

A STABILIZED FINITE ELEMENT METHOD FOR INVERSE PROBLEMS SUBJECT TO THE CONVECTION–DIFFUSION EQUATION. I: DIFFUSION-DOMINATED REGIME

ERIK BURMAN, MIHAI NECHITA, AND LAURI OKSANEN

ABSTRACT. The numerical approximation of an inverse problem subject to the convection–diffusion equation when diffusion dominates is studied. We derive Carleman estimates that are on a form suitable for use in numerical analysis and with explicit dependence on the Péclet number. A stabilized finite element method is then proposed and analysed. An upper bound on the condition number is first derived. Combining the stability estimates on the continuous problem with the numerical stability of the method, we then obtain error estimates in local H^1 - or L^2 -norms that are optimal with respect to the approximation order, the problem’s stability and perturbations in data. The convergence order is the same for both norms, but the H^1 -estimate requires an additional divergence assumption for the convective field. The theory is illustrated in some computational examples.

1. INTRODUCTION

We consider the convection–diffusion equation

$$(1) \quad \mathcal{L}u := -\mu\Delta u + \beta \cdot \nabla u = f \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is open and bounded, $\mu > 0$ is the diffusion coefficient and $\beta \in [W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)]^n$ is the convective velocity field. For an open subset $\omega \subset \Omega$, let $\tilde{U}_\omega = u|_\omega + \delta$, where we assume $u \in H^2(\Omega)$ is the solution to (1), and $\delta \in L^2(\omega)$ is some perturbation. The data assimilation (or unique continuation) problem consists in finding u given f and \tilde{U}_ω .

The aim is to design a finite element method for data assimilation with weakly consistent regularization applied to the convection–diffusion equation (1). In the present analysis we consider the regime where diffusion dominates and in the companion paper [7] we treat the one with dominating convective transport. To make this more precise we introduce the Péclet number associated to a given length scale l by

$$Pe(l) := \frac{|\beta|l}{\mu},$$

for a suitable norm $|\cdot|$ for β . If h denotes the characteristic length scale of the computation, we define the diffusive regime by $Pe(h) < 1$ and the convective regime by $Pe(h) > 1$. It is known that the character of the system changes drastically in the two regimes and we therefore need to apply different concepts of stability in the two cases. In the present paper we assume that the Péclet number is small and we use an approach similar to that employed

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY COLLEGE LONDON, GOWER STREET, LONDON UK, WC1E 6BT.

E-mail addresses: {e.burman, mihai.nechita.16, l.oksanen}@ucl.ac.uk

Date: November 2, 2018.

for the Laplace equation in [5], for the Helmholtz equation in [8] and for the heat equation in [9], that is we combine conditional stability estimates for the physical problem with optimal numerical stability obtained using a bespoke weakly consistent stabilizing term. For high Péclet numbers on the other hand, we prove in [7] weighted estimates directly on the discrete solution, that reflect the anisotropic character of the convection–diffusion problem.

In the case of optimal control problems subject to convection-diffusion problems that are well-posed, there are several works in the literature on stabilized finite element methods. In [10] the authors considered stabilization using a Galerkin least squares approach in the Lagrangian. Symmetric stabilization in the form of local projection stabilization was proposed in [1] and using penalty on the gradient jumps in [19, 15]. The key difference between the well-posed case and the ill-posed case that we consider herein is that we can not use stability of neither the forward nor the backward equations. Crucial instead is the convergence of the weakly consistent stabilizing terms and the matching of the quantities in the discrete method and the available (best) stability of the continuous problem. Such considerations lead to results both in the case of high and low Péclet numbers, but the different stability properties in the two regimes lead to a different analysis for each case that will be considered in the two parts of this paper.

The main results of this current work are the convergence estimates with explicit dependence on the Péclet number in Theorem 1 and Theorem 2, that rely on the continuous three-ball inequalities in Lemma 2 and Corollary 2.

2. STABILITY ESTIMATES

We prove conditional stability estimates for the unique continuation problem subject to the convection–diffusion equation (1) in the form of three-ball inequalities, see e.g. [17] and the references therein. The novelty here is that we keep track of explicit dependence on the diffusion coefficient μ and the convective vector field β . The first such inequality is proven in Corollary 1, followed by Lemma 2 and Corollary 2, where the norms for measuring the size of the data are weakened to serve the purpose of devising a finite element method in Section 3.

First we prove an auxiliary logarithmic convexity inequality, which is a more explicit version of [16, Lemma 5.2].

Lemma 1. *Suppose that $a, b, c \geq 0$ and $p, q > 0$ satisfy $c \leq b$ and $c \leq e^{p\lambda}a + e^{-q\lambda}b$ for all $\lambda > \lambda_0 \geq 0$. Then there are $C > 0$ and $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ (depending only on p and q) such that*

$$c \leq Ce^{q\lambda_0}a^\kappa b^{1-\kappa}.$$

Proof. We may assume that $a, b > 0$, since $c = 0$ if $a = 0$ or $b = 0$. The minimizer λ_* of the function $f(\lambda) = e^{p\lambda}a + e^{-q\lambda}b$ is given by

$$\lambda_* = \frac{1}{p+q} \log \frac{qb}{pa},$$

and writing $r = q/p$, the minimum value is

$$f(\lambda_*) = a \left(\frac{qb}{pa} \right)^{p/(p+q)} + b \left(\frac{qb}{pa} \right)^{-q/(p+q)} = (r^{p/(p+q)} + r^{-q/(p+q)}) a^{q/(p+q)} b^{p/(p+q)}.$$

This shows that if $\lambda_* > \lambda_0$ then

$$c \leq C_1 a^\kappa b^{1-\kappa},$$

where $\kappa = q/(p+q)$ and $C_1 = r^{p/(p+q)} + r^{-q/(p+q)}$. On the other hand, if $\lambda_* \leq \lambda_0$ then it holds that $e^{-q\lambda_0} \leq e^{-q\lambda_*} = a^{q/(p+q)}(rb)^{-q/(p+q)}$, or equivalently,

$$b^{q/(p+q)} \leq e^{q\lambda_0} a^{q/(p+q)} r^{-q/(p+q)}.$$

Therefore

$$c \leq b = b^{q/(p+q)} b^{p/(p+q)} \leq e^{q\lambda_0} r^{-q/(p+q)} a^{q/(p+q)} b^{p/(p+q)}.$$

That is, if $\lambda_* \leq \lambda_0$ then

$$c \leq C_2 e^{q\lambda_0} a^\kappa b^{1-\kappa},$$

where $C_2 = r^{-q/(p+q)}$. As $e^{q\lambda_0} \geq 1$ and $C_1 > C_2$, the claim follows by taking $C = C_1$. \square

The following Carleman inequality is well-known, see e.g. [16]. For the convenience of the reader we have included an elementary proof in Appendix A.

Proposition 1. *Let $\rho \in C^3(\Omega)$ and $K \subset \Omega$ be a compact set that does not contain critical points of ρ . Let $\alpha, \tau > 0$ and $\phi = e^{\alpha\rho}$. Let $w \in C_0^2(K)$ and $v = e^{\tau\phi}w$. Then there is $C > 0$ such that*

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

for α large enough and $\tau \geq \tau_0$, where $\tau_0 > 1$ depends only on α and ρ .

Using the above Carleman estimate we prove a three-ball inequality that is explicit with respect to μ and β , i.e. the constants in the inequality are independent of the Péclet number. The corresponding inequality with constant depending implicitly on the Péclet number is proven for instance in [17]. We denote by $B(x, r)$ the open ball of radius r centred at x , and by $d(x, \partial\Omega)$ the distance from x to the boundary of Ω .

Corollary 1. *Let $x_0 \in \Omega$ and $0 < r_1 < r_2 < d(x_0, \partial\Omega)$. Define $B_j = B(x_0, r_j)$, $j = 1, 2$. Then there are $C > 0$ and $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ such that for $\mu > 0$, $\beta \in [L^\infty(\Omega)]^n$ and $u \in H^2(\Omega)$ it holds that*

$$\|u\|_{H^1(B_2)} \leq C e^{C\tilde{P}e^2} \left(\|u\|_{H^1(B_1)} + \frac{1}{\mu} \|\mathcal{L}u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \right)^\kappa \|u\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^{1-\kappa},$$

where $\tilde{P}e = 1 + |\beta|/\mu$ and $|\beta| = \|\beta\|_{[L^\infty(\Omega)]^n}$.

