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## First Strang Lemma - Abstract Error Estimate Including Consistency Error

## Theorem

Let $\mathbb{V}_{h} \subset \mathbb{V}$, and let the bilinear form $a_{h}(\cdot, \cdot)$ defined on $\mathbb{V}_{h} \times \mathbb{V}_{h}$ be uniform $\mathbb{V}_{h}$-elliptic, i.e. there exists a constant $\hat{\alpha}>0$ independent of $h$ such that

$$
a_{h}\left(v_{h}, v_{h}\right) \geq \hat{\alpha}\left\|v_{h}\right\|^{2}, \quad \forall v_{h} \in \mathbb{V}_{h} .
$$

Then, there exists a constant $C$ independent $h$ such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left\|u-u_{h}\right\| \leq C\left(\inf _{v_{h} \in \mathbb{V}_{h}}\left\{\left\|u-v_{h}\right\|+\sup _{w_{h} \in \mathbb{V}_{h}} \frac{\left|a\left(v_{h}, w_{h}\right)-a_{h}\left(v_{h}, w_{h}\right)\right|}{\left\|w_{h}\right\|}\right\}\right. \\
&\left.+\sup _{w_{h} \in \mathbb{V}_{h}} \frac{\left|f\left(w_{h}\right)-f_{h}\left(w_{h}\right)\right|}{\left\|w_{h}\right\|}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

## Second Strang Lemma - Abstract Error Estimate for Non-Conforming FE

## Theorem

Let the bilinear form $a_{h}(\cdot, \cdot)$ be uniformly bounded on $\left(\mathbb{V}+\mathbb{V}_{h}\right) \times\left(\mathbb{V}+\mathbb{V}_{h}\right)$, and be uniformly $\mathbb{V}_{h}$-elliptic, i.e. there exist constants $\hat{M}$ and $\hat{\alpha}>0$ independent of $h$ such that

$$
\begin{array}{cl}
\left|a_{h}\left(u_{h}, v_{h}\right)\right| \leq \hat{M}\left\|u_{h}\right\|_{h}\left\|v_{h}\right\|_{h}, & \forall u_{h}, v_{h} \in \mathbb{V}+\mathbb{V}_{h}, \\
a_{h}\left(v_{h}, v_{h}\right) \geq \hat{\alpha}\left\|v_{h}\right\|_{h}^{2}, & \forall v_{h} \in \mathbb{V}_{h} .
\end{array}
$$

Then, the error of the solution $u_{h}$ of the corresponding approximation variational problem with respect to the solution $u$ of the original variational problem satisfies

$$
\left\|u-u_{h}\right\|_{h} \cong\left(\inf _{v_{h} \in \mathbb{V}_{h}}\left\|u-v_{h}\right\|_{h}+\sup _{w_{h} \in \mathbb{V}_{h}} \frac{\left|a_{h}\left(u, w_{h}\right)-f_{h}\left(w_{h}\right)\right|}{\left\|w_{h}\right\|_{h}}\right) .
$$

Here $A_{h}(u) \cong B_{h}(u)$ means that there exist positive constants $C_{1}$ and $C_{2}$ independent of $u$ and $h$ s.t. $C_{1} B_{h}(u) \leq A_{h}(u) \leq C_{2} B_{h}(u)$, for all $h>0$ sufficiently small.

## The Bramble-Hilbert Lemma -

## - An Abstract Estimate on Polynomial Vanishing Linear Forms

## Theorem

Let $\Omega$ be a bounded open set in $\mathbb{R}^{n}$ with Lipschitz continuous boundary. For some $p \in[1, \infty]$ and some integer $k \geq 0$, let the bounded linear form $f$ defined on $\mathbb{W}^{k+1, p}(\Omega)$ be such that

$$
f(w)=0, \quad \forall w \in \mathbb{P}_{k}(\Omega)
$$

Then, there exists a constant $C(\Omega)$ such that

$$
|f(v)| \leq C(\Omega)\|f\|_{k+1, p, \Omega}^{*}|v|_{k+1, p, \Omega}
$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{k+1, p, \Omega}^{*}$ is the norm on the dual space of $\mathbb{W}^{k+1, p}(\Omega)$.

