arXiv:gr-qc/0611011v3 23 Aug 2007

WELL-POSED INITIAL-BOUNDARY VALUE PROBLEM FOR A CONSTRAINED EVOLUTION SYSTEM AND RADIATION-CONTROLLING CONSTRAINT-PRESERVING BOUNDARY CONDITIONS

ALEXANDER M. ALEKSEENKO

Submitted 5 Aug. 2006
Revised 21 Mar. 2007

Abstract. **Abstract.** A well-posed initial-boundary value problem is formulated for the model problem of the vector wave equation subject to the divergence-free constraint. Existence, uniqueness and stability of the solution is proved by reduction to a system evolving the constraint quantity statically, i.e., the second time derivative of the constraint quantity is zero. A new set of radiation-controlling constraint-preserving boundary conditions is constructed for the free evolution problem. Comparison between the new conditions and the standard constraint-preserving boundary conditions is made using the Fourier-Laplace analysis and the power series decomposition in time. The new boundary conditions satisfy the Kreiss condition and are free from the ill-posed modes growing polynomially in time.

1. Introduction

When formulated for the purpose of numerical integration the equations of general relativity are customary divided into the two subsets: the subset that contains both time and space derivatives, called the evolution subset, and the subset that has spatial derivatives only, called the constraint subset. Usually, the evolution subset is the one that is being solved, while the constraint subset is made automatically compatible by a choice of initial and boundary data. Exact compatibility, however, can never be achieved in numerical calculations, which are the primary source of solutions to Einstein's equations. To predict accuracy of the solution, a new formalism is needed to describe systems of constrained evolution.

In fact, it has been a challenge in numerical relativity to keep the constraint subset of equations from exponential growth [5, 12, 21, 30], when evolution equations are solved exclusively. Methods were introduced to enforce compatibility of the solution with the constraint equations by adding differential terms to the evolution equations so as to minimize growth of the constraints (e.g., [21]), periodically resolving constraint equations, when they become too large, (e.g., [14]), and controlling the constraint perturbations from entering the domain through the timelike boundaries (e.g., [1, 2, 7, 8, 12, 16, 21, 32, 29]). The method proposed in this paper is related to the last group. We explore the idea of [10] and study the closely related system that propagates the constraint quantities statically. The results are used to formulate a well-posed initial-boundary value problem for the original constrained

evolution system. On the next step, the constrained problem is used to define a well-posed initial-boundary value problem for the free evolution.

We consider a model problem of the vector wave equation

$$\partial_t^2 u_i = \partial^j \partial_j u_i, \tag{1}$$

subject to the differential constraint

$$\partial^i u_i = 0. \tag{2}$$

The choice of the model problem is motivated by re-formulations of Einstein's field equations (e.g., [3, 34, 4, 31, 24, 11, 12, 26]) in which second order in space equations are coupled to first order differential constraints (if necessary, (1) can be reduced to first order in time by introducing $\pi_i = \partial_t u_i$; all results can be repeated for the pair (u_i, π_i) without much complication). First order symmetric hyperbolic reductions of (1) has been used as a source of insight in numerical relativity in the past [6, 9, 21, 27] and methods for constructing constraint-preserving boundary conditions were investigated using the same model problem. In this work we prove that (1), (2), taken as a *constrained evolution problem*, is related very closely to the equation

$$\partial_t^2 u_i = \partial^j \partial_j u_i - \partial_i \partial^j u_j$$

which evolves the constraint (2) statically. Based on this observation, we formulate an initial-boundary value problem for the constrained evolution system (1), (2), and prove existence, uniqueness, and stability of its solution.

The first application of the new approach is the new set of radiative constraint-preserving boundary conditions (see e.g., [21, 16, 27, 29, 18, 28]) for the free evolution problem (1). In the simplest case, when homogeneous conditions are specified on the incoming waves, the boundary conditions take the form

$$\partial_t u_A + \partial_n u_A - \partial_A u_n = 0, \quad \partial_t u_n + \partial_n u_n = 0, \tag{3}$$

where ∂_n stands for the normal, and ∂_A for the tangential derivatives at the boundary, and u_n, u_A are projections of u_i on the outward pointing unit normal and the tangential directions, respectively.

In [27], an example of constraint-preserving radiation-controlling boundary conditions is constructed for a symmetric hyperbolic reduction of the fat Maxwell system. The boundary conditions (3) overlap with the boundary conditions of [27] in two, but differ significantly in one equation. Following the standard approach of the subsidiary evolution system for constraint quantities, the radiative boundary condition enforcing the constraint in [27] takes the form of a first order differential condition (containing both spatial and temporal derivatives) for the first order system. Here, however, the new approach allows us to write all three conditions as first order conditions (but still including tangential derivatives) for the second order system, and existence is proved without any additional gauge assumptions.

The problem (1), (2) has been considered in [18] in the case of a four-dimensional vector u, e.g., $u = (u_t, u_x, u_y, u_z)$. As in [27], the intuition derived from Maxwell's equations has been used to formulate a set of Sommerfeld-type boundary conditions that are constraint-preserving. In fact, three of the four conditions of [18] coincide with (3) if the component u_t is set to zero. The fourth condition, however, is closely related to the homogeneous Dirichlet data for the constraint quantity. It does not vanish for $u_t = 0$, and, therefore, the boundary conditions of [18] do not reduce to (3).

Several authors (e.g., [16, 26]) had experimented with boundary conditions motivated by physics rather than the equation analysis. Surprisingly, the stability of the calculations improved when physical data was employed. Their results motivated us to search for the mathematical framework that could explain such effect, and possibly describe the accurate boundary conditions for constrained evolution systems.

The idea of reducing Einstein's equations to a form evolving the constraint quantities statically was first used in [10]. By exploiting gauge freedom, the authors re-write the tetrad formulation of Einstein's equations as to have the constraint quantities propagating along the boundary (but not inside the domain), thus making any boundary conditions that are well-posed for the problem automatically compatible with preservation of the constraints. This approach allowed the authors to formulate a set of maximally dissipative boundary conditions for which well-posedness can be proved in the full nonlinear case using standard theorems for symmetric hyperbolic systems.

In this work we use constraint equations — rather than gauge freedom — to formulate the static constraint evolution reduction, as described in Sections 2 and 3. In Section 4 we use standard theorems for first order symmetric hyperbolic systems to prove the existence of the solution to the static constraint evolution problem. In Section 5 we formulate a well-posed initial boundary value problem for the constrained evolution system (1), (2). The existence, uniqueness, and stability of the solution follows from the theorems for the static constraint evolution problem. We also formulate a set of constraint-preserving radiative-controlling boundary conditions for the free evolution problem (1) and prove that this set is well-posed. Notice that the norm in which the well-posedness is proved is built on the antisymmetric part of the gradient and the divergence of the solution. However we believe that this is the natural norm for the problem, and any "extra" estimates on the gradient require additional assumptions, like more restrictive boundary conditions exemplified in Section 6, or a special gauge choice similar to one in [27].

Section 7 is devoted to the Laplace-Fourier analysis of the free evolution problem. We prove that the new boundary conditions (3) satisfy the Kreiss condition, thus the free evolution problem is stable for zero initial data. (Notice that the stability of the system can be studied for arbitrary initial data using techniques of [17, 18] if the Kreiss condition is satisfied). We find that the Neumann-Dirichlet constrain-preserving conditions obtained by the standard method do not meet the Kreiss condition. Also, the radiative differential conditions following from the standard approach were found not to meet the Kreiss condition. Finally in Section 8 we study stability of the system in the case of non-vanishing initial data using the framework developed in [28] to quantify instabilities that grow polynomially in time. It was found that both the new conditions (3) and the radiative differential condition similar to one in [27] do not expose such instabilities, while the standard Neumann-Dirichlet data does.

Notations

We denote by Ω a bounded convex subset of $\mathbb{R}^3$ with boundary consisting of parts of planes. The polyhedron domains are relatively easy to implement numerically, and therefore represent an important example from the practical point of view.

Vector n_i in most cases denotes the outward pointing unit normal vector to $\partial\Omega$. Vectors m_i and l_i are tangential to $\partial\Omega$ and complement n_i to an orthonormal triple.

We use notations of general relativity, in which the repeated indices denote summation, small roman indices run from 1 to 3, the indices are raised and lowered with the flat metric $\delta_{ij} = \{1 \text{ if } i = j,\ 0 \text{ if } i \neq j\}$. Later we use parenthesised and bracketed indices to denote the symmetric and anti-symmetric parts of an array correspondingly, e.g., $w_{(ij)} = (w_{ij}+w_{ji})/2$, $w_{[ij]} = (w_{ij}-w_{ji})/2$, $w_{ij} = w_{(ij)}+w_{[ij]}$.

The symbol ∂_i denotes the gradient, however, ∂_n is reserved for the directional derivative in n_i. We will use capital roman indices to indicate the tangential components of the fields, for example, ∂_A stands for derivatives in tangential directions to $\partial\Omega$ (or, if n_i is not associated with $\partial\Omega$, ∂_A will denote derivatives in directions normal to n_i). Similar notations are used for vectors: $v_n = n^j v_j$, $v_A = (\delta^j_i - n_i n^j)v_j$.

2. Subordinate constraint evolution and constraint preservation

Our goal is to formulate a well-posed initial-boundary value problem for the constrained evolution system (1), (2). We introduce the constraint quantity

$$C = \partial^i u_i.$$

Lemma 1. *If u_i is a solution of (1) then the constraint quantity C obeys the wave equation,*

$$\partial_t^2 C = \partial^i \partial_i C. \tag{4}$$

Proof. The lemma follows by taking the divergence of Eq. (1) and commuting derivatives. □

Corollary 1. *Consider the problem of solving Eq. (1) in $\mathbb{R}^3$. Let u_i be a solution to (1), corresponding to constraint-compatible initial data, i.e., $C(0) = \partial^i u_i(0) = 0$ and $\partial_t C(0) = \partial^i \partial_t u_i(0) = 0$, and u_i is regular to guarantee existence of the spatial integrals of C and its derivatives. Then, $C \equiv 0$.*

Proof. According to Lemma 1, the constraint quantity C is a solution to (4). Multiply (4) by $\partial_t C$ and integrate over $\mathbb{R}^3$. After integration by parts,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\partial_t^2 C)(\partial_t C)dx = -\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\partial_i C)(\partial^i \partial_t C)dx.$$

By commuting derivatives and re-grouping terms, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2}\partial_t[\|\partial_t C\|^2_{L_2(\mathbb{R}^3)} + \|\partial_i C\|^2_{L_2(\mathbb{R}^3)}] = 0.$$

Therefore, $\|\partial_t C\|^2_{L_2(\mathbb{R}^3)} + \|\partial_i C\|^2_{L_2(\mathbb{R}^3)}$ is constant in time. Since it is zero initially, it remains zero for all times, which in turn gives that $C \equiv 0$. □

Remark. Note that Corollary 1 does not hold if $\mathbb{R}^3$ is replaced with a bounded region. Indeed, if $C \neq 0$ at some point of the boundary, in view of (4), the constraint perturbation will flow inside the domain regardless of the compatibility of the initial data.

