

Galerkin method for nonlocal diffusion equations on self-similar domains

Georgi S. Medvedev*

December 13, 2023

Abstract

Integro–differential equations, analyzed in this work, comprise an important class of models of continuum media with nonlocal interactions. Examples include peridynamics, population and opinion dynamics, the spread of disease models, and nonlocal diffusion, to name a few. They also arise naturally as a continuum limit of interacting dynamical systems on networks. Many real-world networks, including neuronal, epidemiological, and information networks, exhibit self-similarity, which translates into self-similarity of the spatial domain of the continuum limit.

For a class of evolution equations with nonlocal interactions on self-similar domains, we construct a discontinuous Galerkin method and develop a framework for studying its convergence. Specifically, for the model at hand, we identify a natural scale of function spaces, which respects self-similarity of the spatial domain, and estimate the rate of convergence under minimal assumptions on the regularity of the interaction kernel. The analytical results are illustrated by numerical experiments on a model problem.

1 Introduction

For a class of interacting dynamical systems on a convergent graph sequence, one can write a continuum limit in the form of a nonlocal diffusion equation [12–14]

$$\partial_t u(t, x) = f(t, u) + \int_{[0,1]} W(x, y) D(u(t, y), u(t, x)) dy, \quad x \in [0, 1], \quad (1.1)$$

where $W \in L^2([0, 1]^2)$ and f, D are sufficiently regular functions. As an example, consider the Kuramoto model of coupled phase oscillators with nonlocal nearest-neighbor coupling

$$\dot{u}_i = \omega + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=i-k}^{i+k} \sin(2\pi(u_j - u_i)), \quad i \in \mathbb{Z}_n \doteq \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}, \quad (1.2)$$

*Department of Mathematics, Drexel University, 3141 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104, medvedev@drexel.edu




Figure 1: Support of W^n (see (1.4)) and that of W , the limit of W^n as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

where $k = \lfloor rn \rfloor$ with $r \in (0, 1/2)$ and $u_i : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{T} \doteq \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ is the phase of oscillator i . In [18], in the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$ (1.2) was approximated by

$$\partial_t u(t, x) = \omega + \int_{\mathbb{T}} K(x - y) \sin(2\pi(u(t, x) - u(t, y))) dy, \quad x \in \mathbb{T}, \quad (1.3)$$

where $K(x)$ is a 1-periodic function equal to $\mathbf{1}_{|x| \leq r}$ for $|x| \leq 1/2$.

The geometric basis of such approximation is clear from the structure of the adjacency matrix of the k -nearest-neighbor graph

$$a_{i,j} = \mathbf{1}_{\{d_n(i,j) \leq \lfloor rn \rfloor\}}, \quad d_n(i, j) = \min\{|i - j|, n - |i - j|\}.$$

Representing this matrix by a step function on the unit square

$$W^n(x, y) = \sum_{i,j=1}^n a_{ij}^n \mathbf{1}_{\left[\frac{i-1}{n}, \frac{i}{n}\right) \times \left[\frac{j-1}{n}, \frac{j}{n}\right)}(x, y), \quad (1.4)$$

it is easy to see that as $n \rightarrow \infty$, the support of W^n tends to the support of the indicator function of W , the kernel in the continuum limit (1.1) (see Figure 1). Thus, formally one expects that the sum on the right-hand side of (1.2) is transformed into the integral on the right-hand side of the continuum limit (1.3). A more careful analysis reveals that the relation between the discrete model and the continuum limit (1.1) can be interpreted with the help of the Galerkin scheme [12]. Specifically, given the continuum limit (1.1) we discretize it by projecting onto a finite-dimensional subspace of the phase space $\mathcal{H} \doteq L^2([0, 1])$, $\mathcal{H}^n \doteq \text{span}\{\mathbf{1}_{\left[\frac{i-1}{n}, \frac{i}{n}\right)}, i \in [n]\}$. To this end, approximate u by

$$u^n(t, x) = \sum_{i=1}^n u_i^n(t) \mathbf{1}_{\left[\frac{i-1}{n}, \frac{i}{n}\right)}(x),$$

plug this in (1.3) and take the inner product with $\mathbf{1}_{\left[\frac{i-1}{n}, \frac{i}{n}\right)}$ to obtain

$$\dot{u}_i^n = f(t, u_i^n) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n W_{ij}^n D(u_j^n, u_i^n), \quad i \in [n], \quad (1.5)$$




Figure 2: **a)** ST. **b,c)** Graphs approximating ST.

where

$$W_{ij}^n = n^2 \int_{\left[\frac{i-1}{n}, \frac{i}{n}\right] \times \left[\frac{j-1}{n}, \frac{j}{n}\right]} W dx = \int_{\left[\frac{i-1}{n}, \frac{i}{n}\right]} W dx. \quad (1.6)$$

Here and below, for $f \in L^1(Q, \mu)$, $\int_Q f(x) d\mu(x)$ stands for $\mu(Q)^{-1} \int_Q f(x) d\mu(x)$.

It is instructive to rewrite (1.5) as a PDE on $[0, 1]$:

$$\partial_t u^n(t, x) = f(t, u^n) + \int_{[0,1]} W^n(x, y) D(u^n(t, y), u^n(t, x)) dy, \quad x \in [0, 1], \quad (1.7)$$

where

$$W^n(x, y) = \sum_{i,j=1}^n W_{ij}^n \mathbf{1}_{\left[\frac{i-1}{n}, \frac{i}{n}\right] \times \left[\frac{j-1}{n}, \frac{j}{n}\right]}(x, y). \quad (1.8)$$

Thus, the justification of the continuum limit can be rephrased as a convergence problem for the Galerkin scheme for (1.1). Standard estimates yield the following bound for the error of the Galerkin scheme for the problem at hand (cf. [12])

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u(t, \cdot) - u^n(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2([0,1])} \leq C (\|W - W^n\|_{L^2([0,1]^2)} + \|u(0, \cdot) - u^n(0, \cdot)\|_{L^2([0,1])}). \quad (1.9)$$

Thus, the accuracy of the continuum limit is determined by the accuracy of approximation of the graphon W by its L^2 -projection onto \mathcal{H}^n . For W , as a limit of a graph sequence, the only natural regularity assumption is measurability or integrability in case of the L^p -graphons [1]. For $W \in L^p([0, 1]^2)$, $p \geq 1$, by construction, $W^n \rightarrow W$ a.e. and in L^p (see, e.g., [2, Proposition 2.6]). However, in the absence of additional assumptions, the convergence may be arbitrarily slow as the following example from [12] shows.

