

SOLVING THE UNIQUE CONTINUATION PROBLEM FOR SCHRÖDINGER EQUATIONS WITH LOW REGULARITY SOLUTIONS USING A STABILIZED FINITE ELEMENT METHOD

ERIK BURMAN, MINGFEI LU, AND LAURI OKSANEN

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we consider the unique continuation problem for the Schrödinger equations. We prove a Hölder type conditional stability estimate and build up a parameterized stabilized finite element scheme adaptive to the *a priori* knowledge of the solution, achieving error estimates in interior domains with convergence up to continuous stability. The approximability of the scheme to solutions with only H^1 -regularity is studied and the convergence rate for solutions with regularity higher than H^1 is also shown. Comparisons in terms of different parameterization for different regularities will be illustrated with respect to the convergence and condition numbers of the linear systems. Finally, numerical experiments will be given to illustrate the theory.

1. INTRODUCTION

We will consider the **Unique Continuation Problem** for Schrödinger equations

$$-\Delta u + Pu = f,$$

and develop a stabilized finite element method to solve it numerically. Similar work for Poisson's equation can be found in [3, 4], and that for Helmholtz equation in [5]. These works can be seen as developments of the quasi-reversibility method introduced in [1] where numerical stability and Tikhonov regularization have been separated in order to allow for error estimates using conditional stability. In particular in [1] the convergence for vanishing regularization was proven assuming only that the solution is in $H^1(\Omega)$ for unperturbed data. The analysis of [3–5] typically requires stronger regularity assumptions in order to show that the numerical method has a convergence order. However the instability of the problem excludes the extension of their analysis of the method to the low regularity case, even in the absence of perturbations. The objective of the present work is to show how to design the stabilized methods so that low regularity can be handled in a similar fashion, reflecting the conditional stability and the approximation of the finite element space in the regularity class of the exact solution. Observe that the design of the method requires *a priori* knowledge of this regularity to obtain the best convergence rate. Let us also point out that similar estimates combining conditional stability and approximation have recently been obtained in [8].

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary .

The mathematical formulation of the unique continuation problem for Schrödinger equations is as follows: $\omega \subset \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be domains. Let $P \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ be the potential. Find $u \in H^1(\Omega)$, such that

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta u + Pu &= f & \text{in } \Omega \\ u &= q & \text{in } \omega \end{cases}.$$

It is shown, in Chapter 2, that if the solution exists then it is unique. However, since such unique continuation problem has been shown to be ill-posed, in terms of continuity, we can at most expect a conditional stability estimate that reads:

$$\|u\|_{H^1(B)} \leq C(P)(\|-\Delta u + Pu\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|u\|_{L^2(\omega)})^\kappa (\|u\|_{H^1(\Omega)})^{1-\kappa},$$

for $B \setminus \omega \subset \subset \Omega$. When $B \setminus \omega$ touches the boundary, the best estimate we could achieve is a logarithmic estimate, see [15]. In this paper, we will focus on the former case, i.e. the area of interest $\overline{B \setminus \omega} \subset \Omega$.

Our aim is to build a stabilized finite element method to solve (1.1) computationally. Observe that with the least a priori knowledge $u \in H^1(\Omega)$ we will only be able to show that the scheme converges weakly in both L^2 and H^1 norms without a convergence rate. However such low regularity can be a result from three different reasons:

1. low regularity of the right hand side f ;
2. low regularity of the geometry Ω ;
3. low regularity of the unknown boundary data.

Let us first assume that the unknown boundary data are smooth and that Ω is a convex polygonal. If only the right hand side has low regularity, $f \in H^{-1}(\Omega)$ we can decompose the solution into a singular part $u_s \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, solution to

$$(1.2) \quad -\Delta u_s + Pu_s = f \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

and $u_r \in H^r(\Omega)$ with $r \geq 2$ such that $u_r = q - u_s$ in ω , and

$$(1.3) \quad -\Delta u_r + Pu_r = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

Clearly in this situation we can solve (1.2) using the standard finite element method with piece-wise affine elements, leading to the error estimate

$$(1.4) \quad \|u_s - u_{h,s}\|_\Omega \leq Ch\|f\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)}.$$

Since u_r is smooth we can apply the primal-dual stabilised method (see Chapter 3), with elements of polynomial degree less than or equal to p , to obtain the optimal approximation $u_{h,r}$ satisfying

$$\|u_r - u_{h,r}\|_B \leq C(P)h^{\kappa t}\|u_r\|_{H^{t+1}(\Omega)},$$

where $t = \min\{p, r-1\}$, $B \subset \subset \Omega$ and $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ a coefficient depending on the distance from the boundary of B to the boundary of Ω . As this distance goes to zero, so does κ .

It follows that in the special case where the only cause of poor regularity is the right hand side f , we can still obtain an error estimate for $u_h = u_{h,s} + u_{h,r}$,

$$\|u - u_h\|_B \lesssim h\|f\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)} + h^{\kappa t}\|u_r\|_{H^{t+1}(\Omega)}.$$

Hence for unperturbed data it is possible to achieve up to first order convergence in spite of the singular right hand side. Of course these arguments do not work for the second and third points above. If Ω is not smooth enough then the estimate (1.4) fails due to lack of stability of the adjoint equation and if the boundary data has insufficient smoothness then $u_r \in H^r(\Omega)$ can not hold with $r \geq 2$. The objective of the present work is to propose an error analysis that is valid for all sources of low regularity. We will follow a standard optimization approach by optimizing the stabilized Lagrange functional $L_h(u_h, z_h)$ at the discrete level, namely,

$$L_h(u_h, z_h) := \frac{1}{2} \|u_h - q\|_{\omega}^2 + \text{Primal stabilizer} - \text{Dual stabilizer} \\ + a(u_h, z_h) - \langle f, z_h \rangle_{\Omega}.$$

The stabilization method combines tools known from finite element methods to ensure a discrete inf-sup condition and Tikhonov type regularization, see, for example [11, Chapter 5]. Similar type of approaches have been used in [5, 6]. The main differences between this paper and [5, 6] are that we build up a parameterized approach adaptive to the prior knowledge for the smoothness of the exact solution u , for $u \in H^1(\Omega)$ or $u \in H^s(\Omega)$, with $s > 1$. The main results are that for $u \in H^1(\Omega)$, we prove our scheme converges weakly, with error estimates on residual quantities only,

$$\|u_h - q\|_{L^2(\omega)} \leq Ch^{\alpha} \|u\|_{H^1(\Omega)},$$

and

$$\|\mathcal{L}u_h - f\|_{H^{-2}(\Omega)} \leq C(h + h^{\frac{\tau}{2}}) \|u\|_{H^1(\Omega)},$$

where $0 < \alpha \leq 1, 0 < \tau \leq 2$ are parameters we will use in the scheme. Moreover, for $u \in H^s(\Omega)$ with $s > 1$ (s may be fractional), we will show that our scheme has a convergence matching the approximation order of the finite element space and the conditional stability estimate, namely,

$$\|u - u_h\|_{H^1(B)} \leq C(P) h^{\kappa(s-1)} \|u\|_{H^s(\Omega)}.$$

2. CONTINUOUS STABILITY ESTIMATE

Our stabilized finite element method relies on several conditional stability estimates at the continuous level. The layout of needed estimates follows [5] for Helmholtz equations. We will state similar estimates for Schrödinger equations that we are interested in. These estimates are based on the following well known Carleman estimate:

Lemma 2.1 (Carleman estimate). *let $\rho \in C^3(\Omega)$ and $K \subset \Omega$ be a compact subset and contains no critical point of ρ . Let $\alpha > 0$ and $\phi = e^{\alpha\rho}$. Then for some large α there exists $\tau_0 \geq 1$ and $C > 0$ depending on α and ρ , such that for all $\tau \geq \tau_0$ and $w \in C_0^2(K)$,*

$$\int_K e^{2\tau\phi} (\tau |\nabla w|^2 + \tau^3 |w|^2) dx \leq C \int_K e^{2\tau\phi} |\Delta w|^2 dx.$$

Proof. See [17, Corollary 2.3]. □

Now we give a lemma optimizing exponential parameters and use it to derive three Hölder type continuous stability estimates with optimized parameters, the first one is the estimate for H^1 -norm in the H^2 space, the second one is the estimate

for H^1 -norm in the H^1 -space, and the last one is for L^2 -norm in the H^1 space. The latter two estimates can be used in showing convergence of the stabilized finite element method, and their proof will be based on the first estimate.

Lemma 2.2. *Suppose that A, B, D, c be positive numbers and $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ satisfying $D \leq B$ and $D \leq e^{c(1-\kappa)\lambda}A + e^{-c\kappa\lambda}B$ for all $\lambda \geq \lambda_0 > 0$. Then for any ϵ positive and small there exists constant C depending on c, ϵ such that*

$$D \leq e^{C\kappa^{1-\epsilon}(\lambda_0+1)}A^\kappa B^{1-\kappa}.$$

Proof. See [16, Lemma 5.2]. □

Using Lemma 2.2, we will be able to prove the following estimate.

Corollary 2.3 (Three-ball inequality). *Let $x_0 \in \Omega$ and $0 < r_1 < r_2 < d(x_0, \partial\Omega)$. Define $B_j = B(x_0, r_j)$, $j = 1, 2$. Then there exists $C > 0$ and $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ depending only on Ω , such that for $u \in H^2(\Omega)$ and any small ϵ it holds that:*

$$\|u\|_{H^1(B_2)} \leq \exp(C\kappa^{1-\epsilon}(\|P\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^{\frac{2}{3}} + 1))(\|u\|_{H^1(B_1)} + \|-\Delta u + Pu\|_{L^2(\Omega)})^\kappa \|u\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^{1-\kappa}.$$

Proof. See Appendix A □

Remark 2.4. Note that for simplicity, we only proved in Corollary 2.3 the estimate holds for this specific geometry, say, $B_1 \subset B_2 \subset \Omega$, but actually it can hold for a larger class of geometric settings. Let such a geometry be $\omega \subset B \subset \Omega$.

Corollary 2.5 (Unique continuation property). *Assume problem (1.1) has a solution, and the conditional stability estimate in Corollary 2.3 holds for any B such that $\omega \subset B \subset \Omega$. Then the solution is unique.*

Proof. Let u, v be two different solutions to (1.1), consider the difference $w = u - v$, we have

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta w + Pw &= 0 & \text{in } \Omega \\ u &= 0 & \text{in } \omega \end{cases}.$$

By the estimate in Corollary 2.3, the right hand side vanishes, and thus the conclusion follows. □

Note also that in Corollary 2.3, u is required to be $H^2(\Omega)$ because $\|-\Delta u + Pu\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ is used on the right-hand side. We want to generalize the estimate to make it hold for all $H^1(\Omega)$ functions.

