

# The weak form of the SDOF and MDOF equation of motion, part I: Theory

Nikolaos Karaliolios<sup>1</sup>

Dimitrios L. Karabalis<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>email: nkaraliolios@gmail.com

<sup>2</sup>Department of Civil Engineering, University of Patras

July 2, 2024

## Abstract

The weak form of the SDOF and MDOF equations of motion are obtained. The original initial conditions problem is transformed into a boundary value problem. The boundary value problem is then solved and transformed back to the initial conditions one. Subsequently, a general method for obtaining numerical methods using an arbitrary number of linearly independent approximating functions is outlined.

This is part one of a series of three papers, in the second of which a numerical method is obtained, using Bernstein polynomials of arbitrarily high order. The numerical evidence for the convergence of the method will be presented in the third part paper.

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>The SDOF problem</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>From initial to boundary conditions</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Definitions</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>The weak formulation of the SDOF problem</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Covariance of the Weak form with respect to time reparametrization</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Relation with Lagrangian and Hamiltonian mechanics</b>	<b>9</b>
	6.1 A conservation law . . . . .	11
	6.2 A dissipation law . . . . .	12
<b>7</b>	<b>Some remarks on the weak formulation</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>Weak formulation: The MDOF case</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>From the weak formulation to numerical implementations: the SDOF case</b>	<b>15</b>
	9.1 Obtaining a numerical method . . . . .	16
	9.2 The excitation function of the approximate solution . . . . .	17
	9.3 Bounds for the approximation error . . . . .	19
	9.3.1 Bounds for the error in displacement . . . . .	19
	9.3.2 Bounds for the error in velocity . . . . .	21
	9.3.3 Some energy estimates . . . . .	22
	9.4 Convergence . . . . .	23

## 1 The SDOF problem

The equation of motion of the single-degree-of-freedom (SDOF) problem is

$$m\ddot{x} + c\dot{x} + kx = f \quad (1)$$

where  $m > 0$  is the mass,  $c \geq 0$  the damping coefficient,  $k > 0$  the stiffness, and  $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is the excitation force, which is considered to act for finite time, so that it is 0 outside the interval  $[0, \bar{T}]$ , where  $0 < \bar{T} < \infty$ . In the notation of the next paragraph, this is equivalent to  $\text{supp}(f) \subset [0, \bar{T}]$ . In the following,  $I$  denotes the open interval  $(0, \bar{T})$ , and  $\bar{I}$  its closure  $[0, \bar{T}]$ . Mass normalized to 1 is the standing assumption throughout this study of the SDOF problem, while  $c$ ,  $k$  and  $f$  are considered fixed. The equation thus reaches the form

$$\ddot{x} + c\dot{x} + kx = f \text{ in } [0, \bar{T}] \quad (2)$$

For later use, the operator defining the lhs of the equation is denoted by

$$\mathbb{F}(x) : x \rightarrow \ddot{x} + c\dot{x} + kx \quad (3)$$

which is a linear operator  $H^{s+2} \rightarrow H^s$ , for all  $s \geq -1$  (see §3 for the definition of the Sobolev spaces  $H^s$ ). The operator  $\mathbb{F}$  associates a smooth enough displacement function to the excitation force of the corresponding SDOF problem.

The equation is coupled with initial conditions

$$\begin{cases} x(0) = x_0 \in \mathbb{R} \\ \dot{x}(0) = \dot{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

In the underdamped case, i.e.  $c < 2\sqrt{k}$ , which is the case of interest, the homogeneous case of eq. (2), i.e. for  $f(\cdot) \equiv 0$ , admits the well known solution (see, e.g., [CP75])

$$x_h(t) = x_h(t; x_0, \dot{x}_0) = e^{-\xi\omega_n t} \left[ x_0 \cos(\omega_d t) + \frac{\dot{x}_0 + \xi\omega_n x_0}{\omega_d} \sin(\omega_d t) \right] \quad (5)$$

where the subscript  $h$  stands for homogeneous; and

$$\xi = \frac{c}{2\sqrt{k}} < 1 \quad (6)$$

is the damping ratio,

$$\omega_n = \sqrt{k} \quad (7)$$

is the natural eigenfrequency of the undamped system, and

$$\omega_d = \omega_n \sqrt{1 - \xi^2} \quad (8)$$

is the eigenfrequency of the damped system.

If  $f$  is, say,  $C^0$ , the traditional theory of ODEs, see e.g. [HS74], provides existence and uniqueness of the solution. Another way of obtaining the existence and uniqueness for the inhomogeneous problem, admitting existence and uniqueness for the homogeneous one, is by the Duhamel convolution formula

$$\begin{aligned} x(t) &= \frac{1}{\omega_d} \int_0^t f(\tau) e^{-\xi\omega_n(t-\tau)} \sin[\omega_d(t-\tau)] d\tau + x_h(t; x_0, \dot{x}_0) \\ &= \frac{1}{\omega_d} \int_0^t f(\tau) e^{-c(t-\tau)/2} \sin[\omega_d(t-\tau)] d\tau + x_h(t; x_0, \dot{x}_0) \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

The formula of eq. (9) is meaningful even in lower regularity, for example  $f \in L^\infty$  or even  $f \in L^1$ , even though the differential equation, eq. (2), is not well defined for such an  $f$  due to regularity issues concerning the definition of the acceleration,  $\ddot{x}$ , as a well-defined pointwise function.

## 2 From initial to boundary conditions

The linearity of the problem also provides a natural way of transforming the initial value problem of eqs. (2) and (4) to a boundary-value problem. If the goal is to solve the equation for times  $t \in [0, \bar{T}]$  with  $\bar{T} < \infty$ , then the operator

$$\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}_{x_0, f, \bar{T}}: \dot{x}_0 \mapsto x(\bar{T}) \quad (10)$$

can be defined, where  $x(\cdot)$  is the solution of the eq. (2) with initial velocity  $\dot{x}_0$ . The initial position  $x_0$ , the excitation function  $f$  and the time  $\bar{T}$  are to be considered as fixed parameters.

The solution of the homogeneous problem, eq. (5), which is well defined as a  $C^\infty$  smooth function of time, together with the Duhamel representation of the solution show that for a given set of parameters  $x_0$ ,  $f$  and  $\bar{T}$ , the mapping  $\mathcal{B}: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is affine linear, i.e. of the form  $\dot{x}_0 \mapsto \alpha \dot{x}_0 + \beta$  for some real constants  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ , and  $\dot{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ . The slope  $\alpha$  is non-zero and, consequently, the mapping is one-to-one if, and only if,  $\sin(\omega_d \bar{T}) \neq 0$ , which holds for  $\bar{T}$  in an open-dense subset of  $\mathbb{R}$ .<sup>1</sup> This is the case where no stationary waves of the eigenfrequency of the SDOF system fit exactly in the interval  $\bar{T}$ . In terms of Control Theory, this is the case where the final displacement can be controlled by the initial velocity. The slope  $\alpha$  and the constant  $\beta$  depend in a linear way on the parameters  $x_0$  and  $f$ , for fixed  $\bar{T}$ . Therefore, for a typical  $\bar{T}$ , the initial value problem is equivalent to a unique boundary condition problem

$$\begin{cases} x(0) = x_0 \in \mathbb{R} \\ x(\bar{T}) = x_{\bar{T}} = \mathcal{B}_{x_0, f, \bar{T}}(\dot{x}_0) \in \mathbb{R} \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

As in the underdamped case, a simple calculation can show that for overdamped systems this operator is always one-to-one, independent of  $\bar{T}$ .

Using this notation, the goal of this paper is to obtain the weak formulation of the initial value problem of eq. (2) with the initial conditions of eq. (4). This amounts to stating and proving theorem (4.3). Subsequently, its direct generalization to the multi-degree-of-freedom (MDOF) case, theorem (8.1), is stated below and proved.

## 3 Definitions

The following material is recalled and defined for reasons of completeness of the article. The reader unfamiliar with the notions defined below can refer to [Rud76] and [Rud87] for the mathematical and real analysis related concepts, and to [Bré83] for a general background in functional analysis, the definition of Sobolev spaces and some applications on the Sturm-Liouville problem which can serve as an introduction to this work.

The open interval  $I = (0, \bar{T})$  with  $\bar{T} < \infty$  is to be considered fixed, and  $\mu$  is the standard Lebesgue measure on  $\mathbb{R}$  and its restriction on  $I$ . The space of  $C^s$  smooth real functions on  $I$  will be denoted by  $C^s(I, \mathbb{R})$ , or simply by  $C^s$ , for  $0 \leq s \leq \infty$ . The space of  $C^s$  smooth functions on the closed interval  $\bar{I} = [0, \bar{T}]$  will be denoted by  $C^s(\bar{I}, \mathbb{R})$ . The support of a function  $f$ , denoted by  $\text{supp} f$ , is the closure<sup>2</sup> of the set  $\{x \in I, f(x) \neq 0\}$ . Smooth functions whose support is contained in  $I$  will be denoted by  $C_0^s$ . Informally, such functions, when used as test functions, do not see (or measure) the behavior of the tested object at the endpoints of the interval  $I$ , since the values of the object close enough to the endpoints are indifferent, as they are integrated against 0.

The space  $L^2(I)$  is the Hilbert space of Lebesgue square integrable functions on  $I$  with its standard scalar product

$$\langle f, g \rangle_{L^2} = \int_I f g d\mu \quad (12)$$

<sup>1</sup>An open-dense subset of  $\mathbb{R}$  is a union of open intervals, the complement of which is a sequence of points. The set where  $\sin(\omega_d \bar{T}) = 0$  is such a set, which satisfies the additional property of not having finite accumulation points. The complement of such a set is exceptional in any relevant sense.

<sup>2</sup>The closure of an open or semi-open interval is the closed interval with the same endpoints. For a more general definition of the closure of a set, see [Rud76].

Another, equivalent, scalar product will be defined in eq. (23), which is more adapted to the framework of this article. The space  $L^2(I)$  is the Cauchy completion of  $C^\infty$  for the  $L^2$  norm

$$\|f\|_{L^2} = \left( \int_I f^2 d\mu \right)^{1/2} \quad (13)$$

The space of essentially bounded functions on  $I$  will be denoted by  $L^\infty$ , and the space of Lebesgue integrable functions will be denoted by  $L^1$ .

The Sobolev space  $H^1 = H^1(I)$  can be defined as the completion of  $C^\infty(\bar{I}, \mathbb{R})$  for the norm induced by the scalar product

$$\langle f, g \rangle_{H^1} = \int_I fg d\mu + \int_I f'g' d\mu \quad (14)$$

while the Sobolev space  $H_0^1 \subset H^1$  as the completion of  $C_0^\infty(I, \mathbb{R})$  for the same norm. Informally, the functions in  $H^1$  have "one derivative in  $L^2$ ". An alternative definition for  $H^1$  is

$$\{u \in L^2, \exists v \in L^2, \int_I v\varphi d\mu = - \int_I u\varphi' d\mu, \forall \varphi \in C_0^\infty(I, \mathbb{R})\} \quad (15)$$

where  $\varphi$  are test functions. The function  $v$  is then by definition the weak derivative of  $u$  and is denoted by  $u'$  or by  $\dot{u}$  when the variable is time. The Sobolev injection theorem states that, in fact,  $H^1 \hookrightarrow C^0(\bar{I})$  and thus functions in  $H_0^1$  can be defined as

$$\{u \in H^1, u(0) = u(\bar{T}) = 0\} \quad (16)$$

In other words, functions in  $H_0^1$  satisfy homogeneous boundary conditions.

The Sobolev spaces of higher regularity  $H^s$  are defined as the completions of  $C^\infty(\bar{I}, \mathbb{R})$  for the respective norm associated to the scalar product

$$\langle f, g \rangle_{H^s} = \int_I fg d\mu + \int_I f^{(s)}g^{(s)} d\mu \quad (17)$$

and the spaces  $H_0^s$  as the completions of  $C_0^\infty(I, \mathbb{R})$  for the same respective norms. Functions in  $H^s$  have  $s - 1$  continuous derivatives and "their derivative of order  $s$  is in  $L^2$ ", while functions in  $H_0^s$  satisfy the homogeneous boundary conditions

$$u^{(i)}(0) = u^{(i)}(T) = 0, 0 \leq i \leq s - 1 \quad (18)$$

Finally, let a function  $f: H \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , where  $H$  is, say, a Hilbert space. The directional, or Gâteaux, derivative of  $f$  at the point  $u \in H$  is defined as the mapping of  $H$  into itself given by

$$v \mapsto \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(u + tv) - f(u)}{t\|v\|} \quad (19)$$

provided that the limit exists for all  $v \in H$ , and provided that the resulting map is a continuous linear selfmapping of  $H$ .

