


IMM 411
COO-3077-106
January 1976

New York University
Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences

ON FINITE-DIFFERENCE APPROXIMATIONS AND ENTROPY
CONDITIONS FOR SHOCKS

A. Harten, J. M. Hyman and P. D. Lax

with Appendix by B. Keyfitz



This report represents results obtained at the Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences, New York University, with the Air Force Office of Scientific Research, Contract AF-F44620-74-C-0062 and the Energy Research and Development Administration, Contract E(11-1)-3077.

Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted for any purpose of the United States Government.

Distribution of this document is unlimited.

DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS UNLIMITED

fy

DISCLAIMER

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency Thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

DISCLAIMER

Portions of this document may be illegible in electronic image products. Images are produced from the best available original document.

THIS PAGE
WAS INTENTIONALLY
LEFT BLANK

Abstract

Weak solutions of hyperbolic conservation laws are not uniquely determined by their initial values; an entropy condition is needed to pick out the physically relevant solution. The question arises whether finite-difference approximations converge to this particular solution. It is shown in this paper that in the case of a single conservation law, monotone schemes, when convergent, always converge to the physically relevant solution. Numerical examples show that this is not always the case with nonmonotone schemes, such as the Lax-Wendroff scheme.

1. Introduction.

In this paper we consider solutions $u(x,t)$, $t \geq 0$, of the single conservation law

$$(1.1a) \quad u_t + f(u)_x = 0$$

subject to the initial data

$$(1.1b) \quad u(x,0) = \phi(x) , \quad -\infty < x < \infty$$

where $\phi(x)$ is a given function. Equation (1.1a) can be written in the form

$$(1.2a) \quad u_t + a(u)u_x = 0 , \quad a(u) = \frac{df}{du}$$

which asserts that u is constant along the characteristic curves $x = x(t)$, where

$$(1.2b) \quad \frac{dx}{dt} = a(u) .$$

The constancy of u along the characteristics combined with (1.2b) implies that the characteristics are straight lines. Their slope, however, depends upon the solution and therefore they may intersect, and where they do, no continuous solution can exist. To get existence in the large, i.e. for all time, we admit weak solutions which satisfy an integral version of (1.1),

$$(1.3) \quad \int_0^\infty \int_{-\infty}^\infty [w_t u + w_x f(u)] dx dt + \int_{-\infty}^\infty w(x,0) \phi(x) dx = 0$$

for every smooth test function $w(x,t)$ of compact support.

If u is a piecewise continuous weak solution, then it

follows from (1.3) (see [10]), that across the line of discontinuity the Rankine-Hugoniot relation

$$(1.4) \quad f(u_R) - f(u_L) = S(u_R - u_L)$$

holds, where S is the speed of propagation of the discontinuity and u_L and u_R are the states on the left and on the right of the discontinuity, respectively.

The class of all weak solutions is too wide in the sense that there is no uniqueness for the initial value problem, and an additional principle is needed for determining a physically relevant solution. Usually this principle identifies the physically relevant solution as a limit of solutions with some dissipation, namely

$$(1.5) \quad u_t + f(u)_x = \epsilon [\beta(u)u_x]_x, \quad \beta(u) > 0, \quad \epsilon \downarrow 0.$$

Oleinik [15] has shown that discontinuities of such admissible solutions can be characterized by the following condition

$$(1.6) \quad \frac{f(u) - f(u_L)}{u - u_L} \geq S \geq \frac{f(u) - f(u_R)}{u - u_R}$$

for all u between u_L and u_R ; this is called the entropy condition, or condition E. Oleinik has shown, see [15], that weak solutions satisfying condition E are uniquely determined by their initial data. Another elegant proof is given in [7].

Let $v(x,t)$ be a finite difference approximation to (1.1)

$$(1.7) \quad v_j^{n+1} = (L \cdot v^n)_j, \quad v_j^n = v(j\Delta x, n\Delta t)$$

Δt and Δx are the time and space increments. Equation (1.7)

is said to be in conservation form if it can be written in the following way.

$$(1.8a) \quad v_j^{n+1} = v_j^n - \lambda(h_{j+1/2} - h_{j-1/2})$$

where $h_{j+1/2} = h(v_{j-k+1}, v_{j-k+2}, \dots, v_{j+k})$, $h_{j-1/2} = h(v_{j-k}, v_{j-k+1}, \dots, v_{j+k-1})$, and $\lambda = \Delta t / \Delta x$. In order for (1.8a) to be consistent with (1.1), h must be related to f as follows.

$$(1.8b) \quad h(w, w, \dots, w) = f(w) .$$

Lax and Wendroff [13] proved the following theorem: let $v(x, t)$ be a solution of a finite difference scheme in conservation form. If $v(x, t)$ converges boundedly almost everywhere to some function $u(x, t)$ as Δx and Δt tend to zero, then $u(x, t)$ is a weak solution of (1.1).

Thus we know that if a finite difference scheme in conservation form is convergent, then it converges to a weak solution; is this limit the unique physically relevant solution, i.e. do all its discontinuities satisfy the entropy condition (1.6)? The answer to this question will be discussed in the following sections. It will be shown in Section 2 that solutions of so-called monotone finite-difference schemes do satisfy the entropy condition. In Section 3 we shall present several examples to demonstrate that this is not always the case for nonmonotone schemes.

2. Monotone Finite-difference Schemes.

A finite-difference scheme

$$(2.1) \quad v_j^{n+1} = H(v_{j-k}^n, v_{j-k+1}^n, \dots, v_{j+k}^n)$$

is said to be monotone if H is a monotone increasing function of each of its arguments.

THEOREM. Let

$$(2.2a) \quad v_j^{n+1} = H_f(v_{j-k}^n, v_{j-k+1}^n, \dots, v_{j+k}^n) \\ = v_j^n - \lambda [h_f(v_{j-k+1}^n, \dots, v_{j+k}^n) - h_f(v_{j-k}^n, \dots, v_{j+k-1}^n)]$$

be a finite-difference approximation to (1.1) in conservation form, i.e.

$$(2.2b) \quad h_f(w, w, \dots, w) = f(w)$$

and which is monotone

$$(2.2c) \quad \frac{\partial H_f}{\partial w_i}(w_{-k}, \dots, w_{+k}) \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } -k \leq i \leq k.$$

Assume that as Δt and Δx tend to zero, $\lambda = \Delta t / \Delta x = \text{const.}$, v_j^n converges boundedly almost everywhere to some function $u(x, t)$. Then according to the theorem of Lax and Wendroff quoted earlier, $u(x, t)$ is a weak solution of (1.1).

Assertion. The entropy condition (1.6) is satisfied for all discontinuities of u .

