

Consistency, convergence and error estimates for a mixed finite element–finite volume scheme to compressible Navier-Stokes equations with general inflow/outflow boundary data

Young-Sam Kwon * Antonin Novotny†

Department of Mathematics, Dong-A University
Busan 604-714, Republic of Korea, ykwon@dau.ac.kr

University of Toulon, IMATH, EA 2134, BP 20139
839 57 La Garde, France, novotny@univ-tln.fr

Abstract

We study convergence of a mixed finite element-finite volume scheme for the compressible Navier-Stokes equations in the isentropic regime under the full range $1 < \gamma < \infty$ of the adiabatic coefficient γ for the problem with general non zero inflow-outflow boundary conditions. We propose a modification of Karper’s scheme [Numer. Math. 125:441-510, 2013] in order to accommodate the non zero boundary data, prove existence of its solutions, establish the stability and uniform estimates, derive a convenient consistency formulation of the balance laws and use it to show the weak convergence of the numerical solutions to a dissipative solution with the Reynolds defect introduced in Abbatiello et al. [Preprint Arxiv 1912.12896]. If the target system admits a strong solution then the convergence is strong towards the strong solution. Moreover, we establish the convergence rate of the strong convergence in terms of the size of the space discretization h (which is supposed to be comparable with the time step Δt). In the case of non zero inflow-outflow boundary data, all results are new. The latter result is new also for the no-slip boundary conditions.

Key words: Navier-Stokes equations, Compressible fluids, Dissipative solutions, Defect measure, Crouzeix-Raviart finite element method, Finite volume method, Stability, Convergence, Error estimate

AMS classification: 35Q30, 65N12, 65N30, 76N10, 76N15, 76M10, 76M12

Contents

1	Introduction	3
1.1	State of the art and goals	3
1.2	Some basic notions and assumptions	6
1.3	Dissipative solutions with Reynolds defect	7

*The work of the first author was partially supported by NRF- 2017R1D1A1B03030249 and NRF-2019H1D3A2A01101128.

†The work of the second author was supported by Brain Pool program funded by the Ministry of Science and ICT through the National Research Foundation of Korea, NRF-2019H1D3A2A01101128.

2	Numerical setting	8
2.1	Mesh	8
2.2	Piecewise constant finite elements	9
2.3	Crouzeix-Raviart finite elements	9
2.4	Convective terms, upwinds	10
2.5	Time discretization	10
3	Numerical scheme, main results	10
3.1	Numerical scheme	11
3.2	Main results	12
4	Preliminaries	14
4.1	Preliminaries from numerical analysis	14
4.1.1	Some useful elementary inequalities	14
4.1.2	Properties of piecewise constant and Crouzeix-Raviart finite elements	15
4.1.3	Trace and “negative” $L^p - L^q$ estimates for finite elements	16
4.1.4	Some formulas related to upwinding	16
4.2	Preliminaries from mathematical analysis	17
5	Existence of solutions for the discrete problem	18
5.1	Renormalization of the continuity equation	18
5.2	Positivity of density	18
5.3	Existence of solutions to the numerical scheme	19
6	Uniform estimates	20
6.1	Energy balance	20
6.2	Estimates	24
7	Consistency	25
7.1	Continuity equation	26
7.2	Momentum equation	29
7.3	Energy balance	34
8	Convergence to a dissipative solution	34
8.1	Weak limits. Continuity equation	34
8.2	Limit in the momentum equation	36
8.3	Limit in the energy balance	38
9	Strong convergence to a strong solution	38
10	Relative energy for the numerical solution	39
10.1	Relative energy inequality	40
10.2	Error estimates	43
11	Concluding remarks	45

1 Introduction

1.1 State of the art and goals

Evolution of the density $\tau = \tau(t, x)$ and velocity $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}(t, x)$ through the time interval $[0, T)$, $T > 0$, $t \in [0, T)$ in a bounded (Lipschitz) domain Ω , $x \in \Omega$ of a viscous compressible fluid can be described by the Navier-Stokes equations. *Unlike most of the theoretical literature*, in this paper, we consider the Navier-Stokes system with the *nonzero inflow-outflow boundary conditions*, which is, from the point of view of applications, a more appropriate setting, than the "standard" setting with the no-slip or Navier boundary conditions. The equations read:

$$\partial_t \tau + \operatorname{div}_x(\tau \mathbf{u}) = 0, \quad (1.1)$$

$$\partial_t(\tau \mathbf{u}) + \operatorname{div}_x(\tau \mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{u}) + \nabla_x p(\tau) = \operatorname{div}_x \mathbb{S}(\nabla_x \mathbf{u}),$$

$$\mathbb{S}(\nabla_x \mathbf{u}) = \mu \nabla_x \mathbf{u} + (\mu + \lambda) \operatorname{div}_x \mathbb{I}, \quad \mu > 0, \lambda + \frac{2}{3}\mu > 0^1$$

with initial and boundary conditions,

$$\tau(0) = \tau_0, \quad \mathbf{u}(0) = \mathbf{u}_0, \quad \mathbf{u}|_{\partial\Omega} = \mathbf{u}_B, \quad \tau|_{\Gamma_{\text{in}}} = \tau_B, \quad (1.2)$$

where (for the case of simplicity),²

$$0 < \tau_0 \in C(\overline{\Omega}), \quad \mathbf{u}_0 \in C(\overline{\Omega}), \quad (1.3)$$

$$0 < \tau_B \in C^1(\overline{\Omega}), \quad \mathbf{u}_B \in C^2(\overline{\Omega}) \quad (1.4)$$

are given initial and boundary data, and

$$\Gamma^{\text{in}} = \partial\Omega \setminus \Gamma^{\text{out}}, \quad \Gamma^{\text{out}} = \overline{\{x \in \partial\Omega \mid \mathbf{u}_B(x) \cdot \mathbf{n}(x) \geq 0 \text{ or } \mathbf{n}(x) \text{ is not defined}\}} \quad (1.5)$$

(where \mathbf{n} is the outer normal to $\partial\Omega$), is the inflow boundary. Here, " $\overline{\{\dots\}}$ " means the closure with respect to the trace topology of R^3 on $\partial\Omega$.

In the above the pressure p is a given function of density τ which will be specified later. A typical example which will be treated in the paper includes pressure functions

$$p(\tau) \approx \tau^\gamma, \quad \text{for large values of } \tau, \quad \gamma > 1.$$

In the mathematical literature there is a large variety of numerical methods for solving efficiently compressible Navier-Stokes or Euler equations, see [26], [51], [60], [9], [27], [28], [35], [36], [11] – for the finite volume and/or a combination of finite volume and the finite element methods, e.g. [29], [30] – for the discontinuous Galerkin methods and e.g. [43], [42], [37],[39] – for the finite volume/finite difference schemes – and the references quoted there. Although these methods give quite convincing results in numerical experiments and engineering applications, their mathematical analysis is less advanced, see the works of Tadmor et al. [58], [59], [60], Gallouet et al. [35], [36], [12], [38], Jovanovic, Rohde [46], [45] for some pertinent results in this direction. Namely, the rigorous results about the convergence of the numerical solutions to the (weak,

¹ One usually writes $\mathbb{S}(\nabla_x \mathbf{u})$ in its frame indifferent form, $\mathbb{S}(\nabla_x \mathbf{u}) = \mu(\nabla_x \mathbf{u} + (\nabla_x \mathbf{u})^T) + \lambda \operatorname{div}_x \mathbb{I}$. Both writing are equivalent in the strong formulation but not in the weak formulation later and in the numerical scheme

²The regularity of initial conditions could be relaxed up to

$$0 < \tau_0 \in L^\gamma(\Omega), \quad \mathbf{u}_0 \in L^1(\Omega), \quad \tau_0 \mathbf{u}_0^2 \in L^1(\Omega).$$

Young measure-valued, strong) solutions is in a short supply, and if available, then only for the flows with the no slip or Navier boundary conditions.

We name the work of Karper [50] (and subsequent papers by Feireisl et al. [17], [15]) which provide the convergence for one particular (implicit) scheme (proposed originally by Karlsen and Karper [47],[48], [49] and which we will call Karper’s scheme) to a weak solution for large adiabatic coefficient ($\gamma > 3$)—and so far no other scheme was proved to have this convergence property, meaning that the proof is strongly dependent on the structure of the scheme. The convergence to a larger class of dissipative Young measure valued solutions (introduced in Feireisl et al. in [14]) is available for a larger class of schemes and, under some circumstances, for the whole range of adiabatic exponents $\gamma > 1$, see [21], [22], [23], [44], and the proofs, again, are quite scheme structure dependent. Moreover, in these papers, the weak strong uniqueness property of the class of Young-measure valued solutions translates to the proofs of strong convergence of the numerical solutions to a strong solution, provided the latter exists. This approach, however, does not provide the rate of convergence in terms of the size of the discretization, the so called error estimates.

In 2016, Gallouet et al. [38] established the rigorous error estimates for the Karper’s scheme and the adiabatic exponents $\gamma > 3/2$. These works were followed by other works establishing error estimates for a few other schemes, see [39], [54], [19], [24]. We remark that the proofs of the error estimates are much more ”structure dependent” than the convergence proofs and that they are available only for the adiabatic exponents $\gamma > 3/2$.

Let us notice that none of those results is available for the flows with the non zero inflow-outflow boundary conditions which we consider in this paper. No error estimates are known under the threshold $\gamma \leq 3/2$ even for the no-slip boundary value case.

Recently, the authors of [1] suggested a notion of the dissipative solutions with a Reynolds defect, which is still consistent with the notion of the classical solution (any dissipative solution which is regular is a classical solution), whose class is larger than the class of Young measure valued solutions suggested in [14], but which still possesses the weak strong uniqueness property. Moreover, this notion was built within the class of flows allowing the non zero inflow-outflow boundary conditions. As claimed by Fjordholm et al. [32], [34], [33] at least in the context of hyperbolic conservation laws, this type of solutions may represent a more appropriate concept of solutions than the concept of weak solutions. This may be the case for the compressible Navier-Stokes equations as well.

Note that existence of weak solutions to the Navier-Stokes system (1.1–1.5) is known only in the case $\gamma > 3/2$, and it is nowadays a standard result, see [25] (and monographs by Lions [53], Feireisl [13], Novotny, Straskraba [56]) for the no-slip boundary conditions. The same result for the nonzero inflow-outflow boundary conditions is more recent, see [6], [7], [52] preceded by Girion [40]. This is just to say that the proof of the convergence of any numerical scheme to a weak solution below the treshold $\gamma = 3/2$ is nowadays unreachable, and any proof of this type below ”Karper’s” treshold $\gamma = 3$ would be a tremendous progress. Even for the Karper’s scheme and adiabatic coefficients $\gamma > 3$ the convergence of numerical solutions to weak solutions in the non zero inflow/outflow setting is an open problem. We do not wish to address it here, however, the methodology we develop would allow to address it in an efficient way.

Our goal in this paper is to *adapt the Karper’s numerical scheme to the nonzero inflow-outflow boundary conditions, to prove existence of numerical solutions for this scheme on the polygonal domains and to study the convergence of its solutions to the dissipative solutions with Reynolds defect* introduced in [1] for the *whole scale of adiabatic exponents* $1 < \gamma < \infty$. We did not choose Karper’s scheme for its computational performance, but rather because it is recognized for its structural closeness to the original system which allows to adapt to it in a large extend the well known techniques from the ”continuous case”. However, when doing this we have always in mind the universality of the approach and the transportability of the ”main steps” of the method to other numerical schemes.

We consider the Karper's scheme in several versions: 1) The "classical" version with artificial density dissipation. 2) Without artificial density dissipation but with artificial pressure perturbation. 3) Combining both features mentioned above.

Our approach is based on the following steps:

1. We modify Karper's scheme in order to be able to accommodate the *non-zero inflow/outflow boundary data*, we prove *existence of numerical solutions* with the positive density.
2. We deduce from the scheme the balance of mass and the balance of energy and we use the balance of energy to derive the uniform estimates.
3. We rewrite the *numerical continuity equation* and the *numerical momentum equation* in their *variational forms* letting appear "remainders" vanishing as space h and time Δt discretizations tend to zero.
4. We rewrite the *numerical balance of energy* in a *consistent form compatible with the variational formulations of the balance of mass and momentum*.
5. Using the *consistency formulation of the balance of mass, momentum, and energy*, and employing the uniform estimates, we show that the *numerical solution generates a dissipative solution with the Reynolds defect* in the sense of [1]. This part provides *another proof of the existence of the dissipative solutions via a numerical scheme*, and by itself, it is of independent interest.
6. Last but not least, by using the weak strong uniqueness principle established in [1] for the limiting dissipative solution we show that the *whole sequence of numerical solutions converges strongly to the pointwise classical solution* of the original problem provided the latter exists.
7. Finally using again the consistency formulations of the continuity and momentum, and employing in addition the consistency formulation of the energy balance, we derive, by mimicking the continuous case, the *relative energy inequality* between the numerical and strong solutions and deduce the *error estimates*.

All convergence results are "*unconditional*": to obtain them *we use only a priori estimates derived from the numerical scheme*. No a posteriori bounds are needed, in contrast with the most mathematical literature about the subject.

To the best of our knowledge, *all results listed above are new in the case of general non-zero inflow/outflow boundary conditions*. They hold true also *in the case of zero boundary conditions*, in which situation the *error estimates* mentioned in the point 7 *is a new result*, as well. In the latter case, the convergence to dissipative solutions with Reynolds stress is reminiscent to the convergence to Young measure valued solutions proved in Feireisl et al. [14]. The advantage of the dissipative solutions with the Reynolds stress may dwell in the fact that the convergence proofs in this setting require slightly less from the structure of the scheme and thus, may be applicable to a larger class of numerical methods. The pertinence of this statement, however, remains to be confirmed. All results in this paper are obtained through *an extensive application of the functional analysis and theory of PDEs in the numerical analysis which goes far beyond the standard approaches current in this domain of research*.

The paper is organized as follows. In the Introduction, we fix the structural assumptions, define the dissipative solutions with the Reynolds defect and report the weak-strong uniqueness principle in this class. In Section 2 we describe the numerical setting and introduce the discrete functional spaces related to it.

In Section 3 we suggest the adaptation of Karper's numerical scheme, see (3.1–3.3), and state the main results. Theorem 3.1 about the the existence of numerical solutions and Theorem 3.2 consisting of three parts: 1) Convergence to dissipative solutions (item 1). 2) Strong convergence to strong solutions (item 2a). 3) Error estimates related to the strong convergence (item 2b). Section 4 is reporting necessary numerical and analytical preliminaries for the treatment of the problem. Then, Theorem 3.1 is proved in Section 5, and the proof of Theorem 3.2 is established through Sections 6–10. More exactly, we derive energy balance and uniform estimates for the numerical solutions in Section 6 in Lemmas 6.1 and 6.2. In Section 7 in Lemmas 7.1, 7.2 and in formulas (7.23–7.24) we derive the convenient consistency formulations of continuity, momentum and energy balance. In Section 8 we use the consistency formulation and uniform estimates to establish the weak convergence to dissipative solutions. This finishes the proof of the first part of Theorem 3.2. In Section 9, we use the weak strong uniqueness principle in the class of dissipative solutions to prove the strong convergence to a strong solution. This concludes the proofs of part 2 of Theorem 3.2. Finally, in Section 10, we establish the relative energy inequality between the numerical and strong solutions and conclude the proof of part 3 of Theorem 3.2 by Lemma 10.3 which states the error estimates. We finish the paper by several concluding remarks in Section 11.

We conclude this introductory part by a remark concerning the notation: The special functional spaces are always defined in the text. For the classical Lebesgue, Sobolev, Bochner spaces and their duals, we use the standard notation, see e.g. Evans [10]. Strong convergence in a Banach space is always denoted " \rightarrow ", while " \rightharpoonup " means the weak convergence and " \rightharpoonup_* " means the star-weak convergence.

1.2 Some basic notions and assumptions

We suppose

$$p \in C^1[0, \infty), p(0) = 0, p'(\varrho) > 0 \text{ for all } \varrho > 0 \quad (1.6)$$

(and we extend p by zero to the negative real line so that $p \in C(R)$ if needed). We associate to p its Helmholtz function H ,

$$H(\varrho) = \varrho \int_1^\varrho \frac{p(z)}{z^2} dz \text{ in particular } \varrho H'(\varrho) - H(\varrho) = p(\varrho). \quad (1.7)$$

and we shall additionally suppose that³

$$H - \underline{a}p, \quad \bar{a}p - H \text{ are convex functions for some } 0 < \underline{a} < \bar{a}. \quad (1.8)$$

It is to be noticed that an iconic example of the isentropic pressure $p(\varrho) = a\varrho^\gamma$, $a > 0$, $\gamma > 1$ complies with (1.6–1.8).

For a function $B \in C^1([0, \infty))$, we define

$$E_B(\varrho|r) = B(\varrho) - B'(r)(\varrho - r) - B(r)$$

and we write $E_H = E$ for the particular $B = H$. For the further use, we also introduce the relative energy functional

$$\mathcal{E}(\varrho, \mathbf{u}|r, \mathbf{U}) = \int_\Omega \left(\frac{1}{2} \varrho |\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{U}|^2 dx + E(\varrho|r) \right) dx \quad (1.9)$$

to measure a "distance" between vector fields \mathbf{u} , \mathbf{U} and positive scalar fields ϱ and r .

³We remark that (1.7) in combination with (1.6) yields, in particular, $H(0) = 0$.

1.3 Dissipative solutions with Reynolds defect

Definition 1.1 [Dissipative solution with Reynolds defect]

The quantity $[\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{u}]$ is a dissipative solution of the problem (1.1–1.5) in $(0, T) \times \Omega$ if the following is satisfied:

1.

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq \mathbf{r} \in C_{\text{weak}}([0, T]; L^\gamma(\Omega)) \cap L^\gamma(0, T; L^\gamma(\partial\Omega; |\mathbf{u}_B \cdot \mathbf{n}| dS_x)), \quad \text{for some } \gamma > 1,^4 \\ \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_B \in L^2(0, T; W_0^{1,2}(\Omega; R^3)), \mathbf{m} \in C_{\text{weak}}([0, T]; L^{\frac{2\gamma}{\gamma+1}}(\Omega; R^3)), \\ \mathbf{m} = \mathbf{r}\mathbf{u} \text{ a.e. in } (0, T) \times \Omega, \mathbf{r}\mathbf{u}^2 \in L^\infty(0, T; L^1(\Omega)), p(\mathbf{r}) \in L^1((0, T) \times \Omega); \end{aligned} \quad (1.10)$$

2. The continuity equation

$$\begin{aligned} \left[\int_{\Omega} \mathbf{r}\varphi \, dx \right]_{t=0}^{t=\tau} + \int_0^\tau \int_{\Gamma_{\text{out}}} \varphi \mathbf{r}\mathbf{u}_B \cdot \mathbf{n} \, dS_x + \int_0^\tau \int_{\Gamma_{\text{in}}} \varphi \mathbf{r}_B \mathbf{u}_B \cdot \mathbf{n} \, dS_x \\ = \int_0^\tau \int_{\Omega} [\mathbf{r}\partial_t \varphi + \mathbf{r}\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla_x \varphi] \, dx dt, \quad \mathbf{r}(0, \cdot) = \mathbf{r}_0, \end{aligned} \quad (1.11)$$

holds for any $0 \leq \tau \leq T$, and any test function $\varphi \in C^1([0, T] \times \overline{\Omega})$;

3. There is a tensor

$$\mathfrak{R} \in L^\infty(0, T; \mathcal{M}^+(\overline{\Omega}; R_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})),^5$$

where $\mathcal{M}^+(\overline{\Omega}; R_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$ denotes the space of positively semi-definite tensor valued (Radon) measures on $\overline{\Omega}$, such that the integral identity

$$\begin{aligned} \left[\int_{\Omega} \mathbf{m} \cdot \phi \, dx \right]_{t=0}^{t=\tau} = \int_0^\tau \int_{\Omega} [\mathbf{r}\mathbf{u} \cdot \partial_t \phi + \mathbf{r}\mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{u} : \nabla_x \phi + p(\mathbf{r}) \text{div}_x \phi - \mathbb{S}(\nabla_x \mathbf{u}) : \nabla_x \phi] \, dx dt \\ + \int_0^\tau \int_{\Omega} \nabla_x \phi : d\mathfrak{R}(t) \, dt, \quad \mathbf{m}(0, \cdot) = \mathbf{r}_0 \mathbf{u}_0 \end{aligned} \quad (1.12)$$

holds for any $0 \leq \tau \leq T$ and any $\phi \in C^1([0, T] \times \overline{\Omega}; R^3)$, $\phi|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$;

4. The energy inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \left[\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{r} |\mathbf{v}|^2 + H(\mathbf{r}) \right] (\tau) \, dx + D \int_{\overline{\Omega}} d\text{Tr}[\mathfrak{R}(\tau)] + \int_0^\tau \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{S}(\nabla_x \mathbf{u}) : \nabla_x \mathbf{u} \, dx dt \\ + \int_0^\tau \int_{\Gamma_{\text{out}}} H(\mathbf{r}) \mathbf{u}_B \cdot \mathbf{n} \, dS_x dt + \int_0^\tau \int_{\Gamma_{\text{in}}} H(\mathbf{r}_B) \mathbf{u}_B \cdot \mathbf{n} \, dS_x dt \leq \int_{\Omega} \left[\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{r}_0 |\mathbf{v}_0|^2 + H(\mathbf{r}_0) \right] \, dx \\ - \int_0^\tau \int_{\Omega} [\mathbf{r}\mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{u} + p(\mathbf{r}) \mathbb{I}] : \nabla_x \mathbf{u}_B \, dx dt + \int_0^\tau \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{r}\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla_x \mathbf{u}_B \cdot \mathbf{u}_B \, dx dt \\ + \int_0^\tau \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{S}(\nabla_x \mathbf{u}) : \nabla_x \mathbf{u}_B \, dx dt - \int_0^\tau \int_{\overline{\Omega}} \nabla_x \mathbf{u}_B : d\mathfrak{R}(t) dt \end{aligned} \quad (1.13)$$

holds for a.a. $\tau \in (0, T)$ with $D = \min \{1/2, \underline{\alpha}/3\}$, $\mathbf{v}_0 = \mathbf{u}_0 - \mathbf{u}_B$.

⁴We say that $r \in C_{\text{weak}}([0, T]; X)$, X a Banach space, if $r : [0, T] \mapsto X$ is defined on $[0, T]$, $r \in L^\infty(0, T; X)$ and $\langle \mathcal{F}, r \rangle_{X^*, X} \in C[0, T]$ with any \mathcal{F} in the dual space X^* to X .

⁵This means that for any $\xi \in R^3$ and a. a. $t \in (0, T)$, $\xi^T \mathfrak{R}(t) \xi$ is a positive Radon measure on $\overline{\Omega}$ and $\forall \varphi \in C(\overline{\Omega})$, $\int_{\overline{\Omega}} \varphi(x) d\mathfrak{R}(\cdot) \in L^\infty((0, T))$.

Global existence of dissipative solutions with Reynolds defect has been proved in [1, Theorem 3.8], in particular, under assumptions (1.3–1.4), (1.6), (1.8). The compatibility of these solutions with the classical formulation has been proved in [1, Theorem 4.1]. For the purpose of this paper, we report the following weak–strong uniqueness theorem in the class of these solutions, see [1, Theorem 6.3].

Lemma 1.1 [Weak–strong uniqueness for dissipative solutions] *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ be a bounded Lipschitz domain. Suppose that p satisfies the hypotheses (1.6–1.8) and the initial and boundary conditions verify (1.3–1.4). Let $[\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{u}]$ be a dissipative solution of problem (1.1–1.2) in the sense of Definition 1.1, and let $[r, \mathbf{U} = \mathbf{V} + \mathbf{u}_B]$ be a strong solution of the same problem belonging to the class*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{V} &\in C^1([0, T] \times \overline{\Omega}; \mathbb{R}^3), \nabla_x^2 \mathbf{V} \in C([0, T] \times \overline{\Omega}; \mathbb{R}^3), \\ \mathbf{V}|_{\partial\Omega} &= 0, r \in C^1([0, T] \times \overline{\Omega}), \underline{r} := \inf_{(0, T) \times \Omega} r > 0 \end{aligned} \quad (1.14)$$

emanating from the same initial and boundary data. Then

$$\mathbf{r} = r, \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{U} \text{ in } (0, T) \times \Omega, \mathfrak{R} = 0.$$

2 Numerical setting

2.1 Mesh

We suppose that the physical space is a *polyhedral bounded domain* $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ that admits a *tetrahedral mesh* $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}_h$; the individual elements in the mesh will be denoted by $K = K_h \in \mathcal{T}$ (closed sets) and their gravity centers by x_K . Faces in the mesh are denoted as $\sigma = \sigma_h$ (close sets in \mathbb{R}^2) and their gravity centers by x_σ , whereas $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_h$ is the set of all faces.⁶ We also denote by $\mathcal{E}(K)$ the set of all faces of $K \in \mathcal{T}$. The set of faces $\sigma \subset \partial\Omega$ is denoted \mathcal{E}_{ext} , while $\mathcal{E}_{\text{int}} = \mathcal{E} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\text{ext}}$. Finally, we suppose that the mesh fits to the inflow-outflow boundaries, meaning that

$$\mathcal{E}_{\text{ext}} = \mathcal{E}^{\text{in}} \cup \mathcal{E}^{\text{out}}, \overline{\Gamma}^{\text{in}} = \cup_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}^{\text{in}}} \sigma, \overline{\Gamma}^{\text{out}} = \cup_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}^{\text{out}}} \sigma, \quad (2.1)$$

where $\mathcal{E}^{\text{in}}, \mathcal{E}^{\text{out}}$ are defined in (2.7) later.