## The Bilinear Lemma -

## - An Abstract Estimate on Polynomial Vanishing Bilinear Forms

## Theorem

Let $\Omega$ be a bounded open set in $\mathbb{R}^{n}$ with Lipschitz continuous boundary. For some $p, q \in[1, \infty]$, some integers $k, I \geq 0$ and a subspace $\mathbb{W}$ which satisfies the inclusion relation $\mathbb{P}^{\prime}(\Omega) \subset \mathbb{W} \subset \mathbb{W}^{\prime+1, q}(\Omega)$ and is endowed with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{I+1, q, \Omega}$, let the bounded bilinear form $b$ defined on $\mathbb{W}^{k+1, p}(\Omega) \times \mathbb{W}$ be such that

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
b(r, w)=0, & \forall r \in \mathbb{P}_{k}(\Omega), \quad \forall w \in \mathbb{W} \\
b(v, r)=0, & \forall v \in \mathbb{W}^{k+1, p}(\Omega), \quad \forall r \in \mathbb{P}_{l}(\Omega)
\end{array}
$$

Then, there exists a constant $C(\Omega)$ such that $|b(v, w)| \leq C(\Omega) \| b| ||v|_{k+1, p, \Omega}|w|_{\iota+1, q, \Omega}, \quad \forall v \in \mathbb{W}^{k+1, p}(\Omega), \forall w \in \mathbb{W}$, where $\|b\|$ is the norm of the bilinear form $b$ on $\mathbb{W}^{k+1, p}(\Omega) \times \mathbb{W}$.

## L Nonconformity and the Consistency Error

## Lonsistency Error Caused by Numerical Integration

## Approximate $a(u, v)$ by $a_{h}(u, v)$ Using Numerical Quadratures

(1) Let $\Omega$ be a polygonal region, and $\mathfrak{T}_{h}(\Omega)$ be a family of regular affine equivalent finite element triangulations of $\Omega$.
(2) $F_{K}: \hat{x} \in \hat{K} \rightarrow B_{K} \hat{x}+b_{K} \in K$ : the corresponding affine equivalent mappings.
(3) Let $a_{i j} \in \mathbb{W}^{1, \infty}(\Omega), i, j=1, \ldots, n$, and

$$
a(u, v)=\int_{\Omega} \sum_{i, j=1}^{n} a_{i j} \partial_{i} u \partial_{j} v d x=\sum_{K \in \mathfrak{T}_{h}(\Omega)} \sum_{i, j=1}^{n} \int_{K} a_{i j} \partial_{i} u \partial_{j} v d x .
$$

(4) $\left\{\hat{b}_{l}\right\}_{l=1}^{L},\left\{b_{l, K}=F_{K}\left(\hat{b}_{l}\right)\right\}_{l=1}^{L}$ : quadrature nodes on $\hat{K}, K$.
(5) $\left\{\hat{\omega}_{l}\right\}_{l=1}^{L},\left\{\omega_{l, K}=\operatorname{det}\left(B_{K}\right) \hat{\omega}_{l}\right\}_{l=1}^{L}$, quadrature weights on $\hat{K}, K$.

## Approximate $a(u, v)$ by $a_{h}(u, v)$ Using Numerical Quadratures

(0) Approximate $a(u, v)$ by numerical quadrature

$$
a_{h}(u, v)=\sum_{K \in \mathfrak{T}_{h}(\Omega)} \sum_{i, j=1}^{n} \sum_{l=1}^{L} \omega_{l, K} a_{i j}\left(b_{l, K}\right) \partial_{i} u\left(b_{l, K}\right) \partial_{j} v\left(b_{l, K}\right)
$$

