

Local Averaging Type a Posteriori Error Estimates for the Nonlinear Steady-state Poisson-Nernst-Planck Equations

Ying Yang¹ · Ruigang Shen² · Mingjuan Fang³ · Shi Shu^{4,*}

Received: date / Accepted: date

Abstract The a posteriori error estimates are studied for a class of nonlinear steady-state Poisson-Nernst-Planck equations, which are a coupled system consisting of the Nernst-Planck equation and the Poisson equation. Both the global upper bounds and the local lower bounds of the error estimators are obtained by using a local averaging operator. Numerical experiments are given to confirm the reliability and efficiency of the error estimators.

Keywords Poisson-Nernst-Planck equations · a posteriori error estimates · finite element · local averaging · nonlinear

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010) 65N15 · 65N30

✉ Shi Shu
shushi@xtu.edu.cn

Ying Yang
yangying@lsec.cc.ac.cn

Ruigang Shen
shenruigang@163.com

Mingjuan Fang
mingjuanfang2012@163.com

¹ School of Mathematics and Computational Science, Guangxi Colleges and Universities Key Laboratory of Data Analysis and Computation, Guilin University of Electronic Technology, Guilin 541004, People's Republic of China

² School of Mathematics and Computational Science, Hunan Key Laboratory for Computation and Simulation in Science and Engineering, Xiangtan University, Xiangtan 411105, People's Republic of China

³ School of Mathematics and Computational Science, Guilin University of Electronic Technology, Guilin 541004, Guangxi, People's Republic of China

^{4,*} **Corresponding author.** Hunan Key Laboratory for Computation and Simulation in Science and Engineering, Key Laboratory of Intelligent Computing and Information Processing of Ministry of Education, Xiangtan University, Xiangtan 411105, People's Republic of China

1 Introduction

In this paper, we study the a posteriori error estimates for a class of nonlinear steady-state Poisson-Nernst-Planck (PNP) equations. The classic PNP equations were originally proposed by Nernst [1] and Planck [2] which were used to describe the mass conservation of ions and the process of the electrostatic diffusion-reaction. As an important mathematical model to describe the ion transport, PNP equations have been widely applied to study the transport of charged particles in semiconductors [3, 4], electrochemical systems [5, 6, 7], the process of the electrostatic diffusion-reaction [8, 9], and ion conversion between biological membrane channels [10, 11], etc.

However, the classical PNP equations have some drawbacks in simulating the physical or biological phenomenon in some practical problems. For example, the PNP model cannot reflect the effects caused by the ion size effect when it is used to simulate the experimental data of the ion channel. However, these effects are of great importance in determining selectivity of channels and the properties of ionic solutions in general [12]. In order to observe and study the biochemical phenomena in the experiment more precisely and then analyze the corresponding diffusion phenomena and principles in detail, some modified PNP equations are presented to deal with the existing limitations. Lu and Zhou [8] proposed a class of nonlinear PNP equations including the ion size effect. Compared with the classic PNP equations, the nonlinear PNP equations are more effective in simulating the biomolecular diffusion-reaction processes. By taking the protein (ion channel) structure into account, Hyon et al. [13] developed a class of nonlinear PNP system for ion channel. Compared with the primitive PNP model, these modifications in PNP models cause strong nonlinearity, which brings many difficulties in analysis and computation.

Due to the coupling between the electrostatic potential and concentrations of the ionic species, the PNP system can hardly be solved analytically. Hence, there appears a lot of literature on numerical methods for PNP equations, including the finite difference method [14, 15, 16], the finite volume method [17, 18], and the finite element method [8, 19, 20], etc. In terms of error analysis, there are some work on the finite element method. In [21], Yang and Lu presented a finite element error analysis for a type of steady-state PNP equations modeling the electrodiffusion of ions in a solvated biomolecular system. Sun et al. [22] analyzed the a priori error estimates of the finite element approximation to a type of time-dependent PNP equations, in which a fully implicit nonlinear Crank-Nicolson scheme is studied and the optimal H^1 norm error estimate is obtained for both the ion concentration and electrostatic potential. Gao and He [20] constructed a linearized conservative finite element method to discrete the PNP system with zero Neumann boundary conditions and established unconditionally optimal error estimates in L^2 norm. The superconvergence analysis of finite element method for the time-dependent PNP equations is studied by Shi and Yang in [23]. Besides, in order to obtain the optimal error estimates in L^2 norm for both the electrostatic potential and the ionic concentrations, a mixed finite element method is also studied for PNP equations, see [24, 25] for more details. Recently, by introducing a similar projection operator as in [20], Shen et al. [26] presented the optimal error estimate in L^2 norm for both the semi- and full implicit nonlinear schemes for the time-dependent PNP equations.

Although there has been some work on the a priori error analysis of the finite element method for PNP equations, to the best of authors' knowledge, there is no work on the a posteriori error analysis for PNP equations. The main purpose of this paper is to provide a complete a posteriori error analysis for the finite element approximation to a class of nonlinear steady-state PNP equations. We consider the following generic nonlinear PNP problem

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}(p^i, \phi) = -\nabla \cdot (\alpha(x, p^i) \nabla p^i + \beta(x, p^i) + \gamma(x, p^i) \nabla \phi) + g(x, p^i) = 0, & \text{in } \Omega, 1 \leq i \leq n, \\ -\nabla \cdot (\epsilon(x) \nabla \phi) - \sum_{i=1}^n q^i p^i = f, & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions

$$p^i = \phi = 0, \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega, \quad (1.2)$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is a polygonal domain with a Lipschitz boundary $\partial\Omega$, p^i is the concentration of the i -th ionic species with charge q^i and ϕ is the electrostatic potential. The coefficients $\alpha(x, y) : \bar{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^1$, $\beta(x, y) : \bar{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$, $\gamma(x, y) : \bar{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^1$, $g(x, y) : \bar{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^1$ and the dielectric coefficient $\epsilon(x) : \bar{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^1$ are smooth functions. This work focuses on proposing and analyzing the a posteriori error estimates for the nonlinear steady-state PNP problem (1.1)-(1.2).

In general, there are two types of a posteriori error estimators, the gradient recovery-type a posteriori error estimator and the residual-type a posteriori error estimator. Compared with the residual-type a posteriori error estimator, the recovery-type a posteriori error estimator based on the gradient recovery operator is simpler in implementation. In this paper, by using a local averaging operator which is an extension of the gradient recovery operator, we derive a local averaging type a posteriori error estimates for the nonlinear PNP problem (1.1)-(1.2). Then the global upper bounds and the local lower bounds of the error estimators are obtained for both the electrostatic potential and concentrations. A corresponding adaptive finite element algorithm is designed for the nonlinear PNP equations. Numerical experiments verify the efficiency and reliability of the error estimators derived in this paper.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In section 2, the basic notations for Sobolev space and some useful preliminary results for the finite element approximation are introduced. In section 3, we present the global upper bounds and the local lower bounds both for the electrostatic potential and concentrations. Based on the a posteriori error estimators, a corresponding adaptive finite element algorithm is also proposed in this section. In section 4, numerical experiments are reported to support our theoretical analysis. Finally, in section 5, some conclusions are presented.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we shall describe some basic notations and assumptions. Let Ω be a bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^2 . For the integer $k \geq 0$ and $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, let $W^{k,p}(\Omega)$ be the Sobolev space with norm (see, e.g., [27, 28]),

$$\|u\|_{W^{k,p}} = \begin{cases} \left(\sum_{|\beta| \leq k} \int_{\Omega} |D^{\beta} u|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}, & \text{for } 1 \leq p < \infty, \\ \sum_{|\beta| \leq k} \text{ess sup}_{\Omega} |D^{\beta} u|, & \text{for } p = \infty, \end{cases}$$

where

$$D^{\beta} = \frac{\partial^{|\beta|}}{\partial x_1^{\beta_1} \partial x_2^{\beta_2}}, \quad |\beta| = \sum_{i=1}^2 \beta_i,$$

for the multi-index $\beta = (\beta_1, \beta_2)$, $\beta_i \geq 0$, $1 \leq i \leq 2$. For $p = 2$, denote by $H^k(\Omega) := W^{k,2}(\Omega)$ and $H_0^1(\Omega) = \{v | v \in H^1(\Omega) : v|_{\partial\Omega} = 0\}$, where $v|_{\partial\Omega}$ is in the sense of trace, $\|\cdot\|_{k,\Omega} := \|\cdot\|_{k,2,\Omega}$ with the expression that $\|\cdot\|_0$ and (\cdot, \cdot) denote the norm and inner product in L^2 , respectively, and $\|\cdot\|_{0,\infty} := \|\cdot\|_{L^\infty}$. Throughout this paper, we shall use C denote a generic positive constant which may stand for different values at its different occurrences and are independent of the mesh parameters.

Let $\mathcal{T}^h = \{\tau\}$ be a shape-regular simplices of Ω with mesh size $h = \max_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}^h} \{h_\tau\}$, where h_τ is the diameter of the elements τ . Denote by $\partial\mathcal{T}^h$ the set of all surfaces of simplices, $\partial^2\mathcal{T}^h$ the set of all vertices of \mathcal{T}^h and $\Lambda = \partial^2\mathcal{T}^h \setminus \partial\Omega$. We define the linear finite element space

$$S^h = \{v \in H^1(\Omega) : v|_\tau \in \mathcal{P}^1(\tau), \forall \tau \in \mathcal{T}_h\}, \quad S_0^h = S^h \cap H_0^1(\Omega), \quad (2.1)$$

where $\mathcal{P}^1(\tau)$ is the space of linear polynomials on τ . Let $\{\varphi_z : z \in \partial^2\mathcal{T}^h\} \subset S^h$ be the standard nodal basis functions of S^h , namely,

$$\varphi_{z_1}(z_2) = \delta_{z_1 z_2}, \quad \forall z_1, z_2 \in \partial^2\mathcal{T}^h,$$

where δ is the Kronecker symbol. For given $z \in \partial^2\mathcal{T}^h$, $l \in \partial\mathcal{T}^h$ and $\tau \in \mathcal{T}^h$, denote by

$$\omega_z = \bigcup_{z \in \bar{\tau}} \tau, \quad \omega_l = \bigcup_{l \subset \bar{\tau}} \tau, \quad \omega_\tau = \bigcup_{\bar{\tau}' \cap \bar{\tau} \neq \emptyset} \tau', \quad (2.2)$$

where $\bar{\tau}$ is the closure of τ .

2.1 Clément interpolation and local averaging operator

We need introduce two Clément-type interpolation operators π_h and $\Pi_h: L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow S_0^h$, which are defined respectively by (cf. [29,30])

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_h v &= \sum_{z \in \Lambda} v_z \varphi_z, & v_z &= \frac{(v, \varphi_z)}{(\varphi_z, 1)}, \quad \forall v \in L^2(\Omega), \\ \Pi_h v &= \sum_{z \in \partial^2\mathcal{T}^h} v^z \varphi_z, & v^z &= \sum_{j=1}^{J_z} \alpha_z^j v|_{\tau_z^j}(z), \quad \forall v \in L^2(\Omega), \end{aligned}$$

where φ_z is the basis function, $\bigcup_{j=1}^{J_z} \tau_z^j = \omega_z$, $\sum_{j=1}^{J_z} \alpha_z^j = 1$, and $\alpha_z^j \geq 0$. For instance, $\alpha_z^j = \frac{1}{J_z}$ or $\alpha_z^j = \frac{|\tau_z^j|}{|\omega_z|}$. It should be pointed out that $v|_{\tau_z^j}$ is understood in the sense of trace in τ_z^j here. For $v \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, there hold (see e.g., [30,31,32])

$$\|v - \pi_h v\|_{0,\tau} \leq Ch_\tau \|\nabla v\|_{0,\omega_\tau}, \quad \forall \tau \in \mathcal{T}^h, \quad (2.3)$$

$$\|v - \pi_h v\|_{0,l} \leq Ch_l^{1/2} \|\nabla v\|_{0,\omega_l}, \quad \forall l \in \partial\mathcal{T}^h, \quad (2.4)$$

$$|\pi_h v|_{1,\tau} \leq C|v|_{1,\omega_\tau}, \quad \forall \tau \in \mathcal{T}^h. \quad (2.5)$$

The local averaging operator $G_h : S_0^h \rightarrow S^h \times S^h$ is defined as follows (cf. e.g., [30,33])

$$G_h v = \Pi_h(\alpha(x, v)\nabla v), \quad (\alpha(x, v)\nabla v)_z = \sum_{j=1}^{J_z} \alpha_z^j (\alpha(z, v(z))\nabla v)_{\tau_z^j}, \quad \forall v \in S_0^h. \quad (2.6)$$

By the definition of the local averaging operator G_h , a smoothed flux field $G_h v$ is then obtained from the flux field “ $\alpha(\cdot, v)\nabla v$ ”. Hence, the operator G_h is also called flux recovery operator (cf. [34]). Note that if the

coefficient $\alpha(\cdot, v) \equiv 1$, then a so-called gradient recovery operator $\tilde{G}_h : S_0^h \mapsto S^h \times S^h$ is defined by (see e.g., [30, 33, 35])

$$\tilde{G}_h v = \sum_{z \in \partial^2 \mathcal{T}^h} (\nabla v)_z \varphi_z, \quad (\nabla v)_z = \sum_{j=1}^{J_z} \alpha_z^j (\nabla v)_{\tau_z^j}, \quad \forall v \in S_0^h. \quad (2.7)$$

In this paper, we shall use the local averaging operator G_h to derive the a posteriori error estimators for the nonlinear PNP problem (1.1)-(1.2).

At the end of the subsection, according to the definition of the operator \tilde{G}_h and the properties of the basis function, we can easily get the following lemma which shall be used in our later analysis.

Lemma 2.1 *Suppose \tilde{G}_h is defined by (2.7). For any $w_h \in S_0^h$, there hold*

$$\|\tilde{G}_h w_h\|_0 \leq C \|\nabla w_h\|_0, \quad (2.8)$$

and

$$\|\tilde{G}_h w_h\|_{0,\infty} \leq C \|\nabla w_h\|_{0,\infty}. \quad (2.9)$$

2.2 A finite element approximation

In this subsection, we consider the finite element approximation for the nonlinear PNP problem (1.1)-(1.2).

Suppose the problem (1.1)-(1.2) has a solution (p^i, ϕ) , where $\phi \in H_0^1(\Omega) \cap W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ and $p^i \in H_0^1(\Omega) \cap W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ for some $p > 2$. For any $w \in H_0^1(\Omega) \cap W^{1,p}(\Omega)$, the linearized operator \mathcal{L} at w (namely, the Fréchet derivative of \mathcal{L} at w) is then given by

$$\mathcal{L}'(w, \phi)\psi = -\operatorname{div}(\alpha(\cdot, w)\nabla\psi + (\alpha_y(\cdot, w)\nabla w + \beta_y(\cdot, w))\psi) + g_y(\cdot, w)\psi - \operatorname{div}(\gamma_y(\cdot, w)\nabla\phi)\psi.$$

Furthermore, if we denote

$$H'(w)\psi = -\operatorname{div}(\alpha(\cdot, w)\nabla\psi + (\alpha_y(\cdot, w)\nabla w + \beta_y(\cdot, w))\psi) + g_y(\cdot, w)\psi,$$

then, the bilinear form (induced by $H'(w)$) is that

$$a'(w; \psi, v) = (\alpha(\cdot, w)\nabla\psi + (\alpha_y(\cdot, w)\nabla w + \beta_y(\cdot, w))\psi, \nabla v) + (g_y(\cdot, w)\psi, v). \quad (2.10)$$

Our basic assumptions are, first of all, the exact solution p^i of (1.1) satisfies

$$\xi^T \alpha(x, p^i) \xi \geq C^{-1} |\xi|^2, \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^2, \quad x \in \bar{\Omega}, \quad (2.11)$$

for some constant $C > 0$ and, secondly, $\mathcal{L}'(p^i, \phi) : H_0^1(\Omega) \rightarrow H^{-1}(\Omega)$ is an isomorphism. As a result of these assumptions, p^i must be an isolated solution (cf. [36]).

Denote by

$$a(w, v) = (\alpha(\cdot, w)\nabla w + \beta(\cdot, w), \nabla v) + (g(\cdot, w), v), \quad (2.12)$$

and

$$b(w, \psi, v) = (\gamma(\cdot, w)\nabla\psi, \nabla v), \quad \tilde{a}(w, v) = (\epsilon(x)\nabla w, \nabla v). \quad (2.13)$$

Then the weak forms of (1.1)-(1.2) are that: find $p^i, i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ and $\phi \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that

$$a(p^i, v) + b(p^i, \phi, v) = 0, \quad \forall v \in H_0^1(\Omega), \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n, \quad (2.14)$$

$$\tilde{a}(\phi, w) = (\tilde{f}(p^i), w), \quad \forall w \in H_0^1(\Omega), \quad (2.15)$$

where $\tilde{f}(p^i) := \tilde{f}(p^1, p^2, \dots, p^n) = \sum_{i=1}^n q^i p^i + f$. Similarly, from now on, we use (p^i, ϕ) to denote $(p^1, p^2, \dots, p^n, \phi)$ for simlicity.

