

Error analysis for a Crouzeix–Raviart approximation of the variable exponent Dirichlet problem

Anna Kh. Balci^{*1} and Alex Kaltenbach^{†2}

¹Faculty of Mathematics, University of Bielefeld, Universitätsstraße 25, 33615 Bielefeld

²Department of Applied Mathematics, University of Freiburg, Ernst–Zermelo–Straße 1, 79104 Freiburg

May 26, 2023

Abstract

In the present paper, we examine a Crouzeix–Raviart approximation of the $p(\cdot)$ -Dirichlet problem. We derive a medius error estimate, i.e., a best-approximation result, which holds for uniformly continuous exponents and implies a priori error estimates, which apply for Hölder continuous exponents and are optimal for Lipschitz continuous exponents. Numerical experiments are carried out to review the theoretical findings.

Keywords: $p(\cdot)$ -Dirichlet problem; Crouzeix–Raviart element; a priori error analysis; medius error analysis.

AMS MSC (2020): 49M29; 65N15; 65N30; 35J60; 46E30.

1. INTRODUCTION

We examine the numerical approximation of a non-linear system of $p(\cdot)$ -Dirichlet type, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} -\operatorname{div}(\mathcal{A}(\cdot, \nabla u)) &= f && \text{in } \Omega, \\ u &= 0 && \text{on } \Gamma_D, \\ \mathcal{A}(\cdot, \nabla u) \cdot n &= 0 && \text{on } \Gamma_N, \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

using the Crouzeix–Raviart element, cf. [22]. More precisely, given $f \in L^{p'(\cdot)}(\Omega)$, where $p'(x) := \frac{p(x)}{p(x)-1}$ for all $x \in \Omega$, and $p \in C^0(\bar{\Omega})$ with $p^- := \min_{x \in \bar{\Omega}} p(x) > 1$, we seek $u \in W_D^{1,p(\cdot)}(\Omega)$ solving (1.1). Here, $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$, is a bounded Lipschitz domain whose topological boundary $\partial\Omega$ is disjointly divided into a Dirichlet part Γ_D and a Neumann part Γ_N , and $W_D^{1,p(\cdot)}(\Omega) := \{v \in W^{1,p(\cdot)}(\Omega) \mid \operatorname{tr} v = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_D\}$. The non-linear operator $\mathcal{A}: \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is supposed to assume the form

$$\mathcal{A}(\cdot, \nabla u) := (\delta + |\nabla u|)^{p(\cdot)-2} \nabla u. \tag{1.2}$$

Since $\mathcal{A}: \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ possesses a potential with respect to its second component, i.e., there exists a function $\varphi: \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, which is strictly convex with respect to its second component, such that $D(\varphi(x, |\cdot|))(a) = \mathcal{A}(x, a)$ for all $(x, a)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^d$, each solution $u \in W_D^{1,p(\cdot)}(\Omega)$ of (1.1) is the unique minimizer of the functional $I: W_D^{1,p(\cdot)}(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, for every $v \in W_D^{1,p(\cdot)}(\Omega)$ defined by

$$I(v) := \int_{\Omega} \varphi(\cdot, |\nabla v|) \, dx - \int_{\Omega} f v \, dx, \tag{1.3}$$

and vice-versa, leading to a primal and a dual formulation of (1.1), and to convex duality relations.

The $p(\cdot)$ -Dirichlet problem (1.1) is a prototypical example of a non-linear system with variable growth conditions. It appears in physical models for smart fluids, e.g., electro-rheological fluids, cf. [48, 50], micro-polar electro-rheological fluids, cf. [33, 35], chemically reacting fluids, cf. [43, 38], and thermo-rheological fluids, cf. [56, 3]. In these models, the variable exponent depends on physical quantities such as, e.g., an electric field, a concentration field or a temperature field. In addition, the $p(\cdot)$ -Dirichlet problem (1.1) has applications in the field of image reconstruction, cf. [1, 21, 44]. The main difficulty in treating models of type (1.1) is the non-autonomous structure (i.e., the

^{*}Email: akhripun@math.uni-bielefeld.de

Anna Kh.Balci research is funded by by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) - SFB 1283/2 2021 - 317210226

[†]Email: alex.kaltenbach@mathematik.uni-freiburg.de

dependency on the space variable). In general, without additional assumptions on the space variable, there could be difficulties in numerical treatment of such problems. The essential feature of such models is the possibility of so-called energy gap (or Lavrentiev phenomenon), which could lead to the disconvergence of conforming schemes to the global minimizer of the problem. In comparison to the Lagrange elements, non-conforming methods, in particular, the Crouzeix–Raviart method, converges, see for example [4]. In this paper, we consider the situation without energy gap, so additional regularity assumption on the variable exponent $p \in C^{0,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})$ is needed. The obtained convergence rate result is new for the non-conforming Crouzeix–Raviart method.

1.1 Related contributions

The numerical approximation of (1.1) in the case of a constant exponent $p \in (1, \infty)$ has already been subject of numerous contributions: The best approximation property in terms of the natural distance for these kind of problems has first been proven for the p -Dirichlet problem in [6]. This had been extended in [30] to the functionals with Orlicz growth. A-priori estimates in terms of the mesh-size were obtained in [32, 30]. This was done in [30] by extending the approximation properties of standard interpolation operators to Orlicz spaces. Results for generalized Newtonian fluids could be found [53]. The p -Laplace problem with DG methods was studied in [18] and [17]; for the Orlicz problems in [31]. In [11], it has been shown that the adaptive finite element method with element-wise affine functions and Dörfler marking converges with optimal rates. As the problem is non-linear, it has to be solved by iterative methods. A stable procedure, that is very efficient in the experiments, was introduced in [26] for the case $p < 2$ and in [4] for the case $p > 2$. In [39], an error analysis for a Crouzeix–Raviart approximation of the p -Dirichlet problem was carried out, including optimal a priori error estimates, a medius error estimate, i.e., a best-approximation result, and a posteriori error estimates.

However, there are only a few contributions in the case of a variable exponent $p \in C^0(\bar{\Omega})$. The paper [19] is concerned with the (weak) convergence of a conforming, discretely inf-sup stable finite element approximation of the model for electro-rheological fluids. The first contribution addressing a priori error estimates for finite element approximations of (1.1) can be found in [13]; see also [12], for a extension to the model for electro-rheological fluids.

In [24], the (weak) convergence of discontinuous Galerkin type methods is studied; the result contains no convergence rates. In [41, 42], the (weak) convergence of a conforming, discretely inf-sup stable finite element approximation of the model for chemically reacting fluids is proved. In [5], the weak convergence of an approximation using the Crouzeix–Raviart element was established. To the best of the authors’ knowledge, however, no a priori error analysis for (1.1) for approximations using non-conforming ansatz classes –in particular, the Crouzeix–Raviart element, which is usually the first step towards a fully-non-conforming a priori error analysis– has been carried out yet.

1.2 New contributions

Deriving local efficiency estimates in terms of shifted N -functions and deploying the so-called node-averaging quasi-interpolation operator, cf. [47, 15], we generalize the medius error analysis in [16] from $p = 2$ and $\delta = 0$ in (1.2), i.e., $\mathcal{A} = \text{id}_{\mathbb{R}^d} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, and of [39] from $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $\delta \geq 0$ in (1.2) to variable exponents $p \in C^0(\bar{\Omega})$ with $p^- > 1$. This medius error analysis implies that the performances of the conforming Lagrange finite element method applied to (1.1) and the non-conforming Crouzeix–Raviart finite element method applied to (1.1) are comparable. As a result, we obtain a priori error estimates for the approximation of (1.1) using Crouzeix–Raviart element, which apply for Hölder continuous variable exponents $p \in C^{0,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})$, where $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ and $p^- > 1$, and $\delta \geq 0$, and are optimal for Lipschitz continuous variable exponents $p \in C^{0,1}(\bar{\Omega})$ and $\delta > 0$. Since $\mathcal{A} : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ has a potential and, therefore, (1.1) admits an equivalent formulation as a convex minimization problem, cf. (1.3), we have access to a (discrete) convex duality theory, cf. [45, 7, 10], and (1.1) as well as the approximation of (1.1) using the Crouzeix–Raviart element admit dual formulations with a dual solution as well as a discrete dual solution, respectively. We derive a priori error estimates for the dual solution and the discrete dual solution.

1.3 Outline

This article is organized as follows: In Section 2, we introduce the employed notation, the basic properties of non-linear operator $\mathcal{A}: \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ and its consequences, the relevant finite element spaces, and give brief review of the continuous and the discrete $p(\cdot)$ -Dirichlet problem. In Section 3, we establish a medius error analysis, i.e., best-approximation result, for the Crouzeix–Raviart finite element method applied to (1.1). In Section 4, by means of this medius error analysis, we derive a priori error estimates for the Crouzeix–Raviart finite element method applied to (1.1), which are optimal for all Lipschitz continuous exponents $p \in C^{0,1}(\bar{\Omega})$ with $p^- > 1$ and all $\delta > 0$. In Section 5, we review our theoretical findings via numerical experiments.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Throughout the article, let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$, always be a bounded polyhedral Lipschitz domain, whose topological boundary $\partial\Omega$ is disjointly divided into a closed Dirichlet part Γ_D , for which we always assume that $|\Gamma_D| > 0$, and a Neumann part Γ_N , i.e., $\partial\Omega = \Gamma_D \cup \Gamma_N$ and $\emptyset = \Gamma_D \cap \Gamma_N$. The integral mean of a locally integrable function $f: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ over a (Lebesgue) measurable set $M \subseteq \Omega$ is denoted by $f_M := \frac{1}{|M|} \int_M f \, dx$. For (Lebesgue) measurable functions $f, g: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and a (Lebesgue) measurable set $M \subseteq \Omega$, we write $(f, g)_M := \int_M fg \, dx$, whenever the right-hand side is well-defined. We use the notation \wedge and \vee , for the minimum and maximum, respectively.

2.1 Variable Lebesgue spaces and variable Sobolev spaces

Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$, be an open set and $p: \Omega \rightarrow [1, +\infty]$ be a (Lebesgue) measurable function, a so-called *variable exponent*. By $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$, we denote the *set of variable exponents*. Then, for $p \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$, we denote by $p^+ := \text{ess sup}_{x \in \Omega} p(x)$ and $p^- := \text{ess inf}_{x \in \Omega} p(x)$ its constant *limit exponents*. Then, by $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Omega) := \{p \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega) \mid p^+ < \infty\}$, we denote the *set of bounded variable exponents*. For $p \in \mathcal{P}^\infty(\Omega)$ and $l \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote by $L^{p(\cdot)}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^l)$, the *variable Lebesgue space*, i.e., the vector space of (Lebesgue) measurable functions $v: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^l$ for which the *modular* $\rho_{p(\cdot), \Omega}(v) := \int_\Omega |v|^{p(\cdot)} \, dx < \infty$. Then, the *Luxembourg norm* $\|v\|_{p(\cdot), \Omega} := \inf\{\lambda > 0 \mid \rho_{p(\cdot), \Omega}(\frac{v}{\lambda}) \leq 1\}$ turns $L^{p(\cdot)}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^l)$ into a Banach space.

Moreover, for $p \in \mathcal{P}^\infty(\Omega)$ and $l \in \mathbb{N}$, we define the spaces

$$\begin{aligned} W_D^{1,p(\cdot)}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^l) &:= \{v \in L^{p(\cdot)}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^l) \mid \nabla v \in L^{p(\cdot)}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{l \times d}), \text{tr} v = 0 \text{ in } L^{p^-}(\Gamma_D; \mathbb{R}^l)\}, \\ W_N^{p(\cdot)}(\text{div}; \Omega) &:= \{y \in L^{p(\cdot)}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) \mid \text{div} y \in L^{p(\cdot)}(\Omega), \text{tr}_n y = 0 \text{ in } W^{-\frac{1}{p^-}, p^-}(\Gamma_N)\}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.1)$$

$W^{1,p(\cdot)}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^l) := W_D^{1,p(\cdot)}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^l)$ if $\Gamma_D = \emptyset$, and $W^{p(\cdot)}(\text{div}; \Omega) := W_N^{p(\cdot)}(\text{div}; \Omega)$ if $\Gamma_N = \emptyset$. Here, $\text{tr}: W^{1,p(\cdot)}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^l) \rightarrow L^{p^-}(\partial\Omega; \mathbb{R}^l)$ and by $\text{tr}_n: W^{p(\cdot)}(\text{div}; \Omega) \rightarrow W^{-\frac{1}{p^-}, p^-}(\partial\Omega)$ denote the *trace operator* and the *normal trace operator*, respectively. In particular, we will always omit tr and tr_n . We write $L^{p(\cdot)}(\Omega) := L^{p(\cdot)}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^1)$, $W^{1,p(\cdot)}(\Omega) := W^{1,p(\cdot)}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^1)$, and $W_D^{1,p(\cdot)}(\Omega) := W_D^{1,p(\cdot)}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^1)$.

2.2 (Generalized) N -functions

A (real) convex function $\psi: \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is called *N -function*, if $\psi(0) = 0$, $\psi(t) > 0$ for all $t > 0$, $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \psi(t)/t = 0$, and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \psi(t)/t = \infty$. If, in addition, $\psi \in C^1(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}) \cap C^2(\mathbb{R}_{> 0})$ and $\psi''(t) > 0$ for all $t > 0$, we call ψ a *regular N -function*. For a regular N -function $\psi: \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, we have that $\psi(0) = \psi'(0) = 0$, $\psi': \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is increasing and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \psi'(t) = \infty$. For a given N -function $\psi: \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, we define the (Fenchel) conjugate N -function $\psi^*: \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, for every $t \geq 0$, by $\psi^*(t) := \sup_{s \geq 0} (st - \psi(s))$, which satisfies $(\psi^*)' = (\psi')^{-1}$ in $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. An N -function ψ satisfies the Δ_2 -condition (in short, $\psi \in \Delta_2$), if there exists $K > 2$ such that for all $t \geq 0$, it holds $\psi(2t) \leq K \psi(t)$. Then, we denote the smallest such constant by $\Delta_2(\psi) > 0$. We say that an N -function $\psi: \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ satisfies the ∇_2 -condition (in short, $\psi \in \nabla_2$), if its (Fenchel) conjugate $\psi^*: \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is an N -function satisfying the Δ_2 -condition. If $\psi: \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ satisfies the Δ_2 - and the ∇_2 -condition (in short, $\psi \in \Delta_2 \cap \nabla_2$), then, there holds the ε -Young inequality: for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a

constant $c_\varepsilon > 0$, depending only on $\Delta_2(\psi), \Delta_2(\psi^*) < \infty$, such that for every $s, t \geq 0$, it holds

$$st \leq c_\varepsilon \psi^*(s) + \varepsilon \psi(t). \quad (2.2)$$

A function $\psi: \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is called *generalized N -function* if it is Carathéodory mapping and $\psi(x, \cdot): \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is for a.e. $x \in \Omega$ an N -function. For a generalized N -function $\psi: \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, a (Lebesgue) measurable function $f: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and a (Lebesgue) measurable set $M \subseteq \Omega$, we write $\rho_{\psi, M}(f) := \int_M \psi(\cdot, |f|) dx$, whenever the right-hand side is well-defined.

2.3 Basic properties of the non-linear operators

Throughout the entire article, we always assume that $\mathcal{A}: \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ has $(p(\cdot), \delta)$ -structure, where $p \in \mathcal{P}^\infty(\Omega)$ with $p^- > 1$ and $\delta \geq 0$, i.e., for a.e. $x \in \Omega$ and every $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$, it holds

$$\mathcal{A}(x, a) := (\delta + |a|)^{p(x)-2} a. \quad (2.3)$$

For given $p \in \mathcal{P}^\infty(\Omega)$ with $p^- > 1$ and $\delta \geq 0$, we introduce the special generalized N -function $\varphi := \varphi_{p, \delta}: \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, for a.e. $x \in \Omega$ and all $t \geq 0$, defined by

$$\varphi(x, t) := \int_0^t \varphi'(x, s) ds, \quad \text{where} \quad \varphi'(x, t) := (\delta + t)^{p(x)-2} t. \quad (2.4)$$

For (Lebesgue) measurable functions $f, g: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, we write $f \sim g$ (or $f \lesssim g$) if there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that $c^{-1}g \leq f \leq cg$ (or $f \leq cg$) a.e. in Ω . In particular, if not otherwise specified, we always assume that the hidden constant in \sim and \lesssim depends only on $p^-, p^+ > 1$ and $\delta \geq 0$.

Then, $\varphi: \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ satisfies, uniformly in $\delta \geq 0$ and a.e. $x \in \Omega$, the Δ_2 -condition with $\text{ess sup}_{x \in \Omega} \Delta_2(\varphi(x, \cdot)) \lesssim 2^{\max\{2, p^+\}}$. In addition, the (Fenchel) conjugate function (with respect to the second argument) $\varphi^*: \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ satisfies, uniformly in both $t \geq 0, \delta \geq 0$, and a.e. $x \in \Omega$, $\varphi^*(x, t) \sim (\delta^{p(x)-1} + t)^{p'(x)-2} t^2$ and the Δ_2 -condition with $\text{ess sup}_{x \in \Omega} \Delta_2(\varphi^*(x, \cdot)) \lesssim 2^{\max\{2, (p^-)'\}}$.

For a generalized N -function $\psi: \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, we introduce *shifted generalized N -functions* $\psi_a: \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, $a \geq 0$, for a.e. $x \in \Omega$ and all $a, t \geq 0$, defined by

$$\psi_a(x, t) := \int_0^t \psi'_a(x, s) ds, \quad \text{where} \quad \psi'_a(x, t) := \psi'(x, a+t) \frac{t}{a+t}. \quad (2.5)$$

Remark 2.1. For the above defined N -function $\varphi: \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, cf. (2.4), uniformly in $a, t \geq 0$ and a.e. $x \in \Omega$, it holds $\varphi_a(x, t) \sim (\delta + a + t)^{p(x)-2} t^2$ and $(\varphi_a)^*(x, t) \sim ((\delta + a)^{p(x)-1} + t)^{p'(x)-2} t^2$. The families $\{\varphi_a\}_{a \geq 0}, \{(\varphi_a)^*\}_{a \geq 0}: \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ satisfy, uniformly in $a \geq 0$, the Δ_2 -condition with $\text{ess sup}_{x \in \Omega} \Delta_2(\varphi_a(x, \cdot)) \lesssim 2^{\max\{2, p^+\}}$ and $\text{ess sup}_{x \in \Omega} \Delta_2((\varphi_a)^*(x, \cdot)) \lesssim 2^{\max\{2, (p^-)'\}}$, respectively.

Closely related to $\mathcal{A}: \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ defined by (2.3) are the non-linear operators $F, F^*: \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, for a.e. $x \in \Omega$ and every $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$ defined by

$$F(x, a) := (\delta + |a|)^{\frac{p(x)-2}{2}} a, \quad F^*(x, a) := (\delta^{p(x)-1} + |a|)^{\frac{p'(x)-2}{2}} a. \quad (2.6)$$

The relations between $\mathcal{A}, F, F^*: \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\varphi_a, (\varphi^*)_a, (\varphi_a)^*: \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, $a \geq 0$, are presented in the following proposition.

Proposition 2.2. Uniformly in a.e. $x, y \in \Omega$, $t \geq 0$, and $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{A}(x, a) - \mathcal{A}(x, b)) \cdot (a - b) &\sim |F(x, a) - F(x, b)|^2 \\ &\sim \varphi_{|a|}(x, |a - b|), \end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$

$$|F^*(x, a) - F^*(x, b)|^2 \sim (\varphi^*)_{|a|}(x, |a - b|), \quad (2.8)$$

$$(\varphi^*)_{|\mathcal{A}(x, a)|}(x, t) \sim (\varphi_{|a|})^*(x, t), \quad (2.9)$$

$$|F^*(x, \mathcal{A}(x, a)) - F^*(x, \mathcal{A}(y, b))|^2 \sim (\varphi_{|a|})^*(x, |\mathcal{A}(x, a) - \mathcal{A}(y, b)|). \quad (2.10)$$

Proof. For the equivalences (2.7)–(2.9), we refer to [14, Remark A.9]. The equivalence (2.10) follows from the equivalences (2.8) and (2.9). \square

In addition, we need the following shift change result.

Lemma 2.3. *For every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $c_\varepsilon \geq 1$ (depending only on $\varepsilon > 0$, $p^-, p^+ > 1$ and $\delta \geq 0$) such that for a.e. $x \in \Omega$, for every $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and for all $t \geq 0$, it holds*

$$\varphi_{|a|}(x, t) \leq c_\varepsilon \varphi_{|b|}(x, t) + \varepsilon |F(x, a) - F(x, b)|^2, \quad (2.11)$$

$$(\varphi_{|a|})^*(x, t) \leq c_\varepsilon (\varphi_{|b|})^*(x, t) + \varepsilon |F(x, a) - F(x, b)|^2. \quad (2.12)$$

Proof. See [14, Remark A.9]. \square

Remark 2.4 (Natural distance). *Due to (2.7), uniformly in $u, v \in W^{1,p(\cdot)}(\Omega)$, it holds*

$$(\mathcal{A}(\cdot, \nabla u) - \mathcal{A}(\cdot, \nabla v), \nabla u - \nabla v)_\Omega \sim \|F(\cdot, \nabla u) - F(\cdot, \nabla v)\|_{2,\Omega}^2 \sim \rho_{\varphi_{|\nabla u|}, \Omega}(\nabla u - \nabla v).$$

We refer to all three equivalent quantities as the natural distance. In particular, note that $\varphi_{|\nabla v|}: \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ for every $v \in W^{1,p(\cdot)}(\Omega)$ is a generalized N -function.

