

On maximum norm convergence of multigrid methods for two-point boundary value problems

Citation for published version (APA):

Reusken, A. A. (1992). On maximum norm convergence of multigrid methods for two-point boundary value problems. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 29(6), 1569-1578. <https://doi.org/10.1137/0729090>

DOI:

[10.1137/0729090](https://doi.org/10.1137/0729090)

Document status and date:

Published: 01/01/1992

Document Version:

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of Record (includes final page, issue and volume numbers)

Please check the document version of this publication:

- A submitted manuscript is the version of the article upon submission and before peer-review. There can be important differences between the submitted version and the official published version of record. People interested in the research are advised to contact the author for the final version of the publication, or visit the DOI to the publisher's website.
- The final author version and the galley proof are versions of the publication after peer review.
- The final published version features the final layout of the paper including the volume, issue and page numbers.

[Link to publication](#)

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

If the publication is distributed under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license above, please follow below link for the End User Agreement:

www.tue.nl/taverne

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at:

openaccess@tue.nl

providing details and we will investigate your claim.

ON MAXIMUM NORM CONVERGENCE OF MULTIGRID METHODS FOR TWO-POINT BOUNDARY VALUE PROBLEMS*

ARNOLD REUSKEN†

Abstract. Multigrid methods applied to standard linear finite element discretizations of linear elliptic two-point boundary value problems are considered. In the multigrid method damped Jacobi or damped Gauss–Seidel is used as a smoother. It is shown that the contraction number with respect to the maximum norm has an upper bound which is smaller than one and independent of the mesh size.

Key words. multigrid, convergence, maximum norm, two-point boundary value problems

AMS(MOS) subject classification. 65N20

1. Introduction. If we consider elliptic boundary value problems in \mathbb{R}^N ($N = 1, 2, 3$) then multigrid methods can be used to solve the large sparse linear systems that arise after discretization. If $N = 1$ then often the matrix involved is tridiagonal, and thus many efficient solvers exist. If $N \geq 2$ then, in general, there are only a few efficient solvers and often multigrid is one of them.

There is extensive literature about the convergence analysis of multigrid methods. We refer to Hackbusch [3], McCormick [4], and the references given therein. The main feature of multigrid is that the contraction number has an upper bound which is smaller than one and independent of the mesh size. In theoretical analyses this has been shown for a broad class of problems and for several variants of multigrid. In these analyses the contraction number is measured with respect to the energy norm (for symmetric problems) or the Euclidean norm (or sometimes some other exotic norm). However, there are no results with respect to the maximum norm. In this paper we present some first results about multigrid convergence in the maximum norm. We consider multigrid applied to two-point boundary value problems and we prove the usual mesh-independent convergence of multigrid, but now with respect to the maximum norm. An important part of the analysis has a straightforward generalization to dimension $N = 2$ (cf. Remark 7.2). The analysis for the case $N = 2$ will be presented in a forthcoming paper.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: in §2 we introduce a class of two-point boundary value problems and we give some regularity results. In §3 we derive some properties of the usual linear finite element discretization. Our convergence analysis of the multigrid method is based on the approximation property and smoothing property as introduced by Hackbusch (cf. [3]). In §4 we prove the approximation property with respect to the maximum norm; our analysis is similar to the one used in Hackbusch [3]. In §5 we prove the smoothing property in the maximum norm; here a new approach is used. Based on the approximation property and smoothing property we prove convergence of the two-grid method and of the multigrid W -cycle in §6 and §7, respectively.

*Received by the editors July 31, 1991; accepted for publication (in revised form) January 30, 1992.

†Department of Mathematics and Computing Science, Eindhoven University of Technology, P.O. Box 513, 5600 MB Eindhoven, the Netherlands.