Proof: Our proof mimics one given by Hopf [6] and

Krushkov [9] who have shown that if u is the limit of solutions of the parabolic equation (1.5), then u satisfies the inequality

$$(2.3) \quad U(u)_t + F(u)_x \leq 0$$

where

$$(2.4) \quad U(u) = \begin{cases} 0, & u < z \\ u-z, & u \geq z \end{cases}, \quad F(u) = \begin{cases} 0 & u < z \\ f(u)-f(z), & u \geq z \end{cases}$$

and z is an arbitrary number. At a point of discontinuity

(2.3) implies

$$(2.5) \quad S[U(u_L)-U(u_R)] - [F(u_L)-F(u_R)] \leq 0.$$

Inequality (2.5) is equivalent to Oleinik's condition E given by (1.7). Our proof of the theorem consists in showing that likewise the limits of solutions of (2.2) satisfy inequality (2.3) with U and F given by (2.4).

Let v_j^n be a solution of the finite-difference scheme (2.2); we shall show that

$$v_j^n = U(v_j^n)$$

where U is defined by (2.4), satisfies an inequality of the form

$$(2.6) \quad \frac{v_j^{n+1} - v_j^n}{\Delta t} + \frac{h_F(v_{j-k+1}^n, \dots, v_{j+k}^n) - h_F(v_{j-k}^n, \dots, v_{j+k-1}^n)}{\Delta x} \leq 0$$

where h_F is given by

$$(2.7) \quad h_F(w_{-k+1}, \dots, w_k)$$

$$= \sum_{j=-k+1}^k \dot{U}(w_j) (w_j - z) \int_0^1 \frac{\partial h_f}{\partial w_j} (w_{-k+1}(\theta), \dots, w_k(\theta)) d\theta$$

Here $w_j(\theta)$, $-k+1 \leq j \leq k$, denotes the straight line connecting z with w_j , i.e. $w_j(\theta) = z + \theta(w_j - z)$ and

$$(2.8) \quad \dot{U}(u) = \frac{d}{du} U(u) = \begin{cases} 0, & u < z \\ 1, & u > z \end{cases}$$

Notice that h_F as defined by (2.7) is continuous and is consistent with $F(u)$ given by (2.4); i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} h_F(u, u, \dots, u) &= \dot{U}(u) \int_0^1 \sum_{j=-k+1}^k \frac{\partial h_f}{\partial w_j} (u(\theta), \dots, u(\theta)) (u - z) d\theta \\ &= \dot{U}(u) \int_0^1 \frac{d}{d\theta} h_f(u(\theta), \dots, u(\theta)) d\theta = \dot{U}(u) [h_f(u, \dots, u) - h_f(z, \dots, z)] \\ &= \dot{U}(u) [f(u) - f(z)] = F(u) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore it follows from (2.6), as in the Lax-Wendroff theorem quoted earlier, that if $v_j^n \rightarrow u$ boundedly a.e., then the limit u satisfies the inequality (2.3). Thus, a verification of (2.6) will complete the proof of our theorem.

Again we introduce the parametrization

$$v_{j+i}^n(\theta) = z + \theta(v_{j+i}^n - z), \quad -k \leq i \leq k$$

and define

$$(2.9a) \quad v(\theta) = H_f(v_{j-k}(\theta), \dots, v_{j+k}(\theta))$$

where H_f is defined by (2.2a). It follows from (2.2b) and (2.2a) that

$$(2.9b) \quad v(0) = z, \quad v(1) = v_j^{n+1}$$

Next we express v_j^{n+1} by

$$\begin{aligned} U(v_j^{n+1}) &= U(v_j^{n+1}) - U(z) = \int_0^1 \frac{d}{d\theta} U(v(\theta)) d\theta \\ &= \int_0^1 U(v(\theta)) \sum_{i=-k}^k \frac{\partial H_f}{\partial w_i}(v_{j-k}(\theta), \dots, v_{j+k}(\theta)) (v_{j+1}^n - z) d\theta \end{aligned}$$

Similarly we get, using (2.7), that

$$\begin{aligned} &- U(v_j^n) + \lambda [h_F(v_{j-k+1}^n, \dots, v_{j+k}^n) - h_F(v_{j-k}^n, \dots, v_{j+k-1}^n)] \\ &= - \int_0^1 U(v_j(\theta)) (v_j - z) d\theta + \lambda \int_0^1 \sum_{i=-k+1}^k \left[\frac{\partial h_j}{\partial w_i}(v_{j-k+1}(\theta), \dots, v_{j+k}(\theta)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{\partial h_f}{\partial w_{i-1}}(v_{j-k}(\theta), \dots, v_{j+k-1}(\theta)) \right] \dot{U}(v_{i+j}(\theta)) (v_{j+1}^n - z) d\theta \\ &= - \int_0^1 \sum_{i=-k}^k \dot{U}(v_{j+1}(\theta)) \frac{\partial H_f}{\partial w_i}(v_{j-k}(\theta), \dots, v_{j+k}(\theta)) (v_{j+i}^n - z) d\theta . \end{aligned}$$

Multiplying (2.6) by Δt and using the above two expressions, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.10) \quad & U(v_j^{n+1}) - U(v_j^n) + \lambda [h_F(v_{j-k+1}^n, \dots, v_{j+k}^n) - h_F(v_{j-k}^n, \dots, v_{j+k-1}^n)] \\
& = \sum_{i=-k}^k (v_{j+i}^n - z) \int_0^1 \frac{\partial H_F}{\partial w_i} (v_{j-k}(\theta), \dots, v_{j+k}(\theta)) \\
& \quad \cdot [\dot{U}(v(\theta)) - \dot{U}(v_{j+i}(\theta))] d\theta.
\end{aligned}$$

By our assumption $\frac{\partial H_F}{\partial w_i} (w_{-k}, \dots, w_k) \geq 0$ for all $-k \leq i \leq k$.

We claim that

$$(2.11) \quad [\dot{U}(v(\theta)) - \dot{U}(v_{j+i}(\theta))] (v_{j+i}^n - z) \geq 0.$$

For, if $v_{j+1}^n - z < 0$ by (2.8) $\dot{U}(v_{j+i}(\theta)) \equiv 0$ and $\dot{U}(v(\theta)) \geq 0$ for all $0 \leq \theta \leq 1$; if, on the other hand, $v_{j+1}^n - z > 0$, then again by (2.8) $\dot{U}(v_{j+i}(\theta)) \equiv 1$ and $\dot{U}(v(\theta)) \leq 1$ for all $0 \leq \theta \leq 1$; this proves (2.11). Thus all the terms in the sum on the right-hand side of (2.10) are nonpositive and so (2.6) holds; this completes the proof of the theorem.

A different proof to this theorem using the characterization of solutions of (1.1) which satisfy the entropy condition as an L_1 -contractive semigroup, is given by Barbara Keyfitz in an appendix.

