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YUWEN LI †, LUDMIL T. ZIKATANOV‡
Department of Mathematics, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802, USA

[Received on 31 August 2020]

We present residual-based a posteriori error estimates of mixed finite element methods for the three-field formulation of Biot’s consolidation model. The error estimator is an upper and lower bound of the space time discretization error up to data oscillation. As a by-product, we also obtain new a posteriori error estimate of mixed finite element methods for the heat equation.
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1. Introduction

The mathematical modeling of poro-elastic materials is aimed at describing the interactions between the deformation and fluid flow in a fluid-saturated porous medium. In this paper we provide a posteriori error estimators for the fully discrete, time dependent Biot’s consolidation model for poroelastic media. A pioneering model of poroelasticity in one-dimensional setting was given in Terzaghi (1943). Nowadays, the popular formulations are in three-dimensions and they follow the model by Maurice Biot in several works, e.g., Biot (1941, 1955). The system of partial differential equations describing the Biot’s consolidation model has a great deal of applications in geomechanics, petroleum engineering, and biomechanics.

The two-field formulation of Biot’s consolidation model is classical and has been investigated in e.g., Ženíšek (1984); Showalter (2000); Murad et al. (1996); Ern & Meunier (2009). Three-field formulations, which include an unknown Darcy velocity, several conforming and non-conforming discretizations involving Stokes-stable finite-element spaces have been recently proposed as a viable approach for discretization of the Biot’s model. Various three field formulations were considered in Phillips & Wheeler (2007a,b) with and a priori error estimates are presented in such a work. Recenly, three-field formulation using Stokes stable elements, based on displacement, pressure, and total pressure was proposed and analysed in Oyarzúa & Ruiz-Baier (2016). A nonconforming discretization, which also provides element-wise mass conservation, is found in Hu et al. (2017). Parameter robust analysis using three field discontinuous Galerkin formulation is given in Hong & Kraus (2018), where a general theory for the a priori error analysis was introduced. Other stable discretizations and solvers are presented in e.g., Lee (2016); Lee et al. (2017); Rodrigo et al. (2018). Readers are referred to Lee (2016) for parameter robust error analysis for four- and five-field formulations. Finite volume and finite difference discretizations have also been used in this field and we point to Gaspar et al. (2003, 2006); Nordbotten (2016) for more results and references on such methods for Biot’s system. We note that our further considerations are restricted to the finite element method and we will not discuss finite difference and
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finite volume methods here.

There are a few works on a posteriori error control for the fully discretized time-dependent problem, see, e.g., Eriksson & Johnson (1991, 1995); Picasso (1998); Verfürth (2003); Makridakis & Nochetto (2003); Lakiss & Makridakis (2006); Ern & Vohralík (2015); Ern et al. (2019) for a posteriori error estimates of the primal formulation of the heat equation. A posteriori error estimation of the mixed formulation of the heat equation can be found in e.g., Cascón et al. (2006); Ern & Vohralík (2010); Larson & Målqvist (2011); Memon et al. (2012); Kim et al. (2018). For the classical two-field formulation in Biot’s consolidation model, residual, equilibrated, and functional error estimators are derived in Ern & Meunier (2009); Riedelbeck et al. (2017); Kumar et al. (2018). In addition, equilibrated error estimators are developed in Ahmed et al. (2019, 2020) for the four- and five-field formulations and the fixed stress splitting scheme. Comparing to the equilibrated error indicators, residual error estimators are simpler to implement and do not require solving auxiliary problems on local patches. Several space-time adaptive algorithms based on residual error estimators are proven to be convergent, see, e.g., Chen & Feng (2004); Kreuzer et al. (2012); Gaspoz et al. (2019).

A main result in our paper is the construction of the reliable residual-based a posteriori error estimator for the three field Biot’s system. To the best of our knowledge, there are no such error estimators for the mixed formulations of the Biot’s model using more than two fields. Formulations using more than two fields have conservation properties which makes them practically interesting, however, their analysis is more challenging. In this paper, we derive residual a posteriori error estimates for the three-field formulation and prove that the estimator is reliable, that is, it provides an upper bound of the space-time error in the natural variational norm. Since the three-field formulation directly approximates the flux $w \in H(\text{div}, \Omega)$, special attention must be paid to energy estimates and the residual in the dual space $H(\text{div}, \Omega)^\prime$, which is a major obstacle in the construction of such error estimators. The analysis presented here with the help of regular decomposition and commuting quasi-interpolations, however, successfully tackles such problems, see Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 for details.

Another main result of this paper is the lower bound in Theorem 5.1. As far as we know, existing residual, equilibrated, and functional error estimators in Biot’s consolidation model are not shown to be lower bounds of the space-time discretization error. This is partly due to the complexity of the Biot’s model equations. Motivated by Verfürth’s technique introduced in Verfürth (2003), we split the residual and estimator into space and time parts. The temporal estimator can be controlled by the spatial estimator and discretization error, while the spatial estimator is in turn controlled by the finite element error and a small portion of the temporal estimator, where the “smallness” is due to a weight function in time. The details are given later in Section 5.

Since the three-field formulation of Biot’s consolidation model (2.2) contains the mixed formulation of the heat equation (2.3), we review existing a posteriori error estimates of mixed methods for the heat equation. Using a duality argument, Cascón et al. (2006) first obtained $L^2(0,T;H(\text{div}, \Omega)^\prime)$ a posteriori estimates of the flux variable and $L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega))$ estimates of the potential in mixed methods for the heat equation. Using the idea of elliptic reconstruction proposed by Makridakis & Nochetto (2003), the works Larson & Målqvist (2011); Memon et al. (2012) presented $L^2(0,T;L^2(\Omega))$- and $L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega))$-type a posteriori error estimates of the flux variable in mixed methods for the heat equation. However, there is no proof that the estimators proposed in Cascón et al. (2006); Larson & Målqvist (2011); Memon et al. (2012) provide lower bounds of the discretization error. On the other hand, Ern & Vohralík (2010) presented an equilibrated estimator with a lower bound for the error in post-processed potential based on the $L^2(0,T;H^1(\Omega)) \cap H^1(0,T;H^{-1}(\Omega))$-norm. Their estimator does not control the error in the flux variable. Comparing to the aforementioned error estimators, a posteriori analysis in this paper indeed yields a new estimator for the mixed discretization of the heat equation that is both an upper and lower
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bound of the space time error in the natural norm, see Section 5 for details.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we present preliminaries and derive energy estimate for the three field formulation of Biot’s consolidation model. Section 3 is devoted to a posteriori error estimates of a semi-discrete scheme (3.1). In Section 4, we develop a posteriori error estimator of the fully discrete scheme (4.1) and prove its reliability. In Section 5, we show that the error estimators are lower bounds of the space-time error and present a posteriori estimates of mixed methods for the heat equation. In Section 6, we present numerical experiments validating our theoretical results. Section 7 is for concluding remarks.

2. Preliminaries and Energy estimates

Given a $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued function $u$, the symmetric gradient $\mathbf{e}$ and stress tensor $\mathbf{\sigma}$ are

$$
\mathbf{e}(u) := \frac{1}{2} (\nabla u + (\nabla u)^T), \quad \mathbf{\sigma}(u) := 2\mu \mathbf{e}(u) + \lambda (\text{div } u) \mathbf{I},
$$

where $\mu > 0, \lambda > 0$ are Lamé coefficients, $\mathbf{I}$ is the $d \times d$ identity matrix. Let $\Omega$ be a Lipschitz domain in $\mathbb{R}^d$ and $T > 0$ be the final time. The three-field formulation of the Biot’s consolidation model reads

$$
\begin{align}
-\text{div } \mathbf{\sigma}(u) + \alpha \nabla p &= f \text{ in } \Omega \times (0,T], \\
\partial_t (\beta p + \alpha \text{div } u) + \text{div } w &= g \text{ in } \Omega \times (0,T], \\
K^{-1}w + \nabla p &= 0 \text{ in } \Omega \times (0,T],
\end{align}
$$

subject to the initial condition $u(0) = u_0, p(0) = p_0$ in $\Omega$. For the simplicity of presentation, we consider homogeneous boundary conditions

$$
\begin{align}
\mathbf{u} &= 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_1 \times (0,T], \quad \mathbf{\sigma}(u) \mathbf{n} = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_2 \times (0,T], \\
p &= 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_2 \times (0,T], \quad (K \nabla p) \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_1 \times (0,T],
\end{align}
$$

where $\partial \Omega = \Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2$, $\Gamma_1 \cap \Gamma_2 = \emptyset$, and $\mathbf{n}$ denotes the outward unit normal to $\partial \Omega$. Note that the Neumann boundary condition for $p$ on $\Gamma_1$ imposes an essential boundary condition for $w$ on $\Gamma_1$. In addition, we assume $\alpha, \beta$ are constants and $K = K(x)$ is a time-independent and uniformly elliptic matrix-valued function, i.e.,

$$
C_1||\xi||^2 \leq \xi^T K(x) \xi \leq C_2||\xi||^2 \text{ for all } \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d \text{ and } x \in \Omega,
$$

where $C_1, C_2$ are positive constants. We introduce function spaces where we seek a weak solution to the system given in (2.1):

$$
\begin{align}
\mathbf{V} &= \{ \mathbf{v} \in [H^1(\Omega)]^d : \mathbf{v} = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_1 \}, \quad \mathbf{Q} = L^2(\Omega), \\
\mathbf{W} &= \{ \mathbf{w} \in [L^2(\Omega)]^d : \text{div } \mathbf{w} \in L^2(\Omega), \mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_1 \}.
\end{align}
$$

