

# Convergence of a finite element method on a Bakhvalov-type mesh for a singularly perturbed convection–diffusion equation in 2D

Jin Zhang · Xiaowei Liu

Received: date / Accepted: date

**Abstract** A finite element method of any order is applied on a Bakhvalov-type mesh to solve a singularly perturbed convection–diffusion equation in 2D, whose solution exhibits exponential boundary layers. A uniform convergence of (almost) optimal order is proved by means of a carefully defined interpolant.

**Keywords** Singular perturbation · Convection–diffusion equation · Bakhvalov-type mesh · Finite element method · Uniform convergence.

**Mathematics Subject Classification (2000)** 65N12 · 65N30 · 65N50

## 1 Introduction

Consider the elliptic boundary value problem

$$\begin{aligned} -\varepsilon\Delta u - \mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla u + cu &= f & \text{in } \Omega = (0, 1)^2, \\ u &= 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

where  $\varepsilon \ll 1$  is a small positive parameter and  $\mathbf{b}(x, y) = (b_1(x, y), b_2(x, y))^T$ . The functions  $b_1, b_2, c$  and  $f$  are assumed to be smooth on  $\bar{\Omega}$ . We also assume that

$$b_1(x, y) \geq \beta_1 > 0, b_2(x, y) \geq \beta_2 > 0, c(x, y) + \frac{1}{2}\nabla \cdot \mathbf{b}(x, y) \geq \gamma > 0 \quad \text{on } \bar{\Omega}, \tag{1.2}$$

---

This research is partially supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (11771257, 11601251).

Jin Zhang  
School of Mathematics and Statistics, Shandong Normal University, Jinan 250014, China  
E-mail: jinzhangalex@hotmail.com

Corresponding author: Xiaowei Liu  
School of Mathematics and Statistics, Qilu University of Technology (Shandong Academy of Sciences), Jinan 250353, China  
E-mail: xwliuvivi@hotmail.com

where  $\beta_1$ ,  $\beta_2$  and  $\gamma$  are some constants. These conditions ensure that (1.1) has a unique solution in  $H_0^1(\Omega) \cap H^2(\Omega)$  for all  $f \in L^2(\Omega)$  (see, e.g., [12]). Because  $\varepsilon$  is small, the problem is in general singularly perturbed and its solution typically has exponential boundary layers at  $x = 0$  and  $y = 0$  and a corner layer at  $(0, 0)$ .

Layer phenomena appears in different kinds of problems, for example singularly perturbed problems, which is one of the important topics in scientific computing. If a priori knowledge of layers has been obtained from asymptotic analysis etc., different kinds of meshes could be designed for uniform convergent numerical methods (see [12, 9]). Here “uniform” means that the convergence is independent of the singular perturbation parameter. Bakhvalov-type meshes are one of the most popular layer-adapted meshes and usually have better numerical performances than Shishkin-type meshes—another popular layer-adapted meshes ( see [7]).

However, it is far from mature for convergence theories of finite element methods on Bakhvalov-type meshes. One of the main reasons is that the standard Lagrange interpolant does not work for Bakhvalov-type meshes (see [10]). In [14], we gave a new idea for convergence analysis on Bakhvalov-type meshes in 1D. Here we extend the analysis to two dimensions. The extension is not trivial, because we must pay attention to the construction of the interpolant used in the case of 2D. This interpolant is carefully defined according to the characteristics of layer functions and the structures of Bakhvalov-type meshes. Besides, different from 1D case, we must pay attention to the homogenous Dirichlet boundary condition when the idea in [14] is applied to 2D case. The interpolation errors are derived in a delicate way. Then almost uniform convergence of optimal order is proved for finite element methods.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we describe the assumptions on the regularity of the solution, introduce a Bakhvalov-type mesh and define a finite element method of any order. Some preliminary results for the subsequent analysis are also given in this section. In Section 3 we construct and analyze an interpolant to the solution for uniform convergence on the Bakhvalov-type mesh. In Section 4 almost uniform convergence of optimal order is obtained by means of the interpolant and careful analysis of the convective term in the bilinear form. In Section 5, numerical results illustrate our theoretical bounds.

Denote by  $\|\cdot\|_{\infty, D}$  the norms in the Lebesgue space  $L^\infty(D)$ . In  $L^2(D)$ , the inner product and the  $L^2(D)$ -norm are denoted by  $(\cdot, \cdot)_D$  and  $\|\cdot\|_D$ , respectively. In  $H^1(D)$ , the seminorms are denoted by  $|\cdot|_1$ . Here  $D$  is any measurable subset of  $\Omega$ . When  $D = \Omega$  we drop the subscript  $D$  from the notation for simplicity. Throughout the article, all constants  $C$  are independent of  $\varepsilon$  and the mesh parameter  $N$  and may take different values in different formulas.

## 2 Decomposition of the solution, Bakhvalov-type mesh and finite element method

In this section we present a decomposition of the solution to (1.1), introduce a Bakhvalov-type mesh and define a finite element method. Some preliminary inequalities are also presented. In the subsequent analysis, let  $k$  be a fixed integer with  $k \geq 1$ .

### 2.1 Regularity of the solution

We make the following assumption about the solution  $u$  to (1.1), which describes the layer structure of  $u$ . This assumption is also used in [5].

**Assumption 1** *The solution  $u$  of (1.1) can be decomposed as*

$$u = S + E_1 + E_2 + E_{12}, \quad (2.1a)$$

where  $S$  is the smooth part of  $u$ ,  $E_1$  and  $E_2$  are exponential layers along the sides  $x = 0$  and  $y = 0$  of  $\Omega$  respectively, while  $E_{12}$  is an exponential corner layer at  $(0, 0)$ . Moreover, there exists a constant  $C$  such that for all  $(x, y) \in \bar{\Omega}$  and  $0 \leq i + j \leq k + 1$  one has

$$\left| \frac{\partial^{i+j} S}{\partial x^i \partial y^j}(x, y) \right| \leq C, \quad (2.1b)$$

$$\left| \frac{\partial^{i+j} E_1}{\partial x^i \partial y^j}(x, y) \right| \leq C \varepsilon^{-i} e^{-\beta_1 x / \varepsilon}, \quad (2.1c)$$

$$\left| \frac{\partial^{i+j} E_2}{\partial x^i \partial y^j}(x, y) \right| \leq C \varepsilon^{-j} e^{-\beta_2 y / \varepsilon},$$

$$\left| \frac{\partial^{i+j} E_{12}}{\partial x^i \partial y^j}(x, y) \right| \leq C \varepsilon^{-(i+j)} e^{-(\beta_1 x + \beta_2 y) / \varepsilon}. \quad (2.1d)$$


*Remark 2.1* For the case  $k = 1$ , the existence of this decomposition of  $u$  with the bounds on derivatives can be guaranteed by conditions on the data of the problem (1.1) (see [8]). The arguments in [8] make this assumption with  $k \geq 2$  credible if we impose sufficient compatibility conditions on  $f$  (see some explanations in [13, Sect.7]).

### 2.2 Bakhvalov-type mesh

Bakhvalov mesh first appeared in [2] and is graded in the layer. Its applications require the solution of a nonlinear equation. To avoid this difficulty, Bakhvalov-type meshes are proposed as approximations of Bakhvalov mesh (see [7]).

