

# Error analysis for discretizations of parabolic problems using continuous finite elements in time and mixed finite elements in space

M. Bause\*, F. A. Radu<sup>†</sup>, U. Köcher<sup>‡</sup>

\*<sup>‡</sup> Helmut Schmidt University, Faculty of Mechanical Engineering, Holstenhofweg 85, 220433 Hamburg, Germany

<sup>†</sup> University of Bergen, Department of Mathematics, Allégaten 41, 50520 Bergen, Norway

January 27, 2023

**Abstract.** Variational space-time discretization schemes are getting of increasing importance for the accurate numerical approximation of transient phenomena. The applicability and value of mixed finite element methods for simulating transport processes in heterogeneous and anisotropic (porous) media have been demonstrated in a wide class of works. We consider a family of continuous Galerkin-Petrov time discretization schemes that is combined with a mixed finite element approximation of the spatial variables. The existence and uniqueness of a semidiscrete approximation and of the fully discrete solution are established. Error estimates of optimal order are proved. The convergence rates are illustrated by a numerical experiment.

## 1. Introduction

Numerical simulations of time dependent single and multiphase phase flow and multicomponent transport processes in complex and porous media with strong heterogeneities and anisotropies are desirable in several fields of natural sciences and civil engineering as well as in a large number of branches of technology; cf. e.g. [21, 26].

---

\*bause@hsu-hh.de (corresponding author), <sup>†</sup>Florin.Radu@uib.no, <sup>‡</sup>koecheru@hsu-hh.de

Typically, the discretization in space involves a significant set of complexities and challenges. Mixed finite element methods (cf. [16, 20]) have proved their potential and capability to approximate solutions with high accuracy and physical consistency. So far, the temporal approximation of flows and transport phenomena in porous media have received relatively little interest (cf., e.g., [25, 5, 17, 38, 39, 37, 45] and the references therein) and have been limited to traditional non-adaptive first and second order methods, even if strong chemical reactions with high temporal variations in profiles are present. Rigorous studies of higher order time discretizations are still missing. The low-order implicit time discretization is of particular concern with respect to numerical diffusion for smooth solutions of transport problems (cf. [40] for a study on numerical diffusion for different temporal and spatial discretizations of a transport equation).

The Galerkin method is a known approach to solve time dependent problems; cf., e.g., [6, 44]. However, until now it has rarely been used in practice for discretizing the time variable in approximations of initial-boundary value problems. Since recently, variational time discretization schemes based on continuous or discontinuous finite element techniques have been developed to the point that it can be put into use due to their significant advantages. Higher order methods are naturally embedded in these schemes and the uniform variational approach simplifies stability and error analyses. Further, goal-oriented error control [8] based on the dual weighted residual approach relies on variational space-time formulations and the concepts of adaptive finite element techniques for changing the polynomial degree as well as the length of the time intervals are applicable. Variational time discretization schemes that are combined with continuous or discontinuous finite element methods for the spatial variables are studied for flow and parabolic problems in, for instance, [1, 2, 3, 4, 9, 14, 27, 28, 29, 34, 42] and for wave problems in, for instance, [7, 32, 33]. In these works algebraic formulations of the variational time discretizations are developed [4, 28, 27, 32, 33, 42], preconditioning techniques for the arising block matrix systems are addressed [4, 9, 29, 33] and, finally, computational studies are performed. Numerical analyses of semidiscretizations in time by variational methods and of variational space-time approaches can be found in, for instance, [19, 30, 31, 41, 44]. In [44] discontinuous variational approximations of the time variable are studied for abstract parabolic problems whereas in [41] their continuous counterparts are analyzed. In [19, 42] discontinuous variational approximations in time and space are studied and error estimates are proved where in [42] time-dependent domains are considered in an arbitrary Lagrangian Eulerian (ALE) framework. In [42] the advection-diffusion equation is written in mixed form as a system of first order equations in space before the discontinuous Galerkin approximation in space is applied. In [30, 31] continuous space-time approximations for nonlinear wave equations with mesh modifications and for the Schrödinger equation are considered. Existence and uniqueness of the discrete solutions are discussed and error estimates are proved for the schemes. To the best of our knowledge, rigorous error estimates for fully discrete variational space-time discretization schemes based on mixed approximations of the spatial variables are still missing although such schemes have already been applied successfully to problems of incompressible viscous flow [27, 28].

In this work we analyze variational space-time discretizations of a parabolic prototype

model written in mixed form as a system of first order equations in space. For the discretization in time a continuous Galerkin-Petrov method is used such that solution and test space differ. For the discretization of the spatial variables the mixed finite element method [16, 20] is applied. Appreciable advantages of the mixed finite element method are its local mass conservation property and the inherent approximation of the flux field as part of the formation itself. In simulating coupled flow and transport processes in porous media the flux approximation of the flow problem is usually of higher practical interest than the approximation of the scalar variable itself since the flux field is needed as an input quantity for the particle transport. In our numerical analysis we split the temporal discretization error from the spatial discretization error by introducing an auxiliary problem based on the semidiscretization in time and estimating firstly the temporal discretization error and secondly the error between the semidiscrete and the fully discrete solution. Optimal order error estimates are derived in natural norms of the variational space-time approach that are summarized in Thm. 4.6. The existence and uniqueness of the semidiscrete and fully discrete solution is further established. Even though a prototype model problem is studied here only, we believe that the techniques for analyzing mixed variational space-time approximation schemes can be applied similarly to more complex single and multiphase flow and transport problems in porous media as well as to Stokes, Oseen or even Navier–Stokes flow. Thus, this work focuses on developing firstly rigorous methods for analyzing variational space-time approaches rather than considering complex models.

This work is organized as follows. In Sec. 2 our fully discrete variational space-time method is developed. In Sec. 3 we address the semidiscrete problem by proving existence and uniqueness of its solution and error estimates for the semidiscretization in time. In Sec. 4 we study the fully discrete problem and show the existence and uniqueness of its solution. The error between the semidiscrete and fully discrete problem is estimated. Finally, in Subsec. 4.3 an error estimate for the simultaneous space-time discretization is derived by combining the before-given estimates of the temporal and spatial discretization. Our main result is given in Thm. 4.6. In Sec. 5 we illustrate and validate our derived error estimates by a numerical experiment. We end our work with some conclusions in Sec. 6.

## 2. The fully discrete variational scheme

### 2.1. Notation and preliminaries

As a prototype model for more sophisticated multiphase flow and multicomponent reactive transport systems in porous media (cf. e.g. [21, 26]) we study in this work the initial boundary value problem

$$\partial_t u - \nabla \cdot (\mathbf{D} \nabla u) = f \quad \text{in } \Omega \times I, \quad (2.1)$$

$$u = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \times I, \quad (2.2)$$

$$u(\cdot, 0) = u_0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad (2.3)$$

where  $I = (0, T)$  with final time  $T > 0$  and  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $d = 2$  or  $d = 3$ , is a polygonal or polyhedral bounded domain, respectively. We assume that the symmetric diffusion matrix  $\mathbf{D} = \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{x}) = (d_{ij}(\mathbf{x}))_{i,j=1}^d$  satisfies  $d_{ij} \in L^\infty(\Omega)$  and  $d_{ij} = d_{ji}$  for  $i, j = 1, \dots, d$  and is (uniformly) elliptic with

$$D_M |\boldsymbol{\xi}|^2 \geq \boldsymbol{\xi}^\top \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{x}) \boldsymbol{\xi} \geq D_m |\boldsymbol{\xi}|^2, \quad \theta_M |\boldsymbol{\xi}|^2 \geq \boldsymbol{\xi}^\top \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{x})^{-1} \boldsymbol{\xi} \geq \theta_m |\boldsymbol{\xi}|^2 \quad (2.4)$$

for almost every  $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$  and all  $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and some constants  $0 < D_m \leq D_M < \infty$  and  $0 < \theta_m \leq \theta_M < \infty$ . Further, we let  $f \in L^2(I, L^2(\Omega))$  and  $u_0 \in H_0^1(\Omega)$  such that the existence of a unique weak solution

$$u \in L^2(I; H_0^1(\Omega)) \cap H^1(I; L^2(\Omega)) \cap C(\bar{I}; L^2(\Omega)) \quad (2.5)$$

of problem (2.1)–(2.3) is ensured; cf. [24]. The application of our error analyses given below to more sophisticated systems is considered as being possible. However, we focus here on introducing techniques and concepts for analyzing variational space-time discretization schemes and, therefore, restrict ourselves to the model problem (2.1)–(2.3). More general boundary conditions for (2.1) can be incorporated in (2.1)–(2.3) and in its mixed finite element discretization in the usual way.

Throughout this paper, standard notations and conventions will be used. We denote by  $H^m(\Omega)$  the Sobolev space of  $L^2$  functions with derivatives up to order  $m$  in  $L^2(\Omega)$  and by  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  the inner product in  $L^2(\Omega)$ . Further, let  $H_0^1(\Omega) = \{u \in H^1(\Omega) \mid u = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega\}$  and  $H^{-1}(\Omega)$  denote the dual space of  $H_0^1(\Omega)$ . For the solution spaces of the mixed problem formulation we use the following notation,

$$\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{H}(\text{div}; \Omega), \quad W = L^2(\Omega), \quad (2.6)$$

where  $\mathbf{H}(\text{div}; \Omega) = \{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbf{L}^2(\Omega) \mid \nabla \cdot \mathbf{q} \in L^2(\Omega)\}$ . Let  $X_0 \subset X \subset X_1$  be three reflexive Banach spaces with continuous embeddings. Then we consider the following set of Banach space valued function spaces,

$$\begin{aligned} C(\bar{I}; X) &= \{w : [0, T] \rightarrow X \mid w \text{ is continuous}\}, \\ L^2(I; X) &= \left\{ w : (0, T) \rightarrow X \mid \int_I \|w(t)\|_X^2 dt < \infty \right\}, \\ H^1(I; X_0, X_1) &= \{w \in L^2(I; X_0) \mid \partial_t w \in L^2(I; X_1)\}, \end{aligned}$$

that are equipped with their natural norms (cf. [23]) and where the time derivative  $\partial_t$  is understood in the sense of distributions on  $(0, T)$ . In particular, every function in  $H^1(I; X_0, X_1)$  is continuous on  $[0, T]$  with values in  $X$ ; cf. [23]. For  $X_0 = X = X_1$  we simply write  $H^1(I; X)$ . Moreover, we put  $H_0^1(I; X) = \{u \in H^1(I, X) \mid u(0) = 0\}$ .

In order to derive our family of discretization schemes, we first define the auxiliary flux variable  $\mathbf{q} := -\mathbf{D}\nabla u$ . Since  $\partial_t u \in L^2(I; L^2(\Omega))$  is satisfied by (2.5) and  $f \in L^2(I; L^2(\Omega))$  holds by assumption, it follows that  $\mathbf{q} \in L^2(I; \mathbf{V})$ . The pair  $\{u, \mathbf{q}\} \in$

$H^1(I; W) \cap C(\bar{I}; W) \times L^2(I; \mathbf{V})$  then satisfies the set of variational equations

$$\int_0^T \langle \partial_t u, w \rangle dt + \int_0^T \langle \nabla \cdot \mathbf{q}, w \rangle dt = \int_0^T \langle f, w \rangle dt, \quad (2.7)$$

$$\int_0^T \langle \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{v} \rangle dt - \int_0^T \langle \nabla u, \mathbf{v} \rangle dt = 0 \quad (2.8)$$

for all  $w \in L^2(I; W)$  and  $\mathbf{v} \in L^2(I; \mathbf{V})$  and the initial condition  $u(0) = u_0$ . The global in time variational problem (2.7), (2.8) is now the starting point for deriving our semidiscretization in time.

## 2.2. Variational discretization in time by a continuous Galerkin method

For the discretization in time we decompose the time interval  $(0, T]$  into  $N$  subintervals  $I_n = (t_{n-1}, t_n]$ , where  $n \in \{1, \dots, N\}$  and  $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_{n-1} < t_n = T$ . Further  $\tau$  denotes the discretization parameter in time and is defined as the maximum time step size  $\tau = \max_{1 \leq n \leq N} \tau_n$ , where  $\tau_n = t_n - t_{n-1}$ . We introduce the function spaces of piecewise polynomials of order  $r$  in time,

$$\mathcal{X}^r(X) := \left\{ u_\tau \in C(\bar{I}; X) \mid u_\tau|_{I_n} \in \mathbb{P}_r(\bar{I}_n; X), \forall n \in \{1, \dots, N\} \right\},$$

$$\mathcal{Y}^r(X) := \left\{ w_\tau \in L^2(I; X) \mid w_\tau|_{I_n} \in \mathbb{P}_r(I_n; X), \forall n \in \{1, \dots, N\} \right\},$$

where

$$\mathbb{P}_r(J; X) = \left\{ p : J \rightarrow X \mid p(t) = \sum_{j=0}^r \xi_n^j t^j, \xi_n^j \in X, j = 0, \dots, r \right\}.$$

The subspace of  $\mathcal{X}^r(X)$  of functions with homogeneous initial values is denoted by  $\mathcal{X}_0^r(X)$ , i.e.

$$\mathcal{X}_0^r(X) = \left\{ u_\tau \in \mathcal{X}^r(X) \mid u_\tau(0) = 0 \right\}.$$

In particular, it holds that  $\mathcal{X}^r(W) \subset H^1(0, T; W)$ .

For the family of continuous variational time discretization schemes the spaces  $\mathcal{X}^r(X)$  of continuous functions act as spaces for the solution whereas the spaces  $\mathcal{Y}^{r-1}(X)$  consisting of piecewise polynomials that are discontinuous at the end points of the time intervals are used as test spaces. Since the spaces of the trial and test functions differ here, a discretization of Galerkin-Petrov type is thus obtained.

A semidiscrete variational approximation in time of the mixed form of problem (2.1)–(2.3) is then defined by solving the variational equations (2.7), (2.8) in discrete sub-

spaces: Find  $\{u_\tau, \mathbf{q}_\tau\} \in \mathcal{X}^r(W) \times \mathcal{X}^r(\mathbf{V})$  such that

$$\int_0^T \langle \partial_t u_\tau, w_\tau \rangle dt + \int_0^T \langle \nabla \cdot \mathbf{q}_\tau, w_\tau \rangle dt = \int_0^T \langle f, w_\tau \rangle dt, \quad (2.9)$$

$$\int_0^T \langle \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{q}_\tau, \mathbf{v}_\tau \rangle dt - \int_0^T \langle u_\tau, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_\tau \rangle dt = 0, \quad (2.10)$$

for all  $w_\tau \in \mathcal{Y}^{r-1}(W)$  and  $\mathbf{v}_\tau \in \mathcal{Y}^{r-1}(\mathbf{V})$  with the initial conditions  $u_\tau(0) = u_0$  and  $\mathbf{q}_\tau(0) = -\mathbf{D}\nabla u_0$ .

**Remark 2.1.** The initial condition for the flux variable,  $\mathbf{q}_\tau(0) = -\mathbf{D}\nabla u_0$ , requires the additional regularity assumption that  $\mathbf{D}\nabla u_0 \in \mathbf{V}$  that we tacitly assume here. However, the initial condition for the flux variable is somehow artificial. Below, we will observe that in the numerically integrated counterpart of Eqs. (2.9), (2.10), being defined by Eqs. (2.19), (2.20), an initial value for the flux variable is no longer required. For this issue we also refer to Rem. 2.2 below.

We refer to the solution of Eqs. (2.9), (2.10) as the continuous Galerkin–Petrov method with piecewise polynomials of order  $r$  and use the notation cGP( $r$ ). To ensure the existence of solutions to (2.9), (2.10), it is sufficient to use the test spaces  $\mathcal{Y}^{r-1}(W)$  and  $\mathcal{Y}^{r-1}(\mathbf{V})$  with piecewise polynomials of order  $r-1$ , since the continuity constraint at the discrete time points  $t_n$ ,  $n = 0, \dots, N-1$ , that is implied by the definition of the solution spaces  $\mathcal{X}^r(W)$  and  $\mathcal{X}^r(\mathbf{V})$ , yields a further condition. By using discontinuous test basis functions  $w_\tau(t) = w\psi_{n,i}(t)$  and  $\mathbf{v}_\tau = \mathbf{v}\psi_{n,i}(t)$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, r$ , with arbitrary time independent functions  $w \in W$  and  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{V}$ , respectively, and piecewise polynomial functions  $\psi_{n,i} : I \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  that are of order  $r-1$  on  $I_n$  and vanish outside  $I \setminus \bar{I}_n$ , we can recast the variational equations (2.9), (2.10) as a time marching scheme: For  $n = 1, \dots, N$  find  $u_\tau|_{\bar{I}_n} \in \mathbb{P}_r(\bar{I}_n; W)$  and  $\mathbf{q}_\tau|_{\bar{I}_n} \in P_r(\bar{I}_n; \mathbf{V})$  such that

$$\int_{I_n} \langle \partial_t u_\tau, w \rangle \psi_{n,i}(t) dt + \int_{I_n} \langle \nabla \cdot \mathbf{q}_\tau, w \rangle \psi_{n,i}(t) dt = \int_{I_n} \langle f, w \rangle \psi_{n,i}(t) dt, \quad (2.11)$$

$$\int_{I_n} \langle \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{q}_\tau, \mathbf{v} \rangle \psi_{n,i}(t) dt - \int_{I_n} \langle u_\tau, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v} \rangle \psi_{n,i}(t) dt = 0 \quad (2.12)$$

for all  $w \in W$  and  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{V}$  and  $i = 1, \dots, r$  with the continuity constraints  $u_\tau|_{I_n}(t_{n-1}) = u_\tau|_{I_{n-1}}(t_{n-1})$  and  $\mathbf{q}_\tau|_{I_n}(t_{n-1}) = \mathbf{q}_\tau|_{I_{n-1}}(t_{n-1})$  for  $n \geq 2$  and the initial conditions  $u_\tau|_{I_1}(t_{n-1}) = u_0$  and  $\mathbf{q}_\tau(0) = -\mathbf{D}\nabla u_0$  for  $n = 1$ .

