

DFG-Schwerpunktprogramm 1324

„Extraktion quantifizierbarer Information aus komplexen Systemen“

On Elliptic Partial Differential Equations with Random Coefficients

A. Mugler, H.-J. Starkloff

Preprint 79



Edited by

AG Numerik/Optimierung
Fachbereich 12 - Mathematik und Informatik
Philipps-Universität Marburg
Hans-Meerwein-Str.
35032 Marburg

DFG-Schwerpunktprogramm 1324

„Extraktion quantifizierbarer Information aus komplexen Systemen“

On Elliptic Partial Differential Equations with Random Coefficients

A. Mugler, H.-J. Starkloff

Preprint 79



The consecutive numbering of the publications is determined by their chronological order.

The aim of this preprint series is to make new research rapidly available for scientific discussion. Therefore, the responsibility for the contents is solely due to the authors. The publications will be distributed by the authors.

On Elliptic Partial Differential Equations with Random Coefficients*

Antje Mugler and Hans-Jörg Starkloff

Abstract. We consider stationary diffusion equations with random coefficients which cannot be bounded strictly away from zero and infinity by constants. We prove the existence of a unique solution to the corresponding weak formulation with different solution and test function spaces. Furthermore, the convergence of the Stochastic Galerkin solution is established under certain conditions.

Key words. random partial differential equation, Stochastic Galerkin Methods, generalized polynomial chaos

1 Introduction

In recent years there has been a growing interest in quantifying uncertainty in complex systems which are modeled via algebraic, ordinary or partial differential equations with random input data. For example, the stationary diffusion equation with a random coefficient is an instructive model problem. Thus, we consider the boundary value problem consisting of the random partial differential equation

$$-\nabla \cdot (\kappa \nabla u) = f$$

and some suitable boundary conditions. Thereby, the coefficient κ and also the forcing f are random functions. In previous works (see for example Babuska et al. [1, 3, 4] or Schwab et al. [5, 6, 14]) it is often assumed that there exist constants $\underline{\kappa}, \bar{\kappa} > 0$, such that

$$0 < \underline{\kappa} \leq \kappa(x, \omega) \leq \bar{\kappa} \quad \text{a.e. and a.s.}$$

Then the theorem of Lax-Milgram can be used to prove the existence of a unique weak solution. In a first step towards a generalization of the problem setting Galvis and Sarkis [9] as well as Gittelsohn [11] investigate this random partial differential equation where the coefficient is modeled as a lognormal random field. That is, $\kappa(x) = \exp(G(x))$ with a Gaussian random field $G(x)$. In this case, however, there do not exist constants $\underline{\kappa}, \bar{\kappa} > 0$ as above and thus the Lax-Milgram theorem is not applicable. For this reason, the authors employ alternative techniques to prove the existence and uniqueness of the weak solution and to obtain a priori error estimates of the Stochastic Galerkin approximation to this solution. In the following we generalize these results to arbitrary random input fields which can be bounded by random variables $\kappa_{min}, \kappa_{max} > 0$ a.s., that is,

$$0 < \kappa_{min}(\omega) \leq \kappa(x, \omega) \leq \kappa_{max}(\omega) < \infty \quad \text{a.e. and a.s.}$$

*This work was supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft Priority Programme 1324.

2 Setting and Problem Formulation

Let $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$, be a bounded Lipschitz domain and $(\Omega, \mathfrak{A}, \mathbf{P})$ a probability space. We consider the following boundary value problem

$$\begin{aligned} -\nabla \cdot (\kappa(x, \omega) \nabla u(x, \omega)) &= f(x, \omega) & x \in D, \omega \in \Omega \\ u(x, \omega) &= 0 & x \in \partial D, \omega \in \Omega \end{aligned} \quad (2.1)$$

with random coefficient κ and random forcing f . We assume that the coefficient function $\kappa : D \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a strongly measurable random variable with values in $L^\infty(D)$ and that there exist real-valued random variables κ_{min} and κ_{max} such that

$$0 < \kappa_{min}(\omega) \leq \kappa(x, \omega) \leq \kappa_{max}(\omega) < \infty \quad \text{a.e. and a.s.} \quad (2.2)$$

We define the pathwise bilinear form $b(\cdot, \cdot; \omega) : H^1(D) \times H^1(D) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$b(u, v; \omega) = \int_D \kappa(x, \omega) \nabla u(x) \cdot \nabla v(x) dx$$

for $\omega \in \Omega$ and we denote by $\langle g, v \rangle_{H^{-1}, \dot{H}^1}$ the duality pairing between $g \in H^{-1}(D)$ and $v \in \dot{H}^1(D)$. Now, assuming that f is a random variable with values in $H^{-1}(D)$, we consider a pathwise weak formulation of the boundary value problem:

Problem 2.1 (Pathwise Weak Formulation) Find a random variable \tilde{u} with values in $\dot{H}^1(D)$, such that

$$b(\tilde{u}(\omega), v; \omega) = \langle f(\omega), v \rangle_{H^{-1}, \dot{H}^1} \quad \text{for all } v \in \dot{H}^1(D) \quad (2.3)$$

holds almost surely.

Remark 2.2 In Problem 2.1 we look for a random variable \tilde{u} with values in $\dot{H}^1(D)$, such that

$$\mathbf{P} \left(b(\tilde{u}(\omega), v; \omega) = \langle f(\omega), v \rangle_{H^{-1}, \dot{H}^1} \quad \text{for all } v \in \dot{H}^1(D) \right) = 1. \quad (2.3a)$$

Due to the separability of $\dot{H}^1(D)$ this problem is equivalent to the weaker problem formulation: Find a random variable \tilde{u} with values in $\dot{H}^1(D)$, such that for all $v \in \dot{H}^1(D)$ there holds

$$\mathbf{P} \left(b(\tilde{u}(\omega), v; \omega) = \langle f(\omega), v \rangle_{H^{-1}, \dot{H}^1} \right) = 1. \quad (2.4)$$

To see this consider a basis $\{e_k, k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ of $\dot{H}^1(D)$, then it follows from formulation (2.4) that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there holds

$$\mathbf{P} \left(b(\tilde{u}(\omega), e_k; \omega) = \langle f(\omega), e_k \rangle_{H^{-1}, H_0^1} \right) = 1.$$

This implies that there exists a null set $N \in \mathfrak{A}$ such that for all $\omega \in \Omega \setminus N$

$$b(\tilde{u}(\omega), v; \omega) = \langle f(\omega), v \rangle_{H^{-1}, H_0^1} \quad \text{for all } v \in \text{span}\{e_k, k \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

Any $v \in \dot{H}^1(D)$ can be approximated by a sequence $(v_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $v_n \in \text{span}\{e_k, k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and we denote by $M \in \mathfrak{A}$ the null set such that condition (2.2) is fulfilled for $\kappa(x, \omega)$ a.e. for all $\omega \in \Omega \setminus M$, $\tilde{u}(\omega) \in \dot{H}^1(D)$ and $f(\omega) \in H^{-1}(D)$ for all $\omega \in \Omega \setminus M$. Then it follows that

$$b(\tilde{u}(\omega), v_n; \omega) \rightarrow b(\tilde{u}(\omega), v; \omega) \quad \text{and} \quad \langle f(\omega), v_n \rangle_{H^{-1}, \dot{H}^1} \rightarrow \langle f(\omega), v \rangle_{H^{-1}, \dot{H}^1}, \quad n \rightarrow \infty,$$

for all $\omega \in \Omega \setminus M$ and thus for all $\omega \in \Omega \setminus (N \cup M)$ there holds

$$b(\tilde{u}(\omega), v; \omega) = \langle f(\omega), v \rangle_{H^{-1}, \dot{H}^1} \quad \text{for all } v \in \dot{H}^1(D)$$

and $\mathbf{P}(\Omega \setminus (N \cup M)) = 1$.

Since every realization of the coefficient κ is bounded by assumption (2.2) and f is a random variable with values in $H^{-1}(D)$, by the theorem of Lax-Milgram (see e.g. [7] Theorem 2.7.7) there exists a mapping $\tilde{u} : \Omega \rightarrow \mathring{H}^1(D)$, $\omega \mapsto \tilde{u}(\omega)$ satisfying

$$b(\tilde{u}(\omega), v; \omega) = \langle f(\omega), v \rangle_{H^{-1}, \mathring{H}^1} \quad \text{for all } v \in \mathring{H}^1(D)$$

for almost all $\omega \in \Omega$. Furthermore, the estimate

$$\|\tilde{u}(\omega)\|_{\mathring{H}^1(D)} \leq C \frac{\|f(\omega)\|_{H^{-1}(D)}}{\kappa_{\min}(\omega)} \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (2.5)$$

holds, where $C > 0$ is a suitable constant which does not depend on $\omega \in \Omega$. This mapping \tilde{u} is a.s. uniquely defined and measurable as is proved in the next lemma.

Lemma 2.3 *Assume $\kappa : D \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a strongly measurable random variable in $L^\infty(D)$ satisfying*

$$0 < \kappa_{\min}(\omega) \leq \kappa(x, \omega) \leq \kappa_{\max}(\omega) < \infty \quad \text{a.e. and a.s.}$$

for real-valued random variables $\kappa_{\min}, \kappa_{\max}$, and f is a random variable with values in $H^{-1}(D)$. Then the mapping $\tilde{u} : \Omega \rightarrow \mathring{H}^1(D)$ is a random variable in $\mathring{H}^1(D)$ which is measurable with respect to the σ -algebra $\sigma(f, \kappa)$, generated by f and κ , and solves problem (2.3) and (2.4), respectively.

Proof.