## 4 The weak formulation of the SDOF problem

The following calculations and transformations of eq. (2) constitute the preparation for the statement of the weak formulation of the SDOF problem, i.e. of theorem 4.3.

Multiplication of eq. (2) by  $e^{ct}$  and use of the formula for the derivative of a product yields

$$\frac{d}{dt} [e^{ct}\dot{x}(t)] + ke^{ct}x(t) = e^{ct}f(t) \quad (20)$$

Multiplication by  $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(I)$  and integration by parts then gives

$$[e^{ct}\dot{x}(t)\varphi(t)]_0^{\bar{T}} - \int_0^{\bar{T}} e^{ct}\dot{x}(t)\dot{\varphi}(t)dt + k \int_0^{\bar{T}} e^{ct}x(t)\varphi(t)dt = \int_0^{\bar{T}} e^{ct}f(t)\varphi(t)dt \quad (21)$$

Since  $\varphi(0) = \varphi(\bar{T}) = 0$ , the first term of eq. (21) vanishes, so that the equation

$$- \int_0^{\bar{T}} e^{ct}\dot{x}(t)\dot{\varphi}(t)dt + k \int_0^{\bar{T}} e^{ct}x(t)\varphi(t)dt = \int_0^{\bar{T}} e^{ct}f(t)\varphi(t)dt \quad (22)$$

is satisfied for every  $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(I)$ . Upon introduction of the space  $L_c^2(I)$ , consisting of the square-integrable functions on  $I$  and its inner product

$$\langle \varphi(\cdot), \psi(\cdot) \rangle = \langle \varphi(\cdot), \psi(\cdot) \rangle_c = \int_0^{\bar{T}} e^{ct}\varphi(t)\psi(t)dt, \quad (23)$$

where  $c$  will be suppressed from the notation whenever its value is clear from the context, eq. (22) can be written in a more compact form

$$-\langle \dot{x}(\cdot), \dot{\varphi}(\cdot) \rangle + k\langle x(\cdot), \varphi(\cdot) \rangle = \langle f(\cdot), \varphi(\cdot) \rangle, \forall \varphi \in C_0^\infty(I) \quad (24)$$

Assuming boundary conditions as in eq. (11), two  $C^\infty$  functions  $v_0, v_{\bar{T}}: [0, \bar{T}] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  can be chosen and fixed such that

$$\begin{cases} v_0(0) = v_{\bar{T}}(\bar{T}) = 1 \\ v_0(\bar{T}) = v_{\bar{T}}(0) = 0 \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

Thus, if  $x(\cdot)$  solves eq. (2) with boundary conditions those of eq. (11), then the function

$$u(\cdot) = x(\cdot) - x_0v_0(\cdot) - x_{\bar{T}}v_{\bar{T}}(\cdot) \quad (26)$$

satisfies homogeneous boundary conditions  $u(0) = u(\bar{T}) = 0$ . Calling

$$v_{0, \bar{T}}(\cdot) = x_0v_0(\cdot) + x_{\bar{T}}v_{\bar{T}}(\cdot) \quad (27)$$

and

$$u(\cdot) = x(\cdot) - v_{0, \bar{T}}(\cdot) \in H_0^1 \quad (28)$$

so that

$$x(\cdot) = u(\cdot) + v_{0, \bar{T}}(\cdot) \quad (29)$$

eq. (24) reaches the form

$$-\langle \dot{u}(\cdot), \dot{\varphi}(\cdot) \rangle + k\langle u(\cdot), \varphi(\cdot) \rangle = \langle f(\cdot), \varphi(\cdot) \rangle - \langle \dot{v}_{0, \bar{T}}(\cdot), \dot{\varphi}(\cdot) \rangle + k\langle v_{0, \bar{T}}(\cdot), \varphi(\cdot) \rangle \quad (30)$$

Finally, under the weak assumption that  $e^c f(\cdot)$  is the weak derivative of a function  $F(\cdot) \in L^2(I)$ , assumption equivalent to  $f \in H^{-1}$ , and by performing yet another integration by parts, one obtains

$$-\langle \dot{u}(\cdot), \dot{\varphi}(\cdot) \rangle_c + k\langle u(\cdot), \varphi(\cdot) \rangle_c = -\langle F(\cdot), \dot{\varphi}(\cdot) \rangle_0 - \langle \dot{v}_{0, \bar{T}}(\cdot), \dot{\varphi}(\cdot) \rangle_c + k\langle v_{0, \bar{T}}(\cdot), \varphi(\cdot) \rangle_c \quad (31)$$

The following fundamental lemma establishing the equivalence between  $F(\cdot)$  and  $e^c f(\cdot)$  is relevant.

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let  $f \in H^{-1}$  and  $F \in L^2$  be a weak integral of  $e^c f(\cdot)$ . Then,*

$$\|e^c f(\cdot)\|_{H^{-1}} = \|F\|_{L^2} \leq K\|f\|_{H^{-1}} \quad (32)$$

where  $K > 0$  is a constant depending only on  $c$  and  $\bar{T}$ .

*Proof.* By definition and by integration by parts,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|e^c f(\cdot)\|_{H^{-1}} &= \sup_{\substack{\varphi \in H_0^1 \\ \|\varphi'\|_{L^2} = 1}} \int_0^{\bar{T}} e^c f(\cdot) \varphi(\cdot) \\
&= \sup_{\substack{\varphi \in H_0^1 \\ \|\varphi'\|_{L^2} = 1}} \int_0^{\bar{T}} F(\cdot) \varphi'(\cdot) \\
&= \|F\|_{L^2}
\end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

The second part follows easily since  $\bar{T} < \infty$  and  $e^c$  is a bounded smooth function.  $\square$

The following lemma will be useful later on. Its proof is straightforward given the calculations already carried out.

**Lemma 4.2.** *Let  $F = \int e^c \mathbb{F}(x)$ , i.e.  $F$  be the primitive of the excitation function corresponding to the displacement function  $x$  (multiplied by the corresponding exponential factor). Then,*

$$F = F_{c,k}(x) = e^c \dot{x} + k \int e^c x \tag{34}$$

*modulo a constant.*

In practice, i.e. in the construction of numerical methods, the form of eq. (30) is more useful, as it involves the excitation force function itself. However, the form (31) is more useful in the estimation of error rates, since it places  $f \in H^{-1}(I)$ ,<sup>3</sup> which is the correct functional space for the excitation function, as it is the weakest regularity of an excitation function for which the weak form and the Duhamel formula produce a pointwise well-defined displacement function.

We can now state and prove the main theoretical result of the present paper, the theorem establishing that eq. (30) is the weak formulation of the SDOF problem.

**Theorem 4.3.** *Eq. (30) is the weak form of eq. (2), with boundary conditions those of eq. (11). Equivalently*

1. *If  $\bar{T}$  is fixed and does not belong to the exceptional set  $\{\tau \in \mathbb{R}, \sin(\omega_d \tau) = 0\}$ , and if  $v_{0,\bar{T}} \in H^1$  satisfies the boundary conditions of eq. (11), then for every  $f \in H^{-1}$  the weak form admits a unique solution  $u \in H_0^1$*
2. *Moreover, if  $f \in H^s(\bar{I})$ , for some  $s \geq -1$ , then  $u \in H^{s+2}$*
3. *the boundary value problems solved by the weak formulation, when we let the function  $v_{0,\bar{T}} \in C^{s+2}$  vary, are in a one-to-one correspondence with the initial condition problems solved by the ODE of eq. (2).*

**Remark.** *For the initial and final velocity to be well defined, the excitation function  $f$  needs only be  $H^{-1/2+\varepsilon}$  for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  locally around 0 and  $\bar{T}$ , i.e. in some intervals  $[0, \delta]$  and  $[\bar{T} - \delta, \bar{T}]$  for some  $\delta > 0$ . This assumption allows for the weak integral of  $f(\cdot)$  to admit a trace operator, i.e. for its values on the boundary of  $I$  to be well defined.*

*This additional regularity of  $f$  will be a standing assumption from now on. It is not included in the notation, in order to keep it as light as possible. If  $f$  is supposed to be compactly supported, the assumption is automatically satisfied as soon as the interval  $(0, \bar{T})$  contains the support of  $f$ .*

---

<sup>3</sup>The space  $H^{-1}(I)$  consists of functions that are weak derivatives of functions in  $L^2(I)$ . The assumption that  $e^c f(\cdot)$  be in  $H^{-1}$  is clearly equivalent to  $f \in H^{-1}$ , since  $e^c$  is bounded and smooth. The space  $H^{-1}$  is the dual of  $H^1$ , i.e. the space of all continuous linear functionals  $H^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , see [Br683].

The theorem states that eq. (30) is defined for less regular functions  $f$  (in our case for  $f \in H^{-1}$ ) than the differential equation of eq. (2). The two equations, eq. (30) and eq. (2), are equivalent whenever they are both defined, in the sense that when  $f$  is regular enough ( $f \in C^0$  will suffice), the solution of the weak form of the equation is sufficiently regular in order to satisfy eq. (2) and is actually equal to its solution. Eq. (30) is indeed the weak form of eq. (2) since the two following facts hold true.

1. Firstly, the weak form is equivalent to the classical one, under the relevant regularity assumption on  $f$ .
2. Secondly only the first derivative appears in the weak form, instead of the second derivative appearing in the ODE, since one derivative has been transferred to the test function by integration by parts.

The weak form is an equation whose unknown is the function  $u \in H_0^1(I)$  and the equation should be satisfied for every  $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(I)$ . The function  $v_{0,\bar{T}}$  is to be considered as a moving observer whose position coincides with the moving body at times 0 and  $\bar{T}$ . The unknown function  $u$  is in fact the position of the body relative to the moving observer. The terms  $\langle \dot{v}_{0,\bar{T}}(\cdot), \dot{\varphi}(\cdot) \rangle - k \langle v_{0,\bar{T}}(\cdot), \varphi(\cdot) \rangle$  on the right-hand-side of eq. (30) are to be considered as the effects of fictitious forces in the (not necessarily inertial) frame of reference attached to the moving observer.

The role of the functions  $\varphi$  is that of test functions. Evaluation of the integrals in eq. (30) can be viewed as an act of measurement relative to the shape of the function  $\varphi$ . On the right-hand-side, the correlation between the function  $f$  and the test function is measured, by calculating a virtual-work-like integral (it is actually the projection of the function  $f$  on the subspace generated by  $\varphi$  in the sense of the  $L_c^2$  inner product). The weak form of the equation states that this measurement should be equal to the one on the left-hand-side, where the correlation between the test function and the position, and the derivative of the test function and the velocity are measured. If all such measurements agree, for all admissible test functions, then the function  $u$  solves the weak form of the equation.

It is also useful for later use to note that in the language of  $L^2$  products,  $H^{-1}$  and  $H^1$  duality, and of the operator  $\mathbb{F}$ , the weak formulation amounts to the equation

$$\begin{aligned} H^{-1} \langle e^c \mathbb{F}(x)(\cdot), \varphi \rangle_{H^1} &= \langle f(\cdot) - \mathbb{F}(v_{0,\bar{T}})(\cdot), \varphi(\cdot) \rangle_c \\ &= \langle e^c (f(\cdot) - \mathbb{F}(v_{0,\bar{T}})(\cdot)), \varphi(\cdot) \rangle_0 \\ &= \langle \tilde{F}, \dot{\varphi}(\cdot) \rangle_0 \end{aligned}$$

where  $\tilde{F}$  is an integral of  $e^c (f(\cdot) - \mathbb{F}(v_{0,\bar{T}})(\cdot))$ .

