

Discontinuous Galerkin Finite Element Methods for 1D Rosenau Equation

P. Danumjaya * K. Balaje
 Department of Mathematics,
 BITS-Pilani K K Birla Goa Campus,
 Goa-403726, India.

Abstract

In this paper, discontinuous Galerkin finite element methods are applied to one dimensional Rosenau equation. Theoretical results including consistency, *a priori* bounds and optimal error estimates are established for both semidiscrete and fully discrete schemes. Numerical experiments are performed to validate the theoretical results. The decay estimates are verified numerically for the Rosenau equation.

Key words. Rosenau equation, discontinuous Galerkin finite element methods (DGFEM), semidiscrete DGFEM, completely discrete DGFEM, optimal error estimates, decay estimates.

AMS Subject Classification: 65M60, 65M12

1 Introduction

Consider the one dimensional Rosenau equation:

$$u_t + u_{xxxxt} = f(u)_x, \quad (x, t) \in (a, b) \times (0, T] \quad (1.1)$$

with initial condition

$$u(x, 0) = u_0(x), \quad x \in (a, b), \quad (1.2)$$

and the boundary conditions

$$\begin{aligned} u(a, t) &= u(b, t) = 0, \\ u_x(a, t) &= u_x(b, t) = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (1.3)$$

where $f(u)$ is a nonlinear term in u of the type $f(u) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{c_i u^{p_i+1}}{p_i + 1}$, here c_i is a real constant and p_i is a positive integer.

The Rosenau equation is an example of a nonlinear partial differential equation, which governs the dynamics of dense discrete systems and models wave propagation in nonlinear dispersive media.

*e-mail address: danu@goa.bits-pilani.ac.in

Recently, several numerical techniques like conforming finite element methods, mixed finite element methods, orthogonal cubic spline collocation methods, etc., were proposed to find the approximate solution of Rosenau equation. The different conforming finite element techniques are used to approximate the solution of Rosenau equation needs C^1 -interelement continuity condition and mixed finite element formulations are required C^0 -continuity condition. In this article discontinuous Galerkin finite element methods are used to approximate the solution.

The well-posedness results of (1.1)-(1.3) was proved by Park [16] and Atouani *et al.* in [2]. Earlier, some numerical methods were proposed to solve the Rosenau equation (1.1)-(1.3) using finite difference methods by Chung [6], conservative difference schemes by Hu and Zheng [11] and Atouni and Omrani [3]. Finite element Galerkin method was used by [2, 7], a second order splitting combined with orthogonal cubic spline collocation method was used by Manickam *et al.* [13] and Chung and Pani in [5] constructed a C^1 -conforming finite element method for the Rosenau equation (1.1)-(1.3) in two-space dimensions.

In recent years, there has been a growing interest in discontinuous Galerkin finite element methods because of their flexibility in approximating globally rough solutions and their potential for error control and mesh adaptation.

Recently, a cGdG method was proposed by Choo. *et. al* in [8]. A subdomain finite element method using sextic b-spline was proposed by Battal and Turgut in [12]. But constructing C^1 finite elements for fourth order problems becomes expensive and hence discontinuous Galerkin finite element methods can be used to solve fourth order problems [9].

In this paper, we introduce discontinuous Galerkin finite element methods (DGFEM) in space to solve the one dimensional Rosenau equation (1.1)-(1.3). Comparative to existing methods our proposed method require less regularity.

The outline of the paper is as follows. In Section 2, we derive the discontinuous weak formulation of the Rosenau equation. In Section 3, we discuss the *a priori* bounds and optimal error estimates for the semidiscrete problem. In Section 4, we discretize the semidiscrete problem in the temporal direction using a backward Euler method and discuss the *a priori* bounds and optimal error estimates. Finally, in Section 5, we present some numerical results to validate the theoretical results.

Throughout this paper, C denotes a generic positive constant which is independent of the discretization parameter h which may have different values at different places.

2 Weak Formulation

In this section, we derive the weak formulation for the problem (1.1)-(1.3).

We discretize the domain (a, b) into N subintervals as

$$a = x_0 < x_1 < x_2 < \cdots < x_N = b,$$

and $I_n = (x_n, x_{n+1})$ for $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots, N-1$. We denote this partition by \mathcal{E}_h consisting of sub-intervals I_n , $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots, N-1$. Below, we define the broken Sobolev space and corresponding

norm

$$H^s(\mathcal{E}_h) = \{v \in L^2(a, b) : v|_{I_n} \in H^s(I_n), \forall I_n \in \mathcal{E}_h\}$$

and

$$|||v|||_{H^s(\mathcal{E}_h)} = \left(\sum_{K \in \mathcal{E}_h} \|v\|_{H^s(K)}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Now define the jump and average of v across the nodes $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^{N-1}$ as follows. The jump of a function value $v(x_n)$ across the inter-element node x_n , shared by I_{n-1} and I_n denoted by $[v(x_n)]$ and defined by

$$[v(x_n)] = v(x_n^-) - v(x_n^+).$$

At the boundary x_0 and x_N , we set

$$[v(x_0)] = -v(x_0), \quad \text{and} \quad [v(x_N)] = v(x_N).$$

The average of a function value $v(x_n)$ across the inter-element node x_n , shared by I_{n-1} and I_n denoted by $\{v(x_n)\}$ and defined by

$$\{v(x_n)\} = \frac{1}{2} (v(x_n^-) + v(x_n^+)).$$

At the boundary x_0 and x_N , we set

$$\{v(x_0)\} = v(x_0), \quad \text{and} \quad \{v(x_N)\} = v(x_N).$$

We multiply (1.1) with $v \in H^s(\mathcal{E}_h)$ and integrate over $I_n = (x_n, x_{n+1})$ to obtain

$$\int_{x_n}^{x_{n+1}} (u_t + u_{xxxxt})v \, dx = \int_{x_n}^{x_{n+1}} f(u)_x v \, dx. \quad (2.4)$$

