

12.1: Show (12.1) is consistent with (12.1) and (12.2)

$$(12.1) \quad u_t + \left(\frac{1}{2}u^2\right)_x = 0$$

$$(12.2) \quad (u^2)_t + \left(\frac{2}{3}u^3\right)_x = 0$$

$$(12.4) \quad u_j^{n+1} = u_j^n - \frac{\kappa}{h} u_j^n (u_j^n - u_{j-1}^n)$$

To show consistency, we need to show $\|L_h(x, t)\| \rightarrow 0$ as $h \rightarrow 0$

where

$$L_h(x, t) = \frac{1}{\kappa} [u(x, t+h) - H_h(u(\cdot, t); x)]$$

$$\begin{aligned} L_h(x, t) &= \frac{1}{\kappa} \left[u(x, t+h) - u(x, t) + \frac{\kappa}{h} u(x, t) (u(x, t) - u(x-h, t)) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\kappa} \left[\left(u + \kappa u_t + \frac{\kappa^2}{2} u_{tt} + \dots \right) - u + \frac{\kappa}{h} u \left(u - \left(u - h u_x + \frac{h^2}{2} u_{xx} - \dots \right) \right) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\kappa} u_t + u_{tt} + \frac{\kappa}{2} u_{ttt} + \frac{\kappa^2}{6} u_{ttt} - \frac{1}{\kappa} u + u u_x - \frac{h}{2} u u_{xx} + \frac{h^2}{6} u u_{xxx} - \dots \\ &= u_t + u u_x + \frac{\kappa}{2} u_{tt} - \frac{h}{2} u u_{xx} + \frac{\kappa^2}{6} u_{ttt} + \frac{h^2}{6} u u_{xxx} - \dots \end{aligned}$$

From (12.1) $u_t + \left(\frac{1}{2}u^2\right)_x = u_t + 2u u_x = 0$

From (12.2) $(u^2)_t + \left(\frac{2}{3}u^3\right)_x = 2u u_t + 2u^2 u_x = 2u(u_t + u u_x) = 0$

and assuming $u \neq 0$, we have $u_t + u u_x = 0$ as well. So

$$\begin{aligned} &= u_t + u u_x + \frac{\kappa}{2} u_{tt} - \frac{h}{2} u u_{xx} + \frac{\kappa^2}{6} u_{ttt} + \frac{h^2}{6} u u_{xxx} - \dots \\ &\quad \cancel{= 0} \end{aligned}$$

$$= \kappa \left[\frac{1}{2} u_{tt} - \frac{h}{2\kappa} u u_{xx} + \frac{\kappa}{6} u_{ttt} + \frac{h^2}{6\kappa} u u_{xxx} - \dots \right]$$

$$= O(\kappa) \text{ as } \kappa \rightarrow 0$$

So $\|L_K(y, t)\| \rightarrow 0$ as $|t| \rightarrow 0$ so (12.41) is consistent
for 12.1 and 12.2.

12.2: Verify that the Lax-Friedrichs flux (12.15) is consistent (including Lipschitz continuity).

$$(12.15) \quad U_j^{n+1} = \frac{1}{2} (U_{j-1}^n + U_{j+1}^n) - \frac{k}{2h} (f(U_{j+1}^n) - f(U_{j-1}^n))$$

In conservation form, we have

$$(12.16) \quad F(U_j, U_{j+1}) = \frac{h}{2k} (U_j - U_{j+1}) + \frac{1}{2} (f(U_j) + f(U_{j+1}))$$

We first check and see

$$\begin{aligned} F(\bar{u}, \bar{u}) &= \frac{h}{2k} (\bar{u} - \bar{u}) + \frac{1}{2} (f(\bar{u}) + f(\bar{u})) \\ &= 0 + \frac{1}{2} (2f(\bar{u})) \\ &= f(\bar{u}) \end{aligned}$$

so (12.17) is satisfied.

