1. Introduction

The method-of-moments (MoM) implementation of the electric-field integral equation (EFIE) yields many code-verification challenges due to the various sources of numerical error and their possible interactions [1, 2]. Matters are further complicated by singular integrals, which arise from the presence of a Green’s function. To address these singular integrals, an approach is presented in [1] wherein both the solution and Green’s function are manufactured. Because the arising equations are poorly conditioned, they are reformulated as a set of constraints for an optimization problem that selects the solution closest to the manufactured solution. In this paper, we demonstrate how, for such practically singular systems of equations, computing the truncation error by inserting the exact solution into the discretized equations cannot detect certain orders of coding errors. On the other hand, the discretization error from the optimal solution [1] is a more sensitive metric.

2. Truncation and Discretization Error

Letting $L(\cdot)$ and $L_h(\cdot)$ respectively denote the operators representing the continuous and discretized equations, the truncation error $\tau$ is the difference between them [3, 4]:

$$L_h(v) = L(v) + \tau(v).$$

If $u$ denotes the solution to the continuous equations, then $L(u) = 0$ and

$$\tau(u) = L_h(u).$$

Letting $u_h$ denote the solution to the discretized equations ($L_h(u_h) = 0$) and setting $v = u_h$, (1) becomes

$$L(u_h) = -\tau(u_h).$$

Subtracting $L(u) = 0$ from (3) yields

$$L(u_h) - L(u) = -\tau(u_h).$$

Inserting a Taylor series expansion of $L(u_h)$ about $u$ into (4) yields

$$\frac{\partial L(u)}{\partial u} \cdot e_h + O(\|e_h\|^2) = -\tau(u_h),$$

where $e_h = u_h - u$ is the discretization error. Therefore, from (2) and (5), $L_h(u)$ can be used to measure the order of the discretization error.

3. The Method-of-Moments Implementation of the EFIE

The variational form of the EFIE is: find $u \in V$, such that

$$a(u, v) = (f, v) \quad \forall v \in V,$$

where $f$ is a source, $V$ is the solution space, and the sesquilinear form and inner product are defined by

$$a(u, v) = \alpha \int_S \tilde{v}(x) \cdot \int_{S'} u(x')G(x, x')dS'dS + \beta \int_S \nabla \cdot \tilde{v}(x) \int_{S'} \nabla' \cdot u(x')G(x, x')dS'dS,$$

$$(u, v) = \int_S u(x) \cdot \tilde{v}(x)dS.$$
In (7), \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) are constants, \( G \) is a Green’s function, and the bar notation denotes complex conjugation. If the domain is open, the component of \( u \) normal to the boundary is zero.

To solve (6), we approximate \( u \) with \( u_h \) using a Galerkin method with Rao–Wilton–Glisson (RWG) basis functions \( \phi_j(x) \) [5]:

\[
\mathbf{u}_h(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} u_j^h \phi_j(x),
\]

where \( n \) is the total number of unknowns. Defining \( \mathcal{V}_h \) to be the span of the RWG basis functions, the Galerkin approximation of the original problem is now: find \( \mathbf{u}_h \in \mathcal{V}_h \), such that

\[
a(\mathbf{u}_h, \phi_i) = (f, \phi_i) \quad (8)
\]

for \( i = 1, \ldots, n \).

To verify the order of accuracy of (8), we can manufacture \( f \) [1] so that (8) becomes

\[
a(\mathbf{u}_h, \phi_i) = a(\mathbf{u}, \phi_i). \quad (9)
\]

In (9), \( \mathbf{u} \) is a manufactured solution that coerces \( \mathbf{u}_h \) to \( \mathbf{u} \) and permits the discretization error \( \mathbf{e}_h = \mathbf{u}_h - \mathbf{u} \) and the truncation error \( \tau_h(\mathbf{u}) = a(\mathbf{u}_h, \phi_i) - (f, \phi_i) = a(\mathbf{u}, \phi_i) - a(\mathbf{u}_h, \phi_i) \) to be measured.

However, the integrals in (9) cannot be accurately computed due to the presence of the Green’s function, which yields a singularity when \( x = x' \). In [1], this challenge is mitigated by manufacturing the Green’s function as well. As a result, the matrix becomes practically singular, admitting infinite solutions \( \mathbf{u}_h \). Therefore, \( \mathbf{u}_h \) is chosen by selecting the closest choice to \( \mathbf{u} \) that satisfies (9). The implications for the truncation and discretization errors as code-verification metrics for such singular systems of equations is discussed in the next section.