2. Continuous problem. Consider the linear two-point boundary value problem

$$(2.1) \quad -(a(x)\varphi')' + b(x)\varphi' + c(x)\varphi = f(x) \quad x \in I = (0, 1), \quad \varphi(0) = \varphi(1) = 0,$$

or, in weak form, the problem of finding $\bar{\varphi} \in H_0^1(I)$ such that for all $\psi \in H_0^1(I)$

$$(2.2) \quad a(\bar{\varphi}, \psi) = \int_I f(x)\psi(x)dx$$

holds, with

$$(2.3) \quad \begin{aligned} a(\bar{\varphi}, \psi) := & \int_I a(x)\bar{\varphi}'(x)\psi'(x)dx \\ & + \int_I b(x)\bar{\varphi}'(x)\psi(x)dx + \int_I c(x)\bar{\varphi}(x)\psi(x)dx. \end{aligned}$$

We take $f \in L^2(I)$ and make the following assumptions about the coefficients a, b, c :

$$(2.4.a) \quad a, b \in W^{1,\infty}(I), \quad c \in L^\infty(I),$$

$$(2.4.b) \quad a(x) \geq a_0 > 0 \quad \text{for all } x \in I,$$

$$(2.4.c) \quad c(x) \geq c_0 \geq 0, \quad |b(x)| \leq \delta \sqrt{a_0 c_0} \quad \text{for all } x \in I, \quad \text{with } \delta < 2.$$

Remark 2.1. Due to the assumptions in (2.4) the bilinear form in (2.3) is H_0^1 -elliptic. We note that for the conditions in (2.4.c) there are alternatives; for example, H_0^1 -ellipticity is still guaranteed if the condition $|b(x)| \leq \delta \sqrt{a_0 c_0}$ is replaced by $\|b'\|_{L^\infty} \leq 2c_0$. Moreover, the conditions in (2.4.c) are not essential; if (2.4.c) is deleted our analysis is applicable with some technical modifications and the results still hold provided the discretizations we use are “fine enough.”

The L^2 -inner product is denoted by (\cdot, \cdot) . The following notation for Sobolev spaces and corresponding norms is used.

$$W^{1,p}(I) = \{\varphi \in L^p(I) \mid \varphi' \in L^p(I)\}, \quad W^{2,p}(I) = \{\varphi \in W^{1,p}(I) \mid \varphi' \in W^{1,p}(I)\},$$

$$\|\varphi\|_{W^{m,p}} = \sum_{0 \leq r \leq m} \|\varphi^{(r)}\|_{L^p}, \quad H_0^1(I) : \text{closure of } C_0^\infty(I) \text{ in } W^{1,2}(I).$$

It is well known that for every $f \in L^2(I)$ the corresponding weak solution $\bar{\varphi} \in H_0^1(I)$ is also an element of $W^{2,2}(I)$ and satisfies

$$(2.5) \quad \|\bar{\varphi}\|_{W^{2,2}} \leq C \|f\|_{L^2}.$$

Note that for every $\psi \in C_0^\infty(I)$ we have

$$(2.6) \quad (a\bar{\varphi}'', \psi) = ((b - a')\bar{\varphi}' + c\bar{\varphi} - f, \psi).$$

The (continuous) imbeddings $W^{2,2}(I) \hookrightarrow W^{1,2}(I) \hookrightarrow L^\infty(I)$ imply that for $\bar{\varphi} \in W^{2,2}(I)$ we have $\bar{\varphi}, \bar{\varphi}' \in L^\infty(I)$. From (2.6) we then see that if $f \in L^\infty(I)$ then $a\bar{\varphi}'' \in L^\infty(I)$, and thus $\bar{\varphi} \in W^{2,\infty}(I)$ and

$$(2.7) \quad \|\bar{\varphi}''\|_{L^\infty} \leq \frac{1}{a_0} \left\{ (\|b\|_{L^\infty} + \|a\|_{W^{1,\infty}}) \|\bar{\varphi}'\|_{L^\infty} + \|c\|_{L^\infty} \|\bar{\varphi}\|_{L^\infty} + \|f\|_{L^\infty} \right\}.$$

Combining the inequality in (2.7) with $\|\bar{\varphi}'\|_{L^\infty} \leq C \|\bar{\varphi}\|_{W^{2,2}}$, $\|\bar{\varphi}\|_{L^\infty} \leq C \|\bar{\varphi}\|_{W^{2,2}}$, $\|\bar{\varphi}\|_{W^{2,2}} \leq C \|f\|_{L^2} \leq C \|f\|_{L^\infty}$ (cf. (2.5)) yields that

$$(2.8) \quad \text{if } f \in L^\infty(I), \quad \text{then } \|\bar{\varphi}\|_{W^{2,\infty}} \leq C \|f\|_{L^\infty}, \quad \text{with } C = C(a, b, c).$$

This regularity result will be used in the proof of the approximation property in §4.

