

Asymptotic Methods

Course given by Dr. D. Stuart
L^AT_EX by Dominic Skinner
Dom-Skinner@github.com

January 26, 2016

Contents

1 Asymptotic expansions of functions 1

Books: Bender and Orszag, “*Advanced Mathematical methods for scientists and engineers*”, Chapters 3,6,10

More details can be found on the Moodle course site; login to Moodle at <https://www.vle.cam.ac.uk/login/index.php>, then self-enrol into the Asymptotic methods course.

What we’ll learn in this course

Examples:

1. $I(\lambda) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp[-\lambda \cosh u] du$

We expect that $I(\lambda) \rightarrow 0$ as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$. But how fast?

2. $i\hbar \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{\partial^2 \psi}{\partial x^2} + V(x)$ with $\psi(x, t) \in \mathbb{C}$, $V = V(x)$.

Look for a solution $\psi(x, t) = \exp\left[\frac{-iEt}{\hbar}\right] f(x) \implies \hbar^2 f'' = 2m(V(x) - E)f$

\hbar is very small. So a natural problem is to try and understand $\epsilon^2 \frac{d^2 y}{dx^2} = Q(x)y$ when $\epsilon \ll 1$.
The “semi-classical limit” or “geometric optics”.

3. Put $\hbar = 1$, $m = \frac{1}{2}$, $V = 0$; specify $\psi(x, 0) = \psi_0(x)$

Fourier transform $\rightarrow \psi(x, t) = \frac{1}{(4\pi it)^{1/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp\left[\frac{i|x-y|^2}{4t}\right] \psi_0(y) dy$.

Question: Does $\psi(x, t)$ really approach $\psi_0(x)$ as $t \rightarrow 0$?

1 Asymptotic expansions of functions

$$\sinh x = \frac{e^x - e^{-x}}{2} = x + \frac{x^3}{3!} + \frac{x^5}{5!} + \dots$$

say $\sinh x \sim x$ as $x \rightarrow 0$.

Definition: $f \sim g$ as $x \rightarrow x_0$ is $|f(x) - g(x)| = o(g(x))$ as $x \rightarrow x_0$.

Example:

$$|\sinh x - x| = \left| \frac{x^3}{3!} + \frac{x^5}{5!} + \dots \right| = O(x^3) = o(x)$$

($F = O(G)$ as $x \rightarrow x_0$ means $\exists C > 0$ such that $|F(x)| \leq C|G(x)|$ in some open interval I , with $x_0 \in I$)
In fact, by remainder estimate for Taylor expansion

$$\left| \sinh x - \sum_0^N \frac{x^{2n+1}}{(2n+1)!} \right| = O(x^{2N+3}) = o(x^{2N+1}) \text{ as } x \rightarrow 0$$

We write $\sinh x \sim \sum_0^\infty \frac{x^{2n+1}}{(2n+1)!}$

Definition: Asymptotic sequence and asymptotic expansion.

- (i) $\{\phi_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ is an asymptotic sequence (of functions) as $x \rightarrow x_0$ if $\phi_{n+1}(x) = o(\phi_n(x))$ as $x \rightarrow x_0$.
- (ii) A function f has asymptotic expansion w.r.t. $\{\phi_n\}$ as $x \rightarrow x_0$ written $f \sim \sum_{n=0}^\infty a_n \phi_n$ if

$$\left| f(x) - \sum_{n=0}^N a_n \phi_n(x) \right| = o(\phi_N(x)) \text{ as } x \rightarrow x_0 \forall N$$

Notice the difference with Taylor expansion - an asymptotic expansion need not converge as $N \rightarrow \infty$ for any x !

Examples:

- $\{\phi_n(x) = x^n\}$ as $x \rightarrow 0$, the most common sequence.
- $\{\phi_n(x) = x^{2n+1}\}$ as $x \rightarrow 0$
- $\{\phi_n(x) = e^{-n/x}\}$ as $x \rightarrow 0^+$ (i.e. $x > 0$ and $x \rightarrow 0$ on right)

Warning: $\sin x \sim x - \frac{x^3}{3!} - \frac{x^5}{5!} + \dots$ as $x \rightarrow 0$.
 $\sin x + e^{-1/x} \sim x - \frac{x^3}{3!} + \frac{x^5}{5!} - \dots$ as $x \rightarrow 0^+$.

