates on a one-dimensional circle. Unlike the ring solutions, the smoke-ring solution is not radially symmetric, but axisymmetric; the cross-sectional profile of the activator \( a \) for a smoke-ring is (almost) a two-dimensional spike. To our knowledge, this is the first non-radial solution of the GM model in \( \mathbb{R}^3 \).

Related to the GM system (1) is the Gierer-Meinhardt system with saturation:

\[
\varepsilon^2 \Delta a - a + \frac{ap}{(1 + \kappa a^p)h^q} = 0, \quad \Delta h - h + \frac{am}{h^s} = 0.
\]

Note the saturation constant \( \kappa > 0 \) in (3). In [24] Ren and Wei studied a geometric problem that arises as a singular limit of (3). Solutions to their geometric problem are subsets of \( \mathbb{R}^3 \) that satisfy an equation involving the mean curvature and the Newtonian potential on the boundaries of the subsets. They found a solution shaped like a torus.

Since smoke-ring solutions have cylindrical symmetry, we rewrite (1) in cylindrical coordinates. Let \( r = \sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2}, \quad z = x_3 \). We also rescale \( a = \alpha u, \quad h = \beta v \) where we take \( \alpha = \left( \frac{\eta}{\varepsilon^2} \right)^{\frac{p-1}{q(m-1-s)}}, \quad \beta = \frac{\alpha^{p-1}}{\eta} \) to put the system (1) in the form:

\[
\begin{align*}
\varepsilon^2 \left( \Delta_{(r,z)} u + \frac{1}{r} u_r \right) - u + \frac{u^p}{u^q} &= 0, \\
\Delta_{(r,z)} v + \varepsilon^2 \left( \frac{1}{r} v_r - v + \frac{\eta u^m}{v^s} \right) &= 0, \\
u_r(0, z) = v_r(0, z) &= 0, \\
u, v &\to 0 \quad \text{as } ((r, z)) \to \infty
\end{align*}
\]

where \( \Delta_{(r,z)} = \partial_{rr} + \partial_{zz}, \quad \mathbb{R}^2_+ = (0, \infty) \times (-\infty, \infty), \) and

\[
\eta = \frac{1}{\ln(1/\varepsilon)}.
\]

The reason for using this scaling is that as we will show later, \( u, v = O(1) \) in the inner region of the spike. Equation (4) is our starting point. We now summarize the main result of this paper.

**Main result 1.** Consider the GM model (4) with \( p > 1, m > 0, \) and with additional constraints,

\[
p = q + 1,
\]

and

\[
1 < m - s < 3.
\]

Then (4) admits a smoke-ring solution of the form

\[
u(r, z) \sim Cw(R) + O \left( \frac{1}{\ln(1/\varepsilon)} \right) \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \to 0
\]
Figure 2. A numerical solution of (4) showing a smoke-ring. The parameters are \( \varepsilon = 0.02, p = 2, q = 1, m = 2, s = 0 \). The computation was performed on a quarter-disk of radius 8, see \( \S 4 \) for the details. An initial condition in the form of a smoke-ring was used. Here, the solution is shown with \( z^2 + r^2 < 4 \). (a) \( u(x) \); (b) \( v(x) \); (c) The cross-sections of \( u \) (solid curve) and \( v \) (dashed curve) along the \( r \) axis. The spike center is located at \( r_0 = 0.349, z_0 = 0 \).

where \( C \) is some positive constant; \( R = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sqrt{(r - r_0)^2 + z^2} \); \( w \) is the unique radially symmetric ground state solution in two dimensions that satisfies

\[
\begin{align*}
  w_{RR} + \frac{1}{R} w_R - w + w^p &= 0, & R \in (0, \infty) \\
  w_R(0) &= 0, & w \to 0 \text{ as } R \to \infty
\end{align*}
\]

and \( r_0 \) is the asymptotic radius of the smoke-ring which satisfies the algebraic equation

\[
1 - 2r_0 \int_0^1 \frac{e^{-2r_0 t}}{\sqrt{1 - t^2}} \, dt = \frac{1}{2} (m - s - 1) \left( \frac{\int_0^\infty w^m R \, RdR}{\left( \int_0^\infty w^{p+1} R \, RdR \right) \left( \int_0^\infty w^{p+1} R \, RdR \right)} \right).
\]

The equation (10) has exactly one solution \( r_0 > 0 \) provided that (7) is satisfied.

Our analysis reveals a distinguished regime \( p = q + 1 \). In particular the “standard” GM system \( (p, q, m, s) = (2, 1, 2, 0) \) happens to satisfy this condition. For the standard case, the numerical solution of (10) yields \( r_0 = 0.327929 \) (see \( \S 4 \)). Figure 2 shows the structure of the ring solution in this case.

The existence of smoke-ring solutions for the case \( p \neq q + 1 \) is an open problem. Based mainly on numerical experience in \( \S 4 \), we conjecture that they can still exist if \( p < q + 1 \), but with radius \( \varepsilon \ll r_0 \ll 1 \).

We remark that the derivation of Main Result 1 is based on formal but very careful asymptotics. A rigorous derivation is not yet available (see \( \S 5 \)).

Our approach involves a mix of formal asymptotics as well as a careful study of a Green’s function. The analysis is complicated by the presence of two scales, \( O(\varepsilon) \) and \( O(\frac{1}{m^{1/\varepsilon}}) \). Moreover the outer and inner region of \( u \) interact in an intricate way, and a relatively high order expansion is required.
We now summarize the contents of the paper. In Section 2 we construct the inner and outer solutions and formulate the first-order solvability condition in order to determine the smoke-ring radius $r_0$. Assuming $r_0 = O(1)$, it then becomes clear that in the case $p = q + 1$, a higher-order expansion is required (if $p \neq q + 1$, the first order solvability condition will imply that $r_0$ cannot be of $O(1)$). This is done in Section 3, and leads to the formula (10), which is the main result of this paper. In Section 4 we show some numerical computations of the full two-dimensional system (4) and observe a favourable agreement with our analytical results. We also include some additional numerical experiments to speculate what happens when $p < q + 1$ or $p > q + 1$. Finally we mention some related phenomena and open problems in Section 5.

2. Preliminaries: smoke-ring profile and the first-order solvability condition

In this section, we first construct the leading order asymptotic profile of the smoke-ring equilibrium of a fixed radius $r_0$. We will then derive a solvability condition in an attempt to determine the value of $r_0$. This condition will yield the following dichotomy: either $p = q + 1$, in which case a higher order expansion will be necessary to determine $r_0$; or else $r_0$ cannot be of $O(1)$. The case $p = q + 1$ will then be further analyzed in Section 3 where a higher-order expansion will finally enable us to determine $r_0$. The derivation of the asymptotic profile and the first-order solvability condition is relatively standard; here we follow a procedure similar to the one used in [12].

The exposition below is divided into three steps. In step 1 we derive the leading order asymptotic profile. The first-order solvability condition is derived in step 2. Finally in step 3 we use Pohozhaev-type identities to simplify the resulting expression and identify the distinguished case $p = q + 1$.

**Step 1.** We begin by constructing the asymptotic profile of the smoke-ring solution. We seek a solution to (4) where $u(x)$ is assumed to concentrate at some point $x_0 = (r_0, z_0)$; that is, $u(x)$ is assumed to be very small everywhere except in a disc of radius $O(\varepsilon)$ centered at $x_0$. On the other hand, $v(x)$ will be nearly constant in the $O(\varepsilon)$ neighborhood of $x_0$. An example of such a solution is shown in Figure 2.

To simplify the notation, we define

$$g(u, v) := u^m v^{-s}; \quad h(v) := v^{-q}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (11)

In the limit $\varepsilon \to 0$, we formally replace the nonlinearity in the second equation of (4) by a multiple of a delta function:

$$\frac{\eta}{\varepsilon^2} g(u, v) \sim C_0 \delta(x - x_0)$$  \hspace{1cm} (12)

where $x = (r, z); \quad x_0 = (r_0, z_0),$

$$C_0 := \int_{\mathbb{R}^2_+} \frac{\eta}{\varepsilon^2} g(u, v) dx,$$

and $\delta$ is the delta function. Here $\mathbb{R}^2_+ = \{(r, z): r > 0, \ z \in \mathbb{R}\}$. Then in the outer region, i.e. when $|(r, z) - (r_0, z_0)| \gg O(\varepsilon)$, we estimate

$$v \sim C_0 G(r, z, r_0, z_0)$$  \hspace{1cm} (13)
where $G$ is a Green’s function in the cylindrical coordinates that satisfies
\begin{equation}
\Delta_{(r,z)} G + \frac{1}{r} G_r - G = -\delta(x - x_0)
\end{equation}
on all of $\mathbb{R}_+^2$. When matching with the inner region, we will need to know the behavior of $G$ when $x$ is near $x_0$. This behavior is summarized as follows.

