

THE GRADIENT DISCRETISATION METHOD FOR THE CHEMICAL REACTIONS OF BIOCHEMICAL SYSTEMS

YAHYA ALNASHRI AND HASAN ALZUBAIDI

ABSTRACT. We consider a biochemical model that consists of a system of partial differential equations based on reaction terms and subject to non-homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions. The model is discretised using the gradient discretisation method (GDM) which is a framework covering a large class of conforming and non conforming schemes. Under classical regularity assumptions on the exact solutions, the GDM enables us to establish the existence of the model solutions in a weak sense, and strong convergence for the approximate solution and its approximate gradient. Numerical test employing a finite volume method is presented to demonstrate the behaviour of the solutions to the model.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we are interested in studying reaction diffusion equations:

$$\partial_t \bar{u}(\mathbf{x}, t) - \mu_1 \operatorname{div}(\nabla \bar{u}(\mathbf{x}, t)) = F(\bar{u}, \bar{v}), \quad (\mathbf{x}, t) \in \Omega \times (0, T), \quad (1.1a)$$

$$\partial_t \bar{v}(\mathbf{x}, t) - \mu_2 \operatorname{div}(\nabla \bar{v}(\mathbf{x}, t)) = G(\bar{u}, \bar{v}), \quad (\mathbf{x}, t) \in \Omega \times (0, T), \quad (1.1b)$$

where μ_1 and μ_2 are the diffusion coefficients corresponding to the chemical concentrations \bar{u} and \bar{v} respectively. The functions F and G describe the governing kinetics of the chemical reactions and some biochemical phenomena have been expressed in literature based on the choice of these reaction terms. For an example, in 2014, Yung-Rong Lee and Sy-Sang Lia [16] proposed a reaction-diffusion model that stimulated the relationship between concentrations of oxygen and lactic acid to simulate oxidative phosphorylation and glycolysis reactions in tissues. They concluded that a reaction-diffusion model can generate and maintain the ideal micro-environment for stem cells.

Another example is the Gray-Scott model, a very well-known reaction-diffusion system. The model describes the chemical reaction between two substances, an activator \bar{v} and substrate \bar{u} where both of which diffuse over time and so represents what is called cubic autocatalysis [15].

The Brusselator model is also an example of such chemical reaction systems which is used to describe mechanism of chemical reaction – diffusion with non-linear oscillations [17]. The model occurs in a large number of physical problems

Date: November 29, 2021.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 35K57, 65N12, 65M08.

Key words and phrases. A gradient discretisation method (GDM), Gradient schemes, Convergence analysis, Existence of weak solutions, Two-dimensional reaction – diffusion Brusselator system, Dirichlet boundary conditions, Non conforming finite element methods, Finite volume schemes, Hybrid mixed mimetic (HMM) method.

such as the formation of ozone by atomic oxygen, in enzymatic reactions, and arises in laser and plasma physics from multiple coupling between modes[4, 19].

The gradient discretisation method (GDM) is a generic framework to design numerical schemes together with their convergence analysis for different models which are based on partial differential equations. It covers a variety of numerical schemes such as finite volumes, finite elements, discontinuous Galerkin, etc. We refer the reader to [1–3, 8, 10–12, 14] and the monograph [9] for a complete presentation. The main purpose of this paper is the proof of convergence, in the GDM setting, of the approximate solutions to the weak solution of a system of reaction diffusion equations with non-homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions. The convergence is established without non-physical regularity assumptions on the solutions since it is based on discrete compactness techniques detailed in [7].

The paper is organised as follows. Section 2 introduces the continuous model and its weak formulation. Section 3 describes the gradient discretisation method for the model and states four required properties. Section 4 states the theorem corresponding to the convergence results. In Section 5, we include numerical test by employing a finite volume scheme, namely the Hybrid Mimetic Mixed (HMM) method, to study and analyse the behaviour of the solutions of the Brusselator model as an example of the biochemical systems. The resultant relative errors with respect to the mesh size are also studied.

2. CONTINUOUS MODEL

We consider the following biochemical system of partial differential equations:

$$\partial_t \bar{u}(\mathbf{x}, t) - \mu_1 \operatorname{div}(\nabla \bar{u}(\mathbf{x}, t)) = F(\bar{u}, \bar{v}), \quad (\mathbf{x}, t) \in \Omega \times (0, T), \quad (2.1)$$

$$\partial_t \bar{v}(\mathbf{x}, t) - \mu_2 \operatorname{div}(\nabla \bar{v}(\mathbf{x}, t)) = G(\bar{u}, \bar{v}), \quad (\mathbf{x}, t) \in \Omega \times (0, T), \quad (2.2)$$

$$\bar{u}(\mathbf{x}, t) = g, \quad (\mathbf{x}, t) \in \partial\Omega \times (0, T), \quad (2.3)$$

$$\bar{u}(\mathbf{x}, t) = h, \quad (\mathbf{x}, t) \in \partial\Omega \times (0, T), \quad (2.4)$$

$$\bar{u}(\mathbf{x}, 0) = u_{\text{ini}}(\mathbf{x}), \quad \mathbf{x} \in \Omega, \quad (2.5)$$

$$\bar{v}(\mathbf{x}, 0) = v_{\text{ini}}(\mathbf{x}), \quad \mathbf{x} \in \Omega. \quad (2.6)$$

Our analysis focuses on the weak formulation of the above reaction diffusion model. Let us assume the following properties on the data of the model.

Assumptions 2.1. *The assumptions on the data in Problem (2.1)–(2.6) are the following:*

- Ω is an open bounded connected subset of \mathbb{R}^d ($d > 1$), $T > 0$, $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathbb{R}^+$,
- $(u_{\text{ini}}, v_{\text{ini}})$ are in $L^\infty(\Omega) \times L^\infty(\Omega)$,
- g and h are traces of functions in $L^2(0, T; H^1(\Omega))$ whose time derivatives are in $L^2(0, T; H^{-1}(\Omega))$,
- the functions $F, G : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are Lipschitz continuous with Lipschitz constants L_F and L_G , respectively.