Now, take v, w

$$\begin{aligned} |F(v, w) - f(\bar{u})| &= \frac{h}{2k} (v - w) + \frac{1}{2} (f(v) + f(w)) - f(\bar{u}) \\ &= \frac{h}{2k} ((v - \bar{u}) - (w - \bar{u})) + \frac{1}{2} (f(v) - f(\bar{u})) + \frac{1}{2} (f(w) - f(\bar{u})) \end{aligned}$$

f is assumed to be smooth, thus Lipschitz. So if $|v - \bar{u}| \leq \epsilon$, $|w - \bar{u}| \leq \delta$ then

$$|F(v, w) - f(\bar{u})| \leq \frac{h}{2k} (\epsilon - \delta) + \frac{1}{2} K\epsilon + \frac{1}{2} K\delta$$

$$\text{WLOG, let } \epsilon > \delta \quad \leq \frac{h}{k} \epsilon + K\epsilon = \left(\frac{h}{k} + K \right) \epsilon$$

So $F(v, w)$ is Lipschitz and thus (12.15) is consistent.

12.3: (Paraphrased) Show (12.26)

- 1) reduced to (12.24) in the constant coefficient linear case,
 - 2) is second order accurate for nonlinear problems (smooth solutions),
 - 3) is conservative;
 - 4) write (12.26) in conservation form.
-

$$(12.24) \quad U_j^{n+1} = U_j^n - \frac{\kappa}{2h} A (U_{j+1}^n - U_{j-1}^n) + \frac{\kappa^2}{2h^2} A^2 (U_{j+1}^n - 2U_j^n + U_{j-1}^n)$$

$$(12.26) \quad U_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}} = \frac{1}{2} (U_j^n + U_{j+1}^n) - \frac{\kappa}{2h} [f(U_{j+1}^n) - f(U_j^n)]$$

$$U_j^{n+1} = U_j^n - \frac{\kappa}{h} [f(U_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}}) - f(U_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}})].$$

I) In the constant coefficient linear case, $f(u) = Au$

So, for 12.26

$$U_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}} = \frac{1}{2} (U_j^n + U_{j+1}^n) - \frac{\kappa}{2h} A (U_{j+1}^n - U_j^n)$$

$$U_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}} = \frac{1}{2} (U_{j+1}^n + U_j^n) - \frac{\kappa}{2h} A (U_j^n - U_{j-1}^n)$$

$$U_j^{n+1} = U_j^n - \frac{\kappa}{h} A (U_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}} - U_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}})$$

$$= U_j^n - \frac{\kappa}{h} A \left[\frac{1}{2} U_j^n + \frac{1}{2} U_{j+1}^n - \frac{\kappa}{2h} A U_{j+1}^n + \frac{\kappa}{2h} A U_j^n \right. \\ \left. - \frac{1}{2} U_{j-1}^n - \frac{1}{2} U_j^n + \frac{\kappa}{2h} A U_j^n - \frac{\kappa}{2h} A U_{j-1}^n \right]$$

$$= U_j^n - \frac{\kappa}{2h} A (U_{j+1}^n - U_{j-1}^n) + \frac{\kappa^2}{2h^2} A^2 (U_{j+1}^n - 2U_j^n + U_{j-1}^n)$$

$$= (12.24) \text{ as wanted.}$$

2) Using Taylor Series Expansion, recall $U_t + f(u)_x = 0$

$$U_j^{n+1} - U_j^n + \frac{k}{h} [f(U_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}}) - f(U_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{n-\frac{1}{2}})] = 0$$

$$= \underline{U} + k \underline{U}_t + \frac{k^2}{2} \underline{U}_{tt} + O(k^3) - \underline{U} + \frac{k}{h} \left(\underline{f}(u) + \frac{h}{2} \underline{f}'(u)_x + \frac{k}{2} \underline{f}'(u)_t + \frac{h^2}{4} \underline{f}''(u)_{xx} + \frac{kh}{4} \underline{f}''(u)_{xt} + \frac{h^2}{4} \underline{f}'''(u)_{tt} + \dots \right) \\ - \underline{f}(u) + \frac{h}{2} \underline{f}'(u)_x - \frac{k}{2} \underline{f}'(u)_t - \frac{h^2}{4} \underline{f}''(u)_{xx} + \frac{kh}{4} \underline{f}''(u)_{xt} - \frac{k^2}{4} \underline{f}'''(u)_{tt} + \dots$$

$$= k \underline{U}_t + \frac{k^2}{2} \underline{U}_{tt} + \frac{k}{h} \left(h \underline{f}(u)_x + \frac{kh}{2} \underline{f}'(u)_{xt} + O(k^3) \right) + O(k^3)$$

$$= k \left[\underline{U}_t + f(u)_x + \frac{k}{2} (\underline{U}_{tt} + f(u)_{xt}) + O(k^3) \right] + O(k)^3 \\ = 0$$

