



## Supplement to The Discrete Galerkin Method for Integral Equations

Kendall Atkinson; Alex Bogomolny

*Mathematics of Computation*, Vol. 48, No. 178. (Apr., 1987), pp. S11-S15.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0025-5718%28198704%2948%3A178%3CS11%3ASTTDGM%3E2.0.CO%3B2-7>

*Mathematics of Computation* is currently published by American Mathematical Society.

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/ams.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

---

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## Supplement to The Discrete Galerkin Method for Integral Equations

By Kendall Atkinson and Alex Bogomolny

6. Bound on  $C_h^{-1}$ . In this section we adopt the approach of [17] in order to bound  $\|C_h^{-1}\|$  in (4.20). This approach is quite general, and the reader may wish to refer ahead to Section 7, which contains more specific examples of subspaces  $S_h$ .

We distinguish between two cases:

- (i)  $D$  is a region in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .
- (ii)  $D$  is a surface in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

In the first case, the modifications needed of Descloux's presentation are just notational; while in the second, they are minor in every respect. Thus we introduce the following notations and assumptions.

- (a)  $D \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  is either a region or a piecewise smooth hypersurface in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . In the latter case, the surface  $D$  is assumed to be Lipschitz; and the general schema for  $D$  is that of application 2 in Section 3.
- (b)  $m$  is either the Lebesgue measure in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  or the measure over  $D$  induced by the latter.
- (c) The closure  $\bar{D}$  of  $D$  is subdivided into the union of closed sets  $e_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, E_h = E$ , each one of which is the closure of its interior in the natural topology of  $D$ .  $h$  is a characteristic parameter of the division. In the case  $D$  is a piecewise smooth surface, the interior of each  $e_i$  belongs to one and only one of the smooth sections that make up  $D$ .
- (d)  $m(e_i) > 0$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, E$ ;  
 $m(e_i \cap e_j) = 0$ ,  $i, j = 1, \dots, E$ ;  $i \neq j$ .

(e)  $S_h = \text{span}\{\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_N\}$ ,  $N = N_h$ ; and for all  $i = 1, \dots, N$ ,  $C_i = \text{supp } \varphi_i$  is a union of a finite number of  $e_i$ 's.

(f) For all  $i$ , there exists  $j$  such that  $C_j \supset e_i$ .

(g) Let  $I_i = \{j : C_j \supset e_i\}$ ; and let  $|Z|$  denote the number of elements in a finite set  $Z$ . Then

$$|I_i| \leq M, \quad i = 1, \dots, E$$

independent of  $h$ .

(h) For  $Y \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , let  $d(Y)$  denote the diameter of  $Y$ . Then with  $\bar{n} = n$  or  $\bar{n} = n-1$ , depending on whether  $D$  is a region or a surface,

$$d^{\bar{n}}(C_i)/m(e_j) \leq \tau, \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \quad j = 1, \dots, E,$$

and

$$d^{\bar{n}}(e_i)/d^{\bar{n}}(e_j) \leq \delta, \quad i, j = 1, \dots, E,$$

both independent of  $h$ .

(i) On  $S_h|_{e_i}$ , let there be given a scalar product  $(\cdot, \cdot)_i$ . Assume also that for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $i = 1, \dots, E$ ,

$$\alpha \sum_{j \in I_i} x_j^2 \leq \sum_{j, k \in I_i} (\varphi_j, \varphi_k)_i x_j x_k \leq \omega \sum_{j \in I_i} x_j^2 \quad (6.1)$$

with  $\alpha > 0$ .

With this, we state the following theorem.

Theorem 6.1. Assume (a)-(i) hold. Define

$$(\cdot, \cdot)_h = \sum_{i=1}^E (\cdot, \cdot)_i. \quad (6.2)$$

Then  $(\cdot, \cdot)_h$  is an inner product on  $S_h$ ; and for the Gram matrix  $G_h = ((\varphi_i, \varphi_j)_h)$ , one has

$$\|G_h^{-1}\| \leq C \alpha^{-1}, \quad (6.3)$$

where  $C$  does not depend on  $h$ .

Proof. The proof follows that of Theorem 1 in [17] very closely. For some  $f \in S_h$ , suppose  $(f, f)_h = \sum_{i=1}^E (f, f)_i e_i = 0$ .

This implies  $(f, f)_i e_i = 0$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, E$ , and it is obvious that  $f|_{e_i} = 0$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, E$ . By (e),  $\text{supp } f \subset \bigcup_{j=1}^N \text{supp } \varphi_j = \bigcup_{i=1}^E e_i$  by (f) and (e). Therefore,  $f \equiv 0$ .