Under Assumptions 2.1, the weak solution of (2.1)–(2.6) is seeking

$\bar{u} \in \{w \in L^2(0, T; H^1(\Omega)) : \gamma(\bar{u}) = g\}$, $\bar{v} \in \{w \in L^2(0, T; H^1(\Omega)) : \gamma(\bar{v}) = h\}$ such that

$$\bar{u} \in L^2(0, T; H^1(\Omega)) \cap C([0, T]; L^2(\Omega)), \quad \bar{v} \in L^2(0, T; H^1(\Omega)) \cap C([0, T]; L^2(\Omega)),$$

$$\forall \varphi \in L^2(0, T; H_0^1(\Omega)), \quad \partial_t \varphi \in L^2(0, T; L^2(\Omega)), \quad \varphi(\cdot, T) = 0,$$

$$\forall \psi \in L^2(0, T; H_0^1(\Omega)), \quad \partial_t \psi \in L^2(0, T; L^2(\Omega)), \quad \psi(\cdot, T) = 0,$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & - \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \bar{u}(\mathbf{x}, t) \partial_t \varphi(\mathbf{x}, t) \, d\mathbf{x} \, dt + \mu_1 \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \nabla \bar{u}(\mathbf{x}, t) \cdot \nabla \varphi(\mathbf{x}, t) \, d\mathbf{x} \, dt, \\
 & \quad - \int_{\Omega} u_{\text{ini}}(\mathbf{x}) \varphi(\mathbf{x}, 0) \, dx \tag{2.7a}
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & = \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} F(\bar{u}, \bar{v}) \varphi(\mathbf{x}, t) \, d\mathbf{x} \, dt, \\
 & - \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \bar{v}(\mathbf{x}, t) \partial_t \psi(\mathbf{x}, t) \, d\mathbf{x} \, dt + \mu_2 \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \nabla \bar{v}(\mathbf{x}, t) \cdot \nabla \psi(\mathbf{x}, t) \, d\mathbf{x} \, dt \\
 & \quad - \int_{\Omega} v_{\text{ini}}(\mathbf{x}) \psi(\mathbf{x}, 0) \, dx \tag{2.7b} \\
 & = \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} G(\bar{u}, \bar{v}) \psi(\mathbf{x}, t) \, d\mathbf{x} \, dt.
 \end{aligned}$$

3. DISCRETE PROBLEM

The analysis of numerical schemes for the approximation of solutions to our model is performed using the GDM. The first step to reach this analysis is the reconstruction of a set of discrete spaces and operators, which is called gradient discretisation.

Definition 3.1 (Gradient discretisation for time-dependent problems with non-homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions). Let Ω be an open subset of \mathbb{R}^d (with $d > 1$) and $T > 0$. A gradient discretisation for time-dependent problems with non-homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions is $\mathcal{D} = (X_{\mathcal{D}}, \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{D}, \partial}, \Pi_{\mathcal{D}}, \nabla_{\mathcal{D}}, J_{\mathcal{D}}, (t^{(n)})_{n=0, \dots, N})$, where

- the set of discrete unknowns $X_{\mathcal{D}} = X_{\mathcal{D}, 0} \oplus X_{\mathcal{D}, \partial\Omega}$ is the direct sum of two finite dimensional spaces on \mathbb{R} , corresponding respectively to the interior unknowns and to the boundary unknowns,
- the linear mapping $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{D}, \partial} : H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\partial\Omega) \rightarrow X_{\mathcal{D}, \partial\Omega}$ is an interpolation operator for the trace,
- the function reconstruction $\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} : X_{\mathcal{D}} \rightarrow L^2(\Omega)$ is a linear,
- the gradient reconstruction $\nabla_{\mathcal{D}} : X_{\mathcal{D}} \rightarrow L^2(\Omega)^d$ is a linear and must be defined so that $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{D}} := \|\nabla_{\mathcal{D}} \cdot\|_{L^2(\Omega)^d}$ defines a norm on $X_{\mathcal{D}, 0}$,
- $J_{\mathcal{D}} : L^{\infty}(\Omega) \rightarrow X_{\mathcal{D}}$ is a linear and continuous interpolation operators for the initial conditions,
- $t^{(0)} = 0 < t^{(1)} < \dots < t^{(N)} = T$ are discrete times.

Let us introduce some notations to define the space-time reconstructions $\Pi_{\mathcal{D}}\varphi : \Omega \times [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and $\nabla_{\mathcal{D}}\varphi : \Omega \times [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, and the discrete time derivative $\delta_{\mathcal{D}}\varphi : (0, T) \rightarrow L^2(\Omega)$, for $\varphi = (\varphi^{(n)})_{n=0, \dots, N} \in X_{\mathcal{D}}^N$.

For a.e $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$, for all $n \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}$ and for all $t \in (t^{(n)}, t^{(n+1)})$, let

$$\begin{aligned}
 \Pi_{\mathcal{D}}\varphi(\mathbf{x}, 0) &= \Pi_{\mathcal{D}}\varphi^{(0)}(\mathbf{x}), \quad \Pi_{\mathcal{D}}\varphi(\mathbf{x}, t) = \Pi_{\mathcal{D}}\varphi^{(n+1)}(\mathbf{x}), \\
 \nabla_{\mathcal{D}}\varphi(\mathbf{x}, t) &= \nabla_{\mathcal{D}}\varphi^{(n+1)}(\mathbf{x}).
 \end{aligned}$$

Set $\delta t^{(n+\frac{1}{2})} = t^{(n+1)} - t^{(n)}$ and $\delta t_{\mathcal{D}} = \max_{n=0, \dots, N-1} \delta t^{(n+\frac{1}{2})}$, to define

$$\delta_{\mathcal{D}}\varphi(t) = \delta_{\mathcal{D}}^{(n+\frac{1}{2})}\varphi := \frac{\Pi_{\mathcal{D}}(\varphi^{(n+1)} - \varphi^{(n)})}{\delta t^{(n+\frac{1}{2})}}.$$

Setting the gradient discretisation defined previously in the place of the continuous space and operators in the weak formulation of the model leads to a numerical scheme, called a gradient scheme.

Definition 3.2 (Gradient scheme). The gradient scheme for the continuous problem (2.7) is to find families of pair $(u^{(n)}, v^{(n)})_{n=0, \dots, N} \in (\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{D}, \partial g} + X_{\mathcal{D}, 0}^{N+1}) \times (\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{D}, \partial h} + X_{\mathcal{D}, 0}^{N+1})$ such that $(u^{(0)}, v^{(0)}) = (J_{\mathcal{D}} u_{\text{ini}}, J_{\mathcal{D}} v_{\text{ini}})$, and for all $n = 0, \dots, N-1$, $u^{(n+1)}$ and $v^{(n+1)}$ satisfy the following equalities:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \delta_{\mathcal{D}}^{(n+\frac{1}{2})} u(\mathbf{x}) \Pi_{\mathcal{D}} \varphi(\mathbf{x}) + \mu_1 \int_{\Omega} \nabla_{\mathcal{D}} u^{(n+1)}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla_{\mathcal{D}} \varphi(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x} \\ &= \int_{\Omega} F(\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} u^{(n+1)}(\mathbf{x}), \Pi_{\mathcal{D}} v^{(n+1)}(\mathbf{x})) \Pi_{\mathcal{D}} \varphi(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x}, \quad \forall \varphi \in X_{\mathcal{D}, 0}, \text{ and} \end{aligned} \quad (3.1a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \delta_{\mathcal{D}}^{(n+\frac{1}{2})} v(\mathbf{x}) \Pi_{\mathcal{D}} \psi(\mathbf{x}) + \mu_2 \int_{\Omega} \nabla_{\mathcal{D}} v^{(n+1)}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla_{\mathcal{D}} \psi(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x} \\ &= \int_{\Omega} G(\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} u^{(n+1)}(\mathbf{x}), \Pi_{\mathcal{D}} v^{(n+1)}(\mathbf{x})) \Pi_{\mathcal{D}} \psi(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x}, \quad \forall \psi \in X_{\mathcal{D}, 0}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.1b)$$