Now, using integration by parts twice in (2.4), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{x_n}^{x_{n+1}} u_t v \, dx + \int_{x_n}^{x_{n+1}} u_{xxt} v_{xx} \, dx + u_{xxxt}(x_{n+1})v(x_{n+1}^-) - u_{xxxt}(x_n)v(x_n^+) \\ & - u_{xxt}(x_{n+1})v_x(x_{n+1}^-) + u_{xxt}(x_n)v_x(x_n^+) = \int_{x_n}^{x_{n+1}} f(u)_x v \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

Summing over all the elements $n = 0, 1, \dots, N-1$ and using

$$ps - qr = \frac{1}{2}(p+q)(s-r) + \frac{1}{2}(r+s)(p-q), \quad p, q, r \text{ and } s \in \mathbb{R},$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{x_n}^{x_{n+1}} u_t v \, dx + \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{x_n}^{x_{n+1}} u_{xxt} v_{xx} \, dx + \sum_{n=0}^N \{u_{xxxt}(x_n)\} [v(x_n)] - \sum_{n=0}^N \{u_{xxt}(x_n)\} [v_x(x_n)] \\ & = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{x_n}^{x_{n+1}} f(u)_x v \, dx. \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

Since $u(x, t)$ is assumed to be sufficiently smooth, we have $[u_t(x_n)] = [u_{xt}(x_n)] = 0$. Using this, we write as

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{n=0}^N \{v_{xxx}(x_n)\} [u_t(x_n)] - \sum_{n=0}^N \{v_{xx}(x_n)\} [u_{xt}(x_n)] + \sum_{n=0}^N \frac{\sigma_0}{h^\beta} [v(x_n)] [u_t(x_n)] + \sum_{n=0}^N \frac{\sigma_1}{h} [v_x(x_n)] [u_{xt}(x_n)] \\ &= v_{xxx}(x_0)u_t(x_0) - v_{xxx}(x_N)u_t(x_N) - v_{xx}(x_0)u_{xt}(x_0) + v_{xx}(x_N)u_{xt}(x_N) - \\ & \frac{\sigma_0}{h^\beta} v(x_0)u_t(x_0) - \frac{\sigma_0}{h^\beta} v(x_N)u_t(x_N) - \frac{\sigma_1}{h} v_x(x_0)u_{xt}(x_0) - \frac{\sigma_1}{h} v_x(x_N)u_{xt}(x_N) = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

The right hand side of (2.6) was found out using the boundary conditions 1.3. Adding (2.6) to (2.5) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{x_n}^{x_{n+1}} u_t v \, dx + \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{x_n}^{x_{n+1}} u_{xxt} v_{xx} \, dx + \sum_{n=0}^N \{u_{xxxt}(x_n)\} [v(x_n)] + \sum_{n=0}^N \{v_{xxx}(x_n)\} [u_t(x_n)] \\ & - \sum_{n=0}^N \{u_{xxt}(x_n)\} [v_x(x_n)] - \sum_{n=0}^N \{v_{xx}(x_n)\} [u_{xt}(x_n)] + \frac{\sigma_0}{h^\beta} \sum_{n=0}^N [v(x_n)] [u_t(x_n)] \\ & + \frac{\sigma_1}{h} \sum_{n=0}^N [v_x(x_n)] [u_{xt}(x_n)] = \sum_{n=0}^N \int_{x_n}^{x_{n+1}} f(u)_x v \, dx. \end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$

We define the bilinear form as

$$B(u, v) = A(u, v) + J^{\sigma_0}(u, v) + J^{\sigma_1}(u, v), \quad (2.8)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A(u, v) &= \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{x_n}^{x_{n+1}} u_{xx} v_{xx} \, dx + \sum_{n=0}^N (\{u_{xxx}(x_n)\} [v(x_n)] + \{v_{xxx}(x_n)\} [u(x_n)]) \\ &- \sum_{n=0}^N (\{u_{xx}(x_n)\} [v_x(x_n)] + \{v_{xx}(x_n)\} [u_x(x_n)]), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$J^{\sigma_0}(u, v) = \sum_{n=0}^N \frac{\sigma_0}{h^\beta} [u(x_n)] [v(x_n)], \quad J^{\sigma_1}(u, v) = \sum_{n=0}^N \frac{\sigma_1}{h} [u_x(x_n)] [v_x(x_n)].$$

In (2.8), J^{σ_0} and J^{σ_1} are the penalty terms and $\sigma_0, \sigma_1 > 0$. The value of β will be defined later.

The weak formulation of (1.1)-(1.3) as follows: Find $u(t) \in H^s(\mathcal{E}_h)$, $s > 7/2$, such that

$$(u_t, v) + B(u_t, v) = (f(u)_x, v), \quad \forall v \in H^s(\mathcal{E}_h), \quad t > 0 \quad (2.9)$$

$$u(x, 0) = u_0(x). \quad (2.10)$$

Below, we state and prove the consistency result of the weak formulation (2.9)-(2.10).

THEOREM 2.1. *Let $u(x, t) \in C^4(a, b)$ be a solution of the continuous problem (1.1)-(1.3). Then $u(x, t)$ satisfies the weak formulation (2.9)-(2.10). Conversely, if $u(x, t) \in H^2(a, b) \cap H^s(\mathcal{E}_h)$ for $s > 7/2$ is a solution of (2.9)-(2.10), then $u(x, t)$ satisfies (1.1)-(1.3).*

Proof. Let $u(x, t) \in C^4(a, b)$ and $v \in H^s(\mathcal{E}_h)$. Multiply (1.1) by v and integrate from x_n to x_{n+1} . Sum over all $n = 0, 1, \dots, N-1$ and using (2.5), (2.6) and (2.7), we obtain the weak formulation (2.9).

