

IDENTIFICATION OF A BOUNDARY INFLUX CONDITION IN A ONE-PHASE STEFAN PROBLEM

CHIFAA GHANMI, SALOUA MANI-AOUADI, AND FAOUZI TRIKI

ABSTRACT. We consider a one-dimensional one-phase inverse Stefan problem for the heat equation. It consists in recovering a boundary influx condition from the knowledge of the position of the moving front, and the initial state. We derived a logarithmic stability estimate that shows that the inversion is ill-posed. The proof is based on integral equations and unique continuation for holomorphic functions. We also proposed a direct algorithm with a regularization term to solve the nonlinear inverse problem. Several numerical tests using noisy data are provided with relative errors analysis.

1. INTRODUCTION

Stefan problem is a specific type of free boundary problems in partial differential equations related to heat diffusion. It aims to describe the temperature distribution in a homogeneous medium undergoing a phase change, for example water passing to ice. Stefan problems model finds application in many engineering settings in which there is melting or freezing causing a boundary change in time. Examples include melting of ice, recrystallization of metals, tumor growth, freezing of liquids, etc [25, 30].

The Stefan problem for the heat equation consists in determining the temperature and location of the melting front delimiting the different phases when the initial and boundary conditions are given. Conversely, the inverse Stefan problem is to recover boundary conditions, and/or initial condition from measurement of the moving boundary position. The Stefan problem as a mathematical model has been studied in the literature for many decades, and has attracted the attention of many mathematicians and physicists (see for instance [23, 30, 36] and references therein).

The direct Stefan problem is known to be well-posed, i.e., it possesses a unique solution which depends continuously on the data, provided that the initial state and the source functions have the correct signs [17, 21]. If the sign requirements are not fulfilled, the direct Stefan problem may not have a global solution or may be an ill-posed problem [4, 28]. In contrast with the direct Stefan problem only few theoretical results are available for the related inverse problem. Indeed most published materials have considered the numerical reconstruction of the temperature or heat flux on the boundary [12, 14, 26, 27, 31, 35]. Solving numerically both direct and inverse Stefan problems can be a difficult task because of the free boundary, the nonlinearity and the ill-posedness in the sense that these problems may not possess a solution, or that in case there exist solutions they may not depend continuously on the given data [8, 31, 34].

In this paper we are interested in solving the so-called one-dimensional one-phase inverse Stefan problem which is *to find the heat influx at the boundary from the knowledge of the moving free boundary*. The one-dimensional Stefan problem has been extensively studied by many authors [7, 14, 18, 30, 33, 34]. Assuming that the temperature of the solid is constant, and the heat conduction in the melted portion is governed by the heat equation, leads to a simple one-phase free boundary value problem. If in addition the heat influx stays positive, which means that heat is continuously entering the domain, only one phase remains, and the direct Stefan problem admits a unique global smooth solution. The inverse problem can be recasted as a non

Date: February 18, 2022.

The work of FT is supported in part by the grant ANR-17-CE40-0029 of the French National Research Agency ANR (project MultiOnde).

standard Cauchy problem. The uniqueness of the inversion has been established by several authors under different smoothness assumptions on the boundary influx and the initial state [9, 11, 18, 19]. The novelty in this paper is a logarithmic stability estimate of the inversion, and the numerical treatment of the problem based on the resolution of regularized linear integral equations.

This paper is composed of five sections. Section 2 provides an introduction to the direct problem. We first recall known useful existence, uniqueness, stability and regularity properties for solutions of the classical one Stefan problem in Theorems 2.1 and 2.2. We set the inverse Stefan problem in section 3. The main stability estimate is given in Theorem 3.1. We detailed the proof of the principal results in section 4. Finally, section 5 is devoted to the numerical resolution of both the direct and inverse Stefan problems. Several numerical tests are provided with relative errors analysis.

2. THE DIRECT PROBLEM

We next introduce the one dimension one-phase Stefan problem. Let $b > 0$ and $T > 0$ be two fixed constants. For any positive function $s \in C([0, T])$ satisfying $s(0) = b$, we define the open set $Q_{s,T} \subset \mathbb{R}_+ \times (0, T)$, by

$$(2.1) \quad Q_{s,T} = \{(x, t) \mid 0 < x < s(t), \quad 0 < t < T\}.$$

The direct Stefan problem is to determine $u(x, t) \in C(\overline{Q_{s,T}}) \cap C^{2,1}(Q_{s,T})$ and $s(t) \in C^1((0, T]) \cap C^{0,1}([0, T])$, satisfying

$$(2.2) \quad u_t - u_{xx} = 0 \quad \text{in } Q_{s,T},$$

$$(2.3) \quad -u_x(0, t) = h(t) > 0 \quad 0 < t < T,$$

$$(2.4) \quad u(x, 0) = u_0(x) \geq 0 \quad 0 < x < b,$$

$$(2.5) \quad -u_x(s(t), t) = \dot{s}(t) \quad 0 < t < T,$$

$$(2.6) \quad u(s(t), t) = 0 \quad 0 < t < T,$$

$$(2.7) \quad s(0) = b,$$

where $h \in C([0, T])$, $u_0 \in C([0, b])$ are given.

Let $H > 0$ be a fixed constant. Throughout the paper we assume

$$(2.8) \quad h \in C([0, T]), \quad h(t) > 0 \quad 0 \leq t \leq T,$$

$$(2.9) \quad u_0 \in C([0, b]), \quad 0 \leq u_0(x) \leq H(b - x), \quad 0 \leq x \leq b.$$

Let

$$(2.10) \quad M = \max\{\|h\|_\infty, H\}.$$

Next, we give a result of existence and uniqueness of the Stefan problem (2.2)-(2.7).

Theorem 2.1. *The problem (2.2)-(2.7) admits a unique solution $(s(t), u(x, t))$. In addition the solution $(s(t), u(x, t))$ satisfies*

$$(2.11) \quad 0 < u(x, t) \leq M(s(t) - x) \quad \text{in } Q_{s,T},$$

$$(2.12) \quad 0 \leq -u_x(s(t), t) = \dot{s}(t) \leq M \quad \text{in } (0, T].$$

The proof is based on the Maximum principle and the fixed point Theorem. The existence and uniqueness of the Stefan problem has been studied by various authors under different smoothness assumptions (see for instance [8, 10] and references therein).

Remark 2.1. *The assumption on the sign of the flux $h(t)$ means that heat is entering the domain, so that, for each t only one phase remains. If the sign requirement on $h(t)$ are not fulfilled, the direct Stefan problem may not have a global solution or may be an ill-posed problem [4, 28].*

Remark 2.2. Since $C^{0,1}([0, T])$ and $W^{1,\infty}(0, T)$ are somehow identical for smooth domains (Theorem 4, page 294 in [15]), we deduce from Theorem 2.1 that $s \in W^{1,\infty}(0, T)$. Moreover, a simple calculation gives

$$(2.13) \quad s(t) = b + \int_0^t h(\tau) d\tau + \int_0^b u_0(x) dx - \int_0^{s(t)} u(x, t) dx.$$

Since u is nonnegative, we deduce from (2.13), the following estimate

$$b \leq s(t) \leq T\|h\|_\infty + b(\|u_0\|_\infty + 1) \quad \text{in } (0, T],$$

which combined to inequality (2.12), leads to

$$(2.14) \quad \|s\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \leq s_\infty := \max(T\|h\|_\infty + b(\|u_0\|_\infty + 1); M).$$

Next we give some useful properties of the solutions of Stefan problem as well as their stability with respect to boundary and initial data.

Consider two sets $(h_i(t), u_{0,i}(x)), i = 1, 2$, of Stefan data satisfying assumptions (2.8) and (2.9). Theorem 2.1 guarantees the existence of a unique solution (s_i, u_i) to each one of the two problems.