Why?

$$\left| \sin x + e^{-1/x} - \sum_0^N \frac{(-1)^n x^{2n+1}}{(2n+1)!} \right| = \left| \sum_{n=2N+1}^\infty \frac{(-1)^n x^{2n+1}}{(2n+1)!} + e^{-1/x} \right| = O(x^{2N+3}) = o(x^{2N+1})$$

Moral: information is lost in asymptotic expansions!

However, given f and asymptotic sequence, the a_j 's are unique, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} a_0 &= \lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} \frac{f(x)}{\phi_0(x)} \\ a_1 &= \lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} \frac{f(x) - a_0 \phi_0(x)}{\phi_1(x)} \\ &\vdots \end{aligned}$$

Question: Is it possible that $f(x) \sim 0$ as $x \rightarrow 0$?

If $|f(x) - 0| = o(0) = 0$ in some interval I , containing 0, then $f \equiv 0$ on I .

Example: Consider $E_1(x) = \int_x^\infty \frac{e^{-t}}{t} dt$ as $x \rightarrow +\infty$.

Consider the asymptotic sequence $\phi_n(x) = 1/x^n$ as $x \rightarrow +\infty$

$$E_1(x) = \int_x^\infty \frac{-d(e^{-t})}{t} = \left[-\frac{e^{-t}}{t} \right]_x^\infty - \int_x^\infty \frac{e^{-t}}{t^2} dt = \frac{e^{-x}}{x} - \int_x^\infty \frac{e^{-t}}{t^2} dt$$

Claim: $E_1(x) \sim e^{-x}/x$ as $x \rightarrow +\infty$.

$$\left| E_1(x) - \frac{e^{-x}}{x} \right| = \left| \int_x^\infty \frac{e^{-t}}{t^2} dt \right| \leq \frac{1}{x^2} \int_x^\infty e^{-t} dt = \frac{e^{-x}}{x^2} = o\left(\frac{e^{-x}}{x}\right)$$

Working out the full expansion of E_1 with respect to $\phi_n = e^{-x}/x^n$ gives that.

$$E_1(x) \sim \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n n! e^{-x}}{x^{n+1}}$$

What do we mean?

(i) $\phi_n(x) = e^{-x}/x^{n+1}$ satisfies $\phi_{n+1}(x) = o(\phi_n(x))$ as $x \rightarrow +\infty$. i.e. it forms an “asymptotic sequence.”

(ii) The notation “ \sim ” (“asymptotic to”) means

$$\left| E_1(x) - \sum_{n=0}^N \frac{(-1)^n n! e^{-x}}{x^{n+1}} \right| = o\left(\frac{e^{-x}}{x^{N+1}}\right) \text{ as } x \rightarrow +\infty$$

This can be proved with integration by parts:

$$\begin{aligned} E_1(x) &= - \int_x^\infty \frac{1}{t} d(e^{-t}) = e^{-x}/x + \int_x^\infty \frac{1}{t^2} d(e^{-t}) \\ &= e^{-x}/x - e^{-x}/x^2 + 2 \int_x^\infty \frac{e^{-t}}{t^3} dt \\ &= e^{-x} \left[\frac{1}{x} - \frac{1}{x^2} + \frac{2!}{x^3} - \frac{3!}{x^4} + \cdots + \frac{(-1)^n n!}{x^{n+1}} \right] + \underbrace{(-1)^{n+1} (n+1)! \int_x^\infty \frac{e^{-t}}{t^{n+2}} dt}_{Rem_{n+1}(x)} \end{aligned}$$

Where

$$|Rem_{n+1}(x)| \leq \frac{(n+1)!}{x^{n+2}} \int_x^\infty e^{-t} dt = \frac{(n+1)! e^{-x}}{x^{n+2}} = o\left(\frac{e^{-x}}{x^{n+1}}\right) \text{ as } x \rightarrow +\infty$$

So it is an asymptotic expansion. Not convergent because $\sum (-1)^n n! y^{n+1}$ has radius of convergence 0. (In fact for fixed y the terms become unbounded.)

Consider magnitudes of successive terms $f_n(x) = \frac{(-1)^n n! e^{-x}}{x^{n+1}}$

$$\left| \frac{f_{n+1}(x)}{f_n(x)} \right| = \frac{n+1}{x}$$

Optimal truncation: Truncate the asymptotic expansion at the point $n = N_x$, such that the first term excluded is the smallest.