In general to ensure $C \equiv 0$ the boundary data must be given consistently with the evolution of the constraint quantity. The data that guarantees that C remains zero for all times is called *constraint-preserving*.

3. Static constraint evolution reduction

In domain Ω, consider the equation

$$\partial_t^2 u_i = \partial^j \partial_j u_i - \partial_i C \tag{5}$$

subject to constraint (2).

Lemma 2. *Evolution of the constraint quantity C in Eq. (5) is static. That is, let u_i be any (sufficiently smooth) solution to (5), then*

$$\partial_t^2 C = 0. \tag{6}$$

Proof. The proof follows by substituting the definition of C, commuting derivatives, and using (5). □

Remark. One may notice that in (5), we recover the second order reduction of Maxwell's equations in the Coulomb gauge. Indeed, by substituting the definition of C, we rewrite (5) as

$$\partial_t^2 u_i = 2\partial^j \partial_{[j} u_{i]} = (\operatorname{curl} \operatorname{curl} u)_i,$$

where $(\operatorname{curl} u)_i$ is the usual curl operator defined by $(\operatorname{curl} u)_i = \varepsilon_i{}^{jk}\partial_j u_k$; here ε_{ijk} is the unit totally antisymmetric tensor, and we have made use of the identity $\varepsilon_{pjk}\varepsilon^{pmn} = 2\delta^m_{[j}\delta^n_{k]}$.

It is known that the divergence constraint is preserved trivially for Maxwell's equations.

Using notations of [33], we introduce the linear algebraic operator $L_{ji}{}^{pq} = 2\delta^p_{[j}\delta^q_{i]}$ acting on matrix fields in $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$, and rewrite Eq. (5) as

$$\partial_t^2 u_i = \partial^j L_{ji}{}^{pq} \partial_p u_q. \tag{7}$$

Lemma 3. *The operator $L_{ji}{}^{pq}$ is symmetric in the sense of the scalar product*

$$\langle \phi_{ij}, \psi_{ij} \rangle := \int_\Omega \phi_{ij}\psi^{ij}\, dx = \int_\Omega \phi_{ij}\psi_{ab}\delta^{ai}\delta^{bj}\, dx.$$

Let vectors n_i, m_i, and l_i constitute an orthonormal triple in $\mathbb{R}^3$. The eigenvalues and eigenvectors of $L_{ji}{}^{pq}$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned} 2: &\quad \sqrt{2}\, n_{[j}m_{i]},\ \sqrt{2}\, n_{[j}l_{i]},\ \sqrt{2}\, m_{[j}l_{i]} \\ 0: &\quad \sqrt{2}\, n_{(j}m_{i)},\ \sqrt{2}\, n_{(j}l_{i)},\ \sqrt{2}\, m_{(j}l_{i)},\ n_jn_i,\ m_jm_i,\ l_jl_i. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The symmetry property follows by direct substitution and rearrangement of dummy indices:

$$\langle \phi_{ji}, L_{ji}{}^{pq}\psi_{pq} \rangle = \int_\Omega \phi_{ji} L_{ab}{}^{pq}\psi_{pq}\delta^{aj}\delta^{bi} = \int_\Omega \phi_{ji}[\delta^{pj}\delta^{qi} - \delta^{pi}\delta^{qj}]\psi_{pq}$$
$$= \int_\Omega \phi_{ji}[\delta^j_a\delta^i_b - \delta^j_b\delta^i_a]\psi_{pq}\delta^{ap}\delta^{bq} = \int_\Omega \phi_{ji} L_{ab}{}^{ji}\psi_{pq}\delta^{ap}\delta^{bq} = \langle L_{pq}{}^{ji}\phi_{ji}, \psi_{pq} \rangle.$$

Note also that in the standard basis for 3×3 matrices, $\mathbf{e1} = n_in_j$, $\mathbf{e2} = n_im_j$, $\mathbf{e3} = n_il_j$, …, $\mathbf{e9} = l_il_j$, the operator $L_{ji}{}^{pq}$ takes the form of a 9×9 symmetric matrix. □

Remark. Spectral structure of $L_{ji}{}^{pq}$ suggests that Eq. (7) does not allow control of the components of $\partial_p u_q$ that are spanned by the zero eigenvectors, since $L_{ji}{}^{pq}$ annihilates them. However, this conclusion is often only partly true. An energy estimate on the entire gradient can be established using methods described in Section 6.

4. First order reduction and boundary conditions

Well-posedness of (7), (2) is proved by the first order symmetric hyperbolic reduction. We introduce the components of $\partial_j u_i$ spanned by the nonzero eigenvectors of $L_{ji}{}^{pq}$ as the new variables, namely, $\psi_{ji} = 2\partial_{[j}u_{i]}$. Then Eq. (7) is reduced to

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t u_i &= \pi_i, \\ \partial_t \pi_i &= \partial^j \psi_{ji}, \\ \partial_t \psi_{ji} &= 2\partial_{[j}\pi_{i]}. \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

The initial data for the new variables is given by

$$\pi_i(0) = \partial_t u_i(0), \qquad \psi_{ji}(0) = 2\partial_{[j}u_{i]}(0). \tag{9}$$

Remark. Equation $\psi_{ji} = 2\partial_{[j}u_{i]}$, the definition of variable ψ_{ji}, formally has to be added to (8) as an extra (artificial) constraint equation to guarantee the equivalence of (8) and (7). However, this constraint follows from the last equation of (8) by integration in time. Because of the simple behaviour, we postpone it in the analysis.

Remark. A different first order decomposition, corresponding to $\tilde{\psi}_{ji} = \partial_j u_i$, $\pi_i = \partial_t u_i$, can be proposed for (7). The resulting system is called the fat Maxwell system and is only weakly hyperbolic. A detailed study of this system can be found in [27]. However, Lemma 2 predicts that the symmetric part of the variable $\tilde{\psi}_{ji}$ is not "seen" by the right side of (7). This results in the incomplete set of characteristic variables for the fat Maxwell system. It is possible, however, to obtain a strongly hyperbolic system by adding a suitable combination of constraints to the evolution equations.

Let us introduce the scalar product for vectors fields, $\langle u_i, v_i\rangle = \int_\Omega u^i v_i dx$, and the norms $\|u\|^2_{L_2(\Omega)} = \langle u_i, u_i\rangle$, $\|\psi\|^2_{L_2(\Omega)} = \langle \psi_{ij}, \psi_{ij}\rangle$. By contracting the last two equations of (8) with π^i and ψ^{ji} correspondingly, integrating by parts, and re-grouping terms, we have

$$\partial_t[2\|\pi\|^2_{L_2(\Omega)} + \|\psi\|^2_{L_2(\Omega)}] = 4\int_{\partial\Omega} n_{[j}\pi_{i]}\psi^{ji} d\sigma. \tag{10}$$

The boundary conditions for system (8) are obtained from the theory of symmetric hyperbolic systems. Let n_i be the outward unit normal to $\partial\Omega$. Then the characteristic speeds and fields in the direction n_i are

$$\begin{aligned} 0: &\quad \pi_n, \quad \psi_{AB}, \\ \pm 1: &\quad w^\pm_A = \pi_A \pm \psi_{nA}. \end{aligned}$$

On each face of the boundary $\partial\Omega$, we impose the maximal non-negative boundary conditions (in the sense of [19, 20, 25, 22], see also in [21, 27]),

$$w^+_A = \alpha^B_A w^-_B + g_A, \tag{11}$$

where the smooth matrix α^B_A is defined on $\partial\Omega$, and satisfies $\|\alpha\| = \sup \frac{\|\alpha^B_A v_B\|}{\|v\|} \le 1$. Since one may think of the characteristic variables as the coefficients of the zero,

incoming, and outgoing modes correspondingly, condition (11) relates the amount of incoming radiation to the outgoing.

Let us consider the case of homogeneous data first. If $g_A = 0$, then (11) implies that the right side of (10) is non-positive. Indeed, introducing the notation $|v|^2 = v_A v^A$, we have

$$4\pi_A \psi^{nA} = |\pi_A + \psi_{nA}|^2 - |\pi_A - \psi_{nA}|^2 \leq (\|\alpha\|^2 - 1)|w^-|^2 \leq 0. \tag{12}$$

Let the differential operator L be defined by Eq. (8), i.e.,

$$L(\pi_i, \psi_{ji}) = (\partial_t \pi_i - \partial^j \psi_{ji}, \partial_t \psi_{ji} - 2\partial_{[j}\pi_{i]}).$$

Let

$$\mathcal{H}_L = \{(\pi_i, \psi_{ji}) \in L_2(\Omega \times [0,T]) \mid L(\pi_i, \psi_{ji}) \in L_2(\Omega \times [0,T]),$$
$$\|(\pi_i, \psi_{ji})\|_{\mathcal{H}_L} = \|(\pi_i, \psi_{ji})\|_{L_2(\Omega\times[0,T])} + \|L(\pi_i, \psi_{ji})\|_{L_2(\Omega\times[0,T])}\},$$

where $\|(\pi_i, \psi_{ji})\|_{L_2(\Omega\times[0,T])} = \|\pi_i\|_{L_2(\Omega\times[0,T])} + \|\psi_{ji}\|_{L_2(\Omega\times[0,T])}$. It was shown in [25] (see [25], Theorem 2) that the integration by parts formula holds for $(\pi_i, \psi_{ji}) \in \mathcal{H}_L$, which implies that the boundary integral in (10) is well-defined. Moreover, one can apply the result of [25], to formulate the following

Theorem 1. *A unique solution $(\pi_i, \psi_{ji}) \in \mathcal{H}_L$ exists satisfying (8), (9) and (11) (with $g_A = 0$). In addition, $(\pi_i, \psi_{ji}) \in C((0,T) : L_2(\Omega))$ and satisfies the estimate*

$$\sup_{0\leq t\leq T} [2\|\pi(t)\|_{L_2(\Omega)} + \|\psi(t)\|_{L_2(\Omega)}] \leq [2\|\pi(0)\|_{L_2(\Omega)} + \|\psi(0)\|_{L_2(\Omega)}].$$

Remark. The original theorem in [25] uses the assumption that the spatial boundary is C^1 while here $\partial\Omega$ is only piece-wise smooth. However, in [25] it is suggested how to generalize the result to a boundary with corners. In general, both initial and boundary data have to be compatible at the corners to maintain smoothness of the solution.