Theorem 2.2. If $b_1 < b_2$, then the free boundaries $s_1(t)$, $s_2(t)$, corresponding to the data $(h_i(t), u_{0,i}(x)), i = 1, 2$, satisfy

$$(2.15) \quad |s_1(t) - s_2(t)| \leq C \left(b_2 - b_1 + \int_0^{b_1} |u_{0,1}(x) - u_{0,2}(x)| dx + \int_{b_2}^{b_1} u_{0,2}(x) dx + \int_0^t |h_1(\tau) - h_2(\tau)| d\tau \right), \quad 0 \leq t \leq T,$$

where $C > 0$ only depends on T and M .

The proof of this theorem is detailed in [8]. The constant $C > 0$ appearing in Theorem 2.2 is in fact exponentially increasing as function of T and M .

3. THE INVERSE PROBLEM

In this paper we are interested in the following inverse problem: to determine $h = -u_x$ from the knowledge of the moving boundary s and the initial state u_0 . Clearly, the inverse Stefan problem is a Cauchy-like problem of determining a function u which satisfies [11]

$$(3.16) \quad (\mathcal{P}) \quad \begin{cases} u_t - u_{xx} = 0 & \text{in } Q_{s,T}, \\ u(x, 0) = u_0(x) \geq 0, & 0 < x < b, \\ -u_x(s(t), t) = \dot{s}(t), & 0 < t < T, \\ u(s(t), t) = 0, & 0 < t < T, \\ s(0) = b. \end{cases}$$

We first study the uniqueness of recovery of the heat flux for a given free boundary $s \in C^1([0, T])$, and a nonnegative initial state $u_0 \in C^1([0, b])$. Showing the uniqueness in Stefan inverse problem is then equivalent to proving that the linear non-standard Cauchy problem (\mathcal{P}) admits a unique solution. The following result has been established by J.R. Cannon and J. Douglas in [11].

Proposition 3.1. For given $s \in C^1([0, T])$ and $u_0 \in C^1([0, b])$, there can exist at most one solution $u \in C^2(Q_{s,T}) \cap C^1(\overline{Q_{s,T}})$ of the problem (\mathcal{P}) .

Since $u \in C^1(\overline{Q_{s,T}})$, we deduce from Proposition 3.1 that there exists a unique solution to inverse Stefan problem given by $h = -u_x$.

Notice that required C^1 regularity of the free boundary $s(t)$ in the previous uniqueness result is not guaranteed by the regularity assumptions (2.8) and (2.9) (does not need to be C^1 close to 0). In order to reach

such a regularity one needs to impose stronger smoothness and compatibility conditions on the data [10, 19].

Let $A : L^2(0, T) \rightarrow L^2(0, T)$ be the Laplacian $Ah = -h_{tt}$ with Dirichlet boundary condition. It is an unbounded self-adjoint, strictly positive operator with a compact resolvent.

Denote by $D(A^{\frac{1}{2}})$ the domain of $A^{\frac{1}{2}}$, and introduce for $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ the scale of Hilbert spaces X_β , as follows: for every $\beta \geq 0$, $X_\beta = D(A^{\frac{\beta}{2}})$, with the norm $\|h\|_\beta = \|A^{\frac{\beta}{2}}h\|_{L^2}$ (note that $0 \notin \sigma(A)$ where $\sigma(A)$ is the spectrum of A). The space $X_{-\beta}$ is defined by duality with respect to the pivot space X as follows: $X_{-\beta} = X_\beta^*$ for $\beta > 0$ [2]. The norm $\|h\|_\beta$ is given in terms of the eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of the operator A [29].

Let A_0 be the Abel linear integral operator [6]

$$A_0 : L^2(0, T) \rightarrow L^2(0, T)$$

$$A_0 h(t) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^t \frac{1}{\sqrt{t-\tau}} h(\tau) d\tau.$$

In [29], the authors showed the equivalence between the norm $\|h\|_{-\frac{1}{2}}$ and $\|A_0 h\|_{L^2}$, that is, there exists an universal constant $C > 0$, such that

$$(3.17) \quad C^{-1} \|h\|_{-\frac{1}{2}} \leq \|A_0 h\|_{L^2} \leq C \|h\|_{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Next, we state our main result in this paper.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $u_0 \in C([0, T])$ be a given function verifying assumption (2.9), $h, \tilde{h} \in C([0, T])$ be strictly positive functions satisfying $\|h\|_\infty, \|\tilde{h}\|_\infty \leq M$. Let u and \tilde{u} be the solutions to the system (2.2)-(2.7) associated to respectively h and \tilde{h} . Denote s, \tilde{s} the free boundaries of respectively the solutions u and \tilde{u} , and assume that*

$$\|s - \tilde{s}\|_{W^{1,\infty}} < e^{-1}.$$

Then

$$(3.18) \quad \|h - \tilde{h}\|_{-\frac{1}{2}} \leq \frac{C}{\ln(|\ln \|s - \tilde{s}\|_{W^{1,\infty}}|)},$$

where the constant $C > 0$, depends only on u_0, b, T, H , and M .

Remark 3.1. *The double logarithmic stability estimate (3.18) shows that the inverse Stefan problem is indeed ill-posed. The obtained result is then consistent with known stability estimates in the standard Cauchy problem for parabolic equations in time independent domains (see for instance Theorem 1.1 in [13]). Therefore the motion of the free boundary causing the nonlinearity and higher complexity of the direct problem, does not seem to modify the nature of the Cauchy inversion.*

Remark 3.2. *Our stability estimate is carried out within the Hilbert scale $X_{-\frac{1}{2}}$, but it can be also done using more classical spaces. The characterization of $X_\beta, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$, in terms of Sobolev spaces, can be found in [29]. The inequality (3.17) shows that the Abel linear integral operator is invertible from $L^2(0, T)$ to $X_{-\frac{1}{2}}$, and hence expressing $h - \tilde{h}$ in this later space, is indeed the best choice when L^2 norm estimates of $A_0(h - \tilde{h})$ are available.*

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 3.1

We first derive an integral representation of the solution of the system (2.2)-(2.7). The following result can be found in many references including [11, 18]. For the convenience of the reader, we provide its proof.

Lemma 4.1. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 3.1, the solution u to the system (2.2)-(2.7) associated to h , satisfies*

$$(4.19) \quad u(x, t) = \int_0^t N(x, 0; t, \tau) h(\tau) d\tau - \int_0^t N(x, s(\tau); t, \tau) \dot{s}(\tau) d\tau + \int_0^b N(x, \xi; t, 0) u_0(\xi) d\xi,$$

where the Neumann function N is defined by

$$(4.20) \quad N(x, \xi; t, \tau) = K(x, \xi; t, \tau) + K(-x, \xi; t, \tau),$$

with

$$(4.21) \quad K(x, \xi; t, \tau) = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi(t-\tau)}} \exp\left(\frac{-(x-\xi)^2}{4(t-\tau)}\right), \quad \tau < t.$$

Proof. By definition, we have

$$(4.22) \quad N(x, \xi; t, \tau) = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi(t-\tau)}} \left[\exp\left(\frac{-(x-\xi)^2}{4(t-\tau)}\right) + \exp\left(\frac{-(x+\xi)^2}{4(t-\tau)}\right) \right], \quad \tau < t.$$

