

Institut für Angewandte Analysis und Stochastik

im Forschungsverbund Berlin e.V.

Approximation of the Boltzmann equation by discrete velocity models

Wolfgang Wagner

submitted: 2nd May 1994

Institute of Applied Analysis
and Stochastics
Mohrenstraße 39
D – 10117 Berlin
Germany

Preprint No. 96
Berlin 1994

1991 Mathematics Subject Classification. 60K35, 76P05, 82C40.

Key words and phrases. Boltzmann equation, discrete velocity models, weak convergence, random mass flow.

Edited by
Institut für Angewandte Analysis und Stochastik (IAAS)
Mohrenstraße 39
D — 10117 Berlin
Germany

Fax: + 49 30 2004975
e-mail (X.400): c=de;a=d400;p=iaas-berlin;s=preprint
e-mail (Internet): preprint@iaas-berlin.d400.de

Approximation of the Boltzmann equation by discrete velocity models

Wolfgang Wagner

Institute of Applied Analysis and Stochastics
Mohrenstraße 39
D-10117 Berlin, Germany

April 25, 1994

Abstract. Two convergence results related to the approximation of the Boltzmann equation by discrete velocity models are presented. First we construct a sequence of deterministic discrete velocity models and prove convergence (as the number of discrete velocities tends to infinity) of their solutions to the solution of a spatially homogeneous Boltzmann equation. Second we introduce a sequence of Markov jump processes (interpreted as random discrete velocity models) and prove convergence (as the intensity of jumps tends to infinity) of these processes to the solution of a deterministic discrete velocity model.

Contents

1. Introduction	2
2. A convergence result for discrete velocity models	5
3. Random mass flow and discrete velocity models	12
4. Concluding remarks	16
References	17

1. Introduction

We consider the spatially homogeneous Boltzmann equation (cf. [6, p. 26], or [3, p. 392])

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} p(t, v) = \int_{\mathcal{R}^3} dw \int_{S^2} de B(v, w, e) [p(t, v^*) p(t, w^*) - p(t, v) p(t, w)] \quad (1.1)$$

with the initial condition

$$p(0, v) = p_0(v). \quad (1.2)$$

The symbols dw and de denote the Lebesgue measure on the three-dimensional Euclidean space \mathcal{R}^3 and the uniform surface measure on the unit sphere S^2 , respectively. The function B is called the collision kernel. The objects v^* and w^* are defined as

$$v^* = v + e(e, w - v), \quad w^* = w + e(e, v - w),$$

where $v, w \in \mathcal{R}^3$, $e \in S^2$, and (\cdot, \cdot) denotes the scalar product. They are interpreted as the post-collision velocities of two particles with the pre-collision velocities v and w . Eq. (1.1)–(1.2) describes the time evolution of a probability density function $p(t, v)$ on the velocity space \mathcal{R}^3 .

The purpose of this paper is to study the problem of approximating the measures

$$\lambda(t, dv) = p(t, v) dv,$$

which correspond to the solution of the Boltzmann equation (1.1)–(1.2), by measures concentrated on a finite subset of the velocity space.

The investigation will be carried out in the following more general setup. Let (\mathcal{Z}, r) be a locally compact separable metric space (r denoting the metric) and $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{Z}}$ denote the Borel- σ -algebra. Let $B(\mathcal{Z})$ be the Banach space of bounded Borel measurable functions on \mathcal{Z} with $\|\varphi\| = \sup_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} |\varphi(z)|$, and let $\bar{C}(\mathcal{Z})$ denote the subspace of bounded continuous functions. Furthermore, let $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z})$ be the space of finite, positive measures on $(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{Z}})$.

Let Q be a function on $\mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{Z}} \times \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{Z}}$ with the properties

$$Q(z_1, z_2, \cdot, \Gamma), Q(z_1, z_2, \Gamma, \cdot) \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z}), \quad \forall z_1, z_2 \in \mathcal{Z}, \Gamma \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{Z}}, \quad (1.3)$$

$$Q(\cdot, \cdot, \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in B(\mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{Z}), \quad \forall \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{Z}}, \quad (1.4)$$

and

$$Q(z_1, z_2, \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{Z}) \leq C_{Q, \max}, \quad \forall z_1, z_2 \in \mathcal{Z}. \quad (1.5)$$

We consider the equation

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathcal{Z}} \varphi(z) \lambda(t, dz) &= \int_{\mathcal{Z}} \int_{\mathcal{Z}} \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{Z}} \int_{\mathcal{Z}} [\varphi(\tilde{z}_1) + \varphi(\tilde{z}_2) - \varphi(z_1) - \varphi(z_2)] \times \right. \\ &\quad \left. Q(z_1, z_2, d\tilde{z}_1, d\tilde{z}_2) \right\} \lambda(t, dz_1) \lambda(t, dz_2), \quad \lambda(0) = \lambda_0, \end{aligned} \quad (1.6)$$

where $\varphi \in B(\mathcal{Z})$ and $\lambda_0 \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z})$. The solution $\lambda(t)$ is a function of the time variable $t \in [0, \infty)$ taking values in $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z})$.

First we note that Eq. (1.6) is a generalized weak form of the Boltzmann equation (1.1)–(1.2) (cf. [12], [11]). To see that, one considers $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{R}^3$, and the collision kernel Q of the form

$$Q(v_1, v_2, \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) = \int_{S^2} \frac{1}{2} B(v_1, v_2, e) \delta_{v_1^*}(\Gamma_1) \delta_{v_2^*}(\Gamma_2) de, \quad (1.7)$$

where

$$v_1^* = v_1 + e(e, v_2 - v_1), \quad v_2^* = v_2 + e(e, v_1 - v_2), \quad (1.8)$$

and δ_z denotes the Dirac measure concentrated in z . The integral with respect to Q on the right-hand side of Eq. (1.6) takes the form

$$\int_{S^2} \frac{1}{2} B(v_1, v_2, e) [\varphi(v_1^*) + \varphi(v_2^*) - \varphi(v_1) - \varphi(v_2)] de.$$