Remark. A similar statement can be proved using methods of [15, 19, 20, 22, 23].

In the case of inhomogeneous boundary data ($g_A(x,t) \neq 0$) we will assume as in [25] that the problem is reducible to the homogeneous case by subtracting an H^1 function from the solution. For that, we require that the function $g_A(x,t) \in H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega \times [0,T])$ and satisfies the necessary compatibility conditions at corners so as to ensure that a vector field $\hat{g}_i \in H^1(\Omega \times [0,T])$ exists such that $\hat{g}_A|_{\partial\Omega} = g_A/2$. Moreover, we assume that a vector field $\check{g}_i \in H^1(\Omega \times [0,T])$ exists such that (a) $\check{g}^A \hat{g}_A|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$; (b) at each point of boundary, $\|\check{g}_A\| = \|g_A\|/2$ (here $\|\cdot\|$ is referencing to the length of the two-vector). From these two assumptions, it is not difficult to deduce that

$$n^j \varepsilon_{jlA} \check{g}^l = (\pm)\hat{g}_A = (\pm) g_A/2, \qquad \text{on } \partial\Omega.$$

We will assume that coefficients of $\check{g}_i$ are chosen in such a way as to have $n^j \varepsilon_{jlA} \check{g}^l = \hat{g}_A = g_A/2$.

It is straightforward to verify that if fields $\hat{g}_i$ and $\check{g}_i$ with the above properties exist, the problem (8), (9), and (11) can be reduced to the homogeneous case (with a non-trivial forcing term in the evolution equations) by introducing the variables $\tilde{\pi}_i = \pi_i - \hat{g}_i$, $\tilde{\psi}_{ji} = \psi_{ji} - \varepsilon_{jli}\check{g}^l$.

Remark. In Sections 7 and 8, methods are presented to study properties of the solution in the case of inhomogeneous data g_A in (11) not invoking the above reduction. Instead, the techniques of the Laplace-Fourier transform are used for the half-plane reduction of the problem [13, 17, 18, 28].

The result in [25] implies that boundary integral in (10) is defined. However, in (11) holds, we can strengthen the result slightly by showing that, for $(\pi_i, \psi_{ji}) \in \mathcal{H}_L$, the traces $w_A^+ = \pi_A + \psi_{nA}$ and $w_A^- = \pi_A - \psi_{nA}$ are $L_2(\partial\Omega)$.

Lemma 4. *Let a vector field π_i, and an anti-symmetric matrix field ψ_{ji} be such that $\pi_i \in L_2(\Omega)$, $\partial_{[j}\pi_{i]} \in L_2(\Omega)$, and similarly, $\psi_{ji} \in L_2(\Omega)$, $\partial^j\psi_{ji} \in L_2(\Omega)$. If, in addition, π_i and ψ_{ji} satisfy (11) with $g_A = 0$, then*

$$\|\pi_A - \psi_{nA}\|^2_{L_2(\partial\Omega)} \le \frac{1}{1-\|\alpha\|^2}[\|\pi\|^2_{L_2(\Omega)} + \|\partial_{[j}\pi_{i]}\|^2_{L_2(\Omega)} + \|\psi\|^2_{L_2(\Omega)} + \|\partial^j\psi_{ji}\|^2_{L_2(\Omega)}]$$
$$:= \frac{1}{1-\|\alpha\|^2}[\|\pi\|_{H^1(\mathrm{curl}\,;\Omega)} + \|\psi\|_{H^1(\mathrm{div}\,;\Omega)}].$$

Proof. The following identity can be verified by integration by parts:

$$\int_\Omega \partial_{[j}\pi_{i]}\psi^{ji}dx + \int_\Omega \partial^j\psi_{ji}\pi^i dx = \int_{\partial\Omega} \pi_A\psi^{nA}d\sigma.$$

Recalling (12),

$$\Big|\int_{\partial\Omega} \pi_A\psi^{nA}d\sigma\Big| \ge (1-\|\alpha\|^2)\|\pi_A - \psi_{nA}\|^2_{L_2(\partial\Omega)}.$$

The statement of the lemma follows by applying the Schwartz inequality to the left side of the integral identity. □

Adjusting notations of [25] to the variables of system (8), one can formulate the following theorem

Theorem 2. *Let conditions (11) be imposed on the boundary $\partial\Omega \times (0,T)$ and let the vector function $g_A(x,t) \in H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega \times [0,T]))$ be such that the fields $\hat{g}_i$ and $\check{g}_i$ exist with the above properties. Then there exists a unique solution $(\pi_i, \psi_{ji}) \in \mathcal{H}_L$ to (8), (9). In addition, $(\pi_i, \psi_{ji}) \in C((0,T) : L_2(\Omega))$ and satisfies the estimate*

$$\sup_{0\le t\le T}[2\|\pi(t)\|_{L_2(\Omega)} + \|\psi(t)\|_{L_2(\Omega)}] \le c\int_0^T \|g_A\|_{H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)}dt + [2\|\pi(0)\|_{L_2(\Omega)} + \|\psi(0)\|_{L_2(\Omega)}],$$

where the constant c is independent of π_i, ψ_{ji}.

Remark. A similar statement for (8), (9), (11) can be found in [23].

5. Constraint-preserving boundary conditions for the second order equations

When written in terms of the original variables of Eq. (7), the characteristic speeds and variables read

$$0: \quad \partial_t u_n, \quad \partial_{[A}u_{B]},$$
$$\pm 1: \quad w_A^\pm = \partial_t u_A \pm 2\partial_{[n}u_{A]}.$$

The maximally dissipative boundary conditions (11) take the form

$$(\partial_t u_A + 2\partial_{[n}u_{A]}) = \alpha_A^B(\partial_t u_B - 2\partial_{[n}u_{B]}) + g_A. \tag{13}$$

Using Theorem 2 one can formulate the following

Theorem 3. *There exists a unique solution to the problem (7), (13). Moreover, the solution obeys the energy estimate:*

$$\begin{aligned}&\sup_{0\le t\le T}[\|\partial_t u_i\|_{L_2(\Omega)}+2\|\partial_{[j}u_{i]}\|_{L_2(\Omega)}]\\ &\qquad\le c\int_0^T\|g_A\|_{H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)}dt+[\|\partial_t u_i(0)\|_{L_2(\Omega)}+2\|\partial_{[j}u_{i]}(0)\|_{L_2(\Omega)}].\end{aligned}\tag{14}$$

We use well-posedness of (7), (13) to establish the following result.

Theorem 4. *The constrained evolution problem (1), (2), provided with boundary conditions (13) is well-posed, i.e., for any initial data compatible with the constraint (in the sense of Corollary 1), a unique solution to (1), (2), (13) exists and satisfies the estimate of Theorem 3.*

Proof. To construct the solution of (1) we explore the relationship between the two evolution Eqs., (1) and (7). Specifically, we use the fact that any solution to (1) that satisfies (2) solves (7) as well, and that conversely, any solution to (7) that satisfies constraint (2) solves (1).

According to Lemma 2 the evolution of the constraint quantity under (7) is static. This implies that any solution to (7) corresponding to constraint-compatible data automatically satisfies (2) for all t. Thus any solution to (7), (13) obtained from constraint-compatible initial data solves (1), (2) as well. Existence is established. Similarly, multiple solutions to (1), (2), (13) imply multiple solution solutions to (7), (13) which is impossible in view of Theorem 3. Thus uniqueness is established. □

Remark. Theorem 4 states that the constrained evolution problem (1), (2) is well-posed if the initial data is constraint-compatible and two boundary conditions are given in the form of (13) (with freely specifiable g_A).

It is often advantageous from the numerical point of view to solve the free evolution problem versus the fully constrained problem. We recall that only the evolution Eq. (1) is solved in the free evolution problem, while constraint (2) is monitored but not actively enforced on the solution. As is discussed in Section 2, to guarantee that (2) is satisfied for all times, the boundary data on variables of (1) must be given consistently with Eq. (4) that describes evolution of the constraint quantity. The following theorem gives an example of radiation-controlling boundary conditions that guarantee preservation of the constraint.

Theorem 5. *Let $\alpha\in\mathbb{R}$, $|\alpha|\le 1$, and the fields g and g_A defined on the boundary be compatible at corners and satisfy*

$$\partial_t g=-\partial^A g_A,\quad g(0)=(1+\alpha)\partial_t u_n(0)+(1-\alpha)\partial_n u_n(0),\quad \text{on}\quad \partial\Omega.\tag{15}$$

Then there exists a unique solution to the free evolution problem (1) satisfying the constraint compatible initial data (in the sense of Corollary 1) and the boundary conditions

$$\begin{aligned}(\partial_t u_A+2\partial_{[n}u_{A]})&=\alpha(\partial_t u_A-2\partial_{[n}u_{A]})+g_A,\\ (\partial_t u_n+\partial_n u_n)&=-\alpha(\partial_t u_n-\partial_n u_n)+g.\end{aligned}\tag{16}$$

Moreover, the solution satisfies the constraint Eq. (2).

Proof. To prove existence we recall that by Theorem 4 there exists a unique solution satisfying (1), (2), and the first condition of (16).

