

ANALYSIS OF A FULLY DISCRETIZED FDM-FEM SCHEME FOR SOLVING THERMO-ELASTIC-DAMAGE COUPLED NONLINEAR PDE SYSTEMS*

MARYAM PARVIZI¹, AMIRREZA KHODADADIAN^{2,1} AND THOMAS WICK¹

Abstract. In this paper, we consider a nonlinear PDE system governed by a parabolic heat equation coupled in a nonlinear way with a hyperbolic momentum equation describing the behavior of a displacement field coupled with a nonlinear elliptic equation based on an internal damage variable. We present a numerical scheme based on a low-order Galerkin finite element method (FEM) for the space discretization of the time-dependent nonlinear PDE system and an implicit finite difference method (FDM) to discretize in the direction of the time variable. Moreover, we present a priori estimates for the exact and discrete solutions for the pointwise-in-time L^2 -norm. Based on the a priori estimates, we rigorously prove the convergence of the solutions of the fully discretized system to the exact solutions. Denoting the properties of the internal parameters, we find the order of convergence concerning the discretization parameters.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 65N12, 65M12, 35K61.

November 16, 2023.

1. INTRODUCTION

Damage models consist of a system of nonlinear partial differential equations (PDEs) that enable us to monitor and observe the behavior of occurred failure, fracture, and displacements in different materials, especially in brittle, quasi-brittle, and thermoelastic solids [BFM00, MHS15]. In thermoelastic materials, a temperature change (e.g., a thermal shock) leads to a non-uniform volume change and thermal stress. Exceeding the material tensile strength initiates a fracture that can continue until full separation. The material separation occurs by mechanical forces or thermoelastic effects. For instance, lasers can be used effectively to cut ceramic substrates and glasses.

In this paper, we consider a nonlinear PDE system, including three coupled equations to model the thermal and mechanical behavior of thermoelastic materials. This system consists of a nonlinear hyperbolic momentum equation coupled with a parabolic heat equation that describe the behavior of the displacement field and the heat distribution, respectively. Moreover, the momentum equation is coupled with a nonlinear elliptic equation that describes the behavior of an internal variable.

To the best of the authors' knowledge, there are only a few papers studying the existence, uniqueness, and regularity properties of the solutions of such nonlinear PDE systems (in the presence of the thermoelastic materials) with respect to the time and space variables in the weak form as well as in the time discretized version. A model to simulate the thermoelastic fracture problems is presented in [MHS15] to

Keywords and phrases: Damage model; a priori error estimates; thermoelastic materials; nonlinear coupled system; finite elements

* All authors are funded by Germany Excellence Strategy within the Cluster of Excellence PhoenixD (EXC 2122, Project ID 390833453). Maryam Parvizi is also funded by the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation project named \mathcal{H} -matrix approximability of the inverses for FEM, BEM, and FEM-BEM coupling of the electromagnetic problems.

¹ Leibniz Universität Hannover, Welfengarten 1, 30167 Hannover, Germany e-mail: {parvizi, khodadadian, wick}@ifam.uni-hannover.de

² School of Computer Science and Mathematics, Keele University, Keele, UK

describe a phase-field fracture equation coupled with heat conduction. Another model that studies damage [HKRR17] uses a system of nonlinear PDE system including viscous Cahn–Hilliard equation (to model the phase separation), and momentum balance (to model the displacement) coupled with a thermal system. A thermodynamic consistent PDE system for phase transition and damage addressing the existence of the weak solution is given in [RR15]. In [Rou10], the author presents a damage model governed by a PDE system consisting of the momentum equation for the displacement coupled with a heat equation as well as coupled with a rate-independent flow equation for the damage variable in a strongly nonlinear way. Concerning thermo-viscoelastic materials, the weak formulation and the existence of solutions for the coupled system are given in [LRTT18,Rou10].

In the presence of material damage or regularized fractures, one approach is to introduce an internal variable that determines the current state of the process. In such cases, additional nonlinearities, in terms of inequalities, appear in the auxiliary equations. Additionally, the new internal parameters, i.e., κ and ℓ , interact with each other in a certain way. In the discrete setting of the damage models, to guarantee a reliable approximation of the solution, we assume $\kappa = \mathcal{O}(\ell)$ and $h = \mathcal{O}(\ell)$ where h is the spatial discretization parameter. We notice that the relations $\kappa = \mathcal{O}(\ell)$ and $h = \mathcal{O}(\ell)$ go into the direction of Γ -convergence [AT90,Bra98], but are in general, weaker than the assumptions of the Γ -convergence theorems.

In [MHSA15], the authors introduce a thermodynamically consistent model for regularized fracture, and present a finite element method for discretization.

The main aim of this paper is to study the stability and convergence of a discrete scheme based on a low-order Galerkin FEM (for the space discretization), and an implicit finite difference scheme (for the time discretization) for solving the time-dependent nonlinear PDE system. In the model described in this paper, we allow that certain internal parameters interact with each other in a certain way.

List of difficulties. Below, we list the problems that should be overcome to achieve the main findings of this paper:

- The internal variable (φ) may reach zero leading to an elliptic degeneracy in the momentum equation [RR14]. To avoid this problem, a parameter κ is inserted into the equation, and we need to study the effect of the degenerate limit $\kappa \downarrow 0$ in our analysis, especially in the stability estimates of the discrete solutions and the order of convergence.
- Due to the assumptions $\kappa = \mathcal{O}(\ell)$ and $h = \mathcal{O}(\ell)$, we have the same consideration as above for the length scale parameter ℓ .
- The highly nonlinear nature of the PDE system, i.e., nonlinear quadratic terms appearing in the PDE system, requires several techniques to study convergence of the discrete solutions to the continuous solutions.
- The imposed irreversibility condition guarantees that the crack never heals (no crack reverse). This inequality will add the complexity of the system.

Our results. For the time-dependent nonlinear PDE system, we present a discretization scheme based on a low-order Galerkin FEM, and an implicit finite difference scheme to discretize in space and time, respectively. The results of this paper can be summarized as follows:

- We present a priori estimates for the exact and discrete solutions of the momentum equation as well as the heat equation, i.e., estimates for the pointwise-in-time L^2 -norms of the displacement field, the strain tensor of displacement, the pointwise derivative of the strain tensor, and the heat function (as well as for their discrete counterparts).
- Defining the \mathcal{A} -norm as the norm associated with the linear elasticity operator \mathcal{A} , we also provide an a priori estimate for the pointwise-in-time \mathcal{A} -norm of the strain tensor of the displacement field (and the strain tensor of the discrete counterpart of the displacement field).
- For τ defined as the time discretization parameter, we rigorously prove the convergence of the discrete displacement field, heat function, and internal variable to their continuous counterparts in the pointwise-in-time L^2 -norms with the order of convergence $\mathcal{O}(\kappa^{-1/2}(\tau + h))$. Additionally, since we are allowed to consider the relations $\kappa = \mathcal{O}(\ell)$ and $h = \mathcal{O}(\ell)$, we prove that if the assumptions $\tau\ell^{-1} = \mathcal{O}(1)$ and $\tau\kappa^{-1} = \mathcal{O}(1)$ are satisfied, the convergence of the discrete solutions to the exact solutions is obtained in the pointwise-in-time L^2 -norm with the order of convergence $\mathcal{O}(\kappa^{-1/2}\tau + (\kappa^{-1/2} + \ell^{-1/2})h)$.

Outline of the paper. In Section 2, we start with fixing some notations and continue with a short introduction to the time-dependent model PDE system. Section 3 contains a fully discretized scheme based on a FDM to discretize in time, and a Galerkin FEM for the spatial discretization. We also provide a priori estimates for the solutions of the semi-discrete formulation as well as for the solutions of the fully discretized one. Section 4 is concerned with the main result of this paper, i.e., we investigate the convergence of the solutions of the fully discretized system to the exact solutions. Finally, in Section 5, we present a numerical example to illustrate our theoretical results.

2. PROBLEM STATEMENT AND NOTATION

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $d = 2, 3$ be a bounded and sufficiently regular domain with the boundary $\Gamma := \partial\Omega$. Through this paper, for $p \geq 1$, we denote $L^p(\Omega)$ as the usual Lebesgue spaces on Ω with the corresponding norm $\|\cdot\|_{L^p(\Omega)}$. For $p = 2$, the space $L^2(\Omega)$ is a Hilbert space with the inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_\Omega$. For this inner product, when there is no risk of confusion, we drop the subscript Ω . Moreover, the Lebesgue space $L^2(\Gamma)$ is defined as the space of square integrable functions on Γ with the inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_\Gamma$ and the corresponding norm $\|\cdot\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}$. For $s \geq 0$ and $q \geq 0$, we use the standard notations for the Sobolev space $W^{s,q}(\Omega)$ with the corresponding norm $\|\cdot\|_{s,q,\Omega}$ and semi-norm $|\cdot|_{s,q,\Omega}$. For the case, $q = 2$, we also use the notation $H^s(\Omega)$ with the standard norm $\|\cdot\|_{H^s(\Omega)}$ and semi-norm $|\cdot|_{H^s(\Omega)}$. Let $\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ be the space of $d \times d$ square matrices with entries in \mathbb{R} and $\mathbf{I} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ be the identity matrix. We also define the following tensor space

$$[L^2(\Omega)]^{d \times d} := \{ \boldsymbol{\tau} = (\tau_{i,j})_{i,j \in \{1, \dots, d\}} \quad : \quad \tau_{i,j} \in L^2(\Omega) \},$$

with the inner product

$$\langle \boldsymbol{\tau}, \boldsymbol{\zeta} \rangle := \int_{\Omega} \boldsymbol{\tau} : \boldsymbol{\zeta} \, dx \quad \forall \boldsymbol{\tau}, \boldsymbol{\zeta} \in [L^2(\Omega)]^{d \times d},$$

which induces the following norm

$$\|\boldsymbol{\tau}\|_{[L^2(\Omega)]^{d \times d}} = \sqrt{\langle \boldsymbol{\tau}, \boldsymbol{\tau} \rangle} \quad \forall \boldsymbol{\tau} \in [L^2(\Omega)]^{d \times d}.$$

Given the tensors $\boldsymbol{\tau} := (\tau_{ij}) \in [L^2(\Omega)]^{d \times d}$ and $\boldsymbol{\sigma} := (\sigma_{ij}) \in [L^2(\Omega)]^{d \times d}$, we consider the following notations for the trace of a tensor and the scalar product of two tensors

$$\text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\tau}) := \sum_{i=1}^d \tau_{ii}, \quad \boldsymbol{\tau} : \boldsymbol{\sigma} := \sum_{i,j=1}^d \tau_{ij} \sigma_{ij}.$$

Moreover, the deviatoric part of a tensor $\mathbf{dev} : [L^2(\Omega)]^{d \times d} \rightarrow [L^2(\Omega)]^{d \times d}$ is defined as $\mathbf{dev}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) := \boldsymbol{\sigma} - 1/d \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})\mathbf{I}$. Given the Lamé parameters $\lambda, \mu > 0$, the linear mapping $\mathcal{A} : [L^2(\Omega)]^{d \times d} \rightarrow [L^2(\Omega)]^{d \times d}$ is defined as follows

$$\mathcal{A}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) := \lambda \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})\mathbf{I} + 2\mu\boldsymbol{\sigma} \quad \forall \boldsymbol{\sigma} \in [L^2(\Omega)]^{d \times d}. \quad (2.1)$$

The operator \mathcal{A} is positive definite and symmetric. Moreover, $\mathcal{A}^{1/2}$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{A}^{1/2}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) := \sqrt{2\mu}\boldsymbol{\sigma} + \frac{\sqrt{2\mu + d\lambda} - \sqrt{2\mu}}{d} \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})\mathbf{I} \quad \forall \boldsymbol{\sigma} \in [L^2(\Omega)]^{d \times d}.$$

With the elasticity tensor \mathcal{A} , we define the following \mathcal{A} -norm

$$\|\boldsymbol{\tau}\|_{\mathcal{A}}^2 := \left\| \mathcal{A}^{1/2}(\boldsymbol{\tau}) \right\|_{[L^2(\Omega)]^{d \times d}}^2 := \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{A}(\boldsymbol{\tau}) : \boldsymbol{\tau} \, dx \quad \forall \boldsymbol{\tau} \in [L^2(\Omega)]^{d \times d}.$$

Furthermore, we define the operator

$$\mathcal{B}(\boldsymbol{\tau}) := \mathcal{A}(\boldsymbol{\tau}) : \boldsymbol{\tau} \quad \forall \boldsymbol{\tau} \in [L^2(\Omega)]^{d \times d}. \quad (2.2)$$

We continue with the definition of the vector space

$$\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega) := \left\{ \mathbf{v} = (v_i)_{i=1}^d \quad : \quad v_i \in L^2(\Omega) \right\},$$

with the inner product $\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)} := \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{v} \, dx$ for all $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)$, which induces the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}$. When there is no risk of confusion, we use the notation $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}$ to denote both of the norms $\|\cdot\|_{[L^2(\Omega)]^{d \times d}}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}$, and we also drop $\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)$ from the subscript $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}$. Moreover, for $s \geq 0$, we set

$$\mathbf{H}^s(\Omega) := \left\{ \mathbf{u} = (u_i)_{i=1}^d \quad : \quad u_i \in H^s(\Omega) \right\}, \quad \mathbf{H}_0^1(\Omega) := \left\{ \mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{H}^1(\Omega) \quad : \quad \mathbf{u}|_{\Gamma} = 0 \right\},$$

with the corresponding norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbf{H}^s(\Omega)}$ and semi-norm $|\cdot|_{\mathbf{H}^s(\Omega)}$. We also denote the strain tensor of displacement by $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}) := \frac{1}{2} (\nabla \mathbf{u} + \nabla \mathbf{u}^T)$ for $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)$. Let the operator $\nabla \cdot : [L^2(\Omega)]^{d \times d} \rightarrow \mathbf{H}^{-1}(\Omega)$ be the distributional vector valued divergence defined as follows:

$$\langle \nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{\tau}, \mathbf{v} \rangle := - \int_{\Omega} \boldsymbol{\tau} : \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{v}) \, dx \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{H}_0^1(\Omega),$$

where $\mathbf{H}^{-1}(\Omega)$ denotes the dual of $\mathbf{H}_0^1(\Omega)$. We also define the positive part of a scalar $a \in \mathbb{R}$ as follows

$$[a]_+ := \begin{cases} a & \text{if } a > 0 \\ 0 & \text{o.w.} \end{cases}$$

satisfying the following properties [BHL17, Lem 3.2]

$$([c]_+ - [d]_+) (c - d) \geq ([c]_+ - [d]_+)^2 \quad \forall c, d \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (2.3)$$

$$|[c]_+ - [d]_+| \leq |c - d| \quad \forall c, d \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (2.4)$$

Finally, throughout this paper, the notation \lesssim indicates \leq up to a constant $C > 0$.

