Second Variation. One-variable problem

February 11, 2013

Contents

Stationary conditions point to a possibly optimal trajectory but they do not state that the trajectory corresponds to the minimum of the functional. A stationary solution can correspond to minimum, local minimum, maximum, local maximum, of a saddle point of the functional. In this chapter, we establish methods aiming to distinguish local minimum from local maximum or saddle. In addition to being a solution to the Euler equation, the true minimizer satisfies necessary conditions in the form of inequalities. We introduce variational tests, Weierstrass and Jacobi conditions, that supplement each other.

The conclusion of optimality of the tested stationary curve $u(x)$ is based on a comparison of the problem costs $I(u)$ and $I(u + \delta u)$ computed at u and any close-by admissible curve $u + \delta u$. The closeness of admissible curve is required to simplify the calculation and obtain convenient optimality conditions. The question whether or not two curves are close to each other or whether $v(x)$ is small depends on what curves we consider to be close. Below, we work out three tests of optimality using different definitions of closeness.

1 Local variations

1.1 Legendre Tests

Consider again the simplest problem of the calculus of variations

$$\min_{u(x), x\in[a,b]} I(u), \quad I(u) = \int_a^b F(x, u, u')dx, \quad u(a) = u_a, \ u(b) = u_b \tag{1}$$

and function $u(x)$ that satisfies the Euler equation and boundary conditions,

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial u} - \frac{d}{dx}\frac{\partial F}{\partial u'} = 0, \quad u(a) = u_a, \ u(b) = u_b, \tag{2}$$

so that the first variation δI is zero.

Let us compute the increment $\delta^2 I$ of the objective caused by the variation

$$\delta u(x, x_0) = \begin{cases} \epsilon^2 \phi\left(\frac{x - x_0}{\epsilon}\right) & \text{if } |x - x_0| < \epsilon \\ 0 & \text{if } |x - x_0| \geq \epsilon \end{cases} \tag{3}$$

where $\phi(x)$ is a function with the following properties:

$$\phi(-1) = \phi(1) = 0, \quad \max_{x\in[-1,1]} |\phi(x)| \leq 1, \quad \max_{x\in[-1,1]} |\phi'(x)| \leq 1$$

The magnitude of this *Legendre-type* variation tends to zero when $\epsilon \to 0$, and the magnitude of its derivative

$$\delta u'(x, x_0) = \begin{cases} -\epsilon\, \phi'\left(\frac{x - x_0}{\epsilon}\right) & \text{if } |x - x_0| < \epsilon \\ 0 & \text{if } |x - x_0| \geq \epsilon \end{cases}$$

tends to zero as well. Additionally, the variation is *local*: it is zero outside of the interval of the length 2ϵ. We use these features of the variation in the calculation of the increment of the cost.

Expanding F into Taylor series and keeping the quadratic terms, we obtain

$$\delta I = I(u+\delta u) - I(u) = \int_a^b (F(x, u+\delta u, u'+\delta u') - F(x,u,u'))dx$$

$$= \int_a^b \left(\left[\frac{\partial F}{\partial u} - \frac{d}{dx}\frac{\partial F}{\partial u'} \right] \delta u + A\delta u^2 + 2B\delta u\, \delta u' + C(\delta u')^2 \right) dx + \left. \frac{\partial F}{\partial u'} \right|_{x=a}^{x=b}, \quad (4)$$

where

$$A = \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial u^2}, \quad B = \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial u \partial u'}, \quad C = \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial (u')^2}$$

and all derivatives are computed at the point x_0 at the optimal trajectory $u(x)$. The term in the brackets in the integrand in the right-hand side of (4) is zero because the Euler equation is satisfied. Let us estimate the remaining terms

$$\int_a^b A(x)(\delta u)^2 dx = \int_{x_0-\varepsilon}^{x_0+\varepsilon} A(x)(\delta u)^2 dx$$

$$\leq \varepsilon^4 \int_{x_0-\varepsilon}^{x_0+\varepsilon} A(x)dx = A(x_0)\,\varepsilon^5 + o(\varepsilon|\delta u|^5)$$

Indeed, the variation δu is zero outside of the interval $[x-\varepsilon, x+\varepsilon]$, has magnitude of the order of ε^2 in this interval, and A(x) is assumed to be continuous at the trajectory. Similarly, we estimate

$$\int_a^b B(x)\delta u\, \delta u'\, dx \leq \varepsilon^3 \int_{x_0-\varepsilon}^{x_0+\varepsilon} B(x)dx = B(x_0)\,\varepsilon^4 + o(\varepsilon|\delta u|^4)$$

$$\int_a^b C(x)(\delta u')^2 dx \leq \varepsilon^2 \int_{x_0-\varepsilon}^{x_0+\varepsilon} C(x)dx = C(x_0)\,\varepsilon^3 + o(\varepsilon|\delta u|^3)$$

