

# ASYMPTOTIC PRESERVING DISCONTINUOUS GALERKIN METHODS FOR A LINEAR BOLTZMANN SEMICONDUCTOR MODEL\*

VICTOR P. DECARIA<sup>†</sup>, CORY D. HAUCK<sup>‡</sup>, AND STEFAN R. SCHNAKE<sup>§</sup>

**Abstract.** A key property of the linear Boltzmann semiconductor model is that as the collision frequency tends to infinity, the phase space density  $f = f(x, v, t)$  converges to an isotropic function  $M(v)\rho(x, t)$ , called the drift-diffusion limit, where  $M$  is a Maxwellian and the physical density  $\rho$  satisfies a second-order parabolic PDE known as the drift-diffusion equation. Numerical approximations that mirror this property are said to be asymptotic preserving. In this paper we build two discontinuous Galerkin methods to the semiconductor model: one with the standard upwinding flux and the other with a  $\varepsilon$ -scaled Lax-Friedrichs flux, where  $1/\varepsilon$  is the scale of the collision frequency. We show that these schemes are uniformly stable in  $\varepsilon$  and are asymptotic preserving. In particular, we discuss what properties the discrete Maxwellian must satisfy in order for the schemes to converge in  $\varepsilon$  to an accurate  $h$ -approximation of the drift diffusion limit. Discrete versions of the drift-diffusion equation and error estimates in several norms with respect to  $\varepsilon$  and the spacial resolution are also included.

**Key words.** drift-diffusion, asymptotic preserving, discontinuous Galerkin, semiconductor models

**AMS subject classifications.** 65M08, 65M12, 65M15, 65M60

**1. Introduction.** Kinetic equations are an established tool for modeling charged-particle transport in semiconductors, particularly in non-equilibrium settings [18, 26, 29]. However, numerical simulations of such equations are known to be challenging, due to the size of the space on which they are defined (in general three position, three momentum variables, plus time) and the multiscale nature of the equations. With regards to the latter, it is well-known that for large collision frequencies and long-time scales, the kinetic solution is well-approximated by a drift-diffusion equation which depends on space and time only. Under reasonable conditions, this limit was established rigorously for the case of an applied electric field in [28]. The case of a self-consistent field was later treated in [1, 27].

Because of the drift-diffusion approximation, solving a kinetic model of charge transport in collisional regimes may be unnecessarily expensive; to ameliorate this cost, methods which leverage the drift-diffusion approximation, either via domain decomposition [20] or acceleration [11, 22] are sometimes used. At a minimum, it

---

\*This material is based upon work supported by the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research, as part of their Applied Mathematics Research Program. The work was performed at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, which is managed by UT-Battelle, LLC under Contract No. De-AC05-00OR22725. The United States Government retains and the publisher, by accepting the article for publication, acknowledges that the United States Government retains a non-exclusive, paid-up, irrevocable, world-wide license to publish or reproduce the published form of this manuscript, or allow others to do so, for the United States Government purposes. The Department of Energy will provide public access to these results of federally sponsored research in accordance with the DOE Public Access Plan (<http://energy.gov/downloads/doe-public-access-plan>).

<sup>†</sup>Mathematics in Computation Section, Computer Science and Mathematics Division, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN 37831, USA ([vpdecaria@gmail.com](mailto:vpdecaria@gmail.com)).

<sup>‡</sup>Mathematics in Computation Section, Computer Science and Mathematics Division, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN 37831, USA and Mathematics Department, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN 37996, USA ([hauckc@ornl.gov](mailto:hauckc@ornl.gov)).

<sup>§</sup>Mathematics in Computation Section, Computer Science and Mathematics Division, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN 37831, USA ([schnakesr@ornl.gov](mailto:schnakesr@ornl.gov)).

is important that a discretization of the kinetic equation recover a stable and consistent discretization of the drift-diffusion limit as the collision frequency becomes infinitely large; this is the so-called asymptotic preserving (AP) property [15, 16]. While standard finite volume or finite-difference methods that rely on upwinding to discretize advection terms are not asymptotic preserving, there are specialized spatial discretizations [31] and operator splitting techniques [16, 17, 21] that are.

A different approach for capturing the numerical drift-diffusion limit is to use discontinuous Galerkin (DG) methods. These methods have been developed both for kinetic semiconductor equations [6–9, 25] and for the drift-diffusion equations [5, 24]. While not yet rigorously established in the literature, it is reasonable to assume that DG methods will recover the numerical drift-diffusion limit. Such a conjecture rests on a similar body of work for kinetic equations of radiation transport. In that setting, collisional dynamics over long time scales lead to a standard diffusion equation [3, 14, 23]. The asymptotic preserving properties of DG methods for transport equations were first established in [23] for one-dimensional (slab) geometries and later extended to the general multi-dimensional setting in [2]. In [13], the work in [2] was re-established using a rigorous functional analysis framework. The work presented here follows in the spirit of that framework.

In the current paper, we rigorously prove the numerical drift-diffusion limit for a DG method applied to a linear kinetic semiconductor equation. In particular, the collision operator approximates very complicated material interactions with a simple relaxation model and the electric field is not self-consistent, but rather assumed to be given. The DG method relies on a reformulation of the kinetic equation in terms of a weighted distribution function. While such a reformulation is likely not necessary, it does make some stability results easier to prove. Such results are challenging because, unlike the radiation transport case, the advection operator and collision operator of the kinetic semiconductor equation are stable in different  $L^2$  spaces, one of which is weighted. Even at the analytical level, this mismatch poses significant challenges [27]. Even so, we expect that the analysis presented here can be leveraged for “more standard” implementations.

Beyond linearity, there are several other assumptions made in the analysis. Some of these are technical, but others are quite important. Among these, the most important is a zero-inflow boundary condition which precludes the development of a boundary layer. We also assume that the initial data is well-prepared in the sense that it is consistent with the state of local thermal equilibrium. Removing these three assumptions—linearity, zero inflow, and well-prepared initial data—will be important steps in future work. In addition, uniform error estimates independent of the collision frequency, along the lines of [32] for the radiation transport case, should be considered. However, the analysis here is already fairly involved and requires more work than the radiation transport case. In contrast to [13], which most closely resembles and inspires the work here, the kinetic equation in the current setting is time-dependent, involves advection in both the physical and velocity variables, is defined over an unbounded velocity domain, and has a collision operator with a kernel (the local thermal equilibrium) that is not contained in a standard finite element space.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the relevant equations, preliminary notation, assumptions used to construct a discrete Maxwellian, and the numerical method for solving the kinetic semiconductor model given in (2.1) below. We characterize the collision frequency by an asymptotic parameter  $\varepsilon > 0$  which is inversely proportional to the mean-free-path between collisions, and in Section 3, we develop stability and pre-compactness estimates that allow us to

take the  $\varepsilon$ -limit to 0. In [Section 4](#), we show the numerical density  $\rho_h^\varepsilon$  of the kinetic model converges to the solution of a discretized version  $\rho_h^0$  of the drift diffusion system, given in [\(2.7\)](#) below. In [Section 5](#), we show error estimates for  $\|\rho_h^\varepsilon - \rho_h^0\|$  in  $\varepsilon$  and  $h$  as well as error estimates for  $\|\rho_h^0 - \rho^0\|$  in  $h$ . This allows us to build estimates for  $\|\rho_h^\varepsilon - \rho^0\|$  in  $\varepsilon$  and  $h$ .

**2. Background, Preliminaries, and Assumptions.** Given  $\varepsilon > 0$ , a Lipschitz spatial domain  $\Omega_x \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ , and data  $f_0$  prescribed on  $\Omega_x$ , let  $f_\varepsilon(x, v, t)$  be the solution of the following kinetic semiconductor model

$$(2.1a) \quad \varepsilon \frac{\partial f^\varepsilon}{\partial t} + v \cdot \nabla_x f^\varepsilon + E(x, t) \cdot \nabla_v f^\varepsilon - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} Q(f^\varepsilon) = 0, \quad (x, v) \in \Omega_x \times \mathbb{R}^3, t > 0;$$

$$(2.1b) \quad f^\varepsilon(x, v, t) = f_-(x, v, t), \quad (x, v) \in \partial\Omega_-, t > 0;$$

$$(2.1c) \quad f^\varepsilon(x, v, 0) = f_0(x, v), \quad (x, v) \in \Omega_x \times \mathbb{R}^3,$$

where  $E \in W^{1,\infty}([0, T]; L^\infty(\Omega_x))$  is a given electric field,  $f_-$  is the inflow data, and

$$(2.2) \quad \partial\Omega_- = \{(x, v) \in \partial\Omega_x \times \mathbb{R}^3 : v \cdot n_x(x) < 0\},$$

with  $n_x(x_0)$  being the normal to  $\Omega_x$  at the point  $x_0$ , is the inflow component of the boundary. Additionally the collision operator  $Q$  is defined by

$$(2.3) \quad Q(f^\varepsilon) = \omega(M\rho^\varepsilon - f^\varepsilon)$$

where

$$(2.4) \quad \rho^\varepsilon(x, t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} f^\varepsilon(x, v, t) dv; \quad M(v) = (2\pi\theta)^{-3/2} e^{-|v|^2/2\theta}$$

with  $\theta > 0$  the (lattice) temperature; and  $\omega \in L^\infty(\Omega_x)$  with  $0 < \omega_{\min} \leq \omega$  on  $\Omega_x$  is the (scaled) collision frequency.

**DEFINITION 2.1.** *The function  $\rho^\varepsilon$  defined in [\(2.4\)](#) is the number density and*

$$(2.5) \quad J^\varepsilon = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} v f^\varepsilon(x, v, t) dv$$

*is the current density.*

It has been shown in [\[28\]](#) that if the inflow and initial data are isotropic, that is,  $f_-(x, v, t) = m(x)M(v)$  and  $f_0(x, v) = \rho_0(x, t)M(v)$ , then as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ ,  $f^\varepsilon$  converges to  $M(v)\rho^0(x)$ , where  $\rho^0$  solves the drift-diffusion equation:

$$(2.6a) \quad \frac{\partial \rho^0}{\partial t} + \nabla_x \cdot \left( \frac{1}{\omega} (-\theta \nabla_x \rho^0 + E \rho^0) \right) = 0, \quad x \in \Omega_x, t > 0;$$

$$(2.6b) \quad \rho^0(x, t) = m(x), \quad x \in \partial\Omega_x, t > 0;$$

$$(2.6c) \quad \rho^0(x, 0) = \rho_0(x), \quad x \in \Omega_x.$$

Let  $J^0 = \frac{1}{\omega} (-\theta \nabla_x \rho^0 + E \rho^0)$ . Then the pair  $\{\rho^0, J^0\}$  solves the equivalent first-order system:

$$(2.7a) \quad \frac{\partial \rho^0}{\partial t} + \nabla_x \cdot J^0 = 0, \quad x \in \Omega_x, t > 0;$$

$$(2.7b) \quad \omega J^0 + \theta \nabla_x \rho^0 - E \rho^0 = 0, \quad x \in \Omega_x, t > 0;$$

$$(2.7c) \quad \rho^0(x, t) = m(x), \quad x \in \partial\Omega_x, t > 0;$$

$$(2.7d) \quad \rho^0(x, 0) = \rho_0(x), \quad x \in \Omega_x.$$

**2.1. Notation.** Given a measurable open set  $D \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ , let  $L^2(D)$  and  $W^{k,p}(D)$  be the standard Lebesgue and Sobolev spaces of functions on  $D$  and let  $H^k(D) := W^{k,2}(D)$ . When  $D$  is a volume (a three-dimensional manifold) in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , we use  $(\cdot, \cdot)_D$  to denote the standard  $L^2$  inner product with respect to the Lebesgue measure  $dx$ . If  $D$  is a surface (a two-dimensional manifold) in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , we use  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_D$  to denote the  $L^2$  inner product with respect to the Lebesgue measure on the surface. These inner products can be extended to vector valued functions in a natural way by use of the Euclidean inner product.

To discretize (2.1), we first restrict the domain in  $v$ . Given  $L > 0$ , let  $\Omega_v = [-L, L]^3$  and define  $\Omega = \Omega_x \times \Omega_v$ . Given a mesh parameters  $h_x > 0$ , let  $\mathcal{T}_{x,h} := \mathcal{T}_{x,h_x}$  be a mesh on  $\Omega_x$  constructed from open polygonal cells  $K$  of maximum diameter  $h_x$ , and let  $\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I$  be the interior skeleton of  $\mathcal{T}_{x,h}$ , i.e., the set of edges  $e \subset \partial K \not\subset \partial\Omega_x$ . Similarly, given  $h_v > 0$ , let  $\mathcal{T}_{v,h} := \mathcal{T}_{v,h_v}$  and  $\mathcal{E}_{v,h}^I$  be a mesh and interior skeleton for  $\Omega_v$  respectively.

Given an edge  $e \in \mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I = \partial K^+ \cap \partial K^-$  for some  $K^+, K^- \in \mathcal{T}_{x,h}$ , let  $z \in L^2(\Omega_x)$  and  $\tau \in [L^2(\Omega_x)]^3$  be scalar and vector-valued functions, respectively, each with well-defined traces on  $K^+$  and  $K^-$ . For such functions, we define the average and jump methods

$$(2.8a) \quad \llbracket z \rrbracket = \frac{1}{2} (z|_{K^+} + z|_{K^-}), \quad \llbracket z \rrbracket = z|_{K^+} n_x^+ + z|_{K^-} n_x^-,$$

$$(2.8b) \quad \llbracket \tau \rrbracket = \frac{1}{2} (\tau|_{K^+} + \tau|_{K^-}), \quad \llbracket \tau \rrbracket = \tau|_{K^+} \cdot n_x^+ + \tau|_{K^-} \cdot n_x^-,$$

where  $n_x^\pm$  are the unit normal vectors pointing outward from  $K^\pm$ , respectively. These definitions can be modified to average and jumps in the  $v$ -direction in a natural way with unit normal vector  $n_v$ .

For ease of presentation we will use  $a \lesssim b$  to denote  $a \leq Cb$  where  $C > 0$  is a constant independent of  $h_x$  and  $\varepsilon$ . In Lemma 3.5 we will explicitly show the dependence on  $h_v$ , but as we will not take  $h_v \rightarrow 0$ ,  $h_v$  dependence will be absorbed into the constant beyond Lemma 3.5. The constant additionally depends on the data  $\omega$  and  $E$  (see Assumption 2.2), the final time  $T$ ,  $h_x$ -independent mesh parameters of  $\mathcal{T}_{x,h}$ , and the discrete Maxwellian discussed in Subsection 2.3 which depends on  $h_v$ ,  $L$ , and  $\theta$ .

Given integers  $k_x \geq 0$  and  $k_v \geq 0$ , let

$$(2.9) \quad V_{x,h} = \{z \in L^2(\Omega_x) : z|_T \in \mathbb{Q}_{k_x}(T) \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_{x,h}\}$$

$$(2.10) \quad V_{v,h} = \{z \in L^2(\Omega_v) : z|_T \in \mathbb{Q}_{k_v}(T) \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_{v,h}\},$$

where  $\mathbb{Q}_k(T)$  is the set of all polynomials on  $K$  with  $k$  being the maximum degree in any variable, and let

$$(2.11) \quad V_h = V_{x,h} \otimes V_{v,h}$$

be the tensor DG discrete space. For purposes of this paper, we assume  $k_x \geq 0$  and  $k_v \geq 1$ .<sup>1</sup> For any function  $z_h \in V_h$ , let  $\nabla_x z_h \subset V_h$  and  $\nabla_v z_h \subset V_h$  denote piece-wise gradients defined on  $K$  for all  $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ .<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>The assumption on  $k_v$  is to enable the construction of the discrete Maxwellian; see Subsection 2.3.

<sup>2</sup>The discrete gradient ignores the jumps in  $z_h$  across the boundary, but agrees with the standard definition of gradient for continuous functions.

For the discretization in  $x$ , some additional notation is needed. Let

$$(2.12) \quad V_{x,h}^0 = \{q_h \in V_{x,h} : q_h|_{\partial\Omega_x} = 0\}$$

be the space of DG functions with vanishing trace, and let

$$(2.13) \quad S_{x,h} = V_{x,h} \cap C^0(\overline{\Omega_x}) \quad \text{and} \quad S_{x,h}^0 = V_{x,h}^0 \cap C^0(\overline{\Omega_x})$$

be the continuous finite element analogues to the DG spaces  $V_{x,h}$  and  $V_{x,h}^0$ , respectively.

Below we consider two discretizations parameterized by an integer  $\beta \in \{0, 1\}$  that determines the type of numerical flux used and, consequently, the space that the discrete drift-diffusion limit will live; see [Remark 2.1](#). Let  $S_h^\beta$  be an  $L^2$ -orthogonal projection operator from  $L^2(\Omega_x)$  onto  $V_{x,h}^0$  if  $\beta = 1$  and from  $L^2(\Omega_x)$  onto  $S_{x,h}^0$  if  $\beta = 0$ . Moreover, let  $(S_{x,h}^0)^*$  and  $(V_{x,h}^0)^*$  denote the topological dual of  $S_{x,h}^0$  and  $V_{x,h}^0$  respectively and let  $\rightharpoonup$  represent convergence in the weak topology. Additionally, for  $\beta \in \{0, 1\}$  define the discrete dual-norm  $H_{h,\beta}^{-1}(\Omega_x)$  by

$$(2.14) \quad \|z_h\|_{H_{h,0}^{-1}(\Omega_x)} = \sup_{\substack{q_h \in S_{x,h}^0 \\ q_h \neq 0}} \frac{(z_h, q_h)_{\Omega_x}}{\|\nabla_x q_h\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)}} \quad \text{or} \quad \|z_h\|_{H_{h,1}^{-1}(\Omega_x)} = \sup_{\substack{q_h \in V_{x,h}^0 \\ q_h \neq 0}} \frac{(z_h, q_h)_{\Omega_x}}{\|q_h\|_{H_h^1(\Omega_x)}}$$

where  $\|\cdot\|_{H_h^1(\Omega_x)}$  is a discrete  $H^1$  norm:

$$(2.15) \quad \|q_h\|_{H_h^1(\Omega_x)}^2 = \|\nabla_x q_h\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)}^2 + \frac{1}{h_x} \|\llbracket q_h \rrbracket\|_{L^2(\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I)}^2 + \frac{1}{h_x} \|q_h\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega_x)}^2.$$

A discrete Poincaré-Friedrichs inequality [[4](#), Theorem 10.6.12] yields

$$(2.16) \quad \|q_h\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)} \lesssim \|q_h\|_{H_h^1(\Omega_x)}.$$

Given a Banach space  $X$ ,  $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ , and the final time  $T$ , we let  $L_T^p(X) := L^p([0, T]; X)$ ,  $C^0([0, T]; X)$ , and  $H^1([0, T]; X)$  be the standard  $L^p/C^0/H^1$  spaces of Banach-space valued functions with Bochner integration.