Consider $W : [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ and denote by W^+ and ∂W^+ , the support of W and its boundary respectively. It is not hard to see that in this case

$$\|W - W^n\|_{L^p([0,1]^2)}^p \leq N(\partial W^+, n) n^{-2}, \quad (1.10)$$

where $N(\partial W^+, n)$ is the number of discrete cells $\left[\frac{i-1}{n}, \frac{i}{n}\right] \times \left[\frac{j-1}{n}, \frac{j}{n}\right]$, $i, j \in [n]$, that intersect ∂W^+ . Let γ stand for the upper box counting dimension $N(\partial W^+, n)$ (cf. [4]),

$$\gamma = \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log N(\partial W^+, n)}{\log n}.$$

Then for any $\epsilon > 0$, we have

$$N(\partial W^+, n) \leq n^{\gamma+\epsilon}. \quad (1.11)$$

By plugging (1.11) into (1.10), we have

$$\|W - W^n\|_{L^p([0,1]^2)} \leq n^{\frac{-2+\gamma+\epsilon}{p}}. \quad (1.12)$$

The bound on the error of approximation suggests that the convergence can be in principle arbitrarily slow if the fractal dimension of the boundary of support of W is sufficiently close to 2.

This leads to the following question: What are the natural assumptions on W just beyond integrability that allow to deduce the rate of convergence of W^n to W ? In [9], the generalized Lipschitz spaces (cf. [16]) were suggested for this role:

$$\text{Lip}(L^p(Q), \alpha) = \{f \in L^p(Q) : \omega_p(f, \delta) \leq C\delta^\alpha\}, \quad 0 < \alpha \leq 1. \quad (1.13)$$

Here, the L^p -modulus of continuity $\omega_p(f, \delta)$ is defined as follows

$$\omega_p(f, \delta) = \sup_{|h| \leq \delta} \|f(\cdot) - f(\cdot + h)\|_{L^p(Q'_h)}, \quad Q'_h = \{x \in Q : x + h \in Q\}, \quad (1.14)$$

and $|x|$ stands for the ℓ^∞ -norm of $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and Q is a given domain.

$\text{Lip}(L^p(Q), \alpha)$ is equipped with the norm

$$\|f\|_{\text{Lip}(L^p(Q), \alpha)} = \sup_{\delta > 0} \delta^{-\alpha} \omega_p(f, \delta). \quad (1.15)$$

For $f \in \text{Lip}(L^p([0, 1]^d), \alpha)$, $p \geq 1$, it was shown [9, 15]

$$\|f - f^n\|_{L^p([0,1]^d)} = O(n^{-\alpha}), \quad (1.16)$$

where f^n is the L^2 -projection of f onto a subspace of piecewise constant functions corresponding to the rectangular discretization of $[0, 1]^d$ with step n^{-1} . The proof of the estimate (1.16) in [9], which is included in the appendix to this paper for completeness, uses a dyadic discretization of $[0, 1]^d$. It turns out that it extends naturally to a large class of self-similar sets. Specifically, in this paper we prove a counterpart of (1.16) for functions defined on attractors of Iterated Function Systems (IFSs) (cf. [3]), which include Sierpinski Triangle (ST), Sierpinski Carpet (SC), and hexagasket, to name a few fractals. Extending Galerkin method to nonlocal equations on fractal domains and obtaining rate of convergence estimate similar to (1.16) requires suitable adaptations of the Galerkin scheme and the generalized Lipschitz spaces to functions on self-similar domains. This is the main contribution of this work.

The outline of this paper is as follows. In Section 2, we collect basic facts about attractors of IFSs following [3] and formulate a nonlocal diffusion equation on a self-similar domain

$$\partial_t u(t, x) = f(t, u) + \int_K W(x, y) D(u(t, y), u(t, x)) d\mu(y), \quad x \in K, \quad (1.17)$$

where compact $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is an attractor of an IFS [3, 5] equipped with self-similar probability measure μ [3, 5, 10]). After that we develop a Galerkin scheme for the nonlocal equation on self-similar sets (§ 2.3). In Section 3, we estimate the rate of convergence of the L^2 -projection of an L^p -function on a self-similar set, which is the key for estimating convergence of the Galerkin scheme. In Section 4, we review numerical methods for integrating functions on fractals, which is needed for the implementation of the Galerkin method. We conclude with a numerical example for a model problem on a ST in Section 5.

2 The nonlocal equation on self-similar domains

In this section, we extend the nonlocal equation (1.1) to fractal domains. First, we review the IFSs to the extent needed to formulate the assumptions on the spatial domain. We follow [10, Chapter 1] (see also [3, § 2.2]). After that we formulate the initial value problem and develop a Galerkin scheme for the counterpart of (1.1) on a self-similar domain.