The corresponding finite element discretizations for (2.14)-(2.15) are that: find $p_h^i, i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ and $\phi_h \in S_0^h$ such that

$$a(p_h^i, v_h) + b(p_h^i, \phi_h, v_h) = 0, \quad \forall v_h \in S_0^h, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n, \quad (2.16)$$

$$\tilde{a}(\phi_h, w_h) = (\tilde{f}(p_h^i), w_h), \quad \forall w_h \in S_0^h, \quad (2.17)$$

where $\tilde{f}(p_h^i) = \sum_{i=1}^n q^i p_h^i + f$.

In the later analysis, we need the following identity. For any $w, \psi, \tilde{w}, \tilde{\psi}, v \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, define the remainder

$$R(w, \psi, \tilde{w}, \tilde{\psi}, v) = a(\tilde{w}, v) + b(\tilde{w}, \tilde{\psi}, v) - a(w, v) - b(w, \psi, v) - a'(w; \tilde{w} - w, v). \quad (2.18)$$

By using the similar arguments in [36], we have the following lemma.

Lemma 2.2 *Let (p^i, ϕ) be the solution to (2.14)-(2.15). Then the finite element approximation (p_h^i, ϕ_h) is the solution to (2.16) if and only if*

$$a'(p^i; p^i - p_h^i, v_h) = R(p^i, \phi, p_h^i, \phi_h, v_h), \quad \forall v_h \in S_0^h. \quad (2.19)$$

Moreover, for any $w, \psi, \tilde{w}, \tilde{\psi}, v \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, if $\psi \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ and $\gamma(\cdot, \tilde{w}) \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ satisfies

$$\|\gamma(\cdot, \tilde{w}) - \gamma(\cdot, w)\|_0 \leq C\|\tilde{w} - w\|_0, \quad (2.20)$$

then the remainder R satisfies

$$|R(w, \psi, \tilde{w}, \tilde{\psi}, v)| \leq C(\|w - \tilde{w}\|_{1,3}\|w - \tilde{w}\|_1 + \|\nabla\tilde{\psi} - \nabla\psi\|_0 + \|\tilde{w} - w\|_0)\|v\|_1. \quad (2.21)$$

Proof Taking $w = p^i, \psi = \phi, \tilde{w} = p_h^i, \tilde{\psi} = \phi_h$ and $v = v_h$ in (2.18) and from (2.14) and (2.16), it yields (2.19).

Now we turn to show (2.21). Let $\eta(t) = a(w + t(\tilde{w} - w), v)$. Since

$$\eta(1) = \eta(0) + \eta'(0) + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \eta''(t)(1-t)dt,$$

we have

$$a(\tilde{w}, v) = a(w, v) + a'(w; \tilde{w} - w, v) + \tilde{R}(w, \tilde{w}, v),$$

where $\tilde{R}(w, \tilde{w}, v) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \eta''(t)(1-t)dt$. Compared with (2.18), it apparently shows that

$$\begin{aligned} |R(w, \psi, \tilde{w}, \tilde{\psi}, v)| &= |b(\tilde{w}, \tilde{\psi}, v) - b(w, \psi, v) + \tilde{R}(w, \tilde{w}, v)| \\ &\leq |b(\tilde{w}, \tilde{\psi}, v) - b(w, \psi, v)| + |\tilde{R}(w, \tilde{w}, v)|. \end{aligned} \quad (2.22)$$

For the first term on the right-hand side in (2.22), by $\psi \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$, $\gamma(\cdot, \tilde{w}) \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ and (2.20), we get

$$\begin{aligned} |b(\tilde{w}, \tilde{\psi}, v) - b(w, \psi, v)| &= |(\gamma(\cdot, \tilde{w})\nabla\tilde{\psi} - \gamma(\cdot, w)\nabla\psi, \nabla v)| \\ &= |(\gamma(\cdot, \tilde{w})(\nabla\tilde{\psi} - \nabla\psi), \nabla v) + ((\gamma(\cdot, \tilde{w}) - \gamma(\cdot, w))\nabla\psi, \nabla v)| \\ &\leq C(\|\gamma(\cdot, \tilde{w})\|_{0,\infty}\|\nabla\tilde{\psi} - \nabla\psi\|_0 + \|\nabla\psi\|_{0,\infty}\|\gamma(\cdot, \tilde{w}) - \gamma(\cdot, w)\|_0)\|v\|_1 \\ &\leq C(\|\nabla\tilde{\psi} - \nabla\psi\|_0 + \|\tilde{w} - w\|_0)\|v\|_1. \end{aligned} \quad (2.23)$$

On the other hand, from Lemma 3.1 in [36], the second term on the right-hand side in (2.22) can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{R}(w, \tilde{w}, v)| &\leq C_\lambda(\|w - \tilde{w}\|_{1,3}\|w - \tilde{w}\|_1 + (\|\nabla w\|_{0,p} + \|\nabla\tilde{w}\|_{0,p})\|w - \tilde{w}\|_{1,3}\|w - \tilde{w}\|_1)\|v\|_1 \\ &\leq C\|w - \tilde{w}\|_{1,3}\|w - \tilde{w}\|_1\|v\|_1, \end{aligned} \quad (2.24)$$

where $C_\lambda = \max\{|\alpha_y|, |\alpha_{yy}|, |\beta_{yy}|, |g_{yy}|\}$ on $\bar{\Omega} \times [-\lambda, \lambda]$.

Inserting (2.23) and (2.24) into (2.22), then we complete the proof. \square

Lemma 2.3 *Let (p^i, ϕ) and (p_h^i, ϕ_h) be the solutions of (2.14)-(2.15) and (2.16)-(2.17), respectively. If $f \in H^1(\Omega)$, then we have*

$$\|\nabla\phi_h\|_{0,\infty} \leq C. \quad (2.25)$$

Proof From (2.17), we know that ϕ_h is the finite element approximation to the solution of the following problem

$$-\nabla \cdot (\epsilon(x)\nabla\phi) = \sum_{i=1}^n q^i p_h^i + f. \quad (2.26)$$

Hence, by Gagliardo–Nirenberg–Sobolev inequality (see [37]) and the regularity estimate (see [38]), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla\phi_h\|_{0,\infty} &\leq C\|\phi\|_{1,\infty} \leq C\|\phi\|_{2,4} \leq C\left\|\sum_{i=1}^n q^i p_h^i + f\right\|_{0,4} \\ &\leq C\left(\left\|\sum_{i=1}^n p_h^i\right\|_{0,4} + \|f\|_{0,4}\right) \\ &\leq C\left(\left\|\sum_{i=1}^n p_h^i\right\|_{1,2} + \|f\|_{1,2}\right) \\ &\leq C, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the assumption that p_h^i and $f \in H^1(\Omega)$. Thus, we finish the proof of Lemma 2.3. \square

In [21], the a priori error estimate is shown for the potential as follows.

Lemma 2.4 [21] *Let (p^i, ϕ) and (p_h^i, ϕ_h) be the solutions of (2.14)-(2.15) and (2.16)-(2.17), respectively. If $\phi \in H^2(\Omega)$, then there holds*

$$\|\phi - \phi_h\|_1 \leq C(h + \sum_{i=1}^n \|p^i - p_h^i\|_0). \quad (2.27)$$

In the later analysis, we also need the following lemmas.

Lemma 2.5 [36, 39] *If $h \ll 1$ and p^i is the solution of (2.14)-(2.15), then*

$$\|w_h\|_1 \leq C \sup_{\varphi \in S_0^h} \frac{a'(p^i, w_h, \varphi)}{\|\varphi\|_1}, \quad \forall w_h \in S_0^h. \quad (2.28)$$

Lemma 2.6 [36] *Let $R_h : H_0^1(\Omega) \rightarrow S_0^h$ be defined by*

$$a'(p^i; p^i - R_h p^i, v_h) = 0, \quad \forall v_h \in S_0^h. \quad (2.29)$$

If $p^i \in H_0^1(\Omega) \cap H^2(\Omega)$, then

$$\|p^i - R_h p^i\|_{1,t} \leq Ch^{1+2(1/t-1/2)} \|p^i\|_2, \quad t \geq 2, \quad (2.30)$$

and

$$\|R_h p^i\|_{1,p} \leq C \|p^i\|_2. \quad (2.31)$$

Furthermore, by using Lemmas 2.5, 2.6 and the similar arguments as in [36], we have the the following lemma.

Lemma 2.7 *Let (p^i, ϕ) and (p_h^i, ϕ_h) be the solutions of (2.14)-(2.15) and (2.16)-(2.17), respectively. If $\phi, p^i \in H_0^1(\Omega) \cap H^2(\Omega)$, $\|p^i - p_h^i\|_0 \leq Ch$ and $h \ll 1$, then*

$$\|p_h^i - R_h p^i\|_1 \leq Ch. \quad (2.32)$$

Proof For any $\chi \in S_0^h$, let $\Phi : S_0^h \rightarrow S_0^h$ be defined by

$$a'(p^i; \Phi(\chi), v_h) = a'(p^i; p^i, v_h) - R(p^i, \phi, \chi, \phi_h, v_h), \quad \forall v_h \in S_0^h. \quad (2.33)$$

Obviously, Φ is continuous. Define

$$\mathcal{B} = \{v_h \in S_0^h : \|v_h - R_h p^i\|_1 \leq Ch, \|v_h\|_{1,p} \leq C(1 + \|p^i\|_2)\}. \quad (2.34)$$

If $\Phi(\mathcal{B}) \subset \mathcal{B}$, then by Brouwer's fixed point theorem, there exists a fixed point $p_h^i \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $\Phi(p_h^i) = p_h^i$, which combining with (2.33) and Lemma 2.2 yields that p_h^i is the finite element solution of (2.16) and (2.32) holds from $p_h^i \in \mathcal{B}$. Hence, in order to obtain (2.32), we only need to show $\Phi(\mathcal{B}) \subset \mathcal{B}$.

For any $\chi \in \mathcal{B}$, by (2.29) and (2.33), we get

$$a'(p^i; \Phi(\chi) - R_h p^i, v_h) = R(p^i, \phi, \chi, \phi_h, v_h), \quad \forall v_h \in S_0^h.$$

Since $\Phi(\chi) - R_h p^i \in S_0^h$, by Lemma 2.5, it yields

$$\|\Phi(\chi) - R_h p^i\|_1 \leq C \sup_{\varphi \in S_0^h} \frac{a'(p^i; \Phi(\chi) - R_h p^i, \varphi)}{\|\varphi\|_1} \leq C \sup_{\varphi \in S_0^h(\Omega)} \frac{|R(p^i, \phi, \chi, \phi_h, \varphi)|}{\|\varphi\|_1}.$$

From (2.21), (2.25) and $\chi \in \mathcal{B}$, there holds

$$\|\Phi(\chi) - R_h p^i\|_1 \leq C(\|p^i - \chi\|_{1,3} \|p^i - \chi\|_1 + \|\nabla \phi - \nabla \phi_h\|_0 + \|p^i - \chi\|_0). \quad (2.35)$$

Then from (2.27), we have

$$\|\Phi(\chi) - R_h p^i\|_1 \leq C(\|p^i - \chi\|_{1,3} \|p^i - \chi\|_1 + h + \|p^i - \chi\|_0). \quad (2.36)$$

By inverse inequality and $\chi \in \mathcal{B}$, from (2.34), we get

$$\|R_h p^i - \chi\|_{1,3} \leq Ch^{2(1/3-1/2)} \|R_h p^i - \chi\|_1 \leq Ch^{2/3}. \quad (2.37)$$

In addition, combining (2.30) and (2.37), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|p^i - \chi\|_{1,3} \|p^i - \chi\|_1 &\leq C(\|p^i - R_h p^i\|_{1,3} + \|R_h p^i - \chi\|_{1,3})(\|p^i - R_h p^i\|_1 + \|R_h p^i - \chi\|_1) \\ &\leq Ch^{5/3}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, from (2.36), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Phi(\chi) - R_h p^i\|_1 &\leq C(h^{5/3} + h + \|p^i - \chi\|_0) \\ &\leq C(h + \|p^i - \chi\|_0). \end{aligned} \quad (2.38)$$

Then from (2.31) and (2.38), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Phi(\chi)\|_{1,p} &\leq \|\Phi(\chi) - R_h p^i\|_{1,p} + \|R_h p^i\|_{1,p} \\ &\leq Ch^{2(1/p-1/2)} \|\Phi(\chi) - R_h p^i\|_1 + \|R_h p^i\|_{1,p} \\ &\leq C(h^{2(1/p-1/2)}(h + \|p^i - \chi\|_0) + \|p^i\|_2). \end{aligned} \quad (2.39)$$

For the term $\|p^i - \chi\|_0$, from $\chi \in \mathcal{B}$, (2.30) and (2.34), we have

$$\|p^i - \chi\|_0 \leq \|p^i - R_h p^i\|_0 + \|R_h p^i - \chi\|_0 \leq Ch. \quad (2.40)$$

Substituting (2.40) into (2.38) and (2.39), respectively, it easily yields

$$\|\Phi(\chi) - R_h p^i\|_1 \leq Ch$$

and

$$\|\Phi(\chi)\|_{1,p} \leq C(1 + \|p^i\|_2).$$

Hence $\Phi(\mathcal{B}) \subset \mathcal{B}$. This completes the proof of (2.32). \square

3 A posteriori error estimates

In this section, we first present the a posteriori error estimates including the global upper bounds and the local lower bounds for the nonlinear PNP equations (1.1) with boundary conditions (1.2). Then a typical finite element adaptive algorithm is developed based on the a posteriori error analysis.

3.1 Upper bound

In this subsection, we shall derive the global upper bounds of the a posteriori error indicators for both the electrostatic potential and concentrations.

First, the upper bound of $\|\nabla(\phi - \phi_h)\|_{0,\Omega}$ is presented as follows.

Theorem 3.1 *Let (p^i, ϕ) and (p_h^i, ϕ_h) be the solutions of (2.14)-(2.15) and (2.16)-(2.17), respectively. There holds*

$$\|\nabla(\phi - \phi_h)\|_{0,\Omega} \leq C \left(\eta_\phi(p_h^i, \phi_h) + \sum_{i=1}^n \|p^i - p_h^i\|_{0,\Omega} \right), \quad (3.1)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_\phi(p_h^i, \phi_h) &= \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}^h} \left(h_\tau \|R_{1h}(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} + \|D_h(\phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} \right), \\ R_{1h}(p_h^i, \phi_h) &= \sum_{i=1}^n q^i p_h^i + \operatorname{div}(G_h \phi_h) + f, \\ D_h(\phi_h) &= G_h \phi_h - \epsilon(x) \nabla \phi_h. \end{aligned}$$

Proof For any $w \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, $\chi \in S_0^h$, it follows from (2.15) and (2.17) that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{a}(\phi - \phi_h, w) &= \tilde{a}(\phi, w) - \tilde{a}(\phi_h, w) = (\tilde{f}(p^i), w) - \tilde{a}(\phi_h, w) \\ &= (\tilde{f}(p^i), w - \chi) + (\tilde{f}(p^i), \chi) - \tilde{a}(\phi_h, w) \\ &= (\tilde{f}(p^i), w - \chi) + (\tilde{f}(p^i) - \tilde{f}(p_h^i), \chi) + (\tilde{f}(p_h^i), \chi) - \tilde{a}(\phi_h, w - \chi) - \tilde{a}(\phi_h, \chi) \\ &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^n q^i p^i + f, w - \chi \right) - \left(\sum_{i=1}^n q^i (p^i - p_h^i), w - \chi \right) \\ &\quad + \left(\sum_{i=1}^n q^i (p^i - p_h^i), w \right) - \tilde{a}(\phi_h, w - \chi) \\ &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^n q^i p_h^i + f, w - \chi \right) + \left(\sum_{i=1}^n q^i (p^i - p_h^i), w \right) - \tilde{a}(\phi_h, w - \chi). \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

By Green's formula, we rewrite the third term on the right-hand side of (3.2) as follows

$$\begin{aligned} -\tilde{a}(\phi_h, w - \chi) &= - \int_{\Omega} \epsilon(x) \nabla \phi_h \cdot \nabla (w - \chi) \\ &= \int_{\Omega} (G_h \phi_h - \epsilon(x) \nabla \phi_h) \cdot \nabla (w - \chi) - \int_{\Omega} G_h \phi_h \cdot \nabla (w - \chi) \\ &= \int_{\Omega} (G_h \phi_h - \epsilon(x) \nabla \phi_h) \cdot \nabla (w - \chi) + \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}^h} \int_{\tau} \operatorname{div}(G_h \phi_h) (w - \chi). \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

Substituting (3.3) into (3.2), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{a}(\phi - \phi_h, w) &= \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}^h} \int_{\tau} R_{1h}(p_h^i, \phi_h)(w - \chi) + \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}^h} \int_{\tau} D_h(\phi_h) \cdot \nabla(w - \chi) \\ &\quad + \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}^h} \int_{\tau} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n q^i(p^i - p_h^i) \right) w \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq C \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}^h} \left(\|R_{1h}(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} \|w - \chi\|_{0,\tau} + \|D_h(\phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} \|\nabla(w - \chi)\|_{0,\tau} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{i=1}^n \|p^i - p_h^i\|_{0,\tau} \|w\|_{0,\tau} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

where

$$R_{1h}(p_h^i, \phi_h) = \sum_{i=1}^n q^i p_h^i + \operatorname{div}(G_h \phi_h) + f, \quad D_h(\phi_h) = G_h \phi_h - \epsilon(x) \nabla \phi_h.$$

Taking $\chi = \pi_h w$ in (3.5) and using Clément interpolation estimates (2.3) and (2.5), it yields

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{a}(\phi - \phi_h, w) &\leq C \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}^h} \left((h_{\tau} \|R_{1h}(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} + \|D_h(\phi_h)\|_{0,\tau}) \|\nabla w\|_{0,\omega_{\tau}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{i=1}^n \|p^i - p_h^i\|_{0,\tau} \|w\|_{0,\tau} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

Then the desired result (3.1) can be easily obtained by taking $w = \phi - \phi_h$ in (3.6). \square

Now we turn to present the upper bound of $\|\nabla(p^i - p_h^i)\|_{0,\Omega}$. First, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 3.1 [36, 40] *Suppose p^i is an isolated solution and the finite element solution p_h^i is sufficiently close to the exact solution p^i provided by $h \ll 1$. Then for any $w \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, there holds*

$$\|w\|_{1,\Omega} \leq C \sup_{v \in H_0^1(\Omega)} \frac{a'(p_h^i; w, v)}{\|v\|_{1,\Omega}}. \quad (3.7)$$

The global upper bound for $\|\nabla(p^i - p_h^i)\|_{0,\Omega}$ is presented as follows.