Finally we will often write  $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}$  as  $\partial_t$  in order to keep the spacing consistent in longer estimates. Both will be used interchangeably.

**2.2. Alternate form of the PDE.** It is easy to show that the collision operator  $Q$ , defined in [\(2.3\)](#), is semi-coercive in the weighted norm  $\|M^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\cdot)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ . Indeed, testing  $Q$  by  $M^{-1}f^\varepsilon$  gives

$$(2.17) \quad -(M^{-1}f^\varepsilon, Q(f^\varepsilon))_\Omega = \|\omega^{\frac{1}{2}} M^{-\frac{1}{2}}(f^\varepsilon - M\rho^\varepsilon)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2.$$

This structure is critical to achieving the drift-diffusion limit. However since standard discretizations of [\(2.1\)](#) do not allow test functions with an  $M^{-1}$  weight, we instead rewrite [\(2.1\)](#) in terms of the weighted distribution  $g^\varepsilon = M^{-\frac{1}{2}}f^\varepsilon$ :

$$(2.18a) \quad \varepsilon \frac{\partial g^\varepsilon}{\partial t} + v \cdot \nabla_x g^\varepsilon + E(x, t) \cdot \nabla_v g^\varepsilon - \frac{\omega}{\varepsilon} \left( M^{\frac{1}{2}}\rho^\varepsilon - g^\varepsilon \right) = \frac{1}{2\theta} E(x, t) \cdot v g^\varepsilon, \quad (x, v) \in \Omega_x \times \mathbb{R}^3, t > 0;$$

$$(2.18b) \quad g^\varepsilon(x, v, t) = f_-(x, v, t)/M^{\frac{1}{2}}(v), \quad (x, v) \in \partial\Omega_-, t > 0;$$

$$(2.18c) \quad g^\varepsilon(x, v, 0) = f_0(x, v)/M^{\frac{1}{2}}(v), \quad (x, v) \in \Omega_x \times \mathbb{R}^3,$$

where, in terms of  $g^\varepsilon$ ,  $\rho^\varepsilon = (M^{\frac{1}{2}}, g^\varepsilon)_{\mathbb{R}^3}$ . Since  $\|g^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)} = \|M^{-\frac{1}{2}} f^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ , the weighted collision operator

$$(2.19) \quad M^{-\frac{1}{2}} Q(M^{\frac{1}{2}} g^\varepsilon) = \omega \left( M^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho^\varepsilon - g^\varepsilon \right)$$

will be  $L^2$ -coercive and symmetric as a function of  $g^\varepsilon$ . We refer to the function  $M^{\frac{1}{2}} g^\varepsilon$  as the weighted equilibrium. The cost of this additional structure is the electric field term on the right-hand side of (2.18a).

**2.3. Construction of Discrete Maxwellian.** In order to recover the proper drift-diffusion limit, we need to construct a suitable discrete Maxwellian on the bounded domain  $\Omega_v$ . This is done via an approximation of the square root of the one-dimensional Maxwellian. Assume that  $\mathcal{T}_{v,h}$  is a tensor product mesh, i.e.,  $\mathcal{T}_{v,h} = \mathcal{T}_{v,h}^1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{T}_{v,h}^3$ , and let  $M_{h,i}^{\frac{1}{2}}$  be a continuous, strictly positive, piecewise-polynomial approximation of the one-dimensional root-Maxwellian over  $\mathcal{T}_{v,h}^i$ :

$$(2.20) \quad M_{h,i}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v_i) \approx M_i^{\frac{1}{2}}(v_i) := \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\theta}} e^{-\frac{v_i^2}{2\theta}} \right)^{1/2}, \quad i = 1, \dots, 3,$$

with the following properties:

ASSUMPTION 2.1. *For each  $i = 1, \dots, 3$ , the function  $M_{h,i}^{\frac{1}{2}}$  satisfies the following properties:*

- a.  $(M_{h,i}^{\frac{1}{2}}, M_{h,i}^{\frac{1}{2}})_{[-L,L]} = 1$ ,
- b.  $M_{h,i}^{\frac{1}{2}}(L) = M_{h,i}^{\frac{1}{2}}(-L)$ ,
- c.  $(\partial_v M_{h,i}^{\frac{1}{2}}, \partial_v M_{h,i}^{\frac{1}{2}})_{[-L,L]} = \frac{1}{4\theta}$ ,
- d.  $(\partial_v M_{h,i}^{\frac{1}{2}}, M_{h,i}^{\frac{1}{2}})_{[-L,L]} = 0$ .

DEFINITION 2.2. *The discrete root-Maxwellian  $M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \in V_{v,h} \cap C^0(\overline{\Omega_v})$  is*

$$(2.21) \quad M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}(v) = \prod_{i=1}^3 M_{h,i}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v_i),$$

and the discrete velocity  $v_h$  is

$$(2.22) \quad v_h = -2\theta \frac{\nabla_v M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}}{M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}} = -2\theta \nabla_v \log(M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}).$$

Since  $M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} > 0$  on  $\overline{\Omega_v}$ , it follows that  $v_h \in L^\infty(\Omega_v)$ . Moreover  $v_h M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \in V_{v,h}$ , even though  $v_h \notin V_{v,h}$ .

REMARK 2.1. *In defining the discrete root-Maxwellian:*

1. *The continuity requirement on  $M_{h,i}^{\frac{1}{2}}$  is the reason for assumption  $k_v \geq 1$  in Subsection 2.1.*
2. *Assumption 2.1.d is not independent, but rather is implied by Assumption 2.1.b.*
3. *If Assumption 2.1.c is not satisfied, then the numerical discretization below will still converge in the  $\varepsilon$ -limit to a discretization of a drift-diffusion system, but the temperature  $\theta_h$  will not match  $\theta$  from (2.7). To create a discrete Maxwellian that satisfies every assumption but Assumption 2.1.c, take  $M_{h,i}^{\frac{1}{2}}$  to be the Lagrange linear nodal interpolant of  $M_i^{\frac{1}{2}}$  and scale it to have an  $L^2$  norm of 1. Such a discrete Maxwellian is easy to construct and satisfies several other valuable properties; examples being that the  $i$ th component of the discrete velocity  $v_h(v)$  is monotone and of the same sign of  $v_i$ .*

**2.4. The Numerical Method.** We now give our numerical method for (2.18).

PROBLEM 2.1. Find  $g_h^\varepsilon \in H^1([0, T]; V_h)$  such that

(2.23a)

$$\varepsilon \left( \frac{\partial g_h^\varepsilon}{\partial t}, z_h \right)_\Omega + \mathcal{A}(g_h^\varepsilon, z_h) + \mathcal{B}(g_h^\varepsilon, z_h) + \mathcal{D}(g_h^\varepsilon, z_h) - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \mathcal{Q}(g_h^\varepsilon, z_h) = \mathcal{C}(g_h^\varepsilon, z_h) + \mathcal{R}(z_h),$$

(2.23b)

$$g_h^\varepsilon(0) := g_{0,h}$$

for all  $z_h \in V_h$  and a.e  $0 < t \leq T$  where

$$(2.24a) \quad \mathcal{A}(w_h, z_h) = -(v_h w_h, \nabla_x z_h)_\Omega + \left\langle v_h \{w_h\} + \varepsilon^\beta \frac{|v_h \cdot n_x|}{2} \llbracket w_h \rrbracket, \llbracket z_h \rrbracket \right\rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I \times \Omega_v} + \langle v_h w_h, n_x z_h \rangle_{\partial\Omega_+},$$

$$(2.24b) \quad \mathcal{B}(w_h, z_h) = -(E w_h, \nabla_v z_h)_\Omega + \left\langle E \{w_h\} + \frac{|E \cdot n_v|}{2} \llbracket w_h \rrbracket, \llbracket z_h \rrbracket \right\rangle_{\Omega_x \times \mathcal{E}_{v,h}^I},$$

$$(2.24c) \quad \mathcal{D}(w_h, z_h) = \left\langle EM_h^{\frac{1}{2}} P(w_h), n_v z_h \right\rangle_{\Omega_x \times \partial\Omega_v}$$

$$(2.24d) \quad P(w_h) = (M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}, w_h)_{\Omega_v}$$

$$(2.24e) \quad \mathcal{Q}(w_h, z_h) = \left( \omega (M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} P(w_h) - w_h), z_h \right)_\Omega,$$

$$(2.24f) \quad \mathcal{C}(w_h, z_h) = \frac{1}{2\theta} (E \cdot v_h w_h, z_h)_\Omega,$$

$$(2.24g) \quad \mathcal{R}(z_h) = - \langle v_h g_{-,h}, n_x z_h \rangle_{\partial\Omega_x^-},$$

and the functions  $g_{-,h} \in V_h$  and  $g_{0,h} \in V_h$  are the discrete inflow and initial data respectively.

DEFINITION 2.3. The discrete number density  $\rho_h^\varepsilon$  and current density  $J_h^\varepsilon$  are given by

$$(2.25) \quad \rho_h^\varepsilon = P(g_h^\varepsilon) = (M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}, g_h^\varepsilon)_{\Omega_v},$$

$$(2.26) \quad J_h^\varepsilon = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} P(v_h g_h^\varepsilon) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} (M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} v_h, g_h^\varepsilon)_{\Omega_v}.$$

REMARK 2.2. In Problem 2.1,

1. The bilinear forms  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{R}$  are the result of the discretizations of the operator  $v \cdot \nabla_x$  with  $v$  replaced by  $v_h$ . The parameter  $\beta$  is a switch between a standard upwinding and a scaled upwinding flux. If  $\beta = 0$ , the flux  $\widehat{v_h g}$  is the standard upwinding flux, namely

$$\widehat{v_h g} = \begin{cases} v_h \{g\} + \frac{|v_h \cdot n_x|}{2} \llbracket g \rrbracket & \text{on } \mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I \times \Omega_v \\ v_h g & \text{on } \partial\Omega_+ \\ v_h g_{-,h} & \text{on } \partial\Omega_- \end{cases}$$

In this case,  $\rho_h^\varepsilon$  will converge to a continuous finite element function as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ ; see Section 4. As a result, locking will occur when  $k_x = 0$ , i.e. when  $V_{x,h}$  is comprised of piecewise constant functions in  $x$ . If  $\beta = 1$ , the flux  $\widehat{v_h g}$  instead contains an  $\varepsilon$ -scaled Lax-Friedrichs penalty in the jump. This modification yields a LDG-like discretization of the drift-diffusion equations; see Section 4.

2. The bilinear forms  $\mathcal{B}$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  are constructed using standard upwind fluxes for the Vlasov operator  $E \cdot \nabla_v$  but, due to the velocity boundary domain restriction, we weakly impose the boundary condition  $g_h^\varepsilon = M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon$  on  $\Omega_x \times \partial\Omega_v$ . This provides two benefits. First, the density  $g_h^\varepsilon$  will not lose or gain mass out of the velocity boundary. Second, this boundary condition keeps the restriction of  $v$  to the bounded domain  $\Omega_v$  from polluting the discrete drift-diffusion limit.
3. The bilinear form  $\mathcal{Q}$  is a standard discretization of the collision operator.
4. The bilinear form  $\mathcal{C}$  is a standard discretization of the term  $E \cdot vg$ , with  $v$  replaced by  $v_h$ .

**2.5. Other Assumptions.** Here we collect any other assumptions used in the analysis of [Problem 2.1](#).

ASSUMPTION 2.2. The collision frequency  $\omega$  and the electric field  $E$  in (2.1) are specified as  $\omega \in L^\infty(\Omega_x)$  with  $0 < \omega_{\min} \leq \omega$  on  $\Omega_x$  and  $E \in W^{1,\infty}([0, T]; L^\infty(\Omega_x))$ .

ASSUMPTION 2.3. The inflow data in (2.1) is isotropic, that is,  $f_0(x, v) = \rho_0(x)M(v)$ . Additionally we require  $g_{0,h}$  in [Problem 2.1](#) to be discretely isotropic, that is,  $g_{0,h} = \rho_{0,h}M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}$  where  $\rho_{0,h} \in V_{x,h}$  is defined by

$$(\rho_{0,h}, q_h)_{\Omega_x} = (\rho_0, q_h)_{\Omega_x} \quad \forall q_h \in V_{x,h}.$$

It follows from [Assumption 2.3](#), [Assumption 2.1.a](#), and [Assumption 2.1.d](#) that

$$(2.27) \quad \rho_h^\varepsilon|_{t=0} = (M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}, g_{0,h})_{\Omega_v} = (M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}, M_h^{\frac{1}{2}})_{\Omega_v} \rho_{0,h} = \rho_{0,h},$$

$$(2.28) \quad J_h^\varepsilon|_{t=0} = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} (v_h M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}, g_{0,h})_{\Omega_v} = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} (v_h M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}, M_h^{\frac{1}{2}})_{\Omega_v} \rho_{0,h} = 0.$$

ASSUMPTION 2.4. The continuous incoming data  $f_-$  in (2.1b), the discrete incoming data  $g_{-,h}$  in [Problem 2.1](#) and, consequently, the functional  $\mathcal{R}$  in [Problem 2.1](#) are identically zero.

Assumptions like [Assumption 2.4](#) are commonly made in the analysis of diffusion limits to avoid handling complications due to boundary layers. While it is not expected that the equilibrium boundary condition will induce a boundary layer, the case of non-zero incoming data will be treated elsewhere.

ASSUMPTION 2.5. For  $\beta \in \{0, 1\}$ , the projection  $\mathcal{S}_h^\beta$  is stable on  $V_{x,h}$  with respect to  $H_h^1(\Omega_x)$ , that is,

$$(2.29) \quad \|\mathcal{S}_h^\beta z_h\|_{H_h^1(\Omega_x)} \lesssim \|z_h\|_{H_h^1(\Omega_x)} \quad \forall z_h \in V_{x,h}.$$

A similar result showing that the  $L^2$  projection from  $H^1(\Omega)$  to  $S_{x,h}$  is stable in the  $H^1$  norm has been shown with mild mesh restrictions in [10].

ASSUMPTION 2.6. There is an interpolant  $I_h^\beta : V_{x,h} \rightarrow S_{x,h}^0$  if  $\beta = 0$  and  $I_h^\beta : V_{x,h} \rightarrow V_{x,h}^0$  if  $\beta = 1$  such that for any  $q_h \in V_{x,h}$  we have

$$(2.30) \quad \|q_h - I_h^0 q_h\|_{H_h^1(\Omega_x)}^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{h_x} \|q_h\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega_x)}^2 + \frac{1}{h_x} \|[[q_h]]\|_{L^2(\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I)}^2,$$

$$(2.31) \quad \|q_h - I_h^1 q_h\|_{H_h^1(\Omega_x)}^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{h_x} \|q_h\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega_x)}^2.$$

The existence of  $I_h^0$  and (2.30) are true due to the results of the Karakashian-Pascal interpolant [19, Theorem 2.2]. We believe such a result holds for the  $\beta = 1$  case as



any change in the interior jumps by interpolating/projecting into a strongly enforced boundary condition space would be bounded by the error produced on the boundary.

**ASSUMPTION 2.7.** *There is a constant  $C > 0$  such that  $\frac{\varepsilon}{h_x} < C$ , that is,  $h_x$  cannot go to zero faster than  $\varepsilon$ .*

Assumption 2.7 is to improve the readability of the paper. There are several estimates that include bounds of  $1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{h_x}$  and these bounds will not improve any rates of convergence regardless of the choice of  $\varepsilon$  and  $h_x$ . Thus with Assumption 2.7 we have the bounds  $1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{h_x} \lesssim 1$  and  $1 + \sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{h_x}} \lesssim 1$ .

**3. A Priori Estimates.** In this section we develop space-time stability estimates for  $g_h^\varepsilon$ , the number density  $\rho_h^\varepsilon$ , and the current density  $J_h^\varepsilon$  in [Problem 2.1](#).

**3.1. Preliminary Estimates and Identities.** In this subsection we list an inverse and trace inequality, derived from the standard estimates in [\[30\]](#), as well as a useful integration by parts identity.

**LEMMA 3.1 (Trace Inequality).** *For any  $z_h \in V_h$  and  $q_h \in V_{x,h}$  we have*

$$(3.1) \quad \| [z_h] \|_{L^2(\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I \times \Omega_v)}^2 + \| z_h \|_{L^2(\partial\Omega_x \times \Omega_v)}^2 \leq \frac{C}{h_x} \| z_h \|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2,$$

$$(3.2) \quad \| [q_h] \|_{L^2(\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I)}^2 + \| q_h \|_{L^2(\partial\Omega_x)}^2 \leq \frac{C}{h_x} \| q_h \|_{L^2(\Omega_x)}^2,$$

$$(3.3) \quad \| [z_h] \|_{L^2(\Omega_x \times \mathcal{E}_{v,h}^I)}^2 + \| z_h \|_{L^2(\Omega_x \times \partial\Omega_v)}^2 \leq \frac{C}{h_v} \| z_h \|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2.$$

Here  $C > 0$  is an  $\varepsilon$ ,  $h_x$ , and  $h_v$ -independent constant.  $C$  depends on the polynomial degree of  $V_h$  and other  $h_x$  and  $h_v$ -independent mesh parameters of  $\mathcal{T}_{x,h}$  and  $\mathcal{T}_{v,h}$ .

**LEMMA 3.2 (Inverse Inequality).** *For any  $q_h \in V_{x,h}$  we have*

$$(3.4) \quad \| \nabla q_h \|_{L^2(\Omega_x)} \leq C h_x^{-1} \| q_h \|_{L^2(\Omega_x)}$$

where  $C > 0$  is some  $\varepsilon$  and  $h_x$ -independent constant that depends on the polynomial degree of  $V_{x,h}$ .

**LEMMA 3.3 (Integration by Parts).** *For any  $z_h \in V_{x,h}$  and  $\tau_h \in [V_{x,h}]^3$ , there holds*

$$(3.5) \quad (q_h, \nabla_x \cdot \tau_h)_{\Omega_x} = -(\nabla_x q_h, \tau_h)_{\Omega_x} + \langle \llbracket q_h \rrbracket, \llbracket \tau_h \rrbracket \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} + \langle \llbracket q_h \rrbracket, \llbracket \tau_h \rrbracket \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} + \langle q_h n_x, \tau_h \rangle_{\partial\Omega_x}.$$

**3.2. Initial Estimates.** We first focus on estimates for  $g_h^\varepsilon$  that will lead to estimates for  $\rho_h^\varepsilon$  and  $J_h^\varepsilon$ .