Let $(\cdot, \cdot)$ denote the $L^2(\Omega)$ inner product for scalar-, vector-, or matrix-valued functions. Next, we introduce several bilinear forms:

$$
\begin{align}
a(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) := (\mathbf{\sigma}(\mathbf{u}), \mathbf{e}(\mathbf{v})), \quad b(\mathbf{v}, q) := (\alpha \text{div } \mathbf{v}, p), \\
c(p, q) := (\beta p, q), \quad d(z, q) := (\text{div } z, q), \quad e(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z}) := (K^{-1} \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z}).
\end{align}
$$
The norms associated with the bilinear forms given above are

\[ \|v\|_a^2 := a(v, v), \quad \|q\|_c^2 := c(q, q), \]
\[ \|z\|_e^2 := e(z, z), \quad \|z\|_w := \|z\|_e + \|\text{div} z\|, \]

where \( \| \cdot \| \) denotes the \( L^2(\Omega) \) norm. For the spaces defined earlier we have the following correspondence with the norms: \( V \) is equipped with the \( \| \cdot \|_a \)-norm, \( Q \) is equipped with \( \| \cdot \|_c \)-norm, and \( W \) is equipped with the \( W \)-norm. Because we are dealing with a time-dependent problem, we need the spaces of Hilbert-valued functions as follows: Given a Hilbert space \( H \), we define

\[ L^\infty(0, T; H) = \{ v : v(t) \in H \text{ for } t \in T, \text{ ess sup}_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|v(t)\|_H < \infty \}, \]
\[ L^2(0, T; H) = \{ v : v(t) \in H \text{ for } t \in T, \int_0^T \|v(t)\|_H^2 dt < \infty \}, \]
\[ H^1(0, T; H) = \{ v \in L^2(0, T; H) : \partial_t v \in L^2(0, T; H) \}, \]

see, e.g., Evans (2010) for more details. The variational formulation of (2.1) then is to find \( u \in H^1(0, T; V) \), \( p \in H^1(0, T; Q) \), and \( w \in L^2(0, T; W) \) such that \( u(0) = u_0 \), \( p(0) = p_0 \) and

\[ a(u, v) - b(v, p) = (f, v), \quad \text{(2.2a)} \]
\[ c(\partial_t p, q) + b(\partial_t u, q) + d(w, q) = (g, q), \quad \text{(2.2b)} \]
\[ e(w, z) - d(z, p) = 0 \quad \text{(2.2c)} \]

for all \( v \in V, q \in Q \), and \( z \in W \) a.e. \( t \in (0, T] \). It can be observed that (2.2) with \( u = v = 0 \) reduces to the mixed formulation of the heat equation or time-dependent Darcy flow:

\[ c(\partial_t p, q) + d(w, q) = (g, q), \quad q \in Q, \quad \text{(2.3a)} \]
\[ e(w, z) - d(z, p) = 0, \quad z \in W. \quad \text{(2.3b)} \]

In the rest of this section, we establish an energy estimate of (2.2) which is the main tool for deriving a posteriori error estimates. The well-posedness of two-field formulation can be found in e.g., Ženíšek (1984); Showalter (2000). For the three-field formulation we have the following result.

**Theorem 2.1** Let \( u_0 \in V, p_0 \in Q, f \in H^1(0, T; V') \), and \( g \in L^2(0, T; Q) \). Then the variational formulation (2.2) admits a unique weak solution

\[ (u, p, w) \in H^1(0, T; V) \times H^1(0, T; Q) \times L^2(0, T; W). \]

We skip the proof of Theorem 2.1 as it directly follows from the energy estimates in Lemma 2.1 and a standard argument using a Galerkin method in space, in the same fashion as for the linear parabolic equation (see, e.g., Evans (2010)). For the purpose of a posteriori error estimation, we consider a more general variational problem: Find \( \tilde{u} \in H^1(0, T; V) \), \( \tilde{p} \in H^1(0, T; Q) \), \( \tilde{w} \in L^2(0, T; W) \), such that

\[ a(\tilde{u}, v) - b(v, \tilde{p}) = (F_1, v), \quad v \in V, \quad \text{(2.4a)} \]
\[ c(\partial_t \tilde{p}, q) + b(\partial_t \tilde{u}, q) + d(\tilde{w}, q) = (F_2, q), \quad q \in Q, \quad \text{(2.4b)} \]
\[ e(\tilde{w}, z) - d(z, \tilde{p}) = (F_3, z), \quad z \in W, \quad \text{(2.4c)} \]
where $F_1 \in H^1(0,T;V')$, $F_2 \in L^2(0,T;Q')$, $F_3 \in H^1(0,T;W')$ are time-dependent bounded linear functionals living in dual spaces. At each time $t \in [0,T]$, the dual norms are given by

$$
\|F_1\|_t = \|F_1\|_{V'} := \sup_{v \in V \ | \ |v|_a = 1} \langle F_1, v \rangle,
$$

$$
\|F_2\|_t = \|F_2\|_{Q'} := \sup_{q \in Q \ | \ |q|_c = 1} \langle F_2, q \rangle,
$$

$$
\|F_3\|_t = \|F_3\|_{W'} := \sup_{z \in W \ | \ |z|_w = 1} \langle F_3, z \rangle.
$$

Norms of $\partial_t F_1 \in V'$ and $\partial_t F_3 \in W'$ are defined in a similar fashion. Given $t \in [0,T]$ and an interval $I \subseteq [0,T]$, we make use of the norms

$$
\|\langle \tilde{u}, \tilde{p}, \tilde{w} \rangle(t) \|_I^2 := \|\tilde{u}(t)\|_a^2 + \|\tilde{p}(t)\|_c^2 + \|\tilde{w}(t)\|_w^2,
$$

$$
\|\langle \tilde{u}, \tilde{p}, \tilde{w} \rangle\|_{L^2(I;X)}^2 := \int_I (\|\tilde{u}\|_a^2 + \|\tilde{p}\|_c^2 + \|\tilde{w}\|_w^2) \ d s.
$$

The following energy estimate is crucial to a posteriori error estimation of numerical methods for (2.2).

**Lemma 2.1** There exists a constant $C_{\text{stab}}$ dependent only on $\mu$, $\alpha$, $\beta$, $K$, $\Omega$ such that for all $t \in (0,T]$,

$$
\|\langle \tilde{u}, \tilde{p}, \tilde{w} \rangle(t) \|_I^2 + \|\langle \tilde{u}, \tilde{p}, \tilde{w} \rangle\|_{L^2(I;X)}^2 \leq C_{\text{stab}} \left\{ \|\langle \tilde{u}, \tilde{p}, \tilde{w} \rangle(0) \|_I^2 \right. \\
+ \left. \left( \int_0^t \|F_2\|_s \ ds \right)^2 + \int_0^t \left( \|F_1\|_t^2 + \|\partial_t F_1\|_t^2 + \|F_2\|_t^2 + \|F_3\|_t^2 + \|\partial_t F_3\|_t^2 \right) \ ds \right\}.
$$

**Proof.** Setting $v = \partial_t \tilde{u}$, $z = \tilde{w}$, $q = \tilde{p}$ in (2.4) yields

$$
\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{d t} \|\tilde{u}\|_a^2 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{d t} \|\tilde{p}\|_c^2 + \|\tilde{w}\|_w^2 = \langle F_1, \partial_t \tilde{u} \rangle + \langle F_2, \tilde{p} \rangle + \langle F_3, \tilde{w} \rangle. \quad (2.5)
$$

On the other hand, differentiating (2.4a) and (2.4c) with respect to time $t$ gives

$$
a(\partial_t \tilde{u}, v) - b(v, \partial_t \tilde{p}) = \langle \partial_t F_1, v \rangle,
$$

$$
e(\partial_t \tilde{w}, z) - d(z, \partial_t \tilde{p}) = \langle \partial_t F_3, z \rangle.
$$

Taking as test functions $v = \partial_t \tilde{u}$ and $z = \tilde{w}$ in the equations above and using (2.4b) with $q = \partial_t \tilde{p}$ then leads to

$$
\|\partial_t \tilde{u}\|_a^2 + \|\partial_t \tilde{p}\|_c^2 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{d t} \|\tilde{w}\|_w^2 = \langle \partial_t F_1, \partial_t \tilde{u} \rangle + \langle F_2, \partial_t \tilde{p} \rangle + \langle \partial_t F_3, \tilde{w} \rangle. \quad (2.6)
$$

Using (2.5), (2.6), the Cauchy–Schwarz and Young’s inequalities, we obtain

$$
\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{d t} \|\tilde{u}\|_a^2 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{d t} \|\tilde{p}\|_c^2 + \|\tilde{w}\|_w^2 \leq G + \|F_2\|_t \|\tilde{p}\|_c + \|F_3\|_t \|\tilde{w}\|_w^2,
$$

where $\delta > 0$ and

$$
G = \|F_1\|_t^2 + \|\partial_t F_1\|_t^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|F_2\|_t^2 + \frac{\delta^{-1}}{2} \|F_3\|_t^2 + \frac{\delta^{-1}}{2} \|\partial_t F_3\|_t^2.
$$
Integrating the previous inequality yields

\[
\frac{1}{2} \| (\hat{u}, \hat{\rho}, \hat{\omega})(t) \|^2 + \int_0^t \left( \frac{1}{2} \| \partial_t \hat{u} \|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \| \partial_t \hat{\rho} \|^2 + \| (1 - \delta) \| \hat{\omega} \|^2 \right) ds \\
\leq \frac{1}{2} \| (\hat{u}, \hat{\rho}, \hat{\omega})(0) \|^2 + \int_0^t \left( G + \| F_2 \|_c + \delta \| \text{div} \hat{\omega} \|^2 \right) ds.
\]  

(2.7)

Recall that \( \| \hat{\rho} \|_{L^\infty(0,t;L^\infty)} := \max_{0 \leq s \leq t} \| \hat{\rho}(s) \|_c \). In particular, (2.7) implies that

\[
\frac{1}{2} \| \hat{\rho}(s) \|^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \| (\hat{u}, \hat{\rho}, \hat{\omega})(0) \|^2 \\
+ \int_0^s \left( G + \delta \| \text{div} \hat{\omega} \|^2 \right) ds + \| \hat{\rho} \|_{L^\infty(0,t;L^\infty)} \int_0^t \| F_2 \| ds
\]

for all 0 \( \leq s \leq t \). Hence a combination of the previous estimate with

\[
\| \hat{\rho} \|_{L^\infty(0,t;L^\infty)} \int_0^t \| F_2 \| ds \leq \frac{1}{4} \| \hat{\rho} \|^2_{L^\infty(0,t;L^\infty)} + \left( \int_0^t \| F_2 \| ds \right)^2
\]

shows that

\[
\frac{1}{4} \| \hat{\rho} \|^2_{L^\infty(0,t;L^\infty)} \leq \frac{1}{2} \| (\hat{u}, \hat{\rho}, \hat{\omega})(0) \|^2 \\
+ \int_0^t \left( G + \delta \| \text{div} \hat{\omega} \|^2 \right) ds + \left( \int_0^t \| F_2 \| ds \right)^2.
\]  

