AD-A070 196 WISCONSIN UNIV-MADISON MATHEMATICS RESEARCH CENTER F/G 12/1
ERROR ESTIMATES FOR MIXED METHODS.(U)
MAR 79 R S FALK, J E OSBORN DAAG29-75-C-0024
UNCLASSIFIED MRC-TSR-1936 NL

| OF |
AD A070196

END
DATE FILMED
7-79
DDC

(12) LEVEL II

MRC Technical Summary Report #1936

# ERROR ESTIMATES FOR MIXED METHODS

R. S. Falk and J. E. Osborn

See back page for 1473

AD A070196

**Mathematics Research Center**
**University of Wisconsin—Madison**
**610 Walnut Street**
**Madison, Wisconsin 53706**

March 1979

Received January 25, 1979



**Approved for public release**
**Distribution unlimited**

Sponsored by

U. S. Army Research Office
P.O. Box 12211
Research Triangle Park
North Carolina 27709

National Science Foundation
Washington, D. C. 20550

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN - MADISON
MATHEMATICS RESEARCH CENTER

# ERROR ESTIMATES FOR MIXED METHODS

R. S. Falk[†] and J. E. Osborn[‡]

Technical Summary Report #1936
March 1979

## ABSTRACT

This paper presents abstract error estimates for mixed methods for the approximate solution of elliptic boundary value problems. These estimates are then applied to obtain quasi-optimal error estimates in the usual Sobolev norms for four examples: three mixed methods for the biharmonic problem and a mixed method for $2^{nd}$ order elliptic problems.

AMS(MOS) Subject Classifications: 65N15, 65N30

Key Words: mixed methods, error estimates

Work Unit Number 7 - Numerical Analysis

[†]Department of Mathematics, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J. and The Mathematics Research Center, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

[‡]Department of Mathematics, University of Maryland, College Park and The Mathematics Research Center, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Sponsored by the United States Army under Contract No. DAAG29-75-C-0024. This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant Nos. MCS78-02737 and MCS78-02851.

## SIGNIFICANCE AND EXPLANATION

This paper presents abstract error estimates for mixed methods for the approximate solution of elliptic boundary value problems. In a mixed method, one introduces an auxiliary variable, usually representing another physically important quantity, in order to write the differential equation as a lower order system. One then considers Ritz-Galerkin approximation schemes based on a variational formulation of this lower order system. The abstract estimates are then applied to obtain quasi-optimal error estimates in the usual Sobolev norms for four examples: three mixed methods for the biharmonic problem and a mixed method for second order elliptic problems. In the biharmonic problem, for example, one obtains by these mixed methods direct approximations to the stream function and vorticity in hydrodynamical problems or to the displacements and forces (or moments) in elasticity problems.

# ERROR ESTIMATES FOR MIXED METHODS

R. S. Falk[+] and J. E. Osborn[‡]

## 1. Introduction

In [5] Brezzi studied Ritz-Galerkin approximation of saddle-point problems arising in connection with Lagrange multipliers. These problems have the form:

Given $f \in V'$ and $g \in W'$, find $(u,\psi) \in V \times W$ satisfying

$$(1.1)\qquad \begin{cases} a(u,v) + b(v,\psi) = (f,v) & \forall\ v \in V \\ b(u,\varphi) = (g,\varphi) & \forall\ \varphi \in W\ , \end{cases}$$

where $V$ and $W$ are real Hilbert spaces, and $a(\cdot,\cdot)$ and $b(\cdot,\cdot)$ are bounded bilinear forms on $V \times V$ and $V \times W$, respectively.

Given finite dimensional spaces $V_h \subset V$ and $W_h \subset W$, $0 < h < 1$, the Ritz-Galerkin approximation $(u_h,\psi_h)$ to $(u,\psi)$ is the solution of the following problem:

Find $(u_h,\psi_h) \in V_h \times W_h$ satisfying

$$(1.2)\qquad \begin{cases} a(u_h,v) + b(v,\psi_h) = (f,v) & \forall\ v \in V_h \\ b(u_h,\varphi) = (g,\varphi) & \forall\ \varphi \in W_h\ . \end{cases}$$

The major assumptions in Brezzi's results are

$$(1.3)\qquad \sup_{v \in Z_h} \frac{|a(u,v)|}{\|v\|_V} \geq \gamma_0 \|u\|_{V'} \quad \forall\ u \in Z_h \text{ and } \forall\ h\ ,$$

where $\gamma_0 > 0$ is a constant independent of $h$ and $Z_h = \{v \in V_h : b(v,\varphi) = 0\ \forall\ \varphi \in W_h\}$, and

$$(1.4)\qquad \sup_{v \in V_h} \frac{|b(v,\varphi)|}{\|v\|_V} \geq k_0 \|\varphi\|_W \quad \forall\ \varphi \in W_h \text{ and } \forall\ h\ ,$$

where $k_0 > 0$ is independent of $h$.

Using (1.3) and (1.4) Brezzi proves the following error estimate for the approximation method determined by (1.2):

---

[+]Department of Mathematics, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J. and The Mathematics Research Center, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

[‡]Department of Mathematics, University of Maryland, College Park and The Mathematics Research Center, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Sponsored by the United States Army under Contract No. DAAG29-75-C-0024. This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant Nos. MCS78-02737 and MCS78-02851.

$$(1.5)\qquad \|u-u_h\|_V + \|\psi-\psi_h\|_W \le C\Big(\inf_{\chi\in V_h}\|u-\chi\|_V + \inf_{\eta\in W_h}\|\psi-\eta\|_W\Big) \quad \forall\ h\ .$$

In [1,2] Babuška studied Ritz-Galerkin approximation of general variationally posed problems. The main result of [1,2], applied to (1.1) and (1.2), is that (1.5) holds provided

$$(1.6)\qquad \sup_{(v,\varphi)\in V_h\times W_h} \frac{|a(u,v) + b(v,\psi) + b(u,\varphi)|}{\|v\|_V + \|\varphi\|_W} \ge \tau_0\big(\|u\|_V + \|\psi\|_W\big) \quad \forall\ (u,\psi)\in V_h\times W_h \text{ and } \forall\ h,$$

where $\tau_0 > 0$ is independent of $h$.

It is clear from [1,2,5] that (1.3) and (1.4) hold if and only if (1.6) holds. (1.3)-(1.4) or, equivalently, (1.6) is referred to as the stability condition for this approximation method.

The results of [1,2,5] can be viewed as a strategy for analyzing these approximation methods: the approximation method is characterized by certain bilinear forms, norms (spaces), and families of finite dimensional approximating spaces, and if the method can be shown to be stable with respect to the chosen norms, then the error estimates in these norms follow in a simple manner provided the bilinear forms are bounded and the approximation properties of $V_h$ and $W_h$ are known in these norms. These results can be used to analyze, for example, certain hybrid methods for the biharmonic problem [5,6] and the stationary Stokes problem [10]. The results of [1,2] have also been used to analyze a variety of variationally posed problems that are not of form (1.1).

There are other problems of a similar nature, however, where attempts at using the ideas of [1,2,5] were not entirely successful since not all of the abstract hypotheses were satisfied: specifically the Brezzi condition (1.3) or, equivalently, the Babuška condition (1.6), is not satisfied with the usual choice of norms, i.e., the approximation methods for these problems are not stable with respect to the usual norms. This is the case, for example, in the analysis in [7] of the Hermann-Miyoshi [13,14,17] mixed method for the biharmonic problem. In the analysis of this method a natural choice for both $\|\cdot\|_V$ and $\|\cdot\|_W$ is the $1^{\underline{st}}$ order Sobolev norm; however this method is not stable with respect to this choice. As a result of this difficulty, the error estimates obtained in

[7] are not quasi-optimal. A similar difficulty arises in the analysis of the Hermann-Johnson [13,14,15] and Ciarlet-Raviart [9] mixed methods for the biharmonic problem. In later work of Scholz [21] and Rannacher [19] quasi-optimal error estimates were obtained for the mixed methods of Ciarlet-Raviart and Hermann-Miyoshi, although the systematic approach of Brezzi and Babuška was abandoned.

In a forthcoming paper of Babuška, Osborn, and Pitkäranta [3] quasi-optimal error estimates for mixed methods for the biharmonic problem are derived by an application of the results of Brezzi and Babuška. In this work a new family of (mesh dependent) norms are introduced with respect to which the above mentioned mixed methods (Ciarlet-Raviart, Hermann-Miyoshi, Hermann-Johnson) are stable. Error estimates in these norms then follow directly from the results of Brezzi and Babuška, once the approximation properties of the subspaces $V_h$ and $W_h$ have been determined in these new norms. Error estimates in the more standard norms are then obtained by using the usual duality argument.

It is the intent of this paper to provide an abstract approach to the analysis of mixed methods which leads to quasi-optimal error estimates, uses only standard norms, and is systematic. We shall assume that existence and uniqueness for the continuous (infinite dimensional) problem has been established and develop an abstract framework under which quasi-optimal error estimates can be derived for a variety of examples which do not fit within the convergence theory of Brezzi and Babuška using the usual norms.

Section 2 contains the abstract convergence results of the paper. In Section 3 we present four examples previously analyzed in the literature and show how error estimates can be derived from the theorems in Section 2. Three of these methods are mixed methods for the biharmonic problem and the fourth is a mixed method for a second order problem analyzed by Raviart-Thomas [20].

It is interesting to note that in this last example the results of Brezzi and Babuška apply with the choice of spaces used by Raviart-Thomas, but fail to yield quasi-optimal error estimates in all cases due to the way in which the variables are tied together in the error estimates. In our analysis the error estimates for the two variables are separated and quasi-optimal error estimates are obtained. For the three mixed methods for the biharmonic problem that are analyzed in Section 3 the results of the present paper and those obtained

in [3], using different techniques, are the same. For additional results on mixed methods see Oden [18].

Throughout this paper, we shall use the Sobolev spaces $W^{m,p}(\Omega)$, where $\Omega$ is a convex polygon in the plane, $m$ is a nonnegative integer, and $1 \leq p < \infty$. On these spaces we have the seminorms and norms

$$|v|_{m,p,\Omega} = \left( \int_{\Omega} \sum_{|\alpha|=m} |D^{\alpha} v|^{p} \, dx \right)^{1/p}$$

and

$$\|v\|_{m,p,\Omega} = \left( \int_{\Omega} \sum_{|\alpha| \leq m} |D^{\alpha} v|^{p} \, dx \right)^{1/p} .$$

When $p = 2$, we denote $W^{m,2}(\Omega)$ by $H^{m}(\Omega)$ and write

$$|v|_{m,2,\Omega} = |v|_{m,\Omega}$$

and

$$\|v\|_{m,2,\Omega} = \|v\|_{m,\Omega}.$$

We will further denote by $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ the subspace of $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ of functions that vanish on $\Gamma = \partial\Omega$ and by $H_0^2(\Omega)$ the subspace of $H^2(\Omega)$ of functions that vanish together with their normal derivatives on $\Gamma$. For $m = 1$ and $2$ we will also use the spaces $H^{-m}(\Omega) = [H_0^m(\Omega)]'$ (the dual space of $H_0^m(\Omega)$) with the norm on $H^{-m}(\Omega)$ taken to be the usual dual norm. To further simplify notation we often drop the use of the subscript $\Omega$ in the norm when the context is clear.