Its derivative's magnitude $\delta u'$ is of the order of ε, therefore $|\delta u'| \gg |\delta u|$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$; we conclude that the last term in the integrand in the right-hand side of (4) dominates. The inequality $\delta I > 0$ implies inequality

$$\frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial (u')^2} \geq 0 \qquad (5)$$

which is called *Legendre condition* or *Legendre test.*

Example 1.1 (Two-well Lagrangian. I) Consider the Lagrangian

$$F(u, u') = [(u')^2 - u^2]^2$$

The Legendre test gives the inequality

$$\frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial u'^2} = 4(3u'^2 - u^2) \geq 0.$$

Consequently, the solution u of Euler equation

$$\frac{d}{dx}[(u')^3 - u^2 u'] + u(u')^2 - u^3 = 0, \quad u(0) = a_0,\ u(1) = a_1$$

or

$$(3(u')^2 - u^2)u'' - u((u')^2 + u^2) = 0 \quad u(0) = a_0,\ u(1) = a_1$$

corresponds to a local minimum of the functional if, in addition, the inequality $3u'^2 - u^2 \geq 0$ is satisfied in all points $x \in (0, 1)$.

1.2 Weierstrass Tests

The Weierstrass test detects stability of a solution to a variational problem against a different kind of variations – the strong local perturbations. It is also local: it compares trajectories that coincide everywhere except a small interval where their derivatives significantly differ.

Suppose that u is the minimizer of the variational problem (1) that satisfies the Euler equation (2). Additionally, u should satisfy another test that uses a different from (3) type of variation. The variation is an infinitesimal triangle supported on the interval $[x_0, x_0 + \varepsilon]$ in a neighborhood of a point $x_0 \in (0,\ 1)$ (see **??**):

$$\Delta u(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if} \quad x \notin [x_0, x_0 + \varepsilon], \\ v_1(x - x_0) & \text{if} \quad x \in [x_0, x_0 + \alpha\varepsilon], \\ v_2(x - x_0) - \alpha\varepsilon(v_1 - v_2) & \text{if} \quad x \in [x_0 + \alpha\varepsilon, x_0 + \varepsilon] \end{cases}$$

where v_1 and v_2 are two real numbers, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, and parameters α $(0 < \alpha < 1)$, v_1 and v_2 are related

$$\alpha v_1 + (1 - \alpha) v_2 = 0 \tag{6}$$

to provide the continuity of $u + \Delta u$ at the point $x_0 + \varepsilon$, or equality

$$\Delta u(x_0 + \varepsilon - 0) = 0.$$

Condition (6) can be rewritten as

$$v_1 = (1 - \alpha)v, \quad v_2 = -\alpha v = 0, \tag{7}$$

v is an arbitrary real number.

The considered variation (the Weierstrass variation) is localized and has an infinitesimal absolute value (if $\varepsilon \to 0$), but, unlike the Legendre variation, its derivative $(\Delta u)'$ is finite:

$$(\Delta u)' = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if} \quad x \notin [x_0, x_0 + \varepsilon], \\ v_1 & \text{if} \quad x \in [x_0, x_0 + \alpha\varepsilon], \\ v_2 & \text{if} \quad x \in [x_0 + \alpha\varepsilon, x_0 + \varepsilon]. \end{cases} \tag{8}$$

The increment is

$$\delta I = I(u+\delta u) - I(u) = \int_a^b (F(x,u+\delta u, u' + \Delta u') - F(x,u,u'))dx$$
$$\int_{x_0}^{x_0+\alpha\epsilon} (F(x,u+\delta u, u' + v_1) - F(x,u,u'))dx$$
$$+ \int_{x_0+\alpha\epsilon}^{x_0-\epsilon} (F(x,u+\delta u, u' + v_2) - F(x,u,u'))dx \quad (9)$$

$$\delta I = I(u+\delta u) - I(u) = \int_a^b (F(x,u+\delta u, u' + \Delta u') - F(x,u,u'))dx$$
$$\int_{x_0}^{x_0+\alpha\epsilon} F(x,u+\delta u, u' + v_1)dx + \int_{x_0+\alpha\epsilon}^{x_0-\epsilon} F(x,u+\delta u, u' + v_2)dx$$
$$- \int_{x_0}^{x_0+\epsilon} F(x,u,u')dx \quad (10)$$

Computing increment δI and rounding up to ε, we estimate integrands as

$$F(x, u(x) + \Delta u, u(x)' + v) = F(x_0, u(x_0), u'(x_0) + v) + O(1).$$

The smallness of the variation Δu is due to smallness of the interval of the variation. Also, we assume that

$$F(x, u(x), u'(x) - F(x_0, u(x_0), u'(x_0)| = O(\epsilon) \quad \forall x \in [x_0, x_0 + \epsilon]$$

.