4. Singular Systems of Equations

Given their similar properties, in [6], expectations for the RWG basis functions are based on those for rooftop basis functions. Likewise, in this section, we consider the one-dimensional analogy with piecewise linear basis functions \( \phi_j(x) \). We restrict the solution to real numbers and set \( S = [a, b] \) in (7). We consider the extreme case of \( G(x, x') = 1 \), which yields a singular system of equations. As a result, (9) becomes: find \( u_h \in H_0^1 \), such that

\[
\alpha \int_a^b \phi_i(x) \int_a^b u_h(x') dx' dx + \beta \int_a^b \phi'_i(x) \int_a^b u_h(x') dx' dx = \alpha \int_a^b \phi_i(x) \int_a^b u(x') dx' dx + \beta \int_a^b \phi'_i(x) \int_a^b u'(x') dx' dx \quad (10)
\]

for \( i = 1, \ldots, n \). Since \( \int_a^b \phi'_i(x) dx = 0 \), (10) is reduced to

\[
\alpha \int_a^b \phi_i(x) \int_a^b u_h(x') dx' dx = \alpha \int_a^b \phi_i(x) \int_a^b u(x') dx' dx. \quad (11)
\]

Letting \( u_h(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} u_j^h \phi_j(x) \), for a uniform discretization, after dividing both sides by \( \alpha h \), where \( h = (b-a)/(n+1) \), the system of equations for (11) is

\[
h \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & \cdots & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} u_1^h \\ \vdots \\ u_n^h \end{bmatrix} = \int_a^b u(x) dx \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (12)
\]

which can be written as \( \mathcal{L}_h(u_h) = Au^h - b = 0 \), where \( A = h \mathbf{1}_{n \times n} \) and \( b = \left( \int_a^b u(x) dx \right) \mathbf{1}_{n \times 1} \).
4.1. Original System

The integral in (12) can be approximated using the trapezoidal rule. Accounting for the boundary conditions \(u(a) = u(b) = 0\),

\[
\int_a^b u(x) \, dx = h \sum_{j=1}^n u_j + \mathcal{O}(h^2),
\]

such that \(\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{A} \mathbf{u} + \mathcal{O}(h^2)\) and (12) becomes

\[
\mathcal{L}_h(u_h) = \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{u}^h - \mathbf{u}) + \mathcal{O}(h^2) = 0.
\]

From (2) and (14),

\[
\mathbf{r}(u) = \mathcal{L}_h(u) = \mathcal{O}(h^2),
\]

indicating the truncation error is \(\mathcal{O}(h^2)\), as expected. Because \(\mathbf{A}\) is singular, a unique solution cannot be computed and a meaningful discretization error cannot be obtained.

If an error \(\varepsilon \neq 0\) is introduced in \(A_{i,j}\) in (12), such that it becomes \((1 + \varepsilon)A_{i,j}\), the truncation error (15) becomes

\[
\mathbf{r}(\mathbf{u}) = \mathcal{L}_h(\mathbf{u}) = \varepsilon u_j h \begin{bmatrix} 0_{n-1 \times 1} \\ \mathbf{1}_{1 \times 1} \\ 0_{n-1 \times 1} \end{bmatrix} + \mathcal{O}(h^2).
\]

If \(j\) is fixed, as \(n\) is increased, \(x_j\) will approach \(a\) and \(u_j = u(x_j)\) will be proportional to the leading term of the Taylor series expansion at \(x = a + h\) about \(x = a\). If that term is \(\mathcal{O}(h^8)\), (16) will have a leading term that is \(\mathcal{O}(h^\text{min}(n+1,2))\).

4.2. Reduced System

To perform code verification for a singular system of equations, such as that in (12), an approach is presented in [1], which uses a QR factorization of the transpose of the matrix to select the \(\mathbf{u}^h\) closest to \(\mathbf{u}\) that satisfies the system of equations. To simplify the factorization, we divide both sides of (12) by \(h\) once more:

\[
\begin{bmatrix} 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & \cdots & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} u_1^h \\ \vdots \\ u_n^h \end{bmatrix} = \frac{1}{h} \int_a^b u(x) \, dx \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{bmatrix},
\]

which can be written as \(\mathbf{A} \mathbf{u}^h = \mathbf{b}\), where \(\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{1}_{n \times n}\) and \(\mathbf{b} = \frac{1}{h} \int_a^b u(x) \, dx \mathbf{1}_{n \times 1}\). Performing a pivoted QR factorization of \(\mathbf{A}^T\), such that

