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## Globally convergent method

A numerical method X is globally convergent if:

1. A theorem is proved claiming convergence to a good approximation for the correct solution regardless on a priori availability of a good guess
2. This theorem is confirmed by numerical experiments for at least one applied problem

## Challenges in solution of CIP

- Solution of any PDE depends nonlinearly on its coefficients.

$$
y^{\prime}-a y=0 \rightarrow y(a, t)=C e^{a t}
$$

- Any coefficient inverse problem is nonlinear.
- Two major challenges in numerical solution of any coefficient inverse problem: NONLINEARITY and Ill-POSEDNESS.
- Local minima of objective functionals.
- Locally convergent methods: linearizaton, Newton-like and gradient-like methods.

A hyperbolic equation

$$
\begin{gathered}
c(x) u_{t t}=\Delta u-a(x) u \text { in } \mathbb{R}^{n} \times(0, \infty), n=2,3 \\
u(x, 0)=0, u_{t}(x, 0)=\delta\left(x-x_{0}\right)
\end{gathered}
$$

INVERSE PROBLEM. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{n}$ be a bounded domain. Let one of coefficients $c(x)$ or $a(x)$ be unknown in $\Omega$ but it is a given constant outside of $\Omega$. Determine this coefficient in $\Omega$, given the function $g(x, t)$,

$$
u(x, t)=g(x, t), x \in \partial \Omega, t \in(0, \infty)
$$

Similarly for the parabolic equation

$$
\begin{gathered}
c(x) \widetilde{u}_{t}=\Delta \widetilde{u}-a(x) \widetilde{u} \text { in } \mathbb{R}^{n} \times(0, \infty) \\
\widetilde{u}(x, 0)=\delta\left(x-x_{0}\right)
\end{gathered}
$$

## Applications

## 1. MEDICINE

a. medical optical imaging;
b. acoustic imaging.
2. MILITARY
a. identification of hidden targets, like, e.g. landmines; improvised explosive devices via electric or acoustic sensing.
b. detecting targets covered by smog or flames on the battlefield (via diffuse optics).

## Laplace transform:

$$
\begin{gather*}
w(x, s)=\int_{0}^{\infty} u(x, t) e^{-s t} d t=\int_{0}^{\infty} \widetilde{u}(x, t) e^{-s^{2} t} d t \\
\Delta w-\left[s^{2} c(x)+a(x)\right] w=-\delta\left(x-x_{0}\right)  \tag{1}\\
\forall s>s_{0}=\text { const. }>0
\end{gather*}
$$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{|x| \rightarrow \infty} w(x, s)=0, \forall s>s_{0}=\text { const } .>0 \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

$$
w(x, s)>0, \forall s>s_{0}
$$

## THE TRANSFORMATION PROCEDURE.

First, we eliminate the unknown coefficient from the equation:

$$
\begin{gathered}
v=\ln w \\
\Delta v+|\nabla v|^{2}=s^{2} c(x)+a(x) \text { in } \Omega
\end{gathered}
$$

- Let, for example $c(x)=$ ? For simplicity let $a(x)=0$. It follows from works of V.G. Romanov that

$$
D_{x}^{\alpha} D_{s}^{\beta}(v)=D_{x}^{\alpha} D_{s}^{\beta}\left[-\frac{s l\left(x, x_{0}\right)}{g\left(x, x_{0}\right)}\left(1+O\left(\frac{1}{s}\right)\right)\right], s \rightarrow \infty
$$

- Introduce a new function

$$
\widetilde{v}=\frac{v}{s^{2}}
$$

. Then

$$
\widetilde{v}(x, s)=O\left(\frac{1}{s}\right), s \rightarrow \infty
$$

- Eliminate the unknown coefficient $c(x)$ via the differentiation: $\partial_{s} c(x) \equiv 0$

$$
\begin{gathered}
q(x, s)=\partial_{s} \widetilde{v}(x, s), \\
\widetilde{v}(x, s)=-\int_{s}^{\infty} q(x, \tau) d \tau \approx-\int_{s}^{\bar{s}} q(x, \tau) d \tau+V(x, \bar{s}) .
\end{gathered}
$$

- $V(x, \bar{s})$ is the tail function, $V(x, \bar{s}) \approx 0$. But still we iterate with respect to the tail.
- This truncation is similar to the truncation of high frequencies.
- Obtain Dirichlet boundary value problem for the nonlinear equation

$$
\begin{gather*}
\Delta q-2 s^{2} \nabla q \cdot \int_{s}^{\bar{s}} \nabla q(x, \tau) d \tau+2 s\left[\int_{s}^{\bar{s}} \nabla q(x, \tau) d \tau\right]^{2}  \tag{3}\\
+2 s^{2} \nabla q \nabla V-2 s \nabla V \cdot \int_{s}^{\bar{s}} \nabla q(x, \tau) d \tau+2 s(\nabla V)^{2}=0, \\
q(x, s)=\psi(x, s), \forall(x, s) \in \partial \Omega \times[\underline{s}, \bar{s}] . \tag{4}
\end{gather*}
$$

- Backwards calculations

$$
c(x)=\Delta \widetilde{v}+\underline{s}^{2}(\nabla \widetilde{v})^{2},
$$

## How To Solve the Problem (3), (4)?

- Layer stripping with respect to the pseudo frequency $s$.
- On each step the Dirichlet boundary value problem is solved for an elliptic equation.

