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ABSTRACT

Techniques useful for efficiently time-stepping Galerkin methods for various types of time-dependent partial differential equations are presented and analyzed. Second-order quasilinear hyperbolic problems with smooth solutions are studied as a simple model problem for illustrating the widely applicable techniques. The procedure involves the use of a preconditioned iterative method for approximately solving the different linear systems of equations arising at each time-step in a discrete-time Galerkin method. Optimal order $L^2$ spatial errors and almost optimal order work estimates are obtained for the second-order hyperbolic equation.
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SIGNIFICANCE AND EXPLANATION

Recently very efficient procedures have been developed for time-stepping non-linear partial differential equations of parabolic type by the author and others. This report extends some of these techniques to various types of partial differential equations which are second-order in the time derivative. Equations to which these techniques can be applied have been used as models for vibrational problems, for dynamics of rotating fluids, for nonlinear viscoelasticity, and for other physical problems.

Significant amounts of computation are saved by an iterative time-stepping procedure for approximating the solution of the large systems of linear equations produced by a Galerkin-type numerical procedure. Instead of factoring a different large matrix at each time step to solve the linear equations exactly, a new matrix is factored periodically and used as a preconditioner in an iterative procedure. Work estimates that are presented indicate how often the preconditioner must be updated to obtain near-optimal amounts of work. Very few iterations are then required at each time step since the iterative procedure is just a stabilizing process for the underlying time-stepping procedure. A complete error analysis is presented.

The responsibility for the wording and views expressed in this descriptive summary lies with MRC, and not with the author of this report.
1. Introduction

We shall consider, as a model problem, efficient procedures for time-stepping Galerkin methods for approximating smooth solutions of quasilinear second-order hyperbolic equations. The techniques presented in this analysis can be applied to various generalized wave equations which are used as model equations for many different types of vibrational problems. We consider the problem of approximating the smooth solution $u = u(x,t)$ which satisfies

\begin{align}
(a) \quad & c(x) \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial t^2} - \nabla \cdot [a(x,u) \nabla u] = f(x,t,u), \quad x \in \Omega, \quad t \in J, \\
(b) \quad & u(x,0) = u_0(x), \quad x \in \Omega, \\
(c) \quad & \frac{\partial u}{\partial t}(x,0) = v_0(x), \quad x \in \Omega, \\
(d) \quad & a(x,u) \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} = g(x,t), \quad x \in \partial \Omega, \quad t \in J,
\end{align}

where $\Omega$ is a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^d$, $d \leq 3$, with boundary $\partial \Omega$, $\mathbf{v}$ is the outward unit normal to $\partial \Omega$, $J \equiv (0,T)$, and $c$, $a$, $f$, $u_0$, $v_0$, and $g$ are prescribed. We shall first present a Crank-Nicolson-Galerkin approximation to (1.1) which produces a different linear system of equations to be solved at each time step. Procedures of this type have been analyzed in [7,8,11,3].

Our modification of the basic procedure will consist of using a preconditioned iterative procedure for only approximating the solution of these linear equations at each time step. The use of a preconditioning matrix eliminates...
the need to refactor a new matrix at each time step, while the iterative
procedure is used to stabilize the resulting algorithm. Using this modifica-
tion, we obtain the same order error estimates as for the base scheme with
greatly reduced computational complexity. We obtain very nearly optimal
possible work estimates for our procedure.

The techniques presented here can also be used to analyze approxima-
tion procedures for initial-boundary value problems for equations of the form
\[(1.2) \quad c(x) \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial t^2} - \nabla \cdot [\tilde{a}(x,\nabla u)\nabla u + b(x,\nabla u)\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}] = f(x,t,u,\nabla u), \quad x \in \Omega, \ t \in J,\]

with appropriate initial and boundary conditions. Equations of this type
have been used as models in nonlinear viscoelasticity and hydrodynamics.
Existence, uniqueness, and stability of equations of this type have been
studied by Dafermos, Greenberg, MacCamy, Mizel, Showalter and others (see
[5,6,18,22,25]). The coefficient \( \tilde{a} \) can be allowed to degenerate to zero
in (1.2).

We can also treat approximations of solutions of equations of the form
\[(1.3) \quad c(x) \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial t^2} - \nabla \cdot \left[ \tilde{a}(x,\nabla u)\nabla u + \tilde{b}(x,\nabla u)\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + e(x,\nabla u)\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial t^2} \right] = f(x,t,u,\nabla u), \quad x \in \Omega, \ t \in J,\]

with appropriate initial and boundary conditions. Equations of this type
have been used as classical vibration models [21, §278] and in the dynamics
of rotating fluids [20,23]. The coefficients \( \tilde{a} \) or \( \tilde{b} \) can be allowed
to degenerate to zero in (1.3).

Efficient time-stepping procedures of the type presented here have
been used by the author and others, for pseudoparabolic equations in [13],
for parabolic equations in [10,4], and for systems of equations used to
model miscible displacement in porous media in [14,15,16].
In Section 2 we introduce finite element spaces, present the hypotheses on (1.1) and its solution $u$, discuss an elliptic projection of $u$, and present various Crank-Nicolson-Galerkin methods for (1.1)-(1.3). In Section 3 we present our preconditioned modification of the base method and discuss the effect of the iterative stabilization on a single time step. We obtain global error estimates for both the base scheme and the iterative modification in Section 4. Section 5 contains a brief description of estimates of the computational complexity of the methods presented in the paper.

2. Preliminaries and Description of Galerkin Methods

Let $(\varphi, \psi) = \int_{\Omega} \varphi \psi \, dx$, $\|\psi\|^2 = (\psi, \psi)$, and $|\varphi|^2 = (\varphi, \varphi)$. Let $W_s(\Omega)$ be the Sobolev space on $\Omega$ with norm

$$\|\psi\|_{W_s}^2 = \left( \sum_{|\alpha| \leq k} \left\| \frac{\partial^\alpha \psi}{\partial x^\alpha} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

with the usual modification for $s = \infty$. When $s = 2$, let

$$\|\psi\|_{W_2^k} = \|\psi\|_{H^k} = \|\psi\|_{H^k}.$$

If $\nabla F = (F_1, F_2)$, write $\|\nabla F\|_{W_s^k}$ in place of $\|\nabla F\|_{W_s^k}$.