To determine  $u_\tau|_{\bar{I}_n}$  and  $\mathbf{q}_\tau|_{\bar{I}_n}$ , we represent them in terms of basis functions, with respect to the time variable, of the spaces  $\mathcal{X}^r(W)$  and  $\mathcal{X}^r(\mathbf{V})$  such that

$$u_\tau|_{\bar{I}_n}(t) = \sum_{j=0}^r U_n^j \varphi_{n,j}(t) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{q}_\tau|_{\bar{I}_n}(t) = \sum_{j=0}^r \mathbf{Q}_n^j \varphi_{n,j}(t), \quad \text{for } t \in I_n, \quad (2.13)$$

with coefficient functions  $U_n^j \in W$  and  $\mathbf{Q}_n^j \in \mathbf{V}$  for  $j = 0, \dots, r$  and polynomial basis functions  $\varphi_{n,j} \in \mathbb{P}_r(\bar{I}_n; \mathbb{R})$  that are Lagrange functions with respect to  $r + 1$  nodal points  $t_{n,j} \in I_n$  satisfying the conditions

$$\varphi_{n,j}(t_{n,i}) = \delta_{i,j}, \quad \text{for } i, j = 0, \dots, r, \quad (2.14)$$

with the Kronecker symbol  $\delta_{i,j}$ . For the treatment of the continuity constraints and the initial condition we put  $t_{n,0} = t_{n-1}$ . This implies that

$$U_n^0 = u_{\tau|I_{n-1}}(t_{n-1}) \text{ if } n \geq 2 \quad \text{and} \quad U_n^0 = u_0 \text{ if } n = 1, \quad (2.15)$$

and (cf. Rem 2.1)

$$\mathbf{Q}_n^0 = \mathbf{q}_{\tau|I_{n-1}}(t_{n-1}) \text{ if } n \geq 2 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{Q}_n^0 = -\mathbf{D}\nabla u_0 \text{ if } n = 1. \quad (2.16)$$

The other points  $t_{n,1}, \dots, t_{n,r}$  are chosen as the quadrature points of the  $r$ -point Gaussian quadrature formula on  $I_n$  which is exact if the function to be integrated is a polynomial of degree less or equal to  $2r - 1$ . The basis functions  $\varphi_{n,j} \in \mathbb{P}_r(\bar{I}_n; \mathbb{R})$  of (2.13), for  $j = 0, \dots, r$ , are defined via the affine reference transformation onto  $\hat{I} = [0, 1]$ ,  $\hat{t} := \tau_n^{-1}(t - t_{n-1}) \in \hat{I}$  for  $t \in \bar{I}_n$ , by means of

$$\varphi_{n,j}(t) = \hat{\varphi}_j(\hat{t}) \quad \text{with} \quad \hat{\varphi}_j \in \mathbb{P}_r(\hat{I}; \mathbb{R}) \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\varphi}_j(\hat{t}_i) = \delta_{i,j}, \text{ for } i, j = 0, \dots, r, \quad (2.17)$$

where  $\hat{t}_0 = 0$  and  $\hat{t}_i, i = 1, \dots, r$  are the standard  $r$  point Gaussian quadrature points on the interval  $\hat{I} = [0, 1]$ . Similarly, the test basis functions  $\psi_{n,i} \in P_{r-1}(\bar{I}_n; \mathbb{R})$  are defined by suitable reference basis functions  $\hat{\psi}_i \in \mathbb{P}_{r-1}(\hat{I}; \mathbb{R})$  through

$$\psi_{n,i}(t) = \hat{\psi}_i(\hat{t}) \quad \text{with} \quad \hat{\psi}_i(\hat{t}_l) = \delta_{i,l}, \quad \text{for } i, l = 1, \dots, r, \quad (2.18)$$

where  $\hat{t}_l, l = 1, \dots, r$ , again denote the quadrature points of the  $r$  point Gaussian formula on  $\hat{I}$ . Now we transform all the time integrals in (2.11), (2.12) to the reference interval  $\hat{I}$  and obtain the following system of variational problems for the coefficient functions  $U_n^j \in W$  and  $\mathbf{Q}_n^j \in \mathbf{V}$  of the representation (2.13): *For  $n = 1, \dots, N$  find coefficient functions  $\{U_n^j, \mathbf{Q}_n^j\} \in W \times \mathbf{V}$ , for  $j = 1, \dots, r$ , such that*

$$\sum_{j=0}^r \hat{\alpha}_{ij} \langle U_n^j, w \rangle + \tau_n \hat{\beta}_{ii} \langle \nabla \cdot \mathbf{Q}_n^i, w \rangle = \tau_n \hat{\beta}_{ii} \langle f(t_{n,i}), w \rangle, \quad (2.19)$$

$$\langle \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{Q}_n^i, \mathbf{v} \rangle - \langle U_n^i, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v} \rangle = 0, \quad (2.20)$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, r$  and all  $\{w, \mathbf{v}\} \in W \times \mathbf{V}$ , where  $U_n^0 \in W$  is defined by means of the continuity constraints (2.15).

For the derivation of (2.19), (2.20) from (2.11), (2.12) we note the following issues. Firstly, the time integration in (2.11) of the product of the source term  $f$  with the test functions is done in practice by numerical quadrature. Therefore, we tacitly replaced

the integrand  $f$  in the integral on the right-hand side of Eq. (2.11) by its Lagrange interpolate  $\Pi_r f \in \mathbb{P}_r(I_n; L^2(\Omega))$  defined by

$$\Pi_r f(t)|_{I_n} = \sum_{j=0}^r f(t_{n,i}) \varphi_{n,i}(t) \quad \text{for } t \in I_n. \quad (2.21)$$

Further, we used that the  $r$ -point Gaussian quadrature formula on  $\hat{I}$  implies that

$$\int_{I_n} \frac{d}{dt} \varphi_{n,j}(t) \cdot \psi_{n,i}(t) dt = \int_{\hat{I}} \frac{d}{d\hat{t}} \hat{\varphi}_{n,j}(\hat{t}) \cdot \hat{\psi}_{n,i}(\hat{t}) d\hat{t} = \hat{\omega}_i \cdot \frac{d}{d\hat{t}} \hat{\varphi}_j(\hat{t}_i) =: \hat{\alpha}_{ij},$$

$$\int_{I_n} \varphi_{n,j}(t) \cdot \psi_{n,i}(t) dt = \tau_n \int_{\hat{I}} \hat{\varphi}_{n,j}(\hat{t}) \cdot \hat{\psi}_{n,i}(\hat{t}) d\hat{t} = \tau_n \cdot \hat{\omega}_i \cdot \delta_{i,j} := \tau_n \cdot \hat{\beta}_{ij} \quad (2.22)$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, r, j = 0, \dots, r$  by means of definitions (2.14), (2.17); cf. [14, 32, 41].

We note that the constants  $\hat{\beta}_{ii}$  in (2.22) are satisfying the following condition.

**Coefficient condition (C).** *There exist constants  $\beta_m, \beta_M \in \mathbb{R}$  such that*

$$0 < \beta_m \leq \hat{\beta}_{ii} \leq \beta_M < \infty, \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, r, \quad (2.23)$$

*is satisfied. The constants are not depending on the time step size, but only on the number  $r$  of involved Gauss quadrature points.*

Indeed, the coefficients  $\beta_{ii} = \hat{\omega}_i$  are the Gauss-Legendre quadrature weights

$$\tilde{\omega}_i = \int_{-1}^1 \prod_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^r \left( \frac{x - x_j}{x_i - x_j} \right)^2 dx = \frac{1}{(1 - x_i^2)(P_r'(x_i))^2}, \quad i = 1, \dots, r, \quad (2.24)$$

scaled to the interval  $[0, 1]$ , i.e.  $\hat{\omega}_i = \tilde{\omega}_i/2$ . In (2.24),  $P_r$  denotes the Legendre polynomial of degree  $r$  and  $x_i$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, r$ , are its roots, cf., e.g., [36, p. 436]. Since the sum of the weights  $\tilde{\omega}_i$  equals to two and the weights are all strictly positive, we immediately conclude that an upper bound for  $\hat{\omega}_i$  is given by one. On the other hand, we know that  $|P_r'(x)| \leq \frac{r(r+1)}{2}$  for any  $x \in [-1, 1]$ ; cf. [15, p. 73]. This gives us the lower bound  $\hat{\omega}_i \geq 4/(r(r+1))^2$ .

**Remark 2.2.** *The advantage of using the Gaussian quadrature rule for evaluating the time integrals in (2.11), (2.12) is that in the resulting scheme (2.19), (2.20) no flux approximation  $\mathbf{Q}_n^0$  at the initial time point  $t_{n-1}$  of the subinterval  $I_n$  arises. Therefore, the initial flux at time  $t = 0$ , that we usually do not have in practice, is not involved and needed for calculating the coefficient functions  $U_n^j$  and  $\mathbf{Q}_n^j$  for  $j = 1, \dots, r$  at the intermediate Gaussian quadrature points  $t_{n,l} \in (t_{n-1}, t_n)$  for  $l = 1, \dots, r$ . For evaluating (2.15) for  $n \geq 2$ , we calculate  $u_{\tau}|_{I_{n-1}}(t_{n-1})$  explicitly by evaluating the fully discrete counterpart of the first of the representations in (2.13) on  $I_{n-1}$ . Approximations of the flux variable are computed similarly by evaluating the fully discrete counterpart of the second of the representations in (2.13) on  $I_{n-1}$ . For the initial value of the flux variable either a sufficiently smooth quantity  $-\mathbf{D}\nabla \mathbf{u}_0$ , if available, or an approximation computed by an extrapolation technique (cf. [28]) is used.*



Below, we will also need the following auxiliary results.

**Lemma 2.3.** *Let  $F(t, \mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=0}^r F_n^i(\mathbf{x})\varphi_{n,i}(t)$ , for  $t \in I_n$ , with coefficient functions  $F_n^i \in W$  for  $i = 0, \dots, r$ . Then it holds that*

$$\sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=0}^r \hat{\alpha}_{ij} \langle F_n^j, F_n^i \rangle = \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} \langle \partial_t F, F \rangle dt = \frac{1}{2} \|F(t_n)\|^2 - \frac{1}{2} \|F(t_{n-1})\|^2 \quad (2.25)$$

and

$$\|F\|_{L^2(I_n, W)}^2 \leq c_0 \tau_n \sum_{j=0}^r \|F_n^j\|_W^2, \quad (2.26)$$

for some  $c_0 > 0$  independent of  $\tau_n$ . An analogous results holds for coefficients  $F_n^i \in V$ .

**Proof.** Using the properties of the basis functions  $\varphi_i$  and that the  $r$ -point Gauss quadrature is exact for polynomials of maximum degree  $2r - 1$  there holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} \langle \partial_t F, F \rangle dt &= \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} \int_{\Omega} \sum_{j=0}^r \varphi'_{n,j}(t) F_n^j(\mathbf{x}) \sum_{i=0}^r \varphi_{n,i}(t) F_n^i(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} dt \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^r \sum_{i=0}^r \int_0^1 \frac{d}{dt} \hat{\varphi}_j(\hat{t}) \cdot \hat{\varphi}_i(\hat{t}) d\hat{t} \langle F_n^i, F_n^j \rangle \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^r \sum_{i=1}^r \hat{w}_i \hat{\varphi}'_j(\hat{t}_i) \langle F_n^i, F_n^j \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=0}^r \hat{\alpha}_{ij} \langle F_n^j, F_n^i \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

The second of the equalities in (2.25) follows immediately from the first one. It remains to prove (2.26). There holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \|F\|_{L^2(I_n, W)}^2 &= \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} \left\| \sum_{i=0}^r F_n^i(\mathbf{x}) \varphi_{n,i}(t) \right\|^2 dt \\ &\leq (r+1) \sum_{i=0}^r \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} \varphi_{n,i}^2(t) dt \|F_n^i\|^2 \\ &\leq c(r+1) \sum_{i=0}^r \tau_n \|F_n^i\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

with  $c$  independent of  $\tau_n$ . Here we used that  $\int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} \varphi_{n,i}^2(t) dt \leq c\tau_n$ ; cf. [31, p. 1790]. ■

### 2.3. Discretization in space by the mixed finite element method

Now, we present the fully discrete approximation scheme that is obtained by discretizing the variational equations (2.19), (2.20) with respect to their spatial variables. For

this we choose a pair of finite element spaces  $W_h \subset W$  and  $\mathbf{V}_h \subset \mathbf{V} = \mathbf{H}(\text{div}; \Omega)$  satisfying the inf-sup stability condition; cf. [16, 20]. Here, we denote by  $\mathcal{T}_h = \{K\}$  a finite element decomposition of mesh size  $h$  of the polyhedral domain  $\bar{\Omega}$  into closed subsets  $K$ , quadrilaterals in two space dimensions and hexahedra in three space dimensions. Since the software library `deal.ii` [22] that we use for our implementation of the schemes allows only quadrilateral and hexahedral elements, we restrict ourselves to these types of elements in the following. Triangular and tetrahedral elements can be treated in an analogous way. In our calculations (cf. Sec. 5) we use the class of Raviart–Thomas elements on quadrilateral elements for the two-dimensional case. For an application in three space dimensions based on the class of Raviart–Thomas–Nédélec elements we refer to [14, 33].

The construction of the discrete function spaces on quadrilateral and hexahedral finite elements is done by a transformation  $\mathcal{T}_K : \hat{K} \rightarrow K$  of the reference element  $\hat{K} = [0, 1]^d$ , with  $d = 2$  or  $d = 3$  respectively, to the element  $K$  through a diffeomorphism  $\mathcal{T}_K$  for all  $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$ . For this, let

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{Q}^{p_1, p_2} &:= \left\{ \hat{p} : [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid \hat{p}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) = \sum_{i=0}^{p_1} \sum_{j=0}^{p_2} p_{i,j} x_1^i x_2^j, p_{i,j} \in \mathbb{R} \right\}, \\ \hat{Q}^{p_1, p_2, p_3} &:= \left\{ \hat{p} : [0, 1]^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid \hat{p}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) = \sum_{i=0}^{p_1} \sum_{j=0}^{p_2} \sum_{k=0}^{p_3} p_{i,j,k} x_1^i x_2^j x_3^k, p_{i,j,k} \in \mathbb{R} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

We then define the discrete subspaces  $W_h^p \subset W$  and  $\mathbf{V}_h^p \subset \mathbf{V}$  by

$$W_h = W_h^p := \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \left\{ w \in W \mid w_K \circ \mathcal{T}_K^{-1} \in \hat{Q}^{p,p}, \text{ for } K \in \mathcal{T}_h \right\} \\ \left\{ \mathbf{w} \in W \mid w_K \circ \mathcal{T}_K^{-1} \in \hat{Q}^{p,p,p}, \text{ for } K \in \mathcal{T}_h \right\} \end{array} \right\}, \quad (2.27)$$

for  $d = 2$  and  $d = 3$ , respectively, as well as

$$\mathbf{V}_h = \mathbf{V}_h^p := \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \left\{ \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{V} \mid \mathbf{v}_K \circ \mathcal{T}_K^{-1} \in \hat{Q}^{p+1,p} \times \hat{Q}^{p,p+1}, \text{ for } K \in \mathcal{T}_h \right\} \\ \left\{ \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{V} \mid \mathbf{v}_K \circ \mathcal{T}_K^{-1} \in \hat{Q}^{p+1,p,p} \times \hat{Q}^{p,p+1,p} \times \hat{Q}^{p,p,p+1}, \text{ for } K \in \mathcal{T}_h \right\} \end{array} \right\} \quad (2.28)$$

for  $d = 2$  and  $d = 3$ , respectively, with space dimensions

$$\dim W_h = N_{W_h} := |\mathcal{T}_h| \cdot (p+1)^d$$

and

$$\dim \mathbf{V}_h = N_{\mathbf{V}_h} := \left( |\mathcal{T}_h| - \frac{|\mathcal{F}_h^{\mathcal{I}}|}{4} \right) \cdot [d(p+1)^{d-1}(p+2)],$$

where  $|\mathcal{T}_h|$  denotes the cardinality of  $\mathcal{T}_h$  and  $|\mathcal{F}_h^{\mathcal{I}}|$  is the number of interior faces.

The fully discrete continuous Galerkin-Petrov and mixed finite element approximation scheme, referred to as cGP( $r$ )–MFEM( $p$ ), is then obtained by solving the variational problem (2.19), (2.20) in the discrete subspaces  $W_h \subset W$  and  $\mathbf{V}_h \subset \mathbf{V}$ : For  $n = 1, \dots, N$  find coefficient functions  $\{U_{n,h}^j, \mathbf{Q}_{n,h}^j\} \in W_h \times \mathbf{V}_h$ , for  $j = 1, \dots, r$ , such that

$$\sum_{j=0}^r \hat{\alpha}_{ij} \langle U_{n,h}^j, w_h \rangle + \tau_n \hat{\beta}_{ii} \langle \nabla \cdot \mathbf{Q}_{n,h}^i, w_h \rangle = \tau_n \hat{\beta}_{ii} \langle f(t_{n,i}), w \rangle, \quad (2.29)$$

$$\langle \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{Q}_{n,h}^i, \mathbf{v}_h \rangle - \langle U_{n,h}^i, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_h \rangle = 0 \quad (2.30)$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, r$  and all  $\{w_h, \mathbf{v}_h\} \in W_h \times \mathbf{V}_h$ , where  $U_{n,h}^0 \in W_h$  is defined by means of the discrete counterpart of the continuity constraints (2.15), i.e.

$$U_{n,h}^0 = \sum_{j=0}^r U_{n-1,h}^j \varphi_{n-1,j}(t_{n-1}) \quad \text{if } n \geq 2 \quad \text{and} \quad U_{n,h}^0 = P_h u_0 \quad \text{if } n = 1,$$

where  $P_h : L^2(\Omega) \mapsto W_h$  denotes the  $L^2$  projection onto  $W_h$ .

The solution  $\{U_{n,h}^j, \mathbf{Q}_{n,h}^j\} \in W_h \times \mathbf{V}_h$ , for  $j = 1, \dots, r$ , of problem (2.29), (2.30) now defines similarly to the semidiscrete approximation (2.13) the coefficients of the fully discrete space-time approximation  $\{u_{\tau,h}, \mathbf{q}_{\tau,h}\} \in \mathcal{X}^r(W_h) \times \mathcal{X}^r(\mathbf{V}_h)$  that is given by

$$u_{\tau,h}|_{I_n}(t) = \sum_{j=0}^r U_{n,h}^j \varphi_{n,j}(t) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{q}_{\tau,h}|_{I_n}(t) = \sum_{j=0}^r \mathbf{Q}_{n,h}^j \varphi_{n,j}(t) \quad (2.31)$$

for  $t \in I_n$ . In terms of the unknown fully discrete functions  $u_{\tau,h}$  and  $\mathbf{q}_{\tau,h}$  we can rewrite the fully discrete system (2.29), (2.30) as the following space-time variational problem: Find  $u_{\tau,h} \in \mathcal{X}^r(I; W_h)$  and  $\mathbf{q}_{\tau,h} \in \mathcal{X}^r(I; \mathbf{V}_h)$  such that

$$\int_{I_n} \langle \partial_t u_{\tau,h}, w_h \rangle \psi_{n,i}(t) dt + \int_{I_n} \langle \nabla \cdot \mathbf{q}_{\tau,h}, w_h \rangle \psi_{n,i}(t) dt = \int_{I_n} \langle \Pi_r f, w_h \rangle \psi_{n,i}(t) dt, \quad (2.32)$$

$$\int_{I_n} \langle \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{q}_{\tau,h}, \mathbf{v}_h \rangle \psi_{n,i}(t) dt - \int_{I_n} \langle u_{\tau,h}, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_h \rangle \psi_{n,i}(t) dt = 0 \quad (2.33)$$

for all  $w_h \in W_h$  and  $\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{V}_h$  and  $i = 1, \dots, r$  with the initial condition  $u_{\tau,h}(0) = P_h u_0$ .