## 2. Abstract Results

Let $V$, $W$, and $H$ be three real Banach spaces with norms $\|\ \|_V$, $\|\ \|_W$, and $\|\ \|_H$ respectively. We assume $V \subset H$ with a continuous imbedding. Let $a(\cdot,\cdot)$ and $b(\cdot,\cdot)$ be continuous bilinear forms on $H \times H$ and $V \times W$, respectively:

$$|a(u,v)| \leq \|a\|\ \|u\|_H\ \|v\|_H \qquad \forall\ u,v \in H\ , \tag{2.1}$$

$$|b(u,\psi)| \leq \|b\|\ \|u\|_V\ \|\psi\|_W \qquad \forall\ u \in V,\ \forall\ \psi \in W\ . \tag{2.2}$$

We consider the following problem, which we refer to as problem P:

Given $f \in V'$ and $g \in W'$, find $(u,\psi) \in V \times W$ satisfying:

$$a(u,v) + b(v,\psi) = (f,v) \qquad \forall\ v \in V\ , \tag{2.3}$$

$$b(u,\varphi) = (g,\varphi) \qquad \forall\ \varphi \in W\ , \tag{2.4}$$

where $(\cdot,\cdot)$ denotes the pairing between $V$ and $V'$ or $W$ and $W'$.

We shall be interested in this problem for a subclass of data, i.e., for $(f,g) \in D$, where $D$ is a subclass of $V' \times W'$. We shall assume that:

(H1) For $(f,g) \in D$, P has a unique solution.

In the analysis of Problem P we will also consider the adjoint problem:

Given $d \in G'$, where $G$ is a Banach space satisfying $W \subset G$ with a continuous imbedding, find $(y,\lambda) = (y_d,\lambda_d) \in V \times W$ satisfying

$$a(v,y) + b(v,\lambda) = 0 \qquad \forall\ v \in V\ , \tag{2.5}$$

$$b(y,\varphi) = (d,\varphi)\ ,\ \forall\ \varphi \in W\ . \tag{2.6}$$

We shall assume that:

(H2) Problem (2.5)-(2.6) has a unique solution for each $d \in G'$.

Throughout this paper we shall be concerned with the problem of approximating the solution $(u,\psi)$ of P. Toward this end, we suppose we are given finite dimensional spaces $V_h \subset V$ and $W_h \subset W$. We then consider the following approximate problem, which we refer to as problem $P_h$:

Find $(u_h,\psi_h) \in V_h \times W_h$ satisfying:

$$a(u_h,v) + b(v,\psi_h) = (f,v) \qquad \forall\ v \in V_h\ , \tag{2.7}$$

$$b(u_h,\varphi) = (g,\varphi) \qquad \forall\ \varphi \in W_h\ . \tag{2.8}$$

We will then view $u_h$ as an approximation to $u$ and $\psi_h$ as an approximation to $\psi$. In this section we obtain estimates for $u-u_h$ and $\psi-\psi_h$.

We now state several further assumptions which we will require in the proofs of our main results.

(H3) There is a constant $\alpha > 0$ ( $\alpha$ independent of $h$ ) such that

$$a(v,v) \geq \alpha \|v\|_H^2 \qquad \forall \quad v \in Z_h ,$$

where $Z_h = \{v \in V_h : b(v,\varphi) = 0 \quad \forall \quad \varphi \in W_h\}$.

(H4) $S(h)$ is a number satisfying

$$\|v\|_V \leq S(h) \|v\|_H \qquad \forall \quad v \in V_h .$$

(H5) There is an operator $\pi_h : Y \to V_h$ satisfying

$$b(y - \pi_h y, \varphi) = 0 \qquad \forall \quad y \in Y \quad \text{and} \quad \forall \quad \varphi \in W_h$$

where $Y = \text{span}(\{y_d\}_{d \in G'}, u)$, $(u,\psi)$ is the solution of problem $P$, and $(y_d, \lambda_d)$ is the solution of (2.5)-(2.6) corresponding to $d \in G'$.

For the examples treated in Section 3 the existence and uniqueness of the approximate solution $(u_h, \psi_h)$ can be established in various ways. We now give a proof based on the assumptions made above.

Theorem 1. Assume that hypotheses (H2), (H3), and (H5) are valid. Then problem $P_h$ has a unique solution.

Proof. Since $V_h$ and $W_h$ are finite dimensional, it suffices to show that if $(u_h, \psi_h) \in V_h \times W_h$ satisfies

$$a(u_h, v) + b(v, \psi_h) = 0 \qquad \forall \quad v \in V_h , \tag{2.9}$$

$$b(u_h, \varphi) = 0 \qquad \forall \quad \varphi \in W_h , \tag{2.10}$$

then $u_h = \psi_h = 0$. Choosing $v = u_h$ in (2.9) and $\varphi = -\psi_h$ in (2.10) and adding the equations, we get $a(u_h, u_h) = 0$.

Noting from (2.10) that $u_h \in Z_h$ and using (H3) we have $\|u_h\|_H = 0$. Hence $u_h = 0$.

Setting $u_h = 0$ in (2.9) we obtain

$$b(v, \psi_h) = 0 \qquad \forall \quad v \in V_h . \tag{2.11}$$

Now

$$\|\psi_h\|_G = \sup_{d \in G'} \frac{(d, \psi_h)}{\|d\|_{G'}} . \tag{2.12}$$

By (H2), for each $d \in G'$, there exists $y_d \in V$ such that for all $\varphi \in W$

$$(d,\varphi) = b(y_d,\varphi).$$

Thus
$$\begin{aligned}(d,\psi_h) &= b(y_d,\psi_h)\\ &= b(\pi_h y_d,\psi_h) \qquad \text{(applying H5)}\\ &= 0 \qquad \text{(using (2.11))}.\end{aligned}$$

Equation (2.12) then implies $\psi_h = 0$.

Our main result in this section are Theorems 2 and 3 which present abstract estimates for the errors $u-u_h$ and $\psi-\psi_h$.

Theorem 2. Suppose hypotheses (H1)-(H5) are valid and that $(u,\psi)$ and $(u_h,\psi_h)$ are the respective solutions of problems $P$ and $P_h$. Then (with $\pi_h$ defined by (H5)),

$$\|u-u_h\|_H \le \frac{1}{\alpha}\left[\|b\|S(h)\|\psi-\varphi\|_W + (\|a\| + \alpha)\|u-\pi_h u\|_H\right] \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in W_h \tag{2.13}$$

and

$$\|u-u_h\|_V \le \|u-\pi_h u\|_V + \frac{S(h)}{\alpha}\left[\|b\|S(h)\|\psi-\varphi\|_W + \|a\|\|u-\pi_h u\|_H\right] \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in W_h. \tag{2.14}$$

If in addition

$$Z_h \subset Z \tag{H6}$$

where

$$Z = \{v \in V: b(v,\varphi) = 0 \ \ \forall \ \ \varphi \in W\},$$

then

$$\|u-u_h\|_H \le \left[1 + \frac{\|a\|}{\alpha}\right]\|u-\pi_h u\|_H \tag{2.15}$$

and

$$\|u-u_h\|_V \le \|u-\pi_h u\|_V + \frac{S(h)\|a\|}{\alpha}\|u-\pi_h u\|_H. \tag{2.16}$$

Proof. Using (2.3) we see that

$$\begin{aligned}a(\pi_h u,v) + b(v,\psi) &= a(u,v) + b(v,\psi) + a(\pi_h u-u,v)\\ &= (f,v) + a(\pi_h u-u,v) \quad \forall \quad v \in V_h,\end{aligned} \tag{2.17}$$

and from (2.4) and (H5) we see that

$$b(\pi_h u,\varphi) = (g,\varphi) \quad \forall \quad \varphi \in W_h. \tag{2.18}$$

Subtracting (2.7) from (2.17) we find

$$a(\pi_h u-u_h,v) + b(v,\psi-\psi_h) = a(\pi_h u-u,v) \quad \forall \quad v \in V_h, \tag{2.19}$$

and subtracting (2.8) from (2.18) we obtain

(2.20) $\quad b(\pi_h u-u_h,\varphi) = 0 \qquad \forall \quad \varphi \in W_h$ .

Choosing $v = \pi_h u-u_h$ in (2.19) we have

$$a(\pi_h u-u_h,\pi_h u-u_h) + b(\pi_h u-u_h,\psi-\psi_h) = a(\pi_h u-u,\pi_h u-u_h).$$

Applying (2.20) we get

(2.21) $\quad a(\pi_h u-u_h,\pi_h u-u_h) = a(\pi_h u-u,\pi_h u-u_h) + b(u_h-\pi_h u,\psi-\varphi)$ for all $\varphi \in W_h$ .

Using (2.1), (2.2), (H3), (H4), and noting from (2.20) that $\pi_h u-u_h \in Z_h$, we then obtain

$$\alpha\|\pi_h u-u_h\|_H^2 \le \|a\|\|\pi_h u-u\|_H\|\pi_h u-u_h\|_H + \|b\|S(h)\|u_h-\pi_h u\|_H\|\psi-\varphi\|_W$$

and hence

(2.22) $\quad \|\pi_h u-u_h\|_H \le \frac{1}{\alpha}\left[\|a\|\|u-\pi_h u\|_H + \|b\|S(h)\|\psi-\varphi\|_W\right]$ for all $\varphi \in W_h$ .

Thus

$$\|u-u_h\|_H \le \|u-\pi_h u\|_H + \|\pi_h u-u_h\|_H \le \frac{1}{\alpha}[\|b\|S(h)\|\psi-\varphi\|_W + (\|a\|+\alpha)\|u-\pi_h u\|_H]$$

for all $\varphi \in W_h$ . This proves (2.13).

In order to prove (2.14) we first note that

$$\|u-u_h\|_V \le \|u-\pi_h u\|_V + \|\pi_h u-u_h\|_V \le \|u-\pi_h u\|_V + S(h)\|\pi_h u-u_h\|_H .$$

(2.14) now follows from (2.22).

To prove (2.15) we observe that (2.20) together with $Z_h \subset Z$ implies that

(2.23) $\quad b(\pi_h u-u_h,\varphi) = 0 \qquad \forall \quad \varphi \in W.$

Hence (2.21) simplifies to

(2.24) $\quad a(\pi_h u-u_h,\pi_h u-u_h) = a(\pi_h u-u,\pi_h u-u_h).$

Applying (2.1) and (H3) to (2.24) yields

(2.25) $\quad \|\pi_h u-u_h\|_H \le \frac{\|a\|}{\alpha}\|\pi_h u-u\|_H$ .

(2.15) follows by the triangle inequality.

To establish (2.16) we write

$$\|u-u_h\|_V \le \|u-\pi_h u\|_V + \|\pi_h u-u_h\|_V$$

$$\le \|u-\pi_h u\|_V + S(h)\|\pi_h u-u_h\|_H \quad \text{(by H4)}$$

$$\le \|u-\pi_h u\|_V + S(h)\ \frac{\|a\|}{\alpha}\|u-\pi_h u\|_H \quad \text{(using (2.25))}.$$

Corollary. Inequality (2.15) holds without assumption (H4).

