

Interior Estimates for Ritz-Galerkin Methods

By Joachim A. Nitsche and Alfred H. Schatz

Abstract. Interior a priori error estimates in Sobolev norms are derived from interior Ritz-Galerkin equations which are common to a class of methods used in approximating solutions of second order elliptic boundary value problems. The estimates are valid for a large class of piecewise polynomial subspaces used in practice, which are defined on both uniform and nonuniform meshes. It is shown that the error in an interior domain Ω can be estimated with the best order of accuracy that is possible locally for the subspaces used plus the error in a weaker norm over a slightly larger domain which measures the effects from outside of the domain Ω . Additional results are given in the case when the subspaces are defined on a uniform mesh. Applications to specific boundary value problems are given.

0. Introduction. There are presently many methods which are available for computing approximate solutions of elliptic boundary value problems which may be classified as Ritz-Galerkin type methods. Many of these methods differ from each other in some respects (for example, in how they treat the boundary conditions) but have much in common in that they have what may be called “interior Ritz-Galerkin equations” which are the same. Here we shall be concerned with finding interior estimates for the rate of convergence for such a class of methods which are consequences of these interior equations. Let us briefly describe, in a special case, the type of question we wish to consider.

Let Ω be a bounded domain in \mathbf{R}^N with boundary $\partial\Omega$ and consider, for simplicity, the problem of finding an approximate solution of a boundary value problem

$$(0.1) \quad \Delta u = f \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

$$(0.2) \quad Au = g \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega,$$

where A is some boundary operator. Suppose now that we are given a one-parameter family of finite-dimensional subspaces S^h ($0 < h \leq 1$) of an appropriate Hilbert space in which u lies and that, for each h , we have computed an approximate solution $u_h \in S^h$ to u using some Ritz-Galerkin type method. Here we have in mind, for example, methods such as the “engineer’s” finite element method [8], [22], the Aubin-Babuška penalty method [2], [4], the methods of Nitsche [12], [13] or the

Received October 15, 1973.

AMS (MOS) subject classifications (1970). Primary 65N30, 65N15.

Copyright © 1974, American Mathematical Society

Lagrange multiplier method of Babuška [3]. Consider now subdomains Ω_0 and Ω_1 of Ω , with $\Omega_0 \subset \subset \Omega_1 \subset \subset \Omega$. We seek estimates for the error $u - u_h$ as $h \rightarrow 0$ in various Sobolev norms on Ω_0 , valid for a large class of such methods. The estimates will implicitly take into consideration possible "pollution" from effects outside of Ω_0 . These may be, for example, due to the following: (i) the smoothness of the boundary; (ii) the way in which a given method treats the boundary conditions; (iii) the smoothness of the solution outside of say Ω_1 .

In the special case of Eq. (0.1), our interior equations are as follows: Let u satisfy (0.1) in Ω_1 and $u_h \in S^h$ be given satisfying

$$(0.3) \quad \int_{\Omega_1} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\frac{\partial u_h}{\partial x_i} \right) \left(\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_i} \right) dx = \int_{\Omega_1} f \varphi = \int_{\Omega_1} \left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \right) \left(\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_i} \right) dx, \quad \forall \varphi \in \mathring{S}^h(\Omega_1),$$

where $\mathring{S}^h(\Omega_1)$ is the subspace of S^h consisting of elements whose support is contained in Ω_1 . For example, we may consider S^h to be such that its restriction to Ω_1 consists of splines generated by a B -spline basis defined on a uniform mesh of size h (cf. [19]). The broad class of triangular elements with maximum size h defined by Bramble and Zlámal [8] (here the triangulation need not be uniform) or Hermite splines on a uniform mesh of size h are other examples of such spaces. The Eq. (0.3) is common to all the methods previously cited.

One type of result we shall prove is the following: Suppose the subspace S^h has the following approximability property (and some others shared for example by the subspaces cited above). Let $u \in H^r(\Omega_1)$, then there exists a $u_h \in S^h$ such that

$$(0.4) \quad \|u - u_h\|_{0, \Omega_1} \leq Ch^r \|u\|_{r, \Omega_1}$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{r, \Omega_1}$ is the norm on the Sobolev space $H^r(\Omega_1)$ and $H^0(\Omega_1) = L_2(\Omega_1)$. Suppose further that $u_h \in S^h$ satisfies (0.3). Then, for any given nonnegative integer p , there exists a constant C independent of h, u and u_h such that for h sufficiently small

$$(0.5) \quad \|u - u_h\|_{0, \Omega_0} \leq C(h^r \|u\|_{r, \Omega_1} + \|u - u_h\|_{-p, \Omega_1}).$$

Here the negative norm $\|\cdot\|_{-p, \Omega_1}$ denotes the norm of dual space of the Sobolev space $\mathring{H}^p(\Omega_1)$ (cf. Section 1).

In view of (0.4), the estimate (0.5) may be interpreted as follows: If $u \in H^r(\Omega_1)$, then the error in the norm of $L_2(\Omega_0)$ over any compact subdomain Ω_0 of Ω_1 may be estimated with the best order of accuracy that the subspace S^h can provide over Ω_1 plus the error in the much weaker norm of $H^{-p}(\Omega_1)$. We emphasize that, since (0.3) is local in nature, so is the estimate (0.5), in the sense that, when related to boundary value problems, they do not explicitly involve the particular boundary operators, the nature of the boundary, the manner in which the particular method treats the boundary operators and the nature of the solution outside of Ω_1 . As remarked previously, all of these may have an effect on the rate of

convergence on Ω_0 . All of these effects are lumped together in the term $\|u - u_h\|_{-p, \Omega_1}$, which must be estimated separately for each particular problem. One way this can be done is to first use the inequality $\|e\|_{-p, \Omega_1} \leq \|e\|_{-p, \Omega}$. For many methods, the estimate for $\|e\|_{-p, \Omega}$ already exists in the literature and is obtained by using a modification of a duality argument of Nitsche [15]. The significance of the negative norm is that, under some very important circumstances, one can prove high rates of convergence in negative norms with relatively less requirements on the smoothness of u than one would need, for example, to obtain the same rate of convergence for the error in the L_2 norm.

Interior estimates for L_2 projections were given in [17]. Interior estimates for elliptic difference operators were obtained by Thomée and Westergren [20] and Thomée [21]. We would like to thank the organizers of the conference "On the mathematical foundations of the finite element method", University of Maryland, Baltimore, June 1972 for allowing us to present the results given in this paper.

An outline of our paper is as follows. Section 1 contains notations and some preliminary notions. In Section 2, we define the approximating properties of the subspaces S^h which we shall need. In Section 3, we introduce the interior equations and, in Section 4, we prove some interior duality estimates. Section 5 contains the first of our results on interior rates of convergence which are valid, for example, for some classes of piecewise polynomial subspaces which may be defined on uniform or nonuniform meshes. In Section 6, we consider subspaces which have certain translation invariant properties (satisfied by the previous examples defined on uniform meshes). This allows us to discuss the interior rate of convergence of difference quotients of u_h to derivatives of u . In Section 7, we apply the results to specific boundary value problems and to several methods.

This paper is concerned with interior Galerkin equations associated with second order differential operators. The methods easily generalize to corresponding higher order equations.

1. Notation and Preliminaries. All functions considered in this paper will be real valued. Let R be a bounded open set in \mathbf{R}^N (N -dimensional Euclidean space).

For $s \geq 0$ any real number $H^s(R)$ will denote the Sobolev space of order s on R , i.e., for $s \geq 0$ an integer, $H^s(R)$ is the completion of $C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ under the norm

$$(1.1) \quad \|u\|_{s, R} = \left(\sum_{|\alpha| \leq s} \|D^\alpha u\|_{0, R}^2 \right)^{1/2},$$

where $H^0(R) = L_2(R)$ and $\|u\|_{0, R}^2 = \int_R |u|^2 dx$. For $k \geq 0$, an integer, and $k < s < k + 1$, $H^s(R)$ is defined by interpolation between $H^k(R)$ and $H^{k+1}(R)$ (cf. [11]).

For $s \geq 0$ an integer, $\dot{H}^s(R)$ will denote the completion of $C_0^\infty(R)$ under the norm (1.1). For $k \geq 0$ an integer and $k < s < k+1$, $\dot{H}^s(R)$ is defined by interpolation between $\dot{H}^k(R)$ and $\dot{H}^{k+1}(R)$.

For $s \leq 0$ any real number, $\dot{H}^s(R)$ will denote the completion of $C_0^\infty(R)$ under the norm

$$(1.2) \quad \|u\|_{s,R} = \sup_{v \in \dot{H}^{-s}(R)} (u, v) / \|v\|_{-s,R}$$

where $(u, v) = \int_R uv \, dx$.