Next we expand $C = \partial^i u_i = \partial_n u_n + \partial^A u_A$ using normal and tangential derivatives and consider

$$\partial_t C + \partial_n C = \partial_t \partial_n u_n + \partial_t \partial^A u_A + \partial_n \partial_n u_n + \partial_n \partial^A u_A. \tag{17}$$

Taking the normal component of (1) we have

$$\partial_t^2 u_n = \partial_n \partial_n u_n + \partial^A \partial_A u_n.$$

Solving the last expression for $\partial_n \partial_n u_n$ and substituting into (17), we obtain

$$\partial_t C + \partial_n C = \partial_t \partial_n u_n + \partial_t \partial^A u_A + \partial_t \partial_t u_n - \partial^A \partial_A u_n + \partial_n \partial^A u_A.$$

By commuting derivatives and rearranging terms in the last expression, we have

$$\partial_t C + \partial_n C = \partial_t (\partial_t u_n + \partial_n u_n) + \partial^A (\partial_t u_A + 2\partial_{[n} u_{A]}). \tag{18}$$

Similarly,

$$\partial_t C - \partial_n C = -\partial_t (\partial_t u_n - \partial_n u_n) + \partial^A (\partial_t u_A - 2\partial_{[n} u_{A]}). \tag{19}$$

Let us show that the second condition of (16) is a consequence of (1), (2), and the first condition. First of all since (2) is satisfied, both $\partial_t C + \partial_n C = 0$ and $\partial_t C - \partial_n C = 0$. Multiplying (19) by α and subtracting it from (18), we obtain

$$0 = \partial_t [(\partial_t u_n + \partial_n u_n) + \alpha(\partial_t u_n - \partial_n u_n)] + \partial^A [(\partial_t u_A + 2\partial_{[n} u_{A]}) - \alpha(\partial_t u_A - 2\partial_{[n} u_{A]})].$$

In view of the first condition of (16) the latter can be rewritten as

$$0 = \partial_t [(\partial_t u_n + \partial_n u_n) + \alpha(\partial_t u_n - \partial_n u_n)] + \partial^A g_A.$$

Using (15) we have (16) by integration in time. Existence is proved.

To prove uniqueness, it is sufficient to show that any solution to (1), (16) preserves the constraint, so that we can employ the second part of the proof of Theorem 4.

By multiplying (4) with $\partial_t C$, taking the integral over Ω, and integrating by parts,

$$\int_\Omega (\partial_t^2 C)(\partial_t C) dx = -\int_\Omega (\partial_i C)(\partial^i \partial_t C) dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} (\partial_n C)(\partial_t C) d\sigma,$$

where n_i is the outward pointing unit normal vector to the boundary. By commuting derivatives and reorganizing terms we rewrite the last equation as

$$\partial_t [\|\partial_t C\|^2_{L_2(\mathbb{R}^3)} + \|\partial_i C\|^2_{L_2(\mathbb{R}^3)}] = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial\Omega} [(\partial_t C + \partial_n C)^2 - (\partial_t C - \partial_n C)^2] d\sigma. \tag{20}$$

An argument similar to that of Corollary 1 can be used to show that if C satisfies

$$(\partial_t C + \partial_n C) = \alpha(\partial_t C - \partial_n C) \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega, \tag{21}$$

with some constant $|\alpha| \leq 1$, the energy quantity in (20) is not increasing. Thus the constraint quantity remains zero if it is zero initially.

Indeed, (21) follows from (18) and (19) by (16) and (15). Uniqueness is proved. □

Remark. To establish Theorem 5 we use the assumption of the exact compatibility of data. Such assumption, however, is not practical in numerical applications where the equations are satisfied only approximately, and where one has to worry about propagation of small constraint violations. The next result generalizes Theorem 5 to the case of arbitrary data.

We rewrite Eq. (1) as

$$\partial_t^2 u_i = 2\partial^l \partial_{[l} u_{i]} + \partial_i \partial^l u_l. \tag{22}$$

We introduce the new variables $\pi_i = \partial_t u_i$, $\psi_{ji} = 2\partial_{[j} u_{i]}$ and $\varphi = \partial^l u_l$, and decompose (22) into

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t u_i &= \pi_i, \\ \partial_t \pi_i &= \partial^j \psi_{ji} + \partial_i \varphi, \\ \partial_t \psi_{ji} &= 2\partial_{[j} \pi_{i]}, \\ \partial_t \varphi &= \partial^l \pi_l. \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

The resulting first order system is symmetric hyperbolic. Its characteristic speeds and fields in the direction n_i are given by

$$\begin{aligned} 0: &\quad \psi_{AB}, \\ \pm 1: &\quad w^{\pm}_A = \pi_A \pm \psi_{nA}, \quad w^{\pm} = \pi_n \pm \varphi. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that the first two boundary conditions in (16) remain the same for (23) and, in fact, take the familiar form of (11) with the substitution $\alpha_{ij} = \alpha\delta_{ij}$. The last condition, however, can not be implemented directly since $\partial_n u_n$ is not among the variables ψ_{ij} and φ (but is closely related to φ). To formulate an equivalent condition by considering Eqs. (23) at the face of the boundary we derive the following identity:

$$(\partial_t \varphi \pm \partial_n \varphi) = \pm(\partial_t \pi_n \pm \partial_n \pi_n) + \partial^A (\pi_A \pm \psi_{nA}). \tag{24}$$

Let the differential operator $\tilde{L}$ be defined by Eqs. (23), i.e.,

$$\tilde{L}(\pi_i, \psi_{ji}, \varphi) = (\partial_t \pi_i - \partial^j \psi_{ji} - \partial_i \varphi, \partial_t \psi_{ji} - 2\partial_{[j} \pi_{i]}, \partial_t \varphi - \partial^l \pi_l).$$

As in Section 4, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{L}} = \{(\pi_i, \psi_{ji}, \varphi) \in L_2(\Omega \times [0,T]) \mid \tilde{L}(\pi_i, \psi_{ji}, \varphi) \in L_2(\Omega \times [0,T]), \\ \|(\pi_i, \psi_{ji}, \varphi)\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\tilde{L}}} = \|(\pi_i, \psi_{ji}, \varphi)\|_{L_2(\Omega\times[0,T])} + \|L(\pi_i, \psi_{ji}, \varphi)\|_{L_2(\Omega\times[0,T])}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 6. *Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, $|\alpha| \le 1$, and the fields g and g_A be defined on the boundary and compatible at corners and assume that g_A meets the assumptions of Theorem 2. Let, in addition, functions g and g_A be such that $(\partial_t g + \partial^A g_A) \in H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)$. Then there exists a unique solution $(\pi_i, \psi_{ji}, \varphi) \in \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{L}}$ to (23) satisfying the boundary conditions*

$$\begin{aligned} w^+_A &= \alpha w^-_A + g_A, \\ (\partial_t \varphi + \partial_n \varphi) &= \alpha(\partial_t \varphi - \partial_n \varphi) - (\partial_t g + \partial^A g_A). \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

Moreover, the solution satisfies the energy estimate

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{0\le t\le T} [2\|\pi(t)\|_{L_2(\Omega)} + \|\psi(t)\|_{L_2(\Omega)} + \|\varphi(t)\|_{L_2(\Omega)}] \\ &\qquad \le c \int_0^T \|g_A\|_{H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)} dt + c_2 \mathrm{e}^T (c_1 \int_0^T \|\partial_t g + \partial^A g_A\|_{H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)} dt \\ &\qquad + [\|\partial^l \partial_t u_l(0)\|_{L_2(\Omega)} + \|\partial^l u_l(0)\|_{L_2(\Omega)}]) \\ &\qquad + [2\|\pi(0)\|_{L_2(\Omega)} + \|\psi(0)\|_{L_2(\Omega)}], \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

where the constants c, c_1, c_2 are independent of π_i, ψ_{ji}, φ.

Proof. By differentiating the last of Eqs. (23) with respect to time and substituting the second in the result, we obtain

$$\partial_t^2\varphi = \partial^l\partial_l\varphi. \tag{27}$$

The initial data for (27) is given by $\varphi(0) = \partial^l u_l(0)$ and $\partial_t\varphi(0) = \partial^l\partial_t u_l(0)$. By employing the first order reduction, it is straightforward to establish existence and uniqueness of the solution. Indeed, by introducing $\partial_t\varphi = \xi$ and $\zeta_l = \partial_l\varphi$, we obtain the first order symmetric hyperbolic decomposition of (27). Notice that, when written in terms of ξ and ζ_l, (25) represents the maximally nonnegative boundary conditions (which are in general non-homogeneous). To establish the existence, it is sufficient to notice that the assumption $(\partial_t g + \partial^A g_A) \in H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)$ guarantees the existence of functions $\hat{h}$ and $\check{h}_l$ such that $\tilde{\xi} = \xi - \hat{h}$, $\tilde{\zeta}_l = \zeta_l - \check{h}_l$ satisfy the homogeneous conditions. Indeed, one could take $\hat{h}$ to be the H^1 extension of $(\partial_t g + \partial^A g_A)/2$, and set $\check{h}_l = \partial_l\rho$, where ρ solves $\partial^l\partial_l\rho = 0$, $(\partial/\partial n)\rho|_{\partial\Omega} = (\partial_t g + \partial^A g_A)/2$. By completing the argument as in Section 4, we arrive at the estimate

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{0\le t\le T}[\|\partial_t\varphi(t)\|_{L_2(\Omega)} + \|\partial_l\varphi(t)\|_{L_2(\Omega)}] \le c_1\int_0^T \|\partial_t g + \partial^A g_A\|_{H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)}dt \\ + [\|\partial^l\partial_t u_l(0)\|_{L_2(\Omega)} + \|\partial^l u_l(0)\|_{L_2(\Omega)}].\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

Finally, by repeating the constructions of Theorems 2 and 1, with the only difference being that $\partial_i\varphi$ is now the forcing term in the second equation of (23), we establish the existence result and the estimate (26). The term $\|\varphi(t)\|_{L_2(\Omega)}$ is added to (26) by considering the inequality

$$\partial_t\|\varphi\|^2_{L_2(\Omega)} = 2(\partial_t\varphi,\varphi) \le \|\partial_t\varphi\|^2 + \|\varphi\|^2$$

and using (28). □

Remark. It seems to be more natural to seek a solution to the problem (23) in the space $\mathcal{K}_{\tilde{L}} = \{(\pi_i,\psi_{ji},\varphi) \in L_2(\Omega) \mid \tilde{L}(\pi_i,\psi_{ji},\varphi) \in H^{-1}(\Omega)\}$ (see [25]). This is possible if one extends the results of [25] to weaker spaces and constructs the solution $\varphi \in L_2(\Omega)$, $\partial^l\partial_l\varphi \in H^{-2}(\Omega)$ to (27). A solution in this form does not require the "extra" smoothness assumption $(\partial_t g + \partial^A g_A) \in H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)$. Instead, it requires the milder assumption $(\partial_t g + \partial^A g_A) \in H^{-1/2}(\partial\Omega)$ which is the consequence of the other assumptions of Theorem 6. It seems likely that one could use the general scheme of [25] to prove the existence without the extra smoothness assumption. The proof, however, is rather technically involved. We, therefore, do not attempt it in this work.