*Proof of theorem 4.3.* The existence of a solution follows from the Duhamel integral formula, eq. (9), which defines a (weak) solution  $x \in H^1$  as long as  $f \in H^{-1}$ . This is so because the Duhamel Integral representation, c.f. eq. (9), implies directly that

$$x(t) = \frac{e^{-ct/2}}{\omega_d} \left( \sin[\omega_d t] \int_0^t e^{c\tau} f(\tau) e^{-c\tau/2} \cos[\omega_d \tau] d\tau - \cos[\omega_d t] \int_0^t e^{c\tau} f(\tau) e^{-c\tau/2} \sin[\omega_d \tau] d\tau \right) \quad (35)$$

which is in  $L^2$  as soon as  $f \in H^{-1}$  and integration is to be interpreted as  $H^{-1} \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{H^1}$  duality. The following lemma establishes this fact. The calculations involved in its proof will be useful in §9.3.

**Lemma 4.4.** *The solution is independent of the constant of integration when choosing the integral of  $e^c f(\cdot)$  in the Duhamel integral formula.*

*Proof of the lemma.* Let  $F(\cdot) \in L_0^2$  be the weak integral of  $e^c f(\cdot) \in H^{-1}$  satisfying  $F(0) = 0$  and let  $K \in \mathbb{R}$  be an arbitrary constant of integration. Call, also,

$$\begin{aligned} d(t) &= e^{-ct/2} \cos[\omega_d t], \quad d(0) = 1, \quad \dot{d}(0) = -c/2 \\ s(t) &= \frac{e^{-ct/2}}{\omega_d} \sin[\omega_d t], \quad s(0) = 0, \quad \dot{s}(0) = 1 \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

the two fundamental solutions of the SDOF problem. Direct calculation yields

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{d}(t) &= -\frac{c}{2}d(t) - \omega_d^2 s(t) \\ \dot{s}(t) &= -\frac{c}{2}s(t) + d(t)\end{aligned}\tag{37}$$

With this notation, eq. (35) gives

$$\begin{aligned}x(t) &= s(t) \int_0^t e^{c\tau} f(\tau) d(\tau) d\tau - d(t) \int_0^t e^{c\tau} f(\tau) s(\tau) d\tau \\ &= s(t) \int_0^t \frac{d}{dt}(F(\tau) + K) d(\tau) d\tau - d(t) \int_0^t \frac{d}{dt}(F(\tau) + K) s(\tau) d\tau \\ &= s(t) \left( (F(t) + K)d(t) - K - \int_0^t (F(\tau) + K) \dot{d}(\tau) d\tau \right) - \\ &\quad - d(t) \left( (F(t) + K)s(t) - \int_0^t (F(\tau) + K) \dot{s}(\tau) d\tau \right) \\ &= -s(t) \int_0^t F(\tau) \dot{d}(\tau) d\tau + d(t) \int_0^t F(\tau) \dot{s}(\tau) d\tau \\ &= s(t) \int_0^t F(\tau) \left( \frac{c}{2}d(\tau) + \omega_d^2 s(\tau) \right) d\tau + d(t) \int_0^t F(\tau) \left( d(\tau) - \frac{c}{2}s(\tau) \right) d\tau\end{aligned}\tag{38}$$

This ends the proof of the lemma, since the last three expressions are independent of  $K$ . The formula in the last expression will be useful in §9.3.

Back to the proof of the theorem, one can obtain the velocity  $\dot{x}$  by taking one derivative of the Duhamel integral. The same type of calculation gives

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{x}(t) &= \frac{d}{dt} \left( s(t) \int_0^t e^{c\tau} f(\tau) d(\tau) d\tau - d(t) \int_0^t e^{c\tau} f(\tau) s(\tau) d\tau \right) \\ &= e^{-ct} F(t) + (d(t) - \frac{c}{2}s(t)) \int_0^t F(\tau) \left( \frac{c}{2}d(\tau) + \omega_d^2 s(\tau) \right) d\tau \\ &\quad - \left( \frac{c}{2}d(t) + \omega_d^2 s(t) \right) \int_0^t F(\tau) \left( d(\tau) - \frac{c}{2}s(\tau) \right) d\tau\end{aligned}\tag{39}$$

which again is in  $L^2$  as soon as  $f \in H^{-1}$ , which directly yields that  $x \in H^1$ .

Calculation of the acceleration in the same fashion cannot result in anything better than

$$\ddot{x}(t) = f(t) - x(t) - c\dot{x}(t)\tag{40}$$

which has the same regularity as  $f$ , i.e. is in  $H^{-1}$ .

The equivalence of the weak and the strong forms of the SDOF problem follows from eq. (31) which implies that

$$\langle \dot{u}(\cdot), \dot{\varphi}(\cdot) \rangle_c = k \langle u(\cdot), \varphi(\cdot) \rangle_c + \langle F(\cdot), \dot{\varphi}(\cdot) \rangle_0 - \langle \dot{v}_{0,\bar{T}}(\cdot), \dot{\varphi}(\cdot) \rangle_c + k \langle v_{0,\bar{T}}(\cdot), \varphi(\cdot) \rangle_c\tag{41}$$

where  $u \in H_0^1$ , and  $v_{0,\bar{T}}(\cdot)$  is smooth by construction. If  $f \in H^{-1}$  or equivalently  $F \in L^2$ , then the above equation implies that  $\dot{u} \in L^2$ , and therefore  $u \in H_0^1$ . By induction, if  $f \in H^s$ ,  $s \geq -1$ , then  $u \in H^{s+2} \cap H_0^1$  and the transformation leading from eq. (2) to the eq. (30) can be reversed, showing that  $x(\cdot) = u(\cdot) + v_{0,\bar{T}}(\cdot)$  is a solution to the initial value problem.

Finally, uniqueness for the weak form reduces to uniqueness for the classical problem, thanks to the classical argument for uniqueness of solution of linear systems. Let  $u_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$  be a solution to eq. (30) for the same excitation function  $f$ , initial conditions and final time  $\bar{T}$ , and therefore also for the same boundary conditions. Calling  $u = u_1 - u_2 \in H_0^1$ , one obtains directly

$$-\langle \dot{u}(\cdot), \dot{\varphi}(\cdot) \rangle + k \langle u(\cdot), \varphi(\cdot) \rangle = 0\tag{42}$$

for all test functions  $\varphi$ . Consequently,

$$-\langle \dot{u}(\cdot), \dot{\varphi}(\cdot) \rangle = -k \langle u(\cdot), \varphi(\cdot) \rangle\tag{43}$$



which implies that  $\dot{u}$  has a weak derivative which can be calculated by integration by parts, yielding

$$\ddot{u}(\cdot) = -ku(\cdot) - c\dot{u}(\cdot) \quad (44)$$

coupled with 0 boundary conditions:  $u(0) = u(\bar{T}) = 0$ . Since the right-hand side of eq. (43) is continuous, the weak derivative  $\ddot{u}$  is in fact a strong derivative and by induction  $u \in C^\infty$ . The choice of  $\bar{T}$  now implies that  $u \equiv 0$ , which is equivalent to the uniqueness of the weak solution.

**Remark.** *The test functions need only be of regularity  $H_0^{s+2}$  when  $f \in H^s$ .*

This remark is important for numerical applications, since no additional smoothness condition needs to be imposed, other than, say, continuity of the first derivative.

## 5 Covariance of the Weak form with respect to time reparametrization

If one considers the SDOF equation in its classical form with unit mass and restricted on a finite interval, cf. eq. (2), six defining parameters appear in the problem:  $c, k, f, x_0, \dot{x}_0$ , and  $\bar{T}$ , the mass having been eliminated via normalization.

Upon introduction of time-dilation  $t \mapsto \lambda^{-1}t$ , one more parameter can be eliminated, and the remaining parameters are transformed as follows. Introducing the local notation  $\chi(t) = x(\lambda^{-1}t)$  and  $\varphi(t) = f(\lambda^{-1}t)$ , one gets that

$$\lambda^2 \ddot{\chi}(\lambda t) + \lambda c \dot{\chi}(\lambda t) + k \chi(\lambda t) = f(t) \text{ in } [0, \bar{T}] \quad (45)$$

or, equivalently,

$$\ddot{\chi} + \lambda^{-1} c \dot{\chi} + k \lambda^{-2} \chi = \lambda^{-2} \varphi \text{ in } [0, \lambda^{-1} \bar{T}] \quad (46)$$

Under time-dilation, therefore, the parameters defining the SDOF problem are transformed by

$$(c, k, f, x_0, \dot{x}_0, \bar{T}) \mapsto \left( \frac{c}{\lambda}, \frac{k}{\lambda^2}, \frac{f(\lambda^{-1} \cdot)}{\lambda^2}, x_0, \frac{\dot{x}_0}{\lambda}, \frac{\bar{T}}{\lambda} \right) \quad (47)$$

In particular, for  $\lambda = \omega_n = \sqrt{k}$ , one gets that  $k$  is normalized to 1 and  $c$  to  $c/\sqrt{k} = 2\xi$ , cf. eqs. (6) and (7).

It can be easily verified that the weak formulation transforms in the same way under time-dilations. Therefore, the study of the weak formulation can be restricted to  $k = 1$ , provided that all other parameters are not constrained. This will be helpful in obtaining error estimates for methods constructed upon the weak formulation.

## 6 Relation with Lagrangian and Hamiltonian mechanics

For this section see e.g. [AM78]. See, also, [Lag88], section 2.2, for a similar manipulation.

The Lagrangian for the undamped linear oscillator with 0 excitation function is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(x, \dot{x}) &= \mathcal{L}_0(x, \dot{x}) = \frac{1}{2} \dot{x}^2 - \frac{1}{2} k x^2 \\ &= T(\dot{x}) - V(x) \\ &= T_0(\dot{x}) - V_0(x) \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

where  $T$  is the kinetic and  $V$  is the potential energy. The equation of motion can be obtained by the formula

$$\frac{d}{dt} \frac{\partial}{\partial \dot{x}} \mathcal{L}(x, \dot{x}) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \mathcal{L}(x, \dot{x}) \quad (49)$$

and is coupled with boundary conditions as in eq. (11). Solutions to the weak problem for the homogeneous system are obtained as the stationary points of the averaged action functional

$$\int_0^{\bar{T}} \mathcal{L}(x, \dot{x}) \quad (50)$$

The differential of this functional can be easily calculated as

$$\text{D} \left( \int_0^{\bar{T}} \mathcal{L}(x, \dot{x}) \right) \cdot \varphi = \langle \dot{x}, \dot{\varphi} \rangle_0 - \langle x, \varphi \rangle_0, \forall \varphi \in H_0^1 \quad (51)$$

Stationary points are therefore given by the equation

$$\text{D} \left( \int_0^{\bar{T}} \mathcal{L}(x, \dot{x}) \right) \cdot \varphi = 0, \forall \varphi \in H_0^1 \quad (52)$$

and an integration by parts with respect to  $\dot{x}$  gives the equation of motion, i.e. the strong SDOF problem.

The Hamiltonian function for the same system is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}(x, \dot{x}) &= \mathcal{H}_0(x, \dot{x}) = \frac{1}{2}\dot{x}^2 + \frac{1}{2}kx^2 \\ &= T(\dot{x}) + V(x) \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

The equation of motion can be obtained by the formula

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dx}{dt} &= \frac{\partial \mathcal{H}(x, \dot{x})}{\partial \dot{x}} \\ \frac{d\dot{x}}{dt} &= -\frac{\partial \mathcal{H}(x, \dot{x})}{\partial x} \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

and is coupled with initial conditions as in eq. (4).

Both formulations work for the undamped system where total energy is conserved, which in this notation is equivalent to saying that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{H}(x, \dot{x}) = 0 \quad (55)$$

provided that  $(x, \dot{x})$  is a solution of the equation of motion, eq. (2). Direct calculation can show the more general fact that solutions of the Lagrangian problem have constant energy.

In the context of a damped system, where energy is dissipated due to the presence of the term  $c\dot{x}^2$  in the relevant calculations (see §6.2), and in the presence of an excitation function, where energy input takes place, the Lagrangian and Hamiltonian formulations can be modified in the following way.

