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ABSTRACT. Linear multistep methods are considered which have a stability region S and are D-stable on the whole boundary ∂S ⊂ S of S. Error estimates are derived which hold uniformly for the class of initial value problems \( Y' = AY + B(t), \ t > 0, \ Y(0) = Y_0 \), with normal matrix A satisfying the spectral condition \( \text{Sp}(A) \subset S \), At time step, \( \text{Sp}(A) \) spectrum of A. Because of this property, the result can be applied to semidiscrete systems arising in the Galerkin approximation of parabolic problems. Using known results of the Ritz theory in elliptic boundary value problems error bounds for Galerkin multistep procedures are then obtained in this way.
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1. **INTRODUCTION.**

If a linear parabolic initial boundary value problem is discretized in the space dimensions by the finite element method then the resulting semidiscrete problem is an initial value problem for a system of ordinary differential equations:

\[ M(\Delta x) \frac{U_t}{t} + K(\Delta x) U = P(t), \quad t > 0, \; U(0) = U_0, \]  

(1)

see e.g. Strang and Fix [19]. In the nomenclature of matrix structural analysis, \( P(t) \) is the external load vector, \( M(\Delta x) \) the mass matrix, and \( K(\Delta x) \) the stiffness matrix; cf. e.g. Bathe and Wilson [2] and Przemieniecki [15]. In the present communication both matrices are supposed to be independent of the time \( t \), real symmetric and positive definite. They depend together with their dimension on the small parameter \( \Delta x \) which is, in general, the maximum diameter of all elements in the finite element subspace; see e.g. [2, 15, 19]. The condition number of \( M(\Delta x) \), \( \text{cond}(M(\Delta x)) = \|M(\Delta x)\|_2 \|M(\Delta x)^{-1}\|_2 \), depends not on \( \Delta x \) but for \( L(\Delta x) = M(\Delta x)^{-1/2} \cdot K(\Delta x) M(\Delta x)^{-1/2} \) we find \( \text{cond}(L(\Delta x)) \sim 1/\Delta x^j \) with \( j = 2 \) or \( j = 4 \) respectively if the elliptic operator \( \mathcal{L} \) in the analytic problem is of order two or four, cf. e.g. Strang and Fix [19, ch. 5]. These properties follow in a natural way since the finite-dimensional operator \( L \) must be an approximation to the analytical operator \( \mathcal{L} \). As a consequence the problem (1) becomes very stiff if a small mesh width \( \Delta x \) is chosen.

Linear multistep methods were frequently proposed for the solution of stiff problems, cf. e.g. Lambert [10]. Their application to systems of the form (1) was studied for instance by Descloux [5], Zlamal [23, 24], and Gekeler [6, 7]. Apart from the drawback to need a special starting procedure, (one-stage) multistep methods have two advantageous properties in comparison with multistage (one-step) methods (i.e. Runge-Kutta methods etc.):

- The order of the discretization error is not negatively affected if the mesh width \( \Delta x \) becomes small.
The linear system of equations to be solved in every time step of an implicit multistep method has the simple form \((M(\Delta x) + \kappa \Delta t K(\Delta x)) Y = C, \Delta t \) time step.

The aim of this paper is to show that the stability of linear multistep approximations to (1), too, remains unaffected by the space discretization if the below defined spectral condition is satisfied. This condition implies no restriction of the relation between \(\Delta t\) and \(\Delta x\) if the multistep method is \(A_0\)-stable (definition below).

In the last section we apply our estimates to Galerkin multistep discretizations of parabolic initial boundary problems and show that the order of consistence is the order of convergence in this class of numerical approximations. The results improve some of our error bounds derived in [6] where exponential stability was not yet obtained.

An other goal of the present contribution was to obtain error estimates in a form which is applicable to multistep methods in systems of second order. In a subsequent paper we use our results and consider Galerkin multistep discretizations of hyperbolic initial boundary value problems. The error estimates deduced there correspond to a high degree to those established here for parabolic problems.

2. \textbf{UNIFORM STABILITY.}

To introduce linear multistep methods let

\[
\rho(\xi) = \sum_{k=0}^{\kappa} a_k \xi^{k-\kappa}, \quad a_0 > 0, \quad \sigma(\xi) = \sum_{k=0}^{\kappa} \beta_k \xi^{k-\kappa}, \quad \beta_0 > 0,
\]

be two real polynomials without common roots (including zero). Let \(\Delta t\) be a small increment of time \(t\), \(Y_n = Y(n\Delta t)\), and let the shift operator \(T\) be defined by \((TY)(t) = Y(t+\Delta t)\), \(T^\kappa = T \cdot \ldots \cdot T\). Then a linear \(k\)-step method \(\langle \rho, \sigma \rangle\) for the initial value problem
is formally defined by
\[ \rho(T)v_n = \Delta t A\sigma(T)v_n + \Delta t \sigma(T)b_n, \quad n = 0, 1, \ldots. \] (3)

Here the starting values \( v_0, \ldots, v_{k-1} \) are assumed to be known. If we apply the scheme \( \langle \rho, \sigma \rangle \) to (1) then we obtain
\[ M(\Delta x) \rho(T)v_n + \Delta t K(\Delta x)\sigma(T)v_n = \Delta t \sigma(T)p_n, \quad n = 0, 1, \ldots. \] (3')

By the linearity of the multistep method this relation is equivalent to (3) if we set \( A = -L(\Delta x) \) and replace \( M(\Delta x)^{1/2}v_n \) by \( v_n \) again.