(7) Denote the errors of integrals and numerical integrals of $\varphi$ and $\hat{\varphi}$ on $K$ and $\hat{K}$ by

$$
\begin{aligned}
E_{K}(\varphi) & =\int_{K} \varphi(x) d x-\sum_{l=1}^{L} \omega_{l, K} \varphi\left(b_{l, K}\right) \\
\hat{E}(\hat{\varphi}) & =\int_{\hat{K}} \hat{\varphi}(\hat{x}) d \hat{x}-\sum_{l=1}^{L} \hat{\omega}_{l} \hat{\varphi}\left(\hat{b}_{l}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

## L Nonconformity and the Consistency Error

- Consistency Error Caused by Numerical Integration


## Error on K of a Numerical Quadrature with Algebraic Accuracy $2 k$ - 2

## Lemma

Let $a_{i j} \in \mathbb{W}^{k, \infty}(\Omega), i, j=1, \ldots, n$, for some integer $k \geq 1$. Let the reference finite element $(\hat{K}, \hat{P}, \hat{\Sigma})$ and the numerical quadrature satisfy

$$
\hat{P}=\mathbb{P}_{k}(\hat{K}) \quad \text { and } \quad \hat{E}(\hat{\varphi})=0, \quad \forall \hat{\varphi} \in \mathbb{P}_{2 k-2}(\hat{K})
$$

Then, there exists a constant $C$ independent of $K$ and $h$, such that

$$
\left|E_{K}\left(a_{i j} \partial_{i} \tilde{v} \partial_{j} \tilde{w}\right)\right| \leq C h_{K}^{k}\|\tilde{v}\|_{k, K}|\tilde{w}|_{1, K}, \quad \forall \tilde{v} \in \mathbb{P}_{k}(K), \forall \tilde{w} \in \mathbb{P}_{k}(K) .
$$

## L Nonconformity and the Consistency Error

- Consistency Error Caused by Numerical Integration


## Proof of the Lemma - Key: Bounds the Error in Semi-Norms

(1) $a \in \mathbb{W}^{k}, \infty(K)$ and $v, w \in \mathbb{P}_{k-1}(K) \Rightarrow \hat{a} \in \mathbb{W}^{k, \infty}(\hat{K})$ and $\hat{v}$, $\hat{w} \in \mathbb{P}_{k-1}(\hat{K})$, and we have $E_{K}(a v w)=\operatorname{det}\left(B_{K}\right) \hat{E}(\hat{a} \hat{v} \hat{w})$.
(2) For a given $\hat{w} \in \mathbb{P}_{k-1}(\hat{K})$ and an arbitrary $\hat{\varphi} \in \mathbb{W}^{k, \infty}(\hat{K})$, $|\hat{E}(\hat{\varphi} \hat{w})| \leq \hat{C}\|\hat{\varphi} \hat{w}\|_{0, \infty, \hat{K}} \leq \hat{C}\|\hat{\varphi}\|_{0, \infty, \hat{K}}\|\hat{w}\|_{0, \infty, \hat{K}}$.
(3) Since norms on the finite dimensional space $\mathbb{P}_{k-1}(\hat{K})$ are equivalent, we have

$$
|\hat{E}(\hat{\varphi} \hat{w})| \leq \hat{C}\|\hat{\varphi}\|_{0, \infty, \hat{K}}\|\hat{w}\|_{0, \hat{K}} \leq \hat{C}\|\hat{\varphi}\|_{k, \infty, \hat{K}}\|\hat{w}\|_{0, \hat{K}} .
$$

(4) Therefore, for a fixed $\hat{w} \in \mathbb{P}_{k-1}(\hat{K}), \hat{E}(\cdot \hat{w})$ is a bounded linear form on $\mathbb{W}^{k, \infty}(\hat{K})$ with its norm $\leq \hat{C}\|\hat{w}\|_{0, \hat{K}}$.