2.1 Iterated function system

Let (X, \mathbf{d}) be a complete metric space and let $\{F_1, F_2, \dots, F_d\}$ be a set of contractions on X

$$\mathbf{d}(F_i(x), F_i(y)) \leq \lambda_i \mathbf{d}(x, y), \quad x, y \in X, \quad 0 < \lambda_i < 1, \quad i \in [d]. \quad (2.1)$$

A unique compact $K \subset X$ satisfying

$$K = \bigcup_{i=1}^d F_i(K) \quad (2.2)$$

is called an attractor of IFS (2.1) (see [3, Theorem 2.6]). The topological structure of K is understood with the help of the symbolic space $\Sigma = S^{\mathbb{N}}$, where $S = \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$. On Σ , we define the shift map

$$\Sigma \ni w = w_1 w_2 w_3 \dots \mapsto \sigma(w) = w_2 w_3 \dots \in \Sigma.$$

The i th branch of the inverse of σ is denoted by

$$\sigma_i^{-1}(w_1 w_2 w_3 \dots) = i w_1 w_2 w_3 \dots, \quad i \in S.$$

For a fixed $r \in (0, 1)$, $\delta_r(w, v) = r^{\min\{m: w_m \neq v_m\}}$ defines a metric on Σ . (Σ, δ_r) is a compact metric space (cf. [10, Theorem 1.2.2]).

Let $\pi: \Sigma \rightarrow K$ be defined by

$$\Sigma \ni w \mapsto \pi(w) = \bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} F_{w_1 w_2 \dots w_k}(K) \in K, \quad (2.3)$$

where $F_w \doteq F_{w_1} \circ F_{w_2} \circ \dots \circ F_{w_m}$, $w = w_1 w_2 \dots w_m$. π is a continuous surjective map [10, Theorem 1.2.3].

Bernoulli measure with weights

$$\mathbf{p} = (p_1, p_2, \dots, p_d), \quad \sum_{i=1}^d p_i = 1, \quad p_i > 0, \quad (2.4)$$

is defined on cylinders $C_{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_l} = \{(w_1, w_2, \dots) \in \Sigma : w_1 = c_1, w_2 = c_2, \dots, w_l = c_l\}$, $c_i \in S$,

$$\nu(C_{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_p}) = p_{c_1} p_{c_2} \dots p_{c_p}, \quad (2.5)$$

and is extended to a unique measure on (Σ, \mathcal{B}) . Here, \mathcal{B} is a Borel σ -algebra in Σ generated by the collection of cylinders.

The Bernoulli measure can be characterized as a unique Borel regular probability measure on Σ that satisfies

$$\nu(A) = \sum_{i \in S} p_i \nu(\sigma_i A)$$

for any Borel set $A \subset \Sigma$ [10].

A pushforward of ν yields a self-similar measure on K :

$$\mu(A) = \nu(\pi^{-1}A), \quad A \in \mathcal{N} = \{A \subset K : \pi^{-1}A \in \mathcal{M}\}. \quad (2.6)$$

We suppress the dependence of ν and μ on \mathbf{p} to avoid overcomplicated notation.

Theorem 1.4.5 in [10] gives necessary and sufficient conditions for

$$\mu(K_w) = p_{w_1} p_{w_2} \dots p_{w_m}, \quad K_w = F_w(K), \quad w = w_1 w_2 \dots w_m, \quad (2.7)$$

where as before F_w stands for $F_{w_1} \circ F_{w_2} \circ \dots \circ F_{w_m}$. These conditions are usually straightforward to check in practice. For instance, (2.7) holds if $\pi^{-1}(x)$ is a finite set for any $x \in K$ (cf. [10, Corollary 1.4.8]). Instead of stating the conditions from [10, Theorem 1.4.5], we postulate (2.7) as an assumption on K as an attractor of an IFS. Alternatively, one can impose the Open Set Condition (see [3]).

An important implication of (2.7) is the following property

$$\mu\left(K_{wi} \cap K_{wj}\right) = 0, \quad i \neq j, |w| = m, \quad (2.8)$$

for any $m = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. Measure ν is ergodic with respect to the measure preserving shift map σ . We conclude our review of IFSs with a few examples of self-similar sets.

Example 2.1. *The following are three representative examples of self-similar sets.*

(ST) *We begin with the definition of ST. Let $X = \mathbb{R}^2$ and let v_1, v_2, v_3 be vertices of an equilateral triangle (see Fig. 2a) and*

$$F_i = 2^{-1}(x - v_i) + v_i, \quad i \in [3].$$

Then (2.2) defines ST. The self-similar probability measure in this case satisfies

$$\mu(B) = \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{1}{3} \mu(F_i^{-1}(B)),$$

for every Borel $B \subset K$. Here, we took $p_1 = p_2 = p_3 = 1/3$. With this choice of \mathbf{p} , μ is called a standard self-similar measure on ST (cf. [10]).

(SC) *Let $X = \mathbb{R}^2$ and the set of v_i , $i \in [8]$ consists of $(0, 0)$, $(0, 0.5)$, $(0, 1)$, $(1, 0.5)$, $(1, 1)$, $(0.5, 1)$, $(0, 1)$, $(0, 0.5)$, $F_i = \frac{1}{3}(x + 2v_i)$. This yields Sierpinski carpet (SC).*

(UC) *Let $X = \mathbb{R}^d$, $v_i \in \{0, 1\}^d$, $i \in [2^d]$, are the vertices of the unit square, and*

$$F_i = 2^{-1}(x - v_i) + v_i, \quad i \in [2^d].$$

Then (2.2) defines the d -cube. The self-similar measure in this case is the Lebesgue measure. Thus, the IFS model naturally combines both Euclidean and fractal sets as possible domains for the nonlocal diffusion equation.