For $s \leq 0$ any real number, $H^s(\Omega)$ will denote the completion of $C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ under the norm

$$\|u\|_{s,R} = \sup_{v \in H^{-s}(R)} (u, v) / \|v\|_{-s,R}.$$

Let Ω_1 be a bounded open set in \mathbb{R}^N . In what follows, we shall be concerned with bilinear forms of the type

$$(1.3) \quad B(u, v) = \int_{\Omega_1} \left(\sum_{i,j=1}^N a_{ij}(x) D_i u D_j v + \sum_{i=1}^N b_i(x) (D_i u) v + c(x) uv \right) dx,$$

defined on $H^1(\Omega_1) \times H^1(\Omega_1)$, where, for simplicity, the coefficients a_{ij} , b_i , c are assumed to be of class $C^\infty(\bar{\Omega}_1)$.

Such forms may be associated (in a nonunique way) with partial differential operators of the form

$$(1.4) \quad Lu = - \sum_{i,j=1}^N a_{ij} D_i D_j u + \sum_{i=1}^N a_i D_i u + au = f.$$

The form B comes about by integrating by parts so that

$$(1.5) \quad (Lu, v) = B(u, v)$$

holds for all $u, v \in C_0^\infty(\Omega_1)$.

In what follows, C_1, C_2, \dots, C_t will denote constants. We shall frequently omit subscripts and simply write C for a constant which is not necessarily the same in any two places. $C(G, p)$ means, for example, that the constant C depends on the known parameters G and p .

We shall not require that $B(u, v)$ be symmetric. We define the adjoint B^* of B to be

$$(1.6) \quad B^*(u, v) = B(v, u).$$

The following regularity assumption will be made concerning $B(u, v)$:

R1. There exists a constant $d_1 > 0$ such that, if $G \subset \subset \Omega_1$ is any (open) sphere with $\text{diam}(G) \leq d_1$, then $B(u, v)$ is coercive over $\dot{H}^1(G)$, i.e., there exists a constant C_1 depending only on d_1 such that

$$(1.7) \quad (C_1)^2 \|u\|_{1,G}^2 \leq B(u, u) \leq (C_1)^{-2} \|u\|_{1,G}^2 \quad \text{for all } u \in \dot{H}^1(G).$$

Remark 1.1. It follows immediately from (1.5) that B^* satisfies R1.

Remark 1.2. Assumption R1 is always satisfied if d_1 is sufficiently small, provided $B(u, v)$ is uniformly elliptic on Ω_1 , i.e., there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $x \in \bar{\Omega}_1$ and all real vectors

$$\xi = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_N) \neq 0, \quad \left| \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^N a_{ij}(x) \xi_i \xi_j \right| \geq C \sum_{i=1}^N \xi_i^2.$$

For then Gårding's inequality holds in Ω_1 , i.e., there exist positive constants C_2 and C_3 such that

$$C_2 \|u\|_{1, \Omega_1}^2 - C_3 \|u\|_{0, \Omega_1}^2 \leq B(u, u) \quad \text{for all } u \in \dot{H}^1(\Omega_1).$$

Now, Poincaré's inequality states that

$$\|u\|_{0, G} \leq \text{diam}(G) \|u\|_{1, G} \quad \text{for all } u \in \dot{H}^1(G).$$

The inequality (1.7) follows immediately from the last two inequalities by taking $\text{diam}(G) < d_1$ to be sufficiently small.

We shall find the following lemma useful later on.

LEMMA 1.1. (Cf. e.g. [1], [5].) Let $G \subset\subset \Omega_1$ be a sphere with $\text{diam}(G) \leq d_1$. Suppose that $f \in H^s(G)$, $s \geq 0$, then there exist uniquely determined functions u and v belonging to $H^{s+2}(G) \cap \dot{H}^1(G)$ satisfying

$$(1.8) \quad B(u, \psi) = B^*(v, \psi) = (f, \psi) \quad \text{for all } \psi \in \dot{H}^1(G).$$

Furthermore, there exists a constant C , which depends on s but is independent of f and G , such that

$$(1.9) \quad \|u\|_{s+2, G} \leq C \|f\|_{s, G}, \quad \|v\|_{s+2, G} \leq C \|f\|_{s, G}.$$

2. Finite-Dimensional Subspaces of $H^1(\Omega_1)$. Let $\Omega_1 \subset\subset \mathbf{R}^N$ be an open set. In this section, we shall define a class of finite-dimensional subspaces of $H^1(\Omega_1)$ which have properties that are shared by many finite-dimensional subspaces used in practice to approximate solutions of partial differential equations. We shall first state the approximation properties which we shall need and then give some examples.

Let h be a parameter and k and r given integers with $1 \leq k \leq r$. $S_{k, r}^h(\Omega_1)$ will denote a one-parameter family of finite-dimensional subspaces of $H^k(\Omega_1)$. For $\Omega_0 \subseteq \Omega_1$, we define

$$S_{k, r}^h(\Omega_0) = \{\varphi \in S_{k, r}^h(\Omega_1) \mid \text{supp } \varphi \subseteq \bar{\Omega}_0\}.$$

Let G_0 and G , with $G_0 \subset\subset G \subset\subset \Omega_1$, be arbitrary but fixed concentric spheres. We shall make the following approximability assumptions concerning $S_{k, r}^h(\Omega_1)$:

There exists an $h_0 \leq 1$, depending in general on G_0 and G , such that for all $h \in (0, h_0]$:

A.1. (i) For each $u \in H^l(G)$, there exists an $\eta \in S_{k, r}^h(\Omega_1)$ such that for any $0 \leq s \leq k$, $s \leq l \leq r$,

$$(2.1) \quad \|u - \eta\|_{s, G} \leq Ch^{l-s} \|u\|_{l, G}.$$

(ii) Furthermore, if $u \in \dot{H}^1(G_0)$, then $\eta \in \dot{S}_{k,r}^h(G)$.

REMARK. If $\omega \in C_0^\infty(G_0)$ and $u \in H^1(G)$, then $\omega u \in \dot{H}^1(G_0)$ and it follows from (ii) that $\eta \in \dot{S}_{k,r}^h(G)$ and

$$(2.2) \quad \|\omega u - \eta\|_{s,G} \leq Ch^{l-s} \|u\|_{l,G},$$

where $C = C(G_0, G, \omega)$.

A.2. Let $\omega \in C_0^\infty(G_0)$ and $u_h \in S_{k,r}^h(\Omega_1)$, then there exists an $\eta \in \dot{S}_{k,r}^h(G)$ such that

$$(2.3) \quad \|\omega u_h - \eta\|_{1,G} \leq Ch \|u_h\|_{1,G},$$

where $C = C(G_0, G, \omega)$.

A.3. For each $h \in (0, h_0]$, there exists a set $G_h, G_0 \subset G_h \subset G$ such that, if $0 \leq \nu \leq s \leq k$, then for all $\varphi \in S_{k,r}^h(\Omega_1)$

$$(2.4) \quad \|\varphi\|_{s,G_h} \leq Ch^{\nu-s} \|\varphi\|_{\nu,G_h}.$$

Remark. If Green's formula is valid on G_h and $p \geq 1$ is an integer, then it can be shown, as a consequence of (2.4), that

$$(2.5) \quad \|\varphi\|_{0,G_h} \leq Ch^{-p} \|\varphi\|_{-p,G_h},$$

where $C = C(G_0, G)$.

We shall now give some examples of subspaces which satisfy A.1, A.2, and A.3.

Example 1. Let $S_{k,r}^h(\Omega_1)$ denote the restriction to Ω_1 of Hermite splines defined on a uniform mesh with sides of length h . Here $k = m$, $r = 2m$, $m = 1, 2, \dots$, etc. For $m = 2$, these are the piecewise cubic polynomials which are of class C^1 .

Example 2. Consider \mathbf{R}^2 and let $S_{k,r}^h(\Omega_1)$ be the restrictions to Ω_1 of the triangular elements of Bramble-Zlámal [8]. Briefly, these are piecewise polynomials in two variables of order $4m + 1$ ($m = 0, 1, \dots$) defined on a regular triangulation (i.e., the smallest interior angle of all the triangles is uniformly bounded away from zero) whose length of the largest side of any triangle is less than or equal to h . We note here that these triangulations are generally not uniform. Here, we may take $k = m + 1$ and $r = 4m + 2$ ($m = 0, 1, \dots$).

Example 3. Let $S_{k,r}^h(\Omega_1)$ be the restriction to Ω_1 of splines generated by a B -spline basis [19], defined on a uniform mesh in \mathbf{R}^N with sides of length h . These are tensor products of one-dimensional piecewise polynomials of order $m - 1$ which are globally C^{m-2} ($m = 2, 3, \dots$). Here, $k = m - 1$, $r = m$ ($m = 2, 3, \dots$).

For these examples, Property A.1 is well known. Property A.3 follows easily from [14]. Property A.2 is more delicate than Property A.1. We shall verify it here in the case of Example 2.