Proof. Due to the density of $C^2(\Omega)$ in $H^2(\Omega)$, it is enough to consider $u \in C^2(\Omega)$. Let now $0 < r_0 < r_1$ and $r_2 < r_3 < r_4 < d(x_0, \partial\Omega)$. We choose non-positive $\rho \in C^\infty(\Omega)$ such that $\rho(x) = -d(x, x_0)$ outside B_0 . Since $|\nabla\rho| = 1$ outside B_0 , ρ does not have critical points in $B_4 \setminus B_0$. Let $\chi \in C_0^\infty(B_4 \setminus B_0)$ satisfy $\chi = 1$ in $B_3 \setminus B_1$, and set $w = \chi u$. We apply Proposition 1 with $K = \overline{B_4} \setminus B_0$ to get

$$(2) \quad \mu^2 \int_{B_4 \setminus B_0} (\tau^3 |w|^2 + \tau |\nabla w|^2) e^{2\tau\phi} dx \leq C \int_{B_4 \setminus B_0} |\mu \Delta w|^2 e^{2\tau\phi} dx,$$

for $\phi = e^{\alpha\rho}$, with large enough $\alpha > 0$, and $\tau \geq \tau_0$ (where $\tau_0 > 1$ depends only on α and ρ). We bound from above the right-hand side by a constant times

$$\int_{B_4 \setminus B_0} |\mu\Delta w - \beta \cdot \nabla w|^2 e^{2\tau\phi} \, dx + |\beta|^2 \int_{B_4 \setminus B_0} |\nabla w|^2 e^{2\tau\phi} \, dx.$$

Taking $\tau \geq 2|\beta|^2/\mu^2$, the second term above is absorbed by the left-hand side of (2) to give

$$(3) \quad \mu^2 \int_{B_4 \setminus B_0} (\tau^3 |w|^2 + \frac{\tau}{2} |\nabla w|^2) e^{2\tau\phi} \, dx \leq C \int_{B_4 \setminus B_0} |\mu\Delta w - \beta \cdot \nabla w|^2 e^{2\tau\phi} \, dx.$$

Since $\phi \leq 1$ everywhere, by defining $\Phi(r) = e^{-\alpha r}$ we now bound from below the left-hand side in (3) by

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

An upper bound for the right-hand side in (3) is given by

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

Combining the last two inequalities we thus obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^2 e^{2\tau\Phi(r_2)} \|u\|_{H^1(B_2)}^2 & \leq C e^{2\tau} \left((\mu^2 + |\beta|^2) \|u\|_{H^1(B_1)}^2 + \|\mu\Delta u - \beta \cdot \nabla u\|_{L^2(B_4)}^2 \right) \\ & \quad + C e^{2\tau\Phi(r_3)} (\mu^2 + |\beta|^2) \|u\|_{H^1(B_4)}^2, \end{aligned}$$

for $\tau \geq \tau_0 + 2|\beta|^2/\mu^2$. We divide by μ^2 and conclude by Lemma 1 with $p = 1 - \Phi(r_2) > 0$ and $q = \Phi(r_2) - \Phi(r_3) > 0$, followed by absorbing the $\tilde{P}e = 1 + |\beta|/\mu$ factor into the exponential factor $e^{C\tilde{P}e^2}$. \square

We now shift down the Sobolev indices in Corollary 1 by making a similar argument to that in Section 4 of [11] or Section 2.2 of [8], based on semiclassical pseudodifferential calculus.

Lemma 2. *Let $x_0 \in \Omega$ and $0 < r_1 < r_2 < d(x_0, \partial\Omega)$. Define $B_j = B(x_0, r_j)$, $j = 1, 2$. Then there are $C > 0$ and $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ such that for $\mu > 0$, $\beta \in [L^\infty(\Omega)]^n$ and $u \in H^2(\Omega)$ it holds that*

$$\|u\|_{L^2(B_2)} \leq C e^{C\tilde{P}e^2} \left(\|u\|_{L^2(B_1)} + \frac{1}{\mu} \|\mathcal{L}u\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)} \right)^\kappa \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{1-\kappa},$$

where $\tilde{P}e = 1 + |\beta|/\mu$ and $|\beta| = \|\beta\|_{[L^\infty(\Omega)]^n}$.

Proof. Let $\hbar > 0$ be the semiclassical parameter that satisfies $\hbar = 1/\tau$, where τ is the parameter previously introduced in Proposition 1. The scale of semiclassical Bessel potentials is defined by

$$J^s = (1 - \hbar^2 \Delta)^{s/2}, \quad s \in \mathbb{R},$$

and the semiclassical Sobolev spaces by

$$\|u\|_{H_{\text{scl}}^s(\mathbb{R}^n)} = \|J^s u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}.$$

We will make strong use of the following commutator and pseudolocal estimates for semiclassical pseudodifferential operators, see e.g. [20, Theorem 4.12]. Suppose that $\eta, \vartheta \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and that $\eta = 1$ near $\text{supp}(\vartheta)$, and let A, B be two semiclassical pseudodifferential operators of orders s, m , respectively. Then for all $p, q, N \in \mathbb{R}$, there is $C > 0$,

$$(4) \quad \|[A, B]u\|_{H_{\text{scl}}^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C\hbar \|u\|_{H_{\text{scl}}^{p+s+m-1}(\mathbb{R}^n)},$$

$$(5) \quad \|(1 - \eta)A\vartheta u\|_{H_{\text{scl}}^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C\hbar^N \|u\|_{H_{\text{scl}}^q(\mathbb{R}^n)}.$$

Let $0 < r_j < r_{j+1} < d(x_0, \partial\Omega)$, $j = 0, \dots, 4$ and $B_j = B(x_0, r_j)$, keeping B_1, B_2 unchanged. Let $\tilde{r}_j \in (r_{j-1}, r_j)$ and $\tilde{B}_j = B(x_0, \tilde{r}_j)$, $j = 0, \dots, 3$, where $r_{-1} = 0$. Choose $\rho \in C^\infty(\Omega)$ such that $\rho(x) = -d(x, x_0)$ outside \tilde{B}_0 , and define $\phi = e^{\alpha\rho}$ for large enough α . Consider $v \in C_0^\infty(B_5 \setminus \tilde{B}_0)$. As in Appendix A, by taking $\ell = \phi/\hbar$ and $\sigma = \Delta\ell + 3\alpha\lambda\phi/\hbar$, we obtain

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

Scaling this with $\mu^2 \hbar^4$, we insert the convective term and obtain that

$$C \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\mu e^{\phi/\hbar} \hbar^2 \Delta(e^{-\phi/\hbar} v) - e^{\phi/\hbar} \hbar^2 \beta \cdot \nabla(e^{-\phi/\hbar} v))^2 dx$$

can be bounded from below by

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \hbar \mu^2 (\hbar^2 |\nabla v|^2 + v^2) dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \hbar^2 \mu^2 (\hbar^2 |\nabla v|^2 + v^2) dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (e^{\phi/\hbar} \hbar^2 \beta \cdot \nabla(e^{-\phi/\hbar} v))^2 dx.$$

Since

$$e^{\phi/\hbar} \hbar^2 \beta \cdot \nabla(e^{-\phi/\hbar} v) = -\hbar(\beta \cdot \nabla\phi)v + \hbar^2 \beta \cdot \nabla v,$$

introducing the conjugated operator $Pv = -\hbar^2 e^{\phi/\hbar} \mathcal{L}(e^{-\phi/\hbar} v)$, the previous bound implies

$$C \|Pv\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}^2 \geq \hbar \mu^2 \|v\|_{H_{\text{scl}}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)}^2 - \hbar^2 \mu^2 \|v\|_{H_{\text{scl}}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)}^2 - \hbar^2 |\beta|^2 \|v\|_{H_{\text{scl}}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)}^2.$$

The last two terms in the right-hand side can be absorbed by the first one when

$$(6) \quad \hbar \leq \frac{1}{2} \text{ and } \hbar \leq \frac{1}{2} \frac{\mu^2}{|\beta|^2},$$

thus obtaining

$$(7) \quad \sqrt{\hbar} \mu \|v\|_{H_{\text{scl}}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C \|Pv\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}.$$

