

Galerkin approximation of a nonlocal diffusion equation on Euclidean and fractal domains

Georgi S. Medvedev*

June 29, 2023

Abstract

The continuum limit of a system of interacting particles on a convergent family of graphs can be described by a nonlocal evolution equation in the limit as the number of particles goes to infinity. Given the continuum limit, the discrete model can be viewed as a Galerkin approximation of the limiting continuous equation. We estimate the speed of convergence of the Galerkin scheme for the model at hand on Euclidean and fractal domains. The latter are relevant when the underlying family of graphs approximates a fractal. Conversely, this paper proposes a Galerkin scheme for a nonlocal diffusion equation on self-similar domains and establishes its convergence rate. Convergence analysis is complemented with numerical integration results for a model problem on Sierpinski Triangle. The rate of convergence of numerical solutions of the model problem fits well the analytical estimate.

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 [11–13]

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

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

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

where $k = \lfloor rn \rfloor$ with $r \in (0, 1/2)$ and $u_i : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{T} \doteq \mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z}$ is the phase of oscillator i . In [17], in the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$ (1.2) was approximated by

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

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

*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 $n \rightarrow \infty$.

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

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

By representing this matrix by a 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 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 [11]. Specifically, given the continuum limit (1.1) we discretize it by projecting onto the 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

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

where

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

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

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




Figure 2: **a)** ST. **b)** Graph approximating ST.

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. [11])

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

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 integrality in case of the L^p -graphons [1]. For $W \in L^p([0, 1]^2)$, $W^n \rightarrow W$ a.e. or in L^p by standard results in real analysis, albeit the rate of convergence may be arbitrarily slow as the following example from [11] 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

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

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^+ . Using the upper box counting dimension $N(\partial W^+, n)$ [3],

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

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

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

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 question of what are the natural (minimal) assumptions on W beyond integrability that would allow to deduce the rate of convergence of W^n to W . In [8], the generalized Lipschitz spaces (cf. [15]) were suggested for this role:

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

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

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

and $|x|$ stands for the ℓ^∞ -norm of $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

$\text{Lip}(L^p(Q), \alpha)$ 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 $f \in \text{Lip}(L^p(Q), \alpha)$, using Jensen's inequality one can show [14]

$$\|f - f^n\|_{L^p(Q)} \leq Cn^{-\alpha}, \quad (1.16)$$

where for simplicity $Q = [0, 1]^d$. An alternative proof given in [8] uses a dyadic discretization of $[0, 1]^d$. For completeness we present both proofs of the convergence estimate (1.16) for Euclidean domains in Section 2. The latter proof extends naturally to other self-similar sets including Sierpinski Triangle (ST) and Sierpinski Carpet (SC). Extending Galerkin method to nonlocal equations on fractal domains is the main focus of this work.

After a brief review of the convergence analysis of the Galerkin method for a nonlocal problem on a unit d -cube (§ 2), we turn to the analysis of the fractal case. In Section 3, we collect basic facts about attractors of IFSs following [2] (§ 3.1) and formulate a nonlocal diffusion equation on a self-similar domain (§ 3.2)

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

where compact $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is an attractor of an IFS [2, 4] equipped with self-similar probability measure μ [4] (see also [2, 9]). After that we develop a Galerkin scheme for the nonlocal equation on self-similar sets (§ 3.3). In Section 4, 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 5, we review numerical methods for integrating functions on fractals, which is needed for the implementation of the Galerkin method. We conclude with a numerical integration of a model problem on a ST in Section 6.

2 Approximation of functions on the unit cube

In this sections, we prove (1.16) for functions defined on the unit cube $Q = [0, 1]^d$. Let $f \in \text{Lip}(L^p(Q), \alpha)$, $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ and approximate it by

$$f^n(x) = \sum_{i \in [n]^d} \int_{Q_i} f(z) dz \mathbf{1}_{Q_i}(x), \quad (2.1)$$

where

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

Lemma 2.1.