**DEFINITION 1.** (Cf. Stetter [17, Def. 4.1.7], Lambert [10, ch. 2].)

Let \( 0 < \delta \) be a fixed constant and \( 0 < \Delta t < \delta \). A linear multistep method \( \langle \rho, \sigma \rangle \) is consistent if there exists a positive integer \( q \) called the order of \( \langle \rho, \sigma \rangle \) such that the truncation error (or defect)
\[ d_{\langle \rho, \sigma \rangle}(\Delta t, w)(t) = \rho(T)w(t) - \Delta t \sigma(T)w'(t) \]

satisfies
\[ |d_{\langle \rho, \sigma \rangle}(\Delta t, w)(t)| \leq \kappa \Delta t^{q+1}, \]
for all \( w \in C^{q+1}_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}) \), where \( \kappa \) depends on \( t, \delta, \) and \( w \) but not on \( \Delta t \).

A method \( \langle \rho, \sigma \rangle \) is consistent if and only if the following conditions are fulfilled:
\[ \rho(1) = 0, \quad \rho'(1) = \sigma(1), \] (4)

see e.g. Lambert [10, p.30]. The following estimation of the truncation error is due to Dahlquist [4, ch.4]; see also Lambert [10, § 3.3].

**LEMMA 1.** If the linear multistep method \( \langle \rho, \sigma \rangle \) is consistent of order \( q \) then
\[ \|d_{\langle \rho, \sigma \rangle}(\Delta t, w)(t)\| \leq \kappa_c \max_{t \leq \tau \leq t + k \Delta t} \| w^{(q+1)}(\tau) \| \Delta t^{q+1}, \]
for all \( w \in C^{q+1}_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}) \), where \( \kappa_c \) depends on the data of \( \langle \rho, \sigma \rangle \) but not on \( t, \Delta t, w, \) and the norm.

Let now \( \hat{\mathbb{C}} \) be the complex plane extended by the point \( \zeta = \infty \) in the usual way, let
\[ \pi(\zeta, \eta) \equiv \rho(\zeta) - \eta \sigma(\zeta), \pi(\zeta, \omega) = \sigma(\zeta), \]

be the characteristic polynomial of the method \( \langle \rho, \sigma \rangle \) and let \( \text{Sp}(A) \) be the spectrum of the matrix \( A \). As well-known, the concept of absolute stability plays a fundamental role in the numerical solution of stiff differential equations. However, there exists no method \( \langle \rho, \sigma \rangle \) of order \( q > 2 \) which is \( A \)-stable in the sense of Dahlquist, see e.g. Stetter [17, Def. 2.3.13, Th. 4.6.6]. Therefore Odeh and Liniger [13] weakened the requirement of \( A \)-stability in the following way.

**DEFINITION 2.** A method \( \langle \rho, \sigma \rangle \) is \( A_G \)-stable if \( G \neq \emptyset \) and
\[
\eta \in G \subset \mathbb{C} \text{ implies } |\zeta_\nu| < 1 \text{ for all roots } \zeta_\nu \text{ of } \pi(\zeta, \eta).
\]

A method \( \langle \rho, \sigma \rangle \) is said to be \( D \)-stable if no root of the polynomial \( \pi(\zeta, 0) = \rho(\zeta) \) has modulus greater than one and every root with modulus one is simple. It is strongly \( D \)-stable if it is \( D \)-stable and \( \zeta = 1 \) is the only root of \( \rho(\zeta) \) with modulus one. In a \( D \)-stable method \( \langle \rho, \sigma \rangle \) the roots \( \zeta_\nu \) of \( \rho(\zeta) \) with modulus one are called essential roots of \( \rho(\zeta) \), the quantity \( \chi_\nu = \sigma(\zeta_\nu)/(\zeta_\nu \rho'(\zeta_\nu)) \) associated with an essential root \( \zeta_\nu \) of \( \rho(\zeta) \) is called the growth parameter of \( \zeta_\nu \). A \( D \)-stable and consistent method \( \langle \rho, \sigma \rangle \) is \( A_G \)-stable if all \( \text{Re} \chi_\nu > 0 \), cf. e.g. [17, Th. 4.6.4]. Especially, every consistent and strongly \( D \)-stable method \( \langle \rho, \sigma \rangle \) is \( A_G \)-stable with \( G \) including the negative real line in a neighborhood of the origin since the essential root \( \zeta_1 = 1 \) has the growth parameter \( \chi_1 = 1 \).

If a method \( \langle \rho, \sigma \rangle \) is \( A_G \)-stable then the numerical approximation of (2) obtained by (3) is exponentially stable for every fixed matrix \( A \) and fixed time step \( \Delta t \) if \( \text{Sp}(\Delta tA) \subset G \), cf. e.g. [17, Th. 4.6.3]. But in the present communication we consider an entire class of initial value problems (2) thus \( \text{Sp}(\Delta tA) \) can be arbitrary close to the whole boundary \( \partial G \) of \( G \) where - by a continuity argument - roots of \( \pi(\zeta, \eta) \) can have modulus one. (Moreover, if we admit an arbitrary small \( \Delta t \) then \( G \) must contain the negative real line in a neighborhood of the origin, i.e., \( 0 \in \partial G \).) Therefore we must require that \( \langle \rho, \sigma \rangle \) is \( D \)-stable on \( \partial G \) - and not only in the origin. The next definition was also used by Nevanlinna [12].
DEFINITION 3. The stability region $S$ of a method $<\rho,\sigma>$ consists of those $\eta \in \mathbb{C}$ for which all roots of $\pi(\zeta,\eta)$ satisfy $|\zeta| < 1$ and those of modulus one are simple.

Obviously, an $A_G$-stable method $<\rho,\sigma>$ has the stability region $S = G$. With this notation the below needed spectral condition can now be written as follows.

DEFINITION 4. The method $<\rho,\sigma>$, $\Delta t$, and the matrix $A$ fulfill the spectral condition if

(i) $<\rho,\sigma>$ has a stability region $S \neq \emptyset$.