For the derivation of the algebraic formulation of the fully discrete variational problem (2.29), (2.30) we also refer to [14, 32]. In [14, 32], the iterative solution of the arising linear systems and the construction of an efficient preconditioner is further addressed. For solving the algebraic counterpart of Eqs. (2.29), (2.30) we do not apply an additional hybridization technique as it was done, for instance, in [10, 11, 13] and references therein. We solve the algebraic system by using a Schur complement technique. In [32] the efficiency of the proposed iterative solver along with an adapted preconditioning technique is analyzed numerically. In [14, 32], the approximation properties of

some families of space-time discretization schemes, including the cGP( $r$ )–MFEM( $p$ ) approach, in terms of convergence rates and their robustness are studied by numerous numerical experiments. Test cases in three space dimensions and with heterogeneous and strongly anisotropic material properties are also included.

### 3. Existence and uniqueness of the semidiscrete approximation and error estimates

In this subsection we prove the existence and uniqueness of solutions to the semidiscrete approximation scheme that is defined by the variational problem (2.9), (2.10) and its numerically integrated counterpart (2.19), (2.20), respectively. To derive error estimates for the fully discrete scheme we use the triangle inequality to bound the overall discretization error by the error of temporal discretization and the error of the mixed finite element discretization of the semidiscrete system. The first of these errors is also studied in this section, whereas the error of the spatial discretization is analyzed in Sec. 4. In Sec. 4 we also provide the resulting estimate for the fully discrete scheme.

In the sequel we need some further notation. For  $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$  let  $A : H_0^1(\Omega) \mapsto H^{-1}(\Omega)$  be defined uniquely by

$$\langle Au, v \rangle = a(u, v) \quad \text{for all } u, v \in H_0^1(\Omega) \quad (3.1)$$

with

$$a(u, v) := \langle \mathbf{D}\nabla u, \nabla v \rangle.$$

Under the assumptions of Subsec. 2.1 it holds that

$$a(v, v) \geq c_1 \|v\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)}^2 \quad \text{for all } v \in H_0^1(\Omega), \quad (3.2)$$

$$|a(u, v)| \leq c_2 \|u\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)} \|v\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)} \quad \text{for all } u, v \in H_0^1(\Omega). \quad (3.3)$$

Thus,  $A : H_0^1(\Omega) \mapsto H^{-1}(\Omega)$  is a linear and continuous operator. For a subspace  $D(A) \subset H_0^1(\Omega)$  let  $A : D(A) \mapsto H^{-1}(\Omega)$  be a bijective linear continuous operator. For instance, if  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ , with  $d = 2$  or  $d = 3$ , is a convex polygonal or polyhedral bounded domain and  $d_{ij} \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ , for  $i, j = 1, \dots, d$ , is satisfied, then the operator  $A$  is a bijective linear continuous operator from  $D(A) = H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$  to  $L^2(\Omega)$ .

#### 3.1. Existence and uniqueness of the semidiscrete approximation

**Theorem 3.1** (Uniqueness of solutions). *Let the assumptions of Subsec. 2.1 about  $\Omega, u_0$  and  $f$  be satisfied. Then the solution  $\{u_\tau, \mathbf{q}_\tau\} \in \mathcal{X}^r(W) \times \mathcal{X}^r(\mathbf{V})$  of the semidiscrete problem (2.9), (2.10) is unique.*

**Proof.** Suppose  $\{u_{\tau,1}, \mathbf{q}_{\tau,2}\} \in \mathcal{X}^r(W) \times \mathcal{X}^r(\mathbf{V})$  and  $\{u_{\tau,2}, \mathbf{q}_{\tau,1}\} \in \mathcal{X}^r(W) \times \mathcal{X}^r(\mathbf{V})$ , respectively, satisfy the semidiscrete problem (2.9), (2.10) and let  $u_\tau := u_{\tau,1} - u_{\tau,2}$  and  $\mathbf{q}_\tau := \mathbf{q}_{\tau,1} - \mathbf{q}_{\tau,2}$ . Then, the tuple  $\{u_\tau, \mathbf{q}_\tau\}$  satisfies (2.9), (2.10) with  $f \equiv 0$ . Choosing the test function  $w_\tau = A^{-1}\partial_t u_\tau$  in (2.9) yields that

$$\int_0^T \langle \partial_t u_\tau, A^{-1}\partial_t u_\tau \rangle dt + \int_0^T \langle \nabla \cdot \mathbf{q}_\tau, A^{-1}\partial_t u_\tau \rangle dt = 0. \quad (3.4)$$

Due to the properties (3.2), (3.3) of the bilinear form  $a(\cdot, \cdot)$  the lemma of Lax–Milgram ensures that the operator  $A : H_0^1(\Omega) \mapsto H^{-1}(\Omega)$  defined in (3.1) is invertible and satisfies the stability estimates

$$\|\mathbf{A}\| \leq c_2 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\mathbf{A}^{-1}\| \leq c_1.$$

Moreover, for all  $g \in H^{-1}(\Omega)$  it holds that

$$\langle g, A^{-1}g \rangle = \langle AA^{-1}g, A^{-1}g \rangle \geq c_1 \|A^{-1}g\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)}^2 \geq \frac{c_1}{c_2^2} \|g\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)}^2. \quad (3.5)$$

From estimate (3.5) we get that

$$\int_0^T \langle \partial_t u_\tau, A^{-1}\partial_t u_\tau \rangle dt \geq \frac{c_1}{c_2^2} \int_0^T \|\partial_t u_\tau\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)}^2 dt. \quad (3.6)$$

Using integration by parts in the second of the integrals in (3.4) and recalling that  $A^{-1}\partial_t u_\tau \in D(A) \subset H_0^1(\Omega)$ , Eq. (3.4) along with (3.6) yields that

$$0 \geq \frac{c_1}{c_2^2} \int_0^T \|\partial_t u_\tau\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)}^2 dt - \int_0^T \langle \mathbf{q}_\tau, \nabla A^{-1}\partial_t u_\tau \rangle dt. \quad (3.7)$$

Next, by choosing the test function  $\mathbf{v}_\tau = \mathbf{D}\nabla A^{-1}\partial_t u_\tau$  in Eq. (2.9) we find that

$$\int_0^T \langle \mathbf{D}^{-1}\mathbf{q}_\tau, \mathbf{D}\nabla A^{-1}\partial_t u_\tau \rangle dt - \int_0^T \langle u_\tau, \nabla \cdot (\mathbf{D}\nabla A^{-1}\partial_t u_\tau) \rangle dt = 0. \quad (3.8)$$

Since

$$\nabla \cdot (\mathbf{D}\nabla A^{-1}\partial_t u_\tau) = -AA^{-1}\partial_t u_\tau = -\partial_t u_\tau$$

and  $\mathbf{D} = \mathbf{D}^\top$  by assumption, it follows from (3.8) that

$$\int_0^T \langle \mathbf{q}_\tau, \nabla A^{-1}\partial_t u_\tau \rangle dt + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \frac{d}{dt} \|u_\tau\|^2 dt = 0.$$

Since  $u_\tau(0) = u_{\tau,1}(0) - u_{\tau,2}(0) = 0$  it follows that

$$\int_0^T \langle \mathbf{q}_\tau, \nabla A^{-1}\partial_t u_\tau \rangle dt + \frac{1}{2} \|u_\tau(T)\|^2 = 0. \quad (3.9)$$

Combing relations (3.7) and (3.9) shows that

$$0 \geq c \int_0^T \|\partial_t u_\tau\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)}^2 dt + \frac{1}{2} \|u_\tau(T)\|^2 \quad (3.10)$$

and, therefore,  $u_\tau = 0$ . This implies the uniqueness of solutions  $u_\tau$  to (2.9), (2.10).

To show the uniqueness of solutions  $\mathbf{q}_\tau$  of (2.9), (2.10), we choose the test function  $\mathbf{v}_\tau = \partial_t \mathbf{q}_\tau$ . Recalling that  $u_\tau = 0$  by means of the uniqueness result (3.10) we obtain from Eq. (2.10) that

$$\int_0^T \langle \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{q}_\tau, \partial_t \mathbf{q}_\tau \rangle dt = 0.$$

From  $\langle \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{q}_\tau, \partial_t \mathbf{q}_\tau \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \langle \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{q}_\tau, \mathbf{q}_\tau \rangle$  and  $\mathbf{q}_\tau(0) = \mathbf{0}$  we conclude that

$$0 = \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{D}^{-1/2} \mathbf{q}_\tau(T)\|^2. \quad (3.11)$$

Next, we choose  $\mathbf{v}_\tau = \partial_t^2 \mathbf{q}_\tau$  in (2.10), recall that  $u_\tau = 0$  and use that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \langle \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{q}_\tau, \partial_t \mathbf{q}_\tau \rangle = \langle \mathbf{D}^{-1} \partial_t \mathbf{q}_\tau, \partial_t \mathbf{q}_\tau \rangle + \langle \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{q}_\tau, \partial_t^2 \mathbf{q}_\tau \rangle.$$

Together, this implies that

$$0 = \int_0^T \frac{d}{dt} \langle \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{q}_\tau, \partial_t \mathbf{q}_\tau \rangle dt - \int_0^T \|\mathbf{D}^{-1/2} \partial_t \mathbf{q}_\tau\|^2 dt. \quad (3.12)$$

Since  $\mathbf{q}_\tau(0) = \mathbf{q}_{\tau,1}(0) - \mathbf{q}_{\tau,2}(0) = \mathbf{0}$  and, further,  $\mathbf{q}_\tau(T) = \mathbf{0}$  by means of (3.11), it follows from Eq. (3.12) along with property (3.11) that  $\mathbf{q}_\tau = 0$ . This shows that  $\mathbf{q}_\tau = 0$ . The uniqueness of solutions to the variational problem (2.9), (2.10) is thus proved.  $\blacksquare$

**Theorem 3.2** (Existence of solutions). *Let the assumptions of Subsec. 2.1 about  $\Omega, u_0, \mathbf{D}$  and  $f$  be satisfied. Then the semidiscrete problem (2.9), (2.10) admits a solution  $\{u_\tau, \mathbf{q}_\tau\} \in \mathcal{X}^r(W) \times \mathcal{X}^r(\mathbf{V})$ .*

**Proof.** To prove existence of solutions to problem (2.9), (2.10), we let  $\tilde{u}_\tau \in X^r(H_0^1(\Omega))$  denote the solution of the semidiscrete problem that results from the variational in time discretization of the weak formulation of (2.1)–(2.3), i.e. without rewriting Eq. (2.1) as a first order system of equations with respect to the spatial variables: *Find  $\tilde{u}_\tau \in X^r(H_0^1(\Omega))$  such that  $\tilde{u}_\tau(0) = u_0$  and*

$$\int_0^T \langle \partial_t \tilde{u}_\tau, w_\tau \rangle dt + \int_0^T a(\tilde{u}_\tau, w_\tau) dt = \int_0^T \langle f, w_\tau \rangle dt \quad (3.13)$$

for all  $w_\tau \in Y^{r-1}(H_0^1(\Omega))$ .

The existence and uniqueness of the semidiscrete approximation satisfying (3.13) can be established. This is shown in the appendix of this work. Then we define

$$u_\tau := \tilde{u}_\tau \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{q}_\tau := -\mathbf{D}\nabla\tilde{u}_\tau. \quad (3.14)$$

Obviously, it holds that  $u_\tau \in X^r(W)$  since  $H_0^1(\Omega) \subset W$ . Further, we have that  $\partial_t \tilde{u}_\tau \in L^2(I; H_0^1(\Omega))$  since on each of the subintervals  $I_n$ ,  $n = 1, \dots, N$  the function  $\tilde{u}_\tau \in X^r(H_0^1(\Omega))$  admits the representation

$$u_\tau|_{I_n}(t) = \sum_{j=0}^r U_n^j \varphi_{n,j}(t), \quad \text{for } t \in I_n,$$

with coefficients  $U_n^j \in H_0^1(\Omega)$  and polynomial basis functions  $\varphi_{n,j} \in \mathbb{P}_r(I_n; \mathbb{R})$  for  $j = 0, \dots, r$ .

Next, we prove that  $\mathbf{q}_\tau \in X^r(\mathbf{V})$ . Under the assumption of Subsec. 2.1 that  $f \in L^2(I; L^2(\Omega))$  it follows that

$$\int_0^T \langle -\mathbf{q}_\tau, \nabla w_\tau \rangle dt = \int_0^T \langle \mathbf{D}\nabla u_\tau, \nabla w_\tau \rangle dt = \int_0^T \langle f - \partial_t u_\tau, w_\tau \rangle dt =: \int_0^T \langle \tilde{f}, w_\tau \rangle dt$$

for all  $w_\tau \in Y_\tau^{r-1}(C_0^\infty(\Omega))$  with  $\tilde{f} \in L^2(I; L^2(\Omega))$ . Thus, we have that

$$\int_0^T \langle -\mathbf{q}_\tau, \nabla w_\tau \rangle dt = \int_0^T \langle \tilde{f}, w_\tau \rangle dt.$$

Consequently, it holds that

$$\int_0^T \langle \nabla \cdot \mathbf{q}_\tau, w_\tau \rangle dt = \int_0^T \langle \tilde{f}, w_\tau \rangle dt$$

for all  $w_\tau \in Y_\tau^{r-1}(C_0^\infty(\Omega))$  in the sense of distributions. Since  $\tilde{f} \in L^2(I; L^2(\Omega))$ , it follows that  $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{q}_\tau \in L^2(I; L^2(\Omega))$  and, therefore, that  $\mathbf{q}_\tau \in L^2(I; \mathbf{V})$  is fulfilled. Finally, from the expansion in terms of polynomial basis functions with respect to the temporal variable,

$$\mathbf{q}_\tau(t) = - \sum_{j=0}^r \mathbf{D}\nabla U_n^j \varphi_{n,j}(t), \quad (3.15)$$

we conclude that  $\mathbf{q}_\tau \in C([0, T]; \mathbf{V})$ .

Eq. (3.13) then directly implies that the functions  $u_\tau$  and  $\mathbf{q}_\tau$  defined in (3.14) satisfy the first equation of the variational problem (2.9), (2.10). The second equation of the system (2.9), (2.10) then follows from the representation (3.15) of the variable  $\mathbf{q}_\tau$  by testing the identity (3.15) with some function  $\mathbf{v}_\tau \in \mathcal{Y}^{r-1}(\mathbf{V})$  and applying the divergence theorem of Gauss. Hence, the assertion of the theorem is proved.  $\blacksquare$

As a corollary of the previous two theorems proving the existence of a unique solution to the semidiscrete problem (2.9), (2.10) we obtain an inf-sup stability condition

within our space-time framework. This result will play a fundamental role in our error analyses. For this we need some further notation. Let  $\{u_\tau, \mathbf{q}_\tau\} \in \mathcal{X}^r(W) \times \mathcal{X}^r(\mathbf{V})$  denote the solution of the semidiscrete problem (2.9), (2.10). We split  $u_\tau$  as

$$u_\tau(t) = u_0 + u_\tau^0(t) \quad \text{with} \quad u_\tau^0 \in \mathcal{X}_0^r(W). \quad (3.16)$$

In terms of the tuple  $\{u_\tau^0, \mathbf{q}_\tau\}$  of unknowns we recast the existence and uniqueness result of Thm. 3.1 and 3.2 in the following form.

**Corollary 3.3.** *Let the assumptions of Subsec. 2.1 about  $\Omega, u_0, \mathbf{D}$  and  $f$  be satisfied. Let  $\{u_\tau, \mathbf{q}_\tau\} \in \mathcal{X}^r(W) \times \mathcal{X}^r(\mathbf{V})$  be the unique solution of the semidiscrete problem (2.9), (2.10) according to Thm. 3.1 and 3.2. Then, the tuple  $\{u_\tau^0, \mathbf{q}_\tau\} \in \mathcal{X}_0^r(W) \times \mathcal{X}^r(\mathbf{V})$  with  $u_\tau^0$  being defined in (3.16) is the unique solution of the following variational problem: Find  $\{u_\tau^0, \mathbf{q}_\tau\} \in \mathcal{X}_0^r(W) \times \mathcal{X}^r(\mathbf{V})$  such that*

$$\int_0^T \langle \partial_t u_\tau^0, w_\tau \rangle dt + \int_0^T \langle \nabla \cdot \mathbf{q}_\tau, w_\tau \rangle dt = \int_0^T \langle f, w_\tau \rangle dt \quad (3.17)$$

$$\int_0^T \langle \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{q}_\tau, \mathbf{v}_\tau \rangle dt - \int_0^T \langle u_\tau^0, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_\tau \rangle dt = \int_0^T \langle u_0, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_\tau \rangle dt \quad (3.18)$$

for all  $w_\tau \in \mathcal{Y}^{r-1}(W)$  and  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{Y}^{r-1}(\mathbf{V})$ .

In the sequel, we let

$$\mathcal{W} = X_0^r(W) \times X^r(\mathbf{V}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{V} = Y^{r-1}(W) \times Y^{r-1}(\mathbf{V}).$$

We equip the function spaces  $\mathcal{W}$  and  $\mathcal{V}$  with their natural norms being defined by

$$\|\{u_\tau, \mathbf{q}_\tau\}\|_{\mathcal{W}}^2 = \|u_\tau\|_{L^2(I;W)}^2 + \|\partial_t u_\tau\|_{L^2(I;W)}^2 + \|\mathbf{q}_\tau\|_{L^2(I;\mathbf{H}(\text{div};\Omega))}^2, \quad (3.19)$$

$$\|\{w_\tau, \mathbf{v}_\tau\}\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2 = \|w_\tau\|_{L^2(I;W)}^2 + \|\mathbf{v}_\tau\|_{L^2(I;\mathbf{H}(\text{div};\Omega))}^2,$$

where  $\|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbf{H}(\text{div};\Omega)}^2 := \|\mathbf{v}\|^2 + \|\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}\|^2$ . With respect to these norms the space  $\mathcal{W}$  is a Banach space and the space  $\mathcal{V}$  is a reflexive Banach space. Further, we define the space-time bilinear form  $a_\tau \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{W} \times \mathcal{V}; \mathbb{R})$  by means of

$$\begin{aligned} a_\tau(\{u_\tau, \mathbf{q}_\tau\}, \{w_\tau, \mathbf{v}_\tau\}) &= \int_0^T \left( \langle \partial_t u_\tau, w_\tau \rangle + \langle \nabla \cdot \mathbf{q}_\tau, w_\tau \rangle \right) dt \\ &\quad + \int_0^T \langle \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{q}_\tau, \mathbf{v}_\tau \rangle dt - \int_0^T \langle u_\tau, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_\tau \rangle dt \end{aligned}$$

for  $\{u_\tau, \mathbf{q}_\tau\} \in \mathcal{W}$  and  $\{w_\tau, \mathbf{v}_\tau\} \in \mathcal{V}$ . Obviously, the mapping  $a_\tau : \mathcal{W} \times \mathcal{V} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  is linear and continuous, i.e.

$$|a_\tau(\{u_\tau, \mathbf{q}_\tau\}, \{w_\tau, \mathbf{v}_\tau\})| \leq c_3 \|\{u_\tau^0, \mathbf{q}_\tau\}\|_{\mathcal{W}} \|\{w_\tau, \mathbf{v}_\tau\}\|_{\mathcal{V}} \quad (3.20)$$

with some constant  $c_3 > 0$  independent of  $\tau$  and  $T$ .