In order to establish the stability and convergence of the above gradient scheme, sequences of gradient discretisations $(\mathcal{D}_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ described in Definition 3 are required to satisfy four properties; coercivity, consistency, limit-conformity and compactness.

Definition 3.3 (Coercivity). Let \mathcal{D} be a gradient discretisation and let $C_{\mathcal{D}}$ be defined by

$$C_{\mathcal{D}} = \max_{\varphi \in X_{\mathcal{D}, 0} \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\|\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} \varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega)}}{\|\nabla_{\mathcal{D}} \varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega)^d}}. \quad (3.2)$$

A sequence $(\mathcal{D}_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ of a gradient discretisation is coercive if $C_{\mathcal{D}}$ is bounded.

Definition 3.4 (Consistency). If \mathcal{D} is a gradient discretisation, define the function $S_{\mathcal{D}} : H^1(\Omega) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ by, for $\varphi \in H^1(\Omega)$,

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\mathcal{D}}(\varphi) = \min \left\{ \|\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} w - \varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\nabla_{\mathcal{D}} w - \nabla \varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega)^d} : w \in X_{\mathcal{D}}, \right. \\ \left. \text{such that } w - \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{D}, \partial \gamma} \varphi \in X_{\mathcal{D}, 0} \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

A sequence $(\mathcal{D}_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ of gradient discretisations is *consistent* if, as $m \rightarrow \infty$

- for all $\varphi \in H^1(\Omega)$, $S_{\mathcal{D}_m}(\varphi) \rightarrow 0$,
- for all $w \in L^2(\Omega)$, $\Pi_{\mathcal{D}_m} J_{\mathcal{D}_m} w \rightarrow w$ in $L^2(\Omega)$,
- $\delta t_{\mathcal{D}_m} \rightarrow 0$.

Definition 3.5 (Limit-conformity). If \mathcal{D} is a gradient discretisation, and the space $H_{\text{div}} = \{\psi \in L^2(\Omega)^d : \text{div} \psi \in L^2(\Omega)\}$, define the function $W_{\mathcal{D}} : H_{\text{div}} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ by, for all $\psi \in H_{\text{div}}$,

$$W_{\mathcal{D}}(\psi) = \sup_{w \in X_{\mathcal{D}, 0} \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\left| \int_{\Omega} (\nabla_{\mathcal{D}} w \cdot \psi + \Pi_{\mathcal{D}} w \text{div}(\psi)) \, dx \right|}{\|\nabla_{\mathcal{D}} w\|_{L^2(\Omega)^d}}. \quad (3.4)$$

A sequence $(\mathcal{D}_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ of gradient discretisations is *limit-conforming* if for all $\psi \in H_{\text{div}}$, $W_{\mathcal{D}_m}(\psi) \rightarrow 0$, as $m \rightarrow \infty$.

Definition 3.6 (Compactness). A sequence of gradient discretisation $(\mathcal{D}_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ in the sense of Definition 3.1 is *compact* if for any sequence $(\varphi_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \in X_{\mathcal{D}_m, 0}$, such that $(\|\nabla_{\mathcal{D}_m} \varphi_m\|_{L^2(\Omega)^d})_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded, the sequence $(\Pi_{\mathcal{D}_m} \varphi_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ is relatively compact in $L^2(\Omega)$.

Definition 3.7 (Dual norm on $\Pi_{\mathcal{D}}(X_{\mathcal{D}})$). If \mathcal{D} be a gradient discretisation, the dual norm $\|\cdot\|_{*, \mathcal{D}}$ on $\Pi_{\mathcal{D}}(X_{\mathcal{D}, 0})$ is defined by, for all $w \in \Pi_{\mathcal{D}}(X_{\mathcal{D}, 0})$,

$$\|w\|_{*, \mathcal{D}} = \sup \left\{ \int_{\Omega} w(\mathbf{x}) \Pi_{\mathcal{D}} \varphi(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x} : \varphi \in X_{\mathcal{D}, 0}, \|\nabla_{\mathcal{D}} \varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega)^d} = 1 \right\}. \quad (3.5)$$

4. CONVERGENCE RESULTS

Our convergence results are stated in the following theorem.

Theorem 4.1 (Convergence of the gradient scheme). *Assume (2.1) and let $(\mathcal{D}_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of gradient discretisations, that is coercive, consistent, limit-conforming and compact. For $m \in \mathbb{N}$, let $(u_m, v_m) \in (\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{D}_m, \partial g} + X_{\mathcal{D}_m, 0}^{N+1}) \times (\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{D}_m, \partial h} + X_{\mathcal{D}_m, 0}^{N+1})$ be a solution to the gradient scheme (3.1) with $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}_m$. Then there exists a weak solution (\bar{u}, \bar{v}) of (2.7) and a subsequence of gradient discretisations, still denoted by $(\mathcal{D}_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$, such that, as $m \rightarrow \infty$,*

- (1) $\Pi_{\mathcal{D}_m} u_m$ converges strongly to \bar{u} in $L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\Omega))$,
- (2) $\Pi_{\mathcal{D}_m} v_m$ converges strongly to \bar{v} in $L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\Omega))$,
- (3) $\nabla_{\mathcal{D}_m} u_m$ converges strongly to $\nabla \bar{u}$ in $L^2(\Omega \times (0, T))^d$,
- (4) $\nabla_{\mathcal{D}_m} v_m$ converges strongly to $\nabla \bar{v}$ in $L^2(\Omega \times (0, T))^d$.

Proof. The proof relies on the compactness arguments as in [9], and is divided into four stages.

