

# LOCAL DISCONTINUOUS GALERKIN METHOD FOR FRACTIONAL KORTEWEG-DE VRIES EQUATION

MUKUL DWIVEDI AND TANMAY SARKAR

**ABSTRACT.** We propose a local discontinuous Galerkin (LDG) method for fractional Korteweg-de Vries equation involving the fractional Laplacian with exponent  $\alpha \in (1, 2)$  in one and two space dimensions. By decomposing the fractional Laplacian into a first order derivative and a fractional integral, we prove  $L^2$ -stability of the semi-discrete LDG scheme incorporating suitable interface and boundary fluxes. We analyze the error estimate by considering linear convection term and utilizing the estimate, we derive the error estimate for general nonlinear flux and demonstrate an order of convergence  $\mathcal{O}(h^{k+1/2})$ . Moreover, the stability and error analysis have been extended to multiple space dimensional case. Additionally, we devise a fully discrete LDG scheme using the four-stage fourth-order Runge-Kutta method. We prove that the scheme is strongly stable under an appropriate time step constraint by establishing a *three-step strong stability* estimate. Numerical illustrations are shown to demonstrate the efficiency of the scheme by obtaining an optimal order of convergence.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

We consider the following degenerate nonlinear non-local integral partial differential equation known as the fractional Korteweg-de Vries (KdV) equation:

$$\begin{cases} U_t + f(U)_x - (-\Delta)^{\alpha/2} U_x = 0, & (x, t) \in \mathbb{R} \times (0, T], \\ U(x, 0) = U_0(x), & x \in \mathbb{R}, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where  $T > 0$  is fixed and  $U_0$  is the prescribed initial condition. The non-local integro-differential operator  $-(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}$  in (1.1) is the fractional Laplacian with the values  $\alpha \in (1, 2)$  defined for all  $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$  by the Fourier transform as

$$\widehat{(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2} \phi}(\xi) = |\xi|^\alpha \hat{\phi}(\xi). \quad (1.2)$$

The fractional KdV equation (1.1), featuring the fractional Laplacian, finds applications in various fields such as nonlinear dispersive equations, plasma physics, and inverse scattering methods [1, 16, 23, 31, 35]. In particular, whenever  $\alpha = 2$ , (1.1) reduces to the classical KdV equation [6, 29, 31, 36, 45], while for  $\alpha = 1$ , it represents the Benjamin-Ono (BO) equation [23, 30, 50].

The fractional Laplacian operator (1.2) is a non-local operator, known for its efficacy in various localized computations such as image segmentation, modeling water flow in narrow channels, plasma physics, and other related applications [41, 12]. Its computational properties make it a valuable tool to study the phenomena where non-local effects play a crucial role. For further insights and applications of (1.1), refer to [31, 32, 16, 19, 18] and references therein.

Over the years, extensive research has been conducted to study the well-posedness of the fractional KdV equation (1.1) for various values of  $\alpha$ . For the classical case where  $\alpha = 2$ , seminal

---

(Mukul Dwivedi)

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY JAMMU, JAGTI, NH-44 BYPASS ROAD, POST OFFICE NAGROTA, JAMMU - 181221, INDIA

(Tanmay Sarkar)

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY JAMMU, JAGTI, NH-44 BYPASS ROAD, POST OFFICE NAGROTA, JAMMU - 181221, INDIA

*E-mail addresses:* 2020rma1031@iitjammu.ac.in, tanmay.sarkar@iitjammu.ac.in.

*2020 Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 65M60, 26A33, 35Q53, 35R11; Secondary: 65M12.

*Key words and phrases.* Fractional Korteweg-de Vries equation; fractional Laplacian; fractional Sobolev spaces; local discontinuous Galerkin method.

work by Kato [29] established the well-posedness and local smoothing effects of the solution of the KdV equation for the initial data in  $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ . More recently, Killip et al. [34] demonstrated the global well-posedness for the initial data in  $H^{-1}(\mathbb{R})$ . On the other hand, for  $\alpha = 1$ , corresponding to the Benjamin-Ono equation, foundational contributions on well-posedness were made by Fokas et al. in [22]. Subsequently, significant advancements in well-posedness were made by Ponce et al. in [42] and Kenig et al. in [30]. Further improvements on the global well-posedness of the Benjamin-Ono equation were developed by Tao [49] and Fonseca et al. [23]. Whenever  $\alpha \in (1, 2)$ , the approach to local well-posedness of equation (1.1) differs significantly from the classical KdV equation as remarked in [31]. However, Kenig et al. [31, 32] explored the local well-posedness of the generalized dispersion model (1.1) for initial data in  $H^s(\mathbb{R})$ ,  $s > (9 - 3\alpha)/4$ . These studies utilized compactness arguments based on the smoothing effect and a priori estimates of the solution. Recent advancement in the well-posedness of equation (1.1) have been achieved through the frequency-dependent renormalization technique as demonstrated by Herr et al. [25] for the initial data in  $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ . These ongoing efforts underscore the continual endeavor to enhance the theoretical foundations of generalized dispersive equation (1.1).

Several numerical methods have been developed and are employed in practice to study (1.1). However, we refer only to the literature which are relevant for our study. For  $\alpha = 2$ , recent years have seen the emergence of fully discrete finite difference schemes [17, 27, 51], and continuous Galerkin schemes [14, 15]. In case of  $\alpha = 1$ , Thomée et al. [50] introduced a fully implicit finite difference scheme. Afterwards, Dutta et al. [13] established the convergence of the fully discrete Crank-Nicolson scheme and Galtung [24] devised a continuous Galerkin scheme. However, for  $\alpha \in (1, 2)$ , the literature on numerical methods for (1.1) is relatively limited. An operator splitting scheme for (1.1) was introduced by Dutta et al. [16]. Furthermore, Dwivedi et al. [19] designed a continuous Galerkin scheme and demonstrated its convergence to the weak solution.

The discontinuous Galerkin (DG) method, a class of finite element method was first introduced by Reed and Hill in [44], employing discontinuous piecewise polynomial space for approximating the solution and test functions. Although this method requires more degrees of freedom due to the discontinuities at element boundaries (so called interfaces), nevertheless, it offers flexibility in choosing fluxes at these interfaces to ensure high-order accuracy and stability. In recent decades, Cockburn and Shu have significantly advanced the DG method for hyperbolic problems, see [9] and references therein. However, due to instability and inconsistency, usual DG methods for the equations containing higher-order derivative terms may not perform efficiently, refer to [26, 10, 56] and references therein.

The Local Discontinuous Galerkin (LDG) method, a special type of the DG method, is often used for tackling higher-order time-dependent problems by reformulating the equation into a first-order system by introducing auxiliary variables to approximate the lower derivatives and then applying the DG method to the resulting system [10]. This extension of DG method was motivated by the successful numerical experiments of Bassi and Rebay [4]. The ‘local’ term associated to LDG comes in a sense that auxiliary variables are superficial, and can be eliminated locally. The design of numerical fluxes at the interfaces play a crucial role to the success of such methods. Therefore, all the numerical fluxes must be designed in such a way that the method becomes stable and locally solvable for the auxiliary variables.

The LDG method has been developed to address equations featuring higher-order derivative terms while retaining its advantages in efficient adaptivity and higher order accuracy. For instance, Yan and Shu [57] introduced the LDG method for KdV-type equations containing third-order spatial derivatives, achieving an error estimate of order  $k + 1/2$  in the linear case. Subsequently, Xu and Shu [55] extended the error analysis to the nonlinear case and obtained the same order of convergence. Xu and Shu [56] further expanded the LDG method to equations involving fourth and fifth order spatial derivatives, including nonlinear Schrödinger equations [54]. Levy et al. [38] developed a LDG method tailored for nonlinear dispersive equations with compactly supported traveling wave solutions. The LDG method has gained attention for partial differential equations involving the fractional Laplacian in recent years. Notably, Xu and Hesthaven [52] introduced a LDG method for the fractional convection-diffusion equation, decomposing the fractional Laplacian of order  $\alpha$  into a first-order derivative and a fractional integral of order  $2 - \alpha$ , achieving optimal

error of  $\mathcal{O}(h^{k+1})$  in the linear case and  $\mathcal{O}(h^{k+1/2})$  in the nonlinear case. Furthermore, Aboelenen [2] developed a LDG method for the fractional Schrödinger-type equations.

In recent decades, significant progress has been made in developing fully discrete high-order Runge-Kutta (RK) LDG method for time-dependent equations with higher-order derivatives. Various studies have addressed stability and error estimates in the linear setup, as seen in [46, 47, 48] and references therein. However, stability and error estimates of RKLDG method for nonlinear equations with higher-order derivatives remain an active area of research. A notable advancement was made by Ai et al. [3], where they established an a priori  $L^2$ -error estimate with optimal order using the generalized Gauss-Radau projection of the fourth-order RKDG method for solving scalar nonlinear conservation laws. In a recent work, Hunter et al. [28] determined the stability and time-step constraints of implicit-explicit RK Methods for the linearized KdV equation. Our approach differs significantly in compare to [28].

In this paper, our approach to design the LDG scheme for the fractional KdV equation (1.1) involves decomposing the fractional Laplacian into a lower-order derivative and a fractional integral, and introducing auxiliary variables to represent (1.1) into a system involving first order derivatives and fractional integral terms. This transformation modifies (1.1) to an equation containing third-order derivatives along with a fractional integral of order  $2 - \alpha$  term instead of  $-(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}U_x$ . For detailed information, refer to Section 2 and 3. Since the equation involves a non-local operator, the original problem is defined over the entire real line. However, for numerical approach, we restrict the problem to a bounded domain. To design the scheme, we employ the usual DG method within each element to all equations of the system. A critical aspect of this process is the construction of appropriate numerical fluxes at the interfaces and at the boundary with the help of boundary conditions. Furthermore, proving spatial stability in this case requires careful choice of test functions, unlike in the usual stability approach of existing LDG schemes for higher-order equations, see [52, 57]. In Section 3, assuming  $\|U - u_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq h$ , we establish an error estimate of  $\mathcal{O}(h^{k+1/2})$  considering nonlinear flux functions. Furthermore, we extend our methodology to include temporal discretization of equation (1.1) using a high-order time discretization. Specifically, we employ the classical four-stage fourth-order Runge-Kutta (RK) method [48]. For the linear case, we are able to show that the proposed fully discrete scheme is *strongly stable* through the two-step and *three-step strong stability* estimates.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: we commence our investigation by introducing key definitions and preliminary lemmas of fractional calculus in Section 2. Section 3 outlines the development of the LDG scheme, accompanied by the proof of its spatial stability and the derivation of error estimates. In Section 4, we extend our analysis to the higher dimension as well, presenting the LDG scheme tailored for this equation along with its stability. Additionally, in Section 5, we expand our analysis by incorporating time discretization using the fourth-order Runge-Kutta method, providing stability analysis in the linear setup. The order of convergence is validated through several numerical examples presented in Section 6. We end up with a few concluding remarks in Section 7.

## 2. PRELIMINARY RESULTS AND FRACTIONAL CALCULUS

We introduce an alternative definition of the fractional Laplacian using the framework of fractional calculus [20, 40, 58]. Let us consider  $u \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ . Then the left and right integrals of fractional order  $\alpha > 0$  are defined as follows:

$$-_{\infty}I_x^\alpha u(x) := -_{\infty}D_x^{-\alpha}u(x) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_{-\infty}^x (x-t)^{\alpha-1}u(t) dt, \quad (2.1)$$

$$xI_\infty^\alpha u(x) := xD_\infty^{-\alpha}u(x) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_x^\infty (t-x)^{\alpha-1}u(t) dt, \quad (2.2)$$

where  $I^\alpha u$  denotes the  $\alpha$  times fractional integration of  $u$ . Whenever  $\alpha$  is a natural number, these definitions correspond to exactly  $\alpha$  times integration in the classical sense.

The left and right Riemann-Liouville derivatives of fractional order  $\alpha$  ( $n - 1 < \alpha < n$ ),  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  are described as

$$-_{\infty}D_x^\alpha u(x) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(n - \alpha)} \left( \frac{d}{dx} \right)^n \int_{-\infty}^x (x - t)^{n - \alpha - 1} u(t) dt = \left( \frac{d}{dx} \right)^n (-_{\infty}I_x^{n - \alpha} u(x)), \quad (2.3)$$

$${}_x D_\infty^\alpha u(x) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(n - \alpha)} \left( -\frac{d}{dx} \right)^n \int_x^\infty (t - x)^{n - \alpha - 1} u(t) dt = \left( -\frac{d}{dx} \right)^n ({}_x I_\infty^{n - \alpha} u(x)). \quad (2.4)$$

The fractional Laplacian using Riemann-Liouville fractional derivative (also known as a Riesz derivative) is defined as

$$\frac{\partial^\alpha}{\partial |x|^\alpha} u(x) = -(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2} u(x) = -\frac{-_{\infty}D_x^\alpha u(x) + {}_x D_\infty^\alpha u(x)}{2 \cos\left(\frac{\alpha\pi}{2}\right)}, \quad 1 < \alpha < 2. \quad (2.5)$$

Building upon the aforementioned definition, we extend the notion to introduce the fractional Laplacian of negative order. When  $\alpha < 0$ , the negative order fractional Laplacian reduces to a fractional integral operator. As a consequence, for any  $0 < s < 1$ , we define

$$\Delta_{-s/2} u(x) := \frac{-_{\infty}I_x^s u(x) + {}_x I_\infty^s u(x)}{2 \cos\left(\frac{s\pi}{2}\right)}. \quad (2.6)$$

This definition serves as the basis for various analytical investigations. Subsequently, we review a set of relevant definitions and results that will constitute the fundamental components of our subsequent analysis.

**Lemma 2.1** (See [41]). *Let  $u, v \in C^n(\mathbb{R})$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , such that  $\frac{d^j}{dx^j} v(x) = 0$  and  $\frac{d^j}{dx^j} u(x) = 0$  as  $x \rightarrow \pm\infty$ ,  $\forall 0 \leq j \leq n$ . Then the fractional integrals and derivatives defined in (2.1)-(2.4) satisfy the following properties:*

i) (Linearity) Let  $\lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then

$$-_{\infty}I_x^\alpha (\lambda u(x) + \mu v(x)) = \lambda -_{\infty}I_x^\alpha u(x) + \mu -_{\infty}I_x^\alpha v(x), \quad (2.7)$$

$$-_{\infty}D_x^\alpha (\lambda u(x) + \mu v(x)) = \lambda -_{\infty}D_x^\alpha u(x) + \mu -_{\infty}D_x^\alpha v(x). \quad (2.8)$$

ii) (Semi-group property) Let  $\alpha, \beta > 0$ . Then

$$-_{\infty}I_x^{\alpha + \beta} u(x) = -_{\infty}I_x^\alpha (-_{\infty}I_x^\beta u(x)) = -_{\infty}I_x^\beta (-_{\infty}I_x^\alpha u(x)). \quad (2.9)$$

iii) Let  $n - 1 < \alpha < n$  and  $m = 1, \dots, n$  for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then

$$-_{\infty}D_x^\alpha u(x) = \left( \frac{d}{dx} \right)^n (-_{\infty}I_x^{n - \alpha} u(x)) = \left( \frac{d}{dx} \right)^{n - m} \left( -_{\infty}I_x^{n - \alpha} \frac{d^m u(x)}{dx^m} \right), \quad (2.10)$$

$${}_x D_\infty^\alpha u(x) = \left( -\frac{d}{dx} \right)^n ({}_x I_\infty^{n - \alpha} u(x)) = \left( -\frac{d}{dx} \right)^{n - m} \left( {}_x I_\infty^{n - \alpha} \left( -\frac{d}{dx} \right)^m u(x) \right). \quad (2.11)$$

In order to decompose the fractional Laplacian into a lower-order derivative and a fractional integral, a crucial step for expressing the problem into a system, we apply the properties outlined in Lemma 2.1. This application yields the following result for  $1 < \alpha < 2$ :

$$\begin{aligned} -(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2} u(x) &= -\frac{1}{2 \cos(\alpha\pi/2)} (-_{\infty}D_x^\alpha u(x) + {}_x D_\infty^\alpha u(x)) \\ &= \frac{1}{2 \cos((2 - \alpha)\pi/2)} \frac{d^2}{dx^2} (-_{\infty}I_x^{2 - \alpha} u(x) + {}_x I_\infty^{2 - \alpha} u(x)) = \frac{d^2}{dx^2} \left( \Delta_{\frac{\alpha - 2}{2}} u(x) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2 \cos((2 - \alpha)\pi/2)} \frac{d}{dx} \left( -_{\infty}I_x^{2 - \alpha} \frac{du(x)}{dx} + {}_x I_\infty^{2 - \alpha} \frac{du(x)}{dx} \right) = \frac{d}{dx} \left( \Delta_{\frac{\alpha - 2}{2}} \frac{du(x)}{dx} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence the fractional Laplacian can be written in the decomposed form

$$-(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2} u(x) = \frac{d}{dx} \left( \Delta_{\frac{\alpha - 2}{2}} \frac{du(x)}{dx} \right) = \frac{d^2}{dx^2} \left( \Delta_{\frac{\alpha - 2}{2}} u(x) \right). \quad (2.12)$$

**Definition 2.2** (Fractional space [21]). Let  $u \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$  and  $\mu > 0$ . We define the semi-norms

$$|u|_{J_L^\mu(\mathbb{R})} = \|-\infty D_x^\mu u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}, \quad |u|_{J_L^{-\mu}(\mathbb{R})} = \|-\infty I_x^\mu u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}, \quad (2.13)$$

$$|u|_{J_R^\mu(\mathbb{R})} = \|x D_\infty^\mu u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}, \quad |u|_{J_R^{-\mu}(\mathbb{R})} = \|x I_\infty^\mu u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}, \quad (2.14)$$

$$|u|_{J_S^\mu(\mathbb{R})} = |(-\infty D_x^\mu u, x D_\infty^\mu u)|^{1/2}, \quad |u|_{J_S^{-\mu}(\mathbb{R})} = |(-\infty I_x^\mu u, x I_\infty^\mu u)|^{1/2}, \quad (2.15)$$

where  $(\cdot, \cdot)$  is the standard  $L^2$ -inner product. We define the norms

$$\|u\|_{J_L^\mu(\mathbb{R})} = |u|_{J_L^\mu(\mathbb{R})} + \|u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}, \quad \|u\|_{J_L^{-\mu}(\mathbb{R})} = |u|_{J_L^{-\mu}(\mathbb{R})} + \|u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}, \quad (2.16)$$

$$\|u\|_{J_R^\mu(\mathbb{R})} = |u|_{J_R^\mu(\mathbb{R})} + \|u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}, \quad \|u\|_{J_R^{-\mu}(\mathbb{R})} = |u|_{J_R^{-\mu}(\mathbb{R})} + \|u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}, \quad (2.17)$$

$$\|u\|_{J_S^\mu(\mathbb{R})} = \left( |u|_{J_S^\mu(\mathbb{R})}^2 + \|u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2 \right)^{1/2}, \quad \|u\|_{J_S^{-\mu}(\mathbb{R})} = \left( |u|_{J_S^{-\mu}(\mathbb{R})}^2 + \|u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2 \right)^{1/2} \quad (2.18)$$

and let  $J_L^\mu(\mathbb{R})$ ,  $J_R^\mu(\mathbb{R})$  and  $J_S^\mu(\mathbb{R})$  denote the closure of  $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$  with respect to  $\|\cdot\|_{J_L^\mu(\mathbb{R})}$ ,  $\|\cdot\|_{J_R^\mu(\mathbb{R})}$  and  $\|\cdot\|_{J_S^\mu(\mathbb{R})}$  respectively.

**Remark 2.3.** It is important to note that these definitions can be naturally extended to the case where  $\mu = 0$ . In this particular case, all the norms defined in 2.2 reduce to the  $L^2$ -norm.