(2.8)

Using (2.7) and (2.8) and a Young’s inequality, we obtain

\[
\frac{1}{2} \| (\hat{u}, \hat{\rho}, \hat{\omega})(t) \|^2 + \int_0^t \left( \frac{1}{2} \| \partial_t \hat{u} \|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \| \partial_t \hat{\rho} \|^2 + (1 - \delta) \| \hat{\omega} \|^2 \right) ds \\
\leq \| (\hat{u}, \hat{\rho}, \hat{\omega})(0) \|^2 + 2 \int_0^t \left( G + \delta \| \text{div} \hat{\omega} \|^2 \right) ds + 2 \left( \int_0^t \| F_2 \| ds \right)^2.
\]  

(2.9)

Let C be a generic constant dependent only on \( \alpha, \beta, \mu, \Omega \). It follows from (2.4b) with \( q = \text{div} \hat{\omega} \) that

\[
\| \text{div} \hat{\omega} \|^2 \leq C \left( \| F_2 \|^2 + \| \partial_\tau \hat{\rho} \|^2 + \| \partial_\tau \hat{u} \|^2 \right).
\]  

(2.10)

Taking the derivative with respect to time on both sides of (2.4c) shows that

\[
\| \partial_t \hat{\omega} \|_{\mathcal{W}'} \leq C \left( \| \partial_\tau F_3 \|_c + \| \partial_\tau \hat{\rho} \|_c \right).
\]  

(2.11)

The inf-sup condition for \( d(\cdot, \cdot) \) together with (2.4c) and (2.4a) then imply the following inequality:

\[
\| \hat{\rho} \|_c + \| \hat{u} \|_a \leq C \left( \| F_1 \|_c, \| F_3 \|_c, \| \hat{\omega} \|_c \right).
\]  

(2.12)

Choosing a sufficiently small \( \delta > 0 \) and combining (2.9) and (2.10)–(2.12) completes the proof of the lemma. \( \square \)
3. Error estimator for the semi-discrete problem

Let \( \mathcal{T}_h \) be a conforming simplicial triangulation of \( \Omega \) that is aligned with \( \Gamma_1 \) and \( \Gamma_2 \). The mesh \( \mathcal{T}_h \) is shape-regular in the sense that

\[
\max_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \frac{r_K}{p_K} := C_{\text{shape}} < \infty,
\]

where \( r_K, p_K \) are radii of circumscribed and inscribed spheres of \( K \). Let \( V_h \subset V, W_h \subset W, Q_h \subset Q \) be suitable finite element spaces based on \( \mathcal{T}_h \). In particular, we choose \( V_h \times Q_h \) to be a stable mixed element pair for the Stokes equation, and \( W_h \times Q_h \) to be a stable mixed element pair for the mixed formulation of Poisson’s equation. It has been shown in e.g., Hong & Kraus (2018); Rodrigo et al. (2018) that this choice leads to stable space discretization. For example, \( V_h \times Q_h \) can be chosen to be the \((P_1 + \text{face bubble functions}) \times P_0\) element (see Girault & Raviart (1986)) and \( W_h \times Q_h \) can be the lowest order Raviart–Thomas (see Raviart & Thomas (1977)) or Brezzi–Douglas–Marini element (see Brezzi et al. (1985)). Let \( \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{T}_h) \) denote the collection of faces in \( \mathcal{T}_h \) and \( n_F \) be a unit normal to \( F \) for any face \( F \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{T}_h) \). Let \( \mathcal{P}_k(K) \) denote the space of polynomials of degree no greater than \( k \) on \( K \), and

\[
\begin{align*}
V_{h,l} &= \{ v \in V : v|_K \in [\mathcal{P}_l(K)]^d \text{ for all } K \in \mathcal{T}_h \}, \\
B_h &= \{ v \in V : v|_K \in \text{span}\{\phi_F n_F\}_{F \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{T}_h)} \text{ for all } K \in \mathcal{T}_h \}.
\end{align*}
\]

Here, \( \phi_F \) is the face bubble function supported on union of elements having \( F \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{T}_h) \) as a face, i.e., \( \phi_F = \prod_{j \in F} \lambda_j \) where \( \lambda_j \) is the barycentric coordinate corresponding to the vertex \( z_j \) in the face \( F \). The triple \( V_h \times Q_h \times W_h \) can be chosen as \( V^0 \times Q^0 \times W^0_h \), where

\[
\begin{align*}
V^0_h &= V_{h,l} \oplus B_h, \\
Q^0_h &= \{ q \in L^2(\Omega) : q|_K \in \mathcal{P}_0(K) \text{ for all } K \in \mathcal{T}_h \}, \\
W^0_h &= \{ z \in W : z|_K \in [\mathcal{P}_0(K)]^d + \mathcal{P}_0(K)x \text{ for all } K \in \mathcal{T}_h \}.
\end{align*}
\]

Here \( x = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_d)^T \) is the linear position vector. In general, we assume the inclusion \( W^0_h \subset W_h \).

The semi-discrete version of (2.2) is to find \( u_h \in H^1(0, T; V_h), p_h \in H^1(0, T; Q_h) \), and \( w_h \in L^2(0, T; W_h) \) such that \( u_h(0) = u^0_h, p_h(0) = p^0_h \) and

\[
\begin{align*}
a(u_h, v) - b(v, p_h) &= (f, v), \quad v \in V_h, \quad \text{(3.1a)} \\
c(\partial_t p_h, q) + b(\partial_t u_h, q) + d(w_h, q) &= (g, q), \quad q \in Q_h, \quad \text{(3.1b)} \\
e(w_h, z) - d(z, p_h) &= 0, \quad z \in W_h. \quad \text{(3.1c)}
\end{align*}
\]

Here \( u_h^0 \in V_h, p_h^0 \in Q_h \) are some finite element approximation to \( u_0 \) and \( p_0 \). In this section, we derive a posteriori error estimation for the semi-discrete method (3.1). To this end, let

\[
\begin{align*}
ea &= u - u_h, \quad e_p = p - p_h, \quad e_w = w - w_h. \quad \text{(3.2)}
\end{align*}
\]

It follows from (2.2) that the errors satisfy

\[
\begin{align*}
a(e_u, v) - b(v, e_p) &= \langle r_1, v \rangle, \quad v \in V, \quad \text{(3.3a)} \\
c(\partial_t e_p, q) + b(\partial_t e_u, q) + d(e_w, q) &= \langle r_2, q \rangle, \quad q \in Q, \quad \text{(3.3b)} \\
e(e_w, z) - d(z, e_p) &= \langle r_3, z \rangle, \quad z \in W. \quad \text{(3.3c)}
\end{align*}
\]
where the residuals \( r_1(t) \in V', r_2(t) \in Q', r_3(t) \in W' \) are defined by

\[
\langle r_1, v \rangle := (f, v) - a(u_h, v) + b(v, p_h), \\
\langle r_2, q \rangle := (g, q) - c(\partial_t p_h, q) - b(\partial_t u_h, q) - d(w_h, q), \\
\langle r_3, z \rangle := -e(w_h, z) + d(z, p_h).
\]

With the help of Lemma 2.1, we immediately obtain the following corollary.

**Corollary 3.1** For the errors defined in (3.2) and \( t \in (0, T) \), we have

\[
||| (e_u, e_p, e_w)(t) \|||_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq C_{stab} \{ ||| (e_u, e_p, e_w)(0) \|||_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\
+ \int_0^t \| r_2 \| ds \} + \int_0^t \{ \| r_1 \|_2^2 + \| \partial_t r_1 \|_2^2 + \| r_2 \|_2^2 + \| r_3 \|_2^2 + \| \partial_t r_3 \|_2^2 \} ds \}.
\]

For a \( \mathbb{R}^d \)-valued function \( v = (v_i)_{1 \leq i \leq d} \) and a scalar-valued function \( v \), let

\[
\text{curl} \, v = (\partial_{x_2} v_3 - \partial_{x_3} v_2, \partial_{x_3} v_1 - \partial_{x_1} v_3, \partial_{x_1} v_2 - \partial_{x_2} v_1)^T \\
\text{rot} \, v = \partial_{x_1} v_2 - \partial_{x_2} v_1 \quad \text{when} \quad d = 3,
\]

\[
\text{curl} \, v = (\partial_{x_2} v, -\partial_{x_1} v)^T, \quad \text{rot} \, v = \partial_{x_1} v_2 - \partial_{x_2} v_1 \quad \text{when} \quad d = 2.
\]

Let \( N_0^0 \) denote the lowest order Nédélec edge element space (see Nédélec (1980))

\[
N_0^0 = \{ v \in [L^2(\Omega)]^3 : \text{curl} \, v \in [L^2(\Omega)]^3, \| v \times n \| = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_1, \\
\| v \|_{K} \in [\mathcal{P}_0(K)]^3 + [\mathcal{P}_0(K)]^3 \times x \text{ for all } K \in T_h \},
\]

and \( V_h \) denote the scalar linear element space

\[
V_h = \{ v \in H^1(\Omega) : \| v \|_{K} \in \mathcal{P}_1(K) \text{ for all } K \in T_h, \| v \|_{\Gamma_1} = 0 \}.
\]

For each \( K \in T_h \), let \( h_K = |K|^\frac{1}{2} \) denote the size of \( K \), \( \| \cdot \|_K \) denote the \( L^2 \)-norm on \( K \), and \( \| \cdot \|_{\partial K} \) denote the \( L^2 \)-norm on \( \partial K \). To estimate the norms of \( r_3, \partial_t r_3 \in W' \), we need the following theorem, which is a combination of the \( H^1 \)-regular decomposition (see e.g., Hiptmair (2002); Pasciak & Zhao (2002); Demlow & Hirani (2014)) and bounded quasi-interpolation operators which commute with the exterior differentiation (see Schöberl (2008); Demlow & Hirani (2014)).

