

# Solution of two-dimensional parabolic equation with nonlocal integral boundary conditions\*

Kristina Jakubeliėnė

*Vilnius University, Institute of Mathematics and Informatics*  
Akademijos g. 4 LT-08663 Vilnius  
E-mail: gibaite@gmail.com

**Abstract.** Two-dimensional parabolic equation with nonlocal integral boundary conditions in a rectangle domain in this paper is solved by alternating direction method. To find the solutions of this problem we are looking to solve a linear system of equations. This algorithm is realized on particular example and assess the error of solution.

**Keywords:** two-dimensional parabolic equation, nonlocal integral condition, finite-difference method, alternating direction method.

## Introduction

We consider boundary value problem of two-dimensional parabolic equation in rectangular with two integral boundary conditions. We investigate boundary value problem

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial y^2} + f(x, y, t), \quad x, y \in \Omega = \{0 \leq x, y \leq 1\}, \quad 0 < t \leq T, \quad (1)$$

$$u(x, y, 0) = \varphi(x, y), \quad x, y \in \Omega, \quad (2)$$

$$u(0, y, t) = \mu_1(y, t), \quad y \in \Omega, \quad 0 < t \leq T, \quad (3)$$

$$u(1, y, t) = \mu_2(y, t), \quad y \in \Omega, \quad 0 < t \leq T, \quad (4)$$

$$u(x, 0, t) = \iint_{\Omega} \gamma_3(x, \xi) u(\xi, \eta, t) d\xi d\eta + \mu_3(x, t), \quad x \in \Omega, \quad 0 < t \leq T, \quad (5)$$

$$u(x, 1, t) = \iint_{\Omega} \gamma_4(x, \xi) u(\xi, \eta, t) d\xi d\eta + \mu_4(x, t), \quad x \in \Omega, \quad 0 < t \leq T. \quad (6)$$

Numerical methods for two-dimensional and three-dimensional parabolic equations with nonlocal conditions are considered in many articles (for example [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6]). The specificity of the problem (1)–(6) is that boundary conditions (5)–(6) include integral through entire domain  $\Omega$ . Integral condition of this type in more general form is

$$u(x, y, t) = \iint_{\Omega} K(x, y, \xi, \eta) u(\xi, \eta, t) d\xi d\eta + \mu(x, y, t), \quad (7)$$

---

\* This research was funded by a grant (No. MIP-051/2011) from the Research Council of Lithuania.

when  $(x, y) \in \partial\Omega$ . Parabolic equation with this type of condition is solved in article [7] by finite difference method when the kernel  $K(x, y, \xi, \eta)$  satisfies

$$\iint_{\Omega} K(x, y, \xi, \eta) d\xi d\eta \leq \rho < 1, \quad x, y \in \partial\Omega. \tag{8}$$

In our article assumption (8) is disposed. However, numerical experiment performed by our method confirms, that  $K(x, y, \xi, \eta)$  should satisfy certain condition the difference scheme would be stable.

### 1 Numerical method

We apply alternating direction method for differential problem (1)–(6). So we have to solve two systems of difference equations. First we consider one-dimensional problem with boundary conditions:

$$\frac{u_{ij}^{n+\frac{1}{2}} - u_{ij}^n}{\frac{\tau}{2}} = A_1 u_{ij}^{n+\frac{1}{2}} + A_2 u_{ij}^n + f_{ij}^{n+\frac{1}{2}}, \quad i, j = \overline{1, N-1}, \tag{9}$$

$$u_{0j}^{n+\frac{1}{2}} = \mu_{1j}^{n+\frac{1}{2}}, \quad u_{Nj}^{n+\frac{1}{2}} = \mu_{2j}^{n+\frac{1}{2}}, \quad j = \overline{1, N-1}, \tag{10}$$

where

$$A_1 u_{ij}^{n+1} = \frac{u_{i-1,j}^{n+1} - 2u_{ij}^{n+1} + u_{i+1,j}^{n+1}}{h^2}, \quad i, j = \overline{1, N-1}, \tag{11}$$

$$A_2 u_{ij}^{n+1} = \frac{u_{i,j-1}^{n+1} - 2u_{ij}^{n+1} + u_{i,j+1}^{n+1}}{h^2}, \quad i, j = \overline{1, N-1}. \tag{12}$$