2.1. Model Problem

Let $I := (0, T]$ be a time interval where $T > 0$ is an arbitrary real number. Let $\varphi : \Omega \times I \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be the internal variable describing the irreversible damage ($\varphi = 0$ indicates completely damaged material and $\varphi = 1$ denotes the unbroken material), $\mathbf{u} : \Omega \times I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ be the displacement vector, and $\vartheta : \Omega \times I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the absolute temperature function. Then, the model problem is presented as a PDE system consisting of three

coupled nonlinear equations introduced in [HR15,RR15] (the reduced version) and [LRTT18] as follows:

$$\partial_{tt}\mathbf{u} - \nabla \cdot ((g(\varphi) + \kappa)\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u})) - \rho\vartheta\mathbf{I}) = \mathbf{f} \quad \text{in } \Omega \times I, \quad (2.5a)$$

$$-\ell\Delta\varphi + \frac{1}{\ell}\varphi + \frac{1}{\mathcal{G}_c}g_c(\varphi, \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u})) \geq 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \times I, \quad (2.5b)$$

$$\partial_t\vartheta + \rho\vartheta \nabla \cdot \partial_t\mathbf{u} - \nabla \cdot (K(\vartheta)\nabla\vartheta) = \gamma \quad \text{in } \Omega \times I, \quad (2.5c)$$

$$\partial_t\varphi \left(-\ell\Delta\varphi + \frac{1}{\ell}\varphi + \frac{1}{\mathcal{G}_c}g_c(\varphi, \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u})) \right) = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \times I, \quad (2.5d)$$

$$\mathbf{u} = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma \times I, \quad (2.5e)$$

$$\nabla\varphi \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma \times I, \quad (2.5f)$$

$$(K(\vartheta)\nabla\vartheta) \cdot \mathbf{n} = \bar{\gamma} \quad \text{on } \Gamma \times I, \quad (2.5g)$$

$$\mathbf{u}(\cdot, 0) = \mathbf{u}_0, \quad \partial_t\mathbf{u}(\cdot, 0) = \mathbf{v}_0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \times \{0\}, \quad (2.5h)$$

$$\varphi(\cdot, 0) = \varphi_0, \quad \vartheta(\cdot, 0) = \vartheta_0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \times \{0\}, \quad (2.5i)$$

where \mathbf{n} denotes the outward unit vector normal to Γ . In (2.5a), the parameter $\rho > 0$ is the thermal expansion constant, the function g is defined as $g(\varphi) := \varphi^2$, κ is a positive stability constant for the bulk regularization, and $\mathbf{f} \in \mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)$ is the source term. In (2.5b), $\ell > 0$ is the length scale (i.e., damage regularization) parameter, \mathcal{G}_c is a damage dependence positive constant, and the function

$$g_c(\varphi, \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u})) := g'(\varphi)\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u})) = \frac{1}{2}g'(\varphi)\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u})) : \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}),$$

is the Cauchy stress. Moreover, the damage indicator φ fulfils the irreversibility condition, i.e., $\partial_t\varphi \leq 0$ and we assume $0 \leq \varphi_0 \leq 1$. Using these assumptions as well as $\varphi \geq 0$, one can easily see that $0 \leq \varphi \leq 1$. In (2.5c), K is called the heat conductivity function, and $\gamma \in L^2(\Omega)$ is the heat source term. Following [Ros17, Eq. 11.a], for all $\boldsymbol{\tau} \in [L^2(\Omega)]^{d \times d}$ there holds

$$g_c(z_1, \boldsymbol{\tau})(z_1 - z_2) \geq g(z_1)\mathcal{A}(\boldsymbol{\tau}) : \boldsymbol{\tau} - g(z_2)\mathcal{A}(\boldsymbol{\tau}) : \boldsymbol{\tau} \quad \forall z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (2.6)$$

and hence

$$g_c(z_1, \boldsymbol{\tau})(z_1 - z_2) - g_c(z_2, \boldsymbol{\tau})(z_1 - z_2) \geq 0. \quad (2.7)$$

In the following, we mention the required assumptions on the heat conductivity function, the initial conditions, and the source terms.

Assumption 2.1. *In order to proceed further with the main results of this paper, we need to impose these assumptions:*

- We assume the heat conductivity function $K : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is Lipschitz continuous and satisfies the following inequalities

$$\exists \beta \in (1, \beta_d) \quad \exists c_0 > 0 \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \forall \zeta \in \mathbb{R}^d \quad c_0(|\vartheta|^\beta + 1)|\zeta|^2 \leq K(\vartheta)\zeta \cdot \zeta,$$

$$\exists \beta \in (1, \beta_d) \quad \exists c_1, c_2 > 0 \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \forall \zeta \in \mathbb{R}^d :$$

$$c_1(|\vartheta|^\beta + 1) \leq |K(\vartheta)| \leq c_2(|\vartheta|^\beta + 1),$$

where $\beta_d = 2$ for $d = 2$ and $\beta_d = 5/3$ for $d = 3$.

- Moreover, the source and loading terms satisfy the following assumptions

$$\mathbf{f} \in H^1(I; \mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)), \quad \gamma \in H^1(I, L^2(\Omega)), \quad \gamma \geq 0,$$

$$\bar{\gamma} \in L^1(I; L^2(\Gamma)), \quad \bar{\gamma} \geq 0 \quad \text{a.e.} \quad \text{in } \Gamma \times I,$$

where $(\mathbf{H}^1(\Omega))'$ denotes the dual space of $\mathbf{H}^1(\Omega)$.

- We also impose the following assumptions on the initial data

$$\mathbf{u}_0 \in \mathbf{H}_0^2(\Omega), \quad \mathbf{v}_0 \in \mathbf{H}_0^1(\Omega), \quad \vartheta_0 \in L^2(\Omega).$$

- In general, we are allowed to assume $\kappa = \mathcal{O}(\ell)$, $h = \mathcal{O}(\ell)$, and $\kappa \ll \ell$.

3. VARIATIONAL FORMULATION IN SPACE

In order to present a variational formulation (see e.g., [RR15, LRTT18]) for (2.5a)-(2.5i) with respect to the spatial variable, we introduce the following function spaces

$$\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{H}_0^1(\Omega), \quad W := H^1(\Omega) \quad W_+ := \{\varphi \in H^1(\Omega) \quad : \quad \varphi \geq 0 \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega\}, \quad Z := H^1(\Omega),$$

where the space \mathbf{V} is equipped with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbf{H}_0^1(\Omega)}$, and the spaces W and Z are both equipped with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{H^1(\Omega)}$. Then, the variational formulation for (2.5a)-(2.5c) reads as: For all $t \in I$, find $(\mathbf{u}(\cdot, t), \varphi(\cdot, t), \vartheta(\cdot, t)) \in \mathbf{X} := \mathbf{V} \times W_+ \times Z$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \partial_{tt} \mathbf{u} \mathbf{v} dx + \int_{\Omega} (g(\varphi) + \kappa) \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u})) : \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{v}) dx - \rho \int_{\Omega} \vartheta \mathbf{I} : \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{v}) dx &= \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{f}(t) \cdot \mathbf{v} dx \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{V}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.1a)$$

$$\ell \int_{\Omega} \nabla \varphi \cdot \nabla (w - \varphi) dx + \frac{1}{\ell} \int_{\Omega} \varphi (w - \varphi) dx \geq \frac{-1}{\underline{g}_c} \int_{\Omega} g_c(\varphi, \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u})) (w - \varphi) dx \quad \forall w \in W_+, \quad (3.1b)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \partial_t \vartheta z dx + \int_{\Omega} K(\vartheta) \nabla \vartheta \cdot \nabla z dx + \rho \int_{\Omega} \vartheta \nabla \cdot \partial_t \mathbf{u} z dx \\ + \int_{\Gamma} \bar{\gamma} z ds = \int_{\Omega} \gamma(t) z dx \quad \forall z \in Z, \end{aligned} \quad (3.1c)$$

plus the initial conditions (2.5h) and (2.5i). In the next lemma, we mention some results on the existence and regularity of the solutions of (3.1a)–(3.1c).

Lemma 3.1. *(Existence and regularity of the solutions of the variational formulations (3.1a)–(3.1c)) (see e.g., [HR15, Thm. 3.7]). Let Ω be a Lipschitz continuous domain, and let all the conditions mentioned in Assumption 2.1 be satisfied for the right-hand side terms and the boundary conditions. Then, for every vector $(\mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{v}_0, \vartheta_0)$ satisfying Assumption 2.1, there exists a solution $(\mathbf{u}, \vartheta, \varphi)$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{u} &\in H^1(I; \mathbf{H}_0^2(\Omega)) \cap W^{1,\infty}(I; \mathbf{H}_0^1(\Omega)) \cap H^2(I; \mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)), \\ \varphi &\in L^\infty(I; H^1(\Omega)) \cap H^1(I; L^2(\Omega)), \\ \vartheta &\in L^2(I; H^1(\Omega)) \cap L^\infty(I; L^2(\Omega)) \cap H^1(I; (H^1(\Omega))^*), \quad \vartheta > 0 \quad \text{a.e. in } I \times \Omega. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we use the properties of the trace-free tensor \mathbf{dev} to prove the Lipschitz continuity of the operator \mathcal{A} . First, we mention the following properties of the deviatoric operator [CKP11, CH16]:

$$\|\mathbf{dev}(\boldsymbol{\tau})\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)} \leq \|\boldsymbol{\tau}\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)} \quad \forall \boldsymbol{\tau} \in [L^2(\Omega)]^{d \times d}, \quad (3.2)$$

$$\langle \mathbf{dev}(\boldsymbol{\tau}), \boldsymbol{\sigma} \rangle = \langle \boldsymbol{\tau}, \mathbf{dev}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) \rangle \quad \forall \boldsymbol{\tau}, \boldsymbol{\sigma} \in [L^2(\Omega)]^{d \times d}, \quad (3.3)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbf{dev}(\boldsymbol{\tau}), \mathbf{dev}(\boldsymbol{\tau}) \rangle &= \langle \mathbf{dev}(\boldsymbol{\tau}), \boldsymbol{\tau} \rangle \\ &= \langle \boldsymbol{\tau}, \boldsymbol{\tau} \rangle - \frac{1}{d} \langle \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\tau}), \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\tau}) \rangle \quad \forall \boldsymbol{\tau} \in [L^2(\Omega)]^{d \times d}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

Here, we prove that the operator \mathcal{A} is Lipschitz continuous and elliptic.

Lemma 3.2. *The operator \mathcal{A} defined in (2.1) satisfies the following property:*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{A}(\boldsymbol{\tau}) - \mathcal{A}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)} &\leq C_{\mu,\gamma} \|\boldsymbol{\tau} - \boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)} & \forall \boldsymbol{\tau}, \boldsymbol{\sigma} \in [L^2(\Omega)]^{d \times d}, \\ C_{ell,\mathcal{A}} \|\boldsymbol{\tau}\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 &\leq \langle \mathcal{A}(\boldsymbol{\tau}), \boldsymbol{\tau} \rangle & \forall \boldsymbol{\tau} \in [L^2(\Omega)]^{d \times d}, \end{aligned}$$

where $C_{\mu,\lambda} := 2\lambda d + 2\mu$, and $C_{ell,\mathcal{A}} := \frac{1}{2\mu}$.

Proof. From the definition of \mathcal{A} and the triangle inequality we have

$$\|\mathcal{A}(\boldsymbol{\tau}) - \mathcal{A}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)} \leq \lambda \|(\text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\tau}) - \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})) : \mathbf{I}\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)} + 2\mu \|\boldsymbol{\tau} - \boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}. \quad (3.5)$$

It follows by the definition of \mathbf{dev} that $\text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\tau}) : \mathbf{I} = d(\boldsymbol{\tau} : \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{dev}(\boldsymbol{\tau}))$. Using this and (3.2) for (3.5), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{A}(\boldsymbol{\tau}) - \mathcal{A}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)} &\leq \lambda d \|\boldsymbol{\tau} - \boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)} + \lambda d \|\mathbf{dev}(\boldsymbol{\tau}) - \mathbf{dev}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)} \\ &\quad + 2\mu \|\boldsymbol{\tau} - \boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)} \leq (2\lambda d + 2\mu) \|\boldsymbol{\tau} - \boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}, \end{aligned}$$

denoting $C_{\mu,\lambda} := 2\lambda d + 2\mu$ completes the first part of proof. The second part can be easily proven considering the definition of \mathcal{A} . \square

One of the inequalities that we use repeatedly thorough this paper is the following special case of the Gagliardo–Nirenberg inequality (see e.g., [Rou13, Prop. III.2.35] and [Nir59, P. 125])

$$\|v\|_{L^q(\Omega)} \lesssim \|v\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^\alpha \|v\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{1-\alpha} \quad \forall v \in H^1(\Omega), \quad \frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\alpha}{d} \quad \alpha \in [0, 1]. \quad (3.6)$$

Moreover, we recall the continuous embeddings $W^{1,q}(\Omega) \subset L^\infty(\Omega)$ for $q > d$ and $H^1(\Omega) \subset L^r(\Omega)$ for $1 \leq r \leq 2d/(d-2)$. (see e.g., [Rou13, Thm. 1.20])

3.1. Semi-discretization in time

For the time discretization, we use a finite difference scheme, and define the following time points and subintervals with the step size $\tau = t_k - t_{k-1} = \frac{T}{M}$:

$$0 = t_0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_M = T, \quad I_k = (t_{k-1}, t_k].$$

Then, for sufficiently smooth function $v : [0, T] \rightarrow H^1(\Omega)$, we introduce the following notations

$$\begin{aligned} v^k &:= v(t_k), \quad \partial_\tau^k v := \frac{v^{k+1} - v^k}{\tau}, \quad \partial_{\tau\tau}^k v := \frac{v^{k-1} - 2v^k + v^{k+1}}{\tau^2} = \frac{\partial_\tau^k v - \partial_\tau^{k-1} v}{\tau}, \\ \delta_\tau^k v &:= \frac{v^{k+1} - v^{k-1}}{2\tau} = \frac{\partial_\tau^k v + \partial_\tau^{k-1} v}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

We set $\mathbf{u}^{-1} := \mathbf{u}_0 - \tau \mathbf{v}_0$ and $\vartheta^0 := \vartheta_0$. Then, the semi-discretized weak formulation for (3.1a)-(3.1c) reads as: For $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, M-1\}$, find $(\mathbf{u}^{k+1}, \varphi^{k+1}, \vartheta^{k+1}) \in \mathbf{V} \times W \times Z$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \partial_{\tau\tau}^k \mathbf{u} \mathbf{v} dx + \int_{\Omega} (g(\varphi^{k+1}) + \kappa) \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^{k+1})) : \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{v}) dx - \rho \int_{\Omega} \vartheta^k \mathbf{I} : \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{v}) dx \\ = \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{f}^k \cdot \mathbf{v} dx \end{aligned} \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{V}, \quad (3.7a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \ell \int_{\Omega} \nabla \varphi^{k+1} \cdot \nabla w dx + \frac{1}{\ell} \int_{\Omega} \varphi^{k+1} w dx + \gamma_0 \int_{\Omega} [\varphi^{k+1} - \varphi^k]_+ w dx \\ = \frac{-1}{\mathcal{G}_c} \int_{\Omega} g_c(\varphi^k, \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^k)) w dx \end{aligned} \quad \forall w \in W, \quad (3.7b)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \partial_{\tau}^k \vartheta z dx + \int_{\Omega} K(\vartheta^{k+1}) \nabla \vartheta^{k+1} \cdot \nabla z dx + \rho \int_{\Omega} \vartheta^k \nabla \cdot \delta_{\tau}^k \mathbf{u} z dx \\ + \int_{\Gamma} \bar{\gamma}^k z ds = \int_{\Omega} \gamma^k z dx \end{aligned} \quad \forall z \in Z, \quad (3.7c)$$

where $\gamma_0 > 0$ is a sufficiently large penalization parameter.

3.1.1. A priori estimates

Among the essential tools in the proof of the main result of this paper are a priori estimates for the strain tensor of the semi-discrete solution of (3.7a), the semi discrete solution of (3.7c) as well as its gradient at each time step, i.e., $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^k)$, ϑ^k and $\nabla \vartheta^k$ ($\forall k = 1, 2, \dots, M$), respectively. The above discussion leads to the following lemma.

