## Vector calculus MA2VC 2015-16: Assignment 1 SOLUTIONS

(Exercise 1) Consider the vector field $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{F}}=-x^{3} y^{4} \hat{\boldsymbol{\imath}}+3 x^{2} y^{4} z \hat{\boldsymbol{k}}$.
Compute the divergence and the curl of $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{F}}$.
Is $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{F}}$ solenoidal, irrotational?
Is $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{F}}$ conservative? If the answer is positive compute a scalar potential.
Does $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{F}}$ admit a vector potential $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{A}}$ ? If the answer is positive compute a potential. (In this case, look for the simplest one!)
We apply the definitions of divergence and curl:

$$
\begin{array}{rlrl}
\overrightarrow{\mathbf{F}} & =-x^{3} y^{4} \hat{\boldsymbol{\imath}}+3 x^{2} y^{4} z \hat{\boldsymbol{k}}, \\
\text { divergence: } \quad \vec{\nabla} \cdot \overrightarrow{\mathbf{F}} & =-3 x^{2} y^{4}+3 x^{2} y^{4}=0 & & \\
\text { curl: } \quad \vec{\nabla} \times \overrightarrow{\mathbf{F}} & =12 x^{2} y^{3} z \hat{\boldsymbol{\imath}}-6 x y^{4} z \hat{\boldsymbol{\jmath}}-4 x^{3} y^{3} \hat{\boldsymbol{k}} & & \Rightarrow \overrightarrow{\mathbf{F}} \text { is solenoidal, } \\
\end{array}
$$

Since the field is not irrotational, it is not conservative and there exists no scalar potential (recall the box on page 26).

On the other hand, the field is solenoidal, so it may admit a vector potential $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{A}}$. (Actually, $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{F}}$ is solenoidal and defined on the whole of $\mathbb{R}^{3}$, so it admits a vector potential by Remark 1.68.) The vector potential $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{A}}$ has to satisfy $\vec{\nabla} \times \overrightarrow{\mathbf{A}}=\overrightarrow{\mathbf{F}}$, which, by definition (23) of curl, is equivalent to the following three conditions:

$$
\frac{\partial A_{3}}{\partial y}-\frac{\partial A_{2}}{\partial z}=F_{1}=-x^{3} y^{4}, \quad \frac{\partial A_{1}}{\partial z}-\frac{\partial A_{3}}{\partial x}=F_{2}=0, \quad \frac{\partial A_{2}}{\partial x}-\frac{\partial A_{1}}{\partial y}=F_{3}=3 x^{2} y^{4} z
$$

There are many possible vector potentials, we look for the simplest possible. In particular we look for $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{A}}$ with only one non-zero component. From the conditions we have just written, we see that the non-zero component must necessarily be $A_{2}$, as it is the only one entering the two equations with non-zero right-hand sides. So, setting $A_{1}=A_{3}=0$, we have

$$
-\frac{\partial A_{2}}{\partial z}=-x^{3} y^{4}, \quad \frac{\partial A_{2}}{\partial x}=3 x^{2} y^{4} z
$$

Integrating the first equation with respect to $z$ we have $A_{2}=x^{3} y^{4} z+g(x, y)$ for some $g$ independent of $z$. We see immediately that $A_{2}=x^{3} y^{4} z$ with $g=0$ satisfies the second condition $\frac{\partial A_{2}}{\partial x}=3 x^{2} y^{4} z$, so $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{A}}=x^{3} y^{4} z \hat{\boldsymbol{\jmath}}$. Recall that there are plenty of other correct vector potentials, your solution might differ from this one.
(Exercise 2) Let $f$ be a smooth scalar field. Prove the following identity:

$$
\vec{\nabla} \cdot(\vec{\nabla} f \times(\overrightarrow{\mathbf{r}} f))=0 .
$$

Hint: use the identities of Section 1.4 and the values of the curl and the divergence of the position vector $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{r}}$. Recall also Exercise 1.15.
(Version 1.) We use the product rules for divergence and curl (31) and (32), the curl-of-gradient identity (26), the fact that $\vec{\nabla} \times \overrightarrow{\mathbf{r}}=\overrightarrow{\mathbf{0}}$ (recall e.g. Exercise 1.60) and the properties of the triple and vector products $(\overrightarrow{\mathbf{u}} \cdot(\overrightarrow{\mathbf{u}} \times \overrightarrow{\mathbf{w}})=$ $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{w}} \cdot(\overrightarrow{\mathbf{u}} \times \overrightarrow{\mathbf{u}})=\overrightarrow{\mathbf{w}} \cdot \overrightarrow{\mathbf{0}}=0$, by Exercise 1.15$)^{1}$ :