We denote by h_K the diameter of K and by \mathfrak{h}_K the radius of the largest ball included in K . We call $h = \sup_{K \in \mathcal{T}} h_K$ the size of the mesh and denote $\mathfrak{h} = \inf_{K \in \mathcal{T}} \mathfrak{h}_K$.

For two numerical quantities a, b , we shall write

$$a \lesssim b \text{ if } a \leq cb, c > 0 \text{ a constant, } a \approx b \text{ if } a \lesssim b \text{ and } b \lesssim a.$$

Here, “constant” typically means a generic quantity independent of the size h of the mesh and the time step Δt used in the numerical scheme as well as other parameters as the case may be.

In addition, we require the mesh to be admissible in the sense of Eymard et al. [11, Definition 2.1]:

1. For $K, L \in \mathcal{T}$, $K \neq L$, the intersection $K \cap L$, if non-empty, is either a vertex, or an edge, or a face $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}$. In the latter case, we write $\sigma = K|L$.
2. There holds

$$h \approx \mathfrak{h}$$

We denote by $\mathbf{n}_{\sigma, K}$ the unit normal to the face $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}(K)$ outwards to K . On the other hand we associate to each element $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}$ a fixed normal vector $\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{n}_\sigma$. If $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{ext}}$ then \mathbf{n}_σ is always the outer normal to $\partial\Omega$.

⁶In the sequel we shall omit in the notation the dependence on the “size” h whenever there is no danger of confusion.

2.2 Piecewise constant finite elements

We introduce the space

$$Q(\Omega) = Q_h(\Omega) = \left\{ g \in L^1(\Omega) \mid g|_K = a_K \in \mathbb{R} \right\}$$

of piecewise constant functions along with the associated projection

$$\Pi^Q = \Pi_h^Q : L^1(\Omega) \rightarrow Q(\Omega), \quad \widehat{g}|_K := \Pi^Q[g]|_K = g_K := \frac{1}{|K|} \int_K g dx.$$

For a function $g \in Q(\Omega)$ and any $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}$, we denote

$$g_\sigma^+ := g_{\mathbf{n}_\sigma}^+ = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} g(x_\sigma + \delta \mathbf{n}), \quad g_\sigma^- := g_{\mathbf{n}_\sigma}^- = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} g(x_\sigma - \delta \mathbf{n}). \quad (2.2)$$

Further, we define the jumps and mean values over σ (relative to \mathbf{n}_σ),

$$[[g]]_\sigma = [[g]]_{\sigma, \mathbf{n}} := g_\sigma^+ - g_\sigma^-, \quad \{g\}_\sigma := \frac{1}{2} (g^+ + g^-). \quad (2.3)$$

2.3 Crouzeix-Raviart finite elements

A differential operator D acting on the x -variable will be discretized as

$$D_h v|_K = D(v|_K) \text{ for any } v \text{ differentiable on each element } K \in \mathcal{T}.$$

The *Crouzeix-Raviart finite element spaces* (see Brezzi and Fortin [5], among others) are defined as

$$V(\Omega) = V_h(\Omega) := \left\{ v \in L^1(\Omega) \mid v|_K = \text{affine function}, \quad (2.4) \right.$$

$$\left. \int_\sigma v|_K dS_x = \int_\sigma v|_L dS_x \text{ for any } \sigma = K|L \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}} \right\},$$

together with

$$V_0(\Omega) = V_{h,0} = \left\{ v \in V(\Omega) \mid \int_\sigma v dS_x = 0 \text{ for any } \sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{ext}} \right\}. \quad (2.5)$$

Next, we introduce the associated projection

$$\Pi_V = \Pi_h^V : W^{1,1}(\Omega) \rightarrow V(\Omega), \quad \tilde{v} = \Pi^V[v] := \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}} v_\sigma \phi_\sigma, \quad (2.6)$$

where

$$v_\sigma = \frac{1}{|\sigma|} \int_\sigma v dS_x$$

and $\{\phi_\sigma\}_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}} \subset V(\Omega)$ is a basis in $V(\Omega)$ given by

$$\frac{1}{|\sigma'|} \int_{\sigma'} \phi_\sigma = \delta_{\sigma, \sigma'}, \quad (\sigma, \sigma') \in \mathcal{E}^2.$$

2.4 Convective terms, upwinds

Suppose, that we are given $\mathbf{u}_B \in V(\Omega, R^3)$. We define

$$\mathcal{E}^{\text{in}} = \{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{ext}} \mid \mathbf{u}_{B,\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n} < 0\}, \quad \mathcal{E}^{\text{out}} = \{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{ext}} \mid \mathbf{u}_{B,\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n} \geq 0\} \quad (2.7)$$

We define for any $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}$ for any $g \in Q(\Omega)$ its upwind value on any $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}$,

$$g_\sigma^{\text{up}} = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} g_K \text{ if } \sigma = K|L \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}} \text{ and } \mathbf{u}_\sigma \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma,K} \geq 0, \\ g_L \text{ if } \sigma = K|L \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}} \text{ and } \mathbf{u}_\sigma \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma,K} < 0 \end{array} \right\}. \quad (2.8)$$

Finally, we associate to any face $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}$ the *upwind* operator $\text{Up}_\sigma[g, \mathbf{u}] := \text{Up}_{\sigma,\mathbf{n}}[g, \mathbf{u}]$ defined as

$$\text{Up}_{\sigma,\mathbf{n}}[g, \mathbf{u}] = g^- [\mathbf{u}_\sigma \cdot \mathbf{n}]^+ + g^+ [\mathbf{u}_\sigma \cdot \mathbf{n}]^-, \quad \text{where } [c]^+ = \max\{c, 0\}, \quad [c]^- = \min\{c, 0\}, \quad (2.9)$$

and to any face $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}(K)$ the specific flux $F_{\sigma,K}$ (outwards the element K) defined as

$$F_{\sigma,K}[g, \mathbf{u}] = g_\sigma^{\text{up}} \mathbf{u}_\sigma \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma,K}. \quad (2.10)$$

2.5 Time discretization

For simplicity, we shall consider the constant time step $\Delta t > 0$ where $T = N\Delta t$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and we set

$$I_k = (\tau_{k-1}, \tau_k], \quad \tau_k = k\Delta t, \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}. \quad (2.11)$$

Suppose that we have functions $v^k : \Omega \rightarrow R$, $k = 0, \dots, N$. For convenience, we set $v^k(x) = v^0(x)$ if $k \leq 0$ and $v^k(x) = v^N(x)$ if $k > N$, and we introduce numbers

$$D_t v^k(x) = \frac{v^k(x) - v^{k-1}(x)}{\Delta t}, \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Finally, we define

$$v(t, x) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} 1_{I_k}(t) v^k(x), \quad D_t v(t, x) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} 1_{I_k}(t) D_t v^k(x), \quad (2.12)$$

$$\underline{v}(t, x) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} 1_{I_k}(t) \left(v^{k-1}(x) + (t - (k-1)\Delta t) D_t v^k(x) \right), \quad \text{so that } \partial_t \underline{v}(t, x) = D_t v(x). \quad (2.13)$$

In the sequel, we denote by $L_{\Delta t}(0, T; Q_h(\Omega)) := L(0, T; Q(\Omega))$ resp. $L_{\Delta t}(0, T; V_h(\Omega)) := L(0, T; V(\Omega))$ the spaces of piecewise constant functions from $[0, T]$ to $Q(\Omega)$ and $V(\Omega)$, respectively (constant on each I_k and extended by the value in I_0 to the negative real axes and by the value in I_N to $[T, \infty)$).

3 Numerical scheme, main results

Having collected the necessary preliminary material, we are ready to introduce the numerical scheme to solve the compressible Navier-Stokes system with the nonhomogenous boundary conditions.

3.1 Numerical scheme

We are given the approximations of the initial and boundary conditions

$$\varrho^0 = \varrho_h^0 = \Pi_h^Q[\mathbf{r}_0], \mathbf{u}^0 = \mathbf{u}_h^0 = \Pi^V[\mathbf{u}_0], \varrho_B = \varrho_{B,h} = \Pi^Q[\mathbf{r}_B], \mathbf{u}_B = \mathbf{u}_{B,h} = \Pi^V[\mathbf{u}_B] \quad (3.1)$$

We are searching for

$$\varrho_{h,\Delta t}(t, x) = \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} 1_{I_k}(t) 1_K(x) \varrho_{K,h,\Delta t}^k, \mathbf{u}_{h,\Delta t}(t, x) = \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} 1_{I_k}(t) 1_K(x) \mathbf{u}_{K,h,\Delta t}^k$$

where

$$\varrho^k \in Q(\Omega), \varrho_{h,\Delta t}^k > 0, \mathbf{u}_{h,\Delta t}^k \in V(\Omega; R^3), \mathbf{v}^k = \mathbf{u}^k - \mathbf{u}_B \in V_0(\Omega; R^3), k = 1, \dots, N \quad (3.2)$$

such that the following algebraic equations (for the unknowns $\varrho_K^k, \mathbf{u}_\sigma^k, k = 1, \dots, N, K \in \mathcal{T}, \sigma \in \mathcal{E}$) are satisfied:⁷

1. APPROXIMATION OF THE CONTINUITY EQUATION

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} D_t \varrho^k \phi \, dx + \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}(K) \cap \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} \int_{\sigma} F_{\sigma,K}(\varrho^k, \mathbf{u}^k) \phi \, dS_x + \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{out}}} \int_{\sigma} \varrho^k \mathbf{u}_{B,\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma} \phi \, dS_x \\ + \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{in}}} \int_{\sigma} \varrho_B \mathbf{u}_{B,\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma} \phi \, dS_x + \kappa h^{\omega} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} \int_{\sigma} [[\varrho^k]]_{\sigma} [[\phi]]_{\sigma} \, dS_x = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

for all $\phi \in Q(\Omega)$, where $\kappa = 1$ or $\kappa = 0$ and $\omega > 0$.

2. APPROXIMATION OF THE MOMENTUM EQUATION

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} D_t(\varrho^k \widehat{\mathbf{v}}^k) \cdot \widehat{\phi} \, dx + \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}(K) \cap \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} \int_{\sigma} F_{\sigma,K}(\varrho^k \widehat{\mathbf{v}}^k, \mathbf{u}^k) \cdot \widehat{\phi} \, dS_x \\ + \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}(K)} \int_{\sigma} \varrho^k \widehat{\mathbf{u}}^k \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma,K} \mathbf{u}_B \cdot \widehat{\phi} \, dS_x + \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{out}}} \int_{\sigma} \varrho^k \mathbf{u}_{B,\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma} \widehat{\mathbf{v}}^k \cdot \widehat{\phi} \, dS_x + \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{in}}} \int_{\sigma} \varrho_B \mathbf{u}_{B,\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma} \widehat{\mathbf{v}}^k \cdot \widehat{\phi} \, dS_x \\ + \int_{\Omega} (\mathbb{S}(\nabla_h \mathbf{u}^k) : \nabla_h \phi - p_h(\varrho^k) \text{div}_h \phi) \, dx + \kappa h^{\omega} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} \int_{\sigma} [[\varrho^k]]_{\sigma} \{\widehat{\mathbf{v}}^k\}_{\sigma} [[\widehat{\phi}]]_{\sigma} \, dS_x = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

for any $\phi \in V_0(\Omega; R^3)$,⁸ where

$$p_h(\varrho) = p(\varrho) + \tilde{\kappa} h^{\eta} \varrho^2, \tilde{\kappa} \in \{0, 1\}, \eta > 0. \quad (3.5)$$

Remark 3.1 1. It is to be noticed that the background linear momentum $\varrho \mathbf{u}_B$ in the momentum equation is not "upwinded". If it were "upwinded" we would lose the derivation of uniform estimates from the energy balance. This observation seems to have an universal character valid for the discretizations of the inflow/outflow problems via the finite volume methods, in general.

⁷In what follows, we omit the indexes "h" and/or "Δt" and write simply ϱ^k instead of $\varrho_{h,\Delta t}^k$, ϱ instead of $\varrho_{h,\Delta t}$, etc., in order to avoid the cumbersome notation, whenever there is no danger of confusion.

⁸In agreement with (1.1), here and in the sequel, $\int_{\Omega} \mathbb{S}(\nabla_h \mathbf{u}^k) : \nabla_h \phi \, dx$ means exactly $\int_{\Omega} (\mu \nabla_h \mathbf{u}^k : \nabla_h \phi + (\mu + \lambda) \text{div}_h \mathbf{u}^k \text{div}_h \phi) \, dx$. This form is important for the estimates, since the Korn inequality does not hold in the Crouzeix-Raviart finite element space.

2. The term $\kappa h^\omega \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} \int_{\sigma} [[\varrho^k]]_{\sigma} [[\phi]]_{\sigma} dS_x$ and the last term at the last line of the momentum equation create an artificial diffusion in the density field. The perturbation $\tilde{\kappa} h^\eta \varrho^2$ represents a "regularization" of pressure. Under certain assumptions on η , the pressure regularization itself guarantees already the convergence of the scheme to the dissipative solutions with Reynolds defect (with or without the artificial density diffusion) for the whole range $1 < \gamma < \infty$. We have chosen this particular setting to state the convergence theorem (Theorem 3.2). However, under certain hypotheses on p and for some ranges of γ 's, the artificial pressure perturbation and even the artificial diffusion are not needed. We shall discuss these situations in the Remark 6.2 after the main theorem.

3.2 Main results

The first result postulates the existence of numerical solutions.

Theorem 3.1 [Existence of numerical solutions.] *Under assumptions (1.6–1.8), (1.3–1.4), the algebraic system (3.1–3.4) admits at least one solution $[\varrho_h, \Delta t, \mathbf{u}_h, \Delta t] \in L_{\Delta t}(0, T; Q_h(\Omega)) \times L_{\Delta t}(0, T; V_h(\Omega))$. Any of its solution has a strictly positive density.*

Theorem 3.1 will be proved in Section 5. Let us notice that uniqueness of numerical solutions to this scheme is not known.

The main result deals with the case $h \approx \Delta t$. It guarantees a (weak) convergence of a subsequence of numerical solutions to a dissipative solution with Reynolds defect. Moreover, if the original problem admits a strong solution, than the weak convergence of a subsequence becomes a strong convergence of the whole sequence to the strong solution. Even more, in the latter case the convergence rate of the strong convergence can be evaluated in terms of a power of the discretization parameter h : in the other words we have an error estimate.

Theorem 3.2 [Main theorem: Convergence and error estimates.] *Let $h = \Delta t$ and*

$$\tilde{\kappa} = 1, \text{ and } \eta \in (0, 2/3) \text{ if } \kappa = 0 \quad \text{or} \quad \eta \in (0, \min\{2\omega, 2/3\}) \text{ if } \kappa = 1. \quad (3.6)$$

Suppose that the pressure satisfies assumptions (1.6–1.8) and that the initial and boundary conditions verify (1.3–1.4). Consider a sequence of numerical solutions $[\varrho_h, \mathbf{u}_h] \in L_h(0, T; Q_h(\Omega)) \times L_h(0, T; V_h(\Omega))$ of the problem (3.1–3.4).⁹ Then we have:

1. *There exists a subsequence $[\varrho_h, \mathbf{u}_h]$ (not relabeled) such that*

$$\varrho_h \rightharpoonup \mathbf{r} \text{ in } L^\infty(0, T; L^\gamma(\Omega)), \quad \gamma = 1 + 1/\bar{\alpha}, \quad (3.7)$$

$$\mathbf{v}_h \rightharpoonup \mathbf{v} \text{ in } L^2(0, T; L^6(\Omega)), \quad (3.8)$$

$$\varrho_h \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_h \rightharpoonup_* \mathbf{r} \mathbf{u} \text{ in } L^\infty(0, T; L^{\frac{2\gamma}{\gamma+1}}(\Omega)) \quad (3.9)$$

(where $\mathbf{r} \mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{u}, p(\mathbf{r}) \in L^\infty(0, T; L^1(\Omega))$, $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u}_B$) and

$$\varrho_h \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_h \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_h + p(\varrho_h) \mathbb{I} \rightharpoonup_* \overline{(\mathbf{r} \mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{u} + p(\mathbf{r}) \mathbb{I})} \text{ in } L^\infty(0, T; \mathcal{M}(\overline{\Omega}; R_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})) \quad (3.10)$$

where

$$[\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{u}] \text{ and } \mathfrak{R} = \overline{(\mathbf{r} \mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{u} + p(\mathbf{r}) \mathbb{I})} - (\mathbf{r} \mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{u} + p(\mathbf{r}) \mathbb{I})$$

is a dissipative solution of the problem (1.1–1.5) in the sense of Definition 1.1.

⁹To simplify notation, we denote $\varrho_{h,h}$ by ϱ_h or even ϱ , $\mathbf{u}_{h,h}$ by \mathbf{u}_h or even \mathbf{u} etc., if there is no danger of confusion.

2. If the problem (1.1–1.5) admits a strong solution $[r, \mathbf{U}]$ in the class (1.14) then there holds:

(a) The (weak) limit $[\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{u}]$ in (3.7–3.8) is equal to $[r, \mathbf{U} = \mathbf{V} + \mathbf{u}_B]$ and the defect $\mathfrak{R} = 0$. In this case the whole sequence $[\varrho_h, \mathbf{u}_h]$ converges to $[r, \mathbf{U}]$ in the sense (3.7–3.9), and, moreover,

$$p_h(\varrho_h) \rightharpoonup p(r) \text{ in } L^1((0, T) \times \Omega), \quad (3.11)$$

$$\varrho_h \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_h^2 \rightharpoonup r \mathbf{U}^2 \text{ in } L^1((0, T) \times \Omega). \quad (3.12)$$

(b) There exists $\alpha = \alpha(\eta) > 0$ (in the case $\kappa = 0$) and $\alpha = \alpha(\eta, \omega) > 0$ (in the case $\kappa = 1$), and a positive number c dependent on

$$\underline{r} := \inf_{(0, T) \times \Omega} r, \quad \bar{r} := \sup_{(0, T) \times \Omega} r, \quad \|\nabla_x r, \partial_t r, \mathbf{V}, \nabla_x \mathbf{V}, \nabla_x^2 \mathbf{V}, \partial_t \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{u}_B, \nabla_x \mathbf{u}_B, \nabla_x^2 \mathbf{u}_B\|_{C([0, T] \times \bar{\Omega})} \quad (3.13)$$

such that

$$\left[\mathcal{E}(\varrho_h, \widehat{\mathbf{v}}_h | r, \mathbf{V}) \right]_0^\tau + \int_0^\tau \left(\|\mathbf{u}_h - \tilde{\mathbf{U}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\nabla_h(\mathbf{u}_h - \tilde{\mathbf{U}})\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \right) dt \lesssim c h^\alpha. \quad (3.14)$$

Remark 3.2 1. Theorem 3.2 holds, in particular, for the isentropic pressure $p(\varrho) = a\varrho^\gamma$, $a > 0$, $1 < \gamma < \infty$.

2. Formulas (3.11) and (3.12) imply strong convergence in many particular pertinent situations: For example, for the "iconic" isentropic pressure $p(\varrho) = a\varrho^\gamma$, $a > 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varrho_h &\rightarrow r \text{ in } L^\gamma((0, T) \times \Omega), \\ \sqrt{\varrho_h} \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_h &\rightarrow \sqrt{r} \mathbf{U} \text{ in } L^2((0, T) \times \Omega) \end{aligned}$$

for the whole sequence of numerical approximations. Moreover, formula (3.14) implies, in addition,

$$\mathbf{u}_h \rightarrow \mathbf{U}, \quad \nabla_h \mathbf{u}_h \rightarrow \nabla_x \mathbf{U} \text{ in } L^2((0, T) \times \Omega)$$

for the whole sequence.

3. Suppose now that $\tilde{\kappa} = 0$. In this situation, we shall suppose for the pressure p in addition to (1.6–1.8) also

$$\forall \varrho > 0, \quad \underline{\pi} \varrho^{\mathbf{a}-1} + \underline{p} \varrho^{\gamma-1} \leq p'(\varrho), \quad 1 < \mathbf{a} \leq \min\{\gamma, 2\}, \quad \gamma > 1, \quad \text{where } 0 \leq \underline{\pi}, \quad 0 < \underline{p}. \quad (3.15)$$

In this setting, Theorem 3.2 continues still to hold in the following situations:

(a) If in (3.15), $\underline{\pi} > 0$, and

$$\kappa \in \{0, 1\}, \quad \omega > 0, \quad 2 \leq \gamma < \infty. \quad (3.16)$$

In this case, if $\kappa = 0$, the number $\alpha > 0$ in (3.14) depends solely on γ .

(b) If $3/2 < \gamma < 2$, and in addition to (1.6–1.8), (3.15)

$$\varrho \mapsto \frac{p'(\varrho)}{\varrho} \text{ is nonincreasing on } (0, \infty), \quad (3.17)$$

provided

$$\kappa \in \{0, 1\}, \quad \omega > 0. \quad (3.18)$$

In this case, in (3.14), $\alpha = \alpha(\gamma)$ if $\kappa = 0$ and $\alpha = \alpha(\gamma, \omega)$ if $\kappa = 1$.

We notice that this case includes the isentropic pressure $p(\varrho) = a\varrho^\gamma$, $a > 0$.

(c) If $6/5 < \gamma \leq 3/2$ and if, in addition to (1.6–1.8), the condition (3.17) holds, provided

$$\kappa = 1, \omega \in (0, 2(\gamma - 1)). \quad (3.19)$$

In this case, in (3.14), $\alpha = \alpha(\gamma, \omega)$.

We notice that this case includes the isentropic pressure $p(\varrho) = a\varrho^\gamma$, $a > 0$.

4. The error estimates derived in Theorem 3.2 require $\Delta t \approx h$, and they may not be optimal. They certainly are not optimal in the range $\gamma > 3/2$ when, at least in the case of no-slip boundary conditions, "better" estimates (which do not require the condition $\Delta t \approx h$) can be derived by using another approach, see Gallouet et al. [38]. For the general non zero inflow/outflow setting, this is still an interesting open problem. We refer the reader to the paper [54] for the discussion on the "optimality" of the error estimates.
5. Local in time existence of strong solutions to problem (1.1–1.5) notably with non zero inflow outflow boundary conditions is discussed in Valli, Zajackowski [61].

Theorem 3.2 will be proved through Sections 6–10. Some hints how to modify the proof of its variants mentioned in the third item of Remark 3.2 are available in Remarks 6.2, 7.1, 7.2.

4 Preliminaries

4.1 Preliminaries from numerical analysis

In this part, we recall several classical inequalities related to the discrete functional spaces which will be used throughout the paper.