Theorem 6 is used to formulate a well-posedness result for the free evolution problem (1), (16).

Theorem 7. *Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, $|\alpha| \le 1$, and the fields g and g_A satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 6. Let, in addition, the initial and boundary data be compatible, i.e.,*

$$g(0) = (1+\alpha)\partial_t u_n(0) + (1-\alpha)\partial_n u_n(0), \quad \text{on} \quad \partial\Omega. \tag{29}$$

Then a unique solution $u_i \in L_2(\Omega)$, $\partial_{[j}u_{j]} \in L_2(\Omega)$, $\partial^l u_l \in L_2(\Omega)$ exists to (22) satisfying boundary conditions (16). Moreover, the solution satisfies the estimate

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{0\le t\le T}&[2\|\partial_t u_i\|_{L_2(\Omega)} + \|\partial_{[j}u_{i]}\|_{L_2(\Omega)} + \|\partial^l u_l\|_{L_2(\Omega)}]\\ &\le c\int_0^T \|g_A\|_{H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)}dt + c_2 \mathrm{e}^T(c_1\int_0^T \|\partial_t g + \partial^A g_A\|_{H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)}dt\\ &+ [\|\partial^l\partial_t u_l(0)\|_{L_2(\Omega)} + \|\partial^l u_l(0)\|_{L_2(\Omega)}]) + [2\|\partial_t u_i(0)\|_{L_2(\Omega)} + \|\partial_{[j}u_{i]}(0)\|_{L_2(\Omega)}].\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Existence of the solution follows from the first order reduction and Theorem 6. It should be noted, however, that the first order reduction (23) involves the constraint $C_{ji} = \psi_{ji} - 2\partial_{[j}u_{i]} = 0$. Thus a solution to (23) only yields a solution to (22) if this constraint is satisfied. However, this poses no problems since (23) yields that $\partial_t C_{ji} = 0$. Since $C_{ji} = 0$ for the initial data $u_i(0)$, $\psi_{ji}(0)$, the latter implies that $C_{ji} = 0$ is automatically satisfied for future times. Thus the component u_i of the solution to (23) gives a solution to (22). Finally, one has to check that second part of (16) is satisfied by u_i. In view of (29), the latter follows from identities (24) and conditions (25) by integration in time. For the uniqueness proof, it is sufficient to notice that any solution to (22), (16) solves (23) in the sense of the first order reduction described above. Moreover, the variable φ satisfies (25) in view of identities (24). Then the uniqueness follows from Theorem 6. □

6. The full gradient estimate for the static constraint evolution system

Energy estimates of the type (14) are often considered to be a disadvantage for the numerical solution of (1), because they do not control all components of the gradient. The main objection to (14) comes from the fact that if lower order (nonlinear) terms are present in the equations that include components of the gradient not controlled by (14), coupling to such not-controlled terms may threaten the stability of the entire system.

Next we will show how energy estimate (14) can be improved by employing the constraint preservation property. It has to be emphasized, however, that the existence and uniqueness results above suggest that energy estimate (14) is accurate for the problem and may not be improved unless one further restricts the class of solutions by specifying special boundary or initial data, or making additional assumptions about the equations (e.g., the gauge choice of [27] for the fat Maxwell's system).

The following energy argument can be applied to a static constraint evolution system to provide additional energy estimates. Rewrite (7) in the divergence form,

$$\partial_t^2 u_i = \partial^j(\partial_j u_i - \delta_{ji}\partial^p u_p).$$

Contracting the last expression with $\partial_t u^i$ and integrating by parts, we have

$$\frac{1}{2}\partial_t\|\partial_t u\|^2_{L_2(\Omega)} = -\int_\Omega(\partial_j u_i - \delta_{ji}\partial^p u_p)(\partial^j\partial_t u^i)dx + \int_{\partial\Omega}(\partial_n u_i - n_i\partial^p u_p)(\partial_t u^i)d\sigma.$$

Recalling that $C = \partial^p u_p$ we expand the identity by adding and subtracting terms in the first integral:

$$\frac{1}{2}\partial_t \|\partial_t u\|^2_{L_2(\Omega)} = -\int_\Omega (\partial_j u_i - \delta_{ji} C)(\partial^j \partial_t u^i - \delta^{ji}\partial_t C)dx \\ -\int_\Omega (\partial_j u_i - \delta_{ji} C)(\delta^{ji}\partial_t C)dx + \int_{\partial\Omega}(\partial_n u_i - n_i \partial^p u_p)(\partial_t u^i)d\sigma.$$

The latter becomes after rearrangement

$$\frac{1}{2}\partial_t[\|\partial_t u\|^2_{L_2(\Omega)} + \|\partial_j u_i - \delta_{ji}C\|^2_{L_2(\Omega)}] = -\int_\Omega (\partial_j u_i - \delta_{ji} C)(\delta^{ji}\partial_t C)dx \\ + \int_{\partial\Omega}(\partial_n u_i - n_i \partial^p u_p)(\partial_t u^i)d\sigma. \tag{30}$$

Let us for a moment assume that a solution to Eq. (7) is defined in the entire $\mathbb{R}^3$ and is integrable. Then the boundary integral in the last expression drops out. Also, if the solution u_i is obtained from the constraint compatible initial data, then the first integral at the right side as well as all other terms in C drop out due to the trivial constraint preservation (see Lemma 2). As a result, we obtain an estimate on all components of the solution's gradient.

If the initial data is not constraint compatible, e.g., is perturbed by roundoff error, and one is dealing with a bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ one can rewrite (30) as

$$\partial_t[\|\partial_t u_i\|^2_{L_2(\Omega)} + \|\partial_j u_i - \delta_{ji}C\|^2_{L_2(\Omega)} - 2\|C\|^2_{L_2(\Omega)}] = 2\int_{\partial\Omega}(\partial_n u_i - n_i\partial^p u_p)(\partial_t u^i)d\sigma.$$

Due to the static constraint evolution, $C = \partial_t C(0)t + C(0)$. In other words, $\|C\|$ is completely determined by the initial data. Thus the left side gives the norm of the gradient of the solution up to some integral terms depending on the initial values $u_i(0)$, $\partial_t u_i(0)$. We define $\epsilon = \|\partial_t u_i\|^2_{L_2(\Omega)} + \|\partial_j u_i - \delta_{ji}C\|^2_{L_2(\Omega)} - 2\|C\|^2_{L_2(\Omega)}$ noting that the right side of the identity contains a boundary integral and is thus dependent on the particular boundary conditions.

Rewriting the integrand in terms of normal and tangential components and simplifying, we have

$$\partial_t \epsilon = 2\int_{\partial\Omega}(\partial_n u_A \partial_t u^A + \partial^A u_A \partial_t u_n). \tag{31}$$

It may look as if the boundary integral requires conditions on all three components of u_i but this is not so. In fact, the energy ϵ is conserved if we require the solution to satisfy

$$u_A\Big|_{\partial\Omega} = 0. \tag{32}$$

For, the integrand on the right side vanishes. Therefore the full gradient norm of the solution to (7), (32) grows at a rate not faster than t^2.

Another interesting example is given by the boundary conditions:

$$(\partial_n u_A - \partial_A u_n)|_{\partial\Omega} = 0. \tag{33}$$

Notice that taking the normal component of (7) at the boundary, we obtain

$$\partial_t^2 u_n = \partial_n \partial_n u_n + \partial^A \partial_A u_n.$$

Due to the static constraint evolution, $\partial^i u_i = \partial_t C(0)t + C(0)$, which implies that

$$\partial_n \partial_n u_n = -\partial_n \partial^A u_A + \partial_n(\partial_t C(0)t + C(0)).$$

Combining the last two equations and using (33),

$$\partial_t^2 u_n = \partial^A \partial_A u_n - \partial_n \partial^A u_A + \partial_n(\partial_t C(0)t + C(0)) = \partial_n(\partial_t C(0)t + C(0)).$$

In other words, we have showed that the component u_n at the boundary is determined by the initial data. If the initial data is such that (a) $u_n|_{\partial\Omega} = \partial_t u_n|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$, and (b) the data is constraint compatible (so $C \equiv 0$), then the last identity implies that $u_n|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$. Together with (33), this implies that the boundary integral in (31) vanishes. (Notice that assumption (a) overlaps with the well-posedness result of [27] for the fat Maxwell's system.)

Remark. A similar full gradient estimate can be derived from the identity which is true for all H^1 vector functions (not necessarily solutions of (7)):

$$\|\partial_{[j}u_{i]}\|^2_{L_2(\Omega)} + \|\partial^i u_i\|^2_{L_2(\Omega)} + \int_{\partial\Omega}(\partial_j u_i n^i)u^j = \|\partial_{(j}u_{i)}\|^2_{L_2(\Omega)} + \int_{\partial\Omega}(\partial^i u_i)n^j u_j.$$

Using this identity, a full gradient estimate can be developed for the radiative condition (13). The estimate does not need (a), but requires a special assumption, namely, the half plane reduction for the problem. We investigate this further in the next section.

7. Comparison stability analysis by Laplace-Fourier transform

In this section we make a comparison of the data derived by the static constraint evolution reduction to the constraint-preserving boundary conditions obtained by the standard methods using the subordinate constraint evolution equation (cf., [1, 2, 8, 16, 12, 21, 27]). In [27] a general class of constraint-preserving boundary conditions is derived for a symmetric hyperbolic reduction of the fat Maxwell's system and the well-posedness is proved for a subclass of these conditions (which, in fact, overlaps with (16) in two equations). We will study (16) and the conditions of [27] to see if any significant difference can be observed in the Lapalace-Fourier analysis.

