A Collocation-$H^{-1}$-Galerkin Method for Some Elliptic Equations

By Mitsuhiro Nakao

Abstract. A collocation-$H^{-1}$-Galerkin method is defined for some elliptic boundary value problems on a rectangle. The method uses tensor products of discontinuous piecewise polynomial spaces and collocation based on Jacobi points with weight function $x^2(1-x)^2$. Optimal order of $L^2$ rates of convergence is established for the approximation solution. A numerical example which confirms these results is presented.

1. Introduction. In this paper we define and analyze a collocation-$H^{-1}$-Galerkin method, for some elliptic equations on a rectangular domain in two-dimensional Euclidean space. The method uses tensor products of discontinuous piecewise polynomial spaces as the trial functions family.


In the following sections, we define a collocation-$H^{-1}$-Galerkin method for the boundary value problem: $Lu = \Delta u + qu = f$ on a rectangular domain with $u = 0$ on the boundary, and establish optimal order $L^2$ error estimates. Finally, we present
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some results of computational experiments comparing this method with the collocation-\(L^2\)-Galerkin method in [3]. In the error analysis we reduce the problem to a one-dimensional case but do not intend to use the existing estimation results. That is, this paper is essentially self-contained.

2. The Problem and Notations. Let \(E\) be a bounded open set in an \(n\)-dimensional Euclidean space \((n = 1 \text{ or } 2)\). For any integer \(s \geq 0\), we denote the usual Sobolev space of order \(s\) by \(H^s(E)\), i.e., \(H^s(E)\) is the completion of \(C_0^\infty(E)\) under the norm

\[
\|u\|_{H^s(E)} = \left( \sum_{|\alpha| \leq s} \|D^\alpha u\|_{L^2(E)}^2 \right)^{1/2},
\]

where \(\alpha\) are multi-integers and \(\|u\|_{L^2(E)}^2 = \int_E |u|^2 \, dx\).

Consider the following elliptic boundary value problem on a rectangular domain

\[
\begin{aligned}
L u &= \Delta u + qu = f, \quad \text{in } R, \\
u &= 0, \quad \text{on } \partial R,
\end{aligned}
\]

where \(R = (0,1) \times (0,1)\) and \(\Delta = \partial^2/\partial x^2 + \partial^2/\partial y^2\). Assume that \(q \in H^2(R)\) and given \(f \in L^2(R)\), (1) has a unique solution.

Let \(\delta: 0 = x_0 < x_1 < \cdots < x_n = 1,\) be a quasi-uniform partition of \(I = (0,1)\). Also let \(I_i = (x_{i-1}, x_i), h_i = x_i - x_{i-1}, h = \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} h_i,\) and \(y_k = x_k, 0 \leq k \leq N\).

For a positive integer \(r \geq 2\) and \(E \subset I\), let \(P_r(E)\) denote the set of polynomials of degree at most \(r\) on \(E\). Let

\[
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{N}_{r-1}(\delta) &= \{ v : v|_{I_i} \in P_r(I_i), 1 \leq i \leq N \}, \\
\mathcal{N}_k(\delta) &= \mathcal{N}_{r-1} \cap C^k(I) \cap H^1_0(I), \quad \text{for } k \geq 0, \\
Z_k^{r}(\delta) &= \left\{ v : v \in \mathcal{N}_k, \frac{d^r v}{dx^r}(x_i) = 0, 0 \leq i \leq N, 0 \leq j \leq k \right\}, \\
\mathcal{M}(\delta) &= \mathcal{N}_{r-1}(\delta) \otimes \mathcal{N}_1(\delta), \\
\mathcal{N}(\delta) &= \mathcal{N}_{r+2}^{r+2}(\delta) \otimes \mathcal{N}_1^{r+2}(\delta).
\end{aligned}
\]

Usually, we shall suppress the dependency on the partition in these notations. The following partition into direct sum is immediately obtained by the fact that \(\mathcal{N}_{r+2}^{r+2} = Z_{r+2}^{r+2} \otimes Z_1^{r+2}\)

\[
\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{N}_1 \oplus \mathcal{N}_2 \oplus \mathcal{N}_3 \oplus \mathcal{N}_4,
\]

where \(\mathcal{N}_1 = Z_1^{r+2} \otimes Z_1^{r+2}, \mathcal{N}_2 = Z_1^{r+2} \otimes Z_1^{r+2}, \mathcal{N}_3 = \mathcal{N}_1 \otimes Z_1^{r+2}\) and \(\mathcal{N}_4 = \mathcal{N}_1 \otimes \mathcal{N}_1^{r+2}\).