Under these assumptions, we compute the main term of the increment as

$$\delta I(u, x_0) =$$
$$\varepsilon[\alpha F(x_0, u, u' + v_1) + (1-\alpha)F(x_0, u, u' + v_2) - F(x_0, u, u')] + o(\varepsilon) \quad (11)$$

The smallness of the variation is due to smallness of the interval of the variation.

Repeating the variational arguments and using the arbitrariness of x_0, we find that an inequality holds

$$\delta(u, x) \geq 0 \quad \forall x \in [a, b] \quad (12)$$

for a minimizer u. The last expression yields to the Weierstrass necessary condition.

Any minimizer $u(x)$ of (1) satisfies the inequality

$$\alpha F(x, u, u' + (1-\alpha)v) + (1-\alpha)F(x, u, u' - \alpha v) - F(x, u, u') \geq 0 \quad (13)$$
$$\forall v,\ \forall \alpha \in [0, 1]$$
$$(14)$$

The reader may recognize in this inequality the definition of convexity, or the condition that the graph of the function $F(.,.,z)$ (considered as a function of the third argument u' lies below the the chord in between the points there the chord meet the graph. The Weierstrass condition requires *convexity of the Lagrangian* $F(x, y, z)$ *with respect to its third argument* $z = u'$. The first two arguments $x,\ y = u$ here are the coordinates $x,\ u(x)$ of the testing minimizer $u(x)$. Recall that the tested minimizer $u(x)$ is a solution to the Euler equation.

The Weierstrass test is stronger than the Legendre test because convexity implies nonnegativity of the second derivative. It compares the optimal trajectory with larger set of admissible trajectories.

Example 1.2 (Two-well Lagrangian. II) Consider again the Lagrangian

$$F(u, u') = \left((u')^2 - u^2\right)^2$$

It is convex as a function of u' if

$$|u'| \geq |u|$$

The solution u of Euler equation corresponds to a local minimum of the functional if, the inequality $|u'(x)| \geq |u(x)|$ is satisfied in all points $x \in (0, 1)$.

The Weierstrass test is stronger than Legendre test,

$$u'^2 \geq u^2 > \frac{1}{3} u^2$$

Remark 1.1 Convexity of the Lagrangian does not guarantee the existence of a solution to variational problem. It states only that a differentiable minimizer (if it exists) is stable against fine-scale perturbations. However, the minimum may not exist at all or be unstable to other variations.

If the solution of a variational problem fails the Weierstrass test, then its cost can be decreased by adding infinitesimal centered wiggles to the solution. The wiggles are the Weierstrass trial functions, which decrease the cost. In this case, we call the variational problem ill-posed, and we say that the solution is unstable against fine-scale perturbations.

Remark 1.2 Weierstrass condition is always satisfied in the geometric optics. The Lagrangian depends on the derivative as $L = \frac{\sqrt{1+y'^2}}{v(y)}$ and its second derivative

$$\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial y'^{\,2}} = \frac{1}{v(y)(1 + y'^2)^{\frac{3}{2}}}$$

is always nonnegative if $v > 0$. It is physically obvious that the fastest path is stable to short-term perturbations.

Weierstrass condition is also always satisfied in the Lagrangian mechanics. The Lagrangian depends on the derivatives of the generalized coordinates through the

Figure 1: The construction of Weierstrass $\mathcal{E}$-function. The graph of a convex function and its tangent plane.

kinetic energy $T = \frac{1}{2}\dot{q}R(q)\dot{q}$ and its Hessian equals generalized inertia R which is always positive definite. Physically speaking, inertia does not allow for infinitesimal oscillations because they always increase the kinetic energy while potential energy is insensitive to them.

Weierstrass $\mathcal{E}$-function Weierstrass suggested a convenient test for convexity of Lagrangian, the so-called $\mathcal{E}$-function equal to the difference between the value of Lagrangian $L(x, u, \hat{z})$ in a trial point $u, z = z'$ and the tangent hyperplane $L(x, u, u') - (\hat{z} - u')^T \frac{\partial L(x,u,u')}{\partial u'}$ to the optimal trajectory at the point u, u':

$$\mathcal{E}(L(x, u, u', \hat{z}) = L(x, u, \hat{z}) - L(x, u, u') - (\hat{z} - u')^T \frac{\partial L(x, u, u')}{\partial u'} \tag{15}$$

Function $\mathcal{E}(L(x, u, u', \hat{z})$ vanishes together with the derivative $\frac{\partial \mathcal{E}(L)}{\partial \hat{z}}$ when $\hat{z} = u'$:

$$\mathcal{E}(L(x, u, u', \hat{z})|_{\hat{z}=u'} = 0, \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{z}}\mathcal{E}(L(x, u, u', \hat{z})|_{\hat{z}=u'} = 0.$$

According to the basic definition of convexity, the graph of a convex function is greater than or equal to a tangent hyperplane. Thereafter, the Weierstrass condition of minimum of the objective functional can be written as the condition of positivity of the Weierstrass $\mathcal{E}$-function for the Lagrangian,

$$\mathcal{E}(L(x, u, u', \hat{z}) \geq 0 \quad \forall \hat{z}, \ \forall x, u(x)$$

where $u(x)$ tested trajectory.

