MATH 620: Variational Methods and Optimization I

Homework 6



Problem 1 (A small variation for the Dirichlet problem). In class, we have gone through the details of a proof for guaranteeing that a minimizer exists for the functional

$$I(u) = \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{2} |\nabla u|^2$$

over the (affine) space

$$X_g = \left\{ u \in W^{1,2}(\Omega) : u|_{\partial\Omega} = g \right\}.$$

Among the other consequences of the theorem were that the (unique) minimizer \bar{u} had to satisfy the weak Euler-Lagrange equation

$$\int_{\Omega} \nabla \bar{u} \cdot \nabla \varphi = 0 \qquad \forall \varphi \in X_0,$$

where X_0 is the tangent space to X_g (i.e., consists of functions with zero boundary values), and that if \bar{u} happens to be smooth enough, that it then has to satisfy the partial differential equation

$$-\Delta \bar{u} = 0 \qquad \text{in } \Omega,$$

$$\bar{u} = g \qquad \text{on } \partial \Omega,$$

i.e., it has to solve the Laplace equation.

Repeat some of the steps of the proof for the following variation:

$$I(u) = \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{2} |\nabla u|^2 - hu,$$

where $h \in L^2(\Omega)$ is a given function. For simplicity take $X_0 = W_0^{1,2}$ as the set to find a minimum over, i.e., g = 0.

In particular, do the following:

• Repeat the first step of showing that a minimizer exists. Namely, we needed to show that for a minimizing sequence $\{u_n\} \subset X_g$ so that $I(u_n) \to m = \inf_{u \in X_g} I(u)$, there exists an N and $\gamma < \infty$ so that for all $n \geq N$, we have that $\|u_n\|_{W^{1,2}} \leq \gamma$.

$$||u||_{W^{1,2}} \leq \gamma.$$

The key to this was to show that

$$||u||_{W^{1,2}}^2 \le c_1 I(u) + c_2.$$

If this is true, then we know – because u_n is a minimizing sequence – that there are $N < \infty, |a| < \infty, b < \infty$ so that

$$I(u_n) \le am + b$$

for all sufficiently large $n \ge N$. As a consequence, we know that after that point in the sequence, $||u||_{W^{1,2}} \le \sqrt{c_1(am+b)+c_2} = \gamma$ and the weak compactness of the ball of radius γ in $W^{1,2}$ then guarantees that there is a weakly convergent subsequence.

Show a similar proof with the variation of the functional I(u) above.

- Show the weak Euler-Lagrange equation a minimizer has to satisfy.
- Show the strong Euler-Lagrange equation a minimizer has to satisfy if it is regular (smooth) enough.

(40 points)

The remainder of the homework is concerned with finding counter-examples for extensions of the general theorem we have mentioned in class. It reads as follows:

Theorem: Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded open set with a Lipschitz boundary. Let $f \in C^0(\Omega \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$, $f = f(x, u, \xi)$ be a function that satisfies the following conditions:

- (i) $\xi \mapsto f(x, u, \xi)$ is convex for all $x \in \Omega, u \in \mathbb{R}$;
- (ii) there exist $p > q \ge 1$ and $\alpha_1 > 0$, $\alpha_2, \alpha_3 \in \mathbb{R}$ (i.e., they must be finite) so that

$$f(x, u, \xi) \ge \alpha_1 |\xi|^p + \alpha_2 |u|^q + \alpha_3$$

for all $x \in \Omega, u \in \mathbb{R}, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Then the functional

$$I(u) = \int_{\Omega} f(x, u(x), \nabla u(x)) dx$$

has a minimizer \bar{u} in

$$X_g = \left\{ u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega) : u|_{\partial\Omega} = g \right\},$$

where g is the restriction of some $\tilde{g} \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ to $\partial\Omega$. (Or viewed differently, g are prescribed boundary values that are nice enough so that we can find an extension of g called \tilde{g} so that $\tilde{g} \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ and so that $\tilde{g}|_{\partial\Omega} = g$.)

If, furthermore,

(iii) $f \in C^1$ and if there is a $\beta \geq 0$ so that

$$|f_u(x, u, \xi)| \le \beta (1 + |u|^{p-1} + |\xi|^{p-1}),$$

 $|f_{\xi}(x, u, \xi)| \le \beta (1 + |u|^{p-1} + |\xi|^{p-1}),$

for all $x \in \Omega, u \in \mathbb{R}, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

then \bar{u} satisfies the weak Euler-Lagrange equations

$$\int_{\Omega} (f_u(x, \bar{u}(x), \nabla \bar{u}(x))\varphi + f_{\xi}(x, \bar{u}(x), \nabla \bar{u}(x)) \cdot \nabla \varphi) dx = 0$$

for all $\varphi \in X_0$.

The theorem as stated seems to have a lot of restrictions, but it turns out that they all seem necessary since one can find counter-examples without too much trouble. The following exercises are therefore meant to probe the applicability of the theorem.

