# Subtraction Techniques for the close evaluation of layer potentials

Camille Carvalho







Subtraction techniques for layer potentials, CARVALHO, 2020.



$$\begin{aligned} \Delta u + k^2 u &= 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \overline{D}, \\ u &= f \quad \text{on } \partial D, \\ \partial_r u - \mathrm{i} k u &= o(r^{-1/2}), \quad r \to \infty, \end{aligned}$$

2



$$\begin{aligned} \Delta u + k^2 u &= 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \overline{D}, \\ u &= f \quad \text{on } \partial D, \\ \partial_r u - \mathbf{i} k u &= o(r^{-1/2}), \quad r \to \infty, \end{aligned}$$

Goal: accurately evaluate the near field, that is the solution of the scattering problem near the boundary.



$$\begin{aligned} \Delta u + k^2 u &= 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \overline{D}, \\ u &= f \quad \text{on } \partial D, \\ \partial_r u - \mathbf{i} k u &= o(r^{-1/2}), \quad r \to \infty, \end{aligned}$$

Goal: accurately evaluate the near field, that is the solution of the scattering problem near the boundary.

Why ? Problems in Stokes flow and plasmonic problems require accurate evaluation near the boundary.



$$\begin{aligned} \Delta u + k^2 u &= 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \overline{D}, \\ u &= f \quad \text{on } \partial D, \\ \partial_r u - \mathbf{i} k u &= o(r^{-1/2}), \quad r \to \infty, \end{aligned}$$

Goal: accurately evaluate the near field, that is the solution of the scattering problem near the boundary.

Why ? Problems in Stokes flow and plasmonic problems require accurate evaluation

near the boundary.









$$\begin{aligned} \Delta u + k^2 u &= 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \overline{D}, \\ u &= f \quad \text{on } \partial D, \\ \partial_r u - \mathbf{i} k u &= o(r^{-1/2}), \quad r \to \infty, \end{aligned}$$

Goal: accurately evaluate the near field, that is the solution of the scattering problem near the boundary.

Why ? Problems in Stokes flow and plasmonic problems require accurate evaluation

near the boundary.





$$\begin{aligned} \Delta u + k^2 u &= 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \overline{D}, \\ u &= f \quad \text{on } \partial D, \\ \partial_r u - \mathbf{i} k u &= o(r^{-1/2}), \quad r \to \infty, \end{aligned}$$

Goal: accurately evaluate the near field, that is the solution of the scattering problem near the boundary.

Why ? Problems in Stokes flow and plasmonic problems require accurate evaluation

near the boundary.





JFL Lab. How ? Using boundary integral methods.



$$\begin{aligned} \Delta u + k^2 u &= 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \overline{D}, \\ u &= f \quad \text{on } \partial D, \\ \partial_r u - \mathrm{i} k u &= o(r^{-1/2}), \quad r \to \infty, \end{aligned}$$



Subtraction techniques for layer potentials, CARVALHO, 2020.





Subtraction techniques for layer potentials, CARVALHO, 2020.

D



Boundary integral methods represents the solution via layer potentials:

$$u(x) = \int_{\partial D} [\partial_{n_y} G(x, y) - ik G(x, y)] \mu(y) \, dy, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus D$$





D



Boundary integral methods represents the solution via layer potentials:

$$u(x) = \int_{\partial D} [\partial_{n_y} G(x, y) - ik G(x, y)] \mu(y) \, dy, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus D$$
  
G: fundamental solution  $G(x, y) = \frac{i}{4} H_0^{(1)}(k(|x - y|))$ 



D



Boundary integral methods represents the solution via layer potentials:

$$u(x) = \int_{\partial D} [\partial_{n_y} G(x, y) - ik G(x, y)] \mu(y) \, dy, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus D$$
  
*G*: fundamental solution  $G(x, y) = \frac{i}{4} H_0^{(1)}(k(|x - y|))$   
 $\mu$ : solution of the BIE

$$\frac{1}{2}\mu(y') + \int_{\partial D} [\partial_{n_y} G(y', y) - ikG(y', y)]\mu(y) \, dy = f(y'), \quad \forall y' \in \partial D$$