Example 1.3 Check the optimality of Lagrangian

$$L = u'^4 - \phi(u, x)u'^2 + \psi(u, x)$$

where ϕ and ψ are some functions of u and x using Weierstrass $\mathcal{E}$-function.

The Weierstrass $\mathcal{E}$-function for this Lagrangian is

$$\mathcal{E}(L(x, u, u', \hat{z}) = \left[\hat{z}^4 - \phi(u, x)\hat{z}^2 + \psi(u, x)\right]$$
$$- \left[u'^4 - \phi(u, x)u'^2 + \psi(u, x)\right] - (\hat{z} - u')(4u'^3 - 2\phi(u, x)u).$$

or

$$\mathcal{E}(L(x, u, u', \hat{z}) = (\hat{z} - u')^2 \left(\hat{z}^2 + 2\hat{z}u' - \phi + 3u'^2\right).$$

As expected, $\mathcal{E}(L(x, u, u', \hat{z})$ is independent of an additive term ψ and contains a quadratic coefficient $(\hat{z} - u')^2$. It is positive for any trial function $\hat{z}$ if the quadratic

$$\pi(\hat{z}) = -\hat{z}^2 - 2\hat{z}u' + \phi - 3u'^2$$

does not have real roots, or if

$$\phi(u,x) - 2u^2 \leq 0$$

If this condition is violated at a point of an optimal trajectory $u(x)$, the trajectory is nonoptimal.

Vector-Valued Minimizer The Legendre and Weierstrass conditions and can be naturally generalized to the problem with the vector-valued minimizer. If the Lagrangian is twice differentiable function of the vector $u' = z$, the Legendre condition becomes

$$He(F,z) \geq 0 \tag{16}$$

(see Section **??**) where $He(F,z)$ is the Hessian

$$He(F,z) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial z_1^2} & \dots & \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial z_1 \partial z_n} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots \\ \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial z_1 \partial z_n} & \dots & \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial z_n^2} \end{pmatrix}$$

and inequality in (16) means that the matrix is nonnegative definite (all its eigenvalues are nonnegative). The Weierstrass test requires convexity of $F(x,y,z)$ with respect to the third vector argument.

1.3 Null-Lagrangians and convexity

Find the Lagrangian cannot be uniquely reconstructed from its Euler equation. Similarly to antiderivative, it is defined up to some term called null-Lagrangian.

Definition 1.1 The Lagrangians $\phi(x,u,u')$ for which the operator $S(\phi,u)$ of the Euler equation (**??**) identically vanishes

$$S(\phi,u) = 0 \quad \forall u$$

are called *Null-Lagrangians*.

Null-Lagrangians in variational problems with one independent variable are linear functions of u'. Indeed, the Euler equation is a second-order differential equation with respect to u:

$$\frac{d}{dx}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial u'}\phi\right) - \frac{\partial}{\partial u}\phi = \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial (u')^2} \cdot u'' + \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial u' \partial u} \cdot u' + \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial u \partial x} - \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial u} \equiv 0. \tag{17}$$

The coefficient of u'' is equal to $\frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial (u')^2}$. If the Euler equation holds identically, this coefficient is zero, and therefore $\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial u'}$ does not depend on u'. Hence, ϕ linearly depends on u':

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(x,u,u') &= u' \cdot A(u,x) + B(u,x); \\ A = \tfrac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial u' \partial u}, &\quad B = \tfrac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial u \partial x} - \tfrac{\partial \phi}{\partial u}. \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

Additionally, if the following equality holds

$$\frac{\partial A}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial B}{\partial u}, \tag{19}$$

then the Euler equation vanishes identically. In this case, ϕ is a null-Lagrangian.

We notice that the Null-Lagrangian (18) is simply a full differential of a function $\Phi(x, u)$:

$$\phi(x, u, u') = \frac{d}{dx}\Phi(x, u) = \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial u} u';$$

equations (19) are the integrability conditions (equality of mixed derivatives) for Φ. The vanishing of the Euler equation corresponds to the Fundamental theorem of calculus: The equality

$$\int_a^b \frac{d\Phi(x, u)}{dx} dx = \Phi(b, u(b)) - \Phi(a, u(a)).$$

that does not depend on $u(x)$ only on its end-points values.

Example 1.4 Function $\phi = u\,u'$ is the null-Lagrangian. Indeed,we check

$$\frac{d}{dx}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial u'}\phi\right) - \frac{\partial}{\partial u}\phi = u' - u' \equiv 0.$$

Null-Lagrangians and Convexity The convexity requirements of the Lagrangian F that follow from the Weierstrass test are in agreement with the concept of null-Lagrangians (see, for example [**?**]).