Then we find the following inf-sup stability condition.



**Corollary 3.4.** *Let the assumptions of Subsec. 2.1 about  $\Omega, u_0, \mathbf{D}$  and  $f$  be satisfied. Let  $\{u_\tau^0, \mathbf{q}_\tau\} \in \mathcal{X}_0^r(W) \times \mathcal{X}^r(\mathbf{V})$  be the unique solution of the semidiscrete problem (3.17), (3.18) according to Corollary 3.3. Then, there exists a constant  $c_4 > 0$  such that*

$$\inf_{\{u_\tau^0, \mathbf{q}_\tau\} \in \mathcal{W} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}} \sup_{\{w_\tau, \mathbf{v}_\tau\} \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}} \frac{a_\tau(\{u_\tau^0, \mathbf{q}_\tau\}, \{w_\tau, \mathbf{v}_\tau\})}{\|\{u_\tau^0, \mathbf{q}_\tau\}\|_{\mathcal{W}} \|\{w_\tau, \mathbf{v}_\tau\}\|_{\mathcal{V}}} \geq c_4 > 0. \quad (3.21)$$

**Proof.** The discrete problem (3.17), (3.18) satisfies the assumptions of the Banach-Nečas-Babuška theorem [23, p. 85]. Since the discrete problem (3.17), (3.18) is well-posed according to Corollary 3.3, the Banach-Nečas-Babuška theorem implies the inf-sup stability condition (3.21).  $\blacksquare$

### 3.2. Estimates for the error between the continuous and the semidiscrete solution

Now we shall show error estimates for the exact form (2.9), (2.10) of the cGP( $r$ ) approach applied to the mixed formulation (2.7), (2.8) of our parabolic model problem.

For this we assume that the following approximation property are satisfied. There exist interpolation operators  $I_\tau : H_0^1(I, W) \mapsto \mathcal{X}_0^r(W)$ ,  $J_\tau : L^2(I; \mathbf{V}) \mapsto \mathcal{X}^r(\mathbf{V})$  such that for sufficiently smooth functions  $u \in H^1(I; W)$  and  $\mathbf{q} \in L(I; \mathbf{V})$  and all time intervals  $I_n$ , for  $n = 1, \dots, N$ , it holds that

$$\|u - I_\tau u\|_{L^2(I_n; W)} \leq c_5 \tau_n^{r+1} \|\partial_t^{r+1} u\|_{L^2(I_n; W)}, \quad (3.22)$$

$$\|\partial_t(u - I_\tau u)\|_{L^2(I_n; W)} \leq c_6 \tau_n^r \|\partial_t^{r+1} u\|_{L^2(I_n; W)}, \quad (3.23)$$

$$\|\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{J}_\tau \mathbf{q}\|_{L^2(I_n; \mathbf{V})} \leq c_7 \tau_n^{r+1} \|\partial_t^{r+1} \mathbf{q}\|_{L^2(I_n; \mathbf{V})}. \quad (3.24)$$

Then we get the following error estimates in the natural norm of our variational time discretization scheme.

**Theorem 3.5** (Space-time error estimate for exact form of cGP( $r$ )). *Let the assumptions of Subsec. 2.1 about  $\Omega, u_0, \mathbf{D}$  and  $f$  be satisfied. Let  $\{u, \mathbf{q}\} \in H^1(I; W) \times L^2(I; \mathbf{V})$  denote the unique solution of the mixed problem (2.7), (2.8) that is supposed to be sufficiently regular. Then the solution  $\{u_\tau, \mathbf{q}_\tau\} \in \mathcal{X}^r(W) \times \mathcal{X}^r(\mathbf{V})$  of the semidiscrete problem (2.9), (2.10) satisfies the error estimate*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\{u - u_\tau, \mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}_\tau\}\|_{\mathcal{W}} &\leq c_9 \left\{ \sum_{n=1}^N \tau_n^{2r} \left( \|\partial_t^{r+1} u\|_{L^2(I_n; W)}^2 + \|\partial_t^{r+1} \mathbf{q}\|_{L^2(I_n; \mathbf{V})}^2 \right) \right\}^{1/2} \\ &\leq c_{10} \tau^r \left( \|\partial_t^{r+1} u\|_{L^2(I; W)} + \|\partial_t^{r+1} \mathbf{q}\|_{L^2(I; \mathbf{V})} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the constants  $c_9$  and  $c_{10}$  are independent of  $\tau_n$ ,  $\tau$  and  $T$ .

**Proof.** By splitting

$$u(t) = u_0 + u^0(t) \quad \text{with} \quad u^0 \in H_0^1(I; W) \quad (3.25)$$

and recalling the semidiscrete counterpart (3.16), we get that

$$u(t) - u_\tau(t) = u^0(t) - u_\tau^0(t), \quad \partial_t^r u(t) = \partial_t^r u^0(t)$$

for almost every  $t \in (0, t)$ , such that it is sufficient to derive the asserted error bounds of the theorem for  $u^0 - u_\tau^0$  instead of estimating  $u - u_\tau$ . This will be done in the following.

By (3.22) to (3.24) it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\{u^0 - I_\tau u^0, \mathbf{q} - \mathbf{J}_\tau \mathbf{q}\}\|_{\mathcal{W}} &\leq c \left\{ \sum_{n=1}^N \tau_n^{2r} \left( \|\partial_t^{r+1} u^0\|_{L^2(I_n; W)}^2 + \|\partial_t^{r+1} \mathbf{q}\|_{L^2(I_n; \mathbf{V})}^2 \right) \right\}^{1/2} \\ &\leq c_8 \tau^r \left( \|\partial_t^{r+1} u^0\|_{L^2(I; W)} + \|\partial_t^{r+1} \mathbf{q}\|_{L^2(I; \mathbf{V})} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.26)$$

with  $c_8 = c_8(c_5, c_6, c_7)$ . For the discrete functions  $w_\tau := u_\tau^0 - I_\tau u^0 \in \mathcal{X}_0^r(W)$ ,  $\mathbf{v}_\tau = \mathbf{q}_\tau - \mathbf{J}_\tau \mathbf{q} \in \mathcal{X}^r(\mathbf{V})$  there exist, due to the inf-sup stability condition (3.21), functions  $\varphi_\tau \in \mathcal{X}_0^r(W)$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\psi}_\tau \in \mathcal{X}^r(\mathbf{V})$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} c_4 \|\{w_\tau, \mathbf{v}_\tau\}\|_{\mathcal{W}} \|\{\varphi_\tau, \boldsymbol{\psi}_\tau\}\|_{\mathcal{V}} &\leq a_\tau(\{w_\tau, \mathbf{v}_\tau\}, \{\varphi_\tau, \boldsymbol{\psi}_\tau\}) \\ &= a_\tau(\{u^0 - I_\tau u^0, \mathbf{q} - \mathbf{J}_\tau \mathbf{q}\}, \{\varphi_\tau, \boldsymbol{\psi}_\tau\}) \\ &\leq c_3 \|\{u^0 - I_\tau u^0, \mathbf{q} - \mathbf{J}_\tau \mathbf{q}\}\|_{\mathcal{W}} \|\{\varphi_\tau, \boldsymbol{\psi}_\tau\}\|_{\mathcal{V}}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.27)$$

where the Galerkin orthogonalities

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T \langle \partial_t(u_\tau^0 - u^0), w_\tau \rangle dt + \int_0^T \langle \nabla \cdot (\mathbf{q}_\tau - \mathbf{q}), w_\tau \rangle dt &= 0, \\ \int_0^T \langle \mathbf{D}^{-1}(\mathbf{q}_\tau - \mathbf{q}), \mathbf{v}_\tau \rangle dt - \int_0^T \langle u_\tau^0 - u^0, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_\tau \rangle dt &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

have been used. From (3.27) along with (3.26), we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\{u_\tau^0 - I_\tau u^0, \mathbf{q}_\tau - \mathbf{J}_\tau \mathbf{q}\}\|_{\mathcal{W}} &\leq \frac{c_3}{c_4} \|\{u^0 - I_\tau u^0, \mathbf{q} - \mathbf{J}_\tau \mathbf{q}\}\|_{\mathcal{W}} \\ &\leq \frac{c_3 c_8}{c_4} \tau^r \left( \|\partial_t^{r+1} u\|_{L^2(I; W)} + \|\partial_t^{r+1} \mathbf{q}\|_{L^2(I; \mathbf{V})} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.28)$$

From inequality (3.28) along with the interpolation error estimate (3.26) we conclude the assertion of the theorem by means of the triangle inequality.  $\blacksquare$

Thm. 3.5 yields an error estimate with respect to the natural space-time norm of the discretization scheme. The estimate is sharp with respect to the contribution of  $\|\partial_t(u - u_\tau)\|_{L^2(I;W)}$  to the overall norm (3.19). However, the estimate is suboptimal with respect to the error contribution  $\|u - u_\tau\|_{L^2(I;W)}$ . In the following theorem, we sharpen our analysis by providing an optimal order error estimate also for  $\|u - u_\tau\|_{L^2(I;W)}$ . This is done by a duality argument. For this, the following additional regularity assumption is needed.

**Regularity condition ( $\mathbf{R}_{\text{mix}}$ ).** *Suppose that  $g \in L^2(I;W)$ . The variational problem, find  $z \in H^1(I;W)$  and  $\mathbf{p} \in L^2(I;\mathbf{V})$  such that*

$$\int_0^T (\langle \partial_t z, w \rangle + \langle \nabla \cdot \mathbf{p}, w \rangle) dt = \int_0^T \langle g, w \rangle dt,$$

$$\int_0^T (\langle \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{v} \rangle - \langle z, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v} \rangle) dt = 0$$

for all  $w \in L^2(T, 0; W)$  and  $\mathbf{v} \in L^2(T, 0; \mathbf{V})$ , admits a unique solution  $\{z, \mathbf{p}\} \in H^1(I; L^2(\Omega)) \times L^2(I; \mathbf{V})$  satisfying the improved regularity condition  $\mathbf{p} \in H^1(I; \mathbf{V})$  and the a priori estimate

$$\|\partial_t \mathbf{p}\|_{L^2(I; \mathbf{V})} \leq c_{11} \|g\|_{L^2(I; W)}. \quad (3.29)$$

**Remark 3.6.** *A similar regularity condition is used in [41, p. 48, (6.16)] to prove the convergence of variational time discretizations of second order parabolic problems in non-mixed formulation. Currently, it remains an open problem how this limiting condition can be avoided. The numerical convergence studies that are presented below in Sec. 5 show that the convergence rates in the  $L^2(I;W)$  norm, that the derived under the condition ( $\mathbf{R}_{\text{mix}}$ ) in Thm. 3.7 below, can realistically be expected in computations.*

**Theorem 3.7** ( $L^2$  Error estimate for the exact form of cGP( $r$ )). *Let the assumptions of Subsec. 2.1 about  $\Omega, u_0, \mathbf{D}$  and  $f$  be satisfied. Further, suppose that the regularity condition ( $\mathbf{R}_{\text{mix}}$ ) holds. Let  $\{u, \mathbf{q}\} \in H^1(I; W) \times L^2(I; \mathbf{V})$  denote the unique solution of the mixed problem (2.7), (2.8) that is supposed to be sufficiently regular. Then the solution  $\{u_\tau, \mathbf{q}_\tau\} \in \mathcal{X}^r(W) \times \mathcal{X}^r(\mathbf{V})$  of the semidiscrete problem (2.9), (2.10) satisfies the error estimate*

$$\|u - u_\tau\|_{L^2(I;W)} \leq c_{14} \tau \left\{ \sum_{n=1}^N \tau_n^{2r} \left( \|\partial_t^{r+1} u\|_{L^2(I_n; W)}^2 + \|\partial_t^{r+1} \mathbf{q}\|_{L^2(I_n; \mathbf{V})}^2 \right) \right\}^{1/2}$$

$$\leq c_{15} \tau^{r+1} \left( \|\partial_t^{r+1} u\|_{L^2(I; H_0^1(\Omega))} + \|\partial_t^{r+1} \mathbf{q}\|_{L^2(I; \mathbf{V})} \right).$$

**Proof.** In the sequel, we put  $e_u := u^0 - u_\tau^0 \in L^2(I; W)$  and  $\mathbf{e}_q := \mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}_\tau \in L^2(I; \mathbf{V})$  with the splitting (3.25) and (3.16) of the scalar variable and its semidiscrete approximation, respectively. For the mixed form (2.9), (2.10) of the initial boundary value problem (2.1)–(2.3) we define the following dual problem: Find  $\{z, \mathbf{p}\} \in$

$H^1(0, T; W) \cap C([0, T]; W) \times L^2(0, T; \mathbf{V})$  with  $z(T) = 0$  such that

$$\int_0^T (\langle -\partial_t z, w \rangle + \langle \nabla \cdot \mathbf{p}, w \rangle) dt = \int_0^T \langle e_u, w \rangle dt, \quad (3.30)$$

$$\int_0^T (\langle \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{v} \rangle - \langle z, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v} \rangle) dt = 0 \quad (3.31)$$

for all  $w \in L^2(T, 0; W)$  and  $\mathbf{v} \in L^2(T, 0; \mathbf{V})$ .

Formally, the corresponding strong form of (3.30), (3.31) is given by

$$-\partial_t z + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{p} = e_u, \quad \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{p} + \nabla z = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \times I, \quad (3.32)$$

with  $z(T) = 0$  and homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions, that is obtained by rewriting the dual problem associated with (2.1)–(2.3),

$$-\partial_t z - \nabla \cdot (\mathbf{D} \nabla z) = e_u \quad \text{in } \Omega \times I, \quad z(T) = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad z = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \times I \quad (3.33)$$

as a system of first order equations. Defining the transformations  $\tilde{z} := z(T - t)$  we recast the dual problem (3.33) as a forward parabolic problem in the unknown  $\tilde{z}$  such that standard existence and stability estimates can be applied; cf. [24, p. 382, Theorem 5]. Then, defining the variable  $\mathbf{p}$  by means of the second of the identities in (3.32), the thus obtained tuple  $\{z, \mathbf{p}\}$  satisfies the variational problem (3.30), (3.31). Moreover, recalling that  $e_u \in L^2(I; W)$ , from [24, p. 382, Theorem 5] we get the a priori estimate

$$\|\partial_t z\|_{L^2(I; W)} + \|\mathbf{p}\|_{L^2(I; \mathbf{V})} \leq c_{12} \|e_u\|_{L^2(I; W)}. \quad (3.34)$$

For this we note that  $\mathbf{p} \in L^2(I; \mathbf{V})$  can be shown by using the arguments of the proof of Thm. 3.2. The a priori estimate of the vector variable  $\mathbf{p}$  in (3.34) is then a direct consequence of the variational equation (3.30).