Remark 2.5 (Conjugate natural distance). *For a.e. $x \in \Omega$, $\mathcal{A}(x, \cdot): \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is a continuous, strictly monotone and coercive operator, so that from the theory of monotone operators, cf. [55], it follows that $\mathcal{A}(x, \cdot): \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ for a.e. $x \in \Omega$ is bijective and its inverse $\mathcal{A}^{-1}(x, \cdot): \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is continuous. Due to (2.7), uniformly in $z, y \in L^{p'(\cdot)}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$, it holds*

$$(\mathcal{A}^{-1}(\cdot, z) - \mathcal{A}^{-1}(\cdot, y), z - y)_\Omega \sim \|F^*(\cdot, z) - F^*(\cdot, y)\|_{2,\Omega}^2 \sim \rho_{(\varphi^*)_{|z|}, \Omega}(z - y).$$

We refer to all three equivalent quantities as the conjugate natural distance. In particular, note that $(\varphi^)_{|y|}: \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ for every $y \in L^{p'(\cdot)}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ is a generalized N -function.*

2.4 Triangulations and standard finite element spaces

Throughout the article, let \mathcal{T}_h , $h > 0$, be a family of uniformly shape regular and conforming, triangulations of $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$, cf. [36]. Here, the parameter $h > 0$ denotes the *average mesh-size*, i.e., $h := \frac{1}{\text{card}(\mathcal{T}_h)} \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} h_T$, where $h_T := \text{diam}(T) > 0$ for all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$. We assume there exists $\omega_0 > 0$, independent of $h > 0$, such that $\max_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} h_T \rho_T^{-1} \leq \omega_0$, where $\rho_T := \sup\{r > 0 \mid \exists x \in T : B_r^d(x) \subseteq T\}$ for all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$. The smallest such constant is called the *chunkiness* of $(\mathcal{T}_h)_{h>0}$. For every $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$, let $\omega_T := \bigcup\{T' \in \mathcal{T}_h \mid T' \cap T \neq \emptyset\}$ denote the *element patch* of T . Then, we assume that $\text{int}(\omega_T)$ is connected for all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$, so that $\text{card}(\bigcup\{T' \in \mathcal{T}_h \mid T' \subseteq \omega_T\}) + \text{card}(\bigcup\{T' \in \mathcal{T}_h \mid T \subseteq \omega_{T'}\}) \leq c$, where $c > 0$ depends only on the chunkiness $\omega_0 > 0$, and $|T| \sim |\omega_T|$ for all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$. Eventually, we define the *maximum mesh-size* by $h_{\max} := \max_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} h_T > 0$.

We define interior and boundary sides of \mathcal{T}_h in the following way: an *interior side* is the closure of the non-empty relative interior of $\partial T \cap \partial T'$, where $T, T' \in \mathcal{T}_h$ are two adjacent elements. For an interior side $S := \partial T \cap \partial T' \in \mathcal{S}_h$, where $T, T' \in \mathcal{T}_h$, the *side patch* is defined by $\omega_S := T \cup T'$. A *boundary side* is the closure of the non-empty relative interior of $\partial T \cap \partial \Omega$, where $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ denotes a boundary element of \mathcal{T}_h . For a boundary side $S := \partial T \cap \partial \Omega$, the side patch is defined by $\omega_S := T$. Eventually, by \mathcal{S}_h^i , we denote the set of interior sides, and by \mathcal{S}_h , we denote the set of all sides.

For (Lebesgue) measurable functions $u, v: \mathcal{S}_h \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathcal{M}_h \subseteq \mathcal{S}_h$, we write

$$(u, v)_{\mathcal{M}_h} := \sum_{S \in \mathcal{M}_h} (u, v)_S, \quad \text{where } (u, v)_S := \int_S uv \, ds,$$

whenever all integrals are well-defined. Analogously, for (Lebesgue) measurable vector fields $z, y: \mathcal{S}_h \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\mathcal{M}_h \subseteq \mathcal{S}_h$, we write $(z, y)_{\mathcal{M}_h} := \sum_{S \in \mathcal{M}_h} (z, y)_S$, where $(z, y)_S := \int_S z \cdot y \, ds$.

For $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$, let $\mathcal{P}_k(T)$ denote the set of polynomials of maximal degree k on T . Then, for $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and $l \in \mathbb{N}$, the sets of continuous and element-wise polynomial functions or vector fields, respectively, are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}^k(\mathcal{T}_h)^l &:= \{v_h \in C^0(\bar{\Omega}; \mathbb{R}^l) \mid v_h|_T \in \mathcal{P}_k(T)^l \text{ for all } T \in \mathcal{T}_h\}, \\ \mathcal{L}^k(\mathcal{T}_h)^l &:= \{v_h \in L^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^l) \mid v_h|_T \in \mathcal{P}_k(T)^l \text{ for all } T \in \mathcal{T}_h\}. \end{aligned}$$

The *element-wise constant mesh-size function* $h_{\mathcal{T}} \in \mathcal{L}^0(\mathcal{T}_h)$ is defined by $h_{\mathcal{T}}|_T := h_T$ for all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$. The *side-wise constant mesh-size function* $h_S \in \mathcal{L}^0(\mathcal{S}_h)$ is defined by $h_S|_S := h_S$ for all $S \in \mathcal{S}_h$, where $h_S := \text{diam}(S)$ for all $S \in \mathcal{S}_h$. Denoting by \mathcal{N}_h , the set of all vertices of \mathcal{T}_h , for every $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ and $S \in \mathcal{S}_h$, we denote by $x_T := \frac{1}{d+1} \sum_{z \in \mathcal{N}_h \cap T} z$ and $x_S := \frac{1}{d} \sum_{z \in \mathcal{N}_h \cap S} z$, the barycenters of T and S , respectively. The *(local) L^2 -projection operator* onto element-wise constant functions or vector fields, respectively, is denoted by $\Pi_h: L^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^l) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}^0(\mathcal{T}_h)^l$. The *element-wise gradient* $\nabla_h: \mathcal{L}^1(\mathcal{T}_h)^l \rightarrow \mathcal{L}^0(\mathcal{T}_h)^{l \times d}$, for every $v_h \in \mathcal{L}^1(\mathcal{T}_h)^l$, is defined by $\nabla_h v_h|_T := \nabla(v_h|_T)$ for all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$.

2.4.1 Crouzeix–Raviart element

The Crouzeix–Raviart finite element space, cf. [22], is defined as the space of element-wise affine functions that are continuous in the barycenters of inner element sides, i.e.,¹

$$\mathcal{S}^{1,cr}(\mathcal{T}_h) := \{v_h \in \mathcal{L}^1(\mathcal{T}_h) \mid \llbracket v_h \rrbracket_S(x_S) = 0 \text{ for all } S \in \mathcal{S}_h^i\}.$$

The Crouzeix–Raviart finite element space with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary condition is defined as the space of Crouzeix–Raviart functions that vanish in the barycenters of boundary sides that belong to Γ_D , i.e.,

$$\mathcal{S}_D^{1,cr}(\mathcal{T}_h) := \{v_h \in \mathcal{S}^{1,cr}(\mathcal{T}_h) \mid v_h(x_S) = 0 \text{ for all } S \in \mathcal{S}_h \cap \Gamma_D\}.$$

2.4.2 Raviart–Thomas element

The lowest order Raviart–Thomas finite element space, cf. [49], is defined as the space of element-wise affine vector fields that have continuous constant normal components on inner elements sides, i.e.,²

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{RT}^0(\mathcal{T}_h) := \{y_h \in \mathcal{L}^1(\mathcal{T}_h)^d \mid y_h|_T \cdot n_T = \text{const on } \partial T \text{ for all } T \in \mathcal{T}_h, \\ \llbracket y_h \cdot n \rrbracket_S = 0 \text{ on } S \text{ for all } S \in \mathcal{S}_h^i\}. \end{aligned}$$

The Raviart–Thomas finite element space with homogeneous slip boundary condition is defined as the space of Raviart–Thomas functions that have vanishing normal components on Γ_N , i.e.,

$$\mathcal{RT}_N^0(\mathcal{T}_h) := \{y_h \in \mathcal{RT}^0(\mathcal{T}_h) \mid y_h \cdot n = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_N\}.$$

2.4.3 Discrete integration-by-parts formula

For every $v_h \in \mathcal{S}^{1,cr}(\mathcal{T}_h)$ and $y_h \in \mathcal{RT}^0(\mathcal{T}_h)$, we have the *discrete integration-by-parts formula*

$$(\nabla_h v_h, \Pi_h y_h)_\Omega + (\Pi_h v_h, \text{div } y_h)_\Omega = (v_h, y_h \cdot n)_{\partial\Omega}, \quad (2.13)$$

which follows from the fact that, by definition, for every $y_h \in \mathcal{RT}^0(\mathcal{T}_h)$, it holds $y_h|_T \cdot n_T = \text{const}$ on ∂T for all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ and $\llbracket y_h \cdot n \rrbracket_S = 0$ on S for all $S \in \mathcal{S}_h^i$, and for every $v_h \in \mathcal{S}^{1,cr}(\mathcal{T}_h)$, it holds $\int_S \llbracket v_h \rrbracket_S ds = \llbracket v_h \rrbracket_S(x_S) = 0$ for all $S \in \mathcal{S}_h^i$. For every $v_h \in \mathcal{S}_D^{1,cr}(\mathcal{T}_h)$ and $y_h \in \mathcal{RT}_N^0(\mathcal{T}_h)$, (2.13) reads

$$(\nabla_h v_h, \Pi_h y_h)_\Omega = -(\Pi_h v_h, \text{div } y_h)_\Omega. \quad (2.14)$$

In addition, cf. [9, Section 2.4], there holds the orthogonal decomposition

$$\mathcal{L}^0(\mathcal{T}_h)^d = \ker(\text{div}|_{\mathcal{RT}_N^0(\mathcal{T}_h)}) \oplus \nabla_h(\mathcal{S}_D^{1,cr}(\mathcal{T}_h)), \quad (2.15)$$

which shows that for every vector field $y_h \in \mathcal{L}^0(\mathcal{T}_h)^d$, the following implication applies:

$$(y_h, \nabla_h v_h)_\Omega = 0 \quad \text{for all } v_h \in \mathcal{S}_D^{1,cr}(\mathcal{T}_h) \quad \Rightarrow \quad y_h \in \mathcal{RT}_N^0(\mathcal{T}_h) \cap \mathcal{L}^0(\mathcal{T}_h)^d. \quad (2.16)$$

The implication (2.16) is of crucial importance in the derivation of discrete strong duality relations and a discrete reconstruction formula in Proposition 2.12.

¹Here, for every inner element side $S \in \mathcal{S}_h^i$, $\llbracket v_h \rrbracket_S := v_h|_{T_+} - v_h|_{T_-}$ on S , where $T_+, T_- \in \mathcal{T}_h$ satisfy $\partial T_+ \cap \partial T_- = S$, and for every boundary side $S \in \mathcal{S}_h \setminus \mathcal{S}_h^i$, $\llbracket v_h \rrbracket_S := v_h|_T$ on S , where $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ satisfies $S \subseteq \partial T$.

²Here, for every inner element side $S \in \mathcal{S}_h \setminus \partial\Omega$, $\llbracket y_h \cdot n \rrbracket_S := y_h|_{T_+} \cdot n_{T_+} + y_h|_{T_-} \cdot n_{T_-}$ on S , where $T_+, T_- \in \mathcal{T}_h$ satisfy $\partial T_+ \cap \partial T_- = S$, and for every $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$, $n_T: \partial T \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ denotes the outward unit normal vector field to T , and for every boundary side $S \in \mathcal{S}_h \setminus \mathcal{S}_h^i$, $\llbracket y_h \cdot n \rrbracket_S := y_h|_T \cdot n$ on S , where $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ satisfies $S \subseteq \partial T$ and $n: \partial\Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ denotes the outward unit normal vector field to Ω .

2.5 $p(\cdot)$ -Dirichlet problem

In this section, we briefly review the variational formulation, the primal formulation, and the dual formulation of the $p(\cdot)$ -Dirichlet problem (1.1).

2.5.1 Variational problem

Given a right-hand side $f \in L^{p'(\cdot)}(\Omega)$, where $p \in \mathcal{P}^\infty(\Omega)$ with $p^- > 1$, the $p(\cdot)$ -Dirichlet problem seeks for a function $u \in W_D^{1,p(\cdot)}(\Omega)$ such that for every $v \in W_D^{1,p(\cdot)}(\Omega)$, it holds

$$(\mathcal{A}(\cdot, \nabla u), \nabla v)_\Omega = (f, v)_\Omega. \quad (2.17)$$

The theory of monotone operators, cf. [55, 51], proves the existence of a unique solution to (2.17). In what follows, we reserve the notation $u \in W_D^{1,p(\cdot)}(\Omega)$ for this solution.

2.5.2 Minimization problem and convex duality relations

The variational problem (2.17) emerges as an optimality condition of an equivalent convex minimization problem, leading to a primal and a dual formulation, and convex duality relations.

Primal problem. The problem (2.17) is equivalent to the minimization of the $p(\cdot)$ -Dirichlet energy, i.e., $I: W_D^{1,p(\cdot)}(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, for every $v \in W_D^{1,p(\cdot)}(\Omega)$ defined by

$$I(v) := \rho_{\varphi, \Omega}(\nabla v) - (f, v)_\Omega. \quad (2.18)$$

We will always refer to the minimization of the $p(\cdot)$ -Dirichlet energy (2.18) as the *primal problem*. Since the $p(\cdot)$ -Dirichlet energy (2.18) is proper, strictly convex, weakly coercive, and lower semi-continuous, the existence of a unique minimizer of (2.18), called the *primal solution*, follows using the direct method in the calculus of variations, cf. [23]. In particular, since the $p(\cdot)$ -Dirichlet energy is Fréchet differentiable and for every $v, w \in W_D^{1,p(\cdot)}(\Omega)$, it holds

$$\langle DI(v), w \rangle_{W_D^{1,p(\cdot)}(\Omega)} = (\mathcal{A}(\cdot, \nabla v), \nabla w)_\Omega,$$

the optimality conditions of the primal problem and the strict convexity of the $p(\cdot)$ -Dirichlet energy imply that $u \in W_D^{1,p(\cdot)}(\Omega)$ is the unique minimizer of the $p(\cdot)$ -Dirichlet energy.

Dual problem. Generalizing the methods in [34, p. 113 ff.] to the spaces (2.1), one finds that the dual problem consists in the maximization of the functional $D: W_N^{p'(\cdot)}(\text{div}; \Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$, for every $y \in W_N^{p'(\cdot)}(\text{div}; \Omega)$ defined by

$$D(y) := -\rho_{\varphi^*, \Omega}(y) - I_{\{-f\}}(\text{div } y), \quad (2.19)$$

where $I_{\{-f\}}: L^{p'(\cdot)}(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ for every $g \in L^{p'(\cdot)}(\Omega)$ is defined by

$$I_{\{-f\}}(g) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } g = -f \text{ a.e. in } \Omega \\ +\infty & \text{else} \end{cases}. \quad (2.20)$$

Due to [34, Remark 4.1 (4.21), p. 60], the dual problem admits a unique solution $z \in W_N^{p'(\cdot)}(\text{div}; \Omega)$, i.e., a maximizer of (2.19), called the *dual solution*, and a *strong duality relation* applies, i.e.,

$$I(u) = D(z).$$

In addition, cf. [34, Remark 4.1 (4.22)–(4.25), p. 60], there hold the *convex optimality relations*

$$\text{div } z = -f \quad \text{in } L^{p'(\cdot)}(\Omega), \quad (2.21)$$

$$z = \mathcal{A}(\cdot, \nabla u) \quad \text{in } L^{p'(\cdot)}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d). \quad (2.22)$$

By the Fenchel–Young identity, cf. [34, Proposition 5.1, p. 21], (2.22) is equivalent to

$$z \cdot \nabla u = \varphi^*(\cdot, |z|) + \varphi(\cdot, |\nabla u|) \quad \text{in } L^1(\Omega). \quad (2.23)$$

2.6 Discrete $p_h(\cdot)$ -Dirichlet problem

One important aspect in the numerical approximation of the $p(\cdot)$ -Dirichlet problem (2.17) consists in the discretization of the x -dependent non-linearity. Here, it is convenient to use a simple one-point quadrature rule. More precisely, if $p \in C^0(\bar{\Omega})$ with $p^- > 1$, then we define the element-wise constant variable exponent $p_h \in \mathcal{L}^0(\mathcal{T}_h)$, the generalized N -function $\varphi_h : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, and the non-linear operators $\mathcal{A}_h, F_h, F_h^* : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ for all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$, a.e. $x \in T$, and all $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$ by

$$\begin{aligned} p_h(x) &:= p(q_T), & \varphi_h(x, |a|) &:= \varphi(q_T, |a|), \\ \mathcal{A}_h(x, a) &:= \mathcal{A}(q_T, a), & F_h(x, a) &:= F(q_T, a), & F_h^*(x, a) &:= F^*(q_T, a), \end{aligned} \quad (2.24)$$

where $q_T \in T$ is some arbitrary quadrature point, e.g., the barycenter of the element T .

Remark 2.6. *Since the hidden constants in all equivalences in Section 2.3 depend only on $p^-, p^+ > 1$ and $\delta \geq 0$ and since $p^- \leq p_h^- \leq p_h^+ \leq p^+$ a.e. in Ω for all $h > 0$, the same equivalences apply to the discretizations (2.24) with the hidden constants depending only on $p^-, p^+ \in (1, \infty)$.*

2.6.1 $\mathcal{S}_D^1(\mathcal{T}_h)$ -approximation of the $p(\cdot)$ -Dirichlet problem

Given a right-hand side $f \in L^{p'(\cdot)}(\Omega)$, where $p \in C^0(\bar{\Omega})$ with $p^- > 1$, the $\mathcal{S}_D^1(\mathcal{T}_h)$ -approximation of the $p(\cdot)$ -Dirichlet problem, where $\mathcal{S}_D^1(\mathcal{T}_h) := \mathcal{S}^1(\mathcal{T}_h) \cap W_D^{1,p(\cdot)}(\Omega)$, seeks for $u_h^c \in \mathcal{S}_D^1(\mathcal{T}_h)$ such that for every $v_h \in \mathcal{S}_D^1(\mathcal{T}_h)$, it holds

$$(\mathcal{A}_h(\cdot, \nabla u_h^c), \nabla v_h)_\Omega = (f, v_h)_\Omega. \quad (2.25)$$

The theory of monotone operators, cf. [55], proves the existence of a unique solution to (2.25). In what follows, we reserve the notation $u_h^c \in \mathcal{S}_D^1(\mathcal{T}_h)$ for this solution.

In [14], the following best-approximation result was derived:

Theorem 2.7 (Best-approximation). *Let $p \in C^{0,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})$ with $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ and $p^- > 1$ and let $\delta \geq 0$. Then, there exists some $s > 1$, which can be chosen to be close to 1 if $h_{\max} > 0$ is close to 0, such that if $u \in W^{1,p(\cdot)s}(\Omega)$, then*

$$\|F_h(\cdot, \nabla u_h^c) - F_h(\cdot, \nabla u)\|_{2,\Omega}^2 \lesssim \inf_{v_h \in \mathcal{S}_D^1(\mathcal{T}_h)} \|F_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h) - F_h(\cdot, \nabla u)\|_{2,\Omega}^2 + h_{\max}^{2\alpha} (1 + \rho_{p(\cdot)s,\Omega}(\nabla u)),$$

where the hidden constant also depends on $s > 1$ and the chunkiness $\omega_0 > 0$.

Proof. In [14, Lemma 4.7], only the case $q_T := \arg \min_{x \in T} p(x)$ for all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ has been considered. However, an analysis of the proof of [14, Lemma 4.7] reveals that this particular quadrature rule is not needed there. \square

Resorting in Theorem 2.7 to the approximation properties of the *Scott–Zhang quasi-interpolation operator* $I_h^{sz} : W_D^{1,p(\cdot)}(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_D^1(\mathcal{T}_h)$, cf. [52], one arrives at the following a priori error estimate for the $\mathcal{S}_D^1(\mathcal{T}_h)$ -approximation (2.25) of the $p(\cdot)$ -Dirichlet problem (2.17).

Theorem 2.8 (A priori error estimate). *Let $p \in C^{0,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})$ with $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ and $p^- > 1$ and let $\delta \geq 0$. Moreover, let $F(\cdot, \nabla u) \in W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$. Then, there exists some $s > 1$, which can be chosen to be close to 1 if $h_{\max} > 0$ is close to 0, such that*

$$\|F_h(\cdot, \nabla u_h^c) - F_h(\cdot, \nabla u)\|_{2,\Omega}^2 \lesssim h_{\max}^2 \|\nabla F(\cdot, \nabla u)\|_{2,\Omega}^2 + h_{\max}^{2\alpha} (1 + \rho_{p(\cdot)s,\Omega}(\nabla u)),$$

where the hidden constant also depends on $s > 1$ and the chunkiness $\omega_0 > 0$.