Consider a variational problem with the Lagrangian F,

$$\min_u \int_0^1 F(x, u, u')dx.$$

Adding a null-Lagrangian ϕ to the given Lagrangian F does not affect the Euler equation of the problem. The family of problems

$$\min_u \int_0^1 \left(F(x, u, u') + t\phi(x, u, u')\right) dx,$$

where t is an arbitrary number, corresponds to the same Euler equation. Therefore, each solution to the Euler equation corresponds to a family of Lagrangians $F(x, u, z) + t\phi(x, u, z)$, where t is an arbitrary real number. In particular, a Lagrangian cannot be uniquely defined by the solution to the Euler equation.

The stability of the minimizer against the Weierstrass variations should be a property of the Lagrangian that is independent of the value of the parameter t. It should be a common property of the family of equivalent Lagrangians. On the other hand, if $F(x, u, z)$ is convex with respect to $\boldsymbol{z}$, then $F(x, u, z) + t\phi(x, u, z)$ is also convex. Indeed, $\phi(x, u, z)$ is linear as a function of $\boldsymbol{z}$, and adding the term $t\phi(x, u, z)$ does not affect the convexity of the sum. In other words, convexity is a characteristic property of the family. Accordingly, it serves as a test for the stability of an optimal solution.

2 Nonlocal conditions

2.1 Sufficient condition for the weak local minimum

We assume that a trajectory $u(x)$ satisfies the stationary conditions and Legendre condition. We investigate the increment caused by a nonlocal variation δu of an infinitesimal magnitude:

$$|\upsilon| < \varepsilon, \quad |\upsilon'| < \varepsilon, \quad \text{variation interval is arbitrary.}$$

To compute the increment, we expand the Lagrangian into Taylor series keeping terms up to $O(\epsilon^2)$. Recall that the linear of ϵ terms are zero because the Euler equation $S(u, u') = 0$ for $u(x)$ holds. We have

$$\delta I = \int_0^r S(u, u')\delta u \, dx + \int_0^r \delta^2 F dx + o(\epsilon^2) \tag{20}$$

where

$$\delta^2 F = \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial u^2}(\delta u)^2 + 2\frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial u \partial u'}(\delta u)(\delta u') + \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial (u')^2}(\delta u')^2 \tag{21}$$

Because the variation is nonlocal, we cannot neglect υ in comparison with υ'.

No variation of this kind can improve the stationary solution if the quadratic form

$$Q(u, u') = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial u^2} & \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial u \partial u'} \\ \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial u \partial u'} & \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial (u')^2} \end{pmatrix}$$

is positively defined,

$$Q(u, u') > 0 \quad \text{on the stationary trajectory } u(x) \tag{22}$$

This condition is called the *sufficient condition for the weak minimum.* It neglects the relation between δu and $\delta u'$ and treats them as two independent trial functions. If the sufficient condition is satisfied, no trajectory that is smooth and sufficiently close to the stationary trajectory can increase the objective functional of the problem compared with the objective at that tested stationary trajectory.

Notice that the first term $\frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial u'^2}$ is nonnegative because of the Legendre condition.

Problem 2.1 Show that the sufficient condition is satisfied for the Lagrangians

$$F_1 = \frac{1}{2}u^2 + \frac{1}{2}(u')^2 \text{ and } F_2 = \frac{1}{|u|}(u')^2$$

Example: Stationary solution is not a minimizer . The Weierstrass test does not guarantee that the stationary solution is a minimizer. One can find a nonlocal variation that decreases the cost below its stationary value. Consider the problem:

$$I = \min_u \int_0^r \left(\frac{1}{2}(u')^2 - \frac{c^2}{2} u^2 \right) dx \quad u(0) = 0; \quad u(r) = A \tag{23}$$

where c is a constant. The first variation δI i

$$\delta I = \int_0^r \left(u'' + c^2 u \right) \delta u \, dx$$

s zero if $u(x)$ satisfies the Euler equation

$$u'' + c^2 u = 0, \quad u(0) = 0, u(r) = A. \tag{24}$$

The stationary solution $u(x)$ is

$$u(x) = \left(\frac{A}{\sin(cr)} \right) \sin(cx)$$

The Weierstrass test is satisfied, because the dependence of the Lagrangian on the derivative u' is convex, $\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial u'^2} = 1$. The sufficient condition of local minimum is not satisfied because $\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial u^2} = -c^2$.

Let us show that the stationary condition does not correspond to a minimum of I is the interval's length r is large enough. We simply demonstrate a variation that improves the stationary trajectory by decreasing cost of the problem. Compute the second variation (21):

$$\delta^2 I = \int_0^r \left(\frac{1}{2}(\delta u')^2 - \frac{c^2}{2}(\delta u)^2 \right) dx \tag{25}$$

Since the boundary conditions at the ends of the trajectory are fixed, the variation δu satisfies homogeneous conditions $\delta u(0) = \delta u(r) = 0$.

