

Differences of solutions of implicit Euler schemes with accretive operators on Banach spaces

Johann Beurich

Abstract

We give an upper bound for the difference of two solutions of Euler schemes approximating the Cauchy problem

$$\begin{cases} \dot{u}(t) + Au(t) \ni f(t) & (t \in [0, T]), \\ u(0) = u^0, \end{cases}$$

where $A \subseteq X \times X$ is a quasi-accretive operator on a Banach space X , $T > 0$, $f \in L^1(0, T; X)$ and $u^0 \in X$. This upper bound generalizes a result from Kobayashi, who established an upper bound for the problem with $f = 0$ in [11]. We show, that the upper bound can be used to establish existence and uniqueness of Euler solutions as limits of solutions of Euler schemes as well as regularity of Euler solutions.

1 Introduction

Let X be a Banach space with norm $\|\cdot\|_X$. We consider the Cauchy problem

$$\begin{cases} \dot{u}(t) + Au(t) \ni f(t) & (t \in [0, T]), \\ u(0) = u^0, \end{cases} \quad (\text{CP: } f, u^0)$$

where $A \subseteq X \times X$, $T > 0$, $f \in L^1(0, T; X)$ and $u^0 \in X$. We assume that the operator A is accretive of type $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$. We call uniform limits of solutions of implicit Euler schemes corresponding to the Cauchy problem, Euler solutions. The fundamental questions of existence and uniqueness of Euler solutions were first discussed in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Crandall and Liggett [7] showed in 1971 existence and uniqueness of Euler solutions, if $f = 0$ and A satisfies some range condition.

For $f \neq 0$ and A being m -accretive of type ω , Crandall and Evans were able to show existence and uniqueness of Euler solutions in 1975 [6] by comparing norms of differences of solutions of Euler schemes to exact solutions of boundary value problems involving the differential operator $\partial/\partial s + \partial/\partial \tau$. In the same year Kobayashi [11] found an elegant way of estimating the difference of two solutions of Euler schemes, which gave a direct way of showing existence and uniqueness of Euler solutions for $f = 0$. He also established the rate of convergence $O(|\pi|^{1/2})$, where $|\pi|$ is the mesh size of the time partition π used in the Euler schemes. Kobayashi was aware, that his results overlapped with the results from Crandall and Evans in [6]. He wrote [11, Remark 2.2]:

After the preparation of this manuscript, Prof. M. Crandall informed me that Crandall and Evans [6] proved Theorem 2.1 by an entirely different method, which is interesting in itself. They treat a more general evolution equation [...] where $f \in L^1(0, T; X)$ is given. Our method is also applicable to this case.

However, Kobayashi's result stated in [11] is not sufficient to show convergence of solutions of Euler schemes for $f \neq 0$. Crandall and Evans also mention this. They wrote [6]:

Kobayashi's note came to the attention of the authors after most of the research in the current paper was complete. There is some minor intersection of our development with that of [11]. The case $f \neq 0$ seems genuinely more complex than the case $f = 0$, and our main point is not only Theorem 1.2 but its proof, which is of independent interest.

Our main result Theorem 16 is a generalization of Kobayashi's result. We obtain an explicit estimate for the norm of differences for solutions of implicit Euler schemes even in the case $f \neq 0$. From there one deduces easily existence of solutions, a priori estimates (obtained earlier by Nochetto and Savaré [12]), stability of solutions and regularity.

2 Euler solutions and accretive operators

We use the following notation. We call any set $A \subseteq X \times X$ an *operator* on X and we define

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dom } A &:= \{u \in X : (u, v) \in A \text{ for some } v \in X\}, \\ \text{range } A &:= \{v \in X : (u, v) \in A \text{ for some } u \in X\}, \\ Au &:= \{v \in X : (u, v) \in A\} \quad \text{for } u \in X, \\ \lambda A &:= \{(u, \lambda v) : (u, v) \in A\} \quad \text{for } \lambda \in \mathbb{R}, \\ A + B &:= \{(u, v + w) : (u, v) \in A \text{ and } (u, w) \in B\} \quad \text{for } B \subseteq X \times X, \\ A + x &:= \{(u, v + x) : (u, v) \in A\} \quad \text{for } x \in X, \\ A^{-1} &:= \{(v, u) : (u, v) \in A\} \quad \text{and} \\ I &:= \{(u, u) : u \in X\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, $a < b$. Any finite subset

$$\{t_0, t_1, \dots, t_N\} \subseteq [a, b]$$

containing a and b is called a *partition* of the compact interval $[a, b]$. We usually think, without loss of generality, that the elements $t_0, t_1, \dots, t_N \in \pi$ are ordered, and we write

$$\pi: a = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_N = b.$$

For every partition $\pi: a = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_N = b$ we define the *time steps*

$$h_i := t_{i+1} - t_i$$

for every $i \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}$ and the *mesh size* of the partition

$$|\pi| := \sup \{h_i : i \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}\}.$$

We further define the *floor function* $[\cdot]_\pi: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$[s]_\pi := \begin{cases} t_i & \text{if } s \in [t_i, t_{i+1}), i \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}, \\ s & \text{if } s \notin [a, b), \end{cases}$$

and the *ceiling function* $\lceil \cdot \rceil_\pi: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\lceil s \rceil_\pi := \begin{cases} t_{i+1} & \text{if } s \in [t_i, t_{i+1}), i \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}, \\ s & \text{if } s \notin [a, b]. \end{cases}$$

A function $f: [a, b] \rightarrow X$ is *adapted to the partition* π , if

$$f \text{ is constant on } [t_i, t_{i+1}) \text{ for every } i \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}.$$

A *discretization* θ is any triple of the form $(\pi_\theta, f_\theta, u_\theta^0)$, where π_θ is a partition of the interval $[0, T]$, $f_\theta: [0, T] \rightarrow X$ is a step function adapted to the partition π_θ and $u_\theta^0 \in X$.

For a given operator $A \subseteq X \times X$ and a discretization $\theta = (\pi_\theta, f_\theta, u_\theta^0)$ we consider the implicit Euler scheme

$$\begin{cases} \frac{u_\theta(t_{i+1}) - u_\theta(t_i)}{h_i} + Au_\theta(t_{i+1}) \ni f_\theta(t_i) \text{ for } i \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}, \\ u_\theta(0) = u_\theta^0. \end{cases} \quad (E_\theta)$$

We say that $u_\theta \in C([0, T]; X)$ is a *solution of the implicit Euler scheme* (E_θ) , if (E_θ) holds and u_θ is affine on the intervals $[t_i, t_{i+1}]$, that is,

$$u_\theta(t) = \frac{t_{i+1} - t}{t_{i+1} - t_i} u_\theta(t_i) + \frac{t - t_i}{t_{i+1} - t_i} u_\theta(t_{i+1})$$

for all $t \in [t_i, t_{i+1}]$ and all $i \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}$.

Let $f \in L^1(0, T; X)$ and $u^0 \in X$. We call a function $u \in C([0, T]; X)$ an *Euler solution* of $(\text{CP}: f, u^0)$ if there exists a sequence of discretizations $(\theta_n) = ((\pi_{\theta_n}, f_{\theta_n}, u_{\theta_n}^0))$ and a sequence $(u_{\theta_n})_n$ in $C([0, T]; X)$, such that u_{θ_n} is a solution of the implicit Euler scheme (E_{θ_n}) for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\pi_{\theta_n}| &= 0, \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f_{\theta_n} - f\|_{L^1(0, T; X)} &= 0 \text{ and} \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|u_{\theta_n} - u\|_{C([0, T]; X)} &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

In the literature Euler solutions of $(\text{CP}: f, u^0)$ are often called *mild solutions* of $(\text{CP}: f, u^0)$.

The *bracket* for $u, v \in X$ is defined as

$$[u, v] := \inf_{\lambda > 0} \frac{\|u + \lambda v\|_X - \|u\|_X}{\lambda}.$$

For properties of the bracket we refer the reader to [1].

An operator $A \subseteq X \times X$ is *accretive of type* $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$ if

$$[u - \hat{u}, v - \hat{v}] + \omega \|u - \hat{u}\|_X \geq 0 \quad (1)$$

for every $(u, v), (\hat{u}, \hat{v}) \in A$. The operator A is *accretive* if A is accretive of type 0 and A is *quasi-accretive* if A is accretive of type ω for some $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$.

If A is accretive of type $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$ and

$$\text{range}(I + \lambda A) = X$$

for all $\lambda > 0$ with $\lambda\omega < 1$, then A is *m-accretive of type* ω . The operator A is *m-accretive* if A is *m-accretive* of type 0 and A is *quasi-m-accretive* if A is *m-accretive* of type ω for some $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$.

A quasi-accretive operator A is said to satisfy the *range condition* if there exists $\lambda_0 > 0$ such that

$$\overline{\text{dom } A} \subseteq \text{range}(I + \lambda A)$$

for every $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0)$. Clearly, every quasi-*m-accretive* operator satisfies the range condition.

3 Differences of solutions of implicit Euler schemes

In this section we take two discretizations $\theta = (\pi_\theta, f_\theta, u_\theta^0)$ and $\hat{\theta} = (\pi_{\hat{\theta}}, f_{\hat{\theta}}, u_{\hat{\theta}}^0)$. Let $u_\theta \in C([0, T]; X)$ be a solution of the implicit Euler scheme (E_θ) and $u_{\hat{\theta}} \in C([0, T]; X)$ be a solution of $(E_{\hat{\theta}})$. For $i \in \{0, \dots, N\}$ and $j \in \{0, \dots, \hat{N}\}$ we define

$$a_{i,j} := \|u_\theta(t_i) - u_{\hat{\theta}}(\hat{t}_j)\|_X.$$

Our goal is to find an estimate for $a_{i,j}$, which only depends on the discretizations θ and $\hat{\theta}$.

To see that $a_{i,j}$ gets small, if $|t_i - \hat{t}_j|$, $|\pi_\theta|$, $|\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|$, $\|u_\theta^0 - u_{\hat{\theta}}^0\|_X$ and $\|f_\theta - f_{\hat{\theta}}\|_{L^1(0,T;X)}$ are small, we want to obtain an upper bound, which works for all partitions with small mesh sizes $|\pi_\theta|$ and $|\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|$.

3.1 An implicit upper bound

Lemma 1. For $i \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}$ and $j \in \{0, \dots, \hat{N}-1\}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - (h_i \wedge \hat{h}_j)\omega)a_{i+1,j+1} &\leq \left(1 - \frac{\hat{h}_j}{h_i}\right)^+ a_{i+1,j} + \left(1 - \frac{h_i}{\hat{h}_j}\right)^+ a_{i,j+1} + \frac{h_i \wedge \hat{h}_j}{h_i \vee \hat{h}_j} a_{i,j} \\ &\quad + (h_i \wedge \hat{h}_j) [u_\theta(t_{i+1}) - u_{\hat{\theta}}(\hat{t}_{j+1}), f_\theta(t_i) - f_{\hat{\theta}}(\hat{t}_j)]. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Proof. Let us first assume $\hat{h}_j \leq h_i$. Using the Euler schemes (E_θ) and $(E_{\hat{\theta}})$, that A is accretive of type ω and properties of the bracket (see [1, Proposition 3.7]), we get

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \hat{h}_j \left[u_\theta(t_{i+1}) - u_{\hat{\theta}}(\hat{t}_{j+1}), f_\theta(t_i) - \frac{u_\theta(t_{i+1}) - u_\theta(t_i)}{h_i} - f_{\hat{\theta}}(\hat{t}_j) + \frac{u_{\hat{\theta}}(\hat{t}_{j+1}) - u_{\hat{\theta}}(\hat{t}_j)}{\hat{h}_j} \right] \\ &\quad + \hat{h}_j \omega \|u_\theta(t_{i+1}) - u_{\hat{\theta}}(\hat{t}_{j+1})\|_X \\ &= \left[u_\theta(t_{i+1}) - u_{\hat{\theta}}(\hat{t}_{j+1}), \hat{h}_j (f_\theta(t_i) - f_{\hat{\theta}}(\hat{t}_j)) - (u_\theta(t_{i+1}) - u_{\hat{\theta}}(\hat{t}_{j+1})) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left(1 - \frac{\hat{h}_j}{h_i}\right) (u_\theta(t_{i+1}) - u_{\hat{\theta}}(\hat{t}_j)) + \frac{\hat{h}_j}{h_i} (u_\theta(t_i) - u_{\hat{\theta}}(\hat{t}_j)) \right] + \hat{h}_j \omega a_{i+1,j+1} \\ &\leq \hat{h}_j [u_\theta(t_{i+1}) - u_{\hat{\theta}}(\hat{t}_{j+1}), f_\theta(t_i) - f_{\hat{\theta}}(\hat{t}_j)] - a_{i+1,j+1} \\ &\quad + \left(1 - \frac{\hat{h}_j}{h_i}\right) a_{i+1,j} + \frac{\hat{h}_j}{h_i} a_{i,j} + \hat{h}_j \omega a_{i+1,j+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging the terms gives us the desired inequality. The case $\hat{h}_j > h_i$ can be treated analogously. \square

Remark 2. For $i \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}$ and $j \in \{0, \dots, \hat{N}-1\}$ we also have

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - (h_i \wedge \hat{h}_j)\omega)a_{i+1,j+1} &\leq \frac{h_i}{h_i + \hat{h}_j} a_{i+1,j} + \frac{\hat{h}_j}{h_i + \hat{h}_j} a_{i,j+1} \\ &\quad + \frac{h_i \hat{h}_j}{h_i + \hat{h}_j} [u_\theta(t_{i+1}) - u_{\hat{\theta}}(\hat{t}_{j+1}), f_\theta(t_i) - f_{\hat{\theta}}(\hat{t}_j)]. \end{aligned}$$

Many authors work with this version of an iterative estimate for $a_{i+1,j+1}$.