Utilizing the Definition 2.2, we have the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.4** (See [21]). Let  $u \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$  and  $\mu > 0$ . Then there holds

i) Adjoint property:

$$(-\infty I_x^\mu u, u) = (u, x I_\infty^\mu u).$$

ii) Inner-product between fractional integrals:

$$(-\infty I_x^\mu u, x I_\infty^\mu u) = \cos(\mu\pi) |u|_{J_L^{-\mu}(\mathbb{R})}^2 = \cos(\mu\pi) |u|_{J_R^{-\mu}(\mathbb{R})}^2.$$

**Lemma 2.5** (See [52]). Let  $0 < s < 1$ . Then the negative fractional Laplacian defined by (2.6) satisfies the following identity:

$$(\Delta_{-s/2} u, u) = |u|_{J_L^{-s}(\mathbb{R})}^2 = |u|_{J_R^{-s}(\mathbb{R})}^2. \quad (2.19)$$

We formulate the scheme for (1.1) within a bounded domain instead of  $\mathbb{R}$ . Consequently, we confine the definitions and identities to the bounded domain  $\Omega = [a, b]$  in the following analysis.

**Definition 2.6.** The fractional derivative spaces  $J_{L,0}^\mu(\Omega)$ ,  $J_{R,0}^\mu(\Omega)$  and  $J_{S,0}^\mu(\Omega)$  of order  $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$  are the closure of  $C_c^\infty(\Omega)$  under their respective norms defined in Definition 2.2.

**Lemma 2.7** (See [33]). Let  $0 < s < 1$ . Then there is a constant  $C$  such that the fractional integrals defined by (2.1) and (2.2) satisfy the following:

$$\|{}_a I_x^s u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \quad \|{}_x I_b^s u\| \leq C \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

Moreover, we have

$$\|\Delta_{-s/2} u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

**Lemma 2.8** (Fractional Poincaré-Friedrichs [21]). Let  $u \in J_{L,0}^\mu(\Omega)$  and  $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then, we have the following estimate

$$\|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C |u|_{J_{L,0}^\mu(\Omega)},$$

and for  $u \in J_{R,0}^\mu(\Omega)$ , we have

$$\|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C |u|_{J_{R,0}^\mu(\Omega)}.$$

### 3. LDG SCHEME FOR THE ONE-DIMENSIONAL FRACTIONAL KDV EQUATION

To address the complexity introduced by the higher order derivative with fractional Laplacian, we decompose it into a lower-order derivative and a fractional integral. Regarding this, we introduce the suitable auxiliary variables. Consequently, the equation (1.1) transforms into a system of fractional integral equation and first-order derivative equations. To solve this system, we employ the discontinuous Galerkin [9] method. This approach is introduced by Cockburn et al. [10] for the development of LDG method to the problems involving higher order derivatives.

Considering the decomposition of the fractional Laplacian by the equation (2.12), we introduce three auxiliary variables, namely,  $P$ ,  $Q$ , and  $R$  such that

$$P = \Delta_{(\alpha-2)/2}Q, \quad Q = R_x, \quad R = U_x.$$

As a consequence, the equation (1.1) can be rewritten in the following form

$$\begin{aligned} U_t &= -(f(U) + P)_x, \\ P &= \Delta_{(\alpha-2)/2}Q, \\ Q &= R_x, \\ R &= U_x. \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

Our approach to implement the DG scheme for the system (3.1) begins with introducing the weak formulation of the system. This involves multiplying the system (3.1) by test functions from the appropriate finite element space and integrating over an element. Subsequently, flux terms emerge by the use of integration by parts. To initiate this process, we introduce the finite element space denoted by  $V_h^k$  and subsequent discretization of the domain.

**Remark 3.1.** *The equation (1.1) is defined over  $\mathbb{R}$ . However, to design an efficient numerical scheme, we restrict it to a bounded domain  $\Omega = [a, b] \subset \mathbb{R}$  by assuming that  $U$  has a compact support within  $\Omega$ . Consequently, we impose homogeneous boundary conditions to the problem (1.1), i.e.  $U(a, t) = 0 = U(b, t)$  for all  $t < T$ .*

**Remark 3.2.** *In order to establish the  $L^2$ -stability estimate, we encounter with the term  $UU_{xx} = (U, R_x)$  on the right boundary, where  $U_{xx}$  is not known a priori. This fact leads us to impose the mixed boundary conditions. More precisely, we consider the Dirichlet boundary data on the left, i.e.  $U(a, t) = 0$ , and Neumann boundary data on the right, i.e.  $U_x(b, t) = 0$ .*

We discretize the domain  $\Omega = [a, b]$  using the partition  $a = x_{1/2} < x_{3/2} < \dots < x_{N+1/2} = b$ , where  $N$  is the number of elements. We denote the mesh of elements by  $\mathcal{I} := \{I_i = (x_{i-1/2}, x_{i+1/2}) \mid i = 1, 2, \dots, N\}$ , and  $h_i = x_{i+1/2} - x_{i-1/2}$  is the spatial step size with  $h = \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} h_i$ .

We define the following broken Sobolev spaces associated with the mesh of elements  $\mathcal{I}$ :

$$L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{I}) := \{v : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \text{ such that } v|_{I_i} \in L^2(I_i), i = 1, 2, \dots, N\};$$

and

$$H^1(\Omega, \mathcal{I}) := \{v : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \text{ such that } v|_{I_i} \in H^1(I_i), i = 1, 2, \dots, N\}.$$

For a function  $v \in H^1(\Omega, \mathcal{I})$ , we denote the value at nodes  $\{x_{i+1/2}\}$  as follows

$$v_{i+1/2} := v(x_{i+1/2}), \quad v_{i+1/2}^\pm = v(x_{i+1/2}^\pm) := \lim_{x \rightarrow x_{i+1/2}^\pm} v(x).$$

Furthermore, we define the local inner product and local  $L^2(I_i)$  norm as follows:

$$(u, v)_{I_i} = \int_{I_i} uv \, dx, \quad \|u\|_{I_i} = (u, u)_{I_i}^{1/2}.$$

Prior to introduce the LDG scheme, we assume that the exact solution  $(U, P, Q, R)$  of the system (3.1) lies in

$$\mathcal{H}(\Omega, \mathcal{I}) := H^1(0, T; H^1(\Omega, \mathcal{I})) \times L^2(0, T; H^1(\Omega, \mathcal{I})) \times L^2(0, T; L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{I})) \times L^2(0, T; H^1(\Omega, \mathcal{I})).$$

This assumption carries no ambiguity, as both  $L^2(\Omega)$  and  $H^1(\Omega)$  is embedded in the fractional spaces defined in Definition 2.2, see [52, Theorem 2.11]. Thus, the solution  $(U, P, Q, R)$  satisfies the system: for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} (U_t, v)_{I_i} &= (f(U) + P, v_x)_{I_i} - (fv + Pv) \Big|_{x_{i-1/2}^+}^{x_{i+1/2}^-}, \\ (P, w)_{I_i} &= (\Delta_{(\alpha-2)/2} Q, w)_{I_i}, \\ (Q, z)_{I_i} &= -(R, z_x)_{I_i} + (Rz) \Big|_{x_{i-1/2}^+}^{x_{i+1/2}^-}, \\ (R, s)_{I_i} &= -(U, s_x)_{I_i} + (Us) \Big|_{x_{i-1/2}^+}^{x_{i+1/2}^-}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

for all  $w \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{I})$  and  $v, z, s \in H^1(\Omega, \mathcal{I})$ .

We define the finite dimensional discontinuous piecewise polynomial space  $V_h^k \subset H^1(\Omega, \mathcal{I})$  by

$$V_h^k = \{v : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \text{ such that } v|_{I_i} \in P^k(I_i), \forall i = 1, 2, \dots, N\}, \quad (3.3)$$

where  $P^k(I_i)$  is the space of polynomials of degree up to order  $k$  ( $\geq 1$ ) on  $I_i$ . The finite element space  $V_h^k$  is embedded into the fractional derivative spaces [11, Theorem 2.8].

**LDG scheme:** We seek an approximations  $(u_h, p_h, q_h, r_h) \in H^1(0, T; V_h^k) \times L^2(0, T; V_h^k) \times L^2(0, T; V_h^k) \times L^2(0, T; V_h^k) =: \mathcal{T}_4 \times \mathcal{V}_h^k$  to  $(U, P, Q, R)$ , where  $U$  is an exact solution of (1.1) with

$$P = \Delta_{(\alpha-2)/2} Q, \quad Q = R_x, \quad R = U_x,$$

such that for all test functions  $(v, w, z, s) \in \mathcal{T}_4 \times \mathcal{V}_h^k$  and  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} ((u_h)_t, v)_{I_i} &= (f(u_h) + p_h, v_x)_{I_i} - (\hat{f}_h v + \hat{p}_h v) \Big|_{x_{i-1/2}^+}^{x_{i+1/2}^-}, \\ (p_h, w)_{I_i} &= (\Delta_{(\alpha-2)/2} q_h, w)_{I_i}, \\ (q_h, z)_{I_i} &= -(r_h, z_x)_{I_i} + (\hat{r}_h z) \Big|_{x_{i-1/2}^+}^{x_{i+1/2}^-}, \\ (r_h, s)_{I_i} &= -(u_h, s_x)_{I_i} + (\hat{u}_h s) \Big|_{x_{i-1/2}^+}^{x_{i+1/2}^-}, \\ (u_h^0, v)_{I_i} &= (U_0, v)_{I_i}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

To complete the LDG scheme (3.4), it is necessary to define the numerical fluxes  $\hat{u}_h, \hat{p}_h, \hat{r}_h$ , and  $\hat{f}_h$ . To do this, we introduce the following notations:

$$\{\{u\}\} = \frac{u^- + u^+}{2}, \quad \llbracket u \rrbracket = u^+ - u^-.$$

For the numerical fluxes, we opt for alternative fluxes at all interfaces  $x_{j+1/2}$ ,  $j = 1, 2, \dots, N-1$ :

$$\hat{p}_h = p_h^+, \quad \hat{r}_h = r_h^+, \quad \hat{u}_h = u_h^- \quad (3.5)$$

or alternatively,

$$\hat{p}_h = p_h^-, \quad \hat{r}_h = r_h^+, \quad \hat{u}_h = u_h^+.$$

Sign of  $\hat{r}_h$  usually depends on the sign of higher order derivative term, which is positive in equation (1.1). We define the fluxes at the boundary

$$(\hat{r}_h)_{1/2} = (r_h)_{1/2}^+, \quad (\hat{p}_h)_{N+1/2} = (p_h)_{N+1/2}^-, \quad (\hat{p}_h)_{1/2} = (p_h)_{1/2}^+, \quad (3.6)$$

and rest of the boundary fluxes can be chosen by imposing the mixed boundary condition and compact support of  $U$  in  $\Omega$ , that we have already mentioned in Remark 3.2. In this case, we have

$$(\hat{u}_h)_{1/2} = U(a, t) = 0, \quad (\hat{u}_h)_{N+1/2} = U(b, t) = 0, \quad (\hat{r}_h)_{N+1/2} = (r_h)_{N+1/2}^- = U_x(b, t) = 0. \quad (3.7)$$

For the numerical flux function  $\hat{f}_h$ , we can use any monotone flux [57]. In particular, we use the following Lax-Friedrichs flux

$$\hat{f}_h = \hat{f}(u_h^-, u_h^+) = \frac{1}{2}(f(u_h^-) + f(u_h^+) - \delta \llbracket u_h \rrbracket), \quad \delta = \max_u |f'(u)|, \quad (3.8)$$

where the maximum is taken over a range of  $u$  in a relevant element.

**Remark 3.3.** *It is important to note that, for the sake of writing convenience, we adopt the notation  $(v, w, z, s) \in V_h^k$  instead of  $(v, w, z, s) \in \mathcal{T}_4 \times \mathcal{V}_h^k$ . The notation  $(v, w, z, s) \in V_h^k$  signifies that each element within the tuple belongs to  $V_h^k$ . This choice is motivated by the fact that the time variable does not play a role in defining the finite element space.*

**3.1. Stability and Error estimates.** In this section, we analyze the  $L^2$ -stability and error estimates of the semi-discrete scheme (3.4)-(3.5) designed for the fractional KdV equation (1.1).

**Lemma 3.4 (Stability Lemma).** *Let  $u_h$  be the approximate solution obtained by the LDG scheme (3.4)-(3.7) with the auxiliary variables  $p_h, q_h$  and  $r_h$ . Then the LDG scheme (3.4)-(3.7) is  $L^2$ -stable. Moreover, there holds*

$$\|u_h(\cdot, T)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq e^{-2CT} \|u_h^0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \quad (3.9)$$

for any  $T > 0$  and a constant  $C$ .

*Proof.* To carry out the stability analysis, incorporating (3.4), we define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}(u, p, q, r; v, w, z, s) := & \sum_{i=1}^N \left[ (u_t, v)_{I_i} - (f(u) + p, v_x)_{I_i} \right. \\ & + (p, w)_{I_i} - (\Delta_{(\alpha-2)/2} q, w)_{I_i} \\ & + (q, z)_{I_i} + (r, z_x)_{I_i} + (r, s)_{I_i} + (u, s_x)_{I_i} \\ & \left. + \left( (\hat{f} + \hat{p})v \right) \Big|_{x_{i-1/2}^+}^{x_{i+1/2}^-} - (\hat{r}z) \Big|_{x_{i-1/2}^+}^{x_{i+1/2}^-} - (\hat{u}s) \Big|_{x_{i-1/2}^+}^{x_{i+1/2}^-} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

for all  $u, p, q, r \in \mathcal{H}(\Omega, \mathcal{I})$  and  $v, w, z, s \in V_h^k$ . We observe that the interface fluxes can be simplified as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^N \left( (\hat{f} + \hat{p})v \right) \Big|_{x_{i-1/2}^+}^{x_{i+1/2}^-} &= -(\hat{f}_{1/2} + \hat{p}_{1/2})v_{1/2}^+ + (\hat{f}_{N+1/2} + \hat{p}_{N+1/2})v_{N+1/2}^- \\ &\quad - \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} (\hat{f}_{i+1/2} + \hat{p}_{i+1/2}) \llbracket v \rrbracket_{i+1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^N (\hat{r}z) \Big|_{x_{i-1/2}^+}^{x_{i+1/2}^-} = -\hat{r}_{1/2} z_{1/2}^+ + \hat{r}_{N+1/2} z_{N+1/2}^- - \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \hat{r}_{i+1/2} \llbracket z \rrbracket_{i+1/2},$$

and

$$\sum_{i=1}^N (\hat{u}s) \Big|_{x_{i-1/2}^+}^{x_{i+1/2}^-} = -\hat{u}_{1/2} s_{1/2}^+ + \hat{u}_{N+1/2} s_{N+1/2}^- - \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \hat{u}_{i+1/2} \llbracket s \rrbracket_{i+1/2}.$$

Using the numerical fluxes (3.5)-(3.7) and the above identities, (3.10) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}(u, p, q, r; v, w, z, s) = & \sum_{i=1}^N \left[ (u_t, v)_{I_i} - ((f(u) + p), v_x)_{I_i} \right. \\ & + (p, w)_{I_i} - (\Delta_{(\alpha-2)/2} q, w)_{I_i} \\ & + (q, z)_{I_i} + (r, z_x)_{I_i} \\ & \left. + (r, s)_{I_i} + (u, s_x)_{I_i} \right] + \mathcal{IF}(u, p, r; v, z, s), \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

where numerical flux  $\mathcal{IF}$  at interfaces is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{IF}(u, p, r; v, z, s) &= -\left(\hat{f}_{1/2} + p_{1/2}^+\right) v_{1/2}^+ + \left(\hat{f}_{N+1/2} + p_{N+1/2}^-\right) v_{N+1/2}^- \\ &\quad - \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \left(\hat{f}_{i+1/2} + p_{i+1/2}^+\right) \llbracket v \rrbracket_{i+1/2} \\ &\quad + r_{1/2}^+ z_{1/2}^+ - r_{N+1/2}^- z_{N+1/2}^- + \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} r_{i+1/2}^+ \llbracket z \rrbracket_{i+1/2} + \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} u_{i+1/2}^- \llbracket s \rrbracket_{i+1/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

In order to estimate  $\mathcal{B}$ , we choose test functions  $(v, w, z, s) = (u, -q + p + r, u + r, r - p)$  in (3.11) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}(u, p, q, r; u, -q + p + r, u + r, r - p) &= \sum_{i=1}^N \left[ (u_t, u)_{I_i} - (f(u), u_x)_{I_i} - (p, u_x)_{I_i} \right. \\ &\quad - (p, q)_{I_i} + (p, p)_{I_i} + (p, r)_{I_i} + (\Delta_{(\alpha-2)/2} q, q)_{I_i} \\ &\quad - (\Delta_{(\alpha-2)/2} q, p)_{I_i} - (\Delta_{(\alpha-2)/2} q, r)_{I_i} + (q, u)_{I_i} \\ &\quad + (q, r)_{I_i} + (r, u_x)_{I_i} + (r, r_x)_{I_i} + (r, r)_{I_i} \\ &\quad \left. - (r, p)_{I_i} + (u, r_x)_{I_i} - (u, p_x)_{I_i} \right] \\ &\quad + \mathcal{IF}(u, p, r; u, u + r, r - p). \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

Applying the integration by parts, we have

$$(p, u_x)_{I_i} + (u, p_x)_{I_i} = (up) \Big|_{x_{i-1/2}^+}^{x_{i+1/2}^-} \quad \text{and} \quad (r, u_x)_{I_i} + (u, r_x)_{I_i} = (ur) \Big|_{x_{i-1/2}^+}^{x_{i+1/2}^-},$$

and substituting these identities in equation (3.13), the compact form  $\mathcal{B}$  reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}(u, p, q, r; u, -q + p + r, u + r, r - p) &= \sum_{i=1}^N \left[ (u_t, u)_{I_i} - (f(u), u_x)_{I_i} - (p, q)_{I_i} + (p, p)_{I_i} \right. \\ &\quad + (\Delta_{(\alpha-2)/2} q, q)_{I_i} - (\Delta_{(\alpha-2)/2} q, p)_{I_i} - (\Delta_{(\alpha-2)/2} q, r)_{I_i} \\ &\quad \left. + (q, u)_{I_i} + (q, r)_{I_i} + (r, r_x)_{I_i} + (r, r)_{I_i} \right] \\ &\quad - \underbrace{\sum_{i=1}^N (up) \Big|_{x_{i-1/2}^+}^{x_{i+1/2}^-} + \sum_{i=1}^N (ur) \Big|_{x_{i-1/2}^+}^{x_{i+1/2}^-}}_{\mathcal{E}_1} + \mathcal{IF}(u, p, r; u, u + r, r - p). \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

In order to simplify  $\mathcal{E}_1$ , we observe that

$$\sum_{i=1}^N (up) \Big|_{x_{i-1/2}^+}^{x_{i+1/2}^-} = -u_{1/2}^+ p_{1/2}^+ + u_{N+1/2}^- p_{N+1/2}^- - \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} u_{i+1/2}^- \llbracket p \rrbracket_{i+1/2} - \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} p_{i+1/2}^+ \llbracket u \rrbracket_{i+1/2}, \quad (3.15)$$

and similarly,

$$\sum_{i=1}^N (ur) \Big|_{x_{i-1/2}^+}^{x_{i+1/2}^-} = -u_{1/2}^+ r_{1/2}^+ + u_{N+1/2}^- r_{N+1/2}^- - \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} u_{i+1/2}^- \llbracket r \rrbracket_{i+1/2} - \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} r_{i+1/2}^+ \llbracket u \rrbracket_{i+1/2}. \quad (3.16)$$