**LEMMA 3.4.** *The bilinear forms defined in [Problem 2.1](#) satisfy the following bounds*

$$(3.6) \quad -\mathcal{Q}(g_h^\varepsilon, g_h^\varepsilon) \geq \omega_{\min} \left\| g_h^\varepsilon - M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2,$$

$$(3.7) \quad \mathcal{C}(g_h^\varepsilon, g_h^\varepsilon) \leq \frac{1}{2} \left( 2C_1 + \frac{\omega_{\min}}{\varepsilon} \right) \left\| g_h^\varepsilon - M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2\omega_{\min}} C_1^2 \| g_h^\varepsilon \|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2,$$

$$(3.8) \quad \mathcal{A}(g_h^\varepsilon, g_h^\varepsilon) = \left\langle \frac{|v_h \cdot n_x|}{2} \llbracket g_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket, \llbracket g_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket \right\rangle_{\partial\Omega_x \times \Omega_v} + \varepsilon^\beta \left\langle \frac{|v_h \cdot n_x|}{2} \llbracket g_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket, \llbracket g_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket \right\rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I \times \Omega_v},$$

$$(3.9) \quad \mathcal{B}(g_h^\varepsilon, g_h^\varepsilon) + \mathcal{D}(g_h^\varepsilon, g_h^\varepsilon) \geq \left\langle \frac{|E \cdot n_v|}{2} \llbracket g_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket, \llbracket g_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket \right\rangle_{\Omega_x \times \mathcal{E}_{v,h}^I} - \frac{C_2}{2h_v} \left\| g_h^\varepsilon - M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2$$

where

$$(3.10) \quad C_1 := \frac{\|E \cdot v_h\|_{L_T^\infty(L^\infty(\Omega))}}{2\theta} \quad \text{and} \quad C_2 := C_T \|E\|_{L_T^\infty(L^\infty(\Omega_x))}$$

are constants independent of  $\varepsilon$ ,  $h_x$ , and  $h_v$ ; and  $C_T > 0$  is a constant from the trace inequality (3.2),

*Proof.* For (3.6), the definition of  $\rho_h^\varepsilon$ , along with Assumption 2.1.a, implies that

$$(3.11) \quad (M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon, M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon)_{\Omega_v} = |\rho_h^\varepsilon|^2 = (M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon, g_h^\varepsilon)_{\Omega_v}.$$

Therefore by expansion we see

$$(3.12) \quad \|g_h^\varepsilon - M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_v)}^2 = (g_h^\varepsilon, g_h^\varepsilon - M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon)_{\Omega_v}.$$

Using the identity in (3.12) gives

$$\begin{aligned} -\mathcal{Q}(g_h^\varepsilon, g_h^\varepsilon) &= \left( \omega, (g_h^\varepsilon, g_h^\varepsilon - M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon)_{\Omega_v} \right)_{\Omega_x} = \left( \omega, \|g_h^\varepsilon - M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_v)}^2 \right)_{\Omega_x} \\ &\geq \omega_{\min} \left\| g_h^\varepsilon - M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2, \end{aligned}$$

which is (3.6).

For (3.7), by Assumption 2.1.d,

$$(3.13) \quad \mathcal{C}(M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon, M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon) = \frac{1}{2\theta} (E \rho_h^\varepsilon, \rho_h^\varepsilon)_{\Omega_x} \cdot (v_h M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon, M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon)_{\Omega_v} = 0.$$

Thus by (3.13),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}(g_h^\varepsilon - M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon, g_h^\varepsilon - M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon) &= \mathcal{C}(g_h^\varepsilon, g_h^\varepsilon) - 2\mathcal{C}(g_h^\varepsilon, M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon) + \mathcal{C}(M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon, M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon) \\ (3.14) \quad &= \mathcal{C}(g_h^\varepsilon, g_h^\varepsilon) - 2\mathcal{C}(g_h^\varepsilon, M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon) + 2\mathcal{C}(M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon, M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon) \\ &= \mathcal{C}(g_h^\varepsilon, g_h^\varepsilon) - 2\mathcal{C}(g_h^\varepsilon - M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon, M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

Applying Hölder's inequality to (3.14) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}(g_h^\varepsilon, g_h^\varepsilon) &= \mathcal{C}(g_h^\varepsilon - M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon, g_h^\varepsilon - M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon) + 2\mathcal{C}(g_h^\varepsilon - M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon, M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon) \\ (3.15) \quad &\leq \frac{\|E \cdot v_h\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}}{2\theta} \|g_h^\varepsilon - M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{\|E \cdot v_h\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}}{2\theta} \|M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|g_h^\varepsilon - M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

Meanwhile, integrating (3.11) over  $\Omega_x$  and applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality gives

$$(3.16) \quad \|M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \|g_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

Substituting (3.16) into (3.15) and invoking Young's inequality gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}(g_h^\varepsilon, g_h^\varepsilon) &\leq C_1 \|g_h^\varepsilon - M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + C_1 \|g_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|g_h^\varepsilon - M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ (3.17) \quad &\leq \left( C_1 + \frac{\omega_{\min}}{2\varepsilon} \right) \|g_h^\varepsilon - M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2\omega_{\min}} C_1^2 \|g_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

which yields (3.7).

For (3.8), it follows from Lemma 3.3 (setting  $z_h = g_h$  and  $\tau_h = v g_h$ ) that

$$(3.18) \quad (v_h g_h^\varepsilon, \nabla_x g_h^\varepsilon)_\Omega = \langle v_h \{g_h^\varepsilon\}, \llbracket g_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I \times \Omega_v} + \frac{1}{2} \langle v_h g_h^\varepsilon, n_x g_h^\varepsilon \rangle_{\partial \Omega_x \times \Omega_v}.$$

Direct substitution of this formula into the definition of  $\mathcal{A}$  gives

$$(3.19) \quad \mathcal{A}(g_h^\varepsilon, g_h^\varepsilon) = \varepsilon^\beta \left\langle \frac{|v_h \cdot n_x|}{2} \llbracket g_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket, \llbracket g_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket \right\rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I \times \Omega_v} + \left\langle \frac{|v_h \cdot n_x|}{2} g_h^\varepsilon, g_h^\varepsilon \right\rangle_{\partial \Omega_x \times \Omega_v},$$

which is (3.8).

For (3.9), a formula similar to (3.18) gives

$$(3.20) \quad \mathcal{B}(g_h^\varepsilon, g_h^\varepsilon) = \left\langle \frac{|E \cdot n_v|}{2} \llbracket g_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket, \llbracket g_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket \right\rangle_{\Omega_x \times \mathcal{E}_{v,h}^I} - \frac{1}{2} \langle E g_h^\varepsilon, n_v g_h^\varepsilon \rangle_{\Omega_x \times \partial \Omega_v}.$$

Meanwhile applying the polarization identity  $ab = \frac{1}{2}(a^2 + b^2 - (a-b)^2)$  with  $a := g_h^\varepsilon$  and  $b := M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h$  and invoking Assumption 2.1.b gives the following bound on  $\mathcal{D}$ :

$$(3.21) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}(g_h^\varepsilon, g_h^\varepsilon) &= \left\langle E \cdot n_v, M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h g_h^\varepsilon \right\rangle_{\Omega_x \times \partial \Omega_v} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left\langle E \cdot n_v, (g_h^\varepsilon)^2 + (M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon)^2 - (g_h^\varepsilon - M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon)^2 \right\rangle_{\Omega_x \times \partial \Omega_v} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left\langle E \cdot n_v, (g_h^\varepsilon)^2 \right\rangle_{\Omega_x \times \partial \Omega_v} - \frac{1}{2} \left\langle E \cdot n_v, (g_h^\varepsilon - M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon)^2 \right\rangle_{\Omega_x \times \partial \Omega_v} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \langle E g_h^\varepsilon, n_v g_h^\varepsilon \rangle_{\Omega_x \times \partial \Omega_v} - \frac{\|E\|_{L_T^\infty(L^\infty(\Omega_x))}}{2} \|g_h^\varepsilon - M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_x \times \partial \Omega_v)}^2 \end{aligned}$$

Applying the discrete trace estimate (3.3) to (3.21) gives

$$(3.22) \quad \mathcal{D}(g_h^\varepsilon, g_h^\varepsilon) \geq \frac{1}{2} \langle E g_h^\varepsilon, n_v g_h^\varepsilon \rangle_{\Omega_x \times \partial \Omega_v} - \frac{C_T \|E\|_{L_T^\infty(L^\infty(\Omega_x))}}{2h_v} \|g_h^\varepsilon - M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2,$$

where the constant  $C_T > 0$  is independent of  $\varepsilon$ ,  $h_x$ , and  $h_v$ . Adding (3.20) and (3.22) yields

$$(3.23) \quad \mathcal{B}(g_h^\varepsilon, g_h^\varepsilon) + \mathcal{D}(g_h^\varepsilon, g_h^\varepsilon) \geq \left\langle \frac{|E \cdot n_v|}{2} \llbracket g_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket, \llbracket g_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket \right\rangle_{\Omega_x \times \mathcal{E}_{v,h}^I} - \frac{C_T \|E\|_{L_T^\infty(L^\infty(\Omega_x))}}{2h_v} \|g_h^\varepsilon - M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2$$

which is (3.9). The proof is complete.  $\square$

REMARK 3.1. We note that the inverse relation in  $h_v$  in (3.9) will not lead to a severe  $\varepsilon$  restriction since in the diffusion regime a course mesh is typically used in the velocity domain.

Using Lemma 3.4, we derive a space-time energy estimate for  $g_h^\varepsilon$  and  $M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon - g_h$ . Define

$$(3.24) \quad \varepsilon_{h_v} := \frac{\omega_{\min} h_v}{4C_1 h_v + 2C_2}.$$

LEMMA 3.5. *Given  $h_v > 0$ ,  $h_x > 0$ , and  $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_{h_v}$ ,*

$$(3.25) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|g_h^\varepsilon(T)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{\omega_{\min}}{2\varepsilon^2} \|g_h^\varepsilon - M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\Omega))}^2 \\ & + \int_0^T \left[ \varepsilon^{\beta-1} \langle |v_h \cdot n_x| \llbracket g_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket, \llbracket g_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I \times \Omega_v} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \langle |v_h \cdot n_x| g_h^\varepsilon, g_h^\varepsilon \rangle_{\partial\Omega_x \times \Omega_v} \right] dt \\ & \leq \|g_{0,h}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \exp\left(\frac{C_1^2}{\omega_{\min}} T\right). \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* Letting  $z_h = \frac{2}{\varepsilon} g_h$  in (2.23) yields the energy equation

$$(3.26) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \|g_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{2}{\varepsilon} \mathcal{A}(g_h^\varepsilon, g_h^\varepsilon) + \frac{2}{\varepsilon} (\mathcal{B}(g_h^\varepsilon, g_h^\varepsilon) + \mathcal{D}(g_h^\varepsilon, g_h^\varepsilon)) - \frac{2}{\varepsilon^2} \mathcal{Q}(g_h^\varepsilon, g_h^\varepsilon) = \frac{2}{\varepsilon} \mathcal{C}(g_h^\varepsilon, g_h^\varepsilon)$$

Substituting the estimates in Lemma 3.4 yields

$$(3.27) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} \|g_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \varepsilon^{\beta-1} \langle |v_h \cdot n_x| \llbracket g_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket, \llbracket g_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I \times \Omega_v} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \langle |v_h \cdot n_x| g_h^\varepsilon, g_h^\varepsilon \rangle_{\partial\Omega_x \times \Omega_v} \\ & + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \langle |E \cdot n_v| \llbracket g_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket, \llbracket g_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket \rangle_{\Omega_x \times \mathcal{E}_{v,h}^I} - \frac{C_2}{\varepsilon h_v} \|M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon - g_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ & + \frac{2\omega_{\min}}{\varepsilon^2} \|M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon - g_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\omega_{\min}} C_1^2 \|g_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \left( \frac{2C_1}{\varepsilon} + \frac{\omega_{\min}}{\varepsilon^2} \right) \|g_h^\varepsilon - M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \end{aligned}$$

Dropping the positive contribution  $\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \langle |E \cdot n_v| \llbracket g_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket, \llbracket g_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket \rangle_{\Omega_x \times \mathcal{E}_{v,h}^I}$  and collecting like terms gives

$$(3.28) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} \|g_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \varepsilon^{\beta-1} \langle |v_h \cdot n_x| \llbracket g_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket, \llbracket g_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I \times \Omega_v} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \langle |v_h \cdot n_x| g_h^\varepsilon, g_h^\varepsilon \rangle_{\partial\Omega_x \times \Omega_v} \\ & + \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \left( \omega_{\min} - 2\varepsilon C_1 - \varepsilon \frac{C_2}{h_v} \right) \|M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon - g_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq \frac{C_1^2}{\omega_{\min}} \|g_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\varepsilon_{h_v} = \frac{\omega_{\min} h_v}{4C_1 h_v + 2C_2}$  (see (3.24)), it follows that for any  $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_{h_v}$ ,

$$(3.29) \quad \omega_{\min} - 2\varepsilon C_1 - \varepsilon \frac{C_2}{h_v} \geq \frac{\omega_{\min}}{2}.$$

Therefore

$$(3.30) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} \|g_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \varepsilon^{\beta-1} \langle |v_h \cdot n_x| \llbracket g_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket, \llbracket g_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I \times \Omega_v} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \langle |v_h \cdot n_x| g_h^\varepsilon, g_h^\varepsilon \rangle_{\partial\Omega_x \times \Omega_v} \\ & + \frac{\omega_{\min}}{2\varepsilon^2} \|M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon - g_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq \frac{C_1^2}{\omega_{\min}} \|g_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Grönwall's inequality to (3.30) yields (3.25). The proof is complete.  $\square$

With Lemma 3.5 in hand, we can obtain stability estimates for  $\rho_h^\varepsilon$  and  $J_h^\varepsilon$  as well as some projection estimates which will be useful in the next section. We first list a technical lemma whose proof is provided in the appendix.

LEMMA 3.6. *Let*

(3.31)

$$\gamma_I(x) := \left( \frac{|v_h \cdot n_x(x)|}{2} M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}, M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \right)_{\Omega_v} \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_B(x) := \left( v_h M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}, M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \right)_{\{v: v_h(v) \cdot n_x(x) > 0\}}$$

for  $x \in \mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I$  and  $x \in \partial\Omega$  respectively. Then there exists  $\gamma_* = \gamma_*(h_v) > 0$  such that  $\gamma_I > \gamma_*$  on  $\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I$  and  $\gamma_B \cdot n > \gamma_*$  on  $\partial\Omega_x$  for all  $h_x$  and  $\varepsilon$ .

LEMMA 3.7. *Recall the definitions of  $\rho_h^\varepsilon$  and  $J_h^\varepsilon$  from (2.25) and (2.26), respectively. For all  $h_x > 0$  and every  $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_{h_v}$ , where  $\varepsilon_{h_v}$  is defined in (3.24), the following space-time stability estimates hold:*

$$(3.32) \quad \|\rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{L_T^\infty(L^2(\Omega_x))} \leq \|g_h^\varepsilon\|_{L_T^\infty(L^2(\Omega))} \lesssim \|g_{0,h}\|_{L^2(\Omega)},$$

$$(3.33) \quad \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \|M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon - g_h^\varepsilon\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\Omega))} \lesssim \|g_{0,h}\|_{L^2(\Omega)},$$

$$(3.34) \quad \|J_h^\varepsilon\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\Omega_x))} \lesssim \|g_{0,h}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

Moreover,

$$(3.35) \quad \frac{\sqrt{\gamma_*}}{\sqrt{\varepsilon^{1-\beta}}} \|\llbracket \rho_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I))} + \frac{\sqrt{\gamma_*}}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \|\rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\partial\Omega_x))} \lesssim \left( \sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{h_x}} + 1 \right) \|g_{0,h}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$$

$$(3.36) \quad \sqrt{\frac{h_x}{\varepsilon}} \|\rho_h^\varepsilon - \mathcal{S}_h^\beta \rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\Omega_x))} + \sqrt{\frac{h_x}{\varepsilon}} \|\rho_h^\varepsilon - \mathcal{S}_h^\beta \rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{L_T^2(H_h^1(\Omega_x))} \lesssim \left( \sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{h_x}} + 1 \right) \|g_{0,h}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$$

where  $\gamma_*$  is defined in Lemma 3.6.

*Proof.* Estimates (3.32) and (3.33) follow from (3.25). For (3.34), the definition of  $J_h^\varepsilon$  and Assumption 2.1.d give

$$(3.37) \quad \begin{aligned} J_h^\varepsilon &= \frac{1}{\varepsilon} (v_h M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}, g_h^\varepsilon)_{\Omega_v} = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} (v_h M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}, g_h^\varepsilon - M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon)_{\Omega_v} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} (v_h M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}, M_h^{\frac{1}{2}})_{\Omega_v} \rho_h^\varepsilon \\ &= -\frac{2\theta}{\varepsilon} (\nabla_v M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}, g_h^\varepsilon - M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon)_{\Omega_v}. \end{aligned}$$

Together (3.33) and (3.37) imply that

$$(3.38) \quad \|J_h^\varepsilon\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\Omega_x))} \leq \frac{2\theta}{\varepsilon} \|M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{H^1(\Omega_v)} \|M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon - g_h^\varepsilon\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\Omega))} \lesssim \|g_{0,h}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

We now focus on (3.35). We will only prove the bound on the first term of (3.35) as the bound on the second term is similar. Using the definition of  $\gamma_I$ ; adding and subtracting  $g_h^\varepsilon$ ; and using the trace inequality (3.1), we obtain

(3.39)

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{\gamma_*} \|\llbracket \rho_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket\|_{L^2(\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I)} &\leq \|\sqrt{\gamma_I} \llbracket \rho_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket\|_{L^2(\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I)} = \left\| \sqrt{\frac{|v_h \cdot n_x|}{2}} \llbracket M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket \right\|_{L^2(\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I \times \Omega_v)} \\ &\leq \left\| \sqrt{\frac{|v_h \cdot n_x|}{2}} \llbracket M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon - g_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket \right\|_{L^2(\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I \times \Omega_v)} + \left\| \sqrt{\frac{|v_h \cdot n_x|}{2}} \llbracket g_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket \right\|_{L^2(\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I \times \Omega_v)} \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{h_x}} \|M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon - g_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \left\| \sqrt{\frac{|v_h \cdot n_x|}{2}} \llbracket g_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket \right\|_{L^2(\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I \times \Omega_v)}. \end{aligned}$$

Integrating (3.39) from 0 to  $T$  and using both (3.25) and (3.33) yields

$$(3.40) \quad \sqrt{\gamma_*} \|\llbracket \rho_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I))} \lesssim \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{h_x}} + \sqrt{\varepsilon^{1-\beta}} \right) \|g_{0,h}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

If  $\beta = 1$ , the proof is complete by noting that  $\varepsilon \lesssim \sqrt{\varepsilon}$ . If  $\beta = 0$ , then we can divide (3.40) by  $\sqrt{\varepsilon}$  and arrive at (3.35).