Now, we start proving the assertion of the theorem. Firstly, recalling that  $z(T) = 0$  and  $e_u(0) = 0$  by definition, we get that

$$\int_0^T \langle -\partial_t z, e_u \rangle dt = -z(T)e_u(T) + z(0)e_u(0) + \int_0^T \langle \partial_t e_u, z \rangle dt = \int_0^T \langle \partial_t e_u, z \rangle dt. \quad (3.35)$$

Choosing the test function  $w = e_u$  in (3.30) and using (3.35), we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T \|e_u\|^2 dt &= \int_0^T (\langle \partial_t e_u, z \rangle + \langle \nabla \cdot \mathbf{p}, e_u \rangle) dt \\ &= \int_0^T (\langle \partial_t e_u, z \rangle + \langle \nabla \cdot \mathbf{e}_q, z \rangle) dt - \int_0^T (\langle \nabla \cdot \mathbf{e}_q, z \rangle - \langle \nabla \cdot \mathbf{p}, e_u \rangle) dt. \end{aligned} \quad (3.36)$$

Choosing the test function  $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{e}_q$  in (3.31) and recalling that the matrix  $\mathbf{D}$  is symmetric by assumption, we conclude that

$$\int_0^T \langle \nabla \cdot \mathbf{e}_q, z \rangle dt = \int_0^T \langle \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{e}_q \rangle dt = \int_0^T \langle \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{e}_q, \mathbf{p} \rangle dt. \quad (3.37)$$

From (3.36) and (3.37) it then follows that

$$\int_0^T \|e_u\|^2 dt = \int_0^T (\langle \partial_t e_u, z \rangle + \langle \nabla \cdot \mathbf{e}_q, z \rangle) dt - \int_0^T (\langle \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{e}_q, \mathbf{p} \rangle - \langle e_u, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{p} \rangle) dt. \quad (3.38)$$

Next, let  $I_0 : H^1(I, W) \mapsto \mathcal{Y}^0(W)$  be an interpolation operator that is defined on each subinterval  $I_n$  be means of

$$I_0 u(t) := u(t_{n-1}) \quad \text{for all } t \in I_n.$$

Since  $z \in C(\bar{I}; W)$ , it holds that (cf. [41, p. 49])

$$\|z - I_0 z\|_{L^2(I_n; W)} \leq \tau_n \|\partial_t z\|_{L^2(I_n; W)}. \quad (3.39)$$

Further, let  $\mathbf{J}_0 : H^1(I, \mathbf{V}) \mapsto \mathcal{Y}^0(\mathbf{V})$  be an interpolation operator that is defined on each subinterval  $I_n$  be means of

$$\mathbf{J}_0 \mathbf{v}(t) := \mathbf{v}(t_{n-1}) \quad \text{for all } t \in I_n.$$

Under the additional regularity assumption ( $\mathbf{R}_{\text{mix}}$ ) of this theorem that  $\mathbf{p} \in H^1(I; \mathbf{V})$  such that  $\mathbf{p} \in C(\bar{I}; \mathbf{V})$  (cf. [24]), it holds that (cf. [41, p. 49])

$$\|\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{J}_0 \mathbf{p}\|_{L^2(I_n; \mathbf{V})} \leq \tau_n \|\partial_t \mathbf{p}\|_{L^2(I_n; \mathbf{V})}. \quad (3.40)$$

Next, by Galerkin orthogonality we find that

$$\int_0^T (\langle \partial_t e_u, w_\tau \rangle + \langle \nabla \cdot \mathbf{e}_q, w_\tau \rangle) dt = 0, \quad (3.41)$$

$$\int_0^T (\langle \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{e}_q, \mathbf{v}_\tau \rangle - \langle e_u, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_\tau \rangle) dt = 0 \quad (3.42)$$

for all  $w_\tau \in \mathcal{Y}^{r-1}(W)$  and  $\mathbf{v}_\tau \in \mathcal{Y}^{r-1}(\mathbf{V})$ . Choosing  $w_\tau = I_0 z$  in (3.41), it follows that

$$\int_0^T (\langle \partial_t e_u, I_0 z \rangle + \langle \nabla \cdot \mathbf{e}_q, I_0 z \rangle) dt = 0. \quad (3.43)$$

Further, choosing  $\mathbf{v}_\tau = \mathbf{J}_0 \mathbf{p}$  in (3.42) yields that

$$\int_0^T (\langle \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{e}_q, \mathbf{J}_0 \mathbf{p} \rangle - \langle e_u, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{J}_0 \mathbf{p} \rangle) dt = 0. \quad (3.44)$$

Combining (3.38) with (3.43) and (3.44), and then using the Cauchy–Schwarz inequal-

ity as well as the interpolation error estimates (3.39) and (3.40) yields that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|e_u\|_{L^2(I;W)}^2 &= \int_0^T (\langle \partial_t e_u, z - I_0 z \rangle + \langle \nabla \cdot \mathbf{e}_q, z - I_0 z \rangle) dt \\
&\quad - \int_0^T (\langle \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{e}_q, \mathbf{p} - \mathbf{J}_0 \mathbf{p} \rangle - \langle e_u, \nabla \cdot (\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{J}_0 \mathbf{p}) \rangle) dt. \\
&\leq (\|\partial_t e_u\|_{L^2(I;W)} + \|\mathbf{e}_q\|_{L^2(I;\mathbf{V})}) \|z - I_0 z\|_{L^2(I;W)} \\
&\quad + (\|\mathbf{D}^{-1}\|_2 \|\mathbf{e}_q\|_{L^2(I;\mathbf{V})} + \|e_u\|_{L^2(I;W)}) \|\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{J}_0 \mathbf{p}\|_{L^2(I;\mathbf{V})} \\
&\leq \tau (\|\partial_t e_u\|_{L^2(I;W)} + \|\mathbf{e}_q\|_{L^2(I;\mathbf{V})}) \|\partial_t z\|_{L^2(I;W)} \\
&\quad + c_{13} \tau (\|\mathbf{e}_q\|_{L^2(I;\mathbf{V})} + \|e_u\|_{L^2(I;W)}) \|\partial_t \mathbf{p}\|_{L^2(I;\mathbf{V})}.
\end{aligned}$$

Recalling the a priori estimate (3.34), the additional regularity assumption (3.29) and the error estimate of Thm. 3.5, we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|e_u\|_{L^2(I;W)} &\leq c_9 (c_{12} + c_{11} c_{13}) \tau \left\{ \sum_{n=1}^N \tau_n^{2r} \left( \|\partial_t^{r+1} u\|_{L^2(I_n;W)}^2 + \|\partial_t^{r+1} \mathbf{q}\|_{L^2(I_n;\mathbf{V})}^2 \right) \right\}^{1/2} \\
&\leq c_{15} \tau^{r+1} \left( \|\partial_t^{r+1} u\|_{L^2(I;W)} + \|\partial_t^{r+1} \mathbf{q}\|_{L^2(I;\mathbf{V})} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

This proves the assertion of the theorem.  $\blacksquare$

Next we derive an error estimate for the non-exact form (2.19), (2.20) of the cGP( $r$ ) method. The difference of the non-exact form of cGP( $r$ ) to (2.9), (2.10) comes through the numerically integrated right-hand side term in (2.19). Firstly, we ensure the existence and uniqueness of the solution to the non-exact form of cGP( $r$ ).

**Theorem 3.8** (Existence and uniqueness). *Let the assumptions of Subsec. 2.1 about  $\Omega, u_0, \mathbf{D}$  and  $f$  be satisfied. Then the non-exact form (2.19), (2.20) of the semidiscrete problem admits a unique solution  $\{U_n^j, \mathbf{Q}_n^j\} \in W \times \mathbf{V}$  for  $j = 1, \dots, r$  and  $n = 1, \dots, N$  defining semidiscrete approximations  $\{u_\tau, \mathbf{q}_\tau\} \in \mathcal{X}^r(W) \times \mathcal{X}^r(\mathbf{V})$  by means of the expansions (2.13) and the continuity constraints (2.15) and (2.16).*

**Proof.** By the definition of the Lagrange interpolation operator  $\Pi_r$  given in (2.21) and the representations (2.13) of  $u_\tau$  and  $\mathbf{q}_\tau$  in terms of basis functions we recast the non-exact form (2.19), (2.20) of the semidiscrete problem in the equivalent form: *Find*

$\{u_\tau, \mathbf{q}_\tau\} \in \mathcal{X}^r(W) \times \mathcal{X}^r(\mathbf{V})$  such that

$$\int_0^T \langle \partial_t u_\tau, w_\tau \rangle dt + \int_0^T \langle \nabla \cdot \mathbf{q}_\tau, w_\tau \rangle dt = \int_0^T \langle \Pi_r f, w_\tau \rangle dt \quad (3.45)$$

$$\int_0^T \langle \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{q}_\tau, \mathbf{v}_\tau \rangle dt - \int_0^T \langle u_\tau, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_\tau \rangle dt = 0 \quad (3.46)$$

for all  $w_\tau \in \mathcal{Y}^{r-1}(W)$  and  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{Y}^{r-1}(\mathbf{V})$  with the initial condition  $u_\tau(0) = u_0$ .

Existence and uniqueness of the solution  $\{u_\tau, \mathbf{q}_\tau\} \in \mathcal{X}^r(W) \times \mathcal{X}^r(\mathbf{V})$  to the system (3.45), (3.46) then follows as in Thm. 3.1 and 3.2 with  $\Pi_r f$  replacing  $f$  in the arguments of the proofs.  $\blacksquare$

**Remark 3.9.** *Splitting the scalar variable  $u_\tau$  as in (3.25) then yields the space-time inf-sup stability condition (3.21) by the same arguments as used in Cor. 3.4. Next, we present the corresponding a priori error estimate.*

**Theorem 3.10.** *Let the assumptions of Subsec. 2.1 about  $\Omega, u_0, \mathbf{D}$  and  $f$  be satisfied. Suppose that  $f$  is sufficiently regular with respect to the time variable. Let  $\{u, \mathbf{q}\} \in H^1(I; W) \times L^2(I; \mathbf{V})$  denote the unique solution of the mixed problem (2.7), (2.8) that is supposed to be sufficiently regular. Then the solution  $\{u_\tau, \mathbf{q}_\tau\} \in \mathcal{X}^r(W) \times \mathcal{X}^r(\mathbf{V})$  of the non-exact semidiscrete problem (3.45), (3.46) or of its algebraic version (2.9), (2.10), respectively, satisfies the error estimate*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\{u - u_\tau, \mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}_\tau\}\|_{\mathcal{W}} &\leq c_{16} \left( \sum_{n=1}^N \tau_n^{2r} \left\{ \|\partial_t^{r+1} u\|_{L^2(I_n; W)}^2 + \tau_n^2 \|\partial_t^{r+1} \mathbf{q}\|_{L^2(I_n; \mathbf{V})}^2 \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \tau_n^2 \|\partial_t^{r+1} f\|_{L^2(I_n; W)}^2 \right\} \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq c_{17} \tau^r \left\{ \|\partial_t^{r+1} u\|_{L^2(I; W)} + \tau \|\partial_t^{r+1} \mathbf{q}\|_{L^2(I; \mathbf{V})} + \tau \|\partial_t^{r+1} f\|_{L^2(I; W)} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

where the constants  $c_{16}$  and  $c_{17}$  are independent of  $\tau_n$ ,  $\tau$  and  $T$ .

Since the proof of Thm. 3.10 follows from the proof of Thm. 3.5 by a standard estimate of the interpolation error, we skip it here. For the sake of completeness we summarize the proof in the appendix of this work.

## 4. Existence and uniqueness of the fully discrete approximation and error estimates

In the first subsection of Sec. 4 we prove the existence and uniqueness of solutions to the fully discrete approximation scheme (2.29), (2.30). Then, in Subsec. 4.2 we

establish an estimate for the error between the non-exact form of the semidiscrete approximation defined by Eqs. (2.19), (2.20) and the fully discrete solution given by Eqs. (2.29), (2.30). Finally, in Subsec. 4.3 we combine the error estimates of the temporal discretization that are derived in Sec. 3 with the error estimates of Subsec. 4.2 to get the desired error estimates for our variational space time discretization (2.29), (2.30). In the following we use the notation introduced in Subsec. 2.3.

#### 4.1. Existence and uniqueness of the fully discrete approximation

First, we prove the existence and uniqueness of solutions to the fully discrete cGP( $r$ )–MFEM( $p$ ) scheme (2.29), (2.30). For this we need the following lemma (cf. [43]).

**Lemma 4.1.** *For given  $w_h \in W_h$  there exists a function  $\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{V}_h$  satisfying*

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_h = w_h \quad \text{and} \quad \|\mathbf{v}_h\| \leq c_{18} \|w_h\|$$

for some constant  $c_{18} > 0$  depending on  $\Omega$  and the space dimension  $d$  but not on  $w_h$  or the mesh size  $h$ .

**Theorem 4.2** (Existence and uniqueness of solutions). *Let the assumptions of Subsec. 2.1 about  $\Omega, u_0, \mathbf{D}$  and  $f$  be satisfied. Suppose further that the coefficient condition (C) given in (2.23) holds. Then the fully discrete problem (2.32), (2.33), with its equivalent algebraic form (2.29), (2.30), admits a unique solution  $\{u_{\tau,h}, \mathbf{q}_{\tau,h}\} \in \mathcal{X}^r(W_h) \times \mathcal{X}^r(\mathbf{V}_h)$ .*

**Proof.** Since the fully discrete problem (2.32), (2.33) or (2.29), (2.30) is finite dimensional, it is sufficient to show the uniqueness of the solution. The existence is then a direct consequence. Assume that there exist two pairs of solutions  $\{u_{\tau,h}^k, \mathbf{q}_{\tau,h}^k\} \in \mathcal{X}^r(W_h) \times \mathcal{X}^r(\mathbf{V}_h)$ , for  $k = 1, 2$ , that are represented (cf. Eq. (2.31)) in terms of basis functions by

$$u_{\tau,h}^k(t)|_{I_n} = \sum_{j=0}^r U_{n,h}^{j,k} \varphi_{n,j}(t) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{q}_{\tau,h}^k(t)|_{I_n} = \sum_{j=0}^r \mathbf{Q}_{n,h}^{j,k} \varphi_{n,j}(t), \quad \text{for } k = 1, 2,$$

and  $t \in I_n$  with coefficient functions  $U_{n,h}^{j,k} \in W_h$  and  $\mathbf{Q}_{n,h}^{j,k} \in \mathbf{V}_h$ . The continuity constraints (2.15) imposed by the definition of  $\mathcal{X}^r(W_h)$  and  $\mathcal{X}^r(\mathbf{V}_h)$ , respectively, directly imply that  $U_{n,h}^{0,1} = U_{n,h}^{0,2}$  and  $\mathbf{Q}_{n,h}^{0,1} = \mathbf{Q}_{n,h}^{0,2}$ . Further, the pairs  $\{u_{\tau,h}^{n,k}(t), \mathbf{q}_{\tau,h}^{n,k}(t)\}$ , for  $k = 1, 2$ , both satisfy the discrete equations (2.29), (2.30). Therefore, it follows that

$$\sum_{j=0}^r \hat{\alpha}_{ij} \langle U_{n,h}^{j,1} - U_{n,h}^{j,2}, w_h \rangle + \tau_n \hat{\beta}_{ii} \langle \nabla \cdot (\mathbf{Q}_{n,h}^{i,1} - \mathbf{Q}_{n,h}^{i,2}), w_h \rangle = 0, \quad (4.1)$$

$$\langle \mathbf{D}^{-1}(\mathbf{Q}_{n,h}^{i,1} - \mathbf{Q}_{n,h}^{i,2}), \mathbf{v}_h \rangle - \langle U_{n,h}^{i,1} - U_{n,h}^{i,2}, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_h \rangle = 0 \quad (4.2)$$



for  $i = 1, \dots, r$  and all  $\{w_h, \mathbf{v}_h\} \in W_h \times \mathbf{V}_h$ . Now, by subtracting the equations (4.1) and (4.2) from each other and choosing the test functions  $w_h = U_{n,h}^{i,1} - U_{n,h}^{i,2}$  and  $\mathbf{v}_h = \tau_n \hat{\beta}_{ii} (\mathbf{Q}_{n,h}^{i,1} - \mathbf{Q}_{n,h}^{i,2})$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, r$  in (4.1) and (4.2), respectively, we get that

$$\sum_{j=0}^r \hat{\alpha}_{ij} \langle U_{n,h}^{j,1} - U_{n,h}^{j,2}, U_{n,h}^{i,1} - U_{n,h}^{i,2} \rangle + \tau_n \hat{\beta}_{ii} \langle \mathbf{D}^{-1}(\mathbf{Q}_{n,h}^{i,1} - \mathbf{Q}_{n,h}^{i,2}), \mathbf{Q}_{n,h}^{i,1} - \mathbf{Q}_{n,h}^{i,2} \rangle = 0, \quad (4.3)$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, r$ . Summing up Eq. (4.3) from  $i = 1$  to  $i = r$ , using Lemma 2.3 and recalling that  $U_{n,h}^{0,1} = U_{n,h}^{0,2}$  then implies that

$$\frac{1}{2} \|u_{\tau,h}^1(t_n) - u_{\tau,h}^2(t_n)\|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^r \tau_n \hat{\beta}_{ii} \langle \mathbf{D}^{-1}(\mathbf{Q}_{n,h}^{i,1} - \mathbf{Q}_{n,h}^{i,2}), \mathbf{Q}_{n,h}^{i,1} - \mathbf{Q}_{n,h}^{i,2} \rangle = 0. \quad (4.4)$$

The symmetric matrix  $\mathbf{D}^{-1}$  is positive definite by assumption (2.4) and  $\hat{\beta}_{ii} > 0$  under the coefficient condition (C). Therefore, Eq. (4.4) immediately implies that  $\mathbf{Q}_{n,h}^{i,1} = \mathbf{Q}_{n,h}^{i,2}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, r$ . By Lemma 4.1 there exists some  $\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{V}_h$  such that  $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_h = U_{n,h}^{i,1} - U_{n,h}^{i,2}$ . Using this  $\mathbf{v}_h$  as test function in (4.2) and noting that the first term in (4.2) now vanishes, we obtain that  $U_{n,h}^{i,1} = U_{n,h}^{i,2}$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, r$ . This implies the uniqueness of the solution to the fully discrete problem (2.29), (2.30) and proves the assertion of the theorem.  $\blacksquare$

## 4.2. Estimates for the error between the semidiscrete and the fully discrete solution

In this subsection we derive estimates for the error between the semidiscrete approximation defined by Eqs. (2.9), (2.10) and the fully discrete solution given by Eqs. (2.29), (2.30). For this we use the following projection operators (cf. [16] and [35, p. 237]) defined in  $L^2(\Omega)$  and  $\mathbf{H}(\text{div}; \Omega)$ , respectively, by

$$P_h : L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow W_h, \quad \langle P_h w - w, w_h \rangle = 0 \quad (4.5)$$

for all  $w_h \in L^2(\Omega)$  and

$$\mathbf{\Pi}_h : \mathbf{H}(\text{div}; \Omega) \rightarrow \mathbf{V}_h, \quad \langle \nabla \cdot (\mathbf{\Pi}_h \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}), w_h \rangle = 0, \quad (4.6)$$

$$\mathbf{P}_h : \mathbf{H}(\text{div}; \Omega) \rightarrow \mathbf{V}_h \quad \langle \mathbf{P}_h \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}_h \rangle = 0, \quad (4.7)$$

for all  $w_h \in L^2(\Omega)$  and  $\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{H}(\text{div}; \Omega)$ , respectively. For these operators and the family of Raviart–Thomas elements on quadrilateral elements for the two-dimensional case and the class of Raviart–Thomas–Nédélec elements in three space dimensions there holds that

$$\|w - P_h w\| \leq c_{19} h^{p+1} \|w\|_{p+1}, \quad (4.8)$$

$$\|\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{\Pi}_h \mathbf{v}\| \leq c_{20} h^{p+1} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{p+1}, \quad \|\nabla \cdot (\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{\Pi}_h \mathbf{v})\| \leq c_{21} h^{p+1} \|\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}\|_{p+1}, \quad (4.9)$$

$$\|\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{P}_h \mathbf{v}\| \leq c_{22} h^{p+1} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{p+1}, \quad \|\nabla \cdot (\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{P}_h \mathbf{v})\| \leq c_{23} h^{p+1} \|\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}\|_{p+1}, \quad (4.10)$$

for any  $w \in H^{p+1}(\Omega)$  and  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{H}^{p+1}(\Omega)$ ,  $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{H}^{p+1}(\Omega)$ , respectively.

For the error between the semidiscrete solution and fully discrete we use the notation

$$\begin{aligned} E_u(t) &= u_\tau(t) - u_{\tau,h}(t), & \mathbf{E}_q(t) &= \mathbf{q}_\tau(t) - \mathbf{q}_{\tau,h}(t), \\ E_{u,n}^i &= E_u(t_{n,i}), & \mathbf{E}_{q,n}^i &= \mathbf{E}_q(t_{n,i}) \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

for  $t \in I$  and  $n \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ ,  $i \in \{0, \dots, r\}$ , respectively. Following the representation of the semidiscrete and fully discrete solutions in (2.13) and (2.31) there holds that

$$E_u(t) = \sum_{i=0}^r E_{u,n}^i \varphi_{n,i}(t) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{E}_q(t) = \sum_{i=0}^r \mathbf{E}_{q,n}^i \varphi_{n,i}(t), \quad \text{for } t \in I_n. \quad (4.12)$$

Now, we prove now two preliminary lemmas.