Step 1: Take liftings $\bar{g} \in L^2(0, T; H^1(\Omega))$ of g and $\bar{h} \in L^2(0, T; H^1(\Omega))$ of h , such that $\gamma \bar{g} = g$ and $\gamma \bar{h} = h$. Thanks to the density of space–time tensorial functions in the space $L^2(0, T; H^1(\Omega))$ established in [6, Corollary 1.3.1], we can express the liftings \bar{g} and \bar{h} in the following way: let $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, $(\phi)_{i=1, \dots, \ell}$, $(\xi)_{i=1, \dots, \ell} \subset C^\infty([0, T])$, and $(p_i)_{i=1, \dots, \ell}$, $(q_i)_{i=1, \dots, \ell} \subset H^1(\Omega)$ such that

$$\bar{g}(\mathbf{x}, t) = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \phi_i(t) p_i(\mathbf{x}) \text{ and a.e. } \mathbf{x} \in \Omega \text{ and for all } t \in (0, T),$$

$$\bar{h}(\mathbf{x}, t) = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \xi_i(t) q_i(\mathbf{x}) \text{ and a.e. } \mathbf{x} \in \Omega \text{ and for all } t \in (0, T).$$

Let $g_{\mathcal{D}}, h_{\mathcal{D}} \in X_{\mathcal{D}}^{N_m+1}$ be defined by $g_{\mathcal{D}}^{(n)} = \phi(t^{(n)}) I_{\mathcal{D}} p$ and $h_{\mathcal{D}}^{(n)} = \xi(t^{(n)}) I_{\mathcal{D}} q$ for $0, \dots, N_m$, where

$$I_{\mathcal{D}} p = \operatorname{argmin}_{\varphi \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{D}, \partial g} + X_{\mathcal{D}, 0}} \left(\|\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} \varphi - p\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\nabla_{\mathcal{D}} \varphi - \nabla p\|_{L^2(\Omega)^d} \right),$$

$$I_{\mathcal{D}} q = \operatorname{argmin}_{\varphi \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{D}, \partial h} + X_{\mathcal{D}, 0}} \left(\|\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} \varphi - q\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\nabla_{\mathcal{D}} \varphi - \nabla q\|_{L^2(\Omega)^d} \right).$$

From the consistency property, as $m \rightarrow \infty$, we have

- (1) $\Pi_{\mathcal{D}_m} g_{\mathcal{D}_m} \rightarrow \bar{g}$ strongly in $L^2(\Omega \times (0, T))$ and $\Pi_{\mathcal{D}_m} h_{\mathcal{D}_m} \rightarrow \bar{h}$ strongly in $L^2(\Omega \times (0, T))$,

- (2) $\nabla_{\mathcal{D}_m} g_{\mathcal{D}_m} \rightarrow \nabla \bar{g}$ strongly in $L^2(\Omega \times (0, T))^d$ and $\nabla_{\mathcal{D}_m} h_{\mathcal{D}_m} \rightarrow \nabla \bar{h}$ strongly in $L^2(\Omega \times (0, T))^d$,
- (3) $\delta_{\mathcal{D}_m}^{(n+\frac{1}{2})} g_{\mathcal{D}_m} \rightarrow \partial_t \bar{g}$ strongly in $L^2(\Omega \times (0, T))$ and $\delta_{\mathcal{D}_m}^{(n+\frac{1}{2})} h_{\mathcal{D}_m} \rightarrow \partial_t \bar{h}$ strongly in $L^2(\Omega \times (0, T))$.

For any solution (u, v) to the gradient scheme (3.1), writing $w_1 = u - g_{\mathcal{D}} \in X_{\mathcal{D},0}$ and $w_2 = v - h_{\mathcal{D}} \in X_{\mathcal{D},0}$, we have for all $\varphi, \psi \in X_{\mathcal{D},0}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \delta_{\mathcal{D}}^{(n+\frac{1}{2})} w_1(\mathbf{x}) \Pi_{\mathcal{D}} \varphi(\mathbf{x}) + \mu_1 \int_{\Omega} \nabla_{\mathcal{D}} w_1^{(n+1)}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla_{\mathcal{D}} \varphi(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x} \\ &= \int_{\Omega} F(\Pi_{\mathcal{D}}(w_1 + g_{\mathcal{D}}), \Pi_{\mathcal{D}}(w_2 + h_{\mathcal{D}})) \Pi_{\mathcal{D}} \varphi(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x} \\ & \quad - \int_{\Omega} \delta_{\mathcal{D}}^{(n+\frac{1}{2})} g_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{x}) \Pi_{\mathcal{D}} \varphi(\mathbf{x}) - \mu_1 \int_{\Omega} \nabla_{\mathcal{D}} g_{\mathcal{D}}^{(n+1)}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla_{\mathcal{D}} \varphi(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.1a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \delta_{\mathcal{D}}^{(n+\frac{1}{2})} w_2(\mathbf{x}) \Pi_{\mathcal{D}} \psi(\mathbf{x}) + \mu_2 \int_{\Omega} \nabla_{\mathcal{D}} w_2^{(n+1)}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla_{\mathcal{D}} \psi(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x} \\ &= \int_{\Omega} G(\Pi_{\mathcal{D}}(w_1 + g_{\mathcal{D}}), \Pi_{\mathcal{D}}(w_2 + h_{\mathcal{D}})) \Pi_{\mathcal{D}} \psi(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x} \\ & \quad - \int_{\Omega} \delta_{\mathcal{D}}^{(n+\frac{1}{2})} h_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{x}) \Pi_{\mathcal{D}} \psi(\mathbf{x}) - \mu_2 \int_{\Omega} \nabla_{\mathcal{D}} h_{\mathcal{D}}^{(n+1)}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla_{\mathcal{D}} \psi(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.1b)$$

Step 2: We need to have estimates on the quantities $\|\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} w_1(t)\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega))}$, $\|\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} w_2(t)\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega))}$, $\|\nabla_{\mathcal{D}} w_1\|_{L^2(\Omega \times (0,T))^d}$, and $\|\nabla_{\mathcal{D}} w_2\|_{L^2(\Omega \times (0,T))^d}$.