For (3.36), we first focus on  $\beta = 0$ . Recall  $I_h^\beta$  from Assumption 2.6. From (2.30) and (3.35) we have

$$(3.41) \quad \begin{aligned} \sqrt{\frac{h_x}{\varepsilon}} \|(\rho_h^\varepsilon - I_h \rho_h^\varepsilon)\|_{L_T^2(H_h^1(\Omega_x))} &\lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \|\llbracket \rho_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I))} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \|\rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\partial\Omega_x))} \\ &\lesssim \left( \sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{h_x}} + 1 \right) \|g_{0,h}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

We now extend (3.41) to  $\rho_h^\varepsilon - \mathcal{S}_h^\beta \rho_h^\varepsilon$  using the stability of  $\mathcal{S}_h^\beta$ . By Assumption 2.5 and the triangle inequality we have

$$(3.42) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\rho_h^\varepsilon - \mathcal{S}_h^\beta \rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{H_h^1(\Omega_x)} &\leq \|\rho_h^\varepsilon - I_h^\beta \rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{H_h^1(\Omega_x)} + \|I_h^\beta \rho_h^\varepsilon - \mathcal{S}_h^\beta \rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{H_h^1(\Omega_x)} \\ &\leq \|\rho_h^\varepsilon - I_h^\beta \rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{H_h^1(\Omega_x)} + \|\mathcal{S}_h^\beta I_h^\beta \rho_h^\varepsilon - \mathcal{S}_h^\beta \rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{H_h^1(\Omega_x)} \\ &\leq \|\rho_h^\varepsilon - I_h^\beta \rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{H_h^1(\Omega_x)} + \|\mathcal{S}_h^\beta (I_h^\beta \rho_h^\varepsilon - \rho_h^\varepsilon)\|_{H_h^1(\Omega_x)} \\ &\lesssim \|\rho_h^\varepsilon - I_h^\beta \rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{H_h^1(\Omega_x)}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying (3.41) to (3.42) yields

$$(3.43) \quad \sqrt{\frac{h_x}{\varepsilon}} \|(\rho_h^\varepsilon - \mathcal{S}_h^\beta \rho_h^\varepsilon)\|_{L_T^2(H_h^1(\Omega_x))} \lesssim \left( \sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{h_x}} + 1 \right) \|g_{0,h}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

We can extend (3.43) to the  $L_T^2(L^2(\Omega_x))$  norm by (2.16) and arrive at (3.36). The case  $\beta = 1$  is similar. The proof is complete.  $\square$

**3.3. Time Derivative Estimates.** In this subsection, we construct temporal estimates for  $\partial_t \rho_h^\varepsilon$  and  $\partial_t J_h^\varepsilon$  by determining the evolution equations for  $\rho_h^\varepsilon$  and  $J_h^\varepsilon$ . The evolution equations (see Lemma 3.8 and Lemma 3.10) are formed by choosing a particular type of test function in Problem 2.1. By adding and subtracting the discrete weighted equilibrium  $M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon$ , we can write the evolution equations (3.44) and (3.65) into the terms that will build the discretization of (2.7) and the remainder terms  $\Theta_i$  where  $\Theta_i$  is uniformly bounded in  $\varepsilon$  when integrated over time.

We begin with the evolution equation for  $\rho_h^\varepsilon$ :

LEMMA 3.8. *For any  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $\rho_h^\varepsilon$  and  $J_h^\varepsilon$  satisfy*

$$(3.44) \quad \begin{aligned} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \rho_h^\varepsilon, q_h \right)_{\Omega_x} - (J_h^\varepsilon, \nabla_x q_h)_{\Omega_x} + \langle \llbracket J_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket, \llbracket q_h \rrbracket \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} + \varepsilon^{\beta-1} \langle \gamma_I \llbracket \rho_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket, \llbracket q_h \rrbracket \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} \\ + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \langle \gamma_B \rho_h^\varepsilon, n_x q_h \rangle_{\partial\Omega_x} = \varepsilon^\beta \Theta_1(\tilde{g}_h^\varepsilon, q_h) + \Theta_2(\tilde{g}_h^\varepsilon, q_h), \end{aligned}$$

for all  $q_h \in V_{x,h}$ , where  $\tilde{g}_h^\varepsilon = g_h^\varepsilon - M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon$  and

$$(3.45) \quad \Theta_1(\tilde{g}_h^\varepsilon, q_h) = -\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \left\langle \frac{|v_h \cdot n_x|}{2} \llbracket g_h^\varepsilon - M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket, \llbracket M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} q_h \rrbracket \right\rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I \times \Omega_v},$$

$$(3.46) \quad \Theta_2(\tilde{g}_h^\varepsilon, q_h) = -\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \left\langle v_h (g_h^\varepsilon - M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon), n_x M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} q_h \right\rangle_{\partial\Omega_+}.$$

Additionally, we have the following bounds:

$$(3.47) \quad |\Theta_1(\tilde{g}_h^\varepsilon, q_h)| \lesssim \frac{1}{\varepsilon\sqrt{h_x}} \|g_h^\varepsilon - M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}\rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|[q_h]\|_{L^2(\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I)},$$

$$(3.48) \quad |\Theta_2(\tilde{g}_h^\varepsilon, q_h)| \lesssim \frac{1}{\varepsilon\sqrt{h_x}} \|g_h^\varepsilon - M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}\rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|q_h\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega_x)}.$$

*Proof.* To show (3.44), we let  $q_h \in V_{x,h}$  and choose  $z_h = M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}q_h \in V_h$  into (2.23a) and evaluate term by term. First, the time derivative term reduces to

$$(3.49) \quad \varepsilon \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial t} g_h^\varepsilon, M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} q_h \right)_\Omega = \varepsilon \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (g_h^\varepsilon, M_h^{\frac{1}{2}})_{\Omega_v}, q_h \right)_{\Omega_x} = \varepsilon \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \rho_h^\varepsilon, q_h \right)_{\Omega_x}.$$

Next, using the definition of  $J_h^\varepsilon$  in (2.26), we compute

$$(3.50) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}(g_h^\varepsilon, M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} q_h) &= - \left( (v_h g_h^\varepsilon, M_h^{\frac{1}{2}})_{\Omega_v}, \nabla_x q_h \right)_{\Omega_x} + \left\langle \{ \{ (v_h g_h^\varepsilon, M_h^{\frac{1}{2}})_{\Omega_v} \} \}, [q_h] \right\rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} \\ &\quad + \varepsilon^\beta \left\langle \frac{1}{2} |v_h \cdot n_x| [g_h^\varepsilon], [M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} q_h] \right\rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I \times \Omega_v} + \left\langle v_h g_h^\varepsilon, n_x M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} q_h \right\rangle_{\partial\Omega_+} \\ &= -\varepsilon (J_h^\varepsilon, \nabla q_h)_{\Omega_x} + \varepsilon \langle \{ \{ J_h^\varepsilon \} \}, [q_h] \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} \\ &\quad + \varepsilon^\beta \left\langle \frac{1}{2} |v_h \cdot n_x| [g_h^\varepsilon], [M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} q_h] \right\rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I \times \Omega_v} + \left\langle v_h g_h^\varepsilon, n_x M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} q_h \right\rangle_{\partial\Omega_+} \end{aligned}$$

Adding and subtracting  $M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}\rho_h^\varepsilon$  from the last two terms of (3.50) and using the definitions of  $\Theta_1$  and  $\Theta_2$  gives

$$(3.51) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}(g_h^\varepsilon, M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} q_h) &= -\varepsilon (J_h^\varepsilon, \nabla q_h)_{\Omega_x} + \varepsilon \langle \{ \{ J_h^\varepsilon \} \}, [q_h] \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} \\ &\quad + \varepsilon^\beta \left\langle \frac{1}{2} |v_h \cdot n_x| [M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon], [M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} q_h] \right\rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I \times \Omega_v} + \left\langle v_h M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon, n_x M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} q_h \right\rangle_{\partial\Omega_+} \\ &\quad + \varepsilon^\beta \left\langle \frac{1}{2} |v_h \cdot n_x| [g_h^\varepsilon - M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon], [M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} q_h] \right\rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I \times \Omega_v} + \left\langle v_h (g_h^\varepsilon - M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon), n_x M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} q_h \right\rangle_{\partial\Omega_+} \\ &= -\varepsilon (J_h^\varepsilon, \nabla q_h)_{\Omega_x} + \varepsilon \langle \{ \{ J_h^\varepsilon \} \}, [q_h] \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} + \varepsilon^\beta \langle \gamma_I [\rho_h^\varepsilon], [q_h] \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} + \langle \gamma_B \rho_h^\varepsilon, n_x q_h \rangle_{\partial\Omega_x} \\ &\quad - \varepsilon^{\beta+1} \Theta_1(\tilde{g}_h^\varepsilon, q_h) - \varepsilon \Theta_2(\tilde{g}_h^\varepsilon, q_h), \end{aligned}$$

After division by  $\varepsilon$ , (3.49) and (3.51) recover (3.44). Thus it remains to show that

$$(3.52) \quad \mathcal{B}(g_h^\varepsilon, M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} q_h) + \mathcal{D}(g_h^\varepsilon, M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} q_h) + \mathcal{Q}(g_h^\varepsilon, M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} q_h) = \mathcal{C}(g_h^\varepsilon, M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} q_h).$$

For  $\mathcal{B}$ , any edge integral in (2.24b) vanishes because  $M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}q_h$  is continuous in  $v$ . Thus by the definition of the discrete velocity  $v_h$  in (2.22),

$$(3.53) \quad \mathcal{B}(g_h^\varepsilon, M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} q_h) = -(E g_h^\varepsilon, q_h \nabla_v M_h^{\frac{1}{2}})_{\Omega} = \frac{1}{2\theta} (E \cdot v_h g_h^\varepsilon, M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} q_h)_{\Omega} = \mathcal{C}(g_h^\varepsilon, M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} q_h).$$

For  $\mathcal{D}$ , Assumption 2.1.b implies that  $\mathcal{D}(g_h^\varepsilon, M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} q_h) = 0$ . For  $\mathcal{Q}$ , because  $M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}q_h$  is isotropic,  $\mathcal{Q}(g_h^\varepsilon, M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} q_h) = 0$  as well. Thus (3.52) holds and consequently so does (3.44).

We now prove the bounds on  $\Theta_1$  and  $\Theta_2$ . For  $\Theta_1$ , Hölder's inequality and the trace inequality (3.1) give

$$(3.54) \quad \begin{aligned} |\Theta_1(\tilde{g}_h^\varepsilon, q_h)| &\lesssim \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \|v_h M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_v)} \| [g_h^\varepsilon - M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon] \|_{L^2(\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I)} \| [q_h] \|_{L^2(\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I)} \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{\varepsilon \sqrt{h_x}} \|v_h M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_v)} \|g_h^\varepsilon - M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \| [q_h] \|_{L^2(\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I)} \end{aligned}$$

which is (3.47). A similar argument for  $\Theta_2$  recovers (3.48). The proof is complete.  $\square$

Using (3.44), we derive an  $\varepsilon$ -independent bound for  $\partial_t \rho_h^\varepsilon$  in various norms.

LEMMA 3.9. *For any  $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_{h_v}$ , where  $\varepsilon_{h_v}$  is defined in (3.24), and all  $h_x > 0$ ,*

$$(3.55) \quad \|\partial_t \rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(H_{h,\beta}^{-1}(\Omega_x))} \lesssim \|g_{0,h}\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)},$$

$$(3.56) \quad \|\partial_t \mathcal{S}_h^\beta \rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\Omega_x))} \lesssim \frac{1}{h_x} \|g_{0,h}\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)},$$

where the  $H_{h,\beta}^{-1}(\Omega_x)$  norm is defined in (2.14).

*Proof.* We first focus on (3.55) and  $\beta = 1$ . Let  $q_h \in V_{x,h}^0$  in (3.44), with  $q_h \neq 0$ . For such  $q_h$ ,  $\Theta_2(\tilde{g}_h^\varepsilon, q_h) = 0$ ; therefore

$$(3.57) \quad (\partial_t \rho_h^\varepsilon, q_h) = (J_h^\varepsilon, \nabla_x q_h)_{\Omega_x} - \langle \{J_h^\varepsilon\}, [q_h] \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} - \langle \gamma_I [ \rho_h^\varepsilon ], [q_h] \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} + \Theta_1(g_h^\varepsilon, q_h).$$

We bound the remaining terms on the right-hand side of (3.57). For the first term, the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality implies that,

$$(3.58) \quad (J_h^\varepsilon, \nabla_x q_h)_{\Omega_x} \lesssim \|\nabla_x q_h\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)} \|J_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)}.$$

For the second and third terms, the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the trace inequality (3.2) imply that

$$(3.59) \quad \langle \{J_h^\varepsilon\}, [q_h] \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{h_x}} \| [q_h] \|_{L^2(\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I)} \|J_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$$

and

$$(3.60) \quad \langle \gamma_I [ \rho_h^\varepsilon ], [q_h] \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{h_x}} \| [q_h] \|_{L^2(\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I)} \| \rho_h^\varepsilon \|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

Substituting (3.58) through (3.60) and the bound on  $\Theta_1$  in (3.54) into (3.57) gives

$$(3.61) \quad (\partial_t \rho_h^\varepsilon, q_h)_{\Omega_x} \lesssim \left( \|J_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)} + \| \rho_h^\varepsilon \|_{L^2(\Omega_x)} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \|g_h^\varepsilon - M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)} \right) \|q_h\|_{H_h^1(\Omega_x)}.$$

After dividing (3.61) by  $\|q_h\|_{H_h^1(\Omega_x)}$  and taking the supremum over all  $q_h \in V_{x,h}^0$ , the result is

$$(3.62) \quad \|\partial_t \rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{H_{h,\beta}^{-1}(\Omega_x)} \lesssim \|J_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)} + \| \rho_h^\varepsilon \|_{L^2(\Omega_x)} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \|g_h^\varepsilon - M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)}.$$

Integrating (3.62) over  $t \in [0, T]$  and applying (3.32)–(3.34) yields (3.55).



When  $\beta = 0$ , the bound on (3.55) is simpler to show. Indeed, if  $q_h \in S_{x,h}^0$  is continuous, only the first term on the right-hand side of (3.57) remains. This term is bounded using (3.58) so that the argument follows when replacing  $\|q_h\|_{H_h^1(\Omega_x)}$  by  $\|\nabla_x q_h\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)}$ .

To show (3.56), we first use the trace inequality (3.2) and inverse inequality (3.4) to obtain

$$(3.63) \quad \|q_h\|_{H_h^1(\Omega_x)} \lesssim \frac{1}{h_x} \|q_h\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)}$$

Choosing  $q_h = \partial_t \mathcal{S}_h^\beta \rho_h^\varepsilon$  in (3.61) and using (3.63) and the identity

$$(3.64) \quad \left( \partial_t \rho_h^\varepsilon, \partial_t \mathcal{S}_h^\beta \rho_h^\varepsilon \right)_{\Omega_x} = \left( \partial_t \mathcal{S}_h^\beta \rho_h^\varepsilon, \partial_t \mathcal{S}_h^\beta \rho_h^\varepsilon \right)_{\Omega_x}$$

we see that the desired estimate holds. The proof is complete.  $\square$

We next turn to the evolution equation for  $J_h^\varepsilon$ .

LEMMA 3.10. *For any  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $\rho_h^\varepsilon$  and  $J_h^\varepsilon$  satisfy*

$$(3.65) \quad \begin{aligned} \varepsilon^2 \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial t} J_h^\varepsilon, \tau_h \right)_{\Omega_x} + (\omega J_h^\varepsilon, \tau_h)_{\Omega_x} + \theta (\nabla_x \rho_h^\varepsilon, \tau_h)_{\Omega_x} - \theta \langle \llbracket \rho_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket, \{\{\tau_h\}\} \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} \\ - (E \rho_h^\varepsilon, \tau_h)_{\Omega_x} = \varepsilon \Theta_3(\tilde{g}_h^\varepsilon, \tau_h) + \sqrt{\varepsilon^{\beta+1}} \Theta_4(\rho_h^\varepsilon, \tau_h) + \sqrt{\varepsilon} \Theta_5(\rho_h^\varepsilon, \tau_h), \end{aligned}$$

for all  $\tau_h \in [V_{x,h}]^3$ . Here  $\Theta_3$  is a remainder that includes several terms that depend on  $\tilde{g}_h^\varepsilon = g_h^\varepsilon - M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon$ ; it satisfies the bound

$$(3.66) \quad |\Theta_3(\tilde{g}_h^\varepsilon, \tau_h)| \lesssim \frac{1}{\varepsilon h_x} \|g_h^\varepsilon - M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\tau_h\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)}.$$

The terms

$$(3.67) \quad \Theta_4(\rho_h^\varepsilon, \tau_h) = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon^{1-\beta}}} \left\langle \left( \frac{|v_h \cdot n_x|}{2} M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}, v_h^i M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \right)_{\Omega_v} \llbracket \rho_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket, \llbracket \tau_h \rrbracket \right\rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I},$$

$$(3.68) \quad \Theta_5(\rho_h^\varepsilon, \tau_h) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \left\langle (v_h^i v_h \cdot n_x M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}, M_h^{\frac{1}{2}})_{\{v: v_h \cdot n_x < 0\}} \rho_h^\varepsilon, \tau_h \right\rangle_{\partial \Omega_x}$$

are also remainder terms satisfying the bounds

$$(3.69) \quad |\Theta_4(\rho_h^\varepsilon, \tau_h)| \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon^{1-\beta}} h_x} \|\llbracket \rho_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket\|_{L^2(\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I)} \|\tau_h\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)} \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon^{1-\beta}} h_x} \|\rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)} \|\tau_h\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)},$$

$$(3.70) \quad |\Theta_5(\rho_h^\varepsilon, \tau_h)| \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon} h_x} \|\rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\partial \Omega_x)} \|\tau_h\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)} \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon} h_x} \|\rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)} \|\tau_h\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)}$$

*Proof.* Let  $v_h^i = v_h \cdot e_i$ , where  $e_i$  is the standard unit basis vector in the  $i$ -th coordinate direction. From the definition of  $v_h$  in (2.22), it follows that  $v_h^i M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \in V_{v,h}$ . To derive (3.65), we let  $z_h = v_h^i M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \tau_h \in V_h$  in (2.23a), where  $\tau_h \in V_{x,h}$  is arbitrary, and evaluate the result term by term. For brevity, we will not gather all of the terms

of  $\Theta_3$  together, but rather identify each piece as we go and show that it satisfies the bound in (3.66).