## L Nonconformity and the Consistency Error

## - Consistency Error Caused by Numerical Integration

## Proof of the Lemma - Key: Bounds the Error by Semi-Norms

© In addition, $\hat{E}(\hat{\varphi} \hat{w})=0, \forall \hat{\varphi} \in \mathbb{P}_{k-1}(\hat{K})$. Consequently, by the Bramble-Hilbert lemma (see Theorem 7.15), we have

$$
|\hat{E}(\hat{\varphi} \hat{w})| \leq \hat{C}|\hat{\varphi}|_{k, \infty, \hat{K}}\|\hat{w}\|_{0, \hat{K}}, \forall \hat{\varphi} \in \mathbb{W}^{k, \infty}(\hat{K}), \forall \hat{w} \in \mathbb{P}_{k-1}(\hat{K}) .
$$

(0) On the other hand, for $\hat{a} \in \mathbb{W}^{k, \infty}(\hat{K})$ and $\hat{v} \in \mathbb{P}_{k-1}(\hat{K})$, by the chain rule of the derivatives of composition functions and the equivalence of norms in the finite dimensional space $\mathbb{P}_{k-1}(\hat{K})$, we have

$$
|\hat{a} \hat{v}|_{k, \infty, \hat{K}} \leq \hat{C} \sum_{j=0}^{k-1}|\hat{a}|_{k-j, \infty, \hat{K}}|\hat{v}|_{j, \infty, \hat{K}} \leq \hat{C} \sum_{j=0}^{k-1}|\hat{a}|_{k-j, \infty, \hat{K}}|\hat{v}|_{j, \hat{K}} .
$$

## Proof of the Lemma - Key: Bounds the Error in Semi-Norms

(7) (5) and (6) yield that, $\forall \hat{a} \in \mathbb{W}^{k} \infty(\hat{K})$,

$$
|\hat{E}(\hat{a} \hat{v} \hat{w})| \leq \hat{C}\left(\sum_{j=0}^{k-1}|\hat{a}|_{k-j, \infty, \hat{K}}|\hat{v}|_{j, \hat{K}}\right)\|\hat{w}\|_{0, \hat{K}}, \quad \forall \hat{v}, \hat{w} \in \mathbb{P}_{k-1}(\hat{K})
$$

(8) By the relations of the semi-norms on $K$ and $\hat{K}$, this yields

$$
\left|E_{K}(a v w)\right| \leq C h_{K}^{k}\left(\sum_{j=0}^{k-1}|a|_{k-j, \infty, K}|v|_{j, K}\right)\|w\|_{0, K}, \quad \forall v, w \in \mathbb{P}_{k-1}(K)
$$

(9) Thus, the lemma follows by taking $a=a_{i j}, v=\partial_{i} \tilde{v}$ and $w=\partial_{j} \tilde{w}$.

## L Nonconformity and the Consistency Error

- Consistency Error Caused by Numerical Integration


## Consistency Error Estimate of Bilinear Forms

(1) As a consequence of Lemma 7.2, for numerical quadrature with algebraic accuracy $2 k-2$, we see that

$$
\left|a\left(\Pi_{h} u, w_{h}\right)-a_{h}\left(\Pi_{h} u, w_{h}\right)\right| \leq C h^{k}\left(\sum_{K \in \mathfrak{T}_{h}(\Omega)}\left\|\Pi_{h} u\right\|_{k, K}^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}\left|w_{h}\right|_{1, \Omega} .
$$

(2) On the other hand, by the interpolation error estimates of the finite element solutions and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$
\left(\sum_{K \in \mathfrak{T}_{h}(\Omega)}\left\|\Pi_{h} u\right\|_{k, K}^{2}\right)^{1 / 2} \leq\|u\|_{k, \Omega}+\left(\sum_{K \in \mathfrak{T}_{h}(\Omega)}\left\|u-\Pi_{h} u\right\|_{k, K}^{2}\right)^{1 / 2} \leq C\|u\|_{k+1, \Omega}
$$

## Consistency Error Estimate of Bilinear Forms

(3) Consequently, we obtain the following consistency error estimate:

$$
\sup _{w_{h} \in \mathbb{V}_{h}} \frac{\left|a\left(\Pi_{h} u, w_{h}\right)-a_{h}\left(\Pi_{h} u, w_{h}\right)\right|}{\left\|w_{h}\right\|_{1, \Omega}} \leq C h^{k}\|u\|_{k+1, \Omega}
$$

which is the same order as the interpolation error estimate.