Since $\kappa \in L^\infty(D)$ is strongly measurable and $f \in H^{-1}(D)$, there exist sequences $(\kappa_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset L^\infty(D)$ and $(f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset H^{-1}(D)$ of $\sigma(f, \kappa)$ -measurable, simple random variables with

$$\|\kappa - \kappa_n\|_{L^\infty(D)} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \|f - f_n\|_{H^{-1}(D)} \rightarrow 0, \quad n \rightarrow \infty, \quad \text{a.s.}$$

W.l.o.g. we can suppose that the simple random variables $(\kappa_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ are given by

$$\kappa_n(x, \omega) = \sum_{i=1}^n \kappa_i^{(n)}(x) \mathbb{1}_{A_i^{(n)}}(\omega) \quad \text{and} \quad f_n(x, \omega) = \sum_{i=1}^n f_i^{(n)}(x) \mathbb{1}_{A_i^{(n)}}(\omega), \quad n \in \mathbb{N},$$

with $A_i^{(n)} \in \sigma(f, \kappa)$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $\bigcup_{i=1}^n A_i^{(n)} = \Omega$ and $A_i^{(n)} \cap A_j^{(n)} = \emptyset$ for $i \neq j$. Thereby $f_i^{(n)} \in H^{-1}(D)$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and since κ satisfies

$$0 < \kappa_{\min}(\omega) \leq \kappa(x, \omega) \leq \kappa_{\max}(\omega) < \infty \quad \text{a.e. and a.s.}$$

for random variables $\kappa_{\min}, \kappa_{\max}$, we can assume for $\kappa_i^{(n)} \in L^\infty(D)$ that

$$0 < \kappa_{\min}(\omega) \leq \kappa_i^{(n)}(x) \leq \kappa_{\max}(\omega) < \infty \quad \text{a.e. and a.s. on } A_i^{(n)}$$

for all $i = 1, \dots, n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Now, we define the approximate bilinear form $b_n(\cdot, \cdot; \omega) : H^1(D) \times H^1(D) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} b_n(u, v; \omega) &:= \int_D \kappa_n(x, \omega) \nabla u(x) \cdot \nabla v(x) \, dx \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{A_i^{(n)}}(\omega) \int_D \kappa_i^{(n)}(x) \nabla u(x) \cdot \nabla v(x) \, dx, \quad u, v \in \mathring{H}^1(D) \end{aligned}$$

and the duality pairing yields

$$\langle f_n(\omega), v \rangle_{H^{-1}, \dot{H}^1} = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{A_i^{(n)}}(\omega) \langle f_i^{(n)}, v \rangle_{H^{-1}, \dot{H}^1}, \quad v \in \dot{H}^1(D).$$

Hence, the Lax-Milgram theorem implies that there exist unique functions $u_i^{(n)} \in \dot{H}^1(D)$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, satisfying

$$\int_D \kappa_i^{(n)}(x) \nabla u_i^{(n)}(x) \cdot \nabla v(x) dx = \langle f_i^{(n)}, v \rangle_{H^{-1}, \dot{H}^1} \quad \text{for all } v \in \dot{H}^1(D).$$

Thus, the random variable $u_n(x, \omega) := \sum_{i=1}^n u_i^{(n)}(x) \mathbb{1}_{A_i^{(n)}}(\omega)$ fulfills

$$b_n(u_n(\omega), v; \omega) = \langle f_n(\omega), v \rangle_{H^{-1}, \dot{H}^1} \quad \text{for all } v \in \dot{H}^1(D)$$

and is $\sigma(f, \kappa)$ -measurable. Furthermore, it holds with $v := u_n - u_m$ and a suitable constant $c > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} & c\kappa_{\min}(\omega) \|u_n(\omega) - u_m(\omega)\|_{H^1(D)}^2 \\ & \leq \int_D \kappa_n(x, \omega) \nabla u_n(x, \omega) \cdot \nabla v(x, \omega) dx - \int_D \kappa_m(x, \omega) \nabla u_m(x, \omega) \cdot \nabla v(x, \omega) dx \\ & \quad + \int_D (\kappa_m(x, \omega) - \kappa_n(x, \omega)) \nabla u_m(x, \omega) \cdot \nabla v(x, \omega) dx \\ & \leq \langle f_n(\omega), v(\omega) \rangle_{H^{-1}, \dot{H}^1} - \langle f_m(\omega), v(\omega) \rangle_{H^{-1}, \dot{H}^1} \\ & \quad + \|\kappa_n(\omega) - \kappa_m(\omega)\|_{L^\infty(D)} \|u_m(\omega)\|_{H^1(D)} \|v(\omega)\|_{H^1(D)} \\ & \leq \left(\|f_n(\omega) - f_m(\omega)\|_{H^{-1}(D)} + \|\kappa_n(\omega) - \kappa_m(\omega)\|_{L^\infty(D)} \|u_m(\omega)\|_{H^1(D)} \right) \|v(\omega)\|_{H^1(D)} \end{aligned}$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} & c\kappa_{\min}(\omega) \|u_n(\omega) - u_m(\omega)\|_{H^1(D)} \\ & \leq \|f_n(\omega) - f_m(\omega)\|_{H^{-1}(D)} + \|\kappa_n(\omega) - \kappa_m(\omega)\|_{L^\infty(D)} \|u_m(\omega)\|_{H^1(D)}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

Since the norm of $u_m(\omega)$ is almost surely bounded

$$\|u_m(\omega)\|_{H^1(D)} \leq \frac{C}{\kappa_{\min}(\omega)} \|f_m(\omega)\|_{H^{-1}(D)} \rightarrow \frac{C}{\kappa_{\min}(\omega)} \|f\|_{H^{-1}(D)}$$

the right hand-side of (2.6) tends almost surely to zero when $n, m \rightarrow \infty$. Thus the sequence $(u_n(\omega))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ has as limit a random variable $u \in \dot{H}^1(D)$ which is $\sigma(f, \kappa)$ -measurable, too. Moreover the limit u solves the equation

$$b(u(\omega), v; \omega) = \langle f(\omega), v \rangle_{H^{-1}, \dot{H}^1} \quad \text{for all } v \in \dot{H}^1(D) \quad \text{a.s.}$$

because of

$$\begin{aligned} & |b(u(\omega), v; \omega) - \langle f(\omega), v \rangle_{H^{-1}, \dot{H}^1}| \\ & \leq |b(u(\omega), v; \omega) - b(u_n(\omega), v; \omega)| + |b(u_n(\omega), v; \omega) - b_n(u_n(\omega), v; \omega)| \\ & \quad + |b_n(u_n(\omega), v; \omega) - \langle f_n(\omega), v \rangle_{H^{-1}, \dot{H}^1}| \\ & \quad + |\langle f_n(\omega), v \rangle_{H^{-1}, \dot{H}^1} - \langle f(\omega), v \rangle_{H^{-1}, \dot{H}^1}| \\ & \leq \kappa_{\max}(\omega) \|u(\omega) - u_n(\omega)\|_{H^1(D)} \|v\|_{H^1(D)} \\ & \quad + \|\kappa(\omega) - \kappa_n(\omega)\|_{L^\infty(D)} \|u_n(\omega)\|_{H^1(D)} \|v\|_{H^1(D)} \\ & \quad + \|f(\omega) - f_n(\omega)\|_{H^{-1}(D)} \|v\|_{H^1(D)} \end{aligned}$$

and the convergencies $\|u_n(\omega)\|_{H^1(D)} \rightarrow \|u(\omega)\|_{H^1(D)} < \infty$, $\|u(\omega) - u_n(\omega)\|_{H^1(D)} \rightarrow 0$, $\|\kappa(\omega) - \kappa_n(\omega)\|_{L^\infty(D)} \rightarrow 0$ and $\|f(\omega) - f_n(\omega)\|_{H^{-1}(D)} \rightarrow 0$ almost surely. Since the mapping $\tilde{u} : \Omega \rightarrow \mathring{H}^1(D)$ is due to Lax-Milgram unique we have $u = \tilde{u}$ a.s. and thus \tilde{u} is a $\sigma(f, \kappa)$ -measurable random variable in $\mathring{H}^1(D)$. \square

In analogy to variational formulations of boundary value problems with purely deterministic input data we want to study also the corresponding variational formulation for random input data which is sometimes referred to as ‘‘stochastic variational formulation’’. Such a formulation is obtained by defining a suitable bilinear form on a Hilbert space of random variables in $\mathring{H}^1(D)$, e.g. $a(u(\cdot), v(\cdot)) = \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{P}}b(u(\cdot), v(\cdot); \cdot)$, and correspondingly by defining a linear form. However, since the coefficient κ is not bounded by constants but random variables we cannot directly use the Lax-Milgram theorem to prove existence and uniqueness of the weak solution. To address this problem we will define suitable solution and test function spaces to formulate the problem and to ensure the existence of a unique weak solution. The key observation is obtained as follows: Squaring inequality (2.5) and taking the expectation $\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{P}}$ with respect to the probability measure \mathbf{P} yields

$$\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{P}} \left(\|\tilde{u}\|_{H^1(D)}^2 \right) \leq C^2 \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{P}} \left(\frac{\|f\|_{H^{-1}(D)}^2}{\kappa_{min}^2} \right). \quad (2.7)$$

Hence, the pathwise solution \tilde{u} is a second-order random variable in $\mathring{H}^1(D)$ if the second-order moment of the H^{-1} -norm of f , weighted with the reciprocal of the real-valued random variable κ_{min}^2 , is finite. Thus, we need weighted function spaces in order to formulate the stochastic variational problem. Given a general real-valued random variable $\varrho > 0$ a.s. we introduce the spaces

$$\begin{aligned} U_\varrho^m &:= L^2(\Omega, \mathfrak{A}, \varrho d\mathbf{P}; H^m(D)), \quad m \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad \text{and} \\ \mathring{U}_\varrho^m &:= L^2(\Omega, \mathfrak{A}, \varrho d\mathbf{P}; \mathring{H}^m(D)), \quad m \in \mathbb{N}_0, \end{aligned}$$

where the ϱ -weighted L^2 -spaces are defined by

$$L^2(\Omega, \mathfrak{A}, \varrho d\mathbf{P}; V) := \{ \xi : \Omega \rightarrow V \text{ measurable} : \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{P}}(\|\xi\|_V^2 \varrho) < \infty \}$$

with $V = H^m(D)$ or $\mathring{H}^m(D)$, respectively. In fact, the elements of these spaces are equivalence classes of V -valued random variables where two random variables ξ_1 and ξ_2 with values in V coincide if $\|\xi_1 - \xi_2\|_V = 0$ a.s. Then endowing the spaces U_ϱ^m and \mathring{U}_ϱ^m with the inner product

$$(u, v)_{U_\varrho^m} = \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{P}} \left((u, v)_{H^m(D)} \varrho \right), \quad u, v \in U_\varrho^m$$

and the induced norm

$$\|u\|_{U_\varrho^m} = \sqrt{\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{P}} \left(\|u\|_{H^m(D)}^2 \varrho \right)}, \quad u \in U_\varrho^m$$

these spaces are also Hilbert spaces and there exist isomorphisms to the corresponding tensor product spaces (see e.g. [13])

$$U_\varrho^m \cong H^m(D) \otimes L^2(\Omega, \mathfrak{A}, \varrho d\mathbf{P}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathring{U}_\varrho^m \cong \mathring{H}^m(D) \otimes L^2(\Omega, \mathfrak{A}, \varrho d\mathbf{P}).$$

