

Partial Differential Equations with Numerical Methods

Stig Larsson and Vidar Thomée, Springer 2003, 2005

AUGUST 18, 2015.

p. 44, l. 17: $a_j \pm \frac{1}{2}hb_j \geq 0$ **should be** $a_j \pm \frac{1}{2}hb_j > 0$

p. 44, l. 6-: nonnegative **should be** positive

List of corrections, October 10, 2006. Page numbers refer to the second corrected printing 2005.

p. 94, l. Problem 6.6: Problem A.15 **should be** Problem A.14

p. 83, l. (6.16): $\left\| v - \sum_{j=1}^N (v, \varphi_j) \varphi_j \right\| \leq C \lambda_{N+1}^{-1/2}$ **should be** $\left\| v - \sum_{j=1}^N (v, \varphi_j) \varphi_j \right\| \leq \lambda_{N+1}^{-1/2} \|\nabla v\|$

p. 40, l. 1-: $\int_{\Omega} f \, dx$ **should be** $\frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_{\Omega} f \, dx$

p. 31, l. 2: $L_1(\mathbf{R}^d)$ **should be** $L_1(B)$ in view of (3.14)

p. 31, l. 5-: $\int_{|x|=\epsilon} \varphi \frac{\partial U}{\partial n} \, ds$ **should be** $-\int_{|x|=\epsilon} \varphi \frac{\partial U}{\partial n} \, ds$

List of corrections, February 13, 2006. Page numbers refer to the second corrected printing 2005.

p. 88, l. 4: $N_{\rho} \approx \rho^2 b^2 / \pi$ **should be** $N_{\rho} \approx \rho^2 b^2 / (4\pi)$

p. 88, l. 5: $\lambda_n = \lambda_{ml} \approx \rho^2 \approx \pi N_{\rho} / b^2 \approx \pi n / b^2$ **should be** $\lambda_n = \lambda_{ml} \approx \rho^2 \approx 4\pi N_{\rho} / b^2 \approx 4\pi n / b^2$

p. 158, l. 4: $n \geq 1$ **should be** $n \geq 0$

p. 236, l. 2: if it **should be** if it is

List of corrections, August 24, 2005.

Most of the following errors have been corrected in the second corrected printing 2005.

p. 3, l. 12-: $\rightarrow \infty$ **should be** $t \rightarrow \infty$

p. 6, l. 1-: $\left(\int_{\Omega} vw \, dx \right)^{1/2}$ **should be** $\int_{\Omega} vw \, dx$

p. 7, l. 15: we we **should be** we

p. 9, l. 1-: definition of b should be $b = \frac{v_f \sigma_f L}{\lambda_f} \frac{\sigma}{\sigma_f} \frac{v}{v_f}$

p. 10, l. 1.21: $b - \nabla \cdot a$ **should be** $b - \nabla a$

p. 16, l. 2-: for ϵ **should be** for $\epsilon > 0$

p. 23, l. Problem 2.2: where c is a positive constant

p. 27, l. 1: \leq **should be** $=$ (in two places)

p. 27, l. 3: $\min_{\Omega} u \leq \min_{\Gamma} \{ \min_{\Omega} u, 0 \}$ **should be** $\min_{\Omega} u \geq \min_{\Gamma} \{ \min_{\Omega} u, 0 \}$

p. 30, l. 5: by parts **should be** by parts twice

p. 30, l. 6: . **should be** ,

p. 31, l. 3-: $\left| \int_{|x|=\epsilon} \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial n} U \, ds \right| = \left| \frac{1}{2\pi} \log(\epsilon) \int_{|x|=\epsilon} \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial n} \, ds \right| \leq \epsilon |\log(\epsilon)| \|\nabla \varphi\|_C \rightarrow 0$

p. 33, l. 14-: formulation (3.23) **should be** formulation (3.20)