Let  $N$  be an even positive integer. We introduce a Bakhvalov-type mesh in the  $x$ -direction

$$0 = x_0 < x_1 < \dots < x_{N-1} < x_N = 1.$$



**Fig. 2.1** Bakhvalov-type mesh  $\mathcal{T}_N$ .

To resolve the layer along  $x = 0$ , the mesh is graded in  $[x_0, x_{N/2}]$  and equidistant in  $[x_{N/2}, 1]$ . The mesh points  $x_i$  is defined by

$$x_i = \begin{cases} \frac{\sigma\varepsilon}{\beta_1} \varphi(t_i) \text{ with } t_i = i/N & \text{for } i = 0, 1, \dots, N/2, \\ 1 - (1 - x_{N/2})2(N - i)/N & \text{for } i = N/2 + 1, \dots, N, \end{cases} \quad (2.2)$$

with  $\sigma \geq k + 1$  and  $\varphi(t) := -\ln(1 - 2(1 - \varepsilon)t)$ . The parameter  $\sigma$  determines the smallness of the layer terms in  $x_{N/2}$ . This Bakhvalov-type mesh is also analyzed in [10]. In a similar way we define the mesh  $\{y_j\}_{j=0}^N$  along the  $y$ -direction except that we replace  $\beta_1$  by  $\beta_2$  in (2.2). Then we obtain a tensor-product rectangular mesh  $\mathcal{T}_N$  with mesh points  $(x_i, y_j)$  (see Figure 2.1).

**Assumption 2** Assume that  $\varepsilon \leq N^{-1}$  in our analysis, as is not a restriction in practice.

Moreover, assume  $N \geq 4$  is an even integer. Set  $h_{i,x} := x_{i+1} - x_i$  and  $h_{j,y} := y_{j+1} - y_j$  for all  $i, j$ . A mesh rectangle is often written as  $\tau_{i,j} = [x_i, x_{i+1}] \times [y_j, y_{j+1}]$  for a specific element and more simply as  $\tau$  for a generic mesh rectangle.

According to [14, Lemma 3], we have the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.1** *For the Bakhvalov-type mesh (2.2), one has*

$$h_{0,x} \leq h_{1,x} \leq \dots \leq h_{N/2-2,x}, \quad (2.3)$$

$$C\varepsilon N^{-1} \leq h_{0,x} \leq C\varepsilon N^{-1}, \quad (2.4)$$

$$\frac{1}{4}\sigma\varepsilon \leq h_{N/2-2,x} \leq \sigma\varepsilon, \quad (2.5)$$

$$\frac{1}{2}\sigma\varepsilon \leq h_{N/2-1,x} \leq 2\sigma N^{-1}, \quad (2.6)$$

$$N^{-1} \leq h_{i,x} \leq 2N^{-1} \quad N/2 \leq i \leq N-1, \quad (2.7)$$

$$x_{N/2-1} \geq C\sigma\varepsilon \ln N, \quad x_{N/2} \geq C\sigma\varepsilon |\ln \varepsilon|, \quad (2.8)$$

$$h_{i,x}^\mu e^{-\beta_1 x_i/\varepsilon} \leq C\varepsilon^\mu N^{-\mu} \quad \text{for } 0 \leq i \leq N/2-2 \text{ and } 0 \leq \mu \leq \sigma. \quad (2.9)$$

For  $h_{j,y}$ ,  $0 \leq j < N$ , bounds analogous to (2.3)–(2.9) also hold.

### 2.3 Finite element method

On the above Bakhvalov-type mesh, define the finite element space by

$$V^N := \{v^N \in C(\bar{\Omega}) : v^N|_{\partial\Omega} = 0 \text{ and } v^N|_\tau \in \mathcal{Q}_k(\tau) \quad \forall \tau \in \mathcal{T}_N\},$$

where  $\mathcal{Q}_k(\tau) = \text{span}\{x^i y^j : 0 \leq i, j \leq k\}$ .

The finite element method is defined as follows: Find  $u^N \in V^N$  such that

$$a(u^N, v^N) = (f, v^N) \quad \forall v^N \in V^N, \quad (2.10)$$

with  $a(u^N, v^N) := \varepsilon(\nabla u^N, \nabla v^N) + (-\mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla u^N + cu^N, v^N)$ . Condition (1.2) implies the coercivity

$$a(v^N, v^N) \geq \alpha \|v^N\|_\varepsilon^2 \quad \text{for all } v^N \in V^N, \quad (2.11)$$

where  $\alpha = \min\{1, \gamma\}$  and

$$\|v\|_\varepsilon := \{\varepsilon|v|_1^2 + \|v\|^2\}^{1/2} \quad \forall v \in H^1(\Omega).$$

It follows that there exists a unique solution  $u^N$  for problem (2.10) from Lax-Milgram lemma. Clearly, (1.1) and (2.10) imply the Galerkin orthogonality property

$$a(u - u^N, v^N) = 0 \quad \text{for all } v^N \in V^N. \quad (2.12)$$

### 3 Interpolation and its errors

A new interpolation operator is introduced for uniform convergence. Set  $x_i^s := x_i + (s/k)h_{i,x}$  and  $y_j^t := y_j + (t/k)h_{j,y}$  for  $i, j = 0, 1, \dots, N-1$  and  $s, t = 0, \dots, k-1$ . For the consistency of notation, set  $x_N^0 = x_N$  and  $y_N^0 = y_N$ . For any  $v \in C^0(\bar{\Omega})$  its standard Lagrange interpolant  $v^I \in V^N$  on the Bakhvalov-type mesh can be written in the following form

$$\begin{aligned} v^I(x, y) = & \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \sum_{s=0}^{k-1} \left( \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} v(x_i^s, y_j^t) \theta_{i,j}^{s,t}(x, y) + v(x_i^s, y_N^0) \theta_{i,N}^{s,0}(x, y) \right) \\ & + \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} v(x_N^0, y_j^t) \theta_{N,j}^{0,t}(x, y) + v(x_N^0, y_N^0) \theta_{N,N}^{0,0}(x, y), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\theta_{i,j}^{s,t}(x, y) \in V^N$  is the piecewise  $k$ th-order hat function associated with the point  $(x_i^s, y_j^t)$ . For the solution  $u$  to (1.1), recall (2.1a) in Assumption 1 and define the interpolant  $Iu$  by

$$Iu = S^I + \pi_1 E_1 + \pi_2 E_2 + \pi_{12} E_{12}. \quad (3.1)$$

Here  $S^I$  is the Lagrange interpolant to  $S$  and

$$\begin{aligned} (\pi_i E_i)(x, y) &= E_i^I - \mathcal{P}_i E_i - \mathcal{B}_i E_i \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, \\ (\pi_{12} E_{12})(x, y) &= E_{12}^I - \mathcal{P}_{12} E_{12} \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

where

$$\mathcal{P}_1 E_1 = \sum_{i=N/2-1}^{k-1} \sum_{s=0}^{k-1} \left( \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} E_1(x_i^s, y_j^t) \theta_{i,j}^{s,t}(x, y) + E_1(x_i^s, y_N^0) \theta_{i,N}^{s,0}(x, y) \right), \quad (3.3)$$

$$\mathcal{P}_2 E_2 = \sum_{j=N/2-1}^{k-1} \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} \left( \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \sum_{s=0}^{k-1} E_2(x_i^s, y_j^t) \theta_{i,j}^{s,t}(x, y) + E_2(x_N^0, y_j^t) \theta_{N,j}^{0,t}(x, y) \right), \quad (3.4)$$

$$\mathcal{P}_{12} E_{12} = \sum_{i=N/2-1}^{k-1} \sum_{j=N/2-1}^{k-1} \left( \sum_{s=0}^{k-1} \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} E_{12}(x_i^s, y_j^t) \theta_{i,j}^{s,t}(x, y) \right) \quad (3.5)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_1 E_1 &= \sum_{i=N/2-1}^{k-1} \sum_{s=0}^{k-1} \sum_{j=0, N} E_1(x_i^s, y_j^0) \theta_{i,j}^{s,0}(x, y), \\ \mathcal{B}_2 E_2 &= \sum_{i=0, N} \sum_{j=N/2-1}^{k-1} \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} E_2(x_i^0, y_j^t) \theta_{i,j}^{0,t}(x, y). \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

