

A WELL-POSED FIRST ORDER SYSTEM LEAST SQUARES FORMULATION OF THE INSTATIONARY STOKES EQUATIONS

GREGOR GANTNER AND ROB STEVENSON

ABSTRACT. In this paper, a well-posed simultaneous space-time First Order System Least Squares formulation is constructed of the instationary incompressible Stokes equations with slip boundary conditions. As a consequence of this well-posedness, the minimization over any conforming triple of finite element spaces for velocities, pressure and stress tensor gives a quasi-best approximation from that triple. The formulation is practical in the sense that all norms in the least squares functional can be efficiently evaluated. Being of least squares type, the formulation comes with an efficient and reliable a posteriori error estimator. In addition, a priori error estimates are derived, and numerical results are presented.

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper is about the numerical solution of the instationary incompressible Stokes equations in a simultaneous space-time variational formulation. Compared to classical time-stepping schemes, space-time methods for evolutionary PDEs are much better suited for a massively parallel implementation (e.g. [NS19, vVW21a]), allow for local refinements simultaneously in space and time (e.g. [DFW16, SY18, GS19, DS20, SvVW21, vVW21b]), produce numerical approximations that are quasi-best in the employed trial spaces, and are advantageous for all applications where the whole time-evolution is simultaneously needed as for optimal control or data-assimilation problems.

The usual bilinear form resulting from a space-time variational formulation is not coercive¹. Consequently, trial and test spaces of equal dimension that give a stable Petrov–Galerkin discretization are difficult to construct. For this reason, R. Andreev proposed in [And13] to use minimal residual discretizations for parabolic problems. They have an equivalent interpretation as Galerkin discretizations of an extended self-adjoint, but indefinite mixed system having as secondary variable the Riesz lift of the residual of the primal variable. To ensure that the discrete solution is a quasi-best approximation from a pair of trial spaces, a remaining restriction is the Ladyshenskaja–Babuška–Brezzi (LBB) stability of this pair.

Date: January 27, 2022.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 35F46, 35K20, 35A15, 65M12, 65M15, 65M60, 76D07.

Key words and phrases. Instationary Stokes equations, slip boundary conditions, simultaneous space-time variational formulation, First Order System Least Squares (FOSLS), finite elements with a commuting diagram.

The first author has been supported by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) under grant J4379-N. The second author has been supported by NSF Grant DMS 172029.

¹For parabolic problems ‘almost’ coercive bilinear forms based on $H^{\frac{1}{2}}$ -type spaces in time are considered in [Fon09, Dev20, SZ20].

In [FK21], T. Führer and M. Karkulik showed well-posedness of a First Order System Least Squares (FOSLS) formulation of the heat equation that was proposed earlier in [BG09]. In the terminology from [BG09], this formulation is ‘practical’ in the sense that the different components of the residual are all measured in L_2 -type norms, which, unlike fractional Sobolev norms or dual norms, are efficiently computable. The minimizer of this least squares functional over *any* finite dimensional subspace of the solution space is a quasi-best approximation from that subspace. Further results about this FOSLS can be found in [GS21].

The topic of the current work is to find a similar FOSLS formulation of the instationary incompressible Stokes equations posed on a time-space cylinder $(0, T) \times \Omega$. The velocity component of the solution of these Stokes equations solves a parabolic evolution equation. To use this fact as the basis of a numerical approximation scheme, however, one would have to construct trial spaces of divergence free velocities, which even in two space-dimensions is not very practical, and furthermore it does not yield an approximation for the pressure.

Well-posed space-time variational formulations of the instationary incompressible Stokes equations of second order for the *pair* of velocities and pressure were given in [GSS14, SS17]. So far these formulations have not been used for the construction of a numerical solution method. From these references it appears that no-slip and slip boundary conditions require a quite different treatment. In the current work, which is partly based on insights from [GSS14], we consider slip boundary conditions. An important work on the numerical treatment of slip boundary conditions in the setting of the (stationary) incompressible (Navier-)Stokes equations is [Ver87].

Although in our FOSLS one component of the residual, viz. the (spatial) divergence $\operatorname{div}_x u_\delta$ of the approximating velocity-field u_δ is not measured in the L_2 -norm but in the $H^1((0, T); L_2(\Omega))$ -norm, since also the latter norm can be efficiently evaluated the method is practical in the aforementioned sense. Since our proof of well-posedness of the FOSLS requires L_2 -boundedness of the so-called Leray projector, our proof is restricted to domains Ω that are convex or have a C^2 -boundary. Numerical experiments that we will report on indicate that well-posedness is indeed lost when the $H^1((0, T); L_2(\Omega))$ -norm is replaced by the $L_2((0, T) \times \Omega)$ -norm, and furthermore that likely our FOSLS is not (‘fully’) well-posed on an L-shaped domain.

Although efficiently evaluable, the term $\|\operatorname{div}_x u_\delta\|_{H^1((0, T); L_2(\Omega))}$ in the least-squares functional causes two problems. First, for u_δ being a continuous piecewise polynomial w.r.t. an arbitrary polytopal partition of the time-space cylinder $(0, T) \times \Omega$, generally $\operatorname{div}_x u_\delta \notin H^1((0, T); L_2(\Omega))$. Since on the other hand C^1 -finite elements are not very practical, as approximation spaces for the velocity-field u , the pressure p , and the symmetric stress tensor $\underline{\underline{w}} := \nu(\underline{\underline{\nabla}}_x u + (\underline{\underline{\nabla}}_x u)^\top) - p\operatorname{Id}$, we consider finite element spaces w.r.t. (joint) partitions of $(0, T) \times \Omega$ into *prismatic elements*. Then global continuity of the functions in the trial space for the velocities suffices for this space to be conforming. Secondly, when employing standard piecewise polynomial trial spaces w.r.t. aforementioned partitions, the term $\|\operatorname{div}_x u_\delta\|_{H^1((0, T); L_2(\Omega))}$ can be expected to restrict the convergence rate. For that reason we will enrich such trial spaces with bubble functions as introduced in

[CH18], which allow the construction of a quasi-interpolator that has a commuting diagram property, and so maps divergence-free functions to divergence-free functions.

This paper is organized as follows: In the remainder of the current section we introduce some notations, and specify the instationary Stokes problem with slip boundary conditions.

In Section 2 we present our FOSLS formulation of this Stokes problem and show that it is well-posed. Initially, we consider a space for the pressure of functions that for each time t have a zero average over the spatial domain. Since such a constraint is difficult to incorporate into a trial space of piecewise polynomials w.r.t. a partition of the time-space cylinder that cannot be subdivided into time slabs, later we extend our FOSLS by adding this constraint to the least-squares functional.

In Section 3 we construct suitable finite-dimensional trial spaces in the solution space of our FOSLS, and give a priori bounds for the error attained by the minimizer of the least squares functional over these trial spaces. Although not essential, here we restrict ourselves to two-dimensional spatial domains Ω and lowest order finite element spaces. Furthermore, we consider only quasi-uniform partitions that are products of partitions of the temporal and the spatial domain, so that the finite element spaces are of tensor product form. Insisting on prismatic elements, locally refined partitions necessarily will contain ‘hanging nodes’, which will be addressed in future work.

Aiming at minimizing regularity conditions needed to ensure a certain convergence rate, also for the approximation of the stress tensor \underline{w} we want to employ a trial space in the spatial direction that has an appropriate commuting diagram property. We use the trial space introduced in [CH20], which has only 9 DOFs per element, and show such a commuting diagram property.

In Section 4, we report on several numerical experiments that illustrate that our FOSLS is also quantitatively well-conditioned, that likely the conditions on the spatial domain for well-posedness of our FOSLS can generally not be omitted, that measuring the term $\operatorname{div}_x \underline{u}_\delta$ in the $H^1((0, T); L_2(\Omega))$ -norm is indeed necessary, and that likely well-posedness of our FOSLS does not generalize to no-slip boundary conditions.

1.1. Notation. In this work, by $C \lesssim D$ we will mean that C can be bounded by a multiple of D , independently of parameters on which C and D may depend. Obviously, $C \gtrsim D$ is defined as $D \lesssim C$, and $C \approx D$ as $C \lesssim D$ and $C \gtrsim D$.

For normed linear spaces E and F , we will denote by $\mathcal{L}(E, F)$ the normed linear space of bounded linear mappings $E \rightarrow F$, and by $\mathcal{L}\text{is}(E, F)$ its subset of boundedly invertible linear mappings $E \rightarrow F$. We write $E \hookrightarrow F$ to denote that E is continuously embedded into F . For simplicity only, we exclusively consider linear spaces over the scalar field \mathbb{R} .

For a Hilbert space W that is dense and continuously embedded in a Hilbert space equipped with $L_2(\Sigma)^n$ -norm, often we find it convenient to use the scalar product on $L_2(\Sigma)^n$ to denote its unique extension to the duality pairing on $W' \times W$.

We adopt the convention that an undertilde denotes vector-valued functions, operators, and their associated spaces. Double undertildes are used for matrix-valued functions, operators, and associated spaces. Here vectors and matrices are

of size n and $n \times n$, respectively, with n being the dimension of the ‘spatial domain’ Ω . With \mathbb{S} we denote the linear space of symmetric $n \times n$ matrices.

1.2. Stokes problem with slip conditions. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded Lipschitz domain, and $I := (0, T)$ for some $T > 0$. Given vector fields \underline{u}_0 on Ω and \underline{f} on $I \times \Omega$, a function g on $I \times \Omega$, and a viscosity $\nu > 0$, we consider the instantaneous Stokes problem with *slip boundary* conditions of finding a velocity field \underline{u} and corresponding pressure p that satisfy

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t \underline{u} - \nu \Delta_x \underline{u} + \nabla_x p = \underline{f} & \text{in } I \times \Omega, \\ \operatorname{div}_x \underline{u} = g & \text{in } I \times \Omega, \\ \underline{u} \cdot \underline{n} = 0 & \text{on } I \times \partial\Omega, \\ (\operatorname{Id} - \underline{n}\underline{n}^\top) \underline{T}(\nu \underline{u}, p) \underline{n} = 0 & \text{on } I \times \partial\Omega, \\ \underline{u}(0, \cdot) = \underline{u}_0 & \text{on } \Omega. \end{cases}$$

Here $(0, \underline{n}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ denotes the outward pointing normal vector on $I \times \partial\Omega$, and for $\underline{v}: I \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ and $q: I \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the *deformation tensor* and *stress tensor* are defined by $\underline{D}(\underline{v}) := \nabla_x \underline{v} + (\nabla_x \underline{v})^\top$ and $\underline{T}(\underline{v}, q) := \underline{D}(\underline{v}) - q \operatorname{Id}$, respectively. Notice that the second boundary condition means that for all $\underline{\tau} \perp \underline{n}$, $(\underline{D}(\underline{u}) \underline{n}) \cdot \underline{\tau} = (\underline{T}(\nu \underline{u}, p) \underline{n}) \cdot \underline{\tau} = 0$ on $I \times \partial\Omega$.

Using that for a \underline{v} that is twice continuously partially differentiable w.r.t. the spatial variables, it holds that

$$\operatorname{div}_x \underline{D}(\underline{v}) = \Delta_x \underline{v} + \nabla_x \operatorname{div}_x \underline{v},$$

we infer that a classical solution (\underline{u}, p) of (1.1) with $\underline{w} := -\underline{T}(\nu \underline{u}, p)$ satisfies

$$(1.2) \quad \mathbf{G}(\underline{u}, \underline{w}, p) := (\underline{w} + \underline{T}(\nu \underline{u}, p), \partial_t \underline{u} + \operatorname{div}_x \underline{w}, \operatorname{div}_x \underline{u}, \underline{u}(0, \cdot)) = (0, \underline{f} + \nu \nabla_x g, g, \underline{u}_0),$$

as well as $\underline{u} \cdot \underline{n} = 0$ on $I \times \partial\Omega$, and $(\operatorname{Id} - \underline{n}\underline{n}^\top) \underline{w} \underline{n} = 0$ on $I \times \partial\Omega$. We will show that (1.2) gives rise to a well-posed *First Order System Least Squares* (FOSLS) formulation of (1.1). This means that \mathbf{G} will be shown to be a boundedly invertible operator from some solution space onto its *range* in the data space $\underline{L}_2(I \times \Omega) \times \underline{L}_2(I \times \Omega) \times H^1(I; L_{2,0}(\Omega)) \times L_2(\Omega)$.

2. FIRST ORDER SYSTEM LEAST SQUARES

2.1. The solution space for our FOSLS. We define

$$L_{2,0}(\Omega) := \{p \in L_2(\Omega) : \int_{\Omega} p \, dx = 0\},$$

being, by our assumption of Ω being bounded, a closed subspace of $L_2(\Omega)$, and

$$\mathbb{H}^1(\Omega) := \{\underline{u} \in \underline{H}^1(\Omega) : \underline{u} \cdot \underline{n} = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega\}.$$

Knowing that $\underline{u} \mapsto \underline{u}|_{\partial\Omega}$ is in $\mathcal{L}(\underline{H}^1(\Omega), \underline{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\partial\Omega))$, and thus in $\mathcal{L}(\underline{H}^1(\Omega), \underline{L}_2(\partial\Omega))$, from $\underline{n} \in L_\infty(\partial\Omega)$ we infer that $\underline{u} \mapsto \underline{u}|_{\partial\Omega} \cdot \underline{n} \in \mathcal{L}(\underline{H}^1(\Omega), L_2(\partial\Omega))$, and thus that

$\mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)$ is a closed subspace of $H^1(\Omega)$. We set

$$\mathcal{Z} := \{(u, \underline{w}) \in L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)) \times L_2(I; L_2(\Omega; \mathbb{S})) : \partial_t u + \operatorname{div}_x \underline{w} \in L_2(I \times \Omega), \\ \operatorname{div}_x u \in H^1(I; L_{2,0}(\Omega)), (\operatorname{Id} - \underline{nn}^\top) \underline{w}|_{I \times \partial\Omega} = 0\},$$

equipped with the (squared) graph norm

$$\|(u, \underline{w})\|_{\mathcal{Z}}^2 := \|u\|_{L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega))}^2 + \|\underline{w}\|_{L_2(I \times \Omega)}^2 \\ + \|\partial_t u + \operatorname{div}_x \underline{w}\|_{L_2(I \times \Omega)}^2 + \|\operatorname{div}_x u\|_{H^1(I; L_{2,0}(\Omega))}^2.$$

The solution space of our FOSLS will be $\mathcal{Z} \times L_2(I; L_{2,0}(\Omega))$. We show that \mathcal{Z} , and so the solution space are Hilbert spaces.