For the time derivative, the definition of  $J_h^\varepsilon$  in (2.26) gives

$$(3.71) \quad \varepsilon \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial t} g_h^\varepsilon, v_h^i M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \tau_h \right)_\Omega = \varepsilon \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (g_h^\varepsilon, v_h M_h^{\frac{1}{2}})_{\Omega_v}, \tau_h e_i \right)_{\Omega_x} = \varepsilon^2 \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial t} J_h^\varepsilon, \tau_h e_i \right)_{\Omega_x}.$$

To evaluate  $\mathcal{A}$ , we add and subtract  $M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon$  from the first argument and write

$$(3.72) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}(g_h^\varepsilon, v_h^i M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \tau_h) &= \mathcal{A}(M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon, v_h^i M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \tau_h) - \varepsilon \left\{ \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \mathcal{A}(g_h^\varepsilon - M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon, v_h^i M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \tau_h) \right\} \\ &=: I_1 - \varepsilon \{I_2\}. \end{aligned}$$

The term  $I_2$  belongs to  $\Theta_3$ . Since  $I_2$  contains  $g_h^\varepsilon - M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon$ , following a similar treatment to  $\Theta_1$  in Lemma 3.8, we can show  $I_2$  satisfies (3.66). For  $I_1$ , the definition of  $\mathcal{A}$  in (2.24a) implies that,

$$(3.73) \quad I_1 = I_3 - \sqrt{\varepsilon^{\beta+1}} \{I_4\} - \sqrt{\varepsilon} \{I_5\},$$

where

$$(3.74a) \quad \begin{aligned} I_3 &= -(\rho_h^\varepsilon, \nabla_x \tau_h)_{\Omega_x} \cdot (v_h M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}, v_h^i M_h^{\frac{1}{2}})_{\Omega_v} + \langle \{\{\rho_h^\varepsilon\}\}, \llbracket \tau_h \rrbracket \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} \cdot (v_h M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}, v_h^i M_h^{\frac{1}{2}})_{\Omega_v} \\ &\quad + \langle \rho_h, n_x \tau_h \rangle_{\partial \Omega_x} \cdot (v_h M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}, v_h^i M_h^{\frac{1}{2}})_{\Omega_v} \end{aligned}$$

$$(3.74b) \quad I_4 = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon^{1-\beta}}} \left\langle \left( \frac{|v_h \cdot n_x|}{2} M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}, v_h^i M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \right)_{\Omega_v} \llbracket \rho_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket, \llbracket \tau_h \rrbracket \right\rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I}$$

$$(3.74c) \quad I_5 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \left\langle (v_h^i v_h \cdot n_x M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}, M_h^{\frac{1}{2}})_{\{v: v_h \cdot n_x < 0\}} \rho_h^\varepsilon, \tau_h \right\rangle_{\partial \Omega_x}$$

The definitions of  $M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}$  and  $v_h$  in Definition 2.2, combined with Assumptions 2.1.d and 2.1.c, imply that

$$(3.75) \quad (v_h M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}, v_h^i M_h^{\frac{1}{2}})_{\Omega_v} = (-2\theta \nabla_v M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}, -2\theta \partial_{v_i} M_h^{\frac{1}{2}})_{\Omega_v} = \theta e_i.$$

Substituting (3.75) into (3.74a) and then applying the discrete integration-by-parts formula from (3.5) gives

$$(3.76) \quad \begin{aligned} I_3 &= -\theta (\rho_h^\varepsilon e_i, \nabla_x \tau_h)_{\Omega_x} + \theta \langle \{\{\rho_h^\varepsilon e_i\}\}, \llbracket \tau_h \rrbracket \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} + \theta \langle \rho_h^\varepsilon e_i, n_x \tau_h \rangle_{\partial \Omega_x} \\ &= \theta (\nabla_x \rho_h^\varepsilon, \tau_h e_i) - \theta \langle \llbracket \rho_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket, \{\{\tau_h e_i\}\} \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I}. \end{aligned}$$

Meanwhile  $I_4$  is the only component of  $\Theta_4$  and can be bounded using the trace inequality (3.2) to obtain

$$(3.77) \quad |I_4| \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{h_x \varepsilon^{1-\beta}}} \|v_h\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_v)}^2 \|M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_v)}^2 \|\llbracket \rho_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket\|_{L^2(\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I)} \|\tau_h\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)}.$$

Likewise,  $I_5$  is the only component of  $\Theta_5$  and can be bounded in a similar fashion.

To evaluate  $\mathcal{B}$ , we add and subtract  $M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}\rho_h^\varepsilon$  from the first argument and write

$$(3.78) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}(g_h^\varepsilon, v_h^i M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \tau_h) &= \mathcal{B}(M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon, v_h^i M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \tau_h) - \varepsilon \left\{ \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \mathcal{B}(g_h^\varepsilon - M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon, v_h^i M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \tau_h) \right\} \\ &= I_5 + \varepsilon \{I_6\}. \end{aligned}$$

Here  $I_6$  is a remainder term that belongs to  $\Theta_3$  and satisfies the bound in (3.66) due to the trace estimate (3.3) and inverse estimate (3.4). Meanwhile, the upwind penalty term in  $\mathcal{B}(M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon, v_h^i M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \tau_h)$  vanishes because the first argument is continuous in  $v$ ; this leaves

$$(3.79) \quad I_5 = - (E \rho_h^\varepsilon, \tau_h)_{\Omega_x} \cdot \left[ \left( M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}, \nabla_v (v_h^i M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}) \right)_{\Omega_v} - \left\langle M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}, \llbracket v_h^i M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rrbracket \right\rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{v,h}^I} \right].$$

From the integration-by-parts identity (3.5) (applied to functions in  $V_{v,h}$ ) and continuity of  $M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}$ ,

$$(3.80) \quad \left( M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}, \nabla_v (v_h^i M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}) \right)_{\Omega_v} - \left\langle M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}, \llbracket v_h^i M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rrbracket \right\rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{v,h}^I} = - \left( \nabla_v M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}, v_h^i M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \right)_{\Omega_v} + \left\langle M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}, n_v v_h^i M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\rangle_{\partial \Omega_v}.$$

The definition of  $v_h$  in (2.22), along with (3.75), implies that for the first term above,

$$(3.81) \quad - \left( \nabla_v M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}, v_h^i M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \right)_{\Omega_v} = \frac{1}{2\theta} \left( v_h M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}, v_h^i M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \right)_{\Omega_v} = \frac{1}{2} e_i.$$

Substituting (3.80) with (3.81) into (3.79) and recalling the definition of  $\mathcal{D}$  from (2.24c) gives

$$(3.82) \quad \begin{aligned} I_5 &= -\frac{1}{2} (E \rho_h^\varepsilon, \tau_h e_i)_{\Omega_x} + \frac{1}{2} (E \rho_h^\varepsilon, \tau_h e_i)_{\Omega_x} \left\langle M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}, n_v v_h^i M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\rangle_{\partial \Omega_v} \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} (E \rho_h^\varepsilon, \tau_h e_i)_{\Omega_x} - \mathcal{D}(g_h^\varepsilon, v_h^i M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \tau_h) \end{aligned}$$

To evaluate  $\mathcal{Q}$ , we use Assumption 2.1.d:

$$(3.83) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \mathcal{Q}(g_h^\varepsilon, v_h^i M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \tau_h) &= -\frac{1}{\varepsilon} (\omega (M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon - g_h^\varepsilon), v_h^i M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \tau_h)_\Omega \\ &= -\frac{1}{\varepsilon} (\omega \rho_h^\varepsilon, \tau_h)_{\Omega_x} (M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}, v_h^i M_h^{\frac{1}{2}})_{\Omega_v} + \left( \frac{\omega}{\varepsilon} (g_h^\varepsilon, v_h M_h^{\frac{1}{2}})_{\Omega_v}, \tau_h e_i \right)_{\Omega_x} \\ &= (\omega J_h^\varepsilon, \tau_h e_i)_{\Omega_x}. \end{aligned}$$

Lastly, to evaluate  $\mathcal{C}$ , we add and subtract  $M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}\rho_h^\varepsilon$  from the first argument and write

$$(3.84) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}(g_h^\varepsilon, v_h^i M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \tau_h) &= \frac{1}{2\theta} (E \cdot v_h M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon, v_h^i M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \tau_h)_\Omega + \varepsilon \left\{ \frac{1}{2\theta \varepsilon} (E \cdot v_h (g_h^\varepsilon - M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon), v_h^i M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \tau_h)_\Omega \right\} \\ &= I_7 + \varepsilon \{I_8\}. \end{aligned}$$

Here  $I_8$  is a remainder term of  $\Theta_3$  which satisfies the bound in (3.66) and, because of (3.75),

$$(3.85) \quad I_7 = \frac{1}{2\theta} (E \rho_h^\varepsilon, \tau_h)_{\Omega_x} \cdot (v_h M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}, v_h^i M_h^{\frac{1}{2}})_{\Omega_v} = \frac{1}{2} (E \rho_h^\varepsilon, \tau_h e_i)_{\Omega_x}.$$

We have shown (3.65) for all  $\tau_h e_i$  where  $\tau_h \in V_{x,h}$ , and thus for all  $\tau_h \in [V_{x,h}]^3$ . The proof is complete.  $\square$

We now use (3.65) to get a space-time bound on  $\partial_t J_h^\varepsilon$ . Recall the definition of  $\varepsilon_{h_v}$  in (3.24).

LEMMA 3.11. *Assume  $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_{h_v} \lesssim h_x \leq 1$ . Then*

$$(3.86) \quad \|J_h^\varepsilon\|_{L_T^\infty(L^2(\Omega_x))} \lesssim \frac{1}{h_x} \|g_{0,h}\|_{L^2(\Omega)},$$

$$(3.87) \quad \varepsilon^{3/2} \|\partial_t J_h^\varepsilon\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\Omega_x))} \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{h_x}} \|g_{0,h}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

*Proof.* We will first prove (3.86) which is an estimate needed to obtain (3.87). Setting  $\tau_h = J_h^\varepsilon$  in (3.65) gives

$$(3.88) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|J_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)}^2 + \omega_{\min} \|J_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)}^2 &\leq -\theta(\nabla_x \rho_h^\varepsilon, J_h^\varepsilon)_{\Omega_x} + \theta \langle \llbracket \rho_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket, \{\!\!\{ J_h^\varepsilon \}\!\!\} \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} \\ &\quad + (E \rho_h^\varepsilon, J_h^\varepsilon)_{\Omega_x} + \varepsilon \Theta_3(\tilde{g}_h^\varepsilon, J_h^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon^\beta \Theta_4(\rho_h^\varepsilon, J_h^\varepsilon) + \sqrt{\varepsilon} \Theta_5(\rho_h^\varepsilon, J_h^\varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

The first three terms on the right-hand side of (3.88) can be bounded using Cauchy-Schwarz together with the inverse inequality (3.4) for the first, a trace inequality (3.2) for the second, and the  $L^\infty$  bound on  $E$  for the third. After absorbing  $\varepsilon$ -independent constants,

$$(3.89) \quad -\theta(\nabla_x \rho_h^\varepsilon, J_h^\varepsilon)_{\Omega_x} + \theta \langle \llbracket \rho_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket, \{\!\!\{ J_h^\varepsilon \}\!\!\} \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} + (E \rho_h^\varepsilon, J_h^\varepsilon)_{\Omega_x} \lesssim \frac{1}{h_x} \|\rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)} \|J_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)}$$

Meanwhile, the bounds on  $\Theta_3$ ,  $\Theta_4$ , and  $\Theta_5$  from Lemma 3.8 and Lemma 3.10 imply that

$$(3.90) \quad \varepsilon \Theta_3(\tilde{g}_h^\varepsilon, J_h^\varepsilon) + \sqrt{\varepsilon^{\beta+1}} \Theta_4(\rho_h^\varepsilon, J_h^\varepsilon) + \sqrt{\varepsilon} \Theta_5(\rho_h^\varepsilon, J_h^\varepsilon) \lesssim \frac{1}{h_x} \left( \|\rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)} + \|g_h^\varepsilon - M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \right) \|J_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)}$$

Substituting these bounds into (3.88) and dividing by  $\varepsilon^2 \|J_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)}$  yields

$$(3.91) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \|J_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)} + \frac{\omega_{\min}}{\varepsilon^2} \|J_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)} \lesssim \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2 h_x} \left( \|\rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)} + \|g_h^\varepsilon - M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \right).$$

According to (2.28),  $J_h^\varepsilon|_{t=0} = 0$ . Thus Grönwall's Lemma applied to (3.91), along with the  $L^\infty$  in time bound in (3.32), recovers (3.86).

We now prove (3.87). As the proof below is quite technical, we first briefly summarize the process. The idea is to pass the time derivative from  $J_h^\varepsilon$  to  $\rho_h^\varepsilon$  for the terms that are not sufficiently small in  $\varepsilon$  to bound with the usual techniques. However, since  $\partial_t \rho_h^\varepsilon$  is not uniformly bounded w.r.t  $\varepsilon$  in  $L_T^2(L^2(\Omega_x))$ , we will first add and subtract its projection  $\mathcal{S}_h^\beta \rho_h^\varepsilon$ , whose time derivative is uniformly bounded in  $\varepsilon$  by Lemma 3.9, before passing the time derivative over. Having an explicit bound on the size of  $\rho_h^\varepsilon - \mathcal{S}_h^\beta \rho_h^\varepsilon$  by (3.36), we can obtain the  $\varepsilon^{3/2}$  scale in (3.87).

Setting  $\tau_h = \varepsilon \partial_t J_h^\varepsilon$  in (3.65) gives

(3.92)

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon^3 \|\partial_t J_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)}^2 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\sqrt{\omega} J_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)}^2 &= -\varepsilon \theta (\nabla_x \rho_h^\varepsilon, \partial_t J_h^\varepsilon)_{\Omega_x} + \varepsilon \theta \langle \llbracket \rho_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket, \{\{\partial_t J_h^\varepsilon\}\} \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} \\ &\quad + \varepsilon (E \rho_h^\varepsilon, \partial_t J_h^\varepsilon)_{\Omega_x} + \varepsilon^2 \Theta_3(\tilde{g}_h^\varepsilon, \partial_t J_h^\varepsilon) \\ &\quad + \varepsilon^{\beta+1} \Theta_4(\rho_h^\varepsilon, \partial_t J_h^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon^{3/2} \Theta_5(\rho_h^\varepsilon, \partial_t J_h^\varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

We then integrate (3.92) over  $t \in [0, T]$ , use the zero initial condition in (2.28), and drop the positive term  $\|\sqrt{\omega} J_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)}^2|_{t=T}$ . This gives

$$(3.93) \quad \varepsilon^3 \|\partial_t J_h^\varepsilon\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\Omega_x))}^2 \leq \int_0^T \left[ -\varepsilon \theta (\nabla_x \rho_h^\varepsilon, \partial_t J_h^\varepsilon)_{\Omega_x} + \varepsilon \theta \langle \llbracket \rho_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket, \{\{\partial_t J_h^\varepsilon\}\} \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} \right. \\ \left. + \varepsilon (E \rho_h^\varepsilon, \partial_t J_h^\varepsilon)_{\Omega_x} + \varepsilon^2 \Theta_3(\tilde{g}_h^\varepsilon, \partial_t J_h^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon^{(\beta+3)/2} \Theta_4(\rho_h^\varepsilon, \partial_t J_h^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon^{3/2} \Theta_5(\rho_h^\varepsilon, \partial_t J_h^\varepsilon) \right] dt.$$

We now add and subtract  $\mathcal{S}_h^\beta \rho_h^\varepsilon$  (recall  $\mathcal{S}_h^\beta$  is an  $L^2$  projection) to several terms of (3.93):

(3.94)

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon^3 \|\partial_t J_h^\varepsilon\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\Omega_x))}^2 &\leq \int_0^T \left[ \left\{ -\varepsilon \theta (\nabla_x (\rho_h^\varepsilon - \mathcal{S}_h^\beta \rho_h^\varepsilon), \partial_t J_h^\varepsilon)_{\Omega_x} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \varepsilon \theta \langle \llbracket \rho_h^\varepsilon - \mathcal{S}_h^\beta \rho_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket, \{\{\partial_t J_h^\varepsilon\}\} \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} + \varepsilon (E(\rho_h^\varepsilon - \mathcal{S}_h^\beta \rho_h^\varepsilon), \partial_t J_h^\varepsilon)_{\Omega_x} \right\} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left\{ -\varepsilon \theta (\nabla_x \mathcal{S}_h^\beta \rho_h^\varepsilon, \partial_t J_h^\varepsilon)_{\Omega_x} + \varepsilon \theta \langle \llbracket \mathcal{S}_h^\beta \rho_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket, \{\{\partial_t J_h^\varepsilon\}\} \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} \right\} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left\{ \varepsilon (E \mathcal{S}_h^\beta \rho_h^\varepsilon, \partial_t J_h^\varepsilon)_{\Omega_x} \right\} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left\{ \varepsilon^2 \Theta_3(\tilde{g}_h^\varepsilon, \partial_t J_h^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon^{(\beta+3)/2} \Theta_4(\rho_h^\varepsilon, \partial_t J_h^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon^{3/2} \Theta_5(\rho_h^\varepsilon, \partial_t J_h^\varepsilon) \right\} \right] dt \\ &\leq \int_0^T \left[ \{I_1\} + \{I_2\} + \{I_3\} + \{I_4\} \right] dt. \end{aligned}$$

We will bound  $I_1, I_2, I_3,$  and  $I_4$  independently. For  $I_1$ , after applying Cauchy-Schwarz, the trace inequality (3.2), the projection bound (3.36), Assumption 2.7, and Young's inequality, we have

(3.95)

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T I_1 dt &\lesssim \varepsilon \left( \|\rho_h^\varepsilon - \mathcal{S}_h^\beta \rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\Omega_x))} + \|\rho_h^\varepsilon - \mathcal{S}_h^\beta \rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(H_h^1(\Omega_x))} \right) \|\partial_t J_h^\varepsilon\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\Omega_x))} \\ &\lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^{3/2}}{\sqrt{h_x}} \left( \sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{h_x}} + 1 \right) \|g_{0,h}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\partial_t J_h^\varepsilon\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\Omega_x))} \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{h_x \nu} \|g_{0,h}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \nu \varepsilon^3 \|\partial_t J_h^\varepsilon\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\Omega_x))}^2. \end{aligned}$$

for all  $\nu > 0$ .