In our example, choose $N_x = [x] - 1 = \sup\{j - 1 : j \leq x, j \in \mathbb{N}\}$

$$\left. \begin{aligned} |f_{N_x+1}(x)/f_{N_x}(x)| &= (N_x + 1)/x \leq 1 \\ |f_{N_x+2}(x)/f_{N_x+1}(x)| &= (N_x + 2)/x > 1 \end{aligned} \right\} \text{ so } f_{N_x+1} \text{ is the smallest term, later terms are larger}$$

So we write

$$E_1(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{N_x} \frac{(-1)^n n! e^{-x}}{x^{n+1}} + \text{Rem}_{N_x+1}(x)$$

$$|\text{Rem}_{n+1}(x)| \leq \frac{(N_x + 1)!}{x^{N_x+2}} e^{-x} = \frac{[x]! e^{-x}}{x^{[x]+1}} \leq \frac{2 \left(\frac{[x]}{e}\right)^{[x]} \sqrt{2\pi[x]} e^{-x}}{x^{[x]+1}} \leq \frac{2\sqrt{2\pi[x]}}{[x]} e^{-x} e^{-[x]}$$

Where we have used Stirling's formula.

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n!}{(n/e)^n \sqrt{2\pi n}} \rightarrow 1 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

The good new is the additional $e^{-[x]}$ term. Optimal truncation (often) gives an exponentially small remainder.

Examples:

$$\sinh x = \frac{e^x - e^{-x}}{2} \sim e^{-x}/2 \text{ as } x \rightarrow +\infty$$

Works because $e^{-x} = o(e^x)$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$

$$\text{sech } x = \frac{2}{e^x + e^{-x}} = \frac{2}{e^x} (1 + e^{-2x})^{-1} = \frac{2}{e^x} (1 - e^{-2x} + e^{-4x} - \dots)$$

This gives an asymptotic expansion for the sequence $\phi_n = e^{-nx}$ (Which is asymptotic since $e^{-x} = o(e^x)$ as $x \rightarrow +\infty$)

Note: $\sinh x \sim -e^{-x}/2$ as $x \rightarrow -\infty$

Consider $\sinh z$, for $z \in \mathbb{C}$

$$\sinh z = \frac{e^z - e^{-z}}{2} = \frac{e^{x+iy} - e^{-x-iy}}{2}$$

$$\sim e^z/2 \text{ as } z \rightarrow \infty \text{ in sector } \left\{-\frac{\pi}{2} < \arg(z) < \frac{\pi}{2}\right\}$$

$$\sim e^{-z}/2 \text{ as } z \rightarrow \infty \text{ in sector } \left\{\frac{\pi}{2} < \arg(z) < \frac{3\pi}{2}\right\}$$

Conclusion: The asymptotic seems to change suddenly when going from sector to sector.

The lines separating the different sectors are Stokes Lines.

Exercise: Prove that the definition of asymptotics in a sector must satisfy that you do not approach Stokes lines too fast.

Terminology:

$$\left. \begin{array}{ll} e^z/2 & \text{dominant} \\ -e^z/2 & \text{subdominant or recessive} \end{array} \right\} \text{ for } \text{Arg } z \in (-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2})$$

On Stokes lines, neither of these terms is dominant. This means that the asymptotic relation holds if “ $z \rightarrow \infty$ but not approaching Stokes lines.”

Why? Consider $z_n = 1/n + in^2$ has $\text{Re } z_n > 0$, and $|z_n| \rightarrow \infty$.

$$\sinh z_n = \frac{1}{2} \left(e^{1/n+in^2} - e^{-1/n-in^2} \right)$$

where

$$\sinh z_n \sim \frac{1}{2} e^{1/n+in^2}$$

means that

$$\left| \sinh z_n - \frac{1}{2} e^{1/n+in^2} \right| = \frac{1}{2} \left| e^{-1/n-in^2} \right| = \frac{1}{2} e^{-1/n}$$

but $e^{-1/n} \neq o(e^{1/n})$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. So we must consider $z \rightarrow \infty$ with $\text{Arg } z \in [-\frac{\pi}{2} + \epsilon, \frac{\pi}{2} - \epsilon]$ for some $\epsilon > 0$