Lemma 2.1. *\mathcal{Z} is a Hilbert space.*

Proof. Realizing that $(\partial_t u + \operatorname{div}_x \underline{w})_i$ is the divergence of the vector field $(u_i, \underline{w}_i)^\top$, one infers that

$$\mathcal{Z}_1 := \{(u, \underline{w}) \in L_2(I \times \Omega) \times L_2(I \times \Omega) : \partial_t u + \operatorname{div}_x \underline{w} \in L_2(I \times \Omega)\},$$

equipped with the graph norm, is a Hilbert space.

Consider $\mathcal{V} := H_0^1(I; L_2(\Omega)) \cap L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega))$, its closed subspace $\mathcal{V}_0 := \{v \in \mathcal{V} : v|_{I \times \partial\Omega} = 0\}$, and the quotient space $\mathcal{V}/\mathcal{V}_0$ equipped with $\|[v]\|_{\mathcal{V}/\mathcal{V}_0} := \inf\{\|v\| + \|v_0\|_{\mathcal{V}} : v_0 \in \mathcal{V}_0\}$. For smooth $(u, \underline{w}) \in \mathcal{Z}_1$ and $v \in \mathcal{V}$, integration-by-parts shows that

$$\int_I \int_{\partial\Omega} (\operatorname{Id} - \underline{nn}^\top) \underline{wn} \cdot v \, ds \, dt = \int_I \int_{\partial\Omega} \underline{wn} \cdot v \, ds \, dt + \int_{\Omega} (u \cdot v)(T, \cdot) - (u \cdot v)(0, \cdot) \, dx \\ (2.1) \quad = \int_I \int_{\Omega} (\partial_t u + \operatorname{div}_x \underline{w}) \cdot v + u \cdot \partial_t v + \underline{w} : \nabla_x v \, dx \, dt,$$

and so $|\int_I \int_{\partial\Omega} (\operatorname{Id} - \underline{nn}^\top) \underline{wn} \cdot v \, ds \, dt| \lesssim \|(u, \underline{w})\|_{\mathcal{Z}_1} \|[v]\|_{\mathcal{V}/\mathcal{V}_0}$. We conclude that $(u, \underline{w}) \mapsto (\operatorname{Id} - \underline{nn}^\top) \underline{wn} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{Z}_1, (\mathcal{V}/\mathcal{V}_0)')$, so that

$$(2.2) \quad \mathcal{Z}_2 := \{(u, \underline{w}) \in \mathcal{Z}_1 : (\operatorname{Id} - \underline{nn}^\top) \underline{w}|_{I \times \partial\Omega} = 0\}$$

is a Hilbert space.

Because furthermore $(u, \underline{w}) \mapsto \underline{w} - \underline{w}^\top \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{Z}_2, L_2(I \times \Omega))$, we have that

$$\mathcal{Z}_3 := \{(u, \underline{w}) \in \mathcal{Z}_2 : \underline{w} \in L_2(I; L_2(\Omega; \mathbb{S}))\}$$

is a Hilbert space.

Knowing that $(u, \underline{w}) \mapsto \partial_t u + \operatorname{div}_x \underline{w}$ is a closed map from its domain in $L_2(I \times \Omega) \times L_2(I \times \Omega)$ into $L_2(I \times \Omega)$, it is a closed map from its domain in $L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)) \times L_2(I \times \Omega)$ into $L_2(I \times \Omega)$, and so

$$\mathcal{Z}_4 := \mathcal{Z}_3 \cap L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)) \times L_2(I \times \Omega)$$

is a Hilbert space.

Let (u_k, \underline{w}_k) a converging sequence in \mathcal{Z}_4 with limit (u, \underline{w}) for which $\operatorname{div}_x u_k \rightarrow z$ in $H^1(I; L_{2,0}(\Omega))$. From $u_k \rightarrow u$ in $L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega))$, we have $\operatorname{div}_x u_k \rightarrow \operatorname{div}_x u$ in $L_2(I \times \Omega)$, and apparently $z = \operatorname{div}_x u$. We conclude that \mathcal{Z} is a Hilbert space. \square

Remark 2.2. With $\mathcal{Z}_2 := \{(u, \underline{w}) \in \mathcal{D}(\overline{I \times \Omega}) \times \mathcal{D}(\overline{I \times \Omega}) : (\text{Id} - \underline{nn}^\top) \underline{w}|_{I \times \partial\Omega} = 0\}$ below we will need that $\overline{\mathcal{Z}_2} = \mathcal{Z}_2$. To show this we follow the arguments used in [GR79, Thm. 2.4]. Let $\ell \in \mathcal{Z}_2'$ be arbitrary. There exists a $(\hat{u}, \hat{w}) \in \mathcal{Z}_2$ with

$$\ell(u, \underline{w}) = \int_I \int_\Omega \underline{u} \cdot \hat{u} + \underline{w} \cdot \hat{w} + (\partial_t \underline{u} + \text{div}_x \underline{w}) \hat{k} \, dx \, dt,$$

where $\hat{k} := \partial_t \hat{u} + \text{div}_x \hat{w}$. Suppose that ℓ vanishes on \mathcal{Z}_2 . Then in particular it vanishes on $\mathcal{D}(I \times \Omega) \times \mathcal{D}(I \times \Omega)$, from which it follows that $\hat{u} = \partial_t \hat{k}$ and $\hat{w} = \nabla_x \hat{k}$, and so $\hat{k} \in \mathbb{H}^1(I \times \Omega)$. Now using that ℓ vanishes on \mathcal{Z}_2 , integration-by-parts shows that $\hat{k}(0, \cdot) = 0 = \hat{k}(T, \cdot)$ and $\hat{k} \cdot \underline{n} = 0$ on $I \times \partial\Omega$, i.e., $\hat{k} \in \underline{V}$. Now from (2.1) it follows that ℓ vanishes on the whole of \mathcal{Z}_2 . We conclude that $\overline{\mathcal{Z}_2} = \mathcal{Z}_2$.

The following lemma shows that for $(u, \underline{w}) \in \mathcal{Z}$ it holds that $\partial_t u \in L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)')$, which will be relevant later.

Lemma 2.3. *It holds that $(u, \underline{w}) \mapsto u \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{Z}, H^1(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)'))$.*

Proof. For $(u, \underline{w}) \in \mathcal{Z}_2$ and $v \in L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega))$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} (2.3) \quad \int_I \int_\Omega \underline{w} : \nabla_x v \, dx \, dt &= - \int_I \int_\Omega \text{div}_x \underline{w} \cdot v \, dx \, dt + \int_I \int_{\partial\Omega} \underline{wn} \cdot v \, ds \, dt \\ &= - \int_I \int_\Omega \text{div}_x \underline{w} \cdot v \, dx \, dt. \end{aligned}$$

i.e., $\text{div}_x \underline{w}$ extends to an element in $L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)')$, with norm bounded by $\|\underline{w}\|_{L_2(I \times \Omega)}$. We conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_t u\|_{L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)')} &\leq \|\partial_t u + \text{div}_x \underline{w}\|_{L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)')} + \|\text{div}_x \underline{w}\|_{L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)')} \\ &\leq \|\partial_t u + \text{div}_x \underline{w}\|_{L_2(I \times \Omega)} + \|\underline{w}\|_{L_2(I \times \Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

By $\overline{\mathcal{Z}_2} = \mathcal{Z}_2$ this result extends to all $(u, \underline{w}) \in \mathcal{Z}_2$, and thus to all $(u, \underline{w}) \in \mathcal{Z}$. \square

2.2. Parabolic PDE on the space of divergence-free velocities. In order to be able to show that

$$(2.4) \quad \|(u, \underline{w}, p)\|_{\mathcal{X} \times L_2(I; L_{2,0}(\Omega))} \lesssim \|\mathbf{G}(u, \underline{w}, p)\|_{L_2(I \times \Omega) \times L_2(I \times \Omega) \times H^1(I; L_{2,0}(\Omega)) \times L_2(\Omega)'}$$

we will use that a divergence-free velocity field u is the solution of a well-posed parabolic evolution problem.

We define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}^1(\Omega) &:= \{u \in \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega) : \text{div} \, u = 0\}, \\ \mathcal{H}^0(\Omega) &:= \{u \in L_2(\Omega) : \text{div} \, u = 0, u \cdot \underline{n} = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then $\mathcal{H}^1(\Omega) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}^0(\Omega)$ with dense embedding, see, e.g., [GR86, Thm. 2.8], and so $\mathcal{H}^1(\Omega) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}^0(\Omega) \simeq \mathcal{H}^0(\Omega)' \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}^1(\Omega)'$ forms a Gelfand triple.

For almost all $t \in I$, let $a(t; \cdot, \cdot)$ be a bilinear form on $\mathcal{H}^1(\Omega) \times \mathcal{H}^1(\Omega)$ such that for any $\underline{\mu}, \underline{\lambda} \in \mathcal{H}^1(\Omega)$, $t \mapsto a(t; \underline{\mu}, \underline{\lambda})$ is measurable on I , and such that for some

constant $\varrho \geq 0$, for a.e. $t \in I$, and all $\underline{\mu}, \underline{\lambda}$,

$$(2.5) \quad |a(t; \underline{\mu}, \underline{\lambda})| \lesssim \|\underline{\mu}\|_{\mathcal{H}^1(\Omega)} \|\underline{\lambda}\|_{\mathcal{H}^1(\Omega)} \quad (\text{boundedness}),$$

$$(2.6) \quad a(t; \underline{\mu}, \underline{\mu}) + \varrho \|\underline{\mu}\|_{\mathcal{H}^0(\Omega)}^2 \gtrsim \|\underline{\mu}\|_{\mathcal{H}^1(\Omega)}^2 \quad (\text{Gårding inequality}).$$

A proof of the following result can be found, e.g. in [Wlo87, Ch. IV, §26], [DL92, Ch. XVIII, §3], or [SS09].

Theorem 2.4. *Assuming (2.5) and (2.6), the operator B defined by*

$$(B\underline{u})(\underline{v}) := \int_I \int_{\Omega} \partial_t \underline{u}(t, x) \cdot \underline{v}(t, x) \, dx + a(t; \underline{u}(t), \underline{v}(t)) \, dt,$$

satisfies

$$\left[\begin{array}{c} B \\ \gamma_0 \end{array} \right] \in \mathcal{L} \text{is} (L_2(I; \mathcal{H}^1(\Omega)) \cap H^1(I; \mathcal{H}^1(\Omega)'), L_2(I; \mathcal{H}^1(\Omega))' \times \mathcal{H}^0(\Omega)),$$

where $\gamma_0 := \underline{u} \mapsto \underline{u}|_{t=0}$.

To motivate the following Proposition 2.6, we summarize the main steps of the forthcoming proof of (2.4) in Section 2.3. Consider a triple $(\underline{u}, \underline{w}, p) \in \mathcal{X} \times L_2(I; L_{2,0}(\Omega))$, for simplicity here with $\text{div}_x \underline{u} = 0$. Setting

$$\underline{f}(\underline{v}) := \int_I \int_{\Omega} \partial_t \underline{u} \cdot \underline{v} + \frac{1}{2} T_{\underline{\underline{w}}}(\nu \underline{u}, p) : D_{\underline{\underline{w}}}(\underline{v}) \, dx \, dt,$$

integration-by-parts (2.3) and the triangle inequality show that

$$(2.7) \quad \|\underline{f}\|_{L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)')} \lesssim \|\underline{w}\|_{\underline{\underline{L}}_2(I \times \Omega)} + T_{\underline{\underline{w}}}(\nu \underline{u}, p) \|_{\underline{\underline{L}}_2(I \times \Omega)} + \|\partial_t \underline{u} + \text{div}_x \underline{w}\|_{\underline{\underline{L}}_2(I \times \Omega)}.$$

Since $\underline{f}(\underline{v}) = \int_I \int_{\Omega} \partial_t \underline{u} \cdot \underline{v} + \frac{\nu}{2} D_{\underline{\underline{w}}}(\underline{u}) : D_{\underline{\underline{w}}}(\underline{v}) \, dx \, dt$ for $\underline{v} \in L_2(I; \mathcal{H}^1(\Omega))$, an application of Theorem 2.4 will give

$$(2.8) \quad \|\underline{u}\|_{L_2(I; \mathcal{H}^1(\Omega))} + \|\partial_t \underline{u}\|_{L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)')} \lesssim \|\underline{f}\|_{L_2(I; \mathcal{H}^1(\Omega)')} + \|\underline{u}(0, \cdot)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0(\Omega)},$$

whereas for $\underline{v} \in L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega))$,

$$\int_I \int_{\Omega} p \, \text{div}_x \underline{v} \, dx \, dt = \int_I \int_{\Omega} \partial_t \underline{u} \cdot \underline{v} + \frac{\nu}{2} D_{\underline{\underline{w}}}(\underline{u}) : D_{\underline{\underline{w}}}(\underline{v}) \, dx \, dt - \underline{f}(\underline{v}).$$

Using that $\inf_{0 \neq q \in L_{2,0}(\Omega)} \sup_{0 \neq \underline{v} \in \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)} \frac{|\int_{\Omega} q \, \text{div}_x \underline{v} \, dx|}{\|q\|_{L_{2,0}(\Omega)} \|\underline{v}\|_{\mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)}} > 0$, one arrives at

$$(2.9) \quad \|p\|_{L_2(I; L_{2,0}(\Omega))} \lesssim \|\partial_t \underline{u}\|_{L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)')} + \|\underline{u}\|_{L_2(I; \mathcal{H}^1(\Omega))} + \|\underline{f}\|_{L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)')}.$$

Since $\|\underline{w}\|_{\underline{\underline{L}}_2(I \times \Omega)} \lesssim \|\underline{w}\|_{\underline{\underline{L}}_2(I \times \Omega)} + T_{\underline{\underline{w}}}(\nu \underline{u}, p) \|_{\underline{\underline{L}}_2(I \times \Omega)} + \|\underline{u}\|_{L_2(I; \mathcal{H}^1(\Omega))} + \|p\|_{L_2(I; L_{2,0}(\Omega))}$, the combination of (2.9), (2.8), and (2.7) shows (2.4) if, in addition, $\|\partial_t \underline{u}\|_{L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)')} \lesssim \|\partial_t \underline{u}\|_{L_2(I; \mathcal{H}^1(\Omega)')}$, which is shown in Proposition 2.6.

