

# NONLOCAL DIFFUSIONS ON FRACTALS. QUALITATIVE PROPERTIES AND NUMERICAL APPROXIMATIONS.

MARCELO ACTIS, MARILINA CARENA, AND PEDRO MORIN

ABSTRACT. We propose a numerical method to approximate the solution of a nonlocal diffusion problem on a general setting of metric measure spaces. These spaces include, but are not limited to, fractals, manifolds and Euclidean domains. We obtain error estimates in  $L^\infty(L^p)$  for  $p = 1, \infty$  under the sole assumption of the initial datum being in  $L^p$ . An improved bound for the error in  $L^\infty(L^1)$  is obtained when the initial datum is in  $L^2$ . We also derive some qualitative properties of the solutions like stability, comparison principles and study the asymptotic behavior as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . We finally present two examples on fractals: the Sierpinski gasket and the Sierpinski carpet, which illustrate on the effect of nonlocal diffusion for piecewise constant initial datum.

## 1. INTRODUCTION AND MAIN RESULT

Many results from classical harmonic analysis have been developed on more general metric measure spaces, containing typical fractals and manifolds. However, the study of differential equations in such a primitive context are under development (see [BHS14, LS14, SST13, IRS13, QS13, BKS13, OS12] and references therein). Kigami defined a Laplacian on the Sierpinski gasket in [Kig89], and extended his construction to a wider class of fractals in [Kig93]. This set the stage for an analytic study of the analogs of some of the classical partial differential equations on these fractals, which are a particular case of metric measure spaces.

Linear nonlocal diffusion equations of the form

$$u_t(x, t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} J(x - y)[u(y, t) - u(x, t)] dy,$$

have been widely used to model diffusion problems (see [Fif03]), and can be generalized as follows (see [Act14] or [RBSG14]). Let  $(X, d, \mu)$  be a metric measure space. Given  $T \in \mathbb{R}^+$  fixed,  $f \in L^1(X, \mu)$  and  $J : X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  we can consider the following nonlocal diffusion problem:

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{cases} u_t(x, t) = \int_X J(x, y)[u(y, t) - u(x, t)] d\mu(y), & x \in X, t \in (0, T), \\ u(x, 0) = f(x), & x \in X. \end{cases}$$

where the equalities are understood in the sense of  $L^1(X, \mu)$ . The well posedness of (1.1) has been addressed in [Act14] and [RBSG14] for the metric measure space setting (see [CER09] for the Euclidean case). It has been proved that for each  $f \in L^1(X, \mu)$  there exists a unique function  $u$  belonging to

$$\mathcal{B}_T := C([0, T]; L^1(X, \mu)) \cap C^1((0, T); L^1(X, \mu)),$$

which solves problem (1.1). Here  $C([0, T]; L^1(X, \mu))$  denotes the space of continuous functions from  $[0, T]$  to  $L^1(X, \mu)$ , i.e.,  $u(\cdot, t) \in L^1(X, \mu)$  for each  $t \in [0, T]$  and

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary: 45A05, 65N40, 65N15. Secondary: 42B37, 28A80.

*Key words and phrases*. non-local diffusions, discretizations, space of homogeneous type, fractals.

$\|u(\cdot, t) - u(\cdot, t + h)\|_{L^1} \rightarrow 0$  when  $h \rightarrow 0$ ; and  $C^1((0, T); L^1(X, \mu))$  denotes the space of functions with continuous Frechet's derivative in  $L^1$ , i.e., there exists  $v \in C((0, T); L^1(X, \mu))$  such that

$$\left\| \frac{u(\cdot, t + h) - u(\cdot, t)}{h} - v(\cdot, t) \right\|_{L^1} \rightarrow 0,$$

when  $h \rightarrow 0$ , for each  $t \in (0, T)$ . In such case we write  $u_t = v$ .

Nevertheless, no explicit form of the solution is known. The goal of this article is to propose a general method for the approximation of this solution in metric measure spaces, solving discrete problems, and provide error estimates, analogous to those in [PLR11] which hold in domains of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Also, as in [PLR11], we study the asymptotic behavior as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  of the solutions of (1.1).

In order to define the discrete solutions, let us assume that we can decompose  $X$  into a union of  $K$  pairwise disjoint measurable subsets, i.e. we can write  $X = \bigcup_{k=1}^K X_k$ , with  $X_k \cap X_j = \emptyset$  if  $k \neq j$ . We shall refer to this sets  $X_k$  as the *components* of the space  $X$ .

For each  $k$  let us fix a point  $x_k \in X_k$ , that we shall call the *representative point* of the component  $X_k$ . Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be the set of all the representative points, i.e.  $\mathcal{X} = \{x_k \in X_k : 1 \leq k \leq K\}$ , and let  $\nu$  be the measure defined on  $\mathcal{X}$  by  $\nu(\{x_k\}) = \mu(X_k)$ . Then  $(\mathcal{X}, d, \nu)$  is also a metric measure space.

Problem (1.1) considered on  $(\mathcal{X}, d, \nu)$ , with a preassigned initial condition  $\mathbf{f} = [f_1, f_2, \dots, f_K] \in \mathbb{R}^K$ , can be equivalently written as

$$(1.2) \quad \begin{cases} u_t(x_i, t) = \sum_{j=1}^K J(x_i, x_j)[u(x_j, t) - u(x_i, t)]\mu(X_j), & i \in I_K, t \in (0, T), \\ u(x_i, 0) = f_i, & i \in I_K, \end{cases}$$

where  $I_K := \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$ . Notice that (1.2) is a homogeneous first-order linear system of ordinary differential equations. Indeed, if we denote  $u_i(t) := u(x_i, t)$ ,  $\mathbf{u}(t) = [u_1(t), u_2(t), \dots, u_K(t)]$  and  $A = (a_{ij})_{i,j=1}^K$  the matrix given by

$$a_{ij} = \begin{cases} -\sum_{j=1}^K J(x_i, x_j)\mu(X_j), & \text{if } i = j. \\ J(x_i, x_j)\mu(X_i), & \text{if } i \neq j, \end{cases}$$

then the first equation in (1.2) can be rewritten as

$$\frac{d\mathbf{u}}{dt} = A\mathbf{u}.$$

Therefore,  $\mathbf{u}(t) = e^{At}\mathbf{f}$  is the unique solution, it belongs to  $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+)$  and can be easily approximated using a computer algebra system.

We now extend  $\mathbf{u}$  and  $\mathbf{f}$  to  $X \times (0, T)$  as follows

$$U(x, t) := u_k(t) \quad \text{and} \quad F(x) := f_k \quad \text{for every } x \in X_k.$$

In other words, if  $\mathbb{I}_A(x)$  denotes the indicator function on the set  $A$ ,

$$(1.3) \quad U(x, t) = \sum_{k=1}^K u_k(t)\mathbb{I}_{X_k}(x) \quad \text{and} \quad F = \sum_{k=1}^K f_k \mathbb{I}_{X_k}(x),$$

so both are constant on each component  $X_k$ . We shall refer to  $F$  as *the extension of  $\mathbf{f}$*  and  $U$  as *the extended solution associated to  $\mathbf{f}$* .

The following error estimate between  $U$  and  $u$  is the main result of this article:

**Main Result.** *Let  $u$  be the solution of (1.1) for a given  $f \in L^1(X, \mu)$ , and let  $U$  be the extended solution associated to a given  $\mathbf{f} \in \mathbb{R}^K$ . Then*

$$\|u - U\|_1 := \max_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|u(\cdot, t) - U(\cdot, t)\|_{L^1} \leq C\xi + \|f - F\|_{L^1},$$

where  $F$  is the extension of  $\mathbf{f}$  and  $\xi$  depends on  $\max\{\text{diam}(X_k) : k \in I_K\}$  and regularity properties of  $J$ . Moreover, if  $f \in C(X)$ , then

$$\|u - U\|_\infty := \max_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|u(\cdot, t) - U(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty} \leq C\xi + \|f - F\|_{L^\infty}.$$

In both cases  $C$  denotes a constant which depends on  $J$  but is otherwise independent of the particular decomposition of  $X$ .

