

A fitted space-time finite element method for an advection-diffusion problem with moving interfaces

Quang Huy Nguyen^a, Van Chien Le^b, Phuong Cuc Hoang^a, Thi Thanh Mai Ta^{a,*}

^aFaculty of Mathematics and Informatics, Hanoi University of Science and Technology, 11657 Hanoi, Vietnam.

^bIDLab, Department of Information Technology, Ghent University - imec, 9000 Ghent, Belgium.

Abstract

This paper presents a fitted space-time finite element method for solving a parabolic advection-diffusion problem with a nonstationary interface. The jumping diffusion coefficient gives rise to the discontinuity of the spatial gradient of solution across the interface. We use the Banach-Nečas-Babuška theorem to show the well-posedness of the continuous variational problem. A fully discrete finite-element based scheme is analyzed using the Galerkin method and unstructured fitted meshes. An optimal error estimate is established in a discrete energy norm under appropriate globally low but locally high regularity conditions. Some numerical results corroborate our theoretical results.

Keywords: moving-interface advection-diffusion problem, space-time finite element method, fitted mesh, a priori error estimate

2010 MSC: 35K20, 65M15, 65M60

1. Introduction

1.1. Problem statement

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, with $d = 1$ or 2 , be an open, bounded domain with Lipschitz continuous boundary $\partial\Omega$. The domain Ω consists of two time-dependent subdomains $\Omega_1(t)$ and $\Omega_2(t)$ sharing a common interface $\Gamma(t)$. Mathematically speaking

$$\Omega = \Omega_1(t) \cup \Omega_2(t) \cup \Gamma(t), \quad \partial\Omega_1(t) \cap \partial\Omega_2(t) = \Gamma(t),$$

for all $t \in [0, T]$, with $T > 0$. The evolution of the interface Γ over time is determined by a velocity vector $\mathbf{v} \in C([0, T], \mathbf{C}^2(\Omega))$ satisfying $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x}, t) = 0$ for all $(\mathbf{x}, t) \in \Omega \times [0, T]$ [1] (see Figure 1).

We denote the space-time domain $Q_T := \Omega \times (0, T)$ and its subdomains

$$Q_i := \{(\mathbf{x}, t) \mid \mathbf{x} \in \Omega_i(t), t \in (0, T)\},$$

with $i = 1, 2$. The two space-time subdomains are separated by the space-time interface

$$\Gamma^* := \bigcup_{t \in (0, T)} \Gamma(t) \times \{t\} = \partial Q_1 \cap \partial Q_2.$$

Throughout the paper, we assume that Γ^* is C^2 -continuous hypersurface in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} .

*Corresponding author

Email addresses: huy.nguyenquang1@hust.edu.vn (Quang Huy Nguyen), vanchien.le@ugent.be (Van Chien Le), cuc.hp222163m@sis.hust.edu.vn (Phuong Cuc Hoang), mai.tathithanh@hust.edu.vn (Thi Thanh Mai Ta)




Figure 1: The domain Ω consisting of two subdomains $\Omega_1(t)$ and $\Omega_2(t)$ moving with a velocity \mathbf{v} , separated by the interface $\Gamma(t)$.

This paper is concerned with the following parabolic moving interface problem

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla u - \nabla \cdot (\kappa \nabla u) = f & \text{in } Q_T, \\ [u] = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma^*, \\ [\kappa \nabla u \cdot \mathbf{n}] = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma^*, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times (0, T), \\ u(\cdot, 0) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where \mathbf{n} is the unit normal to $\Gamma(t)$ pointing from $\Omega_1(t)$ to $\Omega_2(t)$ and f is the given source. The notation $[u] = (u_1)_{|\Gamma(t)} - (u_2)_{|\Gamma(t)}$ stands for the jump of u across the interface $\Gamma(t)$, with $(u_i)_{|\Gamma(t)}$ the limiting value of u on $\Gamma(t)$ from $\Omega_i(t)$ ($i = 1, 2$). The first equation in (1) is usually called an advection-diffusion equation. The second and third conditions describe the behavior of the unknown u and its spatial gradient across the interface Γ^* . The problem is supplemented with a homogeneous Dirichlet boundary condition and a homogeneous initial condition. For simplicity, we assume that the diffusion coefficient κ is a positive constant on each subdomain, i.e.,

$$\kappa = \begin{cases} \kappa_1 > 0 & \text{in } \Omega_1(t), \\ \kappa_2 > 0 & \text{in } \Omega_2(t). \end{cases}$$

In practice, the two values κ_1 and κ_2 might characterize two different materials occupying two subdomains. Hence, they are generally different, leading to the jump of κ across the interface $\Gamma(t)$.

