

A Nonoverlapping Domain Decomposition Method for Variational Inequalities Derived from Free Boundary Problems

Bin Jiang,¹ John C. Bruch, Jr.,^{2,3} James M. Sloss³

¹*Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Portland State University, Portland, Oregon 97207*

Departments of ²Mechanical and Environmental Engineering, and ³Mathematics, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA 93106

Received 3 May 2004; accepted 28 February 2005

Published online 20 April 2005 in Wiley InterScience (www.interscience.wiley.com).

DOI 10.1002/num.20083

The article proposes a nonoverlapping domain decomposition method for variational inequalities derived from free boundary problems. The free boundary value problem is broken up into two problems on nonoverlapping regions. In one region the problem is treated as a partial differential equation, while in the second region that contains the free boundary part, a variational inequality is considered. By solving these two related problems successively, we have shown that the successive solutions converge to the solution of the original problem. Application to a free surface seepage problem is given. © 2005 Wiley Periodicals, Inc. *Numer Methods Partial Differential Eq* 22: 1–17, 2006

Keywords: domain decomposition; variational inequality; fixed domain; free surface seepage

I. INTRODUCTION

Domain decomposition (DD) methods have been intensively studied for partial differential equations. The first original work by Schwarz proposed an overlapping method for the solution of classical boundary value problems for harmonic functions. Afterwards, many researchers have conducted research along this direction. See [1] and [2] and the references therein for the research on overlapping domain decomposition methods for partial differential equations.

Meanwhile, nonoverlapping DD methods are also being investigated by researchers. Compared with the overlapping DD methods, the nonoverlapping DD methods have many advantages, such as direct split of the original domain into mutually disjoint subdomains where

Correspondence to: Bin Jiang, Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Portland State University, Portland, OR 97207 (e-mail: bjiang@pdx.edu)

© 2005 Wiley Periodicals, Inc.

parallel computation can be applied in each subdomain. See [3]–[7] for all the algorithms and convergence analysis provided therein.

Problems described by variational inequalities have been an important topic for mathematicians and engineers for a long time because many physical and engineering problems such as fluid flow in porous media, obstacle problems, elastic problems, and lubrication phenomena fall under this category. These problems are in general of free boundary type and can be transformed into variational inequalities. Crank [8] and Elliott and Ockendon [9] proposed several numerical techniques to solve general free boundary problems. Friedman [10] provided detailed theoretical analysis about regularity of the solution and the free boundary.

Because domain decomposition methods have shown great advantage in the field of scientific computation, mathematicians began to apply the overlapping domain decomposition methods to solve variational inequality problems. The basic idea is to split the original domain into several overlapping subdomains and solve the variational inequality on each sub domain via data transfer from the common area between those subdomains. Bruch and Sloss [11], Tai et al. [12], Tai [13], Hoffmann and Zou [14, 15], Badea and Wang [16], Zeng and Zhou [17] and their references provide many variants of this approach, whereas convergence analyses of the algorithms and their application to many problems in different fields are provided.

Actually for many practical problems in the engineering and industrial fields, it is much easier and more convenient to split the original domain into two or three nonoverlapping subdomains and then take care of the problems in each subdomain where the original problem may show different behavior. However, no active research has been reported by applying nonoverlapping DD method for variational inequalities. Even though many numerical tests have shown the stability and convergence of nonoverlapping DD methods for variational inequalities, see Bruch [18], Papadopoulos et al. [19], Jiang et al. [20, 21], no convergence analysis has been fully provided.

In this article, we propose a free boundary problem that can be generalized into a variational inequality. We follow along the work of Lions [3] and Deng [6] to construct an algorithm to handle the original problem in nonoverlapping subdomains. A robin boundary condition is utilized on the common boundary between these two subdomains. We obtain the convergence result for this new method for our variational inequality problem.

This article is organized as follows. In Section 2, we reformulate the general free boundary problem as a two subdomain problem where the partial differential equation and the variational inequality are considered in each subdomain, respectively. In Section 3, convergence analysis of the domain decomposition method is provided. In Section 4, we apply our new nonoverlapping DDM to a free surface seepage problem and the numerical result confirms the convergence property. A summary of the article and some future considerations are outlined in Section 5.

II. FORMULATION OF THE PROBLEM

Let D be a domain in R^2 , whose boundary will be denoted by ∂D , and $D = D_1 \cup D_2 \cup \Gamma_0$, D_1 and D_2 are open sets, $D_1 \cap D_2 = \phi$. $\Gamma_0 = \overline{D_1} \cap \overline{D_2}$ is the common boundary between D_1 and D_2 . $\Gamma_1 = \partial D \cap \overline{D_1}$ and $\Gamma_2 = \partial D \cap \overline{D_2}$ represent the boundary of D (see Fig. 1).