(ii) $S$ is closed in $\mathbb{C}$.

(iii) $\text{Sp}(\Delta tA) \subseteq S$.

A method $<\rho,\sigma>$ is called $A_0$-stable if it is $A_G$-stable with $G$ containing the open negative real line $\mathbb{R}_-$. Thus, for instance, $<\rho,\sigma>$ fulfills the first two conditions of Def. 4 with $S = \mathbb{R}_-$ if it is $A_0$-stable, D-stable in the origin and in $\zeta = \infty$ the latter meaning that all roots of $\sigma(\zeta)$ have modulus not greater than one and those of modulus one are simple.

We now consider the Frobenius matrix $F_\pi(\eta)$ associated with the characteristic polynomial $\pi(\zeta,\eta) = \rho(\zeta) - \eta\sigma(\zeta) = \sum_{k=0}^{k-\kappa} \gamma_k(\eta)\zeta^{k-\kappa}$, $\gamma_0(\eta) \neq 0$,

$$
F_\pi(\eta) = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & 1 & & & & 0 \\
& 0 & & & 1 & \\
& & & & &
-\gamma_0(\eta)^{-1}\gamma_1(\eta) & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & -\gamma_0(\eta)^{-1}\gamma_1(\eta)
\end{bmatrix}
$$

For a matrix $A$ with regular $\gamma_0(A) = \alpha_0 I - \beta_0 A$ the block matrix $F_\pi(A)$ is obtained if in $F_\pi(\eta)$ the scalar $\eta$ is replaced by the matrix $A$. The following lemma represents the basic tool of this paper. It was proved in an entirely different way by Zlamal [23, p. 355] for $A_0$-stable methods which are D-stable in $\zeta = 0$ and $\zeta = \infty$.

LEMMA 2. Let $<\rho,\sigma>$ be a multistep method with stability region $S$. If $S$ is
closed then

\[\mathbb{E}_{\rho,\sigma} \equiv \sup_{\eta \in S} \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|F_n(\eta)^n\| < \infty\]

\[\| \cdot \|\] denoting the Euclidean norm (spectral norm).

**PROOF.** (i) By assumption there exists for every fixed \( \eta \in S \) a lub-norm \( \| \cdot \|_\eta \) such that \( \| F_\pi(\eta) \|_\eta \leq 1 \), see e.g. Stoer and Bulirsch [18, Th. 6.8.2]. Hence \( \| F_\pi(\eta)^n \|_\eta \leq 1 \), and by the norm equivalence theorem (cf. e.g. Ortega and Rheinboldt [14, Th. 2.2.1]) we obtain

\[\| F_\pi(\eta)^n \|_\eta \leq c(\eta) \| F_\pi(\eta) \|_\eta \leq c(\eta) < \infty\]

where \( c(\eta) \) depends only on \( \eta \) and the dimension \( k \). Therefore the assertion follows for every fixed \( \eta \in S \).

(ii) The matrix \( F_\pi(\eta) \) has the characteristic polynomial \( \pi(\zeta,\eta) \), i.e., the eigenvalues of \( F_\pi(\eta) \) are the roots of \( \pi(\zeta,\eta) \). Hence the eigenvalues of \( F_\pi(\eta) \) are the branches of the algebraic variety \( \zeta \) defined by \( \pi(\zeta,\eta) = 0 \). This algebraic variety has the unique finite pole at \( \eta = \alpha_0 / \beta_0 > 0 \) which cannot lie in \( S \). Moreover, a simple calculation shows that \( \zeta \) can have only a finite set \( \mathcal{E} \) of exceptional points or branching points \( \eta^* \), i.e., points in the complex plane where some eigenvalues coalesce or - in other words - where \( F_\pi(\eta^*) \) has multiple eigenvalues. Now, we have by (i) that \( c(\eta^*) < \infty \) for every \( \eta^* \in S \cap \mathcal{E} \) but by construction of the norm \( \| \cdot \|_\eta \) (cf. [18] and the explicit Jordan decomposition of \( F_\pi(\eta) \) given below) we find \( \lim_{\eta \to \eta^*} c(\eta) = \infty \) for \( \eta^* \in S \cap \mathcal{E} \). Thus we must prove the assertion of the lemma for \( \eta \to \eta^* \) in a separated way. For simplicity we show the boundedness of \( \| F_\pi(\eta)^n \| \) near \( \eta^* \) here only for a finite \( \eta^* \) in which the algebraic variety \( \zeta \) has only one confluenting cycle of branches. The assertion is proved analogously if \( \eta^* = \infty \in S \) replacing \( 1/\eta \) by \( \eta \) since in this case the method \( \langle \rho,\sigma \rangle \) must be implicit, i.e., \( \beta_0 \neq 0 \).

(iii) Consider a fixed \( \eta^* \in S \cap \mathcal{E} \). By assumption all confluenting branches \( \zeta(\eta) \) - where without loss of generality \( \nu = 1, \ldots, m \leq k \) - satisfy
\[ |\xi_{\nu}(\eta)| < 1 \] in a small disc \( \mathcal{D} \) with center \( \eta^* \). By Kato [8, 2.1.7] we may write \( \xi_{\nu}(\eta) \) in \( \mathcal{D} \) as a Puiseux series,

\[ \xi_{\nu}(\eta) = \sum_{\mu=0}^{\infty} \phi_{\mu} \omega^{\nu(\eta - \eta^*)^{1/m}}, \quad \nu = 1, \ldots, m, \] (5)

where \( \phi_0 = \xi_1(\eta^*) = \cdots = \xi_m(\eta^*) \) and \( \omega = \exp(2\pi i/m) \). \( \psi(\xi) = \sum_{\mu=0}^{\infty} \phi_\mu \xi^\mu \) represents an analytic function in \( \mathcal{D} \) with \( |\psi(\xi)| < 1 \) in a sufficiently small disc \( \mathcal{D} \) with center 0 and radius 0. Hence we can estimate the coefficients \( \phi_{\mu}^{(n)} \) of \( \xi_{\nu}(\eta)^n \) as the coefficients of \( \psi(\xi)^n \) by Cauchy's estimate (see Ahlfors [1, p. 98]),

\[ |\phi_{\mu}^{(n)}| \leq \max_{\xi \in \partial \mathcal{D}} |\psi(\xi)^n|/\theta^{\mu}, \quad \mu = 0, \ldots, \] (6)