## L Nonconformity and the Consistency Error

Lonsistency Error Caused by Numerical Integration

## Consistency Error Estimate of Linear Forms

Similarly, the consistency error estimation can be carried out for the numerical integration of $f(v)=\int_{\Omega} f v d x$. However, to reach accuracy of order $h^{k}$, the algebraic accuracy of the numerical quadrature needs to be $2 k-1$.
(1) Consider the linear form $f(v)=\int_{\Omega} f v d x$, and numerical quadrature $f_{h}(v)=\sum_{K \in \mathfrak{T}_{h}(\Omega)} \sum_{l=1}^{L} \omega_{l, K} f\left(b_{l, K}\right) v\left(b_{l, K}\right)$.
(2) Assume $\mathbb{H}^{k}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}(\bar{\Omega})$, and the finite element $(\hat{K}, \hat{P}, \hat{\Sigma})$ and the numerical quadrature satisfy

$$
\hat{P}=\mathbb{P}_{k}(\hat{K}), \quad \text { and } \quad \hat{E}(\hat{\varphi})=0, \quad \forall \hat{\varphi} \in \mathbb{P}_{2 k-1}(\hat{K})
$$

## Consistency Error Estimate of Linear Forms

(3) Then, follows a similar argument as above, we can obtain the error estimate (see Exercise 7.9)

$$
\sup _{w_{h} \in \mathbb{V}_{h}} \frac{\left|f\left(w_{h}\right)-f_{h}\left(w_{h}\right)\right|}{\left\|w_{h}\right\|_{1, \Omega}} \leq C h^{k}|f|_{k, \Omega}
$$

## L Nonconformity and the Consistency Error

Lonsistency Error Caused by Numerical Integration

## Consistency Error Estimate of Linear Forms

There is another approach, in which, to reach the accuracy of the same order $h^{k}$, the algebraic accuracy of the numerical quadrature needed goes back to $2 k-2$. In fact, we have the following result:
(1) Let $q \geq 2$ and assume $k q>n\left(\right.$ so $\left.\mathbb{W}^{k, q}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}(\bar{\Omega})\right)$.
(2) The reference finite element $(\hat{K}, \hat{P}, \hat{\Sigma})$ and the numerical quadrature satisfy

$$
\hat{P}=\mathbb{P}_{k}(\hat{K}), \quad \text { and } \quad \hat{E}(\hat{\varphi})=0, \quad \forall \hat{\varphi} \in \mathbb{P}_{2 k-2}(\hat{K})
$$

## Consistency Error Estimate of Linear Forms

(3) Introduce a $\mathbb{P}_{0}(\hat{K})$ invariant orthogonal projection operator $\hat{\Pi}: \mathbb{L}^{2}(\hat{K}) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_{1}(\hat{K})$ induced by the $\mathbb{L}^{2}(\hat{K})$ inner product.
(4) Rewrite the error as $E\left(f w_{h}\right)=E\left(f\left(w_{h}-\Pi w_{h}\right)\right)+E\left(f \Pi w_{h}\right)$.
(5) Then, we have

$$
\sup _{w_{h} \in \mathbb{V}_{h}} \frac{\left|f\left(w_{h}\right)-f_{h}\left(w_{h}\right)\right|}{\left\|w_{h}\right\|_{1, \Omega}} \leq C h^{k}\|f\|_{k, q, \Omega} .
$$

## Summary of the a Priori Finite Element Error Estimates

The a priori finite element error estimates basically consist of the following main parts
(1) Abstract error estimate - transform the problem to the errors of subspace approximation and consistency of discrete operators.
(2) Error estimates of subspace approximation - polynomial invariant interpolation operators, polynomial invariant projection operators, polynomial quotient spaces, relations of semi-norms on affine equivalent open sets, etc..
(3) Error estimates of consistency of discrete operators polynomial invariant interpolation or projection operators and linear, bilinear forms, polynomial quotient spaces, relations of semi-norms on affine equivalent open sets, etc..

