ÖAW Austrian Academy of Sciences

Doctoral Program
Computational Mathematics
Numerical Analysis and Symbolic Computation

JKU JOHANNES KEPLER UNIVERSITY LINZ

A Robust Preconditioner for Distributed Optimal Control for Stokes Flow with Control Constraints

Markus Kollmann Walter Zulehner

DK-Report No. 2012-02 01 2012

A–4040 LINZ, ALTENBERGERSTRASSE 69, AUSTRIA

Supported by

Austrian Science Fund (FWF) Upper Austria

FWF Der Wissenschaftsfonds.

LAND OBERÖSTERREICH

DK sponsors:

- **Johannes Kepler University Linz** (JKU)
- **Austrian Science Fund** (FWF)
- **Upper Austria**

A Robust Preconditioner for Distributed Optimal Control for Stokes Flow with Control Constraints

Markus Kollmann and Walter Zulehner

Abstract This work is devoted to the construction and analysis of robust solution techniques for the distributed optimal control problem for the Stokes equations with inequality constraints on the control. There the first order system of necessary and sufficient optimality conditions is nonlinear. A primal-dual active set method is applied in order to linearize the system. In every step a linear saddle point system has to be solved. For this system, we analyze a block-diagonal preconditioner that is robust with respect to the discretization parameter as well as the active set.

1 Introduction

Velocity tracking plays an important role in fluid mechanics. There the main focus is to steer the velocity to a desired state (target velocity) by controlling it by some force, which is typically restricted by inequality constraints. The corresponding nonlinear optimality system can be solved by a primal-dual active set method, which is equivalent to a semi-smooth Newton method (cf. [8]). The resulting linear system in each Newton step is a parameter dependent saddle point problem. In this paper we discuss the preconditioned MinRes method for solving these linear problems robustly with respect to the discretization parameter and the involved active set.

A similar approach is presented in [7] for a distributed optimal control of elliptic equations with various types of inequality constraints, where a preconditioner is

Markus Kollmann
Doctoral Program Computational Mathematics, Johannes Kepler University, Altenbergerstr. 69, A-4040 Linz, Austria, e-mail: markus.kollmann@dk-compmath.jku.at

Walter Zulehner
Institute of Computational Mathematics, Johannes Kepler University, Altenbergerstr. 69, A-4040 Linz, Austria, e-mail: zulehner@numa.uni-linz.ac.at

constructed based on the mapping properties of the involved operators in Sobolev spaces equipped with the standard norms.

Our construction of a preconditioner and the analysis are based on a result in [14], where a block-diagonal preconditioner for the distributed optimal control problem for the Stokes equations without constraints is presented, which is robust with respect to the discretization parameter and the model parameter. This preconditioner is based on the mapping properties of the involved operators in Sobolev spaces equipped with non-standard norms. Here we use this preconditioner also in the case of constrained optimization and show its robustness with respect to the discretization parameter and the involved active set.

The paper is organized as follows: In Sect. 2 we introduce the velocity tracking problem, discretize it by a finite element method and derive the resulting linearized system. Section 3 deals with the analysis of our block-diagonal preconditioner used in a MinRes method for the linear system. In Sect. 4 we present some numerical experiments. The paper ends with a few concluding remarks.

2 The Optimal Control Problem

As a model problem, we consider the following velocity tracking problem for Stokes flow with distributed control: Find the velocity $\mathbf{u} \in H_0^1(\Omega)^d$, the pressure $p \in L_0^2(\Omega) := \left\{ q \in L^2(\Omega) : \int_\Omega q\, dx = 0 \right\}$, and the force $\mathbf{f} \in L^2(\Omega)^d$ that minimizes the cost functional

$$J(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{f}) = \frac{1}{2}||\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{u_d}||^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + \frac{\alpha}{2}||\mathbf{f}||^2_{L^2(\Omega)}\,, \tag{1}$$

subject to the state equations

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta\mathbf{u} + \nabla p &= \mathbf{f} \quad \text{in } \Omega\,, \quad \operatorname{div}\mathbf{u} = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega\,, \\ \mathbf{u} &= \mathbf{0} \quad \text{on } \Gamma\,, \quad \mathbf{f_a} \le \mathbf{f} \le \mathbf{f_b} \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega\,. \end{aligned}$$

