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ABSTRACT

We consider the problem of identifying the spatially varying coefficient of elasticity using an observed solution to the forward problem. Under appropriate conditions this problem can be treated as a first order hyperbolic equation in the unknown coefficient. We develop some continuous dependence results for this problem and propose a spline-based technique for approximating the unknown coefficient, based on these results. We establish the convergence of our numerical scheme and obtain error estimates.
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1. INTRODUCTION

A class of control and identification problems for which the models are based on the equations for elastic structures are those dealing with large space antennas. Mathematical models of these problems are based on the partial differential equation

(1.1) \[ \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( e \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} \right) + \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left( e \frac{\partial u}{\partial y} \right) = f \]

where \( u(x,y) \) is the vertical displacement of the antenna surface, \( f(x,y) \) is the distributed loading force per unit area, and \( e(x,y) \) is the distributed coefficient of elasticity of the antenna surface [1].

The identification of \( e \) using measured \( u \) and \( f \) values for the antenna surface is an important inverse problem. A common identification strategy is the "indirect" one in which one minimizes via an iterative process the deviation between a computed forward solution \( u_e \) and the observations (see, for example [1]). Alternatively, \( e \) can sometimes be identified by a direct approach involving approximate solution of the hyperbolic equation

(1.2) \[ \nabla e \cdot \nabla u + e \Delta u = f, \]

for example, by seeking the finite dimensional representation for \( e \) which minimizes the residuals of a difference approximation for equation (1.2). This is referred to as the "equation-error" method.

A practical limitation to the direct approach for identifying \( e \) is that the coefficients of the hyperbolic problem (1.2) involve derivatives of the measured quantity \( u \). However, when it is feasible it is simpler and cheaper than the indirect approach.
In [2] Richter presented a systematic analysis of the inverse problem

\[ \nabla e \cdot \nabla u + e \Delta u = f, \quad x \in \Omega, \mathbb{R}^n, \]

in which the coefficient \( e \) is to be determined on the basis of an observed \((f,u)\) pair. He showed that the hyperbolic problem (1.3) has a unique solution assuming prescribed values along the inflow portion of \( \partial \Omega \) for \( f \in L^\infty(\Omega) \), provided

\[ \inf \{ \max \{ |\nabla u(p)|^2, \Delta u(p) \} \} > 0. \quad p \in \Omega \]

He also proved that if condition (1.4) holds, then \( e \) depends continuously on \( f \) in \( L^\infty(\Omega) \).

In this paper, we show that if condition (1.4) holds then \( e \) depends continuously on \( f \) in \( L^p(\Omega) \) for all \( p \in [1,\infty) \). We then use this continuous dependence result in \( L^2(\Omega) \) to propose a spline-based technique for approximating the unknown coefficient \( e \) in equation (1.3). We prove that our scheme converges to the actual solution \( e \) of (1.3) and obtain error estimates.

In [2] Richter proposed especially favorable "test conditions" for observing a forward solution \( u \) to the elliptic problem for (1.3):

\[ \inf f > 0, \quad u = 0 \text{ on } \partial \Omega. \quad \Omega \]

Under these conditions (1.4) will be satisfied and the hyperbolic problem (1.3) with the resulting \((f,u)\) pair will require no Cauchy data for \( e \)
because the characteristics of $e$ will originate at points of degeneracy within $\Omega$, rather than on $\partial \Omega$.

Typically, condition (1.5) holds for antenna problems. Thus, the numerical algorithm we propose in this paper, and which is based on a continuous dependence result in $L^2(\Omega)$, would be particularly suitable for antenna problems. In a companion paper [4], we present a multigrid algorithm for approximating $e$ numerically.

2. CONTINUOUS DEPENDENCE OF THE HYPERBOLIC PROBLEM

Let $B(u)e$ be the operator

\begin{equation}
B(u)e = \nabla \cdot (e \nabla u) = f, \quad x \in \Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^3,
\end{equation}

where $e$ and $u$ are defined in a connected, bounded domain $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^3$. Throughout this paper we shall assume that $u \in C^2(\overline{\Omega})$ and $e \in C^1_{p}(\overline{\Omega})$, where $C^1_{p}(\overline{\Omega})$ denotes the class of piecewise continuously differentiable functions in $\overline{\Omega}$.

We shall denote the boundary of $\Omega$ by $\gamma$. Let

$$\gamma_1 = \{x \in \gamma : \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} < 0\},$$

where $\frac{\partial u}{\partial n}$ is the outward normal derivative of $u$ along $\gamma$. $\gamma_1$ is the inflow portion of the boundary $\gamma$.

Suppose that $u$ satisfies the condition
(2.2) \[
\inf_{P \in \Omega} \{ |\nabla u(P)|^2, \Delta u(P) \} = \alpha > 0,
\]
where \( |\nabla u(P)|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \right)^2 \). Then \( \Omega \) can be divided into compact subregions \( \Omega_1 \) and \( \Omega_2 \) such that

\[
|\nabla u|^2 > \alpha \text{ in } \Omega_1, \quad \Delta u > \alpha \text{ in } \Omega_2,
\]

and \( \Omega = \Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2 \).

