

NUMERICAL ANALYSIS OF A STABILIZED OPTIMAL CONTROL PROBLEM GOVERNED BY A PARABOLIC CONVECTION–DIFFUSION EQUATION

CHRISTOS PERVOLIANAKIS

ABSTRACT. We consider an optimal control problem on a bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, governed by a parabolic convection–diffusion equation with pointwise control constraints. We follow the optimize-then-discretize-approach, where for the state and the co-state variable, we consider the piecewise finite element method alongside with the algebraic flux correction method for its stabilization and the for temporal discretization, we use the backward Euler for the state variable and explicit Euler for the co-state variable. The discrete control variable is obtained by the projection of the discretized adjoint state on the set of admissible controls. The resulting stabilized fully–discrete scheme is nonlinear and a fixed point argument is used in order to prove its existence and uniqueness under a mild condition between the time step k and the mesh step h , e.g., $k = \mathcal{O}(h^{1+\epsilon})$, $0 < \epsilon < 1$. Further, for sufficiently regular solution, we derive error estimates in L^2 and H^1 norm with respect on space and ℓ^∞ norm in time for the state and the co-state variable. For the control variable we also derive an L^2 estimate for its error with respect to spatial variable and ℓ^∞ in time. Finally, we present numerical experiments that validate the the order of convergence of the stabilized fully–discrete scheme via algebraic flux correction method.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, a bounded convex polygonal domain with Lipschitz boundary $\partial\Omega$. We shall consider the following optimal control problem:

$$(1.1) \quad \min_{u \in \mathbb{U}_{\text{ad}}} J(y, u) = \min_{u \in \mathbb{U}_{\text{ad}}} \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T (\|y(t) - y_d(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \lambda \|u(t)\|_{L^2}^2) dt$$

subject to the state equation governed by the parabolic convection–diffusion equation,

$$(1.2) \quad \begin{cases} y_t - \mu \Delta y + \mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla y = u, & \text{in } \Omega \times [0, T], \\ y = 0, & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times [0, T], \\ y(\cdot, 0) = y^0, & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases}$$

with the regularization parameter $\lambda > 0$ and the diffusion coefficient $\mu > 0$. In addition, the velocity field $\mathbf{b} := \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ is assumed to be divergence free, i.e., $\text{div } \mathbf{b} = 0$. We assume the pointwise control constraints,

$$u_a \leq u(\mathbf{x}, t) \leq u_b, \quad \text{a.e in } \Omega \times (0, T],$$

where $y = y(\mathbf{x}, t)$ denote the state variable and $u = u(\mathbf{x}, t)$ the control variable. The set of admissible controls is defined by

$$\mathbb{U}_{\text{ad}} = \{u \in L^2(0, T; L^2) : u_a \leq u \leq u_b, \quad \text{a.e in } \Omega \times (0, T]\},$$

with $u_a, u_b \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $u_a < u_b$.

Many physical or chemical optimization processes can be modeled by optimal control problems that governed by a (non-)linear–convection–diffusion–reaction equations, see, e.g., the optimal control of Keller–Segel equations [33], where optimal control strategies for optimizing chemotactic movement is presenting. For more applications and a systematic introduction of finite elements for optimal control problems, we refer to the books [28, 32].

Discretizing optimal control problems the optimize-then-discretize-approach and the discretize-then-optimize-approach is usually considered, see, e.g., [19]. More specifically, in the optimize-then-discretize-approach, the optimality conditions are derived in continuous level while in discretize-then-optimize-approach the optimal control problem first discretized by a numerical method, e.g., the finite element method, and then, the optimality conditions are derived. In this work, we focus on the discretize-then-optimize-approach, since the stabilization of the corresponding convection–diffusion equation is done via algebraic flux correction. The main reason is that the correction factors of the AFC method are solution–dependent and there are non-differentiable.

There are many works considering optimal control problems governed by an elliptic or parabolic equations which are based in the finite element method. To name a few, for optimal control problems governed by elliptic equations, we refer to [1, 2, 10, 13, 16, 17, 31] and for parabolic equations [9, 29, 30, 35]. For the optimal control problems governed by elliptic equations, an error estimate of order $\mathcal{O}(h)$ was shown for the control variable using constant discretizations for the control variable. The estimate can be refined to $\mathcal{O}(h^{3/2})$ in case where the control

Date: December 31, 2024.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 49J20, 65M60, 65M15.

Key words and phrases. finite element method, error analysis, parabolic optimal control problem, algebraic flux correction.

variable is discretized by (bi-/tri-)linear H^1 -conforming element, see, e.g., [10, 36]. When the control variable is not discretized and implicitly utilize the optimality conditions by only discretize the state and the co-state variable, then a $\mathcal{O}(h^2)$ can be proved, see [19].

The convection–diffusion equations may possess layers, i.e., small regions where the solution has a large gradient, and therefore the standard finite element method may fail to approximate the exact solution due to these layers. Consequently, nonlinear discretizations have been developed which preserve the maximum principle of the solution and accurately determine the position of the layers, e.g., the streamline–upwind Petrov–Galerkin method [12], the so-called SOLD methods [21], the least-square stabilization of the gradient jumps across element edges for an optimal control problem governed by an elliptic convection–diffusion equation [36] as well as the Algebraic Flux Correction schemes (AFC), [22–24] and the references therein. For this reason, the AFC schemes has also recently proposed also in elliptic optimal control problems, see, e.g., [8].

1.1. Finite element method. The basis for the methods studied is the variational formulation of the model problem, to find functions $(y, u) \in L^\infty(0, T; H_0^1) \times \mathbb{U}_{\text{ad}}$ such that

$$(1.3) \quad \min_{u \in \mathbb{U}_{\text{ad}}} J(y, u) = \min_{u \in \mathbb{U}_{\text{ad}}} \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T (\|y(t) - y_d(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \lambda \|u(t)\|_{L^2}^2) dt,$$

subject to the weak formulation to the state equation,

$$(1.4) \quad (y_t(t), v) + \mu(\nabla y(t), \nabla v) + (\mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla y(t), v) = (u(t), v), \quad \forall v \in H_0^1.$$

It is known, see [27], that the optimal control problem (1.3)–(1.4) has a unique solution (y, u) , if and only if there exists a co-state variable \bar{p} such that $(\bar{y}, \bar{p}, \bar{u}) \in H_0^1 \times H_0^1 \times \mathbb{U}_{\text{ad}}$, satisfies the following optimality conditions for $t \in [0, T]$,

$$(1.5) \quad (\bar{y}_t, v) + \mu(\nabla \bar{y}, \nabla v) + (\mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla \bar{y}, v) = (\bar{u}, v), \quad \forall v \in H_0^1,$$

$$(1.6) \quad -(\bar{p}_t, v) + \mu(\nabla \bar{p}, \nabla v) - (\mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla \bar{p}, v) = (\bar{y} - y_d, v), \quad \forall v \in H_0^1,$$

$$(1.7) \quad (\lambda \bar{u} + \bar{p}, u - \bar{u}) \geq 0, \quad \forall u \in \mathbb{U}_{\text{ad}}$$

$$\bar{y}(\mathbf{x}, 0) = y_0(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{p}(\mathbf{x}, T) = 0.$$

We now introduce the projection operator $\Pi_{[a, b]} : L^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{U}_{\text{ad}}$ as

$$(1.8) \quad \Pi_{[a, b]}(v) := \max\{a, \min\{b, v\}\}, \quad \text{a.e in } \Omega$$

In view of [31, Lemma 2.2], we can express the (1.7), in the following equivalent form,

$$(1.9) \quad \bar{u}(t) := \Pi_{[u_a, u_b]}(-\lambda^{-1} \bar{p}(t)), \quad t \in [0, T].$$

The finite element methods studied are based on triangulations $\mathcal{T}_h = \{K\}$ of Ω , with $h = \max_{\mathcal{T}_h} \text{diam}(K)$. We use the finite element spaces

$$(1.10) \quad \mathcal{S}_h := \{\chi \in \mathcal{C}(\bar{\Omega}) : \chi|_K \in \mathbb{P}_1, \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h, \text{ such that } \chi = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega\},$$

The semi-discrete approximation of the variational problem (1.3)–(1.4), may be written as follows: Find functions $(y_h, u_h) \in \mathcal{S}_h \times \mathbb{U}_{\text{ad}}$, with $y_h(0) = y_h^0 \in \mathcal{S}_h$, such that

$$(1.11) \quad \min_{u_h \in \mathbb{U}_{\text{ad}}} J(y_h, u_h) = \min_{u_h \in \mathbb{U}_{\text{ad}}} \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T (\|y_h - y_d\|_{L^2}^2 + \|u_h\|_{L^2}^2) dt,$$

subject to

$$(1.12) \quad (y_{h,t}, \chi) + \mu(\nabla y_h, \nabla \chi) + (\mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla y_h + c y_h, \chi) = (u_h, \chi), \quad \forall \chi \in \mathcal{S}_h.$$

The optimal control problem (1.11)–(1.12) has a unique solution $(y_h, u_h) \in \mathcal{S}_h \times \mathbb{U}_{\text{ad}}$ if and only if there exists a co-state variable $p_h \in \mathcal{S}_h$ such that the following optimality conditions are satisfied.

$$(1.13) \quad (y_{h,t}, \chi) + \mu(\nabla y_h, \nabla \chi) + (\mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla y_h, \chi) = (u_h, \chi), \quad \forall \chi \in \mathcal{S}_h$$

$$(1.14) \quad -(p_{h,t}, \chi) + \mu(\nabla p_h, \nabla \chi) - (\mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla p_h, \chi) = (y_h - y_d, \chi), \quad \forall \chi \in \mathcal{S}_h,$$

$$(1.15) \quad (\lambda u_h + p_h, \psi - u_h) \geq 0, \quad \forall \psi \in \mathbb{U}_{\text{ad}}$$

$$(1.16) \quad y_h(0) = y_h^0 \quad \text{and} \quad p_h(T) = 0.$$

Similar to (1.9), one can express (1.15) by using (1.8), as

$$(1.17) \quad u_h(t) := \Pi_{[u_a, u_b]}(-\lambda^{-1} p_h(t)), \quad t \in [0, T].$$

The equation (1.17) means that the control variable $u_h \in \mathbb{U}_{\text{ad}}$ is the projection of the finite element function onto the admissible space \mathbb{U}_{ad} . Notice that u_h in general does not belong to \mathcal{S}_h , see, e.g., its definition (1.17). While it is not directly discretized, it depends on h , indirectly due to its definition, thus, we use the subscript h on it.

In addition, assume $P_h : L^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_h$, the usual L^2 -projection onto \mathcal{S}_h , defined by

$$(1.18) \quad (P_h v - v, \chi) = 0, \quad \forall \chi \in \mathcal{S}_h.$$

The semi-discrete equation for state variable (1.13), can be written as

$$(y_{h,t}, \chi) + \mu (\nabla y_h, \nabla \chi) + (\mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla y_h, \chi) = (P_h u_h, \chi), \quad \forall \chi \in \mathcal{S}_h.$$

In this work, we will stabilize the semi-discrete scheme (1.13)–(1.17) using the algebraic flux correction method. To accomplish this, we need first to write the matrix formulation of the latter semi-discrete scheme. Let $\mathcal{Z}_h = \{Z_j\}_{j=1}^N$ be the set of nodes in the triangulation \mathcal{T}_h and $\{\phi_j\}_{j=1}^N \subset \mathcal{S}_h$ the corresponding nodal basis, with $\phi_j(Z_i) = \delta_{ij}$. Then, we may write $y_h(t) = \sum_{j=1}^N \alpha_j(t) \phi_j$, $p_h(t) = \sum_{j=1}^N \beta_j(t) \phi_j$, with $y_h^0 = \sum_{j=1}^N \alpha_j^0 \phi_j$, $p_h^{N_0} = \sum_{j=1}^N \beta_j^{N_0} \phi_j$. In addition, since $P_h u_h(t) \in \mathcal{S}_h$, we may write $P_h u_h(t) = \sum_{j=1}^N \gamma_j(t) \phi_j$. The semidiscrete problem (1.13)–(1.16) can then be expressed, with $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = \boldsymbol{\alpha}(t)$, $\boldsymbol{\beta} = \boldsymbol{\beta}(t)$, $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = \boldsymbol{\gamma}(t)$ and $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_N)^T$, $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_N)^T$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_N)^T$ as follows,

$$(1.19) \quad \mathbf{M}\boldsymbol{\alpha}'(t) + (\mu \mathbf{S} + \mathbf{T})\boldsymbol{\alpha}(t) = \mathbf{M}\boldsymbol{\gamma}(t), \quad \text{for } t \in [0, T], \text{ with } \boldsymbol{\alpha}(0) = \boldsymbol{\alpha}^0,$$

$$(1.20) \quad -\mathbf{M}\boldsymbol{\beta}'(t) + (\mu \mathbf{S} - \mathbf{T})\boldsymbol{\beta}(t) = \mathbf{M}\boldsymbol{\alpha}(t) - \mathbf{r}(y_d), \quad \text{for } t \in [0, T], \text{ with } \boldsymbol{\beta}(T) = \mathbf{0},$$

$$(1.21) \quad \mathbf{M}\boldsymbol{\gamma}(t) = \mathbf{r}(u_h),$$

where $\mathbf{0}$ the zero vector and for an $s \in L^2$, the vector $\mathbf{r}(s) = (r_i(s))$, with elements $r_i(s) = (s, \phi_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, N$. The matrix $\mathbf{M} = (m_{ij})$ with elements $m_{ij} = (\phi_i, \phi_j)$ and $\mathbf{S} = (s_{ij})$ with elements $s_{ij} = (\nabla \phi_i, \nabla \phi_j)$ are the usual mass and stiffness matrix, respectively. The matrix due to the convection term in (1.13) and in (1.14) is $\mathbf{T} = (\tau_{ij})$, and its elements are defined as follows,

$$(1.22) \quad \tau_{ij} = (\mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla \phi_j, \phi_i), \quad \text{for } i, j = 1, \dots, N.$$

The mass matrix \mathbf{M} and the stiffness matrix \mathbf{S} , are both symmetric and positive definite while on the other hand the matrix due to the nonlinear gradient term is not symmetric.

Our aim it to develop numerical schemes for (1.13)–(1.17) that their solution satisfies the discrete analogue of maximum principle.

To enforce this property, we use the algebraic flux correction method to (1.13) as well as to (1.14), see, e.g., [23, 26], and the references therein.

1.2. Contributions and outline of the paper. Our aim is to analyze fully-discrete schemes for the approximation of the optimal control problem governed by a parabolic convection–diffusion equation (1.1)–(1.2), by enforcing it to satisfy the discrete maximum principle. We follow the optimize-then-discretize-approach, where for the state and the co-state variable, we consider the piecewise finite element method alongside with the algebraic flux correction method for its stabilization in space and the for temporal discretization, we use the backward Euler for the state variable and explicit Euler for the co-state variable. For the control discretization, we use the variational discretization proposed in [19], where the control variable is not directly discretized by finite element method, rather than, it is a projection of a finite element function that belongs to \mathbb{U}_{ad} .

The resulting stabilized with AFC method fully-discrete scheme is nonlinear, thus, we employ a Brouwer fixed point argument to prove its existence and uniqueness. Also, an iterative scheme via fixed point method is proposed and proved that under a mild condition between the time step and the mesh step k, h , respectively, e.g., for $k = \mathcal{O}(h^{1+\epsilon})$, $\epsilon > 0$, it converges to the solution of the nonlinear scheme.


Throughout the paper, we use the standard notation for Lebesgue and Sobolev spaces, namely we denote $W_p^m = W_p^m(\Omega)$, $H^m = W_2^m$, $L^p = L^p(\Omega)$, and with $\|\cdot\|_{m,p} = \|\cdot\|_{W_p^m}$, $\|\cdot\|_m = \|\cdot\|_{H^m}$, $\|\cdot\|_{L^p} = \|\cdot\|_{L^p(\Omega)}$, for $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $p \in [1, \infty]$, the corresponding norms.

The fully-discrete schemes we consider approximate \bar{y}^n by $Y^n \in \mathcal{S}_h$ where $\bar{y}^n = \bar{y}(\cdot, t^n)$, solution of (1.5) and $t^n = nk$, $n = 0, \dots, N_0$ and $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, $N_0 \geq 1$, $k = T/N_0$. Similarly, approximate \bar{p}^n by $P^n \in \mathcal{S}_h$ where $\bar{p}^n = \bar{p}(\cdot, t^n)$ solution of (1.6) and \bar{u}^n by $U^n \in \mathbb{U}_{\text{ad}}$ where $\bar{u}^n = \bar{u}(\cdot, t^n)$, solution of (1.7). Under sufficient regular solution, namely $(\bar{y}, \bar{p}, \bar{u}) \in H^2 \times H^2 \times H^1$, and small k, h , with $k = \mathcal{O}(h^{1+\epsilon})$, $0 < \epsilon < 1$, we derive error estimates for the AFC scheme

$$\begin{aligned} \|Y^n - \bar{y}^n\|_{L^2} + \|P^n - \bar{p}^n\|_{L^2} + \|U^n - \bar{u}^n\|_{L^2} &\leq C(k + h^2) \\ \|\nabla(Y^n - \bar{y}^n)\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla(P^n - \bar{p}^n)\|_{L^2} &\leq C(k + h), \end{aligned}$$

where the constant C depends on the norms of the solution as well as the parameter μ .

The paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we introduce the semi-discrete AFC scheme for the discretization of the optimal control problem governed by a parabolic convection–diffusion equation. Further, we recall some auxiliary results for the stabilization terms from [14], that we will employ in the analysis. In Section 3, we discretize the state variable using the backward Euler method, the co-state variable with the explicit Euler backwards in time. We prove that the resulting nonlinear fully-discrete scheme has a unique solution and for a smooth solution of (1.5)–(1.9) and we derive error estimates in L^2 and H^1 norm in spatial variable and ℓ^∞ in time. In Section 4, we define the fixed point scheme for the fully-discrete scheme and we prove that converges to the solution of the nonlinear fully-discrete scheme. Finally, in Section 5, we present numerical experiments, validating our theoretical results about order of convergence as well as we test the stabilized fully-discrete scheme

FIGURE 2.1. The subdomain ω_i of the triangulation \mathcal{T}_h .

in optimal control problems governed by a convection–dominant equation where the solution possess interior or boundary layers.