After the substitution of the integration variables (v_1, v_2) by (v_1^*, v_2^*) and removing the test function φ , one obtains Eq. (1.1)–(1.2) provided that the kernel B has the properties

$$B(v_1, v_2, e) = B(v_2, v_1, e) = B(v_1^*, v_2^*, e).$$

Next we consider Eq. (1.6) in the case $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{Z}^{(N)}$, where

$$\mathcal{Z}^{(N)} = \left\{ \xi_1^{(N)}, \dots, \xi_N^{(N)} \right\}, \quad \xi_i^{(N)} \in \mathcal{R}^3, \quad i = 1, \dots, N.$$

The solution $\lambda^{(N)}(t)$ is determined by its values $\lambda^{(N)}(t, \{\xi_i^{(N)}\}) =: p_i^{(N)}(t)$, $i = 1, \dots, N$. Considering the functions

$$\varphi_m(v) = \mathbb{1}_{\{\xi_m^{(N)}\}}(v), \quad m = 1, \dots, N,$$

where $\mathbb{1}_\Gamma$ denotes the indicator function of a set Γ , shows that Eq. (1.6) is equivalent to the system of ordinary differential equations

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} p_m^{(N)}(t) = \sum_{i,j,k,l=1}^N \left[\varphi_m(\xi_k^{(N)}) + \varphi_m(\xi_l^{(N)}) - \varphi_m(\xi_i^{(N)}) - \varphi_m(\xi_j^{(N)}) \right] \times \\ Q^{(N)}(\xi_i^{(N)}, \xi_j^{(N)}, \{\xi_k^{(N)}\}, \{\xi_l^{(N)}\}) p_i^{(N)}(t) p_j^{(N)}(t), \end{aligned} \quad (1.9)$$

$$p_m^{(N)}(0) = \lambda_0^{(N)}(\{\xi_m^{(N)}\}), \quad m = 1, \dots, N. \quad (1.10)$$

Moreover, one easily realizes that the system (1.9)–(1.10) is equivalent to the system

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} p_i^{(N)}(t) = \\ \sum_{j,k,l=1}^N \left\{ \alpha^{(N)}(k, l, i, j) p_k^{(N)}(t) p_l^{(N)}(t) - \alpha^{(N)}(i, j, k, l) p_i^{(N)}(t) p_j^{(N)}(t) \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (1.11)$$

$$p_i^{(N)}(0) = \lambda_0^{(N)}(\{\xi_i^{(N)}\}), \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \quad (1.12)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha^{(N)}(i, j, k, l) = \\ \frac{1}{2} \left[Q^{(N)}(\xi_i^{(N)}, \xi_j^{(N)}, \{\xi_k^{(N)}\}, \{\xi_l^{(N)}\}) + Q^{(N)}(\xi_j^{(N)}, \xi_i^{(N)}, \{\xi_k^{(N)}\}, \{\xi_l^{(N)}\}) + \right. \\ \left. Q^{(N)}(\xi_i^{(N)}, \xi_j^{(N)}, \{\xi_l^{(N)}\}, \{\xi_k^{(N)}\}) + Q^{(N)}(\xi_j^{(N)}, \xi_i^{(N)}, \{\xi_l^{(N)}\}, \{\xi_k^{(N)}\}) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (1.13)$$

The system (1.11)–(1.12) is called a discrete velocity model (in the spatially homogeneous case). It describes the time evolution of the weight functions $p_i^{(N)}(t)$, which correspond to the "discrete velocities" $\xi_i^{(N)}$, $i = 1, \dots, N$. We refer to [10], [2] concerning more details about discrete velocity models.

In Section 2 we are concerned with the problem of approximating the solution $\lambda(t)$ of the generalized Boltzmann equation (1.6) by measures of the form

$$\lambda^{(N)}(t) = \sum_{i=1}^N p_i^{(N)}(t) \delta_{\xi_i^{(N)}},$$

where δ is the Dirac measure, and $p_i^{(N)}(t)$, $i = 1, \dots, N$, is the solution to a discrete velocity model of the form (1.11)–(1.13). We construct an appropriate sequence $(\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{(N)}, \tilde{\lambda}_0^{(N)}, \tilde{Q}^{(N)})$ and prove that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \varrho(\lambda(t), \tilde{\lambda}^{(N)}(t)) = 0, \quad \forall T > 0,$$

where ϱ is a metric, which is equivalent to weak convergence in the space $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z})$.

In Section 3 we study the problem of approximating the solution $p_i^{(N)}(t)$, $i = 1, \dots, N$, of a discrete velocity model (1.11)–(1.13) by a stochastic process. We introduce a Markov jump process $(g_i^{(N,\gamma)}(t))_{i=1}^N$, where γ is a parameter governing the intensity of the jumps. The functions $g_i^{(N,\gamma)}(t)$ are interpreted as random weight functions, which correspond to the discrete velocities $\xi_i^{(N)}$, $i = 1, \dots, N$. A model of such type was introduced in [5] and called random discrete velocity model. We prove that

$$\lim_{\gamma \rightarrow \infty} E \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \sum_{i=1}^N |p_i^{(N)}(t) - g_i^{(N,\gamma)}(t)| = 0, \quad \forall T > 0,$$

where E denotes mathematical expectation.