4.1.1 Some useful elementary inequalities

We recall Jensen's inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{v}\|_{L^q(K)} &\lesssim \|v\|_{L^q(K)} \text{ for all } v \in L^q(K), 1 \leq q \leq \infty, \\ \|v_\sigma\|_{L^q(\sigma)} &\lesssim \|v\|_{L^q(\sigma)} \text{ for all } v \in L^q(\sigma), 1 \leq q \leq \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

together with the error estimate

$$\forall v \in W^{1,q}(\Omega), \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \|v - \widehat{v}\|_{L^q(K)} \lesssim h \|\nabla_x v\|_{L^q(K; \mathbb{R}^3)} \quad \forall v \in W^{1,q}(K) \\ \|v - \widehat{v}\|_{L^q(\Omega)} \lesssim h \|\nabla_x v\|_{L^q(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)} \quad \forall v \in W^{1,q}(\Omega) \end{array} \right\}, 1 \leq q \leq \infty. \quad (4.2)$$

We also recall the Poincaré type inequalities on the mesh elements,

$$\begin{aligned} \|v - v_\sigma\|_{L^q(K)} &\lesssim h \|\nabla_x v\|_{L^q(K; \mathbb{R}^3)}, \quad \forall \sigma \in \mathcal{E}(K), v \in W^{1,q}(K), 1 \leq q \leq \infty, \\ \|v - v_K\|_{L^q(K)} &\lesssim h \|\nabla_x v\|_{L^q(K; \mathbb{R}^3)}, \quad \forall K \in \mathcal{T}, v \in W^{1,q}(K), 1 \leq q \leq \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

4.1.2 Properties of piecewise constant and Crouzeix-Raviart finite elements

We report the estimates of jumps on mesh elements,

$$\begin{aligned} \|[[\widehat{v}]]_{\sigma=K|L}\|_{L^q(\sigma)} &\lesssim h \|\nabla_h v\|_{L^q(K \cup L; R^3)}, \quad \forall v \in V(\Omega), \quad 1 \leq q \leq \infty, \\ \|v|_K - v|_L\|_{L^q(K \cup L)} &\lesssim h \|\nabla_h v\|_{L^q(K \cup L; R^3)}, \quad \forall \sigma = K|L, \quad v \in V(\Omega), \quad 1 \leq q \leq \infty, \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

see Gallouet et al. [36, Lemma 2.2].

Further we recall a global version of the Poincaré inequality on $V(\Omega)$

$$\|v - \widehat{v}\|_{L^q(\Omega)} \lesssim h \|\nabla_h v\|_{L^q(\Omega)} \quad \text{for all } v \in V(\Omega), \quad 1 \leq q < \infty, \quad (4.5)$$

along with the global error estimate

$$\|v - \tilde{v}\|_{L^q(\Omega)} + h \|\nabla_h (v - \tilde{v})\|_{L^q(\Omega; R^3)} \lesssim h^m \|v\|_{W^{m,q}(\Omega)} \quad (4.6)$$

for any $v \in W^{m,q}(\Omega)$, $m = 1, 2$, $1 \leq q \leq \infty$, see Karper [50, Lemma 2.7] or Crouzeix and Raviart [8].

Next, we shall deal with the Sobolev properties of piecewise constant and Crouzeix-Raviart finite elements. To this end we introduce a discrete (so called broken) Sobolev $H^{1,p}$ -(semi)norm on $Q(\Omega)$,

$$\|g\|_{Q^{1,p}(\Omega)}^p = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} \int_{\sigma} \frac{[[g]]_{\sigma}^p}{h^{p-1}} \, dS_x, \quad 1 \leq p < \infty. \quad (4.7)$$

and a discrete (so called broken) Sobolev $H^{1,p}$ -(semi)norm on $V(\Omega)$,

$$\|v\|_{V^{1,p}(\Omega)}^p = \int_{\Omega} |\nabla_h v|^p \, dx. \quad (4.8)$$

Related to the $Q^{1,p}$ -norm, we report the following discrete Sobolev and Poincaré type inequalities: We have

$$\forall g \in Q(\Omega), \quad \|g\|_{L^{p^*}(\Omega)} \lesssim \|g\|_{Q^{1,p}(\Omega)} + \|g\|_{L^p(\Omega)}, \quad (4.9)$$

where $1 \leq p^* \leq \frac{3p}{3-p}$ if $1 \leq p < 3$, and $1 \leq p^* < \infty$, if $p \geq 3$, see Bessemoulin-Chatard et al. [4, Theorem 3]. Likewise, we have the Discrete Sobolev inequality,

$$\forall v \in V(\Omega), \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \|v\|_{L^{p^*}(K)} \lesssim \|\nabla_x v\|_{L^p(K)} + \|v\|_{L^p(K)}, \\ \|v\|_{L^{p^*}(\Omega)} \lesssim \|v\|_{V^{1,p}(\Omega)} + \|v\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \end{array} \right\}, \quad 1 \leq p \leq \infty, \quad (4.10)$$

$$\forall v \in V_0(\Omega), \quad \|v\|_{L^{p^*}(\Omega)} \lesssim \|v\|_{V^{1,p}(\Omega)}, \quad (4.11)$$

see e.g. [38, Lemma 9.3].

Finally, we report the well-known identities for the Crouzeix-Raviart finite elements,

$$\int_{\Omega} \operatorname{div}_h \tilde{\mathbf{u}} \, w \, dx = \int_{\Omega} \operatorname{div}_x \mathbf{u} \, w \, dx \quad \text{for any } w \in Q(\Omega) \text{ and } \mathbf{u} \in V(\Omega; R^3), \quad (4.12)$$

$$\int_{\Omega} \nabla_h v \otimes \nabla_h \tilde{\varphi} \, dx = \int_{\Omega} \nabla_h v \otimes \nabla_x \varphi \, dx \quad \text{for all } v \in V_h(\Omega), \quad \varphi \in W^{1,1}(\Omega), \quad (4.13)$$

see [50, Lemma 2.11].

4.1.3 Trace and “negative” $L^p - L^q$ estimates for finite elements

We start by the classical trace estimate,

$$\|v\|_{L^q(\partial K)} \lesssim \frac{1}{h^{1/q}} (\|v\|_{L^q(K)} + h\|\nabla_x v\|_{L^q(K;R^3)}), \quad 1 \leq q \leq \infty \text{ for any } v \in C^1(\overline{K}), \quad (4.14)$$

The following can be easily obtained from the previous one by means of the scaling arguments:

$$\|w\|_{L^q(\partial K)} \lesssim \frac{1}{h^{1/q}} \|w\|_{L^q(K)} \text{ for any } 1 \leq q \leq \infty, \quad w \in P_m, \quad (4.15)$$

where P_m denotes the space of polynomials of order m .

In a similar way, from the local estimate

$$\|w\|_{L^p(K)} \lesssim h^{3\left(\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q}\right)} \|w\|_{L^q(K)} \quad 1 \leq q < p \leq \infty, \quad w \in P_m, \quad (4.16)$$

we deduce the global version

$$\|w\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq ch^{3\left(\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q}\right)} \|w\|_{L^q(\Omega)} \quad 1 \leq q < p \leq \infty, \text{ for any } w|_K \in P_m(K), \quad K \in \mathcal{T}. \quad (4.17)$$

In particular, for a piecewise constant function in $(0, T = N\Delta t]$, $a(t) = \sum_{k=1}^N a_k 1_{I_k}(t)$, where $I_k = ((k-1)\Delta t, k\Delta t]$ we have

$$\|w\|_{L^p(I_k)} \lesssim (\Delta t)^{\left(\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q}\right)} \|w\|_{L^q(I_k)} \quad 1 \leq q < p \leq \infty, \quad (4.18)$$

and

$$\|w\|_{L^p(0,T)} \lesssim (\Delta t)^{\left(\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q}\right)} \|w\|_{L^q(0,T)} \quad 1 \leq q < p \leq \infty. \quad (4.19)$$

4.1.4 Some formulas related to upwinding

The following formulas can be easily verified by a direct calculation, see e.g. [17, Section 2.4]

1. Local conservation of fluxes:

$$\begin{aligned} \forall \sigma = K|L \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}, \quad F_{\sigma,K}[g, \mathbf{u}] &= -F_{\sigma,L}[g, \mathbf{u}], \\ \forall \sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}, \quad \text{Up}_{\sigma,\mathbf{n}}[g, \mathbf{u}] &= -\text{Up}_{\sigma,-\mathbf{n}}[g, \mathbf{u}] \text{ and } [[g]]_{\mathbf{n}_\sigma} = -[[g]]_{-\mathbf{n}_\sigma}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.20)$$

2. For all $r, g \in Q(\Omega)$, $\mathbf{u} \in V(\Omega, R^3)$,

$$\sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} r_K \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} |\sigma| F_{\sigma,K}[g, \mathbf{u}] = - \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} \text{Up}_{\sigma}[g, \mathbf{u}][r]_{\sigma}. \quad (4.21)$$

3. For all $r, g \in Q(\Omega)$, $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}_B \in V(\Omega; R^3)$, $\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_B \in V_0(\Omega; R^3)$, $\phi \in C^1(\overline{\Omega})$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} g \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla_x \phi \, dx &= - \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}(K) \cap \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} F_{\sigma,K}[g, \mathbf{u}] r \\ &+ \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}(K) \cap \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} \int_{\sigma} (r - \phi) [[g]]_{\sigma, \mathbf{n}_{\sigma,K}} [\mathbf{u}_{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma,K}]^{-} dS_x \\ &+ \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}(K)} \int_{\sigma} g (\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_{\sigma}) \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma,K} (\phi - r) dS_x + \int_{\Omega} (r - \phi) g \text{div}_h \mathbf{u} \, dx \\ &+ \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}^{\text{out}}} \int_{\sigma} g \mathbf{u}_{B,\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma} (\phi - r) dS_x + \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}^{\text{in}}} \int_{\sigma} g \mathbf{u}_{B,\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma} (\phi - r) dS_x. \end{aligned} \quad (4.22)$$

4.2 Preliminaries from mathematical analysis

Here we recall some elements of mathematical analysis needed in the proofs. First is the Shaeffer's fixed point theorem, see e.g. Evans [10, Theorem 9.2.4].

Lemma 4.1 [Shaeffer's fixed point theorem] *Let $\Theta : Z \mapsto Z$ be a continuous mapping defined on a finite dimensional normed vector space Z . Suppose that the set*

$$\{z \in Z \mid z = \Lambda\Theta(z), \Lambda \in [0, 1]\}$$

is non empty and bounded. Then there exists $z \in Z$ such that

$$z = \Theta(z).$$

The next result is a version of Div-Curl lemma, see Lemma 8.1 in [1].

Lemma 4.2 *Let $O = (0, T) \times \Omega$, where $\Omega \subset R^d$, $d \geq 2$ is a bounded domain. Suppose that*

$$r_n \rightharpoonup r \text{ weakly in } L^p(O), \quad v_n \rightharpoonup v \text{ in } L^q(O), \quad p > 1, q > 1,$$

and

$$r_n v_n \rightharpoonup w \text{ in } L^r(O), \quad r > 1.$$

In addition, let

$$\partial_t r_n = \operatorname{div}_x \mathbf{g}_n + h_n \text{ in } \mathcal{D}'(O),$$

$$\|\mathbf{g}_n\|_{L^s(O; R^d)} \lesssim 1, \quad s > 1, \quad h_n \text{ precompact in } W^{-1, z}(O), \quad z > 1,$$

and

$$\|\nabla_x v_n\|_{\mathcal{M}(\bar{O}; R^d)} \lesssim 1 \text{ uniformly for } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Then

$$w = rv \text{ a.a. in } O.$$

Finally, the last two lemmas are well known results from convex analysis, see e.g. Lemma 2.11 and Corollary 2.2 in Feireisl [13].

Lemma 4.3 *Let $O \subset R^d$, $d \geq 2$, be a measurable set and $\{\mathbf{v}_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ a sequence of functions in $L^1(O; R^M)$ such that*

$$\mathbf{v}_n \rightharpoonup \mathbf{v} \text{ in } L^1(O; R^M).$$

Let $\Phi : R^M \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$ be a lower semi-continuous convex function.

Then $\Phi(\mathbf{v}) : O \mapsto R$ is integrable and

$$\int_O \Phi(\mathbf{v}) dx \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_O \Phi(\mathbf{v}_n) dx.$$

Lemma 4.4 *Let $O \subset R^d$, $d \geq 2$ be a measurable set and $\{\mathbf{v}_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ a sequence of functions in $L^1(O; R^M)$ such that*

$$\mathbf{v}_n \rightharpoonup \mathbf{v} \text{ in } L^1(O; R^M).$$

Let $\Phi : \mathbb{R}^M \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$ be a lower semi-continuous convex function such that $\Phi(\mathbf{v}_n) \in L^1(O)$ for any n , and

$$\Phi(\mathbf{v}_n) \rightharpoonup \overline{\Phi(\mathbf{v})} \text{ in } L^1(O).$$

Then

$$\Phi(\mathbf{v}) \leq \overline{\Phi(\mathbf{v})} \text{ a.e. in } O. \quad (4.23)$$

If, moreover, Φ is strictly convex on an open convex set $U \subset \mathbb{R}^M$, and

$$\Phi(\mathbf{v}) = \overline{\Phi(\mathbf{v})} \text{ a.e. on } O,$$

then

$$\mathbf{v}_n(\mathbf{y}) \rightarrow \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{y}) \text{ for a.a. } \mathbf{y} \in \{\mathbf{y} \in O \mid \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{y}) \in U\} \quad (4.24)$$

extracting a subsequence as the case may be.

5 Existence of solutions for the discrete problem

5.1 Renormalization of the continuity equation

Using in the discrete continuity equation test function $\phi \approx \phi B'(\varrho^k)$, $\phi \in Q(\Omega)$ we obtain after an elementary but laborious calculation the discrete renormalized continuity equation. This result is formulated in the following lemma.

Lemma 5.1 [Renormalized discrete continuity equation] *Let $B \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} D_t B(\varrho^k) \phi \, dx + \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}(K) \cap \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} \int_{\sigma} F_{\sigma, K}(B(\varrho^k), \mathbf{u}^k) \phi \, dS_x \\ & + \kappa h^\omega \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} \int_{\sigma} [[\varrho^k]]_{\sigma} [[\phi B'(\varrho^k)]]_{\sigma} \, dS_x - \int_{\Omega} \phi \left(B(\varrho^k) - \varrho^k B'(\varrho^k) \right) \text{div}_h \mathbf{u}^k \, dx \\ & + \frac{1}{\Delta t} \int_{\Omega} E_B(\varrho^{k-1} | \varrho^k) \phi \, dx + \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} \int_{\sigma} E_B(\varrho_{\sigma}^{k,+} | \varrho_{\sigma}^{k,-}) |\mathbf{u}_{\sigma}^k \cdot \mathbf{n}| \phi^+ \, dS_x \\ & + \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{out}}} \int_{\sigma} B(\varrho^k) \mathbf{u}_{B, \sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma} \cdot \phi \, dS_x + \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{in}}} \int_{\sigma} E_B(\varrho_B | \varrho^k) |\mathbf{u}_{B, \sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma}| \phi \, dS_x = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{in}}} \int_{\sigma} B(\varrho_B) |\mathbf{u}_{B, \sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma}| \phi \, dS_x \end{aligned} \quad (5.1)$$

for all $\phi \in Q(\Omega)$.

5.2 Positivity of density

It is enough to show that $\varrho^k > 0$ provided $\varrho^{k-1} > 0$. (Recall that $\varrho_B > 0$.)

We take in (5.1) $\phi = 1$ and B the non negative convex function $B(\varrho) = \max\{-\varrho, 0\}$ (resp. any of its non negative $C^1(\mathbb{R})$ convex approximations B_{ε} such that $B_{\varepsilon}(s) \rightarrow B(s)$, $B'_{\varepsilon} \rightarrow B'(s)$ for all $s \neq 0$). We get,

$$\int_{\Omega} B_{\varepsilon}(\varrho^k) \, dx \leq \int_{\Omega} B_{\varepsilon}(\varrho^{k-1}) \, dx + \Delta t \left(\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{in}}} \int_{\sigma} B_{\varepsilon}(\varrho_B) |\mathbf{u}_{B, \sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma}| \, dS_x + \int_{\Omega} (B_{\varepsilon}(\varrho^k) - \varrho^k B'_{\varepsilon}(\varrho^k)) \text{div}_h \mathbf{u}^k \, dx \right).$$

Seeing that $B(s) - sB'(s) = 0$ for all $s \neq 0$, $B(\varrho^{k-1}) = 0$, $B(\varrho_B) = 0$, we deduce from the above that $B(\varrho^k) = 0$, i.e. $\varrho_k \geq 0$.

Suppose that $\Omega_0 := \{x \in \Omega | \varrho^k(x) = 0\} = \cup_{K \in \tilde{\mathcal{T}}} K$, where $\emptyset \neq \tilde{\mathcal{T}} \subset \mathcal{T}$. Taking in the continuity equation (3.3) test function $\phi = 1_{\Omega_0}$, we get

$$-\int_{\Omega_0} \varrho^{k-1} dx = - \sum_{K \in \tilde{\mathcal{T}}} \sum_{\sigma \in \partial\Omega_0 \cap \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}} \cap \mathcal{E}(K)} \int_{\sigma} \varrho_{\mathbf{n}_{\sigma,K}}^{k,+} [\mathbf{u}_{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma,K}]^- dS_x + \sum_{\sigma \in \partial\Omega_0 \cap \mathcal{E}^{\text{in}}} \int_{\sigma} \varrho_B |\mathbf{u}_{B,\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma}| dS_x,$$

where the left hand side is strictly negative while the right hand side is positive. Consequently $\Omega_0 = \emptyset$.

5.3 Existence of solutions to the numerical scheme

Our goal is to show the following: Given $0 < \varrho^{k-1} \in Q(\Omega)$, $\mathbf{v}^{k-1} \in V_0(\Omega; R^3)$ (and the boundary data ϱ_B, \mathbf{u}_B), the algebraic system (3.3-3.4) admits a solution $0 < \varrho^k \in Q(\Omega)$ and $\mathbf{v}^k \in V_0(\Omega; R^3)$.

We first prove the solvability of the linear equation (3.3) with $\mathbf{u}^k = \mathbf{v}^k + \mathbf{u}_B$, $\mathbf{v}^k \in V_0(\Omega; R^3)$ given: It reads

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \varrho^k \phi_K dx + \Delta t \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}(K) \cap \mathcal{E}^{\text{int}}} \int_{\sigma} F_{\sigma,K}(\varrho^k, \mathbf{u}^k) \phi_K dS_x \\ & + \Delta t \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}^{\text{out}}} \int_{\sigma} \varrho^k \mathbf{u}_{B,\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma} \phi_K dS_x + \Delta t \kappa h^{\omega} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}^{\text{int}}} \int_{\sigma} [[\varrho^k]]_{\sigma} [[\phi_K]]_{\sigma} dS_x = F_K, \end{aligned}$$

where $\{\phi_K\}_{K \in \mathcal{T}}$ is a basis in $Q(\Omega)$ and

$$F_K = \int_{\Omega} \varrho^{k-1} \phi_K dx - \Delta t \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}^{\text{in}}} \int_{\sigma} \varrho_B \mathbf{u}_{B,\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma} \phi_K dS_x.$$

It admits a unique solutions $\varrho^k \in Q(\Omega)$ – we denote it by $\eta(\mathbf{v}^k)$ – since the corresponding homogenous system

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \varrho^k \phi_K dx + \Delta t \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}(K) \cap \mathcal{E}^{\text{int}}} \int_{\sigma} F_{\sigma,K}(\varrho^k, \mathbf{u}^k) \phi_K dS_x \\ & + \Delta t \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}^{\text{out}}} \int_{\sigma} \varrho^k \mathbf{u}_{B,\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma} \phi_K dS_x + \Delta t \kappa h^{\omega} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}^{\text{int}}} \int_{\sigma} [[\varrho^k]]_{\sigma} [[\phi_K]]_{\sigma} dS_x = 0 \end{aligned}$$

admits a unique solution $\varrho^k = 0$ as we easily show by applying to it the reasoning of Section 5.2 with the convex function $B(s) = |s|$. We already proved in Section 5.2 that $\eta(\mathbf{v}^k) > 0$ and it is easy to see that $\int_{\Omega} \eta(\mathbf{v}^k) dx$ is bounded and that the map η is continuous from $V_0(\Omega; R^3)$ to $Q(\Omega)$.

We now define a map $\Theta : V_0(\Omega; R^3) \rightarrow V_0(\Omega; R^3)$ by saying that for $\mathbf{z} \in V_0(\Omega; R^3)$, $\mathbf{v}^k = \Theta(\mathbf{z})$ is a solution of the problem

$$-\int_{\Omega} \mathbb{S}(\nabla_h \mathbf{v}^k) : \nabla_h \phi dx = \langle \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{z}), \phi \rangle + \langle \mathcal{S}, \phi \rangle \text{ for any } \phi \in V_0(\Omega; R^3), \quad (5.2)$$

where

$$\langle \mathcal{S}, \phi \rangle = \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{S}(\nabla_h \mathbf{u}_B) : \nabla_h \phi dx,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{z}), \phi \rangle &= \int_{\Omega} D_t(\eta(\mathbf{z})\widehat{\mathbf{v}}^k) \cdot \widehat{\phi} \, dx + \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}(K) \cap \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} \int_{\sigma} F_{\sigma, K}(\eta(\mathbf{z})\widehat{\mathbf{v}}^k, \mathbf{u}^k) \cdot \widehat{\phi} \, dS_x \\
&+ \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}(K)} \int_{\sigma} \eta(\mathbf{z})\widehat{\mathbf{u}}^k \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma, K} \mathbf{u}_B \cdot \widehat{\phi} \, dS_x + \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{out}}} \int_{\sigma} \eta(\mathbf{z})\mathbf{u}_{B, \sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma} \widehat{\mathbf{v}}^k \cdot \widehat{\phi} \, dS_x + \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{in}}} \int_{\sigma} \varrho_B \mathbf{u}_{B, \sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma} \widehat{\mathbf{v}}^k \cdot \widehat{\phi} \, dS_x \\
&- \int_{\Omega} p_h(\eta(\mathbf{z})) \operatorname{div}_h \phi \, dx + \kappa h^{\omega} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} \int_{\sigma} [[\eta(\mathbf{z}^k)]]_{\sigma} \{\widehat{\mathbf{v}}^k\}_{\sigma} [[\widehat{\phi}]]_{\sigma} \, dS_x.
\end{aligned}$$

Clearly, $\mathbf{u}^k = \mathbf{v}^k + \mathbf{u}_B$, $\varrho^k = \eta(\mathbf{v}^k)$, with \mathbf{v}^k any fixed point of the map Θ solves the algebraic problem (3.1–3.4).

We apply to the map Θ Schaeffer’s fixed point theorem (see Lemma 4.1) with $Z = V_0(\Omega; R^3)$. We have only to verify that the set

$$\{\mathbf{z} \in Z \mid \mathbf{z} \text{ solves (5.2) with r.h.s. } \Lambda \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{z}) + \Lambda \mathcal{S}, \Lambda \in [0, 1]\}$$

is non empty (indeed 0 belongs to the set) and is bounded. The boundedness, follows from the energy balance. Indeed, the same calculation –as we effectuate later in Section 6 to derive the energy estimates for the numerical scheme– performed on the modified problem (5.2) with $\mathbf{v}^k = \mathbf{z}$, yields (6.4) with \mathbf{v}^k replaced by \mathbf{z} , where all terms are multiplied by Λ except the term $\Delta t \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{S}(\nabla_h \mathbf{z}) : \nabla_h \mathbf{z} \, dx$ at its left hand side. This readily implies the boundedness of the latter set by the argumentation in the proof of Lemma 6.1.

This completes the proof of Theorem 3.1.