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be a small constant. Integrating the Green's identity

$$(4.23) \quad \partial_\xi(N\partial_\xi u - u\partial_\xi N) - \partial_\tau(Nu) = 0$$

over the domain $\{0 < \xi < s(\tau), 0 < \varepsilon < \tau < t - \varepsilon\}$, we obtain

$$(4.24) \quad \int_\varepsilon^{t-\varepsilon} \int_0^{s(\tau)} \left\{ \partial_\xi(N\partial_\xi u - u\partial_\xi N) - \partial_\tau(Nu) \right\} d\tau d\xi = 0.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \int_\varepsilon^{t-\varepsilon} \int_0^{s(\tau)} \partial_\xi(N\partial_\xi u - u\partial_\xi N) d\tau d\xi &= \int_\varepsilon^{t-\varepsilon} N(x, s(\tau); t, \tau) u_\xi(s(\tau), \tau) d\tau - \int_\varepsilon^{t-\varepsilon} u(s(\tau), \tau) N_\xi(x, s(\tau); t, \tau) d\tau \\ &\quad - \int_\varepsilon^{t-\varepsilon} N(x, 0; t, \tau) u_\xi(0, \tau) d\tau + \int_\varepsilon^{t-\varepsilon} u(0, \tau) N_\xi(x, 0; t, \tau) d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Differentiate (4.22) with respect to ξ , we get

$$N_\xi(x, \xi; t, \tau) = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi(t-\tau)}} \left\{ \frac{(x-\xi)}{2(t-\tau)} \exp\left(\frac{-(x-\xi)^2}{4(t-\tau)}\right) - \frac{(x+\xi)}{2(t-\tau)} \exp\left(\frac{-(x+\xi)^2}{4(t-\tau)}\right) \right\}.$$

Consequently $N_\xi(x, 0; t, \tau) = 0$. Allowing ε to tend to 0, we obtain

$$(4.25) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_0^t \int_0^{s(\tau)} \partial_\xi(N\partial_\xi u - u\partial_\xi N) d\tau d\xi &= \int_0^t N(x, s(\tau); t, \tau) u_\xi(s(\tau), \tau) d\tau - \int_0^t u(s(\tau), \tau) N_\xi(x, s(\tau); t, \tau) d\tau \\ &\quad - \int_0^t N(x, 0; t, \tau) u_\xi(0, \tau) d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_\varepsilon^{t-\varepsilon} \int_0^{s(\tau)} \partial_\tau(Nu) d\tau d\xi &= \int_\varepsilon^{t-\varepsilon} \partial_\tau \int_0^{s(\tau)} Nu d\xi d\tau - \int_\varepsilon^{t-\varepsilon} \dot{s}(\tau) N(x, s(\tau); t, \tau) u(s(\tau), \tau) d\tau \\ &= \int_0^{s(t-\varepsilon)} N(x, \xi; t, t-\varepsilon) u(\xi, t-\varepsilon) d\xi - \int_0^{s(\varepsilon)} N(x, \xi; t, \varepsilon) u(\xi, \varepsilon) d\xi \\ &\quad - \int_\varepsilon^{t-\varepsilon} \dot{s}(\tau) N(x, s(\tau); t, \tau) u(s(\tau), \tau) d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Allowing again ε to tend to 0, we find

$$(4.26) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_0^t \int_0^{s(\tau)} \partial_\tau(Nu) d\tau d\xi &= \int_0^{s(t)} N(x, \xi; t, t) u(\xi, t) d\xi - \int_0^{s(0)} N(x, \xi; t, 0) u(\xi, 0) d\xi \\ &\quad - \int_0^t \dot{s}(\tau) N(x, s(\tau); t, \tau) u(s(\tau), \tau) d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting (4.25)-(4.26) into (4.24), yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^t N(x, s(\tau); t, \tau) u_\xi(s(\tau), \tau) d\tau - \int_0^t u(s(\tau), \tau) N_\xi(x, s(\tau); t, \tau) d\tau - \int_0^t N(x, 0; t, \tau) u_\xi(0, \tau) d\tau \\ & - \int_0^{s(t)} N(x, \xi; t, t) u(\xi, t) d\xi - \int_0^{s(0)} N(x, \xi; t, 0) u(\xi, 0) d\xi + \int_0^t \dot{s}(\tau) N(x, s(\tau); t, \tau) u(s(\tau), \tau) d\tau = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we obtain

$$(4.27) \quad u(x, t) = \int_0^t N(x, 0; t, \tau) h(\tau) d\tau - \int_0^t N(x, s(\tau); t, \tau) \dot{s}(\tau) d\tau + \int_0^b N(x, \xi; t, 0) u_0(\xi) d\xi.$$

■

We next reduce the inverse Stefan problem to solving an ill-posed linear integral equation.

Since u is the unique solution to the system (2.2)-(2.7) associated to s , it satisfies $u(s(t), t) = 0$ for all $t \in (0, T)$, which combined to equality (4.19), leads to

$$u(s(t), t) = \int_0^t N(s(t), 0; t, \tau) h(\tau) d\tau - \int_0^t N(s(t), s(\tau); t, \tau) \dot{s}(\tau) d\tau + \int_0^b N(s(t), \xi; t, 0) u_0(\xi) d\xi = 0,$$

for all $t \in (0, T)$. Consequently $h(t)$ is a solution to the following principal integral equation

$$(4.28) \quad \int_0^t N(s(t), 0; t, \tau) h(\tau) d\tau = \int_0^t N(s(t), s(\tau); t, \tau) \dot{s}(\tau) d\tau - \int_0^b N(s(t), \xi; t, 0) u_0(\xi) d\xi, \text{ for all } t \in (0, T).$$

The proof of stability is based on estimating the modulus of continuity of the corresponding linear integral operator.

Lemma 4.2. *Under the assumptions in Theorem 3.1, the following inequality*

$$(4.29) \quad \left| \int_0^t N(x, 0; t, \tau) [h(\tau) - \tilde{h}(\tau)] d\tau \right| \leq C \|s - \tilde{s}\|_{W^{1,\infty}}^{1/4}, \text{ for all } x \geq s(t), 0 < t < T,$$

holds. The constant $C > 0$ only depends on u_0, b, T, H , and M .

Proof. In the following proof C stands for a generic constant strictly larger than zero that only depends on u_0, b, T, H , and M .

We deduce from Remark 2.2, that there exists $s_\infty > 0$ depending only on b, M and T , such that

$$\|s\|_{W^{1,\infty}}, \|\tilde{s}\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \leq s_\infty.$$

Without loss of generality we can assume that $s_\infty \geq 1$.

Since \tilde{u} is the unique solution to the system (2.2)-(2.7), associated to \tilde{s}, \tilde{h} , it also satisfies (4.28) with \tilde{h} and \tilde{s} substituting respectively h and s on the right side. Taking the difference between the two linear equations (4.28) related respectively to u and \tilde{u} , gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^t N(s(t), 0; t, \tau) [h(\tau) - \tilde{h}(\tau)] d\tau = \int_0^t [N(s(t), 0; t, \tau) - N(\tilde{s}(t), 0; t, \tau)] \tilde{h}(\tau) d\tau \\ & - \int_0^t [N(\tilde{s}(t), \tilde{s}(\tau); t, \tau) - N(s(t), s(\tau); t, \tau)] \dot{\tilde{s}}(\tau) d\tau - \int_0^t N(s(t), s(\tau); t, \tau) [\dot{\tilde{s}}(\tau) - \dot{s}(\tau)] d\tau \\ & - \int_0^b [N(s(t), \xi; t, 0) - N(\tilde{s}(t), \xi; t, 0)] u_0(\xi) d\xi = \sum_{i=1}^4 I_i, \end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in (0, T)$.

Now, we shall estimate each of the integrals $I_i, i = 1, \dots, 4$, in terms of the difference between s and \tilde{s} .