2.2 The nonlocal equation

Let K be an attractor of an IFS equipped with a self-similar probability measure μ and consider

$$\partial_t u(t, x) = f(t, u) + \int_K W(x, y) D(u(t, x), u(t, y)) d\mu(y), \quad (2.9)$$

$$u(0, x) = g(x), \quad x \in K, \quad (2.10)$$

where $W \in L^2(K \times K, \mu \times \mu)$, $g \in L^2(K, \mu)$ and f, D are subject to the following conditions. We assume

$$\max \left\{ \text{ess sup}_{x \in K} \int_K |W(x, y)| d\mu(y), \text{ess sup}_{y \in K} \int_K |W(x, y)| d\mu(x) \right\} < \infty. \quad (2.11)$$

Functions $f(t, u)$ and $D(u, v)$ are jointly continuous and

$$|f(t, u) - f(t, u')| \leq L_f |u - u'|, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}, u, u' \in K, \quad (2.12)$$

$$|D(u, v) - D(u', v')| \leq L_D (|u - u'| + |v - v'|), \quad \forall u, v, u', v' \in K, \quad (2.13)$$

where L_f and L_D are positive Lipschitz constants. In addition,

$$\sup_{K \times K} |D(u, v)| \leq 1. \quad (2.14)$$

Theorem 2.2. *Suppose (2.11)-(2.14) hold and $g \in L^2(K, \mu)$. Then for any $T > 0$, the IVP (2.9)-(2.10) has a unique solution $u \in C^1(0, T; L^2(K, \mu))$.*

Proof. The proof is the same as in [7, Theorem 3.1] modulo minor notational adjustments. \square

2.3 Galerkin scheme for a nonlocal equation on a self-similar domain

Next, we construct a Galerkin approximation of (2.9), (2.10). First, we discretize K . To this end, we build self-similar partitions that are naturally associated with K . Let $w = (w_1, w_2, \dots, w_m) \in \Sigma_m$, $w_i \in S$, be an itinerary of length $m = |w|$ and consider the following partition of K :

$$\mathcal{K}^m \doteq \{K_w : K_w = F_w(K), |w| = m\}, \quad K = \bigcup_{|w|=m} K_w. \quad (2.15)$$

Using \mathcal{K}^m , we define a finite-dimensional subspace of $\mathcal{H} \doteq L^2(K, \mu \times \mu)$, $\mathcal{H}^m = \text{span}\{\mathbf{1}_A : A \in \mathcal{K}^m\}$. Here and below, $\mathbf{1}_A$ is the indicator of A . In general, $K_w \cap K_v$ may be nonempty for two distinct $w, v \in \Sigma_m$, but $\mu(K_w \cap K_v) = 0$ thanks to (2.8). The overlap in support of the basis functions of \mathcal{H}^m does not interfere with the convergence of the L^2 -projections of the elements of \mathcal{H} onto \mathcal{H}^m .

Next, we approximate the solution of the IVP (2.9), (2.10) by a piecewise constant function:

$$u^m(t, x) = \sum_{|w|=m} u_w(t) \mathbf{1}_{K_w}(x). \quad (2.16)$$

After inserting (2.16) into (2.9) and projecting onto \mathcal{H}^m we arrive at the following discretization of (2.9):

$$\dot{u}_w = f(u_w, t) + \sum_{|v|=m} W_{wv} D(u_w, u_v) \mu(K_v), \quad (2.17)$$

where

$$W_{wv} = \int_{K_w \times K_v} W(x) d(\mu \times \mu)(x), \quad |w| = |v| = m. \quad (2.18)$$

System of ODEs (2.17) can be rewritten as

$$\partial_t u^m(t, x) = f(u^m, t) + \int_K W^m(x, y) D(u^m(t, x), u^m(t, y)) d\mu(y), \quad (2.19)$$

where

$$W^m = \sum_{|w|, |v|=m} W_{wv} \mathbf{1}_{K_{wv}}, \quad K_{wv} \doteq K_w \times K_v. \quad (2.20)$$

Similarly we approximate the initial condition (2.10) by

$$g^m = \sum_{|w|=m} g_w \mathbf{1}_{K_w}, \quad g_w = \int_{K_w} g d\mu. \quad (2.21)$$

Theorem 2.3. *Consider the IVPs for (2.9), (2.19) subject to initial conditions (2.10) and (2.21) respectively. Then for a given $T > 0$, there exists $C > 0$ not dependent on $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that*

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u^m(t, \cdot) - u(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2(K, \mu)} \leq C \left(\|W^m - W\|_{L^2(K \times K, \mu \times \mu)} + \|u^m(0, \cdot) - u(0, \cdot)\|_{L^2(K, \mu)} \right). \quad (2.22)$$

Proof. The proof follows the lines of the proof the analogous statement in the Euclidean setting (cf. [8, 14]). \square

3 Approximation of functions on self-similar domains

In view of (2.22), our next step is to study convergence of the L^2 -projections for functions defined on self-similar sets. As will be clear from the analysis of this section, the convergence estimates in this case depend on the geometry of the domain in general. The solution is more transparent in the case of self-affine sets, which already contains many interesting domains. Thus, in this section we restrict to $F_i : X \rightarrow X, i \in [d]$, are affine contracting maps with the same contraction constant

$$|F_i(x) - F_i(y)| = \lambda |x - y|, \quad 0 < \lambda < 1, \quad x, y \in X. \quad (3.1)$$

To this end, let K be an attractor of the IFS (3.1). Assume that K is equipped with a self-similar measure μ , defined as a pushforward of the Bernoulli measure with weights $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, p_2, \dots, p_d)$ (see (2.5)).

For $i, j \in S, i \neq j$, define τ_{ij} as a unique vector such that

$$T_{\tau_{ij}}(F_i(K)) = F_j(K),$$

where $T_{\tau_{ij}}(x) \doteq x + \tau_{ij}$.

Before we continue, we need to modify the definition of the generalized Lipschitz spaces to make them applicable to the analysis of functions on attractors of IFSs.

Definition 3.1. For $\phi \in L^p(K, \mu)$, $p \geq 1$, define the L^p -modulus of continuity as follows

$$\omega_p(\phi, \lambda, m) = \sup_{\ell \geq m} \max_{i \neq j} \left\{ \|\phi(\cdot + \tau) - \phi(\cdot)\|_{L^p(K'_\tau, \mu)} : \tau = \lambda^{-(\ell+1)} \tau_{ij}, i, j \in S \right\},$$

where $K'_\tau = \{x \in K : x + \tau \in K\}$.