Conversely, let $u \in H^2(a, b) \cap H^s(\mathcal{E}_h)$, $s > 7/2$ and $v \in \mathcal{D}(I_n)$, the space of infinitely differentiable functions with compact support in I_n . Then, (2.9) becomes

$$\int_{x_n}^{x_{n+1}} u_t v \, dx + \int_{x_n}^{x_{n+1}} u_{xxt} v_{xx} \, dx = \int_{x_n}^{x_{n+1}} f(u)_x v \, dx. \quad (2.11)$$

Applying integration by parts twice on the second term on the left hand side of (2.11) to obtain,

$$\int_{x_n}^{x_{n+1}} u_{xxt} v_{xx} \, dx = \int_{x_n}^{x_{n+1}} u_{xxxxt} v \, dx,$$

as v is compactly supported on I_n . This immediately yields

$$u_t + u_{xxxxt} = f(u)_x, \quad \text{a.e in } I_n. \quad (2.12)$$

Consider the node x_k shared between I_{k-1} and I_k . Choose $v \in H_0^2(I_{k-1} \cup I_k)$, multiply (2.12) by v and integrate over (a, b) to obtain

$$\int_{I_{k-1} \cup I_k} u_t v \, dx + \int_{I_{k-1} \cup I_k} u_{xxxxt} v \, dx = \int_{I_{k-1} \cup I_k} f(u)_x v \, dx. \quad (2.13)$$

Applying integration by parts twice on the second term of (2.13) and using $v \in H_0^2(I_{k-1} \cup I_k)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{I_{k-1} \cup I_k} u_t v \, dx &+ \int_{I_{k-1} \cup I_k} u_{xxt} v_{xx} \, dx + [u_{xxt}(x_k)] v(x_k) - [u_{xxt}(x_k)] v_x(x_k) \\ &= \int_{I_{k-1} \cup I_k} f(u)_x v \, dx. \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

On the other hand, we have from (2.9) for the choice of u and v ,

$$\int_{I_{k-1} \cup I_k} u_t v \, dx + \int_{I_{k-1} \cup I_k} u_{xxt} v_{xx} \, dx = \int_{I_{k-1} \cup I_k} f(u)_x v \, dx. \quad (2.15)$$

Comparing (2.14) and (2.15) and using the fact that v is arbitrary, we obtain

$$[u_{xxt}(x_k)] = 0.$$

Thus $u_{xxxxt} \in L^2(\Omega)$ and hence, from (2.13), we obtain

$$u_t + u_{xxxxt} = f(u)_x \quad \text{a.e in } (a, b). \quad (2.16)$$

This completes the proof. \square

3 Semidiscrete DGFEM

In this section, we discuss the *a priori* bounds and optimal error estimates for the semidiscrete Galerkin method.

We define a finite dimensional subspace $D_k(\mathcal{E}_h)$ of $H^s(\mathcal{E}_h)$, $s > 7/2$ as

$$D_k(\mathcal{E}_h) = \{v \in L^2(a, b) : v|_{I_n} \in \mathbb{P}_k(I_n), \ I_n \in \mathcal{E}_h\}.$$

The weak formulation for the semidiscrete Galerkin method is to find $u^h(t) \in D_k(\mathcal{E}_h)$ such that

$$(u_t^h, \chi) + B(u_t^h, \chi) = (f(u^h)_x, \chi), \text{ for all } \chi \in D_k(\mathcal{E}_h), \quad (3.1)$$

$$u^h(0) = u_0^h, \quad (3.2)$$

where u_0^h is an appropriate approximation of u_0 which will be defined later.

3.1 *A priori* Bounds

In this sub-section, we derive the *a priori* bounds.

Define the energy norm

$$\|u\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2 = \sum_{n=0}^N \int_{x_n}^{x_{n+1}} u_{xx}^2 + \sum_{n=0}^N \frac{\sigma_0}{h^\beta} |u(x_n)|^2 + \sum_{n=0}^N \frac{\sigma_1}{h} |u_x(x_n)|^2.$$

We note from [9] that $B(., .)$ is coercive with respect to the energy norm, i.e.,

$$B(v, v) \geq C \|v\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2, \quad v \in D^k(\mathcal{E}_h),$$

for sufficiently large values of σ_0 and σ_1 .

Observe that (3.1) yields a system of non-linear ordinary differential equations and the existence and uniqueness of the solution can be guaranteed locally using the Picard's theorem. To obtain existence and uniqueness globally, we use continuation arguments and hence we need the following *a priori* bounds.

THEOREM 3.1. *Let $u^h(t)$ be a solution to (3.1) and assume that f' is bounded. Then there exists a positive constant C such that*

$$\|u^h(t)\| + \|u^h(t)\|_{\mathcal{E}} \leq C(\|u_0^h\|_{\mathcal{E}}). \quad (3.3)$$

Proof. On setting $\chi = u^h$ in (3.1), we obtain

$$(u_t^h, u^h) + B(u_t^h, u^h) = (f(u^h)_x, u^h). \quad (3.4)$$

We rewrite the equation (3.4) as

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|u^h(t)\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} B(u^h(t), u^h(t)) = (f'(u^h) u_x^h, u^h).$$

Integrating from 0 to t , we obtain

$$\|u^h(t)\|^2 + B(u^h(t), u^h(t)) = \|u^h(0)\|^2 + B(u^h(0), u^h(0)) + \int_0^t (f'(u^h)u_x^h, u^h) ds. \quad (3.5)$$

On using the coercivity of $B(u^h(t), u^h(t))$ and the boundedness of f' , we arrive at

$$\|u^h(t)\|^2 + C\|u^h(t)\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2 \leq \|u^h(0)\|^2 + B(u^h(0), u^h(0)) + C \int_0^t (u_x^h, u^h) ds. \quad (3.6)$$

Using the Cauchy Schwarz inequality and the Poincaré inequality on the right hand side of (3.6), we obtain

$$\|u^h(t)\|^2 + C\|u^h(t)\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2 \leq C(\|u_0^h\|_{\mathcal{E}}) + \int_0^t \|u^h(s)\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2 ds. \quad (3.7)$$

An application of Gronwall's inequality yields the desired *a priori* bound for $u^h(t)$. \square

3.2 Error Estimates in the energy and L^2 -norm

In this subsection, we derive the optimal error estimates in energy and L^2 -norm.