**Theorem 3.1** Let \( \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d \) with \( d = 3 \) (resp. \( d = 2 \)). There exist quasi-interpolations \( \Pi_h : [L^2(\Omega)]^3 \rightarrow W_h^0 \) (resp. \( \Pi_h : [L^2(\Omega)]^2 \rightarrow W_h^0 \)), and \( J_h : [L^2(\Omega)]^3 \rightarrow N_h^0 \) (resp. \( J_h : L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow V_h \)) such that \( \Pi_h \text{curl} = \text{curl} J_h \). In addition, for any \( z \in W \), there exist \( \phi \in V \) (resp. \( \phi \in H^1(\Omega) \), \( \phi |_{\Gamma_1} = 0 \) and \( \phi \in V \), such that

\[
z = \text{curl} \, \phi + \phi, \quad \Pi_h z = \text{curl} J_h \phi + \Pi_h \phi,
\]

and

\[
\sum_{K \in T_h} \left( h_K^{-2} \| \phi - J_h \phi \|_K^2 + h_K^{-1} \| \phi - \Pi_h \phi \|_K^2 \\
+ h_K^{-1} \| \phi - J_h \phi \|_{\partial K}^2 + h_K^{-1} \| \phi - \Pi_h \phi \|_{\partial K}^2 \right) \leq C_{\text{reg}} \| z \|_W^2,
\]

where \( C_{\text{reg}} \) depends only on \( K, \Omega, \Gamma_1, \text{shape} \).
Theorem 3.1 or its variants are widely used in the a posteriori error estimation of stationary problems based on $H(\text{div})$ or $H(\text{curl})$, see, e.g., Cascon et al. (2007); Schöberl (2008); Huang & Xu (2012); Demlow & Hirani (2014); Chen & Wu (2017); Li (2019,b); Holst et al. (2020).

Now we are in a position to derive a posteriori error estimator of the system given in (3.1). For each face $F$, let $\mathbf{n}_F$ be a unit normal to $F$ where $\mathbf{n}_F$ is chosen to be outward pointing when $F$ is a boundary face. For each interior $F \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{T}_h)$ shared by $K_1,K_2 \in \mathcal{T}_h$ and a piecewise $H^1$-function $\chi$, let $[\chi]|_F := \langle \chi|_{K_1} - \chi|_{K_2} \rangle |_F$ denote the jump across $F$, where $\mathbf{n}_F$ is pointing from $K_1$ to $K_2$. For any $F \subset \partial \Omega$ that is a boundary face in $\mathcal{T}_h$, we set $[\chi]|_F := 0$ if $F \subset \Gamma_1$, and $[\chi]|_F \equiv \chi|_F$ if $F \subset \Gamma_2$. Regarding the mesh $\mathcal{T}_h$, we use the following error indicators

$$
\delta_{\partial K}^1(u_h, p_h, f) := \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \left\{ h_K^2 \| f + \nabla \sigma(u_h) - \alpha \nabla p_h \|_K^2 \right. \\
+ \left. \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{T}_h), F \subset \partial K} h_K \| [\sigma(u_h)] - \alpha p_h \mathbf{n}_F \|_F^2 \right\},
$$

and when $d = 2$ (for a two dimensional problem)

$$
\delta_{\partial K}^2(p_h, w_h) := \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \left\{ h_K^2 \| \mathbf{K}^{-1} w_h + \nabla p_h \|_K^2 + h_K^2 \| \text{curl}(\mathbf{K}^{-1} w_h) \|_K^2 \right\}
+ \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{T}_h), F \subset \partial K} h_K \| \left[ (\mathbf{K}^{-1} w_h) \times \mathbf{n}_F \right] \|_F^2 + h_K \| [p_h] \|_F^2 \right\}
+ \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{T}_h), F \subset \partial K} h_K \| \left[ (\mathbf{K}^{-1} w_h) \cdot \mathbf{t}_F \right] \|_F^2 + h_K \| [p_h] \|_F^2 \right\}
$$

Another error estimator is

$$
\delta_{\partial K}^3(p_h, w_h) := \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \left\{ h_K^2 \| \mathbf{K}^{-1} w_h + \nabla p_h \|_K^2 + h_K^2 \| \text{curl}(\mathbf{K}^{-1} w_h) \|_K^2 \right\}
+ \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{T}_h), F \subset \partial K} h_K \| \left[ (\mathbf{K}^{-1} w_h) \times \mathbf{n}_F \right] \|_F^2 + h_K \| [p_h] \|_F^2 \right\},
$$

where $\mathbf{t}_F$ is a unit tangent vector to $F$. The next theorem presents a posteriori error estimates of the semi-discrete method (3.1).

**Theorem 3.2** When $d = 2$ or $3$, there exists a constant $C_{\text{rel}}$ dependent only on $\mu$, $\alpha$, $\beta$, $\mathbf{K}$, $\Omega$, $\Gamma_1$ and the shape regularity of $\mathcal{T}_h$, such that

$$
\left\| (e_u, e_p, e_w)(t) \right\|_{L^2(0,t;X)}^2 \leq C_{\text{rel}} \left\{ \left\| (e_u, e_p, e_w)(0) \right\|_{L^2(0,t;X)}^2 
+ \left( \int_0^t \delta_{\partial K}^2(\partial_t u_h, \partial_t p_h, w_h, g) \frac{1}{2} ds \right)^2 + \int_0^t \left\{ \delta_{\partial K}^3(\partial_t u_h, \partial_t p_h, f) + \delta_{\partial K}^3(\partial_t u_h, \partial_t p_h, \partial_t f) \\
+ \delta_{\partial K}^3(\partial_t u_h, \partial_t p_h, w_h, g) + \delta_{\partial K}^3(p_h, w_h) + b_v(p_h, v) \right\} ds \right\}.
$$

**Proof.** We focus on the case $d = 3$ since the proof when $d = 2$ is similar. In the proof, we use $C$ to denote generic constant dependent only on $\mu$, $\alpha$, $\beta$, $\mathbf{K}$, $C_{\text{shape}}$, and $\Omega$, $\Gamma_1$. In view of Corollary 3.1, it remains to estimate the norm of each residual. Let $I_h : V \rightarrow V_h$ denote the Clément interpolation (see Clément (1975); Verfürth (2013)). Thanks to (3.1a), it holds that for each $v \in V$,

$$
\langle r_1, v \rangle = (f, v - I_h v - a(u_h, v - I_h v) + b(v - I_h v) + p_h).
$$

(3.5)
Element-wise integration by parts leads to
\[
\langle r_1, v \rangle = \langle f, v - I_h v \rangle + \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \left\{ - \int_K \sigma(u_h) : \varepsilon(v - I_h v) + \int_K \text{div}(\alpha(v - I_h v)) p_h \right\}
\]
\[
= \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_K (f + \text{div} \sigma(u_h) - \alpha \nabla p_h) \cdot (v - I_h v)
\]
\[
+ \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{T}_h)} \int_F \left[ (-\sigma(u_h) + \alpha p_h n_F) \cdot (v - I_h v) \right].
\]

Combining the previous equation with the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality and shape-regularity of $\mathcal{T}_h$, we obtain
\[
\langle r_1, v \rangle \leq C \delta^{1/2}_{\mathcal{T}_h}(u_h, p_h, f) \left( \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} h_K^2 \|v - I_h v\|^2_K + h_K^{-1} \|v - I_h v\|^2_{\partial K} \right)^{1/2}.
\]

It then follows from (3.6), the well-known approximation result
\[
\sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} h_K^2 \|v - I_h v\|^2_K + h_K^{-1} \|v - I_h v\|^2_{\partial K} \leq C\|v\|^2_{H^1(\Omega)}
\]
and the Korn's inequality (cf. Kondratiev & Oleinik (1989))
\[
|v|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq C\|v\|_{\partial \Omega}, \quad \forall v \in V,
\]
that
\[
\|r_1\| \leq C \delta^{1/2}_{\mathcal{T}_h}(u_h, p_h, f). \tag{3.7}
\]

Similarly (3.5) implies that for each $v \in V$,
\[
\langle \partial r_1, v \rangle = (\partial f, v - I_h v) - a(\partial u_h, v - I_h v) + b(v - I_h v, \partial p_h).
\]

Then the next estimate
\[
\|\partial r_1\| \leq C \delta^{1/2}_{\mathcal{T}_h}(\partial u_h, \partial p_h, \partial f). \tag{3.8}
\]
can be proved in the same way as (3.8). The norm of $r_2$ is trivially estimated by
\[
\|r_2\| \leq C \|g - \beta \partial p_h - \text{div} \partial u_h - \text{div} w_h\|. \tag{3.9}
\]

To estimate $\|r_3\|$, we use (3.1c) to obtain
\[
\langle r_3, z \rangle = -c(w_h, z - \Pi_h z) + d(z - \Pi_h z, p_h). \tag{3.10}
\]

Due to Theorem 3.1, there exists $\varphi \in V$ and $\phi \in V$ such that
\[
z - \Pi_h z = \text{curl}(\varphi - J_h \varphi) + \phi - J_h \phi, \tag{3.11}
\]
where $\varphi$ and $\phi$ satisfy (3.4). Using (3.11), (3.12), and element-wise integration by parts, we arrive at
\[
\langle r_3, z \rangle = -(K^{-1} w_h, \text{curl}(\varphi - J_h \varphi)) - (K^{-1} w_h, \phi - J_h \phi) + (\text{div}(\phi - J_h \phi), p_h)
\]
\[
= \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \left\{ - \int_K \text{curl}(K^{-1} w_h) \cdot (\varphi - J_h \varphi) - \int_K (K^{-1} w_h + \nabla p_h) \cdot (\phi - J_h \phi) \right\}
\]
\[
+ \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{T}_h)} \left\{ \int_F [(K^{-1} w_h) \times n_F] \cdot (\varphi - J_h \varphi) + \int_F [p_h] (\phi - J_h \phi) \cdot n_F \right\}.
\]
It then follows from the previous equation, the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, and (3.4) that
\[ \langle r_3, z \rangle \leq C \delta^3 (p_h, w_h)^{\frac{1}{2}} \| z \|_W. \]  
(3.13)

Similarly, it holds that
\[ \| \partial r_3 \| \leq C \delta^3 (p_h, \partial w_h)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \]  
(3.14)

Combining (3.8)–(3.10), (3.13), (3.14) completes the proof.