Let ε be a fixed constant satisfying $0 < \varepsilon < t < T$, and set

$$I_1^\varepsilon = \int_0^{t-\varepsilon} [N(s(t), 0; t, \tau) - N(\tilde{s}(t), 0; t, \tau)] \tilde{h}(\tau) d\tau.$$

From the mean value Theorem, we deduce

$$(4.30) \quad |e^{-a} - e^{-b}| \leq e^{-\min(a,b)} |a - b|, \quad a, b \geq 0.$$

Recalling that $s(t), \tilde{s}(t) > b$ for all $t \in [0, T]$, and applying the inequality (4.30) to the integrand of I_1^ε , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |I_1^\varepsilon| &= \left| \int_0^{t-\varepsilon} \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi(t-\tau)}} \left[2 \exp\left(\frac{-s(t)^2}{4(t-\tau)}\right) - 2 \exp\left(\frac{-\tilde{s}(t)^2}{4(t-\tau)}\right) \right] \tilde{h}(\tau) d\tau \right| \\ &\leq \int_0^{t-\varepsilon} \frac{e^{\frac{-b^2}{4(t-\tau)}}}{\sqrt{\pi(t-\tau)}} \left| \frac{s^2(t) - \tilde{s}^2(t)}{4(t-\tau)} \right| |\tilde{h}(\tau)| d\tau \\ &\leq \int_0^{t-\varepsilon} \frac{e^{\frac{-b^2}{4(t-\tau)}}}{2\sqrt{\pi}(t-\tau)^{3/2}} d\tau \max(\|s\|_\infty, \|\tilde{s}\|_\infty) \|\tilde{h}\|_\infty \|s - \tilde{s}\|_\infty \\ &\leq \int_0^T \frac{e^{\frac{-b^2}{4r}}}{2\sqrt{\pi}(r)^{3/2}} dr \max(\|s\|_\infty, \|\tilde{s}\|_\infty) \|\tilde{h}\|_\infty \|s - \tilde{s}\|_\infty \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$(4.31) \quad |I_1| \leq C \|s - \tilde{s}\|_\infty.$$

Now, let

$$I_2^\varepsilon = \int_0^{t-\varepsilon} [N(\tilde{s}(t), \tilde{s}(\tau); t, \tau) - N(s(t), s(\tau); t, \tau)] \dot{\tilde{s}}(\tau) d\tau,$$

or equivalently

$$\begin{aligned} I_2^\varepsilon &= \int_0^{t-\varepsilon} \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi}(t-\tau)} \left[\exp\left(\frac{-(\tilde{s}(t) - \tilde{s}(\tau))^2}{4(t-\tau)}\right) - \exp\left(\frac{-(s(t) - s(\tau))^2}{4(t-\tau)}\right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \exp\left(\frac{-(\tilde{s}(t) + \tilde{s}(\tau))^2}{4(t-\tau)}\right) - \exp\left(\frac{-(s(t) + s(\tau))^2}{4(t-\tau)}\right) \right] \dot{\tilde{s}}(\tau) d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

For $0 < \tau < t - \varepsilon$, using (4.30), gives

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \exp\left(\frac{-(\tilde{s}(t) - \tilde{s}(\tau))^2}{4(t-\tau)}\right) - \exp\left(\frac{-(s(t) - s(\tau))^2}{4(t-\tau)}\right) \right| &\leq \frac{1}{4(t-\tau)} |(\tilde{s}(t) - \tilde{s}(\tau))^2 - (s(t) - s(\tau))^2| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4(t-\tau)} |(\tilde{s}(t) - \tilde{s}(\tau)) - (s(t) - s(\tau))| |(\tilde{s}(t) - \tilde{s}(\tau)) + (s(t) - s(\tau))|. \end{aligned}$$

Since s, \tilde{s} are Lipschitz functions, we have

$$(4.32) \quad \frac{|s(t) - s(\tau)|}{t - \tau}, \quad \frac{|\tilde{s}(t) - \tilde{s}(\tau)|}{t - \tau} \leq \max(\|s\|_{C^{0,1}([0,T])}, \|\tilde{s}\|_{C^{0,1}([0,T])}) \leq C \max(\|s\|_{W^{1,\infty}}, \|\tilde{s}\|_{W^{1,\infty}}).$$

Therefore

$$\left| \exp\left(\frac{-(\tilde{s}(t) - \tilde{s}(\tau))^2}{4(t-\tau)}\right) - \exp\left(\frac{-(s(t) - s(\tau))^2}{4(t-\tau)}\right) \right| \leq C \max(\|s\|_{W^{1,\infty}}, \|\tilde{s}\|_{W^{1,\infty}}) \|s - \tilde{s}\|_\infty.$$

Consequently

$$|I_2^\varepsilon| \leq C \int_0^{t-\varepsilon} \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi(t-\tau)}} d\tau \max(\|s\|_{W^{1,\infty}}, \|\tilde{s}\|_{W^{1,\infty}}) \|\tilde{s}\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \|s - \tilde{s}\|_\infty \leq C \|s - \tilde{s}\|_\infty,$$

which leads to

$$(4.33) \quad |I_2| \leq C \|s - \tilde{s}\|_\infty,$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |I_3| &= \left| \int_0^t N(s(t), s(\tau); t, \tau) [\dot{s}(\tau) - \dot{s}(t)] d\tau \right| \\ &= \left| \int_0^t \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi(t-\tau)}} \left[\exp\left(\frac{-(s(t)-s(\tau))^2}{4(t-\tau)}\right) + \exp\left(\frac{-(s(t)+s(\tau))^2}{4(t-\tau)}\right) \right] (\dot{s}(\tau) - \dot{s}(t)) d\tau \right| \\ &\leq \int_0^t \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi(t-\tau)}} |\dot{s}(\tau) - \dot{s}(t)| d\tau \leq \int_0^t \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi(t-\tau)}} d\tau \|\dot{s} - \dot{s}\|_\infty \leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \sqrt{t} \|\dot{s} - \dot{s}\|_\infty \\ (4.34) \quad &\leq C \|s - \tilde{s}\|_{W^{1,\infty}}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we estimate I_4 .

$$\begin{aligned} |I_4| &= \left| \int_0^b [N(s(t), \xi; t, 0) - N(\tilde{s}(t), \xi; t, 0)] u_0(\xi) d\xi \right| \\ &= \left| \int_0^b \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi t}} \left[\exp\left(\frac{-(s(t)-\xi)^2}{4t}\right) + \exp\left(\frac{-(s(t)+\xi)^2}{4t}\right) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. - \exp\left(\frac{-(\tilde{s}(t)-\xi)^2}{4t}\right) - \exp\left(\frac{-(\tilde{s}(t)+\xi)^2}{4t}\right) \right] u_0(\xi) d\xi \right| \\ &\leq \int_0^b \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi t}} \left| \exp\left(\frac{-(s(t)-\xi)^2}{4t}\right) - \exp\left(\frac{-(\tilde{s}(t)-\xi)^2}{4t}\right) \right| |u_0(\xi)| d\xi \\ &\quad + \int_0^b \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi t}} \left| \exp\left(\frac{-(s(t)+\xi)^2}{4t}\right) - \exp\left(\frac{-(\tilde{s}(t)+\xi)^2}{4t}\right) \right| |u_0(\xi)| d\xi. \end{aligned}$$

Since $s(t) > 0$, applying inequality (4.30) to the estimate of I_4 , yields

$$\begin{aligned} |I_4| &\leq \frac{1}{8\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^b (|(s(t)+\xi)^2 - (\tilde{s}(t)+\xi)^2| + |(s(t)-\xi)^2 - (\tilde{s}(t)-\xi)^2|) \frac{e^{-\frac{\xi^2}{t}}}{t^{3/2}} |u_0(\xi)| d\xi \\ &\leq \frac{1}{8\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^b |s(t) - \tilde{s}(t)| (|s(t) + \tilde{s}(t) - 2\xi| + |s(t) + \tilde{s}(t) - 2\xi|) \frac{e^{-\frac{\xi^2}{t}}}{t^{3/2}} d\xi \|u_0\|_\infty \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^b \frac{e^{-\frac{\xi^2}{t}}}{\sqrt{t}} d\xi \frac{|s(t) - \tilde{s}(t)|}{t} \max(\|s\|_\infty, \|\tilde{s}\|_\infty) \|u_0\|_\infty \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4} \frac{|s(t) - \tilde{s}(t)|}{t} \max(\|s\|_\infty, \|\tilde{s}\|_\infty) \|u_0\|_\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Since $s(b) = \tilde{s}(b)$, we have

$$\frac{|s(t) - \tilde{s}(t)|}{t} \leq 2\|s - \tilde{s}\|_{C^{0,1}([0,T])} \leq C\|s - \tilde{s}\|_{W^{1,\infty}}.$$