 $\sum$ 

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta u + k^2 u &= 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \overline{D}, \\ u &= f \quad \text{on } \partial D, \\ \partial_r u - \mathbf{i} k u &= o(r^{-1/2}), \quad r \to \infty, \end{aligned}$$

Boundary integral methods represents the solution via layer potentials:

$$u(x) = \int_{\partial D} [\partial_{n_y} G(x, y) - ik G(x, y)] \mu(y) \, dy, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus D$$
  
*G*: fundamental solution  $G(x, y) = \frac{i}{4} H_0^{(1)}(k(|x - y|))$   
 $\mu$ : solution of the BIE

$$\frac{1}{2}\mu(y') + \int_{\partial D} [\partial_{n_y} G(y', y) - ikG(y', y)]\mu(y) \, dy = f(y'), \quad \forall y' \in \partial D$$

 $\checkmark$  reduces the problem by one dimension



 $\sum$ 

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta u + k^2 u &= 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \overline{D}, \\ u &= f \quad \text{on } \partial D, \\ \partial_r u - \mathbf{i} k u &= o(r^{-1/2}), \quad r \to \infty, \end{aligned}$$

Boundary integral methods represents the solution via layer potentials:

$$u(x) = \int_{\partial D} [\partial_{n_y} G(x, y) - ik G(x, y)] \mu(y) \, dy, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus D$$
  
*G*: fundamental solution  $G(x, y) = \frac{i}{4} H_0^{(1)}(k(|x - y|))$   
 $\mu$ : solution of the BIE

$$\frac{1}{2}\mu(y') + \int_{\partial D} [\partial_{n_y} G(y', y) - ikG(y', y)]\mu(y) \, dy = f(y'), \quad \forall y' \in \partial D$$

✓ reduces the problem by one dimension✓ high order methods

D



Boundary integral methods represents the solution via layer potentials:

$$u(x) = \int_{\partial D} [\partial_{n_y} G(x, y) - ikG(x, y)]\mu(y) \, dy, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus D$$

$$G: \text{fundamental solution} \quad G(x, y) = \frac{i}{4} H_0^{(1)}(k(|x - y|))$$

$$\mu: \text{ solution of the BIE}$$

$$\frac{1}{2} \mu(y') + \int_{\partial D} [\partial_{n_y} G(y', y) - ikG(y', y)]\mu(y) \, dy = f(y'), \quad \forall y' \in \partial D$$

reduces the problem by one dimensionhigh order methods





Numerically









Problem: the kernel is sharply peaked when x approaches the boundary.









Subtraction techniques for layer potentials, CARVALHO, 2020.







-25

-30

-35

-40

-0.5

kernel,

Nystrom method

 $y = y^*$ 

0.5



Subtraction techniques for layer potentials, CARVALHO, 2020.





Subtraction techniques for layer potentials, CARVALHO, 2020.

1) increase the number of quadrature points





1) increase the number of quadrature points

**X** bigger linear system to solve





- 1) increase the number of quadrature points
  - **X** bigger linear system to solve
- 2) use high-order Nyström methods





- 1) increase the number of quadrature points
  - **X** bigger linear system to solve
- 2) use high-order Nyström methods*x* requires sophisticated accelerated schemes





- 1) increase the number of quadrature points
  - **X** bigger linear system to solve
- 2) use high-order Nyström methods
  - **X** requires sophisticated accelerated schemes
- 3) other techniques that achieve accurate precision: regularization, interpolation, QBX ...



Beale et al. (2001), Helsing et al. (2008), Barnett (2014).



- 1) increase the number of quadrature points
  - **X** bigger linear system to solve
- 2) use high-order Nyström methods
  - **X** requires sophisticated accelerated schemes
- 3) other techniques that achieve accurate precision: regularization, interpolation, QBX ...



Beale et al. (2001), Helsing et al. (2008), Barnett (2014).

Can we provide a simple method without 1), 2) (or 3))?





- 1) increase the number of quadrature points
  - **X** bigger linear system to solve
- 2) use high-order Nyström methods
  - **X** requires sophisticated accelerated schemes
- 3) other techniques that achieve accurate precision: regularization, interpolation, QBX ...



Beale et al. (2001), Helsing et al. (2008), Barnett (2014).

Can we provide a simple method without 1), 2) (or 3))?

