J. of Inequal. & Appl., 2000, Vol. 5, pp. 343-349 Reprints available directly from the publisher Photocopying permitted by license only

A Generalized 2-D Poincaré Inequality

FABIO CAVALLINI^{a,*} and FULVIO CRISCIANI^b

^a Osservatorio Geofisico Sperimentale, P.O. Box 2011, 34016 Trieste, Italy; ^b Istituto Talassografico del CNR, 34123 Trieste, Italy

(Received 29 April 1999; Revised 10 July 1999)

Two 1-D Poincaré-like inequalities are proved under the mild assumption that the integrand function is zero at just one point. These results are used to derive a 2-D generalized Poincaré inequality in which the integrand function is zero on a suitable arc contained in the domain (instead of the whole boundary). As an application, it is shown that a set of boundary conditions for the quasi geostrophic equation of order four are compatible with general physical constraints dictated by the dissipation of kinetic energy.

Keywords: Inequalities; Quasi-geostrophic equations; Boundary conditions

AMS Subject Classification: 46E20, 86A05

1 INTRODUCTION

Very roughly speaking, Poincaré inequality states that the L^2 -norm of a function is less than the L^2 -norm of its gradient, provided that the function fulfills some general requirements. Usually, Poincaré inequality is formulated in terms of a class of functions that are equal to zero on the boundary of a finite domain, and is typically applied – outside functional analysis – to stability problems in continuum mechanics (e.g., [1]).

In this work, by focusing on one- and two-dimensional situations, we give sharper results in that the involved functions are assumed to be zero only on a part of the boundary (or on a topologically equivalent part of the interior). Moreover, we motivate and illustrate the relevance of these results with an application to an important problem in (geophysical)

^{*} Corresponding author. E-mail: fcavallini@ogs.trieste.it.

fluid dynamics, namely, that of finding physically admissible boundary conditions for the quasi-geostrophic equations when the turbulence is parametrized by means of lateral diffusion of vorticity, thus giving rise to fourth-order spatial derivatives.

2 POINCARÉ INEQUALITIES WITH NONZERO BOUNDARY CONDITIONS

In the following lemmata, a prime (') denotes differentiation.

LEMMA 1 If $\phi:[a,b] \to \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth function such that $\phi[c] = 0$ for a given $c \in [a, b]$, then

$$\int_{a}^{b} \phi^{2}[x] \, \mathrm{d}x \le 4(b-a)^{2} \int_{a}^{b} (\phi'[x])^{2} \, \mathrm{d}x. \tag{1}$$

Proof Using the assumption $\phi[c] = 0$, we get the identity

$$\phi^2[x] = 2 \int_c^x \phi \phi' \quad \forall x \in [a, b].$$

Hence, because of Schwarz inequality,

$$\phi^{2}[x] \leq 2 \left| \int_{c}^{x} \phi^{2} \right|^{1/2} \left| \int_{c}^{x} (\phi')^{2} \right|^{1/2}$$

and, a fortiori,

$$\phi^{2}[x] \leq 2 \left(\int_{a}^{b} \phi^{2} \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_{a}^{b} (\phi')^{2} \right)^{1/2}.$$

Integrating with respect to x, we obtain

$$\int_{a}^{b} \phi^{2} \leq 2(b-a) \left(\int_{a}^{b} \phi^{2} \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_{a}^{b} (\phi')^{2} \right)^{1/2}.$$

Simplifying and squaring yields inequality (1).

344

LEMMA 2 If 0 < a, and $\phi: [a, b] \to \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth function such that $\phi[c] = 0$ for a given $c \in [a, b]$, then

$$\int_{a}^{b} \phi^{2}[x] x \, \mathrm{d}x \le 4 \frac{b}{a} (b-a)^{2} \int_{a}^{b} (\phi'[x])^{2} x \, \mathrm{d}x.$$
⁽²⁾

Proof From the obvious inequality

$$\int_{a}^{b} \phi^{2}[x] x \, \mathrm{d}x \le b \int_{a}^{b} \phi^{2}[x] \, \mathrm{d}x$$

we get, using Lemma 1,

$$\int_{a}^{b} \phi^{2}[x] x \, \mathrm{d}x \le 4b(b-a)^{2} \int_{a}^{b} (\phi'[x])^{2} \, \mathrm{d}x.$$

The integral in the right-hand side of this inequality may be estimated as

$$\int_{a}^{b} (\phi'[x])^{2} \, \mathrm{d}x \le \frac{1}{a} \int_{a}^{b} (\phi'[x])^{2} x \, \mathrm{d}x.$$

Our claim follows from the last two inequalities.

