Solution of the exercises

Nicola Perin

February 20, 2025

Contents

1 Lecture 1

1.1 Proof that $A(u,v)$ and $F(v)$ in the Poisson problem satisfy the hypotheses of the Lax-Milgram lemma

We need to show that the bilinear form

$$A(u,v) = \int_0^1 u'(x)v'(x)\,dx.$$

is continuous:

$$\exists \gamma > 0 : |A(u,v)| \leq \gamma \|u\|_V \|v\|_V \quad \forall u, v \in V.$$

and coercive:

$$\exists \alpha_0 > 0 : A(u,u) \geq \alpha_0 \|u\|_V^2 \quad \forall u \in V.$$

We also need to show that the linear functional

$$F(v) = \int_0^1 f(x)v(x)\,dx.$$

is continuous:

$$\exists \beta > 0 : |F(v)| \leq \beta \|v\|_V \quad \forall v \in V.$$

1.1.1 Continuity of $A(u, v)$

Recall that the norm on $V = H_0^1(0,1)$ is given by

$$\|u\|_V = \left(\int_0^1 |u'(x)|^2 \, dx \right)^{1/2}.$$

Now, consider the absolute value of $A(u, v)$:

$$|A(u,v)| = \left| \int_0^1 u'(x)v'(x) \, dx \right|.$$

Using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality:

$$|A(u,v)| \leq \left(\int_0^1 |u'(x)|^2 \, dx \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_0^1 |v'(x)|^2 \, dx \right)^{1/2}.$$

But this is exactly $\|u\|_V \|v\|_V$. Therefore, the bilinear form $A(u, v)$ is continuous with $\gamma = 1$:

$$|A(u,v)| \leq \|u\|_V \|v\|_V.$$

1.1.2 Coercivity of $A(u, v)$

$$A(u,u) = \int_0^1 |u'(x)|^2 \, dx = \|u\|_V^2.$$

If we take $\alpha = 1$ we get:

$$A(u,u) = \|u\|_V^2 \geq \alpha \|u\|_V^2.$$

Thus $A(u, v)$ is coercive with $\alpha = 1$.

1.1.3 Continuity of $F(v)$

Using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality:

$$|F(v)| = \left| \int_0^1 f(x)v(x) \, dx \right| \leq \left(\int_0^1 |f(x)|^2 \, dx \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_0^1 |v(x)|^2 \, dx \right)^{1/2}$$

and recognizing the L^2-norm:

$$\|f\|_{L^2(0,1)} = \left(\int_0^1 |f(x)|^2 \, dx \right)^{1/2}$$

we obtain:

$$|F(v)| \leq \|f\|_{L^2(0,1)} \|v\|_{L^2(0,1)}.$$

Now from the Poincaré inequality we know that for $v \in H_0^1(0,1)$:

$$\|v\|_{L^2(0,1)} \leq C_p \|v'\|_{L^2(0,1)} = C_p \|v\|_V$$

Thus, $F(v)$ is continuous with $\beta = \|f\|_{L^2(0,1)} C_p$:

$$|F(v)| \leq \|f\|_{L^2(0,1)} C_p \|v\|_V.$$

1.2 Proof that if u minimizes the energy functional then is solution of the weak problem

Given the potential energy functional

$$J(v) = \frac{1}{2}A(v,v) - F(v)$$

we want to prove that if a function u minimizes such functional, is then solution of the weak problem $A(u,v) = F(v)$. Let's introduce the auxiliary $u_\epsilon = u + \epsilon v$ and compute

$$\frac{d}{d\epsilon}\left[J(u+\epsilon v)\right]_{\epsilon=0} = 0$$

- substitute the expression for J:

$$\frac{d}{d\epsilon}\left[\frac{1}{2}A(u+\epsilon v, u+\epsilon v) - F(u+\epsilon v)\right]_{\epsilon=0} = 0$$

- expand both A and F:

$$\frac{d}{d\epsilon}\left[\frac{1}{2}A(u,u) + \epsilon A(u,v) + \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^2 A(v,v) - F(u) - \epsilon F(v)\right]_{\epsilon=0} = 0$$

- compute the derivative:

$$\left[A(u,v) + \epsilon A(v,v) - F(v)\right]_{\epsilon=0} = 0$$

- evaluating at $\epsilon = 0$ and rearranging we get

$$A(u,v) = F(v)$$

  which is the weak formulation we wanted.

2 Lecture 2

2.1 Proof of the Strong maximum principle for harmonic functions

Let Ω be a connected open subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and u be a harmonic function, i.e., $\Delta u = 0$, such that $u \in C^2(\Omega) \cap C(\overline{\Omega})$. Then:

1. $\max_{\overline{\Omega}} u = \max_{\partial\Omega} u$.
2. If $\exists\ x_0 \in \Omega$ such that $u(x_0) = \max_{\overline{\Omega}} u = M$, then u is constant in Ω.

By contradiction suppose that u attains its maximum at some point $x_0 \in \Omega$, i.e. $u(x_0) = \max_{\overline{\Omega}} u$; now letting $B(x_0, r) \subset \Omega$, it follows that since u is harmonic, by the mean value property its value at a point is equal to the average integral over a sphere of any radius centred at that point:

$$M = u(x_0) = \frac{1}{|B(x_0, r)|} \int_{B(x_0,r)} u(x) dx.$$

For the average to be equal to the maximum value it must be that $u(x) = M$ $\forall x \in B(x_0, r)$.

Now consider the set

$$\{x \in \Omega : u(x) = M\}$$

this set is open because inside the open ball $B(x_0, r)$ where $u(x_0) = M$, all nearby points satisfy also $u(y) = M$. Since u is continuous, if a sequence of points in $B(x_0, r)$ converges to a point in Ω, that point must also be in $B(x_0, r)$; this implies that the set is also relatively closed in Ω. If a non-empty set S is both open and closed within a connected space U, then it must be the entire space:

1. suppose S is not the entire space U; then $U \backslash S$ is non-empty
2. since S is open and relatively closed, $U \backslash S$ is both relatively open and relatively closed
3. this would imply that U can be divided into two disjoint, non-empty, open subsets, which contradicts the assumption that it is connected

We conclude that the set

$$\{x \in \Omega : u(x) = M\}$$

is the entire space Ω and thus u is constant in Ω.

2.2 Proof of the corollary (uniqueness for Poisson)

Suppose there exist two solutions u and v to the Poisson problem:

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = g & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta v = f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ v = g & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

defining $w = u - v$ we get:

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta w = -\Delta u + \Delta v = f - f = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ w = u - v = g - g = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

so w is a harmonic function that is null on $\partial\Omega$ and we can apply the strong maximum principle: since w achieves both its maximum and minimum on the boundary, it must be constant on Ω, thus proving $u = v$.