3. A Collocation-\(H^{-1}\)-Galerkin Method. Let \(\sigma_j (1 \leq j \leq r - 1)\) be zeros of the Jacobi polynomial on \(I\) with weight function \(x^2(1-x)^2\). We adopt as collocation points the \((r-1)^2\) points \((x_{ij}, y_{kl}), 1 \leq j, l \leq r - 1\) on each subrectangle \(I_i \times I_k\) which are the following affine transformations of \(\sigma_j:\)

\[
x_{ij} = x_{i-1} + h_i \sigma_j, \quad y_{kl} = y_{k-1} + h_k \sigma_j, \quad 1 \leq j, l \leq r - 1.
\]

Now we define a collocation-\(H^{-1}\)-Galerkin approximation to (1) by \(U \in \mathcal{N}\) satisfying:

\[
\begin{aligned}
\Delta U(x_{ij}, y_{kl}) + q(x_{ij}, y_{kl})U(x_{ij}, y_{kl}) &= f(x_{ij}, y_{kl}), \\
1 \leq i, k \leq N, 1 \leq j, l \leq r - 1,
\end{aligned}
\]
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(2-ii) \[ \int_{I} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} U(x_{ij}, \eta) v(\eta) \, d\eta + \int_{I} q(x_{ij}, \eta) U(x_{ij}, \eta) v''(\eta) \, d\eta \]
\[ + \int_{I} f(x_{ij}, \eta) U(x_{ij}, \eta) \, d\eta = \int_{I} f(x_{ij}, \eta) v(\eta) \, d\eta, \]
\[ 1 \leq i \leq N, \ 1 \leq j \leq r - 1, \ v \in \mathbb{R}^3, \]

(2-iii) \[ \int_{I} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} U(\xi, y_{kl}) v(\xi) \, d\xi + \int_{I} U(\xi, y_{kl}) v''(\xi) \, d\xi \]
\[ + \int_{I} q(\xi, y_{kl}) U(\xi, y_{kl}) v(\xi) \, d\xi = \int_{I} f(\xi, y_{kl}) v(\xi) \, d\xi, \]
\[ 1 \leq k \leq N, \ 1 \leq l \leq r - 1, \ v \in \mathbb{R}^3, \]

(2-iv) \[ \int_{\mathbb{R}} U(\xi, \eta)(\Delta v(\xi, \eta) + q(\xi, \eta) v(\xi, \eta)) \, d\xi d\eta \]
\[ = \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(\xi, \eta) v(\xi, \eta) \, d\xi d\eta, \ v \in \mathbb{R}^4. \]

In order to make the error estimates easy, we represent (2) in a semidiscrete variational equation. First, as in [4], we define for a function $\phi$ defined on $I$ and $v \in Z_{r+2}^r$

\[ \langle \phi, v \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} h_j \omega_j \frac{\phi(x_{ij}) v(x_{ij})}{\sigma_j^2 (1 - \sigma_j)^2} \quad \text{and} \quad \langle \phi, v \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \langle \phi, v \rangle_i, \]

where $\omega_j$ are positive constants determined by

\[ \int_{I} x^2 (1 - x)^2 p(x) \, dx = \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} \omega_j p(\sigma_j), \quad p \in P_{2r-3}(I). \]

Note that if $\phi, v \in P_{2r+1}(I_i)$, then

\[ \langle \phi, v \rangle_i = \int_{I_i} \phi(x) v(x) \, dx. \]

Furthermore, for $\phi \in \mathbb{R}^r_{+2}$

\[ \langle \phi'', \phi_1 \rangle + \langle \phi'', \phi_2 \rangle = - \langle \phi', \phi' \rangle, \]

where $\phi = \phi_1 + \phi_2$ such that $\phi_1 \in Z_{r+2}^r$ and $\phi_2 \in \mathbb{R}^3$.