2. ALGEBRAIC FLUX CORRECTION

2.1. Mesh assumptions. We consider a family of regular triangulations \mathcal{T}_h of the domain $\bar{\Omega} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$. We will assume that the family \mathcal{T}_h satisfies the following assumption.

Assumption 2.1. Let $\mathcal{T}_h = \{K\}$ be a family of regular triangulations of $\bar{\Omega}$ such that any edge of any K is either a subset of the boundary $\partial\Omega$ or an edge of another $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$, and in addition

(1) \mathcal{T}_h is shape regular, i.e., there exists a constant $\varpi > 0$, independent of K and \mathcal{T}_h , such that

$$(2.1) \quad \frac{h_K}{\varrho_K} \leq \varpi, \quad \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h,$$

where h_K the longest edge of K , $\varrho_K = \text{diam}(B_K)$, and B_K is the inscribed ball in K .

(2) The family of triangulations \mathcal{T}_h is quasiuniform, i.e., there exists constant $\varrho > 0$ such that

$$(2.2) \quad \frac{\max_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} h_K}{\min_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} h_K} \leq \varrho, \quad \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h.$$

Since \mathcal{T}_h satisfies (2.2), we have for all $\chi \in \mathcal{S}_h$, cf., e.g., [11, Chapter 4],

$$(2.3) \quad \|\chi\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla\chi\|_{L^2} \leq Ch^{-1}\|\chi\|_{L^2} \text{ and } \|\nabla\chi\|_{L^\infty} \leq Ch^{-1}\|\nabla\chi\|_{L^2}.$$

Let \mathcal{N}_h be the the indices of all the nodes of \mathcal{Z}_h , $\mathcal{N}_h := \{i : Z_i \text{ a node of the triangulation } \mathcal{T}_h\}$ which can be splitted into the indices of the internal nodes, \mathcal{N}_h^0 , and the indices of the nodes on the boundary $\partial\Omega$, \mathcal{N}_h^∂ , i.e. $\mathcal{N}_h := \mathcal{N}_h^0 \cup \mathcal{N}_h^\partial$. Also let \mathcal{E}_h be the set of all edges of the triangulation \mathcal{T}_h . Similarly, we split this set into the internal edges, \mathcal{E}_h^0 and the edges on the boundary $\partial\Omega$, \mathcal{E}_h^∂ , i.e. $\mathcal{E}_h := \mathcal{E}_h^0 \cup \mathcal{E}_h^\partial$. We denote ω_e the collection of triangles with a common edge $e \in \mathcal{E}_h$, see Fig. 2.1, and ω_i , $i \in \mathcal{N}_h$, the collection of triangles with a common vertex Z_i , i.e. $\omega_i = \cup_{Z_j \in \mathcal{K}} \bar{K}$, see Fig. 2.1. The sets $\mathcal{Z}_h(\omega)$ and $\mathcal{E}_h(\omega)$ contain the vertices and the edges, respectively, of a subset of $\omega \subset \mathcal{T}_h$ and \mathcal{Z}_h^i the set of nodes adjacent to Z_i , $\mathcal{Z}_h^i := \{j : Z_j \in \mathcal{Z}_h, \text{ adjacent to } Z_i\}$. Using the fact that \mathcal{T}_h is shape regular, there exists a constant C_ϖ , independent of h , such that the number of vertices in \mathcal{Z}_h^i is less than C_ϖ , for $i = 1, \dots, N$. Also $e_{ij} \in \mathcal{E}_h$ denotes an edge of \mathcal{T}_h with endpoints $Z_i, Z_j \in \mathcal{Z}_h$.

2.2. A semi–discrete scheme satisfying the discrete maximum principle. We replace the composite mass matrix \mathbf{M} by the corresponding lumped mass matrix \mathbf{M}_L and the negative off-diagonal element of \mathbf{T} are cured by an artificial diffusion operator $\mathbf{D} = (d_{ij})$ so that the off-diagonal elements of $\mathbf{T} + \mathbf{D} \geq 0$, element-wise. Similar, we also define an artificial diffusion $\widehat{\mathbf{D}} = (\widehat{d}_{ij})$ so that the off-diagonal elements $\mathbf{T} + \widehat{\mathbf{D}} \leq 0$, element-wise.

Since, we would like our not to add mass in our scheme, \mathbf{D} must be symmetric with zero row and column sums, cf. [25], which is true if $\mathbf{D} = (d_{ij})_{i,j=1}^N$ is defined by

$$(2.4) \quad d_{ij} := \min\{-\tau_{ij}, 0, -\tau_{ji}\} = d_{ji} \leq 0, \quad \forall j \neq i \text{ and } d_{ii} := -\sum_{j \neq i} d_{ij}.$$

In a similar way, we define the matrix $\widehat{\mathbf{D}} = (\widehat{d}_{ij})_{i,j=1}^N$, with elements,

$$(2.5) \quad \widehat{d}_{ij} := \max\{-\tau_{ij}, 0, -\tau_{ji}\} = \widehat{d}_{ji} \geq 0, \quad \forall j \neq i \text{ and } \widehat{d}_{ii} := -\sum_{j \neq i} \widehat{d}_{ij}.$$

In view of the latter definition of the elements of the artificial diffusion operator, we can derive for a $\mathbf{b} \in L^\infty$, (1.22) and the fact that the triangulation \mathcal{T}_h is shape regular, i.e., (2.1), that there exists a constant $C(\varpi) > 0$ independent of h , such that

$$(2.6) \quad \begin{aligned} |d_{ij}| &\leq |\tau_{ij}| + |\tau_{ji}| \leq \|\mathbf{b}\|_{L^\infty} \sum_{K \in \omega_i} (\|\nabla\phi_i\|_{L^2(K)}\|\phi_j\|_{L^2(K)} + \|\nabla\phi_j\|_{L^2(K)}\|\phi_i\|_{L^2(K)}) \\ &\leq C\|\mathbf{b}\|_{L^\infty} \sum_{K \in \omega_i} h_K \leq C(\varpi) \|\mathbf{b}\|_{L^\infty} h. \end{aligned}$$

A similar estimate holds also for (2.5), i.e.,

$$(2.7) \quad |\widehat{d}_{ij}| \leq C(\varpi) \|\mathbf{b}\|_{L^\infty} h.$$

Recall the bilinear form $(\cdot, \cdot)_h$, see, e.g., [34, Chapter 15], is an inner product in \mathcal{S}_h that approximates (\cdot, \cdot) and is defined by

$$(2.8) \quad (\psi, \chi)_h = \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} Q_h^K(\psi\chi), \quad \text{with } Q_h^K(g) = \frac{1}{3}|K| \sum_{j=1}^3 g(Z_j^K) \approx \int_K g \, dx,$$

with $\{Z_j^K\}_{j=1}^3$ the vertices of a triangle $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$.

We recall a modified L^2 -projection operator $\widetilde{P}_h : L^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_h$, see, e.g., [7, Lemma 2.2], defined by

$$(2.9) \quad (\widetilde{P}_h v, \chi)_h = (v, \chi), \quad \forall \chi \in \mathcal{S}_h.$$

For the latter modified L^2 -projection, similar to P_h properties can be proved, see, e.g., [7, Lemma 2.2]. More specifically, there exists a constant C , such that for a $v \in H_0^1$, holds that

$$\|\nabla \widetilde{P}_h v\|_{L^2} + h^{-1} \|v - \widetilde{P}_h v\|_{L^2} \leq C \|\nabla v\|_{L^2}.$$

Therefore, in what follows, we use the modified L^2 -projection operator \widetilde{P}_h instead of P_h .

Thus the resulting system for the approximation of (1.1)–(1.2) is expressed as follows, we seek $\boldsymbol{\alpha}(t)$, $\boldsymbol{\beta}(t)$, $\boldsymbol{\gamma}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ such that, for $t \in [0, T]$,

$$(2.10) \quad \mathbf{M}_L \boldsymbol{\alpha}'(t) + (\mu \mathbf{S} + \mathbf{T} + \mathbf{D}) \boldsymbol{\alpha}(t) = \mathbf{M}_L \boldsymbol{\gamma}(t), \quad \text{for } t \in [0, T], \quad \text{with } \boldsymbol{\alpha}(0) = \boldsymbol{\alpha}^0,$$

$$(2.11) \quad -\mathbf{M}_L \boldsymbol{\beta}'(t) + (\mu \mathbf{S} - \mathbf{T} - \widehat{\mathbf{D}}) \boldsymbol{\beta}(t) = \mathbf{M}_L \boldsymbol{\alpha}(t) - \mathbf{r}(y_d), \quad \text{for } t \in [0, T], \quad \text{with } \boldsymbol{\beta}(T) = \mathbf{0},$$

$$(2.12) \quad \mathbf{M}_L \boldsymbol{\gamma}(t) = \mathbf{r}(u_h),$$

While the later semi-discrete scheme satisfies the maximum principle, we will use it as a basis for the stabilized scheme that also maintains the maximum principle and at the same time it can be proved that is of high-order. This scheme is called as algebraic flux correction scheme (AFC scheme). This procedure is commonly used in scalar conservation laws, see, e.g., [23, Chapter 4], [26].

To formulate the variational formulation of (2.10)–(2.11), recall the stabilization term that also used in [3].

Define for a function $s \in \mathcal{S}_h$, its nodal values as $s_i = s(Z_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, N$. The bilinear form $d_{\mathbf{D},h}(\cdot, \cdot) : \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, is defined by

$$(2.13) \quad d_{\mathbf{D},h}(v, z) := \sum_{i,j=1}^N d_{ij}(v_i - v_j) z_i = \sum_{i < j} d_{ij}(v_i - v_j)(z_i - z_j), \quad \forall v, z \in \mathcal{C},$$

where the last equality is due to the symmetry of matrix \mathbf{D} , see, e.g., [6]. In a similar way, we can define the stabilization term due to the artificial diffusion operator $\widehat{\mathbf{D}}$, the $d_{\widehat{\mathbf{D}},h}$.

The, following the analysis in [3], the low order scheme (2.10)–(2.12), may be formulate as follows. We seek $(y_h, u_h) \in \mathcal{S}_h \times \mathbb{U}_{\text{ad}}$, such that

$$(2.14) \quad (y_{h,t}, \chi)_h + \mu(\nabla y_h, \nabla \chi) + (\mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla y_h, \chi) + \widehat{d}_{\mathbf{D},h}(y_h; y_h, \chi) = (\widetilde{P}_h u_h, \chi)_h,$$

for all $\chi \in \mathcal{S}_h$ with $y_h(0) = y_h^0$,

$$(2.15) \quad -(p_{h,t}, \chi)_h + \mu(\nabla p_h, \nabla \chi) - (\mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla p_h, \chi) + d_{\widehat{\mathbf{D}},h}(p_h, \chi) = (y_h, \chi)_h - (y_d, \chi),$$

for all $\chi \in \mathcal{S}_h$ with $p_h(T) = 0$, and for the control variable,

$$(2.16) \quad (\lambda u_h + p_h, \psi - u_h) \geq 0, \quad \psi \in \mathbb{U}_{\text{ad}}$$

Similar to (1.9), one can express (2.16) by using (1.8), as

$$(2.17) \quad u_h(t) := \Pi_{[\underline{u}_a, \underline{u}_b]}(-\lambda^{-1} p_h(t)), \quad t \in [0, T].$$

The latter scheme may pollute the accuracy of the approximation. A common remedy is to return to the system the elements that are harmless to the discrete maximum principle, see, e.g., [23, 26] and the references therein. This approach is called algebraic flux correction (AFC) scheme, which involves the decomposition of this error into internodal fluxes, which can be used to restore high accuracy in regions where the solution is well resolved and no modifications of the standard FEM are required. Algebraic flux corrections schemes were proposed in [25] and have attained a lot of attention by many authors, see, e.g., [3, 4, 6, 23–26].

In what follows, we will describe the application of the AFC method to the low-order scheme (2.14)–(2.17), by recalling arguments that have already presented extensively in the literature in the context of the convection–diffusion equations, see, e.g., [3, 4, 6].

Let $\mathbf{f} = (f_1, \dots, f_N)^T$ denote the error of inserting the artificial diffusion operator \mathbf{D} in (2.10), i.e., $\mathbf{f}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\alpha}$. Similar, the function $\widehat{\mathbf{f}} = (\widehat{f}_1, \dots, \widehat{f}_N)^T$ denote the error of inserting the artificial diffusion operator $\widehat{\mathbf{D}}$ in (2.11), i.e., $\widehat{\mathbf{f}}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = -\widehat{\mathbf{D}}\boldsymbol{\alpha}$. In addition, the functions $\mathbf{g} = (g_1, \dots, g_N)^T$, $\widehat{\mathbf{g}} = (\widehat{g}_1, \dots, \widehat{g}_N)^T$, denotes the error due to the

replacement of the mass matrix \mathbf{M} by its mass lumped \mathbf{M}_L , i.e., $\mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = (\mathbf{M}_L - \mathbf{M})\boldsymbol{\alpha}'$, $\widehat{\mathbf{g}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = (\mathbf{M}_L - \mathbf{M})\boldsymbol{\beta}'$, where $\boldsymbol{\alpha}'$, $\boldsymbol{\beta}'$ denotes the derivative with respect to temporal variable of $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = \boldsymbol{\alpha}(t)$, $\boldsymbol{\beta} = \boldsymbol{\beta}(t)$, respectively. Notice that, we use four different correction factors, two for the error due to the matrices \mathbf{D} , $\widehat{\mathbf{D}}$, and two for the error due to the mass lumping.

Using the zero row sum property of matrices \mathbf{D} , $\widehat{\mathbf{D}}$, cf. (2.4),(2.5), we can show, see e.g., [25], that the residual admits a conservative decomposition into internodal fluxes,

$$(2.18) \quad \mathbf{f}_i = \sum_{j \neq i} \mathbf{f}_{ij}, \quad \mathbf{f}_{ji} = -\mathbf{f}_{ij} \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{\mathbf{f}}_i = \sum_{j \neq i} \widehat{\mathbf{f}}_{ij}, \quad \widehat{\mathbf{f}}_{ji} = -\widehat{\mathbf{f}}_{ij}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N.$$

Also, the differences $(\mathbf{M}_L - \mathbf{M})\boldsymbol{\alpha}'$, $(\mathbf{M}_L - \mathbf{M})\boldsymbol{\beta}'$,

$$(2.19) \quad \mathbf{g}_i = \sum_{j \neq i} \mathbf{g}_{ij}, \quad \mathbf{g}_{ji} = -\mathbf{g}_{ij} \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{\mathbf{g}}_i = \sum_{j \neq i} \widehat{\mathbf{g}}_{ij}, \quad \widehat{\mathbf{g}}_{ji} = -\widehat{\mathbf{g}}_{ij}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N,$$

where the amount of mass transported by the raw *antidiffusive flux* is given by

$$(2.20) \quad \mathbf{f}_{ij} := \mathbf{f}_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}(t)) = d_{ij}(\alpha_j(t) - \alpha_i(t)), \quad \forall j \neq i,$$

$$(2.21) \quad \widehat{\mathbf{f}}_{ij} := \widehat{\mathbf{f}}_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}(t)) = \widehat{d}_{ij}(\alpha_i(t) - \alpha_j(t)), \quad \forall j \neq i,$$

$$(2.22) \quad \mathbf{g}_{ij} := \mathbf{g}_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}(t)) = m_{ij}(\alpha'_i(t) - \alpha'_j(t)), \quad \forall j \neq i.$$

$$(2.23) \quad \widehat{\mathbf{g}}_{ij} := \widehat{\mathbf{g}}_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\beta}(t)) = m_{ij}(\beta'_i(t) - \beta'_j(t)), \quad \forall j \neq i.$$

The correction terms are defined as

$$(2.24) \quad \bar{\mathbf{f}}_i = \sum_{j \neq i} \mathbf{a}_{ij} \mathbf{f}_{ij}, \quad \widehat{\bar{\mathbf{f}}}_i = \sum_{j \neq i} \widehat{\mathbf{a}}_{ij} \widehat{\mathbf{f}}_{ij}, \quad \bar{\mathbf{g}}_i = \sum_{j \neq i} \mathbf{a}_{ij} \mathbf{g}_{ij} \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{\bar{\mathbf{g}}}_i = \sum_{j \neq i} \widehat{\mathbf{a}}_{ij} \widehat{\mathbf{g}}_{ij}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N,$$

where the correction factors $\mathbf{a}_{ij} = \mathbf{a}_{ji}$, $\widehat{\mathbf{a}}_{ij} = \widehat{\mathbf{a}}_{ji}$, $\mathbf{a}_{ij} = \mathbf{a}_{ji}$, $\widehat{\mathbf{a}}_{ij} = \widehat{\mathbf{a}}_{ji} \in [0, 1]$, $i, j = 1, \dots, N$, are appropriately defined in view of (2.20)–(2.22), respectively.

For the rest of this paper we will call the internodal fluxes as anti-diffusive fluxes. Every anti-diffusive flux \mathbf{f}_{ij} , $\widehat{\mathbf{f}}_{ij}$, \mathbf{g}_{ij} , $\widehat{\mathbf{g}}_{ij}$ is multiplied by a solution-depended correction factor \mathbf{a}_{ij} , $\widehat{\mathbf{a}}_{ij}$, \mathbf{a}_{ij} , $\widehat{\mathbf{a}}_{ij} \in [0, 1]$, respectively, before it is inserted into the equation. Hence, the AFC scheme is the following: We seek $\boldsymbol{\alpha}(t)$, $\boldsymbol{\beta}(t)$, $\boldsymbol{\gamma}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ such that, for $t \in [0, T]$,

$$(2.25) \quad \mathbf{M}_L \boldsymbol{\alpha}'(t) + (\mu \mathbf{S} + \mathbf{T} + \mathbf{D})\boldsymbol{\alpha}(t) = \mathbf{M}_L \boldsymbol{\gamma}(t) + \bar{\mathbf{f}}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}(t)) + \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}(t)),$$

$$(2.26) \quad -\mathbf{M}_L \boldsymbol{\beta}'(t) + (\mu \mathbf{S} - \widehat{\mathbf{T}} - \widehat{\mathbf{D}})\boldsymbol{\beta}(t) = \mathbf{M}_L \boldsymbol{\alpha}(t) - \mathbf{r}(y_d) + \widehat{\bar{\mathbf{f}}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}(t)) - \widehat{\bar{\mathbf{g}}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}(t)),$$

$$(2.27) \quad \mathbf{M}_L \boldsymbol{\gamma}(t) = \mathbf{r}(u_h),$$

with $\boldsymbol{\alpha}(0) = \boldsymbol{\alpha}^0$, $\boldsymbol{\beta}(T) = \mathbf{0}$.