Definition 3. We define the continuous and strictly increasing function $\varphi: (-\infty, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\varphi(x) := \begin{cases} \frac{-\log(1-x)}{x} & \text{if } x \neq 0, \\ 1 & \text{if } x = 0. \end{cases}$$




Figure 1: Graph of φ .

Lemma 4. If $(|\pi_\theta| \wedge |\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|)\omega < 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned} a_{i+1,j+1} \leq & \exp\left(\varphi((|\pi_\theta| \wedge |\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|)\omega)(h_i \wedge \hat{h}_j)\omega\right) \left(\left(1 - \frac{\hat{h}_j}{h_i}\right)^+ a_{i+1,j} + \left(1 - \frac{h_i}{\hat{h}_j}\right)^+ a_{i,j+1} \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{h_i \wedge \hat{h}_j}{h_i \vee \hat{h}_j} a_{i,j} + (h_i \wedge \hat{h}_j) [u_\theta(t_{i+1}) - u_{\hat{\theta}}(\hat{t}_{j+1}), f_\theta(t_i) - f_{\hat{\theta}}(\hat{t}_j)] \right) \end{aligned}$$

for $i \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}$ and $j \in \{0, \dots, \hat{N}-1\}$.

Proof. By assumption we have $1 - (h_i \wedge \hat{h}_j)\omega > 0$, so we can use Lemma 1 and divide both sides of (2) by $1 - (h_i \wedge \hat{h}_j)\omega$. Since \exp and φ are increasing, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{1 - (h_i \wedge \hat{h}_j)\omega} &= \exp\left(-\log(1 - (h_i \wedge \hat{h}_j)\omega)\right) \\ &= \exp\left(\varphi((h_i \wedge \hat{h}_j)\omega)(h_i \wedge \hat{h}_j)\omega\right) \\ &\leq \exp\left(\varphi((|\pi_\theta| \wedge |\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|)\omega)(h_i \wedge \hat{h}_j)\omega\right). \end{aligned}$$

Note that for $\omega < 0$ we get $\varphi((h_i \wedge \hat{h}_j)\omega) \geq \varphi((|\pi_\theta| \wedge |\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|)\omega)$, which still works for the estimate above. This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 5. If $|\pi_\theta|\omega < 1$, then for every $(u, v) \in A$ and for every $i \in \{0, \dots, N\}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_\theta(t_i) - u\|_X &\leq \exp(\varphi(|\pi_\theta|\omega)t_i\omega) \|u_\theta^0 - u\|_X \\ &\quad + \int_0^{t_i} \exp(\varphi(|\pi_\theta|\omega)(t_i - \lceil \tau \rceil_{\pi_\theta})\omega) [u_\theta(\lceil \tau \rceil_{\pi_\theta}) - u, f_\theta(\tau) - v] d\tau. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

If $|\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|\omega < 1$, then, as above, for every $(u, v) \in A$ and every $j \in \{0, \dots, \hat{N}\}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_{\hat{\theta}}(\hat{t}_j) - u\|_X &\leq \exp(\varphi(|\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|\omega)\hat{t}_j\omega) \|u_{\hat{\theta}}^0 - u\|_X \\ &\quad + \int_0^{\hat{t}_j} \exp(\varphi(|\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|\omega)(\hat{t}_j - \lfloor \tau \rfloor_{\pi_{\hat{\theta}}})\omega) [u_{\hat{\theta}}(\lceil \tau \rceil_{\pi_{\hat{\theta}}}) - u, f_{\hat{\theta}}(\tau) - v] d\tau. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Proof. We prove (3) by induction over i . For $i = 0$ both sides are equal to $\|u_{\hat{\theta}}^0 - u\|_X$. If the statement is true for some $i \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}$, then note that

$$\frac{u - u}{h_i} + Au \ni v,$$

so we can use Lemma 4 with the discretization $\hat{\theta} = (\pi_{\theta}, v, u)$ and constant solution $u_{\hat{\theta}} = u$ of the implicit Euler scheme $(E_{\hat{\theta}})$ to get

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_{\theta}(t_{i+1}) - u\|_X &\leq \exp(\varphi(|\pi_{\theta}|\omega)h_i\omega) (\|u_{\theta}(t_i) - u\|_X + h_i[u_{\theta}(t_{i+1}) - u, f_{\theta}(t_i) - v]) \\ &= \exp(\varphi(|\pi_{\theta}|\omega)h_i\omega) \|u_{\theta}(t_i) - u\|_X \\ &\quad + \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} \exp(\varphi(|\pi_{\theta}|\omega)(t_{i+1} - \lfloor \tau \rfloor_{\pi_{\theta}})\omega) [u_{\theta}(\lceil \tau \rceil_{\pi_{\theta}}) - u, f_{\theta}(\tau) - v] d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

and together with the induction hypothesis we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_{\theta}(t_{i+1}) - u\|_X &\leq \exp(\varphi(|\pi_{\theta}|\omega)t_{i+1}\omega) \|u_{\theta}^0 - u\|_X \\ &\quad + \int_0^{t_{i+1}} \exp(\varphi(|\pi_{\theta}|\omega)(t_{i+1} - \lfloor \tau \rfloor_{\pi_{\theta}})\omega) [u_{\theta}(\lceil \tau \rceil_{\pi_{\theta}}) - u, f_{\theta}(\tau) - v] d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the induction. The inequality (4) can be shown analogously. \square

We can now already establish an upper bound for $a_{i,j}$, if the partitions are equidistant.

Lemma 6. *Let $N \in \mathbb{N}_{>T\omega}$. If $\pi_{\theta} = \pi_{\hat{\theta}} = \{0, \frac{1}{N}T, \frac{2}{N}T, \dots, \frac{N-1}{N}T, T\}$, then for every $(u, v) \in A$ and for every $i \in \{0, \dots, N\}$ and $j \in \{0, \dots, N\}$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned} a_{i,j} &\leq \exp(\varphi(|\pi_{\theta}|\omega)t_i\omega) \|u_{\theta}^0 - u\|_X + \exp(\varphi(|\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|\omega)\hat{t}_j\omega) \|u_{\hat{\theta}}^0 - u\|_X \\ &\quad + \int_0^{(t_i - \hat{t}_j)^+} \exp(\varphi(|\pi_{\theta}|\omega)(t_i - \lfloor \tau \rfloor_{\pi_{\theta}})\omega) [u_{\theta}(\lceil \tau \rceil_{\pi_{\theta}}) - u, f_{\theta}(\tau) - v] d\tau \\ &\quad + \int_0^{(\hat{t}_j - t_i)^+} \exp(\varphi(|\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|\omega)(\hat{t}_j - \lfloor \hat{\tau} \rfloor_{\pi_{\hat{\theta}}})\omega) [u_{\hat{\theta}}(\lceil \hat{\tau} \rceil_{\pi_{\hat{\theta}}}) - u, f_{\hat{\theta}}(\hat{\tau}) - v] d\hat{\tau} \\ &\quad + \int_0^{t_i \wedge \hat{t}_j} \exp(\varphi(|\pi_{\theta}|\omega)((t_i \wedge \hat{t}_j) - \lfloor \tau \rfloor_{\pi_{\theta}})\omega) \left[u_{\theta}(\lceil \tau \rceil_{\pi_{\theta}} + (t_i - \hat{t}_j)^+) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - u_{\hat{\theta}}(\lceil \tau \rceil_{\pi_{\hat{\theta}}} + (\hat{t}_j - t_i)^+), f_{\theta}(\tau + (t_i - \hat{t}_j)^+) - f_{\hat{\theta}}(\tau + (\hat{t}_j - t_i)^+) \right] d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We prove this by induction over (i, j) . Note that $|\pi_{\theta}|\omega = \frac{T}{N}\omega < 1$. If $j = 0$, we can apply Lemma 4 and use (3) to get

$$\begin{aligned} a_{i,0} &\leq \|u_{\theta}(t_i) - u\|_X + \|u_{\hat{\theta}}^0 - u\|_X \\ &\leq \exp(\varphi(|\pi_{\theta}|\omega)t_i\omega) \|u_{\theta}^0 - u\|_X + \|u_{\hat{\theta}}^0 - u\|_X \\ &\quad + \int_0^{t_i} \exp(\varphi(|\pi_{\theta}|\omega)(t_i - \lfloor \tau \rfloor_{\pi_{\theta}})\omega) [u_{\theta}(\lceil \tau \rceil_{\pi_{\theta}}) - u, f_{\theta}(\tau) - v] d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

If $i = 0$, we can use (4) analogously. If the statement is true for (i, j) , then note that $h_i = h_j = |\pi_\theta| = |\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|$, so by applying Lemma 4, we get

$$a_{i+1, j+1} \leq \exp(\varphi(|\pi_\theta|)\omega) h_i \omega (a_{i, j} + h_i [u_\theta(t_{i+1}) - u_{\hat{\theta}}(\hat{t}_{j+1}), f_\theta(t_i) - f_{\hat{\theta}}(\hat{t}_j)]).$$

By using

$$\begin{aligned} & \exp(\varphi(|\pi_\theta|)\omega) h_i \omega [u_\theta(t_{i+1}) - u_{\hat{\theta}}(\hat{t}_{j+1}), f_\theta(t_i) - f_{\hat{\theta}}(\hat{t}_j)] \\ = & \int_{t_i \wedge \hat{t}_j}^{t_{i+1} \wedge \hat{t}_{j+1}} \exp(\varphi(|\pi_\theta|)\omega) ((t_{i+1} \wedge \hat{t}_{j+1}) - \lceil \tau \rceil_{\pi_\theta}) \omega \left[u_\theta (\lceil \tau \rceil_{\pi_\theta} + (t_{i+1} - \hat{t}_{j+1})^+) \right. \\ & \left. - u_{\hat{\theta}} (\lceil \tau \rceil_{\pi_{\hat{\theta}}} + (\hat{t}_{j+1} - t_{i+1})^+), f_\theta (\tau + (t_{i+1} - \hat{t}_{j+1})^+) - f_{\hat{\theta}} (\tau + (\hat{t}_{j+1} - t_{i+1})^+) \right] d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

and the induction hypothesis for $a_{i, j}$ as well as

$$\begin{aligned} (t_i - \hat{t}_j)^+ &= (t_{i+1} - \hat{t}_{j+1})^+ \text{ and} \\ (\hat{t}_j - t_i)^+ &= (\hat{t}_{j+1} - t_{i+1})^+, \end{aligned}$$

we get the statement for $(i + 1, j + 1)$. This completes the induction. \square

To get an upper bound for $a_{i, j}$, which holds for all partitions π_θ and $\pi_{\hat{\theta}}$, we use the following density function $\rho^{i, j}$.

Definition 7. Let $\rho^{i, j} : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be recursively defined by

$$\rho^{i, 0} := \mathbf{1}_{[0, t_i] \times [-1, 0]} \quad (5)$$

for $i \in \{0, \dots, N\}$,

$$\rho^{0, j} := \mathbf{1}_{[-1, 0] \times [0, \hat{t}_j]} \quad (6)$$

for $j \in \{0, \dots, \hat{N}\}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^{i+1, j+1} &:= \left(1 - \frac{\hat{h}_j}{h_i}\right)^+ \rho^{i+1, j} + \left(1 - \frac{h_i}{\hat{h}_j}\right)^+ \rho^{i, j+1} + \frac{h_i \wedge \hat{h}_j}{h_i \vee \hat{h}_j} \rho^{i, j} \\ &+ \frac{1}{h_i \vee \hat{h}_j} \mathbf{1}_{[t_i, t_{i+1}] \times [\hat{t}_j, \hat{t}_{j+1}]} \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

for $i \in \{0, \dots, N - 1\}$ and $j \in \{0, \dots, \hat{N} - 1\}$.

Lemma 8. Let $(u, v) \in A$ and $g \in BV(-1, T; X)$ with $g(\tau) = v$ for $\tau < 0$. If $(|\pi_\theta| \vee |\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|)\omega < 1$, then for all $i \in \{0, \dots, N\}$ and $j \in \{0, \dots, \hat{N}\}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} a_{i, j} &\leq \exp(\varphi(|\pi_\theta| \vee |\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|)\omega) (t_i + \hat{t}_j) \omega^+ \left(\|u_\theta^0 - u\|_X + \|u_{\hat{\theta}}^0 - u\|_X \right. \\ &\left. + \|f_\theta - g\|_{L^1(0, t_i; X)} + \|f_{\hat{\theta}} - g\|_{L^1(0, \hat{t}_j; X)} + \int_{-1}^T \int_{-1}^T \rho^{i, j}(\tau, \hat{\tau}) \|g(\tau) - g(\hat{\tau})\|_X d\hat{\tau} d\tau \right). \end{aligned}$$





Figure 2: Plots of the density $\rho^{i,j}$ for different partitions π_θ and $\pi_{\hat{\theta}}$. For small mesh sizes $|\pi_\theta|$ and $|\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|$ the density $\rho^{i,j}$ is concentrated along the diagonal through the point (t_i, \hat{t}_j) .

