

# MATH 527 LECTURE 2: CONSERVATION LAWS I

SEP. 9, 2011

## Conservation laws.

- Evolution of the density  $\rho$  of a certain substance:
  - The total amount inside a set  $\Omega$  at time  $t$ :

$$\int_{\Omega} \rho(t, x) \, dx. \quad (1)$$

- Assumption: Change only occurs as this substance goes through the boundary. Quantified by a “flux”  $F$ . That is

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} \rho(t, x) \, dx = - \int_{\partial\Omega} F \cdot n \, ds \quad (2)$$

where  $n$  is the outer normal.

- Gauss Theorem:

$$\int_{\partial\Omega} F \cdot n \, ds = \int_{\Omega} \nabla \cdot F \, dx \quad (3)$$

- We have

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} \rho(t, x) \, dx + \int_{\Omega} \nabla \cdot F \, dx = 0 \quad (4)$$

as  $\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} \rho(t, x) = \int_{\Omega} \rho_t \, dx$ , we reach

$$\int_{\Omega} [\rho_t + \nabla \cdot F] \, dx = 0. \quad (5)$$

- As  $\Omega$  is arbitrary, when  $\rho_t + \nabla \cdot F$  is assumed to be regular enough, we have a differential equation

$$\rho_t + \nabla \cdot F = 0. \quad (6)$$

- Conservation Laws.

- A conservation law is obtained when  $F$  is a function of  $\rho$  (from now on we use  $u$  instead):

$$u_t + \nabla \cdot F(u) = 0, \quad u(0, x) = g(x) \quad (7)$$

- In particular, a 1D scalar conservation law is

$$u_t + f(u)_x = 0, \quad u(0, x) = g(x) \quad (8)$$

- Solving conservation laws using method of characteristics.

- Denote  $a(u) = f'(u)$ . We can write the equation as

$$u_t + a(u) u_x = 0. \quad (9)$$

the method of characteristics gives

$$\frac{dt}{ds} = 1, \quad t(0) = 0 \quad (10)$$

$$\frac{dx}{ds} = a(u), \quad x(0) = x_0 \quad (11)$$

$$\frac{du}{ds} = 0, \quad u(0) = g(x_0) \quad (12)$$

The solution is given by

$$u(t, x) = g(x_0) \quad (13)$$

with

$$x = x_0 + a(g(x_0)) t \quad (14)$$

Combine these we get an implicit formula for  $u$ :

$$u = g(x - a(u) t). \quad (15)$$

- Although under certain conditions the implicit function theorem gives the existence of a uniquely determined  $u$ , we cannot really write it down explicitly.
- However we can compute  $u_x$  explicitly:

$$u_x = g'(1 - a' t u_x) \implies u_x = \frac{g'}{1 + g' a' t}. \quad (16)$$

We see that there is the possibility that  $u_x$  will become infinity – when  $g' a' < 0$ .

- Indeed, consider the Burgers equation

$$u_t + u u_x = 0 \quad (17)$$

with

$$u(0, x) = g(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & x < -1 \\ x + 1 & -1 < x < 0 \\ 1 - x & 0 < x < 1 \\ 0 & x > 1 \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

we see that characteristics will cross each other, leading to multi-valued solutions which are usually non-physical.

- Weak solution.

- We would like to define “weak solutions” for the equation<sup>1</sup>

$$u_t + f(u)_x = 0, \quad u(x, 0) = u_0(x). \quad (19)$$

As any meaningful definition of “weak solutions” should coincide with the classical definition when the solution is smooth enough, we multiply the equation by a  $C^1$  test function  $\phi$  and integrate by parts as if  $u$  is  $C^1$ .

$$[u_t + f(u)_x] \phi(x, t) = 0 \implies - \iint_{\Omega} u \phi_t + f(u) \phi_x \, dx \, dt + \oint_{\partial\Omega} \phi(x, t) [u n_t + f(u) n_x] \, dS = 0. \quad (20)$$

If we take  $\Omega$  to be the intersection of the support of  $\phi$  and the half-plane  $t > 0$ , we obtain

$$\iint_{t>0} u \phi_t + f(u) \phi_x \, dx \, dt + \int_{\mathbb{R}} u_0 \phi \, dx = 0. \quad (21)$$

Notice that  $u$  no longer needs to be  $C^1$  to make the above integrals meaningful. For  $\phi \in C^1$ , the only requirement we should put on  $u$  is that both  $u, f(u)$  are measures. In particular, it is OK for  $u$  to be piecewise continuous.