3 Lecture 3

3.1 Convergence of the truncation error

Given the finite difference discretization

$$-\frac{a_i}{h^2}(u_{i+1} - 2u_i + u_{i-1}) + \frac{b_i}{2h}(u_{i+1} - u_{i-1}) = f_i$$

we want to show that the truncation error $|T| = |Lu(x_i) - L_h(u(x_i)|$ is bounded by

$$|T| \leq \frac{h^2}{12}\|a\|\|u^{(4)}\| + \frac{h^2}{6}\|b\|\|u^{(3)}\|$$

3.1.1 Second derivative term

Using Taylor expansion around x_i:

$$u_{i+1} = u(x_i+h) = u(x_i)+hu'(x_i)+\frac{h^2}{2}u''(x_i)+\frac{h^3}{6}u^{(3)}(x_i)+\frac{h^4}{24}u^{(4)}(x_i)+O(h^5)$$

$$u_{i-1} = u(x_i-h) = u(x_i)-hu'(x_i)+\frac{h^2}{2}u''(x_i)-\frac{h^3}{6}u^{(3)}(x_i)+\frac{h^4}{24}u^{(4)}(x_i)+O(h^5)$$

Thus $u_{i+1} - 2u_i + u_{i-1} = h^2u''(x_i) + \frac{h^4}{12}u^{(4)}(x_i) + O(h^6)$

3.1.2 First derivative term

Using the same Taylor expansion around x_i we get:

$$u_{i+1} - u_{i-1} = 2hu'(x_i) + \frac{2h^3}{6}u^{(3)}(x_i) + O(h^5)$$

3.1.3 Combine the errors

Combining the truncation errors for both terms, we have:

$$T_i = -a_i\left(\frac{h^2}{12}u^{(4)}(x_i)\right) + b_i\left(\frac{h^2}{6}u^{(3)}(x_i)\right)$$

Taking the absolute value and using the norms $\|a\|$ and $\|b\|$, we get:

$$|T_i| \leq \frac{h^2}{12}\|a\|\|u^{(4)}\| + \frac{h^2}{6}\|b\|\|u^{(3)}\|.$$

3.2 Construction of a 3-point scheme: method of undetermined coefficients

We want to find the best combination of values for the coefficients $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ that appear in the finite difference operator

$$L = \alpha u_{i+1} + \beta u_i + \gamma u_{i-1}$$

so that the approximation $u''(x_i) = u''_i$ is the best possible. We start by expanding using Taylor series:

$$L = \alpha\left(u_i + h_{i+1}u'_i + \frac{h_{i+1}^2}{2}u''_i + \frac{h_i^3}{6}u'''(\xi_{i+1})\right) + \beta u_i + \gamma\left(u_i - h_i u'_i + \frac{h_i^2}{2}u''_i + \frac{h_i^3}{6}u'''(\xi_i)\right)$$

The terms of order 0 and 1 must cancel out, while the second order term must have coefficient 1, so we get the following conditions on the coefficients:

$$\begin{cases} \alpha + \beta + \gamma = 0 \\ \alpha h_{i+1} - \gamma h_i = 0 \\ \alpha \frac{h_{i+1}^2}{2} + \gamma \frac{h_i^2}{2} = 1 \end{cases}$$

from the second equation we get $\alpha = \frac{h_i}{h_{i+1}}\gamma$; by substituting in the third find $\gamma = \frac{2}{h_i(h_{i+1}+h_i)}$ which gives $\alpha = \frac{2}{h_{i+1}(h_{i+1}+h_i)}$ and $\beta = -\frac{2}{h_{i+1}+h_i}$. The resulting FD scheme is therefore:

$$\begin{cases} u_0 = 0 \\ \frac{2}{h_{i+1}(h_{i+1}+h_i)}u_{i+1} - \frac{2}{h_{i+1}+h_i}u_i + \frac{2}{h_i(h_{i+1}+h_i)}u_{i-1} = f_i \quad \text{for } i = 1, ..., N-1 \\ u_N = 0 \end{cases}$$

3.3 Stability for generalized Poisson BVP

Let $u(x)$ be the exact solution and u_i the numerical solution at $x_i = ih$ for $0 \le i \le N$. Define the error

$$e_i = u(x_i) - u_i$$

Using the standard centered finite difference approximation, we have the expansion

$$u''(x_i) = \delta_h^2 u(x_i) - \frac{h^2}{12}u''''(\xi_i), \quad \text{with } \delta_h^2 u(x_i) = \frac{u(x_{i+1}) - 2u(x_i) + u(x_{i-1})}{h^2}$$

where ξ_i is some point in (x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}). Multiplying by $-a$ yields

$$-a\,\delta_h^2 u(x_i) = f(x_i) + T_i, \quad \text{with } T_i = \frac{a\,h^2}{12}u''''(\xi_i)$$

The finite difference scheme for u_i is given by

$$-a\,\delta_h^2 u_i = f(x_i)$$

Subtracting the scheme from the Taylor expansion, we obtain the error equation:

$$-a\,\delta_h^2 e_i = T_i$$

Before we showed how

$$\|T_i\| \le \|a\|\frac{h^2}{12}\|u^{(4)}\|$$

so

$$\max_i |u(x_i) - u_i| \le C\,\max_i |\tau_i| \le C\,h^2\,\|u''''\|_\infty.$$

4 Lecture 4

4.1 Truncation error bound for 2D Poisson b.v.p.

If $u \in C^4(\Omega) \cap C^0(\Omega)$ then the truncation error of the 5-point scheme is bounded by:

$$|T(x)| \leq \frac{h^2}{12}(\|u_{xxxx}\|_{C(\overline{\Omega})} + \|u_{yyyy}\|_{C(\overline{\Omega})})$$

To prove this we remember that the truncation error in this case is defined as:

$$T_{ij} = \frac{1}{h^2}\left(u(x_{i+1}, y_j) + u(x_{i-1}, y_j) + u(x_i, y_{j+1}) + u(x_i, y_{j-1}) - 4u(x_i, y_j)\right) - f(x_i, y_j)$$

which we rewrite as:

$$T_{ij} = \frac{u(x_{i+1}, y_j) - 2u(x_i, y_j) + u(x_{i-1}, y_j)}{h^2} + \frac{u(x_i, y_{j+1}) - 2u(x_i, y_j) + u(x_i, y_{j-1})}{h^2} - f(x_i, y_j)$$

using Taylor expansion we can prove that the first two terms are equivalent to:

$$u_{xx}(x_i, y_j) + \frac{h^2}{24}(u_{xxxx}(\xi_1, y_j) + u_{xxxx}(\zeta_1, y_j))$$

and

$$u_{yy}(x_i, y_j) + \frac{h^2}{24}(u_{yyyy}(x_i, \xi_2) + u_{yyyy}(x_i, \zeta_2))$$

for some $\xi_1, \zeta_1 \in [x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}]$ and $\xi_2, \zeta_2 \in [y_{i-1}, y_{i+1}]$ respectively. Thus, combining the result and taking the maximum of the absolute value for each derivative we get the following bound:

$$|T_i| \leq \frac{h^2}{12}\left(\max_{(x,y)\in\overline{\Omega}} |u_{xxxx}(x, y)| + \max_{(x,y)\in\overline{\Omega}} |u_{yyyy}(x, y)|\right)$$

which is equivalent to the result we want to prove if we recall the definition of L^∞ norm.