We want to point out the following remarks concerning the above result.

- The approximation  $U$  of  $u$  is as good as the approximation  $F$  of  $f$ , except for the term  $\xi$  measuring the approximation of  $J$  by piecewise constant kernels. This term will have the form  $\delta^r$ , where  $\delta = \max\{\text{diam}(X_k) : k \in I_K\}$  and  $r > 0$  is the Lipschitz regularity of  $J$ . In the particular case of  $f$  and  $J$  Lipschitz continuous, we obtain  $\|u - U\|_\infty \leq C\delta^r$ .
- In every bounded metric space with finite Assouad dimension, and in particular in every bounded space of homogeneous type, we can decompose the space in such a way that  $\delta$  is as small as desired (see [Chr90], [ABI07] or [HK12]).
- In non-atomic spaces of homogeneous type, such as manifolds and typical fractals, the aforementioned decomposition can be obtained such that  $\max\{\mu(X_k) : k \in I_K\}$  is small, allowing the elementary function  $F$  to be as close to  $f$  as desired, choosing  $f_k = \frac{1}{\mu(X_k)} \int_{X_k} f d\mu$ . Moreover, if  $f \in C(X)$ ,  $F$  can be constructed using  $f_k = f(x_k)$ .
- The first numerical method for computing approximate solutions of this kind of nonlocal diffusion problems was presented in [PLR11] for domains of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . We generalize that result to metric measure spaces and provide a different proof, by considering the approximations as solutions to problem (1.1) for piecewise constant kernels  $\bar{J}$ , rather than looking at the solution at points. Indeed, the function  $U$  is the unique solution in  $\mathcal{B}_T$  of problem (1.1) with kernel  $\bar{J}$  and initial datum  $F$  (see Lemma 3.2). So that  $u$  and  $U$  satisfy the same qualitative properties (see Section 2) without having to prove a discrete version of the results.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we present the setting and we prove some qualitative properties of the solution. We shall use these results to show our main result, which is precisely stated in Theorem 3.1 and proved in Section 3. In Section 4 we improve the error estimation given in the main result for the particular case that the initial datum  $f \in L^2(X, \mu)$ . Section 5 is devoted to apply the results on the Sierpinski gasket and the Sierpinski carpet. Finally in Section 6 we state some conclusions and remarks.

## 2. SETTING AND QUALITATIVE PROPERTIES

Let  $X$  be a set. A *quasi-distance* on  $X$  is a non-negative symmetric function  $d$  defined on  $X \times X$  such that  $d(x, y) = 0$  if and only if  $x = y$ , and there exists a constant  $K \geq 1$  such that

$$d(x, y) \leq K(d(x, z) + d(z, y)), \quad \forall x, y, z \in X.$$

A quasi-distance  $d$  on  $X$  induces a topology through the neighborhood system given by the family of all subsets of  $X$  containing a  $d$ -ball  $B(x, r) = \{y \in X : d(x, y) < r\}$ ,  $r > 0$  (see [CW71], [MS79]).

Throughout this paper  $(X, d, \mu)$  shall be a compact quasi-metric measure space such that the  $d$ -balls are open sets with positive  $\mu$ -measure, and  $\mu$  is a finite non-negative Borel measure on  $X$ .

Also,  $J : X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  shall be a measurable function with respect to the product  $\sigma$ -algebra in  $X \times X$  having the following properties:

**(J1)**  $J(x, y) = J(y, x)$  for all  $x, y \in X$ .

**(J2)** The integral  $\int_X J(x, y) d\mu(x)$  is positive and uniformly bounded in  $y \in X$ .

It is worth mentioning that assumptions (J1) and (J2) guarantee that problem (1.1) has a unique solution in  $\mathcal{B}_T$  for each  $f \in L^1(X, \mu)$ , and it belongs to  $C([0, T]; C(X)) \cap C^1((0, T); C(X))$  if  $f \in C(X)$  (see [Act14, Thm. 8.2.2 and Lemma 8.3.1] or [RBSG14]). In this section we shall analyze some qualitative properties of this solution: conservation of the total mass, a comparison principle, stability and asymptotic behavior as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . These properties are analogous to well known properties in the Euclidean case.

**Proposition 2.1** (Conservation of total mass). *Let  $f \in L^1(X, \mu)$  and let  $u$  be the solution of (1.1). Then*

$$\int_X u(x, t) d\mu(x) = \int_X f(x) d\mu(x), \quad \text{for all } t > 0.$$

*Proof.* Notice that for each  $t > 0$  we have

$$u(x, t) = f(x) + \int_0^t \int_X J(x, y)[u(y, s) - u(x, s)] d\mu(y) ds, \quad \text{a.e. } x \in X.$$

The assertion follows after integrating on  $x$  over  $X$ , applying Fubini's theorem and using the symmetry of  $J$ .  $\square$

In order to state the stability of the problem, which is contained in Proposition 2.6, we shall first prove some previous results.

**Lemma 2.2.** *If  $u \in \mathcal{B}_T$  then the scalar function  $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $g(t) = \|u^+(\cdot, t)\|_{L^1}$  is weakly differentiable on  $[0, T]$  and*

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|u^+(\cdot, t)\|_{L^1} = \int_X u_t(x, t) \mathbb{I}_{\{u(\cdot, t) > 0\}}(x) d\mu(x),$$

where  $u^+(x, t) = \max\{u(x, t), 0\}$  is the positive part of  $u$ .

*Remark 2.3.* Notice that if  $u^-(x, t) = \max\{-u(x, t), 0\}$  denotes the negative part of  $u$ , then we have that  $u^-(x, t) = (-u)^+(x, t)$ , so that Lemma 2.2 yields

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|u^-(\cdot, t)\|_{L^1} = - \int_X u_t(x, t) \mathbb{I}_{\{u(\cdot, t) < 0\}}(x) d\mu(x).$$

*Proof of Lemma 2.2.* For  $\varepsilon > 0$ , let  $u_\varepsilon = \varphi_\varepsilon \circ u$  with

$$\varphi_\varepsilon : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad \varphi_\varepsilon(s) = \begin{cases} \sqrt{s^2 + \varepsilon^2} - \varepsilon, & \text{if } s > 0, \\ 0, & \text{if } s \leq 0. \end{cases}$$

Since  $\varphi_\varepsilon(s) \rightarrow \max\{s, 0\}$  uniformly in  $s \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $0 \leq \varphi_\varepsilon(s) \leq \max\{s, 0\}$ , for all  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ , the dominated convergence theorem in  $X$  yields, as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ ,

$$\|u_\varepsilon(\cdot, t)\|_{L^1} = \int_X u_\varepsilon(x, t) d\mu(x) \rightarrow \int_X \max\{u(x, t), 0\} d\mu(x) = \|u^+(\cdot, t)\|_{L^1}.$$

Let  $\psi \in C_0^\infty(0, T)$ . Then, on the one hand, as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$

$$(2.1) \quad \int_0^T \|u_\varepsilon(\cdot, t)\|_{L^1} \psi'(t) dt \rightarrow \int_0^T \|u^+(\cdot, t)\|_{L^1} \psi'(t) dt,$$

by the dominated convergence theorem on  $[0, T]$ .