6 Uniform estimates

6.1 Energy balance

1. We take in the continuity equation (3.3) the test function $\phi = 1$ and obtain the conservation of mass (see equation (6.3)).
2. We shall mimick the derivation of the energy inequality in the continuous case (cf. [52]) and compute

$$(3.4)_{\phi=\mathbf{v}^k} + (3.3)_{\phi=-\frac{1}{2}|\widehat{\mathbf{v}}^k|^2} + (3.3)_{\phi=H'_h(\varrho^k)}, \quad (6.1)$$

where

$$H_h(\varrho) = H(\varrho) + \tilde{\kappa} h^{\eta} \varrho^2. \quad (6.2)$$

Regrouping conveniently various terms, we get the following identities:

- (a) Contribution of the terms with the time derivatives to (6.1):

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\Omega} \left(D_t[\varrho^k \mathbf{v}^k] \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{v}}^k - \frac{1}{2} D_t[\varrho^k] |\widehat{\mathbf{v}}^k|^2 + D_t[\varrho^k] H'_h(\varrho^k) \right) \, dx = \int_{\Omega} D_t \left[\frac{1}{2} \varrho^k |\widehat{\mathbf{v}}^k|^2 + H_h(\varrho^k) \right] \, dx \\
&+ \Delta t \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{2} \varrho^{k-1} |D_t[\widehat{\mathbf{v}}^k]|^2 \, dx + \frac{1}{\Delta t} \int_{\Omega} \left(H_h(\varrho^{k-1}) - H'_h(\varrho^k)(\varrho^{k-1} - \varrho^k) - H_h(\varrho^k) \right) \, dx.
\end{aligned}$$

(b) Contribution of the convective terms to (3.4) $_{\phi=\mathbf{v}^k}$ + (3.3) $_{\phi=-\frac{1}{2}|\widehat{\mathbf{v}}^k|^2}$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}(K) \cap \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} \int_{\sigma} F_{\sigma,K}(\varrho^k \widehat{\mathbf{v}}^k, \mathbf{u}^k) \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{v}}^k \, dS_x - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}(K) \cap \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} \int_{\sigma} F(\varrho^k, \mathbf{u}^k) |\widehat{\mathbf{v}}^k|^2 \, dS_x \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} \int_{\sigma} |\text{Up}_{\sigma}(\varrho^k, \mathbf{u}^k)| [[\widehat{\mathbf{v}}^k]]_{\sigma}^2. \end{aligned}$$

(c) Contribution of the artificial density dissipation to (3.4) $_{\phi=\mathbf{v}^k}$ + (3.3) $_{\phi=-\frac{1}{2}|\widehat{\mathbf{v}}^k|^2}$:

$$\kappa h^{\omega} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} \int_{\sigma} \left([[\varrho^k]]_{\sigma} \{\widehat{\mathbf{v}}^k\}_{\sigma} \cdot [[\widehat{\mathbf{v}}^k]]_{\sigma} - \frac{1}{2} [[\varrho^k]]_{\sigma} [[|\widehat{\mathbf{v}}^k|^2]]_{\sigma} \right) dS_x = 0.$$

(d) Contribution of the pressure term in the momentum and of the convective term in the continuity equation to (3.4) $_{\phi=\mathbf{v}^k}$ + (3.3) $_{\phi=H'(\varrho^k)}$:

$$\begin{aligned} & - \int_{\Omega} p_h(\varrho^k) \text{div}_h \mathbf{v}^k \, dx + \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}(K) \cap \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} \int_{\sigma} F_{\sigma,K}(\varrho^k, \mathbf{u}^k) H'_h(\varrho^k) \, dS_x \\ & + \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}^{\text{out}}} \int_{\sigma} \varrho^k \mathbf{u}_{B,\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma} H'_h(\varrho^k) \, dS_x + \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}^{\text{in}}} \int_{\sigma} \varrho_B, \sigma \mathbf{u}_{B,\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma} H'_h(\varrho^k) \, dS_x \\ &= \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}(K)} \int_{\sigma} p_h(\varrho^k) \mathbf{u}_{B,\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma,K} \, dS_x \\ & + \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} \int_{\sigma} \left(H_h(\varrho^{k,-}) - H'_h(\varrho^{k,+})(\varrho^{k,-} - \varrho^{k,+}) - H_h(\varrho^{k,+}) \right) |\mathbf{u}_{\sigma}^k \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma}| \, dS_x \\ & + \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}^{\text{out}}} \int_{\sigma} H_h(\varrho^k) \mathbf{u}_{B,\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma} \, dS_x + \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}^{\text{in}}} \int_{\sigma} H_h(\varrho_B) \mathbf{u}_{B,\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma} \, dS_x \\ & + \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}^{\text{in}}} \int_{\sigma} \left(H_h(\varrho_B) - H'(\varrho^k)(\varrho_B - \varrho^k) - H_h(\varrho^k) \right) |\mathbf{u}_{B,\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma}| \, dS_x. \end{aligned}$$

(e) Contribution of the artificial viscosity term in the continuity equation to (3.3) $_{\phi=H'(\varrho^k)}$ is

$$\kappa h^{\omega} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} \int_{\sigma} [[\varrho^k]]_{\sigma} [[H'_h(\varrho^k)]]_{\sigma} \, dS_x.$$

Putting together items 2(a)–2(e) while taking into account the evident contribution of the dissipative terms for the velocity in the momentum equation to (3.4) $_{\phi=\mathbf{v}^k}$, we get the energy balance. We gather the above calculations in the following lemma.

Lemma 6.1 [Mass conservation and energy balance] *Suppose that the pressure satisfies assumptions (1.6). Then any solution of (ϱ, \mathbf{u}) of the algebraic system (3.1–3.4) satisfies for all $m = 1, \dots, N$ the following:*

1. *Mass conservation*

$$\varrho^m > 0, \int_{\Omega} \varrho^m dx + \Delta t \sum_{k=1}^m \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}^{\text{out}}} \int_{\sigma} \varrho^k \mathbf{u}_{B,\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma} dS_x = \int_{\Omega} \varrho^0 dx - \Delta t \sum_{k=1}^m \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}^{\text{in}}} \int_{\sigma} \varrho_B \mathbf{u}_{B,\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma} dS_x; \quad (6.3)$$

2. *Energy balance.* There exist $\bar{\varrho}^{k-1,k} \in Q(\Omega)$, $\bar{\varrho}_K^{k-1,k} \in [\min\{\varrho_K^{k-1}, \varrho_K^k\}, \max\{\varrho_K^{k-1}, \varrho_K^k\}]$, $K \in \mathcal{T}$ and $\bar{\varrho}^{k,\sigma} \in [\min\{\varrho_{\sigma}^-, \varrho_{\sigma}^+\}, \max\{\varrho_{\sigma}^-, \varrho_{\sigma}^+\}]$, $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}^{\text{int}}$, $k = 1, \dots, N$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{2} \varrho^m |\widehat{\mathbf{v}}^m|^2 dx + \int_{\Omega} H_h(\varrho^m) dx + \Delta t \sum_{k=1}^m \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{S}(\nabla_h \mathbf{v}^k) : \nabla_h \mathbf{v}^k dx & (6.4) \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^m \int_{\Omega} \left(\varrho^{k-1} |\widehat{\mathbf{v}}^k - \widehat{\mathbf{v}}^{k-1}|^2 + H_h''(\bar{\varrho}^{k-1,k}) |\varrho^k - \varrho^{k-1}|^2 \right) dx \\ & + \frac{\Delta t}{2} \sum_{k=1}^m \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}^{\text{int}}} \int_{\sigma} |\text{Up}_{\sigma}(\varrho^k, \mathbf{u}^k)| [|\widehat{\mathbf{v}}^k|]_{\sigma}^2 dS_x + \kappa h^{\omega} \Delta t \sum_{k=1}^m \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}^{\text{int}}} \int_{\sigma} [[\varrho^k]]_{\sigma} [[H_h'(\varrho^k)]]_{\sigma} dS_x \\ & + \frac{\Delta t}{2} \sum_{k=1}^m \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}^{\text{int}}} \int_{\sigma} H_h''(\bar{\varrho}^{k,\sigma}) [[\varrho^k]]_{\sigma}^2 |\mathbf{u}_{\sigma}^k \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma}| dS_x + \Delta t \sum_{k=1}^m \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}^{\text{out}}} \int_{\sigma} \varrho^k \mathbf{u}_{\sigma}^k \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma} |\widehat{\mathbf{v}}^k|^2 dS_x \\ & + \Delta t \sum_{k=1}^m \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}^{\text{out}}} \int_{\sigma} H_h(\varrho^k) \mathbf{u}_{B,\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma} dS_x + \Delta t \sum_{k=1}^m \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}^{\text{in}}} E_{H_h}(\varrho_B |\varrho^k)| \mathbf{u}_{B,\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma} dS_x \\ & = \int_{\Omega} \left[\frac{1}{2} \varrho^0 |\widehat{\mathbf{v}}^0|^2 + H_h(\varrho^0) \right] dx + \Delta t \sum_{k=1}^m \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}^{\text{in}}} \int_{\sigma} H_h(\varrho_B) |\mathbf{u}_{B,\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma}| dS_x \\ & - \Delta t \sum_{k=1}^m \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{S}(\nabla_h \mathbf{u}_B) : \nabla_h \mathbf{v}^k dx - \Delta t \sum_{k=1}^m \int_{\Omega} p_h(\varrho^k) \text{div}_h \mathbf{u}_B dx \\ & - \Delta t \sum_{k=1}^m \int_{\Omega} \varrho^k \widehat{\mathbf{u}}^k \cdot \nabla_h \mathbf{u}_B \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{v}}^k dx - \Delta t \sum_{k=1}^m \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}^{\text{in}}} \int_{\sigma} \varrho_B \mathbf{u}_{B,\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma} |\widehat{\mathbf{v}}^k|^2 dS_x. \end{aligned}$$

We are now in position to deduce from the energy balance (6.4) the uniform estimates. This will be done by using the Gronwall lemma. Before starting, it would be convenient to mention some properties of the pressure p and of the Helmholtz function H which can be deduced from assumptions (1.6–1.8).

Remark 6.1 1. We know that H is strictly convex (since $p'(\varrho) > 0$). Consequently p is strictly convex as well (since $\bar{a}p - H$ is convex). We may thus suppose, without loss of generality, that both $H - \underline{a}p$ and $\bar{a}p - H$ are strictly convex functions.

2. It is easy to deduce from the convexity of function $\bar{a}p - H$ that

$$\exists \bar{R} > 0, \forall \varrho > \bar{R}, \varrho^{\gamma-1} \lesssim H'(\varrho), \varrho^{\gamma-1} \lesssim p'(\varrho) \text{ where } \gamma = 1 + 1/\bar{a}, \quad (6.5)$$

see [1, formula (2.3)]. This observation explains the value of γ in Theorem 3.2.

3. Convexity of $\underline{ap} - H$ and $p(0) = H(0) = 0$ yield

$$\forall \varrho \in (0, \infty), p(\varrho) \lesssim \frac{1}{\underline{a}} H(\varrho) + c\varrho, \quad c = \frac{\underline{ap}'(0) - H'(0)}{\underline{a}}. \quad (6.6)$$

This observation allows to prove later Lemma 10.2 and consequently the error estimates.

4. Since $H - \underline{ap}$ is convex, there are numbers $d \geq 0, e \geq 0$ such that

$$\inf_{\varrho > 0} (\mathcal{H}(\varrho) - \underline{ap}(\varrho)) \geq 0, \quad \lim_{\varrho \rightarrow \infty} (\mathcal{H}(\varrho) - \underline{ap}(\varrho)) = \infty, \quad \text{where } \mathcal{H}(\varrho) = H(\varrho) + d\varrho + e. \quad (6.7)$$

This observation allows to derive the uniform estimates from the energy balance (6.4).

With this observation at hand, for the purpose of obtaining the uniform estimates, we can replace in the energy balance at its left hand side

$$\int_{\Omega} H_h(\varrho^m) \, dx \text{ by } \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{H}_h(\varrho^m) \, dx, \quad \mathcal{H}_h(\varrho) = \mathcal{H}(\varrho) + \tilde{\kappa} h^\eta \varrho^2$$

and add the non negative term

$$\Delta t \sum_{k=1}^m \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}^{\text{out}}} \int_{\sigma} d\varrho^k \mathbf{u}_{B,\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma} \, dS_x.$$

Likewise we can replace at its right hand side

$$\int_{\Omega} H_h(\varrho^0) \, dx \text{ by } \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{H}_h(\varrho^0) \, dx$$

and add the term

$$-\Delta t \sum_{k=1}^m \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}^{\text{in}}} \int_{\sigma} d\varrho_B \mathbf{u}_{B,\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma} \, dS_x.$$

Due to the balance of mass (6.3) the energy balance modified in this way is again satisfied as an identity.

Now, we shall write the term $\int_{\Omega} \mathcal{H}_h(\varrho^m) \, dx$ at the left hand side of the modified energy balance as a sum

$$\int_{\Omega} (\mathcal{H}_h(\varrho^m) - \underline{ap}(\varrho^m)) \, dx + \underline{a} \int_{\Omega} p(\varrho^m) \, dx$$

In view of this, in order to deduce from the modified energy balance the uniform estimates, we want to find a bound from above of its right hand side by the expression

$$\frac{1}{\delta} \int_0^{\tau_m} \int_{\Omega} \left(\varrho |\widehat{\mathbf{v}}|^2 + p(\varrho) + \tilde{\kappa} h^\eta \varrho^2 \right) \, dx dt + \delta \int_0^{\tau_m} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla_h \mathbf{v}|^2 \, dx dt + C, \quad \tau_m = m\Delta t$$

with some $C > 0$ depending only of the data, T and Ω and on $\delta > 0$, with the goal to employ the Gronwall inequality.

The first line contains only the data. The third term can be treated by the Cauchy-Schwartz and Young inequalities. The fourth term is easy as well. For the fifth term, we have,

$$\int_0^{\tau_m} \int_{\Omega} \varrho \widehat{\mathbf{u}} \cdot \nabla_h \mathbf{u}_B \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{v}} \, dx dt \lesssim \tau_m + \int_0^{\tau_m} \int_{\Omega} \varrho \widehat{\mathbf{v}}^2 \, dx dt.$$

For the last term, we write

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}^{\text{in}}} \int_{\sigma} \varrho_B \mathbf{u}_{B,\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma} |\widehat{\mathbf{v}}|^2 dS_x \right| \lesssim \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}^{\text{in}}} \|\widehat{\mathbf{v}}\|_{L^2(\sigma)}^2 \quad (6.8) \\
& \lesssim h^{-1} \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}, K \cap \mathcal{E}^{\text{in}} \neq \emptyset} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^2(K)}^2 \lesssim h \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}, K \cap \mathcal{E}^{\text{in}} \neq \emptyset} \|\nabla_x \mathbf{v}\|_{L^2(K)}^2 \lesssim h \|\nabla_h \mathbf{v}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Indeed the first inequality is the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality for the integrals over σ . The second inequality uses the discrete trace estimate (4.15) and the Jensen's inequality (4.1). Finally, we use one of the inequalities (4.3) in combination with the fact that $\mathbf{v}_{\sigma} = 0$ for any $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}^{\text{in}}$.

6.2 Estimates

In the following lemma we shall gather all estimates which can be deduced from Lemma 6.1.

Lemma 6.2 *We denote $I = [0, T]$,*

$$\overline{E}_0 = \sup_{h \in (0,1)} E_{0,h}, \quad E_{0,h} = \int_{\Omega} \left[\frac{1}{2} \varrho_h^0 |\widehat{\mathbf{u}}_h^0|^2 + H_h(\varrho_h^0) \right] dx.$$

We suppose that the pressure satisfies assumption (1.6–1.8) and that $h = \Delta t$.

Then there exists a number \mathfrak{d} , $\mathfrak{d} := \mathfrak{d}(\|\mathbf{u}_B\|_{C^1(\overline{\Omega})}, \|\mathbf{r}_B\|_{C(\overline{\Omega})}, \overline{E}_0, T, \Omega) \lesssim 1$, such that any solution $(\varrho, \mathbf{u}) = (\varrho_{h,\Delta t}, \mathbf{u}_{h,\Delta t})$ of the discrete problem (3.1–3.4) admits the following estimates:

$$\varrho > 0, \|\varrho\|_{L^\infty(I; L^\gamma(\Omega))} \lesssim 1, \|\rho(\varrho)\|_{L^\infty(0,T; L^1(\Omega))} \lesssim 1, \|H(\varrho)\|_{L^\infty(0,T; L^1(\Omega))} \lesssim 1, \quad (6.9)$$

$$\|\varrho |\mathbf{u}_B \cdot \mathbf{n}|^{1/\gamma}\|_{L^\gamma(I; L^\gamma(\partial\Omega))} \lesssim 1, \|H(\varrho) |\mathbf{u}_B \cdot \mathbf{n}|\|_{L^1(I; L^1(\partial\Omega))} \lesssim 1,^{10} \quad (6.10)$$

$$\tilde{\kappa} h^{\eta/2} \|\varrho\|_{L^\infty(I; L^2(\Omega))} \lesssim 1, \quad (6.11)$$

$$\tilde{\kappa} h^{\eta/2} \|\varrho |\mathbf{u}_B \cdot \mathbf{n}|^{1/2}\|_{L^2(I; L^2(\partial\Omega))} \lesssim 1, \quad (6.12)$$

$$\sup_{\tau \in (0,T)} \|\sqrt{\varrho} \widehat{\mathbf{u}}(\tau, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty(I; L^2(\Omega))} \lesssim 1, \quad (6.13)$$

$$\|\nabla_h \mathbf{v}\|_{L^2(I \times \Omega)} \lesssim 1, \quad \|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^2(I; L^6(\Omega))} \lesssim 1,^{11} \quad (6.14)$$

$$\tilde{\kappa} h^\eta \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \Delta t |D_t \varrho|^2 dx dt = \tilde{\kappa} h^\eta \sum_{k=1}^m \int_{\Omega} \left| \varrho^k - \varrho^{k-1} \right|^2 dx \lesssim 1, \quad (6.15)$$

$$\int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \Delta t \varrho(t - \Delta t) |D_t \mathbf{v}(t)|^2 dx dt = \sum_{k=1}^m \int_{\Omega} \varrho^{k-1} \left| \widehat{\mathbf{v}}^k - \widehat{\mathbf{v}}^{k-1} \right|^2 dx \lesssim 1, \quad (6.16)$$

$$\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} \int_0^T \int_{\sigma} |\text{Up}_{\sigma}(\varrho, \mathbf{u})| [[\mathbf{v}]]_{\sigma}^2 dS_x dt \lesssim 1, \quad (6.17)$$

¹⁰Here we use the definition of Π^V and the property (2.1) of the mesh.

¹¹The latter estimate follows from the first one by the discrete Sobolev inequality (4.11).

$$\tilde{\kappa} h^\eta \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} \int_0^T \int_\sigma [[\varrho]]_\sigma^2 |\mathbf{u}_\sigma \cdot \mathbf{n}| dS_x dt \lesssim 1, \quad (6.18)$$

$$\kappa \tilde{\kappa} h^{\omega+\eta} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} \int_0^T \int_\sigma [[\varrho]]_\sigma^2 dS_x dt \lesssim 1. \quad (6.19)$$

Remark 6.2 *Some other estimates can be deduced if we consider particular situations enumerated in Remark 3.2. They are essential in the proof of the versions of Theorem 3.2 in those particular situations.*

Suppose that the pressure satisfies in addition to (1.6–1.8) also (3.15). Then we have:

1. *If in (3.15), $\underline{\pi} > 0$ and $\gamma \geq 2$ we have in addition to (6.18),*

$$\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} \int_0^T \int_\sigma [[\varrho]]_\sigma^2 |\mathbf{u}_\sigma \cdot \mathbf{n}| dS_x dt \lesssim 1, \quad (6.20)$$

and, in addition to (6.15)

$$\int_0^T \int_\Omega \Delta t |D_t \varrho|^2 dx dt = \sum_{k=1}^m \int_\Omega \left| \varrho^k - \varrho^{k-1} \right|^2 dx \lesssim 1. \quad (6.21)$$

2. *If $1 < \gamma \leq 2$, we have in addition to (6.18)*

$$\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} \int_0^T \int_\sigma \left(\frac{1}{\{\varrho\}_\sigma + 1} \right)^{2-\gamma} [[\varrho]]_\sigma^2 |\mathbf{u}_\sigma \cdot \mathbf{n}| dS_x dt \lesssim 1, \quad (6.22)$$

and, in addition to (6.15),

$$\sum_{k=1}^m \int_\Omega \left(\frac{1}{\varrho^{k-1} + \varrho^k + 1} \right)^{2-\gamma} \left| \varrho^k - \varrho^{k-1} \right|^2 dx \lesssim 1. \quad (6.23)$$

3. *If $1 < \gamma < 2$ and condition (3.17) is satisfied, we have also*

$$\kappa h^\omega \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} \int_0^T \int_\sigma [[\varrho^{\gamma/2}]]_\sigma^2 dS_x dt \lesssim 1, \quad (6.24)$$

and consequently

$$\kappa h^{1+\omega} \int_0^T \|\varrho\|_{L^{3\gamma}(\Omega)}^\gamma dt \lesssim 1.^{12} \quad (6.25)$$

7 Consistency

Having collected all the available uniform bounds, our next task is to verify that our numerical method is *consistent* with the variational formulation of the original problem.

¹²This requires some explanation: We deduce from (3.17) that $[[\varrho^{\gamma/2}]]_\sigma^2 \lesssim H''(\bar{\varrho}^{k,\sigma})(\varrho^{k,-} - \varrho^{k,+})^2$ and thus the fourth line of (6.4) yields, in particular, (6.24). The latter implies (6.25) by virtue of Sobolev inequality (4.9) for the broken norms.

7.1 Continuity equation

For $\phi \in C^1([0, T] \times \overline{\Omega})$, take $\widehat{\phi}(t)$ as a test function in the discrete continuity equation (3.3). We see that

$$\int_{\Omega} D_t \varrho \widehat{\phi} \, dx = \int_{\Omega} D_t \varrho \phi \, dx.$$

Further, using the formula (4.22), and noticing that

$$\int_{\Omega} (\widehat{\phi} - \phi) \varrho \operatorname{div}_h \mathbf{u} \, dx = \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} \int_K (\widehat{\phi} - \phi) \varrho \operatorname{div}_x \mathbf{u} = 0$$

(indeed $\operatorname{div}_h \mathbf{u}(t)$ is constant on each element K), we check without difficulty using formula (4.22) that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \varrho \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla_x \phi \, dx &= \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}(K)} \int_{\sigma} (\phi - \widehat{\phi}) \varrho (\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_{\sigma}) \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma, K} \, dS_x + \int_{\Omega} (\widehat{\phi} - \phi) \varrho \operatorname{div}_h \mathbf{u} \, dx \\ &- \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}(K) \cap \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} \int_{\sigma} F_{\sigma, K}(\varrho, \mathbf{u}) \widehat{\phi} \, dS_x + \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}(K) \cap \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} \int_{\sigma} (\widehat{\phi} - \phi) [[\varrho]]_{\mathbf{n}_{\sigma, K}} [\mathbf{u}_{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma, K}]^{-} \, dS_x \\ &+ \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{out}}} \int_{\sigma} \varrho \mathbf{u}_{B, \sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma} (\phi - \widehat{\phi}) \, dS_x + \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{in}}} \int_{\sigma} \varrho \mathbf{u}_{B, \sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma} (\phi - \widehat{\phi}) \, dS_x. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, equation (3.3) rewrites

$$\int_{\Omega} \left(D_t \varrho \phi - \varrho \widehat{\mathbf{u}} \cdot \nabla_x \phi \right) \, dx + \int_{\Gamma_{\text{out}}} \varrho \mathbf{u}_B \cdot \mathbf{n} \phi \, dS_x + \int_{\Gamma_{\text{in}}} \varrho \mathbf{u}_B \cdot \mathbf{n} \phi \, dS_x = \langle R_h^C(t), \phi \rangle \quad (7.1)$$

in $(0, T]$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \langle R_h^C(t), \phi \rangle &= \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}(K) \cap \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} \int_{\sigma} (\phi - \widehat{\phi}) [[\varrho]]_{\mathbf{n}_{\sigma, K}} [\mathbf{u}_{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma, K}]^{-} \, dS_x \\ &+ \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}(K)} \int_{\sigma} (\widehat{\phi} - \phi) \varrho (\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_{\sigma}) \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma, K} \, dS_x + \int_{\Omega} \varrho \operatorname{div}_h \mathbf{u} (\phi - \widehat{\phi}) \, dx \\ &- \kappa h^{\omega} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} \int_{\sigma} [[\varrho]]_{\sigma} [[\widehat{\phi}]]_{\sigma} \, dS_x + \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{in}}} \int_{\sigma} (\varrho - \varrho_B) \mathbf{u}_{B, \sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma} (\widehat{\phi} - \phi) \, dS_x + \int_{\Omega} \varrho (\mathbf{u} - \widehat{\mathbf{u}}) \cdot \nabla_x \phi \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

In the above, we have also used the fact that the mesh fits to the inflow-outflow boundary and the definition (2.6) of the projection Π^V .

Alternatively, in view of (2.13), we can integrate the equation (7.1) over time and rewrite it in the form

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \varrho \phi(\tau) \, dx - \int_{\Omega} \varrho^0 \phi(0) \, dx - \int_0^{\tau} \int_{\Omega} \left(\varrho \partial_t \phi + \varrho \widehat{\mathbf{u}} \cdot \nabla_x \phi \right) \, dx \, dt \\ + \int_0^{\tau} \int_{\Gamma_{\text{out}}} \varrho \mathbf{u}_B \cdot \mathbf{n} \phi \, dS_x \, dt + \int_0^{\tau} \int_{\Gamma_{\text{in}}} \varrho \mathbf{u}_B \cdot \mathbf{n} \phi \, dS_x \, dt = \int_0^{\tau} \langle R_h^C(t), \phi \rangle \, dt \end{aligned} \quad (7.2)$$

with any $\tau \in (0, T]$ and all $\phi \in C^1([0, T] \times \overline{\Omega})$, where ϱ is defined in (2.13).