Proof. We prove this by induction over (i, j) . If $j = 0$, we can use Lemma 5 to get

$$\begin{aligned}
a_{i,0} &= \|u_\theta(t_i) - u_\theta^0\|_X \\
&\leq \|u_\theta(t_i) - u\|_X + \|u_\theta^0 - u\|_X \\
&\leq \exp(\varphi(|\pi_\theta|\omega)t_i\omega) \|u_\theta^0 - u\|_X + \|u_\theta^0 - u\|_X \\
&\quad + \int_0^{t_i} \exp(\varphi(|\pi_\theta|\omega)(t_i - \lceil\tau\rceil_{\pi_\theta})\omega) [u_\theta(\lceil\tau\rceil_{\pi_\theta}) - u, f_\theta(\tau) - v] \, d\tau \\
&\leq \exp(\varphi((|\pi_\theta| \vee |\pi_\theta|)\omega)t_i\omega^+) \left(\|u_\theta^0 - u\|_X + \|u_\theta^0 - u\|_X + \int_0^{t_i} \|f_\theta(\tau) - v\|_X \, d\tau \right) \\
&\leq \exp(\varphi((|\pi_\theta| \vee |\pi_\theta|)\omega)t_i\omega^+) \left(\|u_\theta^0 - u\|_X + \|u_\theta^0 - u\|_X \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \|f_\theta - g\|_{L^1(0,t_i;X)} + \int_{-1}^T \int_{-1}^T \rho^{i,0}(\tau, \hat{\tau}) \|g(\tau) - g(\hat{\tau})\|_X \, d\hat{\tau} \, d\tau \right).
\end{aligned}$$

The case $i = 0$ can be treated analogously. If we assume the statement to be true for (i, j) , $(i+1, j)$ and $(i, j+1)$, then we can use Lemma 4 to get

$$\begin{aligned}
a_{i+1,j+1} &\leq \exp(\varphi((|\pi_\theta| \vee |\pi_\theta|)\omega)(h_i \wedge \hat{h}_j)\omega^+) \left(\left(1 - \frac{\hat{h}_j}{h_i}\right)^+ a_{i+1,j} + \left(1 - \frac{h_i}{\hat{h}_j}\right)^+ a_{i,j+1} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{h_i \wedge \hat{h}_j}{h_i \vee \hat{h}_j} a_{i,j} + (h_i \wedge \hat{h}_j) [u_\theta(t_{i+1}) - u_\theta(\hat{t}_{j+1}), f_\theta(t_i) - f_\theta(\hat{t}_j)] \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
&(h_i \wedge \hat{h}_j) [u_\theta(t_{i+1}) - u_\theta(\hat{t}_{j+1}), f_\theta(t_i) - f_\theta(\hat{t}_j)] \\
&\leq (h_i \wedge \hat{h}_j) \|f_\theta(t_i) - f_\theta(\hat{t}_j)\|_X \\
&= \frac{1}{h_i \vee \hat{h}_j} \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} \int_{\hat{t}_j}^{\hat{t}_{j+1}} \|f_\theta(\tau) - g(\tau) + g(\tau) - g(\hat{\tau}) + g(\hat{\tau}) - f_\theta(\hat{\tau})\|_X \, d\hat{\tau} \, d\tau \\
&\leq \frac{\hat{h}_j}{h_i \vee \hat{h}_j} \|f_\theta - g\|_{L^1(t_i, t_{i+1}; X)} + \frac{h_i}{h_i \vee \hat{h}_j} \|f_\theta - g\|_{L^1(\hat{t}_j, \hat{t}_{j+1}; X)} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{h_i \vee \hat{h}_j} \int_{-1}^T \int_{-1}^T \mathbf{1}_{[t_i, t_{i+1}] \times [\hat{t}_j, \hat{t}_{j+1}]}(\tau, \hat{\tau}) \|g(\tau) - g(\hat{\tau})\|_X \, d\hat{\tau} \, d\tau.
\end{aligned}$$

By using the equalities

$$\begin{aligned}
1 &= \left(1 - \frac{\hat{h}_j}{h_i}\right)^+ + \left(1 - \frac{h_i}{\hat{h}_j}\right)^+ + \frac{h_i \wedge \hat{h}_j}{h_i \vee \hat{h}_j} \\
&= \left(1 - \frac{\hat{h}_j}{h_i}\right)^+ + \frac{\hat{h}_j}{h_i \vee \hat{h}_j} \\
&= \left(1 - \frac{h_i}{\hat{h}_j}\right)^+ + \frac{h_i}{h_i \vee \hat{h}_j}
\end{aligned}$$

as well as the recursive definition of $\rho^{i+1,j+1}$ in (7) we get

$$\begin{aligned} a_{i+1,j+1} &\leq \exp(\varphi(|\pi_\theta| \vee |\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|)\omega)(t_{i+1} + \hat{t}_{j+1})\omega^+ \left(\|u_\theta^0 - u\|_X + \|u_{\hat{\theta}}^0 - u\|_X \right. \\ &\quad + \|f_\theta - g\|_{L^1(0,t_{i+1};X)} + \|f_{\hat{\theta}} - g\|_{L^1(0,\hat{t}_{j+1};X)} \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{-1}^T \int_{-1}^T \rho^{i+1,j+1}(\tau, \hat{\tau}) \|g(\tau) - g(\hat{\tau})\|_X d\hat{\tau} d\tau \right). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the induction. \square

Lemma 8 already achieves the goal of finding an upper bound for $a_{i,j}$, but it is not clear, whether the upper bound is small, if the mesh sizes $|\pi_\theta|$ and $|\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|$ are small. The next results show some properties of the density $\rho^{i,j}$ and lead to a good explicit estimate of the double integral

$$\int_{-1}^T \int_{-1}^T \rho^{i,j}(\tau, \hat{\tau}) \|g(\tau) - g(\hat{\tau})\|_X d\hat{\tau} d\tau.$$

3.2 Properties of the density

Lemma 9. For $i \in \{0, \dots, N\}$ and $j \in \{0, \dots, \hat{N}\}$ we have

$$\text{supp } \rho^{i,j} \subseteq ([-1, t_i] \times [-1, \hat{t}_j]) \setminus ([-1, 0] \times [-1, 0]).$$

Proof. This is a direct consequence of the definition of the density $\rho^{i,j}$. We prove this by induction over (i, j) . For $(i, j) = (0, 0)$ the statement is true since $\text{supp } \rho^{0,0} = \emptyset$. For $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ we have

$$\text{supp } \rho^{i,0} = [0, t_i] \times [-1, 0] = ([-1, t_i] \times [-1, \hat{t}_0]) \setminus ([-1, 0] \times [-1, 0])$$

and for $j \in \{1, \dots, \hat{N}\}$ we have

$$\text{supp } \rho^{0,j} = [-1, 0] \times [0, \hat{t}_j] = ([-1, t_0] \times [-1, \hat{t}_j]) \setminus ([-1, 0] \times [-1, 0]).$$

If the statement is true for (i, j) , $(i+1, j)$ and $(i, j+1)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{supp } \rho^{i+1,j+1} &\subseteq \text{supp } \rho^{i+1,j} \cup \text{supp } \rho^{i,j+1} \cup \text{supp } \rho^{i,j} \cup ([t_i, t_{i+1}] \times [\hat{t}_j, \hat{t}_{j+1}]) \\ &\subseteq ([-1, t_{i+1}] \times [-1, \hat{t}_{j+1}]) \setminus ([-1, 0] \times [-1, 0]). \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the induction. \square

Lemma 10. Let $i \in \{0, \dots, N\}$ and $j \in \{0, \dots, \hat{N}\}$. For all $\tau \geq 0$ we have

$$\int_{-1}^T \rho^{i,j}(\tau, \hat{\tau}) d\hat{\tau} = \mathbf{1}_{[0,t_i]}(\tau),$$

and for all $\hat{\tau} \geq 0$ we have

$$\int_{-1}^T \rho^{i,j}(\tau, \hat{\tau}) d\tau = \mathbf{1}_{[0,\hat{t}_j]}(\hat{\tau}).$$

Proof. We prove the first statement by induction over (i, j) . Let $\tau \geq 0$. If $j = 0$, then

$$\int_{-1}^T \rho^{i,0}(\tau, \hat{\tau}) d\hat{\tau} = \int_{-1}^T \mathbf{1}_{[0,t_i]}(\tau) \mathbf{1}_{[-1,0]}(\hat{\tau}) d\hat{\tau} = \mathbf{1}_{[0,t_i]}(\tau).$$

If $i = 0$, then

$$\int_{-1}^T \rho^{0,j}(\tau, \hat{\tau}) d\hat{\tau} = \int_{-1}^T \mathbf{1}_{[-1,0)}(\tau) \mathbf{1}_{[0,\hat{t}_j)}(\hat{\tau}) d\hat{\tau} = 0 = \mathbf{1}_{[0,t_0)}(\tau).$$

If the statement is true for (i, j) , $(i+1, j)$ and $(i, j+1)$, then together with the recursive definition of $\rho^{i+1,j+1}$ in (7) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{-1}^T \rho^{i+1,j+1}(\tau, \hat{\tau}) d\hat{\tau} &= \left(1 - \frac{\hat{h}_j}{h_i}\right)^+ \mathbf{1}_{[0,t_{i+1})}(\tau) + \left(1 - \frac{h_i}{\hat{h}_j}\right)^+ \mathbf{1}_{[0,t_i)}(\tau) \\ &\quad + \frac{h_i \wedge \hat{h}_j}{h_i \vee \hat{h}_j} \mathbf{1}_{[0,t_i)}(\tau) + \frac{1}{h_i \vee \hat{h}_j} \underbrace{\int_{-1}^T \mathbf{1}_{[t_i,t_{i+1})}(\tau) \mathbf{1}_{[\hat{t}_j,\hat{t}_{j+1})}(\hat{\tau}) d\hat{\tau}}_{= \hat{h}_j \mathbf{1}_{[t_i,t_{i+1})}(\tau)} \\ &= \mathbf{1}_{[0,t_{i+1})}(\tau). \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the induction. The second statement can be treated analogously. \square

Remark 11. Lemma 10 shows that the mass stays constant in some sense. More precisely, it follows from Lemma 10, that

$$\int_0^T \int_{-1}^T \rho^{i,j}(\tau, \hat{\tau}) d\hat{\tau} d\tau = \int_0^T \mathbf{1}_{[0,t_i)}(\tau) d\tau = t_i$$

and

$$\int_{-1}^T \int_0^T \rho^{i,j}(\tau, \hat{\tau}) d\hat{\tau} d\tau = \int_0^T \mathbf{1}_{[0,\hat{t}_j)}(\hat{\tau}) d\hat{\tau} = \hat{t}_j.$$

Furthermore one can show that

$$\int_{-1}^T \rho^{i,j}(\tau, \hat{\tau}) d\hat{\tau} \leq \hat{t}_j \text{ for all } \tau < 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{-1}^T \rho^{i,j}(\tau, \hat{\tau}) d\tau \leq t_i \text{ for all } \hat{\tau} < 0.$$

Therefore

$$\int_0^T \int_0^T \rho^{i,j}(\tau, \hat{\tau}) d\hat{\tau} d\tau \leq t_i \wedge \hat{t}_j \leq t_i \vee \hat{t}_j \leq \int_{-1}^T \int_{-1}^T \rho^{i,j}(\tau, \hat{\tau}) d\hat{\tau} d\tau \leq t_i + \hat{t}_j.$$

The next lemma shows how the density $\rho^{i,j}$ can be computed directly without iteration over i and j .

Lemma 12. For every $i \in \{0, \dots, N\}$, $j \in \{0, \dots, \hat{N}\}$, $k \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}$ and every $l \in \{0, \dots, \hat{N}-1\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^{i,j}(t_k, \hat{t}_l) &= \frac{1}{h_k \vee \hat{h}_l} \left((h_k - \hat{h}_{l+1})^+ \rho^{i,j}(t_k, \hat{t}_{l+1}) + (\hat{h}_l - h_{k+1})^+ \rho^{i,j}(t_{k+1}, \hat{t}_l) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (h_{k+1} \wedge \hat{h}_{l+1}) \rho^{i,j}(t_{k+1}, \hat{t}_{l+1}) + \delta_{(i,k+1),(j,l+1)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. In this proof we use the short notation $\rho_{k,l}^{i,j} := \rho^{i,j}(t_k, \hat{t}_l)$ and the Kronecker delta. Let $k \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}$ and $l \in \{0, \dots, \hat{N}-1\}$. We prove the statement by induction over (i, j) . For $i = 0$ or $j = 0$ this is true since

$$\rho^{i,0}(\tau, \hat{\tau}) = \rho^{0,j}(\tau, \hat{\tau}) = 0$$

for all $\tau, \hat{\tau} \geq 0$ by definition (see (5) and (6)) and

$$\mathbf{1}_{[t_i, t_{i+1}) \times [\hat{t}_0, \hat{t}_1)}(t_{k+1}, \hat{t}_{l+1}) = \mathbf{1}_{[t_0, t_1) \times [\hat{t}_j, \hat{t}_{j+1})}(t_{k+1}, \hat{t}_{l+1}) = 0.$$

Now let us assume that the statement is true for $(i+1, j)$, $(i, j+1)$ and (i, j) . Using the definition of $\rho^{i+1, j+1}$ in (7) and our induction hypothesis we get

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{k,l}^{i+1, j+1} &= \left(1 - \frac{\hat{h}_j}{h_i}\right)^+ \rho_{k,l}^{i+1, j} + \left(1 - \frac{h_i}{\hat{h}_j}\right)^+ \rho_{k,l}^{i, j+1} + \frac{h_i \wedge \hat{h}_j}{h_i \vee \hat{h}_j} \rho_{k,l}^{i, j} + \frac{1}{h_i \vee \hat{h}_j} \delta_{(i, j), (k, l)} \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{\hat{h}_j}{h_i}\right)^+ \frac{1}{h_k \vee \hat{h}_l} \left((h_k - \hat{h}_{l+1})^+ \rho_{k, l+1}^{i+1, j} + (\hat{h}_l - h_{k+1})^+ \rho_{k+1, l}^{i+1, j} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (h_{k+1} \wedge \hat{h}_{l+1}) \rho_{k+1, l+1}^{i+1, j} + \delta_{(i+1, j), (k+1, l+1)} \right) \\ &\quad + \left(1 - \frac{h_i}{\hat{h}_j}\right)^+ \frac{1}{h_k \vee \hat{h}_l} \left((h_k - \hat{h}_{l+1})^+ \rho_{k, l+1}^{i, j+1} + (\hat{h}_l - h_{k+1})^+ \rho_{k+1, l}^{i, j+1} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (h_{k+1} \wedge \hat{h}_{l+1}) \rho_{k+1, l+1}^{i, j+1} + \delta_{(i, j+1), (k+1, l+1)} \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{h_i \wedge \hat{h}_j}{h_i \vee \hat{h}_j} \frac{1}{h_k \vee \hat{h}_l} \left((h_k - \hat{h}_{l+1})^+ \rho_{k, l+1}^{i, j} + (\hat{h}_l - h_{k+1})^+ \rho_{k+1, l}^{i, j} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (h_{k+1} \wedge \hat{h}_{l+1}) \rho_{k+1, l+1}^{i, j} + \delta_{(i, j), (k+1, l+1)} \right) + \frac{1}{h_i \vee \hat{h}_j} \delta_{(i, j), (k, l)}. \end{aligned}$$