$$
\begin{gathered}
\underline{s}=s_{N}<s_{N-1}<\ldots<s_{1}<s_{0}=\bar{s}, s_{i-1}-s_{i}=h \\
q(x, s)=q_{n}(x) \text { for } s \in\left(s_{n}, s_{n-1}\right] . \\
\int_{s}^{\bar{s}} \nabla q(x, \tau) d \tau=\left(s_{n-1}-s\right) \nabla q_{n}(x)+h \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \nabla q_{j}(x), s \in\left(s_{n}, s_{n-1}\right] .
\end{gathered}
$$

- Dirichlet boundary condition:

$$
q_{n}(x)=\bar{\psi}_{n}(x), x \in \partial \Omega
$$

$$
\bar{\psi}_{n}(x)=\frac{1}{h} \int_{s_{n}}^{s_{n-1}} \psi(x, s) d s
$$

Hence,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \widetilde{L}_{n}\left(q_{n}\right):=\Delta q_{n}-2\left(s^{2}-2 s\left(s_{n-1}-s\right)\right)\left(h \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \nabla q_{j}(x)\right) \cdot \nabla q_{n} \\
& +2\left(s^{2}-2 s\left(s_{n-1}-s\right)\right) \nabla q_{n} \cdot \nabla V(x, \bar{s})-\varepsilon q_{n} \\
& =2\left(s_{n-1}-s\right)\left[s^{2}-s\left(s_{n-1}-s\right)\right]\left(\nabla q_{n}\right)^{2}-2 s h^{2}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \nabla q_{j}(x)\right)^{2} \\
& +4 s \nabla V(x, \bar{s}) \cdot\left(h \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \nabla q_{j}(x)\right)-2 s[\nabla V(x, \bar{s})]^{2}, s \in\left(s_{n-1}, s_{n}\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

Introduce the $s$-dependent Carleman Weight Function $\mathcal{C}_{n \mu}(s)$ by

$$
\mathcal{C}_{n \mu}(s)=\exp \left[\mu\left(s-s_{n-1}\right)\right], s \in\left(s_{n}, s_{n-1}\right],
$$

where $\mu \gg 1$ is a parameter.

- Multiply the equation by $\mathcal{C}_{n \mu}(s)$ and integrate with respect to $s \in$ $\left[s_{n}, s_{n-1}\right]$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& L_{n}\left(q_{n}\right):=\Delta q_{n}-A_{1 n}(\mu, h)\left(h \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \nabla q_{i}(x)\right) \cdot \nabla q_{n}-\varepsilon q_{n} \\
& =2 \frac{I_{1 n}(\mu, h)}{I_{0}(\mu, h)}\left(\nabla q_{n}\right)^{2}-A_{2 n}(\mu, h) h^{2}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \nabla q_{i}(x)\right)^{2} \\
& \quad+2 A_{1 n}(\mu, h) \nabla V(x, \bar{s}) \cdot\left(h \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \nabla q_{i}(x)\right) \\
& - \\
& -A_{2 n}(\mu, h) \nabla q_{n} \cdot \nabla V(x, \bar{s})-A_{2 n}(\mu, h)[\nabla V(x, \bar{s})]^{2},
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
I_{0}(\mu, h)=\int_{s_{n}}^{s_{n-1}} \mathcal{C}_{n \mu}(s) d s=\frac{1-e^{-\mu h}}{\mu}
$$

$$
\begin{gathered}
I_{1 n}(\mu, h)=\int_{s_{n}}^{s_{n-1}}\left(s_{n-1}-s\right)\left[s^{2}-s\left(s_{n-1}-s\right)\right] \mathcal{C}_{n \mu}(s) d s \\
A_{1 n}(\mu, h)=\frac{2}{I_{0}(\mu, h)} \int_{s_{n}}^{s_{n-1}}\left(s^{2}-2 s\left(s_{n-1}-s\right)\right) \mathcal{C}_{n \mu}(s) d s \\
A_{2 n}(\mu, h)=\frac{2}{I_{0}(\mu, h)} \int_{s_{n}}^{s_{n-1}} s \mathcal{C}_{n \mu}(s) d s
\end{gathered}
$$

- Important observation:

$$
\frac{\left|I_{1 n}(\mu, h)\right|}{I_{0}(\mu, h)} \leq \frac{4 \bar{s}^{2}}{\mu}, \text { for } \mu h>1
$$

- Iterative solution for every $q_{n}$

$$
\begin{gathered}
\Delta q_{n k}^{i}-A_{1 n}\left(h \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \nabla q_{j}\right) \cdot \nabla q_{n k}^{i}-\varepsilon q_{n k}^{i}+A_{1 n} \nabla q_{n k}^{i} \cdot \nabla V_{n}^{i}= \\
2 \frac{I_{1 n}(\mu, h)}{I_{0}(\mu, h)}\left(\nabla q_{n(k-1)}^{i}\right)^{2}-A_{2 n} h^{2}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \nabla q_{j}(x)\right)^{2} \\
+2 A_{2 n} \nabla V_{n}^{i} \cdot\left(h \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \nabla q_{j}(x)\right)-A_{2 n}\left(\nabla V_{n}^{i}\right)^{2}, k \geq 1 \\
q_{n k}^{i}(x)=\bar{\psi}_{n}(x), x \in \partial \Omega
\end{gathered}
$$

- Hence, we obtain the function

$$
q_{n}^{i}=\lim _{k \rightarrow \infty} q_{n k}^{i}, \text { in } C^{2+\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})
$$

## CONVERGENCE THEOREM.

- First, Schauder Theorem. Consider the Dirichlet boundary value problem

$$
\begin{gathered}
\Delta u+\sum_{j=1}^{3} b_{j}(x) u_{x_{j}}-m(x) u=f(x), x \in \Omega \\
\left.u\right|_{\partial \Omega}=g(x) \in C^{2+\alpha}(\partial \Omega)
\end{gathered}
$$

Let

$$
b_{j}, m, f \in C^{\alpha}(\bar{\Omega}), d(x) \geq 0 ; \max \left(\left|b_{j}\right|_{\alpha},|m|_{\alpha}\right) \leq 1
$$

Then

$$
|u|_{2+\alpha} \leq K\left[\|g\|_{C^{2+\alpha}(\partial \Omega)}+|f|_{\alpha}\right]
$$

where $K=K(\Omega)=$ const. $\geq 1$.