Theorem 3.2 *Let (p^i, ϕ) and (p_h^i, ϕ_h) be the solutions of (2.14)-(2.15) and (2.16)-(2.17), respectively. Suppose the finite element solution p_h^i is sufficiently close to the exact solution p^i . If $\phi, p^i \in H_0^1(\Omega) \cap H^2(\Omega)$, $\|p^i - p_h^i\|_0 \leq Ch$ and $h \ll 1$, then there holds*

$$\|\nabla(p^i - p_h^i)\|_{0,\Omega} \leq C \left(\eta_{p^i}(p_h^i, \phi_h) + \sum_{i=1}^n \|p^i - p_h^i\|_{0,\Omega} \right), \quad (3.8)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\eta_{p^i}(p_h^i, \phi_h) &= \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}^h} \left(\|D_h(p_h^i)\|_{0,\tau} + \|\gamma(x, p_h^i)(\tilde{G}_h \phi_h - \nabla \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} + h_\tau \|R_{2h}(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} \right) \\
&\quad + \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}^h} \left(\|D_h(\phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} + h_\tau \|R_{1h}(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} \right), \\
D_h(p_h^i) &= G_h p_h^i - \alpha(x, p_h^i) \nabla p_h^i, \quad D_h(\phi_h) = G_h \phi_h - \epsilon(x) \nabla \phi_h, \\
R_{1h}(p_h^i, \phi_h) &= \sum_{i=1}^n q^i p_h^i + \operatorname{div}(G_h \phi_h) + f, \\
R_{2h}(p_h^i, \phi_h) &= \operatorname{div}(G_h p_h^i) + \operatorname{div}(\beta(x, p_h^i)) - g(x, p_h^i) + \operatorname{div}(\gamma(x, p_h^i) \tilde{G}_h \phi_h).
\end{aligned}$$

Proof For any $v \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, $\chi \in S_0^h$, first, by (2.16), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
-a(p_h^i, v) &= -(a(p_h^i, v - \chi) + a(p_h^i, \chi)) \\
&= -a(p_h^i, v - \chi) + b(p_h^i, \phi_h, \chi) \\
&= -(\alpha(x, p_h^i) \nabla p_h^i + \beta(x, p_h^i), \nabla(v - \chi)) - (g(x, p_h^i), v - \chi) + b(p_h^i, \phi_h, \chi) \\
&= -(\alpha(x, p_h^i) \nabla p_h^i - G_h p_h^i, \nabla(v - \chi)) - (G_h p_h^i + \beta(x, p_h^i), \nabla(v - \chi)) \\
&\quad - (g(x, p_h^i), v - \chi) + b(p_h^i, \phi_h, \chi) \\
&= \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}^h} \int_{\tau} (G_h p_h^i - \alpha(x, p_h^i) \nabla p_h^i) \cdot \nabla(v - \chi) + \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}^h} \int_{\tau} \operatorname{div}(G_h p_h^i + \beta(x, p_h^i))(v - \chi) \\
&\quad - \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}^h} \int_{\tau} g(x, p_h^i)(v - \chi) + b(p_h^i, \phi_h, \chi) \\
&= \tilde{A}(p_h^i, v, \chi) + b(p_h^i, \phi_h, \chi),
\end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{A}(p_h^i, v, \chi) &= \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}^h} \int_{\tau} D_h(p_h^i) \cdot \nabla(v - \chi) + \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}^h} \int_{\tau} R_h(p_h^i)(v - \chi), \\
D_h(p_h^i) &= G_h p_h^i - \alpha(x, p_h^i) \nabla p_h^i, \quad R_h(p_h^i) = \operatorname{div}(G_h p_h^i) + \operatorname{div}(\beta(x, p_h^i)) - g(x, p_h^i).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

On the other hand, by (2.14) and taking $\tilde{w} = p^i$, $\tilde{\psi} = \phi$, $w = p_h^i$, $\psi = \phi_h$ in (2.18), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
a'(p_h^i; p^i - p_h^i, v) &= a(p^i, v) + b(p^i, \phi, v) - a(p_h^i, v) - b(p_h^i, \phi_h, v) - R(p_h^i, \phi_h, p^i, \phi, v) \\
&= -a(p_h^i, v) - b(p_h^i, \phi_h, v) - R(p_h^i, \phi_h, p^i, \phi, v).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

Combining (3.9), (3.10) and (3.11), it yields

$$\begin{aligned}
a'(p_h^i; p^i - p_h^i, v) &= \tilde{A}(p_h^i, v, \chi) + b(p_h^i, \phi_h, \chi - v) - R(p_h^i, \phi_h, p^i, \phi, v) \\
&= \tilde{A}(p_h^i, v, \chi) + (\gamma(x, p_h^i) \nabla \phi_h, \nabla(\chi - v)) - R(p_h^i, \phi_h, p^i, \phi, v) \\
&= \tilde{A}(p_h^i, v, \chi) + (\gamma(x, p_h^i) (\nabla \phi_h - \tilde{G}_h \phi_h), \nabla(\chi - v)) + (\gamma(x, p_h^i) \tilde{G}_h \phi_h, \nabla(\chi - v)) - R(p_h^i, \phi_h, p^i, \phi, v) \\
&= \tilde{A}(p_h^i, v, \chi) + \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}^h} \int_{\tau} (\gamma(x, p_h^i) (\tilde{G}_h \phi_h - \nabla \phi_h)) \cdot \nabla(v - \chi) + \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}^h} \int_{\tau} \operatorname{div}(\gamma(x, p_h^i) \tilde{G}_h \phi_h)(v - \chi) \\
&\quad - R(p_h^i, \phi_h, p^i, \phi, v) \\
&= \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}^h} \int_{\tau} D_h(p_h^i) \cdot \nabla(v - \chi) + \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}^h} \int_{\tau} (R_h(p_h^i) + \operatorname{div}(\gamma(x, p_h^i) \tilde{G}_h \phi_h))(v - \chi) \\
&\quad + \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}^h} \int_{\tau} (\gamma(x, p_h^i) (\tilde{G}_h \phi_h - \nabla \phi_h)) \cdot \nabla(v - \chi) - R(p_h^i, \phi_h, p^i, \phi, v). \tag{3.12}
\end{aligned}$$

Then taking $\chi = \pi_h v$ in (3.12), by Clément interpolation (2.3) and (2.5), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
a'(p_h^i; p^i - p_h^i, v) &\leq C \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}^h} \left(\|D_h(p_h^i)\|_{0,\tau} + \|\gamma(x, p_h^i) (\tilde{G}_h \phi_h - \nabla \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + h_{\tau} \|R_h(p_h^i) + \operatorname{div}(\gamma(x, p_h^i) \tilde{G}_h \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} \right) \|v\|_{1,\omega_{\tau}} + |R(p_h^i, \phi_h, p^i, \phi, v)|. \tag{3.13}
\end{aligned}$$

Now it remains to estimate the remainder $R(p_h^i, \phi_h, p^i, \phi, v)$. From (2.21), we have

$$|R(p_h^i, \phi_h, p^i, \phi, v)| \leq C (\|p_h^i - p^i\|_{1,3} \|p_h^i - p^i\|_1 + \|\nabla(\phi - \phi_h)\|_0 + \|p^i - p_h^i\|_0) \|v\|_1. \tag{3.14}$$

We turn to estimate $\|p_h^i - p^i\|_{1,3}$ on the right-hand side of (3.14).

By the inverse estimate, (2.30) and (2.32), it yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\|p_h^i - p^i\|_{1,3} &\leq C (\|p_h^i - R_h p^i\|_{1,3} + \|R_h p^i - p^i\|_{1,3}) \\
&\leq C (h^{2(1/3-1/2)} \|p_h^i - R_h p^i\|_1 + h^{1+2(1/3-1/2)} \|p^i\|_2) \\
&\leq C h^{\frac{2}{3}}. \tag{3.15}
\end{aligned}$$

Substituting (3.15) into (3.14), we have

$$|R(p_h^i, \phi_h, p^i, \phi, v)| \leq C (h^{\frac{2}{3}} \|p_h^i - p^i\|_1 + \|\nabla(\phi - \phi_h)\|_0 + \|p^i - p_h^i\|_0) \|v\|_1. \tag{3.16}$$

By (3.13), (3.16) and using Lemma 3.1, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|p^i - p_h^i\|_{1,\Omega} &\leq C \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}^h} \left(\|D_h(p_h^i)\|_{0,\tau} + \|\gamma(x, p_h^i) (\tilde{G}_h \phi_h - \nabla \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + h_{\tau} \|R_h(p_h^i) + \operatorname{div}(\gamma(x, p_h^i) \tilde{G}_h \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} \right) \\
&\quad + C (h^{\frac{2}{3}} \|p_h^i - p^i\|_1 + \|\nabla(\phi - \phi_h)\|_0 + \|p^i - p_h^i\|_0). \tag{3.17}
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, choosing h sufficiently small such that $Ch^{\frac{2}{3}} \ll 1$, then we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|p^i - p_h^i\|_{1,\Omega} &\leq C \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}^h} \left(\|D_h(p_h^i)\|_{0,\tau} + \|\gamma(x, p_h^i)(\tilde{G}_h \phi_h - \nabla \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} + h_\tau \|R_{2h}(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} \right) \\ &\quad + C(\|\nabla(\phi - \phi_h)\|_{0,\Omega} + \|p^i - p_h^i\|_0), \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} R_{2h}(p_h^i, \phi_h) &= R_h(p_h^i) + \operatorname{div}(\gamma(x, p_h^i)\tilde{G}_h \phi_h) \\ &= \operatorname{div}(G_h p_h^i) + \operatorname{div}(\beta(x, p_h^i)) - g(x, p_h^i) + \operatorname{div}(\gamma(x, p_h^i)\tilde{G}_h \phi_h). \end{aligned}$$

Then the desired result (3.8) is completed by using (3.1) and (3.18). This completes the proof of Theorem 3.2. \square

Remark 3.1 Note that $\|p^i - p_h^i\|_{0,\Omega}$ is usually higher-order term compared with $\|\nabla(\phi - \phi_h)\|_{0,\Omega}$ and $\|\nabla(p^i - p_h^i)\|_{0,\Omega}$. From (3.1) and (3.8), if $\|p^i - p_h^i\|_{0,\Omega} \leq Ch\|\nabla(p^i - p_h^i)\|_{0,\Omega}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla(p^i - p_h^i)\|_{0,\Omega} &\leq C\eta_{p^i}(p_h^i, \phi_h), \\ \|\nabla(\phi - \phi_h)\|_{0,\Omega} &\leq C\left(\eta_\phi(p_h^i, \phi_h) + h\eta_{p^i}(p_h^i, \phi_h)\right). \end{aligned}$$

Up to now, there is no relevant work on the L^2 norm error estimate for both the steady-state PNP equations (1.1) with $\alpha = \beta = 1$, $\gamma = p^i$, $g = f_i(x)$ and the nonlinear PNP equations (1.1). It is difficult to derive the L^2 norm error estimate for p^i by using the traditional duality arguments for the steady-state PNP equations. Recently, we present an optimal L^2 norm error estimate of the finite element approximation p_h^i in [26] for a time-dependent PNP equations, but the arguments used in [26] can not successfully applied to the steady-state model because of the difference between the steady-state and time-dependent PNP equations. Although there is no theoretical results on the L^2 norm error estimate for the steady-state PNP equations, numerical examples including PNP equations for practical biological problems solved on irregular meshes show that $\|p^i - p_h^i\|_{0,\Omega} \leq Ch\|\nabla(p^i - p_h^i)\|_{0,\Omega}$ holds (see Figs. 2, 3 and Figs. 5, 6 in our work [21], where Figs. 5, 6 presents the results for a practical biological problem).

In the next subsection, we will present the local lower bounds of the a posteriori error indicators for both the electrostatic potential and concentrations.

3.2 Lower bound

Now, we study the lower bounds of the a posteriori error indicators for both the electrostatic potential and concentrations. We need further some assumptions for the coefficients in (1.1). Suppose that $\alpha(x, y) \in W^{2,\infty}(\Omega \times (-\lambda, \lambda))$, $\beta(x, y) \in (H^2(\Omega \times (-\lambda, \lambda)))^2$, $g(x, y) \in H^1(\Omega \times (-\lambda, \lambda))$, and $\epsilon(x) \in W^{2,\infty}(\omega_\tau)$, where $l \in \partial\mathcal{T}^h$, $l \not\subset \partial\Omega$ and ω_l is defined in (2.2). In addition, we assume that $\gamma(x, y)$ is a linear function with respect to the second variable y (actually, $\gamma(x, p^i) = q^i p^i$ in the practical problems, where q^i is a constant). We also need the assumption that there exist positive constants α_0 , α_1 , ϵ_0 and ϵ_1 , such that

$$\alpha_0 \leq \alpha(x, y) \leq \alpha_1 \quad (3.19)$$

and

$$\epsilon_0 \leq \epsilon(x) \leq \epsilon_1. \quad (3.20)$$

Denote by $[g]_l$ the jump of g across the surface $l \in \partial\mathcal{T}^h, l \not\subset \partial\Omega$, for example,

$$[\alpha(\cdot, v)\nabla v \cdot n_l]_l = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} [(\alpha(\cdot, v)\nabla v)(x + sn_l) - (\alpha(\cdot, v)\nabla v)(x - sn_l)] \cdot n_l, \quad (3.21)$$

and

$$[\epsilon(x)\nabla v \cdot n_l]_l = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} [(\epsilon(x)\nabla v)(x + sn_l) - (\epsilon(x)\nabla v)(x - sn_l)] \cdot n_l, \quad (3.22)$$

where n_l is the unit normal vector to l and $v \in H_0^1(\Omega)$.

Let $J_{h,l}(p_h^i) = [\alpha(x, p_h^i)\nabla p_h^i \cdot n_l]$ and $\widehat{J}_{h,l}(\phi_h) = [\epsilon(x)\nabla\phi_h \cdot n_l]$ represent the jumps of p_h^i and ϕ_h across the surface $l \in \partial\mathcal{T}^h, l \not\subset \partial\Omega$, respectively, where $p_h^i, \phi_h \in S_0^h$.

The following results will be used in our analysis for the lower bound.

Lemma 3.2 (cf. [31, 41]) *Let $\tau \in \mathcal{T}^h$ be a shape-regular mesh and $l \in \partial\mathcal{T}^h$. Then there exists $\mu_\tau : \mathcal{P}^1(\tau) \rightarrow H_0^1(\tau)$, such that for any $v \in \mathcal{P}^1(\tau)$, there hold*

$$C^{-1}\|\mu_\tau v\|_{0,\tau}^2 \leq \|v\|_{0,\tau}^2 \leq C(v, \mu_\tau v)_\tau, \quad (3.23)$$

$$\|\mu_\tau v\|_{1,\tau} \leq Ch_\tau^{-1}\|v\|_{0,\tau}. \quad (3.24)$$

And there exists $\nu_l : \mathcal{P}^1(l) \rightarrow H_0^1(\omega_l)$, such that for any $v \in \mathcal{P}^1(l)$, there hold

$$C^{-1}\|\nu_l v\|_{0,l}^2 \leq \|v\|_{0,l}^2 \leq C(v, \nu_l v)_l, \quad (3.25)$$

$$\|\nu_l v\|_{0,\omega_l} \leq Ch_{\omega_l}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|v\|_{0,l}, \quad (3.26)$$

$$\|\nu_l v\|_{1,\omega_l} \leq Ch_{\omega_l}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|v\|_{0,l}. \quad (3.27)$$

From (3.2) and Lemma 3.2, we get the following result.

Lemma 3.3 *Let (p^i, ϕ) and (p_h^i, ϕ_h) be the solutions of (2.14)-(2.15) and (2.16)-(2.17), respectively. For any $l \in \partial\mathcal{T}^h, l \not\subset \partial\Omega$, if $h_l \ll 1$, then there holds*

$$h_{\omega_l}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\widehat{J}_{h,l}(\phi_h)\|_{0,l} \leq C\left(\|\nabla(\phi - \phi_h)\|_{0,\omega_l} + h_{\omega_l} \sum_{i=1}^n \|p^i - p_h^i\|_{0,\omega_l}\right) + r_{\phi_h, \omega_l}, \quad (3.28)$$

where $\widehat{J}_{h,l}(\phi_h) = [\epsilon\nabla\phi_h \cdot n_l]$, and $r_{\phi_h, \omega_l} \leq Ch_{\omega_l}^2(|f|_{1,\omega_l} + \|\epsilon\|_{2,\infty,\omega_l}\|\phi_h\|_{1,\omega_l})$.