We introduce some notation we shall need later. Let

\[
u_{\text{max}} = \max_{P \in \Omega} u(P),
\]

\[
u_{\text{min}} = \min_{P \in \Omega} u(P),
\]

\([u] = \nu_{\text{max}} - \nu_{\text{min}},\]

\[
s = \max_{P \in \Gamma} \left| \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} (P) \right|,
\]

\[
\beta = \max_{P \in \Omega_1} \left\{ \frac{-\Delta u(P)}{|\nabla u(P)|^2} \right\}.
\]

We now obtain an a priori bound on the stability of the hyperbolic problem (2.1).
Theorem 1: Suppose $u$ satisfies condition (2.2). Then for any $f$ for which $B(u)e = f$ has a solution $e$ assuming prescribed values along $\gamma_1$ the solution is unique, and

\[
\|e\|_p \leq A_p(u)\|f\|_p + D_p(u) \left( \int_{\gamma_1} |e|^{p-1} \right)^{1/p}
\]

for all $p \in [1, \infty)$. Here

\[
A_p(u) = \frac{1}{\alpha} \left( \frac{1}{p} \right)^{1/p} \left( \frac{2}{p-1} \right) \frac{C_p(u)}{C_p'(u)}, \quad \text{and}
\]

\[
D_p(u) = \left( \frac{2s}{aC_p(u)} \right)^{1/p}.
\]

$C_p(u)$ is defined as

\[
C_p(u) = \min \left[ \frac{\beta}{p}, 1 - \frac{1}{p} \right] \exp(-p\beta[u]) \quad \text{if } \beta > 0,
\]

\[
C_p(u) = \min \left[ \frac{1}{p}, 1 - \frac{1}{p} \right] \exp(-[u]) \quad \text{if } \beta \leq 0.
\]

Proof: Let $g(u)$ be a smooth function of $u$, which we shall specify later. Multiplying equation (2.1) by $g(u)|e|^{p-1}\text{sgn}(e)$ and integrating over $\Omega$, we obtain

\[
\int_{\Omega} g(u)|e|^{p-1}\text{sgn}(e)f \, dx = \int_{\Omega} g(u)|e|^{p-1}\text{sgn}(e) \, (\nabla \cdot (e\nabla u)) \, dx.
\]
Here \( \text{sgn}(e) \) is the function defined as

\[
\text{sgn}(e) = \begin{cases} 
-1, & e < 0, \\
0, & e = 0, \\
1, & e > 0.
\end{cases}
\]

Integrating the r.h.s. of (2.4) by parts gives

\[
\int \limits_{\Omega} g(u)|e|^{p-1} \text{sgn}(e)(\nabla \cdot (e \nabla u)) dx = -\int \limits_{\Omega} \frac{dg}{du} \left| \nabla u \right|^2 |e|^p dx 
\]

(2.5)

\[
-\int \limits_{\Omega} (p-1)(g(u)\nabla u) \cdot (|e|^{p-1}\text{sgn}(e)\nabla e) dx + \int \limits_{\gamma} g(u)|e|^p \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} ds.
\]

Now

(2.6)

\[
-\int \limits_{\Omega} (p-1)(g(u)\nabla u) \cdot (|e|^{p-1}\text{sgn}(e)\nabla e) dx = -\int \limits_{\Omega} (p-1)(g(u)\nabla u) \cdot \nabla (|e|^p) dx.
\]

Integrating the r.h.s. of (2.6) by parts, we obtain

\[
-\int \limits_{\Omega} \frac{p-1}{p} (g(u)\nabla u) \cdot (|e|^{p-1}\text{sgn}(e)\nabla e) dx = \frac{p-1}{p} \int \limits_{\Omega} \frac{dg}{du} \left| \nabla u \right|^2 |e|^p dx 
\]

(2.7)

\[
+ \frac{p-1}{p} \int \limits_{\Omega} (g(u)\Delta u)|e|^p dx - \frac{p-1}{p} \int \limits_{\gamma} g(u) \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} |e|^p ds.
\]

Combining (2.5) and (2.7) gives
\[
\int_{\Omega} g(u)|e|^p \frac{1}{2} \text{sgn}(e)(\nabla \cdot (e \nabla u)) dx = \int_{\Omega} \left[ -\frac{1}{p} \frac{dg}{du} |\nabla u|^2 + (1 - \frac{1}{p}) g(u) \Delta u \right] |e|^p dx
\]

(2.8)

\[ + \frac{1}{p} \int_{\gamma} (g(u) \frac{\partial u}{\partial n}) |e|^p ds. \]

We wish to choose \( g(u) \) so that

\[ g(u) > 0, \text{ and} \]

\[ [-\frac{1}{p} \frac{dg}{du} + (1 - \frac{1}{p}) g(u) \Delta u] > 0, \]

for all \( x \in \Omega. \)

We first treat the case \( B > 0, \) where \( B = \max_{P \in \Omega_1} \frac{\Delta u(P)}{\nabla u(P)} \). Let \( P \in \Omega_1 \)

\[ g(u) = \frac{1}{a} \exp(-pB(u - u_{\min})). \]