Proof. See [14, Theorem 4.8]. \square

Remark 2.9. *If $F(\cdot, \nabla u) \in W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$, then $F(\cdot, \nabla u) \in L^{2^*}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$, where $2^* := \frac{2d}{d-2}$ if $2 < d$ and $2^* \in [1, \infty)$ if $2 \geq d$. Thus, for $s > 1$ close to 1, i.e., $h_{\max} > 0$ close to 0, it holds $\nabla u \in L^{p(\cdot)s}(\Omega)$. Similarly, if $F^*(\cdot, z) \in W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$, then for $s > 1$ close to 1, i.e., $h_{\max} > 0$ close to 0, it holds $z \in L^{p'(\cdot)s}(\Omega)$.*

The following lemma is of crucial importance for the hereinafter analysis; it bounds the error resulting from switching from $\mathcal{A}_h: \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, $h > 0$, to $\mathcal{A}: \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ or from switching from $F_h: \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, $h > 0$, to $F: \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ and vice versa, respectively.

Proposition 2.10. *Let $p \in C^0(\overline{\Omega})$ with $p^- > 1$ and let $\delta \geq 0$. Then, there exists some $s > 1$, which can be chosen to be close to 0 if $h_T > 0$ is close to 0, such that for every $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$, $g \in L^{p'(\cdot)s}(T)$, $v \in W^{1,p(\cdot)s}(T)$, and $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, it holds*

$$\|F_h(\cdot, \nabla v) - F(\cdot, \nabla v)\|_{2,T}^2 \lesssim \|\omega_{p,T}(h_T)^2 (1 + |\nabla v|^{p(\cdot)s})\|_{1,T}, \quad (2.26)$$

$$\|F_h^*(\cdot, \mathcal{A}_h(\cdot, \nabla v)) - F_h^*(\cdot, \mathcal{A}(\cdot, \nabla v))\|_{2,T}^2 \lesssim \|\omega_{p,T}(h_T)^2 (1 + |\nabla v|^{p(\cdot)s})\|_{1,T}, \quad (2.27)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{((\varphi_h)_{|\nabla v})^*, T}(\lambda g) &\lesssim \rho_{(\varphi_{|\nabla v})^*, T}(\lambda g) \\ &\quad + \lambda^{2 \wedge (p^+)'} \|\omega_{p,T}(h_T) (1 + |\nabla v|^{p(\cdot)s} + |g|^{p'(\cdot)s})\|_{1,T}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.28)$$

where the hidden constants also depend on $s > 1$ and the chunkiness $\omega_0 > 0$. Furthermore, $\omega_{p,T}$ denotes the modulus of continuity of $p|_T \in C^0(T)$.

Proposition 2.10 is based on the following point-wise estimates.

Lemma 2.11. *Let $p \in C^0(\overline{\Omega})$ with $p^- > 1$ and let $\delta \geq 0$. Then, there exists some $s > 1$, which can be chosen to be close to 0 if $|x - y|$ is close to 0, such that for every $x, y \in \overline{\Omega}$, $t \geq 0$, $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, it holds*

$$|F(x, a) - F(y, a)|^2 \lesssim |p(x) - p(y)|^2 (1 + |a|^{p(x)s}), \quad (2.29)$$

$$|F^*(x, a) - F^*(y, a)|^2 \lesssim |p(x) - p(y)|^2 (1 + |a|^{p(x)s}), \quad (2.30)$$

$$|F^*(x, \mathcal{A}(x, a)) - F^*(x, \mathcal{A}(y, a))|^2 \lesssim |p(x) - p(y)|^2 (1 + |a|^{p(x)s}), \quad (2.31)$$

$$\begin{aligned} (\varphi_{|b|})^*(x, t) &\lesssim (\varphi_{|b|})^*(y, t) \\ &\quad + \lambda^{2 \wedge (p^+)'} |p(x) - p(y)| (1 + |b|^{p(y)s} + t^{p'(y)s}), \end{aligned} \quad (2.32)$$

where the hidden constants also depend on $s > 1$ and the chunkiness $\omega_0 > 0$.

Proof. ad (2.29). The Newton–Leibniz formula yields for all $x, y \in \overline{\Omega}$ and $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$ that

$$\begin{aligned} |F(x, a) - F(y, a)|^2 &\lesssim |p(x) - p(y)|^2 \ln(\delta + |a|)^2 (\varphi(x, |a|) + \varphi(y, |a|)) \\ &\lesssim |p(x) - p(y)|^2 \ln(\delta + |a|)^2 (1 + (\delta + |a|)^{p(y)-p(x)}) \varphi(x, |a|) \\ &\lesssim |p(x) - p(y)|^2 (1 + |a|^{p(x)s}), \end{aligned} \quad (2.33)$$

for some $s > 1$, which can be chosen to be close to 1 if $|x - y|$ is close to 0.

ad (2.31). The Newton–Leibniz formula yields for all $x, y \in \overline{\Omega}$ and $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$ that

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{A}(x, a) - \mathcal{A}(y, a)| &\lesssim |p(x) - p(y)| |\ln(\delta + |a|)| (\varphi'(x, |a|) + \varphi'(y, |a|)) \\ &\lesssim |p(x) - p(y)| |\ln(\delta + |a|)| (1 + (\delta + |a|)^{p(y)-p(x)}) \varphi'(x, |a|). \end{aligned} \quad (2.34)$$

Using (2.34), (2.8), (2.9), the monotonicity of $(\varphi_{|a|})^*(x, \cdot)$, that $\Delta_2((\varphi_{|a|})^*(x, \cdot)) \lesssim 2^{\max\{2, (p^-)'\}}$, cf. Remark 2.1,

$$(\varphi_{|a|})^*(x, \lambda t) \lesssim \max\{\lambda^{p'(x)}, \lambda^2\} (\varphi_{|a|})^*(x, t), \quad (2.35)$$

$$(\varphi_{|a|})^*(x, \lambda \varphi'(x, |a|)) \sim \lambda^2 \varphi(x, |a|), \quad (2.36)$$

cf. [13, Lemma A.7 & Lemma A.8], in conjunction with Remark 2.6, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} |F^*(x, \mathcal{A}(x, a)) - F^*(x, \mathcal{A}(y, a))|^2 &\lesssim (\varphi_{|a|})^*(x, |\mathcal{A}(x, a) - \mathcal{A}(y, a)|) \\ &\lesssim ((1 + |\ln(\delta + |a|)|) (1 + (\delta + |a|)^{p(y)-p(x)}))^{\max\{2, p'(x)\}} (\varphi_{|a|})^*(x, |p(x) - p(y)| \varphi'(x, |a|)) \\ &\lesssim |p(x) - p(y)|^2 ((1 + |\ln(\delta + |a|)|) (1 + (\delta + |a|)^{p(y)-p(x)}))^{\max\{2, p'(x)\}} \varphi(x, |a|) \\ &\lesssim |p(x) - p(y)|^2 (1 + |a|^{p(x)s}), \end{aligned}$$

for some $s > 1$, which can be chosen to be close to 1 if $|x - y|$ is close to 0.

ad (2.32). Using twice the Newton–Leibniz formula yields for all $x, y \in \overline{\Omega}$ and $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
(\varphi_{|b|})^*(x, \lambda t) &\lesssim ((\delta + |b|)^{p(x)-1} + \lambda t)^{p'(x)-2} (\lambda t)^2 \\
&= ((\delta + |b|)^{p(y)-1} + \lambda t)^{p'(x)-2} (\lambda t)^2 \\
&\quad + \int_{p(x) \wedge p(y)}^{p(x) \vee p(y)} (p'(x) - 2)(\delta + |b|)^{r-1} \ln(\delta + |b|) ((\delta + |b|)^{r-1} + \lambda t)^{p'(x)-3} (\lambda t)^2 dr \\
&= ((\delta + |b|)^{p(y)-1} + \lambda t)^{p'(y)-2} (\lambda t)^2 \\
&\quad + \int_{p(x) \wedge p(y)}^{p(x) \vee p(y)} (p'(x) - 2)(\delta + |b|)^{r-1} \ln(\delta + |b|) ((\delta + |b|)^{r-1} + \lambda t)^{p'(x)-3} (\lambda t)^2 dr \\
&\quad + \int_{p'(x) \wedge p'(y)}^{p'(x) \vee p'(y)} \ln((\delta + |b|)^{p(y)-1} + \lambda t) ((\delta + |b|)^{p(y)-1} + \lambda t)^{r-2} (\lambda t)^2 dr. \\
&=: ((\delta + |b|)^{p(y)-1} + \lambda t)^{p'(y)-2} (\lambda t)^2 + I_1 + I_2.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.37}$$

Next, we need to estimate the terms I_1 and I_2 :

ad I_1 . Using $((\delta + |b|)^{r-1} + \lambda t)^{p'(x)-2} (\lambda t)^2 \lesssim \lambda^{\min\{2, p'(x)\}} ((\delta + |b|)^{r-1} + t)^{p'(x)-2} t^2$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 &\lesssim |\ln(\delta + |b|)| \int_{p(x) \wedge p(y)}^{p(x) \vee p(y)} ((\delta + |b|)^{r-1} + \lambda t)^{p'(x)-2} (\lambda t)^2 dr \\
&\lesssim \lambda^{2 \wedge p'(x)} |p(x) - p(y)| |\ln(\delta + |b|)| ((\delta + |b|)^{p(x)-1} + (\delta + |b|)^{p(y)-1} + t)^{p'(x)} \\
&\lesssim \lambda^{2 \wedge (p^+)' } |p(x) - p(y)| (1 + (\delta + |b|)^{p(x)-1} + (\delta + |b|)^{p(y)-1} + t)^{p'(x)s} \\
&\lesssim \lambda^{2 \wedge (p^+)' } |p(x) - p(y)| (1 + (\delta + |b|)^{p(x)s} + (\delta + |b|)^{p(y)(p'(x)/p'(y))s} + t^{p'(y)(p'(x)/p'(y))s}) \\
&\lesssim \lambda^{2 \wedge (p^+)' } |p(x) - p(y)| (1 + |b|^{p(y)s} + t^{p'(y)s}),
\end{aligned} \tag{2.38}$$

for some $s > 1$, which can be chosen to be close to 1 if $|x - y|$ is close to 0.

ad I_2 . Using $((\delta + |b|)^{p(y)-1} + \lambda t)^{r-2} (\lambda t)^2 \lesssim \lambda^{\min\{2, r\}} ((\delta + |b|)^{p(y)-1} + t)^{r-2} t^2$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
I_2 &\lesssim \lambda^{2 \wedge (p^+)' } |p'(x) - p'(y)| |\ln((\delta + |b|)^{p(y)-1} + t)| (1 + (\delta + |b|)^{p(y)-1} + t)^{p'(x)-2} t^2 \\
&\quad + \lambda^{2 \wedge (p^+)' } |p'(x) - p'(y)| |\ln((\delta + |b|)^{p(y)-1} + t)| (1 + (\delta + |b|)^{p(y)-1} + t)^{p'(y)-2} t^2 \\
&\lesssim \lambda^{2 \wedge (p^+)' } \frac{|p(x) - p(y)|}{(p(x)-1)(p(y)-1)} |\ln((\delta + |b|)^{p(y)-1} + t)| (1 + (\delta + |b|)^{p(y)-1} + t)^{p'(x)} \\
&\quad + \lambda^{2 \wedge (p^+)' } \frac{|p(x) - p(y)|}{(p(x)-1)(p(y)-1)} |\ln((\delta + |b|)^{p(y)-1} + t)| (1 + (\delta + |b|)^{p(y)-1} + t)^{p'(y)} \\
&\lesssim \lambda^{2 \wedge (p^+)' } |p(x) - p(y)| |\ln((\delta + |b|)^{p(y)-1} + t)| (1 + (\delta + |b|)^{p(y)-1} + t)^{p'(y)(p'(x)/p'(y))} \\
&\quad + \lambda^{2 \wedge (p^+)' } |p(x) - p(y)| |\ln((\delta + |b|)^{p(y)-1} + t)| (1 + (\delta + |b|)^{p(y)-1} + t)^{p'(y)} \\
&\lesssim \lambda^{2 \wedge (p^+)' } |p(x) - p(y)| (1 + |b|^{p(y)s} + t^{p'(y)s}),
\end{aligned} \tag{2.39}$$

for some $s > 1$, which can be chosen to be close to 1 if $|x - y|$ is close to 0.

Eventually, combining (2.38) and (2.39) in (2.37), appealing to Remark 2.1, we conclude that

$$(\varphi_{|b|})^*(x, \lambda t) \lesssim (\varphi_{|b|})^*(y, \lambda t) + \lambda^{2 \wedge (p^+)' } |p(x) - p(y)| (1 + |b|^{p(y)s} + t^{p'(y)s}).$$

ad (2.30). Using the Newton–Leibniz formula and proceeding as for (2.30) and (2.39) yields for all $x, y \in \overline{\Omega}$ and $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
|F^*(x, a) - F^*(y, a)|^2 &\lesssim |(\delta^{p(x)-1} + |a|)^{\frac{p'(x)-2}{2}} a - (\delta^{p(x)-1} + |a|)^{\frac{p'(y)-2}{2}} a|^2 \\
&\quad + \int_{p(x) \wedge p(y)}^{p(x) \vee p(y)} |\ln(\delta)| (\delta^{r-1} + |a|)^{p'(x)-2} |a|^2 dr \\
&\lesssim |p(x) - p(y)| (1 + |a|^{p(y)s}). \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

2.7 $\mathcal{S}_D^{1,cr}(\mathcal{T}_h)$ -approximation of the $p(\cdot)$ -Dirichlet problem

Given a right-hand side $f \in L^{p'(\cdot)}(\Omega)$, $p \in C^0(\bar{\Omega})$ with $p^- > 1$, and setting $f_h := \Pi_h f \in \mathcal{L}^0(\mathcal{T}_h)$, the $\mathcal{S}_D^{1,cr}(\mathcal{T}_h)$ -approximation of the $p(\cdot)$ -Dirichlet problem seeks for $u_h^{cr} \in \mathcal{S}_D^{1,cr}(\mathcal{T}_h)$ such that for every $v_h \in \mathcal{S}_D^{1,cr}(\mathcal{T}_h)$, it holds

$$(\mathcal{A}_h(\cdot, \nabla_h u_h^{cr}), \nabla_h v_h)_\Omega = (f_h, \Pi_h v_h)_\Omega. \quad (2.40)$$

The theory of monotone operators, cf. [55, 51], proves the existence of a unique solution to (2.40). In what follows, we reserve the notation $u_h^{cr} \in \mathcal{S}_D^{1,cr}(\mathcal{T}_h)$ for this solution.

2.7.1 Discrete minimization problem and discrete convex duality relations

The discrete variational problem (2.40) emerges as an optimality condition of an equivalent convex minimization problem.

Discrete primal problem. The problem (2.40) is equivalent to the minimization of the discrete $p_h(\cdot)$ -Dirichlet energy, i.e., $I_h^{cr}: \mathcal{S}_D^{1,cr}(\mathcal{T}_h) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, for every $v_h \in \mathcal{S}_D^{1,cr}(\mathcal{T}_h)$ defined by

$$I_h^{cr}(v_h) := \rho_{\varphi_h, \Omega}(\nabla_h v_h) - (f_h, \Pi_h v_h)_\Omega. \quad (2.41)$$

Hereinafter, we refer the minimization of the discrete $p_h(\cdot)$ -Dirichlet energy (2.41) to as the *discrete primal problem*. Since the discrete $p_h(\cdot)$ -Dirichlet energy (2.41) is proper, strictly convex, weakly coercive, and lower semi-continuous, the existence of a unique minimizer of (2.41), called the *discrete primal solution*, follows using the direct method in the calculus of variations, cf. [23]. More precisely, since the discrete $p_h(\cdot)$ -Dirichlet energy (2.41) is Fréchet differentiable and for every $v_h, w_h \in \mathcal{S}_D^{1,cr}(\mathcal{T}_h)$, it holds

$$\langle DI_h^{cr}(v_h), w_h \rangle_{\mathcal{S}_D^{1,cr}(\mathcal{T}_h)} = (\mathcal{A}_h(\cdot, \nabla_h v_h), \nabla_h w_h)_\Omega,$$

the optimality conditions of the discrete primal problem and convexity of the discrete $p_h(\cdot)$ -Dirichlet energy (2.41) imply that $u_h^{cr} \in \mathcal{S}_D^{1,cr}(\mathcal{T}_h)$ solves the discrete primal problem, i.e., is the unique minimizer of the discrete $p_h(\cdot)$ -Dirichlet energy (2.41).

Discrete dual problem. The discrete dual problem consists in the maximization of the functional $D_h^{rt}: \mathcal{RT}_N^0(\mathcal{T}_h) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$, for every $y_h \in \mathcal{RT}_N^0(\mathcal{T}_h)$ defined by

$$D_h^{rt}(y_h) := -\rho_{\varphi_h^*, \Omega}(\Pi_h y_h) - I_{\{-f_h\}}(\operatorname{div} y_h). \quad (2.42)$$

The following proposition establishes the well-posedness of the discrete dual problem, i.e., the existence of a maximizer, the so-called *discrete dual solution*, and discrete strong duality. In addition, it provides a reconstruction formula for this maximizer from the discrete primal solution.

Proposition 2.12. *The following statements apply:*

(i) *There holds a discrete weak duality relation, i.e.,*

$$\inf_{v_h \in \mathcal{S}_D^{1,cr}(\mathcal{T}_h)} I_h^{cr}(v_h) \geq \sup_{y_h \in \mathcal{RT}_N^0(\mathcal{T}_h)} D_h^{rt}(y_h). \quad (2.43)$$

(ii) *The discrete flux $z_h^{rt} \in \mathcal{L}^1(\mathcal{T}_h)$, defined via the generalized Marini formula*

$$z_h^{rt} = \mathcal{A}_h(\cdot, \nabla_h u_h^{cr}) - \frac{f_h}{d} (\operatorname{id}_{\mathbb{R}^d} - \Pi_h \operatorname{id}_{\mathbb{R}^d}) \quad \text{in } \mathcal{RT}_N^0(\mathcal{T}_h), \quad (2.44)$$

satisfies $z_h^{rt} \in \mathcal{RT}_N^0(\mathcal{T}_h)$ and the discrete convex optimality relations

$$\operatorname{div} z_h^{rt} = -f_h \quad \text{in } \mathcal{L}^0(\mathcal{T}_h), \quad (2.45)$$

$$\Pi_h z_h^{rt} = \mathcal{A}_h(\cdot, \nabla_h u_h^{cr}) \quad \text{in } \mathcal{L}^0(\mathcal{T}_h)^d. \quad (2.46)$$

(iii) *The discrete flux $z_h^{rt} \in \mathcal{RT}_N^0(\mathcal{T}_h)$ is the unique maximizer of (2.42) and discrete strong duality applies, i.e.,*

$$I_h^{cr}(u_h^{cr}) = D_h^{rt}(z_h^{rt}). \quad (2.47)$$

By the Fenchel–Young identity, cf. [34, Proposition 5.1, p. 21], (2.46) is equivalent to

$$\Pi_h z_h^{rt} \cdot \nabla_h u_h^{cr} = \varphi_h^*(\cdot, |\Pi_h z_h^{rt}|) + \varphi_h(\cdot, |\nabla_h u_h^{cr}|) \quad \text{in } \mathcal{L}^0(\mathcal{T}_h). \quad (2.48)$$