To ensure that the AFC scheme maintains the positivity, we choose the correction factors \mathbf{a}_{ij} such that the sum of anti-diffusive fluxes is constrained by, see, cf. e.g., [23],

$$(2.28) \quad q_i (\delta_i^{\min}(t) - \delta_i(t)) \leq \sum_{j \neq i} \mathbf{a}_{ij} \mathbf{p}_{ij} \leq q_i (\delta_i^{\max}(t) - \delta_i(t)), \quad q_i \geq 0,$$

where either $\mathbf{a}_{ij} = \mathbf{a}_{ij}$ and $\mathbf{p}_{ij} = \mathbf{f}_{ij}$ with $\delta(t) = \alpha(t)$, or $\mathbf{a}_{ij} = \widehat{\mathbf{a}}_{ij}$ and $\mathbf{p}_{ij} = \widehat{\mathbf{f}}_{ij}$ with $\delta(t) = \beta(t)$, for the corrections factors associated with the matrices \mathbf{D} , $\widehat{\mathbf{D}}$, respectively. In addition, either $\mathbf{a}_{ij} = \mathbf{a}_{ij}$ and $\mathbf{p}_{ij} = \mathbf{g}_{ij}$ with $\delta(t) = \alpha(t)$ or $\mathbf{a}_{ij} = \widehat{\mathbf{a}}_{ij}$ and $\mathbf{p}_{ij} = \widehat{\mathbf{g}}_{ij}$ with $\delta(t) = \beta(t)$ for the correction factors associated with the mass lumping. Here, δ_i^{\max} , δ_i^{\min} , denotes the local maximum and local minimum at ω_i , respectively.

To formulate the variational form, we define for a function $s \in \mathcal{S}_h$, its nodal values as $s_i = s(Z_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, N$, the bilinear form $\widehat{d}_{\mathbf{D},h}(w; \cdot, \cdot) : \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, with $w \in \mathcal{S}_h$, is defined by

$$(2.29) \quad \widehat{d}_{\mathbf{D},h}(w; v, z) := \sum_{i,j=1}^N d_{ij}(1 - \mathbf{a}_{ij}(w))(v_i - v_j)z_i = \sum_{i < j} d_{ij}(1 - \mathbf{a}_{ij}(w))(v_i - v_j)(z_i - z_j), \quad \forall v, z \in \mathcal{C},$$

and in a similar way, the bilinear form $\widehat{d}_{\widehat{\mathbf{D}},h}(w; \cdot, \cdot) : \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, with $w \in \mathcal{S}_h$, is defined by

$$(2.30) \quad \widehat{d}_{\widehat{\mathbf{D}},h}(w; v, z) := \sum_{i,j=1}^N \widehat{d}_{ij}(1 - \mathbf{a}_{ij}(w))(v_i - v_j)z_i = \sum_{i < j} \widehat{d}_{ij}(1 - \mathbf{a}_{ij}(w))(v_i - v_j)(z_i - z_j), \quad \forall v, z \in \mathcal{C}.$$

In both of the stabilization terms, the last equality is due to the symmetry of matrix \mathbf{D} and $\widehat{\mathbf{D}}$, respectively, see, e.g., [6]. Further, the stabilization term due to the mass lumping, is the bilinear form $\widehat{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L,h}(w; \cdot, \cdot) : \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, with $w \in \mathcal{S}_h$, is defined by

$$(2.31) \quad \widehat{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L,h}(w; v, z) := \sum_{i,j=1}^N m_{ij}(1 - \mathbf{a}_{ij}(w))(v_i - v_j)z_i = \sum_{i < j} \widehat{d}_{ij}(1 - \mathbf{a}_{ij}(w))(v_i - v_j)(z_i - z_j), \quad \forall v, z \in \mathcal{C},$$

where $a_{ij} = a_{ij}$ or $a_{ij} = \widehat{a}_{ij}$.

The variational formulation of the algebraic flux correction scheme (2.25)–(2.27) is as follows. We seek $(y_h, p_h, u_h) \in \mathcal{S}_h \times \mathcal{S}_h \times \mathbb{U}_{\text{ad}}$, such that

$$(2.32) \quad (y_{h,t}, \chi) + \mu(\nabla y_h, \nabla \chi) + (\mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla y_h, \chi) + \widehat{d}_{\mathbf{D},h}(y_h; y_h, \chi) + \widehat{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L,h}(y_{h,t}; y_{h,t}, \chi) = (\widetilde{P}_h u_h, \chi)_h,$$

for all $\chi \in \mathcal{S}_h$ with $y_h(0) = y_h^0$,

$$(2.33) \quad -(p_{h,t}, \chi) + \mu(\nabla p_h, \nabla \chi) - (\mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla p_h, \chi) + \widehat{d}_{\mathbf{D},h}(p_h; p_h, \chi) - \widehat{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L,h}(p_{h,t}; p_{h,t}, \chi) = (y_h, \chi)_h - (y_d, \chi),$$

for all $\chi \in \mathcal{S}_h$ with $p_h(T) = 0$, and for the control variable,

$$(2.34) \quad (\lambda u_h + p_h, \psi - u_h) \geq 0, \quad \psi \in \mathbb{U}_{\text{ad}}$$

Similar to (1.9), one can express (2.34) by using (1.8), as

$$(2.35) \quad u_h(t) := \Pi_{[\underline{u}_a, \underline{u}_b]}(-\lambda^{-1} p_h(t)), \quad t \in [0, T].$$

The semi-discrete scheme (2.32)–(2.35) is a coupled non-linear scheme. To prove the existence and the uniqueness of the solution, we will use a fixed point argument. To be able to form this argument, we first need to specify the correction factors of the stabilization terms.

2.3. Correction factors. To compute the coefficients \mathbf{a}_{ij} , we need to fix a set of nonnegative q_i , $i = 1, \dots, N$. Their choice can be arbitrary, but efficiency and accuracy can dictate a strategy, see, e.g, [23]. For a detailed presentation we refer to [23] and in the survey [5]. Example of correction factors can be found also in [3, 5, 6, 23, 25, 26] and the references therein. We shall compute the correction factors \mathbf{a}_{ij} using Algorithm 1, which has been proposed by Kuzmin, cf. [23, Section 4] with the choice of q_i as in [6].

Algorithm 1. [6, Lemma 6] [Computation of the correction factors]

Given data:

- (1) The positive coefficients q_i , $i, j = 1, \dots, N$,
- (2) The fluxes \mathbf{p}_{ij} , $i \neq j$, $i, j = 1, \dots, N$.
- (3) The coefficients α_j , $j = 1, \dots, N$.

Computation of factors \mathbf{a}_{ij} , for $i, j \in \mathcal{N}_h$, as follows.

- (1) Compute for $i \in \mathcal{N}_h^0$, $j \in \mathcal{N}_h$, the limited sums $P_i^\pm := P_i^\pm(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ of positive and negative anti-diffusive fluxes

$$P_i^+ = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{Z}_h^i} \max\{0, \mathbf{p}_{ij}\}, \quad \text{and} \quad P_i^- = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{Z}_h^i} \min\{0, \mathbf{p}_{ij}\}.$$

- (2) Retrieve for $i \in \mathcal{N}_h^0$, $j \in \mathcal{N}_h$, the local extremum diminishing upper and lower bounds $Q_i^\pm := Q_i^\pm(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$,

$$Q_i^+ = q_i(\alpha_i^{\max} - \alpha_i), \quad \text{and} \quad Q_i^- = q_i(\alpha_i^{\min} - \alpha_i),$$

where α_i^{\max} , α_i^{\min} are the local maximum and local minimum at ω_i .

- (3) Compute for $i \in \mathcal{N}_h^0$, $j \in \mathcal{N}_h$, also the coefficients $\bar{\mathbf{a}}_{ij}$, for $j \neq i$ are given by

$$(2.36) \quad R_i^+ = \min \left\{ 1, \frac{Q_i^+}{P_i^+} \right\}, \quad R_i^- = \min \left\{ 1, \frac{Q_i^-}{P_i^-} \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\mathbf{a}}_{ij} = \begin{cases} R_i^+, & \text{if } \mathbf{p}_{ij} > 0, \\ 1, & \text{if } \mathbf{p}_{ij} = 0, \\ R_i^-, & \text{if } \mathbf{p}_{ij} < 0. \end{cases}$$

Then, the coefficients \mathbf{a}_{ij} , for $j \neq i$ with $i \in \mathcal{N}_h^0$, $j \in \mathcal{N}_h$, are given by $\mathbf{a}_{ij} = \min\{\bar{\mathbf{a}}_{ij}, \bar{\mathbf{a}}_{ji}\}$ and $\mathbf{a}_{ji} = \mathbf{a}_{ij}$. For the Dirichlet nodes, i.e., $i \in \mathcal{N}_h^b$, $j \in \mathcal{N}_h^b$, we set $\mathbf{a}_{ij} = 1$.

Remark 2.1. In view of [6, Section 4.2], the limiter (2.36) is linearity preserving, i.e., for every edge e with endpoints Z_i, Z_j ,

$$(2.37) \quad \mathbf{a}_{ij}(v) = 1, \quad \text{if } v \in \mathbb{P}_1(\mathbb{R}^2),$$

where ω_e is the union of triangles with e as a common edges, see the left patch of Fig. 2.1. The linearity preservation is equivalent to have

$$(2.38) \quad Q_i^+ > P_i^+ \text{ if } r_{ij} > 0, \quad \text{and} \quad Q_i^- < P_i^- \text{ if } r_{ij} < 0,$$

see [4, Section 6].

Remark 2.2. There exist $\gamma_i \in \mathbb{R}$, $i \in \mathcal{N}_h^0$, cf. [4, Section 6], such that

$$(2.39) \quad v_i - v_i^{\min} \leq \gamma_i(v_i^{\max} - v_i), \quad \forall v \in \mathbb{P}_1(\mathbb{R}^2),$$

for $v_i = v(Z_i)$ and v_i^{\max} and v_i^{\min} the local maximum and local minimum, respectively, on ω_i , where ω_i is the union of triangles with Z_i as a common vertex, see the right patch of Fig. 2.1. Note that in the case of a symmetric ω_i we have that $\gamma_i = 1$ and $v_i - v_i^{\min} \leq \gamma_i(v_i^{\max} - v_i)$, for $v \in \mathbb{P}_1(\mathbb{R}^2)$, cf. [4, Lemma 6.1].

Lemma 2.1. [6, Lemma 6] *Let the positive coefficients q_i , $i \in \mathcal{N}_h^0$, in Algorithm 1 be defined by*

$$(2.40) \quad q_i := \gamma_i \sum_{j \in \mathcal{Z}_i^0} d_{ij}, \quad i \in \mathcal{N}_h^0,$$

with γ_i defined in (2.39), then the linearity preservation property (2.37) is satisfied.

Remark 2.3. In [6, Lemma 6.1], the authors proved that if ω_i is symmetric with respect to Z_i , then $\gamma_i = 1$. An example of such a partition depicted in Fig. 5.1.

2.4. Auxiliary results. To estimate the error we will split the error by intersecting a suitable projection. We recall the Ritz projection as defined e.g., [34, Chapter 1] and the references therein. The projection $R_h : H^1 \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_h$, for a function $v \in H^1$, is defined such that

$$(2.41) \quad (\nabla(R_h v - v), \nabla \chi) = 0, \quad \forall \chi \in \mathcal{S}_h.$$

In view of the mesh Assumption 2.1, R_h satisfy the following bounds, cf. e.g., [11, Chapter 8] and [34].

$$(2.42) \quad \|v - R_h v\|_{L^2} + h\|v - R_h v\|_1 \leq Ch^2\|v\|_2, \quad \forall v \in H^2,$$

$$(2.43) \quad \|\nabla R_h v\|_{L^2} \leq \|\nabla v\|_{L^2}, \quad \forall v \in H^1.$$

The last inequality may be found in [34, Lemma 13.3].

For our analysis purposes, we assume that the solution $(\bar{y}, \bar{p}, \bar{u})$ of (1.5)–(1.9) is sufficiently smooth, i.e., there exists $M_0 > 0$, independent of h , such that, for $t \in [0, T]$,

Assumption 2.2. *Assume that for the unique solution $(\bar{y}, \bar{p}, \bar{u})$ of the parabolic convection-diffusion equation (1.5)–(1.9), the following estimates are hold. There exist a constant $M > 0$, such that for all $t \in [0, T]$,*

$$(2.44) \quad \|\bar{u}(t)\|_1 + \|\bar{y}(t)\|_2 + \|\bar{p}(t)\|_2 + \|\bar{y}_t(t)\|_1 + \|\bar{p}_t(t)\|_1 \leq M.$$

In what follows, we recall various useful results for the stabilization terms of the AFC scheme, that are crucial to our analysis. Recall the bilinear form $d_{\mathbf{D},h}$, introduced in (2.13), and hence also $\widehat{d}_{\mathbf{D},h}$, defined in (2.30), induces a seminorm on \mathcal{C} , thanks to [3, Lemma 3.1]. This is not true for $d_{\mathbf{D},h}$, $\widehat{d}_{\mathbf{D},h}$, since the off-diagonal elements of \mathbf{D} , are non-positive, see their definition in (2.4).

Therefore, $d_{\widehat{\mathbf{D}},h}(\cdot, \cdot)$, $\widehat{d}_{\widehat{\mathbf{D}},h}(w; \cdot, \cdot) : \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, with $w \in \mathcal{S}_h$, are a non-negative symmetric bilinear forms which satisfies the Cauchy-Schwartz's inequality,

$$(2.45) \quad |\widehat{d}_{\widehat{\mathbf{D}},h}(w; v, z)|^2 \leq \widehat{d}_{\widehat{\mathbf{D}},h}(w; v, v) \widehat{d}_{\widehat{\mathbf{D}},h}(w; z, z), \quad \forall v, z \in \mathcal{C},$$

and thus induces a seminorm on \mathcal{C} . For the stabilization term (2.13), we have the following two results, see [3] since $d_{ij} = \mathcal{O}(h)$, $\widehat{d}_{ij} = \mathcal{O}(h)$, see (2.6).

Lemma 2.2. [3, Lemma 7.3] There are exists a constant C such that,

$$|\widehat{d}_{\mathbf{D},h}(\psi; \psi, \chi)| + |\widehat{d}_{\widehat{\mathbf{D}},h}(\psi; \psi, \chi)| + |d_{\mathbf{D},h}(\psi, \chi)| + |d_{\widehat{\mathbf{D}},h}(\psi, \chi)| \leq Ch\|\mathbf{b}\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla \psi\|_{L^2} \|\nabla \chi\|_{L^2},$$

where the constant C , depend on the shape regularity constant ϖ , see (2.1).

For the bilinear forms (2.29), (2.30) a more sharp estimate holds, see [14, Lemma 2.17]. While in [14] the proof is based on Neumann boundary conditions, the proof can be easily extended in the case of Dirichlet boundary conditions.

Lemma 2.3. [14, Lemma 2.17] *For $v \in H^2$ and the correction factors satisfies Lemma 2.1 there are exists a constant C such that for all $\psi, \chi \in \mathcal{S}_h$,*

$$(2.46) \quad |\widehat{d}_{\mathbf{D},h}(\psi; \psi, \chi)| \leq C(h + \|\mathbf{q}^1\|_{\max})(\|\nabla(\psi - v)\|_{L^2}^2 + h^2\|v\|_2^2)^{1/2} \|\nabla \chi\|_{L^2},$$

$$(2.47) \quad |\widehat{d}_{\widehat{\mathbf{D}},h}(\psi; \psi, \chi)| \leq C(h + \|\mathbf{q}^2\|_{\max})(\|\nabla(\psi - v)\|_{L^2}^2 + h^2\|v\|_2^2)^{1/2} \|\nabla \chi\|_{L^2},$$

where $\|\mathbf{q}^t\|_{\max} = \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} |q_i^t|$, where q_i^t , $i = 1, \dots, N$, are the coefficients on the Algorithm 1, that are used to compute the coefficients $\mathbf{a}_{ij}(\psi)$, $i, j = 1, \dots, N$, for the stabilization term (2.29) and (2.30).

In view of the stabilization terms defined in (2.13) and (2.29), we define the bilinear form $\widetilde{d}_{\mathbf{D},h}(w; \cdot, \cdot) : \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, with $w \in \mathcal{S}_h$, is defined by

$$(2.48) \quad \widetilde{d}_{\mathbf{D},h}(w; v, z) := d_{\mathbf{D},h}(v, z) - \widehat{d}_{\mathbf{D},h}(w; v, z) = \sum_{i < j} d_{ij} \mathbf{a}_{ij}(w)(v_i - v_j)(z_i - z_j), \quad \forall v, z \in \mathcal{C},$$

and the in a similar way, the bilinear form $\widetilde{d}_{\widehat{\mathbf{D}},h}(w; \cdot, \cdot) : \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, with $w \in \mathcal{S}_h$, is defined by

$$(2.49) \quad \widetilde{d}_{\widehat{\mathbf{D}},h}(w; v, z) := d_{\widehat{\mathbf{D}},h}(v, z) - \widehat{d}_{\widehat{\mathbf{D}},h}(w; v, z) = \sum_{i < j} \widehat{d}_{ij} \widehat{\mathbf{a}}_{ij}(w)(v_i - v_j)(z_i - z_j), \quad \forall v, z \in \mathcal{C}.$$

For the stabilization terms defined (2.29), (2.30) as well as those defined in (2.48), (2.49), the following estimates are hold.