$$\|f - f^n\|_{L^p(Q)}^p \leq C \|f\|_{\text{Lip}(L^p(Q), \alpha)} n^{-\alpha}. \quad (2.2)$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} \|f - f^n\|_{L^p(Q)} &= \int_Q \left| f(x) - \sum_{i \in [n]^d} \int_{Q_i} f(z) dz \mathbf{1}_{Q_i}(x) \right|^p dx \\ &= \int_Q \left| \sum_{i \in [n]^d} \int_{Q_i} \{f(x) - f(z)\} dz \right|^p \mathbf{1}_{Q_i}(x) dx \\ &\leq \int_Q \sum_{i \in [n]^d} \left| \int_{Q_i} \{f(x) - f(z)\} dz \right|^p \mathbf{1}_{Q_i}(x) dx. \end{aligned}$$

By Jensen's inequality,

$$\left| \int_{Q_i} \{f(x) - f(z)\} dz \right|^p \leq \int_{Q_i} |f(x) - f(z)|^p dz.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \|f - f^n\|_{L^p(Q)}^p &\leq \sum_{i \in [n]^d} \int_{Q_i} \int_{Q_i} |f(x) - f(z)|^p dz dx \\ &\leq n^d \sum_{i \in [n]^d} \int_{B(0, \sqrt{dn}^{-1})} \int_{Q_i} |f(x) - f(x+y)|^p \mathbf{1}_{\{x+y\} \in Q_i}(y) dy dx \\ &\leq n^d \int_{B(0, \sqrt{dn}^{-1})} \int_{Q'} |f(x) - f(x+y)|^p dx dy \\ &\leq n^d |B(0, \sqrt{dn}^{-1})| \omega_p^p(f, \sqrt{dn}^{-1}) \\ &\leq n^d |B(0, \sqrt{dn}^{-1})| \|f\|_{\text{Lip}(L^p(Q), \alpha)}^p d^{\alpha p} n^{-\alpha p} \\ &\leq C \|f\|_{\text{Lip}(L^p(Q), \alpha)}^p n^{-\alpha p}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$C = \left(\frac{(\pi d)^{d/2}}{\Gamma\left(\frac{d}{2} + 1\right)} \right)^{1/p} d^\alpha.$$

Here, we used

$$n^d |B(0, \sqrt{d}n^{-1})| = \frac{(\pi d)^{d/2}}{\Gamma(\frac{d}{2} + 1)}.$$

□

Next we prove Lemma 2.2 for dyadic discretization of Q . The second proof uses self-similarity of the unit square and can be extended for functions on fractals. This will be done in Section 4.

Let $n = 2^m$. To avoid excessively cumbersome notation, for the remainder of this section, we denote $f^m := f^{2^m}$.

Lemma 2.2.

$$\|f - f^m\|_{L^p(Q)}^p \leq C \|f\|_{\text{Lip}(L^p(Q), \alpha)} 2^{-\alpha m}, \quad C = \frac{(2^d - 1)^{1/p} 2^\alpha d^{\alpha/2}}{2^\alpha - 1}. \quad (2.3)$$

Proof. The notation remain the same as in the previous lemma. In addition, we use $h := n^{-1} = 2^{-m}$ and

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

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

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

$$f^{m+1}(x) = \sum_{i \in [n]^d} \sum_{j \in \{0,1\}^d} \mathbf{1}_{Q_{ij}}(x). \quad (2.4)$$

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.

$$\begin{aligned} f^m(x) &= \sum_i \int_{Q_i} f(z) dz \mathbf{1}_{Q_i}(x) \\ &= 2^{-d} \sum_i \left(\sum_{k \in \{0,1\}^d} \int_{Q_{ik}} f(z) dz \right) \left(\sum_j \mathbf{1}_{Q_{ij}}(x) \right) \\ &= 2^{-d} \sum_{i,j,k} \int_{Q_{ik}} f(z) dz \mathbf{1}_{Q_{ij}}(x). \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