Lemma 3.3. *(A priori estimates for the heat function, the displacement vector field, and the strain tensor of displacement). Let $L \in \{1, 2, \dots, M\}$ and $\mathbf{u}^L \in \mathbf{H}_0^1(\Omega)$, and $\varphi^L, \vartheta^L \in H^1(\Omega)$ be the solutions of (3.7a)–(3.7c) in the L -th time step. Then, for $\mathbf{f}^L \in \mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)$, $\bar{\gamma}^L \in L^2(\Gamma)$ and $\gamma^L \in L^2(\Omega)$ we have the following a priori estimates for the heat function, the displacement vector field, and the strain tensor, respectively*

$$\|\vartheta^L\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \tau \|\nabla \vartheta^L\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq C_{st, \vartheta} \tau \mathcal{L}_{1,L}, \quad (3.8)$$

$$\|\mathbf{u}^L\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C_{st, \mathbf{u}} \left(\tau^2 \mathcal{L}_{1,L} + \tau \|\mathbf{v}_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \right), \quad (3.9)$$

where

$$\mathcal{L}_{1,L} := \sum_{k=0}^{L-1} \|\bar{\gamma}^k\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}^2 + \gamma_{\kappa} \sum_{k=0}^{L-1} \|\mathbf{f}^k\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{(\beta+2)^2/(\beta+1)^2} + \tau \sum_{k=0}^{L-1} \|\gamma^k\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + ((\gamma_{\kappa} + 1) |\Omega|^2),$$

and the nonnegative constants $C_{st, \vartheta}$ and $C_{st, \mathbf{u}}$ are independent of τ , h , ℓ , and κ , and γ_{κ} is defined as $\gamma_{\kappa} := \frac{\rho^4}{\kappa}$. Furthermore, we have the following L^2 -norm estimates for $\mathcal{E}(\delta_{\tau}^{L-1} \mathbf{u})$ and $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^L)$

$$\frac{\tau^2}{2} \|\mathcal{E}(\delta_{\tau}^{L-1} \mathbf{u})\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^L)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq C_{st, \mathcal{E} \mathbf{u}} \left(\frac{\rho^2 \tau^2}{\alpha_{\kappa}} \mathcal{L}_{1,L} + \frac{\tau^2}{2\alpha_{\kappa}} \sum_{k=0}^{L-1} \|\mathbf{f}^k\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \right),$$

where $\alpha_{\kappa} := \kappa C_{ell, \mathcal{A}}$, and $C_{ell, \mathcal{A}}$ is the ellipticity constants of the linear operator \mathcal{A} dependent on the Lamé parameters and the nonnegative constant $C_{st, \mathcal{E} \mathbf{u}}$ is independent of τ , h , ℓ , and κ .

Proof. Choosing $\mathbf{v} = \delta_\tau^k \mathbf{u}$, $k = 1, 2, \dots, M-1$ as the test function in (3.7a) and since the operator \mathcal{A} is symmetric, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2\tau} \left(\|\partial_\tau^k \mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 - \|\partial_\tau^{k-1} \mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 \right) + \frac{\kappa\tau}{4} \langle \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{E}(\delta_\tau^k \mathbf{u})), \mathcal{E}(\delta_\tau^k \mathbf{u}) \rangle \\
& \quad + \frac{\kappa}{2\tau} \langle \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^{k+1})), \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^{k+1}) \rangle \\
& \leq \frac{\kappa\tau}{2} |\langle \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^{k+1}), \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^{k-1})) \rangle| + \frac{\kappa}{2} |\langle \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^{k-1})), \mathcal{E}(\delta_\tau^k \mathbf{u}) \rangle| \\
& \quad + \rho \int_\Omega \vartheta^k \nabla \cdot \delta_\tau^k \mathbf{u} \, dx + \int_\Omega \mathbf{f}^k \delta_\tau^k \mathbf{u} \, dx.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

Integration by parts gives us

$$\int_\Omega \nabla \vartheta^k \cdot \delta_\tau^k \mathbf{u} \, dx = \int_\Omega \vartheta^k \nabla \cdot \delta_\tau^k \mathbf{u} \, dx,$$

which based on that, and applying the ellipticity property of the operator \mathcal{A} from Lemma 3.2, and Young's inequality lead to the following estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2\tau} \left(\|\partial_\tau^k \mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 - \|\partial_\tau^{k-1} \mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 \right) + \frac{\tau\kappa C_{ell,\mathcal{A}}}{4} \|\mathcal{E}(\delta_\tau^k \mathbf{u})\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 \\
& \quad + \frac{\kappa C_{ell,\mathcal{A}}}{2\tau} \|\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^{k+1})\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 \\
& \leq \rho^2 \tau \|\nabla \vartheta^k\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{1}{4\tau} \left(\|\partial_\tau^k \mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\partial_\tau^{k-1} \mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 \right) \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{8\tau} \left(\|\partial_\tau^k \mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\partial_\tau^{k-1} \mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 \right) \\
& \quad + \frac{\tau}{2} \|\mathbf{f}\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{\kappa\tau C_{\mu,\lambda}}{2} \|\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^{k-1})\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{\kappa\tau}{2} \|\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^{k+1})\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 \\
& \quad + \frac{\kappa C_{\mu,\lambda}}{\tau C_{ell,\mathcal{A}}} \|\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^{k-1})\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{\kappa\tau C_{ell,\mathcal{A}}}{8} \|\mathcal{E}(\delta_\tau^k \mathbf{u})\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

Then, for sufficiently small τ it is immediate that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\tau\alpha_\kappa}{4} \|\mathcal{E}(\delta_\tau^k \mathbf{u})\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{\alpha_\kappa}{2\tau} \|\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^{k+1})\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 & \leq \rho^2 \tau \|\nabla \vartheta^k\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{\tau}{2} \|\mathbf{f}^k\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 \\
& \quad + \beta_{\kappa,\tau} \|\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^{k-1})\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

where $\alpha_\kappa := \kappa C_{ell,\mathcal{A}}/2$ and $\beta_{\kappa,\tau} := \tau^{-1} \left(\kappa C_{ell,\mathcal{A}}^{-1} C_{\mu,\lambda} + \kappa\tau^2 C_{\mu,\lambda}/2 \right)$. Finally, the discrete Gronwall inequality results in the following estimate

$$\frac{\tau^2}{2} \|\mathcal{E}(\delta_\tau^k \mathbf{u})\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^{k+1})\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq C_{G,\mathbf{u}} \frac{2\rho^2\tau^2}{\alpha_\kappa} \|\nabla \vartheta^k\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{\tau^2}{2\alpha_\kappa} \|\mathbf{f}^k\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2, \tag{3.13}$$

where $C_{G,\mathbf{u}}$ is a positive constant independent of τ , h , ℓ , and κ . On the other hand, using $z = \vartheta^{k+1}$ as the test function in (3.7c) and via the Hölder inequality [BF13, Prop. II.2.18], we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{\tau} \left(\|\vartheta^{k+1} - \vartheta^k\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\vartheta^{k+1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 - \|\vartheta^k\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \right) \\
& \quad + c_1 \left\| |\vartheta^{k+1}|^{\beta/2} \nabla \vartheta^{k+1} \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 + c_1 \|\nabla \vartheta^{k+1}\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 \\
& \leq \frac{\rho C_K}{2} \|\vartheta^{k+1}\|_{L^3(\Omega)} \|\vartheta^k\|_{L^6(\Omega)} \|\mathcal{E}(\delta_\tau^k \mathbf{u})\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)} + \tau \|\gamma^k\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{4\tau} \|\vartheta^{k+1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{1}{c_1} \|\bar{\gamma}^k\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}^2 + \frac{c_1}{4} \|\nabla \vartheta^{k+1}\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

where C_K is the constant of Korn's inequality. For each $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, M-1\}$, we define the auxiliary variable $\Phi^{k+1} := \vartheta^{k+1} + 1$ and accordingly we denote $w^{k+1} := (\Phi^{k+1})^{(\beta+2)/2}$, which results in

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{c_1}{2} \left\| (|\vartheta^{k+1}|^{\beta/2} + 1) \nabla \vartheta^{k+1} \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 &\geq \frac{c_1}{2} \left\| (\vartheta^{k+1} + 1)^{\beta/2} \nabla \vartheta^{k+1} \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ &\geq \frac{1}{\beta+2} \left\| \nabla w^{k+1} \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

The first inequality is due to the Bernoulli inequality and the last inequality is a direct conclusion of $\nabla w^k = (\beta+2)/2 (\Phi^k)^{\beta/2} \nabla \vartheta^k$. Applying the above estimate allows us to obtain the following inequality for the last two terms in the left hand side of (3.14)

$$\begin{aligned} c_1 \left\| |\vartheta^{k+1}|^{\beta/2} \nabla \vartheta^{k+1} \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 + c_1 \left\| \nabla \vartheta^{k+1} \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ \geq \frac{c_1}{2} \left(\left\| |\vartheta^{k+1}|^{\beta/2} \nabla \vartheta^{k+1} \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 + \left\| \nabla \vartheta^{k+1} \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 \right) \\ + \frac{c_1}{2(\beta+2)} \left\| \nabla w^{k+1} \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

On the other hand, applying the definition of L^6 -norm, we infer that

$$\left\| \vartheta^{k+1} \right\|_{L^6(\Omega)} \leq \left(\int_{\Omega} (w^{k+1})^{\frac{12}{\beta+2}} \right)^{1/6} \leq \left\| w^{k+1} \right\|_{L^3(\Omega)}^{2/(\beta+2)}. \quad (3.17)$$

As a direct result of (3.13), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \rho \left\| \vartheta^{k+1} \right\|_{L^6(\Omega)} \left\| \vartheta^k \right\|_{L^3(\Omega)} \left\| \mathcal{E}(\delta_{\tau}^k \mathbf{u}) \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)} &\leq \sqrt{2} \rho C_{G, \mathbf{u}}^{1/2} \left\| \vartheta^{k+1} \right\|_{L^6(\Omega)} \left\| \vartheta^k \right\|_{L^3(\Omega)} \\ &\quad \left(\frac{\sqrt{2} \rho}{\sqrt{\alpha_{\kappa}}} \left\| \nabla \vartheta^k \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\alpha_{\kappa}}} \left\| \mathbf{f}^k \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

where $C_{G, \mathbf{u}}$ is defined in (3.13). Combining (3.17), the Bernoulli inequality, and the embedding $L^6(\Omega) \subset L^3(\Omega)$ we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \rho \left\| \vartheta^{k+1} \right\|_{L^6(\Omega)} \left\| \vartheta^k \right\|_{L^3(\Omega)} \left\| \mathcal{E}(\delta_{\tau}^k \mathbf{u}) \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)} \\ \leq \frac{2C_{G, \mathbf{u}}^{1/2} \rho^2}{\sqrt{\alpha_{\kappa}}} \left\| \nabla \vartheta^k \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)} \left\| w^{k+1} \right\|_{L^3(\Omega)}^{2/(\beta+2)} \left\| w^k \right\|_{L^3(\Omega)}^{2/(\beta+2)} \\ + \frac{\rho C_{G, \mathbf{u}}^{1/2}}{\sqrt{\alpha_{\kappa}}} \left\| w^{k+1} \right\|_{L^3(\Omega)}^{2/(\beta+2)} \left\| w^k \right\|_{L^3(\Omega)}^{2/(\beta+2)} \left\| \mathbf{f}^k \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)} \\ := I_1 + I_2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.19)$$

In order to kick back the term $\left\| w^{k+1} \right\|_{L^3(\Omega)}^{2/(\beta+2)}$ into the left hand side of (3.14), we use Young's inequality twice with the exponents $p = \beta+2$ and $q = \frac{\beta+2}{\beta+1}$ and $p = \beta+1$ and $q = \frac{\beta}{\beta+1}$ and note the interpolation

inequality from [BF13, Lemma II.2.33] to get

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 &\leq \frac{1}{2(\beta+2)} \|w^{k+1}\|_{L^3(\Omega)}^2 + \gamma_\kappa \|w^k\|_{L^3(\Omega)}^{2/(\beta+1)} \|\nabla \vartheta^k\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{(\beta+2)/(\beta+1)} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2\beta+2} \|w^{k+1}\|_{L^3(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{\gamma_\kappa}{\beta+1} \|w^k\|_{L^3(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{\gamma_\kappa(\beta+1)}{(\beta+2)} \|\nabla \vartheta^k\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{(\beta+2)\beta/(\beta+1)^2} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\beta+2} \|w^{k+1}\|_{L^6(\Omega)} \|w^{k+1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \frac{\gamma_\kappa}{(\beta+1)} \|w^k\|_{L^6(\Omega)} \|w^k\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
&\quad + \frac{\gamma_\kappa(\beta+1)}{(\beta+2)} \|\nabla \vartheta^k\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{(\beta+2)\beta/(\beta+1)^2}, \tag{3.20}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\gamma_\kappa := \frac{4C_{G,u}\rho^4(\beta+1)}{(\beta+2)\alpha_\kappa}$. Applying the Sobolev embedding $H^1(\Omega) \subset L^6(\Omega)$, and Young's inequality give us

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 &\leq \frac{c_1}{8(\beta+2)} \|\nabla w^{k+1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{c^2}{c_1(\beta+2)} \|w^{k+1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{c\gamma_\kappa}{2(\beta+2)} \left(\|\nabla w^k\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|w^k\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{\gamma_\kappa(\beta+1)}{(\beta+2)} \|\nabla \vartheta^k + \mathbf{1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{(\beta+2)\beta/(\beta+1)^2} \\
&\leq \frac{c_1}{8(\beta+2)} \|\nabla w^{k+1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{c^2}{c_1(\beta+2)} \|w^{k+1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{c\gamma_\kappa}{2(\beta+2)} \left(\|\nabla w^k\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|w^k\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{\gamma_\kappa(\beta+1)}{(\beta+2)} \|\nabla \vartheta^k\|^2 + \frac{c|\Omega|^2\gamma_\kappa}{2(\beta+2)}, \tag{3.21}
\end{aligned}$$

where c is a constant independent of h , τ , ℓ , and κ . In a procedure similar to I_1 , we have the following upper bound for I_2

$$\begin{aligned}
I_2 &\leq \frac{c_1}{8(\beta+2)} \|\nabla w^{k+1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{c^2}{c_1(\beta+2)} \|w^{k+1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{c\gamma_\kappa}{2(\beta+2)} \left(\|\nabla w^k\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|w^k\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{\gamma_\kappa(\beta+1)}{(\beta+2)} \|\mathbf{f}^k\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{(\beta+2)^2/(\beta+1)^2}. \tag{3.22}
\end{aligned}$$

As a result of Clarkson's inequality [BF13, Lem. II.2.31], the Bernoulli inequality and again Clarkson's inequality, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|w^{k+1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 &\leq \left\| \vartheta^{k+1}(\vartheta^{k+1} + 1)^{\beta/2} + (\vartheta^{k+1} + 1)^{\beta/2} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\
&\leq \left\| \vartheta^{k+1}(\vartheta^{k+1} + 1)^{\beta/2} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \left\| (\vartheta^{k+1} + 1)^{\beta/2} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\
&\leq \left\| \vartheta^{k+1}(\vartheta^{k+1})^{\beta/2} + \vartheta^{k+1} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \left\| \vartheta^{k+1} + 1 \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^\beta \\
&\leq \left\| (\vartheta^{k+1})^{1+\beta/2} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \left\| \vartheta^{k+1} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \left\| \vartheta^{k+1} + 1 \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\
&\leq \left\| (\vartheta^{k+1})^{1+\beta/2} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + 2 \left\| \vartheta^{k+1} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + |\Omega|^2. \tag{3.23}
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, since $\beta \in (1, 2)$ with the aid of (3.6) and Clarkson's inequality [BF13, Lem. II.2.31], we observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| (\vartheta^{k+1})^{1+\beta/2} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 &\leq \left\| \vartheta^{k+1} \right\|_{L^{\frac{2}{\beta+1}}(\Omega)}^{\frac{2}{\beta+1}} \leq \left\| \vartheta^{k+1} + 1 \right\|_{L^6(\Omega)}^2 \\
&\leq C \left(\left\| \nabla \vartheta^{k+1} \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^{1/2} \left\| \vartheta^{k+1} + 1 \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{1/2} + \left\| \vartheta^{k+1} + 1 \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \right)^2 \\
&\leq \frac{c_1}{8} \left\| \nabla \vartheta^{k+1} \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 + (8c_1 C^2 + 2C) \left(\left\| \vartheta^{k+1} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + |\Omega|^2 \right), \tag{3.24}
\end{aligned}$$

From the definition of w^k , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \vartheta^{k+1} - \vartheta^k \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 &= \left\| (w^{k+1})^{2/(\beta+2)} - (w^k)^{2/(\beta+2)} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\
&\geq \left\| (w^{k+1})^{2/(\beta+2)} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 - \left\| (w^k)^{2/(\beta+2)} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2. \tag{3.25}
\end{aligned}$$

