

Time discretization of an abstract problem applying to the linearized equations of coupled sound and heat flow

Shunsuke Kurima

Department of Mathematics, Tokyo University of Science
1-3, Kagurazaka, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 162-8601, Japan
shunsuke.kurima@gmail.com

January 3, 2020

Abstract. In this paper we deal with an abstract problem which includes the linearized equations of coupled sound and heat flow as an example. Recently, a time discretization of a simultaneous abstract evolution equation applying to some parabolic-hyperbolic phase-field systems has been studied. This paper focuses on a time discretization of an abstract problem applying to the linearized equations of coupled sound and heat flow. Also, this paper gives some parabolic-hyperbolic phase-field systems as examples.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*: 35A35, 47N20, 35G30, 35L70.

Key words and phrases: simultaneous abstract evolution equations; linearized equations of coupled sound and heat flow; existence; time discretizations; error estimates.

1. Introduction

Matsubara–Yokota [10] have established existence and uniqueness of solutions to the initial-boundary value problem for the linearized equations of coupled sound and heat flow

$$\begin{cases} \theta_t + (\gamma - 1)\varphi_t - \sigma\Delta\theta = 0 & \text{in } \Omega \times (0, \infty), \\ \varphi_{tt} - c^2\Delta\varphi - m^2\varphi = -c^2\Delta\theta & \text{in } \Omega \times (0, \infty), \\ \theta = \varphi = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times (0, \infty), \\ \theta(0) = \theta_0, \varphi(0) = \varphi_0, \varphi_t(0) = v_0 & \text{in } \Omega \end{cases}$$

by applying the Hille–Yosida theorem and have derived regularity of solutions, where $c > 0$, $\sigma > 0$, $m \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\gamma > 1$ are constants, $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ ($d \in \mathbb{N}$) is a domain with smooth bounded boundary $\partial\Omega$ and θ_0, φ_0, v_0 are given functions.

The paper [9] has proved existence of solutions to the initial valued problem for the simultaneous abstract evolution equation

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d\theta}{dt} + \frac{d\varphi}{dt} + A_1\theta = f & \text{in } (0, T), \\ L\frac{d^2\varphi}{dt^2} + B\frac{d\varphi}{dt} + A_2\varphi + \Phi\varphi + \mathcal{L}\varphi = \theta & \text{in } (0, T), \\ \theta(0) = \theta_0, \varphi(0) = \varphi_0, \frac{d\varphi}{dt}(0) = v_0 \end{cases}$$

by employing a time discretization scheme in reference to [3, 4] and has obtained an error estimate for the difference between continuous and discrete solutions. Here $T > 0$, $L : H \rightarrow H$ is a linear positive selfadjoint operator, $B : D(B) \subset H \rightarrow H$, $A_j : D(A_j) \subset H \rightarrow H$ ($j = 1, 2$) are linear maximal monotone selfadjoint operators, H and V are real Hilbert spaces satisfying $V \subset H$, V_j ($j = 1, 2$) are linear subspaces of V satisfying $D(A_j) \subset V_j$ ($j = 1, 2$), $\Phi : D(\Phi) \subset H \rightarrow H$ is a maximal monotone operator, $\mathcal{L} : H \rightarrow H$ is a Lipschitz continuous operator, $f : (0, T) \rightarrow H$ and $\theta_0 \in V_1$, $\varphi_0, v_0 \in V_2$ are given. Moreover, the paper [9] has assumed some conditions in reference to [3, Section 2] and assumptions in [4–7, 12, 13], and has given some parabolic-hyperbolic phase-field systems under homogeneous Dirichlet–Dirichlet boundary conditions or homogeneous Dirichlet–Neumann boundary conditions or homogeneous Neumann–Dirichlet boundary conditions or homogeneous Neumann–Neumann boundary conditions as examples.

In this paper we consider the abstract problem

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d\theta}{dt} + \eta\frac{d\varphi}{dt} + A_1\theta = 0 & \text{in } (0, T), \\ L\frac{d^2\varphi}{dt^2} + B_1\frac{d\varphi}{dt} + A_2\varphi + \Phi\varphi + \mathcal{L}\varphi = B_2\theta & \text{in } (0, T), \\ \theta(0) = \theta_0, \varphi(0) = \varphi_0, \frac{d\varphi}{dt}(0) = v_0, \end{cases} \quad (\text{P})$$

where $T > 0$, $\eta > 0$, $L : H \rightarrow H$ is a linear positive selfadjoint operator, $B_j : D(B_j) \subset H \rightarrow H$, $A_j : D(A_j) \subset H \rightarrow H$ ($j = 1, 2$) are linear maximal monotone selfadjoint operators, $D(A_j) \subset V$ ($j = 1, 2$), $\Phi : D(\Phi) \subset H \rightarrow H$ is a maximal monotone operator, $\mathcal{L} : H \rightarrow H$ is a Lipschitz continuous operator, $\theta_0, \varphi_0, v_0 \in V$ are given. Moreover, we deal with the problem

$$\begin{cases} \delta_h \theta_n + \eta \delta_h \varphi_n + A_1 \theta_{n+1} = 0, \\ Lz_{n+1} + B_1 v_{n+1} + A_2 \varphi_{n+1} + \Phi \varphi_{n+1} + \mathcal{L} \varphi_{n+1} = B_2 \theta_{n+1}, \\ z_0 = z_1, z_{n+1} = \delta_h v_n, \\ v_{n+1} = \delta_h \varphi_n \end{cases} \quad (\text{P})_n$$

for $n = 0, \dots, N-1$, where $h = \frac{T}{N}$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\delta_h \theta_n := \frac{\theta_{n+1} - \theta_n}{h}, \quad \delta_h \varphi_n := \frac{\varphi_{n+1} - \varphi_n}{h}, \quad \delta_h v_n := \frac{v_{n+1} - v_n}{h}. \quad (1.1)$$

Here, putting

$$\widehat{\theta}_h(0) := \theta_0, \quad \frac{d\widehat{\theta}_h}{dt}(t) := \delta_h \theta_n, \quad \widehat{\varphi}_h(0) := \varphi_0, \quad \frac{d\widehat{\varphi}_h}{dt}(t) := \delta_h \varphi_n, \quad (1.2)$$

$$\widehat{v}_h(0) := v_0, \quad \frac{d\widehat{v}_h}{dt}(t) := \delta_h v_n, \quad (1.3)$$

$$\overline{\theta}_h(t) := \theta_{n+1}, \quad \overline{z}_h(t) := z_{n+1}, \quad \overline{\varphi}_h(t) := \varphi_{n+1}, \quad \overline{v}_h(t) := v_{n+1} \quad (1.4)$$

for a.a. $t \in (nh, (n+1)h)$, $n = 0, \dots, N-1$, we can rewrite $(\text{P})_n$ as

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d\widehat{\theta}_h}{dt} + \eta \frac{d\widehat{\varphi}_h}{dt} + A_1 \overline{\theta}_h = 0 & \text{in } (0, T), \\ L\overline{z}_h + B_1 \overline{v}_h + A_2 \overline{\varphi}_h + \Phi \overline{\varphi}_h + \mathcal{L} \overline{\varphi}_h = B_2 \overline{\theta}_h & \text{in } (0, T), \\ \overline{z}_h = \frac{d\widehat{v}_h}{dt}, \quad \overline{v}_h = \frac{d\widehat{\varphi}_h}{dt} & \text{in } (0, T), \\ \widehat{\theta}_h(0) = \theta_0, \quad \widehat{\varphi}_h(0) = \varphi_0, \quad \widehat{v}_h(0) = v_0. \end{cases} \quad (\text{P})_h$$

We will assume the following conditions (A1)-(A12):

(A1) V and H are real Hilbert spaces satisfying $V \subset H$ with dense, continuous and compact embedding. Moreover, the inclusions $V \subset H \subset V^*$ hold by identifying H with its dual space H^* , where V^* is the dual space of V .

(A2) $L : H \rightarrow H$ is a bounded linear operator fulfilling

$$(Lw, z)_H = (w, Lz)_H \text{ for all } w, z \in H, \quad (Lw, w)_H \geq c_L \|w\|_H^2 \text{ for all } w \in H,$$

where $c_L > 0$ is a constant.

- (A3) $A_j : D(A_j) \subset H \rightarrow H$ ($j = 1, 2$) are linear maximal monotone selfadjoint operators, where $D(A_j)$ ($j = 1, 2$) are linear subspaces of H and $D(A_j) \subset V$ ($j = 1, 2$). Moreover, there exist bounded linear monotone operators $A_j^* : V \rightarrow V^*$ ($j = 1, 2$) such that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle A_j^* w, z \rangle_{V^*, V} &= \langle A_j^* z, w \rangle_{V^*, V} \quad \text{for all } w, z \in V, \\ A_j^* w &= A_j w \quad \text{for all } w \in D(A_j). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, for all $\alpha > 0$ and for $j = 1, 2$ there exists $\omega_{j,\alpha} > 0$ such that

$$\langle A_j^* w, w \rangle_{V^*, V} + \alpha \|w\|_H^2 \geq \omega_{j,\alpha} \|w\|_V^2 \quad \text{for all } w \in V.$$

- (A4) $B : D(B_j) \subset H \rightarrow H$ ($j = 1, 2$) are linear maximal monotone selfadjoint operators, where $D(B_j)$ ($j = 1, 2$) are linear subspaces of H , satisfying $D(A_1) \subset D(B_2)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} D(B_1) \cap D(A_2) &\neq \emptyset, \\ (B_1 w, A_2 w)_H &\geq 0 \quad \text{for all } w \in D(B_1) \cap D(A_2), \\ (B_2 w, A_1 w)_H &\geq 0 \quad \text{for all } w \in D(A_1), \\ (B_1 w, A_2 z)_H &= (B_1 z, A_2 w)_H \quad \text{for all } w, z \in D(B_1) \cap D(A_2). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the inclusion $D(A_2) \subset V$ holds.

- (A5) There exists a constant $C_{A_1, B_2} > 0$ such that

$$\|B_2 \theta\|_H \leq C_{A_1, B_2} (\|A_1 \theta\|_H + \|\theta\|_H) \quad \text{for all } \theta \in D(A_1).$$

- (A6) $\Phi : D(\Phi) \subset H \rightarrow H$ is a maximal monotone operator satisfying $\Phi(0) = 0$ and $V \subset D(\Phi)$. Moreover, there exist constants $p, q, C_\Phi > 0$ such that

$$\|\Phi w - \Phi z\|_H \leq C_\Phi (1 + \|w\|_V^p + \|z\|_V^q) \|w - z\|_V \quad \text{for all } w, z \in V.$$

- (A7) There exists a lower semicontinuous convex function $i : V \rightarrow \{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid x \geq 0\}$ such that $(\Phi w, w - z)_H \geq i(w) - i(z)$ for all $w, z \in V$.

- (A8) $\Phi_\lambda(0) = 0$, $(\Phi_\lambda w, B_1 w)_H \geq 0$ for all $w \in D(B_1)$, $(\Phi_\lambda w, A_2 w)_H \geq 0$ for all $w \in D(A_2)$, where $\lambda > 0$ and $\Phi_\lambda : H \rightarrow H$ is the Yosida approximation of Φ .

- (A9) $B_j^* : V \rightarrow V^*$ ($j = 1, 2$) are bounded linear monotone operators fulfilling

$$\begin{aligned} \langle B_j^* w, z \rangle_{V^*, V} &= \langle B_j^* z, w \rangle_{V^*, V} \quad \text{for all } w, z \in V, \\ B_j^* w &= B_j w \quad \text{for all } w \in D(B_j) \cap V. \end{aligned}$$

(A10) For all $g \in H$, $a, b, c, d, d' > 0$, $\lambda > 0$, if there exists $\varphi_\lambda \in V$ such that

$$L\varphi_\lambda + aB_1^*\varphi_\lambda + bA_2^*\varphi_\lambda + c\Phi_\lambda\varphi_\lambda + d\mathcal{L}\varphi_\lambda + d'B_2(I + hA_1)^{-1}\varphi_\lambda = g \quad \text{in } V^*,$$

then it follows that $\varphi_\lambda \in D(B_1) \cap D(A_2)$ and

$$L\varphi_\lambda + aB_1\varphi_\lambda + bA_2\varphi_\lambda + c\Phi_\lambda\varphi_\lambda + d\mathcal{L}\varphi_\lambda + d'B_2(I + hA_1)^{-1}\varphi_\lambda = g \quad \text{in } H.$$

(A11) $\mathcal{L} : H \rightarrow H$ is a Lipschitz continuous operator with Lipschitz constant $C_{\mathcal{L}} > 0$.

(A12) $\theta_0 \in D(A_1)$, $A_1\theta_0 \in V$, $\varphi_0 \in D(B_1) \cap D(A_2)$, $v_0 \in D(B_1) \cap V$.

We set the conditions (A2) and (A3) in reference to [3, Section 2]. The condition (A10) is equivalent to the elliptic regularity theory under some cases (see Section 2). Moreover, we set the conditions (A6)-(A8) and (A11) by trying to keep typical examples of not only the linearized equations of coupled sound and heat flow but also some parabolic-hyperbolic phase-field systems (see Section 2) in reference to assumptions in [4–7, 12, 13].