We solve it by using Thomas algorithm and find solution  $(n + \frac{1}{2})$ -th layer of time. Then we are looking for solution in  $(n + 1)$ -th layer of time from second difference problem with nonlocal boundary conditions

$$\frac{u_{ij}^{n+1} - u_{ij}^{n+\frac{1}{2}}}{\frac{\tau}{2}} = A_1 u_{ij}^{n+\frac{1}{2}} + A_2 u_{ij}^{n+1} + f_{ij}^{n+1}, \quad i, j = \overline{1, N-1}, \tag{13}$$

$$u_{i0}^{n+1} = h^2 \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \sum_{l=0}^N \gamma_{3_{ik}} \rho_{kl} u_{kl}^{n+1} + g_{1_{i0}}^{n+1} + \mu_{3_i}^{n+1}, \quad i = \overline{1, N-1}, \tag{14}$$

$$u_{iN}^{n+1} = h^2 \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \sum_{l=0}^N \gamma_{4_{ik}} \rho_{kl} u_{kl}^{n+1} + g_{2_{iN}}^{n+1} + \mu_{4_i}^{n+1}, \quad i = \overline{1, N-1}, \tag{15}$$

where  $g_{1,i0}^{n+1}$  and  $g_{2,iN}^{n+1}$  depends on  $u_{0l}^{n+1}, u_{Nl}^{n+1}, l = \overline{0, N}, h = \frac{1}{N}, \tau = \frac{1}{M}$ , and

$$\rho_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1, & j \neq 0, N, \\ 1/2, & j = 0, j = N. \end{cases}$$

The main question is how to solve system of difference equations (13)–(15).

Let's rewrite equation (13) in the shorter way and have

$$au_{ij-1}^{n+1} - cu_{ij}^{n+1} + bu_{ij+1}^{n+1} = F_{ij}^{n+1}, \tag{16}$$

where  $a = \frac{\tau}{2h^2}$ ,  $b = \frac{\tau}{2h^2}$ ,  $c = 1 + \frac{\tau}{h^2}$  and  $c > a + b$ .

Solution of the equation (16) is taken as following

$$u_{ij}^{n+1} = c_1^{n+1}u_{ij}^{(1)n+1} + c_2^{n+1}u_{ij}^{(2)n+1} + u_{ij}^{(0)n+1}, \quad j = 0, 1, 2, \dots, N, \tag{17}$$

where  $u_{ij}^{(1)}$  and  $u_{ij}^{(2)}$  are two solutions of homogeneous system (13) with boundary conditions  $u_{i0}^{(1)} = 1$ ,  $u_{iN}^{(1)} = 0$ , and  $u_{i0}^{(2)} = 0$ ,  $u_{iN}^{(2)} = 1$ , and  $u_{ij}^{(0)}$  is solution of the system (13) with  $u_{i0}^{(0)} = u_{iN}^{(0)} = 0$ .

*Remark 1.*  $c_1^{n+1}$  and  $c_2^{n+1}$  should be chosen in the way boundary conditions (14) and (15) would be correct.

So  $c_1^{n+1} \equiv u_{i0}^{n+1}$  and  $c_2^{n+1} \equiv u_{iN}^{n+1}$ .