From (20) it is apparent that as soon as either of the three conditions is satisfied,

$$C = 0, \quad \partial_n C = 0, \quad \text{or} \quad \partial_t C + \partial_n C = 0, \qquad \text{on} \quad \partial\Omega, \tag{34}$$

the constraint quantity is preserved.

First, we consider the classical examples of Dirichlet-Neumann constraint-preserving boundary conditions (e.g., [1, 2, 8, 12, 32]). Let g_A be a sufficiently smooth compatible vector field tangential to the boundary. It can be easily verified that the following boundary conditions imply $C|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$:

$$u_A = g_A, \qquad \partial_n u_n = -\partial^A g_A. \tag{35}$$

To construct the boundary condition that enforces $\partial_n C = 0$, recall that

$$\partial_n C = \partial_n(\partial_n u_n + \partial^A u_A) = 0.$$

By trading the second normal derivative of u_n from (1) for the temporal and tangential derivatives, one obtains

$$\partial_t^2 u_n - \partial^A \partial_A u_n + \partial_n \partial^A u_A = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \partial\Omega. \tag{36}$$

One can either impose (36) as a (second order) differential boundary condition, or to evolve it along the boundary using the initial data and compatibility conditions

at corners to produce the value of u_n at the boundary. In this case, the constraint-preserving boundary condition takes the form

$$\partial_n u_A = h_A, \qquad u_n = \hat{u}_n, \tag{37}$$

where h_A is a given tangential vector field and $\hat{u}_n$ is the solution of (36).

Finally, let us construct the examples of radiative conditions similar to one that can be found in [27] (in which the analog of (37) is also considered). Substituting $C = \partial_n u_n + \partial^A u_A$ into the third condition of (34), commuting derivatives, and trading the second normal derivative for the second temporal derivatives in (1), we have

$$\partial_t(\partial_t u_n + \partial_n u_n) - \partial^A \partial_A u_n + \partial^A(\partial_t u_A + \partial_n u_A) = 0. \tag{38}$$

As in [27] we treat this equation as an evolution equation for $\partial_t u_n + \partial_n u_n$. It follows that the following conditions are constraint-preserving:

$$\partial_t u_A + \partial_n u_A = f_A, \quad \partial_t u_n + \partial_n u_n = f; \quad \text{on} \quad \partial\Omega. \tag{39}$$

Here $f = \partial_t u_n + \partial_n u_n$ is obtained by solving (38).

Unfortunately, the equation for the forcing term f does not decouple from the system. We will still include (39) in the analysis since it can be implemented numerically.

We now consider the half space $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$, $x_1 \geq 0$ and write the first order reduction of Eq. (1):

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_t u_i = \pi_i; \quad \varphi_{ki} = \partial_k u_i; \\ &\partial_t \pi_i = \partial^j \varphi_{ji}; \\ &\partial_t \varphi_{ji} = \partial_j \pi_i. \end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

Boundary conditions (16), (35), (37), (39) are imposed at $x_1 = 0$. In terms of the first order variables these boundary conditions read (here g_A, g, h_A, h, and f_A are free functions)

$$\theta\pi_x - \varphi_{xx} = g, \quad \pi_A - \theta(\varphi_{xA} - \varphi_{Ax}) = g_A, \quad \theta = \frac{1+\alpha}{1-\alpha}, \quad |\alpha| < 1, \tag{41}$$

$$\varphi_{xx} = h, \qquad \pi_A = h_A, \tag{42}$$

$$\pi_x = h, \qquad \varphi_{xA} = h_A, \tag{43}$$

$$\partial_t(\pi_x - \varphi_{xx}) - \partial^A(f_A + \varphi_{Ax}) = 0, \quad \pi_A - \varphi_{xA} = f_A. \tag{44}$$

Notice that the right sides g_A, g, h_A, and h are no longer required to be compatible with the constraint. This reflects the situation common in numerical calculations when the constraint-preserving boundary conditions are perturbed by the discretization errors.

We seek a solution of (40) as a superposition of modes

$$\begin{pmatrix} \pi_i \\ \varphi_{ji} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\pi}_i(x_1) \\ \tilde{\varphi}_{ji}(x_1) \end{pmatrix} \exp(st + \imath\omega_A x^A), \tag{45}$$

where $s \in \mathbb{C}$, $\Re(s) > 0$, ω_A is a real two-vector, and fields $\tilde{\pi}_i(x_1)$, $\tilde{\varphi}_{ji}(x_1)$ are differentiable. By inserting (45) into the last two equations of (40), we obtain the

system of ordinary differential equations:

$$
\begin{aligned}
s\tilde{\pi}_i(x_1) &= \partial_x\tilde{\varphi}_{xi}(x_1) + \imath\omega^A\tilde{\varphi}_{Ai}(x_1);\\
s\tilde{\varphi}_{xi}(x_1) &= \partial_x\tilde{\pi}_i(x_1);\\
s\tilde{\varphi}_{Ai}(x_1) &= \imath\omega_A\tilde{\pi}_i(x_1).
\end{aligned}
\tag{46}
$$

Using the fact that $\Re(s) > 0$, we solve the last equation of (46) for $\tilde{\varphi}_{Ai}$. Substituting the obtained expression into the first equation, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\partial_x\tilde{\pi}_i(x_1) &= s\tilde{\varphi}_{xi}(x_1),\\
\partial_x\tilde{\varphi}_{xi}(x_1) &= ([s^2 + |\omega|^2]/s)\tilde{\pi}_i(x_1).
\end{aligned}
\tag{47}
$$

The system's matrix has eigenvalues $\mu^{\pm} = \pm\sqrt{s^2 + |\omega|^2}$ (the branch of the square root is chosen such that $\Re(\mu^+) > 0$), and eigenvectors $r^{-1}(sv_i, \pm\sqrt{s^2 + |\omega|^2}v_i)$. Here v_i is a unit three-vector, $r > 0$ is the normalization factor $r^2 = |s^2+|w|^2|+|s|^2$, where $|s| = \sqrt{s\bar{s}}$.

The most general solution of (47) that is bounded at infinity takes the form

$$
\begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\pi}_i(x_1) \\ \tilde{\varphi}_{xi}(x_1) \end{pmatrix} = \sum_{\nu=1}^{3} \sigma_\nu w_\nu \exp(-\sqrt{s^2 + |\omega|^2}\, x_1),
\tag{48}
$$

where $w_\nu = r^{-1}(s(v_\nu)_i, -\sqrt{s^2 + |\omega|^2}(v_\nu)_i)$, and $(v_1)_i = (1, 0, 0)$, $(v_2)_i = (0, 1, 0)$, $(v_3)_i = (0, 0, 1)$. Notice that in (48) only the components corresponding to the eigenvalues with negative real part are taken.

The coefficients σ_ν are to be determined from the boundary conditions (41)–(44). By taking the Laplace transform with respect to time and the Fourier transform in variables $x_A = (x_2, x_3)$, and using the last equation of (46) to eliminate $\tilde{\varphi}_{Ai}$, we rewrite boundary conditions (41)–(44) as

$$
\begin{gathered}
\theta\tilde{\pi}_x(0) - \tilde{\varphi}_{xx}(0) = \tilde{g},\ \tilde{\pi}_A(0) - \theta(\tilde{\varphi}_{xA}(0) - \frac{\imath\omega_A}{s}\tilde{\pi}_x(0)) = \tilde{g}_A,\ \theta = \frac{1+\alpha}{1-\alpha},\ |\alpha| < 1,\\
\tilde{\varphi}_{xx}(0) = \tilde{h}, \qquad \tilde{\pi}_A(0) = \tilde{h}_A,\\
\tilde{\pi}_x(0) = \tilde{h}, \qquad \tilde{\varphi}_{xA}(0) = \tilde{h}_A,\\
\frac{s^2 + |\omega|^2}{s}\tilde{\pi}_x(0) - s\tilde{\varphi}_{xx}(0) = \imath\omega^A\tilde{f}_A, \qquad \tilde{\pi}_A(0) - \tilde{\varphi}_{xA}(0) = \tilde{f}_A.
\end{gathered}
\tag{49}
$$

In each of the four cases the coefficients σ_ν can be uniquely determined, correspondingly, by

(50)
$$\sigma_1 = \left\{ \frac{r}{\sqrt{s^2+|\omega|^2}+\theta s} \right\} \tilde{g},\ \sigma_{2,3} = \left\{ \frac{r}{\theta\sqrt{s^2+|\omega|^2}+s} \right\} [\tilde{g}_{2,3} - \frac{\theta \imath \omega_{2,3}}{\sqrt{s^2+|\omega|^2}+\theta s}\tilde{g}];$$

(51)
$$\sigma_1 = \left\{ -\frac{r}{\sqrt{s^2+|\omega|^2}} \right\} \tilde{h}, \quad \sigma_{2,3} = \left\{ \frac{r}{s} \right\} \tilde{h}_{2,3};$$

(52)
$$\sigma_1 = \left\{ \frac{r}{s} \right\} \tilde{h}, \quad \sigma_{2,3} = \left\{ -\frac{r}{\sqrt{s^2+|\omega|^2}} \right\} \tilde{h}_{2,3};$$

(53)
$$\sigma_1 = \left\{ \frac{r}{\sqrt{s^2+|\omega|^2}(\sqrt{s^2+|\omega|^2}+s)} \right\} \imath\omega^A \tilde{f}_A, \quad \sigma_{2,3} = \left\{ \frac{r}{\sqrt{s^2+|\omega|^2}+s} \right\} \tilde{f}_{2,3}.$$

Once the coefficients σ_ν are found, the solution to (40) is obtained by substituting (48) into (45).

The necessary condition for stability is that (40) must admit only the trivial solution satisfying the homogeneous boundary conditions [13, 17, 18]. Otherwise, with each solution (45), the function

$$\begin{pmatrix} \pi_i \\ \varphi_{ji} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\pi}_i(ax_1) \\ \tilde{\varphi}_{ji}(ax_1) \end{pmatrix} \exp(ast + \imath a \omega_A x^A)$$

is also a solution, for any $a > 0$. Since we can choose the parameter a to be arbitrarily large, the solution of (40) can not be bounded by any exponential function [17]. The corresponding initial-boundary value problem is therefore strongly unstable.