Clearly we have

$$\Pi u \in V^N, \quad \Pi u = u^I - \sum_{i=1,2,12} \mathcal{P}_i E_i. \quad (3.7)$$

*Remark 3.1* The definitions of interpolation operators  $\pi_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2, 12$  arise from layer functions  $E_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2, 12$  and the construction of Bakhvalov-type mesh (2.2). The idea for operators  $\mathcal{P}_1$ ,  $\mathcal{P}_2$  and  $\mathcal{P}_{12}$  is same to the operator  $\mathcal{P}$  in [14], that is, new interpolations for layer functions are zero at certain degrees of freedom. The operators  $\mathcal{B}_1$  and  $\mathcal{B}_2$  are introduced in order to maintain homogenous Dirichlet boundary conditions.

From [1, Theorem 2.7], we have the following anisotropic interpolation results.

**Lemma 3.1** *Let  $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_N$  and  $v \in H^{k+1}(\tau)$ . Then there exists a constant  $C$  such that Lagrange interpolation  $v^I$  satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} \|v - v^I\|_\tau &\leq C \sum_{i+j=k+1} h_{x,\tau}^i h_{y,\tau}^j \left\| \frac{\partial^{k+1} v}{\partial x^i \partial y^j} \right\|_\tau \\ \|(v - v^I)_x\|_\tau &\leq C \sum_{i+j=k} h_{x,\tau}^i h_{y,\tau}^j \left\| \frac{\partial^{k+1} v}{\partial x^{i+1} \partial y^j} \right\|_\tau \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\|(v - v^I)_y\|_\tau \leq C \sum_{i+j=k} h_{x,\tau}^i h_{y,\tau}^j \left\| \frac{\partial^{k+1} v}{\partial x^i \partial y^{j+1}} \right\|_\tau,$$

where  $h_{x,\tau}$  and  $h_{y,\tau}$  denote the lengths along  $x$ -axis and  $y$ -axis of the rectangle  $\tau$ , respectively.

Set

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_{11} &:= [x_0, x_{N/2-1}] \times [y_0, y_{N/2-1}], & \Omega_{12} &:= [x_{N/2-1}, x_N] \times [y_0, y_{N/2-1}], \\ \Omega_{21} &:= [x_0, x_{N/2-1}] \times [y_{N/2-1}, y_N], & \Omega_{22} &:= [x_{N/2-1}, x_N] \times [y_{N/2-1}, y_N]. \end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 3.2** *Let Assumptions 1 and 2 hold true. Let  $E_i^I$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , denote the Lagrange interpolants of  $E_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , respectively, on the Bakhvalov-type mesh  $\mathcal{T}_N$ . Then there exists a constant  $C$  such that the following interpolation error estimates hold true:*

$$\begin{aligned} \|E_1 - E_1^I\|_{\Omega \setminus ((x_{N/2-1}, x_{N/2}) \times [0,1])} + \|E_2 - E_2^I\|_{\Omega \setminus ([0,1] \times (y_{N/2-1}, y_{N/2}))} &\leq C \varepsilon^{1/2} N^{-(k+1/2)}, \\ \|E_1 - E_1^I\| + \|E_2 - E_2^I\| &\leq CN^{-(k+1)}, \\ \|E_1 - E_1^I\|_\varepsilon + \|E_2 - E_2^I\|_\varepsilon &\leq CN^{-k}, \\ \|\mathcal{P}_1 E_1\|_\varepsilon + \|\mathcal{P}_2 E_2\|_\varepsilon + \|\mathcal{B}_1 E_1\|_\varepsilon + \|\mathcal{B}_2 E_2\|_\varepsilon &\leq CN^{1/2-\sigma}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathcal{P}_i E_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , are defined in (3.3) and (3.4), respectively.

*Proof* We just consider  $E_1$ , since  $E_2$  can be analyzed in a similar way. To consider  $\|E_1 - E_1^I\|$ , we decompose it as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \|E_1 - E_1^I\|^2 &= \|E_1 - E_1^I\|_{[x_0, x_{N/2-1}] \times [0, 1]}^2 + \|E_1 - E_1^I\|_{[x_{N/2-1}, x_{N/2}] \times [0, 1]}^2 \\ &\quad + \|E_1 - E_1^I\|_{[x_{N/2}, x_N] \times [0, 1]}^2 \\ &=: A_1 + A_2 + A_3. \end{aligned}$$

Note  $h_{i,x} \leq C\varepsilon$  for  $i = 0, \dots, N/2 - 2$ . Lemmas 2.1 and 3.1 yield

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &= \sum_{i=0}^{N/2-2} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \|E_1 - E_1^I\|_{\tau_{i,j}}^2 \leq C \sum_{i=0}^{N/2-2} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \sum_{l+m=k+1} h_{i,x}^{2l} h_{j,y}^{2m} \left\| \frac{\partial^{k+1} E_1}{\partial x^l \partial y^m} \right\|_{\tau_{i,j}}^2 \\ &\leq C \sum_{i=0}^{N/2-2} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \sum_{l+m=k+1} h_{i,x}^{2l} h_{j,y}^{2m} (\varepsilon^{-2l} e^{-2\beta_1 x_i/\varepsilon} h_{i,x} h_{j,y}) \\ &\leq C \sum_{i=0}^{N/2-2} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \sum_{l+m=k+1} (\varepsilon^{2l} N^{-2l}) h_{j,y}^{2m+1} \varepsilon^{1-2l} \\ &\leq C\varepsilon N^{-(2k+1)}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

Now we consider the term  $A_2$ . Set  $D_0 := [x_{N/2-1}, x_{N/2}] \times [0, 1]$ . Recall  $|E_1(x_{N/2-1}^i, y_j^t)| \leq CN^{-\sigma}$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|E_1^I\|_{D_0}^2 &\leq CN^{-2\sigma} \left( \sum_{i=N/2-1}^{k-1} \sum_{s=0}^{k-1} \left( \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} \|\theta_{i,j}^{s,t}\|_{D_0}^2 + \|\theta_{i,N}^{s,0}\|_{D_0}^2 \right) \right) \\ &\quad + CN^{-2\sigma} \left( \sum_{i=N/2}^{N-1} \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} \|\theta_{i,j}^{0,t}\|_{D_0}^2 + \|\theta_{i,N}^{0,0}\|_{D_0}^2 \right) \\ &\leq CN^{-2\sigma} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} h_{N/2-1,x} h_{j,y} \leq CN^{-(2\sigma+1)}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

where we have used Lemma 2.1. Direct calculations yield

$$\|E_1\|_{D_0} \leq C\varepsilon^{1/2} N^{-\sigma}. \tag{3.10}$$

From (3.9) and (3.10) we obtain

$$A_2 \leq C(\varepsilon + N^{-1})N^{-2\sigma}. \tag{3.11}$$

Note  $|E_1(x_i^s, y_j^t)| \leq C\varepsilon^\sigma$  for  $i \geq N/2$ . Then the triangle inequality and Hölder inequalities yield

$$\begin{aligned} A_3 &\leq C \left( \|E_1\|_{[x_{N/2}, x_N] \times [0, 1]}^2 + \|E_1^I\|_{[x_{N/2}, x_N] \times [0, 1]}^2 \right) \\ &\leq C \left( \|E_1\|_{\infty, [x_{N/2}, x_N] \times [0, 1]}^2 + \|E_1^I\|_{\infty, [x_{N/2}, x_N] \times [0, 1]}^2 \right) \\ &\leq C\varepsilon^{2\sigma}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

Collecting (3.8), (3.11) and (3.12), we prove the first and the second bounds.