**Lemma 1.** Let $x_0 = (r_0, z_0)$ and let $x = x_0 + \varepsilon y$, where $y = (\rho, Z)$ and $\varepsilon \ll 1$. Let $\eta = 1/\ln(1/\varepsilon)$ be as in (5). Then
\begin{equation}
2\pi\eta G(x, x_0) = 1 - \frac{1}{\ln |y|} + \frac{\varepsilon \rho}{2r_0} (-1 + \eta \ln R + F_1(r_0)) + O(\varepsilon^2).
\end{equation}
where
\begin{align}
F_0(r_0) &= \int_0^1 \left( \frac{1}{\tau} \exp\left(\frac{-2r_0\tau}{\sqrt{1 - \tau^2}}\right) - \frac{1}{\tau} \right) d\tau + \ln 4\pi r_0 \\
F_1(r_0) &= -F_0(r_0) + r_0 F_0'(r_0)
\end{align}
The proof of Lemma 1 is given in Appendix A.

Next we examine the profile of the solution in the inner region, near $x_0$. We define the inner variables $U$ and $V$ by
\begin{equation}
u(x) = U(y); \quad v(x) = V(y)
\end{equation}
where as in (18), $x = x_0 + \varepsilon y$. Then (4) becomes
\begin{equation}
\begin{cases}
\Delta_y U + \frac{\varepsilon}{\rho + \varepsilon r_0} U_\rho - U + U \eta h(V) = 0 \\
\Delta_y V + \frac{\varepsilon}{\rho + \varepsilon r_0} V_\rho - \varepsilon^2 U - \eta g(U, V) = 0
\end{cases}
\end{equation}
Since the problem contains two scales $\varepsilon \ll \eta \ll 1$, we first expand (22) in terms of $\varepsilon$ while treating $\eta$ as a constant. We use the following expansion:

$$U(y) = U_0(R) + \varepsilon U_1(y) + \cdots$$
$$V(y) = V_0(R) + \varepsilon V_1(y) + \cdots$$
$$\xi = \xi_0 + \varepsilon \xi_1 + \cdots$$

The $O(1)$ order equations are

$$\Delta_y U_0 - U_0 + U_0^p h(V_0) = 0$$
$$\Delta_y V_0 + \eta g(U_0, V_0) = 0$$
$$\xi_0 = \int_0^\infty g(U_0, V_0) RdR.$$  \hfill (23)

The solutions $U_0$ and $V_0$ are both radially symmetric. Next we expand in $\eta$:

$$U_0 = U_{00} + \eta U_{01} + \ldots; \quad V_0 = V_{00} + \eta V_{01} + \ldots; \quad \xi_0 = \xi_{00} + \eta \xi_{01} + \ldots$$

(24) to obtain

$$\xi_{00} = \int_0^\infty gRdR$$  \hfill (25)

$$V_{00} = \xi_{00};$$  \hfill (26)

$$\Delta_y U_{00} - U_{00} + hU_{00}^p = 0.$$  \hfill (27)

Here and below, we omit the arguments of $h = h(\xi_{00}), \ g = g(U_{00}, \xi_{00})$. From (27) we deduce

$$U_{00}(y) = h^{1-p} w(R)$$

where $w$ is the radial ground state solution of $\Delta_y w - w + w^p = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^2$, i.e.

$$w_{RR} + \frac{1}{R} w_R - w + w^p = 0, \ w_R(0) = 0, \ \lim_{R \to \infty} w(R) = 0.$$

For the GM model this yields

$$\xi_{00}^{1+s} \frac{m \xi_{00}}{p - 1} = \left( \int_0^\infty w^m RdR \right).$$  \hfill (28)

This computation shows that the leading order profile of the smoke-ring is given by (8); the precise value of the constant $C$ in (8) is $C = \frac{1}{\xi_{00}}$ with $\xi_{00}$ given by (28).

**Step 2:** At this stage, the smoke-ring radius $r_0$ is undetermined. It is therefore necessary to consider the higher-order expansion to determine it.

To this end, we collect the $O(\varepsilon)$ terms in (22), which yield

$$\Delta_y U_1 + \frac{1}{r_0} U_{0\rho} + (-1 + ph(V_0)U_0^{p-1})U_1 + h_v(V_0)U_0^p V_1 = 0,$$

$$\Delta_y V_1 + \frac{1}{r_0} V_{0\rho} + (g_u(U_0, V_0)U_1 + g_v(U_0, V_0) V_1) \eta = 0.$$

(29) \hspace{1cm} (30)
We now expand the $O(\varepsilon)$ equations in terms of $\eta$. We write
\begin{equation}
U_1 = U_{10} + \eta U_{11} + \ldots; \quad V_1 = V_{10} + \eta V_{11} + \ldots; \quad \xi_1 = \xi_{10} + \eta \xi_{11} + \ldots
\end{equation}
and define
\begin{equation}
L \Phi \equiv \Delta_y \Phi + (-1 + phU_{00}^{p-1}) \Phi = \Delta_y \Phi + (-1 + pw^{p-1}) \Phi.
\end{equation}
We deduce
\begin{equation}
L(U_{10}) = -h_v U_{00}^p V_{10} - \frac{1}{r_0} U_{00} \rho,
\end{equation}
\begin{equation}
\Delta_y V_{10} = 0,
\end{equation}
where $h_v = h_v(\xi_{00})$. The first-order solvability condition is obtained by multiplying (29) by $U_{00} \rho$ and integrating by parts. Noting that $U_{00} \rho$ satisfies $L(U_{00} \rho) = 0$, we obtain
\begin{equation}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{1}{r_0} U_{00}^2 \rho dy + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} h_v U_{00}^p U_{00} \rho V_{10} dy = 0.
\end{equation}
To determine $V_{10}$, we invoke Van Dyke’s matching principle [27]. That is, we expand the outer solution $v(x)$ in terms of the inner variables (18) and then match it to the inner solution $V$. Since we seek to determine $V_{10}$, we must expand $v(x)$ up to $O(\varepsilon)$. Starting with (20) we have
\begin{equation}
v \sim \xi \left[ 1 - \eta \ln R + \eta F_0(r_0) + \frac{\varepsilon \rho}{2r_0} (-1 + \eta \ln R + \eta F_1(r_0)) + O(\varepsilon^2) \right], \quad 1 \ll |y| \ll \frac{1}{\varepsilon}
\end{equation}
\begin{equation}
\sim \xi_{00} + O(\eta) + \varepsilon \left( -\frac{\rho \xi_{00}}{2r_0} + O(\eta) \right) + O(\varepsilon^2)
\end{equation}
Matching the $O(\varepsilon^1 \eta^0)$ terms in (37) with the behaviour of $V_{10}$ for large $y$, we obtain that $V_{10} \sim -\frac{\xi_{00} \rho}{2r_0}$ as $y \rightarrow \infty$. In conjunction with (34) this implies that
\[ V_{10} = -\frac{\xi_{00} \rho}{2r_0} + C \]
for some constant $C$. Therefore (35) becomes
\begin{equation}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} U_{00}^2 \rho dy - \frac{\xi_{00} \rho}{2} h_v \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} U_{00}^p U_{00} \rho dy = 0.
\end{equation}
\begin{equation}
\textbf{Step 3.} \quad \text{We now simplify the solvability condition (38). Note that}
\end{equation}
\begin{equation}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} U_{00}^2 \rho = \pi \int_0^\infty U_{00}^2 R dR; \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} U_{00}^p U_{00} \rho = -\pi \frac{2}{p+1} \int_0^\infty U_{00}^{p+1} R dR.
\end{equation}
Next we use Pohozhaev-type identities, see for example [23] or [28]. Multiplying (27) by $U_{00}$ and integrating by parts we obtain
\begin{equation}
-\int_0^\infty U_{00}^2 R dR - \int_0^\infty U_{00}^2 R dR + h \int_0^\infty U_{00}^{p+1} R dR = 0.
\end{equation}
Multiplying (27) by $U_{00}R$ and integrating by parts we obtain

\[(41) \int_0^\infty U_{00}^2 RdR = \frac{2}{p+1} h \int_0^\infty U_{00}^{p+1} RdR \]

so that

\[(42) \int_0^\infty U_{00}^2 RdR = \frac{p-1}{p+1} h \int_0^\infty U_{00}^{p+1} RdR. \]