\[
\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{P} = [\mathbf{Q}_1, \mathbf{Q}_2] \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{R}_1 \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{Q}_1 \mathbf{R}_1,
\]

the optimal solution is

\[
\mathbf{u}^h = \mathbf{Q}_1 \mathbf{u}' + \mathbf{Q}_2 \mathbf{Q}_2^T \mathbf{u},
\]

where \(\mathbf{u}'\) is the solution to (17) when the size is reduced to its rank:

\[
\mathbf{u}' = (\mathbf{R}_1^T)^\dagger \mathbf{P}^T \mathbf{b},
\]

where \((\cdot)^\dagger\) denotes the Moore–Penrose pseudoinverse. Noting that \(\mathbf{Q} \mathbf{Q}^T = \mathbf{Q}_1 \mathbf{Q}_1^T + \mathbf{Q}_2 \mathbf{Q}_2^T = \mathbf{I}_{n \times n}\), (18) can be written as

\[
\mathbf{u}^h = \mathbf{Q}_1 \mathbf{u}' - \mathbf{Q}_1 \mathbf{Q}_1^T \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u}.
\]
4.2.1. Without an Error

The factorization is $P = I_{n \times n}$, $Q_1 = n^{-1/2}1_{n \times 1}$, $R_1 = n^{1/2}1_{1 \times n}$, and $(R_1^T) \dagger = n^{-3/2}1_{1 \times n}$. The first term of (19) is

$$Q_1 u' = Q_1 (R_1^T) \dagger P^T b = \frac{1}{n^2} 1_{n \times n} \eta \left( \int_a^b u(x) dx \right) 1_{n \times 1}.$$  \hfill (20)

Inserting (13) into (20) yields

$$Q_1 u' = \frac{1}{n} 1_{n \times n} u + O(h^2).$$  \hfill (21)

The second term of (19) is

$$Q_1 Q_1^T u = \frac{1}{n} 1_{n \times n} u.$$  \hfill (22)

Inserting (21) and (22) into (19), the discretization error $e_h = u_h - u$ is

$$e_h = \left( \frac{1}{n} 1_{n \times n} \eta + \frac{1}{n} 1_{n \times n} + I_{n \times n} - I_{n \times n} \right) u + O(h^2) = O(h^2).$$

The discretization error is $O(h^2)$, as expected.

4.2.2. With an Error

We now consider the case when an error $\varepsilon \neq 0$ is introduced in $A_{i,j}$ in (17), such that it becomes $(1 + \varepsilon)A_{i,j}$. If $i = 1$, the factorization is $P = I_{n \times n}$,

$$Q_1 = \frac{1}{\gamma} \left[ \begin{array}{cc} 1_{j-1 \times 1} & \eta \xi^{-1/2} 1_{j-1 \times 1} \\ \eta 1_{1 \times 1} & -\xi^{-1/2} 1_{1 \times 1} \\ 1_{n-j \times 1} & \eta \xi^{-1/2} 1_{n-j \times 1} \end{array} \right],$$

$$R_1 = \frac{1}{\gamma} \left[ \begin{array}{cc} \gamma^2 1_{1 \times 1} & \zeta 1_{1 \times n-1} \\ 0_{1 \times 1} & \varepsilon \xi^{1/2} 1_{1 \times n-1} \end{array} \right],$$

$$(R_1^T) \dagger = \frac{1}{\varepsilon \gamma} \left[ \begin{array}{cc} \varepsilon 1_{1 \times 1} & 0_{1 \times n-1} \\ -\zeta \xi^{-1/2} 1_{1 \times 1} & \gamma^2 \xi^{-3/2} 1_{1 \times n-1} \end{array} \right],$$

where $\xi = n - 1$, $\eta = 1 + \varepsilon$, $\zeta = n + \varepsilon$, and $\gamma = \sqrt{\xi + \eta^2}$. If $i \neq 1$, the factorization is $P = I_{n \times n}$,

$$Q_1 = n^{-1/2} \left[ \begin{array}{cc} 1_{j-1 \times 1} & -\xi^{-1/2} 1_{j-1 \times 1} \\ \xi^{1/2} 1_{1 \times 1} & 1_{1 \times 1} \\ 1_{n-j \times 1} & -\xi^{-1/2} 1_{n-j \times 1} \end{array} \right],$$