Combining (3.14), (3.16), (3.19), (3.21), (3.22), (3.23), (3.24), and (3.25) and multiplying both sides of the new estimate in τ , we obtain for sufficiently small τ that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \vartheta^{k+1} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 - \left\| \vartheta^k \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{c_1 \tau}{2} \left(\left\| \nabla \vartheta^{k+1} \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 + \left\| |\vartheta^{k+1}|^{\beta/2} \nabla \vartheta^{k+1} \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{c_1 \tau}{2(\beta+2)} \left\| \nabla w^{k+1} \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 + \tau \left\| (w^{k+1})^{2/(\beta+2)} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 - \tau \left\| (w^k)^{2/(\beta+2)} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\
&\lesssim \gamma_\kappa \tau \left(\left\| \nabla w^k \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 + \left\| \vartheta^k \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \left\| \nabla \vartheta^k \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 \right) + \tau \left\| \vartheta^k \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \tau \left\| \nabla \vartheta^k \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\
&\quad + \gamma_\kappa \tau \left\| \mathbf{f}^k \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^{(\beta+2)^2/(\beta+1)^2} + \tau^2 \left\| \gamma^k \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \tau \left\| \bar{\gamma}^k \right\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}^2 + \tau(\gamma_\kappa + 1) |\Omega|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Summing over k (with $k = 1, 2, \dots, L-1$), and using the discrete Gronwall's lemma leads to the inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \vartheta^L \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \tau \left\| \nabla \vartheta^L \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{\tau}{\beta+2} \left\| \nabla w^L \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 &\lesssim \tau \sum_{k=1}^{L-1} \left\| \bar{\gamma}^k \right\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}^2 \\
&\quad + \gamma_\kappa \tau \sum_{k=1}^{L-1} \left\| \mathbf{f}^k \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^{(\beta+2)^2/(\beta+1)^2} + \tau^2 \sum_{k=1}^{L-1} \left\| \gamma^k \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \tau(\gamma_\kappa + 1) |\Omega|^2. \tag{3.26}
\end{aligned}$$

Combining this estimate with (3.13) results in the following estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\tau^2}{2} \left\| \mathcal{E}(\delta_\tau^{L-1} \mathbf{u}) \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 + \left\| \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^L) \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 \\
\lesssim \frac{C_{G, \mathbf{u}} \rho^2 \tau^2}{\alpha_\kappa} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{L-1} \left\| \bar{\gamma}^k \right\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}^2 + \gamma_\kappa \sum_{k=1}^{L-1} \left\| \mathbf{f}^k \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^{(\beta+2)^2/(\beta+1)^2} \right. \\
\left. + \tau \sum_{k=1}^{L-1} \left\| \gamma^k \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \tau(\gamma_\kappa + 1) |\Omega|^2 \right) + \frac{\tau^2}{2\alpha_\kappa} \sum_{k=1}^{L-1} \left\| \mathbf{f}^k \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2. \tag{3.27}
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, the combination of (3.11), (3.12), and the above estimate as well as a Gronwall's lemma completes the proof. \square

Remark 3.4. *In case $\kappa = \mathcal{O}(h)$, the results of the previous lemma stay valid if and only if $\tau h^{-1} = \mathcal{O}(1)$, which leads to the conditional stability.*

In the following, we present an a priori estimate for $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^L)$ in the \mathcal{A} -norm.

Lemma 3.5. (An a priori estimate for the strain tensor of displacement at the L -th time step in \mathcal{A} -norm) Let $L \in \{1, 2, \dots, M\}$, $\mathbf{u}^L \in \mathbf{H}_0^1(\Omega)$, and $\varphi^L, \vartheta^L \in H^1(\Omega)$ be the solutions of (3.1a), (3.1b), and (3.1c), respectively. Then, for $\mathbf{f}^L \in \mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)$, $\bar{\gamma}^L \in L^2(\Gamma)$ and $\gamma^L \in H^1(\Omega)$ we have the following a priori estimate in the \mathcal{A} -norm

$$\|\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^L)\|_{\mathcal{A}}^2 \leq C_{st, \mathbf{u}, \mathcal{A}} \left(\frac{\rho^2 \tau^2}{\kappa} \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{1, L} + \frac{\tau^2}{\kappa} \sum_{k=0}^{L-1} \|\mathbf{f}^k\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 \right),$$

where

$$\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{1, L} := \sum_{k=0}^{L-1} \|\bar{\gamma}^k\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}^2 + \kappa^{-1} \sum_{k=0}^{L-1} \|\mathbf{f}^k\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^{(\beta+2)^2/(\beta+1)^2} + \tau \sum_{k=0}^{L-1} \|\gamma^k\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + |\Omega|^2,$$

and the nonnegative constant $C_{st, \vartheta, \mathcal{A}}$ is independent of τ, h, ℓ , and κ .

Proof. Choosing $\mathbf{v} = \delta_\tau^k \mathbf{u}$ as the test function in (3.7a), and in a procedure similar to Lemma 3.3, we get

$$\frac{\tau^2}{2} \|\mathcal{E}(\delta_\tau^k \mathbf{u})\|_{\mathcal{A}}^2 + \|\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^{k+1})\|_{\mathcal{A}}^2 \leq C_{G, \mathbf{u}} \frac{4\rho^2 \tau^2}{\kappa} \|\nabla \vartheta^k\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{\tau^2}{\kappa} \|\mathbf{f}^k\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2. \quad (3.28)$$

Then, applying (3.26) in this estimate completes the proof. \square

3.2. Fully discretized variational formulation

Let $\mathcal{T}_h = \{T_1, \dots, T_N\}$ be a quasi-uniform triangulation of Ω with the mesh width $h := \max_{T_i \in \mathcal{T}_h} \text{diam}(T_i)$, where the elements $T_i \in \mathcal{T}_h$ are open triangles (for $d = 2$) or tetrahedra (for $d = 3$). The mesh \mathcal{T}_h is assumed to be regular in the sense of Ciarlet, additionally we assume the elements are γ -shape regular in the sense that we have $\text{diam}(T_i) \leq \gamma |T_i|^{1/d}$ for all $T_i \in \mathcal{T}_h$. Here $|T_i|$ denotes the volume (for $d = 3$) or the area (for $d = 2$) of T_i . In order to provide a Galerkin discretization for (3.1a)-(3.1c), we use the discrete space $\mathbf{S}_0^{1,1}(\mathcal{T}_h) \times S^{1,1}(\mathcal{T}_h) \times S^{1,1}(\mathcal{T}_h)$ where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{S}^{1,1}(\mathcal{T}_h) &:= \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{H}^1(\Omega) & : & \quad \mathbf{u}|_T \in \mathbf{P}_1(T) \quad \forall T \in \mathcal{T}_h\}, \\ S^{1,1}(\mathcal{T}_h) &:= \{u \in H^1(\Omega) & : & \quad u|_T \in P_1(T) \quad \forall T \in \mathcal{T}_h\}, \end{aligned}$$

and $P_1(T)$ denotes the space of polynomials of maximal degree 1 on T , and $\mathbf{P}_1(T) := (P_1(T))_{i=1}^d$. We set $\mathbf{S}_0^{1,1}(\mathcal{T}_h) := \mathbf{S}^{1,1}(\mathcal{T}_h) \cap \mathbf{H}_0^1(\Omega)$ and $S_0^{1,1}(\mathcal{T}_h) := S^{1,1}(\mathcal{T}_h) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$. We define

$$\mathbf{V}_h := \mathbf{S}_0^{1,1}(\mathcal{T}_h), \quad W_h := S^{1,1}(\mathcal{T}_h), \quad Z_h := S^{1,1}(\mathcal{T}_h).$$

Then, we can introduce a Ritz operator $\mathcal{J}_h := (\mathcal{J}_{h, \mathbf{u}}, \mathcal{J}_{h, \varphi}, \mathcal{J}_{h, \vartheta}) : \mathbf{V} \times W \times Z \rightarrow \mathbf{V}_h \times W_h \times Z_h$ through the following equalities (see e.g., [SW00, Sec. 5], [LTW91, Sec. 2], [LZ92, Sec. 2] and [Dur88, Sec. 3])

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \nabla \mathcal{J}_{h, \mathbf{u}} \mathbf{u} - \nabla \mathbf{u}, \nabla \mathbf{v}_h \rangle &= 0 & \forall \mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{V}_h, \\ \langle \nabla \mathcal{J}_{h, \varphi} \varphi - \nabla \varphi, \nabla z_h \rangle &= 0 & \forall z_h \in Z_h, \\ \langle \bar{h} (\nabla \mathcal{J}_{h, \vartheta} \vartheta - \nabla \vartheta), \nabla w_h \rangle &= 0 & \forall w_h \in W_h, \end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{h} : \Omega \times I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is a nonnegative function. Moreover, the entries of \mathcal{J}_h satisfy the properties:

- The operator $\mathcal{J}_{h, \varphi}$ (and similarly $\mathcal{J}_{h, \vartheta}$) satisfies the following stability estimates (see e.g., [SW00, Lem. 9])

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{J}_{h, \varphi} \varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega)} &\leq C_s \|\varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega)} & \forall \varphi \in L^2(\Omega), \\ \|\nabla \mathcal{J}_{h, \varphi} \varphi\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)} &\leq C'_s \|\nabla \varphi\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)} & \forall \varphi \in H^1(\Omega). \end{aligned}$$

- The operator $\mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi}$ (and similarly $\mathcal{J}_{h,\vartheta}$) satisfies the following approximation property (see e.g., [CN00, Lem. 3.2])

$$\|\varphi - \mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi}\varphi\|_{H^k(\Omega)} \lesssim h^{l-k} \|\varphi\|_{H^l(\Omega)} \quad k \in \{0, 1\}, l = k + 1 \quad \forall \varphi \in H^l(\Omega). \quad (3.29)$$

- The operator $\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}$ satisfies the following stability estimates [SW00, Lem. 9]

$$\|\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)} \leq \widehat{C}_s \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)} \quad \forall \mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{L}^2(\Omega), \quad (3.30)$$

$$\|\nabla \mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)} \leq \widehat{C}'_s \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)} \quad \forall \mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{H}_0^1(\Omega), \quad (3.31)$$

where C_s , C'_s , \widehat{C}_s , and \widehat{C}'_s are constants independent of h .

- The operator $\mathcal{I}_{h,\mathbf{u}}$ satisfies the following approximation property [SW00, Lem. 9]

$$\|\mathbf{u} - \mathcal{I}_{h,\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbf{H}^k(\Omega)} \lesssim h^{l-k} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbf{H}^l(\Omega)}, \quad k \in \{0, 1\}, l = k + 1 \quad \forall \mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{H}^l(\Omega). \quad (3.32)$$

Let $\mathcal{I}_h : \mathbf{H}^1(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbf{S}^{1,1}(\mathcal{T}_h)$ and $\mathcal{I}_h : H^1(\Omega) \rightarrow S^{1,1}(\mathcal{T}_h)$ be Scott-Zhang operators with the local approximation properties (see e.g., [EG17, Lem. 1.130]):

$$\|\mathbf{u} - \mathcal{I}_h\mathbf{u}\|_{H^k(T)} \lesssim h^{l-k} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbf{H}^l(\omega_T)} \quad k \in \{0, 1\}, l = k + 1 \quad \forall \mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{H}^l(\omega_T), \quad (3.33)$$

$$\|\varphi - \mathcal{I}_h\varphi\|_{H^k(T)} \lesssim h^{l-k} \|\varphi\|_{H^l(\omega_T)} \quad k \in \{0, 1\}, l = k + 1 \quad \forall \varphi \in H^l(\omega_T), \quad (3.34)$$

where ω_T is the patch of the element $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$.

The fully discretized scheme for (3.1a)-(3.1c) reads as: For $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, M-1\}$, find $(\mathbf{u}_h^{k+1}, \varphi_h^{k+1}, \vartheta_h^{k+1}) \in \mathbf{V}_h \times W_h \times Z_h$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \partial_{\tau\tau}^k \mathbf{u}_h \mathbf{v}_h dx + \int_{\Omega} (g(\varphi_h^{k+1}) + \kappa) \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}_h^{k+1})) : \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{v}_h) dx - \rho \int_{\Omega} \vartheta_h^k \mathbf{I} : \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{v}_h) dx \\ = \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{I}_h \mathbf{f}^k \cdot \mathbf{v}_h dx \quad \forall \mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{V}_h, \end{aligned} \quad (3.35a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \ell \int_{\Omega} \nabla \varphi_h^{k+1} \cdot \nabla w_h dx + \frac{1}{\ell} \int_{\Omega} \varphi_h^{k+1} w_h dx + \gamma_0 \int_{\Omega} [\varphi_h^{k+1} - \varphi_h^k]_+ w_h dx \\ = \frac{-1}{\mathcal{G}_c} \int_{\Omega} g_c(\varphi_h^{k+1}, \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}_h^k)) w_h dx \quad \forall w_h \in W_h, \end{aligned} \quad (3.35b)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \partial_{\tau}^k \vartheta_h z_h dx + \int_{\Omega} K(\vartheta_h^{k+1}) \nabla \vartheta_h^{k+1} \cdot \nabla z_h dx + \rho \int_{\Omega} \vartheta_h^k \nabla \cdot \delta_{\tau}^k \mathbf{u}_h z_h dx \\ + \int_{\Gamma} \bar{\gamma}^k z_h ds = \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{I}_h \gamma^k z_h ds \quad \forall z_h \in Z_h, \end{aligned} \quad (3.35c)$$

and we set $\mathbf{u}_h^{-1} := \mathbf{u}_0 - \tau \mathbf{v}_0$ and $\vartheta_h^0 := \vartheta_0$.

3.2.1. A priori estimates

In the following lemma, for $L \in \{1, 2, \dots, M\}$, we present a priori estimates for ϑ_h^L in the L^2 -norm, and $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}_h^L)$ in the \mathbf{L}^2 - and \mathcal{A} -norms. We also present a priori estimates for $\nabla \vartheta_h^L$ and $\mathcal{E}(\delta_{\tau}^{L-1} \mathbf{u}_h)$ with respect to the \mathbf{L}^2 -norm.

Lemma 3.6. (A priori estimates for ϑ_h^L , $\nabla \vartheta_h^L$, $\mathcal{E}(\delta_{\tau}^{L-1} \mathbf{u}_h)$, and $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}_h^L)$) for $L \in \{1, 2, \dots, M\}$) Let $L \in \{1, 2, \dots, M\}$, and $\mathbf{u}_h^L \in \mathbf{V}_h$, $\varphi_h^L \in W_h$ and $\vartheta_h^L \in Z_h$ be the solutions of (3.35a), (3.35b) and (3.35c),

respectively. Then, for $\mathbf{f}^L \in \mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)$, $\bar{\gamma}^L \in L^2(\Gamma)$, and $\gamma^L \in L^2(\Omega)$, we have the a priori estimate for ϑ_h^L

$$\begin{aligned} \|\vartheta_h^L\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \tau \|\nabla \vartheta_h^L\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 &\leq C_{st,\vartheta} \sum_{k=0}^{L-1} \left(\tau \|\bar{\gamma}^k\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}^2 + \gamma_\kappa \tau \|\mathcal{I}_h \mathbf{f}^k\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{(\beta+2)^2/(\beta+1)^2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \tau^2 \|\mathcal{I}_h \gamma^k\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \tau((\gamma_\kappa + 1)|\Omega|^2) \right) \leq C'_{st,\vartheta} \tau \mathcal{L}_{1,L}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.36)$$

where $\mathcal{L}_{1,L}$ and γ_κ are defined in Lemma 3.3. The constant $C_{st,\vartheta}$ only depends on Ω , and the stability constants of \mathcal{I}_h and \mathcal{I}_h . Moreover, the constant $C'_{st,\vartheta}$ only depends on Ω and $C_{st,\vartheta}$. Then, we have the following estimates in the \mathbf{L}^2 -norm and the \mathcal{A} -norm for $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}_h^L)$ and $\mathcal{E}(\delta_\tau^{L-1} \mathbf{u}_h)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\tau^2}{2} \|\mathcal{E}(\delta_\tau^{L-1} \mathbf{u}_h)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}_h^L)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 &\leq C_{st,\mathcal{E}\mathbf{u}} \left(\frac{\rho^2 \tau^2}{\alpha_\kappa} \mathcal{L}_{1,L} + \frac{\tau^2}{2\alpha_\kappa} \sum_{k=0}^{L-1} \|\mathcal{I}_h \mathbf{f}^k\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \right) \\ &\leq C'_{st,\mathcal{E}\mathbf{u}} \left(\frac{\rho^2 \tau^2}{\alpha_\kappa} \mathcal{L}_{1,L} + \frac{\tau^2}{2\alpha_\kappa} \sum_{k=0}^{L-1} \|\mathbf{f}^k\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \right), \end{aligned} \quad (3.37)$$

and

$$\|\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}_h^L)\|_{\mathcal{A}}^2 \leq C'_{st,\mathbf{u},\mathcal{A}} \left(\frac{\rho^2 \tau^2}{\kappa} \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{1,L} + \frac{\tau^2}{\kappa} \sum_{k=0}^{L-1} \|\mathbf{f}^k\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \right),$$

where the constants $C'_{st,\mathcal{E}\mathbf{u}}$ and $C'_{st,\mathbf{u},\mathcal{A}}$ only depend on Ω , and the stability constants of \mathcal{I}_h and \mathcal{I}_h . Moreover, $\mathcal{L}_{1,L}$, α_κ and $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{1,L}$ are defined in Lemmas 3.3 and 3.5, respectively.