The general free boundary problem is the following:

Problem 2.1. Find an open set $\Omega_2 \subset D_2$ and $u(x) \in H^2(D)$ with $x = (x_1, x_2)$, such that

$$-\Delta u + c(x)u = f(x) \quad \text{in } \Omega = D_1 \cup \Omega_2 \cup \Gamma_0; \quad (2.1)$$




FIG. 1. The original free boundary problem.

$$(-\Delta u + c(x)u - f(x)) \cdot u(x) = 0 \quad \text{in } D; \tag{2.2a}$$

$$u \geq 0 \quad \text{in } D; \tag{2.2b}$$

$$-\Delta u + c(x)u - f(x) \geq 0 \quad \text{in } D; \tag{2.2c}$$

$$u = g(x) \quad \text{on } \partial D; \tag{2.3}$$

$$D_2 - \Omega_2 = \{x \in D \mid u(x) = 0\}, \tag{2.4}$$

where $c(x) \geq 0$, $c(x) \in C^\alpha(\bar{D})$, $f(x) \in C^\alpha(\bar{D})$, $g(x) \in C^{2+\alpha}(\bar{D})$, $g(x) \geq 0$ on Γ_1 and $g(x) = 0$ on Γ_2 , and ∂D is in $C^{2+\alpha}$. Here $C^{m+\alpha}(\bar{D})$ denotes the space of functions whose derivatives up to order m are Hölder continuous with $0 < \alpha < 1$.

It is shown in [10] (Theorem 3.2, p 26) that there exists a unique solution $u(x)$ for problem 2.1 and $u \in W^{2,p}(D)$ for any $p < \infty$. The Sobolev imbedding theorem ([22], p 85) says immediately that the solution of problem 2.1 satisfies

$$u(x) \in C^{1,\lambda}(\bar{D}), \quad 0 < \lambda < 1, \tag{2.5}$$

therefore, $u(x)$ has continuous first order derivatives in D .

To solve the free boundary Problem 2.1, we need to determine the free boundary $\Gamma_{u_2} = \overline{\Omega_2} \cap \overline{D_2 - \Omega_2}$, which is located inside the right domain D_2 . The solution $u(x)$ should satisfy the partial differential equation (2.1) in Ω with boundary conditions (2.3) and $u = 0$ on Γ_{u_2} ; while in $D_2 - \Omega_2$, $u(x) = 0$. The free boundary Problem 2.1 is difficult to solve. In addition to determining the unknown $u(x)$, the free boundary also needs to be determined. Many industrial and engineering problems belong to this category.

Friedman [10] showed that the free boundary Problem 2.1 is equivalent to the following variational inequality, which can be handled conveniently both from theoretical and numerical perspectives.

Problem 2.2. Let $H = \{u : u \in H^1(D), u = g(x) \text{ on } \partial D, u \geq 0 \text{ in } D\}$. Find $u \in H$, such that

$$a(u, v - u) \geq \langle f, v - u \rangle \quad \forall v \in H, \tag{2.6}$$

where

$$a(u, v) = \int_D \left[\sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{\partial u(x)}{\partial x_i} \frac{\partial v(x)}{\partial x_i} + c(x)u(x)v(x) \right] dx,$$

$$\langle f, v \rangle = \int_D f(x)v(x)dx.$$

Since H is a closed convex subset of $H^1(D)$, it is well known [23] that there exists a unique solution u to (2.6). With u determined in D , we can define $\Omega_2 = \{(x_1, x_2) \in D_2 : u(x_1, x_2) > 0\}$. This also yields the solution $u(x)$ of Problem 2.1.

Numerical schemes for variational inequalities have been investigated by many researchers. As to the free boundary Problem 2.1, the free boundary Γ_{u_2} lies in D_2 only, therefore, we can consider the solution u of (2.1) to satisfy two related problems: One in D_1 governed by a partial differential equation and one in D_2 governed by a variational inequality. In D_1 , $u_1 = u|_{D_1}$ satisfies a partial differential equation (2.1); while in D_2 , $u_2 = u|_{D_2}$ satisfies a variational inequality. It is natural to construct a nonoverlapping domain decomposition method to solve for u in these two different regions, respectively. Currently there is no literature reporting on nonoverlapping domain decomposition methods for the general variational inequality problem. Some research work has been done for the case when D_1 and D_2 have a common region which is used to transfer data successively. This is a possible approach, but is not what we shall use here. Here we shall use the approach of splitting the original region into two nonoverlapping subdomains D_1 and D_2 which have the common boundary $D_1 \cap D_2 = \Gamma_0$, and then successively solving these two problems (which are coupled on Γ_0) in D_1 and D_2 , respectively.

We shall construct a new nonoverlapping domain decomposition method in Algorithm 2.1 based on the above idea and provide the convergence analysis in Section 3.

Lemma 2.1. *Define*

$$H_1 = \{w(x) : w \in H^1(D_1), w|_{\Gamma_1} = g(x)\}$$

and

$$H_2 = \{w(x) : w \in H^1(D_2), w \geq 0 \text{ in } D_2, w|_{\Gamma_2} = 0\}.$$

Let $u(x)$ be the solution of Problem 2.1. $u_1 \in H_1$ and $u_2 \in H_2$ be the restriction of u in D_1 , D_2 , respectively, i.e., $u_1 = u|_{D_1}$ and $u_2 = u|_{D_2}$. Then u_1 and u_2 will satisfy

$$a_1(u_1, v) = \langle f, v \rangle_1 + \int_{\Gamma_0} \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial n_1} v ds \quad \forall v \in H^1(D_1), \quad v|_{\Gamma_1} = 0 \quad (2.7)$$

$$a_2(u_2, v - u_2) \geq \langle f, v - u_2 \rangle_2 + \int_{\Gamma_0} \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial n_2} (v - u_2) ds \quad \forall v \in H_2, \quad (2.8)$$

where

$$a_i(u, v) = \int_{D_i} \left[\sum_{j=1}^2 \frac{\partial u(x)}{\partial x_j} \frac{\partial v(x)}{\partial x_j} + c(x)u(x)v(x) \right] dx,$$

$$\langle f, v \rangle_i = \int_{D_i} f(x)v(x)dx,$$

$i = 1, 2$. n_1, n_2 is the normal direction on Γ_0 from D_1, D_2 , respectively.