Here Ω is an open and bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^d$ ($d \in \{1,2,3\}$) with Lipschitz-continuous boundary Γ, $\mathbf{u}_d \in L^2(\Omega)^d$ is the desired velocity, $\alpha > 0$ is a cost parameter and $\mathbf{f_a}, \mathbf{f_b} \in L^2(\Omega)^d$ are the lower and upper bounds for the control variable $\mathbf{f}$, respectively.

In order to solve this optimal control problem, we consider the first-discretize-then-optimize strategy. As an example of a discretization method we discuss the finite element method using the Taylor-Hood element on a simplicial subdivision of Ω consisting of continuous and piecewise quadratic functions for the velocity and the force and continuous and piecewise linear functions for the pressure.

The discrete counterpart of (1) is:

$$\text{Minimize} \quad \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{u_h}-\mathbf{u_{d_h}})^T\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{u_h}-\mathbf{u_{d_h}}) + \frac{\alpha}{2}\mathbf{f_h}^T\mathbf{M}\mathbf{f_h}\,, \tag{2}$$

subject to the state equations

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{K}\mathbf{u_h} - \mathbf{D}^T\mathbf{p_h} &= \mathbf{M}\mathbf{f_h}\,, \\ -\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u_h} &= \mathbf{0}\,, \\ \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{a_h}} \le \mathbf{f_h} &\le \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{b_h}}\,, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{M}$ denotes the mass matrix representing the $L^2(\Omega)^d$ scalar product, $\mathbf{K}$ denotes the stiffness matrix representing the vector Laplace operator on the finite element space, $\mathbf{D}$ denotes the divergence matrix representing the divergence operator on the involved finite element spaces and $\mathbf{u_h}$, $\mathbf{f_h}$ and $\mathbf{p_h}$ are the coordinate vectors of $\mathbf{u}$, $\mathbf{f}$ and p w.r.t. the nodal basis, respectively.

The first order system of necessary and sufficient optimality conditions of (2) can be expressed as follows (cf. [5] for the continuous case):

$$\left.\begin{aligned} \mathbf{M}\mathbf{u_h} + \mathbf{K}\hat{\mathbf{u}}_\mathbf{h} - \mathbf{D}^T\hat{\mathbf{p}}_\mathbf{h} &= \mathbf{M}\mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{d_h}}\,, \\ -\mathbf{D}\hat{\mathbf{u}}_\mathbf{h} &= \mathbf{0}\,, \\ \alpha\mathbf{M}\mathbf{f_h} - \mathbf{M}\hat{\mathbf{u}}_\mathbf{h} + \mathbf{z_h} &= \mathbf{0}\,, \\ \mathbf{K}\mathbf{u_h} - \mathbf{D}^T\mathbf{p_h} - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{f_h} &= \mathbf{0}\,, \\ -\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u_h} &= \mathbf{0}\,, \\ \mathbf{z_h} - \max\left\{\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z_h} + c(\mathbf{f_h} - \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{b_h}})\right\} - \min\left\{\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z_h} - c(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{a_h}} - \mathbf{f_h})\right\} &= \mathbf{0}\,, \end{aligned}\right\} \tag{3}$$

for any $c > 0$ with Lagrange multipliers $\hat{\mathbf{u}}_\mathbf{h}$, $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_\mathbf{h}$ and $\mathbf{z_h}$.

