Journal of Advances and Scholarly Researches in Allied Education
Vol. 15, Issue No. 7, September-2018, ISSN 2230-7540

Evolution Type Inverse Problem for Reaction - Diffusion - Convection System

Anuja Yadav[1]* Dr. Sudesh Kumar[2]

[1] Research Scholar

[2] Professor, Faculty of Mathematics, OPJS University, Churu, Rajasthan

Abstratct – Inverse problems related with the convection-diffusion equation are of much scientific significance, as they show up in the demonstrating of numerous practical problems. The investigation of spatiotemporal patterns in chemically reacting systems is an intriguing subject which has pulled in significant enthusiasm in the course of recent years.

---------------------------------X---------------------------------

The arrangement of spatiotemporal patterns isn't just founded on the chemical reaction and diffusion yet it is likewise subject to convection which moves the chemical reactions related with a volume of fluid starting with one area then onto the next. From the practical perspective, it is hard to disregard convection in a sensible chemical or biological framework. We consider the linearly coupled reaction diffusion convection framework with zero Dirichlet boundary conditions as follows:

$$\left.\begin{array}{l} u_t - u_{xx} + a(x,t)u + b(x,t)v + \theta(x,t)u_x(x,t) = f(x,t),\ (x,t) \in \Omega_T, \\ v_t - v_{xx} + c(x,t)v + d(x,t)u + \vartheta(x,t)v_x(x,t) = g(x,t),\ (x,t) \in \Omega_T, \\ u(x,0) = \phi(x),\ v(x,0) = \varphi(x),\ x \in I, \\ u(0,t) = u(1,t) = v(0,t) = v(1,t) = 0,\ t \in (0,T], \end{array}\right\}$$

Where $\Omega_T = I \times (0,T], I = (0,1)$ and $T > 0$ is an arbitrary but fixed moment of time? The initial conditions φ(x) and ϕ(x) belonging to the Holder space C 2,α(¯I) depend on x and are sufficiently regular and the unknown convection coefficients

$$\theta(x,t), \vartheta(x,t) \in C^{\alpha,\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\Omega_T)$$

And m0(x, t), n0(x, t) are given functions over the domain Ω_T. The inverse problems include the finding of any parameters or properties of the medium from arbitrary discrete or ceaseless or halfway data about the solution, that is, the assurance of the obscure coefficient(s) in the linearly coupled framework from some extra data about the solutions u(x, t), v(x, t). Here the unknown coefficients θ(x, t), ϑ(x, t) in (4.1.1) are known as the convection coefficients which are frequently identified with the medium properties of the reaction diffusion convection framework. The issue expressed above is under-decided in mathematics, to be specific, that, by the given additional conditions (4.1.2), one may not recognize the obscure coefficient θ(x, t), ϑ(x, t) uniquely and steadily. Right off the bat, from (4.1.1), one can without much of a stretch get the accompanying formulae

$$\left.\begin{array}{l} \theta(x,t) = \dfrac{f(x,t) - u_t + u_{xx} - a(x,t)u - b(x,t)v}{u_x(x,t)}, \\ \vartheta(x,t) = \dfrac{g(x,t) - v_t + v_{xx} - c(x,t)v - d(x,t)u}{v_x(x,t)}. \end{array}\right\} \quad (4.1)$$

Then, by interpolation and smoothing technique, we obtain new smooth functions m(x, t) and n(x, t) from (4.1.2) such that

$$\left\{\begin{array}{l} m(x_j,t_i) = m_0(x_j,t_i), \\ n(x_j,t_i) = n_0(x_j,t_i), \end{array}\right. \quad j = 1,2,\cdots,J;\ i = 1,2,\cdots,N.$$

Since the development of the functions m(x, t), n(x, t) isn't unique, it tends to be effectively observed from (4.1.3) and (4.1.4) that m(x, t), n(x, t) are not unique also. Besides the arrangement does not depend consistently on the input data, that is, for an extraordinary chosen set of data which fulfill (4.1.4), we have

$$\|m_k\| \to 0,\quad \|n_k\| \to 0,\ \|\theta_k\| \to \infty,\quad \|\vartheta_k\| \to \infty,$$