Theorem 3.

a) Suppose hypotheses (H1), (H2), (H3), and (H5) are valid and that $(u,\psi)$ and $(u_h,\psi_h)$ are the respective solutions of problems $P$ and $P_h$. Then (with $(y_d,\lambda_d)$ and $\pi_h$ as defined in (H2) and (H5), respectively),

$$\|\psi-\psi_h\|_{G'} = \sup_{d\in G'} \{b(y_d-\pi_h y_d,\psi-\varphi) + a(u_h-u,\pi_h y_d-y_d) + b(u-u_h,\lambda_d-\eta)\}/\|d\|_{G'}, \tag{2.26}$$

for all $\varphi$, $\eta \in W_h$.

b) If in addition (H6) holds $(Z_h \subset Z)$, then

$$b(u-u_h,\lambda_d-\eta) = b(u-\pi_h u,\lambda_d-\eta) \quad \forall \quad \eta \in W_h . \tag{2.27}$$

c) If we further have that

(H7) There is an operator $\Sigma_h : \Lambda \to W_h$ satisfying $b(v,\Sigma_h\lambda-\lambda) = 0$ for all $v \in V_h$ and all $\lambda \in \Lambda$, where $\Lambda = \text{span}(\{\lambda_d\}_{d\in G'},\psi)$, $(u,\psi)$ is the solution of problem $P$, and $(y_d,\lambda_d)$ is the solution of (2.5)-(2.6) corresponding to $d \in G'$, then

$$b(y_d-\pi_h y_d,\psi-\Sigma_h\psi) = (d,\psi-\Sigma_h\psi) \tag{2.28}$$

and

$$b(u-u_h,\lambda_d-\Sigma_h\lambda_d) = (g,\lambda_d-\Sigma_h\lambda_d) . \tag{2.29}$$

Proof. From (2.6) we have

$$\|\psi-\psi_h\|_{G'} = \sup_{d\in G'} (d,\psi-\psi_h)/\|d\|_{G'} = \sup_{d\in G'} b(y_d,\psi-\psi_h)/\|d\|_{G'} . \tag{2.30}$$

Subtraction of (2.7) from (2.3) and (2.8) from (2.4) yields

$$a(u-u_h,v) + b(v,\psi-\psi_h) = 0 \quad \forall \quad v \in V_h \tag{2.31}$$

and

$$b(u-u_h,\eta) = 0 \quad \forall \quad \eta \in W_h . \tag{2.32}$$

Now, combining (2.5), (H5), (2.31), and (2.32) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} b(y_d,\psi-\psi_h) &= b(y_d-\pi_h y_d,\psi-\psi_h) + b(\pi_h y_d,\psi-\psi_h) \\ &= b(y_d-\pi_h y_d,\psi-\varphi) + a(u_h-u,\pi_h y_d) \\ &= b(y_d-\pi_h y_d,\psi-\varphi) + a(u_h-u,\pi_h y_d-y_d) + a(u_h-u,y_d) \\ &= b(y_d-\pi_h y_d,\psi-\varphi) + a(u_h-u,\pi_h y_d-y_d) + b(u-u_h,\lambda_d) \\ &= b(y_d-\pi_h y_d,\psi-\varphi) + a(u_h-u,\pi_h y_d-y_d) + b(u-u_h,\lambda_d-\eta) \text{ for all } \varphi,\eta \in W_h . \end{aligned}$$

Substitution of this identity in (2.30) yields (2.26).

If $Z_n \subset Z$ then

$$b(\pi_h u - u_h, \varphi) = 0 \quad \forall \quad \varphi \in W \qquad \text{(see (2.23) above)}$$

and so (2.27) follows immediately.

Now, if in addition (H7) holds, then

$$b(y_d - \pi_h y_d, \psi - \Sigma_h \psi) = b(y_d, \psi - \Sigma_h \psi) = (d, \psi - \Sigma_h \psi) \qquad \text{(by (2.6))}.$$

and

$$b(u - u_h, \lambda_d - \Sigma_h \lambda_d) = b(u, \lambda_d - \Sigma_h \lambda_d) = (g, \lambda_d - \Sigma_h \lambda_d) \ .$$

Thus (2.28) and (2.29) are established.

Remark. Note that inequality (2.15) in Theorem 2 and all the results of Theorem 3 hold without assumption (2.2). This observation is used in subsection 3c.

We end this section with several remarks on the hypotheses (H3)-(H7). We assume here that $V$ and $W$ are Hilbert spaces.

1) It is clear that if

$$a(v,v) \geq \gamma_0 \|v\|_V^2 \quad \text{for all} \quad v \in Z_h \ , \tag{2.33}$$

then hypotheses (1.3) in Brezzi's theorem is valid. In the applications we consider in section 3, (2.33) is not true (with $\gamma_0$ independent of $h$) but is valid when $\|v\|_V$ is replaced by $\|v\|_H$. This accounts for (H3) (and (H4)).

2) In hypotheses (H5)-(H7) it appears that we are not making use of conditions similar to (1.4). In fact, in applications the operator $\pi_h$ described in (H5) is often constructed in order to verify (1.4). A more precise relationship is given below in Propositions 1 and 2. For further ideas in this direction, consult the work of Fortin [11].

Proposition 1. Suppose

$$\sup_{v \in V_h} \frac{|b(v,\varphi)|}{\|v\|_V} \geq k_0 \|\varphi\|_W \quad \forall \quad \varphi \in W_h \quad \text{and} \quad \forall \ h \ , \tag{2.34}$$

where $k_0 > 0$. Then there is an operator $\pi_h : V \to V_h$ that satisfies

$$b(v - \pi_h v, \varphi) = 0 \quad \forall \quad v \in V \quad \text{and} \quad \forall \quad \varphi \in W_h$$

and

$$\|\pi_h v\|_V \le \frac{\|b\|}{k_0}\|v\|_V \qquad \forall \quad v \in V .$$

Proof. Consider $b(v,\varphi)$ on $Z_h^\perp \times W_h$, where $Z_h^\perp = \{v \in V_h : v \text{ is } V\text{-orthogonal to } Z_h\}$. We immediately see that

$$\sup_{v \in Z_h^\perp} \frac{|b(v,\varphi)|}{\|v\|_V} \ge k_0\|\varphi\|_W \qquad \forall \quad \varphi \in W_h$$

and

$$\sup_{\varphi \in W_h} |b(v,\varphi)| > 0 \qquad \forall \quad 0 \ne v \in Z_h^\perp .$$

It thus follows from [1,2] that for each $v \in V$ there is a unique $\pi_h v \in Z_h^\perp$ satisfying

$$b(\pi_h v,\varphi) = b(v,\varphi) \qquad \forall \quad \varphi \in W_h .$$

Furthermore,

$$\|\pi_h v\|_V \le \frac{\|b\|}{k_0}\|v\|_V .$$

This proves Proposition 1.

We also note that it follows from [1,2] that for each $\varphi \in W$ there exists a unique $\Sigma_h\varphi \in W_h$ satisfying

$$b(v,\Sigma_h\varphi) = b(v,\varphi) \qquad \forall \quad v \in Z_h^\perp .$$

Furthermore,

$$\|\Sigma_h\varphi\|_W \le \frac{\|b\|}{k_0}\|\varphi\|_W .$$

Proposition 2. Suppose

$$\sup_{v \in V} \frac{|b(v,\varphi)|}{\|v\|_V} \ge k\|\varphi\|_W \qquad \forall \quad \varphi \in W, \tag{2.35}$$

where $k > 0$, and suppose there is an operator $\pi_h : V \to V_h$ satisfying

$$b(v-\pi_h v,\varphi) = 0 \quad \forall \quad \varphi \in W_h$$

and

$$\|\pi_h v\|_V \le C\|v\|_V \qquad \forall \quad v \in V .$$

Then (2.34) holds.

Proof: Clearly we have

$$\sup_{v \in V_h} \frac{|b(v,v')|}{\|v\|_V} \geq \sup_{v \in V} \frac{|b(\pi_h v, v')|}{\|\pi_h v\|_V}$$

$$= \sup_{v \in V} \frac{|b(v,v')|}{\|v\|_V} \frac{\|v\|_V}{\|\pi_h v\|_V} \geq \frac{k}{C} \|v'\|_W \qquad \forall \quad v' \in W_h ,$$

i.e., (2.34) holds with $k_0 = k/C$ .

Thus we see that (H5) is closely related to (2.34), which is the same as (1.4).

3). Hypotheses (H6) and (H7) are also closed related as we see by the following result.

Proposition 3. $\Sigma_h : W \to W_h$ , as defined in Remark 2, satisfies

(2.36) $$b(v, \Sigma_h v') = b(v,v') \qquad \forall \quad v \in V_h$$

if and only if $Z_h \subset Z$ .

Proof. Suppose (2.36) holds. Let $v \in Z_h$ . Then

$$b(v,v') = b(v, \Sigma_h v') = 0 \qquad \forall \quad v' \in W ,$$

i.e., $v \in Z$ . Thus $Z_h \subset Z$ .

Now suppose $Z_h \subset Z$ . Then, if $v \in Z_h^{\perp}$ we have (2.36) by the definition of $\Sigma_h$ , and, if $v \in Z_h$ we have (2.36) since both terms are zero. Since $V_h = Z_h \oplus Z_h^{\perp}$ we obtain (2.36) for all $v \in V_h$ .

## 3. Applications

In this section we apply the results of Section 2 to several examples.

### a) Ciarlet-Raviart method

Consider the biharmonic problem

$$(3.1)\qquad \begin{cases} \Delta^2 \psi = g & \text{in } \Omega \\ \psi = \dfrac{\partial \psi}{\partial n} = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma = \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where $\Omega$ is a convex polygon and $g$ is a given function. If $g \in H^{-2}(\Omega)$ then there is a unique solution $\psi \in H_0^2(\Omega)$ of (3.1). In addition the following regularity result is known for this problem: If $g \in H^{-1}(\Omega)$, then $\psi \in H^3(\Omega) \cap H_0^2(\Omega)$ and there is a constant $C$ such that

$$(3.2)\qquad \|\psi\|_3 \leq C\|g\|_{-1} \qquad \forall \quad g \in H^{-1}(\Omega).$$

Using the well-known correspondence between the biharmonic problem and the Stokes problem, this regularity result can be deduced from the regularity result for the Stokes problem proved in [16] (cf. also [12]).

We now seek an approximation to the solution $\psi$ of (3.1) by a mixed method, i.e., we introduce an auxiliary variable ($u \equiv -\Delta\psi$ for the method of this subsection), write (3.1) as a lower order system, cast this system in variational form, and then consider the Ritz-Galerkin method corresponding to this variational formulation. In particular, the mixed method we study will be based on the following variational formulation of (3.1), first considered by Ciarlet and Raviart [9]:

Given $g \in H^{-1}(\Omega)$, find $(u,\psi) \in H^1(\Omega) \times H_0^1(\Omega)$ satisfying

$$(3.3)\qquad \begin{cases} \displaystyle\int_\Omega uv\,dx - \int_\Omega \nabla v \cdot \nabla \psi\,dx = 0 \qquad \forall \quad v \in H^1(\Omega) \\ \displaystyle -\int_\Omega \nabla u \cdot \nabla \varphi\,dx = -\int_\Omega g\varphi\,dx \qquad \forall \quad \varphi \in H_0^1(\Omega). \end{cases}$$

Using the regularity result (3.2) it is not difficult to show (see Theorem 1 of [9]) that if $\psi$ is the solution to (3.1) and $u = -\Delta\psi$, then $(u,\psi)$ is a solution of (3.3), and if $(u,\psi)$ is a solution of (3.3), then $\psi$ is a solution of (3.1) and $u = -\Delta\psi$.

