

An unusual stabilized finite element method for a generalized Stokes problem

Gabriel R. Barrenechea^{1,2}, Frédéric Valentin³

¹ INRIA Projet M3N, Domaine de Voluceau, 78153 Le Chesnay, France;
e-mail: Gabriel.Barrenechea@inria.fr

² Departamento de Ingeniería Matemática, Universidad de Concepción, Casilla 160-C,
Concepción, Chile

³ LNCC, Av. Getúlio Vargas, 333, 25651-070 Petrópolis - RJ, Brazil;
e-mail: Valentin@Incc.br

Received April 26, 2001 / Revised version received July 30, 2001 /
Published online October 17, 2001 – © Springer-Verlag 2001

Summary. An unusual stabilized finite element is presented and analyzed herein for a generalized Stokes problem with a dominating zeroth order term. The method consists in subtracting a mesh dependent term from the formulation without compromising consistency. The design of this mesh dependent term, as well as the stabilization parameter involved, are suggested by bubble condensation. Stability is proven for any combination of velocity and pressure spaces, under the hypotheses of continuity for the pressure space. Optimal order error estimates are derived for the velocity and the pressure, using the standard norms for these unknowns. Numerical experiments confirming these theoretical results, and comparisons with previous methods are presented.

Mathematics Subject Classification (1991): 65N30

1 Introduction

Numerical solution of Stokes-like systems presents a major difficulty, namely, the need for a compatibility condition (the inf-sup condition, see [13], [5], and the references therein) relating the discrete spaces used to approximate the velocity field \mathbf{u} and the pressure p . It is a well known fact that equal order interpolation spaces for velocity and pressure, which are the most attractive spaces from an implementational point of view, fail to satisfy this

Correspondence to: Gabriel R. Barrenechea

condition. To overcome this difficulty, in the mid eighties Hughes et.al. [18], [17] and Brezzi et. al. [7], [6] introduced a new formulation based on a Petrov-Galerkin idea that consists in adding a mesh dependent term to the formulation in order to make stable pairs of spaces that weren't stable. This new formulation received the name of Stabilized Finite Element Methods. An error analysis was performed in all previous references based on a H^1 -type seminorm for the pressure, analysis that was improved in [11] where optimal order approximation results were obtained using the L^2 -norm of the pressure.

On the other hand, stabilized finite element methods for problems with zeroth order terms have been derived in the last few years. In [15] a stabilized finite element method was proposed for the advective-diffusive equation with a production term. In [21] a Streamline Diffusion Finite Element Method (SDFEM) was proposed and analyzed for a Stokes problem with a zeroth order term and under the presence of convection (and also the analysis of the method was performed for the full Navier-Stokes equation). On the other hand, in [10] the connection of Stabilized methods with Galerkin methods enriched with bubble functions (connection first pointed out in [19], [2] and [4]) was used to derive a new kind of stabilized finite element method, namely, the Unusual Stabilized Finite Element Method (USFEM). The particularity of such methods is that the mesh-dependent term is now subtracted from the formulation to reduce the impact of the zeroth order term without compromising the consistency of the method. The method from [10] has been recently improved in [12] where an advective-diffusive-reactive equation is treated (see also [16] where the extension to the case of a negative zeroth order term is considered).

The purpose of this work is to derive, analyze and test a new unusual stabilized finite element method, analogous to the one presented in [12], for a generalized Stokes problem, this is, a Stokes-like system with a dominating zeroth order term. This kind of problems arise naturally in the time discretization of a non-steady Stokes problem, or the full Navier-Stokes equations by means of an operator splitting technique. The derivation of the method is sketched in Sect. 2 using an idea from [1] to build a special bubble space which reproduces the residual of the discrete equations and then to proceed with the bubble condensation procedure. This calculation suggests to us the form of the mesh dependent term to be subtracted from the formulation, as well as the design of the stabilization parameter. The method is then introduced in Sect. 3 where the stability of the method is proved and an error analysis based on an H^1 -type seminorm for the pressure is performed. This estimate is improved in Sect. 4, where a new stability result is given (based on an inf-sup condition now) and an error estimate is given, this time using the L^2 norm of the pressure. Finally, in Sect. 5 we

report some numerical experiments that confirm our approximation results and the absence of oscillations for the pressure for a wide range of physical parameters.

2 Preliminaries: The effect of bubbles

Let Ω be a bounded open subset of \mathbb{R}^2 , $\mathbf{f} \in L^2(\Omega)^2$ and σ a positive real number (typically, $\sigma \approx \frac{1}{\Delta t}$ where Δt is the time step in a time discretization procedure). Then, our generalized Stokes problem reads: Find $(\mathbf{u}, p) \in H^1(\Omega)^2 \times L_0^2(\Omega)$ such that:

$$(1) \quad \begin{aligned} \sigma \mathbf{u} - \nu \Delta \mathbf{u} + \nabla p &= \mathbf{f} && \text{in } \Omega \\ \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} &= 0 && \text{in } \Omega \\ \mathbf{u} &= 0 && \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{aligned}$$

where $L_0^2(\Omega) := \{q \in L^2(\Omega) : (q, 1)_\Omega = 0\}$, and $(\cdot, \cdot)_D$ denotes the L^2 inner product in $L^2(D)$ (or in $L^2(D)^2, L^2(D)^{2 \times 2}$, when necessary). The weak form of this problem reads: Find $(\mathbf{u}, p) \in H_0^1(\Omega)^2 \times L_0^2(\Omega)$ such that:

$$(2) \quad a(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) - (p, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v})_\Omega + (q, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u})_\Omega = (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{v})_\Omega,$$

for all $(\mathbf{v}, q) \in H_0^1(\Omega)^2 \times L_0^2(\Omega)$, where

$$(3) \quad a(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) := \sigma(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})_\Omega + \nu(\nabla \mathbf{u}, \nabla \mathbf{v})_\Omega.$$

Let \mathbf{V}_h and Q_h be finite dimensional subspaces of $H_0^1(\Omega)^2$ and $L_0^2(\Omega)$, respectively. Then, the usual Galerkin scheme reads: Find $(\mathbf{u}_h, p_h) \in \mathbf{V}_h \times Q_h$ such that:

$$(4) \quad a(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h) - (p_h, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_h)_\Omega + (q_h, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}_h)_\Omega = (\mathbf{f}_h, \mathbf{v}_h)_\Omega,$$

for all $(\mathbf{v}_h, q_h) \in \mathbf{V}_h \times Q_h$. This problem is well posed only if the interpolation spaces are compatible in the sense of the inf-sup condition (see [13], [5]). The addition of bubble functions to the velocity space has been proved to be a way of building stable pairs of spaces, and this is why we now introduce a suitable velocity space which contains bubbles. Let \mathcal{T}_h be a triangulation of Ω made up of triangles, and let us suppose that this triangulation is shape regular (for the details, see [8]). We denote by \mathcal{B}_K a space of bubble functions, subspace of $H_0^1(K)$. We define the spaces

$$(5) \quad \mathcal{B} := \bigoplus_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \mathcal{B}_K \subset H_0^1(\Omega),$$

and

$$(6) \quad \mathbf{V}_h := [V_1 + \mathcal{B}]^2,$$

where $V_1 := \{v \in C^0(\overline{\Omega})/v|_K \in P^1(K), \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h\}$, and we seek a solution of (2)-(3) belonging to $\mathbf{V}_h \times V_1$. Hence, what we look for is a solution of the form

$$(7) \quad \mathbf{u}_h = \mathbf{u}_1 + \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \mathbf{u}_B^K,$$

where \mathbf{u}_1 belongs to $[V_1]^2$ and \mathbf{u}_B^K belongs to $[\mathcal{B}_K]^2$, for all $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$.

What we do now is to give an expression of the bubble part of the solution \mathbf{u}_B^K in terms of its linear part \mathbf{u}_1 , pressure p , and \mathbf{f} , and then plug this representation into the equations to build a new method. This process is called bubble condensation procedure. To this end, we first test (4) against a function $(\mathbf{v}_B^K, 0)$ in each K , with $\mathbf{v}_B^K \in [\mathcal{B}_K]^2$, and we arrive at

$$(8) \quad a(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v}_B^K)_K + a(\mathbf{u}_B^K, \mathbf{v}_B^K)_K - (p, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_B^K)_K = (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{v}_B^K)_K \quad \forall \mathbf{v}_B^K \in [\mathcal{B}_K]^2,$$

for all $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$, where the subscript K indicates integration over K . Now, we note that, integrating by parts and using the fact that $\mathbf{u}_1 \in P^1(K)^2$ and $\mathbf{v}_B^K \in H_0^1(K)^2$ we have

$$(9) \quad (\nabla \mathbf{u}_1, \nabla \mathbf{v}_B^K)_K = 0,$$

$$(10) \quad (p, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_B^K)_K = -(\nabla p, \mathbf{v}_B^K)_K.$$