Let $H^2(\partial \Omega)$ denote the corresponding Sobolev space on $\partial \Omega$ with norm $\|\psi\|_{H^2(\partial \Omega)}$ (with $|\psi| = |\psi|_0$).

Let $\{M_h\}$ be a family of finite-dimensional subspaces of $H^1(\Omega)$ with the following property:
For $p = 2$ or $p = \infty$, there exist an integer $r \geq 2$ and a constant $K_0$ such that, for $1 < q < r$ and $\psi \in W^q_p(\Omega)$,

\begin{equation}
\inf \left\{ \|\psi - x\|_p + h\|\psi - x\|_1 \right\} \leq K_0\|\psi\|_p^q.
\end{equation}

We also assume that the family $\{M_h\}$ satisfies the following so-called "inverse hypotheses": if $\psi \in M_h$,

\begin{align}
&\text{a)} \quad \|\psi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq K_0h^{-1/2}\|\psi\|_p, \\
&\text{b)} \quad \|\psi\|_1 \leq K_0h^{-1}\|\psi\|_p.
\end{align}

Restrict $\Omega$ as follows (with (S) denoting the collection of restrictions):

1) The Neumann problem for $-\Delta + I$ on $\Omega$ is $H^2$-regular.

(S)

2) $\partial \Omega$ is Lipschitz.

Assume the following regularity for $c$, $a$, $\tilde{a}$, $b$, $e$, $f$ and $u$:

(Q) 1. There exist uniform constants such that

\begin{align}
&\text{a)} \quad 0 < a_* \leq a(x,u) \leq a^* \leq K_1, \\
&\text{b)} \quad 0 < \tilde{a}_* \leq \tilde{a}(x,\nu u) \leq \tilde{a}^* \leq K_1, \\
&\text{c)} \quad 0 < c_* \leq c(x) \leq c^* \leq K_1, \\
&\text{d)} \quad 0 < b_* \leq b(x,\nu u) \leq K_1, \\
&\text{e)} \quad 0 < \tilde{b}_* \leq \tilde{b}(x,\nu u) \leq K_1, \\
&\text{f)} \quad 0 < e_* \leq e(x,\nu u) \leq K_1, \\
&\text{g)} \quad |f(x,t,u)| \leq K_1.
\end{align}

2. The functions $a = a(x,u)$, $\tilde{a} = \tilde{a}(x,q_1,q_2)$, $b = b(x,q_1,q_2)$, $\tilde{b} = \tilde{b}(x,q_1,q_2)$, $e = e(x,q_1,q_2)$, and $f = f(x,t,u)$ are continuously differentiable with respect to $u$ (respectively $\nu u$) and have a uniform bound, $K_1$, satisfying (for $i = 1,2$)
\( |a|, |\tilde{a}|, |b|, |\tilde{b}|, |c|, |\tilde{c}|, |e|, |f|, \frac{\partial a}{\partial u}, \frac{\partial f}{\partial u}, \frac{\partial a}{\partial q_i}, \frac{\partial f}{\partial q_i} \)

\( \frac{\partial e}{\partial q_i}, \frac{\partial f}{\partial u}, \frac{\partial^2 a}{\partial u^2}, \frac{\partial^2 a}{\partial q_i^2} \leq K_1 \).

Define

\( \|\psi\|_{w^q_p((a,b);x)} \equiv \|\psi(\cdot, t)\|_x \|_{w^q_p(a,b)} \), \quad 1 \leq p, q \leq \infty.

Let \( u \), the solution of (1.1) satisfy the following regularity assumptions:

\( u \) satisfies

\( a) \quad \|u\|_{L^\infty(J;\mathcal{H}^r)} + \|\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}\|_{L^2(J;\mathcal{H}^r)} + \|\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial t^2}\|_{L^2(J;\mathcal{H}^r)} \leq K_2 \),

\( b) \quad \|u\|_{L^\infty(J;\mathcal{H}^3)} + \|\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}\|_{L^\infty(J;\mathcal{H}^2)} + \|\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial t^2}\|_{L^\infty(J;\mathcal{H}^2)} \leq K_2 \),

\( c) \quad \|\frac{\partial^3 u}{\partial t^3}\|_{L^2(J;\mathcal{H}^2)} + \|\frac{\partial^3 u}{\partial t^3}\|_{L^1(J;\mathcal{H}^1)} + \|\frac{\partial^4 u}{\partial t^4}\|_{L^2(J;\mathcal{H}^2)} \leq K_2 \).

Similar regularity assumptions must be satisfied by the solutions of (1.2) and (1.3) but we shall not make these explicit here.

As in [26], we shall introduce an auxiliary elliptic problem to aid in our analysis. Define \( W \) in \( \mathcal{M}_h \) to be the unique function which, for \( t \in [0,T] \), satisfies

\( (a(u)VW, Vx) + (W, x) = (a(u)Vu, Vx) + (u, x), \quad x \in \mathcal{M}_h. \)

Then as in [26,7,12] we obtain the following lemma.