Proof For any $w \in H_0^1(\Omega), \chi \in S_0^h, l \in \partial\mathcal{T}^h$ and $l \not\subset \partial\Omega$, from (3.2) and Green's formula, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{a}(\phi - \phi_h, w) &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^n q^i p_h^i + f, w - \chi\right) + \left(\sum_{i=1}^n q^i (p^i - p_h^i), w\right) - \tilde{a}(\phi_h, w - \chi) \\ &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^n q^i p_h^i + f, w - \chi\right) + \left(\sum_{i=1}^n q^i (p^i - p_h^i), w\right) - \int_{\Omega} \epsilon \nabla \phi_h \cdot \nabla (w - \chi) \\ &= \sum_{\tau} \int_{\tau} \widehat{R}_{1h}(p_h^i, \phi_h)(w - \chi) + \int_{\Omega} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n q^i (p^i - p_h^i)\right) w - \sum_{l \in \partial\mathcal{T}^h, l \not\subset \partial\Omega} \int_l \widehat{J}_{h,l}(\phi_h)(w - \chi), \end{aligned} \quad (3.29)$$

where

$$\widehat{R}_{1h}(p_h^i, \phi_h) = \sum_{i=1}^n q^i p_h^i + \operatorname{div}(\epsilon \nabla \phi_h) + f, \quad \widehat{J}_{h,l}(\phi_h) = [\epsilon \nabla \phi_h \cdot n_l].$$

Taking $\chi = 0$ in (3.29), for any $w \in H_0^1(\omega_l)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\widehat{J}_{h,l}(\phi_h), w)_l &= \sum_{l \in \partial \mathcal{T}^h, l \not\subset \partial \Omega} \int_l \widehat{J}_{h,l}(\phi_h) w \\ &= (\widehat{R}_{1h}(p_h^i, \phi_h), w)_{\omega_l} - \widetilde{a}(\phi - \phi_h, w)_{\omega_l} + \left(\sum_{i=1}^n q^i (p^i - p_h^i), w \right)_{\omega_l} \end{aligned} \quad (3.30)$$

$$\leq \|\widehat{R}_{1h}(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\omega_l} \|w\|_{0,\omega_l} + C(\|\nabla(\phi - \phi_h)\|_{0,\omega_l} \|w\|_{1,\omega_l} + \sum_{i=1}^n \|p^i - p_h^i\|_{0,\omega_l} \|w\|_{0,\omega_l}). \quad (3.31)$$

In the following, in order to estimate $\|\widehat{J}_{h,l}(\phi_h)\|$, we need introduce an approximation to $\widehat{J}_{h,l}(\phi_h)$ defined by

$$\bar{J}_{h,l}(\phi_h) = [\bar{\epsilon} \nabla \phi_{h,l} \cdot n_l],$$

where $\bar{\epsilon}(x) \in S^h$ is a linear interpolation of $\epsilon(x)$ satisfying (cf. [42])

$$\|\epsilon(x) - \bar{\epsilon}(x)\|_{0,\infty,l} \leq Ch_l \|\epsilon(x)\|_{1,\infty,\omega_l}. \quad (3.32)$$

For any $w \in L^2(l)$, from (3.20) and (3.32), we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\widehat{J}_{h,l}(\phi_h) - \bar{J}_{h,l}(\phi_h), w)_l &= \int_l [(\epsilon - \bar{\epsilon}) \nabla \phi_h \cdot n_l] w \\ &\leq C \|\epsilon - \bar{\epsilon}\|_{0,\infty,l} \|\nabla \phi_h \cdot n_l\|_{0,l} \|w\|_{0,l} \\ &\leq Ch_l \|\widehat{J}_{h,l}(\phi_h)\|_{0,l} \|w\|_{0,l}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.33)$$

Taking $w = \widehat{J}_{h,l}(\phi_h) - \bar{J}_{h,l}(\phi_h)$ in the above inequality, it yields

$$\|\widehat{J}_{h,l}(\phi_h) - \bar{J}_{h,l}(\phi_h)\|_{0,l} \leq Ch_l \|\widehat{J}_{h,l}(\phi_h)\|_{0,l}. \quad (3.34)$$

On the other hand, from (3.31) and (3.33), we get

$$\begin{aligned} (\bar{J}_{h,l}(\phi_h), w)_l &= (\bar{J}_{h,l}(\phi_h) - \widehat{J}_{h,l}(\phi_h), w)_l + (\widehat{J}_{h,l}(\phi_h), w)_l \\ &\leq C \left(h_l \|\widehat{J}_{h,l}(\phi_h)\|_{0,l} \|w\|_{0,l} + \|\widehat{R}_{1h}(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\omega_l} \|w\|_{0,\omega_l} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|\nabla(\phi - \phi_h)\|_{0,\omega_l} \|w\|_{1,\omega_l} + \sum_{i=1}^n \|p^i - p_h^i\|_{0,\omega_l} \|w\|_{0,\omega_l} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, taking $w = \nu_l \bar{J}_{h,l}(\phi_h)$ in the above formula and then by Lemma 3.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{J}_{h,l}(\phi_h)\|_{0,l}^2 &\leq C(\bar{J}_{h,l}(\phi_h), \nu_l \bar{J}_{h,l}(\phi_h))_l \\ &\leq C \left(h_{\omega_l}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\widehat{R}_{1h}(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\omega_l} + h_{\omega_l}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla(\phi - \phi_h)\|_{0,\omega_l} + h_{\omega_l}^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{i=1}^n \|p^i - p_h^i\|_{0,\omega_l} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + h_l \|\widehat{J}_{h,l}(\phi_h)\|_{0,l} \right) \|\bar{J}_{h,l}(\phi_h)\|_{0,l}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by using (3.34), it yields

$$\begin{aligned} h_{\omega_l}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\widehat{J}_{h,l}(\phi_h)\|_{0,l} &\leq h_{\omega_l}^{\frac{1}{2}} (\|\bar{J}_{h,l}(\phi_h)\|_{0,l} + \|\widehat{J}_{h,l}(\phi_h) - \bar{J}_{h,l}(\phi_h)\|_{0,l}) \\ &\leq C \left(h_{\omega_l} \|\widehat{R}_{1h}(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\omega_l} + \|\nabla(\phi - \phi_h)\|_{0,\omega_l} + h_{\omega_l} \sum_{i=1}^n \|p^i - p_h^i\|_{0,\omega_l} + h_l^{\frac{3}{2}} \|\widehat{J}_{h,l}(\phi_h)\|_{0,l} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, choosing h_l sufficiently small such that $Ch_l \ll 1$, then we obtain

$$h_{\omega_l}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\widehat{J}_{h,l}(\phi_h)\|_{0,l} \leq C \left(h_{\omega_l} \|\widehat{R}_{1h}(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\omega_l} + \|\nabla(\phi - \phi_h)\|_{0,\omega_l} + h_{\omega_l} \sum_{i=1}^n \|p^i - p_h^i\|_{0,\omega_l} \right). \quad (3.35)$$

Now we turn to estimate $\|\widehat{R}_{1h}(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\omega_l}$. Define

$$\widetilde{M}_h(p_h^i, \phi_h)|_{\tau} = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n q^i p_h^i \right)|_{\tau} + \frac{1}{|\tau|} \int_{\tau} \operatorname{div}(\epsilon(x) \nabla \phi_h) + \frac{1}{|\tau|} \int_{\tau} f.$$

Since $q^i, i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ are constants, it is easy to see that $\widetilde{M}_h(p_h^i, \phi_h) \in \mathcal{P}^1(\tau)$ and

$$\|\widehat{R}_{1h}(p_h^i, \phi_h) - \widetilde{M}_h(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} \leq Ch_{\tau} (\|\epsilon\|_{2,\infty,\tau} \|\phi_h\|_{1,\tau} + |f|_{1,\tau}). \quad (3.36)$$

In addition, for any $w \in H_0^1(\tau)$, by (3.30), we obtain

$$(\widetilde{M}_h(p_h^i, \phi_h), w)_{\tau} = \widetilde{a}(\phi - \phi_h, w)_{\tau} - (\widehat{R}_{1h}(p_h^i, \phi_h) - \widetilde{M}_h(p_h^i, \phi_h), w)_{\tau} - \left(\sum_{i=1}^n q^i (p^i - p_h^i), w \right)_{\tau}, \quad (3.37)$$

where we have used $(\widehat{J}_{h,l}(\phi_h), w)_l = 0, l \in \partial\tau$ in (3.37), for any $w \in H_0^1(\tau)$. Taking $w = \mu_{\tau} \widetilde{M}_h(p_h^i, \phi_h)$ in (3.37) and by Lemma 3.2, there holds

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widetilde{M}_h(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau}^2 &\leq C (\widetilde{M}_h(p_h^i, \phi_h), \mu_{\tau} \widetilde{M}_h(p_h^i, \phi_h))_{\tau} \\ &\leq C \left(\|\nabla(\phi - \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} \|\mu_{\tau} \widetilde{M}_h(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{1,\tau} + \|\widehat{R}_{1h}(p_h^i, \phi_h) - \widetilde{M}_h(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} \|\mu_{\tau} \widetilde{M}_h(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{i=1}^n \|p^i - p_h^i\|_{0,\tau} \|\mu_{\tau} \widetilde{M}_h(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} \right) \\ &\leq C \left(h_{\tau}^{-1} \|\nabla(\phi - \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} + \|\widehat{R}_{1h}(p_h^i, \phi_h) - \widetilde{M}_h(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} + \sum_{i=1}^n \|p^i - p_h^i\|_{0,\tau} \right) \|\widetilde{M}_h(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we get

$$\|\widetilde{M}_h(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} \leq C \left(h_{\tau}^{-1} \|\nabla(\phi - \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} + \|\widehat{R}_{1h}(p_h^i, \phi_h) - \widetilde{M}_h(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} + \sum_{i=1}^n \|p^i - p_h^i\|_{0,\tau} \right). \quad (3.38)$$

Combining (3.36) and (3.38), it yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{R}_{1h}(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} &\leq \|\widetilde{M}_h(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} + \|\widehat{R}_{1h}(p_h^i, \phi_h) - \widetilde{M}_h(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} \\ &\leq C \left(h_{\tau}^{-1} \|\nabla(\phi - \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} + h_{\tau} (\|\epsilon\|_{2,\infty,\tau} \|\phi_h\|_{1,\tau} + |f|_{1,\tau}) + \sum_{i=1}^n \|p^i - p_h^i\|_{0,\tau} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.39)$$

Substituting (3.39) into (3.35), we obtain

$$h_{\omega_l}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\widehat{J}_{h,l}(\phi_h)\|_{0,l} \leq C \left(\|\nabla(\phi - \phi_h)\|_{0,\omega_l} + h_{\omega_l} \sum_{i=1}^n \|p^i - p_h^i\|_{0,\omega_l} \right) + r_{\phi_h, \omega_l}.$$

where $r_{\phi_h, \omega_l} \leq Ch_{\omega_l}^2 (|f|_{1,\omega_l} + \|\phi_h\|_{1,\omega_l} \|\epsilon\|_{2,\infty,\omega_l})$.

This completes the proof of Lemma 3.3. \square

Applying the above results, we have the following lower bound for $\|\nabla(\phi - \phi_h)\|_{0,\omega_\tau}$.

Theorem 3.3 *Let (p^i, ϕ) and (p_h^i, ϕ_h) be the solutions of (2.14)-(2.15) and (2.16)-(2.17), respectively. For any $\tau \in \mathcal{T}^h$, there holds*

$$\eta_{\tau,\phi}(p_h^i, \phi_h) \leq C \xi_{h,\omega_\tau} \left(\|\nabla(\phi - \phi_h)\|_{0,\omega_\tau} + h_{\omega_\tau} \sum_{i=1}^n \|p^i - p_h^i\|_{0,\omega_\tau} \right) + \widetilde{r}_{\phi_h, \omega_\tau}, \quad (3.40)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_{\tau,\phi}(p_h^i, \phi_h) &= h_\tau \|R_{1h}(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} + \|D_h(\phi_h)\|_{0,\tau}, \\ R_{1h}(p_h^i, \phi_h) &= \sum_{i=1}^n q^i p_h^i + \operatorname{div}(G_h \phi_h) + f, \quad D_h(\phi_h) = G_h \phi_h - \epsilon(x) \nabla \phi_h, \\ \widetilde{r}_{\phi_h, \omega_\tau} &\leq C \xi_{h,\omega_\tau} h_{\omega_\tau}^2 (\|\epsilon\|_{2,\infty,\omega_\tau} \|\phi_h\|_{1,\omega_\tau} + |f|_{1,\omega_\tau}), \\ \xi_{h,\omega_\tau} &= \max_{l \in \partial \mathcal{T}^h, l \subset \omega_\tau \setminus \partial \omega_\tau} \xi_{h,l}, \quad \xi_{h,l} = 1 + h_l |\epsilon|_{1,\infty,l} \|\epsilon^{-1}\|_{0,\infty,l}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof From the definition of G_h , we get

$$G_h \phi_h - \epsilon(x) \nabla \phi_h = \sum_{z \in \partial^2 \mathcal{T}^h} (\epsilon(x) \nabla \phi_h)_z \varphi_z - \epsilon(x) \nabla \phi_h,$$

where φ is the basis function. Thus $\forall x \in \tau, \tau \in \mathcal{T}^h$, if $\{z_i : i = 1, 2, 3\}$ is the vertex set of τ , then by using the similar arguments as (3.19)-(3.22) in [40], we have

$$\begin{aligned} G_h \phi_h - \epsilon(x) \nabla \phi_h &= \sum_{i=1}^3 \varphi_{z_i}(x) \left(\sum_{j=1}^{J_{z_i}} \alpha_{z_i}^j (\epsilon(z_i) \nabla \phi_h)_{\tau_{z_i}^j} \right) - (\epsilon \nabla \phi_h)(x) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^3 \varphi_{z_i}(x) \sum_{j=1}^{J_{z_i}} \alpha_{z_i}^j \left((\epsilon(z_i) \nabla \phi_h)_{\tau_{z_i}^j} - (\epsilon(x) \nabla \phi_h)_\tau \right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^3 \varphi_{z_i}(x) \sum_{j=1}^{J_{z_i}} \alpha_{z_i}^j \left((\epsilon(z_i) \nabla \phi_h)_{\tau_{z_i}^j} - (\epsilon(z_i) \nabla \phi_h)_\tau \right) \\ &\quad + \left(\sum_{i=1}^3 \varphi_{z_i}(x) (\epsilon(z_i))_\tau - \epsilon(x) \right) (\nabla \phi_h)_\tau. \end{aligned} \quad (3.41)$$

We can find a cluster of simplices $\tau', \tau_1, \dots, \tau_K, \tau \in \omega_z$, such that $\bar{\tau}_k \cap \bar{\tau}_{k+1} = l_k \in \partial\mathcal{T}^h$ ($k = 0, 1, \dots, K+1$), where $\tau_0 = \tau'$ and $\tau_{K+1} = \tau$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} (\epsilon(z_i) \nabla \phi_h)_{\tau'} - (\epsilon(z_i) \nabla \phi_h)_{\tau} &= \sum_{k=0}^K \left((\epsilon(z_i) \nabla \phi_h)_{\tau_k} - (\epsilon(z_i) \nabla \phi_h)_{\tau_{k+1}} \right) \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^K \left((\epsilon(z_i) \nabla \phi_h)_{\tau_k} \cdot n_{l_k} - (\epsilon(z_i) \nabla \phi_h)_{\tau_{k+1}} \cdot n_{l_k} \right) n_{l_k}. \end{aligned}$$

That is

$$(\epsilon(z_i) \nabla \phi_h)_{\tau'} - (\epsilon(z_i) \nabla \phi_h)_{\tau} = \sum_{k=0}^K [\epsilon(z_i) \nabla \phi_h \cdot n_{l_k}] n_{l_k}, \quad (3.42)$$

where n_{l_k} is the unit normal vector to l_k . If z is a vertex of l_k , then

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| [\epsilon(z) \nabla \phi_h \cdot n_{l_k}] \right\|_{0, l_k} &\leq \left\| [\epsilon \nabla \phi_h \cdot n_{l_k}] \right\|_{0, l_k} + \left\| [(\epsilon - \epsilon(z)) \epsilon^{-1} \epsilon \nabla \phi_h \cdot n_{l_k}] \right\|_{0, l_k} \\ &\leq C \xi_{h, l_k} \left\| [\epsilon \nabla \phi_h \cdot n_{l_k}] \right\|_{0, l_k}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.43)$$

where $\xi_{h, l_k} = 1 + h_{l_k} |\epsilon|_{1, \infty, l_k} \|\epsilon^{-1}\|_{0, \infty, l_k}$.

