

Numerical Solution of Differential Equations I: Problem Sheet 5

1. Suppose that we have discrete data $\{U_j\}$ defined on an infinite grid $x_j = jh, j = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots$. Let δ and μ be the discrete differentiation and smoothing operators defined by

$$(\delta U)_j = (U_{j+1} - U_{j-1})/(2h), \quad (\mu U)_j = (U_{j+1} + U_{j-1})/2.$$

- a. Determine the functions $\delta U, \delta V, \mu U, \mu V$ for $U = (\dots, 1, -1, 1, -1, 1, -1, 1, \dots)$ and $V = (\dots, 1, 0, -1, 0, 1, 0, -1, 0, \dots)$.
- b. Determine what effect δ and μ have on the function U defined by $U_j = e^{ikx_j}, j = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots$, where k is a real constant (the wave number).
- c. The semi-discrete Fourier transform of a function U defined on the infinite grid $x_j = jh, j = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots$, is the function $k \mapsto \hat{U}(k), k \in [-\pi/h, \pi/h]$, defined by

$$\hat{U}(k) = h \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-ikx_j} U_j.$$

[The reason for the restriction on k is that the wave numbers $|k| > \pi/h$ are not resolvable on a grid of spacing h ; this is the phenomenon of *aliasing*.]

Show that the inverse of the semi-discrete Fourier transform is given by the formula

$$U_j = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi/h}^{\pi/h} e^{ikjh} \hat{U}(k) dk.$$

Describe the relationship between $\hat{U}(k)$, and $\widehat{\delta U}(k)$ and $\widehat{\mu U}(k)$.

The ratios $\widehat{\delta U}/\hat{U}$ and $\widehat{\mu U}/\hat{U}$ are referred to as *Fourier multipliers*. Sketch the graphs of these Fourier multipliers as functions of $k \in [-\pi/h, \pi/h]$.

One would think that applying μ repeatedly to U should lead to a function that is much smoother than U . Explain this effect by considering a sketch of the multiplier function $\widehat{\mu^m U}/\hat{U}$ for $m \gg 1$. Your analysis should reveal that taking successive powers of μ is not a perfect smoothing procedure. Explain.

2. The $\ell_2(-\infty, \infty)$ norm of U and the $L_2(-\pi/h, \pi/h)$ norm of \hat{U} are defined, respectively, by

$$\|U\|_{\ell_2} = \left(h \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} |U_j|^2 \right)^{1/2}, \quad \|\hat{U}\|_{L_2} = \left(\int_{-\pi/h}^{\pi/h} |\hat{U}(k)|^2 dk \right)^{1/2}.$$

Prove *Parseval's identity*:

$$\|U\|_{\ell_2} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \|\hat{U}\|_{L_2}.$$

3. Consider the system of linear equations

$$-a_j U_{j-1} + b_j U_j - c_j U_{j+1} = d_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, J-1,$$

with

$$U_0 = 0, \quad U_J = 0,$$

where $a_j > 0, b_j > 0, c_j > 0$ and $b_j > a_j + c_j$ for all j .

a) Show that

$$U_j = e_j U_{j+1} + f_j, \quad j = J-1, J-2, \dots, 1, \quad (1)$$

where

$$e_j = \frac{c_j}{b_j - a_j e_{j-1}}, \quad f_j = \frac{d_j + a_j f_{j-1}}{b_j - a_j e_{j-1}}, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, J-1, \quad (2)$$

with $e_0 = 0$ and $f_0 = 0$. This method for the solution of the linear system of equations (1), (2) is called the *Thomas algorithm*.

b) Show by induction that $0 < e_j < 1$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, J-1$. Show further that the conditions

$$b_j > 0, \quad b_j \geq |a_j| + |c_j|, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, J-1,$$

are sufficient to ensure that $|e_j| \leq 1$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, J-1$. What do you think the practical significance of the last inequality is regarding the sensitivity of the algorithm to rounding errors.

c) Use matlab to do the following:

- (i) Generate any non-zero column vector z with N rows.
- (ii) Generate a $N \times N$ tri-diagonal matrix A with value 2 on the diagonal and -1 on the sub- and super-diagonals. Adjust the first and last row to mimic a Dirichlet boundary condition (so for example, $A(1,2) = 0$).
- (iii) Generate a sparse version S of this matrix by `S=sparse(A)`;
- (iv) Generate a $N \times 3$ matrix B with the vector a in the first column, b in the second column and c in the third column (imagine the tri-diagonal matrix with the diagonal made vertical in the second column).
- (v) Use `tic` and `toc` to determine the time taken to calculate
 - 1 `y=A\z` ;
 - 2 `y=S\z` ;
 - 3 Implement the Thomas algorithm in conjunction with the matrix B to determine y . (needs a little programming!)