**Definition 1.**  $u$  is called a weak solution of

$$u_t + f(u)_x = 0, \quad u(x, 0) = u_0 \quad (22)$$

if

$$\iint_{t>0} u \phi_t + f(u) \phi_x \, dx \, dt + \int_{\mathbb{R}} u_0 \phi \, dx = 0. \quad (23)$$

holds for any  $\phi \in C_0^1$ .

---

1. For simplicity we deal with the scalar case here. We should keep in mind that the “real-world” problems are mostly systems of conservation laws. For them weak solutions can be defined similarly.

One can easily show that if  $u \in C^1$  is a weak solution, then it also solves the equation in the classical sense.

- Note that, the above definition allows discontinuity but not multi-valuedness.
- The goal of introducing weak solution is to do more than method of characteristics, which are faced with two problems:

1. The method of characteristics may leave regions of solution undefined. Consider the example:

$$u_t + u u_x = 0, \quad u(0, x) = \begin{cases} 0 & x < 0 \\ 1 & x > 0 \end{cases}. \quad (24)$$

2. As already illustrated, the method of characteristics may cause ambiguity in the value of  $u$ .

- Filling the void: Rarefaction waves.

- We claim that

$$u(t, x) = \begin{cases} 0 & x < 0 \\ x/t & 0 < x < t \\ 1 & x > t \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

is a weak solution to the problem

$$u_t + u u_x = 0, \quad u(0, x) = \begin{cases} 0 & x < 0 \\ 1 & x > 0 \end{cases}. \quad (26)$$

- More examples in next lecture.

- Resolving the ambiguity: Shock waves.

- Instead of letting characteristics cross, we introduce a discontinuity curve which “cuts” the characteristics. That is, we try to get  $u$  which is piecewise  $C^1$  with jump discontinuities along certain curves. Turns out that the requirement of  $u$  being a weak solution totally determines these curves.

- Consider one such curve, denote it by  $\Gamma$ . Let  $\phi \in C_0^1$  be supported in a small ball centering on  $\Gamma$ . The ball is so small that it does not intersect with the  $x$ -axis and  $u$  is  $C^1$  everywhere in the ball except along  $\Gamma$ .

Denote this ball by  $D$ , which is divided into two parts  $D_1, D_2$  by  $\Gamma$ . As  $\phi = 0$  along the  $x$ -axis, the definition of weak solutions becomes

$$\iint_D u \phi_t + f(u) \phi_x \, dx \, dt = 0. \quad (27)$$

We write the left hand side as  $\int \int_{D_1} + \int \int_{D_2}$  and try to use integration by parts.

Since  $u$  is  $C^1$  in  $D_1, D_2$ , we have

$$\iint_{D_1} u \phi_t + f(u) \phi_x \, dx \, dt = - \iint_{D_1} [u_t + f(u)_x] \phi \, dx \, dt + \oint_{\partial D_1} [u n_t + f(u) n_x] \phi \, dS \quad (28)$$

Since  $u$  solves the equation in the classical sense in  $D_1$  (see exercise) we have

$$\iint_{D_1} u \phi_t + f(u) \phi_x \, dx \, dt = \oint_{\partial D_1} [u n_t + f(u) n_x] \phi \, dS. \quad (29)$$

Similarly

$$\iint_{D_2} u \phi_t + f(u) \phi_x \, dx \, dt = \oint_{\partial D_2} [u n_t + f(u) n_x] \phi \, dS. \quad (30)$$

Since  $\phi$  vanishes on  $\partial D_1$  except along  $\Gamma$ , we finally obtain

$$\int_{\Gamma} [[u] n_t + [f(u)] n_x] \phi \, dS = 0 \quad (31)$$

where  $[u]$  is the “jump” of  $u$  across  $\Gamma$ .

Now let  $\Gamma$  be determined by  $\frac{dx}{dt} = s(x, t)$ . We have  $\frac{n_t}{n_x} = -s$  which gives

$$\int_{\Gamma} [-s[u] + [f(u)]] \phi \, dS = 0. \quad (32)$$

Due to the arbitrariness of  $\phi$ , the weak solution must satisfy

$$[f(u)] = s[u]. \quad (33)$$

This is called the *jump condition*. One can also do the same analysis for systems of conservation laws and obtain

$$[\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u})] = s[\mathbf{u}]. \quad (34)$$

In the special case of gas dynamics, this condition is referred to as *Rankine-Hugoniot condition*.