(iv) By the norm equivalence theorem it suffices to show that the elements \( f_{ij}^{(n)}(\eta) \) of \( F_{\mu}(\eta)^n \) are uniformly bounded in a neighborhood of \( \eta^* \) with exception of \( \eta^* \). Let \( F_{\mu}(\eta) = Q(\eta)Z(\eta)Q(\eta)^{-1} \) be the Jordan canonical decomposition. Then, for \( \eta \in \mathcal{C}, Q(\eta) \) is the matrix of the column eigenvectors of \( F_{\mu}(\eta) \), and it has the form

\[ Q = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & \cdots & 1 \\
\zeta_1 & \cdots & \zeta_k \\
\vdots & \cdots & \vdots \\
\zeta_{k-1} & \cdots & \zeta_{k-1}
\end{bmatrix}, \quad \det(Q) = \Pi_{\mu > \nu}(\zeta_\mu - \zeta_\nu), \] (7)

where the argument \( \eta \) is omitted. Consequently, using Cramer's rule we obtain after some simple calculations

\[ f_{ij}^{(n)}(\eta) = \det(Q_{ij}(\eta))/\det(Q(\eta)). \] (8)

Here \( Q_{ij}^{(n)}(\eta) \) is obtained from \( Q(\eta) \) by replacing the \( j \)th row by

\[ (\zeta_1(\eta)^{n+i-1}, \ldots, \zeta_k(\eta)^{n+i-1}). \] (9)

The denominator of (8) satisfies by (7) \( \lim_{\eta \to \eta^*} \det(Q(\eta)) = 0 \) with exactly the rate of convergence \( m(m-1)/2m = (m-1)/2 \) since by assumption exactly \( m \) roots \( \zeta_\nu \) coalesce in \( \eta^* \). (We assume that \( \phi_1 \neq 0 \) in (5) otherwise the proof follows in a slightly modified way.)

(v) By (6) and (9) the assertion of the lemma is now proved for \( \eta \to \eta^* \) when we show that the numerator in (8) converges to zero at the same rate
as the denominator. To this aim we set briefly \( \Omega = \omega^*(\eta - \eta^*)^{1/m} \) then, substituting (5), \( \det(Q_{ij}^{(n)}(\eta)) \) can be written in the form

\[
\det(Q_{ij}^{(n)}(\eta)) = \sigma((\eta - \eta^*)^{(m-1)/m})
\]

\[
+ \sum_{\mu=0}^{(m-1)^2/2} \sum_{\mu_{i=1}^{\mu_m}} \det(\phi(n)^{(m-1)^2/2}, \phi(n)^{(m-1)^2/2}, \phi(n)^{(m-1)^2/2})
\]

where \( \|Q_{ij}^{(n)}(\eta)\|_\infty \leq 1 \) by assumption for \( \nu = m+1, \ldots, k \), and

\[
\phi(n)^{(m-1)^2/2} = (\phi(0), \ldots, \phi(j-1), \phi(n+i-1), \phi(j+1), \ldots, \phi(k-1))^T
\]

with the notations of (iii). Accordingly, as a determinant is zero if two columns coincide up to a scalar factor,

\[
\det(Q_{ij}^{(n)}(\eta)) = \sigma((\eta - \eta^*)^{(m-1)/2})
\]

\[
+ \sum_{\mu_{i=1}^{\mu_m}} \det(\phi(n)^{(m-1)^2/2}, \phi(n)^{(m-1)^2/2}, \phi(n)^{(m-1)^2/2})
\]

This proves the desired result since

\[
\Omega_1^{(n)} = \sigma((\eta - \eta^*)^{m-1}m/2) = \sigma((\eta - \eta^*)^{m(m-1)/2m})
\]

if \( 0 \leq \mu_1 \leq (m-1)^2/2 \) and \( \mu_r \neq \mu_s \) for \( r \neq s \).

By means of Lemma 2 an error bound is now easily derived. The error \( E_n = Y_n - V_n \) of the method (3) in the problem (2) fulfills the relation

\[
\rho(T)E_n - \Delta tA^\sigma(T)E_n = d_{\rho,\sigma}(\Delta t, A)_n, \quad n = 0, 1, \ldots, (10)
\]

by definition of the truncation error \( d_{\rho,\sigma}(\Delta t, Y) \). Introducing the block vectors

\[
E_n = (E_{n-k+1}, \ldots, E_n)^T,
\]

\[
d_{\rho,\sigma}(\Delta t, Y)_n = (0, \ldots, 0, (\alpha_0 I - \beta_0 \Delta tA)^{-1})d_{\rho,\sigma}(\Delta t, A)^{n-k}_n
\]

the Jordan canonical decomposition of \( A, A = XAX^{-1} \), and the block diagonal matrix \( X = (X, \ldots, X) \) we find that (10) is equivalent to
Therefore Lemma 2 immediately yields

**THEOREM 1.** If the matrix $A$ is diagonalizable and the spectral condition is satisfied then

$$
\|E_n\| \leq \frac{\pi(\Delta t\Lambda)_{n-1} + \frac{d_{\rho,\sigma}}{\Delta t}(\Delta t, Y)}{\Delta t}, n = k, \ldots,
$$

It should be emphasized that this error bound holds uniformly for the class of normal matrices $A$ satisfying the spectral condition.