Since $U_t + f(u)_x = 0$ we have $U_{tt} + f(u)_{xt} = 0$ as well by deriving again.

$$= O(k^3)$$

So the method is Second order accurate for nonlinear Problems

4) In Conservation form

$$(12.7) \quad U_j^{n+1} - \frac{k}{h} [F(U_j^n, U_{j+1}^n) - F(U_{j-1}^n, U_j^n)]$$

(12.26) has

$$F(U_j^n, U_{j+1}^n) = f(U_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}})$$

$$\boxed{F(U_j^n, U_{j+1}^n) = f\left(\frac{1}{2}[U_j^n + U_{j+1}^n] - \frac{k}{2h}[f(U_{j+1}^n) - f(U_j^n)]\right)}$$

3) To show (12.26) is consistent, we first check

$$\begin{aligned}
 (12.17) \quad F(\bar{u}, \bar{u}) &= f\left(\frac{1}{2}[\bar{u} + \bar{u}] - \frac{\kappa}{2h}[f(\bar{u}) - f(\bar{u})]\right) \\
 &= f\left(\frac{1}{2}(2\bar{u}) - \frac{\kappa}{2h}(0)\right) \\
 &= f(\bar{u}) \quad \text{as wanted.}
 \end{aligned}$$

Now, to show F is Lipschitz. Let f be smooth and v, w be such that $|v - \bar{u}| \leq \epsilon$, $|w - \bar{u}| \leq \delta$ and WLOG $\epsilon > \delta$.

$$\begin{aligned}
 |F(v, w) - f(\bar{u})| &= f\left(\frac{1}{2}(v + w) - \frac{\kappa}{2h}[f(v) - f(w)]\right) - f(\bar{u}) \\
 &= f\left(\frac{1}{2}(v - \bar{u}) + \frac{1}{2}(w - \bar{u}) + \bar{u} - \frac{\kappa}{2h}[(f(v) - f(\bar{u})) - (f(w) - f(\bar{u}))]\right) - f(\bar{u}) \\
 &= f\left(\bar{u} + \frac{1}{2}(v - \bar{u}) + \frac{1}{2}(w - \bar{u}) - \frac{\kappa}{2h}[(f(v) - f(\bar{u})) - (f(w) - f(\bar{u}))]\right) - f(\bar{u}) \\
 &\leq C \left(\frac{1}{2}(v - \bar{u}) + \frac{1}{2}(w - \bar{u}) - \frac{\kappa}{2h}[(f(v) - f(\bar{u})) - (f(w) - f(\bar{u}))] \right) \\
 &\leq C \left(\frac{1}{2}\epsilon + \frac{1}{2}\delta - \frac{\kappa}{2h}(C\epsilon + C\delta) \right) \\
 &\leq C \left(\epsilon + C \frac{\kappa}{h} \epsilon \right) \\
 &= C^2 \left(\frac{1}{C} + \frac{\kappa}{h} \right) \epsilon
 \end{aligned}$$

where C is the Lipschitz constant of f .

So F is Lipschitz and thus (12.26) is consistent.

12.4: Consider Upwind w/ flux (12.51). Take $b_{11} = \frac{1}{2}$ and apply it to Burgers' Eqn with

$$U_0(x) = \begin{cases} -1 & x \leq 1 \\ 1 & x > 1 \end{cases}$$

discretized with cell averages $U_j^0 = U_j^0$ (10.3). Argue, referring to the discussion on pg 131, that

1) $U_t(x, t)$ for $b_{11} = \frac{1}{2k}$ converges to the correct refraction wave
solution

2) $U_t(x, t)$ for $b_{11} = \frac{1}{2k+1}$ converges to an entropy violating shock.

3) $U_t(x, t)$ for $b_{11} = \frac{1}{k}$ does not converge

The main change in each case is what the value of U_j^0 is.