As $k \to \infty$, where $\theta_k,\ \vartheta_k$ are obtained from $m_k,\ n_k$ respectively. In fact it can be seen from (4.1.3) that in order to obtain $\theta(x,t),\ \vartheta(x,t)$ we have to compute the numerical derivatives of $m(x,t), n(x,t)$ with respect to x and t, especially the second derivatives with respect to x. Since the measurement error is inescapable, a little irritation in both or any of the measurements m(x, t), n(x, t)

www.ignited.in

may result in a major change in $\theta(x,t),\ \vartheta(x,t)$ which may make the acquired outcomes insignificant. In this section, we consider another sort of additional conditions which are given in the accompanying structure:

$$\left.\begin{aligned} u(x,t) &= m(x,t), \quad (x,t)\in\Omega_T, \\ v(x,t) &= n(x,t), \quad (x,t)\in\Omega_T, \end{aligned}\right\} \qquad (4.2),$$

where m(x, t), n(x, t) are acquired from (4.1.4) by interpolation and extrapolation method together with smoothing strategies. As demonstrated over, the inverse issue of recouping the obscure coefficients θ(x, t), ϑ(x, t) from the additional conditions (4.1.6) is still not well presented regardless of whether $m(x,t), n(x,t) \in C^{2,1}(\Omega_T)$. The additional conditions (4.1.6) encourage theoretical analysis, while, by and by, the suitable structure is (4.1.2). This kind of observation has been effectively inspected for the recreation of radiative coefficient of heat conduction equation. However in regards to arrangement of equations few papers are available in the writing in regards to the parameter ID in reaction diffusion models with spatially varying parameters), at the same time, as far as anyone is concerned, none enable the parameters to vary uninhibitedly in time. By loosening up this presumption and enabling the parameters to vary in existence, we build up the steadiness gauge for an inverse issue of deciding the two coefficients $\theta(x,t)$ and $\vartheta(x,t)$ all the while in the linearly coupled reaction diffusion convection equations with respect to the arrangement of the framework. The optimal control system assumes the urgent job in setting up the stability estimates for the two connected terms.

OPTIMAL CONTROL PROBLEM

In this segment, we change the distinguishing proof issue into an optimization issue through optimal control procedure. Typically the principle part of the optimal control issue involves the minimization of a cost functional which portrays the physical amounts associated with the particular issue. Optimization process is done by a control work which, contingent on the context, may speak to beginning or boundary conditions, constrain terms, sources, and so forth. In our concern, the cost functional relying upon the deliberate yield data is of the structure (4.1.6). All through the paper, for α > 0, expect that the known reaction coefficients a, b, c, d and the obscure convection coefficients θ, ϑ fulfill the accompanying space settings

$$a(x,t), b(x,t), c(x,t), d(x,t), \theta(x,t) \text{ and } \vartheta(x,t)\in C^{\alpha,\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\bar{\Omega}_T),$$

and the initial data φ(x), ϕ(x) are consistent with the homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions and satisfy

$$\phi(x),\ \varphi(x) > 0 \in C^{2,\alpha}(\bar{I}) \text{ and } \phi'(x),\ \varphi'(x) \text{ are bounded.}$$

In the uniqueness of θ(x, t), ϑ(x, t) for the inverse issue However, to the creator's information, these sorts of results appear to be open for general beginning temperature φ(x), ϕ(x) with no confinement. The outstanding Schauder hypothesis and monotone method for explanatory equations ensure that, for some random positive coefficients a(x, $a(x,t), b(x,t), c(x,t), d(x,t), \theta(x,t)$ and $\vartheta(x,t)\in C^{\alpha,\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\bar{\Omega}_T)$, there exists a unique solution $(u,v) \in [C^{2+\alpha,1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\Omega_T)]^2$ to the direct problem (4.1.1). Now we define the admissible set for the space time varying parameters as follows:

$$\mathcal{M} = \{\theta(x,t), \vartheta(x,t) : 0<\theta_0\le\theta\le\theta_1,\ 0<\vartheta_0\le\vartheta\le\vartheta_1, \ /\ \theta,\vartheta\in H^1(\Omega_T)\cap L^\infty([0,T];H^1(I))\}, \qquad (4.3),$$

Where H1 denotes the usual Sobolev space that is,

$$\|w\|_{H^1(\Omega_T)} = \left(\int_{\Omega_T} |\nabla w|^2\,\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}t + \int_{\Omega_T} |D_t w|^2\,\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}t\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

and the optimal control problem is as follows: Find $(\bar{\theta}(x,t), \bar{\vartheta}(x,t)) \in \mathcal{M}\times\mathcal{M}$ satisfying

$$\mathcal{J}(\bar{\theta},\bar{\vartheta}) = \min_{\theta,\vartheta\in\mathcal{M}} \mathcal{J}(\theta,\vartheta), \qquad (4.4)$$