Proof. u_1 satisfies (2.1) in D_1 and $u_1 \in H_1$. Let $v \in H^1(D_1)$ and $v|_{\Gamma_1} = 0$. Then multiply (2.1) by v and use integration by parts in D_1 . We have (2.7) immediately.

To prove (2.8), for any $v \in H_2$, which is well defined in D_2 only, we need to extend v into D_1 properly. To this end, let $v|_{D_1}$ satisfy $-\Delta v + c(x)v = 0$ in D_1 , $v = g(x)$ on Γ_1 and equal to the value of v on Γ_0 . It is easy to see that this is a well-defined extension of v to the whole domain and the new v will be in H .

Since u is also a solution to Problem 2.2, we can deduce from (2.6)

$$a_1(u_1, v - u_1) + a_2(u_2, v - u_2) \geq \langle f, v - u_1 \rangle_1 + \langle f, v - u_2 \rangle_2. \quad (2.9)$$

Since $v - u_1 \in H^1(D_1)$ and $(v - u_1)|_{\Gamma_1} = 0$, from (2.7)

$$a_1(u_1, v - u_1) = \langle f, v - u_1 \rangle_1 + \int_{\Gamma_0} \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial n_1} (v - u_1) ds.$$

Therefore, (2.9) becomes

$$\langle f, v - u_1 \rangle_1 + \int_{\Gamma_0} \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial n_1} (v - u_1) ds + a_2(u_2, v - u_2) \geq \langle f, v - u_1 \rangle_1 + \langle f, v - u_2 \rangle_2,$$

which yields (2.8) directly from the fact that $\partial u_1/\partial n_1 = -\partial u_2/\partial n_2$ and $u_1 = u_2$ on Γ_0 , since u has continuous first-order derivatives in D from (2.5). ■

From Lemma 2.1, we found that the solution u satisfies a partial differential equation in D_1 and satisfies a variational inequality in D_2 . We propose a successive non-overlapping domain decomposition algorithm based on that observation, as follows:

Algorithm 2.1. Given g_1^0, g_2^0 on Γ_0 . Let $n = 0$.

Step 1. Solve the following two subproblems simultaneously:

Subproblem 2.3.1. Find $u_1^n \in H_1$, such that

$$a_1(u_1^n, v) + \int_{\Gamma_0} u_1^n v ds = \langle f, v \rangle_1 + \int_{\Gamma_0} g_1^n v ds \quad \forall v \in H^1(D_1), \quad v|_{\Gamma_1} = 0. \quad (2.10)$$

6 JIANG, BRUCH, AND SLOSS

Subproblem 2.3.2. Find $u_2^n \in H_2$, such that

$$a_2(u_2^n, v - u_2^n) + \int_{\Gamma_0} u_2^n(v - u_2^n)ds \geq \langle f, v - u_2^n \rangle_2 + \int_{\Gamma_0} g_2^n(v - u_2^n)ds \quad \forall v \in H_2. \quad (2.11)$$

Step 2. Define

$$g_2^{n+1} = 2u_1^n - g_1^n, \quad g_1^{n+1} = 2u_2^n - g_2^n. \quad (2.12)$$

Then repeat Step 1 with n replaced by $n + 1$.

Proposition 2.1. *By comparing (2.10) and (2.7), we can see that (2.10) is constructed naturally by utilizing the Robin boundary condition $\partial u_1^n / \partial n_1 + u_1^n = g_1^n$ on Γ_0 , because (2.7) is equivalent to*

$$a_1(u_1, v) + \int_{\Gamma_0} u_1 v ds = \langle f, v \rangle_1 + \int_{\Gamma_0} \left(\frac{\partial u_1}{\partial n_1} + u_1 \right) v ds \quad \forall v \in H^1(D_1), \quad v|_{\Gamma_1} = 0.$$

Then, (2.10) satisfied by u_1^n has the same format as the last equality for u_1 . Therefore, u_1^n satisfies (2.1) with Robin boundary condition $\partial u_1^n / \partial n_1 + u_1^n = g_1^n$ and $u_1^n|_{\Gamma_0} = g(x)$, similarly as u_1 does. This will lead us to solve (2.10) via the traditional finite difference method or finite element method.

Proposition 2.2. *Similarly, (2.11) and (2.8) have the same structure if we rewrite (2.8) as*

$$a_2(u_2, v - u_2) + \int_{\Gamma_0} u_2(v - u_2)ds \geq \langle f, v - u_2 \rangle_2 + \int_{\Gamma_0} \left(\frac{\partial u_2}{\partial n_2} + u_2 \right) (v - u_2) ds \quad \forall v \in H_2.$$

Therefore, u_2^n will satisfy (2.1) in the region where $u_2^n > 0$ with Robin boundary condition $\partial u_2^n / \partial n_2 + u_2^n = g_2^n$ as u_2 does. We can then apply all the traditional numerical methods in the field of variational inequality to solve (2.11).