4.2 Derivation of FD scheme for the mixed operator $\delta_{2h}^x \delta_{2h}^y u_{ij}$

$$(\delta_{2h}^x u)_{i,j} = \frac{u_{i+1,j} - u_{i-1,j}}{2h}, \qquad (\delta_{2h}^y u)_{i,j} = \frac{u_{i,j+1} - u_{i,j-1}}{2h}.$$

Applying δ_{2h}^x first and then δ_{2h}^y:

$$(\delta_{2h}^y \, \delta_{2h}^x u)_{i,j} = \frac{(\delta_{2h}^x u)_{i,j+1} - (\delta_{2h}^x u)_{i,j-1}}{2h}.$$

Substitute $(\delta_{2h}^x u)_{i,j\pm 1}$ into the above and simplify:

$$(\delta_{2h}^x \delta_{2h}^y \, u)_{i,j} = \frac{u_{i+1,j+1} - u_{i+1,j-1} - u_{i-1,j+1} + u_{i-1,j-1}}{4h^2}.$$

5 Lecture 5

5.1 Proof that $\|v\|_1$ is a full norm for the space H_0^1

1. Definiteness: show that

$$\|v\|_1 \;=\; 0 \iff v \equiv 0 \text{ (in } \Omega).$$

($\Longrightarrow$) If $\|\nabla v\|_{L^2(\Omega)} = 0$, then $\nabla v = 0$ almost everywhere. Thus v is (almost everywhere) a constant C. Since $v \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, it satisfies $v = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$. Hence that constant must be $C = 0$. Therefore $v \equiv 0$ in Ω.

($\Longleftarrow$) Clearly if $v \equiv 0$, then $\nabla v \equiv 0$ and thus $\|\nabla v\|_{L^2(\Omega)} = 0$.

Hence

$$\|v\|_1 \;=\; \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \;=\; 0 \iff v \equiv 0.$$

2. Homogeneity: $\forall \alpha \;\in \mathbb{R}$ and $\forall v \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ show that

$$\|\alpha\, v\|_1 \;=\; |\alpha|\;\|v\|_1.$$

By definition,

$$\|\alpha\, v\|_1 \;=\; \|\nabla(\alpha\, v)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \;=\; \|\alpha\,\nabla v\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \;=\; |\alpha|\;\|\nabla v\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \;=\; |\alpha|\;\|v\|_1.$$

3. Triangle inequality: $\forall u, v \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ show that

$$\|u + v\|_1 \;\leq\; \|u\|_1 + \|v\|_1.$$

Indeed,

$$\|u{+}v\|_1 \;=\; \|\nabla(u{+}v)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \;=\; \|\nabla u{+}\nabla v\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \;\leq\; \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \;=\; \|u\|_1{+}\|v\|_1.$$

6 Lecture 6

6.1 Proof of the continuity of the bilinear form in Lax-Milgram

The bilinear form A is continuous if:

$$|A(u,v)| \leq \|u\|\|v\| \forall u, v \in V.$$

We study the three terms separately.

6.1.1 First term

Assume A is a bounded, symmetric and positive definite matrix with components $A_{ij}(x)$, such that:

$$\lambda_{min}|\xi|^2 \leq A(x)\xi \cdot \xi \leq \lambda_{max}|\xi|^2$$

$\forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\forall x \in \Omega$, where λ_{min} and λ_{max} are the minimum and maximum eigenvalues of A. Then taking the absolute value the following inequality holds:

$$\left| \int_\Omega A\nabla u \nabla v dx \right| \leq \lambda_{max} \int_\Omega |\nabla u| \, |\nabla v| \, dx$$

using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality:

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla u| \, |\nabla v| \, dx \leq \left(\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^2 \, dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_\Omega |\nabla v|^2 \, dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$$

so

$$\left| \int_\Omega A\nabla u \nabla v dx \right| \leq \lambda_{max} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$$

6.1.2 Second term

Assume $b(x)$ is a bounded vector field. To obtain boundedness it is sufficient to assume that $b(x) \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. Using then also Cauchy-Schwarz we get:

$$\left| \int_\Omega (b \cdot \nabla u) \, v dx \right| \leq \int_\Omega |b \cdot \nabla u| \, |u| \leq \|b\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \int_\Omega |\nabla u| \, |v| \leq \|b\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|v\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$$

6.1.3 Third term

Assume $c(x)$ is a bounded scalar field and use Cauchy-Schwarz as before:

$$\left| \int_\Omega cuv dx \right| \leq \|c\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|v\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$$

Now combining the results:

$$|A(u,v)| \leq \lambda_{max} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|b\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|v\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|c\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|v\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$$

Now recalling the definition of the H^1 norm $\|u\|_{H^1(\Omega)}$, which is defined as

$$\|u\|_{H^1(\Omega)} = \left(\|u\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\nabla u\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

we can bound each term with the H^1 norm of u or v, for example:

$$\lambda_{max} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \lambda_{max} \|u\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \|v\|_{H^1(\Omega)}$$

so we can factor out $\|u\|_{H^1(\Omega)}$ and $\|v\|_{H^1(\Omega)}$ from each term and obtain:

$$|A(u,v)| \leq C\|u\|_{H^1(\Omega)}\|u\|_{H^1(\Omega)}$$

where the constant C is given by:

$$C = \max\left(\lambda_{max}, \|b\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}, \|c\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\right)$$

which proves the continuity of $A(u,v)$.