We again rewrite expression (17) as

$$u_{ij}^{n+1} = u_{i0}^{n+1}u_j^{(1)} + u_{iN}^{n+1}u_j^{(2)} + u_{ij}^{(0)n+1}. \tag{18}$$

When we put (18) to conditions (14) and (15) receiving  $2(N - 1)$  linear algebraic equations

$$\begin{aligned} u_{i0}^{n+1} = & h \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \gamma_{3_{ik}} u_{k0}^{n+1} * h \sum_{l=0}^N \rho_l u_l^{(1)} + h \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \gamma_{3_{ik}} u_{kN}^{n+1} * h \sum_{l=0}^N \rho_l u_l^{(2)} \\ & + h^2 \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \sum_{l=0}^N \gamma_{3_{ik}} u_{kl}^{(0)n+1} + g_i^{(1)n+1}, \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

$$\begin{aligned} u_{iN}^{n+1} = & h \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \gamma_{4_{ik}} u_{k0}^{n+1} * h \sum_{l=0}^N \rho_l u_l^{(1)} + h \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \gamma_{4_{ik}} u_{kN}^{n+1} * h \sum_{l=0}^N \rho_l u_l^{(2)} \\ & + h^2 \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \sum_{l=0}^N \gamma_{4_{ik}} u_{kl}^{(0)n+1} + g_i^{(1)n+1}, \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

with  $2N - 2$  unknowns  $u_{k0}^{n+1}$ ,  $u_{kN}^{n+1}$ ,  $k = \overline{1, N - 1}$ . We rewrite equations (19) and (20) in the form of matrix equation:

$$Au = F, \tag{21}$$

where matrix  $A$  is

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} (1 - \gamma_{3_{1,1}}\alpha) & \dots & -\gamma_{3_{1,N-1}}\alpha & -\gamma_{3_{1,1}}\beta & \dots & -\gamma_{3_{1,N-1}}\beta \\ -\gamma_{3_{2,1}}\alpha & \dots & -\gamma_{3_{2,N-1}}\alpha & -\gamma_{3_{2,1}}\beta & \dots & -\gamma_{3_{2,N-1}}\beta \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ -\gamma_{3_{N-1,1}}\alpha & \dots & (1 - \gamma_{3_{N-1,N-1}}\alpha) & -\gamma_{3_{N-1,1}}\beta & \dots & -\gamma_{3_{N-1,N-1}}\beta \\ -\gamma_{4_{1,1}}\alpha & \dots & -\gamma_{4_{1,N-1}}\alpha & (1 - \gamma_{4_{1,1}}\beta) & \dots & -\gamma_{4_{1,N-1}}\beta \\ -\gamma_{4_{2,1}}\alpha & \dots & -\gamma_{4_{2,N-1}}\alpha & -\gamma_{4_{2,1}}\beta & \dots & -\gamma_{4_{2,N-1}}\beta \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ -\gamma_{4_{N-1,1}}\alpha & \dots & -\gamma_{4_{N-1,N-1}}\alpha & -\gamma_{4_{N-1,1}}\beta & \dots & (1 - \gamma_{4_{N-1,N-1}}\beta) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Here

$$\alpha = h^2 \sum_{l=0}^N \rho_l u_l^{(1)}, \quad \beta = h^2 \sum_{l=0}^N \rho_l u_l^{(2)}. \tag{22}$$

We apply Gaussian elimination method for solving the system of equations (21) and obtain solutions  $u_{k0}^{n+1}$  and  $u_{kN}^{n+1}$  ( $k = \overline{1, N-1}$ ). The solutions  $u_{k0}^{n+1}$  and  $u_{kn}^{n+1}$  ( $k = \overline{1, N-1}$ ) we put into equation (18) and then find solution we were looking in  $(n+1)$ -th layer of time.