By combining the above two propositions, Subproblems 2.3.1 and 2.3.2 are none other than solving (2.1) in two different regions with Robin boundary conditions on the common boundary. Therefore, Algorithm 2.1 is a general algorithm that can be applied to all free boundary problems.

In Section 3, we shall show that $\{u_1^n\}, \{u_2^n\}$ generated by Algorithm 2.1 converge to the solution of Problem 2.2, i.e., u_1, u_2 , in D_1, D_2 , respectively, when $n \rightarrow \infty$. In Algorithm 2.1, two subproblems are solved independently by using the Robin boundary condition $\partial u_i^n / \partial n_i + u_i^n = g_i^n$ on Γ_0 in each iteration. Then, we update g_i^{n+1} with g_i^n for the next iteration. Therefore, Problem 2.2 can be solved in the two subdomains with the traditional nonoverlapping method. In Section 4, we will consider a free surface seepage problem as a model. In this example, we split the flow field into two nonoverlapping subdomains and apply Algorithm 2.1 there. The numerical result shows the efficiency and stability of Algorithm 2.1.

III. CONVERGENCE ANALYSIS OF NONOVERLAPPING DOMAIN DECOMPOSITION METHODS

Define $e_i^n = u_i^n - u_i$ in D_i , $\tilde{g}_i^n = g_i^n - [u_i + (\partial u_i / \partial n_i)]$ on Γ_0 .

From (2.12) and the fact that $u_1 = u_2$ and $\partial u_2 / \partial n_2 = -\partial u_1 / \partial n_1$ on Γ_0 , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{g}_2^{n+1} &= g_2^{n+1} - \left(\frac{\partial u_2}{\partial n_2} + u_2 \right) = 2u_1^n - g_1^n - \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial n_2} - u_2 = 2u_1^n - 2u_1 - g_1^n + \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial n_1} + u_1 \\ &= 2(u_1^n - u_1) - \left[g_1^n - \left(\frac{\partial u_1}{\partial n_1} + u_1 \right) \right] = 2e_1^n - \tilde{g}_1^n \quad \text{on } \Gamma_0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

Similarly,

$$\tilde{g}_1^{n+1} = 2e_2^n - \tilde{g}_2^n \quad \text{on } \Gamma_0. \quad (3.2)$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{g}^{n+1}\|^2 &= \|\tilde{g}_1^{n+1}\|^2 + \|\tilde{g}_2^{n+1}\|^2 = \int_{\Gamma_0} (\tilde{g}_1^{n+1})^2 ds + \int_{\Gamma_0} (\tilde{g}_2^{n+1})^2 ds = \int_{\Gamma_0} (2e_2^n - \tilde{g}_2^n)^2 ds \\ &\quad + \int_{\Gamma_0} (2e_1^n - \tilde{g}_1^n)^2 ds = \|\tilde{g}^n\|^2 + 4 \int_{\Gamma_0} (e_2^n - \tilde{g}_2^n) e_2^n ds + 4 \int_{\Gamma_0} (e_1^n - \tilde{g}_1^n) e_1^n ds, \end{aligned}$$

where $\|u\|$ is defined as the L^2 -norm of function $u \in L^2(\Gamma_0)$ on Γ_0 , $\|\tilde{g}^n\|$ is regarded as a measurement for the norms of the errors \tilde{g}_1^n and \tilde{g}_2^n on Γ_0 .

Rewrite (2.7) in the form of (2.10) as

$$a_1(u, v) + \int_{\Gamma_0} u_1 v ds = \langle f, v \rangle_1 + \int_{\Gamma_0} \left(u_1 + \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial n_1} \right) v ds \quad \forall v \in H^1(D_1), \quad v|_{\Gamma_1} = 0. \quad (3.4)$$

Subtraction of (3.4) from (2.10) gives

$$a_1(e_1^n, v) + \int_{\Gamma_0} e_1^n v ds = \int_{\Gamma_0} \tilde{g}_1^n v ds \quad \forall v \in H^1(D_1), \quad v|_{\Gamma_1} = 0. \quad (3.5)$$

Since $e_1^n = u_1^n - u_1 \in H^1(D_1)$ and $e_1^n|_{\Gamma_1} = 0$, we replace v by e_1^n in (3.5) and have

$$\int_{\Gamma_0} (e_1^n - \tilde{g}_1^n) e_1^n ds = -a_1(e_1^n, e_1^n). \quad (3.6)$$

Therefore, we can replace the third term of the right hand side of (3.3) by $-a_1(e_1^n, e_1^n)$ and obtain

$$\| \tilde{g}^{n+1} \|^2 = \| \tilde{g}^n \|^2 + 4 \int_{\Gamma_0} (e_2^n - \tilde{g}_2^n) e_2^n ds - 4a_1(e_1^n, e_1^n). \quad (3.7)$$

To simplify the second term on the right hand side of (3.7), we introduce the following lemma which will be proved at the end of this Section.