Let $n \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}$ and put $\varphi := \delta t^{(n+\frac{1}{2})} w_1^{(n+1)}$ in (4.1a) and $\psi := \delta t^{(n+\frac{1}{2})} w_2^{(n+1)}$ in (4.1b). We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \left(\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} w_1^{(n+1)}(\mathbf{x}) - \Pi_{\mathcal{D}} w_1^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}) \right) \Pi_{\mathcal{D}} w_1^{(n+1)}(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x} \\ & \quad + \mu_1 \delta t^{(n+\frac{1}{2})} \int_{\Omega} \nabla_{\mathcal{D}} w_1^{(n+1)}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla_{\mathcal{D}} w_1^{(n+1)}(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x} \\ &= \delta t^{(n+\frac{1}{2})} \int_{\Omega} F(\Pi_{\mathcal{D}}(w_1^{(n+1)}(\mathbf{x}) + g_{\mathcal{D}}), \Pi_{\mathcal{D}}(w_2^{(n+1)}(\mathbf{x}) + h_{\mathcal{D}})) \Pi_{\mathcal{D}} w_1^{(n+1)}(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x} \\ & \quad - \delta t^{(n+\frac{1}{2})} \int_{\Omega} \delta_{\mathcal{D}}^{(n+\frac{1}{2})} g_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{x}) \Pi_{\mathcal{D}} w_1^{(n+1)}(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x} \\ & \quad - \mu_1 \delta t^{(n+\frac{1}{2})} \int_{\Omega} \nabla_{\mathcal{D}} g_{\mathcal{D}}^{(n+1)}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla_{\mathcal{D}} w_1^{(n+1)}(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x}, \quad \text{and} \\ & \int_{\Omega} \left(\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} w_2^{(n+1)}(\mathbf{x}) - \Pi_{\mathcal{D}} w_2^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}) \right) \Pi_{\mathcal{D}} w_2^{(n+1)}(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x} \\ & \quad + \mu_2 \delta t^{(n+\frac{1}{2})} \int_{\Omega} \nabla_{\mathcal{D}} w_2^{(n+1)}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla_{\mathcal{D}} w_2^{(n+1)}(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x} \, dt \\ &= \delta t^{(n+\frac{1}{2})} \int_{\Omega} G(\Pi_{\mathcal{D}}(w_1^{(n+1)}(\mathbf{x}) + g_{\mathcal{D}}), \Pi_{\mathcal{D}}(w_2^{(n+1)}(\mathbf{x}) + h_{\mathcal{D}})) \Pi_{\mathcal{D}} w_2^{(n+1)}(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x} \\ & \quad - \delta t^{(n+\frac{1}{2})} \int_{\Omega} \delta_{\mathcal{D}}^{(n+\frac{1}{2})} h_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{x}) \Pi_{\mathcal{D}} w_2^{(n+1)}(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x} \\ & \quad - \mu_2 \delta t^{(n+\frac{1}{2})} \int_{\Omega} \nabla_{\mathcal{D}} h_{\mathcal{D}}^{(n+1)}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla_{\mathcal{D}} w_2^{(n+1)}(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x}. \end{aligned}$$

Apply the inequality, $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, $(a - b)a \geq \frac{1}{2}(|a|^2 - |b|^2)$, to the first terms in the above equalities, sum on $n = 0, \dots, m - 1$, for some $m = 0, \dots, N$ and apply the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \frac{1}{2} \|\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} w_1^{(m)}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 - \frac{1}{2} \|\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} w_1^{(0)}\|^2 + \mu_1 \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \delta t^{(n+\frac{1}{2})} \|\nabla_{\mathcal{D}} w_1^{(n)}\|_{L^2(\Omega)^d}^2 \\
 & \leq \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \delta t^{(n+\frac{1}{2})} \left\| F(\Pi_{\mathcal{D}}(w_1^{(n+1)} + g_{\mathcal{D}}^{(n+1)}), \Pi_{\mathcal{D}}(w_2^{(n+1)} + h_{\mathcal{D}}^{(n+1)})) \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} w_1^{(n+1)}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
 & \quad + \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \delta t^{(n+\frac{1}{2})} \|\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} w_1^{(n+1)}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\delta_{\mathcal{D}}^{(n+\frac{1}{2})} g_{\mathcal{D}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
 & \quad + \mu_1 \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \delta t^{(n+\frac{1}{2})} \|\nabla_{\mathcal{D}} w_1^{(n)}\|_{L^2(\Omega)^d} \|\nabla_{\mathcal{D}} g_{\mathcal{D}}^{(n)}\|_{L^2(\Omega)^d}, \quad \text{and}
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \frac{1}{2} \|\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} w_2^{(m)}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 - \frac{1}{2} \|\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} w_2^{(0)}\|^2 + \mu_1 \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \delta t^{(n+\frac{1}{2})} \|\nabla_{\mathcal{D}} w_2^{(n)}\|_{L^2(\Omega)^d}^2 \\
 & \leq \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \delta t^{(n+\frac{1}{2})} \left\| G(\Pi_{\mathcal{D}}(w_1^{(n+1)} + g_{\mathcal{D}}^{(n+1)}), \Pi_{\mathcal{D}}(w_2^{(n+1)} + h_{\mathcal{D}}^{(n+1)})) \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} w_1^{(n+1)}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
 & \quad + \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \|\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} w_2^{(n+1)}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\delta_{\mathcal{D}}^{(n+\frac{1}{2})} h_{\mathcal{D}}^{(n+1)}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
 & \quad + \mu_2 \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \delta t^{(n+\frac{1}{2})} \|\nabla_{\mathcal{D}} w_2^{(n)}\|_{L^2(\Omega)^d} \|\nabla_{\mathcal{D}} h_{\mathcal{D}}^{(n)}\|_{L^2(\Omega)^d}.
 \end{aligned}$$