Now we consider  $\|E_1 - E_1^I\|_1^2 = \|(E_1 - E_1^I)_x\|^2 + \|(E_1 - E_1^I)_y\|^2$ . Lemmas 2.1 and 3.1 give

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(E_1 - E_1^I)_x\|_{\Omega_{11} \cup \Omega_{21}}^2 &= \sum_{i=0}^{N/2-2} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \|(E_1 - E_1^I)_x\|_{\tau_{i,j}}^2 \\
&\leq C \sum_{i=0}^{N/2-2} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \sum_{l+m=k} h_{i,x}^{2l} h_{j,y}^{2m} \left\| \frac{\partial^{k+1} E_1}{\partial x^{l+1} \partial y^m} \right\|_{\tau_{i,j}}^2 \\
&\leq C \sum_{i=0}^{N/2-2} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \sum_{l+m=k} h_{i,x}^{2l} h_{j,y}^{2m} (\varepsilon^{-2(l+1)} e^{-2\beta_1 x_i/\varepsilon} h_{i,x} h_{j,y}) \quad (3.13) \\
&\leq C \sum_{i=0}^{N/2-2} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \sum_{l+m=k} (\varepsilon^{2l+1} N^{-(2l+1)}) h_{j,y}^{2m+1} \varepsilon^{-2(l+1)} \\
&\leq C \varepsilon^{-1} N^{-2k}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note  $\|(E_1)_x\|_{\Omega_{12} \cup \Omega_{22}} \leq C \varepsilon^{-1/2} N^{-\sigma}$ . Then from the triangle inequality one has

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(E_1 - E_1^I)_x\|_{\Omega_{12} \cup \Omega_{22}}^2 &\leq 2\|(E_1)_x\|_{\Omega_{12} \cup \Omega_{22}}^2 + 2\|(E_1^I)_x\|_{\Omega_{12} \cup \Omega_{22}}^2 \\
&\leq 2\|(E_1)_x\|_{\Omega_{12} \cup \Omega_{22}}^2 + 2 \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \|(E_1^I)_x\|_{\tau_{N/2-1,j}}^2 + 2 \sum_{i=N/2}^{N-1} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \|(E_1^I)_x\|_{\tau_{i,j}}^2 \quad (3.14) \\
&\leq C \varepsilon^{-1} N^{-2\sigma} + C \varepsilon^{2\sigma} N^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where inverse inequalities [4, Theorem 3.2.6] and Lemma 2.1 yield

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \|(E_1^I)_x\|_{\tau_{N/2-1,j}}^2 + \sum_{i=N/2}^{N-1} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \|(E_1^I)_x\|_{\tau_{i,j}}^2 \\
&\leq C \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} h_{N/2-1,x}^{-2} \|E_1^I\|_{\tau_{N/2-1,j}}^2 + C \sum_{i=N/2}^{N-1} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} h_{i,x}^{-2} \|E_1^I\|_{\tau_{i,j}}^2 \\
&\leq C \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} h_{N/2-1,x}^{-2} \|E_1^I\|_{\infty, \tau_{N/2-1,j}}^2 h_{N/2-1,x} h_{j,y} + C \sum_{i=N/2}^{N-1} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} h_{i,x}^{-2} \|E_1^I\|_{\infty, \tau_{i,j}}^2 h_{i,x} h_{j,y} \\
&\leq C \varepsilon^{-1} N^{-2\sigma} + C \varepsilon^{2\sigma} N^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Similar to the derivations of (3.13), we have

$$\|(E_1 - E_1^I)_y\|_{\Omega_{11} \cup \Omega_{21}}^2 \leq C \varepsilon N^{-2k}. \quad (3.15)$$

Note  $\|(E_1)_y\|_{\Omega_{12} \cup \Omega_{22}} \leq C \varepsilon^{1/2} N^{-\sigma}$  and  $h_{j,y} \geq C \varepsilon N^{-1}$  for  $j = 0, \dots, N-1$ . Then one has

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(E_1 - E_1^I)_y\|_{\Omega_{12} \cup \Omega_{22}}^2 &\leq 2\|(E_1)_y\|_{\Omega_{12} \cup \Omega_{22}}^2 + 2\|(E_1^I)_y\|_{\Omega_{12} \cup \Omega_{22}}^2 \\
&\leq C \varepsilon N^{-2\sigma} + C \varepsilon^{-1} N^{2-2\sigma}, \quad (3.16)
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(E_1^I)_y\|_{\Omega_{12} \cup \Omega_{22}}^2 &= \sum_{i=N/2-1}^{N-1} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \|(E_1^I)_y\|_{\tau_{i,j}}^2 \leq C \sum_{i=N/2-1}^{N-1} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} h_{j,y}^{-2} \|E_1^I\|_{\tau_{i,j}}^2 \\
&\leq C \sum_{i=N/2}^{N-1} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} h_{j,y}^{-2} (N^{-2\sigma} h_{i,x} h_{j,y}) \\
&\leq CN^{1-2\sigma} \max_j h_{j,y}^{-1} \leq \varepsilon^{-1} N^{2-2\sigma}.
\end{aligned}$$

Collecting (3.13)–(3.16) and considering  $\|E_1 - E_1^I\| \leq CN^{-(k+1)}$ , we prove the third bound.

Now we consider  $\|\mathcal{P}_1 E_1\|_\varepsilon$ . From (3.3) and  $|E(x_{N/2-1}^i, y_j^t)| \leq CN^{-\sigma}$ , we can easily obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathcal{P}_1 E_1\|_\varepsilon^2 &\leq CN^{-2\sigma} \sum_{s=0}^{k-1} \left( \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} \|\theta_{N/2-1,j}^{s,t}\|_\varepsilon^2 + \|\theta_{N/2-1,N}^{s,0}\|_\varepsilon^2 \right) \\
&\leq CN^{-2\sigma} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \left( \varepsilon h_{N/2-1,x}^{-1} h_{j,y} + \varepsilon h_{N/2-1,x} h_{j,y}^{-1} + h_{N/2-1,x} h_{j,y} \right) \\
&\leq CN^{1-2\sigma},
\end{aligned} \tag{3.17}$$

where we have used  $h_{j,y}^{-1} \leq C\varepsilon^{-1}N$  from Lemma 2.1. The terms  $\mathcal{P}_2 E_2$ ,  $\mathcal{B}_1 E_1$  and  $\mathcal{B}_2 E_2$  can be analyzed in a similar way.