\[ \square \]

4. Fully discrete method

Let \( 0 = t_0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_{N-1} < t_N = T \) and \( \tau_n = t_n - t_{n-1} \) for \( n = 1, 2, \ldots, N \). Let \( \mathcal{T}_h^N \) be a conforming simplicial triangulation of \( \Omega \) aligned with \( \Gamma_1 \) and \( \Gamma_2 \). Let \( V_h^n, Q_h^n, W_h^n \) be finite element subspaces of \( V, Q, W \) described in Section 3 based on grid \( \mathcal{T}_h^N \), respectively. We assume that \( \{ \mathcal{T}_h^N \}_{n=0}^N \) is uniformly shape-regular w.r.t. \( n \), that is,
\[ \max_{0 \leq n \leq N} \max_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h^N} \frac{r_K}{\rho_K} := C_{\text{shape}} < \infty. \]

Given a sequence \( \{ \chi^n \}_{n=0}^N \), we define the backward difference as
\[ \delta \chi^n = \frac{\chi^n - \chi^{n-1}}{\tau_n}, \]
and the continuous linear interpolant \( \chi^\tau \) on \([0, T]\) as
\[ \chi^\tau(t) = \frac{t-t_{n-1}}{\tau_n} \chi^n + \frac{t_n-t}{\tau_n} \chi^{n-1}, \quad t \in [t_{n-1}, t_n]. \]

Notice that \( \partial \chi^\tau = \delta \chi^n \) over \([t_{n-1}, t_n]\). Let \( u_h^0, p_h^0, w_h^0 \) be suitable approximation to \( u(0), p(0), w(0) \), and \( f^n = f(t_n), g^n = g(t_n) \). The fully discrete scheme for (2.2) is to find \( u^n_h \in V_h^n, p^n_h \in Q_h^n, w^n_h \in W_h^n \) with \( n = 1, 2, \ldots, N \), such that
\[ a(u^n_h, v) - b(v, p^n_h) = (f^n, v), \quad v \in V_h^n, \]  
(4.1a)

\[ c(\delta p^n_h, q) + b(\delta u^n_h, q) + d(w^n_h, q) = (g^n, q), \quad q \in Q_h^n, \]  
(4.1b)

\[ e(w^n_h, z) - d(z, p^n_h) = 0, \quad z \in W_h^n. \]  
(4.1c)

Here, (4.1) is derived using the implicit Euler discretization in time. To apply Lemma 2.1, let \( u_h^\tau(t), p_h^\tau(t), w_h^\tau(t) \) be the continuous linear interpolants of \( u^n_h, p^n_h, w^n_h \) defined above, respectively. Let
\[ E_u = u - u_h^\tau, \quad E_p = p - p_h^\tau, \quad E_w = w - w_h^\tau. \]  
(4.2)

Rewriting (2.2) gives the following the error equation
\[ a(E_u, v) - b(v, E_p) = (R_1, v), \quad v \in V, \]  
(4.3)

\[ c(\partial E_p, q) + b(\partial E_u, q) + d(E_w, q) = (R_2, q), \quad q \in Q, \]  
(4.3)

\[ e(E_w, z) - d(z, E_p) = (R_3, z), \quad z \in W, \]

where residuals \( R_1(t) \in V', R_2(t) \in Q', R_3(t) \in W' \) for each \( t \in [0, T] \) are
\[ \langle R_1, v \rangle := (f, v) - a(u_h^\tau, v) + b(v, p_h^\tau), \]  
(4.4)

\[ \langle R_2, q \rangle := (g, q) - c(\delta p_h^\tau, q) - b(\delta u_h^\tau, q) - d(w_h^\tau, q), \]  
(4.4)

\[ \langle R_3, z \rangle := -e(w_h^\tau, z) + d(z, p_h^\tau). \]  
(4.4)
Similarly to the error analysis of the semi-discrete problem, it suffices to analyze the dual norm of the residuals, defined in (4.4). However, the mesh used in the fully discrete scheme is allowed to change at different time levels and we introduce several useful operations in the following. Given two triangulations $\mathcal{T}_h$ and $\mathcal{T}_{h2}$ of $\Omega$, let $\mathcal{T}_h \vee \mathcal{T}_{h2}$ denote the minimal common refinement, i.e., $\mathcal{T}_h \vee \mathcal{T}_{h2}$ is the coarsest conforming triangulation that is a refinement of both $\mathcal{T}_h$ and $\mathcal{T}_{h2}$. Similarly, let $\mathcal{T}_h \wedge \mathcal{T}_{h2}$ denote the maximal common coarsening, i.e., $\mathcal{T}_h \wedge \mathcal{T}_{h2}$ is the finest conforming triangulation that is a coarsening of both $\mathcal{T}_h$ and $\mathcal{T}_{h2}$. The operations $\wedge$ and $\vee$ on triangulations are widely used in adaptivity literature, see, e.g., Cascon et al. (2008); Diening et al. (2016).

To handle simultaneously $(\mathbf{u}_h^n, p_h^n, w_h^n)$ and $(\mathbf{u}_h^{n-1}, p_h^{n-1}, w_h^{n-1})$, we assume that for $1 \leq n \leq N$ and consecutive meshes $\mathcal{T}_h^n$ and $\mathcal{T}_{h}^{n-1}$, the maximal common coarsening $\mathcal{T}_h^n \wedge \mathcal{T}_{h}^{n-1}$ and the minimal common refinement $\mathcal{T}_h^n \vee \mathcal{T}_{h}^{n-1}$ exist. As is well known, this assumption is true when $\{\mathcal{T}_h^n\}_{n=0}^N$ are newest vertex bisection refinement of the same macrotriangulation, cf. Lakkis & Makridakis (2006); Cascon et al. (2008). In addition, there is a uniform bound on the ratio of the sizes of elements in $K \in \mathcal{T}_h^n \vee \mathcal{T}_{h}^{n-1}$ and of elements $K' \in \mathcal{T}_h^n \wedge \mathcal{T}_{h}^{n-1}$ contained in $K$, that is,

$$\sup_{1 \leq n \leq N} \sup_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h^n \vee \mathcal{T}_{h}^{n-1}} \sup_{K' \in \mathcal{T}_h^n \wedge \mathcal{T}_{h}^{n-1}} \frac{h_K}{h_{K'}} := C_{\text{ratio}} < \infty. \quad (4.5)$$

Similar assumptions are made in a posteriori error estimation of the heat equation, see, e.g., Verfürth (2003). Let $f_h^n \in V_h^n$ and $g_h^n \in Q_h^n$ be approximations to $f^n$ and $g^n$, respectively. Within the interval $[t_{n-1}, t_n]$, we split the residuals into

$$R_1 = f - f_h^n + S_1^t + T_1^t, \quad (4.6a)$$
$$R_2 = g - g_h^n + S_2^t + T_2^t, \quad (4.6b)$$
$$R_3 = S_3^t + T_3^t, \quad (4.6c)$$

where the spatial residuals $S_1^t \in V'$, $S_2^t \in Q'$, $S_3^t \in W'$ are defined as

$$\langle S_1^t, v \rangle := \langle f_h^n, v \rangle - a(u_h^n, v) + b(v, p_h^n),$$
$$\langle S_2^t, q \rangle := \langle g_h^n, q \rangle - c(\partial_t p_h^n, q) - b(\delta u_h^n, q) - d(w_h^n, q),$$
$$\langle S_3^t, z \rangle := -e(w_h^n, z) + d(z, p_h^n),$$

and the temporal residuals $T_1^t(t) \in V'$, $T_2^t(t) \in Q'$, $T_3^t(t) \in W'$ for $t \in [t_{n-1}, t_n]$ are

$$\langle T_1^t, v \rangle := a(u_h^n - u_h^t, v) - b(v, p_h^n - p_h^t),$$
$$\langle T_2^t, q \rangle := d(w_h^n - w_h^t, q),$$
$$\langle T_3^t, z \rangle := e(w_h^n - w_h^t, z) - d(z, p_h^n - p_h^t).$$

By (4.4), the temporal derivatives of $R_1$ and $R_3$ over $[t_{n-1}, t_n]$ are

$$\langle \partial_t R_1, v \rangle = \langle \partial_t f - \partial_t f_h^n, v \rangle + \langle \delta S_1^t, v \rangle, \quad (4.7a)$$
$$\langle \partial_t R_3, v \rangle = \langle \delta S_3^t, v \rangle. \quad (4.7b)$$

Next, we use the following fully discrete spatial error indicators which can be viewed as fully discrete
counterparts of the error estimators introduced in Section 3. We set,

\[ e^n_1 := \beta^n_1(u^n_h, p^n_h, f^n_h), \quad e^n_{1,2} := \beta^n_{3/2} (\delta u^n_h, \delta p^n_h, \delta f^n_h), \]

\[ e^n_2 := \beta^n_2 (\delta u^n_h, \delta p^n_h, w^n_h, s^n_h), \]

\[ e^n_3 := \beta^n_3 (p^n_h, w^n_h), \quad e^n_{3,4} := \beta^n_{3/2} (\delta p^n_h, \delta w^n_h). \]

Throughout the rest of the presentation, we shall write \( \Lambda \lesssim B \) provided \( \Lambda \lesssim CB \), where \( C \) is a constant depending only on \( \mu, \alpha, \beta, K, \Omega, \Gamma_1, C_{\text{shape}}, C_{\text{ratio}} \). Since the spatial residuals are time-independent, their norms can be estimated as in the proof of Theorem 3.2. We have the following result.