From (2.4) and (2.5), 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

$$\begin{aligned}
2^{dp} \|f^{m+1} - f^m\|_{L^p(Q)}^p &\leq 2^{d(m+1)} \sum_{i,j,k \neq j} \left| \int_{Q'_i} \left(f(s + \frac{h}{2}j) - f(s + \frac{h}{2}k) \right) ds \right|^p \\
&\leq \sum_{j,k \neq j} \left(\sum_i \int_{Q'_i} \left| f(s + \frac{h}{2}j) - f(s + \frac{h}{2}k) \right|^p ds \right) \\
&\leq \sum_{j,k \neq j} \int_{Q'} \left| f(s) - f(s + \frac{h}{2}(k-j)) \right|^p ds \\
&\leq 2^d (2^d - 1) \omega_p^p \left(f, \sqrt{d} \frac{h}{2} \right). \tag{2.6}
\end{aligned}$$

From (2.6), we have

$$\|f^{m+1} - f^m\|_{L^p(Q)} \leq (2^d - 1)^{1/p} \|f\|_{\text{Lip}(L^p(Q), \alpha)} d^{\alpha/2} 2^{-\alpha(m+1)}. \tag{2.7}$$

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

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

□

3 The nonlocal equation on self-similar domains

In this section, we extend the nonlocal equation (1.1) to fractal domains. First, we review IFSs to the extent needed to formulate the assumptions on the spatial domain. We follow [9, Chapter 1] (see also [2, § 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.

3.1 Iterated function systems

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

$$d(F_i(x), F_i(y)) \leq \lambda d(x, y), \quad x, y \in X, \quad 0 < \lambda < 1, \quad i \in [d]. \tag{3.1}$$

The (3.1) has a unique attractor (cf. [2, Theorem 2.6])

$$K = \bigcup_{i=1}^d F_i(K). \tag{3.2}$$

The topological structure of K is understood with the help of the shift space defined as follows. Let $S = \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$ and $\Sigma = S^{\mathbb{N}}$. On Σ , one defines 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

$$\sigma_i(w_1 w_2 w_3 \dots) = i w_1 w_2 w_3 \dots, \quad i \in S.$$

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. [9, Theorem 1.2.2]).

The natural map from Σ to K is defined by

$$\Sigma \ni w \mapsto \pi(w) = \bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} F_{w_1 w_2 \dots w_k}(K) \in K. \quad (3.3)$$

π is a continuous surjective map [9, Theorem 1.2.3].

The Bernoulli measure with weights

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

is defined on cylinders $C_{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_l}^{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_l} = \{w \in \Sigma : w_{i_1} = c_1, w_{i_2} = c_2, \dots, w_{i_l} = c_l\}$

$$\nu(C_{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_l}^{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_l}) = p_{c_1} p_{c_2} \dots p_{c_l},$$

and extended to a complete measure on (Σ, \mathcal{M}) .

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

$$\nu(A) = \sum_{i \in S} p_i \nu(\sigma_i^{-1} A)$$

for any Borel set $A \subset \Sigma$ [9].

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

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

We suppress the dependence of ν and μ on p to avoid overcomplicated notation.

Theorem 1.4.5 in [9] gives necessary and sufficient conditions for

$$\mu(K_w) = p_{w_1} p_{w_2} \dots p_{w_m}, \quad K_w = F_w(K), \quad w = w_1 w_2 \dots w_m \quad (3.4)$$

where $F_w \doteq F_{w_1} \circ F_{w_2} \circ \dots \circ F_{w_m}$. These conditions are usually straightforward to check in practice. Instead of stating these conditions we postulate (3.4) as an assumption on K as an attractor of an IFS. For instance, (3.4) holds if $\pi^{-1}(x)$ is a finite set for any $x \in K$ (cf. [9, Corollary 1.4.8])¹.

¹Alternatively, one can impose the open set condition [2].

An important implication of (3.4) is the following

$$\mu \left(K_{wi} \cap K_{wj} \right) = 0, \quad i \neq j, |w| = m, \quad (3.5)$$

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

Example 3.1. *The following are three representative examples of self-similar sets, for which our results apply.*

(ST) *We begin with a definition of ST, a prototypical example of a self-similar set. Let $X = \mathbb{R}^2$ and let q_1, q_2, q_3 be vertices of an equilateral triangle (see Fig. 2a) and*

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

Then (3.2) 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 p , μ is called a standard self-similar measure on ST (cf. [9]).

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

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

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

Then (3.2) 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 domains for the nonlocal diffusion equation.