\textbf{Lemma 2.1.} There exists a constant \( K_3 = K_3(\Omega, a, \alpha, K_0, K_1, K_2) \) such that for \( 2 \leq q \leq r, \eta = u - W, \) and \( s = 0 \) or \( 1, \)
a) \[ \| \eta \|_{L^\infty(J;H^s)} \leq K_3 h^{q-s} \| u \|_{L^\infty(J;H^q)} , \]

b) \[ \| \frac{\partial \eta}{\partial t} \|_{L^2(J;H^s)} + \| \frac{\partial^2 \eta}{\partial t^2} \|_{L^2(J;H^s)} \leq K_3 h^{q-s} \{ \| u \|_{L^2(J;H^q)} + \| \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} \|_{L^2(J;H^q)} + \| \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial t^2} \|_{L^2(J;H^q)} \} . \]

(2.8)

We also make the assumption on \( \{ M_h \} \) and \( u \) that there exists a constant \( K_4 \) such that

\[ \|(2.9) \| \| W \|_{L^\infty(J;L^m)} + \| \nabla W \|_{L^\infty(J;L^m)} + \| \frac{\partial W}{\partial t} \|_{L^\infty(J;L^m)} + \| \frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial t^2} \|_{L^2(J;L^m)} \leq K_4 . \]

Sufficient conditions for (2.9) to hold can be found in [10,26]. Also as in [7,10,12] we can obtain the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.2.** There exists a constant \( K_5 = K_5(G,a_0,K_0,K_1,K_2) \) such that

\[ \|(2.10) \| \| \frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial t^2} \|_{L^\infty(J;H^1)} + \| \frac{\partial^3 W}{\partial t^3} \|_{L^\infty(J;H^1)} \leq K_5 . \]

We shall consider discrete-time Galerkin approximations. Let \( \Delta t > 0 \), \( N = T/\Delta t \in \mathbb{Z} \), and \( t^n = n\Delta t, \sigma \in \mathbb{R} \). Also let \( \psi^n \equiv \psi^n(x) \equiv \psi(x,t^n) \), and

\[ \|(2.11) \| a) \quad d_t \psi^n = \frac{\psi^{n+1} - \psi^n}{\Delta t} , \]

\[ b) \quad d_t^2 \psi^n = \frac{\psi^{n+1} - 2\psi^n + \psi^{n-1}}{(\Delta t)^2} . \]

We shall consider Crank-Nicolson-Galerkin methods for our base time-stepping procedure for each of the equations. Let \( U : \{ t_0, \ldots, t_N \} \rightarrow M_h \)
be an approximation to the solution of (1.1). Assuming that $u^k$ are known for $k \leq n$, determine $u^{n+1}$ by

$$
(2.12) \quad (cd_t^2 u^n, \chi) + \left( a(u^n) \nabla \left( \frac{u^{n+1} + u^{n-1}}{2} \right), \nabla \chi \right) = (f(t^n, u^n), \chi) + (g(t^n), \chi), \quad \chi \in M_h.
$$

Similarly, we define our approximation to the solution of (1.2) by

$$
(2.13) \quad (cd_t^2 u^n, \chi) + \left( a'(v u^n) \nabla \left( \frac{u^{n+1} + u^{n-1}}{2} \right), \nabla \chi \right) = (f(t^n, v u^n), \chi) + (g(t^n), \chi), \quad \chi \in M_h,
$$

and our approximation to the solution of (1.3) by

$$
(2.14) \quad (cd_t^2 u^n, \chi) + \left( a'(v u^n) \nabla \left( \frac{u^{n+1} + u^{n-1}}{2} \right), \nabla \chi \right) + \left( b(v u^n) \nabla \frac{u^{n+1} - u^{n-1}}{2\Delta t}, \nabla \chi \right)
$$

$$
+ (e(v u^n) \nabla d_t^2 u^n, \nabla \chi) = (f(t^n, v u^n, v u^n), \chi) + (g(t^n), \chi), \quad \chi \in M_h.
$$

3. Iterative Procedures

In this section, we shall present the linear equations arising from (2.12)-(2.14). We note that in each case, the coefficient matrices change with each time step. In order to avoid factorization of different matrices at each time step for the solution of the linear equations, we shall discuss an iterative method for approximating their solution. The analysis presented here will extend the analysis of [10,13] to the equations (1.1)-(1.3).

Let $\{u_i\}_{i=1}^M$ be a basis for $M_h$. Let $U^m$ from (2.12) be written as

$$
(3.1) \quad U^m = \sum_{i=1}^M \xi_i^m u_i.
$$

We then see that using (3.1), (2.12) can be written as

$$
(3.2) \quad \left[ C + \frac{(\Delta t)^2}{2} A^h(\xi) \right] (\xi^{n+1} - \xi^n) = C(\xi^n - \xi^{n-1}) - \frac{(\Delta t)^2}{2} A^h(\xi) (\xi^n + \xi^{n-1}) + (\Delta t)^2 R^h_1(\xi) \equiv R_1(\xi).
$$
where

\( a) \quad C = \{(c_{ij}, \nu_j)\} \),

\( (3.3) \)

\( b) \quad A^n(\xi) = \{(a(\sum_{l=1}^{M} \xi_j^{n} \nu_j, \nu_j, \nu_j))\}, \quad \text{and} \)

\( (3.3) \)

\( c) \quad F^n_1(\xi) = \{(f(t^n, \sum_{l=1}^{M} \xi_j^{n} \nu_j), \nu_j) + (g(t^n), \nu_j)\}. \)

Similarly, (2.13) can be written as

\[
\begin{align*}
\left[ C + \frac{(\Delta t)^2}{2} A^n(\xi) + \frac{\Delta t}{2} B^n(\xi) \right] (\xi^{n+1} - \xi^n) \\
= \left[ C - \frac{\Delta t}{2} B^n(\xi) \right] (\xi^n - \xi^{n-1}) - \frac{(\Delta t)^2}{2} A^n(\xi) (\xi^n + \xi^{n-1}) + (\Delta t)^2 F^n_2(\xi)
\end{align*}
\]

and (2.14) can be written as

\[
\begin{align*}
\left[ C + E^n(\xi) + \frac{(\Delta t)^2}{2} A^n(\xi) + \frac{\Delta t}{2} B^n(\xi) \right] (\xi^{n+1} - \xi^n) \\
= \left[ C + E^n(\xi) - \frac{\Delta t}{2} B^n(\xi) \right] (\xi^n - \xi^{n-1}) - \frac{(\Delta t)^2}{2} A^n(\xi) (\xi^n + \xi^{n-1}) + (\Delta t)^2 F^n_2(\xi)
\end{align*}
\]

where \( B^n \) and \( E^n \) are defined as in (3.3b) with the coefficient \( \alpha \) replaced by \( b \) and \( e \) respectively and \( F^n_2 \) is defined in an analogous manner to \( F^n_1 \).

