Variational analysis of the discontinuous Galerkin time-stepping method for parabolic equations
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The discontinuous Galerkin (DG) time-stepping method applied to abstract evolution equation of parabolic type is studied using a variational approach. We establish the inf-sup condition or Babuška–Brezzi condition for the DG bilinear form. Then, a nearly best approximation property and a nearly symmetric error estimate are obtained as corollaries. Moreover, the optimal order error estimates under appropriate regularity assumption on the solution are derived as direct applications of the standard interpolation error estimates. Our method of analysis is new. It differs from previous works on the DG time-stepping method by which the method is formulated as the one-step method. We apply our abstract results to finite element approximation of the inhomogeneous heat equation in a polyhedral domain \( \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d \), \( d = 2, 3 \), and derive the optimal order error estimates in several norms.
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1. Introduction

The discontinuous Galerkin (DG) time-stepping method, which is designated below as the \( dG(q) \) method, is a time discretization method using piecewise polynomials of degree \( q \) with an integer \( q \geq 0 \). The \( dG(q) \) method was proposed originally by Lasaint and Raviart [16] for ordinary differential equations. Galerkin time-stepping methods of other kinds were proposed earlier by [13], [14]. In those works, the methods were formulated using continuous test functions and discontinuous trial functions; the \( dG(q) \) method uses discontinuous functions for both test and trial functions. Later, the method was applied to space-time discretization method for the moving boundary problem of the heat equation by Jamet [15]. Standard time-discretization methods are formulated as one-step or multi-step methods: approximations are computed at nodal points. By contrast, the \( dG(q) \) method gives approximations as piecewise polynomials so that approximations at arbitrary point are available. Therefore, the method is useful to address moving boundary problems and a system composed of equations.
having different natures. Indeed, the method is applied actively to fluid–structure interaction problems (see [3]).

It was described in [16] that the dG(q) method is interpreted as an one-step method and that it is strongly A-stable of order $2q + 1$. Moreover, after applying a numerical quadrature formula, the dG(q) method to $y'(t) = \lambda y(t)$ with a scalar $\lambda$ was found to agree with the sub-diagonal $(q + 1, q)$ Padé rational approximation of $e^{-\tau}$ (see [16]). Particularly, the dG(0) method implies the backward Euler method. For this reason, earlier studies of stability and convergence of the dG(q) method are accomplished by formulating the method as a one-step method. However, this seems to make analysis somewhat intricate, especially for large $q$.

The purpose of this paper is to present a different approach: we study the dG(q) method using a variational approach. In fact, the dG(q) method is the Galerkin approximation of the variational formulation of the equation and several techniques developed in the literature of the DG method (see [1] for example) are applicable. Consequently, the analysis becomes greatly simplified for any $q$ and optimal order error estimates in some appropriate norms are established. To clarify the variational characteristics of the dG(q) method, we apply the method to abstract evolution equations of parabolic type (the coefficient might depend on the time). Then, the finite element approximation of the heat equation is studied as an application of abstract results.

We first formulate the problem to be addressed. Letting $H$ and $V$ be (real) Hilbert spaces such that $V \subset H$ are dense with the continuous injection, then the inner product and norms are denoted as $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle = \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_H$, $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_V$, $\| \cdot \| = \| \cdot \|_H$ and $\| \cdot \|_V$. The topological dual spaces $H'$ and $V'$ are denoted respectively as $H'$ and $V'$. As usual, we identify $H$ with $H'$ and consider the triple $V \subset H \subset V'$. Moreover, $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle = \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_V$ represents the duality pairing between $V'$ and $V$. Let $J = (0, T)$ with $T > 0$.

Assuming that, for a.e. $t \in J$, we are given a linear operator $A(t)$ of $V \to V'$, and assuming that there exist two positive constants $M$ and $\alpha$ which are independent of $t \in J$ such that

$$
|\langle A(t)w, v \rangle| \leq M \|w\|_V \|v\|_V \quad (w, v \in V, \text{ a.e. } t \in J);
$$

$$
\langle A(t)v, v \rangle \geq \alpha \|v\|_V^2 \quad (v \in V, \text{ a.e. } t \in J),
$$

we consider the abstract evolution equation of parabolic type as

$$
u' + A(t)u = F(t), \quad t \in J; \quad u(0) = u_0,
$$

where $u'$ denotes $du(t)/dt$ and where $F : J \to V'$ and $u_0 \in H$ are given functions.

Several frameworks and methods can be used to establish the well-posedness (unique existence of a solution) of (2). For this study, we use the variational method of J. L. Lions ([3] Chap. XVIII and [21] Chap. IV) because it is appropriate for the analysis of the dG(q) method. To recall it, we require some additional notation. Set

$$
\mathcal{X} = L^2(J; V) \cap H^1(J; V'), \quad \|w\|^2_{\mathcal{X}} = \|w\|^2_{L^2(J; V)} + \|w'\|^2_{L^2(J; V')};
$$

$$
\mathcal{Y}_1 = L^2(J; V), \quad \|v\|^2_{\mathcal{Y}_1} = \|v\|^2_{L^2(J; V)};
$$

$$
\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{Y}_1 \times H, \quad \|(v_1, v_2)\|^2_{\mathcal{Y}} = \|v_1\|^2_{L^2(J; V)} + \|v_2\|^2.
$$

The weak formulation of (2) is stated as follows. Given

$$
F \in L^2(J; V'), \quad u_0 \in H,
$$

find $u \in \mathcal{X}$ such that

$$
B(u, v) = \int_J \langle F, v_1 \rangle \, dt + (u_0, v_2) \quad (\forall v = (v_1, v_2) \in \mathcal{Y}),
$$

$$
F \in L^2(J; V'), \quad u_0 \in H,
$$

$$
B(u, v) = \int_J \langle F, v_1 \rangle \, dt + (u_0, v_2) \quad (\forall v = (v_1, v_2) \in \mathcal{Y}),
$$
where
\[ B(w, v) = \int_J \left[ (w', v_1) + \langle A(t)w, v_1 \rangle \right] dt + (w(0), v_2) \] (3c)
for \( w \in X \) and \( v = (v_1, v_2) \in Y \).

The space \( X \) is embedded continuously in the set of \( H \)-valued continuous functions on \( J \) (see [6, theorem XVIII-1], [21, theorem 25.2]). In other words, there exists a positive constant \( C_{T, T} \) depending only on \( T \) such that
\[ \max_{v \in Y} \| v(t) \|_H \leq C_{T, T} \| v \|_X (v \in X). \] (4)

Particularly, \( w(0) \in H \) in (3c) is well-defined.

The bilinear form \( B \) is bounded in \( X \times Y \) as
\[ \| B \| = \sup_{w \in X, v \in Y} \frac{|B(w, v)|}{\|w\|_X \|v\|_Y} < \infty. \]
Moreover, it is known that (see [11, Theorem 6.6]):
\[ \exists \beta > 0, \inf_{w \in X} \sup_{v \in Y} \frac{B(w, v)}{\|w\|_X \|v\|_Y} = \beta; \] (5a)
\[ v \in Y, \quad (\forall w \in X, B(w, v) = 0) \implies (v = 0). \] (5b)

Therefore, we can apply the Banach–Něčas–Babuška theorem or Babuška–Lax–Milgram theorem (see [11, Theorem 2.6] and [2, Theorem 5.2.1] for example) to conclude that there exists a unique \( u \in X \) satisfying (3) and it satisfies
\[ \|u\|_X \leq C (\|F\|_{L^2(J; V')} + \|u_0\|) \]
with a positive constant \( C \). The constant \( C \) depends only on \( M \) and \( \alpha \); it is independent of \( T \). Actually, (5) is the necessary and sufficient condition for the well-posedness of (3). (The case \( u_0 = 0 \) is described explicitly in [11]. However, the modification to the case \( u_0 \neq 0 \) is straightforward.) Equality (5a) is commonly designated as the inf-sup condition or Babuška–Brezzi condition. Furthermore, (5) is equivalent to
\[ \exists \beta > 0, \inf_{w \in X} \sup_{v \in Y} \frac{B(w, v)}{\|w\|_X \|v\|_Y} = \inf_{v \in Y} \sup_{w \in X} \frac{B(w, v)}{\|w\|_X \|v\|_Y} = \beta. \] (6)
This equivalence is verified by considering the associating operators with \( B \) and the operator norms of their inverse operators. Indeed, this equivalence plays an important role in the discussion below.

The dG(\( q \)) method described below (see [10]) is based on the formulation (3), which means that the dG(\( q \)) method is consistent with (6) in the sense of Lemma 2.1 (The consistency is also called the Galerkin orthogonality.) Therefore, it is natural to ask whether a discrete version of (5), particularly (5a), is available. If it is established, then the best approximation property and optimal order error estimates are obtained as direct consequences. Although such an approach is quite standard for elliptic problems, apparently little is done for parabolic problems.