Global Convergence Theorem. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{3}$ be a convex bounded domain with the boundary $\partial \Omega \in C^{3}$. Let the exact coefficient $c^{*}(x) \in C^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right), c^{*} \in\left[2 d_{1}, 2 d_{2}\right]$ and $c^{*}(x)=2 d_{1}$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^{3} \backslash \Omega$, where numbers $d_{1}, d_{2}>0$ are given. For any function $c(x) \in C^{\alpha}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right)$ such that $c(x) \geq d_{1}$ in $\Omega$ and $c(x)=2 d_{1}$ in $\mathbb{R}^{3} \backslash \Omega$ consider the solution $u_{c}(x, t)$ of the original Cauchy problem. Let $C^{*}=$ const. $\geq 1$ be a constant bounding certaon functions associated with the solution of this Cauchy problem. Let $w_{c}(x, s) \in C^{3}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3} \backslash\left\{\left|x-x_{0}\right|<\gamma\right\}\right), \forall \gamma>0$ be the Laplace transform of $u_{c}(x, t)$ and
$V_{c}(x)=\bar{s}^{-2} \ln w_{c}(x, \bar{s}) \in C^{2+\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})$ be the corresponding tail function.
Suppose that the cut-off pseudo frequency $\bar{s}$ is so large that for any such function $c(x)$ the following estimates hold

$$
\left|V^{*}\right|_{2+\alpha} \leq \xi,\left|V_{c}\right|_{2+\alpha} \leq \xi
$$

where $\xi \in(0,1)$ is a sufficiently small number.

Let $V_{1,1}(x, \bar{s}) \in C^{2+\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})$ be the initial tail function and let

$$
\left|V_{1,1}\right|_{2+\alpha} \leq \xi .
$$

Denote $\eta:=2(h+\sigma+\xi+\varepsilon)$. Let $\bar{N} \leq N$ be the total number of functions $q_{n}$ calculated by the algorithm of section 5 . Suppose that the number $\bar{N}=\bar{N}(h)$ is connected with the step size $h$ via $\bar{N}(h) h=\beta$, where the constant $\beta>0$ is independent on $h$. Let $\beta$ be so small that

$$
\beta \leq \frac{1}{384 K C^{*} \bar{s}^{2}} .
$$

In addition, let the number $\eta$ and the parameter $\mu$ of the CWF satisfy the following estimates

$$
\begin{gathered}
\eta \leq \eta_{0}\left(K, C^{*}, d_{1}, \bar{s}\right)=\min \left(\frac{1}{16 K M^{*}}, \frac{3}{8} d_{1}\right)=\min \left(\frac{1}{256 K C^{*} \bar{s}^{2}}, \frac{3}{8} d_{1}\right), \\
\mu \geq \mu_{0}\left(C^{*}, K, \bar{s}, \eta\right)=\max \left(\frac{\left(C^{*}\right)^{2}}{4}, 48 K C^{*} \bar{s}^{2}, \frac{1}{\eta^{2}}\right) .
\end{gathered}
$$

Then for each appropriate $n$ the sequence $\left\{q_{n, 1}^{k}\right\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ converges in $C^{2+\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})$ and the following estimates hold

$$
\begin{gather*}
\left|q_{n}-q_{n}^{*}\right|_{2+\alpha} \leq 2 K M^{*}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu}}+3 \eta\right), n \in[1, \bar{N}], \\
\left|q_{n}\right|_{2+\alpha} \leq 2 C^{*}, n \in[1, \bar{N}], \\
\left|c_{n}-c^{*}\right|_{\alpha} \leq \frac{\eta}{2 \cdot 9^{n-1}}+\frac{23}{8} \eta, n \in[2, \bar{N}] . \tag{5}
\end{gather*}
$$

In addition, functions $c_{n, k}(x) \geq d_{1}$ in $\Omega$ and $c_{n, k}(x)=2 d_{1}$ outside of $\Omega$.