Let now $\eta, \vartheta \in C_0^\infty(B_5 \setminus \tilde{B}_0)$ and suppose that $\vartheta = 1$ near $B_4 \setminus B_0$ and $\eta = 1$ near $\text{supp}(\vartheta)$. Let also $\chi \in C_0^\infty(B_4 \setminus B_0)$ satisfy $\chi = 1$ in $B_3 \setminus \tilde{B}_1$. Then there is $\hbar_0 > 0$ such that for $v = \chi w$, $w \in C^\infty(\Omega)$, and $\hbar < \hbar_0$,

$$(8) \quad \|v\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq \|\eta J^{-1} v\|_{H_{\text{scl}}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|(1 - \eta) J^{-1} \vartheta v\|_{H_{\text{scl}}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C \|\eta J^{-1} v\|_{H_{\text{scl}}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)},$$

where we used (5) to absorb one term by the left-hand side. From (8) and (7) we have

$$(9) \quad \sqrt{\hbar} \mu \|v\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C \sqrt{\hbar} \mu \|\eta J^{-1} v\|_{H_{\text{scl}}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C \|P(\eta J^{-1} v)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)},$$

and the commutator estimate (4) gives

$$\|[P, \eta J^{-1}]v\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C\hbar \mu \|v\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} + C\hbar^2 |\beta| \|v\|_{H_{\text{scl}}^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^n)}.$$

Recalling the assumption (6), these terms can be absorbed by the left-hand side of (9), obtaining

$$(10) \quad \sqrt{\hbar}\mu \|v\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C \|\eta J^{-1}(Pv)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C \|Pv\|_{H_{\text{scl}}^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^n)}.$$

We now combine this estimate with the technique used to prove Corollary 1. Consider $u \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and set $w = e^{\phi/\hbar}u$. Take $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ supported in $B_1 \cup (B_5 \setminus \tilde{B}_3)$ with $\psi = 1$ in $(\tilde{B}_1 \setminus B_0) \cup (B_4 \setminus B_3)$. Recall that $\chi \in C_0^\infty(B_4 \setminus B_0)$ satisfies $\chi = 1$ in $B_3 \setminus \tilde{B}_1$. Using (4) to bound the commutator

$$\|[P, \chi]w\|_{H_{\text{scl}}^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq \|[P, \chi]\psi w\|_{H_{\text{scl}}^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C\hbar(\mu + |\beta|) \|\psi w\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)},$$

we obtain from (10) that

$$\sqrt{\hbar}\mu \|\chi w\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C \|\chi Pw\|_{H_{\text{scl}}^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^n)} + C\hbar(\mu + |\beta|) \|\psi w\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}.$$

This leads to

$$\sqrt{\hbar}\mu \|\chi e^{\phi/\hbar}u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C \|\chi e^{\phi/\hbar}(\mu\Delta u - \beta \cdot \nabla u)\|_{H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^n)} + C\hbar(\mu + |\beta|) \|\psi e^{\phi/\hbar}u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)},$$

where we used the norm inequality $\|\cdot\|_{H_{\text{scl}}^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C\hbar^{-2} \|\cdot\|_{H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^n)}$. Letting $\Phi(r) = e^{-\alpha r}$ and using a similar argument as in the proof of Corollary 1, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu e^{\Phi(r_2)/\hbar} \|u\|_{L^2(B_2)} &\leq C e^{1/\hbar} \left((\mu + |\beta|) \|u\|_{L^2(B_1)} + \hbar^{-\frac{3}{2}} \|(\mu\Delta u - \beta \cdot \nabla u)\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)} \right) \\ &\quad + C e^{\Phi(\tilde{r}_3)/\hbar} \hbar^{\frac{1}{2}} (\mu + |\beta|) \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \end{aligned}$$

when \hbar satisfies (6) and is small enough. Absorbing the negative power of \hbar in the exponential, we then use Lemma 1 and conclude by absorbing the $\tilde{P}e = 1 + |\beta|/\mu$ factor into the exponential factor $e^{C\tilde{P}e^2}$. \square

Making the additional coercivity assumption $\nabla \cdot \beta \leq 0$, we can weaken the norms just in the right-hand side of Corollary 1 by using the stability estimate for a well-posed convection-diffusion problem with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions.

Corollary 2. *Let $x_0 \in \Omega$ and $0 < r_1 < r_2 < d(x_0, \partial\Omega)$. Define $B_j = B(x_0, r_j)$, $j = 1, 2$. Then there are $C > 0$ and $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ such that for $\mu > 0$, $\beta \in [W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)]^n$ having $\text{ess sup}_\Omega \nabla \cdot \beta \leq 0$, and $u \in H^2(\Omega)$ it holds that*

$$\|u\|_{H^1(B_2)} \leq C e^{C\tilde{P}e^2} \left(\|u\|_{L^2(B_1)} + \frac{1}{\mu} \|\mathcal{L}u\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)} \right)^\kappa \left(\|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \frac{1}{\mu} \|\mathcal{L}u\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)} \right)^{1-\kappa},$$

where $\tilde{P}e = 1 + |\beta|/\mu$ and $|\beta| = \|\beta\|_{[L^\infty(\Omega)]^n}$.

Proof. Let the balls $B_0, B_3 \subset \Omega$ such that $B_j \subset B_{j+1}$, for $j = 0, 2$. Consider the well-posed problem

$$\mathcal{L}w = \mathcal{L}u \text{ in } B_3, \quad w = 0 \text{ on } \partial B_3.$$

Since $\text{ess sup}_\Omega \nabla \cdot \beta \leq 0$, as a consequence of the divergence theorem we have

$$\|w\|_{H^1(B_3)} \leq C \frac{1}{\mu} \|\mathcal{L}u\|_{H^{-1}(B_3)}.$$

Taking $v = u - w$, we have $\mathcal{L}v = 0$ in B_3 . The stability estimate in Corollary 1 used for B_0, B_2, B_3 reads as

$$\|v\|_{H^1(B_2)} \leq Ce^{C\tilde{P}e^2} \|v\|_{H^1(B_0)}^\kappa \|v\|_{H^1(B_3)}^{1-\kappa},$$

and the following estimates hold

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{H^1(B_2)} &\leq \|v\|_{H^1(B_2)} + \|w\|_{H^1(B_2)} \\ &\leq Ce^{C\tilde{P}e^2} (\|u\|_{H^1(B_0)} + \frac{1}{\mu} \|\mathcal{L}u\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)})^\kappa (\|u\|_{H^1(B_3)} + \frac{1}{\mu} \|\mathcal{L}u\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)})^{1-\kappa}. \end{aligned}$$

Now we choose a cutoff function $\chi \in C_0^\infty(B_1)$ such that $\chi = 1$ in B_0 . Then χu satisfies

$$\mathcal{L}(\chi u) = \chi \mathcal{L}u + [\mathcal{L}, \chi]u, \quad \chi u = 0 \text{ on } \partial B_1,$$

and we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{H^1(B_0)} &\leq \|\chi u\|_{H^1(B_1)} \leq C \frac{1}{\mu} \left(\|[\mathcal{L}, \chi]u\|_{H^{-1}(B_1)} + \|\chi \mathcal{L}u\|_{H^{-1}(B_1)} \right) \\ &\leq C \frac{1}{\mu} \left((\mu + |\beta|) \|u\|_{L^2(B_1)} + \|\mathcal{L}u\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)} \right) \end{aligned}$$

The same argument for $B_3 \subset \Omega$ gives

$$\|u\|_{H^1(B_3)} \leq C \frac{1}{\mu} \left((\mu + |\beta|) \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\mathcal{L}u\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)} \right),$$

thus leading to the conclusion after absorbing the $\tilde{P}e = 1 + |\beta|/\mu$ factor into the exponential factor $e^{C\tilde{P}e^2}$. \square

3. FINITE ELEMENT METHOD

Let V_h denote the space of piecewise affine finite element functions defined on a conforming computational mesh $\mathcal{T}_h = \{K\}$. \mathcal{T}_h consists of shape regular triangular elements K with diameter h_K and is quasi-uniform. We define the global mesh size by $h = \max_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} h_K$. The interior faces of the triangulation will be denoted by \mathcal{F}_i , the jump of a quantity across a face F by $[[\cdot]]_F$, and the outward unit normal by n .