In this paper, after describing the dG(\( q \)) method, we first prove that there exists a positive constant \( c_1 \) such that (see Theorem 1)
\[ \inf_{w_\tau \in \mathcal{S}_\tau} \sup_{v_\tau \in \mathcal{S}_\tau} \frac{B_\tau(w_\tau, v_\tau)}{\|w_\tau\|_{X, \tau} \|v_\tau\|_{Y, \tau, \#}} = c_1 \]
which is a discrete version of \( (5a) \). Herein, \( B_\tau \) is the DG approximation of \( B \). Also, \( S_\tau \) is the set of \( V \)-valued piecewise polynomials of degree \( q \) defined on a non-uniform partition of \( J \) with size parameter \( \tau > 0 \). Moreover, \( \| \cdot \|_{X, \tau} \) and \( \| \cdot \|_{Y, \tau, \#} \) are the DG norms corresponding to \( \| \cdot \|_X \) and \( \| \cdot \|_Y \), respectively. (The precise definition of these symbols will be presented in Section 2.) Then, as a direct consequence, we demonstrate that there exists a positive constant \( c_1 \) such that (see Theorem 11)

\[
\| u - u_\tau \|_{X, \tau} \leq c_1 \inf_{w_\tau \in S_\tau} \| u - w_\tau \|_{X, \tau, \#},
\]

where \( u_\tau \in S_\tau \) is the solution of dG(\( q \)) method and \( \| \cdot \|_{X, \tau, \#} \) denotes another DG norm corresponding to \( \| \cdot \|_X \) satisfying \( \| v_\tau \|_{X, \tau} \leq \| v_\tau \|_{X, \tau, \#} \) for \( v_\tau \in S_\tau \). This result is neither a best approximation property nor a symmetric error estimate in the sense of [7]; it is only a nearly best approximation property and nearly symmetric error estimate. However, using this result, one can obtain optimal order error estimates under appropriate regularity of solution \( u \) of \( (3) \).

We prove (see Theorem 11)

\[
\left( \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \| u' - u'_\tau \|_{L^2(J; H)}^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq c_3 \tau^q \| u^{(q)} \|_X
\]

and

\[
\sup_{1 \leq n \leq N} \| u(t_n) - u_\tau(t_n) \| + \| u - u_\tau \|_{L^2(J; V)} \leq c_4 \tau^{q+1} \| u^{(q+1)} \|_Y.
\]

The salient benefit of our analysis is its capability of deducing these optimal order error estimates as direct applications of the standard interpolation error estimates (see Lemma 2.3 for example). Particularly, the error estimate for \( u'_\tau \) with \( q \geq 1 \) is a new achievement. Application of those results to concrete partial differential equations is straightforward. As an illustration, we consider the finite element approximation for the inhomogeneous heat equation in a polyhedral domain \( \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d \), \( d = 2, 3 \), and derive several optimal order error estimates under appropriate regularity assumptions of the solution. Our error estimates are global in time: those \( c_1, c_1', c_3 \) and \( c_4 \) are independent of the final time \( T \). Time partition and space triangulation need not to be quasi-uniform. Moreover, our estimates include no log-factors.

At this stage, let us briefly review previous studies of convergence of the dG(\( q \)) method for parabolic equations to clarify the novelty of our results. As described above, Jamet [15] studied space-time finite element discretization for the heat equation defined in the moving domain \( Q_T = \bigcup_{t \in J} \{ t \} \times \Omega(t) \); the space-time slab \( Q_n = \bigcup_{t \in (t_n, t_{n+1})} \{ t \} \times \Omega(t) \) is discretized directly using a space-time mesh with the size parameter \( \rho \) and the conforming \( P^k \) finite element space on the mesh is considered. He proved \( O(\rho^k) \) convergence results in the \( L^2 \) norm for time and \( H^1 \) norm for space. \( O(\rho^k) \) convergence results in the \( L^\infty \) norm for time and \( L^2 \) norm for space were also reported. Eriksson et al. [10] described consideration of the abstract evolution equation of the form \( (3) \) in a Hilbert space \( H \), where \( A \) is assumed to be independent of \( t \), self-adjoint on \( H \) and positive-definite with compact inverse \( A^{-1} \). The optimal convergence, say \( O(\tau^{q+1}) \) convergence, in the \( L^\infty(J; H) \) and a super-convergence, say \( O(\tau^{2q+1}) \) convergence, are presented at nodal points in the \( H \) norm. For super-convergence, the initial value \( u_0 \) is expected to satisfy additional boundary conditions as well as regularity conditions. They succeeded in relaxing those conditions, but the resulting error estimates include the log-factor of the form \( \log(1/\tau) \). Applications to the finite element method for the heat equation in a fixed smooth domain \( \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d \) are also discussed. The space variable is discretized by the conforming \( P^k \) finite element method, which is designated below as the \( cG(k) \) method. The dG(\( q \)) method is applied to the resulting space semi-discrete equation. They offered optimal convergence
results in the $L^\infty(J;L^2(\Omega))$ norm and super-convergence results with the log-factor at time-
nodal points. Those results were extended to several directions in Thomée [20, Chapter 12].
Eriksson and Johnson [8, 9] examined adaptive algorithms and a posteriori error estimates for the $dG(q)cG(1)$ method for the heat equation with $q = 0, 1$. They also proved several a priori estimates of optimal order with the log-factor in, for example, the $L^\infty(J;L^2(\Omega))$ and $L^\infty(J \times \Omega)$ norms. The $hp$-version of the $dG(q)$ method was studied carefully in Schötzau and Schwab [18]. In particular, the exponential convergence results in the $L^2(J;V)$ norm were proved using the graded time partitions. Chrysafinos and Walkington [5] considered the $dG(q)$ method for the heat equation. They presented a kind of symmetric error estimate with a special projection operator with no explicit convergence rate. In [5], [8], and [9], the finite element spaces might be different at each time slab. Leykekhman and Vexler [17] proved a best approximation property of the form

$$
\|u - u_{h,\tau}\|_{L^\infty(J \times \Omega)} \leq C \log(T/\tau) \log(1/h) \inf_{\chi \in X_{h,\tau}} \|u - \chi\|_{L^\infty(J \times \Omega)},
$$

where $u_{h,\tau}$ denotes the solution of the $dG(q)cG(k)$ method for the heat equation in a convex polyhedral domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $d = 2, 3$, and $X_{h,\tau}$ is the $dG(q)cG(k)$ finite element space. Therein, the quasi-uniformity conditions were assumed both for time and space meshes.

This paper comprises four sections with an appendix. In Section 2, the $dG(q)$ method for [8] and the main results, Theorems II, III are stated. The proof of Theorems II and III are also described there. The proof of Theorem I is presented in Section 3. Section 4 is devoted to the study of the $dG(q)cG(k)$ method for the inhomogeneous heat equation. The proof of stability results used in Section 4 is stated in Appendix A.

### 2. DG time-stepping method $dG(q)$ and main results

Let $N$ be a positive integer. We introduce $N + 1$ distinct points $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_n < \cdots < t_N = T$. Set $J_n = (t_n, t_{n+1}]$ and $\tau_n = t_{n+1} - t_n$ for $n = 0, \ldots, N - 1$.

We consider the partitions of $J$ as $\Delta = \{J_0, \ldots, J_{N-1}\}$, where $\tau = \max_{0 \leq n \leq N-1} \tau_n$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $\tau \leq 1$. We set

$$
C^0(\Delta; H) = \{v \in L^\infty(J; H) \mid v|_{J_n} \in C^0(J_n; H), \; 0 \leq n \leq N - 1\},
$$

where $C^0(J_n; H)$ denotes the set of $H$-valued continuous functions on $J_n$. Spaces $C^0(\Delta; V)$ and $C^0(J_n; V)$ are defined similarly. For arbitrary $v \in C^0(\Delta; H)$, we write

$$
v_{n+1} = \lim_{t \downarrow t_n} v(t), \quad v_{n+1} = v(t_{n+1}) \quad (n = 0, \ldots, N - 1).
$$

Let $q \geq 0$ be an integer and set

$$
S_q = S^q(J; V) = \{v \in C^0(\Delta; H) \mid v|_{J_n} \in \mathcal{P}^q(J_n; V), \; 0 \leq n \leq N - 1\},
$$

where $\mathcal{P}^q(J_n; V)$ denotes the set of $V$-valued polynomials of $t \in J_n$ with degree $\leq q$. The DG time-stepping method $dG(q)$ is presented below. Find $u_\tau \in S_q$ such that

$$
B_\tau(u_\tau, v_\tau) = \int_J \langle F, v_\tau \rangle \, dt + (u_0, v_\tau^0) \quad (\forall v_\tau \in S_q),
$$

(10a)
Lemma 2.2. Lemma directly follows those definitions.

\[ B_\tau(u_\tau, v_\tau) = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{J_n} \left[ (u'_\tau, v_\tau) + \langle A(t)u_\tau, v_\tau \rangle \right] dt + (u_{\tau,0}^0, v_{\tau,0}^0) + \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} (u_{\tau,n}^n - u_{\tau,n}^n, v_{\tau,n}^n). \]  

An alternate expression of \( B_\tau(u_\tau, v_\tau) \) is given as

\[ B_\tau(u_\tau, v_\tau) = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{J_n} \left[ -(u_\tau, v'_\tau) + \langle A(t)u_\tau, v_\tau \rangle \right] dt + (u_{\tau,N}^N, v_{\tau,N}^N) + \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} (u_{\tau,n}^n - v_{\tau,n}^n, v_{\tau,n}^n). \]

Because the solution \( u \) of (8) is a function of \( C^0(\bar{\mathcal{J}}; \mathcal{H}) \), we have \((u_{\tau,n}^n - u_{\tau,n}^n, v_{\tau,n}^n) = 0\) for \( v_\tau \in \mathcal{S}_\tau \). Consequently, we obtain the following result.