Today's idea: subtraction techniques





- 1) increase the number of quadrature points
  - **X** bigger linear system to solve
- 2) use high-order Nyström methods
  - **X** requires sophisticated accelerated schemes
- 3) other techniques that achieve accurate precision: regularization, interpolation, QBX ...



Beale et al. (2001), Helsing et al. (2008), Barnett (2014).

Can we provide a simple method without 1), 2) (or 3))? Today's idea: subtraction techniques

$$u(x) = \int_{\partial D} \frac{K(x, y)\mu(y) \, d\sigma_y}{}$$




# How to address this error ?

- 1) increase the number of quadrature points
  - **X** bigger linear system to solve
- 2) use high-order Nyström methods
  - **X** requires sophisticated accelerated schemes
- 3) other techniques that achieve accurate precision: regularization, interpolation, QBX ...



Beale et al. (2001), Helsing et al. (2008), Barnett (2014).

Can we provide a simple method without 1), 2) (or 3))? Today's idea: subtraction techniques

$$u(x) = \int_{\partial D} \frac{K(x,y)\mu(y) \, d\sigma_y}{\int_{\partial D} \frac{K(x,y)[\mu(y) - \alpha(x,y)] \, d\sigma_y}{\int_{\partial D} \frac{K(x,y)\alpha(x,y) \, d\sigma_y}{\int_{\partial D} \frac{K(x,y)\alpha(x,y)\alpha(x,y) \, d\sigma_y}{\int_{\partial D} \frac{K(x,y)\alpha(x,y)\alpha(x,y) \, d\sigma_y}{\int_{\partial D} \frac{K(x,y)\alpha(x,y)\alpha(x,y)}{\int_{\partial D} \frac{K(x,y)\alpha(x,y)\alpha(x,y)\alpha(x,y)}{\int_{\partial D} \frac{K(x,y)\alpha(x,y)\alpha(x,y)\alpha(x,y)}{\int_{\partial D} \frac{K(x,y)\alpha(x,y)\alpha(x,y)\alpha(x,y)}{\int_{\partial D} \frac{K(x,y)\alpha(x,y)\alpha(x,y)\alpha(x,y)\alpha(x,y)}{\int_{\partial D} \frac{K(x,y)\alpha(x,y)\alpha(x,y)\alpha(x,y)\alpha(x,y)\alpha(x,y)}{\int_{\partial D} \frac{K(x,y)\alpha(x,$$



# How to address this error ?

- 1) increase the number of quadrature points
  - **X** bigger linear system to solve
- 2) use high-order Nyström methods
  - **X** requires sophisticated accelerated schemes
- 3) other techniques that achieve accurate precision: regularization, interpolation, QBX ...



Beale et al. (2001), Helsing et al. (2008), Barnett (2014).

Can we provide a simple method without 1), 2) (or 3))? Today's idea: subtraction techniques

$$u(x) = \int_{\partial D} \frac{K(x,y)\mu(y) \, d\sigma_y}{\int_{\partial D} K(x,y)[\mu(y) - \alpha(x,y)] \, d\sigma_y} + \int_{\partial D} \frac{K(x,y)\alpha(x,y) \, d\sigma_y}{\int_{\partial D} K(x,y)\alpha(x,y) \, d\sigma_y}$$
Vanishes at  $x = y$ 



# How to address this error ?

- 1) increase the number of quadrature points
  - **X** bigger linear system to solve
- 2) use high-order Nyström methods
  - **X** requires sophisticated accelerated schemes
- 3) other techniques that achieve accurate precision: regularization, interpolation, QBX ...



Beale et al. (2001), Helsing et al. (2008), Barnett (2014).

Can we provide a simple method without 1), 2) (or 3))? Today's idea: subtraction techniques

$$u(x) = \int_{\partial D} K(x, y) \mu(y) \, d\sigma_y = \int_{\partial D} K(x, y) [\mu(y) - \alpha(x, y)] \, d\sigma_y + \int_{\partial D} K(x, y) \alpha(x, y) \, d\sigma_y$$

$$\uparrow$$
Vanishes at  $x = y$ 
Spectral computation





- Introduction
- Subtraction techniques for Laplace's equation
- Extension to Helmholtz
- Conclusion