Lemma 3.1. *Sub-problem 2.3.2 is equivalent to the following problem:*

Sub-problem 3.1.1. *Find $u_2^n \in H_2$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} a_2(u_2^n, v - u_2^n) + \int_{\Gamma_0} u_2^n (v - u_2^n) ds \geq a_2(u_2, v - u_2^n) - \int_{\Gamma_0} \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial n_2} (v - u_2^n) ds \\ + \int_{\Gamma_0} g_2^n (v - u_2^n) ds \quad \forall v \in H_2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

Suppose Lemma 3.1 holds. (3.8) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} a_2(u_2^n - u_2, v - u_2^n) + \int_{\Gamma_0} (u_2^n - u_2) (v - u_2^n) ds \geq \int_{\Gamma_0} \left[g_2^n - \left(u_2 + \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial n_2} \right) \right] \\ \times (v - u_2^n) ds \quad \forall v \in H_2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

Letting $v = u_2$ in the above inequality, we obtain

$$-a_2(e_2^n, e_2^n) - \int_{\Gamma_0} e_2^n e_2^n ds \geq - \int_{\Gamma_0} \tilde{g}_2^n e_2^n ds,$$

i.e.,

$$\int_{\Gamma_0} (e_2^n - \tilde{g}_2^n) e_2^n ds \leq -a_2(e_2^n, e_2^n).$$

Combining this inequality with (3.7) yields

$$\| \tilde{g}^{n+1} \|^2 \leq \| \tilde{g}^n \|^2 - 4a_1(e_1^n, e_1^n) - 4a_2(e_2^n, e_2^n). \quad (3.10)$$

Since $a_1(e_1^n, e_1^n) \geq 0$, $a_2(e_2^n, e_2^n) \geq 0$, then $\| \tilde{g}^{n+1} \|^2 \leq \| \tilde{g}^n \|^2$. Therefore, $\{ \| \tilde{g}^n \|^2 \}$ is a bounded sequence between 0 and $\| \tilde{g}^1 \|^2 = M$.

From (3.10),

$$a_1(e_1^n, e_1^n) + a_2(e_2^n, e_2^n) \leq \frac{1}{4} (\| \tilde{g}^n \|^2 - \| \tilde{g}^{n+1} \|^2). \quad (3.11)$$

Summation of (3.11) from $n = 1$ to N yields

$$\sum_{n=1}^N [a_1(e_1^n, e_1^n) + a_2(e_2^n, e_2^n)] \leq \frac{1}{4} (\|\tilde{g}^1\|^2 - \|\tilde{g}^N\|^2) \leq \frac{1}{4} M.$$

This holds for arbitrarily large N . Therefore,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} [a_1(e_1^n, e_1^n) + a_2(e_2^n, e_2^n)] = 0.$$

Since both terms in the above limit are non-negative, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_1(e_1^n, e_1^n) = 0 \tag{3.12}$$

and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_2(e_2^n, e_2^n) = 0. \tag{3.13}$$

To prove $\|e_1^n\| \rightarrow 0$, we should consider the following two cases:

Case 1. $c(x) \geq C_0 > 0$, then

$$a_1(e_1^n, e_1^n) = \int_{\Omega_1} \nabla e_1^n \nabla e_1^n dx + C_0 \int_{\Omega_1} e_1^n e_1^n dx \geq \min(1, C_0) \|e_1^n\|_{1,D_1}^2$$

Then (3.12) yields directly $\|e_1^n\|_{1,D_1} \rightarrow 0$. Similarly, $\|e_2^n\|_{1,D_2} \rightarrow 0$. This completes the proof of convergence of Algorithm 2.1.

Case 2. $c(x) \geq 0$. Then

$$a_1(e_1^n, e_1^n) \geq |e_1^n|_{1,D_1}^2.$$

(3.12) yields only $|e_1^n|_{1,D_1} \rightarrow 0$. Similarly, $|e_2^n|_{1,D_2} \rightarrow 0$. However, $e_1^n|_{\Gamma_1} = 0$ in D_1 , and application of Friedrich inequality will yield $\|e_1^n\|_{1,D_1} \rightarrow 0$. Similarly, $\|e_2^n\|_{1,D_2} \rightarrow 0$. This also makes Algorithm 2.1 convergent. Combining the above two cases, we obtain the main result in this article as Theorem 3.2.

Theorem 3.2. *Suppose $\{u_1^n\}, \{u_2^n\}$ are obtained from Algorithm 2.1, then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|u_1^n - u_1\|_{1,D_1} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|u_2^n - u_2\|_{1,D_2} = 0. \tag{3.14}$$

Finally, we will prove Lemma 3.1, which is the foundation of Theorem 3.2.




FIG. 2. The free boundary from approximate solution.

Proof of Lemma 3.1. Suppose \tilde{u}_2^n is the solution to Subproblem 3.1.1. We shall show that \tilde{u}_2^n is also the solution to Subproblem 2.3.2 (see Fig. 2).

From (3.8),

$$a_2(\tilde{u}_2^n, v - \tilde{u}_2^n) + \int_{\Gamma_0} \tilde{u}_2^n (v - \tilde{u}_2^n) ds \geq a_2(u_2, v - \tilde{u}_2^n) - \int_{\Gamma_0} \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial n_2} (v - \tilde{u}_2^n) ds + \int_{\Gamma_0} g_2^n (v - \tilde{u}_2^n) ds \quad \forall v \in H_2. \quad (3.15)$$

