## MA 523: Homework 2

Carlos Salinas

September 9, 2016

## Problem 2.1

Verify assertion (36) in [E, §3.2.3], that when  $\Gamma$  is not flat near  $x^0$  the noncharacteristic condition is

$$D_p F(p^0, z^0, x^0) \cdot \nu(x^0) \neq 0.$$

(Here  $\nu(x^0)$  denotes the normal to the hypersurface  $\Gamma$  at  $x^0$ ).

**Solution**. ▶ First, note that the condition

$$D_p F(p^0, z^0, x^0) \cdot \nu(x^0) \neq 0 \tag{2.1}$$

reduces to the standard noncharacteristic boundary condition if  $\Gamma$  is flat near  $x^0$  because in such case we have  $\nu(x^0) = (0, \dots, 0, 1)$  so

$$0 \neq D_p F(p^0, z^0, x^0) \cdot (0, \dots, 0, 1)$$
  
=  $F_{p_n}(p^0, z^0, x^0)$ .

We shall verify the noncharacteristic condition (2.1) by first flattening the boundary near  $x^0$  and then applying the noncharacteristic boundary conditions to the flattened region. Assuming some degree of regularity near  $x^0$ , e.g., that the boundary of U be smooth, we may express  $\Gamma$  near  $x^0$  as the graph of a smooth function  $f: \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \to \mathbb{R}$ , i.e.,  $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_{n-1}, f(x_1, \ldots, x_{n-1}))$  on  $\Gamma$  and  $x_n \geq f(y)$  after reorienting the coordinate axes. Then we flatten out  $\Gamma$  via the map  $\Phi(x): \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$  given by

$$\begin{cases} y_1 = x_1 = \Phi^1(x), \\ \vdots \\ y_{n-1} = x_{n-1} = \Phi^{n-1}(x), \\ y_n = x_n - f(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}) = \Phi^n(x) \end{cases}$$

and write  $y = \Phi(x)$ . Let  $\Psi = \Phi^{-1}$  and rewrite our PDE F in terms of y as follows,

$$0 = F(Du(\Psi(y)), u(\Psi(y)), \Psi(y)). \tag{2.2}$$

Since  $\Delta = \Phi(\Gamma)$  is flat near  $y^0 = \Phi(x^0) = (y_1^0, \dots, y_{n-1}^0, 0)$ , we may apply the standard noncharacteristic condition on (2.2) and get

$$0 \neq F_{u_{y_n}}(Du(\Psi(y^0)), u(\Psi(y^0)), \Psi(y^0)).$$

Before we move on to finding an expression for this derivative, let us consider the gradient  $Du(\Psi(y))$ . By the chain rule, we have

$$u_{y_i}(\Psi(y)) = \sum_{j=1}^n u_{x_j}(\Psi(y)) \frac{\partial x_j}{\partial y_i}$$

$$= u_{x_i}(\Psi(y)) + u_{x_n}(\Psi(y)) f_{y_i}(y_1, \dots, y_{n-1}),$$

$$u_{y_n}(\Psi(y)) = \sum_{j=1}^n u_{x_j}(\Psi(y)) \frac{\partial x_j}{\partial y_n}$$

$$= u_{x_n}(\Psi(y)),$$

Then, substituting  $u_{y_n}$  for  $u_{x_n}$ , we have

$$u_{y_i}(\Psi(y)) = u_{x_i}(\Psi(y)) + u_{y_n}(\Psi(y)) f_{y_i}(y_1, \dots, y_{n-1}),$$

Now, by the chain rule on (2.2), we have

$$\begin{split} 0 &\neq F_{u_{y_n}} \left( Du(\Psi(y^0)), u(\Psi(y^0)), \Psi(y^0) \right) \\ &= F_{u_{y_n}} \left( u_{x_1} + u_{y_n} f_{y_1}, \dots, u_{x_{n-1}} + u_{y_n} f_{y_{n-1}}, u_{y_n}, z^0, x^0 \right) \\ &= F_{u_{x_1}} f_{y_1} + \dots + F_{u_{x_{n-1}}} f_{y_{n-1}} + F_{u_{x_n}} \\ &= D_p F(p^0, z^0, x^0) \cdot \left( Df(x^0), 1 \right) \\ &= D_p F(p^0, z^0, x^0) \cdot \nu(x^0), \end{split}$$

as we set out to show.

## Problem 2.2

Show that the solution of the quasilinear PDE

$$u_t + a(u)u_x = 0$$

with initial conditions u(x,0) = g(x) is given implicitly by

$$u = g(x - a(u)t).$$

Show that the solution develops a shock (becomes singular) for some t > 0, unless a(g(x)) is a nondecreasing function of x.

**Solution**. ▶ The characteristic ODEs of this PDE are

$$\dot{t} = 1, \qquad \dot{x} = a(z), \qquad \dot{z} = 0.$$
 (2.3)

with initial conditions  $t_0 = 0$ ,  $x_0 = x(0)$  and  $z(x_0, 0) = g(x_0)$  with  $(x_0, 0) \in \mathbb{R} \times (0, \infty)$ . Hence, we have

$$t(s) = s,$$
  $x(s) = a(g(x_0))s + x_0,$   $z(s) = g(x_0).$ 

Thus, solving for  $x_0$  and s in terms of t, x and z, we have

$$x = a(g(x_0))s + x_0$$
$$= a(z)t + x_0,$$

so, moving  $x_0$  to the left-hand side

$$x_0 = x - a(z)t$$

hence,

$$z = g(x - a(z)t),$$

i.e.,

$$u = g(x - a(u)t),$$

as desired.

For the latter half of the problem, write

$$u(x + a(g(x))t, t) = g(x).$$

Suppose that a(g(x)) is not a nondecreasing function of x. Then, there exists  $0 < x_1 < x_2$  such that  $a(g(x_1)) > a(g(x_2))$ . Define

$$y = -\frac{x_1 - x_2}{a(g(x_1)) - a(g(x_2))} > 0.$$
 (2.4)

Then, we have

$$t_0 = x_1 + a(g(x_1))y = x_2 + a(g(x_2))y.$$

Thus,

$$u(x,t_0) = g(x_1)$$

$$= u(x_1 + a(g(x_1))t_0, t_0)$$

$$= g(x_2)$$

$$= u(x_2 + a(g(x_2))t_0, t_0).$$

However,  $g(x_1) \neq g(x_2)$  since  $a(g(x_1)) > a(g(x_2))$ .

## Problem 2.3

Show that the function u(x,t) defined for  $t \ge 0$  by

$$u(x,t) = \begin{cases} -\frac{2}{3} \left( t + \sqrt{3x + t^2} \right) & \text{for } 4x + t^2 > 0\\ 0 & \text{for } 4x + t^2 < 0 \end{cases}$$

is an (unbounded) entropy solution of the conservation law  $u_t + (u^2/2)_x = 0$  (inviscid Burger's equation).

**Solution**.  $\blacktriangleright$  First, we verify that the equation given by u above is in fact a solution to the inviscid Burger's equation: on  $4x + t^2 < 0$  the equation is trivially satisfied whereas for  $4x + t^2 > 0$  we have,

$$-\frac{2}{3}\left(1+\frac{t}{\sqrt{3x+t^2}}\right)+\frac{2}{9}\left(3+\frac{3t}{\sqrt{3x+t^2}}\right)=0.$$

So u is indeed a solution to the inviscid Burger's equation.