The solution of the interior Dirichlet Laplace problem can be represented as

 $u(x) = \int_{\partial D} \partial_{n_y} G(x, y) \mu(y) \, d\sigma_y$ 

 $\Delta u = 0 \qquad D$  u = f



The solution of the interior Dirichlet Laplace problem can be represented as

 $u(x) = \int_{\partial D} \partial_{n_y} G(x, y) \mu(y) \, d\sigma_y$ 







$$u(x) = \int_{\partial D} \partial_{n_y} G(x, y) \mu(y) \, d\sigma_y$$
  
*G*: fundamental solution  

$$\mu: \text{ solution of the BIE}$$
  

$$-\frac{1}{2}\mu(y') + \int_{\partial D} \partial_{n_y} G(y', y) \mu(y) \, d\sigma_y = f(y'), \quad \forall y' \in \partial D$$

$$u(x) = \int_{\partial D} \partial_{n_y} G(x, y) \mu(y) \, d\sigma_y$$
  
*G*: fundamental solution  

$$\mu: \text{ solution of the BIE}$$
  

$$-\frac{1}{2}\mu(y') + \int_{\partial D} \partial_{n_y} G(y', y) \mu(y) \, d\sigma_y = f(y'), \quad \forall y' \in \partial D$$
  
Using Gauss's law: 
$$\int_{\partial D} \partial_{n_y} G(x, y) \, d\sigma_y = \begin{cases} 0 & x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \bar{D} \\ -\frac{1}{2} & x \in \partial D \\ -1 & x \in D \end{cases}$$
  
Kress (1991).



$$u(x) = \int_{\partial D} \partial_{n_y} G(x, y) \mu(y) \, d\sigma_y$$
  
*G*: fundamental solution  

$$\mu: \text{ solution of the BIE}$$
  

$$-\frac{1}{2}\mu(y') + \int_{\partial D} \partial_{n_y} G(y', y) \mu(y) \, d\sigma_y = f(y'), \quad \forall y' \in \partial D$$
  
Using Gauss's law: 
$$\int_{\partial D} \partial_{n_y} G(x, y) \, d\sigma_y = \begin{cases} 0 & x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \overline{D} \\ -\frac{1}{2} & x \in \partial D \\ -1 & x \in D \end{cases}$$
  
Kress (1991).

$$u(x) = \int_{\partial D} \partial_{n_y} G(x, y) [\mu(y) - \mu(x)] \, d\sigma_y + \int_{\partial D} \partial_{n_y} G(x, y) \mu(x) \, d\sigma_y$$



The solution of the interior Dirichlet Laplace problem can be represented as

$$u(x) = \int_{\partial D} \partial_{n_y} G(x, y) \mu(y) \, d\sigma_y$$

$$G: \text{ fundamental solution} \qquad G(x, y) = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \log |x - y|$$

$$\mu: \text{ solution of the BIE}$$

$$-\frac{1}{2} \mu(y') + \int_{\partial D} \partial_{n_y} G(y', y) \mu(y) \, d\sigma_y = f(y'), \quad \forall y' \in \partial D$$

$$\text{Using Gauss's law:} \int_{\partial D} \partial_{n_y} G(x, y) \, d\sigma_y = \begin{cases} 0 & x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \bar{D} \\ -\frac{1}{2} & x \in \partial D \\ -1 & x \in D \end{cases}$$

$$w(x) = \int_{\partial D} \partial_{n_y} G(x, y) [\mu(y) - \mu(x)] \, d\sigma_y + \int_{\partial D} \partial_{n_y} G(x, y) \mu(x) \, d\sigma_y$$

$$Kress (1991).$$

$$= \int_{\partial D} \partial_{n_y} G(x, y) [\mu(y) - \mu(x)] \, d\sigma_y - \mu(x)$$

7

The solution of the interior Dirichlet Laplace problem can be represented as

$$u(x) = \int_{\partial D} \partial_{n_y} G(x, y) \mu(y) \, d\sigma_y$$
  
*G*: fundamental solution  

$$\mu: \text{ solution of the BIE}$$
  

$$-\frac{1}{2}\mu(y') + \int_{\partial D} \partial_{n_y} G(y', y) \mu(y) \, d\sigma_y = f(y'), \quad \forall y' \in \partial D$$
  
Using Gauss's law: 
$$\int_{\partial D} \partial_{n_y} G(x, y) \, d\sigma_y = \begin{cases} 0 & x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \bar{D} \\ -\frac{1}{2} & x \in \partial D \\ -1 & x \in D \end{cases}$$
  
Kress (1991).