Let $\beta \in [W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)]^n$ and adopt the shorthand notation $|\beta| := \|\beta\|_{[L^\infty(\Omega)]^n}$. As already stated in Section 1, we consider the diffusion-dominated regime given by the low Péclet number

$$(11) \quad Pe(h) := \frac{|\beta|h}{\mu} < 1.$$

We will denote by C a generic positive constant independent of the mesh size and the Péclet number. Let $\pi_h : L^2(\Omega) \mapsto V_h$ denote the standard L^2 -projection on V_h , which for $k = 1, 2$ and $m = 0, k - 1$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \|\pi_h u\|_{H^m(\Omega)} &\leq C \|u\|_{H^m(\Omega)}, \quad u \in H^m(\Omega), \\ \|u - \pi_h u\|_{H^m(\Omega)} &\leq Ch^{k-m} \|u\|_{H^k(\Omega)}, \quad u \in H^k(\Omega). \end{aligned}$$

We introduce the standard inner products with the induced norms

$$(v_h, w_h)_\Omega := \int_\Omega v_h w_h \, dx,$$

$$\langle v_h, w_h \rangle_{\partial\Omega} := \int_{\partial\Omega} v_h w_h \, ds,$$

and the following bilinear forms

$$a_h(v_h, w_h) := (\beta \cdot \nabla v_h, w_h)_\Omega + (\mu \nabla v_h, \nabla w_h)_\Omega - \langle \mu \nabla v_h \cdot n, w_h \rangle_{\partial\Omega},$$

$$s_\Omega(v_h, w_h) := \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_i} \gamma \int_F h(\mu + |\beta|h) [\![\nabla v_h \cdot n]\!]_F [\![\nabla w_h \cdot n]\!]_F \, ds,$$

$$s_\omega(v_h, w_h) := ((\mu + |\beta|h)v_h, w_h)_\omega,$$

$$s(v_h, w_h) := s_\Omega(v_h, w_h) + s_\omega(v_h, w_h),$$

and

$$s_*(v_h, w_h) := \gamma_* (\langle (\mu h^{-1} + |\beta|)v_h, w_h \rangle_{\partial\Omega} + (\mu \nabla v_h, \nabla w_h)_\Omega + s_\Omega(v_h, w_h)).$$

The terms s_Ω and s_* are stabilizing terms, while the term s_ω is aimed for data assimilation. After scaling with the coefficients in the above forms, Lemma 2 in [6] writes as

$$(12) \quad \|(\mu^{\frac{1}{2}}h + |\beta|^{\frac{1}{2}}h^{\frac{3}{2}})v_h\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq C\gamma^{-\frac{1}{2}}s(v_h, v_h)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \forall v_h \in V_h,$$

and Lemma 2 in [9] gives the jump inequality

$$(13) \quad s_\Omega(\pi_h u, \pi_h u) \leq C\gamma(\mu + |\beta|h)h^2|u|_{H^2(\Omega)}^2, \quad \forall u \in H^2(\Omega).$$

The parameters γ and γ_* in s_Ω and s_* , respectively, are fixed at the implementation level and, to alleviate notation, our analysis covers the choice $\gamma = 1 = \gamma_*$.

We can then use the general framework in [4] to write the finite element method for unique continuation subject to (1) as follows. Find $(u_h, z_h) \in [V_h]^2$ such that

$$(14) \quad \begin{cases} a_h(u_h, w_h) - s_*(z_h, w_h) &= (f, w_h)_\Omega \\ a_h(v_h, z_h) + s(u_h, v_h) &= s_\omega(\tilde{U}_\omega, v_h) \end{cases}, \quad \forall (v_h, w_h) \in [V_h]^2,$$

where we recall that $\tilde{U}_\omega = u|_\omega + \delta$ and $u \in H^2(\Omega)$ is the solution to (1).

We observe that by the ill-posed character of the problem, only the stabilization operators s_Ω and s_* provide some stability to the discrete system, and the corresponding system matrix is expected to be ill-conditioned. To quantify this effect we first prove an upper bound on the condition number.

Proposition 2. *The finite element formulation (14) has a unique solution $(u_h, z_h) \in [V_h]^2$ and the Euclidean condition number κ_2 of the system matrix satisfies*

$$\kappa_2 \leq Ch^{-4}.$$

Proof. We write (14) as the linear system $A[(u_h, z_h), (v_h, w_h)] = (f, w_h)_\Omega + s_\omega(\tilde{U}_\omega, v_h)$, for all $(v_h, w_h) \in [V_h]^2$, where

$$A[(u_h, z_h), (v_h, w_h)] := a_h(u_h, w_h) - s_*(z_h, w_h) + a_h(v_h, z_h) + s(u_h, v_h).$$

Since $A[(u_h, z_h), (u_h, -z_h)] = s(u_h, u_h) + s_*(z_h, z_h)$, using (12) the following inf-sup condition holds

$$\Psi_h := \inf_{(u_h, z_h) \in [V_h]^2} \sup_{(v_h, w_h) \in [V_h]^2} \frac{A[(u_h, z_h), (v_h, w_h)]}{\|(u_h, z_h)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|(v_h, w_h)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}} \geq C\mu(1 + Pe(h))h^2.$$

This provides the existence of a unique solution for the linear system. We use [13, Theorem 3.1] to estimate the condition number by

$$(15) \quad \kappa_2 \leq C \frac{\Upsilon_h}{\Psi_h},$$

where

$$\Upsilon_h := \sup_{(u_h, z_h) \in [V_h]^2} \sup_{(v_h, w_h) \in [V_h]^2} \frac{A[(u_h, z_h), (v_h, w_h)]}{\|(u_h, z_h)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|(v_h, w_h)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}}.$$

We recall the following discrete inverse inequality, see for instance [12, Lemma 1.138],

$$(16) \quad \|\nabla v_h\|_{L^2(K)} \leq h^{-1} \|v_h\|_{L^2(K)}, \quad \forall v_h \in \mathbb{P}_1(K).$$

We also recall the following continuous trace inequality, see for instance [18],

$$(17) \quad \|v\|_{L^2(\partial K)} \leq C(h^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|v\|_{L^2(K)} + h^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(K)}), \quad \forall v \in H^1(K),$$

and the discrete one

$$(18) \quad \|\nabla v_h \cdot n\|_{L^2(\partial K)} \leq Ch^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla v_h\|_{L^2(K)}, \quad \forall v_h \in \mathbb{P}_1(K).$$

Using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality together with (18) and (16) we get

$$\begin{aligned} s_\Omega(u_h, v_h) &= \gamma\mu(1 + Pe(h)) \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_i} \int_F h [\nabla u_h \cdot n]_F [\nabla v_h \cdot n]_F \, ds \\ &\leq C\mu(1 + Pe(h))h^{-2} \|u_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|v_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \end{aligned}$$

hence

$$s(u_h, v_h) \leq C\mu(1 + Pe(h))h^{-2} \|u_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|v_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

Combining this with the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the inequalities (16) and (17), we obtain

$$-s_*(z_h, w_h) \leq C\mu(1 + Pe(h))h^{-2} \|z_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|w_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

Again due to the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, and trace and inverse inequalities, we have

$$\begin{aligned} a_h(u_h, w_h) &= (\beta \cdot \nabla u_h, w_h)_\Omega + \mu \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_i} \int_F h [\nabla u_h \cdot n]_F w_h \, ds \\ &\leq C\mu(1 + Pe(h))h^{-2} \|u_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|w_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \end{aligned}$$

Collecting the above estimates we have $\Upsilon_h \leq C\mu(1 + Pe(h))h^{-2}$, and we conclude by (15). \square

3.1. Error estimates for the weakly consistent regularization. The error analysis proceeds in two main steps:

- (i) First we prove that the stabilizing terms and the data fitting term must vanish at an optimal rate for smooth solutions, with constant independent of the physical stability (Proposition 3).
- (ii) Then we show that the residual of the PDE is bounded by the stabilizing terms and the data fitting term. Using this result together with the first step and the continuous stability estimates in Section 2, we prove L^2 - and H^1 -convergence results (Theorems 1 and 2).