Note that since the matrices \( A^n, B^n, \) and \( E^n \) change with time, straightforward solution of (3.2), (3.4), or (3.5) would involve the factorization of new matrices at each time step. Instead of solving (3.2) exactly, we shall approximate the solution by using an iterative procedure which has been preconditioned by

\[
(3.6) \quad L^0 = C + \frac{(\Delta t)^2}{2} A^0(\xi)
\]

Similarly, for (3.4) and (3.5) we shall precondition with

\[
\begin{align*}
L^0 = C + \frac{(\Delta t)^2}{2} A^0(\xi) + \frac{\Delta t}{2} B^0(\xi)
\end{align*}
\]
and
\[ L^0 = C + E^0(\xi) + \frac{(\Delta t)^2}{2} A^0(\xi) + \frac{\Delta t}{2} B^0(\xi) , \]
respectively. The preconditioning process eliminates the need for factoring new matrices at each time step, while the iterative procedure stabilizes the resulting problem. The stabilization process requires iteration only until a predetermined norm reduction is achieved.

Let the approximation of \( U^n \) from (2.12) produced by only approximately solving (3.2) using the preconditioner (3.6) be denoted by
\[(3.7) \quad V^m = \sum_{i=1}^{M} \gamma_i \mu_i .\]
A starting procedure for determining \( V^0 \) and \( V^1 \) will be discussed later.
Assuming that these quantities are known, we shall determine \( \gamma^{n+1}, n \geq 1 \), using a preconditioned iterative method to approximate \( \xi^{n+1} \) from (3.2).
As an initial guess for \( \xi^{n+1} - \xi^n \) for \( n \geq 2 \), we shall use quadratic extrapolation. Specifically, we shall use
\[(3.8) \quad x_0 = 2\gamma^n - 3\gamma^{n-1} + \gamma^{n-2} \]
as the initialization for the iterative procedure for \( \gamma^{n+1} - \gamma^n \). Since we use \( \gamma^n, \gamma^{n-1}, \) and \( \gamma^{n-2} \) in the coefficient matrices to determine \( \gamma^{n+1} \), the errors in the approximate solution will accumulate.

In order to estimate the cumulative error, we first consider the single step error. Define \( \gamma^{n+1} \) to satisfy
\[(3.9) \quad L^n(\gamma)(\gamma^{n+1} - \gamma^n) = \left[ C + \frac{(\Delta t)^2}{2} A^n(\gamma) \right] (\gamma^{n+1} - \gamma^n) = R_1(\gamma), \quad n \geq 1 , \]
from (3.2). For all of the analysis to follow, we can use any preconditioned iterative method which yields norm reductions of the form
(3.10) \[ \|L^n(\gamma)^\frac{1}{2}(\gamma^{n+1} - \gamma^n)\|_e \leq \rho_1 \|L^n(\gamma)^\frac{1}{2}(\gamma^{n+1} - 3\gamma^n + 3\gamma^{n-1} - \gamma^{n-2})\|_e, \]

where \( 0 < \rho_1 < 1 \) and the subscript indicates the Euclidean norm of the vector. A particularly efficient iterative procedure for obtaining (3.10) is the preconditioned conjugate gradient method presented in [1,2,9,10,13].

Let

\begin{align*}
\text{a) } & \quad \|\psi\|_c^2 \equiv (\psi, \psi) \\
\text{b) } & \quad \|\psi\|_a^n \equiv (\frac{1}{2} a(V^n)\psi, \psi) \\
\text{c) } & \quad \|\psi\|_n = \|\psi\|_c + \Delta t \|\psi\|_a^n,
\end{align*}

be special norms and semi-norms. Note that \( \|\cdot\|_a^n \) are uniformly equivalent to \( \|\cdot\|_n \). Then letting

(3.12) \[ \tilde{\psi}^n = \sum_{i=1}^{M} \tilde{y}_i \varphi_i, \]

we see that \( \tilde{\psi}^{n+1} \) satisfies

(3.13) \[ \begin{aligned}
\left\{ c \frac{\tilde{\psi}^{n+1} - 2\tilde{\psi}^n + \tilde{\psi}^{n-1}}{(\Delta t)^2}, \chi \right\} + \left\{ a(V^n)\sqrt{\frac{\tilde{\psi}^{n+1} + \tilde{\psi}^{n-1}}{2}}, \psi \chi \right\} \\
= (f(t^n, u^n), \chi) + (g(t^n), \chi), \quad \chi \in M_h.
\end{aligned} \]

We also see that, using (3.11), (3.10) can be written as

(3.14) \[ \|\tilde{\psi}^{n+1} - \psi^{n+1}\|_n \leq \rho_1^n \|\tilde{\psi}^n\|_n, \quad n \geq 2, \]

where

\begin{align*}
\text{a) } & \quad \rho_1^n = \frac{\rho_1}{1 - \rho_1}, \\
\text{b) } & \quad \delta^n \psi \equiv \psi^{n+1} - \psi^n, \\
\text{c) } & \quad \delta^2 \psi \equiv \psi^{n+1} - 2\psi^n + \psi^{n-1}, \\
\text{c) } & \quad \delta^3 \psi \equiv \psi^{n+1} - 3\psi^n + 3\psi^{n-1} - \psi^{n-2}.
\end{align*}
We next discuss a starting procedure for obtaining \( V^0, V^1, \) and \( V^2 \).