Let G_0, G, ω and u_h be as in A.2, and let G be covered by a regular triangulation on which the Bramble-Zlámal elements are defined. Let us number the triangles by T_i . Then it follows from (15) of [8] that

$$(2.6) \quad \|\omega u_h - \eta\|_{1,G}^2 \leq Ch^{2(4m+1)} \sum_i |\omega u_h|_{4m+2, T_i}^2,$$

where

$$|\omega u_h|_{4m+2, T_i}^2 = \sum_{|\alpha|=4m+2} \|D^\alpha u\|_{0, T_i}^2$$

and the sum in (2.6) is taken over those triangles T_i such that their union contains the support of ω . Certainly, this may be chosen so that $\bigcup_i T_i \subset G$ for h sufficiently small. Now, using Leibnitz's rule on each of the triangles T_i , noticing that $D^\alpha u_h = 0$ for $|\alpha| = 4m+2$ (since u_h is a polynomial of order $4m+1$ in two variables), we obtain

$$(2.7) \quad \|\omega u_h - \eta\|_{1,G}^2 \leq Ch^{2(4m+1)} \sum_i \|u_h\|_{4m+1, T_i}^2,$$

where C in general depends on ω . Since u_h is a polynomial and the triangulation is regular, we have

$$\|u_h\|_{4m+1, T_i} \leq Ch^{-4m} \|u_h\|_{1, T_i},$$

where C is independent of u_h and T_i . Hence,

$$\|\omega u_h - \eta\|_{1,G}^2 \leq Ch^2 \sum_i \|u_h\|_{1, T_i}^2 \leq Ch^2 \|u_h\|_{1,G}^2$$

which is precisely (2.3).

We remark that the proof of Property A.2 in the case of Hermite splines (Example 1) follows in a similar manner using the results of Bramble-Hilbert in [6], where an estimate is obtained analogous to (2.6). We make essential use of the fact that only those derivatives which annihilate the Hermite splines occur on the right-hand side.

3. Interior Equations. Let $B(u, v)$ be defined by (1.3) and $u \in H^1(\Omega_1)$. We shall be primarily interested in deriving error estimates for $u - u_h$, where $u_h \in S_{k,r}^h(\Omega_1)$ satisfies

$$(3.1) \quad B(u - u_h, \varphi) = 0 \quad \forall \varphi \in \mathring{S}_{k,r}^h(\Omega_1).$$

Let us note that, in view of (1.4) and (1.5), (3.1) may be rewritten as

$$(3.2) \quad B(u_h, \varphi) = (Lu, \varphi) = (f, \varphi) \quad \forall \varphi \in \mathring{S}_{k,r}^h(\Omega_1).$$

An interesting special case occurs when $Lu = 0$ or $B(u, v) = 0 \quad \forall v \in H^1(\Omega_1)$, for then $u_h \in S_{k,r}^h(\Omega_1)$ satisfies

$$(3.3) \quad B(u_h, \varphi) = 0 \quad \forall \varphi \in \mathring{S}_{k,r}^h(\Omega_1).$$

Here, u_h may be thought of as a discrete analogue (relative to the subspace $\mathring{S}_{k,r}^h(\Omega_1)$) of a weak solution of $Lu = 0$ in Ω_1 . Such u_h will play a central role in deriving error estimates.

In obtaining error estimates for difference quotients for certain classes of sub-

spaces, it will be convenient for us to consider u_h satisfying a more general form of (2.1); namely

$$(3.4) \quad B(e, \varphi) = B(u - u_h, \varphi) = A_e(\varphi) \quad \forall \varphi \in \dot{S}_{k,r}^h(\Omega_1).$$

In general, $A_v(\omega)$ is, for each $v \in H^1(\Omega_1)$, a bounded linear functional defined for $\omega \in \dot{H}^s(\Omega_1)$ for any $-1 \leq s$.

For any open set $G \subseteq \Omega_1$ and $-1 \leq s$, an integer, we define

$$(3.5) \quad \|A_e\|_{s,G} = \sup_{v \in \dot{H}^{s+2}(G)} |A_e(v)| / \|v\|_{s+2,G}.$$

Here, we are essentially defining the norms on A_e by duality with respect to the $H^1(G)$ norm.

Let us note that, if $G_0 \subseteq G_1$, then

$$(3.6) \quad \|A_e\|_{s,G_0} \leq \|A_e\|_{s,G_1},$$

and, if $-1 \leq s_1 \leq s_2$, then

$$(3.7) \quad \|A_e\|_{-s_2,G} \leq \|A_e\|_{-s_1,G}.$$

4. Interior Duality Estimates. For the remainder of this section, we shall assume that R.1, A.1, A.2 and A.3 hold and that $G_0 \subset\subset G$ are concentric spheres with $\text{diam}(G) \leq d_1$ (as in R.1) and $G \subset\subset \Omega_1$. We shall now discuss the properties of the error $e = u - u_h$ satisfying $B(e, \varphi) = A_e(\varphi)$ for all $\varphi \in \dot{S}_{k,r}^h(G)$.

The main result in this section is the following:

LEMMA 4.1. *Let $u \in H^1(\Omega_1)$, $u_h \in \dot{S}_{k,r}^h(\Omega_1)$ with $1 \leq k < r$ and let $p \geq 0$ be a fixed but arbitrary integer. Let $G_0 \subset\subset G$ be as above and suppose that $e = u - u_h$ satisfies*

$$(4.1) \quad B(u - u_h, \varphi) = A_e(\varphi), \quad \forall \varphi \in \dot{S}_{k,r}^h(\Omega_1).$$

Then

$$(4.2) \quad \|e\|_{0,G_0} \leq C(h\|e\|_{1,G} + \|e\|_{-p,G} + h\|A_e\|_{1,G} + \|A_e\|_{0,G}),$$

where $C = C(G_0, G, p, a_{ij}, b_i, c)$.

In order to prove Lemma 4.1, we shall use the following:

LEMMA 4.2. *Let $s \geq 0$ be an integer. Then, for $\gamma = \min(s+1, r-1)$,*

$$(4.3) \quad \|e\|_{s,G_0} \leq C(h^\gamma\|e\|_{1,G} + \|e\|_{-s-1,G} + h^\gamma\|A_e\|_{1,G} + \|A_e\|_{-s,G})$$

where $C = C(s, G_0, G, a_{ij}, b_i, c)$.

Proof of Lemma 4.1. Let us first show that (4.2) follows from (4.3). Let $G_0 \subset\subset G_1 \subset\subset \dots \subset\subset G_p = G$ be concentric spheres. We have from (4.3), with $s = 0$ and $\gamma = 1$, that

$$\|e\|_{0,G_0} \leq C(h\|e\|_{1,G_1} + \|e\|_{-1,G_1} + h\|A_e\|_{1,G_1} + \|A_e\|_{0,G_1}).$$

We now reapply (4.3) to estimate $\|e\|_{-1, G}$. Since $h \leq 1$, we have that

$$\|e\|_{0, G_0} \leq C(h\|e\|_{1, G_2} + \|e\|_{-2, G_2} + h\|A_e\|_{1, G_2} + \|A_e\|_{0, G_2}),$$

where we used (3.6) and (3.7). Continuing in this fashion, the desired result (4.2) is easily obtained.

Proof of Lemma 4.2. Let $G_0 \subset\subset G' \subset\subset G$ be concentric spheres and let $\omega \in C_0^\infty(G')$ with $\omega \equiv 1$ on G_0 . Then, for $s \geq 0$, we have that

$$\|e\|_{s, G_0} \leq \|\omega e\|_{s, G} = \sup_{f \in \dot{H}^s(G)} (\omega e, f) / \|f\|_{s, G}.$$

Now, $\omega e \in \dot{H}^1(G)$ and it follows from Lemma 1.1 that, for each $f \in H^s(G)$, there exists a unique $v \in H^{s+2}(G) \cap \dot{H}^1(G)$ such that $(\eta, f) = B(\eta, v)$ for all $\eta \in \dot{H}^1(G)$ with $\|v\|_{s+2, G} \leq C\|f\|_{s, G}$. Hence

$$(4.4) \quad \|e\|_{s, G_0} \leq C \sup_{v \in H^{s+2}(G)} B(\omega e, v) / \|v\|_{s+2, G}.$$

Let us now examine $B(\omega e, v)$ in detail. We have

$$(4.5) \quad \begin{aligned} B(\omega e, v) &= \int_G \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N a_{ij} D_i(\omega e) D_j v \, dx \\ &\quad + \int_G \sum_{i=1}^N b_i (D_i(\omega e)) v \, dx + \int_G c \omega e v \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

Integration by parts yields

$$(4.6) \quad \begin{aligned} B(\omega e, v) &= B(e, \omega v) \\ &\quad + \int_G \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^N e [D_i(a_{ij}(D_j \omega)) v + a_{ij} D_i \omega D_j v + b_i (D_i \omega) v] \, dx \\ &= B(e, \omega v) + I. \end{aligned}$$

We shall now estimate these terms. Since e satisfies (4.1), we have, for any $\psi \in \dot{S}_{k, r}^h(G)$,

$$|B(e, \omega v)| \leq |B(e, \omega v - \psi)| + |A_e(\omega v - \psi)| + |A_e(\omega v)|.$$

Choosing ψ satisfying (2.2), we obtain, using (3.5), that

$$(4.7) \quad |B(e, \omega v)| \leq C(h^\gamma \|e\|_{1, G} + h^\gamma \|A_e\|_{1, G} + \|A_e\|_{s, G}) \|v\|_{s+2, G},$$

where $\gamma = \min(r-1, s+1)$.