Further, for $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, define the generalized Lipschitz space

$$\text{Lip}(L^p(K, \mu), \alpha, \lambda) = \{\phi \in L^p(K, \mu) : \exists C > 0 : \omega_p(\phi, \lambda, m) \leq C\lambda^{\alpha m}\}$$

equipped with the norm

$$\|\phi\|_{\text{Lip}(L^p(K, \mu), \alpha, \lambda)} \doteq \sup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda^{-\alpha m} \omega_p(\phi, \lambda, m).$$

The following lemma is the key result of this work.

Lemma 3.2. Let $\phi \in \text{Lip}(\alpha, L^p(K, \mu))$, $p \geq 1$. Then

$$\|\phi^m - \phi\|_{L^p(K, \mu)} \leq \frac{d^{1/p}}{1 - \lambda^\alpha} \|\phi\|_{\text{Lip}(L^p(K, \mu), \alpha, \lambda)} \lambda^{\alpha m}. \quad (3.2)$$

Remark 3.3. It is instructive to compare the proof this lemma to the proof of its Euclidean counterpart (see Lemma A.1 in the Appendix).

Proof. Fix $m \geq 1$ and partition K into d^m subsets

$$K_w = F_w(K), \quad w \in \Sigma_m.$$

As in the proof of Lemma A.1, we represent ϕ^{m+1} as

$$\phi^{m+1} = \sum_{|w|=m} \sum_{j \in S} \phi_{wj} \mathbf{1}_{K_{wj}}, \quad (3.3)$$

where

$$\phi_{wj} = \int_{K_{wj}} \phi d\mu.$$

Likewise,

$$\begin{aligned} \phi^m &= \sum_{|w|=m} \sum_{j \in S} \phi_w \mathbf{1}_{K_{wj}} \\ &= \sum_{|w|=m} \sum_{j \in S} \sum_{k \in S} p_k \phi_{wk} \mathbf{1}_{K_{wj}}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

where we used $\phi_w = \sum_{k \in S} p_k \phi_{wk}$.

By subtracting (3.3) from (3.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \phi^m(x) - \phi^{m+1}(x) &= p_k \sum_{w,j,k} \left(\int_{K_{wj}} - \int_{K_{wk}} \right) \phi(z) dz \mathbf{1}_{K_{wj}}(x) \\ &= \sum_{w,j,k} p_k \int_{K_{wj}} [\phi(y + \tau_{jk}^m) - \phi(y)] d\mu(y) \mathbf{1}_{K_{wj}}(x), \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

where

$$\sum_{w,j,k} \doteq \sum_{|w|=m} \sum_{j \in S} \sum_{S \ni k \neq j} \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_{ij}^m = \lambda^m \tau_{ij}, \quad i, j \in S, i \neq j.$$

After raising both sides of (3.5) to the p th power and integrating over K , we have

$$\int_K |\phi^m - \phi^{m+1}|^p d\mu = \sum_{w,j,k} p_k^p \left| \int_{K_{wj}} [\phi(y + \tau_{jk}^m) - \phi(y)] d\mu(y) \right|^p \mu(K_{wj}). \quad (3.6)$$

Using the Jensen's inequality, from (3.6) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_K |\phi^m - \phi^{m+1}|^p d\mu &\leq \sum_{w,j,k} p_k^p \int_{K_{wj}} |\phi(y + \tau_{jk}^m) - \phi(y)|^p d\mu(y) \mu(K_{wj}) \\ &= \sum_{j,k} p_k^p \left(\sum_w \int_{K_{wj}} |\phi(y + \tau_{jk}^m) - \phi(y)|^p d\mu(y) \right) \\ &\leq C(d, \mathbf{p}, p) \omega_p^p(\phi, \lambda, m), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$C(d, \mathbf{p}, p) = \sum_j \sum_{k \neq j} p_k^p \leq \sum_j (1 - p_j^p) \leq d.$$

From this we conclude

$$\|\phi^m - \phi^{m+1}\|_{L^p(K, \mu)} \leq d^{1/p} \omega_p(\phi, \lambda, m).$$

For any integer $M > m$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi^m - \phi^{m+M}\|_{L^p(K, \mu)} &\leq \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} \|\phi^k - \phi^{k+1}\|_{L^p(K, \mu)} \\ &\leq d^{1/p} \|\phi\|_{\text{Lip}(L^p(K, \mu), \alpha, \lambda)} \frac{\lambda^{\alpha m}}{1 - \lambda^\alpha}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

By passing M to infinity in (3.7), we get (3.2). \square

Remark 3.4. For (2.22), we also need error estimate for $W \in L^2(K \times K, \mu \times \mu)$. To this end, we note that under the assumptions made in this section, $K \times K$ is a self-similar subset of $X \times X$ generated by d^2 contractions $F_{ij} = (F_i, F_j)$, $i, j \in S$ with the same contraction constant λ as before. Therefore, (3.2) still holds after replacing d by d^2 .

4 Integration of functions on self-similar domains

Numerical implementation of the Galerkin scheme (2.17) requires computation of the integrals of the form

$$\int_{K_{wv}} Wd(\mu \times \mu) \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{K_w} gd\mu \quad w, v \in \Sigma_m. \quad (4.1)$$

Since μ is a self-similar measure defined as a pushforward of the Bernoulli measure, a few comments on practical evaluation of (4.1) are in order.

In this section, we review three algorithms of numerical evaluation of (4.1). They are based on two sets of ideas. The first one is based on ergodicity of μ [3], which can be used to construct Monte-Carlo type approximations. The second set is related to uniform partitions that are naturally associated with self-similar sets [6]. This leads to quasi-Monte-Carlo type methods. For the latter, we estimate the rate of convergence of numerical approximation of (4.1) assuming some regularity, for instance, Hölder continuity of the integrand.