Therefore

$$(4.35) \quad |I_4| \leq C\|s - \tilde{s}\|_{W^{1,\infty}}.$$

By combining (4.31), (4.33), (4.34) and (4.35), we finally obtain

$$(4.36) \quad \left| \sum_{i=1}^4 I_i \right| \leq C \|s - \tilde{s}\|_{W^{1,\infty}}.$$

By the maximum principle for the heat equation [11], we have

$$(4.37) \quad \left| \int_0^t N(x, 0; t, \tau) [h(\tau) - \tilde{h}(\tau)] d\tau \right| \leq C \|s - \tilde{s}\|_{W^{1,\infty}}, \quad x \geq s(t), \quad 0 \leq t \leq T,$$

which ends the proof of the lemma. \blacksquare

Lemma 4.3. *Under the assumptions in Theorem 3.1, there exists a constant $C > 0$ that only depends on u_0, b, T, H , and M , such that the following inequality*

$$(4.38) \quad \left| \int_0^t N(0, 0; t, \tau) [h(\tau) - \tilde{h}(\tau)] d\tau \right| \leq \frac{C}{\ln(\ln \|s - \tilde{s}\|_{W^{1,\infty}})}.$$

holds for all $t \in (0, T)$.

Proof. Further $C > 0$ denotes a generic constant that only depends on u_0, b, T, H , and M .

Remark 2.2 implies

$$s(t), \tilde{s}(t) \leq s_\infty, \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, T).$$

Let Ω be the triangle defined by $\Omega = \{z \in \mathbb{C}, 0 < \operatorname{Re}(z) < 2s_\infty, |\operatorname{Im}(z)| < |\operatorname{Re}(z)|\}$.

For $z \in \Omega$, define

$$(4.39) \quad F(z, t) = \int_0^t N(z, 0; t, \tau) (h(\tau) - \tilde{h}(\tau)) d\tau = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^t \frac{1}{\sqrt{t - \tau}} \exp\left(\frac{-z^2}{4(t - \tau)}\right) (h(\tau) - \tilde{h}(\tau)) d\tau,$$

We remark that the function $z \rightarrow F(z, t)$ is holomorphic in Ω , and satisfy

$$(4.40) \quad |F(z, t)| \leq F_\infty, \quad z \in \Omega,$$

where $F_\infty = \frac{4M\sqrt{T}}{\sqrt{\pi}}$.

Denote $w_0(z)$, the harmonic measure of $\Omega \setminus [s_\infty, 2s_\infty] \times \{0\}$. It is the unique solution to the system:

$$(4.41) \quad \Delta w_0(z) = 0 \quad z \in \Omega \setminus [s_\infty, 2s_\infty] \times \{0\},$$

$$(4.42) \quad w_0(z) = 0 \quad z \in [s_\infty, 2s_\infty] \times \{0\},$$

$$(4.43) \quad w_0(z) = 1 \quad z \in \partial\Omega.$$

The holomorphic unique continuation of the functions $z \rightarrow F(z, t)$ using the Two constants Theorem [5, 24], gives

$$|F(z, t)| \leq (F_\infty)^{1-w_0(z)} \left(\sup_{r \in [s_\infty, 2s_\infty] \times \{0\}} |F_\varepsilon(r, t)| \right)^{w_0(z)}, \quad z \in \Omega \setminus [s_\infty, 2s_\infty] \times \{0\}.$$

Combining the previous inequality with the estimate in Lemma 4.2, yields

$$(4.44) \quad |F(z, t)| \leq C \|s - \tilde{s}\|_{W^{1,\infty}}^{\frac{w_0(z)}{4}}, \quad z \in \Omega \setminus [s_\infty, 2s_\infty] \times \{0\}.$$

Lemma 4.4. *Let $w_0(z)$ be the unique solution to the system (4.41), (4.42), (4.43). Then, there exist constants $c, C > 0$ that only depend on s_∞ , such that the following inequality*

$$(4.45) \quad w_0(x) \geq \frac{C}{x} e^{-\frac{c}{x}},$$

holds for all $x \in (0, s_\infty)$.

Proof. For $a \in (0, s_\infty)$, let $\mathcal{R}_a \subset \Omega$ be the rectangle defined by $\mathcal{R}_a = \{z \in \mathbb{C}, \frac{a}{2} < \operatorname{Re}(z) < 2s_\infty, |\operatorname{Im}(z)| \leq \frac{a}{2}\}$, and denote $\tilde{w}_0(z, a)$ the harmonic measure of $\mathcal{R}_a \setminus [s_\infty, 2s_\infty] \times \{0\}$. By Maximum principle it follows that

$$(4.46) \quad w_0(z) \geq \tilde{w}_0(z, a),$$

for all $z \in \mathcal{R}_a$. We deduce from Lemma 3.1 in [1] the following estimate

$$(4.47) \quad \tilde{w}_0(a, a) \geq \frac{C}{a} e^{-\frac{c}{a}},$$

holds for all $a \in (0, s_\infty)$, where $c, C > 0$ only depend on s_∞ .

Taking $z = a$ at inequality (4.46), and using (4.47), we obtain the wanted estimate. ■

Applying the estimate (4.45) to inequality (4.44), yields

$$(4.48) \quad |F(x, t)| \leq C \|s - \tilde{s}\|_{W^{1,\infty}}^{\frac{C}{x} e^{-\frac{c}{x}}}, \quad x \in (0, s_\infty).$$

On the other hand, we have

$$(4.49) \quad |F(x, t) - F(0, t)| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^t \frac{1}{\sqrt{t-\tau}} \left(1 - \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{4(t-\tau)}\right)\right) d\tau \leq \frac{4M}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^T \frac{1}{(t-\tau)^{\frac{3}{4}}} d\tau \sqrt{x} \leq C\sqrt{x},$$

for all $t \in (0, T)$.

We deduce from inequalities (4.48) and (4.49), the following estimate

$$(4.50) \quad |F(0, t)| \leq C \left(\|s - \tilde{s}\|_{W^{1,\infty}}^{\frac{C}{x} e^{-\frac{c}{x}}} + \sqrt{x} \right),$$

for all x in $(0, s_\infty)$ and $t \in (0, T)$.

Finally, minimizing for fixed $t \in (0, T)$, the right hand side in (4.50) with respect to $x \in (0, s_\infty)$, we obtain

$$|F(0, t)| \leq \frac{C}{\ln(|\ln \|s - \tilde{s}\|_{W^{1,\infty}}|)},$$

for all $t \in (0, T)$, which achieves the proof of the Lemma. ■

We are now ready to prove Theorem (3.1).