Remark 2.5. The above relates to a discussion in [ABB⁺20, Sect. 1.1] where, in the stationary case (and, actually, for no-slip boundary conditions), it is explained that forcings \underline{f} should be interpreted as functionals in $\mathcal{H}^1(\Omega)'$ when it concerns their influence on the velocity, whereas the pressure depends on their interpretation as elements of $\mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)'$.

Proposition 2.6. *Assume that the $L_2(\Omega)$ -orthogonal projector $\tilde{\Pi}$ onto $\mathcal{H}^0(\Omega)$, also known as the Leray-projector, satisfies $\tilde{\Pi} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{H}^1(\Omega), \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega))$. Then for $\underline{u} \in L_2(I; \mathcal{H}^1(\Omega)) \cap H^1(I; \mathcal{H}^1(\Omega)')$, it holds that*

$$\|\partial_t \underline{u}\|_{L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)')} \approx \|\partial_t \underline{u}\|_{L_2(I; \mathcal{H}^1(\Omega)')}.$$

Proof. The inequality ' \gtrsim '. trivially follows from the inclusion $\mathcal{H}^1(\Omega) \subset \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)$. For the other inequality, let $\underline{u} \in H^1(I; \mathcal{H}^1(\Omega))$. It holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_t \underline{u}\|_{L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)')} &= \sup_{0 \neq \underline{v} \in L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega))} \frac{\int_I \int_\Omega \partial_t \underline{u} \cdot \underline{v} \, dx \, dt}{\|\underline{v}\|_{L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega))}} \\ &= \sup_{0 \neq \underline{v} \in L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega))} \frac{\int_I \int_\Omega (\text{Id} \otimes \tilde{\Pi}) \partial_t \underline{u} \cdot \underline{v} \, dx \, dt}{\|\underline{v}\|_{L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega))}} \\ &= \sup_{0 \neq \underline{v} \in L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega))} \frac{\int_I \int_\Omega \partial_t \underline{u} \cdot (\text{Id} \otimes \tilde{\Pi}) \underline{v} \, dx \, dt}{\|\underline{v}\|_{L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega))}} \\ &\leq \|\tilde{\Pi}\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{H}^1(\Omega), \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega))} \sup_{0 \neq \underline{v} \in L_2(I; \mathcal{H}^1(\Omega))} \frac{\int_I \int_\Omega \partial_t \underline{u} \cdot \underline{v} \, dx \, dt}{\|\underline{v}\|_{L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega))}} \\ &= \|\tilde{\Pi}\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{H}^1(\Omega), \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega))} \|\partial_t \underline{u}\|_{L_2(I; \mathcal{H}^1(\Omega)')} . \end{aligned}$$

So for $H^1(I; \mathcal{H}^1(\Omega)) \supset (\underline{u}_k)_k \rightarrow \underline{u} \in \mathcal{X} := L_2(I; \mathcal{H}^1(\Omega)) \cap H^1(I; \mathcal{H}^1(\Omega)')$, $(\underline{u}_k)_k$ is a Cauchy sequence in $\underline{\mathcal{X}} := L_2(I; \mathcal{H}^1(\Omega)) \cap H^1(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)')$, and therefore convergent to some $\underline{z} \in \underline{\mathcal{X}}$. But then $(\underline{u}_k)_k \rightarrow \underline{z}$ also in \mathcal{X} , or $\underline{z} = \underline{u}$, and $\|\underline{u}\|_{\underline{\mathcal{X}}} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\underline{u}_k\|_{\underline{\mathcal{X}}} \lesssim \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\underline{u}_k\|_{\mathcal{X}} = \|\underline{u}\|_{\mathcal{X}}$, which completes the proof. \square

Remark 2.7 (no-slip conditions). By replacing the boundary conditions $\underline{u} \cdot \underline{n} = 0$ and $(\text{Id} - \underline{n}\underline{n}^\top) \underline{T}(v\underline{u}, p)\underline{n} = 0$ on $I \times \partial\Omega$ in (1.1) by $\underline{u} = 0$ on $I \times \partial\Omega$, one obtains the Stokes problem with *no-slip* boundary conditions. To analyze the corresponding FOSLS, in Section 2.1 the space $\mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)$ should be replaced by $H_0^1(\Omega)$ and the condition $(\text{Id} - \underline{n}\underline{n}^\top) \underline{w}|_{I \times \partial\Omega} \underline{n} = 0$ should be omitted from the definition of \mathcal{Z} , and in Section 2.2 the space $\mathcal{H}^1(\Omega) = \{\underline{u} \in \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega) : \text{div} \underline{u} = 0\}$ should be replaced by $\{\underline{u} \in H_0^1(\Omega) : \text{div} \underline{u} = 0\}$.

The closure of both $\mathcal{H}^1(\Omega)$ and that of $\{\underline{u} \in H_0^1(\Omega) : \text{div} \underline{u} = 0\}$ in $L_2(\Omega)$ is given by $\mathcal{H}^0(\Omega) = \{\underline{u} \in L_2(\Omega) : \text{div} \underline{u} = 0, \underline{u} \cdot \underline{n} = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega\}$ (see [GR86]). Since the $L_2(\Omega)$ -orthogonal projector $\tilde{\Pi}$ onto $\mathcal{H}^0(\Omega)$ does not preserve no-slip boundary conditions, and so $\tilde{\Pi} \notin \mathcal{L}(H_0^1(\Omega), H_0^1(\Omega))$, Proposition 2.6 does not generalize to the no-slip case, and so well-posedness of the corresponding FOSLS in the no-slip case is *not* guaranteed. Numerical results reported in Section 4 seem to suggest that for these boundary conditions this FOSLS is indeed not well-posed.

Proposition 2.8. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be such that for any $q \in L_{2,0}(\Omega)$, the solution $u \in H^1(\Omega) \cap L_{2,0}(\Omega)$ of*

$$\int_\Omega \nabla u \cdot \nabla v \, dx = \int_\Omega qv \, dx \quad (v \in H^1(\Omega) \cap L_{2,0}(\Omega))$$

is in $H^2(\Omega)$, with $\|u\|_{H^2(\Omega)} \lesssim \|q\|_{L_2(\Omega)}$. Then $\tilde{\Pi} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{H}^1(\Omega), \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega))$.

Proof. As shown in, e.g., [Tem79, Ch. 1, Thm. 1.4] or [GR86, Thm. 2.7], one has the following *Helmholtz decomposition*

$$(2.10) \quad L_2(\Omega) = \mathcal{H}^0(\Omega) \oplus^\perp \nabla(H^1(\Omega) \cap L_{2,0}(\Omega)).$$

Given $\underline{u} \in L_2(\Omega)$, $\nabla z = (\text{Id} - \Pi)\underline{u}$ is the solution of $\int_\Omega (\underline{u} - \nabla z) \cdot \nabla v \, dx = 0$ ($v \in H^1(\Omega) \cap L_{2,0}(\Omega)$). When $\underline{u} \in \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)$, this z solves $\int_\Omega \nabla z \cdot \nabla v \, dx = \int_\Omega \text{div } \underline{u} \, v \, dx$ ($v \in H^1(\Omega) \cap L_{2,0}(\Omega)$), and so thanks to our assumption on Ω ,

$$\|\nabla z\|_{\mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)} \approx \|z\|_{H^2(\Omega)} \lesssim \|\text{div } \underline{u}\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \lesssim \|\underline{u}\|_{\mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)},$$

i.e., $\text{Id} - \Pi$, and thus Π , is bounded on $\mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)$. \square

Remarks 2.9. The assumption on Ω made in Proposition 2.8 is known to be satisfied when Ω is convex [Gri85, Thm. 3.2.1.3], or when it has a C^2 -boundary [Gri85, Rem. 3.1.2.4]. (The regularity results in [Gri85] are formulated for the Neumann problem $-\Delta u + \lambda u = q$ on Ω , $\nabla u \cdot \underline{n} = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$ for some $\lambda > 0$, but because the difference with the Laplacian is an operator of lower order it is well-known that this difference is harmless).

Numerical results presented in Section 4 indicate that our FOSLS is not (fully) well-posed in case of a domain with a re-entrant corner.

2.3. Well-posedness of the FOSLS. The following theorem is the main result of this work.

Theorem 2.10. *Let $\Pi \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{H}^1(\Omega), \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega))$. Then for the operator \mathbf{G} defined by*

$$\mathbf{G}(\underline{u}, \underline{w}, p) = (\underline{w} + \mathbb{T}(\underline{v}\underline{u}, p), \partial_t \underline{u} + \text{div}_x \underline{w}, \text{div}_x \underline{u}, \underline{u}(0, \cdot)),$$

it holds that

$$\|\mathbf{G}(\underline{u}, \underline{w}, p)\|_{\mathbb{L}_2(I \times \Omega) \times \mathbb{L}_2(I \times \Omega) \times H^1(I; L_{2,0}(\Omega)) \times L_2(\Omega)} \approx \|(\underline{u}, \underline{w}, p)\|_{\mathcal{Z} \times L_2(I; L_{2,0}(\Omega))}$$

for all $(\underline{u}, \underline{w}, p) \in \mathcal{Z} \times L_2(I; L_{2,0}(\Omega))$.

Proof. The boundedness of \mathbf{G} follows from the definition of \mathcal{Z} , specifically concerning the term $\|\underline{u}(0, \cdot)\|_{L_2(\Omega)}$ from

$$(2.11) \quad \|\underline{u}(0, \cdot)\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \lesssim \|\partial_t \underline{u}\|_{L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)')} + \|\underline{u}\|_{L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega))} \lesssim \|(\underline{u}, \underline{w})\|_{\mathcal{Z}}.$$

Here the first inequality follows from [DL92, Ch. XVIII, §1, Thm. 1] using that $\mathbb{H}^1(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L_2(\Omega)$ with dense embedding, and the second inequality follows from Lemma 2.3. The other direction, i.e. (2.4), amounts to showing that for $(\underline{u}, \underline{w}, p) \in \mathcal{Z} \times L_2(I; L_{2,0}(\Omega))$,

$$(2.12) \quad \|\underline{u}\|_{L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega))} + \|\underline{w}\|_{\mathbb{L}_2(I \times \Omega)} + \|p\|_{L_2(I; L_{2,0}(\Omega))} \lesssim \|\mathbf{G}(\underline{u}, \underline{w}, p)\|,$$

where $\|\mathbf{G}(\underline{u}, \underline{w}, p)\|$ will be used as shorthand notation for the norm of $\mathbf{G}(\underline{u}, \underline{w}, p)$ from the statement.

Given $(\underline{u}, \underline{w}, p) \in \mathcal{Z} \times L_2(I; L_{2,0}(\Omega))$ we start with finding a ‘lift’ of $\text{div}_x \underline{u}$. There exists an operator $\text{div}^+ \in \mathcal{L}(L_{2,0}(\Omega), \mathbb{H}_0^1(\Omega))$ with $\text{div } \text{div}^+ = \text{Id}$. An example of such a right-inverse of div is given by the mapping $h \mapsto \underline{v}$ where (\underline{v}, q)

solves the stationary Stokes problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta \tilde{v} + \nabla q = 0 & \text{on } \Omega, \\ \operatorname{div} \tilde{v} = h & \text{on } \Omega, \\ \tilde{v} = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Setting $\ell := \operatorname{div}_x^+ \operatorname{div}_x \underline{u}$, we have

$$(2.13) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\ell\|_{L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega))} + \|\ell\|_{H^1(I; L_2(\Omega))} &\lesssim \|\ell\|_{H^1(I; \mathbb{H}_0^1(\Omega))} \\ &\lesssim \|\operatorname{div}_x \underline{u}\|_{H^1(I; L_{2,0}(\Omega))} \leq \|\mathbf{G}(\underline{u}, \underline{w}, p)\|, \end{aligned}$$

and so, again using the first inequality from (2.11), also $\|\ell(0, \cdot)\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \lesssim \|\mathbf{G}(\underline{u}, \underline{w}, p)\|$.