## Brief Outline of the Proof

$$
\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{q}_{n, 1}^{k} & =q_{n, 1}^{k}-q_{n}^{*}, \quad \widetilde{q}_{n, i}=q_{n, i}-q_{n}^{*} \\
\widetilde{V}_{n, k} & =V_{n, k}-V^{*}, \widetilde{c}_{n, k}=c_{n, k}-c^{*}, \widetilde{\psi}_{n}=\bar{\psi}_{n}-\bar{\psi}_{n}^{*} \\
\widetilde{H}_{n, i}(x) & =H_{n, i}(x)-H^{*}\left(x, s_{n}\right), \widetilde{H}_{n}(x)=H_{n}(x)-H^{*}\left(x, s_{n}\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

Sequentially estimate norms $\left|\widetilde{q}_{n, 1}^{k}\right|_{2+\alpha},\left|\widetilde{q}_{n, i}\right|_{2+\alpha}$ from the above using Schauder theorem. Subtracting the equation for $q_{1}^{*}$ from the equation for $q_{1,1}^{k}$, we obtain for $x \in \Omega$

$$
\begin{gathered}
\Delta \widetilde{q}_{1,1}^{k}-\varepsilon \widetilde{q}_{1,1}^{k}+A_{1,1} \nabla V_{1,1} \nabla \widetilde{q}_{1,1}^{k}=2 \frac{I_{1,1}}{I_{0}} \nabla \widetilde{q}_{1,1}^{k-1}\left(\nabla q_{1,1}^{k-1}+\nabla q_{1}^{*}\right) \\
-A_{1,1} \nabla \widetilde{V}_{1,1} \nabla q_{1}^{*}-A_{2,1} \nabla \widetilde{V}_{1,1}\left(\nabla V_{1,1}+\nabla V^{*}\right)+\varepsilon q_{1}^{*}-F_{1} \\
\widetilde{q}_{1,1}^{1}(x)=\widetilde{\psi}_{1}(x), x \in \partial \Omega
\end{gathered}
$$

$$
\left|2 \frac{I_{1,1}}{I_{0}}\right| \leq \frac{C}{\mu} \ll 1
$$

- Thus the term responsible for the nonlinearity is small.


## WHY THE FINITE ELEMENT ADAPTIVE METHOD SHOULD BE NEXT?

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|c_{n}-c^{*}\right|_{\alpha} \leq \frac{\eta}{2 \cdot 9^{n-1}}+\frac{23}{8} \eta, n \in[2, \bar{N}] \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

- The estimate (5) is typical for ill-posed problems.
- (5) tells us that our globally convergent numerical method can be categorized as the so-called "stabilizing method".
- The notion of stabilizing numerical methods was introduced in the field of ill-posed problems by one of classics Dr. Anatoly B. Bakushinskii (Moscow, Russia) in Computational Mathematics and Mathematical Physics, 1998, 2000.
- A numerical method for an ill-posed problem is called stabilizing if

$$
\overline{\lim }_{n \rightarrow \infty}\left\|x_{n}-x^{*}\right\|=O(\sigma+\Delta),
$$

where $\sigma>0$ is an error in the data and $\Delta>0$ is a parameter which can be chosen small in a "smart" choice.

- In our case $\Delta=h+\xi$
- As soon as the procedure (5) is stabilized, we have a good approximation $c_{\bar{N}}$ for the exact solution $c^{*}$.
- Thus, on the FIRST globally convergent stage of our procedure we got a good first guess for the solution.


## IDEA:

- Use a locally convergent numerical method on the SECOND stage.
- This method should be independent on the parameter $\Delta=h+\xi$.
- This method should take the the function $c_{\bar{N}}$ as the first guess.
- We have chosen Finite Element Adaptive Method for the second stage.


## Two step procedure.

STEP 1. To get the first approximation using the globally convergent method.

The first approximation is exactly what a locally convergent method needs.

STEP 2. To use the adaptivity technique to improve the first approximation.

The solution taken from the globally convergent method would be a first guess.

The adaptivity does not depend on the tail.

## THE ADAPTIVITY AS THE SECOND STAGE

## OF THE 2-STAGE GLOBALLY CONVERGENT PROCEDURE

Denote $Q_{T}=\Omega \times(0, T), S_{T}=\partial \Omega \times(0, T)$.

- Functional spaces

$$
\begin{aligned}
H_{u}^{2}\left(Q_{T}\right) & =\left\{f \in H^{2}\left(Q_{T}\right): f(x, 0)=f_{t}(x, 0)=0\right\} \\
H_{u}^{1}\left(Q_{T}\right) & =\left\{f \in H^{1}\left(Q_{T}\right): f(x, 0)=0\right\} \\
H_{\varphi}^{2}\left(Q_{T}\right) & =\left\{f \in H^{2}\left(Q_{T}\right): f(x, T)=f_{t}(x, T)=0\right\} \\
H_{\varphi}^{1}\left(Q_{T}\right) & =\left\{f \in H^{1}\left(Q_{T}\right): f(x, T)=0\right\} \\
U & =H_{u}^{2}\left(Q_{T}\right) \times H_{\varphi}^{2}\left(Q_{T}\right) \times C^{2}(\bar{\Omega}) \\
\bar{U} & =H_{u}^{1}\left(Q_{T}\right) \times H_{\varphi}^{1}\left(Q_{T}\right) \times L_{2}(\Omega) \\
\bar{U}^{1} & =L_{2}\left(Q_{T}\right) \times L_{2}\left(Q_{T}\right) \times L_{2}(\Omega)
\end{aligned}
$$

- Finite dimensional subspaces of finite elements

$$
\begin{gathered}
W_{h}^{u} \subset H_{u}^{1}\left(Q_{T}\right), W_{h}^{\varphi} \subset H_{\varphi}^{1}\left(Q_{T}\right), V_{h} \subset L_{2}(\Omega), \\
U_{h} \subset \bar{U}, U_{h}=W_{h}^{u} \times W_{h}^{\varphi} \times V_{h} .
\end{gathered}
$$

- Since all norms in finite dimensional spaces are equivalent, set for convenience $\|\cdot\|_{U_{h}}:=\|\cdot\|_{\bar{U}^{1}}$.
- Tikhonov regularization functional:

$$
E(c)=\frac{1}{2} \int_{S_{T}}\left(\left.u\right|_{S_{T}}-g(x, t)\right)^{2} d \sigma d t+\frac{1}{2} \gamma \int_{\Omega}\left(c-c_{g l o b}\right)^{2} d x .
$$

