

## Master M2 Optimization

by Grégoire Allaire, Antonin Chambolle, Thomas Wick

Basic course of the Master Program "Mathematical Modelling"  
Ecole Polytechnique, ENPC and Pierre et Marie Curie University  
*Academic year 2016-2017*

### Exercise meeting 4, Sep 29, 2016 in Amphi Grégoire

Online version on:

[http://www.cmap.polytechnique.fr/~wick/m2\\_fall\\_2016\\_engl.html](http://www.cmap.polytechnique.fr/~wick/m2_fall_2016_engl.html)

#### Exercise 1

Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$  and  $u \in H^1(\Omega)$ . Consider the functional

$$F(u) = \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 + W(u(x)) dx$$

with for instance  $W(t) = (1 - t^2)^2$ .

1. Is  $F(u)$  convex?
2. Is  $F(u)$  lower semicontinuous? [**Hint:** You can assume that for  $u_n \rightharpoonup u$  in  $H^1(\Omega)$ , it holds

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 dx \leq \liminf_n \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_n|^2 dx$$

which is deduced for instance from the fact that

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 dx = \sup_{v \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N)} \int_{\Omega} v \cdot \nabla u dx - \frac{1}{4} \int_{\Omega} |v|^2 dx$$

hence it is the sup of weakly continuous linear functionals.]

#### Answer of exercise 1

We first study the convexity. The functional  $F(u)$  cannot be convex because the part  $W(u)$  is non-convex. This is clearly seen by two times differentiating  $W(u)$  and checking whether  $W(u) \geq 0$ . Strictly speaking one must use directional derivatives (because the argument of  $W$  is a function itself and not a variable!) and first differentiate into direction  $\delta u_1$  and then into  $\delta u_2$ :

$$\begin{aligned} W(u) &= (1 - u^2)^2, \\ W'(u)(\delta u_1) &= -(4u - 4u^3)\delta u_1, \\ W''(u)(\delta u_2, \delta u_1) &= -(4\delta u - 12u^2\delta u_2)\delta u_1. \end{aligned}$$

Here we see that  $W''(u)$  is not always positive, thus  $W$  cannot be convex. But for simplicity we can just take the derivative of  $W(t)$ :

$$W(t) = -4(1 - 3t^2).$$

We see that for all  $t$ ,  $W(t)$  is not always positive. Thus the function cannot be convex.

With regard to question 2, we need to check if  $F(u)$  is weakly lower semi-continuous in  $H^1$ . That is

$$u_n \rightharpoonup u \text{ in } H^1 \Rightarrow F(u) \leq \liminf_n F(u_n).$$

Now we discuss lower semicontinuity separately for

$$H_1(u) := \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 dx,$$

$$H_2(u) := \int_{\Omega} W(u) dx.$$

To show the lower semi-continuity for the combined functional, we use relation what we already had two weeks ago: If  $H_1$  and  $H_2$  are w.l.sc. then it follows that

$$F(u) = (H_1 + H_2)(u) \leq \liminf_n H_1 + \liminf_n H_2 \leq \liminf_n (H_1 + H_2)(u).$$

For  $H_1$  we already had the hint on the exercise sheet.

Let us now look in more detail to  $H_2(u)$ . We have a lower bound for  $F(u)$  by

$$F(u) = \int_{\Omega} [|\nabla u|^2 + W(u)] dx, \tag{1}$$

$$\geq \int_{\Omega} [|\nabla u|^2 + u^2 - 3] dx, \tag{2}$$

$$= \|u\|_{H^1}^2 - b, \tag{3}$$

where  $b = \int_{\Omega} 3 dx$ . We notice that also  $W(u) \geq u^2 - 2$  could have worked, but not  $W(u) = u^2 - 1!!$ .

Next, we have to justify that there exists a subsequence  $\{u_{n_k}\}_k$ . This can be inferred from the following considerations.

- First we see that  $H_2(u)$  (and specifically  $F(u)$ ) is bounded from below:

$$\inf_{u \in H^1} F(u) > -\infty.$$

This is clearly to see because  $|\nabla u|^2$  and  $W(u)$  are both bounded from below.

- Consequently, there exists a minimizing sequence  $\{u_n\}_n$  such that  $F(u_n) < \infty$ . This can be justified in more detail with the boundedness of a minimizing sequence in terms of coercivity. A sufficient criterion is that a functional  $F(u)$  is coercive if

$$F(u_n) \rightarrow \infty \text{ if } \|u_n\| \rightarrow \infty.$$

Thus, the sequence  $\{u_n\}$  is always bounded by  $F(u_n)$ .

- In our case we have:

$$F(u) \geq \|u\|_{H^1}^2 - b, \quad (4)$$

which shows coercivity.

- Since  $H^1(\Omega)$  is a Hilbert space (and thus reflexive), the functional  $F(u)$  is proper (i.e.,  $F(u) \neq \infty$ ) and coercive, then each minimizing sequence  $\{u_n\}$  for  $F$  has a weakly convergent subsequence. Thus there exists an element  $u \in H^1$  such that

$$u_{n_k} \rightharpoonup u \quad \text{in } H^1.$$

Why is this possible? Because of the coercivity of  $F$  each minimizing sequence is bounded. Otherwise there would be another minimizing subsequence for which  $F(u_{n_k}) \rightarrow \infty$ . But this contradicts that  $\{u_n\}$  is a *minimizing* sequence. Consequently,  $\{u_n\}$  is contained in a closed ball, which is weakly compact.

- Therefore, we have constructed a minimizing subsequence  $\{u_n\}$  and also a limit  $u \in H^1(\Omega)$ .

The theorem of Rellich yields now that there exists another subsequence (using the same index) that converges strongly in  $L^2$ :

$$u_{n_k} \rightarrow u \quad \text{in } L^2.$$

Here we can extract again another subsequence that converges a.e. (almost everywhere). Since  $W$  is (obviously) continuous we have:

$$u_{n_k} \rightarrow u \quad \text{a.e.} \quad \Rightarrow \quad W(u_{n_k}) \rightarrow W(u).$$

Thus, Fatou's lemma is applicable and yields:

$$H_2 := \int_{\Omega} W(u) dx \leq \liminf_k \int_{\Omega} W(u_{n_k}) dx.$$

Consequently we have shown the w.l.sc of  $H_2$  and thus the entire proof is finished.

## Exercise 2

Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$  be a bounded open set (or a cube, or a line for instance), let  $\theta \in ]0, 1[$  and consider  $E_0$  a measurable set of volume  $\theta$  in  $[0, 1]^N$ , and the sets

$$E = \bigcup_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^N} z + E_0, \quad F = \mathbb{R}^N \setminus E.$$

Let  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$  (or in fact any vector space) and  $u_n \in L^\infty(\Omega)$  defined by

$$u_n(x) = a\chi_{E/n}(x) + b\chi_{F/n}(x) = a\chi_E(nx) + b\chi_F(nx),$$

where  $\chi$  is as usual the indicator function. Show that  $u_n \rightharpoonup u$  in  $L^p(\Omega)$  ( $1 \leq p < \infty$ ) or  $u_n \xrightarrow{*} u$  in  $L^\infty(\Omega)$ , where  $u$  is the constant function  $\theta a + (1 - \theta)b$ .

### Answer of exercise 2

Not yet discussed in the TD.