1.2. Relevant literature

The advection-diffusion problem (1) arises in various engineering applications of flows and other physical phenomena. The unknown function u may represent the concentration of a pollutant subject to the diffusion effect and is transported by a stream moving at velocity \mathbf{v} . Alternatively, it can represent the electron concentration in an electromagnetic device. In addition, the advection-diffusion equation (1) can model the eddy-current problem in electromagnetics [2], the heat transfer [3], or the induction heating process [4], which involve moving multiple-component systems.

The difficulties of solving the interface problem (1) are not only the non-smoothness of the solution but also related to the advection component. More specifically, the discontinuity of the diffusion coefficient κ at the interface results in a solution with a discontinuous gradient across the moving interface. Consequently, classical finite element methods applied to this class of problems converge with only sub-optimal orders, e.g., [5, 6]. In handling the issue, two major approaches have been extensively investigated over the last few decades: interface-unfitted and interface-fitted methods. The former approach does not require a triangulation that fits the moving interface. However, it instead accurately approximates discontinuous quantities by adjusting the local finite element basis functions on interface elements. Examples of this class include the multiscale finite element method (MsFEM) [7], the immersed finite

element method (IFEM) [8], and the extended finite element method (XFEM) [9]. In contrast, the interface-fitted methods generate a mesh that matches the interface, i.e., an interface mesh prevents the interface from cutting through an element or resolves the interface approximately to a certain precision [10, 11, 12].

When the interface evolves, we cope with a moving discontinuity. The interface-unfitted approach takes advantage of allowing fixed interface-independent simplicial triangulations, which is convenient when the interface depends on time. In [13], the authors combined the XFEM with a backward Euler discretization to solve the moving interface problem. Lehrenfeld and Reusken in [14, 15] proposed a second-order XFEM scheme using a space-time discontinuous Galerkin discretization. More recently, Badia et al. [16] presented the aggregation finite element method (AgFEM) for tackling the ill-conditioning and small cut cell issues in most unfitted schemes. However, one standing drawback of these interface-unfitted methods is that they require special space-time quadrature rules on the cut elements, resulting in high computational costs. In contrast to the success of unfitted schemes, interface-fitted methods have received very little attention in solving evolving interface problems. The reason is that the re-meshing procedure at each time step introduces additional errors in interpolating two consecutive meshes, which can exceed the feasible effort.

Related to our setting, we also refer to the studies [17, 18] that utilized the arbitrary Lagrangian-Eulerian (ALE) technique to solve moving-domain or interface problems. This technique allows for good domain or interface resolution, but it is less practical when dealing with large deformation.

1.3. Contributions and outline

Our work resolves a challenge of the interface-fitted approach and proposes a new interface-fitted strategy for moving-interface advection-diffusion problems. We introduce a numerical scheme combining the space-time discretization with an interface fitted-mesh continuous Galerkin approximation. In contrast to all mentioned studies evoking the classical time-stepping methods or time-discontinuous Galerkin methods, our approach treats the time variable as another spatial variable. It solves the problem (1) in the space-time setting. The literature refers to this strategy as the space-time finite element method, introduced by Steinbach in [19] for solving non-interface heat equations. In this way, we can employ fully unstructured space-time meshes and cope with geometrically complicated interfaces. Furthermore, our approach takes advantage of the accuracy and practicality of interface-fitted methods with neither the implementation of costly re-meshing algorithms nor the computation of interaction integrals over moving interfaces or enrichment elements.