**Lemma 4.1** For \( 1 \leq n \leq N \), it holds that

\[
\| S^n_1 \|^2 \lesssim e^n_1, \tag{4.8a}
\]

\[
\| \delta S^n_1 \|^2 \lesssim e^n_{1,2}, \tag{4.8b}
\]

\[
\| S^n_2 \|^2 \lesssim e^n_2, \tag{4.8c}
\]

\[
\| S^n_3 \|^2 \lesssim e^n_3, \tag{4.8d}
\]

\[
\| \delta S^n_3 \|^2 \lesssim e^n_{3,4}. \tag{4.8e}
\]

**Proof.** For \( v \in V \), let \( v_h \) be the Clément interpolant on \( T^n_h \). It follows from (4.1a) and element-wise integration by parts that

\[
\langle S^n_1, v \rangle = \langle S^n_1, v - v_h \rangle = \sum_{k \in T^n_h} \int_K (f^n_h + \text{div } \sigma(u^n_h) - \alpha \nabla p^n_h) \cdot (v - v_h) \]

\[
\quad - \sum_{F \in \mathcal{T}(T^n_h)} \int_F ((\sigma(u^n_h) - \alpha p^n_h I|n_F) \cdot (v - v_h). \tag{4.9}
\]

Using (4.9) and the same analysis of estimating \( \| r_1 \| \), in Theorem 3.2, we obtain

\[
\| S^n_1 \| = \sup_{v \in V, \| v \| = 1} \langle S^n_1, v \rangle \lesssim (e^n_1)^{1/2}.
\]

For any \( v \in V \), let \( \tilde{v}_h \) be the Clément interpolant of \( v \) on \( T^n_h \cup T^{n-1}_h \). Using (4.5), (4.1a), and integrating by parts over \( T^n_h \cup T^{n-1}_h \), and following again the same analysis of estimating \( \| r_1 \| \) in Theorem 3.2, we obtain a similar estimate:

\[
\| \delta S^n_1 \| = \sup_{v \in V, \| v \| = 1} \langle \delta S^n_1, v \rangle = \sup_{v \in V, \| v \| = 1} \langle \delta S^n_1, v - \tilde{v}_h \rangle
\]

\[
= \sup_{v \in V, \| v \| = 1} (\delta f^n_h, v - \tilde{v}_h) - a(\delta u^n_h, v - \tilde{v}_h) + b(v - \tilde{v}_h, \delta p^n_h) \lesssim (e^n_{1,2})^{1/2}.
\]

The remaining estimates can be proved in the same way. □

Let \( \| f - f_h \| \) and \( \| \delta f - \delta f_h \| \). We present the first main result of this paper in the following theorem.
Theorem 4.1 For $1 \leq i \leq n$, let $f_h^i$ be the $L^2$-projection of $f^i$ onto $V_h^i$, $g_h^i$ the $L^2$-projection of $g^i$ onto $Q_h^i$. There exists a constant $C_{\text{data}}$ dependent only on $\mu$, $\alpha$, $\beta$, $K$, $\Omega$, $C_{\text{shape}}$, $C_{\text{ratio}}$ such that for $n = 1, 2, \ldots, N$, the error defined in (4.2) satisfies

$$
\left\| (E_u, E_p, E_w)(t_n) \right\|_{L^2(0, t_n; X)}^2 + \left\| (E_u, E_p, E_w)(0) \right\|_{L^2(0, t_n; X)}^2 \leq C_{\text{data}} \left\{ \left\| (E_u, E_p, E_w)(0) \right\|^2 + \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} \tau_i \tilde{\epsilon}_{\text{time}}^i + \tau_i (\epsilon_2^i)^2 + \tilde{\epsilon}_{\text{data}}^i \right)^2 \right. + 
\left. \sum_{i=1}^{n} \tau_i \tilde{\epsilon}_{\text{time}}^i + \tau_i (\epsilon_2^i)^2 + \tilde{\epsilon}_{\text{data}}^i \right\},
$$

where

$$
\tilde{\epsilon}_{\text{time}} = \| \text{div}(w_h^i - w_h^{i-1}) \|, \quad \tilde{\epsilon}_{\text{data}} = \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \| g - g_h \| dt,
$$

$$
\epsilon_{\text{time}}^i = \| u^i_h - u^{i-1}_h \|^2 + \| p^i_h - p^{i-1}_h \|^2 + \| w_h^i - w_h^{i-1} \|^2,
$$

$$
\epsilon_{\text{space}}^i = \epsilon_1^i + \epsilon_3^i + \epsilon_4^i + \epsilon_5^i,
$$

$$
\epsilon_{\text{data}}^i = \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} (\| f - f_h \|^2 + \| \partial_t f - \partial_t f_h \|^2 + \| g - g_h \|^2) dt.
$$

Proof. Applying Lemma 2.1 to (4.3) yields

$$
\left\| (E_u, E_p, E_w)(t_n) \right\|_{L^2(0, t_n; X)}^2 + \left\| (E_u, E_p, E_w)(0) \right\|_{L^2(0, t_n; X)}^2 \leq C_{\text{stab}} \left\{ \left\| (E_u, E_p, E_w)(0) \right\|^2 + \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \| R^i \| dt \right)^2 \right. + 
\left. \sum_{i=1}^{n} \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \| R^i \|^2 + \| \partial_t R^i \|^2 + \| R^i \|^2 + \| \partial_t R^i \|^2 \right)^2 dt.
$$

For any $v \in V$, the continuity of $a(\cdot, \cdot)$ and $b(\cdot, \cdot)$ implies that

$$
\| T^i \| = \sup_{v \in V, \| v \| = 1} \langle T^i, v \rangle \lesssim \| u^i_h - u^i \|^2 + \| p^i_h - p^i \|.
$$

(4.10)

A combination of (4.6a), (4.8a) and (4.10) then shows that when $t \in [t_{i-1}, t_i]$,

$$
\| R^i \| \leq \| f - f_h \| + \| u^i_h - u^i \| + \| p^i_h - p^i \|. \quad (4.11)
$$

For $t \in [t_{i-1}, t_i]$, it is readily checked that

$$
\| u^i_h - u^i \|^2 = \frac{t_i - t}{t_i} \| u^i_h - u^{i-1}_h \|^2 + \frac{t_i - t}{t_i} \| p^i_h - p^{i-1}_h \|^2.
$$

(4.12)

Integrating (4.11) over $[t_{i-1}, t_i]$ and using (4.12), we obtain

$$
\int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \| R^i \| dt \approx \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \| f - f_h \|^2 dt + \| u^i_h - u^{i-1}_h \|^2 + \| p^i_h - p^{i-1}_h \|^2 + \tau_i \tilde{\epsilon}_{\text{data}}^i.
$$

(4.13)
On the other hand, using (4.7a) and (4.8b), we obtain for \( t \in [t_{i-1}, t_i] \),
\[
\| \partial_t R \| \lesssim \| \partial_t f - \delta f_h \|_h + (\delta_t^L)^{1/2}. \tag{4.14}
\]

Similarly, using (4.6), (4.7b), Lemma 4.1, and (4.12), one can estimate \( R_3, \partial_t R_3, R_2 \) and obtain the following bounds
\[
\int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \| R_3 \|_h^2 \, dt \lesssim \| \tau_i \|_h^2 \| w_h^i - w_h^{i-1} \|_h^2 + \| \tau_i p_h^i - p_h^{i-1} \|_h^2 + \| \delta_R^L \|_h^2,
\]
\[
\int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \| \partial_t R_3 \|_h^2 \, dt \lesssim \| \delta_R^L \|_h^2,
\tag{4.15}
\]
and
\[
\int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \| R_2 \|_h^2 \, dt \lesssim \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \| \tau_i g_h^i \|_h \| \nabla(w_h^i - w_h^{i-1}) \|_h \, dt + \| \tau_i \|_h^2 \| \delta_R^L \|_h^2.
\tag{4.16}
\]

Combining (4.13)–(4.16) completes the proof. \(\square\)

**Remark 4.1** The first two terms in \( \delta_{\text{data}}^t \) can be further estimated by
\[
\| f - f_h \|_h \lesssim \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} h_K^2 \| f - f_h \|_K^2,
\]
\[
\| \partial_t f - \delta f_h \|_h \lesssim \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h \setminus \mathcal{T}_h^{-1}} h_K^2 \| \partial_t f - \delta f_h \|_K^2.
\]

## 5. Lower bound

In this section, we show that \( \tau_n^{\epsilon_{\text{time}}} \) and \( \tau_n^{\epsilon_{\text{space}}} \) are lower bounds of the space-time discretization error of the fully discrete scheme (4.1). First we present a lemma comparing the spatial residual with the spatial error indicators. Since the spatial error estimators and residuals are time-independent, the proof follows from the well-known Verfürth bubble function technique for adaptive error estimates for stationary Stokes and Poisson’s equations, see, e.g., Verfürth (1991); Alonso (1996); Demlow & Hirani (2014). Throughout the rest, \( \mathcal{C} \) is a generic constant that depends only on \( \lambda, \mu, \alpha, \beta, K, \Omega, I_1, C_{\text{shape}}, C_{\text{ratio}} \). Hence the constant in some lower bounds may not be locking free.

**Lemma 5.1** Let \( \lambda, \mu, K \) be piecewise constants over \( \mathcal{T}_h^n \). For \( 1 \leq n \leq N \), it holds that
\[
\delta_1^n \lesssim \mathcal{C} \| S_1^n \|_2^2, \tag{5.1a}
\]
\[
\delta_2^n \lesssim \mathcal{C} \| \delta S_1^n \|_2^2, \tag{5.1b}
\]
\[
\delta_3^n \lesssim \| S_2^n \|_2^2, \tag{5.1c}
\]
\[
\delta_4^n \lesssim \| S_3^n \|_2^2, \tag{5.1d}
\]
\[
\delta_5^n \lesssim \| \delta S_3^n \|_2^2. \tag{5.1e}
\]

**Proof.** To prove (5.1a), it suffices to find \( \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{V} \), such that
\[
\delta_1^n \lesssim \mathcal{C} \langle S_1^n, \mathbf{v} \rangle, \quad \| \mathbf{v} \|_a^2 \lesssim \mathcal{C} \delta_1^n.
\]
For each $K \in T_n$, let $R_K = (f_n + \text{div} \sigma(u_h) - \alpha \nabla p_h)|_K$ and let $\phi_F$ denote the volume bubble function supported on $K$ so that the maximum is 1. For each $F \in F(T_n)$, let $J_F = - (\sigma(u_h) - \alpha p_h I)|_F n_F$, and recall that $\phi_F$ is the face bubble function supported on union of neighboring elements of $F$. The desired $v$ is then defined as

$$v = \gamma_1 \sum_{K \in \mathcal{E}_h} h_K^2 R_K \phi_K + \gamma_2 \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}(T_n)} h_F J_F \phi_F,$$

where $h_F$ is the diameter of $F$, and $\gamma_1, \gamma_2$ are undetermined constants. Using the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality and finite overlapping of supports of $\{\phi_K\}$ and $\{\phi_F\}$, one case easily show that $\|v\|^2 \leq C\beta^n_n$. On the other hand, (4.9) implies

$$(S^n_n, v) \geq \sum_{K \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_K R_K \cdot v + \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}(T_n)} \int_F J_F \cdot v.$$

$(S^n_n, v) \geq C\beta^n_n$ then follows from Young’s inequality and suitably chosen $\gamma_1, \gamma_2$, see, e.g., Lemma 5.1 in Verfürth (2003) for details. Other lower bounds can be shown in an analogous fashion.