Hence, (8) reduces to

$$(11) \quad a(\mathbf{u}_B^K, \mathbf{v}_B^K)_K = (\mathbf{f} - \sigma \mathbf{u}_1 - \nabla p, \mathbf{v}_B^K)_K \quad \forall \mathbf{v}_B^K \in [\mathcal{B}_K]^2,$$

or, written in another way

$$(12) \quad a(\mathbf{u}_B^K, \mathbf{v}_B^K)_K = (P_B^K(\mathbf{f} - \sigma \mathbf{u}_1 - \nabla p), \mathbf{v}_B^K)_K \quad \forall \mathbf{v}_B^K \in [\mathcal{B}_K]^2,$$

where P_B^K is the L^2 -projection from $P^1(K)^2$ onto $[\mathcal{B}_K]^2$. We point out now that, for simplicity of the presentation, we have restricted ourselves to the case $\mathbf{f} \in P^1(K)^2 \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h$, and hence our residual $\mathbf{f} - \sigma \mathbf{u}_1 - \nabla p$ belongs to $P^1(K)^2$. Now, to set our problem in the notations used in [1] we define the operator $S_B^K : [\mathcal{B}_K]^2 \rightarrow [\mathcal{B}_K]^2$ as $S_B(\psi) = \mathbf{b}$, where \mathbf{b} is the (unique) solution of

$$(13) \quad a(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{v}_B^K)_K = (\psi, \mathbf{v}_B^K)_K \quad \forall \mathbf{v}_B^K \in [\mathcal{B}_K]^2.$$

With this notation we see that the bubble part of \mathbf{u}_h is given by

$$(14) \quad \mathbf{u}_B^K = S_B P_B^K(\mathbf{f} - \sigma \mathbf{u}_1 - \nabla p) \quad \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h.$$

Our objective is to give an expression for \mathbf{u}_B^K in terms of \mathbf{u}_1 , p and \mathbf{f} simpler than the one given in (14).

Now, for the sake of the derivation of a stabilized finite element method, we will suppose that there exists a bubble space \mathcal{B}_K reproducing the linear

operator $\mu[I_{P_1}]^2$ (where I_{P_1} is the identity operator on $P^1(K)$ and $\mu > 0$ will be specified later); this is, a bubble space \mathcal{B}_K such that $P_{P_1}^K S_B P_B^K = \mu[I_{P_1}]^2$, $P_{P_1}^K$ being the L^2 -projection from $[\mathcal{B}_K]^2$ onto $[P^1(K)]^2$. The detailed proof of this fact can be found in [3], where the same construction from [1] § 3.1 is used, obtaining the constant $\mu = \frac{C_1 h_K^2}{\sigma h_K^2 + C_2 \nu}$, where C_1 and C_2 are positive constants depending only on the shape of triangle K . Hence (14) leads to

$$P_{P_1}(\mathbf{u}_B^K) = \frac{C_1 h_K^2}{\sigma h_K^2 + C_2 \nu} (\mathbf{f} - \sigma \mathbf{u}_1 - \nabla p).$$

Finally, we rewrite (4) with this choice of bubble part. Using (9) we get, for all $\mathbf{v}_1 \in [V_1]^2$

$$\begin{aligned} a(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_1) &= a(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v}_1) + \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} a(\mathbf{u}_B^K, \mathbf{v}_1)_K \\ (15) \quad &= a(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v}_1) + \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \frac{C_1 h_K^2}{\sigma h_K^2 + C_2 \nu} (\mathbf{f} - \sigma \mathbf{u}_1 - \nabla p, \sigma \mathbf{v}_1)_K, \end{aligned}$$

and, analogously

$$\begin{aligned} (q, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}_h)_\Omega &= (q, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}_1)_\Omega + \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} (q, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}_B^K)_K \\ (16) \quad &= (q, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}_1)_\Omega - \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \frac{C_1 h_K^2}{\sigma h_K^2 + C_2 \nu} (\mathbf{f} - \sigma \mathbf{u}_1 - \nabla p, \nabla q)_K. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, adding (15) and (16) we arrive at the following ‘‘bubble condensed’’ Galerkin scheme: Find $(\mathbf{u}_1, p) \in [V_1]^2 \times V_1$ such that:

$$\begin{aligned} &a(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v}_1) - (p, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_1)_\Omega + (q, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}_1)_\Omega \\ &- \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \frac{C_1 h_K^2}{\sigma h_K^2 + C_2 \nu} (\sigma \mathbf{u}_1 + \nabla p, \sigma \mathbf{v}_1 - \nabla q)_K \\ (17) \quad &= (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{v}_1)_\Omega - \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \frac{C_1 h_K^2}{\sigma h_K^2 + C_2 \nu} (\mathbf{f}, \sigma \mathbf{v}_1 - \nabla q)_K. \end{aligned}$$

3 The stabilized finite element method

In this section we present the stabilized finite element method that we are going to use, and state stability and approximation results.

First, based on the calculations made in previous section, we introduce the following unusual stabilized finite element method: Find $(\mathbf{u}_h, p_h) \in \mathbf{V}_h \times Q_h$ such that:

$$(18) \quad \mathbf{B}((\mathbf{u}_h, p_h), (\mathbf{v}, q)) = \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{v}, q) \quad \forall (\mathbf{v}, q) \in \mathbf{V}_h \times Q_h,$$

where $\mathbf{V}_h := [V_k \cap H_0^1(\Omega)]^2$, $Q_h := V_l \cap L_0^2(\Omega)$, $k, l \geq 1$, and where, for $k \geq 1$, $V_k := \{v \in C^0(\bar{\Omega})/v|_K \in P^k(K), \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h\}$. In (18), \mathbf{B} and \mathbf{F} are given by

$$(19) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbf{B}((\mathbf{u}_h, p_h), (\mathbf{v}, q)) := & \sigma(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v})_\Omega + \nu(\nabla \mathbf{u}_h, \nabla \mathbf{v})_\Omega - (p_h, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v})_\Omega \\ & + (q, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}_h)_\Omega - \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \tau_K (\sigma \mathbf{u}_h - \nu \Delta \mathbf{u}_h \\ & + \nabla p_h, \sigma \mathbf{v} - \nu \Delta \mathbf{v} - \nabla q)_K, \end{aligned}$$

$$(20) \quad \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{v}, q) := (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{v})_\Omega - \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \tau_K (\mathbf{f}, \sigma \mathbf{v} - \nu \Delta \mathbf{v} - \nabla q)_K.$$

Here, the stabilization parameter τ_K is given by

$$(21) \quad \tau_K := \frac{h_K^2}{\sigma h_K^2 \xi(\lambda_K) + \frac{4\nu}{m_k}},$$

where

$$(22) \quad \lambda_K = \frac{4\nu}{m_k \sigma h_K^2},$$

$$(23) \quad m_k = \min\left\{\frac{1}{3}, C_k\right\},$$

$$(24) \quad C_k h_K^2 \|\Delta v\|_{0,K}^2 \leq \|\nabla v\|_{0,K}^2 \quad \forall v \in V_k,$$

$$(25) \quad \xi(\lambda) = \max\{\lambda, 1\}.$$

Remark 3.1 The design of the stabilization parameter has been done in order to have no free constants to set, which is a common fact in Stokes flow stabilization (see, for example [18], and [21]). Indeed, the only non explicit constant in the design of the parameter is m_k , which varies from one kind of element to another one, but these constants have been tabulated in [14]. We also remark that, even if the derivation of the method has been done using equal order interpolation spaces for the velocity and pressure, the method can be used for different order interpolation spaces, as long as we use continuous interpolations for the pressure. \square

Remark 3.2 If $k = 1$ (i.e., in the case in which we use piecewise linear elements for the velocity), then our method is much simpler, with $m_1 = \frac{1}{3}$. In fact, it reduces to the formulation (17) from § 2, with τ_K instead of the quotient used there. On the other hand, in the case of a diffusive dominated flow ($\frac{4\nu}{m_k} \geq \sigma h_K^2$), and of course for the Stokes flow as a limit when $\sigma \rightarrow 0$, we recover the GLS method from [17], with the following stabilization parameter

$$\tau_K = \frac{m_k h_K^2}{8\nu} . \square$$

Remark 3.3 We recall the formulation of the SDFEM method from [21]: Find $(\mathbf{u}_h, p_h) \in \mathbf{V}_h \times Q_h$ such that:

$$(26) \mathbf{B}_\delta((\mathbf{u}_h, p_h), (\mathbf{v}_h, q_h)) = \mathbf{F}_\delta(\mathbf{v}_h, q_h) \quad \forall (\mathbf{v}_h, q_h) \in \mathbf{V}_h \times Q_h ,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{B}_\delta((\mathbf{u}_h, p_h), (\mathbf{v}_h, q_h)) &:= \sigma (\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h)_\Omega + \nu (\nabla \mathbf{u}_h, \nabla \mathbf{v}_h)_\Omega \\ &\quad - (p_h, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_h)_\Omega + (q_h, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}_h)_\Omega \\ &\quad + \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \frac{\delta h_K^2}{\nu} (\sigma \mathbf{u}_h - \nu \Delta \mathbf{u}_h + \nabla p_h, \nabla q_h)_K , \\ \mathbf{F}_\delta(\mathbf{v}_h, q_h) &:= (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{v}_h)_\Omega + \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \frac{\delta h_K^2}{\nu} (\mathbf{f}, \nabla q_h)_K , \end{aligned}$$

and δ is a positive real constant. There are two major differences between the SDFEM method and our method. First, the design of the stabilization parameter which has a constant to set in the SDFEM method. Moreover, the constant δ for the SDFEM method must depend on σ to have stability. Indeed, in [21] stability is proved under the assumption $\frac{\delta \sigma h_K^2}{\nu} \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and $\delta \leq \frac{C_k}{2}$. The other difference with our method is the absence of $\sigma \mathbf{v}_h - \nu \Delta \mathbf{v}_h$ on the test function term, which is not present in (26). \square

Remark 3.4 From now on, $\|\cdot\|_{l,D}$ and $|\cdot|_{l,D}$ will denote the norm and seminorm on $H^l(D)$ (or in $H^l(D)^2$ when necessary), respectively, with the usual convention $H^0(D) = L^2(D)$. Also, the following seminorm will be useful later:

$$(27) \quad |p|_h := \left\{ \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \tau_K \|\nabla p\|_{0,K}^2 \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} .$$

Now, since we are looking for continuous approximations of the pressure (since we demand $l \geq 1$), the space in which we are looking the discrete pressure for is a subspace of $H^1(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}$, space in which $|\cdot|_h$ is a norm.