Proof. ad (i). Using element-wise for each $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ that $\varphi(q_T, \cdot) = \varphi^{**}(q_T, \cdot)$, the definition of the convex conjugate, and the discrete integration-by-parts formula (2.14), we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{v_h \in \mathcal{S}_D^{1,cr}(\mathcal{T}_h)} I_h^{cr}(v_h) &= \inf_{v_h \in \mathcal{S}_D^{1,cr}(\mathcal{T}_h)} \rho_{\varphi_h^*, \Omega}(\nabla_h v_h) - (f_h, \Pi_h v_h)_\Omega \\ &= \inf_{v_h \in \mathcal{S}_D^{1,cr}(\mathcal{T}_h)} \sup_{\bar{y}_h \in \mathcal{L}^0(\mathcal{T}_h)^d} (\bar{y}_h, \nabla_h v_h)_\Omega - \rho_{\varphi_h^*, \Omega}(\bar{y}_h) - (f_h, \Pi_h v_h)_\Omega \\ &\geq \inf_{v_h \in \mathcal{S}_D^{1,cr}(\mathcal{T}_h)} \sup_{y_h \in \mathcal{RT}_N^0(\mathcal{T}_h)} -\rho_{\varphi_h^*, \Omega}(\Pi_h y_h) + (\Pi_h y_h, \nabla_h v_h)_\Omega - (f_h, \Pi_h v_h)_\Omega \\ &= \inf_{v_h \in \mathcal{S}_D^{1,cr}(\mathcal{T}_h)} \sup_{y_h \in \mathcal{RT}_N^0(\mathcal{T}_h)} -\rho_{\varphi_h^*, \Omega}(\Pi_h y_h) - (\operatorname{div} y_h + f_h, \Pi_h v_h)_\Omega \\ &\geq \inf_{\bar{v}_h \in \mathcal{L}^0(\mathcal{T}_h)} \sup_{y_h \in \mathcal{RT}_N^0(\mathcal{T}_h)} -\rho_{\varphi_h^*, \Omega}(\Pi_h y_h) - (\operatorname{div} y_h + f_h, \bar{v}_h)_\Omega \\ &\geq \sup_{y_h \in \mathcal{RT}_N^0(\mathcal{T}_h)} \inf_{\bar{v}_h \in \mathcal{L}^0(\mathcal{T}_h)} -\rho_{\varphi_h^*, \Omega}(\Pi_h y_h) - (\operatorname{div} y_h + f_h, \bar{v}_h)_\Omega \\ &= \sup_{y_h \in \mathcal{RT}_N^0(\mathcal{T}_h)} -\rho_{\varphi_h^*, \Omega}(\Pi_h y_h) - \sup_{\bar{v}_h \in \mathcal{L}^0(\mathcal{T}_h)} (\operatorname{div} y_h + f_h, \bar{v}_h)_\Omega \\ &= \sup_{y_h \in \mathcal{RT}_N^0(\mathcal{T}_h)} -\rho_{\varphi_h^*, \Omega}(\Pi_h y_h) - I_{\{-f_h\}}(\operatorname{div} y_h) \\ &= \sup_{y_h \in \mathcal{RT}_N^0(\mathcal{T}_h)} D_h^{rt}(y_h). \end{aligned}$$

ad (ii). By definition, the discrete flux $z_h^{rt} \in \mathcal{L}^1(\mathcal{T}_h)^d$, defined by (2.44), satisfies the discrete convex optimality condition (2.46) and $\operatorname{div}(z_h^{rt}|_T) = -f_h|_T$ in T for all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$. Due to $|\Gamma_D| > 0$, the divergence operator $\operatorname{div}: \mathcal{RT}_N^0(\mathcal{T}_h) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}^0(\mathcal{T}_h)$ is surjective. Hence, there exists $y_h \in \mathcal{RT}_N^0(\mathcal{T}_h)$ such that $\operatorname{div} y_h = -f_h$ in $\mathcal{L}^0(\mathcal{T}_h)$. Then, we have that $\operatorname{div}((z_h^{rt} - y_h)|_T) = 0$ in T for all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$, i.e., $z_h^{rt} - y_h \in \mathcal{L}^0(\mathcal{T}_h)^d$. In addition, for every $v_h \in \mathcal{S}_D^{1,cr}(\mathcal{T}_h)$, it holds

$$\begin{aligned} (\Pi_h y_h, \nabla_h v_h)_\Omega &= -(\operatorname{div} y_h, \Pi_h v_h)_\Omega \\ &= (f_h, \Pi_h v_h)_\Omega \\ &= (\mathcal{A}_h(\cdot, \nabla_h u_h^{cr}), \nabla_h v_h)_\Omega \\ &= (\Pi_h z_h^{rt}, \nabla_h v_h)_\Omega. \end{aligned}$$

In other words, for every $v_h \in \mathcal{S}_D^{1,cr}(\mathcal{T}_h)$, it holds

$$(y_h - z_h^{rt}, \nabla_h v_h)_\Omega = (\Pi_h y_h - \Pi_h z_h^{rt}, \nabla_h v_h)_\Omega = 0,$$

i.e., $y_h - z_h^{rt} \in \nabla_h(\mathcal{S}_D^{1,cr}(\mathcal{T}_h))^\perp$. By the decomposition (2.15), we have that $\nabla_h(\mathcal{S}_D^{1,cr}(\mathcal{T}_h))^\perp = \ker(\operatorname{div}|_{\mathcal{RT}_N^0(\mathcal{T}_h)}) \subseteq \mathcal{RT}_N^0(\mathcal{T}_h)$. As a result, we have that $y_h - z_h^{rt} \in \mathcal{RT}_N^0(\mathcal{T}_h)$. Due to $y_h \in \mathcal{RT}_N^0(\mathcal{T}_h)$, we conclude that $z_h^{rt} \in \mathcal{RT}_N^0(\mathcal{T}_h)$. In particular, now from $\operatorname{div}(z_h^{rt}|_T) = -f_h|_T$ in T for all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$, it follows the discrete optimality condition (2.45).

ad (iii). Using (2.48), (2.21), and the discrete integration-by-parts formula (2.14), we find that

$$\begin{aligned} I_h^{cr}(u_h^{cr}) &= \rho_{\varphi_h, \Omega}(\nabla_h u_h^{cr}) - (f_h, \Pi_h u_h^{cr})_\Omega \\ &= -\rho_{\varphi_h^*, \Omega}(\Pi_h z_h^{rt}) + (\Pi_h z_h^{rt}, \nabla_h u_h^{cr})_\Omega + (\operatorname{div} z_h^{rt}, \Pi_h u_h^{cr})_\Omega \\ &= -\rho_{\varphi_h^*, \Omega}(\Pi_h z_h^{rt}) - I_{\{-f_h\}}(\operatorname{div} z_h^{rt}) \\ &= D_h^{rt}(z_h^{rt}), \end{aligned}$$

i.e., the discrete strong duality relation applies, which in conjunction with the discrete weak duality relation (2.43) implies the maximality of $z_h^{rt} \in \mathcal{RT}_N^0(\mathcal{T}_h)$ for (2.42). Since (2.42) is strictly convex, $z_h^{rt} \in \mathcal{RT}_N^0(\mathcal{T}_h)$ is unique. \square

2.8 Natural regularity assumption for $p \in C^{0,1}(\overline{\Omega})$

In this section, for $p \in C^{0,1}(\overline{\Omega})$, we briefly examine the natural regularity assumption

$$F(\cdot, \nabla u) \in W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d), \quad (2.49)$$

on the solution $u \in W_D^{1,p(\cdot)}(\Omega)$ of (2.17), which is satisfied under mild assumptions on the domain $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$, the exponent $p \in C^{0,1}(\overline{\Omega})$ with $p^- > 1$ and the right-hand side $f \in L^{p'(\cdot)}(\Omega)$, cf. [37]; see also [13, Remark 4.5].

Lemma 2.13. *Let $p \in C^{0,1}(\overline{\Omega})$ with $p^- > 1$ and $\delta > 0$. Then, for every $v \in W^{1,p(\cdot)}(\Omega)$ with $F(\cdot, \nabla v) \in W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$, for $\mu(v) := |\ln(\delta + |\nabla v|)|^2 (\delta + |\nabla v|)^{p(\cdot)-2} |\nabla p \otimes \nabla v|^2 \in L^1(\Omega)$, it holds*

$$(\delta + |\nabla v|)^{p(\cdot)-2} |\nabla^2 v|^2 + \mu(v) \sim |\nabla F(\cdot, \nabla v)|^2 + \mu(v) \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega.$$

Proof. Since the claimed equivalence reads $0 \sim 0$ on $\{|\nabla v| = 0\}$, we restrict to the case $|\nabla v| > 0$. Here, by Rademacher's theorem, the product and chain rule, we find that

$$\nabla F(\cdot, \nabla v) = (\delta + |\nabla v|)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} \left(\frac{\nabla p \otimes \nabla v}{2} \ln(\delta + |\nabla v|) + \frac{p-2}{2} \frac{\nabla |\nabla v| \otimes \nabla v}{\delta + |\nabla v|} + \nabla^2 v \right) \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega.$$

Since $\nabla p \in L^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ as well as $(\delta + |\nabla v|)^{p-2} |\nabla^2 v|^2 \sim (\delta + |\nabla v|)^{p-4} |\nabla |\nabla v| \otimes \nabla v|^2$ a.e. in Ω , cf. [39, Lemma 2.8], we conclude the claimed equivalence on $\{|\nabla v| > 0\}$. \square

The following lemma translates the natural regularity assumption (2.49) to $z := \mathcal{A}(\cdot, \nabla u) \in W_N^{p(\cdot)}(\text{div}; \Omega)$ and vice versa.

Lemma 2.14. *Let $p \in C^{0,1}(\overline{\Omega})$ with $p^- > 1$ and $\delta \geq 0$. Then, for every $v \in W^{1,p(\cdot)}(\Omega)$ and $y := \mathcal{A}(\cdot, \nabla v) \in L^{p'(\cdot)}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$, it holds $F(\cdot, \nabla v) \in W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ if and only if $F^*(\cdot, y) \in W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$. In particular, it holds $|F(\cdot, \nabla v)|^2 \sim |F^*(\cdot, y)|^2$ a.e. in Ω and $|\nabla F(\cdot, \nabla v)|^2 + (1 + |\nabla v|^{p(\cdot)s}) \sim |\nabla F^*(\cdot, y)|^2 + (1 + |y|^{p'(\cdot)s})$ a.e. in Ω for some $s > 1$ with s chosen to be close to 1.*

Proof. The first equivalence is evident. For the second equivalence, we denote by $\tau_h f := |h|^{-1}(f(\cdot+h) - f)$ the difference quotient and exploit that, by Lemma 2.11, for all $h \in \mathbb{R}^d$ small enough

$$\begin{aligned} |\tau_h [F(\cdot, \nabla v)]|^2 &\lesssim |F(\cdot+h, (\nabla v)(\cdot+h)) - F(\cdot+h, \nabla v)|^2 + |F(\cdot+h, \nabla v) - F(\cdot, \nabla v)|^2 \\ &\lesssim |F^*(\cdot+h, \mathcal{A}(\cdot+h, (\nabla v)(\cdot+h))) - F^*(\cdot+h, \mathcal{A}(\cdot+h, \nabla v))|^2 + |\tau_h p|(1 + |\nabla v|^{p(\cdot)s}) \\ &\lesssim |\tau_h [F^*(\cdot, \mathcal{A}(\cdot, \nabla v))]|^2 + |\tau_h p|(1 + |\nabla v|^{p(\cdot)s}) \\ &\quad + |F^*(\cdot+h, \mathcal{A}(\cdot, \nabla v)) - F^*(\cdot+h, \mathcal{A}(\cdot+h, \nabla v))|^2 \\ &\quad + |F^*(\cdot+h, \mathcal{A}(\cdot, \nabla v)) - F^*(\cdot, \mathcal{A}(\cdot, \nabla v))|^2 \\ &\lesssim |\tau_h [F^*(\cdot, y)]|^2 + |\tau_h p|(1 + |y|^{p'(\cdot)s}) \quad \text{a.e. in } \{x \in \Omega \mid \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) > |h|\}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we find that $|\tau_h [F^*(\cdot, y)]| \lesssim |\tau_h [F(\cdot, \nabla v)]| + (1 + |\nabla v|^{p(\cdot)s})$ a.e. in $\{x \in \Omega \mid \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) > |h|\}$. Passing to the limit $|h| \rightarrow 0$ proves the claim. \square

Lemma 2.14, in turn, motivates to prove the following dual counterparts of Lemma 2.13.

Lemma 2.15. *Let $p \in C^{0,1}(\overline{\Omega})$ with $p^- > 1$ and $\delta > 0$. Then, for every $y \in L^{p'(\cdot)}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ with $F^*(\cdot, y) \in W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$, for $\mu^*(y) := |\ln(\delta^{p(\cdot)-1} + |y|)|^2 (\delta^{p(\cdot)-1} + |y|)^{p'(\cdot)-2} |\nabla p' \otimes y|^2 \in L^1(\Omega)$, it holds*

$$(\delta^{p(\cdot)-1} + |y|)^{p'(\cdot)-2} |\nabla y|^2 + \mu^*(y) \sim |\nabla F^*(\cdot, y)|^2 + \mu^*(y) \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega.$$

Proof. Since the claimed equivalence reads $0 \sim 0$ on $\{|y| = 0\}$, we restrict to the case $|y| > 0$. Here, by Rademacher's theorem, the product and chain rule, we find that

$$\nabla F^*(\cdot, y) = (\delta^{p-1} + |y|)^{\frac{p'-2}{2}} \left(\frac{\nabla p' \otimes y}{2} \ln(\delta^{p-1} + |y|) + \frac{p'-2}{2} \frac{\nabla p \ln(\delta)^{\delta^{p-1} + |y|} \otimes y}{\delta^{p-1} + |y|} + \nabla y \right) \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega.$$

Since $\nabla p' \in L^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ as well as $(\delta^{p-1} + |y|)^{p'-2} |\nabla y|^2 \sim (\delta^{p-1} + |y|)^{p'-4} |\nabla |y| \otimes y|^2$ a.e. in Ω , cf. [39, Lemma 2.11], we conclude the claimed equivalence on $\{|y| > 0\}$. \square

3. MEDIUS ERROR ANALYSIS

In this section, we prove a best-approximation result for the $\mathcal{S}_D^{1,cr}(\mathcal{T}_h)$ -approximation (2.40) of (2.17).

Theorem 3.1. *Let $p \in C^0(\bar{\Omega})$ with $p^- > 1$ and $\delta \geq 0$ and let $f \in L^{p'(\cdot)}(\Omega) \cap \bigcap_{h \in (0, h_0]} L^{p_h'(\cdot)}(\Omega)$ for some $h_0 > 0$. Then, there exists some $s > 1$, which can be chosen to be close to 1 if $h > 0$ is close to 0, such that if $u \in W_D^{1,p(\cdot)s}(\Omega)$, then for every $h \in (0, h_0]$, it holds*

$$\begin{aligned} \|F_h(\cdot, \nabla_h u_h^{cr}) - F_h(\cdot, \nabla u)\|_{2,\Omega}^2 &\lesssim \inf_{v_h \in \mathcal{S}_D^1(\mathcal{T}_h)} [\|F_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h) - F_h(\cdot, \nabla u)\|_{2,\Omega}^2 + \text{osc}_h(f, v_h) \\ &\quad + \|\omega_p(h_{\mathcal{T}})^2 (1 + |\nabla u|^{p(\cdot)s} + (|\nabla v_h| + |\nabla v_h - \nabla_h u_h^{cr}|)^{p_h(\cdot)s})\|_{1,\Omega}], \end{aligned}$$

where the hidden constant also depends on $s > 1$ and the chunkiness $\omega_0 > 0$, and for all $v_h \in \mathcal{S}_D^1(\mathcal{T}_h)$ and $\mathcal{M}_h \subseteq \mathcal{T}_h$, we define $\text{osc}_h(f, v_h, \mathcal{M}_h) := \sum_{T \in \mathcal{M}_h} \text{osc}_h(f, v_h, T)$, where we define $\text{osc}_h(f, v_h, T) := \rho_{((\varphi_h)|_{\nabla v_h})^*, T}(h_T(f - f_h))$ for all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ and $\text{osc}_h(f, v_h) := \text{osc}_h(f, v_h, \mathcal{T}_h)$.

The proof of Theorem 3.1 involves three tools.

3.1 Node-averaging quasi-interpolation operator

The first tool is the node-averaging quasi-interpolation operator $I_h^{av}: \mathcal{L}^1(\mathcal{T}_h) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_D^1(\mathcal{T}_h)$, that, denoting for every $z \in \mathcal{N}_h$, by $\mathcal{T}_h(z) := \{T \in \mathcal{T}_h \mid z \in T\}$, the set of elements sharing z , for every $v_h \in \mathcal{L}^1(\mathcal{T}_h)$, is defined by

$$I_h^{av} v_h := \sum_{z \in \mathcal{N}_h} \langle v_h \rangle_z \varphi_z, \quad \langle v_h \rangle_z := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\text{card}(\mathcal{T}_h(z))} \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h(z)} (v_h|_T)(z) & \text{if } z \in \Omega \cup \Gamma_N \\ 0 & \text{if } z \in \Gamma_D \end{cases},$$

where we denote by $(\varphi_z)_{z \in \mathcal{N}_h}$, the nodal basis of $\mathcal{S}^1(\mathcal{T}_h)$. If $p \in C^0(\bar{\Omega})$ with $p^- > 1$ and $\delta \geq 0$, then there exists some $s > 1$, which can be chosen to be close to 1 if $h_T > 0$ is close to 1, such that for every $a \geq 0$, $v_h \in \mathcal{S}_D^{1,cr}(\mathcal{T}_h)$, $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$, and $m \in \{0, 1\}$, cf. [10, Corollary A.2], it holds

$$\begin{aligned} \int_T \varphi_a(q_T, h_T^m |\nabla_h^m (v_h - I_h^{av} v_h)|) dx &\lesssim \int_{\omega_T} \varphi_a(q_T, h_T |\nabla_h v_h|) dx \\ &\lesssim \int_{\omega_T} (\varphi_h)_a(\cdot, h_T |\nabla_h v_h|) dx + \omega_{p,\omega_T} (h_T)^2 \|1 + a^{p_h(\cdot)s} + |\nabla_h v_h|^{p_h(\cdot)s}\|_{1,\omega_T}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

where we exploit that $\varphi_a(q_T, t) \lesssim \varphi_a(q_{T'}, t) + |p(q_T) - p(q_{T'})|^2 (1 + a^{p(q_{T'})^s} + t^{p(q_{T'})^s})$ for all $T' \in \mathcal{T}_h$ with $T' \subseteq \omega_T$ for the second inequality, which follows analogously to the estimate (2.32).

3.2 Local efficiency estimates

The second tool are local efficiency estimates that are based on bubble function techniques.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $p \in C^0(\bar{\Omega})$ with $p^- > 1$ and $\delta \geq 0$ and let $f \in L^{p'(\cdot)}(\Omega) \cap \bigcap_{h \in (0, h_0]} L^{p_h'(\cdot)}(\Omega)$ for some $h_0 > 0$. Then, there exists some $s > 1$, which can be chosen to be close to 1 if $h > 0$ is close to 0, such that if $u \in W_D^{1,p(\cdot)s}(\Omega)$, then for every $h \in (0, h_0]$, $v_h \in \mathcal{S}_D^1(\mathcal{T}_h)$, $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$, and $S \in \mathcal{S}_h^i$, it holds*

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{((\varphi_h)|_{\nabla v_h})^*, T}(h_T f_h) &\lesssim \|F_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h) - F_h(\cdot, \nabla u)\|_{2,T}^2 \\ &\quad + \|\omega_{p,T} (h_T)^2 (1 + |\nabla u|^{p(\cdot)s})\|_{1,T} + \text{osc}_h(f, v_h, T), \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

$$\begin{aligned} h_S \| [F_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h)]_S \|_{2,S}^2 &\lesssim \|F_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h) - F_h(\cdot, \nabla u)\|_{2,\omega_S}^2 \\ &\quad + \|\omega_{p,\omega_S} (h_S)^2 (1 + |\nabla u|^{p(\cdot)s} + |\nabla v_h|^{p_h(\cdot)s})\|_{1,\omega_S} + \text{osc}_h(f, v_h, \omega_S), \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

where the hidden constants in (3.2) and (3.3) also depend on $s > 1$ and the chunkiness $\omega_0 > 0$, and for every $\mathcal{M}_h \subseteq \mathcal{T}_h$, we define $\omega_{p,\mathcal{M}_h}(t)|_T := \omega_{p,T}(t)$ for all $t \geq 0$ and $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ and $\omega_p := \omega_{p,\mathcal{T}_h}$.