From the Lipschitz continuous assumptions on F and G , one has, with letting $L : \max(L_F, L_G)$ and $C_0 = \max(F(\mathbf{0}), G(\mathbf{0}))$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \frac{1}{2} \|\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} w_1^{(m)}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 - \frac{1}{2} \|\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} w_1^{(0)}\|^2 + \mu_1 \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \delta t^{(n+\frac{1}{2})} \|\nabla_{\mathcal{D}} w_1^{(n)}\|_{L^2(\Omega)^d}^2 \\
 & \leq \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \delta t^{(n+\frac{1}{2})} \left[L \left(\|\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} w_1^{(n)}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} w_1^{(n)}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} g_{\mathcal{D}}^{(n)}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \right. \right. \\
 & \quad \left. \left. + \|\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} w_1^{(n)}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} w_2^{(n)}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} w_1^{(n)}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} h_{\mathcal{D}}^{(n)}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \right) \right. \\
 & \quad \left. + C_0 \|\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} w_1^{(n)}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \right] + \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \delta t^{(n+\frac{1}{2})} \|\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} w_1^{(n+1)}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\delta_{\mathcal{D}}^{(n+\frac{1}{2})} g_{\mathcal{D}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
 & \quad + \mu_1 \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \delta t^{(n+\frac{1}{2})} \|\nabla_{\mathcal{D}} w_1^{(n)}\|_{L^2(\Omega)^d} \|\nabla_{\mathcal{D}} g_{\mathcal{D}}^{(n)}\|_{L^2(\Omega)^d}, \quad \text{and}
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2} \|\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} w_2^{(m)}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 - \frac{1}{2} \|\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} w_2^{(0)}\|^2 + \mu_1 \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \delta t^{(n+\frac{1}{2})} \|\nabla_{\mathcal{D}} w_2^{(n)}\|_{L^2(\Omega)^d}^2 \\
& \leq \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \delta t^{(n+\frac{1}{2})} \left[L \left(\|\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} w_2^{(n)}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} w_2^{(n)}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} g_{\mathcal{D}}^{(n)}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. + \|\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} w_2^{(n)}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} w_1^{(n)}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} w_2^{(n)}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} h_{\mathcal{D}}^{(n)}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \right) \right. \\
& \quad \left. + C_0 \|\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} w_2^{(n)}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \right] + \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \delta t^{(n+\frac{1}{2})} \|\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} w_2^{(n+1)}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\delta_{\mathcal{D}}^{(n+\frac{1}{2})} h_{\mathcal{D}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
& \quad + \mu_1 \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \delta t^{(n+\frac{1}{2})} \|\nabla_{\mathcal{D}} w_1^{(n)}\|_{L^2(\Omega)^d} \|\nabla_{\mathcal{D}} h_{\mathcal{D}}^{(n)}\|_{L^2(\Omega)^d}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, using the Young's inequality in the right-hand side of the inequalities, we conclude

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2} \|\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} w_1^{(m)}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 - \frac{1}{2} \|\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} w_1^{(0)}\|^2 + \mu_1 \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \delta t^{(n+\frac{1}{2})} \|\nabla_{\mathcal{D}} w_1^{(n)}\|_{L^2(\Omega)^d}^2 \\
& \leq M_1 \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \delta t^{(n+\frac{1}{2})} \|\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} w_1^{(n)}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{1}{2\varepsilon_2} \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \delta t^{(n+\frac{1}{2})} \|\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} w_2^{(n)}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\
& \quad + \frac{T}{2\varepsilon_4} C_0^2 + \frac{\mu_1}{2} \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \delta t^{(n+\frac{1}{2})} \|\nabla_{\mathcal{D}} w_1^{(n)}\|_{L^2(\Omega)^d}^2 + T M_1 C_1, \quad \text{and}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2} \|\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} w_2^{(m)}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 - \frac{1}{2} \|\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} w_2^{(0)}\|^2 + \mu_2 \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \delta t^{(n+\frac{1}{2})} \|\nabla_{\mathcal{D}} w_2^{(n)}\|_{L^2(\Omega)^d}^2 \\
& \leq M_3 \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \delta t^{(n+\frac{1}{2})} \|\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} w_2^{(n)}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{1}{2\varepsilon_7} \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \delta t^{(n+\frac{1}{2})} \|\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} w_1^{(n)}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\
& \quad + \frac{T}{2\varepsilon_9} C_0^2 + \frac{\mu_2}{2} \sum_{n=0}^{m-2} \delta t^{(n+\frac{1}{2})} \|\nabla_{\mathcal{D}} w_2^{(n)}\|_{L^2(\Omega)^d}^2 + T M_2 C_1,
\end{aligned}$$

where $M_1 := L + \sum_{i=1}^5 \frac{\varepsilon_i}{2}$, $M_2 := L + \sum_{i=6}^{10} \frac{\varepsilon_i}{2}$, and C_1 depends on $C_{\mathcal{D}}$, $\|\nabla_{\mathcal{D}} g_{\mathcal{D}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)^d}$ and $\|\nabla_{\mathcal{D}} h_{\mathcal{D}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)^d}$, which are bounded. The desired estimates follow from combining the above inequalities together and take the supremum on $m = 0, \dots, N$.

Step 3: We need to established estimates on $\|w_1\|_{*,\mathcal{D}}$ and $\|w_2\|_{*,\mathcal{D}}$. Take generic test functions φ and ψ in (4.1). Use the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality to get, thanks to assumptions (2.1) and to the coercivity properties

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Omega} \delta_{\mathcal{D}}^{(n+\frac{1}{2})} w_1(\mathbf{x}) \Pi_{\mathcal{D}} \varphi(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x} \\
& \leq C_{\mathcal{D}} \|\nabla_{\mathcal{D}} \varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega)^d} \left[L \left(\|\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} w_1^{(n+1)}\|_{L^2(\Omega \times (0,T))} + \|\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} w_2^{(n+1)}\|_{L^2(\Omega \times (0,T))} \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. + \|\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} g_{\mathcal{D}}^{(n+1)}\|_{L^2(\Omega \times (0,T))} + \|\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} h_{\mathcal{D}}^{(n+1)}\|_{L^2(\Omega \times (0,T))} \right) + C_0 \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \|\delta_{\mathcal{D}}^{(n+\frac{1}{2})} g_{\mathcal{D}}^{(n+1)}\|_{L^2(\Omega \times (0,T))} + \mu_1 \|\nabla_{\mathcal{D}} w_1^{(n+1)}\|_{L^2(\Omega \times (0,T))^d} \right],
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \int_{\Omega} \delta_{\mathcal{D}}^{(n+\frac{1}{2})} w_2(\mathbf{x}) \Pi_{\mathcal{D}} \psi(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x} \\
 & \leq C_{\mathcal{D}} \|\nabla_{\mathcal{D}} \psi\|_{L^2(\Omega)^d} \left[L \left(\|\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} w_1^{(n+1)}\|_{L^2(\Omega \times (0, T))} + \|\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} w_2^{(n+1)}\|_{L^2(\Omega \times (0, T))} \right. \right. \\
 & \quad \left. \left. + \|\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} g_{\mathcal{D}}^{(n+1)}\|_{L^2(\Omega \times (0, T))} + \|\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} h_{\mathcal{D}}^{(n+1)}\|_{L^2(\Omega \times (0, T))} \right) + C_0 \right. \\
 & \quad \left. + \|\delta_{\mathcal{D}}^{(n+\frac{1}{2})} h_{\mathcal{D}}^{(n+1)}\|_{L^2(\Omega \times (0, T))} + \mu_1 \|\nabla_{\mathcal{D}} w_2^{(n+1)}\|_{L^2(\Omega \times (0, T))^d} \right].
 \end{aligned}$$

The desired estimates is then obtained by taking the supremum over $\varphi, \psi \in X_{\mathcal{D},0}$ with $\|\nabla_{\mathcal{D}} \varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega)^d} = \|\nabla_{\mathcal{D}} \psi\|_{L^2(\Omega)^d} = 1$, multiplying by $\delta t^{(n+1)}$, summing over $n = 0, \dots, N-1$, thanks to the estimates obtained in the previous step.