The time-dependent Lagrangian for the free SDOF system is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_c(x, \dot{x}, t) &= \frac{1}{2}e^{ct}\dot{x}^2 - \frac{1}{2}ke^{ct}x^2 \\ &= T_c(\dot{x}, t) - V_c(x, t) \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

The equation of motion for the free damped system can be obtained by the formula of eq. (49), coupled with boundary conditions.

The weak formulation for a system with excitation function  $f$  can be obtained in otherwise the same way by solving the equation

$$\text{D} \left( \int_0^{\bar{T}} \mathcal{L}_c(x, \dot{x}) \right) \cdot \varphi = \langle f, \varphi \rangle_c = \langle F, \dot{\varphi} \rangle_0, \forall \varphi \in H_0^1 \quad (57)$$

Instead of looking for stationary points, one asks, thus, that the differential be equal to a certain functional in  $L_c^2$ . The equation of motion is once again obtained by integration by parts.

In other words, the function  $x$  is a solution to the weak problem if, and only if, for fixed boundary conditions, the variation of the functional  $\mathcal{L}$  along any virtual deformation  $\varepsilon\varphi$  of the orbit  $x$  is equal to the virtual work  $\varepsilon\langle F, \dot{\varphi} \rangle_0$ , up to terms of the order of  $\varepsilon^2$ . More precisely, the condition is that, for every  $\varphi \in H_0^1$ ,

$$\mathcal{L}_c(x + \varepsilon\varphi) = \mathcal{L}_c(x) + \varepsilon\langle F, \dot{\varphi} \rangle_0 + O(\varepsilon^2) \quad (58)$$

The time-dependent Hamiltonian function for the same system is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_c(x, \dot{x}) &= \frac{1}{2}e^{ct}\dot{x}^2(t) + \frac{1}{2}e^{ct}kx^2(t) \\ &= T_c(\dot{x}) + V_c(x) \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

The equation of motion for the free system can be obtained by the formula of eq. (53), as can show a simple calculation.

In the presence of dissipation, the time-dependent Hamiltonian function of the homogeneous problem is not preserved, but satisfies the equation

$$\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{H}_c(x, \dot{x}, t) = -c\mathcal{L}_c(x, \dot{x}, t) \quad (60)$$

as can show a direct calculation. Therefore, the role of the exponential factor  $e^{ct}$ , introduced in eq. (56), is to balance the dissipation of energy due to damping, since the total energy  $\mathcal{H}_c$  is expected to oscillate around its initial value, while  $\mathcal{H}_0 \rightarrow 0$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  for the same system, since  $\mathcal{H}_0$  represents the standard mechanical energy and the system dissipates energy.

## 6.1 A conservation law

In the case where  $u \in H^2 \cap H_0^1$ , the following proposition can be proved. It is generalization of the conservation of energy in the dissipative setting, since in the case where  $c = 0$ , the energy conservation law is obtained. Here, no hypothesis on  $\bar{T}$  is necessary.

**Proposition 6.1.** *Let  $f \in L^2$  and  $u \in H^2 \cap H_0^1$  be the solution of the weak SDOF problem with 0 boundary conditions. Then,*

$$\frac{1}{2}e^{c\bar{T}}\dot{u}(\bar{T})^2 - \frac{1}{2}\dot{u}(0)^2 = \langle f, \dot{u} \rangle_c - c \int_0^{\bar{T}} \mathcal{L}_c(u, \dot{u}) = \langle \dot{f}, u \rangle_c \quad (61)$$

In the case where  $c = 0$ , the conclusion of the lemma reads simply

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}\dot{u}(\bar{T})^2 - \frac{1}{2}\dot{u}(0)^2 &= \int_0^{\bar{T}} f \dot{u} \\ &= \int_{u(\cdot)} f du \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

which is precisely energy conservation in view of the hypothesis  $u(0) = u(\bar{T}) = 0$ .

In the dissipative case,  $c > 0$ , the conclusion of the proposition can be obtained via the Lagrangian and Hamiltonian formulations.

Since one can transform non-homogeneous boundary conditions to homogeneous one by modifying the excitation function  $f$ , the corresponding hypothesis poses no real restriction to applications.

*Proof.* Multiply the equation

$$d(e^{ct}\dot{u}(t)) + e^{ct}u(t) = e^{ct}f(t) \quad (63)$$

by  $\dot{u}(t) \in H^1$  and integrate by parts. This gives

$$\begin{aligned} e^{ct}\dot{u}(t)^2|_0^{\bar{T}} - \langle \dot{u}, \ddot{u} \rangle_c - ck\|u\|_c^2 - k\langle u, \dot{u} \rangle_c &= \langle f, \dot{u} \rangle_c \iff \\ e^{ct}\dot{u}(t)^2|_0^{\bar{T}} - ck\|u\|_c^2 - \langle \dot{u}, \ddot{u} + ku \rangle_c &= \langle f, \dot{u} \rangle_c \iff \\ e^{ct}\dot{u}(t)^2|_0^{\bar{T}} - ck\|u\|_c^2 - \langle \dot{u}, f - c\dot{u} \rangle_c &= \langle f, \dot{u} \rangle_c \iff \\ e^{ct}\dot{u}(t)^2|_0^{\bar{T}} - 2c \int_0^{\bar{T}} \mathcal{L}_c(u, \dot{u}) &= 2\langle f, \dot{u} \rangle_c \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

Where use has been made of the fact that eq. (2) is satisfied in the weak sense. This gives directly the first part of the equality to be proved.

The second part follows from another integration by parts applied on the term  $\langle f, \dot{u} \rangle_c$ , and from the fact that  $\mathcal{L}_c(u, \dot{u}) = \langle f, u \rangle_c$ . The details are left to the reader.  $\square$

Dropping the homogeneous boundary condition hypothesis, one can obtain the following corollary, practically a restatement of the one here above.

**Corollary 6.2.** *Let  $x \in H^2$  and  $f \in H^1$  be the solution and the excitation function of the weak formulation of the SDOF problem. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{H}_c(\bar{T}) - \mathcal{H}_c(0)| &\leq \langle f, \dot{x} \rangle_c - c \langle f, x \rangle_c \\ &\leq e^{c\bar{T}} f(\bar{T})x(\bar{T}) - f(0)x(0) - \langle \dot{f}, x \rangle_c \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

In the particular case of 0 initial conditions, the above corollary yields the following inequality:

$$|\mathcal{H}_c(\bar{T})| \leq e^{c\bar{T}} f(\bar{T})x(\bar{T}) - \langle \dot{f}, x \rangle_c \quad (66)$$

## 6.2 A dissipation law

The strong form of the SDOF problem can be rewritten as

$$\ddot{x} + kx = f - c\dot{x} \quad (67)$$

Multiplication by  $\dot{x}$  and integration by parts yields the total loss of energy in time  $t \in I$  (cf. eq. (59) for the definition of  $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_0$ ):

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}\dot{x}^2|_0^t + \frac{1}{2}kx^2|_0^t &= \int_0^t f\dot{x} - c \int_0^t \dot{x}^2 \iff \\ \mathcal{H}(t) - \mathcal{H}(0) &= f(t)x(t) - f(0)x(0) - \int_0^t \dot{f}x - c \int_0^t \dot{x}^2 \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

The following proposition follows immediately from this dissipation law.

**Proposition 6.3.** *If  $x \in H^2$  and  $f \in L^2$  are respectively the solution and the excitation function of a weak SDOF problem. Then*

$$\frac{1}{2}\|\dot{x}\|_c^2 + \frac{1}{2}k\|x\|_c^2 \leq \left( \|f\|_c + \frac{1}{c}(e^{c\bar{T}} - 1)\|\dot{f}\|_c \right) \|x\|_c + \frac{1}{c}(e^{c\bar{T}} - 1)(\mathcal{H}(0) - f(0)x(0)) \quad (69)$$

*Proof.* Suppose that  $c > 0$ . The dissipation law gives directly

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{\bar{T}} e^{ct}\mathcal{H}(t) &\leq \int_0^{\bar{T}} e^{ct}f(t)x(t) - \int_0^{\bar{T}} e^{ct} \left( \int_0^t \dot{f}(t)x(t) \right) + \frac{1}{c}(e^{c\bar{T}} - 1)(\mathcal{H}(0) - f(0)x(0)) \\ &\leq \left( \|f\|_c + \frac{1}{c}(e^{c\bar{T}} - 1)\|e^{-c\cdot}\dot{f}(\cdot)\|_c \right) \|x\|_c + \frac{1}{c}(e^{c\bar{T}} - 1)(\mathcal{H}(0) - f(0)x(0)) \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

where  $\frac{1}{c}(e^{c\bar{T}} - 1)$  is of course the measure of the interval  $I$  with respect to the measure  $e^{ct}dt$  when  $c > 0$  and the Hölder inequality has been applied twice. One can formally pass to the limit as  $c \rightarrow 0$  and obtain the factor  $\bar{T}$  in the case  $c = 0$ .  $\square$

## 7 Some remarks on the weak formulation

The weak formulation has an inherent non-local character. The property that characterizes the solution is a non-local one, obtained by integration of the solution against test functions, and therefore the stepwise character of the traditional methods is lost. The loss of the local character is underlined by the fact that the weak formulation works only with a boundary value problem, so that the final displacement of the moving body is considered as a known quantity. A function in  $H^1$  does not have

a well-defined pointwise derivative, so the initial condition  $\dot{x}_0$  makes no sense in this context. Finally, no discretization in the time domain is necessary for obtaining the weak formulation, but it can be eventually introduced a posteriori for applications.

What is traditionally called weak formulation (see, e.g., [Hug87]) is in fact the projection of the (full) weak formulation, as it is obtained in the present work, on a finite dimensional space via the following procedure. A finite dimensional subspace of  $H^1$  is constructed by introducing a discretization of the time domain, and by choosing the order of polynomial approximation, typically equal to 2. Then, the solution is *a priori* projected on this finite dimensional space of functions that are  $C^2$  and piece-wise polynomial of the given order, with breakpoints at the points of the time-discretization mesh. The dimension of the function space thus constructed can be computed, but it is irrelevant, the important point being that it is of positive (in fact infinite) codimension<sup>4</sup>. The construction of the projection, which to the best knowledge of the authors seems to be arbitrary, consists essentially in choosing and fixing a weight function (typically denoted by  $w$ ). This weight function replaces the test function  $\varphi$  of this work and it is *fixed* for each numerical method, as its choice actually defines each particular method. However, in this work the test function cannot be fixed but has to run through the entire function space of admissible weights. The choice of the weight function determines the scope and the efficiency of the method, under the limitations related to the infinite codimensionality of the space in which the solution is sought and the limitation in the choice of the (unique) test function. These limitations are exactly those described by the Dahlquist Barrier Theorem, (see [Dah56] and [Dah63]).

In this work, the actual weak formulation is obtained, since the eq. (30) is a representation of the solution in the full space  $H^1$ , and the construction of a projection onto a finite dimensional subspace is left to be introduced a posteriori for the eventual numerical implementations. Here, the projection cannot be chosen arbitrarily, since it is dictated by the  $L^2$  scalar product of eq. (23). The arbitrary choice defining the particular numerical method would consist in the choice of the space onto which the solution is projected. A reasonable choice seems to be the space of  $C^1$ , piece-wise polynomial functions of constant but arbitrary order. Such a method is constructed in part two of the paper.

Finally, the weak formulation has the advantage that only one derivative appears, and the second derivative is replaced by integration of the unknown function against test functions. Therefore, the price to pay for dropping the degree of the equation by one is the infinite dimensionality of the space in which the problem is posed, the space  $H^1$ . On the other hand, this very fact allows higher-degree polynomial approximation, and derivation is replaced by integration, which is numerically more stable.

## 8 Weak formulation: The MDOF case

The exact same reasoning applies to the Multi-Degree-Of-Freedom (MDOF) case, where the governing equation is

$$[M]\{\ddot{x}\} + [C]\{\dot{x}\} + K\{x\} = \{f\} \quad (71)$$

where  $[M], [C], [K] \in M_n(\mathbb{R})$  are symmetric real  $n \times n$  matrices. The mass matrix  $[M]$  is symmetric and positive definite, as is the stiffness matrix  $[K]$ . The unknown is now a vector-valued function  $\{x\}(\cdot): \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ , where  $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$  is the number of degrees of freedom of the system.