The following Theorem 1 is the main mathematical result of this paper. Its statement, perhaps a little obscure at a first reading, becomes much clearer after looking at Fig. 1. Point \mathbf{c} of Fig. 1, although not explicitly mentioned in Theorem 1, corresponds to point \mathbf{c} of Lemma 1 and Lemma 2. Obviously, any bounded convex domain D satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 1.

THEOREM 1 Let $D \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a bounded set whose boundary ∂D is a Jordan curve. Assume there is a point O external to ∂D such that the intersection between D and any line through O is either empty or a segment. Assume further that there is a continuous arc $AB \subset D$ such that the angle \widehat{AOB} contains D. Then there is a constant C such that

$$\int_{D} \zeta^{2} \, \mathrm{d}x \, \mathrm{d}y \leq C \int_{D} |\nabla \zeta|^{2} \, \mathrm{d}x \, \mathrm{d}y \tag{3}$$

for any smooth function ζ equal to zero on arc AB.



FIGURE 1 Heuristic illustration of the symbols appearing in the statement of Theorem 1. In the application to quasi-geostrophic equations, the curved arcs (straight-line segments) in the boundary of D represent the coastlines (zonal boundaries where the wind forcing vanishes) of the subtropical North Atlantic ocean.

Proof Let (r, θ) be polar coordinates with origin O, and let [a, b] denote the intersection (when nonempty) of D with a straight line through O, where $a = a[\theta]$ and $b = b[\theta]$. Defining $\varphi[r, \theta] = \zeta[r \cos[\theta], r \sin[\theta]]$, we may apply Lemma 2 to the function $r \mapsto \varphi[r, \theta]$ obtaining

$$\int_{a[\theta]}^{b[\theta]} \varphi^2[r,\theta] r \, \mathrm{d}r \leq K[\theta] \int_{a[\theta]}^{b[\theta]} \left(\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial r}\right)^2 r \, \mathrm{d}r,$$

where

$$K[\theta] = 4 rac{b[heta]}{a[heta]} (b[heta] - a[heta])^2.$$

Hence, a fortiori,

$$\int_{\theta_{A}}^{\theta_{B}} \int_{a[\theta]}^{b[\theta]} \varphi^{2}[r,\theta] r \, \mathrm{d}r \, \mathrm{d}\theta \leq K_{\max} \int_{\theta_{A}}^{\theta_{B}} \int_{a[\theta]}^{b[\theta]} \left(\left(\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial r} \right)^{2} + \left(\frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial \theta} \right)^{2} \right) r \, \mathrm{d}r \, \mathrm{d}\theta,$$

where K_{max} is the constant defined by

$$K_{\max} = \max\{K[\theta]: \ \theta_A \leq \theta \leq \theta_B\},\$$

which is well defined because O is assumed to be external to ∂D . Passing from polar to Cartesian coordinates in the last inequality, our claim follows with $C = K_{\text{max}}$.

3 AN APPLICATION TO OCEAN CIRCULATION

The large-scale circulation in the upper oceanic layer is described by the quasi-geostrophic equation [2, p. 32]

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\nabla^2 \psi + RJ[\psi, \nabla^2 \psi] + \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x} = (\operatorname{curl} \tau)_z + \epsilon \nabla^2 \nabla^2 \psi, \qquad (4)$$

where $\psi = \psi[x, y]$ is the stream function, J is the Jacobian (or Poisson bracket) operator defined by $J[a, b] = \operatorname{div}[a\nabla b \times \mathbf{k}]$, τ is wind stress, R and ϵ are positive constants, t is time, and x, y, z are Cartesian coordinates with **k** the unit vector along z-direction. Since Eq. (4) is of order four in space, one more boundary condition is needed besides the obvious no-mass flux condition:

$$\psi[x, y, t] = 0, \quad \forall \{x, y\} \in \partial D, \quad \forall t.$$
(5)

The problem of finding a physically appropriate auxiliary (so-called "dynamic") boundary condition is far from being trivial, because boundary conditions affect also the qualitative behavior of the flow, which must fulfill general energy-related constraints. In the following, we shall use Theorem 1 to show that, if the "ocean" D satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 1 (see also Fig. 1), then the solution arising from the mixed boundary condition

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{n}} \nabla^2 \psi = 0$$
 on the coastline, (6)

$$\nabla^2 \psi = 0$$
 on the sea boundary (7)

successfully passes the following tests:

- (1) The kinetic energy of any flow is bounded if the forcing term is in L^2 .
- (2) The kinetic energy of any flow with zero forcing tends to zero for t→∞.