Define $\Omega_{\tilde{u}_2^n} = \{(x_1, x_2) \in D_2 : \tilde{u}_2^n(x_1, x_2) > 0\}$, $\Gamma_{\tilde{u}_2^n} = \overline{\Omega_{\tilde{u}_2^n}} \cap \overline{D_2} - \overline{\Omega_{\tilde{u}_2^n}}$. It is obvious that \tilde{u}_2^n is positive inside $\Omega_{\tilde{u}_2^n}$ and becomes 0 outside $\Omega_{\tilde{u}_2^n}$. ($\Gamma_{\tilde{u}_2^n}$ is the free boundary of \tilde{u}_2^n). Letting $\tilde{e}_2^n = \tilde{u}_2^n - u_2$, (3.15) can be rewritten as

$$a_2(\tilde{e}_2^n, v - \tilde{u}_2^n) + \int_{\Gamma_0} \tilde{e}_2^n (v - \tilde{u}_2^n) ds \geq \int_{\Gamma_0} \left[g_2^n - \left(u_2 + \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial n_2} \right) \right] (v - u_2^n) ds. \quad (3.16)$$

For any $w \in H_2$ satisfying $w \geq 0$ in $\Omega_{\tilde{u}_2^n}$, $w = 0$ in $D_2 - \Omega_{\tilde{u}_2^n}$, let $v_+ = \tilde{u}_2^n + \epsilon w$, $v_- = \tilde{u}_2^n - \epsilon w$, where ϵ is small enough to make sure $\tilde{u}_2^n + \epsilon w \geq 0$ and $\tilde{u}_2^n - \epsilon w \geq 0$ in $\Omega_{\tilde{u}_2^n}$. Then v_+ and v_- are both ≥ 0 in $\Omega_{\tilde{u}_2^n}$ and $= 0$ in $D_2 - \Omega_{\tilde{u}_2^n}$.

Replacing v by v_+ and v_- , respectively, we obtain the following equality:

$$a_2(\tilde{e}_2^n, w) + \int_{\Gamma_0} \tilde{e}_2^n w ds = \int_{\Gamma_0} \left[g_2^n - \left(u_2 + \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial n} \right) \right] w ds, \quad (3.17)$$

for any $w \in H_{\tilde{u}_2^n} = \{u \in H_2 : u \geq 0 \text{ in } \Omega_{\tilde{u}_2^n}, u = 0 \text{ in } D_2 - \Omega_{\tilde{u}_2^n}\}$. Under integration by parts on $\Omega_{\tilde{u}_2^n}$ to the term on the left-hand side, (3.17) becomes

$$\int_{\Gamma_0} \left(\frac{\partial \tilde{e}_2^n}{\partial n} + \tilde{e}_2^n \right) w ds + \int_{\Omega_{\tilde{u}_2^n}} (-\Delta \tilde{e}_2^n + c \tilde{e}_2^n) w dx = \int_{\Gamma_0} \left[g_2^n - \left(u_2 + \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial n} \right) \right] w ds. \quad (3.18)$$




FIG. 3. Case which does not exist.

By choosing $w \in H_{\tilde{u}_2^n}$ such that $w|_{\Gamma_0} = 0$, we have

$$\int_{\Omega_{\tilde{u}_2^n}} (-\Delta \tilde{e}_2^n + c \tilde{e}_2^n) w dx = 0.$$

This yields directly from the arbitrariness of w that

$$-\Delta \tilde{e}_2^n + c \tilde{e}_2^n = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega_{\tilde{u}_2^n},$$

i.e.,

$$-\Delta \tilde{u}_2^n + c \tilde{u}_2^n = -\Delta u + cu \quad \text{in } \Omega_{\tilde{u}_2^n}. \tag{3.19}$$

Then, (3.18) becomes

$$\int_{\Gamma_0} \left(\frac{\partial \tilde{e}_2^n}{\partial n} + \tilde{e}_2^n \right) w ds = \int_{\Gamma_0} \left[g_2^n - \left(u_2 + \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial n} \right) \right] w ds.$$

From the definition of \tilde{e}_2^n , this can be simplified as

$$\int_{\Gamma_0} \left(\frac{\partial \tilde{u}_2^n}{\partial n} + \tilde{u}_2^n \right) w ds = \int_{\Gamma_0} g_2^n w ds,$$

and because of the arbitrariness of w on Γ_0 , we obtain

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{u}_2^n}{\partial n} + \tilde{u}_2^n = g_2^n \quad \text{on } \Gamma_0. \tag{3.20}$$

Next we will show that $\Omega_2 \supset \Omega_{\tilde{u}_2^n}$, i.e., $\Gamma_{\tilde{u}_2^n}$ is located inside Ω_2 . Assume it is wrong, then part of $\Omega_{\tilde{u}_2^n}$ will be located outside Ω_2 , shown as the region D_{ABC} enclosed by A, B, C as in Fig. 3. \tilde{e}_2^n satisfies the following equation in D_{ABC} :




FIG. 4. Free boundary of the solution and the approximate solution.

$$-\Delta \tilde{e}_2^n + c\tilde{e}_2^n = 0 \quad \text{in } D_{ABC}. \quad (3.21)$$

Because $\tilde{u}_2^n > 0$ and $u_2 = 0$ in D_{ABC} , we have $\tilde{e}_2^n > 0$ in D_{ABC} . Meanwhile, $\tilde{e}_2^n|_{AB} = \tilde{u}_2^n - u_2 = \tilde{u}_2^n \geq 0$; $\tilde{e}_2^n|_{BC} = \tilde{u}_2^n - u_2 = \tilde{u}_2^n \geq 0$; $\tilde{e}_2^n|_{AC} = \tilde{u}_2^n - u_2 = 0 - 0 = 0$. Therefore, $\min \tilde{e}_2^n|_{D_{ABC}} = 0 = \tilde{e}_2^n|_{AC}$, i.e., \tilde{e}_2^n can obtain the minimum value on AC .