By using the identities

$$\begin{aligned} \left(1 - \frac{\hat{h}_j}{h_i}\right)^+ \delta_{(i+1, j), (k+1, l+1)} &= \frac{(h_i - \hat{h}_j)^+}{h_i \vee \hat{h}_j} \delta_{(i+1, j), (k+1, l+1)} = \frac{(h_k - \hat{h}_{l+1})^+}{h_i \vee \hat{h}_j} \delta_{(i, j), (k, l+1)}, \\ \left(1 - \frac{h_i}{\hat{h}_j}\right)^+ \delta_{(i, j+1), (k+1, l+1)} &= \frac{(\hat{h}_j - h_i)^+}{h_i \vee \hat{h}_j} \delta_{(i, j+1), (k+1, l+1)} = \frac{(\hat{h}_l - h_{k+1})^+}{h_i \vee \hat{h}_j} \delta_{(i, j), (k+1, l)}, \\ \frac{h_i \wedge \hat{h}_j}{h_i \vee \hat{h}_j} \delta_{(i, j), (k+1, l+1)} &= \frac{h_{k+1} \wedge \hat{h}_{l+1}}{h_i \vee \hat{h}_j} \delta_{(i, j), (k+1, l+1)} \quad \text{and} \\ \frac{1}{h_i \vee \hat{h}_j} \delta_{(i, j), (k, l)} &= \frac{1}{h_k \vee \hat{h}_l} \delta_{(i+1, j+1), (k+1, l+1)} \end{aligned}$$

and rearranging the terms we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\rho_{k,l}^{i+1, j+1} \\ &= \frac{(h_k - \hat{h}_{l+1})^+}{h_k \vee \hat{h}_l} \left(\left(1 - \frac{\hat{h}_j}{h_i}\right)^+ \rho_{k, l+1}^{i+1, j} + \left(1 - \frac{h_i}{\hat{h}_j}\right)^+ \rho_{k, l+1}^{i, j+1} + \frac{h_i \wedge \hat{h}_j}{h_i \vee \hat{h}_j} \rho_{k, l+1}^{i, j} + \frac{\delta_{(i, j), (k, l+1)}}{h_i \vee \hat{h}_j} \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{(\hat{h}_l - h_{k+1})^+}{h_k \vee \hat{h}_l} \left(\left(1 - \frac{\hat{h}_j}{h_i}\right)^+ \rho_{k+1, l}^{i+1, j} + \left(1 - \frac{h_i}{\hat{h}_j}\right)^+ \rho_{k+1, l}^{i, j+1} + \frac{h_i \wedge \hat{h}_j}{h_i \vee \hat{h}_j} \rho_{k+1, l}^{i, j} + \frac{\delta_{(i, j), (k+1, l)}}{h_i \vee \hat{h}_j} \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{h_{k+1} \wedge \hat{h}_{l+1}}{h_k \vee \hat{h}_l} \left(\left(1 - \frac{\hat{h}_j}{h_i}\right)^+ \rho_{k+1, l+1}^{i+1, j} + \left(1 - \frac{h_i}{\hat{h}_j}\right)^+ \rho_{k+1, l+1}^{i, j+1} + \frac{h_i \wedge \hat{h}_j}{h_i \vee \hat{h}_j} \rho_{k+1, l+1}^{i, j} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{\delta_{(i, j), (k+1, l+1)}}{h_i \vee \hat{h}_j} \right) + \frac{1}{h_k \vee \hat{h}_l} \delta_{(i+1, j+1), (k+1, l+1)} \end{aligned}$$

$$= \frac{1}{h_k \vee \hat{h}_l} \left((h_k - \hat{h}_{l+1})^+ \rho_{k,l+1}^{i+1,j+1} + (\hat{h}_l - h_{k+1})^+ \rho_{k+1,l}^{i+1,j+1} \right. \\ \left. + (h_{k+1} \wedge \hat{h}_{l+1}) \rho_{k+1,l+1}^{i+1,j+1} + \delta_{(i+1,j+1),(k+1,l+1)} \right).$$

This concludes the induction. \square

We only need one more technical lemma before we can state the main estimate for $\rho^{i,j}$.

Lemma 13. *Let $a, b, c > 0$. Then*

$$a + b - \frac{2ab}{c} \leq \sqrt{(a-b)^2 + ac}.$$

Proof. If $4b \leq c$, then we have $a + b - \frac{2ab}{c} \leq a + b = \sqrt{(a-b)^2 + 4ab} \leq \sqrt{(a-b)^2 + ac}$.

If $4b > c$, then we consider the function $h: [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $a \mapsto \sqrt{(a-b)^2 + ac} - a - b + \frac{2ab}{c}$ and get

$$h'(a) = \frac{2(a-b) + c}{2\sqrt{(a-b)^2 + ac}} + \frac{2b}{c} - 1 \quad \text{and} \\ h''(a) = \frac{c(4b-c)}{4((a-b)^2 + ac)^{\frac{3}{2}}}$$

for $a \geq 0$. Since $h(0) = 0$, $h'(0) = \frac{c}{2b} + \frac{2b}{c} - 2 = \left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2b}} - \sqrt{\frac{2b}{c}} \right)^2 \geq 0$ and $h''(a) \geq 0$ for all $a \geq 0$, we get $h(a) \geq 0$ for all $a \geq 0$, which proves the statement. \square

The following lemma shows the concentration of mass on the diagonal.

Lemma 14. *Let $t \in \mathbb{R}$. For every $i \in \{0, \dots, N\}$ and $j \in \{0, \dots, \hat{N}\}$ we have*

$$\int_{-1}^t \int_t^T \rho^{i,j}(\tau, \hat{\tau}) d\hat{\tau} d\tau + \int_t^T \int_{-1}^t \rho^{i,j}(\tau, \hat{\tau}) d\hat{\tau} d\tau \\ \leq \sqrt{(t_i - \hat{t}_j)^2 + |\pi_\theta|(t_i \wedge (t_i - t)^+) + |\pi_\theta|(\hat{t}_j \wedge (\hat{t}_j - t)^+)}.$$

Proof. For this proof we use the notation

$$\kappa_{i,j}(t) := \int_{-1}^t \int_t^T \rho^{i,j}(\tau, \hat{\tau}) d\hat{\tau} d\tau + \int_t^T \int_{-1}^t \rho^{i,j}(\tau, \hat{\tau}) d\hat{\tau} d\tau. \quad (8)$$

First, let $t \geq 0$. Note that by Lemma 10, for every $i \in \{0, \dots, N\}$ and $j \in \{0, \dots, \hat{N}\}$ we have

$$\kappa_{i,j}(t) \leq \int_t^T \mathbf{1}_{[0, \hat{t}_j]}(\hat{\tau}) d\hat{\tau} + \int_t^T \mathbf{1}_{[0, t_i]}(\tau) d\tau = (t_i - t)^+ + (\hat{t}_j - t)^+. \quad (9)$$

In particular $\kappa_{i,j}(t) = 0$ for $t \geq t_i \vee \hat{t}_j$. We now prove the statement by induction over (i, j) . If $j = 0$, then we have

$$\kappa_{i,0}(t) = 0 + (t_i - t)^+ \leq t_i = \sqrt{(t_i - \hat{t}_0)^2}.$$

If $i = 0$, we have

$$\kappa_{0,j}(t) = (\hat{t}_j - t)^+ + 0 \leq \hat{t}_j = \sqrt{(t_0 - \hat{t}_j)^2}.$$

Now let us assume that the statement is true for (i, j) , $(i + 1, j)$ and $(i, j + 1)$. We first treat the case that $\hat{h}_j \leq h_i$. Then by the recursive definition of $\rho^{i+1, j+1}$ in (7) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \kappa_{i+1, j+1}(t) \\
&= \left(1 - \frac{\hat{h}_j}{h_i}\right) \kappa_{i+1, j}(t) + \frac{\hat{h}_j}{h_i} \kappa_{i, j}(t) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{h_i} \left(\int_{-1}^t \int_t^T \mathbf{1}_{[t_i, t_{i+1})}(\tau) \mathbf{1}_{[\hat{t}_j, \hat{t}_{j+1})}(\hat{\tau}) d\hat{\tau} d\tau + \int_t^T \int_{-1}^t \mathbf{1}_{[t_i, t_{i+1})}(\tau) \mathbf{1}_{[\hat{t}_j, \hat{t}_{j+1})}(\hat{\tau}) d\hat{\tau} d\tau \right) \\
&= \left(1 - \frac{\hat{h}_j}{h_i}\right) \kappa_{i+1, j}(t) + \frac{\hat{h}_j}{h_i} \kappa_{i, j}(t) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{h_i} \left(((t - t_i)^+ \wedge h_i)((\hat{t}_{j+1} - t)^+ \wedge \hat{h}_j) + ((t_{i+1} - t)^+ \wedge h_i)((t - \hat{t}_j)^+ \wedge \hat{h}_j) \right). \tag{10}
\end{aligned}$$

If $0 \leq t \leq t_i \wedge \hat{t}_j$, then we have $(t - t_i)^+ = (t - \hat{t}_j)^+ = 0$, so the last term in (10) vanishes. Using also the induction hypothesis and the concavity of the square root function, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\kappa_{i+1, j+1}(t) &= \left(1 - \frac{\hat{h}_j}{h_i}\right) \kappa_{i+1, j}(t) + \frac{\hat{h}_j}{h_i} \kappa_{i, j}(t) \\
&\leq \left(1 - \frac{\hat{h}_j}{h_i}\right) \sqrt{(t_{i+1} - \hat{t}_j)^2 + |\pi_\theta|(t_{i+1} - t) + |\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|(\hat{t}_j - t)} \\
&\quad + \frac{\hat{h}_j}{h_i} \sqrt{(t_i - \hat{t}_j)^2 + |\pi_\theta|(t_i - t) + |\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|(\hat{t}_j - t)} \\
&\leq \left(\left(1 - \frac{\hat{h}_j}{h_i}\right) \left((t_{i+1} - \hat{t}_j)^2 + |\pi_\theta|(t_{i+1} - t) + |\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|(\hat{t}_j - t) \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{\hat{h}_j}{h_i} \left((t_i - \hat{t}_j)^2 + |\pi_\theta|(t_i - t) + |\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|(\hat{t}_j - t) \right) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&= \left((t_{i+1} - \hat{t}_{j+1})^2 + |\pi_\theta|(t_{i+1} - t) + |\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|(\hat{t}_{j+1} - t) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \left(1 - \frac{\hat{h}_j}{h_i}\right) (2(t_{i+1} - \hat{t}_{j+1})\hat{h}_j + \hat{h}_j^2 - |\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|\hat{h}_j) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{\hat{h}_j}{h_i} (2(t_{i+1} - \hat{t}_{j+1})(\hat{h}_j - h_i) + \hat{h}_j^2 - 2\hat{h}_j h_i + h_i^2 - |\pi_\theta|h_i - |\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|\hat{h}_j) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&= \sqrt{(t_{i+1} - \hat{t}_{j+1})^2 + |\pi_\theta|(t_{i+1} - t) + |\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|(\hat{t}_{j+1} - t) - \hat{h}_j(|\pi_\theta| - h_i) - |\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|\hat{h}_j - \hat{h}_j^2} \\
&\leq \sqrt{(t_{i+1} - \hat{t}_{j+1})^2 + |\pi_\theta|(t_{i+1} - t) + |\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|(\hat{t}_{j+1} - t)}.
\end{aligned}$$

If $t_i < t < \hat{t}_j$, then we can use (9), (10), the induction hypothesis and the preceding calculation to get

$$\begin{aligned}
\kappa_{i+1, j+1}(t) &= \left(1 - \frac{\hat{h}_j}{h_i}\right) \kappa_{i+1, j}(t) + \frac{\hat{h}_j}{h_i} \kappa_{i, j}(t) + \frac{1}{h_i} ((t - t_i) \wedge h_i) \hat{h}_j \\
&\leq \left(1 - \frac{\hat{h}_j}{h_i}\right) \kappa_{i+1, j}(t) + \frac{\hat{h}_j}{h_i} (\hat{t}_j - t) + \frac{\hat{h}_j}{h_i} (t - t_i)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \left(1 - \frac{\hat{h}_j}{h_i}\right) \kappa_{i+1,j}(t) + \frac{\hat{h}_j}{h_i} (\hat{t}_j - t_i) \\
&\leq \left(1 - \frac{\hat{h}_j}{h_i}\right) \sqrt{(t_{i+1} - \hat{t}_j)^2 + |\pi_\theta|(t_{i+1} - t) + |\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|(\hat{t}_j - t)} \\
&\quad + \frac{\hat{h}_j}{h_i} \sqrt{(t_i - \hat{t}_j)^2 + |\pi_\theta|(t_i - t) + |\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|(\hat{t}_j - t)} \\
&\leq \sqrt{(t_{i+1} - \hat{t}_{j+1})^2 + |\pi_\theta|(t_{i+1} - t) + |\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|(\hat{t}_{j+1} - t)}.
\end{aligned}$$

If $\hat{t}_j < t < t_i$, then we can use (9) and (10) to get

$$\begin{aligned}
\kappa_{i+1,j+1}(t) &= \left(1 - \frac{\hat{h}_j}{h_i}\right) \kappa_{i+1,j}(t) + \frac{\hat{h}_j}{h_i} \kappa_{i,j}(t) + \frac{1}{h_i} h_i \left((t - \hat{t}_j) \wedge \hat{h}_j\right) \\
&\leq \left(1 - \frac{\hat{h}_j}{h_i}\right) (t_{i+1} - t) + \frac{\hat{h}_j}{h_i} (t_i - t) + t - \hat{t}_j \\
&= t_{i+1} - \hat{t}_{j+1} \\
&= \sqrt{(t_{i+1} - \hat{t}_{j+1})^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