To quantify stabilization and data fitting for $(v_h, w_h) \in [V_h]^2$ we introduce the norm

$$\|(v_h, w_h)\|_s^2 := s(v_h, v_h) + s_*(w_h, w_h).$$

We also define the “continuity norm” on $H^{\frac{3}{2}+\epsilon}(\Omega)$, for any $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\|v\|_{\sharp} := \|\beta^{\frac{1}{2}} h^{-\frac{1}{2}} v\|_{\Omega} + \|\mu^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla v\|_{\Omega} + \|\mu^{\frac{1}{2}} h^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla v \cdot n\|_{\partial\Omega}.$$

Using standard approximation properties and the trace inequality (18), we have

$$\|u - \pi_h u\|_{\sharp} \leq C(\mu^{\frac{1}{2}} h + |\beta|^{\frac{1}{2}} h^{\frac{3}{2}}) |u|_{H^2(\Omega)}.$$

Using (13) and interpolation

$$\begin{aligned} \|(u - \pi_h u, 0)\|_s^2 &= s(u - \pi_h u, u - \pi_h u) = s_{\Omega}(\pi_h u, \pi_h u) + s_{\omega}(u - \pi_h u, u - \pi_h u) \\ &\leq C(\mu h^2 + |\beta| h^3) |u|_{H^2(\Omega)}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where we used that $s_{\Omega}(u, v_h) = 0$, since $u \in H^2(\Omega)$. Hence it follows that for $u \in H^2(\Omega)$

$$(19) \quad \|(u - \pi_h u, 0)\|_s + \|u - \pi_h u\|_{\sharp} \leq C(\mu^{\frac{1}{2}} h + |\beta|^{\frac{1}{2}} h^{\frac{3}{2}}) |u|_{H^2(\Omega)}.$$

Observe that, when $Pe(h) < 1$, the first term dominates and the estimate is $O(h)$, whereas when $Pe(h) > 1$ the bound is $O(h^{\frac{3}{2}})$. We note in passing that the same estimates hold for the nodal interpolant.

Lemma 3 (Consistency). *Let $u \in H^2(\Omega)$ be the solution to (1) and $(u_h, z_h) \in [V_h]^2$ the solution to (14), then*

$$a_h(\pi_h u - u_h, w_h) + s_*(z_h, w_h) = a_h(\pi_h u - u, w_h),$$

and

$$-a_h(v_h, z_h) + s(\pi_h u - u_h, v_h) = s_{\Omega}(\pi_h u - u, v_h) + s_{\omega}(\pi_h u - \tilde{U}_{\omega}, v_h),$$

for all $(v_h, w_h) \in [V_h]^2$.

Proof. The first claim follows from the definition of a_h , since

$$a_h(u_h, w_h) - s_*(z_h, w_h) = (f, w_h)_{\Omega} = (\beta \cdot \nabla u - \mu \Delta u, w_h)_{\Omega} = a_h(u, w_h),$$

where in the last equality we integrated by parts. The second claim follows similarly from

$$a_h(v_h, z_h) + s(u_h, v_h) = s_{\omega}(\tilde{U}_{\omega}, v_h),$$

leading to

$$\begin{aligned} -a_h(v_h, z_h) + s(\pi_h u - u_h, v_h) &= s(\pi_h u, v_h) - s_\omega(\tilde{U}_\omega, v_h) \\ &= s_\Omega(\pi_h u - u, v_h) + s_\omega(\pi_h u - \tilde{U}_\omega, v_h). \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 4 (Continuity). *Assume the low Péclet regime (11) and that $|\beta|_{1,\infty} \leq C|\beta|$. Let $v \in H^2(\Omega)$ and $w_h \in V_h$, then*

$$a_h(v, w_h) \leq C\|v\|_\# \|(0, w_h)\|_s.$$

Proof. Writing out the terms of a_h and integrating by parts in the advective term leads to $a_h(v, w_h) = -(v, \beta \cdot \nabla w_h)_\Omega - (v \nabla \cdot \beta, w_h)_\Omega + \langle v \beta \cdot n, w_h \rangle_{\partial\Omega} + (\mu \nabla v, \nabla w_h)_\Omega - \langle \mu \nabla v \cdot n, w_h \rangle_{\partial\Omega}$. Using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the trace inequality (17) for v , we see that

$$\langle v \beta \cdot n, w_h \rangle_{\partial\Omega} + (\mu \nabla v, \nabla w_h)_\Omega - \langle \mu \nabla v \cdot n, w_h \rangle_{\partial\Omega} \leq C\|v\|_\# \|(0, w_h)\|_s.$$

By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and a discrete Poincaré inequality for w_h , see e.g. [2], we bound

$$-(v \nabla \cdot \beta, w_h)_\Omega \leq C|\beta|_{1,\infty} \|v\|_\Omega \|w_h\|_\Omega \leq C \frac{|\beta|_{1,\infty}}{|\beta|} Pe(h)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|v\|_\# \|(0, w_h)\|_s.$$

Under the assumption $|\beta|_{1,\infty} \leq C|\beta|$, we get

$$-(v \nabla \cdot \beta, w_h)_\Omega \leq C Pe(h)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|v\|_\# \|(0, w_h)\|_s.$$

We bound the remaining term by

$$-(v, \beta \cdot \nabla w_h)_\Omega \leq |\beta|^{\frac{1}{2}} h^{\frac{1}{2}} \|v\|_\# \|\nabla w_h\|_\Omega \leq C Pe(h)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|v\|_\# \|(0, w_h)\|_s.$$

Finally, exploiting the low Péclet regime $Pe(h) < 1$, we obtain the conclusion. □

Proposition 3 (Convergence of regularization). *Assume the low Péclet regime (11) and that $|\beta|_{1,\infty} \leq C|\beta|$. Let $u \in H^2(\Omega)$ be the solution to (1) and $(u_h, z_h) \in [V_h]^2$ the solution to (14), then*

$$\|(\pi_h u - u_h, z_h)\|_s \leq C(\mu^{\frac{1}{2}} h + |\beta|^{\frac{1}{2}} h^{\frac{3}{2}})(\|u\|_{H^2(\Omega)} + h^{-1} \|\delta\|_\omega).$$

Proof. Denoting $e_h = \pi_h u - u_h$, it holds by definition that

$$\|(e_h, z_h)\|_s^2 = a_h(e_h, z_h) + s_*(z_h, z_h) - a_h(e_h, z_h) + s(e_h, e_h).$$

Using both claims in Lemma 3 we may write

$$\|(e_h, z_h)\|_s^2 = a_h(\pi_h u - u, z_h) + s_\Omega(\pi_h u - u, e_h) + s_\omega(\pi_h u - \tilde{U}_\omega, e_h).$$

Lemma 4 gives the bound

$$a_h(\pi_h u - u, z_h) \leq C\|\pi_h u - u\|_\# \|(0, z_h)\|_s.$$

The other terms are simply bounded using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality as follows

$$s_\Omega(\pi_h u - u, e_h) + s_\omega(\pi_h u - \tilde{U}_\omega, e_h) \leq (\|(\pi_h u - u, 0)\|_s + (\mu^{\frac{1}{2}} + |\beta|^{\frac{1}{2}} h^{\frac{1}{2}}) \|\delta\|_\omega) \|(e_h, 0)\|_s.$$

Collecting the above bounds we have

$$\|(e_h, z_h)\|_s^2 \leq C(\|\pi_h u - u\|_\# + \|(\pi_h u - u, 0)\|_s + (\mu^{\frac{1}{2}} + |\beta|^{\frac{1}{2}} h^{\frac{1}{2}}) \|\delta\|_\omega) \|(e_h, z_h)\|_s,$$

and the claim follows by applying the approximation (19). \square

Lemma 5 (Coverage of the convective term). *Assume the low Péclet regime (11) and that $|\beta|_{1,\infty} \leq C|\beta|$. Let $u \in H^2(\Omega)$ be the solution to (1), $(u_h, z_h) \in [V_h]^2$ the solution to (14) and $w \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, then*

$$(\beta \cdot \nabla u_h, w - \pi_h w)_\Omega \leq C(\mu + |\beta|)(h\|u\|_{H^2(\Omega)} + \|\delta\|_\omega)\|w\|_{H^1(\Omega)},$$

Proof. Denote by $\beta_h \in [V_h]^n$ a piecewise linear approximation of β that is L^∞ -stable and for which

$$\|\beta - \beta_h\|_{0,\infty} \leq Ch|\beta|_{1,\infty},$$

and recall the approximation estimate in [3, Theorem 2.2]

$$(20) \quad \inf_{x_h \in V_h} \|h^{\frac{1}{2}}(\beta_h \cdot \nabla u_h - x_h)\|_\Omega \leq C \left(\sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_i} \|h\llbracket \beta_h \cdot \nabla u_h \rrbracket\|_F^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C|\beta|^{\frac{1}{2}} s_\Omega(u_h, u_h)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