D

$$u(x) = \int_{\partial D} \partial_{n_y} G(x, y) [\mu(y) - \mu(x)] \, d\sigma_y + \int_{\partial D} \partial_{n_y} G(x, y) \mu(x) \, d\sigma_y$$

$$= \int_{\partial D} \partial_{n_y} G(x, y) [\mu(y) - \mu(x)] \, d\sigma_y - \mu(x)$$
Vanishes at  $x = y$ 

$$u(x) = \int_{\partial D} \partial_{n_y} G(x, y) \mu(y) \, d\sigma_y$$

$$G: \text{ fundamental solution} \qquad G(x, y) = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \log |x - y|$$

$$\mu: \text{ solution of the BIE}$$

$$-\frac{1}{2}\mu(y') + \int_{\partial D} \partial_{n_y} G(y', y) \mu(y) \, d\sigma_y = f(y'), \quad \forall y' \in \partial D$$

$$\text{Using Gauss's law:} \int_{\partial D} \partial_{n_y} G(x, y) \, d\sigma_y = \begin{cases} 0 & x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \bar{D} \\ -\frac{1}{2} & x \in \partial D \\ -1 & x \in D \end{cases}$$

$$\text{Kress (1991)}$$

$$u(x) = \int_{\partial D} \partial_{n_y} G(x, y) [\mu(y) - \mu(x)] \, d\sigma_y + \int_{\partial D} \partial_{n_y} G(x, y) \mu(x) \, d\sigma_y$$

$$= \int_{\partial D} \partial_{n_y} G(x, y) [\mu(y) - \mu(x)] \, d\sigma_y - \mu(x)$$
Vanishes at  $x = y$  Depends only on  $\mu$  resolution

Test using Periodic Trapezoid Rule (PTR) with N = 128 for  $u(x) = \log |x - x_0|$ 

Method 1: PTR  $u(x) = \int_{\partial D} \partial_{n_y} G(x, y) \mu(y) \, d\sigma_y$  Method 2: PTR + density subtraction  $u(x) = \int_{\partial D} \partial_{n_y} G(x, y) [\mu(y) - \mu(x)] \, d\sigma_y - \mu(x)$ 

Test using Periodic Trapezoid Rule (PTR) with N = 128 for  $u(x) = \log |x - x_0|$ 

Method 1: PTR  $u(x) = \int_{\partial D} \partial_{n_y} G(x, y) \mu(y) \, d\sigma_y$  Method 2: PTR + density subtraction  $u(x) = \int_{\partial D} \partial_{n_y} G(x, y) [\mu(y) - \mu(x)] \, d\sigma_y - \mu(x)$ 





Test using Periodic Trapezoid Rule (PTR) with N = 128 for  $u(x) = \log |x - x_0|$ 



Method 2: PTR + density subtraction  $u(x) = \int_{\partial D} \partial_{n_y} G(x, y) [\mu(y) - \mu(x)] \, d\sigma_y - \mu(x)$ 





Subtraction techniques for layer potentials, CARVALHO, 2020.

Can we do the same trick for scattering problems ?

Can we do the same trick for scattering problems ?

$$\int_{\partial D} \partial_{n_y} G(x, y) \, d\sigma_y = \begin{cases} 0 & x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \bar{D} \\ -\frac{1}{2} & x \in \partial D \\ -1 & x \in D \end{cases} \quad \text{with } G(x, y) := \frac{i}{4} H_0^{(1)}(k|x-y|)$$

Can we do the same trick for scattering problems ?





Subtraction techniques for layer potentials, CARVALHO, 2020.

Can we do the same trick for scattering problems ?