Next we define for the function $\psi$ defined on $R$ and $w \in \mathbb{R}$,

\[ \langle \psi, w \rangle = \sum_{i, k=1}^{N} \left\{ \sum_{j, l=1}^{r-1} h_j h_k \omega_i \omega_l \frac{\psi(x_{ij}, y_{kl}) w(x_{ij}, y_{kl})}{\sigma_j^2 (1 - \sigma_j)^2 \sigma_l^2 (1 - \sigma_l)^2} \right\}. \]

Now, using the following unique partition for $v \in \mathbb{R}$,

\[ v = v_1 + v_2 + v_3 + v_4, \quad v_m \in \mathbb{R}, \]

a semidiscrete bilinear form $\mathcal{E}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is defined as follows:

\[ \mathcal{E}(\psi, v) = \langle L_\psi, v_1 \rangle + \int_{I} \langle L_\psi, v_2 \rangle_x \, dy + \int_{I} \langle \psi, L_\psi v_3 \rangle_x, \, dx \]
\[ + \int_{I} \langle \psi, L_\psi v_2 \rangle_x \, dy + \int_{I} \langle \psi, v_3 \rangle_x, \, dx + \langle \psi, L_\psi v_4 \rangle, \]
where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_x, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_y$ mean discrete bilinear forms defined earlier with respect to $x$ and $y$, respectively, and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ implies the $L^2$ inner product in $\mathbb{R}$. Furthermore, let

$$L_x \psi = \frac{\partial^2 \psi}{\partial x^2} + \frac{1}{2} q \psi \quad \text{and} \quad L_y \psi = \frac{\partial^2 \psi}{\partial y^2} + \frac{1}{2} q \psi.$$  

In particular, when $L = \Delta$, we denote $\mathcal{L}(\cdot, \cdot)$ by $D(\cdot, \cdot)$. Another bilinear form $\mathcal{J} (\psi, v)$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{J} (\psi, v) = \langle \langle \psi, v_1 \rangle \rangle + \int f \langle \psi, v_2 \rangle \, dy + \int g \langle \psi, v_3 \rangle \, dx + \langle \psi, v_4 \rangle.$$  

Then it can be easily seen that (2) is equivalent to

$$\mathcal{L} (U, v) = \mathcal{J} (f, v), \quad v \in \mathcal{R}.$$  

Since $\mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{R}$ are of the same dimension, existence of $U$ satisfying (8) is equivalent to uniqueness, but the uniqueness will immediately follow from the theorems in the next section as it is required that $h$ is sufficiently small except for $L = \Delta$.

We now provide some well-known inequalities for later use. When $\phi \in H^2(I_1)$, we have ([4] and [5])

$$\| \phi \|_{L^\infty(I_1)} \leq C \left( h_1^{1/2} \| \phi_x \|_{L^2(I_1)} + h_1^{-3/2} \| \phi \|_{L^2(I_1)} \right),$$  

and

$$\| \phi \|_{L^\infty(I_1)} \leq C \left( h_1^{1/2} \| \phi_x \|_{L^2(I_1)} + h_1^{-1/2} \| \phi \|_{L^2(I_1)} \right).$$  

Also, let $v \in P_s(I_1) \otimes P_t(I_1)$ and $\rho = I_1 \times I_1$. Then, by the quasi-uniformity assumption on the partition $\mathcal{D}$, we have the following inverse properties [7]:

$$\| v \|_{L^\infty(\rho)} \leq C h^{-1} \| v \|_{L^2(\rho)},$$  

and

$$\| \nabla v \|_{L^2(\rho)} \leq C h^{-1} \| v \|_{L^2(\rho)}.$$  

Here and throughout this paper, we use $C$ to denote a generic constant not necessarily the same in any two places. Also $v_m \ (1 \leq m \leq 4)$ denotes the $m$th component of $v$ in (6) unless otherwise stated.


4.1. For $L = \Delta$.

Let $P : H^3(I) \to \mathcal{R}_{-1}$ be a projection determined by the relations

$$\langle g - (P g)'', w_1 \rangle = 0, \quad w_1 \in Z_1^{r + 2},$$  

and

$$\langle g - P g, w_2'' \rangle = 0, \quad w_2 \in \mathcal{R}_{-1}. $$  

Since the definition of $P$ is local, the following lemma is easily obtained from elementary approximation theory.

