

**ON THE POSITIVITY OF THE DISCRETE GREEN'S  
FUNCTION FOR UNSTRUCTURED FINITE ELEMENT  
DISCRETIZATIONS IN THREE DIMENSIONS.**

A. MILLER

ABSTRACT. The aim of this paper is twofold. First, we prove  $L^p$  estimates for a regularized Green's function in three dimensions. We then establish new estimates for the discrete Green's function and obtain some positivity results. In particular, we prove that the discrete Green's functions with singularity in the interior of the domain cannot be bounded uniformly with respect of the mesh parameter  $h$ . Actually, we show that at the singularity the discrete Green's function is of order  $h^{-1}$ , which is consistent with the behavior of the continuous Green's function. In addition, we also show that the discrete Green's function is positive and decays exponentially away from the singularity. We also provide numerically persistent negative values of the discrete Green's function on Delaunay meshes which then implies a discrete Harnack inequality cannot be established for unstructured finite element discretizations.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ ,  $N = 3$ , be a convex bounded domain with sufficiently smooth boundary. We consider the following Laplace equation;

$$(1) \quad \begin{aligned} -\Delta u &= 0, & \text{in } \Omega \\ u &= b, & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{aligned}$$

Here we assume the boundary data  $b \in C(\partial\Omega)$  and  $b \geq 0$ . Harmonic functions in the classical sense have been well studied across mathematics, mathematical physics, and stochastic processes. Many results are established for harmonic functions, including: regularity results, Liouville's Theorem, weak and strong maximum principles, as well as a mean value property for example. An important and well known result for non-negative harmonic functions is the Harnack inequality [9]. The theorem essentially states that any two values of a non-negative harmonic function are comparable with a constant independent of the particular function itself. The Harnack inequality has been useful in the analysis of fully non-linear elliptic problems. This problem was then extended by Moser in 1961 [15] for uniformly elliptic equations in divergence form with bounded measurable coefficients under the assumption that the eigenvalues of the matrix operator are bounded from above and below. Later in 1980, Krylov and Safonov extended the result to elliptic equations in non-divergence form with bounded measurable coefficients [11]. In addition there is literature on the Harnack inequality

outside of the Euclidean setting on  $\mathbb{R}^N$  including, probability [12], graph theory [5], and infinite dimensional operators [2].

The same cannot be said about the discrete setting, especially when the discretization is less structured. To the author's knowledge there are only two existing papers on the Harnack inequality in the finite element literature. The first is a paper by Aguilera and Caffarelli [1] where they adapted the continuous De Giorgi-Nash-Moser iteration technique. However, this technique required the discrete maximum principle as well as other additional geometric constraints on the discretization. In 2014, Leykekhman and Pruitt established a discrete Harnack inequality [13] on general quasi-uniform meshes in two dimensions only requiring a mesh condition near the boundary of the domain. Their technique involved using a discrete Green's representation for discrete harmonic functions, upper and lower bounds on both the continuous Green's function and discrete Green's functions, as well as applying analytical tools from Sobolev space theory and finite element theory.

Motivated by the Harnack inequality, in this paper we will work towards establishing criteria for the non-negativity of the discrete Green's function including our main result, showing that the discrete Green's function cannot be uniformly bounded at the singularity. We will also prove pointwise upper bounds and establish some  $L^p$  estimates for the discrete Green's function. We will adapt techniques used by Leykekhman and Pruitt in two dimensions, however, some two dimensional techniques do not hold in three dimensions. In this case we introduce new analytical techniques while working to keep the discretization of the original space as general as possible. For example, requiring the stiffness matrix to be a  $M$ -matrix would give positivity of the discrete Green's function, but with significant constraints on the triangulation that many mesh refinement schemes don't follow.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we introduce the problem as well as any relative definitions and preliminaries from finite elements and Green's functions. Section 3 will concern estimates for the regularized Green's function which have been an important tool for optimal control problems. In section 4 we present some new estimates for the discrete Green's function including an interesting result that shows the function decays exponentially towards the boundary, analogous to the behavior of the classical Green's function. Section 5 will present our results on the positivity of the discrete Green's function including a new analytical technique used at the "singularity". Finally, in 6 we will also establish numerically persistent negative values for the discrete Green's function on a polyhedral domain, showing an inconsistency in the finite element approximation of the classical Green's function, suggesting a discrete Harnack inequality cannot be established for unstructured meshes.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

Throughout the paper we make use of standard Sobolev and finite element notation. Let  $0 < h < 1$  and  $\{\mathcal{T}_h\}$  be quasi-uniform shape regular family of triangulations of size  $h$  for the computational domain  $\Omega_h \subset \Omega$ . We define  $V_h(\Omega_h)$  (resp.  $V_h^0(\Omega_h)$  for zero boundary condition) the set of all continuous functions on  $\Omega_h$  that are linear (affine) when restricted to each tetrahedra in  $\mathcal{T}$ . Let  $\{\phi_i\}_{i=1}^{n+m}$  denote the standard nodal basis function for  $V_h(\Omega_h)$  and let  $x_i$  for  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  denote interior nodes and  $x_j$  for  $j \in \{n+1, \dots, n+m\}$  denote boundary nodes (those that lie on the boundary).

We then define  $u_h \in V_h$  to be the solution of the problem,

$$(2) \quad \begin{aligned} (\nabla u_h, \nabla v_h)_{\Omega_h} &= 0, \quad \forall v_h \in V_h^0(\Omega_h), \\ u_h &= I_h b, \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega_h. \end{aligned}$$

Where  $I_h b$  is an interpolant of the form

$$I_h b = \sum_{k=n+1}^{n+m} b_k \phi_k.$$

**Definition 2.1.** *A function  $u_h$  satisfying (2) is said to be discrete harmonic on  $\Omega_h$ .*

We then have the *classical version of the Green's function* for problem (1).

**Definition 2.2.** *Define  $G^z(x)$  to be the solution to the following problem;*

$$(3) \quad \begin{aligned} -\Delta G^z(x) &= \delta^z(x), \quad \text{in } \Omega \\ G^z(x) &= 0, \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{aligned}$$

Here  $z \in \Omega$  is a fixed point and  $\delta^z$  is the delta distribution.

It is well known that a solution  $u$  to Laplace's problem can be represented by Green's function representation. We will then require upper and lower bounds on the Green's function. The proof of the following result for general second order elliptic equations can be found in [10].