If $t_i \vee \hat{t}_j \leq t < t_{i+1} \wedge \hat{t}_{j+1}$, then we can use (9), (10) and Lemma 13 to get

$$\begin{aligned}
\kappa_{i+1,j+1}(t) &= \left(1 - \frac{\hat{h}_j}{h_i}\right) \kappa_{i+1,j}(t) + \frac{\hat{h}_j}{h_i} \kappa_{i,j}(t) + \frac{1}{h_i} \left((t - t_i)(\hat{t}_{j+1} - t) + (t_{i+1} - t)(t - \hat{t}_j)\right) \\
&\leq \left(1 - \frac{\hat{h}_j}{h_i}\right) (t_{i+1} - t) + \frac{1}{h_i} \left((t - t_{i+1} + h_i)(\hat{t}_{j+1} - t) + (t_{i+1} - t)(t - \hat{t}_{j+1} + \hat{h}_j)\right) \\
&= t_{i+1} - t + \hat{t}_{j+1} - t - \frac{2}{h_i} (t_{i+1} - t)(\hat{t}_{j+1} - t) \\
&\leq \sqrt{(t_{i+1} - \hat{t}_{j+1})^2 + h_i(t_{i+1} - t)} \\
&\leq \sqrt{(t_{i+1} - \hat{t}_{j+1})^2 + |\pi_\theta|(t_{i+1} - t)}.
\end{aligned}$$

If $t_{i+1} \vee \hat{t}_j \leq t$, then we can use (9) and (10) to get

$$\begin{aligned}
\kappa_{i+1,j+1}(t) &= \left(1 - \frac{\hat{h}_j}{h_i}\right) \kappa_{i+1,j}(t) + \frac{\hat{h}_j}{h_i} \kappa_{i,j}(t) + \frac{1}{h_i} (h_i(\hat{t}_{j+1} - t)^+ + 0) \\
&= (\hat{t}_{j+1} - t)^+ = \sqrt{((\hat{t}_{j+1} - t)^+)^2} \leq \sqrt{|\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|(\hat{t}_{j+1} - t)^+}.
\end{aligned}$$

We now have shown

$$\kappa_{i+1,j+1}(t) \leq \sqrt{(t_{i+1} - \hat{t}_{j+1})^2 + |\pi_\theta|(t_{i+1} - t)^+ + |\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|(\hat{t}_{j+1} - t)^+}$$

for every $t \geq 0$. The case $\hat{h}_j > h_i$ can be treated analogously. This concludes the induction.

If $t < 0$, then note that by Lemma 9, $\rho^{i,j}(\tau, \hat{\tau}) = 0$ for $\tau < 0$ and $\hat{\tau} < 0$ and therefore

$$\kappa_{i,j}(t) \leq \kappa_{i,j}(0) \leq \sqrt{(t_i - \hat{t}_j)^2 + |\pi_\theta|t_i + |\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|\hat{t}_j}.$$

This concludes the proof for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. □

Lemma 15. Let $g \in BV(-1, T; X)$. Then for $i \in \{0, \dots, N\}$ and $j \in \{0, \dots, \hat{N}\}$ we have

$$\int_{-1}^T \int_{-1}^T \rho^{i,j}(\tau, \hat{\tau}) \|g(\tau) - g(\hat{\tau})\|_X \, d\hat{\tau} \, d\tau \leq \sqrt{(t_i - \hat{t}_j)^2 + |\pi_\theta|t_i + |\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|\hat{t}_j} \cdot \text{essVar}(g).$$

Proof. Let $g_r : [-1, T] \rightarrow X$ be a representative of g and let $\pi : -1 = \tilde{t}_0 < \tilde{t}_1 < \dots < \tilde{t}_{\hat{N}} = T$ be a partition of $[-1, T]$. We define $g_\pi : [-1, T] \rightarrow X$ by

$$g_\pi := g_r(0) + \sum_{k=1}^n (g_r(\tilde{t}_k) - g_r(\tilde{t}_{k-1})) \mathbf{1}_{[\tilde{t}_k, T]}.$$

Then

$$g_\pi(\tau) - g_\pi(\hat{\tau}) = \sum_{k=1}^n (g_r(\tilde{t}_k) - g_r(\tilde{t}_{k-1})) (\mathbf{1}_{[\tilde{t}_k, T] \times [-1, \tilde{t}_k)}(\tau, \hat{\tau}) - \mathbf{1}_{[-1, \tilde{t}_k) \times [\tilde{t}_k, T]}(\tau, \hat{\tau}))$$

for all $\tau, \hat{\tau} \in [-1, T]$. Therefore, by using Lemma 14 and the notation $\kappa_{i,j}$ as defined in (8), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{-1}^T \int_{-1}^T \rho^{i,j}(\tau, \hat{\tau}) \|g_\pi(\tau) - g_\pi(\hat{\tau})\|_X \, d\tau \, d\hat{\tau} \\ & \leq \sum_{k=1}^n \|g_r(\tilde{t}_k) - g_r(\tilde{t}_{k-1})\|_X \kappa_{i,j}(\tilde{t}_k) \\ & \leq \sqrt{(t_i - \hat{t}_j)^2 + |\pi_\theta|t_i + |\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|\hat{t}_j} \cdot \sum_{k=1}^n \|g_r(\tilde{t}_k) - g_r(\tilde{t}_{k-1})\|_X \\ & \leq \sqrt{(t_i - \hat{t}_j)^2 + |\pi_\theta|t_i + |\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|\hat{t}_j} \cdot \text{Var}(g_r). \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Note also that by Lemma 10 and Remark 11 we have

$$\int_{-1}^T \rho^{i,j}(\tau, \hat{\tau}) \, d\hat{\tau} \leq \hat{t}_j \vee 1$$

for all $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{-1}^T \int_{-1}^T \rho^{i,j}(\tau, \hat{\tau}) \|g(\tau) - g_\pi(\tau)\|_X \, d\hat{\tau} \, d\tau \\ & = \int_{-1}^T \int_{-1}^T \rho^{i,j}(\tau, \hat{\tau}) \, d\hat{\tau} \|g_r(\tau) - g_\pi(\tau)\|_X \, d\tau \\ & \leq (\hat{t}_j \vee 1) \int_{-1}^T \|g_r(\tau) - g_\pi(\tau)\|_X \, d\tau \\ & = (\hat{t}_j \vee 1) \sum_{k=1}^n \int_{\tilde{t}_{k-1}}^{\tilde{t}_k} \|g_r(\tau) - g_\pi(\tau)\|_X \, d\tau \\ & = (\hat{t}_j \vee 1) \sum_{k=1}^n \int_{\tilde{t}_{k-1}}^{\tilde{t}_k} \|g_r(\tau) - g_r(\tilde{t}_k)\|_X \, d\tau \\ & \leq (\hat{t}_j \vee 1) \sum_{k=1}^n \int_{\tilde{t}_{k-1}}^{\tilde{t}_k} \text{Var}(g_r|_{[\tilde{t}_{k-1}, \tilde{t}_k]}) \, d\tau \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq |\pi|(\hat{t}_j \vee 1) \sum_{k=1}^n \text{Var}(g_r|_{[\tilde{t}_{k-1}, \tilde{t}_k]}) \\
&= |\pi|(\hat{t}_j \vee 1) \text{Var}(g_r).
\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

and analogously

$$\int_{-1}^T \int_{-1}^T \rho^{i,j}(\tau, \hat{\tau}) \|g(\hat{\tau}) - g_\pi(\hat{\tau})\|_X \, d\hat{\tau} \, d\tau \leq |\pi|(t_i \vee 1) \text{Var}(g_r). \tag{13}$$

Combining (11), (12) and (13) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{-1}^T \int_{-1}^T \rho^{i,j}(\tau, \hat{\tau}) \|g(\tau) - g(\hat{\tau})\|_X \, d\hat{\tau} \, d\tau \\
&\leq \int_{-1}^T \int_{-1}^T \rho^{i,j}(\tau, \hat{\tau}) (\|g(\tau) - g_\pi(\tau)\|_X + \|g_\pi(\tau) - g_\pi(\hat{\tau})\|_X + \|g_\pi(\hat{\tau}) - g(\hat{\tau})\|_X) \, d\hat{\tau} \, d\tau \\
&\leq \sqrt{(t_i - \hat{t}_j)^2 + |\pi_\theta|t_i + |\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|\hat{t}_j} \cdot \text{Var}(g_r) + (t_i \vee 1)|\pi| \text{Var}(g_r) + (\hat{t}_j \vee 1)|\pi| \text{Var}(g_r).
\end{aligned}$$

Taking the infimum over all partitions π of $[-1, T]$ and over all representatives g_r of g completes the proof. \square

3.3 An explicit upper bound

We are now able to state an upper bound for $\|u_\theta(t_i) - u_{\hat{\theta}}(\hat{t}_j)\|_X$, which only depends on the mesh sizes $|\pi_\theta|$, $|\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|$, the given data of the discretizations u_θ^0 , $u_{\hat{\theta}}^0$, f_θ and $f_{\hat{\theta}}$ as well as some arbitrary $(u, v) \in A$ and $g \in BV(0, T; X)$.

Theorem 16. *Let $A \subseteq X \times X$ be accretive of type $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $\theta, \hat{\theta}$ be discretizations, let $u_\theta \in C([0, T]; X)$ be a solution of the implicit Euler scheme (E_θ) and let $u_{\hat{\theta}}$ be a solution of $(E_{\hat{\theta}})$. If $(|\pi_\theta| \vee |\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|)\omega < 1$, then for all $(u, v) \in A$, $g \in BV(0, T; X)$ and all $i \in \{0, \dots, N\}$ and $j \in \{0, \dots, \hat{N}\}$,*

$$\begin{aligned}
\|u_\theta(t_i) - u_{\hat{\theta}}(\hat{t}_j)\|_X &\leq \exp(\varphi((|\pi_\theta| \vee |\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|)\omega)(t_i + \hat{t}_j)\omega^+) \left(\|u_\theta^0 - u\|_X + \|u_{\hat{\theta}}^0 - u\|_X \right. \\
&\quad + \int_0^{t_i} \|f_\theta(\tau) - g(\tau)\|_X \, d\tau + \int_0^{\hat{t}_j} \|f_{\hat{\theta}}(\hat{\tau}) - g(\hat{\tau})\|_X \, d\hat{\tau} \\
&\quad \left. + \sqrt{(t_i - \hat{t}_j)^2 + |\pi_\theta|t_i + |\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|\hat{t}_j} \cdot (\text{essVar}(g) + \|g(0+) - v\|_X) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. We first apply Lemma 8 with $\tilde{g} \in BV(-1, T; X)$ defined by

$$\tilde{g}(\tau) = \begin{cases} v & \text{if } \tau < 0, \\ g(\tau) & \text{if } \tau \geq 0, \end{cases}$$

which gives us

$$\begin{aligned}
a_{i,j} \leq & \exp(\varphi((|\pi_\theta| \vee |\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|)\omega)(t_i + \hat{t}_j)\omega^+) \left(\|u_\theta^0 - u\|_X + \|u_{\hat{\theta}}^0 - u\|_X \right. \\
& + \int_0^{t_i} \|f_\theta(\tau) - g(\tau)\|_X \, d\tau + \int_0^{\hat{t}_j} \|f_{\hat{\theta}}(\hat{\tau}) - g(\hat{\tau})\|_X \, d\hat{\tau} \\
& \left. + \int_{-1}^T \int_{-1}^T \rho^{i,j}(\tau, \hat{\tau}) \|\tilde{g}(\tau) - \tilde{g}(\hat{\tau})\|_X \, d\hat{\tau} \, d\tau \right).
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 15, we have

$$\int_{-1}^T \int_{-1}^T \rho^{i,j}(\tau, \hat{\tau}) \|\tilde{g}(\tau) - \tilde{g}(\hat{\tau})\|_X \, d\hat{\tau} \, d\tau \leq \sqrt{(t_i - \hat{t}_j)^2 + |\pi_\theta|t_i + |\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|\hat{t}_j} \cdot \text{essVar}(\tilde{g}).$$

Since $\text{essVar}(\tilde{g}) = \text{essVar}(g) + \|g(0+) - v\|_X$, this completes the proof. \square

Remark 17 (Properties of φ). Recall that $\varphi: (-\infty, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is given by

$$\varphi(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{-\log(1-x)}{x} & \text{if } x \neq 0, \\ 1 & \text{if } x = 0. \end{cases}$$

Having the limit

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \varphi(x) = 1$$

is quite advantageous when the mesh size tends to 0. Note that for $-1 \leq x < 1$ we have the series representation

$$\varphi(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{x^k}{k+1} = 1 + \frac{x}{2} + \frac{x^2}{3} + \frac{x^3}{4} + \dots.$$

By using $\varphi(x) \leq 2$ for $0 \leq x \leq \frac{1}{2}$, we can see, that Theorem 16 is a generalization of the result by Kobayashi [11, Lemma 2.1].