In order to solve this system, we propose a primal-dual active set method as introduced in [1]. The strategy proceeds as follows: Given the k-th iterate $(\mathbf{u_{h,k}}, \mathbf{p_{h,k}}, \mathbf{f_{h,k}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_\mathbf{h,k}, \hat{\mathbf{p}}_\mathbf{h,k}, \mathbf{z_{h,k}})$, the active sets are determined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathscr{A}_k^+ &= \left\{ i : z_{h,k}^i + c(f_{h,k}^i - f_{b_h}^i) > 0 \right\}\,, \\ \mathscr{A}_k^- &= \left\{ i : z_{h,k}^i - c(f_{a_h}^i - f_{h,k}^i) < 0 \right\}\,, \end{aligned}$$

where $z_{h,k}^i$ is the i-th component of $\mathbf{z_{h,k}}$ and the inactive set $\mathscr{I}_k$ is the complement of $\mathscr{A}_k^+ \cup \mathscr{A}_k^-$ in the set of all indices. One step of the primal-dual active set method for the solution of (3), given in terms of the new iterate, reads as follows:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{M} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{K} & -\mathbf{D}^T & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & -\mathbf{D} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \alpha\mathbf{M} & -\mathbf{M} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I} \\ \mathbf{K} & -\mathbf{D}^T & -\mathbf{M} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ -\mathbf{D} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & c\chi_{\mathscr{A}_\mathbf{k}} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \chi_{\mathscr{I}_\mathbf{k}} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{u_{h,k+1}} \\ \mathbf{p_{h,k+1}} \\ \mathbf{f_{h,k+1}} \\ \hat{\mathbf{u}}_\mathbf{h,k+1} \\ \hat{\mathbf{p}}_\mathbf{h,k+1} \\ \mathbf{z_{h,k+1}} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{M}\mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{d_h}} \\ \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} \\ c(\chi_{\mathscr{A}_\mathbf{k}^+}\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{b_h}} + \chi_{\mathscr{A}_\mathbf{k}^-}\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{a_h}}) \end{pmatrix}\,, \tag{4}$$

where $\chi_{\mathscr{A}_\mathbf{k}^+}$, $\chi_{\mathscr{A}_\mathbf{k}^-}$ and $\chi_{\mathscr{A}_\mathbf{k}}$ are diagonal 0-1-matrices representing the characteristic functions of $\mathscr{A}_k^+$, $\mathscr{A}_k^-$ and $\mathscr{A}_k = \mathscr{A}_k^+ \cup \mathscr{A}_k^-$, respectively. Since we focus here on the solution of individual steps, we drop the iteration index from now on.

By eliminating $\mathbf{f_h}$ and $\mathbf{z_h}$ from the third and the last line the resulting system $\mathscr{K} x = b$ reads:

$$\begin{pmatrix} A & B^T \\ B & -C \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} w_h \\ \hat{w}_h \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} e_h \\ g_h \end{pmatrix} , \tag{5}$$

with

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{M} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix} , \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{K} & -\mathbf{D}^T \\ -\mathbf{D} & \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix} = B^T , \quad C = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha^{-1}\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{C}_\mathscr{A}} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix} ,$$
$$e_h = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{M}\mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{d_h}} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix} , \quad g_h = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{h_1}} \end{pmatrix} , \quad w_h = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{u_h} \\ \mathbf{p_h} \end{pmatrix} , \quad \hat{w}_h = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\mathbf{u}}_\mathbf{h} \\ \hat{\mathbf{p}}_\mathbf{h} \end{pmatrix} ,$$

where

$$\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{C}_\mathscr{A}} = \mathbf{M} - \mathbf{P}_\mathscr{A}{}^T \left(\mathbf{P}_\mathscr{A}\mathbf{M}^{-1}\mathbf{P}_\mathscr{A}{}^T\right)^{-1} \mathbf{P}_\mathscr{A} ,$$
$$\mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{h_1}} = \mathbf{P}_\mathscr{A}{}^T \left(\mathbf{P}_\mathscr{A}\mathbf{M}^{-1}\mathbf{P}_\mathscr{A}{}^T\right)^{-1} \left(\mathbf{P}_{\mathscr{A}^+}\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{b_h}} + \mathbf{P}_{\mathscr{A}^-}\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{a_h}}\right) ,$$

and $\mathbf{P}_\mathscr{A}$ is a rectangular matrix consisting of those rows of $\chi_\mathscr{A}$ which belong to the active indices, similar for $\mathbf{P}_{\mathscr{A}^\pm}$.