Then

\[ \frac{-1}{p} \frac{dg}{du} |\nabla u|^2 + (1 - \frac{1}{p}) g(u) \Delta u = [B \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{a} + (1 - \frac{1}{p}) \frac{\Delta u}{a}] \exp(-pB(u - u_{\min})). \]

If \( \Delta u > a \) it is easy to see that

\[ \frac{-1}{p} \frac{dg}{du} |\nabla u|^2 + (1 - \frac{1}{p}) g(u) \Delta u > (1 - \frac{1}{p}) \exp(-pB(u)). \]

Next, suppose \( \Delta u < a. \) Then \( |\nabla u|^2 > a. \) From the definition of \( B \) we have
Hence we obtain

\[-1 \frac{d\exp(-p\beta|u|)}{du} |v_u|^2 + (1 - \frac{1}{p})g(u)\Delta u \geq \frac{8}{p} \exp(-p\beta|u|).\]

Clearly

\[\frac{\exp(-p\beta|u|)}{\alpha} \leq g(u) \leq \frac{1}{\alpha}.\]

Next, we treat the case \(\beta \leq 0\). Then \(\Delta u \geq 0\) for all \(x \in \Omega\). Let

\[g(u) = \frac{1}{\alpha} \exp(-(u - u_{\min})).\]

Then

\[-1 \frac{d\exp(-[u])}{du} |v_u|^2 + (1 - \frac{1}{p})g(u)\Delta u = (\frac{|v_u|^2}{p\alpha} + (1 - \frac{1}{p}) \frac{\Delta u}{\alpha})\exp(-[u]).\]

It is easy to see that in this case

\[- \frac{1}{p} \frac{dg}{du} |v_u|^2 + (1 - \frac{1}{p})g(u)\Delta u \geq \min \left(\frac{1}{p}, 1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) \exp(-[u]).\]

Also

\[\frac{\exp(-[u])}{\alpha} \leq g(u) \leq \frac{1}{\alpha}.\]
Substituting \( g(u) \) in (2.8) we obtain the following inequality

\[
C_p(u) \int_{\Omega} |e|^P dx + \frac{1}{p} \int_{\gamma} (g(u) \frac{\partial u}{\partial n}) |e|^P ds \\
\leq \int_{\Omega} |g(u)| e^{P-1} \text{sgn}(e)f \, dx dy,
\]

(2.9)

where

\[
C_p(u) = \min((1 - \frac{1}{p}), \frac{\beta}{p}) \exp(-p\beta[u]) \text{ if } \beta > 0,
\]

\[
= \min(\frac{1}{p}, 1 - \frac{1}{p}) \exp(-[u]) \text{ if } \beta \leq 0.
\]

Now

\[
\left| \int_{\Omega} g(u) |e|^{P-1} \text{sgn}(e)f \, dx \right| \leq \frac{1}{q} \int_{\Omega} |e|^{P-1} |f| \, dx.
\]

But by Hölder's inequality

\[
\int_{\Omega} |e|^{P-1} |f| \, dx \leq \left( \int_{\Omega} |e|^{(P-1)q} \, dx \right)^{1/q} \|f\|_p,
\]

where \( \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1. \)

Hence

\[
(2.10) \quad \left| \int_{\Omega} g(u) |e|^{P-1} \text{sgn}(e)f \, dx \right| \leq \frac{1}{q} \|e\|^{p/q} \|f\|_p.
\]

Applying Young's inequality to the r.h.s. of (2.10), we obtain
\[ \int g(u) |e|^{p-1} \text{sgn}(e)f \, dx \leq \frac{C_p(u)}{2} \|e\|^p_p \]

(2.11)
\[ + \left\{ \frac{2}{C_p(u)q} \frac{p/q}{\alpha} \right\} \|f\|^p_p. \]

Thus
\[ \frac{C_p(u)}{2} \|e\|^p_p \leq \frac{s}{\alpha p} \left( \int |e|^p_{\text{ds}} \right)^{1/p} \left( \int |e|^q_{\text{ds}} \right)^{1/q} + \left( \frac{2}{C_p(u)q} \frac{p/q}{\alpha} \right) \|f\|^p_p. \]

Since \( p > 1 \), this implies
\[ \frac{C_p(u)}{2} \|e\|^p_p \leq \left( \frac{s}{\alpha p} \right)^{1/p} \left( \int |e|^p_{\text{ds}} \right)^{1/p} + \left( \frac{1}{\alpha} \frac{2}{C_p(u)q} \right)^{1/q} \left( \frac{1}{p} \right)^{1/p} \|f\|^p_p. \]

Hence
\[ (2.12) \|e\|^p_p \leq \left( \frac{2s}{\alpha p C_p(u)} \right)^{1/p} \left( \int |e|^p_{\text{ds}} \right)^{1/p} + \left( \frac{1}{\alpha} \frac{1}{p} \right)^{1/p} \left( \frac{1}{q} \right)^{1/q} \frac{2}{C_p(u)} \|f\|^p_p. \]

And this gives us the required result.