Normalization with respect to the mass in this context amounts to left multiplication by the matrix  $[M]^{-1}$  which gives

$$\{\ddot{x}\} + [\bar{C}]\{\dot{x}\} + [\bar{K}]\{x\} = \{\bar{f}\} \quad (72)$$

---

<sup>4</sup>The codimension of a subspace of a vector space is the dimension of its complementary space. In this context, the point of the argument is that, since the codimension of the space on which the solution is projected is infinite, the information lost a priori in the construction of the weak solution lives in an infinite dimensional space.

where

$$[\bar{C}] = [M]^{-1}[C] \quad (73)$$

$$[\bar{K}] = [M]^{-1}[K] \quad (74)$$

$$\{\bar{f}\} = [M]^{-1}\{f\} \quad (75)$$

Multiplication by  $e^{[\bar{C}]t}$  and use of the Leibniz rule gives

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left[ e^{[\bar{C}]t} \{\dot{x}\}(t) \right] + e^{[\bar{C}]t} [\bar{K}] \{x\}(t) = e^{[\bar{C}]t} \{f\}(t) \quad (76)$$

As for the SDOF case, left multiplication by  $\{\varphi\}^T$ , where  $\{\varphi\} \in C_0^\infty(I, \mathbb{R}^n)$ , and integration by parts yields

$$-\int_0^{\bar{T}} \{\dot{\varphi}\}^T(t) e^{[\bar{C}]t} \{\dot{x}\}(t) dt + \int_0^{\bar{T}} \{\varphi\}^T(t) e^{[\bar{C}]t} [\bar{K}] \{x\}(t) dt = \int_0^{\bar{T}} \{\varphi\}^T(t) e^{[\bar{C}]t} \{f\}(t) dt \quad (77)$$

Eq. (77) should be satisfied for every  $\{\varphi\} \in C_0^\infty(I, \mathbb{R}^n)$ . The compact form of eq. (77) is obtained by introducing the space  $L_c^2(I, \mathbb{R}^n)$ , consisting of the square-integrable vector-valued functions on  $I$  and its inner product

$$\langle \{\varphi\}(\cdot), \{\psi\}(\cdot) \rangle = \langle \{\varphi\}(\cdot), \{\psi\}(\cdot) \rangle_{[\bar{C}]} = \int_0^{\bar{T}} \{\varphi\}^T(t) e^{[\bar{C}]t} \{\psi\}(t) dt \quad (78)$$

In view of eq. (78), eq. (77) can be rewritten as

$$-\langle \{\dot{x}\}(\cdot), \{\dot{\varphi}\}(\cdot) \rangle + \langle [\bar{K}] \{x\}(\cdot), \{\varphi\}(\cdot) \rangle = \langle \{f\}(\cdot), \{\varphi\}(\cdot) \rangle, \quad \forall \{\varphi\} \in C_0^\infty(I, \mathbb{R}^n) \quad (79)$$

Working in eigenmode coordinates  $\phi_i$ , with  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , where the equations assume the decoupled form

$$\mu_i \ddot{\phi}_i + \xi_i \dot{\phi}_i + \kappa_i \phi_i = \bar{f}_i \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, n \quad (80)$$

with initial conditions  $\phi_i(0) = \phi_{i,0}$  and  $\dot{\phi}_i(0) = \dot{\phi}_{i,0}$ , one can directly verify the following facts. To each eigenmode  $\phi_i$  corresponds, as in eq. (10), an affine linear mapping

$$\mathcal{B}_{\phi_{i,0}, \bar{f}_i, \bar{T}}: \dot{\phi}_{i,0} \mapsto x(\bar{T}) \quad (81)$$

Therefore, the initial conditions in physical coordinates,  $\{x_{i,0}\}$  and  $\{\dot{x}_{i,0}\}$  can be transformed into initial conditions in eigenmode coordinates  $\{\phi_{i,0}\}$  and  $\{\dot{\phi}_{i,0}\}$ , then to boundary conditions  $\{\phi_{i,0}\}$  and  $\{\phi_{i,\bar{T}}\}$  and finally to boundary conditions in physical coordinates  $\{x_{i,0}\}$  and  $\{x_{i,\bar{T}}\}$ . As in the SDOF case, each operator  $\mathcal{B}_{\phi_{i,0}, \bar{f}_i, \bar{T}}$  is invertible iff  $\bar{T}$  is not a half-integer multiple of the eigenperiod  $T_i$  of the corresponding SDOF system. Consequently, the correspondence between initial conditions and boundary value for the MDOF problem (both in physical and eigenmode coordinates) is bijective (i.e. one-to-one and onto) provided that

$$\bar{T} \notin \bigcup_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{N}^* T_i \quad (82)$$

This condition is again typical in any relevant sense, just as for the SDOF problem.

Assuming given boundary conditions, one can fix two  $C^\infty$  matrix valued mappings  $[v_0], [v_{\bar{T}}]: [0, \bar{T}] \rightarrow M_n(\mathbb{R})$  such that

$$\begin{cases} v_{ii,0}(0) = v_{ii,\bar{T}}(\bar{T}) = 1, 1 \leq i \leq n \\ v_{ii,0}(\bar{T}) = v_{ii,\bar{T}}(0) = 0, 1 \leq i \leq n \\ v_{ij}(\cdot) \equiv 0, i \neq j \end{cases} \quad (83)$$

Then, if  $\{x\}(\cdot)$  solves eq. (71) with boundary conditions (11), then the function

$$\{u\}(\cdot) = \{x\}(\cdot) - [v_0](\cdot)\{x\}_0 - [v_{\bar{T}}](\cdot)\{x\}_{\bar{T}} \quad (84)$$

satisfies homogeneous boundary conditions  $u(0) = u(\bar{T}) = 0$ .

Introduction of the mapping

$$\{u\}(\cdot) = \{x\}(\cdot) - [v_0]\{x\}_0(\cdot) - [v_{\bar{T}}]\{x\}_{\bar{T}}(\cdot) \quad (85)$$

yields the decomposition

$$\{x\}(\cdot) = \{u\}(\cdot) + \{v_{0,\bar{T}}\}(\cdot) \quad (86)$$

where, as for the SDOF case,

$$\{v_{0,\bar{T}}\}(\cdot) = [v_0](\cdot)\{x\}_0 + [v_{\bar{T}}](\cdot)\{x\}_{\bar{T}} \quad (87)$$

Then, eq. (24) reaches the form

$$\begin{aligned} - \langle \{\dot{u}\}(\cdot), \{\dot{\varphi}\}(\cdot) \rangle + \langle [\bar{K}]\{u\}(\cdot), \{\varphi\}(\cdot) \rangle = \\ \langle \{f\}(\cdot), \{\varphi\}(\cdot) \rangle + \langle \{\dot{v}_{0,\bar{T}}\}(\cdot), \{\varphi\}(\cdot) \rangle - \langle [\bar{K}]\{v_{0,\bar{T}}\}(\cdot), \{\varphi\}(\cdot) \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (88)$$

which should hold for all  $\varphi \in C_0^\infty$ .

**Theorem 8.1.** *Eq. (88) is the weak form of eq. (71), with boundary conditions  $\{x\}(0) = \{x_{i,0}\}$  and  $\{x\}(\bar{T}) = \{x_{i,\bar{T}}\}$ .*

This is the weak form of the MDOF problem, and as in the SDOF case, it is an equation with unknown  $\{u\}(\cdot) \in H_0^1(I, \mathbb{R}^n)$ , and should be satisfied for all  $\{\varphi\}(\cdot) \in C_0^\infty(I, \mathbb{R}^n)$ .

The weak form of the MDOF problem has the obvious disadvantage that it requires the calculation of the exponential matrix

$$e^{[\bar{C}]t} \quad (89)$$

which is computationally efficient only if the matrix  $[\bar{C}]$  is diagonal. Therefore, for numerical applications the reader should bear in mind the implicit condition that the matrix  $[\bar{C}] = [M]^{-1}[C]$  is considered to be diagonal.

The authors plan to examine the case where  $[\bar{C}]$  is diagonal dominant in a future article.

## 9 From the weak formulation to numerical implementations: the SDOF case

An algorithm based on the weak formulation can be constructed by restricting the solution to  $\mathcal{E}_0^0$ , a finite dimensional subspace of  $H_0^1$ . The restriction is obtained via a projection of the force with respect to the  $H^{-1}$  duality, and then obtaining the solution associated to this problem. The description that follows applies directly to the SDOF problem, and with some obvious modifications to the MDOF one.

## 9.1 Obtaining a numerical method

Suppose that  $\mathcal{E}_0^0$  is generated by the  $n$  functions  $\{b_i\}_{i=1}^n \subset C_0^1(I)$ , i.e.

$$\mathcal{E}_0^0 = \{\varphi \in H_0^1, \exists \beta_i \in \mathbb{R}, \varphi(\cdot) = \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i b_i(\cdot)\} \quad (90)$$

For obvious reasons, it is assumed that there exists a function  $b$  in  $\mathcal{E}_0^0$  such that  $\dot{b}(0) \neq 0$ .

The unknown function  $u$  is restricted to  $\mathcal{E}_0^0$ , and given the choice of a basis of  $\mathcal{E}_0^0$ , namely  $\{b_i\}_{i=1}^n$ , the approximate solution  $u_{ap}$  has an expression  $u_{ap}(\cdot) = \sum_1^n u_i b_i(\cdot)$ . The basis should be completed by two functions  $b_0$  and  $b_{n+1}$  such that

$$b_0(0) = b_1(1) = 1 \text{ and } b_0(1) = b_1(0) = 0 \quad (91)$$

(notice the abuse of notation since  $b_0$  and  $b_1$  are elements of  $H^1 \setminus H_0^1$ ). These functions will be used to form  $v_{0,\bar{T}}$  by

$$v_{0,\bar{T}}(\cdot) = x_0 b_0(\cdot) + x_{\bar{T}} b_{n+1}(\cdot) \quad (92)$$

The functions  $b_i$ ,  $0 \leq i \leq n+1$ , can be chosen in  $C^1$ , which is only slightly more restrictive than  $H^1$  and more convenient for computations. The space generated by the functions  $\{b_i\}_{i=0}^{n+1} \subset C^1(\bar{I})$  will be denoted by  $\mathcal{E}$ , so that  $\mathcal{E}_0^0 \subsetneq \mathcal{E}$ .

Then, by letting the test function  $\varphi$  run through the basis  $\{b_i\}_{i=1}^n$ , and asking that the weak form of the equation be satisfied by  $u_{ap}(\cdot) = \sum u_i b_i(\cdot)$  and for each such  $\varphi$ , one can solve the linear system with the coordinates  $u_i$  as unknowns and with  $x_{\bar{T}}$  as parameter. This linear system reads

$$[\mathbf{B}]\{u\} = \{\mathbf{F}\} \quad (93)$$

Here,  $[\mathbf{B}] = [B_{ij}]$  is the symmetric  $n \times n$  matrix whose entries are

$$B_{ij} = -\langle \dot{b}_i(\cdot), \dot{b}_j(\cdot) \rangle + k \langle b_i(\cdot), b_j(\cdot) \rangle, 1 \leq i, j \leq n \quad (94)$$

the vector  $\{u\}$  is the  $n \times 1$  vector of the unknown coefficients

$$u_i, 1 \leq i \leq n \quad (95)$$

and  $\{\mathbf{F}\}$  is the  $n \times 1$  vector of the known forces,

$$F_i = \langle f(\cdot), b_i(\cdot) \rangle - \langle x_0 \dot{b}_0(\cdot) + x_{\bar{T}} \dot{b}_{n+1}(\cdot), \dot{b}_i(\cdot) \rangle + k \langle x_0 b_0(\cdot) + x_{\bar{T}} b_{n+1}(\cdot), b_i(\cdot) \rangle \quad (96)$$

where  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . The final displacement,  $x(\bar{T}) = x_{\bar{T}}$  appears here as a parameter and the solution  $\{u\}$  of the linear problem depends on it.