Corollary 2.6. *Let $B_1 \subset B_2 \subset \Omega$ be defined as in Corollary 2.3. Let $u \in H^1(\Omega)$. Then the following estimate holds*

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{H^1(B_2)} &\leq C(P)(\|u\|_{L^2(B_1)} + \|-\Delta u + Pu\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)})^\kappa \\ &\quad \cdot (\|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|-\Delta u + Pu\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)})^{1-\kappa} \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, if $P \geq 0$ on Ω , then $C(P)$ is the same as that in Corollary 2.3.

Proof. See Appendix B. □

In Corollary 2.6 we derive a conditional stability estimate for $u \in H^1(\Omega)$. Now we give another bound for $\|u\|_{L^2(B_2)}$, $\forall u \in H^1(\Omega)$.

Corollary 2.7. *Let the geometric setting be the same as in Corollary 2.3. Then there exists $C > 0$ and $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ depending only on Ω , such that for $u \in H^1(\Omega)$ and any small ϵ it holds that:*

$$\|u\|_{L^2(B_2)} \leq C(P) (\|u\|_{L^2(B_1)} + \|-\Delta u + Pu\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)})^\kappa \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{1-\kappa},$$

where $C(P) = \exp\left(C\kappa^{1-\epsilon}(\|P\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^{\frac{2}{3}} + 1)\right)$.

Proof. See Appendix C. □

Note that by shifting $H^1(\Omega)$ norm to $L^2(\Omega)$ norm, we get an exact constant depending on P but win nothing in the order of κ . This means the L^2 -norm error in our finite element method generally doesn't give a higher order of convergence than the H^1 -norm error.

3. STABILIZED FINITE ELEMENT METHOD

In this section we propose a stabilized H^1 -conforming finite element method for problem (1.1), with priori knowledge that $u \in H^s(\Omega)$, $\forall s \geq 1$. We will first form an equivalent optimization problem, then stabilize the optimization problem at the discrete level. Then we show that the method gives an convergence rates up to the conditional stability. We will also discuss the stability of the discrete system and give precision thresholds.

Lagrange optimization problem. In this part we derive the equivalent optimization problem to problem (1.1) and give some useful propositions we will use repeatedly. From now on, we will make some simplifications on notations. Let $(\cdot, \cdot)_U, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_U$ denote the L^2 and H^1 inner product on some domain U , respectively. Let $\mathcal{L}$ be the elliptic operator $-\Delta + P$, and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_U$ be the $H^{-1}(U) - H_0^1(U)$ pair.

Proposition 3.1. *Let problem (1.1) have a unique solution, then $u \in H^1(\Omega)$ solves problem (1.1) iff u solves*

$$(3.1) \quad \min_{u \in H^1(\Omega)} \frac{1}{2} \|u - q\|_\omega^2 \quad \text{subject to} \quad a(u, w) = \langle f, w \rangle_\Omega, \quad \forall w \in H_0^1(\Omega)$$

Now we construct the Lagrange functional for the optimization problem (3.1) with the PDE constraint. Let

$$L(u, z) := \frac{1}{2} \|u - q\|_\omega^2 + a(u, z) - \langle f, z \rangle_\Omega, \quad (u, z) \in H^1(\Omega) \times H_0^1(\Omega),$$

where $z \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ acts as a Lagrange multiplier. The corresponding Euler-Lagrange equation reads:

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{cases} 0 = \partial_u L v = (u - q)_\omega + a(v, z) \\ 0 = \partial_z L w = a(u, w) - \langle f, w \rangle_\Omega \end{cases} \quad \forall (v, w) \in H^1(\Omega) \times H_0^1(\Omega).$$

The continuous problem is clearly ill-posed because the equivalent PDE problem is ill-posed. Instead of regularizing the problem at this stage we will transfer the functional optimization problem to the discrete level and then discuss the stabilization method.

Finite element settings. From now on we will consider for simplicity that $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \in \{2, 3\}$, is a convex polygonal/polyhedral domain. Let $\{\mathcal{T}_h\}_{h>0}$ be a quasi-uniform family of shape-regular meshes covering Ω , each triangulation $\mathcal{T}_h$

containing elements K with maximal diameter h . Let $p \geq 1$ denote the polynomial degree of approximation and let $\mathbb{P}_p(K)$ be the space of polynomials of degree at most p defined on K . Let the H^1 -conforming finite element space

$$V_h^p := \{v_h \in H^1(\Omega) : v_h|_K \in \mathbb{P}_p(K), \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h\}$$

and its subspace with homogeneous boundary conditions

$$W_h^p := V_h^p \cap H_0^1(\Omega).$$

Moreover, define also $V_h^0 := \{v_h \in L^2(\Omega) : v_h|_K = C_K \in \mathbb{R}, \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h\}$ be the space of piece-wise constant functions.

The corresponding discrete problem will be the restriction of (u, z) on $V_h^p \times W_h^p$. One can consider the Lagrange functional

$$L_h^{\text{singular}}(u_h, z_h) := \frac{1}{2} h^{-2\alpha} \|u_h - q\|_\omega^2 + a(u_h, z_h) - \langle f, z_h \rangle_\Omega, \quad (u_h, z_h) \in V_h^p \times W_h^p,$$

where $h^{-2\alpha}$ is the mesh-specific weighting term between interior difference $u_h - q$ and the PDE constraint. We will specify the choice of α later.

Finding saddle points of the above Lagrange functional may still produce a singular linear system. Thus we introduce primal and dual stabilizers, which are bi-linear forms on V_h^p and W_h^p , $s_h(\cdot, \cdot)$ and $s_h^*(\cdot, \cdot)$, and a complimentary term $G(\cdot, \cdot)$ to keep consistency. Now introduce the stabilized Lagrange functional:

$$\begin{aligned} L_h(u_h, z_h) := & \frac{1}{2} h^{-2\alpha} \|u_h - q\|_\omega^2 + \frac{1}{2} s_h(u_h, u_h) \\ & - \frac{1}{2} s_h^*(z_h, z_h) + a(u_h, z_h) - \langle f, z_h \rangle_\Omega + G(f, u_h). \end{aligned}$$

Then the corresponding Euler-Lagrange equations read: for any $(v_h, w_h) \in V_h^p \times W_h^p$,

$$\begin{cases} 0 = \partial_{u_h} L_h v_h = h^{-2\alpha} (u_h - q)_\omega + s_h(u_h, v_h) + a(v_h, z_h) + G(f, v_h) \\ 0 = \partial_{z_h} L_h w_h = a(u_h, w_h) - s_h^*(z_h, w_h) - \langle f, w_h \rangle_\Omega, \end{cases}$$

and the stabilized finite element method reads: find $(u_h, z_h) \in V_h^p \times W_h^p$, such that $\forall (v_h, w_h) \in V_h^p \times W_h^p$,

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{cases} h^{-2\alpha} (u_h, v_h)_\omega + s_h(u_h, v_h) + a(v_h, z_h) &= h^{-2\alpha} (q, v_h)_\omega + G(f, v_h) \\ a(u_h, w_h) - s_h^*(z_h, w_h) &= \langle f, w_h \rangle_\Omega \end{cases}.$$

Stabilization. Now let us introduce our choice of stabilizers. Let $\mathcal{L}_h$ be the discrete Shrödinger operator, namely, $\forall v_h \in V_h^p$,

$$\mathcal{L}_h v_h := \sum_K (-\Delta + P) v_h|_K.$$

For a given mesh $\mathcal{T}_h$, we consider the set of all interior(relative to Ω) edges/faces of elements, denoted by $\mathcal{F}_i$, and the jump function on each edge/face F by $[[\cdot]]_F$, omitting its subscript whenever there is no confusion. For $v_h \in V_h^p$, we denote the jump function of its normal gradient across $F \in \mathcal{F}_i$ by

$$[[\nabla v_h \cdot n]]_F := \nabla v_h \cdot n_1|_{K_1} + \nabla v_h \cdot n_2|_{K_2},$$

with $K_1, K_2 \in \mathcal{T}$ being two elements such that $K_1 \cap K_2 = F$, and n_1, n_2 the outward pointing normals with respect to K_1 and K_2 . Note that for $v \in H^2(\Omega)$, $[\![\nabla v \cdot n]\!]_F = 0$ is well defined. $\forall v_h \in V_h^p$, define

$$\mathcal{J}_h(u_h, v_h) = \sum_F \int_F h [\![\nabla v_h \cdot n]\!] \cdot [\![\nabla v_h \cdot n]\!]_F dS.$$

Now define $s_h : V_h^p \times V_h^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$(3.4) \quad s_h(u_h, v_h) := \mathcal{J}_h(u_h, v_h) + h^2(\mathcal{L}_h u_h, \mathcal{L}_h v_h)_\Omega + h^{2(s-1)} \langle u_h, v_h \rangle_\Omega,$$

$s_\eta^*(z_h, w_h) : W_h^p \times W_h^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$(3.5) \quad s_\eta^*(z_h, w_h) := h^{2\eta} \mathcal{J}_h(z_h, w_h) + h^{2\eta} \int_{\partial\Omega} h \partial_n z_h \partial_n w_h dS + h^{2\eta} (h \mathcal{L}_h z_h, h \mathcal{L}_h w_h),$$

and s_h^* by

$$(3.6) \quad s_h^*(z_h, w_h) := s_\eta^*(z_h, w_h) + h^\tau \langle z_h, w_h \rangle_\Omega,$$

where $h^{2\eta}$ and h^τ is the weights with respect to s_η^* and $\langle z_h, w_h \rangle_\Omega$ in s_h^* .

Now we define the consistency term $G(f, v_h)$. Let f_h be the projection from $H^{-1}(\Omega)$ to W_h^p such that for any $w_h \in W_h^p$,

$$\langle f, w_h \rangle_\Omega = (f_h, w_h)_\Omega.$$

Specifically, if $f \in L^2(\Omega)$, we have

$$(f_h, f_h)_\Omega = (f, f_h)_\Omega \leq \|f\|_\Omega \|f_h\|_\Omega,$$

which gives

$$(3.7) \quad \|f_h\|_\Omega \leq \|f\|_\Omega.$$

Define $G : H^{-1}(\Omega) \times V_h^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$(3.8) \quad G(f, v_h) = h^2 (f_h, \mathcal{L}_h v_h)_\Omega.$$

Inverse and trace inequalities. Now we give some useful inequalities and approximation results (see, for example, [9]), and then introduce our exact choice of stabilizers.

(1) Continuous trace inequality.

$$(3.9) \quad \|v\|_{\partial K} \leq C(h^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|v\|_K + h^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla v\|_K), \quad \forall v \in H^1(K).$$

(2) Discrete trace inequality.

$$(3.10) \quad \|\nabla v_h \cdot n\|_{\partial K} \leq C h^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla v_h\|_K, \quad \forall v_h \in \mathbb{P}_p(K).$$

(3) Inverse inequality.

$$(3.11) \quad \|\nabla v_h\|_K \leq C h^{-1} \|v_h\|_K, \quad \forall v_h \in \mathbb{P}_p(K).$$

Interpolation. We now give interpolants we will use repeatedly.