**Remark 5.1** Based on the $\| \cdot \|_\omega$-norm, it seems that the dependence on $\lambda$ in lower bounds (5.1a) and (5.1b) cannot be avoided. To obtain an error estimator that is a robust lower bound, one can apply the analysis here to the four- or five-field formulation Lee (2016); Ahmed et al. (2019) in Biot’s consolidation model.

We present the second main result in the following theorem. Similar technique in the proof was used in Verfürth (2003) for proving the lower bound in a posteriori error estimation for the primal formulation of the heat equation.

**Theorem 5.1** Let $\lambda, \mu, K$ be piecewise constants on $\mathcal{F}_h^n$. For $n = 1, 2, \ldots, N$,

$$\tau_n \delta^n_{\text{time}} + \tau_n \delta^n_{\text{space}} \leq C \left\{ \left\| (E_u, E_p, E_w) \right\|_{2, (t_{n-1}, t_n, X)} \right.$$

$$+ \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} \left\{ \| f - f^n_n \|^2 + \| \partial_t f - \delta_t f^n_n \|^2 + \| g - g^n_n \|^2 \right\} dt \right\}.$$

**Proof.** First by (2.2) and definitions of residuals in (4.4), we have

$$\| R_1 \|_t \lesssim \| E_u \|_a + \| E_p \|_c,$$

$$\| R_2 \|_t \lesssim \| \partial_t E_p \| + \| \partial_t \text{div} E_u \| + \| \text{div} E_w \|,$$

$$\| R_3 \|_t \lesssim \| E_w \|_c + \| E_p \|_c,$$

$$\| \partial_t R_1 \|_t \lesssim \| \partial_t E_u \|_a + \| \partial_t E_p \|_c,$$

$$\| \partial_t R_2 \|_t \lesssim \| \partial_t E_w \| + \| \partial_t E_p \|_c.$$}

Consider the bilinear form

$$B(w, p; z, q) = e(w, z) - d(z, p) + d(w, q)$$

of the mixed formulation of the elliptic equation. Due to the inf-sup condition of $B$, there exist $z \in W$ and $q \in Q$ with $\| z \|_W = 1, \| q \|_c = 1$ such that

$$\| w^n_n - w^n_n \|_W + \| p^n_n - p^n_n \|_c \lesssim B(w^n_n - w^n_n, p^n_n - p^n_n; z, q)$$

$$= \langle T^n_n, q \rangle + \langle T^n_n, z \rangle, \quad t \in [t_{n-1}, t_n].$$
Using the previous estimate, the triangle and Cauchy–Schwarz inequalities, we obtain

\[
\|w_n^h - w_h^0\|_W + \|p_n^h - p_h^0\|_c \\
\leq \langle R_2, q \rangle + \langle R_3, z \rangle - \langle g - g_n^0, q \rangle - \langle S_n^3, q \rangle - \langle S_h^3, z \rangle
\]

(5.3)

Setting \( v = (u_n^h - u_h^0)/\|u_n^h - u_h^0\|_a \) in the definition of \( T_n^h \), we have for \( t \in [t_{n-1}, t_n] \),

\[
\|u_n^h - u_h^0\|_a = \langle T_n^h, v \rangle + b(v, p_n^h - p_h^0) \\
= \langle R_1, v \rangle - \langle f - f_n^h, v \rangle - \langle S_n^3, v \rangle + b(v, p_n^h - p_h^0) \\
\leq \|R_1\|_a + \|f - f_n^h\|_a + \|S_n^3\|_a + \|p_n^h - p_h^0\|_c.
\]

(5.4)

A combination of (5.3), (5.4), (4.12) and Lemma 4.1 shows that

\[
\tau_n \epsilon_n^\alpha \lesssim \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} (\|f - f_n^h\|^2 + \|g - g_n^0\|^2 + \|R_1\|^2) \\
+ \|R_2\|^2 + \|R_3\|^2) dt + \tau_n (\epsilon_1^\alpha + \epsilon_2^\alpha + \epsilon_3^\alpha).
\]

(5.5)

It remains to estimate \( \epsilon_1^\alpha, \epsilon_2^\alpha, \) and \( \epsilon_3^\alpha \). Let

\[
\phi(t) = (\alpha + 1) \left( \frac{t - t_{n-1}}{\tau_n} \right)^\alpha,
\]

where \( \alpha > 0 \) is a constant that will be specified later. It follows from Lemma 5.1 and the triangle inequality that

\[
\tau_n (\epsilon_1^\alpha + \epsilon_2^\alpha + \epsilon_3^\alpha) = \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} \phi(t) (\epsilon_1^\alpha + \epsilon_2^\alpha + \epsilon_3^\alpha) dt \\
\leq C \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} \phi(t) (\|S_1^n\|^2 + \|S_2^n\|^2 + \|S_3^n\|^2) dt \\
\leq C(\alpha + 1) \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} (\|R_1\|^2 + \|f - f_n^h\|^2 + \|R_2\|^2) \\
+ \|g - g_n^0\|^2 + \|R_3\|^2) dt + C \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} \phi(t) (\|T_1^n\|^2 + \|T_2^n\|^2 + \|T_3^n\|^2) dt,
\]

(5.6)

where the generic constant \( C \) is independent of \( \alpha \). For ant \( v \in V \) with \( \|v\|_a = 1 \), direct calculation shows that

\[
\int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} \phi(t) (T_1^n, v)^2 dt = \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} \phi(t) \{a(u_n^h - u_h^0, v) - b(v, p_n^h - p_h^0)\}^2 dt \\
= \{a(u_n^h - u_h^{n-1}, v) - b(v, p_n^h - p_h^{n-1})\}^2 \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} \phi(t) \left( \frac{t_n - t}{\tau_n} \right)^2 dt \\
\leq C(\|u_n^h - u_h^{n-1}\|^2 + \|p_n^h - p_h^{n-1}\|^2) \tau_n \int_0^1 s^\alpha (1 - s)^2 ds \\
\leq C \tau_n \epsilon_n^\alpha F(\alpha),
\]
where \( F(\alpha) = 1 - \frac{2(\alpha+1)}{\alpha+2} + \frac{\alpha+1}{\alpha+3} \). Hence

\[
\int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} \phi(t) \| T^n_1 \|^2 dt = \sup_{v \in V} \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} \phi(t) \langle T^n_1, v \rangle^2 dt \leq C \tau_n \varepsilon_{\text{time}}^n F(\alpha). \tag{5.7}
\]

Similarly, we have

\[
\int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} \phi(t) (\| T^n_2 \|^2 + \| T^n_3 \|^2) dt \leq C \tau_n \varepsilon_{\text{time}}^n F(\alpha). \tag{5.8}
\]

Combining (5.6), (5.7) and (5.8), we obtain

\[
\tau_n (\varepsilon_{1,1}^n + \varepsilon_{2,1}^n + \varepsilon_{3,1}^n) \leq C (\alpha + 1) \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} (\| R_1 \|^2 + \| f - f^n_1 \|^2 + \| f^n_2 \|^2 + \| R_2 \|^2 + \| g - g^n_2 \|^2 + \| R_3 \|^2) dt + C \tau_n \varepsilon_{\text{time}}^n F(\alpha). \tag{5.9}
\]

Note that \( F(\alpha) \to 0 \) as \( \alpha \to \infty \). It then follows from (5.5) and (5.9) with sufficiently large \( \alpha \) that

\[
\tau_n \varepsilon_{\text{time}}^n \leq C \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} (\| f - f^n_1 \|^2 + \| g - g^n_2 \|^2 + \| R_1 \|^2 + \| R_2 \|^2 + \| R_3 \|^2) dt. \tag{5.10}
\]

Clearly, the bounds (5.9) and (5.10) imply that

\[
\tau_n (\varepsilon_{1,1}^n + \varepsilon_{2,1}^n + \varepsilon_{3,1}^n) \leq C \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} (\| f - f^n_1 \|^2 + \| g - g^n_2 \|^2 + \| R_1 \|^2 + \| R_2 \|^2 + \| R_3 \|^2) dt. \tag{5.11}
\]

Finally, using Lemma 5.1 and (4.7a), (4.7b), we have

\[
\varepsilon_{1,1}^n + \varepsilon_{3,1}^n \leq C (\| \partial S_1^n \|^2 + \| \partial S_3^n \|^2) \leq C (\| \partial f - \partial f^n_1 \|^2 + \| \partial R_1 \|^2 + \| \partial R_3 \|^2). \tag{5.12}
\]

on \([t_{n-1}, t_n]\). Combining (5.10), (5.11), (5.12), and (5.2) then completes the proof. \( \square \)

In practice, one can use \( \varepsilon_{\text{time}}^n \) and \( \varepsilon_{\text{data}}^n \) to adjust the time step size and \( \varepsilon_{\text{space}}^n \) to refine and coarsen the spatial mesh. Due to the complexity of space-time adaptivity, we shall not present a concrete adaptive algorithm for the Biot's system. Such algorithms can be found in e.g., Ern & Meunier (2009); Riedbeck et al. (2017); Ahmed et al. (2019). For the heat equation, readers are referred to e.g., Chen & Feng (2004); Kreuzer et al. (2012); Verfürth (2013); Gaspoz et al. (2019) for space-time adaptive algorithms as well as convergence analysis of adaptive methods. We point out that, once a space-time error indicator is available, a corresponding adaptive strategy follows and is largely independent of the equations.