It can be seen from (50)–(53) that if $\tilde{g}_A = \tilde{h}_A = \tilde{f}_A = 0$, $\tilde{g} = \tilde{h} = 0$, then the coefficients $\sigma_\nu = 0$. Thus $(\tilde{\pi}_i(x_1), \tilde{\varphi}_{xi}(x_1)) \equiv 0$, and the necessary condition for stability is satisfied for each of the four sets of boundary conditions.

In the case of vanishing initial data, well-posedness of the initial-boundary value problem for system (40) follows if (48) is uniformly bounded by the boundary data. This is also known as the Kreiss condition [13, 17, 18]. Specifically, if a constant $K > 0$ independent of s and ω_A can be found such that (here $\|\cdot\|$ is the pointwise vector norm)

(54)
$$\|(\tilde{\pi}_i(0), \tilde{\varphi}_{xi}(0))\| \le K\|\tilde{g}, \tilde{g}_A\| \quad (\le K\|\tilde{h}, \tilde{h}_A\|, \quad \le K\|\tilde{f}_A\|),$$

then the unique solution to (40) can be constructed by the inverse Laplace-Fourier transform, and can also be estimated by the boundary data [13, 17].

It can be noticed that Kreiss condition is not satisfied by (42) and (43). Indeed, by fixing ω_A and letting $s \to 0$, one can use (51), (52) to verify that the coefficients σ_ν can not be bounded uniformly in s. Also, the coefficients can not be uniformly bounded in ω_A either.

To discuss (41) and (44) we will need the following lemma from [27]

Lemma 5. *Let $P > 0$, $A, B \in \mathbb{R}$, $(A, B) \neq (0, 0)$, and consider the function*

$$\psi : \{\Re(\zeta) > 0\} \to \mathbb{C}, \quad \psi(\zeta) = A\zeta - B\sqrt{\zeta^2 + P^2},$$

where we choose the branch of the square root such that $\Re(\sqrt{\zeta^2+P^2}) > 0$ for $\Re(\zeta) > 0$.

Then, ψ has zeros if and only if $A > B > 0$ or $A < B < 0$. Furthermore, $|\psi|$ is uniformly bounded away from zero if and only if $AB < 0$.

From Lemma 5 it is apparent that as long as $|\alpha| < 1$, both $\sqrt{s^2+|\omega|^2}+\theta s$ and $\theta\sqrt{s^2+|\omega|^2}+s$ are uniformly bounded away from zero. This implies that coefficients σ_ν in (50) remain bounded if $s \to 0$, $\Re(s) > 0$. At the same time, when $|s| \to \infty$,

$$\frac{r}{|\sqrt{s^2+|\omega|^2}+\theta s|} = \frac{\sqrt{|s^2+|\omega|^2|+|s|^2}}{|\sqrt{s^2+|\omega|^2}+\theta s|} = \frac{\sqrt{|1+|\omega|^2/s^2|+1}}{|\sqrt{1+|\omega|^2/s^2}+\theta|} \quad \underset{|s|\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} \quad \frac{2}{1+\theta}.$$

Similarly, when $|\omega|^2 \to \infty$, the above expression converges to 1. Therefore, we conclude that σ_1 is uniformly bounded by $\tilde{g}$. By a similar argument, $\sigma_{2,3}$ are also uniformly bounded by $\tilde{g}_{2,3}$ and $\tilde{g}$ since the coefficient in braces can be treated similar to that of σ_1, and also, $|\omega|(\sqrt{s^2+|\omega|^2}+\theta s)^{-1} \to 1$ as $|\omega| \to \infty$. Thus the Kreiss condition is satisfied for (41).

The condition (44) does not meet the Kreiss condition since σ_1 in (53) depends on $1/\sqrt{s^2+|\omega|^2}$, which can be made large by choosing $s = |\varepsilon| + i|\omega|$, $\varepsilon \to 0$. However, the coefficients remain bounded in the high frequency regime, when $|\omega| \to \infty$.

Remark. The necessary condition for stability is equivalent to the non-vanishing determinant of the corresponding matrix for the coefficients σ_ν (cf., [13, 17, 18, 28]). At the same time, for the Kreiss condition the explicit formulae for the coefficients σ_ν are more informative. In particular, in (50), the matrix appears to be lower-triangular and thus its determinant does not include off-diagonal terms. As the result, terms $(\theta\imath\omega_{2,3})(\sqrt{s^2+|\omega|^2}+\theta s)^{-1}$ in the expressions for $\sigma_{2,3}$ are overlooked in the determinant condition. However, they clearly depend on ω_A.

8. Weak instabilities

A framework to quantify instabilities that grow polynomially in time was formulated in [28]. Such instabilities may be triggered by small perturbations of the initial data, and, for certain types of boundary conditions, can grow faster in time than a polynomial of any degree. We complement the analysis of Section 7 with this technique to see if non-vanishing initial data can produce a milder instability, similar to the one described in [27].

Following [28], we perform the Fourier transform of the solution in tangential variables x_A and look for a solution in the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} \pi_i \\ \varphi_{ji} \end{pmatrix} = \exp(\imath\omega\omega_A x^A) \sum_{\nu=0}^{p} \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\pi}_i^{(\nu)}(\omega x_1) \\ \tilde{\varphi}_{ji}^{(\nu)}(\omega x_1) \end{pmatrix} \frac{(\omega t)^\nu}{\nu!}, \tag{55}$$

where $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$, $\omega > 0$, ω_A is a real two-vector, $(\tilde{\pi}_i^{(p)}, \tilde{\varphi}_{ji}^{(p)}) \neq 0$, and $p \geq 1$.

Substituting (55) into (40), and grouping terms by powers of t, we have t^p:

$$0 = \partial_x \tilde{\varphi}_{xi}^{(p)}(\omega x_1) + \imath\omega^A \tilde{\varphi}_{Ai}^{(p)}(\omega x_1), \tag{56}$$

$$0 = \partial_x \tilde{\pi}_i^{(p)}(\omega x_1),$$

$$0 = \imath\omega_A \tilde{\pi}_i^{(p)}(\omega x_1); \tag{57}$$

t^ν, $\nu = 0, \dots, p-1$:

$$\tilde\pi_i^{(\nu+1)}(\omega x_1) = \partial_x \tilde\varphi_{xi}^{(\nu)}(\omega x_1) + \imath\omega^A \tilde\varphi_{Ai}^{(\nu)}(\omega x_1), \tag{58}$$

$$\tilde\varphi_{xi}^{(\nu+1)}(\omega x_1) = \partial_x \tilde\pi_i^{(\nu)}(\omega x_1), \tag{59}$$

$$\tilde\varphi_{Ai}^{(\nu+1)}(\omega x_1) = \imath\omega_A \tilde\pi_i^{(\nu)}(\omega x_1). \tag{60}$$

Obviously, $\tilde\pi_i^{(p)} \equiv 0$ as long as $\omega_A \neq 0$. We let $\nu = p-1$, differentiate (59) in x_1, and substitute the result in (56). Similarly, we substitute (60) in (56) to obtain

$$0 = \partial_x^2 \tilde\pi_i^{(p-1)}(\omega x_1) - |\omega_A|^2 \tilde\pi_i^{(p-1)}(\omega x_1).$$

The most general solution that is bounded at infinity is

$$\tilde\pi_i^{(p-1)}(\omega x_1) = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{3} \sigma_\alpha^{(p-1)} v_\alpha \exp(-|\omega_A| x_1),$$

where $v_1 = (1,0,0)$, $v_2 = (0,1,0)$, and $v_3 = (0,0,1)$.

The coefficients $\sigma_\alpha^{(p-1)}$ are to be determined from the boundary conditions in view of the following relations that are consequences of (59) and (60)

$$\tilde\varphi_{xi}^{(p)}(\omega x_1) = -|\omega_A| \tilde\pi_i^{(p-1)}(\omega x_1), \quad \tilde\varphi_{Ai}^{(p)}(\omega x_1) = \imath\omega_A \tilde\pi_i^{(p-1)}(\omega x_1). \tag{61}$$

One can check that $\tilde\varphi_{xi}^{(p)}(\omega x_1)$ and $\tilde\varphi_{Ai}^{(p)}(\omega x_1)$ obtained from (61) satisfy (56) automatically.

Similarly, for $\nu = 2, \dots, p$, one finds

$$\tilde\pi_i^{(\nu)}(\omega x_1) = \partial_x^2 \tilde\pi_i^{(\nu-2)}(\omega x_1) - |\omega_A|^2 \tilde\pi_i^{(\nu-2)}(\omega x_1),$$

which can be recursively solved. As in the previous case, the general formulas for $\tilde\varphi_{xi}^{(\nu)}$ and $\tilde\varphi_{Ai}^{(\nu)}$ can be obtained from (59) and (60), and the coefficients are determined from the boundary conditions.

Consider the case of boundary conditions (41). By taking the Fourier transform in x_A of g_A and g, and decomposing the result in the Taylor series, we have

$$\theta\tilde\pi_x^{(\nu)}(0) - \tilde\varphi_{xx}^{(\nu)}(0) = \tilde g^{(\nu)}, \quad \tilde\pi_A^{(\nu)}(0) - \theta(\tilde\varphi_{xA}^{(\nu)}(0) - \tilde\varphi_{Ax}^{(\nu)}(0)) = \tilde g_A^{(\nu)}, \tag{62}$$

where $\nu = 0, 1, \dots, p$, and $\theta = \frac{1+\alpha}{1-\alpha}$, $|\alpha| < 1$.

Let functions g_A and g be such that $\tilde g_A^{(p)} = 0$, $\tilde g^{(p)} = 0$. If a nontrivial solution (55) (with some $\tilde\varphi_{ki}^{(p)} \neq 0$) can be found satisfying boundary conditions (62), then the initial-boundary value problem is ill-posed. Indeed, in this case, the solution at times $t > 0$ is $O(\omega^p)$ whereas the initial data is $O(\omega^0)$ and the boundary data is $O(\omega^{p-1})$. Therefore, the solution can not be estimated in terms of the initial data as $\omega \to \infty$, and the problem is ill-posed [28].

Using $\tilde\pi_i^{(p)} \equiv 0$ and (61) we have

$$\sigma_1^{(p-1)} = \frac{1}{|\omega_A|}\tilde g^{(p)}, \quad \sigma_{2,3}^{(p-1)} = \frac{1}{\theta|\omega_A|}\tilde g_{2,3}^{(p)} - \frac{\imath\omega_{2,3}}{|\omega_A|^2}\tilde g^{(p)}. \tag{63}$$

This guarantees that $\tilde\pi_i^{(p-1)}(\omega x_1)$, and thus $\tilde\varphi_{xi}^{(p)}(\omega x_1)$ and $\tilde\varphi_{Ai}^{(p)}(\omega x_1)$ are zero as long as $\tilde g_A^{(p)} = 0$ and $\tilde g^{(p)} = 0$. Therefore, (41) is polynomially stable.