Substituting (39) to (42) into (38) we find

\[(43) \left( p - 1 + \frac{\xi_{00} h_v}{h} \right) \frac{\pi}{4r_0} \int_0^\infty U_{00}^2 RdR = 0. \]

From (11), we have $\frac{\xi_{00} h_v}{h} = -q$, so that (43) becomes

\[(44) (p - 1 - q) \int_0^\infty U_{00}^2 RdR = 0. \]

If $p - 1 \neq q$, the condition (44) simply states that no smoke-ring of radius $O(1)$ can exist in the limit $\varepsilon \to 0$. On the other hand, if $p - 1 = q$, the condition (44) cannot determine the value of $r_0$ and a deeper expansion is necessary. This is the subject of the next section.

3. The case $p = q + 1$.

We now consider the distinguished regime $p = q + 1$. In this section we will show that in this case, the smoke-ring radius is given by (10), which is the main result of the paper. When $p = q + 1$, the first-order solvability condition (44) is $0 = 0$ and hence a deeper expansion is required to determine $r_0$. The derivation is very involved but unexpectedly, there are many cancellations, so that the end-result is surprisingly simple.

We break the computations of this section into three steps. In step 1, we compute the $O(\eta)$ and $O(\varepsilon \eta)$ corrections to $U(y)$ and $V(y)$ (refer to Section 2 for notations). In step 2, we formulate the solvability condition at the $O(\varepsilon \eta)$ order. In step 3, we explore some identities to significantly simplify the solvability condition and to finally obtain (10).

**Step 1.** In this step we derive the expressions for the inner solution, up to order $O(\varepsilon \eta)$. These expressions will play a key role in formulating and simplifying the solvability condition of step 2.

We start by computing the $O(\eta)$ terms $U_{01}$, $V_{01}$ and $\xi_{01}$ in (24). The $O(\eta)$ terms in (23) yield

\[(45) LU_{01} + U_{00}^p h_v V_{01} = 0; \]

\[(46) \Delta_g V_{01} + g = 0; \]

\[(47) \xi_{01} = \int_0^\infty g_u U_{01} RdR + \int_0^\infty g_v V_{01} RdR. \]

Here $h_v = h_v(\xi_{00})$, $g_u = g_u(U_{00}, \xi_{00})$, $g_v = g_v(U_{00}, \xi_{00})$, and $L$ is defined in (32). Integrating (46) we have

\[(48) V_{01R} = -\frac{1}{R} \int_0^R gRdR. \]
so that

\[(49) \quad V_{01} = g_1(R) + c_1 \quad \text{where} \quad g_1(R) := \int_0^R -\frac{1}{t} \int_0^t g(U_{00}, \xi_{00}) ds \]

and \(c_1\) is some constant that will be determined as follows. Expanding \(g_1(R)\) asymptotically for large \(R\) and using the fact that \(g(U_{00}, \xi_{00})\) decays exponentially as \(R \to \infty\), we obtain:

\[(50) \quad g_1(R) \sim -\ln(R) \int_0^\infty gsds + \int_0^\infty \ln(s)gsds, \quad R \to \infty\]

\[(51) \quad V_{01} \sim -\xi_{00} \ln R + \int_0^\infty \ln(s)gsds + c_1, \quad R \to \infty\]

To determine \(c_1\), we match the \(O(\eta)\) order of the inner and outer expansions. Substituting \(\xi = \xi_{00} + \eta \xi_{01}\) into (20), and collecting the \(O(\epsilon_0)\) terms we obtain,

\[(52) \quad v \sim (\xi_{00} + \eta \xi_{01}) [1 - \eta \ln R + \eta F_0(r_0)]
\sim \xi_{00} - \eta \xi_{00} \ln R + \eta (\xi_{00} F_0(r_0) + \xi_{01}) .
\]

Matching the behavior of the inner solution \(V(R)\) as \(R \to \infty\) (51) to that of the outer solution \(v(x)\) as \(x \to x_0\) (52), we obtain

\[(53) \quad c_1 = \xi_{00} F_0 + \xi_{01} + \alpha_1 \quad \text{where} \quad \alpha_1 = -\int_0^\infty \ln(s)gsds.
\]

Next we determine \(\xi_{01}\). We will make use of the identity

\[LU_{00} = (p - 1) hU_{00}^p,\]

so that \(L^{-1}(U_{00}^p) = \frac{1}{(p - 1) h} U_{00}\). Rewrite (45) as \(U_{01} = L^{-1} (-h_v U_{00}^p V_{01})\) and using (49) we obtain

\[U_{01} = L^{-1} (-h_v U_{00}^p V_{01}) = h_v L^{-1} [g_1(R) U_{00}^p] - c_1 h_v L^{-1} [U_0^p]
\]

\[= h_v L^{-1} [g_1(R) U_{00}^p] - c_1 \frac{1}{p - 1} h U_{00}\]

so that

\[(54) \quad \int_0^\infty g_a U_{01} RdR = -c_1 \frac{1}{p - 1} h \int_0^\infty g_a U_{00} RdR + \alpha_2\]

\[(55) \quad \int_0^\infty g_v V_{01} RdR = c_1 \int_0^\infty g_v RdR + \alpha_3\]

where

\[\alpha_2 := \int_0^\infty g_a h_v L^{-1} [g_1(R) U_{00}^p] RdR; \quad \alpha_3 := \int_0^\infty g_v \left(-\xi_{00} \ln R + \int_0^R \ln sgsds\right) RdR\]
are $O(1)$ order constants that are independent of $r_0$. Substituting (54, 55) into (47) and replacing $c_1$ by (53) we obtain

$$\xi_{01} = c_1 \beta + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3$$

$$= (\xi_{00} F_0(r_0) + \xi_{01} + \alpha_1) \beta + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3$$

where

$$\beta = \left(-\frac{1}{p-1} h_v \int_0^\infty g_u U_00 R dR + \int_0^\infty g_v R dR\right).$$

Solving for $\xi_{01}$ we obtain

$$\xi_{01} = \xi_{00} \left(\frac{\beta}{1-\beta} F_0(r_0) + \alpha_5\right)$$

where

$$\alpha_5 := \frac{1}{\xi_{00}} \frac{\alpha_1 \beta + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3}{1-\beta}$$

is an $O(1)$ order constant independent of $r_0$.

From (11) we have $g_u U_{00} = mg$, $g_v \xi_{00} = -sg$, $h_v \xi_{00} = -qh$ and recalling (25) we deduce

$$\beta = \frac{qm}{p-1} - s = m - s.$$

Next, we compute the behaviour of $V_1$ for large $y$ to two orders. To do this, we expand the outer solution $v(x)$ in terms of the inner variables (18). Starting with (20) we have

$$v \sim \xi \left[1 - \eta \ln R + \eta F_0(r_0) + \frac{\varepsilon \rho}{2r_0} \left(-1 + \eta \ln R + \eta F_1(r_0)\right)\right], \quad |y| \to \infty$$

$$\sim \xi_{00} \left[1 - \eta \ln R + \eta \left(F_0 + \frac{\xi_{01}}{\xi_{00}}\right) + \frac{\varepsilon \rho}{2r_0} \left(-1 + \eta \left\{\ln R + F_1(r_0) - \frac{\xi_{01}}{\xi_{00}}\right\}\right)\right]$$

$$+ \varepsilon \xi_1 (1 - \eta \ln R + \eta F_0(r_0))$$

$$\sim \xi_{00} \left[1 - \eta \ln R + \eta \left(\frac{1}{1-\beta} F_0(r_0) + \alpha_5\right)\right]$$

$$+ \frac{\varepsilon \rho \xi_{00}}{2r_0} \left(-1 + \eta \left\{\ln R + F_1(r_0) - \frac{\beta}{1-\beta} F_0(r_0) - \alpha_5\right\}\right)$$

$$+ \xi_{10} \varepsilon + \varepsilon \eta \xi_{10} (- \ln R + F_0(r_0)) + \varepsilon \eta \xi_{11}$$