Now in the case of  $D$  a subregion of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ,

$$C = s^{-1} (Mc, p^n \gamma)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (6.4)$$

where  $0 < s < 1$ ,  $p$  is the smallest integer satisfying

$$\mu^{-2} M_{c_n} \tau^n (1-\mu)^{p-1} p^{n-1} \leq (1-s)^2. \tag{6.5}$$

$\mu = \alpha \omega^{-1} \leq 1$ , and  $c_n$  is the volume of the unit ball in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

The relations (6.4)-(6.5) are found in [17]. These can be modified in different ways to the case of  $D$  being a surface in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . The most immediate modification is as follows.

Let  $\tau$  be a constant with the property

$$m(D \cap B_n(r)) \leq \tau \text{ area}(S_n(r)) \tag{6.6}$$

for all balls  $B_n(r)$  of radius  $r$  and the corresponding spheres  $S_n(r)$ , about all points of  $D$ . Let  $\bar{c}_n$  denote the area of the unit sphere. Then

$$C = s^{-1} (\tau M_{c_n} \bar{c}_n^{n-1})^{1/2}, \tag{6.7}$$

where  $0 < s < 1$  and  $p$  is the smallest integer satisfying

$$\tau \mu^{-2} M_{c_n} \bar{c}_n \tau^n (1-\mu)^{p-1} p^{n-1} \leq (1-s)^2. \tag{6.8}$$

The latter inequality (6.8) can be improved by making a more stringent assumption than (6.6) on the behavior of  $D$ . (6.6) in turn evidently holds for surfaces that are Lipschitz and piecewise smooth. ■

Using Theorem 6.1, the problem of bounding  $\|C_h^{-1}\|$  is thus reduced to evaluating (6.1). To see the connection with the previously discussed bound (4.19)-(4.20), note that one possible choice of the inner products  $(\cdot, \cdot)_{e_i}$  in (6.1) is through the use of integration formulas on  $e_i$  ([17] uses exact integration). Therefore, the inner product (4.1) based on (4.4) and the integration (2.3) fits well into the above framework.

Observe also, that the set  $I_i$  that appears in (6.1) admits a very simple interpretation, as indicated by the following

Lemma 6.2. Assume (a)-(i) hold. Then the set  $S_{e_i}^0 = \{\varphi_k |_{e_i} : k \in I_i\}$  forms a basis in  $S_h |_{e_i} = \{\varphi |_{e_i} : \varphi \in S_h\}$ .

Proof. Since  $\alpha > 0$ , it follows from (6.1) that functions from  $S_{e_i}^0$  are linearly independent.

On the other hand, if  $\psi \in S_h |_{e_i}$ , then there exists

$\varphi \in S_h$  such that  $\psi = \varphi |_{e_i}$ . By (e),  $\varphi = \sum_{k=1}^N c_k \varphi_k$ , hence

$$\psi = \varphi |_{e_i} = \sum_{k=1}^N c_k \varphi_k |_{e_i} = \sum_{k \in I_i} c_k \varphi_k |_{e_i}.$$

Construction of  $S_h$ . Now let us be more specific about the construction of the finite-dimensional spaces  $S_h$ . As in

It is not difficult to see that all finite element spaces, do satisfy (6.13). The proof for spaces of spline functions is much less immediate: see [27, Thm. 4.18].

In addition, we require existence of a basis  $\hat{S}^0$  of  $\hat{S}$  with the property

$$(j) \quad \text{for all } k = 1, \dots, E, \quad i = 1, \dots, N \text{ and } j \in I_i$$

$$\text{there exists } \hat{\varphi} \in \hat{S}^0 \text{ such that } \hat{\varphi} = \varphi_i |_{e_k} \quad (6.14)$$

and write  $\hat{S}^0 = \{\hat{\varphi}_i : i = 1, \dots, v\}$ . By Lemma 6.2 the function  $\hat{\varphi}$  in (j) is unique.

The condition (j) is what singles out finite element spaces, and most of the spline spaces fail to satisfy it. For some that do, see Corollary 7.2.