**Lemma 2.1 (Consistency).** If \( u \in \mathcal{X} \) and \( u_\tau \in \mathcal{S}_\tau \) respectively represent the solutions of (8) and (10), then we have \( B_\tau(u - u_\tau, v_\tau) = 0 \) for all \( v_\tau \in \mathcal{S}_\tau \).

For \( v_\tau \in \mathcal{S}_\tau \) and a sequence \( \{k_n\} = \{k_n\}_{n=0}^{N-1} \), we set the following.

\[ \nu(v_\tau, \{k_n\}) = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{J_n} \left[ ||v'_\tau||^2 + ||v_\tau||^2 \right] dt + ||v_{\tau,0}^0||^2 + \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} k_n ||v_{\tau,n}^n - v_{\tau,n}^n||^2, \]

\[ \eta(v_\tau, \{k_n\}) = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{J_n} ||v_\tau||^2 dt + ||v_{\tau,0}^0||^2 + \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} k_n ||v_{\tau,n}^n||^2, \]

\[ \nu^*(v_\tau, \{k_n\}) = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{J_n} \left[ ||v'_\tau||^2 + ||v_\tau||^2 \right] dt + ||v_{\tau,N}^N||^2 + \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} k_n ||v_{\tau,n}^n - v_{\tau,n}^n||^2, \]

\[ \eta^*(v_\tau, \{k_n\}) = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{J_n} ||v_\tau||^2 dt + ||v_{\tau,N}^N||^2 + \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} k_n ||v_{\tau,n}^n||^2. \]

We use the following norms:

\[ ||v_\tau||^2_{\mathcal{X},\tau} = \nu(v_\tau; \{1\}); \quad ||v_\tau||^2_{\mathcal{X},\tau,*} = \nu(v_\tau; \{\tau_n^{-1}\}); \]

\[ ||v_\tau||^2_{\mathcal{Y},\tau} = \eta(v_\tau; \{1\}); \quad ||v_\tau||^2_{\mathcal{Y},\tau,#} = \eta(v_\tau; \{\tau_n\}); \]

\[ ||v_\tau||^2_{\mathcal{X},\tau,*} = \nu^*(v_\tau; \{1\}); \quad ||v_\tau||^2_{\mathcal{X},\tau,#} = \nu^* (v_\tau; \{\tau_n^{-1}\}); \]

\[ ||v_\tau||^2_{\mathcal{Y},\tau,*} = \eta^*(v_\tau; \{1\}); \quad ||v_\tau||^2_{\mathcal{Y},\tau,#} = \eta^* (v_\tau; \{\tau_n\}). \]

Because we are assuming \( \tau_n \leq 1 \), we have \( ||v_\tau|| _{\mathcal{X},\tau} \leq ||v_\tau|| _{\mathcal{X},\tau,*} \) and \( ||v_\tau|| _{\mathcal{Y},\tau,#} \leq ||v_\tau|| _{\mathcal{Y},\tau} \) for \( v_\tau \in \mathcal{S}_\tau \). The same relations hold for other norms defined as (11c) and (11d). The following lemma directly follows those definitions.

**Lemma 2.2.** For \( w_\tau, v_\tau \in \mathcal{S}_\tau \), we have

\[ |B_\tau(w_\tau, v_\tau)| \leq \begin{cases} M_0 ||w_\tau||_{\mathcal{X},\tau} ||v_\tau||_{\mathcal{Y},\tau} \\ M_1 ||w_\tau||_{\mathcal{X},\tau,*} ||v_\tau||_{\mathcal{Y},\tau,#} \\ M_2 ||w_\tau||_{\mathcal{Y},\tau} ||v_\tau||_{\mathcal{X},\tau} \end{cases} \]

where \( M_j, j = 0, 1, 2 \), are positive constants depending only on \( M \).
We are now in a position to state the main results presented in this paper.

**Theorem I.** There exist positive constants $c_1$ and $c_2$ depending only on $\alpha$, $M$ and $q$ such that

\[
\inf_{u_\tau \in S_r} \sup_{v_\tau \in S_r} \frac{B_r(w_\tau, v_\tau)}{||w_\tau||_{X,\tau}||v_\tau||_{Y,\tau#,}} = c_1; \tag{12a}
\]
\[
\inf_{u_\tau \in S_r} \sup_{v_\tau \in S_r} \frac{B_r(w_\tau, v_\tau)}{||w_\tau||_{Y,\tau,##}||v_\tau||_{X,\tau}} = c_2. \tag{12b}
\]

The proof of Theorem I will be given in Section 3. The following result, Theorem II, is a readily obtainable corollary of Theorem I and Lemma 2.2.

**Theorem II.** Let $u \in X$ and $u_\tau \in S_r$ respectively denote the solutions of (3) and (10), we have

\[
||u - u_\tau||_{X,\tau} \leq \left(1 + \frac{M_1}{c_1}\right) \inf_{w_\tau \in S_r} ||u - w_\tau||_{X,\tau,*}, \tag{13a}
\]
\[
||u - u_\tau||_{Y,\tau,##} \leq \left(1 + \frac{M_2}{c_2}\right) \inf_{w_\tau \in S_r} ||u - w_\tau||_{Y,\tau}, \tag{13b}
\]

**Proof.** Let $w_\tau \in S_r$ be arbitrary. In view of Theorem I Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2 we have

\[
||w_\tau - u_\tau||_{X,\tau} \leq \frac{1}{c_1} \sup_{v_\tau \in S_r} \frac{B_r(w_\tau - u_\tau, v_\tau)}{||v_\tau||_{Y,\tau,##}} = \frac{1}{c_1} \sup_{v_\tau \in S_r} \frac{B_r(w_\tau - u, v_\tau)}{||v_\tau||_{Y,\tau,##}} \leq \frac{M_1}{c_1} ||w_\tau - u||_{X,\tau,*}.
\]

Therefore, using the triangle inequality, we obtain (13a). The proof of (13b) is the same. \qed

We derive some optimal order error estimates using Theorem II. Assuming that $q \geq 1$, we set $t_{n,j} = t_n + j(t_{n+1} - t_n)/q = t_n + j\tilde{r}_n/q$ ($j = 0, \ldots, q$). For $v \in L^2(J_n;V) \cap H^1(J_n;V')$, there exists a unique $I_n v \in \mathcal{P}^q(J_n;V)$ such that

\[
(I_n v)(t_{n,j}) = v(t_{n,j}) \quad (j = 0, \ldots, q).
\]

The following error estimates for the Lagrange interpolation $I_n v$ is proved in the standard way using Taylor’s theorem (see [23], theorem 4.A) for example). We write $v^{(s)} = (d/dt)^sv$ for positive integer $s$.

**Lemma 2.3.** Letting $q \geq 1$ be an integer, then there exists an absolute positive constant $C$ such that

\[
||v - I_n v||_{L^2(J_n;U)} \leq C\tau_n^s ||v^{(s)}||_{L^2(J_n;U)}, \tag{14a}
\]
\[
||v' - (I_n v)'||_{L^2(J_n;U)} \leq C\tau_n^{s-1} ||v^{(s)}||_{L^2(J_n;U)} \tag{14b}
\]

for an integer $s$ with $1 < s \leq q + 1$ and $v \in H^{q+1}(J_n;U)$, where $U = V, H, V'$. Constant $C$ is independent of $U$. Moreover, the estimate (14a) remains true for $q = 0$ and $s = 1$.