3. **UNIFORM EXPONENTIAL STABILITY.**

The regions $S_{\mu}$ of $\mu$-exponential stability considered in this section are here introduced in a slight modification of Stetter [17, Def. 2.3.15 and § 4.6.2].

**DEFINITION 4.** A method $\rho, \sigma$ has the region of $\mu$-exponential stability $S_{\mu}, \mu > 0$, if the associated Frobenius matrix $F_{\pi}(\eta)$ satisfies $\text{spr}(F_{\pi}(\eta)) \leq 1 - 4\mu$ for all $\eta \in S_{\mu}$, spr($F$) denoting the spectral radius of $F$.

For two $(m,m)$-matrices $P, Q$ we write $P \prec Q$ if $W^T P W \prec W^T Q W$ holds for all $W \in \mathbb{C}^m$, $W^T = W^\top$. The following matrix theorem of Kreiss [9] is quoted here in a somewhat shortened form using a modification of Widlund [20].

**KREISS' MATRIX THEOREM.** Let $\mathcal{F}$ denote a family of real or complex $(k,k)$-matrices. Then the following statements are equivalent:

(i) $\Xi_1 \equiv \sup_{F \in \mathcal{F}} \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|F^n\| < \infty$

(ii) There is a constant $\Xi_2 > 0$ depending only on $\Xi_1$ and the dimension $k$, and for every matrix $F \in \mathcal{F}$ a positive definite hermitean matrix $H$ with

$$
\Xi_2^{-1} I \leq H \leq \Xi_2 I \quad \text{ (I identity)}
$$

such that

$$
F^H H F \leq (1 + \text{spr}(F)) H/2.
$$
As already used, we have $\Xi(\Delta t) = X \lambda X^{-1}$ for every diagonal matrix $A = X \lambda X^{-1}$ with regular $\alpha_0 I - \beta_0 \Delta t A$ and, moreover, $\|\Xi(\Delta t)\| = \max_{\lambda \in \lambda} \|\Xi(\Delta t)\|_{\lambda}$ is true. Hence the following corollary is an immediate consequence of Lemma 2 and the Kreiss' Matrix Theorem.

**COROLLARY.** Let the matrix $A$ be diagonal and let the spectral condition be satisfied. If $\text{Sp}(\Delta t) \subseteq S_{\mu}$ then there is a constant $E_2$ depending only on $\Xi_{<p,\sigma>}$ and the dimension $k$, and for every $\Xi(\Delta t)$ a positive definite hermitean matrix $H$ such that

$$E_2^{-1} H < \Xi < E_2 H$$

and

$$\Xi(\Delta t)^H (X^{-1})^H H X^{-1} \Xi(\Delta t) < (1 - 2\mu) (X^{-1})^H H X^{-1}.$$

Let now $\|E_n\|^2 = \Xi_{<p,\sigma>}(\Delta t) E_{n-1} H X_{n-1} \Xi_{<p,\sigma>}(\Delta t) E_n H X_n$ then, multiplying the error equations (11) from left by $H^{1/2} X^{-1}$ we obtain

$$\|E_n\| \leq \|\Xi(\Delta t) E_{n-1} H + \|d_{<p,\sigma>}(\Delta t, Y) Y_n H\|, \ n = k, \ldots,$$

and

$$E_2^{-1/2} X^{-1} E \Xi < E \Xi < E_2^{-1/2} X^{-1} E \Xi.$$

Accordingly, a recursive estimation by means of the Corollary yields

**THEOREM 2.** Let the matrix $A$ be diagonal and the spectral condition be satisfied. If $\text{Sp}(\Delta t) \subseteq S_{\mu}, \mu > 0$, then

$$
\|Y_n - V_n\| \leq \Xi_{<p,\sigma>}(\Delta t) \|X\| \|X^{-1}\| \left[ \exp\{-(\mu/\Delta t)(n\Delta t)\Sigma_{\lambda}^{k-1}\|Y_n - V_n\|\right.

+ \sum_{\lambda=1}^{k} \exp\{-(\mu/\Delta t)(n\Delta t)\} \|d_{<p,\sigma>}(\Delta t, Y) Y_n\|\right],

$$

and

$$d_{<p,\sigma>}(\Delta t, Y) \|Y\| \leq \|\alpha_0 I - \beta_0 \Delta t A\| \|Y\|^{q+1} \|d_{<p,\sigma>}(\Delta t, Y)\|,$$

$$\|Y\| \leq \max_{\lambda \in \lambda} \|\Delta t\| \|Y(t)\|, \text{ if } \langle p, \sigma \rangle \text{ is of order } q.$$

The next lemma shows that for a fixed matrix $A$ the exponential growing factor $\mu/\Delta t$ can be estimated more exactly.

**LEMMA 3.** If the growth parameters $\lambda_{\lambda}$ of a D-stable method $\langle p, \sigma \rangle$ satisfy
Re $\chi_\kappa > 0$ and if all eigenvalues $\lambda_\mu$ of the matrix $A$ satisfy $\lambda_\mu < -\alpha < 0$ then, for $\Delta t$ sufficiently small,

$$\mu/\Delta t \geq \alpha \min \{ \text{Re} \chi_\kappa / 8 \} > 0.$$  

PROOF. For simplicity let $\zeta_\kappa$, $\kappa = 1, \ldots, i$, $i \leq k$, be the essential roots of the polynomial $\rho(\zeta)$ and let $\zeta_\kappa(\eta)$ be the corresponding roots of $\pi(\zeta, \eta)$, $\zeta_\kappa(\eta) \to \zeta_\kappa$, $\eta \to 0$. Then there exists a non-empty interval such that

$$\text{spr}(F_\pi(\eta)) = \max_{1 \leq \kappa \leq i} |\zeta_\kappa(\eta)|, \delta_1 \leq \eta \leq 0, \delta_1 < 0.$$  