Assuming (j), (6.1) is rewritten as

$$\alpha \sum_{i=1}^v X_i^2 \leq \sum_{i,j=1}^v (|DF_k| \frac{1}{2} \hat{\varphi}_i \cdot |DF_k| \frac{1}{2} \hat{\varphi}_j) X_i X_j \leq \omega \sum_{i=1}^v X_i^2. \quad (6.15)$$

If (6.11) holds, (6.15) simplifies to

$$\alpha \sum_{i=1}^v X_i^2 \leq |\det B_k| \sum_{i,j=1}^v (\hat{\varphi}_i \cdot \hat{\varphi}_j) X_i X_j \leq \omega \sum_{i=1}^v X_i^2. \quad (6.16)$$

In this case, if  $\alpha_0$  and  $\omega_0$  are lower and upper bounds for

[11, pp. 88-90], we assume there is given a reference element  $\hat{e}$ , a finite-dimensional space  $\hat{S}$  of functions over  $\hat{e}$ , and for each  $e_k, k = 1, \dots, E$ , a 1-1 transformation  $F_k$  of  $\hat{e}$  onto  $e_k$ . We shall write  $\hat{s} \in \hat{e}$  and  $s = F_k(\hat{s}) \in e_k$ . Set

$$S_{e_k} = \{\varphi : \varphi(s) = \hat{\varphi}(\hat{s}) \text{ for some } \hat{\varphi} \in \hat{S}\}. \quad (6.9)$$

Finally, suppose on  $\hat{S}$  there is defined an inner product  $(\cdot, \cdot)$ . Then it induces inner products  $(\cdot, \cdot)_{e_k}$  on  $S_{e_k}$  by means of

$$(\varphi(s), \psi(s))_{e_k} = (|DF_k| \frac{1}{2} \hat{\varphi} \cdot |DF_k| \frac{1}{2} \hat{\psi}). \quad (6.10)$$

where  $DF_k$  is the Jacobian matrix of  $F_k$ .

In the case when each  $F_k$  is an affine mapping,

$$s = F_k \hat{s} = B_k \hat{s} + b_k. \quad (6.11)$$

$DF_k = \det B_k$  and  $|DF_k| = m(e_k)/m(\hat{e})$ . Hence (6.10) becomes

$$(\varphi, \psi)_{e_k} = |\det B_k| (\hat{\varphi}, \hat{\psi})_{\hat{e}} = \frac{m(e_k)}{m(\hat{e})} (\hat{\varphi}, \hat{\psi})_{\hat{e}}. \quad (6.12)$$

Spaces  $S_{e_k}$  we consider all possess the property

$$S_h |_{e_k} = S_{e_k}, \quad k = 1, \dots, E. \quad (6.13)$$

the eigenvalues of  $(\hat{\varphi}_i, \hat{\varphi}_j)$ ,  $i, j = 1, \dots, v$ , then  $\alpha \leq |\det(B_k)| \alpha_0$  and  $\omega \geq |\det(B_k)| \omega_0$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, E$ .

In the more general case, assume

$$(|DF_k|_{\hat{\varphi}}^{-1} |DF_k|_{\hat{\psi}})^{-1} = (\hat{\varphi}, |DF_k|_{\hat{\psi}}) \tag{6.17}$$

for all  $\hat{\varphi}, \hat{\psi} \in \hat{S}$  and also that

$$(DF_k)(\hat{s}) = \det(B_k)(1 + O_k(h, \hat{s})) \tag{6.18}$$

for some matrix  $B_k$ .

Then write

$$A = ((\hat{\varphi}_i, \hat{\varphi}_j))$$

and

$$A = [(\hat{\varphi}_i, O_k(h, \hat{s}) \hat{\varphi}_j)] = [O_k(h, i, j)] \tag{6.19}$$

Lemma 6.3. With the above notations, assume

$$|O_k(h, i, j)| \leq O(h), \quad i, j = 1, \dots, v; \quad k = 1, \dots, E. \tag{6.20}$$

Then in (6.15) one can choose

$$\alpha = \frac{\alpha_0}{2} \min_{1 \leq k \leq E} |\det(B_k)|, \tag{6.21}$$

provided  $h$  is sufficiently small.

Proof. The proof uses a standard result from perturbation theory; see [6, p. 505]. If  $\lambda$  is an eigenvalue of  $A + \Delta$  then

$$\min_{1 \leq j \leq v} |\lambda - \lambda_j| \leq \|\Delta\|_2,$$

where  $\lambda_j$  are eigenvalues of  $A$ . Then, since  $\|\Delta\|_2 \leq \|\Delta\|_F \leq O(h)$ , where  $\|\cdot\|_F$  is the Frobenius matrix norm, the smallest eigenvalue  $\lambda$  of  $A + \Delta$  satisfies

$$\lambda \geq \alpha_0 - |O(h)| > \frac{1}{2} \alpha_0.$$

provided  $h$  is sufficiently small. ■