Finally we can state the following optimal order error estimates.
Theorem III. Letting \( u \in \mathcal{X} \) and \( u_\tau \in \mathcal{S}_\tau \) respectively denote the solutions of (9) and (11), then if \( q \geq 0 \) and \( u^{(q)} \in \mathcal{X} = L^2(J;V) \cap H^1(J;V') \), it follows that

\[
\left( \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \| u' - u_\tau' \|_{L^2(J_n;V')}^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq c_3 \tau^q \| u^{(q)} \|_\mathcal{X}.
\] (15a)

Moreover, if \( q \geq 1 \) and \( u^{(q+1)} \in \mathcal{Y}_1 = L^2(J;V) \), then

\[
\sup_{1 \leq n \leq N} \| u(t_n) - u_\tau(t_n) \| + \| u - u_\tau \|_{L^2(J;V)} + \left( \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} \tau_n \| u_\tau(t_n) - u^{(q+1)}_\tau \|_2^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq c_4 \tau^{q+1} \| u^{(q+1)} \|_{\mathcal{Y}_1}.
\] (15b)

If \( q = 0 \) and \( u' \in \mathcal{X} \), the estimate (15b) holds with replacement \( \| u^{(q+1)} \|_{\mathcal{Y}_1} \) by \( \| u' \|_\mathcal{X} \). Therein, \( c_3 \) and \( c_4 \) denote positive constants depending only on \( \alpha, M \) and \( q \).

Proof. First, we prove (15b) with \( q \geq 1 \). Let us define \( w_\tau \in \mathcal{S}_\tau \) by \( w_\tau|_{J_n} = I_n u \) for \( n = 0, 1, \ldots, N - 1 \). Set \( c_2' = 1 + M_2/c_2 \). Because \( u^{n+} - w^{n+}_\tau = 0 \) for \( n = 1, \ldots, N - 1 \) and \( u^N - w^N_\tau = 0 \), we have by (13b) and (14a)

\[
\| u - u_\tau \|_{L^2(J;V)}^2 + \| u(t) - u_\tau(t) \|_2^2 + \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} \tau_n \| u_\tau(t) - u^{(q+1)}_\tau \|_2^2 \leq C^2(c_2')^2 \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \tau_n^2 \| u^{(q+1)}_\tau \|_{L^2(J_n;V)}^2,
\] (16)

which implies (15b) with \( q \geq 1 \). We next consider the case \( q = 0 \). Then, we still have \( u^{n+} - w^{n+}_\tau = 0 \) for \( n = 1, \ldots, N - 1 \); however, we have \( u^N - w^N_\tau = u(t_N) - u(t_{N-1}) \neq 0 \). Consequently, the left-hand side of (16) is estimated from above by

\[
C^2(c_2')^2 \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \tau_n^2 \| u' \|_{L^2(J_n;V)}^2 + \tau_{N-1} \max_{t \in J} \| u' \|_2^2.
\]

Therefore, in view of the trace inequality (4), we obtain (15b) with replacement \( \| u^{(q+1)} \|_{\mathcal{Y}_1} \) by \( \| u' \|_\mathcal{X} \). The inequality (15a) with \( q \geq 1 \) is proved similarly using (13a) and (14). Finally, the estimate (15a) with \( q = 0 \) implies a trivial inequality, because \( u_\tau = 0 \) on every \( J_n \).

Remark 2.4. If \( q = 0 \), the estimate (15a) gives no information on the convergence. However, the following observation may be useful. For the solution \( u_\tau \) of (10), there exists a unique \( \partial_t u_\tau \in \mathcal{S}_\tau \) such that

\[
\int_{J_n} \langle \partial_t u_\tau, v_\tau \rangle \ dt = \int_{J_n} (u_\tau', v_\tau) \ dt + (u^{n+}_\tau, v^{n+}_\tau) + (u^N_\tau - u^N_\tau, v^N_\tau) \quad (v_\tau \in \mathcal{S}_\tau, n = 0, \ldots, N - 1),
\]

where we set \( u^{0}_\tau = u_0 \). This, together with Lemma 2.3, implies

\[
\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{J_n} \langle u' - \partial_t u_\tau, v_\tau \rangle \ dt = \int_{J} \langle A(t)(u - u_\tau), v_\tau \rangle \ dt \quad (\forall v_\tau \in \mathcal{S}_\tau).
\]
Therefore, applying (15a) and (15b), we deduce
\[
\mathcal{E}(u' - \tilde{\partial}_t u_x) \leq \begin{cases} 
M \tau^{q+1} \|u^{(q+1)}\|_{L^2} & (q \geq 1) \\
M \tau \|u'\|_{L^2} & (q = 0).
\end{cases}
\] (17)

where
\[
\mathcal{E}(w) = \sup_{v_T \in \mathcal{S}_r} \frac{1}{\|v_T\|_{L^2(J;V)}} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{J_n} |\langle w, v_T \rangle| \, dt \quad (w \in C^0(\Delta_n;H)).
\]

The estimate (17) shows that \(\tilde{\partial}_t u_x\) provides an approximation of order \(\tau^{q+1}\) for \(u'\) with any \(q \geq 0\).

3. Proof of Theorem I

This section is devoted to the proof of Theorem I. First, we collect some preliminary results. Throughout this section, we let \(n = 0, 1, \ldots, N - 1\), unless otherwise stated explicitly.

We let \(q \geq 1\) for the time being. The following projection is a slight modification of [20, (12.9)]. For \(v \in L^2(J_n;V)\), there exists a unique \(\tilde{v} \in \mathcal{P}^q(J_n;V)\) such that
\[
\tilde{v}^{n+1} = 0; \\
\int_{J_n} [v(t) - \tilde{v}(t)] (t - t_n)^l dt = 0 \quad (l = 0, 1, \ldots, q - 1).
\] (18a)

(18b)

Projection \(\pi_n : L^2(J_n;V) \to \mathcal{P}^q(J_n;V)\) is defined as \(\tilde{v} = \pi_n v\). In fact, \(\tilde{v}\) is expressed as \(\tilde{v} = \sum_{l=1}^q a_l (t - t_n)^l\) with \(a_1, \ldots, a_q \in V\) in view of (18a). Therefore, (18b) implies the system of \(V\)-valued linear equations for unknowns \(a_1, \ldots, a_q\). The number of equations is also \(q\): it suffices to check the uniqueness to verify the existence of \(\tilde{v}\). However, it is a direct consequence of the following (19b). Alternatively, one could follow the same argument as [20] to deduce the uniqueness. Therefore, the projection \(\pi_n\) is well-defined.

**Lemma 3.1.** Letting \(q \geq 1\) and \(U = H, V\), the projection \(\pi_n\) satisfies the following:
\[
\int_{J_n} (\pi_n v, \chi)_U \, dt = \int_{J_n} (v, \chi)_U \, dt \quad (\chi \in \mathcal{P}^{q-1}(J_n;V));
\] (19a)

\[
\|\pi_n v\|_{L^2(J_n;U)} \leq C_q \|v\|_{L^2(J_n;U)} \quad (v \in L^2(J_n;V)),
\] (19b)

where \(C_q\) denotes a positive constant depending only on \(q\).

**Proof of (19a).** Let \(v \in L^2(J_n;V)\) and \(\chi \in \mathcal{P}^{q-1}(J_n;V)\). Writing \(\chi = \sum_{l=0}^{q-1} b_l (t - t_n)^l\) with \(b_0, \ldots, b_{q-1} \in V\) and using (18b), we have
\[
\int_{J_n} (v - \pi_n v, \chi)_U \, dt = \sum_{l=0}^{q-1} \left(\int_{J_n} (v - \pi_n v)(t - t_n)^l \, dt, b_l\right)_U = 0.
\]

In fact, the first equality is justified because \(v : J_n \to U\) is Bochner integrable; see [22, §V.5] for example.