3. Discretization and two-grid method. Let Φ_k be the n_k -dimensional space of functions φ with $\varphi(0) = \varphi(1) = 0$ that are piecewise linear on a mesh with nodes $x_{k,i}$ for which $0 = x_{k,0} < x_{k,1} < \dots < x_{k,n_k} < x_{k,n_k+1} = 1$. Φ_k is constructed from Φ_{k-1} by using mesh refinement, so we get a sequence of nested spaces

$$(3.1) \quad \Phi_0 \subset \Phi_1 \subset \dots \subset \Phi_k \subset \dots \subset H_0^1(I).$$

Let $h_{k,i} := x_{k,i} - x_{k,i-1}$ ($i = 1, \dots, n_k + 1$) and $h_k := \max_i h_{k,i}$. We assume quasi-uniformity of the meshes, i.e.,

$$(3.2) \quad \max_{i,j} h_{k,i} h_{k,j}^{-1} \leq \gamma_0 \quad \text{with } \gamma_0 \text{ independent of } k.$$

Furthermore, the mesh refinement should be such that the following holds:

$$(3.3) \quad h_k h_{k+1}^{-1} \leq \gamma_1 \quad \text{with } \gamma_1 \text{ independent of } k.$$

The standard basis on Φ_k is given by the hat functions $\varphi_i^{(k)}$ which satisfy $\varphi_i^{(k)}(x_{k,j}) = \delta_{ij}$. This basis induces a bijection

$$(3.4) \quad P_k : U_k = \mathbb{R}^{n_k} \rightarrow \Phi_k, \quad P_k(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{n_k}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} u_i \varphi_i^{(k)}.$$

On U_k we use a scaled Euclidean inner product

$$(3.5) \quad \langle u, v \rangle_k = h_k \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} u_i v_i.$$

The maximum norm on U_k is denoted by $\|\cdot\|_\infty$. Below, adjoints are always defined with respect to the L^2 -inner product on Φ_k and the scaled Euclidean inner product on U_k .

The norms $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ (on $(U_k)_{k \geq 0}$) and $\|\cdot\|_{L^\infty}$ (on $(\Phi_k)_{k \geq 0}$) induce associated operator norms which are denoted by $\|\cdot\|_\infty$.

The sequences $(P_k)_{k \geq 0}$, $(P_k^{-1})_{k \geq 0}$, $(P_k^*)_{k \geq 0}$, $((P_k^*)^{-1})_{k \geq 0}$ are uniformly bounded with respect to $\|\cdot\|_\infty$:

LEMMA 3.1. *The following holds:*

$$(1) \quad \|P_k u\|_{L^\infty} = \|u\|_\infty \quad \text{for all } u \in U_k,$$

$$(2) \quad (3\gamma_0)^{-1} \|\varphi\|_{L^\infty} \leq \|P_k^* \varphi\|_\infty \leq \|\varphi\|_{L^\infty} \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in \Phi_k \quad (\gamma_0 \text{ as in (3.2)}).$$

Proof. The result in (1) holds because $P_k u$ is piecewise linear and $(P_k u)(x_{k,i})$ equals the i th component of u .

Due to (1) the statement in (2) is equivalent with

$$(2') \quad (3\gamma_0)^{-1} \|u\|_\infty \leq \|P_k^* P_k u\|_\infty \leq \|u\|_\infty \quad \text{for all } u \in U_k.$$

The matrix $P_k^* P_k$ is the well-known mass matrix

$$(P_k^* P_k)_{ij} = h_k^{-1} \langle P_k^* P_k e_j, e_i \rangle_k = h_k^{-1} (\varphi_j^{(k)}, \varphi_i^{(k)}) = h_k^{-1} \int_I \varphi_j^{(k)}(x) \varphi_i^{(k)}(x) dx.$$

So $P_k^* P_k$ is symmetric tridiagonal with elements

$$(P_k^* P_k)_{ii} = \frac{1}{3} h_k^{-1} (h_{k,i} + h_{k,i+1}) =: d_{k,i}, \quad (P_k^* P_k)_{i,i-1} = \frac{1}{6} h_k^{-1} h_{k,i} =: e_{k,i}.$$

Because $|d_{k,i}| \leq \frac{2}{3}$ and $|e_{k,i}| \leq \frac{1}{6}$ we get $\|P_k^* P_k\|_\infty \leq 1$ and thus the second inequality in (2') holds.