Proof. We generalize the procedure in the proof of [39, Lemma 3.2].

ad (3.2). Let $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ be fixed, but arbitrary. Then, there exists a bubble function $b_T \in W_0^{1,\infty}(T)$ such that $0 \leq b_T \lesssim 1$ in T , $|\nabla b_T| \lesssim h_T^{-1}$ in T , and $\int_T b_T \, dx = 1$, where the hidden constant depends only on the chunkiness $\omega_0 > 0$. Using (2.17) and integration-by-parts, taking into account that $\mathcal{A}_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h) \in \mathcal{L}^0(\mathcal{T}_h)^d$ and $b_T \in W_0^{1,\infty}(T)$, for every $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, we find that

$$(\mathcal{A}(\cdot, \nabla u) - \mathcal{A}_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h), \nabla(\lambda b_T))_T = (f, \lambda b_T)_T. \quad (3.4)$$

For the special choice $\lambda_T := \text{sgn}(f_h) \partial_a((\varphi_{|\nabla v_h|})^*)(q_T, h_T |f_h|) \in \mathbb{R}$, by the Fenchel–Young identity, cf. [34, Proposition 5.1, p. 21], we obtain

$$(h_T f_h) \lambda_T = (\varphi_{|\nabla v_h|})^*(q_T, h_T |f_h|) + \varphi_{|\nabla v_h|}(q_T, |\lambda_T|). \quad (3.5)$$

Then, choosing $\lambda = h_T \lambda_T \in \mathbb{R}$, cf. (3.5), in (3.4), we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{((\varphi_h)_{|\nabla v_h|})^*, T}(h_T f_h) + \rho_{(\varphi_h)_{|\nabla v_h|}, T}(\lambda_T) &= (f, h_T \lambda_T b_T)_T \\ &\quad + (f_h - f, h_T \lambda_T b_T)_T \\ &= (\mathcal{A}_h(\cdot, \nabla u) - \mathcal{A}_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h), \nabla(h_T \lambda_T b_T))_T \\ &\quad + (\mathcal{A}(\cdot, \nabla u) - \mathcal{A}_h(\cdot, \nabla u), \nabla(h_T \lambda_T b_T))_T \\ &\quad + (f_h - f, h_T \lambda_T b_T)_T \\ &=: I_1 + I_2 + I_3. \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

Applying the ε -Young inequality (2.2) with $\psi = \varphi_{|\nabla v_h|}(q_T, \cdot)$ together with (2.7), also using that $|b_T| + h_T |\nabla b_T| \lesssim 1$ in T , we find that

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &\leq c_\varepsilon \|F_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h) - F_h(\cdot, \nabla u)\|_{2,T}^2 + \varepsilon \rho_{(\varphi_h)_{|\nabla v_h|}, T}(\lambda_T), \\ I_3 &\leq c_\varepsilon \text{osc}_h(f, v_h, T) + \varepsilon \rho_{(\varphi_h)_{|\nabla v_h|}, T}(\lambda_T). \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

Applying the ε -Young inequality (2.2) with $\psi = \varphi_{|\nabla u|}(q_T, \cdot)$ together with (2.10), $|b_T| + h_T |\nabla b_T| \lesssim 1$ in T , the shift change (2.11), and Lemma 2.10 (2.27), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &\leq c_\varepsilon \|F_h^*(\cdot, \mathcal{A}_h(\cdot, \nabla u)) - F_h^*(\cdot, \mathcal{A}(\cdot, \nabla u))\|_{2,T}^2 + \varepsilon \rho_{(\varphi_h)_{|\nabla u|}, T}(\lambda_T) \\ &\lesssim c_\varepsilon \|\omega_{p,T}(h_T)^2 (1 + |\nabla u|)^{p(\cdot)s}\|_{1,T} + \varepsilon [\rho_{(\varphi_h)_{|\nabla v_h|}, T}(\lambda_T) + \|F_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h) - F_h(\cdot, \nabla u)\|_{2,T}^2], \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

Taking into account (3.7) and (3.8) in (3.6), for sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{((\varphi_h)_{|\nabla v_h|})^*, T}(h_T f_h) &\lesssim \|F_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h) - F_h(\cdot, \nabla u)\|_{2,T}^2 \\ &\quad + \|\omega_{p,T}(h_T)^2 (1 + |\nabla u|)^{p(\cdot)s}\|_{1,T} + \text{osc}_h(f, v_h, T). \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

ad (3.3). Let $S \in \mathcal{S}_h^i$ be fixed, but arbitrary. Then, there exists a bubble function $b_S \in W_0^{1,\infty}(\omega_S)$ such that $0 \leq b_S \lesssim 1$ in ω_S , $|\nabla b_S| \lesssim h_S^{-1}$ in ω_S , and $\int_S b_S \, ds = 1$, where the hidden constant depends only on the chunkiness $\omega_0 > 0$. Using (2.17) and integration-by-parts, taking into account that $\mathcal{A}_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h) \in \mathcal{L}^0(\mathcal{T}_h)^d$ and $b_S \in W_0^{1,\infty}(\omega_S)$ with $\int_S b_S \, ds = 1$, for every $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, we find that

$$(\mathcal{A}(\cdot, \nabla u) - \mathcal{A}_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h), \nabla(\lambda b_S))_{\omega_S} = (f, \lambda b_S)_{\omega_S} - |S| \llbracket \mathcal{A}_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h) \cdot n \rrbracket_S \lambda. \quad (3.10)$$

Let $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ be such that $T \subseteq \omega_S$. Then, using the notation $\nabla v_h(T) := \nabla v_h|_T$ ³, for the choice

$$\lambda_{S,T} := \text{sgn}(\llbracket \mathcal{A}_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h) \cdot n \rrbracket_S) \partial_a((\varphi_{|\nabla v_h(T)|})^*)(q_T, \llbracket \mathcal{A}_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h) \cdot n \rrbracket_S) \in \mathbb{R},$$

by the Fenchel–Young identity, cf. [34, Proposition 5.1, p. 21], it holds

$$\llbracket \mathcal{A}_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h) \cdot n \rrbracket_S \lambda_{S,T} = (\varphi_{|\nabla v_h(T)|})^*(q_T, \llbracket \mathcal{A}_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h) \cdot n \rrbracket_S) + \varphi_{|\nabla v_h(T)|}(q_T, |\lambda_{S,T}|). \quad (3.11)$$

Next, let $T' \in \mathcal{T}_h \setminus \{T\}$ be such that $T' \subseteq \omega_S$. Then, due to the convexity of $(\varphi_{|\nabla v_h(T)|})^*(q_T, \cdot)$ and

³In what follows, we employ this notation to indicate that the value of $\nabla v_h(T) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ depends only on the value of $\nabla v_h \in \mathcal{L}^0(\mathcal{T}_h)$ on $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$.

$\Delta_2((\varphi|_{\nabla v_h(T)})^*(q_T, \cdot)) \lesssim 2^{\max\{2, (p^-)'\}}$, also using the shift change (2.12) and (2.10), we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\varphi|_{\nabla v_h(T)})^*(q_T, |[\mathcal{A}_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h) \cdot n]_S|) \\
& \quad \gtrsim (\varphi|_{\nabla v_h(T)})^*(q_T, |[\mathcal{A}(q_T, \nabla v_h)]_S \cdot n_T|) \\
& \quad \quad - (\varphi|_{\nabla v_h(T)})^*(q_T, |(\mathcal{A}(q_T, \nabla v_h(T')) - \mathcal{A}(q_{T'}, \nabla v_h(T'))) \cdot n_T|) \\
& \quad \gtrsim (\varphi|_{\nabla v_h(T)})^*(q_T, |[\mathcal{A}(q_T, \nabla v_h)]_S \cdot n_T|) \\
& \quad \quad - c_\varepsilon (\varphi|_{\nabla v_h(T')})^*(q_T, |(\mathcal{A}(q_T, \nabla v_h(T')) - \mathcal{A}(q_{T'}, \nabla v_h(T'))) |) \\
& \quad \quad - \varepsilon |F(q_T, \nabla v_h(T')) - F(q_T, \nabla v_h(T))|^2 \\
& \quad \gtrsim (\varphi|_{\nabla v_h(T)})^*(q_T, |[\mathcal{A}(q_T, \nabla v_h)]_S \cdot n_T|) \\
& \quad \quad - c_\varepsilon |F^*(q_T, \mathcal{A}(q_T, \nabla v_h(T'))) - F^*(q_T, \mathcal{A}(q_{T'}, \nabla v_h(T')))|^2 \\
& \quad \quad - \varepsilon \|[F(q_T, \nabla v_h)]_S\|^2 =: I_1 - c_\varepsilon I_2 - \varepsilon I_3.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

Resorting to Lemma 2.11 (2.31), we deduce that

$$I_2 \lesssim \omega_{p, \omega_S}(h_S)^2 (1 + |\nabla v_h(T')|^{p(q_{T'})^s}). \tag{3.13}$$

Using that $n_T = \pm \frac{[\nabla v_h]_S}{\|[\nabla v_h]_S\|}$ since $v_h \in \mathcal{D}_S^1(\mathcal{T}_h)$, cf. [29, p. 12], and (2.7), we find that

$$\|[\mathcal{A}(q_T, \nabla v_h)]_S \cdot n_T\| \sim \frac{\varphi|_{\nabla v_h(T)}(q_T, \frac{[\nabla v_h]_S}{\|[\nabla v_h]_S\|})}{\|[\nabla v_h]_S\|} \sim \partial_a(\varphi|_{\nabla v_h(T)})(q_T, \frac{[\nabla v_h]_S}{\|[\nabla v_h]_S\|}),$$

and, thus, using $(\varphi|_{\nabla v_h(T)})^*(q_T, \cdot) \circ \partial_a(\varphi|_{\nabla v_h(T)})(q_T, \cdot) \sim |F(q_T, \cdot)|^2$, cf. [29, (2.6)], we get $I_1 \sim I_3$. Therefore, for sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, resorting to Lemma 2.11 (2.29), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 - \varepsilon I_3 & \gtrsim \|[F_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h)]_S\|^2 - |F(q_{T'}, \nabla v_h(T')) - F(q_T, \nabla v_h(T'))|^2 \\
& \gtrsim \|[F_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h)]_S\|^2 - \omega_{p, \omega_S}(h_S)^2 (1 + |\nabla v_h(T')|^{p(q_{T'})^s}).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

Combining (3.13) and (3.14) in (3.12), we arrive at

$$\|[F_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h)]_S\|^2 \lesssim (\varphi|_{\nabla v_h(T)})^*(q_T, |[\mathcal{A}_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h) \cdot n]_S|) + \omega_{p, \omega_S}(h_S)^2 (1 + |\nabla v_h(T')|^{p(q_{T'})^s}). \tag{3.15}$$

For $\lambda = \frac{|\omega_S|}{|S|} \lambda_{S, T} \in \mathbb{R}$, cf. (3.11), in (3.10), also using (3.15), we observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
& h_S \|[F_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h)]_S\|_{2, S}^2 + \rho_{(\varphi_h)|_{\nabla v_h(T)}, \omega_S}(\lambda_{S, T}) - \|\omega_{p, \omega_S}(h_S)^2 (1 + |\nabla v_h|^{p_h(\cdot)^s})\|_{1, \omega_S} \\
& \quad \lesssim |\omega_S| \|[\mathcal{A}_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h) \cdot n]_S \lambda_{S, T} \\
& \quad = \frac{|\omega_S|}{|S|} (\mathcal{A}_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h) - \mathcal{A}_h(\cdot, \nabla u), \nabla(\lambda_{S, T} b_S))_{\omega_S} \\
& \quad \quad + \frac{|\omega_S|}{|S|} (\mathcal{A}_h(\cdot, \nabla u) - \mathcal{A}(\cdot, \nabla u), \nabla(\lambda_{S, T} b_S))_{\omega_S} \\
& \quad \quad + \frac{|\omega_S|}{|S|} (f_h, \lambda_{S, T} b_S)_{\omega_S} + \frac{|\omega_S|}{|S|} (f - f_h, \lambda_{S, T} b_S)_{\omega_S} \\
& \quad =: I_1 + I_2 + I_3 + I_4.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.16}$$

Applying the ε -Young inequality (2.2) with $\psi = \varphi|_{\nabla v_h(T')}(q_{T'}, \cdot)$ together with (2.7) for all $T' \in \mathcal{T}_h$ with $T' \subseteq \omega_S$, and $|b_S| + h_S |\nabla b_S| \lesssim 1$ in ω_S , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 & \leq c_\varepsilon \|F_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h) - F_h(\cdot, \nabla u)\|_{2, \omega_S}^2 + \varepsilon \rho_{(\varphi_h)|_{\nabla v_h}, \omega_S}(\lambda_{S, T}), \\
I_3 & \leq c_\varepsilon \rho_{((\varphi_h)|_{\nabla v_h})^*, \omega_S}(h_{\mathcal{T}} f) + \varepsilon \rho_{(\varphi_h)|_{\nabla v_h}, \omega_S}(\lambda_{S, T}), \\
I_4 & \leq c_\varepsilon \text{osc}(f, v_h, \omega_S) + \varepsilon \rho_{(\varphi_h)|_{\nabla v_h}, \omega_S}(\lambda_{S, T}).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.17}$$

Applying the ε -Young inequality (2.2) with $\psi = \varphi|_{\nabla u}(q_{T'}, \cdot)$ together with (2.10) for all $T' \in \mathcal{T}_h$ with $T' \subseteq \omega_S$, $|b_S| + h_S |\nabla b_S| \lesssim 1$ in ω_S , the shift change (2.11), and Lemma 2.10 (2.27), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
I_2 & \leq c_\varepsilon \|F_h^*(\cdot, \mathcal{A}_h(\cdot, \nabla u)) - F_h^*(\cdot, \mathcal{A}(\cdot, \nabla u))\|_{2, \omega_S}^2 + \varepsilon \rho_{(\varphi_h)|_{\nabla u}, \omega_S}(\lambda_{S, T}) \\
& \lesssim c_\varepsilon \|\omega_p(h_{\mathcal{T}})^2 (1 + |\nabla u|^{p(\cdot)^s})\|_{1, \omega_S} + \varepsilon [\rho_{(\varphi_h)|_{\nabla v_h}, \omega_S}(\lambda_{S, T}) + \|F_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h) - F_h(\cdot, \nabla u)\|_{2, \omega_S}^2].
\end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

The shift change (2.11) on $T' \in \mathcal{T}_h \setminus \{T\}$ with $T' \subseteq \omega_S$ further yields that

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{(\varphi_h)|_{\nabla v_h}, \omega_S}(\lambda_T^S) &\lesssim \rho_{(\varphi_h)|_{\nabla v_h(T)}, \omega_S}(\lambda_T^S) + h_S \|[F(q_{T'}, \nabla v_h)]\|_S \|_{2,S}^2 \\ &\lesssim \rho_{(\varphi_h)|_{\nabla v_h(T)}, \omega_S}(\lambda_T^S) + h_S \|[F_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h)]\|_S \|_{2,S}^2 \\ &\quad + \|\omega_{p, \omega_S}(h_S)^2 (1 + |\nabla v_h|^{p_h(\cdot)s})\|_{1, \omega_S}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.19)$$

Combining (3.16)–(3.19), for sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, we conclude that (3.3) applies. \square

3.3 Patch-shift-to-element-shift inequality

The third tool is an estimate that enables to pass from element-patch-shifts to element-shifts. This is essential in the application of quasi-interpolation operators that are only element-to-patch stable, e.g., the node-averaging quasi-interpolation operator $I_h^{av}: \mathcal{S}_D^{1,cr}(\mathcal{T}_h) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_D^1(\mathcal{T}_h)$, cf. (3.1).

Lemma 3.3. *Let $p \in C^0(\overline{\Omega})$ with $p^- > 1$ and let $\delta \geq 0$. Then, there exists some $s > 1$, which can be chosen to be close to 1 if $h_T > 0$ is close to 0, such that for every $y_h \in L^{p_h(\cdot)}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$, $v_h \in \mathcal{L}^1(\mathcal{T}_h)$, and $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$, it holds*

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{(\varphi_h)|_{\nabla_h v_h(T)}, \omega_T}(y_h) &\lesssim \rho_{(\varphi_h)|_{\nabla_h v_h}, \omega_T}(y_h) + \|h_S^{1/2} [F_h(\cdot, \nabla_h v_h)]\|_{2, \mathcal{S}_h^i(T)}^2 \\ &\quad + \|\omega_{p, \omega_T}(h_T)^2 (1 + |\nabla_h v_h|^{p_h(\cdot)s})\|_{1, T}. \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{S}_h^i(T) := \mathcal{S}_h(T) \cap \mathcal{S}_h^i$ and $\mathcal{S}_h(T) := \{S \in \mathcal{S}_h \mid S \cap T \neq \emptyset\}$.

Proof. Applying for every $T' \in \mathcal{T}_h$ with $T' \subseteq \omega_T$, the shift change (2.11), we arrive at

$$\rho_{(\varphi_h)|_{\nabla_h v_h(T)}, \omega_T}(y_h) \lesssim \rho_{(\varphi_h)|_{\nabla_h v_h}, \omega_T}(y_h) + \|F_h(\cdot, \nabla_h v_h(T)) - F_h(\cdot, \nabla_h v_h)\|_{2, \omega_T}^2. \quad (3.20)$$

Since each $T' \in \mathcal{T}_h$ with $T' \subseteq \omega_T$ can be reached by passing through a uniformly bounded number (depending on $\omega_0 > 0$) of sides $S \in \mathcal{S}_h^i(T)$, for every $T' \in \mathcal{T}_h$ with $T' \subseteq \omega_T$, using (2.33), it holds

$$\begin{aligned} &|F(q_{T'}, \nabla_h v_h(T)) - F(q_{T'}, \nabla_h v_h(T'))|^2 \\ &\lesssim |F(q_T, \nabla_h v_h(T)) - F(q_{T'}, \nabla_h v_h(T'))|^2 + |F(q_{T'}, \nabla_h v_h(T)) - F(q_T, \nabla_h v_h(T))|^2 \\ &\lesssim |T|^{-1} \|h_S^{1/2} [F_h(\cdot, \nabla_h v_h)]\|_S \|_{2, \mathcal{S}_h^i(T)}^2 + |T|^{-1} \|\omega_{p, \omega_T}(h_T)^2 (1 + |\nabla_h v_h|^{p_h(\cdot)s})\|_{1, T}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.21)$$

Eventually, multiplying (3.21) by $|T'|$ for all $T' \in \mathcal{T}_h$ with $T' \subseteq \omega_T$, due to $|T'| \sim |T|$, we arrive at the claimed estimate. \square

Proof (of Theorem 3.1). Abbreviating $e_h := v_h - u_h^{cr} \in \mathcal{S}_D^{1,cr}(\mathcal{T}_h)$ and resorting to (2.17) and (2.40) as well as that $f - f_h \perp \Pi_h e_h$ in $L^2(\Omega)$, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{A}_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h) - \mathcal{A}_h(\cdot, \nabla_h u_h^{cr}), \nabla_h e_h)_\Omega &= (\mathcal{A}_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h), \nabla_h (e_h - I_h^{av} e_h))_\Omega \\ &\quad + (f, I_h^{av} e_h - e_h)_\Omega \\ &\quad + (\mathcal{A}_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h) - \mathcal{A}_h(\cdot, \nabla u), \nabla I_h^{av} e_h)_\Omega \\ &\quad + (f - f_h, e_h - \Pi_h e_h)_\Omega \\ &=: I_h^1 + I_h^2 + I_h^3 + I_h^4. \end{aligned} \quad (3.22)$$

ad I_h^1 . An element-wise integration-by-parts, $\llbracket \mathcal{A}_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h) \cdot n (e_h - I_h^{av} e_h) \rrbracket_S = \llbracket \mathcal{A}_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h) \cdot n \rrbracket_S \{e_h - I_h^{av} e_h\}_S + \{\mathcal{A}_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h) \cdot n\}_S \llbracket e_h - I_h^{av} e_h \rrbracket_S$ on S , $\int_S \llbracket e_h - I_h^{av} e_h \rrbracket_S ds = 0$ and $\{\mathcal{A}_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h) \cdot n\}_S = \text{const}$ on S for all $S \in \mathcal{S}_h^i$, the discrete trace inequality [36, Lemma 12.8], and (3.1) with $\psi = |\cdot|$ and $a = 0$ yield

$$\begin{aligned} I_h^1 &= \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_h^i} \llbracket \mathcal{A}_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h) \cdot n \rrbracket_S \int_S \{e_h - I_h^{av} e_h\}_S ds \\ &\lesssim \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_h^i} \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h: T \subseteq \omega_S} \int_{\omega_T} \llbracket \mathcal{A}_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h) \cdot n \rrbracket_S |\nabla_h e_h| dx. \end{aligned} \quad (3.23)$$

Next, let $T' \in \mathcal{T}_h \setminus \{T\}$ with $T' \subseteq \omega_S$. Then, resorting to the convexity of $(\varphi|_{\nabla v_h(T)})^*(q_T, \cdot)$ and $\Delta_2((\varphi|_{\nabla v_h(T)})^*(q_T, \cdot)) \lesssim 2^{\max\{2, (p^-)'\}}$, also using the shift change (2.12) and (2.10), we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\varphi|_{\nabla v_h(T)})^*(q_T, |[\mathcal{A}_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h) \cdot n]_S|) \\
& \lesssim (\varphi|_{\nabla v_h(T)})^*(q_T, |[\mathcal{A}(q_T, \nabla v_h) \cdot n_T]_S|) \\
& \quad + (\varphi|_{\nabla v_h(T)})^*(q_T, |(\mathcal{A}(q_T, \nabla v_h(T')) - \mathcal{A}(q_{T'}, \nabla v_h(T'))) \cdot n_T|) \\
& \lesssim (\varphi|_{\nabla v_h(T)})^*(q_T, |[\mathcal{A}(q_T, \nabla v_h) \cdot n_T]_S|) \\
& \quad + |F(q_T, \nabla v_h(T')) - F(q_T, \nabla v_h(T))|^2 \\
& \quad + |F^*(q_T, \mathcal{A}(q_T, \nabla v_h(T'))) - F^*(q_T, \mathcal{A}(q_{T'}, \nabla v_h(T')))|^2 \\
& \lesssim \|F(q_T, \nabla v_h)\|_S^2 + \omega_{p, \omega_S}(h_S)^2 (1 + |\nabla v_h(T')|^{p(q_{T'})^s}) \\
& \lesssim \|F_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h)\|_S^2 + |F(q_{T'}, \nabla v_h(T')) - F(q_T, \nabla v_h(T'))|^2 \\
& \quad + \omega_{p, \omega_S}(h_S)^2 (1 + |\nabla v_h(T')|^{p(q_{T'})^s}) \\
& \lesssim \|F_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h)\|_S^2 + \omega_{p, \omega_S}^2 (1 + |\nabla v_h(T')|^{p(q_{T'})^s}).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.24}$$

Applying for every $T' \in \mathcal{T}_h$ with $T' \subseteq \omega_T$, the ε -Young inequality (2.2) with $\psi = \varphi|_{\nabla v_h(T)}(q_{T'}, \cdot)$, (3.24), and the finite overlapping of the element patches ω_T , $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$, in (3.23), for every $\varepsilon > 0$, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
I_h^1 & \lesssim c_\varepsilon \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_h^i} \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h; T \subseteq \omega_S} \int_{\omega_T} ((\varphi_h)|_{\nabla v_h(T)})^*(\cdot, |[\mathcal{A}_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h) \cdot n]_S|) \, dx \\
& \quad + \varepsilon \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_h^i} \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h; T \subseteq \omega_S} \int_{\omega_T} (\varphi_h)|_{\nabla v_h(T)}(\cdot, |\nabla_h e_h|) \, dx \\
& \lesssim c_\varepsilon [\|h_S^{1/2} \|F_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h)\|_{2, \mathcal{S}_h^i}^2 + \|\omega_p(h_{\mathcal{T}})^2 (1 + |\nabla_h v_h|^{p_h(\cdot)^s})\|_{1, \Omega}] \\
& \quad + \varepsilon \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} \rho_{(\varphi_h)|_{\nabla v_h(T)}, \omega_T}(\nabla_h e_h).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.25}$$