**Lemma 2.3.** *Let  $G^z(x)$  denote the Green's function of the Laplace equation on  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ ,  $N \geq 3$ . Then the following estimates hold,*

$$(4a) \quad |G^z(x)| \leq C|x - z|^{2-N},$$

$$(4b) \quad |\nabla_x^\alpha \nabla_z^\beta G^z(x)| \leq C|x - z|^{2-N-|\alpha|-|\beta|}, \quad |\alpha| + |\beta| \geq 1.$$

There also exists a lower bound for the Green's function which can be found in section 7 of [14].

**Lemma 2.4.** *Let  $G^z(x)$  denote the Green's function of the Laplace equation on  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ ,  $N \geq 3$ . Then the following estimate holds for some  $C > 0$ ,*

$$(5) \quad C|x - z|^{2-N} \leq G^z(x).$$

We note that when  $N = 3$  we have the following estimates on  $G^z(x)$ ,

$$(6) \quad C_1|x - z|^{-1} \leq G^z(x) \leq C_2|x - z|^{-1}.$$

The *discrete Green's function*,  $G_h^z(x)$ , is simply the finite element approximation to  $G^z(x)$  and can be defined in the following way.

**Definition 2.5.** *The discrete Green's function with singularity at  $z$  is the function  $G_h^z(x) \in V_h^0(\Omega_h)$  satisfying*

$$(7) \quad (\nabla G_h^z, \nabla v_h)_\Omega = v_h(z), \quad \forall v_h \in V_h^0(\Omega_h).$$

From this definition it is clear to see that  $G_h^z(x)$  is also symmetric by substituting  $v_h$  with  $G_h^x(z)$  as is  $G^z(x)$ .

The Ritz projection of a function  $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$  onto  $V_h^0(\Omega_h)$  defined by

$$(8) \quad (\nabla R_h u, \nabla v_h)_{\Omega_h} = (\nabla u, \nabla v_h)_{\Omega_h}, \quad \forall v_h \in V_h^0(\Omega_h).$$

We will also make use of the discrete Laplace operator.

**Definition 2.6.** *The discrete Laplace operator,  $\Delta_h : V_h^0(\Omega_h) \rightarrow V_h^0(\Omega_h)$ , is defined by*

$$(9) \quad (-\Delta_h v_h, \chi)_\Omega = (\nabla v_h, \nabla \chi)_\Omega, \quad \forall \chi \in V_h^0(\Omega_h).$$

In the analysis we will also need a *regularized Green's function*. To define this we first need a *regularized delta function*.

**Definition 2.7.** *Let  $\tilde{\delta}^z(x) \geq 0$  denote a regularized delta function supported in an element  $\tau_0$  containing  $z$  defined by,*

$$(10) \quad (\tilde{\delta}^z, v_h)_\Omega = (\tilde{\delta}^z, v_h)_{\tau_0} = v_h(z), \quad \forall v_h \in V_h(\Omega_h).$$

For an explicit construction of  $\tilde{\delta}^z$  see [3]. In addition we also have the following estimates for  $\tilde{\delta}^z$ . There exists a constant  $C$  independent of  $z$  such that,

$$(11) \quad \|\tilde{\delta}^z\|_{W_p^s(\tau_0)} \leq Ch^{-s-N(1-\frac{1}{p})}, \quad 1 \leq p \leq \infty, \quad s = 0, 1.$$

Therefore we get in particular;  $\|\tilde{\delta}^z\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq C$ ,  $\|\tilde{\delta}^z\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq Ch^{-\frac{3}{2}}$ , and  $\|\tilde{\delta}^z\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq Ch^{-3}$ .

**Remark 2.8.** *Due to the construction of  $\tilde{\delta}^z$  we have  $\tilde{\delta}^z > 0$  which implies  $\int_{\tau_0} \tilde{\delta}^z dx = 1$ . We will use this observation periodically throughout the analysis. See [3].*

Additionally, defining the  $L^2$  projection of a function  $u \in L^2(\Omega)$  onto  $V_h^0(\Omega_h)$  by,

$$(12) \quad (P_h u, v_h)_\Omega = (u, v_h)_\Omega, \quad \forall v_h \in V_h^0(\Omega_h).$$

Then it has been shown that the  $L^2$  projection of  $\tilde{\delta}^z$  has exponential decay away from  $z$ . The following is Lemma 7.2 in [19].

**Lemma 2.9.** *Given a quasi-uniform triangulation  $\Omega_h$  there exists constants  $C$  and  $c$  such that*

$$(13) \quad |P_h \tilde{\delta}^z(x)| \leq Ch^{-N} e^{-\frac{c|x-z|}{h}}.$$

Using  $\tilde{\delta}^z$ , we are able to define a regularized Green's function.

**Definition 2.10.** *The regularized Green's function,  $\tilde{G}^z(x)$ , is defined by*

$$(14) \quad \begin{aligned} -\Delta \tilde{G}^z &= \tilde{\delta}^z, & \text{in } \Omega \\ \tilde{G}^z &= 0, & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{aligned}$$

Integration by parts gives us an alternative definition for  $\tilde{G}^z$ .

$$(15) \quad (\nabla \tilde{G}^z, \nabla v_h)_\Omega = (\tilde{\delta}^z, v_h)_\Omega = v_h(z), \quad \forall v_h \in V_h^0.$$

We note that  $G_h^z = R_h \tilde{G}^z = R_h G^z$ . This implies that  $G_h^z(x)$  is the finite element approximation of both  $G^z(x)$  and  $\tilde{G}^z(x)$ .

### 3. ESTIMATES FOR THE REGULARIZED GREEN'S FUNCTION

In this section we shall present some results concerning the regularized Green's function. It is important to note that these results are valid for  $N = 3$  only. Some of the results are used in the analysis of the discrete Green's function while others are of independent interest.

Our first lemma shows that  $\tilde{G}^z$  cannot be uniformly bounded in  $h$ .