From the strong maximum principle [24], which is applied to (3.21), we have

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{e}_2^n}{\partial n} < 0 \quad \text{on } AC. \quad (3.22)$$

However, since u_2 is the solution to the free boundary Problem 2.1 and AC is in the region where $u_2 = 0$, then $\partial u_2 / \partial n|_{AC} = 0$. Meanwhile \tilde{u}_2^n is also the solution to the free boundary Problem 3.1.1 and AC is part of the free boundary where both the solution and its normal derivative are zero, then $\partial \tilde{u}_2^n / \partial n|_{AC} = 0$. Therefore,

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{e}_2^n}{\partial n} = \frac{\partial \tilde{u}_2^n}{\partial n} - \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial n} = 0 \quad \text{on } AC,$$

which contradicts (3.22). Then our assumption on Ω_2 and $\Omega_{\tilde{u}_2^n}$ is wrong. We conclude that $\Omega_2 \supset \Omega_{\tilde{u}_2^n}$ holds as in Fig. 4.

Since u_2 satisfies $-\Delta u_2 + cu_2 = f$ in Ω_2 , then $-\Delta u_2 + cu_2 = f$ in $\Omega_{\tilde{u}_2^n}$. Combining this and (3.19), we have

$$-\Delta \tilde{u}_2^n + c\tilde{u}_2^n = f \quad \text{in } \Omega_{\tilde{u}_2^n}. \quad (3.23)$$

In short, \tilde{u}_2^n satisfy (3.20) and (3.23), which is equivalent to (2.11) from Proposition 2.2.

Therefore, \tilde{u}_2^n is the solution of Subproblem 2.3.2. Since Subproblems 3.1.1 and 2.3.2 all have a unique solution, we can see that their solutions are the same based on the above conclusion.

This completes the proof of Lemma 3.1. \blacksquare

IV. FREE SURFACE SEEPAGE EXAMPLE

As an example of the method, we consider the problem of free surface seepage (see Fig. 5): find the free surface in a steady, two-dimensional seepage through a rectangular dam.

$$\begin{aligned}
 w_1(x, 0) &= \frac{y_1^2}{2} - \frac{y_1^2 - y_2^2}{2\bar{x}_1} x && \text{on } [ab] \\
 w_1(\bar{x}_1, y) &= \frac{1}{2}(y_2 - y)^2 && \text{on } [bc]
 \end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

Problem 2: Find $\{w_2, \Omega_2\}$ such that $w_2 \in K_2 = \{v|v \in H_1(D_2), v \geq 0 \text{ in } D_2\}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \Delta w_2 &= f(x, y)\chi_{\Omega_2} && \text{in } D_2 \\
 \frac{\partial w_2}{\partial n} + w_2 &= g_2 && \text{on } \Gamma_0 \\
 w_2(0, y) &= \frac{1}{2}(y_1 - y)^2 && \text{on } [c'f] \\
 w_2(x, y) &= 0 && \text{on } [ce] \cup [ef]
 \end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

where $\Omega_2 = \{(x, y)|w_2(x, y) > 0\}$.

Problem 3: Let $g_1 = 2w_2 - g_2, g_2 = 2w_1 - g_1$ on Γ_0 and solve Problems 1 and 2 iteratively. From Propositions 2.1 and 2.2, we can see that (4.5) and (4.6) are actually the direct application of Algorithm 2.1 to the free surface seepage problem.

To solve (4.5) and (4.6) numerically, we will use the SOR (successive over-relation) method combined with projection. Bruch [18] showed that this scheme can be used effectively in the study of the seepage problem.

When applying SOR, (4.6) becomes:

$$w_{ij}^{[m+(1/2)]} = \frac{\Delta x^2 \Delta y^2}{2(\Delta x^2 + \Delta y^2)} \left[\frac{1}{\Delta x^2} (w_{i+1,j}^{(m)} + w_{i-1,j}^{(m+1)}) + \frac{1}{\Delta y^2} (w_{i,j+1}^{(m)} + w_{i,j-1}^{(m+1)}) - 1 \right] \tag{4.7}$$

and

$$w_{ij}^{(m+1)} = \max(0, w_{ij}^{(m)} + \bar{\alpha}(w_{ij}^{[m+(1/2)]} - w_{ij}^{(m)}),$$

where $\bar{\alpha}$ is the relaxation parameter and i, j are the column and row mesh point numbers, respectively. Equation (4.5) can be handled similarly without the max operator.

Convergence on D_1 and D_2 is determined when

$$\max_{ij} |w_{1(i,j)}^{(n+1)} - w_{1(i,j)}^{(n)}| < \epsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \max_{ij} |w_{2(i,j)}^{(n+1)} - w_{2(i,j)}^{(n)}| < \epsilon,$$

respectively, where ϵ is some fixed positive constant.

The numerical example problem investigated used the following data: $y_1 = 1.00, y_2 = \frac{1}{6}, \bar{x}_1 = \frac{2}{3}, \bar{\alpha} = 1.85, \epsilon = 1 \times 10^{-5}, \Delta x = 0.0069, \Delta y = 0.01$.