On the other hand, since  $\varphi_\varepsilon \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$  and  $0 \leq \varphi'_\varepsilon(s) \leq 1$  for all  $s \in \mathbb{R}$  we have that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|u_\varepsilon(\cdot, t)\|_{L^1} = \frac{d}{dt} \int_X \varphi'_\varepsilon(u(x, t)) d\mu(x) = \int_X \varphi_\varepsilon(u(x, t)) u_t(x, t) d\mu(x),$$

so that

$$\int_0^T \|u_\varepsilon(\cdot, t)\|_{L^1} \psi'(t) dt = - \int_0^T \left( \int_X \varphi'_\varepsilon(u(x, t)) u_t(x, t) d\mu(x) \right) \psi(t) dt$$

and thus, as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ ,

$$(2.2) \quad \int_0^T \|u_\varepsilon(\cdot, t)\|_{L^1} \psi'(t) dt \rightarrow - \int_0^T \left( \int_X \mathbb{I}_{\{u(\cdot, t) > 0\}}(x) u_t(x, t) d\mu(x) \right) \psi(t) dt.$$

Here we have used that  $\varphi'_\varepsilon(s) \rightarrow \mathbb{I}_{(0, +\infty)}(s)$  and the dominated convergence theorem twice, once on  $X$  for each  $t \in [0, T]$  and once on  $[0, T]$ . Finally, (2.1) and (2.2) imply that

$$\int_0^T \|u^+(\cdot, t)\|_{L^1} \psi'(t) dt = - \int_0^T \left( \int_X \mathbb{I}_{\{u(\cdot, t) > 0\}}(x) u_t(x, t) d\mu(x) \right) \psi(t) dt$$

and the assertion follows.  $\square$

Let us recall that  $u \in \mathcal{B}_T$  is a *supersolution* of (1.1) if it satisfies

$$\begin{cases} u_t(x, t) \geq Lu(x, t), & \text{in } X \times (0, T), \\ u(x, 0) \geq f(x), & \text{in } X, \end{cases}$$

where

$$Lu(x, t) = \int_X J(x, y) [u(y, t) - u(x, t)] d\mu(y).$$

We define *subsolutions* in a similar way, with  $\leq$  instead of  $\geq$ .

**Lemma 2.4.** *If  $u \in \mathcal{B}_T$  is a supersolution of (1.1), then*

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|u^-(\cdot, t)\|_{L^1} \leq 0.$$

Analogously, if  $u$  is a subsolution, we obtain  $\frac{d}{dt} \|u^+(\cdot, t)\|_{L^1} \leq 0$ .

*Proof.* Since  $u$  is a supersolution of (1.1), Lemma 2.2 (see Remark 2.3) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \|u^-(\cdot, t)\|_{L^1} &= - \int_X u_t(x, t) \mathbb{I}_{\{u(\cdot, t) < 0\}}(x) d\mu(x) \\ &\leq \int_X -Lu(x, t) \mathbb{I}_{\{u(\cdot, t) < 0\}}(x) d\mu(x). \end{aligned}$$

By the definition of  $L$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \|u^-(\cdot, t)\|_{L^1} &\leq \int_{\{x: u(x, t) < 0\}} \left( \int_X J(x, y) [-u(y, t) + u(x, t)] d\mu(y) \right) d\mu(x) \\ &= \int_{\{x: u(x, t) < 0\}} \int_{\{y: u(y, t) < 0\}} J(x, y) [-u(y, t)] d\mu(y) d\mu(x) \\ &\quad + \int_{\{x: u(x, t) < 0\}} \int_{\{y: u(y, t) \geq 0\}} J(x, y) [-u(y, t)] d\mu(y) d\mu(x) \\ &\quad + \int_{\{x: u(x, t) < 0\}} \int_{\{y: u(y, t) < 0\}} J(x, y) u(x, t) d\mu(y) d\mu(x) \\ &\quad + \int_{\{x: u(x, t) < 0\}} \int_{\{y: u(y, t) \geq 0\}} J(x, y) u(x, t) d\mu(y) d\mu(x) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \int_{\{x:u(x,t)<0\}} \int_{\{y:u(y,t)<0\}} J(x,y)[-u(y,t)] d\mu(y) d\mu(x) \\ &\quad + \int_{\{x:u(x,t)<0\}} \int_{\{y:u(y,t)<0\}} J(x,y)u(x,t) d\mu(y) d\mu(x). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $J$  is symmetric the last terms cancel out and we obtain  $\frac{d}{dt}\|u^-(\cdot, t)\|_{L^1} \leq 0$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 2.5** (Comparison principle). *If  $u \in \mathcal{B}_T$  is a supersolution of (1.1) and  $f \geq 0$ , then  $u(\cdot, t) \geq 0$  for every  $t$ .*

*Proof.* From Lemma 2.4, the non-negative function  $g(t) := \|u^-(\cdot, t)\|_{L^1}$  satisfies  $g'(t) \leq 0$  and  $g(0) = 0$ , because  $u(x, 0) \geq 0$  implies  $u^-(\cdot, 0) = 0$ . Then  $g(t) = 0$  for every  $t$ , and therefore  $u(x, t) \geq 0$  for almost every  $x$ , for every  $t$ .  $\square$

We shall use Lemma 2.4 and Corollary 2.5 to prove the following result concerning the stability of problem (1.1).

**Proposition 2.6** (Stability). *Let  $f, g \in L^1(X, \mu)$  and let  $u$  and  $v$  denote the solutions of problem (1.1) with initial conditions  $f$  and  $g$ , respectively. Then*

$$(2.3) \quad \|u - v\|_1 := \max_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|u(\cdot, t) - v(\cdot, t)\|_{L^1} = \|f - g\|_{L^1}.$$

Moreover, if  $f, g \in L^\infty(X, \mu)$ ,

$$(2.4) \quad \|u - v\|_\infty := \max_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|u(\cdot, t) - v(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty} = \|f - g\|_{L^\infty}.$$

*Proof.* In order to prove (2.3), let  $e = u - v$  and observe that

$$\|e(\cdot, t)\|_{L^1} = \|e^+(\cdot, t)\|_{L^1} + \|e^-(\cdot, t)\|_{L^1}.$$

Since  $e_t(x, t) = Le(x, t)$ ,  $e$  is a subsolution and a supersolution to (1.1), so that Lemma 2.4 yields

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|e(\cdot, t)\|_{L^1} = \frac{d}{dt}\|e^+(\cdot, t)\|_{L^1} + \frac{d}{dt}\|e^-(\cdot, t)\|_{L^1} \leq 0.$$

Therefore  $\|e(\cdot, t)\|_{L^1} \leq \|e(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^1} = \|f - g\|_{L^1}$  and (2.3) follows.

To prove (2.4) let  $\ell = \|f - g\|_{L^\infty}$ . Then  $\bar{w} = u - v + \ell$  satisfies  $\bar{w}_t = L\bar{w}$  and  $\bar{w}(0, t) \geq 0$ , so that from Corollary 2.5 we have  $\bar{w}(x, t) \geq 0$  for almost every  $x$  and every  $t$ . Similarly, if we define  $\underline{w} = \ell - (u - v)$  we obtain  $\underline{w}(x, t) \geq 0$ . Then

$$-\ell \leq u(x, t) - v(x, t) \leq \ell,$$

and (2.4) is proved.  $\square$

*Remark 2.7.* Notice that as a consequence of the above proposition we have that if  $u \in \mathcal{B}_T$  is the solution of (1.1) with  $f \in L^\infty(X, \mu)$ , then  $u(\cdot, t) \in L^\infty(X, \mu)$  for each  $t \in [0, T]$ . Moreover,  $\|u\|_\infty = \|f\|_{L^\infty}$ .

Finally we shall study the asymptotic behavior of the solutions. Throughout the rest of this section, we shall assume:

- $(X, d)$  is connected,
- $J(x, x) > 0$  for every  $x$  and  $J(x, y)$  is continuous in  $x$  for each  $y$ .

We shall first consider the corresponding stationary problem:

$$(2.5) \quad Lu(x) = \int_X J(x, y)[u(y) - u(x)] d\mu(y) = 0, \quad x \in X.$$

**Lemma 2.8.** *Every solution in  $L^1(X, \mu)$  of the stationary problem is constant in  $X$ .*

*Proof.* We shall first prove that if  $u \in L^1(X, \mu)$  is a solution of (2.5), then  $u$  is a continuous function. Indeed, for almost every  $x \in X$  we have that

$$u(x) = \int_X \frac{J(x, y)}{I(x)} u(y) d\mu(y),$$

where  $I(x) := \int_X J(x, y) d\mu(y) > 0$  due to (J2). Since  $J$  is continuous and  $X$  is compact, there exists  $I_0 > 0$  such that  $I(x) \geq I_0$  for all  $x \in X$ . Then the function  $\tilde{J}(\cdot, y) = \frac{J(\cdot, y)}{I(\cdot)}$  is continuous and thus uniformly continuous for each  $y$ , which immediately implies that  $u$  is continuous.

