

The Wave Equation III

MA 436

Kurt Bryan

1 Review

We've figured out how to solve the wave equation

$$\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial t^2} - c^2 \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2} = 0 \quad (1)$$

for a function $u(x, t)$ for $-\infty < x < \infty$ and $t > 0$ with initial conditions

$$u(x, 0) = f(x), \quad (2)$$

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}(x, 0) = g(x) \quad (3)$$

and showed that the problem is well-posed. The solution is in fact

$$u(x, t) = \frac{1}{2} (f(x - ct) + f(x + ct)) + \frac{1}{2c} \int_{x-ct}^{x+ct} g(z) dz. \quad (4)$$

Solution on a Half-Space

It's not hard to modify the solution procedure to solve the wave equation (1) on the half-line $x > 0$; think of a string with one end tied at $x = 0$. In fact, we need one additional condition: the value of u (the vertical displacement) at $x = 0$. For simplicity we'll use $u(0, t) = 0$ for all t . Of course f and g are given only for $x \geq 0$. For consistency we should assume that $f(0) = 0$ and $g(0) = 0$ (think physically: why?)

To solve the half-line problem, we extend f as an odd function to the whole real line, as

$$\tilde{f}(x) = \begin{cases} f(x), & x \geq 0 \\ -f(-x), & x < 0 \end{cases}$$

Note that \tilde{f} is continuous if f is continuous. Let \tilde{g} denote the similar odd extension of g . Let $\tilde{u}(x, t)$ denote the solution to the wave equation on the whole real line with initial data \tilde{f} and \tilde{g} , so that

$$\tilde{u}(x, t) = \frac{1}{2} (\tilde{f}(x - ct) + \tilde{f}(x + ct)) + \frac{1}{2c} \int_{x-ct}^{x+ct} \tilde{g}(z) dz. \quad (5)$$

Now take $u(x, t) = \tilde{u}(x, t)$ for $x \geq 0$. The function u obviously satisfies the wave equation, since \tilde{u} also does, and u has the right initial conditions. The only question is whether $u(0, t) = 0$ for all $t > 0$ (equivalently, $\tilde{u}(0, t) = 0$). From equation (5) we have

$$\tilde{u}(0, t) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\tilde{f}(-ct) + \tilde{f}(ct) \right) + \frac{1}{2c} \int_{-ct}^{ct} \tilde{g}(z) dz.$$

But $\tilde{f}(-ct) = -\tilde{f}(ct)$, so those terms cancel. Also, \tilde{g} is odd, so the integral is zero; it works!

There's more to say, though. Here's where a picture is helpful:

For a point (x_0, t_0) which lies below the line $x = ct$ (i.e., $x_0 > ct_0$), as illustrated on the left, the function \tilde{u} is synthesized from initial data from $x = x_0 - ct_0$ to $x = x_0 + ct_0$, and here $f = \tilde{f}$ and $g = \tilde{g}$. For such points we can use the standard D'Alembert formula (4), without reference to any odd extensions of f and g . This is merely another consequences of causality: such points lie too far from the endpoint $x = 0$ to be affected by the boundary by time $t = t_0$.

On the other hand, for a point (x_0, t_0) which lies above the line $x = ct$ (so $x_0 < ct_0$) we really do need to use (5). But that formula can be massaged into a slightly nicer form that also makes no reference to odd extensions. Refer to the above picture on the right: The integral of \tilde{g} from $x = x_0 - ct_0$ to $x = x_0 + ct_0$ splits into two integrals, one from $x = x_0 - ct_0$ to $x = 0$, the other from $x = 0$ to $x = x_0 + ct_0$. We write $\tilde{u}(x_0, t_0)$ as

$$u(x_0, t_0) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\tilde{f}(x_0 - ct_0) + \tilde{f}(x_0 + ct_0) \right) + \frac{1}{2c} \int_{x_0 - ct_0}^0 \tilde{g}(z) dz + \frac{1}{2c} \int_0^{x_0 + ct_0} \tilde{g}(z) dz$$

But $\tilde{f}(x_0 + ct_0) = f(x_0 + ct_0)$, and between $x = 0$ and $x = x_0 + ct_0$ in the

last integral above we have $\tilde{g} = g$. We can thus write

$$u(x_0, t_0) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\tilde{f}(x_0 - ct_0) + f(x_0 + ct_0) \right) + \frac{1}{2c} \int_{x_0 - ct_0}^0 \tilde{g}(z) dz + \frac{1}{2c} \int_0^{x_0 + ct_0} g(z) dz$$

Now make use of the fact that $\tilde{f}(z) = -f(-z)$ for $z < 0$ to write $\tilde{f}(x_0 - ct_0) = -f(ct_0 - x_0)$. Also, in the range $x_0 - ct_0 \leq z < 0$ we have $\tilde{g}(z) = -g(-z)$. We now have

$$u(x_0, t_0) = \frac{1}{2} (-f(ct_0 - x_0) + f(x_0 + ct_0)) - \frac{1}{2c} \int_{x_0 - ct_0}^0 g(-z) dz + \frac{1}{2c} \int_0^{x_0 + ct_0} g(z) dz$$

One final change of variables in the first integral on the right above (substitute $-z \rightarrow z$, so $dz \Rightarrow -dz$) and lumping the resulting integral together gives

$$u(x, t) = \frac{1}{2} (f(ct + x) - f(ct - x)) + \frac{1}{2c} \int_{ct-x}^{ct+x} g(z) dz \quad (6)$$

where I also dropped the subscripts on the variables. This gives the solution for $x < ct$.

Problem 1: Replace the boundary condition $u(0, t) = 0$ by the so-called *Neumann condition* $\frac{\partial u}{\partial x}(0, t) = 0$ for all t . Find a formula for the solution to the wave equation with the Neumann condition on the half-line analogous to (6) for $x < ct$. Hint: Make EVEN extensions of f and g to the whole line.

Solution on Bounded Intervals

The above trick for the half-line can also be used to write down the solution to the wave equation on a bounded interval. We won't do this in great detail, for there are better ways to do this problem, but it's kind of fun to think about (for a few minutes!) For simplicity take the interval to be $(0, 1)$. Suppose we want a solution to the wave equation for $0 < x < 1$ and $t > 0$ with initial data f and g , both defined for $0 \leq x \leq 1$, and we also want $u(0, t) = u(1, t) = 0$ at all times (the string is tied at both ends).

To solve this we can extend f and g periodically to the whole real line, as odd functions. Specifically, set $\tilde{f}(x) = -f(-x)$ for $-1 < x < 0$, and then extend \tilde{f} to the whole real line as a function with period 2. Here's a crude

picture:

Do the same for g to obtain \tilde{g} . The original D'Alembert formula (4) with $f = \tilde{f}, g = \tilde{g}$ yields the solution! One could even try to manipulate the formula to get it in terms of f and g alone, with no reference to the periodic extensions \tilde{f} and \tilde{g} , but this turns out to be a bit of mess. You end up with infinitely many different formulas, depending on the point (x, t) ! In any case, you ought to convince yourself (draw a picture) that $u(0, t) = u(1, t)$ at all times. It's very similar to the half-line case. So we've proved that the wave equation has a solution on a bounded interval!

Problem 2: Draw a picture and explain why $u(0, t) = u(1, t)$.