**Proof of (19b).** Let \(v \in L^2(J_n;V)\) and set \(\tilde{v} = \pi_n v \in \mathcal{P}^q(J_n;V)\). The proof is divided into two steps.
**Step 1.** Substituting $\chi = \tilde{v}' \in \mathcal{P}^{q-1}(J_n; V)$ into (19a), we have
\[
\int_{J_n} (\tilde{v}, \tilde{v}')_U \, dt = \int_{J_n} (v, \tilde{v}')_U \, dt.
\] (20)

To estimate the right-hand side, we apply the inverse inequality
\[
\|w\|_{L^2(J_n; U)} \leq \frac{c_q}{2\tau_n} \|w\|_{L^2(J_n; U)} \quad (w \in \mathcal{P}^q(J_n; U)),
\]
where $c_q > 0$ denotes a constant depending only on $q$. The proof of this inequality is exactly the same as the scalar case. In particular, $c_q$ is independent of $U$. Using this, we have
\[
\left| \int_{J_n} (v, \tilde{v}')_U \, dt \right| \leq \|v\|_{L^2(J_n; U)} \|\tilde{v}'\|_{L^2(J_n; U)} \leq \frac{c_q}{2\tau_n} \|v\|_{L^2(J_n; U)} \|\tilde{v}\|_{L^2(J_n; U)}.
\] (21)

On the other hand, by virtue of (18a), we have
\[
\int_{J_n} (\tilde{v}, \tilde{v}')_U \, dt = \frac{1}{2} \int_{J_n} \frac{d}{dt}(\tilde{v}(t))_U^2 \, dt = \frac{1}{2} \|\tilde{v}(t_n+1)\|_U^2.
\] (22)

Combining (20), (21) and (22), we obtain
\[
\|\tilde{v}(t_{n+1})\|_U^2 \leq \frac{c_q}{\tau_n} \|v\|_{L^2(J_n; U)} \|\tilde{v}\|_{L^2(J_n; U)}.
\]

**Step 2.** For $\tilde{v}$ defined above and $s \in J_n$, there exists a $\hat{v} \in \mathcal{P}^q(J_n; V)$ such that
\[
\tilde{v}(t_{n+1}) = \hat{v}(t_{n+1});
\] (23a)
\[
\int_{J_n} (\tilde{v}, \chi)_U \, dt = \int_{J_n} (\hat{v}, \chi)_U \, dt \quad (\chi \in \mathcal{P}^{q-1}(J_n; V));
\] (23b)
\[
\|\hat{v}\|_{L^2(J_n; U)} \leq c'_q \|\tilde{v}\|_{L^2(J_n; U)},
\] (23c)
where $c'_q > 0$ denotes a constant depending only on $q$. Function $\hat{v}$ is a modification of the discrete characteristic function of $\hat{v}$ described in [5, (2.8)]. The proof of (23c) is exactly the same as that of [5, Lemma 2.4]. Using (18a), (19a), (23a), (23b) and applying the integration by parts, we can calculate as
\[
\frac{1}{2} \|\tilde{v}(s)\|_U^2 = \int_0^s (\tilde{v}, \tilde{v}')_U \, dt = \int_{J_n} (\hat{v}, \tilde{v}')_U \, dt
\]
\[
= (\hat{v}(t_{n+1}), \hat{v}(t_{n+1}))_U - \int_{J_n} (\tilde{v}', \tilde{v})_U \, dt
\]
\[
= \|\hat{v}(t_{n+1})\|_U^2 - \int_{J_n} (\tilde{v}', \tilde{v})_U \, dt.
\]

In the same way as the derivation of (21), we deduce by (23c)
\[
\left| \int_{J_n} (\hat{v}', \tilde{v})_U \, dt \right| \leq \frac{c_q}{2\tau_n} \|v\|_{L^2(J_n; U)} \|\tilde{v}\|_{L^2(J_n; U)} \leq \frac{c_q c'_q}{2\tau_n} \|v\|_{L^2(J_n; U)} \|\tilde{v}\|_{L^2(J_n; U)}.
\]

Summing up those results, we obtain
\[
\|\tilde{v}(s)\|_U^2 \leq \frac{C_q}{\tau_n} \|v\|_{L^2(J_n; U)} \|\tilde{v}\|_{L^2(J_n; U)}
\]
for $s \in J_n$, where $C_q > 0$ denotes a constant depending only on $q$. Integrating the both sides in $s \in J_n$, we deduce the desired inequality (19b). 
\[\square\]
We consider the trace inequality (11) for $T = 1$ and write $C_{Tv} = C_{Tv,1}$, which is an absolute constant. The scaling argument gives the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.2.** For $v \in L^2(J_n; V) \cap H^1(J_n; V')$, we have

$$
\max_{t_n \leq t \leq t_{n+1}} \|v(t)\| \leq \frac{C_{Tv}}{\tau_n^{1/2}} \left(\|v\|_{L^2(J_n; V)}^2 + \tau_n^2 \|v'\|_{L^2(J_n; V')}^2\right)^{1/2}.
$$

(24)

By virtue of (11), $A(t)$ is invertible for a.e. $t \in J$. Moreover, we have the following.

**Lemma 3.3.**

(i) $\langle g, A(t)^{-1} g \rangle \geq \frac{\alpha}{M^2} \|g\|_{V'}$ for all $g \in V'$ and a.e. $t \in J$.

(ii) $\|A(t)^{-1} g\|_V \leq \frac{1}{\alpha} \|g\|_{V'}$ for all $g \in V'$ and a.e. $t \in J$.

Now, we can state the following proof.

**Proof of Theorem 1.** (12a). Let $w_\tau \in S_\tau$. First, we consider the case $q \geq 1$. Setting $\phi = A(t)^{-1} w_\tau' \in L^2(J; V)$, we define $\tilde{\phi}_\tau \in S_\tau$ as $\tilde{\phi}_\tau|_{J_n} = \pi_n(\phi|_{J_n})$ for $n = 0, \ldots, N - 1$.

For abbreviation, we write $w = w_\tau$ and $\tilde{\phi} = \tilde{\phi}_\tau$. According to (18a), Lemmas 3.1 and 3.3, we know

$$
\tilde{\phi}_\tau^n = 0; \quad (25a)
$$

$$
\int_{J_n} (\chi, \tilde{\phi}) \, dt = \int_{J_n} (\chi, \phi) \, dt \quad (\forall \chi \in \mathcal{H}^{q-1}(J_n; V)); \quad (25b)
$$

$$
\|\tilde{\phi}\|_{L^2(J_n; V)} \leq C_q \|A^{-1} w_\tau'\|_{L^2(J_n; V)} \leq \frac{C_q}{\alpha} \|w_\tau'\|_{L^2(J_n; V')} \quad (25c)
$$

Now set $v = \tilde{\phi} + \mu w \in S_\tau$ with $\mu > 0$; the value of $\mu$ will be specified later.

We prove

$$
\|v\|_{Y, \tau, #} \leq C_1 \|w\|_{X, \tau}, \quad (26)
$$

where $C_1$ is a positive constant depending only on $\mu, \alpha$ and $q$. Using (25a), (25b) and Lemma 3.2, we can calculate

$$
\|v\|_{Y, \tau, #}^2 \leq \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{J_n} 2 \left[\|\tilde{\phi}\|_{V'}^2 + \mu^2 \|w\|_{V}^2\right] \, dt + \mu^2 \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} \tau_n \|w_{n-}^n\|^2 + \mu^2 \|w_{0+}^0\|^2
$$

$$
\leq \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{J_n} \left[\frac{C_q}{\alpha^2} + \mu^2 C_{V1}^2 \tau_n\right] \|w_\tau'\|_{V'}^2 + \mu^2 \left(2 + C_{V1}^2\right) \|w_\tau\|_{V}^2 \right] \, dt + \mu^2 \|w_{0+}^0\|^2,
$$

which implies (26).

We apply (25a), (25b), (25c), Lemma 3.3 and Young’s inequality to obtain

$$
B_{\tau}(w, \tilde{\phi}) = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{J_n} 2 \left[(w', A(t)^{-1} w') + \langle A(t)w, \tilde{\phi}\rangle\right] \, dt
$$

$$
\geq \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{J_n} 2 \left[\frac{\alpha}{M^2} \|w_\tau'\|_{V'} - M \|w\|_V \|\tilde{\phi}\|_V\right] \, dt
$$

$$
\geq \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{J_n} 2 \left[\frac{\alpha}{M^2} \|w_\tau'\|_{V'} - M \|w\|_V \|\tilde{\phi}\|_V\right] \, dt
$$

$$
\geq \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{J_n} 2 \left[\frac{\alpha}{M^2} \|w_\tau'\|_{V'} - M \|w\|_V \|\tilde{\phi}\|_V\right] \, dt,
$$
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where $\delta > 0$ is arbitrary. To estimate $B_\tau(w, \mu w)$, we recall the elementary identity
\[
(\chi^{n,+} - \chi^n, \chi^{n,+}) = \frac{1}{2}\|\chi^{n,+}\|^2 - \frac{1}{2}\|\chi^n\|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|\chi^{n,+} - \chi^n\|^2
\]
for $\chi \in S_\tau$ and $n = 0, \ldots, N - 1$. That is, we can calculate as
\[
B_\tau(w, \mu w) = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{J_n} \left[ \frac{\mu}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|w\|^2 + \mu \langle A(t)w, w \rangle \right] dt + \frac{\mu}{2} \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} \|w^{n,+} - w^n\|^2 + \mu \|w^{0,+}\|^2.
\]
This, together with (26), implies
\[
B_\tau(w, v) \geq \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{J_n} \left[ 2 \left( \frac{\alpha}{M^2} - \frac{C^2\delta}{\alpha^2} \right) \|w'\|^2_{V'} + \left( \mu\alpha - \frac{M^2}{\delta} \right) \|w\|^2_{V'} \right] dt + \frac{\mu}{2} \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} \|w^{n,+} - w^n\|^2 + \mu \|w^{0,+}\|^2.
\]
We take a suitably small $\delta$ and then choose a suitably large $\mu$. Consequently, there exists a positive constant $C_2$ depending only on $\alpha, M$ and $q$ such that
\[
B_\tau(w, v) \geq C_2 \|w\|^2_{X,\tau}.
\]
This, together with (26), implies
\[
\sup_{v \in S_\tau} \frac{B_\tau(w, v)}{\|v\|_{Y,\tau,\#}} \geq C \|w\|_{X,\tau}
\]
with $C = C_2/C_1$.