Matching the $O(\varepsilon)$ terms we obtain

$$V_1 \sim \frac{\xi_{00} \rho}{2r_0} \left(-1 + \eta \{\ln R + F(r_0)\}\right) + \xi_{10} + \eta F_2(R, r_0), \quad |y| \to \infty$$

where

$$F(r_0) := F_1(r_0) - \frac{\beta}{1-\beta} F_0(r_0) - \alpha_5; \quad F_2(R, r_0) := \xi_{10} (- \ln R + F_0(r_0)) + \xi_{11}.$$
Step 2. We now formulate the main solvability condition for \( r_0 \). We anticipate that \( r_0 = O(1) \) and with (60) in mind, we make a change of variables

\[
V_1 := \hat{V} + \frac{ξ_{00}ρ}{2r_0} (-1 + η \ln R + ηF(r_0)) + ξ_{10} + ηF_2(R, r_0).
\]

Matching with the outer solution, we then note that

\[
\hat{V} = O \left( \frac{1}{|y|} \right) \text{ as } |y| → ∞.
\]

To formulate a higher order solvability condition, we use the idea introduced in [12] to rewrite \( O(ε) \) order equations as a system. Let

\[
W := \begin{bmatrix} U_1 \\ \hat{V} \end{bmatrix}.
\]

Since

\[
\Delta_y (ρ \ln R) = \frac{2\cos θ}{R},
\]

the equations (29, 30) become

(62) \( \Delta_y W + MW = K \)

in the matrix form where

(63) \[
M = \begin{bmatrix}
-1 + pU_0^{p-1} & h_υU_0^p \\
ηg_υ & ηg_υ
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

(64) \[
K = \frac{1}{r_0} \begin{bmatrix}
-U_0ρ - h_υU_0^p \left[ \frac{ξ_{00}ρ}{2} (-1 + η \ln R + ηF(r_0)) + r_0ξ_{10} + ηr_0F_2(R, r_0) \right] \\
-V_0ρ - ηξ_{00} \frac{ρ}{2} ηg_υ + O(η^2)
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

Now let \( Ψ = [N, P] \) be the solution to the adjoint system,

\[
\Delta_y Ψ + ΨM = 0.
\]

The solvability condition is formulated by multiplying (62) by \( Ψ \) on the left, and integrating over a big ball \( B = \{ y : |y| < R \} \), then letting \( R → ∞ \). We obtain

\[
\int_{∂B} Ψ ∂_n W - ∂_n Ψ W = \int_B Ψ K.
\]

Write \( Ψ = [N, P] \) and expand in \( η \):

\[
Ψ = Ψ_0 + ηΨ_1 + \cdots.
\]

\[
N = N_0 + ηN_1 + \cdots
\]

\[
P = P_0 + ηP_1 + \cdots
\]

In addition expand

\[
U_1 = U_{10} + ηU_{11}; \ V_1 = V_{10} + ηV_{11}.
\]

The equation for \( N_0 \) then becomes

\[
\Delta_y N_0 + N_0 (-1 + hU_{00}^p) = 0,
\]
which admits a solution

\[ N_0 = \partial_\rho U_{00}. \]

Since \( U \) decays exponentially at infinity and \( \hat{V} \sim O(1/|y|) \) for large \(|y|\), we find that for sufficiently large ball \( B \),

\[ \int_{\partial B} \Psi \partial_n W - \partial_n \Psi W \sim 0. \]

Next we evaluate \( \int_B \Psi K \). At the leading order, we estimate \( V_{00} \sim 0 \), \( \hat{U} \sim U_{00} \) so that

\[ 0 = \int_B \Psi K = \frac{1}{r_0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \left( -U_{000}^2 + h_v \xi_{00} U^{p}_{000} U_{000} \right) + O(\eta). \]

Using integration by parts, the identity (42) and by assumption \( p = q - 1 \), this integral is zero. Therefore to determine \( r_0 \) it is necessary to look at \( O(\eta) \) order terms. The full expansion is,

\[ (65) \quad 0 = \int_B \Psi K \sim \eta \frac{1}{r_0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \left( \left( -U_{000}^2 + \frac{\xi_{00}}{2} h_v \xi_{00} U^{p}_{000}^2 + r_0 \xi_{10} \right) N_1 - U_{000} U_{010} \right.
\]

\[ + \left. \frac{\xi_{00}}{2} h_v \xi_{00} U^{p}_{000}^2 U_{001} + \xi_{00} \xi_{00} U^{p}_{000} U_{000} U_{000} \right) \]

\[ - h_v U^{p}_{00} \left[ \frac{\xi_{00}}{2} \left( \ln R + F(r_0) \right) + r_0 F_2(R, r_0) \right] U_{000} + O(\eta^2). \]

At first sight, this looks daunting. However surprisingly, there are hidden identities that greatly simplify this expression as we now show.

**Step 3.** We start with equations for \( N_1 \) and \( P_0 \) which are

\[ \Delta_y N_1 + N_1 \left( -1 + p h U^{p-1}_{000} \right) + U_{000} \left( p(p - 1) h U^{p-2}_{000} U_{010} + p h_v U^{p-1}_{000} V_{010} \right) + g_u P_0 = 0; \]

\[ (67) \quad \Delta_y P_0 + h_v U^{p}_{000} \partial_\rho U_{000} = 0. \]

We will now make use of (66) to derive an additional identity and eliminate \( N_1 \) from (65). To do this, multiply (66) by \( \rho U_{00} \) and integrate. First note that:

\[ \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \Delta_y N_1 U_{000} \rho = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} N_1 \Delta_y (U_{000} \rho) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} N_1 \cos \theta \left( R \left( U_{00RR} + \frac{U_{000}^2}{R} \right) + 2 U_{000} \right) \]

\[ = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} N_1 \left( \rho (U_{00} - h U^{p}_{000}) + 2 U_{000} \right) \]

so that

\[ (68) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} [2 U_{000} + (p - 1) h \rho U^{p}_{000} ] N_1 + U_{000} \left( p(p - 1) h \rho U^{p-1}_{000} U_{010} + p h_v \rho U^{p}_{000} V_{010} \right) + g_u P_0 \rho U_{00} = 0. \]

Using \( \xi_{00} h_v = -(q + 1) h_v \), as well as \( p = q + 1 \) we then obtain,

\[ 2 \int \left( -U_{000} + \frac{\xi_{00}}{2} h_v \rho U^{p}_{000} \right) N_1 + \frac{\xi_{00}}{2} h_v \rho U^{p-1}_{000} U_{000} + \frac{\xi_{00}}{2} h_v h_{000} U^{p}_{000} U_{000} \]

\[ = \int (-2 U_{000} - (p - 1) h \rho U^{p}_{000} ) N_1 - (p - 1) h \rho U^{p-1}_{000} U_{000} - p h_v U^{p}_{000} \rho U_{000} V_{01} \]

\[ = \int g_u P_0 \rho U_{00}. \]
Also by parity we have
\[ \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} h_v U_{00}^p U_{00} \rho F_2(R, r_0) = 0; \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} N_1 = 0. \]

Therefore (65) simplifies to (69)
\[ 0 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} -U_{00} U_{01} - h_v U_{00}^p U_{00} \rho \frac{\xi_{00} \rho}{2} (\ln R + F(r_0)) + \left(-V_{01} - \xi_{00} \frac{R}{R} \cos \frac{\theta}{R} + \xi_{00} \frac{\rho}{2} g_v + \frac{\rho}{2} g_u U_{00}\right) P_0. \]

Next we write (69) as
\[ I_1 + I_2 + I_3 + I_4 = 0 \]
where
\[ I_1 = \int -U_{00} U_{01}, \quad I_2 = \int -h_v U_{00}^p U_{00} \rho \frac{\xi_{00} \rho}{2} (\ln R + F(r_0)), \]
\[ I_3 = \int \left(-V_{01} - \xi_{00} \frac{R}{R} \cos \frac{\theta}{R}\right) P_0, \quad I_4 = \int \left(\xi_{00} \frac{\rho}{2} g_v + \frac{\rho}{2} g_u U_{00}\right) P_0. \]