- p. 35, l. 5-: $\frac{\partial u}{\partial n}$ should be $a \frac{\partial u}{\partial n}$
- p. 38, l. 14: $m, k = 1$ should be $j, k = 1$
- p. 39, l. 11-: Hint: $v(x) = v(y) + \int_{y_1}^{x_1} D_1 v(s, x_2) ds + \int_{y_2}^{x_2} D_2 v(y_1, s) ds$.
- p. 44, l. 13: of the should be of the absolute values of the
- p. 44, l. 12-: $\min_j U_j \leq \min \{U_0, U_M, 0\}$ should be $\min_j U_j \geq \min \{U_0, U_M, 0\}$
- p. 45, l. 2-: delete $+b_j(u'(x_j) - \hat{\partial}u(x_j))$
- p. 46, l. 12-: inter should be interior
- p. 49, l. 17: dominant should be dominant, i.e., $\sum_{j \neq i} |a_{ij}| \leq a_{ii}$
- p. 49, l. 17: Hint: assume $a_j \pm \frac{1}{2}hb_j \geq 0$.
- p. 54, l. 5: with $\|v\|_{K_j} = \|v\|_{L_2(K_j)}$ and $|v|_{2, K_j} = |v|_{H^2(K_j)}$
- p. 54, l. 10: $)^{1/2}$ should be $)^{1/2}$
- p. 55, l. 9: v should be u
- p. 56, l. 21: $\leq s$ should be $\leq k$
- p. 61, l. 11-: $.$ should be $,$
- p. 65, l. 12: We then find should be We then find, for $2 \leq s \leq r$,
- p. 65, l. 13: r should be s
- p. 65, l. 14: These ... should be These estimates thus show a reduced convergence rate $O(h^s)$ if $v \in H^s$ with $s < r$.
- p. 73, l. 20-: $\|I_h v - v\|_{C(K_j)}$ should be $\|I_h v - v\|_{C(K_j)} = \|I_h(v - Q_1 v) + (Q_1 v - v)\|_{C(K_j)}$
- p. 81, l. 11: dimension n should be dimension m
- p. 87, l. Example 6.2: \int_0^1 should be \int_0^b
- p. 88, l. 1: a_0 should be $a_0 > 0$
- p. 88, l. 9: $a_{j+1/2}U_{j+1} + (a_{j+1/2} + a_{j-1/2})U_j - a_{j-1/2}U_{j-1}$ should be $a_{j+1/2}U_{j+1} - (a_{j+1/2} + a_{j-1/2})U_j + a_{j-1/2}U_{j-1}$
- p. 93, l. Problem 6.3: Assume that Ω is such that (3.36) holds.
- p. 96, l. 3: he should be the
- p. 97, l. 7-: $g = P^{-1}u$ should be $g = P^{-1}f$
- p. 112, l. 11: Bu should be By
- p. 112, l. 18: has should be have
- p. 115, l. 11: $\hat{v}_j^k e^{-\lambda_j t}$ should be $\hat{v}_i e^{-\lambda_i t}$
- p. 115, l. 3-: C_1 should be $\frac{1}{2}C_1$
- p. 117, l. 8: t^{-k} should be $t^{-m-s/2}$
- p. 117, l. 3-: $D_t^m E(t)v(\cdot, t)$ should be $D_t^m E(t)v$
- p. 117, l. 15: (6.4) should be Theorem 6.4
- p. 119, l. 4: $D_t e$ should be $D_t E$
- p. 119, l. (8.27): $=$ should be \leq
- p. 123, l. 3: (\bar{x}, \bar{t}) should be (\tilde{x}, \tilde{t})
- p. 124, l. 15: $|u(x, t)| \leq e^{c|x|^2}$ should be $|u(x, t)| \leq M e^{c|x|^2}$
- p. 133, l. 3: $\sum_p a_p e^{i(j-p)\xi_0}$ should be $\epsilon \sum_p a_p e^{i(j-p)\xi_0}$
- p. 150, l. 1-: should be Since $u_h(t) \in S_h$ we may choose $\chi = u_h(t) \dots$

- p. 150, l. 1-: $U^n \in S_h$ should be $u_h \in S_h$
- p. 150, l. 1-: $\chi = u$ should be $\chi = u_h$
- p. 154, l. 7: 10.1 should be 10.3
- p. 155, l. 1: $\left(\int_0^t \|\rho_t\|_2 ds\right)^{1/2}$ should be $\left(\int_0^t \|\rho_t\|^2 ds\right)^{1/2}$
- p. 155, l. 9-: v should be w (four times)
- p. 155, l. 3-: v should be w
- p. 156, l. 12: Φ should be Φ_j
- p. 158, l. 4-: method should be a method
- p. 160, l. 2-: and (8.18). should be (8.18), and Problem 8.10.
- p. 165, l. 9: delete which we may assume to be symmetric,
- p. 169, l. 1: 11.2 should be 11.3
- p. 169, l. 10-: bounded should be bounded or unbounded
- p. 179, l. 16: $+ \|f\| \|u\|$ should be $+2 \|f\| \|u\|$ and $C_1 = 1$
- p. 204, l. 5: 13.3 should be 13.1
- p. 226, l. 6: $w = \lambda v$ should be $w = \lambda v$ or $v = \lambda w$
- p. 227, l. (A.4): w should be u
- p. 233, l. 14: for $1 \leq p < \infty$. should be for $1 \leq p < \infty$, if Γ is sufficiently smooth.
- p. 232, l. 3: The latter should be If Ω is bounded, then the latter
- p. 233, l. 8: $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, and should be $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ if Ω is bounded, and
- p. 234, l. 9: C^1 should be C^1
- p. 235, l. 10: for any l . should be for any $l \geq k$, if Γ is sufficiently smooth.
- p. 237, l. 14-: $\mathcal{C}(\bar{\Omega}) \subset H^k(\Omega)$ should be $H^k(\Omega) \subset \mathcal{C}(\bar{\Omega})$
- p. 237, l. 4-: $C^\ell(\bar{\Omega}) \subset H^k(\Omega)$ should be $H^k(\Omega) \subset C^\ell(\bar{\Omega})$
- p. 239, l. 4: $L_2(\mathbf{R})$ should be $L_2(\mathbf{R}^d)$
- p. 240, l. 3: $e^{-ix \cdot \xi}$ should be $e^{-iz \cdot \xi}$
- p. 242, l. 5: $\|v\|_{W_1^2} \leq |\Omega|^{1/2} \|v\|_{H^2}$ should be $\|v\|_{W_1^2} \leq C \|v\|_{H^2}$
- p. 242, l. 12: $\nabla \hat{v}$ should be $\hat{\nabla} \hat{v}$