Definition:

$$f(z) \sim a_0 + \frac{a_1}{z} + \frac{a_2}{z^2} + \dots \quad (z \rightarrow \infty, \text{Arg } z \in (\alpha, \beta))$$

means given $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $\epsilon > 0$ sufficiently small

$$\left| f(z) - \sum_{i=0}^N \frac{a_i}{z^i} \right| = o(z^{-N})$$

as $z \rightarrow \infty$ $\text{Arg } z \in [\alpha + \epsilon, \beta - \epsilon]$ In this case we write

$$f(z) = \sum_{i=0}^N \frac{a_i}{z^i} \quad (z \rightarrow \infty; \text{Arg } z \in (\alpha, \beta))$$

Exercise: Write out corresponding definition for

$$f(z) = \sum_{i=0}^N a_i (z - z_0)^i \quad (z \rightarrow z_0; \text{Arg } (z - z_0) \in (\alpha, \beta))$$

Example:

$$\sinh \frac{1}{z} \sim \frac{1}{2} e^{1/z} \quad (z \rightarrow 0; \text{Arg } z \in (-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}))$$

but

$$\sinh \frac{1}{z} \sim -\frac{1}{2} e^{-1/z} \quad (z \rightarrow 0; \text{Arg } z \in (\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{3\pi}{2}))$$

(fails on Stokes line)

Consider complex analytic (holomorphic) functions:

$$f(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n (z - z_0)^n$$

if f is holomorphic near z_0 and then

$$f(z) \sim \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n (z - z_0)^n \quad (z \rightarrow z_0; \text{Arg } z \in [0, 2\pi])$$

Fact: If z_0 is an isolated singularity, i.e. f is holomorphic in $\{z : 0 < |z - z_0| < r\}$ for some $r > 0$ and

$$f(z) \sim \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n (z - z_0)^n \quad (z \rightarrow z_0; \text{Arg } z \in [0, 2\pi])$$

then z_0 is a removable singularity, and $\sum a_n (z - z_0)^n$ converges to f in some neighbourhood of z_0 .

Why? At isolated singularity z_0 either

- removable $\implies |f(z)|$ bounded as $z \rightarrow z_0$
- Pole $f(z) = \frac{a_{-N}}{(z-z_0)^N} + \frac{a_{-N+1}}{(z-z_0)^{N-1}} + \dots$
- essential singularity $f(z) = \sum_{-\infty}^{\infty} a_j (z - z_0)^j$ where some $a_{-n} \neq 0$ for arbitrarily large n

The last two have $|f(z)| \rightarrow \infty$ as $z \rightarrow z_0$ on some sequence.

Notice that if $f(z) \sim \sum_0^{\infty} a_n (z - z_0)^n$ holds for all $\text{Arg } z$ then $|f(z) - a_0| = o(1)$ as $z \rightarrow z_0 \forall \text{Arg}(z - z_0)$. I.e. $|f(z)|$ is bounded as $|z - z_0| \rightarrow 0$.

Therefore z_0 is a removable singularity, i.e. f is analytic at z_0 . So $f(z) = \sum a_n (z - z_0)^n$ by uniqueness of asymptotic expansions. So we will often end up considering asymptotic expansions at essential singularities.

Differential Equations

$\sinh x$ solves $\frac{d^2 y}{dx^2} = y$, with $y(0) = 0$, $y'(0) = 1$. $x = 0$ is an “ordinary point”.

Recall:

$$y'' + C_1(x)y' + C_0(x)y = 0$$

$x = 0$ is an ordinary point if

$$C_j(x) = \sum_0^{\infty} c_{jn} x^n, \quad j = 0, 1$$

(and these are convergent)

$x = 0$ is a regular singular point if

$$C_1(x) = \frac{1}{x} P_1(x), \quad C_0(x) = \frac{1}{x^2} P_0(x)$$

where $P_j = \sum_0^{\infty} P_{jn} x^n$, $j = 0, 1$ (and these are convergent).

(This is also written $x^2 y'' + x P_1(x) y' + P_0(x) y = 0$)

Let's see heuristically why y can be singular at a regular point but not an ordinary point. Assume

$$y = b_0 x^a + b_1 x^{a+1} + \dots$$

with $a < 0$.

$$\begin{aligned}y' &= ab_0x^{a-1} + (a+1)b_1x^a + \dots \\y'' &= a(a-1)b_0x^{a-2} + (a+1)ab_1x^{a-1} + \dots\end{aligned}$$

There is no possibility to balance the “worst terms” x^{a-2} at an ordinary point. At a regular singular point we can hope to balance the worst terms because

$$x^2x^{a-2} = x^a$$