We proceed to the case $q = 0$. Set $v = \mu w$ with $\mu > 0$. Then, we deduce (28), because we still have (26) and (27).

At this stage, let us denote by $c_1$ the greatest number $C > 0$ such that the inequality (28) holds. This completes the proof of (12a). \qed

**Proof of Theorem 4.** (12b). It suffices to prove that
\[
\exists c_2 > 0, \inf_{w_\tau \in S_\tau} \sup_{w, v_\tau \in S_\tau} \frac{B_\tau(w_\tau, v_\tau)}{\|w_\tau\|_{Y,\tau,\#} \|v_\tau\|_{X,\tau}} = c_2; \tag{29a}
\]
\[
\forall w_\tau \in S_\tau, \ (\forall v_\tau \in S_\tau, \ B_\tau(w_\tau, v_\tau) = 0) \implies (v_\tau = 0). \tag{29b}
\]
Actually, as recalled from the Introduction (i.e., the equivalence (15) and (16)), (29) is equivalent to
\[
\inf_{w_\tau \in S_\tau} \sup_{v_\tau \in S_\tau} \frac{B_\tau(w_\tau, v_\tau)}{\|w_\tau\|_{Y,\tau,\#} \|v_\tau\|_{X,\tau}} = \inf_{v_\tau \in S_\tau} \sup_{w_\tau \in S_\tau} \frac{B_\tau(w_\tau, v_\tau)}{\|w_\tau\|_{Y,\tau,\#} \|v_\tau\|_{X,\tau}} = c_2.
\]
First, (29b) follows (12a). Let $v_\tau \in S_\tau$. Now, with a suitably large $\mu > 0$, we set $w_\tau = -\tilde{\phi}_\tau + \mu v_\tau$ if $q \geq 1$ and $w_\tau = \mu v_\tau$ if $q = 0$. Therein, $\phi_\tau \in S_\tau$ is defined for $\phi_\tau = A^{-1}v_\tau \in S_\tau$ in the same way as in the proof of (12a).
Then, in exactly the same way, we deduce
\[ B_r(w_\tau, v_\tau) \geq C||v_\tau||^2_{X,\tau}, \quad ||w_\tau||_{Y,\tau,\#} \leq C'||v_\tau||_{X,\tau}, \]
and consequently obtain (29a). This completes the proof of (12b).

4. Application to the finite element method

This section presents application of our results, Theorems I–III, to error analysis of the finite element method. Letting \( \Omega \) be a polyhedral domain \( \mathbb{R}^d, d = 2, 3 \), with the boundary \( \partial \Omega \), we consider the heat equation for the function \( u = u(x, t) \) of \( (x, t) \in \overline{\Omega} \times [0, T) \),

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} &= \Delta u + f & \text{in } \Omega \times J, \\
\frac{\partial u}{\partial n} &= 0 & \text{on } \partial \Omega \times J, \\
\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} \big|_{t=0} &= u_0 & \text{on } \Omega,
\end{align*}
\]

where \( \partial_t u = \partial u/\partial t \) and \( \Delta u = \nabla \cdot \nabla u = \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x_j^2}. \)

We use the Lebesgue space \( L^2 = L^2(\Omega) \) and the standard Sobolev spaces \( H^k = H^k(\Omega), k \geq 1 \). Let \( H = L^2(\Omega) \) with the inner product \( \langle v, w \rangle = (v, w)_{L^2} \) and norm \( ||v|| = ||v||_{H^1} = ||v||_{L^2} \). Moreover, set \( V = H_0^1 = \{ v \in H^1 | v|_{\partial \Omega} = 0 \} \) with the norm \( ||v||_V = ||v||_{H_0^1} = ||\nabla v|| \). The space \( V' \) implies the dual space \( H^{-1} = H^{-1}(\Omega) \) of \( H_0^1 \) equipped with the norm \( ||v||_{H^{-1}} = \sup_{w \in H_0^1} \langle v, w \rangle/||w||_{H_0^1} \). The duality pairing between \( H_0^1 \) and \( H^{-1} \) is denoted as \( \langle w, v \rangle = H^{-1}(w, v)_{H_0^1} \). Spaces \( X = L^2(J; H_0^1) \cap H^1(J; H^{-1}), Y_1 = L^2(J; H_0^1) \) and \( Y = Y_1 \times H \) are Hilbert spaces equipped with the norms \( ||v||_X = ||v||_{L^2(J; H_0^1)} + ||\partial_t v||_{L^2(J; H^{-1})}, ||v||_{Y_1} = ||v||_Y = ||v||_{L^2(J; H_0^1)} + ||v||_{H_0^1} \).

The operator \( A : H_0^1 \rightarrow H^{-1} \) and functional \( F \) on \( H_0^1 \) are defined as

\[
\langle Au, v \rangle = \langle \nabla u, \nabla v \rangle, \quad (u, v \in H_0^1),
\]
\[
\langle F, v \rangle = (f, v), \quad (v \in H_0^1).
\]

With these interpretations, (30) is converted into the abstract evolution equation of (2). The weak formulation of (30) is given as follows: given

\[
f \in L^2(J; L^2), \quad u_0 \in L^2,
\]

find \( u \in X \) such that

\[
B(u, v) = \int_J \langle f, v_1 \rangle \, dt + \langle u_0, v_2 \rangle \quad (\forall v = (v_1, v_2) \in Y),
\]

where

\[
B(u, v) = \int_J [\langle \partial_t u, v_1 \rangle + \langle \nabla u, \nabla v_1 \rangle] \, dt + \langle u(0), v_2 \rangle
\]

for \( u \in X, v = (v_1, v_2) \in Y \).

We proceed to the presentation of the finite element approximation. Let \( \{ T_h \}_h \) be a family of shape-regular triangulation of \( \Omega \). The granularity parameter \( h \) is defined as \( h = \max_{K \in T_h} h_K \), where \( h_K \) denotes the diameter of the circumscribed ball of \( K \). For an integer \( k \geq 1 \), we introduce the conforming \( P^k \) finite element space

\[
X_h = X_h^k = \{ v \in C^0(\Omega), v|_{K} \in P^k(K; \mathbb{R}) | \forall K \in T_h, v|_{\partial \Omega} = 0 \} \subset H_0^1.
\]
Recall that $S_\tau$ is defined as \((9)\). The space–time finite element space is given as

$$S_{h,\tau} = S^q_t(X_h, X_h).$$

It is noteworthy that $S_{h,\tau} \subset S_\tau$.

The dG($q$)cG($k$) method reads: find $u_{h,\tau} \in S_{h,\tau}$ such that

$$B_\tau(u_{h,\tau}, v) = \int_J (f, v) \, dt + (u_0, v_{0,+}) \quad (\forall v \in S_{h,\tau}),$$

where

$$B_\tau(u_{h,\tau}, v) = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{J_n} \left[ (\partial_t u_{h,\tau}, v) + (\nabla u_{h,\tau}, \nabla v) \right] \, dt + (u_{h,\tau}^0, v_{0,+}) + \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} (u_{h,\tau}^n - u_{h,\tau}^{n-1}, v_{n,+}).$$  \(32b\)

**Remark 4.1.** To avoid unimportant difficulties, we set in \((32)\) the same initial function $u_0$ as \((31)\). This fact implies that the initial value $u_{h,\tau}(0) \in X_h$ of the solution $u_{h,\tau}$ of \((32)\) must be

$$u_{h,\tau}(0) = P_h u_0,$$

where $P_h$ denotes the $L^2$ projection of $L^2 \to X_h$ defined as

$$(P_h w - w, v_h) = 0 \quad (v_h \in X_h).$$  \(33\)

In this setting, we have the consistency $B_\tau(u - u_{h,\tau}, v) = 0$ for all $v \in S_{h,\tau}$, where $u$ and $u_{h,\tau}$ respectively represent the solutions of \((31)\) and \((32)\). Therefore, in exactly the same way as for the proof of Theorems 1 and 11, we obtain the nearly best approximation inequalities such as \((13a)\) and \((13b)\). Unfortunately, those results are useless for deducing explicit convergence rates directly.