Multiplying Eq. (4) by the relative vorticity $\zeta = \nabla^2 \psi$, and integrating over the domain *D*, we have

$$\int_{D} \zeta \,\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \zeta + R \int_{D} \zeta J[\psi, \zeta] + \int_{D} \zeta \,\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x} = \int_{D} \zeta \,(\operatorname{curl} \boldsymbol{\tau})_{z} + \epsilon \int_{D} \zeta \nabla^{2} \zeta. \quad (8)$$

We see immediately that

$$\int_{D} \zeta \,\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \zeta = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \int_{D} \zeta^{2}. \tag{9}$$

Straightforward computations (using the identity $bJ[a, b] = J[a, b^2]/2$ and the 2-D divergence theorem $\int_D \text{div} = \int_{\partial D} \mathbf{n} \cdot$ with boundary condition (5)) show that

$$\int_D \zeta J[\psi, \zeta] = 0.$$
(10)

Integrating over D the identity $\zeta \nabla^2 \zeta = \operatorname{div}(\zeta \nabla \zeta) - |\nabla \zeta|^2$, applying the 2-D divergence theorem, and using our mixed boundary conditions yields

$$\int_{D} \zeta \nabla^{2} \zeta = -\int_{D} |\nabla \zeta|^{2}.$$
(11)

Substituting Eqs. (9)-(11) into Eq. (8) gives

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\int_{D}\zeta^{2} + \int_{D}\zeta\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial x} = \int_{D}\zeta\left(\operatorname{curl}\boldsymbol{\tau}\right)_{z} - \epsilon\int_{D}|\nabla\zeta|^{2}.$$
 (12)

Integrating over D the identity

$$\zeta \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (\psi \zeta) - \operatorname{div} \left(\psi \nabla \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} |\nabla \psi|^2,$$

and applying Green's formula $\int_D \partial_x = \int_{\partial D} dy$, together with boundary condition (5), we get

$$\int_{D} \zeta \, \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x} = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial D} \mathrm{d}y |\nabla \psi|^{2} \ge 0.$$
(13)

From (12) and (13), using Theorem 1, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\int_D \zeta^2 \leq \int_D \zeta \left(\operatorname{curl} \boldsymbol{\tau}\right)_z - \frac{\epsilon}{C}\int_D \zeta^2.$$

We point out that in this case the arc AB of Theorem 1 coincides with segment AB of Fig. 1, where $\zeta = 0$ because of (7). Denoting the L^2 -norm

348

by $\|\cdot\|,$ using the Schwarz inequality, and simplifying, the previous relation may be rearranged as

$$rac{\partial}{\partial t} \|\zeta\| \leq \|(\operatorname{curl} \mathbf{\tau})_z\| - rac{\epsilon}{C} \|\zeta\|,$$

which implies

$$\|\zeta[t]\| \le \exp\left[-\frac{\epsilon}{C}t\right] \left(\|\zeta[0]\| - \frac{C}{\epsilon}\|(\operatorname{curl} \boldsymbol{\tau})_{z}\|\right) + \frac{C}{\epsilon}\|(\operatorname{curl} \boldsymbol{\tau})_{z}\|.$$

On the other hand Crisciani and Purini [3] show that

$$E[t] \leq \frac{1}{2\lambda^2} \|\zeta[t]\|^2,$$

where $E[t] = (1/2) \|\nabla \psi[t]\|^2$ represents the kinetic energy, and λ is a constant. From the last two inequalities we get

$$E[t] \le \frac{1}{2\lambda^2} \left(\exp\left[-\frac{\epsilon}{C}t\right] \left(\|\zeta[0]\| - \frac{C}{\epsilon} \|(\operatorname{curl} \boldsymbol{\tau})_z\| \right) + \frac{C}{\epsilon} \|(\operatorname{curl} \boldsymbol{\tau})_z\| \right)^2$$

and hence

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} E[t] = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{C}{\lambda \epsilon} \| (\operatorname{curl} \boldsymbol{\tau})_z \| \right)^2,$$

whence we immediately deduce that our mixed boundary condition has successfully passed both the tests previously stated.

References

- [1] M.E. Gurtin, An Introduction to Continuum Mechanics, Academic Press, New York (1981).
- [2] J. Pedlosky, Ocean Circulation Theory, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg (1996).
- [3] F. Crisciani and R. Purini, A stability condition for planar flows not satisfying the Blumen-Pedlosky criterion, *Il Nuovo Cimento D* 11, 1677-1684 (1998).