On the Evaluation of Double Integrals

By Moshe Levin

Abstract. A cubature formula consisting of line integrals which is optimal on a set of functions satisfying given boundary conditions is obtained. The line integrals of this formula may be evaluated by optimal quadrature formulas. The advantage of this formula over the optimal cubature formula with a rectangular lattice of knots is shown. This approach to optimal cubatures was stimulated by the idea of blending [1], [2].

1. Notations and Definitions. Let $L_{1i}f(\cdot) = 0$, $i = 1, \ldots, r_1$, and $L_{2j}f(\cdot) = 0$, $j = 1, \ldots, r_2$, be linear homogeneous boundary conditions for the interval $[0,1]$ such that the problems

\begin{align*}
(1) \begin{cases}
y^{(r)}(x) = 0, \\
L_{1i}y(\cdot) = 0,
\end{cases} i = 1, \ldots, r_1, \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{cases}
y^{(r)}(x) = 0, \\
L_{2j}y(\cdot) = 0,
\end{cases} j = 1, \ldots, r_2,
\end{align*}

both have the unique solution $y(x) \equiv 0$, and let $g_1(x, t)$ and $g_2(x, t)$ be the Green's functions corresponding to problems (1) [4].

Let \( \Theta = [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \), $1 < p < \infty$, $p^{-1} + q^{-1} = 1$,

$$
\| f(\cdot) \|_p = \left( \int_0^1 |f(x)|^p \, dx \right)^{1/p}, \quad \| \varphi(\cdot, \cdot) \|_p = \left( \int_0^1 \int_0^1 |\varphi(x, y)|^p \, dx \, dy \right)^{1/p}.
$$

We consider the following sets of functions:

\( W_{g_k}^2 \) \( L_p \) = \{ $f(x)$: $f^{(r)}(x)$ piecewise continuous on $[0,1]$, \}

$$
\| f^{(r)}(\cdot) \|_p \leq 1, L_{ki}f(\cdot) = 0, i = 1, \ldots, r_k \}, \quad k = 1, 2,
$$

\( W_{8182}^{2r} \) \( L_p \) = \{ $f(x, y)$: \( \frac{\partial^{l+s}f(x, y)}{\partial x^l \partial y^s} (l, s \leq r) \) piecewise continuous on \( \Theta \), \}

$$
\left\| \frac{\partial^{2r}f(\cdot, \cdot)}{\partial x^r \partial y^r} \right\|_p \leq M, L_{1i}f(\cdot, y) \equiv 0, i = 1, \ldots, r_1; \quad L_{2j}f(x, \cdot) \equiv 0, j = 1, \ldots, r_2 \}.
$$

The quadrature formula

\begin{equation}
\int_0^1 f(x) \, dx = \sum_{k=1}^m A_k f(x_k) + r(f), \quad 0 \leq x_1 < \cdots < x_m \leq 1
\end{equation}
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is called optimal for the set \( H \) of functions \( f(x) \) if the coefficients \( A_k \) and knots \( x_k \) of the formula are chosen so that the quantity
\[
\sup_{f \in H} |r(f)|
\]
is minimal.

Designate
\[
A^{(m)}_p, \ldots, A^{(m)}_{pm}, x^{(m)}_p, \ldots, x^{(m)}_{pm}, r^{(m)}_p
\]
the coefficients, knots, and the value (3) of the optimal formula (2) for the sets \( W^{2r}_{g_1 \ell_p} \) and \( W^{2r}_{g_2 \ell_p} \), respectively. It is known [4] that \( r^{(m)}_p = O(m^{-r}) \), \( r^{(m)}_p = O(m^{-r}) \).

The formula
\[
\int_0^1 \int_0^1 f(x, y) \, dx \, dy = \sum_{k=1}^m \sum_{l=1}^m C_{kl} f(x_k, y_l) + R(f),
\]
(4)
\[
0 \leq x_1 < \ldots < x_m \leq 1, 0 \leq y_1 < \ldots < y_m \leq 1,
\]
is called the optimal formula for the set \( F \) of functions \( f(x, y) \) if its coefficients and knots are chosen so that the quantity
\[
R = \sup_{f \in F} |R(f)|
\]
has the least value.

It is shown in [3], [4] that the optimal formula (4) on the set \( W^{2r}_{g_1 g_2} \) has the coefficients \( C_{kl} = A_{2k}^{(m)} B_{2l}^{(m)} \), the knots \( x_k = x^{(m)}_{2k}, y_l = y^{(m)}_{2l} \), and the remainder \( R = O(m^{-r}) \).

For the case \( p \neq 2 \) the optimal formula (4) on the set \( W^{2r}_{g_1 g_2} \) has not yet been found.