But $\zeta_\kappa(\eta) = \zeta_\kappa[1 + \chi_\kappa \eta + \sigma(\eta^2)]$ as follows by substituting this expansion in $\pi(\zeta, \eta) = 0$. Therefore, $|\zeta_\kappa(\eta)|^2 = 1 + 2 \text{Re} \chi_\kappa \eta + \sigma(\eta^2)$ and there is a non-empty interval such that

$$|\zeta_\kappa(\eta)| \leq 1 + (\text{Re} \chi_\kappa \eta / 2), \kappa = 1, \ldots, i, \delta_2 \leq \eta \leq 0, \delta_2 < 0,$$

since $\text{Re} \chi_\kappa > 0$ by assumption. By (13) and (14) we obtain

$$\text{spr}(F_\pi(\eta)) \leq 1 + \eta \min_{1 \leq \kappa \leq i} (\text{Re} \chi_\kappa / 2), \max\{\delta_1, \delta_2\} \leq \eta \leq 0,$$

and thus

$$\text{spr}(F_\pi(\Delta t \lambda_\mu)) \leq 1 - \Delta t \min_{1 \leq \kappa \leq i} (\text{Re} \chi_\kappa / 2),$$

for $\Delta t \leq \max\{|\delta_1|, |\delta_2|\}$. Now the assertion follows because we can set here

$$\mu = [1 - \max_{1 \leq \mu \leq m} \text{spr}(F_\pi(\Delta t \lambda_\mu))] / 4.$$

4. GALERKIN MULTISTEP PROCEDURES IN PARABOLIC PROBLEMS.

To be brief we first list up some necessary notations: $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ bounded domain;

$$\|f\|_s = \left( \int _{\Omega} \sum_{|\alpha| \leq s} \|D^\alpha f(x)\|^2 \, dx \right)^{1/2}, s \in \mathbb{N},$$

Sobolev norm with the standard multi-index notation;

$C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ set of real-valued functions $f \in C^\infty(\Omega)$ with compact support in $\Omega$;

$W_0^S(\Omega)$ closure of $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ with respect to $\|\cdot\|_s$;

$W^S(\Omega)$ closure of $C^\infty(\Omega)$ with respect to $\|\cdot\|_s$;

$\mathfrak{X} \subset W^S(\Omega)$ closed subspace with $S_0^S(\Omega) \subset \mathfrak{X}$;
a: \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{H} \ni (u,v) \rightarrow a(u,v) \in \mathbb{R} \text{ symmetric bilinear form over } \mathcal{H} \text{ satisfying}

0 < \alpha \|v\|^2_s \leq a(v,v) \quad \text{for all } 0 \neq v \in \mathcal{H} ;

(f,g) = \int f(x)g(x)dx.

Then, following Schultz [16], see also Strang and Fix [19, ch. 7], Mitchell and Wait [11, § 6.3], a large class of parabolic initial boundary value problems with homogeneous boundary conditions can be written in the weak form

\begin{align*}
\left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}, v \right) + a(u, v) + \langle b(\cdot, t), v \rangle &= 0 \\
(u(\cdot, 0) - b_0, v) &= 0
\end{align*}

(15)

Let \mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{H} be a finite-dimensional subspace which is defined by an explicitly known set of basis functions s_1, ..., s_m. The Galerkin approximation to the solution u(\cdot, t) of (15) is a function u_G(\cdot, t) \in \mathcal{F} which satisfies (15) for all v \in \mathcal{F}. Accordingly, substituting in (15)

\begin{align*}
U_G(x, t) = U(t) \sum_{\mu} s^\mu(x), s(x) &= (s_1(x), ..., s_m(x)), U(t) \in \mathbb{R}^m,
\end{align*}

we obtain a system of the form (1) where, as well-known,

\begin{align*}
M &= \left((s^\mu, s^\nu)\right)_{\mu, \nu=1}^m, K = \left(a(s^\mu, s^\nu)\right)_{\mu, \nu=1}^m.
\end{align*}

(16)

The Galerkin multistep approximation u_\Delta(\cdot, n\Delta t) = u_\Delta(\cdot)_n \in \mathcal{F}, n = k, ..., to the problem (15) is given by

\begin{align*}
u_\Delta(x, t) = V(t) \sum_{\mu} s^\mu(x), t = n\Delta t,
\end{align*}

(17)

and

\begin{align*}
h(T)(u_\Delta(\cdot)_n, s^\mu) + \Delta t \sigma(T)a(u_\Delta(\cdot)_n, s^\mu) &= \Delta t \sigma(T)(b(\cdot)_n, s^\mu), \\
\mu &= 1, ..., m, n = k, ..., 
\end{align*}

(18)

where u_\Delta(\cdot)_0, ..., u_\Delta(\cdot)_{k-1} are assumed to be known. It is easily shown that (17) and (18) are equivalent to (3') and (16).

An estimation of \( u - u_G \) usually needs the Ritz projection \( u_R \in \mathcal{F} \) of \( u \) defined by
a(u(·, t) - u_R(·, t), v) = 0 \quad \text{for all } v \in \mathcal{V}, \ t > 0,

see e.g. Strang and Fix [19, § 7.2]. Hence we estimate the error \( u - u_\Delta \) via the decomposition

\[ u - u_\Delta = (u - u_R) + (u_R - u_\Delta) \quad \text{(19)} \]

directly. However, it is not the aim of the present contribution to discuss the vast field of error bounds in the Ritz theory of elliptic boundary value problems. Therefore we make the following assumption on the bilinear form \( a \), the boundary of \( \Omega \), and the subspace \( \mathcal{V} \), cf. Ciarlet [3, Th. 3.2.5], Strang and Fix [19, Th. 3.7], Schultz [16], and Zlamal [21, 22].