Proof. Let

$$\mathfrak{H}(t) = h(t) - \tilde{h}(t).$$

Since $F(0, t) \in L^\infty((0, T))$, according to Theorem 8.1.1 in [7], [6], the Abel integral equation of first kind

$$(4.51) \quad F(0, t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^t \frac{\mathfrak{H}(\tau)}{\sqrt{t-\tau}} d\tau,$$

admits a unique solution, $\mathfrak{H}(t) \in L^1((0, T))$, given by

$$(4.52) \quad \mathfrak{H}(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{d}{dt} \int_0^t \frac{F(0, \tau)}{\sqrt{t-\tau}} d\tau, \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, T).$$

In addition, we deduce from (4.51), (4.38), and (3.17)

$$\|\mathfrak{H}\|_{-\frac{1}{2}} \leq C \|F(0, \cdot)\|_{L^2} \leq \frac{C}{\ln(|\ln \|s - \tilde{s}\|_{W^{1,\infty}}|)},$$

which achieves the proof of the main Theorem. ■

5. NUMERICAL ANALYSIS

5.1. The direct problem.

5.1.1. *Boundary immobilisation method.* This method consists on fixing the moving interface and mapping the moving interval into a fixed one by using the spatial coordinate change [22]

$$(5.53) \quad \xi = \frac{x}{s(t)}.$$

This approach was applied to many moving boundary problems [16]. Now, we reformulate the problem defined by (2.2) and (2.7) using the new coordinate system (ξ, t) in the fixed domain $[0, 1] \times [0, T]$. We get

$$(5.54) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = \frac{\xi}{s} \frac{ds}{dt} \frac{\partial u}{\partial \xi} + \frac{1}{s^2} \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial \xi^2}, & 0 < \xi < 1, \quad t > 0 \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \xi}(0, t) = -s(t)h(t), & t > 0, \\ u(1, t) = 0, & t > 0 \\ \frac{ds}{dt} = -\frac{1}{s} \frac{\partial u}{\partial \xi}, & t > 0 \\ u(\xi, 0) = u_0(b\xi), & 0 < \xi < 1 \\ s(0) = b. & t = 0 \end{array} \right.$$

We subdivide the spatial interval $[0, 1]$ into N equal intervals, we set $h = \Delta\xi = \frac{1}{N}$ and $\xi = ih$. We also subdivide the time interval $[0, T]$ into M equal intervals, and we set $t_m = mk$, $k = \Delta t = \frac{1}{M}$ and $r = \frac{k}{h^2}$. Next, we use an explicit Euler method in time and a finite differences method in space, to obtain

$$(5.55) \quad U_i^{m+1} = U_i^m + \frac{rh\xi_i \dot{s}_m}{2s_m} (U_{i+1}^m - U_{i-1}^m) + \frac{r}{s_m^2} (U_{i+1}^m - 2U_i^m + U_{i-1}^m)$$

Applying a central differences at the boundary conditions (2.3), we get

$$(5.56) \quad U_{i+1}^m = U_{i-1}^m + 2h \cdot h(t_m).$$

Taking $i = 0$ in the equations (5.55) and (5.56), we obtain

$$(5.57) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} U_{-1}^m = U_1^m + 2h \cdot h(t_m) \\ U_0^{m+1} = U_0^m + \frac{rh\xi_0 \dot{s}_m}{2s_m} (U_1^m - U_{-1}^m) + \frac{r}{s_m^2} (U_1^m - 2U_0^m + U_{-1}^m) \end{array} \right.$$

Eliminating the term U_{-1}^m in the equations above, leads to

$$U_0^{m+1} = (1 - \frac{2r}{s_m^2})U_0^m + \frac{2r}{s_m^2}U_1^m + (\frac{2hr}{s_m} - k\xi_0 \dot{s}_m)h(t_m).$$

Finally, applying a change of variable $Z(t) = s^2(t)$, yields

$$(5.58) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} U_1^{m+1} = (1 - \frac{2r}{Z_m})U_1^m + \frac{2r}{Z_m}U(2, m) + \frac{4hr - k\xi_1\dot{Z}_m}{2\sqrt{Z_m}}h(t_m); \quad m = 1, \dots, M \\ U_{N+1}^{m+1} = 0; \quad m = 1, \dots, M \\ U_i^{m+1} = U_i^m + \frac{rh\xi_i\dot{Z}_m}{4Z_m}(U_{i+1}^m - U_{i-1}^m) + \frac{r}{Z_m}(U_{i+1}^m - 2U_i^m + U_{i-1}^m); \quad i = 2, \dots, N \\ Z_{m+1} = Z_m - \frac{k}{h}(3U_{N+1}^m - 4U_N^m + U_{N-1}^m); \quad m = 1, \dots, M \\ \dot{Z}_{m+1} = \frac{Z_{m+1} - Z_m}{dt} \quad m = 1, \dots, M \end{array} \right.$$

For numerical stability requirements, we apply Von-Neumann approach [32] to obtain bounds on the size of the time step k

$$k \leq h^2 \tilde{Z}, \quad \text{where } \tilde{Z} = \inf_{0 < t < T} Z(t).$$

5.1.2. Numerical results. We consider the Stefan problem (2.2)-(2.7) with initial and boundary conditions for which we know the exact solution in order to measure the performance of the numerical method mentioned above. Therefore, we take

$$(5.59) \quad [0, T] = [0, 1], \quad h(t) = \exp(t), \quad u_0(x) = \exp(-x) - 1, \quad b = 0.1$$

The associated exact solution is

$$(5.60) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} u(x, t) = \exp(t - x) - 1 \\ s(t) = t. \end{array} \right.$$

The tables below provide the results obtained by the Boundary Immobilisation Method with a comparison between the exact solution and the approximate one at a fixed time t_m .

Table 1

Values of the temperature distribution as predicted by the numerical and exact solutions at a fixed time, where the error is defined by

$$(5.61) \quad \|e\|_u = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \left| 1 - \frac{U_i^m}{u(x_i, t_m)} \right|.$$

ξ	Numerical solution				exact	
	N=10	N=20	N=40	N=80	solution	Error
0.1	0.094193	0.094187	0.094177	0.094175	0.094175	0.11326×10^{-3}
0.2	0.083340	0.083299	0.083289	0.083287	0.083288	0.26014×10^{-3}
0.3	0.072554	0.072518	0.072510	0.072508	0.072509	0.25743×10^{-3}
0.4	0.061875	0.061845	0.061838	0.061837	0.061837	0.25335×10^{-3}
0.5	0.051303	0.051278	0.051272	0.051271	0.051271	0.26013×10^{-3}
0.6	0.040836	0.040816	0.040812	0.040811	0.040811	0.25318×10^{-3}
0.7	0.030473	0.030458	0.030455	0.030454	0.030455	0.24079×10^{-3}
0.8	0.020213	0.020204	0.020202	0.020201	0.020201	0.26401×10^{-3}
0.9	0.010056	0.010051	0.010050	0.010050	0.010050	0.23217×10^{-3}
1	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 2

Values of the location of the moving interface as predicted by the numerical and exact solutions at a fixed time, where the relative errors of s and \dot{s} are respectively defined by

$$e_s^m = \left| 1 - \frac{S_m}{s(t_m)} \right|,$$

$$e_{\dot{s}}^m = \left| 1 - \frac{\dot{S}_m}{\dot{s}(t_m)} \right|.$$

N	S_m	Error	\dot{S}_m	Error
10	0.10000080	0.61673×10^{-3}	0.99934974	0.65025×10^{-3}
20	0.10001384	0.13847×10^{-3}	0.99985316	0.14683×10^{-3}
40	0.10000328	0.32871×10^{-4}	0.99996504	0.34958×10^{-4}
80	0.10000080	0.80114×10^{-5}	0.99999146	0.85327×10^{-5}
Exact solution	0.1		1	

It is clearly observed that all numerical predictions are in good agreement with the exact solution and that our numerical schemes are convergent.

5.2. The inverse problem.

5.2.1. *Linear integral equations.* Since $u(s(t), t) = 0$, using the equation (4.19), we have

$$(5.62) \quad \int_0^t N(s(t), 0; t, \tau) h(\tau) d\tau = \int_0^t N(s(t), s(\tau); t, \tau) \dot{s}(\tau) d\tau - \int_0^b N(s(t), \xi; t, 0) u_0(\xi) d\xi,$$

We consider a uniform grid of the temporal interval $[0, T]$, with a time step $\Delta t = \frac{T}{N}$, that is, $t_j = j\Delta t$, $j = 0, \dots, N$. We also use a uniform grid of spatial interval $[0, b]$ with a spatial step $\Delta \xi = \frac{b}{M}$, that is, $\xi_i = i\Delta \xi$, $i = 0, \dots, M$. Then the equation (5.62) becomes

$$\sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} N(s(t_i), 0; t_i, \tau) h(\tau) d\tau = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} N(s(t_i), s(\tau); t_i, \tau) \dot{s}(\tau) d\tau - \sum_{k=0}^{M-1} \int_{\xi_k}^{\xi_{k+1}} N(s(t_i), \xi; t_i, 0) u_0(\xi) d\xi.$$

For example if we use a quadrature formula on one point, we get for $i = 1, \dots, N$

$$(5.63) \quad \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} N(s(t_i), 0; t_i, \tau_j) h(\tau_j) \Delta t = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} N(s(t_i), s(\tau_j); t_i, \tau_j) \dot{s}(\tau_j) \Delta t - \sum_{k=0}^{M-1} N(s(t_i), \xi_k; t_i, 0) u_0(\xi_k) \Delta \xi,$$

where $\tau_j \in [t_j, t_{j+1}]$ for $j = 1, \dots, N-1$ and $\xi_k \in [\xi_k, \xi_{k+1}]$ for $k = 1, \dots, M-1$.