Since $D_i \omega \in C_0^\infty(G')$, it follows that

$$(4.8) \quad |I| \leq C\|e\|_{s-1, G} \|v\|_{s+2, G}.$$

The inequality (4.3) now follows from (4.8), (4.7), (4.6) and (4.4).

5. Interior Error Estimates. We now turn to error estimates for solutions of (3.1). We shall first state our results.

THEOREM 5.1. Let $\Omega_0 \subset\subset \Omega_1 \subset\subset \mathbb{R}^N$, $u \in H^l(\Omega_1)$, $u_h \in \dot{S}_{k, r}^h(\Omega_1)$, where $1 \leq k < r$ and p is a nonnegative integer, arbitrary but fixed. Suppose that R.1,

A.1, A.2 and A.3 are satisfied. There exists a $0 < h_1 \leq 1$ such that, if $e = u - u_h$ satisfies (3.1), then for all $h \in (0, h_1]$

(i) If $s = 0, 1$ and $1 \leq l \leq r$,

$$(5.1) \quad \|e\|_{s, \Omega_0} \leq C(h^{1-s} \|u\|_{l, \Omega_1} + \|e\|_{-p, \Omega_1}).$$

(ii) If $2 \leq s \leq l \leq r$, $s \leq k < r$, then

$$(5.2) \quad \|e\|_{s, \Omega_0} \leq C(h^{1-s} \|u\|_{l, \Omega_1} + h^{1-s} \|e\|_{-p, \Omega_1})$$

where $C = C(p, \Omega_0, \Omega_1, a_{ij}, b_i, c)$.

We note that if $B(u, v) = 0 \quad \forall v \in \mathring{H}^1(\Omega_1)$, then u_h satisfies

$$(5.3) \quad B(u_h, \varphi) = 0 \quad \forall \varphi \in \mathring{S}_{k, r}^h(\Omega_1).$$

Using Theorem 5.1, we may obtain estimates for both u and u_h . In particular, for u_h we are at liberty to set $u \equiv 0$ in Theorem 5.1 and we have

$$(5.4) \quad \|u_h\|_{1, \Omega_0} \leq C \|u_h\|_{-p, \Omega_1}.$$

If $u - u_h$ satisfies (3.4) we have:

THEOREM 5.2. Suppose that the conditions of Theorem (5.1) are satisfied except that $e = u - u_h$ satisfies (3.4); then instead of (5.1) we have

$$(5.5) \quad \|e\|_{0, \Omega_0} \leq C(h^1 \|u\|_{l, \Omega_1} + \|e\|_{-p, \Omega_1} + h \|A_e\|_{1, \Omega_1} + \|A_e\|_{0, \Omega_1})$$

and

$$(5.6) \quad \|e\|_{1, \Omega_0} \leq C(h^{1-1} \|u\|_{l, \Omega_1} + \|e\|_{-p, \Omega_1} + \|A_e\|_{1, \Omega_1}),$$

where $C = C(p, \Omega_0, \Omega_1, a_{ij}, b_i, c)$.

We shall first prove a local version (Lemma 5.2) of the estimate (5.4). For the remainder of this section, we shall assume that R.1, A.1, A.2 and A.3 hold.

LEMMA 5.1. Suppose that $u_h \in \mathring{S}_{k, r}^h(\Omega_1)$ satisfies (5.3) and that $G_0 \subset\subset G \subset\subset \Omega_1$ are concentric spheres with $\text{diam}(G) < d_1$. Let p be a nonnegative integer arbitrary but fixed; then, for h sufficiently small,

$$(5.7) \quad \|u_h\|_{1, G_0} \leq C(h \|u_h\|_{1, G} + \|u_h\|_{-p, G}),$$

where $C = C(p, G_0, G, a_{ij}, b_i, c)$.

Proof. For any given $v \in \mathring{H}^1(G)$, let $Pv \in \mathring{S}_{k, r}^h(G)$ and $P^*v \in \mathring{S}_{k, r}^h(G)$ be defined as the solutions of the equations

$$(5.8) \quad B(v - Pv, \varphi) = 0, \quad \forall \varphi \in \mathring{S}_{k, r}^h(G),$$

$$(5.9) \quad B(\chi, v - P^*v) = 0, \quad \forall \chi \in \mathring{S}_{k, r}^h(G).$$

It follows from (1.7) that Pv and P^*v exist and are unique and furthermore

$$\begin{aligned}
 (5.10) \quad \|Pv\|_{1,G} &\leq C\sqrt{B(Pv, Pv)} \leq C \sup_{\varphi \in \dot{S}_{k,r}^h(G)} B(Pv, \varphi)/\|\varphi\|_{1,G} \\
 &\leq C \sup_{\varphi \in \dot{S}_{k,r}^h(G)} B(v, \varphi)/\|\varphi\|_{1,G} \leq \|v\|_{1,G}.
 \end{aligned}$$

In a similar fashion, we obtain

$$(5.11) \quad \|P^*v\|_{1,G} \leq C\|v\|_{1,G}.$$

Let $G_0 \subset\subset G' \subset\subset G$ be concentric spheres, $\omega \in C_0^\infty(G')$ with $\omega \equiv 1$ on G_0 and set $\tilde{u}_h = \omega u_h$. We have

$$(5.12) \quad \|u_h\|_{1,G_0} \leq \|\tilde{u}_h\|_{1,G} \leq \|\tilde{u}_h - P\tilde{u}_h\|_{1,G} + \|P\tilde{u}_h\|_{1,G}.$$

We shall estimate these terms separately. Since $P\tilde{u}_h \in \dot{S}_{k,r}^h(G)$ satisfies (5.8) with $v = \tilde{u}_h$, it follows from (1.7) that

$$\|\tilde{u}_h - P\tilde{u}_h\|_{1,G} \leq C\|\tilde{u}_h - \eta\|_{1,G} \quad \text{for any } \eta \in \dot{S}_{k,r}^h(G).$$

In view of (2.3), we have

$$(5.13) \quad \|\tilde{u}_h - P\tilde{u}_h\|_{1,G} \leq Ch\|u_h\|_{1,G}.$$

Now let us consider the second term on the right-hand side of (5.12). For $P\tilde{u}_h \neq 0$, we have

$$(5.14) \quad \|P\tilde{u}_h\|_{1,G} \leq CB(P\tilde{u}_h, \psi) = CB(\tilde{u}_h, \psi),$$

where $\psi = P\tilde{u}_h/\|P\tilde{u}_h\|_{1,G}$ and therefore $\|\psi\|_{1,G} = 1$. It follows from (4.6) that

$$\begin{aligned}
 B(\tilde{u}_h, \psi) &= B(u_h, \tilde{\psi}) \\
 &+ \int_G \sum_{i,j=1}^N u_h [D_i(a_{ij}(D_j\omega)\psi) + a_{ij}D_i\omega D_j\psi + b_i(D_i\omega)\psi] dx \\
 &= B(u_h, \tilde{\psi}) + I.
 \end{aligned}$$

Since u_h satisfies (5.3) and $\text{supp}(\omega) \subseteq G'$, we have

$$B(\tilde{u}_h, \psi) = B(u_h, \tilde{\psi} - \eta) + I \quad \text{for any } \eta \in \dot{S}_{k,r}^h(G).$$

In view of (2.3) and the definition of I , it follows that

$$B(\tilde{u}_h, \psi) \leq C(h\|u_h\|_{1,G} + \|u_h\|_{0,G'}).$$

Applying Lemma 4.1 with $e = u_h$ and $A_e = 0$ and G' in place of G_0 , we obtain

$$(5.15) \quad B(\tilde{u}_h, \psi) \leq C(h\|u_h\|_{1,G} + \|u_h\|_{-p,G}).$$

The estimate (5.7) now easily follows from (5.12), (5.13), (5.14) and (5.15), which completes the proof.

LEMMA 5.2. *Suppose the conditions of Lemma 5.1 are satisfied; then*

$$(5.16) \quad \|u_h\|_{1,G_0} \leq C\|u_h\|_{-p,G},$$

where $C = C(p, G_0, G, a_{ij}, b_i, c)$.

Proof. Let $G_0 \subset\subset G_1 \subset\subset \cdots \subset\subset G_{p+2} = G$ be concentric spheres. Lemma

5.1 applies to each pair $G_j \subset G_{j+1}$ (with possibly different constants C_j). We have from (5.5) that

$$\|u_h\|_{1, G_j} \leq C_j(h\|u_h\|_{1, G_{j+1}} + \|u_h\|_{-p, G_{j+1}}).$$

Starting with $j = 0$ and iterating $p + 1$ times, we obtain

$$(5.17) \quad \|u_h\|_{1, G_0} \leq C(h^{p+1}\|u_h\|_{1, G_{p+1}} + \|u_h\|_{-p, G_{p+1}}).$$

Now, let $G_h, G_{p+1} \subset G_h \subset G_{p+2} = G$, be as in A.3, then it follows from (2.4) and (2.5) that

$$(5.18) \quad h^{p+1}\|u_h\|_{1, G_{p+1}} \leq h^{p+1}\|u_h\|_{1, G_h} \leq C\|u_h\|_{-p, G_h} \leq C\|u_h\|_{-p, G}.$$

The inequality (5.16) now follows immediately from (5.17) and (5.18).