6.2 Proof of special case of Ceà's lemma

Let V be a Hilbert space and V_h a finite-dimensional subspace of V. Consider a bilinear form $a : V \times V \to \mathbb{R}$ and a linear functional $F : V \to \mathbb{R}$. Assume a is coercive, continuous and symmetric. Let $u \in V$ be the solution of the variational problem: $a(u,v) = F(v)\ \forall v \in V$, and let $u_h \in V_h$ be the solution of the corresponding finite-dimensional problem $a(u_h, v_h) = F(v_h)\ \forall v_h \in V_h$. Then, we have:

$$\|u - u_h\|_V \leq \sqrt{\frac{\gamma}{\alpha_0}} \min_{v_h \in V_h} \|u - v_h\|$$

Proof

adding symmetry to the properties of the form a makes it an inner product on the space V, which allows us to define the norm $\|u\|_a = \sqrt{a(u,u)}$. Thus,

$$\|u-u_h\|_a^2 = a(u-u_h, u-u_h) = a(u-u_h, u-v_h) \leq \|u-u_h\|_a\|u-v_h\|_a\ \forall v_h \in V_h$$

which leads to

$$\|u - u_h\|_a \leq \|u - v_h\|_a\ \forall v_h \in V_h$$

Using this result together with continuity and coercivity we can derive:

$$\alpha\|u-u_h\|^2 \leq a(u-u_h, u-u_h) = \|u-u_h\|_a^2 \leq \|u-v_h\|_a^2 \leq \gamma\|u-v_h\|^2\ \forall v_h \in V_h$$

form which follows:

$$\|u - u_h\| \leq \sqrt{\frac{\gamma}{\alpha}}\|u - v_h\|\ \forall v_h \in V_h$$

7 Lecture 11

7.1 Local truncation error (consistency) of the θ-method

Prove that the local truncation error of the θ-method for the heat equation $u_t = a\,u_{xx}$ is given by:

$$T_i^{n+\theta} = \delta_k^t u_i^{n+\theta} - \theta\, a\, \delta_h^2 u_i^{n+1} - (1-\theta)\, a\, \delta_h^2 u_i^n$$

and that:

- For $\theta \neq \frac{1}{2}$, the scheme is **first order** in time:

$$T_i^{n+\theta} = O(k) + O(h^2)$$

- For $\theta = \frac{1}{2}$ (the Crank–Nicolson case), it is **second order** in time:

$$T_i^{n+1/2} = O(k^2) + O(h^2)$$

Proof
Let $k = t_{n+1} - t_n$, $h = x_i - x_{i-1}$, $u_i^n \;=\; u(x_i,\, t_n)$. Our scheme is:

$$\frac{U_i^{n+1} - U_i^n}{k} \;=\; \theta\, a\, \delta_h^2 U_i^{n+1} \;+\; (1-\theta)\, a\, \delta_h^2 U_i^n,$$

where δ_h^2 is the centered-difference operator in space:

$$\delta_h^2 v_i \;=\; \frac{v_{i+1} - 2\, v_i + v_{i-1}}{h^2}.$$

The local truncation error is obtained by substituting the true PDE solution u into the discrete scheme and measuring the residual:

1. replace U_i^n by $u_i^n = u(x_i, t_n)$
2. define

$$T_i^{n+\theta} \;:=\; \frac{u_i^{n+1} - u_i^n}{k} \;-\; \Big[\theta\, a\, \delta_h^2 u_i^{n+1} \;+\; (1-\theta)\, a\, \delta_h^2 u_i^n\Big].$$

Because u satisfies $u_t - a\, u_{xx} = 0$, we can write:

$$\delta_k^t u_i^{n+\theta} \;-\; a\, u_{xx}(t_{n+\theta},\, x_i) \;=\; 0.$$

Now using Taylor expansion we will show that:

- If $\theta \neq \frac{1}{2}$, then $T_i^{n+\theta} = \mathcal{O}(k) + \mathcal{O}(h^2)$.
- If $\theta = \frac{1}{2}$ (the Crank–Nicolson/trapezoid rule in time), then $T_i^{n+1/2} = \mathcal{O}(k^2) + \mathcal{O}(h^2)$.

To see the orders cleanly, we rewrite the truncation error as follows:

$$T_i^{n+\theta} \;=\; \big[\delta_k^t u_i^{n+\theta} - u_t(t_{n+\theta},\, x_i)\big] - a\left[\theta\, \delta_h^2 u_i^{n+1} + (1-\theta)\, \delta_h^2 u_i^n \,-\, u_{xx}(t_{n+\theta},\, x_i)\right].$$

and name the two main brackets as:

$$T_i^{n+\theta} \;=\; R_{\text{time}} \;-\; a\, R_{\text{space}}.$$

7.1.1 The time part $R_{\textbf{time}}$

$$R_{\text{time}} \;=\; \frac{u(x_i,\, t_{n+1}) - u(x_i,\, t_n)}{k} \;-\; u_t(t_{n+\theta},\, x_i)$$

Case (a): $\theta \neq \frac{1}{2}$

We expand $u(t_{n+1},\, x_i)$ and $u(t_n,\, x_i)$ in Taylor series around $t_{n+\theta}$. Let $t_{n+\theta} = t_n + \theta\, k$. Then

$$t_{n+1} = t_{n+\theta} + (1-\theta)\, k, \quad t_n = t_{n+\theta} - \theta\, k.$$

which gives

$$u\big(t_{n+1},\, x_i\big) = u\big(t_{n+\theta},\, x_i\big) + (1-\theta)\, k\, u_t\big(t_{n+\theta},\, x_i\big) + \frac{(1-\theta)^2\, k^2}{2}\, u_{tt}(\xi_1,\, x_i),$$

for some $\xi_1 \in (\, t_{n+\theta},\, t_{n+1}\,)$, and similarly

$$u\big(t_n,\, x_i\big) = u\big(t_{n+\theta},\, x_i\big) - \theta\, k\, u_t\big(t_{n+\theta},\, x_i\big) + \frac{\theta^2\, k^2}{2}\, u_{tt}(\xi_2,\, x_i).$$

Subtracting and dividing by k:

$$\frac{u_i^{n+1} - u_i^n}{k} = u_t\big(t_{n+\theta},\, x_i\big) \;+\; \frac{\big[(1-\theta)^2 - \theta^2\big]\, k}{2}\, u_{tt}(\xi_3,\, x_i).$$

Therefore

$$R_{\text{time}} = \frac{u_i^{n+1} - u_i^n}{k} - u_t(t_{n+\theta},\, x_i) = \frac{\big[(1-\theta)^2 - \theta^2\big]\, k}{2}\, u_{tt}(\xi_3,\, x_i) = \mathcal{O}(k).$$

Hence for $\theta \neq \frac{1}{2}$, R_{time} is first-order in k.