Often a direct comparison between u and u^h does not yield optimal rate of convergence. Therefore, there is a need to introduce an appropriate auxiliary or intermediate function \tilde{u} so that the optimal estimate of $u - \tilde{u}$ is easy to obtain and the comparison between u^h and \tilde{u} yields a sharper estimate which leads to optimal rate of convergence for $u - u^h$. In literature, Wheeler [20] for the first time introduced this technique in the context of parabolic problem. Following Wheeler [20], we introduce \tilde{u} be an auxiliary projection of u defined by

$$B(u - \tilde{u}, \chi) = 0, \quad \text{for all } \chi \in D^k(\mathcal{E}_h). \quad (3.8)$$

Now set the error $e = u - u^h$ and split as follows: $e = u - \tilde{u} - (u^h - \tilde{u}) = \eta - \theta$, where $\eta = u - \tilde{u}$ and $\theta = u^h - \tilde{u}$. Below, we state some error estimates for $\eta = u - \tilde{u}$ and its temporal derivative.

LEMMA 3.1. *For $t \in (0, T]$ and $s > 7/2$ then there exists a positive constant C independent of h such that the following error estimates for η hold:*

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{\partial^l \eta}{\partial t^l} \right\|_{\mathcal{E}} &\leq Ch^{\min(k+1, s)-2} \left(\sum_{m=0}^l \left\| \frac{\partial^m u}{\partial t^m} \right\|_{H^s(\mathcal{E}_h)} \right), \\ \left\| \frac{\partial^l \eta}{\partial t^l} \right\| &\leq Ch^{\min(k+1, s)} \left(\sum_{m=0}^l \left\| \frac{\partial^m u}{\partial t^m} \right\| \right), \quad l = 0, 1. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We split η as follows:

$$\eta = u - \tilde{u} = (u - \bar{u}) - (\tilde{u} - \bar{u}) = \rho - \xi,$$

where $\rho = u - \bar{u}$, $\xi = \tilde{u} - \bar{u}$ and \bar{u} is an interpolant of u satisfying good approximation properties. Now from (3.8), we have

$$B(\xi, \chi) = B(\rho, \chi). \quad (3.9)$$

We note that ρ satisfies the following approximation property [17]:

$$\|\rho\|_{H^q(I_n)} \leq Ch^{\min(k+1,s)-q} \|u\|_{H^s(I_n)}.$$

Set $\chi = \xi$ in (3.9) to obtain

$$B(\xi, \xi) = B(\rho, \xi).$$

A use of coercivity of $B(.,.)$ and the assumption that \bar{u} is a sufficiently smooth interpolant of u , we obtain

$$C\|\xi\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2 \leq \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{x_n}^{x_{n+1}} \rho_{xx} \xi_{xx} dx + \sum_{n=0}^N \{\rho_{xxx}(x_n)\}[\xi(x_n)] - \sum_{n=0}^N \{\rho_{xx}(x_n)\}[\xi_x(x_n)]. \quad (3.10)$$

Now we estimate the first term as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{x_n}^{x_{n+1}} \rho_{xx} \xi_{xx} dx &\leq |||\rho_{xx}||| |||\xi_{xx}||| \leq \frac{1}{6C} \|\rho\|_{H^2}^2 + \frac{C}{6} \|\xi\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2, \\ &\leq Ch^{2\min(k+1,s)-4} |||u|||_{H^s(\mathcal{E}_h)}^2 + \frac{C}{6} \|\xi\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

Estimating the second term using Hölder's inequality, trace inequality and the Young's inequality, we obtain

$$\sum_{n=0}^N \{\rho_{xxx}(x_n)\}[\xi(x_n)] \leq Ch^{2\min(k+1,s)-6+\beta-1} |||u|||_{H^s(\mathcal{E}_h)}^2 + \frac{C}{6} \|\xi\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2. \quad (3.12)$$

Similarly the last term can be estimated as

$$\sum_{n=0}^N \{\rho_{xx}(x_n)\}[\xi_x(x_n)] \leq Ch^{2\min(k+1,s)-6+\beta-1} |||u|||_{H^s(\mathcal{E}_h)}^2 + \frac{C}{6} \|\xi\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2. \quad (3.13)$$

Combining (3.11)-(3.13), we obtain the following bound for ξ when $\beta \geq 3$

$$\|\xi\|_{\mathcal{E}} \leq Ch^{\min(k+1,s)-2} |||u|||_{H^s(\mathcal{E}_h)}. \quad (3.14)$$

Now using $\|\eta\|_{\mathcal{E}} \leq \|\xi\|_{\mathcal{E}} + \|\rho\|_{\mathcal{E}}$, we obtain the energy norm estimate for η . For the L^2 -estimate of η , we use the Aubin Nitsché duality argument. Consider the dual problem

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^4 \phi}{dx^4} &= \eta, \quad x \in (a, b), \\ \phi(a) &= \phi(b) = 0, \\ \phi'(a) &= \phi'(b) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

We note that ϕ satisfies the regularity condition $\|\phi\|_{H^4} \leq C\|\eta\|$. Consider

$$(\eta, \eta) = (\eta, \phi_{xxxx}) = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{x_n}^{x_{n+1}} \phi_{xx} \eta_{xx} dx + \sum_{n=0}^N \{\phi_{xxx}(x_n)\}[\eta(x_n)] - \sum_{n=0}^N \{\phi_{xx}(x_n)\}[\eta_x(x_n)].$$

Since $B(\eta, \chi) = 0 \quad \forall \chi \in D^k(\mathcal{E}_h)$, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \|\eta\|^2 = (\eta, \eta) - B(\eta, \tilde{\phi}) &= \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{x_n}^{x_{n+1}} (\phi - \tilde{\phi})_{xx} \eta_{xx} dx + \sum_{n=0}^N \{(\phi - \tilde{\phi})_{xxx}(x_n)\} [\eta(x_n)] \\ &\quad - \sum_{n=0}^N \{(\phi - \tilde{\phi})_{xx}(x_n)\} [\eta_x(x_n)], \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

where $\tilde{\phi}$ is a continuous interpolant of ϕ and satisfies the approximation property:

$$\|\phi - \tilde{\phi}\|_{H^q} \leq Ch^{s-q} \|\phi\|_{H^s}. \quad (3.16)$$

We use the approximation property (3.16), the energy norm estimate for η and the regularity result to bound each term on the right hand side of (3.15) and obtain the estimate for $\|\eta\|$ as:

$$\|\eta\| \leq Ch^{\min(k+1, s)} \|u\|_{H^s(\mathcal{E}_h)}.$$

For the estimates of the temporal derivative of η , we differentiate (3.8) with respect to t and repeat the arguments. Hence, it completes the rest of the proof. \square