Let  $M = \max\{u(x) : x \in X\}$ , and consider the set

$$\mathcal{M} = \{x \in X : u(x) = M\}.$$

Then the set  $\mathcal{M}$  is nonempty and closed. Since the only subsets of a connected space  $X$  which are both open and closed are  $X$  and the empty set, the result is proved if we show that  $\mathcal{M}$  is also open. Fix  $x_0 \in \mathcal{M}$ . Since  $J(x_0, x_0) > 0$  and  $J(x_0, \cdot)$  is continuous, there exists  $r_0 > 0$  such that  $B(x_0, r_0) \subseteq \text{supp } J(x_0, \cdot)$ . Assume that  $B(x_0, r_0) \not\subseteq \mathcal{M}$ , so that there exists  $z \in B(x_0, r_0)$  with  $u(z) < M$ . Hence  $u(y) < M$  for each  $y$  in some ball  $B$  centered in  $z$  and contained in  $\text{supp } J(x_0, \cdot)$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} M = u(x_0) &= \int_{X \setminus B} \tilde{J}(x_0, y) u(y) d\mu(y) + \int_B \tilde{J}(x_0, y) u(y) d\mu(y) \\ &< M \int_X \tilde{J}(x_0, y) d\mu(y) = M, \end{aligned}$$

which is absurd. Hence  $\mathcal{M}$  is open, so that  $u(x) = M$  for every  $x \in X$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 2.9** (Asymptotic behavior). *If  $u \in \mathcal{B}_T$  is the solution of (1.1) for  $f \in L^2(X, \mu)$ , then there exists  $\beta > 0$  such that*

$$\left\| u(\cdot, t) - \int_X f d\mu \right\|_{L^2} \leq e^{-\beta t} \left\| f - \int_X f d\mu \right\|_{L^2},$$

where  $\int_X f d\mu := \frac{1}{\mu(X)} \int_X f d\mu$  denotes the average value of  $f$ .

The proof of this proposition is analogous to the one in [AVMRTM10] but we decided to include it here for the sake of completeness.

*Proof.* From the linearity of the problem, we can assume  $\int_X f d\mu = 0$ . Proposition 2.1 implies that also  $\int_X u d\mu = 0$  for all  $t > 0$ . From the results of [RBSG14], since  $f \in L^2(X, \mu)$  we have that  $u(\cdot, t) \in L^2(X, \mu)$  for each  $t$ . Being  $u$  a solution of problem (1.1), we have that

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2}^2 = \langle u_t, u \rangle = \langle Lu, u \rangle = \frac{\langle Lu, u \rangle}{\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2}^2} \|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq -\beta \|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2}^2,$$

where  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  denotes the usual inner product in  $L^2(X, \mu)$ , and

$$(2.6) \quad \beta := \inf_{v \in L_0^2} -\frac{\langle Lv, v \rangle}{\|v\|_{L^2}^2} = \inf_{v \in L_0^2, \|v\|_{L^2}=1} \langle -Lv, v \rangle,$$

with  $L_0^2 = \{v \in L^2(X, \mu) : \int_X v d\mu = 0\}$ . Hence, if we denote

$$H(t) = \frac{1}{2} \|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2}^2,$$

we have proved that  $H'(t) \leq -2\beta H(t)$ , and using Gronwall's inequality we obtain

$$H(t) \leq e^{-2\beta t} H(0).$$

Therefore, the assertion will be proved if we show that  $\beta > 0$ . Notice that

$$\beta = \inf_{v \in L_0^2} \frac{\frac{1}{2} \int_X \int_X J(x, y) [v(y) - v(x)]^2 d\mu(y) d\mu(x)}{\|v\|_{L^2}^2},$$

hence  $\beta \geq 0$ . To prove that  $\beta$  is strictly positive, consider the operator  $-L : L_0^2 \rightarrow L_0^2$ , and notice that it is self-adjoint, so that  $\beta$  belongs to its spectrum  $\sigma(-L)$  (see [Bre83]). If  $\beta = 0$ , we have that  $0 \in \sigma(-L)$ , then  $-L$  is not invertible. But notice that

$$-Lv(x) = Av(x) - Kv(x) = [A(I - A^{-1}K)]v(x),$$

with

$$Av(x) = v(x) \int_X J(x, y) d\mu(y), \quad \text{and} \quad Kv(x) = \int_X J(x, y)v(y) d\mu(y),$$

so that  $A$  is invertible and  $K$  is compact (see [RBSG14, Prop.3.6]). Then  $I - A^{-1}K$  is not invertible, and Fredholm's alternative yields the existence of a nontrivial  $u \in L_0^2$  such that  $(I - A^{-1}K)u = 0$ , or equivalently,  $Lu = 0$ . From Lemma 2.8  $u$  must be constant, and thus  $\int_X u d\mu \neq 0$ , which is a contradiction.  $\square$

**Corollary 2.10.** *If  $u \in \mathcal{B}_T$  is the solution of (1.1) for a given  $f \in L^1(X, \mu)$ , then*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \left\| u(\cdot, t) - \int_X f d\mu \right\|_{L^1} = 0.$$

*Proof.* Let  $f \in L^1(X)$ , and as before, assume without loss of generality, that  $\int_X f d\mu = 0$ . Given  $\varepsilon > 0$ , let  $g \in L^2(X)$  be such that  $\int_X g d\mu = 0$  and  $\|f - g\|_{L^1} \leq \varepsilon/2$ . Let  $v$  be the solution of (1.1) with initial datum  $g$ , so that Proposition 2.9 yields

$$\|v(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2} \leq e^{-\beta t} \|g\|_{L^2}$$

for some  $\beta > 0$ . Then, by Proposition 2.6 and Hölder inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^1} &\leq \|u(\cdot, t) - v(\cdot, t)\|_{L^1} + \|v(\cdot, t)\|_{L^1} \\ &\leq \|f - g\|_{L^1} + \mu(X)^{1/2} \|v(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq \varepsilon/2 + \mu(X)^{1/2} e^{-\beta t} \|g\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Choosing  $t_* > 0$  such that  $\mu(X)^{1/2} e^{-\beta t_*} \|g\|_{L^2} = \varepsilon/2$  we have that

$$\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^1} \leq \varepsilon,$$

for all  $t \geq t_*$  and the claim follows.  $\square$

*Remark 2.11.* The assumption of  $X$  being connected is used only in the proof of Lemma 2.8 and can be weakened. Assuming  $X$  to be  $R$ -connected as in [RBSG14] is sufficient for the assertion. A weaker assumption, stated in [GO07, Lemma 2.2] also implies the assertion of Lemma 2.8. It reads as follows: given two points  $x, y \in X$  there exists a finite sequence  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k \in X$  such that

$$J(x, x_1)J(x_1, x_2) \dots J(x_{k-1}, x_k)J(x_k, y) > 0.$$

We kept the stronger assumption of  $X$  being connected to simplify the presentation.

## 3. MAIN RESULT

From now on we shall assume:

**(J3)** There exists a constant  $\lambda > 0$  and  $r \in (0, 1]$  such that

$$(3.1) \quad |J(x, y) - J(x, z)| \leq \lambda d(y, z)^r, \quad \forall x, y, z \in X.$$

Notice that this condition implies condition (J2) stated in page 4.