The system matrix $\mathscr{K}$ is symmetric and indefinite. For solving the corresponding linear system we propose a MinRes method, see, e.g., [13]. Without preconditioning the convergence rate would deteriorate with respect to the discretization parameter h and the cost parameter α. Therefore, preconditioning is an important issue.

3 A Robust Preconditioning Technique

In this section, we discuss a preconditioning strategy for the saddle point system (5). Due to the symmetry and coercivity properties of the underlying operators the blocks fulfill the following properties: $\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{K}^T > 0$, $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{M}^T > 0$ and $\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{C}_\mathscr{A}} = \mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{C}_\mathscr{A}}{}^T \geq 0$. For our choice of the finite element functions, $\mathbf{D}$ is of full rank.

In [14] a block-diagonal preconditioner is constructed for the distributed optimal control problem of the Stokes equations without constraints on the control. Its robustness w.r.t. h and α is shown for this case, which corresponds to the setting $\mathscr{A} = \emptyset$.

This preconditioner reads as follows:

$$\mathscr{P} = \text{ diag } (P_1, P_2) , \tag{6}$$

where $P_1 = \text{ diag } \left(\mathbf{P}, \alpha\mathbf{D}\mathbf{P}^{-1}\mathbf{D}^T\right)$ and $P_2 = \alpha^{-1}P_1$ with $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{M} + \alpha^{1/2}\mathbf{K}$. The idea is now to use this preconditioner also in our case. The next theorem contains the main result of this paper, where we use the following notation: For any symmetric

and positive (semi-) definite matrix Q we denote by $\|\cdot\|_Q$ the energy (semi-) norm induced by Q.

Theorem 1. *The system matrix $\mathscr{K}$ of (5) satisfies:*

$$\underline{c}\|x\|_{\mathscr{P}} \leq \sup_{y\neq 0} \frac{y^T \mathscr{K} x}{\|y\|_{\mathscr{P}}} \leq \overline{c}\|x\|_{\mathscr{P}} \quad \forall x\,,$$

with constants $\underline{c}$, $\overline{c}$ independent of the discretization parameter h and the active set $\mathscr{A}$.

Proof. Due to Theorem 2.6 from [14], it is necessary and sufficient to prove

$$\underline{c}_1 \|w_h\|_{P_1}^2 \leq \|w_h\|_A^2 + \sup_{\hat{r}_h\neq 0} \frac{\left(\hat{r}_h^T B w_h\right)^2}{\|\hat{r}_h\|_{P_2}^2} \leq \overline{c}_1 \|w_h\|_{P_1}^2\,, \tag{7}$$

$$\underline{c}_2 \|\hat{w}_h\|_{P_2}^2 \leq \|\hat{w}_h\|_C^2 + \sup_{r_h\neq 0} \frac{\left(r_h^T B \hat{w}_h\right)^2}{\|r_h\|_{P_1}^2} \leq \overline{c}_2 \|\hat{w}_h\|_{P_2}^2\,, \tag{8}$$

with $r_h = \begin{pmatrix}\mathbf{v_h}\\ \mathbf{q_h}\end{pmatrix}$, $\hat{r}_h = \begin{pmatrix}\hat{\mathbf{v}}_\mathbf{h}\\ \hat{\mathbf{q}}_\mathbf{h}\end{pmatrix}$ for constants $\underline{c}_1$, $\overline{c}_1$, $\underline{c}_2$ and $\overline{c}_2$ independent of the discretization parameter h and the active set $\mathscr{A}$. For proving (7), we first show

$$\underline{c}_3 \|w_h\|_{P_1} \leq \sup_{\hat{r}_h\neq 0} \frac{\hat{r}_h^T B w_h}{\|\hat{r}_h\|_{P_1}} \leq \overline{c}_3 \|w_h\|_{P_1}\,, \tag{9}$$

for constants $\underline{c}_3$ and $\overline{c}_3$ independent of the discretization parameter h and the active set $\mathscr{A}$. In order to prove (9) we have to verify the conditions of the Theorem of Brezzi [3]:

The boundedness of the bilinear forms, say a and b, associated with $\mathbf{K}$ and $\mathbf{D}$ is trivial. Using Friedrichs inequality with constant c_F we can show the coercivity of a:

$$a(\mathbf{u_h},\mathbf{u_h}) = \|\mathbf{u_h}\|_\mathbf{K}^2 \geq \frac{1}{2c_F}\|\mathbf{u_h}\|_\mathbf{M}^2 + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\alpha}}\sqrt{\alpha}\|\mathbf{u_h}\|_\mathbf{K}^2 \geq \min\left\{\frac{1}{2c_F}, \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\alpha}}\right\}\|\mathbf{u_h}\|_\mathbf{P}^2\,.$$

Since

$$\sup_{\hat{\mathbf{v}}_\mathbf{h}\neq\mathbf{0}} \frac{b(\hat{\mathbf{v}}_\mathbf{h},\mathbf{p_h})}{\|\hat{\mathbf{v}}_\mathbf{h}\|_\mathbf{P}} = \sup_{\hat{\mathbf{v}}_\mathbf{h}\neq\mathbf{0}} \frac{\mathbf{p_h}^T\mathbf{D}\hat{\mathbf{v}}_\mathbf{h}}{\|\hat{\mathbf{v}}_\mathbf{h}\|_\mathbf{P}} = \|\mathbf{p_h}\|_{\mathbf{D}\mathbf{P}^{-1}\mathbf{D}^T} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}}\|\mathbf{p_h}\|_{\alpha\mathbf{D}\mathbf{P}^{-1}\mathbf{D}^T}\,,$$

the inf-sup condition of b is satisfied. Hence (9) follows.

From (9) and the fact that $P_2 = \alpha^{-1}P_1$ we get

$$\sqrt{\alpha}\underline{c}_3 \|w_h\|_{P_1} \leq \sup_{\hat{r}_h\neq 0} \frac{\hat{r}_h^T B w_h}{\|\hat{r}_h\|_{P_2}} \leq \sqrt{\alpha}\overline{c}_3 \|w_h\|_{P_1}\,. \tag{10}$$

Furthermore we have

$$0 \leq \|w_h\|_A^2 = \|\mathbf{u_h}\|_{\mathbf{M}}^2 \leq \|w_h\|_{P_1}^2 \ . \tag{11}$$

Therefore, combining (10) with (11) yields (7). Equation (8) can be shown analogously. □

As a consequence of Theorem 1 we have:

$$\kappa(\mathscr{P}^{-1}\mathscr{K}) := \|\mathscr{P}^{-1}\mathscr{K}\|_{\mathscr{P}}\|\mathscr{K}^{-1}\mathscr{P}\|_{\mathscr{P}} \leq \frac{\overline{c}}{\underline{c}}\,, \tag{12}$$

i.e., the condition number of the preconditioned system is bounded independently of h and $\mathscr{A}$. Therefore, the number of iterations of the preconditioned MinRes method can be bounded independently of h and $\mathscr{A}$ (see e.g. [6]).

Remark 1. The result of Theorem 1 can be shown not only on the discrete level but also on the continuous level using the corresponding non-standard norms in $H_0^1(\Omega) \times L_0^2(\Omega)$ for $\mathbf{u}$ and p as well as for the Lagrange multipliers $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$ and $\hat{p}$.