For  $I_2$ , we integrate by parts in time to obtain

$$(3.96) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_0^T I_2 dt &= \left\{ \varepsilon \int_0^T \theta \left( \nabla_x \partial_t \mathcal{S}_h^\beta \rho_h^\varepsilon, J_h^\varepsilon \right)_{\Omega_x} - \theta \left\langle \llbracket \partial_t \mathcal{S}_h^\beta \rho_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket, \{\!\{ J_h^\varepsilon \}\!\} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} dt \right\} \\ &+ \left\{ -\varepsilon \theta \left( \nabla_x \mathcal{S}_h^\beta \rho_h^\varepsilon, J_h^\varepsilon \right)_{\Omega_x} \Big|_0^T + \varepsilon \theta \left\langle \llbracket \mathcal{S}_h^\beta \rho_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket, \{\!\{ J_h^\varepsilon \}\!\} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} \Big|_0^T \right\} \\ &= \{K_1\} + \{K_2\}. \end{aligned}$$

We first bound  $K_1$ . Using Cauchy-Schwarz, the inverse inequality (3.4), and the trace inequality (3.2), as well as the bound on  $\partial_t \mathcal{S}_h^\beta \rho_h^\varepsilon$  in (3.56) and the bound on  $J_h^\varepsilon$  in (3.34), we have

$$(3.97) \quad K_1 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{h_x} \|\partial_t \mathcal{S}_h^\beta \rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\Omega_x))} \|J_h^\varepsilon\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\Omega_x))} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{h_x^2} \|g_{0,h}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2.$$

For  $K_2$ , terms evaluated at  $t = 0$  vanish due to Assumption 2.3. Following a similar treatment as for  $K_1$ , but instead using the  $L_T^\infty$  estimates (3.34) and (3.32), we obtain

$$(3.98) \quad K_2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{h_x} \|\mathcal{S}_h^\beta \rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(L^2(\Omega_x))} \|J_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(L^2(\Omega_x))} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{h_x^2} \|g_{0,h}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2.$$

For  $I_3$ , the treatment is similar to that of  $I_2$ . Integrating by parts in time and applying bounds similar to those used for  $K_1$  and  $K_2$ , we find

$$(3.99) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_0^T I_3 dt &= -\varepsilon \int_0^T \left( \partial_t (E \mathcal{S}_h^\beta \rho_h^\varepsilon), J_h^\varepsilon \right)_{\Omega_x} dt + \varepsilon \left( E \mathcal{S}_h^\beta \rho_h^\varepsilon, J_h^\varepsilon \right)_{\Omega_x} \Big|_0^T \\ &= -\varepsilon \int_0^T \left[ \left( \mathcal{S}_h^\beta \rho_h^\varepsilon \partial_t E, J_h^\varepsilon \right)_{\Omega_x} + \left( E \partial_t \mathcal{S}_h^\beta \rho_h^\varepsilon, J_h^\varepsilon \right)_{\Omega_x} \right] dt + \varepsilon \left( E \mathcal{S}_h^\beta \rho_h^\varepsilon, J_h^\varepsilon \right)_{\Omega_x} \Big|_0^T \\ &\lesssim \varepsilon \|\rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\Omega_x))} \|J_h^\varepsilon\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\Omega_x))} + \varepsilon \|\partial_t \mathcal{S}_h^\beta \rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\Omega_x))} \|J_h^\varepsilon\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\Omega_x))} \\ &\quad + \varepsilon \|\rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(L^2(\Omega_x))} \|J_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(L^2(\Omega_x))} \\ &\lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{h_x} \|g_{0,h}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

We now focus on each term of  $I_4$ . To bound  $\Theta_3$ , we use (3.66), (3.33), and Young's inequality:

$$(3.100) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_0^T \varepsilon^2 \Theta_3(\tilde{g}_h^\varepsilon, \partial_t J_h^\varepsilon) dt &\lesssim \frac{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}{h_x} \left( \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \|g_h^\varepsilon - M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\Omega))} \right) \left( \varepsilon^{3/2} \|\partial_t J_h^\varepsilon\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\Omega_x))} \right) \\ &\lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{\nu h_x^2} \|g_{0,h}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \nu \varepsilon^3 \|\partial_t J_h^\varepsilon\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\Omega_x))}^2 \end{aligned}$$

for any  $\nu > 0$ . We treat  $\Theta_4$  in a similar manner. Using (3.69) and (3.35) with

Assumption 2.7, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.101) \quad \int_0^T \varepsilon^{(\beta+3)/2} \Theta_4(\rho_h^\varepsilon, \partial_t J_h^\varepsilon) dt &\lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^{\beta/2}}{\sqrt{h_x}} \left( \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{(1-\beta)/2}} \|\llbracket \rho_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I))} \right) \left( \varepsilon^{3/2} \|\partial_t J_h^\varepsilon\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\Omega_x))} \right) \\
&\lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^\beta}{\nu h_x} \left( \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{(1-\beta)}} \|\llbracket \rho_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I))}^2 \right) + \nu \varepsilon^3 \|\partial_t J_h^\varepsilon\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\Omega_x))}^2 \\
&\lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^\beta}{\nu h_x} \|g_{0,h}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \nu \varepsilon^3 \|\partial_t J_h^\varepsilon\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\Omega_x))}^2
\end{aligned}$$

for any  $\nu > 0$ . We treat  $\Theta_5$  similar to the  $\beta = 0$  case of  $\Theta_4$ ; cf. (3.101):

$$(3.102) \quad \int_0^T \varepsilon^{3/2} \Theta_5(\rho_h^\varepsilon, \partial_t J_h^\varepsilon) dt \lesssim \frac{1}{\nu h_x} \|g_{0,h}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \nu \varepsilon^3 \|\partial_t J_h^\varepsilon\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\Omega_x))}^2$$

for any  $\nu > 0$ . Combining (3.100)-(3.102) yields the following bound for  $I_4$ :

$$(3.103) \quad \int_0^T I_4 dt \lesssim \frac{1}{\nu} \left( \frac{1}{h_x} + \frac{\varepsilon}{h_x^2} \right) \|g_{0,h}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \nu \varepsilon^3 \|\partial_t J_h^\varepsilon\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\Omega_x))}^2.$$

for any  $\nu > 0$ . Combining (3.94)-(3.98) and (3.103) we obtain

$$(3.104) \quad \varepsilon^3 \|\partial_t J_h^\varepsilon\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\Omega_x))}^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{\nu} \left( \frac{1}{h_x} + \frac{\varepsilon}{h_x^2} \right) \|g_{0,h}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{\varepsilon}{h_x^2} \|g_{0,h}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \nu \varepsilon^3 \|\partial_t J_h^\varepsilon\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\Omega_x))}^2.$$

Choosing  $\nu$ , independent of  $\varepsilon$  and  $h_x$ , sufficiently small to move  $\varepsilon^3 \|\partial_t J_h^\varepsilon\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\Omega_x))}^2$  from the right hand side of (3.104) and applying Assumption 2.7 to the first two terms on the right hand side of (3.104) gives us (3.87). The proof is complete.  $\square$

**4. The Drift Diffusion Limit.** The bounds in Section 3 allow us to take the limit of  $\rho_h^\varepsilon$  and  $J_h^\varepsilon$  as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ . In this section, we show these limits satisfy (4.2), a discrete version of the drift-diffusion equations (2.7). Recall the definition of  $\varepsilon_{h_v}$  from (3.24).

**THEOREM 4.1.** *Let  $h_x, h_v > 0$  be fixed. Then for all  $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_{h_v}$ , we have  $\rho_h^\varepsilon \in L_T^2(L^2(\Omega_x))$ ,  $\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \rho_h^\varepsilon \in L_T^2(H_{h,\beta}^{-1}(\Omega_x))$  and  $J_h^\varepsilon \in L_T^2(L^2(\Omega_x))$  with bound*

$$(4.1) \quad \|\rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\Omega_x))} + \|\partial_t \rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(H_{h,\beta}^{-1}(\Omega_x))} + \|J_h^\varepsilon\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\Omega_x))} \lesssim \|g_{0,h}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

Moreover, there exist functions  $\rho_h^0 \in H^1([0, T]; V_{x,h}^0)$ ,  $J_h^0 \in L^2([0, T]; [V_{x,h}]^3)$ , and subsequences of  $\{\rho_h^\varepsilon\}_\varepsilon$  and  $\{J_h^\varepsilon\}_\varepsilon$ , not relabeled, such that  $\rho_h^\varepsilon \rightharpoonup \rho_h^0$  in  $L_T^2(L^2(\Omega_x))$  and  $J_h^\varepsilon \rightharpoonup J_h^0$  in  $L_T^2([L^2(\Omega_x)]^3)$ . If  $\beta = 0$ , then we have  $\rho_h^0 \in H^1([0, T]; S_{x,h}^0)$  and  $\partial_t \rho_h^\varepsilon \rightharpoonup \partial_t \rho_h^0$  in  $L_T^2((S_{x,h}^0)^*)$ . If  $\beta = 1$ , then  $\partial_t \rho_h^\varepsilon \rightharpoonup \partial_t \rho_h^0$  in  $L_T^2((V_{x,h}^0)^*)$ .

Additionally,  $\rho_h^0$  and  $J_h^0$  satisfy the following drift-diffusion system:

$$(4.2a) \quad \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \rho_h^0, q_h \right)_{\Omega_x} - (J_h^0, \nabla_x q_h)_{\Omega_x} + \langle \llbracket J_h^0 \rrbracket, \llbracket q_h \rrbracket \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} + \langle \gamma_I \llbracket \rho_h^0 \rrbracket, \llbracket q_h \rrbracket \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} = 0,$$

$$(4.2b) \quad (\omega J_h^0, \tau_h)_{\Omega_x} + \theta (\nabla_x \rho_h^0, \tau_h)_{\Omega_x} - \theta \langle \llbracket \rho_h^0 \rrbracket, \llbracket \tau_h \rrbracket \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} - (E \rho_h^0, \tau_h)_{\Omega_x} = 0,$$

$$(4.2c) \quad (\rho_h^0(0), q_h)_{\Omega_x} = (\rho_{0,h}, q_h)_{\Omega_x}.$$

for all  $\tau_h \in [V_{x,h}]^3$  and  $q_h \in V_{x,h}^0$  if  $\beta = 1$  and for all  $\tau_h \in [V_{x,h}]^3$  and  $q_h \in S_{x,h}^0$  if  $\beta = 0$ .

REMARK 4.1. When  $\beta = 0$  all of the interior edge terms in (4.2) vanish due to the continuity of the  $\rho_h^\varepsilon$  and  $q_h$ .

*Proof.* The proof proceeds in two steps.

*Step 1: Existence of Limits.* It follows from (3.32), (3.34), and (3.55) that  $\|\rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\Omega_x))}$ ,  $\|J_h^\varepsilon\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\Omega_x))}$ , and  $\|\partial_t \rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{L_T^2(H_{h,\beta}^{-1}(\Omega_x))}$ , respectively, (4.1) holds and each term is uniformly bounded in  $\varepsilon$ . Since each of these spaces are Hilbert spaces, we can extract a subsequence  $\rho_h^\varepsilon$  and  $J_h^\varepsilon$ , not relabeled, and limiting functions  $\rho_h^0 \in L_T^2(V_{x,h})$  and  $J_h^0 \in L_T^2([V_{x,h}]^3)$  such that  $\rho_h^\varepsilon \rightharpoonup \rho_h^0$  in  $L_T^2(L^2(\Omega_x))$  and  $J_h^\varepsilon \rightharpoonup J_h^0$  in  $L_T^2([L^2(\Omega_x)]^3)$ . We now show  $\rho_h^0 \in L_T^2(V_{x,h}^0)$ . By (3.35),

$$(4.3) \quad \|\rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\partial\Omega_x))}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon \|g_{0,h}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2.$$

Since  $V_h$  is finite dimensional, then  $\rho_h^\varepsilon \rightharpoonup \rho_h^0$  in  $L_T^2(L^2(\partial\Omega_x))$ . Because the norm is weakly lower semi-continuous, (4.3) implies that

$$\|\rho_h^0\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\partial\Omega_x))}^2 = 0.$$

Therefore  $\rho_h^0 \in L_T^2(V_{x,h}^0)$ . If  $\beta = 0$ , then (3.35) additionally gives us

$$(4.4) \quad \|\llbracket \rho_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I))}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon \|g_{0,h}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2,$$

and thus passing the limit as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  in (4.4) we obtains

$$\|\llbracket \rho_h^0 \rrbracket\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I))}^2 = 0.$$

Hence  $\rho_h^0(t)$  is continuous in  $x$  for a.e. time  $t$  and  $\rho_h^0 \in L_T^2(S_{x,h}^0)$  if  $\beta = 0$ .

For this paragraph we will consider the case  $\beta = 0$  and put the respective  $\beta = 1$  result in parentheses. By (3.55),  $\partial_t \rho_h^0$  is uniformly bounded in  $\varepsilon$  in  $L_T^2((S_{x,h}^0)^*)$  (resp  $L_T^2((V_{x,h}^0)^*)$ ) where  $(S_{x,h}^0)^*$  (resp  $(V_{x,h}^0)^*$ ) is the dual space of  $S_{x,h}^0$  (resp  $V_{x,h}^0$ ). Hence there is a subsequence of  $\partial_t \rho_h^\varepsilon$  such that  $\partial_t \rho_h^\varepsilon \rightharpoonup \zeta$  for some  $\zeta \in L_T^2((S_{x,h}^0)^*)$  (resp  $L_T^2((V_{x,h}^0)^*)$ ). Since  $S_{x,h}^0$  (resp.  $V_{x,h}^0$ ) is a finite-dimensional and thus Hilbert spaces with respect to the  $L^2$  inner product on  $\Omega_x$ , we can apply the Riesz representation theorem to show there is  $\zeta_h \in L_T^2(S_{x,h}^0)$  (resp  $L_T^2(V_{x,h}^0)$ ) such that

$$\zeta(t; q_h) = (\zeta_h(t), q_h(t))_{\Omega_x}$$

for all  $q_h \in S_{x,h}^0$  (resp  $V_{x,h}^0$ ) and a.e.  $t$  where  $\zeta(t; \cdot) \in (S_{x,h}^0)^*$  (resp  $(V_{x,h}^0)^*$ ). By a standard density argument (see [12, Chapter 7, Problem 5]), we have  $\zeta_h = \partial_t \rho_h^0$ . Therefore  $\rho_h^0 \in H^1([0, T]; S_{x,h}^0) \hookrightarrow C^0([0, T]; S_{x,h}^0)$  (resp  $H^1([0, T]; V_{x,h}^0) \hookrightarrow C^0([0, T]; V_{x,h}^0)$ ).

*Step 2: The Limiting System.* We first recover (4.2a), we choose  $q_h \in L_T^2(S_{x,h}^0)$  if  $\beta = 0$  and  $q_h \in L_T^2(V_{x,h}^0)$  if  $\beta = 1$  in (3.44) and integrate in time to obtain

$$(4.5) \quad \int_0^T \left[ (\partial_t \rho_h^\varepsilon, q_h)_{\Omega_x} - (J_h^\varepsilon, \nabla_x q_h)_{\Omega_x} + \langle \llbracket J_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket, \llbracket q_h \rrbracket \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} + \langle \gamma_I \llbracket \rho_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket, \llbracket q_h \rrbracket \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} \right] dt = \int_0^T \varepsilon^\beta \Theta_1(\tilde{g}_h^\varepsilon, q_h) dt.$$

Note that  $\int_0^T \Theta_2(\tilde{g}_h^\varepsilon, q_h) dt = 0$  since for a.e.  $t$ ,  $q_h(t) = 0$  on  $\partial\Omega_x$ . If  $\beta = 0$ , then  $\int_0^T \Theta_1(\tilde{g}_h^\varepsilon, q_h) dt = 0$  since  $q_h(t)$  is continuous in  $x$  for a.e.  $t$ ; additionally, the interior penalty term is also zero so we drop its  $\varepsilon^{\beta-1}$  multiplier found in (3.44). If  $\beta = 1$ , then



$\int_0^T \Theta_1(\tilde{g}_h^\varepsilon, q_h) dt$  is uniformly bounded with respect to  $\varepsilon$  by (3.47) and (3.33); thus the right hand side will vanish as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ . Therefore we can pass the weak limit as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  in (4.5) and obtain

$$\int_0^T \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \rho_h^0, q_h \right)_{\Omega_x} - (J_h^0, \nabla_x q_h)_{\Omega_x} + \langle \{\{J_h^0\}\}, \llbracket q_h \rrbracket \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} + \langle \gamma_I \llbracket \rho_h^0 \rrbracket, \llbracket q_h \rrbracket \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} dt = 0,$$

which implies

$$\left( \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \rho_h^0, q_h \right)_{\Omega_x} - (J_h^0, \nabla_x q_h)_{\Omega_x} + \langle \{\{J_h^0\}\}, \llbracket q_h \rrbracket \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} + \langle \gamma_I \llbracket \rho_h^0 \rrbracket, \llbracket q_h \rrbracket \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} = 0.$$

for all  $q_h \in V_{x,h}^0$  if  $\beta = 1$  and all  $q_h \in S_{x,h}^0$  if  $\beta = 0$  and a.e.  $0 < t \leq T$ . Thus we arrive at (4.2a).

For (4.2b), choose  $\tau_h \in L_T^2([V_{x,h}]^3)$  in (3.65) and integrate in time to obtain

$$(4.6) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_0^T (\omega J_h^\varepsilon, \tau_h)_{\Omega_x} + \theta (\nabla_x \rho_h^\varepsilon, \tau_h)_{\Omega_x} - \theta \langle \llbracket \rho_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket, \{\{\tau_h\}\} \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} - (E \rho_h^\varepsilon, \tau_h)_{\Omega_x} dt \\ &= \int_0^T \varepsilon \Theta_3(\tilde{g}_h^\varepsilon, \tau_h) + \sqrt{\varepsilon^{\beta+1}} \Theta_4(\rho_h^\varepsilon, \tau_h) \\ & \quad + \sqrt{\varepsilon} \Theta_5(\rho_h^\varepsilon, \tau_h) - \varepsilon^2 (\partial_t J_h^\varepsilon, \tau_h)_{\Omega_x} dt. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\varepsilon^{3/2} \|\partial_t J_h^\varepsilon\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\Omega_x))}$  is bounded in  $\varepsilon$  by (3.87), the time derivative term in (4.6) vanishes as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ . Additionally since  $\int_0^T \Theta_3(\tilde{g}_h^\varepsilon, \tau_h) dt$ ,  $\int_0^T \Theta_4(\rho_h^\varepsilon, \tau_h) dt$ , and  $\int_0^T \Theta_5(\rho_h^\varepsilon, \tau_h) dt$  are bounded in  $\varepsilon$  by (3.66), (3.69), and (3.70) respectively, then the entire right hand side of (4.6) vanishes as  $\varepsilon$  vanishes. Therefore the limiting equation of (4.6) as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  is

$$\int_0^T (\omega J_h^0, \tau_h)_{\Omega_x} + \theta (\nabla_x \rho_h^0, \tau_h)_{\Omega_x} - \theta \langle \llbracket \rho_h^0 \rrbracket, \{\{\tau_h\}\} \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} - (E \rho_h^0, \tau_h)_{\Omega_x} dt = 0,$$

which implies

$$(\omega J_h^0, \tau_h)_{\Omega_x} + \theta (\nabla_x \rho_h^0, \tau_h)_{\Omega_x} - \theta \langle \llbracket \rho_h^0 \rrbracket, \{\{\tau_h\}\} \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} - (E \rho_h^0, \tau_h)_{\Omega_x} = 0$$

for all  $\tau_h \in [V_{x,h}]^3$  and a.e.  $0 < t \leq T$ . Therefore we recover (4.2b).