Step 4: Owing to these estimates and the strong convergence of $\Pi_{\mathcal{D}_m} g_{\mathcal{D}_m}, \Pi_{\mathcal{D}_m} h_{\mathcal{D}_m}, \nabla_{\mathcal{D}_m} g_{\mathcal{D}_m}$, and $\nabla_{\mathcal{D}_m} h_{\mathcal{D}_m}$, the remaining of the proof is then similar to that of [9, Theorem 3.2]. \square

5. NUMERICAL RESULTS

To measure the efficiency of the gradient scheme (3.1) for the continuous problem (2.1)–(2.6), we consider a particular choice of the gradient discretisation method known as the Hybrid Mimetic Mixed (HMM) method, which is a kind of finite volume scheme and can be written in three different formats; the hybrid finite volume method [13], the (mixed–hybrid) mimetic finite differences methods [5], and the mixed finite volume methods [18]. For the sake of completeness we briefly recall the definition of this gradient discretisation. Let $\mathcal{T} = (\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{V})$ be the polytopal mesh of the spatial domain Ω used in the previous section and described in [9, Definition 7.2]. The elements of the gradient discretisation are:

- The discrete spaces are

$$X_{\mathcal{D},0} = \{v = ((\varphi_K)_{K \in \mathcal{M}}, (\varphi_{\sigma})_{\sigma \in \mathcal{F}}) : \varphi_K, \varphi_{\sigma} \in \mathbb{R}, \varphi_{\sigma} = 0, \forall \sigma \in \mathcal{F} \cap \partial\Omega\},$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 X_{\mathcal{D},\partial\Omega} &= \{v = ((v_K)_{K \in \mathcal{M}}, (v_{\sigma})_{\sigma \in \mathcal{F}}) : v_K \in \mathbb{R}, v_{\sigma} \in \mathbb{R}, \\
 & \quad v_K = 0 \text{ for all } K \in \mathcal{M}, v_{\sigma} = 0 \text{ for all } \sigma \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{int}}\}.
 \end{aligned}$$

- The non conforming a piecewise affine reconstruction $\Pi_{\mathcal{D}}$ is defined by

$$\begin{aligned}
 \forall \varphi \in X_{\mathcal{D}}, \forall K \in \mathcal{M}, \text{ for a.e. } \mathbf{x} \in K, \\
 \Pi_{\mathcal{D}} \varphi = \varphi_K \text{ on } K.
 \end{aligned}$$

- The reconstructed gradients is piecewise constant on the cells (broken gradient), defined by

$$\begin{aligned}
 \forall \varphi \in X_{\mathcal{D}}, \forall K \in \mathcal{M}, \forall \sigma \in \mathcal{F}_K, \\
 \nabla_{\mathcal{D}} \varphi = \nabla_K \varphi + \frac{\sqrt{d}}{d_{K,\sigma}} R_K(\varphi) \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma} \text{ on } D_{K,\sigma},
 \end{aligned}$$

where a cell–wise constant gradient $\nabla_K \varphi$ and a stabilisation term $R_K(\varphi)$ are respectively defined by:

$$\nabla_K \varphi = \frac{1}{|K|} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{F}_K} |\sigma| \varphi_{\sigma} \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma} \text{ and } R_K(\varphi) = (\varphi_{\sigma} - \varphi_K - \nabla_K \varphi \cdot (x_{\sigma} - x_K))_{\sigma \in \mathcal{F}_K},$$

in which x_{σ} is centre of mass of σ , x_K is the gravity centre of cell K , $d_{K,\sigma}$ is the orthogonal distance between x_K and $\sigma \in \mathcal{F}_K$, $\mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma}$ is the unit vector normal to σ outward to K and $D_{K,\sigma}$ is the convex hull of $\sigma \cup \{x_K\}$.

- The interpolant $J_{\mathcal{D}} : L^\infty(\Omega) \rightarrow X_{\mathcal{D}}$ is defined by:

$$\begin{aligned} \forall w \in L^\infty(\Omega) : J_{\mathcal{D}}w &= ((w_K)_{K \in \mathcal{M}}, (w_\sigma)_{\sigma \in \mathcal{F}}), \\ \forall K \in \mathcal{M}, w_K &= \frac{1}{|K|} \int_K w(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x} \text{ and } \forall \sigma \in \mathcal{F}, w_\sigma = 0. \end{aligned}$$

- the interpolant $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{D},\partial} : H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\partial\Omega) \rightarrow X_{\mathcal{D},\partial\Omega}$ is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \forall g \in H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\partial\Omega) : (\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{D},\partial}g)_\sigma &= \frac{1}{|\sigma|} \int_\sigma g(x) \, ds(x), \\ &\text{for all } \sigma \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{ext}} \text{ such that } \sigma \subset \partial\Omega. \end{aligned}$$

The HMM scheme for (3.1) is the gradient scheme (2.7) written with the gradient discretisation constructed above.

As a test, we consider the Brusselator reaction-diffusion model (2.1)–(2.6) with non-homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions over the domain $\Omega = [0, 1]^2$. The reaction functions in the Brusselator system are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} F(\bar{u}, \bar{v}) &= a - (b + 1)\bar{u} + \bar{u}^2\bar{v}, \\ G(\bar{u}, \bar{v}) &= b\bar{u} - \bar{u}^2\bar{v}, \end{aligned}$$

where a is positive constant and b is a parameter that can be varied to result in a range of different patterns. With $\mathbf{x} = (x, y) \in \Omega$, the exact solution in such a case is given as [4]

$$\bar{u}(\mathbf{x}, t) = \exp(-x - y - 0.5t), \quad (5.2a)$$

$$\bar{v}(\mathbf{x}, t) = \exp(x + y + 0.5t), \quad (5.2b)$$

with parameters chosen as $a = 0$, $b = 1$, $\mu_1 = \mu_2 = 0.25$.

The initial and the Dirichlet boundary conditions are extracted from the analytical solutions (5.2). The simulation is performed on a sequence of triangular meshes and is done up to $T = 1$. The chosen meshes are of size $h = 0.125$, $h = 0.0625$, $h = 0.03125$, and $h = 0.015625$, respectively with time step is fixed as 0.0001. Table 1 shows the relative errors on \bar{u} and \bar{v} and the corresponding rates of convergence with respect to the mesh size h . The resultant errors on the solutions \bar{u} and \bar{v} are proportional to the mesh size h , indicating that the HMM scheme behaves very well.