Remark 2. Using the standard norms in $H_0^1(\Omega) \times L_0^2(\Omega)$, as it is done in [7] for the elliptic case, leads to the preconditioner:

$$\mathscr{P}_s = \text{ diag } (\mathbf{K}, \mathbf{M_p}, \mathbf{K}, \mathbf{M_p}) \ , \tag{13}$$

where $\mathbf{M_p}$ denotes the mass matrix for the pressure element. In this case, one can show a similar result as in Theorem 1.

Remark 3. If we consider the distributed optimal control problem for the Stokes equations with different observation and control domains Ω_1 and Ω_2, we end up with the following linear system:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{M_1} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{K} & -\mathbf{D}^T \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & -\mathbf{D} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{K} & -\mathbf{D}^T & -\alpha^{-1}\mathbf{M_2} & \mathbf{0} \\ -\mathbf{D} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{u_h} \\ \mathbf{p_h} \\ \hat{\mathbf{u}}_\mathbf{h} \\ \hat{\mathbf{p}}_\mathbf{h} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{M}\mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{d_h}} \\ \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix} \ ,$$

where $\mathbf{M_1}$ and $\mathbf{M_2}$ are the mass matrices on Ω_1 and Ω_2, respectively. With the preconditioner $\mathscr{P}$ from above, one can show a similar result as in Theorem 1 with robustness w.r.t. h, Ω_1 and Ω_2.

4 Numerical Experiments

The numerical experiments are carried out on the unit square domain $\Omega = (0,1) \times (0,1) \subset \mathbb{R}^2$. The initial mesh contains four triangles obtained by connecting the two diagonals. The final mesh was constructed by applying k uniform refinement steps to the initial mesh, leading to a meshsize $h = 2^{-k}$. For constructing a practically realizable preconditioner we proceed as follows: First we replace the matrix $\mathbf{D}\left(\mathbf{M} + \alpha^{1/2}\mathbf{K}\right)^{-1}\mathbf{D}^T$ by $\left(\alpha^{1/2}\mathbf{M_p}^{-1} + \mathbf{K_p}^{-1}\right)^{-1}$ as proposed in [4], where $\mathbf{K_p}$

denotes the stiffness matrix for the pressure element. Then the application of the preconditioner would require the multiplication of a vector from the left by the inverse of the matrices $\mathbf{M}+\alpha^{1/2}\mathbf{K}$, $\mathbf{M_p}$ and $\mathbf{K_p}$. These actions are replaced by one step of a V-cycle iteration for $\mathbf{M}+\alpha^{1/2}\mathbf{K}$ and $\mathbf{K_p}$ and by one step of a symmetric Gauss-Seidel iteration for $\mathbf{M_p}$. The V-cycle is done with one step of a symmetric Gauss-Seidel iteration for the pre-smoothing process and for the post-smoothing process. The resulting realizable preconditioner is spectrally equivalent to the theoretical preconditioner according to the analysis in [2, 12, 9, 11, 10].

We demonstrate the efficiency of our solver with two different prescribed active sets.

As a first test case, the active set $\mathscr{A}$ is chosen as the set of all indices of those nodes which lie in the upper half of the computational domain. Table 1 shows the condition number of the preconditioned system matrix with preconditioner $\mathscr{P}$ for various values of h and α, where k denotes the number of refinements, N is the total number of degrees of freedom of the discretized optimality system (5). In the

Table 1 Condition numbers

k	N	α							
		10^{-7}	10^{-6}	10^{-5}	10^{-4}	10^{-3}	10^{-2}	10^{-1}	1
4	9 030	>500	70.9	13.92	7.49	8.12	8.68	9.2	9.53
5	36 486	>500	74	14.16	8.25	8.81	9.3	9.72	9.99
6	146 694	>500	79	14.63	8.87	9.46	9.92	10.16	10.34
7	588 294	>500	83	15.21	9.06	9.79	10.25	10.47	10.66

second test case, the active set $\mathscr{A}$ is chosen as a randomly distributed set, having the same cardinality as in the first test case. Table 2 shows the condition number of the preconditioned system matrix with preconditioner $\mathscr{P}$.