Remark 1.1. Owing to (1.2)-(1.4), the reader can check directly the following identities:

$$\|\widehat{\varphi}_h\|_{L^\infty(0,T;V)} = \max\{\|\varphi_0\|_V, \|\overline{\varphi}_h\|_{L^\infty(0,T;V)}\}, \quad (1.5)$$

$$\|\widehat{v}_h\|_{L^\infty(0,T;V)} = \max\{\|v_0\|_V, \|\overline{v}_h\|_{L^\infty(0,T;V)}\}, \quad (1.6)$$

$$\|\widehat{\theta}_h\|_{L^\infty(0,T;V)} = \max\{\|\theta_0\|_V, \|\overline{\theta}_h\|_{L^\infty(0,T;V)}\}, \quad (1.7)$$

$$\|\overline{\varphi}_h - \widehat{\varphi}_h\|_{L^\infty(0,T;V)} = h \left\| \frac{d\widehat{\varphi}_h}{dt} \right\|_{L^\infty(0,T;V)} = h \|\overline{v}_h\|_{L^\infty(0,T;V)}, \quad (1.8)$$

$$\|\overline{v}_h - \widehat{v}_h\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H)} = h \left\| \frac{d\widehat{v}_h}{dt} \right\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H)} = h \|\overline{z}_h\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H)}, \quad (1.9)$$

$$\|\overline{\theta}_h - \widehat{\theta}_h\|_{L^2(0,T;V)}^2 = \frac{h^2}{3} \left\| \frac{d\widehat{\theta}_h}{dt} \right\|_{L^2(0,T;V)}^2. \quad (1.10)$$

We define solutions of (P) as follows.

Definition 1.1. A pair (θ, φ) with

$$\begin{aligned} \theta &\in H^1(0, T; V) \cap L^\infty(0, T; V) \cap L^\infty(0, T; D(A_1)), \\ \varphi &\in W^{2,\infty}(0, T; H) \cap W^{1,\infty}(0, T; V) \cap L^2(0, T; D(A_2)), \\ \frac{d\varphi}{dt} &\in L^2(0, T; D(B_1)), \quad \Phi\varphi \in L^\infty(0, T; H) \end{aligned}$$

is called a solution of (P) if (θ, φ) satisfies

$$\frac{d\theta}{dt} + \eta \frac{d\varphi}{dt} + A_1\theta = 0 \quad \text{in } H \quad \text{a.e. on } (0, T), \quad (1.11)$$

$$L \frac{d^2\varphi}{dt^2} + B_1 \frac{d\varphi}{dt} + A_2\varphi + \Phi\varphi + \mathcal{L}\varphi = B_2\theta \quad \text{in } H \quad \text{a.e. on } (0, T), \quad (1.12)$$

$$\theta(0) = \theta_0, \quad \varphi(0) = \varphi_0, \quad \frac{d\varphi}{dt}(0) = v_0 \quad \text{in } H. \quad (1.13)$$

Now the main results read as follows.

Theorem 1.1. *Assume that (A1)-(A12) hold. Then there exists $h_0 \in (0, 1)$ such that for all $h \in (0, h_0)$ there exists a unique solution $(\theta_{n+1}, \varphi_{n+1})$ of $(P)_n$ satisfying*

$$\theta_{n+1} \in D(A_1), \quad \varphi_{n+1} \in D(B_1) \cap D(A_2) \quad \text{for } n = 0, \dots, N-1.$$

Theorem 1.2. *Assume that (A1)-(A12) hold. Then there exists a unique solution (θ, φ) of (P).*

Theorem 1.3. *Let h_0 be as in Theorem 1.1. Assume that (A1)-(A12) hold. Then there exist constants $h_{00} \in (0, h_0)$ and $M = M(T) > 0$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} & \|L^{1/2}(\widehat{v}_h - v)\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H)} + \|B_1^{1/2}(\bar{v}_h - v)\|_{L^2(0,T;H)} + \|\widehat{\varphi}_h - \varphi\|_{L^\infty(0,T;V)} \\ & + \|\widehat{\theta}_h - \theta\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H)} + \|\bar{\theta}_h - \theta\|_{L^2(0,T;V)} \\ & + \|B_2^{1/2}(\widehat{\theta}_h - \theta)\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H)} + \int_0^T (B_2(\bar{\theta}_h(t) - \theta(t)), A_1(\bar{\theta}_h(t) - \theta(t)))_H dt \leq Mh^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

for all $h \in (0, h_{00})$, where $v = \frac{d\varphi}{dt}$.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we give the linearized equations of coupled sound and heat flow and some parabolic-hyperbolic phase-field systems as examples. In Section 3 we derive existence of solutions to $(P)_n$. In Section 4 we prove that there exists a solution of (P). In Section 5 we establish uniqueness for (P). In Section 6 we obtain error estimates between solutions of (P) and solutions of $(P)_h$.

2. Examples

In this section we give the following examples.

Example 2.1. We can verify that the problem

$$\begin{cases} \theta_t + (\gamma - 1)\varphi_t - \sigma\Delta\theta = 0 & \text{in } \Omega \times (0, T), \\ \varphi_{tt} - c^2\Delta\varphi - m^2\varphi = -c^2\Delta\theta & \text{in } \Omega \times (0, T), \\ \theta = \varphi = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times (0, T), \\ \theta(0) = \theta_0, \varphi(0) = \varphi_0, \varphi_t(0) = v_0 & \text{in } \Omega \end{cases} \quad (P1)$$

is an example, where $c > 0$, $\sigma > 0$, $m \in \mathbb{R}$, $\gamma > 1$, $T > 0$ are constants and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ is a bounded domain with smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$, under the case that

$$\theta_0 \in H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega), -\Delta\theta_0 \in H_0^1(\Omega), \varphi_0 \in H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega), v_0 \in H_0^1(\Omega).$$

Indeed, putting

$$\begin{aligned} V &:= H_0^1(\Omega), \quad H := L^2(\Omega), \\ L &:= I : H \rightarrow H, \\ A_1 &:= -\sigma\Delta : D(A_1) := H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega) \subset H \rightarrow H, \\ B_1 &:= 0 : D(B_1) := H \rightarrow H, \\ A_2 &:= -c^2\Delta : D(A_2) := H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega) \subset H \rightarrow H, \\ B_2 &:= -c^2\Delta : D(B_2) := H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega) \subset H \rightarrow H \end{aligned}$$

and defining the operators $A_1^* : V \rightarrow V^*$, $B_1^* : V \rightarrow V^*$, $A_2^* : V \rightarrow V^*$, $\Phi : D(\Phi) \subset H \rightarrow H$, $\mathcal{L} : H \rightarrow H$, $B_2^* : V \rightarrow V^*$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \langle A_1^*w, z \rangle_{V^*,V} &:= \sigma \int_{\Omega} \nabla w \cdot \nabla z \quad \text{for } w, z \in V, \\ \langle B_1^*w, z \rangle_{V^*,V} &:= 0 \quad \text{for } w, z \in V, \\ \langle A_2^*w, z \rangle_{V^*,V} &:= c^2 \int_{\Omega} \nabla w \cdot \nabla z \quad \text{for } w, z \in V, \\ \Phi z &:= 0 \quad \text{for } z \in D(\Phi) := H, \\ \mathcal{L}z &:= -m^2z \quad \text{for } z \in H, \\ \langle B_2^*w, z \rangle_{V^*,V} &:= c^2 \int_{\Omega} \nabla w \cdot \nabla z \quad \text{for } w, z \in V, \end{aligned}$$

we can check that (A1)–(A12) hold. Similarly, we can confirm that the homogeneous Neumann–Neumann problem is an example.

Example 2.2. We see that the problem

$$\begin{cases} \theta_t + (\gamma - 1)\varphi_t - \sigma\Delta\theta = 0 & \text{in } \Omega \times (0, T), \\ \varphi_{tt} + \varepsilon\varphi_t - c^2\Delta\varphi + \beta(\varphi) + \pi(\varphi) = -c^2\Delta\theta & \text{in } \Omega \times (0, T), \\ \theta = \varphi = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times (0, T), \\ \theta(0) = \theta_0, \varphi(0) = \varphi_0, \varphi_t(0) = v_0 & \text{in } \Omega \end{cases} \quad (\text{P2})$$

is an example, where $c > 0$, $\sigma > 0$, $\varepsilon \geq 0$, $\gamma > 1$, $T > 0$ are constants and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ is a bounded domain with smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$, under the following conditions:

(H1) $\beta : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a single-valued maximal monotone function and there exists a proper differentiable (lower semicontinuous) convex function $\widehat{\beta} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ such that $\widehat{\beta}(0) = 0$ and $\beta(r) = \widehat{\beta}'(r) = \partial\widehat{\beta}(r)$ for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$, where $\widehat{\beta}'$ and $\partial\widehat{\beta}$, respectively, are the differential and subdifferential of $\widehat{\beta}$.

(H2) $\beta \in C^2(\mathbb{R})$. Moreover, there exists a constant $C_\beta > 0$ such that $|\beta''(r)| \leq C_\beta(1 + |r|)$ for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$.

(H3) $\pi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a Lipschitz continuous function.

(H4) $\theta_0 \in H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$, $-\Delta\theta_0 \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, $\varphi_0 \in H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$, $v_0 \in H_0^1(\Omega)$.

Indeed, putting

$$V := H_0^1(\Omega), \quad H := L^2(\Omega),$$

$$L := I : H \rightarrow H,$$

$$A_1 := -\sigma\Delta : D(A_1) := H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega) \subset H \rightarrow H,$$

$$B_1 := \varepsilon I : D(B_1) := H \rightarrow H,$$

$$A_2 := -c^2\Delta : D(A_2) := H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega) \subset H \rightarrow H,$$

$$B_2 := -c^2\Delta : D(B_2) := H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega) \subset H \rightarrow H$$

and defining the operators $A_1^* : V \rightarrow V^*$, $B_1^* : V \rightarrow V^*$, $A_2^* : V \rightarrow V^*$, $\Phi : D(\Phi) \subset H \rightarrow H$, $\mathcal{L} : H \rightarrow H$, $B_2^* : V \rightarrow V^*$ as

$$\langle A_1^*w, z \rangle_{V^*,V} := \sigma \int_{\Omega} \nabla w \cdot \nabla z \quad \text{for } w, z \in V,$$

$$\langle B_1^*w, z \rangle_{V^*,V} := \varepsilon(w, z)_H \quad \text{for } w, z \in V,$$

$$\langle A_2^*w, z \rangle_{V^*,V} := c^2 \int_{\Omega} \nabla w \cdot \nabla z \quad \text{for } w, z \in V,$$

$$\Phi z := \beta(z) \quad \text{for } z \in D(\Phi) := \{z \in H \mid \beta(z) \in H\},$$

$$\mathcal{L}z := \pi(z) \quad \text{for } z \in H,$$

$$\langle B_2^*w, z \rangle_{V^*,V} := c^2 \int_{\Omega} \nabla w \cdot \nabla z \quad \text{for } w, z \in V,$$

we can confirm that (A1)–(A12) hold in reference to [9]. Similarly, we can verify that the homogeneous Neumann–Neumann problem is an example.

Example 2.3. We see that the problem

$$\begin{cases} \theta_t + (\gamma - 1)\varphi_t - \sigma\Delta\theta = 0 & \text{in } \Omega \times (0, T), \\ \varphi_{tt} - \varepsilon\Delta\varphi_t - c^2\Delta\varphi + \beta(\varphi) + \pi(\varphi) = -c^2\Delta\theta & \text{in } \Omega \times (0, T), \\ \theta = \varphi = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times (0, T), \\ \theta(0) = \theta_0, \varphi(0) = \varphi_0, \varphi_t(0) = v_0 & \text{in } \Omega \end{cases} \quad (\text{P3})$$

is an example, where $c > 0$, $\sigma > 0$, $\varepsilon \geq 0$, $\gamma > 1$, $T > 0$ are constants and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ is a bounded domain with smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$, under the three conditions (H1)-(H3) and the condition

$$(H5) \quad \theta_0 \in H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega), \quad -\Delta\theta_0 \in H_0^1(\Omega), \quad \varphi_0 \in H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega), \quad v_0 \in H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega).$$

Indeed, putting

$$\begin{aligned} V &:= H_0^1(\Omega), \quad H := L^2(\Omega), \\ L &:= I : H \rightarrow H, \\ A_1 &:= -\sigma\Delta : D(A_1) := H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega) \subset H \rightarrow H, \\ B_1 &:= -\varepsilon\Delta : D(B_1) := H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega) \subset H \rightarrow H, \\ A_2 &:= -c^2\Delta : D(A_2) := H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega) \subset H \rightarrow H, \\ B_2 &:= -c^2\Delta : D(B_2) := H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega) \subset H \rightarrow H \end{aligned}$$

and defining the operators $A_1^* : V \rightarrow V^*$, $B_1^* : V \rightarrow V^*$, $A_2^* : V \rightarrow V^*$, $\Phi : D(\Phi) \subset H \rightarrow H$, $\mathcal{L} : H \rightarrow H$, $B_2^* : V \rightarrow V^*$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \langle A_1^*w, z \rangle_{V^*,V} &:= \sigma \int_{\Omega} \nabla w \cdot \nabla z \quad \text{for } w, z \in V, \\ \langle B_1^*w, z \rangle_{V^*,V} &:= \varepsilon \int_{\Omega} \nabla w \cdot \nabla z \quad \text{for } w, z \in V, \\ \langle A_2^*w, z \rangle_{V^*,V} &:= c^2 \int_{\Omega} \nabla w \cdot \nabla z \quad \text{for } w, z \in V, \\ \Phi z &:= \beta(z) \quad \text{for } z \in D(\Phi) := \{z \in H \mid \beta(z) \in H\}, \\ \mathcal{L}z &:= \pi(z) \quad \text{for } z \in H, \\ \langle B_2^*w, z \rangle_{V^*,V} &:= c^2 \int_{\Omega} \nabla w \cdot \nabla z \quad \text{for } w, z \in V, \end{aligned}$$

we can verify that (A1)–(A12) hold in reference to [9]. Similarly, we can check that the homogeneous Neumann–Neumann problem is an example.