**Lemma 4.3.** *Let the assumptions of Subsec. 2.1 about  $\Omega, u_0, \mathbf{D}$  and  $f$  be satisfied. Suppose further that the coefficient condition (C) given in (2.23) holds. Let the semidiscrete solution  $\{u_\tau, \mathbf{q}_\tau\} \in \mathcal{X}^r(W) \times \mathcal{X}^r(\mathbf{V})$  be defined by (2.13) with coefficient functions  $\{U_n^j, \mathbf{Q}_n^j\} \in W \times \mathbf{V}$ , for  $j = 1, \dots, r$  being uniquely given by the set of equations (2.19), (2.20). Further, let  $\{u_{\tau,h}, \mathbf{q}_{\tau,h}\} \in \mathcal{X}^r(W_h) \times \mathcal{X}^r(\mathbf{V}_h)$  be the uniquely defined solution of the fully discrete problem (2.29), (2.30) or (2.32), (2.33), respectively. Then, for any  $K = 1, \dots, N$  it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} \|E_u(t_K)\|^2 &+ \sum_{n=1}^K \sum_{i=1}^r \tau_n \|E_{u,n}^i\|^2 + \sum_{n=1}^K \sum_{i=1}^r \tau_n \|\mathbf{E}_{q,n}^i\|^2 \\ &\leq \|u_\tau(t_K) - P_h u_\tau(t_K)\|^2 + c_{24} \sum_{n=1}^K \sum_{i=1}^r \tau_n (\|U_n^i - P_h U_n^i\|^2 + \|\mathbf{Q}_n^i - \mathbf{\Pi}_h \mathbf{Q}_n^i\|^2) \end{aligned} \quad (4.13)$$

with some constant  $c_{24} > 0$  not depending on the discretization parameters  $h$  and  $\tau$ .

**Proof.** By subtracting (2.29), (2.30) from (2.19), (2.20), respectively, it follows that

$$\sum_{j=0}^r \hat{\alpha}_{ij} \langle U_n^j - U_{n,h}^j, w_h \rangle + \tau_n \hat{\beta}_{ii} \langle \nabla \cdot (\mathbf{Q}_n^i - \mathbf{Q}_{n,h}^i), w_h \rangle = 0, \quad (4.14)$$

$$\langle \mathbf{D}^{-1}(\mathbf{Q}_n^i - \mathbf{Q}_{n,h}^i), \mathbf{v}_h \rangle - \langle U_n^i - U_{n,h}^i, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_h \rangle = 0 \quad (4.15)$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, r$  and all  $\{w_h, \mathbf{v}_h\} \in W_h \times \mathbf{V}_h$ . For any  $i = 1, \dots, r$  we choose the test functions  $w_h = P_h U_n^i - U_{n,h}^i \in W_h$  and  $\mathbf{v}_h = \tau_n \hat{\beta}_{ii} (\mathbf{\Pi}_h \mathbf{Q}_n^i - \mathbf{Q}_{n,h}^i) \in \mathbf{V}_h$  in (4.14) and (4.15), respectively. By adding the thus obtained equations, using the properties of the projection projectors  $P_h$  and  $\mathbf{\Pi}_h$  defined in (4.5) and (4.6), respectively, and

summing up from  $i = 1$  to  $r$  we get that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=0}^r \hat{\alpha}_{ij} \langle P_h U_n^j - U_{n,h}^j, P_h U_n^i - U_{n,h}^i \rangle \\ & + \sum_{i=1}^r \tau_n \hat{\beta}_{ii} \langle \mathbf{D}^{-1}(\mathbf{Q}_n^i - \mathbf{Q}_{n,h}^i), \mathbf{\Pi}_h \mathbf{Q}_n^i - \mathbf{Q}_{n,h}^i \rangle = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (4.16)$$

We note that due to Lemma 2.3, the first term in (4.16) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=0}^r \hat{\alpha}_{ij} \langle P_h U_n^j - U_{n,h}^j, P_h U_n^i - U_{n,h}^i \rangle \\ & = \frac{1}{2} \|P_h E_{u,n}(t_n)\|^2 - \frac{1}{2} \|P_h E_{u,n-1}(t_{n-1})\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Along with some further algebraic manipulations we then conclude from (4.16) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \|P_h E_{u,n}(t_n)\|^2 - \frac{1}{2} \|P_h E_{u,n-1}(t_{n-1})\|^2 \\ & + \sum_{i=1}^r \tau_n \hat{\beta}_{ii} \langle \mathbf{D}^{-1}(\mathbf{Q}_n^i - \mathbf{Q}_{n,h}^i), \mathbf{Q}_n^i - \mathbf{Q}_{n,h}^i \rangle \\ & = \sum_{i=1}^r \tau_n \hat{\beta}_{ii} \langle \mathbf{D}^{-1}(\mathbf{Q}_n^i - \mathbf{Q}_{n,h}^i), \mathbf{Q}_n^i - \mathbf{\Pi}_h \mathbf{Q}_n^i \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (4.17)$$

Recalling assumption (2.4) about  $\mathbf{D}$  and assumption (2.23) in condition (C) about the coefficients  $\hat{\beta}_{ii}$  and applying Cauchy–Young’s inequality we obtain from Eq. (4.17) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|P_h E_u(t_n)\|^2 - \|P_h E_u(t_{n-1})\|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^r \tau_n \beta_m \theta_m \|\mathbf{Q}_n^i - \mathbf{Q}_{n,h}^i\|^2 \\ & \leq \frac{\beta_M^2}{\beta_m \theta_m} \sum_{i=1}^r \tau_n \|\mathbf{Q}_n^i - \mathbf{\Pi}_h \mathbf{Q}_n^i\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.18)$$

Summing up inequality (4.18) from  $n = 1$  to  $K$  and noting that  $P_h E_u(t_0) = 0$  then shows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|P_h E_u(t_K)\|^2 + \sum_{n=1}^K \sum_{i=1}^r \tau_n \beta_m \|\mathbf{Q}_n^i - \mathbf{Q}_{n,h}^i\|^2 \\ & \leq \frac{\beta_M^2}{\beta_m \theta_m} \sum_{n=1}^K \sum_{i=1}^r \tau_n \|\mathbf{Q}_n^i - \mathbf{\Pi}_h \mathbf{Q}_n^i\|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (4.19)$$

for any  $K \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $K \leq N$ . By using now Lemma 4.1, there exists for any  $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$  a  $\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{V}_h$  such that  $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_h = P_h E_{u,n}^i$  and  $\|\mathbf{v}_h\| \leq c_{18} \|P_h E_{u,n}^i\|$ . By

testing (4.15) with this  $\mathbf{v}_h$ , we get by using the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality along with assumption (2.4) about  $\mathbf{D}$  that

$$\|P_h E_{u,n}^i\| \leq c_{18} \theta_M \|\mathbf{Q}_n^i - \mathbf{Q}_{n,h}^i\|, \quad (4.20)$$

for  $n = 1, \dots, N$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, r$ . Assertion (4.13) is now a direct consequence of the results (4.19) and (4.20).  $\blacksquare$

In the second lemma we derive an error estimate for the divergence of the flux variable. For this we restrict ourselves to the case that  $\mathbf{D} = \mathbf{I}$  is satisfied. An extension of the error estimate to non homogeneous matrices  $\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{x})$  still remains an open problem and has to be left for our future work. We note that the error estimate of Lemma 4.4 still holds under the assumption of a non-realistic permutation property of  $\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{x})$  with  $\mathbf{P}_h$ .

**Lemma 4.4.** *Let the assumptions of Subsec. 2.1 about  $\Omega, u_0, \mathbf{D}$  and  $f$  be satisfied. Suppose further that the coefficient condition (C) given in (2.23) holds. Let the semidiscrete solution  $\{u_\tau, \mathbf{q}_\tau\} \in \mathcal{X}^r(W) \times \mathcal{X}^r(\mathbf{V})$  be defined by (2.13) with coefficient functions  $\{U_n^j, \mathbf{Q}_n^j\} \in W \times \mathbf{V}$ , for  $j = 1, \dots, r$  being uniquely given by the set of equations (2.19), (2.20). Further, let  $\{u_{\tau,h}, \mathbf{q}_{\tau,h}\} \in \mathcal{X}^r(W_h) \times \mathcal{X}^r(\mathbf{V}_h)$  be the uniquely defined solution of the fully discrete problem (2.29), (2.30) or (2.32), (2.33), respectively. Then, for any  $K = 1, \dots, N$  it holds that*

$$\sum_{n=1}^K \tau_n \sum_{i=1}^r \hat{\beta}_{ii} \|\nabla \cdot \mathbf{\Pi}_h \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{q},n}^i\|^2 \leq \sum_{n=1}^K \tau_n \sum_{i=1}^r \hat{\beta}_{ii} \|\nabla \cdot (\mathbf{P}_h - \mathbf{\Pi}_h) \mathbf{Q}_n^i\|^2. \quad (4.21)$$

**Proof.** Introducing the projectors into the error equations (4.14)–(4.15) yields that

$$\sum_{j=0}^r \hat{\alpha}_{ij} \langle P_h E_{u,n}^j, w_h \rangle + \tau_n \hat{\beta}_{ii} \langle \nabla \cdot \mathbf{\Pi}_h \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{q},n}^i, w_h \rangle = 0, \quad (4.22)$$

$$\langle \mathbf{P}_h \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{q},n}^i, \mathbf{v}_h \rangle - \langle P_h E_{u,n}^i, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_h \rangle = 0 \quad (4.23)$$

for  $n = 1, \dots, N$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, r$  and all  $\{w_h, \mathbf{v}_h\} \in W_h \times \mathbf{V}_h$ . Observing that for any  $n \geq 2$  the quantities  $\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{q},n}^0$  and  $E_{u,n}^0$  are linear combinations of  $\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{q},n-1}^i$  and  $E_{u,n-1}^i$ , for  $i = 0, \dots, r$ , respectively, and that  $P_h E_{u,1}^0 = 0$  by definition as well as  $\mathbf{P}_h \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{q},1}^0 = \mathbf{0}$  by a suitable choice of the fully discrete initial flux coefficient function  $\mathbf{Q}_{1,h}^0$  of (2.31), it follows that Eq. (4.23) is also satisfied for  $i = 0$  and any  $n \geq 1$ . Using this, we obtain by multiplying (4.23) with  $\hat{\alpha}_{ji}$  and summing up the resulting identity from  $i = 0$  to  $r$  that

$$\left\langle \sum_{j=0}^r \hat{\alpha}_{ij} \mathbf{P}_h \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{q},n}^j, \mathbf{v}_h \right\rangle - \left\langle \sum_{j=0}^r \hat{\alpha}_{ij} P_h E_{u,n}^j, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_h \right\rangle = 0 \quad (4.24)$$

for any  $\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{V}_h$ . We note that we changed the notation for the indices. By testing now (4.22) with  $w_h = \sum_{j=0}^r \hat{\alpha}_{ij} P_h E_{u,n}^j \in W_h$  and (4.24) with  $\mathbf{v}_h = \tau_n \hat{\beta}_{ii} \mathbf{P}_h \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{q},n}^i \in \mathbf{V}_h$ , we

get by summing the resulting equations and using the inequalities of Cauchy–Schwarz and Cauchy–Young that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \sum_{j=0}^r \hat{\alpha}_{ij} P_h E_{u,n}^j \right\|^2 + \tau_n \hat{\beta}_{ii} \left\langle \sum_{j=0}^r \hat{\alpha}_{ij} \mathbf{P}_h \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{q},n}^j, \mathbf{P}_h \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{q},n}^i \right\rangle \\
&= \tau_n \hat{\beta}_{ii} \left\langle \sum_{j=0}^r \hat{\alpha}_{ij} P_h E_{u,n}^j, \nabla \cdot (\mathbf{P}_h - \mathbf{\Pi}_h) \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{q},n}^i \right\rangle \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \left\| \sum_{j=0}^r \hat{\alpha}_{ij} P_h E_{u,n}^j \right\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \tau_n^2 \hat{\beta}_{ii}^2 \|\nabla \cdot (\mathbf{P}_h - \mathbf{\Pi}_h) \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{q},n}^i\|^2
\end{aligned}$$

for  $n = 1, \dots, N$  and  $i = 1, \dots, r$ . The inequality above further simplifies to

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \sum_{j=0}^r \hat{\alpha}_{ij} P_h E_{u,n}^j \right\|^2 + 2\tau_n \hat{\beta}_{ii} \left\langle \sum_{j=0}^r \hat{\alpha}_{ij} \mathbf{P}_h \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{q},n}^j, \mathbf{P}_h \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{q},n}^i \right\rangle \\
&\leq \tau_n^2 \hat{\beta}_{ii}^2 \|\nabla \cdot (\mathbf{P}_h - \mathbf{\Pi}_h) \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{q},n}^i\|^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.25}$$

for  $n = 1, \dots, N$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, r$ . Dividing (4.25) by  $\tau_n \hat{\beta}_{ii}$  (note that  $\hat{\beta}_{ii} > 0$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, r$ ), summing up the resulting inequality from  $i = 1, \dots, r$  and using Lemma 2.3 gives that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=1}^r \frac{1}{\tau_n \hat{\beta}_{ii}} \left\| \sum_{j=0}^r \hat{\alpha}_{ij} P_h E_{u,n}^j \right\|^2 + \|\mathbf{P}_h \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{q}}(t_n)\|^2 \leq \|\mathbf{P}_h \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{q}}(t_{n-1})\|^2 \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=1}^r \tau_n \hat{\beta}_{ii} \|\nabla \cdot (\mathbf{P}_h - \mathbf{\Pi}_h) \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{q},n}^i\|^2
\end{aligned} \tag{4.26}$$

for  $n = 1, \dots, N$ . By summing up (4.26) from  $n = 1, \dots, K$  and noting that  $\mathbf{P}_h \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{q}}(t_0) = \mathbf{0}$  for a suitable choice of the flux coefficient function  $\mathbf{Q}_{1,h}^0$  of (2.31) we finally get that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{n=1}^K \sum_{i=1}^r \frac{1}{\tau_n \hat{\beta}_{ii}} \left\| \sum_{j=0}^r \hat{\alpha}_{ij} P_h E_{u,n}^j \right\|^2 + \|\mathbf{P}_h \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{q}}(t_K)\|^2 \\
&\leq \sum_{n=1}^K \sum_{i=1}^r \tau_n \hat{\beta}_{ii} \|\nabla \cdot (\mathbf{P}_h - \mathbf{\Pi}_h) \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{q},n}^i\|^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.27}$$

We can now estimate the divergence of the flux. By testing (4.22) with  $w_h = \nabla \cdot \mathbf{\Pi}_h \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{q},n}^i \in W_h$ , and using the inequalities of Cauchy–Schwarz and Cauchy–Young

( $\hat{\beta}_{ii} > 0$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, r$ ) we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_n \hat{\beta}_{ii} \|\nabla \cdot \mathbf{\Pi}_h \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{q},n}^i\|^2 &= - \left\langle \sum_{j=0}^r \hat{\alpha}_{ij} P_h E_{u,n}^j, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{\Pi}_h \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{q},n}^i \right\rangle \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2\tau_n \hat{\beta}_{ii}} \left\| \sum_{j=0}^r \hat{\alpha}_{ij} P_h E_{u,n}^j \right\|^2 + \frac{\tau_n \hat{\beta}_{ii}}{2} \|\nabla \cdot \mathbf{\Pi}_h \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{q},n}^i\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

for  $n = 1, \dots, N$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, r$ . Summing up the previous inequality from  $n = 1, \dots, K$  as well as from  $i = 1, \dots, r$ , and using (4.26) we obtain that

$$\sum_{n=1}^K \sum_{i=1}^r \tau_n \hat{\beta}_{ii} \|\nabla \cdot \mathbf{\Pi}_h \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{q},n}^i\|^2 \leq \sum_{n=1}^K \sum_{i=1}^r \tau_n \hat{\beta}_{ii} \|\nabla \cdot (\mathbf{P}_h - \mathbf{\Pi}_h) \mathbf{Q}_n^i\|^2,$$

which proves the assertion of the lemma.  $\blacksquare$

Now we combine the inequalities (4.13) and (4.21) to estimate the error between the semidiscrete and the fully discrete solutions in the norms of  $L^2(I, W)$  and  $L^2(I, \mathbf{V})$ .

**Theorem 4.5.** *Let the assumptions of Subsec. 2.1 about  $\Omega, u_0, \mathbf{D}$  and  $f$  be satisfied. Suppose further that the coefficient condition (C) given in (2.23) holds. Let the semidiscrete solution  $\{u_\tau, \mathbf{q}_\tau\} \in \mathcal{X}^r(W) \times \mathcal{X}^r(\mathbf{V})$  be defined by (2.13) with sufficiently regular coefficient functions  $U_n^j \in W$  for  $j = 0, \dots, r$  and  $\mathbf{Q}_n^j \in \mathbf{V}$  for  $j = 1, \dots, r$  and  $n = 1, \dots, N$  being uniquely given by the set of equations (2.19), (2.20) and the continuity constraint (2.15). Further, let  $\{u_{\tau,h}, \mathbf{q}_{\tau,h}\} \in \mathcal{X}^r(W_h) \times \mathcal{X}^r(\mathbf{V}_h)$  be the uniquely defined solution of the fully discrete problem (2.32), (2.33) or (2.29), (2.30), respectively. Then, there holds that*

$$\|u_\tau - u_{\tau,h}\|_{L^2(I,W)} \leq c_{25} h^{(p+1)}, \quad (4.28)$$

$$\|\mathbf{q}_\tau - \mathbf{q}_{\tau,h}\|_{L^2(I,L^2(\Omega))} \leq c_{26} h^{(p+1)}. \quad (4.29)$$

For  $\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{x}) = d\mathbf{I}$ , for some  $d > 0$ , it holds that

$$\|\mathbf{q}_\tau - \mathbf{q}_{\tau,h}\|_{L^2(I,\mathbf{V})} \leq c_{27} h^{(p+1)} \quad (4.30)$$

The constants  $c_{25}, c_{26}, c_{27}$  do not depend on the discretization parameters  $h$  and  $\tau$ .