Proof. The proof is done similar to Lemmas 3.3 and 3.5 based on (3.35a)-(3.35c). \square

4. MAIN RESULTS

In this section, we state and proof the main result of this article, which is to present a priori error estimates for $\mathbf{u}_h^L - \mathbf{u}^L$ and $\varphi_h^L - \varphi^L$, and $\vartheta_h^L - \vartheta^L$ ($L \in \{1, 2, \dots, M\}$), respectively. We introduce the following operators:

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathcal{A}_1(\varphi, \mathbf{u}) : \mathbf{v}] &:= \int_{\Omega} (g(\varphi) + \kappa) \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u})) : \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{v}) \, dx, \\ [\mathcal{A}_2(\varphi, \mathbf{u}) : w] &:= \int_{\Omega} g_c(\varphi, \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u})) w \, dx, \\ [\mathcal{A}_3(\vartheta, \mathbf{u}) : z] &:= \int_{\Omega} \vartheta \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} z \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

For $k = 0, 1, \dots, M$, we also define the following difference functions

$$\widehat{\mathbf{e}}_{\mathbf{u},h}^k := \mathbf{u}_h^k - \mathbf{u}^k, \quad \widehat{e}_{\varphi,h}^k := \varphi_h^k - \varphi^k, \quad \widehat{e}_{\vartheta,h}^k := \vartheta_h^k - \vartheta^k.$$

Theorem 4.1. *Let $k \in \{1, \dots, M\}$, and $\mathbf{u}^k \in \mathbf{H}^2(\Omega) \cap \mathbf{H}_0^1(\Omega)$, $\varphi^k \in H^1(\Omega)$ and $\vartheta^k \in H^1(\Omega)$ be the solutions of (3.1a), (3.1b) and (3.1c), respectively. Moreover, we consider \mathbf{u}_h^k , φ_h^k and ϑ_h^k as the solutions of (3.35a), (3.35b) and (3.35c), respectively. Assume the space and time discretization parameters h , τ and the right hand side functions $\mathbf{f}^k \in \mathbf{H}^1(\Omega)$, $\gamma^k \in H^1(\Omega)$, and $\bar{\gamma}^k \in L^2(\Gamma)$ satisfy the assumptions:*

- $\ell \left(\frac{\rho^2 \tau^2}{\kappa} \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{1,M} + \frac{\tau^2}{\kappa} \sum_{m=0}^M \|\mathbf{f}^m\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \right) \leq 1,$
- $\ell \left(\frac{\rho\tau}{\alpha_\kappa} \sqrt{\mathcal{L}_{1,M}} + \frac{\tau}{\sqrt{2\alpha_\kappa}} \sum_{m=0}^M \|\mathbf{f}^m\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \right) \leq 1,$
- $2\tau^2 \mathcal{L}_{1,M} \leq \kappa C_{ell,\mathcal{A}},$
- $\left(\frac{\rho\tau}{\sqrt{\alpha_\kappa}} \sqrt{\mathcal{L}_{1,M}} + \frac{\tau}{\sqrt{\alpha_\kappa}} \sum_{m=0}^M \|\mathbf{f}^m\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \right) \leq 1,$

where $\mathcal{L}_{1,M}$, α_κ and $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{1,M}$ are defined in Lemmas 3.3 and 3.5, and $C_{ell,\mathcal{A}}$ is the ellipticity constant of \mathcal{A} . Then, the following estimate holds true for $L \in \{0, 1, \dots, M-1\}$

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\partial_\tau^L \widehat{\mathbf{e}}_{\mathbf{u},h}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \kappa\tau \left\| \mathcal{E}(\widehat{\mathbf{e}}_{\mathbf{u},h}^{L+1}) \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{e}}_{\vartheta,h}^{L+1} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \tau \left\| \nabla \widehat{\mathbf{e}}_{\vartheta,h}^{L+1} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \ell\tau \left\| \nabla \widehat{e}_{\varphi,h}^{L+1} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ & + \frac{\tau}{\ell} \left\| \widehat{e}_{\varphi,h}^{L+1} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \lesssim \mathcal{L}_{1,L+1} \tau^2 \left\| \nabla \vartheta^{L+1} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \kappa^{-1} h^2 \left(\left\| \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^{L+1}) \right\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(\Omega)}^2 \left\| \varphi^{L+1} \right\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 + \left\| \vartheta^L \right\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \right) \\ & + h^2 \left\| \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^{L+1}) \right\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(\Omega)}^2 \left\| \varphi^{L+1} \right\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 + \ell^{-1} \tau h^2 \left(\left\| \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^{L+1}) \right\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(\Omega)}^2 \left\| \varphi^{L+1} \right\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \right. \\ & \left. + \left\| \varphi^{L+1} \right\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 + \left\| \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^{L+1}) \right\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(\Omega)}^4 \right) + \ell\tau h^2 \left\| \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^{L+1}) \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^4 \left\| \varphi^{L+1} \right\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \\ & + \tau h^2 \left(\left\| \partial_{\tau\tau}^L \mathbf{u} \right\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(\Omega)}^2 + \left\| \mathbf{f}^{L+1} \right\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(\Omega)}^2 + \left\| \vartheta^{L+1} \right\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \right) \\ & + h^2 \tau^2 \left(\left\| \vartheta^L \right\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \left\| \delta_\tau^L \mathbf{u} \right\|_{\mathbf{H}^2(\Omega)}^2 + \left\| \delta_\tau^L \vartheta \right\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 + \left\| \gamma^{L+1} \right\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

where the constant of the inequality is independent of critical parameters such as the mesh size h , τ , ℓ , μ , λ and κ . Moreover, $\mathcal{L}_{1,L+1}$ is defined in Lemma 3.3.

Proof. For $k = 0, 1, \dots, L$, we define the difference functions

$$\mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}^k := \mathbf{u}_h^k - \mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{u}^k, \quad e_{\varphi,h}^k := \varphi_h^k - \mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi} \varphi^k, \quad e_{\vartheta,h}^k := \vartheta_h^k - \mathcal{J}_{h,\vartheta} \vartheta^k,$$

then, subtracting (3.35a)-(3.35c) and (3.1a)-(3.1c) gives us

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle \partial_{\tau\tau}^k \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}, \mathbf{v}_h \rangle + [\mathcal{A}_1(\varphi_h^{k+1}, \mathbf{u}_h^{k+1}) - \mathcal{A}_1(\mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi}\varphi^{k+1}, \mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{u}^{k+1}) : \mathbf{v}_h] \\
& = [\mathcal{A}_1(\varphi^{k+1}, \mathbf{u}^{k+1}) - \mathcal{A}_1(\mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi}\varphi^{k+1}, \mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{u}^{k+1}) : \mathbf{v}_h] \\
& + \langle \partial_{\tau\tau}^k (\mathbf{u} - \mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{u}), \mathbf{v}_h \rangle + \rho \langle e_{\vartheta,h}^k \mathbf{I}, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_h \rangle \\
& + \rho \langle (\mathcal{J}_{h,\vartheta}\vartheta^k - \vartheta^k) \mathbf{I}, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_h \rangle \\
& + \langle \mathcal{I}_h \mathbf{f}^k - \mathbf{f}^k, \mathbf{v}_h \rangle, \quad \forall \mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{V}_h, \quad (4.1a)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \ell \langle \nabla e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1}, \nabla w_h \rangle + \frac{1}{\ell} \langle e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1}, w_h \rangle + \frac{1}{\mathcal{G}_c} ([\mathcal{A}_2(\varphi_h^{k+1}, \mathbf{u}_h^k) - \mathcal{A}_2(\mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi}\varphi^{k+1}, \mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{u}^k) : w_h] \\
& - [\mathcal{A}_2(\varphi^{k+1}, \mathbf{u}^k) - \mathcal{A}_2(\mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi}\varphi^{k+1}, \mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{u}^k) : w_h]) \\
& + \gamma_0 \langle [\varphi_h^{k+1} - \varphi_h^k]_+ - [\mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi}\varphi^{k+1} - \mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi}\varphi^k]_+, w_h \rangle \\
& = \ell \langle \nabla(\varphi^{k+1} - \mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi}\varphi^{k+1}), \nabla w_h \rangle \\
& + \frac{1}{\ell} \langle \varphi^{k+1} - \mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi}\varphi^{k+1}, w_h \rangle \\
& + \gamma_0 \langle [\varphi^{k+1} - \varphi^k]_+ - [\mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi}\varphi^{k+1} - \mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi}\varphi^k]_+, w_h \rangle, \quad \forall w_h \in W_h,
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle \delta_\tau^k e_{\vartheta,h}, z_h \rangle + \langle (K(\vartheta_h^{k+1}) \nabla \vartheta_h^{k+1} - K(\mathcal{J}_{h,\vartheta}\vartheta^{k+1}) \nabla \mathcal{J}_{h,\vartheta}\vartheta^{k+1}), \nabla z_h \rangle \\
& + \rho [\mathcal{A}_3(\vartheta_h^k, \delta_\tau^k \mathbf{u}_h) - \mathcal{A}_3(\vartheta^k, \delta_\tau^k \mathbf{u}) : z_h] = \langle \delta_\tau^k (\vartheta - \mathcal{J}_{h,\vartheta}\vartheta), z_h \rangle \\
& + \langle (K(\vartheta^{k+1}) \nabla \vartheta^{k+1} - K(\mathcal{J}_{h,\vartheta}\vartheta^{k+1}) \nabla \mathcal{J}_{h,\vartheta}\vartheta^{k+1}), \nabla z_h \rangle \\
& + \langle (\mathcal{I}_h \gamma^k - \gamma^k), z_h \rangle, \quad \forall z_h \in Z_h. \quad (4.1c)
\end{aligned}$$

Thought the proof, we consider C as a generic constant independent of h , τ , ℓ , and κ , and may change from line to line. In order to simplify the proof, we split the procedure into four main steps:

Step 1: The displacement error equation. In this step, we deal with the terms that appear in (4.1a). For the sake of simplicity, this step is divided into three sub steps.

Step 1.1: We use the test function $\mathbf{v}_h = \delta_\tau^k \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}$ in the variational formulation (4.1a). We start with rewriting the operator \mathcal{A}_1 as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
& [\mathcal{A}_1(\varphi_h^{k+1}, \mathbf{u}_h^{k+1}) - \mathcal{A}_1(\mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi}\varphi^{k+1}, \mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{u}^{k+1}) : \mathcal{E}(\delta_\tau^k \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h})] \\
& = \left\langle (\kappa + (\mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi}\varphi^{k+1})^2) \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}^{k+1})), \mathcal{E}(\delta_\tau^k \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}) \right\rangle \\
& + 2 \left\langle e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1} \mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi} \varphi^{k+1} \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}_h^{k+1})), \mathcal{E}(\delta_\tau^k \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}) \right\rangle \\
& + \left\langle (e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1})^2 \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{u}^{k+1})), \mathcal{E}(\delta_\tau^k \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}) \right\rangle \\
& + \left\langle (e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1})^2 \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}^{k+1})), \mathcal{E}(\delta_\tau^k \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}) \right\rangle \\
& =: T_1 + T_2 + T_3 + T_4. \quad (4.2)
\end{aligned}$$

Using the ellipticity property of the operator \mathcal{A} from Lemma 3.2, we get

$$\begin{aligned} T_1 &\geq \frac{\kappa\tau C_{ell,\mathcal{A}}}{2} \left\| \mathcal{E}(\delta_\tau^k \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}) \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{\kappa C_{ell,\mathcal{A}}}{2\tau} \left(\left\| \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}^{k+1}) \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 - \left\| \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}^{k-1}) \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4\tau} \left(\left\| \mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi} \varphi^{k+1} \mathcal{A}^{1/2}(\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}^{k+1})) \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 - \left\| \mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi} \varphi^{k+1} \mathcal{A}^{1/2}(\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}^{k-1})) \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 \right), \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

where $C_{ell,\mathcal{A}}$ is the ellipticity constant of \mathcal{A} . In order to find an upper bound for T_2 , we apply the Hölder inequality [BF13, Prop. II.2.18], the Sobolev embedding $W^{1,4}(\Omega) \subset L^\infty(\Omega)$ from [Rou13, Thm. 1.20], and we note that \mathbf{u}_h^{k+1} is indeed in $\mathbf{S}_0^{1,1}(\mathcal{T}_h)$ (which results in $|\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}_h^{k+1})|_{1,4,T} = 0$) to get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} |T_2| &\leq \left\| e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \left\| \mathcal{A}^{1/2}(\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}_h^{k+1})) \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^\infty(\Omega)} \left\| \mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi} \varphi^{k+1} \mathcal{A}^{1/2}(\mathcal{E}(\delta_\tau^k \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h})) \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)} \\ &\leq \left\| e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} \left\| \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}_h^{k+1})) \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^4(T)} \left\| \mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi} \varphi^{k+1} \mathcal{E}(\delta_\tau^k \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}) \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)} \\ &\leq 2\ell \left\| \mathcal{A}^{1/2}(\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}_h^{k+1})) \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 \left\| \mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi} \varphi^{k+1} \mathcal{A}^{1/2}(\mathcal{E}(\delta_\tau^k \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h})) \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{8\ell} \left\| e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

where the last line of (4.4) is estimated by using (3.6), and again noting that $\mathbf{u}_h^{k+1}|_T \in \mathbf{P}_1(T)$ for every $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ (which results in $|\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}_h^{k+1})|_{\mathbf{H}^1(T)} = 0$), and by Young's inequality. Then, from the a priori estimate from Lemma 3.6, we exploit that

$$\begin{aligned} |T_2| &\leq 4\ell C'_{st,\mathbf{u},\mathcal{A}} \left(\frac{\rho^2 \tau^2}{\kappa} \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{1,k+1} + \frac{\tau^2}{\kappa} \sum_{m=0}^k \left\| \mathbf{f}^m \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 \right) \left\| \mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi} \varphi^{k+1} \mathcal{A}^{1/2}(\mathcal{E}(\delta_\tau^k \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h})) \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4\ell} \left\| e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