By the reasons explained in Remark 3.4, it is sufficient to discuss the problem of evaluation of (4.1) only for $\int_{K_w} \phi d\mu$ with $\phi \in L^1(K, \mu)$. Furthermore, since

$$\frac{\mu(\cdot)}{\mu(K_w)}$$

is a probability measure on K_w , without loss of generality we may consider

$$\int_K \phi d\mu, \quad \phi \in L^1(K, \mu). \quad (4.2)$$

Therefore, in the remainder of this section we will focus on the problem of evaluation of (4.2). To this end, let K be an attractor of a system of contractions (cf. (2.1)). We assume that F_i 's satisfy the Open Set Condition (cf. [5, 10]), which, in particular, implies (2.8) (cf. [5]).

The first algorithm relies on the following lemma.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\phi \in L^1(K, \mu)$. Then*

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \phi(\pi(\sigma^j s)) = \int_K \phi(x) d\mu(x). \quad (4.3)$$

Proof. Since ν is an ergodic probability measure, by the Ergodic Theorem (cf. [3, Theorem 6.1]), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \phi(\pi(\sigma^j s)) &= \int_{\Sigma} \phi \circ \pi(y) d\nu(y) \\ &= \int_K \phi(x) d\mu(x). \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 4.1 suggests the following algorithm for evaluating (4.2) in the spirit of the Monte-Carlo method

Algorithm I. Let $\phi \in L^1(K, \mu)$.

- Generate a random string of length $2N$: $s = (s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{2N}) \sim \text{Uniform}(\Sigma_{2N})$.

- Set

$$S_N := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \phi(\pi(\sigma^{i-1}s)).$$

- Use S_N to approximate $\int_K \phi d\mu$.

Algorithm I is essentially a Monte-Carlo method. As usual with the Monte-Carlo schemes, the convergence is slow but it depends neither on the dimension of the spatial domain nor does it require any regularity of ϕ beyond integrability. For continuous functions, one can use a quasi-Monte-Carlo type algorithm based on uniform sequences (cf. [6]).

Algorithm II.

- Pick $x_0 \in K$.

- Compute $x_w = F_w(x_0)$, $w \in \Sigma_m$.

- Set $N = d^m$, $S_N := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{|w|=m} \phi(x_w)$.

Lemma 4.2. For $f \in C(K)$,

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \left| S_N - \int_K f d\mu \right| = 0. \quad (4.4)$$

Proof. Points $\{x_w, |w| = m\}$ form a uniform sequence (cf. [6, Theorem 2.5]). □

Furthermore, Theorem 3.1 in [6] gives an estimate of the discrepancy, which together with Koksma–Hlawka inequality would imply $O(N^{-1})$ convergence in (4.4). We are not aware of an analog of the Koksma–Hlawka inequality applicable to the problem at hand¹. On the other hand, if one allows for a little more regularity of ϕ , the rate of convergence for a slight modification of Algorithm II can be estimated. For simplicity, we formulate the algorithm and the convergence result for functions ST used in the numerical example in the following section.

Algorithm III. Let T stand for an equilateral triangle with sides of length 1 and denote $T_w = F_w(T)$, $w \in \Sigma_m$. Denote the vertices of T_w by

$$q_i^w = \pi(w\bar{i}), \quad \phi_i^w = \phi(q_i), i \in [3].$$

¹There is a variant of Koksma–Hlawka inequality for functions on fractals in [11], but it relies on harmonic splines, and does not apply to our setting.

Set

$$S_N \doteq \frac{1}{3^{m+1}} \sum_{|w|=m} \sum_{j=1}^3 \phi_j^w, \quad N = 3^m. \quad (4.5)$$

Lemma 4.3. *Suppose K is a ST and $\phi \in C(K)$ is a twice continuously differentiable function in directions τ_i , $i \in [3]$. Then*

$$\left| \int_K \phi d\mu - S_N \right| = O(h^2), \quad h = 2^{-m}. \quad (4.6)$$

If ϕ is only Hölder continuous with exponent $\alpha \in (0, 1]$. Then

$$\left| \int_K \phi d\mu - S_N \right| = O(h^\alpha). \quad (4.7)$$

Remark 4.4. *It is evident from the proof of the lemma that (4.7) extends to Hölder continuous functions on attractors of IFS (3.1):*

$$\left| \int_K \phi d\mu - S_N \right| = O(\lambda^{\alpha m}), \quad N = d^m. \quad (4.8)$$

Proof. Denote

$$q_{ij}^w = \frac{1}{2} (q_i^w + q_j^w) \quad \text{and} \quad \phi_{ij}^w = \phi(q_{ij}^w) \quad 0 < i < j \leq 3.$$

By Taylor's formula, for $h = 2^{-(m+1)}$ and $0 < i < j \leq 3$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(q_i^w) &= \phi(q_{ij}^w) - D_{\tau_{ij}} \phi(q_{ij}^w) h + \frac{1}{2} D_{\tau_{ij}}^2 \phi(\xi_{ij}^w) h^2, \\ \phi(q_j^w) &= \phi(q_{ij}^w) + D_{\tau_{ij}} \phi(q_{ij}^w) h + \frac{1}{2} D_{\tau_{ij}}^2 \phi(\eta_{ij}^w) h^2, \end{aligned}$$

where ξ_{ij}^w, η_{ij}^w lie in the segment connecting q_i^w and q_j^w , and D_τ stands for the directional derivative. From here we conclude that

$$2\phi(q_{ij}^w) = \phi(q_i^w) + \phi(q_j^w) + O(h^2). \quad (4.9)$$

Recall

$$S_m = \frac{1}{3^{m+1}} \sum_{|w|=m} \sum_{j=1}^3 \phi_j^w$$

and note that

$$\begin{aligned} S_{m+1} &= \frac{1}{3^{m+2}} \sum_{|w|=m} \left(\sum_{j=1}^3 \phi_j^w + \sum_{k \neq l} \phi_{kl}^w \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{3^{m+1}} \sum_{|w|=m} \left(\sum_{j=1}^3 \phi_j^w + O(h^2) \right) = S_m + O(h^2), \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

where we used (4.9) to obtain the second equality in (4.10). From (4.10), recalling $h = 2^{-(m+1)}$, we conclude that $\{S_m\}$ is a convergent sequence with the rate specified in (4.6).