Theorem 18 (Kobayashi 1975). *If $(|\pi_\theta| \vee |\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|)\omega \leq \frac{1}{2}$, then for all $(u, v) \in A$ and all $i \in \{0, \dots, N\}$ and $j \in \{0, \dots, \hat{N}\}$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
\|u_\theta(t_i) - u_{\hat{\theta}}(\hat{t}_j)\|_X \leq & \exp(2(t_i + \hat{t}_j)\omega^+) \left(\|u_\theta^0 - u\|_X + \|u_{\hat{\theta}}^0 - u\|_X + \int_0^T \|f_\theta(\tau)\|_X \, d\tau \right. \\
& \left. + \int_0^T \|f_{\hat{\theta}}(\hat{\tau})\|_X \, d\hat{\tau} + \sqrt{(t_i - \hat{t}_j)^2 + |\pi_\theta|t_i + |\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|\hat{t}_j} \cdot \|v\|_X \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Apply Theorem 16 with $g = 0$ and use $\varphi(x) \leq 2$ for $0 \leq x \leq \frac{1}{2}$. \square

Remark 19. Note that Theorem 16 only evaluates u_θ and $u_{\hat{\theta}}$ at time points in the partitions π_θ and $\pi_{\hat{\theta}}$. Therefore, Theorem 16 is also true, if the solutions to Euler schemes were defined to be piecewise constant. The following version of our main result however uses our definition of piecewise affine solutions of Euler schemes to give an upper bound for $\|u_\theta(t) - u_{\hat{\theta}}(\hat{t})\|_X$ for all $t, \hat{t} \in [0, T]$.

Theorem 20. Let $A \subseteq X \times X$ be accretive of type $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $\theta, \hat{\theta}$ be discretizations, let $u_\theta \in C([0, T]; X)$ be a solution of the implicit Euler scheme (E_θ) and let $u_{\hat{\theta}}$ be a solution of $(E_{\hat{\theta}})$. If $(|\pi_\theta| \vee |\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|)\omega < 1$, then for all $(u, v) \in A$, $g \in BV(0, T; X)$ and all $t, \hat{t} \in [0, T]$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|u_\theta(t) - u_{\hat{\theta}}(\hat{t})\|_X \\ & \leq \exp(\varphi((|\pi_\theta| \vee |\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|)\omega)(\lceil t \rceil_{\pi_\theta} + \lceil \hat{t} \rceil_{\pi_{\hat{\theta}}})\omega^+) \left(\|u_\theta^0 - u\|_X + \|u_{\hat{\theta}}^0 - u\|_X \right. \\ & \quad + \int_0^{\lceil t \rceil_{\pi_\theta}} \|f_\theta(\tau) - g(\tau)\|_X \, d\tau + \int_0^{\lceil \hat{t} \rceil_{\pi_{\hat{\theta}}}} \|f_{\hat{\theta}}(\hat{\tau}) - g(\hat{\tau})\|_X \, d\hat{\tau} \\ & \quad \left. + \sqrt{(|t - \hat{t}| + |\pi_\theta| + |\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|)^2 + |\pi_\theta|t + |\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|\hat{t}} \cdot (\text{essVar}(g) + \|g(0+) - v\|_X) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Choose $i \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}$ and $j \in \{0, \dots, \hat{N}-1\}$, such that $t \in [t_i, t_{i+1}]$ and $\hat{t} \in [\hat{t}_j, \hat{t}_{j+1}]$, so there exist $\lambda, \hat{\lambda} \in [0, 1]$ such that $t = \lambda t_i + (1-\lambda)t_{i+1}$ and $\hat{t} = \hat{\lambda}\hat{t}_j + (1-\hat{\lambda})\hat{t}_{j+1}$. Since u_θ and $u_{\hat{\theta}}$ are piecewise affine, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_\theta(t) - u_{\hat{\theta}}(\hat{t})\|_X & = \|\lambda u_\theta(t_i) + (1-\lambda)u_\theta(t_{i+1}) - \hat{\lambda}u_{\hat{\theta}}(\hat{t}_j) - (1-\hat{\lambda})u_{\hat{\theta}}(\hat{t}_{j+1})\|_X \\ & \leq \lambda \left(\hat{\lambda}a_{i,j} + (1-\hat{\lambda})a_{i,j+1} \right) + (1-\lambda) \left(\hat{\lambda}a_{i+1,j} + (1-\hat{\lambda})a_{i+1,j+1} \right). \end{aligned}$$

For $k \in \{i, i+1\}$ and $\ell \in \{j, j+1\}$, we can use Theorem 16 to get an upper bound for $a_{k,\ell}$. Note that $t_k \leq \lceil t \rceil_{\pi_\theta}$ and $\hat{t}_\ell \leq \lceil \hat{t} \rceil_{\pi_{\hat{\theta}}}$. By using $|t_k - \hat{t}_\ell| \leq |t - \hat{t}| + |\pi_\theta| + |\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|$ and the concavity of the square root function, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \lambda \hat{\lambda} \sqrt{(t_i - \hat{t}_j)^2 + |\pi_\theta|t_i + |\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|\hat{t}_j} + \lambda(1-\hat{\lambda}) \sqrt{(t_i - \hat{t}_{j+1})^2 + |\pi_\theta|t_i + |\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|\hat{t}_{j+1}} \\ & \quad + (1-\lambda) \hat{\lambda} \sqrt{(t_{i+1} - \hat{t}_j)^2 + |\pi_\theta|t_{i+1} + |\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|\hat{t}_j} \\ & \quad + (1-\lambda)(1-\hat{\lambda}) \sqrt{(t_{i+1} - \hat{t}_{j+1})^2 + |\pi_\theta|t_{i+1} + |\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|\hat{t}_{j+1}} \\ & \leq \left((|t - \hat{t}| + |\pi_\theta| + |\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|)^2 + \lambda \hat{\lambda} (|\pi_\theta|t_i + |\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|\hat{t}_j) + \lambda(1-\hat{\lambda})(|\pi_\theta|t_i + |\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|\hat{t}_{j+1}) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + (1-\lambda) \hat{\lambda} (|\pi_\theta|t_{i+1} + |\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|\hat{t}_j) + (1-\lambda)(1-\hat{\lambda})(|\pi_\theta|t_{i+1} + |\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|\hat{t}_{j+1}) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & = \sqrt{(|t - \hat{t}| + |\pi_\theta| + |\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|)^2 + |\pi_\theta|t + |\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|\hat{t}}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

Corollary 21 (Distance in $C([0, T]; X)$). If $(|\pi_\theta| \vee |\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|)\omega < 1$, then for all $(u, v) \in A$ and $g \in BV(0, T; X)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_\theta - u_{\hat{\theta}}\|_{C([0, T]; X)} & \leq \exp(\varphi((|\pi_\theta| \vee |\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|)\omega)2T\omega^+) \left(\|u_\theta^0 - u\|_X + \|u_{\hat{\theta}}^0 - u\|_X \right. \\ & \quad + \|f_\theta - g\|_{L^1(0, T; X)} + \|f_{\hat{\theta}} - g\|_{L^1(0, T; X)} \\ & \quad \left. + \sqrt{(|\pi_\theta| + |\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|)^2 + |\pi_\theta|T + |\pi_{\hat{\theta}}|T} \cdot (\text{essVar}(g) + \|g(0+) - v\|_X) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Use Theorem 20 and choose $t = \hat{t}$. Using $t \leq \lceil t \rceil_{\pi_\theta} \leq T$ as well as $\hat{t} \leq \lceil \hat{t} \rceil_{\pi_{\hat{\theta}}} \leq T$ yields the desired result. \square

4 Applications

In this section we show how our results can be used to establish existence and uniqueness of Euler solutions for the Cauchy problem (CP: f, u^0) as well as showing some properties of the Euler solution.

Theorem 22. *Let $A \subseteq X \times X$ be quasi-accretive, $f \in L^1(0, T; X)$ and $u^0 \in \overline{\text{dom } A}$. If there exists a sequence of discretizations (θ_n) of the form $\theta_n = (\pi_{\theta_n}, f_{\theta_n}, u_{\theta_n}^0)$ satisfying*

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\pi_{\theta_n}| &= 0, \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f_{\theta_n} - f\|_{L^1(0, T; X)} &= 0, \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|u_{\theta_n}^0 - u^0\|_X &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

and if the implicit Euler scheme (E_{θ_n}) has a solution for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then there exists a unique Euler solution of the Cauchy problem (CP: f, u^0).

Proof. Let A be accretive of type $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$. Let the sequence (θ_n) be as in the assumption. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let $u_n \in C([0, T]; X)$ be a solution of the implicit Euler scheme (E_{θ_n}) , which exists by assumption. Since $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\pi_{\theta_n}| = 0$, there exists an $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $|\pi_{\theta_n}| \omega < 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq n_0}$. By Corollary 21, for every $n, m \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq n_0}$, every $(\hat{u}, \hat{v}) \in A$ and every $g \in BV(0, T; X)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\|u_n - u_m\|_{C([0, T]; X)} \\ &\leq \exp(\varphi(|\pi_{\theta_n}| \vee |\pi_{\theta_m}|) \omega) 2T \omega^+ \left(\|u_{\theta_n}^0 - \hat{u}\|_X + \|u_{\theta_m}^0 - \hat{u}\|_X \right. \\ &\quad + \|f_{\theta_n} - g\|_{L^1(0, T; X)} + \|f_{\theta_m} - g\|_{L^1(0, T; X)} \\ &\quad \left. + \sqrt{(|\pi_{\theta_n}| + |\pi_{\theta_m}|)^2 + |\pi_{\theta_n}|T + |\pi_{\theta_m}|T} \cdot (\text{essVar}(g) + \|g(0+) - \hat{v}\|_X) \right). \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence,

$$\limsup_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} \|u_n - u_m\|_{C([0, T]; X)} \leq 2e^{2T\omega^+} \left(\|u^0 - \hat{u}\|_X + \|f - g\|_{L^1(0, T; X)} \right).$$

Since $\text{dom } A$ is dense in its closure and $BV(0, T; X)$ is dense in $L^1(0, T; X)$, the right hand side can be made arbitrarily small, and it follows that (u_n) is a Cauchy sequence and hence convergent in $C([0, T]; X)$. By definition, the limit u is an Euler solution of the Cauchy problem (CP: f, u^0), and we have proved existence.

Now let $u, \hat{u} \in C([0, T]; X)$ be two Euler solutions of (CP: f, u^0). Then there are sequences of discretizations $(\theta_n)_n = ((\pi_{\theta_n}, f_{\theta_n}, u_{\theta_n}^0))_n$ and $(\hat{\theta}_n)_n = ((\pi_{\hat{\theta}_n}, f_{\hat{\theta}_n}, u_{\hat{\theta}_n}^0))_n$ with

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\pi_{\theta_n}| &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\pi_{\hat{\theta}_n}| = 0, \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f_{\theta_n} - f\|_{L^1(0, T; X)} &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f_{\hat{\theta}_n} - f\|_{L^1(0, T; X)} = 0, \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|u_{\theta_n}^0 - u^0\|_X &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|u_{\hat{\theta}_n}^0 - u^0\|_X = 0 \end{aligned}$$

and there are sequences $(u_n)_n$ and $(\hat{u}_n)_n$ in $C([0, T]; X)$, such that u_n is a solution of (E_{θ_n}) and \hat{u}_n is a solution of $(E_{\hat{\theta}_n})$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|u_n - u\|_{C([0, T]; X)} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\hat{u}_n - \hat{u}\|_{C([0, T]; X)} = 0.$$

Since $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\pi_{\theta_n}| = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\pi_{\hat{\theta}_n}| = 0$, there is an $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $(|\pi_{\theta_n}| \vee |\pi_{\hat{\theta}_n}|)\omega < 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq n_0}$. By Corollary 21, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq n_0}$, every $(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}) \in A$ and every $g \in BV(0, T; X)$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \|u_n - \hat{u}_n\|_{C([0, T]; X)} \\ & \leq \exp\left(\varphi((|\pi_{\theta_n}| \vee |\pi_{\hat{\theta}_n}|)\omega)2T\omega^+\right) \left(\|u_{\theta_n}^0 - \tilde{u}\|_X + \|u_{\hat{\theta}_n}^0 - \tilde{u}\|_X \right. \\ & \quad + \|f_{\theta_n} - g\|_{L^1(0, T; X)} + \|f_{\hat{\theta}_n} - g\|_{L^1(0, T; X)} \\ & \quad \left. + \sqrt{(|\pi_{\theta_n}| + |\pi_{\hat{\theta}_n}|)^2 + |\pi_{\theta_n}|T + |\pi_{\hat{\theta}_n}|T \cdot (\text{essVar}(g) + \|g(0+) - \tilde{v}\|_X)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\|u - \hat{u}\|_{C([0, T]; X)} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|u_n - \hat{u}_n\|_{C([0, T]; X)} \leq 2e^{2T\omega^+} \left(\|u^0 - \tilde{u}\|_X + \|f - g\|_{L^1(0, T; X)} \right).$$

Since $\text{dom } A$ is dense in its closure and $BV(0, T; X)$ is dense in $L^1(0, T; X)$, the right hand side can be made arbitrarily small. Thus, $u = \hat{u}$ and we have proved uniqueness. \square

We are now able to establish the wellposedness of $(\text{CP}: f, u^0)$ as shown by Crandall and Evans in [6] as well as the estimates (14) and (15).