In order to state our main result, fix a decomposition  $\{X_1, \dots, X_K\}$  of  $X$  and a set of representative points  $\{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ . From now on

$$\delta := \max\{\text{diam}(X_k) : k = 1, \dots, K\}$$

is called the *size* of the decomposition. Let  $\bar{J}$  be the kernel defined on  $X \times X$  which is constant on each  $X_i \times X_k$ , taking the value of  $J$  in the representative pair  $(x_i, x_k)$ , i.e.

$$\bar{J}(x, y) := J(x_i, x_k), \quad \text{if } x \in X_i \text{ and } y \in X_k.$$

Finally, given a discrete initial condition  $\mathbf{f} = [f_1, \dots, f_K] \in \mathbb{R}^K$  let  $U$  be the extended solution associated to  $\mathbf{f}$  and let  $F$  be the extension of  $\mathbf{f}$  (see (1.3)). The main error estimate reads as follows:

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $u$  be the solution of (1.1) for a given  $f \in L^p(X, \mu)$ , for  $p = 1$  or  $p = \infty$ . Then*

$$\|u - U\|_p \leq 4\lambda\mu(X)T\|f\|_{L^p}\delta^r + \|f - F\|_{L^p},$$

where  $\lambda$  and  $r$  denote the Lipschitz constants of  $J$  from (3.1).

To prove this theorem we need the following lemmas. We first show that the function  $U$  also solves problem (1.1) with kernel  $\bar{J}$ , and initial datum  $F$ .

**Lemma 3.2.** *The function  $U$  is the unique solution in  $\mathcal{B}_T$  of the problem*

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{cases} U_t(x, t) = \int_X \bar{J}(x, y)[U(y, t) - U(x, t)]d\mu(y), & x \in X, t \in (0, T), \\ U(x, 0) = F(x), & x \in X. \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* Notice first that  $U \in C([0, T]; C(X_k)) \cap C^\infty((0, T); C(X_k))$  for every  $k$ , so that  $U \in \mathcal{B}_T$ . In order to see that  $U$  solves (3.2), fix  $x \in X$  and  $t \in (0, T)$ . Then there exists a unique  $i$  such that  $x \in X_i$ , so that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_X \bar{J}(x, y)[U(y, t) - U(x, t)]d\mu(y) &= \sum_{k=1}^K \int_{X_k} \bar{J}(x, y)[U(y, t) - U(x, t)]d\mu(y) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^K J(x_i, x_k)[u_k(t) - u_i(t)]\mu(X_k) \\ &= \frac{d}{dt}u_i(t) = U_t(x, t), \end{aligned}$$

and  $U(x, 0) = u_i(0) = F(x)$ . Since  $\bar{J}$  satisfies (J1) and (J2) (see page 4), problem (3.2) has a unique solution and the assertion follows.  $\square$

The next lemma shows that

$$\bar{L}u(x, t) := \int_X \bar{J}(x, y)[u(y, t) - u(x, t)]d\mu(y),$$

approximates  $Lu$  in terms of the regularity of  $J$ .

**Lemma 3.3.** *If  $u \in L^p(X, \mu)$  for  $p = 1$  or  $p = \infty$  then*

$$\|Lu - \bar{L}u\|_{L^p} \leq 4\lambda\mu(X)\|u\|_{L^p}\delta^r.$$

*Proof.* Notice that if  $x \in X_i$  and  $y \in X_k$ , from the symmetry and the Lipschitz condition of  $J$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} |J(x, y) - J(x_i, x_k)| &\leq |J(x, y) - J(x_i, y)| + |J(x_i, y) - J(x_i, x_k)| \\ &\leq \lambda(d(x, x_i)^r + d(y, x_k)^r) \\ &\leq 2\lambda\delta^r. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for  $u \in L^1(X, \mu)$  and  $x \in X$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} |Lu(x) - \bar{L}u(x)| &\leq \sum_{k=1}^K \int_{X_k} |J(x, y) - \bar{J}(x, y)| |u(y) - u(x)| d\mu(y) \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^K \int_{X_k} |J(x, y) - J(x_i, x_k)| |u(y) - u(x)| d\mu(y) \\ &\leq 2\lambda\delta^r \sum_{k=1}^K \int_{X_k} |u(y) - u(x)| d\mu(y) \\ (3.3) \qquad &\leq 2\lambda\delta^r \int_X (|u(y) - u(x)|) d\mu(y). \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \|Lu - \bar{L}u\|_{L^1} &= \int_X |Lu(x) - \bar{L}u(x)| d\mu(x) \\ &\leq 2\lambda\delta^r \int_X \left( \int_X (|u(y)| + |u(x)|) d\mu(y) \right) d\mu(x) \\ &= 4\lambda\delta^r \mu(X) \|u\|_{L^1}. \end{aligned}$$

Also, if  $u \in L^\infty(X, \mu)$ ,

$$\|Lu - \bar{L}u\|_{L^\infty} \leq 2\lambda\delta^r \int_X (|u(y)| + \|u\|_{L^\infty}) d\mu(y) \leq 4\lambda\delta^r \mu(X) \|u\|_{L^\infty},$$

and the lemma is proved.  $\square$

The following result compares the solutions of problems with the same initial condition, but with different kernels  $J$  and  $\bar{J}$ .

**Lemma 3.4.** *Let  $f \in L^p(X, \mu)$ , for  $p = 1$  or  $p = \infty$ . Let  $V$  be the unique solution in  $\mathcal{B}_T$  of (1.1) with kernel  $\bar{J}$  instead of  $J$ . Then, if  $u$  is the solution of (1.1), we have that*

$$\|u - V\|_p \leq 4\lambda\mu(X)T\|f\|_{L^p}\delta^r,$$

with  $\lambda$  and  $r$  as in Theorem 3.1.

*Proof.* Define  $w = u - V$ , and notice that  $w$  solves

$$\begin{cases} w_t(x, t) = \bar{L}w(x, t) + G(x, t), & \text{in } X \times (0, T), \\ w(x, 0) = 0, & \text{in } X. \end{cases}$$

where  $G(x, t) = Lu(x, t) - \bar{L}u(x, t)$ .

Let us first consider the case  $u \in \mathcal{B}_T$ . Let  $v$  be the unique solution in  $\mathcal{B}_T$  of

$$\begin{cases} v_t(x, t) = \bar{L}v(x, t) + |G(x, t)|, & \text{in } X \times (0, T), \\ v(x, 0) = 0, & \text{in } X. \end{cases}$$

It is worth mentioning that the exact same arguments used in [Act14] to prove existence of solution of the homogeneous problem (1.1) allow us to prove that this

inhomogeneous problem has a unique solution in  $\mathcal{B}_T$ . Then  $v - w$  satisfies

$$\begin{cases} (v - w)_t(x, t) \geq \bar{L}(v - w)(x, t), & \text{in } X \times (0, T), \\ (v - w)(x, 0) = 0, & \text{in } X. \end{cases}$$

From Corollary 2.5 we have that  $v - w \geq 0$ . Analogously we obtain  $v + w \geq 0$ , so that  $|w| \leq v$ . Notice also that from the symmetry of  $J$  we have that  $\int_X \bar{L}v(x, t) d\mu(x) = 0$ . Then, for each  $t$  we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_X |w(x, t)| d\mu(x) &\leq \int_X v(x, t) d\mu(x) \\ &= \int_X \int_0^t v_t(x, s) ds d\mu(x) \\ &= \int_0^t \int_X |G(x, s)| d\mu(x) ds \\ &\leq t \|G\|_1 \\ &\leq T4\lambda\mu(X) \|u\|_1 \delta^r, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality stems from Lemma 3.3. Hence

$$\|u - V\|_1 \leq 4\lambda\mu(X)T \|u\|_1 \delta^r = 4\lambda\mu(X)T \|f\|_{L^1} \delta^r,$$

due to Proposition 2.6.

Let us now consider the case  $f \in L^\infty(X, \mu)$ . From Remark 2.7 we have that  $\|u\|_\infty = \|f\|_{L^\infty} < \infty$ . Define  $\bar{v}(x, t) = k\delta^r t - w(x, t)$ , with  $k = 4\lambda\mu(X) \|u\|_\infty$ . Notice that

$$\bar{v}_t(x, t) = k\delta^r - w_t(x, t) = k\delta^r - G(x, t) - \bar{L}w(x, t).$$

From Lemma 3.3, we have that  $k\delta^r - G(x, t) \geq 0$ . Then

$$\bar{v}_t(x, t) \geq -\bar{L}w(x, t) = \bar{L}\bar{v}(x, t) - \bar{L}(k\delta^r t) = \bar{L}\bar{v}(x, t).$$

Besides  $\bar{v}(x, 0) = 0$ , so that Corollary 2.5 yields  $\bar{v}(x, t) \geq 0$ , and thus  $w(x, t) \leq k\delta^r t$ .