Instead, we use a space semi-discrete scheme \((35)\) below as an auxiliary problem. Set

$$X_h = H^1(J; X_h), \quad Y_{1h} = L^2(J; X_h) \quad \text{and} \quad Y_h = Y_{1h} \times X_h.$$  

They equip the norms $\|v_h\|_{X_h}^2 = \|\partial_t v_h\|_{L^2(J; X_h)}^2 + \|v_h\|_{L^2(J; H^1)}^2$, $\|v_{1h}\|_{Y_{1h}}^2 = \|v_{1h}\|_{Y_{1h}}^2$, and $\|v_{2h}\|_{Y_h}^2 = \|v_{2h}\|_{Y_h}^2$. Here and hereinafter, we write $\|v\|_{X_h} = \sup_{\phi_h \in X_h} (v, \phi_h)/\|\phi_h\|_{H^1_0}$ for $v \in H^1_0$. It is apparent that

$$\|v\|_{X_h} \leq \|v\|_{Y_{1h}} \quad (v \in H^1_0), \quad \|v\|_{X_h} \leq \|v\|_X \quad (v \in X).$$  \(34\)

It is noteworthy that $X_h \subset X$, $Y_{1h} \subset Y_1$ and $Y_h \subset Y$. We consider the problem to find $u_h \in X_h$ such that

$$B(u_h, v_h) = \int_J (f, v_{1h}) \, dt + (u_0, v_{2h}) \quad (\forall v_h = (v_{1h}, v_{2h}) \in Y_h),$$

where

$$B(u_h, v_h) = \int_J \left[ (\partial_t u_h, v_{1h}) + (\nabla u_h, \nabla v_{1h}) \right] \, dt + (u_h(0), v_{2h}).$$  \(35b\)

Therein, $u_h(0) \in L^2$ in \((35b)\) is well-defined, because there exists a positive constant $C'_{T, T}$ depending only on $T$ such that

$$\max_{t \in J} \|v_h(t)\| \leq C'_{T, T} \|v\|_{X_h} \quad (v_h \in X_h).$$  \(36\)
In fact, we know that \( \frac{d}{dt} \|v_h(t)\|^2 = 2\left( \frac{d}{dt} v_h(t), v_h(t) \right) \) for \( v_h \in X_h \) and \( t \in J \) (see [12, §5.9.2]). Inequality (36) is a direct consequence of this identity.

Introducing the discrete Laplacian \( A_h : X_h \to X_h \) by

\[
(A_h w_h, v_h) = (\nabla w_h, \nabla v_h) \quad (w_h, v_h \in X_h),
\]

the problem (35) is expressed equivalently as

\[
\frac{d}{dt} u_h(t) + A_h u_h(t) = P_h f(t) \quad (t \in J); \quad u_h(0) = P_h u_0,
\]

where \( P_h \) denotes the \( L^2 \) projection defined as (33).

Because (32) is regarded as a time discretization scheme to (35), we can apply Theorem III directly to obtain the following lemma. Here and hereinafter, we use \( C \) to represent general constants independent of \( h, \tau, \) and \( T. \)

**Lemma 4.2.** Let \( u_{h, \tau} \) and \( u_h \) respectively represent the solutions of (32) and (35). If \( q \geq 0 \) and \( \partial_t^q u_h \in X_h \), then

\[
\left( \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \| \partial_t u_h - \partial_t u_{h, \tau} \|_{L^2(J_n; X_h)}^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq C \tau^{q} \| \partial_t^q u_h \|_{X_h}.
\]

Moreover, if \( q \geq 1 \) and \( \partial_t^{q+1} u_h \in Y_{1h} \), then

\[
\sup_{1 \leq n \leq N} \| u_h(t_n) - u_{h, \tau}(t_n) \| + \| u_h - u_{h, \tau} \|_{L^2(J; H^1_0)} + \left( \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} \tau_n \| u_{h, \tau}(t_n) - u_{h, \tau}^{n+1} \|^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq C \tau^{q+1} \| \partial_t^{q+1} u_h \|_{Y_{1h}}. \quad (37)
\]

If \( q = 0 \) and \( \partial_t u_h \in X_h \), the estimate (37) holds with replacement \( \| \partial_t^{q+1} u_h \|_{Y_{1h}} \) by \( \| \partial_t u_h \|_{X_h} \).

Below, we study the error \( u - u_h \) and stability of \( u_h \) in various norms. First, the following stability result is an application of (33); the proof is postponed for Appendix A.

**Lemma 4.3.** Let \( u \) and \( u_h \) respectively represent the solutions of (31) and (35). Moreover, suppose that we are given \( q \geq 0 \). If \( \partial_t^q u \in X \) and \( \partial_t^q u_h \in X_h \), then

\[
\| \partial_t^q u_h \|_{X_h} \leq C \| \partial_t^q u \|_{X}. \quad (38a)
\]

Moreover, if \( \partial_t^q u \in Y_1 \) and \( \partial_t^q u_h \in Y_{1h} \), then

\[
\| \partial_t^q u_h \|_{Y_{1h}} \leq C \| \partial_t^q u \|_{Y_1}. \quad (38b)
\]

For a positive integer \( k \), we write

\[
|v|^2_{L^2(J; H^k)} = \int_J \left( \sum_{|\alpha|=k} \| \partial^\alpha v \|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{1/2} dt,
\]

where \( \alpha = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_d) \) denotes the multi-index with \( |\alpha| = \alpha_1 + \cdots + \alpha_d = k \) and \( \partial^\alpha = (\partial/\partial x_1)^{\alpha_1} \cdots (\partial/\partial x_d)^{\alpha_d}. \)
Lemma 4.4. Let $u$ and $u_h$ respectively represent the solutions of (31) and (35). If $u$ is sufficiently regular, we have

$$
\| \partial_t u - \partial_t u_h \|_{L^2(J; X_h')} \leq C h^k \left( |\partial_t u|_{L^2(J; H^k)} + |u|_{L^2(J; H^{k+1})} \right),
$$

(39a)

$$
\| u - u_h \|_{L^2(J; H^0)} \leq C h^k \left( |\partial_t u|_{L^2(J; H^k)} + |u|_{L^2(J; H^{k+1})} \right),
$$

(39b)

$$
\| u - u_h \|_{L^\infty(J; L^2)} \leq C h^{k+1} \left( |\partial_t u|_{L^2(J; H^{k+1})} + |u|_{L^\infty(J; H^{k+1})} \right).
$$

(39c)

Proof. Because $X_h \subset X$ and $Y_h \subset Y$, we have the consistency

$$
B(u - u_h, v_h) = 0 \quad (v_h \in Y_h).
$$

(40)

Furthermore, there exists $\beta' > 0$ which is independent of $h$ such that

$$
\inf_{w_h \in X_h} \sup_{v_h \in Y_h} \frac{B(w_h, v_h)}{\|w_h\|_{X_h} \|v_h\|_{Y_h}} = \beta'.
$$

(41)

Although Equality (41) does not follow directly from (5a), it is derived using the same method as the proof of (5a). In fact, for any $w_h \in X_h$, let $v_{1h} = A_h^{-1} \partial_t w_h + w_h$ and $v_{2h} = w_h(0)$. Then, we have $\|v_h\|_{Y_h} \leq C \|w_h\|_{X_h}$ in view of the trace inequality (36). Moreover, using

$$
\|A_h^{-1} g_h \|_{H^0} \leq \|g_h\|_{X_h}, \quad (g_h, A_h^{-1} g_h) \geq \|g_h\|_{X_h}'^2 \quad (g_h \in X_h),
$$

(42)

we infer that $B(w_h, v_h) \geq C \|w_h\|_{X_h}'^2$. Those inequalities imply (11).

At this stage, let $w_h \in X_h$ be arbitrary. Using (31), (40) and (41), we have

$$
\| u - u_h \|_{X_h} \leq C \inf_{w_h \in X_h} \| u - w_h \|_{X}
$$

in the similar way as that used for the proof of Theorem 11. This, together with the standard Lagrange interpolation error estimates, implies (39a) and (39b). The estimate (39c) is not new; see [11] Theorem 6.14, Remark 6.15] for example.

Summing up those lemmas, we obtain the following theorem as the final result of this paper. Let

$$
\|v\|_{Z_0} = \begin{cases} 
\| \partial_t v \|_{L^2(J; H^{-1})} + \| v \|_{L^2(J; H^0)} & (q = 0) \\
\| v \|_{L^2(J; H^1')} & (q \geq 1),
\end{cases}
$$

$$
\|v\|_{Z_1} = \| \partial_t^{q+1} v \|_{L^2(J; H^{-1})} + \| \partial_t^q v \|_{L^2(J; H^1')} + | \partial_t v|_{L^2(J; H^k)} + |v|_{L^2(J; H^{k+1})},
$$

$$
\|v\|_{Z_2} = \| \partial_t^{q+1} v \|_{Z_0} + | \partial_t v|_{L^2(J; H^k)} + |v|_{L^2(J; H^{k+1})},
$$

$$
\|v\|_{Z_3} = \| \partial_t^{q+1} v \|_{Z_0} + | \partial_t v|_{L^2(J; H^{k+1})} + |v|_{L^\infty(J; H^{k+1})}
$$

for a sufficiently regular function $v$.