We remark that the convergence of solutions of monotone schemes to the physically relevant solutions can be explained by the very close relation between monotonicity and the presence of viscosity terms. To see that, we compute the truncation error of scheme (2.1). First we prove several identities. Let

$\underline{u} = (u_{-k}, \dots, u_{+k})$, $\bar{u} = (u_{-k}, \dots, u_{k-1})$ and $T\bar{u} = (u_{-k+1}, \dots, u_k)$

where $u_j = u(x+j\Delta x, t)$. It follows from (2.2a) and (2.2b) that

$$(2.12a) \quad H(u, \dots, u) = u$$

By differentiation of the consistency relation (2.2b) we get

$$(2.12b) \quad \sum_{j=-k}^{k-1} h_j(u, u, \dots, u) = a(u)$$

where a subscript j denotes partial differentiation with respect to the j th components and $h_j \equiv 0$ for $j \geq k$ or $j \leq -k-1$.

Differentiating (2.2a) we get

$$(2.13a) \quad H_{\ell} = \delta_{0,\ell} - \lambda [h_{\ell-1}(T\bar{u}) - h_{\ell}(\bar{u})], \quad -k \leq \ell \leq k$$

$$(2.13b) \quad H_{\ell,m} = -\lambda [h_{\ell-1,m-1}(T\bar{u}) - h_{\ell,m}(\bar{u})], \quad -k \leq m \leq k$$

Hence it follows from (2.12) and (2.13) that

$$(2.14) \quad \sum_{\ell=-k}^k H_{\ell}(u, u, \dots, u) = \sum \delta_{0,\ell} = 1$$

$$(2.15) \quad \sum_{\ell=-k}^k \ell H_{\ell}(u, \dots, u) = -\lambda \sum (h_{\ell-1} - h_{\ell}) \ell$$

$$= -\lambda \sum [(\ell+1) - \ell] h_{\ell} = -\lambda a(u)$$

$$(2.16) \quad \sum_{\ell,m=-k}^k (\ell-m)^2 H_{\ell,m}(u, \dots, u) = -\lambda \sum_{\ell,m} (\ell-m)^2 [h_{\ell,m} - h_{\ell-1,m-1}]$$

$$= 0.$$

Using the Taylor series and (2.12a) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
H(u_{-k}, u_{-k+1}, \dots, u_k) &= H(u_0, u_0, \dots, u_0) + \sum_{j=-k}^k H_j(u_0, \dots, u_0) (u_j - u_0) \\
&+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\ell, m} H_{\ell, m}(u_0, \dots, u_0) (u_\ell - u_0) (u_m - u_0) + O((\Delta x)^3) \\
&= u_0 + \Delta x \cdot u_x \sum_j j H_j + \left(\frac{\Delta x}{2}\right)^2 u_{xx} \sum_j j^2 H_j + \left(\frac{\Delta x}{2}\right)^2 u_x^2 \sum_{\ell, m} \ell m H_{\ell, m} + O((\Delta x)^3) \\
&= u_0 + \Delta x \cdot u_x \sum_j j H_j + \left(\frac{\Delta x}{2}\right)^2 \left[\sum_j j^2 H_j u_x \right]_x + \left(\frac{\Delta x}{2}\right)^2 u_x^2 \sum_{\ell, m} H_{\ell, m} (\ell m - \ell^2) + \\
&\hspace{20em} + O((\Delta x)^3).
\end{aligned}$$

From (2.15) $\Delta x \cdot u_x \sum_j j H_j = \Delta x \cdot u_x [-\lambda a(u)]_x = -\Delta t f(u)_x$.

Using the symmetry $H_{\ell, m} = H_{m, \ell}$ and (2.16) we get

$$\sum_{\ell, m} H_{\ell, m} (\ell m - \ell^2) = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\ell, m} H_{\ell, m} (\ell - m)^2 = 0$$

Thus the Taylor series expansion of the numerical scheme is

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.17) \quad &H(u(x-k\Delta x, t), \dots, u(x+k\Delta x, t)) = u(x, t) - \Delta t f(u)_x \\
&+ \left(\frac{\Delta x}{2}\right)^2 \left\{ \sum_{j=-k}^k j^2 H_j(u(x, t), \dots, u(x, t)) u_x(x, t) \right\}_x + O((\Delta x)^3).
\end{aligned}$$

If u is a smooth solution of (1.1) then

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.18) \quad &u(x, t + \Delta t) = u(x, t) + \Delta t u_t + \left(\frac{\Delta t}{2}\right)^2 u_{tt} + O((\Delta t)^3) \\
&= u(x, t) - \Delta t f(u)_x + \left(\frac{\Delta t}{2}\right)^2 [a^2(u) u_x]_x + O((\Delta t)^3)
\end{aligned}$$

Thus the truncation error is

$$\begin{aligned}
 & u(x, t + \Delta t) - H(u(x - k\Delta x, t), \dots, u(x + k\Delta x, t)) \\
 (2.19a) \quad & = - (\Delta t)^2 [\beta(u, \lambda) u_x]_x + O((\Delta t)^3)
 \end{aligned}$$

where

$$(2.19b) \quad \beta(u, \lambda) = \frac{1}{2\lambda^2} \sum_{j=-k}^k j^2 H_j(u, \dots, u) - \frac{1}{2} a^2(u) .$$

We claim that except in a trivial case, $\beta(u, \lambda) \geq 0$ and $\beta(u, \lambda) \neq 0$; this shows that monotone finite difference schemes in conservation form are of first order accuracy. This result is well known in the linear case, see [2] and [11].

Proof: Using the monotonicity assumption $H_j \geq 0$ we can write

$$\sum j H_j = \sum j \sqrt{H_j} \sqrt{H_j} ;$$

by using Schwarz's inequality, we get from (2.14) and (2.15) that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \lambda^2 a^2(u) &= \left(\sum j H_j \right)^2 = \left(\sum j \sqrt{H_j} \sqrt{H_j} \right)^2 \\
 (2.20) \quad &\leq \sum j^2 H_j \cdot \sum H_j = \sum j^2 H_j .
 \end{aligned}$$

It follows from (2.20) and (2.19b) that $\beta(u, \lambda) \geq 0$. This inequality becomes an identity if and only if $H_j(u, \dots, u) \equiv 0$ for all j except one, i.e. the finite-difference operator is a pure translation -- this is the trivial case mentioned above.

Suppose that w is a smooth solution of the parabolic equation

$$(2.21) \quad w_t + f(w)_x = \Delta t [\beta(w, \lambda) w_x]_x$$

where $\beta(w, \lambda) \geq 0$ is given by (2.19b); then the same way that (2.19) was derived from (2.17) and (1.1) we deduce that

$$(2.22) \quad w(x, t + \Delta t) - H(w(x - k\Delta x, t), \dots, w(x + k\Delta x, t)) = O((\Delta t)^3).$$

This implies by standard arguments that $v(x, t)$ given by (2.1), which is a first order accurate approximation to smooth solutions of the conservation law (1.1), is a second order accurate approximation to smooth solutions of the parabolic equation (2.21).