Thereby we denote by $L^2(\Omega, \mathfrak{A}, \varrho d\mathbf{P})$ the space $L^2(\Omega, \mathfrak{A}, \varrho d\mathbf{P}; \mathbb{R})$ which is defined analogously to $L^2(\Omega, \mathfrak{A}, \varrho d\mathbf{P}; V)$ above. Furthermore, we note that the seminorm

$$|u|_{U_\varrho^1} = \sqrt{\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{P}} \left(|u|_{H^1(D)}^2 \varrho \right)} = \sqrt{\int_{D \times \Omega} |\nabla u(x, \omega)|^2 \varrho(\omega) dx d\mathbf{P}(\omega)}$$

is equivalent to the norm $\|\cdot\|_{U_\rho^1}$ in \mathring{U}_ρ^1 and that the dual space of \mathring{U}_ρ^m can be identified with the space $U_{\rho^{-1}}^{-m}$. For convenience we denote by U^m or \mathring{U}^m the spaces $H^m(D) \otimes L^2(\Omega, \mathfrak{A}, \mathbf{P})$ or $\mathring{H}^m(D) \otimes L^2(\Omega, \mathfrak{A}, \mathbf{P})$, respectively. On occasion we will replace \mathbf{P} by another probability measure \mathbf{Q} and write $U_{\mathbf{Q}}^m := H^m(D) \otimes L^2(\Omega, \mathfrak{A}, \mathbf{Q})$ and $\mathring{U}_{\mathbf{Q}}^m := \mathring{H}^m(D) \otimes L^2(\Omega, \mathfrak{A}, \mathbf{Q})$.

Then the stochastic weak formulation reads as follows:

Problem 2.4 (Stochastic Weak Formulation) Find $\hat{u} \in \mathring{U}^1$, such that

$$a(\hat{u}, v) = \langle f, v \rangle \quad \text{for all } v \in \mathring{U}_{\kappa_{min}^2}^1, \quad (2.8)$$

where the bilinear form a is given by

$$a(u, v) = \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{P}} \left(\int_D \kappa(x) \nabla u(x) \cdot \nabla v(x) dx \right) = \int_{\Omega} b(u(\omega), v(\omega); \omega) d\mathbf{P}(\omega) \quad (2.9)$$

and the duality pairing between $f \in U_{\frac{1}{\kappa_{min}^2}}^{-1}$ and $v \in \mathring{U}_{\kappa_{min}^2}^1$ is given by

$$\langle f, v \rangle = \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{P}} \left(\langle f, v \rangle_{H^{-1}, \mathring{H}^1} \right) = \int_{\Omega} \langle f(\omega), v(\omega) \rangle_{H^{-1}, \mathring{H}^1} d\mathbf{P}(\omega).$$

It is important to note that the solution and test function spaces are now different spaces. Furthermore, the domain of the bilinear form a is a proper subset of $\mathring{U}^1 \times \mathring{U}_{\kappa_{min}^2}^1$, i.e., the bilinear form a is not defined or finite for all pairs $(u, v) \in \mathring{U}^1 \times \mathring{U}_{\kappa_{min}^2}^1$. Thus, an implicit requirement of the weak formulation is to find a solution \hat{u} such that the related bilinear form $a(\hat{u}, \cdot)$ is defined and finite for all test functions.

3 Existence and Uniqueness of Weak Solution

In this section, we will present two alternative proofs of existence and uniqueness of a solution to the weak formulation (2.8). Both approaches have benefits and drawbacks but when combined appropriately they are a powerful tool to study weak solutions and their properties. First we state a theorem which is a generalization of the Lax-Milgram theorem where the bilinear form is not defined on a cartesian product.

Theorem 3.1 Let Hilbert spaces X_1, X_2, Y_1, Y_2 with dense and continuous embeddings $X_2 \subset X_1$ and $Y_2 \subset Y_1$ and a bilinear form $a : X_1 \times Y_1 \supseteq \mathcal{D}_a \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be given such that

- (i) the restricted bilinear forms $a|_{X_1 \times Y_2} : X_1 \times Y_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$
and $a|_{X_2 \times Y_1} : X_2 \times Y_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are continuous,

- (ii) there holds the inf-sup condition with a constant $c > 0$

$$\inf_{u \in X_1 \setminus \{0\}} \sup_{v \in Y_1 \setminus \{0\}} \frac{|a(u, v)|}{\|u\|_{X_1} \|v\|_{Y_1}} \geq c > 0, \quad \text{and}$$

- (iii) for any $v \in Y_1 \setminus \{0\}$ there exists $u \in X_1$ such that $a(u, v) > 0$.

Then for any $f \in Y_1^*$ there exists a unique $u \in X_1$ satisfying

$$a(u, v) = \langle f, v \rangle \quad \text{for all } v \in Y_1.$$

Proof.

The operator $T_a : X_1 \rightarrow Y_2^*$, $u \mapsto a(u, \cdot)$, is linear and continuous because of condition (i). The restricted operator $\hat{T}_a : X_1 \supseteq \mathcal{D}(\hat{T}_a) \rightarrow Y_1^* \subset Y_2^*$ associated with T_a is densely defined, since $X_2 \subset \mathcal{D}(\hat{T}_a) \subset X_1$ is densely embedded. The operator \hat{T}_a is also linear, injective, since

$$\|\hat{T}_a(u)\|_{Y_1^*} = \sup_{v \in Y_1 \setminus \{0\}} \frac{|\langle \hat{T}_a(u), v \rangle|}{\|v\|_{Y_1}} = \sup_{v \in Y_1 \setminus \{0\}} \frac{|a(u, v)|}{\|v\|_{Y_1}} \geq c\|u\|_{X_1},$$

and closed because for any sequence $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{D}(\hat{T}_a)$ with $u_n \rightarrow u$ in X_1 such that $\hat{T}_a(u_n) \rightarrow f$ in Y_1^* it follows from the continuity of T_a that $u \in \mathcal{D}(\hat{T}_a)$ and $\hat{T}_a(u) = f$. Now, we show that the range of \hat{T}_a , denoted by $\mathcal{R}(\hat{T}_a)$, is closed. Assuming $(\hat{T}_a u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a convergent sequence in $\mathcal{R}(\hat{T}_a)$ with limit $f \in Y_1^*$ then the inf-sup condition (ii) yields

$$\begin{aligned} c\|u_n - u_m\|_{X_1} &\leq \sup_{v \in Y_1 \setminus \{0\}} \frac{|a(u_n - u_m, v)|}{\|v\|_{Y_1}} \\ &= \sup_{v \in Y_1 \setminus \{0\}} \frac{|\langle T_a(u_n - u_m), v \rangle|}{\|v\|_{Y_1}} = \|T_a(u_n - u_m)\|_{Y_1^*} \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $(u_n)_n$ is a Cauchy-sequence in X_1 with limit $u \in X_1$. Because \hat{T}_a is a closed operator there holds $\hat{T}_a(u) = f$ and the range $\mathcal{R}(\hat{T}_a)$ is closed. Thus, we can deduce from Banach's closed range theorem (see e.g. [17] p. 205) that

$$\mathcal{R}(\hat{T}_a) = \mathcal{N}(\hat{T}_a^*)^\perp$$

where $\hat{T}_a^* : Y_1 \supseteq \mathcal{D}(\hat{T}_a^*) \rightarrow X_1^*$ is the adjoint operator of \hat{T}_a . The null space of \hat{T}_a^* , denoted by $\mathcal{N}(\hat{T}_a^*)$, is defined as

$$\mathcal{N}(\hat{T}_a^*) = \{v \in \mathcal{D}(\hat{T}_a^*) \subsetneq Y_1 : \langle u, \hat{T}_a^*(v) \rangle = 0 \forall u \in X_1\}.$$

From condition (iii) it follows that for any $v \in \mathcal{D}(\hat{T}_a^*) \subsetneq Y_1$, $v \neq 0$, there exists $u \in \mathcal{D}(\hat{T}_a)$ such that

$$\langle u, \hat{T}_a^*(v) \rangle = \langle \hat{T}_a(u), v \rangle = a(u, v) > 0.$$

Therefore, the null space of \hat{T}_a^* contains only the zero element, i.e. $\mathcal{N}(\hat{T}_a^*) = \{0\}$, and thus $\mathcal{R}(\hat{T}_a) = Y_1^*$, which completes the proof. \square

Corollary 3.2 For any $f \in U_{\frac{1}{\kappa_{min}^2}}^{-1}$ there exists a unique $\hat{u} \in \mathring{U}^1$ satisfying the stochastic weak formulation (2.8) and the estimate

$$\|\hat{u}\|_{U^1} \leq C \|f\|_{U_{\frac{1}{\kappa_{min}^2}}^{-1}}.$$

Proof.

We want to prove this result by employing Theorem 3.1 on the Hilbert spaces

$$X_1 = \mathring{U}^1, \quad X_2 = \mathring{U}_{\frac{\kappa_{max}}{\kappa_{min}}^2}^1, \quad Y_1 = \mathring{U}_{\kappa_{min}^2}^1 \quad \text{and} \quad Y_2 = \mathring{U}_{\kappa_{max}^2}^1$$

and the bilinear form $a : \mathring{U}^1 \times \mathring{U}_{\kappa_{min}^2}^1 \supseteq \mathcal{D}_a \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as defined in (2.9). In the following we verify all conditions of Theorem 3.1 generalizing the proof of Theorem 3.1 of Galvis and Sarkis in their paper [9].

Since $\kappa_{min}^2 \leq \kappa_{max}^2$, the Hilbert space $\mathring{U}_{\frac{\kappa_{max}^2}{\kappa_{min}^2}}^1$ is densely and continuously embedded in the Hilbert space \mathring{U}^1 as well as the Hilbert space $\mathring{U}_{\kappa_{max}^2}^1$ in the Hilbert space $\mathring{U}_{\kappa_{min}^2}^1$.