Our next goal is to estimate conveniently all terms in the remainder $\langle R_{h, \Delta t}^C, \phi \rangle$. To do this we shall use the tools evoked in Section 4.1 and employ the bounds (6.9–6.19).

1. The first term in $\langle R_h^C, \phi \rangle$ is bounded from above by

$$\lesssim \left[h^\eta \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} \int_{\sigma} [|\varrho|]_{\sigma}^2 |\mathbf{u}_{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma}| dS_x \right]^{1/2} \times \left[h^{-\eta} \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}(K) \cap \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} \int_{\sigma} (\widehat{\phi} - \phi)^2 |\mathbf{u}_{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma}| dS_x \right]^{1/2}, \quad (7.3)$$

where the first term in the product is controlled by (6.18). As far as for the second term in the product, we have for any $\gamma > 1$:

$$\begin{aligned} h^{-\eta} \left| \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}(K) \cap \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} \int_{\sigma} (\widehat{\phi} - \phi)^2 |\mathbf{u}_{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma}| dS_x \right| &\lesssim h^{-\eta} \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}(K) \cap \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} \int_{\sigma} \|\widehat{\phi} - \phi\|_{L^{\infty}(\sigma)}^2 \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^1(\sigma)} \\ &\lesssim h^{1-\eta} \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} \|\nabla_x \phi\|_{L^{\infty}(K)}^2 \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^1(K)} \lesssim h^{1-\eta} \|\nabla_x \phi\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)}^2 \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^1(\Omega)}, \end{aligned} \quad (7.4)$$

where $\|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \lesssim \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^6(\Omega)}$ is bounded in $L^2((0, T))$. Indeed, to get the second line we have employed the Hölder and Jensen inequalities on σ , cf. (4.1), third line employs the trace estimates (4.14–4.15) and then the Hölder inequality.

2. By the same token, the absolute value of the second term in $\langle R_h^C, \phi \rangle$

$$\sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}(K)} \int_{\sigma} (\widehat{\phi} - \phi) \varrho (\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_{\sigma}) \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma, K} dS_x$$

allows for any $\gamma > 1$ the following estimate

$$\lesssim h^{1-\frac{\eta}{2}} \|h^{\eta/2} \varrho\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\nabla_h \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\nabla_x \phi\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} \lesssim h^{1-\frac{\eta}{2}} \|\nabla_h \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\nabla_x \phi\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)}, \quad (7.5)$$

where we have used (4.3). The third term and the last term in $\langle R_h^C, \phi \rangle$ admit the same estimate.

3. The artificial density diffusion term in $\langle R_h^C, \phi \rangle$ can be processed in the similar way,

$$\lesssim \kappa h^{1+\omega} \|\nabla_x \phi\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} \|\varrho\|_{L^{\gamma}(\sigma)} |\sigma|^{1/\gamma'} \lesssim \kappa h^{\omega} \|\varrho\|_{L^{\gamma}(\Omega)} \|\nabla_x \phi\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} \quad (7.6)$$

for any value $\gamma > 1$.

4. The boundary term in $\langle R_h^C(t), \phi \rangle$ is controlled in the same way (without loss of generality, we perform the calculation just for the first of them, and with ϱ only -instead of with $(\varrho - \varrho_B)$):

$$\lesssim h \|\nabla \phi\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{E}(K) \cap \mathcal{E}^{\text{in}} \neq \emptyset} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}^{\text{in}}} \|\varrho\|_{L^1(\sigma)} \lesssim \|\nabla \phi\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} \|\varrho\|_{L^2(\mathcal{U})} |\mathcal{U}|^{1/2} \lesssim h^{1/2-\eta/2} \|\nabla \phi\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)}, \quad (7.7)$$

where $\mathcal{U} = \cup_{K \in \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{E}(K) \cap \mathcal{E}^{\text{in}} \neq \emptyset} K$. Indeed, in the passage from the first to the second line, we have used trace estimates (4.15), and for the rest the Hölder inequalities as well as the fact that the Lebesgue measure $|\mathcal{U}|$ of \mathcal{U} is $\approx h$.

5. At one place of the convergence proof, we shall need a slightly improved version of the above estimates with test functions $\phi \in L^p(0, T; W_0^{1,p}(\Omega))$ with p "large". To achieve this, we observe that the final bound in (7.4) can be replaced by $\lesssim h^{1-\eta} \|\nabla_x \phi(t)\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \|\mathbf{u}(t)\|_{L^6(\Omega)}$ provided $p \geq 12/5$, final bound in (7.5) by $\lesssim h^{\frac{3(p-2)}{2p} - \frac{1+\eta}{2}} \|h^{\eta/2} \varrho\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\mathbf{u}(t)\|_{L^6(\Omega)} \|\nabla_x \phi(t)\|_{L^p(\Omega)}$ provided $\frac{3(p-2)}{2p} - \frac{1+\eta}{2} > 0$ -here we must use also "negative" interpolation estimate (4.17)- and the final bound in (7.6) by $\lesssim \kappa h^{\omega} \|\varrho(t)\|_{L^{\gamma}(\Omega)} \|\nabla_x \phi(t)\|_{L^p(\Omega)}$ provided $\frac{1}{\gamma} + \frac{1}{p} > 1$.

We resume the above calculations in the following lemma.

Lemma 7.1 [Consistency for the continuity equation] *Let $h = \Delta t$, $\tilde{\kappa} = 1$ and $\eta \in (0, 1)$. Let the pressure satisfy the hypotheses (1.6–1.8).*

1. *Then any numerical solution of problem (3.1–3.4) satisfies the continuity equation in the variational form (7.2) with any $\phi \in C^1([0, T] \times \overline{\Omega})$, where*

$$|\langle R_h^C, \phi \rangle| \lesssim h^{\alpha_C} r_h^C \|\phi\|_{L^\infty(0, T; W^{1, \infty}(\Omega))}, \|r_h^C\|_{L^{4/3}((0, T))} \lesssim 1 \quad (7.8)$$

with $\alpha_C = \frac{1-\eta}{2} > 0$ if $\kappa = 0$ and $\alpha_C = \min\{\frac{1-\eta}{2}, \omega\} > 0$ if $\kappa = 1$.

2. *There is $p_0(\eta) > 1$ such that for all $p > p_0(\eta)$*

$$\int_0^\tau |\langle R_h^C, \phi \rangle| dt \lesssim h^{\underline{\alpha}_C} \|\phi\|_{L^p(0, T; W^{1, p}(\Omega))}, \quad (7.9)$$

with some $\underline{\alpha}_C = \underline{\alpha}_C(p) > 0$ and all $\phi \in C_c^1((0, T) \times \Omega)$.

Remark 7.1 *Let $\tilde{\kappa} = 0$ and let p satisfy in addition to (1.6–1.8) also condition (3.15).*

1. *Formulas (7.8–7.9) with $\alpha_C > 0$ and $\underline{\alpha}_C > 0$ remain still valid under condition $6/5 < \gamma < 2$ provided also (3.17) is satisfied. In this case*

$$\alpha_C = \min \left\{ \frac{1}{2}, \frac{5\gamma - 6}{2\gamma}, \frac{1}{\gamma'} \right\} \text{ if } \kappa = 0$$

and it is minimum of the above value and ω if $\kappa = 1$. Also, there is $p_0 = p_0(\gamma) > 1$ such that (7.9) holds for all $p > p_0$ with some $\underline{\alpha}_C = \underline{\alpha}_C(p) > 0$.

Indeed, we can use estimates (6.22) instead of (6.18) when calculating (7.3) which now yields,

$$\begin{aligned} & \lesssim \left[\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} \int_{\sigma} \left(\frac{1}{\{\varrho\}_{\sigma} + 1} \right)^{2-\gamma} [[\varrho]]_{\sigma}^2 |\mathbf{u}_{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma}| dS_x \right]^{1/2} \\ & \times \left[\sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}(K) \cap \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} \int_{\sigma} \left(\{\varrho\}_{\sigma} + 1 \right)^{2-\gamma} (\hat{\phi} - \phi)^2 |\mathbf{u}_{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma}| dS_x \right]^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

and the estimate (we use systematically the "negative" interpolation (4.17)),

$$\lesssim h^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\varrho\|_{L^{\frac{2-\gamma}{\gamma}}(\Omega)}^{2-\gamma} \|\nabla \phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^6(\Omega)}^{1/2} A_h \lesssim h^{\frac{1}{2}} B_h \|\nabla \phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}, \quad B_h \text{ bounded in } L^{4/3}((0, T))$$

for the first term in R_h^C .

Further, we use estimate

$$\|\varrho\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim h^{\min\{0, \frac{3}{2} - \frac{3}{\gamma}\}} \|\varrho\|_{L^\gamma(\Omega)},$$

when evaluating term corresponding to (7.5), which gives the bound

$$\lesssim h^{1 + \min\{0, \frac{3}{2} - \frac{3}{\gamma}\}} \|\nabla \phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} A_h, \quad A_h \text{ bounded in } L^2((0, T))$$

in these cases.¹³

Estimate (7.6) of the artificial diffusion term remains in force, while the the estimate of the boundary term (7.7) can be replaced by

$$\lesssim \|\nabla\phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\|\varrho\|_{L^\gamma(\mathcal{U})}|\mathcal{U}|^{1/\gamma'}\lesssim h^{1/\gamma'}\|\nabla\phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}.$$

2. Similar reasoning can be carried out if $\gamma \geq 2$ and if in (3.15), $\underline{\pi} > 0$. In this case, in (7.8),

$$\alpha_C = \min\left\{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{\gamma'}\right\} \text{ if } \kappa = 0$$

and it is minimum of the above value and ω if $\kappa = 1$.

7.2 Momentum equation

The next step is to take

$$\tilde{\phi}(t), \phi \in C_c^1([0, T] \times \Omega; R^3),$$

as a test function in the discrete momentum equation (3.4). Seeing that, in accordance with (4.12), (4.13),

$$\int_{\Omega} \mathbb{S}(\nabla_h \mathbf{v}) : \nabla_h \tilde{\phi} \, dx = \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{S}(\nabla_h \mathbf{v}) : \nabla_x \phi \, dx, \quad \int_{\Omega} p_h(\varrho) \operatorname{div}_h \tilde{\phi} \, dx = \int_{\Omega} p_h(\varrho) \operatorname{div}_x \phi \, dx,$$

we may rewrite (3.4)–by using the formula (4.22) and rearranging conveniently several terms– in the form

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} D_t(\varrho \widehat{\mathbf{v}}) \cdot \phi \, dx - \int_{\Omega} \varrho \widehat{\mathbf{u}} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{v}} : \nabla_x \phi \, dx - \int_{\Omega} \varrho \widehat{\mathbf{u}} \cdot \nabla_x \phi \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_B \, dx + \int_{\Omega} \varrho \widehat{\mathbf{u}} \cdot \nabla_h(\mathbf{u}_B \cdot \phi) \, dx \\ & + \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{S}(\nabla_h \mathbf{u}) : \nabla_x \phi \, dx - \int_{\Omega} p_h(\varrho) \operatorname{div}_x \phi \, dx = \langle R_{h, \Delta t}^M, \phi \rangle \text{ in } (0, T], \end{aligned} \quad (7.10)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \langle R_{h, \Delta t}^M, \phi \rangle &= \int_{\Omega} D_t(\varrho \widehat{\mathbf{v}}) \cdot (\phi - \widehat{\phi}) \, dx + \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}(K) \cap \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} \int_{\sigma} (\phi - \widehat{\phi}) \cdot [[\varrho \widehat{\mathbf{v}}]]_{\sigma, \mathbf{n}_{\sigma, K}} [\mathbf{u}_{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma, K}]^- \, dS_x \\ & + \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}(K)} \int_{\sigma} \varrho(\widehat{\phi} - \phi) \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{v}}(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_{\sigma}) \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma, K} \, dS_x + \int_{\Omega} \varrho(\phi - \widehat{\phi}) \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{v}} \operatorname{div}_h \mathbf{u} \, dx \\ & + \int_{\Omega} \varrho(\mathbf{u} - \widehat{\mathbf{u}}) \cdot \nabla_x \phi \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{v}} \, dx + \int_{\Omega} \varrho \widehat{\mathbf{u}} \cdot \nabla_h \mathbf{u}_B \cdot (\phi - \widehat{\phi}) \, dx + \int_{\Omega} \varrho \widehat{\mathbf{u}} \cdot \nabla \phi \cdot (\mathbf{u}_B - \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_B) \, dx \\ & - \kappa h^\omega \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} \int_{\sigma} [[\varrho^k]]_{\sigma} \{\widehat{\mathbf{u}}^k\}_{\sigma} [[\widehat{\phi}]]_{\sigma} \, dS_x + \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{in}}} \int_{\sigma} (\varrho_B - \varrho) \mathbf{u}_{B, \sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma} \widehat{\mathbf{v}} \cdot (\phi - \widehat{\phi}) = \sum_{i=1}^9 I_i \end{aligned}$$

Alternatively, in view of (2.13), equation (7.10) can be rewritten as follows,

$$\int_{\Omega} \varrho \widehat{\mathbf{v}} \cdot \phi(\tau, x) \, dx - \int_{\Omega} \varrho^0 \widehat{\mathbf{v}}^0 \cdot \phi(0, x) \, dx - \int_0^\tau \int_{\Omega} \left[\varrho \widehat{\mathbf{v}} \cdot \partial_t \phi + \left(\varrho \widehat{\mathbf{u}} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{u}} + p_h(\varrho) \mathbb{I} \right) : \nabla_x \phi \right] \, dx dt \quad (7.11)$$

¹³This is the place when $\gamma > 6/5$ is needed, in order to let the power of h positive. Here the situation could be still handled for $1 < \gamma \leq 6/5$ provided $\kappa = 1$ by using estimate (6.25). Similar terms in the remainder of the consistency formulation of the momentum equation, however, impose the restriction $\gamma > 6/5$ even if $\kappa = 1$. It is therefore useless to treat this situation here.

$$+ \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \varrho \widehat{\mathbf{u}} \cdot \nabla_h (\mathbf{u}_B \cdot \phi) \, dx + \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \mathbb{S}(\nabla_h \mathbf{u}) : \nabla_x \phi \, dx dt = \int_0^\tau \langle R_{h,\Delta t}^M(t), \phi \rangle \, dt$$

with any $\tau \in (0, T]$ and all $\phi \in C_c^1([0, T] \times \Omega, \mathbb{R}^3)$.

Our goal is to estimate conveniently all terms in $\langle R_{h,\Delta t}^M, \phi \rangle$. As in Section 7.1, we shall use the tools reported in Section 4.1 and uniform estimates for numerical solutions derived in Lemma 6.2.

1. *Most terms in $\langle R_{h,\Delta t}^M, \phi \rangle$ contain the expression $\widehat{\phi} - \phi = \Pi^Q(\tilde{\phi} - \phi) + \widehat{\phi} - \phi$.* We notice that by virtue of (4.3), (4.5), (4.6),

$$\|\phi - \widehat{\phi}\|_{L^q(\Omega)} \lesssim h \|\nabla_x \phi\|_{L^q(\Omega)}, \quad 1 \leq q \leq \infty.$$

2. *Estimate of the first term in $R_{h,h}^M$ (term I_1):* For the error in the time derivative, we obtain

$$\left| \int_\Omega D_t(\varrho \widehat{\mathbf{v}}) \cdot (\phi - \widehat{\phi}) \, dx \right| \lesssim \sqrt{h} (\Delta t)^{-1/2} A_h, \quad A_h \text{ bounded in } L^2(0, T).$$

Indeed, we split the term $\int_\Omega D_t(\varrho^k \widehat{\mathbf{v}}^k) \cdot (\phi - \widehat{\phi}) \, dx$ into two parts,

$$\int_\Omega \sqrt{\varrho^{k-1}} \sqrt{\varrho^{k-1}} \frac{\mathbf{v}^k - \mathbf{v}^{k-1}}{\Delta t} \cdot (\phi - \widehat{\phi}) \, dx + \int_\Omega \frac{\varrho^k - \varrho^{k-1}}{\Delta t} \mathbf{v}^k \cdot (\phi - \widehat{\phi}) \, dx, \quad (7.12)$$

where, by virtue of Hölder's inequality, for any $\gamma > 1$, the first term is bounded by

$$\lesssim h (\Delta t)^{-1/2} \|\varrho^{k-1}\|_{L^\gamma(\Omega)}^{1/2} \left(\Delta t \int_\Omega \varrho^k \left(\frac{\mathbf{v}^{k-1} - \mathbf{v}^k}{\Delta t} \right)^2 \, dx \right)^{1/2} \|\nabla_x \phi\|_{L^{\frac{2\gamma}{\gamma-1}}(\Omega)} \quad (7.13)$$

while the second one is

$$\lesssim h^{1-\eta/2} (\Delta t)^{-1/2} \left(\Delta t h^\eta \int_\Omega \left(\frac{\varrho^k - \varrho^{k-1}}{\Delta t} \right)^2 \, dx \right)^{1/2} \|\mathbf{v}^k\|_{L^6(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)} \|\nabla_x \phi\|_{L^3(\Omega)}, \quad (7.14)$$

where the first integrals of both expressions are controlled by means of (6.15) and (6.16).

3. *Estimate of the second term in $R_{h,h}^M$ (term I_2):* This essentially amounts to estimate two terms,

$$I_{2,1} = \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}(K) \cap \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} \int_\sigma \varrho_{\sigma, \mathbf{n}_{\sigma, K}}^+ (\phi - \widehat{\phi}) \cdot [[\widehat{\mathbf{v}}]]_{\sigma, \mathbf{n}_{\sigma, K}} [\mathbf{u}_\sigma \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma, K}]^- \, dS_x$$

and

$$I_{2,2} = \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}(K) \cap \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} \int_\sigma (\phi - \widehat{\phi}) \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{v}}_{\sigma, \mathbf{n}_{\sigma, K}}^- [[\widehat{\varrho}]]_{\sigma, \mathbf{n}_{\sigma, K}} [\mathbf{u}_\sigma \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma, K}]^- \, dS_x,$$

where

$$|I_{2,1}| \lesssim \left[\sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}(K) \cap \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} \int_\sigma \varrho_{\sigma, \mathbf{n}_{\sigma, K}}^+ [[\widehat{\mathbf{v}}]]_{\sigma, \mathbf{n}_{\sigma, K}}^2 [[\mathbf{u}_\sigma \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma, K}]^-] \, dS_x \right]^{1/2} \times \left[\sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}(K) \cap \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} \int_\sigma \varrho_{\sigma, \mathbf{n}_{\sigma, K}}^+ (\phi - \widehat{\phi})^2 [[\mathbf{u}_\sigma \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma, K}]^-] \, dS_x \right]^{1/2} \quad (7.15)$$

with the first term in the product controlled by (6.17), i.e. belonging to $L^2((0, T))$, while

$$\begin{aligned} |I_{2,2}| &\lesssim \left[h^\eta \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}(K) \cap \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} \int_{\sigma} [[\hat{\varrho}]]_{\sigma, \mathbf{n}_{\sigma, K}}^2 |[\mathbf{u}_{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma, K}]^-| dS_x \right]^{1/2} \times \\ &\left[h^{-\eta} \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}(K) \cap \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} \int_{\sigma} (\phi - \hat{\phi})^2 \cdot |\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{\sigma, \mathbf{n}_{\sigma, K}}^-|^2 |[\mathbf{u}_{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma, K}]^-| dS_x \right]^{1/2} \end{aligned} \quad (7.16)$$

with the first term in the product controlled by (6.18), i.e. belonging also to $L^2((0, T))$. It will be therefore enough to estimate the expressions under the second square roots of $I_{2,1}$, $I_{2,2}$, respectively. In fact, it is enough to estimate only the "leading terms" of these expressions, where we replace \mathbf{u} by \mathbf{v} .

We have

$$\begin{aligned} &h^{-\eta} \left| \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}(K) \cap \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} \int_{\sigma} \varrho_{\sigma, \mathbf{n}_{\sigma, K}}^+ (\phi - \hat{\phi})^2 |[\mathbf{v}_{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma, K}]^-| dS_x \right| \\ &\lesssim h^{2-\eta} \|\nabla \phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^2 \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}(K) \cap \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} \|\varrho\|_{L^2(\sigma)} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^2(\sigma)} \\ &\lesssim h^{1-\eta} \|\nabla \phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^2 \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} \|\varrho\|_{L^2(K)} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^2(K)} \lesssim h^{1-\frac{3}{2}\eta} \|\nabla \phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^2 \|h^{\eta/2} \varrho\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^6(\Omega)}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.17)$$

Likewise

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}(K) \cap \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} \int_{\sigma} (\phi - \hat{\phi})^2 |\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{\sigma, \mathbf{n}_{\sigma, K}}^-|^2 |[\mathbf{v}_{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma, K}]^-| dS_x \right| \\ &\lesssim h \|\nabla_x \phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^2 \|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^3(\Omega)}^3 \lesssim h(\Delta t)^{-1/2} \|(\Delta t)^{1/6} \mathbf{v}\|_{L^6(\Omega)}^3 \|\nabla_x \phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (7.18)$$

where $\|(\Delta t)^{1/6} \mathbf{v}\|_{L^6(\Omega)}^3$ is bounded in $L^1((0, T))$ by virtue of (4.19).

4. *The upper bound of the third term in $R_{h,h}^M$ (term I_3) is determined by the upper bound of*

$$\left| \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}(K)} \int_{\sigma} \varrho (\phi - \hat{\phi}) \cdot \hat{\mathbf{v}} (\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}_{\sigma}) \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma, K} dS_x \right|,$$

which is

$$\begin{aligned} &\lesssim h \|\varrho\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \|\nabla_h \mathbf{v}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\nabla_x \phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \\ &\lesssim h^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{\eta}{2}} \|h^{\eta/2} \varrho\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^6(\Omega)} \|\nabla_h \mathbf{v}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\nabla_x \phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}, \end{aligned} \quad (7.19)$$

where $\|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^6(\Omega)} \|\nabla_h \mathbf{v}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ is bounded in $L^1((0, T))$.

5. *The bounds of term I_4 in $R_{h,h}^M$ are determined by the bounds of*

$$\left| \int_{\Omega} \varrho (\phi - \hat{\phi}) \cdot \hat{\mathbf{v}} \operatorname{div}_h \mathbf{v} \, dx \right|.$$

They are exactly the same as in the previous case. The same is true for the terms I_5 – I_7 , since they have the same structure.

6. The *the artificial viscosity term* $|I_8| = \kappa h^\omega |\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} \int_{\sigma} [[\varrho^k]]_{\sigma} \{\widehat{\mathbf{v}}^k\}_{\sigma} [[\widehat{\phi}]]_{\sigma} dS_x|$ is bounded by

$$\lesssim \kappa h^\omega \|\varrho\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\nabla \phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \lesssim \kappa h^{\omega-\eta/2} \|h^{\eta/2} \varrho\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\nabla \phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \quad (7.20)$$

where $\|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim \|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^6(\Omega)}$ is bounded in $L^2((0, T))$.

7. The last term in $R_{h,h}^M$ to be evaluated is the boundary term (I_9) whose decay with h is determined by

$$\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}^{\text{in}}} \int_{\sigma} \varrho \mathbf{u}_{B,\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma} \widehat{\mathbf{v}} \cdot (\widehat{\phi} - \phi) dS_x.$$

We have, by the same reasoning as in (7.7), the bound

$$\lesssim h \|\varrho\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\nabla_h \mathbf{v}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\nabla_x \phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \lesssim h^{1-\eta/2} \|h^{\eta/2} \varrho\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\nabla_h \mathbf{v}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\nabla_x \phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}. \quad (7.21)$$

Lemma 7.2 [Consistency for the momentum equation] *Let $h = \Delta t$, $\tilde{\kappa} = 1$ and $\eta \in (0, 2/3)$. Let the pressure satisfy the hypotheses (1.6–1.8). Then any numerical solution of problem (3.1–3.4) satisfies the momentum equation in the variational form (7.11) with any $\phi \in C^1([0, T] \times \overline{\Omega})$, where*

$$|\langle R_{h,h}^M(t), \phi \rangle| \lesssim h^{\alpha_M} r_h^M \|\phi\|_{L^\infty(0, T; W^{1, \infty}(\Omega))}, \quad \|r_h^M\|_{L^1((0, T))} \lesssim 1 \quad (7.22)$$

with $\alpha_M = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{3}{4}\eta > 0$ if $\kappa = 0$ and $\alpha_M = \min\{\omega - \frac{\eta}{2}, \frac{1}{2} - \frac{3}{4}\eta\}$ if $\kappa = 0$, $\eta < 2\omega$.