As a result, the term  $\mathcal{E}_1$  becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}_1 &= - \sum_{i=1}^N (up) \Big|_{x_{i-1/2}^+}^{x_{i+1/2}^-} + \sum_{i=1}^N (ur) \Big|_{x_{i-1/2}^+}^{x_{i+1/2}^-} + \mathcal{IF}(u, p, r; u, u+r, r-p) \\
&= u_{1/2}^+ p_{1/2}^+ - u_{N+1/2}^- p_{N+1/2}^- + \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} u_{i+1/2}^- \llbracket p \rrbracket_{i+1/2} + \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} p_{i+1/2}^+ \llbracket u \rrbracket_{i+1/2} \\
&\quad - u_{1/2}^+ r_{1/2}^+ + u_{N+1/2}^- r_{N+1/2}^- - \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} u_{i+1/2}^- \llbracket r \rrbracket_{i+1/2} - \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} r_{i+1/2}^+ \llbracket u \rrbracket_{i+1/2} \\
&\quad - \left( \hat{f}_{1/2} + p_{1/2}^+ \right) u_{1/2}^+ + \left( \hat{f}_{N+1/2} + p_{N+1/2}^- \right) u_{N+1/2}^- - \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \left( \hat{f}_{i+1/2} + p_{i+1/2}^+ \right) \llbracket u \rrbracket_{i+1/2} \\
&\quad + r_{1/2}^+ (u+r)_{1/2}^+ - r_{N+1/2}^- (u+r)_{N+1/2}^- + \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} r_{i+1/2}^+ \llbracket u+r \rrbracket_{i+1/2} + \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} u_{i+1/2}^- \llbracket r-p \rrbracket_{i+1/2} \\
&= -\hat{f}_{1/2} u_{1/2}^+ + \hat{f}_{N+1/2} u_{N+1/2}^- - \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \hat{f}_{i+1/2} \llbracket u \rrbracket_{i+1/2} + \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} r_{i+1/2}^+ \llbracket r \rrbracket_{i+1/2} + (r_{1/2}^+)^2 - (r_{N+1/2}^-)^2 \\
&= -\hat{f}_{1/2} u_{1/2}^+ + \hat{f}_{N+1/2} u_{N+1/2}^- - \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \hat{f}_{i+1/2} \llbracket u \rrbracket_{i+1/2} + \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \left( (r_{i+1/2}^+)^2 - r_{i+1/2}^+ r_{i+1/2}^- \right) \\
&\quad + (r_{1/2}^+)^2 - (r_{N+1/2}^-)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, we observe that

$$\sum_{i=1}^N (r, r_x)_{I_i} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N r^2 \Big|_{x_{i-1/2}^+}^{x_{i+1/2}^-} = -\frac{1}{2} (r_{1/2}^+)^2 + \frac{1}{2} (r_{N+1/2}^-)^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \left( (r_{i+1/2}^-)^2 - (r_{i+1/2}^+)^2 \right). \quad (3.17)$$

As a consequence, using  $r_{N+1/2}^- = 0$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}_1 + \sum_{i=1}^N (r, r_x)_{I_i} &= -\hat{f}_{1/2} u_{1/2}^+ + \hat{f}_{N+1/2} u_{N+1/2}^- - \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \hat{f}_{i+1/2} \llbracket u \rrbracket_{i+1/2} + \frac{1}{2} (r_{1/2}^+)^2 - \frac{1}{2} (r_{N+1/2}^-)^2 \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \left( \frac{1}{2} (r_{i+1/2}^-)^2 + \frac{1}{2} (r_{i+1/2}^+)^2 - r_{i+1/2}^+ r_{i+1/2}^- \right) \\
&= -\hat{f}_{1/2} u_{1/2}^+ + \hat{f}_{N+1/2} u_{N+1/2}^- - \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \hat{f}_{i+1/2} \llbracket u \rrbracket_{i+1/2} + \frac{1}{2} (r_{1/2}^+)^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \llbracket r \rrbracket_{i+1/2}^2.
\end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

Let us define  $F(u) = \int^u f(u) du$ . Hence we get

$$\sum_{i=1}^N (f(u), u_x)_{I_i} = \sum_{i=1}^N F(u) \Big|_{u_{i-1/2}^+}^{u_{i+1/2}^-} = - \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \llbracket F(u) \rrbracket_{i+1/2} - F(u)_{1/2} + F(u)_{N+1/2}. \quad (3.19)$$

Taking into account (3.18) and (3.19) in (3.14), we end up with

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{B}(u, p, q, r; u, -q + p + r, u + r, r - p) &= \sum_{i=1}^N \left[ (u_t, u)_{I_i} - (p, q)_{I_i} + (p, p)_{I_i} + (\Delta_{(\alpha-2)/2} q, q)_{I_i} \right. \\
&\quad - (\Delta_{(\alpha-2)/2} q, p)_{I_i} - (\Delta_{(\alpha-2)/2} q, r)_{I_i} + (q, u)_{I_i} + (q, r)_{I_i} \\
&\quad \left. + (r, r)_{I_i} \right] + F(u)_{1/2} - F(u)_{N+1/2} + \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \llbracket F(u) \rrbracket_{i+1/2} \\
&\quad - \hat{f}_{1/2} u_{1/2}^+ + \hat{f}_{N+1/2} u_{N+1/2}^- - \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \hat{f}_{i+1/2} \llbracket u \rrbracket_{i+1/2} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \llbracket r \rrbracket_{i+1/2}^2 + \frac{1}{2} (r_{1/2}^+)^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.20}$$

Clearly, if  $(u_h, p_h, q_h, r_h)$  is a solution of scheme (3.4)-(3.7), then

$$\mathcal{B}(u_h, p_h, q_h, r_h; v, w, z, s) = 0 \text{ for any } (v, w, z, s) \in V_h^k.$$

By using the Young's inequality in (3.20), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
((u_h)_t, u_h)_{L^2(\Omega)} &+ \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \llbracket F(u_h) \rrbracket_{i+1/2} + F(u_h)_{1/2} - F(u_h)_{N+1/2} + \|p_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + (\Delta_{(\alpha-2)/2} q_h, q_h)_{I_i} \\
&+ \|r_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 - (\hat{f}_h)_{1/2} (u_h)_{1/2}^+ + (\hat{f}_h)_{N+1/2} (u_h)_{N+1/2}^- - \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} (\hat{f}_h)_{i+1/2} \llbracket u_h \rrbracket_{i+1/2} \\
&+ \frac{1}{2} ((r_h)_{1/2}^+)^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \llbracket r_h \rrbracket_{i+1/2}^2 \\
&\leq \varepsilon \|p_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + c_1(\varepsilon) \|q_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \varepsilon \|r_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + c_2(\varepsilon) \|u_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.21}$$

where we have used the Lemma 2.7, and  $c_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$  are constants and  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Given that  $\hat{f}(u_h^-, u_h^+)$  is a monotone flux, exhibiting non-decreasing behavior in its first argument and non-increasing behavior in its second argument, we have

$$\llbracket F(u_h) \rrbracket_{i+1/2} - (\hat{f}_h)_{i+1/2} \llbracket u_h \rrbracket_{i+1/2} > 0 \text{ for } i = 1, 2, \dots, N-1.$$

With the help of Lemma 2.5, the estimate (3.21) reduces to

$$(u_t, u_h)_{L^2(\Omega)} + F(u_h)_{1/2} - F(u_h)_{N+1/2} - (\hat{f}_h)_{1/2} u_{1/2}^+ + (\hat{f}_h)_{N+1/2} (u_h)_{N+1/2}^- \leq C \|u_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2,$$

where we have omitted the positive terms on the left-hand side. Imposing the boundary conditions, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|u_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq C \|u_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2. \tag{3.22}$$

Using the Gronwall's inequality, (3.22) yields the estimate

$$\|u_h(\cdot, T)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq e^{-2CT} \|u_h^0\|_{L^2(\Omega)},$$

where the constant  $C$  is independent of  $u_h$ . Hence the  $L^2$ -stability is established.  $\square$

**Remark 3.5.** *Following the Remark 3.2, we can extend our stability analysis for an alternate choice of Neumann boundary condition consider in (3.7). More precisely, let us consider the boundary data  $U_x(a, t) = U_x(b, t)$ . We observe that setting  $\hat{r}_{1/2} = r_{1/2}^+$  and  $\hat{r}_{N+1/2} = r_{N+1/2}^-$  implies  $r_{1/2}^+ = r_{N+1/2}^-$ , resulting in  $\frac{1}{2}(r_{1/2}^+)^2 - \frac{1}{2}(r_{N+1/2}^-)^2 = 0$ . From (3.18), the stability estimate follows. Alternatively, if we consider the boundary data  $U(b, t) = \rho(t)$ , we can choose  $\hat{r}^{N+1/2} = \rho(t)$ ,*

leading to  $\frac{1}{2}(r_{N+1/2}^-)^2 = \frac{1}{2}\rho(t)^2$  and subsequently, the stability estimate can be derived from (3.18). These alternative choices of flux functions enrich our understanding of the stability under various boundary conditions.

We derive an estimate for the  $L^2$ -error of the approximate solution  $u_h$  by using the aforementioned stability result. This process unfolds in two steps: initially focusing on the linear convection term  $f(u) = \lambda u$ ,  $\lambda \geq 0$  (see [57]), and then utilizing the linear case estimate to establish the error estimate for the non-linear case [55]. In particular, we can take  $\lambda \leq 0$  with the modification in the numerical flux by setting  $\hat{p}_h = p_h^-$  and  $\hat{u}_h = u_h^+$ . It is worthwhile to mention that error analysis for (1.1) differs from [57, 55] in choosing the test functions and estimating the fractional term.

We begin with by defining the projection operators into  $V_h^k$ . For any  $g \in L^2(\Omega)$ , which is sufficiently smooth, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{I_i} (\mathcal{P}^\pm g(x) - g(x))y(x) dx &= 0 \quad \forall y \in P^{k-1}(I_i), \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, N, \quad \text{and } (\mathcal{P}^\pm u)_{i\mp 1/2}^\pm = u(x_{i\mp 1/2}^\pm), \\ \int_{I_i} (\mathcal{P}g(x) - g(x))y(x) dx &= 0 \quad \forall y \in P^k(I_i), \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, N, \end{aligned} \quad (3.23)$$

where  $\mathcal{P}^\pm$  are special projection operators and  $\mathcal{P}$  is the standard  $L^2$  projection. Let  $U$  be an exact solution of (1.1) and  $u_h$  be an approximate solution obtained by the LDG scheme (3.4)-(3.7). We denote

$$\mathcal{P}_h^- u = \mathcal{P}^- U - u_h, \quad \mathcal{P}_h^+ p = \mathcal{P}^+ P - p_h, \quad \mathcal{P}_h q = \mathcal{P}Q - q_h, \quad \mathcal{P}_h^+ r = \mathcal{P}^+ R - r_h,$$

and

$$\mathcal{P}_e^- U = \mathcal{P}^- U - U, \quad \mathcal{P}_e^+ P = \mathcal{P}^+ P - P, \quad \mathcal{P}_e Q = \mathcal{P}Q - Q, \quad \mathcal{P}_e^+ R = \mathcal{P}^+ R - R.$$

If  $f(u) = \lambda u$ , then  $\hat{f}_h = \hat{f}(u_h^-, u_h^+) = \frac{\lambda}{2}(u_h^- + u_h^+) - \frac{|\lambda|}{2}(u_h^+ - u_h^-)$ . This is the Lax-Friedrichs flux with  $|f'(u)| = |\lambda|$  and the scheme (3.4) reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} ((u_h)_t, v)_{I_i} &= (\lambda u_h + p_h, v_x)_{I_i} - \left( \hat{f}_h v + \hat{p}_h v \right) \Big|_{x_{i-1/2}^+}^{x_{i+1/2}^-}, \\ (p_h, w)_{I_i} &= (\Delta_{(\alpha-2)/2} q_h, w)_{I_i}, \\ (q_h, z)_{I_i} &= -(r_h, z_x)_{I_i} + (\hat{r}_h z) \Big|_{x_{i-1/2}^+}^{x_{i+1/2}^-}, \\ (r, s)_{I_i} &= -(u_h, s_x)_{I_i} + (\hat{u}_h s) \Big|_{x_{i-1/2}^+}^{x_{i+1/2}^-}, \\ (u_h^0, v)_{I_i} &= (U_0, v)_{I_i}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.24)$$

and the associated compact form can be represented as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_\lambda(u, p, q, r; v, w, z, s) &= \sum_{i=1}^N \left[ (u_t, v)_{I_i} - (\lambda u + p, v_x)_{I_i} \right. \\ &\quad + (p, w)_{I_i} - (\Delta_{(\alpha-2)/2} q, w)_{I_i} \\ &\quad + (q, z)_{I_i} + (r, z_x)_{I_i} + (r, s)_{I_i} + (u, s_x)_{I_i} \\ &\quad \left. + \left( (\hat{f} + \hat{p})v \right) \Big|_{x_{i-1/2}^+}^{x_{i+1/2}^-} - (\hat{r}z) \Big|_{x_{i-1/2}^+}^{x_{i+1/2}^-} - (\hat{u}s) \Big|_{x_{i-1/2}^+}^{x_{i+1/2}^-} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (3.25)$$

where numerical fluxes  $\hat{u}$ ,  $\hat{p}$ ,  $\hat{r}$  are defined by (3.5) and boundary fluxes by (3.7). Let us consider equations (3.20) with  $f(u) = \lambda u$ ,  $\lambda \geq 0$  and  $\hat{f}(u^-, u^+) = \frac{\lambda}{2}(u^- + u^+) - \frac{|\lambda|}{2}(u^+ - u^-) = \lambda u^-$ . As a

consequence, the compact form transforms to

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathcal{B}_\lambda(u, p, q, r; u, -q + p + r, u + r, r - p) &= \sum_{i=1}^N \left[ (u_t, u)_{I_i} - (p, q)_{I_i} + (p, p)_{I_i} + (\Delta_{(\alpha-2)/2} q, q)_{I_i} \right. \\
 &\quad - (\Delta_{(\alpha-2)/2} q, p)_{I_i} - (\Delta_{(\alpha-2)/2} q, r)_{I_i} + (q, u)_{I_i} + (q, r)_{I_i} \\
 &\quad \left. + (r, r)_{I_i} \right] + F(u)_{1/2} - F(u)_{N+1/2} + \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \llbracket F(u) \rrbracket_{i+1/2} \\
 &\quad - \hat{f}_{1/2} u_{1/2}^+ + \hat{f}_{N+1/2} u_{N+1/2}^- - \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \hat{f}_{i+1/2} \llbracket u \rrbracket_{i+1/2} \\
 &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \llbracket r \rrbracket_{i+1/2}^2 + \frac{1}{2} (r_{1/2}^+)^2.
 \end{aligned} \tag{3.26}$$

The following lemma will be instrumental for the subsequent error analysis.

**Lemma 3.6** (See [52]). *Let  $U \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$  and  $u_h$  be an approximation of  $U$  in  $V_h^k(\Omega)$ . Further assume that  $(u_h, v)_{I_i} = (U, v)_{I_i}$ ,  $\forall v \in P^k(I_i)$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ . For  $0 < s < 1$ , the following estimate holds*

$$\|\Delta_{-s/2} U - \Delta_{-s/2} u_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq Ch^{k+1}, \tag{3.27}$$

where  $C$  is a constant independent of  $h$ .

**Theorem 3.7.** *Let  $U$  be a sufficiently smooth exact solution of equation (1.1) with  $f(u) = \lambda u$ ,  $\lambda \geq 0$ . Let  $u_h$  be an approximate solution obtained by the LDG scheme (3.25). Then the following error estimate holds*

$$\|U - u_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq Ch^{k+\frac{1}{2}}, \tag{3.28}$$

provided  $h$  is sufficiently small, and  $C$  is a constant independent of  $h$ .

*Proof.* We define

$$P = \Delta_{(\alpha-2)/2} Q, \quad Q = R_x, \quad R = U_x.$$

Then  $U, P, Q$  and  $R$  satisfy (3.25), i.e.

$$\mathcal{B}_\lambda(U, P, Q, R; v, w, z, s) = 0, \quad \text{for all } v, w, z, s \in V_h^k.$$

Since  $f(u) = \lambda u$ , the equation (1.1) becomes linear and  $\mathcal{B}_\lambda$  transforms into a bilinear operator. Assume that  $(u_h, p_h, q_h, r_h) \in V_h^k$  satisfies (3.24). Then we have

$$\mathcal{B}_\lambda(u_h, p_h, q_h, r_h; v, w, z, s) = 0, \quad \text{for all } (v, w, z, s) \in V_h^k.$$

Hence we formulate the error equation

$$\mathcal{B}_\lambda(U - u_h, P - p_h, Q - q_h, R - r_h; v, w, z, s) = 0 \quad \text{for all } (v, w, z, s) \in V_h^k.$$

The error can be represented as  $U - u_h = \mathcal{P}_h^- u - \mathcal{P}_e^- U$ . Consequently, for all  $(v, w, z, s) \in V_h^k$ , we have the following identity

$$\mathcal{B}_\lambda(\mathcal{P}_h^- u, \mathcal{P}_h^+ p, \mathcal{P}_h q, \mathcal{P}_h^+ r; v, w, z, s) = \mathcal{B}_\lambda(\mathcal{P}_e^- U, \mathcal{P}_e^+ P, \mathcal{P}_e Q, \mathcal{P}_e^+ R; v, w, z, s). \tag{3.29}$$

We choose  $(v, w, z, s) = (\mathcal{P}_h^- u, -\mathcal{P}_h q + \mathcal{P}_h^+ p + \mathcal{P}_h^+ r, \mathcal{P}_h^- u + \mathcal{P}_h^+ r, \mathcal{P}_h^+ r - \mathcal{P}_h^+ p)$  in equation (3.29). Taking into account the bilinear form (3.26), the left hand side of the identity (3.29) can be

represented as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{B}_\lambda(\mathcal{P}_h^- u, \mathcal{P}_h^+ p, \mathcal{P}_h q, \mathcal{P}_h^+ r; \mathcal{P}_h^- u, -\mathcal{P}_h q + \mathcal{P}_h^+ p + \mathcal{P}_h^+ r, \mathcal{P}_h^- u + \mathcal{P}_h^+ r, \mathcal{P}_h^+ r - \mathcal{P}_h^+ p) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^N \left[ ((\mathcal{P}_h^- u)_t, \mathcal{P}_h^- u)_{I_i} - (\mathcal{P}_h^+ p, \mathcal{P}_h q)_{I_i} + (\mathcal{P}_h^+ p, \mathcal{P}_h^+ p)_{I_i} + (\Delta_{(\alpha-2)/2} \mathcal{P}_h q, \mathcal{P}_h q)_{I_i} \right. \\
&\quad - (\Delta_{(\alpha-2)/2} \mathcal{P}_h q, \mathcal{P}_h^+ p)_{I_i} - (\Delta_{(\alpha-2)/2} \mathcal{P}_h q, \mathcal{P}_h^+ r)_{I_i} + (\mathcal{P}_h q, \mathcal{P}_h^- u)_{I_i} + (\mathcal{P}_h q, \mathcal{P}_h^+ r)_{I_i} \\
&\quad \left. + (\mathcal{P}_h^+ r, \mathcal{P}_h^+ r)_{I_i} \right] + \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \left( \llbracket F(\mathcal{P}_h^- u) \rrbracket_{i+1/2} - \hat{f}_{i+1/2} \llbracket \mathcal{P}_h^- u \rrbracket_{i+1/2} \right) \\
&\quad + F(\mathcal{P}_h^- u)_{1/2} - F(\mathcal{P}_h^- u)_{N+1/2} - \hat{f}_{1/2} (\mathcal{P}_h^- u)_{1/2}^+ + \hat{f}_{N+1/2} (\mathcal{P}_h^- u)_{N+1/2}^- \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \llbracket \mathcal{P}_h^+ r \rrbracket_{i+1/2}^2 + \frac{1}{2} ((\mathcal{P}_h^+ r)_{1/2}^+)^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.30}$$

and from equation (3.25), the right hand side of the identity (3.29) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{B}_\lambda(\mathcal{P}_e^- U, \mathcal{P}_e^+ P, \mathcal{P}_e Q, \mathcal{P}_e^+ R; \mathcal{P}_h^- u, -\mathcal{P}_h q + \mathcal{P}_h^+ p + \mathcal{P}_h^+ r, \mathcal{P}_h^- u + \mathcal{P}_h^+ r, \mathcal{P}_h^+ r - \mathcal{P}_h^+ p) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^N \left[ ((\mathcal{P}_e^- U)_t, \mathcal{P}_h^- u)_{I_i} - (\lambda \mathcal{P}_e^- U + \mathcal{P}_e^+ P, (\mathcal{P}_h^- u)_x)_{I_i} + (\mathcal{P}_e^+ P, -\mathcal{P}_h q + \mathcal{P}_h^+ p + \mathcal{P}_h^+ r)_{I_i} \right. \\
&\quad - (\Delta_{(\alpha-2)/2} (\mathcal{P}_e Q), -\mathcal{P}_h q + \mathcal{P}_h^+ p + \mathcal{P}_h^+ r)_{I_i} + (\mathcal{P}_e Q, \mathcal{P}_h^- u + \mathcal{P}_h^+ r)_{I_i} \\
&\quad \left. + (\mathcal{P}_e^+ R, (\mathcal{P}_h^- u + \mathcal{P}_h^+ r)_x)_{I_i} + (\mathcal{P}_e^+ R, \mathcal{P}_h^+ r - \mathcal{P}_h^+ p)_{I_i} + (\mathcal{P}_e^- U, (\mathcal{P}_h^+ r - \mathcal{P}_h^+ p)_x)_{I_i} \right] \\
&\quad + \mathcal{IF}(\mathcal{P}_e^- U, \mathcal{P}_e^+ P, \mathcal{P}_e^+ R; \mathcal{P}_h^- u, \mathcal{P}_h^- u + \mathcal{P}_h^+ r, \mathcal{P}_h^+ r - \mathcal{P}_h^+ p),
\end{aligned} \tag{3.31}$$