**Lemma 1.** For any $s$ such that $3 \leq s \leq r + 1$, if $g \in H^s(I_1)$, then there exists a constant $C > 0$, independent of $h$, such that

$$\| g - P g \|_{H^s(I_1)} \leq C h^{r - m} \| g \|_{H^s(I_1)}, \quad 0 \leq m \leq s.$$  


Using this lemma for \( s = 3 \) and \( m = 0 \), by the triangle inequality we obtain

**Corollary 1.** For any \( g \in H^3(I) \), we have

\[
\|Pg\|_{L^2(I)} \leq C\left(\|g\|_{L^2(I)} + h^3\|g\|_{H^1(I)}\right).
\]

For \( u \in H^6(R) \), let \( P_xu \) be the above projection of \( u \) in the \( x \) direction for each fixed \( y \). Similarly \( P_yu \) is defined. From the definition, we have \( P_xP_yu = P_xP_yu \in \mathcal{N} \).

Now we have the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.** Let \( 3 \leq s \leq r + 1 \) and \( u \in H^{s+3}(\rho) \) for \( \rho = I_y \times I_k \). Then there exists a constant \( C > 0 \), independent of \( h \), such that

\[
\|u - P_xP_yu\|_{H^m(\rho)} \leq Ch^{s-m}\left(\|u\|_{H^1(\rho)} + h^3\|u\|_{H^{s+1}(\rho)}\right), \quad 0 \leq m \leq s.
\]

**Proof.** First, by Lemma 1, Corollary 1 and the property of the operator \( P \), we have

\[
\|u - P_xP_yu\|_{L^2(\rho)} \leq \|u - P_xu\|_{L^2(\rho)} + \|P_xu - P_xP_yu\|_{L^2(\rho)}
\]

\[
\leq Ch^s\|u\|_{H^1(\rho)} + Ch^s\sum_{\alpha=0}^s \left( \|\frac{\partial^\alpha u}{\partial x^\alpha}\|_{L^2(\rho)}^2 \right)^{1/2}
\]

\[
= Ch^s\left(\|u\|_{H^1(\rho)} + \sum_{\alpha=0}^s \left( \|\frac{\partial^\alpha u}{\partial x^\alpha}\|_{L^2(\rho)}^2 \right)^{1/2}\right)
\]

\[
\leq Ch^s\left(\|u\|_{H^1(\rho)} + h^3\|u\|_{H^{s+1}(\rho)}\right).
\]

This implies that the lemma is valid for \( m = 0 \). Next, for \( m \geq 1 \), choosing \( Q \in P_x(I_y) \otimes P_y(I_k) \) appropriately to approximate \( u \) (e.g., the \( L^2 \)-projection of \( u \)),(12) and the above inequality yield

\[
\|u - P_xP_yu\|_{H^m(\rho)} \leq \|u - Q\|_{H^m(\rho)} + \|Q - P_yP_yu\|_{H^m(\rho)}
\]

\[
\leq Ch^{s-m}\|u\|_{H^1(\rho)} + Ch^{-m}\|Q - P_yP_yu\|_{L^2(\rho)}
\]

\[
\leq C\left( h^{s-m}\|u\|_{H^1(\rho)} + h^{-m}\|u - Q\|_{L^2(\rho)} + h^{-m}\|u - P_yP_yu\|_{L^2(\rho)}\right)
\]

\[
\leq Ch^{s-m}\left(\|u\|_{H^1(\rho)} + h^3\|u\|_{H^{s+1}(\rho)}\right),
\]

which proves the lemma.

We now prove the following theorem which provides optimal order \( L^2 \) error estimates for \( u - U \) when \( L = \Delta \).