Remark 7.2 *Let $\tilde{\kappa} = 0$ and let p satisfy in addition to (1.6–1.8) also condition (3.15).*

1. Formula (7.22) with $\alpha_M > 0$ remains still valid under condition $6/5 < \gamma < 2$ provided (3.17) is satisfied. In this case, if $\kappa = 0$ and $\gamma > 3/2$,

$$\alpha_M = \min \left\{ \frac{1}{4}, \frac{5\gamma - 6}{2\gamma}, \frac{2\gamma - 3}{2\gamma} \right\}$$

and if $\kappa = 1$, $6/5 < \gamma \leq 3/2$ and $\omega \in (0, 2(\gamma - 1))$,

$$\alpha_M = \min \left\{ \frac{1}{4}, \frac{5\gamma - 6}{2\gamma}, 1 - \frac{1}{2\gamma} - \frac{1 + \omega}{2\gamma}, \omega \right\}.$$

Here are some hints (we suppose $\Delta t = h$ and we use systematically the "negative interpolation" (4.17), (4.19)):

(a) When estimating the second term in formula (7.12), the control (6.15) must be replaced by the control (6.23). Under condition $h = \Delta t$, this amounts to replace (7.14) by

$$\lesssim h^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left[\Delta t \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{1}{\varrho^k + \varrho^{k-1} + 1} \right)^{2-\gamma} \left(\frac{\varrho^k - \varrho^{k-1}}{\Delta t} \right)^2 dx \right]^{1/2} \left[\int_{\Omega} (\varrho^k + \varrho^{k-1} + 1)^{2-\gamma} |\mathbf{v}^k|^2 |\widehat{\phi} - \phi|^2 dx \right]^{1/2}$$

$$\lesssim h^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\varrho\|_{L^{\frac{2-\gamma}{\gamma}}(\Omega)}^{2-\gamma} A_h \|\mathbf{v}^k\|_{L^6(\Omega)} \|\nabla_x \phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)},$$

provided $\gamma \geq 6/5$, where $A_h \|\mathbf{v}^k\|_{L^6(\Omega)}$ is bounded in $L^1((0, T))$.

(b) Decomposition (7.15) remains unchanged and yields the bound

$$\lesssim h^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\varrho\|_{L^\gamma(\Omega)} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^6(\Omega)} A_h \|\nabla_x \phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$$

where $A_h \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^6(\Omega)}$ is bounded in $L^1((0, T))$, cf. (6.14), (6.17), and (7.18).

Decomposition (7.16) takes the form,

$$\left[\sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}(K) \cap \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} \int_{\sigma} \left(\frac{1}{\{\varrho\}_{\sigma} + 1} \right)^{2-\gamma} [[\widehat{\varrho}]]_{\sigma, \mathbf{n}_{\sigma, K}}^2 |[\mathbf{u}_{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma, K}]^{-}| dS_x \right]^{1/2} \times \\ \left[\sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}(K) \cap \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} \int_{\sigma} (\{\varrho\}_{\sigma} + 1)^{2-\gamma} (\phi - \widehat{\phi})^2 \cdot |\widehat{\mathbf{v}}_{\sigma, \mathbf{n}_{\sigma, K}}^{-}|^2 |[\mathbf{u}_{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\sigma, K}]^{-}| dS_x \right]^{1/2},$$

where the first term is controlled by (6.22). Under assumption $\Delta t = h$, the expression under the second square root (where we take \mathbf{v} on place of \mathbf{u} without loss of generality) admits the bound

$$\lesssim h^{\frac{1}{2} + \min\{0, \frac{9}{p_m} - \frac{3}{2}\}} \|\varrho\|_{L^\gamma(\Omega)}^{2-\gamma} \|(\Delta t)^{1/6} \mathbf{v}\|_{L^6(\Omega)}^3 \|\nabla_x \phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^2,$$

where $\frac{3}{p_m} + \frac{2-\gamma}{\gamma} = 1$ and $\|(\Delta t)^{1/6} \mathbf{v}\|_{L^6(\Omega)}^3$ is bounded in $L^1((0, T))$ and the power of h is positive provided $\gamma > 6/5$.¹⁴

(c) The estimate (7.19) is modified as follows,

$$\lesssim h \|\varrho\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^{1/2} \|\varrho \widehat{\mathbf{v}}^2\|_{L^1(\Omega)}^{1/2} \|\nabla_h \mathbf{v}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\nabla_x \phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \lesssim h^{1 - \frac{3}{2\gamma}} \|\nabla_h \mathbf{v}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\nabla_x \phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)},$$

where $\|\nabla_h \mathbf{v}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ is bounded in $L^2((0, T))$ and the power of h is positive provided $\gamma > 3/2$.

Alternatively, if $\kappa = 1$, we have in this case the bound

$$\lesssim h^{1 - \frac{1}{2\gamma} - \frac{1+\omega}{2\gamma}} \left(h^{\frac{1+\omega}{\gamma}} \|\varrho\|_{L^{3\gamma}(\Omega)} \right)^{1/2} \|\varrho \widehat{\mathbf{v}}^2\|_{L^1(\Omega)}^{1/2} \|\nabla_h \mathbf{v}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\nabla_x \phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)},$$

where $\left(h^{\frac{1+\omega}{\gamma}} \|\varrho\|_{L^{3\gamma}(\Omega)} \right)^{1/2} \|\varrho \widehat{\mathbf{v}}^2\|_{L^1(\Omega)}^{1/2} \|\nabla_h \mathbf{v}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ is bounded in $L^1((0, T))$ and the power of h is positive provided $\omega \in (0, 2(\gamma - 1))$. In the above, we have used, in particular, estimate (6.25).

(d) The estimate (7.20) now reads

$$\lesssim \kappa h^\omega \|\varrho\|_{L^\gamma(\Omega)} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^6(\Omega)} \|\nabla \phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)},$$

provided $\gamma \geq 6/5$.

(e) Finally, by the argumentation of (7.7), estimate (7.21) can be modified as

$$\lesssim h^{\frac{5\gamma-6}{6\gamma}} \|\varrho\|_{L^\gamma(\Omega)} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^6(\Omega)} \|\nabla_x \phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}.$$

2. Similar reasoning can be carried out if $\gamma \geq 2$ and in (3.15), $\underline{\pi} > 0$. In this case, we can take also advantage of estimates (6.20) and (6.21). We obtain, at least,

$$\alpha_M = \frac{1}{2} \text{ if } \kappa = 0 \text{ and } \alpha_M = \min\left\{\frac{1}{2}, \omega\right\} \text{ if } \kappa = 1.$$

¹⁴This is the place, where we cannot get a positive power of h for $\gamma \leq 6/5$ even if we take $\kappa = 1$ and employ estimate (6.25). This is not due to the boundary conditions. Indeed, the same limitation is observed for the no-slip boundary conditions.

7.3 Energy balance

Neglecting several positive terms at the left hand side and using the definition of Π^V and (2.1) in order to replace $\mathbf{u}_{B,\sigma} = \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{B,\sigma}$ by \mathbf{u}_B in the remaining boundary integrals, we can rewrite the energy identity (6.4) in the following form,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[\int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{1}{2} \varrho |\widehat{\mathbf{v}}|^2 + H_h(\varrho) \right) dx \right]_0^\tau + \int_0^\tau \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{S}(\nabla_h \mathbf{u}) : \nabla_h \mathbf{v} \, dx dt \\ & + \int_0^\tau \int_{\Gamma^{\text{out}}} H_h(\varrho) \mathbf{u}_B \cdot \mathbf{n} dS_x dt \lesssim - \int_0^\tau \int_{\Gamma^{\text{in}}} H_h(\varrho_B) \mathbf{u}_B \cdot \mathbf{n} dS_x dt \\ & - \int_0^\tau \int_{\Omega} \left(\varrho \widehat{\mathbf{u}} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{u}} + p_h(\varrho) \mathbb{I} \right) : \nabla_h \mathbf{u}_B \, dx dt + \int_0^\tau \int_{\Omega} \varrho \widehat{\mathbf{u}} \cdot \nabla_h \mathbf{u}_B \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_B \, dx dt + R_h^E[\varrho, \mathbf{u}], \end{aligned} \quad (7.23)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[R_h^E[\varrho, \mathbf{u}] \right](\tau) = \int_\tau^{\tau_m} \left[\int_{\Gamma^{\text{in}}} H_h(\varrho_B) |\mathbf{u}_B \cdot \mathbf{n}| dS_x + \int_{\Gamma^{\text{out}}} (d\varrho + e) |\mathbf{u}_B \cdot \mathbf{n}| dS_x \right. \\ & \left. - \int_{\Omega} \left(\varrho \widehat{\mathbf{u}} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{u}} + p_h(\varrho) \mathbb{I} \right) : \nabla_h \mathbf{u}_B \, dx + \int_{\Omega} \varrho \widehat{\mathbf{u}} \cdot \nabla_h \mathbf{u}_B \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_B \, dx \right] dt, \quad \tau \in (\tau_{m-1}, \tau_m], \quad m = 1, \dots, N; \end{aligned}$$

whence

$$\left| R_h^E[\varrho, \mathbf{u}] \right| \lesssim h, \quad \text{where } \Delta t = h \quad (7.24)$$

by virtue of (6.9–6.14), cf. also (6.3), (6.8), (6.7).

8 Convergence to a dissipative solution

We denote by $[\varrho_h, \mathbf{u}_h]$, $h > 0$ a sequence of numerical solution to the scheme (3.1–3.4). We want to show that there is a subsequence with weak limit $[\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{u}]$, and there is a positively semi-definite tensor measure \mathfrak{R} (which we shall construct as well), such that the couple $[\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{u}]$ and the associated \mathfrak{R} is a dissipative solution of the continuous problem (1.1–1.5) in the sense of Definition 1.1.

8.1 Weak limits. Continuity equation

Recalling regularity (1.3–1.4) of the initial and boundary data, we deduce from (4.2–4.3), (4.5) (4.6),

$$\varrho_{B,h} \rightarrow \mathbf{r}_B \text{ in } L^q(\Omega) \text{ and } L^q(\partial\Omega), \quad 1 \leq q \leq \infty, \quad (8.1)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{B,h} &\rightarrow \mathbf{u}_B, \quad \mathbf{u}_{B,h} \rightarrow \mathbf{u}_B, \quad \nabla_h \mathbf{u}_{B,h} \rightarrow \nabla_x \mathbf{u}_B \text{ in } L^q(\Omega), \quad 1 \leq q \leq \infty, \\ \varrho_h^0 &\rightarrow \mathbf{r}_0 \text{ in } L^q(\Omega), \quad \mathbf{u}_h^0 \rightarrow \mathbf{u}_0 \text{ in } L^q(\Omega), \quad 1 \leq q \leq \infty. \end{aligned}$$

By virtue of estimate (6.14) and Jensen's inequality (4.1),

$$\|\widehat{\mathbf{v}}_h\|_{L^2(0,T;L^6(\Omega))} \lesssim 1. \quad (8.2)$$

Consequently,¹⁵

$$\widehat{\mathbf{v}}_h \rightharpoonup \mathbf{v}, \quad \mathbf{v}_h \rightarrow \mathbf{v} \text{ in } L^2(0,T;L^6(\Omega)) \quad (8.3)$$

¹⁵All convergences in this section hold for a chosen subsequence of the original sequence; for the sake of simplicity, we do not relabel.

again by virtue of (6.14), where the limit of both sequences is the same by virtue of (4.5). Further,

$$\int_{\Omega} \mathbf{v}_h \nabla_x \phi \, dx = - \int_{\Omega} \nabla_h \mathbf{v}_h \phi \, dx + I_h + J_h, \quad \phi \in C^1((0, T) \times \overline{\Omega}),$$

where

$$I_h := \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}(K)} \int_{\sigma} \mathbf{v}_h \mathbf{n}_{\sigma, K} \phi \, dS_x = \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}(K) \cap \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} \int_{\sigma} (\mathbf{v}_h - \mathbf{v}_{h, \sigma}) \mathbf{n}_{\sigma, K} (\phi - \phi_{\sigma}) \, dS_x, \quad J_h = \int_{\partial \Omega} \mathbf{v}_h \mathbf{n} \phi \, dS_x$$

admit the bounds

$$|I_h| \lesssim h \|\nabla_h \mathbf{v}_h\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2(\Omega))} \|\phi\|_{L^2(0, T; W^{1, 2}(\Omega))}, \quad |J_h| \lesssim h^{1/3} \|\nabla_h \mathbf{v}_h\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2(\Omega))} \|\phi\|_{L^2(0, T; W^{1, 2}(\Omega))} \quad (8.4)$$

by virtue of the Hölder inequality, trace estimates (4.14–4.15), the first inequality in (4.3), and in the second estimate also the standard Sobolev imbedding $W^{1, 2}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^6(\Omega)$, the fact that $\mathbf{v}_h \in V_0(\Omega; R^3)$ and that $|\cup_{K \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{ext}} \neq \emptyset} K| \lesssim h$. We deduce from this and from (6.14), on one hand,

$$\nabla_h \mathbf{v}_h \rightharpoonup \nabla_x \mathbf{v} \text{ in } L^2(0, T; L^2(\Omega)), \quad \text{and } \mathbf{v} \in L^2(0, T; W_0^{1, 2}(\Omega)), \quad (8.5)$$

and on the other hand, in particular,

$$\|\nabla_x \mathbf{v}_h\|_{L^2(0, T; W^{-1, 2}(\Omega))} \lesssim 1, \quad \|\nabla_x \widehat{\mathbf{v}}_h\|_{L^2(0, T; W^{-1, 2}(\Omega))} \lesssim 1, \quad (8.6)$$

where the very latter bound is derived from the previous one by virtue of (4.5).

According to (6.9), (6.13),

$$\|\varrho_h \widehat{\mathbf{v}}_h\|_{L^\infty(0, T; L^{\frac{2\gamma}{\gamma+1}}(\Omega))} \lesssim 1. \quad (8.7)$$

It is the consequence of (2.13) and (6.9) that

$$\underline{\varrho}_h \text{ is bounded in } L^\infty(0, T; L^\gamma(\Omega)). \quad (8.8)$$

Coming back with (8.7) and (6.9) to the continuity equation (7.2), we find, by virtue of Lemma 7.1, that for all $\phi \in C_c^1(\Omega)$,

$$\int_{\Omega} \underline{\varrho}_h(t) \phi \, dx = A_h^\phi(t) + B_h^\phi(t),$$

where $t \mapsto A_h^\phi(t)$ is equi-bounded and equi-continuous in $C([0, T])$ while $B_h^\phi \rightarrow 0$ in $C([0, T])$. Consequently, by density of $C_c^1(\Omega)$ in $L^{\gamma'}(\Omega)$ and by the Arzela-Ascoli type argument, we get

$$\underline{\varrho}_h \rightarrow \mathbf{r} \text{ in } C_{\text{weak}}([0, T]; L^\gamma(\Omega)). \quad (8.9)$$

We have also, by virtue of (6.9),

$$\varrho_h \rightharpoonup_* \mathbf{r} \text{ in } L^\infty(0, T; L^\gamma(\Omega)). \quad (8.10)$$

The limits (8.9), (8.10) are the same, since $\|\underline{\varrho}_h - \varrho_h\|_{L^1((0, T) \times \Omega)} \lesssim (\Delta t)^{1/2} h^{-\eta/2}$ due to (2.13) and (6.15).

Due to (8.7),

$$\varrho_h \widehat{\mathbf{v}}_h \rightharpoonup_* \mathbf{s} \text{ in } L^\infty(0, T; L^{\frac{2\gamma}{\gamma+1}}(\Omega)), \quad \mathbf{s} = \mathbf{r} \mathbf{v} \quad (8.11)$$

where the latter identity follows from Lemma 4.2, where we set $r_n \approx \varrho_h$, $v_n \approx \widehat{\mathbf{v}}_h$, $\mathbf{g}_n \approx \varrho_h \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_h$, $h_n \approx R_h^C$. (Indeed, one easily checks by using (7.9), (8.7), (8.3), (8.6), (8.9), that assumptions of the Lemma 4.2 are satisfied.¹⁶)

Finally, due to estimate (6.14)

$$\varrho_h \rightharpoonup \mathbf{r} \text{ in } L^\gamma(0, T; L^\gamma(\partial\Omega, |\mathbf{u}_B \cdot \mathbf{n}| dS_x)). \quad (8.12)$$

At this stage we can pass to the limit in the consistency formulation (7.2) of the continuity equation. Due to Lemma 7.1

$$\int_0^\tau \langle R_h^C, \phi \rangle dt \rightarrow 0$$

and we obtain the weak formulation (1.11).

8.2 Limit in the momentum equation

According to (6.9), (6.11),

$$\|p_h(\varrho_h)\|_{L^\infty(0, T; L^1(\Omega))} \lesssim 1. \quad (8.13)$$

In view of (2.13) and (8.7),

$$\underline{\varrho}_h \widehat{\mathbf{v}}_h \text{ is bounded in } L^\infty(0, T; L^{\frac{2\gamma}{\gamma+1}}(\Omega)). \quad (8.14)$$

Coming back with (6.13–6.14), (8.13) to the momentum equation (7.11), we obtain by the same arguments as in (8.9), employing now Lemma 7.2 (instead of Lemma 7.1),

$$\underline{\mathbf{q}}_h \rightarrow \mathbf{q} \text{ in } C_{\text{weak}}([0, T]; L^{\frac{2\gamma}{\gamma+1}}(\Omega)), \quad \mathbf{q}_h := \varrho_h \widehat{\mathbf{v}}_h, \quad (8.15)$$

where

$$\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{r}\mathbf{v} \text{ a.e. in } (0, T) \times \Omega.$$

Indeed, the latter identity can be deduced from (8.11) and from the inequality

$$\|\underline{\varrho}_h \widehat{\mathbf{v}}_h - \varrho_h \widehat{\mathbf{v}}_h\|_{L^1((0, T) \times \Omega)} \lesssim (\Delta t)^{1/2} h^{-\eta/2}$$

which follows from (2.13) and (6.15–6.16).

Due to (8.1) and (8.15), also,

$$\underline{\mathbf{m}}_h \rightarrow \mathbf{m} \text{ in } C_{\text{weak}}([0, T]; L^{\frac{2\gamma}{\gamma+1}}(\Omega)), \quad \mathbf{m}_h := \varrho_h \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_h \quad (8.16)$$

where

$$\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{r}\mathbf{u} \text{ a.e. in } (0, T) \times \Omega \text{ and } \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u}_B. \quad (8.17)$$

We introduce

$$\mathbb{E}(r, \mathbf{z}) = \begin{cases} \frac{\mathbf{z} \otimes \mathbf{z}}{r}, & \text{if } \mathbf{z} \in R^3, r > 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } \mathbf{z} \in R^3, r = 0 \\ +\infty & \text{if } \mathbf{z} \in R^3, r < 0 \end{cases},$$

$$E^{(\xi)}(r, \mathbf{z}) := \xi^T \mathbb{E}(r, \mathbf{z}) \xi = \begin{cases} \frac{|\mathbf{z} \cdot \xi|^2}{r}, & \text{if } \mathbf{z} \in R^3, r > 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } \mathbf{z} \in R^3, r = 0 \\ +\infty & \text{if } \mathbf{z} \in R^3, r < 0 \end{cases}.$$

¹⁶This is the only point, where we need "additional" L^p -estimate (7.9).

In the above $\xi \in R^3$. We observe that $(r, \mathbf{z}) \mapsto E^{(\xi)}(r, \mathbf{z})$ is a lower semi-continuous convex function on R^4 and that

$$\mathbb{E}(\varrho_h, \widehat{\mathbf{m}}_h) = \varrho_h \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_h \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_h.$$

whence, recalling estimate (6.13), we obtain, by a sequential version of the Banach-Alaoglu-Bourbaki theorem

$$\mathbb{E}(\varrho_h, \widehat{\mathbf{m}}_h) \rightharpoonup_* \overline{\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{m})} \text{ in } L^\infty(0, T; \mathcal{M}(\overline{\Omega}; R_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})) \quad (8.18)$$

while¹⁷

$$\overline{\xi^T \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{r}, \widehat{\mathbf{m}}) \xi} - E^{(\xi)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{m}) \geq 0, \quad \text{and } E^{(\xi)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{m}) \in L^\infty(0, T; L^1(\Omega)). \quad (8.19)$$

by virtue of Lemma 4.3. Consequently, seeing (8.17),

$$\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{m}) = \mathbf{r}\mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{u} \in L^\infty(0, T; L^1(\Omega)).$$

We reserve the same treatment to the sequence $p_h(\varrho_h)\mathbb{I}$. Due to (8.13), and since, by (1.8), (3.5), p_h is convex, we have,

$$p_h(\varrho_h)\mathbb{I} \rightharpoonup_* \overline{p(\mathbf{r})}\mathbb{I} \text{ in } L^\infty(0, T; \mathcal{M}(\overline{\Omega}; R_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})), \quad (8.20)$$

where

$$\overline{p(\mathbf{r})} - p(\mathbf{r}) \geq 0, \quad p(\mathbf{r}) \in L^\infty(0, T; L^1(\Omega)).$$

Last but not least, we introduce

$$\mathfrak{R} := \left(\overline{\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{m})} + \overline{p(\mathbf{r})}\mathbb{I} \right) - \left(\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{m}) + p(\mathbf{r})\mathbb{I} \right); \quad (8.21)$$

in view of (8.19–8.20),

$$\text{for all } \xi \in R^3, \quad \xi^T \mathfrak{R} \xi \in L^\infty(0, T; \mathcal{M}^+(\overline{\Omega})) \text{ i.e., } \mathfrak{R} \in L^\infty(0, T; \mathcal{M}^+(\overline{\Omega}; R_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})).$$

Finally, due to Lemma 7.2,

$$\int_0^\tau \langle R_{h,h}^M, \phi \rangle dt \rightarrow 0.$$

Now, we are ready to pass to the limit in the momentum equation (7.11), in order to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_\Omega \mathbf{q} \cdot \phi(\tau, x) dx - \int_\Omega \mathbf{r}_0 \mathbf{v}_0 \cdot \phi(0, x) dx \\ & - \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \left(\mathbf{r}\mathbf{v} \cdot \partial_t \phi + \left(\mathbf{r}\mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{u} + p(\mathbf{r})\mathbb{I} \right) : \nabla_x \phi \right) dx dt \\ & + \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \mathbf{r}\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla(\mathbf{u}_B \cdot \phi) dx dt + \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \mathbb{S}(\nabla_x \mathbf{u}) : \nabla_x \phi dx dt = \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \nabla_x \phi : d\mathfrak{R}(t) dt. \end{aligned} \quad (8.22)$$

According to (1.11),

$$\int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \mathbf{r}\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla_x(\mathbf{u}_B \cdot \phi) dx dt = - \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \mathbf{r}\mathbf{u}_B \cdot \partial_t \phi dx dt + \left[\int_\Omega \mathbf{r}\mathbf{u}_B \cdot \phi dx \right]_0^\tau$$

we obtain from (8.22) the formulation (1.12) of the momentum equation.

¹⁷Here and hereafter $\overline{f(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{v}, \nabla_x \mathbf{v}, \dots)}$ denotes a star-weak limit of the sequence $f(\varrho_h, \mathbf{v}_h, \nabla_h \mathbf{v}_h, \dots)$.