(1) The Scott-Zhang operator $\pi_{sz} : H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Omega) \rightarrow V_h^p$. It keeps homogeneous boundary condition and has the optimal approximation property, see [7]:

$$\|v - \pi_{sz}v\|_{H^m(\mathcal{T}_h)} \leq Ch^{s-m}|v|_{H^s(\Omega)},$$

whenever $v \in H^s(\Omega)$ with $\frac{1}{2} < s \leq p+1$ and $m \in \{0 : [s]\}$.

(2) L^2 -projection $\pi_0 : L^2 \rightarrow V_h^0$. It has local optimal approximation property, see [13, Theorem 18.16]:

$$\|v - \pi_0v\|_K \leq Ch^s|v|_{H^s(K)},$$

whenever $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$, $v \in H^s(K)$ with $0 \leq s \leq 1$. Note that V_h^0 is not H^1 -conforming.

(3) H^1 -conforming L^2 -projection $\pi_h : L^2 \rightarrow V_h^p$ with $p \geq 1$. It is the best approximation in the L^2 -norm, and thus it has optimal approximation property in L^2 -norm

$$\|v - \pi_hv\|_{\Omega} \leq Ch^s|v|_{H^s(\Omega)},$$

whenever $v \in H^s(\Omega)$ with $0 \leq s \leq p+1$.

Properties of the stabilized system. We first show that $\mathcal{J}_h(v_h, v_h)$ and $h^2(\mathcal{L}_h v_h, \mathcal{L}_h v_h)_{\Omega} - G(f_h, v_h)$ are weakly consistent.

Proposition 3.2. *Let π_{sz} be the Scott-Zhang operator and $v \in H^s(\Omega)$ for $s \geq 1$. Then there is a constant C such that*

$$\mathcal{J}_h(\pi_{sz}v, \pi_{sz}v) \leq Ch^{2(s-1)}\|v\|_{H^s(\Omega)}^2.$$

Moreover, if $s < 2$ we have

$$\|h\mathcal{L}_h(\pi_{sz}v)\|_{\Omega} \leq C(1 + h\|P\|_{L^\infty})h^{s-1}\|v\|_{H^s(\Omega)},$$

and if $s \geq 2$, we have

$$\|h\mathcal{L}_h(\pi_{sz}v - v)\|_{\Omega} \leq C(1 + h^2\|P\|_{L^\infty})h^{s-1}\|v\|_{H^s(\Omega)}.$$

Proof. Step 1. We give the estimate for the jump of gradients. Let π_h^n be the product of n π_h acting component-wise on $(L^2(\Omega))^n$. Since the range of π_h is in $H^1(\Omega)$, $[\pi_h w] = 0$ for all $w \in L^2(\Omega)$. This gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_h(\pi_{sz}v, \pi_{sz}v) &= \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_i} \int_F h[(\nabla \pi_{sz}v - \pi_h^n \nabla \pi_{sz}v) \cdot n]_F [(\nabla \pi_{sz}v - \pi_h^n \nabla \pi_{sz}v) \cdot n]_F dS \\ &\leq C \sum_K \|\nabla \pi_{sz}v - \pi_h^n \nabla \pi_{sz}v_h\|_K^2 \\ &\leq C(\|\nabla(\pi_{sz}v - v)\|_{\Omega}^2 + \|\nabla v - \pi_h^n \nabla v\|_{\Omega}^2 + \|\pi_h^n \nabla(v - \pi_{sz}v)\|_{\Omega}^2) \\ &\leq Ch^{2(s-1)}\|v\|_{H^s(\Omega)}^2 \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality is from (3.9), (3.11) and the third inequality is from the H^1 optimal approximation property of π_{sz} and the L^2 optimal approximation property of π_h^n .

Step 2. Now we only need to give the estimate for $\|h\mathcal{L}_h(\pi_{sz}v)\|_{\Omega}$ when $1 \leq s < 2$, since when $s \geq 2$ the estimate is given immediately by the optimal approximation

property of π_{sz} . Let π_0^n be the product of n π_0 , and $\nabla \cdot \pi_0^n \nabla i_h v = 0$ since π_0 maps a function to piece-wise constants. Let Δ_h be the element-wise Laplacian, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|h\Delta_h \pi_{sz} v\|_\Omega &= \left(\sum_K \|h \nabla \cdot \nabla \pi_{sz} v\|_K^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&= \left(\sum_K \|h \nabla \cdot (\nabla \pi_{sz} v - \pi_0^n \nabla \pi_{sz} v)\|_K^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq C \left(\sum_K \|\nabla \pi_{sz} v - \pi_0^n \nabla \pi_{sz} v\|_K^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq C \left(\sum_K (\|\nabla(\pi_{sz} v - v)\|_K^2 + \|\nabla v - \pi_0^n \nabla v\|_K^2 + \|\pi_0^n \nabla(v - \pi_{sz} v)\|_K^2) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq Ch^{s-1} \|v\|_{H^s(\Omega)},
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality is from (3.11), the third inequality is from optimal approximation property of π_{sz} and local optimal approximation property of π_0 , and the last equality is from the summability of H^1 functions. The estimate for $\|h\mathcal{L}_h(\pi_{sz} v)\|_\Omega$ is then obtained by adding the potential term. $\square$

Now we show that the discrete problem is well-posed. Let

$$(3.12) \quad |||(v_h, w_h)|||^2 = h^{-2\alpha}(v_h, v_h)_\omega + s_h(v_h, v_h) + s_h^*(w_h, w_h).$$

Define the discrete bilinear form

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.13) \quad A[(u_h, z_h), (v_h, w_h)] &:= h^{-2\alpha}(u_h, v_h)_\omega + s_h(u_h, v_h) + a(v_h, z_h) \\
&\quad + a(u_h, w_h) - s_h^*(z_h, w_h).
\end{aligned}$$

Proposition 3.3. *Linear system (3.3) is well-posed. In fact, the following inf-sup condition holds*

$$\sup_{(v_h, w_h) \in V_h^p \times W_h^p} \frac{A_h[(u_h, z_h), (v_h, w_h)]}{|||(v_h, w_h)|||} \geq |||(u_h, z_h)|||.$$

Proof. Let $v_h = u_h$, $w_h = -z_h$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
A_h[(u_h, z_h), (u_h, -z_h)] &= h^{-2\alpha} \|u_h\|_\omega^2 + s_h(u_h, u_h) + s_h^*(z_h, z_h) \\
&= |||(u_h, z_h)|||^2.
\end{aligned}$$

$\square$

Proposition 3.3 gives the stability of the linear system, now we give an upper bound of the stabilizers.

Proposition 3.4. *Let $[(u_h, z_h), (v_h, w_h)] \in [V_h^p \times W_h^p]^2$, $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$ and η, τ non-negative. We have the following bound*

$$s_h(u_h, v_h) + s_h^*(z_h, w_h) \leq C(P) (\|u_h\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \|v_h\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \|z_h\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \|w_h\|_{H^1(\Omega)}),$$

where $C(P) = C(1 + h^2 \|P\|_{L^\infty}^2)$.

Proof. Consider each component of s_h . First we have by (3.9) and (3.11)

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.14) \quad \mathcal{J}_h(u_h, v_h) &\leq C \sum_K (h \|u_h\|_{H^2(K)} + \|u_h\|_{H^1(K)}) (h \|v_h\|_{H^2(K)} + \|v_h\|_{H^1(K)}) \\
&\leq C \|u_h\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \|v_h\|_{H^1(\Omega)}
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly for the second component we also have

$$(3.15) \quad h^2(\mathcal{L}_h u_h, \mathcal{L}_h v_h)_\Omega \leq C(1 + h^2 \|P\|_{L^\infty}^2) \|u_h\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \|v_h\|_{H^1(\Omega)}.$$

Since $W_h^p \subset V_h^p$, we have by (3.14) and (3.15)

$$(3.16) \quad h^{2\eta} \mathcal{J}_h(z_h, w_h) \leq C h^{2\eta} \|z_h\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \|w_h\|_{H^1(\Omega)},$$

and

$$(3.17) \quad h^{2\eta} (h \mathcal{L}_h z_h, h \mathcal{L}_h w_h)_\Omega \leq C(1 + h^2 \|P\|_{L^\infty}^2) h^{2\eta} \|z_h\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \|w_h\|_{H^1(\Omega)}.$$

Again, by (3.10), we have

$$(3.18) \quad h^{2\eta} \int_{\partial\Omega} h \partial_n z_h \partial_n w_h dS \leq C h^{2\eta} \|z_h\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \|w_h\|_{H^1(\Omega)},$$

and by Cauchy–Schwarz inequality,

$$(3.19) \quad h^\tau (\nabla z_h, \nabla w_h)_\Omega \leq h^\tau \|z_h\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \|w_h\|_{H^1(\Omega)}.$$

Combining (3.14), (3.15), (3.16), (3.17), (3.18) and (3.19), we have the desired estimate. $\square$

4. STABILITY AND ERROR ANALYSIS

In this section we discuss the error and stability estimate for the stabilized scheme (3.3). This will be separated into two cases: $u \in H^s(\Omega)$ for $1 \leq s < 2$ and $s \geq 2$.

