

Talk:Lecture 8

From 15th ISeminar 2011/12 Operator Semigroups for Numerical Analysis

Contents

- 1 How to contribute?
- 2 Comments
 - 2.1 Some typing errors
 - 2.2 Definition of X_1 missing
 - 2.3 some comments
 - 2.4 Proposition 8.10

How to contribute?

Here you can discuss the material of Lecture 8.

- **To make comments you have to log in.**
- You can add a new comment by clicking on the plus (+) sign on the top of the page.
- Type the title of your comment to the "Subject/headline" field.
- Add your contribution to the main field.
- You can write mathematical expressions in a convenient way, i.e., by using LaTeX commands between `$` and `$` (for instance, `$\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{tA}} u_0$` gives $\mathrm{e}^{tA}u_0$).
- Please always "sign" your comment by writing `~~~~` (i.e., four times tilde) at the end of your contribution. This will be automatically converted to your user name with time and date.
- You can preview or save your comment by clicking on the buttons "Show preview" or "Save page", respectively.

Although all participants are allowed to edit the whole page, we kindly ask you not to do it and refrain from clicking on the "Edit" button. Please do follow the above steps.

Remember that due to safety reasons, the server is **off-line** every day between 4:00 a.m. and 4:20 a.m. in local time (CEST).

Comments

Some typing errors

I've found some typing errors:

p. 85, second line: "a given semigroup T ." (the word "semigroup" is twice)

Exa. 8.1: $J_n(y_0, \dots, y_{n-1})(x)$ (the "(x)" is missing)

p. 86, after Def. 8.2: "context which semigroup" (small letters)

Prop. 8.4, proof: You define a sequence (x_m) , but you want to call it (f_m) because you go on calculating with f_m .
at the same place, p. 87: "if $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is sufficiently"

p. 87, after Rem. 85: The word "in" after "decay" is twice. (Don't we better say "decay at infinity"?)

Prop. 8.6, proof, at the end: You obtain the inequality in the second to the last displayed line not by (8.1), as you write, but by the definition of the $||| \cdot |||_{F_\alpha}$ -norm.

Section 8.3, first line: " $D(A^k)$ for" (there is an extra f)

Section 8.5, third line: "In the first two" (not "to")

JohannesEilinghoff 22:05, 5 December 2011 (CET)

Dear Johannes,

thank you for pointing out these typos.

IsemTeam 13:41, 12 December 2011 (CET)

Definition of X_1 missing

The definition is given for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, but the subsequent propositions and theorems deal with X_1 . The literal extension of the definition gives $X_1 = \ker(A) \neq D(A)$, in contrast to the first line of the Proof of Proposition 8.9. Is $X_1 = D(A)$ with graph norm of A ?

ChristophSchumacher 15:28, 7 December 2011 (CET)

Dear Christoph,

the space X_1 has already been defined in previous lectures, see e.g. 7.1., as $X_1 = D(A)$ with graph norm of A .

MoritzEgert 23:11, 10 December 2011 (CET)

some comments

In Prop.8.4 I suggest to include the inequality $\|T(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(F_\alpha)} \leq \|T(t)\|$ in the statement of the proposition. After all, this is proved anyway.

In the sentence before Prop.8.10 I suggest to add a comma after the first F_α .

p.89, line 4 from below: I am not sure what the 'again' refers to. If it refers to a similar argument you used in Lecture 2, I repeat my comment from Lecture 2, that the equality of the integral $\int_0^r T(s)f ds$ as elements of F_α and of X is a consequence of Prop.2.33 c), applied to the continuous embedding of F_α into X (as the operator T in Prop.2.33 c)). (No Riemann sums needed!)

Definition 8.13: Typo in the last line, $X_\alpha = X \dots$

Example 8.17: What you call 'uniformly bounded variation' is just 'bounded variation', commonly (see Rudin,

Real and complex analysis, e.g.). In the first sentence of the last paragraph one should say '... at most countably many discontinuity points, ...'. And the following statement is just erroneous: If you modify the function $1_{\{0\}}$, which has total variation 2, to its left continuous version, it becomes the zero function. And the 'more precisely' in the parentheses is misleading; the parentheses should read '(i.e., g is in the L^1 -equivalence class of f)'. Note also the missing 'in' in the text!

Best wishes, Jurgen Voigt 21:29, 12 December 2011 (CET)

Dear Jürgen,

thanks for the comments.

"again" refers to the fact that you are right again about those Riemann sums.

About bounded variation: We were arguing about BV or UBV, but about the modification of a BV function you are right. Sorry for that error. The term "more precisely" may be misleading, but is it not so that f as an L^1 "function" is the equivalence class of the function g ? (If you interpret f as an equivalence class and not a representative of that. Of course, you may say then that $f=g$ a.e. does not make any sense, rather $g \in f$ should have been written.) Anyway, in the revised version this paragraph will be rewritten.

Again, many thanks for the careful reading!

IsemTeam 22:32, 12 December 2011 (CET)

Proposition 8.10

It seems to me that the proof given in the first part only covers the cases $\alpha < 1$. In order to give a proof covering the whole range of α 's, one may define the slightly larger 'Hölder space'

$\hat{X}_\alpha := \{f \in F_\alpha; \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{t^\alpha} (T(t)f - f) \text{ exists}\}$. It may come as a surprise that then this 'larger' space turns out to be equal to the Hölder space, for $\alpha < 1$. (We proved this in a discussion with Ralph Chill.) Because it is somewhat cumbersome to include it here, I refer to <http://www.math.tu-dresden.de/~voigt/sem11/> where you can find it under prop-8-10. (Incidentally, the proof given there for the fact that the larger Hölder space is contained in the space of strong continuity is shorter than the proof given in the lecture.)

And a typo(?): In the last line of the proof, the set in the middle should start by $\{f \in F_\alpha \dots\}$, as in the formulation of the Proposition itself.

And a typo on line 2 from below on p.91: completes.

Greetings, Jurgen Voigt 10:36, 13 December 2011 (CET)

Dear Jürgen,

yes, the first part of proof works for $\alpha < 1$ only. Thanks for the comments and the link.

IsemTeam 12:50, 13 December 2011 (CET)

Retrieved from "https://isem-mathematik.uibk.ac.at/isemwiki/index.php/Talk:Lecture_8"

-
- This page was last modified on 13 December 2011, at 11:50.