Case (b): $\theta = \frac{1}{2}$

In this special case, the method is exactly the trapezoid rule in time (Crank–Nicolson):

$$\frac{u(t_{n+1},\, x_i) - u(t_n,\, x_i)}{k} \;-\; u_t\Big(\tfrac{t_n + t_{n+1}}{2},\, x_i\Big) \;=\; \mathcal{O}\big(k^2\big).$$

The leading error term (proportional to k) cancels, leaving a remainder of order k^2. Thus

$$R_{\text{time}} \;=\; \mathcal{O}(k^2) \quad \text{when } \theta = \tfrac{1}{2}.$$

7.1.2 The space part R_{space}

$$R_{\text{space}} \;=\; \theta\,\delta_h^2 u_i^{n+1} \;+\; (1-\theta)\,\delta_h^2 u_i^{n} \;-\; u_{xx}(t_{n+\theta},\,x_i).$$

In space, recalling the standard second-order finite-difference analysis, we know that:

$$\delta_h^2 u\big(t,\,x_i\big) \;-\; u_{xx}\big(t,\,x_i\big) \;=\; \mathcal{O}\big(h^2\big)$$

Now we must also do a Taylor expansion in time so that $\delta_h^2 u(t_n,\,x_i)$ can be compared to $\delta_h^2 u(t_{n+\theta},\,x_i)$:

$$\delta_h^2 u\big(t_n,\,x_i\big) = \delta_h^2 u\big(t_{n+\theta},\,x_i\big) \;-\; \theta\,k\,\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\Big[\delta_h^2 u\big(t_{n+\theta},\,x_i\big)\Big] \;+\; \mathcal{O}\big(k^2\big)$$

$$\delta_h^2 u(t_{n+1},\,x_i) = \delta_h^2 u\big(t_{n+\theta},\,x_i\big) \;+\; (1-\theta)k\,\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\Big[\delta_h^2 u\big(t_{n+\theta},\,x_i\big)\Big] \;+\; \mathcal{O}\big(k^2\big),$$

which when substituting back cancel out and give:

$$\theta\,\delta_h^2 u(t_{n+1},\,x_i) + (1-\theta)\,\delta_h^2 u(t_n,\,x_i) \;=\; \delta_h^2 u\big(t_{n+\theta},\,x_i\big) \;+\; \mathcal{O}(k^2).$$

Now putting everything together:

$$\theta\,\delta_h^2 u_i^{n+1} + (1-\theta)\,\delta_h^2 u_i^{n} = \delta_h^2 u_i^{n+\theta} + \mathcal{O}(k^2),$$

and

$$\delta_h^2 u_i^{n+\theta} - u_{xx}(t_{n+\theta},\,x_i) \;=\; \mathcal{O}(h^2).$$

so

$$R_{\text{space}} \;=\; \delta_h^2 u_i^{n+\theta} - u_{xx}(t_{n+\theta},\,x_i) \;+\; \mathcal{O}(k^2) \;=\; \mathcal{O}(h^2) \;+\; \mathcal{O}(k^2)$$

which holds for any value of θ, thus we arrive at the desired result:

$$\text{Local truncation error} \;=\; \begin{cases} \mathcal{O}(k+h^2), & \theta \neq \frac{1}{2}, \\ \mathcal{O}(k^2+h^2), & \theta = \frac{1}{2}. \end{cases}$$

7.2 Sufficient condition for stability of the θ-method

We want to prove that the condition:

$$\mu(1-\theta) \leq 1/2$$

is sufficient for the stability of the following θ-method scheme:

$$-\mu\theta U_{i+1}^{n+1} + (1+2\mu\theta)U_i^{n+1} - \mu\theta U_{i-1}^{n+1} = -\mu\theta U_{i+1}^{n} + (1-2\mu(1-\theta))U_i^{n} - \mu\theta U_{i-1}^{n}$$

Let's start by bounding the right hand side. By taking the absolute value we get:

$$RHS \leq |\mu(1-\theta)||U_{i+1}^n| + |1-2\mu(1-\theta)||U_i^n| + |\mu(1-\theta)||U_{i-1}^n|$$

Now remember that by definition $\mu = \frac{h}{k^2} > 0$ and $0 \leq \theta \leq 1$, and let $\mu(1-\theta) \leq 1/2$ (our hypothetical sufficient condition). This means that the coefficients $\mu(1-\theta)$ and $1-2\mu(1-\theta)$ are both non-negative, so we can remove the absolute value. Let's also define $U^n_{max} = max_i(U^n_i)$ so we can write:

$$RHS \leq |U^n_{max}|[\mu(1-\theta) + 1 - 2\mu(1-\theta) + \mu(1-\theta)] = |U^n_{max}| = \|U^n\|_\infty$$

Now let's bound the left hand side as well:

$$LHS \leq -|\mu\theta||U^{n+1}_{i+1}| + |1 + 2\mu\theta||U^{n+1}_i| - |\mu\theta||U^{n+1}_{i-1}|$$

by similar consideration we obtain

$$LHS \leq |U^{n+1}_{max}|(-\mu\theta + 1 + 2\mu\theta - \mu\theta) = |U^{n+1}_{max}| = \|U^{n+1}\|_\infty$$

hence $LHS \leq RHS$ translates to $\|U^{n+1}\|_\infty \leq \|U^n\|_\infty \, \forall n$, which by extension implies $\|U^n\|_\infty \leq \|U^0\|_\infty$.

7.3 Fourier (von Neumann) Analysis for the θ-method in 1D

We consider the 1D heat equation

$$u_t \; = \; a\, u_{xx}, \quad x \in (0,1),\ t > 0,$$

with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions. We discretize spatially with a uniform grid

$$x_j = j\, h, \quad j = 0, \ldots, M, \quad h = \frac{1}{M},$$

and discretize time with

$$t_n = n\, k.$$

Let U^n_j approximate $u(x_j, t_n)$. The θ-method for the heat equation in 1D is

$$\frac{U^{n+1}_j - U^n_j}{k} \; = \; \theta\, a\, \delta^2_h U^{n+1}_j \; + \; (1-\theta)\, a\, \delta^2_h U^n_j,$$

where

$$\delta^2_h U^n_j \; = \; \frac{U^n_{j+1} - 2\, U^n_j + U^n_{j-1}}{h^2},$$

for $j = 1, \ldots, M-1$, with boundary conditions $U^n_0 = U^n_M = 0$. Define

$$\mu \; = \; \frac{a\, k}{h^2}.$$

We look for solutions of the form

$$U^n_j \; = \; \lambda^n \exp\bigl(\mathrm{i}\, \alpha\, x_j\bigr) \; = \; \lambda^n \exp\bigl(\mathrm{i}\, \alpha\, j\, h\bigr),$$

where

- j is the spatial index (integer),
- i is the imaginary unit,
- α is a wavenumber

Our goal is to find λ (the amplification factor) in terms of α, μ, and θ.