4.1. Convergence analysis for solutions with low regularity. In this part we assume $u \in H^s(\Omega)$ with $1 \leq s < 2$ and $f \in H^{-1}(\Omega)$. Then we prove the solution of (3.3) converges in this case. Our aim is to show the discrete solution has an optimal estimate $\|u_h - u\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \lesssim h^{s-1} \|u\|_{H^s(\Omega)}$. First, we show the stabilizing term $s_h(\pi_{sz} u, v_h) - G(f, v_h)$ is bounded by $\|u\|_{H^s(\Omega)}$ and $\|v_h\|$.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $u \in H^s(\Omega)$ with $1 \leq s < 2$. $\pi_{sz} u$ be the Scott-Zhang interpolant of u on V_h^p . Then $\forall v_h \in V_h^p$, we have for some constant C such that*

$$s_h(\pi_{sz} u, v_h) - G(f, v_h) \leq C(1 + h \|P\|_{L^\infty}) h^{s-1} \|u\|_{H^s(\Omega)} \cdot \|v_h\|$$

Proof. First we have

$$s_h(\pi_{sz} u, v_h) = \mathcal{J}_h(\pi_{sz} u, v_h) + h^{2(s-1)} \langle \pi_{sz} u, v_h \rangle_\Omega + h^2 (\mathcal{L}_h \pi_{sz} u, \mathcal{L}_h v_h)_\Omega.$$

by Proposition 3.2, we have

$$\mathcal{J}_h(\pi_{sz} u, v_h) \leq C h^{s-1} \|u\|_{H^s(\Omega)} (\mathcal{J}_h(v_h, v_h))^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} h^2 (\mathcal{L}_h \pi_{sz} u, \mathcal{L}_h v_h)_\Omega &\leq \|h \mathcal{L}_h \pi_{sz} u\|_\Omega \|h \mathcal{L}_h v_h\|_\Omega \\ &\leq C(1 + h \|P\|_{L^\infty}) h^{s-1} \|u\|_{H^s(\Omega)} \|h \mathcal{L}_h v_h\|_\Omega. \end{aligned}$$

Now since

$$G(f, v_h) = h^2 (f_h, \mathcal{L}_h v_h)_\Omega \leq \|h f_h\|_\Omega \|h \mathcal{L}_h v_h\|_\Omega,$$

we only need to estimate $\|hf_h\|_\Omega$. Recall that $f_h \in W_h^p$, we have $\forall w_h \in W_h^p$

$$\begin{aligned}
 h(f_h, w_h) &= ha(u, w_h) \\
 &= h \int_\Omega \nabla(u - \pi_{sz}u)w_h + P(u - \pi_{sz}u)w_h dx \\
 &\quad + h \int_\Omega \nabla \pi_{sz}u \cdot \nabla w_h + P\pi_{sz}uw_h dx \\
 &\leq C(1 + h^2\|P\|_{L^\infty})h^{s-1}\|u\|_{H^s(\Omega)}\|w_h\|_\Omega \\
 &\quad + h \sum_F \int_F \llbracket \nabla \pi_{sz}u \cdot n \rrbracket w_h dS + h(\mathcal{L}_h \pi_{sz}u, w_h)_\Omega \\
 &\leq C(1 + h\|P\|_{L^\infty})h^{s-1}\|u\|_{H^s(\Omega)}\|w_h\|_\Omega,
 \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality is due to optimal approximation property of Scott-Zhang interpolant and the second inequality is obtained by Proposition 3.2 and applying discrete trace inequality (3.10). Finally by the definition of $\|v_h\|$ we obtain the desired result. $\square$

Now we give the second lemma which gives an estimate for the difference between $\pi_{sz}u$ and the discrete solution u_h under $\|v_h\|$ norm.

Lemma 4.2. *Let (u_h, z_h) be the solution to (3.3), $u \in H^s(\Omega)$ with $1 \leq s < 2$ be the exact weak solution to the continuous problem, $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$ and $\eta\tau = 0$. Then there exists some constant C , such that*

$$\|(u_h - \pi_{sz}u, z_h)\| \leq C(1 + h\|P\|_{L^\infty})h^{s-1}\|u\|_{H^s(\Omega)}.$$

Proof. We have from the inf – sup condition that we only need to bound

$$A[(u_h - \pi_{sz}u, z_h), (v_h, z_h)] \leq Ch^{s-1}\|u\|_{H^s(\Omega)}\|(v_h, w_h)\|.$$

Now we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.1) \quad A[(u_h - \pi_{sz}u, z_h), (v_h, w_h)] &= h^{-2\alpha}(u - \pi_{sz}u, v_h)_\omega \\
 &\quad + a(u - \pi_{sz}u, w_h) - s(\pi_{sz}u, v_h) + G(f, v_h).
 \end{aligned}$$

For the first term, we have

$$(4.2) \quad h^{-2\alpha}(u - \pi_{sz}u, v_h)_\omega \leq Ch^{s+1-\alpha}\|u\|_{H^s(\Omega)}h^{-\alpha}\|v_h\|_\omega.$$

The second and third term are bounded according to Lemma 4.1, and for the last term in (4.1), if $\eta = 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.3) \quad a(u - \pi_{sz}u, w_h) &= \int_\Omega \nabla(u - \pi_{sz}u) \cdot \nabla w_h dx + \int_\Omega P(u - \pi_{sz}u)w_h dx \\
 &\leq \sum_F \int_F (u - \pi_{sz}u) \llbracket \nabla w_h \cdot n \rrbracket dS \\
 &\quad + \int_{\partial\Omega} (u - \pi_{sz}u) \partial_n w_h dS + (u - \pi_{sz}u, \mathcal{L}_h w_h)_\Omega \\
 &\leq C\|u - \pi_{sz}u\|_{H^1(\Omega)}(s^*(w_h, w_h))^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
 &\leq Ch^{s-1}\|u\|_{H^s(\Omega)}(s^*(w_h, w_h))^{\frac{1}{2}},
 \end{aligned}$$

where the second estimate is by (3.9) and the third estimate is by the optimal convergence property of the Scott-Zhang interpolant. If instead, $\tau = 0$, then by the optimal convergence property of Scott-Zhang interpolant again we have

$$\begin{aligned} a(u - \pi_{sz}u, w_h) &\leq C(1 + h\|P\|_{L^\infty})h^{s-1}\|u\|_{H^s(\Omega)}\|w_h\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \\ &\leq C(1 + h\|P\|_{L^\infty})h^{s-1}\|u\|_{H^s(\Omega)}(s^*(w_h, w_h))^{\frac{1}{2}} \end{aligned}$$

Then by combining the estimates for each term, we conclude that the estimate in the lemma holds. $\square$

From Lemma 4.2 we can get the boundedness of the discrete solution u_h .

Corollary 4.3. *Let $u \in H^s(\Omega)$ with $1 \leq s < 2$, then*

$$\|u_h\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq C(1 + h\|P\|_{L^\infty})\|u\|_{H^s(\Omega)},$$

and

$$h^{\frac{\tau}{2}}\|z_h\|_{\Omega} \leq C(1 + h\|P\|_{L^\infty})h^{s-1}\|u\|_{H^s(\Omega)}.$$

Proof. Since

$$\begin{aligned} \|u - u_h\|_{H^1(\Omega)} &\leq \|u - \pi_{sz}u\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \|\pi_{sz}u - u_h\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \\ &\leq \|u\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + h^{-(s-1)}\|(\pi_{sz}u - u_h, 0)\| \\ &\leq C(1 + h\|P\|_{L^\infty})\|u\|_{H^s(\Omega)}, \end{aligned}$$

we have $\|u_h\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq C(1 + h\|P\|_{L^\infty})\|u\|_{H^s(\Omega)}$. Similarly, we have

$$h^{\frac{\tau}{2}}\|z_h\|_{\Omega} \leq \|(\pi_{sz}u - u_h, 0)\| \leq C(1 + h\|P\|_{L^\infty})h^{s-1}\|u\|_{H^s(\Omega)}.$$

$\square$

Now we derive the weak convergence theorem for system (3.3) with $u \in H^1(\Omega)$ and optimal convergence for $u \in H^s(\Omega)$ when $1 \leq s < 2$ separately.

Theorem 4.4. *Let $u \in H^1(\Omega)$, $s = 1$, $0 < \alpha \leq 1$, $\eta = 0$, and $\tau > 0$. Then the stabilized finite element approximation u_h has a subsequence converging weakly to u and we have the following estimate:*

- (1) $\|u_h - q\|_{\omega} \leq Ch^\alpha\|u\|_{H^1(\Omega)}$,
- (2) $\|\mathcal{L}u_h - f\|_{H^{-2}(\Omega)} \leq C(h + h^{\frac{\tau}{2}})\|u\|_{H^1(\Omega)}$, where C is some constant depending on the potential P .

Proof. It is shown in Corollary 4.3 that $\|u_h\|_{H^1(\Omega)}$ is bounded, so u_h has a subsequence, still denoted by u_h , such that $u_h \rightharpoonup v$ for some $v \in H^1(\Omega)$. We want to show for any $w \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$, v satisfies

$$(v, w)_\omega = (u, w)_\omega \quad \text{and} \quad a(v, w) = a(u, w),$$

and the uniqueness of the continuous problem to show the weak convergence of u_h to u . Recall that the discrete system reads

$$\begin{cases} h^{-2\alpha}(u_h, v_h)_\omega + s_h(u_h, v_h) + a(v_h, z_h) &= h^{2\alpha}(q, v_h)_\omega \\ a(u_h, w_h) - s_h^*(z_h, w_h) &= \langle f, w_h \rangle_\Omega \end{cases}, \quad \forall (v_h, w_h) \in V_h \times W_h.$$

First, we estimate the residual $a(u_h - u, w)$. Let w_h be the Scott-Zhang interpolant of w we have $a(u_h - u, w) = a(u_h - u, w - w_h) + a(u_h - u, w_h)$. For the second term, we have

$$\begin{aligned} a(u_h - u, w_h) &= s^*(z_h, w_h) \\ &\leq (s_h^*(z_h, z_h))^{\frac{1}{2}} (s_h^*(w_h, w_h))^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C \|u\|_{H^1(\Omega)} (\mathcal{J}_h(w_h, w_h) + \int_{\partial\Omega} h \partial_n w_h \partial_n w_h dS \\ &\quad + h^2 (\mathcal{L}_h w_h, \mathcal{L}_h w_h)_\Omega + h^\tau \|w_h\|_{H^1(\Omega)})^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C(h + h^{\frac{\tau}{2}}) \|u\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \|w\|_{H^2(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that we use the fact that the Scott-Zhang operator is bounded with respect to the H^2 -norm in the last inequality. For the first term, we have

$$a(u_h - u, w - w_h) \leq C \|u_h - u\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \|w - w_h\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq Ch \|u\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \|w\|_{H^2(\Omega)}.$$

Now for $(u_h - u, w)_\omega$, we have

$$h^{-2\alpha} (u_h - \pi_{sz} u, w)_\omega \leq |||(u - \pi_{sz} u, 0)||| \cdot \|h^{-\alpha} w\|_\omega \leq Ch^{-\alpha} \|u\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \|w\|_\omega,$$

and

$$(u - \pi_{sz} u, w)_\omega \leq Ch \|u\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \|w\|_\omega,$$

which gives

$$(u_h - u, w)_\omega \leq C(h + h^\alpha) \|u\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \|w\|_\omega.$$

□

Notice that we derived a weak convergence result from Theorem 4.4 without specifying α , and τ . However, different parameters may infect the condition number of the discrete system and the convergence rate with respect to $\|u_h - q\|_\omega$ and $\|\mathcal{L}u_h - f\|_{H^{-2}(\Omega)}$ as indicated in Theorem 4.4.

