

Numerical Analysis of PDE I, Spring 2024, HW#5.

Assignment day: March 24th, 2024

Ignacio Tomas¹, Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Texas Tech University.

Problem #1. *Applications of Deny-Lions.* Prove the following Poincare-like inequalities invoking the Deny-Lions lemma:

$$\begin{aligned}\|u\|_{H^1(\Omega)} &\leq c_p(\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + |\int_{\partial\Omega} u \, ds|) \\ \|u\|_{H^1(\Omega)} &\leq c_p(\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + |\int_{\Omega} u \, d\mathbf{x}|) \\ \|u\|_{H^1(\Omega)} &\leq c_p(\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + |\int_{\Omega_0} u \, d\mathbf{x}|)\end{aligned}$$

where Ω_0 is any subset of Ω of positive measure.

Problem #2. *Proper mapping for $H(\operatorname{div}, \Omega)$ functions.* Consider the scalar-valued function $v(\mathbf{x})$ that is related to the function $\widehat{v}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}})$ by the relationship $v(\mathbf{T}_K(\widehat{\mathbf{x}})) = \widehat{v}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}})$, where $\mathbf{T}_K(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) : \widehat{K} \rightarrow K$. Assume that the mapping is affine, that is $\mathbf{T}_K(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) = A_K \widehat{\mathbf{x}} + b_K$ and that $\det A_K > 0$. Then we have that $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{T}_K(\widehat{\mathbf{x}})$ and $\nabla_{\widehat{\mathbf{x}}}\mathbf{x} = A_K$. The relationship $v(\mathbf{T}_K(\widehat{\mathbf{x}})) = \widehat{v}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}})$ is often called the pullback map, and preserves a few important properties. In particular, if $q(\mathbf{x})$ vanishes on the boundary of K , then $\widehat{q}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) := q(\mathbf{T}_K(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}))$ vanishes on the boundary of \widehat{K} (and converse). However, we might be interested in mappings that preserve other important properties. Let $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x}) : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ be a vector-valued function. Consider the mapping for vector-valued functions defined by $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{T}_K(\widehat{\mathbf{x}})) = \frac{1}{\det A_K} A_K \widehat{\mathbf{v}}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}})$, which is known as the contravariant Piola transform. Then:

1. Using the chain rule show that $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}v = A_K^{-\top} \nabla_{\widehat{\mathbf{x}}}\widehat{v}$.
2. Show that $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{\det A_K} \widehat{\operatorname{div}} \widehat{\mathbf{v}}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}})$, where $\widehat{\operatorname{div}}$ is the divergence with respect to $\widehat{\mathbf{x}}$.
Hint: do not try to prove this identity as a sheer brute-force chain-rule exercise. Instead consider proving that $\int_K \operatorname{div} \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x}) q(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x} = \int_{\widehat{K}} \widehat{\operatorname{div}} \widehat{\mathbf{v}}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) q(\mathbf{T}_K(\widehat{\mathbf{x}})) \, d\widehat{\mathbf{x}}$ for all $q(\mathbf{x}) \in C_0^\infty(K)$. Note that $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x})$ is mapped using the contravariant map, while $q(\mathbf{x})$ is mapped using the pullback transform. You will have to use the result of Part 1.
3. Multiply both sides of the identity $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{\det A_K} \widehat{\operatorname{div}} \widehat{\mathbf{v}}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}})$ by the measure of volume $d\mathbf{x}$ and integrate in K : What do you get?

Note. The contravariant Piola-transform is important for the implementation of $H(\operatorname{div}, \Omega)$ finite elements. The contravariant transform does the right job even if $\mathbf{T}_K(\widehat{\mathbf{x}})$ is non-affine. On the other hand, the pullback map cannot be used to map div-conformig elements since it does not preserve the divergence or normal components of $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x})$.