**Lemma 3.1.** *There exists a constant  $C$  independent of  $h$  and  $z$  such that*

$$(16) \quad (\tilde{G}^z, \tilde{\delta}^z)_\Omega \geq Ch^{-1}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $\tau_0$  be the element such that  $\tilde{\delta}^z$  is supported in. Then by Green's representation, for  $x \in B_z(ch)$ ,  $c > 1$  such that  $B_z(ch) \subset \Omega$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{G}^z(z) &= \int_{\tau_0} G(z, x) \tilde{\delta}^z(x) \, dx \\ &\geq C \int_{\tau_0} |x - z|^{-1} \tilde{\delta}^z(x) \, dx \\ &\geq Ch^{-1} \int_{\tau_0} \tilde{\delta}^z(x) \, dx = Ch^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we get,

$$(\tilde{G}^z, \tilde{\delta}^z)_\Omega = \int_{\tau_0} \tilde{G}^z \tilde{\delta}^z \, dx \geq Ch^{-1} \int_{\tau_0} \tilde{\delta}^z \, dx = Ch^{-1}.$$

□

We now show an upper bound, independent of  $h$ , on the  $L^2$  inner product of  $\tilde{\delta}^z$  and  $\tilde{G}^z$ .

**Lemma 3.2.** *There exists a constant  $C$  independent of  $h$  and  $z$  such that*

$$(17) \quad (\tilde{G}^z, \tilde{\delta}^z)_\Omega \leq Ch^{-1}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $\tau_0$  be the element such that  $\tilde{\delta}^z$  is supported in. Then by Green's representation we have,

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{G}^z(y) &= \int_{\tau_0} G(y, x) \tilde{\delta}^z(x) \, dx \leq C_G \int_{\tau_0} |x - y|^{-1} \tilde{\delta}^z(x) \, dx \\ &\leq C \|\tilde{\delta}^z\|_{L^\infty(\tau_0)} \cdot \int_{\tau_0} |x - y|^{-1} \, dx. \\ &\leq Ch^{-3} \int_{\tau_0} |x - y|^{-1} \, dx \text{ by (11)}.\end{aligned}$$

Now we shall convert to spherical coordinates with  $\rho = |x - y|$  and choose  $c > 1$  such that  $\tau_0 \subset B_{ch}(z)$  to get,

$$\begin{aligned}Ch^{-3} \int_{B_{ch}(z)} |x - y|^{-1} \, dx &= Ch^{-3} \int_0^{ch} \rho^{-1} \rho^2 \, d\rho \\ &\leq Ch^{-1}.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore  $\tilde{G}^z(y) \leq Ch^{-1}$  for  $|x - y| \leq ch$ . Thus,

$$(\tilde{G}^z, \tilde{\delta}^z)_\Omega = \int_{\tau_0} \tilde{G}^z \tilde{\delta}^z \, dx \leq Ch^{-1} \underbrace{\int_{\tau_0} \tilde{\delta}^z \, dx}_{=1} = Ch^{-1}.$$

□

As a result of Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2 we get the following corollary.

**Corollary 3.3.** *There exist constants  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  independent of  $h$  and  $z$  with  $x \in B_{ch}(z)$ ,  $c > 1$  such that  $B_z(ch) \subset \Omega$ , we have*

$$(18) \quad C_1 h^{-1} \leq \tilde{G}^z(x) \leq C_2 h^{-1},$$

and in particular we see,

$$(19) \quad C_1 h^{-1} \leq \tilde{G}^z(z) \leq C_2 h^{-1},$$

The next lemma concerns an upper bound for  $\nabla \tilde{G}^z$  in the  $L^\infty$  norm.

**Lemma 3.4.** *There exists a constant  $C$  independent of  $z$  and  $h$  such that*

$$(20) \quad \|\nabla \tilde{G}^z\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq Ch^{-2}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $y \in \Omega_h$ . We shall observe two cases.

**Case 1:** Let  $c > 1$  and  $y \in \Omega_h \setminus B_{ch}(z)$ .

We appeal to a Green's function representation;

$$\begin{aligned}
 |\nabla \tilde{G}^z(y)| &= \left| \int_{\tau_0} \nabla_y G(y, x) \tilde{\delta}^z(x) \, dx \right| \\
 &\leq \int_{\tau_0} |\nabla_y G(y, x)| |\tilde{\delta}^z(x)| \, dx \\
 &\leq C \int_{\tau_0} |x - y|^{-2} |\tilde{\delta}^z(x)| \, dx \\
 &\leq Ch^{-2} \|\tilde{\delta}^z\|_{L^1(\Omega_h)}, \quad \text{since } |x - y| > ch, \\
 &\leq Ch^{-2}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Where the last line follows from estimate (11). We shall now proceed to case 2.

**Case 2:** Let  $c > 1$  and  $y \in B_{ch}(z)$ .

We again appeal to Green's representation as in case 1 in which we still have,

$$|\nabla \tilde{G}^z(y)| \leq C \int_{\tau_0} |x - y|^{-2} |\tilde{\delta}^z(x)| \, dx.$$

Now we will apply the  $L^\infty$  estimate (11) and the Hölder's inequality to get,

$$\int_{\tau_0} |x - y|^{-2} |\tilde{\delta}^z(x)| \, dx \leq Ch^{-3} \int_{\tau_0} |x - y|^{-2} \, dx.$$

We shall now apply spherical coordinates with  $|x - y| = \rho$  to get,

$$\begin{aligned}
 Ch^{-3} \int_{\tau_0} |x - y|^{-2} \, dx &\leq Ch^{-3} \int_{B_{ch}(z)} |x - y|^{-2} \, dx \\
 &= Ch^{-3} \int_0^{ch} \rho^{-2} \rho^2 \, d\rho \\
 &\leq Ch^{-3} h = Ch^{-2}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Since  $y$  is arbitrary, the result follows. □

Our next result concerns the  $L^1$  norm of the regularized Green's function which requires a different proof technique. The result may be of independent interest, potentially in showing best approximation results.