Where

$$\mathcal{J}(\theta,\vartheta) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{\Omega_T}\left(|u(x,t;\theta)-m(x,t)|^2 + |v(x,t;\vartheta)-n(x,t)|^2\right)\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}t$$

$$+\frac{\wp}{2}\int_{\Omega_T}\left(|\nabla\theta|^2+|\nabla\vartheta|^2+|D_t\theta|^2+|D_t\vartheta|^2\right)\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}t, \qquad (4.5)$$

also, (u, v) is the arrangement of the framework (4.1.1) for the given coefficients θ(x, t), ϑ(x, t) ∊ M. Where the symbol in (4.2.5) signifies the differential administrator in direction and the constants θ0, θ1 and ϑ0, ϑ1 are given and $\wp$ is the regularization parameter

The supposition on *θ, ϑ ∊ H1 (ΩT) ∩ L ∞([0, T]; H1 (I))*is basic in ensuring that the second integral in (4.2.5) is all around characterized. Besides, for any *(θ, ϑ) ∊ M ×M, we have (θ, ϑ) ∊ (C 1 2 , 1 4 (ΩT))*2 (the evidence is appeared in Lemma 4.3.1). By the representation above, we realize that the immediate issue (4.1.1) is all around presented in the feeling of Hadamard. For the extra condition (4.1.6), we accept that m(x, t), n(x, t) fulfill the accompanying condition

www.ignited.in

$$m(x,t), n(x,t) \quad \in L^2(\Omega_T).$$

The condition (4.2.6) is satisfactory by and by. Truth be told, by interpolation and smoothing strategy, we may acquire some increasingly smooth functions from (4.1.2), that is, *m(x, t), n(x, t) ∊ C 2,1 (ΩT) ∩ C 1,0 (ΩT).* However, it isn't important to do as such. On one hand the temperature data may not be adequately smooth: then again, the smoothness of m(x, t), n(x, t) isn't fundamental for the inverse issue. For *m(x, t), n(x, t) ∊ L 2 (ΩT),* it is adequate to ensure that the control functional (4.2.5) is very much characterized. By the optimization method, we can generally ensure the presence of θ(x, t), ϑ(x, t) for any given m(x, t), n(x, t). The key point is to delineate the uniqueness and steadiness of θ(x, t), ϑ(x, t), particularly the soundness.

The control functional (4.2.5) is suitable for the constant observations (4.1.6). In the event that we have to manage the discrete case (4.1.2), we will think about the accompanying optimal control issue**:** Find $\theta(x,t), \vartheta(x,t) \in \mathcal{M}$

$$\mathcal{J}(\bar{\theta}, \bar{\vartheta}) = \min_{\theta,\vartheta\in\mathcal{M}} \mathcal{J}(\theta, \vartheta), \quad (4.6)$$

Where

$$\mathcal{J}(\theta,\vartheta) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{J}\left(|u(x_j,t_i;\theta) - m(x_j,t_i)|^2 + |v(x_j,t_i;\vartheta) - n(x_j,t_i)|^2\right)$$

$$+\frac{\wp}{2}\int_{\Omega_T}\left(|\nabla\theta|^2 + |\nabla\vartheta|^2 + |D_t\theta|^2 + |D_t\vartheta|^2\right) \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}t \quad (4.7)$$

What's more, M is the acceptable set as characterized in (4.2.3). It ought to be referenced that the optimization problems with persistent cost functional and discrete cost functional are not identical when all is said in done. By the dialog in Section 4.1, we realize that there may exist numerous functions θ, ϑ with the end goal that the primary aggregate term in (4.2.8) is equivalent to zero. Notwithstanding, for general observations m(x, t), n(x, t) ∊ L 2 (ΩT), the primary integral in (4.2.5) may not be zero for any θ(x, t), ϑ(x, t) ∊ M. We might want to give a heuristic as opposed to thorough clarification for the relations between the two problems.

REFERENCES

[1] A. Ackleh and S. Reich (1998). Parameter estimation in nonlinear evolution equations, Numerical Functional Analysis and Optimization, 19, pp. 933-947.

[2] R.A.Adams and J.F. Fournier (2003). Sobolev Spaces, Second Edition, Academic Press, New York.

[3] F. Ammar Khodja, A. Benabdallah and C. Dupaix (2006). Null controllability of some reaction-diffusion systems with one control force, Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications, 320, pp. 928-943.

[4] F. Ammar Khodja, A. Benabdallah, C. Dupaix and I. Kostin (2003). Controllability to the trajectories of phase field models by one control force, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 42, pp. 1661-1680.

[5] Yu. E. Anikonov (1995). Multidimensional Inverse and Ill-Posed Problems for Differential Equations, VSP, Utrecht.

Corresponding Author

Anuja Yadav*

Research Scholar