Theorem 4.5. *Given that all parameters satisfying conditions in Theorem 4.4, denote the convergence rate of $\|\mathcal{L}u_h - f\|_{H^{-2}(\Omega)}$ with $\lambda = \frac{\tau}{2} \leq 1$, i.e.*

$$\|\mathcal{L}u_h - f\|_{H^{-2}(\Omega)} \leq Ch^\lambda \|u\|_{H^1(\Omega)}.$$

Then, the discrete equations (3.3) has a condition number

$$\mathcal{K} = \frac{C(P)}{h^{2\lambda+2}}.$$

Proof. First, we notice that α does not affect the condition number with conditions in Theorem 4.4 because the largest singular value is bounded by $\mathcal{J}_h$, which is $\frac{1}{h^2}$. Thus we set $\alpha = 1$ to gain an optimal convergence rate for $\|u_h - u\|_\omega$. In this case, the largest singular value is $\frac{C(P)}{h^2}$ by the same argument as in Proposition 3.4. The smallest singular value is obtained by letting $(v_h, w_h) = (u_h, -z_h)$. We have

$$A[(u_h, z_h), (u_h, -z_h)] = h^{-\alpha} (u_h, u_h)_\omega + s_h(u_h, u_h) + s_h^*(z_h, z_h) \geq Ch^\tau \|(u_h, z_h)\|_\Omega^2,$$

by Poincaré inequality. In this case $\mathcal{K} = C(P)h^{-(2\lambda+2)}$.

□

Now we derive an optimal convergence for the scheme with prior knowledge that $u \in H^s(\Omega)$ with $1 < s < 2$.

Lemma 4.6. *Let $u \in H^s(\Omega)$ with $1 < s < 2$, $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$. τ and η are non-negative and $\eta\tau = 0$. Then the H^{-1} residual converges in optimal sense. That is to say, for $w \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, define r by $\langle r, w \rangle = a(u - u_h, w)$, then we have the estimate*

$$\|u_h - u\|_\omega + \|r\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)} \leq C(1 + h\|P\|_{L^\infty})h^{s-1}\|u\|_{H^s(\Omega)}.$$

Proof. First we bound $\|u_h - u\|_\omega$. We have from Lemma 4.2

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_h - u\|_\omega &\leq \|u_h - \pi_{sz}u\|_\omega + \|u - \pi_{sz}u\|_\omega \\ (4.4) \quad &\lesssim h^{-\alpha}|||(u_h - \pi_{sz}u, 0)||| + h^s\|u\|_{H^s(\Omega)} \\ &\leq C(1 + h\|P\|_{L^\infty})h^{s-\alpha}\|u\|_{H^s(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

Now for the residual, let w_h be the Scott-Zhang interpolant of w , then we have

$$a(u_h - u, w) = a(u_h - u, w_h) + a(u_h - \pi_{sz}u, w - w_h) + a(\pi_{sz}u - u, w - w_h).$$

We bound the three terms separately. First we have

$$\begin{aligned} (4.5) \quad a(u_h - u, w_h) &= s_h^*(z_h, w_h) \leq C|||(0, z_h)||| \cdot |||(0, w_h)||| \\ &\leq C(1 + h\|P\|_{L^\infty})|||(0, z_h)||| \cdot \|w\|_{H^1(\Omega)}, \end{aligned}$$

due to the boundedness of $||| \cdot |||$ in Proposition 3.4 and the boundedness of Scott-Zhang operator. Then, for $a(u_h - \pi_{sz}u, w - w_h)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (4.6) \quad a(u_h - \pi_{sz}u, w - w_h) &= \int_\Omega \nabla(u_h - \pi_{sz}u) \cdot \nabla(w - w_h)dx \\ &\quad + (P(u_h - \pi_{sz}u), w - w_h)_\Omega \\ &= \sum_K \int_K (-\Delta + P)(u_{sz} - \pi_h u)(w - w_h)dx \\ &\quad + \sum_F \int_F \llbracket \nabla(u_h - \pi_{sz}u) \cdot n \rrbracket (w - w_h)dS \\ &\leq C\|h\mathcal{L}_h(u_h - \pi_{sz}u)\|_\Omega \|h^{-1}(w - w_h)\|_\Omega \\ &\quad + (\mathcal{J}_h(u_h - \pi_{sz}u, u_h - \pi_{sz}u))^{\frac{1}{2}}\|w\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \\ &\leq C|||(u_h - \pi_{sz}u, 0)||| \cdot \|w\|_{H^1(\Omega)}, \end{aligned}$$

and for $a(u - \pi_{sz}u, w - w_h)$, we have

$$(4.7) \quad a(u - \pi_{sz}u, w - w_h) \leq C(1 + h^2\|P\|_{L^\infty})h^{s-1}\|u\|_{H^s(\Omega)}\|w\|_{H^1(\Omega)}.$$

By combining (4.4), (4.6), (4.5), (4.7) we get the desired result. $\square$

Theorem 4.7. *Let $u \in H^s(\Omega)$ and (u_h, z_h) be the solutions to system (3.3). Let $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$, $\eta\tau = 0$ and both non-negative. Let B be a region satisfying estimate in Corollary 2.6 and Corollary 2.7; κ, ϵ be the parameters therein. Then*

$$\|u - u_h\|_{H^1(B)} \leq C(P)h^{\kappa(s-1)}\|u\|_{H^s(\Omega)}$$

and

$$\|u - u_h\|_B \leq \exp\left(C\kappa^{1-\epsilon}(\|P\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^{\frac{2}{3}} + 1)\right)h^{\kappa(s-1)}\|u\|_{H^s(\Omega)},$$

Proof. From conditional stability result we have for $u - u_h$, we have

$$\|u - u_h\|_{H^1(B)} \leq C(P)(\|u - u_h\|_\omega + \|r\|_{H^{-1}})^\kappa(\|u - u_h\|_\Omega + \|r\|_{H^{-1}})^{1-\kappa}.$$

Note that from Lemma 4.6, $\|u - u_h\|_\omega$ and $\|r\|_{H^{-1}}$ converge optimally. Bounding

$$\begin{aligned} \|u - u_h\|_\Omega &\leq Ch^{-(s-1)} \|(u - u_h, z_h)\| \\ &\leq C(1 + h\|P\|_{L^\infty}) \|u\|_{H^s(\Omega)}, \end{aligned}$$

we obtain that

$$\|u - u_h\|_{H^1(B)} \leq C(P) h^{\kappa(s-1)} \|u\|_{H^s(\Omega)}.$$

Repeat the procedure we can also obtain the second estimate for L^2 -norm on B . $\square$

4.2. Optimal convergence for solutions with higher regularity. In this part we assume u enjoys higher regularity s , namely, $u \in H^s(\Omega)$ for some $s \geq 2$, and $f \in H^{s-2}(\Omega)$. In this case, we may assume P has a higher regularity $P \in W^{s-2,\infty}(\Omega)$. The discrete system (3.3) then reads:

$$(4.8) \quad \begin{cases} h^{-2\alpha}(u_h, v_h)_\omega + s_h(u_h, v_h) + a(v_h, z_h) &= h^{-2\alpha}(\tilde{q}, v_h)_\omega + (h\tilde{f}_h, h\mathcal{L}_h v_h) \\ a(u_h, w_h) - s_h^*(z_h, w_h) &= (\tilde{f}_h, w_h)_\Omega \end{cases},$$

where $u_h \in V_h^p$ and $w_h \in W_h^p$ are finite element spaces with $p+1 \geq s$. In this session, we will consider the convergence result with perturbed data (at the discrete level), namely

$$(4.9) \quad \tilde{f}_h = f_h + \delta f, \quad \tilde{q} = q + \delta q,$$

where $\delta f, \delta q \in L^2(\Omega)$.

First we give a stability estimate of the linear system in terms of its condition number.

Proposition 4.8. *Let $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$, $\eta \geq 0$, and $0 \leq \tau \leq 2(s-1)$. Then the linear system (4.8) has a Euclidean condition number*

$$\mathcal{K}_2 = C(1 + h^2\|P\|_{L^\infty})h^{-2s}.$$

Proof. Let A be as defined in (3.13). First We have for $\phi_h, \psi_h \in V_h^p$ or W_h^p ,

$$a(\phi_h, \psi_h) \leq \frac{C(1 + h^2\|P\|_{L^\infty}^2)}{h^2} \|\phi_h\|_\Omega \|\psi_h\|_\Omega,$$

by (3.11). Then from Proposition 3.4 we know that

$$\sup_{\substack{(u_h, z_h) \in V_h^p \times W_h^p \\ (v_h, w_h) \in V_h^p \times W_h^p}} \frac{A_h[(u_h, z_h), (v_h, w_h)]}{\|(u_h, z_h)\|_\Omega \|(v_h, w_h)\|_\Omega} \leq C \frac{1 + h^2\|P\|_{L^\infty}^2}{h^2}.$$

Moreover, from Proposition 3.3, we know that for some specific (v_h, w_h) , we have

$$A_h[(u_h, z_h), (v_h, w_h)] = \|u_h\|_\omega^2 + s_h(u_h, u_h) + s_h^*(z_h, z_h).$$

Therefore, for all $(u_h, z_h) \in V_h^p \times W_h^p$, we have

$$\sup_{(v_h, w_h) \in V_h^p \times W_h^p} \frac{A_h[(u_h, z_h), (v_h, w_h)]}{\|(v_h, w_h)\|_\Omega} \geq Ch^{2(s-1)} \|(u_h, z_h)\|_\Omega.$$

Now by [12, Theorem 3.1] we have the desired estimate, where $C(P) = C(1 + h^2\|P\|_{L^\infty}^2)$ $\square$

Our aim now is to show u_h converges to u in L^2 -norm in ω and H^{-1} -norm in Ω . The steps follow as the last section.

Lemma 4.9. *Let $\pi_{sz}u$ be the Scott-Zhang interpolant of u on V_h^p . Then $\forall v_h \in V_h^p$, we have for some constant C ,*

$$\begin{aligned} s_h(\pi_{sz}u, v_h) - h^2(f_h, \mathcal{L}_h v_h)_\Omega \\ \leq C \left((1 + h^2 \|P\|_{L^\infty}) h^{s-1} \|u\|_{H^s(\Omega)} + h^{s-1} \|f\|_{H^{s-2}(\Omega)} \right) \|(v_h, 0)\|. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. First we have

$$\begin{aligned} s(\pi_{sz}u, v_h) - h^2(f_h, \mathcal{L}_h v_h)_\Omega &= \mathcal{J}_h(\pi_{sz}u, v_h) + h^2(\mathcal{L}_h \pi_{sz}u - f_h, \mathcal{L}_h v_h)_\Omega \\ &\quad + h^{2(s-1)} \langle \pi_{sz}u, v_h \rangle_\Omega. \end{aligned}$$

The first quantity is bounded by using Proposition 3.2 directly and the third quantity is easily bounded by using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. For the second quantity, we have

$$\begin{aligned} h^2(\mathcal{L}_h \pi_{sz}u - f_h, \mathcal{L}_h v_h)_\Omega &= h^2(\mathcal{L}_h(\pi_{sz}u - u), \mathcal{L}_h v_h)_\Omega + h^2(f - f_h, \mathcal{L}_h v_h)_\Omega \\ &\leq C h^{s-1} (C(P) \|u\|_{H^s(\Omega)} + \|f\|_{H^{s-2}(\Omega)}) \|h \mathcal{L}_h v_h\|_\Omega, \end{aligned}$$

where $C(P) = 1 + h^2 \|P\|_{L^\infty}$. The estimate is from the fact that π_{sz} has an optimal convergence property for under all Sobolev norms and π_h has an optimal convergence property for L^2 -norm ($f_h = \pi_h f$ when $f \in L^2(\Omega)$). Thus we obtain

$$h^2(\mathcal{L}_h \pi_{sz}u - f_h, \mathcal{L}_h v_h)_\Omega \leq C(1 + h^2 \|P\|_{L^\infty}) h^{s-1} \|u\|_{H^s(\Omega)} \|h \mathcal{L}_h v_h\|_\Omega.$$

Then by combining the two cases above we get the desired estimate

$$(4.10) \quad s_h(\pi_{sz}u, v_h) - h^2(f_h, \mathcal{L}_h v_h)_\Omega \leq C(1 + h^2 \|P\|_{L^\infty}) h^{s-1} \|u\|_{H^s(\Omega)} \|(v_h, 0)\|.$$

□

Remark 4.10. Notice that, comparing with Lemma 4.1, Lemma 4.9 requires the source term f to have a higher order regularity $f \in H^{s-2}(\Omega)$. This is not always the case when the potential is only $L^\infty(\Omega)$. The cause of the problem is that the second order consistency term $h^2(f - f_h, \mathcal{L}_h v_h)$ may fail to generate higher order convergence when P (so as f) is rough.