Example 2.4. The problem

$$\begin{cases} \theta_t + \varphi_t - \Delta\theta = 0 & \text{in } \Omega \times (0, T), \\ \varphi_{tt} + \varphi_t - \Delta\varphi + \beta(\varphi) + \pi(\varphi) = \theta & \text{in } \Omega \times (0, T), \\ \theta = \varphi = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times (0, T), \\ \theta(0) = \theta_0, \quad \varphi(0) = \varphi_0, \quad \varphi_t(0) = v_0 & \text{in } \Omega \end{cases} \quad (\text{P4})$$

is an example, where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ is a bounded domain with smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$, $T > 0$, under the four conditions (H1)-(H4). Indeed, putting

$$\begin{aligned} V &:= H_0^1(\Omega), \quad H := L^2(\Omega), \\ L &:= I : H \rightarrow H, \\ A_1 &:= -\Delta : D(A_1) := H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega) \subset H \rightarrow H, \\ B_1 &:= I : D(B_1) := H \rightarrow H, \\ A_2 &:= -\Delta : D(A_2) := H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega) \subset H \rightarrow H, \\ B_2 &:= I : D(B_2) := H \rightarrow H \end{aligned}$$

and defining the operators $A_1^* : V \rightarrow V^*$, $B_1^* : V \rightarrow V^*$, $A_2^* : V \rightarrow V^*$, $\Phi : D(\Phi) \subset H \rightarrow H$, $\mathcal{L} : H \rightarrow H$, $B_2^* : V \rightarrow V^*$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \langle A_1^* w, z \rangle_{V^*, V} &:= \int_{\Omega} \nabla w \cdot \nabla z \quad \text{for } w, z \in V, \\ \langle B_1^* w, z \rangle_{V^*, V} &:= (w, z)_H \quad \text{for } w, z \in V, \\ \langle A_2^* w, z \rangle_{V^*, V} &:= \int_{\Omega} \nabla w \cdot \nabla z \quad \text{for } w, z \in V, \\ \Phi z &:= \beta(z) \quad \text{for } z \in D(\Phi) := \{z \in H \mid \beta(z) \in H\}, \\ \mathcal{L} z &:= \pi(z) \quad \text{for } z \in H, \\ \langle B_2^* w, z \rangle_{V^*, V} &:= (w, z)_H \quad \text{for } w, z \in V, \end{aligned}$$

we can confirm that (A1)–(A12) hold in reference to [9]. Similarly, we can show that the homogeneous Neumann–Neumann problem is an example.

Example 2.5. The problem

$$\begin{cases} \theta_t + \varphi_t - \Delta \theta = 0 & \text{in } \Omega \times (0, T), \\ \varphi_{tt} - \Delta \varphi_t - \Delta \varphi + \beta(\varphi) + \pi(\varphi) = \theta & \text{in } \Omega \times (0, T), \\ \theta = \varphi = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times (0, T), \\ \theta(0) = \theta_0, \varphi(0) = \varphi_0, \varphi_t(0) = v_0 & \text{in } \Omega \end{cases} \quad (\text{P5})$$

is an example, where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ is a bounded domain with smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$, $T > 0$, under the four conditions (H1)-(H3), (H5). Indeed, putting

$$\begin{aligned} V &:= H_0^1(\Omega), \quad H := L^2(\Omega), \\ L &:= I : H \rightarrow H, \\ A_1 &:= -\Delta : D(A_1) := H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega) \subset H \rightarrow H, \\ B_1 &:= -\Delta : D(B_1) := H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega) \subset H \rightarrow H, \\ A_2 &:= -\Delta : D(A_2) := H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega) \subset H \rightarrow H, \\ B_2 &:= I : D(B_2) := H \rightarrow H \end{aligned}$$

and defining the operators $A_1^* : V \rightarrow V^*$, $B_1^* : V \rightarrow V^*$, $A_2^* : V \rightarrow V^*$, $\Phi : D(\Phi) \subset H \rightarrow H$, $\mathcal{L} : H \rightarrow H$, $B_2^* : V \rightarrow V^*$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \langle A_1^* w, z \rangle_{V^*, V} &:= \int_{\Omega} \nabla w \cdot \nabla z \quad \text{for } w, z \in V, \\ \langle B_1^* w, z \rangle_{V^*, V} &:= \int_{\Omega} \nabla w \cdot \nabla z \quad \text{for } w, z \in V, \\ \langle A_2^* w, z \rangle_{V^*, V} &:= \int_{\Omega} \nabla w \cdot \nabla z \quad \text{for } w, z \in V, \\ \Phi z &:= \beta(z) \quad \text{for } z \in D(\Phi) := \{z \in H \mid \beta(z) \in H\}, \\ \mathcal{L} z &:= \pi(z) \quad \text{for } z \in H, \\ \langle B_2^* w, z \rangle_{V^*, V} &:= (w, z)_H \quad \text{for } w, z \in V, \end{aligned}$$

we can confirm that (A1)–(A12) hold in reference to [9]. Similarly, we can show that the homogeneous Neumann–Neumann problem is an example.

3. Existence of discrete solutions

In this section we will prove Theorem 1.1.

Lemma 3.1. *There exists $h_1 \in (0, 1)$ such that*

$$0 < h_1 < \tilde{h} := \left(\frac{c_L}{1 + C_{\mathcal{L}} + \eta C_{A_1, B_2}} + \frac{\eta^2 C_{A_1, B_2}^2}{4(1 + C_{\mathcal{L}} + \eta C_{A_1, B_2})} \right)^{1/2} - \frac{\eta C_{A_1, B_2}}{2(1 + C_{\mathcal{L}} + \eta C_{A_1, B_2})}$$

and for all $g \in H$ and all $h \in (0, h_1)$ there exists a unique solution $\varphi \in D(B_1) \cap D(A_2)$ of the equation

$$L\varphi + hB_1\varphi + h^2A_2\varphi + h^2\Phi\varphi + h^2\mathcal{L}\varphi + \eta h^2B_2(I + hA_1)^{-1}\varphi = g \quad \text{in } H.$$

Proof. We define the operator $\Psi : V \rightarrow V^*$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Psi\varphi, w \rangle_{V^*, V} &:= (L\varphi, w)_H + h\langle B_1^*\varphi, w \rangle_{V^*, V} + h^2\langle A_2^*\varphi, w \rangle_{V^*, V} + h^2\langle \Phi_\lambda\varphi, w \rangle_H \\ &\quad + h^2\langle \mathcal{L}\varphi, w \rangle_H + \eta h^2\langle B_2(I + hA_1)^{-1}\varphi, w \rangle_H \quad \text{for } \varphi, w \in V. \end{aligned}$$

Then this operator $\Psi : V \rightarrow V^*$ is monotone, continuous and coercive for all $h \in (0, \tilde{h})$. Indeed, since the condition (A5) yields that

$$\begin{aligned} \|B_2(I + hA_1)^{-1}\varphi\|_H &\leq C_{A_1, B_2} (\|(I + hA_1)^{-1}\varphi\|_H + \|A_1(I + hA_1)^{-1}\varphi\|_H) \\ &\leq C_{A_1, B_2} (1 + h^{-1})\|\varphi\|_H \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

for all $\varphi \in H$, we derive from (A2), (A3), (A11), the monotonicity of B_1^* and Φ_λ , and (3.1) that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle \Psi\varphi - \Psi\bar{\varphi}, \varphi - \bar{\varphi} \rangle_{V^*,V} \\
&= (L(\varphi - \bar{\varphi}), \varphi - \bar{\varphi})_H + h\langle B_1^*(\varphi - \bar{\varphi}), \varphi - \bar{\varphi} \rangle_{V^*,V} + h^2\langle A_2^*(\varphi - \bar{\varphi}), \varphi - \bar{\varphi} \rangle_{V^*,V} \\
&\quad + h^2(\Phi_\lambda\varphi - \Phi_\lambda\bar{\varphi}, \varphi - \bar{\varphi})_H + h^2(\mathcal{L}\varphi - \mathcal{L}\bar{\varphi}, \varphi - \bar{\varphi})_H \\
&\quad + \eta h^2(B_2(I + hA_1)^{-1}(\varphi - \bar{\varphi}), (\varphi - \bar{\varphi}))_H \\
&\geq c_L\|\varphi - \bar{\varphi}\|_H^2 + \omega_{2,1}h^2\|\varphi - \bar{\varphi}\|_V^2 - h^2\|\varphi - \bar{\varphi}\|_H^2 - C_{\mathcal{L}}h^2\|\varphi - \bar{\varphi}\|_H^2 \\
&\quad - \eta C_{A_1, B_2}(h + h^2)\|\varphi - \bar{\varphi}\|_H^2 \\
&\geq \omega_{2,1}h^2\|\varphi - \bar{\varphi}\|_V^2
\end{aligned}$$

for all $\varphi, \bar{\varphi} \in V$ and all $h \in (0, \tilde{h})$. It follows from the boundedness of the operators $L : H \rightarrow H$, $B_1^* : V \rightarrow V^*$, $A_2^* : V \rightarrow V^*$, the Lipschitz continuity of $\Phi_\lambda : H \rightarrow H$, the condition (A11), (3.1) and the continuity of the embedding $V \hookrightarrow H$ that there exists a constant $C_1 = C_1(\lambda) > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\langle \Psi\varphi - \Psi\bar{\varphi}, w \rangle_{V^*,V}| \\
&\leq |(L(\varphi - \bar{\varphi}), w)_H| + h|\langle B_1^*(\varphi - \bar{\varphi}), w \rangle_{V^*,V}| + h^2|\langle A_2^*(\varphi - \bar{\varphi}), w \rangle_{V^*,V}| \\
&\quad + h^2|(\Phi_\lambda\varphi - \Phi_\lambda\bar{\varphi}, w)_H| + h^2|(\mathcal{L}\varphi - \mathcal{L}\bar{\varphi}, w)_H| \\
&\quad + \eta h^2|(B_2(I + hA_1)^{-1}(\varphi - \bar{\varphi}), w)_H| \\
&\leq C_1(1 + h + h^2)\|\varphi - \bar{\varphi}\|_V\|w\|_V
\end{aligned}$$

for all $\varphi, \bar{\varphi} \in V$ and all $h > 0$. Moreover, the inequality $\langle \Psi\varphi - \mathcal{L}0, \varphi \rangle_{V^*,V} \geq \omega_{2,1}h^2\|\varphi\|_V^2$ holds for all $\varphi \in V$ and all $h \in (0, \tilde{h})$. Therefore the operator $\Psi : V \rightarrow V^*$ is surjective for all $h \in (0, \tilde{h})$ (see e.g., [2, p. 37]) and then we see from (A10) that for all $g \in H$ and all $h \in (0, \tilde{h})$ there exists a unique solution $\varphi_\lambda \in D(B_1) \cap D(A_2)$ of the equation

$$L\varphi_\lambda + hB_1\varphi_\lambda + h^2A_2\varphi_\lambda + h^2\Phi_\lambda\varphi_\lambda + h^2\mathcal{L}\varphi_\lambda + \eta h^2B_2(I + hA_1)^{-1}\varphi_\lambda = g \quad \text{in } H. \quad (3.2)$$

Here, multiplying (3.2) by φ_λ and using the Young inequality, (A11), (3.1), we infer that

$$\begin{aligned}
& (L\varphi_\lambda, \varphi_\lambda)_H + h(B_1\varphi_\lambda, \varphi_\lambda)_H + h^2\langle A_2^*\varphi_\lambda, \varphi_\lambda \rangle_{V^*,V} + h^2(\Phi_\lambda\varphi_\lambda, \varphi_\lambda)_H \\
&= (g, \varphi_\lambda)_H - h^2(\mathcal{L}\varphi_\lambda - \mathcal{L}0, \varphi_\lambda)_H - h^2(\mathcal{L}0, \varphi_\lambda)_H - \eta h^2(B_2(I + hA_1)^{-1}\varphi_\lambda, \varphi_\lambda)_H \\
&\leq \frac{c_L}{2}\|\varphi_\lambda\|_H^2 + \frac{1}{2c_L}\|g\|_H^2 + C_{\mathcal{L}}h^2\|\varphi_\lambda\|_H^2 + \frac{\|\mathcal{L}0\|_H^2}{2}h^2 + \frac{1}{2}h^2\|\varphi_\lambda\|_H^2 \\
&\quad + \eta C_{A_1, B_2}(h + h^2)\|\varphi_\lambda\|_H^2,
\end{aligned}$$

whence the conditions (A2) and (A3), the monotonicity of B_1 and Φ_λ imply that there exists $h_1 \in (0, \min\{1, \tilde{h}\})$ such that for all $h \in (0, h_1)$ there exists a constant $C_2 = C_2(h) > 0$ satisfying

$$\|\varphi_\lambda\|_V^2 \leq C_2 \quad (3.3)$$

for all $\lambda > 0$. We have from (3.2), (A8), (3.1) and the Young inequality that