To control the term T_3 , we use the Hölder inequality [BF13, Prop. II.2.18], the Sobolev embedding $W^{1,4}(\Omega) \subset L^\infty(\Omega)$, and take into account that $\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{u}^{k+1}|_T \in \mathbf{P}_1(T)$ for all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$, and apply (3.6) with Young's inequality to get

$$\begin{aligned} |T_3| &\leq \left\| e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1} \mathcal{A}^{1/2}(\mathcal{E}(\delta_\tau^k \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h})) \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)} \left\| e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \left\| \mathcal{A}^{1/2}(\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{u}^{k+1})) \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^\infty(\Omega)} \\ &\leq \left\| e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1} \mathcal{A}^{1/2}(\mathcal{E}(\delta_\tau^k \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h})) \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)} \left\| e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} \left\| \mathcal{A}^{1/2}(\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{u}^{k+1})) \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^4(T)} \\ &\leq 2\ell \left\| \mathcal{A}^{1/2}(\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{u}^{k+1})) - \mathcal{A}^{1/2}(\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^{k+1})) \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 \left\| e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1} \mathcal{A}^{1/2}(\mathcal{E}(\delta_\tau^k \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h})) \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ &\quad + 2\ell \left\| \mathcal{A}^{1/2}(\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^{k+1})) \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 \left\| e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1} \mathcal{A}^{1/2}(\mathcal{E}(\delta_\tau^k \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h})) \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{1}{8\ell} \left\| e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Applying the a priori estimate from Lemma 3.5, and stability properties of the operators $\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}$, lead to

$$\begin{aligned} |T_3| &\leq 4\ell C_{st,\mathbf{u},\mathcal{A}} \left(\frac{\rho^2 \tau^2}{\kappa} \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{1,k+1} + \frac{\tau^2}{\kappa} \sum_{m=0}^k \left\| \mathbf{f}^m \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 \right) \left\| e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1} \mathcal{A}^{1/2}(\mathcal{E}(\delta_\tau^k \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h})) \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4\ell} \left\| e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

Finally, the term T_4 can be rewritten in the following form

$$\begin{aligned} T_4 &= \frac{\lambda}{\tau} \left\| e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1} \nabla \cdot \delta_\tau^k \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{\mu}{\tau} \left\| e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1} \mathcal{E}(\delta_\tau^k \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}) \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{\lambda}{\tau} \left\langle e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1} \nabla \cdot \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}^{k-1}, \delta_\tau^k \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h} \right\rangle + \frac{\mu}{\tau} \left\langle e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1} \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}^{k-1}), \delta_\tau^k \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h} \right\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

Step 1.2: In this step, we deal with the first term on the right-hand side of (4.1a). Applying the test function $\mathbf{v}_h = \delta_\tau^k \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &[\mathcal{A}_1(\varphi^{k+1}, \mathbf{u}^{k+1}) - \mathcal{A}_1(\mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi} \varphi^{k+1}, \mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{u}^{k+1}) : \mathcal{E}(\delta_\tau^k \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h})] \\ &= \kappa \int_{\Omega} (\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^{k+1})) - \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{u}^{k+1}))) : \mathcal{E}(\delta_\tau^k \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}) dx \\ &\quad + \int_{\Omega} ((\varphi^{k+1})^2 - (\mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi} \varphi^{k+1})^2) \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^{k+1})) : \mathcal{E}(\delta_\tau^k \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}) dx \\ &\quad + \int_{\Omega} (\mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi} \varphi^{k+1})^2 (\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^{k+1})) - \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{u}^{k+1}))) : \mathcal{E}(\delta_\tau^k \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}) dx \\ &:= T_5 + T_6 + T_7. \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

It follows from the Lipschitz continuity of the operator \mathcal{A} from Lemma 3.2 and approximation properties of the operator $\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}$ that

$$\begin{aligned} |T_5| &\leq \frac{4\kappa C_{\mu,\lambda}}{\tau C_{ell,\mathcal{A}}} \left\| \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^{k+1}) - \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{u}^{k+1}) \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{\kappa\tau C_{ell,\mathcal{A}}}{8} \left\| \mathcal{E}(\delta_\tau^k \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}) \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ &\leq \frac{4\kappa h^2 C C_{\mu,\lambda}}{C_{ell,\mathcal{A}} \tau} \left\| \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^{k+1}) \right\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{\kappa\tau C_{ell,\mathcal{A}}}{8} \left\| \mathcal{E}(\delta_\tau^k \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}) \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

Applying the Hölder inequality [BF13, Prop. II.2.18], the Sobolev embedding $W^{1,4}(\Omega) \subset L^\infty(\Omega)$, as well as taking into account that for $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$, we have $\mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}^k|_T \in \mathbf{P}_1(T)$ which results in $|\mathcal{E}(\delta_\tau^k \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h})|_{1,4,T} = 0$, applying (3.6), and employing the approximation properties of $\mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi}$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} |T_6| &\leq \left\| (\varphi^{k+1})^2 - (\mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi} \varphi^{k+1})^2 \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \left\| \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^{k+1})) \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)} \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} \left\| \mathcal{E}(\delta_\tau^k \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}) \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^4(T)} \\ &\leq C \left\| \varphi^{k+1} - \mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi} \varphi^{k+1} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \left\| \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^{k+1})) \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)} \left\| \mathcal{E}(\delta_\tau^k \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}) \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)} \\ &\leq 4CC_{ell,\mathcal{A}}^{-1} \kappa^{-1} h^2 \tau^{-1} \left\| \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^{k+1})) \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 \left\| \varphi^{k+1} \right\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{\kappa C_{ell,\mathcal{A}}}{8\tau} \left(\left\| \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}^{k+1}) \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 + \left\| \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}^{k-1}) \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 \right), \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

Using the Sobolev embedding $W^{1,4}(\Omega) \subset L^\infty(\Omega)$ as well as taking into account that for all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$, $\mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi} \varphi^{k+1}(T)$ is in fact a linear polynomial, using (3.6), applying Lemma 3.2 and the approximation properties of the operator $\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}$, the following estimate can be obtained similar to (4.9)

$$\begin{aligned} |T_7| &\leq \left\| \mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi} \varphi^{k+1} \right\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \left| \left\langle \mathcal{A}^{1/2}(\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^{k+1}) - \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{u}^{k+1})), \mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi} \varphi^{k+1} \mathcal{A}^{1/2}(\mathcal{E}(\delta_\tau^k \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h})) \right\rangle \right| \\ &\leq 4CC_{\mu,\lambda} \tau^{-1} h^2 \left\| \mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi} \varphi^{k+1} \right\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \left\| \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^{k+1}) \right\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{\tau}{8} \left\| \mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi} \varphi^{k+1} \mathcal{A}^{1/2}(\mathcal{E}(\delta_\tau^k \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h})) \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

By combining (4.8)-(4.11), we obtain immediately that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=5}^7 |T_i| &\leq \frac{4\kappa h^2 C_{\mathbf{u}} C_{\mu, \lambda}}{C_{ell, \mathcal{A} \tau}} \|\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^{k+1})\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(\Omega)}^2 \\
&\quad + 4CC_{\mu, \lambda} \tau^{-1} h^2 \|\mathcal{J}_{h, \varphi} \varphi^{k+1}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \|\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^{k+1})\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(\Omega)}^2 \\
&\quad + 4CC_{ell, \mathcal{A}}^{-1} \kappa^{-1} h^2 \tau^{-1} \|\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^{k+1}))\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 \|\varphi^{k+1}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{\kappa C_{ell, \mathcal{A}}}{4\tau} \left(\|\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u}, h}^{k+1})\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u}, h}^{k-1})\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{\tau}{8} \left\| \mathcal{J}_{h, \varphi} \varphi^{k+1} \mathcal{A}^{1/2} (\mathcal{E}(\delta_{\tau}^k \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u}, h})) \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2. \tag{4.12}
\end{aligned}$$

Step 1.3: In this step, after substituting $\mathbf{v}_h = \delta_{\tau}^k \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u}, h}$ as the test function, we focus on the rest of the term in the variational formulation (4.1a). Recalling the approximation properties of $\mathcal{J}_{h, \mathbf{u}}$ and Young's inequality, the following upper bound is valid

$$\begin{aligned}
T_5 := \langle \partial_{\tau\tau}^k (\mathbf{u} - \mathcal{J}_{h, \mathbf{u}} \mathbf{u}), \delta_{\tau}^k \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u}, h} \rangle &\leq Ch^2 \|\partial_{\tau\tau}^k \mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(\Omega)}^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{8} \left(\|\partial_{\tau}^k \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u}, h}\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\partial_{\tau}^{k-1} \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u}, h}\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 \right), \tag{4.13}
\end{aligned}$$

Integration by parts and Young's inequality lead to

$$\begin{aligned}
T_8 := \rho \langle e_{\vartheta, h}^k \mathbf{I}, \nabla \cdot \delta_{\tau}^k \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u}, h} \rangle &= \rho \langle \nabla e_{\vartheta, h}^k \mathbf{I}, \delta_{\tau}^k \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u}, h} \rangle \\
&\leq \frac{c_0 \rho}{2} \|\nabla e_{\vartheta, h}^k\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{\rho}{8c_0} \left(\|\partial_{\tau}^k \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u}, h}\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\partial_{\tau}^{k-1} \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u}, h}\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 \right). \tag{4.14}
\end{aligned}$$

Applying Korn's inequality [HP83], Young's inequality, in addition to the approximation property of $\mathcal{J}_{h, \vartheta}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
T_{10} := \rho \langle (\mathcal{J}_{h, \vartheta} \vartheta^k - \vartheta^k) \mathbf{I}, \nabla \cdot \delta_{\tau}^k \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u}, h} \rangle &\leq \frac{CC_K^2 \rho^2 h^2}{\kappa \tau} \|\vartheta^k\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{\kappa \tau C_{ell, \mathcal{A}}}{8} \|\mathcal{E}(\delta_{\tau}^k \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u}, h})\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2. \tag{4.15}
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, using the approximation property of \mathcal{I}_h , there holds the following estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
T_{11} := \langle \mathcal{I}_h \mathbf{f}^{k+1} - \mathbf{f}^{k+1}, \delta_{\tau}^k \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u}, h} \rangle &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left\| \mathcal{I}_h \mathbf{f}^{k+1} - \mathbf{f}^{k+1} \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|\delta_{\tau}^k \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u}, h}\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 \\
&\leq Ch^2 \left\| \mathbf{f}^{k+1} \right\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{1}{8} \left(\|\partial_{\tau}^k \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u}, h}\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\partial_{\tau}^{k-1} \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u}, h}\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 \right). \tag{4.16}
\end{aligned}$$

Step 2: The elliptic error equation In this step, we are concerned with the terms appearing in (4.1b). This step is separated into four sub-steps.

Step 2.1: We set $w_h = e_{\varphi, h}^{k+1}$ as the test function in the variational formulation (4.1b), and control the operator \mathcal{A}_2 . We note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}_2(\varphi_h^{k+1}, \mathbf{u}_h^k) - \mathcal{A}_2(\mathcal{J}_{h, \varphi} \varphi^{k+1}, \mathcal{J}_{h, \mathbf{u}}^k \mathbf{u}) &= e_{\varphi, h}^{k+1} (\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}_h^k)) - \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{J}_{h, \mathbf{u}}^k \mathbf{u}))) \\
&\quad + e_{\varphi, h}^{k+1} \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{J}_{h, \mathbf{u}}^k \mathbf{u}^k)) \\
&\quad + \mathcal{J}_{h, \varphi} \varphi^{k+1} (\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}_h^k)) - \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{J}_{h, \mathbf{u}}^k \mathbf{u}^k))). \tag{4.17}
\end{aligned}$$

Applying the mean value theorem, the first term on the right-hand side of (4.2) can be written in the following form

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}_h^k)) - \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{u}^k)) &= \int_0^1 \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{E}} \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{c}) \Big|_{\mathbf{c}=\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{u}^k) + \tilde{\rho}(\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}^k))} \right) d\tilde{\rho} : \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}^k) \\
&= \lambda (\text{tr}(\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{u}^k)) \mathbf{I} : \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}^k)) + \mu (\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{u}^k) : \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}^k)) \\
&\quad + \frac{\lambda}{2} (\text{tr}(\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}^k)) \mathbf{I} : \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}^k)) + \frac{\mu}{2} (\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}^k) : \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}^k)) \\
&= (\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{u}^k)) : \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}^k)) + \frac{1}{2} (\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}^k)) : \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}^k)).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.18}$$

Substituting (4.18) into (4.17), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
[\mathcal{A}_2(\varphi_h^{k+1}, \mathbf{u}_h^k) - \mathcal{A}_2(\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}\varphi^{k+1}, \mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{u}^k) : e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1}] \\
= \left\langle e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1} (\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{u}^k) : \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{u}^k))), e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1} \right\rangle \\
+ \widehat{T}_1 + \widehat{T}_2 + \widehat{T}_3 + \widehat{T}_4,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.19}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{T}_1 &:= \frac{\lambda}{2} \int_{\Omega} \left((\text{tr}(\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}^k)) \mathbf{I} : \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}^k)) + \frac{\mu}{2} (\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}^k) : \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}^k)) \right) (e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1})^2 dx, \\
\widehat{T}_2 &:= \left\langle e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1} (\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{u}^k) : \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}^k))), e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1} \right\rangle, \\
\widehat{T}_3 &:= \left\langle \mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi}\varphi^{k+1} (\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{e}_{h,\mathbf{u}}^k) : \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}^k))), e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1} \right\rangle, \\
\widehat{T}_4 &:= \left\langle \mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi}\varphi^{k+1} (\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{u}^k) : \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}^k))), e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1} \right\rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

The term \widehat{T}_1 can be rewritten in the following form

$$\widehat{T}_1 = \frac{1}{2} \left\| e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1} \mathcal{A}^{1/2}(\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}^k)) \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2. \tag{4.20}$$

We note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{T}_2 &= \left\langle e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1} (\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{u}^k) : \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}_h^k))), e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1} \right\rangle \\
&\quad - \left\langle e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1} (\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{u}^k) : \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{u}^k))), e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1} \right\rangle \\
&=: \widehat{T}_{2,1} - \left\langle e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1} (\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{u}^k) : \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{u}^k))), e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1} \right\rangle.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.21}$$

Applying the Cauchy-Schwarz and Young inequalities as well as the Hölder inequality [BF13, Prop. II.2.18], the Sobolev embedding $W^{1,4}(\Omega) \subset L^\infty(\Omega)$, and considering that $\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{u}^{k+1}$ and \mathbf{u}_h^k are piecewise linear

functions, the estimate (3.6), the stability property of $\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}$, and Lemmas 3.5 and 3.6 lead to

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{T}_{2,1} &\leq \|\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{u}^k))\|_{\mathbf{L}^\infty(\Omega)} \|\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}_h^k)\|_{\mathbf{L}^\infty(\Omega)} \|e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\
&\leq \left(\sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} \|\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{u}^k))\|_{\mathbf{L}^4(T)} + \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} \|\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}_h^k)\|_{\mathbf{L}^4(T)} \right) \|e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\
&\leq \left(\|\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{u}^k))\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)} + \|\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}_h^k)\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)} \right) \|e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\
&\leq \left(C_{st,\mathbf{u},\mathcal{A}} \left(\frac{\rho^2 \tau^2}{\kappa} \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{1,k} + \frac{\tau^2}{\kappa} \sum_{m=0}^{k-2} \|\mathbf{f}^m\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \sqrt{C'_{st,\mathcal{E}\mathbf{u}}} \left(\frac{\rho\tau}{\alpha_\kappa} \sqrt{\mathcal{L}}_{1,k} + \frac{\tau}{\sqrt{2}\alpha_\kappa} \sum_{m=0}^{k-2} \|\mathbf{f}^m\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)} \right) \right) \|e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2. \tag{4.22}
\end{aligned}$$

With the same arguments, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
|\widehat{T}_4| &\leq \|\mathcal{A}^{1/2}(\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{u}^k))\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)} \|e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi}\varphi^{k+1}\mathcal{A}^{1/2}(\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}^k))\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)} \\
&\leq C_{st,\mathbf{u},\mathcal{A}} \left(\frac{\rho^2 \tau^2}{\kappa} \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{1,k} + \frac{\tau^2}{\kappa} \sum_{m=0}^{k-2} \|\mathbf{f}^m\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 \right) \|e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\
&\quad + \|\mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi}\varphi^{k+1}\mathcal{A}^{1/2}(\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}^k))\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2. \tag{4.23}
\end{aligned}$$