3.2 The nonlocal equation

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

$$\partial_t u(t, x) = f(t, u) + \int_K W(x, y) D(u(t, x), u(t, y)) d\mu(y), \quad (3.6)$$

$$u(0, x) = g(x), \quad x \in K, \quad (3.7)$$

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

$$\max \left\{ \text{ess sup}_{x \in K} \int_K |W(x, y)| dy, \text{ess sup}_{y \in K} \int_K |W(x, y)| d\mu(x) \right\} < \infty \quad (3.8)$$

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

$$|f(t, u) - f(t, u')| \leq L_f |u - u'|, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}, u, u' \in K, \quad (3.9)$$

$$|D(u, v) - D(u', v')| \leq L_D (|u - u'| + |v - v'|), \quad \forall u, v, u', v' \in K. \quad (3.10)$$

In addition,

$$\sup_{K^2} |D(u, v)| \leq 1. \quad (3.11)$$

Theorem 3.2. *Suppose (3.8)-(3.11) hold and $g \in L^2(K, \mu)$. Then for any $T > 0$, the IVP (3.6)-(3.7) has a unique solution $u \in C^1(0, T; L^2(K, \mu))$.*

Proof. The proof is the same as in [6, Theorem 3.1] modulo minor notational adjustments. \square

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

Next, we construct Galerkin approximation of (3.6), (3.7). First, we discretize K . To this end, we build self-similar partitions that are naturally associated with K . Let $w = (w_1, w_2, \dots, w_m) \in \Sigma_m$, $w_i \in [d]$, be an itinerary of length $m = |w|$ and consider the following partition of K :

$$K^m \doteq \{K_w = F_w(K), |w| = m\}, \quad K = \bigcup_{|w|=m} K_w. \quad (3.12)$$

Using K^m , we define a finite-dimensional subspace of $\mathcal{H} \doteq L^2(K, \mu \times \mu)$, $\mathcal{H}^m = \text{span}\{\mathbf{1}_{K_w} : |w| = m\}$. Here and below, $\mathbf{1}_A$ is the indicator of A . In general, $K_w \cap K_v$ may be nonempty for two distinct $w, v \in \Sigma_m$. The sets in $\{K_w : w \in \Sigma_m\}$ can be easily modified to make them disjoint. However, this is not necessary, because $\mu(K_w \cap K_v) = 0$ thanks to (3.5). 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 . Thus, we will continue to work with unmodified sets K_w .

Next, we approximate the solution of the IVP (3.6), (3.7) by a piecewise constant function:

$$u^m(t, x) = \sum_{|w|=m} u_w(t) \mathbf{1}_{K_w}(x), \quad (3.13)$$

After inserting (3.13) into (3.6) and projecting onto X_m we arrive at the following discretization of (3.6):

$$\dot{u}_w = f(u_w, t) + \sum_{|v|=m} W_{wv} D(u_w, u_v) \mu(K_v), \quad (3.14)$$

where

$$W_{wv} = \int_{K_w \times K_v} W(x, y) d\mu(x) d\mu(y), \quad |w| = m. \quad (3.15)$$

System of ODEs (3.14) can be rewritten as

$$\partial_t u^m(t, x) = f(u^m, t) + \int_K W^m(x, y) D(u^m(t, x), u^m(t, y)) d\mu(y), \quad (3.16)$$

where

$$W^m = \sum_{|w|,|v|=m} W_{wv} \mathbf{1}_{K_{wv}}, \quad K_{wv} \doteq K_w \times K_v. \quad (3.17)$$

Similarly we approximate the initial condition (3.7) by

$$g^m = \sum_{|w|=m} g_w \mathbf{1}_{K_w}, \quad g_w = \int_{K_w} g d\mu. \quad (3.18)$$

Theorem 3.3. *Consider the IVPs for (3.6), (3.16) subject to initial conditions (3.7) and (3.18) respectively. Then for a given $T > 0$, there exists $C > 0$ not dependent on $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that*

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u^m(t, \cdot) - u(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2(K, \mu)} \leq C (\|W^m - W\|_{L^2(K^2, \mu \times \mu)} + \|u^m(0, \cdot) - u(0, \cdot)\|_{L^2(K, \mu)}). \quad (3.19)$$