$$\begin{aligned}
& h^2 \|\Phi_\lambda \varphi_\lambda\|_H^2 \\
&= (g, \Phi_\lambda \varphi_\lambda)_H - (L\varphi_\lambda, \Phi_\lambda \varphi_\lambda)_H - h(B_1\varphi_\lambda, \Phi_\lambda \varphi_\lambda)_H - h^2(A_2\varphi_\lambda, \Phi_\lambda \varphi_\lambda)_H \\
&\quad - h^2(\mathcal{L}\varphi_\lambda, \Phi_\lambda \varphi_\lambda)_H - \eta h^2(B_2(I + hA_1)^{-1}\varphi_\lambda, \Phi_\lambda \varphi_\lambda)_H \\
&\leq \frac{2}{h^2} \|g\|_H^2 + \frac{2}{h^2} \|L\varphi_\lambda\|_H^2 + 2h^2 \|\mathcal{L}\varphi_\lambda\|_H^2 + 2\eta^2 C_{A_1, B_2}^2 (1+h)^2 \|\varphi_\lambda\|_H^2 + \frac{1}{2} h^2 \|\Phi_\lambda \varphi_\lambda\|_H^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, owing to the boundedness of the operator $L : H \rightarrow H$, (A11) and (3.3), it holds that for all $h \in (0, h_1)$ there exists a constant $C_3 = C_3(h) > 0$ such that

$$\|\Phi_\lambda \varphi_\lambda\|_H^2 \leq C_3 \quad (3.4)$$

for all $\lambda > 0$. The equation (3.2) yields that

$$\begin{aligned}
h \|B_1\varphi_\lambda\|_H^2 &= (g, B_1\varphi_\lambda)_H - (L\varphi_\lambda, B_1\varphi_\lambda)_H - h^2(A_2\varphi_\lambda, B_1\varphi_\lambda)_H - h^2(\Phi_\lambda \varphi_\lambda, B_1\varphi_\lambda)_H \\
&\quad - h^2(\mathcal{L}\varphi_\lambda, B_1\varphi_\lambda)_H - \eta h^2(B_2(I + hA_1)^{-1}\varphi_\lambda, B_1\varphi_\lambda)_H,
\end{aligned}$$

and hence we deduce from the boundedness of the operator $L : H \rightarrow H$, (A4), (A8), (A11), (3.1), the Young inequality and (3.3) that for all $h \in (0, h_1)$ there exists a constant $C_4 = C_4(h) > 0$ satisfying

$$\|B_1\varphi_\lambda\|_H^2 \leq C_4(h) \quad (3.5)$$

for all $\lambda > 0$. We derive from (3.1)-(3.5) that for all $h \in (0, h_1)$ there exists a constant $C_5 = C_5(h) > 0$ such that

$$\|A_2\varphi_\lambda\|_H^2 \leq C_5(h) \quad (3.6)$$

for all $\lambda > 0$. Hence the inequalities (3.3)-(3.6) mean that there exist $\varphi \in D(B_1) \cap D(A_2)$ and $\xi \in H$ such that

$$\varphi_\lambda \rightarrow \varphi \quad \text{weakly in } V, \quad (3.7)$$

$$L\varphi_\lambda \rightarrow L\varphi \quad \text{weakly in } H, \quad (3.8)$$

$$\Phi_\lambda(\varphi_\lambda) \rightarrow \xi \quad \text{weakly in } H, \quad (3.9)$$

$$B_1\varphi_\lambda \rightarrow B_1\varphi \quad \text{weakly in } H, \quad (3.10)$$

$$A_2\varphi_\lambda \rightarrow A_2\varphi \quad \text{weakly in } H \quad (3.11)$$

as $\lambda = \lambda_j \rightarrow +0$. Here it follows from (3.3), (3.7), the compact of the embedding $V \hookrightarrow H$ that

$$\varphi_\lambda \rightarrow \varphi \quad \text{strongly in } H \quad (3.12)$$

as $\lambda = \lambda_j \rightarrow +0$. Also, we see from (3.9) and (3.12) that $(\Phi_\lambda \varphi_\lambda, \varphi_\lambda)_H \rightarrow (\xi, \varphi)_H$ as $\lambda = \lambda_j \rightarrow +0$. Thus the inclusion and the identity

$$\varphi \in D(\Phi), \quad \xi = \Phi\varphi \quad (3.13)$$

hold (see e.g., [1, Lemma 1.3, p. 42]).

Therefore, thanks to (3.2), (3.8)-(3.13) and (A11), we can verify that there exists a solution $\varphi \in D(B_1) \cap D(A_2)$ of the equation

$$L\varphi + hB_1\varphi + h^2A_2\varphi + h^2\Phi\varphi + h^2\mathcal{L}\varphi + \eta h^2B_2(I + hA_1)^{-1}\varphi = g \quad \text{in } H.$$

Moreover, the solution φ of this problem is unique by (A2), (A3), the monotonicity of B_1 and Φ , (A11) and (3.1). \square

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Let h_1 be as in Lemma 3.1 and let $h \in (0, h_1)$. Then we infer from (1.1), the linearity of the operators A_1, L, B_1, B_2 and A_2 that the problem $(P)_n$ can be written as

$$\begin{cases} \theta_{n+1} + hA_1\theta_{n+1} = \theta_n + \eta(\varphi_n - \varphi_{n+1}), \\ L\varphi_{n+1} + hB_1\varphi_{n+1} + h^2A_2\varphi_{n+1} + h^2\Phi\varphi_{n+1} + h^2\mathcal{L}\varphi_{n+1} + \eta h^2B_2(I + hA_1)^{-1}\varphi_{n+1} \\ = L\varphi_n + hLv_n + hB_1\varphi_n + h^2B_2(I + hA_1)^{-1}(\eta\varphi_n + \theta_n) \end{cases} \quad (\text{Q})_n$$

and then proving Theorem 1.1 is equivalent to show existence and uniqueness of solutions to $(Q)_n$ for $n = 0, \dots, N-1$. It suffices to consider the case that $n = 0$. Owing to Lemma 3.1, there exists a unique solution $\varphi_1 \in D(B_1) \cap D(A_2)$ of the equation

$$\begin{aligned} L\varphi_1 + hB_1\varphi_1 + h^2A_2\varphi_1 + h^2\Phi\varphi_1 + h^2\mathcal{L}\varphi_1 + \eta h^2B_2(I + hA_1)^{-1}\varphi_1 \\ = L\varphi_0 + hLv_0 + hB_1\varphi_0 + h^2B_2(I + hA_1)^{-1}(\eta\varphi_0 + \theta_0). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, putting $\theta_1 := (I + hA_1)^{-1}(\theta_0 + \eta(\varphi_0 - \varphi_1))$, we can conclude that there exists a unique solution (θ_1, φ_1) of $(Q)_n$ in the case that $n = 0$. \square

4. Uniform estimates for $(P)_h$ and passage to the limit

In this section we will derive a priori estimates for $(P)_h$ and will show Theorem 1.2 by passing to the limit in $(P)_h$ as $h \rightarrow +0$.

Lemma 4.1. *Let h_0 be as in Theorem 1.1. Then there exist constants $h_2 \in (0, h_0)$ and $C = C(T) > 0$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{v}_h\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H)}^2 + h\|\bar{z}_h\|_{L^2(0,T;H)}^2 + \|B_1^{1/2}\bar{v}_h\|_{L^2(0,T;H)}^2 + \|\bar{\varphi}_h\|_{L^\infty(0,T;V)}^2 \\ + h\|\bar{v}_h\|_{L^2(0,T;V)}^2 + \|B_2^{1/2}\bar{\theta}_h\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H)}^2 + h\left\|B_2^{1/2}\frac{d\hat{\theta}_h}{dt}\right\|_{L^2(0,T;H)}^2 \leq C \end{aligned}$$

for all $h \in (0, h_2)$.

Proof. We test the second equation in $(P)_n$ by hv_{n+1} ($= \varphi_{n+1} - \varphi_n$) and recall (1.1) to obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
& (L(v_{n+1} - v_n), v_{n+1})_H + h\|B_1^{1/2}v_{n+1}\|_H^2 + \langle A_2^*\varphi_{n+1}, \varphi_{n+1} - \varphi_n \rangle_{V^*,V} \\
& + (\varphi_{n+1}, \varphi_{n+1} - \varphi_n)_H + (\Phi\varphi_{n+1}, \varphi_{n+1} - \varphi_n)_H \\
& = h(B_2\theta_{n+1}, v_{n+1})_H - h(\mathcal{L}\varphi_{n+1}, v_{n+1})_H + h(\varphi_{n+1}, v_{n+1})_H.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

Here it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
& (L(v_{n+1} - v_n), v_{n+1})_H \\
& = (L^{1/2}(v_{n+1} - v_n), L^{1/2}v_{n+1})_H \\
& = \frac{1}{2}\|L^{1/2}v_{n+1}\|_H^2 - \frac{1}{2}\|L^{1/2}v_n\|_H^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|L^{1/2}(v_{n+1} - v_n)\|_H^2
\end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle A_2^*\varphi_{n+1}, \varphi_{n+1} - \varphi_n \rangle_{V^*,V} + (\varphi_{n+1}, \varphi_{n+1} - \varphi_n)_H \\
& = \frac{1}{2}\langle A_2^*\varphi_{n+1}, \varphi_{n+1} \rangle_{V^*,V} - \frac{1}{2}\langle A_2^*\varphi_n, \varphi_n \rangle_{V^*,V} + \frac{1}{2}\langle A_2^*(\varphi_{n+1} - \varphi_n), \varphi_{n+1} - \varphi_n \rangle_{V^*,V} \\
& + \frac{1}{2}\|\varphi_{n+1}\|_H^2 - \frac{1}{2}\|\varphi_n\|_H^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|\varphi_{n+1} - \varphi_n\|_H^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

The first equation in $(P)_n$ yields that

$$\begin{aligned}
& h(B_2\theta_{n+1}, v_{n+1})_H \\
& = \frac{h}{\eta} \left(B_2\theta_{n+1}, -\frac{\theta_{n+1} - \theta_n}{h} - A_1\theta_{n+1} \right)_H \\
& = -\frac{1}{2\eta} \left(\|B_2^{1/2}\theta_{n+1}\|_H^2 - \|B_2^{1/2}\theta_n\|_H^2 + \|B_2^{1/2}(\theta_{n+1} - \theta_n)\|_H^2 \right) \\
& - \frac{h}{\eta} (B_2\theta_{n+1}, A_1\theta_{n+1})_H.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

Thus it follows from (4.1)-(4.4), (A4), (A7), (A11), the continuity of the embedding $V \hookrightarrow H$ and the Young inequality that there exist constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2}\|L^{1/2}v_{n+1}\|_H^2 - \frac{1}{2}\|L^{1/2}v_n\|_H^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|L^{1/2}(v_{n+1} - v_n)\|_H^2 + h\|B_1^{1/2}v_{n+1}\|_H^2 \\
& + \frac{1}{2}\langle A_2^*\varphi_{n+1}, \varphi_{n+1} \rangle_{V^*,V} - \frac{1}{2}\langle A_2^*\varphi_n, \varphi_n \rangle_{V^*,V} + \frac{1}{2}\langle A_2^*(\varphi_{n+1} - \varphi_n), \varphi_{n+1} - \varphi_n \rangle_{V^*,V} \\
& + \frac{1}{2}\|\varphi_{n+1}\|_H^2 - \frac{1}{2}\|\varphi_n\|_H^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|\varphi_{n+1} - \varphi_n\|_H^2 + i(\varphi_{n+1}) - i(\varphi_n) \\
& + \frac{1}{2\eta}\|B_2^{1/2}\theta_{n+1}\|_H^2 - \frac{1}{2\eta}\|B_2^{1/2}\theta_n\|_H^2 + \frac{1}{2\eta}\|B_2^{1/2}(\theta_{n+1} - \theta_n)\|_H^2 \\
& \leq h\|v_{n+1}\|_H^2 + C_1h\|\varphi_{n+1}\|_V^2 + C_2h
\end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

for all $h \in (0, h_0)$. Moreover, summing (4.5) over $n = 0, \dots, m-1$ with $1 \leq m \leq N$ leads to the inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2} \|L^{1/2} v_m\|_H^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \|L^{1/2} (v_{n+1} - v_n)\|_H^2 + h \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \|B_1^{1/2} v_{n+1}\|_H^2 + \frac{1}{2} \langle A_2^* \varphi_m, \varphi_m \rangle_{V^*, V} \\
& + \frac{1}{2} \|\varphi_m\|_H^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \langle A_2^* (\varphi_{n+1} - \varphi_n), \varphi_{n+1} - \varphi_n \rangle_{V^*, V} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \|\varphi_{n+1} - \varphi_n\|_H^2 \\
& + i(\varphi_m) + \frac{1}{2\eta} \|B_2^{1/2} \theta_m\|_H^2 + \frac{1}{2\eta} \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \|B_2^{1/2} (\theta_{n+1} - \theta_n)\|_H^2 \\
& \leq \frac{1}{2} \|L^{1/2} v_0\|_H^2 + \frac{1}{2} \langle A_2^* \varphi_0, \varphi_0 \rangle_{V^*, V} + \frac{1}{2} \|\varphi_0\|_H^2 + i(\varphi_0) + \frac{1}{2\eta} \|B_2^{1/2} \theta_0\|_H^2 \\
& + h \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \|v_{n+1}\|_H^2 + C_1 h \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \|\varphi_{n+1}\|_V^2 + C_2 T
\end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

for all $h \in (0, h_0)$. Here we see from (A3) that

$$\frac{1}{2} \langle A_2^* \varphi_m, \varphi_m \rangle_{V^*, V} + \frac{1}{2} \|\varphi_m\|_H^2 \geq \frac{\omega_{2,1}}{2} \|\varphi_m\|_V^2 \tag{4.7}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \langle A_2^* (\varphi_{n+1} - \varphi_n), \varphi_{n+1} - \varphi_n \rangle_{V^*, V} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \|\varphi_{n+1} - \varphi_n\|_H^2 \\
& \geq \frac{\omega_{2,1}}{2} \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \|\varphi_{n+1} - \varphi_n\|_V^2 = \frac{\omega_{2,1}}{2} h^2 \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \|v_{n+1}\|_V^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