We shall follow the ideas of [11] in determining \( V^0 \) and \( V^1 \). Let \( V^0 = W(0) \); i.e. project \( u_0 \) into \( \mathcal{M}_h \). This will require the factorization of one additional matrix to solve the elliptic problem (2.7). Then approximate \( u(x,\Delta t) \) by

\[
u^* = u(x,0) + \Delta t \frac{\partial u}{\partial t}(x,0) + \frac{(\Delta t)^2}{2} \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial t^2}(x,0).
\]

Project \( u^* \) into \( \mathcal{M}_h \). The derivative \( \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial t^2} \) is evaluated using the differential equation. The solution of the second elliptic problem can be approximated using the factored matrix used to determine \( V^0 \). We can thus obtain the estimate

\[
\| \nabla (V-W)^0 \| + \| \nabla (V-W)^1 \| + \| \nabla^2 (V-W)^0 \| \leq C(h^r + (\Delta t)^2).
\]

Once we have \( V^0 \) and \( V^1 \) satisfying (3.16), \( V^2 \) can be determined using the same preconditioned iterative procedure as above by initializing the iterative procedure by \( X_0 = Y^1 - Y^0 \). For details of a starting procedure using the iterative procedure, see [10].

4. A Priori Error Estimates

In this section we develop a priori bounds for the errors \( u^n - u^n \) and \( V^n - u^n \) for the procedures defined in (2.12) and (3.13) respectively. Similar results yielding optimal order \( H^1 \)-estimates can be obtained using similar techniques for the procedures defined in (2.13) and (2.14) and their iterative counterparts. Theorem 4.1 yields optimal order \( L^2 \)-estimates for the procedure satisfying (2.12) and (3.16) under restrictions given in (4.18). Under the slightly stronger mesh-ratio restriction

\[
\Delta t \leq C h,
\]
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we obtain optimal order $L^2$-estimates for the iterative procedure satisfying (3.13) and (3.16) in Theorem 4.2.

**Theorem 4.1.** Let $S$, $Q$, $R$, and the restrictions on $\{K_h\}$ of Section 2 hold. Let $U^n$ satisfy (2.12) and (3.16). Then there exist constants $\tau$, $h_0$, and $K_6 = K_6(K_i; i = 0, \ldots, 5)$ such that if $r > \frac{d}{2}$, $\Delta t \leq \tau$, $h \leq h_0$, and $\Delta t < \frac{d}{4}$,

$$\sup_{\xi^n} \{\|u - U\| + h\|u - U\|_1\} \leq K_6(h^\tau + (\Delta t)^2).$$

**Proof.** Let $\eta^n = u^n - W^n$ and $\zeta^n = u^n - W^n$. From (1.1), (2.7) and (2.12), we see that

$$(\cd_x^2 \zeta^n, \chi) + \left[a(U^n) V \frac{\xi^{n+1} + \xi^{n-1}}{2}, \chi\right] = \left[c \frac{\partial^2 W^n}{\partial t^2}, \chi\right] + (\eta^n, \chi)$$

$$+ \left[a(u^n) V W^n - a(u^n) V \frac{w^{n+1} + w^{n-1}}{2}, \chi\right] + (f(t^n, u^n) - f(t^n, u^n), \chi),$$

$$\chi \in M_h.$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.3)

We shall let $\chi = \zeta^{n+1} - \zeta^{n-1} = \Delta t (d_x \zeta^n + d_x \zeta^{n-1})$ in (4.3). Using this test function and (3.11), the left hand side of (4.3) becomes

$$\left(c \frac{d_x \zeta^n - d_x \zeta^{n-1}}{\Delta t}, \Delta t (d_x \zeta^n + d_x \zeta^{n-1})\right) + \left[a(u^n) V \frac{\xi^{n+1} + \xi^{n-1}}{2}, \chi(\zeta^{n+1} - \zeta^{n-1})\right]$$

$$= \left\|d_x \zeta^n\right\|^2_c - \left\|d_x \zeta^{n-1}\right\|^2_c + \frac{1}{2} \{\left\|\zeta^{n+1}\right\|^2_{a_n} - \left\|\zeta^{n-1}\right\|^2_{a_n}\}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.4)

In order to obtain telescoping sums when (4.4) is summed on $n$, we must shift the indices in two of the terms above. Note that

$$\left\|\zeta^{n-1}\right\|^2_{a_{n-2}} = \left\|\zeta^{n-1}\right\|^2_{a_{n-2}} + (a(U^n) - a(U^{n-2})) V \zeta^{n-1}, V \zeta^{n-1})$$

$$= \left\|\zeta^{n-1}\right\|^2_{a_{n-2}} + \frac{\partial a}{\partial u} [\delta \zeta^{n-1} + \delta \zeta^{n-2} + \delta w^{n-1} + \delta w^{n-2} V \zeta^{n-1}, V \zeta^{n-1}]$$

$$\leq \left\|\zeta^{n-1}\right\|^2_{a_{n-2}} + C \left\|\delta \zeta^{n-1}\right\|^2_{L^s} + \left\|\delta \zeta^{n-2}\right\|^2_{L^s} + (\Delta t) \left\|\zeta^{n-1}\right\|^2_{a_{n-2}}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.5)
We shall henceforth use $C$ as a generic constant in our analysis. For the first term on the right of (4.3), we obtain

$$\left| \sum_{n=1}^{l-1} \left[ c \left[ \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial t^2} - d^2 \zeta \xi \right], \Delta t(d_\xi \zeta^n + d_\xi \zeta^{n-1}) \right] \right|$$

(4.6)

$$\leq C \sum_{n=0}^{l-1} \left( \|d_\xi \zeta^n\|^2 + \|d_\xi \zeta^n\|^2 \Delta t + C(\Delta t)^4 \right).$$

We next bound the second and fourth terms on the right of (4.3) as follows

$$\left| \sum_{n=1}^{l-1} (u^n + f(t^n, u^n) - f(t^n, u^n), \Delta t(d_\xi \zeta^n + d_\xi \zeta^{n-1})) \right|$$

(4.7)

$$\leq C \sum_{n=0}^{l-1} \left( \|u^n\|^2 + \|u^n\|_c^2 + \|d_\xi \zeta^n\|^2 \Delta t \right).$$

We split the third term on the right side of (4.3) as follows.

$$\left| \sum_{n=1}^{l-1} \left[ a(u^n) \nabla \left( \zeta^n - \frac{\zeta^{n+1} + \zeta^{n-1}}{2} \right) + [a(u^n) - a(u^n)] \nabla \frac{\zeta^{n+1} + \zeta^{n-1}}{2}, \zeta^n \right] \right|$$