**Theorem 1.** Let \( u \) and \( U \) be solutions to (1) and (2), respectively, for \( L = \Delta \). If \( u \in H^{r+s+4}(R) \), then there exists a constant \( C > 0 \), independent of \( h \), such that

\[
\|u - U\|_{L^2(R)} \leq Ch^{r+s+1}\left(\|u\|_{H^{s+1}(R)} + h^3\|u\|_{H^{r+s}(R)}\right).
\]

**Proof.** Let \( W = P_yP_xu \), \( \xi = u - W \) and \( \eta = U - W \). Then from (1) and (8),

\[
D(\eta, v) = D(\xi, v), \quad v \in \mathcal{N}.
\]
Let $v \in \mathcal{U}$ satisfy $v_{xxy} = -\eta$. Using (3) and (4) one can verify that

\begin{equation}
D(\eta, v) \geq \|v_{xxy}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R})} + \|v_{yxy}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R})} = \|\nabla v_y\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R})}.
\end{equation}

Next we estimate the right-hand side of (13). By the definition,

\begin{equation}
D(\xi, v) = \langle \langle \xi_{xx}, v_1 \rangle \rangle + \int_I \langle \xi_{xx}, v_2 \rangle_x dy + \int_I \langle \xi, v_{2xx} \rangle_x dx + \langle \xi, v_{4xx} \rangle
+ \langle \langle \xi_{yy}, v_1 \rangle \rangle + \int_I \langle \xi, v_{2yy} \rangle_x dy + \int_I \langle \xi_{yy}, v_3 \rangle_x dx + \langle \xi, v_{4yy} \rangle
= \nu_x + \nu_y,
\end{equation}

where $\nu_x$ and $\nu_y$ are the sums of first and last four terms, respectively.

We now estimate each term in $\nu_x$ separately. Let $\mathcal{R} = \{\rho: \rho = I_i \times I_k, 1 \leq i, k \leq N\}$. First, for any $Q \in \mathcal{U}$, we have

\begin{equation}
\langle \langle \xi_{xx}, v_1 \rangle \rangle \leq C h^2 \sum_{\rho \in \mathcal{R}} \|\xi_{xx}\|_{L^\infty(\rho)} \|v_1\|_{L^\infty(\rho)}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\leq C h^2 \sum_{\rho \in \mathcal{R}} \left( \left\| \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} (u - Q) \right\|_{L^\infty(\rho)} + \left\| \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} (Q - W) \right\|_{L^\infty(\rho)} \right) \|v_1\|_{L^\infty(\rho)}.
\end{equation}

If we select $Q$ appropriately to approximate $u$ (e.g., local $L^2$-projection of $u$ into $\mathcal{U}$), then, by simple calculations using (9) and (10), we obtain

\begin{equation}
\left\| \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} (u - Q) \right\|_{L^\infty(\rho)} \leq C h^{-2} \|u\|_{H^{r+1}(\rho)}.
\end{equation}

Hence, from (15), (11), (12) and Lemma 2,

\begin{equation}
\langle \langle \xi_{xx}, v_1 \rangle \rangle \leq C h^2 \sum_{\rho \in \mathcal{R}} \left( h^{-2} \|u\|_{H^{r+1}(\rho)} + h^{-3} \|Q - W\|_{L^2(\rho)} h^2 \|v_1_{xxy}\|_{L^2(\rho)} \right)
\leq C h^4 \sum_{\rho \in \mathcal{R}} \left( h^{-2} \|u\|_{H^{r+1}(\rho)} + h^{-3} \|u - W\|_{L^2(\rho)} \right) \|v_1_{xxy}\|_{L^2(\rho)}
\leq C h^{r+2} \left( \|u\|_{H^{r+1}(\rho)} + h^3 \|u\|_{H^{r+4}(\rho)} \right) \|v_1_{xxy}\|_{L^2(\rho)}.
\end{equation}

Next, by the definition of $P$ and (3), for any map $w: I_{(x)} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_{-1(y)}$

\begin{equation}
\int_I \langle \xi_{xx}, v_2 \rangle_x dy = \int_I \left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} (u - P_x u), v_2 \right)_x dy
+ \int_I \left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} (P_y u - P_x P_y u), v_2 \right)_x dy
= \int_I \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} (P_x u - P_y P_y u) \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} (v_2 - w_{yy}) dy
\end{equation}