We set $\tilde{z} := \underline{u} - \ell$, which is in $L_2(I; \mathcal{H}^1(\Omega)) \cap H^1(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)')$ by (2.13) and Lemma 2.3, and, for $\tilde{v} \in L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega))$, set

$$\tilde{f}(\tilde{v}) := \int_I \int_{\Omega} \partial_t \tilde{z} \cdot \tilde{v} + \frac{1}{2} \tilde{T}(\tilde{v} \tilde{z}, p) : \tilde{D}(\tilde{v}) \, dx \, dt.$$

The boundedness of γ_0 provided by Theorem 2.4 shows that $\tilde{z}(0, \cdot) \in \mathcal{H}^0(\Omega)$. Below we will show that

$$(2.14) \quad \|\tilde{f}\|_{L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)')} \lesssim \|\mathbf{G}(\underline{u}, \underline{w}, p)\|,$$

$$(2.15) \quad \|\tilde{z}\|_{L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega))} + \|p\|_{L_2(I; L_{2,0}(\Omega))} \lesssim \|\tilde{f}\|_{L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)')} + \|\tilde{z}(0, \cdot)\|_{L_2(\Omega)},$$

which together with

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{z}(0, \cdot)\|_{L_2(\Omega)} &\leq \|\underline{u}(0, \cdot)\|_{L_2(\Omega)} + \|\ell(0, \cdot)\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \lesssim \|\mathbf{G}(\underline{u}, \underline{w}, p)\|, \\ \|\underline{u}\|_{L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega))} &\leq \|\tilde{z}\|_{L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega))} + \|\ell\|_{L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega))} \lesssim \|\tilde{z}\|_{L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega))} + \|\mathbf{G}(\underline{u}, \underline{w}, p)\|, \\ \|\underline{w}\|_{\tilde{L}_2(I \times \Omega)} &\leq \|\underline{w}\|_{\tilde{L}_2(I \times \Omega)} + \|\tilde{T}(\underline{v} \underline{u}, p)\|_{\tilde{L}_2(I \times \Omega)} + \|\tilde{T}(\underline{v} \underline{u}, p)\|_{\tilde{L}_2(I \times \Omega)} \\ &\lesssim \|\mathbf{G}(\underline{u}, \underline{w}, p)\| + \|\underline{u}\|_{L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega))} + \|p\|_{L_2(I; L_{2,0}(\Omega))} \end{aligned}$$

completes the proof of (2.12), and so of the theorem.

Splitting

$$\tilde{f}(\tilde{v}) = \underbrace{\int_I \int_{\Omega} \partial_t \underline{u} \cdot \tilde{v} + \frac{1}{2} \tilde{T}(\underline{v} \underline{u}, p) : \tilde{D}(\tilde{v}) \, dx \, dt}_{\tilde{f}^{(\underline{u}, p)}(\tilde{v})} - \underbrace{\int_I \int_{\Omega} \partial_t \ell \cdot \tilde{v} + \frac{1}{2} \tilde{T}(\tilde{v} \ell) : \tilde{D}(\tilde{v}) \, dx \, dt}_{\tilde{f}^{\ell}(\tilde{v})},$$

it holds that $\|\tilde{f}^{\ell}\|_{L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)')} \lesssim \|\mathbf{G}(\underline{u}, \underline{w}, p)\|$ by (2.13). Writing

$$\tilde{f}^{(\underline{u}, p)}(\tilde{v}) = \int_I \int_{\Omega} \partial_t \underline{u} \cdot \tilde{v} - \frac{1}{2} \underline{w} : \tilde{D}(\tilde{v}) \, dx \, dt + \int_I \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{2} (\underline{w} + \tilde{T}(\underline{v} \underline{u}, p)) : \tilde{D}(\tilde{v}) \, dx \, dt.$$

the second term is bounded by some multiple of $\|\underline{w} + \tilde{T}(\underline{v} \underline{u}, p)\|_{\tilde{L}_2(I \times \Omega)} \|\tilde{v}\|_{L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega))}$.

By symmetry of \underline{w} the first term is equal to $\int_I \int_{\Omega} \partial_t \underline{u} \cdot \tilde{v} - \underline{w} : \nabla_x \tilde{v} \, dx \, dt$. For $(\underline{u}, \underline{w}) \in \mathcal{Z}_2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_I \int_{\Omega} \partial_t \underline{u} \cdot \tilde{v} - \underline{w} : \nabla_x \tilde{v} \, dx \, dt \right| &\stackrel{(2.3)}{=} \left| \int_I \int_{\Omega} (\partial_t \underline{u} + \operatorname{div}_x \underline{w}) \cdot \tilde{v} \, dx \, dt \right| \\ &\lesssim \|\partial_t \underline{u} + \operatorname{div}_x \underline{w}\|_{L_2(I \times \Omega)} \|\tilde{v}\|_{L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega))}. \end{aligned}$$

which extends by density to $(\underline{u}, \underline{w}) \in \mathcal{Z}_2$, and thus to $(\underline{u}, \underline{w}) \in \mathcal{Z}$, which concludes the proof of (2.14).

For $\underline{v} \in L_2(I; \mathcal{H}^1(\Omega))$, we have $\frac{1}{2} \int_I \int_\Omega p \text{Id} : \underline{D}(\underline{v}) \, dx \, dt = \int_I \int_\Omega p \, \text{div}_x \underline{v} \, dx \, dt = 0$, and so

$$\underline{f}(\underline{v}) = \int_I \int_\Omega \partial_t \underline{z} \cdot \underline{v} + \frac{\nu}{2} \underline{D}(\underline{z}) : \underline{D}(\underline{v}) \, dx \, dt.$$

Korn's second inequality, which is valid on Lipschitz domains ([Nit81]), shows that there exists a constant ϱ such that

$$(2.16) \quad \int_\Omega \underline{D}(\underline{v}) : \underline{D}(\underline{v}) \, dx + \varrho \|\underline{v}\|_{L_2(\Omega)}^2 \gtrsim \|\underline{v}\|_{\mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)}^2 \quad (\underline{v} \in \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)).$$

Since besides this Gårding inequality also $\underline{z}(0, \cdot) \in \mathcal{H}^0(\Omega)$, from an application of Theorem 2.4 we conclude that

$$(2.17) \quad \|\underline{z}\|_{L_2(I; \mathcal{H}^1(\Omega))} + \|\partial_t \underline{z}\|_{L_2(I; \mathcal{H}^1(\Omega)')} \lesssim \|f\|_{L_2(I; \mathcal{H}^1(\Omega)')} + \|\underline{z}(0, \cdot)\|_{L_2(\Omega)},$$

where, thanks to the assumption of $\underline{\Pi} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{H}^1(\Omega), \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega))$, an application of Proposition 2.6 shows that

$$(2.18) \quad \|\partial_t \underline{z}\|_{L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)')} \approx \|\partial_t \underline{z}\|_{L_2(I; \mathcal{H}^1(\Omega)')}.$$

By definition of \underline{f} , for $\underline{v} \in L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega))$ we have

$$\int_I \int_\Omega p \, \text{div}_x \underline{v} \, dx \, dt = \int_I \int_\Omega \partial_t \underline{z} \cdot \underline{v} + \frac{\nu}{2} \underline{D}(\underline{z}) : \underline{D}(\underline{v}) \, dx \, dt - \underline{f}(\underline{v}).$$

On any Lipschitz domain,

$$(2.19) \quad \inf_{0 \neq q \in L_2(I; L_{2,0}(\Omega))} \sup_{0 \neq \underline{v} \in L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega))} \frac{|\int_I \int_\Omega q \, \text{div}_x \underline{v} \, dx \, dt|}{\|q\|_{L_2(I; L_{2,0}(\Omega))} \|\underline{v}\|_{L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega))}} > 0,$$

being even true with $\mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)$ reading as $H_0^1(\Omega)$ (e.g. [Tem79, Ch. 1, Rem. 1.4(ii)]). Consequently, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|p\|_{L_2(I; L_{2,0}(\Omega))} &\lesssim \sup_{0 \neq \underline{v} \in L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega))} \frac{|\int_I \int_\Omega \partial_t \underline{z} \cdot \underline{v} + \frac{1}{2} \underline{D}(\underline{z}) : \underline{D}(\underline{v}) \, dx \, dt - \underline{f}(\underline{v})|}{\|\underline{v}\|_{L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega))}} \\ &\lesssim \|\partial_t \underline{z}\|_{L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)')} + \|\underline{z}\|_{L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega))} + \|f\|_{L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)')} \end{aligned}$$

which together with (2.17) and (2.18) completes the proof of (2.15). \square

Remark 2.11. It would be preferable when in the least-squares functional, the component $\text{div}_x \underline{u}$ is measured in $L_2(I; L_{2,0}(\Omega))$ instead of in $H^1(I; L_{2,0}(\Omega))$, in which case also the condition $\text{div}_x \underline{u} \in H^1(I; L_{2,0}(\Omega))$ in the definition of solution space could be removed. Numerical results presented in Section 4 indicate, however, that the corresponding FOSLS is *not* well-posed.

We will apply the FOSLS in the most relevant case that $g = 0$, i.e., $\text{div}_x \underline{u} = 0$. To ensure that the measurement in $H^1(I; L_{2,0}(\Omega))$ of the error in $\text{div}_x \underline{u}$ does *not* increase the smoothness conditions on \underline{u} to achieve a certain convergence rate, we will apply a trial space that has a commuting diagram property. In particular, it comes with a quasi-interpolator into that space that maps spatially divergence-free functions to spatially divergence-free functions (cf. (proof of) Proposition 3.2 and Remark 3.3).

2.4. A slightly modified FOSLS. A problem with our FOSLS is the pressure space $L_2(I; L_{2,0}(\Omega))$. A natural approximation space for the pressure is a space of piecewise polynomials w.r.t. some partition of $I \times \Omega$. Unless this partition can be decomposed into time-slabs, i.e. strips of type $[t_i, t_{i+1}] \times \Omega$, it is not clear how to impose the constraint $\int_{\Omega} p(t, x) dx = 0$ for all $t \in I$ on such piecewise polynomials. To circumvent this problem, we add this constraint to our least-squares functional.

With

$$(2.20) \quad (Mp)(t) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{|\Omega|}} \int_{\Omega} p(t, x) dx,$$

and $(Ev)(t, x) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{|\Omega|}} v(t)$, we have $\|M\|_{\mathcal{L}(L_2(I \times \Omega), L_2(I))} = 1 = \|E\|_{\mathcal{L}(L_2(I), L_2(I \times \Omega))}$ and $\text{ran}(\text{Id} - EM) \subset L_2(I; L_{2,0}(\Omega))$. After extending the operator \mathbf{G} , which was defined on $\mathcal{Z} \times L_2(I; L_{2,0}(\Omega))$, to an operator on $\mathcal{Z} \times L_2(I \times \Omega)$, we define

$$\tilde{\mathbf{G}}(\underline{u}, \underline{w}, p) := (\mathbf{G}(\underline{u}, \underline{w}, p), Mp).$$

Corollary 2.12. *Let $\underline{\Omega} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{H}^1(\Omega), \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega))$. Then with*

$$\mathcal{F} := L_2(I \times \Omega) \times L_2(I \times \Omega) \times H^1(I; L_{2,0}(\Omega)) \times L_2(\Omega) \times L_2(I),$$

it holds that

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{G}}(\underline{u}, \underline{w}, p)\|_{\mathcal{F}} \sim \|(\underline{u}, \underline{w}, p)\|_{\mathcal{Z} \times L_2(I \times \Omega)}$$

for all $(\underline{u}, \underline{w}, p) \in \mathcal{Z} \times L_2(I \times \Omega)$.

Proof. The boundedness of $\tilde{\mathbf{G}}$ follows from that of \mathbf{G} , which in Theorem 2.10 was demonstrated for its domain being $\mathcal{Z} \times L_2(I; L_{2,0}(\Omega))$ but which immediately extends to the larger domain $\mathcal{Z} \times L_2(I \times \Omega)$, together with $\|M\|_{\mathcal{L}(L_2(I \times \Omega), L_2(I))} = 1$.

The other direction follows from

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\underline{u}, \underline{w}, p)\|_{\mathcal{Z} \times L_2(I \times \Omega)} &\lesssim \|(\underline{u}, \underline{w})\|_{\mathcal{Z}} + \|(\text{Id} - EM)p\|_{L_2(I; L_{2,0}(\Omega))} + \|Mp\|_{L_2(I)} \\ &\stackrel{\text{Thm. 2.10}}{\lesssim} \|\mathbf{G}(\underline{u}, \underline{w}, (\text{Id} - EM)p)\| + \|Mp\|_{L_2(I)} \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{G}(\underline{u}, \underline{w}, p)\| + \|\mathbf{G}(0, 0, EMp)\| + \|Mp\|_{L_2(I)} \\ &\lesssim \|\mathbf{G}(\underline{u}, \underline{w}, p)\| + \|EMp\|_{L_2(I \times \Omega)} + \|Mp\|_{L_2(I)} \\ &\lesssim \|\mathbf{G}(\underline{u}, \underline{w}, p)\| + \|Mp\|_{L_2(I)} \lesssim \|\tilde{\mathbf{G}}(\underline{u}, \underline{w}, p)\|_{\mathcal{F}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ abbreviates again the norm of Theorem 2.10. \square

Above corollary can be formulated by saying that $\tilde{\mathbf{G}}$ is a boundedly invertible linear mapping from $\mathcal{Z} \times L_2(I \times \Omega)$ onto its range in \mathcal{F} . Restricting to the *most relevant case* of $\text{div}_x \underline{u} = 0$ on $I \times \Omega$, i.e.,

$$g = 0 \text{ in (1.1),}$$

in order to know for which right-hand sides there exists an exact solution of the first order system reformulation of (1.1),

$$\tilde{\mathbf{G}}(\underline{u}, \underline{w}, p) = (\underline{w} + T(v\underline{u}, p), \partial_t \underline{u} + \text{div}_x \underline{w}, \text{div}_x \underline{u}, \underline{u}(0, \cdot), Mp) = (0, \underline{f}, 0, \underline{u}_0, 0)$$

we study $\text{ran } \tilde{\mathbf{G}}|_{\{(\underline{u}, \underline{w}, p) \in \mathcal{Z} \times L_2(I \times \Omega) : \underline{w} + T(v\underline{u}, p) = 0, \text{div}_x \underline{u} = 0, Mp = 0\}}$.