2. The Optimal Cubature Formula. We will find an optimal formula of the form
\[
\int_0^1 \int_0^1 f(x, y) \, dx \, dy = \sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_k \int_0^1 f(x_k, y) \, dy + \sum_{j=1}^n \beta_j \int_0^1 f(x, y_j) \, dx,
\]
(5)
\[
+ \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \gamma_{kj} f(x_k, y_j) + E(f),
\]
\[
0 \leq x_1 < \ldots < x_n \leq 1, 0 \leq y_1 < \ldots < y_n \leq 1,
\]
for the set \( W^{2r}_{g_1 g_2} \). In other words, we will find the formula (5) with the least value of
\[
E = \sup_{f \in W^{2r}_{g_1 g_2} \ell_p} |E(f)|.
\]

THEOREM. The coefficients and knots
\[
\alpha_k = A_{pk}^{(n)}, \quad \beta_j = B_{pj}^{(n)}, \quad \gamma_{kj} = -A_{pk}^{(n)} B_{pj}^{(n)},
\]
(6)
\[
x_k = x^{(n)}_{pk}, \quad y_j = y^{(n)}_{pj}, \quad k, j = 1, \ldots, n,
\]
and the estimate
\[
E = M r^{(n)}_p r^{(n)}_{p_2}
\]
(7)
are the coefficients, knots, and estimate of the optimal formula (5) on the set \( W^{2r}_{g_1 g_2} \).
ON THE EVALUATION OF DOUBLE INTEGRALS

Proof. Let \( f(x, y) \in W^{2r}_{8182} L_p \). Then [4]

\[
f(x, y) = \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \frac{\partial^2 f(t, u)}{\partial x' \partial y'} \ g_1(x, t) g_2(y, u) \ dt \ du.
\]

Hence by (5)

\[
E(f) = \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \frac{\partial^2 f(t, u)}{\partial x' \partial y'} K(t, u) \ dt \ du,
\]

where

\[
K(t, u) = \varphi_1(t) \varphi_2(u) - \varphi_2(u) \sum_{k=1}^{n} \alpha_k g_1(x_k, t) - \varphi_1(t) \sum_{j=1}^{n} \beta_j g_2(y_j, u) - \sum_{k=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \gamma_{kj} g_1(x_k, t) g_2(y_j, u),
\]

\[
\varphi_l(v) = \int_0^1 g_l(x, v) \ dx, \quad l = 1, 2.
\]

Using Hölder's inequality, we obtain from (8) that

\[
|E(f)| \leq M \|K(\cdot, \cdot)\|_q.
\]

Since the function

\[
f_0(x, y) = \frac{M}{\|K(\cdot, \cdot)\|_q} \int_0^1 \int_0^1 |K(t, u)|^{q-1} \text{sgn} K(t, u) g_1(x, t) g_2(y, u) \ dt \ du
\]

belongs to the set \( W^{2r}_{8182} L_p \), it follows from (8) that \( E(f_0) = M \|K(\cdot, \cdot)\|_q \). Therefore we have from (9) \( E = M \|K(\cdot, \cdot)\|_q \).

By the result on "polynomials" of least deviation from zero [5], we have that

\[
\inf_{\{\alpha_k, \beta_j, \gamma_{kj}, x_k, y_j\}} \|K(\cdot, \cdot)\|_q
\]

\[
= \inf_{\{\alpha_k, \beta_j, x_k, y_j\}} \left\| \varphi_1(x) \varphi_2(y) - \varphi_2(y) \sum_{k=1}^{n} \alpha_k g_1(x_k, x) - \varphi_1(x) \sum_{j=1}^{n} \beta_j g_2(y_j, y) + \sum_{k=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \gamma_{kj} g_1(x_k, t) g_2(y_j, u) \right\|_q
\]

\[
= \inf_{\{\alpha_k, x_k\}} \left\| \varphi_1(\cdot) - \sum_{k=1}^{n} \alpha_k g_1(x_k, \cdot) \right\|_q \cdot \inf_{\{\beta_j, y_j\}} \left\| \varphi_2(\cdot) - \sum_{j=1}^{n} \beta_j g_2(y_j, \cdot) \right\|_q.
\]

As the equalities

\[
\inf_{\{\alpha_k, x_k\}} \left\| \varphi_1(\cdot) - \sum_{k=1}^{n} \alpha_k g_1(x_k, \cdot) \right\|_q = r_{p1}^{(n)}
\]

\[
\inf_{\{\beta_j, y_j\}} \left\| \varphi_2(\cdot) - \sum_{j=1}^{n} \beta_j g_2(y_j, \cdot) \right\|_q = r_{p2}^{(n)}
\]

hold and are achieved by the coefficients and knots (6) [4], it follows from (10) that the numbers (6) and (7) are the coefficients, knots, and estimate of the optimal formula (5) for the set \( W^{2r}_{8182} L_p \).
The theorem is proved.

Now we will obtain a cubature formula which requires less computational work than the optimal formula (4) with the same error estimate.