Although the preceding statement was derived by assuming smoothness of the solutions, a similar statement can be made for solutions of the linear equation

$$(2.23) \quad u_t + cu_x = 0, \quad c = \text{const.}$$

with discontinuous initial data. It is shown in [3] that if $u(x, t)$ is the solution of (2.23), $v(x, t)$ the solution of (2.1) and $w(x, t)$ the solution of (2.21), then

$$(2.24) \quad \|v(x, t) - u(x, t)\| \leq \text{const.} (\Delta t)^{1/4}$$

$$(2.25) \quad \|v(x, t) - w(x, t)\| \leq \text{const.} (\Delta t)^{3/4},$$

where $\| \cdot \|$ is the L_2 -norm. Thus even for linear discontinuities, the numerical solution approximates the solution of the parabolic equation (2.21) better than it approximates the solution of the original conservation law.

The numerical solution $v(x,t)$, and the solution $w(x,t)$ of the parabolic equation (2.21) are both approximations to shock solutions of the conservation law (1.1). Both approximations share many properties like maximum principle, L_1 -contractiveness (see Appendix) and most importantly, existence of monotone steady progressing profiles (see [3] and reference [A2]). A numerical study in [3] revealed exceptional agreement between numerical and viscous profiles. This shows that solutions of the monotone scheme in conservation form (2.1) appear to approximate solutions of the parabolic equation (2.21) better than they approximate solutions of the original conservation law, continuous as well as discontinuous. Since the physically relevant solution was defined as the limit of solutions of the parabolic equation, this may explain why solutions of monotone schemes in conservation form converge to the physically relevant solutions.

3. Non-Monotone Finite-Difference Schemes

In this section we consider schemes of type (2.1) which are not monotone, i.e. for which the function H defined in (2.1) is not a monotone function of all its arguments. As we remarked at the end of the last section, difference schemes which have order of accuracy higher than 1 are not monotone. In this section we shall give examples of non-monotone difference schemes in conservation form whose solutions converge to weak solutions which are not physically relevant, i.e. which violate the entropy condition E .

We consider numerical solutions to the following initial value problem:

$$(3.1a) \quad u_t + f(u)_x = 0, \quad f(u) = u - \alpha u^2(u-1)^2$$

$$(3.1b) \quad u(x,0) = u_0(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & x \leq 0.5 \\ 0 & x > 0.5 \end{cases}$$

Here α is a positive parameter. Figure 1 shows a plot of $f(u)$ for $\alpha = 3\sqrt{3}$; note that f is not convex or concave. In fact $f(u)$ is not convex or concave for all $\alpha > 0$.

The function

$$(3.2) \quad u(x,t) = u_0(x-t)$$

solves the initial value problem and satisfies the Rankine-Hugoniot condition across the discontinuity. It follows from the geometrical interpretation of the entropy condition, see

[7], that (3.2) satisfies the entropy condition. Therefore by the uniqueness theorem it is the only solution.

First we consider the solution of (3.1) by the Lax-Wendroff scheme (LW):

$$(3.3a) \quad v_j^{n+1} = v_j^n - \frac{\lambda}{2} (f_{j+1}^n - f_{j-1}^n) + \frac{\lambda^2}{2} [a_{j+1/2}^n (f_{j+1}^n - f_j^n) - a_{j-1/2}^n (f_j^n - f_{j-1}^n)]$$

$f_k^n = f(v_k^n)$, $a_{k+1/2}^n = a\left(\frac{v_k^n + v_{k+1}^n}{2}\right)$. $\lambda = \Delta t / \Delta x$ is chosen at the beginning of each time-step by

$$(3.3b) \quad \lambda \max_j |a(v_j^n)| = 0.9 .$$

Figures 2a, 2b and 2c show v_j^n of the LW scheme for $n = 5, 15, 150$; the dashed line in these figures is the correct solution (3.2).

The numerical evidence presented in these figures indicates that the solution of (3.2) by the LW scheme converges as $n \rightarrow \infty$ to

$$(3.4) \quad u(x,t) = \begin{cases} u_L = 1 & , & -\infty < x < 0.5 - 3.3t \\ u_0 = 1.41 & , & 0.5 - 3.3t < x < 0.5 \\ u_U = -0.17 & , & 0.5 < x < 0.5 - 2.2t \\ u_R = 0 & , & 0.5 + 2.2t < x < +\infty \end{cases}$$

The Rankine-Hugoniot conditions (1.4) at the three discontinuities are satisfied within the accuracy of the calculation, i.e.

$u(x,t)$ given by (3.4) is a weak solution of (3.1). This is as it has to be according to the theorem of Lax and Wendroff quoted earlier. On the other hand observe that whereas the entropy condition is satisfied for the discontinuity between u_L and u_0 as well as for the discontinuity between u_U and u_R it is violated at the discontinuity between u_0 and u_U ; this is again as it has to be, for according to the uniqueness theorem there is only one solution of (3.1) which satisfies the entropy condition, and that solution is given by (3.2).

It seems that both the non-monotonicity of the finite difference scheme and the non-convexity of the flux function are responsible for this non-physical behavior of the solution (3.4). The non-monotonicity of the finite difference scheme causes the development of an overshoot u_0 (see Figure 2a) and an undershoot u_U (see Figure 2b). The non-convexity of the flux function allows $a(u_0) < a(u_L)$ and $a(u_U) > a(u_R)$. These inequalities explain the backward propagating shock (u_L, u_0) and the forward propagating shock (u_U, u_R) in (3.4).

We remark that numerical experiments with the LW scheme and a flux function $f(u)$,

$$f(u) = \begin{cases} u - \alpha u^2 (u-1)^2, & 0 \leq u \leq 1 \\ u & u \geq 1 \text{ on } u \leq 0, \end{cases}$$

which is identical to (3.1a) in $[0,1]$, but is linear otherwise, did not exhibit nonphysical solutions, although the overshoot was as large as in the case of (3.1).

Computer experiments with the second order accurate 2-step Richtmyer scheme [17], as well as with the third and fourth order accurate generalizations of the LW scheme [19], produced results similar in nature to the one described in Figure 2.

We present now an example which shows that the LW scheme (3.3a) can produce a solution of the conservation law (1.1a) which violates the entropy condition even when f is convex.