We also use Proposition 3 and the jump inequality (13) to estimate

$$\begin{aligned} s_\Omega(u_h, u_h)^{\frac{1}{2}} &\leq s_\Omega(u_h - \pi_h u, u_h - \pi_h u)^{\frac{1}{2}} + s_\Omega(\pi_h u, \pi_h u)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C(\mu^{\frac{1}{2}}h + |\beta|^{\frac{1}{2}}h^{\frac{3}{2}})(|u|_{H^2(\Omega)} + h^{-1}\|\delta\|_\omega) + C(\mu^{\frac{1}{2}} + |\beta|^{\frac{1}{2}}h^{\frac{1}{2}})h|u|_{H^2(\Omega)}, \end{aligned}$$

obtaining

$$(21) \quad s_\Omega(u_h, u_h)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C(\mu^{\frac{1}{2}}h + |\beta|^{\frac{1}{2}}h^{\frac{3}{2}})(|u|_{H^2(\Omega)} + h^{-1}\|\delta\|_\omega).$$

We now write

$$(\beta \cdot \nabla u_h, w - \pi_h w)_\Omega = (\beta_h \cdot \nabla u_h, w - \pi_h w)_\Omega + ((\beta - \beta_h) \cdot \nabla u_h, w - \pi_h w)_\Omega,$$

and using orthogonality, (20), (21), interpolation and (11), we bound the first term by

$$\begin{aligned} (\beta_h \cdot \nabla u_h, w - \pi_h w)_\Omega &\leq C|\beta|^{\frac{1}{2}}h^{-\frac{1}{2}}s_\Omega(u_h, u_h)^{\frac{1}{2}}h\|w\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \\ &\leq C|\beta|^{\frac{1}{2}}h^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mu^{\frac{1}{2}} + |\beta|^{\frac{1}{2}}h^{\frac{1}{2}})(h|u|_{H^2(\Omega)} + \|\delta\|_\omega)\|w\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \\ &\leq C(\mu + |\beta|h)(h|u|_{H^2(\Omega)} + \|\delta\|_\omega)\|w\|_{H^1(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

We now use the Poincaré-type inequality (12) and interpolation to bound the second term

$$\begin{aligned} ((\beta - \beta_h) \cdot \nabla u_h, w - \pi_h w)_\Omega &\leq Ch^2|\beta|_{1,\infty}\|\nabla u_h\|_\Omega\|w\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \\ &\leq Ch|\beta|_{1,\infty}(\mu^{\frac{1}{2}} + |\beta|^{\frac{1}{2}}h^{\frac{1}{2}})^{-1}s(u_h, u_h)^{\frac{1}{2}}\|w\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \\ &\leq Ch|\beta|_{1,\infty}(h|u|_{H^2(\Omega)} + \|u\|_\Omega + \|\delta\|_\omega)\|w\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \\ &\leq Ch|\beta|_{1,\infty}(\|u\|_{H^2(\Omega)} + \|\delta\|_\omega)\|w\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \end{aligned}$$

since due to Proposition 3 and inequality (13)

$$\begin{aligned} s(u_h, u_h)^{\frac{1}{2}} &\leq s(u_h - \pi_h u, u_h - \pi_h u)^{\frac{1}{2}} + s_\Omega(\pi_h u, \pi_h u)^{\frac{1}{2}} + s_\omega(\pi_h u, \pi_h u)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C(\mu^{\frac{1}{2}} + |\beta|^{\frac{1}{2}}h^{\frac{1}{2}})(h|u|_{H^2(\Omega)} + \|\delta\|_\omega + \|u\|_\Omega). \end{aligned}$$

Under the assumption $|\beta|_{1,\infty} \leq C|\beta|$, we collect the above bounds to get

$$(\beta \cdot \nabla u_h, w - \pi_h w)_\Omega \leq C(\mu + |\beta|)(h\|u\|_{H^2(\Omega)} + \|\delta\|_\omega)\|w\|_{H^1(\Omega)}.$$

\square

Theorem 1 (L^2 -error estimate). *Assume the low Péclet regime (11) and that $|\beta|_{1,\infty} \leq C|\beta|$. Let $u \in H^2(\Omega)$ be the solution to (1) and $(u_h, z_h) \in [V_h]^2$ the solution to (14), then there is $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ such that*

$$\|u - u_h\|_{L^2(B)} \leq Ch^\kappa e^{C\tilde{P}e^2} (\|u\|_{H^2(\Omega)} + h^{-1}\|\delta\|_\omega),$$

where $\tilde{P}e = 1 + |\beta|/\mu$.

Proof. Let us consider the residual defined by $\langle r, w \rangle = a_h(u_h, w) - \langle f, w \rangle$, for $w \in H_0^1(\Omega)$. Using (14) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \langle r, w \rangle &= a_h(u_h, w - \pi_h w) - \langle f, w - \pi_h w \rangle + a_h(u_h, \pi_h w) - \langle f, \pi_h w \rangle \\ &= a_h(u_h, w - \pi_h w) - \langle f, w - \pi_h w \rangle + s_*(z_h, \pi_h w). \end{aligned}$$

We split the first term in the right-hand side into convective and non-convective terms, and for the latter we integrate by parts on each element K and use Cauchy-Schwarz followed by the trace inequality (17) to get

$$\begin{aligned} (\mu \nabla u_h, \nabla(w - \pi_h w))_\Omega - \langle \mu \nabla u_h \cdot n, w - \pi_h w \rangle_{\partial\Omega} &= \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_i} \int_F \mu \llbracket \nabla u_h \cdot n \rrbracket_F (w - \pi_h w) \, ds \\ &\leq C\mu(\mu + |\beta|h)^{-\frac{1}{2}} s_\Omega(u_h, u_h)^{\frac{1}{2}} (h^{-1}\|w - \pi_h w\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|w - \pi_h w\|_{H^1(\Omega)}). \end{aligned}$$

Using (21) and interpolation we obtain

$$(\mu \nabla u_h, \nabla(w - \pi_h w))_\Omega - \langle \mu \nabla u_h \cdot n, w - \pi_h w \rangle_{\partial\Omega} \leq C\mu(h|u|_{H^2(\Omega)} + \|\delta\|_\omega)\|w\|_{H^1(\Omega)}.$$

We bound the convective term in $a_h(u_h, w - \pi_h w)$ by Lemma 5, hence obtaining

$$a_h(u_h, w - \pi_h w) \leq C(\mu + |\beta|)(h|u|_{H^2(\Omega)} + \|\delta\|_\omega)\|w\|_{H^1(\Omega)}.$$

The next term in the residual is bounded by

$$\langle f, w - \pi_h w \rangle \leq \|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|w - \pi_h w\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq Ch\|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|w\|_{H^1(\Omega)}.$$

The last term left to bound from the residual is

$$s_*(z_h, \pi_h w) \leq \|(0, z_h)\|_s \|(0, \pi_h w)\|_s,$$

and using (18) for the jump term, together with the H^1 -stability of π_h , we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(0, \pi_h w)\|_s &\leq C(\mu^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\nabla(\pi_h w)\|_\Omega + (\mu^{\frac{1}{2}} + |\beta|^{\frac{1}{2}}h^{\frac{1}{2}})\|\nabla(\pi_h w)\|_\Omega + (\mu h^{-1} + |\beta|)^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\pi_h w\|_{\partial\Omega}) \\ &\leq C(\mu^{\frac{1}{2}} + |\beta|^{\frac{1}{2}}h^{\frac{1}{2}})\|w\|_{H^1(\Omega)}, \end{aligned}$$

where for the boundary term we used that $w|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$ together with interpolation and (17).

Bounding $\|(0, z_h)\|_s$ by Proposition 3, we get

$$s_*(z_h, \pi_h w) \leq C(\mu + |\beta|h)(h|u|_{H^2(\Omega)} + \|\delta\|_\omega)\|w\|_{H^1(\Omega)}.$$

Collecting the above estimates we bound the residual norm by

$$\begin{aligned} \|r\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)} &\leq C(\mu + |\beta|)(h|u|_{H^2(\Omega)} + \|\delta\|_\omega) + Ch\|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &\leq C(\mu + |\beta|)(h|u|_{H^2(\Omega)} + \|\delta\|_\omega). \end{aligned}$$

We now use the stability estimate in Lemma 2 to write

$$\|u - u_h\|_{L^2(B)} \leq C e^{C\tilde{P}e^2} \left(\|u - u_h\|_{L^2(\omega)} + \frac{1}{\mu} \|r\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)} \right)^\kappa \|u - u_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{1-\kappa}.$$

By Proposition 3 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|u - u_h\|_{L^2(\omega)} &\leq \|u - \pi_h u\|_{L^2(\omega)} + \|u_h - \pi_h u\|_{L^2(\omega)} \\ &\leq Ch^2 |u|_{H^2(\Omega)} + Ch |u|_{H^2(\Omega)} + C \|\delta\|_\omega. \\ &\leq C(h |u|_{H^2(\Omega)} + \|\delta\|_\omega). \end{aligned}$$