To condition (i): The restricted bilinear forms

$$a|_{\mathring{U}^1 \times \mathring{U}_{\kappa_{max}^2}^1} : \mathring{U}^1 \times \mathring{U}_{\kappa_{max}^2}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \quad \text{and} \quad a|_{\mathring{U}_{\frac{\kappa_{max}^2}{\kappa_{min}^2}}^1 \times \mathring{U}_{\kappa_{min}^2}^1} : \mathring{U}_{\frac{\kappa_{max}^2}{\kappa_{min}^2}}^1 \times \mathring{U}_{\kappa_{min}^2}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

are continuous because of

$$\left| a|_{\mathring{U}^1 \times \mathring{U}_{\kappa_{max}^2}^1} (u, v) \right| \leq \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{P}} \left(\kappa_{max} |u|_{H^1(D)} |v|_{H^1(D)} \right) \leq \|u\|_{U^1} \|v\|_{U_{\kappa_{max}^2}^1}$$

and

$$\left| a|_{\mathring{U}_{\frac{\kappa_{max}^2}{\kappa_{min}^2}}^1 \times \mathring{U}_{\kappa_{min}^2}^1} (u, v) \right| \leq \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{P}} \left(\frac{\kappa_{max}}{\kappa_{min}} \kappa_{min} |u|_{H^1(D)} |v|_{H^1(D)} \right) \leq \|u\|_{U_{\frac{\kappa_{max}^2}{\kappa_{min}^2}}^1} \|v\|_{U_{\kappa_{min}^2}^1}.$$

To condition (ii): We define for $u \in \mathring{U}^1$ the random variable v_R with values in $\mathring{H}^1(D)$ by

$$v_R := \begin{cases} \frac{u}{\kappa_{min}}, & \frac{\kappa_{max}}{\kappa_{min}} \leq R \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and denote by B_R the set

$$B_R := \left\{ \omega \in \Omega : \frac{\kappa_{max}(\omega)}{\kappa_{min}(\omega)} \leq R \right\}.$$

Thus we obtain $v_R \in \mathring{U}_{\kappa_{min}^2}^1$, since

$$|v_R|_{U_{\kappa_{min}^2}^1}^2 = \int_{B_R} |u(\omega)|_{H^1(D)}^2 d\mathbf{P}(\omega) \leq |u|_{U^1}^2 < \infty,$$

and by assumption (2.2) on the coefficient κ there holds

$$|a(u, v_R)| = \int_{D \times B_R} \frac{\kappa(x, \omega)}{\kappa_{min}(\omega)} |\nabla u(x, \omega)|^2 dx d\mathbf{P}(\omega) \geq \int_{B_R} |u(\omega)|_{H^1(D)}^2 d\mathbf{P}(\omega).$$

Since $\mathbf{P}(\Omega \setminus \bigcup_{R>0} B_R) = 0$, there exists for every $\delta > 0$ a $R > 0$ such that

$$\int_{B_R} |u(\omega)|_{H^1(D)}^2 d\mathbf{P}(\omega) \geq (1 - \delta) |u|_{U^1}^2$$

and thus

$$\sup_{v \in \mathring{U}_{\kappa_{min}^2}^1 \setminus \{0\}} \frac{|a(u, v)|}{|v|_{U_{\kappa_{min}^2}^1}} \geq \frac{|a(u, v_R)|}{|v_R|_{U_{\kappa_{min}^2}^1}} \geq \frac{(1 - \delta) |u|_{U^1}^2}{|u|_{U^1}} = (1 - \delta) |u|_{U^1}.$$

Because $\delta > 0$ can be chosen arbitrarily the inf-sup condition holds with constant $c = 1$.

To condition (iii): Let be $v \in \mathring{U}_{\kappa_{min}}^1 \setminus \{0\}$ then we define

$$u_R := \begin{cases} v\kappa_{min}, & \frac{\kappa_{max}}{\kappa_{min}} \leq R \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \text{and the set } B_R \text{ as above.}$$

So we have $u_R \in \mathring{U}_{\kappa_{min}}^1$ because of

$$\begin{aligned} |u_R|_{\mathring{U}_{\kappa_{min}}^1}^2 &= \int_{B_R} |v(\omega)|_{H^1(D)}^2 \kappa_{max}^2(\omega) d\mathbf{P}(\omega) \\ &\leq R^2 \int_{B_R} |v(\omega)|_{H^1(D)}^2 \kappa_{min}^2(\omega) d\mathbf{P}(\omega) \leq R^2 |v|_{\mathring{U}_{\kappa_{min}}^1}^2 < \infty \end{aligned}$$

and as above it follows for R huge enough

$$\begin{aligned} a(u_R, v) &= \int_{D \times B_R} \kappa(x, \omega) \kappa_{min}(\omega) |\nabla v(x, \omega)|^2 dx d\mathbf{P}(\omega) \\ &\geq \int_{B_R} |v(\omega)|_{H^1(D)}^2 \kappa_{min}^2 d\mathbf{P}(\omega) \geq (1 - \delta) |v|_{\mathring{U}_{\kappa_{min}}^1}^2 > 0. \end{aligned}$$

The estimate $\|\hat{u}\|_{U^1} \leq C \|f\|_{U^{-1}}_{\kappa_{min}^2}$ follows immediately from the inf-sup condition. \square

Obviously, Corollary 3.2 is also true for problems with other boundary conditions as long as the seminorm is a norm in the corresponding function spaces.

An alternative method to prove existence and uniqueness of the solution to problem (2.8) where the coefficient κ is a lognormal random field, is given in the work of Gittelson [11]. For this special case it can be shown that the unique pathwise solution \tilde{u} is also the unique solution of the stochastic variational problem if it belongs to the solution space. Below we prove an analogous result for the more general assumptions (2.2) on the random coefficient.

Theorem 3.3 For $f \in U_{\kappa_{min}^2}^{-1}$ the unique solution \tilde{u} of problem (2.3) belongs to \mathring{U}^1 and it solves also problem (2.8). Furthermore, any solution $\hat{u} \in \mathring{U}^1$ of the weak formulation (2.8) is $\sigma(f, \kappa)$ -measurable and there holds

$$\hat{u}(x, \omega) = \tilde{u}(x, \omega) \quad \text{a.e. and a.s.}$$

Proof.

Recalling that $f \in U_{\kappa_{min}^2}^{-1}$ and utilizing the estimate (2.7) we obtain

$$\|\tilde{u}\|_{U^1}^2 = \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{P}} \|\tilde{u}\|_{H^1(D)}^2 \leq C^2 \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{P}} \frac{\|f\|_{H^{-1}(D)}^2}{\kappa_{min}^2} = C^2 \|f\|_{U_{\kappa_{min}^2}^{-1}}^2 < \infty.$$

Since \tilde{u} satisfies problem (2.3), there holds for all $v \in \mathring{U}_{\kappa_{min}^2}^1$

$$b(\tilde{u}(\omega), v(\omega); \omega) = \langle f(\omega), v(\omega) \rangle_{H^{-1}, \mathring{H}^1} \quad \text{a.s..}$$

Taking the expectation yields $a(\tilde{u}, v) = \langle f, v \rangle$ for all $v \in \mathring{U}_{\kappa_{min}}^1$ and hence \tilde{u} solves problem (2.8). Now, we consider a random variable $\hat{u} \in \mathring{U}^1$ satisfying

$$a(\hat{u}, v) = \langle f, v \rangle \quad \text{for all } v \in \mathring{U}_{\kappa_{min}}^1.$$

Then we define for $w \in \mathring{H}^1(D)$ and $A \in \mathfrak{A}$ the functions $v_{w,A}(x, \omega) := w(x) \frac{\mathbb{1}_A(\omega)}{\kappa_{min}(\omega)}$. It follows $v_{w,A} \in \mathring{U}_{\kappa_{min}}^1$ and we get

$$\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{P}} \frac{\mathbb{1}_A}{\kappa_{min}} b(\hat{u}, w; \cdot) = a(\hat{u}, v_{w,A}) = \langle f, v_{w,A} \rangle = \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{P}} \frac{\mathbb{1}_A}{\kappa_{min}} \langle f, w \rangle_{H^{-1}, \mathring{H}^1}.$$

Since $A \in \mathfrak{A}$ can be chosen arbitrarily this implies for any $w \in \mathring{H}^1(D)$

$$b(\hat{u}(\omega), w; \omega) = \langle f(\omega), w \rangle_{H^{-1}, \mathring{H}^1} \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Hence, the random variable \hat{u} with values in $\mathring{H}^1(D)$ solves problem (2.4) and since its solution is almost surely unique and $\sigma(f, \kappa)$ -measurable (cf. Lemma 2.3), there holds

$$\hat{u}(x, \omega) = \tilde{u}(x, \omega) \quad \text{a.e. and a.s.,}$$

i.e., the random variable \hat{u} is measurable with respect to the σ -algebra $\sigma(f, \kappa)$. \square

4 Stochastic Galerkin Discretization

Let $\xi := (\xi_i)_{i \in I_\xi}$ with index set $I_\xi \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ be a sequence of real-valued so called ‘‘basic’’ random variables, such that there are measurable functions $\kappa_\xi, f_\xi : D \times \mathbb{R}^{|I_\xi|} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying

$$\kappa(x, \omega) = \kappa_\xi(x, \xi(\omega)) \quad \text{and} \quad f(x, \omega) = f_\xi(x, \xi(\omega)) \quad \text{a.e. and a.s.}$$

Thereby the index set I_ξ can be finite, i.e., $I_\xi = \{1, \dots, M\}$, $M \in \mathbb{N}$, or the set of the natural numbers, i.e., $I_\xi = \mathbb{N}$. Sequences of basic random variables can be obtained with the help of Karhunen-Loève expansions (see e.g. [12]) or other series expansions (see e.g. [10]) of the input data.

Then according to Theorem 3.3 the weak solution \hat{u} of variational formulation (2.8) belongs to $L^2(\Omega, \sigma(\xi), \mathbf{P}; \mathring{H}^1(D))$ since κ and f are $\sigma(\xi)$ -measurable.