We now derive the projected initial condition (4.2c) which is similarly shown in [12, Page 379] but is listed here for completeness. Let  $\beta = 1$  and choose  $q_h \in H^1([0, T], V_{x,h}^0)$  with  $q_h(T) = 0$  in (4.5). Integration by parts on the first term of (4.5) recovers

$$(4.7) \quad \begin{aligned} & - \int_0^T \left( \rho_h^\varepsilon, \frac{\partial}{\partial t} q_h \right)_{\Omega_x} - (J_h^\varepsilon, \nabla_x q_h)_{\Omega_x} + \langle \{\{J_h^\varepsilon\}\}, \llbracket q_h \rrbracket \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} \\ & \quad + \langle \gamma_I \llbracket \rho_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket, \llbracket q_h \rrbracket \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} dt = \int_0^T \varepsilon \Theta_1(g_h^\varepsilon, q_h) dt + (\rho_{0,h}, q_h(0))_{\Omega_x}. \end{aligned}$$

Sending  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  in (4.7) yields

$$(4.8) \quad - \int_0^T \left( \rho_h^0, \frac{\partial}{\partial t} q_h \right)_{\Omega_x} - (J_h^0, \nabla_x q_h)_{\Omega_x} + \langle \{\{J_h^0\}\}, \llbracket q_h \rrbracket \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} + \langle \gamma_I \llbracket \rho_h^0 \rrbracket, \llbracket q_h \rrbracket \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} dt = (\rho_{0,h}, q_h(0))_{\Omega_x}.$$

Choosing the same test function in (4.2a) and integrating by parts in time also yields

$$(4.9) \quad - \int_0^T \left( \rho_h^0, \frac{\partial}{\partial t} q_h \right)_{\Omega_x} - (J_h^0, \nabla_x q_h)_{\Omega_x} + \langle \{J_h^0\}, [q_h] \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} + \langle \gamma_I [\rho_h^0], [q_h] \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} dt = (\rho_h^0(0), q_h(0))_{\Omega_x}.$$

Subtracting (4.8) from (4.9) implies (4.2c). The case for  $\beta = 0$  is similar. The proof is complete.  $\square$

Now we show that the whole sequence  $\{\rho_h^\varepsilon\}_\varepsilon$  and  $\{J_h^\varepsilon\}_\varepsilon$  must converge to  $\rho_h^0$  and  $J_h^0$  respectively. We do this by showing uniqueness of solutions to the drift-diffusion system (4.2) with the following lemma.

LEMMA 4.2. *Suppose  $\rho_h$  and  $J_h$  satisfy (4.2), then we have the following bound for any  $h_x > 0$ :*

$$(4.10) \quad \|\rho_h\|_{L_T^\infty(L^2(\Omega_x))}^2 + \frac{\omega_{\min}}{\theta} \|J_h\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\Omega_x))}^2 \leq \exp\left(\frac{\|E\|_{L^\infty([0,T] \times \Omega_x)} T}{\theta \omega_{\min}}\right) \|\rho_{0,h}\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)}^2$$

Moreover, the solution pair  $\{\rho_h, J_h\}$  to (4.2) is unique.

*Proof.* We first focus on (4.10). Choose  $q_h = \theta \rho_h$  and  $\tau_h = J_h$  in (4.2). Adding both equations in (4.2) gives us

$$(4.11) \quad \frac{\theta}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\rho_h\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)}^2 + (\omega J_h, J_h)_{\Omega_x} + \theta \langle \gamma_I [\rho_h], [\rho_h] \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} = (E \rho_h, J_h)_{\Omega_x}$$

for each system. We note if  $\beta = 0$ , then the interior penalty term is zero since  $\rho_h$  is continuous. Thus (4.11) is true independent of  $\beta$ . Dropping the interior penalty term, bounding the right hand side of (4.11) by Hölder's and Young's inequality, and dividing by  $\theta/2$  we arrive at

$$(4.12) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \|\rho_h\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)}^2 + \frac{\omega_{\min}}{\theta} \|J_h\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)}^2 \leq \frac{\|E\|_{L^\infty([0,T] \times \Omega_x)}}{\theta \omega_{\min}} \|\rho_h\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)}^2$$

Applying Grönwall's to (4.12) gives us (4.10).

Uniqueness of the solution pair follows from applying (4.10) to the case where  $\rho_{0,h} = 0$ . The proof is complete.  $\square$

Due to the uniqueness result from Lemma 4.2, we attach the additional corollary.

COROLLARY 4.3. *The full sequences  $\{\rho_h^\varepsilon\}_\varepsilon$  and  $\{J_h^\varepsilon\}_\varepsilon$  weakly converge to  $\rho_h^0$  and  $J_h^0$  respectively in the topologies given in Theorem 4.1.*

**5. Error Estimates.** In this section we develop error estimates for  $\rho_h^\varepsilon$  against the true drift-diffusion limit  $\rho^0$  which solves (2.6). The error estimates are created by comparing both against the discrete drift-diffusion  $\rho_{0,h}$  which solves (4.2). This is summarized in the following theorem whose proof we delay until the end of the section.

THEOREM 5.1. *Suppose  $\rho^0 \in L_T^2(H^s(\Omega))$  and  $J^0 \in L_T^2([L^2(\Omega_x)]^3)$  satisfy (2.7) for some  $s \geq 2$ ,  $\omega \in W^{r,\infty}(\Omega_x)$ , and  $E \in L_T^\infty(W^{r,\infty}(\Omega_x))$  for some  $r \geq s - 1$ . Define*

$$\|E, \omega\|_r = \|\omega\|_{W^{r,\infty}(\Omega_x)} \|E\|_{L_T^\infty(W^{r,\infty}(\Omega_x))}.$$

Then for any  $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_{h_v}$  where  $\varepsilon_{h_v}$  is defined in (3.24) we have the following error estimate:

$$(5.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\rho_h^\varepsilon - \rho^0\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\Omega_x))} &\lesssim \sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{h_x}} \|g_{0,h}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + h_x^{\min\{k+1,s\}-1} \|\rho^0\|_{L_T^2(H^s(\Omega_x))} \\ &\quad + h_x^{\min\{k+1,s-1\}-\beta/2} \|\rho^0\|_{L_T^2(H^s(\Omega_x))} \|E, \omega\|_r. \end{aligned}$$

**5.1. Error Estimates in  $\varepsilon$ .** Here we build estimates comparing  $\rho_h^\varepsilon$  to  $\rho_h^0$ . Define  $e_\rho^\varepsilon = \rho_h^\varepsilon - \rho_h^0$  and  $e_J^\varepsilon = J_h^\varepsilon - J_h^0$ . Subtracting (4.2) from the system (3.44) and (3.65) gives us the following error equations:

$$(5.2) \quad \begin{aligned} &(\partial_t e_\rho^\varepsilon, q_h)_{\Omega_x} - (e_J^\varepsilon, \nabla_x q_h)_{\Omega_x} + \langle \{\{e_J^\varepsilon\}\}, \llbracket q_h \rrbracket \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} + \varepsilon^{\beta-1} \langle \gamma_I \llbracket e_\rho^\varepsilon \rrbracket, \llbracket q_h \rrbracket \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} \\ &= \varepsilon^\beta \Theta_1(\tilde{g}_h^\varepsilon, q_h) \\ &(\omega e_J^\varepsilon, \tau_h)_{\Omega_x} + \theta (\nabla_x e_\rho^\varepsilon, \tau_h)_{\Omega_x} - \theta \langle \llbracket e_\rho^\varepsilon \rrbracket, \{\{\tau_h\}\} \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} - (E e_\rho^\varepsilon, \tau_h)_{\Omega_x} \\ &= \varepsilon \Theta_3(\tilde{g}_h^\varepsilon, \tau_h) + \sqrt{\varepsilon^{\beta+1}} \Theta_4(\rho_h^\varepsilon, \tau_h) + \sqrt{\varepsilon} \Theta_5(\rho_h^\varepsilon, \tau_h) + \sqrt{\varepsilon} \left( \varepsilon^{3/2} \partial_t J_h^\varepsilon, \tau_h \right)_{\Omega_x} \end{aligned}$$

for all  $\tau_h \in [V_{x,h}]^3$  and  $q_h \in V_{x,h}^0$  if  $\beta = 1$  and  $q_h \in S_{x,h}^0$  if  $\beta = 0$ .

In order to bound the error of  $e_\rho^\varepsilon$ , we decompose the  $\rho$  error as  $e_\rho^\varepsilon = \eta_\rho^\varepsilon - \xi_\rho^\varepsilon := (\rho_h^\varepsilon - \mathcal{S}_h^\beta \rho_h^\varepsilon) - (\rho_h^0 - \mathcal{S}_h^\beta \rho_h^0)$ . Thus  $\eta_\rho^\varepsilon \in V_{x,h}$  and  $\xi_\rho^\varepsilon \in V_{x,h}^0$  if  $\beta = 1$  and  $\xi_\rho^\varepsilon \in S_{x,h}^0$  if  $\beta = 0$ .

**LEMMA 5.2.** For any  $h_x > 0$ ,  $h_v > 0$ , and  $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_{h_v}$  where  $\varepsilon_{h_v}$  is defined in Lemma 3.5,  $e_\rho^\varepsilon$  and  $e_J^\varepsilon$  satisfy the following error bound:

$$(5.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\xi_\rho^\varepsilon(T)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{\omega_{\min}}{2} \|e_J^\varepsilon\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\Omega_x))}^2 + \frac{\theta \gamma_*}{2} \|\llbracket \xi_\rho^\varepsilon \rrbracket\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I))}^2 \\ \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{h_x} \|g_{0,h}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* Choose  $q_h = -\theta \xi_\rho^\varepsilon$  and  $\tau_h = e_J^\varepsilon$  in (5.2). Adding the two equations in (5.2) we arrive at

$$(5.4) \quad \begin{aligned} &\theta (\partial_t \xi_\rho^\varepsilon, \xi_\rho^\varepsilon)_{\Omega_x} + (\omega e_J^\varepsilon, e_J^\varepsilon)_{\Omega_x} + \theta \langle \gamma_I \llbracket \xi_\rho^\varepsilon \rrbracket, \llbracket \xi_\rho^\varepsilon \rrbracket \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} \\ &= \{ -\theta (\nabla_x \eta_\rho^\varepsilon, e_J^\varepsilon)_{\Omega_x} + \theta \langle \{\{e_J^\varepsilon\}\}, \llbracket \eta_\rho^\varepsilon \rrbracket \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} + (E \eta_\rho^\varepsilon, e_J^\varepsilon)_{\Omega_x} \} \\ &\quad - (E \xi_\rho^\varepsilon, e_J^\varepsilon)_{\Omega_x} - \varepsilon \theta \Theta_1(\tilde{g}_h^\varepsilon, \xi_\rho^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon \Theta_3(\tilde{g}_h^\varepsilon, e_J^\varepsilon) + \sqrt{\varepsilon^{\beta+1}} \Theta_4(\rho_h^\varepsilon, e_J^\varepsilon) \\ &\quad + \sqrt{\varepsilon} \Theta_5(\rho_h^\varepsilon, e_J^\varepsilon) + \sqrt{\varepsilon} \left( \varepsilon^{3/2} \partial_t J_h^\varepsilon, e_J^\varepsilon \right)_{\Omega_x} + (\partial_t \eta_\rho^\varepsilon, \xi_\rho^\varepsilon)_{\Omega_x}. \end{aligned}$$

We seek to bound each of the terms on the right hand side of (5.4). Let  $I_1$  be all of the terms enclosed by  $\{\}$  in (5.4). By use of inverse inequalities, trace inequalities, and Young's inequality, we can bound  $I_1$  for any  $\nu > 0$  by

$$(5.5) \quad |I_1| \lesssim \frac{1}{\nu} \|\eta_\rho^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)}^2 + \frac{1}{\nu} \|\eta_\rho^\varepsilon\|_{H_h^1(\Omega_x)}^2 + \nu \|e_J^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)}^2.$$

We can bound  $(E \xi_\rho^\varepsilon, e_J^\varepsilon)_{\Omega_x}$  with Young's inequality to obtain

$$(5.6) \quad |(E \xi_\rho^\varepsilon, e_J^\varepsilon)_{\Omega_x}| \lesssim \frac{1}{\nu} \|\xi_\rho^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)}^2 + \nu \|e_J^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)}^2$$

for any  $\nu > 0$ . For  $\Theta_1$ , we note if  $\beta = 0$ , then  $\xi_\rho^\varepsilon$  is continuous in  $x$ , so  $\Theta_1(\tilde{g}_h^\varepsilon, \xi_\rho^\varepsilon) = 0$ . Thus we focus on the case  $\beta = 1$  for which we use (3.47) and Young's inequality to bound  $\Theta_1$  as

$$(5.7) \quad |\varepsilon \Theta_1(\tilde{g}_h^\varepsilon, \xi_\rho^\varepsilon)| \lesssim \frac{1}{\nu h_x} \|M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon - g_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \nu \|\llbracket \xi_\rho^\varepsilon \rrbracket\|_{L^2(\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I)}^2$$

for any  $\nu > 0$ . We use (3.66) and Young's inequality to obtain

$$(5.8) \quad |\varepsilon \Theta_3(\tilde{g}_h^\varepsilon, e_J^\varepsilon)| \lesssim \frac{1}{\nu h_x^2} \|M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon - g_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \nu \|e_J^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)}^2$$

for any  $\nu > 0$ . Similarly, we can bound  $\Theta_4$  and  $\Theta_5$  by (3.69), (3.70), and Young's inequality to find

$$(5.9) \quad |\sqrt{\varepsilon^{\beta+1}} \Theta_4(\rho_h^\varepsilon, e_J^\varepsilon) + \sqrt{\varepsilon} \Theta_5(\rho_h^\varepsilon, e_J^\varepsilon)| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^{2\beta}}{\nu h_x} \|\llbracket \rho_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket\|_{L^2(\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I)}^2 + \frac{1}{\nu h_x} \|\rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega_x)}^2 + \nu \|e_J^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)}^2$$

for any  $\nu > 0$ . We bound the  $\partial_t J_h^\varepsilon$  term as

$$(5.10) \quad |\sqrt{\varepsilon} \left( \varepsilon^{3/2} \partial_t J_h^\varepsilon, e_J^\varepsilon \right)_{\Omega_x}| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{\nu} \|\varepsilon^3 \partial_t J_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)}^2 + \nu \|e_J^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)}^2$$

for any  $\nu > 0$ . The term  $(\partial_t \eta_\rho^\varepsilon, \xi_\rho^\varepsilon)_{\Omega_x}$  is zero since by definition  $\eta_\rho^\varepsilon$  is orthogonal to  $\xi_\rho^\varepsilon$  in  $L^2(\Omega_x)$ . Injecting (5.5) through (5.10) into (5.4) gives us

$$(5.11) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\xi_\rho^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)}^2 + \omega_{\min} \|e_J^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{\theta \gamma_*}{2} \|\llbracket \xi_\rho^\varepsilon \rrbracket\|_{L^2(\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I)}^2 \\ & \lesssim \frac{1}{\nu} \|\xi_\rho^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)}^2 + \frac{1}{\nu} \|\eta_\rho^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)}^2 + \frac{1}{\nu} \|\eta_\rho^\varepsilon\|_{H_h^1(\Omega_x)}^2 \\ & + \frac{1}{\nu h_x} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{h_x} \right) \|M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon - g_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{\varepsilon}{\nu} \|\varepsilon^3 \partial_t J_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)}^2 \\ & + \frac{\varepsilon^{2\beta}}{\nu h_x} \|\llbracket \rho_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket\|_{L^2(\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I)}^2 + \frac{1}{\nu h_x} \|\rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega_x)}^2 \\ & + \nu \|e_J^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \nu \|\llbracket \xi_\rho^\varepsilon \rrbracket\|_{L^2(\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I)}^2 \end{aligned}$$

for all  $\nu > 0$ . Choosing  $\nu$ , independent of  $\varepsilon$  and  $h_x$ , sufficiently small we can move the last two terms on the right of (5.11) over to the left. Since  $\xi_\rho^\varepsilon(0) = 0$ , we can then apply Grönwall's to obtain (assuming  $h_x \lesssim 1$ )

$$(5.12) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|\xi_\rho^\varepsilon\|_{L_T^\infty(L^2(\Omega_x))}^2 + \|e_J^\varepsilon\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\Omega_x))}^2 + \|\llbracket \xi_\rho^\varepsilon \rrbracket\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I))}^2 \\ & \lesssim \|\eta_\rho^\varepsilon\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\Omega_x))}^2 + \|\eta_\rho^\varepsilon\|_{L_T^2(H_h^1(\Omega_x))}^2 \\ & + \frac{1}{\nu h_x^2} \|M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon - g_h^\varepsilon\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\Omega))}^2 \\ & + \varepsilon \|\varepsilon^3 \partial_t J_h^\varepsilon\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\Omega_x))}^2 \\ & + \frac{\varepsilon^{2\beta}}{h_x} \|\llbracket \rho_h^\varepsilon \rrbracket\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I))}^2 + \frac{1}{h_x} \|\rho_h^\varepsilon\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\partial\Omega_x))}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the appropriate norms of  $\eta_\rho^\varepsilon = \rho_h^\varepsilon - \mathcal{S}_h^\beta \rho_h^\varepsilon$ ,  $\rho_h^\varepsilon$ , and  $M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_h^\varepsilon - g_h^\varepsilon$  can all be bounded from Lemma 3.7 while  $\frac{\partial}{\partial t} J_h^\varepsilon$  can be bounded in  $L^2$  by Lemma 3.11. Applying these bounds to (5.12), recalling Assumption 2.7, and noticing  $\varepsilon^2 \lesssim \varepsilon$  gives us (5.3). The proof is complete.  $\square$

We can now show the  $\varepsilon$ -error estimate.