¹<https://www.math.ttu.edu/~igtomas/>, igtomas@ttu.edu

Problem #3. Condition numbers. Let $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ be nonsingular symmetric matrix. The condition number of \mathbf{A} in the 2-norm is $\kappa(\mathbf{A}) = \|\mathbf{A}\|_2 \|\mathbf{A}^{-1}\|_2$. This number dictates the performance iterative solvers. Show that:

- (a) If \mathbf{A} is symmetric positive definite, then $\kappa(\mathbf{A}) = \frac{\lambda_{\max}}{\lambda_{\min}}$, where λ_{\max} (resp λ_{\min}) is the largest (resp smallest) eigenvalue of \mathbf{A} .
- (b) The condition number of the mass matrix $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ with entries given by $\mathbf{M}_{ij} = \int_{\Omega} \phi_i(\mathbf{x}) \phi_j(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}$ over a quasi-uniform triangulation \mathcal{T}_h of size h satisfies $\kappa(\mathbf{M}) = \mathcal{O}(1)$.
Hint: use the results of Problem #3 from Homework #4.
- (c) The condition number of the stiffness matrix \mathbf{K} with entries $\mathbf{K}_{ij} = \int_{\Omega} \nabla \phi_i \cdot \nabla \phi_j d\mathbf{x}$ for the case of vanishing Dirichlet boundary conditions over a quasi-uniform triangulation \mathcal{T}_h of size h satisfies $\kappa(\mathbf{K}) = \mathcal{O}(h^{-2}) = \mathcal{O}(N^{\frac{2}{d}})$ where N is the total number of degree of freedom.
Hint: use the results of Problem #3 from Homework #4.

Problem #4. Consistency of quadrature under lumping. Let $a(u, v) = (c \nabla u, \nabla v)_{L^2(\Omega)}$, where $c(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{C}^2(\Omega)$ and $F(v) = (f, v)_{L^2(\Omega)}$ denote the “exact” bilinear form and right hand side functional. Consider the three-point quadrature rule

$$q_K(g) = \frac{1}{3} |K| \sum_{i=1}^3 g(\mathbf{x}_i)$$

where $g \in \mathcal{C}^0(K)$ and $\{\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_3\}$ are the vertex coordinates of the triangle K , in order to approximate the integral $\int_K g d\mathbf{x}$. Indeed, this quadrature formula is a generalization of the trapezoidal rule. Using similar techniques to those of problem #5 in homework #4 we can easily prove that:

$$|q_K(g) - \int_K g d\mathbf{x}| \leq ch^2 |g|_{W^{2,1}(K)} \quad (*)$$

Consider the functionals $a_{h,K}(u, v)$ and $F_{h,K}(v)$ defined in each element as

$$a_{h,K}(u, v) := q_K(uv) \text{ and } F_{h,K}(v) := q_K(fv)$$

such that $a_h(u, v) = \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} a_{h,K}(u, v)$ and $F_h(v) = \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} F_{h,K}(v)$. Let \mathbb{V}_h be defined by

$$\mathbb{V}_h = \{v \in \mathcal{C}(\Omega) \mid v|_K \in \mathbb{P}_1(K) \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h\}$$

Prove that:

$$\begin{aligned} c_1 |v_h|_{H^1(\Omega)} &\leq a_h(v_h, v_h) \leq c_2 |v_h|_{H^1(\Omega)} \\ |a_h(v_h, w_h) - a(v_h, w_h)| &\leq ch^2 \|a\|_{\mathcal{C}^2(\Omega)} |v_h|_{H^1(\Omega)} |w_h|_{H^1(\Omega)} \\ |F_h(v_h) - F(v_h)| &\leq ch^2 \|f\|_{H^2(\Omega)} |v_h|_{H^1(\Omega)} \end{aligned}$$

for all $v_h, w_h \in \mathbb{V}_h$, where the constants are independent of v_h and w_h .

Hint. First important observation is that the functional $q_K(g)$ is exact for all $g \in \mathbb{P}_1(K)$. The second important observation is that if $v_h|_K \in \mathbb{P}_1(K)$ therefore $\nabla v_h|_K \in [\mathbb{P}_0(K)]^d$. The proofs of the second and third inequalities will require using the error estimate (). At some point of the proof you will have to use the fact that the elementwise hessian of functions in the space \mathbb{V}_h is zero.*