The matrix  $[\mathbf{B}]$  is invertible thanks to the choice of  $\bar{T}$ , which grants a unique vector  $\{u\} = \{u\}(x_{\bar{T}})$  satisfying eq. (93) Then the condition that  $\dot{x}_{ap}(0) = \dot{x}_0$ , where

$$x_{ap}(\cdot) = \sum_{i=0}^{n+1} u_i b_i(\cdot) \in \mathcal{E}, \quad (97)$$

is the approximate solution, allows to rid the linear system of eq. (93) of the dependence on  $x_{\bar{T}}$ .

The action of letting the test function run through a basis of the space  $\mathcal{E}_0^0$  in which the approximate solution is sought does not allow any arbitrary choices of parameters, and lets the geometry of the spaces optimize the approximation. The only arbitrary choice consists in the choice of the space  $\mathcal{B}$  and in the construction of the basis  $\{b_i\}$  which should respectively be "as dense in  $H_0^1$  as possible" and facilitate calculations by satisfying good orthogonality conditions.

An important note is due at this point. In reality, the SDOF problem is presented as an initial values problem. The weak form is better adapted to a boundary value problem. Under the standing



assumption on  $\bar{T}$ , initial and boundary value problems are shown to be in a one-to-one correspondence for the *exact solution*. When approximate solutions are constructed, however, the dependence of the operator  $\mathcal{B}$  of eq. (10) on the excitation function  $f$  comes into play. The correspondence

$$\dot{x}_0 \leftrightarrow x_{ap}(\bar{T}) = \mathcal{B}_{x_0, f_{ap}, \bar{T}}(\dot{x}_0) \quad (98)$$

depends, therefore, on the space  $\mathcal{E}$  in a quite subtle way.

As is expected,  $x_{ap}(\bar{T}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_{x_0, f, \bar{T}}(\dot{x}_0)$  as  $x_{ap} \rightarrow x$ , provided that  $f_{ap} \rightarrow f$  in  $H^{-1}$ . However, equality is in general not true before passage to the limit and convergence needs to be shown, since the solution  $x_{ap}$  as constructed in eq. (97) satisfies the initial conditions  $x_{ap}(0) = x_0$  and  $\dot{x}_{ap}(0) = \dot{x}_0$  and *not* the boundary condition  $x_{ap}(\bar{T}) = x(\bar{T})$ .

For this reason, all statements concerning the construction of the approximate solution will be stated in terms of initial values, and not in terms of boundary conditions.

Concerning the choice of the space  $\mathcal{E}$ , the authors have tried to use "damped stationary waves", i.e. functions like

$$e^{-ct/2} \sin\left(\pi k \frac{t}{T}\right), k \in \mathbb{N}^* \quad (99)$$

for generating the space  $\mathcal{B}$ , coupled with cosines carrying the boundary conditions. The attempt was unsuccessful, but a successful one using  $C^1$  piecewise polynomial functions will be presented in part II of the paper.

## 9.2 The excitation function of the approximate solution

Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be as in the previous paragraph and  $\{b_i\}_{i=0}^{n+1} \subset C_0^\infty$  be a basis for  $\mathcal{E}$ , let  $\mathcal{E}_{00} \subset \mathcal{E}$  be the set of functions in  $\mathcal{E}$  satisfying homogeneous *initial* conditions:

$$\mathcal{E}_{00} = \{b \in \mathcal{E}, b(0) = \dot{b}(0) = 0\} \quad (100)$$

and suppose for convenience and without loss of generality that the first two functions are the only two ones with non-zero derivative at 0.<sup>5</sup>, so that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{ic} &= \mathbb{R}b_0 \oplus \mathbb{R}b_1 \\ \mathcal{E} &= \mathcal{E}_{00} \oplus \mathcal{E}_{ic} \end{aligned} \quad (101)$$

Define also the linear mapping  $\Phi$ , associating to a displacement function  $x \in H^1$ , the corresponding functional in  $H^{-1}$  defining the lhs of the weak formulation,

$$\Phi(x) = \Phi_c(x) = (\varphi(\cdot) \rightarrow -\langle \dot{x}(\cdot), \dot{\varphi}(\cdot) \rangle_c + k \langle x(\cdot), \varphi(\cdot) \rangle_c) \quad (102)$$

This mapping is continuous  $H^1 \rightarrow H^{-1}$ , and the following proposition is obvious, given theorem 4.3.

**Proposition 9.1.** *Under the assumptions of theorem 4.3, with homogeneous boundary conditions, the mapping  $\Phi$  a bijection  $H_0^1 \rightarrow H^{-1}$ . The function  $x$  is a solution to the problem if, and only if,*

$$\Phi_c(x)(u) = \langle e^c f, u \rangle_{H^{-1}} = \langle F, \dot{u} \rangle_{L_0^2}, \forall u \in H_0^1$$

Define, also, the following spaces of excitation functions corresponding to the space  $\mathcal{E}$  and its relevant subspaces:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F} &= \mathbb{F}(\mathcal{E}) \\ \mathcal{F}_{00} &= \mathbb{F}(\mathcal{E}_{00}) \\ \mathcal{F}_0^0 &= \mathbb{F}(\mathcal{E}_0^0) \\ \mathcal{F}_{ic} &= \mathbb{F}(\mathcal{E}_{ic}) \end{aligned} \quad (103)$$

---

<sup>5</sup>It is a standing assumption that  $\{b_i\}_{i=1}^n$  satisfy homogeneous boundary conditions.

where  $\mathbb{F}$  is defined in eq. (3). All these spaces are subspaces of  $H^{-1}$ , that can be identified to subspaces of  $L_0^2$  by means of the  $_{H^{-1}}\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{H^1}$  duality via the mapping  $H^{-1} \rightarrow L_0^2$

$$e^c f \mapsto F = \int e^c f \quad (104)$$

as in lemma 4.1. The shorthand in notation will be preserved when subscripts are used, so that

$$F_{\#} = \int e^c f_{\#} \quad (105)$$

whatever the subscript  $\#$  might be.

Let, now,  $x$  be the exact solution of the SDOF problem with rhs equal to  $f$ , and initial conditions  $x_0, \dot{x}_0$ . There exists  $\lambda = \lambda(x_0, \dot{x}_0) \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $|\lambda| \leq K \max(x_0, \dot{x}_0)$  where  $K > 0$  depends only on the choice of  $b_0$  and  $b_1$ , such that

$$x_h = x - x_0 b_0 - \lambda b_1 \quad (106)$$

satisfies homogeneous initial conditions. Call

$$f_h = \mathbb{F}(x_h) = f - x_0 \mathbb{F}(b_0) - \lambda \mathbb{F}(b_1) \quad (107)$$

the corresponding excitation function. The same procedure can be applied to the approximate solution  $x_{ap}$  constructed in §9.1, which satisfies the strong SDOF equation with rhs  $f_{ap}$ , yielding  $f_{ap,h}$ .

With these notations the following proposition holds, whose proof follows directly from the definitions of the respective functional spaces.

**Proposition 9.2.** *The excitation function  $f_{ap}$  corresponding to the approximate solution  $x_{ap}$  as in eq. (97) satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} f_h &= f - x_0 \mathbb{F}(b_0) - \lambda \mathbb{F}(b_1) \\ f_{ap} &\in \mathcal{F} \\ f_{ap,h} &= f_{ap} - x_0 \mathbb{F}(b_0) - \lambda \mathbb{F}(b_1) \in \mathcal{F}_{00} \\ \pi_{\mathcal{E}_0^0} e^c f_{ap,h} &= \pi_{\mathcal{E}_0^0} e^c f_h \end{aligned} \quad (108)$$

where the projection  $\pi_{\mathcal{E}_0^0}$  is with respect to the  $H^{-1}$  duality.

The definition of the projection  $\pi$  with respect to the duality  $_{H^{-1}}\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{H^1}$  uses the injections  $H^1 \hookrightarrow L^2 \hookrightarrow H^{-1}$  where the space  $L^2 \equiv L_0^2$  is identified with its dual. Thus, projection of  $u \in H^{-1}$  along  $\varphi \in H_0^1$  with respect to the  $_{H^{-1}}\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{H^1}$  duality amounts to projection of  $U \in L^2$ , an integral of  $e^c u(\cdot)$ , along  $\dot{\varphi} \in L^2$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{\mathbb{R}\varphi} e^c u &= \frac{1}{\|\varphi\|_{H^1}^2} \langle u, \varphi \rangle_c \varphi \\ &= \frac{1}{\|\varphi\|_{H^1}^2} \langle U, \dot{\varphi} \rangle_0 \varphi \end{aligned} \quad (109)$$

The proof follows from calculations similar to the ones proving theorem 4.3 and the construction of the approximate solution.

The following proposition is immediate.

**Proposition 9.3.** *The following estimate on  $f_{ap,h}$  is true:*

$$\|f_{ap,h}\|_{H^{-1}} \leq \|f\|_{H^{-1}} + K \max(x_0, x_T) \quad (110)$$

From the properties of projections in Hilbert spaces follows directly the following corollary to proposition 9.2.

**Corollary 9.4.** *The following estimate on the excitation function of the approximate solution holds true:*

$$\|e^c f_{ap,h} - \pi_{\mathcal{E}_0^0} e^c f_h\|_{H^{-1}} \lesssim \|\pi_{\mathcal{E}_0^0} e^c f_h\|_{H^{-1}} \tan \theta_{nh} + K \max(x_0, x_T) \sin \theta_h \quad (111)$$

where  $\theta_{nh}$  is the angle between the spaces  $e^c \mathcal{F}_{00}$  and  $e^c \mathcal{E}_0^0$  in  $H^{-1}$  and  $\theta_h$  is the angle between the spaces  $e^c \mathcal{F}_{ic}$  and  $e^c \mathcal{E}_0^0$  in  $H^{-1}$ .

Equivalently and more easily in terms of calculation, the angle  $\theta_{nh}$  can be obtained as the angle between the space formed by integrals of functions  $e^{c \cdot} u \in \mathcal{F}_0$  and derivatives of functions in  $\mathcal{E}_0^0$  in  $L_0^2$ . Similarly for the angle  $\theta_h$ .

The subscripts in the angles  $\theta$  stand for *non-homogeneous* and *homogeneous* respectively, referring to the SDOF problem with 0 initial conditions and non-0 excitation function; and 0 excitation function and non-0 initial conditions, respectively.

The choice of the space  $\mathcal{E}$  determines the geometry that is captured in the above corollary: the better the corresponding spaces are aligned, i.e. the smaller the angles  $\theta$  are, the better the approximation is.

The following proposition and its corollary conclude the study of the convergence of the numerical method in the general case.

**Proposition 9.5.** *The error in the excitation force,  $f_{er}$ , given by*

$$f_{er,h} = f_h - f_{ap,h} = (f_h - \pi_{\mathcal{E}_0^0} f_h) + (\pi_{\mathcal{E}_0^0} f_h - f_{ap,h}) \quad (112)$$

*satisfies the following estimate*

$$\|f_{er,h}\|_{H^{-1}} \leq \|f_h - \pi_{\mathcal{E}_0^0} f_h\|_{H^{-1}} + \|\pi_{\mathcal{E}_0^0} f_h\|_{H^{-1}} \tan \theta_{nh} + K \max(|x_0|, |\dot{x}_0|) \sin \theta_h \quad (113)$$

The proof follows immediately from the previous corollary and the triangle inequality.

**Corollary 9.6.** *The error in the excitation force for a given SDOF system can be bounded by*

$$\|f_{er,h}\|_{H^{-1}} = O\left(\max(\|f_h - \pi_{\mathcal{E}_0^0} f_h\|_{H^{-1}}, \|\pi_{\mathcal{E}_0^0} f_h\|_{H^{-1}} \tan \theta_{nh}, \sin \theta_h)\right) \quad (114)$$

In applications, the three terms will have to be estimated independently. The first one stands for the error due to projection and it depends on how  $f$  is placed with respect to the space  $\mathcal{E}_0^0$ . The second term depends on the relative position of the spaces  $\mathcal{F}_0^0$  and  $\mathcal{E}_0^0$ , and the last one on the relative position of the spaces  $\mathbb{R}\Phi(e^{c \cdot} b_0) \oplus \mathbb{R}\Phi(e^{c \cdot} b_1)$  and  $\mathcal{E}_0^0$ . For the approximation to converge, all three terms need to go to 0 as  $\mathcal{E} \rightarrow H^1$ .

