

Integrating gradients

1 dimension

The “gradient” of a function $f(x)$ in one dimension (i.e., depending on only one variable) is just the derivative, $f'(x)$. We want to solve

$$f'(x) = k(x), \quad (1)$$

where $k(x)$ is a known function. When we find a primitive function $K(x)$ to $k(x)$, the general form of f is K plus an arbitrary constant,

$$f(x) = K(x) + C. \quad (2)$$

Example: With $f'(x) = 2/x$ we find $f(x) = 2 \ln x + C$, where C is an undetermined constant.

2 dimensions

We let the function depend on two variables, $f(x, y)$. When the gradient ∇f is known, we have known functions k_1 and k_2 for the partial derivatives:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} f(x, y) &= k_1(x, y), \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial y} f(x, y) &= k_2(x, y). \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

To solve this, we integrate one of them. To be specific, we here integrate $\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}$ over x . We find a primitive function *with respect to x* (thus keeping y constant) to k_1 and call it k_3 . The general form of f will be k_3 plus an arbitrary term whose x -derivative is zero. In other words,

$$f(x, y) = k_3(x, y) + B(y), \quad (4)$$

where $B(y)$ is an unknown function of y . We have made some progress, because we have replaced an unknown function of two variables with another unknown function depending only on one variable.

The best way to come further is *not* to integrate $\frac{\partial f}{\partial y}$ over y . That would give us a second unknown function, $D(x)$. Instead, we find B via B' as follows:

$$B'(y) = \frac{\partial}{\partial y} [f(x, y) - k_3(x, y)] = k_2(x, y) - \frac{\partial}{\partial y} k_3(x, y). \quad (5)$$

Since k_3 is known, so is $\frac{\partial}{\partial y} k_3$, and the whole right hand side is known. Here, we call it k_4 . We are back to the familiar one-dimensional case

$$B'(y) = k_4(y), \quad (6)$$

with solution $B(y) = K_4(y) + C$. This is plugged into eq. (4) to find f .

Example: We want to find f satisfying $\frac{\partial}{\partial x} f = 2y/x$ and $\frac{\partial}{\partial y} f = 2(\ln x + y)$. We integrate $\frac{\partial}{\partial x} f$ over x to get $f = 2y \ln x + B(y)$. The derivative of B becomes $B'(y) = \frac{\partial}{\partial y} f - \frac{\partial}{\partial y} 2y \ln x = 2 \ln x + 2y - 2 \ln x = 2y$. This has solution $B(y) = y^2 + C$. Our function f is $f = 2y \ln x + y^2 + C$.

Same example: This time, we start to integrate $\frac{\partial}{\partial y} f$ over y to get $f = 2y \ln x + y^2 + D(x)$. We find $D'(x) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} f - \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (2y \ln x + y^2) = 2y/x - 2y/x = 0$. The solution to $D'(x) = 0$ is $D(x) = C$, so again we get the answer $f(x, y) = 2y \ln x + y^2 + C$.

Important control

Since $B(y)$ is independent of x , so is $B'(y)$. That implies that the known expression k_4 in eq. (6) must be independent of x ,

$$k_2(x, y) - \frac{\partial}{\partial y} k_3(x, y) = k_4(y). \quad (7)$$

So, the x-dependence in k_2 and $\frac{\partial}{\partial y} k_3$ must cancel.

What if it doesn't?

It could be that the whole problem lacks a solution. Since $\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x \partial y} f = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y \partial x} f$, we must have

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial y} k_1 = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} k_2. \quad (8)$$

If that is not the case, the vector field $\mathbf{k} = (k_1, k_2)$ cannot be expressed as the gradient of a scalar field, and f does not exist.

Example: The gradient $\frac{\partial}{\partial x} f = 2y/x$, $\frac{\partial}{\partial y} f = 2 \ln x + 2y$ has a solution, since $\frac{\partial}{\partial y}(2y/x) = 2/x$ is the same as $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}(2 \ln x + 2y) = 2/x$. As a counter-example, the equations $\frac{\partial}{\partial x} f = xy$ and $\frac{\partial}{\partial y} f = y^2$ lack a solution, since $\frac{\partial}{\partial y}(xy) = x$ differs from $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}(y^2) = 0$.

If eq. (8) is fulfilled and we still find ourselves with some x-dependence in k_4 , we have made some simple mistake. We must go back and find it before we continue.

Example: We have accidentally used the derivative instead of primitive function when we integrated $2y/x$ over x , and got $f = -2y/x^2 + B(y)$. Continuing, we find $B'(y) = \frac{\partial}{\partial y} f - \frac{\partial}{\partial x}(-2y/x^2) = 2 \ln x + 2y + 2/x^2$. We cannot cancel the x-dependence, and we get warned that we have erred.

3 dimensions

The approach is again to integrate one equation and reduce the problem to one with a lower dimensionality. Starting with known expressions k_i in

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} f(x, y, z) &= k_1(x, y, z), \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial y} f(x, y, z) &= k_2(x, y, z), \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial z} f(x, y, z) &= k_3(x, y, z), \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

we integrate one line of our choice. Here, we pick $\frac{\partial}{\partial x} f$, integrate over x and get

$$f(x, y, z) = k_4(x, y, z) + A(y, z), \quad (10)$$

where k_4 is a known expression satisfying $\frac{\partial}{\partial x} k_4 = k_1$. We then eliminate f by taking other partial derivatives on A :

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial y} A(y, z) &= \frac{\partial}{\partial y} [f(x, y, z) - k_4(x, y, z)] = k_5(y, z), \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial z} A(y, z) &= \frac{\partial}{\partial z} [f(x, y, z) - k_4(x, y, z)] = k_6(y, z). \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

We are back to the 2-dimensional case, with known expressions for both $\frac{\partial}{\partial y} A$ and $\frac{\partial}{\partial z} A$. This we know how to solve. Once A is found, eq. (10) determines f .

The same important control

Again, there cannot be any x dependence in the known expressions for $\frac{\partial}{\partial y}A$ and $\frac{\partial}{\partial z}A$. If there is, we can control the existence of a solution by looking at cross derivatives, to see if $\frac{\partial}{\partial y}k_1 = \frac{\partial}{\partial x}k_2$, $\frac{\partial}{\partial z}k_1 = \frac{\partial}{\partial x}k_3$, and $\frac{\partial}{\partial z}k_2 = \frac{\partial}{\partial y}k_3$. In other words, we look at the rotation of $\mathbf{k} = (k_1, k_2, k_3)$. If $\nabla \times \mathbf{k} \neq 0$, then \mathbf{k} cannot be the gradient of a scalar field.

When we work with a problem where $\mathbf{k} = \nabla f$ is possible, we may still find ourselves with some x -dependence left where it should not be. Then we have made some mistake and must go back and find it before we continue.

Example: Problem “Find the Pressure” on pdf with recommended problems (under appendix C).