Obviously, we know that $\sum_{i=1}^3 \varphi_{z_i}(x) (\epsilon(z_i))_{\tau}$ is the Lagrange interpolation of $\epsilon(x)$ and

$$\left\| \left(\sum_{i=1}^3 \varphi_{z_i}(x) (\epsilon(z_i))_{\tau} - \epsilon(x) \right) \nabla \phi_h \right\|_{0, \tau} \leq Ch_{\tau}^2 |\epsilon|_{2, \infty, \tau} |\phi_h|_{1, \tau}. \quad (3.44)$$

Then from (3.28) and (3.41)-(3.44), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|D_h(\phi_h)\|_{0, \tau} &\leq C \left(\sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{l \in \partial\mathcal{T}^h, l \subset \omega_{z_i}} h_l^{\frac{1}{2}} \xi_{h, l} \|\epsilon \nabla \phi_h \cdot n_l\|_{0, l} + h_{\tau}^2 |\epsilon|_{2, \infty, \tau} |\phi_h|_{1, \tau} \right) \\ &\leq C \xi_{h, \omega_{\tau}} \left(\|\nabla(\phi - \phi_h)\|_{0, \omega_{\tau}} + h_{\omega_{\tau}} \sum_{i=1}^n \|p^i - p_h^i\|_{0, \omega_{\tau}} + r_{\phi_h, \omega_{\tau}} \right) + Ch_{\tau}^2 |\epsilon|_{2, \infty, \tau} |\phi_h|_{1, \tau} \\ &\leq C \xi_{h, \omega_{\tau}} \left(\|\nabla(\phi - \phi_h)\|_{0, \omega_{\tau}} + h_{\omega_{\tau}} \sum_{i=1}^n \|p^i - p_h^i\|_{0, \omega_{\tau}} \right) + \tilde{r}_{\phi_h, \omega_{\tau}}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.45)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{r}_{\phi_h, \omega_{\tau}} &\leq C \xi_{h, \omega_{\tau}} h_{\omega_{\tau}}^2 (\|\epsilon\|_{2, \infty, \omega_{\tau}} \|\phi_h\|_{1, \omega_{\tau}} + |f|_{1, \omega_{\tau}}), \\ \xi_{h, \omega_{\tau}} &= \max_{l \in \partial\mathcal{T}^h, l \subset \omega_{\tau} \setminus \partial\omega_{\tau}} \xi_{h, l}, \quad \xi_{h, l} = 1 + h_l |\epsilon|_{1, \infty, l} \|\epsilon^{-1}\|_{0, \infty, l}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we only need to estimate $\|R_{1h}(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0, \tau}$. Define

$$\tilde{R}_{1h}(p_h^i, \phi_h)|_{\tau} = (\operatorname{div}(G_h \phi_h))|_{\tau} + \sum_{i=1}^n q^i p_h^i + \frac{1}{|\tau|} \int_{\tau} f.$$

It is seen that $\tilde{R}_{1h}(p_h^i, \phi_h) \in \mathcal{P}^1(\tau)$ and

$$\|R_{1h}(p_h^i, \phi_h) - \tilde{R}_{1h}(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} \leq Ch_\tau |f|_{1,\tau}. \quad (3.46)$$

On the other hand, for any $w \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, taking $\chi = 0$ in (3.4), it yields

$$\tilde{a}(\phi - \phi_h, w) = (R_{1h}(p_h^i, \phi_h), w) + \left(\sum_{i=1}^n q^i (p^i - p_h^i), w \right) + (D_h(\phi_h), \nabla w), \quad (3.47)$$

where $R_{1h}(p_h^i, \phi_h) = \sum_{i=1}^n q^i p_h^i + \text{div}(G_h \phi_h) + f$ and $D_h(\phi_h) = G_h \phi_h - \epsilon(x) \nabla \phi_h$.

Further, from (3.47), we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\tilde{R}_{1h}(p_h^i, \phi_h), w)_\tau &= \tilde{a}(\phi - \phi_h, w)_\tau - (R_{1h}(p_h^i, \phi_h) - \tilde{R}_{1h}(p_h^i, \phi_h), w)_\tau \\ &\quad - \left(\sum_{i=1}^n q^i (p^i - p_h^i), w \right)_\tau - (D_h(\phi_h), \nabla w)_\tau. \end{aligned} \quad (3.48)$$

Taking $w = \mu_\tau \tilde{R}_{1h}(p_h^i, \phi_h)$ in (3.48), by Lemma 3.2, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{R}_{1h}(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau}^2 &\leq C(\tilde{R}_{1h}(p_h^i, \phi_h), \mu_\tau \tilde{R}_{1h}(p_h^i, \phi_h)) \\ &\leq C \left(h_\tau^{-1} \|\nabla(\phi - \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} + \|R_{1h}(p_h^i, \phi_h) - \tilde{R}_{1h}(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{i=1}^n \|p^i - p_h^i\|_{0,\tau} + h_\tau^{-1} \|D_h(\phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} \right) \|\tilde{R}_{1h}(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{R}_{1h}(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} &\leq C \left(h_\tau^{-1} \|\nabla(\phi - \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} + \|R_{1h}(p_h^i, \phi_h) - \tilde{R}_{1h}(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{i=1}^n \|p^i - p_h^i\|_{0,\tau} + h_\tau^{-1} \|D_h(\phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.49)$$

Then, by (3.46) and (3.49), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|R_{1h}(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} &\leq \|\tilde{R}_{1h}(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} + \|R_{1h}(p_h^i, \phi_h) - \tilde{R}_{1h}(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} \\ &\leq C \left(h_\tau^{-1} \|\nabla(\phi - \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} + h_\tau |f|_{1,\tau} + \sum_{i=1}^n \|p^i - p_h^i\|_{0,\tau} + h_\tau^{-1} \|D_h(\phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.50)$$

Hence, from (3.45) and (3.50), there holds

$$h_\tau \|R_{1h}(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} \leq C \xi_{h,\omega_\tau} \left(\|\nabla(\phi - \phi_h)\|_{0,\omega_\tau} + h_{\omega_\tau} \sum_{i=1}^n \|p^i - p_h^i\|_{0,\omega_\tau} \right) + \tilde{r}_{\phi_h,\omega_\tau}. \quad (3.51)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{r}_{\phi_h,\omega_\tau} &\leq C \xi_{h,\omega_\tau} h_{\omega_\tau}^2 \left(\|\epsilon\|_{2,\infty,\omega_\tau} \|\phi_h\|_{1,\omega_\tau} + |f|_{1,\omega_\tau} \right), \\ \xi_{h,\omega_\tau} &= \max_{l \in \partial \mathcal{T}^h, l \subset \omega_\tau \setminus \partial \omega_\tau} \xi_{h,l}, \quad \xi_{h,l} = 1 + h_l |\epsilon|_{1,\infty,l} \|\epsilon^{-1}\|_{0,\infty,l}. \end{aligned}$$

Then the desired result (3.40) can be obtained by (3.45) and (3.51). This completes the proof. \square

Now we turn to derive the lower bound of the a posteriori error indicator for $\|\nabla(p^i - p_h^i)\|_{0,\omega_\tau}$. First, we need the following lemmas.

The following result was shown in [30] for the gradient recovery operator \tilde{G}_h defined in (2.7).

Lemma 3.4 [30] *For any $v_h \in S_0^h$, $\tau \in \mathcal{T}^h$, $l \in \partial\mathcal{T}^h$, $l \not\subset \partial\Omega$, there holds*

$$\|\tilde{G}_h v_h - \nabla v_h\|_{0,\tau} \leq C \sum_{l \subset (\omega_\tau \setminus \partial\omega_\tau)} h_l^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\tilde{J}_{h,l}(v_h)\|_{0,l}, \quad (3.52)$$

where $\tilde{J}_{h,l}(v_h) = [\nabla v_h \cdot n_l]$.

Furthermore, from (3.20) and (3.22), we can easily get

$$\|\tilde{J}_{h,l}(v_h)\|_{0,l} \leq C \|\hat{J}_{h,l}(v_h)\|_{0,l}. \quad (3.53)$$

Then for $\phi_h \in S_0^h$, $\tau \in \mathcal{T}^h$, $l \in \partial\mathcal{T}^h$, $l \not\subset \partial\Omega$, from (3.28), (3.52) and (3.53), we have

$$\|\tilde{G}_h \phi_h - \nabla \phi_h\|_{0,\tau} \leq C \left(\|\nabla(\phi - \phi_h)\|_{0,\omega_\tau} + h_{\omega_\tau} \sum_{i=1}^n \|p^i - p_h^i\|_{0,\omega_\tau} \right) + r_{\phi_h, \omega_\tau}, \quad (3.54)$$

where $r_{\phi_h, \omega_\tau} \leq Ch_{\omega_\tau}^2 (\|\epsilon\|_{2,\infty,\omega_\tau} \|\phi_h\|_{1,\omega_\tau} + \|f\|_{1,\omega_\tau})$.

By using the above results, similar to Lemma 3.3, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 3.5 *Let (p^i, ϕ) and (p_h^i, ϕ_h) be the solutions of (2.14)-(2.15) and (2.16)-(2.17), respectively. For any $l \in \partial\mathcal{T}^h$, $l \not\subset \partial\Omega$, if $h_l \ll 1$, the coefficients α , β , g and γ of (1.1) satisfy*

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\alpha(x, p^i) - \alpha(x, p_h^i)\|_{0,\omega_l} + \|\beta(x, p^i) - \beta(x, p_h^i)\|_{0,\omega_l} + \|g(x, p^i) - g(x, p_h^i)\|_{0,\omega_l} + \|\gamma(x, p^i) - \gamma(x, p_h^i)\|_{0,\omega_l} \\ & \leq C \|p^i - p_h^i\|_{0,\omega_l} \end{aligned} \quad (3.55)$$

and $f \in H^1(\Omega)$, then there holds

$$h_{\omega_l}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|J_{h,l}(p_h^i)\|_{0,l} \leq C \left(\|\nabla(p^i - p_h^i)\|_{0,\omega_\tau} + \|\nabla(\phi - \phi_h)\|_{0,\omega_\tau} + \sum_{i=1}^n \|p^i - p_h^i\|_{0,\omega_\tau} \right) + r_{p_h^i, \omega_\tau}, \quad (3.56)$$

where

$$J_{h,l}(p_h^i) = [\alpha(x, p_h^i) \nabla p_h^i \cdot n_l]$$

and

$$r_{p_h^i, \omega_\tau} \leq Ch_{\omega_\tau}^2 (\|\alpha(x, p_h^i)\|_{2,\infty,\omega_\tau} \|p_h^i\|_{1,\omega_\tau} + |\beta(x, p_h^i)|_{2,\omega_\tau} + |g(x, p_h^i)|_{1,\omega_\tau} + \|\epsilon\|_{2,\infty,\omega_\tau} \|\phi_h\|_{1,\omega_\tau} + |f|_{1,\omega_\tau}).$$

Proof First, for any $v \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, from (2.12) and Green's formula, we have

$$\begin{aligned} a(p_h^i, v) &= - \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}^h} \int_{\tau} \left(\operatorname{div}(\alpha(x, p_h^i) \nabla p_h^i) + \operatorname{div}(\beta(x, p_h^i)) - g(x, p_h^i) \right) v - \sum_{l \in \partial\mathcal{T}^h, l \not\subset \partial\Omega} \int_l [\alpha(x, p_h^i) \nabla p_h^i \cdot n_l] v \\ &= - \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}^h} \int_{\tau} R^h(p_h^i) v + J_h(p_h^i, v), \end{aligned} \quad (3.57)$$

where

$$R^h(p_h^i)|_\tau = \left(\operatorname{div}(\alpha(x, p_h^i) \nabla p_h^i) + \operatorname{div}(\beta(x, p_h^i)) - g(x, p_h^i) \right)|_\tau.$$

and

$$J_h(p_h^i, v) = \sum_{l \in \partial \mathcal{T}^h, l \not\subset \partial \Omega} \int_l [\alpha(x, p_h^i) \nabla p_h^i \cdot n_l] v$$

Hence from (2.14) and (3.57), there holds

$$\begin{aligned} J_h(p_h^i, v) &= a(p_h^i, v) + \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}^h} (R^h(p_h^i), v)_\tau \\ &= a(p_h^i, v) - a(p^i, v) - b(p^i, \phi, v) + \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}^h} (R^h(p_h^i), v)_\tau \\ &= \left((a(p_h^i, v) - a(p^i, v)) \right) + \left(b(p_h^i, \phi_h, v) - b(p^i, \phi, v) \right) - b(p_h^i, \phi_h, v) + \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}^h} (R^h(p_h^i), v)_\tau \end{aligned} \quad (3.58)$$

From (2.13) and using the gradient recovery operator \tilde{G}_h , we rewrite the third term on the right-hand side of (3.58) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} -b(p_h^i, \phi_h, v) &= -(\gamma(x, p_h^i) \nabla \phi_h, \nabla v) \\ &= (\gamma(x, p_h^i) (\tilde{G}_h \phi_h - \nabla \phi_h), \nabla v) - (\gamma(x, p_h^i) \tilde{G}_h \phi_h, \nabla v) \\ &= (\gamma(x, p_h^i) (\tilde{G}_h \phi_h - \nabla \phi_h), \nabla v) + \left(\operatorname{div}(\gamma(x, p_h^i) \tilde{G}_h \phi_h), v \right) \\ &= \left((\gamma(x, p_h^i) - \gamma(x, p^i)) (\tilde{G}_h \phi_h - \nabla \phi_h), \nabla v \right) + (\gamma(x, p^i) (\tilde{G}_h \phi_h - \nabla \phi_h), \nabla v) \\ &\quad + \left(\operatorname{div}(\gamma(x, p_h^i) \tilde{G}_h \phi_h), v \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.59)$$

Substituting (3.59) into (3.58), we have

$$\begin{aligned} J_h(p_h^i, v) &= \left((a(p_h^i, v) - a(p^i, v)) \right) + \left(b(p_h^i, \phi_h, v) - b(p^i, \phi, v) \right) + \left(\hat{R}^h(p_h^i, \phi_h), v \right) \\ &\quad + \left((\gamma(x, p_h^i) - \gamma(x, p^i)) (\tilde{G}_h \phi_h - \nabla \phi_h), \nabla v \right) + (\gamma(x, p^i) (\tilde{G}_h \phi_h - \nabla \phi_h), \nabla v), \end{aligned} \quad (3.60)$$

where

$$\hat{R}^h(p_h^i, \phi_h) = \operatorname{div}(\alpha(x, p_h^i) \nabla p_h^i) + \operatorname{div}(\beta(x, p_h^i)) - g(x, p_h^i) + \operatorname{div}(\gamma(x, p_h^i) \tilde{G}_h \phi_h).$$

By using (3.55), for $v \in H_0^1(\omega_l)$, it is easy to get

$$(a(p_h^i, v) - a(p^i, v) + b(p_h^i, \phi_h, v) - b(p^i, \phi, v)) \leq C(\|p^i - p_h^i\|_{1, \omega_l} + \|\nabla(\phi - \phi_h)\|_{0, \omega_l}) \|v\|_{1, \omega_l}. \quad (3.61)$$

Then for any $v \in H_0^1(\omega_l)$, inserting (3.61) into (3.60) and from (2.9), (2.25) and (3.55), we get

$$\begin{aligned} (J_{h,l}(p_h^i), v)_l &= J_h(p_h^i, v) \\ &\leq C \left(\|p^i - p_h^i\|_{1, \omega_l} \|v\|_{1, \omega_l} + \|\gamma(x, p_h^i) - \gamma(x, p^i)\|_{0, \omega_l} \|\tilde{G}_h \phi_h - \nabla \phi_h\|_{0, \infty, \omega_l} \|v\|_{1, \omega_l} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|\hat{R}^h(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0, \omega_l} \|v\|_{0, \omega_l} + \|\gamma(x, p^i)\|_{0, \infty, \omega_l} \|\tilde{G}_h \phi_h - \nabla \phi_h\|_{0, \omega_l} \|v\|_{1, \omega_l} \right) \\ &\leq C \left(\|p^i - p_h^i\|_{1, \omega_l} \|v\|_{1, \omega_l} + \|\hat{R}^h(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0, \omega_l} \|v\|_{0, \omega_l} + \|\tilde{G}_h \phi_h - \nabla \phi_h\|_{0, \omega_l} \|v\|_{1, \omega_l} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|\nabla(\phi - \phi_h)\|_{0, \omega_l} \|v\|_{1, \omega_l} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.62)$$

In order to estimate $\|J_{h,l}(p_h^i)\|_{0,l}$, similar to the estimation for $\|\widehat{J}_{h,l}(\phi_h)\|_{0,l}$ in Lemma 3.3, we introduce an approximation to $J_{h,l}(p_h^i)$, which is defined as follows

$$\bar{J}_{h,l}(p_h^i) = [\bar{\alpha}(x, p_h^i) \nabla p_h^i \cdot n_l],$$

where $\bar{\alpha}(x, p_h^i) \in S^h$ is a linear interpolation of $\alpha(x, p_h^i)$ on ω_l satisfying (cf. [42])

$$\|\alpha(x, p_h^i) - \bar{\alpha}(x, p_h^i)\|_{0,\infty,l} \leq Ch_l \|\alpha(x, p_h^i)\|_{2,\infty,\omega_l}. \quad (3.63)$$