Thus we derive from (4.6)-(4.8) and (A2) that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left(\frac{c_L}{2} - h \right) \|v_m\|_H^2 + \frac{c_L}{2} h^2 \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \|z_{n+1}\|_H^2 + h \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \|B_1^{1/2} v_{n+1}\|_H^2 + \left(\frac{\omega_{2,1}}{2} - C_1 h \right) \|\varphi_m\|_V^2 \\
& + \frac{\omega_{2,1}}{2} h^2 \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \|v_{n+1}\|_V^2 + \frac{1}{2\eta} \|B_2^{1/2} \theta_m\|_H^2 + \frac{1}{2\eta} h^2 \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \|B_2^{1/2} \delta_h \theta_n\|_H^2 \\
& \leq \frac{1}{2} \|L^{1/2} v_0\|_H^2 + \frac{1}{2} \langle A_2^* \varphi_0, \varphi_0 \rangle_{V^*, V} + \frac{1}{2} \|\varphi_0\|_H^2 + i(\varphi_0) + \frac{1}{2\eta} \|B_2^{1/2} \theta_0\|_H^2 \\
& + h \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \|v_j\|_H^2 + C_1 h \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \|\varphi_j\|_V^2 + C_2 T,
\end{aligned}$$

whence there exist constants $h_2 \in (0, h_0)$ and $C_3 = C_3(T) > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|v_m\|_H^2 + h^2 \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \|z_{n+1}\|_H^2 + h \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \|B_1^{1/2} v_{n+1}\|_H^2 \\
& + \|\varphi_m\|_V^2 + h^2 \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \|v_{n+1}\|_V^2 + \|B_2^{1/2} \theta_m\|_H^2 + h^2 \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \|B_2^{1/2} \delta_h \theta_n\|_H^2 \\
& \leq C_3 h \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \|v_j\|_H^2 + C_3 h \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \|\varphi_j\|_V^2 + C_3
\end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

for all $h \in (0, h_2)$. Therefore it follows from the inequality (4.9) and the discrete Gronwall lemma (see e.g., [8, Prop. 2.2.1]) that there exists a constant $C_4 = C_4(T) > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|v_m\|_H^2 + h^2 \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \|z_{n+1}\|_H^2 + h \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \|B_1^{1/2} v_{n+1}\|_H^2 \\
& + \|\varphi_m\|_V^2 + h^2 \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \|v_{n+1}\|_V^2 + \|B_2^{1/2} \theta_m\|_H^2 + h^2 \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \|B_2^{1/2} \delta_h \theta_n\|_H^2 \leq C_4
\end{aligned}$$

for all $h \in (0, h_2)$ and $m = 1, \dots, N$. □

Lemma 4.2. *Let h_2 be as in Lemma 4.1. Then there exists a constant $C = C(T) > 0$ such that*

$$\|z_1\|_H^2 + h \|B_1^{1/2} z_1\|_H^2 + \|v_1\|_V^2 + h^2 \|z_1\|_V^2 + \langle B_2^*(\eta v_1 + A_1 \theta_1), \eta v_1 + A_1 \theta_1 \rangle_{V^*, V} \leq C$$

for all $h \in (0, h_2)$.

Proof. The second equation in $(P)_n$, the identities $v_1 = v_0 + h z_1$ and $\varphi_1 = \varphi_0 + h v_1$ yield that

$$L z_1 + B_1 v_0 + h B_1 z_1 + A_2 \varphi_0 + h A_2 v_1 + \Phi \varphi_1 + \mathcal{L} \varphi_1 = B_2 \theta_1. \tag{4.10}$$

Then we test (4.10) by z_1 to infer that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|L^{1/2} z_1\|_H^2 + (B_1 v_0, z_1)_H + h (B_1 z_1, z_1)_H + (A_2 \varphi_0, z_1)_H + h (A_2 v_1, z_1)_H \\
& + (\Phi \varphi_1, z_1)_H + (\mathcal{L} \varphi_1, z_1)_H = (B_2 \theta_1, z_1)_H.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.11}$$

Here we derive from (A3) that

$$\begin{aligned}
h(A_2 v_1, z_1)_H &= (A_2 v_1, v_1 - v_0)_H = \langle A_2^* v_1, v_1 - v_0 \rangle_{V^*, V} \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \langle A_2^* v_1, v_1 \rangle_{V^*, V} - \frac{1}{2} \langle A_2^* v_0, v_0 \rangle_{V^*, V} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \langle A_2^* (v_1 - v_0), v_1 - v_0 \rangle_{V^*, V} \\
&\geq \frac{\omega_{2,1}}{2} \|v_1\|_V^2 - \frac{1}{2} \|v_1\|_H^2 - \frac{1}{2} \langle A_2^* v_0, v_0 \rangle_{V^*, V} \\
&\quad + \frac{\omega_{2,1}}{2} \|v_1 - v_0\|_V^2 - \frac{1}{2} \|v_1 - v_0\|_H^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

We see from (A6) and Lemma 4.1 that there exists a constant $C_1 = C_1(T) > 0$ such that

$$|(\Phi \varphi_1, z_1)_H| \leq C_\Phi (1 + \|\varphi_1\|_V^p) \|\varphi_1\|_V \|z_1\|_H \leq C_1 \|z_1\|_H. \tag{4.13}$$

Also, the first equation in $(P)_n$ and the identity $v_1 - v_0 = h z_1$ imply that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2\eta} \langle B_2^*(\eta v_1 + A_1 \theta_1), \eta v_1 + A_1 \theta_1 \rangle_{V^*, V} - \frac{1}{2\eta} \langle B_2^*(\eta v_0 + A_1 \theta_0), \eta v_0 + A_1 \theta_0 \rangle_{V^*, V} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2\eta} \langle B_2^*(\eta(v_1 - v_0) + A_1(\theta_1 - \theta_0)), \eta(v_1 - v_0) + A_1(\theta_1 - \theta_0) \rangle_{V^*, V} \\
&= \frac{1}{\eta} \langle B_2^*(\eta v_1 + A_1 \theta_1), \eta(v_1 - v_0) + A_1(\theta_1 - \theta_0) \rangle_{V^*, V} \\
&= -(B_2 \theta_1, z_1)_H + (B_2 \theta_0, z_1)_H - \frac{1}{\eta h} (B_2(\theta_1 - \theta_0), A_1(\theta_1 - \theta_0))_H.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.14}$$

Hence it follows from (4.11)-(4.14), (A2), (A4) and the monotonicity of $B_2^* : V \rightarrow V^*$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
&c_L \|z_1\|_H^2 + h \|B_1^{1/2} z_1\|_H^2 + \frac{\omega_{2,1}}{2} \|v_1\|_V^2 + \frac{\omega_{2,1}}{2} h^2 \|z_1\|_V^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2\eta} \langle B_2^*(\eta v_1 + A_1 \theta_1), \eta v_1 + A_1 \theta_1 \rangle_{V^*, V} \\
&\leq -(B_1 v_0, z_1)_H - (A_2 \varphi_0, z_1)_H + \frac{1}{2} \|v_1\|_H^2 + \frac{1}{2} \langle A_2^* v_0, v_0 \rangle_{V^*, V} + \frac{1}{2} \|v_1 - v_0\|_H^2 \\
&\quad + C_1 \|z_1\|_H - (\mathcal{L} \varphi_1, z_1)_H + (B_2 \theta_0, z_1)_H + \frac{1}{2\eta} \langle B_2^*(\eta v_0 + A_1 \theta_0), \eta v_0 + A_1 \theta_0 \rangle_{V^*, V}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

Thus we deduce from (4.15), (A11), the Young inequality and Lemma 4.1 that Lemma 4.2 holds. \square

Lemma 4.3. *Let h_2 be as in Lemma 4.1. Then there exist constants $h_3 \in (0, h_2)$ and $C = C(T) > 0$ such that*

$$\|\bar{z}_h\|_{L^\infty(0, T; H)}^2 + \|B_1^{1/2} \bar{z}_h\|_{L^2(0, T; H)}^2 + \|\bar{v}_h\|_{L^\infty(0, T; V)}^2 + h \|\bar{z}_h\|_{L^2(0, T; V)}^2 \leq C$$

for all $h \in (0, h_3)$.

Proof. Let $n \in \{1, \dots, N-1\}$. Then we have from the second equation in $(P)_n$ that

$$\begin{aligned} & L(z_{n+1} - z_n) + hB_1z_{n+1} + hA_2v_{n+1} + \Phi\varphi_{n+1} - \Phi\varphi_n + \mathcal{L}\varphi_{n+1} - \mathcal{L}\varphi_n \\ & = B_2(\theta_{n+1} - \theta_n). \end{aligned}$$

Here, since it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} (L(z_{n+1} - z_n), z_{n+1})_H &= (L^{1/2}(z_{n+1} - z_n), L^{1/2}z_{n+1})_H \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\|L^{1/2}z_{n+1}\|_H^2 - \frac{1}{2}\|L^{1/2}z_n\|_H^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|L^{1/2}(z_{n+1} - z_n)\|_H^2, \end{aligned}$$

we see that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2}\|L^{1/2}z_{n+1}\|_H^2 - \frac{1}{2}\|L^{1/2}z_n\|_H^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|L^{1/2}(z_{n+1} - z_n)\|_H^2 + h\|B_1^{1/2}z_{n+1}\|_H^2 \\ & + \langle A_2^*v_{n+1}, v_{n+1} - v_n \rangle_{V^*,V} + (v_{n+1}, v_{n+1} - v_n)_H \\ & = -h \left(\frac{\Phi\varphi_{n+1} - \Phi\varphi_n}{h}, z_{n+1} \right)_H - h \left(\frac{\mathcal{L}\varphi_{n+1} - \mathcal{L}\varphi_n}{h}, z_{n+1} \right)_H \\ & + (B_2(\theta_{n+1} - \theta_n), z_{n+1})_H + h(v_{n+1}, z_{n+1})_H. \end{aligned} \quad (4.16)$$

On the other hand, the identity

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle A_2^*v_{n+1}, v_{n+1} - v_n \rangle_{V^*,V} + (v_{n+1}, v_{n+1} - v_n)_H \\ & = \frac{1}{2}\langle A_2^*v_{n+1}, v_{n+1} \rangle_{V^*,V} - \frac{1}{2}\langle A_2^*v_n, v_n \rangle_{V^*,V} + \frac{1}{2}\langle A_2^*(v_{n+1} - v_n), v_{n+1} - v_n \rangle_{V^*,V} \\ & + \frac{1}{2}\|v_{n+1}\|_H^2 - \frac{1}{2}\|v_n\|_H^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|v_{n+1} - v_n\|_H^2 \end{aligned} \quad (4.17)$$

holds. The condition (A6) and Lemma 4.1 mean that there exists a constant $C_1 = C_1(T) > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} -h \left(\frac{\Phi\varphi_{n+1} - \Phi\varphi_n}{h}, z_{n+1} \right)_H &\leq C_\Phi h(1 + \|\varphi_{n+1}\|_V^p + \|\varphi_n\|_V^q) \|v_{n+1}\|_V \|z_{n+1}\|_H \\ &\leq C_1 h \|v_{n+1}\|_V \|z_{n+1}\|_H \end{aligned} \quad (4.18)$$

for all $h \in (0, h_2)$. Also, the first equation in $(P)_n$ and the identity $v_{n+1} - v_n = hz_{n+1}$ yield that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2\eta} \langle B_2^*(\eta v_{n+1} + A_1\theta_{n+1}), \eta v_{n+1} + A_1\theta_{n+1} \rangle_{V^*,V} \\ & - \frac{1}{2\eta} \langle B_2^*(\eta v_n + A_1\theta_n), \eta v_n + A_1\theta_n \rangle_{V^*,V} \\ & + \frac{1}{2\eta} \langle B_2^*(\eta(v_{n+1} - v_n) + A_1(\theta_{n+1} - \theta_n)), \eta(v_{n+1} - v_n) + A_1(\theta_{n+1} - \theta_n) \rangle_{V^*,V} \\ & = \frac{1}{\eta} \langle B_2^*(\eta v_{n+1} + A_1\theta_{n+1}), \eta(v_{n+1} - v_n) + A_1(\theta_{n+1} - \theta_n) \rangle_{V^*,V} \\ & = -(B_2(\theta_{n+1} - \theta_n), z_{n+1})_H - \frac{1}{\eta h} (B_2(\theta_{n+1} - \theta_n), A_1(\theta_{n+1} - \theta_n))_H. \end{aligned} \quad (4.19)$$