Analogously, if we define  $\underline{v}(x, t) = k\delta^r t + w(x, t)$ , we can prove that  $\underline{v}(x, t) \geq 0$ , and then  $w(x, t) \geq -k\delta^r t$ . Then for almost every  $x \in X$  and for every  $t$  we have

$$|u(x, t) - V(x, t)| \leq k\delta^r t \leq kT\delta^r.$$

Therefore,

$$\|u - V\|_\infty \leq 4\lambda\mu(X) \|u\|_\infty T\delta^r,$$

and the assertion follows from (2.4).  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 3.1.* From Lemma 3.2,  $U$  is the unique solution in  $\mathcal{B}_T$  of problem (3.2). If  $V$  is defined as in Lemma 3.4, then

$$\|u - V\|_1 \leq 4\lambda T \|f\|_{L^1} \delta^r.$$

Besides, from Proposition 2.6 applied to  $\bar{J}$  and the initial conditions  $F$  and  $f$  we have

$$\|U - V\|_1 \leq \|f - F\|_{L^1}.$$

Hence

$$\|u - U\|_1 \leq \|u - V\|_1 + \|V - U\|_1 \leq 4\lambda T \|f\|_{L^1} \delta^r + \|f - F\|_{L^1}.$$

The case  $f \in L^\infty(X, \mu)$  can be proved analogously.  $\square$

4. A SHARPER ERROR ESTIMATION FOR INITIAL DATUM IN  $L^2$ 

In Lemma 3.4 we proved that the error obtained approximating the solution  $u$  of problem (1.1) by the solution of the same problem but with a piecewise constant kernel  $\bar{J}$ , can be made as small as desired at any time provided the size of the decomposition of  $X$  is small enough. More precisely, if  $f \in L^1(X, \mu)$  and  $u$  and  $V$  denote the unique solutions in  $\mathcal{B}_T$  of (1.1) with kernels  $J$  and  $\bar{J}$  respectively, then for each  $t > 0$  we have

$$\|u(\cdot, t) - V(\cdot, t)\|_{L^1} \leq 4\lambda t \|f\|_{L^1} \delta^r,$$

where  $\delta$  is the size of the decomposition of  $X$ , and  $\lambda$  and  $r$  denote the Lipschitz constants of  $J$  from (3.1). As we mentioned in Section 1, every bounded metric space with finite Assouad dimension, and in particular every bounded space of homogeneous type (such as manifolds and classical fractals), can be decomposed in such a way that  $\delta$  is as small as desired. However, this bound is pessimistic for large values of  $t$ . Notice that, independently of the decomposition, for any  $t > 0$  we have

$$\|u(\cdot, t) - V(\cdot, t)\|_{L^1} \leq \left\| u(\cdot, t) - \int_X f d\mu \right\|_{L^1} + \left\| V(\cdot, t) - \int_X f d\mu \right\|_{L^1},$$

which tends to zero when  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , due to Corollary 2.10. For the case  $f \in L^2(X, \mu)$ , from Proposition 2.9 and Hölder inequality we can obtain a more precise bound:

$$\|u(\cdot, t) - V(\cdot, t)\|_{L^1} \leq 2\mu(X)^{1/2} \left\| f - \int_X f d\mu \right\|_{L^2} e^{-\beta_0 t},$$

with  $\beta_0 = \min\{\beta, \bar{\beta}\} > 0$ , where  $\beta$  and  $\bar{\beta}$  are defined as in (2.6) with  $L$  and  $\bar{L}$  respectively. On the other hand, using (3.3) and following the lines of the proof of Lemma 3.4, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|u(\cdot, t) - V(\cdot, t)\|_{L^1} &\leq \int_0^t \int_X |Lu(x, s) - \bar{L}u(x, s)| d\mu(x) ds \\ &\leq 2\lambda\delta^r \int_0^t \int_X \left( \int_X |u(y, s) - u(x, s)| d\mu(y) \right) d\mu(x) ds \\ &\leq 4\mu(X)\lambda\delta^r \int_0^t \int_X \left| u(y, s) - \int_X f d\mu \right| d\mu(y) ds \\ &= 4\mu(X)\lambda\delta^r \int_0^t \left\| u(\cdot, s) - \int_X f d\mu \right\|_{L^1} ds \\ &\leq 4\mu(X)^{3/2}\lambda\delta^r \int_0^t \left\| u(\cdot, s) - \int_X f d\mu \right\|_{L^2} ds \\ &\leq 4\mu(X)^{3/2}\lambda\delta^r \left\| f - \int_X f d\mu \right\|_{L^2} \int_0^t e^{-\beta s} ds \\ &\leq \frac{4\mu(X)^{3/2}\lambda \left\| f - \int_X f d\mu \right\|_{L^2}}{\beta} \delta^r. \end{aligned}$$

Then, for the case  $f \in L^2(X, \mu)$  we obtain that there exists a constant  $C$  such that

$$\|u(\cdot, t) - V(\cdot, t)\|_{L^1} \leq C \min\{e^{-\beta_0 t}, \delta^r\},$$

so that

$$\|u(\cdot, t) - U(\cdot, t)\|_{L^1} \leq C \min\{e^{-\beta_0 t}, \delta^r\} + \|f - F\|_{L^1}.$$

Therefore, except for the initial error  $\|f - F\|_{L^1}$ , for large times  $t$  the approximation is very good even with a poor decomposition of  $X$ , due to the asymptotic

behavior of the solutions. In order to have good approximations for the initial phase of small time  $t$ , we require that the decomposition has a small size  $\delta$ .

## 5. EXAMPLES

The aim of this section is to give examples of explicit spaces of homogeneous type  $(X, d, \mu)$  where Theorem 3.1 can be applied in order to obtain numerical approximations of the solution of problem (1.1). As we already mentioned, every bounded space of homogeneous type can be decomposed in the required form due to the construction provided by M. Christ in [Chr90]. Nevertheless, in the case of the classical fractals it is more suitable to work with another decomposition of the space that exploit their self-similarity property. We consider the usual approximation induced by the associated iterated function system (IFS); see [Hut81] or [Fal97].

Given a metric space  $(Y, d)$  we shall consider a finite set  $\Phi = \{\phi_i : Y \rightarrow Y, i = 1, 2, \dots, H\}$  of contractive similitudes with the same contraction rate  $\alpha$ . This means that each  $\phi_i$  satisfies

$$d(\phi_i(x), \phi_i(y)) = \alpha d(x, y)$$

for every  $x, y \in Y$  and some  $0 < \alpha < 1$ . Also we shall assume that the IFS  $\Phi$  satisfies the *open set condition*, which means that there exists a non-empty open set  $U \subset Y$  such that

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^H \phi_i(U) \subseteq U,$$

and  $\phi_i(U) \cap \phi_j(U) = \emptyset$  if  $i \neq j$ . For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\mathcal{J}^n = \{1, 2, \dots, H\}^n$  be the set of “words” of length  $n$ . Given  $\mathbf{i} = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n) \in \mathcal{J}^n$ , we denote with  $\phi_{\mathbf{i}}^n$  the composition  $\phi_{i_n} \circ \phi_{i_{n-1}} \circ \dots \circ \phi_{i_2} \circ \phi_{i_1}$ . Then for any subset  $E$  of  $X$  we write  $\phi_{\mathbf{i}}^n(E) = (\phi_{i_n} \circ \phi_{i_{n-1}} \circ \dots \circ \phi_{i_2} \circ \phi_{i_1})(E)$ .

It is well known that if  $E$  is a compact set and  $X^n = \bigcup_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{J}^n} \phi_{\mathbf{i}}^n(E)$ , then the sequence of sets  $\{X^n\}_n$  converges in the sense of the Hausdorff distance to a non-empty compact set  $X$ , which is called the *attractor* of the system  $\Phi$  since it is the unique satisfying

$$X = \bigcup_{i=1}^H \phi_i(X).$$

It is also called the fractal induced by the IFS  $\Phi$ , and moreover, if  $E$  satisfies  $\phi_i(E) \subseteq E$  for every  $i$ , then  $X = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} X^n$ .