- $c_{g l o b}$ is the solution obtained on the globally convergent stage.
- $\gamma \in(0,1)$ is the regularization parameter.
- To calculate the Frechet derivative of $E(c)$, introduce the Lagrangian.
- To be $100 \%$ rigorous, we need to assume in the Lagrangian that variations of state and adjoint operators actually depend on $c$ and depend on each other. This would make things more complicated. We currently are working on this extension.
- However, to simplify things, we assume in this presentation that these functions are mutually independent. In particular, we assume that $E(c):=E(u, c)$, where functions $u$ and $c$ can be varied independently on each other.
- Many authors also use this kind of assumption.
- Given the data $g=\left.u\right|_{S_{T}}$ for the inverse problem, one can uniquely determine the normal derivative $p(x, t)$,

$$
\left.\frac{\partial u}{\partial n}\right|_{S_{T}}=p(x, t)
$$

Let $v=(c, u, \varphi)$. Then we define the Lagrangian as

$$
L(v)=E(u, c)+\int_{Q_{T}} \varphi \cdot\left(c u_{t t}-\Delta u\right) d x d t, \forall \varphi \in H_{\varphi}^{2}\left(Q_{T}\right)
$$

Clearly

$$
L(v)=E(u, c)
$$

The integration by parts leads to

$$
L(v)=E(u, c)-\int_{Q_{T}} c(x) u_{t} \varphi_{t} d x d t+\int_{Q_{T}} \nabla u \nabla \varphi d x d t-\int_{S_{T}} p \varphi d S d t
$$

We search for a stationary point of the functional $L(v), v \in U$ satisfying

$$
L^{\prime}(v)(\bar{v})=0, \quad \forall \bar{v}=(\bar{u}, \bar{\varphi}, \bar{c}) \in \bar{U}
$$

where $L^{\prime}(v)(\cdot)$ is the Frechet derivative of $L$ at the point $v$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
L^{\prime}(v)(\bar{v}) & =\int_{\Omega} \bar{c}\left[\gamma\left(c-c_{0}\right)-\int_{0}^{T} u_{t} \varphi_{t} d t\right] d x-\int_{Q_{T}} c(x)\left(\varphi_{t} \bar{u}_{t}+u_{t} \bar{\varphi}_{t}\right) d x d t \\
& +\int_{Q_{T}}(\nabla u \nabla \bar{\varphi}+\nabla \bar{u} \nabla \varphi)-\int_{S_{T}} p \bar{\varphi} d \sigma d t+\int_{S_{T}}\left(\left.u\right|_{S_{T}}-g\right) \bar{u} d \sigma d t=0 \\
& \forall \bar{v}=(\bar{u}, \bar{\varphi}, \bar{c}) \in \bar{U}
\end{aligned}
$$

Integration by parts leads to

$$
\begin{aligned}
L^{\prime}(v)(\bar{v}) & =\int_{\Omega} \bar{c}\left[\gamma\left(c-c_{0}\right)-\int_{0}^{T} u_{t} \varphi_{t} d t\right] d x+\int_{Q_{T}} \bar{\varphi}\left(c u_{t t}-\Delta u\right) d x d t \\
& +\int_{Q_{T}} \bar{u}\left(c \varphi_{t t}-\Delta \varphi\right) d x d t+\int_{S_{T}} \bar{\varphi}\left[\partial_{n} u-p\right] d \sigma d t \\
& +\int_{S_{T}}\left(\left(\left.u\right|_{S_{T}}-g\right)+\partial_{n} \varphi\right) \bar{u} d \sigma d t, \\
\forall \bar{v} & =(\bar{u}, \bar{\varphi}, \bar{c}) \in \bar{U} .
\end{aligned}
$$

We obtain for the minimizer $v=(c, u, \varphi)$ :

- The state problem is:

$$
\begin{gathered}
c u_{t t}-\Delta u=0,(x, t) \in Q_{T} \\
u(x, 0)=u_{t}(x, 0)=0 \\
\left.\partial_{n} u\right|_{S_{T}}=p(x, t)
\end{gathered}
$$

- The adjoint problem, which should be solved backwards in time, is:

$$
\begin{gathered}
c \varphi_{t t}-\Delta \varphi=0,(x, t) \in Q_{T} \\
\varphi(x, T)=\varphi_{t}(x, T)=0 \\
\left.\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial n}\right|_{S_{T}}=(g-u)(x, t),(x, t) \in S_{T}
\end{gathered}
$$

And the gradient with respect to the unknown coefficient c should be equal to zero:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\gamma\left(c-c_{g l o b}\right)-\int_{0}^{T} u_{t} \varphi_{t} d t=0, x \in \Omega \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

How to Find the Minimizer Which Would Approximately Guarantee (6)?