For any $w \in H_0^1(\omega_l)$, by using (3.19) and (3.63), we get

$$\begin{aligned} (J_{h,l}(p_h^i) - \bar{J}_{h,l}(p_h^i), w)_l &= \int_l [(\alpha(x, p_h^i) - \bar{\alpha}(x, p_h^i)) \nabla p_h^i \cdot n_l] w \\ &\leq C \|\alpha(x, p_h^i) - \bar{\alpha}(x, p_h^i)\|_{0,\infty,l} \|\nabla p_h^i \cdot n_l\|_{0,l} \|w\|_{0,l} \\ &\leq Ch_l \|\alpha(x, p_h^i)\|_{1,\infty,\omega_l} \|\nabla p_h^i \cdot n_l\|_{0,l} \|w\|_{0,l} \\ &\leq Ch_l \|J_{h,l}(p_h^i)\|_{0,l} \|w\|_{0,l}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.64)$$

Taking $w = J_{h,l}(p_h^i) - \bar{J}_{h,l}(p_h^i)$ in the above formula, it yields

$$\|J_{h,l}(p_h^i) - \bar{J}_{h,l}(p_h^i)\|_{0,l} \leq Ch_l \|J_{h,l}(p_h^i)\|_{0,l}. \quad (3.65)$$

On the other hand, from (3.62) and (3.64), for $w \in H_0^1(\omega_l)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\bar{J}_{h,l}(p_h^i), w)_l &= (\bar{J}_{h,l}(p_h^i) - J_{h,l}(p_h^i), w)_l + (J_{h,l}(p_h^i), w)_l \\ &\leq C \left(h_l \|J_{h,l}(p_h^i)\|_{0,l} \|w\|_{0,l} + \|p^i - p_h^i\|_{1,\omega_l} \|w\|_{1,\omega_l} + \|\widehat{R}^h(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\omega_l} \|w\|_{0,\omega_l} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|\widetilde{G}_h \phi_h - \nabla \phi_h\|_{0,\omega_l} \|w\|_{1,\omega_l} + \|\nabla(\phi - \phi_h)\|_{0,\omega_l} \|w\|_{1,\omega_l} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Taking $w = \nu_l \bar{J}_{h,l}(p_h^i)$ in the above formula and by (3.25)-(3.27), there holds

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{J}_{h,l}(p_h^i)\|_{0,l}^2 &\leq C (\bar{J}_{h,l}(p_h^i), \nu_l \bar{J}_{h,l}(p_h^i))_l \\ &\leq C \left(h_{\omega_l}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|p^i - p_h^i\|_{1,\omega_l} + h_{\omega_l}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\widehat{R}^h(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\omega_l} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + h_{\omega_l}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\widetilde{G}_h \phi_h - \nabla \phi_h\|_{0,\omega_l} + h_{\omega_l}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla(\phi - \phi_h)\|_{0,\omega_l} + h_l \|J_{h,l}(p_h^i)\|_{0,l} \right) \|\bar{J}_{h,l}(p_h^i)\|_{0,l}. \end{aligned}$$

From the above inequality and by using (3.65), we get

$$\begin{aligned} h_{\omega_l}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|J_{h,l}(p_h^i)\|_{0,l} &\leq h_{\omega_l}^{\frac{1}{2}} (\|\bar{J}_{h,l}(p_h^i)\|_{0,l} + \|J_{h,l}(p_h^i) - \bar{J}_{h,l}(p_h^i)\|_{0,l}) \\ &\leq C \left(\|p^i - p_h^i\|_{1,\omega_l} + h_{\omega_l} \|\widehat{R}^h(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\omega_l} + \|\widetilde{G}_h \phi_h - \nabla \phi_h\|_{0,\omega_l} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|\nabla(\phi - \phi_h)\|_{0,\omega_l} + h_l^{\frac{3}{2}} \|J_{h,l}(p_h^i)\|_{0,l} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, choosing h_l sufficiently small such that $Ch_l \ll 1$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} h_{\omega_l}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|J_{h,l}(p_h^i)\|_{0,l} &\leq C \left(\|p^i - p_h^i\|_{1,\omega_l} + h_{\omega_l} \|\widehat{R}^h(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\omega_l} + \|\widetilde{G}_h \phi_h - \nabla \phi_h\|_{0,\omega_l} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|\nabla(\phi - \phi_h)\|_{0,\omega_l} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.66)$$

Now we only need to estimate $\|R^h(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\omega_l}$. Define

$$\tilde{R}^h(p_h^i, \phi_h)|_\tau = \operatorname{div}(\gamma(x, p_h^i)\tilde{G}_h\phi_h) + \frac{1}{|\tau|} \int_\tau \operatorname{div}(\alpha(x, p_h^i)\nabla p_h^i) + \frac{1}{|\tau|} \int_\tau \operatorname{div}(\beta(x, p_h^i)) - \frac{1}{|\tau|} \int_\tau g(x, p_h^i). \quad (3.67)$$

Since $\gamma(x, p_h^i)$ is assumed to be a linear function with respect to p_h^i , then $\tilde{R}^h(p_h^i, \phi_h) \in \mathcal{P}^1(\tau)$ and

$$\|\hat{R}^h(p_h^i, \phi_h) - \tilde{R}^h(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} \leq Ch_\tau(\|\alpha(x, p_h^i)\|_{2,\infty,\tau}\|p_h^i\|_{1,\tau} + |\beta(x, p_h^i)|_{2,\tau} + |g(x, p_h^i)|_{1,\tau}). \quad (3.68)$$

On the other hand, from (3.60), for any $v \in H_0^1(\tau)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\tilde{R}^h(p_h^i, \phi_h), v)_\tau &= (\hat{R}^h(p_h^i, \phi_h), v)_\tau - (\hat{R}^h(p_h^i, \phi_h) - \tilde{R}^h(p_h^i, \phi_h), v)_\tau \\ &= -\left((a(p_h^i), v)_\tau - a(p^i, v)_\tau\right) - \left(b(p_h^i, \phi_h, v)_\tau - b(p^i, \phi, v)_\tau\right) \\ &\quad - (\hat{R}^h(p_h^i, \phi_h) - \tilde{R}^h(p_h^i, \phi_h), v)_\tau - \left((\gamma(x, p_h^i) - \gamma(x, p^i))(\tilde{G}_h\phi_h - \nabla\phi_h), \nabla v\right)_\tau \\ &\quad - (\gamma(x, p^i)(\tilde{G}_h\phi_h - \nabla\phi_h), \nabla v)_\tau, \end{aligned} \quad (3.69)$$

where we have used $(J_{h,l}(p_h^i), v)_l = 0$, for any $l \in \partial\tau$. Then from (3.61) and the similar arguments as in (3.62), we get

$$\begin{aligned} (\tilde{R}^h(p_h^i, \phi_h), v)_\tau &\leq C(\|p^i - p_h^i\|_{1,\tau}\|v\|_{1,\tau} + \|\hat{R}^h(p_h^i, \phi_h) - \tilde{R}^h(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau}\|v\|_{0,\tau} \\ &\quad + \|\tilde{G}_h\phi_h - \nabla\phi_h\|_{0,\tau}\|v\|_{1,\tau} + \|\nabla(\phi - \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau}\|v\|_{1,\tau}). \end{aligned} \quad (3.70)$$

Taking $v = \mu_\tau \tilde{R}^h(p_h^i, \phi_h)$ in (3.70) and by Lemma 3.2, there holds

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{R}^h(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau}^2 &\leq C(\tilde{R}^h(p_h^i, \phi_h), \mu_\tau \tilde{R}^h(p_h^i, \phi_h)) \\ &\leq C(h_\tau^{-1}\|p^i - p_h^i\|_{1,\tau} + \|\hat{R}^h(p_h^i, \phi_h) - \tilde{R}^h(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} \\ &\quad + h_\tau^{-1}\|\tilde{G}_h\phi_h - \nabla\phi_h\|_{0,\tau} + h_\tau^{-1}\|\nabla(\phi - \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau})\|\tilde{R}^h(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{R}^h(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} &\leq C(h_\tau^{-1}\|p^i - p_h^i\|_{1,\tau} + \|\hat{R}^h(p_h^i, \phi_h) - \tilde{R}^h(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} \\ &\quad + h_\tau^{-1}\|\tilde{G}_h\phi_h - \nabla\phi_h\|_{0,\tau} + h_\tau^{-1}\|\nabla(\phi - \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau}). \end{aligned} \quad (3.71)$$

Combining (3.68) and (3.71), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{R}^h(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} &\leq \|\tilde{R}^h(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} + \|\hat{R}^h(p_h^i, \phi_h) - \tilde{R}^h(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} \\ &\leq C(h_\tau^{-1}\|p^i - p_h^i\|_{1,\tau} + h_\tau^{-1}\|\tilde{G}_h\phi_h - \nabla\phi_h\|_{0,\tau} + h_\tau^{-1}\|\nabla(\phi - \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau}) \\ &\quad + Ch_\tau(\|\alpha(x, p_h^i)\|_{2,\infty,\tau}\|p_h^i\|_{1,\tau} + |\beta(x, p_h^i)|_{2,\tau} + |g(x, p_h^i)|_{1,\tau}). \end{aligned} \quad (3.72)$$

Inserting (3.72) into (3.66), and using (3.54), we get

$$\begin{aligned} h_{\omega_l}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|J_{h,l}(p_h^i)\|_{0,l} &\leq C(\|p^i - p_h^i\|_{1,\omega_l} + \|\tilde{G}_h\phi_h - \nabla\phi_h\|_{0,\omega_l} + \|\nabla(\phi - \phi_h)\|_{0,\omega_l}) \\ &\quad + Ch_{\omega_l}^2(|\beta(x, p_h^i)|_{2,\omega_l} + |g(x, p_h^i)|_{1,\omega_l} + \|p_h^i\|_{1,\omega_l}\|\alpha(x, p_h^i)\|_{2,\infty,\omega_l}) \\ &\leq C\left(\|\nabla(p^i - p_h^i)\|_{0,\omega_\tau} + \|\nabla(\phi - \phi_h)\|_{0,\omega_\tau} + \sum_{i=1}^n \|p^i - p_h^i\|_{0,\omega_\tau}\right) + r_{p_h^i, \omega_\tau}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.73)$$

where $r_{p_h^i, \omega_l} \leq Ch_{\omega_\tau}^2 (\|p_h^i\|_{1, \omega_\tau} \|\alpha(x, p_h^i)\|_{2, \infty, \omega_\tau} + |\beta(x, p_h^i)|_{2, \omega_\tau} + |g(x, p_h^i)|_{1, \omega_\tau} + |f|_{1, \omega_\tau} + \|\epsilon\|_{2, \infty, \omega_\tau} \|\phi_h\|_{1, \omega_\tau})$.
This completes the proof of Lemma 3.5. \square

By using the above lemma, now we present the lower bound for $\|\nabla(p^i - p_h^i)\|_{0, \omega_\tau}$.

Theorem 3.4 *Let (p^i, ϕ) and (p_h^i, ϕ_h) be the solutions of (2.14)-(2.15) and (2.16)-(2.17), respectively. For any $l \in \partial\mathcal{T}^h$, $l \not\subset \partial\Omega$, if $h_l \ll 1$, the coefficients α , β , g and γ of (1.1) satisfy*

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\alpha(x, p^i) - \alpha(x, p_h^i)\|_{0, \omega_l} + \|\beta(x, p^i) - \beta(x, p_h^i)\|_{0, \omega_l} + \|g(x, p^i) - g(x, p_h^i)\|_{0, \omega_l} + \|\gamma(x, p^i) - \gamma(x, p_h^i)\|_{0, \omega_l} \\ & \leq C\|p^i - p_h^i\|_{0, \omega_l} \end{aligned}$$

and $f \in H^1(\Omega)$, then for any $\tau \in \mathcal{T}^h$, there holds

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_{\tau, p^i}(p_h^i, \phi_h) & \leq C\tilde{\xi}_{h, \omega_\tau}(p_h^i, \phi_h) \left(\|\nabla(p^i - p_h^i)\|_{0, \omega_\tau} + \|\nabla(\phi - \phi_h)\|_{0, \omega_\tau} + \sum_{i=1}^n \|p^i - p_h^i\|_{0, \omega_\tau} \right) \\ & \quad + \tilde{r}_{p_h^i, \omega_\tau}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.74}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_{\tau, p^i}(p_h^i, \phi_h) & = \|D_h(\phi_h)\|_{0, \tau} + \|D_h(p_h^i)\|_{0, \tau} + h_\tau (\|R_{1h}(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0, \tau} + \|R_{2h}(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0, \tau}) \\ & \quad + \|\gamma(x, p_h^i)(\tilde{G}_h\phi_h - \nabla\phi_h)\|_{0, \tau}, \\ D_h(\phi_h) & = G_h\phi_h - \epsilon(x)\nabla\phi_h, \quad D_h(p_h^i) = G_hp_h^i - \alpha(x, p_h^i)\nabla p_h^i, \\ R_{1h}(p_h^i, \phi_h) & = \sum_{i=1}^n q^i p_h^i + \operatorname{div}(G_h\phi_h) + f, \\ R_{2h}(p_h^i, \phi_h) & = \operatorname{div}(G_hp_h^i) + \operatorname{div}(\beta(x, p_h^i)) - g(x, p_h^i) + \operatorname{div}(\gamma(x, p_h^i)\tilde{G}_h\phi_h), \\ \tilde{r}_{p_h^i, \omega_\tau} & \leq C\tilde{\xi}_{h, \omega_\tau} h_{\omega_\tau}^2 \left(\|p_h^i\|_{1, \omega_l} \|\alpha(x, p_h^i)\|_{2, \infty, \omega_l} + |\beta(\cdot, p_h^i)|_{2, \omega_\tau} + |g(\cdot, p_h^i)|_{1, \omega_\tau} + \|\epsilon\|_{2, \infty, \omega_\tau} \|\phi_h\|_{1, \omega_\tau} + |f|_{1, \omega_\tau} \right), \\ \tilde{\xi}_{h, \omega_\tau}(p_h^i, \phi_h) & = \max\{\tilde{\xi}_{h, \omega_\tau}, \xi_{h, \omega_\tau}\}, \\ \tilde{\xi}_{h, \omega_\tau} & = \max_{l \in \partial\mathcal{T}^h, l \subset \omega_\tau \setminus \partial\omega_\tau} \tilde{\xi}_{h, l}, \quad \tilde{\xi}_{h, l} = 1 + h_l |\alpha(\cdot, p_h^i)|_{1, \infty, l} \|\alpha^{-1}(\cdot, p_h^i)\|_{0, \infty, l}, \\ \xi_{h, \omega_\tau} & = \max_{l \in \partial\mathcal{T}^h, l \subset \omega_\tau \setminus \partial\omega_\tau} \xi_{h, l}, \quad \xi_{h, l} = 1 + h_l |\epsilon(x)|_{1, \infty, l} \|\epsilon(x)^{-1}\|_{0, \infty, l}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof Similar to the proof of Theorem 3.3, first from the definition of G_h (see (2.6)), we get

$$G_hp_h^i - \alpha(x, p_h^i)\nabla p_h^i = \sum_{z \in \partial^2\mathcal{T}^h} (\alpha(x, p_h^i)\nabla p_h^i)_z \varphi_z - \alpha(x, p_h^i)\nabla p_h^i,$$

where φ_z is the basis function. Thus for any $x \in \tau, \tau \in \mathcal{T}^h$, suppose $\{z_i : i = 1, 2, 3\}$ is the vertex set of τ . Then by the similar arguments as (3.41)-(3.45) in the proof of Theorem 3.3, we can easily get

$$\begin{aligned}
G_h p_h^i - \alpha(x, p_h^i) \nabla p_h^i &= \sum_{i=1}^3 \varphi_{z_i}(x) \left(\sum_{j=1}^{J_{z_i}} \alpha_{z_i}^j (\alpha(z_i, p_h^i(z_i)) \nabla p_h^i)_{\tau_{z_i}^j} \right) - (\alpha(x, p_h^i) \nabla p_h^i)(x) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^3 \varphi_{z_i}(x) \sum_{j=1}^{J_{z_i}} \alpha_{z_i}^j \left((\alpha(z_i, p_h^i(z_i)) \nabla p_h^i)_{\tau_{z_i}^j} - (\alpha(x, p_h^i) \nabla p_h^i)_{\tau} \right) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^3 \varphi_{z_i}(x) \sum_{j=1}^{J_{z_i}} \alpha_{z_i}^j \left((\alpha(z_i, p_h^i(z_i)) \nabla p_h^i)_{\tau_{z_i}^j} - (\alpha(z_i, p_h^i(z_i)) \nabla p_h^i)_{\tau} \right) \\
&\quad + \left(\sum_{i=1}^3 \varphi_{z_i}(x) (\alpha(z_i, p_h^i(z_i)))_{\tau} - \alpha(x, p_h^i) \right) (\nabla p_h^i)_{\tau}. \tag{3.75}
\end{aligned}$$

It is easy to know we can find a cluster of simplices $\tau', \tau_1, \dots, \tau_K, \tau \in \omega_z$, such that $\bar{\tau}_k \cap \bar{\tau}_{k+1} = l_k \in \partial \mathcal{T}^h$ ($k = 0, 1, \dots, K+1$), where $\tau_0 = \tau'$ and $\tau_{K+1} = \tau$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
&(\alpha(z_i, p_h^i(z_i)) \nabla p_h^i)_{\tau'} - (\alpha(z_i, p_h^i(z_i)) \nabla p_h^i)_{\tau} \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^K \left((\alpha(z_i, p_h^i(z_i)) \nabla p_h^i)_{\tau_k} - (\alpha(z_i, p_h^i(z_i)) \nabla p_h^i)_{\tau_{k+1}} \right) \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^K \left((\alpha(z_i, p_h^i(z_i)) \nabla p_h^i)_{\tau_k} \cdot n_{l_k} - (\alpha(z_i, p_h^i(z_i)) \nabla p_h^i)_{\tau_{k+1}} \cdot n_{l_k} \right) n_{l_k}
\end{aligned}$$

or

$$(\alpha(z_i, p_h^i(z_i)) \nabla p_h^i)_{\tau'} - (\alpha(z_i, p_h^i(z_i)) \nabla p_h^i)_{\tau} = \sum_{k=0}^K [\alpha(z_i, p_h^i(z_i)) \nabla p_h^i \cdot n_{l_k}] n_{l_k}, \tag{3.76}$$

where n_{l_k} is the unit normal vector to l_k . If z is a vertex of l_k , then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| [\alpha(z, p_h^i(z)) \nabla p_h^i \cdot n_{l_k}] \right\|_{0, l_k} \\
&\leq \left\| [\alpha(\cdot, p_h^i) \nabla p_h^i \cdot n_{l_k}] \right\|_{0, l_k} + \left\| [(\alpha(\cdot, p_h^i) - \alpha(z, p_h^i(z))) \alpha^{-1}(\cdot, p_h^i) \alpha(\cdot, p_h^i) \nabla p_h^i \cdot n_{l_k}] \right\|_{0, l_k} \\
&\leq C \tilde{\xi}_{h, l_k} \left\| [\alpha(\cdot, p_h^i) \nabla p_h^i \cdot n_{l_k}] \right\|_{0, l_k}, \tag{3.77}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\xi}_{h, l_k} = 1 + h_{l_k} |\alpha(\cdot, p_h^i)|_{1, \infty, l_k} \|\alpha^{-1}(\cdot, p_h^i)\|_{0, \infty, l_k}$.