**Remark 1:** It is interesting that the continuous dependence estimate (2.3) breaks down for \( p = \infty \). Richter [2] proved that the result holds for \( p = \infty \). Combining Richter's results with Theorem 1, we conclude that \( e \) depends continuously on \( f \) in \( L^p(\Omega) \) for all \( p \in [1, \infty) \), assuming the value of \( e \) is prescribed along the inflow boundary.
We would now like to investigate the rather general situation where at least one of the coefficients of the hyperbolic problem is nonvanishing at each point of $\Omega$, i.e., we wish to see whether the continuous dependence results remain valid if we replace condition (2.2) by the condition

$$\inf_{P \in \Omega} \max \{ |\nabla u(P)|^2, |\Delta u(P)| \} > 0. \quad (2.13)$$

First suppose that

$$\inf_{P \in \Omega} \max \{ |\nabla u(P)|^2, -\Delta u(P) \} > 0. \quad (2.14)$$

Replacing $u$ by $-u$ and $f$ by $-f$ in (2.1) so that it takes the form

$$B(-u)e = -f,$$

it is trivial to see that Theorem 1 remains valid if the following modifications are made:

(i) \quad \inf_{P \in \Omega} \max \{ |\nabla u(P)|^2, -\Delta u(P) \} = \alpha > 0.

(ii) \quad \sup_{P \in \Omega} \left( \frac{\Delta u(P)}{|\nabla u(P)|^2} \right) = \beta

(iii) \quad \Omega_2 = \{ P \in \Omega : -\Delta u(P) \geq \alpha \}$
(iv) \( \gamma_1 = \{ \gamma : \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} > 0 \} \), i.e., \( \gamma_1 \) now represents the outflow portion of the boundary \( \gamma \).

Richter notes in [2] that if \( \Delta u \) is not always positive or negative where \( \nabla u = 0 \) it may or may not be the case that \( B(u)e = f \) has a unique solution for all \( f \in L^\infty(\Omega) \), with appropriate initial data for \( e \). For the sake of completeness we cite two examples from his paper illustrating this. In Figures 1 and 2, the curves indicate characteristics of \( u \), with arrows pointed in the direction of increasing \( u \). Both configurations have one maxima and one minima.

![Diagram of characteristics](image)

**Figure 1**

The first depicts a situation where \( \Omega \) can be separated along a characteristic (any one from \( \gamma_A \) to \( \gamma_B \)) into two subregions \( \Omega_1 \) and \( \Omega_2 \) such that

\[
(2.15) \quad |\nabla u| \text{ or } \Delta u > 0 \text{ in } \Omega_1, \quad |\nabla u| \text{ or } -\Delta u > 0 \text{ in } \Omega_2.
\]
Thus the corresponding hyperbolic problem can be solved uniquely for \( e \) with initial data specified along \( \gamma_A \) or \( \gamma_B \). Clearly the continuous dependence result (2.3) remains valid for this situation.

![Figure 2](image)

This is not so for the second configuration because of the presence of characteristics going between the maximum and minimum points. This difficulty can be circumvented by cutting the domain across characteristics by a line \( \gamma_A \) into subregions \( \Omega_1 \) and \( \Omega_2 \). The resulting \( e \) would in general be discontinuous at the interface \( \gamma_A \). Clearly such a solution depends on the choice of \( \gamma_A \) and hence is not unique. Note that Cauchy data would not be required at such an interface.

3. THE NUMERICAL SCHEME

Our method uses the results of Theorem 2.1 with \( p = 2 \). We describe our method for the two dimensional parameter estimation problem restricting ourselves to the case where the domain \( \Omega \) is the unit square, i.e.,
The results described would carry through for the more general situation where the boundary of $\Omega$ is piecewise smooth, with some technical modifications.

The two dimensional problem can be formulated as follows:

Let $L$ be a grid of points

$$L = \{(\tilde{x}_i, \tilde{y}_j): (i,j) \in A\},$$

where $A$ is a finite index set in $\mathbb{Z}^2$. Given a data set of observations $\{u(\tilde{x}_i, \tilde{y}_j), \{f(\tilde{x}_i, \tilde{y}_j)\}$ for $u$ and $f$ at the points $(\tilde{x}_i, \tilde{y}_j) \in L$ determine $e(x)$ that satisfies the equation

$$B(u)e = \frac{\partial}{\partial x}(e \frac{\partial u}{\partial x}) + \frac{\partial}{\partial y}(e \frac{\partial u}{\partial y}) = f, \quad (x,y) \in \Omega,$$

assuming that the inflow section of the boundary $\gamma_1$ is void.

We assume that $u$, $e$, and $f$ are smooth and that $u$ satisfies condition (2.2).