Now we compute the second difference $\delta_h^2 U_j^n$

$$\delta_h^2 U_j^n \;=\; \frac{U_{j+1}^n - 2\,U_j^n + U_{j-1}^n}{h^2}$$

substitute $U_j^n = \lambda^n \exp(\mathrm{i}\,\alpha\,j\,h)$:

$$\begin{aligned}
U_{j+1}^n &= \lambda^n\ \exp\bigl(\mathrm{i}\,\alpha\,(j+1)\,h\bigr) = \lambda^n\ \exp(\mathrm{i}\,\alpha\,j\,h)\ \exp(\mathrm{i}\,\alpha\,h) \\
U_j^n &= \lambda^n\ \exp(\mathrm{i}\,\alpha\,j\,h) \\
U_{j-1}^n &= \lambda^n\ \exp\bigl(\mathrm{i}\,\alpha\,(j-1)\,h\bigr) = \lambda^n\ \exp(\mathrm{i}\,\alpha\,j\,h)\ \exp(-\mathrm{i}\,\alpha\,h)
\end{aligned}$$

hence

$$\delta_h^2 U_j^n = \frac{\lambda^n\ \exp(\mathrm{i}\,\alpha\,j\,h)}{h^2}\bigl[\exp(\mathrm{i}\,\alpha\,h) - 2 + \exp(-\,\mathrm{i}\,\alpha\,h)\bigr]$$

but

$$\exp(\mathrm{i}\,\alpha\,h) + \exp(-\,\mathrm{i}\,\alpha\,h) = 2\ \cos(\alpha\,h)$$

so

$$\exp(\mathrm{i}\,\alpha\,h) - 2 + \exp(-\,\mathrm{i}\,\alpha\,h) = -\,4\ \sin^2\!\Bigl(\frac{\alpha\,h}{2}\Bigr)$$

therefore,

$$\delta_h^2 U_j^n = -\,\frac{4\ \sin^2(\frac{\alpha\,h}{2})}{h^2}\ \lambda^n\ \exp(\mathrm{i}\,\alpha\,j\,h)$$

which when substituted into the θ-method gives:

$$\frac{U_j^{n+1} - U_j^n}{k} = \theta\,a\,\delta_h^2 U_j^{n+1}\ +\ (1-\theta)\,a\,\delta_h^2 U_j^n.$$

Now we look at the time difference (LHS):

$$U_j^{n+1} = \lambda^{n+1} \exp(\mathrm{i}\,\alpha\,j\,h), \quad U_j^n = \lambda^n \exp(\mathrm{i}\,\alpha\,j\,h).$$

$$\frac{U_j^{n+1} - U_j^n}{k} = \frac{\lambda^{n+1} - \lambda^n}{k}\ \exp(\mathrm{i}\,\alpha\,j\,h) = \exp(\mathrm{i}\,\alpha\,j\,h)\ \frac{\lambda^n}{k}\,(\lambda - 1)$$

and at the space difference (RHS):

$$\theta\, a\, \delta_h^2 U_j^{n+1} + (1-\theta)\, a\, \delta_h^2 U_j^n = \theta\, a \left[-\tfrac{4\sin^2(\frac{\alpha h}{2})}{h^2}\right] \lambda^{n+1} \exp(\mathrm{i}\,\alpha\, j\, h) + (1-\theta)\, a \left[-\tfrac{4\sin^2(\frac{\alpha h}{2})}{h^2}\right] \lambda^n \exp(\mathrm{i}\,\alpha\, j\, h)$$

$$= -\frac{4\, a\, \sin^2(\frac{\alpha h}{2})}{h^2}\, \exp(\mathrm{i}\,\alpha\, j\, h) \Big[\theta\, \lambda^{n+1} + (1-\theta)\, \lambda^n\Big]$$

$$= -\frac{4\, a\, \sin^2(\frac{\alpha h}{2})}{h^2}\, \exp(\mathrm{i}\,\alpha\, j\, h)\, \lambda^n\, \big[\theta\, \lambda + (1-\theta)\big]$$

and finally equating them we find that the original:

$$\frac{U_j^{n+1} - U_j^n}{k} \;=\; \theta\, a\, \delta_h^2 U_j^{n+1} \;+\; (1-\theta)\, a\, \delta_h^2 U_j^n$$

becomes

$$\exp(\mathrm{i}\,\alpha\, j\, h)\, \frac{\lambda^n}{k}\, (\lambda - 1) = -\frac{4\, a\, \sin^2(\frac{\alpha h}{2})}{h^2}\, \exp(\mathrm{i}\,\alpha\, j\, h)\, \lambda^n\, \big[\theta\, \lambda + (1-\theta)\big]$$

and after cancelling $\exp(\mathrm{i}\,\alpha\, j\, h)\, \lambda^n$ we get:

$$\frac{\lambda - 1}{k} \;=\; -\frac{4\, a\, \sin^2\!\big(\frac{\alpha h}{2}\big)}{h^2}\, \big[\theta\, \lambda + (1-\theta)\big].$$

Now by multiplying both sides by k and remembering the substitution $\mu \;=\; \frac{a\,k}{h^2}$ we get:

$$\lambda + 4\,\mu\,\theta\, \sin^2\!\big(\tfrac{\alpha h}{2}\big)\, \lambda = 1 \;-\; 4\,\mu\,(1-\theta)\, \sin^2\!\big(\tfrac{\alpha h}{2}\big).$$

from which we obtain the amplification factor λ:

$$\lambda(\alpha) = \frac{1 - 4\,\mu\,(1-\theta)\, \sin^2\!\big(\frac{\alpha h}{2}\big)}{1 + 4\,\mu\,\theta\, \sin^2\!\big(\frac{\alpha h}{2}\big)}.$$

The stability condition is then $|\lambda(\alpha)| \le 1$ for all relevant α.

- If $\theta \ge 1/2$: the denominator exceeds or equals the numerator in absolute value for any $\mu > 0$, so $|\lambda(\alpha)| \le 1$ unconditionally.
- If $0 \le \theta < 1/2$: the worst case is $\sin^2(\frac{\alpha h}{2}) = 1$, then

  $$\lambda(\alpha) = \frac{1 - 4\,\mu\,(1-\theta)}{1 + 4\,\mu\,\theta}$$

  and requiring $|\lambda(\alpha)| \le 1$ forces

  $$\mu\,(1 - 2\theta) \;\le\; \frac{1}{2}.$$

8 Lecture 14

8.1 Wave equation equivalent system

Consider the classical wave equation:

$$u_{tt} - u_{xx} = 0.$$

Introduce an auxiliary variable v and consider the system:

$$u_t + v_x = 0, \tag{1}$$
$$u_x + v_t = 0. \tag{2}$$

This system is equivalent to the wave equation.

Proof that u satisfies the wave equation:

1. differentiate equation (1) with respect to t:

$$u_{tt} + v_{xt} = 0$$

2. differentiate equation (2) with respect to x:

$$u_{xx} + v_{tx} = 0$$

3. since partial derivatives commute (i.e. $v_{xt} = v_{tx}$), subtract the second equation from the first:

$$u_{tt} - u_{xx} = 0$$

Thus, u satisfies the wave equation.