where numerical flux at interfaces  $\mathcal{IF}$  is given by (3.12) with  $\hat{f}_h = \hat{f}(u_h^-, u_h^+) = \frac{\lambda}{2}(u_h^- + u_h^+) - \frac{|\lambda|}{2}(u_h^+ - u_h^-)$ . We observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\mathcal{P}_h^- u)_x \in P^{k-1}(I_i), \quad \mathcal{P}_h^- u + \mathcal{P}_h^+ r \in P^k(I_i), \\
& (\mathcal{P}_h^- u + \mathcal{P}_h^+ r)_x \in P^{k-1}(I_i), \quad (\mathcal{P}_h^+ r - \mathcal{P}_h^+ p)_x \in P^{k-1}(I_i),
\end{aligned}$$

for all  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ . Since  $U, P, Q$  and  $R$  are sufficiently smooth, applying the projection operators introduced in (3.23), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\lambda \mathcal{P}_e^- U + \mathcal{P}_e^+ P, (\mathcal{P}_h^- u)_x)_{I_i} = 0, \quad (\mathcal{P}_e Q, \mathcal{P}_h^- u + \mathcal{P}_h^+ r)_{I_i} = 0, \\
& (\mathcal{P}_e^+ R, (\mathcal{P}_h^- u + \mathcal{P}_h^+ r)_x)_{I_i} = 0, \quad (\mathcal{P}_e^- U, (\mathcal{P}_h^+ r - \mathcal{P}_h^+ p)_x)_{I_i} = 0,
\end{aligned}$$

and at the interfaces

$$(\lambda \mathcal{P}_e^- U)_{i+1/2}^- = 0, \quad (\mathcal{P}_e^+ P)_{i-1/2}^+ = 0, \quad (\mathcal{P}_e^+ R)_{i-1/2}^+ = 0,$$

and the approximation theory on the point values [8, Section 3.2] yields

$$(\lambda \mathcal{P}_e^- U)_{i-1/2}^- \leq Ch_i^{k+1}, \quad (\mathcal{P}_e^+ P)_{i+1/2}^+ \leq Ch_i^{k+1}, \quad (\mathcal{P}_e^+ R)_{i+1/2}^+ \leq Ch_i^{k+1},$$

for all  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ . Therefore, for the fluxes at interfaces, we have

$$\mathcal{IF}(\mathcal{P}_e^- U, \mathcal{P}_e^+ P, \mathcal{P}_e^+ R; \mathcal{P}_h^- u, \mathcal{P}_h^- u + \mathcal{P}_h^+ r, \mathcal{P}_h^+ r - \mathcal{P}_h^+ p) \leq C \sum_{i=1}^N h_i^{2k+2} \leq C(\Omega) h^{2k+1}.$$

With the help of the above estimate, the bilinear form (3.31) can be estimated as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{B}_\lambda(\mathcal{P}_e^- U, \mathcal{P}_e^+ P, \mathcal{P}_e Q, \mathcal{P}_e^+ R; \mathcal{P}_h^- u, -\mathcal{P}_h q + \mathcal{P}_h^+ p + \mathcal{P}_h^+ r, \mathcal{P}_h^- u + \mathcal{P}_h^+ r, \mathcal{P}_h^+ r - \mathcal{P}_h^+ p) \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^N \left[ ((\mathcal{P}_e^- U)_t, \mathcal{P}_h^- u)_{I_i} + (\Delta_{(\alpha-2)/2} (\mathcal{P}_e Q) - (\mathcal{P}_e^+ P), \mathcal{P}_h q - \mathcal{P}_h^+ p - \mathcal{P}_h^+ r)_{I_i} \right]
\end{aligned}$$

$$+ (\mathcal{P}_e^+ R, \mathcal{P}_h^+ r - \mathcal{P}_h^+ p)_{I_i} \Big] + C(\Omega)h^{2k+1}. \quad (3.32)$$

Using the Young's inequality and also the triangle inequality, Lemma 3.6 and approximation theorem in [8, Section 3.2] in equation (3.32), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{B}_\lambda(\mathcal{P}_e^- U, \mathcal{P}_e^+ P, \mathcal{P}_e^- Q, \mathcal{P}_e^+ R; \mathcal{P}_h^- u, -\mathcal{P}_h q + \mathcal{P}_h^+ p + \mathcal{P}_h^+ r, \mathcal{P}_h^- u + \mathcal{P}_h^+ r, \mathcal{P}_h^+ r - \mathcal{P}_h^+ p) \\ & \leq ((\mathcal{P}_e^- U)_t, \mathcal{P}_h^- u)_{L^2(\Omega)} + c_1(\epsilon)h^{2k+2} + \epsilon \left( \|\mathcal{P}_h q\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\mathcal{P}_h^+ p\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\mathcal{P}_h^+ r\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \right) \\ & \quad + c_2(\epsilon)h^{2k+2} + \epsilon \left( \|\mathcal{P}_h^+ r\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\mathcal{P}_h^+ p\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \right) + C(\Omega)h^{2k+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.33)$$

where  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  are constants and  $\epsilon > 0$ . Equation (3.29) implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{B}_\lambda(\mathcal{P}_h^- u, \mathcal{P}_h^+ p, \mathcal{P}_h q, \mathcal{P}_h^+ r; \mathcal{P}_h^- u, -\mathcal{P}_h q + \mathcal{P}_h^+ p + \mathcal{P}_h^+ r, \mathcal{P}_h^- u + \mathcal{P}_h^+ r, \mathcal{P}_h^+ r - \mathcal{P}_h^+ p) \\ & \leq ((\mathcal{P}_e^- U)_t, \mathcal{P}_h^- u)_{L^2(\Omega)} + c_1(\epsilon)h^{2k+2} + \epsilon \left( \|\mathcal{P}_h q\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\mathcal{P}_h^+ p\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\mathcal{P}_h^+ r\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \right) \\ & \quad + c_2(\epsilon)h^{2k+2} + \epsilon \left( \|\mathcal{P}_h^+ r\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\mathcal{P}_h^+ p\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \right) + C(\Omega)h^{2k+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.34)$$

Incorporating (3.30) in (3.34), and omitting the positive terms on the left-hand side, yields

$$\begin{aligned} & ((\mathcal{P}_h^- u)_t, \mathcal{P}_h^- u)_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\mathcal{P}_h^+ r\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\mathcal{P}_h^+ p\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + (\Delta_{(\alpha-2)/2} \mathcal{P}_h q, \mathcal{P}_h q)_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ & \leq ((\mathcal{P}_e^- U)_t, \mathcal{P}_h^- u)_{L^2(\Omega)} + C(\Omega)h^{2k+1} + \epsilon \|\mathcal{P}_h^+ p\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + c_1(\epsilon) \|\mathcal{P}_h q\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ & \quad + \epsilon \|\mathcal{P}_h^+ r\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + c_2(\epsilon) \|\mathcal{P}_h^- u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (3.35)$$

where we have again used the Young's inequality, Lemma 2.5 and Lemma 2.8. Furthermore, we have

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\mathcal{P}_h^- u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq ((\mathcal{P}_e^- U)_t, \mathcal{P}_h^- u)_{L^2(\Omega)} + C(\Omega)h^{2k+1} + C \|\mathcal{P}_h^- u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2.$$

Since  $\|\mathcal{P}_h^- u(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 = 0$ , using the standard approximation theory associated to the projection operator [8, Section 3.2] and Gronwall's inequality, we have

$$\|U - u_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq Ch^{k+\frac{1}{2}}.$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

We extend the previous error estimate to accommodate a more general non-linear convection term. In the process of formulating the error estimate for the nonlinear fractional KdV equation (1.1), we introduce few lemmas concerning the measure between physical flux  $f$  and numerical flux  $\hat{f}_h$ . Subsequently, we present our main result.

**Lemma 3.8** (See Lemma 3.1 in [59]). *Let  $\xi \in L^2(\Omega)$  be any piecewise smooth function. On each interface of elements and the boundary point, we define*

$$\beta(\hat{f}; \xi) := \beta(\hat{f}; \xi^-, \xi^+) = \begin{cases} \llbracket \xi \rrbracket^{-1} (f(\{\xi\}) - \hat{f}(\xi)), & \text{if } \llbracket \xi \rrbracket \neq 0, \\ \frac{1}{2} |f'(\{\xi\})|, & \text{if } \llbracket \xi \rrbracket = 0, \end{cases}$$

where  $\hat{f}(\xi) = \hat{f}(\xi^-, \xi^+)$  is a monotone numerical flux consistent with the given flux  $f$ . Then  $\beta(\hat{f}; \xi)$  is bounded and nonnegative for any  $(\xi^-, \xi^+) \in \mathbb{R}$ . Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} |f'(\{\xi\})| & \leq \beta(\hat{f}; \xi) + C_* \|\llbracket \xi \rrbracket\|, \\ -\frac{1}{8} f''(\{\xi\}) \|\llbracket \xi \rrbracket\| & \leq \beta(\hat{f}; \xi) + C_* \|\llbracket \xi \rrbracket\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Borrowing the idea from [55], our aim is to find the estimate for nonlinear flux  $f(u)$ . To do this, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{F}_i(f; U, u_h; v) &:= \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{I_i} (f(U) - f(u_h)) v_x dx + \sum_{i=1}^N \left( (f(U) - f(\{\!\!\{u_h\}\!\!\}) \llbracket v \rrbracket \right)_{i+1/2} \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^N \left( (f(\{\!\!\{u_h\}\!\!\}) - \hat{f}) \llbracket v \rrbracket \right)_{i+1/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.36)$$

**Lemma 3.9** (See Corollary 3.6 in [55]). *Let the operator  $\mathcal{F}_i$  be defined by (3.36). Then the following estimate holds:*

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{F}_i(f; U, u_h; v) &\leq -\frac{1}{4} \beta(\hat{f}; u_h) \llbracket v \rrbracket^2 + (C + C_*(\|v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + h^{-1} \|U - u_h\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^2)) \|v\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ &\quad + (C + C_* h^{-1} \|U - u_h\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^2) h^{2k+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Similar to [55], we deal with the nonlinear flux  $f(u)$  by making an *a priori* assumption. Let  $h$  be small enough and  $k \geq 1$  such that

$$\|U - u_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq h. \quad (3.37)$$

The above assumption is unnecessary for linear flux  $f(u) = \lambda u$ .

**Theorem 3.10.** *Let  $U$  be sufficiently smooth exact solution of (1.1) in  $\Omega$ . Assume that the nonlinear flux  $f \in C^3(\Omega)$ . Let  $u_h$  be an approximate solution obtained by the semi-discrete LDG scheme (3.4)-(3.7) with auxiliary variables  $p_h, q_h, r_h$ . Suppose  $V_h^k$  is a space of piecewise polynomials of degree  $k \geq 1$  defined by (3.3). Then for small enough  $h$ , there holds the following error estimate*

$$\|U - u_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq Ch^{k+1/2}, \quad (3.38)$$

where  $C$  is a constant depending on time  $T > 0$ ,  $k$  and the bounds on the derivatives  $|f^{(m)}|$ ,  $m = 1, 2, 3$ .

*Proof.* We define  $P, Q$  and  $R$  as

$$P = \Delta_{(\alpha-2)/2} Q, \quad Q = R_x, \quad R = U_x.$$

It is straightforward to observe that for any  $(v, w, z, s) \in V_h^k$ ,

$$\mathcal{B}(U, P, Q, R; v, w, z, s) = \mathcal{B}(u_h, p_h, q_h, r_h; v, w, z, s) = 0,$$

where the compact form  $\mathcal{B}$  is defined in (3.10). Taking  $\lambda = 0$  in (3.25), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{B}(U, P, Q, R; v, w, z, s) - \mathcal{B}(u_h, p_h, q_h, r_h; v, w, z, s) \\ &= \mathcal{B}_\lambda(U, P, Q, R; v, w, z, s) - \mathcal{B}_\lambda(u_h, p_h, q_h, r_h; v, w, z, s) - \sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{F}_i(f; U, u_h; v) \\ &= \mathcal{B}_\lambda(U - u_h, P - p_h, Q - q_h, R - r_h; v, w, z, s) - \sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{F}_i(f; U, u_h; v) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Choosing the test function  $(v, w, z, s) = (\mathcal{P}_h^- u, -\mathcal{P}_h q + \mathcal{P}_h^+ p + \mathcal{P}_h^+ r, \mathcal{P}_h^- u + \mathcal{P}_h^+ r, \mathcal{P}_h^+ r - \mathcal{P}_h^+ p)$  and using the fact that  $U - u_h = \mathcal{P}_h^- u - \mathcal{P}_e^- U$ , the above identity yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{B}_\lambda(\mathcal{P}_h^- u, \mathcal{P}_h^+ p, \mathcal{P}_h q, \mathcal{P}_h^+ r; \mathcal{P}_h^- u, -\mathcal{P}_h q + \mathcal{P}_h^+ p + \mathcal{P}_h^+ r, \mathcal{P}_h^- u + \mathcal{P}_h^+ r, \mathcal{P}_h^+ r - \mathcal{P}_h^+ p) \\ &= \mathcal{B}_\lambda(\mathcal{P}_e^- U, \mathcal{P}_e^+ P, \mathcal{P}_e Q, \mathcal{P}_e^+ R; \mathcal{P}_h^- u, -\mathcal{P}_h q + \mathcal{P}_h^+ p + \mathcal{P}_h^+ r, \mathcal{P}_h^- u + \mathcal{P}_h^+ r, \mathcal{P}_h^+ r - \mathcal{P}_h^+ p) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{F}_i(f; U, u_h; \mathcal{P}_h^- u). \end{aligned}$$

From equation (3.26), (3.35) and Lemma 3.9, we end up with the following inequality

$$\left( (\mathcal{P}_h^- u)_t, \mathcal{P}_h^- u \right)_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\mathcal{P}_h^+ r\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\mathcal{P}_h^+ p\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \left( \Delta_{(\alpha-2)/2} \mathcal{P}_h q, \mathcal{P}_h q \right)_{L^2(\Omega)}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \frac{1}{4} \beta (\hat{f}; \mathcal{P}_h^- u) [\mathcal{P}_h^- u]^2 \\
& \leq ((\mathcal{P}_e^- U)_t, \mathcal{P}_h^- u)_{L^2(\Omega)} + C(\Omega) h^{2k+1} + \epsilon \|\mathcal{P}_h^+ p\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + c_1(\epsilon) \|\mathcal{P}_h q\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \epsilon \|\mathcal{P}_h^+ r\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\
& \quad + c_2(\epsilon) \|\mathcal{P}_h^- u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \left( C + C_* \left( \|\mathcal{P}_h^- u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + h^{-1} \|U - u_h\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^2 \right) \right) \|\mathcal{P}_h^- u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\
& \quad + (C + C_* h^{-1} \|U - u_h\|_\infty^2) h^{2k+1},
\end{aligned}$$

where  $c_1, c_2$  are constants and  $\epsilon > 0$ . Utilizing the inverse property  $\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq h^{-1/2} \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$  and priori assumption (3.37), we obtain the estimate

$$h^{-1} \|U - u_h\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^2 h^{2k+1} \leq h^{-2} \|U - u_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 h^{2k+1} \leq h^{2k+1}.$$

Using Lemma 2.5 and the positivity of  $\beta$  from Lemma 3.8, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\mathcal{P}_h^- u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq ((\mathcal{P}_e^- U)_t, \mathcal{P}_h^- u)_{L^2(\Omega)} + C(\Omega) h^{2k+1} + C \|\mathcal{P}_h^- u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2.$$

Since  $\|\mathcal{P}_h^- u(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 = 0$ , again integrating with respect to  $t$ , we have

$$\frac{1}{2} \|\mathcal{P}_h^- u(\cdot, T)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq \int_0^T ((\mathcal{P}_e^- U)_t, \mathcal{P}_h^- u)_{L^2(\Omega)} dt + C(T, \Omega) h^{2k+1} + C \int_0^T \|\mathcal{P}_h^- u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 dt.$$

Using the standard approximation theory of the projection operator [8] and Gronwall's inequality, we obtain the desired estimate (3.38).  $\square$

**Remark 3.11.** We have chosen an alternative flux at the interfaces of elements for  $\hat{u}$ ,  $\hat{p}$ , and  $\hat{r}$  to obtain the  $L^2$ -stability and error estimate for the nonlinear flux  $f$ . Another choice of fluxes is the central flux, sometimes referred to conservative flux, given by

$$\hat{p}_h = \{\{p_h\}\}, \quad \hat{r}_h = \{\{r_h\}\}, \quad \hat{u}_h = \{\{u_h\}\}.$$

Both choices of fluxes can be used, and the  $L^2$ -stability and error estimates can be derived for the central flux with straightforward adjustments to the proofs presented earlier. These adjustments involve the following calculations:

$$\sum_{i=1}^N (up) \Big|_{x_{i-1/2}^+}^{x_{i+1/2}^-} = -u_{1/2}^+ p_{1/2}^+ + u_{N+1/2}^- p_{N+1/2}^- - \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \{\{u\}\}_{i+1/2} [p]_{i+1/2} - \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \{\{p\}\}_{i+1/2} [u]_{i+1/2}$$

and

$$\sum_{i=1}^N (ur) \Big|_{x_{i-1/2}^+}^{x_{i+1/2}^-} = -u_{1/2}^+ r_{1/2}^+ + u_{N+1/2}^- r_{N+1/2}^- - \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \{\{u\}\}_{i+1/2} [r]_{i+1/2} - \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \{\{r\}\}_{i+1/2} [u]_{i+1/2}.$$

To prove conservative properties for the semi-discrete scheme (3.4) with conservative fluxes is a complicated task, see [5] for more details. However, our numerical implementation have revealed that the alternative fluxes consistently preform better than the central fluxes in terms of computational efficiency. Although our current approach has yielded a convergence rate of  $k + \frac{1}{2}$ , it is essential to note that different choices of numerical flux for  $\hat{f}$  can impact the convergence rate significantly. This aspect, along with a fully discrete DG method with homogeneous mixed boundary conditions, will be explored in our future work.