2. A convergence result for discrete velocity models

Let $\{\Delta_1^{(N)}, \dots, \Delta_N^{(N)}\}$ be a measurable partition of the space \mathcal{Z} into disjoint cells, i.e.

$$\Delta_i^{(N)} \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{Z}}, \quad \Delta_i^{(N)} \cap \Delta_j^{(N)} = \emptyset, \quad i, j = 1, \dots, N, \quad i \neq j,$$

where \emptyset denotes the empty set, and

$$\cup_{i=1}^N \Delta_i^{(N)} = \mathcal{Z}, \quad \forall N = 1, 2, \dots$$

Let $\xi_i^{(N)} \in \Delta_i^{(N)}$, $i = 1, \dots, N$, and consider the space

$$\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{(N)} = \{\xi_1^{(N)}, \dots, \xi_N^{(N)}\}, \quad (2.1)$$

with the discrete topology. Define the transformation $I^{(N)}$ as

$$I^{(N)}(\mu) = \sum_{i=1}^N \mu(\Delta_i^{(N)}) \delta_{\xi_i^{(N)}}, \quad \mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z}). \quad (2.2)$$

We consider $I^{(N)}(\mu)$ as a measure on $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{(N)}$ as well as a measure on \mathcal{Z} denoting it with the same symbol. Define

$$\tilde{\lambda}_0^{(N)} = I^{(N)}(\lambda_0) \quad (2.3)$$

and

$$\tilde{Q}^{(N)}(\xi_i^{(N)}, \xi_j^{(N)}, \{\xi_k^{(N)}\}, \{\xi_l^{(N)}\}) = Q(\xi_i^{(N)}, \xi_j^{(N)}, \Delta_k^{(N)}, \Delta_l^{(N)}), \quad (2.4)$$

where λ_0 and Q are the initial value and the collision kernel, respectively, of the Boltzmann equation (1.6).

On $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z})$, we consider the bounded Lipschitz metric (cf. [4, p. 150])

$$\varrho(\mu_1, \mu_2) = \sup_{\varphi \in B(\mathcal{Z}): \|\varphi\|_L \leq 1} |\langle \varphi, \mu_1 \rangle - \langle \varphi, \mu_2 \rangle|, \quad \mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z}), \quad (2.5)$$

where

$$\|\varphi\|_L = \max \left(\sup_{x \in \mathcal{Z}} |\varphi(x)|, \sup_{x, y \in \mathcal{Z}, x \neq y} \frac{|\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)|}{r(x, y)} \right) \quad (2.6)$$

and

$$\langle \varphi, \mu \rangle = \int_{\mathcal{Z}} \varphi(y) \mu(dy), \quad \varphi \in B(\mathcal{Z}), \quad \mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z}). \quad (2.7)$$

Theorem 2.1 Let $p_i^{(N)}(t)$, $i = 1, \dots, N$, be the solution of the discrete velocity model (1.11)–(1.13), corresponding to $\tilde{Z}^{(N)}$, $\tilde{\lambda}_0^{(N)}$, and $\tilde{Q}^{(N)}$ defined in (2.1), (2.3), (2.4), and let $\tilde{\lambda}^{(N)}(t)$ be the measure-valued function defined as

$$\tilde{\lambda}^{(N)}(t) = \sum_{i=1}^N p_i^{(N)}(t) \delta_{\xi_i^{(N)}}.$$

Suppose

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \max_{i: \Delta_i^{(N)} \cap K \neq \emptyset} \text{diam}(\Delta_i^{(N)}) = 0, \quad \forall \text{compact } K \subset \mathcal{Z}, \quad (2.8)$$

where $\text{diam}(\Gamma) = \sup_{x, y \in \Gamma} r(x, y)$, $\Gamma \subset \mathcal{Z}$.

Let the kernel Q satisfy (1.3)–(1.5) and

$$\int_{\mathcal{Z}} \int_{\mathcal{Z}} [\varphi(\tilde{z}_1) + \varphi(\tilde{z}_2)] Q(\cdot, \cdot, d\tilde{z}_1, d\tilde{z}_2) \in \bar{C}(\mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{Z}), \quad \forall \varphi \in \bar{C}(\mathcal{Z}). \quad (2.9)$$

Then

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \varrho(\lambda(t), \tilde{\lambda}^{(N)}(t)) = 0, \quad \forall T > 0,$$

where $\lambda(t)$ is the solution of the Boltzmann equation (1.6).

Remark 2.2 Consider the particular case (1.7), (1.8). Assumptions (1.3)–(1.5) and (2.9) are fulfilled, if the function $B(v_1, v_2, e)$ is continuous in (v_1, v_2) and satisfies

$$B(v_1, v_2, e) \leq B_{\max}(e), \quad \forall v_1, v_2 \in \mathcal{R}^3, \quad \forall e \in \mathcal{S}^2,$$

where $\int_{\mathcal{S}^2} B_{\max}(e) de < \infty$. Thus, a truncation of the collision kernel is necessary in most applications (e.g., $B(v_1, v_2, e) = |(e, v_2 - v_1)|$, in the hard sphere case).

To prepare the proof of Theorem 2.1, we describe the representation of the solution of Eq. (1.6) in form of Wild's sum (cf. [14], [8], [11], [1]). Using assumption (1.5), we introduce a kernel

$$Q_{\max}(z_1, z_2, \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) = Q(z_1, z_2, \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) + [C_{Q, \max} - Q(z_1, z_2, \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{Z})] \delta_{z_1}(\Gamma_1) \delta_{z_2}(\Gamma_2), \quad z_1, z_2 \in \mathcal{Z}, \quad \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{Z}}. \quad (2.10)$$

Furthermore, we define an operator $K_{max} : \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z}) \times \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z}) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z})$ as

$$K_{max}(\mu_1, \mu_2)(\Gamma) = \int_{\mathcal{Z}} \int_{\mathcal{Z}} [Q_{max}(z_1, z_2, \Gamma, \mathcal{Z}) + Q_{max}(z_1, z_2, \mathcal{Z}, \Gamma)] \mu_1(dz_1) \mu_2(dz_2), \quad \mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z}), \quad \Gamma \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{Z}}. \quad (2.11)$$

We note that, with the above notations, Eq. (1.6) takes the form

$$\frac{d}{dt} \langle \varphi, \lambda(t) \rangle = \langle \varphi, K_{max}(\lambda(t), \lambda(t)) \rangle - 2 C_{Q, max} \lambda_0(\mathcal{Z}) \langle \varphi, \lambda(t) \rangle, \quad \lambda(0) = \lambda_0.$$

It is easy to check that there is a unique solution of Eq. (1.6). This solution is represented in the form

$$\lambda(t) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} e^{-c_0 t} (1 - e^{-c_0 t})^{k-1} \nu_k, \quad t \in [0, \infty), \quad (2.12)$$

where

$$\nu_1 = \lambda_0, \quad \nu_{k+1} = \frac{1}{c_0 k} \sum_{i=1}^k K_{max}(\nu_i, \nu_{k+1-i}), \quad k \geq 1, \quad (2.13)$$

and

$$c_0 = 2 C_{Q, max} \lambda_0(\mathcal{Z}). \quad (2.14)$$

We assume $\lambda_0(\mathcal{Z}) > 0$, to avoid trivialities. One easily shows by induction on k that

$$\nu_k(\mathcal{Z}) = \lambda_0(\mathcal{Z}), \quad \forall k = 1, 2, \dots. \quad (2.15)$$

The series (2.12) converges in the total variation norm.