Proposition 2.13. *Let $\tilde{\Pi} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{H}^1(\Omega), \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega))$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ran } \tilde{\mathbf{G}}|_{\{(u, \tilde{w}, p) \in \mathcal{Z} \times L_2(I \times \Omega) : \tilde{w} + T(vu, p) = 0, \text{div}_x u = 0, Mp = 0\}} \\ = \{0\} \times L_2(I \times \Omega) \times \{0\} \times \mathcal{H}^0(\Omega) \times \{0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. For $(u, \tilde{w}) \in \mathcal{Z}$, we have $\partial_t u + \text{div}_x \tilde{w} \in L_2(I \times \Omega)$ and $u \in L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)) \cap H^1(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)')$ by Lemma 2.3. When $\text{div}_x u = 0$, then even $u \in L_2(I; \mathcal{H}^1(\Omega)) \cap H^1(I; \mathcal{H}^1(\Omega)')$, and so $u(0, \cdot) \in \mathcal{H}^0(\Omega)$ by Theorem 2.4, which completes the proof of ‘ \subset ’.

To show ‘ \supset ’, given $f \in L_2(I \times \Omega)$ and $u_0 \in \mathcal{H}^0(\Omega)$, let $u \in L_2(I; \mathcal{H}^1(\Omega)) \cap H^1(I; \mathcal{H}^1(\Omega)')$ with $u(0, \cdot) = u_0$ be the solution of

$$\int_I \int_\Omega \partial_t u \cdot \tilde{v} + \frac{v}{2} D(u) : D(\tilde{v}) \, dx \, dt = \int_I \int_\Omega f \cdot \tilde{v} \, dx \, dt \quad (\tilde{v} \in L_2(I; \mathcal{H}^1(\Omega))),$$

whose existence follows from Theorem 2.4 (which is applicable due to (2.16)). Recall from Proposition 2.6 that $u \in H^1(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)')$. Let $p \in L_2(I; L_{2,0}(\Omega))$, i.e., $p \in L_2(I \times \Omega)$ with $Mp = 0$, be the solution of

$$(2.21) \quad \int_I \int_\Omega p \, \text{div}_x \tilde{v} \, dx \, dt = \int_I \int_\Omega \partial_t u \cdot \tilde{v} + \frac{v}{2} D(u) : D(\tilde{v}) \, dx \, dt - \int_I \int_\Omega f \cdot \tilde{v} \, dx \, dt$$

($\tilde{v} \in L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega))$), whose existence follows from (2.19) and the fact the right-hand side vanishes for $\tilde{v} \in L_2(I; \mathcal{H}^1(\Omega))$ being the kernel of div_x in $L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega))$. Setting $\tilde{w} := -T(vu, p) = -vD(u) + p\text{Id}$, the symmetry of \tilde{w} shows that (2.21) is equivalent to

$$(2.22) \quad \int_I \int_\Omega \partial_t u \cdot \tilde{v} - \tilde{w} : \nabla_x \tilde{v} \, dx \, dt = \int_I \int_\Omega f \cdot \tilde{v} \, dx \, dt \quad (\tilde{v} \in L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega))).$$

Realizing that for smooth \tilde{v} that vanish on $\partial I \times \Omega$, $\int_I \int_\Omega \partial_t u \cdot \tilde{v} + u \cdot \partial_t \tilde{v} \, dx \, dt = 0$, and recalling that $(\partial_t u + \text{div}_x \tilde{w})_i$ is the divergence of the vector field $(u_i, \tilde{w}_i)^\top$, by considering (2.22) for $\tilde{v} \in \mathcal{D}(I \times \Omega)$ we infer that $\partial_t u + \text{div}_x \tilde{w} = f \in L_2(I \times \Omega)$. For all $v \in \mathcal{V}$, (2.1) and Remark 2.2 give that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_I \int_{\partial\Omega} (\text{Id} - \underline{nn}^\top) \tilde{w} \underline{n} \cdot \tilde{v} \, ds \, dt &= \int_I \int_{\partial\Omega} \tilde{w} \underline{n} \cdot \tilde{v} \, ds \, dt \\ &= \int_I \int_\Omega \tilde{w} : \nabla_x \tilde{v} - \partial_t u \cdot \tilde{v} + (\partial_t u + \text{div}_x \tilde{w}) \cdot \tilde{v} \, dx \, dt = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we conclude that $(u, \tilde{w}, p) \in \mathcal{Z} \times L_2(I; L_{2,0}(\Omega))$ with $\tilde{\mathbf{G}}(u, \tilde{w}, p) = (0, f, 0, u_0, 0)$, which completes the proof. \square

Remark 2.14. In view of Proposition 2.13, one might incorporate the condition $\text{div}_x u = 0$ in the specification of the domain of $\tilde{\mathbf{G}}$, i.e., replace \mathcal{Z} by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{Z}} := \{(u, \tilde{w}) \in L_2(I; \mathcal{H}^1(\Omega)) \times L_2(I; L_2(\Omega; \mathbb{S})) : \partial_t u + \text{div}_x \tilde{w} \in L_2(I \times \Omega), \\ (\text{Id} - \underline{nn}^\top) \tilde{w}|_{I \times \partial\Omega} = 0\}, \end{aligned}$$

and omit the third component $\text{div}_x u$ from the definition of $\tilde{\mathbf{G}}$. Clearly, the reason not to do so is that generally it is hard to construct suitable finite dimensional subspaces of $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$.

3. NUMERICAL APPROXIMATION

The following proposition recalls that least-squares approximations of a well-posed least-squares system are quasi-optimal.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $\Pi \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{H}^1(\Omega), \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega))$. Let $\mathcal{Z}_\delta \times P_\delta$ be a closed subspace of $\mathcal{Z} \times L_2(I \times \Omega)$. Given $F \in \mathcal{F}$, let $(\underline{u}, \underline{w}, p)$ or $(\underline{u}_\delta, \underline{w}_\delta, p_\delta)$ be the minimizers over $\mathcal{Z} \times L_2(I \times \Omega)$ or $\mathcal{Z}_\delta \times P_\delta$, respectively, of*

$$\frac{1}{2} \|F - \bar{\mathbf{G}}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2.$$

Then with

$$(3.1) \quad \mathfrak{M} := \sup_{0 \neq (\hat{u}, \hat{w}, \hat{p}) \in \mathcal{Z} \times L_2(I \times \Omega)} \|\bar{\mathbf{G}}(\hat{u}, \hat{w}, \hat{p})\|_{\mathcal{F}} / \|(\hat{u}, \hat{w}, \hat{p})\|_{\mathcal{Z} \times L_2(I \times \Omega)},$$

$$(3.2) \quad \mathfrak{m} := \inf_{0 \neq (\hat{u}, \hat{w}, \hat{p}) \in \mathcal{Z} \times L_2(I \times \Omega)} \|\bar{\mathbf{G}}(\hat{u}, \hat{w}, \hat{p})\|_{\mathcal{F}} / \|(\hat{u}, \hat{w}, \hat{p})\|_{\mathcal{Z} \times L_2(I \times \Omega)},$$

which satisfy $\mathfrak{M} < \infty$ and $\mathfrak{m} > 0$ by Corollary 2.12, it holds that

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|(\underline{u}, \underline{w}, p) - (\underline{u}_\delta, \underline{w}_\delta, p_\delta)\|_{\mathcal{Z} \times L_2(I \times \Omega)} \\ & \leq \frac{\mathfrak{M}}{\mathfrak{m}} \inf_{(\hat{u}, \hat{w}, \hat{p}) \in \mathcal{Z}_\delta \times P_\delta} \|(\underline{u}, \underline{w}, p) - (\hat{u}, \hat{w}, \hat{p})\|_{\mathcal{Z} \times L_2(I \times \Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

If $F \in \text{ran } \bar{\mathbf{G}}$, and so in particular if $F \in \{0\} \times L_2(I \times \Omega) \times \{0\} \times \mathcal{H}^0(\Omega) \times \{0\}$, then for any $(\hat{u}, \hat{w}, \hat{p}) \in \mathcal{Z} \times L_2(I \times \Omega)$, we have the a posteriori bounds

$$\mathfrak{M}^{-1} \|F - \bar{\mathbf{G}}(\hat{u}, \hat{w}, \hat{p})\|_{\mathcal{F}} \leq \|(\underline{u}, \underline{w}, p) - (\hat{u}, \hat{w}, \hat{p})\|_{\mathcal{Z} \times L_2(I \times \Omega)} \leq \mathfrak{m}^{-1} \|F - \bar{\mathbf{G}}(\hat{u}, \hat{w}, \hat{p})\|_{\mathcal{F}}.$$

Proof. The first statement follows from $(\underline{u}, \underline{w}, p)$ and $(\underline{u}_\delta, \underline{w}_\delta, p_\delta)$ being the solutions of

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \bar{\mathbf{G}}(\underline{u}, \underline{w}, p), \bar{\mathbf{G}}(\hat{u}, \hat{w}, \hat{p}) \rangle_{\mathcal{F}} &= \langle F, \bar{\mathbf{G}}(\hat{u}, \hat{w}, \hat{p}) \rangle_{\mathcal{F}} \quad ((\hat{u}, \hat{w}, \hat{p}) \in \mathcal{Z} \times L_2(I \times \Omega)), \\ \langle \bar{\mathbf{G}}(\underline{u}_\delta, \underline{w}_\delta, p_\delta), \bar{\mathbf{G}}(\hat{u}, \hat{w}, \hat{p}) \rangle_{\mathcal{F}} &= \langle F, \bar{\mathbf{G}}(\hat{u}, \hat{w}, \hat{p}) \rangle_{\mathcal{F}} \quad ((\hat{u}, \hat{w}, \hat{p}) \in \mathcal{Z}_\delta \times P_\delta) \end{aligned}$$

respectively, the definitions of \mathfrak{M} and \mathfrak{m} , and, e.g., [BS08, Remarks (2.8.5)].

The second statement follows from $\bar{\mathbf{G}}(\underline{u}, \underline{w}, p) = F$. \square

To apply Proposition 3.1 we need to select suitable finite dimensional subspaces of $\mathcal{Z} \times L_2(I \times \Omega)$ of finite element type. We consider spaces of type $\underline{U}_\delta \times \underline{W}_\delta \times P_\delta$, where to achieve conformity

$$(3.4) \quad \underline{U}_\delta \subset \underline{U} := \{u \in L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)) \cap H^1(I; L_2(\Omega)) : \text{div}_x u \in H^1(I; L_{2,0}(\Omega))\},$$

$$(3.5) \quad \underline{W}_\delta \subset L_2(I; H_0(\text{div}; \Omega, \mathbb{S})),$$

$$(3.6) \quad P_\delta \subset L_2(I \times \Omega),$$

where

$$H_0(\text{div}; \Omega, \mathbb{S}) := \{\underline{v} \in L_2(\Omega, \mathbb{S}) : \text{div } \underline{v} \in L_2(\Omega), (\text{Id} - \underline{nn}^\top) \underline{v}|_{\partial\Omega \cap \Omega} = 0\}.$$

Recall that the latter condition $(\text{Id} - \underline{nn}^\top) \underline{v}|_{\partial\Omega \cap \Omega} = 0$ is equivalent to $\underline{v} \underline{n} \cdot \underline{\tau} = 0$ for $\underline{\tau} \perp \underline{n}$. By equipping \underline{U} and $L_2(I; H_0(\text{div}; \Omega, \mathbb{S}))$ with their natural norms, notice that

$$\underline{U} \times L_2(I; H_0(\text{div}; \Omega, \mathbb{S})) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{Z}.$$

When considering \underline{U}_δ to be a finite element space w.r.t. a general partition of $I \times \Omega$ into, say, $(n + 1)$ -simplices, because of the constraint on $\operatorname{div}_x \underline{u}$ one needs C^1 -elements which are not very practical. Therefore, we will consider \underline{U}_δ (and \underline{W}_δ and P_δ) to be finite element spaces w.r.t. (a common) partition of $I \times \Omega$ into *prismatic elements*, i.e., intervals-in-time times n -simplices-in-space. Such spaces have the advantage that the interelement smoothness conditions needed to be conforming w.r.t. the non-isotropic spaces at the right-hand sides of (3.4) and (3.5) can be reduced to their minimum. We expect that such a choice can have a beneficial effect on the convergence rates that can be achieved for solutions that exhibit singularities using appropriately *locally refined partitions*.

Yet, in the current work we will restrict ourselves to quasi-uniform *conforming partitions*, and postpone the treatment of locally refined, and so generally necessarily *nonconforming* partitions to forthcoming work. Although not essential, furthermore for our convenience we consider the situation of a *two-dimensional* domain Ω , and finite element spaces of *lowest order*.

3.1. Trial space for the velocities. Let I_δ be a partition of I into subintervals, and Ω_δ be a conforming partition of Ω into uniformly shape regular triangles. Let N_δ or E_δ denote the union of the vertices or edges of the $K \in \Omega_\delta$.