There exists also a Borel probability measure  $\mu$  supported on the attractor  $X$ . This measure is called *invariant* or *self-affine* since is the unique measure satisfying

$$\mu(A) = \frac{1}{H} \sum_{i=1}^H \mu(\phi_i^{-1}(A))$$

for every Borel set  $A$ . Moreover, the results in [Mos97] show that  $(X, d, \mu)$  is an Ahlfors regular space of dimension  $s = -\log_{\alpha} H$ .

In what follows we will present a couple of simulations for different fractals.

Among other aspects, these numerical approximations allow us to visualize the lack of regularizing effect of the non-local diffusion. We can see that, even though the solution *tries to become continuous*, the jump from the initial condition is present at all times.

**5.1. Sierpinski gasket.** Let  $X$  be the Sierpinski Gasket in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , equipped with the usual distance  $d$  and the normalized  $s$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure  $\mu$ , with  $s = \log 3 / \log 2$ . This fractal  $X$  is induced by the IFS  $\Phi = \{\phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3\}$  given by [Fal97]

$$\phi_1(x) = \frac{1}{2}x, \quad \phi_2(x) = \frac{1}{2}x + \begin{pmatrix} 1/2 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \phi_3(x) = \frac{1}{2}x + \begin{pmatrix} 1/4 \\ \sqrt{3}/4 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Given a natural number  $n$ , we define

$$\Phi_n = \{\phi : \phi = \phi_{i_1} \circ \phi_{i_2} \circ \cdots \circ \phi_{i_n} : i_j \in \{1, 2, 3\}\},$$

and number the functions of  $\Phi_n$  as  $\phi_k^n$ ,  $k \in I_{3^n} = \{1, 2, \dots, 3^n\}$ . Then, on the one hand,  $X = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{k=1}^{3^n} \phi_k^n(S)$ , with  $S$  the triangle of vertices  $(0, 0)$ ,  $(1, 0)$ ,  $(1/2, \sqrt{3}/2)$ . On the other hand, for a fixed  $n$  we define  $X_k = \phi_k^n(X)$ , and it turns out that

$$X = \bigcup_{k=1}^{3^n} X_k.$$

The invariant measure satisfies that  $\mu(X_k) = 1/3^n$ , and except for a set of  $\mu$ -measure zero, this sets  $X_k$  are pairwise disjoint, so that  $\{X_k\}_{k \in I_{3^n}}$  is an appropriate decomposition of  $X$ . In order to apply Theorem 3.1 we only need to identify a point in each one of these components. We choose the bottom left vertex of each  $X_k$ , i.e.,  $x_k = \phi_k^n(0, 0)$ ,  $k \in I_{3^n}$ .

We consider equation (1.1) with  $J(x, y) = 100e^{-100|x-y|^2}$  and  $f(x) = \mathbb{I}_{\{x_1 < x_2\}}(x)$ . The solutions at time  $t = 0, 0.2, 0.5, 1, 2, 4$  for  $n = 7$  are shown in Figure 1. The time discretization was done with the fourth order Runge-Kutta scheme using  $\Delta t = 0.05$ .

**5.2. Sierpinski carpet.** In this subsection we consider the Sierpinski carpet, which is induced by IFS  $\Phi = \{\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_8\}$  given by

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_1(x) &= \frac{1}{3}x, & \phi_2(x) &= \frac{1}{3}x + \begin{pmatrix} 1/3 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, & \phi_3(x) &= \frac{1}{3}x + \begin{pmatrix} 2/3 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\ \phi_4(x) &= \frac{1}{3}x + \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1/3 \end{pmatrix}, & & & \phi_5(x) &= \frac{1}{3}x + \begin{pmatrix} 2/3 \\ 1/3 \end{pmatrix}, \\ \phi_6(x) &= \frac{1}{3}x + \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 2/3 \end{pmatrix}, & \phi_7(x) &= \frac{1}{3}x + \begin{pmatrix} 1/3 \\ 2/3 \end{pmatrix}, & \phi_8(x) &= \frac{1}{3}x + \begin{pmatrix} 2/3 \\ 2/3 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

As before, given a natural number  $n$ , we define

$$\Phi_n = \{\phi : \phi = \phi_{i_1} \circ \phi_{i_2} \circ \cdots \circ \phi_{i_n} : i_j \in \{1, 2, \dots, 8\}\},$$

and number the functions of  $\Phi_n$  as  $\phi_k^n$ ,  $k \in I_{8^n} = \{1, 2, \dots, 8^n\}$ . Then, on the one hand,  $X = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{k=1}^{8^n} \phi_k^n(S)$ , with  $S = [0, 1]^2$  the unit square. On the other hand, for a fixed  $n$ ,  $X = \bigcup_{k=1}^{8^n} X_k$  if  $X_k = \phi_k^n(X)$ . Also, the invariant measure satisfies that  $\mu(X_k) = 1/8^n$ , and except for a set of  $\mu$ -measure zero, this sets  $X_k$  are pairwise disjoint. In order to apply Theorem 3.1 we choose as a representative of each component  $X_k$  the bottom left vertex, i.e.,  $x_k = \phi_k^n(0, 0)$ ,  $k \in I_{8^n}$ .

We consider equation (1.1) with  $J(x, y) = 100e^{-100|x-y|^2}$  and  $f(x) = \mathbb{I}_{\{x_2 > x_1/2\}}(x)$ . The solutions at time  $t = 0, 0.2, 0.5, 1, 2, 4$  for  $n = 4$  are shown in Figure 2. The time discretization was done with the fourth order Runge-Kutta scheme using  $\Delta t = 0.05$ .

The code was implemented in MATLAB and the graphics were produced with PARAVIEW.




FIGURE 1. Nonlocal diffusion on the Sierpinski gasket. Solution with  $J(x, y) = 100e^{-100|x-y|^2}$  and  $f(x) = \mathbb{I}_{\{x_1 < x_2\}}(x)$ . Snapshot of solution, from left to right and top to bottom, at  $t = 0, 0.2, 0.5, 1, 2, 4$ . The space  $X$  is decomposed into  $3^7$  components  $X_k$ . Each set  $X_k = \phi_k(X)$  was drawn as  $\phi_k(S)$  with  $S$  the triangle of vertices  $(0, 0)$ ,  $(1, 0)$ ,  $(1/2, \sqrt{3}/2)$ . The time discretization was done with the fourth order Runge-Kutta scheme using  $\Delta t = 0.05$ . The lack of regularizing effect of the non-local diffusion is apparent. Even though the solution *tries to become continuous*, the jump from the initial condition is present at all times.

## 6. CONCLUSIONS

We have presented a numerical method to approximate the solution of an evolutionary nonlocal diffusion problem. The theory is valid in a general setting of metric measure spaces, which include fractals, manifolds and domains of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  as particular cases. We proved error estimates in  $L^\infty([0, T]; L^p(X, \mu))$  for  $p = 1, 2$  whenever the initial datum  $f \in L^p(X, \mu)$ . If the initial datum belongs to  $L^2(X, \mu)$  the estimate for the error in  $L^\infty([0, T]; L^1(X))$  is improved and made independent of  $T$ .

Besides, we have studied some qualitative properties of the discrete and exact solutions, obtaining stability estimates, proving comparison principles and determining the asymptotic behavior as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . This was done in a unified framework after noticing that the discrete solution is also the exact solution of a nonlocal diffusion problem, with piecewise constant kernel and initial datum.

We have implemented the numerical method in MATLAB and presented at the end some simulations on the Sierpinski gasket and the Sierpinski carpet, with an exponential kernel. This illustrates the behavior of the solutions of the nonlocal diffusion problem on fractals, and sets the basis for the study of other differential equations on fractals.