Lemma 4.11. *Let (u_h, z_h) be the solution to (4.8), $u \in H^s(\Omega)$ be the solution to the continuous problem. Let $\alpha \leq 1$, and $\tau\eta = 0$. Then*

$$\|(u_h - \pi_{sz}u, z_h)\| \leq C \left((1 + h \|P\|_{L^\infty}) h^{s-1} \|u\|_{H^s(\Omega)} + h^{s-1} \|f\|_{H^{s-2}(\Omega)} + Pt \right),$$

where $Pt = h^{-\alpha} \|\delta q\|_\omega + h^{-\frac{\tau}{2}} \|\delta f\|_\Omega$.

Proof. The proof follows as Lemma 4.2. □

Corollary 4.12. *Let $\alpha \geq 0$. The discrete solution u_h converges optimally in ω without perturbation. More precisely,*

$$\|u - u_h\|_\omega \leq C \left((1 + h \|P\|_{L^\infty}) h^{s-1} \|u\|_{H^s(\Omega)} + \|\delta q\|_\omega + h^{-(\frac{\tau}{2} - \alpha)} \|\delta f\|_\Omega \right).$$

Proof. From the definition of $\|\cdot\|$ as (3.12), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|u - u_h\|_\omega &\leq \|u - \pi_{sz}u\|_\omega + \|\pi_{sz}u - u_h\|_\omega \\ &\leq C h^{s-1} \|u\|_{H^s(\Omega)} + h^\alpha \|\pi_{sz}u - u_h\| \\ &\leq C \left((1 + h \|P\|_{L^\infty}) h^{s-1} \|u\|_{H^s(\Omega)} + \|\delta q\|_\omega + h^{-(\frac{\tau}{2} - \alpha)} \|\delta f\|_\Omega \right). \end{aligned}$$

□

Now, with the conditional stability estimates given in Section 2, we have the following estimates

Theorem 4.13. *Let $u \in H^s(\Omega)$ be the solution to the continuous problem and (u_h, z_h) be the solutions to system (4.8). Let $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1, \eta\tau = 0$ and both non-negative. Let B be a region satisfying estimate in Corollary 2.6 and Corollary 2.7; κ, ϵ be the parameters therein. Then*

$$\|u - u_h\|_{H^1(B)} \leq C(P)h^{\kappa(s-1)} (\|u\|_{H^s(\Omega)} + Pt)$$

and

$$\|u - u_h\|_B \leq \exp\left(C\kappa^{1-\epsilon}(\|P\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^{\frac{2}{3}} + 1)\right) h^{\kappa(s-1)} (\|u\|_{H^s(\Omega)} + Pt),$$

where $Pt = h^{-(s-1)-\alpha}\|\delta q\|_\omega + h^{-(s-1)-\frac{\tau}{2}}\|\delta f\|_\Omega$.

Proof. See the proof of Theorem 4.7

□

Note that when $s > 1$, the choice of η is robust. We could choose a set of parameters that depend only on the regularity s working for both lower order and higher order solutions, namely, by letting $0 < \alpha \leq 1, \eta = 0$ and $0 < \tau \leq 2$. However, from Theorem 4.13, it is clear that the optimal choice for α and τ is $\alpha = \tau = 0$, to minimize the error caused by perturbation. Now, if we control $\tau = 0$, then any large number can be taken for η to generate convergence according to the above theorem. Specifically, if $\eta \rightarrow \infty$, we got a reduced system, namely, $s_\eta^*(z_h, w_h) = 0$ and $s_h^*(z_h, w_h) = h^\tau \langle z_h, w_h \rangle_\Omega$. However we also note that this choice of parameters doesn't work for the low regularity case ($u \in H^1(\Omega)$) because it violates the conditions posed in Theorem 4.4 that $\alpha > 0$ and $\tau > 0$. We give a table for different parameters chosen for different smoothness of u . Note that we have not given an

TABLE 1. Parameters range for both lower and higher order regularity solutions

	α	η	τ	Optimal parameters
$s = 1$	$0 < \alpha \leq 1$	$\eta = 0$	$0 < \tau \leq 2$	N/A
$s > 1$	$0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$	$\eta \geq 0, \eta\tau = 0$	$0 \leq \tau \leq 2(s-1)$	$\alpha = \tau = 0$

optimal choice of parameters for lower regularity case, because from Theorem 4.5, there is a trade-off between convergence rate and the stability of the linear system.

Now, we give an estimate for the interpolation error for numerical integration or rounding error in computing the stiffness matrix of the linear system (4.8). Denote the theoretical solution to (4.8) still by u_h and the computational solution by $\tilde{u}_h$. Let $(A_h)A_{h\bar{\epsilon}}$ be the matrix (non)perturbed by rounding errors and numerical integration, and assume

$$(4.11) \quad \|A_h - A_{h\bar{\epsilon}}\| \leq \bar{\epsilon}\|A_h\|,$$

By numerical linear algebra, with shape functions chosen to have mass matrix $\mathcal{M}_h$ with condition number $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{M}_h)$, which is uniform with h due to quasi-uniformity

of $\mathcal{T}_h$. Let U_h and $\tilde{U}_h$ be the coefficients of u_h and $\tilde{u}_h$ in V_h^p , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|u_h - \tilde{u}_h\|_\Omega &\leq \sigma_{\max}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathcal{M}) \|U_h - \tilde{U}_h\|_N \\
 &\leq \sigma_{\max}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathcal{M}) \mathcal{K}(A_h) \|U_h\|_N \\
 (4.12) \quad &\leq \sigma_{\max}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathcal{M}) \mathcal{K}(A_h) \sigma_{\min}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\mathcal{M}) \|M^{\frac{1}{2}} U_h\|_N \\
 &\leq C(1 + h^2 \|P\|_{L^\infty}^2) \mathcal{K}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathcal{M}_h) \frac{\bar{e}}{h^{2s}} \|u_h\|_\Omega.
 \end{aligned}$$

Corollary 4.14 (Error estimate with interpolation error). *Let $\alpha = \tau = 0$ and $\eta \rightarrow \infty$. Let $\bar{e}$ be the error with respect to solving linear equations (rounding errors, interpolation errors, etc), and $\tilde{u}_h$ be the solution considering ϵ , then by (4.12):*

$$\|u - \tilde{u}_h\|_{H^1(B)} \leq C(P) h^{\kappa(s-1)} \left(\|u\|_{H^s(\Omega)} + h^{-(s-1)} \|\delta g\|_\omega + h^{-(s-1)} \|\delta f\|_\Omega \right) + R(h),$$

where

$$R(h) = C(P) \bar{e} \left(\frac{1}{h^{2s+1}} \|u\|_{H^s(\Omega)} + \frac{1}{h^{3s}} \|\delta f\|_\Omega + \frac{1}{h^{3s}} \|\delta q\|_\omega \right),$$

$$\text{and } C(P) = \exp \left(C \kappa^{1-\epsilon} (\|P\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^{\frac{2}{3}} + 1) \right)$$

Proof. The additional error for $\|u - \tilde{u}_h\|_{H^1(B)}$ is $\|u_h - \tilde{u}_h\|_{H^1(B)}$. Following inverse inequality (3.11) and condition number in 4.12 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|u_h - \tilde{u}_h\|_{H^1(B)} &\leq \frac{C}{h} \|u_h - \tilde{u}_h\|_\Omega \\
 &\leq \frac{C(1 + h^2 \|P\|_{L^\infty}^2) \bar{e}}{h^{2s+1}} \|u_h\|_\Omega \\
 &\leq \frac{C(1 + h^2 \|P\|_{L^\infty}^2) \bar{e}}{h^{2s+1}} (\|u_h - u\|_\Omega + \|u\|_\Omega) \\
 &\leq C'(P) \bar{e} \left(\frac{1}{h^{2s+1}} \|u\|_{H^s(\Omega)} + \frac{1}{h^{3s}} \|\delta f\|_\Omega + \frac{1}{h^{3s}} \|\delta q\|_\omega \right),
 \end{aligned}$$

where $C'(P) = \exp \left(C \kappa^{1-\epsilon} (\|P\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^{\frac{2}{3}} + 1) \right)$, and the corollary follows. $\square$

5. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS

We present here numerical experiments for Schrödinger unique continuation problem (1.1). First, we will consider Ω to be the unit disk, and the function to be a piecewise linear function which is not smooth at $y = 0$.

Example 5.1. Let $f \in H^{-1}(\Omega)$ to be defined as

$$\langle f, w \rangle_\Omega = \int_{-1}^1 w dx,$$

and consider the piece-wise linear function

$$u_0(x, y) = \begin{cases} -y & y > 0 \\ 0 & \text{else,} \end{cases}$$

It is easy too observe that u_0 is the solution to

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = f & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = u_0 & \text{in } \omega. \end{cases}$$


In this example we consider Ω to be the unit ball and the geometries we are interested in to be

$$\omega = \{(x, y) \in \Omega | x > 0, x^2 + y^2 > 0.25\}$$

and

$$B = \{(x, y) \in \Omega | x > 0, x^2 + y^2 > 0.0625\}$$

FIGURE 1. Domain in Example 5.1



According to Theorem 4.7, $\eta\tau = 0$ is needed to generate optimal convergence with respect to regularity s , but by Theorem 4.4, $\eta = 0$ is needed to generate weak convergence for H^1 -only case. We show by comparison that this does strengthen the convergence. In Figure 2 it's observed that the simplified scheme by setting $s_h^*(z_h, w_h) = \langle z_h, w_h \rangle_\Omega$ is generating way slower convergence in both L^2 and H^1 -norm than the scheme with dual stabilization terms defined in (3.5) with $\eta = 0$. This indicates that, from Table 1, the robustness for η does not hold for rough u .