The key is work with solutions of Helmholtz: plane waves  $u_d(x) = e^{ik(d \cdot x)}$ 





Can we do the same trick for scattering problems ?

$$\int_{\partial D} \partial_{n_y} \frac{G(x,y) \, d\sigma_y}{\int_{-\frac{1}{2}} \frac{1}{x \in \partial D}} \quad \text{with } \frac{G(x,y) := \frac{i}{4} H_0^{(1)}(k|x-y|)}{\int_{-1} \frac{1}{x \in D}}$$

The key is work with solutions of Helmholtz: plane waves  $u_d(x) = e^{ik(d \cdot x)}$ 



One can show that

$$\int_{\partial D} [\partial_{n_y} G(x, y) - ik(n_y \cdot d) G(x, y)] e^{ik(d \cdot y)} \, d\sigma_y = \begin{cases} 0 & x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \bar{D} \\ -\frac{1}{2} e^{ik(d \cdot x)} & x \in \partial D \\ -e^{ik(d \cdot x)} & x \in D \end{cases}$$



$$u(x) = \int_{\partial D} [\partial_{n_y} G(x, y) - ik G(x, y)] \mu(y) \, d\sigma_y$$





$$u(x) = \int_{\partial D} [\partial_{n_y} G(x, y) - ik G(x, y)] \mu(y) \, d\sigma_y$$

Use the plane wave with incidence  $n_x : u_x(y) = e^{ik(n_x \cdot y)}$ 





$$u(x) = \int_{\partial D} [\partial_{n_y} G(x, y) - ik G(x, y)] \mu(y) \, d\sigma_y$$

Use the plane wave with incidence  $n_x$ :  $u_x(y) = e^{ik(n_x \cdot y)}$ 



 $u(x) = \int_{\partial D} [\partial_{n_y} G(x, y) - ik(n_y \cdot n_x) G(x, y)] \mu(y) \, d\sigma_y - i \int_{\partial D} [k - k(n_y \cdot n_x)] G(x, y) \mu(y) \, d\sigma_y$ 



$$u(x) = \int_{\partial D} [\partial_{n_y} G(x, y) - ikG(x, y)]\mu(y) \, d\sigma_y$$
  
Use the plane wave with incidence  $n_x : u_x(y) = e^{ik(n_x \cdot y)}$   
$$u(x) = \int_{\partial D} [\partial_{n_y} G(x, y) - ik(n_y \cdot n_x)G(x, y)]\mu(y) \, d\sigma_y - i \int_{\partial D} [k - k(n_y \cdot n_x)]G(x, y)\mu(y) \, d\sigma_y$$
  
Vanishes at  $x = y$ 

$$\begin{split} u(x) &= \int_{\partial D} [\partial_{n_y} G(x,y) - ikG(x,y)] \mu(y) \, d\sigma_y \\ \text{Use the plane wave with incidence } n_x : u_x(y) &= e^{ik(n_x \cdot y)} \\ u(x) &= \int_{\partial D} [\partial_{n_y} G(x,y) - ik(n_y \cdot n_x) G(x,y)] \mu(y) \, d\sigma_y - i \int_{\partial D} [k - k(n_y \cdot n_x)] G(x,y) \mu(y) \, d\sigma_y \\ & \uparrow \\ \text{Plane Wave subtraction} \\ \int_{\partial D} [\partial_{n_y} G(x,y) - ik(n_y \cdot n_x) G(x,y)] \left[ \mu(y) - \mu(x) e^{ikn_x \cdot (y-x)} \right] \, d\sigma_y \\ & + \mu(x) e^{ikn_x \cdot x} \int_{\partial D} [\partial_{n_y} G(x,y) - ik(n_y \cdot n_x) G(x,y)] e^{ikn_x \cdot (y)} \, d\sigma_y \end{split}$$



J

$$\begin{split} u(x) &= \int_{\partial D} [\partial_{n_y} G(x,y) - ikG(x,y)] \mu(y) \, d\sigma_y \\ \text{Use the plane wave with incidence } n_x : u_x(y) &= e^{ik(n_x \cdot y)} \\ u(x) &= \int_{\partial D} [\partial_{n_y} G(x,y) - ik(n_y \cdot n_x) G(x,y)] \mu(y) \, d\sigma_y - i \int_{\partial D} [k - k(n_y \cdot n_x)] G(x,y) \mu(y) \, d\sigma_y \\ & \uparrow \\ \text{Plane Wave subtraction} \\ \int_{\partial D} [\partial_{n_y} G(x,y) - ik(n_y \cdot n_x) G(x,y)] \left[ \mu(y) - \mu(x) e^{ikn_x \cdot (y-x)} \right] \, d\sigma_y \\ \leftarrow \text{Vanishes at } x = y \\ + \mu(x) e^{ikn_x \cdot x} \int_{\partial D} [\partial_{n_y} G(x,y) - ik(n_y \cdot n_x) G(x,y)] e^{ikn_x \cdot (y)} \, d\sigma_y \end{split}$$