Appealing to Lemma 3.3 with $y_h = \nabla_h e_h \in L^{p_h(\cdot)}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} \rho_{(\varphi_h)|_{\nabla v_h(T)}, \omega_T}(\nabla_h e_h) & \lesssim \rho_{(\varphi_h)|_{\nabla v_h}, \Omega}(\nabla_h e_h) + \|h_S^{1/2} \|F_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h)\|_{2, \mathcal{S}_h^i}^2 \\
& \quad + \|\omega_p(h_{\mathcal{T}})^2 (1 + |\nabla v_h|^{p_h(\cdot)^s})\|_{1, \Omega}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.26}$$

Thus, resorting in (3.25) to (3.3) and (2.7), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
I_h^1 & \lesssim c_\varepsilon [\|F_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h) - F_h(\cdot, \nabla u)\|_{2, \Omega}^2] \\
& \quad + \|\omega_p(h_{\mathcal{T}})^2 (1 + |\nabla u|^{p(\cdot)^s} + |\nabla v_h|^{p_h(\cdot)^s})\|_{1, \Omega} + \text{osc}_h(f, v_h)] \\
& \quad + \varepsilon \|F_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h) - F_h(\cdot, \nabla_h u_h^{cr})\|_{2, \Omega}^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.27}$$

ad I_h^2 . Applying for every $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ the ε -Young inequality (2.2) with $\psi = \varphi|_{\nabla v_h(T)}(q_T, \cdot)$, for every $\varepsilon > 0$, we obtain

$$I_h^2 \leq c_\varepsilon \rho_{((\varphi_h)|_{\nabla v_h})^*, \Omega}(h_{\mathcal{T}} f) + \varepsilon \rho_{(\varphi_h)|_{\nabla v_h}, \Omega}(h_{\mathcal{T}}^{-1}(e_h - I_h^{av} e_h)). \tag{3.28}$$

Then, using for every $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ the Orlicz-approximation property of $I_h^{av}: \mathcal{S}_D^{1, cr}(\mathcal{T}_h) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_D^1(\mathcal{T}_h)$, cf. (3.1), with $\psi = \varphi_h(q_T, \cdot)$ and $a = |\nabla v_h(T)|$, we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_{(\varphi_h)|_{\nabla v_h}, \Omega}(h_{\mathcal{T}}^{-1}(e_h - I_h^{av} e_h)) & \lesssim \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} \rho_{(\varphi_h)|_{\nabla v_h(T)}, \omega_T}(\nabla_h e_h) \\
& \quad + \|\omega_p(h_{\mathcal{T}})^2 (1 + |\nabla v_h|^{p_h(\cdot)^s} + |\nabla_h e_h|^{p_h(\cdot)^s})\|_{1, \Omega}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.29}$$

Thus, using (3.29) and (3.26) in conjunction with (3.2) and (3.3) in (3.28), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} I_h^2 &\lesssim c_\varepsilon \left[\|F_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h) - F_h(\cdot, \nabla u)\|_{2,\Omega}^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|\omega_p(h_{\mathcal{T}})^2 (1 + |\nabla u|^{p(\cdot)s} + |\nabla v_h|^{p_h(\cdot)s} + |\nabla_h e_h|^{p_h(\cdot)s})\|_{1,\Omega} + \text{osc}_h(f, v_h) \right] \\ &\quad + \varepsilon \|F_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h) - F_h(\cdot, \nabla_h u_h^{cr})\|_{2,\Omega}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.30)$$

ad I_h^3 . Applying for every $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ the ε -Young inequality (2.2) with $\psi = \varphi_{|\nabla v_h(T)|}(q_T, \cdot)$ together with (2.7), for every $\varepsilon > 0$, we obtain

$$I_h^3 \leq c_\varepsilon \|F_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h) - F_h(\cdot, \nabla u)\|_{2,\Omega}^2 + \varepsilon \rho_{(\varphi_h)_{|\nabla v_h|}, \Omega}(\nabla I_h^{av} e_h). \quad (3.31)$$

Then, using for every $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ the Orlicz-stability property of $I_h^{av}: \mathcal{S}_D^{1,cr}(\mathcal{T}_h) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_D^1(\mathcal{T}_h)$, cf. (3.1), with $\psi = \varphi(q_T, \cdot)$ and $a = |\nabla v_h(T)|$, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{(\varphi_h)_{|\nabla v_h|}, \Omega}(\nabla I_h^{av} e_h) &\lesssim \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} \rho_{(\varphi_h)_{|\nabla v_h(T)|}, \omega_T}(\nabla_h e_h) \\ &\quad + \|\omega_p(h_{\mathcal{T}})^2 (1 + |\nabla v_h|^{p_h(\cdot)s} + |\nabla_h e_h|^{p_h(\cdot)s})\|_{1,\Omega}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.32)$$

Thus, using (3.32) and (3.26) in conjunction with (3.3) in (3.31), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} I_h^3 &\lesssim c_\varepsilon \left[\|F_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h) - F_h(\cdot, \nabla u)\|_{2,\Omega}^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|\omega_p(h_{\mathcal{T}})^2 (1 + |\nabla v_h|^{p_h(\cdot)s} + |\nabla_h e_h|^{p_h(\cdot)s})\|_{1,\Omega} + \text{osc}_h(f, v_h) \right] \\ &\quad + \varepsilon \|F_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h) - F_h(\cdot, \nabla_h u_h^{cr})\|_{2,\Omega}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.33)$$

ad I_h^4 . Applying for every $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ the ε -Young inequality (2.2) with $\psi = \varphi_{|\nabla v_h|}$, for every $\varepsilon > 0$, we obtain

$$I_h^4 \leq c_\varepsilon \text{osc}_h(f, v_h) + \varepsilon \rho_{\varphi_{|\nabla v_h|}, \Omega}(h_{\mathcal{T}}^{-1}(e_h - I_h^{av} e_h)). \quad (3.34)$$

Thus, using (3.29) and (3.26) in conjunction with (3.3) in (3.34), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} I_h^4 &\lesssim c_\varepsilon \left[\|F_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h) - F_h(\cdot, \nabla u)\|_{2,\Omega}^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|\omega_p(h_{\mathcal{T}})^2 (1 + |\nabla v_h|^{p_h(\cdot)s} + |\nabla_h e_h|^{p_h(\cdot)s})\|_{1,\Omega} + \text{osc}_h(f, v_h) \right] \\ &\quad + \varepsilon \|F_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h) - F_h(\cdot, \nabla_h u_h^{cr})\|_{2,\Omega}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.35)$$

Then, combining (2.7), (3.27), (3.30), (3.33), and (3.35) in (3.22), for every $\varepsilon > 0$, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \|F_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h) - F_h(\cdot, \nabla_h u_h^{cr})\|_{2,\Omega}^2 &\lesssim c_\varepsilon \left[\|F_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h) - F_h(\cdot, \nabla u)\|_{2,\Omega}^2 + \text{osc}_h(f, v_h) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|\omega_p(h_{\mathcal{T}})^2 (1 + |\nabla u|^{p(\cdot)s} + (|\nabla v_h| + |\nabla_h e_h|)^{p_h(\cdot)s})\|_{1,\Omega} \right] \\ &\quad + \varepsilon \|F_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h) - F_h(\cdot, \nabla_h u_h^{cr})\|_{2,\Omega}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Next, choosing $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, for every $v_h \in \mathcal{S}_D^{1,cr}(\mathcal{T}_h)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|F_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h) - F_h(\cdot, \nabla_h u_h^{cr})\|_{2,\Omega}^2 &\lesssim \|F_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h) - F_h(\cdot, \nabla u)\|_{2,\Omega}^2 + \text{osc}_h(f, v_h) \\ &\quad + \|\omega_p(h_{\mathcal{T}})^2 (1 + |\nabla u|^{p(\cdot)s} + (|\nabla v_h| + |\nabla_h e_h|)^{p_h(\cdot)s})\|_{1,\Omega}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.36)$$

From (3.36), in turn, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \|F_h(\cdot, \nabla_h u_h^{cr}) - F_h(\cdot, \nabla u)\|_{2,\Omega}^2 &\lesssim \|F_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h) - F_h(\cdot, \nabla_h u_h^{cr})\|_{2,\Omega}^2 \\ &\quad + \|F_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h) - F_h(\cdot, \nabla u)\|_{2,\Omega}^2 \\ &\lesssim \|F_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h) - F_h(\cdot, \nabla u)\|_{2,\Omega}^2 + \text{osc}_h(f, v_h) \\ &\quad + \|\omega_p(h_{\mathcal{T}})^2 (1 + |\nabla u|^{p(\cdot)s} + (|\nabla v_h| + |\nabla_h e_h|)^{p_h(\cdot)s})\|_{1,\Omega}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.37)$$

Taking in (3.37) the infimum with respect to $v_h \in \mathcal{S}_D^1(\mathcal{T}_h)$, we conclude the claimed estimate. \square

4. A PRIORI ERROR ANALYSIS

In this section, we establish a priori error estimates for the $S_D^{1,cr}(\mathcal{T}_h)$ -approximation (2.40) of the $p(\cdot)$ -Dirichlet problem (2.17). To this end, we resort to the medius error analysis of Section 3, which allows us to transfer the approximation rate capabilities of the $S_D^1(\mathcal{T}_h)$ -approximation (2.25) (cf. Theorem 2.8) to the $S_D^{1,cr}(\mathcal{T}_h)$ -approximation (2.40).

Theorem 4.1. *Let $p \in C^{0,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$ with $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ and $p^- > 1$ and let $\delta \geq 0$. Moreover, let $F(\cdot, \nabla u) \in W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$, $(\delta^{p(\cdot)-1} + |z|)^{p'(\cdot)-2}|f|^2 \in L^1(\{p > 2\})$, and $f \in L^{(p^-)'}(\Omega)$ or $\Gamma_D = \partial\Omega$. Then, assuming that $h_{\max} \sim h_{\mathcal{T}}$, there exists some $s > 1$, which can be chosen to be close to 1 if $h_{\max} > 0$ is close to 0, such that if $f \in L^{p'(\cdot)s}(\Omega)$ and $2\alpha s + d(1 - s^2) \geq 0$, then*

$$\|F_h(\cdot, \nabla_h u_h^{cr}) - F_h(\cdot, \nabla u)\|_{2,\Omega}^2 \lesssim h_{\max}^{2\alpha} (1 + \|\nabla F(\cdot, \nabla u)\|_{2,\Omega}^2 + \|(\delta^{p(\cdot)-1} + |z|)^{p'(\cdot)-2}|f|^2\|_{1,\{p>2\}}) + \sigma(f, s) + \rho_{p'(\cdot)s,\Omega}(f) + \rho_{p(\cdot)s,\Omega}(\nabla u))^s,$$

where the hidden constants also depend on $s > 1$ and $\sigma(f, s) := 1 + \rho_{(p^-)',\Omega}(f)$ if $f \in L^{(p^-)'}(\Omega)$ and $\sigma(f, s) := 1 + \rho_{p'(\cdot)s,\Omega}(f)^{(p^-)'/(p^+)}'$ if $\Gamma_D = \partial\Omega$.

Remark 4.2 (Comments on the regularity assumptions in Theorem 4.1).

- (i) If $p \in C^{0,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$ with $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, one cannot expect that $F(\cdot, \nabla u) \in W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$, even locally. However, appealing to [13, Remark 4.5], one can expect that $F(\cdot, \nabla u) \in \mathcal{N}^{\alpha,2}(\Omega)$, where $\mathcal{N}^{\alpha,2}(\Omega)$ is the Nikolskiĭ space with order of differentiability $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, which should still be enough to justify the arguments below, but is beyond the scope of this article.
- (ii) If $p \leq 2$ in $\overline{\Omega}$ in Theorem 4.1, then the assumption $(\delta^{p(\cdot)-1} + |z|)^{p'(\cdot)-2}|f|^2 \in L^1(\{p > 2\})$ is trivially satisfied.
- (iii) If $(\delta^{p(\cdot)-1} + |z|)^{p'(\cdot)-2}|\nabla z|^2 \in L^1(\{p > 2\})$ in Theorem 4.1, then, due to $f = -\operatorname{div} z$ in $L^{p'(\cdot)}(\Omega)$, it holds $(\delta^{p(\cdot)-1} + |z|)^{p'(\cdot)-2}|f|^2 \in L^1(\{p > 2\})$.
- (iv) If $f \in L^2(\{p > 2\})$ and $\delta > 0$, then $(\delta^{p(\cdot)-1} + |z|)^{p'(\cdot)-2}|f|^2 \leq \delta^{2-p(\cdot)}|f|^2$ a.e. in $\{p > 2\}$, i.e., it holds $(\delta^{p(\cdot)-1} + |z|)^{p'(\cdot)-2}|f|^2 \in L^1(\{p > 2\})$.
- (v) If $p \in (1, \infty)$, cf. [28, Lemma 2.3], then it holds $F(\nabla u) \in W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ if and only if $F^*(z) \in W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ with $|F(\nabla u)| \sim |F^*(z)|$ a.e. in Ω and $|\nabla F(\nabla u)| \sim |\nabla F^*(z)|$ a.e. in Ω . In addition, appealing to [39, Lemma 2.11], it holds $|\nabla F^*(z)| \sim (\delta^{p-1} + |z|)^{(p-2)/2}|\nabla z|$ a.e. in Ω . Thus, Theorem 4.1 extends the a priori error analysis in [39].

Since the right-hand side in Theorem 3.1 still involves the discrete primal solution, before proving Theorem 4.1, we first derive the following a priori estimate.

Lemma 4.3. *Let the assumptions of Theorem 4.1 be satisfied. Then, there exists some $s > 1$, which can be chosen to be close to 1 if $h_{\max} > 0$ is close to 0, such that if $f \in L^{p'(\cdot)s}(\Omega)$, then*

$$\rho_{\varphi_h,\Omega}(\nabla_h u_h^{cr}) \lesssim \sigma(f, s),$$

where the hidden constants also depend on $s > 1$ and $\sigma(f, s)$ is defined as in Theorem 4.1.

Proof. We distinguish the cases $f \in L^{(p^-)'}(\Omega)$ and $\Gamma_D = \partial\Omega$:

Case $f \in L^{(p^-)'}(\Omega)$. Since $I_h^{cr}(u_h^{cr}) \leq I_h^{cr}(0)$, applying the ε -Young inequality (2.2) with $\psi = |\cdot|^{p^-}$, the L^{p^-} -stability of Π_h , the discrete Poincaré inequality in $\mathcal{S}_D^{1,cr}(\mathcal{T}_h)$, cf. [54, Proposition I.4.13], and $p^- \lesssim p_h$ a.e. in Ω , we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{\varphi_h,\Omega}(\nabla_h u_h^{cr}) &\lesssim (f_h, \Pi_h u_h^{cr})_{\Omega} \\ &\lesssim c_{\varepsilon} \rho_{(p^-)',\Omega}(f_h) + \varepsilon \rho_{p^-,\Omega}(\nabla_h u_h^{cr}) \\ &\lesssim c_{\varepsilon} \rho_{(p^-)',\Omega}(f) + \varepsilon \rho_{p_h(\cdot),\Omega}(\nabla_h u_h^{cr}). \end{aligned}$$

For $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, using $p_h \lesssim 1 + \varphi_h$, we conclude that $\rho_{\varphi_h,\Omega}(\nabla_h u_h^{cr}) \lesssim 1 + \rho_{(p^-)',\Omega}(f)$.

Case $\Gamma_D = \partial\Omega$. Let $R > 0$ be such that $\Omega \subseteq B_R^d(0)$. Then, if $f \in L^{p'(\cdot)s}(\Omega)$, appealing to [27, Theorem 14.1.2], the vector field $G := (-\nabla u)|_\Omega$, where $u \in W^{2,p(\cdot)}(B_R^d(0)) \cap W_0^{1,p(\cdot)}(B_R^d(0))$ is the unique solution of $-\Delta u = \bar{f}$ a.e. in $B_R^d(0)$, where $\bar{f} := f$ a.e. in Ω and $\bar{f} := 0$ a.e. in $B_R^d(0) \setminus \Omega$, satisfies $G \in W^{1,p'(\cdot)s}(\Omega)^d$, $\operatorname{div} G = f$ in $\mathcal{L}^0(\mathcal{T}_h)$, and $\|G\|_{p'(\cdot)s,\Omega} + \|\nabla G\|_{p'(\cdot)s,\Omega} \lesssim \|f\|_{p'(\cdot)s,\Omega}$, with a constant depending on s, p , and Ω . Using [27, Lemma 3.2.5], we find that

$$\rho_{p'(\cdot)s,\Omega}(G) + \rho_{p'(\cdot)s,\Omega}(\nabla G) \lesssim \rho_{p'(\cdot)s,\Omega}(f)^{(p^-)'/(p^+)'} . \quad (4.1)$$

Denote by $I_h^{rt}: W^{1,1}(\Omega)^d \rightarrow \mathcal{RT}^0(\mathcal{T}_h)$ the Raviart–Thomas quasi-interpolation operator. Then, we have that $\operatorname{div} I_h^{rt} G = \Pi_h \operatorname{div} G = f_h$ a.e. in Ω . Appealing to [36, Theorem 16.4], for every $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$, we have that

$$\rho_{p'(q_T),T}(I_h^{rt} G) \lesssim \rho_{p'(q_T),T}(G) + \rho_{p'(q_T),T}(\nabla G) . \quad (4.2)$$

Therefore, since $I_h^{cr}(u_h^{cr}) \leq I_h^{cr}(0)$, using $\operatorname{div} I_h^{rt} G = f_h$ in $\mathcal{L}^0(\mathcal{T}_h)$, the discrete integration-by-parts formula (2.14), for every $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ the ε -Young inequality (2.2) with $\psi = |\cdot|^{p(q_T)}$, (4.2), and (4.1), we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{\varphi_h,\Omega}(\nabla_h u_h^{cr}) &\lesssim (f_h, \Pi_h u_h^{cr})_\Omega = (\operatorname{div} I_h^{rt} G, \Pi_h u_h^{cr})_\Omega = -(\Pi_h I_h^{rt} G, \nabla_h u_h^{cr})_\Omega \\ &\lesssim c_\varepsilon \rho_{p_h(\cdot),\Omega}(I_h^{rt} G) + \varepsilon \rho_{p_h(\cdot),\Omega}(\nabla_h u_h^{cr}) , \\ &\lesssim c_\varepsilon (\rho_{p_h(\cdot)}(G) + \rho_{p_h(\cdot),\Omega}(\nabla G)) + \varepsilon \rho_{p_h(\cdot),\Omega}(\nabla_h u_h^{cr}) \\ &\lesssim c_\varepsilon (1 + \rho_{p'(\cdot)s,\Omega}(G) + \rho_{p'(\cdot)s,\Omega}(\nabla G)) + \varepsilon \rho_{p_h(\cdot),\Omega}(\nabla_h u_h^{cr}) \\ &\lesssim c_\varepsilon (1 + \rho_{p'(\cdot)s,\Omega}(f)^{(p^-)'/(p^+)'}) + \varepsilon \rho_{p_h(\cdot),\Omega}(\nabla_h u_h^{cr}) . \end{aligned}$$

For $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, we conclude that $\rho_{\varphi_h}(\nabla_h u_h^{cr}) \lesssim 1 + \rho_{p'(\cdot)s}(f)^{(p^-)'/(p^+)}'$. \square

Proof (of Theorem 4.1). The convexity of $(\varphi_{|\nabla_h v_h(T)|})^*(q_T, \cdot)$ and that $\Delta_2((\varphi_{|\nabla_h v_h(T)|})^*(q_T, \cdot)) \lesssim 2^{\max\{2,(p^-)'\}}$ for all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$, the Orlicz-stability of Π_h (cf. [40, Corollary A.8, (A.12)]), and the shift change (2.12), for every $v_h \in \mathcal{S}_D^1(\mathcal{T}_h)$, yield

$$\operatorname{osc}_h(f, v_h) \lesssim \rho_{((\varphi_h)_{|\nabla u|})^*,\Omega}(h_{\mathcal{T}} f) + \|F_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h) - F_h(\cdot, \nabla u)\|_{2,\Omega}^2 . \quad (4.3)$$

Using (4.3) in Theorem 3.1, for every $v_h \in \mathcal{S}_D^1(\mathcal{T}_h)$, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \|F_h(\cdot, \nabla_h u_h^{cr}) - F_h(\cdot, \nabla u)\|_{2,\Omega}^2 &\lesssim \|F_h(\cdot, \nabla v_h) - F_h(\cdot, \nabla u)\|_{2,\Omega}^2 \\ &\quad + h_{\max}^{2\alpha} \rho_{p_h(\cdot)s,\Omega}(\nabla v_h) + h_{\max}^{2\alpha} \rho_{p_h(\cdot)s,\Omega}(\nabla_h u_h^{cr}) \\ &\quad + h_{\max}^{2\alpha} (1 + \rho_{p(\cdot)s,\Omega}(\nabla u)) + \rho_{((\varphi_h)_{|\nabla u|})^*,\Omega}(h_{\mathcal{T}} f) . \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