Proof that v satisfies the wave equation:

1. differentiate equation (2) with respect to t:

$$u_{xt} + v_{tt} = 0$$

2. differentiate equation (1) with respect to x:

$$u_{tx} + v_{xx} = 0$$

3. notice that $u_{xt} = u_{tx}$ (same as before), subtract the second equation from the first:

$$v_{tt} - v_{xx} = 0$$

Thus, v also satisfies the wave equation.

8.2 Conservation of energy for the wave equation

Consider the classical wave equation:

$$u_{tt} - u_{xx} = 0, \quad (t, x) \in (0, T] \times \mathbb{R}.$$

Show that the energy

$$E(t) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left[\big(u_t(x,t)\big)^2 + \big(u_x(x,t)\big)^2 \right] dx$$

is conserved, i.e., $E(t)$ is constant in time.

Solution:

1. multiply the wave equation by $u_t(x,t)$ to obtain:

$$u_t\, u_{tt} - u_t\, u_{xx} = 0$$

2. integrate the above expression over $\mathbb{R}$ with respect to x:

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} (u_t\, u_{tt} - u_t\, u_{xx})\, dx = 0$$

3. time derivative term:

   recognize that

$$u_t\, u_{tt} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial t}(u_t^2)$$

   thus,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} u_t\, u_{tt}\, dx = \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{R}} u_t^2\, dx$$

4. space derivative term:

   integrate by parts in x by setting

$$v = u_t \quad \text{and} \quad dw = u_{xx}\, dx$$

   so that $dv = u_{tx}\, dx$ and $w = u_x$. Then,

$$-\int_{\mathbb{R}} u_t\, u_{xx}\, dx = -\left[u_t\, u_x\right]_{-\infty}^{+\infty} + \int_{\mathbb{R}} u_{tx}\, u_x\, dx.$$

   Assuming that u_t and u_x vanish at infinity, the boundary term is zero. Notice that

$$u_{tx}\, u_x = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial t}(u_x^2)$$

   hence

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} u_{tx}\, u_x\, dx = \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{R}} u_x^2\, dx.$$

5. Combine the results:

   putting the two parts together, we have

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int_{\mathbb{R}} u_t^2\,dx + \frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int_{\mathbb{R}} u_x^2\,dx = 0$$

   this can be rewritten as:

$$\frac{d}{dt}\left[\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(u_t^2 + u_x^2\right)dx\right] = 0$$

   therefore, the energy

$$E(t) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(u_t^2 + u_x^2\right)dx$$

   is conserved in time.

9 Lecture 15

9.1 Consistency proof for the Lax-Wendroff scheme

We consider the linear advection PDE:

$$\begin{cases} u_t + a\,u_x = 0, \\ u(0,x) = u_0(x), \\ u(b,x) = u_b(x), \end{cases}$$

where a is taken as a constant for simplicity. The **Lax–Wendroff scheme** for $u_i^n \approx u(x_i, t_n)$ is written as:

$$\frac{u_i^{n+1} - u_i^n}{k} \;+\; a\,\frac{u_{i+1}^n - u_{i-1}^n}{2\,h} \;-\; \frac{k\,(a)^2}{2\,h^2}\left(u_{i+1}^n - 2\,u_i^n + u_{i-1}^n\right) \;=\; 0.$$

We set $\nu := \frac{k}{h}$ (the Courant number). Our goal is to show that the *local truncation error* T_i^n is

$$\left|T_i^n\right| \;\le\; \frac{k^2}{6}\left\|u_{ttt}\right\|_\infty \;+\; |a|\,\frac{h^2}{6}\left\|u_{xxx}\right\|_\infty,$$

i.e. it is $\mathcal{O}(k^2 + h^2)$.

Local truncation error

1. Denoting the exact PDE solution at grid points as $U_i^n = u(x_i,\, t_n)$, substituting into the Lax-Wendroff scheme we get the residual:

$$T_i^n := \frac{U_i^{n+1} - U_i^n}{k} \;+\; a\,\frac{U_{i+1}^n - U_{i-1}^n}{2\,h} \;-\; \frac{k\,a^2}{2\,h^2}\left(U_{i+1}^n - 2\,U_i^n + U_{i-1}^n\right)$$

2. we expand the time shift:

$$U_i^{n+1} = U_i^n + k\,U_t^n + \frac{k^2}{2}\,U_{tt}^n + \frac{k^3}{6}\,U_{ttt}(x_i,t_n) \;+\; \mathcal{O}(k^4)$$

3. and the space shifts:

$$\begin{aligned} U_{i+1}^n &= \; U_i^n + h\,U_x^n + \frac{h^2}{2}\,U_{xx}^n + \frac{h^3}{6}\,U_{xxx}(x_i,t_n) \;+\; \mathcal{O}(h^4) \\ U_{i-1}^n &= \; U_i^n - h\,U_x^n + \frac{h^2}{2}\,U_{xx}^n - \frac{h^3}{6}\,U_{xxx}(x_i,t_n) \;+\; \mathcal{O}(h^4) \end{aligned}$$

Substitute into the scheme

1. $$\frac{U_i^{n+1} - U_i^n}{k} = U_t^n + \frac{k}{2}\,U_{tt}^n + \frac{k^2}{6}\,U_{ttt}(x_i,t_n) + \mathcal{O}(k^3)$$

2. $$a\,\frac{U_{i+1}^n - U_{i-1}^n}{2h} = a\left(U_x^n + \frac{h^2}{6}U_{xxx}^n\right) + \mathcal{O}(h^3)$$

3. $$\frac{k\,a^2}{2}\,\frac{U_{i+1}^n - U_i^n + U_{i-1}^n}{h^2} = \frac{k\,a^2}{2}U_{xx} + \mathcal{O}(h^2)$$

Notice that from the PDE we have:

$$U_t = -\,a\,U_x, U_{tt} = a^2\,U_{xx}, U_{ttt} = -\,a^3\,U_{xxx}$$

so the expression for the truncation error is dominated by $k^2\,U_{ttt}$ and $a\,h^2\,U_{xxx}$ terms, hence $|T_i^n|$ is bounded by a combination of $k^2|U_{ttt}|$ and $|a|\,h^2|U_{xxx}|$, plus higher order terms. Consequently,

$$\left|T_i^n\right| \;\le\; \frac{k^2}{6}\,M_{ttt} \;+\; |a|\,\frac{h^2}{6}\,M_{xxx} \;+\; \cdots\,,$$

which shows $T_i^n = \mathcal{O}(k^2 + h^2)$.