Divide the square $[0,1] \times [0,1]$ into a grid of points

$$L_h = \{(x_i, y_j): (i,j) \in A_h\},$$

where

$$A_h = \{(i,j): 1 \leq i \leq N+1, \quad 1 \leq j \leq N+1\}.$$

We assume that $L_h \subseteq L$. 

$$\Omega = [0,1] \times [0,1].$$
The grid is depicted in Figure 3. Consider now the case where the inflow portion of the boundary $\gamma_1 \neq \phi$. Let

$$\gamma_1^* = \{ P \in \gamma : \frac{\partial u}{\partial n}(P) < \delta \}$$

for any $\delta > 0$. We assume that we are provided Cauchy data for $u$ at a set of points

$$B = \{ (\tilde{x}_i, \tilde{y}_j) : (i,j) \in A \cup \Lambda \}.$$

Here $(i,j) \in \Delta$ whenever $(\tilde{x}_i, \tilde{y}_j) \in \gamma_1^*$, but $\Delta$ may contain other elements besides. We define $\Delta$ precisely below.

---

Figure 3
Consider the situation in Figure 3 where $\gamma_1^*$ is the line segment $AB$ of the boundary $x = 1$. Here $A$ and $B$ do not belong to the grid of points $L_h$. We extend $AB$ to the smallest possible line segment $\gamma_{1,h}$, $P_1 P_6$ in this case, such that

(i) $\gamma_1^* \subseteq \gamma_{1,h}$

(ii) the end points of $\gamma_{1,h}$ belong to the grid $L_h$.

Then

$B = \{(\tilde{x}_i, \tilde{y}_j): (i,j) \in \Delta \subseteq \Lambda\}$

where

$\Delta = \bigcup_h \{(i,j): (\tilde{x}_i, \tilde{y}_j) \in \gamma_{1,h}\}$.

Here the union is taken over all $h$ such that $L_h \subseteq L$.

Thus we are provided with Cauchy data for $e$

$e(\tilde{x}_i, \tilde{y}_j) = w(\tilde{x}_i, \tilde{y}_j), (i,j) \in \Delta$.

We assume the function $w$ is smooth.

Let

$B_h = \{(x_i, y_j): (i,j) \in \Delta_h\}$,

where

$\Delta_h = \{(i,j): (x_i,y_j) \in \gamma_{1,h}\}$. 
In the situation depicted in Figure 3, \( B_h \) consists of the points \( P_1 \) through \( P_6 \).

From the data set of observations \( \{f_{ij}\} \) for \( f \) where

\[
f_{ij} = f(x_i, y_j),
\]

we construct the piecewise bilinear interpolant \( f_h(x,y) \) of \( f(x,y) \), i.e.,

\[
f_h(x_i, y_j) = f_{ij}
\]

and \( f_h \) is piecewise bilinear in \( \overline{\Omega} \).

We approximate the unknown function \( e(x,y) \) by a piecewise bilinear function \( e_h(x,y) \). In case \( \gamma_1,h \) is not void there would be \( M \) grid points belonging to \( B_h \). Then \( e_h(x,y) \) is the bilinear spline function that assumes the values

\[
e_h(x_i, y_j) = w(x_i, y_j) \quad \text{for} \quad (i,j) \in \Delta_h
\]

and whose values at the other mesh points \( \{(x_1,y_j): (i,j) \in \Lambda_h \backslash \Delta_h\} \) have to be determined.

Let \( S_h \) denote the space of piecewise bilinear functions \( v_h(x,y) \) where

\[
v_h(x_i, y_j) = v_{ij} \quad \text{for} \quad (i,j) \in \Lambda_h \backslash \Delta_h, \quad \text{and}
\]

\[
v_h(x_i, y_j) = w(x_i, y_j) \quad \text{for} \quad (i,j) \in \Delta_h.
\]
Let \( E_h \) and \( V_h \) denote the vectors

\[
E_h = \{(e_{ij})^T (i, j) \in \Lambda_h \setminus \Delta_h \},
\]

\[
V_h = \{(v_{ij})^T (i, j) \in \Lambda_h \setminus \Delta_h \}.
\]

Clearly there is a one to one correspondence between the linear spline functions \( e_h(x,y) \), \( v_h(x,y) \), and the vectors \( E_h \) and \( V_h \). \( E_h \) and \( V_h \) belong to a vector space of dimension \( K = (N+1)^2 - M \).

Finally, we approximate \( u(x,y) \) by its cubic B-spline interpolant \( u_h(x,y) \). The cubic B-spline \( \phi(x) \) in one dimension is the function sketched below [3]:

![Figure 4](image-url)
Let \( \phi_j^h(x) = \phi(x - j). \) Then

\[
\phi_j^h(x) = \sum_i \sum_j q_{ij} \phi_i^h(x) \phi_j^h(y)
\]

where \( \{q_{ij}\} \) are obtained by solving a linear system of equations.

The piecewise bilinear approximation for the unknown function \( e(x,y) \) that we choose is the function \( e_h(x,y) \) that minimizes

\[
\int_0^1 \int_0^1 |B(u_h)v_h - f_h|^2 \, dx \, dy
\]

over all \( v_h \in S_h \).