Further, we state two inverse inequalities which will be useful later on. First, using an inverse estimate analogous to (24) (see [8]) we easily obtain

$$(28) \quad |p|_h \leq C(l) \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\nu}} \|p\|_{0,\Omega}.$$

Secondly, by the definition of τ_K , the inverse inequality (24) and the fact that $\frac{m_k}{C_k} \leq 1$, we obtain

$$(29) \quad \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \nu^2 \tau_K \|\Delta \mathbf{v}\|_{0,K}^2 \leq \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \nu \|\nabla \mathbf{v}\|_{0,K}^2.$$

Finally, we point out the fact that, since we are interested in an error estimate for k and l fixed, $C(l)$ (a constant depending only on l) and m_k are treated as simple constants. Moreover, we have $m_k \leq \frac{1}{3}$. \square

3.1 The stability of the method

The main result concerning numerical stability of our method is stated as follows.

Lemma 3.1 *There exists a constant $C_\Omega > 0$ (depending only on Ω) such that*

$$\mathbf{B}((\mathbf{v}, q), (\mathbf{v}, q)) \geq C_\Omega \nu \|\mathbf{v}\|_{1,\Omega}^2 + |q|_h^2,$$

for all $(\mathbf{v}, q) \in \mathbf{V}_h \times Q_h$.

Proof. Let us first remark that, since $\xi(\lambda_K) \geq 1$, we have the following bound for τ_K

$$(30) \quad \tau_K \leq \frac{m_k h_K^2}{m_k \sigma h_K^2 + 4\nu}.$$

Also, by the definition of m_k (cf. (23)) we have $m_k \leq C_k$. Now, using Schwarz's inequality and (24) we see that (denoting with the subscript K the integration over K)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{B}((\mathbf{v}, q), (\mathbf{v}, q))_K &= \sigma \|\mathbf{v}\|_{0,K}^2 + \nu \|\nabla \mathbf{v}\|_{0,K}^2 + \tau_K \|\nabla q\|_{0,K}^2 \\ &\quad - \sigma^2 \tau_K \|\mathbf{v}\|_{0,K}^2 + 2\sigma \nu \tau_K (\mathbf{v}, \Delta \mathbf{v})_K - \tau_K \nu^2 \|\Delta \mathbf{v}\|_{0,K}^2 \\ &\geq (\sigma - \sigma^2 \tau_K) \|\mathbf{v}\|_{0,K}^2 + \nu \|\nabla \mathbf{v}\|_{0,K}^2 + \tau_K \|\nabla q\|_{0,K}^2 \\ &\quad - 2\sigma \nu \tau_K \|\mathbf{v}\|_{0,K} \|\Delta \mathbf{v}\|_{0,K} - \frac{\nu^2 \tau_K h_K^{-2}}{C_k} \|\nabla \mathbf{v}\|_{0,K}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Now, since $2ab \leq \frac{1}{\gamma}a^2 + \gamma b^2$ with $\gamma > 0$, we see that (taking $a = \sqrt{\sigma\nu\tau_K}\|\mathbf{v}\|_{0,K}$ and $b = \sqrt{\sigma\nu\tau_K}\|\Delta\mathbf{v}\|_{0,K}$), applying once more (24)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{B}((\mathbf{v}, q), (\mathbf{v}, q))_K &\geq (\sigma - \sigma^2\tau_K) \|\mathbf{v}\|_{0,K}^2 + \tau_K \|\nabla q\|_{0,K}^2 \\ &\quad + \left(\nu - \frac{\nu^2\tau_K h_K^{-2}}{C_k} \right) \|\nabla\mathbf{v}\|_{0,K}^2 \\ &\quad - \left(\frac{\sigma\nu\tau_K}{\gamma} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{0,K}^2 + \frac{\gamma\sigma\nu\tau_K h_K^{-2}}{C_k} \|\nabla\mathbf{v}\|_{0,K}^2 \right) \\ &= (\sigma - \sigma^2\tau_K - \frac{\sigma\nu\tau_K}{\gamma}) \|\mathbf{v}\|_{0,K}^2 + \tau_K \|\nabla q\|_{0,K}^2 \\ &\quad + \left(\nu - \frac{\nu^2\tau_K h_K^{-2}}{C_k} - \frac{\gamma\sigma\nu\tau_K h_K^{-2}}{C_k} \right) \|\nabla\mathbf{v}\|_{0,K}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Using (30) and the fact that $\frac{m_k}{C_k} \leq 1$ we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{B}((\mathbf{v}, q), (\mathbf{v}, q))_K \\ &\geq \left(\sigma - \frac{\sigma^2 m_k h_K^2}{m_k \sigma h_K^2 + 4\nu} - \frac{\sigma\nu m_k h_K^2}{\gamma(m_k \sigma h_K^2 + 4\nu)} \right) \|\mathbf{v}\|_{0,K}^2 \\ &\quad + \left(\nu - \frac{m_k \nu^2}{C_k(m_k \sigma h_K^2 + 4\nu)} - \frac{m_k \sigma\nu\gamma}{C_k(m_k \sigma h_K^2 + 4\nu)} \right) \|\nabla\mathbf{v}\|_{0,K}^2 \\ &\quad + \tau_K \|\nabla q\|_{0,K}^2 \\ &\geq \left[\frac{\sigma\nu(4\gamma - m_k h_K^2)}{\gamma(m_k \sigma h_K^2 + 4\nu)} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{0,K}^2 + \frac{3\nu^2 + \sigma\nu(m_k h_K^2 - \gamma)}{m_k \sigma h_K^2 + 4\nu} \|\nabla\mathbf{v}\|_{0,K}^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \tau_K \|\nabla q\|_{0,K}^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, it suffices to take $\gamma = \frac{m_k h_K^2}{4}$ to obtain

$$B((\mathbf{v}, q), (\mathbf{v}, q))_K \geq \frac{3\nu}{4} \|\nabla\mathbf{v}\|_{0,K}^2 + \tau_K \|\nabla q\|_{0,K}^2,$$

on each K , and the proof is finished by adding over $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$ and applying Poincaré's inequality. \square

Remark 3.5 From the proof of Lemma 3.1, we note that we have not used the fact that $q \in L_0^2(\Omega)$, and therefore this lower bound for \mathbf{B} is valid also in $\mathbf{V}_h \times V_l$. This fact will be exploited in the proof of the error below, in which we will use an interpolate of p which does not necessarily belong to $L_0^2(\Omega)$. \square

3.2 Error Analysis

Let k, l be integers with $k, l \geq 1$. We suppose the existence of interpolation operators $\mathbf{I}_h^k : (C^0(\bar{\Omega}))^2 \rightarrow [V_k]^2$ and $I_h^l : C^0(\bar{\Omega}) \rightarrow V_l$ (the Lagrange interpolate, see [8]) such that the approximation of \mathbf{u} by $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h := \mathbf{I}_h^k(\mathbf{u})$ and p by $\tilde{p}_h := I_h^l(p)$ can be estimated as follows

$$(31) \quad |\eta^{\mathbf{u}}|_{m,K} := |\mathbf{u} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h|_{m,K} \leq Ch_K^{s-m} |\mathbf{u}|_{s,K} \quad \forall \mathbf{u} \in H^s(K)^2,$$

$$(32) \quad |\eta^p|_{n,K} := |p - \tilde{p}_h|_{n,K} \leq Ch_K^{t-n} |p|_{t,K} \quad \forall p \in H^t(K),$$

for all $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$, with $0 \leq m \leq 2$ and $\max\{m, 1\} \leq s \leq k+1$, and $0 \leq n \leq 1$ and $\max\{n, 1\} \leq t \leq l+1$. Further, we define $h := \max\{h_K : K \in \mathcal{T}_h\}$, and from now on, we will suppose that $h \leq 1$.

Now we state the main result of this section, result analogous to the one given in [12] for an advective-reactive-diffusive equation.