The space-time finite element method has been used in recent studies for solving moving interface or moving domain problems [20, 21, 22]. The authors of these works provided a standard error estimate under the assumption that the solution is sufficiently smooth across the interface. This regularity assumption, however, is typically not satisfied in practical situations when the coefficient κ is discontinuous. In our work, we instead consider a globally low regularity solution. To rectify the non-smooth property of the solution and derive a prior error analysis for the discretization scheme, we combine the space-time technique in [19] with the Stein extension operators [23], which allows us to interpolate functions with locally high but globally low regularity. We arrive at an optimal convergence rate with respect to a mesh-dependent energy norm under an appropriate regularity condition. In the case of a weaker assumption, the convergence rate is nearly optimal when the spatial domain is one-dimensional (1D) and sub-optimal for the two-dimensional (2D) spatial domain. To the best of our knowledge, this type of error bound does not appear anywhere else in the literature on moving interface problems using the space-time method.

The paper is divided as follows. The following section provides necessary functional settings, followed by the variational formulation of the problem (1) in a space-time Sobolev space. The Banach-Nečas-Babuška theorem is involved in proving the well-posedness of the continuous variational problem. Section 3 is devoted to a Galerkin finite element discretization of the continuous variational problem. This section presents the solvability of the discrete problem and derives a prior error estimate in an appropriate discrete energy norm. Some numerical experiments are performed in section 4 to verify the theoretical analysis. Finally, section 5 contains some conclusion remarks.

2. Variational formulation

2.1. Functional setting

For $s \geq 0$, $p \in [1, \infty]$ and a bounded Lipschitz domain Ω , we denote by $W^{s,p}(\Omega)$ the standard Sobolev spaces, where $W^{0,p}(\Omega)$ coincide with the Lebesgue spaces $L^p(\Omega)$ [24, Chapter 2]. Among Sobolev spaces, only $W^{s,2}(\Omega)$

form Hilbert spaces and are usually denoted by $H^s(\Omega)$. Note that when $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, the space $H^1(\Omega)$ is continuously embedded into $L^p(\Omega)$ for all $p \in [1, \infty)$. When $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$, this continuous embedding only holds for $p \in [1, 6]$. We also need the compact embedding of $H^s(\Omega)$ into $C(\overline{\Omega})$ for all $s > \frac{d}{2}$, where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ (see [24, Section 2.3]).

For a space-time domain Q_T and $l, k \in \mathbb{N}$, we recall from [14] the anisotropic Sobolev space $H^{l,k}(Q_T)$ defined by

$$H^{l,k}(Q_T) = \left\{ u \in L^2(Q_T) \mid \partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^r u \in L^2(Q_T) \text{ for all } |\alpha| \leq l, 0 \leq r \leq k \right\},$$

furnished with the graph norm $\|u\|_{H^{l,k}(Q_T)}$. When $l = k$, we retain the classical Sobolev space $H^k(Q_T)$. The notation $H_0^{1,0}(Q_T)$ stands for the closure of $C_0^1(Q_T)$ with respect to the norm $\|\cdot\|_{H^{1,0}(Q_T)}$. Since the space $H_0^{1,0}(Q_T)$ is frequently used below, we shall use the compact notation

$$Y := H_0^{1,0}(Q_T),$$

equipped with the equivalent norm

$$\|u\|_Y^2 := \int_0^T \int_\Omega \kappa |\nabla u|^2 \, dx \, dt.$$

The dual space of Y is denoted by Y' , and the duality pairing between Y' and Y is denoted by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{Y' \times Y}$. For $u \in Y$, its distributional time derivative $\partial_t u$ is defined by

$$\partial_t u(\psi) := - \int_0^T \int_\Omega u \partial_t \psi \, dx \, dt \quad \forall \psi \in C_0^1(Q_T).$$

Then, we introduce the spaces

$$X := \{u \in Y \mid \partial_t u \in Y'\}, \quad X_0 := \{u \in X \mid u(\cdot, 0) = 0\}$$

endowed with the graph norm

$$\|u\|_X^2 := \|u\|_Y^2 + \|\partial_t u\|_{Y'}^2.$$

The space X_0 is the natural space for the weak solution to the problem (1).

Under mild assumptions on Γ^* (see [25, 14] for more details), there exist continuous space-time trace operators $\gamma_i : H^{1,0}(Q_i) \rightarrow L^2(\Gamma^*)$ ($i = 1, 2$), which allows us to define the space-time jump operator $[u]_* := \gamma_1 u - \gamma_2 u$. In what follows, we use $C > 0$ as a generic constant that is independent of the mesh parameter h and the solution u but may depend on the space-time domain Q_T , the norm $\|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^\infty(Q_T)}$ and the coefficient κ . Their different values in different places are allowed.