**Lemma 3.5.** *There exists a constant  $C$  independent of  $h$  and  $z$  such that*

$$(21) \quad \|\nabla \tilde{G}^z\|_{L^1(\Omega_h)} \leq C.$$

*Proof.* We shall proceed using a dyadic decomposition of  $\Omega_h$ . With out loss of generality, assume  $\text{diam}(\Omega_h) \leq 1$ . Then let  $d_j = 2^{-j}$  and

$$\Omega_h = \Omega_* \cup \bigcup_{j=0}^J \Omega_j,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_* &= \{x \in \Omega_h \mid |x - z| \leq Kh\}, \\ \Omega_j &= \{x \in \Omega_h \mid d_{j+1} \leq |x - z| \leq d_j\}, \end{aligned}$$

with  $K$  possibly chosen later and  $J$  such that  $2^{-J} \leq Kh \leq 2^{-J+1}$ . This then gives

$$\|\nabla \tilde{G}^z\|_{L^1(\Omega_h)} \leq \underbrace{\sum_{j=0}^J \|\nabla \tilde{G}^z\|_{L^1(\Omega_j)}}_{(1)} + \underbrace{\|\nabla \tilde{G}^z\|_{L^1(\Omega_*)}}_{(2)}.$$

We will now estimate (1) and (2) individually. For (1) applying the Hölder 's inequality first,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla \tilde{G}^z\|_{L^1(\Omega_j)} &\leq d_j^3 \|\nabla \tilde{G}^z\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_j)} \\ &\leq d_j^3 \int_{\tau_0} C |x - z|^{-2} |\tilde{\delta}^z| \, dx \\ &\leq C d_j^3 d_{j+1}^{-2} \int_{\tau_0} |\tilde{\delta}^z| \, dx \\ &\leq C d_j^3 d_j^{-2} \leq C d_j. \end{aligned}$$

Where the second line follows from Lemma 3.4. Therefore,

$$\sum_{j=0}^J \|\nabla \tilde{G}^z\|_{L^1(\Omega_j)} \leq \sum_{j=0}^J C d_j \leq C.$$

To estimate (2) we again appeal to the Hölder 's inequality and Lemma 3.4 to get,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla \tilde{G}^z\|_{L^1(\Omega_*)} &\leq K^3 h^3 \|\nabla \tilde{G}^z\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_*)} \\ &\leq CK^3 h^3 h^{-2} \\ &\leq Ch. \end{aligned}$$

In fact, as  $h \rightarrow 0$ , we see that  $\|\nabla \tilde{G}^z\|_{L^1(\Omega_*)} \rightarrow 0$ .

□

## 4. ESTIMATES FOR THE DISCRETE GREEN'S FUNCTION

In the analysis we will require the following inverse estimate from Theorem (4.5.11) in [4], for  $v_h \in V_h$ , there exists  $C > 0$  such that

$$(22) \quad \|\nabla v_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq Ch^{-1}\|v_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

Using the regularized Green's function we shall show an estimate for  $G_h^z(z)$  and then give a resulting corollary.

**Lemma 4.1.** *There exists a constant  $C$  independent of  $h$  and  $z$  such that*

$$(23) \quad G_h^z(z) \leq Ch^{-1}.$$

*Proof.* Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} G_h^z(z) &= (G_h^z, \tilde{\delta}^z)_{\Omega_h} \\ &= (\nabla G_h^z, \nabla G_h^z)_{\Omega_h} \\ &= \|\nabla \tilde{G}^z\|_{L^2(\Omega_h)}^2 - \|\nabla \tilde{G}^z\|_{L^2(\Omega_h)}^2 + \|\nabla G_h^z\|_{L^2(\Omega_h)}^2 \\ &= (\tilde{G}^z, \tilde{\delta}^z)_{\Omega_h} + \int_{\Omega_h} (|\nabla G_h^z|^2 - |\nabla \tilde{G}^z|^2) \, dx \\ &= (\tilde{G}^z, \tilde{\delta}^z)_{\Omega_h} - \int_{\Omega_h} (|\nabla \tilde{G}^z|^2 - |\nabla G_h^z|^2) \, dx \\ &= (\tilde{G}^z, \tilde{\delta}^z)_{\Omega_h} - (\nabla(\tilde{G}^z - G_h^z), \nabla(\tilde{G}^z + G_h^z))_{\Omega_h} \\ &= (\tilde{G}^z, \tilde{\delta}^z)_{\Omega_h} - (\nabla(\tilde{G}^z - G_h^z), \nabla \tilde{G}^z)_{\Omega_h} \\ &= (\tilde{G}^z, \tilde{\delta}^z)_{\Omega_h} - (\nabla(\tilde{G}^z - G_h^z), \nabla(\tilde{G}^z - G_h^z))_{\Omega_h} \\ &= (\tilde{G}^z, \tilde{\delta}^z)_{\Omega_h} - \|\nabla(\tilde{G}^z - G_h^z)\|_{L^2(\Omega_h)}^2 \\ &\leq (\tilde{G}^z, \tilde{\delta}^z)_{\Omega_h} = (\tilde{G}^z, \tilde{\delta}^z)_{\tau_0} \\ &\leq Ch^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

We have used the Galerkin orthogonality and Lemma 3.2.  $\square$

We then have a resulting corollary.

**Corollary 4.2.** *There exists a constant  $C$  such that,*

$$(24) \quad \|\nabla G_h^z\|_{L^2(\Omega_h)} \leq \|\nabla \tilde{G}^z\|_{L^2(\Omega_h)} \leq Ch^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

*Proof.* This follows from showing, by Galerkin orthogonality,

$$\int_{\Omega_h} |\nabla G_h^z|^2 - |\nabla \tilde{G}^z|^2 \, dx = -\|\nabla(\tilde{G}^z - G_h^z)\|_{L^2(\Omega_h)}^2 \leq 0.$$

To show that,

$$(25) \quad \|\nabla \tilde{G}^z\|_{L^2(\Omega_h)} \leq Ch^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Observe,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla \tilde{G}^z\|_{L^2(\Omega_h)}^2 &= \int_{\Omega_h} \nabla \tilde{G}^z \cdot \nabla \tilde{G}^z \, dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega_h} \tilde{G}^z \cdot \tilde{\delta}^z \, dx, \quad \text{by (15),} \\ &\leq Ch^{-1}, \quad \text{by (17).} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore the result follows.  $\square$

Next we shall show the discrete Green's function decays exponentially for values away from the singularity.