Let $D_k := \text{diag}(P_k^* P_k)$, $R_k := P_k^* P_k - D_k$. Then $\|D_k^{-1}\|_\infty \leq \max_i d_{k,i}^{-1} \leq \frac{3}{2} \gamma_0$. Also $\|D_k^{-1} R_k\|_\infty = \max_i (d_{k,i}^{-1} (e_{k,i} + e_{k,i+1}))$ (with $e_{k,1} := e_{k,n_k+1} := 0$), and thus $\|D_k^{-1} R_k\|_\infty \leq \frac{1}{2}$. So $\|(P_k^* P_k)^{-1}\|_\infty \leq \|D_k^{-1}\|_\infty (1 - \|D_k^{-1} R_k\|_\infty)^{-1} \leq 3\gamma_0$; this proves the first inequality in (2'). \square

Galerkin discretization results in a stiffness matrix $L_k : U_k \rightarrow U_k$ defined by

$$(3.6) \quad \langle L_k u, v \rangle_k = a(P_k u, P_k v) \quad \text{for all } u, v \in U_k.$$

We also have

$$(3.7) \quad a(P_k L_k^{-1} g, \psi) = ((P_k^*)^{-1} g, \psi) \quad \text{for all } g \in U_k, \quad \psi \in \Phi_k.$$

In §5 we prove the smoothing property for matrices which are weakly diagonally dominant (i.e., $\sum_{j \neq i} |A_{ij}| \leq |A_{ii}|$ for all i). It is well known that often the stiffness matrices L_k are weakly diagonally dominant. For completeness we give a few criteria.

LEMMA 3.2. *Take k fixed and write $L_k = A + B + C$ with*

$$A_{ij} = (a\varphi'_j, \varphi'_i), \quad B_{ij} = (b\varphi'_j, \varphi_i), \quad C_{ij} = (c\varphi_j, \varphi_i) \quad (\varphi_m = \varphi_m^{(k)}).$$

L_k is weakly diagonally dominant if one of the following conditions is satisfied:

- (1) all off-diagonal elements of L_k are nonpositive.
- (2) $A + B$ is weakly diagonally dominant with $(A + B)_{ii} \geq 0$ for all i , and C is weakly diagonally dominant.

$$(3) \quad h_k \frac{1}{2} a_0^{-1} (\|b\|_{L^\infty} + \frac{1}{3} h_k \|c\|_{L^\infty}) \leq 1 \quad (a_0 \text{ as in (2.4.b)}).$$

$$(4) \quad h_k \frac{1}{2} a_0^{-1} \|b\|_{L^\infty} \leq 1 \quad \text{and } c \in \Phi_k.$$

Proof. First we consider (1). Let $I_m = [x_{k,m-1}, x_{k,m}]$ and let $L_k^{(m)}$ be the corresponding element stiffness matrix, i.e.,

$$(L_k^{(m)})_{ij} = a|_{I_m}(\varphi_j^{(k)}, \varphi_i^{(k)}).$$

Note that due to the ellipticity of $a(\cdot, \cdot)$ all diagonal elements of $L_k^{(m)}$ are nonnegative. The p th row of $L_k^{(m)}$ contains at most one nonzero off-diagonal element; this element

is of the form $a_{|I_m}(\varphi_j, \varphi_p)$ with $j \in \{p - 1, p + 1\}$, and

$$\begin{aligned} |a_{|I_m}(\varphi_j, \varphi_p)| &= |a(\varphi_j, \varphi_p)| = -a(\varphi_j, \varphi_p) \\ &= -a_{|I_m}(1 - \varphi_p, \varphi_p) = a_{|I_m}(\varphi_p, \varphi_p) - a_{|I_m}(1, \varphi_p) \leq (L_k^{(m)})_{pp}. \end{aligned}$$

So all element stiffness matrices are weakly diagonally dominant and have nonnegative diagonal elements. This implies that the (global) stiffness matrix is weakly diagonally dominant.