We shall now prove a local version of Theorems 5.1 and 5.2.

LEMMA 5.3. *Suppose the conditions of Theorem 5.2 are satisfied, then (5.1), (5.2), (5.5) and (5.6) hold with Ω_0 and Ω replaced by G_0 and G , concentric spheres satisfying the conditions of Lemma 5.1.*

Proof. Let $G_0 \subset G'_0 \subset G' \subset G \subset \Omega_1$ and $\omega = 1$ on G'_0 , $\omega \in C_0^\infty(G')$ and set $\tilde{u} = \omega u$. Let $T\tilde{u} \in \dot{S}_{k,r}^h(G)$ be the unique solution of

$$(5.19) \quad B(\tilde{u} - T\tilde{u}, \varphi) = A_e(\varphi) \quad \forall \varphi \in \dot{S}_{k,r}^h(G).$$

Now

$$(5.20) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\tilde{u} - T\tilde{u}\|_{1, G} &\leq C \sup_{v \in \dot{H}^1(G)} B(\tilde{u} - T\tilde{u}, v) / \|v\|_{1, G} \\ &\leq C \sup_{v \in \dot{H}^1(G)} \frac{B(\tilde{u} - T\tilde{u}, v - P^*v)}{\|v\|_{1, G}} + \frac{A_e(P^*v)}{\|v\|_{1, G}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $P^*v \in \dot{S}_{k,r}^h(G)$ satisfies (5.9). Hence, for any $\eta \in \dot{S}_{k,r}^h(G)$,

$$(5.21) \quad B(\tilde{u} - T\tilde{u}, v - P^*v) = B(\tilde{u} - \eta, v - P^*v) \leq C\|\tilde{u} - \eta\|_{1, G}\|v\|_{1, G},$$

where we have used (5.11). Also

$$(5.22) \quad A_e(P^*v) \leq \|A_e\|_{1, G}\|P^*v\|_{1, G} \leq \|A_e\|_{1, G}\|v\|_{1, G}.$$

It follows now from (5.20), (5.21), (5.22) and (2.1) that

$$(5.23) \quad \|\tilde{u} - T\tilde{u}\|_{1, G} \leq C \left(\inf_{\eta \in \dot{S}_{k,r}^h(G)} \|\tilde{u} - \eta\|_{1, G} + \|A_e\|_{1, G} \right)$$

$$\leq C(h^{l-1}\|u\|_{l, G} + \|A_e\|_{1, G}),$$

for $1 \leq l \leq r$.

Let us now estimate $\|u - u_h\|_{1, G_0}$.

$$(5.24) \quad \|u - u_h\|_{1, G_0} \leq \|u - T\tilde{u}\|_{1, G_0} + \|T\tilde{u} - u_h\|_{1, G_0}.$$

Certainly, Eqs. (3.4) and (5.19) hold for all $\varphi \in \dot{S}_{k,r}^h(G'_0)$. Subtracting these

two equations, we have

$$B(u_h - T\tilde{u}, \varphi) = 0 \quad \forall \varphi \in \mathring{S}_{k,r}^h(G'_0),$$

and we may apply Lemma 5.2 to $u_h - T\tilde{u}$, with G_0 and G replaced by G_0 and G'_0 , respectively. It follows then from (5.16) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_h - T\tilde{u}\|_{1, G_0} &\leq C \|u_h - T\tilde{u}\|_{-p, G'_0} \\ (5.25) \quad &\leq C (\|u - u_h\|_{-p, G'_0} + \|\tilde{u} - T\tilde{u}\|_{-p, G'_0}) \\ &\leq C (\|e\|_{-p, G} + \|\tilde{u} - T\tilde{u}\|_{1, G}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, (5.24) becomes

$$\|u - u_h\|_{1, G_0} \leq C (\|\tilde{u} - T\tilde{u}\|_{1, G} + \|e\|_{-p, G})$$

and, applying the estimate (5.23), we have

$$(5.26) \quad \|e\|_{1, G_0} \leq C(h^{l-1} \|u\|_{l, G} + \|e\|_{-p, G} + \|A_e\|_{1, G}),$$

which proves a local analogue of (5.6) and hence of (5.1) (with $s = 1$ by simply taking $A_e = 0$). Let us now prove the local analogues of (5.1) (with $s = 0$) and (5.5). We first apply Lemma 4.1 to the spheres G_0 and G' and obtain

$$(5.27) \quad \|e\|_{0, G_0} \leq C(h \|e\|_{1, G'} + \|e\|_{-p, G'} + h \|A_e\|_{1, G'} + \|A_e\|_{0, G'}).$$

Applying the estimate (5.26) to (5.27), with G_0 and G replaced by G' and G , respectively, we obtain the desired result

$$(5.28) \quad \|e\|_{0, G_0} \leq C(h^l \|u\|_{l, G} + \|e\|_{-p, G} + h \|A_e\|_{1, G} + \|A_e\|_{0, G}).$$

We now turn to the proof of a local version of (5.2). Let $2 \leq s \leq k$, $G_0 \subset\subset G_h \subset\subset G_1 \subset\subset G$. Then, for any $\eta \in \mathring{S}_{k,r}^h(\Omega_1)$,

$$\|e\|_{s, G_0} \leq \|u - \eta\|_{s, G} + \|\eta - u_h\|_{s, G_h} \leq \|u - \eta\|_{s, G} + h^{1-s} \|\eta - u_h\|_{1, G_h}$$

$$\leq \|u - \eta\|_{s, G} + h^{1-s} \|u - \eta\|_{1, G} + h^{1-s} \|e\|_{1, G_1},$$

where we used (2.4). We now choose η satisfying (2.1) and estimate $\|e\|_{1, G_1}$ using (5.26) with $A_e = 0$ and G_1 in place of G_0 . We obtain

$$(5.29) \quad \|e\|_{s, G_0} \leq C(h^{l-s} \|u\|_{l, G} + h^{1-s} \|e\|_{-p, G}),$$

which completes the proof.

Proofs of Theorems 5.1 and 5.2. Let $d = \min(d_0/2, d_1/2)$ where $d_0 = \text{dist}(\bar{\Omega}_0, \partial\Omega_1)$. Cover $\bar{\Omega}_0$ with a finite number of spheres $G_0(x_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, centered at $x_i \in \bar{\Omega}_0$ with $\text{diam } G_0(x_i) = d$. Let $G(x_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, be corresponding concentric spheres with $\text{diam } G(x_i) = 2d$. Applying (5.26) and (5.28) we have for $s = 0, 1$ and $1 \leq l \leq r$,

$$(5.30) \quad \|e\|_{s, G_0(x_i)} \leq C_i(h^{l-s}\|u\|_{l, G(x_i)} + \|e\|_{p, G(x_i)})$$

$$\leq C_i(h^{l-s}\|u\|_{l, \Omega_1} + \|e\|_{p, \Omega_1})$$

and from (5.29) for $2 \leq s \leq k$ and $s \leq l \leq r$,

$$(5.31) \quad \|e\|_{s, G_0(x_i)} \leq C_i(h^{l-s}\|u\|_{l, \Omega_1} + h^{1-s}\|e\|_{p, \Omega_1}).$$

The inequalities (5.1) and (5.2) follow from (5.30) and (5.31), which concludes the proof of Theorem 5.1. The proof of Theorem 5.2 follows precisely in the same way from the inequalities (5.26) and (5.28) with the help of (3.6). We shall leave the details to the reader.

6. Convergence of Difference Quotients. The estimates for the error and its derivatives given in the previous section are valid, for example, for subspaces $S_{k,r}^h$ which may be defined on nonuniform meshes. In this section, we shall consider subspaces which have certain translation invariant properties (which are satisfied, for example, by spline subspaces on a uniform mesh). This will allow us to obtain some results concerning the rate of convergence of difference quotients of the approximation u_h to derivatives of u .

Let $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_N)$ be a multi-integer. We define the translation operator

$$T_h^\mu v(x) = v(x + \mu h)$$

and the forward difference quotients

$$\partial_{h,j} v = h^{-1}(T_h^{e_j} - I)u,$$

where I is the identity operator and, for any multi-index α ,

$$\partial_h^\alpha u \equiv \partial_h^{\alpha_1} \dots \partial_h^{\alpha_N} u.$$

We consider difference operators Q_h of order m of the form

$$(6.1) \quad Q_h u = \sum_{\nu, |\beta| \leq m} C_{\nu\beta} T_h^\nu \partial_h^\beta u,$$

where the $C_{\nu\beta}$ are the constants and all but a finite number of the $C_{\nu\beta}$ vanish.

We note that $Q_h u$ may be written as a linear combination of translation operators with coefficients which depend only on h .