Theorem 3.1 *Let us suppose that the solution (\mathbf{u}, p) of (1) belongs to $(H^{k+1}(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega))^2 \times (H^{l+1}(\Omega) \cap L_0^2(\Omega))$. Then, there exists $C > 0$, independent of h , such that the error $(\mathbf{e}^{\mathbf{u}}, e^p) := (\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h, p - p_h)$ satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} & \| \mathbf{e}^{\mathbf{u}} \|_{1,\Omega} + |e^p|_h \leq \\ & C \frac{\max\{\sigma + 1, \nu + 1, \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\nu}}\}}{\min\{C_{\Omega\nu}, 1\}} [h^k |\mathbf{u}|_{k+1,\Omega} + h^{l+1} |p|_{l+1,\Omega}]. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let $\mathbf{e}_h^{\mathbf{u}} := \mathbf{u}_h - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h$ and $e_h^p := p - \tilde{p}_h$. Then, from Lemma 3.1, the definition of \mathbf{B} and the consistency of the method we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \min\{C_{\Omega\nu}, 1\} (\| \mathbf{e}_h^{\mathbf{u}} \|_{1,\Omega}^2 + |e_h^p|_h^2) \\ & \leq C_{\Omega\nu} \| \mathbf{e}_h^{\mathbf{u}} \|_{1,\Omega}^2 + |e_h^p|_h^2 \\ & \leq \mathbf{B}((\mathbf{e}_h^{\mathbf{u}}, e_h^p), (\mathbf{e}_h^{\mathbf{u}}, e_h^p)) \\ & = \mathbf{B}((\eta^{\mathbf{u}}, \eta^p), (\mathbf{e}_h^{\mathbf{u}}, e_h^p)) \\ & = \sigma(\eta^{\mathbf{u}}, \mathbf{e}_h^{\mathbf{u}})_{\Omega} + \nu(\nabla \eta^{\mathbf{u}}, \nabla \mathbf{e}_h^{\mathbf{u}})_{\Omega} - (\eta^p, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{e}_h^{\mathbf{u}})_{\Omega} + (e_h^p, \nabla \cdot \eta^{\mathbf{u}})_{\Omega} \\ & \quad - \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \tau_K (\sigma \eta^{\mathbf{u}} - \nu \Delta \eta^{\mathbf{u}} + \nabla \eta^p, \sigma \mathbf{e}_h^{\mathbf{u}} - \nu \Delta \mathbf{e}_h^{\mathbf{u}} - \nabla e_h^p)_K, \end{aligned}$$

but, since $\eta^{\mathbf{u}}$ vanishes on $\partial\Omega$ (since \mathbf{u} belongs to $H_0^1(\Omega)^2$), we have after integration by parts

$$\begin{aligned} & \min\{C_{\Omega\nu}, 1\} (\| \mathbf{e}_h^{\mathbf{u}} \|_{1,\Omega}^2 + |e_h^p|_h^2) \\ & \leq \sigma(\eta^{\mathbf{u}}, \mathbf{e}_h^{\mathbf{u}})_{\Omega} + \nu(\nabla \eta^{\mathbf{u}}, \nabla \mathbf{e}_h^{\mathbf{u}})_{\Omega} - (\eta^p, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{e}_h^{\mathbf{u}})_{\Omega} - (\nabla e_h^p, \eta^{\mathbf{u}})_{\Omega} \\ & \quad - \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \tau_K (\sigma \eta^{\mathbf{u}} - \nu \Delta \eta^{\mathbf{u}} + \nabla \eta^p, \sigma \mathbf{e}_h^{\mathbf{u}} - \nu \Delta \mathbf{e}_h^{\mathbf{u}} - \nabla e_h^p)_K \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\leq \left[\sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \sigma \|\eta^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{0,K}^2 + \nu \|\nabla \eta^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{0,K}^2 + \|\eta^p\|_{0,K}^2 + \frac{1}{\tau_K} \|\eta^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{0,K}^2 \right. \\
 &\quad \left. + \tau_K \|\sigma \eta^{\mathbf{u}} - \nu \Delta \eta^{\mathbf{u}} + \nabla \eta^p\|_{0,K}^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
 &\quad \cdot \left[\sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \sigma \|\mathbf{e}_h^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{0,K}^2 + \nu \|\nabla \mathbf{e}_h^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{0,K}^2 + \|\nabla \cdot \mathbf{e}_h^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{0,K}^2 + \tau_K \|\nabla e_h^p\|_{0,K}^2 \right. \\
 &\quad \left. + \tau_K \|\sigma \mathbf{e}_h^{\mathbf{u}} - \nu \Delta \mathbf{e}_h^{\mathbf{u}} + \nabla e_h^p\|_{0,K}^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
 &\leq C \left[\sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \left(\sigma + \sigma^2 \tau_K + \frac{1}{\tau_K} \right) \|\eta^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{0,K}^2 + \nu \|\nabla \eta^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{0,K}^2 \right. \\
 &\quad \left. + \nu^2 \tau_K \|\Delta \eta^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{0,K}^2 + \|\eta^p\|_{0,K}^2 + \tau_K \|\nabla \eta^p\|_{0,K}^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
 &\quad \cdot \left[\sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} (\sigma + \sigma^2 \tau_K) \|\mathbf{e}_h^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{0,K}^2 + (\nu + 1) \|\nabla \mathbf{e}_h^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{0,K}^2 \right. \\
 &\quad \left. + \nu^2 \tau_K \|\Delta \mathbf{e}_h^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{0,K}^2 + \tau_K \|\nabla e_h^p\|_{0,K}^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{33}
 \end{aligned}$$

Now, we use (29), the fact that $\sigma^2 \tau_K \leq \sigma$ and $\nu^2 \tau_K \leq C \nu h_K^2$ and we obtain from (33)

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\min\{C_\Omega \nu, 1\} (\|\mathbf{e}_h^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{1,\Omega}^2 + |e_h^p|^2) \\
 &\leq C \left[\sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \left(\sigma + \frac{1}{\tau_K} \right) \|\eta^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{0,K}^2 + \nu \|\nabla \eta^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{0,K}^2 + \nu h_K^2 \|\Delta \eta^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{0,K}^2 \right. \\
 &\quad \left. + \|\eta^p\|_{0,K}^2 + \frac{h_K^2}{4\nu} \|\nabla \eta^p\|_{0,K}^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
 &\quad \cdot \left[\sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \sigma \|\mathbf{e}_h^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{0,K}^2 + (\nu + 1) \|\nabla \mathbf{e}_h^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{0,K}^2 + \tau_K \|\nabla e_h^p\|_{0,K}^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
 &\leq C \sqrt{\max\{\sigma, \nu + 1\}} \left[\sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \left(\sigma + \frac{1}{\tau_K} \right) \|\eta^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{0,K}^2 + \nu \|\nabla \eta^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{0,K}^2 \right.
 \end{aligned}$$

$$+ \nu h_K^2 \|\Delta \eta^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{0,K}^2 + \|\eta^p\|_{0,K}^2 + \frac{h_K^2}{4\nu} \|\nabla \eta^p\|_{0,K}^2 \Big]^{1/2} \cdot [\|\mathbf{e}_h^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{1,\Omega}^2 + |e_h^p|^2]^{1/2},$$

and hence, dividing by the last term we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathbf{e}_h^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{1,\Omega} + |e_h^p|_h \\ & \leq C \frac{\sqrt{\max\{\sigma, \nu + 1\}}}{\min\{C_\Omega \nu, 1\}} \left[\sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \left(\sigma + \frac{1}{\tau_K} \right) \|\eta^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{0,K}^2 + \nu \|\nabla \eta^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{0,K}^2 \right. \\ (34) \quad & \left. + \nu h_K^2 \|\Delta \eta^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{0,K}^2 + \|\eta^p\|_{0,K}^2 + \frac{h_K^2}{4\nu} \|\nabla \eta^p\|_{0,K}^2 \right]^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, since $\mathbf{e}^{\mathbf{u}} = \eta^{\mathbf{u}} - \mathbf{e}_h^{\mathbf{u}}$ and $e^p = \eta^p - e_h^p$, we have thanks to (34) and triangular inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{e}^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{1,\Omega} + |e^p|_h & \leq \|\mathbf{e}_h^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{1,\Omega} + |e_h^p|_h + \|\eta^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{1,\Omega} + |\eta^p|_h \\ & \leq C \frac{\sqrt{\max\{\sigma, \nu + 1\}}}{\min\{C_\Omega \nu, 1\}} \left[\sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \left(\sigma + \frac{1}{\tau_K} \right) \|\eta^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{0,K}^2 + \nu \|\nabla \eta^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{0,K}^2 \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \nu h_K^2 \|\Delta \eta^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{0,K}^2 + \|\eta^p\|_{0,K}^2 + \frac{h_K^2}{4\nu} \|\nabla \eta^p\|_{0,K}^2 \right]^{1/2} + \|\eta^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{1,\Omega} + |\eta^p|_h \\ & \leq C \frac{\sqrt{\max\{\sigma, \nu + 1\}}}{\min\{C_\Omega \nu, 1\}} \left[\sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \left(\sigma + 1 + \frac{1}{\tau_K} \right) \|\eta^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{0,K}^2 + (\nu + 1) \|\nabla \eta^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{0,K}^2 \right. \\ (35) \quad & \left. + \nu h_K^2 \|\Delta \eta^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{0,K}^2 + \|\eta^p\|_{0,K}^2 + \frac{h_K^2}{4\nu} \|\nabla \eta^p\|_{0,K}^2 \right]^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we have to separate two cases:

i).- $\lambda_K < 1$. In this case, we have $4\nu < m_k \sigma h_K^2$ and hence

$$\frac{1}{\tau_K} = \frac{m_k \sigma h_K^2 + 4\nu}{m_k h_K^2} < 2\sigma,$$

and then (35) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathbf{e}^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{1,\Omega} + |e^p|_h \\ & \leq C \frac{\sqrt{\max\{\sigma, \nu + 1\}}}{\min\{C_\Omega \nu, 1\}} \left[\sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} (\sigma + 1) \|\eta^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{0,K}^2 + (\nu + 1) \|\nabla \eta^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{0,K}^2 \right. \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & + \nu h_K^2 \|\Delta \eta^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{0,K}^2 + \max\left\{1, \frac{1}{4\nu}\right\} (\|\eta^p\|_{0,K}^2 + h_K^2 \|\nabla \eta^p\|_{0,K}^2) \Big]^{1/2} \\
 \leq & C \frac{\max\{\sigma + 1, \nu + 1\}}{\min\{C_{\Omega\nu}, 1\}} \left[\sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \|\eta^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{0,K}^2 + \|\nabla \eta^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{0,K}^2 + h_K^2 \|\Delta \eta^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{0,K}^2 \right. \\
 & \left. + \max\left\{1, \frac{1}{4\nu}\right\} (\|\eta^p\|_{0,K}^2 + h_K^2 \|\nabla \eta^p\|_{0,K}^2) \right]^{1/2} \\
 \leq & C \frac{\max\{\sigma + 1, \nu + 1, \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\nu}}\}}{\min\{C_{\Omega\nu}, 1\}} [h^k |\mathbf{u}|_{k+1,\Omega} + h^{l+1} |p|_{l+1,\Omega}].
 \end{aligned}$$

ii).- $\lambda_K \geq 1$. In this case, we have $4\nu \geq m_k \sigma h_K^2$ and hence

$$\frac{1}{\tau_K} = \frac{m_k \sigma h_K^2 + 4\nu}{m_k h_K^2} \leq \frac{8\nu}{m_k h_K^2}.$$

In this case, (35) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|\mathbf{e}^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{1,\Omega} + |e^p|_h & \leq C \frac{\sqrt{\max\{\sigma, \nu + 1\}}}{\min\{C_{\Omega\nu}, 1\}} \\
 & \left[\sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \max\{\sigma + 1, \nu\} h_K^{-2} \|\eta^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{0,K}^2 + (\nu + 1) \|\nabla \eta^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{0,K}^2 \right. \\
 & \left. + \nu h_K^2 \|\Delta \eta^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{0,K}^2 + \max\left\{1, \frac{1}{4\nu}\right\} (\|\eta^p\|_{0,K}^2 + h_K^2 \|\nabla \eta^p\|_{0,K}^2) \right]^{1/2} \\
 \leq & C \frac{\max\{\sigma + 1, \nu + 1\}}{\min\{C_{\Omega\nu}, 1\}} \left[\sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} h_K^{-2} \|\eta^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{0,K}^2 + \|\nabla \eta^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{0,K}^2 \right. \\
 & \left. + h_K^2 \|\Delta \eta^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{0,K}^2 + \max\left\{1, \frac{1}{4\nu}\right\} (\|\eta^p\|_{0,K}^2 + h_K^2 \|\nabla \eta^p\|_{0,K}^2) \right]^{1/2} \\
 \leq & C \frac{\max\{\sigma + 1, \nu + 1, \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\nu}}\}}{\min\{C_{\Omega\nu}, 1\}} [h^k |\mathbf{u}|_{k+1,\Omega} + h^{l+1} |p|_{l+1,\Omega}].
 \end{aligned}$$

Both cases i) and ii) finish the proof. \square

4 An improved error estimate

The approximation result presented in previous section has two drawbacks. First, it does not guarantee convergence for the case in which $p \in H^l(\Omega)$,

which is an interesting case, specially when $l = 1$. Second, it considers only the error in the norm $|\cdot|_h$ for the pressure, norm which is not the natural norm for the pressure space $L^2_0(\Omega)$.

Based on these considerations, in this section we perform an improved error analysis based no longer on the ellipticity of bilinear form \mathbf{B} , but on an inf-sup condition, which is valid for the L^2 -norm for the pressure.

4.1 A new stability result

Throughout all this section (and the following one), C and $C_i, i > 0$ will denote positive constants independent of h , but who may depend on the physical parameters σ and ν . Moreover, the value of C may vary whenever it is written in two different places.

In the proof of the inf-sup condition below, we will use the following technical result, which is a slight variation of Lemma 3.2 in [11] (see also [20], and [22], where the original idea can be found).

Lemma 4.1 *There exist $C_1, C_2 \in \mathbb{R}^+$ such that*

$$\sup_{\mathbf{0} \neq \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{V}_h} \frac{(\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}, p)_\Omega}{\|\mathbf{v}\|_{1,\Omega}} \geq C_1 \|p\|_{0,\Omega} - C_2 \sqrt{\sigma + 4\nu} |p|_h,$$

for all $p \in Q_h$.

Proof. Since $p \in L^2_0(\Omega)$, there exists (cf. [13]) a nonvanishing $\mathbf{w} \in H^1_0(\Omega)^2$ such that

$$(36) \quad (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{w}, p)_\Omega \geq C_3 \|p\|_{0,\Omega} \|\mathbf{w}\|_{1,\Omega}.$$

Furthermore, there exists (cf. [13] pp.109-111) an interpolant (the Clément interpolant, originally proposed in [9]) $\tilde{\mathbf{w}} \in \mathbf{V}_h$ such that

$$(37) \quad \left\{ \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} h_K^{-2} \|\mathbf{w} - \tilde{\mathbf{w}}\|_{0,K}^2 \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C_4 \|\mathbf{w}\|_{1,\Omega},$$

and

$$(38) \quad \|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}\|_{1,\Omega}^2 \leq C_5 \|\mathbf{w}\|_{1,\Omega}^2.$$

Hence, using the fact that $p \in Q_h \subseteq C^0(\bar{\Omega})$ and (36) we can integrate by parts to arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} (\nabla \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{w}}, p)_\Omega &= (\nabla \cdot (\tilde{\mathbf{w}} - \mathbf{w}), p)_\Omega + (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{w}, p)_\Omega \\ &\geq - \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} (\tilde{\mathbf{w}} - \mathbf{w}, \nabla p)_K + C_3 \|p\|_{0,\Omega} \|\mathbf{w}\|_{1,\Omega} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\geq - \left(\sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \frac{1}{\tau_K} \|\mathbf{w} - \tilde{\mathbf{w}}\|_{0,K}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot \left(\sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \tau_K \|\nabla p\|_{0,K}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad + C_3 \|p\|_{0,\Omega} \|\mathbf{w}\|_{1,\Omega}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we have that

$$(39) \quad \frac{1}{\tau_K} = \frac{\sigma h_K^2 \xi(\lambda_K) + \frac{4\nu}{m_k}}{h_K^2} \leq \begin{cases} C_6 \frac{4\nu}{h_K^2} & \text{if } \lambda_K \geq 1 \\ C_6 \frac{\sigma+4\nu}{h_K^2} & \text{if } \lambda_K < 1, \end{cases}$$

keeping in mind that we have supposed that $h_K \leq 1$. Thus we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} &(\nabla \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{w}}, p)_\Omega \\ &\geq -C_6 \left(\sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} (\sigma + 4\nu) h_K^{-2} \|\mathbf{w} - \tilde{\mathbf{w}}\|_{0,K}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot \left(\sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \tau_K \|\nabla p\|_{0,K}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad + C_3 \|\mathbf{w}\|_{1,\Omega} \|p\|_{0,\Omega} \\ &\geq C_6 \left\{ -C_4 \sqrt{\sigma + 4\nu} \left(\sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \tau_K \|\nabla p\|_{0,K}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + C_3 \|p\|_{0,\Omega} \right\} \|\mathbf{w}\|_{1,\Omega} \\ &= C_6 \{ -C_4 \sqrt{\sigma + 4\nu} |p|_h + C_3 \|p\|_{0,\Omega} \} \|\mathbf{w}\|_{1,\Omega}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, using (38) we arrive at

$$(40) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{(\nabla \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{w}}, p)_\Omega}{\|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}\|_{1,\Omega}} &\geq \frac{(\nabla \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{w}}, p)_\Omega}{\sqrt{C_5} \|\mathbf{w}\|_{1,\Omega}} \\ &\geq \frac{-C_6 C_4}{\sqrt{C_5}} \sqrt{\sigma + 4\nu} |p|_h + \frac{C_6 C_3}{\sqrt{C_5}} \|p\|_{0,\Omega}, \end{aligned}$$

which finishes the proof. \square

Now we are ready to prove the second result on stability of the method, namely, the inf-sup condition.

Lemma 4.2 *There exists a constant $C = C(\sigma, \nu) > 0$ such that*

$$\sup_{\mathbf{0} \neq (\mathbf{v}, q) \in \mathbf{V}_h \times Q_h} \frac{\mathbf{B}((\mathbf{u}, p), (\mathbf{v}, q))}{(\|\mathbf{v}\|_{1,\Omega}^2 + \|q\|_{0,\Omega}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \geq C (\|\mathbf{u}\|_{1,\Omega}^2 + \|p\|_{0,\Omega}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

for all $(\mathbf{v}, q) \in \mathbf{V}_h \times Q_h$.