In the following we assume that the random variable $\xi = (\xi_i)_{i \in I_\xi}$ on the probability space $(\Omega, \mathfrak{A}, \mathbf{P})$ has the distribution $F_\xi^{\mathbf{P}}$ and that any $\xi_i, i \in I_\xi$, possesses finite moments of arbitrary order, i.e., $\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{P}} |\xi_i|^n < \infty, n \in \mathbb{N}$, and a continuous distribution function $F_{\xi_i}^{\mathbf{P}}$.

In order to apply the Stochastic Galerkin Method we define the space

$$U_{N,K,p} := U_p \otimes U_{N,K} \subset \mathring{U}^1$$

which serves as solution space for the Stochastic Galerkin approximation. The function space $U_p := \text{span}\{\varphi_i, i \in I_p\}$ is a finite-dimensional subspace of $\mathring{H}^1(D)$ obtained by a uniform p version of the Finite Element Method (FEM) and $U_{N,K}$ is a finite-dimensional subspace of $L^2(\Omega, \sigma(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_K), \mathbf{P}) \subseteq L^2(\Omega, \sigma(\xi), \mathbf{P})$ with $\{1, \dots, K\} \subseteq I_\xi$. Since we want to use generalized polynomial chaos (see e.g. [15, 16]), i.e. polynomials in the underlying basic random variables ξ , we construct the finite dimensional space $U_{N,K}$ as follows,

$$U_{N,K} := \text{span} \left\{ \xi^\alpha := \prod_{i \in I_\xi} \xi_i^{\alpha_i}, \alpha \in \Lambda_{N,K} \right\}.$$

We choose the index set

$$\Lambda_{N,K} \subset \Lambda := \{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^{|I_\xi|} : \alpha \text{ has only finitely many non-zero entries}\}$$

such that the total degree of the multivariate polynomials is bounded,

$$\Lambda_{N,K} = \{\alpha \in \Lambda : \alpha_i = 0 \forall i > K, |\alpha| \leq N\}, \quad |\alpha| := \sum_{i \in I_\xi} \alpha_i.$$

As discretized test function space we choose

$$V_{N,K,p} := \left\{ \frac{u}{\kappa_{min}} : u \in U_{N,K,p} \right\}.$$

Then the discrete version of the weak formulation (2.8) reads as follows:

Problem 4.1 (Discrete Weak Formulation) Find $\hat{u}_{N,K,p} \in U_{N,K,p}$, such that

$$a(\hat{u}_{N,K,p}, v) = \langle f, v \rangle \quad \text{for all } v \in V_{N,K,p}. \quad (4.1)$$

The existence of a unique Stochastic Galerkin solution $\hat{u}_{N,K,p} \in U_{N,K,p}$ to problem (4.1) can be proved under the assumptions in the following lemma.

Lemma 4.2 If $\frac{\kappa_{max}^2}{\kappa_{min}^2} \in L^r(\Omega, \mathfrak{A}, \mathbf{P})$ for some $r > 1$ then for any $f \in U_{\frac{1}{\kappa_{min}^2}}^{-1}$ there exists a unique $\hat{u}_{N,K,p} \in U_{N,K,p}$ such that

$$a(\hat{u}_{N,K,p}, v) = \langle f, v \rangle \quad \text{for all } v \in V_{N,K,p}.$$

Proof.

Since $\frac{\kappa_{max}^2}{\kappa_{min}^2} \in L^r(\Omega, \mathfrak{A}, \mathbf{P})$ for some $r > 1$ and $U_{N,K,p} = \text{span}\{\xi^\alpha \varphi_i, \alpha \in \Lambda_{N,K}, i \in I_p\}$ we obtain with $1 \leq s < \infty$ such that $\frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{s} = 1$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{P}} \left(|\xi^\alpha \varphi_i|_{H^1(D)}^2 \frac{\kappa_{max}^2}{\kappa_{min}^2} \right) &= |\varphi_i|_{H^1(D)}^2 \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{P}} \left(|\xi|^{2\alpha} \frac{\kappa_{max}^2}{\kappa_{min}^2} \right) \\ &\leq |\varphi_i|_{H^1(D)}^2 (\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{P}} |\xi|^{2\alpha s})^{\frac{1}{s}} \left(\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{P}} \left(\frac{\kappa_{max}^2}{\kappa_{min}^2} \right)^r \right)^{\frac{1}{r}} < \infty \end{aligned}$$

for all $\alpha \in \Lambda_{N,K}, i \in I_p$, i.e. $u \in U_{\frac{\kappa_{max}^2}{\kappa_{min}^2}}^1$ for all $u \in U_{N,K,p}$ and $v \in U_{\kappa_{max}^2}^1$ for all $v \in V_{N,K,p}$.

Hence, we can define the Hilbert spaces

$$X_1 = U_{N,K,p} \subset U^1, \quad X_2 = U_{N,K,p} \subset U_{\frac{\kappa_{max}^2}{\kappa_{min}^2}}^1,$$

$$Y_1 = V_{N,K,p} \subset U_{\kappa_{min}^2}^1 \quad \text{and} \quad Y_2 = V_{N,K,p} \subset U_{\kappa_{max}^2}^1$$

with the dense and continuous embeddings $X_2 \subset X_1$ and $Y_2 \subset Y_1$. The continuity of the restricted bilinear forms a as demanded in Theorem 3.1 follows from the continuity of the restricted bilinear forms $a|_{\hat{U}^1 \times \hat{U}_{\kappa_{max}^2}^1}$ and $a|_{\hat{U}_{\frac{\kappa_{max}^2}{\kappa_{min}^2}}^1 \times \hat{U}_{\kappa_{min}^2}^1}$. By utilizing the relation

$$|u|_{U^1}^2 \leq a \left(u, \frac{u}{\kappa_{min}} \right) \quad \text{for all } u \in U_{N,K,p}$$

we obtain a discrete inf-sup condition

$$\begin{aligned} |u|_{U^1} &\leq \frac{a(u, u/\kappa_{min})}{|u|_{U^1}} = \frac{a(u, u/\kappa_{min})}{|u/\kappa_{min}|_{U^1_{\frac{\kappa_{min}^2}{\kappa_{min}}}}} \\ &\leq \sup_{v \in V_{N,K,p} \setminus \{0\}} \frac{a(u, v)}{|v|_{U^1_{\frac{\kappa_{min}^2}{\kappa_{min}}}}} \quad \text{for all } u \in U_{N,K,p} \setminus \{0\} \end{aligned}$$

and that for any $v \in V_{N,K,p} \setminus \{0\}$ the function $u := v\kappa_{min} \in U_{N,K,p}$ fulfills

$$a(u, v) = a(u, u/\kappa_{min}) \geq |u|_{U^1}^2 > 0.$$

Then applying Theorem 3.1 completes the proof. \square

Now, we want to investigate the approximation error of this Stochastic Galerkin solution $\hat{u}_{N,K,p}$. Employing the discrete inf-sup condition we get a quasi-optimal result for the Galerkin solution, i.e., the error can be bounded by a best approximation error in another – a stronger – norm.

Lemma 4.3 *If $\frac{\kappa_{max}^2}{\kappa_{min}^2} \in L^r(\Omega, \mathfrak{A}, \mathbf{P})$ for some $r > 1$ and $\hat{u} \in \mathring{U}^1_{\frac{\kappa_{max}^2}{\kappa_{min}^2}}$ then the following estimate holds*

$$|\hat{u} - \hat{u}_{N,K,p}|_{U^1} \leq \tilde{C} \inf_{z \in U_{N,K,p}} |\hat{u} - z|_{U^1_{\frac{\kappa_{max}^2}{\kappa_{min}^2}}}$$

with a constant $\tilde{C} > 0$ (independent of N, K and p) for the solutions \hat{u} and $\hat{u}_{N,K,p}$ of the weak formulation (2.8) and the discrete weak formulation (4.1), respectively.

Proof.

Utilizing the discrete inf-sup condition and $a(\hat{u} - z, v) = a(\hat{u}_{N,K,p} - z, v)$ for all $v \in V_{N,K,p}$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\hat{u} - \hat{u}_{N,K,p}|_{U^1} &\leq |\hat{u} - z|_{U^1} + |\hat{u}_{N,K,p} - z|_{U^1} \\ &\leq |\hat{u} - z|_{U^1} + \sup_{v \in V_{N,K,p} \setminus \{0\}} \frac{|a(\hat{u}_{N,K,p} - z, v)|}{|v|_{U^1_{\frac{\kappa_{min}^2}{\kappa_{min}}}}} \\ &= |\hat{u} - z|_{U^1} + \sup_{v \in V_{N,K,p} \setminus \{0\}} \frac{|a(\hat{u} - z, v)|}{|v|_{U^1_{\frac{\kappa_{min}^2}{\kappa_{min}}}}} \\ &\leq |\hat{u} - z|_{U^1} + \sup_{v \in V_{N,K,p} \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{P}}(\kappa_{max} |\hat{u} - z|_{H^1(D)} |v|_{H^1(D)})}{|v|_{U^1_{\frac{\kappa_{min}^2}{\kappa_{min}}}}} \\ &\leq |\hat{u} - z|_{U^1} + |\hat{u} - z|_{U^1_{\frac{\kappa_{max}^2}{\kappa_{min}^2}}} \leq 2|\hat{u} - z|_{U^1_{\frac{\kappa_{max}^2}{\kappa_{min}^2}}} \end{aligned}$$

for all $z \in U_{N,K,h}$. \square

Consequently we measure the error in the stronger $U^1_{\frac{\kappa_{max}^2}{\kappa_{min}^2}}$ -norm and we assume the following.

Assumption 4.4 *Let $q := \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{P}} \frac{\kappa_{max}^2}{\kappa_{min}^2} < \infty$ and assume $\frac{\kappa_{max}^2}{\kappa_{min}^2}$ is $\sigma(\xi)$ -measurable, i.e., there exists a measurable transformation $t : \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{I}_{\xi}|} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ with $\frac{\kappa_{max}^2}{\kappa_{min}^2} = t_{\frac{\kappa_{max}^2}{\kappa_{min}^2}}(\xi)$.*

Then the measure \mathbf{Q} with $d\mathbf{Q} = \frac{1}{q} \kappa_{max}^2 \kappa_{min}^{-2} d\mathbf{P}$ is a probability measure. In the following we consider the function spaces $U_{\mathbf{Q}}^m$ and $\mathring{U}_{\mathbf{Q}}^m$ instead of $U_{\frac{\kappa_{max}^2}{\kappa_{min}^2}}^m$ and $\mathring{U}_{\frac{\kappa_{max}^2}{\kappa_{min}^2}}^m$, $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, which coincide with $U_{\frac{\kappa_{max}^2}{\kappa_{min}^2}}^m$ and $\mathring{U}_{\frac{\kappa_{max}^2}{\kappa_{min}^2}}^m$ but are much easier to handle due to the corresponding probability space $(\Omega, \mathfrak{A}, \mathbf{Q})$ at hand.