(4.8)

$$= \left| \sum_{n=1}^{l-1} (T_1 + T_2, \zeta^n) \right| .$$

In order to treat the terms in (4.8), we shall sum by parts in time,

$$\left| \sum_{n=1}^{l-1} (T_1, \nabla ((\zeta^{n+1} + \zeta^n) - (\zeta^n + \zeta^{n-1})) \right|$$

$$\leq \left| \sum_{n=2}^{l-1} \left[ [a(u^n) - a(u^{n-1})] \nabla \left( \zeta^n - \frac{\zeta^{n+1} + \zeta^{n-1}}{2} \right), \nabla (\zeta^n + \zeta^{n-1}) \right] \right|$$

(4.9)

$$+ \left| \sum_{n=2}^{l-1} \left[ a(u^{n-1}) \nabla \left( \left\{ \zeta^n - \frac{\zeta^{n+1} + \zeta^{n-1}}{2} \right\} - \left\{ \zeta^{n-1} - \frac{\zeta^n + \zeta^{n-2}}{2} \right\} \right), \nabla (\zeta^n + \zeta^{n-1}) \right] \right|$$

$$+ \left| (a(u^{l-1}) \nabla (\frac{1}{2} \sigma^2 \xi \zeta^l), (\zeta^{l+1} + \zeta^{l}) \right| + \left| (a(u^l) \nabla (\frac{1}{2} \sigma^2 \zeta), (\zeta^{l+1} + \zeta^0) \right|$$

$$\leq C \left\{ \sum_{n=1}^{l-1} \|c^n\|_a^2 \Delta t + (\Delta t)^4 \right\}$$

$$+ \frac{1}{a_0} \{ \|c^l\|_a^2 + \|c^{l-1}\|_a^2 + \|c^{l-2}\|_a^2 + \|c^1\|_a^2 + \|c^0\|_a^2 \} .$$
Similarly, we see that
\[
\left| \sum_{n=1}^{l-1} (T_n, \mathcal{V}(\zeta^{n+1} + \zeta^n - (\zeta^n + \zeta^{n-1})) \right|
\]
\[
\leq \left| \sum_{n=2}^{l-1} \left( (a(u^n) - a(U^n)) \mathcal{V} \left( \frac{W^{n+1} + W^{n-1}}{2} \right), \mathcal{V}(\zeta^n + \zeta^{n-1}) \right) \right|
\]
\[
= \left| \sum_{n=2}^{l-1} \left( (a(u^n) - a(u^{n-1})) \mathcal{V} \left( \frac{W^{n+1} + W^{n-1}}{2}, \mathcal{V}(\zeta^n + \zeta^{n-1}) \right) \right)
\]
\[
+ \left| \left( a(u^{l-1}) - a(U^{l-1}) \right) \mathcal{V} \frac{W^l + W^{l-2}}{2}, \mathcal{V}(\zeta^l + \zeta^{l-2}) \right| \right|
\]
\[
+ \left| \left( a(u^1) - a(U^1) \right) \mathcal{V} \frac{W^2 + W^0}{2}, \mathcal{V}(\zeta^1 + \zeta^0) \right| \right|
\]
\[
\leq C \left\{ \sum_{n=1}^{l-1} \left[ \|\zeta^n\|^2_{a^{n-1}} + \|\eta^n\|^2 + \|d_{\xi} \zeta^n\|^2_{a^{n-1}} + \|d_{\xi} \zeta^n\|^2_{a^{n-2}} \right] \Delta t + (\Delta t)^4 \right\} .
\]

Combining (4.3)-(4.10), we see that after summing (4.3) on \( n \) for \( n = 1 \)
to \( n = l - 1 \), we use Lemma 2.1 to obtain
\[
\|d_{\xi} \zeta^{l-1}\|^2_{c} + \frac{1}{4} \left( \|\zeta^{l-1}\|^2_{a^{l-1}} + \|\zeta^{l-1}\|^2_{a^{l-2}} \right)
\]
\[
\leq C \sum_{n=0}^{l-1} \|\delta \zeta^{n-1}\|_L^2 \left\{ \|d_{\xi} \zeta^{n-1}\|^2_{c} + \|\zeta^n\|^2_{a^{n-1}} + \|\zeta^{n-1}\|^2_{a^{n-2}} \right\}
\]
\[
+ C \sum_{n=0}^{l-1} \left\{ \|d_{\xi} \zeta^n\|^2_{c} + \|\zeta^n\|^2_{a^{n-1}} + \|\zeta^n\|^2_{c} \right\} \Delta t
\]
\[
+ c_1 \left\{ \|\zeta^0\|^2_{c} + \|\zeta^{l-1}\|^2_{c} \right\} + C \left\{ \|\zeta^0\|^2_{a^0} + \|\zeta^1\|^2_{a^0} + \|d_{\xi} \zeta^0\|^2_{c} + \|d_{\xi} \zeta^0\|^2_{c} \right\} .
\]

In order to bound the terms multiplied by \( C_1 \) on the right side of (4.11)
and to introduce an \( L^2 \) term on the left hand side of (4.11), we note that
\[
\|\zeta^{n+1}\|^2_{c} - \|\zeta^n\|^2_{c} = 2 \Delta t (cd_{\xi} \zeta^n, \zeta^n) + (\Delta t)^2 \|d_{\xi} \zeta^n\|^2_{c}
\]
\[
\leq 2 \Delta t \|d_{\xi} \zeta^n\|^2_{c} + \Delta t \|\zeta^n\|^2_{c} .
\]
Sum this inequality from \( n = 1 \) to the upper limits \( l - 1 \) and \( l - 2 \); then multiply the resulting inequalities by \( C_1 + \frac{1}{4} \), add them to (4.11) and use (3.16) to obtain

\[
\|d_t \xi^{l-1}\|_c^2 + \frac{1}{4} \left\{ \|\xi^l\|_a^{l-1} + \|\xi^{l-1}\|_a^{l-2} + \|\xi^l\|_c^2 \right\} \leq C \left( h^{2r} + (\Delta t)^4 \right)
\]

\[
+ \sum_{n=1}^{l-1} \|\delta \xi^n\|_L^2 \left[ \|d_t \xi^{n-1}\|_c^2 + \|\xi^n\|_a^{n-1} + \|\xi^{n-1}\|_a^{n-2} \right]
\]