Proof. Let $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbf{V}_h$ be a function for which the supremum in Lemma 4.1 is obtained, and let us assume that $\|\mathbf{w}\|_{1,\Omega} = \|p\|_{0,\Omega}$. Then, using the bilinearity of \mathbf{B} , Schwarz's inequality and Lemma 4.1 we arrive at:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mathbf{B}((\mathbf{u}, p), (-\mathbf{w}, 0)) \\
 &= -\mathbf{B}((\mathbf{u}, 0), (\mathbf{w}, 0)) - \mathbf{B}((\mathbf{0}, p), (\mathbf{w}, 0)) \\
 &\geq - \left\{ \sigma \|\mathbf{u}\|_{0,\Omega}^2 + \nu \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{0,\Omega}^2 + \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \tau_K \|\sigma \mathbf{u} - \nu \Delta \mathbf{u}\|_{0,K}^2 \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
 &\quad \cdot \left\{ \sigma \|\mathbf{w}\|_{0,\Omega}^2 + \nu \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{0,\Omega}^2 + \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \tau_K \|\sigma \mathbf{w} - \nu \Delta \mathbf{w}\|_{0,K}^2 \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
 &\quad + C_1 \|p\|_{0,\Omega} \|\mathbf{w}\|_{1,\Omega} - C_2 \sqrt{\sigma + 4\nu} |p|_h \|\mathbf{w}\|_{1,\Omega} \\
 (41) \quad & - \left\{ \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \tau_k \|\nabla p\|_{0,K}^2 \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \left\{ \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \tau_k [\sigma^2 \|\mathbf{w}\|_{0,K}^2 + \nu^2 \|\Delta \mathbf{w}\|_{0,K}^2] \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Now, applying (29), the fact that $\|\mathbf{w}\|_{1,\Omega} = \|p\|_{0,\Omega}$ and $\sigma \tau_K \leq 1$, (41) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mathbf{B}((\mathbf{u}, p), (-\mathbf{w}, 0)) \\
 &\geq -C_7 \left\{ \sigma \|\mathbf{u}\|_{0,\Omega}^2 + \nu \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{0,\Omega}^2 \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot \left\{ \sigma \|\mathbf{w}\|_{0,\Omega}^2 + \nu \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{0,\Omega}^2 \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
 &\quad + C_1 \|p\|_{0,\Omega}^2 - C_2 \sqrt{\sigma + 4\nu} |p|_h \|p\|_{0,\Omega} \\
 &\quad - C_8 |p|_h \left\{ \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} [\sigma \|\mathbf{w}\|_{0,K}^2 + \nu \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{0,K}^2] \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
 &\geq -C_7 \max\{\sigma, \nu\} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{1,\Omega} \|\mathbf{w}\|_{1,\Omega} + C_1 \|p\|_{0,\Omega}^2 - C_2 \sqrt{\sigma + 4\nu} |p|_h \|p\|_{0,\Omega} \\
 &\quad - C_8 |p|_h \left\{ \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} [\sigma \|\mathbf{w}\|_{0,K}^2 + \nu \|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_{0,K}^2] \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
 &\geq -C_7 \max\{\sigma, \nu\} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{1,\Omega} \|p\|_{0,\Omega} + C_1 \|p\|_{0,\Omega}^2 \\
 &\quad - C_2 \sqrt{\sigma + 4\nu} |p|_h \|p\|_{0,\Omega} - C_8 \max\{\sigma, \nu\}^{\frac{1}{2}} |p|_h \|p\|_{0,\Omega}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Now, using the inequality $ab \leq \frac{1}{2\gamma} a^2 + \frac{\gamma}{2} b^2$, $\gamma > 0$, in all the terms which involve a product of norms above, we arrive at

$$\mathbf{B}((\mathbf{u}, p), (-\mathbf{w}, 0))$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\geq -\frac{C_7}{2\gamma_1} \max\{\sigma, \nu\} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{1,\Omega}^2 \\
 &\quad + \left(C_1 - \frac{\max\{\sigma, \nu\}}{2} [C_7\gamma_1 + C_8\gamma_2] - \frac{C_2(\sigma + 4\nu)}{2} \gamma_3 \right) \|p\|_{0,\Omega}^2 \\
 &\quad + \left(-\frac{C_2}{2\gamma_3} - \frac{C_8}{2\gamma_2} \right) |p|_h^2 \\
 (42) &\geq -C_9 \max\{\sigma, \nu\} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{1,\Omega}^2 + C_{10} \|p\|_{0,\Omega} - C_{11} |p|_h^2,
 \end{aligned}$$

with $C_9, C_{10}, C_{11} > 0$, if γ_1, γ_2 and γ_3 are chosen small enough.

Finally, we denote $(\mathbf{v}, q) := (\mathbf{u} - \delta \mathbf{w}, p)$, $\delta > 0$. Combining Lemma 3.1 and (42) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\mathbf{B}((\mathbf{u}, p), (\mathbf{v}, q)) \\
 &= \mathbf{B}((\mathbf{u}, p), (\mathbf{u}, p)) + \delta \mathbf{B}((\mathbf{u}, p), (-\mathbf{w}, 0)) \\
 &\geq C_{\Omega\nu} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{1,\Omega}^2 + |p|_h^2 \\
 &\quad + \delta [-C_9 \max\{\sigma, \nu\} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{1,\Omega}^2 + C_{10} \|p\|_{0,\Omega}^2 - C_{11} |p|_h^2] \\
 &= (C_{\Omega\nu} - \delta C_9 \max\{\sigma, \nu\}) \|\mathbf{u}\|_{1,\Omega}^2 + \delta C_{10} \|p\|_{0,\Omega}^2 \\
 &\quad + (1 - \delta C_{11}) |p|_h^2 \\
 &\geq C (\|\mathbf{u}\|_{1,\Omega}^2 + \|p\|_{0,\Omega}^2),
 \end{aligned}$$

when choosing $0 < \delta < \min \left\{ \frac{C_{\Omega\nu}}{C_9 \max\{\sigma, \nu\}}, \frac{1}{C_{11}} \right\}$. Finally, we remark that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|\mathbf{v}\|_{1,\Omega}^2 + \|q\|_{0,\Omega}^2 &= \|\mathbf{u} - \delta \mathbf{w}\|_{1,\Omega}^2 + \|p\|_{0,\Omega}^2 \\
 &\leq 2 \|\mathbf{u}\|_{1,\Omega}^2 + (2\delta^2 + 1) \|p\|_{0,\Omega}^2 \\
 &\leq C (\|\mathbf{u}\|_{1,\Omega}^2 + \|p\|_{0,\Omega}^2),
 \end{aligned}$$

which finishes the proof. \square

4.2 Error Analysis

Let k, l be integers with $k, l \geq 1$. We use the interpolation operator $\mathbf{I}_h^k : (C^0(\bar{\Omega}))^2 \rightarrow [V_k]^2$ used in previous section, whose interpolation error satisfies (31). We will denote again $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h := \mathbf{I}_h^k(\mathbf{u})$. Now, for the pressure we define \tilde{p} as being the Clément interpolate of p . Denoting now by $\tilde{\eta}^p := p - \tilde{p}$, we have (cf. [13])

$$(43) \quad \|\tilde{\eta}^p\|_{n,\Omega} \leq Ch^{t-n} \|p\|_{t,\Omega} \quad \forall p \in H^t(\Omega),$$

with $0 \leq n \leq 1$ and $\max\{n, 1\} \leq t \leq l + 1$.

Remark 4.1 The Clément interpolate of p does not necessarily belong to $L_0^2(\Omega)$, and that poses a problem in the proof of our error estimate below. This is why we consider a modified interpolate to p given by

$$\bar{p} := \tilde{p} - \frac{1}{|\Omega|} (\tilde{p}, 1)_\Omega,$$

which belongs to $L_0^2(\Omega)$, and which satisfies also

$$\begin{aligned} \|q - \bar{q}\|_{0,\Omega} &\leq \|q - \tilde{q}\|_{0,\Omega}, \\ \|\nabla(q - \bar{q})\|_{0,K} &= \|\nabla(q - \tilde{q})\|_{0,K} \quad \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h, \end{aligned}$$

for all $q \in H^1(\Omega)$, and thus the interpolation error $\eta^p := p - \bar{p}$ associated to this interpolate satisfies the same approximation properties than $\tilde{\eta}^p$ (cf. (43)). \square

The main result concerning approximation is now stated.