Using (12) and Proposition 3 again, we bound

$$\begin{aligned} \|u - u_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} &\leq \|u - \pi_h u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|u_h - \pi_h u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &\leq Ch^2 |u|_{H^2(\Omega)} + C(\mu^{\frac{1}{2}} h + |\beta|^{\frac{1}{2}} h^{\frac{3}{2}})^{-1} s(u_h - \pi_h u, u_h - \pi_h u)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C(|u|_{H^2(\Omega)} + h^{-1} \|\delta\|_\omega). \end{aligned}$$

Hence we conclude by

$$\begin{aligned} \|u - u_h\|_{L^2(B)} &\leq C e^{C\tilde{P}e^2} (h \|u\|_{H^2(\Omega)} + \|\delta\|_\omega)^\kappa (|u|_{H^2(\Omega)} + h^{-1} \|\delta\|_\omega)^{1-\kappa} \\ &\leq C e^{C\tilde{P}e^2} h^\kappa (\|u\|_{H^2(\Omega)} + h^{-1} \|\delta\|_\omega), \end{aligned}$$

where we have absorbed the $\tilde{P}e = 1 + |\beta|/\mu$ factor into the exponential factor $e^{C\tilde{P}e^2}$. \square

Theorem 2 (H^1 -error estimate). *Assume the low Péclet regime (11) and that $|\beta|_{1,\infty} \leq C|\beta|$ and $\text{ess sup}_\Omega \nabla \cdot \beta \leq 0$. Let $u \in H^2(\Omega)$ be the solution to (1), and $(u_h, z_h) \in [V_h]^2$ the solution to (14), then there is $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ such that*

$$\|u - u_h\|_{H^1(B)} \leq Ch^\kappa e^{C\tilde{P}e^2} (\|u\|_{H^2(\Omega)} + h^{-1} \|\delta\|_\omega),$$

where $\tilde{P}e = 1 + |\beta|/\mu$.

Proof. Letting $e_h = u - u_h$, we combine the proof of Theorem 1 with the stability estimate in Corollary 2 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|e_h\|_{H^1(B)} &\leq C e^{C\tilde{P}e^2} \left(\|e_h\|_{L^2(\omega)} + \frac{1}{\mu} \|r\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)} \right)^\kappa \left(\|e_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \frac{1}{\mu} \|r\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)} \right)^{1-\kappa} \\ &\leq C e^{C\tilde{P}e^2} h^\kappa (\|u\|_{H^2(\Omega)} + h^{-1} \|\delta\|_\omega). \end{aligned}$$

\square

4. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS

We illustrate the theoretical results with some numerical examples. The implementation of the stabilized FEM (14) has been carried out in FreeFem++ [14] on uniform triangulations with alternating left and right diagonals. The mesh size is taken as the inverse square root of the number of nodes. The parameters in s_Ω and s_* are set to $\gamma = 10^{-5}$ and $\gamma_* = 1$. We also rescale the boundary term in s_* by the factor 50, drawing on results from different numerical experiments. In this section we denote $e_h = \pi_h u - u_h$.

We consider Ω to be the unit square and the exact solution with global unit L^2 -norm

$$u(x, y) = 30x(1 - x)y(1 - y).$$

We take the diffusion coefficient $\mu = 1$ and investigate two cases for the convection field: the coercive case of the constant field

$$\beta_c = (1, 0),$$

and the case

$$\beta_{nc} = 100(x + y, y - x),$$

plotted in Figure 1, for which $\nabla \cdot \beta = 200$ and $\|\beta\|_{0,\infty} = 200$. This makes the (well-posed) problem strongly non-coercive with a medium high Péclet number. The latter example was also considered in [4] for numerical experiments on a non-coercive convection-diffusion equation with Cauchy data.

We consider the following domains for data assimilation, shown in Figure 2,

$$(22) \quad \omega = (0.2, 0.45) \times (0.2, 0.45), \quad B = (0.2, 0.45) \times (0.55, 0.8),$$

$$(23) \quad \omega = (0, 0.125) \times (0.4, 0.6) \cup (0.875, 1) \times (0.4, 0.6), \quad B = (0.25, 0.75) \times (0.4, 0.6),$$

$$(24) \quad \omega = \Omega \setminus [0, 0.875] \times [0.125, 0.875], \quad B = \Omega \setminus [0, 0.125] \times [0.125, 0.875].$$






FIGURE 1. Left: convection field β_{nc} . Right: condition number κ_2 for domains (22), $\beta = \beta_c$; the dotted lines are proportional to h^{-3} and h^{-4} .


The condition number upper bound in Proposition 2 is illustrated for a particular case in Figure 1, where we plot the condition number κ_2 versus the mesh size h , together with reference dotted lines proportional to h^{-3} and h^{-4} . For five meshes with 2^N elements on each side, $N = 3, \dots, 7$, the approximate rates for κ_2 are -3.03, -3.16, -3.2, -3.34.



(a) Boundaries for (22).



(b) Boundaries for (23).





(c) Boundaries for (24).

FIGURE 2. Computational domains.

The results in Figure 3 for the domains (22) strongly agree with the convergence rates expected from Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 for the relative errors in B computed in the L^2 - and H^1 -norms, and with the rates for $\|(e_h, z_h)\|_s$ given in Proposition 3.


The numerical approximation improves when considering the setting in (23), in which data is given both downstream and upstream, as reported in Figure 4. The convergence is almost linear and the size of the errors is considerably reduced in the non-coercive case. The resolution increases all the more when data is given near a big part of the boundary $\partial\Omega$, as for the computational domains (24). For both convective fields β_c and β_{nc} , the L^2 -errors decrease below 10^{-4} with superlinear rates on the same meshes considered in Figure 3 and Figure 4. We leave out the figure in this case.

(a) Circles: H^1 -error, rate ≈ 0.45 ; Squares: L^2 -error, rate ≈ 0.56 ; Up triangles: $s(e_h, e_h)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, rate ≈ 1.1 ; Down triangles: $s_*(z_h, z_h)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, rate ≈ 1.33 .(b) Circles: H^1 -error, rate ≈ 0.29 ; Squares: L^2 -error, rate ≈ 0.42 ; Up triangles: $s(e_h, e_h)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, rate ≈ 1.32 ; Down triangles: $s_*(z_h, z_h)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, rate ≈ 1.34 .FIGURE 3. Convergence for domains (22). Left: $\beta = \beta_c$. Right: $\beta = \beta_{nc}$.

Comparing the geometries in (22) and (23) we also expect to see different effects of the two convective fields β_c and β_{nc} . Notice that for both geometries the horizontal magnitude of β_{nc} is greater than that of β_c . In (22) the solution is continued in the crosswind direction for both β_c and β_{nc} , and a stronger convective field is not expected to improve the reconstruction. On the other side, in (23) information is propagated both downstream and

upstream, and a stronger convective field can improve the resolution, despite the increase in the Péclet number. Indeed, we can see in Figure 3 that for the geometry in (22) the numerical approximation is better for β_c than for β_{nc} , while Figure 4 shows better results for β_{nc} than for β_c in the case of (23), especially for the L^2 -error.


To exemplify the noisy data $\tilde{U}_\omega = u|_\omega + \delta$, we perturb the restriction of u to ω on every node of the mesh with uniformly distributed values in $[-h^{\frac{1}{2}}, h^{\frac{1}{2}}]$, respectively $[-h, h]$. Recall that by the error estimates in Section 3 the contribution of the perturbation δ is bounded by $h^{-1}\|\delta\|_\omega$. It can be seen in Figure 5 that the perturbations are strongly visible for an $O(h^{\frac{1}{2}})$ amplitude, but not for an $O(h)$ one.



(a) Circles: H^1 -error, rate ≈ 0.8 ; Squares: L^2 -error, rate ≈ 0.94 ; Up triangles: $s(e_h, e_h)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, rate ≈ 1.24 ; Down triangles: $s_*(z_h, z_h)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, rate ≈ 1.2 .

(b) Circles: H^1 -error, rate ≈ 1.02 ; Squares: L^2 -error, rate ≈ 1.07 ; Up triangles: $s(e_h, e_h)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, rate ≈ 1.3 ; Down triangles: $s_*(z_h, z_h)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, rate ≈ 1.25 .

FIGURE 4. Convergence for domains (23). Left: $\beta = \beta_c$. Right: $\beta = \beta_{nc}$.