**Lemma 3.3** *Let Assumptions 1 and 2 hold true. Let  $E_{12}^I$  denote the Lagrange interpolant of  $E_{12}$  on the Bakhvalov-type mesh  $\mathcal{T}_N$ . Then there exists a constant  $C$  such that the following interpolation error estimates hold true:*

$$\begin{aligned}
\|E_{12} - E_{12}^I\|_{\Omega \setminus \tau_{N/2-1, N/2-1}} &\leq C\varepsilon N^{-k} + C\varepsilon^{1/2} N^{-(k+1)}, \\
\|E_{12} - E_{12}^I\| &\leq C\varepsilon N^{-k} + C\varepsilon^{1/2} N^{-(k+1)} + CN^{-1-2\sigma}, \\
\|E_{12} - E_{12}^I\|_\varepsilon &\leq CN^{-k}, \\
\|\mathcal{P}_{12} E_{12}\|_\varepsilon &\leq CN^{-1/2-2\sigma},
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathcal{P}_{12} E_{12}$  is defined in (3.5).

*Proof* Consider

$$\begin{aligned}
\|E_{12} - E_{12}^I\|^2 &= \|E_{12} - E_{12}^I\|_{\Omega_{11}}^2 + \|E_{12} - E_{12}^I\|_{\Omega_{12} \cup \Omega_{21} \cup (\Omega_{22} \setminus \tau_{N/2-1, N/2-1})}^2 \\
&\quad + \|E_{12} - E_{12}^I\|_{\tau_{N/2-1, N/2-1}}^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

Similar to (3.8), the estimation for  $\|E_{12} - E_{12}^I\|_{\Omega_{11}}^2$  is as follows:

$$\|E_{12} - E_{12}^I\|_{\Omega_{11}}^2 \leq C\varepsilon^2 N^{-2k}. \tag{3.19}$$

To analyze the second term in (3.18), we frequently use the following estimation

$$\|E_{12}^I\|_{\tau_{i,j}}^2 \leq \|E_{12}^I\|_{\infty, \tau_{i,j}}^2 h_{i,x} h_{j,y} \leq C e^{-2(\beta_1 x_i + \beta_2 y_j)/\varepsilon} h_{i,x} h_{j,y}. \quad (3.20)$$

From (2.1d), direct calculations yield

$$\|E_{12}\|_{\Omega \setminus \Omega_{11}} \leq C \varepsilon N^{-\sigma}. \quad (3.21)$$

From (3.20) and Lemma 3.1, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \|E_{12}^I\|_{\Omega_{12}}^2 &= \sum_{i=N/2-1}^{N-1} \sum_{j=0}^{N/2-2} \|E_{12}^I\|_{\tau_{i,j}}^2 \leq C \sum_{i=N/2-1}^{N-1} \sum_{j=0}^{N/2-2} e^{-2(\beta_1 x_i + \beta_2 y_j)/\varepsilon} h_{i,x} h_{j,y} \\ &\leq C \sum_{i=N/2-1}^{N-1} e^{-2\beta_1 x_i/\varepsilon} h_{i,x} \sum_{j=0}^{N/2-2} e^{-2\beta_2 y_j/\varepsilon} h_{j,y} \leq C \varepsilon N^{-2\sigma}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.22)$$

where Lemma 2.1 has been used. Similarly, we have

$$\|E_{12}^I\|_{\Omega_{21}}^2 \leq C \varepsilon N^{-2\sigma}. \quad (3.23)$$

Using (3.20) again, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|E_{12}^I\|_{(\Omega_{22} \setminus \tau_{N/2-1, N/2-1})}^2 &= \sum_{j=N/2}^{N-1} \|E_{12}^I\|_{\tau_{N/2-1, j}}^2 + \sum_{i=N/2}^{N-1} \sum_{j=N/2-1}^{N-1} \|E_{12}^I\|_{\tau_{i, j}}^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{j=N/2}^{N-1} e^{-2(\beta_1 x_{N/2-1} + \beta_2 y_j)/\varepsilon} h_{N/2-1, x} h_{j, y} + \sum_{i=N/2}^{N-1} \sum_{j=N/2-1}^{N-1} e^{-2(\beta_1 x_i + \beta_2 y_j)/\varepsilon} h_{i, x} h_{j, y} \\ &\leq C N^{-1-2\sigma} \varepsilon^{2\sigma} + C N^{-2\sigma} \varepsilon^{2\sigma} \end{aligned} \quad (3.24)$$

and

$$\|E_{12}^I\|_{\tau_{N/2-1, N/2-1}}^2 \leq C N^{-2-4\sigma}. \quad (3.25)$$

Then the triangle inequality and (3.19), (3.21)–(3.25) yield the first and the second bounds.

Now we consider  $\|(E_{12} - E_{12}^I)_x\|$ . By similar derivations for (3.13), we have

$$\|(E_{12} - E_{12}^I)_x\|_{\Omega_{11}} \leq C N^{-k}. \quad (3.26)$$

Similar to (3.14), the following bound can be obtained

$$\|(E_{12} - E_{12}^I)_x\|_{\Omega \setminus \Omega_{11}} \leq C \varepsilon^{-1/2} N^{1-\sigma}. \quad (3.27)$$

Combing (3.26) and (3.27), we prove

$$\|(E_{12} - E_{12}^I)_x\| \leq C \varepsilon^{-1/2} N^{1-\sigma}$$

and the same bound for  $\|(E_{12} - E_{12}^I)_y\|$ . Thus we prove the third bound. Similar to (3.17), the final bound can be proved.

**Lemma 3.4** *Let Assumptions 1 and 2 hold true. Let  $S^I$  and  $u^I$  denote the Lagrange interpolants of  $S$  and  $u$  on the Bakhvalov-type mesh  $\mathcal{T}_N$ , respectively. Let  $\Pi u$  and  $\pi_i E_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2, 12$ , be defined in (3.1) and (3.2), respectively. Then there exists a constant  $C$  such that the following interpolation error estimates hold true:*

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1,2,12} \|\pi_i E_i - E_i\| &\leq CN^{-(k+1)}, \\ \|\nabla(S - S^I)\| + \|u - u^I\|_\varepsilon + \|u - \Pi u\|_\varepsilon &\leq CN^{-k}. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof* Check the derivations in (3.17) and one finds that  $\|\mathcal{P}_1 E_1\| \leq CN^{-1/2-\sigma}$ . Thus

$$\|\pi_1 E_1 - E_1\| \leq \|E_1^I - E_1\| + \|\mathcal{P}_1 E_1\| \leq CN^{-(k+1)}.$$

Similarly, we can prove the bounds for  $E_2$  and  $E_{12}$ .

From Lemma 3.1 and (2.1b), we prove  $\|\nabla(S - S^I)\| \leq CN^{-k}$  and  $\|S - S^I\|_\varepsilon \leq C(\varepsilon^{1/2} + N^{-1})N^{-k}$  easily. Then (2.1a), the triangle inequality, Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3 yield  $\|u - u^I\|_\varepsilon \leq CN^{-k}$ . Besides, from (3.7), Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3 one has  $\|u - \Pi u\|_\varepsilon \leq CN^{-k}$ .