The Wild's sum representation (2.12)–(2.14) shows rather explicitly how the solution $\lambda(t)$ depends on the objects \mathcal{Z} , λ_0 , and Q that determine Eq. (1.6). First we study stability of the solution with respect to these objects.

Let $(\mathcal{Z}^{(N)})$ be a sequence of subspaces of \mathcal{Z} endowed with the relative topology. Note that any measure μ on $\mathcal{Z}^{(N)}$ has a natural extension $\hat{\mu}$ on \mathcal{Z} defined as

$$\hat{\mu}(\Gamma) = \mu(\Gamma \cap \mathcal{Z}^{(N)}), \quad \Gamma \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{Z}}.$$

Let, for $N = 1, 2, \dots$, $\lambda_0^{(N)} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z}^{(N)})$ and $Q^{(N)}$ be a kernel having the properties (1.3), (1.4) with \mathcal{Z} replaced by $\mathcal{Z}^{(N)}$. Assume that (1.5) holds uniformly in N , namely

$$Q^{(N)}(z_1, z_2, \mathcal{Z}^{(N)}, \mathcal{Z}^{(N)}) \leq C_{Q, \max}, \quad \forall z_1, z_2 \in \mathcal{Z}^{(N)}, \quad \forall N = 1, 2, \dots \quad (2.16)$$

Let $K_{\max}^{(N)}$ be defined in analogy with (2.11), and let $\hat{K}_{\max}^{(N)}(\mu_1^{(N)}, \mu_2^{(N)})$ denote the extension of the measure $K_{\max}^{(N)}(\mu_1^{(N)}, \mu_2^{(N)})$, where $\mu_1^{(N)}, \mu_2^{(N)} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z}^{(N)})$. Finally, let $\lambda^{(N)}(t)$ denote the solution of Eq. (1.6) corresponding to $(\mathcal{Z}^{(N)}, \lambda_0^{(N)}, Q^{(N)})$.

Lemma 2.3 *Suppose (2.16) and*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \varrho(\hat{K}_{\max}^{(N)}(\mu_1^{(N)}, \mu_2^{(N)}), K_{\max}(\mu_1, \mu_2)) = 0, \quad (2.17)$$

for any sequences $\mu_1^{(N)}, \mu_2^{(N)} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z}^{(N)})$ and measures $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z})$ such that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \varrho(\hat{\mu}_i^{(N)}, \mu_i) = 0, \quad i = 1, 2. \quad (2.18)$$

If

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \varrho(\hat{\lambda}_0^{(N)}, \lambda_0) = 0, \quad (2.19)$$

then

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \varrho(\hat{\lambda}^{(N)}(t), \lambda(t)) = 0, \quad \forall T > 0,$$

where $\lambda(t)$ is the solution of the Boltzmann equation (1.6).

Proof. Comparing the Wild's sum representations (2.12)–(2.14) of $\lambda(t)$ and $\lambda^{(N)}(t)$, respectively, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \varrho(\hat{\lambda}^{(N)}(t), \lambda(t)) &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \sup_{\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{Z}} \leq 1} \\ &|e^{-c_0 t} (1 - e^{-c_0 t})^{k-1} \langle \varphi, \nu_k \rangle - e^{-c_0^{(N)} t} (1 - e^{-c_0^{(N)} t})^{k-1} \langle \varphi, \hat{\nu}_k^{(N)} \rangle|, \end{aligned} \quad (2.20)$$

where

$$\nu_1^{(N)} = \lambda_0^{(N)}, \quad \nu_{k+1}^{(N)} = \frac{1}{c_0^{(N)} k} \sum_{i=1}^k K_{max}^{(N)}(\nu_i^{(N)}, \nu_{k+1-i}^{(N)}), \quad k \geq 1, \quad (2.21)$$

and

$$c_0^{(N)} = 2 C_{Q,max} \lambda_0^{(N)}(\mathcal{Z}^{(N)}). \quad (2.22)$$

The series on the right-hand side of (2.20) has a majorant uniformly in N . This follows from (2.22), (2.15), and the fact that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_0^{(N)}(\mathcal{Z}^{(N)}) = \lambda_0(\mathcal{Z}), \quad (2.23)$$

which is a consequence of (2.19). Thus, it is sufficient to prove

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} s_k^{(N)} = 0, \quad \forall k = 1, 2, \dots,$$

where $s_k^{(N)}$ denotes the elements of the series on the right-hand side of (2.20). One obtains

$$s_k^{(N)} \leq \varrho(\nu_k, \hat{\nu}_k^{(N)}) + \sup_N \lambda_0^{(N)}(\mathcal{Z}^{(N)}) \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |e^{-c_0 t} (1 - e^{-c_0 t})^{k-1} - e^{-c_0^{(N)} t} (1 - e^{-c_0^{(N)} t})^{k-1}|. \quad (2.24)$$