To simplify \( I_1 \) we will make use of the identity
\[ L (U_{00} R) = 2(U_{00} - U_{00}^p h). \]
where \( L \) is the linear operator defined in (32). We have
\[ I_1 = -\int U_{00} U_{01} = -\pi \int_0^\infty U_{00} U_{01} R dR = \pi \int_0^\infty U_{01} (U_{00} - h U_{00}^p) R dR \]
\[ = \pi/2 \int_0^\infty L (U_{00} R) R U_{01} dR = \pi/2 \int_0^\infty U_{00} L (U_{01}) R^2 dR \]
\[ = -\pi/2 \int_0^\infty (h_v U_{00}^p V_{01}) U_{00} R^2 dR \]
\[ = \pi \int_0^\infty \frac{h_v}{p + 1} U_{00}^{p+1} (V_{01} R + V_{01} R^2 / 2) dR \]

Next we evaluate \( I_3 \). First note that the solution to (67) is given explicitly by
\[ P_0 = -\frac{\cos \theta}{R} \frac{h_v}{p + 1} \left(\int_0^R U_{00}^{p+1} (s) ds\right) \]
so that
\[ I_3 = -\int \left(V_{01} + \xi_{00} \frac{\cos \theta}{R}\right) P_0 = \pi \int_0^\infty \left(V_{01} R + \xi_{00} \frac{1}{R}\right) \frac{h_v}{p + 1} \left(\int_0^R U_{00}^{p+1} (s) ds\right) dR \]
\[ = \pi \lim_{t \to \infty} (V_{01}(t) + \xi_{00} \ln(t)) \frac{h_v}{p + 1} \left(\int_0^\infty U_{00}^{p+1} (s) ds\right) - \pi \int_0^\infty \frac{h_v}{p + 1} U_{00}^{p+1} (V_{01} + \xi_{00} \ln(R)) R dR. \]
By (51), (53), and (57) we observe that
\[ V_{01}(R) \sim \xi_{00} \left( -\ln R + \frac{1}{1 - \beta} F_0(r_0) + \alpha_5 \right), \quad R \to \infty \]
so that \( I_3 \) becomes
\[ I_3 = \pi \xi_{00} \left( \frac{1}{1 - \beta} F_0(r_0) + \alpha_5 \right) \frac{h_v}{p + 1} \left( \int_0^\infty U_0^{p+1}(s)ds \right) - \pi \int_0^\infty \frac{h_v}{p + 1} U_0^{p+1}(V_1 + \xi_{00} \ln(t)) RdR. \]

Next we compute
\[ I_2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} -h_v U_0^p U_{00,\rho} \frac{\xi_{00,\rho}}{2} (\ln R + F(r_0)) = \pi \int_0^\infty -h_v U_0^p U_{00R} \frac{\xi_{00}}{2} (\ln R + F(r_0)) R^2 dR \]
\[ = \pi \int_0^\infty \frac{h_v}{p + 1} U_0^{p+1} \xi_{00} (\ln R + F(r_0)) + 1/2) RdR \]
\[ = \pi \int_0^\infty \frac{h_v}{p + 1} U_0^{p+1} \xi_{00} \left( \ln R + F_1(r_0) - \frac{\beta}{1 - \beta} F_0(r_0) - \alpha_5 + 1/2 \right) RdR \]

When combining \( I_1 + I_2 + I_3 \), we get to cancel many terms and obtain
\[ I_1 + I_2 + I_3 = \pi \int_0^\infty \frac{h_v}{p + 1} U_0^{p+1} (V_{01R}/2 + \xi_{00} (F_1(r_0) + F_0(r_0) + 1/2)) RdR. \]

Next we assume \( g(u, v) = u^m v^{-s} \). Using \( g_u U_{00} = mg \) and \( g_v \xi_{00} = -sg \), we simplify
\[ I_4 = -\frac{h_v}{p + 1} \pi (m - s) \int_0^\infty gR \left( \int_0^R U_0^{p+1}(s)ds \right) dR. \]

Moreover recall from (48) that \( gR = (-V_{01R})_R \) so that integrating by parts yields
\[ I_4 = -\frac{h_v}{p + 1} \pi (m - s) \left\{ \lim_{R \to \infty} \left( -V_{01R} \int_0^R U_0^{p+1}(s)ds \right) + \int_0^\infty U_0^{p+1} V_{01R} R^2 dR \right\} \]
\[ = -\frac{h_v}{p + 1} \pi (m - s) \left\{ \xi_{00} \left( \int_0^\infty U_0^{p+1}(s)RdR \right) + \int_0^\infty U_0^{p+1} V_{01R} R^2 dR \right\}. \]

Hence the solvability condition \( I_1 + I_2 + I_3 + I_4 = 0 \) becomes
\[ \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 - m + s \right) \int_0^\infty U_0^{p+1} V_{01R} R^2 dR + \int_0^\infty U_0^{p+1} \xi_{00} \left( F_1(r_0) + F_0(r_0) + \frac{1}{2} (1 - m + s) \right) RdR = 0, \]
or in a simpler form
\[ F_1(r_0) + F_0(r_0) = \frac{1}{2} (m - s - 1) \left( 1 + \frac{\int_0^\infty U_0^{p+1} V_{01R} R^2 dR}{\int_0^\infty U_0^{p+1} \xi_{00}} \right). \]
Using (48) and (25) we obtain
\[
1 + \frac{\int_0^\infty U_0^{p+1} V_{01} R^2 dR}{\int_0^\infty U_0^{p+1} \xi_0} = 1 - \frac{\int_0^\infty w^{p+1} \left( \int_0^R w^m t dt \right) R dR}{\left( \int_0^\infty w^{p+1} RdR \right) \left( \int_0^\infty w^m RdR \right)}.
\]

(73)

Finally, using (16, 17) we have
\[
F_1(r_0) + F_0(r_0) = 1 - 2r_0 \int_0^1 \frac{e^{-2r_0 \tau}}{\sqrt{1 - \tau^2}} d\tau
\]

(74)

Substituting (73) and (74) into (72) we obtain
\[
1 - 2r_0 \int_0^1 \frac{e^{-2r_0 \tau}}{\sqrt{1 - \tau^2}} d\tau = \frac{1}{2} (m - s - 1) \frac{\int_0^\infty w^m \left( \int_0^R w^{p+1} t dt \right) R dR}{\left( \int_0^\infty w^m RdR \right) \left( \int_0^\infty w^{p+1} RdR \right)}
\]

which is precisely the formula (10). To complete the derivation of Main Result 1, it remains to prove existence and uniqueness of solution to the algebraic equation (10). This is done in Appendix B. The derivation of Main Result 1 is then complete.

4. Numerical experiments

To validate our analytical results and explore what happens if \( p \neq q + 1 \), we used FlexPDE software [7] to compute the full two-dimensional smoke-ring solution of (4).