(4.13)

\[
+ \sum_{n=0}^{l-1} \Delta t \left[ \|d_t \xi^n\|_c^2 + \|\xi^n\|_a^{n-1} + \|\xi^n\|_c^2 \right].
\]

In order to apply the discrete Gronwall lemma to (4.13), we wish to show that there exists a constant \( C_0 > 0 \) such that

\[
\sum_{n=0}^{l-1} \|\delta \xi^n\|_L^2 \leq C_0.
\]

(4.14)

The given starting procedure yields

\[
\|\delta \xi^n\|_L^2 \leq C_2.
\]

(4.15)

We shall use an induction argument as in [24,10,13] to yield (4.14) with the summation starting at \( n = 1 \). For \( l = 2 \), the inequality (4.13) and the estimate (3.16) imply that

\[
\|d_t \xi^1\|^2 \leq C \left\{ \|d_t \xi^0\|^2 + \|\xi^1\|^2_0 + \|\xi^0\|^2_0 + h^{2r} + (\Delta t)^4 \right\}
\]

(4.16)

\[
\leq C \left( h^{2r} + (\Delta t)^4 \right).
\]

Then we have by (2.2.a), (4.15), and (4.16),

\[
\|\delta \xi^1\|_L^2 + \|\delta \xi^0\|_L^2 \leq C \Delta t \|d_t \xi^1\|_c^2 h^{\frac{d}{2}} + C_2
\]

(4.17)

\[
\leq C \Delta t (h^{\frac{d}{2}} + (\Delta t)^2) + C_2.
\]
Then if
\[ a) \quad r > \frac{d}{2}, \]
\[ (4.18) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{d}{\Delta t}, \]
\[ b) \quad \Delta t < h^4, \]
we see that for \( \Delta t \) and \( h \) sufficiently small, (4.14) is satisfied with \( k = 3 \). Assume the following induction hypothesis:
\[ (4.19) \quad \sum_{n=0}^{k} \| \delta^n \|_L \leq C_0 \quad \text{for} \quad 1 \leq k < l - 2. \]

We can now apply the discrete Gronwall lemma to (4.13) and obtain for \( 1 \leq l \leq N \).
\[ (4.20) \quad \| \xi^l \|_2^2 + \| \eta^l \|_2^2 + \| d_\xi \xi^{l-1} \|_2^2 \leq \bar{c}(h^{2r} + (\Delta t)^4). \]

Note that from (2.2.a) and (4.20),
\[ (4.21) \quad \sum_{n=0}^{l-1} \| \delta^n \|_L \leq \sum_{n=0}^{l-1} \Delta t \| d_\xi \xi^n \|_{X_0 h} \frac{d}{2} \]
\[ \leq \sum_{n=0}^{l-1} \Delta t X_0 \frac{d}{2} \bar{C}(h^{2r} + (\Delta t)^4) \]
\[ \leq T X_0 \frac{d}{2} \bar{C}(h^{2r} + (\Delta t)^4). \]

Then if (4.18) is satisfied and \( \Delta t \) and \( h \) are sufficiently small, our induction argument is completed. Then since (4.21) holds for \( 1 \leq l \leq N \), using (4.21), (2.8) and the triangle inequality, we obtain the desired result (4.2).

We shall next obtain the same order asymptotic error estimates as derived in Theorem 4.1 for the approximation \( V \) defined in Section 3. We shall see in Section 5 that the work estimates for the approximation \( V \) are far superior to those for the approximation \( U \) analyzed above.
Theorem 4.2. Let \( S, Q, R \), and the restrictions on \( \{M_h\} \) of Section 2 hold. Let \( V^n \) satisfy (3.13), (3.16) and (3.14) where
\[
p_1^* \leq \left\{ 28 \left[ 1 + \frac{a^* k_0 c^*}{2 c_*^*} \right] \right\} \Delta t.
\]
Then there exist constants \( \tau, h_0, \) and \( K_7 = K_7(C^*, k_1, i = 0, \ldots, 5) \) such that if \( r > \frac{d}{2}, \Delta t \leq \tau, h \leq h_0, \) and \( \Delta t \leq \min\{h^{d/4}, c \cdot h\}, \)
\[
\sup_{t^n} \{\|u - \nu\| + h\|u - \nu\|_1\} \leq K_7 (h^r + (\Delta t)^2).
\]
Proof: Let \( Z^n = V^n - W^n \) and \( n^n \) be as above. From (1.1), (2.7), and (3.13), we see that
\[
(c d_t^2 Z^n, \chi) + \left\{ a^*(V^n) \frac{Z^{n+1} + Z^{n-1}}{2}, V(\chi) \right\} = \left\{ c \left[ \frac{2 u}{g t^2} - d_t^2 w^n \right], \chi \right\} + (n^n, \chi)
\]
\[
+ \left\{ a(u^n) w w - a(v^n) \frac{w^{n+1} + w^{n-1}}{2}, V(\chi) \right\} + (f(t^n, V^n) - f(t^n, u^n), \chi)
\]
\[
+ \left\{ c \frac{Z^{n+1} - Z^{n-1}}{2 \Delta t^2}, \chi \right\} + (a(v^n) \frac{1}{2} V(Z^{n+1} - Z^{n-1}), V(\chi)), \quad \chi \in M_h.
\]
We note that except for the last two terms on the right of (4.23), equation (4.23) corresponds exactly with (4.3). We must thus only show how the last two terms on the right of (4.23) are bounded. From (4.1), (3.11) and (3.14) we see that
\[ |T_L| \equiv \left| \left( c \frac{z^{n+1} - z^n}{(\Delta t)^2}, \Delta t (d_t \zeta^n - d_t \zeta^{n-1}) \right) \right| + \left\{ \frac{a(v^n)}{2} v(z^{n+1} - \bar{z}^{n+1}), v(d_t \zeta^n - d_t \zeta^{n-1}) \right\} \Delta t \]