Theorem 23. *Let $A \subseteq X \times X$ be m -accretive of type $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$. Then for every $f \in L^1(0, T; X)$ and for every $u^0 \in \overline{\text{dom } A}$ there exists a unique Euler solution $u \in C([0, T]; X)$ of $(\text{CP}: f, u^0)$.*

If for $(\hat{u}, \hat{v}) \in A$ we define $f_{\hat{v}} \in L^1(-T, T; X)$ by

$$f_{\hat{v}}(\tau) := \begin{cases} f(\tau) & \text{if } \tau \geq 0, \\ \hat{v} & \text{if } \tau < 0, \end{cases}$$

then, for all $t, \hat{t} \in [0, T]$,

$$\|u(t) - u(\hat{t})\|_X \leq \left(e^{t\omega} + e^{\hat{t}\omega} \right) \|u^0 - \hat{u}\|_X + \int_0^{t \vee \hat{t}} e^{\tau\omega} \|f_{\hat{v}}(t - \tau) - f_{\hat{v}}(\hat{t} - \tau)\|_X d\tau. \quad (14)$$

Moreover, if $f, \hat{f} \in L^1(0, T; X)$ and $u^0, \hat{u}^0 \in \overline{\text{dom } A}$, u is the Euler solution of $(\text{CP}: f, u^0)$ and \hat{u} is the Euler solution of $(\text{CP}: \hat{f}, \hat{u}^0)$, then, for every $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\|u(t) - \hat{u}(t)\|_X \leq e^{t\omega} \|u^0 - \hat{u}^0\|_X + \int_0^t e^{(t-s)\omega} [u(s) - \hat{u}(s), f(s) - \hat{f}(s)] ds. \quad (15)$$

Proof. Let (θ_n) be a sequence of discretizations of the form $\theta_n = (\pi_{\theta_n}, f_{\theta_n}, u_{\theta_n}^0)$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |\pi_{\theta_n}| \omega < 1, \\ & \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\pi_{\theta_n}| = 0, \\ & \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f_{\theta_n} - f\|_{L^1(0, T; X)} = 0 \quad \text{and} \\ & \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|u_{\theta_n}^0 - u^0\|_X = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Note that such a sequence exists for every $f \in L^1(0, T; X)$ since step functions are dense in $L^1(0, T; X)$. Specifically, one could choose the conditional expectation

$$f_{\theta_n}(t) := \frac{1}{t_{i+1} - t_i} \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} f(\tau) d\tau$$

for $t \in [t_i, t_{i+1})$, $i \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}$. Since A is m -accretive and $|\pi_{\theta_n}| \omega < 1$, the Euler scheme (E_{θ_n}) has a solution for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, so by Theorem 22, the Cauchy problem (CP: f, u^0) has a unique Euler solution.

To prove (14), we take a sequence of discretizations $(\hat{\theta}_n)$ of the form

$$\hat{\theta}_n = (\pi_n : 0 = \frac{0}{n}T < \frac{1}{n}T < \dots < \frac{n}{n}T = T, f_n, u^0),$$

such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f_n - f\|_{L^1(0, T; X)} = 0.$$

For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let $u_n \in C([0, T]; X)$ be the solution of the corresponding Euler scheme $(E_{\hat{\theta}_n})$. By Lemma 6, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_{>\omega T}$, every $(\hat{u}, \hat{v}) \in A$ and all $t_i^n, t_j^n \in \pi_n$

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_n(t_i^n) - u_n(t_j^n)\|_X &\leq \exp(\varphi(|\pi_n| \omega) t_i^n \omega) \|u^0 - \hat{u}\|_X + \exp(\varphi(|\pi_n| \omega) t_j^n \omega) \|u^0 - \hat{u}\|_X \\ &\quad + \int_0^{|t_i^n - t_j^n|} \exp(\varphi(|\pi_n| \omega)) ((t_i^n \vee t_j^n) - \lfloor \tau \rfloor_{\pi_n}) \omega \|f_n(\tau) - \hat{v}\|_X \, d\tau \\ &\quad + \int_0^{t_i^n \wedge t_j^n} \exp(\varphi(|\pi_n| \omega)) ((t_i^n \wedge t_j^n) - \lfloor \tau \rfloor_{\pi_n}) \omega \\ &\quad \quad \|f_n(\tau + (t_i^n - t_j^n)^+) - f_n(\tau + (t_j^n - t_i^n)^+)\|_X \, d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $t_i^n \rightarrow t$ and $t_j^n \rightarrow \hat{t}$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|u(t) - u(\hat{t})\|_X &\leq (e^{t\omega} + e^{\hat{t}\omega}) \|u^0 - \hat{u}\|_X + \int_0^{|t - \hat{t}|} e^{((t \vee \hat{t}) - \tau)\omega} \|f(\tau) - \hat{v}\|_X \, d\tau \\ &\quad + \int_0^{t_i \wedge \hat{t}_j} e^{((t \wedge \hat{t}) - \tau)\omega} \|f(\tau + (t - \hat{t})^+) - f(\tau + (\hat{t} - t)^+)\|_X \\ &= (e^{t\omega} + e^{\hat{t}\omega}) \|u^0 - \hat{u}\|_X + \int_0^{t \vee \hat{t}} e^{\tau\omega} \|f_{\hat{v}}(t - \tau) - f_{\hat{v}}(\hat{t} - \tau)\|_X \, d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

To prove (15), we take two sequences of discretizations (θ_n) and $(\hat{\theta}_n)$ of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_n &= (\pi_n : 0 = \frac{0}{n}T < \frac{1}{n}T < \dots < \frac{n}{n}T = T, f_n, u_n^0) \quad \text{and} \\ \hat{\theta}_n &= (\pi_n, \hat{f}_n, \hat{u}_n^0) \end{aligned}$$

such that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f_n - f\|_{L^1(0, T; X)} &= 0, \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\hat{f}_n - \hat{f}\|_{L^1(0, T; X)} &= 0, \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|u_n^0 - u^0\|_X &= 0 \quad \text{and} \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\hat{u}_n^0 - \hat{u}^0\|_X &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Let $u_n \in C([0, T]; X)$ be the solution of the corresponding Euler scheme (E_{θ_n}) and let $\hat{u}_n \in C([0, T]; X)$ be the solution of $(E_{\hat{\theta}_n})$. By Lemma 6, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_{>\omega T}$, every $(\hat{u}, \hat{v}) \in A$ and all $t_i^n \in \pi_n$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_n(t_i^n) - \hat{u}_n(t_i^n)\|_X &\leq \exp(\varphi(|\pi_n| \omega) t_i^n \omega) (\|u^0 - \hat{u}\|_X + \|u^0 - \hat{u}\|_X) \\ &\quad + \int_0^{t_i^n} \exp(\varphi(|\pi_n| \omega)) (t_i^n - \lfloor \tau \rfloor_{\pi_n}) \omega \|f_n(\tau) - \hat{f}_n(\tau)\|_X \, d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and $t_i^n \rightarrow t$ yields

$$\|u(t) - \hat{u}(t)\|_X \leq e^{t\omega} \|u^0 - \hat{u}^0\|_X + \int_0^t e^{(t-s)\omega} [u(s) - \hat{u}(s), f(s) - \hat{f}(s)] ds.$$

This completes the proof. \square

Theorem 24 (Crandall-Liggett [7]). *Let $A \subseteq X \times X$ and $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$. Suppose that A is accretive of type ω and that A satisfies the range condition. Then for every initial value $u^0 \in \overline{\text{dom } A}$ the Cauchy problem (CP: $0, u^0$) admits a unique Euler solution $u \in C([0, T]; X)$. Moreover, if u is an Euler solution for initial value $u^0 \in \overline{\text{dom } A}$ and \hat{u} is an Euler solution for initial value $\hat{u}^0 \in \overline{\text{dom } A}$, then, for every $t \in [0, T]$,*

$$\|u(t) - \hat{u}(t)\|_X \leq e^{\omega t} \|u^0 - \hat{u}^0\|_X.$$

If, in addition, $u^0 \in \text{dom } A$, then u is Lipschitz continuous with Lipschitz constant $e^{\omega T} |Au^0|$.

Proof. The existence and uniqueness of solutions, as well as the stability estimate, are proved in the same way as in the proof of Theorem 23. The only difference is the existence of solutions of appropriate implicit Euler schemes. For zero right hand sides and for initial values $u^0 \in \overline{\text{dom } A}$, this existence follows from the range condition. \square

Definition 25. For any $B \subseteq X$ we define the *set norm*

$$|B| := \inf_{x \in B} \|x\|_X.$$

Let $A \subseteq X \times X$. For $x \in X$ we define

$$|x|_A := \liminf_{\hat{x} \rightarrow x} |A\hat{x}| = \sup_{r > 0} \inf_{\hat{x} \in B(x, r)} |A\hat{x}|,$$

where $B(x, r) := \{\hat{x} \in X : \|x - \hat{x}\|_X \leq r\}$. The set

$$\widetilde{\text{dom } A} := \{x \in X : |x|_A < \infty\}$$

is called the *generalized domain of A* .

Remark 26. Let $A \subseteq X \times X$. Since $|x|_A = \liminf_{\hat{x} \rightarrow x} |A\hat{x}| \leq |Ax|$ for all $x \in X$ and $|x|_A = \infty$ if $x \notin \overline{\text{dom } A}$, we have

$$\text{dom } A \subseteq \widetilde{\text{dom } A} \subseteq \overline{\text{dom } A}.$$

Lemma 27. *Let $A \subseteq X \times X$ and $u, x \in X$. Then $|u|_{A+x} \leq |u|_A + \|x\|_X$.*

Proof. As a direct consequence of Definition 25, we get

$$\begin{aligned} |u|_{A+x} &= \liminf_{\hat{x} \rightarrow x} |A\hat{x} + x| \\ &= \liminf_{\hat{x} \rightarrow x} \inf_{v \in A\hat{x}} \|v + x\|_X \\ &\leq \liminf_{\hat{x} \rightarrow x} \inf_{v \in A\hat{x}} (\|v\|_X + \|x\|_X) \\ &= \liminf_{\hat{x} \rightarrow x} |A\hat{x}| + \|x\|_X \\ &= |u|_A + \|x\|_X. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

Corollary 28. Let $A \subseteq X \times X$ be m -accretive of type $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$, $f \in BV(0, T; X)$, $u^0 \in \widetilde{\text{dom}} A$ and $u \in C([0, T]; X)$ be the Euler solution of $(\text{CP}: f, u^0)$. Then u is Lipschitz continuous with Lipschitz constant

$$e^{T\omega^+} (|u^0|_{A-f(0+)} + \text{essVar}(f)).$$

Proof. Let (u_n, v_n) be a sequence in A with

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|u_n - u^0\|_X &= 0 \quad \text{and} \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|v_n - f(0+)\|_X &= \liminf_{\hat{u} \rightarrow u^0} |A\hat{u} - f(0+)| = |u^0|_{A-f(0+)}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $t, \hat{t} \in [0, T]$. By Theorem 23, we can use (14) and get

$$\begin{aligned} \|u(t) - u(\hat{t})\|_X &\leq (e^{t\omega} + e^{\hat{t}\omega}) \|u^0 - u_n\|_X + \int_0^{t \vee \hat{t}} e^{\tau\omega} \|f_{v_n}(t - \tau) - f_{v_n}(\hat{t} - \tau)\|_X \, d\tau \\ &\leq e^{T\omega^+} \left(2\|u^0 - u_n\|_X + \int_0^{t \vee \hat{t}} \|f_{v_n}(t - \tau) - f_{v_n}(\hat{t} - \tau)\|_X \, d\tau \right) \\ &\leq e^{T\omega^+} (2\|u^0 - u_n\|_X + \text{essVar}(f_{v_n})|t - \hat{t}|) \\ &= e^{T\omega^+} (2\|u^0 - u_n\|_X + (\|v_n - f(0+)\|_X + \text{essVar}(f))|t - \hat{t}|) \end{aligned}$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Here we used Lemma 35 to estimate the integral term. Taking the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$ we get

$$\|u(t) - u(\hat{t})\|_X \leq e^{T\omega^+} (|u^0|_{A-f(0+)} + \text{essVar}(f)) |t - \hat{t}|.$$

This completes the proof. \square

Definition 29. A Banach space X has the *Radon-Nikodym property* if

$$\text{Lip}(0, T; X) = W^{1, \infty}(0, T; X).$$

Example 30. Every reflexive Banach space (and therefore every Hilbert space) and every separable dual space has the Radon-Nikodym property [8].

Definition 31. A function $u \in W^{1,1}(0, T; X)$ is a *strong solution* of $(\text{CP}: f, u^0)$, if $u(0) = u^0$ and

$$\dot{u}(t) + Au(t) \ni f(t) \quad \text{for almost every } t \in [0, T].$$

A function $u \in C([0, T]; X)$ is a *mild solution* of $(\text{CP}: f, u^0)$, if there exist sequences (u_n) in $W^{1,1}(0, T; X)$, (f_n) in $L^1(0, T; X)$ and (u_n^0) in X , such that u_n is a strong solution of $(\text{CP}: f_n, u_n^0)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f_n - f\|_{L^1(0, T; X)} &= 0, \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|u_n^0 - u^0\|_X &= 0 \quad \text{and} \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|u_n - u\|_{C([0, T]; X)} &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Corollary 32. Let X be a Banach space, which has the Radon-Nikodym property, and let $A \subseteq X \times X$ be quasi- m -accretive. Then the following statements are true.

- (a) For every $f \in BV(0, T; X)$ and every $u^0 \in \widetilde{\text{dom}} A$ every Euler solution of $(\text{CP}: f, u^0)$ is a strong solution of $(\text{CP}: f, u^0)$.

(b) For every $f \in L^1(0, T; X)$ and every $u^0 \in \overline{\text{dom } A}$ every Euler solution of $(\text{CP}: f, u^0)$ is a mild solution of $(\text{CP}: f, u^0)$.

Proof. Let X be a Banach space, which has the Radon-Nikodym property, and let $A \subseteq X \times X$ be m -accretive of type $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$.

Let $f \in BV(0, T; X)$, $u^0 \in \widetilde{\text{dom } A}$ and u be the Euler solution of $(\text{CP}: f, u^0)$. Then by Corollary 28, $u \in Lip(0, T; X) = W^{1, \infty}(0, T; X)$. By [2], u is a strong solution of $(\text{CP}: f, u^0)$.

Now let $f \in L^1(0, T; X)$, $u^0 \in \overline{\text{dom } A}$ and u be the Euler solution of $(\text{CP}: f, u^0)$. Since $BV(0, T; X)$ is dense in $L^1(0, T; X)$ and $\widetilde{\text{dom } A}$ is dense in $\overline{\text{dom } A}$, there exist sequences (f_n) in $BV(0, T; X)$ and (u_n^0) in $\text{dom } A$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f_n - f\|_{L^1(0, T; X)} &= 0 \quad \text{and} \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|u_n^0 - u^0\|_X &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let u_n be the Euler solution of $(\text{CP}: f, u_n^0)$. By Corollary 32 (a), u_n is a strong solution of $(\text{CP}: f, u_n^0)$ and by Theorem 23,

$$\|u_n - u\|_{C([0, T]; X)} \leq e^{T\omega^+} \left(\|u_n^0 - u^0\|_X + \|f_n - f\|_{L^1(0, T; X)} \right).$$

Therefore,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|u_n - u\|_{C([0, T]; X)} = 0$$

and u is a mild solution of $(\text{CP}: f, u^0)$. □

A Functions of bounded variation

In this appendix, we show some well known results concerning functions of bounded variation. Let X be a Banach space with norm $\|\cdot\|_X$ and $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ with $a < b$.