(a) Noise amplitude $O(h^{\frac{1}{2}})$.

(b) Noise amplitude $O(h)$.

FIGURE 5. Convergence for perturbed \tilde{U}_ω in domains (22), $\beta = \beta_c$.

APPENDIX A.

Denote by (\cdot, \cdot) , $|\cdot|$, div , ∇ and D^2 the inner product, norm, divergence, gradient and Hessian in the Euclidean setting of $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. We recall the following identity [8, Lemma 1].

Lemma 6. *Let $\ell, w \in C^2(\Omega)$ and $\sigma \in C^1(\Omega)$. We define $v = e^\ell w$ and*

$$a = \sigma - \Delta\ell, \quad q = a + |\nabla\ell|^2, \quad b = -\sigma v - 2(\nabla v, \nabla\ell), \quad B = (|\nabla v|^2 - qv^2)\nabla\ell.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} e^{2\ell}(\Delta w)^2/2 &= (\Delta v + qv)^2/2 + b^2/2 \\ &\quad + a|\nabla v|^2 + 2D^2\ell(\nabla v, \nabla v) + (-a|\nabla\ell|^2 + 2D^2\ell(\nabla\ell, \nabla\ell))v^2 \\ &\quad + \text{div}(b\nabla v + B) + R, \end{aligned}$$

where $R = (\nabla\sigma, \nabla v)v + (\text{div}(a\nabla\ell) - a\sigma)v^2$.

Proof of Proposition 1. Let $\ell = \tau\phi$ and let $\lambda > 0$ such that $|D^2\rho(X, X)| \leq \lambda|X|^2$. For a vector field X recall the identity $D^2\phi(X, X) = (D_X\nabla\phi, X)$, where D_X is the covariant derivative, which gives

$$D^2\phi(X, X) = \alpha\phi(\alpha(\nabla\rho, X)^2 + D^2\rho(X, X)),$$

hence

$$D^2\phi(X, X) \geq \alpha\phi D^2\rho(X, X) \geq -\alpha\lambda\phi|X|^2.$$

Combining this with the previous equality, we obtain

$$D^2\phi(\nabla\phi, \nabla\phi) \geq \alpha^3\phi^3(\alpha|\nabla\rho|^4 - \lambda|\nabla\rho|^2).$$

Choosing $\epsilon > 0$ such that $\epsilon \leq |\nabla\rho|^2 \leq \epsilon^{-1}$ it holds

$$D^2\phi(\nabla\phi, \nabla\phi) \geq \alpha^3\phi^3(\alpha\epsilon^2 - \lambda\epsilon^{-1}).$$

Since

$$2D^2\ell(\nabla v, \nabla v) \geq -2\alpha\lambda\phi\tau|\nabla v|^2,$$

by choosing $\sigma = \Delta\ell + 3\alpha\lambda\phi\tau$, i.e. $a = 3\alpha\lambda\phi\tau$ in Lemma 6 we obtain the bounds

$$\begin{aligned} a|\nabla v|^2 + 2D^2\ell(\nabla v, \nabla v) &\geq \alpha\lambda\phi\tau|\nabla v|^2, \\ (-a|\nabla\ell|^2 + 2D^2\ell(\nabla\ell, \nabla\ell))v^2 &\geq (2\alpha\epsilon^2 - (3 + 2\lambda)\epsilon^{-1})(\alpha\phi\tau)^3v^2. \end{aligned}$$

We now bound

$$(\nabla\sigma, \nabla v)v = (\nabla(\Delta\ell), \nabla v)v + 3\alpha\lambda(\nabla\ell, \nabla v)v \geq -(|\nabla(\Delta\phi)| + 3\alpha\lambda|\nabla\phi|)\tau|\nabla v||v|$$

and

$$(\text{div}(a\nabla\ell) - a\sigma)v^2 = ((\nabla a, \nabla\ell) - a^2)v^2 \geq (3\alpha\lambda|\nabla\phi|^2 - 9\alpha^2\lambda^2\phi^2)\tau^2v^2.$$

Combining these lower bounds with

$$\tau|\nabla v||v| \leq \frac{1}{2}(|\nabla v|^2 + \tau^2|v|^2),$$

and taking α large enough, we obtain from Lemma 6 that

$$(25) \quad Ce^{2\tau\phi}(\Delta w)^2 \geq (a_1\tau^3 - a_2\tau^2)v^2 + (b_1\tau - b_0)|\nabla v|^2 + \text{div}(b\nabla v + B),$$

with $a_j, b_j > 0$ depending only on α, ϕ and λ . Taking τ large enough and using the elementary inequality

$$|\nabla v|^2 = e^{2\tau\phi} |\tau w \nabla \phi + \nabla w|^2 \geq e^{2\tau\phi} \frac{1}{2} |\nabla w|^2 - e^{2\tau\phi} |\nabla \phi|^2 \tau^2 w^2,$$

we conclude by integrating over K and using the divergence theorem. \square

Acknowledgements. Erik Burman was supported by EPSRC grants EP/P01576X/1 and EP/P012434/1. Lauri Oksanen was supported by EPSRC grants EP/P01593X/1 and EP/R002207/1.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. Becker and B. Vexler. Optimal control of the convection-diffusion equation using stabilized finite element methods. *Numer. Math.*, 106(3):349–367, 2007.
- [2] S. C. Brenner. Poincaré-Friedrichs inequalities for piecewise H^1 functions. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 41(1):306–324, 2003.
- [3] E. Burman. A unified analysis for conforming and nonconforming stabilized finite element methods using interior penalty. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 43(5):2012–2033, 2005.
- [4] E. Burman. Stabilized finite element methods for nonsymmetric, noncoercive, and ill-posed problems. Part I: elliptic equations. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 35(6):A2752–A2780, 2013.
- [5] E. Burman. Error estimates for stabilized finite element methods applied to ill-posed problems. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 352(7-8):655–659, 2014.
- [6] E. Burman, P. Hansbo, and M. G. Larson. Solving ill-posed control problems by stabilized finite element methods: an alternative to Tikhonov regularization. *Inverse Problems*, 34:035004, 2018.
- [7] E. Burman, M. Nechita, and L. Oksanen. A stabilized finite element method for inverse problems subject to the convection–diffusion equation. II: convection dominated regime. *in preparation*, 2018.
- [8] E. Burman, M. Nechita, and L. Oksanen. Unique continuation for the Helmholtz equation using stabilized finite element methods. *J. Math. Pures Appl.*, 2018.
- [9] E. Burman and L. Oksanen. Data assimilation for the heat equation using stabilized finite element methods. *Numer. Math.*, 139(3):505–528, 2018.
- [10] L. Dede’ and A. Quarteroni. Optimal control and numerical adaptivity for advection-diffusion equations. *M2AN Math. Model. Numer. Anal.*, 39(5):1019–1040, 2005.
- [11] D. Dos Santos Ferreira, C. E. Kenig, M. Salo, and G. Uhlmann. Limiting Carleman weights and anisotropic inverse problems. *Invent. Math.*, 178(1):119–171, 2009.
- [12] A. Ern and J.-L. Guermond. *Theory and practice of finite elements*, volume 159 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2004.
- [13] A. Ern and J.-L. Guermond. Evaluation of the condition number in linear systems arising in finite element approximations. *M2AN Math. Model. Numer. Anal.*, 40(1):29–48, 2006.
- [14] F. Hecht. New development in FreeFem++. *J. Numer. Math.*, 20(3-4):251–265, 2012.
- [15] M. Hinze, N. Yan, and Z. Zhou. Variational discretization for optimal control governed by convection dominated diffusion equations. *J. Comput. Math.*, 27(2-3):237–253, 2009.
- [16] J. Le Rousseau and G. Lebeau. On Carleman estimates for elliptic and parabolic operators. Applications to unique continuation and control of parabolic equations. *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.*, 18(3):712–747, 2012.
- [17] E. Malinnikova and S. Vessella. Quantitative uniqueness for elliptic equations with singular lower order terms. *Math. Ann.*, 353(4):1157–1181, 2012.
- [18] P. Monk and E. Süli. The adaptive computation of far-field patterns by a posteriori error estimation of linear functionals. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 36(1):251–274, 1999.
- [19] N. Yan and Z. Zhou. A priori and a posteriori error analysis of edge stabilization Galerkin method for the optimal control problem governed by convection-dominated diffusion equation. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.*, 223(1):198–217, 2009.

- [20] M. Zworski. *Semiclassical analysis*, volume 138 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2012.