#### 4. LDG FOR MULTIPLE DIMENSION CASE

In this section, we extend the LDG scheme to multiple space dimensional equations involving fractional Laplacian in each direction. We consider the following Cauchy problem:

$$\begin{cases} U_t + \sum_{i=1}^d f_i(U)_{x_i} - \sum_{i=1}^d (-\Delta)_i^{\alpha_i/2} U_{x_i} = 0, & \mathbf{x} := (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d, t \in (0, T], \\ U(\mathbf{x}, 0) = U_{0_d}(\mathbf{x}), & \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d, \end{cases} \quad (4.1)$$

where  $T > 0$  is fixed,  $U_{0_d}$  represents the prescribed periodic initial condition, and  $U$  is the unknown solution. The non-local integro-differential operator  $-(-\Delta)_i^{\alpha_i/2}$  in (4.1) denotes the

one-dimensional fractional Laplacian acting on the  $i$ -th component  $x_i$ , for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$ , defined as in Section 2. More precisely

$$-(-\Delta)_i^{\alpha/2} u(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\partial^\alpha}{\partial |x_i|^\alpha} u(\mathbf{x}) = -\frac{-\infty D_{x_i}^\alpha u(\mathbf{x}) + x_i D_\infty^\alpha u(\mathbf{x})}{2 \cos\left(\frac{\alpha_i \pi}{2}\right)}, \quad 1 < \alpha_i < 2. \quad (4.2)$$

The left and right Riemann-Liouville derivatives in the  $i$ -th component are given by

$$-\infty D_{x_i}^\alpha u(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(n - \alpha)} \left(\frac{d}{dx_i}\right)^n \int_{-\infty}^{x_i} (x_i - t)^{n-\alpha_i-1} u(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, t, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_d) dt, \quad (4.3)$$

$$x_i D_\infty^\alpha u(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(n - \alpha_i)} \left(-\frac{d}{dx_i}\right)^n \int_{x_i}^{\infty} (t - x_i)^{n-\alpha_i-1} u(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, t, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_d) dt, \quad (4.4)$$

for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$  and  $n - 1 < \alpha_i < n$ , respectively. We decompose the fractional Laplacian (4.2) as

$$-(-\Delta)_i^{\alpha/2} u(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{d}{dx_i} \left( \Delta_{\frac{\alpha_i-2}{2}}^i \frac{du(\mathbf{x})}{dx_i} \right) = \frac{d^2}{dx_i^2} \left( \Delta_{\frac{\alpha_i-2}{2}}^i u(\mathbf{x}) \right), \quad (4.5)$$

where the fractional integral  $\Delta_{-s/2}^i$ ,  $0 < s < 1$  is given by

$$\Delta_{-s/2}^i u(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{-\infty D_{x_i}^{-s} u(\mathbf{x}) + x_i D_\infty^{-s} u(\mathbf{x})}{2 \cos\left(\frac{s\pi}{2}\right)}. \quad (4.6)$$

We discretize the domain  $\Omega_d = \left(\prod_{i=1}^d I^i\right)$ , where  $I^i = [-1, 1]$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$ . It is worth noting that assuming the unit box as the domain simplifies the understanding of the method, but it is not essential. We denote the triangulation  $\mathcal{T}_d$  of  $\Omega_d$  as follows:

$$\mathcal{T}_d := \{D^\tau : D^\tau \text{ are non-overlapping polyhedra covering } \Omega_d \text{ completely, } \tau = 1, 2, \dots, \mathcal{N}_d\},$$

where  $\mathcal{N}_d$  is the total number of triangles (we write triangle instead of polyhedra). We do not consider hanging nodes. Associated with the triangulation  $\mathcal{T}_d$ , we define the broken Sobolev spaces as follows:

$$H^1(\Omega_d, \mathcal{T}) := \{v : \Omega_d \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \text{ such that } v|_{D^\tau} \in H^1(D^\tau), \tau = 1, 2, \dots, \mathcal{N}_d\}.$$

For a function  $v \in H^1(\Omega_d, \mathcal{T})$ , we denote the value of  $v$  evaluated from the inside of the triangle  $D^\tau$  by  $v^{int, \tau}$  and from the outside of the triangle  $D^\tau$  by  $v^{ext, \tau}$ . We define the finite-dimensional discontinuous piecewise polynomial space  $V_d^k \subset H^1(\Omega_d, \mathcal{T})$  as

$$V_d^k = \{v : \Omega_d \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \text{ such that } v|_{D^\tau} \in P^k(D^\tau), \forall \tau = 1, 2, \dots, \mathcal{N}_d\} \quad (4.7)$$

and the finite element space  $W_d^k$  as the space of tensor product of piecewise polynomials with degree at most  $k$  in each variable on every element, i.e.

$$W_d^k = \{v : \Omega_d \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \text{ such that } v \in Q^k \left( \prod_{i=1}^d I_{j_i}^i \right), \forall j_i = 1, 2, \dots, N_i \text{ and } i = 1, \dots, d\}, \quad (4.8)$$

where  $I_{j_i}^i = [x_{i, j_i - \frac{1}{2}}, x_{i, j_i + \frac{1}{2}}]$  is a partition of interval  $I^i$  for  $j_i = 1, 2, \dots, N_i$ , and  $N_i$  is the total number of partition of interval  $I^i$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, d$ , and  $Q^k$  is the space of tensor products of one dimensional polynomials of degree up to  $k$ .

Now, we introduce the auxiliary variables  $\mathbf{P} = (P_1, P_2, \dots, P_d)$ ,  $\mathbf{Q} = (Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_d)$ , and  $\mathbf{R} = (R_1, R_2, \dots, R_d)$  such that

$$P_i = \Delta_{(\alpha_i-2)/2}^i Q_i, \quad Q_i = (R_i)_{x_i}, \quad R_i = U_{x_i}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, d.$$

With this definition, the equation (4.1) can be rewritten as a system of equations

$$\begin{aligned} U_t &= - \sum_{i=1}^d (f_i(U) + P_i)_{x_i}, \\ P_i &= \Delta_{(\alpha_i-2)/2}^i Q_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, d, \\ Q_i &= (R_i)_{x_i}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, d, \\ R_i &= U_{x_i}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, d. \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

Now, employing a methodology akin to that of the preceding section, we present the **LDG scheme**. Our objective is to determine approximations  $(u_h, \mathbf{p}_h, \mathbf{q}_h, \mathbf{r}_h) := (u_h, (p_{1h}, \dots, p_{dh}), (q_{1h}, \dots, q_{dh}), (r_{1h}, \dots, r_{dh})) \in H^1(0, T; V_d^k) \times (L^2(0, T; V_d^k))^d \times (L^2(0, T; V_d^k))^d \times (L^2(0, T; V_d^k))^d =: (\mathcal{T}_4 \times \mathcal{V}_d^k)^d$  to the exact solution  $(U, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{R})$  of (4.9). This is subject to the condition that for all test functions  $v \in H^1(0, T; V_d^k)$  and  $w_i, z_i, s_i \in L^2(0, T; V_d^k)$ , for all  $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$ , the following system of equations holds for  $\tau = 1, 2, \dots, \mathcal{N}_d$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{D^\tau} (u_h)_t v \, d\mathbf{x} &= \sum_{i=1}^d \int_{D^\tau} (f_i(u_h) + (p_i)_h) v_{x_i} \, d\mathbf{x} - \int_{\partial D^\tau} (\hat{f}_{h, \mathbf{n}_\tau} + \hat{p}_{h, \tau}) v^{int, \tau} \, d\xi, \\ \int_{D^\tau} p_{i_h} w_i \, d\mathbf{x} &= \int_{D^\tau} \Delta_{(\alpha_i-2)/2}^i q_{i_h} w_i \, d\mathbf{x}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, d, \\ \int_{D^\tau} q_{i_h} z_i \, d\mathbf{x} &= - \int_{D^\tau} r_{i_h} (z_i)_{x_i} \, d\mathbf{x} + \int_{\partial D^\tau} (\hat{r}_i)_{h, \tau} z^{int, \tau} \, d\xi, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, d, \\ \int_{D^\tau} r_{i_h} s_i \, d\mathbf{x} &= - \int_{D^\tau} u_h (s_i)_{x_i} \, d\mathbf{x} + \int_{\partial D^\tau} (\hat{u}_i)_{h, \tau} s^{int, \tau} \, d\xi, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, d, \\ \int_{D^\tau} u_h^{0_d} v \, d\mathbf{x} &= \int_{D^\tau} U_{0_d} v \, d\mathbf{x}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

where  $\partial D^\tau$  is the boundary of  $D^\tau$ , and “the hats” are numerical fluxes which are defined by the following:

$$\hat{f}_{h, \mathbf{n}_\tau} = \widehat{f_{h, \mathbf{n}_\tau}}(u^{int, \tau}, u^{ext, \tau}), \quad \hat{p}_{h, \tau} = \sum_{i=1}^d p_{i_h}^+ n_{i, \tau}, \quad (\hat{r}_i)_{h, \tau} = r_{i_h}^+ n_{i, \tau}, \quad (\hat{u}_i)_{h, \tau} = u_{i_h}^- n_{i, \tau}, \quad (4.11)$$

for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$  and at the boundary of  $\Omega_d$ , choice of fluxes is obvious as  $U$  has compact support. In this context,  $\mathbf{n}_\tau = (n_{1, \tau}, n_{2, \tau}, \dots, n_{d, \tau})$  signifies the outward unit normal vector for the triangle  $D^\tau$  along its boundary  $\partial D^\tau$ . The terms  $p_{i_h}^+$  and  $r_{i_h}^+$  denote the values of  $p_{i_h}$  and  $r_{i_h}$  respectively, calculated from the plus side along an edge  $e$  (of element  $D^\tau$ ), typically formed by the boundaries of two adjacent elements. For a more detailed illustration, refer to [57, Figure 3.1].

The function  $\widehat{f_{h, \mathbf{n}_\tau}}(u^{int, \tau}, u^{ext, \tau})$  represents a monotone flux, which maintains Lipschitz continuity in both arguments. It aligns with  $f_{\mathbf{n}_\tau}(U) = \sum_{i=1}^d f_i(U) n_{i, \tau}$  and behaves as a decreasing function in  $u^{int, \tau}$  while being an increasing function in  $u^{ext, \tau}$ . As an example, we select the Lax-Friedrichs flux

$$\widehat{f_{h, \mathbf{n}_\tau}}(u^{int, \tau}, u^{ext, \tau}) = \frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_{i=1}^d (f_i(u^{int, \tau}) + f_i(u^{ext, \tau})) n_{i, \tau} - \gamma (u^{ext, \tau} - u^{int, \tau}) \right), \quad (4.12)$$

$$\gamma = \max_U |f'_{\mathbf{n}_\tau}(U)|,$$

where the maximum is taken over relevant range of  $U$ .

**Remark 4.1.** We would like to remark that our further analysis applies specifically to the finite element space  $W_d^k$ , and not to the standard  $k$ -th degree polynomial space  $V_d^k$ . The reason for this distinction is that our primary technique involves a special tensor projection, denoted as  $\mathcal{P}^\pm$ , which effectively removes certain jump terms that arise from higher-order derivative terms. However, in our numerical experiments in section 6, we confirm the optimal order of convergence for the LDG method when applied to  $V_d^k$ .

**4.1. Error estimate.** We would like to derive an error estimate for the equation (4.1). For simplicity, let us consider it in two dimension, i.e.  $d = 2$  with the notation  $(x, y) := (x_1, x_2)$ . The following analysis can be extended to the higher dimension case with the same line of technique. Thus the equation (4.1) reads

$$\begin{cases} U_t + f_1(U)_x + f_2(U)_y - (-\Delta)_1^{\alpha_1/2} U_x - (-\Delta)_2^{\alpha_2/2} U_y = 0, & (x, y) \in \Omega_2, t \in (0, T], \\ U(x, y, 0) = U_0(x, y), & (x, y) \in \Omega_2. \end{cases} \quad (4.13)$$

The semi-discrete LDG scheme (4.10) can be rewritten in the finite element space  $W_d^k$  as: find the approximations  $u_h, p_{1h}, p_{2h}, q_{1h}, q_{2h}, r_{1h}, r_{2h} \in W_h^d$  to the exact solution  $(U, P_1, P_2, Q_1, Q_2, R_1, R_2)$  of (4.9) such that  $\forall v, w_1, w_2, z_1, z_2, s_1, s_2 \in W_h^d$  and  $j_i = 1, 2, \dots, N_i, i = 1, 2$ , we have the following system of equations

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} (u_h)_t v \, dy \, dx &= \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} (f_1(u_h) + p_{1h}) v_x \, dy \, dx + \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} (f_2(u_h) + p_{2h}) v_y \, dy \, dx \\ &\quad - \int_{I_{j_2}^2} ((\hat{f}_1 + \hat{p}_{1h}) v^-)_{j_1 + \frac{1}{2}, y} \, dy + \int_{I_{j_2}^2} ((\hat{f}_1 + \hat{p}_{1h}) v^+)_{j_1 - \frac{1}{2}, y} \, dy \\ &\quad - \int_{I_{j_1}^1} ((\hat{f}_2 + \hat{p}_{2h}) v^-)_{x, j_2 + \frac{1}{2}} \, dx + \int_{I_{j_1}^1} ((\hat{f}_2 + \hat{p}_{2h}) v^+)_{x, j_2 - \frac{1}{2}} \, dx, \\ \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} p_{i_h} w_i \, dy \, dx &= \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} \Delta_{(\alpha_i - 2)/2} q_{i_h} w_i \, dy \, dx, \quad i = 1, 2, \\ \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} q_{1h} z_1 \, dy \, dx &= - \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} r_{1h} (z_1)_x \, dy \, dx + \int_{I_{j_2}^2} (\hat{r}_1 z_1^-)_{j_1 + \frac{1}{2}, y} \, dy - \int_{I_{j_2}^2} (\hat{r}_1 z_1^+)_{j_1 - \frac{1}{2}, y} \, dy, \\ \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} q_{2h} z_2 \, dy \, dx &= - \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} r_{2h} (z_2)_y \, dy \, dx + \int_{I_{j_1}^1} (\hat{r}_2 z_2^-)_{x, j_2 + \frac{1}{2}} \, dx - \int_{I_{j_1}^1} (\hat{r}_2 z_2^+)_{x, j_2 - \frac{1}{2}} \, dx, \\ \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} r_{1h} s_1 \, dy \, dx &= - \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} u_h (s_1)_x \, dy \, dx + \int_{I_{j_2}^2} (\hat{u}_h s_1^-)_{j_1 + \frac{1}{2}, y} \, dy - \int_{I_{j_2}^2} (\hat{u}_h s_1^+)_{j_1 - \frac{1}{2}, y} \, dy, \\ \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} r_{2h} s_2 \, dy \, dx &= - \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} u_h (s_2)_y \, dy \, dx + \int_{I_{j_1}^1} (\hat{u}_h s_2^-)_{x, j_2 + \frac{1}{2}} \, dx - \int_{I_{j_1}^1} (\hat{u}_h s_2^+)_{x, j_2 - \frac{1}{2}} \, dx, \\ \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} u_h^0 v \, dy \, dx &= \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} U_0 v \, dy \, dx, \end{aligned} \quad (4.14)$$

where ‘‘hat’’ terms in the above scheme are the numerical fluxes, which can be defined by

$$\hat{u}_h = u_h^-, \quad \hat{p}_{1h} = p_{1h}^+, \quad \hat{r}_1 = r_{1h}^+ \quad (4.15)$$

at interface  $\{j_1 + \frac{1}{2}, y\}$ ,  $j_1 = 1, 2, \dots, N_1 - 1$  and

$$\hat{u}_h = u_h^-, \quad \hat{p}_{2h} = p_{2h}^+, \quad \hat{r}_{2h} = r_{2h}^+ \quad (4.16)$$

at interface  $\{x, j_2 + \frac{1}{2}\}$ ,  $j_2 = 1, 2, \dots, N_2 - 1$ . Since  $U$  has compact support in  $\Omega_2$ , choice of fluxes at the boundary of  $\Omega_2$  is obvious. Further we choose any monotone fluxes for  $\hat{f}_1 = \hat{f}_1(u_h^-, u_h^+)$  and  $\hat{f}_2 = \hat{f}_2(u_h^-, u_h^+)$  at interface  $\{j_1 + \frac{1}{2}, y\}$  and  $\{x, j_2 + \frac{1}{2}\}$  respectively, which have the uniform dissipation property. To proceed further, we define the linear (in each component) compact form

of the scheme (4.14)

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{B}^2(u_h, p_{1h}, p_{2h}, q_{1h}, q_{2h}, r_{1h}, r_{2h}; v, w_1, w_2, z_1, z_2, s_1, s_2) \\
&= \sum_{j_1=1}^N \sum_{j_2=1}^N \left[ \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} (u_h)_t v \, dy \, dx - \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} p_{1h} v_x \, dy \, dx - \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} p_{2h} v_y \, dy \, dx \right. \\
&+ \int_{I_{j_2}^2} (\hat{p}_{1h} v^-)_{j_1+\frac{1}{2}, y} \, dy - \int_{I_{j_2}^2} (\hat{p}_{1h} v^+)_{j_1-\frac{1}{2}, y} \, dy + \int_{I_{j_1}^1} (\hat{p}_{2h} v^-)_{x, j_2+\frac{1}{2}} \, dx \\
&- \int_{I_{j_1}^1} (\hat{p}_{2h} v^+)_{x, j_2-\frac{1}{2}} \, dx + \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} p_{1h} w_1 \, dy \, dx - \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} \Delta_{(\alpha_1-2)/2}^1 q_{1h} w_1 \, dy \, dx \\
&+ \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} p_{2h} w_2 \, dy \, dx - \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} \Delta_{(\alpha_2-2)/2}^2 q_{2h} w_2 \, dy \, dx + \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} q_{1h} z_1 \, dy \, dx \\
&+ \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} r_{1h} (z_1)_x \, dy \, dx - \int_{I_{j_2}^2} (\hat{r}_1 z_1^-)_{j_1+\frac{1}{2}, y} \, dy + \int_{I_{j_2}^2} (\hat{r}_2 z_1^+)_{j_1-\frac{1}{2}, y} \, dy \\
&+ \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} q_{2h} z_2 \, dy \, dx + \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} r_{2h} (z_2)_y \, dy \, dx - \int_{I_{j_1}^1} (\hat{r}_2 z_2^-)_{x, j_2+\frac{1}{2}} \, dx \\
&+ \int_{I_{j_1}^1} (\hat{r}_2 z_2^+)_{x, j_2-\frac{1}{2}} \, dx + \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} r_{1h} s_1 \, dy \, dx + \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} u_h (s_1)_x \, dy \, dx \\
&- \int_{I_{j_2}^2} (\hat{u}_h s_1^-)_{j_1+\frac{1}{2}, y} \, dy + \int_{I_{j_2}^2} (\hat{u}_h s_1^+)_{j_1-\frac{1}{2}, y} \, dy + \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} r_{2h} s_2 \, dy \, dx \\
&+ \left. \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} u_h (s_2)_y \, dy \, dx - \int_{I_{j_1}^1} (\hat{u}_h s_2^-)_{x, j_2+\frac{1}{2}} \, dx + \int_{I_{j_1}^1} (\hat{u}_h s_2^+)_{x, j_2-\frac{1}{2}} \, dx \right]. \tag{4.17}
\end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 4.2.** For the linear form  $\mathcal{B}^2$  defined by (4.17), we have the following estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{B}^2(u_h, p_{1h}, p_{2h}, q_{1h}, q_{2h}, r_{1h}, r_{2h}; u_h, -q_{1h} + p_{1h} + r_{1h}, -q_{2h} + p_{2h} + r_{2h}, u_h + r_{1h}, u_h + r_{2h}, \\
& \quad r_{1h} - p_{1h}, r_{2h} - p_{2h}) \\
&= \sum_{j_1=1}^N \sum_{j_2=1}^N \left[ \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} (u_h)_t v \, dy \, dx - \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} p_{1h} q_{1h} \, dy \, dx - \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} p_{2h} q_{2h} \, dy \, dx \right. \\
&+ \|p_{1h}\|_{L^2(I_{j_1}^1 \times I_{j_2}^2)}^2 + \|p_{2h}\|_{L^2(I_{j_1}^1 \times I_{j_2}^2)}^2 + \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} (\Delta_{(\alpha_1-2)/2}^1 q_{1h}) q_{1h} \, dy \, dx \\
&+ \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} (\Delta_{(\alpha_2-2)/2}^2 q_{2h}) q_{2h} \, dy \, dx - \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} (\Delta_{(\alpha_1-2)/2}^1 q_{1h}) p_{1h} \, dy \, dx \\
&- \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} (\Delta_{(\alpha_2-2)/2}^2 q_{2h}) p_{2h} \, dy \, dx - \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} (\Delta_{(\alpha_1-2)/2}^1 q_{1h}) r_{1h} \, dy \, dx \\
&- \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} (\Delta_{(\alpha_2-2)/2}^2 q_{2h}) r_{2h} \, dy \, dx + \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} q_{1h} u_h \, dy \, dx + \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} q_{2h} u_h \, dy \, dx \\
&+ \left. \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} q_{1h} r_{1h} \, dy \, dx + \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} q_{2h} r_{2h} \, dy \, dx + \|r_{1h}\|_{L^2(I_{j_1}^1 \times I_{j_2}^2)}^2 + \|r_{2h}\|_{L^2(I_{j_1}^1 \times I_{j_2}^2)}^2 \right] \\
&+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j_1=1}^{N_1-1} \llbracket r_{1h} \rrbracket_{j_1+1/2, y}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j_2=1}^{N_2-1} \llbracket r_{2h} \rrbracket_{x, j_2+1/2}^2 + \frac{1}{2} (r_{1h, 1/2, y}^+)^2 + \frac{1}{2} (r_{2h, x, 1/2}^+)^2. \tag{4.18}
\end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 4.3.** The LDG scheme (4.14)-(4.16) is  $L^2$ -stable.