We shall consider a function f for which

$$(3.5) \quad f(-1) = f(1)$$

It can be verified immediately that for such f

$$(3.6) \quad v_j = \begin{cases} -1, & \text{for } j \leq 0 \\ 1, & \text{for } j > 0 \end{cases}$$

is a steady solution of (3.3a). That is, if the initial value v_j^0 is taken to be v_j as given by (3.6), $v_j^1 = v_j^2 = \dots = v_j^n$ are all equal to v_j . The limit of these approximate solutions is, clearly,

$$(3.7) \quad u(x,t) = \begin{cases} -1 & \text{for } x < 0 \\ 1 & \text{for } x > 0 \end{cases}$$

This is a weak solution of the conservation law (1.1a) when (3.5) holds. On the other hand the solution (3.5) will violate the entropy condition when $f'(1)$ is positive; for then the characteristic directions on both sides of the discontinuity point away from the discontinuity and this is

well known to be contrary to the entropy condition.

We turn to investigating the stability of the solution (3.6). Our analysis, partly theoretical and partly numerical suggests very persuasively that even when the entropy condition is violated, (3.6) is semistable in the sense that if we take initial values close to (3.6), the solution ground out by the LW scheme tends to a weak solution which still has a discontinuity at the origin which violates the entropy condition.

We start by linearizing the LW scheme (3.3a) around the solution (3.6). We write

$$v_j^{(n)} = v_j + \varepsilon w_j \quad (3.8)$$

$$v_j^{(n+1)} = v_j + \varepsilon W_j + o(\varepsilon) .$$

Substitute (3.8) into (3.3a) and differentiate with respect to ε ; we get

$$\begin{aligned} w_j = & \frac{\lambda a_{j-1}}{2} (1 + \lambda a_{j-1/2}) w_{j-1} \\ (3.9) \quad & + (1 - \lambda)^2 \frac{a_{j-1/2} + a_{j+1/2}}{2} a_j w_j - \lambda a_{j+1} (1 - \lambda a_{j+1/2}) w_{j+1} . \end{aligned}$$

We abbreviate $\lambda f'(1)$ by b ; for the sake of simplicity we assume that $\lambda f'(-1) = -b$; this will be so whenever f is an even function.

It follows from (3.6) and the definition of $a_{j+1/2}$ in (3.3a) that

$$\lambda a_j = \begin{cases} -b & \text{for } j \leq 0 \\ b & \text{for } j > 0 \end{cases}, \quad \lambda a_{j+1/2} = \begin{cases} -b & \text{for } j < 0 \\ 0 & \text{for } j = 0 \\ b & \text{for } j > 0 \end{cases}$$

Substituting this into (3.9) we get

$$w_j = \left(-\frac{b}{2} + \frac{b^2}{2}\right)w_{j-1} + (1-b^2)w_j + \left(\frac{b}{2} + \frac{b^2}{2}\right)w_{j+1}$$

for $j < 0$

$$w_0 = \left(-\frac{b}{2} + \frac{b^2}{2}\right)w_{-1} + \left(1 - \frac{b^2}{2}\right)w_0 - \frac{b}{2}w_1$$

(3.11)

$$w_1 = -\frac{b}{2}w_0 + \left(1 - \frac{b^2}{2}\right)w_1 + \left(-\frac{b}{2} + \frac{b^2}{2}\right)w_2$$

and

$$w_j = \left(\frac{b}{2} + \frac{b^2}{2}\right)w_{j-1} + (1-b^2)w_j + \left(-\frac{b}{2} + \frac{b^2}{2}\right)w_{j+1}$$

for $j > 1$.

We simplify the operator (3.11) by introducing

$$p_j = w_j + w_{1-j}, \quad q_j = w_j - w_{1-j},$$

(3.12)

$$P_j = W_j + W_{1-j}, \quad Q_j = W_j - W_{1-j},$$

$j = 1, 2, \dots$. In the first equation of (3.11) replace j by $1 - j$ and add it to, respectively subtract it from the last equation in (3.11). We get

$$P_j = \left(\frac{b}{2} + \frac{b^2}{2}\right)p_{j-1} + (1-b^2)p_j + \left(-\frac{b}{2} + \frac{b^2}{2}\right)p_{j+1}$$

(3.13)

$$Q_j = \left(\frac{b}{2} + \frac{b^2}{2}\right)q_{j-1} + (1-b^2)q_j + \left(-\frac{b}{2} + \frac{b^2}{2}\right)q_{j+1}.$$

Adding and subtracting the second equation from the third in (3.11) we get

$$P_1 = \left(1 - \frac{b^2}{2} - \frac{b}{2}\right)P_1 + \left(-\frac{b}{2} + \frac{b^2}{2}\right)P_2$$

(3.14)

$$Q_1 = \left(1 - \frac{b^2}{2} + \frac{b}{2}\right)q_1 + \left(-\frac{b}{2} + \frac{b^2}{2}\right)q_2$$

Now (3.14) can be rewritten as (3.13) with $j = 1$, provided that we define

$$p_0 = \frac{b-1}{b+1} p_1$$

(3.15)

$$q_0 = q_1 .$$

We have (3.15) serve as boundary conditions for equation (3.13).

In equations (3.13), (3.14) and (3.15) the p 's are completely decoupled from the q 's. We denote by $T_p(b)$ the operator relating the p to P , by $T_q(b)$ the operator relating q to Q .

Equations (3.13) with the boundary conditions (3.15) are simple scalar examples of difference equations for mixed initial-boundary value problems. A stability theory for such equations has been developed by Kreiss, another approach to this theory is due to S. Osher.

Kreiss' theory says that a difference scheme is strongly stable, in the sense that the ℓ_2 norm of its solutions remains uniformly bounded for all time, if there are no unstable modes, genuine or generalized. It is not hard to show the following:

For $b > 0$ the operator $T_p(b)$ has no unstable eigenvector,
and $T_q(b)$ has the unstable eigenvector

$$(3.16) \quad q_j = 1, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, \quad T_q(b)q = q.$$

For $b < 0$ the operator $T_q(b)$ has no unstable eigenvector and the operator $T_p(b)$ has the unstable eigenvector

$$(3.17) \quad p_j = \left(\frac{b+1}{b-1}\right)^j, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, \quad T_p(b)p(b) = p(b).$$

It follows from Kreiss' theorem that $T_p(b)$ is strongly stable for $b > 0$ and $T_q(b)$ is strongly stable for $b < 0$. We surmise that $T_q(b)$ is weakly unstable for $b > 0$, $T_p(b)$ is weakly unstable for $b < 0$ in the following sense:

$$(3.18) \quad \begin{aligned} \|T_q^n(b)\| &\approx \text{const.} \sqrt{n}, & b > 0, \\ \|T_p^n(b)\| &\approx \text{const.} \sqrt{n}, & b < 0. \end{aligned}$$

We deduce easily from (3.13), (3.14) that

$$(3.19) \quad T_q^*(b) = T_p(-b),$$

where $*$ denotes the adjoint with respect to the ℓ_2 norm. It follows from (3.19) that

$$(3.20) \quad \|T_p^n(-b)\| = \|T_q^n(b)\|;$$

so it suffices to prove only one of the two statements in (3.18). To study $T_q(b)$, $b > 0$, we compare $T_q^n(b)$ to the solution operator of the differential operator which it approximates. Then (3.13) is an approximation to

$$(3.21a) \quad q_t + bq_x = 0,$$

and (3.15) is an approximation to

$$(3.21b) \quad q_x = 0 \quad \text{at} \quad x = 0 .$$

The solution of (3.21) whose initial value is $\phi(x)$ is, for $b > 0$, given by the formula

$$(3.22) \quad q(x,t) = \begin{cases} \phi(0) & \text{for } x < bt \\ \phi(x-bt) & \text{for } x \geq bt \end{cases}$$

By analogy with (3.22) we expect¹ the solution of the initial value problem for the difference scheme (3.13), (3.15) to be of the form

$$(3.23) \quad q_j^n \approx \ell(\phi) \quad \text{for } j \leq bn ,$$

where $\ell(\phi)$ is some linear functional of the initial data. Numerical calculations bear out this contention, see Table I.