The second term on the right-hand side of (2.24) tends to zero as $N \rightarrow \infty$, since the sequence of functions $e^{-c_0^{(N)} t} (1 - e^{-c_0^{(N)} t})^{k-1}$ is equicontinuous on $[0, T]$ and tends to the function $e^{-c_0 t} (1 - e^{-c_0 t})^{k-1}$, for each $t \in [0, T]$, because of (2.22) and (2.23). Thus, it remains to show that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \varrho(\nu_k, \hat{\nu}_k^{(N)}) = 0, \quad \forall k = 1, 2, \dots. \quad (2.25)$$

This is done by induction on k . For $k = 1$, (2.25) follows directly from (2.19). Considering the definitions (2.13) and (2.21) of ν_{k+1} and $\nu_{k+1}^{(N)}$, respectively, as well as (2.11), (2.15) and (2.14), shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \varrho(\nu_{k+1}, \hat{\nu}_{k+1}^{(N)}) &\leq \frac{1}{c_0 k} \sum_{i=1}^k \varrho(K_{max}(\nu_i, \nu_{k+1-i}), \hat{K}_{max}^{(N)}(\nu_i^{(N)}, \nu_{k+1-i}^{(N)})) \\ &\quad + |1 - \frac{c_0^{(N)}}{c_0}| \lambda_0^{(N)}(\mathcal{Z}^{(N)}). \end{aligned} \quad (2.26)$$

The second term on the right-hand side of (2.26) tends to zero as $N \rightarrow \infty$, because of (2.22) and (2.23). The first term tends to zero, because of the induction hypothesis and assumption (2.17), (2.18). \square

The next two lemmas prepare the application of Lemma 2.3 to the special sequence $(\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{(N)}, \tilde{\lambda}_0^{(N)}, \tilde{Q}^{(N)})$ defined in (2.1), (2.3), (2.4).

Lemma 2.4 *Let the kernel Q satisfy (1.3)–(1.5) and (2.9).*

Then the operator K_{\max} defined in (2.11) is continuous with respect to weak convergence.

Proof. One obtains from (2.11) and (2.10) that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \varphi, K_{\max}(\mu_1, \mu_2) \rangle &= \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{Z}} \int_{\mathcal{Z}} \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{Z}} \int_{\mathcal{Z}} [\varphi(\tilde{z}_1) + \varphi(\tilde{z}_2)] Q_{\max}(z_1, z_2, d\tilde{z}_1, d\tilde{z}_2) \right\} \mu_1(dz_1) \mu_2(dz_2) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{Z}} \int_{\mathcal{Z}} \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{Z}} \int_{\mathcal{Z}} [\varphi(\tilde{z}_1) + \varphi(\tilde{z}_2)] Q(z_1, z_2, d\tilde{z}_1, d\tilde{z}_2) + \right. \\ &\quad \left. [C_{Q, \max} - Q(z_1, z_2, \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{Z})] [\varphi(z_1) + \varphi(z_2)] \right\} \mu_1(dz_1) \mu_2(dz_2), \end{aligned}$$

and the assertion follows. \square

Lemma 2.5 *Suppose assumption (2.8) is fulfilled.*

Let $\mu^{(N)}, \mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z})$ and $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \varrho(\mu^{(N)}, \mu) = 0$.

Then

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \varrho(I^{(N)}(\mu^{(N)}), \mu) = 0,$$

where $I^{(N)}$ is defined in (2.2).

Proof. The triangle inequality shows that it is sufficient to prove

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \varrho(I^{(N)}(\mu^{(N)}), \mu^{(N)}) = 0. \quad (2.27)$$

Let $K \subset \mathcal{Z}$ be a compact set. Taking into account definitions (2.5)–(2.7), we obtain

$$\sup_{\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{Z}} \leq 1} |\langle \varphi, I^{(N)}(\mu^{(N)}) \rangle - \langle \varphi, \mu^{(N)} \rangle| \leq$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \sup_{\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{Z}} \leq 1} \left| \sum_{i: \Delta_i^{(N)} \cap K \neq \emptyset} \left\{ \int_{\Delta_i^{(N)}} \varphi(z) I^{(N)}(\mu^{(N)})(dz) - \int_{\Delta_i^{(N)}} \varphi(z) \mu^{(N)}(dz) \right\} \right| \\
&\quad + \sup_{\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{Z}} \leq 1} \left| \sum_{i: \Delta_i^{(N)} \cap K = \emptyset} \left\{ \int_{\Delta_i^{(N)}} \varphi(z) I^{(N)}(\mu^{(N)})(dz) - \int_{\Delta_i^{(N)}} \varphi(z) \mu^{(N)}(dz) \right\} \right| \\
&\leq \sup_{\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{Z}} \leq 1} \sum_{i: \Delta_i^{(N)} \cap K \neq \emptyset} \int_{\Delta_i^{(N)}} |\varphi(z) - \varphi(\xi_i^{(N)})| \mu^{(N)}(dz) \\
&\quad + \sum_{i: \Delta_i^{(N)} \cap K = \emptyset} 2 \mu^{(N)}(\Delta_i^{(N)}) \\
&\leq \left(\max_{i: \Delta_i^{(N)} \cap K \neq \emptyset} \text{diam}(\Delta_i^{(N)}) \right) \mu^{(N)}(\mathcal{Z}) + 2 \mu^{(N)}(\mathcal{Z} \setminus K). \tag{2.28}
\end{aligned}$$

Assertion (2.27) follows now from (2.28), assumption (2.8), and the tightness of the sequence $(\mu^{(N)})$. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.1. In order to apply Lemma 2.3, we check conditions (2.16)–(2.19). Condition (2.16) follows directly from the definition (2.4) and assumption (1.5). Condition (2.19) is a particular case of Lemma 2.5, because of (2.3). Finally, we note that

$$K_{\max}^{(N)}(\mu_1^{(N)}, \mu_2^{(N)}) = I^{(N)}(K_{\max}(\mu_1^{(N)}, \mu_2^{(N)})),$$

where $\mu_1^{(N)}, \mu_2^{(N)} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z}^{(N)})$, because of (2.4). Thus, condition (2.17), (2.18) follows from Lemma 2.5 provided that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \varrho(K_{\max}(\mu_1^{(N)}, \mu_2^{(N)}), K_{\max}(\mu_1, \mu_2)) = 0,$$

if

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \varrho(\mu_i^{(N)}, \mu_i) = 0, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