It is clear that (3.3) is an example of problem P of Section 2 with $V = H^1(\Omega)$, $W = H_0^1(\Omega)$, $H = L_2(\Omega)$, $a(u,v) = \displaystyle\int_\Omega uv\,dx$, and $b(u,\psi) = -\int_\Omega \nabla u \cdot \nabla \psi\,dx$, (and with $g$ replaced by $-g$). Here the subclass D of data for which (H1) is satisfied is given by

$D = O \times W'$. Since the form $a$ is symmetric, the adjoint problem (2.5), (2.6), with $G = W = H_0^1(\Omega)$, is the same as problem P and thus is uniquely solvable for all $d \in W'$. Hence (H2) is satisfied. Using (3.2) we also have

$$\|y_d\|_1 + \|\lambda_d\|_3 \leq C\|d\|_{-1}. \tag{3.4}$$

Next we discuss the finite dimensional subspaces used in the approximation scheme. For $0 < h < 1$, let $\tau_h$ be a triangulation of $\bar{\Omega}$ with triangles $T$ of diameter less than or equal to $h$. We assume the family $\{\tau_h\}$ satisfies the minimal angle condition, i.e., there is a constant $\sigma > 0$ such that

$$\max_{T \in \tau_h} \frac{h_T}{\rho_T} \leq \sigma \quad \forall\, h,$$

where $h_T$ is the diameter of $T$ and $\rho_T$ is the diameter of the largest circle contained in $T$, and is quasi-uniform, i.e., there is a constant $\tau > 0$ such that

$$\frac{\max_T h_T}{\min_T h_T} \leq \tau \quad \forall\, h.$$

For $k \geq 1$ a fixed integer we define

$$S_h = \{v \in C^0(\bar{\Omega}) : v|_T \in P_k \quad \forall \quad T \in \tau_h\} \tag{3.5}$$

where $P_k$ is the space of polynomials of degree $k$ or less in the variables $x_1$ and $x_2$. We then consider the approximate problem $P_h$ with $V_h = S_h$ and $W_h = S_h \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$. Note that this scheme yields direct approximations to $\psi$ and $u = -\Delta\psi$ (the stream function and vorticity in hydrodynamical problems).

To apply our theorems we must check that hypotheses (H3)-(H5) are valid. (H3) is clearly valid with $\alpha=1$ and since our family of triangulations is quasi-uniform, (H4) is satisfied with $S(h) = C/h$ for some constant $C$. It remains to check (H5). For $v \in H^1(\Omega)$ define $\pi_h v$ by:

$$\pi_h v \in V_h,$$

$$\int_\Omega \nabla(\pi_h v)\cdot\nabla\varphi \, dx = \int_\Omega \nabla v\cdot\nabla\varphi \, dx \quad \forall \quad \varphi \in V_h$$

and

$$\int_\Omega \pi_h v \, dx = \int_\Omega v \, dx, \quad \text{i.e.,}$$

let $\pi_h v$ be the Neumann projection of $v$ into $V_h$. Then (H5) is satisfied, and in addition standard approximability results imply that if $v \in H^{r-2}(\Omega)$, $r \geq 3$, then

$$\|v - \pi_h v\|_j \leq Ch^{\ell-j}\|v\|_\ell , \quad j = 0,1 \quad \text{and} \quad 1 \leq \ell \leq \min(k+1,r-2). \tag{3.6}$$

We are now ready to apply Theorems 2 and 3. Suppose $\psi \in H^r(\Omega)$, $r \geq 3$ and that $k \geq 2$. Then, using (2.13), (3.6), and standard approximability results, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|u-u_h\|_0 &\leq C(h^{-1} \inf_{\varphi \in W_h} \|\psi-\varphi\|_1 + \|u-\pi_h u\|_0) \\ &\leq C(h^{-1}h^{s-1}\|\psi\|_s + h^{s-2}\|u\|_{s-2}) \\ &\leq Ch^{s-2}\|\psi\|_s \qquad (\text{since } u = -\Delta\psi) \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

where $s = \min(r,k+1)$.

From (2.14) we find in a similar fashion that

$$\|u-u_h\|_1 \leq Ch^{s-3}\|\psi\|_s , \tag{3.8}$$

where $s = \min(r,k+1)$.

Finally, from (2.1), (2.2), (2.26), (3.4), (3.7), and (3.8), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\psi-\psi_h\|_1 &\leq C \sup_{d \in H^{-1}(\Omega)} \{\|y_d-\pi_h y_d\|_1 \inf_{\varphi \in W_h} \|\psi-\varphi\|_1 \\ &\quad + \|u-u_h\|_0 \|y_d-\pi_h y_d\|_0 + \|u-u_h\|_1 \inf_{\eta \in W_h} \|\lambda_d-\eta\|_1 \}/\|d\|_{-1} \\ &\leq C \sup_{d \in H^{-1}(\Omega)} \{\|y_d\|_1 h^{s-1}\|\psi\|_s + h^{s-2}\|\psi\|_s h\|y_d\|_1 \\ &\quad + h^{s-3}\|\psi\|_s h^2\|\lambda_d\|_3 \}/\|d\|_{-1} \\ &\leq C h^{s-1}\|\psi\|_s \end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

where $s = \min(r,k+1)$.

Since (3.7)-(3.9) are valid only for $k \geq 2$, the methods of this paper do not yield error estimates for the case $k = 1$ in this example. For this case the reader is referred to Scholz [22]. The estimates (3.7)-(3.9) improve on those in Ciarlet and Raviart [9]. Scholz [21] obtained (3.7) under the assumption that $\Gamma$ is smooth. (3.7) and (3.9) were obtained by Babuška, Osborn, and Pitkäranta [3].

We remark that Theorem 3 could also be used to obtain an error estimate for $\|\psi-\psi_h\|_0$ (by choosing $G = L_2(\Omega)$) when $\psi \in H^4(\Omega)$. However in order to get quasi-optimal results we would require the regularity result that $d \in L_2(\Omega)$ implies $\lambda_d \in H^4(\Omega)$, which is not valid on a convex polygon.

b) Hermann-Miyoshi method

We consider in this subsection another mixed method for the approximate solution of (3.1). In this method the auxiliary variable is the vector of second partial derivatives of $\psi$.

Let

$$V = \{\underset{\sim}{v} = (v_{ij}),\ 1 \le i,j \le 2 : v_{12} = v_{21},\ v_{ij} \in H^1(\Omega)\}$$

(with the usual product norm), and

$$W = H_0^1(\Omega) .$$

Then the mixed method we study will be based on the following variational formulation of (3.1).

Given $q \in H^{-1}(\Omega)$, find $(\underset{\sim}{u},\psi) \in V \times W$ satisfying

$$(3.10)\qquad \begin{cases} \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} \int_\Omega u_{ij} v_{ij}\,dx + \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} \int_\Omega \frac{\partial v_{ij}}{\partial x_j} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x_i}\,dx = 0 \quad \forall\ \underset{\sim}{v} \in V \\ \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} \int_\Omega \frac{\partial u_{ij}}{\partial x_j} \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_i}\,dx = -\int_\Omega q\varphi\,dx \quad \forall\ \varphi \in W. \end{cases}$$

Using the regularity result (3.2) it is not difficult to show that if $\psi$ is a solution of (3.1) and $\underset{\sim}{u} = (u_{ij})$ is defined by $u_{ij} = \frac{\partial^2 \psi}{\partial x_i \partial x_j}$, then $(\underset{\sim}{u},\psi)$ is a solution of (3.10), and if $(\underset{\sim}{u},\psi)$ is a solution of (3.10), then $\psi$ is a solution of (3.1) and $u_{ij} = \frac{\partial^2 \psi}{\partial x_i \partial x_j}$.

We easily observe that (3.10) is an example of problem P with V and W as above,

$$H = \{\underset{\sim}{v} = (v_{ij}),\ 1 \le i,j \le 2 : v_{12}=v_{21},\ v_{ij} \in L_2(\Omega)\}$$

(with the usual product norm),

$$a(\underset{\sim}{u},\underset{\sim}{v}) = \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} \int_\Omega u_{ij} v_{ij}\,dx , \quad \text{and} \quad b(\underset{\sim}{u},\psi) = \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} \int_\Omega \frac{\partial u_{ij}}{\partial x_j} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x_i}\,dx .$$

As in Subsection 3a the subclass $D$ of data for which (H1) is satisfied is given by $D = O \times W'$, and since $a$ is again symmetric (H2) is satisfied with $G = W = H_0^1(\Omega)$.

Letting $S_h$ be as defined in (3.5), we then consider the approximate problem $P_h$ with

$$V_h = \{\underset{\sim}{v} = (v_{ij}) : v_{12} = v_{21},\ v_{ij} \in S_h\}$$

and

$$W_h = S_h \cap H_0^1(\Omega).$$

With this choice for the forms $a$ and $b$ and the spaces $V_h$ and $W_h$, problem $P_h$ now describes the Hermann-Miyoshi method [13, 14, 17] for the approximation of the biharmonic problem. Note that with this method we obtain direct approximations to $\psi$ and $\frac{\partial^2 \psi}{\partial x_i \partial x_j}$ (the displacement and the moments in elasticity problems).

As in Subsection 3a we have hypothesis (H3) satisfied with $\alpha=1$ and (H4) satisfied with $S(h) = C/h$ for some constant $C$. (H5) for this example is contained in Lemma 2 in [7]. Moreover, by a minor modification of the proof of Lemma 2 in [7] we obtain the existence of $\pi_h : V \to V_h$ satisfying:

$$b(\underset{\sim}{v} - \pi_h \underset{\sim}{v}, \varphi) = 0 \qquad \forall \ \varphi \in W_h$$

and for $\underset{\sim}{v} \in V \cap [H^{r-2}(\Omega)]^4$, $r \geq 3$, the estimate

$$\|\underset{\sim}{v} - \pi_h \underset{\sim}{v}\|_j \leq C h^{\ell - j} \|\underset{\sim}{v}\|_\ell, \quad j = 0,1 \quad \text{and} \quad 1 \leq \ell \leq \min(k+1, r-2). \tag{3.11}$$

We can now apply Theorems 2 and 3 in the same way as in Subsection 3a. Combining these theorems with (3.11) and standard approximability results, we obtain for $\psi \in H^r(\Omega)$, with $r \geq 3$ and $k \geq 2$:

$$\|\underset{\sim}{u} - \underset{\sim}{u}_h\|_0 \leq C h^{s-2} \|\psi\|_s, \tag{3.12}$$

$$\|\underset{\sim}{u} - \underset{\sim}{u}_h\|_1 \leq C h^{s-3} \|\psi\|_s, \tag{3.13}$$

and

$$\|\psi - \psi_h\|_1 \leq C h^{s-1} \|\psi\|_s, \tag{3.14}$$

where $s = \min(r, k+1)$. Estimates (3.12)-(3.14) improve those in Brezzi-Raviart [7]. Rannacher [19] recently proved these estimates for $k = 2$. Babuška, Osborn, and Pitkäranta [3] proved (3.12) and (3.14).

c) Hermann-Johnson method

We consider here a further mixed method for the solution of (3.1) in which the auxiliary variable is the vector of second partial derivatives of $\psi$, as in section 3b.