Lemma 2.4. [14, Lemma 2.17] *Let the bilinear forms $\widehat{d}_{\mathbf{D},h}$, $\widehat{d}_{\widehat{\mathbf{D}},h}$, $\widetilde{d}_{\mathbf{D},h}$, $\widetilde{d}_{\widehat{\mathbf{D}},h}$ defined in (2.29), (2.30), (2.48), (2.49), respectively. If their correction factors are satisfying Lemma 2.1 and $w, s, v, \chi \in \mathcal{S}_h$, then*

$$(2.50) \quad \begin{aligned} & |\widehat{d}_{\mathbf{D},h}(v; v, \chi) - \widehat{d}_{\mathbf{D},h}(w; w, \chi)| + |\widetilde{d}_{\mathbf{D},h}(v; v, \chi) - \widetilde{d}_{\mathbf{D},h}(w; w, \chi)| \\ & \leq C(h + \|\mathbf{q}^1\|_{\max}) \|\nabla(v - w)\|_{L^2} \|\nabla\chi\|_{L^2}, \end{aligned}$$

$$(2.51) \quad \begin{aligned} & |\widehat{d}_{\widehat{\mathbf{D}},h}(v; v, \chi) - \widehat{d}_{\widehat{\mathbf{D}},h}(w; w, \chi)| + |\widetilde{d}_{\widehat{\mathbf{D}},h}(v; v, \chi) - \widetilde{d}_{\widehat{\mathbf{D}},h}(w; w, \chi)| \\ & \leq C(h + \|\mathbf{q}^2\|_{\max}) \|\nabla(v - w)\|_{L^2} \|\nabla\chi\|_{L^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\|\mathbf{q}^t\|_{\max} = \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} |q_i^t|$, where q_i^t , $i = 1, \dots, N$, are the coefficients on the Algorithm 1, that are used to compute the coefficients \mathbf{a}_{ij} , $i, j = 1, \dots, N$, for the stabilization term (2.29) and (2.30).

Similar to the stabilization terms due to matrices \mathbf{D} , $\widehat{\mathbf{D}}$, we also define the corresponding one for the matrix \mathbf{M}_L . We define the bilinear forms $\widetilde{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L,h}(s; \cdot, \cdot)$, $d_{\mathbf{M}_L,h}(\cdot, \cdot) : \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, with $s \in \mathcal{S}_h$, for $v, z \in \mathcal{C}$,

$$(2.52) \quad d_{\mathbf{M}_L,h}(v, z) := \sum_{i < j} m_{ij} (v_i - v_j)(z_i - z_j),$$

$$(2.53) \quad \widetilde{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L,h}(s; v, z) := d_{\mathbf{M}_L,h}(v, z) - \widehat{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L,h}(s; v, z) = \sum_{i < j} m_{ij} a_{ij}(s) (v_i - v_j)(z_i - z_j),$$

where $a_{ij} = \mathbf{a}_{ij}$ or $a_{ij} = \widehat{\mathbf{a}}_{ij}$.

Following the proof of [14, Lemma 2.10], the following estimate for the stabilization terms $d_{\mathbf{M}_L,h}$, $\widetilde{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L,h}$, $\widehat{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L,h}$ can be proved.

Lemma 2.5. *There are exists a constant C such that, for $\zeta, \psi, \chi \in \mathcal{S}_h$,*

$$(2.54) \quad |d_{\mathbf{M}_L,h}(\psi, \chi)| + |\widetilde{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L,h}(\zeta; \psi, \chi)| + |\widehat{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L,h}(\zeta; \psi, \chi)| \leq Ch^2 \|\nabla\psi\|_{L^2} \|\nabla\chi\|_{L^2}.$$

Lemma 2.6. *There are exists a constant C such that, for $v, \zeta, \psi, \chi \in \mathcal{S}_h$,*

$$(2.55) \quad |\widetilde{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L,h}(v; \psi, \chi) - \widetilde{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L,h}(v; \zeta, \chi)| + |\widehat{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L,h}(v; \psi, \chi) - \widehat{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L,h}(v; \zeta, \chi)| \leq Ch^2 \|\nabla(\psi - \zeta)\|_{L^2} \|\nabla\chi\|_{L^2}.$$

A similar lemma to Lemma 2.4 can be proved also for the stabilization terms due to mass lumping.

Lemma 2.7. *Let the bilinear forms $\widehat{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L,h}$, $\widetilde{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L,h}$ defined in (2.31), (2.53), respectively. If their correction factors are satisfying Lemma 2.1 and $w, s, v, \chi \in \mathcal{S}_h$, then*

$$(2.56) \quad \begin{aligned} & |\widehat{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L,h}(v; v, \chi) - \widehat{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L,h}(w; w, \chi)| + |\widetilde{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L,h}(v; v, \chi) - \widetilde{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L,h}(w; w, \chi)| \\ & \leq C(h^2 + \|\mathbf{q}\|_{\max}) \|\nabla(v - w)\|_{L^2} \|\nabla\chi\|_{L^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\|\mathbf{q}\|_{\max} = \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} |q_i^t|$, where q_i , $i = 1, \dots, N$, are the coefficients on the Algorithm 1, that are used to compute the coefficients \mathbf{a}_{ij} , $i, j = 1, \dots, N$, for the stabilization term (2.31) and (2.53).

Proof. The proof is similar to Lemma 2.4, where now instead of term $d_{ij} = \mathcal{O}(h)$, we have $m_{ij} = \mathcal{O}(h^2)$. \square

3. FULLY-DISCRETE SCHEME

For the temporal discretization, we will use the backward Euler for the state variable in (2.32) and the explicit Euler for the co-state variable in (2.33) in uniform partition of the temporal domain, i.e., let $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, $N_0 \geq 1$, $k = T/N_0$ and $t^n = nk$, $n = 0, \dots, N_0$. We seek $Y^n \in \mathcal{S}_h$, approximation of $\bar{y}^n = \bar{y}(\cdot, t^n)$ for $n = 1, \dots, N_0$, such that, for all $\chi \in \mathcal{S}_h$,

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{aligned} & (\bar{\partial}Y^n, \chi) + \mu(\nabla Y^n, \nabla\chi) + (\mathbf{b}^n \cdot \nabla Y^n, \chi) \\ & + \widehat{d}_{\mathbf{D},h}(Y^n; Y^n, \chi) + \widehat{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L,h}(Y^n - Y^{n-1}; \bar{\partial}Y^n, \chi) = (\widetilde{P}_h U^n, \chi)_h, \end{aligned}$$

with $Y^0 = y_h^0 \in \mathcal{S}_h$ and $\bar{\partial}Y^n = (Y^n - Y^{n-1})/k$. Moreover, we seek $P^{n-1} \in \mathcal{S}_h$, approximation of $\bar{p}^{n-1} = \bar{p}(\cdot, t^{n-1})$ for $n = 1, \dots, N_0$, such that, for all $\chi \in \mathcal{S}_h$,

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{aligned} & -(\bar{\partial}P^n, \chi) + \mu(\nabla P^{n-1}, \nabla\chi) - (\mathbf{b}^{n-1} \cdot \nabla P^{n-1}, \chi) \\ & + \widehat{d}_{\widehat{\mathbf{D}},h}(P^{n-1}; P^{n-1}, \chi) - \widehat{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L,h}(P^{n-1} - P^n; \bar{\partial}P^n, \chi) = (Y^n, \chi)_h - (y_d^n, \chi), \end{aligned}$$

with $P^{N_0} = 0$. The control variable $U^n \in \mathbb{U}_{\text{ad}}$,

$$(3.3) \quad (\lambda U^n + P^{n-1}, \psi - U^n) \geq 0, \quad \forall \psi \in \mathbb{U}_{\text{ad}}.$$

Similar to (1.9), one can express (3.3) by using (1.8), as

$$(3.4) \quad U^n := \Pi_{[u_a, u_b]}(-\lambda^{-1} P^{n-1}), \quad n = 1, \dots, N_0.$$

The resulting fully-discrete scheme (3.1)–(3.4) is nonlinear, where we need to prove its existence and uniqueness.

First, let us write the matrix formulation of the nonlinear fully-discrete scheme (3.1)–(3.4). To do this, we introduce the following notation. Let $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^n = (\alpha_1^n, \dots, \alpha_N^n)^T$, $\boldsymbol{\beta}^n = (\beta_1^n, \dots, \beta_N^n)^T$, $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^n = (\gamma_1^n, \dots, \gamma_N^n)^T$ the coefficients, with respect to the basis of \mathcal{S}_h of Y^n , $P^n \in \mathcal{S}_h$ and $\tilde{P}_h U^n \in \mathcal{S}_h$, respectively. Then (3.1)–(3.4) can be written as

$$(3.5) \quad (\mathbf{M}_L + k(\mathbf{S} + \mathbf{T} + \mathbf{D}))\boldsymbol{\alpha}^n = \mathbf{M}_L \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{n-1} + k \mathbf{M}_L \boldsymbol{\gamma}^n + k \bar{\mathbf{f}}^1(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^n) + \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^n - \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{n-1}),$$

$$(3.6) \quad (\mathbf{M}_L + k(\mathbf{S} - \mathbf{T} - \widehat{\mathbf{D}}))\boldsymbol{\beta}^{n-1} = \mathbf{M}_L \boldsymbol{\beta}^n + k \mathbf{M}_L \boldsymbol{\alpha}^n - k \mathbf{r}(y_d^n) + k \bar{\mathbf{f}}^2(\boldsymbol{\beta}^{n-1}) + \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^{n-1} - \boldsymbol{\beta}^n),$$

$$(3.7) \quad \mathbf{M}_L \boldsymbol{\gamma}^n = \mathbf{r}(U^n),$$

with $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^0 = \widehat{\mathbf{v}}$, $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{N_0} = \mathbf{0}$, where $\widehat{\mathbf{v}}$, $\mathbf{0}$ are the coefficient vectors of y_h^0 , $p_h^{N_0} \in \mathcal{S}_h$.

The next definition describes how the correction factors are computed.

Definition 3.1. *The correction factors in the stabilization terms in (3.5), (3.6), are computed in view of Algorithm 1 satisfying Lemma 2.1. More specifically, for a finite element function $\psi^n \in \mathcal{S}_h$, at time step $t = t^n$, with coefficient vector $\boldsymbol{\vartheta}^n \in \mathbb{R}^N$, i.e., $\psi^n = \sum_{j=1}^N \vartheta_j^n \phi_j$, the correction factors $\mathbf{a}_{ij}(\psi^n)$, $\widehat{\mathbf{a}}_{ij}(\psi^n)$, $i, j = 1, \dots, N$, are computed as follows.*

The $\mathbf{a}_{ij}(\psi^n)$ are computed from Algorithm 1 with $Q^\pm(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}^n)$, $P^\pm(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}^n)$, and $q_i = \gamma_i \sum_{j \in \mathcal{Z}_h^i} d_{ij}$,

The $\widehat{\mathbf{a}}_{ij}(\psi^n)$ are computed from Algorithm 1 with $Q^\pm(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}^n)$, $P^\pm(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}^n)$, and $q_i = \gamma_i \sum_{j \in \mathcal{Z}_h^i} \widehat{d}_{ij}$,

and the correction factors $\mathbf{a}_{ij}(\psi^n)$, $\widehat{\mathbf{a}}_{ij}(\psi^n)$, $i, j = 1, \dots, N$,

The $\mathbf{a}_{ij}(\psi^n)$, $\widehat{\mathbf{a}}_{ij}(\psi^n)$ are computed from Algorithm 1 with $Q^\pm(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}^n)$, $P^\pm(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}^n - \boldsymbol{\vartheta}^{n-1})$, and $q_i = \gamma_i \sum_{j \in \mathcal{Z}_h^i} m_{ij}$.

3.1. Error estimates for the state and co-state variable.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $(\bar{y}, \bar{p}, \bar{u})$ be the unique solution of (1.13)–(1.17), which is sufficient regular in view of Assumption 2.2 and (Y^n, P^{n-1}, U^n) a solution of the fully-discrete scheme (3.1)–(3.4) with $Y^0 := R_h y^0$. Assume the correction factors computed as in Definition 3.1. Then for k, h sufficiently small there exists $C_M > 0$, depending on M and μ , such that at time level $t = t^n$ we have for the state and co-state functions*

$$(3.8) \quad \begin{aligned} \|Y^n - R_h \bar{y}^n\|_{L^2} + \|P^n - R_h \bar{p}^n\|_{L^2} &\leq C_M \left(k \sum_{j=1}^{N_0} \|U^j - \bar{u}^j\|_{L^2}^2 + k^2 + h^4 \right)^{1/2} \\ \|Y^n - R_h \bar{y}^n\|_1 + \|P^n - R_h \bar{p}^n\|_1 &\leq C_M \left(k \sum_{j=1}^{N_0} \|U^j - \bar{u}^j\|_{L^2}^2 + k^2 + h^4 + k^{-1} h^4 \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let the finite element functions $\theta_y^n, \theta_p^n \in \mathcal{S}_h$, defined as $\theta_y^n = Y^n - R_h \bar{y}^n$, $\theta_p^n = P^n - R_h \bar{p}^n$ and $\rho_y^n = R_h \bar{y}^n - \bar{y}^n$, $\rho_p^n = R_h \bar{p}^n - \bar{p}^n$, for $n \geq 0$, where $R_h : H^1 \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_h$, the usual elliptic projection defined in (2.41).

Combining (1.5) and (3.1), error equation for θ_y^n , is

$$(3.9) \quad \begin{aligned} &(\bar{\partial} \theta_y^n, \chi) + \mu (\nabla \theta_y^n, \nabla \chi) + \widehat{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L, h}(Y^n - Y^{n-1}; \bar{\partial} \theta_y^n, \chi) \\ &= (\mathbf{b}^n \cdot \nabla (\theta_y^n + \rho_y^n), \chi) + (y_t^n - \bar{\partial} R_h \bar{y}^n, \chi) - \widehat{d}_{\mathbf{D}, h}(Y^n; Y^n, \chi) \\ &\quad + \widehat{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L, h}(Y^n - Y^{n-1}; \bar{\partial} R_h \bar{y}^n, \chi) - (\bar{u}^n - U^n, \chi) = I_1(\chi) + \dots + I_5(\chi), \quad \forall \chi \in \mathcal{S}_h. \end{aligned}$$

For the convective term, we have

$$|I_1(\chi)| \leq \|\mathbf{b}^n\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla \theta_y^n\|_{L^2} \|\chi\|_{L^2} + (\mathbf{b}^n \cdot \nabla \rho_y^n, \chi),$$

where for the last term, we will use an integration by parts formula, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{b}^n \cdot \nabla \rho_y^n, \chi) &= \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_K \chi \mathbf{b}^n \cdot \nabla \rho_y^n dx \\ &= \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \left(- \int_K \operatorname{div}(\chi \mathbf{b}^n) \rho_y^n dx + \int_{\partial K} \chi \mathbf{b}^n \cdot \nu_K \rho_y^n dx \right) \\ &= - \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_K \operatorname{div}(\chi \mathbf{b}^n) \rho_y^n dx, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality holds since the function on the boundary integral is continuous through the internodal edges and $\chi = 0$ on the $\partial\Omega$. Moreover, since $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{b} = 0$, we further get

$$(\mathbf{b}^n \cdot \nabla \rho_y^n, \chi) = (\nabla \chi \cdot \mathbf{b}^n, \rho_y^n) \leq \|\mathbf{b}^n\|_{L^\infty} \|\rho_y^n\|_{L^2} \|\nabla \chi\|_{L^2} \leq C_M h^2 \|\nabla \chi\|_{L^2}.$$

Thus,

$$|I_1(\chi)| \leq C_M (\|\nabla\theta_y^n\|_{L^2}\|\chi\|_{L^2} + h^2\|\nabla\chi\|_{L^2}).$$

For the second functional I_2 using the Taylor expansion, the stability of R_h , see, e.g., (2.43) and its estimates (2.42), we get

$$|I_2(\chi)| \leq C_M(k + h^2)\|\chi\|_{L^2}.$$

The third functional can be estimated in view of Lemma 2.3, to get

$$|I_3(\chi)| \leq C(h + \|\mathbf{q}\|_{\max})(\|\nabla\theta_y^n\|_{L^2}^2 + h^2\|R_h\bar{y}^n\|_2^2)^{1/2}\|\nabla\chi\|_{L^2} \leq Ch(\|\nabla\theta_y^n\|_{L^2} + h)\|\nabla\chi\|_{L^2}.$$

For the fourth term, we have in view of Lemma 2.5 and performing Taylor expansion,

$$|I_4(\chi)| \leq C_M h^2 \|\nabla\chi\|_{L^2}.$$

For the last term, we only use the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality for now on. Note now that in view of the symmetry of (\cdot, \cdot) , we obtain

$$(3.10) \quad (\bar{\partial}\theta_y^n, \theta_y^n) = \frac{1}{2k}(\|\theta_y^n\|_{L^2}^2 - \|\theta_y^{n-1}\|_{L^2}^2) + \frac{k}{2}\|\bar{\partial}\theta_y^n\|_{L^2}^2.$$

A similar identity holds also for $\hat{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L, h}(s; \cdot, \cdot)$, $s \in \mathcal{S}_h$, i.e.,

$$(3.11) \quad \hat{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L, h}(s; \bar{\partial}\theta_y^n, \theta_y^n) = \frac{1}{2k} \left(\hat{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L, h}(s; \theta_y^n, \theta_y^n) - \hat{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L, h}(s; \theta_y^{n-1}, \theta_y^{n-1}) \right) + \frac{2}{k} \hat{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L, h}(s; \bar{\partial}\theta_y^n, \bar{\partial}\theta_y^n),$$

and since $\hat{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L, h}(s; \cdot, \cdot)$, forms a seminorm on \mathcal{C} , the last term on the last identity is non-negative.