To prove (4.7), replace (4.9) with

$$2\phi(q_{ij}^w) = \phi(q_i^w) + \phi(q_j^w) + O(h^\alpha)$$

and continue as above. □

5 Numerical example

In this section, we present numerical results illustrating analysis in the previous sections. To this end, consider the following IVP

$$\partial_t u(t, x) = \int_K W(x, y) (u(t, y) - u(t, x)) d\mu(y), \quad (5.1)$$

$$u(0, x) = \begin{cases} 1, & x \in F_2(K), \\ -1, & x \in F_1(K) \cup F_3(K), \end{cases} \quad (5.2)$$

where $W(x, y) = \exp\{-2|x - y|^2\}$ and K is ST (cf. Example 2.1). We use the same notation for W as a function on \mathbb{R}^2 and its restriction to K .

Next we discretize (5.1), (5.2) as explained in § 2.3. Specifically, we approximate $u(t, x)$ by a piecewise constant function in x , $u^m(t, x)$ (cf. (2.16)), and form a system of ODEs (2.17). The latter is solved by the fourth order Runge-Kutta method with temporal step $\Delta t = 10^{-3}$. The spatial profile of the numerical solution in Figure 3a. To better visualize solution, we plot $u^m(t, h(x))$ with

$$h : K \ni x \mapsto \bar{x} \in [0, 1]$$

such that

$$\begin{aligned} x &= F_w(K), \quad w \in \Sigma, \\ \bar{x} &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{w_i - 1}{d^i}, \quad (\text{cf. §2.1}). \end{aligned}$$

Note that h is a measure preserving map from (K, μ) to $[0, 1]$ equipped with Lebesgue measure.

We chose a higher order Runge–Kutta scheme and integrated until a small time $t = 0.1$ to discount for the error due to the temporal discretization. The latter can be analyzed by standard techniques for numerical integration of ODEs (see [9, Section 6] for the analysis of a closely related problem). For the model at hand, the error of temporal discretization is dominated by the error of the Galerkin scheme analyzed above. To estimate the rate of convergence of the numerical scheme, we assume

$$\Delta^l \doteq \|u^{l+1}(t, \cdot) - u^l(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2(K, \mu)} \sim C\lambda^{\alpha^l},$$

as implied by (2.22), (3.2). Then after computing Δ^l and Δ^{l+1} we estimate

$$\alpha^l = \frac{\log \Delta^{l+1} - \log \Delta^l}{\log \lambda}. \quad (5.3)$$




Figure 3: **a**) Numerical solution of the IVP (5.1), (5.2) computed for $t = 0.1$ and $m = 6$. **b**) Numerical approximations $u^m(0.1, x)$ computed with $m = 4$ (black), $m = 5$ (blue), and $m = 6$ (red).

Numerical estimates

$$\alpha^3 \approx 1.002, \alpha^4 \approx 1.015, \alpha^5 \approx 1.007$$

agree well with the theoretical estimate $\alpha = 1$ obtained for smooth W (cf. (3.2)). It would be interesting to test convergence rate for $W \in \text{Lip}(\alpha, L^p(K, \mu))$ with fractional $\alpha \in (0, 1)$.

A Approximation of functions on the unit cube

In this appendix, we include the proof of (1.16) for functions defined on the unit d -cube $Q = [0, 1]^d$, i.e., in the Euclidean setting (cf. [9, Section 5]). The generalization of this proof yields the rate of convergence estimate for functions on self-similar domains (see Section 3).

Let $f \in \text{Lip}(L^p(Q), \alpha)$, $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, $1 \leq p < \infty$, and approximate it by

$$f^n(x) = \sum_{i \in [n]^d} \int_{Q_i} f(z) dz \mathbf{1}_{Q_i}(x), \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where

$$Q_i = \left[\frac{i_1 - 1}{n}, \frac{i_1}{n} \right) \times \cdots \times \left[\frac{i_d - 1}{n}, \frac{i_d}{n} \right), \quad i = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_d).$$

We want to estimate $\|f - f^n\|_{L^p(Q)}^p$, $p \geq 1$. To utilize self-similar structure of the unit cube, below we use a dyadic discretization of Q , i.e., $n := 2^m$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$. To avoid excessively cumbersome notation, for the remainder of this section, we denote $f^m := f^{2^m}$.

Lemma A.1. *Let $f \in \text{Lip}(L^p(Q), \alpha)$, $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, $1 \leq p < \infty$. Then*

$$\|f - f^m\|_{L^p(Q)}^p \leq C \|f\|_{\text{Lip}(L^p(Q), \alpha)}^p 2^{-\alpha m}, \quad C = \frac{(2^d - 1)^{1/p} 2^\alpha d^{\alpha/2}}{2^\alpha - 1}. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Proof. Let $h = 2^{-m}$ and denote

$$Q'_i = \left[\frac{i_1 - 1}{n}, \frac{i_1 - 1}{n} + \frac{h}{2} \right) \times \cdots \times \left[\frac{i_d - 1}{n}, \frac{i_d - 1}{n} + \frac{h}{2} \right),$$

$$Q_{ij} = Q'_i + \frac{h}{2}j, \quad i \in [n]^d, j \in \{0, 1\}^d.$$

The right-hand side of the definition of Q_{ij} is interpreted as the translation of Q'_i by $\frac{h}{2}j$.