Here is an improved version of Theorem 6.4.

Theorem 1. *The eigenfunctions $\{\varphi_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ of (6.5) form an orthonormal basis for L_2 . The series $\sum_{j=1}^\infty \lambda_j(v, \varphi_j)^2$ is convergent if and only if $v \in H_0^1$. Moreover,*

$$\|\nabla v\|^2 = a(v, v) = \sum_{j=1}^\infty \lambda_j(v, \varphi_j)^2, \quad \text{for all } v \in H_0^1. \quad (1)$$

Proof. By our above discussion it follows that for the first statement it suffices to show (6.13) for all v in H_0^1 , which is a dense subspace of L_2 . We shall demonstrate that

$$\left\| v - \sum_{j=1}^N (v, \varphi_j) \varphi_j \right\| \leq \lambda_{N+1}^{-1/2} \|\nabla v\|, \quad \text{for all } v \in H_0^1, \quad (2)$$

which then implies (6.13) in view of Theorem 6.3.

To prove (2), set $v_N = \sum_{j=1}^N (v, \varphi_j) \varphi_j$ and $r_N = v - v_N$. Then $(r_N, \varphi_j) = 0$ for $j = 1, \dots, N$, so that

$$\frac{\|\nabla r_N\|^2}{\|r_N\|^2} \geq \inf \left\{ \|\nabla v\|^2 : v \in H_0^1, \|v\| = 1, (v, \varphi_j) = 0, j = 1, \dots, N \right\} = \lambda_{N+1},$$

and hence

$$\|r_N\| \leq \lambda_{N+1}^{-1/2} \|\nabla r_N\|.$$

It now suffices to show that the sequence $\|\nabla r_N\|$ is bounded. We first recall from Theorem 6.1 that $a(\varphi_i, \varphi_j) = 0$ for $i \neq j$, so that $a(r_N, v_N) = 0$. Hence $a(v, v) = a(v_N, v_N) + 2a(v_N, r_N) + a(r_N, r_N) = a(v_N, v_N) + a(r_N, r_N)$ and

$$\|\nabla r_N\|^2 = a(r_N, r_N) = a(v, v) - a(v_N, v_N) \leq a(v, v) = \|\nabla v\|^2,$$

which completes the proof of (2).

For the proof of the second statement, we first note that, for $v \in H_0^1$,

$$\sum_{j=1}^N \lambda_j(v, \varphi_j)^2 = a(v_N, v_N) = a(v, v) - a(r_N, r_N) \leq a(v, v),$$

and we conclude that $\sum_{j=1}^\infty \lambda_j(v, \varphi_j)^2 < \infty$. Conversely, we assume that $v \in L_2$ and $\sum_{j=1}^\infty \lambda_j(v, \varphi_j)^2 < \infty$. We already know that $v_N \rightarrow v$ in L_2 as $N \rightarrow \infty$. To obtain convergence in H^1 we note that, with $M > N$,

$$\alpha \|v_N - v_M\|_1^2 \leq \|\nabla(v_N - v_M)\|^2 = \sum_{j=N+1}^M \lambda_j(v, \varphi_j)^2 \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

Hence, v_N is a Cauchy sequence in H^1 and converges to a limit in H^1 . Clearly, this limit is the same as v . By the trace theorem (Theorem A.4) v_N is also a Cauchy sequence in $L_2(\Gamma)$, and since $v_N = 0$ on Γ we conclude that $v = 0$ on Γ . Hence, $v \in H_0^1$. Finally, (1) is obtained by letting $N \rightarrow \infty$ in $a(v_N, v_N) = \sum_{j=1}^N \lambda_j(v, \varphi_j)^2$. \square

Here is an improved version of Theorem 13.1.