Corollary 4.5 *If $\frac{\kappa_{max}^2}{\kappa_{min}^2} \in L^r(\Omega, \mathfrak{A}, \mathbf{P})$ for some $r > 1$ and Assumption 4.4 is fulfilled there holds for $\hat{u} \in \mathring{U}_{\mathbf{Q}}^1$ with a suitable constant $C > 0$ (independent of N, K and p)*

$$|\hat{u} - \hat{u}_{N,K,p}|_{U^1} \leq C \inf_{z \in U_{N,K,p}} |\hat{u} - z|_{U_{\mathbf{Q}}^1} \quad (4.2)$$

for the solutions \hat{u} and $\hat{u}_{N,K,p}$ of the corresponding weak formulation (2.8) and discrete weak formulation (4.1).

Proof.

This result follows immediately from Lemma 4.3 and Assumption 4.4. \square

By choosing a suitable $z \in U_{N,K,p}$ and applying the triangle inequality to the right-hand side of (4.2) we can identify different sources of the approximation error. To see this, we introduce some notations: We denote by

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_{\mathring{U}_{\mathbf{Q},N,K,p}^1} &: \mathring{U}_{\mathbf{Q}}^1 \rightarrow U_{N,K,p} \\ &\text{the orthogonal projection onto } U_{N,K,p}, \text{ and by} \\ \Pi_{\mathring{U}_{\mathbf{Q},N,K}^1} &: \mathring{U}_{\mathbf{Q}}^1 \rightarrow \mathring{H}^1(D) \otimes U_{N,K} \\ &\text{the orthogonal projection onto } \mathring{H}^1(D) \otimes U_{N,K}, \end{aligned}$$

both with respect to the $U_{\mathbf{Q}}^1$ -norm. Assuming $\hat{u} \in \mathring{U}_{\mathbf{Q}}^1$ the approximation error of the Stochastic Galerkin approximation to the exact solution can be estimated using (4.2) with $z = \Pi_{\mathring{U}_{\mathbf{Q},N,K,p}^1} \hat{u}$ as

$$|\hat{u} - \hat{u}_{N,K,p}|_{U^1} \leq C \left[|\hat{u} - \Pi_{\mathring{U}_{\mathbf{Q},N,K}^1} \hat{u}|_{U_{\mathbf{Q}}^1} + |\Pi_{\mathring{U}_{\mathbf{Q},N,K}^1} \hat{u} - \Pi_{\mathring{U}_{\mathbf{Q},N,K,p}^1} \hat{u}|_{U_{\mathbf{Q}}^1} \right]. \quad (4.3)$$

Hence this error has two components, namely an approximation error due to discretizing in the stochastic dimension and an approximation error due to discretizing in the spatial dimension.

The spatial approximation error can be bounded using standard arguments from the theory of Finite Element Methods (FEMs). Here, we have employed a p version of the FEM (see e.g. [2]). Under the assumptions of Corollary 2.2 in [2] there holds the following.

Corollary 4.6 *If $\frac{\kappa_{max}^2}{\kappa_{min}^2} \in L^r(\Omega, \mathfrak{A}, \mathbf{P})$ for some $r > 1$ and Assumption 4.4 is satisfied then for $\hat{u} \in U_{\frac{\kappa_{max}^2}{\kappa_{min}^3}}^k \cap \mathring{U}_{\mathbf{Q}}^1$ with constant $\tilde{C} > 0$ (independent of N, K, p and \hat{u}) there holds*

$$|\Pi_{\mathring{U}_{\mathbf{Q},N,K}^1} \hat{u} - \Pi_{\mathring{U}_{\mathbf{Q},N,K,p}^1} \hat{u}|_{U_{\mathbf{Q}}^1} \leq \tilde{C} p^{-(k-1)} \|\hat{u}\|_{U_{\frac{\kappa_{max}^2}{\kappa_{min}^3}}^k}.$$

Proof.

From Corollary 2.2 in [2] it follows

$$\sqrt{\kappa_{min}(\omega)} \left| \Pi_{\mathring{U}_{\mathbf{Q},N,K}^1} \hat{u}(\omega) - \Pi_{\mathring{U}_{\mathbf{Q},N,K,p}^1} \hat{u}(\omega) \right|_{H^1(D)} \leq \tilde{C} p^{-(k-1)} \|\hat{u}(\omega)\|_{H^k(D)}$$

with a constant \tilde{C} independent of $N, K, p, \omega \in \Omega$ and \hat{u} . Squaring and taking the expectation $\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{Q}}$ with respect to \mathbf{Q} leads to

$$\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{Q}} \left| \Pi_{\hat{U}_{\mathbf{Q},N,K}^1} \hat{u} - \Pi_{\hat{U}_{\mathbf{Q},N,K,p}^1} \hat{u} \right|_{H^1(D)}^2 \leq \tilde{C}^2 p^{-2(k-1)} \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{Q}} \frac{\|\hat{u}\|_{H^k(D)}^2}{\kappa_{min}}.$$

□

We note that analogous results to Corollary 4.6 can be obtained for h or h - p versions of the FEM by using Theorem 2.1 in [2].

The first term on the right-hand side of inequality (4.3) can be estimated with the help of generalized polynomial chaos expansions. In view of Assumption 4.4 the random variable $\xi = (\xi_i)_{i \in I_\xi}$ as a random variable on the probability space $(\Omega, \mathfrak{A}, \mathbf{Q})$ has the distribution $F_\xi^{\mathbf{Q}}(dy) = \frac{1}{q} t_{\frac{\kappa_{max}}{2}}^{\frac{\kappa_{max}}{2}}(y) F_\xi^{\mathbf{P}}(dy)$. Assuming $\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{Q}} |\xi_i|^n < \infty$ for all $i \in I_\xi$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the multivariate orthonormal polynomials $\{q_\alpha(\xi), \alpha \in \Lambda\}$ in $L^2(\Omega, \mathfrak{A}, \mathbf{Q})$ exist. Hence, in order to expand any random variable $u \in L^2(\Omega, \sigma(\xi), \mathbf{Q}; \dot{H}^1(D))$ in this generalized polynomial chaos the polynomials $\{q_\alpha(\xi), \alpha \in \Lambda\}$ have to be dense in $L^2(\Omega, \sigma(\xi), \mathbf{Q})$. Some necessary conditions to establish this property are discussed in [8]. If the polynomials lie dense and $\hat{u} \in L^2(\Omega, \sigma(\xi), \mathbf{Q}; \dot{H}^1(D))$ then the solution possesses a generalized polynomial chaos expansion $\{q_\alpha(\xi), \alpha \in \Lambda\}$, i.e.,

$$\hat{u}(x, \omega) = \sum_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \hat{u}_\alpha(x) q_\alpha(\xi(\omega)), \quad \text{where} \quad \hat{u}_\alpha(x) = \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{Q}} \hat{u}(x) q_\alpha(\xi).$$

Furthermore, the projection $\Pi_{\hat{U}_{\mathbf{Q},N,K}^1} \hat{u}$ is given by the truncated expansion

$$\Pi_{\hat{U}_{\mathbf{Q},N,K}^1} \hat{u}(x, \omega) = \sum_{\alpha \in \Lambda_{N,K}} \hat{u}_\alpha(x) q_\alpha(\xi(\omega)).$$

Corollary 4.7 *If the polynomials $\{q_\alpha(\xi), \alpha \in \Lambda\}$ are dense in $L^2(\Omega, \sigma(\xi), \mathbf{Q})$ and $\hat{u} \in \dot{U}_{\mathbf{Q}}^1$ then the approximation error*

$$|\hat{u} - \Pi_{\hat{U}_{\mathbf{Q},N,K}^1} \hat{u}|_{U_{\mathbf{Q}}^1} \rightarrow 0 \quad (K, N \rightarrow \infty).$$

Proof.

The multivariate polynomials $\{q_\alpha(\xi), \alpha \in \Lambda\}$ form an orthonormal basis of $L^2(\Omega, \sigma(\xi), \mathbf{Q})$ because they are dense in $L^2(\Omega, \sigma(\xi), \mathbf{P})$. Since the weak solution \hat{u} is $\sigma(\xi)$ -measurable (according to Theorem 3.3) and

$$\bigcup_{N \geq 0, K \geq 1} \Lambda_{N,K} = \Lambda$$

there holds that $\Pi_{\hat{U}_{\mathbf{Q},N,K}^1} \hat{u} \rightarrow \hat{u}$ in $\dot{U}_{\mathbf{Q}}^1$ for $K \rightarrow \infty, N \rightarrow \infty$. □

Hence in view of Corollary 4.6 and Corollary 4.7 the approximation error $|\hat{u} - \hat{u}_{N,K,p}|_{U^1}$ converges to zero if the solution $\hat{u} \in U_{\frac{\kappa_{max}}{2}}^2 \cap \dot{U}_{\mathbf{Q}}^1$ and the set of orthonormal polynomials $\{q_\alpha(\xi), \alpha \in \Lambda\}$ is complete in $L^2(\Omega, \sigma(\xi), \mathbf{Q})$.