8.3 Limit in the energy balance

Due to estimate (6.13)

$$\mathrm{Tr}[\mathbb{E}(\varrho_h, \varrho_h \widehat{\mathbf{v}}_h)] = \frac{|\varrho_h \widehat{\mathbf{v}}_h|^2}{\varrho_h} \rightharpoonup_* \overline{\mathrm{Tr}[\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{q})]} := \overline{\left(\frac{\mathbf{q}^2}{\mathbf{r}}\right)} \text{ in } L^\infty(0, T; \mathcal{M}(\overline{\Omega})),$$

where, for almost all $\tau \in (0, T)$,

$$\overline{\left(\frac{\mathbf{q}^2}{\mathbf{r}}\right)}(\tau) \geq \mathrm{Tr}[\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{r}(\tau), \mathbf{q}(\tau))] = \mathbf{r}\mathbf{v}^2(\tau)$$

by virtue of Lemma 4.3. Likewise, by the same token, due to estimate (6.9)

$$H_h(\varrho_h) \rightharpoonup_* \overline{H(\mathbf{r})} \text{ in } L^\infty(0, T; \mathcal{M}(\overline{\Omega})), \quad \overline{H(\mathbf{r})} \geq H(\mathbf{r}).$$

We can thus introduce

$$\mathfrak{E} = \left[\frac{1}{2} \overline{\left(\frac{\mathbf{q}^2}{\mathbf{r}}\right)} + \overline{H(\mathbf{r})} \right] - \left[\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{r}\mathbf{v}^2 + H(\mathbf{r}) \right] \in L^\infty(0, T; \mathcal{M}^+(\overline{\Omega})).$$

Clearly, in definition of \mathfrak{E} , one can replace \mathbf{q} by \mathbf{m} and \mathbf{v} by \mathbf{u} . Consequently, due to the structural property (1.8) of the pressure p ,

$$0 \leq D\mathrm{Tr}(\mathfrak{R}) \leq \mathfrak{E} \text{ where } D = \min\{1/2, \underline{a}/3\}. \quad (8.23)$$

Finally, we use (8.12) in conjunction with Lemma 4.3 to show

$$\int_0^\tau \int_{\Gamma_{\mathrm{out}}} H(\mathbf{r}) \mathbf{u}_B \cdot \mathbf{n} dS_x dt \leq \liminf_{h \rightarrow 0} \int_0^\tau \int_{\Gamma_{\mathrm{out}}} H(\varrho_h) \mathbf{u}_B \cdot \mathbf{n} dS_x dt.$$

We can now pass to the limit in the consistency formulation (7.23) of the energy balance, in order to get energy inequality in the form (1.13).

This finishes the proof of the first part of Theorem 3.2.

9 Strong convergence to a strong solution

Let $[\varrho_h, \mathbf{u}_h]$ be any subsequence (not relabeled) of the sequence $[\varrho_h, \mathbf{u}_h]$. Then it contains a subsequence converging weakly (in the sense (3.7–3.10)) to a dissipative solution $[\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{u}]$ with defect \mathfrak{R} .

Let $[r, \mathbf{U}]$ be a strong solution of the problem (1.1–1.5) emanating from the same initial and boundary data as the dissipative solution $[\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{u}]$. Then according to Lemma 1.1, $\mathbf{r} = r$, $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{U}$ and the Reynolds defect $\mathfrak{R} = 0$.

We have one one hand: Any subsequence of the whole sequence $[\varrho_h, \mathbf{u}_h]$ admits a weakly convergent subsequence – in the sense (3.7–3.9) – converging to $[r, \mathbf{U}]$; whence the whole sequence weakly converges to $[r, \mathbf{U}]$.

On the other hand $\mathfrak{R} = 0$ which implies immediately the convergence (3.11–3.12) by virtue of (8.21), (8.23).

This finishes the proof of the first item in the second part of Theorem 3.2.

10 Relative energy for the numerical solution

The relative energy is a basic tool for showing explicit convergence rate of the strong convergence of numerical solutions to a strong solution (provided that the latter exist). Our goal is to evaluate the time evolution of

$$\mathcal{E}_h(\varrho, \widehat{\mathbf{v}} \mid r, \mathbf{V}) = \mathcal{E}(\varrho, \widehat{\mathbf{v}} \mid r, \mathbf{V}) + h^\eta \int_{\Omega} (\varrho - r)^2 dx$$

where the relative energy functional $\mathcal{E}(\cdot, \cdot \mid \cdot, \cdot)$ is introduced in (1.9), $[\varrho, \mathbf{u}]$ is a numerical solution (of system (3.1–3.4)) and $[r, \mathbf{V}]$ are test functions in the class (1.14). To achieve this goal we will be mimicking the proofs from the "continuous case", see [18], [52], [1] using the consistency formulations (7.2), (7.11) and (7.23) of the continuity, momentum and energy balance laws. Before starting, to this end, we have, however, make compatible the consistency formulations of the continuity and momentum equations with the formulation (7.23) of the energy inequality.

In view (2.12–2.13), we deduce from (7.2),

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \varrho \phi(\tau) dx - \int_{\Omega} \varrho^0 \phi(0) dx - \int_0^\tau \int_{\Omega} (\varrho \partial_t \phi + \varrho \widehat{\mathbf{u}} \cdot \nabla_x \phi) dx dt + \int_0^\tau \int_{\Gamma^{\text{out}}} \varrho \mathbf{u}_B \cdot \mathbf{n} \phi dS_x dt \\ + \int_0^\tau \int_{\Gamma^{\text{in}}} \varrho_B \mathbf{u}_B \cdot \mathbf{n} \phi dS_x dt = \langle \Pi_{h, \Delta t}^C(\tau), \phi \rangle, \quad \tau \in (0, T], \end{aligned} \quad (10.1)$$

with all $\phi \in C^1([0, T] \times \overline{\Omega})$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Pi_{h, \Delta t}^C(\tau), \phi \rangle = \int_{\Omega} \varrho(\tau)(\phi(\tau) - \phi(\tau_m)) dx + \int_0^{\tau_m} \langle R_{h, \Delta t}^C, \phi \rangle dt \\ + \int_0^{\tau_m} \int_{\Omega} (\underline{\varrho} - \varrho) \partial_t \phi dx dt + \int_\tau^{\tau_m} \left[\int_{\Omega} (\varrho \partial_t \phi + \varrho \widehat{\mathbf{u}} \cdot \nabla_x \phi) dx \right. \\ \left. - \int_{\Gamma^{\text{out}}} \varrho \mathbf{u}_B \cdot \mathbf{n} \phi dS_x - \int_{\Gamma^{\text{in}}} \varrho_B \mathbf{u}_B \cdot \mathbf{n} \phi dS_x \right] dt, \quad \tau \in (\tau_{m-1}, \tau_m], \quad m = 1, \dots, N. \end{aligned}$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{\tau_m} \int_{\Omega} |\underline{\varrho} - \varrho| |\partial_t \phi| dx dt \lesssim \Delta t \sum_{k=1}^m \|\varrho^k - \varrho^{k-1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\partial_t \phi\|_{L^\infty((0, T) \times \Omega)} \\ \lesssim (\Delta t)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{k=1}^m \|\varrho^k - \varrho^{k-1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \right)^{1/2} \lesssim (\Delta t)^{1/2} h^{-\eta/2} \end{aligned}$$

by virtue of (2.13), where the last inequality follows from (6.15). Employing in estimating of the other terms (6.11), (6.12), (6.13) and (7.8) we get

$$\left| \langle \Pi_{h, h}^C(\tau), \phi \rangle \right| \lesssim h^{\alpha_C} \|\phi, \nabla_x \phi, \partial_t \phi\|_{L^\infty((0, T) \times \Omega)}. \quad (10.2)$$

Concerning the momentum equation, we deduce from (7.11) by the same token,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \varrho \widehat{\mathbf{v}} \cdot \phi(\tau, x) dx - \int_{\Omega} \varrho^0 \widehat{\mathbf{v}}^0 \cdot \phi(0, x) dx \\ - \int_0^\tau \int_{\Omega} \left[\varrho \widehat{\mathbf{v}} \cdot \partial_t \phi + \left(\varrho \widehat{\mathbf{u}} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{u}} + p_h(\varrho) \mathbb{I} \right) : \nabla_x \phi \right] dx dt + \int_0^\tau \int_{\Omega} \varrho \widehat{\mathbf{u}} \cdot \nabla_h(\mathbf{u}_B \cdot \phi) dx dt \end{aligned} \quad (10.3)$$

$$+ \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \mathbb{S}(\nabla_h \mathbf{u}) : \nabla_x \phi \, dx dt = \langle \Pi_{h,\Delta t}^M(\tau), \phi \rangle, \quad \tau \in (0, T],$$

with all $\phi \in C_c^1([0, T] \times \Omega, R^3)$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Pi_{h,\Delta t}^M(\tau), \phi \rangle &= \int_\Omega \varrho \widehat{\mathbf{v}}(\tau) \cdot (\phi(\tau) - \phi(\tau_m)) \, dx + \int_0^{\tau_m} \langle R_{h,\Delta t}^M, \phi \rangle \, dt \\ &+ \int_0^{\tau_m} \int_\Omega (\varrho \widehat{\mathbf{v}} - \varrho \widehat{\mathbf{v}}) \partial_t \phi \, dx dt + \int_\tau^{\tau_m} \left[\int_\Omega \left((\varrho \widehat{\mathbf{u}} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{u}} + p_h(\varrho) \mathbb{I}) : \nabla_x \phi - \varrho \widehat{\mathbf{u}} \cdot \nabla_h(\mathbf{u}_B \cdot \phi) \right) \, dx \right. \\ &\left. + \int_\Omega \mathbb{S}(\nabla_h \mathbf{u}) : \nabla_x \phi \, dx \right] dt; \quad \tau \in (\tau_{m-1}, \tau_m], \quad \tau_m = m\Delta t, \quad m = 1, \dots, N; \end{aligned} \quad (10.4)$$

whence, using (6.11), (6.12), (6.13), (6.15–6.16) and (7.22), we get

$$\left| \langle \Pi_{h,h}^M(\tau), \phi \rangle \right| \lesssim h^{\alpha_M} \|\phi, \nabla_x \phi, \partial_t \phi\|_{L^\infty((0,T) \times \Omega)}. \quad (10.5)$$

10.1 Relative energy inequality

We calculate,

$$(7.23) + (10.2)_{\phi=\frac{1}{2}|\mathbf{V}|^2-H'_h(r)} + (10.5)_{\phi=-\mathbf{v}}$$

1. We denote $\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{V} + \mathbf{u}_B$ and recall that $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{v} + \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_B$.
2. The above expression gives the following inequality

$$\begin{aligned} &\left[\int_\Omega \mathcal{E}_h(\varrho, \widehat{\mathbf{v}} \mid r, \mathbf{V}) \, dx \right]_{t=0}^{t=\tau} + \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \mathbb{S}(\nabla_h \mathbf{u}) : \nabla_h(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{U}) \, dx dt \\ &+ \int_0^\tau \int_{\Gamma_{\text{out}}} [H_h(\varrho) - H'_h(r)\varrho] \mathbf{u}_B \cdot \mathbf{n} \, dS_x dt + \int_0^\tau \int_{\Gamma_{\text{in}}} [H_h(\varrho_B) - H'_h(r)\varrho_B] \mathbf{u}_B \cdot \mathbf{n} \, dS_x dt \\ &\leq - \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \left[\varrho \widehat{\mathbf{u}} \cdot \partial_t \mathbf{U} + \varrho \widehat{\mathbf{u}} \cdot \nabla_x \mathbf{U} \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{u}} + p_h(\varrho) \operatorname{div}_x \mathbf{U} \right] \, dx dt + \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \partial_t p_h(r) \, dx dt \\ &\quad + \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \left[\varrho \partial_t \left(\frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{U}|^2 - H'_h(r) \right) + \varrho \widehat{\mathbf{u}} \cdot \nabla_x \left(\frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{U}|^2 - H'_h(r) \right) \right] \, dx dt \\ &\quad + \int_0^\tau \mathcal{R}_h^R[\varrho, \mathbf{v}, r, \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{u}_B](t) dt + R_h^E[\varrho, \mathbf{u}](\tau) \end{aligned} \quad (10.6)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_h^R[\varrho, \mathbf{v}, r, \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{u}_B] &= \langle \Pi_{h,h}^C, \frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{V}|^2 - H'_h(r) \rangle - \langle \Pi_{h,h}^M, \mathbf{V} \rangle \\ &+ \int_\Omega \left(\mathbb{S}(\nabla_h \mathbf{u}) : \nabla_h(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_B - \mathbf{u}_B) + p_h(\varrho) \operatorname{div}_h(\mathbf{u}_B - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_B) + \varrho \partial_t \mathbf{U} \cdot (\widehat{\mathbf{u}}_B - \mathbf{u}_B) \right. \\ &\left. + \varrho \widehat{\mathbf{u}} \cdot \nabla_h \mathbf{u}_B \cdot (\widehat{\mathbf{u}}_B - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_B) + \varrho \widehat{\mathbf{u}} \cdot \nabla_x \mathbf{V} \cdot (\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_B - \mathbf{u}_B) + \varrho \widehat{\mathbf{u}} \cdot \nabla_h(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_B - \mathbf{u}_B) \cdot (\mathbf{V} - \widehat{\mathbf{v}}) \right) dx. \end{aligned}$$

3. Regrouping conveniently several terms in the above expression, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left[\int_{\Omega} \mathcal{E}_h \left(\varrho, \widehat{\mathbf{v}} \mid r, \mathbf{V} \right) dx \right]_{t=0}^{t=\tau} + \int_0^{\tau} \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{S}(\nabla_h \mathbf{u}) : \nabla_h (\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{U}) dx dt \\
& + \int_0^{\tau} \int_{\Gamma_{\text{out}}} [H_h(\varrho) - H'_h(r)(\varrho - r) - H_h(r)] \mathbf{u}_B \cdot \mathbf{n} dS_x dt \\
& + \int_0^{\tau} \int_{\Gamma_{\text{in}}} [H_h(\varrho_B) - H'_h(r)(\varrho_B - r) - H_h(r)] \mathbf{u}_B \cdot \mathbf{n} dS_x dt \\
& \lesssim - \int_0^{\tau} \int_{\Omega} \varrho (\mathbf{U} - \widehat{\mathbf{u}}) \cdot \nabla_x \mathbf{U} \cdot (\mathbf{U} - \widehat{\mathbf{u}}) dx dt \\
& - \int_0^{\tau} \int_{\Omega} [p_h(\varrho) - p'_h(r)(\varrho - r) - p_h(r)] \operatorname{div}_x \mathbf{U} dx dt \\
& + \int_0^{\tau} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\varrho}{r} (\mathbf{U} - \widehat{\mathbf{u}}) \cdot \left[\partial_t (r \mathbf{U}) + \operatorname{div}_x (r \mathbf{U} \otimes \mathbf{U}) + \nabla_x p_h(r) \right] dx dt \\
& + \int_0^{\tau} \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{\varrho}{r} (\widehat{\mathbf{u}} - \mathbf{U}) \cdot \mathbf{U} + p'_h(r) \left(1 - \frac{\varrho}{r} \right) \right) \left[\partial_t r + \operatorname{div}_x (r \mathbf{U}) \right] dx dt \\
& + \int_0^{\tau} \mathcal{R}_h^R[\varrho, \mathbf{v}, r, \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{u}_B](t) dt + R_h^E[\varrho, \mathbf{u}](\tau),
\end{aligned} \tag{10.7}$$

4. We shall continue to re-arranging the inequality (10.7) and write

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left[\int_{\Omega} \mathcal{E}_h \left(\varrho, \widehat{\mathbf{v}} \mid r, \mathbf{V} \right) dx \right]_{t=0}^{t=\tau} + \int_0^{\tau} \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{S}(\nabla_h (\mathbf{u} - \tilde{\mathbf{U}})) : \nabla_h (\mathbf{u} - \tilde{\mathbf{U}}) dx dt \\
& + \int_0^{\tau} \int_{\Gamma_{\text{out}}} [H_h(\varrho) - H'_h(r)(\varrho - r) - H_h(r)] \mathbf{u}_B \cdot \mathbf{n} dS_x dt \\
& + \int_0^{\tau} \int_{\Gamma_{\text{in}}} [H_h(\varrho_B) - H'_h(r)(\varrho_B - r) - H_h(r)] \mathbf{u}_B \cdot \mathbf{n} dS_x dt \\
& \lesssim - \int_0^{\tau} \int_{\Omega} \varrho (\mathbf{V} - \widehat{\mathbf{v}}) \cdot \nabla_x \mathbf{U} \cdot (\mathbf{V} - \widehat{\mathbf{v}}) dx dt \\
& - \int_0^{\tau} \int_{\Omega} [p_h(\varrho) - p'_h(r)(\varrho - r) - p_h(r)] \operatorname{div}_x \mathbf{U} dx dt \\
& + \int_0^{\tau} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\varrho}{r} (\mathbf{U} - \widehat{\mathbf{u}}) \cdot \left[\partial_t (r \mathbf{U}) + \operatorname{div}_x (r \mathbf{U} \otimes \mathbf{U}) + \nabla_x p(r) \right] dx dt - \int_0^{\tau} \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{S}(\nabla_x \mathbf{U}) : \nabla_h (\mathbf{u} - \tilde{\mathbf{U}}) dx dt \\
& + \int_0^{\tau} \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{\varrho}{r} (\widehat{\mathbf{u}} - \mathbf{U}) \cdot \mathbf{U} + p'_h(r) \left(1 - \frac{\varrho}{r} \right) \right) \left[\partial_t r + \operatorname{div}_x (r \mathbf{U}) \right] dx dt \\
& + \int_0^{\tau} \mathbb{R}_h^R[\varrho, \mathbf{v}, r, \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{u}_B](t) dt + R_h^E[\varrho, \mathbf{u}](\tau),
\end{aligned} \tag{10.8}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{R}_h^R[\varrho, \mathbf{v}, r, \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{u}_B] &= \mathcal{R}_h^R[\varrho, \mathbf{v}, r, \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{u}_B] + \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{S}(\nabla_h \mathbf{u}) : \nabla_h (\mathbf{U} - \tilde{\mathbf{U}}) dx - \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{S}(\nabla_h (\tilde{\mathbf{U}} - \mathbf{U})) : \nabla_h (\mathbf{u} - \tilde{\mathbf{U}}) dx \\
& + \int_{\Omega} (\varrho \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_B - \mathbf{u}_B) \cdot \nabla_x \mathbf{U} \cdot (\mathbf{U} - \widehat{\mathbf{u}}) dx + \int_{\Omega} \varrho (\widehat{\mathbf{v}} - \mathbf{V}) \cdot \nabla_x \mathbf{V} \cdot (\mathbf{u}_B - \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_B) dx + 2h^n \int_{\Omega} \varrho \nabla_x r \cdot (\mathbf{U} - \widehat{\mathbf{u}}) dx.
\end{aligned}$$

5. The strategy we want to apply recommends to estimate the right hand side of (10.7)–where $[r, \mathbf{U}]$ is a strong solution of (1.1–1.5)– via the relative energy functional. Seeing the quantities being compared in the relative energy functional, we shall still rewrite (10.8) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left[\int_{\Omega} \mathcal{E}_h(\varrho, \widehat{\mathbf{v}} \mid r, \mathbf{V}) \, dx \right]_{t=0}^{t=\tau} + \int_0^\tau \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{S}(\nabla_h(\mathbf{u} - \tilde{\mathbf{U}})) : \nabla_h(\mathbf{u} - \tilde{\mathbf{U}}) \, dx dt \quad (10.9) \\
& + \int_0^\tau \int_{\Gamma_{\text{out}}} [H_h(\varrho) - H'_h(r)(\varrho - r) - H_h(r)] \mathbf{u}_B \cdot \mathbf{n} \, dS_x dt \\
& + \int_0^\tau \int_{\Gamma_{\text{in}}} [H_h(\varrho_B) - H'_h(r)(\varrho_B - r) - H_h(r)] \mathbf{u}_B \cdot \mathbf{n} \, dS_x dt \\
& \quad \lesssim - \int_0^\tau \int_{\Omega} \varrho(\mathbf{V} - \widehat{\mathbf{v}}) \cdot \nabla_x \mathbf{U} \cdot (\mathbf{V} - \widehat{\mathbf{v}}) \, dx dt \\
& \quad - \int_0^\tau \int_{\Omega} [p_h(\varrho) - p'_h(r)(\varrho - r) - p_h(r)] \operatorname{div}_x \mathbf{U} \, dx dt \\
& + \int_0^\tau \int_{\Omega} 1_{\varrho \geq 2\bar{r}}(\varrho) \frac{\varrho}{r} (\mathbf{U} - \widehat{\mathbf{u}}) \cdot [\partial_t(r\mathbf{U}) + \operatorname{div}_x(r\mathbf{U} \otimes \mathbf{U}) + \nabla_x p(r)] \, dx dt \\
& \quad + \int_0^\tau \int_{\Omega} 1_{\varrho \geq 2\bar{r}}(\varrho) (\widehat{\mathbf{u}} - \mathbf{U}) \cdot \operatorname{div}_x(\mathbb{S}(\nabla_x \mathbf{U})) \, dx dt \\
& + \int_0^\tau \int_{\Omega} 1_{\varrho \leq 2\bar{r}}(\varrho) \frac{\varrho}{r} (\tilde{\mathbf{U}} - \mathbf{u}) \cdot [\partial_t(r\mathbf{U}) + \operatorname{div}_x(r\mathbf{U} \otimes \mathbf{U}) + \nabla_x p(r)] \, dx dt \\
& \quad + \int_0^\tau \int_{\Omega} 1_{\varrho \leq 2\bar{r}}(\varrho) (\mathbf{u} - \tilde{\mathbf{U}}) \cdot \operatorname{div}_x(\mathbb{S}(\nabla_x \mathbf{U})) \, dx dt \\
& + \int_0^\tau \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{\varrho}{r} (\widehat{\mathbf{u}} - \mathbf{U}) \cdot \mathbf{U} + p'_h(r) \left(1 - \frac{\varrho}{r} \right) \right) [\partial_t r + \operatorname{div}_x(r\mathbf{U})] \, dx dt \\
& \quad + \int_0^\tau R_h^R[\varrho, \mathbf{v}, r, \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{u}_B](t) dt + R_h^E[\varrho, \mathbf{u}](\tau),
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
& R_h^R[\varrho, \mathbf{v}, r, \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{u}_B] = \mathbb{R}_h^R[\varrho, \mathbf{v}, r, \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{u}_B] \\
& \quad + \int_{\Omega} 1_{\varrho \geq 2\bar{r}}(\varrho) \operatorname{div}_x(\mathbb{S}(\nabla_x \mathbf{U})) \cdot (\mathbf{u} - \widehat{\mathbf{u}} + \mathbf{U} - \tilde{\mathbf{U}}) \, dx \\
& + \int_0^\tau \int_{\Omega} 1_{\varrho \leq 2\bar{r}}(\varrho) \frac{\varrho}{r} (\mathbf{U} - \tilde{\mathbf{U}} + \mathbf{u} - \widehat{\mathbf{u}}) \cdot [\partial_t(r\mathbf{U}) + \operatorname{div}_x(r\mathbf{U} \otimes \mathbf{U}) + \nabla_x p(r)] \, dx dt \\
& \quad - \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}(K)} \int_{\sigma} \mathbf{n}_{\sigma, K} \cdot \mathbb{S}(\nabla_x \mathbf{U}) \cdot (\mathbf{u} - \tilde{\mathbf{U}}) dS_x.
\end{aligned}$$

In the above, we have, among others, integrate by parts in $\int_{\Omega} \mathbb{S}(\nabla_x \mathbf{U}) : \nabla_h(\mathbf{u} - \tilde{\mathbf{U}}) \, dx$ and then ”dispatch” the volume integral conveniently, to the sets $\{\varrho \leq 2\bar{r}\}$ and $\{\varrho > 2\bar{r}\}$. We recall that \bar{r} is defined in (3.13).

Since $\mathbf{u} - \tilde{\mathbf{U}} = \mathbf{v} - \tilde{\mathbf{V}}$, the latter term in $R_h^R[\varrho, \mathbf{v}, r, \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{u}_B]$ is equal to

$$- \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}(K)} \int_{\sigma} \mathbf{n}_{\sigma, K} \cdot \mathbb{S}(\nabla_x \mathbf{U}) \cdot (\mathbf{v} - \tilde{\mathbf{V}}) dS_x$$

and thus its absolute value is $\lesssim \sqrt{h}$. Indeed, for any $\mathbf{w} \in V_0(\Omega; R^3)$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}(K)} \int_{\sigma} \mathbf{n}_{\sigma, K} \otimes \nabla_x \mathbf{U} \otimes \mathbf{w} dS_x &= \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}(K) \cap \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} \int_{\sigma} \mathbf{n}_{\sigma, K} \otimes (\nabla_x \mathbf{U} - (\nabla_x \mathbf{U})_{\sigma}) \otimes (\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}_{\sigma}) dS_x \\ &+ \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}(K) \cap \mathcal{E}_{\text{ext}}} \int_{\sigma} \mathbf{n}_{\sigma, K} \otimes \nabla_x \mathbf{U} \otimes \mathbf{w} dS_x \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact that both mean values of \mathbf{w} and $\nabla_x \mathbf{U}$ are continuous over each face $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}$. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}(K) \cap \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} \int_{\sigma} \mathbf{n}_{\sigma, K} \otimes \nabla_x \mathbf{U} \otimes \mathbf{w} dS_x \right| &\lesssim h \|\nabla_x^2 \mathbf{U}\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} \|\nabla_h \mathbf{w}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \\ \left| \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}(K) \cap \mathcal{E}_{\text{ext}}} \int_{\sigma} \mathbf{n}_{\sigma, K} \otimes \nabla_x \mathbf{U} \otimes \mathbf{w} dS_x \right| &\lesssim \sqrt{h} \|\nabla_x \mathbf{U}\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} \|\nabla_h \mathbf{w}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have adapted the reasoning from (8.4) (see also (7.5) and (7.7)).