This is a consequence of Lemma 2.4 and assumptions (1.5) and (2.9). \square

3. Random mass flow and discrete velocity models

We introduce a Markov process $Z(t) = (g_i^{(N,\gamma)}(t))_{i=1}^N$ with the state space

$[0, C_{g,max}]^N$, where $C_{g,max} > 0$, and the infinitesimal generator

$$A(\Phi)(\bar{z}) = \sum_{i,j,k,l=1}^N D^{(N,\gamma)}(\bar{z}, i, j, k, l) [\Phi(J^{(N,\gamma)}(\bar{z}, i, j, k, l)) - \Phi(\bar{z})], \quad (3.1)$$

where $\bar{z} = (g_1, \dots, g_N)$, $\gamma \geq 1$, and Φ is a bounded measurable function on the state space. The mapping $J^{(N,\gamma)}$ is a jump transformation defined as

$$[J^{(N,\gamma)}(\bar{z}, i, j, k, l)]_m = g_m + G^{(N,\gamma)}(\bar{z}, i, j, k, l) [\psi_{k,m} + \psi_{l,m} - \psi_{i,m} - \psi_{j,m}], \quad (3.2)$$

where

$$\psi_{i,m} = 0, \quad i \neq m, \quad \psi_{i,i} = 1, \quad i, m = 1, \dots, N, \quad (3.3)$$

and $G^{(N,\gamma)}$ is a function governing the weight transfer. We assume

$$G^{(N,\gamma)}(\bar{z}, i, j, k, l) \leq \begin{cases} \min(g_i, g_j), & \text{if } i \neq j, \\ \frac{1}{2} g_i, & \text{if } i = j, \end{cases} \quad (3.4)$$

where $\bar{z} = (g_1, \dots, g_N)$ and $i, j, k, l = 1, \dots, N$, so that the components of the process remain positive. Note that mass is preserved, i.e.

$$\sum_{i=1}^N g_i^{(N,\gamma)}(t) = \sum_{i=1}^N g_i^{(N,\gamma)}(0), \quad \forall t > 0.$$

The function $D^{(N,\gamma)}$, expressing the intensity of the jumps, is assumed to be measurable and bounded in \bar{z} .

The process $Z(t)$ is a jump process, which models a random mass flow. The waiting time between successive jumps has an exponential distribution. Each jump is characterized by random indices i, j, k, l . During the jump, a part of the weights g_i, g_j is transferred to g_k, g_l .

Theorem 3.1 *Let $p_i^{(N)}(t)$, $i = 1, \dots, N$, $t \geq 0$, be the solution to a discrete velocity model (1.11)–(1.13).*

Let the parameters $D^{(N,\gamma)}$ and $G^{(N,\gamma)}$ of the stochastic process $Z(t)$ be related to the parameter $Q^{(N)}$ of the discrete velocity model via the condition

$$D^{(N,\gamma)}(\bar{z}, i, j, k, l) G^{(N,\gamma)}(\bar{z}, i, j, k, l) = Q^{(N)}(\xi_i^{(N)}, \xi_j^{(N)}, \{\xi_k^{(N)}\}, \{\xi_l^{(N)}\}) g_i g_j, \\ \forall \bar{z} = (g_1, \dots, g_N), \quad \forall i, j, k, l = 1, \dots, N. \quad (3.5)$$

Let the function $G^{(N,\gamma)}$ satisfy (3.4) and

$$G^{(N,\gamma)}(\bar{z}, i, j, k, l) \leq C_{g,\max} \frac{1}{\gamma}, \quad \forall \gamma \geq 1, \quad \forall \bar{z}, \quad \forall i, j, k, l = 1, \dots, N. \quad (3.6)$$

If

$$\lim_{\gamma \rightarrow \infty} E \sum_{i=1}^N |p_i^{(N)}(0) - g_i^{(N,\gamma)}(0)| = 0, \quad (3.7)$$

then

$$\lim_{\gamma \rightarrow \infty} E \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \sum_{i=1}^N |p_i^{(N)}(t) - g_i^{(N,\gamma)}(t)| = 0, \quad \forall T > 0.$$

Remark 3.2 There are considerable degrees of freedom in the choice of the parameters $D^{(N,\gamma)}$ and $G^{(N,\gamma)}$ of the stochastic process $Z(t)$. We mention as an example the functions

$$G^{(N,\gamma)}(\bar{z}, i, j, k, l) = \frac{1}{\gamma} \frac{g_i g_j}{g_i + g_j}$$

and

$$D^{(N,\gamma)}(\bar{z}, i, j, k, l) = \gamma (g_i + g_j) Q^{(N)}(\xi_i^{(N)}, \xi_j^{(N)}, \{\xi_k^{(N)}\}, \{\xi_l^{(N)}\}).$$

Obviously, conditions (3.4)–(3.6) are fulfilled for the above functions.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. We use the following martingale representation for Markov processes (cf., e.g., [4, Ch. 4, Prop. 1.7]). Let Φ be a function from the domain $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$ of the generator \mathcal{A} (i.e., an arbitrary bounded measurable function in our case). Then

$$\Phi(Z(t)) = \Phi(Z(0)) + \int_0^t \mathcal{A}(\Phi)(Z(s)) ds + M(t), \quad (3.8)$$

where $M(t)$ is a martingale. Moreover, if $\Phi^2 \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$, then

$$E [M(t)]^2 = E \int_0^t [\mathcal{A}(\Phi^2) - 2\Phi \mathcal{A}(\Phi)](Z(s)) ds. \quad (3.9)$$