The linear functional $\ell(\phi)$ is easily determined. With p given by (3.17) but b replaced by $-b$ and using (3.19) we have, for $b > 0$

$$(3.24) \quad (T_q^n(b)\phi, p(-b)) = (\phi, T_p^n(-b)p(-b)) = (\phi, p(-b)) .$$

It follows from (3.23) that as $n \rightarrow \infty$, the left side of (3.24) tends to

$$\ell(\phi) \sum p_j(b) = \ell(\phi) \frac{\frac{b-1}{b+1}}{1 - \frac{b-1}{b+1}} = \ell(\phi) \frac{b-1}{2}$$

¹ We thank Stanley Osher for suggesting this approach.

So from (3.24) we get

$$(3.25) \quad \ell(\phi) = \frac{2}{b-1} (\phi, p) = \frac{2}{b-1} \sum \phi_j \left(\frac{b-1}{b+1}\right)^j$$

This relation was borne out by numerical calculations, see Table I. It would follow from (3.23) that for $b > 0$

$$\|T_q^n(b)\| \geq \text{const.} \sqrt{n}$$

By (3.20) the same inequality follows for $T_p^n(-b)$. This completes the proof of (3.18). It is interesting to note that the instability of $T_p(-b)$ is more violent than the instability of $T_q(b)$; in the former case instability is manifested by the first component of $T_p^n(-b)$ tending to ∞ , see Table II. Recall that $T_p(-b)$, $b > 0$, corresponds to a shock which satisfies the entropy condition whereas $T_q(b)$, $b > 0$, corresponds to a discontinuity that violates the entropy condition. It is amusing that the former should be more unstable than the latter, in the linearized analysis.

In the full nonlinear theory we see no instability at all of the discontinuity which satisfies the entropy condition, see Figures 3a and 3b. When the values (3,6) are perturbed, iterations of the LW operator (3.3a) tend rapidly as n tends from ∞ to one of a one-parameter family of steady profiles connecting -1 to 1. For discontinuities which violate the entropy condition, there is a mild instability. Finite perturbation causes a pair of rarefaction waves to issue from the

point of discontinuity, without however completely dissolving
the discontinuity into single rarefaction waves. See
Figures 4a, 4b and 4c.

4. Conclusions

Our study shows that solutions of certain difference approximations to conservation laws fail to converge to the physically relevant solutions. On the other hand we have shown that a limit of solutions of monotone difference schemes is always the physically relevant solution. This quality, as well as their extreme stability, makes monotone schemes attractive at first. On the other hand monotone schemes are necessarily of first order accuracy and this severely limits their accuracy and resolving power. In 2 or 3 dimensional problems, where mesh sizes are necessarily crude, first order schemes are practically useless. Indeed, the practical schemes today combine high order accuracy in smooth regions with a sufficient amount of dissipation in shock regions. Dissipation is provided either by some version of artificial viscosity, introduced 25 years ago by von Neumann and Richtmyer, see [17], [13], [1], [4], [14], or by some form of hybridization as in the method of Harten and Zwas [5]. The role of artificial viscosity as an entropy-producing mechanism was clearly recognized by von Neumann and Richtmyer, although it is also a device for reducing overshooting, and excessive oscillation, for stabilizing calculations. These two roles of artificial viscosity are related.

It would be extremely desirable to extend the result of Section 2 from monotone schemes to all schemes which have a certain amount of viscosity in regions of rapid transition

and show that limits of such schemes satisfy the entropy condition.

It would be extremely important to extend these results to systems. A notion of entropy for systems is discussed in [12]; it is shown there that limits of solutions of the Lax-Friedrichs scheme satisfy an entropy condition, provided that $\Delta t/\Delta x$ is less than a fraction of the Courant-Friedrichs-Lewy limit.

Another important problem is to study the effect of shocks on the overall accuracy of schemes which are of higher order in smooth regions.

References

1. Burstein, S. Z., Finite Difference Calculations for Hydrodynamic Flows Containing Discontinuities, Jour. Comp. Phys. Vol. 1, 1966, pp. 198-222.
2. Godunov, S. K., Finite Difference Methods for Numerical Computation of Discontinuous Solutions of Equations of Fluid Dynamics, Mat. Sb., Vol. 47, 1959, pp. 271-295.
3. Harten, A., The Method of Artificial Compression: I. Shocks and Contact Discontinuities, AEC Research and Development Report COO-3077-50, Courant Inst. Mathematical Sciences, New York University, June 1974.
4. Harten, A. and Zwas, G., Switched Numerical Shuman Filters for Shock Calculations, Jour. Eng. Math., Vol. 6, 1972, pp. 207-216.
5. Harten, A. and Zwas, G., Self-Adjusting Hybrid Schemes for Shock Computations, Jour. Comp. Phys., Vol. 9, 1972, pp. 568-583.
6. Hopf, E., On the Right Weak Solution of the Cauchy Problem for Quasilinear Equations of First Order, J. Math. Mech., Vol. 19, 1969, pp. 483-487.
7. Kreiss, H. O., Difference Approximations for Initial-Boundary Value Problems for Hyperbolic Differential Equations, in "Numerical Solutions of Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations," Edited by D. Greenspan, Wiley, New York, 1966, pp. 140-166.