$$\begin{split} u(x) &= \int_{\partial D} [\partial_{n_y} G(x,y) - ikG(x,y)] \mu(y) \, d\sigma_y \\ \text{Use the plane wave with incidence } n_x : u_x(y) &= e^{ik(n_x \cdot y)} \\ u(x) &= \int_{\partial D} [\partial_{n_y} G(x,y) - ik(n_y \cdot n_x) G(x,y)] \mu(y) \, d\sigma_y - i \int_{\partial D} [k - k(n_y \cdot n_x)] G(x,y) \mu(y) \, d\sigma_y \\ \text{Plane Wave subtraction} \\ & & & & & \\ \int_{\partial D} [\partial_{n_y} G(x,y) - ik(n_y \cdot n_x) G(x,y)] \left[ \mu(y) - \mu(x) e^{ikn_x \cdot (y-x)} \right] \, d\sigma_y \\ & \leftarrow & & \\ \text{Vanishes at } x = y \\ + \mu(x) e^{ikn_x \cdot x} \int_{\partial D} [\partial_{n_y} G(x,y) - ik(n_y \cdot n_x) G(x,y)] e^{ikn_x \cdot (y)} \, d\sigma_y \\ & \quad & \\ & & & \\ u(x) &= \int_{\partial D} [\partial_{n_y} G(x,y) - ik(n_y \cdot n_x) G(x,y)] \left[ \mu(y) - \mu(x) e^{ikn_x \cdot (y-x)} \right] \, d\sigma_y \\ & \quad & \\ & & - i \int_{\partial D} [k - k(n_y \cdot n_x)] G(x,y) \mu(y) \, d\sigma_y \end{split}$$

10

Test using Periodic Trapezoid Rule (PTR) with N = 256 for  $u(x) := \frac{i}{4}H_0^{(1)}(k|x - x_0|)$  k = 15Method 1: PTR

Method 2: PTR + PW subtraction

Test using Periodic Trapezoid Rule (PTR) with N = 256 for  $u(x) := \frac{i}{4}H_0^{(1)}(k|x-x_0|)$  k = 15

#### Method 1: PTR



1.5

11

-0.5

0

0.5

1

-1

Test using Periodic Trapezoid Rule (PTR) with N = 256 for  $u(x) := \frac{i}{4}H_0^{(1)}(k|x-x_0|)$  k = 15



11

Subtraction techniques for layer potentials, CARVALHO, 2020.

Test using Periodic Trapezoid Rule (PTR) with N = 128 for  $u(x) := \frac{i}{4}H_0^{(1)}(k|x-x_0|)$  k = 5





12



- Introduction
- Subtraction techniques for Laplace's equation
- Extension to Helmholtz
- Conclusion

# Summary

Due to sharply peaked behavior of layer potentials' kernel, one makes an O(1) error for close evaluation.

Subtraction techniques help reduce the error (for free)

2D Helmholtz and Laplace problems
## Summary

Due to sharply peaked behavior of layer potentials' kernel, one makes an O(1) error for close evaluation.

Subtraction techniques help reduce the error (for free)

2D Helmholtz and Laplace problems

Other techniques:

Kernel/singularity subtraction techniques Asymptotic approximations



Perez-Arancibia (2018) Carvalho, Khatri, Kim (2020)

## Summary

Due to sharply peaked behavior of layer potentials' kernel, one makes an O(1) error for close evaluation.

Subtraction techniques help reduce the error (for free)

2D Helmholtz and Laplace problems

Other techniques:

Kernel/singularity subtraction techniques Asymptotic approximations



Perez-Arancibia (2018) Carvalho, Khatri, Kim (2020)

Perspectives:

Stokes flow (3D)

Scattering problem in plasmonics (transmission problem)



## Thank you for your attention.

THIS IS WHAT LEARNING LOGIC GATES FEELS LIKE



smbc.com