#### 4 Uniform convergence

Set  $\chi := \Pi u - u^N$ . From (2.11), (2.12), (2.1a), (3.1) and integration by parts, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha \|\chi\|_\varepsilon^2 &\leq a(\chi, \chi) = a(\Pi u - u, \chi) \\ &= \varepsilon \int_{\Omega} \nabla(\Pi u - u) \nabla \chi \, dx dy + \sum_{i=1,2} \int_{\Omega} (E_i^I - \mathcal{P}_i E_i - E_i) \mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla \chi \, dx dy \\ &\quad + \int_{\Omega} (E_{12}^I - \mathcal{P}_{12} E_{12} - E_{12}) \mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla \chi \, dx dy - \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla(S^I - S) \chi \, dx dy \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1,2,12} \int_{\Omega} (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{b})(\pi_i E_i - E_i) \chi \, dx dy + \int_{\Omega} c(\Pi u - u) \chi \, dx dy \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1,2} \int_{\Omega} (-\mathcal{B}_i E_i) \mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla \chi \, dx dy \\ &=: \text{I} + \text{II} + \text{III} + \text{IV} + \text{V} + \text{VI} + \text{VII}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

Now we analyze the terms on the right-hand side of (4.1). The Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and Lemma 3.4 yield

$$\begin{aligned} &(\text{I} + \text{VI}) + (\text{IV} + \text{V}) \\ &\leq C \|\Pi u - u\|_\varepsilon \|\chi\|_\varepsilon + C (\|\nabla(S^I - S)\| + \sum_{i=1,2,12} \|\pi_i E_i - E_i\|) \|\chi\| \\ &\leq CN^{-k} \|\chi\|_\varepsilon. \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

We put the arguments for II, III and VII in the following three lemmas.

**Lemma 4.1** *Let Assumptions 1 and 2 hold true. Let  $\pi_i E_i$  with  $i = 1, 2$  be defined in (3.2). Then one has*

$$|\text{II}| = \left| \sum_{i=1,2} \int_{\Omega} (E_i^I - \mathcal{P}_i E_i - E_i) \mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla \chi \, dx dy \right| \leq CN^{-(k+1/2)} \|\chi\|_{\varepsilon}. \quad (4.3)$$

*Proof* For the term II, we just consider  $E_1$  since we can analyze  $E_2$  in a similar way. Set  $D_0 := [x_{N/2-1}, x_{N/2}] \times [0, 1]$ . According to (3.2) and (3.3), one has

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} (E_1^I - \mathcal{P}_1 E_1) \mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla \chi \, dx dy \\ &= (E_1^I - \mathcal{P}_1 E_1 - E_1, \mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla \chi)_{\Omega \setminus D_0} + (E_1^I - \mathcal{P}_1 E_1 - E_1, \mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla \chi)_{D_0} \\ &= (E_1^I - E_1, \mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla \chi)_{\Omega \setminus D_0} + (-\mathcal{F}_1, \mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla \chi)_{\Omega \setminus D_0} \\ & \quad + (\mathcal{F}_2 - E_1, \mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla \chi)_{D_0} \\ &=: \text{T}_1 + \text{T}_2 + \text{T}_3, \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

where  $(E_1^I - \mathcal{P}_1 E_1)|_{\Omega \setminus D_0} = (E_1^I - \mathcal{F}_1)|_{\Omega \setminus D_0}$ ,  $(E_1^I - \mathcal{P}_1 E_1)|_{D_0} = \mathcal{F}_2|_{D_0}$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_1 &:= \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} E_1(x_{N/2-1}, y_j^t) \theta_{N/2-1,j}^{0,t} + E_1(x_{N/2-1}, y_N) \theta_{N/2-1,N}^{0,0}, \\ \mathcal{F}_2 &:= \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} E_1(x_{N/2}, y_j^t) \theta_{N/2,j}^{0,t} + E_1(x_{N/2}, y_N) \theta_{N/2,N}^{0,0}. \end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 3.2 and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, one has

$$|\text{T}_1| \leq C \|E_1 - E_1^I\|_{\Omega \setminus D_0} \|\nabla \chi\|_{\Omega \setminus D_0} \leq C \varepsilon^{1/2} N^{-(k+1/2)} \|\nabla \chi\| \leq CN^{-(k+1/2)} \|\chi\|_{\varepsilon}. \quad (4.5)$$

Note  $|E_1(x_{N/2-1}, y_j^t)| \leq CN^{-\sigma}$  for any  $j, t$  and  $h_{N/2-2,x} \leq C\varepsilon$ . The Cauchy-Schwarz inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{T}_2| &\leq C \|\mathcal{F}_1\|_{D_1} \|\nabla \chi\|_{D_1} \\ &\leq CN^{-\sigma} \|\nabla \chi\|_{D_1} \left( \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} \|\theta_{N/2-1,j}^{0,t}\|_{D_1} + \|\theta_{N/2-1,N}^{0,0}\|_{D_1} \right) \\ &\leq CN^{-\sigma} \|\nabla \chi\|_{D_1} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} h_{N/2-2,x}^{1/2} h_{j,y}^{1/2} \\ &\leq CN^{1/2-\sigma} \|\chi\|_{\varepsilon}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

where  $D_1 := [x_{N/2-2}, x_{N/2-1}] \times [0, 1]$  and we have made use of the supports of hat functions  $\theta_{i,j}^{s,t}$ .

Now we deal with the term  $T_3$ . Note  $|E_1(x_{N/2}, y_j^t)| \leq C\varepsilon^\sigma$  for any  $j, t$  and  $h_{N/2-1, x} \leq CN^{-1}$ . The Cauchy-Schwarz inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned} |T_3| &\leq C(\|E_1\|_{D_0} + \|\mathcal{F}_2\|_{D_0})\|\nabla\chi\|_{D_0} \\ &\leq C\left(\varepsilon^{1/2}N^{-\sigma} + \varepsilon^\sigma \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} h_{N/2-1, x}^{1/2} h_{j, y}^{1/2}\right)\|\nabla\chi\|_{D_2} \\ &\leq C(N^{-\sigma} + \varepsilon^{\sigma-1/2})\|\chi\|_\varepsilon \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

where direct calculations and (2.1c) yield  $\|E_1\|_{D_0} \leq C\varepsilon^{1/2}N^{-\sigma}$  and  $\|\mathcal{F}_2\|_{D_0}$  is analyzed in a similar way to  $\|\mathcal{F}_1\|_{D_1}$  in (4.6).

Substituting (4.5)–(4.7) into (4.4), we are done.

**Lemma 4.2** *Let Assumptions 1 and 2 hold true. Let  $\pi_{12}E_{12}$  be defined in (3.2). Then one has*

$$|\text{III}| = \left| \int_{\Omega} (\pi_{12}E_{12} - E_{12}) \mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla\chi dx dy \right| \leq CN^{-(k+1/2)}\|\chi\|_\varepsilon. \quad (4.8)$$

*Proof* Set  $D_3 =: \Omega \setminus \tau_{N/2-1, N/2-1}$ . According to (3.2), one has