It is easy to show that L_k is weakly diagonally dominant if (2) holds. With respect to (3) and (4), we note that some elementary analysis yields that if the inequality in (3) holds then condition (1) is fulfilled, and if the conditions in (4) are fulfilled then (2) holds. \square

Remark 3.3. Note that if c is small (compared with b) or if c is smooth, then the conditions in (3) and (4) in essence yield the usual bound for the Peclet number $h_k \frac{1}{2} a_0^{-1} \|b\|_{L^\infty}$. It is well known that, in general, the standard finite element Galerkin discretization yields a poor approximation if the Peclet number is large. Other discretization techniques should be used in that situation.

For solving systems of the form $L_k u_k = g_k$ we use a standard multigrid method. The iteration matrix of the smoothing method is denoted by S_k . The prolongation $p = p_k : U_{k-1} \rightarrow U_k$ that we use is the natural one:

$$(3.8) \quad p = P_k^{-1} P_{k-1}.$$

For the restriction $r = r_k : U_k \rightarrow U_{k-1}$ we take

$$(3.9) \quad r = p^*.$$

The iteration matrix of the two-grid method with ν presmoothing iterations is given by

$$(3.10) \quad T_k(\nu) = (I - pL_{k-1}^{-1}rL_k)S_k^\nu = (L_k^{-1} - pL_{k-1}^{-1}r)L_kS_k^\nu.$$

For convergence of the two-grid method we will prove the approximation property

$$(3.11) \quad \|L_k^{-1} - pL_{k-1}^{-1}r\|_\infty \leq C h_k^2,$$

and the smoothing property

$$(3.12) \quad \|L_k S_k^\nu\|_\infty \leq \eta(\nu) h_k^{-2} \quad (\text{with } \eta(\nu) \rightarrow 0 \text{ if } \nu \rightarrow \infty).$$

These proofs will be given in §4 and §5, respectively.

4. Approximation property. The proof of the approximation property is based on optimal L^∞ error estimates which can be found, e.g., in Wheeler [10], Douglas–Dupont–Wahlbin [2], and on the uniform boundedness of the sequences $(P_k)_{k \geq 0}$, $((P_k^*)^{-1})_{k \geq 0}$.

LEMMA 4.1. *The following holds with a constant C independent of k :*

$$(4.1) \quad \|L_k^{-1} - pL_{k-1}^{-1}r\|_\infty \leq C h_k^2.$$

Proof. Take $g \in U_k$. In the proof different constants c , all independent of k and g , are used.

Let $\varphi \in H_0^1(I)$ be such that

$$a(\varphi, \psi) = ((P_k^*)^{-1}g, \psi) \quad \text{for all } \psi \in H_0^1(I).$$

From (2.8) it follows that

$$(4.2) \quad \|\varphi\|_{W^{2,\infty}} \leq c \|(P_k^*)^{-1}g\|_{L^\infty}.$$

Let $\varphi_k \in \Phi_k, \varphi_{k-1} \in \Phi_{k-1}$ be such that

$$a(\varphi_k, \psi) = ((P_k^*)^{-1}g, \psi) \quad \text{for all } \psi \in \Phi_k,$$

$$a(\varphi_{k-1}, \psi) = ((P_k^*)^{-1}g, \psi) \quad \text{for all } \psi \in \Phi_{k-1}.$$

In [10], [2] it is shown that the following holds:

$$(4.3) \quad \|\varphi_m - \varphi\|_{L^\infty} \leq c h_m^2 \|\varphi\|_{W^{2,\infty}} \quad \text{for } m \in \{k, k-1\}.$$

Combining (4.2), (4.3), and (3.3) yields

$$(4.4) \quad \|\varphi_k - \varphi_{k-1}\|_{L^\infty} \leq c(h_{k-1}^2 + h_k^2) \|(P_k^*)^{-1}g\|_{L^\infty} \leq c h_k^2 \|(P_k^*)^{-1}g\|_{L^\infty}.$$