Hence it follows from (4.16)-(4.19), (A4) and (A11) that there exists a constant $C_2 = C_2(T) > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2} \|L^{1/2} z_{n+1}\|_H^2 - \frac{1}{2} \|L^{1/2} z_n\|_H^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|L^{1/2} (z_{n+1} - z_n)\|_H^2 + h \|B_1^{1/2} z_{n+1}\|_H^2 \\
& + \frac{1}{2} \langle A_2^* v_{n+1}, v_{n+1} \rangle_{V^*, V} - \frac{1}{2} \langle A_2^* v_n, v_n \rangle_{V^*, V} + \frac{1}{2} \langle A_2^* (v_{n+1} - v_n), v_{n+1} - v_n \rangle_{V^*, V} \\
& + \frac{1}{2} \|v_{n+1}\|_H^2 - \frac{1}{2} \|v_n\|_H^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|v_{n+1} - v_n\|_H^2 \\
& + \frac{1}{2\eta} \langle B_2^* (\eta v_{n+1} + A_1 \theta_{n+1}), \eta v_{n+1} + A_1 \theta_{n+1} \rangle_{V^*, V} \\
& - \frac{1}{2\eta} \langle B_2^* (\eta v_n + A_1 \theta_n), \eta v_n + A_1 \theta_n \rangle_{V^*, V} \\
& + \frac{1}{2\eta} \langle B_2^* (\eta (v_{n+1} - v_n) + A_1 (\theta_{n+1} - \theta_n)), \eta (v_{n+1} - v_n) + A_1 (\theta_{n+1} - \theta_n) \rangle_{V^*, V} \\
& \leq C_2 h \|v_{n+1}\|_V \|z_{n+1}\|_H
\end{aligned} \tag{4.20}$$

for all $h \in (0, h_2)$. Then we sum (4.20) over $n = 1, \dots, \ell - 1$ with $2 \leq \ell \leq N$ to derive that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2} \|L^{1/2} z_\ell\|_H^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^{\ell-1} \|L^{1/2} (z_{n+1} - z_n)\|_H^2 + h \sum_{n=1}^{\ell-1} \|B_1^{1/2} z_{n+1}\|_H^2 \\
& + \frac{1}{2} \langle A_2^* v_\ell, v_\ell \rangle_{V^*, V} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^{\ell-1} \langle A_2^* (v_{n+1} - v_n), v_{n+1} - v_n \rangle_{V^*, V} \\
& + \frac{1}{2} \|v_\ell\|_H^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^{\ell-1} \|v_{n+1} - v_n\|_H^2 + \frac{1}{2\eta} \langle B_2^* (\eta v_\ell + A_1 \theta_\ell), \eta v_\ell + A_1 \theta_\ell \rangle_{V^*, V} \\
& \leq \frac{1}{2} \|L^{1/2} z_1\|_H^2 + \frac{1}{2} \langle A_2^* v_1, v_1 \rangle_{V^*, V} + \frac{1}{2} \|v_1\|_H^2 + \frac{1}{2\eta} \langle B_2^* (\eta v_1 + A_1 \theta_1), \eta v_1 + A_1 \theta_1 \rangle_{V^*, V} \\
& + C_2 h \sum_{n=0}^{\ell-1} \|v_{n+1}\|_V \|z_{n+1}\|_H.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we have from (A2) and (A3) that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{c_L}{2} \|z_\ell\|_H^2 + h \sum_{n=1}^{\ell-1} \|B_1^{1/2} z_{n+1}\|_H^2 + \frac{\omega_{2,1}}{2} \|v_\ell\|_V^2 + \frac{\omega_{2,1}}{2} h^2 \sum_{n=1}^{\ell-1} \|z_{n+1}\|_V^2 \\
& + \frac{1}{2\eta} \langle B_2^* (\eta v_\ell + A_1 \theta_\ell), \eta v_\ell + A_1 \theta_\ell \rangle_{V^*, V} \\
& \leq \frac{1}{2} \|L^{1/2} z_1\|_H^2 + \frac{1}{2} \langle A_2^* v_1, v_1 \rangle_{V^*, V} + \frac{1}{2} \|v_1\|_H^2 + \frac{1}{2\eta} \langle B_2^* (\eta v_1 + A_1 \theta_1), \eta v_1 + A_1 \theta_1 \rangle_{V^*, V} \\
& + C_2 h \sum_{n=0}^{\ell-1} \|v_{n+1}\|_V \|z_{n+1}\|_H
\end{aligned} \tag{4.21}$$

for all $h \in (0, h_2)$ and $\ell = 2, \dots, N$. Therefore we infer from (4.21), the boundedness of L and A_2^* , and Lemma 4.2 that there exists a constant $C_3 = C_3(T) > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{c_L}{2} \|z_m\|_H^2 + h \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \|B_1^{1/2} z_{n+1}\|_H^2 + \frac{\omega_{2,1}}{2} \|v_m\|_V^2 + \frac{\omega_{2,1}}{2} h^2 \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \|z_{n+1}\|_V^2 \\ & \leq C_3 + C_2 h \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \|v_{n+1}\|_V \|z_{n+1}\|_H \end{aligned} \quad (4.22)$$

for all $h \in (0, h_2)$ and $m = 1, \dots, N$. Moreover, we see from (4.22) and the Young inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} (c_L - C_2 h) \|z_m\|_H^2 + h \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \|B_1^{1/2} z_{n+1}\|_H^2 + \frac{1}{2} (\omega_{2,1} - C_2 h) \|v_m\|_V^2 \\ & + \frac{\omega_{2,1}}{2} h^2 \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \|z_{n+1}\|_V^2 \leq C_3 + \frac{C_2}{2} h \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \|v_j\|_V^2 + \frac{C_2}{2} h \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \|z_j\|_H^2 \end{aligned} \quad (4.23)$$

for all $h \in (0, h_2)$ and $m = 1, \dots, N$. Hence there exist constants $h_3 \in (0, h_2)$ and $C_4 = C_4(T) > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|z_m\|_H^2 + h \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \|B_1^{1/2} z_{n+1}\|_H^2 + \|v_m\|_V^2 + h^2 \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \|z_{n+1}\|_V^2 \\ & \leq C_4 + C_4 h \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \|v_j\|_V^2 + C_4 h \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \|z_j\|_H^2 \end{aligned}$$

for all $h \in (0, h_3)$ and $m = 1, \dots, N$. Therefore, owing to the discrete Gronwall lemma (see e.g., [8, Prop. 2.2.1]), there exists a constant $C_5 = C_5(T) > 0$ satisfying

$$\|z_m\|_H^2 + h \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \|B_1^{1/2} z_{n+1}\|_H^2 + \|v_m\|_V^2 + h^2 \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \|z_{n+1}\|_V^2 \leq C_5$$

for all $h \in (0, h_3)$ and $m = 1, \dots, N$. □

Lemma 4.4. *Let h_2 be as in Lemma 4.1. Then there exists a constant $C = C(T) > 0$ such that*

$$\|\Phi \bar{\varphi}_h\|_{L^\infty(0, T; H)} \leq C$$

for all $h \in (0, h_2)$.

Proof. We can obtain this lemma by (A6) and Lemma 4.1. □

Lemma 4.5. *Let h_3 be as in Lemma 4.3. Then there exist constants $h_4 \in (0, h_3)$ and $C = C(T) > 0$ such that*

$$\left\| \frac{d\widehat{\theta}_h}{dt} \right\|_{L^2(0,T;H)}^2 + h \left\| \frac{d\widehat{\theta}_h}{dt} \right\|_{L^2(0,T;V)}^2 + \|\bar{\theta}_h\|_{L^\infty(0,T;V)}^2 \leq C$$

for all $h \in (0, h_4)$.

Proof. We multiply the first equation in $(P)_n$ by $\theta_{n+1} - \theta_n$ and by $h\theta_{n+1}$, respectively, and use the Young inequality to obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & h \left\| \frac{\theta_{n+1} - \theta_n}{h} \right\|_H^2 + \langle A_1^* \theta_{n+1}, \theta_{n+1} - \theta_n \rangle_{V^*,V} + (\theta_{n+1} - \theta_n, \theta_{n+1})_H + h(A_1 \theta_{n+1}, \theta_{n+1})_H \\ &= -\eta h \left(v_{n+1}, \frac{\theta_{n+1} - \theta_n}{h} \right)_H - \eta h (v_{n+1}, \theta_{n+1})_H \\ &\leq \eta^2 h \|v_{n+1}\|_H^2 + \frac{1}{2} h \left\| \frac{\theta_{n+1} - \theta_n}{h} \right\|_H^2 + \frac{1}{2} h \|\theta_{n+1}\|_H^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.24)$$

Here it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle A_1^* \theta_{n+1}, \theta_{n+1} - \theta_n \rangle_{V^*,V} + (\theta_{n+1} - \theta_n, \theta_{n+1})_H \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \langle A_1^* \theta_{n+1}, \theta_{n+1} \rangle_{V^*,V} - \frac{1}{2} \langle A_1^* \theta_n, \theta_n \rangle_{V^*,V} + \frac{1}{2} \langle A_1^* (\theta_{n+1} - \theta_n), \theta_{n+1} - \theta_n \rangle_{V^*,V} \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{2} \|\theta_{n+1}\|_H^2 - \frac{1}{2} \|\theta_n\|_H^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|\theta_{n+1} - \theta_n\|_H^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.25)$$

Thus we see from (4.24), (4.25) and the continuity of the embedding $V \hookrightarrow H$ that there exists a constant $C_1 > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} h \left\| \frac{\theta_{n+1} - \theta_n}{h} \right\|_H^2 + \frac{1}{2} \langle A_1^* \theta_{n+1}, \theta_{n+1} \rangle_{V^*,V} - \frac{1}{2} \langle A_1^* \theta_n, \theta_n \rangle_{V^*,V} \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \langle A_1^* (\theta_{n+1} - \theta_n), \theta_{n+1} - \theta_n \rangle_{V^*,V} + \frac{1}{2} \|\theta_{n+1}\|_H^2 - \frac{1}{2} \|\theta_n\|_H^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|\theta_{n+1} - \theta_n\|_H^2 \\ & \leq \eta^2 h \|v_{n+1}\|_H^2 + C_1 h \|\theta_{n+1}\|_V^2 \end{aligned} \quad (4.26)$$

for all $h \in (0, h_3)$. Therefore we can prove Lemma 4.5 by summing (4.26) over $n = 0, \dots, m-1$ with $1 \leq m \leq N$, the condition (A3), Lemma 4.1 and the discrete Gronwall lemma (see e.g., [8, Prop. 2.2.1]). \square

Lemma 4.6. *Let h_4 be as in Lemma 4.5. Then there exists a constant $C = C(T) > 0$ such that*

$$\left\| \frac{d\widehat{\theta}_h}{dt} \right\|_{L^2(0,T;V)}^2 + \|A_1 \bar{\theta}_h\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H)}^2 \leq C$$

for all $h \in (0, h_4)$.

Proof. It follows from the first equation in $(P)_n$ that

$$\begin{aligned} & h \left\langle A_1^* \frac{\theta_{n+1} - \theta_n}{h}, \frac{\theta_{n+1} - \theta_n}{h} \right\rangle_{V^*, V} + h \left\| \frac{\theta_{n+1} - \theta_n}{h} \right\|_H^2 \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \|A_1 \theta_{n+1}\|_H^2 - \frac{1}{2} \|A_1 \theta_n\|_H^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|A_1(\theta_{n+1} - \theta_n)\|_H^2 \\ & = -\eta h \left\langle A_1^* \frac{\theta_{n+1} - \theta_n}{h}, v_{n+1} \right\rangle_{V^*, V} + h \left\| \frac{\theta_{n+1} - \theta_n}{h} \right\|_H^2 \end{aligned}$$

and then we can prove this lemma by (A3), the boundedness of the operator $A_1^* : V \rightarrow V^*$, the Young inequality, Lemma 4.3, summing over $n = 0, \dots, m-1$ with $1 \leq m \leq N$ and Lemma 4.5. \square

Lemma 4.7. *Let h_4 be as in Lemma 4.5. Then there exists a constant $C = C(T) > 0$ such that*

$$\|B_2 \bar{\theta}_h\|_{L^\infty(0, T; H)}^2 + \|B_1 \bar{v}_h\|_{L^2(0, T; H)}^2 + \|A_2 \bar{\varphi}_h\|_{L^2(0, T; H)}^2 \leq C$$

for all $h \in (0, h_4)$.

Proof. The condition (A5), Lemmas 4.5 and 4.6 mean that there exists a constant $C_1 = C_1(T) > 0$ such that

$$\|B_2 \bar{\theta}_h\|_{L^\infty(0, T; H)}^2 \leq C_1 \tag{4.27}$$

for all $h \in (0, h_4)$. The second equation in $(P)_n$ yields that

$$\begin{aligned} & h \|B_1 v_{n+1}\|_H^2 = h(B_1 v_{n+1}, B_1 v_{n+1})_H \\ & = -h(Lz_{n+1}, B_1 v_{n+1})_H - h(A_2 \varphi_{n+1}, B_1 v_{n+1})_H - h(\Phi \varphi_{n+1}, B_1 v_{n+1})_H \\ & \quad - h(\mathcal{L} \varphi_{n+1}, B_1 v_{n+1})_H + h(B_2 \theta_{n+1}, B_1 v_{n+1})_H \end{aligned}$$

and then we derive from the Young inequality, the boundedness of the operator $L : H \rightarrow H$, (A11) and Lemma 4.1 that there exists a constant $C_2 = C_2(T) > 0$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} h \|B_1 v_{n+1}\|_H^2 & \leq C_2 h \|z_{n+1}\|_H^2 - h(A_2 \varphi_{n+1}, B_1 v_{n+1})_H + C_2 h \|\Phi \varphi_{n+1}\|_H^2 \\ & \quad + C_2 h \|B_2 \theta_{n+1}\|_H^2 + C_2 h \end{aligned} \tag{4.28}$$

for all $h \in (0, h_4)$. Here we have from (A4) that

$$\begin{aligned} -h(A_2 \varphi_{n+1}, B_1 v_{n+1})_H & = -(A_2 \varphi_{n+1}, B_1 \varphi_{n+1} - B_1 \varphi_n)_H \\ & = -\frac{1}{2} (A_2 \varphi_{n+1}, B_1 \varphi_{n+1})_H + \frac{1}{2} (A_2 \varphi_n, B_1 \varphi_n)_H \\ & \quad - \frac{1}{2} (A_2 (\varphi_{n+1} - \varphi_n), B_1 (\varphi_{n+1} - \varphi_n))_H. \end{aligned} \tag{4.29}$$

Thus summing (4.28) over $n = 0, \dots, m - 1$ with $1 \leq m \leq N$ and using (4.27), (4.29), Lemmas 4.3 and 4.4 imply that there exists a constant $C_3 = C_3(T) > 0$ such that

$$\|B_1 \bar{v}_h\|_{L^2(0,T;H)}^2 \leq C_3 \quad (4.30)$$

for all $h \in (0, h_4)$. Moreover, we deduce from the second equation in $(P)_h$, (4.27), (4.30), Lemmas 4.3 and 4.4, (A11) and Lemma 4.1 that there exists a constant $C_4 = C_4(T) > 0$ satisfying

$$\|A_2 \bar{\varphi}_h\|_{L^2(0,T;H)}^2 \leq C_4$$

for all $h \in (0, h_4)$. □

Lemma 4.8. *Let h_4 be as in Lemma 4.5. Then there exists a constant $C = C(T) > 0$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\widehat{\varphi}_h\|_{W^{1,\infty}(0,T;V)} + \|\widehat{v}_h\|_{W^{1,\infty}(0,T;H)} \\ & + \|\widehat{v}_h\|_{L^\infty(0,T;V)} + \|\widehat{\theta}_h\|_{H^1(0,T;V)} + \|\widehat{\theta}_h\|_{L^\infty(0,T;V)} \leq C \end{aligned}$$

for all $h \in (0, h_4)$.