Using that, appealing to [13, Lemma 4.3 & Corollary 3.6], it holds

$$\begin{aligned} \|F_h(\cdot, \nabla I_h^{sz} u) - F_h(\cdot, \nabla u)\|_{2,\Omega}^2 &\lesssim h_{\max}^2 \|\nabla F(\cdot, \nabla u)\|_{2,\Omega}^2 + h_{\max}^{2\alpha} (1 + \rho_{p(\cdot)s,\Omega}(\nabla u)) , \\ \rho_{p_h(\cdot)s,\Omega}(\nabla I_h^{sz} u) &\lesssim 1 + \rho_{p(\cdot)s,\Omega}(\nabla I_h^{sz} u) \lesssim 1 + \rho_{p(\cdot)s,\Omega}(\nabla u) , \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

choosing $v_h = I_h^{sz} u \in \mathcal{S}_D^1(\mathcal{T}_h)$ in (4.4), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \|F_h(\cdot, \nabla_h u_h^{cr}) - F_h(\cdot, \nabla u)\|_{2,\Omega}^2 &\lesssim h_{\max}^2 \|\nabla F(\cdot, \nabla u)\|_{2,\Omega}^2 + h_{\max}^{2\alpha} (1 + \rho_{p(\cdot)s,\Omega}(\nabla u)) \\ &\quad + h_{\max}^{2\alpha} \rho_{p_h(\cdot)s,\Omega}(\nabla_h u_h^{cr}) + \rho_{((\varphi_h)_{|\nabla u|})^*,\Omega}(h_{\mathcal{T}} f) . \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

By the aid of Lemma 2.10 (2.28), also using that $2\alpha \leq 2 \wedge (p^+) + \alpha$, it holds

$$\rho_{((\varphi_h)_{|\nabla u|})^*,\Omega}(h_{\mathcal{T}} f) \lesssim \rho_{(\varphi_{|\nabla u|})^*,\Omega}(h_{\mathcal{T}} f) + h_{\max}^{2\alpha} (1 + \rho_{p'(\cdot)s,\Omega}(f) + \rho_{p(\cdot)s,\Omega}(\nabla u)) . \quad (4.7)$$

Next, for every $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ and $x \in T$, we need to distinguish the cases $p(x) \in (1, 2)$ and $p(x) \in [2, \infty)$:

Case $p(x) \in (1, 2]$. If $p(x) \in (1, 2]$, then, there holds the elementary inequality

$$(\varphi_{|a|})^*(x, ht) \lesssim \lambda^2 (\varphi^*(x, t) + \varphi(x, |a|)) \quad \text{for all } a \in \mathbb{R}^d, t \geq 0, \lambda \in [0, 1] ,$$

which follows from the definition of shifted N -functions, cf. (2.5), and the shift change (2.12) (i.e., with $b = 0$ and using that $|F(x, a)|^2 = \varphi(x, |a|)$ for all $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$), so that

$$(\varphi_{|\nabla u(x)|})^*(x, h_T |f(x)|) \lesssim h_T^2 (\varphi^*(x, |f(x)|) + \varphi(x, |\nabla u(x)|)). \quad (4.8)$$

Case $p(x) \in (2, \infty)$. Since $(\varphi_{|a|})^*(x, \lambda t) \lesssim \lambda^2 (\delta^{p(x)-1} + |a|)^{p'(x)-2} t^2$ for all $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $t, \lambda \geq 0$, we have that

$$(\varphi_{|\nabla u|})^*(x, h_T |f(x)|) \lesssim h_T^2 (\delta^{p(x)-1} + |z(x)|)^{p'(x)-2} |f(x)|^2. \quad (4.9)$$

Combining (4.8) and (4.9), we deduce that

$$\rho_{(\varphi_{|\nabla u|})^*, \Omega}(h_T f) \lesssim h_{\max}^2 (\rho_{\varphi^*, \Omega}(f) + \rho_{\varphi, \Omega}(\nabla u) + \|(\delta^{p(\cdot)-1} + |z|)^{p'(\cdot)-2} |f|^2\|_{1, \{p>2\}}). \quad (4.10)$$

Using (4.10) in (4.7), we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{(\varphi_h)_{|\nabla u|})^*, \Omega}(h_T f) &\lesssim h_{\max}^{2\alpha} (1 + \rho_{p'(\cdot), s, \Omega}(f) + \rho_{p(\cdot), s, \Omega}(\nabla u)) \\ &\quad + h_{\max}^2 \|(\delta^{p(\cdot)-1} + |z|)^{p'(\cdot)-2} |f|^2\|_{1, \{p>2\}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

In addition, due to Lemma 4.3, [36, Lemma 12.1], $h_{\max} \sim h_T$, and $p_h \lesssim 1 + \varphi_h$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{p_h(\cdot), s, \Omega}(\nabla_h u_h^{cr}) &\lesssim h_{\max}^{d(1-s)} \rho_{p_h(\cdot), \Omega}(\nabla_h u_h^{cr})^s \\ &\lesssim h_{\max}^{d(1-s)} (1 + \sigma(f; s))^s. \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

Next, using (4.11) and (4.12) in (4.6), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \|F_h(\cdot, \nabla_h u_h^{cr}) - F_h(\cdot, \nabla u)\|_{2, \Omega}^2 &\lesssim h_{\max}^{2\alpha+d(1-s)} (1 + \|\nabla F(\cdot, \nabla u)\|_{2, \Omega}^2 \\ &\quad + \|(\delta^{p(\cdot)-1} + |z|)^{p'(\cdot)-2} |f|^2\|_{1, \{p>2\}} \\ &\quad + \sigma(f; s)^s + \rho_{p'(\cdot), s, \Omega}(f) + \rho_{p(\cdot), s, \Omega}(\nabla u)). \end{aligned} \quad (4.13)$$

Aided by the a priori error estimate (4.13), we can improve the a priori estimate (4.12) and, in turn, the a priori error estimate (4.13). Using the a priori error estimate (4.13), (4.5)₁, the shift change (2.11), and (4.5)₂, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{\varphi_h, \Omega}(\nabla_h u_h^{cr} - \nabla I_h^{sz} u) &\lesssim c_\varepsilon \|F_h(\cdot, \nabla_h u_h^{cr}) - F_h(\cdot, \nabla I_h^{sz} u)\|_{2, \Omega}^2 + \varepsilon \rho_{\varphi_h, \Omega}(\nabla_h u_h^{cr}) \\ &\lesssim c_\varepsilon (\|F_h(\cdot, \nabla_h u_h^{cr}) - F_h(\cdot, \nabla u)\|_{2, \Omega}^2 + \|F_h(\cdot, \nabla u) - F_h(\cdot, \nabla I_h^{sz} u)\|_{2, \Omega}^2) \\ &\quad + \varepsilon \rho_{\varphi_h, \Omega}(\nabla_h u_h^{cr} - \nabla I_h^{sz} u) + \varepsilon \rho_{\varphi_h, \Omega}(\nabla I_h^{sz} u) \\ &\lesssim c_\varepsilon h_{\max}^{2\alpha+d(1-s)} (1 + \|\nabla F(\cdot, \nabla u)\|_{2, \Omega}^2 + \|(\delta^{p(\cdot)-1} + |z|)^{p'(\cdot)-2} |f|^2\|_{1, \{p>2\}}) \\ &\quad + \sigma(f; s)^s + \rho_{p'(\cdot), s, \Omega}(f) + \rho_{p(\cdot), s, \Omega}(\nabla u) \\ &\quad + \varepsilon \rho_{p_h(\cdot), \Omega}(\nabla_h u_h^{cr} - \nabla I_h^{sz} u) + \varepsilon (1 + \rho_{p(\cdot), s, \Omega}(\nabla u)). \end{aligned}$$

Next, choosing $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, using again (4.5)₂, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{p_h(\cdot), \Omega}(\nabla_h u_h^{cr}) &\lesssim \max\{1, h_{\max}^{2\alpha+d(1-s)}\} (1 + \|\nabla F(\cdot, \nabla u)\|_{2, \Omega}^2 + \|(\delta^{p(\cdot)-1} + |z|)^{p'(\cdot)-2} |f|^2\|_{1, \{p>2\}}) \\ &\quad + \sigma(f; s)^s + \rho_{p'(\cdot), s, \Omega}(f) + \rho_{p(\cdot), s, \Omega}(\nabla u). \end{aligned}$$

As a result, using (4.12)₁ and $2\alpha s + d(1-s^2) \geq 0$, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{p_h(\cdot), s, \Omega}(\nabla_h u_h^{cr}) &\lesssim \max\{1, h_{\max}^{2\alpha s + d(1-s^2)}\} (1 + \|\nabla F(\cdot, \nabla u)\|_{2, \Omega}^2 + \|(\delta^{p(\cdot)-1} + |z|)^{p'(\cdot)-2} |f|^2\|_{1, \{p>2\}}) \\ &\quad + \sigma(f; s) + \rho_{p'(\cdot), s, \Omega}(f) + \rho_{p(\cdot), s, \Omega}(\nabla u))^s \\ &\lesssim (1 + \|\nabla F(\cdot, \nabla u)\|_{2, \Omega}^2 + \|(\delta^{p(\cdot)-1} + |z|)^{p'(\cdot)-2} |f|^2\|_{1, \{p>2\}}) \\ &\quad + \sigma(f; s) + \rho_{p'(\cdot), s, \Omega}(f) + \rho_{p(\cdot), s, \Omega}(\nabla u))^s. \end{aligned} \quad (4.14)$$

Eventually, using (4.11) and (4.14) in (4.6), we arrive at claimed a priori error estimate. \square

Aided by the (discrete) convex optimality relations (2.23) and (2.48), together with the generalized Marini formula, cf. (2.44), we can derive from Corollary 4.1 an a priori error estimate for the error between the dual solution and the discrete dual solution.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $p \in C^0(\overline{\Omega})$ with $p^- > 1$ and $\delta \geq 0$ and let $f \in L^{p'(\cdot)}(\Omega) \cap \bigcap_{h \in (0, h_0]} L^{p'_h(\cdot)}(\Omega)$ for some $h_0 > 0$. Then, there exists some $s > 1$, which can be chosen to be close to 1 if $h > 0$ is close to 0, such that if $u \in W_D^{1, p(\cdot)s}(\Omega)$, then for every $h \in (0, h_0]$, it holds*

$$\begin{aligned} \|F_h^*(\cdot, z_h^{rt}) - F_h^*(\cdot, z)\|_{2, \Omega}^2 &\lesssim \|F_h(\cdot, \nabla_h u_h^{cr}) - F_h(\cdot, \nabla u)\|_{2, \Omega}^2 + h_{\max}^{2\alpha} (1 + \rho_{p(\cdot)s, \Omega}(\nabla u)) \\ &\quad + \rho_{((\varphi_h)|_{\nabla u})^*, \Omega}(h_{\mathcal{T}} f). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Using the discrete convex optimality relations (2.23) and (2.48), two equivalences in (2.7), the generalized Marini formula (2.44), again, the discrete convex optimality relations (2.48), and the Orlicz-stability of Π_h (cf. [40, Corollary A.8, (A.12)]), we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \|F_h^*(\cdot, z_h^{rt}) - F_h^*(\cdot, z)\|_{2, \Omega}^2 &\lesssim \|F_h^*(\cdot, \Pi_h z_h^{rt}) - F_h^*(\cdot, z)\|_{2, \Omega}^2 + \|F_h^*(\cdot, z_h^{rt}) - F_h^*(\cdot, \Pi_h z_h^{rt})\|_{2, \Omega}^2 \\ &\lesssim \|F_h^*(\cdot, \mathcal{A}_h(\cdot, \nabla_h u_h^{cr})) - F_h^*(\cdot, \mathcal{A}_h(\cdot, \nabla u))\|_{2, \Omega}^2 \\ &\quad + \|F_h^*(\cdot, \mathcal{A}_h(\cdot, \nabla u)) - F_h^*(\cdot, \mathcal{A}(\cdot, \nabla u))\|_{2, \Omega}^2 \\ &\quad + \rho_{((\varphi_h)^*)|_{\Pi_h z_h^{rt}}, \Omega}(z_h^{rt} - \Pi_h z_h^{rt}) \\ &\lesssim \|F_h(\cdot, \nabla_h u_h^{cr}) - F_h(\cdot, \nabla u)\|_{2, \Omega}^2 + h_{\max}^{2\alpha} (1 + \rho_{p(\cdot)s}(\nabla u)) \\ &\quad + \rho_{((\varphi_h)^*)|_{\mathcal{A}_h(\cdot, \nabla_h u_h^{cr})}, \Omega}(h_{\mathcal{T}} f). \end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

Using that $(\varphi^*)|_{\mathcal{A}(q_T, a)}(q_T, \cdot) \sim (\varphi|_a)^*(q_T, \cdot)$ for all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ and $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$ (cf. Lemma 2.2 (2.9)) and the shift change (2.12), we observe that

$$\rho_{((\varphi_h)^*)|_{\mathcal{A}_h(\cdot, \nabla_h u_h^{cr})}, \Omega}(h_{\mathcal{T}} f) \lesssim \rho_{((\varphi_h)|_{\nabla u})^*, \Omega}(h_{\mathcal{T}} f) + \|F_h(\cdot, \nabla_h u_h^{cr}) - F_h(\cdot, \nabla u)\|_{2, \Omega}^2. \tag{4.16}$$

Eventually, combining (4.15) and (4.16), we arrive at the claimed inequality. \square

Theorem 4.5. *Let $p \in C^{0, \alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$ with $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ and $p^- > 1$ and $\delta \geq 0$. Moreover, let $F(\cdot, \nabla u) \in W^{1, 2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$, $(\delta^{p(\cdot)-1} + |z|)^{p'(\cdot)-2} |f|^2 \in L^1(\{p > 2\})$, and $f \in L^{(p^-)'}(\Omega)$ or $\Gamma_D = \partial\Omega$. Then, assuming that $h_{\max} \sim h_{\mathcal{T}}$, there exists some $s > 1$, which can be chosen to be close to 1 if $h_{\max} > 0$ is close to 0, such that if $f \in L^{p'(\cdot)s}(\Omega)$ and $2\alpha s + d(1 - s^2) \geq 0$, then*

$$\begin{aligned} \|F_h^*(\cdot, z_h^{rt}) - F_h^*(\cdot, z)\|_{2, \Omega}^2 &\lesssim h_{\max}^2 (1 + \|\nabla F(\cdot, \nabla u)\|_{2, \Omega}^2 + \|(\delta^{p(\cdot)-1} + |z|)^{p'(\cdot)-2} |f|^2\|_{1, \{p > 2\}} \\ &\quad + \sigma(f; s) + \rho_{p'(\cdot)s, \Omega}(f) + \rho_{p(\cdot)s, \Omega}(\nabla u))^s, \end{aligned}$$

where the hidden constant also depends on $s > 1$ and $\sigma(f; s)$ is defined as in Theorem 4.1.

Proof. Immediate consequence of Lemma 4.4 in conjunction with Theorem 4.1. \square

Corollary 4.6. *Let $p \in C^{0, 1}(\overline{\Omega})$ with $p^- > 1$ and $\delta > 0$. Moreover, let $F(\cdot, \nabla u) \in W^{1, 2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ and $f \in L^{(p^-)'}(\Omega)$ or $\Gamma_D = \partial\Omega$. Then, assuming that $h_{\max} \sim h_{\mathcal{T}}$, there exists some $s > 1$, which can be chosen to be close to 1 if h_{\max} is close to 0, such that if $f \in L^{p'(\cdot)s}(\Omega)$ and $2\alpha s + d(1 - s^2) \geq 0$, then*

$$\begin{aligned} \|F_h(\cdot, \nabla_h u_h^{cr}) - F_h(\cdot, \nabla u)\|_{2, \Omega}^2 + \|F_h^*(\cdot, z_h^{rt}) - F_h^*(\cdot, z)\|_{2, \Omega}^2 \\ \lesssim h_{\max}^2 (1 + \|\nabla F(\cdot, \nabla u)\|_{2, \Omega}^2 + \sigma(f; s) + \rho_{p'(\cdot)s, \Omega}(f) + \rho_{p(\cdot)s, \Omega}(\nabla u))^s, \end{aligned}$$

where the hidden constant also depends on $s > 1$ and $\sigma(f; s)$ is defined as in Theorem 4.1.

Proof. Due to Lemma 2.14, from $F(\cdot, \nabla u) \in W^{1, 2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$, it follows that $F^*(\cdot, z) \in W^{1, 2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ and $|\nabla F(\cdot, \nabla u)|^2 + (1 + |\nabla v|^{p(\cdot)s}) \sim |\nabla F^*(\cdot, z)|^2 + (1 + |\nabla z|^{p'(\cdot)s})$ a.e. in Ω for some $s > 1$ which can be chosen to be close to 1. In addition, due to Lemma 2.15, it holds $|\nabla F^*(\cdot, z)|^2 + (1 + |\nabla z|^{p'(\cdot)s}) \sim (\delta^{p(\cdot)-1} + |z|)^{p'(\cdot)-2} |\nabla z|^2$ a.e. in Ω . As a result, the claimed a priori error estimate follows from Theorem 4.1 together with Theorem 4.5. \square

5. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS

In this section, we review the theoretical findings of Section 4 via numerical experiments. All experiments were carried out using the finite element software package FEniCS (version 2019.1.0), cf. [46].

We apply the $\mathcal{S}_D^{1,cr}(\mathcal{T}_h)$ -approximation (2.40) of the variational p -Dirichlet problem (2.17) with $\delta := 1e-4$ and $p \in C^{0,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})$, where $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ and $p^- > 1$, for every $x \in \bar{\Omega}$ defined by

$$p(x) := p^- + \varepsilon |x|^\alpha,$$

where $\varepsilon > 0$. As quadrature points of the one-point quadrature rule used to discretize $p \in C^{0,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})$, we employ barycenters of elements, i.e., for every $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$, we employ $q_T := x_T = \frac{1}{d+1} \sum_{z \in \mathcal{N}_h \cap T} z$.

Then, we approximate the discrete primal solution $u_h^{cr} \in \mathcal{S}_D^{1,cr}(\mathcal{T}_h)$ deploying the Newton line search algorithm of PETSc (version 3.17.3), cf. [46], with an absolute tolerance of $\tau_{abs} = 1e-8$ and a relative tolerance of $\tau_{rel} = 1e-10$. The linear system emerging in each Newton step is solved using a sparse direct solver from MUMPS (version 5.5.0), cf. [2].

For our numerical experiments, we choose $\Omega = (-1, 1)^2$, $\Gamma_D = \partial\Omega$, and as a manufactured solution of (1.1), the function $u \in W_D^{1,p(\cdot)}(\Omega)$, for every $x := (x_1, x_2)^\top \in \Omega$ defined by

$$u(x) := d(x) |x|^\beta,$$

i.e., $f := -\operatorname{div} \mathcal{A}(\cdot, \nabla u)$, where $d \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$, defined by $d(x) := (1 - x_1^2)(1 - x_2^2)$ for every $x := (x_1, x_2)^\top \in \bar{\Omega}$, is a smooth cut-off function enforcing homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions. Moreover, we choose $\beta = 1.01$, which just yields that $u \in W_D^{1,p(\cdot)}(\Omega)$ satisfies

$$F(\cdot, \nabla u), F^*(\cdot, z) \in W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2) \quad \text{and} \quad (\delta^{p(\cdot)-1} + |z|)^{p'(\cdot)-2} |\nabla z|^2 \in L^1(\Omega).$$

Due to Theorem 4.1 and Theorem 4.5, we can expect the convergence rate α for the quantities (5.1).

An initial triangulation \mathcal{T}_{h_0} , $h_0 = \frac{3}{2\sqrt{2}}$, is constructed by subdividing a rectangular Cartesian grid into regular triangles with different orientations. Refined triangulations \mathcal{T}_{h_k} , $k = 1, \dots, 7$, where $h_{k+1} = \frac{h_k}{2}$ for all $k = 1, \dots, 7$, are obtained by applying the red-refinement rule, cf. [20].

Then, for the resulting series of triangulations $\mathcal{T}_k := \mathcal{T}_{h_k}$, $k = 1, \dots, 10$, we apply the above Newton scheme to compute the discrete primal solution $u_k^{cr} := u_{h_k}^{cr} \in \mathcal{S}_D^{1,cr}(\mathcal{T}_k)$, $k = 1, \dots, 10$, and, resorting to the generalized Marini formula (2.44), the discrete dual solution $z_k^{rt} := z_{h_k}^{rt} \in \mathcal{RT}_N^0(\mathcal{T}_k)$, $k = 1, \dots, 10$. Subsequently, we compute the error quantities

$$\left. \begin{aligned} e_{F,k} &:= \|F_h(\cdot, \nabla_{h_k} u_k^{cr}) - F_h(\cdot, \nabla u)\|_{2,\Omega}^2, \\ e_{F^*,k} &:= \|F_h^*(\cdot, z_k^{rt}) - F_h^*(\cdot, z)\|_{2,\Omega}^2, \end{aligned} \right\} \quad k = 1, \dots, 10. \quad (5.1)$$

For the determination of the convergence rates, the experimental order of convergence (EOC)

$$\text{EOC}_k(e_k) := \frac{\log(e_k/e_{k-1})}{\log(h_k/h_{k-1})}, \quad k = 1, \dots, 10,$$

where for every $k = 1, \dots, 10$, we denote by e_k , either $e_{F,k}$ or $e_{F^*,k}$, respectively, is recorded.