Proof. The proof follows along the lines of the proof the analogous statement in the Euclidean setting (cf. [7, 13]). \square

4 Approximation of functions on self-similar domains

In view of (3.19), 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 $X = \mathbb{R}^n$ and $F_i : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, $i \in [d]$, are affine contracting maps with the same contraction ratio

$$|F_i(x) - F_i(y)| = \lambda |x - y|, \quad 0 < \lambda < 1, \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (4.1)$$

Let K be an attractor of the IFS (3.2). Assume that K is equipped with standard self-similar measure μ , i.e., $p_1 = p_2 = \dots = p_d = d^{-1}$ in (3.4). The sets in Example (3.1) satisfy the assumptions of this section.

For $i, j \in S$, $i \neq j$, define by τ_{ij} a unique vector which translates $F_i(K)$ to $F_j(K)$:

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

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

Definition 4.1. For $\phi \in L^p(K, \mu)$ define the L^p -modulus of continuity as follows

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

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

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

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

equipped with the norm

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

Lemma 4.2. *Let $\phi \in \text{Lip}(\alpha, L^p(K, \mu))$. Then*

$$\|\phi^m - \phi\|_{L^p(K, \mu)} \leq \frac{d^{1/p-1} (d-1)^{1/p}}{1 - \lambda^\alpha} \|\phi\|_{\text{Lip}(L^p(K, \mu))} \lambda^{\alpha m}. \quad (4.2)$$

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 2.2, we represent ϕ^{m+1} as

$$\phi^{m+1} = \sum_{|w|=m} \sum_{j \in I} \phi_{w,j} \mathbf{1}_{K_{wj}}, \quad (4.3)$$

where

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

Likewise,

$$\begin{aligned} \phi^m &= \sum_{|w|=m} \sum_{j \in S} \phi_w \mathbf{1}_{K_{wj}} \\ &= d^{-1} \sum_{|w|=m} \sum_{j \in S} \sum_{k \in S} \phi_{wk} \mathbf{1}_{K_{wj}}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

where we used $\mu(K_{w,j}) = d^{-1} \mu(K_w)$.

By subtracting (4.3) from (4.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} d(\phi^m(x) - \phi^{m+1}(x)) &= \sum_{|w|=m, j \in S} \sum_{k \neq j} \left(\int_{K_{wj}} - \int_{K_{wk}} \right) \phi(z) dz \mathbf{1}_{K_{wj}}(x) \\ &= \sum_{w,j,k} \int_{K_{wj}} [\phi(y + \tau_{jk}^m) - \phi(y)] d\mu(y) \mathbf{1}_{K_{wj}}(x), \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

where

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

After raising both sides of (4.5) to the p th power and integrating over K , we have

$$\begin{aligned} d^p \int |\phi^m - \phi^{m+1}|^p d\mu &= \sum_{w,j,k} \left| \int_{K_{wj}} [\phi(y + \tau_{jk}^m) - \phi(y)] d\mu(y) \right|^p \mu(K_{wj}) \\ &\leq \sum_{j,k} \sum_w \int_{G_{wj}} |\phi(y + \tau_{jk}^m) - \phi(y)|^p d\mu(y) \\ &\leq d(d-1) \omega_p^p(\phi, m). \end{aligned}$$

From this we conclude

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

For any integer $M > m$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi^m - \phi^{m+M}\|_{L^p(G, \mu)} &\leq \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} \|\phi^k - \phi^{k+1}\|_{L^p(K, \mu)} \\ &\leq \frac{(d(d-1))^{1/p}}{d} \|\phi\|_{\text{Lip}(L^p(K, \mu))} \frac{\lambda^{\alpha m}}{1 - \lambda^\alpha}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

By passing M to infinity in (4.6), we get (4.2). \square

Remark 4.3. For (3.19), we also need error estimate for $L^2(K^2, \mu \times \mu)$. To this end, we note that under the assumptions made in this section, K^2 is a self-similar subset of \mathbb{R}^{2n} generated by d^2 contractions $F_{ij} = (F_i, F_j)$, $i, j \in S$ with the same contraction constant λ as before. Therefore, (4.2) still holds after replacing d by d^2 .