### 9.3 Bounds for the approximation error

In this paragraph, a method for obtaining bounds for the error of approximation is presented under some assumptions on the  $n$ -dimensional space  $\mathcal{E}_0^0$ , assuming for convenience that the functions in the space  $\mathcal{E}_0^0$  are  $C^\infty$  smooth.

To this end, call

$$\begin{aligned} \ddot{x} + c\dot{x} + kx &= f \\ \ddot{x}_{ap} + c\dot{x}_{ap} + kx_{ap} &= f_{ap} \\ \ddot{x}_{ap,h} + c\dot{x}_{ap,h} + kx_{ap,h} &= f_{ap,h} \\ \ddot{x}_{er,h} + c\dot{x}_{er,h} + kx_{er,h} &= f_{er,h} = f_h - f_{ap,h} \end{aligned} \quad (115)$$

where  $x_{ap,h} \in \mathcal{E}_{00}$  satisfies homogeneous initial conditions, and  $f_{ap,h}$  is obtained by substitution of  $x_{ap,h}$  in the SDOF equation.

#### 9.3.1 Bounds for the error in displacement

Firstly, the Duhamel representation, eq. (9), and the calculations carried out in eq. (38) give the following proposition.

**Proposition 9.7.** *Let  $f \in H^{-1}$  and  $F \in L^2$  an integral of  $e^{c \cdot} f(\cdot)$ . Then, for some irrelevant constant  $K > 0$ , the solution  $x$  to the SDOF problem with homogeneous initial conditions satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} \|x\|_{L^\infty} &\leq K \max_{t \in I} e^{-ct/2} \left(\frac{1-e^{-ct}}{c}\right)^{1/2} \|F(\cdot)\|_{L_0^2(0,t)} \leq K \|F(\cdot)\|_{L_0^2(I)} \\ \|x\|_{L_0^2} &\leq K e^{-c\bar{T}/2} \left(1 - e^{-c\bar{T}}\right)^{1/2} \|F(\cdot)\|_{L_0^2(I)} \end{aligned} \quad (116)$$

The constant  $K$  depends on  $\bar{T}$  and the parameters defining the SDOF system.

*Proof.* The lemma amounts to estimating

$$x(t) = d(t) \int_0^t F(\tau)(d(\tau) - \frac{c}{2}s(\tau))d\tau + s(t) \int_0^t F(\tau)(\frac{c}{2}d(\tau) + \omega_d^2 s(\tau))d\tau \quad (117)$$

in  $L_0^2$  and in  $L^\infty$ . One can get directly that, for some irrelevant constant  $K > 0$  depending on  $c$  and  $\omega_d$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |x(t)| &\leq K e^{-ct/2} \left( \left( \int_0^t F(\tau)d(\tau)d\tau \right)^2 + \left( \int_0^t F(\tau)s(\tau)d\tau \right)^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq K e^{-ct/2} \left( \int_0^t d(\tau)^2 d\tau + \int_0^t s(\tau)^2 d\tau \right)^{1/2} \left( \int_0^t F(\tau)^2 d(\tau)d\tau \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq K e^{-ct/2} \left( \frac{1-e^{-ct}}{c} \right)^{1/2} \|F(\cdot)\|_{L_0^2(0,t)} \end{aligned} \quad (118)$$

by repeated applications of Hölder's inequality. Direct estimation in  $L^2$  gives

$$\begin{aligned} \|x(t)\|_{L_0^2(I)}^2 &\leq K \left\| \frac{e^{-ct} - e^{-2ct}}{c} \right\|_{L_0^1(I)} \| \|F(\cdot)\|_{L_0^2(0,t)} \|^2 \|L^\infty(I, dt) \\ &= K e^{-c\bar{T}} (1 - e^{-c\bar{T}}) \|F(\cdot)\|_{L_0^2(I)}^2 \end{aligned} \quad (119)$$

which concludes the proof.  $\square$

Using lemma 4.1, the following corollary is immediate.

**Corollary 9.8.** *The error in displacement converges to 0 in  $L_0^2$  at the same rate as  $\|f_{er,h}\|_{H^{-1}}$ :*

$$\|x_{er,h}\|_{L_0^2} \leq C \|f_{er,h}\|_{H^{-1}} \quad (120)$$

Under the standing assumptions on  $\mathcal{E}$ , bounds for the errors of the approximate solution of the SDOF problem can be obtained by applying the following proposition.

**Proposition 9.9.** *Let  $x$  be the solution to a weak SDOF problem,  $f_h$  the excitation function corresponding to homogeneous initial conditions, see proposition 9.2, and  $F_h \in L_0^2$  an integral of  $e^c f_h(\cdot)$ . Then, the error of approximation  $x_{er}$  satisfies the following estimates:*

$$\begin{aligned} \|F_h\|_{L_0^2} &\leq \|f\|_{H^{-1}} + K \max(x_0, \dot{x}_0) \\ \|x_{er,h}\|_{L^\infty} &\leq K \max_{t \in I} e^{-ct/2} \left( \frac{1-e^{-ct}}{c} \right)^{1/2} \|F_{h,er}(\cdot)\|_{L_0^2(0,t)} \left( \|d_t(\cdot)\|_{L_0^2(0,t)}^2 + \|s_t(\cdot)\|_{L_0^2(0,t)}^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq K \|F_{h,er}(\cdot)\|_{L_0^2(I)} \left( \|d_h(\cdot)\|_{L_0^2(I)}^2 + \|s_h(\cdot)\|_{L_0^2(I)}^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq K \|F_{h,er}(\cdot)\|_{L_0^2(I)} \\ \|x_{er,h}\|_{L_0^2} &\leq K e^{-c\bar{T}/2} \left( 1 - e^{-c\bar{T}} \right)^{1/2} \|F_{h,er}(\cdot)\|_{L_0^2(I)} \\ |x_{er,h}(\bar{T})| &\leq K e^{-c\bar{T}/2} \|F_{er,h}(\cdot)\|_{L_0^2} \left( \|d_{er,h}(\cdot)\|_{L_0^2}^2 + \|s_{er,h}(\cdot)\|_{L_0^2}^2 \right)^{1/2} \end{aligned} \quad (121)$$

In the statement of the proposition,

$$\begin{aligned} F_{h,er}(\cdot) &= \pi_{(\mathcal{E}_0^0)^\perp} F_h(\cdot) \\ &= F_h(\cdot) - \pi_{\mathcal{E}_h} F_h(\cdot) \\ d_{er,h}(\cdot) &= \pi_{(\mathcal{E}_0^0)^\perp} d(\cdot) \\ &= d(\cdot) - \pi_{\mathcal{E}_0^0} d(\cdot) \\ s_{er,h}(\cdot) &= \pi_{(\mathcal{E}_0^0)^\perp} s(\cdot) \\ &= s(\cdot) - \pi_{\mathcal{E}_0^0} s(\cdot) \end{aligned} \quad (122)$$

The errors of approximation to the fundamental solutions  $d_{er}(\cdot)$  and  $s_{er}(\cdot)$  come from projections on the space  $\mathcal{E}_0^0$  of (the derivatives of) test functions. These errors naturally depend on the choice of the space  $\mathcal{E}$ , and therefore on the specifics of each implementation.

*Proof.* The proof uses the same calculations as the one of proposition 9.7, along with proposition 9.2, and the relation between  $H_0^1$ - $H^{-1}$  duality and the  $L^2$  scalar product of the proof of lemma 4.1. The last inequality follows by substitution  $t = \bar{T}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} x(\bar{T}) &= d(\bar{T}) \int_0^{\bar{T}} F(\tau) (d(\tau) - \frac{c}{2}s(\tau)) d\tau + s(\bar{T}) \int_0^{\bar{T}} F(\tau) (\frac{c}{2}d(\tau) + \omega_d^2 s(\tau)) d\tau \\ &= d(\bar{T}) \langle F(\cdot), d(\cdot) - \frac{c}{2}s(\cdot) \rangle_0 + s(\bar{T}) \langle F(\cdot), \frac{c}{2}d(\cdot) + \omega_d^2 s(\cdot) \rangle_0 \end{aligned} \quad (123)$$

Using the fact that  $|d(\cdot)|^2 + \omega_d^2 |s(\cdot)|^2 = e^{-c \cdot}$ , one gets directly that

$$\begin{aligned} |x(\bar{T})| &\leq e^{-c\bar{T}/2} \left( \langle F(\cdot), d(\cdot) - \frac{c}{2}s(\cdot) \rangle_0^2 + \langle F(\cdot), \frac{c}{2\omega_d}d(\cdot) + \omega_d s(\cdot) \rangle_0^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq e^{-c\bar{T}/2} \|F(\cdot)\|_{L_0^2} \left( \|d(\cdot) - \frac{c}{2}s(\cdot)\|_{L_0^2}^2 + \|\frac{c}{2\omega_d}d(\cdot) + \omega_d s(\cdot)\|_{L_0^2}^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq e^{-c\bar{T}/2} \|F(\cdot)\|_{L_0^2} \left( \|d(\cdot) - \frac{c}{2}s(\cdot)\|_{L_0^2}^2 + \|\frac{c}{2\omega_d}d(\cdot) + \omega_d s(\cdot)\|_{L_0^2}^2 \right)^{1/2} \end{aligned} \quad (124)$$

which implies the desired result as soon as the calculation is carried out for  $F_{er,h}$ , and the projections of the fundamental solutions are substituted for the exact fundamental solutions.  $\square$

It can be noted that further calculations can provide the bound

$$|x(\bar{T})| \leq e^{-c\bar{T}/2} \left( 1 + \frac{c^2}{4\omega_d^2} \frac{1 - e^{-c\bar{T}}}{c} \right) \|F(\cdot)\|_{L_0^2} \quad (125)$$

for the exact solution, but the expression as provided in the statement of the proposition will be more useful in practice, since it comprises the projections of the fundamental solutions, resulting in improved bounds.

This proposition provides an easier way of estimating the errors, since it uses function spaces instead of distribution ones, and measures the error of approximation by the error of approximation to the two fundamental solutions of the problem, which do not depend on the excitation function.

### 9.3.2 Bounds for the error in velocity

The formulas of eq. (37) imply directly that the terms of the first line are of the order of  $x(t)$ , while that of the second line should be expected to be of a greater order, as  $F(\cdot)$  is a priori only  $L^2$  regular, while its integral is in  $H^1$ . The following proposition and its corollaries, the counterparts of proposition 9.7 and corollary 9.8 for the velocity, establish this fact.

**Proposition 9.10.** *Let  $f \in H^{-1}$  and  $F \in L^2$  an integral of  $e^c f(\cdot)$ . Then, for some irrelevant constant  $K > 0$ ,*

$$\|\dot{x}\|_{L_0^2} \leq K \left( \|x\|_{L_0^2} + \|e^{-c \cdot} F(\cdot)\|_{L_0^2(I)} \right) \quad (126)$$

*The constant  $K$  depends on  $\bar{T}$  and the parameters defining the SDOF system.*

The following corollary follows directly from the proposition.

**Corollary 9.11.** *The error in displacement converges to 0 in  $L_c^2$  at the same rate as  $\|f_{h,er}\|_{H^{-1}}$ :*

$$\|\dot{x}_{er}\|_{L_c^2} \leq K \|f_{h,er}\|_{H^{-1}} \quad (127)$$

The following proposition is the counterpart to prop. 9.9, bounding the error in the approximation of the velocity in a similar manner. However, there is no  $L^\infty$  estimation, since a priori  $F$  and therefore  $\dot{x}$  are only  $L^2$  and not  $L^\infty$ .