Theorem IV. Letting $k \geq 1$ and $q \geq 0$ be integers and letting $u \in X$ and $u_{h, \tau} \in S_{h, \tau}$ be the respective solutions of (31) and (35), we assume that $u$ is sufficiently regular that $\|u\|_{Z_j} < \infty$, for
Then, there exist positive constants \( c_4, \ldots, c_7 \) depending only on \( \Omega, k, \) and \( q \) such that

\[
\left( \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \| \partial_t u - \partial_t u_{h,\tau} \|^2_{L^2(J_n;X_h')} \right)^{1/2} \leq c_4(h^k + \tau^q) \| u \|_{Z_1},
\]

\[
\| u - u_{h,\tau} \|_{L^2(J;H^1_0)} \leq c_5(h^k + \tau^{q+1}) \| u \|_{Z_2},
\]

\[
\sup_{1 \leq n \leq N} \| u(t_n) - u_{h,\tau}(t_n) \| \leq c_6(h^{k+1} + \tau^{q+1}) \| u \|_{Z_3},
\]

\[
\left( \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} \| u(t_n) - u_{h,\tau} \|^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq c_7 \tau^{q+1} \| \partial_t^{q+1} u \|_{Z_0}.
\]

**Remark 4.5.** If the \( L^2 \) projection \( P_h \) is \( H^1_0 \) stable, that is, there exists a constant \( c_* > 0 \) which is independent of \( h \) such that

\[
\| P_h v_h \|_{H^1_0} \leq c_* \| v_h \|_{H^1_0} \quad (v_h \in X_h),
\]

the right-hand sides of (39a) and (39b) can be replaced by

\[
Ch^k \left( |\partial_t u|_{L^2(J;H^{k-1})} + |u|_{L^2(J;H^{k+1})} \right).
\]

In fact, if this is the case, we can apply \( P_h \) instead of the Lagrange interpolation and use \( \| v - P_h v \|_{H^{1-1}} \leq Ch^k |v|_{H^{k+1}} \) and \( \| v - P_h v \|_{H^0} \leq Ch^k |v|_{H^{k+1}} \); the first inequality is described in [4 (2.2)], [2 Theorem 4.1.1], and the second one is a consequence of the standard error estimate for the Lagrange interpolation together with [13]. Moreover, the first estimate in Theorem [IV] is improved as

\[
\left( \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \| \partial_t u - \partial_t u_{h,\tau} \|^2_{L^2(J_n;H^{-1})} \right)^{1/2} \leq c'_5(h^k + \tau^q) \| u \|_{Z_4},
\]

where \( \| \cdot \|_{Z_4} \) is an obvious modification of \( \| \cdot \|_{Z_1} \). In fact, dividing \( u - u_{h,\tau} \) into \( (u - P_h u) + (P_h u - u_{h,\tau}) \) and applying \( \| v_h \|_{H^{-1}} \leq c_*^{-1} \| v_h \|_{X_h'} \) for \( v_h \in X_h \) (see [10 Proposition 2.5]), we deduce

\[
\left( \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \| \partial_t u - \partial_t u_{h,\tau} \|^2_{L^2(J_n;H^{-1})} \right)^{1/2} \leq \left( \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \| \partial_t u - P_h \partial_t u \|^2_{L^2(J_n;H^{-1})} \right)^{1/2} + \frac{1}{c_*} \left( \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \| \partial_t u - \partial_t u_{h,\tau} \|^2_{L^2(J_n;X_h')} \right)^{1/2}.
\]

It is noteworthy that (43) actually holds if \( \{T_h\}_h \) is quasi-uniform.

**A. Proof of Lemma 4.3**

This appendix is devoted to the proof of Lemma 4.3. We let \( X_h^0 \) be the completion of \( C_0^\infty(J;X_h) \) by the norm \( \| v \|_{X_h} \). It is noteworthy that we have \( v_h(0) = v_h(T) = 0 \) for \( v_h \in X_h^0 \) according to the trace inequality [11]. Moreover, set

\[
B^*(w, v) = \int_J \left[ \langle w, -\partial_t v \rangle + \langle \nabla w, \nabla v \rangle \right] \, dt
\]

We need the following lemma.
Lemma A.1. 

\[ \exists \beta^* > 0, \quad \inf_{w_h \in \mathcal{Y}_h} \sup_{v_h \in X_h^0} \frac{B^*(w_h, v_h)}{\|w_h\|_{\mathcal{Y}_h} \|v_h\|_{X_h}} = \beta^*, \]  

(44)

Proof. The direct proof of (44) is apparently so difficult that we take a detour. We will show

\[ \exists \beta^* > 0, \quad \inf_{v_h \in X_h^0} \sup_{w_h \in \mathcal{Y}_h} \frac{B^*(w_h, v_h)}{\|w_h\|_{\mathcal{Y}_h} \|v_h\|_{X_h}} = \beta^*, \]  

(45a)

\[ v_h \in X_h^0, \quad (\forall w_h \in \mathcal{Y}_h, \quad B^*(w_h, v_h) = 0) \implies (v_h = 0). \]  

(45b)

Then, the general theory engenders (44); recall the equivalence [5] and [6] described in the Introduction.

Letting \( v_h \in X_h^0 \) and setting \( w_h = -A_h^{-1} \partial_t v_h + v_h \), then we calculate by [42]

\[ B^*(w_h, v_h) \geq \int_J \left( \|\partial_t v_h\|_{X_h^0}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|v_h\|^2 - \|\partial_t v_h\|_{X_h^0} \|v_h\|_{H_0^1} + \|v\|_{L^2(J; H_0^1)}^2 \right) \, dt \]

\[ \geq \frac{1}{2} \|v_h\|_{X_h^0}^2. \]

Combining this with \( \|w_h\|_{\mathcal{Y}_h} \leq C \|v_h\|_{X_h^0} \), we deduce (45a).

Letting \( v_t \in \mathcal{Y}_h \), we prove (45b). Substituting \( w_h = v_h \in \mathcal{Y}_h \) for \( B^*(w_h, v_h) = 0 \), we have

\[ 0 = -\frac{1}{2} \int_J \|v_h\|^2 \, dt + \|v\|_{L^2(J; H_0^1)}^2 = \|v\|_{L^2(J; H_0^1)}^2, \]

which gives \( v_h = 0 \). \qed

Now we can state the following proof.

Proof of Lemma 4.3. Let \( u \) and \( u_h \) be, respectively, the solutions of (31) and (35). Moreover, suppose that we are given \( q \geq 0 \). Assuming \( \partial_t^q u \in \mathcal{Y}_h \) and \( \partial_t^q u_h \in \mathcal{Y}_h \), we first prove (38b). Substituting \( v_h = ((-1)^q \partial_t^q u_{1h}, 0) \) with \( v_{1h} \in C_0^\infty(J; X_h) \) for (40), we have by the integration by parts

\[ B^*(\partial_t^q u - \partial_t^q u_h, v_{1h}) = 0. \]  

(46)

This identity holds for \( v_{1h} \in X_h^0 \). We now apply (44) and (45) to obtain

\[ \|\partial_t^q u_h\|_{\mathcal{Y}_h} \leq \frac{1}{\beta^*} \sup_{v_{1h} \in X_h^0} \frac{B^*(\partial_t^q u_h, v_{1h})}{\|v_{1h}\|_{X_h}} = \frac{1}{\beta^*} \sup_{v_{1h} \in X_h^0} \frac{B^*(\partial_t^q u, v_{1h})}{\|v_{1h}\|_{X_h}} \leq C \|\partial_t^q u\|_{\mathcal{Y}_h}, \]

which implies (38b).

We proceed to the proof of (38a). Assume that \( \partial_t^q u \in \mathcal{X} \) and \( \partial_t^q u_h \in X_h \). In exactly the same way for deriving (46), we have

\[ \int_J \left[ (\partial_t^q (\partial_t^q u - \partial_t^q u_h), v_{1h}) + (\nabla (\partial_t^q u - \partial_t^q u_h), \nabla v_{1h}) \right] \, dt = 0. \]

By the density, the identity holds for \( v_{1h} \in \mathcal{Y}_h \). (It is noteworthy that \( C_0^\infty(J; X_h) \) is dense in \( \mathcal{Y}_h \).) Therefore,

\[ \|\partial_t^{q+1} u_h\|_{L^2(J; X_h')} \leq \|\partial_t^{q+1} u\|_{L^2(J; X_h')} + \|\partial_t^q u\|_{L^2(J; H_0^1)} + \|\partial_t^q u_h\|_{L^2(J; H_0^1)}. \]

This, together with (34) and (38b), implies the desired (38a). \qed
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