**ASSUMPTION A.** The Ritz projection \( \tilde{u}_R \in \mathcal{V} \) of the solution \( \tilde{u} \) of the elliptic boundary value problem

\[ a(\tilde{u}, v) = (f, v) \quad \text{for all } v \in \mathcal{V} \]

satisfies for a fixed \( I \in \mathbb{N} \)

\[ \| \tilde{u} - \tilde{u}_R \|_0 \leq \kappa_R \Delta x^I \| \tilde{u} \|_1 \]

where \( \kappa_R \) depends not on the sufficiently smooth right side \( f \) and the small parameter \( \Delta x \).

Under Assumption A we obtain in case the solution \( u \) of the parabolic problem (15) is sufficiently smooth

\[ \| u(\cdot, t) - u_R(\cdot, t) \|_0 \leq \kappa_R \Delta x^I \| u(\cdot, t) \|_1, \quad t > 0, \]

since \( u(\cdot, t) \) can be viewed as the solution of the elliptic problem

\[ a(u(\cdot, t), v) = (b(\cdot, t) - u_t(\cdot, t), v) \quad \text{for all } v \in \mathcal{V}, \]

\( u_t = \partial u / \partial t \). Further, let

\[ (u_R - u_\Delta)(x, t) = \sum_{\mu=1}^{m} \varepsilon_\mu(t) s_\mu(x), \quad t = n\Delta t, \]

then, writing \( E(t) = M^{1/2} (c_1(t), \ldots, c_m(t))^T \) we obtain

\[ \| (u_R - u_\Delta)(\cdot, t) \|_0 = \| E(t) \|, \ t = n\Delta t, \| \cdot \| \text{ Euclid norm}. \quad \text{(20)} \]

In order to deduce an estimation of \( u_R - u_\Delta \) we first observe that by (18) and Def. 1
\[ \rho(T)((u - u_\Delta)(\cdot)_{n}, s_{\mu}) + \Delta t \sigma(T) a((u - u_\Delta)(\cdot)_{n}, s_{\mu}) = (d_{<\rho, \sigma>}(\Delta t, u(\cdot)), s_{\mu}) \]

or, by definition of the Ritz projection,

\[ \rho(T)((u_R - u_\Delta)(\cdot)_{n}, s_{\mu}) + \Delta t \sigma(T) a((u_R - u_\Delta)(\cdot)_{n}, s_{\mu}) = d_{<\rho, \sigma>}(\Delta t, u(\cdot)), s_{\mu}) + \rho(T)((u_R - u)(\cdot)_{n}, s_{\mu}) \]

\[ \mu = 1, \ldots, m, \quad n = 0, 1, \ldots. \]

This relation is equivalent to

\[ \rho(T)E_n + \Delta t \sigma(T) E_n = D_n, \quad n = 0, 1, \ldots, \quad (21) \]

where \( L = M^{-1/2} K M^{-1/2} \) with the notations of (16), and the vector \( D_n \in \mathbb{R}^m \) has the form

\[ D_n = M^{-1/2} ((\psi_n, s_1), \ldots, (\psi_n, s_m))^T \]

with

\[ \psi_n = d_{<\rho, \sigma>}(\Delta t, u(\cdot))_{n} + \rho(T)(u_R - u)(\cdot)_{n} \in \mathcal{U}. \]

Hence, using the \( \mathcal{W}^0 \)-projection of \( \psi_n \) onto \( \mathcal{J} \) it is easily shown that

\[ \| D_n \| \leq \| d_{<\rho, \sigma>}(\Delta t, u(\cdot))_{n} + \rho(T)(u_R - u)(\cdot)_{n} \|_0. \]

If the method \( <\rho, \sigma> \) is consistent then \( \rho(\xi) \) has the root \( \zeta = 1 \), i.e.,

\[ \rho(\xi) = \tilde{\rho}(\xi)(\xi - 1). \]

Accordingly,

\[ \| \rho(T)(u_R - u)(\cdot)_{n} \|_0 = \| \tilde{\rho}(T)(T - 1)(u_R - u)(\cdot)_{n} \|_0 \]

\[ \leq \kappa_{\rho} \Delta t \max_{n \Delta t \notin t \notin (n+1) \Delta t} \| (u_R - u)(\cdot, t) \|_0 \]

and

\[ \| D_n \| \leq \| d_{<\rho, \sigma>}(\Delta t, u(\cdot))_{n} \|_0 + \kappa_{\rho} \Delta t \max_{0 \notin t \notin (n+1) \Delta t} \| (u - u_R)(\cdot, t) \|_0. \]

But \((u - u_R)_{t} = u_{t} - (u_{R})_{t}\) as \((u_{R})_{t} = (u_{R})_{t}\) in the present case of a time-homogeneous bilinear form a. We therefore obtain under Assumption A

\[ \| D_n \| \leq \| d_{<\rho, \sigma>}(\Delta t, u(\cdot))_{n} \|_0 + \kappa_{\rho} \Delta t \| u_{t} \|_{L_{1,n+k}}, \quad (22) \]

\[ \| u_{t} \|_{1,n} = \max_{0 \notin t \notin n \Delta t} \| u(\cdot, t) \|_1, \quad \text{since} \, u_{t} \text{ can be viewed as solution of an el-} \]
liptic problem, too.

Finally we can apply Theorem 2 to the error equation (21) and estimate the
defect $D_n$ by (22). Then, by means of (20) we obtain an error bound for the second
term on the right side of (19). We summarize our result in the following theorem.