8. Keyfitz, B., Solutions with Shocks, an Example of an L_1 -Contractive Semigroup, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., Vol. 24, 1971, pp. 125-132.
9. Krushkov, S. N., Results on the Character of Continuity of Solutions of Parabolic Equations and Some of Their Applications, Math. Zametky, Vol. 6, 1969, pp. 97-108.
10. Lax, P. D., Hyperbolic Systems of Conservation Laws II, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., Vol. 10, 1957, pp. 537-566.
11. Lax, P. D., On the Stability of Difference Approximations to Solutions of Hyperbolic Equations with Variable Coefficients, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., Vol. 14, 1961, pp. 497-520.
12. Lax, P. D., Shock Waves and Entropy, Proc. Symp. at Univ. of Wisconsin, 1971, E. H. Zarantonello, ed., pp. 603-634.
13. Lax, P. D., and Wendroff, B., Systems of Conservation Laws, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., Vol. 13, 1960, pp. 217-237.
14. MacCormack, R. W., Numerical Solution of the Interaction of a Shock Wave with a Laminar Boundary Layer, Lecture Notes on Physics, No. 8, Springer-Verlag, 1971.
15. Oleinik, O. A., Discontinuous Solutions of Nonlinear Differential Equations, Uspekhi Mat. Nauk, Vol. 12, 1957, pp. 3-73 (Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. Ser. 2, 26, pp. 95-172).
16. Osher, S., System of Difference Equations with General Homogeneous Boundary Conditions, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., Vol. 137, 1969, pp. 177-201.

17. Richtmyer, R. D., and Morton, K. W., Finite Difference Methods for Initial Value Problems, Interscience-Wiley, New York, 1967.
18. von Neumann, J., and Richtmyer, R. D., A Method for the Numerical Calculation of Hydrodynamic Shocks, Jour. Appl. Phys., Vol. 21, 1950, pp. 232-237.
19. Zwas, G., and Abarbanel, S., Third and Fourth Order Accurate Schemes for Hyperbolic Equations of Conservation Laws, Math. Comp., Vol. 25, 1971, pp. 229-236.

Appendix

by Barbara Keyfitz

It was shown in [7] that piecewise smooth solutions of a single conservation equation satisfying Condition E form an L_1 -contractive semigroup. To be precise, if $u(x,t)$ and $w(x,t)$ are two solutions of (1.1a), and $u(x,0) - w(x,0) \in L_1$, and if u and w both satisfy condition E, then

$$(A.1) \quad \|u(\cdot, t_2) - w(\cdot, t_2)\| \leq \|u(\cdot, t_1) - w(\cdot, t_1)\|$$

for all $t_2 \geq t_1 \geq 0$; there $\| \cdot \|$ denotes the L_1 -norm in the space variable. The converse of this proposition is also true, in the following sharp form: if (A.1) is satisfied for a particular weak solution u and all smooth solutions w , then u satisfies Condition E.

To test whether a given weak solution $u(x,t)$ satisfies Condition E, it is thus sufficient to show that $\|u(\cdot, t) - w(\cdot, t)\|$ is a non-increasing function of t for all smooth solutions w . For proofs, see [7], and [A1] in which Krushkov extended this result to general weak solutions.

In this appendix we give an alternate proof of the theorem of Section 2 by showing that if u is a limit of solutions of a monotone difference scheme, then (A.1) is indeed satisfied for all smooth solutions w . This is based on the observation by Gray Jennings [A2] that solutions of a monotone difference scheme satisfy a finite-difference analogue of L_1 -contractiveness: if v_j^n and z_j^n are two solutions of (2.2) defined at

grid points (j, x, n, t) , and $v_j^0 - z_j^0$ is ℓ_1 -summable, then

$$(A.2) \quad |v^m - z^m| \leq |v^n - z^n| \quad \text{for } m \geq n \geq 0,$$

where $| \cdot |$ denotes the ℓ_1 -norm over the spacial grid. For the sake of completeness we present a proof of this.

Clearly it suffices to show that (A.2) holds for $m = n+1$. Introducing the notation $\bar{v}_j^n = (v_{j-k}^n, \dots, v_{j+k}^n)$, a $2k+1$ -dimensional string of points from $\{v_j^n\}$, and letting $s_j^n = \text{sgn}(v_j^n - z_j^n)$ we can write

$$\|v^{n+1} - z^{n+1}\|_1 = \sum_j s_j^{n+1} (v_j^{n+1} - z_j^{n+1}) = \sum_j s_j^{n+1} (H(\bar{v}_j^n) - H(\bar{z}_j^n)).$$

Now, dropping the superscripts

$$H(\bar{v}_j) - H(\bar{z}_j) = H((1-\theta)\bar{z}_j + \theta\bar{v}_j) \Big|_0^1 = \int_0^1 \frac{d}{d\theta} H \, d\theta$$

Let $\bar{\xi}_j(\theta) = (1-\theta)\bar{z}_j + \theta\bar{v}_j$, a $2k+1$ -dimensional string from $\{(1-\theta)v_j + \theta z_j\}$; then

$$\|v^{n+1} - z^{n+1}\|_1 = \sum_j s_j^{n+1} \int_0^1 \sum_{\ell=1}^{2k+1} (v_{j-k+\ell-1} - z_{j-k+\ell-1}) \frac{\partial H}{\partial u_\ell}(\bar{\xi}_j(\theta)) \, d\theta$$

Rearranging terms, we obtain

$$\sum_m (v_m - z_m) \int_0^1 \sum_{\ell=1}^{2k+1} s_{m+k-\ell+1}^{n+1} \frac{\partial H}{\partial u_\ell}(\bar{\xi}_{m+k-\ell+1}(\theta)) \, d\theta,$$

and since $\partial H / \partial u_\ell \geq 0$ for $\ell = 1, \dots, 2k+1$, we may drop the terms s_j^{n+1} and write

$$\|v^{n+1} - z^{n+1}\|_1 \leq \sum_m |v_m^n - z_m^n| \left\{ \int_0^1 \sum_{\ell=1}^{2k+1} \frac{\partial H}{\partial u_\ell} (\bar{\xi}_{m+k-\ell+1}(\theta)) d\theta \right\}$$

However,

$$H(u_1, \dots, u_{2k+1}) = u_{k+1} - \lambda \left\{ h(u_2, \dots, u_{2k+1}) - h(u_1, \dots, u_{2k}) \right\}$$

and so

$$\frac{\partial H}{\partial u_1} = \lambda \frac{\partial h}{\partial u_1} (u_1, \dots, u_{2k})$$

$$\frac{\partial H}{\partial u_{2k+1}} = -\lambda \frac{\partial h}{\partial u_{2k}} (u_2, \dots, u_{2k+1})$$

$$\frac{\partial H}{\partial u_{k+1}} = 1 - \lambda \frac{\partial h}{\partial u_k} (u_2, \dots, u_{2k+1}) + \lambda \frac{\partial h}{\partial u_{k+1}} (u_1, \dots, u_{2k})$$

and

$$\frac{\partial H}{\partial u_i} = -\lambda \frac{\partial h}{\partial u_{i-1}} (u_2, \dots, u_{2k+1}) + \lambda \frac{\partial h}{\partial u_i} (u_1, \dots, u_{2k})$$

otherwise.