9.2 Leap frog scheme for wave equation

We consider the model problem

$$u_{tt} - u_{xx} = 0,$$

and recall its standard leap-frog discretization:

$$\frac{U_i^{n+1} - 2U_i^n + U_i^{n-1}}{k^2} = \frac{U_{i+1}^n - 2U_i^n + U_{i-1}^n}{h^2},$$

where k and h denote the time and space step sizes, respectively.

9.2.1 First-order system formulation

To rewrite the second-order wave equation as a first-order system we define the auxiliary variable v such that:

$$u_t + v_x = 0 \tag{1}$$

$$v_t + u_x = 0 \tag{2}$$

Now we show how u solves $u_{tt} - u_{xx} = 0$:

- differentiatiating (1) w.r.t. t we get:

$$u_{tt} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\big(v_x\big) = -\,v_{xt}$$

- differentiatiating (2) w.r.t. x we get:

$$v_{xt} = -\,u_{xx}$$

- combining, $u_{tt} = -\,v_{xt} = -\big[-\,u_{xx}\big] = u_{xx}$, hence $u_{tt} - u_{xx} = 0$.

9.2.2 Discretize system by leap-frog method

We now discretize the system (1) and (2) using a leap-frog method with staggered grids. In particular, we choose:

- the solution u is approximated at integer grid points in space and time:

$$U_i^n \approx u(x_i, t^n)$$

  with $x_i = i\,h$ and $t^n = n\,k$;

- the auxiliary variable v is approximated at half-grid points in both space and time:

$$V_{i+\frac{1}{2}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}} \approx v\Big(x_{i+\frac{1}{2}}, t^{n+\frac{1}{2}}\Big),$$

  where $x_{i+\frac{1}{2}} = \big(i + \frac{1}{2}\big)\,h$ and $t^{n+\frac{1}{2}} = \big(n + \frac{1}{2}\big)\,k$.

We then have:

$$\frac{U_i^{n+1} - U_i^n}{k} + \frac{V_{i+\frac{1}{2}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}} - V_{i-\frac{1}{2}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}}}{h} = 0 \tag{3}$$

$$\frac{V_{i+\frac{1}{2}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}} - V_{i+\frac{1}{2}}^{n-\frac{1}{2}}}{k} + \frac{U_{i+1}^n - U_i^n}{h} = 0 \tag{4}$$

9.2.3 Derivation of the leap frog scheme for U

The goal now is to eliminate the variable V from (3) and (4) to derive a single scheme for U:

- from (3) we have:

$$\frac{U_i^{n+1} - U_i^n}{k} = -\frac{V_{i+\frac{1}{2}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}} - V_{i-\frac{1}{2}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}}}{h}$$

  so that

$$U_i^{n+1} = U_i^n - \frac{k}{h}\Big(V_{i+\frac{1}{2}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}} - V_{i-\frac{1}{2}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}}\Big) \tag{5}$$

- from (4) we have:

$$\frac{V_{i+\frac{1}{2}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}} - V_{i+\frac{1}{2}}^{n-\frac{1}{2}}}{k} = -\frac{U_{i+1}^n - U_i^n}{h},$$

  so that

$$V_{i+\frac{1}{2}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}} = V_{i+\frac{1}{2}}^{n-\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{k}{h}\Big(U_{i+1}^n - U_i^n\Big) \tag{6}$$

- similarly, for the point $i - \frac{1}{2}$ we have:

$$V_{i-\frac{1}{2}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}} = V_{i-\frac{1}{2}}^{n-\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{k}{h}\Big(U_i^n - U_{i-1}^n\Big) \tag{7}$$

- now subtract (7) from (6):

$$\begin{aligned}
V_{i+\frac{1}{2}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}} - V_{i-\frac{1}{2}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}} &= \Big(V_{i+\frac{1}{2}}^{n-\frac{1}{2}} - V_{i-\frac{1}{2}}^{n-\frac{1}{2}}\Big) - \frac{k}{h}\Big[(U_{i+1}^n - U_i^n) - (U_i^n - U_{i-1}^n)\Big] \\
&= \Big(V_{i+\frac{1}{2}}^{n-\frac{1}{2}} - V_{i-\frac{1}{2}}^{n-\frac{1}{2}}\Big) - \frac{k}{h}\Big(U_{i+1}^n - 2U_i^n + U_{i-1}^n\Big) \qquad (8)
\end{aligned}$$

- Now we want to express $V_{i+\frac{1}{2}}^{n-\frac{1}{2}} - V_{i-\frac{1}{2}}^{n-\frac{1}{2}}$ in terms of U. Notice that the same discretization (3) applied at the previous time level gives:

$$\frac{U_i^n - U_i^{n-1}}{k} + \frac{V_{i+\frac{1}{2}}^{n-\frac{1}{2}} - V_{i-\frac{1}{2}}^{n-\frac{1}{2}}}{h} = 0$$

  so that

$$V_{i+\frac{1}{2}}^{n-\frac{1}{2}} - V_{i-\frac{1}{2}}^{n-\frac{1}{2}} = -\frac{h}{k}\Big(U_i^n - U_i^{n-1}\Big) \tag{9}$$

- using (9) in (8) yields

$$V_{i+\frac{1}{2}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}} - V_{i-\frac{1}{2}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}} = -\frac{h}{k}\Big(U_i^n - U_i^{n-1}\Big) - \frac{k}{h}\Big(U_{i+1}^n - 2U_i^n + U_{i-1}^n\Big) \tag{10}$$

- recall from (5):

$$U_i^{n+1} = U_i^n - \frac{k}{h}\Big(V_{i+\frac{1}{2}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}} - V_{i-\frac{1}{2}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}}\Big)$$

- substitute (10) into this expression and rearrange:

$$\begin{aligned}
U_i^{n+1} &= U_i^n - \frac{k}{h}\left[-\frac{h}{k}\Big(U_i^n - U_i^{n-1}\Big) - \frac{k}{h}\Big(U_{i+1}^n - 2U_i^n + U_{i-1}^n\Big)\right] \\
&= U_i^n + \Big(U_i^n - U_i^{n-1}\Big) + \frac{k^2}{h^2}\Big(U_{i+1}^n - 2U_i^n + U_{i-1}^n\Big) \\
&= 2U_i^n - U_i^{n-1} + \frac{k^2}{h^2}\Big(U_{i+1}^n - 2U_i^n + U_{i-1}^n\Big)
\end{aligned}$$

- Finally, rewriting this in the standard leap-frog form yields:

$$\frac{U_i^{n+1} - 2U_i^n + U_i^{n-1}}{k^2} = \frac{U_{i+1}^n - 2U_i^n + U_{i-1}^n}{h^2}.$$