From (3.7) it follows that $\varphi_k = P_k L_k^{-1}g, \varphi_{k-1} = P_{k-1} L_{k-1}^{-1}rg$. Using Lemma 3.1 and (4.4) we finally get

$$\begin{aligned} \|(L_k^{-1} - pL_{k-1}^{-1}r)g\|_\infty &= \|P_k L_k^{-1}g - P_{k-1} L_{k-1}^{-1}rg\|_{L^\infty} \\ &= \|\varphi_k - \varphi_{k-1}\|_{L^\infty} \leq c h_k^2 \|(P_k^*)^{-1}g\|_{L^\infty} \leq c h_k^2 \|g\|_\infty. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

5. Smoothing property. The usual technique for proving the smoothing property requires symmetry (or a nearly symmetric situation) and yields results in the Euclidean norm or in the energy norm. We refer to Wittum [11], where smoothing and the construction of smoothers are discussed in a general framework. A new approach to the smoothing property that does not use symmetry has been introduced in Reusken [7]. A disadvantage of this new approach is that we need a damping factor less than or equal to 0.5 (whereas the conditions for the damping factor in [11] are less restrictive).

The results of this section can be found in a more general setting in [7]. For completeness we also give proofs here.

Below we prove that the smoothing property, in the maximum norm, holds for damped Jacobi and for damped Gauss–Seidel.

Let $L_k = M_k - N_k$ be the splitting corresponding to the Jacobi method or the Gauss–Seidel method (both without damping). We consider a relaxation method with iteration matrix

$$(5.1) \quad S_k = I - \frac{1}{2} M_k^{-1} L_k$$

(damping with factor $\frac{1}{2}$). In our analysis we use that the splitting is such that $\|M_k^{-1}N_k\|_\infty \leq 1$ holds. Therefore we introduce the following.

Assumption 5.1. For every $k \geq 0$ the matrix L_k is weakly diagonally dominant.

Note that in Lemma 3.2 some criteria with respect to diagonal dominance are given.

LEMMA 5.2. *Let A be an $n \times n$ -matrix with $\|A\|_\infty \leq 1$. Then the following holds:*

$$(5.2) \quad \|(I - A)(I + A)^\nu\|_\infty \leq 2 \binom{\nu}{\lfloor \frac{1}{2} \nu \rfloor} \leq 2^{\nu+1} \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi\nu}} \quad (\nu \geq 1).$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} (I - A)(I + A)^\nu &= (I - A) \sum_{k=0}^\nu \binom{\nu}{k} A^k \\ &= I - A^{\nu+1} + \sum_{k=1}^\nu \left(\binom{\nu}{k} - \binom{\nu}{k-1} \right) A^k. \end{aligned}$$

So

$$(5.3) \quad \|(I - A)(I + A)^\nu\|_\infty \leq 2 + \sum_{k=1}^\nu \left| \binom{\nu}{k} - \binom{\nu}{k-1} \right|.$$

Using

$$\binom{\nu}{k} \geq \binom{\nu}{k-1} \Leftrightarrow k \leq \frac{1}{2}(\nu + 1), \quad \text{and} \quad \binom{\nu}{k} = \binom{\nu}{\nu - k}$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{k=1}^\nu \left| \binom{\nu}{k} - \binom{\nu}{k-1} \right| \\ &= \sum_1^{[(\nu+1)/2]} \left(\binom{\nu}{k} - \binom{\nu}{k-1} \right) + \sum_{[(\nu+1)/2]+1}^\nu \left(\binom{\nu}{k-1} - \binom{\nu}{k} \right) \\ &= \sum_1^{[\nu/2]} \left(\binom{\nu}{k} - \binom{\nu}{k-1} \right) + \sum_{m=1}^{[\nu/2]} \left(\binom{\nu}{m} - \binom{\nu}{m-1} \right) \\ &= 2 \sum_{k=1}^{[\nu/2]} \left(\binom{\nu}{k} - \binom{\nu}{k-1} \right) = 2 \left(\binom{\nu}{[\nu/2]} - \binom{\nu}{0} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Combined with (5.3) this yields the first inequality in (5.2). Elementary analysis yields that

$$\binom{\nu}{\lfloor \frac{1}{2} \nu \rfloor} \leq 2^\nu \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi\nu}} \quad \text{for all } \nu \geq 1.$$