5 Numerical Example

Now, we turn to a specific application, namely the approximation of the solution of an one-dimensional differential equation with random data. Consider the boundary value problem

$$\begin{aligned} -(\kappa(x, \omega)u'(x, \omega))' &= f(x), \quad x \in (0, 1), \quad \omega \in \Omega \\ u(0, \omega) &= 0, \quad \omega \in \Omega \\ \kappa(1, \omega)u'(1, \omega) &= F, \quad \omega \in \Omega \end{aligned}$$

where forcing $f \in H^{-1}(D)$ is a deterministic function, F a given constant and κ a strongly measurable random variable in $L^\infty(D)$ satisfying

$$0 < \kappa_{\min}(\omega) \leq \kappa(x, \omega) \leq \kappa_{\max}(\omega) < \infty \quad \text{a.e. and a.s.}$$

for some real-valued random variables κ_{\min} and κ_{\max} . Then the exact solution is given by

$$u(x, \omega) = \int_0^x \frac{1}{\kappa(y, \omega)} \left(F + \int_y^1 f(z) dz \right) dy.$$

If the coefficient κ is modeled as an exponential function of the absolute value of one standard Gaussian distributed random variable, that is,

$$\kappa(x, \omega) := \exp(|\zeta(\omega)|x) \quad \text{with } \zeta \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$$

then κ is bounded by

$$0 < 1 \leq \kappa(x, \omega) \leq \exp(|\zeta(\omega)|) < \infty \quad \text{a.e. and a.s.}$$

The random variable $\kappa_{\max}^2/\kappa_{\min}^2 = \exp(2|\zeta|)$ is in $L^r(\Omega, \mathfrak{A}, \mathbf{P})$ for all $r \geq 1$. As basic random variable we choose the standard Gaussian distributed random variable ζ , i.e., $\xi = \zeta$, and employ the Stochastic Galerkin Method using orthonormal polynomials, i.e. polynomial chaos, in ξ . Figure 5.1 shows the relative errors of the mean and second-order moment of the Stochas-




Figure 5.1: Relative errors of mean (left) and second moment (right) of the Stochastic Galerkin approximation to the solution with $f \equiv 1$ and $F = 1$ using polynomials of different orders in ξ .

tic Galerkin approximation to the exact solution as a function of the spatial variable x . Thereby we have chosen the forcing $f \equiv 1$ and the boundary value $F = 1$ and we use a p version of

the Finite Element Method, precisely, a single Gauss-Lobatto-Legendre spectral finite element of degree $p = 20$ for the spatial discretization. In the stochastic dimension we use orthonormal polynomials in ξ up to degree 5, 10, 15 and 20. Obviously, the error decays, which agrees with the theory developed in Section 4. On the other hand it is also possible to choose as basic random variable $\eta = |\zeta|$, a chi-distributed random variable with one degree of freedom. Thus, we can use orthonormal polynomials, i.e. generalized polynomial chaos, in η within the Stochastic Galerkin Method, in particular orthonormal polynomials in η up to degree 2 and 5. In the spatial dimension we again use a single Gauss-Lobatto-Legendre spectral finite element of degree $p = 20$. In Figure 5.2 we observe that the associated relative errors of the mean and second-order moment tend to zero much faster than for the standard Gaussian basic random variable ξ .




Figure 5.2: Relative errors of mean (left) and second moment (right) of the Stochastic Galerkin approximation to the solution with $f \equiv 1$ and $F = 1$ using polynomials of different orders in η .

Notably, we obtain much better approximation results by using polynomials up to order 2 and 5 in $\eta = |\zeta|$ as compared to polynomials up to order 20 in $\xi = \zeta$. Hence, the approximation error, more precisely the rate of convergence, and thus the approximation quality depends on the set of basic random variables. This relation is currently being investigated in ongoing research.

References

- [1] I. Babuška, F. Nobile, and R. Tempone, *A Stochastic Collocation Method for Elliptic Partial Differential Equations with Random Input Data*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **45** (2007), no. 3, 1005–1034.
- [2] I. Babuška and M. Suri, *The p and h - p versions of the finite element method, basic principles and properties*, SIAM Review **36** (1994), no. 4, 578–632.
- [3] I. Babuška, R. Tempone, and G. E. Zouraris, *Galerkin Finite Element Approximations of Stochastic Elliptic Partial Differential Equations*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **42** (2004), no. 2, 800–825.
- [4] ———, *Solving elliptic boundary value problems with uncertain coefficients by the finite element method: the stochastic formulation*, Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg. **194** (2005), 1251–1294.
- [5] M. Bieri, R. Andreev, and C. Schwab, *Sparse tensor discretization of elliptic SPDEs*, SIAM J. Sci. Comput. **31** (2009), no. 6, 4281–4304.

- [6] M. Bieri and C. Schwab, *Sparse high order FEM for elliptic sPDEs*, Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg. **198** (2009), no. 13-14, 1149–1170.
- [7] S. C. Brenner and L. R. Scott, *The Mathematical Theory of Finite Element Methods*, 2nd ed., Texts in Applied Mathematics, vol. 15, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2002.
- [8] O. Ernst, A. Mugler, E. Ullmann, and H. J. Starkloff, *On the convergence of generalized polynomial chaos*, <http://www.dfg-spp1324.de/publications.php>, 2010.
- [9] J. Galvis and M. Sarkis, *Approximating infinity-dimensional stochastic Darcy's Equations without uniform ellipticity*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **47** (2009), no. 5, 3624–3651.
- [10] C. J. Gittelsohn, *Representation of Gaussian fields in series with independent coefficients*, ETH Zürich, Research Report (2010), no. 2010-15.
- [11] _____, *Stochastic Galerkin discretization of the log-normal isotropic diffusion problem*, Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci. **20** (2010), no. 2, 237–263.
- [12] M. Loève, *Probability Theory II. 4th Edition*, Springer-Verlag, New York, Heidelberg, Berlin, 1978.
- [13] M. Reed and B. Simon, *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics. 1. Functional analysis*, Academic Press, New York, 1972.
- [14] R. A. Todor and C. Schwab, *Convergence rates for sparse chaos approximations of elliptic problems with stochastic coefficients*, IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis **27** (2007), 232–261.
- [15] D. Xiu and G. E. Karniadakis, *Modeling uncertainty in steady state diffusion problems via generalized polynomial chaos*, Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg. **191** (2002), no. 43, 4927–4948.
- [16] _____, *The Wiener–Askey Polynomial Chaos for Stochastic Differential Equations*, SIAM J. Sci. Comput. **24** (2002), no. 2, 619–644.
- [17] K. Yosida, *Functional analysis*, reprint of the 1980 ed., Classics in mathematics, Springer, Berlin, 1995.

Preprint Series DFG-SPP 1324

<http://www.dfg-spp1324.de>

Reports

- [1] R. Ramlau, G. Teschke, and M. Zhariy. A Compressive Landweber Iteration for Solving Ill-Posed Inverse Problems. Preprint 1, DFG-SPP 1324, September 2008.
- [2] G. Plonka. The Easy Path Wavelet Transform: A New Adaptive Wavelet Transform for Sparse Representation of Two-dimensional Data. Preprint 2, DFG-SPP 1324, September 2008.
- [3] E. Novak and H. Woźniakowski. Optimal Order of Convergence and (In-) Tractability of Multivariate Approximation of Smooth Functions. Preprint 3, DFG-SPP 1324, October 2008.
- [4] M. Espig, L. Grasedyck, and W. Hackbusch. Black Box Low Tensor Rank Approximation Using Fibre-Crosses. Preprint 4, DFG-SPP 1324, October 2008.
- [5] T. Bonesky, S. Dahlke, P. Maass, and T. Raasch. Adaptive Wavelet Methods and Sparsity Reconstruction for Inverse Heat Conduction Problems. Preprint 5, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2009.
- [6] E. Novak and H. Woźniakowski. Approximation of Infinitely Differentiable Multivariate Functions Is Intractable. Preprint 6, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2009.
- [7] J. Ma and G. Plonka. A Review of Curvelets and Recent Applications. Preprint 7, DFG-SPP 1324, February 2009.
- [8] L. Denis, D. A. Lorenz, and D. Trede. Greedy Solution of Ill-Posed Problems: Error Bounds and Exact Inversion. Preprint 8, DFG-SPP 1324, April 2009.
- [9] U. Friedrich. A Two Parameter Generalization of Lions' Nonoverlapping Domain Decomposition Method for Linear Elliptic PDEs. Preprint 9, DFG-SPP 1324, April 2009.
- [10] K. Bredies and D. A. Lorenz. Minimization of Non-smooth, Non-convex Functionals by Iterative Thresholding. Preprint 10, DFG-SPP 1324, April 2009.
- [11] K. Bredies and D. A. Lorenz. Regularization with Non-convex Separable Constraints. Preprint 11, DFG-SPP 1324, April 2009.

- [12] M. Döhler, S. Kunis, and D. Potts. Nonequispaced Hyperbolic Cross Fast Fourier Transform. Preprint 12, DFG-SPP 1324, April 2009.
- [13] C. Bender. Dual Pricing of Multi-Exercise Options under Volume Constraints. Preprint 13, DFG-SPP 1324, April 2009.
- [14] T. Müller-Gronbach and K. Ritter. Variable Subspace Sampling and Multi-level Algorithms. Preprint 14, DFG-SPP 1324, May 2009.
- [15] G. Plonka, S. Tenorth, and A. Iske. Optimally Sparse Image Representation by the Easy Path Wavelet Transform. Preprint 15, DFG-SPP 1324, May 2009.
- [16] S. Dahlke, E. Novak, and W. Sickel. Optimal Approximation of Elliptic Problems by Linear and Nonlinear Mappings IV: Errors in L_2 and Other Norms. Preprint 16, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2009.
- [17] B. Jin, T. Khan, P. Maass, and M. Pidcock. Function Spaces and Optimal Currents in Impedance Tomography. Preprint 17, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2009.
- [18] G. Plonka and J. Ma. Curvelet-Wavelet Regularized Split Bregman Iteration for Compressed Sensing. Preprint 18, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2009.
- [19] G. Teschke and C. Borries. Accelerated Projected Steepest Descent Method for Nonlinear Inverse Problems with Sparsity Constraints. Preprint 19, DFG-SPP 1324, July 2009.
- [20] L. Grasedyck. Hierarchical Singular Value Decomposition of Tensors. Preprint 20, DFG-SPP 1324, July 2009.
- [21] D. Rudolf. Error Bounds for Computing the Expectation by Markov Chain Monte Carlo. Preprint 21, DFG-SPP 1324, July 2009.
- [22] M. Hansen and W. Sickel. Best m-term Approximation and Lizorkin-Triebel Spaces. Preprint 22, DFG-SPP 1324, August 2009.
- [23] F.J. Hickernell, T. Müller-Gronbach, B. Niu, and K. Ritter. Multi-level Monte Carlo Algorithms for Infinite-dimensional Integration on \mathbb{R}^N . Preprint 23, DFG-SPP 1324, August 2009.
- [24] S. Dereich and F. Heidenreich. A Multilevel Monte Carlo Algorithm for Lévy Driven Stochastic Differential Equations. Preprint 24, DFG-SPP 1324, August 2009.
- [25] S. Dahlke, M. Fornasier, and T. Raasch. Multilevel Preconditioning for Adaptive Sparse Optimization. Preprint 25, DFG-SPP 1324, August 2009.