Obviously, we know that $\sum_{i=1}^3 \varphi_{z_i}(x) (\alpha(z_i, p_h^i(z_i)))_{\tau}$ is the Lagrange interpolation of $\alpha(x, p_h^i)$ and

$$\left\| \left(\sum_{i=1}^3 \varphi_{z_i}(x) (\alpha(z_i, p_h^i(z_i)))_{\tau} - \alpha(\cdot, p_h^i) \right) \nabla p_h^i \right\|_{0, \tau} \leq Ch_{\tau}^2 |\alpha(\cdot, p_h^i)|_{2, \infty, \tau} |p_h^i|_{1, \tau}. \tag{3.78}$$

Then from (3.56) and (3.75)-(3.78), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\|D_h(p_h^i)\|_{0,\tau} &\leq C \left(\sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{l \in \partial T^h, l \subset \omega_{z_i}} \xi_{h,l} h_l^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\alpha(\cdot, p_h^i) \nabla p_h \cdot n_l\|_{0,l} + h_\tau^2 |\alpha(\cdot, p_h^i)|_{2,\infty,\tau} |p_h^i|_{1,\tau} \right) \\
&\leq C \tilde{\xi}_{h,\omega_\tau} \left(\|\nabla(p^i - p_h^i)\|_{0,\omega_\tau} + h_{\omega_\tau} \sum_{i=1}^n \|p^i - p_h^i\|_{0,\omega_\tau} + \|\nabla(\phi - \phi_h)\|_{0,\omega_\tau} + r_{p_h^i,\omega_\tau} \right) \\
&\quad + C h_\tau^2 |\alpha(\cdot, p_h^i)|_{2,\infty,\tau} |p_h^i|_{1,\tau} \\
&\leq C \tilde{\xi}_{h,\omega_\tau} \left(\|\nabla(p^i - p_h^i)\|_{0,\omega_\tau} + h_{\omega_\tau} \sum_{i=1}^n \|p^i - p_h^i\|_{0,\omega_\tau} + \|\nabla(\phi - \phi_h)\|_{0,\omega_\tau} \right) + \tilde{r}_{p_h^i,\omega_\tau}, \quad (3.79)
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{r}_{p_h^i,\omega_\tau} &\leq C \tilde{\xi}_{h,\omega_\tau} h_{\omega_\tau}^2 \left(\|\alpha(\cdot, p_h^i)\|_{2,\infty,\omega_\tau} \|p_h^i\|_{1,\omega_\tau} + |\beta(\cdot, p_h^i)|_{2,\omega_\tau} + |g(\cdot, p_h^i)|_{1,\omega_\tau} + \|\epsilon\|_{2,\infty,\omega_\tau} \|\phi_h\|_{1,\omega_\tau} + |f|_{1,\omega_\tau} \right), \\
\tilde{\xi}_{h,\omega_\tau} &= \max_{l \in \partial T^h, l \subset \omega_\tau \setminus \partial \omega_\tau} \tilde{\xi}_{h,l}, \quad \tilde{\xi}_{h,l} = 1 + h_l |\alpha(\cdot, p_h^i)|_{1,\infty,l} \|\alpha^{-1}(\cdot, p_h^i)\|_{0,\infty,l}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now we turn to estimate $\|R_{2h}(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau}$. Define

$$\tilde{R}_{2h}(p_h^i, \phi_h)|_\tau = \operatorname{div}(G_h p_h^i)|_\tau + \operatorname{div}(\gamma(x, p_h^i) \tilde{G}_h \phi_h)|_\tau + \frac{1}{|\tau|} \int_\tau \operatorname{div}(\beta(x, p_h^i)) - \frac{1}{|\tau|} \int_\tau g(x, p_h^i).$$

Since $\gamma(x, p_h^i)$ is assumed to be a linear function with respect to p_h^i , it is easy to see that $\tilde{R}_{2h}(p_h^i, \phi_h) \in \mathcal{P}^1(\tau)$ and

$$\|R_{2h}(p_h^i, \phi_h) - \tilde{R}_{2h}(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} \leq C h_\tau (|\beta(x, p_h^i)|_{2,\tau} + |g(x, p_h^i)|_{1,\tau}). \quad (3.80)$$

For any $v \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, taking $\chi = 0$ in (3.12), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
a'(p_h^i; p^i - p_h^i, v) &= (D_h(p_h^i), \nabla v) + (R_{2h}(p_h^i, \phi_h), v) \\
&\quad + (\gamma(x, p_h^i)(\tilde{G}_h \phi_h - \nabla \phi_h), \nabla v) - R(p_h^i, \phi_h, p^i, \phi, v), \quad (3.81)
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$R_{2h}(p_h^i, \phi_h) = \operatorname{div}(G_h p_h^i) + \operatorname{div}(\beta(x, p_h^i)) - g(x, p_h^i) + \operatorname{div}(\gamma(x, p_h^i) \tilde{G}_h \phi_h).$$

It follows from (3.11) and (3.81) that

$$\begin{aligned}
(\tilde{R}_{2h}(p_h^i, \phi_h), v)_\tau &= (R_{2h}(p_h^i, \phi_h), v)_\tau - (R_{2h}(p_h^i, \phi_h) - \tilde{R}_{2h}(p_h^i, \phi_h), v)_\tau \\
&= a'(p_h^i; p^i - p_h^i, v)_\tau - (D_h(p_h^i), \nabla v)_\tau - (R_{2h}(p_h^i, \phi_h) - \tilde{R}_{2h}(p_h^i, \phi_h), v)_\tau \\
&\quad - (\gamma(x, p_h^i)(\tilde{G}_h \phi_h - \nabla \phi_h), \nabla v)_\tau + R(p_h^i, \phi_h, p^i, \phi, v)_\tau \\
&= -a(p_h^i, v)_\tau - b(p_h^i, \phi_h, v)_\tau - (D_h(p_h^i), \nabla v)_\tau \\
&\quad - (R_{2h}(p_h^i, \phi_h) - \tilde{R}_{2h}(p_h^i, \phi_h), v)_\tau - (\gamma(x, p_h^i)(\tilde{G}_h \phi_h - \nabla \phi_h), \nabla v)_\tau. \quad (3.82)
\end{aligned}$$

Then by using the similar arguments as in (3.61), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(\tilde{R}_{2h}(p_h^i, \phi_h), v)_\tau &\leq C (\|p^i - p_h^i\|_{1,\tau} \|v\|_{1,\tau} + \|D_h(p_h^i)\|_{0,\tau} \|v\|_{1,\tau} + \|R_{2h}(p_h^i, \phi_h) - \tilde{R}_{2h}(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} \|v\|_{0,\tau} \\
&\quad + \|\tilde{G}_h \phi_h - \nabla \phi_h\|_{0,\tau} \|v\|_{1,\tau} + \|\nabla(\phi - \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} \|v\|_{1,\tau}). \quad (3.83)
\end{aligned}$$

Setting $v = \mu_\tau \tilde{R}_{2h}(p_h^i, \phi_h)$ in (3.83) and by Lemma 3.2, it yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{R}_{2h}(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau}^2 &\leq C(\tilde{R}_{2h}(p_h^i, \phi_h), \mu_\tau \tilde{R}_{2h}(p_h^i, \phi_h))_\tau \\ &\leq C(h_\tau^{-1}\|p^i - p_h^i\|_{1,\tau} + h_\tau^{-1}\|D_h(p_h^i)\|_{0,\tau} + \|R_{2h}(p_h^i, \phi_h) - \tilde{R}_{2h}(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} \\ &\quad + h_\tau^{-1}\|\tilde{G}_h\phi_h - \nabla\phi_h\|_{0,\tau} + h_\tau^{-1}\|\nabla(\phi - \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau})\|\tilde{R}_{2h}(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{R}_{2h}(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} &\leq C(h_\tau^{-1}\|p^i - p_h^i\|_{1,\tau} + h_\tau^{-1}\|D_h(p_h^i)\|_{0,\tau} + \|R_{2h}(p_h^i, \phi_h) - \tilde{R}_{2h}(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} \\ &\quad + h_\tau^{-1}\|\tilde{G}_h\phi_h - \nabla\phi_h\|_{0,\tau} + h_\tau^{-1}\|\nabla(\phi - \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau}). \end{aligned} \quad (3.84)$$

Then by (3.80) and (3.84), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|R_{2h}(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} &\leq \|\tilde{R}_{2h}(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} + \|R_{2h}(p_h^i, \phi_h) - \tilde{R}_{2h}(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} \\ &\leq C(h_\tau^{-1}\|p^i - p_h^i\|_{1,\tau} + h_\tau^{-1}\|D_h(p_h^i)\|_{0,\tau} + h_\tau(|\beta(x, p_h^i)|_{2,\tau} + |g(x, p_h^i)|_{1,\tau}) \\ &\quad + h_\tau^{-1}\|\tilde{G}_h\phi_h - \nabla\phi_h\|_{0,\tau} + h_\tau^{-1}\|\nabla(\phi - \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau}) \end{aligned}$$

or

$$\begin{aligned} h_\tau\|R_{2h}(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} &\leq C(\|p^i - p_h^i\|_{1,\tau} + \|D_h(p_h^i)\|_{0,\tau} + h_\tau^2(|\beta(x, p_h^i)|_{2,\tau} + |g(x, p_h^i)|_{1,\tau}) \\ &\quad + \|\tilde{G}_h\phi_h - \nabla\phi_h\|_{0,\tau} + \|\nabla(\phi - \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau}). \end{aligned} \quad (3.85)$$

Combining (3.79) and (3.85), and using (3.54), we get

$$\begin{aligned} h_\tau\|R_{2h}(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} &\leq C\tilde{\xi}_{h,\omega_\tau} \left(\|\nabla(p^i - p_h^i)\|_{0,\omega_\tau} + \|\tilde{G}_h\phi_h - \nabla\phi_h\|_{0,\tau} + \|\nabla(\phi - \phi_h)\|_{0,\omega_\tau} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{i=1}^n \|p^i - p_h^i\|_{0,\omega_\tau} \right) + \tilde{r}_{p_h^i, \omega_\tau} \\ &\leq C\tilde{\xi}_{h,\omega_\tau} \left(\|\nabla(p^i - p_h^i)\|_{0,\omega_\tau} + \|\nabla(\phi - \phi_h)\|_{0,\omega_\tau} + \sum_{i=1}^n \|p^i - p_h^i\|_{0,\omega_\tau} \right) + \tilde{r}_{p_h^i, \omega_\tau}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.86)$$

Therefore, the desired estimate (3.74) is obtained from (3.40), (3.79) and (3.86). \square

Similar to Remark 3.1, we have the following results.

Remark 3.2 *If $\|p^i - p_h^i\|_{0,\omega_\tau} \leq Ch_{\omega_\tau}^2$, then from Theorems 3.3 and 3.4, it yields*

$$\eta_{\tau,\phi}(p_h^i, \phi_h) \leq C(\|\nabla(\phi - \phi_h)\|_{0,\omega_\tau} + h_{\omega_\tau}^2),$$

and

$$\eta_{\tau,p^i}(p_h^i, \phi_h) \leq C(\|\nabla(p^i - p_h^i)\|_{0,\omega_\tau} + \|\nabla(\phi - \phi_h)\|_{0,\omega_\tau} + h_{\omega_\tau}^2).$$

3.3 Adaptive algorithm

In this subsection, we describe a typical adaptive finite element algorithm based on the a posteriori error estimators derived above.

For $\tau \in \mathcal{T}^h$, we denote the local error indicators for the electrostatic potential and concentrations respectively by

$$\eta_{\tau,\phi}(p_h^i, \phi_h) = \|D_h(\phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} + h_\tau \|R_{1h}(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau}, \quad (3.87)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_{\tau,p^i}(p_h^i, \phi_h) &= \|D_h(p_h^i)\|_{0,\tau} + \|D_h(\phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} + \|\gamma(x, p_h^i)(\tilde{G}_h \phi_h - \nabla \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} \\ &\quad + h_\tau (\|R_{1h}(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau} + \|R_{2h}(p_h^i, \phi_h)\|_{0,\tau}), \end{aligned} \quad (3.88)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} D_h(\phi_h) &= G_h \phi_h - \epsilon(x) \nabla \phi_h, \quad D_h(p_h^i) = G_h p_h^i - \alpha(x, p_h^i) \nabla p_h^i, \\ R_{1h}(p_h^i, \phi_h) &= \sum_{i=1}^n q^i p_h^i + \operatorname{div}(G_h \phi_h) + f, \\ R_{2h}(p_h^i, \phi_h) &= \operatorname{div}(G_h p_h^i) + \operatorname{div}(\beta(x, p_h^i)) - g(x, p_h^i) + \operatorname{div}(\gamma(x, p_h^i) \tilde{G}_h \phi_h). \end{aligned}$$

Given an initial conforming mesh \mathcal{T}^h , an associated finite element space S_0^h and a tolerance TOL , the typical adaptive finite element algorithm is then designed as follows:

Algorithm 3.1 Adaptive Computing for nonlinear PNP equations

- Step 1: Computing the finite element solution
Find the finite element solution p_h^i , $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ and $\phi_h \in S_0^h$.
 - Step 2: Error estimation
Compute the local error indicators $\eta_{\tau,\phi}$ and η_{τ,p^i} by (3.87) and (3.88) respectively for all $\tau \in \mathcal{T}^h$.
 - Step 3: Local refinement
If $\left(\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}^h} \eta_{\tau,\phi}^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} > TOL$ or $\left(\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}^h} \eta_{\tau,p^i}^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} > TOL$, then refine those elements which satisfy $\eta_{\tau,\phi} \geq \theta \max_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}^h} \eta_{\tau,\phi}$ or $\eta_{\tau,p^i} \geq \theta \max_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}^h} \eta_{\tau,p^i}$ with $\theta \in (0, 1)$ is a given refinement parameter.
 - Step 4: Generating a new mesh
Generate a new mesh \mathcal{T}^h , a space S_0^h and return to Step 1. Otherwise, the computation is terminated.
-

In our computations, we follow the refining strategies in [43, 44] for two dimensions to obtain a new conforming mesh and choose the refinement parameter $\theta = 0.5$.

4 Numerical experiments

In this section, we will report the numerical results to illustrate the theoretical results obtained in Section 3. First, the true errors of the finite element solutions and the error estimators are compared both on the uniform meshes and the adaptive meshes for a nonlinear PNP model with a smooth solution. Then an example with a singular solution is reported to show the efficiency of the adaptive computation proposed in this paper.

Denote by η_ϕ , η_{p^1} and η_{p^2} the a posteriori error estimators for the electrostatic potential ϕ , the positive ion concentration p^1 and the negative ion concentration p^2 , respectively. Let $\mathcal{T}^h = \{\tau\}$ be a shape-regular mesh of Ω with mesh size $h > 0$ and τ be the element. Define

$$e_\phi = \|\phi - \phi_h\|_{1,\Omega}, \quad e_{p^i} = \|p^i - p_h^i\|_{1,\Omega},$$

$$\eta_\phi = \left(\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}^h} \eta_{\tau,\phi}^2 \right)^{1/2}, \quad \eta_{p^i} = \left(\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}^h} \eta_{\tau,p^i}^2 \right)^{1/2},$$

where $\eta_{\tau,\phi}$ and η_{τ,p^i} are defined in (3.87) and (3.88), respectively. In particular, in the following, we use symbols $e_{u,\phi}$ and e_{u,p^i} represent the errors on uniform meshes, and $e_{a,\phi}$, e_{a,p^i} represent the errors on adaptive meshes for the electrostatic potential and concentrations, respectively. Correspondingly, the symbols $\eta_{u,\phi}$, η_{u,p^i} are used to denote the error estimators on uniform meshes, and $\eta_{a,\phi}$, η_{a,p^i} denote the error estimators on adaptive meshes, respectively.




