

Winter 2018/19, Term 2

Due Date: Thursday, 31 January 2019

Timm Treskatis

## Homework Assignment 4: Model Answers (Analytical Flavour)

Please submit the following files as indicated below: 🐼 source code 🔼 PDF file 🚨 image file 🖻 video file

**Question 1** | **1 mark** |  $\triangle$  Let  $u \in C^3(\bar{\Omega})$  with a bounded domain  $\Omega$ . For simplicity and with no real loss of generality we assume that  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}$  (because even in higher dimensions the partial derivatives are just ordinary 1D directional derivatives).

In Lemma 2.2.6 we showed that the one-sided difference quotients

$$\partial^{+h}u(x) = \frac{u(x+h) - u(x)}{h}$$
 and  $\partial^{-h}u(x) = \frac{u(x) - u(x-h)}{h}$ 

are a first-order consistent approximation of u'(x). Use the same Taylor-series technique to show that these difference quotients actually approximate u'(x) - Du''(x) "better", namely with second-order consistency, than they approximate u'(x). Here  $D \in \mathbb{R}$  is a certain number which may depend on h.

Let  $x \in \Omega$  and h > 0 such that  $[x - h, x + h] \subset \overline{\Omega}$ . Taylor expansion yields

$$u(x \pm h) = u(x) \pm hu'(x) + \frac{h^2}{2}u''(x) \pm \frac{h^3}{6}u'''(\xi_{\pm})$$

where  $\xi_+ \in ]x, x + h[$  and  $\xi_- \in ]x - h, x[$ .

We now obtain

$$\left| \partial^{\pm h} u(x) - (u'(x) - Du''(x)) \right| = \left| u'(x) \pm \frac{h}{2} u''(x) + \frac{h^2}{6} u'''(\xi_{\pm}) - (u'(x) - Du''(x)) \right| \le \frac{h^2}{6} \max_{|x - h, x + h|} |u'''|$$

with  $D = \mp \frac{h}{2}$ .

Important conclusion: Approximating an advection term with a downwind difference quotient introduces artificial anti-diffusion (uh oh - that sounds like trouble!!!), an approximation with an upwind difference quotient introduces artificial diffusion (unphysical smoothing / smearing, which is also undesirable, see Q2(d) of the applied version of this assignment).

Question 2 | 4 marks |  $\triangle$  Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  be a bounded domain and  $L: C^2(\Omega) \cap C(\bar{\Omega}) \to C(\Omega)$  a linear second-order elliptic operator. If—using the notation from the notes—its zeroth-order coefficient  $c \geq 0$ , then the operator is nonnegativity-preserving

$$Lu \ge 0 \text{ in } \Omega \quad \wedge \quad u \ge 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega \qquad \Rightarrow \qquad u \ge 0 \text{ in } \Omega$$
 (1)

(in class we only discussed the case c = 0).

For a matrix  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ , we have shown that the analogous algebraic property, namely monotonicity

$$Ax \ge 0 \qquad \Rightarrow \qquad x \ge 0,$$
 (2)

is equivalent to A being nonsingular and inverse-nonnegative. We then proved the (sufficient) monotonicity criterion that every weakly chained diagonally dominant L-matrix is monotone. Hence, a discretisation scheme that turns operators L with the property (1) into weakly chained diagonally dominant L-matrices preserves very important structure of the problem.

In this assignment, I would like you to refine these results to highlight another characteristic feature of elliptic operators<sup>1</sup>. In fact, elliptic operators of the above form have strictly positive Green's functions in the interior of  $\Omega$ , so in addition to (1) they also have the property

$$Lu \ge 0 \text{ in } \Omega \quad \wedge \quad \exists x \in \Omega : (Lu)(x) > 0 \quad \wedge \quad u \ge 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega \quad \Rightarrow \quad u > 0 \text{ in } \Omega.$$

(a) Formulate the corresponding stronger monotonicity property of matrices and show that it is equivalent to nonsingularity and inverse-positivity.

A matrix  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  satisfies (2) and additionally

$$Ax \ge 0 \quad \land \quad \exists i \in \{1, \dots, n\} : (Ax)_i > 0 \qquad \Rightarrow \qquad x > 0$$
 (3)

if and only if it is nonsingular and inverse-positive.

*Proof.* If the matrix satisfies (2) and (3) then it is nonsingular (Lemma 2.2.16) and from  $A(A^{-1})_i = e_i$  we conclude  $(A^{-1})_i > 0$  for all columns  $i \in \{1, ..., n\}$ .

Conversely, if A is nonsingular and inverse-positive, then (2) follows from Lemma 2.2.16. If  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is a vector such that  $Ax \ge 0$  with  $(Ax)_i > 0$  for one  $i \in \{1, ..., n\}$ , then  $A^{-1} > 0$  yields, for all  $j \in \{1, ..., n\}$ 

$$x_j = (A^{-1}Ax)_j = \sum_{k=1}^n (A^{-1})_{jk} (Ax)_k \ge (A^{-1})_{ji} (Ax)_i > 0,$$

which shows (3).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Even a hyperbolic operator like  $L = a \cdot \nabla$  preserves nonnegativity and also satisfies a similar maximum principle. What we look at in this question is a feature of elliptic operators only, but not of hyperbolic operators.

## (b) Can you also find and prove a sufficient criterion in the style of the M-criterion from Lemma 2.2.19 that implies this stronger form of monotonicity?

Every irreducibly diagonally dominant L-matrix satisfies the monotonicity properties (2) and (3).

*Proof.* Since every irreducibly diagonally dominant matrix is also weakly chained diagonally dominant, we have (2) due to Lemma 2.2.19.

Let  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  be an irreducibly diagonally dominant L-matrix. Let  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  be such that  $Ax \ge 0$  and  $(Ax)_i > 0$  for some  $i \in \{1, ..., n\}$ , i.e. due to the L-matrix property and  $x \ge 0$ 

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{ij} x_{j} > 0$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \qquad \qquad a_{ii} x_{i} > \sum_{j \neq i} |a_{ij}| x_{j} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}_{i}^{\circ}} |a_{ij}| x_{j}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \qquad \qquad x_{i} > \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}_{i}^{\circ}} \frac{|a_{ij}|}{a_{ii}} x_{j} \geq 0$$

$$\tag{4}$$

Assume that there exists  $i_0 \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$  for which  $x_{i_0} = 0$ . Then the same re-arrangement leads to

$$0 = x_{i_0} \ge \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}_{i_0}^{\circ}} \frac{|a_{i_0 j}|}{a_{i_0 i_0}} x_j \tag{5}$$

which is only possible if all  $x_j = 0, j \in \mathcal{S}_{i_0}^{\circ}$ .

Let  $i_0 \to i_1 \to \cdots \to i_s = i$  be a chain of indices such that  $a_{i_{l-1},i_l} \neq 0$ ,  $l = 1, \ldots, s$ . Since  $i_1 \in \mathcal{S}_{i_0}^{\circ}$ , we also have  $x_{i_1} = 0$ . Applying (5) to row  $i_1$  instead of row  $i_0$  gives  $x_{i_2} = 0$  and we continue with this argument until we find that  $x_{i_s} = x_i = 0$ , which is a contradiction to (4). Hence x > 0.

Your Learning Progress   0 marks, but -1 mark if unanswered   D V you have learnt from this assignment?	What is the one most important thing that
What is the most substantial new insight that you have gained from thi	s course this week? Any aha moment?