5 Integration of functions on self-similar domains

The implementation of the Galerkin scheme on self-similar domains as described in § 3.3 requires evaluation of the integrals of the form

$$\int_{K_{wv}} W d(\mu \times \mu) \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{K_w} g d\mu \quad w, v \in \Sigma_m.$$

By reasons explained in Remark 4.3, it is sufficient to address this problem 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

$$\int_K \phi d\mu, \quad \phi \in L^1(K, \mu). \quad (5.1)$$

Therefore, in the remainder of this section we will focus on the problem of evaluation of (5.1). To this end, let K be an attractor of a system of contracting similarities (cf. (4.1)). As an ambient space we take \mathbb{R}^n as in Section 4. Any other complete metric space would work as well. We assume that F_i 's satisfy the open set condition (cf. [4, 9]), which, in particular, implies (3.5) (cf. [4]).

At the first glance, it may appear that numerical integration of functions with respect to a Hausdorff measure requires sophisticated techniques. Surprisingly, for self-similar sets that are attractors of IFS, integrals with respect to a probability measure can be approximated easily thanks to the following simplifying factors. First, one can use ergodicity of μ [2]. Alternatively, numerical integration can be implemented using

uniform partitions that are naturally associated with self-similar sets [5]. Below, we outline three algorithms for evaluating (5.1).

The first algorithm relies on the following lemma.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $\phi \in L^1(\phi, \mu)$. Then*

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \phi(\pi(\sigma^j s)) = \int_K \phi(x) d\mu(x). \quad (5.2)$$

Proof. Since ν is an invariant under σ ergodic probability measure, by the Ergodic Theorem (cf. [2, Theorem 6.1]), we have

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

□

Lemma 5.1 suggests the following algorithm for evaluating (5.1) in the spirit of the Monte-Carlo method.

Algorithm I. Let K be a ST and $\phi \in L^1(K, \mu)$. Here, ϕ stands for a function on T and its restriction to $K \subset T$.

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

$$\xi_i = (s_i, s_{i+1}, \dots, s_{N+i-1}) \in \Sigma_N, \quad i \in [N].$$

- Note that $\pi(\xi_i \xi) \in K_{\xi_i} = F_{\xi_i}(K) \quad \forall \xi \in \Sigma$. Then

$$\phi_i = \int_{K_{\xi_i}} \phi d\mu \approx \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^d \phi(\pi(\xi_i \bar{j})),$$

where $\bar{j} \doteq jjj \dots \in \Sigma$.

- Set

$$S_N := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \phi_i.$$

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. [5]).

Algorithm II.

- Pick $x_0 \in K$.
- Compute $x_w = F_w(x_0)$, $w \in \Sigma_m$.
- Set $N = m^d$, $S_N := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{|w|=m} \phi(x_w)$.

Lemma 5.2. For $f \in C(K)$,

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \left| S_N - \int_K f d\mu \right| = 0. \quad (5.3)$$

Proof. Points $\{x_w, |w| = m\}$ form a uniform sequence (cf. [5, Theorem 2.5]). □

Furthermore, Theorem 3.1 in [5] gives an estimate of the discrepancy, which together with Koksma–Hlawka inequality would imply $O(N^{-1})$ convergence in (5.3). However, we are not aware of an analog of the Koksma–Hlawka inequality applicable to the problem at hand². The result in [10] requires computing harmonic splines [16]. It is not clear how to apply it in our setting. 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 ST.

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

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

Set

$$S_N \doteq \frac{1}{3^{m+1}} \sum_{|w|=m} \sum_{j=1}^3 \phi_j^w, \quad N = 3^m. \quad (5.4)$$

Lemma 5.3. Suppose ϕ is a twice continuously differentiable function in directions τ_i , $i \in [3]$. Then

$$\left| \int_K \phi d\mu - S_N \right| = O(h^2), \quad h = 2^{-m}. \quad (5.5)$$

Remark 5.4. For a general self-similar set generated by contractions with constants $\lambda \in (0, 1)$. The rate of convergence is $O(\lambda^{2m})$. If ϕ is a Hölder continuous function with exponent $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, then the convergence rate is $O(\lambda^{\alpha m})$.