2.2. Well-posedness

Given a source term $f \in Y'$, the variational formulation of (1) reads as: Determine $u \in X_0$ that satisfies

$$a(u, \varphi) = \langle f, \varphi \rangle_{Y' \times Y} \quad \forall \varphi \in Y, \quad (2)$$

where the bilinear form $a : X_0 \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$a(u, \varphi) := \langle \partial_t u, \varphi \rangle_{Y' \times Y} + \int_0^T \int_\Omega (\mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla u) \varphi + \kappa \nabla u \cdot \nabla \varphi \, dx \, dt.$$

In this section, we invoke the Banach-Nečas-Babuška theorem to prove the well-posedness of the variational problem (2). To that end, the two following results are necessary.

Lemma 2.1. *There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\sup_{\varphi \in Y \setminus \{0\}} \frac{a(u, \varphi)}{\|\varphi\|_Y} \geq C \|u\|_X \quad \forall u \in X_0. \quad (3)$$

Proof. For each $u \in X_0$, we denote by $z \in Y$ the unique solution to the auxiliary equation

$$\int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \kappa \nabla z \cdot \nabla \phi \, dx \, dt = \langle \partial_t u, \phi \rangle_{Y' \times Y} \quad \forall \phi \in Y. \quad (4)$$

From Riesz's representation theorem, it is clear that $\|z\|_Y = \|\partial_t u\|_{Y'}$. The idea is to choose $\varphi := z + \lambda u \in Y$ in (3) with sufficiently large $\lambda > 0$. We immediately have that

$$a(u, \varphi) = a(u, z + \lambda u) = a(u, z) + \lambda a(u, u).$$

For the first term, we use the Cauchy inequality to arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} a(u, z) &= \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \kappa \nabla z \cdot \nabla z \, dx \, dt + \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} (\mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla u) z + \kappa \nabla u \cdot \nabla z \, dx \, dt \\ &\geq \|z\|_Y^2 - \|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^\infty(Q_T)} \left(\frac{C}{4\varepsilon} \|u\|_Y^2 + \varepsilon \|z\|_{L^2(Q_T)}^2 \right) - \left(\frac{1}{4\varepsilon} \|u\|_Y^2 + \varepsilon \|z\|_Y^2 \right) \\ &\geq (1 - C\varepsilon) \|z\|_Y^2 - \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \|u\|_Y^2, \end{aligned}$$

for any $\varepsilon > 0$. We invoked the inequality $\|z\|_{L^2(Q_T)} \leq C \|z\|_Y$ for $z \in Y$ in the final step. In handling the term $a(u, u)$, we first deal with the advection part by utilizing the divergence theorem. Noting that $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x}, t) = 0$ for all $(\mathbf{x}, t) \in \Omega \times [0, T]$ and $u = 0$ on $\partial\Omega \times (0, T)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} (\mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla u) u \, dx \, dt &= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \nabla \cdot (u^2 \mathbf{v}) - u^2 (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}) \, dx \, dt \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \nabla \cdot (u^2 \mathbf{v}) \, dx \, dt \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \int_{\partial\Omega} u^2 \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n}_\Omega \, ds \, dt \\ &= 0, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

with \mathbf{n}_Ω the unit outward normal to $\partial\Omega$. Then, we apply the integration by parts [26, Lemma 7.3] to get

$$\begin{aligned} a(u, u) &= \langle \partial_t u, u \rangle_{Y' \times Y} + \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} (\mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla u) u + \kappa \nabla u \cdot \nabla u \, dx \, dt \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \|u(\cdot, T)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 - \frac{1}{2} \|u(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|u\|_Y^2 \\ &\geq \|u\|_Y^2, \end{aligned}$$

owing to $u(\cdot, 0) = 0$. Therefore, we end up with

$$a(u, \varphi) \geq (1 - C\varepsilon) \|z\|_Y^2 + \left(\lambda - \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \right) \|u\|_Y^2 = (1 - C\varepsilon) \|\partial_t u\|_{Y'}^2 + \left(\lambda - \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \right) \|u\|_Y^2.$$