$$
\vec{\nabla} \cdot((\vec{\nabla} f) \times(\overrightarrow{\mathbf{r}} f)) \stackrel{(31)}{=} \underbrace{(\vec{\nabla} \times \vec{\nabla} f)}_{=\overrightarrow{\mathbf{0}}, \text { by }(26)} \cdot \overrightarrow{\mathbf{r}} f-\vec{\nabla} f \cdot(\vec{\nabla} \times(\overrightarrow{\mathbf{r}} f)) \stackrel{(32)}{=}-\vec{\nabla} f \cdot(\vec{\nabla} f \times \overrightarrow{\mathbf{r}}+f \underbrace{\nabla \times \overrightarrow{\mathbf{r}}}_{=\overrightarrow{\mathbf{0}}}) \stackrel{1.15}{=}-\overrightarrow{\mathbf{r}} \cdot \underbrace{(\vec{\nabla} f) \times(\vec{\nabla} f)}_{=\overrightarrow{\mathbf{0}}}=0 .
$$

(Version 2.) We can also prove the identity by expanding in coordinates, however this solution is more complicated and more prone to errors. Using the definition of the vector product (2), of the divergence (22), the product rule for partial derivatives (8) and Clairault's theorem (17):

$$
\vec{\nabla} \cdot((\vec{\nabla} f) \times(\overrightarrow{\mathbf{r}} f))=\vec{\nabla} \cdot\left(\left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \hat{\boldsymbol{\imath}}+\frac{\partial f}{\partial y} \hat{\boldsymbol{\jmath}}+\frac{\partial f}{\partial z} \hat{\boldsymbol{k}}\right) \times(x \hat{\boldsymbol{\imath}}+y \hat{\boldsymbol{\jmath}}+z \hat{\boldsymbol{k}}) f\right)
$$

[^0]\[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{(2)}{=} \vec{\nabla} \cdot\left(\left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial y} z f-\frac{\partial f}{\partial z} y f\right) \hat{\boldsymbol{\imath}}+\left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial z} x f-\frac{\partial f}{\partial x} z f\right) \hat{\boldsymbol{\imath}}+\left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x} y f-\frac{\partial f}{\partial y} x f\right) \hat{\boldsymbol{\imath}}\right) \\
& \stackrel{(22}{=} \frac{\partial}{\partial x}\left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial y} z f-\frac{\partial f}{\partial z} y f\right)+\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial z} x f-\frac{\partial f}{\partial x} z f\right)+\frac{\partial}{\partial z}\left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x} y f-\frac{\partial f}{\partial y} x f\right) \\
& \quad+\frac{\partial^{2} f}{\partial y \partial z} x f+\frac{\partial f}{\partial y} z \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}-\frac{\partial^{2} f}{\partial x \partial z} y f-\frac{\partial f}{\partial z} y \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \\
& \quad+\frac{\partial^{2} f}{\partial y}-\frac{\partial^{2} f}{\partial y \partial x} z f-\frac{\partial f}{\partial x} z \frac{\partial f}{\partial y} \\
& =\left(\frac{\partial^{2} f}{\partial y \partial z}-\frac{\partial f}{\partial x} y \frac{\partial^{2} f}{\partial z \partial y}\right) x f+\left(\frac{\partial^{2} f}{\partial z \partial y} x f-\frac{\partial f}{\partial y} x \frac{\partial f}{\partial z}-\frac{\partial^{2} f}{\partial x \partial z}\right) y f+\left(\frac{\partial^{2} f}{\partial x \partial y}-\frac{\partial^{2} f}{\partial y \partial x}\right) z f \stackrel{(17)}{=} 0 .
\end{aligned}
$$
\]