The proof of the above Lemma 4.2 and 4.3 follow the same line as in previous section for the one dimension with the similar choices of test functions in both the direction, so we are omitting it.

Following the approach from the one-dimensional case, we define the projection operators as in [37]. Moreover, on a rectangle  $\Omega_2$ , we introduce the operators

$$\mathbb{P}v = \mathcal{P}_x \otimes \mathcal{P}_y v, \quad \mathbb{P}^\pm v = \mathcal{P}_x^\pm \otimes \mathcal{P}_y^\pm v, \quad (4.19)$$

where the subscripts  $x$  and  $y$  indicate that the one-dimensional projections  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{P}^\pm$  are defined with respect to the corresponding variables. We enlisted some properties of the projection operators. Let  $g \in L^2(\Omega_2)$  be a sufficiently smooth function. Then we have

(1)  $L^2$ -projection:

$$\int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} \left( \mathbb{P}^\pm g(x, y) - g(x, y) \right) v(x, y) dy dx = 0, \quad (4.20)$$

for any  $v \in (P^{k-1}(I_{j_1}^1) \otimes P^k(I_{j_2}^2)) \cup (P^k(I_{j_1}^1) \otimes P^{k-1}(I_{j_2}^2))$ .

(2) At x-interface

$$\int_{I_{j_2}^2} \left( \mathbb{P}^\pm g(x_{j_1 \mp \frac{1}{2}}^\pm, y) - g(x_{j_1 \mp \frac{1}{2}}^\pm, y) \right) v(x_{j_1 \mp \frac{1}{2}}^\pm, y) dy = 0, \quad \forall v \in \mathcal{Q}^k(I_{j_1}^1 \otimes I_{j_2}^2). \quad (4.21)$$

(3) At y-interface

$$\int_{I_{j_1}^1} \left( \mathbb{P}^\pm g(x, x_{j_2 \mp \frac{1}{2}}^\pm) - g(x, x_{j_2 \mp \frac{1}{2}}^\pm) \right) v(x, x_{j_2 \mp \frac{1}{2}}^\pm) dx = 0, \quad \forall v \in \mathcal{Q}^k(I_{j_1}^1 \otimes I_{j_2}^2). \quad (4.22)$$

(4) Approximation of projection (4.19)

$$\|\mathbb{P}g - g\|_{L^2(\Omega_2)} + h \|\mathbb{P}g - g\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_2)} + h^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\mathbb{P}g - g\|_{\Gamma_h} \leq Ch^{k+1}, \quad (4.23)$$

where  $C$  is a constant depends only on  $g$ .

We provide an error estimate for the LDG scheme (4.14)-(4.16) specifically tailored for two dimensions. However, we opt not to reiterate the proof presented in the previous section concerning one dimension. Instead, we present error equations and an energy inequality, which helps to follow the proof in a similar structure, and for more details, we refer to [55].

**Theorem 4.4.** *Let  $U$  be an exact solution of the Cauchy problem (4.13). We assume that  $U$  is sufficiently smooth and nonlinear fluxes  $f_1, f_2 \in C^3$ . Let  $u_h$  be an approximate solution of  $U$  obtained by the LDG scheme (4.14)-(4.16). Let  $W_2^k$  be the piecewise tensor product polynomials of degree  $k \geq 2$ . Then, the following error estimate holds for the small enough  $h$*

$$\|U - u_h\|_{L^2(\Omega_2)} \leq Ch^{k+\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (4.24)$$

where  $C = C(T, k, \|U\|_{H^k}, |f_1^{(m)}|, |f_2^{(m)}|)$ ,  $m = 1, 2, 3$ .

We find the error equation for the scheme (4.14)-(4.16). As  $U, P_1, P_2, Q_1, Q_2, R_1, R_2$  also satisfies the scheme (4.14)-(4.16), we have the following cell error equation

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{U}_{j_1 j_2}(U, u_h; v, s_1, s_2) - \mathcal{F}_{j_1 j_2}(f_1, f_2; U, u_h; v) + \mathcal{P}_{j_1 j_2}(P_1, p_{1h}, P_2, p_{2h}; v, w_1, w_2) \\ & + \mathcal{Q}_{j_1 j_2}(Q_1, q_{1h}, Q_2, q_{2h}; w_1, w_2, z_1, z_2) + \mathcal{R}_{j_1 j_2}(R_1, r_{1h}, R_2, r_{2h}; z_1, z_2, s_1, s_2) = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (4.25)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}_{j_1 j_2}(U, u_h; v, s_1, s_2) &= \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} (U - u_h)_t v dy dx \\ &+ \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} (U - u_h)(s_1)_x dy dx - \int_{I_{j_2}^2} ((U - \hat{u}_h)s_1^-)_{j_1 + \frac{1}{2}, y} dy \\ &+ \int_{I_{j_2}^2} ((U - \hat{u}_h)s_1^+)_{j_1 - \frac{1}{2}, y} dy + \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} (U - u_h)(s_2)_y dy dx \\ &- \int_{I_{j_1}^1} ((U - \hat{u}_h)s_2^-)_{x, j_2 + \frac{1}{2}} dx + \int_{I_{j_1}^1} ((U - \hat{u}_h)s_2^+)_{x, j_2 - \frac{1}{2}} dx, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{F}_{j_1 j_2}(f_1, f_2; U, u_h; v) &= \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} (f_1(U) - f_1(u_h)) v_x dy dx + \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} (f_2(U) - f_2(u_h)) v_y dy dx \\
&\quad - \int_{I_{j_2}^2} ((f_1(U) - \hat{f}_1) v^-)_{j_1 + \frac{1}{2}, y} dy + \int_{I_{j_2}^2} ((f_1(U) - \hat{f}_1) v^+)_{j_1 - \frac{1}{2}, y} dy \\
&\quad - \int_{I_{j_1}^1} ((f_2(U) - \hat{f}_2) v^-)_{x, j_2 + \frac{1}{2}} dx + \int_{I_{j_1}^1} ((f_2(U) - \hat{f}_2) v^+)_{x, j_2 - \frac{1}{2}} dx,
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{P}_{j_1 j_2}(P_1, p_{1h}, P_2, p_{2h}; v, w_1, w_2) &= - \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} (P_1 - p_{1h}) v_x dy dx - \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} (P_2 - p_{2h}) v_y dy dx \\
&\quad + \int_{I_{j_2}^2} ((P_1 - \hat{p}_{1h}) v^-)_{j_1 + \frac{1}{2}, y} dy - \int_{I_{j_2}^2} ((P_1 - \hat{p}_{1h}) v^+)_{j_1 - \frac{1}{2}, y} dy \\
&\quad + \int_{I_{j_1}^1} ((P_2 - \hat{p}_{2h}) v^-)_{x, j_2 + \frac{1}{2}} dx - \int_{I_{j_1}^1} ((P_2 - \hat{p}_{2h}) v^+)_{x, j_2 - \frac{1}{2}} dx \\
&\quad + \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} (P_1 - p_{1h}) w_1 dy dx + \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} (P_2 - p_{2h}) w_2 dy dx,
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{Q}_{j_1 j_2}(Q_1, q_{1h}, Q_2, q_{2h}; w_1, w_2, z_1, z_2) &= - \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} \Delta_{(\alpha_1 - 2)/2}^1(Q_1 - q_{1h}) w_1 dy dx \\
&\quad - \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} \Delta_{(\alpha_2 - 2)/2}^2(Q_2 - q_{2h}) w_2 dy dx \\
&\quad + \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} (Q_1 - q_{1h}) z_1 dy dx + \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} (Q_2 - q_{2h}) z_2 dy dx,
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{R}_{j_1 j_2}(R_1, r_{1h}, R_2, r_{2h}; z_1, z_2, s_1, s_2) &= \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} (R_1 - r_{1h})(z_1)_x dy dx - \int_{I_{j_2}^2} ((R_1 - \hat{r}_1) z_1^-)_{j_1 + \frac{1}{2}, y} dy \\
&\quad + \int_{I_{j_2}^2} ((R_2 - \hat{r}_2) z_1^+)_{j_1 - \frac{1}{2}, y} dy + \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} (R_2 - r_{2h})(z_2)_y dy dx \\
&\quad - \int_{I_{j_1}^1} ((R_2 - \hat{r}_2) z_2^-)_{x, j_2 + \frac{1}{2}} dx + \int_{I_{j_1}^1} ((R_2 - \hat{r}_2) z_2^+)_{x, j_2 - \frac{1}{2}} dx \\
&\quad + \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} (R_1 - r_{1h}) s_1 dy dx + \int_{I_{j_1}^1} \int_{I_{j_2}^2} (R_2 - r_{2h}) s_2 dy dx,
\end{aligned}$$

for all  $v, w_1, w_2, z_1, z_2, s_1, s_2 \in W_2^k$ . Thus from the (4.17) and (4.25), we have an error equation

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{B}^2(U - u_h, P_1 - p_{1h}, P_2 - p_{2h}, Q_1 - q_{1h}, Q_2 - q_{2h}, R_1 - r_{1h}, R_2 - r_{2h}; v, w_1, w_2, z_1, z_2, s_1, s_2) \\
&= \sum_{j_1=1}^N \sum_{j_2=1}^N \left[ \mathcal{U}_{j_1 j_2}(U, u_h; v, s_1, s_2) + \mathcal{P}_{j_1 j_2}(P_1, p_{1h}, P_2, p_{2h}; v, w_1, w_2) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \mathcal{Q}_{j_1 j_2}(Q_1, q_{1h}, Q_2, q_{2h}; w_1, w_2, z_1, z_2) + \mathcal{R}_{j_1 j_2}(R_1, r_{1h}, R_2, r_{2h}; z_1, z_2, s_1, s_2) \right] \\
&= \sum_{j_1=1}^N \sum_{j_2=1}^N \mathcal{F}_{j_1 j_2}(f, g; U, u_h; v).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.26}$$

Now we define few notations related to the projection operators  $\mathbb{P}$  and  $\mathbb{P}^\pm$  as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}_h^\pm u &= \mathbb{P}^\pm U - u_h, & \mathbb{P}_h u &= \mathbb{P} U - u_h, \\
\mathbb{P}_h^\pm p_i &= \mathbb{P}^\pm P_i - p_{i_h}, & \mathbb{P}_h p_i &= \mathbb{P} P_i - p_{i_h}, \quad i = 1, 2,
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}_h^\pm q_i &= \mathbb{P}^\pm Q_i - q_{i_h}, & \mathbb{P}_h q_i &= \mathbb{P} Q_i - q_{i_h}, & i &= 1, 2, \\
\mathbb{P}_h^\pm r_i &= \mathbb{P}^\pm R_i - r_{i_h}, & \mathbb{P}_h r_i &= \mathbb{P} R_i - r_{i_h}, & i &= 1, 2, \\
\mathbb{P}_e^\pm U &= \mathbb{P}^\pm U - U, & \mathbb{P}_e U &= \mathbb{P} U - U, \\
\mathbb{P}_e^\pm p_i &= \mathbb{P}^\pm P_i - P_i, & \mathbb{P}_e p_i &= \mathbb{P} P_i - P_i, & i &= 1, 2, \\
\mathbb{P}_e^\pm q_i &= \mathbb{P}^\pm Q_i - Q_i, & \mathbb{P}_e q_i &= \mathbb{P} Q_i - Q_i, & i &= 1, 2, \\
\mathbb{P}_e^\pm r_i &= \mathbb{P}^\pm R_i - R_i, & \mathbb{P}_e r_i &= \mathbb{P} R_i - R_i, & i &= 1, 2.
\end{aligned}$$

We choose the test functions  $(v, w_1, w_2, z_1, z_2, s_1, s_2) = (\mathbb{P}_h^- u, -\mathbb{P}_h q_1 + \mathbb{P}_h^+ p_1 + \mathbb{P}_h^+ r_1, -\mathbb{P}_h q_2 + \mathbb{P}_h^+ p_2 + \mathbb{P}_h^+ r_2, \mathbb{P}_h^- u + \mathbb{P}_h^+ r_1, \mathbb{P}_h^- u + \mathbb{P}_h^+ r_2, \mathbb{P}_h^+ r_1 - \mathbb{P}_h^+ p_1, \mathbb{P}_h^+ r_2 - \mathbb{P}_h^+ p_2)$  in the equation (4.26), also note that  $U - u_h = \mathbb{P}_h^\pm u - \mathbb{P}_e^\pm U$  (similarly for  $P, Q, R$ ) and  $\mathcal{B}^2$  is linear, we have the following energy inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{B}^2(\mathbb{P}_h^\pm u, \mathbb{P}_h^\pm p_1, \mathbb{P}_h^\pm p_2, \mathbb{P}_h^\pm q_1, \mathbb{P}_h^\pm q_2, \mathbb{P}_h^\pm r_1, \mathbb{P}_h^\pm r_2; \mathbb{P}_h^- u, -\mathbb{P}_h q_1 + \mathbb{P}_h^+ p_1 + \mathbb{P}_h^+ r_1, -\mathbb{P}_h q_2 + \mathbb{P}_h^+ p_2 \\
& \quad + \mathbb{P}_h^+ r_2, \mathbb{P}_h^- u + \mathbb{P}_h^+ r_1, \mathbb{P}_h^- u + \mathbb{P}_h^+ r_2, \mathbb{P}_h^+ r_1 - \mathbb{P}_h^+ p_1, \mathbb{P}_h^+ r_2 - \mathbb{P}_h^+ p_2) \\
& = \mathcal{B}^2(\mathbb{P}_e^\pm U, \mathbb{P}_e^\pm P_1, \mathbb{P}_e^\pm P_2, \mathbb{P}_e^\pm Q_1, \mathbb{P}_e^\pm Q_2, \mathbb{P}_e^\pm R_1, \mathbb{P}_e^\pm R_2; \mathbb{P}_h^- u, -\mathbb{P}_h q_1 + \mathbb{P}_h^+ p_1 + \mathbb{P}_h^+ r_1, \\
& \quad - \mathbb{P}_h q_2 + \mathbb{P}_h^+ p_2 + \mathbb{P}_h^+ r_2, \mathbb{P}_h^- u + \mathbb{P}_h^+ r_1, \mathbb{P}_h^- u + \mathbb{P}_h^+ r_2, \mathbb{P}_h^+ r_1 - \mathbb{P}_h^+ p_1, \mathbb{P}_h^+ r_2 - \mathbb{P}_h^+ p_2) \\
& \quad + \sum_{j_1=1}^N \sum_{j_2=1}^N \mathcal{F}_{j_1 j_2}(f, g; U, u_h; \mathbb{P}_h^- u).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.27}$$

To figure out the estimates for the nonlinear fluxes  $f_1$  and  $f_2$ , we need an *a priori* assumption stronger than the one-dimensional case. Specifically, for sufficiently small  $h$ , we assume the following condition holds

$$\|U - u_h\|_{L^2(\Omega_2)} \leq h^{3/2}. \tag{4.28}$$

This stronger assumption is necessary due to the following inverse inequality in two dimensions, which are characterized by the bound

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_2)} \leq Ch^{-1} \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega_2)}.$$

The assumption is the reason that we need  $k \geq 2$  restriction in the Theorem 4.4. Although, *a priori* assumption is not necessary for the linear fluxes  $f_1$  and  $f_2$ .

It is now clear that the linear part  $\mathcal{B}^2$  corresponds to  $\mathcal{B}_\lambda$ , and the nonlinear part  $\mathcal{F}_{j_1 j_2}$  corresponds to  $\mathcal{F}_i$  for the one-dimensional problem outlined in the preceding section. The proof of Theorem 4.4 follows a similar approach to that of the one-dimensional case, where we establish estimates for equation (4.27) incorporating the Lemma 4.2. We refrain from restating these bounds here.

## 5. STABILITY ANALYSIS OF FULLY DISCRETE LDG SCHEMES

In this section, we focus on the stability analysis with an explicit fourth-order Runge-Kutta time discretization. The spatial stability of LDG schemes are demonstrated in Section 3. It is worth mentioning that the stability analysis under the higher-order time discretizations is a challenging task, and at present we have pursued this analysis exclusively in the linear case. In particular, for simplicity, we choose the flux function  $f(U) = 0$ . In order to carry out the stability analysis, we define the LDG operators  $D_\pm^h$  and  $D_\alpha^h$  for approximating first order derivatives and fractional integral form

$$\begin{aligned}
(D_\pm^h e, g) &= -(e, g_x) - \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} e_{i+1/2}^\pm \llbracket g \rrbracket_{i+1/2}, & \forall e, g \in V_h^k, \\
(D_\alpha^h e, g) &= \left( \Delta_{\frac{\alpha-2}{2}} e, g \right), & \forall e, g \in V_h^k.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.1}$$

In the above definitions, we are assuming either  $e_{1/2}^+ = 0 = g_{N+1/2}^-$  or  $e_{N+1/2}^- = 0 = g_{1/2}^+$ . The following result states the behavior of the operator  $D^{h^+}$ .

**Proposition 5.1** (Antisymmetry). *The LDG operators  $D_{\pm}^h$  are antisymmetric. In particular, we have*

$$(D_+^h e, g) = -(e, D_-^h g), \quad \forall e, g \in V_h^k.$$

and we denote  $D_+^{h^T} = -D_-^h$ .

*Proof.* Using (3.15), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} (D_+^h e, g) &= -(e, g_x) - \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} e_{i+1/2}^{\pm} \llbracket g \rrbracket_{i+1/2} \\ &= (e_x, g) - \sum_{i=1}^N (eg) \Big|_{x_{i-1/2}^+}^{x_{i+1/2}^-} - \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} e_{i+1/2}^+ \llbracket g \rrbracket_{i+1/2} \\ &= (e_x, g) + \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} e_{i+1/2}^+ \llbracket g \rrbracket_{i+1/2} + \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} g_{i+1/2}^- \llbracket e \rrbracket_{i+1/2} - \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} e_{i+1/2}^+ \llbracket g \rrbracket_{i+1/2} \\ &= -(e, D_-^h g), \end{aligned}$$

for all  $e, g \in V_h^k$ .  $\square$

In a similar way, we can show that the operator  $D_{\alpha}^h$  is also a symmetric operator. Using the above LDG operators (5.1), we can represent the semi-discrete LDG scheme as (3.4)-(3.7) :

$$\left( \frac{d}{dt} u_h, v_h \right) = (L_h u_h, v_h), \quad \forall v_h \in V_h^k,$$

where the operator  $L_h$  is given by  $L_h = -D_+^h D_{\alpha}^h D_+^h D_-^h$ . Then semi-discrete scheme corresponds to

$$\frac{d}{dt} u_h = L_h u_h. \quad (5.2)$$

We consider the four-stage explicit fourth-order RK method for time discretization [48]:

$$u_h^{n+1} = P_4(\Delta t L_h) u_h^n, \quad (5.3)$$

where the operator  $P_4$  is given by

$$P_4(\Delta t L_h) = I + \Delta t L_h + \frac{1}{2}(\Delta t L_h)^2 + \frac{1}{6}(\Delta t L_h)^3 + \frac{1}{24}(\Delta t L_h)^4.$$

We introduce some notations which will be used frequently in subsequent stability analysis.

- We say that the LDG operator  $L_h$  is semi-negative if  $(v_h, (L_h + L_h^T)v_h) \leq 0$ ,  $\forall v_h \in V_h^k$ . Moreover, we denote it by  $L_h + L_h^T \leq 0$ .
- We define  $[u_h, v_h] = -(u_h, (L_h + L_h^T)v_h)$ . It is a bilinear form on  $V_h^k$ .
- We denote  $\mathcal{L}_h := \Delta t L_h$ .

We introduce few definitions which are instrumental for the stability analysis.

**Definition 5.2** (Strong stability). *Let  $u^n$  be the approximate solution obtained by the fully discrete scheme (5.3). Then the scheme (5.3) is said to be strongly stable if there exists an integer  $n_0$ , such that*

$$\|u^n\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \|u^0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \quad \forall n \geq n_0, \quad (5.4)$$

provided CFL number is sufficiently small.