The following Lemma is useful to prove the error estimates:

LEMMA 3.2. *Let $v \in \mathbb{P}_k(I_n)$ where $I_n = (x_n, x_{n+1}) \in \mathcal{E}_h$. Then there exists a positive constant C independent of h such that,*

$$Ch_n^{-4} \|v\|_{L^2(I_n)}^2 \leq \|v_{xx}\|_{L^2(I_n)}^2,$$

where $h_n = (x_{n+1} - x_n)$.

Proof. We define the reference element \hat{I}_n as

$$\hat{I}_n = \left\{ \left(\frac{1}{h_n} \right) x, \quad x \in I_n \right\}.$$

Since $v \in \mathbb{P}_k(I_n)$, we have the following relation (refer [4]) for the norms in the reference element and the interval I_n

$$|\hat{v}|_{H^r(\hat{I}_n)} = h_n^{r-\frac{d}{2}} |v|_{H^r(I_n)}.$$

In one space dimension, i.e., $d = 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{v}\|_{L^2(\hat{I}_n)} &= h_n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|v\|_{L^2(I_n)}, \quad \text{and} \\ |\hat{v}|_{H^2(\hat{I}_n)} &= h_n^{\frac{3}{2}} |v|_{H^2(I_n)}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

By the equivalence of norm (refer [4]), we have

$$C_0 \|\hat{v}\|_{L^2(\hat{I}_n)} \leq \|\hat{v}_{xx}\|_{L^2(\hat{I}_n)} \leq C_1 \|\hat{v}\|_{L^2(\hat{I}_n)}. \quad (3.18)$$

Now from (3.17) and (3.18), we obtain

$$C_0 h_n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|v\|_{L^2(I_n)} \leq h_n^{\frac{3}{2}} \|v_{xx}\|_{L^2(I_n)}.$$

Rearranging the terms and squaring on both sides, we obtain the desired estimate. \square

To obtain the error estimates, we subtract (3.1) from (2.9) and using the auxiliary projection (3.8), we obtain the following error equation

$$(\theta_t, \chi) + B(\theta_t, \chi) = (\eta_t, \chi) + (f(u^h)_x - f(u)_x, \chi). \quad (3.19)$$

Now we state and prove the following theorem.

THEOREM 3.2. *Let $u^h(t)$ and $u(t)$ be the solutions of (3.1) and (2.9), respectively. Let u_0^h be the elliptic projection of u_0 , i.e., $u_0^h = \tilde{u}(0)$. Then for $s > 7/2$ and there exists a positive constant C independent of h such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \|u(t) - u^h(t)\|_{\mathcal{E}} &\leq Ch^{\min(k+1, s)-2} \|u\|_{H^1(0, T; H^s(\mathcal{E}_h))}, \\ \|u(t) - u^h(t)\| &\leq Ch^{\min(k+1, s)} \|u\|_{H^1(0, T; H^s(\mathcal{E}_h))}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Setting $\chi = \theta(t)$ in (3.19), we obtain

$$(\theta_t, \theta) + B(\theta_t, \theta) = (\eta_t, \theta) + (f(u^h)_x - f(u)_x, \theta). \quad (3.20)$$

Now, we write equation (3.20) as

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} (\|\theta(t)\|^2 + B(\theta(t), \theta(t))) = (\eta_t, \theta) + (f(u^h)_x - f(u)_x, \theta).$$

Integrating with respect to t from 0 to T and noting that $\theta(0) = 0$, we obtain

$$\|\theta(t)\|^2 + B(\theta(t), \theta(t)) = \int_0^T (\eta_t, \theta) ds + \int_0^T (f(u^h)_x - f(u)_x, \theta) ds. \quad (3.21)$$

We use integration by parts on the nonlinear term to obtain,

$$\left((f(u^h) - f(u))_x, \theta \right) = \sum_{n=0}^N \{f(u^h) - f(u)\}[\theta(x_n)] + [f(u^h) - f(u)]\{\theta(x_n)\} + \left(f(u) - f(u^h), \theta_x \right). \quad (3.22)$$

Using the Cauchy Schwarz's and Young's inequality, we bound the last term of (3.22) as

$$\left(f(u) - f(u^h), \theta_x \right) \leq C(\|\eta\|^2 + \|\theta\|^2 + \|\theta\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2).$$

Now for the first term in (3.22), we use Hölder's inequality to write

$$\sum_{n=0}^N \{f(u^h) - f(u)\}[\theta(x_n)] \leq \left(\sum_{n=0}^N |f(u^h) - f(u)|^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{n=0}^N |\theta(x_n)|^2 \right)^{1/2}. \quad (3.23)$$

As earlier in (3.12), we use the penalty term to write (3.23) as

$$\sum_{n=0}^N \{f(u^h) - f(u)\}[\theta(x_n)] \leq Ch^{\frac{\beta-1}{2}} \|e\| \|\theta\|_{\mathcal{E}} \leq C\|e\| \|\theta\|_{\mathcal{E}}, \quad \text{since } \beta \geq 3.$$

A similar bound for the second term can be obtained as follows. Using the Hölder's inequality, we write

$$\sum_{n=0}^N [f(u^h) - f(u)]\{\theta(x_n)\} \leq \left(\sum_{n=0}^N h^{\beta} |f(u^h) - f(u)|^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{n=0}^N h^{-\beta} |\theta(x_n)|^2 \right)^{1/2}. \quad (3.24)$$