This system can be represented by the following algebraic linear system

$$(5.64) \quad \mathcal{A}h = g,$$

where \mathcal{A} denotes a matrix depending on the quadrature formulas, $h := (h_j) = (h(\tau_j))$ denotes the vector of unknown Neumann condition of the inverse problem (3.16), and $g := (g_i)$ is the vector representing the right hand side of the equation (5.63).

Since the obtained system corresponds to an ill-posed inverse problem, the matrix \mathcal{A} is ill-conditioned, and the system need to be regularized. We consider here the Tikhonov regularization method, which solves the modified system of equation

$$(5.65) \quad (\mathcal{A}^{tr} \mathcal{A} + \lambda I)h = \mathcal{A}^{tr} g + \lambda h_{exact},$$

where the superscript tr denotes the transpose of a matrix, I the identity matrix, and $\lambda > 0$ is the small regularization parameter.

5.2.2. Numerical results.

Example 1. The first example has a moving boundary given by the linear function

$$(5.66) \quad s(t) = \sqrt{2} - 1 + \frac{t}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad t \in [0, T].$$

We take the exact solution given by

$$(5.67) \quad u(x, t) = -1 + \exp\left(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{t}{2} - \frac{x}{\sqrt{2}}\right), \quad [x, t] \in [0, s(t)] \times [0, 1].$$

Therefore, this example has the following initial and boundary conditions

$$(5.68) \quad b = s(0) = \sqrt{2} - 1,$$

$$(5.69) \quad u_0(x) = -1 + \exp\left(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} - \frac{x}{\sqrt{2}}\right), \quad x \in [0, b],$$

$$(5.70) \quad u(s(t), t) = 0, \quad t \in (0, 1],$$

$$(5.71) \quad u_x(s(t), t) = \dot{s}(t) = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad t \in (0, 1].$$

In this example we wish to recover the Neumann boundary condition along the fixed boundary $x = 0$ given by

$$(5.72) \quad h(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \exp\left(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{t}{2}\right), \quad t \in [0, 1].$$

This example has been previously tested in [14] using the method of fundamental solutions. In a first time, we use Gauss-Legendre formulas in order to




FIGURE 5.1. The exact solution $-u_x(0, t)$ and approximate solution with different Gaussian noise levels obtained with $\lambda = 10^{-3}$ and $N = 1000$ using Gauss-Legendre Formula.

λ	Noise on $s(t)$ (%)	$\frac{\ h_{exact} - h\ _2}{\ h_{exact}\ _2}$
0.001	0 %	0.0025
0.001	1 %	0.0056
0.001	3 %	0.0078
0.001	5 %	0.0124

TABLE 1. Relative errors for all cases.




FIGURE 5.2. The exact solution $-u_x(0, t)$ and approximate solution with different Gaussian noise levels obtained with $\lambda = 10^{-3}$ and $N = 1000$ using mid-point formula.

λ	Noise on $s(t)$ (%)	$\frac{\ h_{exact} - h\ _2}{\ h_{exact}\ _2}$
0.001	0 %	0.0073
0.001	1 %	0.0086
0.001	3 %	0.0209
0.001	5 %	0.0211

TABLE 2. Relative errors for all cases.




FIGURE 5.3. The relative error with different Gaussian noise levels obtained with $\lambda = 10^{-3}$, $N = 1000$.

In Figures (5.1) and (5.2), we present the exact and approximate solution using the linear equation (5.65). In order to test the stability of our inverse problem, we add a different level of gaussian noise to the data $s(t)$. The Tables (2)-(1) show that the accuracy is altered with noise and the relative error on the numerical solution is under 0.03.

The Figures (5.2)-(5.3) and the table (2) are obtained by using mid-point rule. In Figure (5.1), we refined the error on the integration and use Gauss-Legendre formulas of the third order. We remark that we have a better stability around $t = 0$.

In Figure (5.3), we present the evolution of the relative errors with different gaussian noise levels. We remark that the numerical solutions are stable far away from 0, and they become more accurate as the amount of noise decreases. The numerical results confirms the theoretical predictions of the Theorem (3.1) which relates to the stability of the Neumann condition h with respect to the free boundary s .

Example 2. In this example the moving boundary is given by

$$(5.73) \quad s(t) = t + b, \quad t \in [0, 1].$$

We take the exact solution given by

$$(5.74) \quad u(x, t) = \exp(t - x + b) - 1, \quad [x, t] \in [0, s(t)] \times [0, 1].$$

Therefore, this example has the following initial and boundary conditions

$$(5.75) \quad b = s(0),$$

$$(5.76) \quad u_0(x) = \exp(b - x) - 1, \quad x \in [0, b],$$

$$(5.77) \quad u(s(t), t) = 0, \quad t \in (0, 1],$$

$$(5.78) \quad u_x(s(t), t) = \dot{s}(t) = 1, \quad t \in (0, 1].$$

We aim to recover the Neumann boundary condition at the fixed boundary $x = 0$ given by

$$(5.79) \quad h(t) = \exp(t + b), \quad t \in [0, 1].$$




FIGURE 5.4. The exact solution $-u_x(0, t)$ and approximate solution with gaussian noise obtained with $\lambda = 1e - 2$, $N = 1000$.

λ	Noise on $s(t)$ (%)	$\frac{\ h_{exact} - h\ _2}{\ h_{exact}\ _2}$
0.01	0 %	0.0066
0.01	1 %	0.0068
0.01	3 %	0.0080
0.01	5 %	0.0102

TABLE 3. Relative errors for all cases.




FIGURE 5.5. The exact solution $-u_x(0, t)$ and the approximate one with different Gaussian noise levels obtained with $\lambda = 10^{-4}$, $N = 1000$.

λ	Noise on $s(t)$ (%)	$\frac{\ h_{exact} - h\ _2}{\ h_{exact}\ _2}$
0.0001	0 %	0.0081
0.0001	1 %	0.0094
0.0001	3 %	0.0189
0.0001	5 %	0.0292

TABLE 4. Relative errors for all cases.

The Tikhonov regularization parameter λ is chosen arbitrarily and the results in the figures and tables above show that we obtain a better precision with λ of the order 10^{-2} which underscore the need of regularization (5.65).

Example 3. In this example the moving boundary is given by the nonlinear function

$$(5.80) \quad s(t) = \sqrt{t + \frac{1}{4}}, \quad t \in [0, 1].$$

and has the initial condition

$$(5.81) \quad u_0(x) = \frac{\exp(\frac{1}{4})\sqrt{\pi}}{2} \left(\operatorname{erf}\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) - \operatorname{erf}(x) \right), \quad x \in [0, \frac{1}{2}],$$

where $\operatorname{erf}(x)$ is the error function given by $\operatorname{erf}(x) = \frac{2}{\pi} \int_0^x \exp(-t^2) dt$. This example has the Neumann boundary condition $h(t) = \frac{\exp(\frac{1}{4})}{2\sqrt{t + \frac{1}{4}}}$, which is taken from [3, 20]. Here, we considered a Stefan problem with a free boundary function's regularity that is beyond the framework of the derived stability estimates.