Let
\[
\sup_{0 \leq y \leq 1} \left\| \frac{\partial f(\cdot, y)}{\partial x^r} \right\|_p \leq M_1, \quad \sup_{0 \leq x \leq 1} \left\| \frac{\partial f(x, \cdot)}{\partial y^r} \right\|_p \leq M_2.
\]

Then
\[
M_1^{-1} f(x, y_p^{(n)}) \in W_{5, \bar{b}_2}^{2r} L_p, \quad M_2^{-1} f(x_p^{(n)}, y) \in W_{6, \bar{b}_2}^{2r} L_p.
\]

Applying optimal quadrature formulas for these sets to the integrals in (5), we obtain

\[
\int_0^1 f(x, y_p^{(n)}) \, dx = \sum_{k=1}^{n^2} A_{pk}^{(n^2)} f(x_p^{(n^2)}, y_p^{(n^2)}) + r_1(f),
\]

(11)
\[
|r_1(f)| \leq M_1 r_p^{(n^2)},
\]

and

\[
\int_0^1 f(x_p^{(n)}, y) \, dy = \sum_{j=1}^{n^2} B_{pj}^{(n^2)} f(x_p^{(n^2)}, y_p^{(n^2)}) + r_2(f),
\]

(12)
\[
|r_2(f)| \leq M_2 r_p^{(n^2)}.
\]

Designating

\[
a_n = \left| A_{p1}^{(n)} \right| + \cdots + \left| A_{pn}^{(n)} \right|, \quad b_n = \left| B_{p1}^{(n)} \right| + \cdots + \left| B_{pn}^{(n)} \right|
\]

and substituting (11) and (12) into the optimal formula (5) for the set \(W_{5, \bar{b}_2}^{2r} L_p\), we obtain the following cubature formula

\[
\int_0^1 \int_0^1 f(x, y) \, dx \, dy = \sum_{k=1}^{n^2} \sum_{j=1}^{n^2} A_{pk}^{(n^2)} B_{pj}^{(n^2)} f(x_p^{(n^2)}, y_p^{(n^2)})
\]

(13)
\[
+ \sum_{j=1}^{n^2} \sum_{k=1}^{n^2} B_{pj}^{(n^2)} A_{pk}^{(n^2)} f(x_p^{(n^2)}, y_p^{(n^2)})
\]

\[
- \sum_{k=1}^{n^2} \sum_{j=1}^{n^2} A_{pk}^{(n^2)} B_{pj}^{(n^2)} f(x_p^{(n^2)}, y_p^{(n^2)}) + E_1(f),
\]

where

\[
|E_1(f)| \leq a_n M_2 r_p^{(n^2)} + b_n M_1 r_p^{(n^2)} + M_2 r_p^{(n^2)}.
\]

It follows from the convergence of optimal formulas (2) that \(a_n\) and \(b_n\) are bounded as \(n \to \infty\). Hence it follows from (14) that

\[
|E_1(f)| = O(n^{-2r}).
\]

The formula (13) has a remarkable advantage over the optimal formula (4). The optimal formula (4) with \(m = n^2\) has the error estimate \(O(n^{-2r})\), and it uses \(n^4\) point values of \(f(x, y)\), while the formula (13) has the same error estimate \(O(n^{-2r})\) but uses only \(2n^3 + n^2\) point values of the function \(f(x, y)\).
3. Example. We compare the evaluation of the integral

$$I = \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \frac{(x-x^2)(y-y^2)}{0 \cdot 2 + xy} \, dx \, dy = 0.0701598 \ldots$$

with the optimal formula (4) with $m = n^2$ and with the formula (13) obtained from the optimal formula (5). Both formulas are taken for the set $W_{8/8/2}^{2r} L_2, r = 2$.

As the integrand $f(x, y)$ satisfies the conditions

$$f(0, y) \equiv f(1, y) \equiv f(x, 0) \equiv f(x, 1) \equiv 0,$$

we can take the functions $g_1(x, t) \equiv g_2(x, t)$ as Green's functions for the problem

$$y'' = 0, \quad y(0) = y(1) = 0.$$

Then by [4] we have

$$A^{(m)}_{2k} = B^{(m)}_{2k} = 2 \varepsilon, \quad k = 2, \ldots, m - 1,$$

$$A^{(m)}_{21} = B^{(m)}_{21} = A^{(m)}_2 = B^{(m)}_2 = \left(1 + 1.25 \sqrt{2/3} \right) \varepsilon,$$

$$x^{(m)}_{2k} = y^{(m)}_{2k} = 2 \varepsilon \left(\sqrt{2/3} + k - 1\right), \quad k = 1, \ldots, m,$$

$$\varepsilon = 0.5 \left(2 \sqrt{2/3} + m - 1\right)^{-1}.$$

Let $I_n$ be an approximate value of $I$, obtained by the optimal formula (4) with $k_n = n^4$ knots and let $I'_n$ be the approximate value obtained by formula (13) with $q_n = 2n^3 + n^2$ knots.

We obtain for $n = 4, 7, 9$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$I'_n$</th>
<th>$I_n$</th>
<th>$q_n$</th>
<th>$k_n$</th>
<th>$n$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0701302</td>
<td>0.0701319</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0701587</td>
<td>0.0701588</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>2401</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0701596</td>
<td>0.0701596</td>
<td>1539</td>
<td>6561</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The superiority of formula (13) over the optimal formula (4) is obvious.
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