In what follows, we shall make use of the discrete Leibnitz rule

$$\partial_h^\alpha(uv) = \sum_{\beta \leq \alpha} \binom{\alpha}{\beta} T_h^\beta \partial_h^{\alpha-\beta} u \partial_h^\beta v, \quad \binom{\alpha}{\beta} = \binom{\alpha_1}{\beta_1} \dots \binom{\alpha_N}{\beta_N}.$$

Our additional assumption on the subspaces $S_{k,r}^h(\Omega)$ is as follows:

A.4. Let ν be any multi-integer, fixed but arbitrary, and let $\Omega_0 \subset\subset \Omega_1$, then there exists an h_1 (in general depending on ν, Ω_0 and Ω_1) such that for all $h \in (0, h_1]$

$$(6.2) \quad T_h^\nu \varphi \in \hat{S}_{k,r}^h(\Omega_1) \quad \forall \varphi \in \hat{S}_{k,r}^h(\Omega_0).$$

We shall now prove

THEOREM 6.1. *Suppose that the conditions of Theorem 5.1 are satisfied and in addition A.4 holds. Let Q_n be a finite difference operator of order m of the form (6.1). If $1 \leq l \leq r$, $u \in H^{m+l}(\Omega_1)$ and p is any nonnegative integer, fixed but arbitrary, then there exists an h_0 such that for all $h \in (0, h_0]$*

$$(6.3) \quad \|Q_h e\|_{0, \Omega_0} \leq C(h^l \|u\|_{l+m, \Omega_1} + \|e\|_{p, \Omega_1}),$$

where $C = C(p, \Omega_0, \Omega_1, a_{ij}, b_i, c)$.

Proof. Let us first remark that the proof in the case that $B(u, v)$ has constant coefficients is almost an immediate consequence of Theorem 5.1 and A.4. For, if $\Omega_0 \subset \subset \Omega'_0 \subset \subset \Omega_1$, then it is easily seen that for h sufficiently small

$$(6.4) \quad B(Q_h e, \varphi) = B(e, Q_h^* \varphi) = 0 \quad \forall \varphi \in \dot{S}_{k, r}^h(\Omega'_0).$$

Here, Q_h^* is the difference operator adjoint to Q_h . Noticing that for $p' = m + p$, $\|Q_h e\|_{p', \Omega'_0} \leq C \|e\|_{p, \Omega_0}$, we may apply Theorem 5.1, with Ω_0, Ω'_0 and p' replacing Ω_0, Ω_1 and p , respectively, and (6.3) follows immediately.

For the case of variable coefficients, we first note that any difference operator of the form (6.2) is a linear combination of products of translations and difference quotients which commute. It is obviously sufficient to prove (6.3) in the case that $Q_h e = T_h^\nu \partial^\alpha e$. We shall first show that

$$(6.5) \quad \|T_h^\nu \partial^\alpha e\|_{1, \Omega_0} \leq C(h^{l-1} \|u\|_{l+|\alpha|, \Omega_1} + \|e\|_{p, \Omega_1}).$$

Our proof will proceed by induction. Since

$$(6.6) \quad \|T_h^\nu e\|_{1, \Omega_0} \leq \|e\|_{1, \Omega'_0}$$

for h sufficiently small, the inequality (6.5), in the case $|\alpha| = 0$, follows immediately from (6.6) and (5.1).

Let us now assume that $|\alpha| \geq 1$. In view of the inequality (6.6), we may restrict ourselves to estimating $\partial^\alpha e$. Let us investigate the equation satisfied by $\partial^\alpha e$. For ease of computation, we shall assume that $B(u, v)$ is of the form

$$B(u, v) = \int_{\Omega_1} \sum_{i,j=1}^N a_{ij} D_i u D_j v \, dx;$$

the lower order terms can be handled in exactly the same manner. Using the Leibnitz rule, we have

$$(6.7) \quad \begin{aligned} B(\partial^\alpha e, \varphi) &= \int_{\Omega_1} \sum_{i,j=1}^N \partial^\alpha (a_{ij} D_i e) D_j \varphi \, dx \\ &\quad - \int_{\Omega_1} \sum_{i,j=1}^N \sum_{\beta < \alpha} \binom{\alpha}{\alpha - \beta} \partial^{\alpha - \beta} a_{ij} T_h^{\alpha - \beta} \partial^\beta D_i e D_j \varphi \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

It follows, in a manner similar to that used in proving (6.4), that, for h sufficiently small, the first integral on the right-hand side of (6.7) vanishes for all $\varphi \in \dot{S}_{k, r}^h(\Omega'_0)$.

Therefore, for $|\alpha| = t + 1$,

$$(6.8) \quad B(\partial^\alpha e, \varphi) = A_e(\varphi) = - \int_{\Omega_1} \sum_{i,j=1}^N \sum_{\beta < \alpha} \binom{\alpha}{\alpha - \beta} \partial^{\alpha - \beta} a_{ij} T_h^{\alpha - \beta} \partial^\beta D_i e D_j \varphi \, dx$$

where $|\beta| \leq t$. We may therefore apply Theorem 5.2 with $\partial^\alpha e$ replacing e , and Ω_0 and Ω'_0 replacing Ω_1 . For h sufficiently small and $\Omega_0 \subset\subset \Omega'_0 \subset\subset \Omega''_0 \subset\subset \Omega_1$, we have

$$(6.9) \quad \|A_e\|_{1, \Omega'_0} \leq C \sum_{|\beta| \leq t} \|\partial^\beta e\|_{1, \Omega''_0}$$

By our induction hypothesis, we have for each $|\beta| \leq t$

$$(6.10) \quad \|\partial^\beta e\|_{1, \Omega''_0} \leq C(h^{t-1} \|u\|_{t+1, \Omega_1} + \|e\|_{L_p, \Omega_1}).$$

The inequality (6.5) now easily follows from (5.6), (6.9) and (6.10).

The proof of (6.3) now follows from (6.4) and (5.5) in the same manner. One only has to observe that, in place of (6.9), one has the inequality

$$\|A_e\|_{0, \Omega'_0} \leq C \sum_{\beta < \alpha} \|\partial^\beta e\|_{0, \Omega''_0}$$

The details will be left to the reader.

Our next concern is the convergence of difference quotients of u_h to derivatives of u . We shall say that a difference operator $Q_h = Q_h^\alpha$ of order $|\alpha|$ approximates a derivative D^α with order of accuracy t in L_2 , if for any pair of domains $\Omega_0 \subset\subset \Omega_1$

$$(6.11) \quad \|D^\alpha u - Q_h^\alpha u\|_{0, \Omega_0} \leq C(\Omega_0, \Omega_1) h^t \|u\|_{t+|\alpha|, \Omega_1},$$

for all h sufficiently small and $u \in H^{t+|\alpha|}(\Omega_1)$.

THEOREM 6.2. *Suppose that the conditions of Theorem 6.1 are satisfied and let Q_h^α approximate D^α with order of accuracy r in L_2 . Furthermore, let p be a nonnegative integer, fixed but arbitrary. There exists an $h_1 > 0$ such that for all $h \in (0, h_1]$*

$$(6.12) \quad \|D^\alpha u - Q_h^\alpha u_h\|_{0, \Omega_0} \leq C(h^r \|u\|_{r+|\alpha|, \Omega_1} + \|e\|_{L_p, \Omega_1}),$$

where $C = C(p, \Omega_0, \Omega_1, a_{ij}, b_i, c)$.

We remark that, in contrast to the results of Theorem 5.1, Theorem 6.2 says that if u is sufficiently smooth on Ω_1 and Q_h^α a sufficiently good approximation to D^α , then the rate of convergence of $Q_h^\alpha u_h$ to D^α is of order h^r plus the term $\|e\|_{L_p, \Omega_1}$.

Proof. The proof is obvious because of the inequality

$$\|D^\alpha u - Q_h^\alpha u_h\|_{0, \Omega_0} \leq \|D^\alpha u - Q_h^\alpha u\|_{0, \Omega_0} + \|Q_h^\alpha e\|_{0, \Omega_0}.$$

7. Examples. In this section, we shall exemplify the theory given in the previous sections by considering specific methods for approximating specific elliptic boundary value problems on a bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$. In what follows, we shall assume that the subspaces $S_{k,r}^h(\Omega) \subset H^k(\Omega)$, $k \geq 1$, used in approximating the solution, are such that their restrictions to a given subdomain $\Omega_1 \subset \Omega$ satisfies the assumptions A_1 , A_2 and A_3 . Several examples of such subspaces have been given in Section 2.

For the purposes of our applications, we shall further assume that $S_{k,r}^h(\Omega)$ has the following approximation property on Ω : There exists a constant C independent of u and h such that for $k \leq t \leq r$ and all $u \in H^t(\Omega)$

$$(7.1) \quad \inf_{u_h \in S_{k,r}^h(\Omega)} \sum_{j=1}^k h^j \|u - u_h\|_{j,\Omega} \leq Ch^t \|u\|_{t,\Omega}.$$

We shall sometimes use subspaces $S_{k,r}^h(\Omega)$ whose elements are required to vanish on $\partial\Omega$. In this case, we shall require that (7.1) hold only for $u \in H^t(\Omega) \cap \mathring{H}^1(\Omega)$. The assumption (7.1) holds for the examples cited in Section 2, provided for instance Ω is a Lipschitz domain. If additional requirements on the subspaces are needed when considering a specific method, we shall indicate this at that time.