Substituting the explicit form of the functions \( u_h(x,y), f_h(x,y), \) and \( v_h(x,y) \) in (3.2), we obtain

\[
\int_0^1 \int_0^1 |B(u_h)v_h - f_h|^2 \, dx \, dy = v_h^T Ch v_h - 2v_h^T C_h + \lambda_h
\]

where

\( C_h \) is a symmetric matrix of dimension \( K \) by \( K \) depending only on \( u_h(x,y); \)

\( C_h \) is a vector of dimension \( K \) depending on \( u_h(x,y), f_h(x,y), \) and \( w(x,y); \)

\( v_h \) is a vector of dimension \( K \) that corresponds to the linear spline function \( v_h(x,y); \)

and \( \lambda_h \) is a scalar depending on \( f_h(x,y) \) and \( w(x,y). \)
We shall prove in Lemma 2 that \( C_h \) is positive definite for all \( h \leq h_0 \), where \( h_0 \) is a positive constant.

The piecewise bilinear function \( e_h(x,y) \) that minimizes (3.2) corresponds to the vector \( E_h = \{(e_{ij})\}_{(i,j) \in \Lambda_h \setminus \Delta_h} \) that minimizes

\[
(3.4) \quad v_h^T C v_h - 2v_{-h}^T C_{-h} v_{-h}
\]

over all vectors \( v_h \in \mathbb{R}^K \). Thus \( E_h \) is obtained by solving the linear system of equations

\[
(3.5) \quad C_h E_h = G_h.
\]

Since \( C_h \) is positive definite, for \( h \) small enough, there exists a unique solution \( E_h \) of (3.5), and hence the minimization problem (3.2) has a unique solution.

Let \( e_h(x,y) \) be the linear spline function that corresponds to the vector \( E_h \). We claim that \( e_h(x,y) \) converges to the true solution \( e(x,y) \) in the \( L^2 \) norm at a linear rate of convergence. To prove this result we need first to prove a lemma.

**Lemma 1:** Let \( u(x,y) \) be a smooth function that satisfies condition \( (2.2) \) in the unit square \( \bar{\Omega} \). Let \( u_h(x,y) \) be the cubic B-spline interpolant of \( u(x,y) \). Then for \( h \leq h_0 \), where \( h_0 \) is a positive constant, and all functions \( v(x,y) \) that are piecewise continuously differentiable in \( \bar{\Omega} \), the following inequality holds:
where \( A_2(u) \) and \( D_2(u) \) are defined in (2.3).

**Proof:** Since \( u_h(x,y) \) is a cubic B-spline interpolant of \( u(x,y) \), \( u_h(x,y) \) is twice continuously differentiable.

By a standard result in approximation theory, the following inequalities hold, for all \((x,y) \in \Omega\). Here the constants \( K_1 \) through \( K_3 \) depend on higher derivatives of \( u(x,y) \).

\[
(3.6) \quad \|v\|_2 \leq 2A_2(u)\|B(u_h)v\|_2 + 2D_2(u)(\int_{\gamma_{1,h}} |v(x,y)|^2 ds)^{1/2},
\]

(3.7a) \[|u - u_h| \leq K_1 h^4,\]

(3.7b) \[|\nabla u - \nabla u_h| \leq K_2 h^3, \text{ and}\]

(3.7c) \[|\Delta u - \Delta u_h| \leq K_3 h^2\]

Since \( u(x,y) \) satisfies condition (2.2), there exists subregions \( \Omega_1 \) and \( \Omega_2 \) of \( \Omega \) such that \( |\nabla u|^2 \geq \alpha \) in \( \Omega_1 \), \( \Delta u \geq \alpha \) in \( \Omega_2 \). For any \( \varepsilon > 0 \) we can choose \( h_0 \) so small that

\[
(3.8) \quad |\nabla u_h|^2 \geq \alpha - \varepsilon \text{ in } \Omega_1, \quad \Delta u_h \geq \alpha - \varepsilon \text{ in } \Omega_2
\]

for all \( h \leq h_0 \).

Recall that

\[
\beta = \max_{P \in \Omega_1} \left\{ - \frac{\Delta u(P)}{|\nabla u(P)|^2} \right\}.
\]
\[ [u] = \max_{P \in \Omega} \{u(P)\} - \min_{P \in \Omega} \{u(P)\}, \text{ and} \]
\[ s = \max_{P \in \Gamma} \left| \frac{\partial u(P)}{\partial n}\right|. \]

We can now choose \( h_0 \) so small that \((3.8)\) and
\[
\max_{P \in \Omega_1} \left\{ -\frac{\Delta u_h(P)}{|\nabla u_h(P)|^2} \right\} \geq \beta - \epsilon, \\
[u_h] \geq [u] - \epsilon, \text{ and} \\
\max_{P \in \Gamma} \left| \frac{\partial u_h(P)}{\partial n}\right| \geq s - \epsilon. 
\]

hold simultaneously for all \( h \leq h_0 \). Now
\[ \gamma_1^- = \{ P \in \gamma: \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} < \delta \} \]
for some \( \delta > 0 \). Let \( \gamma_2 = \gamma_1 \backslash \gamma_1^- \). Then
\[ \gamma_2 = \{ P \in \gamma: \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} \geq \delta \}. \]