- [26] S. Dereich. Multilevel Monte Carlo Algorithms for Lévy-driven SDEs with Gaussian Correction. Preprint 26, DFG-SPP 1324, August 2009.
- [27] G. Plonka, S. Tenorth, and D. Roşca. A New Hybrid Method for Image Approximation using the Easy Path Wavelet Transform. Preprint 27, DFG-SPP 1324, October 2009.
- [28] O. Koch and C. Lubich. Dynamical Low-rank Approximation of Tensors. Preprint 28, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2009.
- [29] E. Faou, V. Gradinaru, and C. Lubich. Computing Semi-classical Quantum Dynamics with Hagedorn Wavepackets. Preprint 29, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2009.
- [30] D. Conte and C. Lubich. An Error Analysis of the Multi-configuration Time-dependent Hartree Method of Quantum Dynamics. Preprint 30, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2009.
- [31] C. E. Powell and E. Ullmann. Preconditioning Stochastic Galerkin Saddle Point Problems. Preprint 31, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2009.
- [32] O. G. Ernst and E. Ullmann. Stochastic Galerkin Matrices. Preprint 32, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2009.
- [33] F. Lindner and R. L. Schilling. Weak Order for the Discretization of the Stochastic Heat Equation Driven by Impulsive Noise. Preprint 33, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2009.
- [34] L. Kämmerer and S. Kunis. On the Stability of the Hyperbolic Cross Discrete Fourier Transform. Preprint 34, DFG-SPP 1324, December 2009.
- [35] P. Cerejeiras, M. Ferreira, U. Kähler, and G. Teschke. Inversion of the noisy Radon transform on $SO(3)$ by Gabor frames and sparse recovery principles. Preprint 35, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2010.
- [36] T. Jahnke and T. Udrescu. Solving Chemical Master Equations by Adaptive Wavelet Compression. Preprint 36, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2010.
- [37] P. Kittipoom, G. Kutyniok, and W.-Q Lim. Irregular Shearlet Frames: Geometry and Approximation Properties. Preprint 37, DFG-SPP 1324, February 2010.
- [38] G. Kutyniok and W.-Q Lim. Compactly Supported Shearlets are Optimally Sparse. Preprint 38, DFG-SPP 1324, February 2010.
- [39] M. Hansen and W. Sickel. Best m -Term Approximation and Tensor Products of Sobolev and Besov Spaces – the Case of Non-compact Embeddings. Preprint 39, DFG-SPP 1324, March 2010.

- [40] B. Niu, F.J. Hickernell, T. Müller-Gronbach, and K. Ritter. Deterministic Multi-level Algorithms for Infinite-dimensional Integration on \mathbb{R}^N . Preprint 40, DFG-SPP 1324, March 2010.
- [41] P. Kittipoom, G. Kutyniok, and W.-Q Lim. Construction of Compactly Supported Shearlet Frames. Preprint 41, DFG-SPP 1324, March 2010.
- [42] C. Bender and J. Steiner. Error Criteria for Numerical Solutions of Backward SDEs. Preprint 42, DFG-SPP 1324, April 2010.
- [43] L. Grasedyck. Polynomial Approximation in Hierarchical Tucker Format by Vector-Tensorization. Preprint 43, DFG-SPP 1324, April 2010.
- [44] M. Hansen und W. Sickel. Best m -Term Approximation and Sobolev-Besov Spaces of Dominating Mixed Smoothness - the Case of Compact Embeddings. Preprint 44, DFG-SPP 1324, April 2010.
- [45] P. Binev, W. Dahmen, and P. Lamby. Fast High-Dimensional Approximation with Sparse Occupancy Trees. Preprint 45, DFG-SPP 1324, May 2010.
- [46] J. Ballani and L. Grasedyck. A Projection Method to Solve Linear Systems in Tensor Format. Preprint 46, DFG-SPP 1324, May 2010.
- [47] P. Binev, A. Cohen, W. Dahmen, R. DeVore, G. Petrova, and P. Wojtaszczyk. Convergence Rates for Greedy Algorithms in Reduced Basis Methods. Preprint 47, DFG-SPP 1324, May 2010.
- [48] S. Kestler and K. Urban. Adaptive Wavelet Methods on Unbounded Domains. Preprint 48, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2010.
- [49] H. Yserentant. The Mixed Regularity of Electronic Wave Functions Multiplied by Explicit Correlation Factors. Preprint 49, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2010.
- [50] H. Yserentant. On the Complexity of the Electronic Schrödinger Equation. Preprint 50, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2010.
- [51] M. Guillemard and A. Iske. Curvature Analysis of Frequency Modulated Manifolds in Dimensionality Reduction. Preprint 51, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2010.
- [52] E. Herrholz and G. Teschke. Compressive Sensing Principles and Iterative Sparse Recovery for Inverse and Ill-Posed Problems. Preprint 52, DFG-SPP 1324, July 2010.
- [53] L. Kämmerer, S. Kunis, and D. Potts. Interpolation Lattices for Hyperbolic Cross Trigonometric Polynomials. Preprint 53, DFG-SPP 1324, July 2010.

- [54] G. Kutyniok and W.-Q Lim. Shearlets on Bounded Domains. Preprint 54, DFG-SPP 1324, July 2010.
- [55] A. Zeiser. Wavelet Approximation in Weighted Sobolev Spaces of Mixed Order with Applications to the Electronic Schrödinger Equation. Preprint 55, DFG-SPP 1324, July 2010.
- [56] G. Kutyniok, J. Lemvig, and W.-Q Lim. Compactly Supported Shearlets. Preprint 56, DFG-SPP 1324, July 2010.
- [57] A. Zeiser. On the Optimality of the Inexact Inverse Iteration Coupled with Adaptive Finite Element Methods. Preprint 57, DFG-SPP 1324, July 2010.
- [58] S. Jokar. Sparse Recovery and Kronecker Products. Preprint 58, DFG-SPP 1324, August 2010.
- [59] T. Aboiyar, E. H. Georgoulis, and A. Iske. Adaptive ADER Methods Using Kernel-Based Polyharmonic Spline WENO Reconstruction. Preprint 59, DFG-SPP 1324, August 2010.
- [60] O. G. Ernst, A. Mugler, H.-J. Starkloff, and E. Ullmann. On the Convergence of Generalized Polynomial Chaos Expansions. Preprint 60, DFG-SPP 1324, August 2010.
- [61] S. Holtz, T. Rohwedder, and R. Schneider. On Manifolds of Tensors of Fixed TT-Rank. Preprint 61, DFG-SPP 1324, September 2010.
- [62] J. Ballani, L. Grasedyck, and M. Kluge. Black Box Approximation of Tensors in Hierarchical Tucker Format. Preprint 62, DFG-SPP 1324, October 2010.
- [63] M. Hansen. On Tensor Products of Quasi-Banach Spaces. Preprint 63, DFG-SPP 1324, October 2010.
- [64] S. Dahlke, G. Steidl, and G. Teschke. Shearlet Coorbit Spaces: Compactly Supported Analyzing Shearlets, Traces and Embeddings. Preprint 64, DFG-SPP 1324, October 2010.
- [65] W. Hackbusch. Tensorisation of Vectors and their Efficient Convolution. Preprint 65, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2010.
- [66] P. A. Cioica, S. Dahlke, S. Kinzel, F. Lindner, T. Raasch, K. Ritter, and R. L. Schilling. Spatial Besov Regularity for Stochastic Partial Differential Equations on Lipschitz Domains. Preprint 66, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2010.

- [67] E. Novak and H. Woźniakowski. On the Power of Function Values for the Approximation Problem in Various Settings. Preprint 67, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2010.
- [68] A. Hinrichs, E. Novak, and H. Woźniakowski. The Curse of Dimensionality for Monotone and Convex Functions of Many Variables. Preprint 68, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2010.
- [69] G. Kutyniok and W.-Q Lim. Image Separation Using Shearlets. Preprint 69, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2010.
- [70] B. Jin and P. Maass. An Analysis of Electrical Impedance Tomography with Applications to Tikhonov Regularization. Preprint 70, DFG-SPP 1324, December 2010.
- [71] S. Holtz, T. Rohwedder, and R. Schneider. The Alternating Linear Scheme for Tensor Optimisation in the TT Format. Preprint 71, DFG-SPP 1324, December 2010.
- [72] T. Müller-Gronbach and K. Ritter. A Local Refinement Strategy for Constructive Quantization of Scalar SDEs. Preprint 72, DFG-SPP 1324, December 2010.
- [73] T. Rohwedder and R. Schneider. An Analysis for the DIIS Acceleration Method used in Quantum Chemistry Calculations. Preprint 73, DFG-SPP 1324, December 2010.
- [74] C. Bender and J. Steiner. Least-Squares Monte Carlo for Backward SDEs. Preprint 74, DFG-SPP 1324, December 2010.
- [75] C. Bender. Primal and Dual Pricing of Multiple Exercise Options in Continuous Time. Preprint 75, DFG-SPP 1324, December 2010.
- [76] H. Harbrecht, M. Peters, and R. Schneider. On the Low-rank Approximation by the Pivoted Cholesky Decomposition. Preprint 76, DFG-SPP 1324, December 2010.
- [77] P. A. Cioica, S. Dahlke, N. Döhring, S. Kinzel, F. Lindner, T. Raasch, K. Ritter, and R. L. Schilling. Adaptive Wavelet Methods for Elliptic Stochastic Partial Differential Equations. Preprint 77, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2011.
- [78] G. Plonka, S. Tenorth, and A. Iske. Optimal Representation of Piecewise Hölder Smooth Bivariate Functions by the Easy Path Wavelet Transform. Preprint 78, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2011.
- [79] A. Mugler and H.-J. Starkloff. On Elliptic Partial Differential Equations with Random Coefficients. Preprint 79, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2011.