We hence fix a small enough $\varepsilon > 0$, then select an appropriate $\lambda > 0$ to obtain

$$a(u, \varphi) \geq C \|u\|_X^2.$$

In addition, we have

$$\|\varphi\|_Y = \|z + \lambda u\|_Y \leq \|z\|_Y + \lambda \|u\|_Y = \|\partial_t u\|_{Y'} + \lambda \|u\|_Y \leq C \|u\|_X,$$

which leads to

$$\sup_{\varphi \in Y \setminus \{0\}} \frac{a(u, \varphi)}{\|\varphi\|_Y} \geq C \|u\|_X \quad \forall u \in X_0.$$

□

Lemma 2.2. *If $a(u, \varphi) = 0$ for all $u \in X_0$, then $\varphi = 0$.*

Proof. For an arbitrary $u \in C_0^1(Q_T) \subset X_0$ and $\varphi \in Y$, the classical argument yields

$$\langle \partial_t u, \varphi \rangle_{Y' \times Y} = \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \partial_t u \varphi \, dx \, dt.$$

In particular, by taking $\varphi \in Y$ such that

$$a(u, \varphi) = \langle \partial_t u, \varphi \rangle_{Y' \times Y} + \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} (\mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla u) \varphi + \kappa \nabla u \cdot \nabla \varphi \, dx \, dt = 0 \quad \forall u \in X_0, \quad (6)$$

we arrive at

$$\int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \partial_t u \varphi \, dx \, dt = - \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} (\mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla u) \varphi + \kappa \nabla u \cdot \nabla \varphi \, dx \, dt \quad \forall u \in C_0^1(Q_T).$$

For $\varphi \in Y$ and $u \in C_0^1(Q_T)$, the left-hand side defines the distributional derivative $-\partial_t \varphi(u)$. Moreover, as the right-hand side is a bounded linear functional of u on Y , we imply that $\partial_t \varphi \in Y'$, i.e., $\varphi \in X$. Then, we use the density of $C_0^1(Q_T)$ in Y to obtain

$$-\langle \partial_t \varphi, u \rangle_{Y' \times Y} = - \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} (\mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla u) \varphi + \kappa \nabla u \cdot \nabla \varphi \, dx \, dt \quad \forall u \in Y. \quad (7)$$

Especially, for all $u \in X_0$, we subtract (6) from (7) and invoke the integration by parts formula to get $\varphi(\cdot, T) = 0$. Next, we choose $u = \varphi \in X$ in (7) to have

$$\frac{1}{2} \|\varphi(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} (\mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla \varphi) \varphi \, dx \, dt + \|\varphi\|_Y^2 = 0,$$

which means $\varphi = 0 \in Y$. Note that the second term vanishes using the argument (5). We finish the proof. □

The well-posedness of the variational problem (2) is a direct consequence of lemmas 2.1 and 2.2, according to the Banach-Nečas-Babuška theorem [27, Theorem 25.9].

Theorem 2.1. *Given $f \in Y'$. There exists a unique solution $u \in X_0$ to the problem (2) such that*

$$\|u\|_X \leq C \|f\|_{Y'}.$$

3. Finite element discretization

3.1. Space-time interface-fitted method

Let us assume Ω is a polyhedron in \mathbb{R}^d , with $d = 1$ or 2 . We denote by \mathcal{T}_h a space-time interface-fitted decomposition of $Q_T = \Omega \times (0, T)$ into shape-regular simplicial finite elements with mesh size h [6]. Hence, every triangle or tetrahedron $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$ falls into one of the following scenarios:

1. $K \subset \overline{Q_1}$;
2. $K \subset \overline{Q_2}$;
3. $K \cap Q_1 \neq \emptyset$ and $K \cap Q_2 \neq \emptyset$, then $d + 1$ vertices of K lie on Γ^* .

Moreover, we suppose the mesh \mathcal{T}_h is quasi-uniform (see [24, Definition 22.20]). We denote by Γ_h^* the linear approximation to Γ^* , consisting of the edges or faces with all vertices lying on Γ^* . The space-time domain Q_T is separated by Γ_h^* into two regions $Q_{1,h}$ and $Q_{2,h}$, which linearly approximates Q_1 and Q_2 , respectively.