We now also present a new error estimator for mixed methods for time dependent Darcy flow described by (2.3). The fully discrete scheme (4.1) with \( u_h = v = 0 \) reduces to

\[
c(\partial p^n_0, q) + d(w^n_h, q) = (g^n, q), \quad q \in Q_h^n, \tag{5.13a}
\]
\[
e(w^n_h, z) - d(z, p^n_0) = 0, \quad z \in W_h^n, \tag{5.13b}
\]

which obviously is a discretization of the heat equation or time-dependent Darcy flow (2.3). Therefore, the a posteriori analysis for (4.1) directly applies to (5.13). Here \( W_h^n \times Q_h^n \) is the Raviart–Thomas and Brezzi–Douglas–Marini mixed element space. Given an interval \( I \subseteq [0, T] \), we define the norm

\[
\| (q, z) \|^2_{E(I, T)} := \int_I (\| q \|^2 + \| \partial_t q \|^2 + \| z \|^2 + \| \partial_t z \|^2) ds.
\]
Going through the proof of Theorems 4.1 and 5.1, $R_1$ disappears when deriving the upper and lower bounds for the error of (5.13). Therefore we obtain the following a posteriori error estimates.

**Corollary 5.1** For $n = 1, 2, \ldots, N$, the error of (5.13) satisfies

\[
\| E_p(t_n) \|_e^2 + \| E_w(t_n) \|_e^2 + \| (E_p, E_w) \|_{L^2(\Omega, \nu, Y)}^2 \\
\lesssim \eta_{\text{init}} + \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N} \tau_i \bar{\eta}_i \right)^2 + \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N} \tau_i \bar{\eta}_i \right)^2 + \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N} \tau_i \bar{\eta}_i \right)^2 + \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} \| g - g_h \|_e^2 dt,
\]

where

\[
\eta_{\text{init}} = \| p(0) - p_h(0) \|_e^2 + \| w(0) - w_h(0) \|_e^2,
\]

\[
\eta_i = \| p_i - p_{i+1} \|_e^2 + \| w_i - w_{i+1} \|_e^2,
\]

\[
\bar{\eta}_i = \| g_i - \beta \delta p_i - \text{div} w_i \|_e^2,
\]

\[
\bar{\eta}_i = \| g_i - \beta \delta p_i - \text{div} w_i \|_e^2.
\]

In addition, when $K$ is a piecewise constant on $\mathcal{T}^n_h$ it holds that,

\[
\tau_i \eta_i + \tau_i \eta_i \lesssim \| (E_p, E_w) \|_{L^2(\Omega, \nu, Y)}^2 + \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} \| g - g_h \|_e^2 dt.
\]

6. **Numerical examples**

To support the theoretical results and show the behavior of the fully discrete error indicators, we present a two-dimensional numerical example. The domain $\Omega = (0, 1) \times (0, 1)$ is the unit square in $\mathbb{R}^2$, and we consider the three field Biot’s problem (2.1) given in Section 3. The rest of the setup is as follows.

- We set the Lamé parameters as $\lambda = \mu = 0.4$.
- $\beta = 1$, $\alpha = 1$, and $K = I \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$, the $2 \times 2$ identity matrix.
- The analytic solution to the problem is
  \[
  u(t, x) = \cos t \begin{pmatrix} \sin (\pi x_1) \\ \sin (\pi x_2) \end{pmatrix}, \quad w = -\nabla p = \pi \sin t \begin{pmatrix} \sin (\pi x_1) \\ \cos (\pi x_1) \end{pmatrix}, \quad p(t, x) = \sin t \cos (\pi x_1) \cos (\pi x_2)
  \]
- As boundary conditions we take homogeneous Dirichlet condition for $u$ and homogeneous Neumann condition for $p$. Correspondingly, $\Gamma_2 = \emptyset$ in Section 2.
- We use a sequence of uniform triangular grids $\mathcal{T}_{h_k}$ with mesh sizes $h_k = 2^{-k}$, $k = 1 : J$, $J = 6$ or $J = 7$. In Figure 1 we have shown the coarsest mesh and a finer mesh.
- The spatial discretization for (2.1) is based on the lowest order finite space triple $V_h^0 \times Q_h^0 \times W_h^0$ on grid $\mathcal{T}_{h_k}$ in Section 3.
We start the simulations at \( t = 0 \) and reach the final time \( T = 1 \) after \( N = T / \tau \) time steps with uniform time step size \( \tau \). We present two sets of tests: (1) a test where \( h = h_k = 2^{-k} \), \( k = 1:7 \) and \( \tau = \tau_k = 0.4 h_k \) change simultaneously; and (2) a test with fixed \( \tau = 5 \times 10^{-5} \) and varying \( h = h_k = 2^{-k}, k = 1:6 \).

We set \( p_0 = 0, w_0 = 0 \), and choose \( u_0 \) such that (4.1a) is satisfied at \( t = 0 \), i.e. the equation (4.1a) holds for \( n = 0 \).

In computing the a priori error, we have omitted the term containing the error term \( \| \partial_t (w - w_h^T) \|_{w'} \) from the space-time norm \( \|(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)\|_{L^2(I;X)} \) and the modified norm is still denoted as \( \|(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)\|_{L^2(I;X)} \) by abuse of notation. This is motivated by the fact that such term only enters the computation of the a priori error and its computation is rather involved. However, the ratio between the true error and our indicator might be exaggerated by dropping that term.

We first present a simple test illustrating the efficiency of the indicator numerically by decreasing \( h \) and the time step \( \tau \) simultaneously. Let \( (u_h^T, p_h^T, w_h^T) \) be the continuous temporal linear interpolant of the solution from (4.1) with \( \mathcal{T}_h = \mathcal{T}_h^k \) and time step size \( \tau = \tau_k = 0.4 h_k \). In the first test, we compute the a priori error \( E_k = \|(u - u_h^T, p - p_h^T, w - w_h^T)\|_{L^2(I;X)} \) in Theorem 4.1 with 5-point Gaussian quadrature on each time interval \([t_{n-1}, t_n]\) and 25-point Gaussian quadrature on every element in \( \mathcal{T}_h \). The global error \( E_k \) is compared with following a posteriori error indicator

\[
\delta_k = \left( \sum_{n=1}^{N} \tau_n \delta_{\text{time}}^n + \sum_{n=1}^{N} \tau_n \delta_{\text{space}}^n \right)^{1/2}
\]

on the stationary mesh \( \mathcal{T}_h \). Here we do not include the data oscillation \( \delta_{\text{data}}^n \) in \( \delta_k \) because it is generally small and dominated by other terms. The results are shown in Table 1. As is seen from these results the convergence of the method is of order \((h + \tau)\). Moreover, the ratio between the a priori error and the value of the a posteriori error indicator approaches 2.5.

The next set of tests is for a fixed relatively small time step \( \tau \) and aimed at comparing various characteristics of the indicators for different mesh sizes. For a fixed time \( t_n \), \( n = 1:N \) on a grid of size...
\[ h_k = 2^{-k} \] we denote the “true” error at \( t = t_n \) as
\[
e_k^n = (\|u(t_n) - u_h^n\|_a^2 + \|\partial_t u(t_n) - \partial_t u_h^n\|_a^2 + \|p(t_n) - p_h^n\|_c^2 \\
+ \|\partial_t p(t_n) - \partial_t p_h^n\|_c^2 + \|w(t_n) - w_h^n\|_W^2)^{1/2},
\]
which is again computed using 25-point Gaussian quadrature element-wise. We compare \( e_k^n \) with the following instantaneous error estimator at \( t_n \)
\[
\varepsilon_k^n = \left( \varepsilon_{time}^{region} + \varepsilon_{space}^{region} \right)^{1/2}.
\]
Note that \( E_k \approx \left( \sum_{n=1}^{N} \tau [e_k^n]^2 \right)^{1/2} \) and \( \delta_k = \left( \sum_{n=1}^{N} \tau [\varepsilon_k^n]^2 \right)^{1/2} \).

In Figure 2 we show the plot of \( \{\varepsilon_k^n\}_{n=1}^{N} \) for \( n = 1 : N \) with \( N = 20,000 \) for different mesh size \( h_k \) as well as the ratios between the indicators on two consecutive meshes, namely, \( (\varepsilon_k^n / \varepsilon_{k-1}^n) \). Similar behavior is observed in Figure 3, where we have plotted the error reduction as predicted by the fully discrete error indicators.

In Figure 4 we plotted the ratio between the error indicators and the norm of the error as a function of time for varying mesh sizes. As is seen from this plot, this ratio remains bounded. Notice that the theory developed earlier shows reliability and efficiency when we integrate the indicators and the error

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( k )</th>
<th>( E_k )</th>
<th>( \delta_k/E_k )</th>
<th>( \delta_{k-1}/E_k )</th>
<th>( \delta_{k-1}/E_k )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.947</td>
<td>2.375</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.499</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>1.906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>0.633</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>0.317</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. A priori and a posteriori errors for simultaneously decreasing \( h \) and \( \tau \) with \( \tau = 0.4h \).
norm over the interval \([0, T]\). Such results (after integrations) are found in Table 6 where we illustrate the conclusions of Theorem 4.1. As seen from this table, and expected from the theoretical results presented earlier, the ratio between the indicators shows reduction by 2. Moreover we see that the proposed fully discrete error indicators provide two sided bounds for the error up to reasonable multiplicative constant.

7. Conclusion

In this paper, we obtain a two-sided residual a posteriori error estimator for the three-field mixed method in Biot’s consolidation model. It is expected that our a posteriori error analysis generalizes to mixed methods for the five-field formulation based on weakly symmetric stress tensor (see Lee (2016)), although to present such a generalization might require an elaborate analysis. Combining our analysis with a posteriori error estimation of mixed methods for elasticity using strong symmetric stress (see e.g., Carstensen et al. (2019); Chen et al. (2018); Li (2019a)), we hope to obtain a two-sided residual estimator for the four-field formulation.
\[ (h = 2^{-k}) \]

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\delta_{k-1}/\delta_k & k = 1 & k = 2 & k = 3 & k = 4 & k = 5 \\
E_{k-1}/E_k & \text{N/A} & 1.910 & 1.976 & 1.994 & 1.997 \\
\delta_k/E_k & 2.63 & 2.63 & 2.63 & 2.62 & 2.62 \\
\end{array}
\]

Table 2. Robustness and efficiency of the error indicators for \( \tau = 5 \times 10^{-5} \) and varying mesh sizes.
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