$$R_1 = n^{-1/2} \left[ \begin{array}{cc} n 1_{1 \times i-1} & \zeta 1_{1 \times 1} & n 1_{1 \times n-i} \\ 0_{1 \times i-1} & \varepsilon \xi^{1/2} 1_{1 \times 1} & 0_{1 \times n-i} \end{array} \right],$$

$$(R_1^T) \dagger = \frac{n^{-1/2} \xi^{-3/2}}{\varepsilon} \left[ \begin{array}{ccc} \varepsilon \xi^{1/2} 1_{1 \times i-1} & 0_{1 \times 1} & \varepsilon \xi^{1/2} 1_{1 \times n-i} \\ -\xi 1_{1 \times i-1} & n \xi 1_{1 \times 1} & -\xi 1_{1 \times n-i} \end{array} \right].$$
The first term of (19) is

\[
Q_1 u' = Q_1 (R_1^T)^T P^T b = \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \begin{bmatrix}
\eta_1^{j-1 \times i-1} & -\xi_1^{j-1 \times 1} & \eta_1^{j-1 \times n-i}

-\xi_1^{j \times i-1} & \xi_1^{j \times 1} & -\xi_1^{j \times n-i}

\eta_1^{n-j \times i-1} & -\xi_1^{n-j \times 1} & \eta_1^{n-j \times n-i}
\end{bmatrix} b
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{\xi h} \int_a^b u(x) dx \begin{bmatrix}
1_j-1 \times 1
0_1 \times 1
1_{n-j} \times 1
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

Inserting (13) into (23) yields

\[
Q_1 u' = \frac{1}{\xi} \begin{bmatrix}
1_j-1 \times n
0_1 \times n
1_{n-j} \times n
\end{bmatrix} u + O(h^2).
\]

The second term of (19) is

\[
Q_1 Q_1^T u = \begin{bmatrix}
0_{j-1 \times j-1} & 0_{j-1 \times 1} & 0_{j-1 \times n-j}
0_{1 \times j-1} & 1_1 \times 1 & 0_{1 \times n-j}
0_{n-j \times j-1} & 0_{n-j \times 1} & 0_{n-j \times n-j}
\end{bmatrix} + \frac{1}{\xi} \begin{bmatrix}
1_{j-1 \times j-1} & 0_{j-1 \times 1} & 0_{j-1 \times n-j}
0_{1 \times j-1} & 0_1 \times 1 & 0_{1 \times n-j}
0_{n-j \times j-1} & 0_{n-j \times 1} & 0_{n-j \times n-j}
\end{bmatrix} u.
\]

Inserting (24) and (25) into (19), the discretization error \( e_h = u_h - u \) is

\[
e_h = - \begin{bmatrix}
0_{j-1 \times j-1} & 0_{j-1 \times 1} & 0_{j-1 \times n-j}
0_{1 \times j-1} & 1_1 \times 1 & 0_{1 \times n-j}
0_{n-j \times j-1} & 0_{n-j \times 1} & 0_{n-j \times n-j}
\end{bmatrix} + \frac{1}{\xi} \begin{bmatrix}
1_{j-1 \times j-1} & 0_{j-1 \times 1} & 0_{j-1 \times n-j}
0_{1 \times j-1} & 0_1 \times 1 & 0_{1 \times n-j}
0_{n-j \times j-1} & 0_{n-j \times 1} & 0_{n-j \times n-j}
\end{bmatrix} u + O(h^2)
\]

\[
= u_j \left( - \begin{bmatrix}
0_{j-1 \times 1}
1_1 \times 1
0_{n-j \times 1}
\end{bmatrix} + \frac{h}{b-a} \begin{bmatrix}
1_{j-1 \times 1}
0_{1 \times 1}
1_{n-j \times 1}
\end{bmatrix} \right) + O(h^2).
\]

If \( j \) is fixed, as \( n \) is increased, \( x_j \) will approach \( a \) and \( u_j = u(x_j) \) will be proportional to the leading term of the Taylor series expansion at \( x = a + h \) about \( x = a \). If that term is \( O(h^q) \), (26) will have a leading term that is \( O(h^{\min(q,2)}) \). If the error is introduced in a column corresponding to a fixed \( x \) location, (26) will have a leading term that is \( O(h^0) \). Therefore, if \( q < 2 \) or the error is spatially fixed, the error will be detected.

5. Conclusions

In this paper, we showed how, for a singular system of equations, computing the truncation error by inserting the exact solution into the discretized equations cannot detect certain orders of coding errors. However, the discretization error from the optimal solution is a more effective metric.
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