Theorem 4.1 *Let us suppose that the solution (\mathbf{u}, p) of (1) belongs to $(H^{k+1}(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega))^2 \times (H^l(\Omega) \cap L_0^2(\Omega))$. Then, there exists $C > 0$, independent of h , such that the error $(\mathbf{e}^u, e^p) := (\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h, p - p_h)$ satisfies*

$$\|\mathbf{e}^u\|_{1,\Omega} + \|e^p\|_{0,\Omega} \leq C \max \left\{ \sigma, \nu + 1, \frac{1}{4\nu} \right\} (h^k \|\mathbf{u}\|_{k+1,\Omega} + h^l \|p\|_{l,\Omega}).$$

Proof. Let $\mathbf{e}_h^u := \mathbf{u}_h - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h$ and $e_h^p := p_h - \bar{p}$. Since e_h^p belongs to $L_0^2(\Omega)$, we can use the stability result given by Lemma 4.2 to conclude the existence of $(\mathbf{v}, q) \in \mathbf{V}_h \times Q_h$ such that

$$\|\mathbf{v}\|_{1,\Omega}^2 + \|q\|_{0,\Omega}^2 \leq C,$$

and

$$(44) \quad \|\mathbf{e}_h^u\|_{1,\Omega} + \|e_h^p\|_{0,\Omega} \leq \mathbf{B}((\mathbf{e}_h^u, e_h^p), (\mathbf{v}, q)).$$

Using now the consistency of the scheme we obtain

$$(45) \quad \mathbf{B}((\mathbf{e}_h^u, e_h^p), (\mathbf{v}, q)) = \mathbf{B}((\eta^u, \eta^p), (\mathbf{v}, q)).$$

Now, for the right hand side of (45) we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{B}((\eta^u, \eta^p), (\mathbf{v}, q)) \\ &\leq C \left\{ \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} (\sigma \|\eta^u\|_{0,K}^2 + \nu \|\nabla \eta^u\|_{0,K}^2 + \|\eta^p\|_{0,K}^2 + \|\nabla \cdot \eta^u\|_{0,K}^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \tau_K [\sigma^2 \|\eta^u\|_{0,K}^2 + \nu^2 \|\Delta \eta^u\|_{0,K}^2 + \|\nabla \eta^p\|_{0,K}^2]) \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \cdot \left\{ \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} (\sigma \|\mathbf{v}\|_{0,K}^2 + \nu \|\nabla \mathbf{v}\|_{0,K}^2 + \|\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}\|_{0,K}^2 + \|q\|_{0,K}^2 \right. \\
 & \quad \left. + \tau_K [\sigma^2 \|\mathbf{v}\|_{0,K}^2 + \nu^2 \|\Delta \mathbf{v}\|_{0,K}^2 + \|\nabla q\|_{0,K}^2]) \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
 \leq C & \left\{ \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} [(\sigma + \sigma^2 \tau_K) \|\eta^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{0,K}^2 + (\nu + 1) \|\nabla \eta^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{0,K}^2 \right. \\
 & \quad \left. + \nu^2 \tau_K \|\Delta \eta^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{0,K}^2 + \|\eta^p\|_{0,K}^2 + \tau_K \|\nabla \eta^p\|_{0,K}^2] \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
 & \cdot \left\{ \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} [(\sigma + \sigma^2 \tau_K) \|\mathbf{v}\|_{0,K}^2 + (\nu + 1) \|\nabla \mathbf{v}\|_{0,K}^2 + \nu^2 \tau_K \|\Delta \mathbf{v}\|_{0,K}^2 \right. \\
 & \quad \left. + \|q\|_{0,K}^2 + \tau_K \|\nabla q\|_{0,K}^2] \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}}.
 \end{aligned}$$

But, since $(\mathbf{v}, q) \in \mathbf{V}_h \times Q_h$, we can use (28) and (29), which, together with the definition of τ_K , lead to

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mathbf{B}((\eta^{\mathbf{u}}, \eta^p), (\mathbf{v}, q)) \\
 \leq C & \left\{ \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \sigma \|\eta^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{0,K}^2 + (\nu + 1) \|\nabla \eta^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{0,K}^2 + \nu h_K^2 \|\Delta \eta^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{0,K}^2 \right. \\
 & \quad \left. + \|\eta^p\|_{0,K}^2 + \frac{1}{4\nu} h_K^2 \|\nabla \eta^p\|_{0,K}^2 \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
 & \cdot \left\{ \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \sigma \|\mathbf{v}\|_{0,K}^2 + (\nu + 1) \|\nabla \mathbf{v}\|_{0,K}^2 + \nu \|\nabla \mathbf{v}\|_{0,K}^2 \right. \\
 & \quad \left. + \|q\|_{0,K}^2 + \frac{1}{4\nu} \|q\|_{0,K}^2 \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
 \leq C & \left\{ \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \max\{\sigma, \nu + 1\} [\|\eta^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{1,K}^2 + h_K^2 \|\Delta \eta^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{0,K}^2] \right. \\
 & \quad \left. + \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \max\{1, \frac{1}{4\nu}\} [\|\eta^p\|_{0,K}^2 + h_K^2 \|\nabla \eta^p\|_{0,K}^2] \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}}
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \cdot \left\{ \max\{\sigma, \nu + 1\} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{1,\Omega}^2 + \max\left\{1, \frac{1}{4\nu}\right\} \|q\|_{0,\Omega}^2 \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
 & \leq C \max\left\{\sigma, \nu + 1, \frac{1}{4\nu}\right\} \left\{ \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} [\|\eta^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{1,K}^2 + h_K^2 \|\Delta\eta^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{0,K}^2] \right. \\
 (46) \quad & \left. + \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} [\|\eta^p\|_{0,K}^2 + h_K^2 \|\nabla\eta^p\|_{0,K}^2] \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}},
 \end{aligned}$$

where we have also used the fact that $\|\mathbf{v}\|_{1,\Omega} + \|q\|_{0,\Omega} \leq C$.

Finally, we have, since $\mathbf{e}^{\mathbf{u}} = \eta^{\mathbf{u}} - \mathbf{e}_h^{\mathbf{u}}$ and $e^p = \eta^p - e_h^p$, and thanks to (46) and the triangular inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|\mathbf{e}^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{1,\Omega} + \|e^p\|_{0,\Omega} & \leq \|\mathbf{e}_h^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{1,\Omega} + \|e_h^p\|_{0,\Omega} + \|\eta^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{1,\Omega} + \|\eta^p\|_{0,\Omega} \\
 & \leq C \max\left\{\sigma, \nu + 1, \frac{1}{4\nu}\right\} \left\{ \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} [\|\eta^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{1,K}^2 + h_K^2 \|\Delta\eta^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{0,K}^2] \right. \\
 & \quad \left. + \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} [\|\eta^p\|_{0,K}^2 + h_K^2 \|\nabla\eta^p\|_{0,K}^2] \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
 & \quad + C \left\{ \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} [\|\eta^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{1,K}^2 + \|\eta^p\|_{0,K}^2] \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
 & \leq C \max\left\{\sigma, \nu + 1, \frac{1}{4\nu}\right\} \left\{ \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} [\|\eta^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{1,K}^2 + h_K^2 \|\Delta\eta^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{0,K}^2] \right. \\
 & \quad \left. + \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} [\|\eta^p\|_{0,K}^2 + h_K^2 \|\nabla\eta^p\|_{0,K}^2] \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
 & \leq C \max\left\{\sigma, \nu + 1, \frac{1}{4\nu}\right\} [h^k |\mathbf{u}|_{k+1,\Omega} + h^l |p|_{l,\Omega}],
 \end{aligned}$$

which finishes the proof. \square

Remark 4.2 The error estimate given by Theorem 4.1 may be improved if we have a more regular pressure. Indeed, if we suppose that $p \in H^{l+1}(\Omega)$, we can apply (43) differently and obtain

$$\sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} [\|\eta^p\|_{0,K}^2 + h_K^2 \|\nabla\eta^p\|_{0,K}^2] \leq Ch^{2l+2} \|p\|_{l+1,\Omega}^2,$$

which leads to the following improved error estimate

$$\begin{aligned} & \| \mathbf{e}^{\mathbf{u}} \|_{1,\Omega} + \| e^p \|_{0,\Omega} \\ & \leq C \max \left\{ \sigma, \nu + 1, \frac{1}{4\nu} \right\} (h^k | \mathbf{u} |_{k+1,\Omega} + h^{l+1} \| p \|_{l+1,\Omega}). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

5 Numerical experiments

In this section we report two series of numerical results with the unusual stabilized finite element introduced in Sect. 3. We illustrate the applicability of the method for different values of the physical coefficients, mainly for problems in which the quotient $\frac{\sigma h_K^2}{\nu}$ is large.

5.1 An analytical solution

We use as domain the square $(0, 1) \times (0, 1)$, and we set \mathbf{f} to be such as the exact solution of our problem (1) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} (47) \quad & u_1(x_1, x_2) = -256 x_1^2 (x_1 - 1)^2 x_2 (x_2 - 1) (2x_2 - 1) \\ & u_2(x_1, x_2) = -u_1(x_2, x_1) \\ & p(x_1, x_2) = 150 (x_1 - 0.5)(x_2 - 0.5). \end{aligned}$$

Since all numerical experiences have been performed using conforming P^1 finite elements for velocity and pressure, we have measured the relative finite element errors

$$(48) \quad \varepsilon_{\mathbf{u}}(h) := \frac{\| \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h \|_{1,\Omega}}{h},$$

and

$$(49) \quad \varepsilon_p(h) := \frac{\| p - p_h \|_{0,\Omega}}{h}.$$

First, we report the case in which we have considered the case $\sigma = 10^2, \nu = 10^{-3}$. In this case, the results are contained in Tables 1 and 2, and they agree with the theoretical results.

In Table 3, we show an evolution of the finite element errors when σ grows. The interest is to show that the errors are not too much affected by the presence of the zeroth order term. To do this, we consider the solution from (47) and a viscosity $\nu = 10^{-3}$. We use uniform meshes of 40×40 and 60×60 nodes (≈ 3200 and ≈ 7200 P^1/P^1 elements, respectively).