(Exercise 3) Demonstrate the identity in Exercise 2 for the field $f=\mathrm{e}^{x y}$.
We compute all the terms in the identity:

$$
\begin{gathered}
f=\mathrm{e}^{x y}, \quad \vec{\nabla} f=y \mathrm{e}^{x y} \hat{\boldsymbol{\imath}}+x \mathrm{e}^{x y} \hat{\boldsymbol{\jmath}}, \quad \overrightarrow{\mathbf{r}} f \stackrel{(2)}{=} x \mathrm{e}^{x y} \hat{\boldsymbol{\imath}}+y \mathrm{e}^{x y} \hat{\boldsymbol{\jmath}}+z \mathrm{e}^{x y} \hat{\boldsymbol{k}}, \\
\vec{\nabla} f \times \overrightarrow{\mathbf{r}} f \stackrel{(2)}{=} x z \mathrm{e}^{2 x y} \hat{\boldsymbol{\imath}}-y z \mathrm{e}^{2 x y} \hat{\boldsymbol{\jmath}}+\left(y^{2}-x^{2}\right) \mathrm{e}^{2 x y} \hat{\boldsymbol{k}}, \\
\vec{\nabla} \cdot(\vec{\nabla} f \times \overrightarrow{\mathbf{r}} f) \stackrel{(22)}{=} \frac{\partial}{\partial x}\left(x z \mathrm{e}^{2 x y}\right)+\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\left(-y z \mathrm{e}^{2 x y}\right)+\frac{\partial}{\partial z}\left(\left(y^{2}-x^{2}\right) \mathrm{e}^{2 x y}\right) \\
=\left(z \mathrm{e}^{2 x y}+2 x y z \mathrm{e}^{2 x y}\right)-\left(z \mathrm{e}^{2 x y}+2 x y z \mathrm{e}^{2 x y}\right)+0=0 .
\end{gathered}
$$

(Exercise 4) (Match plots and formulas)
The correct matches are: $\quad P_{1}: \overrightarrow{\mathbf{a}}_{G}, \quad P_{2}: \overrightarrow{\mathbf{a}}_{C}, \quad P_{3}: \overrightarrow{\mathbf{a}}_{D}, \quad F_{1}: \overrightarrow{\mathbf{G}}_{C}, \quad F_{2}: \overrightarrow{\mathbf{G}}_{F}, \quad F_{3}: \overrightarrow{\mathbf{G}}_{A}$.
We show here the plots of the 7 curves together with the equations of the corresponding paths. Each path can be drawn by computing the values of the curve for several choices of $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and "joining the points". In most cases it helps to first write the equations of the path, identifying $x=a_{1}(t)$ and $y=a_{2}(t)$. The paths of $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{a}}_{B}$ and $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{a}}_{C}$ can be immediately drawn recalling the formula for the parametrisation of a circumference in item 3 of Remark 1.24. It is easy to see that the path of $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{a}}_{E}$ is the graph of the function $y=x^{2}+1$, and similarly the path of $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{a}}_{G}$ is a "tilted graph", i.e. the coordinate $x$ is function of $y$.



In order to draw the vector fields, we sample them at several points in the plane and we draw the values of the fields as arrows placed at those points. The signs of the components of the fields tell us whether they point left or right and up or down. Under the picture below you can see also the divergence and the curl of the fields; compare them with the interpretation given in Sections 1.3.5-6 in the notes.



[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Alternatively, one can see that the argument of the divergence can be bracketed in equivalent way: $\vec{\nabla} f \times(\overrightarrow{\mathbf{r}} f)=(\vec{\nabla} f \times \overrightarrow{\mathbf{r}}) f$. This leads to a slightly different proof:

    $$
    \begin{aligned}
    \vec{\nabla} \cdot(\vec{\nabla} f \times \overrightarrow{\mathbf{r}} f)=\vec{\nabla} \cdot((\vec{\nabla} f \times \overrightarrow{\mathbf{r}}) f) \stackrel{(30)}{=}(\vec{\nabla} f) \cdot(\vec{\nabla} f \times \overrightarrow{\mathbf{r}})+f \vec{\nabla} \cdot((\vec{\nabla} f) \times \overrightarrow{\mathbf{r}}) \\
    \quad \stackrel{(31)}{=}(\vec{\nabla} f) \cdot(\vec{\nabla} f \times \overrightarrow{\mathbf{r}})+f((\underbrace{\vec{\nabla} \times \vec{\nabla} f}_{=\overrightarrow{\mathbf{0}}, \text { by }(26)}) \cdot \overrightarrow{\mathbf{r}}-(\vec{\nabla} f) \cdot(\underbrace{\nabla \times \overrightarrow{\mathbf{r}}}_{=\overrightarrow{\mathbf{0}}}))=(\vec{\nabla} f) \cdot(\vec{\nabla} f \times \overrightarrow{\mathbf{r}}){ }^{\text {Ex. } \cdot 1 \cdot 15} \overrightarrow{\mathbf{r}} \cdot \underbrace{(\vec{\nabla} f) \times(\vec{\nabla} f)}_{=\overrightarrow{\mathbf{0}}}=0 .
    \end{aligned}
    $$