Let U_δ^t and U_δ^x be the spaces of continuous piecewise linears w.r.t. I_δ and Ω_δ , respectively, and $\underline{U}_\delta^x := U_\delta^x \times U_\delta^x$. For any $e \in E_\delta$, let $\phi^e = \phi_\delta^e \in \underline{C}(\overline{\Omega})$ be the ‘edge bubble’ introduced in [CH18], see also [BCH20, §3.1-3]. We have $\int_e \phi^e \cdot \underline{n} \, ds = 0$, and with $\Omega_\delta^e := \{K \in \Omega_\delta : e \subset \partial K\}$, $\operatorname{supp} \phi^e = \cup \Omega_\delta^e$. For $K \in \Omega_\delta^e$, $\phi^e|_K$ is piecewise linear w.r.t. the Powell–Sabin split of K , and $\operatorname{div} \phi^e|_K \in P_0(K)$. We define

$$\underline{U}_\delta := \underbrace{U_\delta^t \otimes \{\underline{v} \in \underline{U}_\delta^x : \underline{v} \cdot \underline{n} = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega\}}_{\underline{U}_\delta :=} + U_\delta^t \otimes \operatorname{span}\{\phi^e : e \in E_\delta \text{ with } e \not\subset \partial\Omega\}.$$

For $\underline{v} \in \underline{U}_\delta^x$, the condition $\underline{v} \cdot \underline{n} = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$ means that for $z \in N_\delta \cap \partial\Omega$, $\underline{v}(z) = 0$ when z is a corner of Ω , and $(\underline{v} \cdot \underline{n})(z) = 0$ otherwise. We will establish the following *a priori bound* on the approximation error.

Proposition 3.2. *For $\underline{u} \in \underline{H}^2(I \times \Omega) \cap L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega))$ with $\operatorname{div}_x \underline{u} \in H^2(I; L_2(\Omega)) \cap H^1(I; H^1(\Omega))$, with $h_\delta := \max(\max_{J \in I_\delta} \operatorname{diam} J, \max_{K \in \Omega_\delta} \operatorname{diam} K)$ it holds that*

$$\inf_{\underline{v} \in \underline{U}_\delta} \|\underline{u} - \underline{v}\|_{\underline{U}} \lesssim h_\delta (\|\underline{u}\|_{\underline{H}^2(I \times \Omega)} + \|\operatorname{div}_x \underline{u}\|_{H^2(I; L_2(\Omega))} + \|\operatorname{div}_x \underline{u}\|_{H^1(I; H^1(\Omega))}).$$

In particular, if $\operatorname{div}_x \underline{u} = 0$, then $\inf_{\underline{v} \in \underline{U}_\delta} \|\underline{u} - \underline{v}\|_{\underline{U}} \lesssim h_\delta \|\underline{u}\|_{\underline{H}^2(I \times \Omega)}$.

Proof. On $\underline{H}^1(\Omega)$ we define a Scott–Zhang type projector $\hat{\mathcal{J}}_\delta$ onto \underline{U}_δ^x that will map $\mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)$ onto $\{\underline{v} \in \underline{U}_\delta^x : \underline{v} \cdot \underline{n} = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega\}$. Let $\underline{v} \in \underline{H}^1(\Omega)$. For $z \in N_\delta \setminus \partial\Omega$, we define $(\hat{\mathcal{J}}_\delta \underline{v})(z)$ by applying coordinate-wise the standard Scott–Zhang interpolator at an interior node.

For $z \in N_\delta \cap \partial\Omega$, let $e^a, e^b \in E_\delta \cap \partial\Omega$ with $e^a \cap e^b = z$, having normals \underline{n}^a and \underline{n}^b , respectively. For $c \in \{a, b\}$, and with $\tilde{z}^c \in N_\delta \cap \partial\Omega$ denoting the other endpoint of e^c , let $\psi_{e^c} \in P_1(e^c)$ be such that $\int_{e^c} \phi_z \psi_{e^c} \, ds = 1$ and $\int_{e^c} \phi_{\tilde{z}^c} \psi_{e^c} \, ds = 0$, where ϕ_z and $\phi_{\tilde{z}^c}$ are the standard nodal basis functions of U_δ^x associated to z and \tilde{z}^c , respectively.

If z is not a corner of Ω , select $c \in \{a, b\}$ arbitrary, and define $(\hat{\mathcal{J}}_\delta \vartheta)(z)$ by

$$(\hat{\mathcal{J}}_\delta \vartheta)(z) \cdot \underline{n}^c = \int_{e^c} \vartheta \cdot \underline{n}^c \psi_{e^c} ds, \quad (\hat{\mathcal{J}}_\delta \vartheta)(z) \cdot \underline{\tau}^c = \int_{e^c} \vartheta \cdot \underline{\tau}^c \psi_{e^c} ds$$

with $\underline{\tau}^c$ a unit vector that is orthogonal to \underline{n}^c . For z being a corner of Ω , define $(\hat{\mathcal{J}}_\delta \vartheta)(z)$ by

$$(\hat{\mathcal{J}}_\delta \vartheta)(z) \cdot \underline{n}^a = \int_{e^a} \vartheta \cdot \underline{n}^a \psi_{e^a} ds, \quad (\hat{\mathcal{J}}_\delta \vartheta)(z) \cdot \underline{n}^b = \int_{e^b} \vartheta \cdot \underline{n}^b \psi_{e^b} ds.$$

Since $\hat{\mathcal{J}}_\delta$ locally reproduces P_1 , standard arguments show that for $K \in \Omega_\delta$ and $m, k \in \{0, 1\}$,

$$\|\vartheta - \hat{\mathcal{J}}_\delta \vartheta\|_{\mathbb{H}^m(K)} \lesssim \text{diam}(K)^{k+1-m} |\vartheta|_{H^{k+1}(\Omega_\delta(K))},$$

where $\Omega_\delta(K) := \{K' \in \Omega_\delta : K \cap K' \neq \emptyset\}$. Moreover $\hat{\mathcal{J}}_\delta$ preserves vanishing normals, and so maps $\mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)$ onto $\{\vartheta \in \underline{U}_\delta^x : \vartheta \cdot \underline{n} = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega\}$.

We define the linear map $\mathcal{J}_\delta : \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega) \rightarrow \underline{U}_\delta^x + \text{span}\{\phi^e : e \in E_\delta\}$ by

$$(3.7) \quad \mathcal{J}_\delta \vartheta := \hat{\mathcal{J}}_\delta \vartheta + \sum_{e \in E_\delta} \frac{\int_e (\vartheta - \hat{\mathcal{J}}_\delta \vartheta) \cdot \underline{n} ds}{\int_e \phi^e \cdot \underline{n} ds} \phi^e.$$

Because \mathcal{J}_δ locally reproduces P_1 , we have that for $K \in \Omega_\delta$ and $m, k \in \{0, 1\}$,

$$(3.8) \quad \|\vartheta - \mathcal{J}_\delta \vartheta\|_{\mathbb{H}^m(K)} \lesssim \text{diam}(K)^{k+1-m} |\vartheta|_{H^{k+1}(\Omega_\delta(K))}.$$

For any $K \in \Omega_\delta$ and $\vartheta \in \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)$, it holds that

$$\int_T \text{div } \mathcal{J}_\delta \vartheta dx = \int_{\partial K} \mathcal{J}_\delta \vartheta \cdot \underline{n} dx = \int_{\partial K} \vartheta \cdot \underline{n} dx = \int_T \text{div } \vartheta dx,$$

and so thanks to $\text{div } \mathcal{J}_\delta \vartheta$ being piecewise constant w.r.t. Ω_δ , with \mathcal{Q}_δ being the $L_2(\Omega)$ -orthogonal projector onto the piecewise constants, we have the *commuting diagram*

$$(3.9) \quad \text{div } \mathcal{J}_\delta = \mathcal{Q}_\delta \text{div} \quad \text{on } \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega).$$

Finally,

$$\text{ran } \mathcal{J}_\delta|_{\mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)} \subset \{\vartheta \in \underline{U}_\delta^x : \vartheta \cdot \underline{n} = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega\} + \text{span}\{\phi^e : e \in E_\delta \text{ with } e \not\subset \partial\Omega\}.$$

Let $\mathcal{I}_\delta : H^1(I) \mapsto U_\delta^t$ denote the Scott-Zhang projector. Noticing that $\mathcal{I}_\delta \otimes \mathcal{J}_\delta|_{\mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)}$ maps into \underline{U}_δ , and $\text{Id} - \mathcal{I}_\delta \otimes \mathcal{J}_\delta = (\text{Id} - \mathcal{I}_\delta) \otimes \text{Id} + \mathcal{I}_\delta \otimes (\text{Id} - \mathcal{J}_\delta)$, and taking into account (3.9), we have that for $\underline{u} \in H^2(I \times \Omega) \cap L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega))$ with $\text{div}_x \underline{u} \in H^2(I; L_2(\Omega)) \cap H^1(I; H^1(\Omega))$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{\vartheta \in \underline{U}_\delta} \{ \|\underline{u} - \vartheta\|_{\mathbb{H}^1(I \times \Omega)} + \|\text{div}_x(\underline{u} - \vartheta)\|_{H^1(I; L_{2,0}(\Omega))} \} \\ & \leq \|(\text{Id} - \mathcal{I}_\delta) \otimes \text{Id } \underline{u}\|_{\mathbb{H}^1(I \times \Omega)} + \|\mathcal{I}_\delta \otimes (\text{Id} - \mathcal{J}_\delta) \underline{u}\|_{\mathbb{H}^1(I \times \Omega)} + \\ & \quad \|(\text{Id} - \mathcal{I}_\delta) \otimes \text{Id } \text{div}_x \underline{u}\|_{H^1(I; L_{2,0}(\Omega))} + \|\mathcal{I}_\delta \otimes (\text{Id} - \mathcal{Q}_\delta) \text{div}_x \underline{u}\|_{H^1(I; L_{2,0}(\Omega))} \\ & \lesssim h_\delta (\|\underline{u}\|_{H^2(I \times \Omega)} + \|\text{div}_x \underline{u}\|_{H^2(I; L_2(\Omega))} + \|\text{div}_x \underline{u}\|_{H^1(I; H^1(\Omega))}). \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof. \square

Remark 3.3. Without the inclusion of the bubbles in the space \underline{U}_δ , i.e., when taking the space $\widehat{\underline{U}}_\delta$, the estimate from Proposition 3.2 reads as

$$\inf_{\underline{v} \in \widehat{\underline{U}}_\delta} \|\underline{u} - \underline{v}\|_{\underline{U}} \lesssim h_\delta (\|\underline{u}\|_{\underline{H}^2(I \times \Omega)} + \|\operatorname{div}_x \underline{u}\|_{\underline{H}^2(I; L_2(\Omega))} + \|\underline{u}\|_{\underline{H}^2(I; \underline{H}^1(\Omega))})$$

assuming $\underline{u} \in \underline{H}^2(I \times \Omega) \cap \underline{H}^2(I; \underline{H}^1(\Omega)) \cap L_2(I; \underline{H}^1(\Omega))$ with $\operatorname{div}_x \underline{u} \in \underline{H}^2(I; L_2(\Omega))$. This follows from estimating

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\operatorname{div}_x (\operatorname{Id} - \mathcal{I}_\delta \otimes \hat{\mathcal{J}}_\delta) \underline{u}\|_{\underline{H}^1(I; L_{2,0}(\Omega))} \\ &= \|\operatorname{div}_x ((\operatorname{Id} - \mathcal{I}_\delta) \otimes \operatorname{Id} + \mathcal{I}_\delta \otimes (\operatorname{Id} - \hat{\mathcal{J}}_\delta)) \underline{u}\|_{\underline{H}^1(I; L_{2,0}(\Omega))} \\ &\lesssim \|(\operatorname{Id} - \mathcal{I}_\delta) \otimes \operatorname{Id} \operatorname{div}_x \underline{u}\|_{\underline{H}^1(I; L_{2,0}(\Omega))} + \|\mathcal{I}_\delta \otimes (\operatorname{Id} - \hat{\mathcal{J}}_\delta) \underline{u}\|_{\underline{H}^1(I; \underline{H}^1(\Omega))} \\ &\lesssim h_\delta (\|\operatorname{div}_x \underline{u}\|_{\underline{H}^2(I; L_{2,0}(\Omega))} + \|\underline{u}\|_{\underline{H}^1(I; \underline{H}^2(\Omega))}). \end{aligned}$$

3.2. Trial space for the stress tensor. We define $\underline{W}_\delta = W_\delta^t \otimes \underline{W}_\delta^x$, where W_δ^t is the space of piecewise constants w.r.t. I_δ , and \underline{W}_δ^x is a finite element subspace of $H_0(\operatorname{div}; \Omega, \underline{\mathbb{S}})$ w.r.t. Ω_δ . The construction of finite element spaces for symmetric stress tensors is an intensively studied topic, see e.g. [JM78, AW02, AAW08, Hu15, HZ16, GN14]. We will use the recently introduced finite element from [CH20, Remark 5.4] because it has only 9 degrees of freedom, which is (much) less than in other constructions. Moreover, as we will see, this element has a commuting diagram property which will allow us to bound div_x of the approximation error in \underline{w} in terms of $\operatorname{div}_x \underline{w}$ only (cf. (3.11)). This will be beneficial in Theorem 3.6.

Given a triangle K , let $E(K)$ denote the set of its edges and $R(K)$ the Clough-Tocher decomposition of K into 3 subtriangles by connecting the vertices with the centroid. Let

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{V}_K &:= \{\underline{v} \in \underline{P}_0(R(K)) : \underline{v} \cdot \underline{n} \text{ is continuous across the internal edges}\}, \\ \underline{W}_K &:= \{\underline{w} \in \underline{P}_1(R(K), \underline{\mathbb{S}}) : \underline{w} \underline{n} \text{ is continuous across the internal edges,} \\ &\quad \operatorname{div} \underline{w} \in \underline{V}_K, \underline{w} \underline{n} \cdot \underline{\tau} \in P_0(e) (e \in E(K))\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\underline{\tau} \perp \underline{n}$.