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\Omega} (\pi_{12}E_{12} - E_{12}) \mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla\chi dx dy \\ &= (\pi_{12}E_{12} - E_{12}, \mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla\chi)_{D_3} + (\pi_{12}E_{12} - E_{12}, \mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla\chi)_{\tau_{N/2-1, N/2-1}} \\ &= (E_{12}^I - E_{12}, \mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla\chi)_{D_3} - (\mathcal{F}_3, \mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla\chi)_{D_3} + (\mathcal{F}_4 - E_{12}, \mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla\chi)_{\tau_{N/2-1, N/2-1}} \\ &=: Q_1 + Q_2 + Q_3, \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

where  $(\pi_{12}E_{12})|_{D_3} = (E_{12}^I - \mathcal{F}_3)|_{D_3}$ ,  $(\pi_{12}E_{12})|_{\tau_{N/2-1, N/2-1}} = \mathcal{F}_4|_{\tau_{N/2-1, N/2-1}}$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_3 &:= \sum_{t=1}^{k-1} E_{12}(x_{N/2-1}, y_{N/2-1}^t) \theta_{N/2-1, N/2-1}^{0, t} + E_{12}(x_{N/2-1}, y_{N/2-1}) \theta_{N/2-1, N/2-1}^{0, 0} \\ &\quad + \sum_{s=1}^{k-1} E_{12}(x_{N/2-1}^s, y_{N/2-1}) \theta_{N/2-1, N/2-1}^{s, 0}, \\ \mathcal{F}_4 &:= \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} E_{12}(x_{N/2}, y_{N/2-1}^t) \theta_{N/2, N/2-1}^{0, t} + E_{12}(x_{N/2}, y_{N/2}) \theta_{N/2, N/2}^{0, 0} \\ &\quad + \sum_{s=0}^{k-1} E_{12}(x_{N/2-1}^s, y_{N/2}) \theta_{N/2-1, N/2}^{s, 0}. \end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 3.3 and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, one has

$$|Q_1| \leq C\|E_{12}^I - E_{12}\|_{D_3}\|\nabla\chi\|_{D_3} \leq C\varepsilon^{1/2}N^{-(k+1/2)}\|\nabla\chi\| \leq CN^{-(k+1/2)}\|\chi\|_\varepsilon. \quad (4.10)$$

Note  $|E_{12}(x_{N/2-1}^s, y_{N/2-1}^t)| \leq CN^{-2\sigma}$  for any  $0 \leq s, t \leq k-1$  and  $h_{N/2-2,x}, h_{N/2-2,y} \leq C\varepsilon$ . Then one has

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{F}_3\|_{D_3} &\leq CN^{-2\sigma} \left( \sum_{t=1}^{k-1} \|\theta_{N/2-1, N/2-1}^{0,t}\|_{D_3} + \|\theta_{N/2-1, N/2-1}^{0,0}\|_{D_3} + \sum_{s=1}^{k-1} \|\theta_{N/2-1, N/2-1}^{s,0}\|_{D_3} \right) \\ &\leq CN^{-2\sigma} \left( h_{N/2-1,x}^{1/2} h_{N/2-2,y}^{1/2} + h_{N/2-2,x}^{1/2} h_{N/2-2,y}^{1/2} + h_{N/2-2,x}^{1/2} h_{N/2-1,y}^{1/2} \right) \\ &\leq C\varepsilon^{1/2} N^{-1/2-2\sigma}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality yields

$$|Q_2| \leq C\|\mathcal{F}_3\|_{D_3} \|\nabla\chi\|_{D_3} \leq CN^{-1/2-2\sigma} \|\chi\|_\varepsilon. \quad (4.11)$$

Note  $|E_{12}(x_{N/2}^s, y_{N/2-1}^t)| + |E_{12}(x_{N/2-1}^s, y_{N/2}^t)| + |E_{12}(x_{N/2}, y_{N/2})| \leq C\varepsilon^\sigma N^{-\sigma}$  for any  $0 \leq s, t \leq k-1$ . The Cauchy-Schwarz inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned} |Q_3| &\leq C(\|\mathcal{F}_4\|_{\tau_{N/2-1, N/2-1}} + \|E_{12}\|_{\tau_{N/2-1, N/2-1}}) \|\nabla\chi\|_{\tau_{N/2-1, N/2-1}} \\ &\leq C \left( \varepsilon^\sigma N^{-\sigma} h_{N/2-1,x}^{1/2} h_{N/2-1,y}^{1/2} + \varepsilon N^{-2\sigma} \right) \|\nabla\chi\|_{\tau_{N/2-1, N/2-1}} \\ &\leq C\varepsilon^{1/2} N^{-2\sigma} \|\chi\|_\varepsilon. \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

Substituting (4.10)–(4.12) into (4.9), we are done.

**Lemma 4.3** *Let Assumptions 1 and 2 hold true. Let  $\mathcal{B}_i E_i$  with  $i = 1, 2$  be defined in (3.2). Then one has*

$$|\text{VII}| = \left| \sum_{i=1,2} \int_{\Omega} (-\mathcal{B}_i E_i) \mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla\chi \, dx dy \right| \leq CN^{-k} R(N, \varepsilon) \|\chi\|_\varepsilon, \quad (4.13)$$

where  $R(N, \varepsilon) = N^{-3/2} |\ln(\varepsilon N)|^{1/2}$ .

*Proof* We just present the analysis on the term involved with  $\mathcal{B}_1 E_1$  and the other could be analyzed in a similar way. Hölder inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \int_{\Omega} (-\mathcal{B}_1 E_1) \mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla\chi \, dx dy \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{j=0, N-1} \|\mathcal{B}_1 E_1\|_{\infty, \tau_{N/2-1, j}} \|\mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla\chi\|_{1, \tau_{N/2-1, j}} \\ &\leq C \sum_{j=0, N-1} \left( N^{-\sigma} h_{N/2-1,x}^{1/2} h_{j,y}^{1/2} \|\mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla\chi\|_{\tau_{N/2-1, j}} \right) \\ &\leq C(N^{-(1+\sigma)} + N^{-(1/2+\sigma)} |\ln(\varepsilon N)|^{1/2}) \|\chi\|_\varepsilon \\ &\leq CN^{-(1/2+\sigma)} |\ln(\varepsilon N)|^{1/2} \|\chi\|_\varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used  $h_{0,y} \leq C\varepsilon N^{-1}$  in Lemma 2.1 and  $h_{N/2-1,x} = -\frac{\sigma\varepsilon}{\beta} \ln(\varepsilon N)$  from (2.2).

*Remark 4.1* Practically  $R(N, \varepsilon)$  is bounded: If we assume  $N \geq 10$  and  $\varepsilon \geq 10^{-1001}$ , then

$$R(N, \varepsilon) \leq \sqrt{\ln 10}.$$

Now we are in a position to present the main result.

**Theorem 4.1** *Let Assumptions 1 and 2 hold true. Let  $u$  and  $u^N$  be the solutions of (1.1) and (2.10), respectively. Then one has*

$$\|u - u^N\|_\varepsilon \leq CN^{-k}R(N, \varepsilon),$$

where  $R(N, \varepsilon) = N^{-3/2}|\ln(\varepsilon N)|^{1/2}$ .

*Proof* Substituting (4.2), (4.3), (4.8) and (4.13) into (4.1), we obtain  $\|IIu - u^N\|_\varepsilon \leq CN^{-k}R(N, \varepsilon)$ . From a triangle inequality and Lemma 3.4, one has

$$\|u - u^N\|_\varepsilon \leq \|u - IIu\|_\varepsilon + \|IIu - u^N\|_\varepsilon \leq CN^{-k}R(N, \varepsilon).$$

Thus we are done.

*Remark 4.2* In Theorem 4.1, we show the almost optimal estimation, which is slightly better than the bound in [11, Theorem 1].

## 5 Numerical Experiments

In this section we present numerical experiments that support our theoretical results. All calculations were carried out using Intel Visual Fortran 11 and the discrete problems were solved by the nonsymmetric iterative solver GMRES; see, e.g., [3].