It follows from the Cauchy-Schwarz and Young inequalities that

$$\begin{aligned}
|\widehat{T}_3| &\leq \|\mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi}\varphi^{k+1}\mathcal{A}^{1/2}(\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}^k))\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)} \|e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1}\mathcal{A}^{1/2}(\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}^k))\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)} \\
&\leq 4 \|\mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi}\varphi^{k+1}\mathcal{A}^{1/2}(\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}^k))\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{1}{8} \|e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1}\mathcal{A}^{1/2}(\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}^k))\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2. \tag{4.24}
\end{aligned}$$

Step 2.2: Choosing $w_h = e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1}$ as the test function in the variational formulation (4.1b), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
[\mathcal{A}_2(\mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi}\varphi^{k+1}, \mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{u}^k) - \mathcal{A}_2(\varphi^{k+1}, \mathbf{u}^k) : e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1}] \\
&= [\mathcal{A}_2(\varphi^{k+1}, \mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{u}^k) - \mathcal{A}_2(\varphi^{k+1}, \mathbf{u}^k) : e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1}] \\
&\quad + [\mathcal{A}_2(\mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi}\varphi^{k+1}, \mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{u}^k) - \mathcal{A}_2(\varphi^{k+1}, \mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{u}^k) : e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1}] \\
&:= \widehat{T}_5 + \widehat{T}_6. \tag{4.25}
\end{aligned}$$

Applying the mean value theorem analogous to (4.18), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{T}_5 &= \left\langle \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{u}^k)) : (\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{u}^k) - \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^k)), \varphi^{k+1} e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1} \right\rangle \\
&\quad + \left\langle \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{u}^k)) - \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^k)) : (\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{u}^k) - \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^k)), \varphi^{k+1} e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1} \right\rangle \\
&:= \widehat{T}_{5,1} + \widehat{T}_{5,2}. \tag{4.26}
\end{aligned}$$

Employing the Hölder inequality [BF13, Prop. II.2.18], the Sobolev embedding $W^{1,4}(\Omega) \subset L^\infty(\Omega)$, and noting that $\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{u}^k$ and $e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1}$ are piecewise linear functions as well as the approximation properties of $\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}$

and Young's inequality, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{T}_{5,1} &\leq \|\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{u}^k))\|_{\mathbf{L}^\infty(\Omega)} \|\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{u}^k) - \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^k)\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)} \left\| e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1} \right\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \|\varphi^{k+1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &\leq Ch^2\ell^{-1} \|\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{u}^k))\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 \|\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^k)\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{\ell}{8} \left\| e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1} \right\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2.\end{aligned}\quad (4.27)$$

Similar to the previous estimate, in addition to applying the Lipschitz continuity of \mathcal{A} from Lemma 3.2, and using the Sobolev embedding $W^{1,4}(\Omega) \subset L^\infty(\Omega)$, and considering the fact that for $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$, $e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1}|_T \in P_1(T)$, and the inequality (3.6), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{T}_{5,2} &\leq \|(\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^k)) - \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{u}^k))) : \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{u}^k) - \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^k)\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)} \|\varphi^{k+1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \left\| e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1} \right\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \\ &\leq Ch \|\varphi^{k+1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^k)\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(\Omega)} \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} \left\| e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1} \right\|_{L^4(T)} \\ &\leq Ch^2\ell^{-1} \|\varphi^{k+1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \|\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^k)\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{\ell}{8} \left\| e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1} \right\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2.\end{aligned}\quad (4.28)$$

The Hölder inequality [BF13, Prop. II.2.18], the Sobolev embedding $W^{1,4}(\Omega) \subset L^\infty(\Omega)$, and noting that $\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{u}^k$ is a piecewise linear function, the Gagliardo–Nirenberg inequality (3.6), as well as using the approximation properties of $\mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi}$ imply

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{T}_6 &\leq \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} \|\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{u}^k))\|_{\mathbf{L}^4(T)} \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} \|\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{u}^k)\|_{\mathbf{L}^4(T)} \|\varphi^{k+1} - \mathcal{J}_h\varphi^{k+1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \left\| e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &\leq Ch^2\ell \|\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{u}^k))\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 \|\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{u}^k)\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 \|\varphi^{k+1}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{1}{8\ell} \left\| e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2,\end{aligned}\quad (4.29)$$

Combining (4.25)–(4.29) results in

$$\begin{aligned}&\left| [\mathcal{A}_2(\mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi}\varphi^{k+1}, \mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{u}^k) - \mathcal{A}_2(\varphi^{k+1}, \mathbf{u}^k) : e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1}] \right| \\ &\leq Ch^2\ell^{-1} \|\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{u}^k))\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 \|\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^k)\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(\Omega)}^2 \\ &\quad + Ch^2\ell^{-1} \|\varphi^{k+1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \|\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^k)\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(\Omega)}^2 \\ &\quad + Ch^2\ell \|\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{u}^k))\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 \|\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{u}^k)\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 \|\varphi^{k+1}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{8\ell} \left\| e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{\ell}{4} \left\| e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1} \right\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2.\end{aligned}\quad (4.30)$$

Step 2.3: In this step, after using $w_h = e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1}$ as test function in (4.1b), we deal with the rest of the terms on the right hand side of this equation. Considering the definition of the Ritz operator $\mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi}$, the first term on the right hand side of this equation vanishes, and for the second term following Young's inequality and the approximation properties of this Ritz operator, we get

$$\widehat{T}_7 := \frac{1}{\ell} \left\langle \varphi^{k+1} - \mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi}\varphi^{k+1}, e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1} \right\rangle \leq \frac{Ch^2}{\ell} \|\varphi^{k+1}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{1}{8\ell} \left\| e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2,\quad (4.31)$$

where C is a nonnegative constant independent of ℓ , κ , h , and τ .

Step 2.4: Defining $w_h := e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1}$ as the test function in the variational formulation (4.1b), and using (2.3) we conclude

$$\begin{aligned}&\gamma_0 \left\langle [\varphi_h^{k+1} - \varphi_h^k]_+ - [\mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi}\varphi^k - \mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi}\varphi^{k+1}]_+, e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1} \right\rangle \\ &= \gamma_0 \left\| [\varphi_h^{k+1} - \varphi_h^k]_+ - [\mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi}\varphi^k - \mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi}\varphi^{k+1}]_+ \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ &\quad + \gamma_0 \left\langle [\varphi_h^{k+1} - \varphi_h^k]_+ - [\mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi}\varphi^k - \mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi}\varphi^{k+1}]_+, e_{\varphi,h}^k \right\rangle := \widehat{T}_8 + \widehat{T}_9.\end{aligned}\quad (4.32)$$

For the second term in the right and side of the above equation, we can deduce from Young's inequality that

$$\left| \widehat{T}_9 \right| \leq \frac{\gamma_0}{4} \left\| [\varphi_h^{k+1} - \varphi_h^k]_+ - [\mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi} \varphi^k - \mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi} \varphi^{k+1}]_+ \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|e_{\varphi,h}^k\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2. \quad (4.33)$$

Finally, applying (2.4), following Young's inequality and the approximation property of the Ritz operator $\mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi}$ lead to

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_0 \left\langle [\varphi^{k+1} - \varphi^k]_+ - [\mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi} \varphi^{k+1} - \mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi} \varphi^k]_+, e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1} \right\rangle &\leq \gamma_0 \left\| \varphi^{k+1} - \mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi} \varphi^{k+1} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \left\| e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &+ \gamma_0 \left\| \varphi^k - \mathcal{J}_{h,\varphi} \varphi^k \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \left\| e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \frac{Ch^2}{\ell} \left(\|\varphi^k\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 + \|\varphi^{k+1}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \right) + \frac{1}{8\ell} \|e_{\varphi,h}^{k+1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (4.34)$$

where C is a nonnegative constant independent of ℓ , κ , h , and τ .

Step 3: The heat error equation. In this step, we consider the equation (4.1c), to control and simplify the nonlinear terms of this equation.

Step 3.1: We consider the left hand side of (4.1c), and start with substituting $z_h = e_{\vartheta,h}^{k+1}$ as the test function in (4.1c). Then exploiting the definition of the Ritz operator $\mathcal{J}_{h,\vartheta}$ results in

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(K(\vartheta_h^{k+1}) \nabla \vartheta_h^{k+1} - K(\mathcal{J}_h \vartheta^{k+1}) \nabla \mathcal{J}_{h,\vartheta} \vartheta^{k+1}, \nabla e_{\vartheta,h}^{k+1} \right) \\ &\geq c_0 \left\| \nabla e_{\vartheta,h}^{k+1} \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 + c_0 \left\| (|\vartheta_h|^{\beta/2}) \nabla e_{\vartheta,h}^{k+1} \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ &\quad + c_0 \left((K(\vartheta_h^{k+1}) - K(\mathcal{J}_h \vartheta^{k+1})) \nabla \mathcal{J}_{h,\vartheta} \vartheta^{k+1}, \nabla e_{\vartheta,h}^{k+1} \right) \\ &:= H_1 + H_2 + H_3. \end{aligned} \quad (4.35)$$

Indeed, thanks to the Lipschitz continuity of K from Assumption 2.1, applying the Hölder inequality [BF13, Prop. II.2.18], Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, and the Sobolev embedding $H^1(\Omega) \subset L^6(\Omega) \subset L^3(\Omega)$ we conclude

$$H_3 \leq C_{\mathcal{L}} \left(\|\vartheta_h^{k+1} - \mathcal{J}_{h,\vartheta} \vartheta^{k+1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \right) \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} \|\nabla \mathcal{J}_{h,\vartheta} \vartheta^{k+1}\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(T)}^2 + \frac{c_0}{4} \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} \left\| \nabla e_{\vartheta,h}^{k+1} \right\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(T)}^2,$$

where $C_{\mathcal{L}} := c_0 C_{Lip}$ and C_{Lip} is the Lipschitz continuity constant of K . We note that $\mathcal{J}_{h,\vartheta} \vartheta^{k+1}$ and $e_{\vartheta,h}^{k+1}$ both belong to the space of linear piecewise continuous functions, it is then obvious that $|\nabla \mathcal{J}_{h,\vartheta} \vartheta^{k+1}|_{\mathbf{H}^1(T)} = 0$ and $|\nabla e_{\vartheta,h}^{k+1}|_{\mathbf{H}^1(T)} = 0$ for all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$. Hence, from this argument, combined with the a priori estimates (3.8) and (3.36) we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} H_3 &\leq C_{\mathcal{L}} \left(\|\vartheta_h^{k+1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \widehat{C}_{st,\vartheta} \|\vartheta^{k+1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \right) \|\nabla \mathcal{J}_{h,\vartheta} \vartheta^{k+1}\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{c_0}{4} \left\| \nabla e_{\vartheta,h}^{k+1} \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ &\leq C_{\mathcal{L}} \widehat{C}_{st,\vartheta} \left(\|\vartheta_h^{k+1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \widehat{C}_{st,\vartheta} \|\vartheta^{k+1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \right) \|\nabla \vartheta^{k+1}\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{c_0}{4} \left\| \nabla e_{\vartheta,h}^{k+1} \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ &\leq \widehat{C}_{\mathcal{L}} C_{st,\vartheta} \left(1 + \widehat{C}_{st,\vartheta} \right) \mathcal{L}_{1,k\tau} \|\nabla \vartheta^{k+1}\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{c_0}{4} \left\| \nabla e_{\vartheta,h}^{k+1} \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (4.36)$$

where $\widehat{C}_{st,\vartheta}$ is the stability constant of $\mathcal{J}_{h,\vartheta}$.

Step 3.2: Here, we consider the last term in the left hand side of (4.1c), and set $z_h = e_{\vartheta,h}^{k+1}$ to get

$$\begin{aligned}
[\mathcal{A}_3(\vartheta_h^k, \delta_\tau^k \mathbf{u}_h) - \mathcal{A}_3(\vartheta^k, \delta_\tau^k \mathbf{u}) : e_{\vartheta,h}^{k+1}] &= [\mathcal{A}_3(e_{\vartheta,h}^k, \delta_\tau^k \mathbf{u}_h) : e_{\vartheta,h}^{k+1}] \\
&\quad + [\mathcal{A}_3(\vartheta_h^k, \delta_\tau^k \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}) : e_{\vartheta,h}^{k+1}] \\
&\quad + [\mathcal{A}_3(\mathcal{J}_{h,\vartheta} \vartheta^k - \vartheta^k, \delta_\tau^k \mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{u}) : e_{\vartheta,h}^{k+1}] \\
&\quad + [\mathcal{A}_3(\vartheta^k, \delta_\tau^k (\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{u}^k - \mathbf{u}^k)) : e_{\vartheta,h}^{k+1}] \\
&:= H_4 + H_5 + H_6 + H_7.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.37}$$

By the Hölder inequality [BF13, Prop. II.2.18], the Sobolev embedding $W^{1,4}(\Omega) \subset L^\infty(\Omega)$, Korn's inequality [HP83], the inequality (3.6), and exploiting the a priori estimate from Lemma 3.6 and applying Young's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
H_4 &\leq C_K \rho \left\| e_{\vartheta,h}^{k+1} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} \left\| \mathcal{E}(\delta_\tau^k \mathbf{u}_h) \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^4(T)} \left\| e_{\vartheta,h}^k \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
&= C_K \rho \left\| e_{\vartheta,h}^{k+1} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \left\| \mathcal{E}(\delta_\tau^k \mathbf{u}_h) \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)} \\
&\leq C_K \rho \sqrt{C'_{st,\varepsilon \mathbf{u}}} \left(\frac{\rho}{\sqrt{\alpha_\kappa}} \sqrt{\mathcal{L}_{1,L}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha_\kappa}} \sum_{m=0}^k \left\| \mathbf{f}^m \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)} \right) \left\| e_{\vartheta,h}^{k+1} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.38}$$

where the second estimate holds true since $\delta_\tau^k \mathbf{u}_h$ is a piecewise linear function. Completely analogous to the previous estimate, the following upper bound holds true for H_5

$$\begin{aligned}
H_5 &\leq C_K \left\| \vartheta_h^k \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \left\| \mathcal{E}(\delta_\tau^k \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}) \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^\infty(\Omega)} \left\| e_{\vartheta,h}^{k+1} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
&\leq 2C_K^2 C_{st,\vartheta} \tau^2 \mathcal{L}_{1,k} \left\| \mathcal{E}(\delta_\tau^k \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u},h}) \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{1}{8\tau} \left\| e_{\vartheta,h}^{k+1} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.39}$$

where the last inequality obtained from the a priori estimate for ϑ_h^k in Lemma 3.6. One can use the Hölder inequality [BF13, Prop. II.2.18], the Sobolev embedding $W^{1,4}(\Omega) \subset L^\infty(\Omega)$, and note that $\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{u}$ is a piecewise linear function, and apply the inequality (3.6) to get

$$\begin{aligned}
H_6 &\leq \left\| \mathcal{J}_{h,\vartheta} \vartheta^k - \vartheta^k \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} \left\| \delta_\tau^k \mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{u} \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^4(T)} \left\| e_{\vartheta,h}^{k+1} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
&\leq Ch^2 \tau \left\| \delta_\tau^k \mathbf{u} \right\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(\Omega)}^2 \left\| \vartheta^k \right\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{1}{8\tau} \left\| e_{\vartheta,h}^{k+1} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.40}$$

where the last term is a result of applying the approximation property of $\mathcal{J}_{h,\vartheta}$ and Young's inequality. Finally, from the Hölder inequality [BF13, Prop. II.2.18], the Sobolev embedding $H^1(\Omega) \subset L^6(\Omega) \subset L^3(\Omega)$ combined with the approximation property of $\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}}$ yield

$$\begin{aligned}
H_7 &\leq \left\| \vartheta^k \right\|_{L^3(\Omega)} \left\| \delta_\tau^k \nabla \cdot (\mathcal{J}_{h,\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{u}^k - \mathbf{u}^k) \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)} \left\| e_{\vartheta,h}^{k+1} \right\|_{L^6(\Omega)} \\
&\leq Ch^2 \left\| \vartheta^k \right\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \left\| \delta_\tau^k \mathbf{u} \right\|_{\mathbf{H}^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{c_0}{8} \left\| e_{\vartheta,h}^{k+1} \right\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.41}$$