**Lemma 4.3.** *For  $x \in \Omega$  there exists constants  $C$  and  $c$  independent of  $z$  and  $h$  such that*

$$(26) \quad G_h^z(x) \leq Ch^{-5} e^{-\frac{c|x-z|}{h}}.$$

*Proof.* We shall use the fact that the discrete Laplace operator is bounded as well as estimate (13). First note that by (7), (10), (12), and (9) we have,

$$(27) \quad -\Delta_h G_h^z = P_h \tilde{\delta}^z.$$

Therefore let  $x \in \Omega$  be fixed and arbitrary with associated regularized delta function  $\tilde{\delta}^x$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} G_h^z(x) &= (\tilde{\delta}^x, G_h^z)_{\tau_x} = (-\Delta_h \tilde{\delta}^x, P_h \tilde{\delta}^z)_{\tau_x} \\ &\leq C \|\tilde{\delta}^x\|_{L^1(\tau_x)} \|\Delta_h P_h \tilde{\delta}^z\|_{L^\infty(\tau_x)} \\ &\leq Ch^{-2} \|P_h \tilde{\delta}^z\|_{L^\infty(\tau_x)} \\ &\leq Ch^{-5} e^{-\frac{|x-z|}{h}}. \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

We first note that this result does not give us insight to the positivity of  $G_h^z(x)$ . However, in contrast to Lemma 4.1 we gain a significantly sharper bound on the discrete Green's function for  $x$  outside of a ball around the singularity.

Next, we present an upper bound for the discrete Green's function in the  $W_\infty^1(\Omega)$  norm.

**Lemma 4.4.** *There exists a constant  $C$  independent of  $h$  such that*

$$(28) \quad \|G_h^z\|_{W_\infty^1(\Omega)} \leq Ch^{-2}.$$

*Proof.* We first note that by Theorem 4.5.11 in [4] we have the following,

$$\|G_h^z\|_{W_\infty^1(\Omega)} \leq Ch^{-\frac{3}{2}} \|G_h^z\|_{H^1(\Omega)}.$$

Then since  $G_h^z \in H_0^1(\Omega)$  we have,

$$\|G_h^z\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq C |G_h^z|_{H^1(\Omega)}.$$

Therefore applying Corollary 4.2 we see,

$$\begin{aligned} Ch^{-\frac{3}{2}}|G_h^z|_{H^1(\Omega)} &\leq Ch^{-\frac{3}{2}}\|\nabla\tilde{G}^z\|_{L^2(\Omega_h)} \\ &\leq Ch^{-2}, \end{aligned}$$

and we arrive at the desired result.  $\square$

This result is most notable close to the singularity as it may suggest, due to Lemma 4.1, that the discrete Green's function will have a persistent negative value. Otherwise, this result along with Lemma 4.1 can be thought of as an analog to the upper bounds of the continuous elliptic Green's function since this result implies,

$$\|\nabla G_h^z\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq Ch^{-2}.$$

Additionally, since Corollary 4.2 and Lemma 4.4 give,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla G_h^z\|_{L^2(\Omega)} &\leq Ch^{-\frac{1}{2}} \quad \text{and} \\ \|\nabla G_h^z\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} &\leq Ch^{-2}. \end{aligned}$$

We can apply the interpolation inequality found in [8] to get the following Corollary.

**Corollary 4.5.** *There exists a constant  $C$  independent of  $h$  and  $z$  such that*

$$(29) \quad \|\nabla G_h^z\|_{L^p(\Omega_h)} \leq Ch^{\frac{3}{p}-2}, \quad \text{for } 2 \leq p \leq \infty.$$

## 5. ON THE POSITIVITY OF THE DISCRETE GREEN'S FUNCTION IN 3D

It is well known that the classical Green's function for (4) is positive. However, the discrete Green's function arising from the finite element method is not as straightforward. For  $N = 2$ , Drăgănescu, et al. [7], provided a counterexample showing on general meshes the discrete Green's function may have a persistent negative value. For these meshes, the negative value and the singularity were both an  $O(h)$  away from the boundary of the mesh. Later for  $N = 2$ , Leykekhman and Pruitt [13], showed on a quasi-uniform, shape regular mesh of a polygonal domain, that if the singularity is of  $O(1)$  away from the boundary the discrete Green's function must eventually be non-negative. With the help of a solution representation using the discrete Green's function they were then able to show the non-negativity of discrete harmonic functions which then led to the establishment of a discrete Harnack type inequality. In this section we will work towards showing the positivity of the discrete Green's function in three dimensions.

Positivity at the singularity is a simple consequence of Definition 2.5. By choosing  $v_h = G_h^z$  we see that,

$$G_h^z(z) = (\nabla G_h^z, \nabla G_h^z)_\Omega = |G_h^z|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 > 0.$$

Considering the estimate (6) for the classical Green's function one would expect that  $G_h^z(z) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $h \rightarrow 0$ . In fact, in Section 5 of [7], it was conjectured that,

$$G_h^z(z) = O(h^{2-N}) \quad \forall z \text{ (up to the boundary)}.$$

We shall show that this holds for  $N = 3$ , however, the proof can be easily adapted for  $N > 3$ .

**Theorem 5.1.** *There exists a constant  $C$  independent of  $h$  and  $z$  such that*

$$(30) \quad G_h^z(z) \geq Ch^{-1}.$$

*Proof.* We again note that by (7), (10), (12), and (9) we have,

$$(31) \quad -\Delta_h G_h^z = P_h \tilde{\delta}^z,$$

where  $-\Delta_h$  is the discrete Laplace operator. Since for all  $v_h \in V_h^0(\Omega_h)$  we have,

$$(-\Delta_h G_h^z, v_h)_\Omega = \underbrace{(\nabla G_h^z, \nabla v_h)_\Omega}_{=v_h(z)} = (\tilde{\delta}^z, v_h)_\Omega = (P_h \tilde{\delta}^z, v_h)_\Omega.$$

Now, for all  $v_h \in V_h^0$  we have by the Poincaré's inequality,

$$(32) \quad C_1(v_h, v_h)_\Omega \leq (\nabla v_h, \nabla v_h)_\Omega = (-\Delta_h v_h, v_h)_\Omega.$$

In addition, the inverse estimate (22) gives,

$$(33) \quad (-\Delta_h v_h, v_h)_\Omega = (\nabla v_h, \nabla v_h)_\Omega \leq C_2 h^{-2}(v_h, v_h)_\Omega.$$

Combining (32) and (33) we see that,

$$C_1 \leq \frac{(v_h, -\Delta_h v_h)_\Omega}{(v_h, v_h)_\Omega} \leq C_2 h^{-2}.$$

This then implies the following estimate which holds by Lemma A.1, given in the appendix with proof,

$$(34) \quad C_2^{-1} h^2 \leq \frac{(v_h, (-\Delta_h)^{-1} v_h)_\Omega}{(v_h, v_h)_\Omega} \leq C_1^{-1}.$$

Now by (31) and (34) we have,

$$\begin{aligned} G_h^z(z) &= (\tilde{\delta}^z, G_h^z)_\Omega \\ &= (P_h \tilde{\delta}^z, G_h^z)_\Omega \\ &= (P_h \tilde{\delta}^z, (-\Delta_h)^{-1} P_h \tilde{\delta}^z)_\Omega \\ &\geq Ch^2 \|P_h \tilde{\delta}^z\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Here the key step is to apply the  $L^2$ -projection to  $\tilde{\delta}^z$  in order to project our regularized delta function onto  $V_h^0(\Omega)$ .