Let us choose the variation as follow:

$$\delta u = \begin{cases} \epsilon x(a - x), & 0 \le x \le a \\ 0 & x > a \end{cases}$$

where the interval of variation $[0, a]$ is not greater that $[0, r]$, $a \le r$. Computing the second variation of the goal functional from (25), we obtain

$$\delta^2 I(a) = \frac{\epsilon^2}{60} a^3 (10 - c^2 a^2), \quad a \le r$$

The increment $\delta^2 I$ is positive only if

$$a < r_{\text{crit}}, \quad r_{\text{crit}} = \frac{\sqrt{10}}{c}.$$

The most dangerous variation corresponds to the maximal value $a = r$. This increment is negative when r is sufficiently large,

$$r > r_{\mathrm{crit}}.$$

In this case $\delta^2 I(a)$ is negative, $\delta^2 I(a) < 0$ We conclude that the stationary solution does not correspond to the minimum of I if the length of the trajectory is larger than r_{crit}.

If the length is smaller than r_{crit}, the situation is inconclusive. It could still be possible to choose another type of variation different from considered here that disproves the optimality of the stationary solution.

2.2 Jacobi variation

The Jacobi necessary condition chooses the most sensitive long and shallow variation and examines the increment caused by such variation. It complements the Weierstrass test that investigates stability of a stationary trajectory to strong localized variations. Jacobi condition tries to disprove optimality by testing stability against "optimal" nonlocal variations with small magnitude.

Assume that a trajectory $u(x)$ satisfies the stationary and Legendre conditions but does not satisfy the sufficient conditions for weak minimum, that is $Q(u, u')$ in (22) is not positively defined,

$$S(u, u') = 0, \quad \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial (u')^2} > 0, \quad Q(u, u') \not> 0$$

To derive Jacobi condition, we consider an infinitesimal nonlocal variation: $\delta u = O(\epsilon) \ll 1$ and $\delta u' = O(\epsilon) \ll 1$ and examine the expression (21) for the second variation. When an infinitesimal nonlocal variation is applied, the increment increases because of assumed positivity of $\frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial (u')^2}$ and decreases because of assumed nonpositivity of the matrix Q. Depending on the length r of the interval of integration and of chosen form of the variation δu, one of these effects prevails. If the second effect is stronger, the extremal fails the test and is nonoptimal.

Jacobi conditions asks for the choice of the best δu of the variation. The expression (21) itself is a variational problem for δu which we rename here as v for short; the Lagrangian is quadratic of v and v' and the coefficients are functions of x determined at the stationary trajectory $u(x)$ which is assumed to be known:

$$\delta I = \int_0^r \left[A v^2 + 2B\, v\, v' + C (v')^2 \right] dx, \quad v(0) = v(r) = 0 \tag{26}$$

where

$$A = \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial u^2}, \quad B = \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial u \partial u'}, \quad C = \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial (u')^2}$$

The problem (26) is the variational problem for the unknown variation v. Its Euler equation:

$$\frac{d}{dx}(Cv' + Bv) - Av = 0, \quad v(r_0) = v(r_{\text{conj}}) = 0 \quad [r_0, r_{\text{conj}}] \subset [0, r] \tag{27}$$

is a solution to Storm-Liouville problem The point r_0 and r_{conj} are called the conjugate points. The problem is homogeneous: If $v(x)$ is a solution and c is a real number, $cv(x)$ is also a solution.

Jacobi condition is satisfied if the interval does not contain conjugate points, that is if there is no nontrivial solutions to (27) on any subinterval of $[r_0, r_{\text{conj}}] \subset [0, r]$, that is if there are no nontrivial solutions of (27) with boundary conditions $v(r_0) = v(r_{\text{conj}}) = 0$.

If this condition is violated, than there exist a family of trajectories

$$U(x) = \begin{cases} u + \alpha v & \text{if } \; x \in [r_0, r_{\text{conj}}] \\ u & \text{if } \; x \in [0, r]/[r_0, r_{\text{conj}}] \end{cases}$$

that deliver the same value of the cost. Indeed, v is defined up to a multiplier: If v is a solution, αv is a solution too. These trajectories have discontinuous derivative at the points r_0 and r_{conj}. Such discontinuity leads to a contradiction to the Weierstrass-Erdman condition which does not allow a broken extremal at these points.