Proof. We can check this lemma by (1.5)-(1.7), Lemmas 4.1, 4.3, 4.5 and 4.6. □

Proof of Theorem 1.2 (existence part). By Lemmas 4.1, 4.3-4.8, and (1.8)-(1.10), there exist some functions

$$\begin{aligned} \theta & \in H^1(0, T; V) \cap L^\infty(0, T; V) \cap L^\infty(0, T; D(A_1)), \\ \varphi & \in L^\infty(0, T; V) \cap L^2(0, T; D(A_2)), \\ \xi & \in L^\infty(0, T; H) \end{aligned}$$

such that

$$\frac{d\varphi}{dt} \in L^\infty(0, T; V) \cap L^2(0, T; D(B_1)), \quad \frac{d^2\varphi}{dt^2} \in L^\infty(0, T; H)$$

and

$$\widehat{\varphi}_h \rightarrow \varphi \quad \text{weakly}^* \text{ in } W^{1,\infty}(0, T; V), \quad (4.31)$$

$$\bar{v}_h \rightarrow \frac{d\varphi}{dt} \quad \text{weakly}^* \text{ in } L^\infty(0, T; V),$$

$$\widehat{v}_h \rightarrow \frac{d\varphi}{dt} \quad \text{weakly}^* \text{ in } W^{1,\infty}(0, T; H) \cap L^\infty(0, T; V), \quad (4.32)$$

$$\bar{z}_h \rightarrow \frac{d^2\varphi}{dt^2} \quad \text{weakly}^* \text{ in } L^\infty(0, T; H),$$

$$L\bar{z}_h \rightarrow L\frac{d^2\varphi}{dt^2} \quad \text{weakly}^* \text{ in } L^\infty(0, T; H), \quad (4.33)$$

$$\widehat{\theta}_h \rightarrow \theta \quad \text{weakly}^* \text{ in } H^1(0, T; V) \cap L^\infty(0, T; V), \quad (4.34)$$

$$\bar{\varphi}_h \rightarrow \varphi \quad \text{weakly}^* \text{ in } L^\infty(0, T; V),$$

$$\bar{\theta}_h \rightarrow \theta \quad \text{weakly}^* \text{ in } L^\infty(0, T; V),$$

$$A_1\bar{\theta}_h \rightarrow A_1\theta \quad \text{weakly}^* \text{ in } L^\infty(0, T; H), \quad (4.35)$$

$$B_1\bar{v}_h \rightarrow B_1\frac{d\varphi}{dt} \quad \text{weakly in } L^2(0, T; H), \quad (4.36)$$

$$A_2\bar{\varphi}_h \rightarrow A_2\varphi \quad \text{weakly in } L^2(0, T; H), \quad (4.37)$$

$$\Phi\bar{\varphi}_h \rightarrow \xi \quad \text{weakly}^* \text{ in } L^\infty(0, T; H), \quad (4.38)$$

$$B_2\bar{\theta}_h \rightarrow B_2\theta \quad \text{weakly}^* \text{ in } L^\infty(0, T; H) \quad (4.39)$$

as $h = h_j \rightarrow +0$. Here, since we infer from Lemma 4.8, the compactness of the embedding $V \hookrightarrow H$ and the convergence (4.31) that

$$\widehat{\varphi}_h \rightarrow \varphi \quad \text{strongly in } C([0, T]; H) \quad (4.40)$$

as $h = h_j \rightarrow +0$ (see e.g., [11, Section 8, Corollary 4]), we see from (1.8) and Lemma 4.3 that

$$\bar{\varphi}_h \rightarrow \varphi \quad \text{strongly in } L^\infty(0, T; H) \quad (4.41)$$

as $h = h_j \rightarrow +0$. Hence the convergences (4.38) and (4.41) yield that

$$\int_0^T (\Phi\bar{\varphi}_h(t), \bar{\varphi}_h(t))_H dt \rightarrow \int_0^T (\xi(t), \varphi(t))_H dt$$

as $h = h_j \rightarrow +0$ and then it holds that

$$\xi = \Phi\varphi \quad \text{in } H \text{ a.e. on } (0, T) \quad (4.42)$$

(see e.g., [1, Lemma 1.3, p. 42]). On the other hand, it follows from Lemma 4.8, the compactness of the embedding $V \hookrightarrow H$ and (4.34) that

$$\widehat{\theta}_h \rightarrow \theta \quad \text{strongly in } C([0, T]; H) \quad (4.43)$$

as $h = h_j \rightarrow +0$. Similarly, we derive from (4.32) that

$$\widehat{v}_h \rightarrow \frac{d\varphi}{dt} \quad \text{strongly in } C([0, T]; H) \quad (4.44)$$

as $h = h_j \rightarrow +0$. Therefore, combining (4.31), (4.33)-(4.44) and (A11), we can verify that there exists a solution of (P). \square

5. Uniqueness for (P)

This section proves uniqueness of solutions to (P).

Proof of Theorem 1.2 (uniqueness part). We let (θ, φ) , $(\bar{\theta}, \bar{\varphi})$ be two solutions of (P) and put $\tilde{\theta} := \theta - \bar{\theta}$, $\tilde{\varphi} := \varphi - \bar{\varphi}$. Then the identity (1.12), the Young inequality, (A6), (A11), Lemma 4.1, the continuity of the embedding $V \hookrightarrow H$ and (A2) imply that there exists a constant $C_1 = C_1(T) > 0$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \left\| L^{1/2} \frac{d\tilde{\varphi}}{dt}(t) \right\|_H^2 + \left(B_1 \frac{d\tilde{\varphi}}{dt}(t), \frac{d\tilde{\varphi}}{dt}(t) \right)_H + \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \left\| A_2^{1/2} \tilde{\varphi}(t) \right\|_H^2 \\ &= \left(B_2 \tilde{\theta}(t), \frac{d\tilde{\varphi}}{dt}(t) \right)_H - \left(\Phi\varphi(t) - \Phi\bar{\varphi}(t), \frac{d\tilde{\varphi}}{dt}(t) \right)_H - \left(\mathcal{L}\varphi(t) - \mathcal{L}\bar{\varphi}(t), \frac{d\tilde{\varphi}}{dt}(t) \right)_H \\ &\leq \left(B_2 \tilde{\theta}(t), \frac{d\tilde{\varphi}}{dt}(t) \right)_H + \frac{C_\Phi^2}{2} (1 + \|\varphi(t)\|_V^p + \|\bar{\varphi}(t)\|_V^q)^2 \|\tilde{\varphi}(t)\|_V^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{C_L^2}{2} \|\tilde{\varphi}(t)\|_H^2 + \left\| \frac{d\tilde{\varphi}}{dt}(t) \right\|_H^2 \\ &\leq \left(B_2 \tilde{\theta}(t), \frac{d\tilde{\varphi}}{dt}(t) \right)_H + C_1 \|\tilde{\varphi}(t)\|_V^2 + \frac{1}{c_L} \left\| L^{1/2} \frac{d\tilde{\varphi}}{dt}(t) \right\|_H^2 \end{aligned} \quad (5.1)$$

for a.a. $t \in (0, T)$. Here we have from the Young inequality, (A2) and the continuity of the embedding $V \hookrightarrow H$ that there exists a constant $C_2 > 0$ such that

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\tilde{\varphi}(t)\|_H^2 = \left(\frac{d\tilde{\varphi}}{dt}(t), \tilde{\varphi}(t) \right)_H \leq \frac{1}{2c_L} \left\| L^{1/2} \frac{d\tilde{\varphi}}{dt}(t) \right\|_H^2 + C_2 \|\tilde{\varphi}(t)\|_V^2 \quad (5.2)$$

for a.a. $t \in (0, T)$. We see from (A3) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \left\| A_2^{1/2} \tilde{\varphi}(t) \right\|_H^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|\tilde{\varphi}\|_H^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \langle A_2^* \tilde{\varphi}(t), \tilde{\varphi}(t) \rangle_{V^*, V} + \frac{1}{2} \|\tilde{\varphi}\|_H^2 \geq \frac{\omega_{2,1}}{2} \|\tilde{\varphi}(t)\|_V^2. \end{aligned} \quad (5.3)$$

Moreover, the identity (1.11) yields that

$$\begin{aligned} \left(B_2 \tilde{\theta}(t), \frac{d\tilde{\varphi}}{dt}(t) \right)_H &= \frac{1}{\eta} \left(B_2 \tilde{\theta}(t), -\frac{d\tilde{\theta}}{dt}(t) - A_1 \tilde{\theta}(t) \right)_H \\ &= -\frac{1}{2\eta} \frac{d}{dt} \left\| B_2^{1/2} \tilde{\theta}(t) \right\|_H^2 - \frac{1}{\eta} (B_2 \tilde{\theta}(t), A_1 \tilde{\theta}(t))_H. \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

Therefore it follows from (5.1)-(5.4) and (A4) that there exists a constant $C_3 = C_3(T) > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \left\| L^{1/2} \frac{d\tilde{\varphi}}{dt}(t) \right\|_H^2 + \frac{\omega_{2,1}}{2} \|\tilde{\varphi}(t)\|_V^2 + \frac{1}{2\eta} \left\| B_2^{1/2} \tilde{\theta}(t) \right\|_H^2 \\ & \leq C_3 \int_0^t \left\| L^{1/2} \frac{d\tilde{\varphi}}{dt}(s) \right\|_H^2 ds + C_3 \int_0^t \|\tilde{\varphi}(s)\|_V^2 ds \end{aligned}$$

for a.a. $t \in (0, T)$, whence we obtain that $\frac{d\tilde{\varphi}}{dt} = \tilde{\varphi} = 0$ by the Gronwall lemma and (A2). Then the identity (1.11) leads to the identity

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\tilde{\theta}(t)\|_H^2 + (A_1 \tilde{\theta}(t), \tilde{\theta}(t))_H = 0. \quad (5.5)$$

Thus it holds that $\tilde{\theta} = 0$. □

6. Error estimates

In this section we will show Theorem 1.3.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Let h_4 be as in Lemma 4.5. Then, putting $z := \frac{dv}{dt}$, we derive from the identity $\frac{d\hat{v}_h}{dt} = \bar{z}_h$, the second equation in $(P)_h$ and (1.12) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \left\| L^{1/2} (\hat{v}_h(t) - v(t)) \right\|_H^2 \\ &= (L(\bar{z}_h(t) - z(t)), \hat{v}_h(t) - \bar{v}_h(t))_H + (L(\bar{z}_h(t) - z(t)), \bar{v}_h(t) - v(t))_H \\ &= (L(\bar{z}_h(t) - z(t)), \hat{v}_h(t) - \bar{v}_h(t))_H - (B_1(\bar{v}_h(t) - v(t)), \bar{v}_h(t) - v(t))_H \\ & \quad - (A_2(\bar{\varphi}_h(t) - \varphi(t)), \bar{v}_h(t) - v(t))_H - (\Phi \bar{\varphi}_h(t) - \Phi \varphi(t), \bar{v}_h(t) - v(t))_H \\ & \quad - (\mathcal{L} \bar{\varphi}_h(t) - \mathcal{L} \varphi(t), \bar{v}_h(t) - v(t))_H + (B_2(\bar{\theta}_h(t) - \theta(t)), \bar{v}_h(t) - v(t))_H. \end{aligned} \quad (6.1)$$