Therefore it remains to show  $\|P_h \tilde{\delta}^z\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \geq Ch^{-3}$ . Indeed, by (12),

$$\|P_h \tilde{\delta}^z\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 = (P_h \tilde{\delta}^z, P_h \tilde{\delta}^z)_\Omega = (P_h \tilde{\delta}^z, \tilde{\delta}^z)_\Omega = P_h \tilde{\delta}^z(z),$$

where  $P_h \tilde{\delta}^z(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i \phi_i(x)$  by definition of  $P_h \tilde{\delta}^z \in V_h^0(\Omega_h)$  using the nodal basis. Now for  $z = x_k$ ,  $x_k$  an interior node, we get,  $P_h \tilde{\delta}^{x_k}(x_k) = \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i \phi_i(x_k) = \gamma_k$ . In addition, for  $j = 1, \dots, n$  we have,

$$(P_h \tilde{\delta}^{x_k}, \phi_j)_\Omega = (\tilde{\delta}^{x_k}, \phi_j)_\Omega = \phi_j(x_k) = \delta_{kj},$$

and therefore we get,

$$(P_h \tilde{\delta}^{x_k}, \phi_j)_\Omega = \left( \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i \phi_i(x), \phi_j \right)_\Omega = \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i (\phi_i, \phi_j)_\Omega = \delta_{kj}, \quad j = 1, \dots, n.$$

Interpreting the system as a matrix equation,

$$M \vec{\gamma} = \vec{e}_k,$$

where  $M$  is the *Mass matrix* with entries  $M_{ij} = (\phi_i, \phi_j)_\Omega$ ,  $\vec{\gamma}^\top = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n)^\top$ , and  $\vec{e}_k^\top = (0, \dots, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0)^\top$  with 1 in the  $k^{\text{th}}$  position. Which then implies,

$$(35) \quad \gamma_k = \vec{e}_k^\top \vec{\gamma} = \vec{e}_k^\top M^{-1} \vec{e}_k.$$

Now by properties of the Mass matrix for finite elements in three dimensions, see for example, Rannacher [16] (page 121), there exists constants  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  independent of  $h$  such that for any  $\vec{v} \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{\vec{0}\}$ ,

$$c_1 h^3 \leq \frac{\vec{v}^\top M \vec{v}}{\vec{v}^\top \vec{v}} \leq c_2 h^3.$$

Therefore by Lemma A.1 we see,

$$(36) \quad c_2^{-1} h^{-3} \leq \frac{\vec{v}^\top M^{-1} \vec{v}}{\vec{v}^\top \vec{v}} \leq c_1^{-1} h^{-3}.$$

Thus, choosing  $\vec{v} = \vec{e}_k$  and substituting (35) into (36) we have shown  $\|P_h \tilde{\delta}^z\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \geq Ch^{-3}$  and the result follows.  $\square$

We shall now show that the discrete Green's function is positive away from the singularity. The proof technique used will give us insight into the scaling of  $G_h^z$ .

**Theorem 5.2.** *Assume for some constant  $K$  that  $|x - z| \geq Kh^{\frac{1}{2}}$ . Then  $G_h^z(x) > 0$ .*

*Proof.* We know using (10) that,

$$\begin{aligned} G_h^z(x) &= (G_h^z, \tilde{\delta}^x)_{\tau_x} \\ &= \underbrace{(G_h^z - G^z, \tilde{\delta}^x)_{\tau_x}}_{I_1} + \underbrace{(G^z, \tilde{\delta}^x)_{\tau_x}}_{I_2}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\tau_x$  is the element containing the support of  $\tilde{\delta}^x$ . Clearly  $I_2$  is positive due to the properties of  $G^z$  and  $\tilde{\delta}^x$ , however, we can find a lower bound for  $I_2$ . Observe,

$$\begin{aligned} (G^z, \tilde{\delta}^x)_{\tau_x} &= \int_{\tau_x} G^z(y) \cdot \tilde{\delta}^x(y) \, dy \\ &\geq C \int_{\tau_x} |x-y|^{-1} \cdot \tilde{\delta}^x(y) \, dy, \quad \text{by (5)} \\ &\geq C(|z-x|+h)^{-1} \int_{\tau_x} \tilde{\delta}^x(y) \, dy, \quad \text{since } |x-y| \leq ch \\ &\geq C|z-x|^{-1} > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Now we shall show that  $I_1 \rightarrow 0$  as  $h \rightarrow 0$ , therefore showing  $G_h^z(x) \approx C|z-x|^{-1}$  when  $|x-z| \geq Kh^{\frac{1}{2}}$ , showing that the behavior of  $G_h^z(x)$  is consistent with the classical Green's function. Indeed, we will use Theorem 6.1 where  $K$  is the constant  $C_7$  in estimate (6.3) in [18] which states: if  $|x-z| \geq Kh$ , then

$$(37) \quad |G_h^z(x) - G^z(x)| \leq \frac{Ch^2 \ln\left(\frac{|x-z|}{h}\right)}{|x-z|^3}.$$

Adopting the notation  $\omega = \frac{|x-z|}{h}$  and using the assumption (37) becomes,

$$(38) \quad \begin{aligned} |G_h^z(x) - G^z(x)| &\leq \frac{C \ln(\omega) \omega^{-2}}{|x-z|} \\ &\leq \frac{C \ln(\omega) \omega^{-2}}{Kh^{\frac{1}{2}}}. \end{aligned}$$