## Scaling Technique is the Key

## Remark:

An important technique: scaling

- polynomial invariant + polynomial quotient space - show the required inequality in semi-norms in the function spaces on the reference finite element;
- the relations of semi-norms on affine equivalent open sets bring out the power of $h$ (scaling).
$h^{\alpha}$ appeared in the error estimates can usually be efficiently derived by the scaling technique.
(1) A Priori Error Estimate: error bounds given by known information on the solution of the variational problem and the finite element function spaces. For example, for the second order elliptic problems, the error estimate is given by $\left\|u-u_{h}\right\|_{1, \Omega} \leq C h^{k}|u|_{k+1, \Omega}$ (see Theorem 7.10).
(2) A Posteriori Error Estimate: error bounds given by information on the numerical solutions obtained on the finite element function spaces.


## Remarks:

- In applications, $|u|_{k+1, \Omega}$ is generally not known a priori.
- A priori error estimate doesn't give a clue on how the mesh should be distributed to balance the cost and accuracy.
- Compared with the extrapolation technique (see § 1.5), the a posteriori local error estimator can be used to refine or coarsen the mesh wherever necessary locally.


## Mixed BVP of Poisson Equation on Polygonal Region in $\mathbb{R}^{2}$

- Consider the boundary value problem of the Poisson equation

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{rl}
-\Delta u & =f, \\
u & =0,
\end{array} \quad x \in \partial \Omega_{0}, \quad \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu}=g, \quad x \in \partial \Omega_{1},\right.
$$

where $\Omega$ is a polygonal region in $\mathbb{R}^{2}, \partial \Omega_{0}$ is a relatively closed subset in $\partial \Omega$ with positive 1-dimensional measure,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \partial \Omega=\partial \Omega_{0} \cup \partial \Omega_{1}, \quad \partial \Omega_{0} \cap \partial \Omega_{1}=\emptyset \\
& f \in \mathbb{L}^{2}(\Omega), g \in \mathbb{L}^{2}\left(\partial \Omega_{1}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

## Mixed BVP of Poisson Equation on Polygonal Region in $\mathbb{R}^{2}$

- consider the standard weak form of the problem:

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\text { Find } \quad u \in \mathbb{V} \text { such that } \\
\int_{\Omega} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v d x=\int_{\Omega} f v d x+\int_{\partial \Omega_{1}} g v d s, \quad \forall v \in \mathbb{V}
\end{array}\right.
$$

where $\mathbb{V}=\left\{v \in \mathbb{H}^{1}(\Omega):\left.v\right|_{\partial \Omega_{0}}=0\right\} ;$

- consider the conforming finite element method based on a family of regular class $C^{0}$ type (1) Lagrange triangular elements.


## A Theorem on the Relation of Residual and Error of a FE Solution

(1) Define the residual operator $R: \mathbb{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{V}^{*}$ of the problem by

$$
R(v)(w)=\int_{\Omega} f w d x+\int_{\partial \Omega_{1}} g w d s-\int_{\Omega} \nabla v \cdot \nabla w d x, \quad \forall w \in \mathbb{V}
$$

(2) The dual norm of the residual of a finite element solution $u_{h}$ :

$$
\left\|R\left(u_{h}\right)\right\|_{\mathbb{V}^{*}}=\sup _{\substack{w \in \mathbb{V} \\\|w\|_{1,2, \Omega}=1}}\left\{\int_{\Omega} f w d x+\int_{\partial \Omega_{1}} g w d s-\int_{\Omega} \nabla u_{h} \cdot \nabla w d x\right\}
$$

## Theorem

Let $u \in \mathbb{V}, u_{h} \in \mathbb{V}_{h}$ be the weak solution and the finite element solution of the problem respectively. Then, there exists a constant $C(\Omega)$, which depends only on $\Omega$, such that

$$
\left\|R\left(u_{h}\right)\right\|_{\mathbb{V}^{*}} \leq\left\|u-u_{h}\right\|_{1,2, \Omega} \leq C(\Omega)\left\|R\left(u_{h}\right)\right\|_{\mathbb{V}^{*}}
$$