The free surface is taken as the first mesh point with a value of w that is less than ϵ when you move in the vertical direction for a fixed x . The final free surface location based on (4.5) and




FIG. 7. Numerical result.

(4.6) is shown in Fig. 7 along with the numerical result by the fixed domain method as in [18] and the exact solution reported by Crank [8], attributed to Polubarinova-Kochina. We can see that our numerical method is as good as the traditional fixed domain method in approximating the exact solution of the seepage problem. The total number of iteration steps required to reach the tolerance is 461.

V. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

In this article, we studied the variational inequality arising from a free boundary problem. The characteristic of this problem is that the free boundary is unknown in advance. However, we can determine that the free boundary is located in one of the subdomains if we can properly split the domain into two or more subdomains. Then we can apply the traditional nonoverlapping domain decomposition method to this problem where in one subdomain, a partial differential equation is solved while in the other domain a variational inequality is considered. We have shown that this nonoverlapping DD method is convergent.

However, there are other kinds of variational inequalities whose free boundaries are absolutely unknown in advance, therefore the above technique does NOT apply. In our future work, we will construct a new algorithm for this general variational inequality problem and provide the convergence analysis there.

References

1. O. Widlund, Some Schwarz methods for symmetric and nonsymmetric elliptic problems, Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium on Domain Decomposition Methods for Partial Differential Equations, SIAM, Philadelphia, 1992, pp. 19–36.
2. P. Lions, On the Schwarz alternating method I, First International Symposium on Domain Decomposition Methods for Partial Differential Equations, SIAM, Philadelphia, 1988, pp 1–42.

3. P. Lions, On the Schwarz alternating method III: A variant for non-overlapping subdomains, *Domain Decomposition Methods for Partial Differential Equations*, SIAM, Philadelphia, 1990, pp 202–223.
4. D. Funaro, A. Quarteroni, and P. Zanolli, An iterative procedure with interface relaxation for domain decomposition methods, *SIAM J Numer Anal* 25 (1988), 1213–1236.
5. L. Marini and A. Quarteroni, A relaxation procedure for domain decomposition methods using finite element, *Numer Math* 55 (1989), 575–598.
6. Q. Deng, An analysis for a nonoverlapping domain decomposition iterative procedure, *SIAM J Sci Comput* 18 (1997), 1517–1525.
7. J. Xu and J. Zou, Some nonoverlapping domain decomposition methods, *SIAM Rev* 40 (1998), 857–914.
8. J. Crank, *Free and moving boundary problems*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1984.
9. C. M. Elliott and J. R. Ockendon, *Weak and variational methods for moving boundary problems*, *Research Notes in Mathematics* 59, Pitman, Boston, 1982.
10. A. Friedman, *Variational principles and free boundary problems*, John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1982.
11. J. C. Bruch, Jr. and J. M. Sloss, Alternating iteration and elliptic variational inequalities, *Numer Math* 47 (1985), 459–481.
12. X. Tai, O. Heimsund, and J. Xu, Rate of convergence for parallel subspace correction methods for nonlinear variational inequalities, *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Domain Decomposition Methods*, Barcelona, Spain, 2002, pp 127–138.
13. X. Tai, Rate of convergence for some constraint decomposition methods for nonlinear variational inequalities, *Numer Math* 93 (2003), 755–786.
14. K. Hoffmann and J. Zou, Parallel algorithms of Schwarz variant for variational inequalities, *Numer Funct Anal Optim* 13 (1992), 449–462.
15. K. Hoffmann and J. Zou, Parallel solution of variational inequality problems with nonlinear source terms, *IMA J Numer Anal* 16 (1996), 31–45.
16. L. Badea and J. Wang, An additive Schwarz method for variational inequalities, *Math Comp* 69 (2000), 1341–1354.
17. J. Zeng and S. Zhou, On monotone and geometric convergence of Schwarz methods for two sided obstacle problems, *SIAM J Numer Anal* 35 (1998), 600–616.
18. J. C. Bruch, Jr., A survey of free boundary value problems in the theory of flow through porous media: Variational inequality approach, Part I, *Adv Water Res* 3 (1980), 65–80.
19. C. Papadopoulos, K. Wang, J. M. Sloss, and J. C. Bruch, Jr., Domain decomposition for free boundary seepage, *Proceedings of the First International Conference on Computational Modeling of Free and Moving Boundary Problems*, Southampton, UK, 1991, 37–48.
20. B. Jiang, J. C. Bruch, Jr., and J. M. Sloss, Domain decomposition and heterogeneous modeling used in solving a free streamline flow, B. Sarler, C. A. Brebbia, and H. Power, editors, *Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Computational Modeling of Free and Moving Boundary Problems*, Ljubljana, Slovenia, 1999, pp 101–110.
21. B. Jiang, J. C. Bruch, Jr., and J. M. Sloss, Convergence of the solution for a domain decomposed, heterogeneously modeled flow past a concave profile problem, *Numer Methods Partial Differential Eq* 16 (2000), 459–479.
22. R. Adams and J. Fournier, *Sobolev spaces*, Elsevier Science, New York, 2003.
23. J. L. Lions and Stampacchia, Variational inequalities, *Commun Pure Appl Math* XX (1967), 493–519.
24. R. McOwen, *Partial differential equations*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1995.