**Experiment 1: \( p = q + 1 \), effect of \( \varepsilon \)**. We first consider the “standard” parameter values, \((p, q, m, s) = (2, 1, 2, 0)\). This satisfies the condition \( p = q + 1 \) of Main Result 1. We used Maple to compute the theoretically predicted value of \( r_0 \) by numerically solving (10) as follows. First, we used Maple’s boundary value problem solver to determine the steady state \( w \) numerically. The integrals in (10) are then easily evaluated using Maple’s numerical integrator. We found that the right hand side of (10) is equal to 0.307043; the solution to (10) is given by \( r_0 = 0.327929 \). We then used FlexPDE to compute a fully two-dimensional smoke-ring type steady state solution of (4) numerically, for several different values of \( \varepsilon \). We solved (4) on a quarter-disk of radius 8. Due to the presence of the logarithmic scaling, a very high error tolerance was required in order to achieve good convergence. For example, when we took \( \varepsilon = 0.02 \), the numerical solution and the corresponding center of the spike \( r_0 \) appeared to change as the tolerance was slowly decreased even with relatively strict error tolerance; it finally settled for global error tolerances smaller than 5e-5. Fortunately, FlexPDE uses automatic adaptive gridding, and was able to handle such tight tolerance. Using the tolerance of 5e-6 required about 4500 gridpoints (with most of the gridpoints concentrated near the spike), and yielded the numerical value of \( r_0 = 0.3537 \). The resulting solution is shown in Figure 2. This agrees well with the theoretical prediction (relative error about 7.9%). The following table shows the computation for several different values of \( \varepsilon \).
Figure 3. Experiment 2: The effect of parameter \( s \) on the smoke-ring radius with \((p, q, m) = (2, 1, 2)\) and \(\epsilon = 0.04\). Dots indicate the radius obtained with direct numerical computation of (4) using FlexPDE. Solid line is obtained by solving for \( r_0 \) from formula (10). (b) Experiment 3: The effect of \( q \) with \((p, m, s) = (2, 2, 0)\) and \(\epsilon = 0.04\). A smoke-ring solution exists for \(1 < q < 1.5\). For \(0.97 < q < 1\), FlexPDE has a hard time converging and the solution seems to jump around; FlexPDE fails to converge when \(q \leq 0.97\). (c) Experiment 4: The effect of \( \epsilon \) with \((p, m, s) = (2, 2, 0)\) and \(q = 1.2\). It appears that \( \epsilon \ll r_0 \ll 1 \) but the analytic formula for \( r_0 \) is an open question when \( p \neq q + 1 \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>((p, q, m, s) = (2, 1, 2, 0))</th>
<th>(\epsilon)</th>
<th>(r_0) using (4)</th>
<th>(r_0) from (10)</th>
<th>%error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.353170</td>
<td>0.327929</td>
<td>7.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.377903</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>15.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.450895</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.357921</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>9.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.394113</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>20.18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It appears from the table that the error is of \(O(\epsilon)\) order: doubling \(\epsilon\) appears to roughly double the error.

**Experiment 2:** \( p = q + 1 \), **effect of** \( s \). We fix \((p, q, m) = (2, 1, 2)\) and \(\epsilon = 0.04\), and we vary \( s \). As in experiment 1, the asymptotic radius \( r_0 \) is given by equation (10), which is solved numerically for a given \( s \). We then compare \( r_0 \) given by (10) with the numerical value computed using FlexPDE.
We obtain the following table, see also Figure 3(a).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(s, r_0) using (4)</th>
<th>(r_0) from (10)</th>
<th>difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-0.5000 0.293970</td>
<td>0.226969</td>
<td>0.067001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.3750 0.312172</td>
<td>0.249738</td>
<td>0.062434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.2500 0.332351</td>
<td>0.273998</td>
<td>0.058353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.1250 0.354415</td>
<td>0.299970</td>
<td>0.054445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0000 0.378852</td>
<td>0.327930</td>
<td>0.050922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1250 0.405267</td>
<td>0.358231</td>
<td>0.047036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2500 0.435668</td>
<td>0.391330</td>
<td>0.043338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3750 0.469093</td>
<td>0.427841</td>
<td>0.041252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5000 0.508206</td>
<td>0.468612</td>
<td>0.039594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6250 0.541612</td>
<td>0.514871</td>
<td>0.026741</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A clear agreement is observed between the analytical and numerical results. Also a good agreement is observed even with \(s < 0\). Indeed, while \(s\) is usually taken to be positive, nothing in our analysis prevents it from being negative, as long as (7) is satisfied.

**Experiment 3:** \(q > p - 1\), effect of \(q\). We take \((p, m, s) = (2, 2, 0)\), \(\varepsilon = 0.04\) and slowly increase \(q\) from 1. Computing the corresponding \(r_0\) numerically, we obtain the following table (see also Figure 3(b)):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(q)</th>
<th>(r_0) using (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.378721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0500</td>
<td>0.298360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1000</td>
<td>0.247756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1500</td>
<td>0.215230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2000</td>
<td>0.193186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2500</td>
<td>0.176765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3000</td>
<td>0.163324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3500</td>
<td>0.150154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4000</td>
<td>0.135573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4500</td>
<td>0.113338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5000</td>
<td>0.063746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The smoke-ring appears to exist for \(1 \leq q < 1.5\), until eventually \(r_0\) becomes zero, at which point the smoke-ring becomes a three-dimensional spike.
Experiment 4: $q > p - 1$, effect of $\varepsilon$. We take $(p, m, s) = (2, 2, 0)$, $q = 1.2$ and vary $\varepsilon$. We then obtain the following table (see also Figure 3(c)):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$(p, m, s) = (2, 2, 0)$, $q = 1.2$</th>
<th>$\varepsilon$</th>
<th>$r_0$ using (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.030432</td>
<td>0.161432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.029286</td>
<td>0.157386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.025119</td>
<td>0.142218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.019953</td>
<td>0.122872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.015252</td>
<td>0.103564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.013082</td>
<td>0.094056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.011659</td>
<td>0.087490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.010000</td>
<td>0.079302</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear that $r_0$ depends on $\varepsilon$ in this case, and indeed $r_0 \to 0$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$. It remains an open problem to determine the precise nature of such a small smoke-ring solution.

Experiment 5: $q < p - 1$. We take $(p, m, s) = (2, 2, 0)$, $\varepsilon = 0.04$ and attempt to compute $r_0$ with $q < 1$. We set the error tolerance to $10^{-5}$ and slowly decreased $q$ below 1. *FlexPDE failed to converge to a solution even when $q = 0.97$*. For $q \in (0.98, 1]$, FlexPDE gave seemingly discontinuous values for $r_0$ as $q$ was slowly decreased, as the following table demonstrates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$(p, m, s) = (2, 2, 0)$, $\varepsilon = 0.04$</th>
<th>$q$</th>
<th>$r_0$ using (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.378721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.996875</td>
<td>0.357755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.993750</td>
<td>0.369243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.990625</td>
<td>0.404194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.987500</td>
<td>0.405338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.984375</td>
<td>0.406227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.981250</td>
<td>0.420731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.978125</td>
<td>0.362330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.975000</td>
<td>0.325908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.971875</td>
<td>Failure to converge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on these numerical experiments, we conjecture that the smoke-ring solution does not exist when $q < p - 1$.

5. Discussion

In this paper, we used formal asymptotics to construct smoke-ring solutions when $p - 1 = q$. This may be viewed as a first step towards a more rigorous proof, which remains an open problem. The main obstacle in making our results rigorous is the presence of two scales, $\varepsilon$ and $\log \varepsilon$, which require a double expansion, and make it hard to apply standard rigorous techniques – such as Liapunov-Schmidt reduction – directly. In addition, a rigorous proof usually requires error estimates, so even
higher-order expansions are required. This appears to be a formidable challenge, given that simply computing the radius $r_0$ required a manipulation of more than 10 terms (see equation (65)).

An outstanding open problem is the possible existence of the smoke-ring solutions when $p-1 \neq q$. From §2, it is clear that in such a case, the radius cannot be $O(1)$, since this would contradict (44). However, we do not rule out the possible existence of smoke-rings of either a large radius, or a small radius of size $\varepsilon \ll r_0 \ll 1$. Indeed, numerics of §4 suggest the latter is possible for the case $q > p-1$. However so far, we were unable to construct such a solution analytically.

Let us contrast the results of this paper to the radially symmetric solutions in 3D which concentrate on a sphere. Those were studied in [20] and [9]. It was found that such a solution exists provided that $q/2 < p-1 < q$. In this case, the radius of the sphere was found to be of order $O(1)$, independent of $m, s$; moreover it satisfies

$$\frac{p - 1}{q} = \frac{e^{2r_0} - 1 - r_0}{e^{2r_0} - 1}.$$ 

It is clear that $r_0$ becomes large as $p \to q+1$ from the left. By contrast, the smoke-ring solutions of radius $r_0 = O(1)$ exists when $p = q+1$. Numerical simulations of §4 also indicate that a smoke-ring solution may exist when $p < q+1$; however in this case the radius appears to be small. In addition the smoke-ring radius also depends on $m, s$. An open question is whether a solution concentrating on a large sphere can exist in the borderline case $p = q+1$.

It is unclear what happens if the condition (7) is violated, since neither existence nor uniqueness of a solution to (7) can be guaranteed in such a case. In particular, the shape of the left hand side of (10) (see Figure 4) indicates that a multiplicity of smoke-ring solutions should be possible if $m-s-1$ is just slightly below zero, although eventually all such solutions disappear if $m-s-1$ is too negative. On the other hand, the smoke-ring solution will eventually disappear if $s$ is sufficiently decreased so that the right hand side of (7) exceeds 1; however this generally happens when $m-s-1 > 3$. In other words, the sufficient condition (7) is clearly not necessary for the existence of a smoke-ring solution.