FIGURE 5.6. The exact solution $-u_x(0, t)$ and approximate solution with different Gaussian noise levels obtained with $\lambda = 10^{-3}$, $N = 1000$.




FIGURE 5.7. The relative error with different Gaussian noise levels obtained with $\lambda = 10^{-3}$, $N = 1000$.

λ	Noise on $s(t)$ (%)	$\frac{\ h_{exact} - h\ _2}{\ h_{exact}\ _2}$
0.001	0 %	0.0040
0.001	1 %	0.0110
0.001	3 %	0.0126
0.001	5 %	0.0124

TABLE 5.
Relative errors for all cases.

In Figure (5.6), we plot the Neumann condition h for three different Gaussian noise levels 1, 3 and 5% and when compared, they match well with the exact solution especially far from t tending to 0.

Remark 5.1. Notice that in the three considered examples the explicit boundary influxes are analytic functions of t . This explains the relatively good recovery of the boundary influx from the measurement of the free boundary far away from $t = 0$.

Remark 5.2. Recall that for a smooth right hand side f the inverse of the Abel integral operator is given by [6]

$$A_0^{-1}f(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{f(0)}{\sqrt{t}} + A_0 f'(t), \text{ for } t \in (0, T).$$

It seems that the regularization, and discretization (5.62) of the Abel-like integral equation (4.28) produce a numerical weak singularity at the origin that doesn't match the real regularity of the boundary influx, and slightly increases the relative error there. This numerical problem will be considered in future works.

REFERENCES

- [1] G. Alessandrini, and F. Alberto. *Sharp stability estimates of harmonic continuation along lines*. Math. Meth. Appl. Sci. 23(2000), 1037-1056.
- [2] K. Ammari, and F. Triki. *On Weak Observability for Evolution Systems with Skew-Adjoint Generators*. arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.07791 (2018).
- [3] D. Andreucci. *Lecture notes on the Stefan problem*. Lecture notes, Università da Roma La Sapienza, Italy, (2004).
- [4] E. DiBenedetto, A. Friedman, *The ill-posed Hele-Shaw model and the Stefan problem for supercooled water*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 282 (1984), 183-204.
- [5] G. Bao and F. Triki, *Stability estimates for the 1d multifrequency inverse medium problem*, hal-00997189 (2019).
- [6] H. Brunner. *Volterra integral equations: an introduction to theory and applications*. Vol. 30. Cambridge University Press, (2017).
- [7] John R. Cannon. *The one-dimensional heat equation*. Number 23. Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- [8] J. R. Cannon and J. Douglas Jr. *The stability of the boundary in a stefan problem*. Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa-Classe di Scienze, 21(1):83-91, 1967. 6
- [9] J. R. Cannon and C. D. Hill, *Existence, uniqueness, stability, and monotone dependence in a Stefan problem for the heat equation*, J. Math. Mecha. 17 (1967), 1-20.
- [10] J. R. Cannon, and P. Mario. *Remarks on the one-phase Stefan problem for the heat equation with the flux prescribed on the fixed boundary*. Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications 35.2 (1971): 361-373.
- [11] J.R. Cannon and J. Douglas. *The Cauchy problem for the heat equation*. SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis, 4(3):317-336, (1967).
- [12] D. Colton. *The inverse Stefan problem for the heat equation in two space variables*, Mathematika, 21 (1974), pp. 282-286.
- [13] M. Choulli, and M. Yamamoto. *Logarithmic stability of parabolic Cauchy problems*. arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.06299 (2017).
- [14] BT Johansson, D Lesnic, and T Reeve. *A method of fundamental solutions for the one-dimensional inverse Stefan problem*. Applied Mathematical Modelling, 35(9): 4367-4378, (2011).
- [15] L. C. Evans. *Partial differential equations*. Vol. 19. American Mathematical Soc., (2010).
- [16] E. Fernández-Cara, H. Freddy, and J. Limaco. *Local null controllability of a 1d Stefan problem*. Bulletin of the Brazilian Mathematical Society, New Series 50.3 (2019): 745-769.
- [17] A. Friedman. *Variational Principles and Free-Boundary Problems*, Wiley-Interscience, New York, (1982).
- [18] A. Friedman. *Partial differential equations of parabolic type*. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J. (1964).

- [19] W. T. Kyner. *An existence and uniqueness theorem for non-linear Stefan problem*. Math. Mech. 8 (1959), 483-498.
- [20] Peter Knabner. Control of stefan problems by means of linear-quadratic defect minimization. Numerische Mathematik, 46(3):429-442, 1985.
- [21] O.A. Ladyzenskaya, V.A. Solonnikov, and N.N. Ural'ceva, *Linear and Quasilinear Equations of Parabolic Type*. Volume 23 of Transl. Math. Monographs. Amer. Math. Soc., (1968).
- [22] H Go Landau. *Heat conduction in a melting solid*. Quarterly of Applied Mathematics, 8(1):81-94, (1950).
- [23] A.M. Meirmanov. *The Stefan Problem*, De Gruyter, Berlin, (1992).
- [24] R. Nevanlinna, *Analytic Functions*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, (translated from german by B. Eckmann), (1970).
- [25] N.L. Goldman, *Inverse Stefan Problem*, Kluwer Academic Publ., Dordrecht, (1997).
- [26] P. Jochum. *The numerical solution of the inverse Stefan problem*, Numer. Math., 34. (1980), pp.411-429.
- [27] P. Jochum. *To the solution of an inverse Stefan problem in two space variables*, in *Numerical Treatment of Free Boundary Value Problems*, J. Albrecht, et al., eds., ISNM 58, Birkhäuser-Verlag, Basel, (1982), pp. 127-136.
- [28] J. Pruss, J. Saal, and G. Simonett. *Existence of analytic solutions for the classical Stefan problem*. Mathematische Annalen, 338(3), 703-756 (2007).
- [29] G., Rudolf, and M. Yamamoto. *Operator theoretic treatment of linear Abel integral equations of first kind*. Japan journal of industrial and applied mathematics 16.1 (1999): 137.
- [30] L.I. Rubinstein, *The Stefan Problem*, American Mathematical Society, Providence, (1971).
- [31] R. Reemtsen, A. Kirsch. *A method for the numerical solution of the one dimensional inverse Stefan problem*, Numerische Mathematik 45.2 (1984): 253-273.
- [32] G. D. Smith. *Numerical solution of partial differential equations: finite difference methods*. Oxford university press, (1985).
- [33] P.E. Sacks. *Continuity of solutions of a singular parabolic equation*. Nonlinear Anal. 7 (1983), 387-409.
- [34] T. Wei, M. Yamamoto. *Reconstruction of a moving boundary from Cauchy data in one-dimensional heat equation*, Inverse Probl. Sci. Eng. 17 (2009) 551-567.
- [35] L.C. Wrobel, *A boundary element solution to Stefan's problem*, in: C.A. Brebbia, T. Futagami, M. Tanaka (Eds.), Boundary Elements V, Computational Mechanics Publications, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1983, pp. 173-182.
- [36] A. Visintin. *Models of Phase Transitions*. Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and Their Applications, Volume 28, Birkhäuser, Boston, (1996).

CHIFAA GHANMI, FACULTÉ DES SCIENCES DE TUNIS, UNIVERSITÉ TUNIS EL MANAR, TUNISIA

E-mail address: Chifaa.Ghanmi@fst.utm.tn

SALOUA MANI AOUADI, FACULTÉ DES SCIENCES DE TUNIS, UNIVERSITÉ TUNIS EL MANAR, TUNISIA

E-mail address: Saloua.Mani@fst.utm.tn

FAOUZI TRIKI, LABORATOIRE JEAN KUNTZMANN, UMR CNRS 5224, UNIVERSITÉ GRENOBLE-ALPES, 700 AVENUE CENTRALE, 38401 SAINT-MARTIN-D'HÈRES, FRANCE

E-mail address: faouzi.triki@univ.grenoble-alpes.fr