Testing $\chi = \theta_y^n$ in (3.9), setting $s = Y^n - Y^{n-1}$ and using the above estimates as well as the Young inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\theta_y^n\|_{L^2}^2 + \mu k \|\nabla\theta_y^n\|_{L^2}^2 + \hat{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L, h}(Y^n - Y^{n-1}; \theta_y^n, \theta_y^n) \\ & \leq \|\theta_y^{n-1}\|_{L^2}^2 + \hat{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L, h}(Y^n - Y^{n-1}; \theta_y^{n-1}, \theta_y^{n-1}) + C_M k (k^2 + h^4 + \|U^n - \bar{u}^n\|_{L^2}^2), \end{aligned}$$

where summing from 1 to $n \leq N_0$, we get

$$(3.12) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|\theta_y^n\|_{L^2}^2 + \mu k \|\nabla\theta_y^n\|_{L^2}^2 + \hat{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L, h}(Y^n - Y^{n-1}; \theta_y^n, \theta_y^n) \\ & \leq \|\theta_y^0\|_{L^2}^2 + \hat{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L, h}(Y^n - Y^{n-1}; \theta_y^0, \theta_y^0) + C_M \left(k \sum_{j=1}^n \|U^j - \bar{u}^j\|_{L^2}^2 + k^2 + h^4 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Testing $\chi = \bar{\partial}\theta_y^n$ into (3.9), and using similar manipulations, we further get

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\bar{\partial}\theta_y^n\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\mu}{2k}(\|\nabla\theta_y^n\|_{L^2}^2 - \|\nabla\theta_y^{n-1}\|_{L^2}^2) + \frac{k}{2}\|\bar{\partial}\nabla\theta_y^n\|_{L^2}^2 + \hat{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L, h}(Y^n - Y^{n-1}; \bar{\partial}\theta_y^n, \bar{\partial}\theta_y^n) \\ & \leq C_M ((k + h^2 + \|\nabla\theta_y^n\|_{L^2} + \|U^n - \bar{u}^n\|_{L^2})\|\bar{\partial}\theta_y^n\|_{L^2} + h^2\|\bar{\partial}\nabla\theta_y^n\|_{L^2}^2) \\ & \leq C_M (k^2 + h^4 + \|\nabla\theta_y^n\|_{L^2}^2 + \|U^n - \bar{u}^n\|_{L^2}^2) + \frac{1}{2}\|\bar{\partial}\theta_y^n\|_{L^2}^2 + C_M k^{-1}h^4 + \frac{1}{4}k\|\bar{\partial}\nabla\theta_y^n\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging the terms, using the properties of the stabilization term, i.e., its non-negativity and for small k , we get

$$(3.13) \quad k \sum_{j=1}^n \|\bar{\partial}\theta_y^j\|_{L^2}^2 + \mu \|\nabla\theta_y^n\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \mu \|\nabla\theta_y^0\|_{L^2}^2 + C_M \left(k \sum_{j=1}^n \|U^j - \bar{u}^j\|_{L^2}^2 + k^2 + h^4 + k^{-1}h^4 \right).$$

Next, the error for the co-state function, is given by combining (1.6) and (3.2),

$$(3.14) \quad \begin{aligned} & -(\bar{\partial}\theta_p^n, \chi) + \mu (\nabla\theta_p^{n-1}, \nabla\chi) - \hat{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L, h}(P^{n-1} - P^n; \bar{\partial}\theta_p^n, \chi) \\ & = -(\mathbf{b}^{n-1} \cdot \nabla(\theta_p^{n-1} + \rho_p^{n-1}), \chi) - (\bar{p}_t^{n-1} - \bar{\partial}R_h\bar{p}^n, \chi) - \hat{d}_{\mathbf{D}, h}(P^{n-1}; P^{n-1}, \chi) \\ & \quad + \hat{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L, h}(P^{n-1} - P^n; \bar{\partial}R_h\bar{p}^n, \chi) + (\theta_y^n + \rho_y^n + k\bar{y}_t^{n-1}, \chi)_h = I_1(\chi) + \dots + I_5(\chi), \end{aligned}$$

for all $\chi \in \mathcal{S}_h$. Using similar arguments to estimate the functionals I_1, \dots, I_5 as before, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & -(\bar{\partial}\theta_p^n, \chi) + \mu (\nabla\theta_p^{n-1}, \nabla\chi) - \hat{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L, h}(P^{n-1} - P^n; \bar{\partial}\theta_p^n, \chi) \\ & \leq C_M ((k + h^2 + \|\nabla\theta_p^n\|_{L^2} + \|\theta_u^n\|_{L^2})\|\chi\|_{L^2} + h^2\|\nabla\chi\|_{L^2}). \end{aligned}$$

By setting $\chi = \theta_p^{n-1}$, we further get

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\theta_p^{n-1}\|_{L^2}^2 - \|\theta_p^n\|_{L^2}^2 + \mu k \|\nabla\theta_p^{n-1}\|_{L^2}^2 + \hat{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L, h}(P^{n-1} - P^n; \theta_p^{n-1}, \theta_p^{n-1}) \\ & \leq \hat{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L, h}(P^{n-1} - P^n; \theta_p^n, \theta_p^n) + C_M k (k^2 + h^4 + \|\theta_u^n\|_{L^2}^2). \end{aligned}$$

Summing over N_0 to $n \geq 1$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\theta_p^{n-1}\|_{L^2}^2 + \mu k \sum_{j=n}^{N_0} \|\nabla \theta^{j-1}\|_{L^2}^2 + \widehat{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L, h}(P^{n-1} - P^n; \theta_p^{n-1}, \theta_p^{n-1}) \\ & \leq \|\theta_p^{N_0}\|_{L^2}^2 + \widehat{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L, h}(P^{n-1} - P^n; \theta_p^{N_0}, \theta_p^{N_0}) + C_M \left(k \sum_{j=1}^{N_0} \|\theta_u^j\|_{L^2}^2 + k^2 + h^4 \right). \end{aligned}$$

In view of the estimate (3.12), we further obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} k \sum_{j=1}^{N_0} \|\theta_u^j\|_{L^2}^2 & \leq k \sum_{j=1}^{N_0} \left(\|\theta_y^0\|_{L^2}^2 + \widehat{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L, h}(Y^j - Y^{j-1}; \theta_y^0, \theta_y^0) + C_M \left(k \sum_{\ell=1}^j \|U^\ell - \bar{u}^\ell\|_{L^2}^2 + k^2 + h^4 \right) \right) \\ & \leq \|\theta_y^0\|_{L^2}^2 + k \sum_{j=1}^{N_0} \widehat{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L, h}(Y^j - Y^{j-1}; \theta_y^0, \theta_y^0) + C_M \left(k \sum_{\ell=1}^{N_0} \|U^\ell - \bar{u}^\ell\|_{L^2}^2 + k^2 + h^4 \right), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $k \sum_{j=1}^{N_0} 1 = T$. Thus, since $\bar{p}^{N_0} = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\theta_p^{n-1}\|_{L^2}^2 + \mu k \sum_{j=n}^{N_0} \|\nabla \theta^{j-1}\|_{L^2}^2 + \widehat{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L, h}(P^{n-1} - P^n; \theta_p^{n-1}, \theta_p^{n-1}) \\ (3.15) \quad & \leq C_M \left(\|\theta_y^0\|_{L^2}^2 + k \sum_{j=1}^{N_0} (\widehat{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L, h}(Y^j - Y^{j-1}; \theta_y^0, \theta_y^0) + \|U^j - \bar{u}^j\|_{L^2}^2) + k^2 + h^4 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Testing $\chi = -\bar{\partial} \theta_p^n$ into (3.14), and using similar calculations as the derivation of the estimate (3.13), we get

$$(3.16) \quad k \sum_{j=n}^{N_0} \|\bar{\partial} \theta_p^j\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla \theta_p^{n-1}\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C_M \left(k \sum_{j=1}^{N_0} \|U^j - \bar{u}^j\|_{L^2}^2 + k^2 + h^4 + k^{-1} h^4 \right).$$

□

3.2. Error estimates for the control variable. It remains to derive an error estimate for the control discretization. To do so, we follow standard arguments that have already used for the discretization of the control variables, see, e.g., [19] and [36] and the references therein.

We define the following auxiliary variables. For any $w \in \mathbb{U}_{\text{ad}}$, we seek $(\bar{y}_w, \bar{p}_w) := (\bar{y}(w), \bar{p}(w))$, satisfies the following optimality conditions for $t \in [0, T]$,

$$(3.17) \quad (\bar{y}_{w,t}, v) + \mu (\nabla \bar{y}_w, \nabla v) + (\mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla \bar{y}_w, v) = (w, v), \quad \forall v \in H_0^1,$$

$$(3.18) \quad -(\bar{p}_{w,t}, v) + \mu (\nabla \bar{p}_w, \nabla v) - (\mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla \bar{p}_w, v) = (\bar{y}_w - y_d, v), \quad \forall v \in H_0^1,$$

with $\bar{y}_w(0) = y_0$, $\bar{p}_w(T) = 0$.

Remark 3.1. The weak formulations (1.5)–(1.6) and (3.17)–(3.18) coincide for $u = w$, where $u \in \mathbb{U}_{\text{ad}}$ as defined in (1.7) or equivalently in (1.9).

Similar, at every time step $t = t^n$, the auxiliary variables for the fully-discrete scheme (3.1)–(3.2). For fixed $\zeta^n \in \mathbb{U}_{\text{ad}}$, we seek $Y_{\zeta^n}^n \in \mathcal{S}_h$, approximation of $\bar{y}_{\zeta^n}^n = \bar{y}_{\zeta^n}(\cdot, t^n)$ for $n = 1, \dots, N_0$, such that, for all $\chi \in \mathcal{S}_h$,

$$(3.19) \quad \begin{aligned} & (\bar{\partial} Y_{\zeta^n}^n, \chi) + \mu (\nabla Y_{\zeta^n}^n, \nabla \chi) + (\mathbf{b}^n \cdot \nabla Y_{\zeta^n}^n, \chi) \\ & + \widehat{d}_{\mathbf{D}, h}(Y_{\zeta^n}^n; Y_{\zeta^n}^n, \chi) + \widehat{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L, h}(Y_{\zeta^n}^n - Y_{\zeta^{n-1}}^{n-1}; \bar{\partial} Y_{\zeta^n}^n, \chi) = (\zeta^n, \chi), \end{aligned}$$

with $Y_{\zeta^0}^0 = y_h^0 \in \mathcal{S}_h$ and $\bar{\partial} Y_{\zeta^n}^n = (Y_{\zeta^n}^n - Y_{\zeta^{n-1}}^{n-1})/k$. Moreover, we seek $P_{\zeta^n}^{n-1} \in \mathcal{S}_h$, approximation of $\bar{p}_{\zeta^n}^{n-1} = \bar{p}_{\zeta^n}(\cdot, t^{n-1})$ for $n = 1, \dots, N_0$, such that, for all $\chi \in \mathcal{S}_h$,

$$(3.20) \quad \begin{aligned} & -(\bar{\partial} P_{\zeta^{n+1}}^n, \chi) + \mu (\nabla P_{\zeta^n}^{n-1}, \nabla \chi) - (\mathbf{b}^{n-1} \cdot \nabla P_{\zeta^n}^{n-1}, \chi) \\ & + \widehat{d}_{\mathbf{D}, h}(P_{\zeta^n}^{n-1}; P_{\zeta^n}^{n-1}, \chi) - \widehat{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L, h}(P_{\zeta^n}^{n-1} - P_{\zeta^{n+1}}^n; \bar{\partial} P_{\zeta^{n+1}}^n, \chi) = (Y_{\zeta^n}^n, \chi)_h - (y_d^n, \chi), \end{aligned}$$

with $P_{\zeta^{N_0+1}}^{N_0} = p_h^0 \in \mathcal{S}_h$ where we set $\zeta^{N_0+1} = \zeta^{N_0}$ and $\bar{\partial} P_{\zeta^{n+1}}^n = (P_{\zeta^{n+1}}^n - P_{\zeta^n}^{n-1})/k$.

Remark 3.2. The weak formulations (3.1)–(3.2) and (3.19)–(3.20) coincide for $U^n = \zeta^n$, where $U^n \in \mathbb{U}_{\text{ad}}$ as defined in (3.3) or equivalently in (3.4).

The proof of the next theorem is due to [19, Theorem 2.4] and can be found in various works for various temporal discretizations, for instance for the parabolic convection–diffusion equation in the context of the local discontinuous Galerkin method, see, e.g., [38, Theorem 4.4]. Also, in the context of a parabolic optimal control where the Crank–Nicolson scheme is used for the temporal discretization [37, Theorem 3.6]. In addition, for elliptic stabilized convection–dominant diffusion equations, see, e.g., [20, Theorem 3.1]. For completeness reasons, we will also describe the proof.

Theorem 3.2. *Let $(\bar{y}, \bar{p}, \bar{u})$ be the unique solution of the fully-discrete scheme (3.1)–(3.4), which is sufficient regular in view of Assumption 2.2. Then there exists $C > 0$, independent of k, h , such that at time level $t = t^n$ we have for the control function*

$$(3.21) \quad \lambda \|U^n - \bar{u}^n\|_{L^2} \leq C_M k + \|P^{n-1}(U^n) - \bar{p}^{n-1}(\bar{u}^n)\|_{L^2}.$$

Proof. We follow the arguments of [19, Theorem 2.4]. The proof is based in (1.7) and (3.3). More specifically, we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda \|\bar{u}^n - U^n\|_{L^2}^2 &= \lambda (\bar{u}^n - U^n, \bar{u}^n - U^n) \\ &= (\lambda \bar{u}^n + \bar{p}^{n-1}(\bar{u}^n), \bar{u}^n - U^n) + (P^{n-1}(U^n) - \bar{p}^{n-1}(\bar{u}^n), \bar{u}^n - U^n) - (\lambda U^n + P^{n-1}(U^n), \bar{u}^n - U^n), \end{aligned}$$

and by Taylor expansion,

$$\begin{aligned} &(\lambda \bar{u}^n + \bar{p}^{n-1}(\bar{u}^n), \bar{u}^n - U^n) \\ &= (\lambda \bar{u}^n + \bar{p}^n(\bar{u}^n), \bar{u}^n - U^n) + (\bar{p}^{n-1}(\bar{u}^n) - \bar{p}^n(\bar{u}^n), \bar{u}^n - U^n) \\ &= (\lambda \bar{u}^n + \bar{p}^n(\bar{u}^n), \bar{u}^n - U^n) - k (\bar{p}_t^n(\bar{u}^n), \bar{u}^n - U^n) + \frac{1}{2} \int_{t^n}^{t^{n-1}} (\bar{p}_{tt}(\bar{u}^n)(s)(t^{n-1} - s), \bar{u}^n - U^n) ds \\ &\leq C_M k \|\bar{u}^n - U^n\|_{L^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where the first term was non-positive for $v = U^n$ into (1.7). Thus, using the fact that $(\lambda U^n + P^{n-1}(U^n), \bar{u}^n - U^n) \geq 0$ when $\psi = \bar{u}^n$ into (3.3), we further get,

$$\lambda \|U^n - \bar{u}^n\|_{L^2}^2 \leq (C_M k + \|P^{n-1}(U^n) - \bar{p}^{n-1}(\bar{u}^n)\|_{L^2}) \|\bar{u}^n - U^n\|_{L^2}.$$

□

To find an upper bound for (3.21) that depends on k, h , we notice (see also in [19, Theorem 2.4], [20, Theorem 3.1]) that

$$(3.22) \quad \|\bar{p}_{\bar{u}^n}^{n-1} - P_{U^n}^{n-1}\|_{L^2} \leq \|\bar{p}_{\bar{u}^n}^{n-1} - P_{\bar{u}^n}^{n-1}\|_{L^2} + \|P_{\bar{u}^n}^{n-1} - P_{U^n}^{n-1}\|_{L^2}, \quad n = 1, \dots, N_0.$$

Thus, the next two lemmas, are devoted to derive an estimate for the norms that lying on the right hand side of (3.22).

Lemma 3.3. *For a $\zeta^n \in \mathbb{U}_{\text{ad}}$, let $(\bar{y}_{\zeta^n}, \bar{p}_{\zeta^n})$ be the unique solution of (3.17)–(3.18), sufficient regular in view of Assumption 2.2. Also, let $(Y_{\zeta^n}^n, P_{\zeta^n}^{n-1})$ be the unique solution of (3.19)–(3.20), where the correction factors computed as in Definition 3.1. Then, there exists a positive constant $C_M > 0$, depending on M and μ , such that,*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{y}_{\zeta^n}^n - Y_{\zeta^n}^n\|_{L^2} + \|\bar{p}_{\zeta^n}^{n-1} - P_{\zeta^n}^{n-1}\|_{L^2} &\leq C_M (k + h^2) \\ \|\bar{y}_{\zeta^n}^n - Y_{\zeta^n}^n\|_1 + \|\bar{p}_{\zeta^n}^{n-1} - P_{\zeta^n}^{n-1}\|_1 &\leq C_M (k + h + k^{-1/2}h^2). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The proof follows the same arguments to the proof of Theorem 3.1, where now, since both (3.17) and (3.19) depend on the same control variable ζ^n , its contribution vanishes and the estimate follows from (3.8). □

Lemma 3.4. *For $\bar{u}^n, U^n \in \mathbb{U}_{\text{ad}}$ as defined in (1.7), (3.3), let $(Y_{\bar{u}^n}^n, P_{\bar{u}^n}^{n-1}), (Y_{U^n}^n, P_{U^n}^{n-1})$ be the unique solution of (3.19)–(3.20), respectively, where the correction factors computed as in Definition 3.1. Then, for small k, h and $k = \mathcal{O}(h^{1+\epsilon})$, $0 < \epsilon < 1$, there exists a positive constant $C_M > 0$, depending on M and μ , such that,*

$$\|Y_{\bar{u}^n}^n - Y_{U^n}^n\|_{L^2} + \|P_{\bar{u}^n}^{n-1} - P_{U^n}^{n-1}\|_{L^2} \leq C_M \left(k \sum_{j=1}^{N_0} \|\bar{u}^j - U^j\|_{L^2}^2 + k^2 + h^4 \right)^{1/2}.$$

Proof. Let the finite element functions $\eta_y^n, \eta_p^n \in \mathcal{S}_h$, defined as $\eta_y^n = Y_{\bar{u}^n}^n - Y_{U^n}^n, \eta_p^n = P_{\bar{u}^n}^{n-1} - P_{U^n}^{n-1}$ for $n \geq 0$.