An open (and difficult) question is to elucidate any connections between various types of solutions. For example numerical simulations show that a ring solution in two dimensions connects to a spike solution as $\varepsilon$ increases to $O(1)$. Such a connection is related to pattern-forming instabilities in one dimension: a two-dimensional spike can become unstable and expand into a hollow sphere. As the sphere radius is increased, it also becomes unstable and breaks up into spots. We speculate that in three dimensions, a spike can bifurcate into either a smoke-ring or a sphere when $p \leq q+1$.

The stability of smoke-ring solutions is also an open question. In two dimensions, it is known that a ring solution whose radius is of $O(1)$ is unstable and breaks up into spots, see for example [17], [10]. We therefore anticipate that the smoke-ring solution we constructed will be unstable with respect to angular perturbations when $p = q+1$. By contrast, numerical simulations indicate that smoke-ring with small radius may exist when $p < q+1$. It is unclear whether such a solution may be stable.
It would be interesting to study smoke-ring solutions on bounded domains. While Green’s function for a general bounded domain is difficult, it may be possible to compute it for a special case of a three dimensional ball. In particular, is \( p = q + 1 \) still an essential condition, on a bounded domain? Some numerical simulations (not shown here) on a ball domain and with \((p, q, m, s) = (2,1,2,0)\) suggest that the smoke-ring solution disappears as the domain radius is decreased below 2.
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Appendix A: Proof of Lemma 1

Step 1. The Green’s function (14) has an integral representation that can be constructed as follows. Let \( \Gamma(X, X_0) \) be the entire space Green’s function in three dimensions satisfying

\[
\Delta_X \Gamma - \Gamma = -\delta(X - X_0), \quad X, X_0 \in \mathbb{R}^3.
\]

Explicitly we have,

\[
\Gamma(X, X_0) = \frac{e^{-|X - X_0|}}{4\pi|X - X_0|}.
\]

Now the equation (14) can be trivially extended to three dimensions by letting \( r = \sqrt{X_1^2 + X_2^2}, \quad z = X_3 \). It follows that \( G \) is the convolution of \( \Gamma \) with the circle of delta functions of radius \( r_0 \) (more precisely with the one-dimensional Hausdorff measure restricted on the circle). This yields an integral representation of \( G \),

\[
G(r, z, r_0, z_0) = \frac{r_0}{4\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{\exp\left[-(r^2 + r_0^2 - 2rr_0 \cos \omega + (z - z_0)^2)^{1/2}\right]}{(r^2 + r_0^2 - 2rr_0 \cos \omega + (z - z_0)^2)^{1/2}} \, d\omega.
\]

We rewrite this as

\[
G = \frac{r_0}{2\pi} \int_0^\pi \frac{\exp\left\{-[2rr_0(1 - \cos \theta) + (r - r_0)^2 + (z - z_0)^2]^{1/2}\right\}}{[2rr_0(1 - \cos \theta) + (r - r_0)^2 + (z - z_0)^2]^{1/2}} \, d\theta.
\]

and make a change of variables,

\[
s = [2rr_0(1 - \cos \theta) + (r - r_0)^2 + (z - z_0)^2]^{1/2}.
\]

After some simplifications we obtain

\[
G = \frac{r_0 e^{-\beta}}{\pi(\alpha - \beta)} \int_0^1 \frac{\exp\left[-(\alpha - \beta)\tau\right] \, d\tau}{\sqrt{\tau(\delta + \tau)(1 + \delta + \tau)(1 - \tau)}}, \quad \text{where}
\]

\[
\beta = [(r - r_0)^2 + (z - z_0)^2]^{1/2}; \quad \alpha = [(r + r_0)^2 + (z - z_0)^2]^{1/2}; \quad \delta = \frac{2\beta}{\alpha - \beta}.
\]
Now write \( x = x_0 + \varepsilon y \) where \( y = (\rho, Z) \), so that
\[
    r = r_0 + \varepsilon \rho, \quad z = z_0 + \varepsilon Z.
\]
Then we have:
\[
    \beta = \varepsilon |y|, \quad \alpha = 2r_0 + \varepsilon \rho + O(\varepsilon^2), \quad \delta = \frac{\varepsilon |y|}{r_0} \left( 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2r_0} (\rho - |y|) \right), \quad \alpha - \beta = 2r_0 + \varepsilon (\rho - |y|)
\]
and
\[
    G = \frac{r_0 e^{-\varepsilon |y|}}{\pi (2r_0 + \varepsilon (\rho - |y|))} I(2r_0 + \varepsilon (\rho - |y|); \delta)
\]
where
\[
    I(a, \delta) := \int_0^1 \frac{\exp[-a \tau] d\tau}{\sqrt{\delta + \tau}(1 + \delta + \tau)(1 - \tau)}
\]

**Step 2.** In this step we derive the following estimate of (80):
\[
    I(a, \delta) \sim \ln \frac{1}{\delta} + 2 \ln 2 + g_1(a) + \delta \left\{ (-1 + a) \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{1}{\delta} + (a - 1) \left( \ln 2 - \frac{1}{2} \right) + g_2(a) \right\} + O(\delta^2 \ln \delta),
\]
where
\[
    g_1(a) := \int_0^1 \left( \frac{\exp(-a \tau)}{\tau \sqrt{1 - \tau^2}} - \frac{1}{\tau} \right) d\tau;
    g_2(a) := \int_0^1 \left( \frac{-2\tau - 1}{2\tau^2(\tau + 1) \sqrt{1 - \tau^2}} \exp(-a \tau) + \frac{1}{2\tau^2} - \left( \frac{a}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \right) \frac{1}{\tau} \right) d\tau.
\]
Note that the integral (80) becomes singular near \( \tau = 0 \) as \( \delta \to 0 \). We therefore choose \( \gamma \) with
\[
    \delta \ll \gamma \ll 1
\]
and split \( I = \int_0^\gamma + \int_\gamma^1 = I_1 + I_2 \). To determine \( I_1 \), we rescale
\[
    \tau = \delta y
\]
so that
\[
    I_1 = \int_0^{\gamma/\delta} \frac{\exp(-a\delta y) dy}{\sqrt{y(y + 1)(1 + \delta(y + 1))(1 - \delta y)}}.
\]
Next we expand the integrand in terms of \( \delta \):
\[
    \frac{\exp(-a\delta y) dy}{\sqrt{y(y + 1)(1 + \delta(y + 1))(1 - \delta y)}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{y(1 + y)}} + \delta \frac{(-ay - \frac{1}{2})}{\sqrt{y(1 + y)}} + O(\delta^2).
\]
Note that
\[
    \int_0^y \frac{1}{\sqrt{y(1 + y)}} dy = 2 \ln(\sqrt{y} + \sqrt{y + 1}),
    \int_0^y \frac{y}{\sqrt{y(1 + y)}} dy = \sqrt{y(1 + y)} - \ln(\sqrt{y} + \sqrt{y + 1})
\]
so that

\[ I_1 = 2 \ln(\sqrt{y} + \sqrt{y + 1}) + \delta \left\{ (-1 + a) \ln(\sqrt{y} + \sqrt{y + 1}) - a \left( \sqrt{y(1 + y)} \right) \right\} , \quad y = \frac{\gamma}{\delta}. \]

Now in the limit \( y \to \infty \), we have

\[ \ln(\sqrt{y} + \sqrt{y + 1}) \sim \frac{1}{2} \ln y + \ln 2 + \frac{1}{4y} + O\left(\frac{1}{y^2}\right) , \quad y \to \infty \]

and

\[ \sqrt{y(1 + y)} \sim y + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{8y} + O\left(\frac{1}{y^2}\right). \]

So we obtain

(84)

\[ I_1 \sim \ln \frac{\gamma}{\delta} + 2 \ln 2 + \frac{\delta}{2\gamma} + \delta \left\{ (-1 + a) \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{\gamma}{\delta} - \ln 2 + a \left( \ln 2 - \frac{1}{2} \right) \right\} + O\left(\frac{\delta^2}{\gamma^2}\right) + O\left(\frac{\delta^2}{\gamma}\right) + O(\gamma). \]