\[ \leq \frac{1}{\Delta t} \sum_{n=1}^{L-1} \sum_{n=0}^{L-1} \left\{ \|d_t \zeta^n\|_c + \|d_t \zeta^{n-1}\|_c + \Delta t \left[ \|d_t \zeta^n\|_a + \|d_t \zeta^{n-1}\|_a \right] \right\} \]

\[ \leq \rho_1 \left[ 1 + \frac{a \cdot k_0 c^*}{2 \kappa} \right] \left[ \|d_t \zeta^n\|_c + \|d_t \zeta^{n-1}\|_c \right] \left\| \delta^3 v^n \right\|_n \]

\[ \leq \rho_1 \left[ 1 + \frac{a \cdot k_0 c^*}{2 \kappa} \right] \left[ \|d_t \zeta^n\|_c + \|d_t \zeta^{n-1}\|_c \right] \left[ \|d_t \zeta^n\|_c + \|d_t \zeta^{n-1}\|_c \right] \]

\[ + \|d_t \zeta^{n-2}\|_c + C(\Delta t)^2 \right]. \]

We then see that if

\[ \rho_1 \leq \left\{ 28 \left[ 1 + \frac{a \cdot k_0 c^*}{2 \kappa} \right] \right\} \Delta t , \]

then

\[ \sum_{n=1}^{L-1} |T_L| \leq \frac{1}{4} \sum_{n=0}^{L-1} \|d_t \zeta^n\|^2 + C(\Delta t)^4 . \]

The rest of the proof follows as in the proof of Theorem 4.1.

Similar techniques can be used to give a-priori error estimates for the approximations given in (2.13) and (2.14) as well as for the corresponding iterative approximations defined in Section 3. Since in the major applications, the coefficients depend upon \( v_\mu \) (the strain), the techniques presented here will only yield optimal order \( H^1 \)-estimates instead of the optimal order \( L^2 \)-estimates obtained in Theorem 4.1 and 4.2.

5. Computational Considerations

In this section we shall consider some rough operation counts to estimate the computational complexity of the methods presented here. We
shall show that the iterative methods presented in Section 3 allow us to obtain near optimal order work estimates. Therefore, these methods are very efficient computationally.

First consider \( d = 2 \) and the second order hyperbolic equation. Let \( M \) be the dimension of \( H^2 \) and \( N \) be the number of time steps. George [17] has shown in some special cases that the procedure of setting up and factoring \( L^N \) (from (3.9)) requires \( O(M^{3/2}) \) operations and that the solution of (3.2), given the factorization, requires \( O(M \log M) \) operations. Hoffman, Martin and Rose [19] have shown that such bounds are minimal. Therefore, if we conjecture the validity of the above estimates for our problem and refactor \( L^N \) and solve (3.2) at each time step, the total amount of work done is

\[
O(N(M^{3/2} + M \log M)) = O(NM^{3/2}).
\]

We note that the work of factorization dominates the estimates.

Using the preconditioned iterative methods presented in Section 3, one does not have to refactor at every time step. With \( d = 2 \) we have

\[
N \approx (\Delta t)^{-1} \approx h^{-2} \approx M^{1/4}.
\]

We are willing to refactor periodically, but our goal is to have the total work estimate (5.1) dominated by the work of solving, \( O(NM \log M) \). We shall see that for \( r \geq 3 \), this goal can be achieved. For \( r = 2 \) (piecewise linear elements), the work of factoring one matrix is already almost as large as the total work of solving \( O(M^{3/2} \log M) \) in this case. If we refactor and update the preconditioning matrix \( N^{1/4} \) equally spaced times, one can show that the preconditioning matrices are sufficiently comparable to the true matrices that each iteration of the iterative procedure yields
a norm reduction of $O((\Delta t)^{1/4})$. Then for $\Delta t$ sufficiently small, five
iterations per time step will satisfy the norm reduction requirement of
(4.25). Next, for $n = 3$ (piecewise quadratic elements), (5.1) and (5.2)
show that the total work is

\[
O(N^2 M^2 + 5NM \log M) = O(M^{3/2} + M^{7/4} \log M) = O(M^{3/2} \log M),
\]

and the work of solving dominates the estimate. If $r = 2$, the total work is

\[
O(M^{2 + 1/2} + 5M^{2} \log M) = O(M^8)
\]

which is still much better than the $O(M^2)$ work estimate if the matrices
are factored at each time step.

If $r \geq 4$, one can refactor and update the preconditioning matrix more
frequently (specifically $N^{1/2}$ equally spaced times), obtain a norm reduc-
tion of $O((\Delta t)^{1/2})$ with each iteration and by iterating only three times
per time step, still have the work of solving dominate the work estimate.

If $r = 4$ (piecewise cubics), the total work is

\[
O(M^4 + 3M^2 \log M) = O(M^4 \log M)
\]

We thus see that if $r \geq 3$, then by refactoring and updating the pre-
conditioning matrix sufficiently often (depending upon $r$), the total work
is of the order $O(NM \log M)$. Since the total number of unknowns in the
problem is $O(NM)$, we see that we can obtain almost optimal order work
estimates for $r \geq 3$.

For $d = 3$, the work of factoring a matrix is $O(M^2)$ while the work of
solving the result is $O(M^{4/3})$. Thus if $r \geq 2$ the total work of solving
again dominates the work of factoring a matrix. Thus if refactoring is done
sufficiently infrequently (depending upon $r$) the total work of solving
will again dominate the total work estimates.
It is computationally wasteful to iterate sufficiently many times at each time step to achieve the pessimistic bounds given by (4.25). Instead, one can monitor the norm reduction actually produced at each step of the iteration and stop iterating when sufficient norm reduction is achieved. Additional stopping criteria can be imposed in this monitoring process. See [10] for a discussion of stopping criteria for a related problem.
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