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

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

²There is a variant of Koksma–Hlawka inequality for functions on fractals in [10], but it relies on harmonic splines, and does not apply to our setting.

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

$$2\phi(q_{ij}^w) = \phi(q_i^w) + \phi(q_j^w) + O(h^2). \quad (5.6)$$

Recall

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

and note that

$$\begin{aligned} S_{m+1} &= \frac{1}{3^{m+2}} \sum_{|w|=m} \left(\sum_{j=1}^3 \phi_j^w + \sum_{k \neq l} \phi_{kl}^w \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{3^{m+1}} \sum_{|w|=m} \left(\sum_{j=1}^3 \phi_j^w + O(h^2) \right) \\ &= S_m + O(h^2). \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

From (5.7), recalling $h = 2^{-(m+1)}$, we conclude that $\{S_m\}$ is a convergent sequence with the rate specified in (5.5). \square

6 Numerical example

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

$$\partial_t u(t, x) = \int_K W(x, y) (u(t, y) - u(t, x)) d\mu(y), \quad (6.1)$$

$$u(0, x) = \begin{cases} 1, & x \in F_2(K), \\ -1, & x \in F_1(K) \cup F_3(K), \end{cases} \quad (6.2)$$

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

Next we discretize (6.1), (6.2) as explained in § 3.3. Specifically, we approximate $u(t, x)$ by a piecewise constant function in x , $u^m(t, x)$ (cf. (3.13)), and form a system of ODEs (3.14). 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

$$\begin{aligned} x &= F_w(K), \quad w \in \Sigma, \\ \bar{x} &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{w_i - 1}{d^i}, \quad (\text{cf. §3.1}). \end{aligned}$$




Figure 3: **a**) Numerical solution of the IVP (6.1), (6.2) 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).

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

We intentionally chose a higher order Runge–Kutta scheme and 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 [8, 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 (3.19), (4.2). Then after computing Δ^l and Δ^{l+1} we estimate

$$\alpha^l = \frac{\log \Delta^{l+1} - \log \Delta^l}{\log \lambda}. \quad (6.3)$$

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. (4.2)). It would be interesting to find $W \in \text{Lip}(\alpha, L^p(K, \mu))$ with $0 < \alpha < 1$ to test convergence rate for fractional α .

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] Kenneth Falconer, *Techniques in fractal geometry*, John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Chichester, 1997. MR 1449135
- [3] ———, *Fractal geometry*, third ed., John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Chichester, 2014, Mathematical foundations and applications.
- [4] John E. Hutchinson, *Fractals and self-similarity*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **30** (1981), no. 5, 713–747.
- [5] Maria Infusino and Aljoša Volčič, *Uniform distribution on fractals*, Unif. Distrib. Theory **4** (2009), no. 2, 47–58.
- [6] 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.
- [7] ———, *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.
- [8] ———, *Sparse Monte Carlo method for nonlocal diffusion problems*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **60** (2022), no. 6, 3001–3028.
- [9] Jun Kigami, *Analysis on fractals*, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, vol. 143, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2001.
- [10] Jens Malmquist and Robert S. Strichartz, *Numerical integration for fractal measures*, J. Fractal Geom. **5** (2018), no. 2, 165–226.
- [11] Georgi S. Medvedev, *The nonlinear heat equation on dense graphs and graph limits*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **46** (2014), no. 4, 2743–2766.
- [12] ———, *The nonlinear heat equation on W -random graphs*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **212** (2014), no. 3, 781–803.
- [13] ———, *The continuum limit of the Kuramoto model on sparse random graphs*, Communications in Mathematical Sciences **17** (2019), no. 4, 883–898.
- [14] 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).
- [15] S. M. Nikol'skiĭ, *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.
- [16] Robert S. Strichartz and Michael Usher, *Splines on fractals*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **129** (2000), no. 2, 331–360.
- [17] D.A. Wiley, S.H. Strogatz, and M. Girvan, *The size of the sync basin*, Chaos **16** (2006), no. 1, 015103, 8.