As stated in [CH20], the space \underline{W}_K has dimension 9, and the zeroth order moment of $\underline{w} \underline{n} \cdot \underline{\tau}$, and zeroth and first order moments of $\underline{w} \underline{n} \cdot \underline{n}$ over each of the edges $e \in E(K)$ can be used as the $3 * (1 + 2)$ degrees of freedom.

Knowing that a \underline{w} with $\underline{w}|_K \in \underline{W}_K$ ($K \in \Omega_\delta$) is in $H(\operatorname{div}; \Omega, \underline{\mathbb{S}})$ whenever $\underline{w} \underline{n}$ is continuous across any edge between triangles in Ω_δ , we conclude that a valid set of degrees of freedom for

$$\underline{W}_\delta^x := \{\underline{w} \in H_0(\operatorname{div}; \Omega, \underline{\mathbb{S}}) : \underline{w}|_K \in \underline{W}_K (K \in \Omega_\delta)\}$$

is given by the union of the aforementioned moments over all $e \in E_\delta$, setting the zeroth order moments of $\underline{w} \underline{n} \cdot \underline{\tau}$ over the edges $e \subset \partial\Omega$ to zero.

Proposition 3.4. For $\tilde{w} \in L_2(I; H_0(\operatorname{div}; \Omega, \mathbb{S})) \cap H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{S}) \cap H^1(I; H(\operatorname{div}; \Omega, \mathbb{S}))$ with $\operatorname{div}_x \tilde{w} \in L_2(I; \tilde{H}^1(\Omega))$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{\tilde{v} \in \tilde{W}_\delta} \|\tilde{w} - \tilde{v}\|_{L_2(I; H(\operatorname{div}; \Omega, \mathbb{S}))} \\ & \lesssim h_\delta (\|\tilde{w}\|_{H^1(I; H(\operatorname{div}; \Omega, \mathbb{S}))} + \|\tilde{w}\|_{L_2(I; H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{S}))} + \|\operatorname{div}_x \tilde{w}\|_{L_2(I; \tilde{H}^1(\Omega))}). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. For $\tilde{w} \in H^1(K, \mathbb{S})$, we define the projection $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_K \tilde{w}$ onto \tilde{W}_K by

$$\int_e (\tilde{w} - \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_K \tilde{w}) \tilde{n} \cdot \tau P_0(e) ds = 0 = \int_e (\tilde{w} - \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_K \tilde{w}) \tilde{n} \cdot \tilde{n} P_1(e) ds \quad (e \in E(K)).$$

Using that $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_K$ reproduces \tilde{W}_K and so in particular all constant symmetric tensors, one infers that

$$(3.10) \quad \|(\operatorname{Id} - \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_K) \tilde{w}\|_{L_2(K, \mathbb{S})} \lesssim \operatorname{diam}(K) \|\tilde{w}\|_{H^1(K, \mathbb{S})}.$$

On $H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{S})$ the corresponding global projector $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_\delta$ is defined by $(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_\delta \tilde{w})|_K = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_K \tilde{w}|_K$ ($K \in \Omega_\delta$). It maps $H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{S}) \cap H_0(\operatorname{div}; \Omega, \mathbb{S})$ onto \tilde{W}_δ^x .

We define $\tilde{R}M_K := \tilde{P}_0(K) + (x_2, -x_1)^\top P_0(K)$. Both \tilde{V}_K and $\tilde{R}M_K$ are 3-dimensional, and, as stated in [CH20], the integrals over K against a basis for $\tilde{R}M_K$ is a valid set of degrees of freedom for \tilde{V}_K . In particular, the *biorthogonal* projector $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_K$ onto $\tilde{R}M_K$ with $\operatorname{ran}(\operatorname{Id} - \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_K) \perp_{L_2(K)} \tilde{V}_K$ is well-defined. Its adjoint $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_K^*$ is the projector onto \tilde{V}_K with $\operatorname{ran}(\operatorname{Id} - \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_K^*) \perp_{L_2(K)} \tilde{R}M_K$.

Using that for $\tilde{v} \in \tilde{R}M_K$, $\tilde{v} \cdot \tau \in P_0(e)$ for $e \in E(K)$ and $\tilde{D}(\tilde{v}) = 0$, for $\tilde{w} \in H^1(K, \mathbb{S})$ it holds that

$$\int_T \operatorname{div}(\tilde{w} - \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_K \tilde{w}) \cdot \tilde{v} dx = \int_{\partial K} (\tilde{w} - \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_K \tilde{w}) \tilde{n} \cdot \tilde{v} ds - \frac{1}{2} \int_T (\tilde{w} - \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_K \tilde{w}) : \tilde{D}(\tilde{v}) dx = 0,$$

i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \langle \operatorname{div}(\operatorname{Id} - \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_K) \tilde{w}, \tilde{R}M_K \rangle_{L_2(K)} = \langle \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_K^* \operatorname{div}(\operatorname{Id} - \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_K) \tilde{w}, \tilde{R}M_K \rangle_{L_2(K)} \\ &= \langle \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_K^* \operatorname{div} \tilde{w} - \operatorname{div} \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_K \tilde{w}, \tilde{R}M_K \rangle_{L_2(K)}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used that $\operatorname{ran} \operatorname{div}|_{\tilde{W}_K} \subset \tilde{V}_T$. Thanks to $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_K^* \operatorname{div} \tilde{w} - \operatorname{div} \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_K \tilde{w} \in \tilde{V}_T$ we conclude that

$$\operatorname{div} \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_K = \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_K^* \operatorname{div} \quad \text{on } H^1(K, \mathbb{S}).$$

From this *commuting diagram property*, using that $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_K^*$ reproduces all constant vectors we infer that

$$(3.11) \quad \|\operatorname{div}(\tilde{w} - \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_K \tilde{w})\|_{L_2(K)} = \|(\operatorname{Id} - \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_K^*) \operatorname{div} \tilde{w}\|_{L_2(K)} \lesssim \operatorname{diam}(K) \|\operatorname{div} \tilde{w}\|_{H^1(K)}.$$

By writing $\operatorname{Id} - \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_\delta \otimes \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_\delta = (\operatorname{Id} - \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_\delta) \otimes \operatorname{Id} + \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_\delta \otimes (\operatorname{Id} - \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_\delta)$, where $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_\delta$ denotes the $L_2(I)$ -orthogonal projector onto W_δ^t , the proof follows from (3.10) and (3.11). \square

3.3. Trial space for the pressure, and combined a priori error estimate. For the pressure, we employ the standard trial space of piecewise constants.

Proposition 3.5. *For P_δ being the space of piecewise constants w.r.t. $I_\delta \times \Omega_\delta$, and $p \in H^1(I \times \Omega)$, it holds that*

$$\inf_{q \in P_\delta} \|p - q\|_{L_2(I \times \Omega)} \lesssim h_\delta \|p\|_{H^1(I \times \Omega)}.$$

By combining Propositions 2.13, 3.1, 3.2, 3.4, and 3.5, we obtain the following a priori error estimate.

Theorem 3.6. *Let $\bar{\Pi} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{H}^1(\Omega), \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega))$. For $(\underline{f}, \underline{u}_0) \in \underline{L}_2(I \times \Omega) \times \underline{\mathcal{H}}^0$, let $(\underline{u}, \underline{w}, p) \in \underline{\mathcal{X}} \times L_2(I \times \Omega)$ be the solution of $\bar{\mathbf{G}}(\underline{u}, \underline{w}, p) = (0, \underline{f}, 0, \underline{u}_0, 0)$. Then if $(\underline{u}, p, f) \in \underline{H}^2(I \times \Omega) \times H^1(I \times \Omega) \times \underline{H}^1(I \times \Omega)$, the minimizer $(\underline{u}_\delta, \underline{w}_\delta, p_\delta)$ over $\underline{U}_\delta \times \underline{W}_\delta \times P_\delta$ of*

$$\frac{1}{2} \|(0, \underline{f}, 0, \underline{u}_0, 0) - \bar{\mathbf{G}}(\underline{u}_\delta, \underline{w}_\delta, p_\delta)\|_{\underline{L}_2(I \times \Omega) \times \underline{L}_2(I \times \Omega) \times H^1(I; L_{2,0}(\Omega)) \times \underline{L}_2(\Omega) \times L_2(I)}$$

satisfies

$$\|(\underline{u}, \underline{w}, p) - (\underline{u}_\delta, \underline{w}_\delta, p_\delta)\|_{\underline{\mathcal{X}} \times L_2(I \times \Omega)} \lesssim h_\delta (\|\underline{u}\|_{\underline{H}^2(I \times \Omega)} + \|p\|_{H^1(I \times \Omega)} + \|\underline{f}\|_{\underline{H}^1(I \times \Omega)}).$$

Proof. Using that $\operatorname{div}_x \underline{w} = \underline{f} - \partial_t \underline{u}$, the results follows. \square

4. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS

In this section we consider $I = (0, 1)$ and Ω to be either the unit square $(0, 1)^2$ or the L-shaped domain $(-1, 1)^2 \setminus [-1, 0]^2$.

To construct test problems for (1.1) with $\nu = 1$, $g = 0$, and a known solution, we need to find a \underline{u} with $\operatorname{div}_x \underline{u} = 0$ on $I \times \Omega$, and $\underline{u} \cdot \underline{n} = 0 = D_{\underline{\tau}}(\underline{u}) \underline{n} \cdot \underline{\tau}$ on $I \times \partial\Omega$. By taking $\underline{u} = \operatorname{curl}_x \psi$, the first condition is satisfied, whereas the second and third conditions read as $\partial_{\underline{\tau}} \psi = 0$ on $I \times \partial\Omega$, and $4n_1 n_2 \partial_{x_1} \partial_{x_2} \psi + (n_2^2 - n_1^2)(\partial_{x_2}^2 - \partial_{x_1}^2) \psi = 0$ on $I \times \partial\Omega$, respectively.

On both domains we prescribe the exact solution

$$\underline{u}(t, x_1, x_2) := \exp(-t) \operatorname{curl}_x \frac{\sin(\pi x_1) \sin(\pi x_2)}{\pi}$$

which satisfies aforementioned conditions,

$$p(t, x_1, x_2) := \exp(-t) \sin(\pi(x_1 - x_2)),$$

and $\underline{w} := -\underline{T}(\nu \underline{u}, p)$, and take the data $\underline{u}_0(x_1, x_2) := u(0, x_1, x_2)$, $\underline{f} := \partial_t \underline{u} - \nu \Delta_x \underline{u} + \nabla_x p$, and $F := (0, \underline{f}, 0, \underline{u}_0, 0)$ correspondingly.

We compute the least-squares approximation $(\underline{u}_\delta, \underline{w}_\delta, p_\delta)$ of $(\underline{u}, \underline{w}, p)$ in the triple of lowest order finite element spaces $\underline{U}_\delta \times \underline{W}_\delta \times P_\delta$ specified in Section 3 w.r.t. a partition of $I \times \Omega$ from a sequence of partitions created by subsequent uniform refinements starting from I times the initial triangulations of Ω from Figure 1. Each uniform refinement consists of splitting each prismatic element into 8 subelements by applying one bisection in time and two recursive newest vertex bisections in space.




FIGURE 1. Unit square $\Omega = (0, 1)^2$ and L-shaped domain $\Omega = (-1, 1)^2 \setminus [-1, 0]^2$ with initial triangulation. The newest vertices are marked with a dot.

The approximations are computed as the solution in $\underline{U}_\delta \times \underline{W}_\delta \times P_\delta$ of

$$\langle \bar{\mathbf{G}}(\underline{u}_\delta, \underline{w}_\delta, p_\delta), \bar{\mathbf{G}}(\hat{u}, \hat{w}, \hat{p}) \rangle_{\mathcal{F}} = \langle F, \bar{\mathbf{G}}(\hat{u}, \hat{w}, \hat{p}) \rangle_{\mathcal{F}} \quad ((\hat{u}, \hat{w}, \hat{p}) \in \underline{U}_\delta \times \underline{W}_\delta \times P_\delta).$$

While the corresponding Galerkin matrix is not sparse due to the presence of the operator M from (2.20), the matrix can easily be applied in linear complexity. We thus compute the discretizations via PCG with diagonal preconditioner.

Note that on the L-shaped domain well-posedness of our FOSLS is not guaranteed by our theory as the equivalence of norms from Proposition 2.6 has only been shown for convex domains or domains with a C^2 -boundary (see Remark 2.9). With \mathfrak{M}_δ or \mathfrak{m}_δ defined as the supremum or infimum over $\underline{U}_\delta \times \underline{W}_\delta \times P_\delta$ of the right-hand sides of (3.1) or (3.2), respectively, in view of the estimate from (3.3) in Table 1 we provide the values of the quotients $\mathfrak{M}_\delta/\mathfrak{m}_\delta$ for decreasing mesh-sizes $h_\delta = \max(\max_{J \in \mathcal{I}_\delta} \text{diam } J, \max_{K \in \Omega_\delta} \text{diam } K)$. These can be computed by solving a discrete general eigenvalue problem. On the unit square, the constants remain uniformly bounded in correspondence with Corollary 2.12. While the constants keep slightly increasing on the L-shaped domain as the mesh is refined, suggesting that generally Corollary 2.12 is *not* valid without $H^2(\Omega)$ -regularity of the Poisson problem (cf. Proposition 2.8), they remain relatively small and one might hope for reasonable approximations $(\underline{u}_\delta, \underline{w}_\delta, p_\delta)$.