For the estimation of the velocity at time  $t = \bar{T}$ , the following calculation will be necessary. Taking the derivative of eq. (38) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{x}(t) &= \dot{d}(t) \int_0^t F(\tau)(d(\tau) - \frac{c}{2}s(\tau))d\tau + \dot{s}(t) \int_0^t F(\tau)(\frac{c}{2}d(\tau) + \omega_d^2 s(\tau))d\tau \\
&\quad + (d(t)^2 + \omega_d^2 s(t)^2)F(t) \\
&= \dot{d}(t) \int_0^t F(\tau)(d(\tau) - \frac{c}{2}s(\tau))d\tau + \dot{s}(t) \int_0^t F(\tau)(\frac{c}{2}d(\tau) + \omega_d^2 s(\tau))d\tau \\
&\quad + e^{-ct}F(t)
\end{aligned} \tag{128}$$

**Proposition 9.12.** *Let  $x$  be the solution to a weak SDOF problem,  $f_h$  the excitation function corresponding to homogeneous initial conditions, see proposition 9.2, and  $F_h \in L_0^2$  an integral of  $e^c f_h(\cdot)$ . Then, the error of approximation  $\dot{x}_{er}$  satisfies the following estimates:*

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\dot{x}_{er,h}\|_{L_0^2} &\leq K \left( \frac{1-e^{-2c\bar{T}}}{2c} \right)^{1/2} \|F_{er,h}(\cdot)\|_{L_0^2(I)} + K \|x_{er,h}\|_{L_0^2} \\
|\dot{x}_{er,h}(\bar{T})| &\leq e^{-c\bar{T}/2} \|F_{er,h}(\cdot)\|_{L^1(I)} + K |x_{er,h}(\bar{T})| \\
&\leq e^{-c\bar{T}/2} \sqrt{\bar{T}} \|F_{er,h}(\cdot)\|_{L^2(I)} + K |x_{er,h}(\bar{T})|
\end{aligned} \tag{129}$$

The proof is similar to that of proposition 9.9. To recall,  $f$  is supposed  $L^2$  close to the boundary, which makes  $F(\bar{T})$  unambiguously defined. The quantity  $\|F_{h,er}(\cdot)\|_{L^1(I)}$  is also well defined thanks to the good boundary behavior of  $f$ .

*Proof.* Concerning the estimate at time  $t = \bar{T}$ , one gets

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{x}(\bar{T}) &= e^{-ch}F(\bar{T}) + (d(\bar{T}) - \frac{c}{2}s(\bar{T})) \int_0^h F(\tau)(\frac{c}{2}d(\tau) + \omega_d^2 s(\tau))d\tau \\
&\quad - (\frac{c}{2}d(\bar{T}) + \omega_d^2 s(\bar{T})) \int_0^h F(\tau)(d(\tau) - \frac{c}{2}s(\tau))d\tau \\
&= e^{-ch}F(\bar{T}) + (d(\bar{T}) - \frac{c}{2}s(\bar{T})) \langle F(\cdot), (\frac{c}{2}d(\cdot) + \omega_d^2 s(\cdot)) \rangle_0 \\
&\quad - (\frac{c}{2}d(\bar{T}) + \omega_d^2 s(\bar{T})) \langle F(\cdot), (d(\cdot) - \frac{c}{2}s(\cdot)) \rangle_0
\end{aligned} \tag{130}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}
|\dot{x}(\bar{T})| &\leq |e^{-ch}F(\bar{T})| + \left( (d(\bar{T}) - \frac{c}{2}s(\bar{T}))^2 \|F(\cdot)\|_{L_0^2}^2 \|(\frac{c}{2}d(\cdot) + \omega_d^2 s(\cdot))\|_{L_0^2}^2 \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (\frac{c}{2}d(\bar{T}) + \omega_d^2 s(\bar{T}))^2 \|F(\cdot)\|_{L_0^2}^2 \|(d(\cdot) - \frac{c}{2}s(\cdot))\|_{L_0^2}^2 \right)^{1/2}
\end{aligned} \tag{131}$$

from which the estimate of the proposition follows immediately.  $\square$

### 9.3.3 Some energy estimates

The conservation (cf. §6.1) and dissipation (cf. §6.2) estimates, together with the above proposition and proposition 9.7 provide the following corollaries.

**Corollary 9.13.** *Let  $x$  and  $x_{er}$  as in prop. 9.9. Then,*

$$\|\dot{x}_{er}\|_{L_0^2} + \|x_{er}\|_{L_0^2} \leq K \|F_{h,er}\|_{L_0^2} \tag{132}$$

where the constant  $C$  depends on the space  $\mathcal{E}$ , the parameters of the SDOF system and  $\bar{T}$ .

Concerning the convergence of the velocity,  $\dot{x}$ , lemma 9.13 already provides bounds in  $H^1$ . In order to obtain uniform convergence,  $H^2$  bounds are needed. They are provided by the following obvious corollary.

**Corollary 9.14.** *Let  $f_{h,er}$  and  $x_{er}$  be as in prop. 9.9. Then,*

$$\|\ddot{x}_{er}\|_{H^{-1}} \leq K \|F_{h,er}\|_{L_0^2} \tag{133}$$

*Proof.* The acceleration satisfies the equation

$$\ddot{x} = f - c\dot{x} - kx \quad (134)$$

Estimation by duality, the triangle inequality and corollary 9.13 conclude the proof.  $\square$

## 9.4 Convergence

Summing up, the following theorem holds true.

**Theorem 9.15.** *Suppose a sequence of spaces  $\mathcal{E}_n$  is given and such that  $\cup \dot{\mathcal{E}}_n = L^2 \pmod{\mathbb{R}}$ . Then, the sequence of corresponding approximate solution  $x_{ap}^{(n)} \in \mathcal{E}_n$  converges to  $x$  in  $H^1$ :*

$$\|x_{er}^{(n)}\|_{H^1} = O(\|F_{h,er}^{(n)}\|_{L_0^2}) \rightarrow 0 \quad (135)$$

*In particular, since  $\bar{T} < \infty$ ,*

$$\|x_{er}^{(n)}\|_{L^\infty} = O(\|F_{h,er}^{(n)}\|_{L_0^2}) \rightarrow 0 \quad (136)$$

*Proof.* The theorem follows from corollaries 9.8 and 9.11. The uniform convergence for the displacement follows from Sobolev the injection  $H_0^1 \hookrightarrow L^\infty$  which holds for finite intervals.  $\square$

Under additional assumptions on the excitation function, and by invoking the energy estimates, the following stronger theorem can be proved.

**Theorem 9.16.** *Suppose a sequence of spaces  $\mathcal{E}_n$  is given and such that  $\cup \mathcal{E}_n = L^2 \pmod{\mathbb{R}}$ . Suppose, moreover, that  $F_{er}^{(n)}$  stays bounded in the  $H^1$  norm. Then, the sequence of corresponding approximate solution  $x_{ap}^{(n)} \in \mathcal{E}_n$  converges to  $x$  in  $H^2$ :*

$$\|x_{er}^{(n)}\|_{H^2} = O(\|F_{h,er}^{(n)}\|_{L_c^2}) \rightarrow 0 \quad (137)$$

*In particular, since  $\bar{T} < \infty$ ,*

$$\|x_{er}^{(n)}\|_{L^\infty} + \|\dot{x}_{er}^{(n)}\|_{L^\infty} = O(\|F_{h,er}^{(n)}\|_{L_c^2}) \rightarrow 0 \quad (138)$$

*Proof.* The theorem follows from propositions 9.9 and 9.12.  $\square$

Summing up, suppose that one can consider a sequence of spaces  $\mathcal{E}_n$  satisfying the assumptions of this section and such that  $\cup \mathcal{E}_n = L_c^2$ . Then, the sequence of corresponding approximate solution  $x_{ap}^{(n)} \in \mathcal{E}_n$  converges to  $x$  in  $H^2$  as long as  $f - f_{ap}$  stays bounded in the  $H^1$  norm. This convergence implies that

$$\begin{aligned} x_{ap}^{(n)} &\rightarrow x \text{ uniformly} \\ \dot{x}_{ap}^{(n)} &\rightarrow \dot{x} \text{ uniformly} \\ \ddot{x}_{ap}^{(n)} &\rightarrow \ddot{x} \text{ in } L_c^2 \end{aligned} \quad (139)$$

and the rates of convergence are given by corollary 9.14.

Similarly one can compute

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_{er}(t) = & -\frac{c}{2\omega_d} \int_0^t f_{er}(\tau) e^{-c(t-\tau)/2} \sin[\omega_d(t-\tau)] d\tau + \\ & + \int_0^t f_{er}(\tau) e^{-c(t-\tau)/2} \cos[\omega_d(t-\tau)] d\tau \end{aligned} \quad (140)$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} |\dot{x}_{er}(\bar{T})| \leq & -\frac{ce^{-c\bar{T}/2}}{2\omega_d} \int_0^{\bar{T}} f_{er}(\tau) e^{c\tau/2} \sin[\omega_d(\bar{T}-\tau)] d\tau + \\ & + e^{-c\bar{T}/2} \int_0^{\bar{T}} f_{er}(\tau) e^{c\tau/2} \cos[\omega_d(\bar{T}-\tau)] d\tau \end{aligned} \quad (141)$$

## 10 Conclusion

This is the first of three parts of a work on the weak formulation of the SDOF and MDOF problems. The weak formulation of both problems has been obtained, and a framework for obtaining numerical methods using the weak formulation has been laid out. The particular instances of the numerical methods using the weak formulation depend on the choices of bases for the functional space  $H^1$ . The framework presented in this work includes results about the convergence properties of the particular instances.

In part two of the work, such an instance will be presented, using Bernstein polynomials as basis for  $H^1$ , and the convergence results will be specified in this context, proving fast rates of convergence that are outside the scope of traditional step-wise methods.

## References

- [AM78] R. ABRAHAM and J. MARSDEN, *Foundations of Mechanics*, AMS Chelsea publishing, AMS Chelsea Pub./American Mathematical Society, 1978. Available at <https://books.google.com.br/books?id=4Y-ownk6ilsC>.
- [dB78] C. DE BOOR, *A practical guide to splines*, *Applied Mathematical Sciences* **27**, Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1978. MR 507062.
- [Br683] H. BRÉZIS, *Analyse fonctionnelle: théorie et applications*, *Collection Mathématiques appliquées pour la maîtrise*, Masson, 1983. Available at <https://books.google.com.br/books?id=ic04ngEACAAJ>.
- [CQ82] C. CANUTO and A. QUARTERONI, Approximation results for orthogonal polynomials in sobolev spaces, *Mathematics of Computation* **38** (1982), 67–86.
- [CP75] R. CLOUGH and J. PENZIEN, *Dynamics of structures*, *Dynamics of Structures Ray W. Clough, Joseph Penzien*, McGraw-Hill, 1975. Available at <https://books.google.com.br/books?id=UdxRAAAAMAAJ>.
- [Dah56] G. DAHLQUIST, Convergence and stability in the numerical integration of ordinary differential equations, *MATHEMATICA SCANDINAVICA* **4** (1956), 33–53. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7146/math.scand.a-10454>. Available at <http://www.mscand.dk/article/view/10454>.
- [Dah63] G. G. DAHLQUIST, A special stability problem for linear multistep methods, *BIT Numerical Mathematics* **3** (1963), 27–43. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF01963532>. Available at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF01963532>.
- [Far00] R. T. FAROUKI, Legendre–bernstein basis transformations, *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics* **119** (2000), 145–160. [http://dx.doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S0377-0427\(00\)00376-9](http://dx.doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S0377-0427(00)00376-9). Available at <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0377042700003769>.
- [HS74] M. W. HIRSCH and S. SMALE, *Differential equations, dynamical systems, and linear algebra*, Academic Press New York, 1974 (English). Available at <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/toc/els031/73018951.html>.
- [Hug87] T. J. R. HUGHES, *The finite element method : linear static and dynamic finite element analysis*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J. Prentice-Hall International, 1987. Available at <http://opac.inria.fr/record=b1086028>.



- [Kac38] M. KAC, Une remarque sur les polynomes de ms bernstein, *Studia Mathematica* **7** (1938), 49–51.
- [Lag88] P. A. LAGERSTROM, *Matched asymptotic expansions, Applied Mathematical Sciences* **76**, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1988, Ideas and techniques. MR 958913. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4757-1990-1>. Available at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4757-1990-1>.
- [Rud76] W. RUDIN, *Principles of mathematical analysis*, 3d ed. ed., McGraw-Hill New York, 1976 (English). Available at <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/toc/mh031/75017903.html>.
- [Rud87] W. RUDIN, *Real and complex analysis*, third ed., McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, 1987. MR 924157 (88k:00002).