

Topics in Mathematical and Computational Fluid Dynamics

Problem Sheet 1

Problem 1.1 The trilinear form b

Consider the trilinear form defined by

$$\begin{aligned} b &: H_0^1(\Omega) \times H_0^1(\Omega) \times H_0^1(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ b(u, v, w) &:= \int_{\Omega} [(u \cdot \nabla)v] \cdot w \, dx. \end{aligned} \tag{1.1.1}$$

1.1a) Show that b is continuous on $H_0^1(\Omega) \times H_0^1(\Omega) \times H_0^1(\Omega)$ for bounded domains $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \leq 4$.

Hint: Use the Gagliardo-Nirenberg interpolation inequality.

1.1b) Show that for u divergence free ($\operatorname{div} u = 0$), b is skew-symmetric in the second and third argument, that is, show

$$b(u, v, w) = -b(u, w, v),$$

for $u \in V := H_0^1(\Omega) \cap \{\operatorname{div} f = 0\}$, $v, w \in H_0^1(\Omega)$.

Problem 1.2 An auxiliary lemma to prove the Aubin-Lions Lemma

In the proof of the Aubin-Lions lemma, the following lemma is useful:

Lemma 1.1. *Let X, Y, Z be three Banach spaces such that $X \subset Y \subset Z$ and the injection of X into Y is compact and the injection of Y into Z is continuous. Then, for any $\delta > 0$, there exists some constant C_{δ} depending on δ (and the spaces X, Y and Z) such that*

$$\|v\|_Y \leq \delta \|v\|_X + C_{\delta} \|v\|_Z, \quad \forall v \in X.$$

Prove this lemma.

Hint: Argue by contradiction. Assume that the contrary statement is true, i.e. there exists some $\delta > 0$ such that for any $c \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\|v\|_Y \geq \delta \|v\|_X + c \|v\|_Z,$$

for at least one $v \in X$.

If you need more inspiration, recall or look up the proof of Poincaré's inequality (e.g. Evans: Partial Differential Equations, p. 290).

Problem 1.3 Continuous version of Aubin-Lions lemma

In the lecture, we saw the L^p -version of the Aubin-Lions lemma. One can also show a different version of the lemma, the so-called C^0 -version which is the following:

Lemma 1.2. *Let X, Y, Z be three separable, reflexive Banach spaces such that $X \subset Y \subset Z$ and the injection of X into Y is compact and the injection of Y into Z is continuous. Let $T > 0$ and assume that the sequence of functions $\{u_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ satisfies for an $M > 0$,*

- $\|u_n(t)\|_X \leq M$ for all $t \in [0, T]$,
- $\{u_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ is uniformly equicontinuous on $[0, T]$ with values in Z .

Then the sequence $\{u_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ is precompact in $C([0, T]; Y)$.

The proof of this lemma is much shorter than the one for the L^p -version given the lemma from the previous exercise. Prove this lemma.

Hint: Use the lemma from the previous problem to show that $u_n \in C([0, T]; Y)$ and is uniformly equicontinuous. Then apply the Arzela-Ascoli theorem.

Problem 1.4 Weak formulation of the Stokes problem

In the lecture, we talked about the Stokes problem:

$$\begin{aligned} -\mu \Delta u + \nabla p &= f, & \text{in } \Omega \\ \operatorname{div} u &= 0, & \text{in } \Omega \\ u &= 0, & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{aligned}$$

We stated the following theorem which shows that the Stokes problem can be reformulated as a variational formulation:

Theorem 1.3. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be open bounded and its boundary of class C^2 . Then the following are equivalent:*

(i) u is a weak solution of the Stokes equation, i.e. it satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} u \in V &:= H_0^1(\Omega) \cap \{\operatorname{div} f = 0\}, \\ a(u, v) &= (f, v), \quad \forall v \in \mathcal{V} := C_c^\infty(\Omega) \cap \{\operatorname{div} f = 0\}. \end{aligned} \tag{1.4.1}$$

(ii) $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ satisfies: There exists $p \in L^2(\Omega)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} -\mu \Delta u + \nabla p &= f, & \text{in the sense of distributions,} \\ \operatorname{div} u &= 0, & \text{in the sense of distributions,} \\ u &= 0, & \text{in the sense of traces.} \end{aligned}$$

(iii) $u \in V$ achieves the minimum of $\Phi(v) = a(v, v) - 2(f, v)$ on V .

where the bilinear forms (\cdot, \cdot) and $a(\cdot, \cdot)$ are defined by

$$(f, v) := \int_{\Omega} f \cdot v \, dx$$
$$a(u, v) := \mu \int_{\Omega} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v \, dx$$

Prove this theorem.

Hint: Try to show (i) \iff (ii) and (i) \iff (iii).

Published on March 11, 2016.

To be submitted by March 24. Submit solved assignments to F. Leonardi or before/after class if you decide to do so.