In the end, all the \( \gamma \) terms should cancel with the \( \gamma \) terms coming from \( I_2 \). To compute \( I_2 \), expand

\[ I_2 = \int_{\gamma}^{1} \frac{\exp(-a\tau)d\tau}{\sqrt{\tau (\tau + \delta) (\tau + 1 + \delta) (1 - \tau)}} \]

\[ \sim \int_{\gamma}^{1} \frac{\exp(-a\tau)d\tau}{\tau \sqrt{1 - \tau^2}} + \delta \int_{\gamma}^{1} \frac{-2\tau - 1}{2\tau^2(\tau + 1)\sqrt{1 - \tau^2}} \exp(-a\tau)d\tau \]

\[ = I_{21} + \delta I_{22}. \]

To find \( I_{21} \), we note that the integrand behaves like \( \tau^{-1} \) for small \( \tau \). We therefore rewrite

(85)

\[ I_{21} = -\ln \gamma + g_1(a) + O(\gamma), \]

where \( g_1 \) is given in (82). Note that \( g_1 \) is a non-singular integral that is independent of \( \gamma \). To determine \( O(\delta) \) terms, we need to extract the singularity from \( I_{22} \). Note that for small \( \tau \) we have

\[ \frac{-2\tau - 1}{2\tau^2(\tau + 1)\sqrt{1 - \tau^2}} \exp(-a\tau)d\tau \sim -\frac{1}{2\tau^2} + \left( \frac{a}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \right) \frac{1}{\tau} + O(1), \quad \tau \to 0 \]

Therefore we may write

(86)

\[ I_{22} \sim \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{\gamma} \right) + \left( -\frac{a}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \right) \ln \gamma + g_2(a) + O(\gamma) \]

where \( g_2 \) is given by (83). The integrals \( g_1 \) and \( g_2 \) are non-singular and can be easily evaluated numerically. Combining (85), (86) and (84) we note that \( O(\ln \gamma) \) and \( O(\delta \gamma^{-1}) \) order terms cancel out as expected and we get (81).

**Step 3.** Recall that we have

\[ a = 2r_0 + \epsilon (\rho - |y|) , \quad \delta = \frac{\epsilon |y|}{r_0} \left( 1 - \frac{\epsilon}{2r_0} (\rho - |y|) \right) \]
so using (81) we obtain

\[
I(a, \delta) \sim \ln \frac{r_0}{\varepsilon |y|} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2r_0} (\rho - |y|) + 2 \ln 2 + g_1(2r_0) + \varepsilon (\rho - |y|) g'_1(2r_0)
\]

\[
+ \epsilon |y| \left\{ (-1 + 2r_0) \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{r_0}{\varepsilon |y|} + (2r_0 - 1) \left( \ln 2 - \frac{1}{2} \right) + g_2(2r_0) \right\} + O(\varepsilon^2 \ln \varepsilon)
\]

\[
\sim \ln \frac{r_0}{\varepsilon |y|} + 2 \ln 2 + g_1(2r_0)
\]

\[
\epsilon \left\{ \frac{1}{2r_0} \rho - |y| \left( -\frac{1}{2r_0} + 1 \right) \left( \ln \frac{r_0}{\varepsilon |y|} - 1 + 2 \ln 2 \right)
\]

\[
+ \frac{|y|}{r_0} g_2(2r_0) + (\rho - |y|) g'_1(2r_0) \right\} + O(\varepsilon^2 \ln \varepsilon)
\]

(87)

We also expand

\[
\frac{r_0 e^{-|y|}}{\pi (2r_0 + \varepsilon (\rho - |y|))} \sim \frac{1}{2\pi} \left( 1 + \epsilon \left( \frac{|y| - \rho - |y|}{2r_0} \right) \right).
\]

Substituting (87) and (88) into (79) and after some algebra, we find

\[
2\pi G \sim \ln \frac{r_0}{\varepsilon |y|} + 2 \ln 2 + g_1(2r_0)
\]

\[
+ \epsilon \left\{ -\frac{\rho}{2r_0} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + \frac{\rho}{2r_0} \{ \ln |y| - \ln r_0 - 2 \ln 2 - g_1(2r_0) + 1 + 2r_0 g'_1(2r_0) \}
\]

\[
+ \frac{|y|}{2r_0} \left\{ (g_1(2r_0) + 1) (1 - 2r_0) + 2g_2(2r_0) - 2r_0 g'_1(2r_0) - 1 \right\} \right\}
\]

(89)

**Step 4.** To complete the proof, we claim that

\[
2g_2(z) = (g_1(z) + 1)(z - 1) - zg'_1(z) + 1
\]

so that (89) simplifies to

\[
2\pi G \sim \ln \frac{r_0}{\varepsilon |y|} + 2 \ln 2 + g_1(2r_0) + \varepsilon \frac{\rho}{2r_0} \left\{ -\frac{1}{\varepsilon} + \{ \ln |y| - \ln r_0 - 2 \ln 2 - g_1(2r_0) + 1 + 2r_0 g'_1(2r_0) \} \right\}
\]

(91)

This is precisely the equation (15) after some simplifications and by \( \eta = -\frac{1}{\ln \varepsilon} \). To prove (90), rewrite

\[
2g_2(z) = \int_0^1 \left[ \frac{2\tau^2 - \tau - 1}{\tau^2 (1 - \tau^2)^{3/2}} \exp (-z\tau) \right] + \frac{1}{\tau} - (z - 1) \frac{1}{\tau} d\tau.
\]

Next note that

\[
\frac{1}{\tau^2 (1 - \tau^2)^{3/2}} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} \left( \frac{-1 + 2\tau^2}{\tau (1 - \tau^2)^{1/2}} \right).
\]

Integrating by parts we then obtain

\[
2g_2(z) = \int_0^1 \left[ \frac{P(\tau) e^{-z\tau}}{\tau (1 - \tau^2)^{1/2}} - (z - 1) \frac{1}{\tau} \right] d\tau + z - 2
\]

(92)
Suppose that (7) holds. The uniqueness will be proved if we show that $g$ is shown on Figure 4. Note that $0 \leq g^\prime \leq 1$ and is decreasing whenever $g(z)$ is positive.

Substituting (95) into (94) and simplifying we obtain

$$2g_2 = -zf + z + (z - 1)g_1$$

Finally, note that $f(z) = -g_1'(z)$ so that (90) follows.

**APPENDIX B: EXISTENCE AND UNIQUENESS OF THE SOLUTION TO (10)**

Let $f(z)$ be given as in (93) and let $g(z) = 1 - zf(z)$. Then the left hand side of (10) is $g_2(2r_0)$ and is shown on Figure 4. Note that $g(0) = 1$. For large $z$, we have the asymptotic expansion

$$f(z) = \int_0^1 \frac{e^{-zt}}{1 - \tau^2} d\tau \sim \frac{1}{z} + \frac{1}{z^3} + O(z^{-5}), \ z \to \infty$$

so that $g(z) \to 0^-$ as $z \to \infty$. Hence $g(z)$ has at least one root. On the other hand, note that $m - s - 1 > 0$ by assumption (7) so that the right hand side of (10) is positive. Moreover it is clear that $0 \leq \frac{1}{R_0} w^m R_0 \leq 1$, so that the right hand side of (10) is at most 1 provided that $\frac{1}{2}(m - s - 1) < 1$; the latter follows from (7). We conclude that the solution to (10) exists provided that (7) holds. The uniqueness will be proved if we show that $g(z)$ is decreasing whenever $g(z)$ is positive.

By substituting $f = (1 - g)/z$ into (95) we see that $g(z)$ satisfies

$$g'' - \frac{g'}{z} + g\left(\frac{1}{z^2} - 1\right) = \frac{1}{z^2}.$$ 

Now suppose that $g'(z_0) = 0$ and $g(z_0) > 0$ for some $z_0$. Then $g''(z_0) = \frac{1}{z_0^2} (1 - g(z_0)) + g(z_0)$. Note that $f(z) > 0$ for all $z$ so that $0 < g(z_0) < 1$. It then follows that $g''(z_0) > 0$. We conclude that $g(z)$ has no maximum if $g(z) > 0$. On the other hand, $g(z) \to 0$ as $z \to \infty$ and $g(0) = 1$. It follows that $g(z)$ is decreasing whenever $g(z)$ is positive. This concludes the proof of the uniqueness of $r_0$ satisfying (10).
Figure 4. The plot of the left hand side of (10)
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