- We solve (6) iteratively.
- Let $u_{n}=u\left(x, t, c_{n}\right), \varphi_{n}=\varphi\left(x, t, c_{n}\right)$ be solutions of state and adjoint problems with $c:=c_{n}$.
- Set

$$
\begin{gathered}
c_{0}:=c_{g l o b} \\
c_{n}=\frac{1}{\gamma} \int_{0}^{T} \partial_{t} u_{n-1} \cdot \partial_{t} \varphi_{n-1} d t+c_{g l o b}, x \in \Omega
\end{gathered}
$$

- We have computationally observed convergence of this procedure in terms of a stabilizing procedure introduced above


## A POSTERIORI ERROR ESTIMATE FOR THE LAGRANGIAN

- Let $v \in U$ and $v_{h} \in U_{h}$ be the local minimizers of $L$ on the spaces $\bar{U}$ and $U_{h}$ respectively (recall that $U_{h} \subset \bar{U}$ as a set),

$$
\left\|v-v^{*}\right\|_{\bar{U}},\left\|v_{h}-v^{*}\right\|_{\bar{U}} \leq \delta \ll 1
$$

where $v^{*}$ is the exact solution of our inverse problem.

- We assume that such local minimizers $v, v_{h}$ exist
- For any vector $w \in \bar{U}^{1}$ let $w_{h}^{I}$ be the interpolant of $w$ via finite elements of $U_{h}$.
- Using the Galerkin orthogonality with the splitting $v-v_{h}=\left(v-v_{h}^{I}\right)+\left(v_{h}^{I}-v_{h}\right)$, we obtain the following error representation:

$$
L(v)-L\left(v_{h}\right) \approx L^{\prime}\left(v_{h}\right)\left(v-v_{h}^{I}\right)
$$

involving the residual $L^{\prime}\left(v_{h}\right)(\cdot)$ with $v-v_{h}^{I}$ appearing as the interpolation error.

- It turns out that an approximate error estimate from the above for the Lagrangian is

$$
\begin{gather*}
\left|L(v)-L\left(v_{h}\right)\right| \approx\left|L^{\prime}\left(v_{h}\right)\left(v-v_{h}^{I}\right)\right| \\
\leq V(\Omega) \max \left|\left[c_{h}\right]\right| \cdot\left[\gamma \max _{\bar{\Omega}}\left|c-c_{g l o b}\right|+\int_{0}^{T} \max _{\bar{\Omega}}\left|u_{h t}\right|\left|\varphi_{h t}\right| d t\right] \tag{7}
\end{gather*}
$$

- Thus, we refine the mesh in regions where

$$
\begin{gathered}
\gamma\left|c-c_{g l o b}\right|(x)+\int_{0}^{T}\left|u_{h t}\right|\left|\varphi_{h t}\right|(x, t) d t \\
\geq \beta\left[\gamma \max _{\bar{\Omega}}\left|c-c_{g l o b}\right|+\int_{0}^{T} \max _{\bar{\Omega}}\left|u_{h t}\right|\left|\varphi_{h t}\right| d t\right]
\end{gathered}
$$

where $\beta=$ const. $\in(0,1)$ is a parameter which we choose in computational experiments.

- We have chosen in our computations:

$$
\beta=\left\{\begin{array}{c}
0.1 \text { on the coarse mesh, } \\
0.2 \text { on first two refinements, } \\
0.6 \text { on the refinement } n \geq 3 .
\end{array}\right\} .
$$

## A POSTERIORI ERROR ESTIMATE FOR THE UNKNOWN COEFFICIENT

- In a paper
L. Beilina and C. Johnson " A posteriori error estimation in computational inverse scattering", Math. Models and Methods in Applied Sciences, V. 15, pp. 23-37, 2005.
a posteriori error estimate for the unknown coefficient in the adaptivity was introduced.
- This estimate was based on the so-called "error estimator", which was denoted as $\psi(x)$.
- The meaning of $\psi(x)$ was not explained analytically and we are unaware about other references where this meaning would be explained for inverse problems.
- We provide this explanation below.
- Let $((\cdot, \cdot))$ be the inner product in $\bar{U}^{1}$.
- Let $L^{\prime \prime}\left(v_{h}\right)(\bar{v}, \widetilde{v})$ be the Hessian, i.e., the second Frechet derivative of the Lagrangian $L$, at the point $v_{h}$, where $v_{h}$ is the local minimizer of $L$ on the space $U_{h}$.
- Consider solution $\widetilde{v}$ of the following so-called "Hessian problem"

$$
-L^{\prime \prime}\left(v_{h}\right)(\bar{v}, \widetilde{v})=((\psi, \bar{v})), \forall \bar{v} \in U_{h} .
$$

- $\psi \in \bar{U}$ is a function of our choice.
- Suppose that for any $\psi \in \bar{U}$ there exists such a solution $\widetilde{v}=\widetilde{v}_{\psi} \in \bar{U}$ that $\left\|\widetilde{v}_{\psi}-v^{*}\right\|_{\bar{U}} \leq \delta$.
- Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left(\left(\psi, v-v_{h}\right)\right) & =-L^{\prime \prime}\left(v_{h}\right)\left(v-v_{h}, \widetilde{v}_{\psi}\right) \\
& =-L^{\prime}(v)\left(\widetilde{v}_{\psi}\right)+L^{\prime}\left(v_{h}\right)\left(\widetilde{v}_{\psi}\right)+R=L^{\prime}\left(v_{h}\right)\left(\widetilde{v}_{\psi}\right)+R
\end{aligned}
$$

where $R \approx 0$ is the reminder term, which is of the second order of smallness with respect to $\left\|v-v_{h}\right\|_{\bar{U}}$. Thus, we ignore $R$.