Additionally  $\omega \geq Kh^{-\frac{1}{2}}$  and observe that  $\ln(\omega)\omega^{-2}$  is decreasing for  $\omega \geq \sqrt{e}$ . Therefore it's maximum must occur at the left endpoint of  $\omega \geq Kh^{-\frac{1}{2}}$  for  $h$  small enough. Now (38) becomes,

$$\begin{aligned} |G_h^z(x) - G^z(x)| &\leq \frac{C \ln(\omega) \omega^{-2}}{Kh^{\frac{1}{2}}} \\ &\leq \frac{C \ln(Kh^{-\frac{1}{2}}) K^{-2} h}{Kh^{\frac{1}{2}}} \\ &\leq C \ln(Kh^{-\frac{1}{2}}) h^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $C \ln(Kh^{-\frac{1}{2}}) h^{\frac{1}{2}} \rightarrow 0$  as  $h \rightarrow 0$ . Thus,  $G_h^z(x) > 0$ . □

## 6. NUMERICAL RESULTS

In this section we shall provide numerical results concerning the positivity of  $G_h^z(x)$ . The results were obtained using the MATLAB package iFEM [6] developed by L. Chen.

The first mesh we consider is a cube positioned at the nodes  $\{(-1,-1,-1), (-1,-1,1), (-1,1,1), (1,-1,-1), (1,1,-1), (-1,1,-1), (1,-1,1), (1,1,1)\}$  with the singularity at  $z = (-0.75,-0.75,-0.75)$ . The initial triangulation is Delaunay.




FIGURE 1. First triangulation of the cubic domain.

We apply a uniform refinement algorithm which subdivides each tetrahedron into 8 smaller and similar “sub-tetrahedrons” of equal volume. To retain shape regularity of the mesh we calculate the lengths of the three interior diagonals of the octahedron and subdivide through the shortest diagonal.




FIGURE 2. Uniform refinement of a single tetrahedron across shortest diagonal.

The result of this mesh refinement scheme are shown below. We observe a consistent negative value for the discrete Green’s function. Additionally, after the third refinement, we see the number of nodes increases by an approximate factor of 8 and we should have  $G_h^z$  increase by an approximate factor of 2.

No. Nodes	No. Elements	$\min_{x \in \Omega_h} G_h^z(x)$	$\max_{x \in \Omega_h} G_h^z(x)$
35	96	-0.00279777	0.148468
189	768	-0.0252328	0.366708
1241	6144	-0.0144661	0.841241
9009	49152	-0.00116218	1.84198
68705	393216	-0.00249823	3.88512
536769	3.14573e+06	-0.000698242	7.99231

TABLE 1. Discrete Green's function values using uniform refinement across shortest diagonal.

We are now motivated to investigate local refinement around the singularity. For the second mesh, we shall again consider a cube positioned at the nodes  $\{(-1,-1,-1), (-1,-1,1), (-1,1,1), (1,-1,-1), (1,1,-1), (-1,1,-1), (1,-1,1), (1,1,1)\}$  with the singularity at  $z = (-0.75, -0.75, -0.75)$ . Except we would like to refine locally around the singularity. In this case, we also add in the nodes  $\{(-.74,-.74,-.74), (-.74,-.74,-.76), (-.74,-.76,-.76), (-.76,-.74,-.76), (-.76,-.76,-.74), (-.74,-.76,-.74), (-.76,-.74,-.74), (-.76,-.76,-.76)\}$  to generate the initial mesh. We again use a uniform refinement scheme across the shortest diagonal to obtain the following results.

No. Nodes	No. Elements	$\min_{x \in \Omega_h} G_h^z(x)$	$\max_{x \in \Omega_h} G_h^z(x)$
87	384	0	25
581	3072	-0.000515941	58.7273
4329	24576	-0.00000412	130.022
33617	196608	-0.00275881	273.436
265377	1.57286e+06	-0.00138705	566.92
2.10976e+06	1.25829e+07	-0.00102935	1139.63

TABLE 2. Discrete Green's function values using local and uniform refinement across shortest diagonal.

As we can see, in each case  $|\min_{x \in \Omega_h} G_h^z(x)|$  begins to eventually decrease which may give rise to potential mesh restrictions that will guarantee positivity. One could, for example, require that the stiffness matrix  $A$  be a  $M$ -matrix. This would automatically imply positivity of the discrete Green's function. However, in three dimensions, this is quite restrictive to the triangulation. We are interested in being able to describe weaker mesh restrictions that guarantee positivity.

## 7. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we have established some sharp pointwise bounds on the discrete Green's function. In particular we showed that in three dimensions

the discrete Green's function cannot be uniformly bounded in  $h$  at the singularity. Furthermore, we show that away from the singularity the discrete Green's function is positive and decays exponentially to the boundary. We also prove analogous results for the discrete Green's function showing similarities to the continuous Green's function. Numerically, we show that on an a convex domain with sufficiently smooth boundary on an unstructured mesh the discrete Green's function has persistent negative values. The results are summarized in the following table.

Let $x \in \Omega_h$	Results for $G_h^z(x)$
$x = z$	$G_h^z(z) \geq Ch^{-1}$
$x \in \Omega_h \setminus B_{Kh\frac{1}{2}}(z)$	$G_h^z(x) \geq C x - z ^{-1}$
$x \in B_{Kh\frac{1}{2}}(z)$	$G_h^z(x) < 0^*$

TABLE 3. Summary of results for the discrete Green's function. \*Numerical Result.

Additionally we establish  $L^p$  estimates for the gradient of both the discrete and regularized Green's function for  $2 \leq p \leq \infty$ . Furthermore, we prove a  $L^1$  estimate for  $\nabla \tilde{G}^z$ . At this time we suspect a similar result can be shown for  $G_h^z$ . Additionally, establishing a lower bound for  $\nabla G_h^z$  close to the singularity is an immediate priority. We believe these results could be used in establishing best approximation results in optimal control problems.

Going forward our goal is to theoretically establish the existence of a persistent negative value for the discrete Green's function in three dimensions on unstructured meshes. We are also interested in providing a constructive mesh for which negativity occurs as well as detailing weaker mesh restrictions that give positivity. Finally, another direction for investigation may include the extension of the Harnack inequality to the inhomogeneous case and to parabolic or more general elliptic equations on non-smooth domains.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to thank Prof. Dmitriy Leykekhman for the many valuable discussions and support throughout the preparation of this paper.