## 2 Numerical experiment

The method considered in this paper for the solution of the system of difference equations is applied for solving of testing example (1)–(6) with  $\gamma_3(x, \xi) = \gamma_3(x)$  and  $\gamma_4(x, \xi) = \gamma_4(x)$ . Choosing appropriate functions  $f(x, y, t)$ ,  $\varphi(x, y)$ ,  $\mu_1(y, t)$ ,  $\mu_2(y, t)$ ,  $\mu_3(x, t)$ ,  $\mu_4(x, t)$ ,  $\gamma_3(x)$  and  $\gamma_4(x)$  the solutions would be  $u(x, y, t) = \sin(\pi x) \sin(\pi y) e^{2t}$ . The accuracy of solution depends on the selection of functions  $\gamma_3(x)$  and  $\gamma_4(x)$ . Errors of solution  $u_{ij}^{n+1}$  ( $i, j = \overline{1, N-1}$ ) are given in four tables, with functions  $\gamma_3(x)$  and  $\gamma_4(x)$ .

Here

$$\varepsilon_u = \max_{0 \leq i, j \leq N} |z_{ij}| = \max_{0 \leq i, j \leq N} |u(x_i, y_j, t^n) - u_{ij}^n|. \tag{23}$$

The results of numerical experiment shows, that difference scheme is stable (Table 1), when

$$|\gamma_3| < 1, \quad |\gamma_4| < 1. \tag{24}$$

The similar conclusion was derived in some other papers, where more simple non-local conditions were considered [5, 7]. However our difference scheme is stable even in the case, when  $\gamma_3$  and  $\gamma_4$  don't satisfy conditions (24) but at the same time are negative (Table 2).

Furthermore, taken with some positive values of  $\gamma_3$  and  $\gamma_4$ , not satisfy conditions (24) the errors of the solutions in the case of  $T = 1$ , also are of the order

**Table 1.**

|                                           |   |                 |        |         |           |
|-------------------------------------------|---|-----------------|--------|---------|-----------|
| $h$                                       | : | 0.2             | 0.1    | 0.05    | 0.025     |
| $\tau$                                    | : | 0.1             | 0.025  | 0.00625 | 0.0015625 |
|                                           |   | $\varepsilon_u$ |        |         |           |
| $\gamma_3(x) = 0, \gamma_4(x) = 0$        | : | 0.5476          | 0.1485 | 0.0369  | 0.0092    |
| $\gamma_3(x) = 1, \gamma_4(x) = 1$        | : | 0.5762          | 0.1567 | 0.0391  | 0.0098    |
| $\gamma_3(x) = e^x, \gamma_4(x) = 0.1e^x$ | : | 0.5809          | 0.1556 | 0.0388  | 0.0097    |

**Table 2.**

|                                             |   |                 |        |         |           |
|---------------------------------------------|---|-----------------|--------|---------|-----------|
| $h$                                         | : | 0.2             | 0.1    | 0.05    | 0.025     |
| $\tau$                                      | : | 0.1             | 0.025  | 0.00625 | 0.0015625 |
|                                             |   | $\varepsilon_u$ |        |         |           |
| $\gamma_3(x) = -2e^x, \gamma_4(x) = -10e^x$ | : | 0.5271          | 0.1408 | 0.0350  | 0.0087    |
| $\gamma_3(x) = -5, \gamma_4(x) = -10$       | : | 0.5245          | 0.1412 | 0.0351  | 0.0088    |

**Table 3.**

|                                        |   |                 |        |         |           |
|----------------------------------------|---|-----------------|--------|---------|-----------|
| $h$                                    | : | 0.2             | 0.1    | 0.05    | 0.025     |
| $\tau$                                 | : | 0.1             | 0.025  | 0.00625 | 0.0015625 |
|                                        |   | $\varepsilon_u$ |        |         |           |
| $\gamma_3(x) = 5, \gamma_4(x) = -0.3$  | : | 317.393         | 6.224  | 1.065   | 0.236     |
| $\gamma_3(x) = 2.3, \gamma_4(x) = 2.3$ | : | 36.578          | 1.9426 | 0.3964  | 0.0940    |