Notice that we can choose $w$ satisfying

\[ \|v_2 - w_{yy}(x, \cdot)\|_{L^2(I)} \leq C h \|v_2(x, \cdot)\|_{H^r(I)}. \]
Thus, by (17), (12) for its one-dimensional version and Corollary 1, we obtain

\[
\int_I \langle \xi_{xx}, v_{3xx} \rangle_y \, dx \leq C \int_I h^{r+2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} P_x u(x, \cdot) \left\| v_{3y}(x, \cdot) \right\|_{L^2(I)} \, dx
\]

\[
\leq Ch^{r+2} \sum_{j=1}^N \left( \sum_{a=0}^{r+1} h^2 \left\| \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} P_x \frac{\partial a u}{\partial y^a} \right\|_{L^2(I, I)} \right) \left\| v_{2xyz} \right\|_{L^2(I, I)}
\]

\[
\leq Ch^{r+2} \sum_{j=1}^N \left( \sum_{a=0}^{r+1} \left\| P_x \frac{\partial a u}{\partial y^a} \right\|_{L^2(I, I)} \right) \left\| v_{2xyz} \right\|_{L^2(I, I)}
\]

\[
\leq Ch^{r+2} \sum_{j=1}^N \left( \left\| u \right\|_{H^{r+1}(I, I)} + h^3 \left\| u \right\|_{H^{r+4}(I, I)} \right) \left\| v_{2xyz} \right\|_{L^2(I, I)}
\]

\[
\leq Ch^{r+2} \left( \left\| u \right\|_{H^{r+1}(I)} + h^3 \left\| u \right\|_{H^{r+4}(R)} \right) \left\| v_{2xyz} \right\|_{L^2(R)}.
\]

On the third term, we see that

\[
\int_I \langle \xi, v_{3xx} \rangle_y \, dx = \int_I \langle u - P_x u, v_{3xx} \rangle_y \, dx + \int_I \langle P_x u - P_x P_x u, v_{3xx} \rangle_y \, dx
\]

\[
= \int_I \left( \langle u - P_x u, v_{3xx} \rangle_y - \langle u - P_x u, v_{3xx} \rangle_y \right) \, dx
\]

\[
+ \int_I \langle u - P_x u, v_{3xx} \rangle_y \, dx.
\]

But, it is shown in [4, Lemma 4.1] that

\[
\left| \langle u - P_x u, v_{3xx} \rangle_y - \langle u - P_x u, v_{3xx} \rangle_y \right| \leq C h^2 \sum_{k=1}^N \left\| u - P_x u \right\|_{H^k(I)} \left\| v_{3xx} \right\|_{L^2(I)}.
\]

Also, using a similar estimation to that of the preceding term

\[
\left| \langle u - P_x u, v_{3xx} \rangle_y \right| \leq C \left\| u - P_x u \right\|_{L^2(I)} \left\| v_{3xx} \right\|_{L^2(I)}.
\]

Thus, by Lemma 1 we have

\[
\int_I \langle \xi, v_{3xx} \rangle_y \, dx \leq Ch^{r+2} \left\| u \right\|_{H^{r+1}(R)} \left\| v_{3xx} \right\|_{L^2(R)}.
\]

The last term is estimated by an argument similar to a part of the previous terms and Lemma 1. That is,

\[
\left| \langle \xi, v_{4xx} \rangle \right| = \left| \langle u - P_x u, v_{4xx} \rangle \right| \leq Ch^{r+2} \left\| u \right\|_{H^{r+1}(R)} \left\| v_{4xx} \right\|_{L^2(R)}.
\]

Now, note that

\[
\left\| v_{mxx} \right\|_{L^2(R)} \leq C \left\| v_{xx} \right\|_{L^2(R)}, \quad 1 \leq m \leq 4.
\]

Therefore, from (16), (18), (19), (20) and (21), we have

\[
\left\| v_x \right\| \leq Ch^{r+2} \left( \left\| u \right\|_{H^{r+1}(R)} + h^3 \left\| u \right\|_{H^{r+4}(R)} \right) \left\| \nabla v_y \right\|_{L^2(R)}.
\]
Since \( v \) is estimated in a similar manner, by (13) and (14),

\[
\| \nabla v_{xy} \|_{L^2(R)} \leq C h^{r+2} \left( \| u \|_{H^{r+1}(R)} + h^3 \| u \|_{H^{r+4}(R)} \right).
\]

Thus by (12)

\[
\| U - W \|_{L^2(R)} \leq C h^{r+1} \left( \| u \|_{H^{r+1}(R)} + h^3 \| u \|_{H^{r+4}(R)} \right).
\]

The proof of the theorem now follows from (23), Lemma 2 and the triangle inequality.