From (3.19), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &(\bar{\partial} \eta_y^n, \chi) + \mu (\nabla \eta_y^n, \nabla \chi) + \widehat{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L, h}(Y_{\bar{u}^n}^n - Y_{\bar{u}^n}^{n-1}; \bar{\partial} \eta_y^n, \chi) \\ &= -(\mathbf{b}^n \cdot \nabla \eta_y^n, \chi) + \widehat{d}_{\mathbf{D}, h}(Y_{U^n}^n; Y_{U^n}^n, \chi) - \widehat{d}_{\mathbf{D}, h}(Y_{\bar{u}^n}^n; Y_{\bar{u}^n}^n, \chi) \\ &+ \widehat{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L, h}(Y_{\bar{u}^n}^n - Y_{\bar{u}^n}^{n-1}; \bar{\partial} Y_{U^n}^n, \chi) - \widehat{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L, h}(Y_{U^n}^n - Y_{U^n}^{n-1}; \bar{\partial} Y_{U^n}^n, \chi) + (\bar{u}^n - U^n, \chi), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used (2.53). Using the same arguments as in Theorem 3.1 to estimate the term due to the convection, Lemma 2.4 to estimate the stabilization term $\widehat{d}_{\mathbf{D},h}$ together with the inverse inequality (2.3) and Lemma 2.5 twice for $\widehat{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L,h}$, we obtain, that

$$\begin{aligned} & (\bar{\partial}\eta_y^n, \chi) + \mu (\nabla\eta_y^n, \nabla\chi) + \widehat{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L,h}(Y_{\bar{u}^n}^n - Y_{\bar{u}^{n-1}}^{n-1}; \bar{\partial}\eta_y^n, \chi) \\ & \leq C_M (\|\nabla\eta_y^n\|_{L^2} + \|\bar{u}^n - U^n\|_{L^2}) \|\chi\|_{L^2} + h^2 \|\bar{\partial}\nabla Y_{U^n}^n\|_{L^2} \|\nabla\chi\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that for $\theta_y^n := Y_{U^n}^n - R_h\bar{y}^n$, and recalling the estimate (3.13) together with the fact that $Y_{U^0}^0 := R_h y^0$, and the inverse inequality (2.3), yields,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{\partial}\nabla Y_{U^n}^n\|_{L^2} & \leq Ch^{-1} \|\bar{\partial}\theta_y^n\|_{L^2} + \|\bar{\partial}\nabla R_h\bar{y}^n\|_{L^2} \\ & \leq C_M h^{-1} k^{-1/2} \left(k \sum_{j=1}^n \|U^j - \bar{u}^j\|_{L^2}^2 + k^2 + h^4 + k^{-1}h^4 \right)^{1/2} + C_M, \end{aligned}$$

where for the last term we have used Taylor expansion and the Assumption 2.2. This means that

$$\begin{aligned} h^2 \|\bar{\partial}\nabla Y_{U^n}^n\|_{L^2} \|\nabla\chi\|_{L^2} & \leq C h^4 \|\bar{\partial}\nabla Y_{U^n}^n\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\mu}{4} \|\nabla\chi\|_{L^2}^2 \\ & \leq C_M h^2 k^{-1} \left(k \sum_{j=1}^n \|U^j - \bar{u}^j\|_{L^2}^2 + k^2 + h^4 + k^{-1}h^4 \right) + \frac{\mu}{4} \|\nabla\chi\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that $h^2 k^{-1} = \mathcal{O}(h^{1-\epsilon})$ where $0 < \epsilon < 1$, and thus always bounded. Combining all these estimates, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & (\bar{\partial}\eta_y^n, \chi) + \mu (\nabla\eta_y^n, \nabla\chi) + \widehat{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L,h}(Y_{\bar{u}^n}^n - Y_{\bar{u}^{n-1}}^{n-1}; \bar{\partial}\eta_y^n, \chi) \\ & \leq C_M \left(\|\chi\|_{L^2}^2 + k \sum_{j=1}^n \|U^j - \bar{u}^j\|_{L^2}^2 + k^2 + h^4 + k^{-1}h^4 \right) + \frac{\mu}{4} \|\nabla\chi\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\mu}{4} \|\nabla\eta_y^n\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Testing $\chi = \eta_y^n$ we get the L^2 estimate. In addition, combining the above estimate with the estimates of Theorem 3.1, yields, the estimates for η_p^n , i.e., we have in view of (3.20),

$$\begin{aligned} & -(\bar{\partial}\eta_p^n, \chi) + \mu (\nabla\eta_p^{n-1}, \nabla\chi) - \widehat{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L,h}(P_{\bar{u}^n}^n - P_{\bar{u}^{n-1}}^{n-1}; \bar{\partial}\eta_p^n, \chi) \\ & = (\mathbf{b}^{n-1} \cdot \nabla\eta_p^{n-1}, \chi) + \widehat{d}_{\widehat{\mathbf{D}},h}(P_{U^n}^{n-1}; P_{U^n}^{n-1}, \chi) - \widehat{d}_{\widehat{\mathbf{D}},h}(P_{\bar{u}^n}^{n-1}; P_{\bar{u}^n}^{n-1}, \chi) \\ & \quad + \widehat{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L,h}(P_{U^n}^n - P_{U^{n-1}}^{n-1}; \bar{\partial}P_{U^n}^n, \chi) - \widehat{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L,h}(P_{\bar{u}^n}^n - P_{\bar{u}^{n-1}}^{n-1}; \bar{\partial}P_{U^n}^n, \chi) + (\eta_y^n, \chi)_h, \end{aligned}$$

and using similar arguments as before,

$$\begin{aligned} & -(\bar{\partial}\eta_p^n, \chi) + \mu (\nabla\eta_p^{n-1}, \nabla\chi) - \widehat{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L,h}(P_{\bar{u}^n}^n - P_{\bar{u}^{n-1}}^{n-1}; \bar{\partial}\eta_p^n, \chi) \\ & \leq C_M \left(\|\chi\|_{L^2}^2 + k \sum_{j=1}^{N_0} \|U^j - \bar{u}^j\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\eta_y^n\|_{L^2}^2 + k^2 + h^4 + k^{-1}h^4 \right) + \frac{\mu}{4} \|\nabla\chi\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\mu}{4} \|\nabla\eta_p^{n-1}\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Testing $\chi = \eta_p^{n-1}$ we get the L^2 estimate. □

Theorem 3.5. *Let $(\bar{y}, \bar{p}, \bar{u})$ be the unique solution of the fully-discrete scheme (3.1)–(3.4), which is sufficient regular in view of Assumption 2.2. Assume the correction factors computed as in Definition 3.1. Then for k, h sufficiently small and $k = \mathcal{O}(h^{1+\epsilon})$, $0 < \epsilon < 1$, there exists $C_M > 0$, depending on M and μ , such that at time level $t = t^n$ we have for the state and co-state functions*

$$(3.23) \quad \begin{aligned} \|Y^n - \bar{y}^n\|_{L^2} + \|P^n - \bar{p}^n\|_{L^2} + \|U^n - \bar{u}^n\|_{L^2} & \leq C_M(k + h^2) \\ \|Y^n - \bar{y}^n\|_1 + \|P^n - \bar{p}^n\|_1 & \leq C_M(k + h). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The proof of the estimates is a direct consequence of the estimates in Theorems 3.1, 3.2, Lemmas 3.3, 3.4, the inequality (3.22), the estimates (2.42) and the error splittings $Y^n - \bar{y}^n = (Y^n - R_h\bar{y}^n) + (R_h\bar{y}^n - \bar{y}^n)$ and $P^n - \bar{p}^n = (P^n - R_h\bar{p}^n) + (R_h\bar{p}^n - \bar{p}^n)$. □

3.3. Existence and uniqueness of the AFC scheme. In this subsection, our aim is to prove the existence and uniqueness of (3.1)–(3.2) for a $U^n \in \mathbb{U}_{\text{ad}}$, using Brouwer fixed point theorem.

Theorem 3.6. *Assume the correction factors computed as in Definition 3.1. For every $U^n \in \mathbb{U}_{\text{ad}}$ and for k, h sufficiently small and $k = \mathcal{O}(h^{1+\epsilon})$, $0 < \epsilon < 1$, there exist a unique solution of the fully-discrete scheme (3.1)–(3.2).*

Proof. In order to show the existence of the solution for (3.1), at time step $t = t^n$, we notice that (3.1) after a multiplication with k , it can be written as $(\mathcal{G}_1^n(Y^n), \chi) = 0$ where $\mathcal{G}_1^n : \mathcal{S}_h \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_h$ be continuous. Then, according to [34, Chapter 13], the equation $\mathcal{G}_1^n(X) = 0$ has solution $X \in \mathfrak{B}_L$, where

$$\mathfrak{B}_L = \{\chi \in \mathcal{S}_h : \|\chi\|_{L^2} \leq L\},$$

where L some sufficiently large constant, if $(\mathcal{G}_1^n(\chi), \chi) > 0$ for $\|\chi\|_{L^2} = L$. Then, we have, using standard estimates and Lemma 2.2,

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{G}_1^n(\chi), \chi) &= \|\chi\|_{L^2}^2 - (Y^{n-1}, \chi) + k\mu \|\nabla\chi\|_{L^2}^2 + k(\mathbf{b}^n \cdot \nabla\chi, \chi) \\ &\quad + k\widehat{d}_{\mathbf{D},h}(\chi; \chi, \chi) + \widehat{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L,h}(\chi - Y^{n-1}; \chi - Y^{n-1}, \chi) - (U^n, \chi) \\ &\geq \|\chi\|_{L^2}^2 (\|\chi\|_{L^2} - C_\infty \|Y^{n-1}\|_{L^2} - C\|\mathbf{b}^n\|_{L^\infty} k h^{-1} \|\chi\|_{L^2} - k\|U^n\|_{L^2}) \\ &\quad + k\|\nabla\chi\|_{L^2}^2 (\mu - C_\infty \|\mathbf{b}^n\|_{L^\infty} h) \end{aligned}$$

where in the last estimate we have used the inverse inequality (2.3) and the fact that $\widehat{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L,h}(\cdot; \chi, \chi) \geq 0$, for all $\chi \in \mathcal{S}_h$. According to (3.4), we obtain that $\|U^n\|_{L^\infty} \leq \max\{|u_a|, |u_b|\}$, and then $(\mathcal{G}_1^n(\chi), \chi) > 0$ if L is large enough and provided that $k = \mathcal{O}(h^{1+\epsilon})$, $\epsilon > 0$. This proves the existence of $Y^n \in \mathfrak{B}_L$ that solves (3.1).

Similar for the time step $t = t^{n-1}$, we write (3.2) as $(\mathcal{G}_2^{n-1}(P^{n-1}), \chi) = 0$ where $\mathcal{G}_2^{n-1} : \mathcal{S}_h \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_h$ be continuous. The equation $\mathcal{G}_2^{n-1}(X) = 0$ has solution $X \in \mathfrak{B}_L$ if $(\mathcal{G}_2^{n-1}(\chi), \chi) > 0$ for $\|\chi\|_{L^2} = L$. Then, we have,

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{G}_2^{n-1}(\chi), \chi) &= \|\chi\|_{L^2}^2 - (P^n, \chi) + k\mu \|\nabla\chi\|_{L^2}^2 - k(\mathbf{b}^{n-1} \cdot \nabla\chi, \chi) \\ &\quad + k\widehat{d}_{\mathbf{D},h}(\chi; \chi, \chi) + \widehat{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L,h}(\chi - P^n; \chi - P^n, \chi) - (Y^n, \chi)_h - (y_d^n, \chi) \\ &\geq \|\chi\|_{L^2}^2 (\|\chi\|_{L^2} - \|P^n\|_{L^2} - C\|\mathbf{b}^{n-1}\|_{L^\infty} k h^{-1} \|\chi\|_{L^2} - k\|Y^n\|_{L^2} - k\|y_d^n\|_{L^2} - Ch\|\nabla P^n\|_{L^2}), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the inverse inequality (2.3) and the fact that $\widehat{d}_{\mathbf{D},h}(\cdot; \chi, \chi), \widehat{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L,h}(\cdot; \chi, \chi) \geq 0$, for all $\chi \in \mathcal{S}_h$. Also, in view of the previous step, we have that $Y^n \in \mathfrak{B}_L$, and then $(\mathcal{G}_2^{n-1}(\chi), \chi) > 0$ if L is large enough and provided that $k = \mathcal{O}(h^{1+\epsilon})$, $\epsilon > 0$. This proves the existence of $P^{n-1} \in \mathfrak{B}_L$ that solves (3.2).

To prove the uniqueness of (3.1)–(3.4), assume $(\widehat{v}_1, \widehat{w}_1, \widehat{z}_1), (\widehat{v}_2, \widehat{w}_2, \widehat{z}_2)$ solutions of (3.1)–(3.4) with (Y^{n-1}, P^n) given. In addition, $\widehat{v}_1 \neq \widehat{v}_2, \widehat{w}_1 \neq \widehat{w}_2, \widehat{z}_1 \neq \widehat{z}_2$ and $\widehat{v} := \widehat{v}_1 - \widehat{v}_2, \widehat{w} := \widehat{w}_1 - \widehat{w}_2, \widehat{z} := \widehat{z}_1 - \widehat{z}_2$. In view of (3.1), we have

$$(3.24) \quad (\widehat{v}, \chi) + \mu k (\nabla\widehat{v}, \nabla\chi) = -I_1(\chi) - I_2(\chi) - I_3(\chi),$$

where the functionals I_1, I_2, I_3 , are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} I_1(\chi) &= k(\mathbf{b}^n \cdot \nabla\widehat{v}, \chi) - k(\widehat{z}, \chi), \\ I_2(\chi) &= k\widehat{d}_{\mathbf{D},h}(\widehat{v}_1; \widehat{v}_1, \chi) - k\widehat{d}_{\mathbf{D},h}(\widehat{v}_2; \widehat{v}_2, \chi), \\ I_3(\chi) &= \widehat{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L,h}(\widehat{v}_1 - Y^{n-1}; \widehat{v}_1 - Y^{n-1}, \chi) - \widehat{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L,h}(\widehat{v}_2 - Y^{n-1}; \widehat{v}_2 - Y^{n-1}, \chi). \end{aligned}$$

Standard estimates, gives

$$I_1(\chi) \leq C_M k (\|\nabla\widehat{v}\|_{L^2} + \|\widehat{z}\|_{L^2}) \|\chi\|_{L^2} \leq C_M k^2 (\|\nabla\widehat{v}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\widehat{z}\|_{L^2}^2) + \frac{1}{4} \|\chi\|_{L^2}^2.$$

In addition, in view of Lemma 2.6 and Lemma 2.4,

$$I_2(\chi) + I_3(\chi) \leq C_M (h^2 + kh) \|\nabla\widehat{v}\|_{L^2} \|\nabla\chi\|_{L^2}.$$

Then, for $\chi = \widehat{v}$, and performing standard calculations, we obtain,

$$(3.25) \quad \frac{3}{4} \|\widehat{v}\|_{L^2}^2 + k \|\nabla\widehat{v}\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C_M ((h^2 + k^2 + kh) \|\nabla\widehat{v}\|_{L^2}^2 + k^2 \|\widehat{z}\|_{L^2}^2).$$

Further, from (3.2), performing similar estimations, we obtain

$$(3.26) \quad \frac{3}{4} \|\widehat{w}\|_{L^2}^2 + k \|\nabla\widehat{w}\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C_M ((h^2 + k^2 + kh) \|\nabla\widehat{w}\|_{L^2}^2 + k \|\widehat{v}\|_{L^2}^2).$$

Also, in view of (3.4), i.e., due to the Lipschitz estimate of control variable, $\|\widehat{z}\|_{L^2} \leq \lambda^{-1} \|\widehat{w}\|_{L^2}$ and thus combining (3.25) with (3.26) with $k = \mathcal{O}(h^{1+\epsilon})$, $0 < \epsilon < 1$, we get that $\widehat{v} = 0, \widehat{w} = 0, \widehat{z} = 0$ a.e. in Ω , which shows uniqueness. \square

4. AN ITERATIVE SCHEME FOR APPROXIMATING THE NONLINEAR PROBLEM

In this section, we define an iterative scheme via fixed point method, which under sufficient choice of the correction factors, we will demonstrate its convergence to nonlinear AFC scheme (3.1)–(3.4).

4.1. A fixed point scheme. We consider the following iteration operator $\mathcal{G}^n : \mathcal{X}_h \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_h$, $(v^n, w^{n-1}, z^n) \mapsto (\mathcal{G}_1^n v^n, \mathcal{G}_2^{n-1} w^{n-1}, \mathcal{G}_3^n z^n)$ defined as follows. For a $(v^n, w^{n-1}, z^n) \in \mathcal{X}_h$, for every time step $t = t^n$, $n = 1, \dots, N_0$ we define $\mathcal{G}_1^n v^n$ as

$$(4.1) \quad \begin{aligned} & (\mathcal{G}_1^n v^n - Y^{n-1}, \chi) + \mu k (\nabla \mathcal{G}_1^n v^n, \nabla \chi) + k (\mathbf{b}^n \cdot \nabla \mathcal{G}_1^n v^n, \chi) + k d_{\mathbf{D},h}(\mathcal{G}_1^n v^n, \chi) \\ & + d_{\mathbf{M}_L,h}(\mathcal{G}_1^n v^n - Y^{n-1}, \chi) - \tilde{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L,h}(v^n - Y^{n-1}; v^n - Y^{n-1}, \chi) \\ & = k \tilde{d}_{\mathbf{D},h}(v^n; v^n, \chi) + (z^n, \chi), \end{aligned}$$

for the state variable for all $\chi \in \mathcal{S}_h$ with $v^n = Y^{n-1}$. After, we have computed $\mathcal{G}_1^n v^n$ for all $n = 1, \dots, N_0$, we define $\mathcal{G}_2^{n-1} w^{n-1}$, solution of the linearized scheme for the co-state variable, for every time step $t = t^{n-1}$, $n = N_0, \dots, 1$, as

$$(4.2) \quad \begin{aligned} & (\mathcal{G}_2^{n-1} w^{n-1} - P^n, \chi) + \mu k (\nabla \mathcal{G}_2^{n-1} w^{n-1}, \nabla \chi) - k (\mathbf{b}^{n-1} \cdot \nabla \mathcal{G}_2^{n-1} w^{n-1}, \chi) + k d_{\widehat{\mathbf{D}},h}(\mathcal{G}_2^{n-1} w^{n-1}, \chi) \\ & + d_{\mathbf{M}_L,h}(\mathcal{G}_2^{n-1} w^{n-1} - P^n, \chi) - \tilde{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L,h}(w^{n-1} - P^n; w^{n-1} - P^n, \chi) \\ & = k \tilde{d}_{\widehat{\mathbf{D}},h}(w^{n-1}; w^{n-1}, \chi) + (\mathcal{G}_1^n v^n, \chi)_h - (y_d^n, \chi), \end{aligned}$$

for all $\chi \in \mathcal{S}_h$ with $w^n = P^n$. Furthermore, the control variable, can be computed from

$$(4.3) \quad (\lambda \mathcal{G}_3^n z^n + \mathcal{G}_2^{n-1} w^{n-1}, \psi - \mathcal{G}_3^n z^n) \geq 0, \quad \forall \psi \in \mathbb{U}_{\text{ad}}.$$

Similar to (1.9), one can express (4.3) by using (1.8), as

$$(4.4) \quad \mathcal{G}_3^n z^n := \Pi_{[u_a, u_b]}(-\lambda^{-1} \mathcal{G}_2^{n-1} w^{n-1}), \quad n = 1, \dots, N_0.$$

Next, we write the matrix formulation of the nonlinear fully-discrete scheme (4.1)–(4.4). To do this, we introduce the following notation. Let $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^n = (\tilde{\alpha}_1^n, \dots, \tilde{\alpha}_N^n)^T$, $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{n-1} = (\tilde{\beta}_1^{n-1}, \dots, \tilde{\beta}_N^{n-1})^T$, $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}^n = (\tilde{\gamma}_1^n, \dots, \tilde{\gamma}_N^n)^T$ the coefficients, with respect to the basis of \mathcal{S}_h of $\mathcal{G}_1^n v^n$, $\mathcal{G}_2^{n-1} w^{n-1} \in \mathcal{S}_h$ and $\tilde{P}_h \mathcal{G}_3^n z^n \in \mathcal{S}_h$, respectively. Similar, let $\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^n = (\hat{\alpha}_1^n, \dots, \hat{\alpha}_N^n)^T$, $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{n-1} = (\hat{\beta}_1^{n-1}, \dots, \hat{\beta}_N^{n-1})^T$, $\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}^n = (\hat{\gamma}_1^n, \dots, \hat{\gamma}_N^n)^T$ the coefficients, with respect to the basis of \mathcal{S}_h of v^n , $w^{n-1} \in \mathcal{S}_h$ and $\tilde{P}_h z^n \in \mathcal{S}_h$, respectively. Then (4.1)–(4.4) can be written as

$$(4.5) \quad (\mathbf{M}_L + k(\mathbf{S} + \mathbf{T} + \mathbf{D}))\tilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^n = \mathbf{M}_L \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{n-1} + k \mathbf{M}_L \hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}^n + k \bar{\mathbf{f}}^1(\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^n) + \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^n, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{n-1}),$$

$$(4.6) \quad (\mathbf{M}_L + k(\mathbf{S} - \mathbf{T} - \widehat{\mathbf{D}}))\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{n-1} = \mathbf{M}_L \boldsymbol{\beta}^n + k \mathbf{M}_L \tilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^n - k \mathbf{r}(y_d^n) + k \bar{\mathbf{f}}^2(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{n-1}) + \bar{\mathbf{g}}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{n-1}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^n),$$

$$(4.7) \quad \mathbf{M}_L \hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}^n = \mathbf{r}(z^n), \quad \mathbf{M}_L \tilde{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}^n = \mathbf{r}(\mathcal{G}_3^n z^n),$$

with $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^0 = \hat{v}_1$, $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{N_0} = \mathbf{0}$, where \hat{v}_1 , $\mathbf{0}$ are the coefficient vectors of y_h^0 , $p_h^{N_0} \in \mathcal{S}_h$.