Table 2 Condition numbers

k	N	α			
		10^{-12}	10^{-8}	10^{-4}	1
4	9 030	>500	7.34	7.41	9.52
5	36 486	>500	4.95	8.21	9.98
6	146 694	133	6.13	8.88	10.34
7	588 294	16.65	6.71	9.12	10.58

Additional numerical experiments using the preconditioner $\mathscr{P}_s$ showed that the preconditioner $\mathscr{P}$ has a better performance than the standard one, e.g., while the preconditioner $\mathscr{P}_s$ behaves reasonably only for $\alpha \geq 10^{-2}$, the preconditioner $\mathscr{P}$ behaves reasonably as long as $\alpha \geq 10^{-5}$.

5 Concluding Remarks

In order to develop a robust solver for the linear system (5) we used the block-diagonal preconditioning technique introduced in [14]. The preconditioner constructed there was reused for the control constrained distributed optimal control problem for the Stokes equations and robustness w.r.t. the discretization parameter as well as the active set was shown. Even though the preconditioner is not robust w.r.t. α, the numerical experiments show a good performance of this preconditioner as long as α is not extremely small.

Acknowledgements The research was funded by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF): W1214-N15, project DK12.

References

1. M. Bergounioux, K. Ito, and K. Kunisch. Primal-dual strategy for constrained optimal control problems. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 37(4):1176–1194 (electronic), 1999.
2. J. H. Bramble and J. E. Pasciak. Iterative techniques for time dependent Stokes problems. *Comput. Math. Appl.*, 33(1-2):13–30, 1997. Approximation theory and applications.
3. F. Brezzi. On the existence, uniqueness and approximation of saddle-point problems arising from Lagrangian multipliers. *Rev. Française Automat. Informat. Recherche Opérationnelle Sér. Rouge*, 8(R-2):129–151, 1974.
4. J. Cahouet and J.-P. Chabard. Some fast 3D finite element solvers for the generalized Stokes problem. *Internat. J. Numer. Methods Fluids*, 8(8):869–895, 1988.
5. J. C. De Los Reyes. Primal-dual active set method for control constrained optimal control of the Stokes equations. *Optim. Methods Softw.*, 21(2):267–293, 2006.
6. A. Greenbaum. *Iterative methods for solving linear systems*, volume 17 of *Frontiers in Applied Mathematics*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 1997.
7. R. Herzog and E. Sachs. Preconditioned conjugate gradient method for optimal control problems with control and state constraints. *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, 31(5):2291–2317, 2010.
8. M. Hintermüller, K. Ito, and K. Kunisch. The primal-dual active set strategy as a semismooth Newton method. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 13(3):865–888 (electronic) (2003), 2002.
9. K.-A. Mardal and R. Winther. Uniform preconditioners for the time dependent Stokes problem. *Numer. Math.*, 98(2):305–327, 2004.
10. K.-A. Mardal and R. Winther. Uniform preconditioners for the time dependent Stokes problem. *Numer. Math.*, 103(1):171–172, 2006.
11. M. A. Olshanskii, J. Peters, and A. Reusken. Uniform preconditioners for a parameter dependent saddle point problem with application to generalized Stokes interface equations. *Numer. Math.*, 105(1):159–191, 2006.
12. M. A. Olshanskii and A. Reusken. On the convergence of a multigrid method for linear reaction-diffusion problems. *Computing*, 65(3):193–202, 2000.
13. C. C. Paige and M. A. Saunders. Solutions of sparse indefinite systems of linear equations. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 12(4):617–629, 1975.
14. W. Zulehner. Non-standard Norms and Robust Estimates for Saddle Point Problems. *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, 32(2):536–560, 2011.