Using the trace inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{n=0}^N [f(u^h) - f(u)] \{\theta(x_n)\} &\leq \left(Ch^{\frac{\beta-1}{2}} \|e\| \right) \left(\sum_{n=0}^N h^{-\beta-1} \|\theta\|_{L^2(I_n)}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \\
&\leq Ch^{\frac{\beta-1}{2}} \left(\sum_{n=0}^N h^{-4+(3-\beta)} \|\theta\|_{L^2(I_n)}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|e\|, \\
&\leq Ch \left(\sum_{n=0}^N h^{-4} \|\theta\|_{L^2(I_n)}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|e\| \leq C \|e\| \|\theta\|_{\mathcal{E}},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last step is obtained by using LEMMA 3.2. Using the triangle inequality together with Young's inequality we obtain the bound

$$((f(u^h) - f(u))_x, \theta) \leq C(\|\theta\|^2 + \|\theta\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2) + Ch^{2\min(k+1,s)} \|u\|_{H^s(\mathcal{E}_h)}^2.$$

Now using the coercivity of $B(\cdot, \cdot)$ and estimate of the nonlinear term in (3.21), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\theta\|^2 + \|\theta\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2 &\leq Ch^{2\min(k+1,s)} \int_0^T \|u\|_{H^s(\mathcal{E}_h)}^2 ds + Ch^{2\min(k+1,s)} \int_0^T \|u_t\|_{H^s(\mathcal{E}_h)}^2 ds \\
&\quad + C \int_0^t (\|\theta\|^2 + \|\theta\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2) ds. \tag{3.25}
\end{aligned}$$

An application of Gronwall's inequality yields an estimate for θ . We then use the triangle inequality to obtain the estimates for $e = u - u^h$. The estimates are optimal in L^2 -norm if $\beta \geq 3$. \square

4 Fully Discrete DGFEM

In this section, we derive a fully discrete DGFEM and establish *a priori* bounds along with optimal error estimates.

Backward Euler discretization: Let Δt denote the size of time discretization. Divide $[0, T]$ by

$$0 = t_0 < t_1 < t_2 < \cdots < t_{M-1} < t_M = T$$

where $t_{i+1} = t_i + \Delta t$, $i = 0, 1, \dots, M-1$ and $\Delta t = \frac{T}{M}$. Let $u(t_n) = u^n$ and approximate $\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}$ by using backward Euler difference formula as :

$$\partial_t u^n = \frac{u^n - u^{n-1}}{\Delta t}.$$

Now, the fully discrete discontinuous Galerkin finite element method is given as follows:

$$(\partial_t U^{n+1}, \chi) + B(\partial_t U^{n+1}, \chi) = (f(U^{n+1}), \chi), \text{ for all } \chi \in D^k(\mathcal{E}_h), \tag{4.1}$$

$$U^0 = U_0,$$

where U^n is the fully discrete approximation of $u(x, t_n)$.

4.1 *A priori* bounds

In this sub-section, we prove an *a priori* bound for the fully discrete DGFEM.

THEOREM 4.1. *Let U^n be a solution to (4.1) and assume that f' is bounded. Then there exists a positive constant C such that*

$$\|U^n\| + \|U^n\|_{\mathcal{E}} \leq C(\|U_0\|). \quad (4.2)$$

Proof. Set $\chi = U^{n+1}$ in (4.1) to obtain

$$\left(\frac{U^{n+1} - U^n}{\Delta t}, U^{n+1} \right) + B \left(\frac{U^{n+1} - U^n}{\Delta t}, U^{n+1} \right) = (f(U^{n+1})_x, U^{n+1}).$$

Multiplying by Δt throughout, we arrive at

$$(U^{n+1} - U^n, U^{n+1}) + B(U^{n+1} - U^n, U^{n+1}) = \Delta t (f(U^{n+1})_x, U^{n+1}). \quad (4.3)$$

Using the fact that for any two real numbers x and y , we have

$$\frac{1}{2}(x^2 - y^2) \leq \frac{1}{2}(x^2 - y^2 + (x - y)^2) = (x - y)x.$$

We rewrite the equation (4.3), we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2}\|U^{n+1}\|^2 - \frac{1}{2}\|U^n\|^2 + \frac{1}{2}(B(U^{n+1}, U^{n+1}) - B(U^n, U^n)) \leq \Delta t (f(U^{n+1})_x, U^{n+1}). \quad (4.4)$$

Using the Cauchy Schwarz's inequality, Poincare inequality and Young's inequality with the bound on $f'(u)$, we obtain the following inequality from (4.4)

$$\frac{1}{2}\|U^{n+1}\|^2 - \frac{1}{2}\|U^n\|^2 + \frac{1}{2}(B(U^{n+1}, U^{n+1}) - B(U^n, U^n)) \leq C\Delta t \left(\frac{\|U^{n+1}\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2}{2} + \frac{\|U^{n+1}\|^2}{2} \right).$$

Summing over $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots, J-1$ and using the coercivity of $B(\cdot, \cdot)$, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2}\|U^J\|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|U^J\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}\|U^J\|^2 + \frac{1}{2}B(U^0, U^0) + C\Delta t \sum_{n=0}^{J-1} (\|U^{n+1}\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2 + \|U^{n+1}\|^2).$$

Rearranging the terms and applying the discrete Gronwall Inequality, we obtain the desired *a priori* bound on U^J . \square

4.2 Error Estimates

In this sub-section, we prove the optimal error estimates for the fully discrete discontinuous Galerkin method.

Subtracting equation (4.1) from (2.9) and using the auxiliary projection (3.8), we obtain the error equation as

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_t \theta^{n+1}, \chi) + B(\partial_t \theta^{n+1}, \chi) &= (\partial_t \eta^{n+1}, \chi) + ((f(U^{n+1})_x - f(u^{n+1})_x), \chi) \\ &+ (\sigma^{n+1}, \chi) + B(\sigma^{n+1}, \chi). \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

where $\sigma^{n+1} = u_t^{n+1} - \partial_t U^{n+1}$. Before we derive the error estimate, we state and prove the following Lemma.