It is easily seen that, from the above process of the proof and Lemma 2, Theorem 1 is extended to the following form.

**Corollary 2.** Let \( u \) and \( U \) be solutions to (1) and (2), respectively, for \( L = \Delta \). If \( u \in H^{r+4}(\rho) \) for \( \rho \in \Re \), there exists a constant \( C > 0 \), independent of \( h \), such that for \( 0 \leq m \leq r \),

\[
\left( \sum_{\rho \in \Re} \| u - U \|_{H^m(\rho)}^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq C h^{r+1-m} \left( \sum_{\rho \in \Re} \| u \|_{H^r(\rho)}^2 + h^6 \| u \|_{H^{r+4}(\rho)} \right)^{1/2}.
\]

4.2. For \( L = \Delta + q \).

We define a projection \( Y \in \mathcal{N} \) by

\[
D(u - Y, v) = 0, \quad v \in \mathcal{N}.
\]

Now, let \( \eta = U - Y \) and \( \xi = U - Y \). Then, from (8),

\[
\mathcal{L}(\eta, v) - (\eta, qv_4) = \mathcal{L}(\xi, v) - (\eta, qv_4), \quad v \in \mathcal{N}.
\]

One can easily verify that if we take \( v \in \mathcal{N} \) satisfying \( v_{xy} = -\eta \), then

\[
|\mathcal{L}(\eta, v) - (\eta, qv_4) - D(\eta, v)| \leq C h^2 \| \nabla v_{xy} \|_{L^2(R)}.
\]

Hence, if \( h \) is sufficiently small, by (14), there exists a constant \( C > 0 \), independent of \( h \), such that

\[
\mathcal{L}(\eta, v) - (\eta, qv_4) \leq \mathcal{L}(\eta, v) - (\eta, qv_4).
\]

This relation will play an essential role in the proof of the following theorem.

**Theorem 2.** Let \( u \) and \( U \) be solutions to (1) and (2), respectively. If \( u \in H^{r+4}(R) \), then, for \( h \) sufficiently small, there exists a constant \( C > 0 \), independent of \( h \), such that

\[
\| u - U \|_{L^2(R)} \leq C h^{r+1} \left( \| u \|_{H^{r+1}(R)} + h^3 \| u \|_{H^{r+4}(R)} \right).
\]

**Proof.** From (24), we have

\[
\mathcal{L}(\xi, v) - (\eta, qv_4) = \langle \langle q\xi, v_1 \rangle \rangle + \int_I \langle q\xi, v_2 \rangle_x dy
\]

\[
+ \int_I \langle q\xi, v_3 \rangle_x dx + (u - U, qv_4).
\]

First, by Sobolev's lemma, Corollary 2 and (11)

\[
|\langle \langle q\xi, v_1 \rangle \rangle| \leq C h^2 \sum_{\rho \in \Re} \| \xi \|_{L^\infty(\rho)} \| v_1 \|_{L^2(\rho)}
\]

\[
\leq C h^3 \sum_{\rho \in \Re} \| \xi \|_{H^2(\rho)} \| \nabla v_{xy} \|_{L^2(\rho)}
\]

\[
\leq C h^{r+2} \left( \| u \|_{H^{r+1}(R)} + h^3 \| u \|_{H^{r+4}(R)} \right) \| \nabla v_{xy} \|_{L^2(R)}.
\]
Similarly, we have
\[
\left| \int f \langle q \xi, v_2 \rangle_\gamma \, dy \right| \leq C \int \sum_{i=1}^{N} h \| \xi (\cdot, y) \|_{L^2_\gamma (I_i)} \| v_2 (\cdot, y) \|_{L^2_\gamma (I_i)} \, dy
\]
\[
\leq C \int \sum_{i=1}^{N} h^2 \| \xi (\cdot, y) \|_{H^2_\gamma (I_i)} \| v_2, y (\cdot, y) \|_{L^2_\gamma (I_i)} \, dy
\]
\[
\leq Ch^{r+2} \left( \| u \|_{H^{r+1} (R)} + h^3 \| u \|_{H^{r+4} (R)} \right) \| v_2 x y \|_{L^2 (R)}
\]
The third term is estimated in the same manner.