We will apply (3.8), (3.9) to the process $Z(t)$ with the generator (3.1). Consider a function of the form

$$\Phi(\bar{z}) = \sum_{i=1}^N g_i \varphi_i, \quad \bar{z} = (g_1, \dots, g_N), \quad (3.10)$$

where $\varphi \in \mathcal{R}^N$ is a fixed vector. Notice that

$$\Phi(J^{(N,\gamma)}(\bar{z}, i, j, k, l)) = \Phi(\bar{z}) + G^{(N,\gamma)}(\bar{z}, i, j, k, l) [\varphi_k + \varphi_l - \varphi_i - \varphi_j], \quad (3.11)$$

according to (3.2), (3.3). Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}(\Phi)(\bar{z}) &= \sum_{i,j,k,l=1}^N D^{(N,\gamma)}(\bar{z}, i, j, k, l) G^{(N,\gamma)}(\bar{z}, i, j, k, l) [\varphi_k + \varphi_l - \varphi_i - \varphi_j] \\ &= \sum_{i,j,k,l=1}^N Q^{(N)}(\xi_i^{(N)}, \xi_j^{(N)}, \{\xi_k^{(N)}\}, \{\xi_l^{(N)}\}) [\varphi_k + \varphi_l - \varphi_i - \varphi_j] g_i g_j, \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

according to assumption (3.5). It follows from (3.11) that

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi^2(J^{(N,\gamma)}(\bar{z}, i, j, k, l)) &= \Phi^2(\bar{z}) + 2 \Phi(\bar{z}) G^{(N,\gamma)}(\bar{z}, i, j, k, l) \times \\ &\quad [\varphi_k + \varphi_l - \varphi_i - \varphi_j] + [G^{(N,\gamma)}(\bar{z}, i, j, k, l)]^2 [\varphi_k + \varphi_l - \varphi_i - \varphi_j]^2 \end{aligned}$$

and, consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}(\Phi^2)(\bar{z}) &= 2 \Phi(\bar{z}) \mathcal{A}(\Phi)(\bar{z}) + \\ &\quad \sum_{i,j,k,l=1}^N D^{(N,\gamma)}(\bar{z}, i, j, k, l) [G^{(N,\gamma)}(\bar{z}, i, j, k, l)]^2 [\varphi_k + \varphi_l - \varphi_i - \varphi_j]^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

From (3.13), (3.5) and (3.6), we obtain the estimates

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{A}(\Phi^2)(\bar{z}) - 2 \Phi(\bar{z}) \mathcal{A}(\Phi)(\bar{z})| &\leq \\ &\leq 16 \max_i |\varphi_i| \sum_{i,j,k,l=1}^N Q^{(N)}(\xi_i^{(N)}, \xi_j^{(N)}, \{\xi_k^{(N)}\}, \{\xi_l^{(N)}\}) g_i g_j G^{(N,\gamma)}(\bar{z}, i, j, k, l) \\ &\leq 16 \max_i |\varphi_i| C_{g,\max} \frac{1}{\gamma} C_{Q^{(N)},\max} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N g_i \right)^2, \end{aligned}$$

and, using (3.9),

$$E [M(t)]^2 \leq 16 \max_i |\varphi_i| N^2 [C_{g,max}]^3 \frac{1}{\gamma} C_{Q^{(N)},max} t. \quad (3.14)$$

Using the vectors $\varphi_i^{(m)} = \psi_{m,i}$, $m, i = 1, \dots, N$, where the symbols $\psi_{m,i}$ are defined in (3.3), one obtains from (3.8), (3.10), and (3.12)

$$g_m^{(N,\gamma)}(t) = g_m^{(N,\gamma)}(0) + \int_0^t \sum_{i,j,k,l=1}^N [\psi_{m,k} + \psi_{m,l} - \psi_{m,i} - \psi_{m,j}] \times \quad (3.15)$$

$$Q^{(N)}(\xi_i^{(N)}, \xi_j^{(N)}, \{\xi_k^{(N)}\}, \{\xi_l^{(N)}\}) g_i^{(N,\gamma)}(s) g_j^{(N,\gamma)}(s) ds + M_m(t).$$

Comparing (3.15) with (1.9), one obtains the estimate

$$|p_m^{(N)}(t) - g_m^{(N,\gamma)}(t)| \leq |p_m^{(N)}(0) - g_m^{(N,\gamma)}(0)| + \quad (3.16)$$

$$\int_0^t 4 C_{Q^{(N)},max} 2 N C_{g,max} \sum_{i=1}^N |p_i^{(N)}(s) - g_i^{(N,\gamma)}(s)| ds + |M_m(t)|.$$

Taking the sum with respect to m in (3.16), and applying Gronwall's inequality, one obtains

$$\sum_{i=1}^N |p_i^{(N)}(t) - g_i^{(N,\gamma)}(t)| \leq$$

$$\exp(8 C_{Q^{(N)},max} C_{g,max} N^2 t) \left[\sum_{i=1}^N |p_i^{(N)}(0) - g_i^{(N,\gamma)}(0)| + \sum_{i=1}^N |M_i(t)| \right].$$

After taking the supremum with respect to $t \in [0, T]$ and the mathematical expectation, the assertion of Theorem 3.1 follows from (3.14), (3.7), and the martingale inequality. \square

4. Concluding remarks

Theorem 2.1 provides a rather general solution to the problem of approximating the Boltzmann equation (1.6) by discrete velocity models. This result was possible, since we have neglected the properties of conservation of momentum and energy. These properties are fulfilled only approximately for

the discrete velocity model defined in (2.1)–(2.4). The difficulties connected with the "closure problem" for discrete velocity models were discussed in detail in [5]. We refer to [7] and [9] concerning the construction of discrete velocity models possessing conservation properties.

Theorem 3.1 provides a simple stochastic process approximating the solution to a discrete velocity model. This process can be applied for solving a discrete velocity model numerically. To this end, the exponentially distributed waiting time between the jumps should be approximated in an appropriate way. Such a procedure was discussed in some detail in [13], where Bird's DSMC algorithm was treated.

The application of the numerical algorithm based on Theorem 3.1 to the spatially inhomogeneous Boltzmann equation is straightforward, if one applies the usual technique of splitting the free flow and the collision simulation. However, as far as numerical applications are concerned, conservation properties of the algorithm become essential.