Check that your solutions are working for a small value, for example, $N = 5$. Then calculate times for $N = 10, 50, 100, 250, 500, 1000$ and plot \log_{10} of the time versus N . Note that times will depend on speed of your computer so only relative times are important. Hence explain why using the full matrix is impractical for large N .

4. Consider the simplest finite difference approximation of the heat equation $u_t = u_{xx}$, given by

$$\frac{U_j^{n+1} - U_j^n}{\Delta t} = \frac{U_{j+1}^n - 2U_j^n + U_{j-1}^n}{h^2}, \quad j = \dots, -2, -1, 0, 1, 2, \dots; \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

What would the analogous difference approximation be based on values of U at just every other point in the x direction, i.e., U_{j+2}^n , U_j^n and U_{j-2}^n ? Now suppose that you create a new difference approximation from these two schemes by adding $1/2$ of the first difference approximation to $1/2$ of the second difference approximation. Using Fourier analysis, explore how large Δt can be in relation to h if this last scheme is to be stable in the $\ell_2(-\infty, \infty)$ norm.

5. (Finals 2010 - a more complex version of the previous question)

Suppose that $h > 0$ is a fixed mesh spacing and let \mathbb{Z} denote the set of all integers.

(a) Let U be a real-valued function, defined on the mesh $\{x_r := rh : r \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, such that the ℓ^2 norm of U is finite, that is:

$$\|U\|_{\ell^2} = \left(h \sum_{r=-\infty}^{\infty} |U_r|^2 \right)^{1/2} < \infty.$$

Define the *semi-discrete Fourier transform* \hat{U} of U . Show that Parseval's identity holds, that is,

$$\|U\|_{\ell^2}^2 = \frac{1}{2\pi} \|\hat{U}\|_{L^2}^2,$$

where

$$\|\hat{U}\|_{L^2} = \left(\int_{-\pi/2}^{\pi/2} |\hat{U}(k)|^2 dk \right)^{1/2}.$$

(b) Consider the initial value problem

$$u_t = \kappa u_{xx}, \quad x \in (-\infty, \infty) \quad t \in (0, T];$$

$$u(x, 0) = u_0(x), \quad x \in (-\infty, \infty),$$

where κ is a positive real number and u_0 a real-valued function, defined and continuous on $(-\infty, \infty)$ and identically zero outside of a certain bounded closed interval of \mathbb{R} .

Let

$$\mathcal{M} := \{(x_r, t_n) : r \in \mathbb{Z}, n = 0, 1, \dots, M\},$$

where $x_r = rh$ and $t_n = n\Delta t$ with $\Delta t = T/M$, $M \geq 2$ and $T > 0$. The following finite difference scheme is proposed for the numerical solution of the initial-value problem on the mesh \mathcal{M} :

$$\frac{U_r^{n+1} - U_r^n}{\Delta t} = \theta \kappa \frac{U_{r+1}^{n+1} - 2U_r^{n+1} + U_{r-1}^{n+1}}{h^2} + (1 - \theta) \kappa \frac{U_{r+2}^n - 2U_r^n + U_{r-2}^n}{(2h)^2}$$

for $r \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $n = 0, 1, \dots, M - 1$ with $U_r^0 = u_0(x_r)$ for $r \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Show, using Parseval's Identity, that

$$\|U^{n+1}\|_{\ell^2} \leq \|U^n\|_{\ell^2}, \quad n = 0, 1, \dots, M - 1,$$

provided that either (i) $\theta \in [0, \frac{1}{2})$ and $\mu(1 - 2\theta)^2 \leq 2(1 - \theta)$ where $\mu = \kappa\Delta t/h^2$, or (ii) $\theta \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$,

Deduce that the scheme is conditionally stable in the ℓ^2 norm when $\theta \in [0, \frac{1}{2})$, and unconditionally stable in the ℓ^2 norm when $\theta \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$.