Technical Reports of the Doctoral Program "Computational Mathematics"

2012

2012-01 M.T. Khan: *Formal Semantics of* MiniMaple January 2012. Eds.: W. Schreiner, F. Winkler

2012-02 M. Kollmann, W. Zulehner: *A Robust Preconditioner for Distributed Optimal Control for Stokes Flow with Control Constraints* January 2012. Eds.: U. Langer, R. Ramlau

2011

2011-01 S. Takacs, W. Zulehner: *Convergence Analysis of Multigrid Methods with Collective Point Smoothers for Optimal Control Problems* February 2011. Eds.: U. Langer, J. Schicho

2011-02 L.X.Châu Ngô: *Finding rational solutions of rational systems of autonomous ODEs* February 2011. Eds.: F. Winkler, P. Paule

2011-03 C.G. Raab: *Using Gröbner Bases for Finding the Logarithmic Part of the Integral of Transcendental Functions* February 2011. Eds.: P. Paule, V. Pillwein

2011-04 S.K. Kleiss, B. Jüttler, W. Zulehner: *Enhancing Isogeometric Analysis by a Finite Element-Based Local Refinement Strategy* April 2011. Eds.: U. Langer, J. Schicho

2011-05 M.T. Khan: *A Type Checker for MiniMaple* April 2011. Eds.: W. Schreiner, F. Winkler

2011-06 M. Kolmbauer: *Existence and Uniqueness of Eddy current problems in bounded and unbounded domains* May 2011. Eds.: U. Langer, V. Pillwein

2011-07 M. Kolmbauer, U. Langer: *A Robust Preconditioned-MinRes-Solver for Distributed Time-Periodic Eddy Current Optimal Control Problems* May 2011. Eds.: R. Ramlau, W. Zulehner

2011-08 M. Wiesinger-Widi: *Sylvester Matrix and GCD for Several Univariate Polynomials* May 2011. Eds.: B. Buchberger, V. Pillwein

2011-09 M. Wiesinger-Widi: *Towards Computing a Gröbner Basis of a Polynomial Ideal over a Field by Using Matrix Triangularization* May 2011. Eds.: B. Buchberger, V. Pillwein

2011-10 M. Kollmann, M. Kolmbauer: *A preconditioned MinRes solver for time-periodic parabolic optimal control problems* August 2011. Eds.: U. Langer, V. Pillwein

2011-11 C. Giannelli, B. Jüttler: *Bases and dimensions of bivariate hierarchical tensor–product splines* October 2011. Eds.: U. Langer, J. Schicho

2011-12 I. Georgieva, C. Hofreither, C. Koutschan, V. Pillwein, T. Thanatipanonda: *Harmonic interpolation based on Radon projections along the sides of regular polygons* October 2011. Eds.: U. Langer, J. Schicho

2011-13 M.T. Khan: *Towards a Behavioral Analysis of Computer Algebra Programs* November 2011. Eds.: W. Schreiner, F. Winkler

2011-14 M. Kolmbauer: *A Robust FEM-BEM MinRes Solver for Distributed Multiharmonic Eddy Current Optimal Control Problems in unbounded domains* November 2011. Eds.: W. Zulehner, V. Pillwein

2011-15 C. Hofreither, U. Langer, C. Pechstein: *A Non-Standard Finite Element Method based on Boundary Integral Operators* December 2011. Eds.: V. Pillwein, W. Zulehner

The complete list since 2009 can be found at
`https://www.dk-compmath.jku.at/publications/`

Doctoral Program
"Computational Mathematics"

Director:

Prof. Dr. Peter Paule
Research Institute for Symbolic Computation

Deputy Director:

Prof. Dr. Bert Jüttler
Institute of Applied Geometry

Address:

Johannes Kepler University Linz
Doctoral Program "Computational Mathematics"
Altenbergerstr. 69
A-4040 Linz
Austria
Tel.: ++43 732-2468-7174

E-Mail:

office@dk-compmath.jku.at

Homepage:

http://www.dk-compmath.jku.at

Submissions to the DK-Report Series are sent to two members of the Editorial Board who communicate their decision to the Managing Editor.