**THEOREM 3.** If the spectral condition is satisfied and

$$\text{Sp}(\Delta t M^{-1/2} K M^{-1/2}) \subseteq S_\mu, \mu > 0,$$

then

$$\|u_R(\cdot)_n - u_\Delta(\cdot)_n\|_0 \leq \Xi_2 \left\{ \exp \left\{ -(\mu/\Delta t)n\Delta t \right\} \sum_{\kappa=0}^{k-1} \| u_R(\cdot)_{\kappa} - u_\Delta(\cdot)_{\kappa} \|_0 + \sum_{n=0}^{n_\Delta} \exp \left\{ -(\mu/\Delta t)(n-v)\Delta t \right\} \| D_{(n)} \| \right\}.$$

If the solution $u$ of (15) is sufficiently smooth, Assumption A is fulfilled,
and the method $<\rho, o>$ is consistent of order $q$ then

$$\| D_{(n)} \| \leq \alpha_0^{-1} \left( k \Delta t^q + l \| u/\partial t^q \|_0 \right) + \kappa_0 \Delta t \Delta x^l \| u_t \|_1.$$
8. Kato, T. Perturbation Theory for Linear Operators, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York (1966).

9. Kreiss, H.O. Über die Stabilitätsdefinition für Differenzengleichungen, die partielle Differentialgleichungen approximieren, BIT 2 (1962) 153-181.

10. Lambert, J.D. Computational Methods in Ordinary Differential Equations, John Wiley, New York (1973).

11. Mitchell, A.R. and Wait, R. The Finite Element Method in Partial Differential Equations, John Wiley, New York (1977).

12. Nevanlinna, O. On the Numerical Integration of Nonlinear Initial Value Problems by Linear Multistep Methods, BIT 17 (1977) 58-71.

13. Odeh, F. and Liniger, W. A Note on Unconditional Fixed-h Stability of Linear Multistep Formulae, Computing 7 (1971) 240-253.

14. Ortega, J.M. and Rheinboldt, W.C. Iterative Solution of Nonlinear Equations in Several Variables, Academic Press, New York-London (1970).

15. Przemieniecki, J.S. Theory of Matrix Structural Analysis, McGraw-Hill, New York (1968).

16. Schultz, M.H. L² Error Bounds for the Rayleigh-Ritz-Galerkin method, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. 8 (1971) 737-748.

17. Stetter, H.J. Analysis of Discretization Methods for Ordinary Differential Equations, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York (1973).

18. Stoer, J. and Bulirsch, R. Einführung in die Numerische Mathematik II, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York (1973).

19. Strang, G. and Fix, G.J. An Analysis of the Finite Element Method, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J. (1973).

20. Widlund, O.B. Stability of Parabolic Difference Schemes in the Maximum Norm, Numer. Math. 8 (1966) 186-202.

21. Zlamal, M. Curved Elements in the Finite Element Method I, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. 10 (1973) 229-240.

22. Zlamal, M. Curved Elements in the Finite Element Method II, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. 11 (1974) 347-362.

23. Zlamal, M. Finite Element Multistep Discretizations of Parabolic Boundary Value Problems, Mathem. Comput. 29 (1975) 350-359.

24. Zlamal, M. Finite Element Multistep Methods for Parabolic Equations, in: Finite Elemente und Differenzenverfahren (J.Albrecht, L.Collatz eds.) ISNM Bd. 28, Birkhäuser-Verlag, Basel (1975).
Special Issue on
Time-Dependent Billiards

Call for Papers

This subject has been extensively studied in the past years for one-, two-, and three-dimensional space. Additionally, such dynamical systems can exhibit a very important and still unexplained phenomenon, called as the Fermi acceleration phenomenon. Basically, the phenomenon of Fermi acceleration (FA) is a process in which a classical particle can acquire unbounded energy from collisions with a heavy moving wall. This phenomenon was originally proposed by Enrico Fermi in 1949 as a possible explanation of the origin of the large energies of the cosmic particles. His original model was then modified and considered under different approaches and using many versions. Moreover, applications of FA have been of a large broad interest in many different fields of science including plasma physics, astrophysics, atomic physics, optics, and time-dependent billiard problems and they are useful for controlling chaos in Engineering and dynamical systems exhibiting chaos (both conservative and dissipative chaos).

We intend to publish in this special issue papers reporting research on time-dependent billiards. The topic includes both conservative and dissipative dynamics. Papers discussing dynamical properties, statistical and mathematical results, stability investigation of the phase space structure, the phenomenon of Fermi acceleration, conditions for having suppression of Fermi acceleration, and computational and numerical methods for exploring these structures and applications are welcome.

To be acceptable for publication in the special issue of Mathematical Problems in Engineering, papers must make significant, original, and correct contributions to one or more of the topics above mentioned. Mathematical papers regarding the topics above are also welcome.

Authors should follow the Mathematical Problems in Engineering manuscript format described at http://www.hindawi.com/journals/mpe/. Prospective authors should submit an electronic copy of their complete manuscript through the journal Manuscript Tracking System at http://mts.hindawi.com/ according to the following timetable:

| Event                | Due Date       |
|----------------------|----------------|
| Manuscript Due       | March 1, 2009  |
| First Round of Reviews | June 1, 2009  |
| Publication Date     | September 1, 2009 |

Guest Editors

Edson Denis Leonel, Department of Statistics, Applied Mathematics and Computing, Institute of Geosciences and Exact Sciences, State University of São Paulo at Rio Claro, Avenida 24A, 1515 Bela Vista, 13506-700 Rio Claro, SP, Brazil; edleonel@rc.unesp.br

Alexander Loskutov, Physics Faculty, Moscow State University, Vorob’evy Gory, Moscow 119992, Russia; loskutov@chaos.phys.msu.ru

Hindawi Publishing Corporation
http://www.hindawi.com