Here the boundedness of the operator $L : H \rightarrow H$ implies that there exists a constant $C_1 > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} (L(\bar{z}_h(t) - z(t)), \widehat{v}_h(t) - \bar{v}_h(t))_H &\leq \|L(\bar{z}_h(t) - z(t))\|_H \|\widehat{v}_h(t) - \bar{v}_h(t)\|_H \\ &\leq C_1 \|\bar{z}_h(t) - z(t)\|_H \|\widehat{v}_h(t) - \bar{v}_h(t)\|_H \end{aligned} \quad (6.2)$$

for a.a. $t \in (0, T)$ and all $h \in (0, h_4)$. We have from the identities $\bar{v}_h = \frac{d\widehat{\varphi}_h}{dt}$, $v = \frac{d\varphi}{dt}$ and the boundedness of the operator $A_2^* : V \rightarrow V^*$ that there exists a constant $C_2 > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} &-(A_2(\bar{\varphi}_h(t) - \varphi(t)), \bar{v}_h(t) - v(t))_H \\ &= -\langle A_2^*(\bar{\varphi}_h(t) - \widehat{\varphi}_h(t)), \bar{v}_h(t) - v(t) \rangle_{V^*, V} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|A_2^{1/2}(\widehat{\varphi}_h(t) - \varphi(t))\|_H^2 \\ &\leq C_2 \|\bar{\varphi}_h(t) - \widehat{\varphi}_h(t)\|_V \|\bar{v}_h(t) - v(t)\|_V - \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|A_2^{1/2}(\widehat{\varphi}_h(t) - \varphi(t))\|_H^2 \end{aligned} \quad (6.3)$$

for a.a. $t \in (0, T)$ and all $h \in (0, h_4)$. We see from (A6), Lemma 4.1, the Young inequality and (A2) that there exists a constant $C_3 = C_3(T) > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} &-(\Phi \bar{\varphi}_h(t) - \Phi \varphi(t), \bar{v}_h(t) - v(t))_H \\ &\leq C_\Phi (1 + \|\bar{\varphi}_h(t)\|_V^p + \|\varphi(t)\|_V^q) \|\bar{\varphi}_h(t) - \varphi(t)\|_V \|\bar{v}_h(t) - v(t)\|_H \\ &\leq C_3 \|\bar{\varphi}_h(t) - \varphi(t)\|_V \|\bar{v}_h(t) - v(t)\|_H \\ &\leq \frac{C_3}{2} \|\bar{\varphi}_h(t) - \varphi(t)\|_V^2 + \frac{C_3}{2} \|\bar{v}_h(t) - v(t)\|_H^2 \\ &\leq C_3 \|\bar{\varphi}_h(t) - \widehat{\varphi}_h(t)\|_V^2 + C_3 \|\widehat{\varphi}_h(t) - \varphi(t)\|_V^2 \\ &\quad + C_3 \|\bar{v}_h(t) - \widehat{v}_h(t)\|_H^2 + \frac{C_3}{c_L} \|L^{1/2}(\widehat{v}_h(t) - v(t))\|_H^2 \end{aligned} \quad (6.4)$$

for a.a. $t \in (0, T)$ and all $h \in (0, h_4)$. The condition (A11), the continuity of the embedding $V \hookrightarrow H$, the Young inequality and (A2) mean that there exists a constant $C_4 > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} &-(\mathcal{L} \bar{\varphi}_h(t) - \mathcal{L} \varphi(t), \bar{v}_h(t) - v(t))_H \\ &\leq C_4 \|\bar{\varphi}_h(t) - \varphi(t)\|_V \|\bar{v}_h(t) - v(t)\|_H \\ &\leq \frac{C_4}{2} \|\bar{\varphi}_h(t) - \varphi(t)\|_V^2 + \frac{C_4}{2} \|\bar{v}_h(t) - v(t)\|_H^2 \\ &\leq C_4 \|\bar{\varphi}_h(t) - \widehat{\varphi}_h(t)\|_V^2 + C_4 \|\widehat{\varphi}_h(t) - \varphi(t)\|_V^2 \\ &\quad + C_4 \|\bar{v}_h(t) - \widehat{v}_h(t)\|_H^2 + \frac{C_4}{c_L} \|L^{1/2}(\widehat{v}_h(t) - v(t))\|_H^2 \end{aligned} \quad (6.5)$$

for a.a. $t \in (0, T)$ and all $h \in (0, h_4)$. It follows from the first equation in $(P)_h$ and (1.11)

that

$$\begin{aligned}
& (B_2(\bar{\theta}_h(t) - \theta(t)), \bar{v}_h(t) - v(t))_H \\
&= -\frac{1}{\eta} \left(B_2(\bar{\theta}_h(t) - \theta(t)), \frac{d\hat{\theta}_h}{dt}(t) - \frac{d\theta}{dt}(t) \right)_H \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{\eta} (B_2(\bar{\theta}_h(t) - \theta(t)), A_1(\bar{\theta}_h(t) - \theta(t)))_H \\
&= -\frac{1}{\eta} \left\langle B_2^*(\bar{\theta}_h(t) - \hat{\theta}_h(t)), \frac{d\hat{\theta}_h}{dt}(t) - \frac{d\theta}{dt}(t) \right\rangle_{V^*, V} - \frac{1}{2\eta} \frac{d}{dt} \|B_2^{1/2}(\hat{\theta}_h(t) - \theta(t))\|_H^2 \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{\eta} (B_2(\bar{\theta}_h(t) - \theta(t)), A_1(\bar{\theta}_h(t) - \theta(t)))_H. \tag{6.6}
\end{aligned}$$

Hence we derive from (6.1)-(6.6), the integration over $(0, t)$, where $t \in [0, T]$, the boundedness of the operator $B_2^* : V \rightarrow V^*$, (1.8)-(1.10), Lemmas 4.3 and 4.6 that there exists a constant $C_5 = C_5(T) > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2} \|L^{1/2}(\hat{v}_h(t) - v(t))\|_H^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|A_2^{1/2}(\hat{\varphi}_h(t) - \varphi(t))\|_H^2 + \int_0^t \|B_1^{1/2}(\bar{v}_h(s) - v(s))\|_H^2 ds \\
&+ \frac{1}{2\eta} \|B_2^{1/2}(\hat{\theta}_h(t) - \theta(t))\|_H^2 + \frac{1}{\eta} \int_0^t (B_2(\bar{\theta}_h(s) - \theta(s)), A_1(\bar{\theta}_h(s) - \theta(s)))_H ds \\
&\leq C_5 h + C_5 \int_0^t \|\hat{\varphi}_h(s) - \varphi(s)\|_V^2 ds + C_5 \int_0^t \|L^{1/2}(\hat{v}_h(s) - v(s))\|_H^2 ds \tag{6.7}
\end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in [0, T]$ and all $h \in (0, h_4)$. Here the identities $\frac{d\hat{\varphi}_h}{dt} = \bar{v}_h$, $\frac{d\varphi}{dt} = v$, the Young inequality, (A2) and the continuity of the embedding $V \hookrightarrow H$ yield that there exists a constant $C_6 > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\hat{\varphi}_h(t) - \varphi(t)\|_H^2 \\
&= (\bar{v}_h(t) - v(t), \hat{\varphi}_h(t) - \varphi(t))_H \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \|\bar{v}_h(t) - v(t)\|_H^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|\hat{\varphi}_h(t) - \varphi(t)\|_H^2 \\
&\leq \|\bar{v}_h(t) - \hat{v}_h(t)\|_H^2 + \frac{1}{c_L} \|L^{1/2}(\hat{v}_h(t) - v(t))\|_H^2 + C_6 \|\hat{\varphi}_h(t) - \varphi(t)\|_V^2 \tag{6.8}
\end{aligned}$$

for a.a. $t \in (0, T)$ and all $h \in (0, h_4)$. Thus, integrating (6.8) over $(0, t)$, where $t \in [0, T]$, we deduce from (6.7) and (A3) that there exists a constant $C_7 = C_7(T) > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2} \|L^{1/2}(\hat{v}_h(t) - v(t))\|_H^2 + \frac{\omega_{2,1}}{2} \|\hat{\varphi}_h(t) - \varphi(t)\|_V^2 + \int_0^t \|B_1^{1/2}(\bar{v}_h(s) - v(s))\|_H^2 ds \\
&+ \frac{1}{2\eta} \|B_2^{1/2}(\hat{\theta}_h(t) - \theta(t))\|_H^2 + \frac{1}{\eta} \int_0^t (B_2(\bar{\theta}_h(s) - \theta(s)), A_1(\bar{\theta}_h(s) - \theta(s)))_H ds \\
&\leq C_7 h + C_7 \int_0^t \|\hat{\varphi}_h(s) - \varphi(s)\|_V^2 ds + C_7 \int_0^t \|L^{1/2}(\hat{v}_h(s) - v(s))\|_H^2 ds \tag{6.9}
\end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in [0, T]$ and all $h \in (0, h_4)$.

Next the first equation in $(P)_h$ and (1.11) lead to the identity

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\widehat{\theta}_h(t) - \theta(t)\|_H^2 \\ &= -\eta(\bar{v}_h(t) - v(t), \widehat{\theta}_h(t) - \theta(t))_H - (A_1(\bar{\theta}_h(t) - \theta(t)), \widehat{\theta}_h(t) - \bar{\theta}_h(t))_H \\ & \quad - \langle A_1^*(\bar{\theta}_h(t) - \theta(t)), \bar{\theta}_h(t) - \theta(t) \rangle_{V^*, V}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.10)$$

Here we use the Young inequality and (A2) to infer that

$$\begin{aligned} & -(\bar{v}_h(t) - v(t), \widehat{\theta}_h(t) - \theta(t))_H \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\bar{v}_h(t) - v(t)\|_H^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|\widehat{\theta}_h(t) - \theta(t)\|_H^2 \\ & \leq \|\bar{v}_h(t) - \widehat{v}_h(t)\|_H^2 + \|\widehat{v}_h(t) - v(t)\|_H^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|\widehat{\theta}_h(t) - \theta(t)\|_H^2 \\ & \leq \|\bar{v}_h(t) - \widehat{v}_h(t)\|_H^2 + \frac{1}{c_L} \|L^{1/2}(\widehat{v}_h(t) - v(t))\|_H^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|\widehat{\theta}_h(t) - \theta(t)\|_H^2. \end{aligned} \quad (6.11)$$

We have from (A3) that

$$\begin{aligned} & -\langle A_1^*(\bar{\theta}_h(t) - \theta(t)), \bar{\theta}_h(t) - \theta(t) \rangle_{V^*, V} \\ & \leq -\omega_{1,1} \|\bar{\theta}_h(t) - \theta(t)\|_V^2 + \|\bar{\theta}_h(t) - \theta(t)\|_H^2 \\ & \leq -\omega_{1,1} \|\bar{\theta}_h(t) - \theta(t)\|_V^2 + 2\|\bar{\theta}_h(t) - \widehat{\theta}_h(t)\|_H^2 + 2\|\widehat{\theta}_h(t) - \theta(t)\|_H^2. \end{aligned} \quad (6.12)$$

Hence, owing to (6.10)-(6.12), the integration over $(0, t)$, where $t \in [0, T]$, (1.9), (1.10), Lemmas 4.3 and 4.6, there exists a constant $C_8 = C_8(T) > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \|\widehat{\theta}_h(t) - \theta(t)\|_H^2 + \omega_{1,1} \int_0^t \|\bar{\theta}_h(s) - \theta(s)\|_V^2 ds \\ & \leq C_8 h + C_8 \int_0^t \|L^{1/2}(\widehat{v}_h(s) - v(s))\|_H^2 ds + C_8 \int_0^t \|\widehat{\theta}_h(s) - \theta(s)\|_H^2 ds \end{aligned} \quad (6.13)$$

for all $t \in [0, T]$ and all $h \in (0, h_4)$.

Therefore we can obtain Theorem 1.3 by combining (6.9), (6.13) and by applying the Gronwall lemma. \square

Acknowledgments

The author is supported by JSPS Research Fellowships for Young Scientists (No. 18J21006).

References

- [1] V. Barbu, “Nonlinear Semigroups and Differential Equations in Banach spaces”, Noordhoff International Publishing, Leyden, 1976.
- [2] V. Barbu, “Nonlinear Differential Equations of Monotone Types in Banach Spaces”, Springer, New York, 2010.
- [3] P. Colli, A. Favini, *Time discretization of nonlinear Cauchy problems applying to mixed hyperbolic-parabolic equations*, Internat. J. Math. Math. Sci. **19** (1996), 481–494.
- [4] P. Colli, S. Kurima, *Time discretization of a nonlinear phase-field system in general domains*, Commun. Pure Appl. Anal. **18** (2019), 3161–3179.
- [5] M. Grasselli, V. Pata, *Existence of a universal attractor for a parabolic-hyperbolic phase-field system*, Adv. Math. Sci. Appl. **13** (2003), 443–459.
- [6] M. Grasselli, V. Pata, *Asymptotic behavior of a parabolic-hyperbolic system*, Comm. Pure Appl. Anal. **3** (2004), 849–881.
- [7] M. Grasselli, H. Petzeltová, G. Schimperna, *Convergence to stationary solutions for a parabolic-hyperbolic phase-field system*, Commun. Pure Appl. Anal. **5** (2006), 827–838.
- [8] J.W. Jerome, “Approximations of Nonlinear Evolution Systems”, Mathematics in Science and Engineering **164**, Academic Press Inc., Orlando, 1983.
- [9] S. Kurima, *Time discretization of an initial value problem for a simultaneous abstract evolution equation applying to parabolic-hyperbolic phase-field systems*, ESAIM Math. Model. Numer. Anal., to appear.
- [10] A. Matsubara, T. Yokota, *Applications of the Hille–Yosida theorem to the linearized equations of coupled sound and heat flow*, AIMS Mathematics **1** (2016), 165–177.
- [11] J. Simon, *Compact sets in the space $L^p(0, T; B)$* , Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4) **146** (1987), 65–96.
- [12] H. Wu, M. Grasselli, S. Zheng, *Convergence to equilibrium for a parabolic-hyperbolic phase-field system with Neumann boundary conditions*, Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci. **17** (2007), 125–153.
- [13] H. Wu, M. Grasselli, S. Zheng, *Convergence to equilibrium for a parabolic-hyperbolic phase-field system with dynamical boundary condition*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **329** (2007), 948–976.