LEMMA 4.1. Let $\sigma^n = u_t^n - \partial_t U^n$. Then the following holds

$$\|\sigma^n\|^2 \leq \Delta t \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} \|u_{tt}(s)\|^2 ds.$$

Proof. Consider $I = \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} (s - t_{n-1}) u_{tt}(s) ds$. Using integration by parts, we see that $I = \Delta t \sigma^n$. A use of the Hölder's inequality, we obtain $\|\sigma^n\|^2 \leq \Delta t \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} \|u_{tt}(s)\|^2 ds$. The same inequality can be proved in the energy norm as well. \square

THEOREM 4.2. Let $U^0 = \tilde{u}(0)$ so that $\theta^0 = 0$. Then there exists a positive constant C independent of h and Δt such that,

$$\begin{aligned} \|u(t_n) - U^n\|_{\mathcal{E}} &\leq C \left(h^{\min(k+1,s)-2} \|u\|_{H^1(0,T,H^s(\mathcal{E}_h))} + \Delta t \| \|u_{tt}\| \|_{L^2(0,T;H^s(\mathcal{E}_h))} \right), \\ \|u(t_n) - U^n\| &\leq C \left(h^{\min(k+1,s)} \|u\|_{H^1(0,T,H^s(\mathcal{E}_h))} + \Delta t \| \|u_{tt}\| \|_{L^2(0,T;H^s(\mathcal{E}_h))} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

Proof. Set $\chi = \theta^{n+1}$ in (4.5) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (\theta^{n+1} - \theta^n, \theta^{n+1}) + B(\theta^{n+1} - \theta^n, \theta^{n+1}) &= (\eta^{n+1} - \eta^n, \theta^{n+1}) + \Delta t (f(U^{n+1})_x - f(u^{n+1})_x, \theta^{n+1}) \\ &\quad + \Delta t (\sigma^{n+1}, \theta^{n+1}) + \Delta t B(\sigma^{n+1}, \theta^{n+1}). \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

Using Cauchy Schwarz's Inequality and constructing upper bounds similar to the semidiscrete case on the right hand side of (4.7), we obtain the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \|\theta^{n+1}\|^2 - \frac{1}{2} \|\theta^n\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} (B(\theta^{n+1}, \theta^{n+1}) - B(\theta^n, \theta^n)) &\leq C h^{2\min(k+1,s)} \int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} \|u_t\|^2 ds \\ &\quad + C h^{2\min(k+1,s)+\beta-3} \| \|u\| \|_{H^s(\mathcal{E}_h)}^2 + C \Delta t (\|\theta^{n+1}\|^2 + \|\theta^{n+1}\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2 + \|\sigma^{n+1}\|^2 + \|\sigma^{n+1}\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2). \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

Sum over $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots, M-1$ on both sides of (4.8) and using LEMMA 4.1, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\theta^M\|^2 + \|\theta^M\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2 &\leq C h^{2\min(k+1,s)} \| \|u\| \|_{H^s(\mathcal{E}_h)}^2 + C h^{2\min(k+1,s)} \int_0^T \|u_t\|^2 ds \\ &\quad + C \Delta t \sum_{n=0}^{M-1} (\|\theta^{n+1}\| + \|\theta^{n+1}\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2) + C \Delta t^2 \|u_{tt}\|_{L^2(0,T;H^s(\mathcal{E}_h))}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

Using the discrete Gronwall's inequality, we obtain the estimate for θ^M as

$$\|\theta^M\|^2 + \|\theta^M\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2 \leq C \left(h^{2\min(k+1,s)} \|u\|_{H^1(0,T,H^s(\mathcal{E}_h))}^2 + \Delta t^2 \|u_{tt}\|_{L^2(0,T;H^s(\mathcal{E}_h))}^2 \right),$$

provided $\beta \geq 3$. Using the triangle inequality, we can prove the required estimate for $\|e\|_{\mathcal{E}}$ and $\|e\|$. \square

5 Numerical Results

In this section, we perform some numerical experiments to validate the theoretical results.

We consider the following Rosenau equation

$$u_t + \frac{1}{2} u_{xxxxx} = f(u)_x \quad (5.1)$$

with the boundary conditions (1.3) and the nonlinear function $f(u) = 10u^3 - 12u^5 - \frac{3}{2}u$. The exact solution of the equation (5.1) is $u(x, t) = \text{sech}(x - t)$. Since the equation (5.1) was considered as a benchmark example to validate the results by several authors (for instance [13, 8]), the same example has been taken to compare the existing results.

We choose the computational domain $\Omega = (-10, 10)$ and the final time $T = 1$. The equation is solved numerically with corresponding initial and boundary conditions.

The order of convergence for the numerical method was computed by using the formula

$$p \approx \frac{\log \left(\frac{\|E_i\|}{\|E_{i+1}\|} \right)}{\log \left(\frac{h_i}{h_{i+1}} \right)}, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, 4.$$

In Table 1, we show the order of convergences for piecewise quadratic and piecewise cubic basis functions.

Quadratic Elements ($k = 2$)			Cubic Elements ($k = 3$)		
h	Error $\ e\ $	Order	h	Error $\ e\ $	Order
0.20000	1.47828×10^{-2}	-	0.40000	5.17824×10^{-2}	-
0.18182	1.12327×10^{-2}	2.8815	0.33331	2.58529×10^{-2}	3.8099
0.16667	8.68469×10^{-3}	2.9567	0.28571	1.41359×10^{-2}	3.9164
0.15384	6.87521×10^{-3}	2.9189	0.25000	8.35109×10^{-3}	3.9416
0.14257	5.46407×10^{-3}	3.0999	0.22222	5.23371×10^{-3}	3.9672

Table 1: Order of convergence for P_2 and P_3 elements with $\sigma_0 = \sigma_1 = 2000$.

Below, we show the Figures (1a)-(1c), for the comparison of exact solution profile with that of the approximate solution obtained from DGFEM. The Figure (1d) shows the solution profile at different time levels.