Further, revisiting (10.6), the form of \mathbb{R}_h^R in (10.8), recalling that $\int_{\Omega} p_h(\varrho) \operatorname{div}_h(\mathbf{u}_B - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_B) dx = 0$, cf. (4.12), using (7.8), (7.22), (7.24) and employing (4.3), (4.6), (4.5) together with estimates proved in Lemma 6.2, we deduce

$$\left| \int_0^{\tau} R_h^R[\varrho, \mathbf{v}, r, \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{u}_B](t) dt \right| \lesssim C h^{\alpha_R}, \quad R_h^E[\varrho, \mathbf{u}](\tau) \lesssim h, \quad \alpha_R = \min\{\alpha_C, \alpha_M, \eta\} \quad (10.10)$$

with some number $C > 0$ which depends on the strong solution $[r, \mathbf{U}]$ as indicated in (3.13).

We have shown the following result.

Lemma 10.1 [Relative energy inequality for numerical solutions] *Let $[\varrho, \mathbf{u}]$ be a numerical solution of the algebraic system (3.1–3.4) in the setting (3.6) with the pressure satisfying (1.6–1.8) and the initial and boundary conditions verifying (1.2–1.4). Suppose that the couple $[r, \mathbf{V}]$ belongs to the class (1.14). Let $\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{V} + \mathbf{u}_B$. Then the relative energy inequality (10.9) holds for all $0 \leq \tau \leq T$. The remainders R_h^R, R_h^E verify estimates (10.10).*

10.2 Error estimates

Now, we use in the relative energy inequality (10.9) as test functions a strong solution $[r, \mathbf{U}]$ of problem (1.1–1.5) in the class (1.14).

In view of (1.1) we can rewrite (10.9) in the form

$$\left[\int_{\Omega} \mathcal{E}_h(\varrho, \hat{\mathbf{v}} \mid r, \mathbf{V}) dx \right]_{t=0}^{t=\tau} + \int_0^{\tau} \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{S}(\nabla_h(\mathbf{u} - \tilde{\mathbf{U}})) : \nabla_h(\mathbf{u} - \tilde{\mathbf{U}}) dx dt \quad (10.11)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \int_0^\tau \int_{\Gamma_{\text{out}}} [H_h(\varrho) - H'_h(r)(\varrho - r) - H_h(r)] \mathbf{u}_B \cdot \mathbf{n} \, dS_x dt \\
& \quad \lesssim - \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \varrho (\mathbf{V} - \widehat{\mathbf{v}}) \cdot \nabla_x \mathbf{U} \cdot (\mathbf{V} - \widehat{\mathbf{v}}) \, dx dt \\
& \quad - \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega [p_h(\varrho) - p'_h(r)(\varrho - r) - p_h(r)] \operatorname{div}_x \mathbf{U} \, dx dt \\
& + \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega 1_{\varrho \leq 2\bar{r}}(\varrho) \frac{\varrho - r}{r} (\tilde{\mathbf{U}} - \mathbf{u}) \cdot \operatorname{div}_x \mathbb{S}(\nabla_x \mathbf{U}) \, dx dt + \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega 1_{\varrho \geq 2\bar{r}}(\varrho) \frac{\varrho - r}{r} (\mathbf{U} - \widehat{\mathbf{u}}) \cdot \operatorname{div}_x \mathbb{S}(\nabla_x \mathbf{U}) \, dx dt + h^{\alpha_R},
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the inequality

$$\left| \int_0^\tau \int_{\Gamma_{\text{in}}} [H_h(\varrho_B) - H'_h(r)(\varrho_B - r) - H_h(r)] \mathbf{u}_B \cdot \mathbf{n} \, dS_x dt \right| \lesssim h^2$$

(recall that $\varrho_B = \widehat{\mathbf{v}}_B$).

At this stage, it is convenient to recall a simple but in our context important algebraic lemma:

Lemma 10.2 *Let $0 < a < b < \infty$ and let p satisfy (1.6–1.8). Then there exists a number $c = c(a, b) > 0$ such that for all $\varrho \in [0, \infty)$ and $r \in [a, b]$,*

$$E(\varrho|r) \geq c(a, b) \left(1_{\mathcal{O}_{\text{res}}}(\varrho) + \varrho 1_{\mathcal{O}_{\text{res}}}(\varrho) + 1_{\mathcal{O}_{\text{res}}}(\varrho) p(\varrho) + (\varrho - r)^2 1_{\mathcal{O}_{\text{ess}}}(\varrho) \right), \quad (10.12)$$

where E is defined in (1.9) and $\mathcal{O}_{\text{ess}} = [a/2, 2b]$, $\mathcal{O}_{\text{res}} = [0, \infty) \setminus \mathcal{O}_{\text{ess}}$.

With Lemma 10.2 it is rudimentary to see that

$$\left| \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \varrho (\mathbf{V} - \widehat{\mathbf{v}}) \cdot \nabla_x \mathbf{U} \cdot (\mathbf{V} - \widehat{\mathbf{v}}) \, dx dt \right| \lesssim C \int_0^\tau \mathcal{E}(\varrho, \widehat{\mathbf{v}}|r, \mathbf{V}) dt$$

and, under assumptions (1.6–1.8) on the pressure, also

$$\left| \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega [p(\varrho) - p'(r)(\varrho - r) - p(r)] \operatorname{div}_x \mathbf{U} \, dx dt \right| \lesssim C \int_0^\tau \mathcal{E}(\varrho, \widehat{\mathbf{v}}|r, \mathbf{V}) dt,$$

We observe that, under (1.6–1.8), also

$$\left| \int_0^\tau \int_{\varrho \geq 2\bar{r}} \frac{\varrho - r}{r} (\mathbf{U} - \widehat{\mathbf{u}}) \cdot \operatorname{div}_x \mathbb{S}(\nabla_x \mathbf{U}) dx dt \right| \lesssim C \left(\int_0^\tau \mathcal{E}(\varrho, \widehat{\mathbf{v}}|r, \mathbf{V}) dt + h \right)$$

while

$$\left| \int_0^\tau \int_{\varrho \leq 2\bar{r}} \frac{\varrho - r}{r} (\tilde{\mathbf{U}} - \mathbf{u}) \cdot \operatorname{div}_x \mathbb{S}(\nabla_x \mathbf{U}) dx dt \right| \lesssim \delta \int_0^\tau \|\tilde{\mathbf{U}} - \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 dt + c(\delta) C \int_0^\tau \mathcal{E}(\varrho, \widehat{\mathbf{v}}|r, \mathbf{V}) dt$$

In the last four estimates $\delta > 0$, $c = c(\delta) > 0$ and $C > 0$ depends on the strong solution at most as indicated in (3.13) and \bar{r} is defined in (3.13).

Finally recalling the inequality, cf. (4.11),

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{U}} - \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \lesssim \|\nabla_h(\tilde{\mathbf{U}} - \mathbf{u})\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2,$$

and estimates (10.10), we deduce from (10.9),

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[\int_{\Omega} \mathcal{E}_h(\varrho, \widehat{\mathbf{v}} \mid r, \mathbf{V}) \, dx \right]_{t=0}^{t=\tau} + \int_0^\tau \left(\|\tilde{\mathbf{U}} - \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\nabla_h(\tilde{\mathbf{U}} - \mathbf{u})\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \right) dt \\ & \lesssim C \left(h^{\alpha_R} + \int_0^\tau \mathcal{E}_h(\varrho, \widehat{\mathbf{v}} \mid r, \mathbf{V}) dt \right). \end{aligned}$$

Applying to (10.11) the Gronwall argument, we get the following lemma

Lemma 10.3 [Error estimates for the numerical solution] *Let assumptions of Lemma 10.1 be satisfied. Let $[\varrho_h, \mathbf{u}_h]$ be a numerical solution of the algebraic system (3.1–3.4) in the setting (3.6) emanating from the initial and boundary value data (1.2–1.4). Suppose that the couple $[r, \mathbf{U}]$, $\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{V} + \mathbf{u}_B$ belongs to the class (1.14) and represents a strong solution of the problem (1.1–1.5). Then*

$$\left[\int_{\Omega} \mathcal{E}_h(\varrho_h, \widehat{\mathbf{v}}_h \mid r, \mathbf{V}) \, dx \right]_{t=0}^{t=\tau} + \int_0^\tau \left(\|\tilde{\mathbf{U}} - \mathbf{u}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\nabla_h(\tilde{\mathbf{U}} - \mathbf{u}_h)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \right) dt \lesssim Ch^{\alpha_R},$$

where $\alpha_R = \min\{\alpha_C, \alpha_M, \eta\} > 0$ with $C > 0$ dependent on the strong solution in the way indicated in (10.7).

This finishes the proof of Theorem 3.2.

Remark 10.1 *In view of estimates evoked in Remark 6.2, and due to Remarks 7.1, 7.2 and (7.24), Lemma 10.3 remains true with $\alpha_R = \min\{\alpha_C, \alpha_M\} > 0$ also for the numerical solutions of the scheme (3.1–3.4) with $\tilde{\kappa} = 0$ and p in the class (1.6–1.8) in the situations described by conditions (3.15), (3.16) resp. (3.15), (3.17), (3.18), resp. (3.15), (3.17), (3.19). We let the details for the interested reader.*

11 Concluding remarks

In this section, we wish to mention some open problems related to the numerical approximations of the Navier-Stokes equations with non-homogenous boundary data.

1. In this paper, we consider only the case when the computational domain $\Omega_h = \cup_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} K$ coincides with the physical domain Ω . If this is not the case, one must work on so called unfitted meshes (see e.g. Babuška [2]), i.e. $\Omega_h \neq \Omega$. For the no-slip boundary conditions, a solution has been proposed in [19], [15] but for the non-homogenous boundary data, this problem is clearly more involved. Namely, the quality of approximation of Ω by Ω_h and of $\partial\Omega$ by $\partial\Omega_h$ will play a preponderant role, and remains to be determined.
2. Karper's scheme [50] is a colocalized scheme (the density and velocity are discretized on the same "primal" mesh). Quite often, the staggered schemes (the density resp. the pressure are discretized on a primal mesh while the velocity components on a "bi-dual" meshes) –as e.g. the Marker and Cell (MAC) finite difference schemes, [41], [37], [39], [31], [35] or staggered discretizations combined with Rannacher-Turek finite elements or Crouzeix-Raviart finite elements [43]– are computationally more efficient. It would be certainly of interest to extend the convergence results to dissipative solutions to these types of schemes.

3. Since the proof of convergence to dissipative solutions is relatively weakly scheme-structure dependent it would be of great interest to determine as weak as possible universal criteria imposed on the numerical scheme in order to obtain the convergence to the dissipative solutions. The universal description of several staggered schemes in one unique formalism provided in [43] may be a starting point to approach this task.
4. Gallouet et al. established in [38] the error estimates for the Karper's scheme and in [39] for the MAC scheme under assumption $\gamma > 3/2$ without any correlation between the time step Δt and the size of the space discretization h by using a different approach, which consists in mimicking the proof of the weak-strong uniqueness known from the continuous case (see [18]). For "large" values of γ , these estimates seem to be optimal judging from what can be obtained for the sole continuity equation with the same regularity of the transporting velocity field, see [54] for the discussion about the optimality. It is certainly of interest to try to prove similar results with the general non homogenous boundary data. The weak strong uniqueness principle established in this boundary value setting in the continuous case in [52] and later in [1] encourages the attempts in this direction.
5. Weak solutions to the problem (1.1–1.5) are known to exist for the adiabatic coefficients $\gamma > 3/2$, see [25] for the no-slip case and [6], [7], [52] for the general inflow-outflow boundary conditions. The proofs use, among others, very specific mathematical tools closely related to the structure of the system – as. e.g. compensated compactness and various commutator lemmas– the tools whose numerical counterpart is usually not available. The consistency formulation of the balance laws allows to bring the numerical solution close to a weak solution modulo a remainder, which in the case of the convergence to weak solutions must have a "better quality" than in the proofs of the convergence to the dissipative solutions. T. Karper provided in 2013 in [50] a convergence proof of the Karper's scheme to a weak solution under assumption $\gamma > 3$ in the case of the no-slip boundary conditions. To prove the same for the general inflow-outflow boundary data is definitely an imminent open problem whose solutions is of independent interest.
6. Last but not least some more complex hydrodynamical models with the similar structure of convective terms as e.g. models of compressible fluids with non-linear stress, see [1], fluids of compressible polymers, see Süli et al. [3], [20] or multi-fluid models with differential closure, see [55], could be treated on the basis of the methodology introduced in this paper. These studies would certainly be of a non negligible interest.

References

- [1] A. Abbatiello, E. Feireisl, and A. Novotný. Generalized solutions to models of compressible viscous fluids. Arxiv preprint No. 1912.12896, 2019.
- [2] I. Babuška. The finite element method with penalty *Math. Comput.* 27: 221-228, 1973.
- [3] J. W. Barrett, E. Süli. Existence of global weak solutions to compressible isentropic finitely extensible nonlinear bead-spring chainmodels for dilute polymers. *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.* 16 (2016) DOI: 10.1142/S0218202516500093
- [4] M. Bessemoulin-Chatard, C. Chainais-Hillairet, F. Filbet On discrete functional inequalities for some finite volume schemes. *IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis*, 2014

- [5] F. Brezzi, M. Fortin. *Mixed and hybrid finite element methods*. Springer Series in Computational Mathematics. Vol. 15, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1991.
- [6] T. Chang, B. J. Jin, and A. Novotný. Compressible Navier-Stokes system with general inflow-outflow boundary data. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, **51**(2):1238–1278, 2019.
- [7] H.J. Choe, A. Novotny, M. Yang Compressible Navier-Stokes system with general inflow-outflow boundary data on piecewise regular domains *ZAMM Z. Angew. Math. Mech.* 98(8): 1447–1471, 2018
- [8] M. Crouzeix, P-A. Raviart. Conforming and nonconforming finite element methods for solving the stationary Stokes equations. *Rev. Francaise Automat. In-format. Recherche Opérationnelle Sér. Rouge* 7: 3375, 1973
- [9] V. Dolejší, E. Feistauer, J. Felcman, A. Kliková. Error estimates for barycentric finite volumes combined with nonconforming finite elements applied to nonlinear convection diffusion problems. *Appl. Maths.* 47: 301-340, 2002
- [10] L.C. Evans *Partial Differential Equations*. Graduate Studies in Mathematics, vol. 19, AMS Providence, 1998.
- [11] R. Eymard, T. Gallouët, and R. Herbin. Finite volume methods. *Handbook of numerical analysis*, 7:713–1018. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 2000.
- [12] R. Eymard, T. Gallouët, R. Herbin J-C. Latché. A convergent finite element-finite volume scheme for the compressible Stokes problem. II. The isentropic case. *Math. Comp.*, 270(79):649–675, 2010.
- [13] E. Feireisl. *Dynamics of viscous compressible fluids*, volume 26 of *Oxford Lecture Series in Mathematics and its Applications*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2004.
- [14] E. Feireisl, P. Gwiazda, A. Swierczewska-Gwiazda, E Wiedemann Dissipative measure valued solutions to the compressible Navier-Stokes system. *Calc. Var.*55, 141 (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00526-016-1089-1>
- [15] E. Feireisl, T. Karper, M. Michálek. Convergence of a numerical method for the compressible Navier-stokes system on general domains. *Numer. Math.* 134, 667704 (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00211-015-0786-6>
- [16] E. Feireisl, T. Karper, M. Pokorný. *Mathematical theory of compressible viscous fluids: Analysis and Numerics*. Springer. Heidelberg. 2016
- [17] E. Feireisl, T. Karper, A. Novotný. A convergent numerical method for the Navier-Stokes-Fourier system *IMA J.Numer. Anal.* 36: 1477-1535, 2016
- [18] E. Feireisl, B J. Jin, and A. Novotný. Relative entropies, suitable weak solutions, and weak-strong uniqueness for the compressible Navier–Stokes system. *J. Math. Fluid. Mech.*, 14(4):717–730, 2012.
- [19] E. Feireisl, R. Hošek, D. Maltese, and A. Novotný. Error estimates for a numerical method for the compressible Navier-Stokes system on sufficiently smooth domains. *ESAIM : Mathematical Modeling and Numerical Analysis*, 51(1):279–319, 2017.

- [20] E. Feireisl, Y. Lu, E. Süli Dissipative weak solutions to compressible NavierStokesFokkerPlanck systems with variable viscosity coefficients. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 443 (1):322-351, 2016.
- [21] E. Feireisl, M. Lukáčová-Medvidová. Convergence of a mixed finite element finite volume scheme for the isentropic Navier-Stokes system via dissipative measure-valued solutions. *Found Comput Math* 18: 703730 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10208-017-9351-2>
- [22] E. Feireisl, M. Lukáčová-Medvidová, H. Mizerová A finite volume scheme for the Euler system inspired by the two velocities approach. Arxiv 1805.05072, 2019
- [23] E. Feireisl, M. Lukáčová-Medvidová, H. Mizerová, B. She. Convergence of a finite volume scheme for the compressible Navier-Stokes system Arxiv 1811.02866, 2019
- [24] E. Feireisl, M. Lukáčová-Medvidová, and S. Nečasová, A. Novotný, and B. She. Asymptotic preserving error estimates for numerical solutions of compressible Navier-Stokes equations in the low Mach number regime. *Multiscale Model. Simul.*, 16(1), 150–183, 2017
- [25] E. Feireisl, A. Novotný and H. Petzeltová, *On the existence of globally defined weak solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations of compressible isentropic fluids*, *J. Math. Fluid Mech.*, 3(2001), 358–392.
- [26] M. Feistauer. *Mathematical methods in fluid dynamics*. Pitman Monographs and Surveys in Pure and Applied Mathematics Series 67, Longman, Harlow, 1993
- [27] M. Feistauer, J. Felcman, M. Lukáčová-Medvidová. Combined finite element-finite volume solution of compressible flow. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.* 63 : 179–199, 1995
- [28] M. Feistauer, J. Felcman, M. Lukáčová-Medvidová, G. Warnecke. Error estimates of a combined finite element-finite volume solution for non linear convection-diffusion problems. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* 36(5) : 1528–1548, 1999
- [29] M. Feistauer, J. Felcman, I. Straskraba. *Mathematical and computational methods for compressible flow*. Clarendon Press. Oxford, 2003.
- [30] M. Feistauer, J. Cesenek, V. Kučera. Discontinuous Galerkin method– a robust solver for compressible flow. *Recent developments in the numerics of conservation laws. Notes Numer. Fluid. Multidiscip. Des.* 120: 143-160, 2013
- [31] A. Fettah and T. Gallouët. Numerical approximation of the general compressible Stokes problem. *IMA J. Numer. Anal.*, 33(3):922–951, 2013.
- [32] U. S. Fjordholm, S. Mishra and E. Tadmor. Arbitrarily high order accurate entropy stable essentially non-oscillatory schemes for systems of conservation laws. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* 50(2):544573, 2012.
- [33] U. S. Fjordholm, R. Kappeli, S. Mishra, E. Tadmor. Construction of approximate entropy measure valued solutions for hyperbolic systems of conservation laws. *Found. Comput. Math.* 17(3):763827, 2017.
- [34] U. S. Fjordholm, S. Mishra and E. Tadmor. On the computation of measure-valued solutions. *Acta Numer.* 25:567679, 2016.

- [35] T. Gallouët, L. Gastaldo, J-C. Latché, and R. Herbin. An unconditionally stable pressure correction scheme for compressible barotropic Navier-Stokes equations. *M2AN Math. Model. Numer. Anal.* 44(2):251–287, 2010.
- [36] T. Gallouët, R. Herbin, J-C. Latché. A convergent finite element-finite volume scheme for the compressible Stokes problem. I. The isothermal case. *Math. Comp.*, 267(78):1333–1352, 2009.
- [37] T. Gallouët, R. Herbin, J-C Latché, and K Mallem. Convergence of the MAC scheme for the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 18(1): 249–289, 2018.
- [38] T. Gallouët, R. Herbin, D. Maltese, and A. Novotny. Error estimates for a numerical approximation to the compressible barotropic Navier–Stokes equations. *IMA J. Numer. Anal.*, 36(2):543–592, 2016.
- [39] T. Gallouët, D. Maltese, and A. Novotný. Error estimates for the implicit MAC scheme for the compressible Navier-Stokes equations. *Numer. Math.*, 141(2):495–567, 2019.
- [40] V. Girinon. Navier-Stokes equations with nonhomogeneous boundary conditions in a bounded three-dimensional domain. *J. Math. Fluid Mech.*, 13: 309–339, 2011
- [41] F.H. Harlow and A.A. Amsden. A numerical fluid dynamics calculation method for all flow speeds. *J. Comp. Phys.*, 8:197–213, 1971.
- [42] R. Herbin, W. Kheriji, J-C. Latché. On some implicit and semi-implicit staggered schemes for the shallow water and Euler equations. *ESAIM Math. Model. Numer. Anal.* 48(6): 1807–1857, 2014.
- [43] R. Herbin, J-C. Latché, S. Minjeaud and N. Therme. Conservativity and weak consistency of a class of staggered finite volume methods for the Euler equations. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1910.03998.pdf>, 2019
- [44] R. Hosek, B. She. Stability and consistency of a finite difference scheme for compressible viscous isentropic flow in multi-dimension. *J. Numer. Math.* 26(3) : 111–140, 2018
- [45] V. Jovanović. An error estimate for a numerical scheme for the compressible Navier-Stokes system. *Kragujevac J. Math.*, 30(1):263–275, 2007.
- [46] V. Jovanović and C. Rohde. Finite-volume schemes for friedrichs systems in multiple space dimensions: A priori and a posteriori error estimates. *Numerical Methods for Partial Differential Equations*, 21(1):104–131, 2005.
- [47] K. H. Karlsen, T. Karper. A convergent nonconforming finite element method for compressible Stokes flow. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* 48(5):1846–1876, 2010
- [48] K. H. Karlsen, T. Karper. Convergence of a mixed method for a semi-stationary compressible Stokes system. *Math. Comp.* 80(275):1459–1498, 2011
- [49] K. H. Karlsen, T. Karper. A convergent mixed method for the Stokes approximation of viscous compressible flow. *IMA J. Numer. Anal.* 32(3): 725–764, 2012
- [50] T. Karper. A convergent FEM-DG method for the compressible Navier–Stokes equations. *Numer. Math.*, 125(3) : 441–510, 2013.

- [51] D. Kröner *Numerical schemes for conservation laws*. Willey-Teubner, 1997
- [52] Y. Kwon, A. Novotny. Dissipative solutions to compressible Navier-Stokes equations with general inflow-outflow data: existence, stability and weak-strong uniqueness. arXiv:1905.02667, 2019
- [53] P-L. Lions. *Mathematical topics in fluid mechanics. Vol. 2*, volume 10 of *Oxford Lecture Series in Mathematics and its Applications*. Oxford University Press, New York, 1998.
- [54] D. Maltese, A. Novotny. Implicit MAC scheme for compressible Navier-Stokes equations: Low Mach number asymptotics. IMA J. Numer. Anal. 2020, accepted
- [55] A. Novotny. Weak solutions for a bi-fluid model for a mixture of two compressible non interacting fluids. *Sci. China Math.*, 2019, DOI10.1007/s11425-019-9552-1.
- [56] A. Novotný and I. Straskraba. Introduction to the mathematical theory of compressible flow. volume 27 of *Oxford Lecture Series in Mathematics and its Applications*. Oxford University Press, New York, 2004.
- [57] R. Rannacher and S. Turek. Simple nonconforming quadrilateral Stokes element. *Numerical Methods for Partial Differential Equations*, 8(2):97–111, 1992.
- [58] E. Tadmor Perfect derivatives, conservative differences and entropy stable computation of hyperbolic conservation laws. *Discr. Cont. Systems* 36(8): 4579–4598, 2016
- [59] E. Tadmor Entropy stability theory for difference approximation of non linear conservation laws and related time dependent problems. *Acta Numer.* 12: 451–512, 2003
- [60] E. Tadmor, W. Zhong Entropy stable approximations of Navier-Stokes equations with no artificial numerical viscosity. *J. Hyperbolic Diff. Eq.* 3: 529–559, 2006
- [61] A. Valli and W. M. Zajaczkowski. Navier-Stokes equations for compressible fluids: global existence and qualitative properties of the solutions in the general case. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 103(2):259–296, 1986.