**Proof.** By using (2.26) and (4.13) along with the approximation properties (4.8)–(4.10) of the projection operators we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_\tau - u_{\tau,h}\|_{L^2(I,W)}^2 &\leq c_0 \sum_{n=1}^N \tau_n \sum_{i=0}^r \|E_{u,n}^i\|^2 \\ &\leq c_0 \left( \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{i=0}^r c_{24} \tau_n \|U_n^i - P_h U_n^i\|^2 + \tau_N \|u_\tau(t_N) - P_h u_\tau(t_N)\|^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^r c_{24} \tau_n \|\mathbf{Q}_n^i - \mathbf{\Pi}_h \mathbf{Q}_n^i\|^2 \right) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_\tau - u_{\tau,h}\|_{L^2(I,W)}^2 &\leq c_0 \left( \sum_{n=1}^N c_{24} c_{19}^2 \tau_n h^{2(p+1)} \sum_{i=0}^r \|U_n^i\|_{p+1}^2 \right. \\ &\quad + c_{19}^2 \tau_N h^{2(p+1)} \|u_\tau(t_N)\|_{p+1}^2 \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{n=1}^N c_{24} c_{20}^2 \tau_n h^{2(p+1)} \sum_{i=1}^r \|\mathbf{Q}_n^i\|_{p+1}^2 \right), \end{aligned} \quad (4.31)$$

where the arising constants do not depend on the discretization parameters  $h$  and  $\tau$ . The result (4.28) directly follows from (4.31) under the assumption of the theorem of sufficiently regular coefficient functions  $\{U_n^j, \mathbf{Q}_n^j\} \in W \times \mathbf{V}$ . The inequalities (4.29) and (4.30) can be derived in an analogous way.  $\blacksquare$

### 4.3. Error estimates for the error between the continuous and the fully discrete solution

In this section we combine the results of Thm. 3.7 and Thm. 3.10 with the estimates of Thm. 4.5 to prove the convergence of the fully discrete scheme.

**Theorem 4.6.** *Let the assumptions of Subsec. 2.1 about  $\Omega, u_0, \mathbf{D}$  and  $f$  and the coefficient condition (C) given in (2.23) be satisfied. Let  $\{u, \mathbf{q}\} \in H^1(I; W) \times L^2(I; \mathbf{V})$  denote the unique solution of the mixed problem (2.7), (2.8) that is supposed to be sufficiently regular. Further, let  $\{u_{\tau,h}, \mathbf{q}_{\tau,h}\} \in \mathcal{X}^r(W_h) \times \mathcal{X}^r(\mathbf{V}_h)$  be the uniquely defined solution of the fully discrete problem (2.32), (2.33) or (2.29), (2.30), respectively. Suppose that the semidiscrete problem (2.19), (2.20) along with the continuity constraint (2.15) defines a sufficiently regular semidiscrete solution  $\{u_\tau, \mathbf{q}_\tau\} \in \mathcal{X}^r(W) \times \mathcal{X}^r(\mathbf{V})$ . Then, there holds that*

$$\|u - u_{\tau,h}\|_{L^2(I, L^2(\Omega))} \leq c_{28}(\tau^r + h^{p+1}), \quad (4.32)$$

$$\|\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}_{\tau,h}\|_{L^2(I, L^2(\Omega))} \leq c_{29}(\tau^r + h^{p+1}). \quad (4.33)$$

For homogeneous diffusion coefficients  $\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{x}) = d\mathbf{I}$ , with some constant  $d > 0$ , there holds that

$$\|\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}_{\tau,h}\|_{L^2(I, \mathbf{V})} \leq c_{30}(\tau^r + h^{p+1}). \quad (4.34)$$

Under the regularity condition ( $R_{\text{mix}}$ ) given in (3.29) and for interpolated right-hand side functions (2.21) there holds that

$$\|u - u_{\tau,h}\|_{L^2(I, L^2(\Omega))} \leq c_{31}(\tau^{r+1} + h^{p+1}). \quad (4.35)$$

All the constants  $c_i$ ,  $i = 28, \dots, 31$  in (4.32)–(4.35) do not depend on the discretization parameters  $h$  and  $\tau$ .

**Proof.** By using the triangle inequality, Thm. 3.10 and Thm. 4.5 it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|u - u_{\tau,h}\|_{L^2(I,L^2(\Omega))}^2 &\leq 2\|u - u_\tau\|_{L^2(I,L^2(\Omega))}^2 + 2\|u_\tau - u_{\tau,h}\|_{L^2(I,L^2(\Omega))}^2 \\ &\leq c_{28} \left( \tau^{2r} + h^{2(p+1)} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where sufficient regularity of the continuous and semidiscrete solution with appropriate upper bounds for the solutions (cf. Thm. 3.10 and Thm. 4.5) is assumed. The inequalities (4.33) and (4.34) are obtained similarly. The estimate (4.35) can be concluded in the same way by using now the result of Thm. 3.7 instead of Thm. 3.10.  $\blacksquare$

**Remark 4.7.** • *The error estimate (4.35) is optimal in time and space. The assumption of an interpolated right-hand side function (2.21) can still be dropped even though this is not explicitly done in this work. It requires to estimate the error between the exact form of cGP( $r$ ) defined in (2.9), (2.10) and the fully discrete solution. In this case the arguments used to prove Thm. 4.5 have to be augmented by an estimate of the interpolation error for the right-hand side function, similarly to the proof of Thm. 3.10.*

- *The error estimates (4.33) and (4.34) are suboptimal in time. It remains an open problem to analyze if the estimates can still be sharpened to order  $r + 1$ . In our numerical study presented in Sec. 5 convergence of order  $r + 1$  will be observed for the temporal discretization of the scalar and the flux variable.*

## 5. Numerical studies

In this section we present a numerical study in order to illustrate the error estimate given in Thm. 4.6 for the fully discrete scheme (2.29), (2.30) combining a variational time discretization with the mixed finite element method. Additional convergence studies for variational space-time discretizations of the proposed type as well as for discontinuous time discretizations can be found in [14, 33] for parabolic problems and in [32, 33] for variational space-time discretizations of wave equations. In [33, 14] the efficient iterative solution of the resulting algebraic system of equations (2.29), (2.30) along with the construction of appropriate preconditioning techniques is carefully addressed. In the literature, further computational studies of variational time discretization schemes are presented also for different kind of flow and transport problems in, e.g., [2, 1, 3, 41, 34, 29, 27, 28].

In order to determine the space-time convergence behavior we consider in our numerical study the cGP(2)–MFEM(2) approach. That is (2.9)–(2.10) with  $r = 2$  combined with the mixed finite element method MFEM(2) based on the choice  $p = 2$  in the definition (2.27) and (2.28) of the tuple of mixed finite element spaces. For the diffusion problem (2.1)–(2.3) with identity tensor  $\mathbf{D} = \mathbf{I}$  we prescribe the solution

$$u_E(\mathbf{x}, t) := \sin(\omega t) \sin(\pi x_1) \sin(\pi x_2), \quad \text{in } \Omega \times (0, T), \quad (5.1)$$



with the corresponding flux function  $\mathbf{q}_E = -\mathbf{D}\nabla u_E$  given by

$$\mathbf{q}_E(\mathbf{x}, t) = -\pi \sin(\omega t) \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\pi x_1) \sin(\pi x_2) \\ \sin(\pi x_1) \cos(\pi x_2) \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{in } \Omega \times (0, T). \quad (5.2)$$

The initial flux, that is only needed to evaluate the second of the identities (2.31) when the error is computed, is here given by  $\mathbf{q}_E(\mathbf{x}, 0) = (0, 0)^\top$  in  $\Omega \times \{0\}$ . The corresponding source term  $f$  reads as

$$f(\mathbf{x}, t) := (\omega \cos(\omega t) + 2\pi^2 \sin(\omega t)) \sin(\pi x_1) \sin(\pi x_2). \quad (5.3)$$

We choose the final time  $T = 1$  and  $\omega = 10\pi$ . The initial temporal mesh is uniformly refined into  $N = 10$  time subintervals and the initial spatial mesh contains one cell. To determine the experimental order of convergence the mesh is refined uniformly by the factor of two in each of the space dimensions and the time dimension. We put

$$e_u^{\text{cGP}(2)}(t) := u_E(t) - u_{\tau, h}(t) \quad \text{and} \quad e_{\mathbf{q}}^{\text{cGP}(2)}(t) := \mathbf{q}_E(t) - \mathbf{q}_{\tau, h}(t), \quad (5.4)$$

where we denote by  $u_{\tau, h}$  and by  $\mathbf{q}_{\tau, h}$  the fully discrete cGP(2)–MFEM(2) approximation of the primal variable and the flux field. The discretization errors are measured in the  $L^2(I; \mathbf{L}^2(\Omega))$ -norm

$$\|\mathbf{e}\|_{L^2(I; \mathbf{L}^2(\Omega))} := \left( \int_0^T \|\mathbf{e}(t)\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (5.5)$$

for  $e_{\mathbf{q}}^{\text{cGP}(2)}$  and  $e_u^{\text{cGP}(2)}$ , respectively, and additionally in the norm of  $L^2(I; \mathbf{V})$ ,

$$\|\mathbf{e}\|_{L^2(I; \mathbf{V})} := \left( \int_0^T \|\mathbf{e}(t)\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)^2}^2 + \|\nabla \cdot \mathbf{e}(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (5.6)$$

for the error  $e_{\mathbf{q}}^{\text{cGP}(2)}$  in the flux variable. As usual, the integral over the spatial domain  $\Omega$  and the integral over the time domain  $I = (0, T)$  in Eq. (5.5) and (5.6) are evaluated elementwise in space and time by appropriate quadrature rules of sufficiently high order of accuracy.

We summarize the calculated errors and their experimental order of convergence (EOC) for the proposed space-time discretization in Tab. 5.1 and further illustrate them in Fig. 5.1. The numerical results nicely confirm the expected third order rate of convergence established in Thm. 4.6 (cf. also Rem. 4.7) for the discretization in the space-time domain with polynomial order  $r = 2$  and  $p = 2$ , respectively, in the definition of the underlying finite element spaces. We note that the optimal order convergence in time and space is obtained for the scalar and the flux variable. Thus, the estimates (4.29) and (4.30) still seem to be suboptimal with respect to the time discretization; cf. Rem. 4.7. Further, we note that the optimal rate of convergence is obtained for the spatial discretization of the flux field in the norm of  $\mathbf{H}(\text{div}; \Omega)$ . In this point the family of Raviart–Thomas pairs of mixed finite elements is superior to the family of Brezzi–Douglas–Marini pairs of mixed finite elements (cf. [16]) for that the optimal order of convergence of the flux variable can be obtained only in the norm of  $\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)$ .

$N$	$N_{\text{DoF}}$	$\ e_u^{\text{cGP}(2)}\ _{L^2(I;L^2(\Omega))}$	EOC	$\ e_q^{\text{cGP}(2)}\ _{L^2(I;L^2(\Omega))}$	EOC
10	33	4.0298e-02	—	1.6206e-01	—
20	120	1.1316e-02	1.83	4.1231e-02	1.97
40	456	1.4371e-03	2.98	5.2081e-03	2.98
80	1776	1.8037e-04	2.99	6.5268e-04	3.00
160	7008	2.2569e-05	3.00	8.1636e-05	3.00
320	27840	2.8219e-06	3.00	1.0206e-05	3.00

Table 5.1: Experimental order of convergence (EOC) in space-time for cGP(2)–MFEM(2).  $N$  denotes the total number of time subintervals and  $N_{\text{DoF}}$  denotes the total number of degrees of freedom in space for each pair of unknowns  $\{U_{n,h}^j, Q_{n,h}^j\}$ ,  $j = 1, 2$ , of the expansion (2.31).

$\tau_n$	$h$	$\ e_q^{\text{cGP}(2)}\ _{L^2(I;V)}$	EOC
1.000e-01	1.4142e-00	8.2000e-01	—
5.000e-02	7.0711e-01	2.2827e-01	1.84
2.500e-02	3.5355e-01	2.8876e-02	2.98
1.250e-02	1.7678e-01	3.6208e-03	3.00
6.250e-03	8.8388e-02	4.5295e-04	3.00
3.125e-03	4.4194e-02	5.6631e-05	3.00

Table 5.2: Experimental order of convergence (EOC) in space-time for cGP(2)–MFEM(2).  $\tau_n$  denotes the time subinterval length and  $h$  denotes the diameter of each spatial mesh cell.




Figure 5.1: Experimental order of convergence in space-time for cGP(2)–MFEM(2).  $N$  denotes the total number of time subintervals and  $N_{\text{DoF}}$  denotes the total number of degrees of freedom in space for each pair of unknowns  $\{U_{n,h}^j, Q_{n,h}^j\}$ ,  $j = 1, 2$ , of the expansion (2.31).

## 6. Conclusions

In this work a numerical analysis of a family of variational space approximation schemes that combine continuous finite elements in time with mixed finite element methods in space was presented for a parabolic prototype model of flow in porous media. The existence and uniqueness of the temporally semidiscrete and the fully discrete approximations were proved. Optimal order error estimates in natural norms of the scheme were established. The error estimates were illustrated by a numerical convergence study. We believe that our analyses and techniques can be extended and applied to more sophisticated flow and transport processes in porous media or to incompressible viscous free flow. This will be our work for the future.

## Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) under the grant ID 56435737 and by the Research Council of Norway under the grant DAADppp225267.

## References

- [1] N. Ahmed, V. John: Adaptive time step control for higher order variational time discretizations applied to convection-diffusion-reaction equations, *Comput. Meth. Appl. Mech. Engrg.*, 285:83–101 (2015)
- [2] N. Ahmed, G. Matthies: Numerical studies of Galerkin-type time-discretizations applied to transient convection-diffusion-reaction equations, *World Acad. Sci. Eng. Tech.*, 66:586–593 (2012)
- [3] N. Ahmed, G. Matthies: Numerical studies of variational-type time-discretization techniques for transient Oseen problem, *Proceedings of contributed papers and posters*, Bratislava: Slovak University of Technology, Faculty of Civil Engineering, Department of Mathematics and Descriptive Geometry (ISBN 978-80-227-3742-5/pbk), 404-415 (2012)
- [4] R. Andreev: Space-time discretization of the heat equation, *Numer. Algor.*, 67:713–731 (2014)
- [5] T. Arbogast, M. F. Wheeler, N. Y. Zhang: A nonlinear mixed finite element method for a degenerate parabolic equation arising in flow in porous media, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 33:1669–1687 (1996)
- [6] A. K. Aziz, P. Monk: Continuous finite elements in space and time for the heat equation, *Math. Comp.*, 52: 255-274 (1989)
- [7] W. Bangerth, M. Geiger, R. Rannacher: Adaptive Galerkin finite element methods for the wave equation, *Comput. Meth. Appl. Math.*, 10(1):3–48 (2010)

- [8] W. Bangerth, R. Rannacher: Adaptive finite element methods for differential equations, Birkhäuser, Basel (2003)
- [9] S. Basting, S. Weller: Efficient preconditioning of variational time discretization methods for parabolic partial differential equations, *Math. Model. Numer. Anal.*, 49(2): 331–347 (2015)
- [10] M. Bause: Higher and lowest order mixed finite element methods for subsurface flow problems with solutions of weak regularity, *Adv. Water Res.*, 31:370–382 (2008)
- [11] M. Bause, F. Brunner, P. Knabner, F. Radu, An improved optimal order mixed finite element method for semilinear transport problems, in *Numerical Mathematics and Advanced Applications 2011: Proceedings of ENUMATH 2011*, A. Cangiani, Andrea et al. (eds.), Springer, Berlin, 247–256 (2013)
- [12] M. Bause, J. Hoffmann, P. Knabner: First-order convergence of multi point flux approximation on triangular grids and comparison with mixed finite element methods, *Numer. Math.*, 116:1–29 (2010)
- [13] M. Bause, P. Knabner: Computation of variably saturated subsurface flow by adaptive mixed hybrid finite element methods, *Adv. Water Res.*, 27:565–581 (2004)
- [14] M. Bause, U. Köcher: Variational time discretization for mixed finite element approximations of nonstationary diffusion problems, *J. Comput. Appl. Math.*, accepted for publication (2015), DOI: 10.1016/j.cam.2015.02.015
- [15] C. Bernardi, Y. Maday: *Approximations spectrales des problèmes aux limites elliptique*, Springer, Paris (1992)
- [16] F. Brezzi, M. Fortin: *Mixed and Hybrid Finite Element Methods*, Springer, New York (1991)
- [17] F. Brunner, F. A. Radu, M. Bause, P. Knabner: Optimal order convergence of a modified BDM<sub>1</sub> mixed finite element scheme for reactive transport in porous media, *Adv. Water Res.*, 35:163–171 (2012)
- [18] M. A. Celia, E. T. Bouloutas, R. L. Zarba: A general mass-conservative numerical solution for the unsaturated flow equation, *Water Resour. Res.*, 26(7):1483–1496 (1990)
- [19] J. Česenek, M. Feistauer: Theory of the space-time discontinuous Galerkin method for nonstationary parabolic problems with nonlinear convection and diffusion, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 50(3):1181–1206 (2012)
- [20] Z. Chen: *Finite Element Methods and their Applications*. Springer, Berlin (2010)
- [21] Z. Chen, G. Huan, Y. Ma: *Computational Methods for Multiphase Flows in Porous Media*, SIAM, Philadelphia (2005)
- [22] W. Bangerth, T. Heister, G. Kanschat: *deal.II differential equations analysis library*, Technical reference, <http://www.dealii.org> (2014)

- [23] A. Ern, J. L. Guermond: *Theory and Practice of Finite Elements*, Springer, Berlin (2010)
- [24] L. C. Evans: *Partial Differential Equations*, American Mathematical Society, Providence, Rhode Island (2010)
- [25] M. W. Farthing, C. E. Kees, C. T. Miller: Mixed finite element methods and higher-order temporal approximations, *Adv. Water Resour.*, 25:85–101 (2002)
- [26] R. Helmig: *Multiphase Flow and Transport Processes in the Subsurface: A Contribution to the Modeling of Hydrosystems*, Springer, Berlin (1997)
- [27] S. Hussain, F. Schieweck, S. Turek: Higher order Galerkin time discretization for nonstationary incompressible flow, in A. Cangiani et al. (eds.), *Numer. Math. and Adv. Appl.* 2011, Springer, Berlin, 509–517 (2013)
- [28] S. Hussain, F. Schieweck, S. Turek: A note on accurate and efficient higher order Galerkin time stepping schemes for nonstationary Stokes equations, *The Open Numer. Meth. J.*, 4:35–45 (2012)
- [29] S. Hussain, F. Schieweck, S. Turek: Higher order Galerkin time discretizations and fast multigrid solvers for the heat equation, *J. Numer. Math.*, 19(1):41–61 (2011)
- [30] O. Karakashin, C. Makridakis: Convergence of a continuous Galerkin method with mesh modification for nonlinear wave equations, *Math. Comp.*, 74:85–102 (2004)
- [31] O. Karakashin, C. Makridakis: A space-time finite element method for the nonlinear Schrödinger equation: the continuous Galerkin method, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 36:1779–1807 (1999)
- [32] U. Köcher, M. Bause: Variational space-time methods for the wave equation, *J. Sci. Comput.*, 61:424–453 (2014)
- [33] U. Köcher: *Variational Space-Time Methods for the Elastic Wave Equation and the Diffusion Equation*, PhD Thesis, Helmut Schmidt University Hamburg, submitted, Hamburg (2015)
- [34] G. Matthies, F. Schieweck: Higher order variational time discretizations for nonlinear systems of ordinary differential equations. Preprint No. 23/2011 Otto von Guericke Universität Magdeburg, 1–30 (2011)
- [35] A. Quarteroni, A. Valli: *Numerical Approximation of Partial Differential Equations*, Springer, Heidelberg (1994)
- [36] A. Quarteroni, R. Sacco, F. Saleri: *Numerical Mathematics*, Springer, Berlin Heidelberg (2007).
- [37] F. A. Radu, I. S. Pop, S. Attinger: Analysis of an Euler implicit-mixed finite element scheme for reactive solute transport in porous media, *Numer. Methods Partial Differential Equations*, 26:320–344 (2010)
- [38] F. A. Radu, I. S. Pop, P. Knabner: Order of convergence estimates for an Eu-