Hence, for each fixed value of θ , dropping the θ -dependence of ξ ,

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^{2k+1} \frac{\partial H}{\partial u_\ell} (\xi_{m-\ell+1}, \xi_{m-\ell+2}, \dots, \xi_{m+2k-\ell+1}) = \lambda \frac{\partial h}{\partial u_1} (\xi_m, \xi_{m+1}, \dots)$$

$$+ \sum_{\ell=2}^{2k} \left\{ -\lambda \frac{\partial h}{\partial u_{\ell-1}} (\xi_{m-\ell+2}, \dots) + \lambda \frac{\partial h}{\partial u_\ell} (\xi_{m-\ell+1}, \dots) \right\} + 1$$

(for the $k+1$ term)

$$-\lambda \frac{\partial h}{\partial u_{2k}} (\xi_{m-2k+1}, \dots) = 1$$

Thus

$$\|v^{n+1} - z^{n+1}\|_1 \leq \sum_m |v_m^n - z_m^n| \int_0^1 1 d\theta = \|v^n - z^n\|_1,$$

proving (A.1).

To complete the argument, let $u(x,t)$ be the strong limit of solutions v_j^n of (2.2) as $\Delta x, \Delta t \rightarrow 0$ with λ fixed. Let $w(x,t)$ be any smooth solution of (1.1a) with $u(x,0) - w(x,0) \in L_1$. Now w can be approximated by a solution z_j^n of (2.2) which converges strongly to w as $\Delta x \rightarrow 0$ with λ fixed, as a consequence of a result of Strang [A3], which shows that for positive methods (including monotone schemes), convergence to smooth solutions is guaranteed.

In (A.2) let $\Delta x \rightarrow 0$ with λ fixed, and $m, n \rightarrow \infty$ so that $m\Delta t = t_2$, $n\Delta t = t_1$. Since v_j^n and z_j^n converge strongly and hence in norm,

$$\Delta x \|v_j^n - z_j^n\| \rightarrow \|u(\cdot, t) - w(\cdot, t)\|,$$

whence (A.1) follows.

We remark that monotonicity is necessary for (A.2) to hold: a difference scheme approximating (1.1a) which is consistent and conservative and satisfies (A.2) is monotone.

Additional Bibliography:

- A1. S. I. Krushkov, First Order Quasilinear Equations in Several Independent Variables, Math. USSR Sbornik, Vol. 10 (1970), pp. 217-243.
- A2. G. Jennings, Discrete Shocks, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., Vol. 27, 1974, pp. 25-37.
- A3. G. Strang, Accurate Partial Difference Methods II, Nonlinear Problems, Numerische Mathematik, Vol. 6, 1964, pp. 37-46.

Table I: (*) $T_q^n(0.9)\phi$, (3.13)-(3.14)

j	ϕ	$T_q^5(0.9)\phi$	$T_q^{10}(0.9)\phi$	$T_q^{15}(0.9)\phi$	$T_q^{20}(0.9)\phi$
0		1.053	1.053	1.053	1.053
1	1.	1.053	1.053	1.053	1.053
2	0.	1.052	1.053	1.053	1.053
3	0.	1.064	1.053	1.053	1.053
4	0.	1.094	1.053	1.053	1.053
5	0.	0.965	1.051	1.053	1.053
6	0.	0.457	1.050	1.053	1.053
7	0.	0.	1.074	1.053	1.053
8	0.	0.	1.117	1.052	1.053
9	0.	0.	1.038	1.049	1.053
10	0.	0.	0.673	1.047	1.053
11	0.	0.	0.209	1.073	1.053
12	0.	0.	0.	1.125	1.053
13	0.	0.	0.	1.096	1.048
14	0.	0.	0.	0.838	1.044
15	0.	0.	0.	0.413	1.066
16	0.	0.	0.	0.095	1.123
17	0.	0.	0.	0.	1.134

(*) Observe that by (3.25) $\ell(\phi) = \frac{2}{0.9-1} \cdot \frac{0.9-1}{0.9+1} = 1.053$

Table 2: $T_p^n(-0.9)\phi$, (3.13)-(3.14).

n \ j	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
0 (*)		1.	1.	1.	1.	1.	1.
5	- 90.	5.68	.81	1.01	1.	1.	1.
10	-180.	10.42	.56	1.02	1.	1.	1.
15	-270.	15.16	.31	1.03	1.	1.	1.
20	-360.	19.89	.06	1.05	1.	1.	1.
25	-450.	24.63	-.19	1.06	1.	1.	1.
30	-540.	29.37	-.44	1.07	1.	1.	1.
35	-630.	34.10	-.69	1.09	1.	1.	1.
40	-720.	38.84	-.94	1.10	1.	1.	1.

$$(*) \quad \phi_j = \begin{cases} 1, & 1 \leq j \leq 49 \\ 0, & j \geq 50 \end{cases}$$




FIGURE 1




FIGURE 2a




FIGURE 2h




FIGURE 2c




FIGURE 3a Initial value




FIGURE 3b Steady state




FIGURE 4a





FIGURE 4b



$t = 20\Delta t$

FIGURE 4c

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM	
1. REPORT NUMBER IMM 411	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER	
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) On Finite-Difference Approximations and Entropy Conditions for Shocks		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Technical	
		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER	
7. AUTHOR(s) A. Harten, J. M. Hyman and P. D. Lax		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) AF-F44620-74-C-0062 E(11-1)-3077	
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences New York University 251 Mercer St., New York, N.Y. 10012		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS	
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS AFOSR, Bldg 410, Bolling AFB, D.C. 20332; U.S. ERDA - COO, 9800 South Cass Ave., Argonne, Illinois 60439		12. REPORT DATE January 1976	
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 45	
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) none	
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE	
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Distribution of this document is unlimited.			
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report) none			
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES none			
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) none			
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Weak solutions of hyperbolic conservation laws are not uniquely determined by their initial values; an entropy condition is needed to pick out the physically relevant solution. The question arises whether finite-difference approximations converge to this particular solution. It is shown in this paper that in			

20. continued:

the case of a single conservation law, monotone schemes, when convergent, always converge to the physically relevant solution. Numerical examples show that this is not always the case with non-monotone schemes, such as the Lax-Wendroff scheme.

This report was prepared as an account of Government sponsored work. Neither the United States, nor the Administration, nor any person acting on behalf of the Administration:

- A. Makes any warranty or representation, express or implied, with respect to the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of the information contained in this report, or that the use of any information, apparatus, method, or process disclosed in this report may not infringe privately owned rights; or
- B. Assumes any liabilities with respect to the use of, or for damages resulting from the use of any information, apparatus, method, or process disclosed in this report.

As used in the above, "person acting on behalf of the Administration" includes any employee or contractor of the Administration, or employee of such contractor, to the extent that such employee or contractor of the Administration, or employee of such contractor prepares, disseminates, or provides access to, any information pursuant to his employment or contract with the Administration, or his employment with such contractor.