At the same time boundary conditions (42) yield,

$$\tilde\varphi_{xx}^{(\nu)}(0) = \tilde h^{(\nu)}, \quad \tilde\pi_A^{(\nu)}(0) = \tilde h_A^{(\nu)}, \qquad \nu = 0, 1, \dots, p.$$

It can be seen that if $\tilde{h}_A^{(p)} = 0$ and $\tilde{h}^{(p)} = 0$, but $\tilde{h}_A^{(p-1)} \neq 0$, the second condition implies that $\tilde{\pi}_A^{(p-1)}(\omega x_1) = \tilde{h}_A^{(p-1)} \exp(-|\omega_A| x_1) \neq 0$, and, in view of (61), $\tilde{\varphi}_{xA}^{(p)}(\omega x_1) = -|\omega_A| \tilde{h}_A^{(p-1)} \exp(-|\omega_A| x_1) \neq 0$. Thus condition (42) admits ill-posed polynomially growing modes (unless $h_A = 0$, $h = 0$).

Similarly, (43) is ill-posed, since it implies that if $\tilde{h}^{(p-1)} \neq 0$, then $\tilde{\varphi}_{xx}^{(p)}(\omega x_1) = -|\omega_A| \tilde{h}^{(p-1)} \exp(-|\omega_A| x_1) \neq 0$.

Finally, consider boundary conditions (44). Using the Fourier transformation in variables x_A and substituting decomposition (55), the boundary condition yields

$$\tilde{\pi}_A^{(\nu)}(0) - \tilde{\varphi}_{xA}^{(\nu)}(0) = \tilde{f}_A^{(\nu)}, \quad \nu = 0, 1, \ldots, p, \tag{64}$$

$$\omega^A (\tilde{f}_A^{(p)} + \tilde{\varphi}_{Ax}^{(p)}(0)) = 0, \tag{65}$$

$$\tilde{\pi}_x^{(\nu)}(0) - \tilde{\varphi}_{xx}^{(\nu)}(0) - \imath \omega^A (\tilde{f}_A^{(\nu-1)} + \tilde{\varphi}_{Ax}^{(\nu-1)}(0)) = 0, \quad \nu = 1, 2, \ldots, p. \tag{66}$$

Since $\tilde{\pi}_i^{(p)} \equiv 0$, from (64) it follows that $\tilde{\varphi}_{xA}^{(p)} = 0$ if $\tilde{f}_A^{(p)} = 0$. Therefore, from (61), $\tilde{\pi}_A^{(p-1)} = 0$ and $\tilde{\varphi}_{BA}^{(p)} = 0$. It remains to check that $\tilde{\varphi}_{xx}^{(p)} = 0$, and $\tilde{\varphi}_{Ax}^{(p)} = 0$. First of all $\omega^A \tilde{\varphi}_{Ax}^{(p)} = 0$ due to (65). This, in view of (61), implies that $\tilde{\pi}_x^{(p-1)} = 0$ and $\tilde{\varphi}_{xx}^{(p)} = 0$. By (61) this yields $\tilde{\varphi}_{Ax}^{(p)} = 0$ as well. Thus boundary condition (44) is stable in the sense that no polynomially growing modes that can not be estimated by the data is generated.

9. Acknowledgements

The author thanks O. Rinne for collaboration and fruitful discussions, and the Caltech Numerical Relativity group for helpful comments and interest in this work. The author thanks O. Sarbach for suggesting improvements to results of Section 5. The author thanks L. Lindblom, M. Scheel, H. Pfeiffer, D. Arnold, and L. L. Foster for illuminating conversations, support, and helpful suggestions that helped this work to appear. The author thanks the JHDE reviewers for their meticulous work and consequential comments that resulted in many improvements to this manuscript.

This work was supported by the Probationary Faculty Research Support Program at California State University, Northridge.

References

[1] A. M. Alekseenko. Constraint preserving boundary conditions for the linearized BSSN formulation. *Preprint*, 2004.

[2] D. N. Arnold and N. Tarfulea. Boundary conditions for the Einstein-Christoffel formulation of Einstein's equations. *Electron. J. Diff. Eq.*, Conference 15:11–27, 2007. Sixth Mississippi State Conference on Differential Equations and Computational Simulations.

[3] R. Arnowitt, S. Deser, and C. W. Misner. The dynamics of general relativity. In L. Witten, editor, *Gravitation: An introduction to Current Research*, pages 227–265. Wiley, New York, 1962.

[4] T. W. Baumgarte and S. L. Shapiro. On the numerical integration of Einstein's field equations. *Phys. Rev. D*, 59:024007, 1999.

[5] O. Brodbeck, S. Frittelli, P. Huebner, and O. A. Reula. Einstein's equations with asymptotically stable constraint propagation. *J. Math. Phys.*, 40:909, 1999.

[6] G. Calabrese. A remedy for constraint growth in numerical relativty. *Class. Quant. Grav.*, 21:4025–4040, 2004.

[7] G. Calabrese, L. Lehner, and M. Tiglio. Constraint-preserving boundary conditions in numerical relativity. *Phys. Rev. D*, 65:104031(1)–104031(13), 2002.

[8] G. Calabrese, J. Pullin, O. Sarbach, M. Tiglio, and O. Reula. Well-posed constraint-preserving boundary conditions for the linearized Einstein equations. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 240:377–395, 2003.

[9] D. R. Fiske. Toward making the constraint hypersurface an attractor in free evolution. *Phys. Rev. D*, 69:047501, 2004.

[10] H. Friedrich and G. Nagy. The initial boundary value problem for Einstein's vacuum field equation. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 201(3):619–655, 1999.

[11] C. Gundlach and J. M. Martin-Garcia. Symmetric hyperbolic form of systems of second-order evolution equations subject to constraints. *Phys. Rev. D*, 70:044031, 2004.

[12] C. Gundlach and J. M. Martin-Garcia. Symmetric hyperbolicity and consistent boundary conditions for second-order Einstein equations. *Phys. Rev. D*, 70:044032, 2004.

[13] B. Gustafsson, H.-O. Kreiss, and J. Oliger. *Time Dependent Problems and Difference Methods*. Wiley & Sons, New York, 1995.

[14] M. Holst, L. Lindblom, R. Owen, H. P. Pfeiffer, M. A. Scheel, and L. E. Kidder. Optimal constraint projection for hyperbolic evolution systems. *Phys. Rev. D*, 70:084017, 2004.

[15] F. John. *Partial Differential Equations*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1991.

[16] L. E. Kidder, L. Lindblom, M. A. Scheel, L. T. Buchman, and H. P. Pfeiffer. Boundary conditions for the Einstein evolution system. *Phys. Rev. D*, 71:064020, 2005.

[17] H.-O. Kreiss and J. Lorenz. *Initial-Boundary Value Problems and the Navier-Stokes Equations*. Academic Press, San Diego, 1989.

[18] H.-O. Kreiss and J. Winicour. Problems which are well-posed in a generalized sense with applications to the Einstein equations. *Class. Quant. Grav.*, 23:S405–S420, 2006.

[19] P. D. Lax and R. S. Phillips. Local boundary conditions for dissipative symmetric linear differential operators. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 13:427–455, 1960.

[20] P. D. Lax and R. S. Phillips. Scattering theory for dissipative hyperbolic systems. *J. Functional Analysis*, 14:172–235, 1973.

[21] L. Lindblom, M. A. Scheel, L. E. Kidder, H. P. Pfeiffer, D. Shoemaker, and S. A. Teukolsky. Controlling the growth of constraints in hyperbolic evolution systems. *Phys. Rev. D*, 69:124025, 2004.

[22] A. J. Majda. Coercive inequalities for nonelliptic symmetric systems. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 28:49–89, 1975.

[23] A. J. Majda and S. Osher. Initial-boundary value problems for hyperbolic equations with uniformly characteristic boundary. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 28:49–89, 1975.

[24] G. Nagy, O. E. Ortiz, and O. A. Reula. Strongly hyperbolic second order einstein's evolution equations. *Phys. Rev. D*, 70:044012, 2004.

[25] J. Rauch. Symmetric positive systems with boundary characteristics of constant multiplicity. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 291(1):167–187, 1985.

[26] B. Reimann and B. Bruegmann. Maximal slicing for puncture evolutions of Schwarzschild and Reissner-Nordström black holes. *Phys. Rev. D*, 69:044006, 2004.

[27] O. Reula and O. Sarbach. A model problem for the initial-boundary value problem of Einstein equations. *J. Hyperbolic Differ. Equ.*, 2(2):397–435, 2005.

[28] O. Rinne. Stable radiation-controlling boundary conditions for the generalized harmonic Einstein equations. *Class. Quant. Grav.*, 23(22):6275–6300, 2006.

[29] O. Sarbach and M. Tiglio. Boundary conditions for Einstein's field equations: Mathematical and numerical analysis. *J. Hyperbolic Differ. Equ.*, 2:839–883, 2005.

[30] M. A. Scheel, L. E. Kidder, L. Lindblom, H. P. Pfeiffer, and S. A. Teukolsky. Toward stable 3d numerical evolutions of black holes spacetimes. *Phys. Rev. D*, 66:124005, 2002.

[31] M. Shibata and T. Nakamura. Evolution of three-dimensional gravitational waves: Harmonic slicing case. *Phys. Rev. D*, 52(10):5428, 1995.

[32] B. Szilagyi and J. Winicour. Well-posed initial-boundary evolution in general relativity. *Phys. Rev. D*, 68:041501(1)–041501(5), 2003.

[33] M. E. Taylor. *Partial Differential Equations. I*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1996.

[34] J. W. York, Jr. Kinematics and dynamics of general relativity. In L. L. Smarr, editor, *Sources of Gravitational Radiation*, pages 83–126. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 1979.

Department of Mathematics, California State University Northridge, 18111 Nordhoff St., Northridge, CA 91330-8313
E-mail address: alexander.alekseenko@csun.edu