Given a triangle $T \in \tau_h$ and a function $\underset{\sim}{v} = (v_{ij})$ with $v_{ij} \in H^1(T)$, $1 \le i,j \le 2$, and $v_{12} = v_{21}$ we define

$$M_{\nu}(\underset{\sim}{v}) = \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} v_{ij}\nu_j\nu_i$$

and

$$M_{\nu\tau}(\underset{\sim}{v}) = \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} v_{ij}\nu_j\tau_i$$

where $\underset{\sim}{\nu} = (\nu_1, \nu_2)$ is the unit outward normal and $\underset{\sim}{\tau} = (\tau_1,\tau_2) = (\nu_2,-\nu_1)$ is the unit tangent along $\partial T$. Let

$$V = V(h) = \{\underset{\sim}{v} = (v_{ij}) : v_{ij} \in L_2(\Omega),\ v_{12} = v_{21},$$
$$v_{ij}|_T \in H^1(T)\ \ \forall\ T \in \tau_h,\ \text{and}\ M_{\nu}(\underset{\sim}{v})\ \text{is continuous}$$
$$\text{at the interelement boundaries}\}\ \text{with}$$
$$\|\underset{\sim}{v}\|_V^2 = \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} \sum_{T\in\tau_h} \|v_{ij}\|_{1,T}^2,$$

and

$$W = W_0^{1,p}(\Omega),\ \text{where } p \text{ is some number larger than } 2.$$

The mixed method we study in this subsection will be based on the following variational formulation of (3.1).

Given $g \in H^{-1}(\Omega)$, find $(u,\psi) \in V \times W$ satisfying

$$(3.15)\quad \begin{cases} \displaystyle\sum_{i,j=1}^{2} \int_{\Omega} u_{ij}v_{ij}\,dx + \sum_{T\in\tau_h} \Big\{ \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} \int_T \frac{\partial v_{ij}}{\partial x_j}\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x_i}\,dx - \int_{\partial T} M_{\nu\tau}(\underset{\sim}{v})\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \tau}\,ds \Big\} = 0 \quad \forall\ \underset{\sim}{v} \in V \\ \displaystyle\sum_{T\in\tau_h} \Big\{ \sum_{i,j=1} \int_T \frac{\partial u_{ij}}{\partial x_j}\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_i}\,dx - \int_{\partial T} M_{\nu\tau}(\underset{\sim}{u})\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial \tau}\,ds \Big\} = -\int_{\Omega} g\varphi\,dx \quad \forall\ \varphi \in W. \end{cases}$$

The correspondence between (3.1) and (3.15) is the same as the correspondence between (3.1) and (3.10), i.e., if $\psi$ is the solution of (3.1), then $\left(\left(\frac{\partial^2\psi}{\partial x_i \partial x_j}\right),\psi\right)$ is a solution of (3.15), and if $((u_{ij}),\psi)$ is a solution of (3.15), then $\psi$ is the solution of (3.1) and $u_{ij} = \frac{\partial^2\psi}{\partial x_i \partial x_j}$.

One easily sees that (3.15) is an example of problem P with V and W as above, H as in Section 3b,

$$a(\underset{\sim}{u},\underset{\sim}{v}) = \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} \int_{\Omega} u_{ij} v_{ij} \, dx$$

and

$$b(\underset{\sim}{u},\psi) = \sum_{T \in \tau_h} \left\{ \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} \int_{T} \frac{\partial u_{ij}}{\partial x_j} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x_i} \, dx - \int_{\partial T} M_{\nu\tau}(\underset{\sim}{u}) \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \tau} \, ds \right\} .$$

As in the previous subsections, a subclass D of data for which (H1) is satisfied is given by $D = O \times H^{-1}(\Omega)$, and since a is again symmetric, (H2) is satisfied for $G = H_0^1(\Omega)$. We note that in this example the space $V = V(h)$ depends on h. For each h the form $b(\underset{\sim}{u},\psi)$ is bounded on $V(h) \times W$ (where $W = W_0^{1,p}$, $p > 2$) with a bound b that depends on h. In the error estimates in this subsection we do not require that this bound be independent of h. Cf. the Remark following Theorem 3.

Letting $S_h$ be as defined by (3.5), we then consider the approximate problem $P_h$ with

$$V_h = \{\underset{\sim}{v} \in V : v_{ij}|_T \in P_{k-1} \quad \forall \quad T \in \tau_h\}$$

and

$$W_h = S_h \cap H_0^1(\Omega).$$

With this choice for the forms a and b and the spaces $V_h$ and $W_h$, we have the method of Herrmann-Johnson [13, 14, 15].

As in the previous subsections, hypothesis (H3) is satisfied with $\alpha = 1$. We now consider (H5).

For $\underset{\sim}{v} \in V$ we define $\pi_h v \in V_h$ as in [7, Section 4], i.e., $\pi_h \underset{\sim}{v}$ is defined by the conditions

$$(3.16) \quad \begin{cases} \displaystyle\int_{T'} M_\nu(\underset{\sim}{v} - \pi_h \underset{\sim}{v}) q \, ds = 0 \quad \forall \quad q \in P_{k-1} \\ \quad \text{and for all sides } T' \text{ of } \tau_h \\ \text{and} \\ \displaystyle\int_{T} [v_{ij} - (\pi_h \underset{\sim}{v})_{ij}] q \, dx = 0 \quad \forall \quad q \in P_{k-2} \\ \quad \text{and } \forall \ T \in \tau_h . \end{cases}$$

By Lemma 3 in [7], $\pi_h \underset{\sim}{v}$ is uniquely determined by (3.16). Since we can write

$$b(\underset{\sim}{v},\mu) = \sum_{T\in\tau_h}\Big\{ -\sum_{i,j=1}^{2}\int_T v_{ij}\frac{\partial^2\mu}{\partial x_i\partial x_j}\,dx + \int_{\partial T} M_\nu(\underset{\sim}{v})\frac{\partial\mu}{\partial\nu}\,ds\Big\},$$

(3.16) easily implies (H5). We note that by Lemma 4 of [7] we also have for all $\underset{\sim}{v} \in V \cap [H^{r-2}(\Omega)]^4$, $r \geq 3$, that

$$\|\pi_h\underset{\sim}{v} - \underset{\sim}{v}\|_0 \leq Ch^\ell\|\underset{\sim}{v}\|_\ell , \qquad 1 \leq \ell \leq \min(k,r-2). \tag{3.17}$$

We next observe that by Lemma 5 of [7], $Z_n \subset Z$, so that we are in the special cases of Theorems 2 and 3. In particular, by the Corollary to Theorem 2, (H4) need not be satisfied in order to apply (2.15), so we shall not require $\{\tau_h\}$ to be quasi-uniform. Since we wish to apply Theorem 3, part c, we now show that hypothesis (H7) is satisfied. As in the proof of Lemma 5 in [7], for $\underset{\sim}{v} \in V_h$ and $\mu \in W = W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ we can write

$$\begin{aligned} b(\underset{\sim}{v},\mu) &= -\sum_{T\in\tau_h}\sum_{i,j=1}^{2}\int_T \frac{\partial^2 v_{ij}}{\partial x_i\partial x_j}\,\mu\,dx \\ &\quad + \sum_{T'\in I_h}\int_{T'} A(T',\underset{\sim}{v})\mu\,ds + \sum_{a\in J_h} B(a,\underset{\sim}{v})\mu(a) , \end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

where $I_h$ is the set of all sides of the triangulation $\tau_h$, $J_h$ is the set of all vertices of $\tau_h$, and $A(T',\underset{\sim}{v})$ is a polynomial of degree less than or equal to $k-2$ in the variable $s$.

For $\mu \in W$ we now choose $\Sigma_h\mu \in W_h$ so that

$$\int_T (\mu - \Sigma_h\mu)q\,dx = 0 \quad \forall \quad q \in P_{k-3} \text{ and } \forall \quad T \in \tau_h , \tag{3.19}$$

$$\int_{T'} (\mu-\Sigma_h\mu)\,q\,ds = 0 \quad \forall \quad q \in P_{k-2} \text{ and } \forall \quad T' \in I_h , \tag{3.20}$$

and

$$(\Sigma_h\mu-\mu)(a) = 0 \quad \forall \quad a \in J_h . \tag{3.21}$$

The unique solvability of this system is easily checked. Note that by the Sobolev imbedding theorem, $\mu \in W$ implies $\mu \in C^0(\bar{\Omega})$. Since for $\underset{\sim}{v} \in V_h$ we have $\frac{\partial^2 v_{ij}}{\partial x_i\partial x_j}\Big|_T \in P_{k-3}$ and $A(T',\underset{\sim}{v}) \in P_{k-2}$, it follows from (3.18) that $\Sigma_h\mu$, as defined by

(3.19)-(3.21), satisfies (H7). Furthermore, by a standard application of the Bramble-Hilbert lemma [4], we obtain for all $\mu \in W \cap H^r(\Omega)$,

$$\|\mu - \Sigma_h \mu\|_j \leq C h^{\ell-j} \|\mu\|_\ell , \qquad j = 0,1 \quad \text{and} \quad 1 \leq \ell \leq \min(r,k+1). \tag{3.22}$$

We are now ready to apply Theorems 2 and 3. Suppose that $k \geq 1$ and $\psi \in H^r(\Omega)$, $r \geq 3$. From (2.15) and (3.17) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\underset{\sim}{u} - \underset{\sim}{u}_h\|_0 &\leq C \|\underset{\sim}{u} - \pi_h \underset{\sim}{u}\|_0 \\ &\leq C h^\delta \|\underset{\sim}{u}\|_\delta \\ &\leq C h^\delta \|\psi\|_{\delta+2} , \end{aligned} \tag{3.23}$$

where $\delta = \min(k,r-2)$.

To obtain estimates for $\psi - \psi_h$ we shall apply Theorem 3 in several different ways. Choosing $G = H_0^1(\Omega)$, $\varphi = I_h \psi$, and $\eta = I_h \lambda_d$ (where $I_h \varphi$ denotes the standard Lagrange interpolant of $\varphi$ in $S_h$), we get from Theorem 3(a)-(b) that

$$\|\psi - \psi_h\|_1 = \sup_{d \in H^{-1}(\Omega)} \{ b(\underset{\sim}{\gamma}_d - \pi_h \underset{\sim}{\gamma}_d, \psi - I_h \psi)$$

$$+ a(\underset{\sim}{u}_h - \underset{\sim}{u}, \pi_h \underset{\sim}{\gamma}_d - \underset{\sim}{\gamma}_d) + b(\underset{\sim}{u} - \pi_h \underset{\sim}{u}, \lambda_d - I_h \lambda_d) \} / \|d\|_{-1} .$$

To estimate the terms in the above expression, we introduce the affine transformation

$$x = F(\hat{x}) = B\hat{x} + b$$

mapping the reference triangle $\hat{T}$ with vertices $(0,0)$, $(1,0)$ and $(0,1)$ onto T, and set

$$\hat{\underset{\sim}{\gamma}}(\hat{x}) = B^{-1} \underset{\sim}{\gamma} \circ F(\hat{x}) (B^{-1})^T ,$$

where $\hat{\underset{\sim}{\gamma}} = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{v}_{11} & \hat{v}_{12} \\ \hat{v}_{21} & \hat{v}_{22} \end{pmatrix}$ and $\underset{\sim}{\gamma} = \begin{pmatrix} v_{11} & v_{12} \\ v_{21} & v_{22} \end{pmatrix}$, and

$$\hat{\varphi}(\hat{x}) = \varphi \circ F(\hat{x}).$$

Using the standard change of variables argument, we have that if $\underset{\sim}{\gamma} \in [H^\ell(T)]^4$ and $\varphi \in H^t(T)$, where $1 \leq \ell$ and $2 \leq t$, then

$$\int_T \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} \frac{\partial v_{ij}}{\partial x_j} \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_i} \, dx = |\det B| \int_{\hat{T}} \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} \frac{\partial \hat{v}_{ij}}{\partial \hat{x}_j} \frac{\partial \hat{\varphi}}{\partial \hat{x}_i} \, d\hat{x}$$

and

$$\int_{\partial T} M_{\nu\tau}(\underset{\sim}{v})\,\frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial\tau}\,ds \le \sum_{i=1}^{3} \|B^{-1}\tau\|^2 \|B^T\nu\|\,|T_i'| \int_{\hat{T}_i'} \hat{\tau}^T B^T B\,\hat{v}(\hat{x})\,\hat{v}\,\frac{\partial\hat{\varphi}}{\partial\hat{\tau}}\,d\hat{s}$$

where $\hat{\tau}$ and $\hat{\nu}$ denote the unit tangent and unit outward normal to $\partial\hat{T}$, respectively, $T_i'$ are the sides of $T$, and $|T_i'|$ = length of $T_i'$.