**Table 4.**

|                                         |   |                     |                     |                     |                     |
|-----------------------------------------|---|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| $h$                                     | : | 0.2                 | 0.1                 | 0.05                | 0.025               |
| $\tau$                                  | : | 0.1                 | 0.025               | 0.00625             | 0.0015625           |
|                                         |   | $\varepsilon_u$     |                     |                     |                     |
| $\gamma_3(x) = 5, \gamma_4(x) = 1$      | : | 1.5035              | $4.531 \times 10^6$ | $2.895 \times 10^5$ | $6.736 \times 10^4$ |
| $\gamma_3(x) = 2e^x, \gamma_4(x) = e^x$ | : | $1.229 \times 10^3$ | 18.754              | 16.950              | 5.419               |

$O(\tau + h^2)$  (Table 3). But with the growth of  $T$ , the scheme generally becomes unstable. Moreover, in the case of sufficiently big meanings of  $\gamma_3$  and  $\gamma_4$  the instability of the difference scheme could be seen even, then  $T = 1$  (Table 4).

### 3 Conclusions

The numerical experiment based on the method provided in this paper was performed with various meanings of  $\gamma_3$  and  $\gamma_4$  investigating the influence of these parameters on the stability of the difference scheme. It was proven in the papers [8] that stability of the difference scheme depends on the structure of the spectrum of matrix of this scheme. It was shown, that in the case of more simple nonlocal conditions (see [5]) the difference scheme might be stable with considerably big in absolute values negative meanings of  $\gamma_3$  and  $\gamma_4$ . In our case, considering the results of the numerical experiment, this characteristic was observed. More precised conclusions about the stability of the difference scheme could be obtained investigating the spectrum of the system of difference equations.

### References

- [1] J.R. Cannon, Y. Lin and A.L. Matheson. Locally explicit schemes for three-dimensional diffusion with non-local boundary specification. *Appl. Anal.*, **50**:1–19, 1993. Pastaba
- [2] R. Čiegis. Parallel numerical algorithms for 3d parabolic problem with nonlocal boundary condition. *Informatica*, **17**(3):309–324, 2006.
- [3] M. Dehgham. Alternating direction implicit methods for two-dimensional diffusion with non-local boundary condition. *Intern. J. Comp. Math.*, **72**(3):349–366, 1999.
- [4] A.V. Gulin, N.I. Ionkin and V. A. Morozova. Stability of a nonlocal two-dimensional finite-difference problem. *Differ. Equ.*, **37**(7):960–978, 2001.
- [5] F. Ivanauskas, T. Meškauskas and M. Sapagovas. Stability of difference schemes for two-dimensional parabolic equations with non-local boundary conditions. *Appl. Math. Comp.*, **215**(7):2716–2732, 2009.
- [6] Y. Lin, S. Hu and H. M.Yin. Finite difference approximations for a class of non-local parabolic equations. *Inter. J. Math. Math. Sci.*, **20**(1):147–164, 1997.

- [7] M. Sapagovas. On stability of finite difference schemes for nonlocal parabolic boundary value problems. *Lith. Math. J.*, **48**(3):339–356, 2008.
- [8] M. Sapagovas, G. Kairytė, O. Štikonienė and A. Štikonas. Alternating direction implicit method for a two-dimensional parabolic equation with a nonlocal boundary condition. *Math. Model. Anal.*, **12**(1):131–142, 2007.

## REZIUOMĖ

**Dvimatės parabolinės lygties su dviem nelokaliosiomis integralinėmis sąlygomis sprendimas***K. Jakubėlienė*

Straipsnyje išnagrinėtas dvimatės parabolinės lygties su nelokaliosiomis integralinėmis kraštinėmis sąlygomis sprendimas kintamųjų krypčių metodu. Uždavinio sprendinį randame išsprendę tiesinę lygčių sistemą. Pateikti skaitinio eksperimento rezultatai.

*Raktiniai žodžiai:* dvimatė parabolinė lygtis, nelokalioji integralinė sąlyga, baigtinių skirtumų metodas, kintamųjų krypčių metodas.