With these definitions, we can express

$$f^{m+1}(x) = \sum_{i \in [n]^d} \sum_{j \in \{0, 1\}^d} \int_{Q_{ij}} f(z) dz \mathbf{1}_{Q_{ij}}(x). \quad (\text{A.3})$$

In the remainder of the proof, the ranges of the indices i and j will remain $[n]^d$ and $\{0, 1\}^d$ respectively. They will be omitted for brevity.

$$\begin{aligned} f^m(x) &= \sum_i \int_{Q_i} f(z) dz \mathbf{1}_{Q_i}(x) \\ &= \sum_i \left\{ \left(2^{-d} \sum_{k \in \{0, 1\}^d} \int_{Q_{ik}} f(z) dz \right) \left(\sum_j \mathbf{1}_{Q_{ij}}(x) \right) \right\} \\ &= 2^{-d} \sum_{i, j, k} \int_{Q_{ik}} f(z) dz \mathbf{1}_{Q_{ij}}(x). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.4})$$

From (A.3) and (A.4), we have

$$2^d (f^{m+1}(x) - f^m(x)) = \sum_{i, j} \sum_{k \neq j} \left(\int_{Q_{ij}} - \int_{Q_{ik}} \right) f(z) dz \mathbf{1}_{Q_{ij}}(x).$$

We continue with the following estimates

$$\begin{aligned} 2^{dp} \|f^{m+1} - f^m\|_{L^p(Q)}^p &\leq 2^{-d(m+1)} \sum_{i, j, k \neq j} \left| \int_{Q'_i} \left(f(s + \frac{h}{2}j) - f(s + \frac{h}{2}k) \right) ds \right|^p \\ &\leq 2^{-d(m+1)} \sum_{i, k \neq j} \left(\sum_i \int_{Q'_i} \left| f(s + \frac{h}{2}j) - f(s + \frac{h}{2}k) \right|^p ds \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{i, k \neq j} \int_{Q'} \left| f(s) - f(s + \frac{h}{2}(k - j)) \right|^p ds \\ &\leq 2^d (2^d - 1) \omega_p^p \left(f, \sqrt{d} \frac{h}{2} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

From (A.5), we have

$$\|f^{m+1} - f^m\|_{L^p(Q)} \leq (2^d - 1)^{1/p} \|f\|_{\text{Lip}(L^p(Q), \alpha)} d^{\alpha/2} 2^{-\alpha(m+1)}. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

We conclude that $\{f^m\}$ is a Cauchy sequence and

$$\|f^m - f\|_{L^p(Q)} \leq \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} \|f^{k+1} - f^k\|_{L^p(Q)} \leq \frac{(2^d - 1)^{1/p} 2^{\alpha} d^{\alpha/2}}{2^{\alpha} - 1} \|f\|_{\text{Lip}(L^p(Q), \alpha)} 2^{-\alpha m}.$$

□

Acknowledgements. The author is grateful to Alexander Teplyaev for very helpful discussions on the Galerkin scheme in the fractal setting. This work was partially supported by NSF grant DMS 2009233.

References

- [1] Christian Borgs, Jennifer T. Chayes, Henry Cohn, and Yufei Zhao, *An L^p theory of sparse graph convergence I: Limits, sparse random graph models, and power law distributions*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **372** (2019), no. 5, 3019–3062.
- [2] S. Chatterjee, *Large deviations for random graphs*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 2197, Springer, Cham, 2017, Lecture notes from the 45th Probability Summer School held in Saint-Flour, June 2015, École d’Été de Probabilités de Saint-Flour. [Saint-Flour Probability Summer School].
- [3] Kenneth Falconer, *Techniques in fractal geometry*, John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Chichester, 1997. MR 1449135
- [4] ———, *Fractal geometry*, third ed., John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Chichester, 2014, Mathematical foundations and applications.
- [5] John E. Hutchinson, *Fractals and self-similarity*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **30** (1981), no. 5, 713–747.
- [6] Maria Infusino and Aljoša Volčič, *Uniform distribution on fractals*, Unif. Distrib. Theory **4** (2009), no. 2, 47–58.
- [7] Dmitry Kaliuzhnyi-Verbovetskyi and Georgi S. Medvedev, *The semilinear heat equation on sparse random graphs*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **49** (2017), no. 2, 1333–1355.
- [8] ———, *The Mean Field Equation for the Kuramoto Model on Graph Sequences with Non-Lipschitz Limit*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **50** (2018), no. 3, 2441–2465.
- [9] ———, *Sparse Monte Carlo method for nonlocal diffusion problems*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **60** (2022), no. 6, 3001–3028.
- [10] Jun Kigami, *Analysis on fractals*, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, vol. 143, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2001.
- [11] Jens Malmquist and Robert S. Strichartz, *Numerical integration for fractal measures*, J. Fractal Geom. **5** (2018), no. 2, 165–226.

- [12] Georgi S. Medvedev, *The nonlinear heat equation on dense graphs and graph limits*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **46** (2014), no. 4, 2743–2766.
- [13] ———, *The nonlinear heat equation on W -random graphs*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **212** (2014), no. 3, 781–803.
- [14] ———, *The continuum limit of the Kuramoto model on sparse random graphs*, Communications in Mathematical Sciences **17** (2019), no. 4, 883–898.
- [15] Georgi S. Medvedev and Gideon Simpson, *A numerical method for a nonlocal diffusion equation with additive noise*, Stochastics and Partial Differential Equations: Analysis and Computations (2022).
- [16] S. M. Nikolskiĭ, *Approximation of functions of several variables and imbedding theorems*, Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 205, Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1975, Translated from the Russian by John M. Danskin, Jr.
- [17] Robert S. Strichartz and Michael Usher, *Splines on fractals*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **129** (2000), no. 2, 331–360.
- [18] D.A. Wiley, S.H. Strogatz, and M. Girvan, *The size of the sync basin*, Chaos **16** (2006), no. 1, 015103, 8.