Definition 4.1. The correction terms $\bar{\mathbf{f}}^\iota$, $\iota = 1, 2$, with correction factors $\mathbf{a}_{ij} = \mathbf{a}_{ij}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^n)$, $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{ij} = \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{ij}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{n-1})$, $i, j = 1, \dots, N$, for $\iota = 1, 2$, respectively, are computed in view of Algorithm 1 and they satisfying Lemma 2.1, i.e.,

$$(4.8) \quad \begin{aligned} (\bar{\mathbf{f}}^1)_i & := (\bar{\mathbf{f}}^1(\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^n))_i = \sum_{j \neq i} \mathbf{a}_{ij} \mathbf{f}_{ij}, \quad \text{with } P^\pm := P^\pm(\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^n), \quad Q^\pm := Q^\pm(\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^n), \quad q_i = \gamma_i \sum_{j \in \mathcal{Z}_h^i} d_{ij}, \\ (\bar{\mathbf{f}}^2)_i & := (\bar{\mathbf{f}}^2(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{n-1}))_i = \sum_{j \neq i} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{ij} \hat{\mathbf{f}}_{ij}, \quad \text{with } P^\pm := P^\pm(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{n-1}), \quad Q^\pm := Q^\pm(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{n-1}), \quad q_i = \gamma_i \sum_{j \in \mathcal{Z}_h^i} \hat{d}_{ij}, \end{aligned}$$

for $i = 1, \dots, N$. Similar, the correction terms $\bar{\mathbf{g}}^\iota$, $\iota = 1, 2$, with correction factors $\mathbf{a}_{ij} = \mathbf{a}_{ij}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^n, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{n-1})$, $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{ij} = \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{ij}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{n-1}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^n)$, $i, j = 1, \dots, N$, respectively, are computed in view of Algorithm 1 and satisfying Lemma 2.1, i.e.,

$$(4.9) \quad \begin{aligned} (\bar{\mathbf{g}}^1)_i & := (\bar{\mathbf{g}}^1(\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^n, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{n-1}))_i = \sum_{j \neq i} \mathbf{a}_{ij} \mathbf{g}_{ij}, \quad \text{with } P^\pm := P^\pm(\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^n - \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{n-1}), \quad Q^\pm := Q^\pm(\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^n), \\ (\bar{\mathbf{g}}^2)_i & := (\bar{\mathbf{g}}^2(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{n-1}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^n))_i = \sum_{j \neq i} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{ij} \hat{\mathbf{g}}_{ij}, \quad \text{with } P^\pm := P^\pm(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{n-1} - \boldsymbol{\beta}^n), \quad Q^\pm := Q^\pm(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{n-1}), \end{aligned}$$

with $q_i = \gamma_i \sum_{j \in \mathcal{Z}_h^i} m_{ij}$ for $i = 1, \dots, N$. The amount of mass transported by the raw antidiffusive flux $\hat{\mathbf{f}}_{ij}$ is given by

$$(4.10) \quad \mathbf{f}_{ij} := \mathbf{f}_{ij}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^n) = (\hat{\alpha}_i^n - \hat{\alpha}_j^n) d_{ij}, \quad \forall j \neq i,$$

$$(4.11) \quad \hat{\mathbf{f}}_{ij} := \hat{\mathbf{f}}_{ij}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{n-1}) = (\hat{\beta}_i^{n-1} - \hat{\beta}_j^{n-1}) \hat{d}_{ij}, \quad \forall j \neq i,$$

and the amount of mass due to the replacement of the mass matrix \mathbf{M} by its mass lumped \mathbf{M}_L , by its mass lumped $\widehat{\mathbf{M}}_L$, the $\hat{\mathbf{g}}_{ij}$, are given by

$$(4.12) \quad \mathbf{g}_{ij} := \mathbf{g}_{ij}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^n, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{n-1}) = m_{ij}((\hat{\alpha}_i^n - \hat{\alpha}_j^n) - (\alpha_i^{n-1} - \alpha_j^{n-1})), \quad \forall j \neq i,$$

$$(4.13) \quad \hat{\mathbf{g}}_{ij} := \hat{\mathbf{g}}_{ij}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{n-1}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^n) = m_{ij}((\hat{\beta}_i^{n-1} - \hat{\beta}_j^{n-1}) - (\beta_i^n - \beta_j^n)), \quad \forall j \neq i,$$

The above linearized scheme can be summarized in the following algorithm.

Algorithm 2. [Computation of the fixed point scheme (4.1)–(4.4)]

- 1: Given a tolerance for the while loop, defined as TOL .
- 2: Set the initial values α^0, β^{N_0} as the coefficient vectors of $y_h^0, p_h^{N_0}$, respectively.
- 3: Initialize $\hat{\gamma}^n, \tilde{\gamma}^n = \mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $n = 1, \dots, N_0$, the zero vector, also $\hat{\alpha}^0 = \hat{\alpha}^1 := \alpha^0$ and $\hat{\beta}^{N_0} = \hat{\beta}^{N_0-1} := \beta^{N_0}$.
- 4: **while** 1 **do**
- 5: **for** $n = 1, \dots, N_0$ **do**
- 6: **while** 1 **do**
- 7: Given $\hat{\alpha}^{n-1}(\tilde{\gamma}^{n-1}), \hat{\alpha}^n(\tilde{\gamma}^n) \in \mathbb{R}^N$, compute the correction factors $\hat{a}_{ij}, \hat{a}_{ij}$ as in Definition 4.1.
- 8: Given $\tilde{\gamma}^n \in \mathbb{R}^N$, solve (4.5) to obtain $\tilde{\alpha}^n(\tilde{\gamma}^n) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ for which $\tilde{\alpha}^n(\tilde{\gamma}^n) \approx \alpha^n(\tilde{\gamma}^n)$.
- 9: If $\frac{\|\tilde{\alpha}^n(\tilde{\gamma}^n) - \hat{\alpha}^n(\tilde{\gamma}^n)\|_{\max}}{\|\hat{\alpha}^n(\tilde{\gamma}^n)\|_{\max}} \leq TOL$ set $\hat{\alpha}^n(\tilde{\gamma}^n) = \tilde{\alpha}^n(\tilde{\gamma}^n)$ and break the inner while.
- 10: **end while**
- 11: **end for**
- 12: **for** $n = N_0, \dots, 1$ **do**
- 13: **while** 1 **do**
- 14: Given $\hat{\beta}^n(\tilde{\gamma}^n), \hat{\beta}^{n-1}(\tilde{\gamma}^{n-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^N$, compute the correction factors $\hat{a}_{ij}, \hat{a}_{ij}$ as in Definition 4.1.
- 15: Given $\tilde{\alpha}^n(\tilde{\gamma}^n) \in \mathbb{R}^N$, solve (4.6) to obtain $\tilde{\beta}^{n-1}(\tilde{\gamma}^n) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ for which $\tilde{\beta}^{n-1}(\tilde{\gamma}^n) \approx \beta^{n-1}(\tilde{\gamma}^n)$.
- 16: Compute the control $\tilde{\gamma}^n = \max\{u_a, \min\{u_b, -\lambda^{-1}\tilde{\beta}^{n-1}(\tilde{\gamma}^n)\}\}$
- 17: If $\frac{\|\tilde{\beta}^n(\tilde{\gamma}^n) - \hat{\beta}^n(\tilde{\gamma}^n)\|_{\max}}{\|\hat{\beta}^n(\tilde{\gamma}^n)\|_{\max}} \leq TOL$ set $\hat{\beta}^{n-1}(\tilde{\gamma}^n) = \tilde{\beta}^{n-1}(\tilde{\gamma}^n)$ and break the inner while.
- 18: **end while**
- 19: **end for**
- 20: Compute $A := \max_{0 \leq n \leq N_0} \left\{ \frac{\|\tilde{\alpha}^n(\tilde{\gamma}^n) - \hat{\alpha}^n(\tilde{\gamma}^n)\|_{\max}}{\|\hat{\alpha}^n(\tilde{\gamma}^n)\|_{\max}} \right\}$
- 21: Compute $B := \max_{0 \leq n \leq N_0} \left\{ \frac{\|\tilde{\beta}^n(\tilde{\gamma}^n) - \hat{\beta}^n(\tilde{\gamma}^n)\|_{\max}}{\|\hat{\beta}^n(\tilde{\gamma}^n)\|_{\max}} \right\}$
- 22: Compute $\Gamma := \max_{0 \leq n \leq N_0} \left\{ \frac{\|\tilde{\gamma}^n - \hat{\gamma}^n\|_{\max}}{\|\hat{\gamma}^n\|_{\max}} \right\}$
- 23: **if** $\max\{A, B, \Gamma\} \leq TOL$ **then**
- 24: Set $\hat{\gamma}^n := \tilde{\gamma}^n$, $\hat{\alpha}^n(\tilde{\gamma}^n) := \tilde{\alpha}^n(\tilde{\gamma}^n)$ for $n = 1, \dots, N_0$ and $\hat{\beta}^{n-1}(\tilde{\gamma}^n) := \tilde{\beta}^{n-1}(\tilde{\gamma}^n)$ for $n = N_0, \dots, 1$.
- 25: Break the while loop
- 26: **else**
- 27: Continue.
- 28: **end if**
- 29: **end while**

4.2. Converge of the iterative scheme to the solution. In this subsection, we will demonstrate the converge of the iterative scheme defined via fixed point in (4.1)–(4.4) into the solution of (3.1)–(3.4).

Theorem 4.1. Let (Y^n, P^{n-1}, U^n) for $n = 1, \dots, N_0$ be a unique solution of (3.1)–(3.4) with correction factors chosen according to Definition 3.1. Also, let $(\mathcal{G}_1^n v^n, \mathcal{G}_2^{n-1} w^{n-1}, \mathcal{G}_3^n z^n)$ for $n = 1, \dots, N_0$ be a unique solution of (4.1)–(4.4) with correction factors chosen according to Definition 4.1. Then, for small k, h and $k = \mathcal{O}(h^{1+\epsilon})$, $0 < \epsilon < 1$, we the iterative scheme converges to the solution of (3.1)–(3.4), i.e.,

$$\|Y^n - \mathcal{G}_1^n v^n\|_{L^2} + \|P^{n-1} - \mathcal{G}_2^{n-1} w^{n-1}\|_{L^2} \leq \varsigma (\|Y^n - v^n\|_{L^2} + \|P^{n-1} - w^{n-1}\|_{L^2}),$$

where $\varsigma < 1$.

Proof. Let the finite element functions $\eta_y^n, \eta_p^n \in \mathcal{S}_h$, defined as $\eta_y^n = Y^n - \mathcal{G}_1^n v^n$ for $n \geq 0$ and $\eta_p^{n-1} = P^{n-1} - \mathcal{G}_2^{n-1} w^{n-1}$ for $n \geq 1$.

Subtracting the (4.1) from (3.1), we get

$$(\eta_y^n, \chi) + \mu k (\nabla \eta_y^n, \nabla \chi) + d_{\mathbf{M}_L, h}(\eta_y^n, \chi) = -I_1(\chi) - I_2(\chi) - I_3(\chi),$$

where the functionals I_1, I_2, I_3 , are defined as

$$I_1(\chi) = k (\mathbf{b}^n \cdot \nabla \eta_y^n, \chi) - k ((U^n - z^n), \chi) + k d_{\mathbf{D}, h}(\eta_y^n, \chi),$$

$$I_2(\chi) = k \tilde{d}_{\mathbf{D}, h}(Y^n; Y^n, \chi) - k \tilde{d}_{\mathbf{D}, h}(v^n; v^n, \chi),$$

$$I_3(\chi) = \tilde{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L, h}(Y^n - Y^{n-1}; Y^n - Y^{n-1}, \chi) - \tilde{d}_{\mathbf{M}_L, h}(v^n - Y^{n-1}; v^n - Y^{n-1}, \chi).$$

For the last functional, we use the Lemma 2.7. Performing similar arguments as in Theorem 3.6, yields,

$$\|\eta_y^n\|_{L^2}^2 + \mu k \|\nabla \eta_y^n\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C_M ((k + k^{-1}h^2) \|Y^n - v^n\|_{L^2}^2 + k^2 \|U^n - z^n\|_{L^2}^2).$$

Similar, subtracting (4.2) from (3.2), we also get

$$\|\eta_p^{n-1}\|_{L^2}^2 + \mu k \|\nabla \eta_p^{n-1}\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C_M (k^2 \|\eta_y^n\|_{L^2}^2 + (k + k^{-1}h^2) \|P^{n-1} - w^{n-1}\|_{L^2}^2).$$




FIGURE 5.1. A triangulation of a square domain.

TABLE 1. L^2 , H^1 -norm error and convergence order for the state variable $Y^{N_0} \approx \bar{y}(\mathbf{x}, T)$ for (5.1)–(5.2) with solution defined in (5.3).

h_0	$\ Y^{N_0} - \bar{y}(\mathbf{x}, T)\ _{L^2}$	Order	$\ Y^{N_0} - \bar{y}(\mathbf{x}, T)\ _1$	Order
1/4	$2.2854e - 01$		$1.2365e - 00$	
1/8	$4.2054e - 02$	2.4421	$5.7801e - 01$	1.0970
1/16	$9.4761e - 03$	2.1499	$2.8995e - 01$	0.9953
1/32	$2.3089e - 03$	2.0371	$1.4527e - 01$	0.9971
1/64	$5.7274e - 04$	2.0113	$7.2680e - 02$	0.9991

Combining the last two estimates and (3.4) with (4.4), yields,

$$\|\eta_y^n\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\eta_p^{n-1}\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C_M \max\{k + h^{1-\epsilon}, k^2\} (\|Y^n - v^n\|_{L^2}^2 + \|P^{n-1} - w^{n-1}\|_{L^2}^2),$$

where for small k, h , we obtain the desired result. \square

5. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS

In this section we present several numerical experiments, validating our theoretical results. For this reason, we consider a uniform mesh \mathcal{T}_h of the unit square $\Omega = [0, 1]^2$. Each side of Ω is divided into M intervals of length $h_0 = 1/M$ for $M \in \mathbb{N}$ and we define the triangulation \mathcal{T}_h by dividing each small square by its diagonal as in Fig. 5.1. This means that \mathcal{T}_h consists of $2M^2$ right-angle triangles with diameter $h = \sqrt{2}h_0$. Notice that \mathcal{T}_h satisfies Assumption 2.1 and therefore, the corresponding stiffness matrix \mathbf{S} has non-positive off-diagonal elements and positive diagonal elements. Also, $\gamma_i = 1$, $i = 1, \dots, N$, in the Definition 4.1, see, e.g., Remark 2.3.

5.1. Convergence study. In this subsection, we will study the error convergence of the stabilized fully-discrete schemes (4.1)–(4.13). We consider the following optimal control problem:

$$(5.1) \quad \min_{u \in \mathbb{U}_{\text{ad}}} J(y, u) = \min_{u \in \mathbb{U}_{\text{ad}}} \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T (\|y(t) - y_d(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \lambda \|u(t)\|_{L^2}^2) dt, \quad \lambda > 0,$$

subject to the state equation governed by convection–diffusion equation,

$$(5.2) \quad \begin{cases} y_t - \mu \Delta y + \mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla y = u + f(\mathbf{x}, t), & \text{in } \Omega \times [0, T], \\ y = 0, & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times [0, T], \\ y(\cdot, 0) = y^0, & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases}$$

where the source term $f(\mathbf{x}, t)$ and the vector $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ with $\text{div } \mathbf{b} = 0$, are chosen so as the control problem (5.1)–(5.2) have the following solution for $\mathbf{x} = (x, y)^T \in \Omega$, $t \in [0, T] = [0, 1]$, with $\lambda = 1$, $\mathbf{b} = (2, 3)^T$ and $\mu = 1$,

$$(5.3) \quad \begin{aligned} y(\mathbf{x}, t) &= t \sin(\pi x) \sin(\pi y), \\ y_d(\mathbf{x}, t) &= y(\mathbf{x}, t) + p_t(\mathbf{x}, t) + \mu \Delta p(\mathbf{x}, t) + \mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla p(\mathbf{x}, t), \\ p(\mathbf{x}, t) &= -(T - t)^2 \sin(\pi x) \sin(\pi y), \\ u(\mathbf{x}, t) &= \max\{u_a, \min\{u_b, -\lambda^{-1} p(\mathbf{x}, t)\}\}, \\ (u_a, u_b) &= (-1, 1), \quad \lambda = 1, \quad \mathbf{b} = (2, 3)^T. \end{aligned}$$

as the unique solution of (5.1)–(5.2).