For different values of $p^- \in \{1.5, 2, 2.5\}$, $\alpha \in \{0.1, 0.25, 0.5, 1.0\}$, $\varepsilon \in \{0.5, 1.0\}$, and a series of triangulations \mathcal{T}_k , $k = 1, \dots, 10$, obtained by uniform mesh refinement as described above, the EOC is computed and for $k = 5, \dots, 10$ presented in Table 1, Table 2, Table 3 and Table 4, respectively. In each case, we report a convergence ratio of about $\text{EOC}_k(e_k) \approx 1$, $k = 5, \dots, 10$, conforming the optimality of the a priori error estimates derived in Corollary 4.6 and also indicating the sub-optimality of the a priori error estimates derived in Theorem 4.1 and Theorem 4.5 for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. We believe that this can be traced back to an imbalance of between the regularity assumptions $F(\cdot, \nabla u) \in W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ and $p \in C^{0,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})$ with $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ in Theorem 4.1 and Theorem 4.5; and expect that the assumptions $F(\cdot, \nabla u) \in \mathcal{N}^{\alpha,2}(\Omega)$ and $p \in C^{0,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})$ with $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ are more balanced and may lead to optimal a priori error estimates. The examination of this hypothesis, however, is beyond the scope of this article and, therefore, left open for follow-up research.

| ε | | 1.0 | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| α | | 0.1 | | | 0.25 | | | 0.5 | | | 1.0 | | |
| $k \backslash p^-$ | | 1.5 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 1.5 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 1.5 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 1.5 | 2.0 | 2.5 |
| 5 | | 0.978 | 0.986 | 0.987 | 0.958 | 0.972 | 0.974 | 0.971 | 0.986 | 0.989 | 0.969 | 0.988 | 0.992 |
| 6 | | 0.979 | 0.989 | 0.992 | 0.975 | 0.985 | 0.985 | 0.971 | 0.987 | 0.992 | 0.970 | 0.988 | 0.993 |
| 7 | | 0.981 | 0.990 | 0.994 | 0.975 | 0.988 | 0.988 | 0.972 | 0.988 | 0.993 | 0.972 | 0.988 | 0.994 |
| 8 | | 0.981 | 0.990 | 0.994 | 0.976 | 0.989 | 0.989 | 0.973 | 0.988 | 0.994 | 0.973 | 0.989 | 0.994 |
| 9 | | 0.981 | 0.990 | 0.994 | 0.976 | 0.989 | 0.990 | 0.974 | 0.989 | 0.994 | 0.974 | 0.989 | 0.994 |
| 10 | | 0.982 | 0.990 | 0.995 | 0.977 | 0.989 | 0.990 | 0.975 | 0.989 | 0.994 | 0.975 | 0.989 | 0.994 |
| expected | | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |

Table 1: Experimental order of convergence: $\text{EOC}_k(e_{F,k})$, $k = 5, \dots, 10$.

| ε | | 1.0 | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| α | | 0.1 | | | 0.25 | | | 0.5 | | | 1.0 | | |
| $k \backslash p^-$ | | 1.5 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 1.5 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 1.5 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 1.5 | 2.0 | 2.5 |
| 5 | | 0.978 | 0.986 | 0.987 | 0.975 | 0.985 | 0.988 | 0.971 | 0.986 | 0.989 | 0.969 | 0.988 | 0.992 |
| 6 | | 0.979 | 0.989 | 0.992 | 0.975 | 0.988 | 0.992 | 0.971 | 0.987 | 0.992 | 0.970 | 0.988 | 0.993 |
| 7 | | 0.981 | 0.990 | 0.994 | 0.976 | 0.989 | 0.993 | 0.972 | 0.988 | 0.993 | 0.972 | 0.988 | 0.994 |
| 8 | | 0.981 | 0.990 | 0.994 | 0.976 | 0.989 | 0.994 | 0.973 | 0.988 | 0.994 | 0.973 | 0.989 | 0.994 |
| 9 | | 0.981 | 0.990 | 0.994 | 0.977 | 0.989 | 0.994 | 0.974 | 0.989 | 0.994 | 0.974 | 0.989 | 0.994 |
| 10 | | 0.982 | 0.990 | 0.995 | 0.977 | 0.989 | 0.994 | 0.975 | 0.989 | 0.994 | 0.975 | 0.989 | 0.994 |
| expected | | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |

Table 2: Experimental order of convergence: $\text{EOC}_k(e_{F^*,k})$, $k = 5, \dots, 10$.

| ε | | 0.5 | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| α | | 0.1 | | | 0.25 | | | 0.5 | | | 1.0 | | |
| $k \backslash p^-$ | | 1.5 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 1.5 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 1.5 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 1.5 | 2.0 | 2.5 |
| 5 | | 0.959 | 0.979 | 0.986 | 0.975 | 0.985 | 0.988 | 0.971 | 0.978 | 0.986 | 0.944 | 0.979 | 0.988 |
| 6 | | 0.965 | 0.981 | 0.989 | 0.975 | 0.988 | 0.992 | 0.971 | 0.979 | 0.989 | 0.958 | 0.980 | 0.989 |
| 7 | | 0.966 | 0.983 | 0.990 | 0.976 | 0.989 | 0.993 | 0.972 | 0.981 | 0.990 | 0.958 | 0.981 | 0.990 |
| 8 | | 0.968 | 0.983 | 0.991 | 0.976 | 0.989 | 0.994 | 0.973 | 0.982 | 0.990 | 0.962 | 0.982 | 0.990 |
| 9 | | 0.969 | 0.984 | 0.991 | 0.977 | 0.989 | 0.994 | 0.974 | 0.982 | 0.990 | 0.964 | 0.983 | 0.991 |
| 10 | | 0.970 | 0.984 | 0.991 | 0.977 | 0.989 | 0.994 | 0.975 | 0.983 | 0.991 | 0.966 | 0.983 | 0.991 |
| expected | | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |

Table 3: Experimental order of convergence: $\text{EOC}_k(e_{F,k})$, $k = 5, \dots, 10$.

| ε | | 0.5 | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| α | | 0.1 | | | 0.25 | | | 0.5 | | | 1.0 | | |
| $k \backslash p^-$ | | 1.5 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 1.5 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 1.5 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 1.5 | 2.0 | 2.5 |
| 5 | | 0.959 | 0.979 | 0.986 | 0.953 | 0.978 | 0.986 | 0.947 | 0.978 | 0.986 | 0.943 | 0.979 | 0.988 |
| 6 | | 0.965 | 0.981 | 0.989 | 0.960 | 0.980 | 0.989 | 0.956 | 0.979 | 0.989 | 0.958 | 0.980 | 0.989 |
| 7 | | 0.966 | 0.983 | 0.990 | 0.961 | 0.981 | 0.990 | 0.958 | 0.981 | 0.990 | 0.958 | 0.981 | 0.990 |
| 8 | | 0.968 | 0.983 | 0.991 | 0.963 | 0.982 | 0.990 | 0.961 | 0.982 | 0.990 | 0.962 | 0.982 | 0.990 |
| 9 | | 0.969 | 0.984 | 0.991 | 0.964 | 0.983 | 0.991 | 0.963 | 0.982 | 0.990 | 0.964 | 0.983 | 0.991 |
| 10 | | 0.970 | 0.984 | 0.991 | 0.966 | 0.983 | 0.991 | 0.965 | 0.983 | 0.991 | 0.966 | 0.983 | 0.991 |
| expected | | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |

Table 4: Experimental order of convergence: $\text{EOC}_k(e_{F^*,k})$, $k = 5, \dots, 10$.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. ABOULAICH, D. MESKINE, and A. SOUSSI, New diffusion models in image processing, *Comput. Math. Appl.* **56** (2008), 874–882. doi:[10.1016/j.camwa.2008.01.017](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.camwa.2008.01.017).
- [2] P. R. AMESTOY, I. S. DUFF, J. KOSTER, and J.-Y. L'EXCELLENT, A fully asynchronous multifrontal solver using distributed dynamic scheduling, *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.* **23** no. 1 (2001), 15–41.
- [3] S. ANTONTSEV and J. RODRIGUES, On stationary thermo-rheological viscous flows, *ANNALI DELL'UNIVERSITA' DI FERRARA* **52** (2006), 19–36. doi:[10.1007/s11565-006-0002-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11565-006-0002-9).
- [4] A. K. BALCI, L. DIENING, and J. STORN, Relaxed kacanov scheme for the p-laplacian with large p, 2022. doi:[10.48550/ARXIV.2210.06402](https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2210.06402).
- [5] A. K. BALCI, C. ORTNER, and J. STORN, Crouzeix-Raviart finite element method for non-autonomous variational problems with Lavrentiev gap, *Numer. Math.* **151** no. 4 (2022), 779–805. doi:[10.1007/s00211-022-01303-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00211-022-01303-1).
- [6] J. W. BARRETT and W. B. LIU, Finite element approximation of degenerate quasilinear elliptic and parabolic problems, in *Numerical analysis 1993 (Dundee, 1993)*, *Pitman Res. Notes Math. Ser.* **303**, Longman Sci. Tech., Harlow, 1994, pp. 1–16.
- [7] S. BARTELS, Nonconforming discretizations of convex minimization problems and precise relations to mixed methods, *Comput. Math. Appl.* **93** (2021), 214–229. MR [4253261](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.camwa.2021.04.014). doi:[10.1016/j.camwa.2021.04.014](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.camwa.2021.04.014).
- [8] S. BARTELS and A. KALTENBACH, Explicit and efficient error estimation for convex minimization problems, *Math. Comp.* (2023), (accepted).
- [9] S. BARTELS and Z. WANG, Orthogonality relations of Crouzeix-Raviart and Raviart-Thomas finite element spaces, *Numer. Math.* **148** no. 1 (2021), 127–139. doi:[10.1007/s00211-021-01199-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00211-021-01199-3).
- [10] S. BARTELS and A. KALTENBACH, Error estimates for total-variation regularized minimization problems with singular dual solutions, *Numer. Math.* **152** no. 4 (2022), 881–906. doi:[10.1007/s00211-022-01324-w](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00211-022-01324-w).
- [11] L. BELENKI, L. DIENING, and C. KREUZER, Optimality of an adaptive finite element method for the p -Laplacian equation, *IMA J. Numer. Anal.* **32** no. 2 (2012), 484–510. doi:[10.1093/imanum/drr016](https://doi.org/10.1093/imanum/drr016).
- [12] L. C. BERSELLI, D. BREIT, and L. DIENING, Convergence analysis for a finite element approximation of a steady model for electrorheological fluids, *Numer. Math.* **132** no. 4 (2016), 657–689. doi:[10.1007/s00211-015-0735-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00211-015-0735-4).
- [13] D. BREIT, L. DIENING, and S. SCHWARZACHER, Solenoidal Lipschitz truncation for parabolic PDEs, *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.* **23** no. 14 (2013), 2671–2700. doi:[10.1142/S0218202513500437](https://doi.org/10.1142/S0218202513500437).
- [14] D. BREIT, L. DIENING, and S. SCHWARZACHER, Finite element approximation of the $p(\cdot)$ -laplacian, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* **53** no. 1 (2015), 551–572. doi:[10.1137/130946046](https://doi.org/10.1137/130946046).
- [15] S. C. BRENNER, Two-level additive schwarz preconditioners for nonconforming finite element methods, *Math. Comp.* **65** no. 215 (1996), 897–921.
- [16] S. C. BRENNER, Forty years of the Crouzeix-Raviart element, *Numer. Methods Partial Differ. Equ.* **31** no. 2 (2015), 367–396. doi:[10.1002/num.21892](https://doi.org/10.1002/num.21892).
- [17] A. BUFFA and C. ORTNER, Compact embeddings of broken Sobolev spaces and applications, *IMA J. Numer. Anal.* **29** no. 4 (2009), 827–855. doi:[10.1093/imanum/drn038](https://doi.org/10.1093/imanum/drn038).
- [18] E. BURMAN and A. ERN, Discontinuous Galerkin approximation with discrete variational principle for the nonlinear Laplacian, *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris* **346** no. 17-18 (2008), 1013–1016. doi:[10.1016/j.crma.2008.07.005](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crma.2008.07.005).
- [19] E. CARELLI, J. HAEHNLE, and A. PROHL, Convergence analysis for incompressible generalized Newtonian fluid flows with nonstandard anisotropic growth conditions, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* **48** no. 1 (2010), 164–190. doi:[10.1137/080718978](https://doi.org/10.1137/080718978).
- [20] C. CARSTENSEN, An adaptive mesh-refining algorithm allowing for an H^1 stable L^2 projection onto Courant finite element spaces, *Constr. Approx.* **20** no. 4 (2004), 549–564. doi:[10.1007/s00365-003-0550-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00365-003-0550-5).
- [21] Y. CHEN, S. LEVINE, and M. RAO, Variable exponent, linear growth functionals in image restoration, *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* **66** no. 4 (2006), 1383–1406. doi:[10.1137/050624522](https://doi.org/10.1137/050624522).
- [22] M. CROUZEIX and P.-A. RAVIART, Conforming and nonconforming finite element methods for solving the stationary Stokes equations. I, *Rev. Française Automat. Informat. Recherche Opérationnelle Sér. Rouge* **7** no. R-3 (1973), 33–75.

- [23] B. DACOROGNA, *Direct methods in the calculus of variations*, second ed., *Appl. Math. Sci.* **78**, Springer, New York, 2008.
- [24] L. M. DEL PEZZO, A. L. LOMBARDI, and S. MARTÍNEZ, Interior penalty discontinuous galerkin fem for the $p(x)$ -Laplacian, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* **50** no. 5 (2012), 2497–2521. doi:[10.1137/110820324](https://doi.org/10.1137/110820324).
- [25] L. DIENING and F. ETTWEIN, Fractional estimates for non-differentiable elliptic systems with general growth, *Forum Math.* **20** no. 3 (2008), 523–556.
- [26] L. DIENING, M. FORNASIER, R. TOMASI, and M. WANK, A relaxed Kačanov iteration for the p -Poisson problem, *Numer. Math.* **145** no. 1 (2020), 1–34. doi:[10.1007/s00211-020-01107-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00211-020-01107-1).
- [27] L. DIENING, P. HARJULEHTO, P. HÄSTÖ, and M. RŮŽIČKA, *Lebesgue and Sobolev spaces with variable exponents*, *Lect. Notes Math.* **2017**, Springer, Heidelberg, 2011. doi:[10.1007/978-3-642-18363-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-18363-8).
- [28] L. DIENING, D. KÖNER, M. RŮŽIČKA, and I. TOULOPOULOS, A local discontinuous Galerkin approximation for systems with p -structure, *IMA J. Numer. Anal.* **34** no. 4 (2014), 1447–1488 doi:[10.1093/imanum/drt040](https://doi.org/10.1093/imanum/drt040).
- [29] L. DIENING and C. KREUZER, Linear convergence of an adaptive finite element method for the p -Laplacian equation, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* **46** no. 2 (2008), 614–638. doi:[10.1137/070681508](https://doi.org/10.1137/070681508).
- [30] L. DIENING and M. RŮŽIČKA, Interpolation operators in Orlicz-Sobolev spaces, *Numer. Math.* **107** no. 1 (2007), 107–129. doi:[10.1007/s00211-007-0079-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00211-007-0079-9).
- [31] L. DIENING, D. KÖNER, M. RŮŽIČKA, M., and I. TOULOPOULOS, A local discontinuous Galerkin approximation for systems with p -structure, *IMA J. Numer. Anal.* **34** no. 4 (2014), 1447–1488. doi:[10.1093/imanum/drt040](https://doi.org/10.1093/imanum/drt040).
- [32] C. EBMEYER and W. LIU, Quasi-norm interpolation error estimates for the piecewise linear finite element approximation of p -Laplacian problems, *Numer. Math.* **100** no. 2 (2005), 233–258. doi:[10.1007/s00211-005-0594-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00211-005-0594-5).
- [33] W. ECKART and M. RŮŽIČKA, Modeling micropolar electrorheological fluids, *Int. J. Appl. Mech. Eng.* **11** (2006), 813–844.
- [34] I. EKELAND and R. TÉMAM, *Convex analysis and variational problems*, english ed., *Classics Appl. Math.* **28**, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 1999, Translated from the French. doi:[10.1137/1.9781611971088](https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611971088).
- [35] A. C. ERINGEN, *Microcontinuum field theories. I,II.*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1999.
- [36] A. ERN and J. L. GUERMOND, *Finite Elements I: Approximation and Interpolation*, *Texts in Applied Mathematics* no. 1, Springer International Publishing, 2021. doi:[10.1007/978-3-030-56341-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-56341-7).
- [37] L. ESPOSITO, F. LEONETTI, and G. MINGIONE, Sharp regularity for functionals with (p,q) growth, *J. Differ. Equ.* **204** no. 1 (2004), 5–55. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jde.2003.11.007>.
- [38] J. HRON, J. MÁLEK, P. PUSTĚJOVSKÁ, and K. R. RAJAGOPAL, On the modeling of the synovial fluid, *Advances in Tribology* **2010** (2010). doi:[10.1155/2010/104957](https://doi.org/10.1155/2010/104957).
- [39] A. KALTENBACH, *Error analysis for a Crouzeix–Raviart approximation of the p -Dirichlet problem*, submitted, 2023.
- [40] A. KALTENBACH and M. RŮŽIČKA, *Convergence analysis of a Local Discontinuous Galerkin approximation for nonlinear systems with Orlicz-structure*, submitted, 2022.
- [41] S. KO, P. PUSTĚJOVSKÁ, and E. SÜLI, Finite element approximation of an incompressible chemically reacting non-Newtonian fluid, *ESAIM Math. Model. Numer. Anal.* **52** no. 2 (2018), 509–541. doi:[10.1051/m2an/2017043](https://doi.org/10.1051/m2an/2017043).
- [42] S. KO and E. SÜLI, Finite element approximation of steady flows of generalized Newtonian fluids with concentration-dependent power-law index, *Math. Comp.* **88** no. 317 (2019), 1061–1090. doi:[10.1090/mcom/3379](https://doi.org/10.1090/mcom/3379).
- [43] W. M. LAI, S. C. KUEI, and V. C. MOW, Rheological Equations for Synovial Fluids, *J. Biomech. Eng.* **100** no. 4 (1978), 169–186. doi:[10.1115/1.3426208](https://doi.org/10.1115/1.3426208).
- [44] F. LI, Z. LI, and L. PI, Variable exponent functionals in image restoration, *Appl. Math. Comput.* **216** no. 3 (2010), 870–882. doi:[10.1016/j.amc.2010.01.094](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amc.2010.01.094).
- [45] D. J. LIU, A. Q. LI, and Z. R. CHEN, Nonconforming FEMs for the p -Laplace problem, *Adv. Appl. Math. Mech.* **10** no. 6 (2018), 1365–1383. doi:[10.4208/aamm](https://doi.org/10.4208/aamm).
- [46] A. LOGG and G. N. WELLS, Dolfin: Automated finite element computing, *ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software* **37** no. 2 (2010). doi:[10.1145/1731022.1731030](https://doi.org/10.1145/1731022.1731030).
- [47] P. OSWALD, On the robustness of the bpx-preconditioner with respect to jumps in the coefficients, *Math. Comp.* **68** no. 226 (1999), 633–650.

- [48] K. R. RAJAGOPAL and M. RŮŽIČKA, On the modeling of electrorheological materials, *Mech. Res. Commun.* **13** (2001), 59–78. doi:[10.1007/s001610100034](https://doi.org/10.1007/s001610100034).
- [49] P.-A. RAVIART and J. M. THOMAS, A mixed finite element method for 2nd order elliptic problems, in *Mathematical aspects of finite element methods (Proc. Conf., Consiglio Naz. delle Ricerche (C.N.R.), Rome, 1975)*, 1977, pp. 292–315. Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. 606.
- [50] M. RŮŽIČKA, *Electrorheological fluids: modeling and mathematical theory*, *Lect. Notes Math.* **1748**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2000. doi:[10.1007/BFb0104029](https://doi.org/10.1007/BFb0104029).
- [51] M. RŮŽIČKA, *Nichtlineare Funktionalanalysis. Eine Einführung*, Berlin: Springer. xii, 2004 (German).
- [52] L. SCOTT and S. ZHANG, Finite element interpolation of nonsmooth functions satisfying boundary conditions, *Math. Comp.* **54** (1990), 483–493. doi:[10.1090/S0025-5718-1990-1011446-7](https://doi.org/10.1090/S0025-5718-1990-1011446-7).
- [53] E. SÜLI and T. TSCHERPEL, Fully discrete finite element approximation of unsteady flows of implicitly constituted incompressible fluids, *IMA J. Numer. Anal.* **40**,(202), 801–849. doi:[10.1093/imanum/dry097](https://doi.org/10.1093/imanum/dry097).
- [54] R. TEMAM, *Navier-Stokes equations. Theory and numerical analysis*, North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam-New York-Oxford, 1977, Studies in Mathematics and its Applications, Vol. 2.
- [55] E. ZEIDLER, *Nonlinear functional analysis and its applications. II/B Nonlinear monotone operators*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1990. doi:[10.1007/978-1-4612-0985-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-0985-0).
- [56] V. V. ZHIKOV, Meyer-type estimates for solving the nonlinear Stokes system, *Differ. Uravn.* **33** no. 1 (1997), 107–114.