2.2.1 Examples

Example 2.1 (Nonexistence of the minimizer: Blow up) Consider again problem (23)

$$I = \min_u \int_0^r \left(\frac{1}{2}(u')^2 - \frac{c^2}{2}u^2 \right) dx \quad u(0) = 0; \quad u(r) = A$$

The stationary trajectory and the second variation are given by formulas (24) and (25), respectively. Instead of arbitrary choosing the second variation (as we did above), we choose it as a solution to the homogeneous problem (27) for $v = \delta u$

$$v'' + c^2 v = 0, \quad r_0 = 0, \; u(0) = 0, \; u(r_{\text{conj}}) = 0, \quad r_{\text{conj}} \leq r \tag{28}$$

This problem has a nontrivial solution $v = \epsilon \sin(cx)$ if the length of the interval is large enough to satisfy homogeneous condition of the right end. We compute $cr_{\text{conj}} = \pi$ or

$$r(_{\text{conj}}) = \frac{\pi}{c}$$

The second variation $\delta^2 I$ is positive when r is small enough,

$$\delta^2 I = \frac{1}{r}\epsilon^2 \left(\frac{\pi^2}{r^2} - c^2 \right) > 0 \quad \text{if } r < \frac{\pi}{c}$$

In the opposite case $r > \frac{\pi}{c}$, the increment is negative which shows that the stationary solution is not a minimizer.

To clarify this, let us compute the stationary solution (24). We have

$$u(x) = \left(\frac{A}{\sin(cr)}\right)\sin(cx) \quad \text{ and } I(u) = \frac{A^2}{\sin^2(cr)}\left(\frac{\pi^2}{r^2} - c^2\right)$$

When r increases approaching the value $\frac{c}{\pi}$, the magnitude of the stationary solution indefinitely grows, and the cost indefinitely decreases:

$$\lim_{r \to \frac{c}{\pi} - 0} I(u) = -\infty$$

The cost of the problem cannot increase if r increases. Indeed, the trajectory that correspond to the same cost is easily constructed. Indeed, let $u(x), x \in [0, r]$ be a minimizer (recall, that $u(0) = 0$) and the cost functional is I_r. In a larger interval $x \in [0, r + d]$, the admissible trajectory

$$\hat{u}(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } 0 < x < d \\ u(x - d) & \text{if } d \leq x \leq r + d \end{cases}$$

corresponds to the same cost I_r. Obviously, this trajectory of the Euler equation is not a minimizer if $r > \frac{\pi}{c}$, because it corresponds to finite cost $I(u) > -\infty$.

Remark 2.1 Comparing this result with the result in Example (2.1), we see that for this example the optimal choice of variation improved the length of the critical interval at only 0.65%.

2.3 Distance on a sphere: Columbus problem

This simple example illustrates the use of second variation without a single calculation. We consider the problem of geodesics (shortest path) on a sphere.

Stationarity Let us prove that a geodesics is a part of the great circle. Suppose that geodesics is a different curve, or that it exists an arc C, C' that is a part of the geodesics but does not coincide with the arc of the great circle. Let us perform a variation: Replace this arc with its mirror image – the reflection across the plane that passes through the ends C, C' of this arc and the center of the sphere. The reflected curve has the same length of the path and it lies on the sphere, therefore the new path remains a geodesics. On the other hand, the new path is broken in two points C and C' , and therefore cannot be the shortest path. Indeed, consider a part of the path in an infinitesimal circle around the point C of breakage and fix the points A and B where the path crosses that circle. This path can be shorten by a arc of a great circle that passes through the points A and B. To demonstrate this, it is enough to imagine a human-size scale on Earth: The infinitesimal part of the round surface becomes flat and obviously the shortest path correspond to a straight line and not to a zigzag line with an angle.

Jacobi-type variation The same consideration shows that the length of geodesics is no larger than π times the radius of the sphere, or it is shorter than the great semicircle. Indeed, if the length of geodesics is larger than the great semicircle one can fix two opposite points – the poles of the sphere – on the path and turn on an arbitrary angle the axis the part of geodesics that passes through these points. The new path lies on the sphere, has the same length as the original one, and is broken at the poles, thereby its length is not minimal. We conclude that the minimizer does not satisfy Jacobi test if the length of geodesics is larger than π times the radius of the sphere. Therefore, *geodesics on a sphere is a part of the great circle that joins the start and end points and which length is less that a half of the equator's length.*

Remark 2.2 The argument that the solution to the problem of shortest distance on a sphere bifurcates when its length exceeds a half of the great circle was famously used by Columbus who argued that the shortest way to India passes through the Western route. As we know, Columbus wasn't be able to prove or disprove the conjecture because he bumped into American continent discovering New World for better and for worse.

2.4 Nature does not minimize action

The next example deals with a system of multiple degrees of freedom. Consider the variational problem with the Lagrangian

$$L = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{2} m \dot{u}_i^2 - \frac{1}{2} C (u_i - u_{i-1})^2, \quad u(0) = u_0$$

We will see later in Chapter **??** that this Lagrangian describes the *action* of a chain of particles with masses m connected by springs with constant C.

Stationarity is the solution to the system

$$m_i \ddot{u}_i + C(-u_{i+1} + 2u_i - u_{i-1}), \quad u(0) = u_0$$

That describes dynamics of the chain. The continuous limit of the chain dynamics is the dynamics of an elastic rod.