From 10.3,

$$U_j^0 = \bar{U}_j^0 = \frac{1}{h} \int_{x_{j-\frac{1}{2}}}^{x_{j+\frac{1}{2}}} U_0(x) dx , \text{ here } x_{j \pm \frac{1}{2}} = (j \pm \frac{1}{2})h$$

Since, $b_{11} = \frac{1}{2}$. $h = 2k$

Note, for any $h \neq 1$

$$\text{If } x_j \leq 1, \quad \frac{1}{h} \int_{(j-\frac{1}{2})h}^{(j+\frac{1}{2})h} U_0(x) dx = -\frac{1}{h} \int_{(j-\frac{1}{2})h}^{(j+\frac{1}{2})h} dx = -\frac{1}{h} [(j+\frac{1}{2})h - (j-\frac{1}{2})h] = -1 \quad , \quad j \in \mathbb{Z}$$

If $x_j > 1$,

$$\frac{1}{h} \int_{(j-\frac{1}{2})h}^{(j+\frac{1}{2})h} U_0(x) dx = \frac{1}{h} \int_{(j-\frac{1}{2})h}^{(j+\frac{1}{2})h} dx = \frac{1}{h} [(j+\frac{1}{2})h - (j-\frac{1}{2})h] = 1$$

Since for each k_l , we only need to check the case when $x_j=1$
 $\Leftrightarrow j = \frac{1}{h} = l$

1) If $k_l = \frac{1}{2l}$, $h_l = \frac{1}{l}$. Then $j=l$

$$U_j^0 = l \int_{1-\frac{1}{2l}}^{1+\frac{1}{2l}} u_0(x) dx = l \left[\int_1^{1+\frac{1}{2l}} u_0(x) dx + \int_{1-\frac{1}{2l}}^1 u_0(x) dx \right]$$

$$= l \left[(1)(1+\frac{1}{2l}-1) + (-1)(1-1+\frac{1}{2l}) \right]$$

$$= l(0) = 0$$

So

$$U_j^0 = \begin{cases} -1 & j < l \quad (x_j < 1) \\ 0 & j = l \quad (x_j = 1) \text{ for all } l \text{ as } l \rightarrow 0 \\ 1 & j > l \quad (x_j > 1) \end{cases}$$

as discussed in the text, the upwind method should work well here and converge to the proper reflection wave.

2) If $k_l = \frac{1}{2l+1}$, $h_l = \frac{2}{2l+1}$, then $x_j=1$ isn't even possible as

$$x_j = j \cdot h = 1 \Rightarrow j = \frac{1}{h} \quad \text{but } j \text{ is an integer and } \frac{1}{h} = \frac{2l+1}{2} \text{ is never an integer.}$$

So,

$$U_j^0 = \begin{cases} -1 & j < \frac{2l+1}{2} \quad (x_j < 1) \\ 1 & j > \frac{2l+1}{2} \quad (x_j > 1) \end{cases}$$

As exemplified in the text, since

$$F(U_j^n, U_{j+1}^n) - F(U_{j-1}^n, U_j^n)$$

$$\text{since } f(-1)=f(1)$$

$$= f(U_j^n) - f(U_{j-1}^n) = 0$$

So $U_j^{n+1} = U_j^n + \frac{k}{h}(c)$ and the solution converges to

$$U(x, t) = U_0(x)$$

here the shock speed is 0, and $f'(x) = x$

We have $f'(u_l) = -1$ and $f'(u_r) = 1$

so we breaks the entropy condition $f'(u_l) > s > f'(u_r)$

3) If, $k_l = \frac{1}{l}$, $h_l = \frac{2}{l}$, then we consider $j = \frac{l}{2}$

however, this isn't always an integer. That is, $X_j = 1$ only if $l \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$

So

if l is even

$$U_j^0 = \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } j < \frac{l}{2} \\ 0 & \text{if } j = \frac{l}{2} \\ 1 & \text{if } j > \frac{l}{2} \end{cases}$$

$$, \quad U_j^0 = \begin{cases} -1 & j < \frac{l}{2} \\ 1 & j > \frac{l}{2} \end{cases}$$

If l is even, U_l converges to the reflection wave (case 1)

If l is odd, $U_l \rightarrow U_0(x)$ (case 2)

U_l cannot converge to multiple solutions, so it does not converge as $l \rightarrow \infty$.