For details we refer to [7]. □

LEMMA 5.3. *Suppose that Assumption 5.1 holds. Then for the damped Jacobi and for the damped Gauss-Seidel relaxation (cf. (5.1)) we have the following smoothing property:*

$$\|L_k S_k^\nu\|_\infty \leq C \frac{1}{\sqrt{\nu}} h_k^{-2} \quad (C \text{ independent of } k, \nu).$$

Proof. Let $A := M_k^{-1}N_k = I - M_k^{-1}L_k$. Then, due to Assumption 5.1, we have $\|A\|_\infty \leq 1$. Using Lemma 5.2 we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|L_k S_k^\nu\|_\infty &= \left\| L_k \left(I - \frac{1}{2} M_k^{-1} L_k \right)^\nu \right\|_\infty \\ &= \|M_k(I - A) \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^\nu (I + A)^\nu\|_\infty \\ &\leq \|M_k\|_\infty \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^\nu 2^{\nu+1} \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi\nu}} \\ &= 2 \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\nu}} \|M_k\|_\infty \\ &\leq C \frac{1}{\sqrt{\nu}} h_k^{-2} \quad (C = C(a, b, c)). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

6. Convergence of the two-grid method. Lemmas 4.1 and 5.3 together immediately yield the following result.

THEOREM 6.1. *Suppose that Assumption 5.1 holds. Let $T_k(\nu)$ be the iteration matrix of a two-grid method with ν presmoothing iterations of a damped Jacobi or a damped Gauss–Seidel relaxation (cf. (3.10), (5.1)). Then the following holds:*

$$(6.1) \quad \|T_k(\nu)\|_\infty \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{\nu}} \quad \text{with } C \text{ independent of } k \text{ and } \nu.$$

Remark 6.2. Clearly Theorem 6.1 shows that for the two-grid method with ν large enough (but fixed) the contraction number *with respect to the maximum norm* has an upperbound which is smaller than one and independent of the mesh size.

7. Convergence of the multigrid method. The analysis of the multigrid W -cycle follows the approach given in Hackbusch [3].

The error iteration matrix $M_k(\nu)$ of the multigrid W -cycle with ν presmoothing iterations on each level is recursively defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} M_1(\nu) &= T_1(\nu) \\ M_k(\nu) &= T_k(\nu) + pM_{k-1}(\nu)^2 L_{k-1}^{-1} r L_k S_k^\nu, \quad k \geq 2. \end{aligned}$$

THEOREM 7.1. *Suppose that Assumption 5.1 holds. Let $T_k(\nu)$ be as in Theorem 6.1, and assume that ν is large enough such that $\xi_\nu := \|T_k(\nu)\|_\infty < \frac{1}{2}(\sqrt{2} - 1)$ holds. Let μ_ν be the smallest root of the polynomial $p(x) = (1 + \xi_\nu)x^2 - x + \xi_\nu$. Now the following holds:*

$$(7.1) \quad \|M_k(\nu)\|_\infty \leq \mu_\nu < 1,$$

and also

$$(7.2) \quad \mu_\nu \leq \xi_\nu + 4\xi_\nu^2(1 + \xi_\nu).$$

Proof. Let $m_k(\nu) := \|M_k(\nu)\|_\infty$. Note that, due to Assumption 5.1, we have $\|S_k\|_\infty = \|I - \frac{1}{2} M_k^{-1} L_k\|_\infty = \|\frac{1}{2} I + \frac{1}{2} M_k^{-1} N_k\|_\infty \leq 1$. Note that $m_1(\nu) = \xi_\nu$, and

for $k \geq 2$

$$\begin{aligned} m_k(\nu) &\leq \|T_k(\nu)\|_\infty + \|pM_{k-1}(\nu)^2 L_{k-1}^{-1} r L_k S_k^\nu\|_\infty \\ &\leq \xi_\nu + \|M_{k-1}(\nu)\|_\infty^2 \|pL_{k-1}^{-1} r L_k S_k^\nu\|_\infty \quad (\text{use } \|pv\|_\infty = \|v\|_\infty) \\ &= \xi_\nu + m_{k-1}(\nu)^2 \|S_k^\nu - T_k(\nu)\|_\infty \\ &\leq \xi_\nu + m_{k-1}(\nu)^2 (1 + \xi_\nu). \end{aligned}$$