Since $\|B\| \le Ch$, $|\det B| \le Ch^2$, $\|B^{-1}\| \le C/h$, and $|T_i'| \le Ch$ (c f. [8]), it easily follows that

(3.24)
$$\Big|\int_T \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} \frac{\partial v_{ij}}{\partial x_j}\,\frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial x_i}\,dx - \int_{\partial T} M_{\nu\tau}(\underset{\sim}{v})\,\frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial\tau}\,ds\Big|$$

$$\le Ch^2\Big\{\int_{\hat{T}} \Big|\sum_{i,j=1} \frac{\partial\hat{v}_{ij}}{\partial\hat{x}_j}\,\frac{\partial\hat{\varphi}}{\partial\hat{x}_i}\Big|\,d\hat{x} + \int_{\partial\hat{T}} \Big(\sum_{i,j=1}^{2} \hat{v}_{ij}^2\Big)^{1/2}\Big|\frac{\partial\hat{\varphi}}{\partial\hat{\tau}}\Big|\,d\hat{s}\Big\}$$

$$\le Ch^2 \|\hat{\underset{\sim}{v}}\|_{1,\hat{T}} \|\hat{\varphi}\|_{2,\hat{T}}\,.$$

Now from Lemma 4 of [7],

(3.25)
$$\pi_h^{\wedge}\underset{\sim}{v} - \hat{\underset{\sim}{v}} = 0 \quad \text{if} \quad \hat{\underset{\sim}{v}} \in P_{k-1}^4(\hat{T}) = \{\hat{\underset{\sim}{v}} = (\hat{v}_{ij}),\ \hat{v}_{ij} \in P_{k-1}(\hat{T}),\ \hat{v}_{12} = \hat{v}_{21}\}$$

and

(3.26)
$$\|\pi_h^{\wedge}\underset{\sim}{v} - \hat{\underset{\sim}{v}}\|_{1,\hat{T}} \le C(\hat{T})\|\hat{\underset{\sim}{v}}\|_{1,\hat{T}}\,.$$

Using the standard properties of the interpolant (c f. [8]) we also get

(3.27)
$$I_h^{\wedge}\varphi - \hat{\varphi} = 0 \quad \text{if} \quad \hat{\varphi} \in P_k(\hat{T})$$

and

(3.28)
$$\|I_h\hat{\varphi} - \hat{\varphi}\|_{2,\hat{T}} \le C(\hat{T})\|\hat{\varphi}\|_{2,\hat{T}}\,.$$

Using (3.24)-(3.28) we easily obtain

$$\Big|\int_T \sum_{i,j=1} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}(\underset{\sim}{v} - \pi_h\underset{\sim}{v})_{ij}\,\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}(\varphi - I_h\varphi)\,dx$$

$$- \int_{\partial T} M_{\nu\tau}(\underset{\sim}{v} - \pi_h\underset{\sim}{v})\,\frac{\partial}{\partial\tau}(\varphi - I_h\varphi)\,ds\Big|$$

$$\le Ch^2 \inf_{p \in P_{k-1}^4(\hat{T})} \|\hat{\underset{\sim}{v}} - p\|_{1,\hat{T}} \inf_{q \in P_k(\hat{T})} \|\hat{\varphi} - q\|_{2,\hat{T}}$$

$$\le Ch^2 \inf_{p \in P_{k-1}^4(\hat{T})} \|\hat{\underset{\sim}{v}} - p\|_{\ell,\hat{T}} \inf_{q \in P_k(\hat{T})} \|\hat{\varphi} - q\|_{t,\hat{T}}$$

$$\leq Ch^2 \, |\hat{\underset{\sim}{\chi}}|_{\ell,T} \, |\hat{\varphi}|_{t,\hat{T}}$$

for $1 \leq \ell \leq k$ and $2 \leq t \leq k+1$. Changing back to the original variables we further obtain

$$|\hat{\underset{\sim}{\chi}}|_{\ell,\hat{T}} \leq Ch^{\ell-3} |\underset{\sim}{\chi}|_{\ell,T}$$

and

$$|\hat{\psi}|_{t,\hat{T}} \leq Ch^{t-1} |\psi|_{t,T} .$$

Hence if $\underset{\sim}{\chi} \in [H^{\ell}(\Omega)]^4$ and $\varphi \in H^{t}(\Omega)$ for $1 \leq \ell \leq k$ and $2 \leq t \leq k+1$, then

(3.29)

$$\begin{aligned} &|b(\underset{\sim}{\chi} - \pi_h \underset{\sim}{\chi}, \varphi - I_h\varphi)| \\ &\leq \sum_{T} \Big| \int_{T} \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} (\underset{\sim}{\chi} - \pi_h \underset{\sim}{\chi})_{ij} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} (\varphi - I_h\varphi) dx \\ &\quad - \int_{\partial T} M_{\nu\tau} (\underset{\sim}{\chi} - \pi_h \underset{\sim}{\nu}) \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} (\varphi - I_h\varphi) ds \Big| \\ &\leq \sum_{T} Ch^{t+\ell-2} \, |\underset{\sim}{\chi}|_{\ell,T} \, |\psi|_{t,T} \\ &\leq Ch^{t+\ell-2} \, \|\underset{\sim}{\chi}\|_{\ell} \|\psi\|_{t} . \end{aligned}$$

Choosing $\underset{\sim}{\chi} = \underset{\sim}{\chi}_d$, $\varphi = \psi$, $\ell = 1$ and $t = \min(r,k+1) \equiv s$ in (3.29) we get

$$|b(\underset{\sim}{\chi}_d - \pi_h \underset{\sim}{\chi}_d, \psi - I_h\psi)| \leq Ch^{s-1} \|\underset{\sim}{\chi}_d\|_1 \|\psi\|_s .$$

If $k \geq 2$ we choose $\underset{\sim}{\chi} = \underset{\sim}{u}$, $\varphi = \lambda_d$, $\ell = s-2$, and $t = 3$ in (3.29) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &|b(\underset{\sim}{u} - \pi_h \underset{\sim}{u}, \lambda_d - I_h\lambda_d)| \\ &\leq Ch^{s-1} \|\underset{\sim}{u}\|_{s-2} \|\lambda_d\|_3 \\ &\leq Ch^{s-1} \|\psi\|_s \|\lambda_d\|_3 . \end{aligned}$$

If $k = 1$ we choose $\ell = 1$ and $t = 2$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &|b(\underset{\sim}{u} - \pi_h \underset{\sim}{u}, \lambda_d - I_h\lambda_d)| \\ &\leq Ch \|\underset{\sim}{u}\|_1 \|\lambda_d\|_2 \\ &\leq Ch \|\psi\|_3 \|\lambda_d\|_3 . \end{aligned}$$

Finally if $k \geq 2$, from (2.1), (2.15), and (3.17) with $\ell = 1$ and $\ell = s-2$ we have

$$|a(\underset{\sim}{u}_h - \underset{\sim}{u}, \pi_h \underset{\sim}{\chi}_d - \underset{\sim}{\chi}_d) \leq C\|\underset{\sim}{u}_h - \underset{\sim}{u}\|_0 \|\pi_h \underset{\sim}{\chi}_d - \underset{\sim}{\chi}_d\|_0$$

$$\leq C\|\pi_h \underset{\sim}{u} - \underset{\sim}{u}\|_0 \|\pi_h \underset{\sim}{\chi}_d - \underset{\sim}{\chi}_d\|_0$$

$$\leq Ch^{s-2}\|\underset{\sim}{u}\|_{s-2}\, h\|\underset{\sim}{\chi}_d\|_1$$

$$\leq Ch^{s-1}\|\psi\|_s \|\underset{\sim}{\chi}_d\|_1 .$$

If $k = 1$ we choose $\ell = 1$ in (3.17) to get

$$|a(\underset{\sim}{u}_h - \underset{\sim}{u}, \pi_h \underset{\sim}{y}_d - \underset{\sim}{y}_d) \leq Ch \|\underset{\sim}{u}\|_1 \, h \|\underset{\sim}{y}_d\|_1$$

$$\leq Ch^2 \|\psi\|_3 \|\underset{\sim}{y}_d\|_1 .$$

Applying the regularity result

$$\|\underset{\sim}{y}_d\|_1 + \|\lambda_d\|_3 \leq C\|d\|_{-1} \tag{3.30}$$

and collecting terms, we get

$$\|\psi - \psi_h\|_1 \leq Ch^{s-1}\|\psi\|_s \quad \text{for } k \geq 2 \text{ where } s = \min(r, k+1) \tag{3.31}$$

and

$$\|\psi - \psi_h\|_1 \leq Ch \|\psi\|_3 \quad \text{for } k = 1 . \tag{3.32}$$

We now derive estimates in $L_2(\Omega)$. First consider the case when $k = 1$ and $\psi \in H^4(\Omega)$. Using Theorem 3(a)-(c) with $G = L_2(\Omega)$, $\varphi = \Sigma_h \psi$, and $\eta = \Sigma_h \lambda_d$, and (2.1) we easily obtain

$$\|\psi - \psi_h\|_0 \leq C \sup_{d \in L_2(\Omega)} \{\|d\|_0 \|\psi - \Sigma_h \psi\|_0 + \|\underset{\sim}{u} - \underset{\sim}{u}_h\|_0 \|\underset{\sim}{y}_d - \pi_h \underset{\sim}{y}_d\|_0$$

$$+ \|g\|_0 \|\lambda_d - \pi_h \lambda_d\|_0\} / \|d\|_0$$

From (3.22) we get

$$\|\psi - \Sigma_h \psi\|_0 \leq Ch^2 \|\psi\|_2$$

and

$$\|\lambda_d - \Sigma_h \lambda_d\|_0 \leq Ch^2 \|\lambda_d\|_2 .$$

Using (2.15) and (3.17) we have

$$\|\underset{\sim}{u} - \underset{\sim}{u}_h\|_0 \|\underset{\sim}{y}_d - \pi_h \underset{\sim}{y}_d\|_0 \leq C\|\underset{\sim}{u} - \pi_h \underset{\sim}{u}\|_0 \|\underset{\sim}{y}_d - \pi_h \underset{\sim}{y}_d\|_0$$

$$\leq Ch^2 \|\underset{\sim}{u}\|_1 \|\underset{\sim}{y}_d\|_1 .$$

Noting that $\|d\|_{-1} \leq \|d\|_0$ and $\|g\|_0 \leq C\|\psi\|_4$, using (3.30) and combining terms we obtain

$$\|\psi-\psi_h\|_0 \leq Ch^2\|\psi\|_4 \tag{3.33}$$

for $k = 1$.