As announced in Remark 2.11, in Table 1 we further consider the case where the component $\text{div}_x \underline{u}$ in the least-squares functional is measured in $L_2(I; L_{2,0}(\Omega))$ instead of in $H^1(I; L_{2,0}(\Omega))$. In this case, we also remove the condition $\text{div}_x \underline{u} \in H^1(I; L_{2,0}(\Omega))$ in the definition of the solution space \mathcal{L} . The constants \mathfrak{M}_δ and \mathfrak{m}_δ are defined accordingly. The increasing values of $\mathfrak{M}_\delta/\mathfrak{m}_\delta$ indicate that this modified FOSLS is not well-posed. Finally, as discussed in Remark 2.7, we briefly consider no-slip boundary conditions adapting the boundary conditions of the solution space and its finite-dimensional trial spaces accordingly. The values of the quotient $\mathfrak{M}_\delta/\mathfrak{m}_\delta$ give an indication that for these boundary conditions the FOSLS is not well-posed.

4.1. Experiment on unit square. In Figure 2 we plot the least-squares estimator $\eta_\delta := \|F - \bar{\mathbf{G}}(\underline{u}_\delta, \underline{w}_\delta, p_\delta)\|_{\mathcal{F}}$. As predicted in Section 3, the convergence rate on

TABLE 1. Ratios $\mathfrak{M}_\delta/m_\delta$ for decreasing mesh-sizes h_δ on the unit square $\Omega = (0, 1)^2$ and the L-shape $\Omega = (-1, 1)^2 \setminus [-1, 0]^2$. On the square, we measure the component $\operatorname{div}_x \underline{u}$ in $H^1(I; L_{2,0}(\Omega))$ or $L_2(I; L_{2,0}(\Omega))$, and consider slip or no-slip boundary conditions.

Mesh-size	2^0	2^{-1}	2^{-2}	2^{-3}	2^{-4}	2^{-5}
Square (slip, $\partial_t \operatorname{div}_x \underline{u} \in L_2$)	3.73	6.75	6.81	6.82	6.82	6.82
L-shape (slip, $\partial_t \operatorname{div}_x \underline{u} \in L_2$)	7.65	9.23	10.73	12.22	13.59	14.81
Square (slip, $\operatorname{div}_x \underline{u} \in L_2$)	3.73	6.88	7.37	8.21	10.96	18.88
Square (no-slip, $\partial_t \operatorname{div}_x \underline{u} \in L_2$)	5.92	7.94	10.62	13.36	15.28	16.72

the unit square is given by $\mathcal{O}(\operatorname{dofs}^{-1/3}) = \mathcal{O}(h_\delta)$. We also plot the errors $\underline{u} - \underline{u}_\delta$, $\underline{w} - \underline{w}_\delta$, $\partial_t(\underline{u} - \underline{u}_\delta) + \operatorname{div}_x(\underline{w} - \underline{w}_\delta) = \underline{f} - (\partial_t \underline{u}_\delta + \operatorname{div}_x \underline{w}_\delta)$, and $p - p_\delta$ measured in the norms $(\|\cdot\|_{L_2(I; H^1(\Omega))}^2 + \|\operatorname{div}_x \cdot\|_{H^1(I; L_2(\Omega))}^2)^{1/2}$, $\|\cdot\|_{\tilde{L}_2(I \times \Omega)}$, $\|\cdot\|_{L_2(I \times \Omega)}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{L_2(I \times \Omega)}$. In Corollary 2.12 the sum of these quantities were proven to be equivalent to the estimator. We thus expect and indeed observe the same convergence rate $\mathcal{O}(\operatorname{dofs}^{-1/3})$.

Remark 4.1. In this, as well as in other examples that we have tested, we got similar, actually slightly better convergence behavior (in terms of a multiplicative constant) when we omitted the bubbles from the space \underline{U}_δ , i.e., when we replaced \underline{U}_δ by $\widehat{\underline{U}}_\delta$. A possible explanation might be that for the regular triangulations that we have used, there exists a suitable quasi-interpolator to the space of continuous piecewise linear vector fields that maps divergence-free functions to divergence-free functions, similar to \mathcal{J}_δ from (3.7) for this space enriched with edge bubbles.

4.2. Experiment on L-shape. In Figure 3 we plot again the least-squares estimator as well as the errors measured in different norms. Although not covered by the theory anymore, we observe in each case the same convergence rate $\mathcal{O}(\operatorname{dofs}^{-1/3})$.

REFERENCES

- [AAW08] D.N. Arnold, G. Awanou, and R. Winther. Finite elements for symmetric tensors in three dimensions. *Math. Comp.*, 77(263):1229–1251, 2008. doi:10.1090/S0025-5718-08-02071-1.
- [ABB⁺20] N. Ahmed, G.R. Barrenechea, E. Burman, J. Guzmán, A. Linke, and Ch. Merdon. A pressure-robust discretization of Oseen’s equation using stabilization in the vorticity equation, 2020. arXiv:2007.04012.
- [And13] R. Andreev. Stability of sparse space-time finite element discretizations of linear parabolic evolution equations. *IMA J. Numer. Anal.*, 33(1):242–260, 2013. doi:10.1093/imanum/drs014.
- [AW02] D.N. Arnold and R. Winther. Mixed finite elements for elasticity. *Numer. Math.*, 92(3):401–419, 2002. doi:10.1007/s002110100348.
- [BCH20] E. Burman, S.H. Christiansen, and P. Hansbo. Application of a minimal compatible element to incompressible and nearly incompressible continuum mechanics. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.*, 369:113224, 20, 2020. doi:10.1016/j.cma.2020.113224.
- [BG09] P. B. Bochev and M. D. Gunzburger. *Least-squares finite element methods*, volume 166 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences*. Springer, New York, 2009. doi:10.1007/b13382.
- [BS08] S. C. Brenner and L. R. Scott. *The mathematical theory of finite element methods*, volume 15 of *Texts in Applied Mathematics*. Springer, New York, third edition, 2008. doi:10.1007/978-0-387-75934-0.




FIGURE 2. Least-squares estimator $\eta_\delta = \|F - \tilde{\mathbf{G}}(u_\delta, w_\delta, p_\delta)\|_{\mathcal{F}}$ and errors $u - u_\delta$, $w - w_\delta$, $f - (\partial_t u_\delta + \operatorname{div}_x w_\delta)$, and $p - p_\delta$ measured in $(\|\cdot\|_{L_2(I; \tilde{H}^1(\Omega))}^2 + \|\operatorname{div}_x \cdot\|_{H^1(I; L_2(\Omega))}^2)^{1/2}$, $\|\cdot\|_{L_2(I \times \Omega)}$, $\|\cdot\|_{L_2(I \times \Omega)}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{L_2(I \times \Omega)}$, respectively, for the problem on the unit square from Section 4.

- [CH18] S.H. Christiansen and K. Hu. Generalized finite element systems for smooth differential forms and Stokes' problem. *Numer. Math.*, 140(2):327–371, 2018. doi:10.1007/s00211-018-0970-6.
- [CH20] S.H. Christiansen and K. Hu. Finite element systems for vector bundles: elasticity and curvature, 2020. arXiv:1906.09128.
- [Dev20] D. Devaud. Petrov-Galerkin space-time hp -approximation of parabolic equations in $H^{1/2}$. *IMA J. Numer. Anal.*, 40(4):2717–2745, 2020. doi:10.1093/imanum/drz036.
- [DFW16] W. Dörfler, S. Findeisen, and Ch. Wieners. Space-time discontinuous Galerkin discretizations for linear first-order hyperbolic evolution systems. *Comput. Methods Appl. Math.*, 16(3):409–428, 2016. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1515/cmam-2016-0015>.
- [DL92] R. Dautray and J.-L. Lions. *Mathematical analysis and numerical methods for science and technology. Vol. 5*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1992. Evolution problems I. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-58090-1.
- [DS20] L. Diening and J. Storn. A space-time DPG method for the heat equation, 2020. arXiv:2012.13229.
- [FK21] T. Führer and M. Karkulik. Space-time least-squares finite elements for parabolic equations. *Comput. Math. Appl.*, 92:27–36, 2021. doi:10.1016/j.camwa.2021.03.004.
- [Fon09] M. Fontes. Initial-boundary value problems for parabolic equations. *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math.*, 34(2):583–605, 2009.
- [GN14] J. Guzmán and M. Neilan. Symmetric and conforming mixed finite elements for plane elasticity using rational plane bubble functions. *Numer. Math.*, 126(1):153–171, 2014. doi:10.1007/s00211-013-0557-1.
- [GR79] V. Girault and P.A. Raviart. An analysis of a mixed finite element method for the Navier-Stokes equations. *Numer. Math.*, 33:235–271, 1979.
- [GR86] V. Girault and P.A. Raviart. *Finite element methods for Navier-Stokes equations, Theory and Algorithms*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1986.




FIGURE 3. Least-squares estimator $\eta_\delta := \|F - \tilde{\mathbf{G}}(u_\delta, w_\delta, p_\delta)\|_{\mathcal{F}}$ and errors $u - u_\delta$, $w - w_\delta$, $f - (\partial_t u_\delta + \operatorname{div}_x w_\delta)$, and $p - p_\delta$ measured in $(\|\cdot\|_{L_2(I; \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega))}^2 + \|\operatorname{div}_x \cdot\|_{H^1(I; L_2(\Omega))}^2)^{1/2}$, $\|\cdot\|_{L_2(I \times \Omega)}$, $\|\cdot\|_{L_2(I \times \Omega)}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{L_2(I \times \Omega)}$, respectively, for the problem on the L-shape from Section 4.

- [Gri85] P. Grisvard. *Elliptic problems in nonsmooth domains*, volume 24 of *Monographs and Studies in Mathematics*. Pitman (Advanced Publishing Program), Boston, MA, 1985.
- [GS19] H. Gimperlein and J. Stocck. Space-time adaptive finite elements for nonlocal parabolic variational inequalities. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.*, 352:137–171, 2019. doi:10.1016/j.cma.2019.04.019.
- [GS21] G. Gantner and R. Stevenson. Further results on a space-time FOSLS formulation of parabolic PDEs. *ESAIM Math. Model. Numer. Anal.*, 55(1):283–299, 2021. doi:10.1051/m2an/2020084.
- [GSS14] R. Guberovic, Ch. Schwab, and R. Stevenson. Space-time variational saddle point formulations of Stokes and Navier-Stokes equations. *ESAIM Math. Model. Numer. Anal.*, 48(3):875–894, 2014. doi:10.1051/m2an/2013124.
- [Hu15] J. Hu. Finite element approximations of symmetric tensors on simplicial grids in \mathbb{R}^n : the higher order case. *J. Comput. Math.*, 33(3):283–296, 2015. doi:10.4208/jcm.1412-m2014-0071.
- [HZ16] J. Hu and S. Zhang. Finite element approximations of symmetric tensors on simplicial grids in \mathbb{R}^n : the lower order case. *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.*, 26(9):1649–1669, 2016. doi:10.1142/S0218202516500408.
- [JM78] C. Johnson and B. Mercier. Some equilibrium finite element methods for two-dimensional elasticity problems. *Numer. Math.*, 30(1):103–116, 1978. doi:10.1007/BF01403910.
- [Nit81] J. A. Nitsche. On Korn’s second inequality. *RAIRO Anal. Numér.*, 15(3):237–248, 1981.
- [NS19] M. Neumüller and I. Smears. Time-parallel iterative solvers for parabolic evolution equations. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 41(1):C28–C51, 2019. doi:10.1137/18M1172466.
- [SS09] Ch. Schwab and R.P. Stevenson. A space-time adaptive wavelet method for parabolic evolution problems. *Math. Comp.*, 78:1293–1318, 2009. doi:10.1090/S0025-5718-08-02205-9.
- [SS17] Ch. Schwab and R.P. Stevenson. Fractional space-time variational formulations of (Navier)-Stokes equations. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 49(4):2442–2467, 2017. doi:10.1137/15M1051725.

- [SvVW21] R.P. Stevenson, R. van Venetië, and J. Westerdiep. A wavelet-in-time, finite element-in-space adaptive method for parabolic evolution equations, 2021. arXiv:2101.03956.
- [SY18] O. Steinbach and H. Yang. Comparison of algebraic multigrid methods for an adaptive space-time finite-element discretization of the heat equation in 3D and 4D. *Numer. Linear Algebra Appl.*, 25(3):e2143, 17, 2018. doi:10.1002/nla.2143.
- [SZ20] O. Steinbach and M. Zank. Coercive space-time finite element methods for initial boundary value problems. *Electron. Trans. Numer. Anal.*, 52:154–194, 2020. URL: https://doi.org/10.1553/etna_vol152s154.
- [Tem79] R. Temam. *Navier-Stokes equations*, volume 2 of *Studies in Mathematics and its Applications*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, revised edition, 1979. Theory and numerical analysis, with an appendix by F. Thomasset.
- [Ver87] R. Verfürth. Finite element approximation of incompressible Navier-Stokes equations with slip boundary condition. *Numer. Math.*, 50(6):697–721, 1987. doi:10.1007/BF01398380.
- [vVW21a] R. van Venetië and J. Westerdiep. A parallel algorithm for solving linear parabolic evolution equations, 2021. arXiv:2009.08875.
- [vVW21b] R. van Venetië and J. Westerdiep. Efficient space-time adaptivity for parabolic evolution equations using wavelets in time and finite elements in space, 2021. arXiv:2104.08143.
- [Wlo87] J. Wloka. *Partial differential equations*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1987. Translated from the German by C. B. Thomas and M. J. Thomas. doi:10.1017/CBO9781139171755.

KORTEWEG-DE VRIES (KDV) INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM, P.O. BOX 94248, 1090 GE AMSTERDAM, THE NETHERLANDS.

Email address: `g.gantner@uva.nl`, `r.p.stevenson@uva.nl`