- Splitting: $\widetilde{v}_{\psi}=\widetilde{v}_{\psi}^{I}+\left(\widetilde{v}_{\psi}-\widetilde{v}_{\psi}^{I}\right), L^{\prime}\left(v_{h}\right)\left(\widetilde{v}_{\psi}^{I}\right)=0$.
- Thus, we have obtained the following analog of a posteriori error estimate for the error in the Lagrangian

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\left(\psi, v-v_{h}\right)\right) \approx L^{\prime}\left(v_{h}\right)\left(\widetilde{v}_{\psi}-\widetilde{v}_{\psi h}^{I}\right) . \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

- We conclude, that the concrete form of the estimate (8) is the same as one for the Lagrangian $L(v)$ with only $v-v_{h}^{I}$ replaced with $\widetilde{v}_{\psi}-\widetilde{v}_{\psi h}^{I}$.
- Let $\left\{\psi_{k}\right\}_{k=1}^{M} \subset U_{h}$ be an orthonormal basis in the finite dimensional space $U_{h}$.
- Let $P_{h}: \bar{U}^{1} \rightarrow U_{h}$ be the operator of the orthogonal projection of the space $\bar{U}^{1}$ on the subspace $U_{h}$. Represent $\bar{U}^{1}=U_{h}+G$, where the subspace $G$ is orthogonal to $U_{h}$. We have
$v-v_{h}=\left(P_{h} v-v_{h}\right)+\left(v-P_{h} v\right)$, where $v-P_{h} v \in G$ and $P_{h} v-v_{h} \in U_{h}$. Therefore $\left(\left(\psi_{k}, v-P_{h} v\right)\right)=0$.
- Hence, numbers $\left(\left(\psi_{k}, v-v_{h}\right)\right)=\left(\left(\psi_{k}, P_{h} v-v_{h}\right)\right)$ are Fourier coefficients of the vector function with respect to the orthonormal basis $\left\{\psi_{k}\right\}_{k=1}^{M}$ in the space $U_{h}$. Thus,

$$
\begin{gathered}
{\left[P_{h} v-v_{h}\right]^{2}=\sum_{k=1}^{M}\left|\left(\left(\psi_{k}, v-v_{h}\right)\right)\right|^{2} \leq \sum_{k=1}^{M}\left|L^{\prime}\left(v_{h}\right)\left(\widetilde{v}_{\psi_{k}}-\widetilde{v}_{\psi_{k} h}^{I}\right)\right|^{2}} \\
{\left[P_{h} v-v_{h}\right] \leq\left(\sum_{k=1}^{M}\left|L^{\prime}\left(v_{h}\right)\left(\widetilde{v}_{\psi_{k}}-\widetilde{v}_{\psi_{k} h}^{I}\right)\right|^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}}
\end{gathered}
$$

- In summary, estimates $\left|L^{\prime}\left(v_{h}\right)\left(\widetilde{v}_{\psi_{k}}-\widetilde{v}_{\psi_{k} h}^{I}\right)\right|$ from the above for all $k=1, \ldots, M$ would provide us with an estimate of the difference between the $\bar{U}^{1}$-projection (i.e., $L_{2}$-like projection) of our target minimizer of the Lagrangian on the subspace of finite elements and the minimizer of this Lagrangian on the subspace $U_{h}$, which will be found in computations.
- Thus, assuming the existence of the solution of the Hessian problem, and using (7), we obtain the following approximate error estimate for the unknown coefficient
$\left\|P_{h} c-c_{h}\right\| \leq M C V(\Omega) \max \left|\left[\tilde{c}_{h}\right]\right| \cdot\left[\gamma \max _{\bar{\Omega}}\left|c-c_{g l o b}\right|+\int_{0}^{T} \max _{\bar{\Omega}}\left|u_{h t}\right|\left|\varphi_{h t}\right| d t\right]$.


## A globally convergent numerical method and adaptivity in 2-d


(a) $G=G_{F E M} \cup G_{F D M}$

(b) $G_{F E M}=\Omega$

Figure 1:
1-a. The forward problem for $c(x) u_{t t}=\Delta u, c(x) \geq$ const. $>0$ is solved in the bigger rectangle to generate the boundary data for the inverse problem. The data for the inverse problem are generated at the
boundary of the smaller square. 1-b. The correct image. The unknown coefficient $c(x)=1$ in the background and $c(x)=4$ in two inclusions. A priori knowledge of neither background nor inclusions nor values of the unknown coefficient $c(x)$ is not assumed and the coefficient $c(x)$ is the target of solution by the globally convergent numerical method. Applications: Imaging of antipersonnel land mines in which case $c(x):=\varepsilon(x)$, the spatially distributed dielectric permittivity; also acoustical imaging of land mines, in which case $1 / \sqrt{c(x)}$ is the speed of sound.
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Figure 2: Isosurfaces of the simulated exact solution to the forward problem with a plane wave initialized at the top boundary.


Figure 3: Spatial distribution of $c_{h}$ after computing $q_{n, k} ; n=9,10,11,12$, where $n$ is number of the computed function $q$ for the case of Fig. 1b. We have incorporated $5 \%$ random noise in the data. While values of the unknown coefficient $c(x)$ are correctly reconstructed both inside and outside inclusions, locations of inclusions need to be enhanced. Thus, using our globally convergent method, we got a good first approximation for the solution of the inverse problem. And now we need to enhance it using a locally convergent adaptivity technique. The resulting method is a two-stage procedure: global convergence on the first stage and a more detailed enhancement on the second.

a) 4608 el .

f) 4608 el .

b) 5340 el .

g) 5340 el .

c) 6356 el .

h) 6356 el .

d) 10058 el .

i) 10058 el .

e) 14586 el .

j) 14586 el .