Next we consider the case $k \geq 2$. Using Theorems 3(a)-(c) with $G = L_2(\Omega)$, $v = \Sigma_h\psi$, and $\eta = I_h\lambda_d$, and (2.1) we have

$$\|\psi-\psi_h\|_0 \leq C \sup_{d\in L_2(\Omega)} \{\|d\|_0 \|\psi-\Sigma_h\psi\|_0 + \|\underset{\sim}{u}-\underset{\sim}{u}_h\|_0\|\underset{\sim}{y}_d - \pi_h\underset{\sim}{y}_d\|_0 + |b(\underset{\sim}{u} - \pi_h\underset{\sim}{u}, \lambda_d - I_h\lambda_d)|\}/\|d\|_0 .$$

From (3.22) with $\ell = \bar{s} = \min(r-1,k+1)$ we get

$$\|\psi - \Sigma_h\psi\|_0 \leq Ch^{\bar{s}} \|\psi\|_{\bar{s}} .$$

Using (2.15) and (3.17) with $\ell = \bar{s}-1$ we see that

$$\|\underset{\sim}{u} - \underset{\sim}{u}_h\|_0 \leq Ch^{\bar{s}-1} \|\psi\|_{\bar{s}+1}$$

and using (3.17) with $\ell = 1$ and (3.30) we obtain

$$\|\underset{\sim}{y}_d - \pi_h\underset{\sim}{y}_d\|_0 \leq Ch \|d\|_0 .$$

Finally from (3.29) with $\underset{\sim}{y} = \underset{\sim}{u}$, $v = \lambda_d$, $\ell = \bar{s}-1$, and $t = 3$, and (3.31) we see that

$$|b(\underset{\sim}{u} - \pi_h\underset{\sim}{u}, \lambda_d - I_h\lambda_d)| \leq Ch^{\bar{s}} \|\psi\|_{\bar{s}+1} \|d\|_0 .$$

Combining these estimates we have

$$\|\psi - \psi_h\|_0 \leq Ch^{\bar{s}} \|\psi\|_{\bar{s}+1} , \tag{3.34}$$

where $\bar{s} = \min(r-1,k+1)$ and $k \geq 2$.

Note that (3.34) gives an improvement over (3.31) only for $k+1 \leq r-1$. Estimates (3.31) improve estimates in [7]. Babuška, Osborn, and Pitkäranta [3] have proved (3.23), (3.31)-(3.34).

d) Raviart-Thomas method

In our final example we study a mixed method for second order elliptic problems introduced by Raviart and Thomas [20]. For $q \in L_2(\Omega)$, $\Omega$ a convex polygon in $\mathbb{R}^2$, we consider the model problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta\psi = q & \text{in } \Omega \\ \psi = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma. \end{cases} \tag{3.35}$$

Let $\underset{\sim}{H}(\mathrm{div};\Omega) = \{\underset{\sim}{v} \in [L_2(\Omega)]^2 : \mathrm{div}\ \underset{\sim}{v} \in L_2(\Omega)\}$ with the norm

$$\|\underset{\sim}{v}\|_{\underset{\sim}{H}(\mathrm{div};\Omega)} = (\|\underset{\sim}{v}\|_0^2 + \|\mathrm{div}\ \underset{\sim}{v}\|_0^2)^{1/2}.$$

The mixed method we study is based on the following variational formulation of (3.35).

Find $(\underset{\sim}{\mu},\psi) \in \underset{\sim}{H}(\mathrm{div};\Omega) \times L_2(\Omega)$ such that

$$\int_\Omega \underset{\sim}{\mu} \cdot \underset{\sim}{\chi}\, dx + \int_\Omega \psi \,\mathrm{div}\, \underset{\sim}{\chi}\, dx = 0 \qquad \forall \quad \underset{\sim}{\chi} \in \underset{\sim}{H}(\mathrm{div};\Omega) \tag{3.36}$$

and

$$\int_\Omega \varphi(\mathrm{div}\, \underset{\sim}{\mu} + g)dx = 0 \qquad \forall \quad \varphi \in L_2(\Omega)\ . \tag{3.37}$$

In Theorem 1 of [20] it is shown that problem (3.36)-(3.37) has a unique solution $(\underset{\sim}{\mu},\psi) \in \underset{\sim}{H}(\mathrm{div};\Omega) \times L_2(\Omega)$, that $\psi$ is the solution of problem (3.35), and $\underset{\sim}{\mu} = \underset{\sim}{\mathrm{grad}}\, \psi$. In addition the following regularity result is known for this problem:

If $g \in L_2(\Omega)$ then $\psi \in H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$ and

$$\|\psi\|_2 \le C\|g\|_0 \qquad \forall \quad g \in L_2(\Omega)\ . \tag{3.38}$$

One easily sees that (3.36)-(3.37) is an example of problem P with $V = \underset{\sim}{H}(\mathrm{div};\Omega)$, $W = L_2(\Omega)$, $R = [L_2(\Omega)]^2$, $a(\underset{\sim}{\mu},\underset{\sim}{\chi}) = \int_\Omega \underset{\sim}{\mu} \cdot \underset{\sim}{\chi}\, dx$, and $b(\underset{\sim}{\mu},\psi) = \int_\Omega \psi\, \mathrm{div}\, \underset{\sim}{\mu}\, dx$. The subclass D of data for which (H1) is satisfied is given by $D = 0 \times W'$. Since a is symmetric, the adjoint problem (2.5), (2.6) with $G = W = L_2(\Omega)$ is the same as probelm P and thus is uniquely solvable for all $d \in W'$. Hence (H2) is satisfied. Using (3.38) we also see that $\lambda_d \in H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$, $\underset{\sim}{\chi}_d = \underset{\sim}{\mathrm{grad}}\, \lambda_d$, and

$$\|\underset{\sim}{\chi}_d\|_1 + \|\lambda_d\|_2 \le C\|d\|_0\ . \tag{3.39}$$

We now describe the finite dimensional subspaces used in the approximation scheme. Following [20] we begin by introducing the space $\hat{\underset{\sim}{Q}}$ associated with the unit right triangle $\hat{T}$ in the $(\xi,\eta)$-plane whose vertices are $\hat{a}_1 = (1,0)$, $\hat{a}_2 = (0,1)$, $\hat{a}_3 = (0,0)$. For $k \ge 0$ an even integer, define $\hat{\underset{\sim}{Q}}_k$ to be the space of all functions $\hat{\underset{\sim}{q}}$ of the form

$$\hat{q}_1 = \mathrm{pol}_k(\xi,\eta) + \alpha_0\xi^{k+1} + \alpha_1\xi^k\eta + \ldots + \alpha_{k/2}\xi^{k/2+1}\eta^{k/2}\ ,$$

$$\hat{q}_2 = \mathrm{pol}_k(\xi,\eta) + \beta_0\eta^{k+1} + \beta_1\xi\eta^k + \ldots + \beta_{k/2}\xi^{k/2}\eta^{k/2+1}$$

with

$$\sum_{i=0}^{k/2} (-1)^i(\alpha_i - \beta_i) = 0\ ,$$

where $\mathrm{pol}_k(\xi,\eta)$ denotes any polynomial of degree $k$ in the two variables $\xi,\eta$.

For $k \geq 1$ an odd integer, define $\hat{Q}_k$ to be the space of all functions $\hat{q}$ of the form

$$\hat{q}_1 = \mathrm{pol}_k(\xi,\eta) + \alpha_0\xi^{k+1} + \alpha_1\xi^k\eta + \ldots + \alpha_{(k+1)/2}\,\xi^{(k+1)/2}\,\eta^{(k+1)/2}$$

$$\hat{q}_2 = \mathrm{pol}_k(\xi,\eta) + \beta_0\eta^{k+1} + \beta_1\xi\eta^k + \ldots + \beta_{(k+1)/2}\,\xi^{(k+1)/2}\,\eta^{(k+1)/2}$$

with

$$\sum_{i=0}^{(k+1)/2} (-1)^i\alpha_i = \sum_{i=0}^{(k+1)/2} (-1)^i\beta_i = 0 \ .$$

Now consider any triangle $T$ in the $(x_1,x_2)$-plane whose vertices are denoted by $a_i$, $1 \leq i \leq 3$. Let $F_T : \hat{x} \to F_T(\hat{x}) = B_T\,\hat{x} + b_T$, $B_T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, $b_T \in \mathbb{R}^2$ be the unique invertible affine mapping such that $F_T(\hat{a}_i) = a_i$, $1 \leq i \leq 3$. With each vector-valued function $\hat{\underset{\sim}{v}} = (\hat{v}_1,\hat{v}_2)$ defined on $\hat{T}$, we associate the function $\underset{\sim}{v}$ defined on $T$ by

$$\underset{\sim}{v} = \frac{1}{J_T}\ B_T\,\hat{\underset{\sim}{v}} \circ F_T^{-1}$$

where

$$J_T = \det\,(B_T) \ .$$

For $0 < h < 1$, assume that $\tau_h$ is a triangulation of $\bar{\Omega}$ made up of triangles $T$ whose diameters are less than or equal to $h$ which satisfy the minimal angle condition (see Subsection 3a). We finally consider problem $P_h$ with

$$V_h = \{\underset{\sim}{v}_h \in \underset{\sim}{H}(\mathrm{div};\Omega) : \ \forall\ T \in \tau_h\ ,\ \underset{\sim}{v}_h\big|_T \in \underset{\sim}{Q}_T\}$$

where

$$\underset{\sim}{Q}_T = \{\underset{\sim}{v} \in \underset{\sim}{H}(\mathrm{div};T) : \hat{\underset{\sim}{v}} \in \hat{\underset{\sim}{Q}}\ \}$$

and

$$W_h = \{\varphi_h \in L_2(\Omega) : \ \forall\ T \in \tau_h\ ,\ \varphi_h\big|_T \in P_k\}.$$

To apply our theorems we must check that the appropriate hypotheses are satisfied. Now (H3) is trivially satisfied with $\alpha = 1$. In the proof of Theorem 3 of [20] it is essentially shown that there is an operator $\pi_h : [H^1(\Omega)]^2 \to V_h$ satisfying

$$b(\underset{\sim}{v} - \pi_h\underset{\sim}{v},\varphi) = 0 \quad \forall\ \underset{\sim}{v} \in [H^1(\Omega)]^2 \text{ and } \forall\ \varphi \in W_h$$

Furthermore, for $\underset{\sim}{v} \in [H^{r-1}(\Omega)]^2$, $r \geq 2$, we have

(3.40) $\|\underset{\sim}{v} - \pi_{h\underset{\sim}{V}}\underset{\sim}{v}\|_0 \le Ch^{\ell}\|\underset{\sim}{v}\|_{\ell}, \qquad 1 \le \ell \le \min(r-1, k+1),$

and

(3.41) $\|\mathrm{div}(\underset{\sim}{v} - \pi_{h\underset{\sim}{V}}\underset{\sim}{v})\|_0 \le Ch^{m}\|\mathrm{div}\ \underset{\sim}{v}\|_m, \qquad 0 \le m \le \min(r-2,k+1).$

Using the regularity results (3.38) and (3.39) we easily see that $Y \subset [H^1(\Omega)]^2$ so that (H5) is valid.