**Definition 5.3** (Monotonicity stability). *Let  $u^n$  be the approximate solution obtained by the fully discrete scheme (5.3). Then the scheme (5.3) is said to have monotonicity stability, if we have*

$$\|u^{n+1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \|u^n\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \quad \forall n \geq 0, \quad (5.5)$$

provided CFL number is sufficiently small. Moreover, monotonicity stability implies the strong stability.

**Lemma 5.4** (Energy equality [48]). *Let  $u_h^n$  be the solution of fully discrete scheme (5.3). Then*

$$\|u_h^{n+1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 - \|u_h^n\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 = \mathcal{Q}(u_h^n), \quad \forall n \geq 1,$$

where

$$\mathcal{Q}(u_h^n) = \frac{1}{576} \|\mathcal{L}_h^4 u_h^n\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 - \frac{1}{72} \|\mathcal{L}_h^3 u_h^n\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \Delta t \sum_{i,j=0}^3 \alpha_{ij} [\mathcal{L}_h^i u_h^n, \mathcal{L}_h^j u_h^n],$$

and

$$A = (\alpha_{ij})_{i,j=0}^3 = - \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1/2 & 1/6 & 1/24 \\ 1/2 & 1/3 & 1/8 & 1/24 \\ 1/6 & 1/8 & 1/24 & 1/48 \\ 1/24 & 1/24 & 1/48 & 1/144 \end{pmatrix}.$$

In Lemma 5.4,  $\mathcal{Q}(u_h^n)$  is referred as the energy change of the approximate solution, consisting of two components: the numerical dissipation  $\frac{1}{576} \|\mathcal{L}_h^4 u_h^n\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 - \frac{1}{72} \|\mathcal{L}_h^3 u_h^n\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2$  and the quadratic form  $\Delta t \sum_{i,j=0}^3 \alpha_{ij} [\mathcal{L}_h^i u_h^n, \mathcal{L}_h^j u_h^n]$ . The next lemma establishes the negativity of the quadratic form, also provides conditions for the strong stability.

**Lemma 5.5** (See Lemma 2.4 in [48]). *Let  $L_h$  be a semi-negative operator and*

$$\mathcal{Q}_1(u) = \zeta \|\mathcal{L}_h^3(u)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \Delta t \sum_{i,j=0}^m \bar{\alpha}_{ij} [\mathcal{L}_h^i u, \mathcal{L}_h^j u], \quad (5.6)$$

where  $\bar{\alpha}_{ij} = \bar{\alpha}_{ji}$  and  $m \geq 2$ . If  $\zeta < 0$  and  $\bar{A} = (\bar{\alpha}_{ij})_{i,j=0}^m$  is negative definite, then there exists a constant  $c_0 > 0$  such that  $\mathcal{Q}_1(u) \leq 0$  provided  $\|L_h\| \leq c_0$ .

For simplicity, we are using uniform time stepping. Since the semi-discrete scheme (3.4)-(3.7) is spatially stable from the Lemma 3.4, that is

$$\left( \frac{d}{dt} u_h, u_h \right) = (L_h u_h, u_h) \leq 0,$$

the LDG operator  $L_h$  is semi-negative [47], i.e.  $L_h + L_h^T \leq 0$ . Furthermore,  $L_h^T$  is well defined, and using the Proposition 5.1, we get  $L_h^T = D_+^h D_-^h D_\alpha^h D_-^h$ .

The question of whether the classical fourth-order Runge-Kutta method is strongly stable or not remained open until Sun and Shu partially addressed it in [48], where they provided a counterexample showing that this method is not always strongly stable for semi-negative operators. However, it is worth noting that the semi-negative operator provided in the counterexample in [48] is not a DG operator. Another counterexample is presented in [53, Section 6], illustrating that this method does not have monotonicity stability for semi-negative DG operators. However, in [48], it was demonstrated that applying the classical fourth-order Runge-Kutta scheme for two consecutive time steps, which can be viewed as an eight-stage, fourth-order Runge-Kutta method, is strongly stable for semi-negative operators.

**Theorem 5.6** (Two-step strong stability [48]). *Let  $L_h + L_h^T \leq 0$ . Then the four-stage fourth-order RK scheme (5.3) is strongly stable in two steps and we have*

$$\|u_h^{n+2}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \|u_h^n\|_{L^2(\Omega)},$$

provided  $\Delta t \|L_h\| \leq c_0$ , where  $c_0$  is a constant and  $\|\cdot\|$  is an operator norm.

Recently, Sun and Shu in [47] have further generalize their results obtained in [48] for showing stability of fully discrete Runge-Kutta scheme for semi-negative operators. We follow the idea from [48] to prove that the scheme is strongly stable in three steps in the following theorem which helps us to show the scheme (5.3) is strongly stable in the sense of Definition 5.4.

**Theorem 5.7** (Three-step strong stability). *Let  $L_h + L_h^T \leq 0$ . Then the four-stage fourth-order RK scheme (5.3) is strongly stable in three steps. Therefore, we have*

$$\|u_h^{n+3}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \|u_h^n\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \quad n \geq 0,$$

provided  $\Delta t \|L_h\| \leq c_0$ , where  $c_0$  is a constant.

*Proof.* From the Lemma 5.4, energy equality implies

$$\|u_h^{n+3}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 - \|u_h^n\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 = \mathcal{Q}(u_h^{n+2}) + \mathcal{Q}(u_h^{n+1}) + \mathcal{Q}(u_h^n), \quad (5.7)$$

where  $\mathcal{Q}(u^n)$  is defined in Lemma 5.4. We find the estimates for  $\mathcal{Q}(u_h^{n+1})$  and  $\mathcal{Q}(u_h^{n+2})$  in terms of  $u^n$  in its quadratic part by the following calculation:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}(u^{n+1}) &= \frac{1}{576} \|\mathcal{L}_h^4 u_h^{n+1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 - \frac{1}{72} \|\mathcal{L}_h^3 u_h^{n+1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \Delta t \sum_{i,j=0}^3 \alpha_{ij} [\mathcal{L}_h^i u_h^{n+1}, \mathcal{L}_h^j u_h^{n+1}] \\ &= \frac{1}{576} \|\mathcal{L}_h^4 u_h^{n+1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 - \frac{1}{72} \|\mathcal{L}_h^3 u_h^{n+1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \Delta t \sum_{i,j=0}^3 \alpha_{ij} [\mathcal{L}_h^i P_4(\mathcal{L}_h) u_h^n, \mathcal{L}_h^j P_4(\mathcal{L}_h) u_h^n] \\ &= \frac{1}{576} \|\mathcal{L}_h^4 u_h^{n+1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 - \frac{1}{72} \|\mathcal{L}_h^3 u_h^{n+1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \Delta t \sum_{i,j=0}^7 \tilde{\alpha}_{ij} [\mathcal{L}_h^i u_h^n, \mathcal{L}_h^j u_h^n], \end{aligned}$$

where

$$A_0 = (\alpha_{ij})_{i,j=0}^3 = - \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1/2 & 1/6 \\ 1/2 & 1/3 & 1/8 \\ 1/6 & 1/8 & 1/24 \end{pmatrix}, \quad A_1 = (\tilde{\alpha}_{ij})_{i,j=0}^3 = - \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 3/2 & 7/6 \\ 3/2 & 7/3 & 15/8 \\ 7/6 & 15/8 & 37/24 \end{pmatrix},$$

as our interest in the first  $3 \times 3$  coefficient matrix, it is important to note that this is sufficient to apply the result in Lemma 5.5. While the complete matrix can be obtained and is not difficult, it involves a lengthy derivation. For brevity, we choose not to provide the complete matrix here, and we refer to [48] for detailed information.

In a similar way, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}(u^{n+2}) &= \frac{1}{576} \|\mathcal{L}_h^4 u_h^{n+2}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 - \frac{1}{72} \|\mathcal{L}_h^3 u_h^{n+2}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \Delta t \sum_{i,j=0}^3 \alpha_{ij} [\mathcal{L}_h^i u_h^{n+2}, \mathcal{L}_h^j u_h^{n+2}] \\ &= \frac{1}{576} \|\mathcal{L}_h^4 u_h^{n+2}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 - \frac{1}{72} \|\mathcal{L}_h^3 u_h^{n+2}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \Delta t \sum_{i,j=0}^7 \tilde{\alpha}_{ij} [\mathcal{L}_h^i u_h^{n+1}, \mathcal{L}_h^j u_h^{n+1}] \\ &= \frac{1}{576} \|\mathcal{L}_h^4 u_h^{n+2}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 - \frac{1}{72} \|\mathcal{L}_h^3 u_h^{n+2}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \Delta t \sum_{i,j=0}^7 \tilde{\alpha}_{ij} [\mathcal{L}_h^i P_4(\mathcal{L}_h) u_h^n, \mathcal{L}_h^j P_4(\mathcal{L}_h) u_h^n] \\ &= \frac{1}{576} \|\mathcal{L}_h^4 u_h^{n+2}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 - \frac{1}{72} \|\mathcal{L}_h^3 u_h^{n+2}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \Delta t \sum_{i,j=0}^{11} \hat{\alpha}_{ij} [\mathcal{L}_h^i u_h^n, \mathcal{L}_h^j u_h^n], \end{aligned}$$

where

$$A_2 = (\hat{\alpha}_{ij})_{i,j=0}^3 = - \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 5/2 & 19/6 \\ 5/2 & 19/3 & 57/8 \\ 19/6 & 57/8 & 253/24 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Assuming  $\|\mathcal{L}_h\| \leq 2$ , we have the following estimates

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{576} \|\mathcal{L}_h^4 u_h^{n+2}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 - \frac{1}{72} \|\mathcal{L}_h^3 u_h^{n+2}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 &\leq 0, \\ \frac{1}{576} \|\mathcal{L}_h^4 u_h^{n+1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 - \frac{1}{72} \|\mathcal{L}_h^3 u_h^{n+1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 &\leq 0, \\ \frac{1}{576} \|\mathcal{L}_h^4 u_h^n\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 - \frac{1}{72} \|\mathcal{L}_h^3 u_h^n\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 &\leq -\frac{1}{144} \|\mathcal{L}_h^3 u_h^n\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence (5.7) becomes

$$\|u_h^{n+3}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 - \|u_h^n\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq -\frac{1}{144} \|\mathcal{L}_h^3 u_h^n\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \Delta t \sum_{i,j=0}^{11} \bar{\alpha}_{ij} [\mathcal{L}_h^i u_h^n, \mathcal{L}_h^j u_h^n] =: \mathcal{Q}_1(u_h^n),$$

where

$$A = (\bar{\alpha}_{ij})_{i,j=0}^2 = (\alpha_{ij})_{i,j=0}^2 + (\tilde{\alpha}_{ij})_{i,j=0}^2 + (\hat{\alpha}_{ij})_{i,j=0}^2 = - \begin{pmatrix} 3 & 9/2 & 9/2 \\ 9/2 & 9 & 73/8 \\ 9/2 & 73/8 & 97/8 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since the eigenvalues of  $A$  are -21.9444, -1.64399 and -0.536623, it follows that  $A$  is negative definite. Applying the Lemma 5.5, we obtain  $\mathcal{Q}_1(u_h^n) \leq 0$ . Hence

$$\|u_h^{n+3}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \|u_h^n\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

Stability in two and three steps of the fully discrete LDG scheme (5.3) combined together proves the following theorem.

**Theorem 5.8.** *Let  $L_h + L_h^T \leq 0$ . Then the four-stage fourth-order RK LDG scheme (5.3) is strongly stable. That is, we have*

$$\|u_h^n\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \|u_h^0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \quad \forall n \geq 2,$$

provided  $\Delta t \|L_h\| \leq c_0$ , where  $c_0$  is a constant.

**Remark 5.9.** *We can define LDG operator  $L_h$  for the fully discrete LDG scheme in case of higher dimension linear equation in a similar way. Whenever the operator  $L_h$  is linear, we can obtain the  $L^2$ -stability in case of multiple space dimensional equation (4.1).*

## 6. NUMERICAL EXAMPLES

In this section, our aim is to validate the proposed LDG scheme (3.4) for solving the fractional KdV equation (1.1) with  $\alpha$  ranging between 1 and 2. We have achieved the stability and error analysis results for the semi discretized scheme of the form

$$\frac{d}{dt} u_h = L_h u_h.$$

Our focus lies on verifying the performance of scheme using a low storage explicit Runge-Kutta (LSERK) of fourth order [7, 26] time discretization method of the form

$$\begin{aligned} r^{(0)} &= u_h^n, \\ \text{for } j &= 1 : 5 \\ &\begin{cases} k^j = a_j k^{j-1} + \Delta t L_h r^{(j-1)}, \\ r^{(j)} = r^{(j-1)} + b_j k^j, \end{cases} \\ u_h^{n+1} &= r^{(5)}, \end{aligned}$$

where the weighted coefficients  $a_j$ ,  $b_j$  and  $c_j$  of the LSERK method given in [26]. The above iteration in competitive with the classical fourth-order method (5.3) is considerably more efficient and accurate than (5.3), as it has the disadvantage that it requires four extra storage arrays.

For the numerical computation of the fractional integral  $\Delta_{\frac{\alpha-2}{2}}$ , we redefine  ${}_a I_x^{2-\alpha}$  and  ${}_x I_b^{2-\alpha}$  in the interval  $\Omega$  by applying the linear transformations  $t \mapsto \left(\frac{x+a}{2} + \frac{x-a}{2}\xi\right)$  and  $t \mapsto \left(\frac{b+x}{2} + \frac{b-x}{2}\xi\right)$  to the definitions (2.1) and (2.2), respectively. This results in:

$$\begin{aligned} {}_a I_x^{2-\alpha} u(x) &= \frac{1}{\Gamma(2-\alpha)} \left(\frac{x-a}{2}\right)^{2-\alpha} \int_{-1}^1 (1-\xi)^{1-\alpha} u\left(\frac{x+a}{2} + \frac{x-a}{2}\xi\right) d\xi, \\ {}_x I_b^{2-\alpha} u(x) &= \frac{1}{\Gamma(2-\alpha)} \left(\frac{b-x}{2}\right)^{2-\alpha} \int_{-1}^1 (1+\xi)^{1-\alpha} u\left(\frac{b+x}{2} + \frac{b-x}{2}\xi\right) d\xi. \end{aligned}$$

With this setup, we can efficiently compute the fractional integral using the Gauss–Jacobi quadrature with weight functions  $(1 - \xi)^{1-\alpha}$  and  $(1 + \xi)^{1-\alpha}$ , where the condition  $1 - \alpha > -1$  is satisfied, as required. For more details and algorithm, one may refer to [26, Appendix A] and [43]. The order of convergence is defined for each intermediate step between element numbers  $N_1$  and  $N_2$  as

$$\text{order} = \frac{\ln(E(N_1)) - \ln(E(N_2))}{\ln(N_2) - \ln(N_1)},$$

where the error  $E$  can be seen as a function of number of elements  $N$ .

**6.1. Compare with classical KdV.** In this numerical example, we explore the behavior of the LDG scheme (3.4)-(3.7) for the fractional KdV equation (1.1) by selecting the exponent  $\alpha$  close to 2. The flux function is considered as  $f(U) = -3U^2$  and the exact solution of the KdV equation  $U_t - 3U^2 + U_{xxx} = 0$  is used in [57]:

$$U(x, t) = -2 \operatorname{sech}^2(x - 4t), \quad x \in [-10, 12], \quad t \in [0, 1]. \quad (6.1)$$

Since for  $\alpha = 2$  the equation (1.1) corresponds to the generalized KdV equation, we have shown that the approximate solution obtained by the LDG scheme (3.4)-(3.7) converges to the exact solution of the generalized KdV equation when  $\alpha$  is chosen close to 2.

We initialize our simulation with the initial condition at  $t = 0$  given by

$$U_0(x) = U(x, 0) = -2 \operatorname{sech}^2(x), \quad x \in [-10, 12], \quad (6.2)$$

and compare the results at final time  $T = 1$ .

This numerical experiment allows us to verify theoretical results obtained in previous sections for the LDG scheme (3.4)-(3.7) and it also captures the dynamics of the KdV equation for fractional values of  $\alpha$  close to 2 for the initial condition  $U_0$  defined in (6.2). The Table 6.1 represents the error rates which are optimal even for coarser grids, provided the CFL condition number is sufficiently small. Its graphical representation is depicted in Figure 6.1 with taking number of grid points  $N = 160$  and degree of polynomial  $k = 3$ . From the Figure 6.1, it is evident that as  $\alpha$  tends to 2, specifically, for  $\alpha = 1.900, 1.950, 1.999$ , approximate solutions converge to the exact solution (6.1). We choose the polynomials of degree  $k = 1, 2, 3$ , and it is observed that for higher degree polynomials, approximate solution converges more accurately.

$\alpha = 1.999$						
N/k	k=1		k=2		k=3	
	error	order	error	order	error	order
N=40	2.02e-01	3.30	7.07e-02	2.89	1.13e-03	3.98
N=80	2.04e-02		9.52e-03		7.21e-05	
N=160	3.46e-03	2.55	2.95	4.57e-06	3.98	
		2.28				2.98
N=320	7.09e-04		1.54e-04		3.04e-07	

TABLE 6.1. Error and order of convergence for fractional KdV equation (1.1) with  $\alpha$  close to 2 taking  $N$  elements and polynomial degree  $k$ .

**6.2. Fractional Case.** For the fractional value of  $\alpha$ , we consider the following linear fractional KdV equation:

$$\begin{cases} U_t(x, t) - (-\Delta)^{\alpha/2} U_x(x, t) = g(x, t), & \text{in } [0, 1] \times (0, 0.01], \\ U(x, 0) = U_{0g}(x), & \text{on } [0, 1], \end{cases} \quad (6.3)$$

with the initial condition  $U_{0g}(x) = x^6(1-x)^6$ . Here  $g(x, t)$  is an additional source term, and we choose

$$g(x, t) = e^{-t} \left( -U_{0g}(x) - (-\Delta)^{\alpha/2} (U_{0g})_x(x) \right),$$




FIGURE 6.1. The exact solutions and approximate solution of (1.1) at  $T = 1$  with  $N = 80$ ,  $k = 3$  and fractional exponent  $\alpha = 1.950, 1.970$  and  $1.999$ .

to obtain the exact solution  $U(x, t) = e^{-t}x^6(1-x)^6$ . We verify the order of convergence of the

$\alpha$ is chosen in between 1 and 2							
$\alpha/N/k$		k=1		k=2		k=3	
		error	order	error	order	error	order
$\alpha = 1.1$	<b>N=20</b>	8.22e-03		5.16e-04		1.10e-05	
	<b>N=40</b>	2.05e-03	1.99	6.45e-05	2.98	7.23e-07	3.93
	<b>N=80</b>	5.14e-04	2.00	8.07e-06	3.00	4.52e-08	3.99
	<b>N=160</b>	1.28e-04	2.00	1.01e-06	3.00	2.83e-09	3.99
$\alpha = 1.5$	<b>N=20</b>	8.21e-03		5.16e-04		1.11e-05	
	<b>N=40</b>	2.06e-03	1.98	6.43e-05	2.99	7.23e-07	3.92
	<b>N=80</b>	5.14e-04	2.00	8.08e-06	2.99	4.51e-08	3.99
	<b>N=160</b>	1.28e-04	2.00	1.01e-06	3.00	2.82e-09	4.00
$\alpha = 1.8$	<b>N=20</b>	8.28e-03		5.18e-04		1.12e-05	
	<b>N=40</b>	2.12e-03	1.96	6.45e-05	2.99	7.22e-07	3.89
	<b>N=80</b>	5.23e-04	1.98	8.09e-06	3.01	4.48e-08	3.97
	<b>N=160</b>	1.35e-04	2.00	1.01e-06	3.00	2.80e-09	4.00

TABLE 6.2. Error and order of convergence for different values of  $\alpha$  for the example (6.3) with the source term taking  $N$  elements and polynomial degree  $k$ .

scheme (3.4) with a very small final time  $T = 0.01$ . Table 6.2 displays the convergence rates and




FIGURE 6.2. Approximate solution of fractional KdV equation at  $T = 1$  with  $N = 320$ ,  $k = 3$  for the fractional values  $\alpha = 1.2, 1.4, 1.6$  and  $1.8$ , by choosing smooth initial condition  $V_0$  in (6.4).