Definition 33. A function $f: [a, b] \rightarrow X$ is of *bounded pointwise variation*, if

$$\text{Var}(f) := \sup \left\{ \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \|f(t_{k+1}) - f(t_k)\|_X : n \in \mathbb{N}, t_0, \dots, t_n \in [a, b], t_0 < \dots < t_n \right\} < \infty$$

and f is of *bounded (essential) variation*, if

$$\text{essVar}(f) := \inf \{ \text{Var}(g) \mid g: [a, b] \rightarrow X, f(t) = g(t) \text{ for a.e. } t \in I \} < \infty.$$

For $f \in L^1(a, b; X)$ we define $\text{essVar}(f) := \text{essVar}(f_r)$, where $f_r: [a, b] \rightarrow X$ is a representative of f . We denote the space of all functions in $L^1(a, b; X)$ with bounded essential variation by $BV(a, b; X)$ and endow it with the norm

$$\|f\|_{BV(a, b; X)} := \|f\|_{L^1(a, b; X)} + \text{essVar}(f). \quad (16)$$

Lemma 34. If $f: [a, b] \rightarrow X$ is of bounded pointwise variation, then f has a limit from the right $f(t+)$ at every $t \in [a, b)$ and a limit from the left $f(t-)$ at every $t \in (a, b]$ and

$$f(t+) = f(t-) = f(t) \quad (17)$$

for all $t \in (a, b)$ except on a countable set.

Proof. Let us first assume, that there exists a $t \in [a, b)$, such that the limit from the right $f(t+)$ does not exist. Then there exists a strictly decreasing sequence $(t_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in (t, b) , such that $(\|f(t_{n+1}) - f(t_n)\|_X)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ does not converge to 0. This implies

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \|f(t_{k+1}) - f(t_k)\|_X = \infty,$$

but since f is of bounded pointwise variation, we get

$$\sum_{k=1}^n \|f(t_{k+1}) - f(t_k)\|_X \leq \text{Var}(f)$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. This is a contradiction and therefore $f(t+)$ exists for all $t \in [a, b)$. Analogously $f(t-)$ exists for all $t \in (a, b]$.

To prove, that (17) holds for all $t \in (a, b)$ except on a countable set, we define

$$S_n := \left\{ t \in (a, b) : \|f(t-) - f(t)\|_X + \|f(t) - f(t+)\|_X \geq \frac{1}{n} \right\}$$

for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. For every finite collection of elements $t_1, t_2, \dots, t_N \in S_n$ with $t_1 < t_2 < \dots < t_N$, $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we can choose $a < \hat{t}_1 < \hat{t}_2 < \dots < \hat{t}_{3N} < b$, such that for all $k \in \{1, \dots, N\}$

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{t}_{3k-1} &= t_k, \\ \|f(\hat{t}_{3k-2}) - f(\hat{t}_{3k-1})\|_X &\geq \frac{1}{2} \|f(t_k-) - f(t_k)\|_X \quad \text{and} \\ \|f(\hat{t}_{3k-1}) - f(\hat{t}_{3k})\|_X &\geq \frac{1}{2} \|f(t_k) - f(t_k+)\|_X. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{N}{n} &= \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{1}{n} \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^N (\|f(t_k-) - f(t_k)\|_X + \|f(t_k) - f(t_k+)\|_X) \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{3N} 2(\|f(\hat{t}_{3k-2}) - f(\hat{t}_{3k-1})\|_X + \|f(\hat{t}_{3k-1}) - f(\hat{t}_{3k})\|_X) \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{k=0}^{3N-1} \|f(\hat{t}_{k+1}) - f(\hat{t}_k)\|_X \\ &\leq 2 \text{Var}(f). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $N \leq 2n \text{Var}(f)$, so S_n is finite for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence

$$\{t \in (a, b) : f(t+) \neq f(t) \text{ or } f(t) \neq f(t-)\} = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} S_n$$

is a countable union of finite sets and therefore countable. \square

Lemma 35. Let $f \in BV(a, b; X)$. Then

$$\int_a^{b-h} \|f(\tau + h) - f(\tau)\|_X \, d\tau \leq h \operatorname{essVar}(f)$$

for all $h > 0$.

Proof. Let f_r be a representative of f and let $h > 0$. For $\tau \geq 0$ we set

$$N_\tau := \left\lfloor \frac{b-a-\tau}{h} \right\rfloor \quad \text{and} \\ t_{\tau,k} := \tau + a + kh \quad \text{for } k \in \{0, \dots, N_\tau\}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_a^{b-h} \|f(\tau + h) - f(\tau)\|_X \, d\tau &= \sum_{k=0}^{N_0} \int_{a+kh}^{(a+(k+1)h) \wedge b} \|f_r(\tau + h) - f_r(\tau)\|_X \, d\tau \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{N_0-1} \int_0^h \|f_r(t_{\tau,k+1}) - f_r(t_{\tau,k})\|_X \, d\tau \\ &\quad + \int_0^{b-a-N_0h} \|f_r(t_{\tau,N_\tau}) - f_r(t_{\tau,N_\tau-1})\|_X \, d\tau \\ &= \int_0^h \sum_{k=0}^{N_\tau-1} \|f_r(t_{\tau,k+1}) - f_r(t_{\tau,k})\|_X \, d\tau \\ &\leq \int_0^h \operatorname{Var}(f_r) \, d\tau \\ &= \operatorname{Var}(f_r)h. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the infimum over all representatives f_r of f gives the result. \square

Note that if $f \in BV(a, b; X)$, then f has a representative f_r that is of bounded pointwise variation. By Lemma 34, for every $t \in [a, b)$ the limit from the right $f_r(t+)$ exists. If \widehat{f}_r is also a representative of f that is of bounded pointwise variation, then $f_r - \widehat{f}_r$ is also of bounded pointwise variation and $f_r - \widehat{f}_r = 0$ almost everywhere. Therefore $(f_r - \widehat{f}_r)(t+) = 0$ and hence

$$f_r(t+) = (f_r - \widehat{f}_r)(t+) + \widehat{f}_r(t+) = \widehat{f}_r(t+).$$

We have shown, that $f_r(t+)$ does not depend on the choice of f_r . Therefore the following definition is well-defined.

Definition 36. Let $f \in BV(a, b; X)$ and $t \in [a, b)$. Then

$$f(t+) := f_r(t+),$$

where f_r is a representative of f that is of bounded pointwise variation.

We could replace the L^1 -norm in the definition of the BV -norm (see (16)) by $\|f(a+)\|_X$ and get an equivalent norm. More precisely, we obtain the following lemma.

Lemma 37. *Let $f \in BV(a, b; X)$. Then*

$$\frac{1}{b-a+1} \|f\|_{BV(a,b;X)} \leq \|f(a+)\|_X + \text{essVar}(f) \leq \left(2 \vee \frac{1}{b-a}\right) \|f\|_{BV(a,b;X)}.$$

Proof. Let $f \in BV(a, b; X)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{b-a+1} \|f\|_{BV(a,b;X)} &= \frac{1}{b-a+1} \left(\int_a^b \|f(\tau)\|_X \, d\tau + \text{essVar}(f) \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{b-a+1} \left(\int_a^b (\|f(\tau) - f(a+)\|_X + \|f(a+)\|_X) \, d\tau + \text{essVar}(f) \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{b-a+1} ((b-a) \text{essVar}(f) + \|f(a+)\|_X) + \text{essVar}(f) \\ &\leq \|f(a+)\|_X + \text{essVar}(f) \\ &= \frac{1}{b-a} \int_a^b \|f(a+)\|_X \, d\tau + \text{essVar}(f) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{b-a} \int_a^b (\|f(a+) - f(\tau)\|_X + \|f(\tau)\|_X) \, d\tau + \text{essVar}(f) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{b-a} \left((b-a) \text{essVar}(f) + \|f\|_{L^1(a,b;X)} \right) + \text{essVar}(f) \\ &= \frac{1}{b-a} \|f\|_{L^1(a,b;X)} + 2 \text{essVar}(f) \\ &\leq \left(2 \vee \frac{1}{b-a}\right) \|f\|_{BV(a,b;X)}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

The following theorem is a result from Camille Jordan, who introduced the notion of bounded variation in [10] in 1881.

Theorem 38 (Jordan decomposition). *A function $f: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is of bounded pointwise variation if and only if there exist two increasing functions $f_+, f_-: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, such that*

$$f = f_+ - f_-. \quad (18)$$

Proof. If $f: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is of bounded pointwise variation, then for $t \in [a, b]$ we can define

$$f_+(t) := f(t) + \text{Var}(f|_{[a,t]}) \quad \text{and} \quad f_-(t) := \text{Var}(f|_{[a,t]}).$$

For all $t, \hat{t} \in [a, b]$ with $t < \hat{t}$ we now have

$$\begin{aligned} f_+(t) &= f(\hat{t}) + f(t) - f(\hat{t}) + \text{Var}(f|_{[a,t]}) \\ &\leq f(\hat{t}) + \text{Var}(f|_{[t,\hat{t}]} + \text{Var}(f|_{[a,t]}) \\ &= f_+(\hat{t}). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, f_+ is increasing. Also f_- is increasing and $f = f_+ - f_-$.

To prove the implication in the other direction, note that for any $g, h: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we have

$$\text{Var}(g+h) \leq \text{Var}(g) + \text{Var}(h).$$

If we assume that $f_+, f_- : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are increasing, then

$$\text{Var}(f_+ - f_-) \leq \text{Var}(f_+) + \text{Var}(-f_-) = f_+(b) - f_+(a) + f_-(a) - f_-(b) < \infty,$$

so $f_+ - f_-$ is of bounded pointwise variation. \square

Lemma 39. *If $f \in C^1([a, b])$, then*

$$\text{Var}(f) = \text{essVar}(f) = \int_a^b |f'(\tau)| \, d\tau. \quad (19)$$

Proof. Since f' is continuous, the set $\Omega := \{t \in (a, b) : f'(t) > 0\}$ is open, so there exists a sequence of intervals $(I_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} I_{2n} \text{ is open for all } n \in \mathbb{N}, & & \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} I_{2n} = \Omega, \\ I_{2n-1} \text{ is closed for all } n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and} & & \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} I_{2n-1} = [a, b] \setminus \Omega. \end{aligned}$$

Let $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(b_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be sequences in $[a, b]$ such that

$$I_{2n} = (a_{2n}, b_{2n}) \quad \text{and} \quad I_{2n-1} = [a_{2n-1}, b_{2n-1}]$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Now, $f|_{I_n}$ is monotone and $\text{Var}(f|_{I_n}) = \text{Var}((-f)|_{I_n})$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \int_a^b |f'(\tau)| \, d\tau &= \int_{\Omega} f'(\tau) \, d\tau - \int_{[a, b] \setminus \Omega} f'(\tau) \, d\tau \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\int_{I_{2n}} f'(\tau) \, d\tau - \int_{I_{2n-1}} f'(\tau) \, d\tau \right) \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (f(b_{2n}) - f(a_{2n}) - (f(b_{2n-1}) - f(a_{2n-1}))) \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (\text{Var}(f|_{I_{2n}}) + \text{Var}(f|_{I_{2n-1}})) \\ &= \text{Var}(f). \end{aligned}$$

Since f is continuous, $\text{Var}(f) = \text{essVar}(f)$. \square

Acknowledgment. The author is grateful to Ralph Chill for his valuable insights, thoughtful comments, and constructive suggestions, which have played a significant role in shaping this work.

References

- [1] V. Barbu. *Nonlinear differential equations of monotone types in Banach spaces*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer, New York, 2010.
- [2] Ph. Bénylan, M. G. Crandall, and A. Pazy. *Nonlinear Evolution Equations Governed by Accretive Operators*. Book manuscript, 1999.

- [3] J. Beurich *Euler schemes for accretive operators on Banach spaces*. PhD thesis, TU Dresden, Dresden, 2023.
- [4] J. Beurich and P. Sharma. Interpolation results for convergence of implicit Euler schemes with accretive operators. To be published.
- [5] D. Brézis. *Interpolation et opérateurs non linéaires*. Thèse de doctorat, Université Paris VI, 1974.
- [6] M. G. Crandall and L. C. Evans. On the relation of the operator $\partial/\partial s + \partial/\partial \tau$ to evolution governed by accretive operators. *Israel J. Math.* 21, 261-278 (1975).
- [7] M. G. Crandall and T. M. Liggett. Generation of semi-groups of nonlinear transformations on general Banach spaces. *American Journal of Mathematics* 93, 265-298 (1971)
- [8] J. Diestel and J. J. Uhl Jr. *Vector measures*. Mathematical Surveys, No. 15. American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 1977.
- [9] A. Dufetel. *Interpolation non-linéaire associée à un opérateur m -accretif dans un espace de Banach*. Thèse de doctorat, Université de Franche-Comté, Besançon, 1981.
- [10] C. Jordan. On Fourier series. (Sur la série de Fourier.) *C. R. Acad. Sci., Paris* 92 (1881), 228-230.
- [11] Y. Kobayashi. Difference approximation of Cauchy problems for quasi-dissipative operators and generation of nonlinear semigroups. *J. Math. Soc. Japan* 27 (1975), 640-665.
- [12] R. H. Nochetto and G. Savaré. *Nonlinear evolution governed by accretive operators in Banach spaces: error control and applications*, *Mathematical Models and Methods in Applied Sciences*, Volume-16, 2006.
- [13] R. E. Showalter. *Monotone operators in Banach space and nonlinear partial differential equations*, *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*, volume-49, American Mathematical Society, 1997.