We next observe that for $\underset{\sim}{v}_h \in V_h$, $\mathrm{div}\ \underset{\sim}{v}_h\big|_T \in P_k$. Hence $\underset{\sim}{v}_h \in Z_h$ easily implies $\mathrm{div}\ \underset{\sim}{v}_h = 0$ and so $\underset{\sim}{v}_h \in Z$. Thus $Z_h \subset Z$ and so we are in the special cases of Theorems 2 and 3. Again by the Corollary to Theorem 2, (H4) need not be satisfied in order to apply (2.15), so we shall not require $\{\tau_h\}$ to be quasi-uniform.

We are now ready to derive the error estimates. Assume that $\psi \in H^r(\Omega)$, $r \ge 2$. From (2.15) and (3.40) we obtain for $k \ge 0$,

(3.42) $$\|\underset{\sim}{u} - \underset{\sim}{u}_h\|_0 \le C\|\underset{\sim}{u} - \pi_{h\underset{\sim}{V}}\underset{\sim}{u}\|_0 \le Ch^{t}\|\underset{\sim}{u}\|_t \le Ch^{t}\|\psi\|_{t+1},$$

where $t = \min(r-1,k+1)$.

Now applying Theorem 3(a)-(b) we get

(3.43) $$\|\psi-\psi_h\|_0 = \sup_{d\in L_2(\Omega)} \{b(\underset{\sim}{y}_d - \pi_{h\underset{\sim}{V}}\underset{\sim}{y}_d, \psi-\varphi) + a(\underset{\sim}{u}_h - \underset{\sim}{u}, \pi_{h\underset{\sim}{V}}\underset{\sim}{y}_d - \underset{\sim}{y}_d) + b(\underset{\sim}{u} - \pi_{h\underset{\sim}{V}}\underset{\sim}{u}, \lambda_d - \eta)\}/\|d\|_0$$

for all $\varphi, \eta \in W_h$. Using (3.41) and standard approximatility properties of $W_h$, we have

(3.44) $$\inf_{\eta\in W_h}|b(\underset{\sim}{y}_d - \pi_{h\underset{\sim}{V}}\underset{\sim}{y}_d, \psi-\varphi)| \le \|\mathrm{div}(\underset{\sim}{y}_d - \pi_{h\underset{\sim}{V}}\underset{\sim}{y}_d)\|_0 \inf_{\eta\in W_h}\|\psi-\varphi\|_0 \le C\|\mathrm{div}\ \underset{\sim}{y}_d\|_0\, h^{\mu}\|\psi\|_{\mu},$$

where $\mu = \min(r,k+1)$, and choosing $m = \mu - 2$ in (3.32),

(3.45) $$\inf_{\eta\in W_h}|b(\underset{\sim}{u} - \pi_{h\underset{\sim}{V}}\underset{\sim}{u}, \lambda_d - \eta)| \le \|\mathrm{div}(\underset{\sim}{u} - \pi_{h\underset{\sim}{V}}\underset{\sim}{u})\|_0 \inf_{\eta\in W_h}\|\lambda_d - \eta\|_0 \le Ch^{\mu-2}\|\mathrm{div}\ \underset{\sim}{u}\|_{\mu-2}\, h^2\|\lambda_d\|_2,$$

provided $k \ge 1$.

Using (2.1), (2.15), and (3.40) (with $\ell = \mu-1$) we obtain for $k \geq 1$,

$$(3.46)\qquad |a(\underset{\sim}{u}_h - \underset{\sim}{u}, \pi_h \underset{\sim}{\gamma}_d - \underset{\sim}{\gamma}_d)| \leq \|\underset{\sim}{u}_h - \underset{\sim}{u}\|_0 \, \|\pi_h \underset{\sim}{\gamma}_d - \underset{\sim}{\gamma}_d\|_0$$

$$\leq C\|\underset{\sim}{u} - \pi_h \underset{\sim}{u}\|_0 \, \|\pi_h \underset{\sim}{\gamma}_d - \underset{\sim}{\gamma}_d\|_0$$

$$\leq Ch^{\mu-1} \|\underset{\sim}{u}\|_{\mu-1} \, h \, \|\underset{\sim}{\gamma}_d\|_1 \ .$$

Now from (3.43), (3.44), (3.45), (3.46) and the regularity result (3.39) we obtain for $k \geq 1$,

$$(3.47)\qquad \|\psi - \psi_h\|_0 \leq h^{\mu} \ \|\psi\|_{\mu},$$

where $\mu = \min(r, k+1)$.

To obtain an estimate when $k = 0$, we choose $m = 0$ in (3.41) to obtain

$$(3.48)\qquad \inf_{\eta \in W_h} |b(\underset{\sim}{u} - \pi_h \underset{\sim}{u}, \lambda_d - \eta)| \leq \|\mathrm{div}(\underset{\sim}{u} - \pi_h \underset{\sim}{u})\|_0 \ \inf_{\eta \in W_h} \|\lambda_d - \eta\|_0$$

$$\leq C \|\mathrm{div}\, \underset{\sim}{u}\|_0 \, h \|\lambda_d\|_1$$

and choose $\ell = 1$ in (3.40) to obtain in the same manner as in (4.36) that

$$(3.49)\qquad |a(\underset{\sim}{u}_h - \underset{\sim}{u}, \pi_h \underset{\sim}{\gamma}_d - \underset{\sim}{\gamma}_d)| \leq C\|\underset{\sim}{u} - \pi_h \underset{\sim}{u}\|_0 \, \|\pi_h \underset{\sim}{\gamma}_d - \underset{\sim}{\gamma}_d\|_0$$

$$\leq Ch \, \|\underset{\sim}{u}\|_1 \, h \, \|\underset{\sim}{\gamma}_d\|_1 \ .$$

Combining (3.43), (3.44) with $k = 0$, (3.48), (3.49), and the regularity result (3.39) we get

$$(3.50)\qquad \|\psi - \psi_h\|_0 \leq Ch\|\psi\|_2 \ , \quad k = 0 \ .$$

We note that estimate (3.42) was obtained in [23, IX - 3.22a] and that (3.47) gives an improvement over the result in [23, IX - 3.22a] in the case where $\psi \in H^r(\Omega)$, $\underset{\sim}{u} \in H^{r-1}(\Omega)$, and $2 \leq r < k+1$ .

Acknowledgement: The second author would like to thank I. Babuška and J. Pitkäranta for several helpful discussions on mixed methods.

References


1. I Babuška, Error-bounds for finite element method, Numer. Math., 16, 1971, pp. 322-333.

2. I. Babuška and A. Aziz, Survey Lectures on the Mathematical Foundations of the Finite Element Method in The Mathematical Foundations of the Finite Element Method with Application to Partial Differential Equations (A. K. Aziz, Editor) Academic Press, New York, 1973, pp. 5-359.

3. I. Babuška, J. Osborn, J. Pitkäranta, Analysis of mixed methods for $4^{th}$ order elliptic equations, to appear.

4. J. Bramble and S. Hilbert, Estimation of linear functionals on Sobolov spaces with application to Fourier transforms and spline interpolation, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 13, 1976, pp. 185-197.

5. F. Brezzi, On the existence, uniqueness and approximation of saddle-point problems arising from Lagrangian multipliers, R.A.I.R.O., 8 - R2, 1974 pp.129-151.

6. F. Brezzi, Sur la methods des elements finis hybrides pour le probleme biharmonique, Numer. Math. 24, 1975, pp. 103-131.

7. F. Brezzi and P. Raviart, Mixed finite element methods for $4^{th}$ order elliptic equations, Topics in Numerical Analysis III (J. Miller, Ed.), Academic Press, 1978.

8. P. Ciarlet, The Finite Element Method for Elliptic Problems, North-Holland, 1978.

9. P. Ciarlet and P. Raviart, A mixed finite element method for the biharmonic equation, Symposium on Mathematical Aspects of Finite Elements in Partial Differential Equations, (C. de Boor, Editor) pp. 125-143, Academic Press, New York, 1974.

10. M. Crouzeix and P. Raviart, Conforming and nonconforming finite element methods for solving the stationary Stokes equations I, R.A.I.R.O., 1973, R-3, pp. 33-76.

11. M. Fortin, Analysis of the convergence of mixed finite element methods, R.A.I.R.O., 11, 1977, pp. 341-354.

12. P. Grisvard, Singular Solutions of Elliptic Boundary Value Problems, Lecture Notes, University of Maryland, to appear.

13. L. Herrmann , Finite element bending analysis for plates, J. Eng. Mech. Div. ASCE EM5, 93 1967, pp. 49-83.

14. L. Herrmann , A bending analysis for plates, Proc. Conf. On Matrix Methods in Structural Mechanics, AFFDL-TR-66-88, pp. 577-604.

15. C. Johnson, On the convergnece of a mixed finite element method for plate bending problems, Numer. Math., 21, 1973, pp. 43-62.

16. R. Kellogg and J. Osborn, A regularity result for the Stokes problem, J. of Functional Analysis, 21, 1976, pp. 397-431.

17. T. Miyoshi, A finite element method for the solution of fourth order partial differential equations, Kunamoto J. Sci. (Math.), 9, 1973, pp. 87-116.

18. J. Oden , Some contributions to the mathematical theory of mixed finite element approximations, in Theory and Practice in Finite Element Structural Analysis, pp. 3-23, University of Tokyo Press, 1973.

19. R. Rannacher, On nonconforming and mixed finite element methods for plate bending problems - the linear case, preprint.

20. P. Raviart and J. Thomas, A mixed finite element method for $2^{nd}$ order elliptic problems, preprint.

21. R. Scholz, Approximation von Sattelpunkten mit finiten Elementen, Tagungsband, Bonn. Math. Schr. 89, 1976, pp. 53-66.

22. R. Scholz, A mixed method for $4^{th}$ order problems using linear finite elements, R.A.I.R.O., 12, 1978, pp. 85-90.

23, J. Thomas, Sur l'Analyse Numérique des Methodes d'Elements Finis Hybrides et Mixtes, Thesis, P&M Curie, Paris, 1977.

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

## REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM

1. REPORT NUMBER: 1936

2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.

3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER

4. TITLE (and Subtitle): ERROR ESTIMATES FOR MIXED METHODS

5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED: Summary Report, no specific reporting period

6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER

7. AUTHOR(s): R. S. Falk and J. E. Osborn

8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s): MCS78-02737; DAAG29-75-C-0024; MCS78-02851

9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS: Mathematics Research Center, University of Wisconsin
610 Walnut Street
Madison, Wisconsin 53706

10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS: 7 - Numerical Analysis

11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS: See Item 18 below

12. REPORT DATE: March 1979

13. NUMBER OF PAGES: 31

14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)

15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report): UNCLASSIFIED

15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE

16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

MRC-TSR-1936

17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)

18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

U.S. Army Research Office
P.O. Box 12211
Research Triangle Park
North Carolina 27709

National Science Foundation
Washington, D. C. 20550

19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

Mixed methods, error estimates

20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

This paper presents abstract error estimates for mixed methods for the approximate solution of elliptic boundary value problems. These estimates are then applied to obtain quasi-optimal error estimates in the usual Sobolev norms for four examples: three mixed methods for the biharmonic problem and a mixed method for 2nd order elliptic problems.

221 200

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)