- ler implicit, mixed finite element discretization of Richards' equation, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 42:1452–1478 (2004)
- [39] F. A. Radu, I. S. Pop, P. Knabner: Error estimates for a mixed finite element discretization of some degenerate parabolic equations, *Numer. Math.*, 109:285–311 (2008)
- [40] F. A. Radu, N. Suciu, J. Hoffmann, A. Vogel, O. Kolditz, C-H. Park, S. Attinger: Accuracy of numerical simulations of contaminant transport in heterogeneous aquifers: a comparative study, *Adv. Water Res.*, 34:47-61 (2011)
- [41] F. Schieweck: A-stable discontinuous Galerkin–Petrov time discretization of higher order, *J. Numer. Math.*, 18(1):25–57 (2010)
- [42] J. J. Sudirham, J. J. W. van der Vegt, R. M. J. van Damme: Space-time discontinuous Galerkin method for advection-diffusion problems on time-dependent domains, *Appl. Numer. Math.*, 56:1491–1518 (2006)
- [43] J.M. Thomas: *Sur l'analyse numerique des methodes d'elements finis hybrides et mixtes*, These d'Etat, University Pierre et Marie Curie, Paris 6 (1977)
- [44] V. Thomeé: *Galerkin Finite Element Methods for Parabolic Problems*, Springer, Berlin (2006)
- [45] C. S. Woodward, C. N. Dawson: Analysis of expanded mixed finite element methods for a nonlinear parabolic equation modeling flow into variably saturated porous media, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 37:701–724 (2000)

## A. Appendix

In the sequel we introduce a variational semidiscretization in time of the weak formulation of the second order problem (2.1)–(2.3), i.e. without rewriting Eq. (2.1) as a first order system of equations as it is done in Subsec. 2.2. Then we prove the existence and uniqueness of solutions to the resulting semidiscrete variational problem. This results is used to establish the existence of the semidiscrete approximation in mixed form defined by the variational problem (2.9), (2.10) in Sec. 3. Here, we present a different technique of proof than in [41] since one of the arguments that is used [41, Lemma 6.1] does not hold in the applied form from our point of view. Thereby, we aim to keep our work self-contained. Further, we summarize the proof of Thm. 3.10.

### A.1. Variational time discretization of the second order problem

In the following we use the notation that is introduced in Subsec. 2.1 and 2.2, respectively. Moreover we use the splitting (cf. Eq. (3.16))

$$u_\tau(t) = u_0 + u_\tau^0(t) \quad \text{with} \quad u_\tau^0 \in \mathcal{X}_0^r(H_0^1(\Omega)). \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Further, we put

$$f_0(t) = f(t) - Au_0$$

for  $u_0 \in H_0^1(\Omega)$  such that by definition  $Au_0 \in H^{-1}(\Omega)$ ; cf. Sec. 2.1. Under the additional regularity condition that

$$D(A) = H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega) \quad (\text{A.2})$$

it even holds that  $f_0 \in L^2(I; L^2(\Omega))$ . The semidiscrete variational approximation of the system (2.1)–(2.3) is now defined by: *Find*  $u_\tau^0 \in X_\tau^r(H_0^1(\Omega))$  such that

$$\int_0^T \langle \partial_t u_\tau^0, w_\tau \rangle dt + \int_0^T a(u_\tau^0, w_\tau) dt = \int_0^T \langle f_0, w_\tau \rangle dt \quad (\text{A.3})$$

for all  $w_\tau \in Y^{r-1}(H_0^1(\Omega))$ .

Firstly, we show the uniqueness of solutions to (A.3). For the variational time discretization we use the notation that is introduced in Subsec. 2.2. In particular, we denote by  $\varphi_{n,j} = \varphi_{n,j}(t)$  for  $j = 0, \dots, r$  the Lagrange basis functions in  $I_n = (t_{n-1}, t_n]$  with respect to  $r+1$  quadrature points  $t_{n,l}$ ,  $l = 0, \dots, r$ . Then, any function  $u_\tau^0 \in X_\tau^r(H_0^1(\Omega))$  and its time derivative admit the representation

$$u_\tau^0(t) = \sum_{j=0}^r U_n^j \varphi_{n,j}(t), \quad \partial_t u_\tau^0(t) = \sum_{j=0}^r U_n^j \varphi'_{n,j}(t) \quad (\text{A.4})$$

for all  $t \in I_n$  with coefficient functions  $U_n^j \in H_0^1(\Omega)$  for  $j = 0, \dots, r$ .

**Theorem A.1** (Uniqueness of solutions to (A.3)). *Let the assumptions of Subsec. 2.1 about  $\Omega, u_0$  and  $f$  as the be satisfied. Then the solution  $u_\tau^0 \in \mathcal{X}_\tau^r(H_0^1(\Omega))$  of the semidiscrete problem (A.3) is unique.*

**Proof.** We suppose that there exist two solutions  $u_{\tau,1}^0, u_{\tau,2}^0 \in \mathcal{X}_\tau^r(H_0^1(\Omega))$  of the semidiscrete variational problem (A.3). We put  $u_\tau^0(t) := u_{\tau,1}^0 - u_{\tau,2}^0$ . We choose the test function  $v_\tau := A^{-1} \partial_t u_\tau^0 + \mu \partial_t u_\tau^0$  for some fixed parameter  $\mu \geq 0$ . By means of (A.4), it holds that  $v_\tau \in \mathcal{Y}^{r-1}(H_0^1(\Omega))$ . For this choice of  $v_\tau$  it follows that

$$I := \int_0^T \langle \partial_t u_\tau^0(t), A^{-1} \partial_t u_\tau^0 + \mu \partial_t u_\tau^0 \rangle dt + \int_0^T \langle Au_\tau^0(t), A^{-1} \partial_t u_\tau^0 + \mu \partial_t u_\tau^0 \rangle dt = 0. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

By the symmetry of  $a(\cdot, \cdot)$  we have that  $a(u_\tau^0, \partial_t u_\tau^0) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} a(u_\tau^0, u_\tau^0)$ . Further, we have that  $\langle u_\tau^0, \partial_t u_\tau^0 \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|u_\tau^0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2$ . Putting  $c_3 := c_1/c_2^2$ , recalling (3.5) and noting that

$u_\tau^0(0) = 0$  and  $\partial_t u_\tau^0 \in \mathcal{Y}^{r-1}(H_0^1(\Omega))$ , it follows from (A.5) that

$$\begin{aligned}
0 = I &= \int_0^T \langle \partial_t u_\tau^0(t), A^{-1} \partial_t u_\tau^0 \rangle dt + \int_0^T \langle \partial_t u_\tau^0(t), \mu \partial_t u_\tau^0 \rangle dt \\
&\quad + \int_0^T \langle A u_\tau(t), A^{-1} \partial_t u_\tau^0 \rangle dt + \int_0^T \langle A u_\tau^0(t), \mu \partial_t u_\tau^0 \rangle dt \\
&\geq c_3 \int_0^T \|\partial_t u_\tau^0\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)}^2 dt + \mu \int_0^T \|\partial_t u_\tau^0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 dt \\
&\quad + \int_0^T \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|u_\tau^0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 dt + \mu \int_0^T \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} a(u_\tau^0, u_\tau^0) dt \\
&\geq c_3 \int_0^T \|\partial_t u_\tau^0\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)}^2 dt + \mu \int_0^T \|\partial_t u_\tau^0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 dt \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \|u_\tau^0(T)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{c_1 \mu}{2} \|u_\tau^0(T)\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

This implies that  $u_\tau^0 = 0$  and, consequently, that  $u_{\tau,1}^0 = u_{\tau,2}^0$ . The uniqueness of solutions to (A.3) is thus established.  $\blacksquare$

We remark that testing Eq. (A.3) with  $v_\tau = A^{-1} \partial_t u_\tau^0$  or  $v_\tau = \partial_t u_\tau^0$  would already be sufficient for proving the uniqueness result. Further, the symmetry of  $a(\cdot, \cdot)$  is essential in the previous proof. A generalization of the arguments to problems with nonsymmetric bilinearforms, for instance to convection-diffusion equations, still remains an open problem.

The existence of a solution to the semidiscrete problem (A.3) follows from the uniqueness of the solutions. Using the eigenspaces of  $A$ , problem (A.3) can be reduced to a set of finite dimensional problems, for each of which obviously uniqueness implies existence. For this we recall the following result from [24, Appendix D.6].

**Lemma A.2.** *Let  $H$  be a separable Hilbert space, and suppose that  $S : H \mapsto H$  is a compact and symmetric operator. Then there exists a countable orthonormal basis of  $H$  consisting of eigenfunctions of  $S$ .*

**Theorem A.3** (Existence of solutions to (A.3)). *Let the assumptions of Subsec. 2.1 about  $\Omega, u_0$  and  $f$  as the be satisfied. Then the semidiscrete problem (A.3) admits an solution  $u_\tau^0 \in \mathcal{X}_0^r(H_0^1(\Omega))$ .*

**Proof.** The operator  $S := A^{-1} : L^2(\Omega) \mapsto L^2(\Omega)$  with  $A$  being defined in (3.1) is a bounded, linear compact operator mapping  $L^2(\Omega)$  into itself. By means of Lemma A.2 there exists a set of appropriately scaled eigenfunctions  $\{w_k\}_{k=1}^\infty \subset L^2(\Omega)$  with  $w_k \in H_0^1(\Omega)$  such that  $\{w_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$  is an orthogonal basis of  $H_0^1(\Omega)$  and an orthonormal basis of  $L^2(\Omega)$ .



In terms of these eigenfunctions  $\{w_k\}_{k=1}^\infty \subset H_0^1(\Omega)$  the solution  $u_\tau^0$  of problem (A.3) can be represented as

$$u_\tau(x, t) = \sum_{j=0}^r U_n^{(j)}(x) \varphi_n^{(j)}(t) = \sum_{j=0}^r \sum_{k=1}^\infty d_{n,k}^{(j)} w_k(x) \varphi_n^{(j)}(t), \quad \text{for } t \in \bar{I}_n.$$

with coefficients  $d_{n,k}^{(j)} \in \mathbb{R}$  for  $k = 1, \dots, \infty$  and each  $j = 0, \dots, r$  and  $n = 0, \dots, N$ . We choose a basis of testfunctions  $v_\tau \in \mathcal{Y}^{r-1}(H_0^1(\Omega))$  being defined by

$$v_\tau = \begin{cases} w_k \psi_n^{(i)}, & \text{for } t \in \bar{I}_n, \\ 0, & \text{for } t \in I \setminus \bar{I}_n \end{cases}$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, r$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, \infty$  and  $n = 1, \dots, N$ . Then, for each  $k = 1, \dots, \infty$ , we get the finite dimensional problem

$$\sum_{j=0}^r d_{n,k}^{(j)} \underbrace{\int_{I_n} d_t \varphi_n^{(j)}(t) \psi_n^{(i)}(t) dt}_{:=\alpha_{ij}} + \sum_{j=0}^r d_{n,k}^{(j)} \underbrace{a(w_k, w_k)}_{:=\gamma_k} \underbrace{\int_{I_n} \varphi_n^{(j)}(t) \psi_n^{(i)}(t) dt}_{:=\beta_{ij}} \quad (\text{A.6})$$

$$= \underbrace{\int_0^T \langle f_0(t), w_k \rangle \psi_n^{(i)}(t) dt}_{:=b_{k,i}} \quad (\text{A.7})$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, r$  and  $n = 1, \dots, N$ . Due to the continuity of functions  $u_\tau \in \mathcal{X}_0^r(H_0^1(\Omega))$  it holds that

$$U_n^{(0)} = U_{n-1}^{(r)} \quad \text{or} \quad d_{n,k}^{(0)} = d_{n-1,k}^{(r)},$$

respectively. Therefore, we recast the finite dimensional problem (A.6) as

$$\sum_{j=1}^r (\alpha_{ij} + \gamma_k \beta_{ij}) d_{n,k}^{(j)} = b_{k,i} + (\alpha_{i0} + \gamma_k \beta_{i0}) d_{n,k}^{(0)} \quad (\text{A.8})$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, r$  and each  $k = 1, \dots, \infty$ . For the finite dimensional problem (A.8) the uniqueness of the solution established in Thm. A.1 then implies the existence of a solution.  $\blacksquare$

Similarly to Corollary 3.4, the existence and uniqueness of the semidiscrete solution implies that an inf-sup stability condition in the underlying space-time framework is satisfied; cf. [23, p. 85, Thm. 2.6].

**Corollary A.4.** *Let the assumptions of Subsec. 2.1 about  $\Omega, u_0, \mathbf{D}$  and  $f$  be satisfied. Let  $u_\tau^0 \in \mathcal{X}_0^r(H_0^1(\Omega))$  be the unique solution of the semidiscrete problem (A.3) according to Thm. A.1 and A.3. Then, there exists a constant  $c > 0$  such that*

$$\inf_{u_\tau \in \mathcal{X}_0^r(H_0^1(\Omega)) \setminus \{0\}} \sup_{v_\tau \in \mathcal{Y}^{r-1}(H_0^1(\Omega)) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{B(u_\tau, v_\tau)}{\|u_\tau\|_{\mathcal{X}} \|v_\tau\|_{\mathcal{Y}}} \geq c > 0$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
B(u_\tau, v_\tau) &= \int_0^T \langle \partial_t u_\tau + Au_\tau, v_\tau \rangle dt, \\
\|u_\tau\|_{\mathcal{X}} &= \left( \|u_\tau\|_{L^2(I, H_0^1(\Omega))}^2 + \|\partial_t u_\tau\|_{L^2(I, H^{-1}(\Omega))}^2 \right)^{1/2}, \\
\|v_\tau\|_{\mathcal{Y}} &= \|u_\tau\|_{L^2(I, H_0^1(\Omega))}.
\end{aligned} \tag{A.9}$$

**Remark A.5.** *By the arguments of [41, Thm. 6.2] the inf-sup stability condition implies an error estimate for the semidiscretization (A.3) where the error is measured in the corresponding natural norm (A.9) of the scheme.*

## A.2. Proof of Thm. 3.10

**Proof.** We let  $w_\tau := I_\tau u - u_\tau$ ,  $\mathbf{v}_\tau = \mathbf{J}_\tau \mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}_\tau$  with the interpolation operators  $I_\tau$  and  $\mathbf{J}_\tau$  of Subsec. 3.2. Using the inf-sup stability condition (cf. Rem. 3.9) along with problem (2.7), (2.8) and the non-exact semidiscrete problem (3.45), (3.46), applying the inequality of Cauchy–Schwarz and the continuity (3.20) of  $a_\tau(\cdot, \cdot)$  we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\alpha \|\{w_\tau, \mathbf{v}_\tau\}\|_{\mathcal{W}} \|\{\varphi_\tau, \boldsymbol{\psi}_\tau\}\|_{\mathcal{V}} \leq a(\{w_\tau, \mathbf{v}_\tau\}, \{\varphi_\tau, \boldsymbol{\psi}_\tau\}) \\
&= a(\{u^0, \mathbf{q}\}, \{\varphi_\tau, \boldsymbol{\psi}_\tau\}) - a(\{u_\tau^0, \mathbf{q}_\tau\}, \{\varphi_\tau, \boldsymbol{\psi}_\tau\}) \\
&\quad - a(\{u^0 - I_\tau u_\tau^0, \mathbf{q} - \mathbf{J}_\tau \mathbf{q}\}, \{\varphi_\tau, \boldsymbol{\psi}_\tau\}) \\
&= \int_0^T \langle f(t) - \Pi_r f(t), \varphi_\tau \rangle dt - a(\{u^0 - I_\tau u_\tau^0, \mathbf{q} - \mathbf{J}_\tau \mathbf{q}\}, \{\varphi_\tau, \boldsymbol{\psi}_\tau\}) \\
&\leq \|f - \Pi_r f\|_{L^2(I; W)} \|\{\varphi_\tau, \boldsymbol{\psi}_\tau\}\|_{\mathcal{V}} + c_3 \|\{u^0 - I_\tau u_\tau^0, \mathbf{q} - \mathbf{J}_\tau \mathbf{q}\}\|_{\mathcal{W}} \|\{\varphi_\tau, \boldsymbol{\psi}_\tau\}\|_{\mathcal{V}} \\
&\leq \left( \sum_{n=1}^N \left\{ \|f - \Pi_r f\|_{L^2(I; W)}^2 + c_3^2 \|u^0 - I_\tau u_\tau^0\|_{L^2(I_n; W)}^2 \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + c_3^2 \|\partial_t(u^0 - I_\tau u_\tau^0)\|_{L^2(I_n; W)}^2 + c_3^2 \|\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{J}_\tau \mathbf{q}\|_{L^2(I_n; \mathbf{V})}^2 \right\} \right)^{1/2} \cdot \|\{\varphi_\tau, \boldsymbol{\psi}_\tau\}\|_{\mathcal{V}}.
\end{aligned}$$

By means of the approximation properties (3.22) to (3.24) we then get that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\{w_\tau, \mathbf{v}_\tau\}\|_{\mathcal{W}} &\leq \frac{1}{\alpha} \left( \sum_{n=1}^N \tau_n^{2r} \left\{ c_3^2 (c_5^2 \tau_n^2 + c_6^2) \|\partial_t^{r+1} u\|_{L^2(I_n; W)}^2 \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + c_3^2 c_7^2 \tau_n^2 \|\partial_t^{r+1} \mathbf{q}\|_{L^2(I_n; \mathbf{V})}^2 + c_5^2 \tau_n^2 \|\partial_t^{r+1} f\|_{L^2(I_n; W)}^2 \right\} \right)^{1/2}
\end{aligned}$$

Combining this estimate with the triangle inequality yields the assertion of Thm. 3.10. ■