Now we show the influence of parameter τ on the convergence rate. In this example, we control $\alpha = 1, \eta = 0$. In Figure 3, we present an increase in convergence rate with respect to L^2 and H^1 norm, which achieves their optima at $\frac{\tau}{2} = 1$, which shows consistency with Theorem 4.4. *prs* and *dus* represents $\sqrt{\mathcal{J}_h(u_h, u_h)}$ and $\|z_h\|_\Omega$. It is shown in part (A) that $\|z_h\|_\Omega$ is bounded while $\tau = 0$ and may not be bounded when $\tau > 0$, which is consistent with Corollary 4.3.



FIGURE 2. Error comparison of schemes with $\eta = 0$ and $\tau = 0$ 

FIGURE 3. Different parameters achieving increasing convergence



In the second example, we present numerical experiments for real Schrödinger unique continuation problem (1.1) with the high order H^1 -conforming method (3.3). We will focus on the classical Hadamard example for ill-posed elliptic equations with logarithm potential.

Example 5.2. Consider the unique continuation problem

$$(5.1) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta u + 10 \log(y + \frac{1}{2})u &= 10 \log(y + \frac{1}{2}) \sin x \sinh y & \text{in } \Omega : (0, \pi) \times (0, 1), \\ u(x, y) &= \sin(x) \sinh(y) & \text{for } (x, y) \in \omega \end{cases}$$

whose solution is given by

$$u(x, y) = \sin(x) \sinh(y).$$

For such Hadamard-type solutions, we consider the interior datum $q = u|_{\omega}$ and study the convergence in the target set B for two geometric settings of ω and B , namely

$$(5.2) \quad \omega = \Omega \setminus [\frac{\pi}{4}, \frac{3\pi}{4}] \times [0.05, 1], \quad B = \Omega \setminus [\frac{\pi}{4}, \frac{3\pi}{4}] \times [0.75, 1],$$

and

$$(5.3) \quad \omega = (\frac{\pi}{4}, \frac{3\pi}{4}) \times (0.05, 0.5), \quad B = (\frac{\pi}{8}, \frac{7\pi}{8}) \times (0.05, 0.75).$$

FIGURE 4. Different domains.



In domain (5.2) we examined the H^1 -error in the region of interest B using three different orders of finite element space. It can be observed from Figure 5 that the scheme with or without additional dual stabilizer $s_{\eta}^*(\cdot, \cdot)$ (as defined in (3.5)) almost coincides, which indicates the robustness of η for higher regularity solutions.

Now we give a convergence comparison for different domains. In this example we set $\alpha = \tau = 0$ and $\eta \rightarrow \infty$.

In Figure 6, we observe that for domain (5.2), the convergence rate for each choice of order p almost achieves optima, which means in Theorem 4.13, $\kappa \approx 1$, while for domain (5.3), κ is around 0.35. It is also worth noting that, for both cases, the finite element approximation using $p = 3$ space has a turning point for convergence while no perturbation of data is forced. This is probably due to the ill-posedness (high condition number) of the linear system system (4.8) and the enlarged quadratic error in numerical integration by such ill-posedness, which is consistent with Corollary 4.14.



FIGURE 5. Convergence comparison by letting $\eta = 0$ and $\eta \rightarrow \infty$ 

FIGURE 6. Convergence comparison for different domains.



APPENDIX A. PROOF OF COROLLARY 2.3

The proof is similar with [6, Corollary 1]. Due to the density of $C^2(\Omega)$ in $H^2(\Omega)$, it suffices to show the inequality holds for $u \in C^2(\Omega)$. Let $r_0 < r_1 < r_2 < r_3 < r_4$ and $B_j \subset \Omega$, $j = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4$. Choose $\rho(x) = -d(x, x_0)$ and $K = \bar{B}_4 \setminus B_0$. Notice that ρ has no critical point in K . Let $\chi \in C_0^\infty(K)$ satisfies $\chi = 1$ in $B_3 \setminus B_1$, and $w = \chi u$. Then according to Theorem Lemma 2.1 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \int_{B_4 \setminus B_0} (\tau^3 |w|^2 + \tau |\nabla w|^2) e^{2\tau\phi} dx &\leq C \int_{B_4 \setminus B_0} |\Delta w|^2 e^{2\tau\phi} dx \\
 &\leq 2C \int_{B_4 \setminus B_0} |-\Delta w + Pw|^2 e^{2\tau\phi} dx \\
 &\quad + 2C \int_{B_4 \setminus B_0} |Pw|^2 e^{2\tau\phi} dx.
 \end{aligned}$$

Set $\tau_0 = (4C \|P\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^2)^{\frac{1}{3}} + 1$, we obtain

$$(A.1) \quad \int_{B_4 \setminus B_0} \left(\frac{\tau^3}{2} |w|^2 + \tau |\nabla w|^2 \right) e^{2\tau\phi} dx \leq 2C \int_{B_4 \setminus B_0} |-\Delta w + Pw|^2 e^{2\tau\phi} dx.$$

Denote $\Phi(r) = e^{-\alpha r}$, and then we can bound the left-hand side in (A.1) by

$$\int_{B_2 \setminus B_1} (\tau^3 |w|^2 + \tau |\nabla w|^2) e^{2\tau\phi} dx \geq \tau e^{2\tau\Phi(r_2)} \|u\|_{H^1(B_2)}^2 - \tau e^{2\tau} \|u\|_{H^1(B_1)}^2$$

since $\phi \leq 1$ and $\tau_0 > 1$. Moreover, the right-hand side can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_4 \setminus B_0} |-\Delta u + Pu|^2 e^{2\tau\phi} dx + \int_{(B_4 \setminus B_3) \cup B_1} |[\Delta, \chi]u|^2 e^{2\tau\phi} dx \\ & \leq e^{2\tau} \|-\Delta u + Pu\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + e^{2\tau\Phi(r_3)} \|u\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 + e^{2\tau} \|u\|_{H^1(B_1)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the two bounds we obtain

$$(A.2) \quad \tau e^{2\tau\Phi(r_2)} \|u\|_{H^1(B_2)}^2 \leq C\tau e^{2\tau} (\|u\|_{H^1(B_1)}^2 + \|-\Delta u + Pu\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2) + C e^{2\tau\Phi(r_3)} \|u\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2.$$

Then by setting $\tau_0 = C(1 + \|P\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^{\frac{2}{3}})$ for some large C to absorb the constant before $\|u\|_{H^1(B_2)}$, we have

$$\|u\|_{H^1(B_2)} \leq C e^{\tau(1-\Phi(r_2))} (\|u\|_{H^1(B_1)} + \|-\Delta u + Pu\|_{L^2(\Omega)}) + C e^{\tau(\Phi(r_3)-\Phi(r_2))} \|u\|_{H^1(\Omega)}.$$

The conclusion follows from 4.2.2 by letting

$$c = 1 - \Phi(r_3), \quad \kappa = \frac{\Phi(r_2) - \Phi(r_3)}{1 - \Phi(r_3)} \in (0, 1).$$

APPENDIX B. PROOF OF COROLLARY 2.6

To prove Corollary 2.6, we need the following Lemma

Lemma B.1. *Let Ω be any domain having smooth or piecewise polygonal boundary. Then the auxiliary Schrödinger equation with complex Robin boundary is well-posed, i.e., the system*

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + Pu &= f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \partial_n u + iu &= 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

has a unique solution for $f \in (H^1(\Omega))'$, and

$$\|u\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq C(P) \|f\|_{(H^1(\Omega))'}.$$

Moreover, if P is positive in Ω , the constant is independent of P .

proof of Lemma B.1. To show existence and uniqueness of the problem, it suffices to show that if the following primal and dual weak formulation has a solution then it's the unique solution. That is, there is a unique $u \in H^1(\Omega)$, such that for all $v \in H^1(\Omega)$,

$$\int_{\Omega} \nabla u \cdot \nabla \bar{v} dx + \int_{\Omega} Pu \bar{v} dx \pm i \int_{\partial\Omega} u \bar{v} dS = \langle f, \bar{v} \rangle.$$

To show this, consider the difference w between two solutions, which satisfies

$$\int_{\Omega} \nabla w \cdot \nabla \bar{v} dx + \int_{\Omega} Pw \bar{v} dx \pm i \int_{\partial\Omega} w \bar{v} dS = 0.$$

Let $v = w$. The real and imaginary part should be 0, we deduce that $w = 0$ on the boundary, and so is its outer normal derivative. Since the right-hand side is in $L^2(\Omega)$, we have that $w \in H^2(\Omega)$ by elliptic regularity. See, for example [14].

Moreover, Since the normal derivatives vanishes and the boundary is smooth. We have that $w \in H_0^2(\Omega)$. According to Lemma 2.1, we have for large τ

$$\|w\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq C \int_{\Omega} (\tau |\nabla w|^2 + \tau^3 |w|^2) dx \leq C \int_{\Omega} |\Delta w|^2 dx = 0.$$

This shows the uniqueness of both problems, and thus the existence, and the inverse bound follows by **bounded inverse theorem**, see, for example in [2, Corollary 2.7]. In the specific case when $P \geq 0$, we choose $v = u$ in the weak formulation and take real and imaginary part to get estimates

$$\|\nabla u\|_{\Omega} \leq C \|f\|_{(H^1(\Omega))'},$$

and b

$$\|u\|_{\partial\Omega} \leq C \|f\|_{(H^1(\Omega))'}$$

Combining the two equations and by **Poincare's inequality** we have

$$\|u\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq C \|f\|_{(H^1(\Omega))'}.$$

□

APPENDIX C. PROOF OF 2.7

Before proving the following estimate, we first state two inequalities for semiclassical Soblev norm, see, for example, [10, 18]. Let

$$J^s = (1 - \hbar^2 \Delta)^{\frac{s}{2}}$$

be the Bessel potential, we will use two estimates with semiclassical Sobolev norm. Let $\theta, \eta \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$, where $\eta = 1$ near $\text{supp}(\theta)$, and A, B be two semiclassical pseudodifferential operators of orders s, m , respectively. Then for all $p, q, N \in \mathbb{R}$, there exists C , such that

$$(C.1) \quad \|[A, B]v\|_{H_{scl}^p} \leq C\hbar \|v\|_{H_{scl}^{p+s+m-1}},$$

$$(C.2) \quad \|(1 - \eta)A\theta v\|_{H_{scl}^p} \leq C\hbar^N \|v\|_{H_{scl}^q}.$$

To prove Corollary 2.7, we need the following lemma:

Lemma C.1. *Let $v \in C_0^\infty(B(x_0, R) \setminus B(x_0, r))$ for some R, r , $\hbar = \frac{1}{\tau}$, $F := -\hbar^2 e^{\frac{\phi}{\hbar}} \Delta e^{\frac{\phi}{\hbar}}$ be a semiclassical pseudodifferential operator, where τ and ϕ is defined as in Lemma 2.1, and P be the bounded potential. Then, there exists a constant C , such that*

$$\sqrt{\hbar} \|v\|_{L^2} \leq C \|(F + \hbar^2 P)v\|_{H_{scl}^{-1}},$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{H_{scl}^{-1}}$ denotes semiclassical Sobolev norm, defined by

$$\|u\|_{H_{scl}^{-1}} := \|(1 - \hbar^2 \Delta)^{\frac{1}{2}} u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}$$

Proof of Lemma C.1. A similar proof can be referred to [6] for the convection-diffusion equation, but we will give it for the readers' convenience. Since $v \in C_0^\infty(B(x_0, R) \setminus B(x_0, r))$, we construct the same way as in Corollary 2.3, and by Carleman estimate and some simple algebra, we have

$$C \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |e^{\frac{\phi}{\hbar}} \Delta e^{-\frac{\phi}{\hbar}} v|^2 dx \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\hbar^{-1} - 1) |\nabla v|^2 + (\hbar^{-3} - \hbar^{-2}) v^2 dx.$$

Adding potential term on both sides and rescaling by $\hbar^4$ with $\hbar \ll 1$ we obtain

$$C \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |(F + \hbar^2 P)v|^2 dx \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \hbar^3 |\nabla v|^2 + (\hbar - C\hbar^4 P^2)v^2 dx.$$

Note that $\|v\|_{H_{scl}^1} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \hbar^2 |\nabla v|^2 + v^2 dx$. By letting

$$(C.3) \quad \hbar^3 \ll \frac{1}{C\|P\|_\infty^2}$$

the right-hand term with potential can be absorbed and thus we have

$$(C.4) \quad \sqrt{\hbar}\|v\|_{H_{scl}^1} \leq C\|(F + \hbar^2 P)v\|_{L^2}$$

Now let $\theta, \eta \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfying that $\theta = 1$ around support of v and $\eta = 1$ near support of θ . Then by (C.2), for $\hbar < \hbar_0$ for $\hbar_0$ depending only on geometry, we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \|v\|_{L^2} &= \|J^{-1}v\|_{H_{scl}^1} \\ &\leq \|\eta J^{-1}v\|_{H_{scl}^1} + \|(1-\eta)J^{-1}\theta v\|_{H_{scl}^1} \\ &\leq C\|\eta J^{-1}v\|_{H_{scl}^1} \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\eta J^{-1}v$ is also compactly supported. By (C.4) we have

$$\sqrt{\hbar}\|v\|_{L^2} \leq C\sqrt{\hbar}\|\eta J^{-1}v\|_{H_{scl}^1} \leq C\|(F + \hbar^2 P)\eta J^{-1}v\|_{L^2}$$

Now commute $(F + \hbar^2 P)$ and ηJ^{-1} , we have the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \|[(F + \hbar^2 P), \eta J^{-1}]v\|_{L^2} &= \|[F, \eta J^{-1}]v\|_{L^2} + \|[\hbar^2 P, \eta J^{-1}]v\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C\hbar\|v\|_{L^2} + C\hbar^2\|P\|_{L^\infty}\|v\|_{H_{scl}^{-1}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the first estimate is from (C.2) and the second estimate is simply from the definition of $\|\cdot\|_{H_{scl}^{-1}}$. Note that the constant C above only depends on geometry, we can make $\hbar_0$ small enough to absorb the first term, and by (C.3) the second term can also be absorbed. Thus

$$(C.5) \quad \sqrt{\hbar}\|v\|_{L^2} \leq C\|J^{-1}(F + \hbar^2 P)v\|_{L^2} = C\|(F + \hbar^2 P)v\|_{H_{scl}^{-1}}.$$

□

Proof of Corollary 2.7. Let $r_0 < r_1 < r_2$, $\chi \in C_0^\infty(B_4 \setminus B_0)$ and $\chi = 1$ in $B_3 \setminus B_{1'}$, $\psi \in C_0^\infty(B_1 \cup \Omega \setminus B_2)$ and $\psi = 1$ in $(B_4 \setminus B_3) \cup (B_{1'} \setminus B_0)$, then we have $\psi = 1$ while $[F, \chi] \neq 0$. Let $u \in C^\infty(\Omega)$, and we obtain by (C.2)

$$\|[F + \hbar^2 P, \chi]e^{\frac{\phi}{\hbar}}u\|_{H_{scl}^{-1}} \leq C\|[F, \chi]\psi e^{\frac{\phi}{\hbar}}u\|_{H_{scl}^{-1}} \leq C\hbar\|\psi e^{\frac{\phi}{\hbar}}u\|_{L^2}.$$

Notice that $\chi e^{\frac{\phi}{\hbar}}u \in C_0^\infty(B_4)$, which satisfies the condition in Lemma C.1. Thus combining (C.2) and (C.5) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{\hbar}\|\chi e^{\frac{\phi}{\hbar}}u\|_{L^2} &\leq C\|(F + \hbar^2 P)\chi e^{\frac{\phi}{\hbar}}u\|_{H_{scl}^{-1}} \\ &\leq C\hbar^2\|\chi e^{\frac{\phi}{\hbar}}(-\Delta + P)u\|_{H_{scl}^{-1}} + C\hbar\|\psi e^{\frac{\phi}{\hbar}}u\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Now according to the norm bound $\|\cdot\|_{H_{scl}^{-1}} \leq C\hbar^{-2}\|\cdot\|_{H^{-1}}$ and the support of χ and ψ , a local version of estimate is obtained:

$$(C.6) \quad \sqrt{\hbar}\|e^{\frac{\phi}{\hbar}}u\|_{L^2(B_3)} \leq \sqrt{\hbar}\|e^{\frac{\phi}{\hbar}}u\|_{L^2(B_1)} + C\|e^{\frac{\phi}{\hbar}}(-\Delta + P)u\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)} + C\hbar\|\psi e^{\frac{\phi}{\hbar}}u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

Notice the last term on the right-hand side can be separated into three components, i.e. $B_1, B_3 \setminus B_2, \Omega \setminus B_3$. Notice that the B_1 part can be absorbed by $\sqrt{\hbar} \|e^{\frac{\phi}{\hbar}} u\|_{L^2(B_1)}$ and the $B_3 \setminus B_2$ part can be absorbed by the left-hand side for small $\hbar$. Thus we have by (C.6),

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{L^2(B_2)} &\leq C e^{-\frac{\Phi(r_2)}{\hbar}} \left(\|u\|_{L^2(B_1)} + \hbar^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|(-\Delta + P)u\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)} \right) \\ &\quad + C \hbar^{-\frac{3}{2}} e^{-\frac{\Phi(r_2) - \Phi(r_3)}{\hbar}} \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

Then by absorbing the polynomial term by exponential term and following the same procedure as in Corollary 2.3, the conclusion follows. $\square$

REFERENCES

- [1] L. Bourgeois, *A mixed formulation of quasi-reversibility to solve the Cauchy problem for Laplace's equation*, Inverse Problems **21** (2005), no. 3, 1087–1104. MR2146823
- [2] Haim Brezis, *Functional analysis, Sobolev spaces and partial differential equations*, Universitext, Springer, New York, 2011. MR2759829
- [3] Erik Burman, *Stabilized finite element methods for nonsymmetric, noncoercive, and ill-posed problems. Part I: Elliptic equations*, SIAM J. Sci. Comput. **35** (2013), no. 6, A2752–A2780. MR3134434
- [4] Erik Burman, Peter Hansbo, and Mats G Larson, *Solving ill-posed control problems by stabilized finite element methods: an alternative to tikhonov regularization*, Inverse Problems **34** (2018), no. 3, 035004.
- [5] Erik Burman, Mihai Nechita, and Lauri Oksanen, *Unique continuation for the Helmholtz equation using stabilized finite element methods*, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) **129** (2019), 1–22. MR3998787
- [6] Erik Burman, Mihai Nechita, and Lauri Oksanen, *A stabilized finite element method for inverse problems subject to the convection-diffusion equation. I: diffusion-dominated regime*, Numer. Math. **144** (2020), no. 3, 451–477. MR4071822
- [7] P. Ciarlet Jr., *Analysis of the Scott-Zhang interpolation in the fractional order Sobolev spaces*, J. Numer. Math. **21** (2013), no. 3, 173–180. MR3118443
- [8] Wolfgang Dahmen, Harald Monsuur, and Rob Stevenson, *Least squares solvers for ill-posed PDEs that are conditionally stable*, ESAIM Math. Model. Numer. Anal. **57** (2023), no. 4, 2227–2255. MR4609875
- [9] Daniele Antonio Di Pietro and Alexandre Ern, *Mathematical aspects of discontinuous Galerkin methods*, Mathématiques & Applications (Berlin) [Mathematics & Applications], vol. 69, Springer, Heidelberg, 2012. MR2882148
- [10] David Dos Santos Ferreira, Carlos E. Kenig, Mikko Salo, and Gunther Uhlmann, *Limiting Carleman weights and anisotropic inverse problems*, Invent. Math. **178** (2009), no. 1, 119–171. MR2534094
- [11] Heinz W. Engl, Martin Hanke, and Andreas Neubauer, *Regularization of inverse problems*, Mathematics and its Applications, vol. 375, Kluwer Academic Publishers Group, Dordrecht, 1996. MR1408680
- [12] Alexandre Ern and Jean-Luc Guermond, *Evaluation of the condition number in linear systems arising in finite element approximations*, M2AN Math. Model. Numer. Anal. **40** (2006), no. 1, 29–48. MR2223503
- [13] Alexandre Ern and Jean-Luc Guermond, *Finite elements I—Approximation and interpolation*, Texts in Applied Mathematics, vol. 72, Springer, Cham, [2021] ©2021. MR4242224
- [14] Lawrence C. Evans, *Partial differential equations*, Second, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, vol. 19, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2010. MR2597943
- [15] Fritz John, *Continuous dependence on data for solutions of partial differential equations with a prescribed bound*, Communications on pure and applied mathematics **13** (1960), no. 4, 551–585.

- [16] Jérôme Le Rousseau and Gilles Lebeau, *On Carleman estimates for elliptic and parabolic operators. Applications to unique continuation and control of parabolic equations*, ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var. **18** (2012), no. 3, 712–747. MR3041662
- [17] Mihai Nechita, *Unique Continuation Problems and Stabilised Finite Element Methods*, ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 2020. Thesis (Ph.D.)—University of London, University College London (United Kingdom). MR4197654
- [18] Maciej Zworski, *Semiclassical analysis*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, vol. 138, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2012. MR2952218

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY COLLEGE LONDON, UK
Email address: `e.burman@ucl.ac.uk`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY COLLEGE LONDON, UK
Email address: `mingfei.lu.21@ucl.ac.uk`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI, FINLAND
Email address: `lauri.oksanen@helsinki.fi`