## Proof of Residual Dual Norm $\cong$ Error of a FE Solution in $\mathbb{H}^{1}$-Norm

(1) Since $u$ is the weak solution of the problem, we have $\int_{\Omega} \nabla\left(u-u_{h}\right) \cdot \nabla w d x=\int_{\Omega} f w d x+\int_{\partial \Omega_{1}} g w d s-\int_{\Omega} \nabla u_{h} \cdot \nabla w d x, \quad \forall w \in \mathbb{V}$.
(2) Hence, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have $\int_{\Omega} \nabla\left(u-u_{h}\right) \cdot \nabla w d x \leq\left|u-u_{h}\right|_{1,2, \Omega}|w|_{1,2, \Omega} \leq\left\|u-u_{h}\right\|_{1,2, \Omega}\|w\|_{1,2, \Omega}$.
(3) Thus, the first inequality follows directly from the definition.

## Proof of Residual Dual Norm $\cong$ Error of a FE Solution in $\mathbb{H}^{1}$-Norm

(4) On the other hand, by the Poincaré-Friedrichs inequality (see Exercise 5.6), $\exists$ constant $\gamma_{0}(\Omega)>0$, s.t.

$$
\gamma_{0}\|v\|_{1,2, \Omega} \leq|v|_{1,2, \Omega}, \quad \forall v \in \mathbb{V}
$$

(5) Thus, by taking $w=u-u_{h}$ in (1), the second inequality follows for $C(\Omega)=\gamma_{0}^{-2}$.

## Remarks on Residual Dual Norm Estimation

(1) We hope to develop a formula, which is easily computed and involves only available data such as $f, g, u_{h}$ and geometric parameters of the triangulation and thus is usually called an a posteriori error estimator, to evaluate the dual norm of the residual.
(2) Recall that in the a priori error estimates, the polynomial invariant interpolation operator plays an important role. For example, write $w$ as $\left(w-\Pi_{h} w\right)+\Pi_{h} w$ can have some advantage.
(3) However, the Lagrange nodal type interpolation operators require the function to be at least in $\mathbb{C}^{0}$.
(4) Here, we need to introduce a polynomial invariant interpolation operator for functions in $\mathbb{H}^{1}$.
(1) $\mathcal{E}(K), \mathcal{N}(K):$ the sets of all edges and vertices of $K \in \mathfrak{T}_{h}(\Omega)$.
(2) Denote $\mathcal{E}_{h}:=\bigcup_{K \in \mathfrak{T}_{h}(\Omega)} \mathcal{E}(K), \mathcal{N}_{h}:=\bigcup_{K \in \mathfrak{T}_{h}(\Omega)} \mathcal{N}(K)$.
(3) $\mathcal{N}(E)$ : the sets of all vertices of an edge $E \in \mathcal{E}_{h}$.
(4) $\mathcal{E}_{h, i}:=\left\{E \in \mathcal{E}_{h}: \stackrel{\circ}{E} \subset \partial \Omega_{i}\right\}, \mathcal{N}_{h, i}:=\mathcal{N}_{h} \cap \partial \Omega_{i}, i=0,1$.
(5) $\mathcal{E}_{h, \Omega}=\mathcal{E}_{h} \backslash\left(\mathcal{E}_{h, 0} \cup \mathcal{E}_{h, 1}\right), \mathcal{N}_{h, \Omega}=\mathcal{N}_{h} \backslash\left(\mathcal{N}_{h, 0} \cup \mathcal{N}_{h, 1}\right)$.
(6) $\omega_{K}:=\bigcup_{\mathcal{E}(K) \cap \mathcal{E}\left(K^{\prime}\right) \neq \emptyset} K^{\prime}, \omega_{E}:=\bigcup_{E \in \mathcal{E}\left(K^{\prime}\right)} K^{\prime}, \omega_{x}:=\bigcup_{x \in \mathcal{N}\left(K^{\prime}\right)} K^{\prime}$.
(1) $\tilde{\omega}_{K}:=\bigcup_{\mathcal{N}(K) \cap \mathcal{N}\left(K^{\prime}\right) \neq \emptyset} K^{\prime}, \quad \tilde{\omega}_{E}:=\bigcup_{\mathcal{N}(E) \cap \mathcal{N}\left(K^{\prime}\right) \neq \emptyset} K^{\prime}$.
(8) The corresponding finite element function space:

$$
\mathbb{V}_{h}=\left\{v \in \mathbb{C}(\bar{\Omega}):\left.v\right|_{K} \in \mathbb{P}_{1}(K), \forall K \in \mathfrak{T}_{h}(\Omega), v(x)=0, \forall x \in \mathcal{N}_{h, 0}\right\} .
$$

The Clément Interpolation Operator $I_{h}: \mathbb{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{V}_{h}$

## Definition

For any $v \in \mathbb{V}$ and $x \in \mathcal{N}_{h}$, denote $\pi_{x} v$ as the $\mathbb{L}^{2}\left(\omega_{x}\right)$ projection of $v$ on $\mathbb{P}_{1}\left(\omega_{x}\right)$, meaning $\pi_{x} v \in \mathbb{P}_{1}\left(\omega_{x}\right)$ satisfies

$$
\int_{\omega_{x}} v p d x=\int_{\omega_{x}}\left(\pi_{x} v\right) p d x, \quad \forall p \in \mathbb{P}_{1}\left(\omega_{x}\right) .
$$

The Clément interpolation operator $I_{h}: \mathbb{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{V}_{h}$ is defined by
$I_{h} v(x)=\left(\pi_{x} v\right)(x), \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{N}_{h, \Omega} \cup \mathcal{N}_{h, 1} ; \quad I_{h} v(x)=0, \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{N}_{h, 0}$.
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## The Clément Interpolation Operator $I_{h}: \mathbb{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{V}_{h}$

(1) The Clément interpolation operator is well defined on $\mathbb{L}^{1}(\Omega)$.
(2) If $v \in \mathbb{P}_{1}\left(\omega_{x}\right)$, then $\left(\pi_{x}\right) v(x)=v(x), \forall x \in \omega_{x}$.
(3) If $v \in \mathbb{P}_{1}\left(\tilde{\omega}_{K}\right)$, then $I_{h} v(x)=v(x), \forall x \in K$.
(4) It is in the above sense that the Clément interpolation operator is polynomial (more precisely $\mathbb{P}_{1}$ ) invariant.

## Error Estimates of the Clément Interpolation Operator $I_{h}$

## Lemma

There exist constants $C_{1}\left(\theta_{\min }\right)$ and $C_{2}\left(\theta_{\min }\right)$, which depend only on the smallest angle $\theta_{\text {min }}$ of the triangular elements in the triangulation $\mathfrak{T}_{h}(\Omega)$, such that, for any given $K \in \mathfrak{T}_{h}(\Omega), E \in \mathcal{E}_{h}$ and $v \in \mathbb{V}$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\|v-I_{h} v\right\|_{0,2, K} & \leq C_{1}\left(\theta_{\min }\right) h_{K}|v|_{1,2, \tilde{\omega}_{K}}, \\
\left\|v-I_{h} v\right\|_{0, E}:=\left\|v-I_{h} v\right\|_{0,2, E} & \leq C_{2}\left(\theta_{\min }\right) h_{K}^{1 / 2}|v|_{1,2, \tilde{\omega}_{E}} .
\end{aligned}
$$

## Error Estimates of the Clément Interpolation Operator $I_{h}$

- More general properties and proofs on the Clément interpolation operator may be found in [8, 31].
- The basic ingredients of the proof are the scaling techniques (which include the polynomial quotient space and equivalent quotient norms, the relations of semi-norms on affine equivalent open sets), and the inverse inequality.


## 习题 8: 1, 2, 3. <br> Thank You!