The second variation (here we also use the notation $v = \delta u$)

$$\delta^2 L = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{2} m \dot{v_i}^2 - \frac{1}{2} C (v_i - v_{i-1})^2, \quad v_0 = 0, \quad v_n = 0$$

corresponds to the Euler equation – the eigenvalue problem

$$m \ddot{v} = \frac{C}{m} A v$$

where $v(t) = [v_1(t), \dots, v_n(t)]$ is the vector of variations and

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} -2 & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 1 & -2 & 1 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -2 & \dots & 0 \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & -2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The problem has a solution

$$v(t) = \sum \alpha_k v_k \sin \omega_k t \quad v(0) = v(T_{\text{conj}}) = 0, \quad T_{\text{conj}} \leq T$$

where v_k are the eigenvectors, α are coefficients found from initial conditions, and ω_k are the square roots of eigenvalues of the matrix A. Solving the characteristic equation for eigenvalues $\det(A - \omega^2 I) = 0$ we find that these eigenvalues are

$$\omega_k = 2\sqrt{\frac{C}{m}} \sin^2 \left(\sqrt{\frac{C}{m}} \frac{\pi k}{n} \right), \quad k = 1, \dots n$$

The Jacobi condition is violated if $v(t)$ is consistent with the homogeneous initial and final conditions that is if the time interval is short enough. Namely, the condition is violated when the duration T is larger than

$$T \geq \frac{\pi}{\max(\omega_k)} \approx 2\pi \sqrt{\frac{m}{C}}$$

.

The continuous limit of the chain is achieved when the number N of masses indefinitely growth and each mass decreases correspondingly as $m(N) = \frac{m(0)}{N}$. The distance between masses decreases, the stiffness of one link increases as $C(N) = C(0)N$ as it become N times shorter. Correspondingly,

$$\sqrt{\frac{C(N)}{m(N)}} = N \sqrt{\frac{C(0)}{m(0)}}$$

and the maximal eigenvalue ω_N tends to infinity as $N \to \infty$. This implies Jacobi condition is violated at any finite time interval, or that action J of the continuous system is not minimized at any finite time interval.

What is minimized in classical mechanics? Lagrangian mechanics states that differential equations of Newtonian mechanics correspond to the stationarity of action: the integral of difference between kinetic T and potential V energies. Kinetic energy is a quadratic form of velocities $\dot{q}_i$ of particles, and potential energy depends only on positions (generalized coordinates) q_i of them

$$T(q, \dot{q}) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_i^n \dot{q}^T R(q) \dot{q} \quad V = V(q)$$

We assume that T is a convex function of q and $\dot{q}$, and V is a convex function of q.

As we have seen at the above examples, action $L = T - V$ does not satisfy Jacobi condition because kinetic and potential energies, which both are convex functions or q and $\dot{q}$, enter the action with different signs. Generally, the action is a saddle function of q and $\dot{q}$. The notion that Newton mechanics is not equivalent to minimization of a universal quantity, had significant philosophical implications, it destroyed the hypothesis about universal optimality of the world.

The minimal action principle can be made a minimal principle, in the Minkovski space. Formally, we replace time t with the imaginary variable $t = i\tau$ and use the second-order homogeneity of T:

$$T(q, \dot{q}) = \frac{1}{2}\dot{q}^T R(q)\dot{q} = -{q'_\tau}^T R(q) q'_\tau$$

The Lagrangian, considered as a function of q and q'_τ instead of q and $\dot{q}$, become a negative of a convex function if potential energy V and inertia $R(q)$ are convex. It become formally equal to the first integral (the energy)

$$L(q, q'_\tau) = -{q'_\tau}^T R(q) q'_\tau - V(q)$$

that is conserved in the original problem.

The local maximum of the variational problem, or

$$J = -\min_{q(\tau)} \int_{t_0}^{t} (-L(q, q'_\tau)) d\tau$$

does exist, since the Lagrangian $-L(q, q'_\tau)$ is convex with respect to q and q'_τ.

Example 2.2 The Lagrangian L for an oscillator

$$L = \frac{1}{2}\left(m\dot{u}^2 - Cu^2\right)$$

becomes

$$\hat{L} = -\frac{1}{2}\left(m{u'}^2 + Cu^2\right).$$

The Euler Equation for $\hat{L}$

$$m\, u'' - Cu = 0$$

corresponds to the solution

$$u(\tau) = A\cosh(\omega\tau) + B\sinh(\omega\tau), \quad \omega = \sqrt{\frac{C}{m}}$$

The stationary solution satisfies Weierstrass and Jacobi conditions. Returning to original notations $t = i\tau$ we obtain

$$A\cos(\omega t) + B\sin(\omega t)$$

the correct solution of the original problem. Remarkable, that this solution is unstable, but its transform to Minkovski space is stable.

These ideas have been developed in the special theory of relativity (world lines).