APPENDIX A. MISCELLANEOUS PROOFS

In the paper *Variational Bounds on the Entries of a Inverse Matrix* [17] the authors conclude the following result, which was critical in the proof of Theorem 5.1 so we felt as though it were important to include a proof of the result.

**Lemma A.1.** *Assume  $\vec{v} \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{\vec{0}\}$  and the matrix  $A$  is symmetric. Then the following inequalities are equivalent.*

$$(39) \quad \beta \leq \frac{\vec{v}^\top A \vec{v}}{\vec{v}^\top \vec{v}} \leq \alpha \iff \frac{1}{\alpha} \leq \frac{\vec{v}^\top A^{-1} \vec{v}}{\vec{v}^\top \vec{v}} \leq \frac{1}{\beta}.$$

*Proof.* We shall start with the left hand result and show it is equivalent to the right hand side. The reverse implication follows immediately. That is, assume

$$\beta \leq \frac{\vec{v}^\top A \vec{v}}{\vec{v}^\top \vec{v}} \leq \alpha,$$

holds for all  $\vec{v} \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{\vec{0}\}$ . Then the result also holds for  $A^{-\frac{1}{2}} \vec{v}$ . Therefore by the symmetry of  $A$  we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \beta \leq \frac{(A^{-\frac{1}{2}} \vec{v})^\top A A^{-\frac{1}{2}} \vec{v}}{(A^{-\frac{1}{2}} \vec{v})^\top A^{-\frac{1}{2}} \vec{v}} \leq \alpha &\implies \beta \leq \frac{\vec{v}^\top A^{-\frac{1}{2}} A^{\frac{1}{2}} \vec{v}}{(A^{-\frac{1}{2}} \vec{v})^\top A^{-\frac{1}{2}} \vec{v}} \leq \alpha \\ &\implies \beta \leq \frac{\vec{v}^\top A^{-\frac{1}{2}} A^{\frac{1}{2}} \vec{v}}{\vec{v}^\top A^{-\frac{1}{2}} A^{-\frac{1}{2}} \vec{v}} \leq \alpha \\ &\implies \beta \leq \frac{\vec{v}^\top \vec{v}}{\vec{v}^\top A^{-1} \vec{v}} \leq \alpha \\ &\implies \frac{1}{\alpha} \leq \frac{\vec{v}^\top A^{-1} \vec{v}}{\vec{v}^\top \vec{v}} \leq \frac{1}{\beta}. \end{aligned}$$

□

## REFERENCES

- [1] N. E. AGUILERA AND L. A. CAFFARELLI, *Regularity results for discrete solutions of second order elliptic problems in the finite element method*, *Calcolo*, 23 (1986), pp. 327–353 (1987).
- [2] R. F. BASS AND M. GORDINA, *Harnack inequalities in infinite dimensions*, *J. Funct. Anal.*, 263 (2012), pp. 3707–3740.
- [3] S. BERTOLUZZA, A. DECOENE, L. LACOUTURE, AND S. MARTIN, *Local error estimates of the finite element method for an elliptic problem with a Dirac source term*, *Numer. Methods Partial Differential Equations*, 34 (2018), pp. 97–120.
- [4] S. C. BRENNER AND L. R. SCOTT, *The mathematical theory of finite element methods*, vol. 15 of *Texts in Applied Mathematics*, Springer, New York, third ed., 2008.
- [5] M. CERENZIA AND L. SALOFF-COSTE, *Discrete/continuous elliptic Harnack inequality and kernel estimates for functions of the Laplacian on a graph*, *New York J. Math.*, 19 (2013), pp. 487–509.
- [6] L. CHEN, *ifem: An integrated finite element method package in matlab*, 2009.
- [7] A. DRĂGĂNESCU, T. F. DUPONT, AND L. R. SCOTT, *Failure of the discrete maximum principle for an elliptic finite element problem*, *Math. Comp.*, 74 (2005), pp. 1–23.
- [8] L. C. EVANS, *Partial differential equations*, vol. 19 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, second ed., 2010.
- [9] A. HARNACK, *Über die mit Ecken behafteten Schwingungen gespannter Saiten*, *Math. Ann.*, 29 (1887), pp. 486–499.
- [10] J. P. KRASOVSKIĬ, *Properties of Green's functions and generalized solutions of elliptic boundary value problems*, *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat.*, 33 (1969), pp. 109–137.

- [11] N. V. KRYLOV AND M. V. SAFONOV, *A property of the solutions of parabolic equations with measurable coefficients*, *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat.*, 44 (1980), pp. 161–175, 239.
- [12] G. F. LAWLER, *Estimates for differences and Harnack inequality for difference operators coming from random walks with symmetric, spatially inhomogeneous, increments*, *Proc. London Math. Soc.* (3), 63 (1991), pp. 552–568.
- [13] D. LEYKEKHMAN AND M. PRUITT, *On the positivity of discrete harmonic functions and the discrete Harnack inequality for piecewise linear finite elements*, *Math. Comp.*, 86 (2017), pp. 1127–1145.
- [14] W. LITTMAN, G. STAMPACCHIA, AND H. F. WEINBERGER, *Regular points for elliptic equations with discontinuous coefficients*, *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci.* (3), 17 (1963), pp. 43–77.
- [15] J. MOSER, *On Harnack's theorem for elliptic differential equations*, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 14 (1961), pp. 577–591.
- [16] R. RANNACHER, *Numerische Mathematik 2 (Numerik Partieller Differentialgleichungen)*, 2008.
- [17] P. D. ROBINSON AND A. J. WATHEN, *Variational bounds on the entries of the inverse of a matrix*, *IMA J. Numer. Anal.*, 12 (1992), pp. 463–486.
- [18] A. H. SCHATZ AND L. B. WAHLBIN, *Interior maximum norm estimates for finite element methods*, *Math. Comp.*, 31 (1977), pp. 414–442.
- [19] L. B. WAHLBIN, *Local behavior in finite element methods*, in *Handbook of numerical analysis, Vol. II*, *Handb. Numer. Anal.*, II, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1991, pp. 353–522.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, BRIDGEWATER STATE UNIVERSITY, BRIDGEWATER, MA 02325, USA.

*Email address:* `andrew.miller@bridgew.edu`