References

- [1] R. O. Barrachina. Wild's solution of the nonlinear Boltzmann equation. *J. Statist. Phys.*, 52(1/2), 357–368, 1988.
- [2] J.-M. Bony. Existence globale à données de cauchy petites pour les modèles discrets de l'équation de Boltzmann. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 16(4&5), 533–545, 1991.
- [3] C. Cercignani. *The Boltzmann Equation and its Applications*. Springer, New York, 1988.
- [4] S. N. Ethier and T. G. Kurtz. *Markov Processes, Characterization and Convergence*. Wiley, New York, 1986.
- [5] R. Illner and W. Wagner. A random discrete velocity model and approximation of the Boltzmann equation. *J. Statist. Phys.*, 70(3/4), 773–792, 1993.
- [6] J. L. Lebowitz and E. W. Montroll, editors. *Nonequilibrium Phenomena. I. The Boltzmann Equation*. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1983.

- [7] Y. L. Martin, F. Rogier, and J. Schneider. A deterministic method for solving the nonhomogeneous Boltzmann equation. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.*, 314(6), 483–487, 1992.
- [8] H. P. McKean. Speed of approach to equilibrium for Kac’s caricature of a Maxwellian gas. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 21, 343–367, 1966.
- [9] N. A. Nurlybaev. Discrete velocity method in the theory of kinetic equations. *Transport Theory Statist. Phys.*, 22(1), 109–119, 1993.
- [10] T. Płatkowski and R. Illner. Discrete velocity models of the Boltzmann equation: A survey on the mathematical aspects of the theory. *SIAM Rev.*, 30(2), 213–255, 1988.
- [11] A. S. Sznitman. Équations de type de Boltzmann, spatialement homogènes. *Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Geb.*, 66(4), 559–592, 1984.
- [12] H. Tanaka. Probabilistic treatment of the Boltzmann equation of Maxwellian molecules. *Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Geb.*, 46(1), 67–105, 1978.
- [13] W. Wagner. A convergence proof for Bird’s direct simulation Monte Carlo method for the Boltzmann equation. *J. Statist. Phys.*, 66(3/4), 1011–1044, 1992.
- [14] E. Wild. On Boltzmann’s equation in the kinetic theory of gases. *Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, 47, 602–609, 1951.

Recent publications of the Institut für Angewandte Analysis und Stochastik

Preprints 1993

67. Jörg Schmeling, Reinhard Winkler: Typical dimension of the graph of certain functions.
68. Ale Jan Homburg: On the computation of hyperbolic sets and their invariant manifolds.
69. John W. Barrett, Peter Knabner: Finite element approximation of transport of reactive solutes in porous media. Part 2: Error estimates for equilibrium adsorption processes.
70. Herbert Gajewski, Willi Jäger, Alexander Koshelev: About loss of regularity and "blow up" of solutions for quasilinear parabolic systems.
71. Friedrich Grund: Numerical solution of hierarchically structured systems of algebraic-differential equations.
72. Henri Schurz: Mean square stability for discrete linear stochastic systems.
73. Roger Tribe: A travelling wave solution to the Kolmogorov equation with noise.
74. Roger Tribe: The long term behavior of a Stochastic PDE.
75. Annegret Glitzky, Konrad Gröger, Rolf Hünlich: Rothe's method for equations modelling transport of dopants in semiconductors.
76. Wolfgang Dahmen, Bernd Kleemann, Siegfried Pröbldorf, Reinhold Schneider: A multiscale method for the double layer potential equation on a polyhedron.
77. Hans-Günter Bothe: Attractors of non invertible maps.
78. Gregori Milstein, Michael Nussbaum: Autoregression approximation of a nonparametric diffusion model.

Preprints 1994

79. Anton Bovier, Véronique Gayraud, Pierre Picco: Gibbs states of the Hopfield model in the regime of perfect memory.

80. Roland Duduchava, Siegfried Prößdorf: On the approximation of singular integral equations by equations with smooth kernels.
81. Klaus Fleischmann, Jean-François Le Gall: A new approach to the single point catalytic super-Brownian motion.
82. Anton Bovier, Jean-Michel Ghez: Remarks on the spectral properties of tight binding and Kronig-Penney models with substitution sequences.
83. Klaus Matthes, Rainer Siegmund-Schultze, Anton Wakolbinger: Recurrence of ancestral lines and offspring trees in time stationary branching populations.
84. Karmeshu, Henri Schurz: Moment evolution of the outflow-rate from nonlinear conceptual reservoirs.
85. Wolfdietrich Müller, Klaus R. Schneider: Feedback stabilization of nonlinear discrete-time systems.
86. Gennadii A. Leonov: A method of constructing of dynamical systems with bounded nonperiodic trajectories.
87. Gennadii A. Leonov: Pendulum with positive and negative dry friction. Continuum of homoclinic orbits.
88. Reiner Lauterbach, Jan A. Sanders: Bifurcation analysis for spherically symmetric systems using invariant theory.
89. Milan Kučera: Stability of bifurcating periodic solutions of differential inequalities in \mathbb{R}^3 .
90. Peter Knabner, Cornelius J. van Duijn, Sabine Hengst: An analysis of crystal dissolution fronts in flows through porous media Part I: Homogeneous charge distribution.
91. Werner Horn, Philippe Laurençot, Jürgen Sprekels: Global solutions to a Penrose-Fife phase-field model under flux boundary conditions for the inverse temperature.
92. Oleg V. Lepskii, Vladimir G. Spokoiny: Local adaptivity to inhomogeneous smoothness. 1. Resolution level.
93. Wolfgang Wagner: A functional law of large numbers for Boltzmann type stochastic particle systems.
94. Hermann Haaf: Existence of periodic travelling waves to reaction-diffusion equations with excitable-oscillatory kinetics.
95. Anton Bovier, Véronique Gayrard, Pierre Picco: Large deviation principles for the Hopfield model and the Kac-Hopfield model.