Figure 1: Approximate solution using P_2 elements with exact solution $u(x) = \text{sech}(x - 1)$

We compare our numerical results with Choo *et al.* [8]. We observe that our solution profiles matches very accurately and we have achieved third order convergence for quadratic elements and fourth order convergence for cubic elements which are optimal. The proposed method can be easily extended to higher degree polynomials and higher dimensions also. But the cGdG method considered in [8] is difficult to apply for higher dimensions due to the requirement of C^1 -elements.

5.1 Decay Estimates

In this sub-section, we validate the decay estimates that was derived by Park in [15]. As in [13], we consider the following equation

$$u_t + u_{xxxxt} + u_x = f(u)_x, \quad (x, t) \in (0, 1) \times (0, T] \quad (5.2)$$

with the initial condition

$$u(x, 0) = \phi_0(x), \quad (5.3)$$

and boundary conditions (1.3). Here $f(u) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{c_i u^{p_i+1}}{p_i+1}$, $c_i \in \mathbb{R}, p_i > 0$.

For a small initial data, it has been proven that the solution to the Rosenau equation with small initial data decays like $\frac{1}{(1+t)^{\frac{1}{5}}}$ in the L^∞ -norm for $\min_{1 \leq i \leq n} p_i > 6$. Like in [13], we take $c_1 = -1, p_1 = 7, c_2 = \frac{4}{7}, p_2 = 8, c_3 = -\frac{4}{3}, p_3 = 9$ and $\phi_0(x) = 0.001e^{-x^2}$ in (5.3). The solution curves for (5.2) and (5.3) for $t = 0$ to $t = 10$ is shown in Figure (2). The height of the initial pulse decreases with time, indicating a decaying behavior of the solution. The decay in L^∞ -norm of the approximate solution with time is shown in Figure (3).




Figure 2: Curves illustrating the decaying nature of the solution




Figure 3: The variation of the L^∞ -norm of the solution with respect to time ($t = 0 - 100$).

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we derived *a priori* bounds and optimal error estimates for the semidiscrete problem. Next, we discretized the semidiscrete problem in the temporal direction using a backward Euler method, and derived *a priori* bounds and optimal error estimates. We have validated the theoretical results by performing some numerical experiments. Compared to the existing results, our method requires less regularity of the original problem.

7 Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Department of Science and Technology DST-FIST Level-1 Program Grant No. SR/FST/MSI-092/2013 for providing computational facilities.

References

- [1] N. ARNOLD, F. BREZZI, B. COCKBURN, AND L. MARINI. Unified Analysis of Discontinuous Galerkin Methods for Elliptic Problems. *SIAM J. Num. Anal.* (2006), 1749–1779.
- [2] N. ATOUANI AND K. OMRANI. Galerkin finite element method for the Rosenau-RLW equation. *Computers and Mathematics with applications* 66 (2013), 289–303.
- [3] N. ATOUANI AND K. OMRANI. A new conservative high-order accurate difference scheme for the Rosenau equation. *Applicable Analysis* 54 (2015), 2435–2455.
- [4] S. C. BRENNER AND L. R. SCOTT. The Mathematical Theory of Finite Element Methods. *Texts in App. Math., (Third Edition) Springer Verlag* (2007).
- [5] S. K. CHUNG AND A. K. PANI. Numerical Methods for the Rosenau Equation. *Applicable Analysis* (2007), 351–369.

- [6] S. K. CHUNG. Finite difference approximate solutions for the Rosenau equation,. *Applicable Analysis* (1998), 149–156.
- [7] S. K. CHUNG AND S. N. HA. Finite Element Galerkin solutions for the Rosenau equation. *Applicable Analysis* 56 (1994), 39–56.
- [8] S. M. CHOO, S. K. CHUNG AND K. I. KIM. A discontinuous Galerkin method for the Rosenau equation. *Appl. Numer. Math.* (2008), 783–799.
- [9] T. GUDI. A new error analysis for Discontinuous Finite Element Methods for linear elliptic problems. *Math. Comp.* 79 (2010), 2169–2189.
- [10] T. GUDI, N. NATARAJ AND A. K. PANI. Mixed Discontinuous Galerkin Finite Element Method for the Biharmonic Equation. *J. Sc. Comp* 37 (2008), 139–161.
- [11] J. HU AND K. ZHENG. Two Conservative Difference Schemes for the Generalized Rosenau Equation. *Boundary Value Problems* (2010).
- [12] S. B. KARAKOC AND A. K. TURGUT. Numerical solution of Rosenau-KdV equation using subdomain finite element method. *New Trends in Mathematical Sciences* 4 (2016), 223–235.
- [13] S. A. V. MANICKAM, A. K. PANI AND S. K. CHUNG. A second-order splitting combined with orthogonal cubic spline collocation method for the Rosenau equation. *Numerical Methods for PDE* 14 (1998), 695–716.
- [14] P. MONK. A Mixed Finite Element Method for the Biharmonic Equation. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis* 24 (1986), 737–749.
- [15] M. A. PARK. *Model Equation in Fluid Dynamics*. PhD thesis, Tulane University, 1990.
- [16] M. A. PARK. On the Rosenau equation in multidimensional space. *Non-Linear Analysis : Theory, Methods & Applications* 21 (1993).
- [17] B. RIVIERÉ, M. WHEELER AND V. GIRAULT. A priori error estimates for finite element methods based on discontinuous approximation spaces for elliptic problems. *SIAM J. Num. Anal.* 39 (2001), 902–931.
- [18] B. RIVIÉRE. *Discontinuous Galerkin Methods for Solving Elliptic and Parabolic Equations: Theory and Implementation*. Frontiers in Applied Mathematics. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics Philadelphia, 2008.
- [19] P. ROSENAU. Dynamics of Dense Discrete Systems. *Progress of Theoretical Physics* 79 (1988).
- [20] M. F. WHEELER. A priori L_2 error estimates for Galerkin approximations to parabolic differential equations. *SIAM J. Num. Anal.* 10 (1973), 723–759.