Example 1. The Neumann Problem. Let Ω be a bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^N with smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$. Let u be a solution of

$$(7.2) \quad \begin{aligned} -\Delta u + u &= f \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\ \partial u / \partial n &= 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{aligned}$$

where $\partial u / \partial n$ is the outward normal derivative of u to $\partial\Omega$. Let $u_h \in S_{k,r}^h(\Omega)$ be the approximate solution defined by

$$(7.3) \quad B(u_h, \varphi) = \int_{\Omega} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\partial u_h}{\partial x_i} \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_i} dx + \int_{\Omega} u_h \varphi dx = \int_{\Omega} f \varphi dx = B(u, \varphi)$$

for all $\varphi \in S_{k,r}^h(\Omega)$. Here $S_{k,r}^h(\Omega)$ need not satisfy any conditions on $\partial\Omega$ and any one of the previous examples of subspaces can be used. We note that this procedure is well defined if $f \in H^{-1}(\Omega)$ and that in general

$$(7.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \|u\|_{1,\Omega} &\leq C \|f\|_{-1,\Omega}, \\ \|u\|_{s+2,\Omega} &\leq C(s) \|f\|_{s,\Omega} \quad \text{if } 0 \leq s. \end{aligned}$$

It was shown in [7], that, if (7.1) holds, then for $e = u - u_h$

$$(7.5) \quad \|e\|_{2-r,\Omega} \leq \|e\|_{2-r,\Omega} \leq Ch^{r-2+t} \|u\|_{t,\Omega}, \quad 1 \leq t \leq r, r \geq 1.$$

If $\Omega_0 \subset \subset \Omega_1 \subset \subset \Omega$, then our interior Eqs. (2.1) are satisfied for h sufficiently small and, using the inequality $\|e\|_{2-r,\Omega_1} \leq \|e\|_{2-r,\Omega}$, we obtain from Theorem

5.1 that, if $u \in H^r(\Omega_1) \cap H^2(\Omega)$, then

$$(7.6) \quad \|e\|_{0, \Omega_0} \leq Ch^r (\|u\|_{r, \Omega_1} + \|u\|_{2, \Omega}).$$

If $u \in H^r(\Omega_1) \cap H^1(\Omega)$, then

$$(7.7) \quad \|e\|_{1, \Omega_0} \leq Ch^{r-1} (\|u\|_{r, \Omega_1} + \|u\|_{1, \Omega}).$$

We note that the best estimates one can obtain on all of Ω for any $u \in H^r(\Omega)$ is

$$\|e\|_{0, \Omega} \leq Ch^r \|u\|_{r, \Omega}, \quad \|e\|_{1, \Omega} \leq Ch^{r-1} \|u\|_{r, \Omega}.$$

In contrast to those, (7.6) and (7.7) say that we obtain quasi-optimal estimates in $L_2(\Omega_0)$ and $H^1(\Omega_0)$ provided in both cases $u \in H^r(\Omega_1)$ and $u \in H^2(\Omega)$ and $H^1(\Omega)$, respectively. It follows from interior a priori estimates for elliptic equations that (7.6) and (7.7) may be replaced by

$$(7.8) \quad \|e\|_{0, \Omega_0} \leq Ch^r (\|f\|_{r-2, \Omega_1} + \|f\|_{0, \Omega})$$

and

$$(7.9) \quad \|e\|_{1, \Omega_0} \leq Ch^{r-1} (\|f\|_{r-2, \Omega_1} + \|f\|_{-1, \Omega}),$$

respectively.

In this particular problem, we are at liberty to choose our subspaces to be defined on a uniform mesh; hence, the results of Section 6 on difference quotients are applicable.

If α is any multi-index and Q_h^α is a finite difference operator of the form (6.1) which approximates D^α with order of accuracy r , then, for h sufficiently small, we obtain from Theorem 6.2 that

$$(7.10) \quad \|D^\alpha u - Q_h^\alpha u_h\|_{0, \Omega_0} \leq Ch^r (\|u\|_{r+|\alpha|, \Omega_1} + \|u\|_{2, \Omega}).$$

One can show that in terms of data

$$(7.11) \quad \|D^\alpha u - Q_h^\alpha u_h\|_{0, \Omega_0} \leq Ch^r (\|f\|_{r+|\alpha|-2, \Omega_1} + \|f\|_{0, \Omega}).$$

Example 2. The Dirichlet Problem, Babuška's Method of Lagrange Multipliers and Two Methods of Nitsche. In Babuška [3] and Nitsche [12] and [13], methods are introduced for approximating solutions of

$$(7.12) \quad -\Delta u = f \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

$$(7.13) \quad u = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega$$

(in [3] and [12] in general $u = g$ on $\partial\Omega$) in which the approximating subspace need not satisfy boundary conditions. In [3], the subspaces $S_{k,r}^h(\Omega)$ need not satisfy any additional requirements and may be taken to be any one of the examples given. However, another one-parameter family of subspaces is introduced, which are defined only on $\partial\Omega$ and which may be thought of as approximating the normal

derivative of u on $\partial\Omega$. In [12] and [13], subspaces are constructed which have certain additional properties near $\partial\Omega$. What is important here is that subspaces used in these methods can be chosen to satisfy the conditions of Theorem 5.1 and, if $\Omega_0 \subset \subset \Omega_1 \subset \subset \Omega$ and h is sufficiently small, then the interior equations for all of these methods are the same, i.e., of the form

$$B(u_h, \varphi) = \int_{\Omega} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\partial u_h}{\partial x_i} \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_i} dx = (f, \varphi) = B(u, \varphi) \quad \forall \varphi \in \mathring{S}_{k,r}^h(\Omega_1).$$

It was shown in [7] that the estimate (7.5) is valid for all three of these methods provided $\partial\Omega$ is smooth and hence it follows that the error estimates (7.6), (7.7) and (if a uniform mesh is used on Ω_1) (7.10) remain valid. We remark that the same estimates hold if in (7.12) the Laplacian is replaced by any second order elliptic operator of the form (1.4), such that the corresponding boundary value problem has a unique solution.

Example 3. Dirichlet's Problem on the Unit Square. Let us again consider the problem (7.12), (7.13) on Ω in \mathbb{R}^2 where $\Omega = \{x \mid 0 < x_i < 1, i = 1, 2\}$. We shall approximate u using subspaces $S_{k,r}^h(\Omega)$ which vanish on $\partial\Omega$. Let $u_h \in S_{k,r}^h(\Omega)$ be the approximate solution defined by

$$(7.14) \quad B(u_h, \varphi) = \int_{\Omega} \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{\partial u_h}{\partial x_i} \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_i} dx = (f, \varphi) = B(u, \varphi) \quad \forall \varphi \in S_{k,r}^h.$$

In order to obtain interior estimates, we estimate $\|e\|_{2-r, \Omega}$. We shall show that the estimate (7.5) remains valid here. The basic idea in obtaining this estimate in this case may be found in [18]. For completeness, we shall outline the proof. Now

$$(7.15) \quad \|e\|_{2-r, \Omega} = \sup_{v \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)} (e, v) / \|v\|_{r-2, \Omega}.$$

For each $v \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$, let ψ be the solution of (7.12), (7.13) with $f = v$. In general, solutions of (7.12), (7.13) need not be smooth even for smooth f and the best one can say is that, if $f \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$, then $u \in H^{3-\epsilon}(\Omega) \cap \dot{H}^1(\Omega)$ for any $\epsilon > 0$. However, in the case that $v \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$, then, in fact, $\psi \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ and the a priori estimate

$$(7.16) \quad \|\psi\|_{s,r} \leq C \|v\|_{s-2, \Omega}, \quad 0 \leq s,$$

holds, where C is independent of v and depends only on s . In order to see this, we notice that ψ may be continued to a square domain G where $\bar{\Omega} \subset G$ as a solution of $-\Delta\psi = g$ in G , $\psi = 0$ on ∂G where $g \in C_0^\infty(G)$, $g = v$ on $\bar{\Omega}$. This is done by repeated reflection of ψ across the edges as an odd function. It then follows from standard interior estimates for solutions of (7.12) that ψ is C^∞ on every subdomain of G and hence on $\bar{\Omega}$. The estimate (7.16) is valid for

smooth solutions. Hence, for any $\eta \in S_{k,r}^h$, we have, using (7.14), that $(e, v) = -(e, \Delta\psi) = B(e, \psi) = B(e, \psi - \eta)$ or

$$(7.17) \quad |(e, v)| \leq \|e\|_{1,\Omega} \inf_{\eta \in S_{k,r}^h} \|\psi - \eta\|_{1,\Omega} \leq Ch^{r-1} \|e\|_{1,\Omega} \|\psi\|_{r,\Omega}.$$

In view of (7.17), (7.16), (7.15) and the fact that u_h is the best approximation in $S_{k,r}^h$ to u in $\dot{H}^1(\Omega)$, the inequality (7.5) now follows. This immediately implies that the estimates (7.10), (7.6) and (7.7) are valid in this case, even though there are corners. However, the method of proof of the estimate (7.4) depends very much on the fact that the interior angles of Ω are $\pi/2$. We shall now treat the case of the L -shaped membrane where we are generally not able to show that (7.5) holds.