We compute the approximation for a sequence of triangulations \mathcal{T}_h as described above with $h_0 = 1/M$, $M = 4, 8, 16, 32, 64$. The final time is chosen to be $T = 1$, and we choose $k = \frac{2}{25}h_0$ for all h_0 . In Tables 1–2 we present the errors obtained in L^2 and H^1 norm for the state, co-state and control variable for (5.1)–(5.2) with solution (y, p, u) defined in (5.3) with the stabilized scheme. It is verifiable that the AFC method has the optimal order of convergence, verifying the theoretical results of Theorem 3.5.

TABLE 2. L^2 , H^1 -norm error and convergence order for the co-state variable $P^0 \approx \bar{p}(\mathbf{x}, 0)$ for (5.1)–(5.2) with solution defined in (5.3) and L^2 -norm error for the control variable $U^1 \approx \bar{u}(\mathbf{x}, h)$

h_0	$\ P^0 - \bar{p}(\mathbf{x}, T)\ _{L^2}$	Order	$\ P^0 - \bar{p}(\mathbf{x}, 0)\ _1$	Order	$\ U^1 - \bar{u}(\mathbf{x}, h)\ _{L^2}$	Order
1/4	$2.2602e - 01$		$2.2602e - 00$		$2.2602e - 01$	
1/8	$4.2019e - 02$	2.4273	$3.2019e - 01$	1.0898	$4.2019e - 02$	2.4273
1/16	$9.4059e - 03$	2.1594	$9.4059e - 01$	0.9950	$9.4059e - 03$	2.1594
1/32	$2.2582e - 03$	2.0584	$2.2582e - 01$	0.9971	$2.2582e - 03$	2.0584
1/64	$5.4756e - 04$	2.0441	$5.4756e - 02$	0.9991	$5.4756e - 04$	2.0441




FIGURE 5.2. First row: The state variable y . Second row: The co-state variable p . Left column: The exact solution for (5.4). Middle column: The standard FEM. Right column: The AFC scheme

5.2. Optimal control governed by convection–diffusion with known layer. In this subsection we will test our scheme into two optimal control problems that governed by parabolic convection–diffusion equation that have layers. More specifically, we consider a test example for which the solution that develop steep gradients along an inner circle and a test example where the solution has a boundary layer. In both cases, we also present the numerical schemes for the standard FEM scheme, i.e., the scheme (4.1)–(4.13) with $\mathbf{a}_{ij} = \mathbf{a}_{ij} = \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{ij} = \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{ij} = 1$, $i, j = 1, \dots, N$.

5.2.1. Test example that develop steep gradients. Consider the optimal control problem (1.1)–(1.2) for $(\mathbf{x}, t) \in [0, 1]^2 \times [0, 0.1]$ with $\lambda = 0.1$, $\mathbf{b} = (x, -y)^T$ and $\mu = 10^{-4}$. The exact solution is taken as

$$\begin{aligned}
 (5.4) \quad y(\mathbf{x}, t) &= 16e^{-t}x(1-x)y(1-y) \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{\pi} \arctan \left(\frac{2}{\sqrt{\mu}} \left(\frac{1}{16} - \left(x - \frac{1}{2}\right)^2 - \left(y - \frac{1}{2}\right)^2 \right) \right) \right), \\
 y_d(\mathbf{x}, t) &= y(\mathbf{x}, t) + p_t(\mathbf{x}, t) + \mu \Delta p(\mathbf{x}, t) + \mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla p(\mathbf{x}, t), \\
 p(\mathbf{x}, t) &= 16(T-t)x(1-x)y(1-y) \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{\pi} \arctan \left(\frac{2}{\sqrt{\mu}} \left(\frac{1}{16} - \left(x - \frac{1}{2}\right)^2 - \left(y - \frac{1}{2}\right)^2 \right) \right) \right), \\
 u(\mathbf{x}, t) &= \max\{-5, \min\{-1, -1/0.1 p(\mathbf{x}, t)\}\}.
 \end{aligned}$$

A similar example can be found in [20, Example 5.2]. Both the state variable y and co-state variable p develop steep gradients along the circle $\frac{1}{16} - \left(\frac{1}{2} - x\right)^2 - \left(\frac{1}{2} - y\right)^2 = 0$ for all $t \geq 0$.

In the Fig. 5.2, we consider the standard FEM as well as for the AFC scheme for (1.1)–(1.2) with exact solution given by (5.4). In both cases, we obtain the numerical results with $h_0 = 1/21$ and $k = 10^{-2}$. From Fig. 5.2 it is easily verifiable that the standard FEM fails to produce an non-oscillatory solution along the circle $\frac{1}{16} - \left(\frac{1}{2} - x\right)^2 - \left(\frac{1}{2} - y\right)^2 = 0$, where in contrast, the AFC method seems to provide accurate results.

In the Fig. 5.3, we consider the standard FEM as well as for the AFC scheme for (1.1)–(1.2) with exact solution given by (5.4), where in both cases, we obtain the numerical results with $h_0 = 1/51$ and $k = 10^{-3}$. Again, it is easily verifiable that the standard FEM fails to produce an non-oscillatory solution along the circle $\frac{1}{16} - \left(\frac{1}{2} - x\right)^2 - \left(\frac{1}{2} - y\right)^2 = 0$, where in contrast, the AFC method seems to provide accurate results.




FIGURE 5.3. First row: The state variable y . Second row: The co-state variable p . Left column: The exact solution for (5.4). Middle column: The standard FEM. Right column: The AFC scheme




FIGURE 5.4. First row: The state variable y . Second row: The co-state variable p . Left column: The exact solution for (5.5). Middle column: The standard FEM. Right column: The AFC scheme

5.2.2. *Test example with boundary layer.* Consider the optimal control problem (1.1)–(1.2) for $(\mathbf{x}, t) \in [0, 1]^2 \times [0, 0.1]$ with $\lambda = 1$, $\mathbf{b} = (\cos(\pi/4), \sin(\pi/4))^T$ and $\mu = 10^{-8}$. The exact solution is taken as

$$\begin{aligned}
 \eta(s) &= s - \frac{e^{-\frac{s-1}{\mu}} - e^{-\frac{1}{\mu}}}{1 - e^{-\frac{1}{\mu}}}, \quad s \in \mathbb{R} \\
 y(\mathbf{x}, t) &= e^{-t} \eta(x) \eta(y), \\
 y_d(\mathbf{x}, t) &= y(\mathbf{x}, t) + p_t(\mathbf{x}, t) + \mu \Delta p(\mathbf{x}, t) + \mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla p(\mathbf{x}, t), \\
 p(\mathbf{x}, t) &= (T - t) \eta(1 - x) \eta(1 - y), \\
 u(\mathbf{x}, t) &= \max\{-2, \min\{2, -p(\mathbf{x}, t)\}\}.
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{5.5}$$

The latter example can be found in [15, Example 3] for the optimal control problem governed by a elliptic convection–diffusion–reaction equation. The state variable y develop a boundary layer on the upper and right boundary of the domain whereas the co-state variable p , develop a boundary layer on the left and bottom boundary of the domain. In the Fig. 5.4, we consider the standard FEM for (1.1)–(1.2) with solution (5.5) as well as the AFC scheme. In both cases, we obtain the numerical results with $h_0 = 1/21$ and $k = 10^{-3}$.

From Fig. 5.4 it easily verifiable that the standard FEM fails to produce an non-oscillatory solution across the boundary layer, where in contrast, the AFC method seems to provide accurate results.




FIGURE 5.5. Results for $T = 0.3$. First row: The state variable y . Second row: The control variable u . Left column: The exact solution for (5.5). Middle column: The standard FEM. Right column: The AFC scheme




FIGURE 5.6. Results for $T = 0.5$. First row: The state variable y . Second row: The control variable u . Left column: The exact solution for (5.5). Middle column: The standard FEM. Right column: The AFC scheme

5.2.3. *Test example with traveling wave.* Consider the optimal control problem (1.1)–(1.2) for $(\mathbf{x}, t) \in [0, 1]^2 \times [0, T]$ with $T = 0.3$ and $T = 0.5$, $\lambda = 1$, $\mathbf{b} = (\cos(\pi/3), \sin(\pi/3))^T$ and $\mu = 10^{-8}$. The exact solution is taken as

$$(5.6) \quad \begin{aligned} y(\mathbf{x}, t) &= \frac{1}{2} \sin(\pi x) \sin(\pi y) \left(\tanh \left(\frac{x + y - t - \frac{1}{2}}{\sqrt{\mu}} \right) + 1 \right), \\ y_d(\mathbf{x}, t) &= y(\mathbf{x}, t) + p_t(\mathbf{x}, t) + \mu \Delta p(\mathbf{x}, t) + \mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla p(\mathbf{x}, t), \\ p(\mathbf{x}, t) &= -(T - t) \sin(\pi x) \sin(\pi y), \\ u(\mathbf{x}, t) &= \max\{-2, \min\{2, -p(\mathbf{x}, t)\}\}. \end{aligned}$$

The latter example can be found in [18, Example 4.2]. The state variable y develop an internal layer of with $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\mu})$ whereas the position of the layer depends on the time. In the Fig. 5.5, we set $T = 0.3$ and we compute the standard FEM for (1.1)–(1.2) with solution (5.6) as well as the AFC scheme. In both cases, we obtain the numerical results with $h_0 = 1/41$ and $k = 0.3/1000$.

Notice that the AFC solution may also have negative values, see, e.g, the third column of Fig. 5.5, despite the fact that y, p are non-negative functions. This explained by the fact that the computation of the right hand side function f , may pollute the sign of the right hand side vector of (4.5). Notice that in (4.5) the proposed AFC scheme is for the case where $f = 0$. Further, the AFC method seems to provide a non-oscillatory solution for (5.6) in contrast (as expected) to the standard FEM, cf. Fig. 5.5.

Next, we set $T = 0.5$, so the interior layer is placed in a different position as before. In both cases, we obtain the numerical results with $h_0 = 1/41$ and $k = 0.5/1000$. Similar to the previous case, AFC scheme provide a non-oscillatory solution for (5.6) in contrast to the standard FEM, cf. Fig. 5.6.

6. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we considered an optimal control problem governed by a parabolic convection–diffusion equation on a bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$. We focused in the optimize-then-discretize-approach and we consider the piecewise finite element method alongside with the algebraic flux correction method for its stabilization and the for temporal discretization, we use the backward Euler for the state variable and explicit Euler for the co-state variable. The discrete control variable is obtained by the projection of the discretized adjoint state on the set of admissible controls. We proved results concerning the existence and uniqueness of the fully–discrete scheme as well as we derived optimal error estimates under a sufficient choice of time and mesh step. We also present numerical experiments that validate the the order of convergence of the stabilized fully–discrete scheme via algebraic flux correction method.

REFERENCES

- [1] ARADA, N., CASAS, E., AND TROLTZSCH, F. Error estimates for a semilinear elliptic control problem. *Comput. Optim. Appl.* 23 (2002), 201–229.
- [2] BACUTA, C., BRAMBLE, J., AND XU, J. Regularity estimates for elliptic boundary value problems with smooth data on polygonal domains. *Numer. Math.* 11 (2003), 75–94.
- [3] BARRENECHEA, G. R., JOHN, V., AND KNOBLOCH, P. Analysis of algebraic flux correction schemes. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* 54 (2016), 2427–2451.
- [4] BARRENECHEA, G. R., JOHN, V., AND KNOBLOCH, P. An algebraic flux correction scheme satisfying the discrete maximum principle and linearity preservation on general meshes. *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.* 27 (2017), 525–548.
- [5] BARRENECHEA, G. R., JOHN, V., AND KNOBLOCH, P. Finite element methods respecting the discrete maximum principle for convection-diffusion equations. *SIAM Rev.* 66, 1 (2024), 3–88.
- [6] BARRENECHEA, G. R., JOHN, V., KNOBLOCH, P., AND RANKIN, R. A unified analysis of algebraic flux correction schemes for convection–diffusion equations. *SeMA* 75 (2018), 655–685.
- [7] BARTELS, S., PALUS, C., AND WANG, Z. Quasi-optimal error estimates for the approximation of stable harmonic maps. *arXiv preprint <https://arxiv.org/abs/2209.11985>* (2022).
- [8] BAUMGARTNER, J. *Optimal control problems and algebraic flux correction schemes*. PhD thesis, Universität Duisburg-Essen, 2022.
- [9] BECKER, R., MEIDNER, D., AND VEXLER, B. Efficient numerical solution of parabolic optimization problems by finite element methods. *Optim. Meth. Soft.* 22, 5 (2007), 813–833.
- [10] BECKER, R., AND VEXLER, B. Optimal control of the convection-diffusion equation using stabilized finite element methods. *Numer. Math.* 106 (2007), 349–367.
- [11] BRENNER, S. C., AND SCOTT, L. R. *The Mathematical Theory of Finite Element Methods*, second ed. Springer, New York, 2008.
- [12] BROOKS, A. N., AND HUGHES, T. J. R. Streamline upwind/Petrov–Galerkin formulations for convection dominated flows with particular emphasis on the incompressible Navier–Stokes equations. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Eng.* 32, 1–3 (1982), 199–259.
- [13] CASAS, E., MATEOS, M., AND TRÖLTZCH, F. Error estimates for the numerical approximation of boundary semilinear elliptic control problems. *Comput. Optim. Appl.* 31 (2005), 193–220.
- [14] CHATZIPANTELIDIS, P., AND PERVOLIANAKIS, C. Error analysis of a backward Euler positive preserving stabilization scheme for a Chemotaxis system. *arXiv preprint <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2210.04709>* (2022).
- [15] COLLIS, S. S., AND HEINKENSCHLOSS, M. Analysis of the Streamline Upwind/Petrov Galerkin method applied to the solution of optimal control problems. Tech. Rep. TR02-01, CAAM, 2002. Also available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2411.09828>.
- [16] FALK, R. Approximation of a class of optimal control problems with order of convergence estimates. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 44 (1973), 28–47.
- [17] FU, H., AND RUI, H. A priori error estimates for optimal control problems governed by transient advection-diffusion equations. *J. Sci. Comput.* 38 (2009), 290–315.
- [18] GIÈRE, S., ILIESCU, T., JOHN, V., AND WELLS, D. Supg reduced order models for convection-dominated convection–diffusion–reaction equations. *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering* 289 (June 2015), 454–474.
- [19] HINZE, M. A Variational Discretization Concept in Control Constrained Optimization: The Linear-Quadratic Case. *Comput. Optim. Appl.* 30 (2005), 45–61.
- [20] HINZE, M., YAN, N., AND ZHOU, Z. Variational discretization for optimal control governed by convection dominated diffusion equations. *J. Comput. Math.* 27, 2–3 (2009), 237–253.
- [21] JOHN, V., AND KNOBLOCH, P. On spurious oscillations at layers diminishing SOLD methods for convection–diffusion equations. i. a review. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Eng.* 196, 17–20 (2007), 2197–2215.
- [22] JOHN, V., AND KNOBLOCH, P. Existence of solutions of a finite element Flux-Corrected-Transport scheme. *Appl. Math. Lett.* 115 (2021), Paper No. 106932, 6 pp.
- [23] KUZMIN, D. *A Guide to Numerical Methods for Transport Equations*. University Erlangen-Nuremberg, Nuremberg, 2010.
- [24] KUZMIN, D., AND MÖLLER, M. *Algebraic Flux Correction I. Scalar Conservation Laws*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2005, pp. 155–206.
- [25] KUZMIN, D., AND TUREK, S. Flux correction tools for finite elements. *J. Comput. Phys.* 175 (2002), 525–558.
- [26] KUZMIN, D., AND TUREK, S. High-resolution FEM-TVD schemes based on a fully multidimensional flux limiter. *J. Comput. Phys.* 198 (2004), 131–158.
- [27] LIONS, J. L. *Optimal Control of Systems Governed by Partial Differential Equations*, vol. 170 of *Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften*. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1971. Softcover reprint of the original 1st edition.
- [28] LIU, W., AND YAN, N. *Adaptive Finite Elements for Optimal Control Governed by PDEs*. Science Press, Beijing, 2008.

- [29] MEIDNER, D., AND VEXLER, B. A priori error estimates for space-time finite element discretization of parabolic optimal control problems. part I: problems without control constraints. *SIAM J. Control Optim.* 47, 3 (2008), 1150–1177.
- [30] MEIDNER, D., AND VEXLER, B. A priori error estimates for space-time finite element discretization of parabolic optimal control problems. part II: problems with control constraints. *SIAM J. Control Optim.* 47, 3 (2008), 1301–1329.
- [31] MEYER, C., AND RÖSCH, A. Superconvergence properties of optimal control problems. *SIAM J. Control Optim.* 43 (2004), 970–985.
- [32] NEITTAANMAKI, P., AND TIBA, D. *Optimal Control of Nonlinear Parabolic Systems: Theory, Algorithms and Applications*. Dekker, New York, 1994.
- [33] RYU, S. U., AND YAGI, A. Optimal control of Keller–Segel equations. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 256, 1 (2001), 45–66.
- [34] THOMÉE, V. *Galerkin finite element methods for parabolic problems*, second ed. Springer, 2006.
- [35] XIONG, C., AND LI, Y. A posteriori error estimates for optimal distributed control governed by the evolution equations. *Appl. Numer. Math.* 61 (2011), 181–200.
- [36] YAN, N., AND ZHOU, Z. A priori and a posteriori error analysis of edge stabilization Galerkin method for the optimal control problem governed by convection-dominated diffusion equation. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.* 223, 1 (2009), 198–217.
- [37] ZHANG, X., ZHAO, J., AND HOU, Y. A Priori Error Estimates of Crank–Nicolson Finite Element Method for Parabolic Optimal Control Problems. *Comput. Math. Appl.* 144 (2023), 274–289.
- [38] ZHOU, Z., AND YAN, N. The Local Discontinuous Galerkin Method for Optimal Control Problem Governed by Convection Diffusion Equations. *Int. J. Numer. Anal. Model.* 7, 4 (2010), 681–699.

INSTITUT FÜR MATHEMATIK, FRIEDRICH-SCHILLER-UNIVERSITÄT JENA, 07743, JENA, GERMANY
Email address: christos.pervolianakis@uni-jena.de