Step 3.3: We set $z_h = e_{\vartheta,h}^{k+1}$ in (4.1c), and find upper bounds for the terms in the right hand side of this equation. Using the approximation property of \mathcal{I}_h , there holds the following estimate

$$H_8 := \left\langle \delta_\tau^k (\vartheta - \mathcal{J}_{h,\vartheta} \vartheta), e_{\vartheta,h}^{k+1} \right\rangle \leq Ch^2 \tau \left\| \delta_\tau^k \vartheta \right\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{1}{8\tau} \left\| e_{\vartheta,h}^{k+1} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2, \tag{4.42}$$

and

$$H_9 := \left\langle \mathcal{I}_h \gamma^{k+1} - \gamma^{k+1}, e_{\vartheta, h}^{k+1} \right\rangle \leq Ch^2 \tau \|\gamma^{k+1}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{1}{8\tau} \|e_{\vartheta, h}^{k+1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2. \quad (4.43)$$

Finally, from the definition of the Ritz operator $\mathcal{J}_{h, \vartheta}$, the Sobolev embedding $W^{1,4}(\Omega) \subset L^\infty(\Omega)$, and since $e_{\vartheta, h}^{k+1}$ belongs to the space of linear piecewise continuous functions, the estimate (3.6), as well as the approximation property of this operator, we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} H_{10} &:= \left\langle (K(\vartheta^{k+1}) \nabla \vartheta^{k+1} - K(\mathcal{J}_{h, \vartheta} \vartheta^{k+1}) \nabla \mathcal{J}_{h, \vartheta} \vartheta^{k+1}), \nabla e_{\vartheta, h}^{k+1} \right\rangle \\ &= \left\langle K(\mathcal{J}_{h, \vartheta} \vartheta^{k+1}) (\nabla \mathcal{J}_{h, \vartheta} \vartheta^{k+1} - \nabla \vartheta^{k+1}), \nabla e_{\vartheta, h}^{k+1} \right\rangle \\ &\quad + \left\langle (K(\vartheta^{k+1}) - K(\mathcal{J}_{h, \vartheta} \vartheta^{k+1})) \nabla \vartheta^{k+1}, \nabla e_{\vartheta, h}^{k+1} \right\rangle \\ &\leq Cc_0^{-1} h^2 \|\vartheta^{k+1}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{c_0}{8} \|\nabla e_{\vartheta, h}^{k+1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.44)$$

Step 4: Collecting everything. We use the test functions $\mathbf{v}_h = \delta_\tau^k \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u}, h}$, $w_h = e_{\varphi, h}^{k+1}$, and $z_h = e_{\vartheta, h}^{k+1}$ in the variational formulations (4.1a), (4.1b) and (4.1c), respectively. Then, we apply (4.2), (4.3), (4.7), (4.8), (4.19), (4.32), (4.35) and (4.37) to have the following inequality

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2\tau} \left(\|\partial_\tau^k \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u}, h}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 - \|\partial_\tau^{k-1} \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u}, h}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \right) + \ell \|\nabla e_{\varphi, h}^{k+1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{1}{\ell} \|e_{\varphi, h}^{k+1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\tau} \left(\|e_{\vartheta, h}^{k+1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 - \|e_{\vartheta, h}^{k-1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \right) + c_0 \|(|\vartheta_h|^{\beta/2}) \nabla e_{\vartheta, h}^{k+1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ &\quad + c_0 \|\nabla e_{\vartheta, h}^{k+1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + T_1 + T_4 + \widehat{T}_1 + \widehat{T}_8 \\ &\leq \sum_{i=2}^{11} |T_i| + \sum_{i=2}^7 \widehat{T}_i + \widehat{T}_9 + \sum_{i=3}^{10} H_i. \end{aligned} \quad (4.45)$$

After multiplying both sides of (4.45) into τ and considering the assumptions of this theorem and combining (4.3), (4.5), (4.6), (4.12)–(4.16), (4.20), (4.21)–(4.24), (4.30), (4.31), (4.33), (4.34)–(4.36), (4.38)–(4.44), applying the discrete Gronwall's lemma, and for sufficiently small h and τ , the following inequality holds true for all $k \leq L \leq M - 1$

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\partial_\tau^L \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u}, h}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \kappa\tau \|\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{u}, h}^{L+1})\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\mathbf{e}_{\vartheta, h}^{L+1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \tau \|\nabla \mathbf{e}_{\vartheta, h}^{L+1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ &\quad + \ell\tau \|\nabla e_{\varphi, h}^{L+1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{\tau}{\ell} \|e_{\varphi, h}^{L+1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \lesssim \mathcal{L}_{1, L+1} \tau^2 \|\nabla \vartheta^{L+1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ &\quad + \kappa^{-1} h^2 \left(\|\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^{L+1})\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(\Omega)}^2 \|\varphi^{L+1}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 + \|\vartheta^L\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \right) \\ &\quad + h^2 \|\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^{L+1})\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(\Omega)}^2 \|\varphi^{L+1}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 + \ell^{-1} \tau h^2 \left(\|\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^{L+1})\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(\Omega)}^2 \|\varphi^{L+1}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|\varphi^{L+1}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 + \|\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^{L+1})\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(\Omega)}^4 \right) + \ell\tau h^2 \|\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}^{L+1})\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^4 \|\varphi^{L+1}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \\ &\quad + \tau h^2 \left(\|\partial_{\tau\tau}^L \mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(\Omega)}^2 + \|\mathbf{f}^{L+1}\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(\Omega)}^2 + \|\vartheta^{L+1}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \right) \\ &\quad + h^2 \tau^2 \left(\|\vartheta^L\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \|\delta_\tau^L \mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbf{H}^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\delta_\tau^L \vartheta\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 + \|\gamma^{L+1}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then, combining this with the triangle inequality and making use of the approximation properties of $\mathcal{J}_{h, \varphi}$, $\mathcal{J}_{h, \vartheta}$ and $\mathcal{J}_{h, \mathbf{u}}$ complete the proof. \square




FIGURE 5.1. A Schematic of the single edge notch including its dimensions and boundary conditions (left) and the phase field φ at the last time step (full failure) (right).

Remark 4.2. *In some practical examples, we need to assume $\kappa = \mathcal{O}(\ell)$ and $h = \mathcal{O}(\ell)$, then in the statement of Theorem 4.1, we are required to add the assumptions $\tau\ell^{-1} = \mathcal{O}(1)$ and $\tau\kappa^{-1} = \mathcal{O}(1)$.*

5. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENT

Here, we present a numerical example to illustrate the theoretical results. We consider an area inside a square with a length of 1 mm ($\Omega = (0, 1)^2 \text{mm}^2$) having a notch with a length of 0.5 mm (and a thickness of $1 \mu\text{m}$) on the left side as the domain. The time interval is considered to be $I = [0, 0.2]$. The specimen is fixed at the bottom and we denote traction-free conditions on both sides.

A non-homogeneous Dirichlet condition is applied at the top. In order to observe the material failure, we impose a monotonic displacement $\bar{\mathbf{u}} = (0, 1 \times 10^{-5})^T$ at the top side in a vertical direction (until the full fracture). We also assume a zero load term $\mathbf{f} = (0, 0)^T$, zero initial displacement $\mathbf{u}_0 = (0, 0)^T$ and we set $\mathbf{v}_0 = (0, 0)^T$, $\gamma = 0$, and $\vartheta_0 = 0$. For the material parameters, we use a shear modulus of $\mu = 13.33 \times 10^9 \text{ Pa}$, a Lamé constant of $\lambda = 8.88 \times 10^9 \text{ Pa}$. In this problem, the stabilization parameter is assumed to be $\kappa = 10^{-8}$. The length scale is assumed $\ell = \mathcal{O}(h)$, i.e., we set $\ell = 2h$. Moreover, the energy release rate is $G_c = 3.0 \times 10^6 \text{ Pa}$. For the temporal discretization, we use a time-step of $\tau = 1 \times 10^{-3} \text{ s}$. A schematic of the computational domain is given in Figure 5.1. Regarding the thermal effect, we utilize a constant thermal conductivity $K = 0.158 \text{ W/mK}$, a Neumann boundary condition $\bar{\gamma} = 300\text{K}$ is imposed to the front of the notch (shown in z in Figure 5.1), and the thermal expansion is $2 \times 10^{-6} \text{ K}^{-1}$.

In order to solve the nonlinear system resulting from (3.35a)-(3.35c), we use Newton method's with the stopping criterion $\text{To1}_{\text{N-R}} = 10^{-8}$, i.e. the relative residual norm that is less than $\text{To1}_{\text{N-R}} = 10^{-8}$. At each Newton iteration, we use a direct solver to solve the linear systems. For this example, since there is no exact value for the displacement coordinates (i.e., \mathbf{u}_x , \mathbf{u}_y), the function φ , and the temperature ϑ a reference observation employing 214321 elements and 214728 nodes is used to compute the error terms. The crack pattern and the heat distribution for this problem at the final time step, i.e, $M = 200$ are shown in Figure 5.1.

For the space discretization, we use first-order quadrilateral finite elements for four integration points. In all time steps, the solutions are computed at the node; however, the derivatives are computed at the integration points. For the L_2 -norm computations (of the derivatives), we interpolate from the Gauss points to the nodes. For this, at each point, we find the four closest integration points in the neighboring elements, estimate the weights with respect to the distances, and compute the derivative values. Table 5 shows the convergence of the error for solutions and the derivatives. Both results confirm the theoretical results.

	$\ \mathbf{u}^M - \mathbf{u}_h^M\ _{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}$	rate	$\ \varphi^M - \varphi_h^M\ _{L^2(\Omega)}$	rate	$\ \vartheta^M - \vartheta_h^M\ _{L^2(\Omega)}$	rate
$h = 1/20$	0.0014	–	0.2081	–	0.102	–
$h = 1/40$	8.10×10^{-4}	0.807	0.122	0.778	0.064	0.9075
$h = 1/80$	4.25×10^{-4}	0.930	0.061	0.997	0.033	0.9556
$h = 1/160$	2.07×10^{-4}	1.003	0.030	1.002	0.0166	0.9911
$h = 1/320$	1.03×10^{-4}	0.9958	0.015	0.988	0.0082	1.0087

	$ \nabla(\mathbf{u}^M - \mathbf{u}_h^M) _{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}$	rate	$ \nabla(\varphi^M - \varphi_h^M) _{L^2(\Omega)}$	rate	$ \nabla(\vartheta^M - \vartheta_h^M) _{L^2(\Omega)}$	rate
$h = 1/20$	0.0495	–	6.90	–	3.103	–
$h = 1/40$	0.0403	0.2010	6.25	0.141	2.261	0.457
$h = 1/80$	0.0298	0.4355	4.61	0.442	1.581	0.516
$h = 1/160$	0.0217	0.4576	3.39	0.443	1.110	0.509
$h = 1/320$	0.0161	0.4390	2.46	0.458	0.785	0.498

TABLE 5.1. The rate of convergence in L^2 -norm and H^1 -semi norm for the discrete solutions of the test problem at the final time step, i.e., $M = 200$.

REFERENCES

- [AT90] Luigi Ambrosio and Vincenzo Maria Tortorelli, *Approximation of functional depending on jumps by elliptic functional via Γ -convergence*, Commun. Pure Appl. Math. **43** (1990), no. 8, 999–1036.
- [BF13] Franck Boyer and Pierre Fabrie, *Mathematical tools for the study of the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations and related models*, Applied Mathematical Sciences, vol. 183, Springer, New York, 2013. MR 2986590
- [BFM00] Blaise Bourdin, Gilles A Francfort, and Jean-Jacques Marigo, *Numerical experiments in revisited brittle fracture*, J. Mech. Phys. Solids **48** (2000), no. 4, 797–826.
- [BHL17] Erik Burman, Peter Hansbo, and Mats G Larson, *The penalty-free nitsche method and nonconforming finite elements for the signorini problem*, SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis **55** (2017), no. 6, 2523–2539.
- [Bra98] A. Braides, *Approximation of free-discontinuity problems*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1998.
- [CH16] C. Carstensen and F. Hellwig, *Low-order discontinuous Petrov-Galerkin finite element methods for linear elasticity*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **54** (2016), no. 6, 3388–3410. MR 3576569
- [CKP11] Carsten Carstensen, Dongho Kim, and Eun-Jae Park, *A priori and a posteriori pseudostress-velocity mixed finite element error analysis for the Stokes problem*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **49** (2011), no. 6, 2501–2523. MR 2873244
- [CN00] Zhiming Chen and Ricardo H. Nochetto, *Residual type a posteriori error estimates for elliptic obstacle problems*, Numer. Math. **84** (2000), no. 4, 527–548. MR 1742264
- [Dur88] Ricardo G. Durán, *Error analysis in L^p , $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, for mixed finite element methods for linear and quasi-linear elliptic problems*, RAIRO Modél. Math. Anal. Numér. **22** (1988), no. 3, 371–387. MR 958875
- [EG17] Alexandre Ern and Jean-Luc Guermond, *Finite element quasi-interpolation and best approximation*, ESAIM Math. Model. Numer. Anal. **51** (2017), no. 4, 1367–1385. MR 3702417
- [HKRR17] Christian Heinemann, Christiane Kraus, Elisabetta Rocca, and Riccarda Rossi, *A temperature-dependent phase-field model for phase separation and damage*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **225** (2017), no. 1, 177–247. MR 3634026
- [HP83] Cornelius O Horgan and Lawrence E Payne, *On inequalities of Korn, Friedrichs and Babuška-Aziz*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **82** (1983), no. 2, 165–179.
- [HR15] Christian Heinemann and Elisabetta Rocca, *Damage processes in thermoviscoelastic materials with damage-dependent thermal expansion coefficients*, Math. Methods Appl. Sci. **38** (2015), no. 18, 4587–4612. MR 3449619
- [LRTT18] Giuliano Lazzaroni, Riccarda Rossi, Marita Thomas, and Rodica Toader, *Rate-independent damage in thermoviscoelastic materials with inertia*, J. Dynam. Differential Equations **30** (2018), no. 3, 1311–1364. MR 3842151
- [LTW91] Yan Ping Lin, Vidar Thomée, and Lars B. Wahlbin, *Ritz-Volterra projections to finite-element spaces and applications to integrodifferential and related equations*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **28** (1991), no. 4, 1047–1070. MR 1111453
- [LZ92] Yan Ping Lin and Tie Zhang, *Finite element methods for nonlinear Sobolev equations with nonlinear boundary conditions*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **165** (1992), no. 1, 180–191. MR 1151067
- [MHSA15] C. Miehe, M. Hofacker, L.-M. Schänzel, and F. Aldakheel, *Phase field modeling of fracture in multi-physics problems. Part II. Coupled brittle-to-ductile failure criteria and crack propagation in thermo-elastic-plastic solids*, Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg. **294** (2015), 486–522. MR 3373458
- [Nir59] L. Nirenberg, *On elliptic partial differential equations*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (3) **13** (1959), 115–162. MR 109940
- [Ros17] Riccarda Rossi, *Existence results for a coupled viscoplastic-damage model in thermoviscoelasticity*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. S **10** (2017), no. 6, 1413–1466. MR 3666698
- [Rou10] Tomáš Roubíček, *Thermodynamics of rate-independent processes in viscous solids at small strains*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **42** (2010), no. 1, 256–297. MR 2596554

- [Rou13] ———, *Nonlinear partial differential equations with applications*, second ed., International Series of Numerical Mathematics, vol. 153, Birkhäuser/Springer Basel AG, Basel, 2013. MR 3014456
- [RR14] Elisabetta Rocca and Riccarda Rossi, *A degenerating pde system for phase transitions and damage*, *Mathematical Models and Methods in Applied Sciences* **24** (2014), no. 07, 1265–1341.
- [RR15] ———, *“Entropic” solutions to a thermodynamically consistent PDE system for phase transitions and damage*, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **47** (2015), no. 4, 2519–2586. MR 3365562
- [SW00] Simon Shaw and J. R. Whiteman, *Numerical solution of linear quasistatic hereditary viscoelasticity problems*, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* **38** (2000), no. 1, 80–97. MR 1770343