The iteration $x_1 := \xi_\nu$, $x_{i+1} := \xi_\nu + (1 + \xi_\nu)x_i^2$ ($i \geq 1$) has a fixed point $\mu_\nu := \frac{1}{2}(1 + \xi_\nu)^{-1} \left(1 - \sqrt{1 - 4\xi_\nu(1 + \xi_\nu)}\right) < 1$, and for all i $x_i \leq \mu_\nu$ holds. So the inequalities in (7.1) hold. The inequality in (7.2) follows from

$$1 - \sqrt{1 - x} \leq \frac{1}{2}x + \frac{1}{2}x^2 \quad \text{for all } x \in [0, 1]. \quad \square$$

Remark 7.2. With respect to a generalization of our analysis to the two-dimensional situation we note the following: The arguments used in the proof of multigrid convergence (Theorem 7.1) can be used for the two-dimensional case also, provided we have an upper bound for the two-grid contraction number as in (6.1). Such an upper bound is a direct consequence of the approximation property and the smoothing property. The analysis of the smoothing property in §5 can also be used in two dimensions. So in essence it is only the approximation property that needs to be reconsidered. It is known from the literature (cf., e.g., [1], [5], [6], [8], [9]) that for linear finite element Galerkin approximations in two dimensions the optimal L^∞ error estimate is of the order $h_k^2 |\log h_k|$ (instead of h_k^2). So in the approximation property we do not expect an upper bound Ch_k^2 as in (4.1) but an upper bound $Ch_k^2 |\log h_k|$.

Multigrid convergence in the maximum norm for two-dimensional elliptic boundary value problems will be analyzed in detail in a forthcoming paper.

REFERENCES

- [1] P. G. CIARLET, *Basic error estimates for elliptic problems*, in Handbook of Numerical Analysis, Vol. II, P. G. Ciarlet and J. L. Lions, eds., North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1991, pp. 17–352.
- [2] J. DOUGLAS, JR., T. DUPONT, AND L. WAHLBIN, *Optimal L^∞ error estimates for Galerkin approximations to solutions of two-point boundary value problems*, Math. Comp., 29 (1975), pp. 475–483.
- [3] W. HACKBUSCH, *Multi-grid Methods and Applications*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1985.
- [4] S. MCCORMICK, ED., *Multigrid Methods*, Frontiers Appl. Math., Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia, PA, 1987.
- [5] J. NITSCHKE, *L^∞ -convergence of finite element approximations*, in Mathematical Aspects of Finite Element Methods, Rome, 1975, pp. 261–274.
- [6] R. RANNACHER AND R. SCOTT, *Some optimal error estimates for piecewise linear finite element approximations*, Math. Comp., 38 (1982), pp. 437–445.
- [7] A. REUSKEN, *A new lemma in multigrid convergence theory*, RANA report 91-07, Department of Mathematics and Computing Science, Eindhoven University of Technology, Eindhoven, the Netherlands, 1991.
- [8] A. H. SCHATZ AND L. B. WAHLBIN, *Maximum norm estimates in the finite element method on plane polygonal domains, Part 1*, Math. Comp., 32 (1978), pp. 73–109.
- [9] R. SCOTT, *Optimal L^∞ estimates for the finite element method on irregular meshes*, Math. Comp., 30 (1976), pp. 681–697.
- [10] M. F. WHEELER, *An optimal L^∞ error estimate for Galerkin approximations to solutions of two-point boundary value problems*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 10 (1973), pp. 914–917.

- [11] G. WITTUM, *Linear iterations as smoothers in multigrid methods: Theory with applications to incomplete decompositions*, Impact of Computing in Science and Engineering, 1 (1989), pp. 180–215.