In order to estimate the last term, let \( \xi = u - U \), and we consider the following boundary value problem.

\[
L \Phi = q v_4 \quad \text{in } R,
\]
\[
\Phi = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial R.
\]
Choosing \( \Phi \in \mathcal{N}_4 \) appropriately to approximate \( \Phi \) (e.g. piecewise Hermite interpolant), by (2-iv) and elliptic regularity, we have
\[
\left| \left( \xi, q v_4 \right) \right| = \left| \left( \xi, L (\Phi - \Phi) \right) \right| \leq \sum_{\rho \in \Omega} \left| \left( \xi, L (\Phi - \Phi) \right) \right|_{\rho}
\]
\[
\leq C \sum_{\rho \in \Omega} \| \xi \|_{L^2_\gamma (I)} \| h^2 \Phi \|_{H^2 (\rho)} \leq Ch^2 \| \xi \|_{L^2 (R)} \| q v_4 \|_{H^2 (R)}
\]
\[
\leq Ch^2 \| \xi \|_{L^2 (I)} \| v_4 \|_{L^2 (R)}
\]
Thus, by (25), (26), (27) and (12)
\[
\| \eta \|_{L^2 (R)} \leq Ch^{r+1} \left( \| u \|_{H^{r+1} (R)} + h^3 \| u \|_{H^{r+4} (R)} \right) + h \| u - U \|_{L^2 (R)}
\]
Therefore, if \( h \) is sufficiently small, by Theorem 1 and the triangle inequality we obtain the desired result.

Remarks. 1. While Theorem 2 is valid for sufficiently small \( h \), Theorem 1 is so for an arbitrary mesh size.

2. For \( r \geq 5 \), it is possible that the norms on the right-hand side of all inequalities in the theorems can be weakened up to optimal size.

5. A Numerical Example. We made a numerical experiment with our method for the following problem.

\[
(28) \quad \Delta u = -2\pi^2 \sin \pi x \sin \pi y, \quad (x, y) \in R,
\quad u = 0, \quad (x, y) \in \partial R.
\]
The exact solution of the above is \( u(x, y) = \sin \pi x \sin \pi y \). We used piecewise quadratic polynomials and uniform partitions. Table I shows the results of this experiment. Each item in Table I reads as follows:

- \( N \): Number of partitions of \( I \) (\( h = 1/N \)).
- \( E_{\text{mesh}} \): Maximum of the errors at all interior mesh points.
- \( E_{\text{mild}} \): Maximum of the errors at the middle points of all subrectangles.
- \( E_{\text{oth}} \): Maximum of the errors at the points of the form \((x_i - 0.75h, y_j - 0.75h) \), \( 1 \leq i, j \leq N \).
Here, we adopted the maximum value of four different limits as the interior mesh point error for the discontinuity of the approximate solution. These results will be sufficient to confirm the cubic rates of convergence.

**Table I**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>$E_{\text{mesh}}$</th>
<th>$E_{\text{midd}}$</th>
<th>$E_{\text{oth}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1211E-1</td>
<td>0.1146E-2</td>
<td>0.4716E-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.2327E-2</td>
<td>0.1575E-3</td>
<td>0.9639E-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.8373E-3</td>
<td>0.4181E-4</td>
<td>0.3501E-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now, in order to compare our method, we also computed numerical solutions by the collocation-$L^2$-Galerkin method in [3] to (28) using the same degree ($r = 2$). The results are illustrated in Table II.

**Table II**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>$E_{\text{mesh}}$</th>
<th>$E_{\text{midd}}$</th>
<th>$E_{\text{oth}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3286E-3</td>
<td>0.5131E-2</td>
<td>0.9266E-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.8165E-4</td>
<td>0.6895E-3</td>
<td>0.1979E-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.2521E-4</td>
<td>0.1816E-3</td>
<td>0.7154E-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From these two tables it is seen that our method is inferior in the mesh points error. However, it seems to be a rather natural result because our trial functions were permitted discontinuity across the elements. On the other hand, it is clear that our method is superior for the error at the middle points. Similar phenomena were also observed at several other interior points in each subrectangle (see $E_{\text{oth}}$ in these tables).
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