Example 4. Dirichlet's Problem on the L -shaped Membrane. We again consider $(-1,1)$ $(1,1)$ $(1,-1)$ $(-1,0)$ $(0,0)$ $(0,-1)$ $(1,-1)$ (7.12) and (7.13) where Ω is the L -shaped domain (see figure). For our subspace, we choose $S_{k,r}^h(\Omega) = S_{1,2}^h$ to be piecewise linear functions on a uniform triangulation of Ω which vanish on $\partial\Omega$ and again denote by u_h the approximate solution determined by (7.14). Now, in general, if f is $C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ or even $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$, then the most one can say of solutions u of (7.12), (7.13) is that $u \in H^{5/3-\epsilon}(\Omega) \cap \dot{H}^1(\Omega)$ for any $\epsilon > 0$. The following estimate (cf. [9]) is valid for any $f \in H^{-1/3-\epsilon}(\Omega)$,

$$\|u\|_{5/3-\epsilon,\Omega} \leq C \|f\|_{-1/3-\epsilon,\Omega}.$$

We shall now estimate $\|e\|_{p,\Omega}$. For any $p \geq 0$, we have

$$\|e\|_{p,\Omega} = \sup_{v \in C_0^\infty} (e, v) / \|v\|_{p,\Omega}.$$

Again, let $\Delta\psi = v$ on Ω , $\psi = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$; then, in general, $\psi \in H^{5/3-\epsilon}(\Omega)$ for any $\epsilon > 0$ (in contrast to the unit square where $\psi \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$). We then have for any $\eta \in S_{1,2}^h(\Omega)$

$$\begin{aligned} (e, v) &= -(e, \Delta\psi) = B(e, \psi) = B(e, \psi - \eta) \leq \|e\|_{1,\Omega} \inf_{\eta \in S_{1,2}^h} \|\psi - \eta\|_{1,\Omega} \\ &\leq Ch^{4/3-2\epsilon} \|u\|_{5/3-\epsilon,\Omega} \|\psi\|_{5/3-\epsilon,\Omega}. \end{aligned}$$

From this it follows that for any $p > 0$

$$(7.18) \quad \|e\|_{p,\Omega} \leq C(\epsilon) h^{4/3-2\epsilon} \|u\|_{5/3-\epsilon,\Omega}.$$

Hence, in general, the convergence seems to be no better in any negative norm than

in $L_2(\Omega)$. In particular, for all $u \in H^{5/3-\epsilon}$, we have

$$(7.19) \quad \|e\|_{0, \Omega} \leq Ch^{4/3-2\epsilon} \|u\|_{5/3-\epsilon, \Omega},$$

where C is independent of h and u .

If we apply the estimate (7.18) to the results of Theorem 5.1, we see that for all $u \in H^2(\Omega_1)$ (here $r = 2$)

$$(7.20) \quad \|e\|_{0, \Omega_0} \leq C(h^2 \|u\|_{2, \Omega_1} + h^{4/3-2\epsilon} \|u\|_{5/3-\epsilon, \Omega}).$$

Hence, for h small, the order of convergence is $h^{4/3-2\epsilon}$ which is no better than that over all of Ω and the estimate (7.20) yields nothing new since (7.18) is also trivially valid with $\|e\|_{0, \Omega}$ replaced by $\|e\|_{0, \Omega_0}$.

In some sense, this inequality is sharp. Following an idea of Babuška, one can show that, for each h , there exists a function $u = U^h$ such that

$$\|e\|_{0, \Omega_0} = \|U^h - u_h\|_{0, \Omega_0} \geq Ch^{4/3-\epsilon} \|U^h\|_{5/3-\epsilon, \Omega}.$$

We shall not give the details here.

However, we note that this does not say that for a given fixed u the rate of convergence in the interior is not higher than $h^{4/3-\epsilon}$. This is an open question at this time.

Institut für Angewandte Mathematik
Universität Freiburg
Freiburg, Germany

Department of Mathematics
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York 14850

1. S. AGMON, *Lectures on Elliptic Boundary Value Problems*, Van Nostrand Math. Studies, no. 2, Van Nostrand, Princeton, N. J., 1965. MR 31 #2504.

2. J. P. AUBIN, "Approximation des problèmes aux limites non homogènes et régularité de la convergence," *Calcolo*, v. 6, 1969, pp. 117–139.

3. I. BABUŠKA, *The Finite Element Method with Lagrangian Multipliers*, Technical Note BN-724, Institute for Fluid Dynamics and Appl. Math., University of Maryland, College Park, Md., 1972.

4. I. BABUŠKA, *Numerical Solution of Boundary Value Problems by the Perturbed Variational Principle*, Technical Note BN-624, University of Maryland, College Park, Md., 1969.

5. JU. M. BEREZANSKIĬ, *Expansions in Eigenfunctions of Selfadjoint Operators*, "Naukova Dumka", Kiev, 1965; English transl., Transl. Math. Monographs, vol. 17, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R. I., 1968. MR 36 #5768; #5769.

6. J. H. BRAMBLE & S. HILBERT, "Bounds for a class of linear functionals with applications to Hermite interpolation," *Numer. Math.*, v. 16, 1971, pp. 362–369. MR 44 #7704.

7. J. H. BRAMBLE & J. E. OSBORN, "Rate of convergence estimates for non-selfadjoint eigenvalue approximations," *Math. Comp.*, v. 27, 1973, pp. 525–550.

8. J. H. BRAMBLE & M. ZLAMAL, "Triangular elements in the finite element method," *Math. Comp.*, v. 24, 1970, pp. 809–820. MR 43 #8250.
9. R. B. KELLOGG, "Higher order singularities for interface problems," *Proceedings of Conference on The Mathematical Foundations of the Finite Element Method with Applications to Partial Differential Equations* (edited by A. K. Aziz), Academic Press, New York, 1972, pp. 589–602.
10. R. B. KELLOGG, *Interpolation Between Subspaces of a Hilbert Space*, Technical Note BN-719, Institute for Fluid Dynamics and Appl. Math., University of Maryland, College Park, Md., 1972.
11. J. L. LIONS & E. MAGENES, *Problème aux limites non homogènes et applications*, Vol. 1, Travaux et Recherches Mathématiques, no. 17, Dunod, Paris, 1968. MR 40 #512.
12. J. A. NITSCHKE, "Über ein Variationsprinzip zur Lösung von Dirichlet Problemen bei Verwendung von Teilräumen, die keinen Randbedingungen unterworfen sind," *Abh. Math. Sem. Univ. Hamburg*, v. 36, 1971, pp. 9–15.
13. J. A. NITSCHKE, "A projection method for Dirichlet-problems using subspaces with nearly zero boundary conditions," *Proceedings of Conference on The Mathematical Foundations of the Finite Element Method with Applications to Partial Differential Equations* (edited by A. K. Aziz), Academic Press, New York, 1972, pp. 603–627.
14. J. A. NITSCHKE, "Umkehrsätze für Spline Approximationen," *Compositio Math.*, v. 21, 1969, pp. 400–416. MR 41 #4074.
15. J. A. NITSCHKE, "Ein Kriterium für die Quasi-Optimalität des Ritzschen Verfahrens," *Numer. Math.*, v. 11, 1968, pp. 346–348. MR 38 #1823.
16. J. A. NITSCHKE, "Interior error estimates for projection methods," *Proceedings of the Czechoslovak Conference on Differential Equations and Their Applications*, Brno 1972.
17. J. A. NITSCHKE & A. H. SCHATZ, "On local approximation properties of L_2 projections on spline subspaces," *Applicable Anal.*, v. 2, 1972, pp. 161–168.
18. L. SERBIN, *A Computational Investigation of Least Squares and Other Projection Methods for the Approximate Solution of Boundary Value Problems*, Doctoral Thesis, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y., 1971.
19. I. J. SCHOENBERG, *Approximation with Special Emphasis on Spline Functions*, Academic Press, New York, 1969. MR 40 #4638.
20. V. THOMÉE & B. WESTERGREN, "Elliptic difference equations and interior regularity," *Numer. Math.*, v. 11, 1968, pp. 196–210. MR 36 #7347.
21. V. THOMÉE, "Discrete interior Schauder estimates for elliptic difference operators," *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, v. 5, 1968, pp. 626–645. MR 38 #6781.
22. M. ZLAMAL, "A Finite element procedure of second order accuracy," *Numer. Math.*, v. 14, 1969/70, pp. 394–402. MR 41 #1233.