Theorem 2. *Let u_h and u be the solutions of (13.2) and (13.1). Then we have, for $t \geq 0$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_{h,t}(t) - u_t(t)\| &\leq C \left(|v_h - R_h v|_1 + \|w_h - R_h w\| \right) \\ &\quad + Ch^2 \left(\|u_t(t)\|_2 + \int_0^t \|u_{tt}\|_2 ds \right), \\ \|u_h(t) - u(t)\| &\leq C \left(|v_h - R_h v|_1 + \|w_h - R_h w\| \right) \\ &\quad + Ch^2 \left(\|u(t)\|_2 + \int_0^t \|u_{tt}\|_2 ds \right), \\ |u_h(t) - u(t)|_1 &\leq C \left(|v_h - R_h v|_1 + \|w_h - R_h w\| \right) \\ &\quad + Ch \left(\|u(t)\|_2 + \int_0^t \|u_{tt}\|_1 ds \right). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Writing as usual

$$u_h - u = (u_h - R_h u) + (R_h u - u) = \theta + \rho,$$

we may bound ρ and ρ_t as in the proof of Theorem 10.1 by

$$\|\rho(t)\| + h|\rho(t)|_1 \leq Ch^2 \|u(t)\|_2, \quad \|\rho_t(t)\| \leq Ch^2 \|u_t(t)\|_2. \quad (3)$$

For $\theta(t)$ we have, after a calculation analogous to that in (10.14),

$$(\theta_{tt}, \chi) + a(\theta, \chi) = -(\rho_{tt}, \chi), \quad \forall \chi \in S_h, \quad \text{for } t > 0. \quad (4)$$

Imitating the proof of Lemma 13.1, we choose $\chi = \theta_t$:

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} (\|\theta_t\|^2 + |\theta|_1^2) \leq \|\rho_{tt}\| \|\theta_t\|.$$

After integration in t we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\theta_t(t)\|^2 + |\theta(t)|_1^2 &\leq \|\theta_t(0)\|^2 + |\theta(0)|_1^2 + 2 \int_0^t \|\rho_{tt}\| \|\theta_t\| ds \\ &\leq \|\theta_t(0)\|^2 + |\theta(0)|_1^2 + 2 \int_0^t \|\rho_{tt}\| ds \max_{s \in [0,t]} \|\theta_t\| \\ &\leq \|\theta_t(0)\|^2 + |\theta(0)|_1^2 + 2 \left(\int_0^T \|\rho_{tt}\| ds \right)^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left(\max_{s \in [0,T]} \|\theta_t\| \right)^2, \end{aligned}$$

for $t \in [0, T]$. This implies

$$\frac{1}{2} \left(\max_{s \in [0,T]} \|\theta_t\| \right)^2 \leq \|\theta_t(0)\|^2 + |\theta(0)|_1^2 + 2 \left(\int_0^T \|\rho_{tt}\| ds \right)^2$$

and hence

$$\|\theta_t(t)\|^2 + |\theta(t)|_1^2 \leq 2\|\theta_t(0)\|^2 + 2|\theta(0)|_1^2 + 4 \left(\int_0^T \|\rho_{tt}\| ds \right)^2,$$

for $t \in [0, T]$. In particular this holds with $t = T$ where T is arbitrary. Using also bounds for ρ_{tt} similar to (3), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\theta_t(t)\| + \|\theta(t)\| &\leq C \left(\|\theta_t(t)\| + |\theta(t)|_1 \right) \\ &\leq C \left(\|w_h - R_h w\| + |v_h - R_h v|_1 \right) + Ch^2 \int_0^t \|u_{tt}\|_2 ds, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$|\theta(t)|_1 \leq C \left(\|w_h - R_h w\| + |v_h - R_h v|_1 \right) + Ch \int_0^t \|u_{tt}\|_1 \, ds.$$

Together with the bounds in (3) this completes the proof. \square

We remark that the choices $v_h = R_h v$ and $w_h = R_h w$ in Theorem 2 give optimal order error estimates for all the three quantities considered, but that other optimal choices of v_h could cause a loss of one power of h , because of the gradient in the first term on the right. This can be avoided by a more refined argument. The regularity requirement on the exact solution can also be reduced.

/stig