**THEOREM 5.3.** *Let  $\{\rho_h^0, J_h^0\}$  satisfy (4.2). Then for any  $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_{h_v}$ , where  $\varepsilon_{h_v}$  is defined in (3.24), we have the following error estimate:*

$$(5.13) \quad \|\rho_h^\varepsilon - \rho_h^0\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\Omega_x))} + \|J_h^\varepsilon - J_h^0\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\Omega_x))} \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{h_x}} \|g_{0,h}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

*Proof.* Using the triangle inequality and Hölder's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\rho_h^\varepsilon - \rho_h^0\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\Omega_x))} &\leq \|\eta_\rho^\varepsilon\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\Omega_x))} + \|\xi_\rho^\varepsilon\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\Omega_x))} \\ &\lesssim \|\eta_\rho^\varepsilon\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\Omega_x))} + \|\xi_\rho^\varepsilon\|_{L_T^\infty(L^2(\Omega_x))} \end{aligned}$$

which we can bound by (3.36) and (5.3). The  $J_h^\varepsilon$  error estimate follows from (5.3). The proof is complete.  $\square$

**5.2. Error Estimate in  $h$ .** We now focus on the error estimates of the limiting drift diffusion system (4.2). Here we guarantee a positive rate of convergence for  $k_x \geq 1$ . The polynomial degree restriction is not surprising as traditionally an interior penalty term on  $J_h^0$  is required in order to obtain a positive rate of convergence for piecewise-constant polynomial approximations (see [30, Table 2.6]). We note that DG discretizations of (2.7) have been studied for the one-dimensional case in [24]; however, their discretization defines the auxiliary variable in the system as a scalar multiple of  $\nabla_x \rho_h^0$  rather than  $J_h^\varepsilon$ . Additionally, their error estimates rely on  $\rho_h^0$  being discontinuous in space and the fluxes for  $\rho_h^0$  and  $J_h^0$  to be alternating so that the Gauss-Radau projection can be utilized. Since both of these properties do not hold for (4.2), we include our own error estimates in  $h$ .

**LEMMA 5.4.** *Suppose  $\rho^0 \in L_T^2(H^s(\Omega))$  and  $J^0 \in L_T^2([L^2(\Omega_x)]^3)$  satisfy (2.7) for some  $s \geq 2$ ,  $\omega \in W^{r,\infty}(\Omega_x)$ , and  $E \in L_T^\infty(W^{r,\infty}(\Omega_x))$  for some  $r \geq 1$ . Define  $\mu = \min\{r, s-1\}$  and recall  $\|E, \omega\|_r$  from Theorem 5.1. Then*

$$(5.14) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\rho_h^0 - \rho^0\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\Omega_x))} + \|J_h^0 - J^0\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\Omega_x))} \\ \lesssim h_x^{\min\{k+1, s\}-1} \|\rho^0\|_{L_T^2(H^s(\Omega_x))} + h_x^{\min\{k+1, \mu\}-\beta/2} \|\rho^0\|_{L_T^2(H^s(\Omega_x))} \|E, \omega\|_r. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* We decompose  $e_{h,\rho} := \rho_h^0 - \rho^0$  and  $e_{h,J} := J_h^0 - J^0$  as

$$(5.15a) \quad e_{h,\rho} = \xi_{h,\rho} - \eta_{h,\rho} := (\rho_h^0 - \mathcal{S}_h^\beta \rho^0) - (\rho^0 - \mathcal{S}_h^\beta \rho^0),$$

$$(5.15b) \quad e_{h,J} = \xi_{h,J} - \eta_{h,J} := (J_h^0 - \mathcal{P}_h J^0) - (J^0 - \mathcal{P}_h J^0),$$

where  $\mathcal{P}_h$  is the  $L^2$ -orthogonal projection onto  $V_h$ . Because  $\rho^0, J^0$  also solve (4.2), the differences  $e_{h,\rho}$  and  $e_{h,J}$  satisfy

$$(5.16) \quad \begin{aligned} (\partial_t e_{h,\rho}, q_h)_{\Omega_x} - (e_{h,J}, \nabla_x q_h)_{\Omega_x} + \langle \{\{e_{h,J}\}\}, [q_h] \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} + \langle \gamma_I [e_{h,\rho}], [q_h] \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} &= 0 \\ (\omega e_{h,J}, \tau_h)_{\Omega_x} + \theta (\nabla_x e_{h,\rho}, \tau_h)_{\Omega_x} - \theta \langle [e_{h,\rho}], \{\{\tau_h\}\} \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} - (E e_{h,\rho}, \tau_h)_{\Omega_x} &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

for all  $\tau_h \in [V_{x,h}]^3$  and  $q_h \in S_{x,h}^0$  if  $\beta = 0$  and  $q_h \in V_{x,h}^0$  if  $\beta = 1$ . Choosing  $q_h = \theta \xi_{h,\rho}$  and  $\tau_h = \xi_{h,J}$  in (5.16) gives

$$(5.17) \quad \begin{aligned} & \theta (\partial_t \xi_{h,\rho}, \xi_{h,\rho})_{\Omega_x} - \theta (\xi_{h,J}, \nabla_x \xi_{h,\rho})_{\Omega_x} + \theta \langle \{\{\xi_{h,J}\}\}, \llbracket \xi_{h,\rho} \rrbracket \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} + \theta \langle \gamma_I \llbracket \xi_{h,\rho} \rrbracket, \llbracket \xi_{h,\rho} \rrbracket \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} \\ & = \theta (\partial_t \eta_{h,\rho}, \xi_{h,\rho})_{\Omega_x} - \theta (\eta_{h,J}, \nabla_x \xi_{h,\rho})_{\Omega_x} + \theta \langle \{\{\eta_{h,J}\}\}, \llbracket \xi_{h,\rho} \rrbracket \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} + \theta \langle \gamma_I \llbracket \eta_{h,\rho} \rrbracket, \llbracket \xi_{h,\rho} \rrbracket \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I}, \end{aligned}$$

$$(5.18) \quad \begin{aligned} & (\omega \xi_{h,J}, \xi_{h,J})_{\Omega_x} + \theta (\nabla_x \xi_{h,\rho}, \xi_{h,J})_{\Omega_x} - \theta \langle \llbracket \xi_{h,\rho} \rrbracket, \{\{\xi_{h,J}\}\} \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} - (E \xi_{h,\rho}, \xi_{h,J})_{\Omega_x} \\ & = (\omega \eta_{h,J}, \xi_{h,J})_{\Omega_x} + \theta (\nabla_x \eta_{h,\rho}, \xi_{h,J})_{\Omega_x} - \theta \langle \llbracket \eta_{h,\rho} \rrbracket, \{\{\xi_{h,J}\}\} \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} - (E \eta_{h,\rho}, \xi_{h,J})_{\Omega_x}. \end{aligned}$$

By properties of the  $L^2$ -projection.  $(\partial_t \eta_{h,\rho}, \xi_{h,\rho})_{\Omega_x} = 0$  and  $(\eta_{h,J}, \nabla_x \xi_{h,\rho})_{\Omega_x} = 0$ . Adding (5.17) and (5.18) gives

$$(5.19) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{\theta}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\xi_{h,\rho}\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)}^2 + \omega_{\min} \|\xi_{h,J}\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)}^2 + \gamma_* \theta \|\llbracket \xi_{h,\rho} \rrbracket\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)}^2 \leq \theta \langle \{\{\eta_{h,J}\}\}, \llbracket \xi_{h,\rho} \rrbracket \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} \\ & \quad + \theta \langle \gamma_I \llbracket \eta_{h,\rho} \rrbracket, \llbracket \xi_{h,\rho} \rrbracket \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} + (E \xi_{h,\rho}, \xi_{h,J})_{\Omega_x} \\ & \quad + (\omega \eta_{h,J}, \xi_{h,J})_{\Omega_x} + \theta (\nabla_x \eta_{h,\rho}, \xi_{h,J})_{\Omega_x} \\ & \quad - \theta \langle \llbracket \eta_{h,\rho} \rrbracket, \{\{\xi_{h,J}\}\} \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I} - (E \eta_{h,\rho}, \xi_{h,J})_{\Omega_x}. \end{aligned}$$

We now bound the terms on the right hand side of (5.16) using a combination of Cauchy-Schwarz, trace (3.2), inverse (3.4), and Young's inequalities. Note any integral on  $\mathcal{E}_{x,h}^I$  vanishes if  $\beta = 0$  so we will multiply the edge contributions by  $\beta$  to compensate. Doing this gives us

$$(5.20) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} \|\xi_{h,\rho}\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)}^2 + \|\xi_{h,J}\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)}^2 + \beta \|\llbracket \xi_{h,\rho} \rrbracket\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)}^2 \lesssim \|\xi_{h,\rho}\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)}^2 \\ & \quad + \frac{\beta}{h_x} \|\eta_{h,J}\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)}^2 + \frac{1}{h_x^2} \|\eta_{h,\rho}\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)}^2 + \|\eta_{h,J}\|_{L^2(\Omega_x)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\omega, E(t) \in W^{r,\infty}(\Omega)$ , then  $J^0(t) \in H^\mu(\Omega_x)$  where  $\mu = \min\{r, s-1\}$ . From standard finite element interpolation theory (cf [4]) we have the projection estimates

$$(5.21) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|\eta_{h,\rho}\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\Omega_x))} \lesssim h_x^{\min\{k+1, s\}} \|\rho^0\|_{L_T^2(H^s(\Omega_x))}, \\ & \|\eta_{h,J}\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\Omega_x))} \lesssim h_x^{\min\{k+1, \mu\}} \|\rho^0\|_{L_T^2(H^s(\Omega))} \|E, \omega\|_r. \end{aligned}$$

Integrating (5.20) from 0 to  $T$ , applying the bounds (5.21), and invoking Grönwall's lemma we have

$$(5.22) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|\xi_{h,\rho}\|_{L_T^\infty(L^2(\Omega_x))}^2 + \|\xi_{h,J}\|_{L_T^2(L^2(\Omega_x))}^2 \lesssim h_x^{2 \min\{k+1, s\} - 2} \|\rho^0\|_{L_T^2(H^s(\Omega_x))}^2 \\ & \quad + h_x^{2 \min\{k+1, \mu\} - \beta} \|\rho^0\|_{L_T^2(H^s(\Omega_x))}^2 \|E, \omega\|_r^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus by (5.22) and a triangle inequality we have (5.14). The proof is complete.  $\square$

We can now prove Theorem 5.1 as a consequence of Theorem 5.3 and Lemma 5.4.

*Proof of Theorem 5.1.* Using a triangle inequality and applying Theorem 5.3 and Lemma 5.4 immediately implies the result. The proof is complete.  $\square$

REMARK 5.1. Consider an  $H^2$  solution  $\rho^0$ ,  $k_x = 1$ , and full upwinding, that is,  $\beta = 0$ . Then the error in (5.1) is  $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\varepsilon/h_x} + h_x)$  which is optimal if we set  $h_x = \varepsilon^{1/3}$ .

**Appendix A. Appendix.** Lemma 3.6 is a result of the following lemma:

LEMMA A.1. There exists  $\gamma_* > 0$  independent of  $\varepsilon$  and  $h_x$  such that

$$(A.1) \quad \inf_{\substack{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d \\ \|\xi\|_2=1}} \left( v_h M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}, \xi M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \right)_{\{v: v_h(v) \cdot \xi > 0\}} > \gamma_*,$$

$$(A.2) \quad \inf_{\substack{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d \\ \|\xi\|_2=1}} \left( \frac{|v_h \cdot \xi|}{2} M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}, M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \right)_{\Omega_v} > \gamma_*.$$

*Proof.* We first focus on (A.1). We will show the function  $\gamma : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined by

$$\gamma(\xi) = \left( v_h M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}, \xi M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \right)_{\{v: v_h(v) \cdot \xi > 0\}}$$

is lower semi-continuous. Let  $\xi_n \rightarrow \xi$ . Define  $\gamma_n : \Omega_v \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$\gamma_n(v) = v_h \cdot \xi_n M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \chi_{\{v_h(v) \cdot \xi_n > 0\}}$$

where  $\chi_A$  is the indicator function for the set  $A$ . By Fatou's Lemma we have

$$(A.3) \quad \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \gamma(\xi_n) = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega_v} \gamma_n(v) dv \geq \int_{\Omega_v} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_n(v) dv.$$

We claim

$$(A.4) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_n(v) = v_h \cdot \xi M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \chi_{\{v_h(v) \cdot \xi > 0\}}$$

for all a.e.  $v \in \Omega_v$ . Let  $v \in \Omega_v$  with  $v_h(v) \cdot \xi < 0$ . Then eventually we have  $v_h(v) \cdot \xi_k < 0$  for all  $k$  sufficiently large. Thus the indicator function evaluates to zero and  $\gamma_k(v) = 0$ ; thus (A.4) holds. Let  $v \in \Omega_v$  with  $v_h(v) \cdot \xi > 0$ . Then similarly  $v_h(v) \cdot \xi_k > 0$  for all  $k$  sufficiently large. Hence the indicator function evaluates to 1 and we can pass the limit to show (A.4) holds. Since the set  $\{v : v_h(v) \cdot \xi = 0\}$  is a set of measure zero, (A.4) holds for all a.e.  $v \in \Omega_v$ . Using (A.4) we continue (A.3) to obtain

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \gamma(\xi_n) \geq \int_{\Omega_v} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_n(v) dv = \int_{\Omega_v} v_h \cdot \xi M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \chi_{\{v_h(v) \cdot \xi > 0\}} dv = \gamma(\xi).$$

Therefore  $\gamma$  is lower semi-continuous. Since  $\gamma > 0$  on the compact unit sphere, it obtains a positive minimum. Thus the first equality of (A.1) holds.

For (A.2), we note that the function  $\xi \rightarrow \left( \frac{|v_h \cdot \xi|}{2} M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}, M_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \right)_{\Omega_v}$  is Lipschitz continuous. Since it is also positive on the compact unit sphere, it obtains a positive minimum. The proof is complete.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [1] N. B. Abdallah and M. L. Tayeb. Diffusion approximation for the one dimensional boltzmann-poisson system. *Discrete & Continuous Dynamical Systems-B*, 4(4):1129, 2004.
- [2] M. L. Adams. Discontinuous finite element transport solutions in thick diffusive problems. *Nuclear science and engineering*, 137(3):298–333, 2001.

- [3] A. Bensoussan, P.-L. Lions, and G. C. Papanicolaou. Boundary layers and homogenization of transport processes. Publications of the Research Institute for Mathematical Sciences, 15(1):53–157, 1979.
- [4] S. C. Brenner, L. R. Scott, and L. R. Scott. The mathematical theory of finite element methods, volume 3. Springer, 2008.
- [5] L. Chen and H. Bagci. Steady-state simulation of semiconductor devices using discontinuous galerkin methods. IEEE Access, 8:16203–16215, 2020.
- [6] Y. Cheng, I. M. Gamba, A. Majorana, and C.-W. Shu. Discontinuous galerkin solver for the semiconductor boltzmann equation. In Simulation of Semiconductor Processes and Devices 2007, pages 257–260. Springer, 2007.
- [7] Y. Cheng, I. M. Gamba, A. Majorana, and C.-W. Shu. Discontinuous galerkin solver for boltzmann-poisson transients. Journal of Computational Electronics, 7(3):119–123, 2008.
- [8] Y. Cheng, I. M. Gamba, A. Majorana, and C.-W. Shu. A discontinuous galerkin solver for boltzmann–poisson systems in nano devices. Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering, 198(37-40):3130–3150, 2009.
- [9] Y. Cheng, I. M. Gamba, A. Majorana, and C.-W. Shu. A brief survey of the discontinuous galerkin method for the boltzmann-poisson equations. SeMA Journal, 54(1):47–64, 2011.
- [10] M. Crouzeix and V. Thomée. The stability in  $l^p$  and  $w^{1,p}$  of the  $l^2$ -projection onto finite element function spaces. Mathematics of Computation, 48(178):521–532, 1987.
- [11] V. P. DeCaria, C. D. Hauck, and M. T. P. Laiu. Analysis of a new implicit solver for a semiconductor model. SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing, 43(3):B733–B758, 2021.
- [12] L. Evans. Partial Differential Equations. Graduate studies in mathematics. American Mathematical Society, 2010.
- [13] J.-L. Guermond and G. Kanschat. Asymptotic analysis of upwind discontinuous galerkin approximation of the radiative transport equation in the diffusive limit. SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis, 48(1):53–78, 2010.
- [14] G. Habetler and B. Matkowsky. Uniform asymptotic expansions in transport theory with small mean free paths, and the diffusion approximation. Journal of Mathematical Physics, 16(4):846–854, 1975.
- [15] S. Jin. Efficient asymptotic-preserving (ap) schemes for some multiscale kinetic equations. SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing, 21(2):441–454, 1999.
- [16] S. Jin. Asymptotic preserving (ap) schemes for multiscale kinetic and hyperbolic equations: a review. Lecture notes for summer school on methods and models of kinetic theory (M&MKT), Porto Ercole (Grosseto, Italy), pages 177–216, 2010.
- [17] S. Jin and L. Pareschi. Discretization of the multiscale semiconductor boltzmann equation by diffusive relaxation schemes. Journal of Computational Physics, 161(1):312–330, 2000.
- [18] A. Jüngel. Transport equations for semiconductors, volume 773. Springer, 2009.
- [19] O. A. Karakashian and F. Pascal. A posteriori error estimates for a discontinuous galerkin approximation of second-order elliptic problems. SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis, 41(6):2374–2399, 2003.
- [20] A. Klar. Asymptotic-induced domain decomposition methods for kinetic and drift diffusion semiconductor equations. SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing, 19(6):2032–2050, 1998.
- [21] A. Klar. A numerical method for kinetic semiconductor equations in the drift-diffusion limit. SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing, 20(5):1696–1712, 1999.
- [22] M. P. Laiu, Z. Chen, and C. D. Hauck. A fast implicit solver for semiconductor models in one space dimension. Journal of Computational Physics, 417:109567, 2020.
- [23] E. W. Larsen and J. B. Keller. Asymptotic solution of neutron transport problems for small mean free paths. Journal of Mathematical Physics, 15(1):75–81, 1974.
- [24] Y. Liu and C.-W. Shu. Analysis of the local discontinuous galerkin method for the drift-diffusion model of semiconductor devices. Science China Mathematics, 59(1):115–140, 2016.
- [25] A. Majorana, G. Nastasi, and V. Romano. Simulation of bipolar charge transport in graphene by using a discontinuous galerkin method. Commun. Comput. Phys., 26(1):114–134, 2019.
- [26] P. A. Markowich, C. A. Ringhofer, and C. Schmeiser. Semiconductor equations. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [27] N. Masmoudi and M. L. Tayeb. Diffusion limit of a semiconductor boltzmann–poisson system. SIAM journal on mathematical analysis, 38(6):1788–1807, 2007.
- [28] F. Poupaud. Diffusion approximation of the linear semiconductor boltzmann equation: analysis of boundary layers. Asymptotic analysis, 4(4):293–317, 1991.
- [29] F. Poupaud. Mathematical theory of kinetic equations for transport modelling in semiconductors. In Advances in Kinetic Theory and Computing: Selected Papers, pages 141–168. World Scientific, 1994.
- [30] B. Rivière. Discontinuous Galerkin methods for solving elliptic and parabolic equations: theory



- and implementation. SIAM, 2008.
- [31] C. Schmeiser and A. Zwirchmayr. Convergence of moment methods for linear kinetic equations. SIAM journal on numerical analysis, 36(1):74–88, 1998.
- [32] Q. Sheng and C. Hauck. Uniform convergence of an upwind discontinuous galerkin method for solving scaled discrete-ordinate radiative transfer equations with isotropic scattering. Mathematics of Computation, 90(332):2645–2669, 2021.