If we choose \( h_0 \) smaller, if necessary, we can obtain
\[ \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} h(P) \geq \frac{\delta}{2}, \text{ for all } P \in \gamma_2, \]
whenever \( h \leq h_0 \). Clearly the inflow section of the boundary for
\[ u_h \subseteq \gamma_1^r \subseteq \gamma_{1,h}. \]
If we choose $\varepsilon$ small enough (and $h_0$ correspondingly small), we can always arrange

\begin{equation}
A_2(u_{h}) \leq 2A_2(u), \quad \text{and}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
D_2(u_{h}) \leq 2D_2(u)
\end{equation}

to hold for all $h \leq h_0$. We then obtain a cruder version of estimate (2.3)

\begin{equation}
\|v\|_2 \leq 2A_2(u)\|B(u_{h})v\|_2 + 2D_2(u)(\int_{\gamma_{1,h}} |v(x,y)|^2 ds)^{1/2}
\end{equation}

replacing $\gamma_1 = \{ P \in \gamma : \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} (P) < 0 \}$ by $\gamma_{1,h}$ in the second term on the r.h.s. in (2.3).

We shall use Lemma 1 to prove that the matrix $C_h$ defined in (3.3) is positive definite for all $h \leq h_0$, where $h_0$ is a positive constant.

**Lemma 2:** Let $C_h$ be the matrix defined in (3.3). Then $C_h$ is positive definite for all $h \leq h_0$, where $h_0$ is a positive constant.

**Proof:** Since the matrix $C_h$ depends only on $u_h(x,y)$, we may, without loss of generality, choose $w(x,y) \equiv 0$. Then by (2.3)

$$
\int_0^1 \int_0^1 |B(u_{h})v_h|^2 dx dy = V_h^T C_h V_h.
$$
By Lemma 1

(3.11) \[ \| v_h \|_2^2 \leq 4(A_2(u))^2 \| B(u_h) v_h \|_2^2 \]

since \( v_h(x,y) = 0 \), for all \((x,y) \in \gamma_{1,h}^*\).

By elementary means one can show that

(3.12) \[ \| v_h \|_2^2 \geq \frac{h^2}{24} v_h^T v_h. \]

Combining (3.11) and (3.12) we obtain

(3.13) \[ v_h^T C_{1,h} v_h \geq \frac{h^2}{96A_2(u)^2} v_h^T v_h. \]

The lemma is proved.

We can now prove the main result of this section.

**Theorem 2:** Consider the parameter estimation problem

(3.1) \[ B(u)e = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( e \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} \right) + \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left( e \frac{\partial u}{\partial y} \right) = f \]

in the unit square \( \tilde{\Omega} \), and assume that we are provided with Cauchy data for \( e \) on \( \gamma_{1,h}^* \).
Here \( u, e, w, \) and \( f \) are smooth functions, and we assume that \( u \) satisfies condition (2.2). Let \( e_h(x, y) \) be the piecewise bilinear function that minimizes

\[
\int_0^1 \int_0^1 |B(u_h)v - f_h|^2 \, dx \, dy
\]

over all piecewise bilinear functions \( v_h(x, y) \in S_h \). Then \( e_h(x, y) \) converges to the true solution \( e(x, y) \) in the \( L^2 \) norm at a linear rate of convergence.

**Proof:** Let \( e^a_h(x, y) \) be the piecewise bilinear function \( \in S_h \) that interpolates \( e(x, y) \) at the mesh points \( \{(x_i, y_j): (i, j) \in \Lambda_h \setminus \Lambda_{h\sharp}\} \). Then \( e^a_h(x, y) \) interpolates \( e(x, y) \) at all the mesh points \( \{(x_i, y_j): (i, j) \in \Lambda_h \} \).

Since \( e_h(x, y) \) minimizes

\[
\int_0^1 \int_0^1 |B(u_h)v - f_h|^2 \, dx \, dy
\]

over all piecewise bilinear functions \( v_h(x, y) \in S_h \), the inequality

\[
(\int_0^1 \int_0^1 |B(u_h)e_h - f_h|^2 \, dx \, dy)^{1/2} \leq (\int_0^1 \int_0^1 |B(u_h)e^a_h - f_h|^2 \, dx \, dy)^{1/2}
\]

holds.
By a standard result in approximation theory, we have the inequalities

\[(3.15a)\quad \|e - e_h\|_2 \leq K_4 h^2, \quad \text{and}\]

\[(3.15b)\quad \|\nabla e - \nabla e_h\|_2 \leq K_5 h.\]

Here \(K_4\) and \(K_5\) are positive constants depending on higher derivatives of \(e\).

Further, since \(f_h\) is the piecewise bilinear interpolant of \(f\) we have

\[(3.16)\quad \|f - f_h\|_2 \leq K_6 h^2,\]

where \(K_6\) is a positive constant depending on higher derivatives of \(f\).