We observe that the error in the velocity remains bounded while σ grows and that the pressure error presents a good behavior even in the very large σ case.

Table 1. Convergence history of $p - p_h$

h	mesh	$\ p - p_h\ _{0,\Omega}$	$\varepsilon_p(h)$	$\frac{\ p - p_h\ _{0,\Omega}}{h^2}$
$0.05 \times \sqrt{2}$	20×20	6.51044×10^{-2}	0.92071	13.02088
$0.025 \times \sqrt{2}$	40×40	1.58807×10^{-2}	0.44917	12.70460
$0.01\bar{6} \times \sqrt{2}$	60×60	6.71384×10^{-3}	0.28484	12.08492
$0.0125 \times \sqrt{2}$	80×80	3.56025×10^{-3}	0.20139	11.39282
$0.01 \times \sqrt{2}$	100×100	2.13122×10^{-3}	0.15070	10.65611

Table 2. Convergence history of $\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h$

h	mesh	$\ \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h\ _{1,\Omega}$	$\varepsilon_{\mathbf{u}}(h)$
$0.05 \times \sqrt{2}$	20×20	1.026323	14.514407
$0.025 \times \sqrt{2}$	40×40	0.512346	14.491358
$0.01\bar{6} \times \sqrt{2}$	60×60	0.341159	14.474150
$0.0125 \times \sqrt{2}$	80×80	0.255665	14.462634
$0.01 \times \sqrt{2}$	100×100	0.204416	14.454439

Table 3. Behavior of the Finite Element error when σ grows

σ	40 × 40 mesh		60 × 60 mesh	
	$\ \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h\ _{1,\Omega}$	$\ p - p_h\ _{0,\Omega}$	$\ \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h\ _{1,\Omega}$	$\ p - p_h\ _{0,\Omega}$
0.1	0.54099	9.8847×10^{-3}	0.34409	4.4027×10^{-3}
1	0.53931	9.9729×10^{-3}	0.34404	4.4278×10^{-3}
10	0.52704	1.2339×10^{-2}	0.34322	4.7199×10^{-3}
100	0.51234	1.5880×10^{-2}	0.34115	6.7128×10^{-3}
10^3	0.51194	1.6699×10^{-2}	0.34095	7.4121×10^{-3}
10^4	0.51194	1.7435×10^{-2}	0.34095	7.6226×10^{-3}

Remark 5.1 Similar results could be obtained by using SDFEM method, but after a very accurate selection of δ . To illustrate this fact, we consider the viscosity $\nu = 10^{-3}$, use a mesh of 7200 P^1/P^1 elements; we use two values for δ : first, the (inappropriate for this mesh and viscosity) $\delta = \frac{1}{24}$ (in order to recover the same stabilization parameter used in Stokes flow stabilization), and secondly, the value $\delta = 10^{-4}$, correct for this mesh and viscosity. We have the following behavior of the error: We remark that a bad choice of δ in SDFEM method has a direct impact on the behavior of the finite element error, as is shown in Table 4, where the error on the pressure explodes dramatically with σ for the inappropriate case (the error on the velocity remains bounded). We see then that the restriction $\delta \leq \frac{9}{25000}$ given by Remark 3.3 (in order fit the stability condition for all the range of

Table 4. SDFEM method Finite Element error when σ grows

σ	$\delta = \frac{1}{24}$		$\delta = 10^{-4}$	
	$\ \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h\ _{1,\Omega}$	$\ p - p_h\ _{0,\Omega}$	$\ \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h\ _{1,\Omega}$	$\ p - p_h\ _{0,\Omega}$
0.1	0.34419	4.4027×10^{-3}	0.34788	5.5502×10^{-3}
1	0.34438	4.4279×10^{-3}	0.34807	5.5398×10^{-3}
10	0.34433	4.7322×10^{-3}	0.34778	5.6406×10^{-3}
100	0.34289	1.4445×10^{-2}	0.34577	5.9609×10^{-3}
10^3	0.34139	0.12598	0.34340	1.0408×10^{-2}
10^4	0.34102	2.65805	0.34228	2.9764×10^{-2}




Fig. 1. Statement of the problem

tested values for σ) is not only a theoretical restriction, but a real numerical restriction. \square

5.2 The lid-driven cavity problem

In this section we treat the lid driven cavity problem and compare the results from present method with the solution obtained by the SDFEM method. The problem statement is as in Fig. 1, using $\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{0}$. In all the calculations a uniform mesh of 441 P^1/P^1 elements was used. We have performed tests for values of ν going from 10^{-6} to 1, and values of σ going from 0.1 to 10^4 , and in all of them we observe no oscillations on the pressure, even considering a very high quotient $\frac{\sigma h_K^2}{\nu}$. To illustrate this fact, we plot in Fig. 2 the pressure contours obtained for the case $\sigma = 10^4, \nu = 10^{-4}$.

Finally, in Fig. 3 we show a vertical cross section of the tangential velocity of the lid driven cavity problem with $\sigma = 10^3$ and $\nu = 10^{-3}$, comparing the solutions of present method and SDFEM method. We observe the presence of a boundary layer on the velocity that is well recovered by our method, and that the SDFEM method fails to capture. The calculation has been made using $\delta = 0.0001$ for the SDFEM method.




Fig. 2. Pressure contours for $\sigma = 10^4$, $\nu = 10^{-4}$




Fig. 3. Vertical cross section of tangential velocity at $x_1 = 0.5$

Acknowledgements. The authors would like to thank Professor Patrick Le Tallec from Ecole Polytechnique, France, for his helpful discussions and comments.

References

1. B. Baiocchi, F. Brezzi, and L.P. Franca. Virtual bubbles and Galerkin-least-squares type methods (Ga. L. S.). *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.*, 105:125–141, 1993
2. R. Bank and B. Welfert. A comparison between the MINI-Element and the Petrov-Galerkin formulations for the Generalized Stokes problem. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.*, 83:61–68, 1990
3. G. Barrenechea and F. Valentin. An unusual stabilized finite element method for a generalized Stokes problem. Technical Report 01-09, Departamento de Ingeniería

- Matemática, Universidad de Concepción, April 2001. <http://www.ing-mat.udec.cl/inf-loc-dim.html>
4. F. Brezzi, M.O. Bristeau, L. Franca, M. Mallet, and G. Rogé. A relationship between stabilized finite element methods and the Galerkin method with bubble functions. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.*, 96:117–129, 1992
 5. F. Brezzi and M. Fortin. *Mixed and Hybrid Finite Element Methods*. Springer-Verlag, 1991
 6. F. Brezzi and J. Douglas Jr. Stabilized mixed methods for the Stokes problem. *Numer. Math.*, 53:225–235, 1988
 7. F. Brezzi and J. Pitkaranta. On the stabilization of finite element approximations of the Stokes problem. In W. Hackbush, editor, *Efficient Solution of Elliptic Systems*, volume 10 of *Notes on Numerical Fluid Mechanics*, pages 11–19. Vieweg, 1984
 8. Ph. G. Ciarlet. *The Finite Element Method for Elliptic Problems*. North Holland, 1978
 9. P. Clément. Approximation by finite element functions using local regularization. *R.A.I.R.O. Anal. Numer.*, 9:77–84, 1975
 10. L.P. Franca and C. Farhat. Bubble functions prompt unusual stabilized finite element methods. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.*, 123:299–308, 1995
 11. L.P. Franca and R. Stenberg. Error analysis of some Galerkin least squares methods for the elasticity equations. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 28(6):1680–1697, 1991
 12. L.P. Franca and F. Valentin. On an improved unusual stabilized finite element method for the advective-reactive-diffusive equation. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.*, 190:1785–1800, 2000
 13. V. Girault and P.A. Raviart. *Finite Element Methods for the Navier-Stokes Equations*. Springer-Verlag, 1986
 14. I. Harari and T.J.R. Hughes. What are C and h ? Inequalities for the analysis and design of finite element methods. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.*, 97(2):157–192, 1992
 15. I. Harari and T.J.R. Hughes. Stabilized finite element methods for steady advection-diffusion with production. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.*, 115:165–191, 1994
 16. G. Hauke. A simple subgrid scale stabilized method for the advection-diffusion-reaction equation. Preprint, 2000
 17. T.J.R. Hughes and L.P. Franca. A new finite element formulation for computational fluid dynamics: VII. the Stokes problem with various well-posed boundary conditions: Symmetric formulations that converge for all velocity/pressure spaces. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.*, 65(1):85–96, 1987
 18. T.J.R. Hughes, L.P. Franca, and M. Balestra. A new finite element formulation for computational fluids dynamics: V. Circumventing the Babuska-Brezzi condition : A stable Petrov-Galerkin formulation of the Stokes problem accommodating equal-order interpolations. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.*, 59(1):85–99, 1986
 19. R. Pierre. Simple C^0 approximations for the computation of incompressible flows. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.*, 68:205–227, 1988
 20. R. Stenberg. Error analysis of some finite element methods for the Stokes problem. *Math. Comp.*, 54:495–508, 1990
 21. L. Tobiska and R. Verfürth. Analysis of a streamline diffusion finite element method for the Stokes and Navier-Stokes equations. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 33(1):107–127, 1996
 22. R. Verfürth. Error estimates for a mixed finite element approximation of the Stokes problem. *RAIRO Anal. Numer.*, 18:175–182, 1984