Figure 4:
Adaptively refined computational meshes: with $\sigma=5 \%$ - on a),b),c),d),e), and correspondingly spatial distribution of the parameter $c_{h}$ : with $\sigma=5 \%-$ on f$\left.\left.\left.), \mathrm{g}\right), \mathrm{h}\right), \mathrm{i}\right), \mathrm{j}$ ) when the first guess was taken from the globally convergent numerical method (Fig. 3). Upper figures represent refined meshes and lower figures represent corresponding images. The final image ( j ) displays correctly located inclusions and the function $c$ both inside and outside of them.

## A globally convergent numerical method and adaptivity in 3-d



Figure 5:
The forward problem is solved in the larger rectangular prizm depicted on Fig. 5a. The plane wave is falling from the top.

## A globally convergent numerical method in 3-d



Figure 6:
The image of Fig. 6 reconstructed by the globally convergent numerical method. This image corresponds to the function $q_{12}$ in the globally convergent method. The maximal computed value of the coefficient $c(x)=3.66$ inside of inclusions depicted here and $c(x)=1$ outside. Recall that correct values are $c(x)=4$ inside of inclusions and $c(x)=1$ outside. Both locations of inclusions and values of the unknown coefficient $c(x)$ inside of them need to be enhanced by the adaptivity technique.

| it. n | $\mathrm{i}=1$ | $\mathrm{i}=2$ | $\mathrm{i}=3$ |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | 0.0522995 | 0.0522995 |  |
| 2 | 0.0523043 | 0.0521772 |  |
| 3 | 0.0535235 | 0.053353 |  |
| 4 | 0.0516891 | 0.0556757 |  |
| 5 | 0.0467661 | 0.091598 |  |
| 6 | 0.0466467 | 0.0440336 | 0.0464053 |

Table 1: Test 1. Computed $L_{2}$ norms of the $F_{n, i}=\left\|\left.q_{n, i}\right|_{\partial \Omega}-\bar{\psi}_{n}\right\|_{L_{2}(\partial \Omega)}$ with $\mu=100$.

| it. n | $\mathrm{i}=1$ | $\mathrm{i}=2$ | $\mathrm{i}=3$ |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 7 | 0.0486575 | 0.0657632 |  |
| 8 | 0.0631762 | 0.0892608 |  |
| 9 | 0.0852419 | 0.111969 |  |
| 10 | 0.0914603 | 0.106285 |  |
| 11 | 0.090428 | 0.104433 |  |
| 12 | 0.11104 | 0.133783 |  |

Table 2: Test 1. Computed $L_{2}$ norms of the $F_{n, i}=\left\|\left.q_{n, i}\right|_{\partial \Omega}-\bar{\psi}_{n}\right\|_{L_{2}(\partial \Omega)}$ with $\mu=100$.

Conclusion: we should stop at $n \leq 7$, because norms start to grow at $\mathrm{n}=8$. This is one of the key ideas of the stopping criterion for stablizing algorithms in ill-posed problems.

## Adaptivity in 3-d

Since the adaptivity is a locally convergent numerical method, we take the starting point on the coarse mesh from the results of Test 1 of the globally convergent method and with the plane wave initialized at the top boundary of the computational domain $G$. More precisely, we present two set of tests where the starting point for the coefficient $c(x)$ in the adaptive algorithm on the coarse mesh is $c_{4,2}$, and $c_{7,2}$, correspondingly.

At the boundary data $g=\left.u\right|_{\partial \Omega}$ we use three noise levels: $0 \%, 3 \%$, and $5 \%$ correspondingly. In all tests let $\Gamma$ be the side of the cube $\Omega$, opposite to the side from which the plane wave is launched and $\Gamma_{T}=\Gamma \times(0, T)$.

## Test 1.



$$
c_{4,2} \approx 1.2
$$

Figure 7:
The starting point for the coefficient $c(x)$ in the adaptive algorithm.
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Figure 9:

| Mesh | $\sigma=3 \%$ | q.N.it. | CPU time (s) | min CPU time/node (s) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9375 | 0.030811 | 3 | 26.2 | 0.0028 |
| 10564 | 0.029154 | 3 | 29.08 | 0.0028 |
| 12001 | 0.035018 | 3 | 32.91 | 0.0027 |
| 16598 | 0.034 | 8 | 46.49 | 0.0028 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Mesh | $\sigma=5 \%$ | q.N.it. | CPU time (s) | min CPU time/node (s) |
| 9375 | 0.0345013 | 3 | 26.53 | 0.0028 |
| 10600 | 0.0324908 | 3 | 29.78 | 0.0028 |
| 12370 | 0.03923 | 2 | 34.88 | 0.0028 |
| 19821 | 0.0277991 | 8 | 53.12 | 0.0027 |

Table 3: Test 2.2: $\left\|\left.u\right|_{\Gamma_{T}}-g\right\|_{L_{2}\left(\Gamma_{T}\right)}$ on adaptively refined meshes with different noise level $\sigma$ in data.

## Test2



$$
c_{7,2} \approx 1.8
$$

Figure 10:
The starting point for the coefficient $c(x)$ in the adapt. algorithm.
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Figure 11: Test 2.3: reconstruction parameter on different adaptively refined meshes.
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Figure 12: Test 2.3: reconstruction parameter on different adaptively refined meshes.

## Work in progress

We eliminate two assumptions of our adaptivity technique. Rather, we prove them now: These are:

1. The assumption of the existence of the minimizer.
2. We now can estimate the accuracy of the reconstruction of the coefficient without using a Hessian but rather via a new idea.
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