Using these and the earlier results (3.7) from approximation theory, it is easy to show that

\[(3.17)\quad \int_0^1 \int_0^1 |B(u_h) e_h - f_h|^2 dx dy \leq O(h).\]

By the triangle inequality

\[(3.18)\quad \|B(u_h)(e_h - e)\|_2 \leq \|B(u_h) e_h - f_h\|_2 + \|B(u_h) e - f_h\|_2.\]

From (3.14) and (3.17) we conclude that

\[(3.19)\quad \|B(u_h)(e_h - e)\|_2 \leq O(h).\]
Since both $e_a^h(x,y)$ and $e_h(x,y)$ interpolate $e(x,y)$ at the points
\[\{(x_i, y_j) : (i, j) \in \Delta_h\}\], it is easy to see that

(3.20) \[\int_{\gamma_{1,h}} |e_a^h - e_h|^2 ds = 0.\]

From Lemma 1 we have that

(3.6) \[\|v\|_2 \leq 2A_2(u)\|B(u_h)v\|_2 + 2D_2(u)\int_{\gamma_{1,h}} |v|^2 ds]^{1/2}\]

for all functions $v$ that are piecewise continuously differentiable in $\overline{\Omega}$.

Using (3.19) and (3.20) we conclude that

(3.21) \[\|e_h - e_a^h\|_2 \leq 2A_2(u)\|B(u_h)(e_a^h - e_h)\|_2 \leq 0(h).\]

By (3.15a)

\[\|e_a^h - e\|_2 \leq 0(h^2).\]

Using the triangle inequality once more we obtain the result

(3.22) \[\|e - e_h\|_2 \leq 0(h).\]
Remark: If we were to interpolate $e(x,y)$ by piecewise Hermite cubics or by a B-cubic spline, our method would converge at a quadratic rate of convergence. It is easy to modify the method to obtain higher orders of convergence.

Finally we indicate how the numerical method we have proposed can be adapted in case $u$ does not satisfy condition (2.2) but the more general condition

$$(2.13) \quad \inf_{P \in \Omega} \left[ \max \{ |\nabla u(P)|^2, |\Delta u(P)| \} \right] = \alpha > 0. $$

Consider the situation depicted in Figure 2 where $u$ has both a maximum and minimum. Let us suppose that $f$ is such that a unique solution $e$ to (2.1) exists. We do not need to specify any Cauchy data for $e$ in this situation. As before, we cut the domain $\Omega$ across characteristics into two subdomains $\Omega_1$ and $\Omega_2$ such that $u$ satisfies condition (2.2) in $\Omega_1$ and condition (2.14) in $\Omega_2$.

Let

$$a(x,y) = e(x,y) \quad \text{for } (x,y) \in \Omega_1, \text{ and}$$

$$b(x,y) = e(x,y) \quad \text{for } (x,y) \in \Omega_2.$$

We can find a solution $a$ of 2.1 in the domain $\Omega_1$ without any Cauchy data. The same holds for $b$ in the domain $\Omega_2$. Clearly if a solution $e$ to problem (2.1) exists in $\Omega$ then $e$ must be continuous along $\gamma_A$. 
Hence we must have

\[ a(P) = b(P) \text{ for all } P \in \gamma_A. \]

Let \( a_h \) and \( b_h \) denote piecewise bilinear approximations for \( a \) and \( b \) respectively. Then \( a_h \) and \( b_h \) are the piecewise bilinear functions defined in \( \Omega_1 \) and \( \Omega_2 \) respectively which minimize

\[
\int \int_{\Omega_1} |B(u_h)v_h - f_h|^2 \, dx \, dy + \int \int_{\Omega_1} |B(u_h)t_h - f_h|^2 \, dx \, dy \\
+ \theta \int_{\gamma_A} |t_h - v_h|^2 \, ds
\]

over all piecewise bilinear functions \( v_h \) and \( t_h \) defined in \( \Omega_1 \) and \( \Omega_2 \) respectively. Here \( \theta \) is a weighting parameter.

In case a smooth solution \( e \) to (2.1) exists, it is easy to show that the function \( e_h \) defined as

\[
\begin{align*}
\left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
  e_h(x,y) = a_h(x,y) & \text{for } (x,y) \in \Omega_1, \\
  e_h(x,y) = b_h(x,y) & \text{for } (x,y) \in \Omega_2
\end{array} \right.
\]

converges to the true solution \( e(x,y) \) in the \( L^2 \) norm at a linear rate of convergence.

In a companion paper [4], we present a multigrid algorithm for parameter estimation problems. In this algorithm we seek a finite dimensional representation for \( e \) which minimizes the \( L^2 \) norm of the residuals of a
second order difference approximation of (2.1). Extensive numerical experiments indicate that the method converges to the true solution in the $l^2$ norm at a quadratic rate of convergence.
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We consider the problem of identifying the spatially varying coefficient of elasticity using an observed solution to the forward problem. Under appropriate conditions this problem can be treated as a first order hyperbolic equation in the unknown coefficient. We develop some continuous dependence results for this problem and propose a spline-based technique for approximating the unknown coefficient, based on these results. We establish the convergence of our numerical scheme and obtain error estimates.