Fig. 1 The left figure is the initial uniform mesh with 81 degrees of freedom and the right one is an adaptive mesh with 6,253 degrees of freedom constructed by the error indicators $\eta_{\tau,\phi}$ and η_{τ,p^i} for Example 4.1.

Example 4.1 Consider the following steady-state nonlinear PNP equations, which is a simplified form of the PNP equations for ion channel (cf. [13])

$$\begin{cases} -\nabla \cdot (\nabla p^i + p^i \nabla(\operatorname{sech}^2 p^i) + q^i p^i \nabla \phi) = f_i, & \text{in } \Omega, \quad i = 1, 2, \\ -\Delta \phi - \sum_{i=1}^2 q^i p^i = f_3, & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (4.1)$$

Here the computational domain $\Omega = [0, 1]^2 \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, $q^1 = 1$ and $q^2 = -1$. The boundary condition and the right-hand side functions are chosen such that the exact solution (ϕ, p^1, p^2) is given by

$$\begin{cases} \phi = \sin(\pi x) \sin(\pi y), \\ p^1 = \sin(2\pi x) \sin(2\pi y), \\ p^2 = \sin(3\pi x) \sin(3\pi y). \end{cases} \quad (4.2)$$

First by a simple calculation, the first equation in (4.1) can be rewritten as

$$\mathcal{L}(p^i, \phi) \equiv -\nabla \cdot ((1 - 2p^i \tanh p^i \operatorname{sech}^2 p^i) \nabla p^i + q^i p^i \nabla \phi) - f_i = 0, \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad i = 1, 2. \quad (4.3)$$

Then from (1.1) and (4.3), we see that $\alpha(x, p^i) = 1 - 2p^i \tanh p^i \operatorname{sech}^2 p^i$, $\beta(x, p^i) = 0$, $\gamma(x, p^i) = q^i p^i$, $g(x, p^i) = -f_i$, $\epsilon(x) = 1$, and $f = f_3$ in this example. In addition, by (4.2), we know that $p^i \in [0, 1]$, so that $\tanh p^i \operatorname{sech}^2 p^i < \frac{1}{2}$ and $\alpha(x, p^i) \geq 0$. Hence the assumption (2.11) is satisfied, which indicates that $\mathcal{L}'(p, \phi)$ is isomorphic. According to Lax-Milgram theorem, it follows that the solution (p^i, ϕ) is unique.

This example is mainly used to verify the reliability of the error indicators. The initial uniform mesh and an adaptive mesh constructed by the error indicators $\eta_{\tau, \phi}$ and η_{τ, p^i} for Example 4.1 are shown in Fig. 1. The numerical results on the uniform meshes and the adaptive meshes for the electrostatic potential ϕ , the concentrations p^1 and p^2 are presented in Figs. 2, 3 and 4, respectively. It is apparent from Fig. 2 that the a posteriori error estimators of the electrostatic potential ϕ approximate the true errors as the increase of the degrees of freedom both on the uniform meshes and the adaptive meshes. On the other hand, it is also shown that the error curves of the electrostatic potential keep the quasi-optimal convergence order (since the error curves are parallel to the quasi-optimal convergence curve with slope of $-\frac{1}{2}$), which verifies the theoretical results shown in Lemma 2.4 and Theorem 3.1. Similarly, for the concentrations p^1 and p^2 , we can get the similar results, see Figs. 3 and 4.




Fig. 2 The error indicators and H^1 norm errors of the electrostatic potential ϕ on uniform meshes and adaptive meshes for Example 4.1. The black solid line is a quasi-optimal convergence curve with slope $-\frac{1}{2}$ and N is the number of degrees of freedom.




Fig. 3 The error indicators and H^1 norm errors of the positive ion concentration p^1 on uniform meshes and adaptive meshes for Example 4.1. The black solid line is a quasi-optimal convergence curve with slope $-\frac{1}{2}$ and N is the number of degrees of freedom.




Fig. 4 The error indicators and H^1 norm errors of the negative ion concentration p^2 on uniform meshes and adaptive meshes for Example 4.1. The black solid line is a quasi-optimal convergence curve with slope $-\frac{1}{2}$ and N is the number of degrees of freedom.

In the above, we have presented the example with a smooth solution to verify the reliability of the a posteriori error indicators. In the following, we consider another example of which the exact solution has a strong singularity at the point $(x_0, y_0) = (0, 0)$.

Example 4.2 Consider the following nonlinear PNP equations with a singular point $(0, 0)$:

$$\begin{cases} -\nabla \cdot (\nabla p_i + q_i p_i \nabla \phi) + p_i^3 = f_i, & \text{in } \Omega, \quad i = 1, 2, \\ -\Delta \phi - \sum_{i=1}^2 q_i p_i = f_3, & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (4.4)$$

where $\Omega = [0, 1]^2 \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ and $q_1 = 1$, $q_2 = -1$. Compared (4.4) with (1.1), it is seen that $\alpha(x, p^i) = 1$, $\beta(x, p^i) = 0$, $\gamma(x, p^i) = q^i p^i$, $g(x, p^i) = p_i^3 - f_i$, $\epsilon(x) = 1$ and $f = f_3$. The boundary condition and the right-hand side functions are chosen such that the exact solution (ϕ, p_1, p_2) is given by

$$\begin{cases} \phi = (x^2 + y^2)^{0.1}, \\ p_1 = \frac{\sin(2\pi x) \sin(2\pi y)}{2x^2 + 2y^2}, \\ p_2 = \frac{\sin(3\pi x) \sin(3\pi y)}{2x^2 + 2y^2}. \end{cases} \quad (4.5)$$




Fig. 5 The left figure is the initial uniform mesh with 81 degrees of freedom and the right one is an adaptive mesh with 7,432 degrees of freedom for Example 4.2.

Fig. 5 shows the initial uniform mesh with 81 degrees of freedom (left) and an adaptive mesh with 7,432 degrees of freedom (right). It is shown by Fig. 5 that the adaptive mesh is locally refined near the origin which coincides with the position of the singularity at the point $(0, 0)$.

The numerical results of the electrostatic potential ϕ and the concentrations p_1 , p_2 on uniform meshes and adaptive meshes are presented in Figs. 6, 7 and 8, respectively. It is observed from Figs. 6, 7 and 8 that the errors on adaptive meshes (solid line) are much less than that on uniform meshes (dashed line), which indicates the efficiency of Algorithm 3.1. For example, for the electrostatic potential ϕ , it is shown in Fig. 6 that the error value $e_\phi \leq 0.086$ achieved with about 130 degrees of freedom on the adaptive mesh. However, it costs about 260,000 degrees of freedom on the uniform mesh to achieve the same accuracy. The ratio of degrees of freedom is about 1 : 2,000. For the concentrations p_1 and p_2 , similar results can be obtained from

Figs. 7 and 8. On the other hand, it is shown from Figs. 6, 7 and 8 that the convergence orders of the error curves (solid line) for the true errors and the error estimators on adaptive meshes are quasi-optimal both for the electrostatic potential and concentrations, which indicates the adaptive finite element computation based on the a posteriori error indicators derived in this paper is efficient for the nonlinear PNP system with a singular solution.




Fig. 6 The H^1 norm errors and error indicators of the electrostatic potential ϕ versus the degrees of freedom N of the mesh for Example 4.2 by the uniform refinement (dashed line) and adaptive refinement (solid line). The black solid line is a quasi-optimal convergence curve with slope $-\frac{1}{2}$.




Fig. 7 The H^1 norm errors and error indicators of the positive ion concentration p_1 versus the degrees of freedom N of the mesh for Example 4.2 by the uniform refinement (dashed line) and adaptive refinement (solid line). The black solid line is a quasi-optimal convergence curve with slope $-\frac{1}{2}$.




Fig. 8 The H^1 norm errors and error indicators of the negative ion concentration p_2 versus the degrees of freedom N of the mesh for Example 4.2 by the uniform refinement (dashed line) and adaptive refinement (solid line). The black solid line is a quasi-optimal convergence curve with slope $-\frac{1}{2}$.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we have derived a local averaging type a posteriori error estimators for a class of nonlinear steady-state Poisson-Nernst-Planck equations. Both the global upper bounds and the local lower bounds of the a posteriori error estimators are obtained for the electrostatic potential and concentrations. It is shown by the theoretical analysis and numerical experiments that the adaptive finite element computation based on the a posteriori error estimators is efficient and reliable. The a posteriori error analysis and the corresponding adaptive finite element algorithms can be extended to more general and complex nonlinear PNP equations, for example, the coefficients $\alpha(\cdot, p^i)$ and $\epsilon(x)$ can be discontinuous coefficients or piecewise constants, which will be discussed in our next work for practical ion channel problems.

Acknowledgements Deep thanks must be expressed to Professor Benzhuo Lu for his helpful discussions and valuable suggestions. Thanks also go to Ming Tang for his help on numerical experiments. Y. Yang was supported by the China NSF (NSFC 11561016, NSFC 11771105), Guangxi Colleges and Universities Key Laboratory of Data Analysis and Computation open fund and the Hunan Key Laboratory for Computation and Simulation in Science and Engineering, Xiangtan University. S. Shu was supported by the China NSF (NSFC 11971414). R. G. Shen was supported by Postgraduate Scientific Research and Innovation Fund of the Hunan Provincial Education Department (CX2017B268).

References

1. Nernst, W.: Die elektromotorische wirksamkeit der io-nen. *Z. Phys. Chem.* **4**, 129–181 (1889)
2. Planck, M.: Über die erregung von electricität und wärme in electrolyten. *Annalen Der Physik.* **275**, 161–186 (1890)
3. Jerome, J.: *Analysis of Charge Transport: A Mathematical Theory and Approximation of Semiconductor Models.* Springer-Verlag, New York (1996)
4. Selberherr, S.: *Analysis and Simulation of Semiconductor Devices.* Springer-Verlag, Wien, New York (1984)
5. Bazant, M.Z., Kilic, M.S., Storey, B.D., Ajdari, A.: Towards an understanding of induced-charge electrokinetics at large applied voltages in concentrated solutions. *Adv. Colloid Interface Sci.* **152**, 48–88 (2009)
6. Richardson, G., King, J.R.: Time-dependent modelling and asymptotic analysis of electrochemical cells. *J. Eng. Math.* **59**, 239–275 (2007)
7. Soestbergen, M.V., Biesheuvel, P.M., Bazant, M.Z.: Diffuse-charge effects on the transient response of electrochemical cells. *Phys. Rev. E* **81**, 021503 (2010)
8. Lu, B.Z., Zhou, Y.C.: Poisson-Nernst-Planck equations for simulating biomolecular diffusion-reaction processes II: size effects on ionic distributions and diffusion-reaction rates. *Biophys J.* **100**, 2475–2485 (2011)
9. Lu, B.Z., Zhou, Y.C., Huber, G.A., Bond, S.D., Holst, M.J., McCammon, J.A.: Electrodiffusion: a continuum modeling framework for biomolecular systems with realistic spatiotemporal resolution. *J. Chem. Phys.* **127**, 10B604–78 (2007)
10. Coalson, R.D., Kurnikova, M.G.: Poisson-Nernst-Planck theory approach to the calculation of current through biological ion channels. *IEEE T. Nanobiosci.* **4**, 81–93 (2005)
11. Singer, A., Norbury, J.: A Poisson-Nernst-Planck model for biological ion channels—An asymptotic analysis in a three-dimensional narrow funnel. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* **70**, 949–968 (2009)
12. Horng, T.L., Lin, T.C., Liu, C., Eisenberg, B.: PNP equations with steric effects: a model of ion flow through channels. *J. Phys. Chem. B* **116**, 11422–11441 (2012)
13. Hyon, Y.K., Eisenberg, B., Liu, C.: An energetic variational approach to ion channel dynamics. *Math. Method Appl. Sci.* **37**, 952–961 (2014)
14. Flavell, A., Machen, M., Eisenberg, R., Kabre, J., Liu, C., Li, X.: A conservative finite difference scheme for Poisson-Nernst-Planck equations. *J. Comput. Electron.* **13**, 235–249 (2014)
15. He, D.D., Pan, K.J.: An energy preserving finite difference scheme for the Poisson-Nernst-Planck system. *Appl. Math. Comput.* **287-288**, 214–223 (2016)
16. Liu, H., Wang, Z.: A free energy satisfying finite difference method for Poisson-Nernst-Planck equations. *J. Comput. Phys.* **268**, 363–376 (2014)
17. Chainais, -H.C., Peng, Y.: Finite volume approximation for degenerate drift-diffusion system in several space dimensions. *Math. Models and Methods Appl. Sci.* **14**, 461–481 (2004)
18. Bessemoulin, -C.M., Chainais, -H.C., Vignal, M.-H.: Study of a finite volume scheme for the drift-diffusion system, asymptotic behavior in the quasi-neutral limit. *SIAM. J. Numer. Anal.* **52**, 1666–1691 (2014)

19. Lu, B.Z., Holst, M.J., McCammond, J.A., Zhou, Y.C.: Poisson-Nernst-Planck equations for simulating biomolecular diffusion-reaction processes I: finite element solutions. *J. Comput. Phys.* **229**, 6979–6994 (2010)
20. Gao, H.D., He, D.D.: Linearized conservative finite element methods for the Nernst-Planck-Poisson equations. *J. Sci. Comput.* **72**, 1269–1289 (2017)
21. Yang, Y., Lu, B.Z.: An error analysis for the finite element approximation to the steady-state Poisson-Nernst-Planck equations. *Adv. Appl. Math. Mech.* **5**, 113–130 (2013)
22. Sun, Y.Z., Sun, P.T., Zheng, B., Lin, G.: Error analysis of finite element method for Poisson-Nernst-Planck equations. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.* **301**, 28–43 (2016)
23. Shi, D.Y., Yang, H.J.: Superconvergence analysis of finite element method for Poisson-Nernst-Planck equations. *Numer. Methods Partial Differential Eq.* **35**, 1206–1223 (2019)
24. He, M.Y., Sun, P.T.: Error analysis of mixed finite element method for Poisson-Nernst-Planck system. *Numer. Methods Partial Differential Eq.* **33**, 1924–1948 (2017)
25. He, M.Y., Sun, P.T.: Mixed finite element analysis for the Poisson-Nernst-Planck/Stokes coupling. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.* **341**, 61–79 (2018)
26. Shen, R.G., Shu, S., Yang, Y., Lu, B.Z.: A decoupling two-grid method for the time-dependent Poisson-Nernst-Planck equations. *Numer. Algor.* <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11075-019-00744-4>, (2019)
27. Adams, R.A.: *Sobolev Spaces*. Academic Press, New York (1975)
28. Brenner, S.C., Scott, L.R.: *The Mathematical Theory of Finite Element Methods*, 2nd edn. Springer, Berlin (2002)
29. Clément, P.: Approximation by finite element functions using local regularization. *RAIRO Anal. Numér.* **9**, 77–84 (1975)
30. Yan, N., Zhou, A.: Gradient recovery type a posteriori error estimates for finite element approximations on irregular meshes. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engng.* **190**, 4289–4299 (2001)
31. Verfürth, R.: A posteriori error estimators for convection–diffusion equations. *Numer. Math.* **80**, 641–663 (1998)
32. Carstensen, C.: Quasi-interpolation and a posteriori analysis in finite element methods. *RAIRO M²AN.* **33**, 1187–1202 (1999)
33. Zienkiewicz, O.C., Zhu, J.Z.: The superconvergence patch recovery and a posteriori error estimates. *Int. J. Numer. Methods Engrg.* **33**, 1331–1364 (1992)
34. Mao, D., Shen, L., Zhou, A.: Adaptive finite element algorithms for eigenvalue problems based on local averaging type a posteriori error estimates. *Adv. Comput. Math.* **25**, 135–160 (2006)
35. Zhang, Z.: A posteriori error estimates on irregular grids based on gradient recovery. *Adv. Comput. Math.* **15**, 363–374 (2001)
36. Xu, J., Zhou, A.: Local and parallel finite element algorithms based on two-grid discretizations for nonlinear problems. *Adv. Comput. Math.* **14**, 293–327 (2001)
37. Evans, L.C.: *Partial Differential Equation*, American Mathematics Society (AMS), (1998)
38. Chen, Y., Wu, L.: *Second-order Elliptic Equations and Elliptic Systems*. Translations of Mathematical Monographs, 174, AMS (1998)
39. Xu, J.: Two-grid discretization techniques for linear and nonlinear PDE. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* **33**, 1759–1777 (1996)
40. Yang, Y., Zhou, A.: Local averaging based a posteriori finite element error control for quasilinear elliptic problems with application to electrical potential computation. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engng.* **196**, 452–465 (2006)
41. Ainsworth, M., Oden, J.: *A Posterior Error Estimation in Finite Element Analysis*. Wiley Interscience, New York (2000)
42. Verfürth, R.: A posteriori error estimates for nonlinear problems. Finite element discretizations of elliptic equations, *Math. Comput.* **62**, 445–475 (1994)
43. Verfürth, R.: A posteriori error estimation and adaptive mesh-refinement techniques. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.* **50**, 67–83 (1994)
44. Verfürth, R.: *A Review of a Posteriori Error Estimates and Adaptive Mesh-refinement Techniques*. Wiley-Teubner, New York (1996)