Moreover, the L_2 relative errors on the gradients of the solutions with respect to the mesh size h are shown in log-log scale Figure 5.1a for $\nabla\bar{u}$ and in Figure 5.1b for $\nabla\bar{v}$. A line of slope one is added in both figures as a reference. We observe that the relative errors on $\nabla\bar{u}$ and $\nabla\bar{v}$ scale linearly with h , giving a rate of convergence of one, which are compatible with behaviour expectations associated with the low-order methods such as the HMM method.

Acknowledgement:

The authors would like to thank the Deanship of Scientific Research at Umm Al-Qura University for supporting this work Grant Code: 19-SCI-1-01-0027.

REFERENCES

- [1] Y. ALNASHRI, *The gradient discretisation method for the navier–stokes problem coupled with the heat equation*, Results in Applied Mathematics, 11 (2021), p. 100176.

h	$\frac{\ \bar{u}(\cdot, t^{(n)}) - \Pi_{\mathcal{D}} u^{(n)}\ _{L^2(\Omega)}}{\ \bar{u}(\cdot, t^{(n)})\ _{L^2(\Omega)}}$	Rate	$\frac{\ \bar{v}(\cdot, t^{(n)}) - \Pi_{\mathcal{D}} v^{(n)}\ _{L^2(\Omega)}}{\ \bar{v}(\cdot, t^{(n)})\ _{L^2(\Omega)}}$	Rate
0.125	0.000720746	–	0.000561639	–
0.0625	0.000184132	1.968753	0.000140295	2.0011797
0.03125	0.0000501972	1.8750586	0.0000342813	2.03296997
0.015625	0.0000149187	1.750485	0.00000688301	2.31630842

TABLE 1. The relative errors and convergence rates w.r.t. the mesh size h at time $t = 1$ for the Brusselator model with parameters chosen as $a = 0$, $b = 1$, $\mu_1 = \mu_2 = 0.25$.




FIGURE 5.1. The relative errors on (a) $\nabla \bar{u}$ and (b) $\nabla \bar{v}$ w.r.t. the mesh size h at time $t = 1$ for the Brusselator model with parameters chosen as in Table 1.

- [2] Y. ALNASHRI AND J. DRONIOU, *Gradient schemes for the Signorini and the obstacle problems, and application to hybrid mimetic mixed methods*, Computers and Mathematics with Applications, 72 (2016), pp. 2788–2807.
- [3] ———, *A gradient discretization method to analyze numerical schemes for nonlinear variational inequalities, application to the seepage problem*, SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis, 56 (2018), pp. 2375–2405.
- [4] W.-T. ANG, *The two-dimensional reaction-diffusion brusselator system: a dual-reciprocity boundary element solution*, Engineering Analysis with Boundary Elements, 7 (2003), pp. 897—903.

- [5] F. BREZZI AND M. FORTIN, *Mixed and Hybrid Finite Element Methods*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1991.
- [6] J. DRONIOU, *Intégration et Espaces de Sobolev à Valeurs Vectorielles*. working paper or preprint, Apr. 2001.
- [7] J. DRONIOU, *Introduction to discrete functional analysis techniques for the numerical study of diffusion equations with irregular data*, in Proceedings of the 17th Biennial Computational Techniques and Applications Conference, CTAC-2014, J. Sharples and J. Bunder, eds., vol. 56 of ANZIAM J., 2015, pp. C101–C127.
- [8] J. DRONIOU AND R. EYMARD, *Uniform-in-time convergence of numerical methods for non-linear degenerate parabolic equations*, Numer. Math., 132 (2016), pp. 721–766.
- [9] J. DRONIOU, R. EYMARD, T. GALLOUËT, C. GUICHARD, AND R. HERBIN, *The gradient discretisation method*, Mathematics & Applications, Springer, Heidelberg, 2018.
- [10] J. DRONIOU, R. EYMARD, T. GALLOUËT, AND R. HERBIN, *Gradient schemes: a generic framework for the discretisation of linear, nonlinear and nonlocal elliptic and parabolic problems*, Mathematical Models and Methods in Applied Sciences, 23 (2013), pp. 2395–2432.
- [11] J. DRONIOU, R. EYMARD, AND R. HERBIN, *Gradient schemes: generic tools for the numerical analysis of diffusion equations*, M2AN Math. Model. Numer. Anal., 50 (2016), pp. 749–781.
- [12] R. EYMARD, P. FERON, T. GALLOUËT, R. HERBIN, AND C. GUICHARD, *Gradient schemes for the Stefan problem*, International Journal On Finite Volumes, 10s (2013).
- [13] R. EYMARD, T. GALLOUËT, AND R. HERBIN, *Discretization of heterogeneous and anisotropic diffusion problems on general nonconforming meshes SUSHI: a scheme using stabilization and hybrid interfaces*, IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis, 30 (2010), pp. 1009–1043.
- [14] R. EYMARD, C. GUICHARD, R. HERBIN, AND R. MASSON, *Gradient schemes for two-phase flow in heterogeneous porous media and Richards equation*, ZAMM Z. Angew. Math. Mech., 94 (2014), pp. 560–585.
- [15] P. GRAY AND S. K. SCOTT, *Autocatalytic reactions in the isothermal, continuous stirred tank reactor: Oscillations and instabilities in the system $a + 2b \rightarrow 3b$, $b \rightarrow c$* , Chemical Engineering Science, 39 (1984), pp. 1087–1097.
- [16] Y. R. LEE AND S.-S. LIAW, *A diffusion-reaction model to reproduce the suitable environment for stem cells in tissue*, Chinese journal of Physics, 52 (2014), pp. 927–933.
- [17] I. PRIGOGINE AND R. LEFEVER, *Symmetry breaking instabilities in dissipative systems ii*, Journal of chemical Physics, 48 (1968), pp. 1695–1700.
- [18] M. E. TAYLOR, *Review: Martin Schechter, modern methods in partial differential equations, an introduction*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.), 1 (1979), pp. 661–667.
- [19] J. TYSON, *Some further studies of non-linear oscillations in chemical systems*, Journal of chemical Physics, 58 (1973), pp. 3919–3930.

(Yahya Alnashri) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, AL-QUNFUDAH UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, UMM AL-QURA UNIVERSITY, SAUDI ARABIA
Email address: yanashri@uqu.edu.sa

(Hasan Alzubaidi) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, AL-QUNFUDAH UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, UMM AL-QURA UNIVERSITY, SAUDI ARABIA
Email address: hmzubaidi@uqu.edu.sa