The MATLAB code and some animations can be found at

<http://imal.santafe-conicet.gov.ar/pmorin/Papers/42/MATLAB>

**Acknowledgements.** This work was partially supported by CONICET through grant PIP 112-2011-0100742, by Universidad Nacional del Litoral through grants




FIGURE 2. Nonlocal diffusion on the Sierpinski carpet. Solution with  $J(x, y) = 100e^{-100|x-y|^2}$  and  $f(x) = \mathbb{I}_{\{x_2 > x_1/2\}}(x)$ . Snapshot of solution, from left to right and top to bottom, at  $t = 0, 0.5, 1, 2, 4, 8$ . The space  $X$  is decomposed into  $8^4$  components  $X_k$ . Each set  $X_k = \phi_k(X)$  was drawn as  $\phi_k(S)$  with  $S$  the unit square. The time discretization was done with the fourth order Runge-Kutta scheme using  $\Delta t = 0.05$ .

CAI+D PJ 500 201101 00048 LI, CAI+D PI 501 201101 00476 LI, and by Agencia Nacional de Promoción Científica y Tecnológica, through grants PICT-2012-2590, PICT-2013-3293 (Argentina).

#### REFERENCES

- [ABI07] Hugo A. Aimar, Ana Bernardis, and Bibiana Iaffei, *Multiresolution approximations and unconditional bases on weighed Lebesgue spaces on spaces of homogeneous type*, *Journal of Approximation Theory* **148** (2007), 12–34.
- [Act14] Marcelo Actis, *Difusiones no locales y operadores de derivación fraccionaria en espacios métricos de medida*, 2014, PHD Thesis, Universidad Nacional del Litoral.
- [AVMRTM10] Fuensanta Andreu-Vaillo, José M. Mazón, Julio D. Rossi, and J. Julián Toledo-Melero, *Nonlocal diffusion problems*, *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*, vol. 165, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2010. MR 2722295 (2011i:35002)
- [BHS14] Renee Bell, Ching-Wei Ho, and Robert S. Strichartz, *Energy measures of harmonic functions on the Sierpiński gasket*, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **63** (2014), no. 3, 831–868. MR 3254525
- [BKS13] Matthew Begué, Tristan Kalloniatis, and Robert S. Strichartz, *Harmonic functions and the spectrum of the Laplacian on the Sierpinski carpet*, *Fractals* **21** (2013), no. 1, 1350002, 32. MR 3042410
- [Bre83] Haïm Brezis, *Analyse fonctionnelle*, *Collection Mathématiques Appliquées pour la Maîtrise. [Collection of Applied Mathematics for the Master's Degree]*, Masson, Paris, 1983, Théorie et applications. [Theory and applications]. MR 697382 (85a:46001)
- [CER09] Carmen Cortazar, Manuel Elgueta, and Julio D. Rossi, *Nonlocal diffusion problems that approximate the heat equation with Dirichlet boundary conditions*, *Israel J. Math.* **170** (2009), 53–60. MR 2506317 (2010e:35197)
- [Chr90] Michael Christ, *A  $T(b)$  theorem with remarks on analytic capacity and the Cauchy integral*, *Colloq. Math.* **60/61** (1990), no. 2, 601–628. MR 1096400 (92k:42020)

- [CW71] Ronald R. Coifman and Guido Weiss, *Analyse harmonique non-commutative sur certains espaces homogènes*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 242, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1971, Étude de certaines intégrales singulières. MR 0499948 (58 #17690)
- [Fal97] Kenneth Falconer, *Techniques in fractal geometry*, John Wiley & Sons Ltd., Chichester, 1997. MR 99f:28013
- [Fif03] Paul Fife, *Some nonclassical trends in parabolic and parabolic-like evolutions*, Trends in nonlinear analysis, Springer, Berlin, 2003, pp. 153–191. MR 1999098 (2004h:35100)
- [GO07] Guy Gilboa and Stanley Osher, *Nonlocal linear image regularization and supervised segmentation*, Multiscale Model. Simul. **6** (2007), no. 2, 595–630. MR 2338496 (2008m:68215)
- [HK12] Tuomas Hytönen and Anna Kairema, *Systems of dyadic cubes in a doubling metric space*, Colloq. Math. **126** (2012), no. 1, 1–33. MR 2901199
- [Hut81] John E. Hutchinson, *Fractals and self-similarity*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **30** (1981), no. 5, 713–747. MR 625600 (82h:49026)
- [IRS13] Marius Ionescu, Luke G. Rogers, and Robert S. Strichartz, *Pseudo-differential operators on fractals and other metric measure spaces*, Rev. Mat. Iberoam. **29** (2013), no. 4, 1159–1190. MR 3148599
- [Kig89] Jun Kigami, *A harmonic calculus on the Sierpiński spaces*, Japan J. Appl. Math. **6** (1989), no. 2, 259–290. MR 1001286 (91g:31005)
- [Kig93] ———, *Harmonic calculus on p.c.f. self-similar sets*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **335** (1993), no. 2, 721–755. MR 1076617 (93d:39008)
- [LS14] Weilin Li and Robert S. Strichartz, *Boundary value problems on a half Sierpinski gasket*, J. Fractal Geom. **1** (2014), no. 1, 1–43. MR 3166205
- [Mos97] Umberto Mosco, *Variational fractals*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4) **25** (1997), no. 3-4, 683–712 (1998), Dedicated to Ennio De Giorgi. MR 1655537 (99m:28023)
- [MS79] Roberto A. Macías and Carlos Segovia, *Lipschitz functions on spaces of homogeneous type*, Adv. in Math. **33** (1979), no. 3, 257–270. MR 546295 (81c:32017a)
- [OS12] Justin Owen and Robert S. Strichartz, *Boundary value problems for harmonic functions on a domain in the Sierpinski gasket*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **61** (2012), no. 1, 319–335. MR 3029400
- [PLR11] Mayte Pérez-Llanos and Julio D. Rossi, *Numerical approximations for a non-local evolution equation*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **49** (2011), no. 5, 2103–2123. MR 2861711 (2012m:65475)
- [QS13] Hua Qiu and Robert S. Strichartz, *Mean value properties of harmonic functions on Sierpinski gasket type fractals*, J. Fourier Anal. Appl. **19** (2013), no. 5, 943–966. MR 3110587
- [RBSG14] Aníbal Rodríguez-Bernal and Silvia Sastre-Gómez, *Linear nonlocal diffusion problems in metric measure spaces*, Preprint (2014), arXiv:1412.5438.
- [SST13] Calum Spicer, Robert S. Strichartz, and Emad Totari, *Laplacians on Julia sets III: Cubic Julia sets and formal matings*, Fractal geometry and dynamical systems in pure and applied mathematics. I. Fractals in pure mathematics, Contemp. Math., vol. 600, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2013, pp. 327–348. MR 3203408

INSTITUTO DE MATEMÁTICA APLICADA DEL LITORAL, UNIVERSIDAD NACIONAL DEL LITORAL AND CONICET. DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICA, FACULTAD DE INGENIERÍA QUÍMICA, UNIVERSIDAD NACIONAL DEL LITORAL, SANTA FE, ARGENTINA.

*E-mail address:* [mactis@santafe-conicet.gov.ar](mailto:mactis@santafe-conicet.gov.ar)

INSTITUTO DE MATEMÁTICA APLICADA DEL LITORAL, UNIVERSIDAD NACIONAL DEL LITORAL AND CONICET. DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICA, FACULTAD DE HUMANIDADES Y CIENCIAS, UNIVERSIDAD NACIONAL DEL LITORAL, SANTA FE, ARGENTINA.

*E-mail address:* [mcarena@santafe-conicet.gov.ar](mailto:mcarena@santafe-conicet.gov.ar)

INSTITUTO DE MATEMÁTICA APLICADA DEL LITORAL, UNIVERSIDAD NACIONAL DEL LITORAL AND CONICET. DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICA, FACULTAD DE INGENIERÍA QUÍMICA, UNIVERSIDAD NACIONAL DEL LITORAL, SANTA FE, ARGENTINA.

*E-mail address:* [pmorin@santafe-conicet.gov.ar](mailto:pmorin@santafe-conicet.gov.ar)