$L^2$ -errors obtained by implementing the LDG scheme with the initial data  $U_{0g}$  for  $\alpha = 1.1, 1.5$ , and  $1.8$  respectively.

Afterwards, we investigate the performance of the LDG scheme (3.4) across different fractional values of  $\alpha$ , utilizing smooth initial data and without a source term. We examine the nonlinear fractional KdV equation (1.1) incorporating the nonlinear flux  $f(U) = \frac{1}{2}U^2$ . The simulation is extended to a final time  $T = 1$  incorporating smooth initial conditions with the Dirichlet boundary conditions as described in [16]:

$$V_0(x) = U(x, 0) = \frac{1}{4} \sin(x), \quad x \in (-2\pi, 2\pi). \quad (6.4)$$

Due to unavailability of the exact solution, our focus lies solely on observing the behavior of the approximate solution over time. In Figure 6.2, we observe the expected rightward movement of the solution, consistent with the positive sign of the higher derivative for initial condition  $V_0$  in (6.4).

Furthermore, we carry out the numerical investigations for non-smooth initial data which is defined in the interval  $[-5, 5]$  as

$$W_0(x) = U(x, 0) = \begin{cases} 1, & -1 \leq x \leq 1, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Since the initial data  $W_0$  exhibits a jump discontinuity at two points, it belongs to  $L^2(\Omega)$  but not to any other Sobolev spaces of positive indices. In this case, an exact solution is unavailable of the fKdV equation (1.1). However, our primary objective is to understand the qualitative behavior at the discontinuity of the solution produced by our scheme, rather than comparing it or determining its convergence rate. In Figure 6.3 and 6.4, we use the grid points  $N = 320$  and final time  $T = 0.001$  and  $T = 0.005$  respectively. We observe that the dispersion term forces the solution to evolve into traveling waves. Even at early time stages, approximate solution breaks up in many oscillation




FIGURE 6.3. Approximate solution at  $T = 0.001$  with  $N = 320$ ,  $k = 3$  and initial condition  $W_0$  of (1.1).

waves at the discontinuities. Furthermore, we note that as  $\alpha$  increases between 1 and 2, the height of the traveling waves increases but the number of oscillation decreases near discontinuity.

**6.3. Examples of multiple dimensional equation.** We consider the following equation in two space dimensions with the source term  $g_d$ :

$$\begin{cases} U_t - (-\Delta)_1^{\alpha_1/2} U_x - (-\Delta)_2^{\alpha_2/2} U_y = g_d(\mathbf{x}, t), & \mathbf{x} := (x, y) \in [-1, 1]^2, t \in (0, 0.001], \\ U_{0_d}(\mathbf{x}) = \sin(\pi x) \sin(\pi y), & (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2, \end{cases} \quad (6.5)$$

where  $1 < \alpha_1, \alpha_2 < 2$ . Since we do not have the exact solution for (6.5), we choose the source term  $g_d(\mathbf{x}, t)$  as

$$g_d(\mathbf{x}, t) = e^{-t} \left( -U_{0_d}(\mathbf{x}) - \pi^3 \sin(\pi y) \Delta_{(\alpha_1-2)/2}^1 \cos(\pi x) - \pi^3 \sin(\pi x) \Delta_{(\alpha_2-2)/2}^2 \cos(\pi y) \right)$$

such that we have the exact solution  $U(\mathbf{x}, t) = e^{-t} \sin(\pi x) \sin(\pi y)$ . In this example, we choose number of triangles as  $N = 2m^2$ ,  $m = 3, 4, \dots$ . The  $L^2$ -errors and numerical order of accuracy are depicted in Table 6.3. For various values of  $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$ , we have obtained the optimal rates of convergence for polynomials with degree up to 3.

Next we consider the following equation without the source term

$$\begin{cases} U_t - (-\Delta)_1^{\alpha_1/2} U_x - (-\Delta)_2^{\alpha_2/2} U_y = 0, & \mathbf{x} := (x, y) \in [-\pi, \pi]^2, t \in (0, 0.1], \\ U_{0_d}(\mathbf{x}) = \sin(x) \sin(y), & (x, y) \in [-\pi, \pi]^2. \end{cases} \quad (6.6)$$




FIGURE 6.4. Approximate solution at  $T = 0.005$  with  $N = 320$ ,  $k = 3$  and initial condition  $W_0$  of (1.1).

Whenever  $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) = (2, 2)$ , the equation (6.6) becomes  $U_t + U_{xxx} + U_{yyy} = 0$ , and it has the exact solution which is given by  $U(\mathbf{x}, t) = \sin(x + t)\sin(y + t)$ . We wish to investigate the approximate solution of (6.6) whenever  $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$  is close to  $(2, 2)$ . The Table 6.4 provides  $L^2$ -errors by using the number of triangles  $N = 2m^2$ ,  $m = 4, 5, \dots$ . It is evident that the proposed LDG scheme with  $P^k$  elements provides a uniform  $(k + 1)$ -th order of accuracy even for the coarser meshes.

## 7. CONCLUDING REMARKS

We have developed a stable LDG scheme for fractional KdV equation (1.1) and (4.13) in one space dimension and multiple space dimensions. Although we have achieved a theoretical order of convergence of  $k + 1/2$  for the nonlinear flux, the numerical experiments demonstrate the optimal order of convergence  $\mathcal{O}(h^{k+1})$ . Through extensive numerical experiments covering various values of  $\alpha$ , we have demonstrated the efficiency of the LDG scheme for one dimensional and multiple dimensional problems. In cases where exact solutions were not available to validate the LDG scheme, we have introduced an additional source term to obtain the exact solutions, allowing us to obtain the convergence rates.

Indeed, while we have established the error estimates for the spatial discretization, obtaining error estimates for the fully discrete scheme remains an ongoing task. This endeavor demands additional insights and techniques, which we plan to address in our future work. Furthermore, extending the stability analysis of the fully discrete scheme to the nonlinear case is another important aspect that we intend to explore. Our future work will focus on proving stability and obtaining error estimates in the nonlinear setup of the fully discrete LDG scheme.

$(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$ is chosen in between (1,1) and (2,2)							
$(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)/N/k$		k=1		k=2		k=3	
		error	order	error	order	error	order
$(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) = (1.1, 1.1)$	<b>N=18</b>	5.91e-02		1.42e-02		8.51e-03	
	<b>N=32</b>		1.80		3.07		3.89
	<b>N=50</b>	2.09e-02		2.40e-03		9.11e-04	
	<b>N=72</b>		2.00		3.04		3.80
$(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) = (1.4, 1.6)$	<b>N=18</b>	8.56e-03		6.12e-04		1.67e-04	
	<b>N=32</b>		1.97		3.00		4.07
	<b>N=50</b>	4.16e-03		2.08e-04		3.78e-05	
	<b>N=72</b>		1.98		2.94		3.88
$(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) = (1.8, 1.8)$	<b>N=18</b>	5.59e-02		1.31e-02		8.32e-03	
	<b>N=32</b>		1.98		2.94		3.88
	<b>N=50</b>	1.95e-02		2.38e-03		8.92e-04	
	<b>N=72</b>		2.17		3.05		4.07
$(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) = (1.8, 1.8)$	<b>N=18</b>	7.39e-03		6.09e-04		1.52e-04	
	<b>N=32</b>		1.99		3.04		3.98
	<b>N=50</b>	3.57e-03		2.03e-04		3.49e-05	
	<b>N=72</b>		1.97		2.94		3.93
$(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) = (1.8, 1.8)$	<b>N=18</b>	5.37e-02		1.27e-02		8.30e-03	
	<b>N=32</b>		1.97		2.94		3.93
	<b>N=50</b>	1.73e-02		2.34e-03		8.66e-04	
	<b>N=72</b>		1.99		3.03		3.99
$(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) = (1.8, 1.8)$	<b>N=18</b>	7.15e-03		6.07e-04		1.46e-04	
	<b>N=32</b>		2.00		2.98		4.00
	<b>N=50</b>	3.45e-03		2.05e-04		3.41e-05	
	<b>N=72</b>		2.00		2.98		4.00

TABLE 6.3. Error and order of convergence for different values of  $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$  for the 2D example (6.5) with source term at time  $T = 0.001$  taking  $N$  elements and polynomial degree  $k$ .

$(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) = (1.999, 1.999)$						
N/k	k=1		k=2		k=3	
	error	order	error	order	error	order
<b>N=32</b>	5.97e-01		5.74e-02		3.20e-02	
		1.88		2.78		3.72
<b>N=50</b>	2.58e-01		1.66e-02		6.07e-03	
		2.10		2.81		3.88
<b>N=72</b>	1.20e-01		5.98e-03		1.47e-03	
		2.06		2.91		3.94
<b>N=98</b>	6.39e-02		2.44e-03		4.36e-04	

TABLE 6.4. Error and order of convergence for  $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$  close to (2,2) to compare equation (6.6) with the equation  $U_t + U_{xxx} + U_{yyy} = 0$  at time  $T = 0.1$  taking  $N$  elements and polynomial degree  $k$ .

#### REFERENCES

- [1] L. Abdelouhab, J. L. Bona, M. Felland, and J. -C. Saut. Nonlocal models for nonlinear, dispersive waves. *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena*, 40 (1989), no. 3, 360–392.
- [2] T. Aboelenen. A high-order nodal discontinuous Galerkin method for nonlinear fractional Schrödinger type equations. *Communications in Nonlinear Science and Numerical Simulation*, 54 (2018), 428–452.
- [3] J. Ai, Y. Xu, C.-W. Shu and Q. Zhang.  $L^2$  error estimate to smooth solutions of high order Runge–Kutta discontinuous Galerkin method for scalar nonlinear conservation laws with and without sonic points. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 60 (2022), no. 4, 1741–1773.
- [4] F. Bassi and S. Rebay. A high-order accurate discontinuous finite element method for the numerical solution of the compressible Navier–Stokes equations. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 131 (1997), no. 2, 267–279.

- [5] J. L. Bona, H. Chen, O. Karakashian and Y. Xing. Conservative, discontinuous Galerkin–methods for the generalized Korteweg–de Vries equation. *Mathematics of Computation*, 82 (2013), no. 283, 1401–1432.
- [6] J. L. Bona and R. Smith. The initial-value problem for the Korteweg–de Vries equation. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Mathematical and Physical Sciences*, 278 (1975), no. 1287, 555–601.
- [7] H. M. Carpenter and A. C. Kennedy. Fourth-order 2N-storage Runge-Kutta schemes. *NASA TM 109112, NASA Langley Research Center*, (1994).
- [8] P. G. Ciarlet. The Finite Element Method for Elliptic Problems. *Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics*, (2002).
- [9] B. Cockburn, G. E. Karniadakis and C.-W. Shu. Discontinuous Galerkin methods: theory, computation and applications. *Springer Science & Business Media*, 11 (2012).
- [10] B. Cockburn and C.-W. Shu. The local discontinuous Galerkin method for time-dependent convection-diffusion systems. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 35 (1998), no. 6, 2440–2463.
- [11] W. H. Deng and J. S. Hesthaven. Local Discontinuous Galerkin methods for fractional diffusion equations. *ESAIM: Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Analysis*, 47 (2013), no. 6, 1845–1864.
- [12] E. Di Nezza, G. Palatucci and E. Valdinoci. Hitchhiker’s guide to the fractional Sobolev spaces. *Bulletin des Sciences Mathématiques*, 136 (2012), no. 5, 521–573.
- [13] R. Dutta, H. Holden, U. Koley, and N. H. Risebro. Convergence of finite difference schemes for the Benjamin–Ono equation. *Numerische Mathematik*, 134 (2016), no. 2, 249–274.
- [14] R. Dutta, U. Koley, and N. H. Risebro. Convergence of a higher order scheme for the Korteweg–de Vries equation. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 53 (2015), no. 4, 1963–1983.
- [15] R. Dutta and N. H. Risebro. A note on the convergence of a Crank–Nicolson scheme for the KdV equation. *Int. J. Numer. Anal. Model*, 13 (2016), no. 5, 657–675.
- [16] R. Dutta and T. Sarkar. Operator splitting for the fractional Korteweg–de Vries equation. *Numerical Methods for Partial Differential Equations*, 37 (2021), no. 6, 3000–3022.
- [17] M. Dwivedi and T. Sarkar. Convergence of a conservative Crank–Nicolson finite difference scheme for the KdV equation with smooth and non-smooth initial data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.14454*, (2023).
- [18] M. Dwivedi and T. Sarkar. Fully discrete finite difference schemes for the Fractional Korteweg–de Vries equation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.08275*, (2024).
- [19] M. Dwivedi and T. Sarkar. Stability and Convergence analysis of a Crank–Nicolson Galerkin scheme for the fractional Korteweg–de Vries equation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.06589*, (2023).
- [20] A. M. A. El-Sayed and M. Gaber. On the finite Caputo and finite Riesz derivatives. *Electronic Journal of Theoretical Physics*, 3 (2006), no. 12, 81–95.
- [21] V. J. Ervin and J. P. Roop. Variational formulation for the stationary fractional advection dispersion equation. *Numerical Methods for Partial Differential Equations*, 22 (2006), no. 3, 558–576.
- [22] A. S. Fokas and B. Fuchssteiner. The hierarchy of the Benjamin–Ono equation. *Physics letters A*, 86 (1981), no. 6-7, 341–345.
- [23] G. Fonseca, F. Linares, and G. Ponce. The IVP for the dispersion generalized Benjamin–Ono equation in weighted Sobolev spaces. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 30 (2013), no. 5, 763–790.
- [24] S. T. Galtung. Convergent Crank–Nicolson Galerkin Scheme for the Benjamin–Ono Equation. *Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems*, 38 (2018), no. 3, 1243–1268.
- [25] E. Herr, A. D. Ionescu, C. E. Kenig, and H. Koch. A Para-differential renormalization technique for nonlinear dispersive equations. *Communication in Partial Differential Equation*, 35 (2010), no. 10, 1827–1875.
- [26] J. S. Hesthaven and T. Warburton. Nodal discontinuous Galerkin methods: algorithms, analysis, and applications. *Springer Science and Business Media*, 52 (2007).
- [27] H. Holden, U. Koley and N. H. Risebro. Convergence of a fully discrete finite difference scheme for the Korteweg–de Vries equation. *IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis*, 35 (2015), no. 3, 1047–1077.
- [28] J. Hunter, Z. Sun and Y. Xing. Stability and time-step constraints of implicit-explicit Runge-Kutta methods for the linearized Korteweg–de Vries equation. *Communications on Applied Mathematics and Computation*, (2023), 1–30.
- [29] T. Kato. On the Cauchy problem for the (generalized) Korteweg–de Vries equation. *Studies in Appl. Math. Ad. in Math. Suppl. Stud.*, (1983), no. 8, 93–128.
- [30] C. E. Kenig, G. Ponce and L. Vega. On the generalized Benjamin–Ono equation. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 342 (1994), no. 1, 155–172.
- [31] C. E. Kenig, G. Ponce and L. Vega. Well-posedness of the initial value problem for the Korteweg–de Vries equation. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, 4 (1991), no. 2, 323–347.
- [32] C. E. Kenig, G. Ponce and L. Vega. The Cauchy problem for the Korteweg–de Vries equation in Sobolev spaces of negative indices. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 71 (1993), no. 1, 1–21.
- [33] A. A. Kilbas, H. M. Srivastava and J. J. Trujillo. Theory and applications of fractional differential equations. (*North-Holland Mathematics Studies*), Elsevier Science Inc., New York, USA, 204 (2006).
- [34] R. Killip and M. Viřan. KdV is wellposed in  $H^{-1}$ . *Annals of Mathematics*, 190 (2019), no. 1, 249–305.
- [35] C. Klein, and J.-C. Saut. A numerical approach to blow-up issues for dispersive perturbations of Burgers’ equation. *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena*, 295 (2015), 46–65.

- [36] D. J. Korteweg and G. d. Vries. On the change of form of long waves advancing in a rectangular canal, and on a new type of long stationary waves. *The London, Edinburgh, and Dublin Philosophical Magazine and Journal of Science*, 39 (1895), no. 240, 422–443.
- [37] P. Le Saint and P. A. Raviart. On a finite element method for solving the neutron transport equation. *Mathematical Aspects of Finite Elements in Partial Differential Equations*, (1974), 89–145.
- [38] D. Levy, C.-W. Shu and J. Yan. Local discontinuous Galerkin methods for nonlinear dispersive equations. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 196 (2004), no. 2, 751–772.
- [39] H. Liu and J. Yan. A local discontinuous Galerkin method for the Korteweg–de Vries equation with boundary effect. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 215 (2006), no. 1, 197–218.
- [40] S. I. Muslih and O. P. Agrawal. Riesz fractional derivatives and fractional dimensional space. *International Journal of Theoretical Physics*, 49 (2010), 270–275.
- [41] I. Podlubny. Fractional differential equations: an introduction to fractional derivatives, fractional differential equations, to methods of their solution and some of their applications. *Elsevier*, (1998).
- [42] G. Ponce. On the global well-posedness of the Benjamin–Ono equation. *Differential and Integral Equations*, 4 (1991), 527–542.
- [43] L. Qiu, W. H. Deng and J. S. Hesthaven. Nodal discontinuous Galerkin methods for fractional diffusion equations on 2D domain with triangular meshes. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 298 (2015), 678–694.
- [44] W. H. Reed and T. R. Hill. Triangular mesh methods for the neutron transport equation. *Technical report LA-UR-73-479, Los Alamos Scientific Lab*, (1973).
- [45] A. Sjöberg. On the Korteweg–de Vries equation: Existence and uniqueness. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 29 (1970), no. 3, 569–579.
- [46] Z. Sun and C.-W. Shu. Error analysis of Runge–Kutta discontinuous Galerkin methods for linear time-dependent partial differential equations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.00971*, (2020).
- [47] Z. Sun and C.-W. Shu. Strong stability of explicit Runge–Kutta time discretizations. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 57 (2019), no. 3, 1158–1182.
- [48] Z. Sun and C.-W. Shu. Stability of the fourth order Runge–Kutta method for time-dependent partial differential equations. *Annals of Mathematical Sciences and Applications*, 2 (2017), no. 2, 255–284.
- [49] T. Tao. Global well-posedness of the Benjamin–Ono equation in  $H^1(\mathbb{R})$ . *Journal of Hyperbolic Differential Equations*, 1 (2004), no. 1, 27–49.
- [50] V. Thomée and A. S. Vasudeva Murthy. A numerical method for the Benjamin–Ono equation. *BIT Numerical Mathematics*, 38 (1998), 597–611.
- [51] X. Wang, W. Dai and M. Usman. A high-order accurate finite difference scheme for the KdV equation with time-periodic boundary forcing. *Applied Numerical Mathematics*, 160 (2021), 102–121.
- [52] Q. Xu and J. S. Hesthaven. Discontinuous Galerkin method for fractional convection–diffusion equations. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 52 (2014), no. 1, 405–423.
- [53] Y. Xu, Q. Zhang, C.-W. Shu and H. wang. The  $L^2$ -norm stability analysis of Runge–Kutta discontinuous Galerkin methods for linear hyperbolic equations. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 57 (2019), no. 4, 1574–1601.
- [54] Y. Xu and C.-W. Shu. Local discontinuous Galerkin methods for nonlinear Schrödinger equations. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 205 (2005), no. 1, 72–97.
- [55] Y. Xu and C.-W. Shu. Error estimates of the semi-discrete local discontinuous Galerkin method for nonlinear convection–diffusion and KdV equations. *Computer methods in applied mechanics and engineering*, 196 (2007), no. 37-40, 3805–3822.
- [56] Y. Xu and C.-W. Shu. Local discontinuous Galerkin methods for high-order time-dependent partial differential equations. *Communications in Computational Physics*, 7 (2010), no. 1, 1–46.
- [57] J. Yan and C.-W. Shu. A local discontinuous Galerkin method for KdV type equations. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 40 (2002), no. 2, 769–791.
- [58] Q. Yang, F. Liu and I. Turner. Numerical methods for fractional partial differential equations with Riesz space fractional derivatives. *Applied Mathematical Modelling*, 34 (2010), no. 1, 200–218.
- [59] Q. Zhang and C.-W. Shu. Error estimates to smooth solutions of Runge–Kutta discontinuous Galerkin methods for scalar conservation laws. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 42 (2004), no. 2, 641–666.