For our experiments we used the boundary value problem

$$\begin{aligned} -\varepsilon \Delta u - (2 + 2x - y)u_x - (3 - x + 2y)u_y + u &= f(x, y) && \text{in } \Omega = (0, 1)^2, \\ u &= 0 && \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{aligned}$$

where the right-hand side  $f$  is chosen such that

$$u(x, y) = 2 \sin(\pi x) \left(1 - e^{-\frac{2x}{\varepsilon}}\right) (1 - y)^2 \left(1 - e^{-\frac{y}{\varepsilon}}\right)$$

is the exact solution. This solution exhibits typical exponential layer behaviour as described in Assumption 1.

Numerical results are presented in Tables 5.1 and 5.2 and Figure 5.1, which support our main result. Tables 5.1 and 5.2 list errors in the energy norm, i.e.,  $\|u - u^N\|_\varepsilon$ , for  $\varepsilon = 10^{-4}, 10^{-5}, \dots, 10^{-8}$  and  $N = 8, 16, 32, 64, 128, 256$ , in the cases of  $k = 1, 2$ . These data show uniform convergence with respect to the singular perturbation parameter  $\varepsilon$ . In the cases of  $k = 3, 4$ , errors and convergence orders also show uniform convergence, which are plotted in Figure 5.1.

Here we also compare two meshes, which are Bakhvalov-type mesh (2.2) (denoted by B-mesh) and Bakhvalov-Shishkin mesh (denoted by B-S-mesh). B-S-mesh [6] yields an optimal convergence order for bilinear element and has excellent performances. According to [6], B-S-mesh is defined by tensor product and the mesh points in  $x$ -direction are defined by

$$\varphi(i/N) = \begin{cases} -\frac{(k+1)\varepsilon}{\beta_1} \ln\left(\frac{N^2 - 2i(N-1)}{N^2}\right) & \text{for } i = 0, \dots, N/2, \\ \varphi(1/2) + 2(1 - \varphi(1/2))/(i/N - 1/2) & \text{for } i = N/2 + 1, \dots, N. \end{cases}$$

The mesh points along  $y$ -direction can be defined similarly.

To compare B-mesh and B-S-mesh, we plot errors in the energy norm on these meshes for  $\varepsilon = 10^{-8}$  and  $N = 8, 16, 32, 64, 128$ , for the cases  $k = 1, 2, 3, 4$  on log-log chart in Figure 5.1. We can see that these meshes have similar performances and B-S-mesh yields slightly smaller errors.

Besides, from numerical experiments we find that the linear systems become harder to be solved by iterative solvers when  $k$  and  $N$  become bigger and  $\varepsilon$  becomes smaller.

**Table 5.1** Errors and orders in the energy norm on B-mesh for  $k = 1$

$\varepsilon \backslash N$	8	16	32	64	128	256
$10^{-4}$	0.227E+0	0.109E+0	0.540E-1	0.269E-1	0.135E-1	0.673E-2
$10^{-4}$	1.06	1.02	1.00	1.00	1.00	—
$10^{-5}$	0.228E+0	0.109E+0	0.540E-1	0.269E-1	0.135E-1	0.673E-2
$10^{-5}$	1.06	1.02	1.00	1.00	1.00	—
$10^{-6}$	0.229E+0	0.109E+0	0.540E-1	0.269E-1	0.135E-1	0.673E-2
$10^{-6}$	1.07	1.02	1.00	1.00	1.00	—
$10^{-7}$	0.231E+0	0.110E+0	0.541E-1	0.269E-1	0.135E-1	0.673E-2
$10^{-7}$	1.08	1.02	1.00	1.00	1.00	—
$10^{-8}$	0.234E+0	0.110E+0	0.541E-1	0.269E-1	0.135E-1	0.673E-2
$10^{-8}$	1.09	1.02	1.01	1.00	1.00	—

**Table 5.2** Errors and orders in the energy norm on B-mesh for  $k = 2$

$\varepsilon \backslash N$	8	16	32	64	128
$10^{-4}$	0.502E-1	0.105E-1	0.247E-2	0.603E-3	0.150E-3
$10^{-4}$	2.25	2.10	2.03	2.01	—
$10^{-5}$	0.501E-1	0.105E-1	0.247E-2	0.604E-3	0.150E-3
$10^{-5}$	2.25	2.09	2.03	2.01	—
$10^{-6}$	0.500E-1	0.105E-1	0.246E-2	0.604E-3	0.150E-3
$10^{-6}$	2.25	2.09	2.03	2.01	—
$10^{-7}$	0.500E-1	0.105E-1	0.246E-2	0.604E-3	0.150E-3
$10^{-7}$	2.25	2.09	2.03	2.01	—
$10^{-8}$	0.502E-1	0.105E-1	0.246E-2	0.604E-3	0.150E-3
$10^{-8}$	2.25	2.10	2.03	2.01	—




Fig. 5.1 Error: energy norm,  $\varepsilon = 10^{-8}$ .

## 6 Bibliography

### References

1. T. Apel. *Anisotropic Finite Elements: Local Estimates and Applications*. Advances in Numerical Mathematics. B. G. Teubner, Stuttgart, 1999.
2. N. S. Bahvalov. On the optimization of the methods for solving boundary value problems in the presence of a boundary layer. *Zh. Vychisl. Mat. Mat. Fiz.*, 9:841–859, 1969.
3. M. Benzi, G. H. Golub, and J. Liesen. Numerical solution of saddle point problems. *Acta Numer.*, 14:1–137, 2005.
4. P. G. Ciarlet. *The Finite Element Method for Elliptic Problems*. Studies in Mathematics and its Applications. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1978.
5. S. Franz, T. Linß, H.-G. Roos, and S. Schiller. Uniform superconvergence of a finite element method with edge stabilization for convection-diffusion problems. *J. Comput. Math.*, 28(1):32–44, 2010.
6. T. Linß. Analysis of a Galerkin finite element method on a Bakhvalov-Shishkin mesh for a linear convection-diffusion problem. *IMA J. Numer. Anal.*, 20(4):621–632, 2000.
7. T. Linß. *Layer-adapted meshes for reaction-convection-diffusion problems*, volume 1985 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2010.
8. T. Linß and M. Stynes. Asymptotic analysis and Shishkin-type decomposition for an elliptic convection-diffusion problem. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 261(2):604–632, 2001.
9. J. J. H. Miller, E. O’Riordan, and G. I. Shishkin. *Fitted Numerical Methods for Singular Perturbation Problems*. World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd., Hackensack, NJ, revised edition, 2012. Error Estimates in the Maximum Norm for Linear Problems in One and Two Dimensions.
10. H.-G. Roos. Error estimates for linear finite elements on Bakhvalov-type meshes. *Appl. Math.*, 51(1):63–72, 2006.
11. H.-G. Roos and M. Schopf. Analysis of finite element methods on Bakhvalov-type meshes for linear convection-diffusion problems in 2D. *Appl. Math.*, 57(2):97–108, 2012.
12. H.-G. Roos, M. Stynes, and L. Tobiska. *Robust Numerical Methods for Singularly Perturbed Differential Equations*, volume 24 of *Springer Series in Computational Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second edition, 2008.
13. M. Stynes. Steady-state convection-diffusion problems. *Acta Numer.*, 14:445–508, 2005.
14. J. Zhang and X. Liu. Optimal order of uniform convergence for finite element method on Bakhvalov-type meshes. *J. Sci. Comput.*, 85(1):2, 2020.