Let V_h be the finite element space of continuous element-wise linear functions on \mathcal{T}_h with zero values on $\partial\Omega \times (0, T)$ and $\Omega \times \{0\}$, respectively. Obviously, $V_h \subset X_0$ and $V_h \subset Y$. We consider the following discrete variational problem of (2): Identify $u_h \in V_h$ that solves

$$a_h(u_h, \varphi_h) = \langle f, \varphi_h \rangle_{Y' \times Y} \quad \forall \varphi_h \in V_h, \quad (8)$$

where the bilinear form $a_h : X_0 \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$a_h(u, \varphi) = \langle \partial_t u, \varphi \rangle_{Y' \times Y} + \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} (\mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla u) \varphi + \kappa_h \nabla u \cdot \nabla \varphi \, dx \, dt,$$

with κ_h the mesh-dependent approximation of κ

$$\kappa_h(\mathbf{x}, t) := \begin{cases} \kappa_1 & \text{for } (\mathbf{x}, t) \in Q_{1,h} \\ \kappa_2 & \text{for } (\mathbf{x}, t) \in Q_{2,h} \end{cases}.$$

The bilinear form $a_h(\cdot, \cdot)$ differs from $a(\cdot, \cdot)$ in the coefficient κ_h substituting κ . For the convenience in establishing the solvability of (8), we introduce the following seminorm associated with κ_h :

$$\|v\|^2 := \sum_{i=1}^2 \int_{Q_{i,h}} \kappa_i |\nabla v|^2 \, dx \, dt \quad \forall v \in H^{1,0}(Q_{1,h} \cup Q_{2,h}).$$

Please note that this seminorm is defined on the space $H^{1,0}(Q_{1,h} \cup Q_{2,h})$, which allows a jump of functions across the interface Γ^* . When restricted on Y , it defines an equivalent norm, also denoted by $\|\cdot\|$. In practice, this norm is more favorable than $\|\cdot\|_Y$ since it involves the approximation κ_h , which is a constant on each element. Next, we consider the following auxiliary problem: For $v \in H^1(Q_{1,h} \cup Q_{2,h})$, determine $z_h(v) \in V_h$ such that

$$\int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \kappa_h \nabla z_h(v) \cdot \nabla \phi_h \, dx \, dt = \sum_{i=1}^2 \int_{Q_{i,h}} \partial_t v \phi_h \, dx \, dt \quad \forall \phi_h \in V_h. \quad (9)$$

It is clear that (9) has a unique solution. Choosing $\phi_h = z_h(v)$ gives us that

$$\|z_h(v)\|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^2 \int_{Q_{i,h}} \partial_t v z_h(v) \, dx \, dt \leq \|\partial_t v\|_{L^2(Q_{1,h} \cup Q_{2,h})} \|z_h(v)\|_{L^2(Q_T)} \leq C \|\partial_t v\|_{L^2(Q_{1,h} \cup Q_{2,h})} \|z_h(v)\|,$$

where we invoked the following property in the last step

$$\|v\|_{L^2(Q_T)} \leq C \|v\| \quad \forall v \in Y. \quad (10)$$

We arrive at the useful inequality

$$\|z_h(v)\| \leq C \|\partial_t v\|_{L^2(Q_{1,h} \cup Q_{2,h})} \quad \forall v \in H^1(Q_{1,h} \cup Q_{2,h}). \quad (11)$$

Now, we can introduce the following discrete mesh-dependent analog to $\|\cdot\|_X$

$$\|v\|_*^2 = \|v\|^2 + \|z_h(v)\|^2 \quad \forall v \in H^1(Q_{1,h} \cup Q_{2,h}). \quad (12)$$

Hence, the stability condition for the bilinear form $a_h(\cdot, \cdot)$ shall be established with respect to the discrete norm $\|\cdot\|_*$. The following result is a discrete version of the continuous inf-sup condition (3).

Lemma 3.1. *There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\sup_{\varphi_h \in V_h \setminus \{0\}} \frac{a_h(u_h, \varphi_h)}{\|\varphi_h\|} \geq C \|u_h\|_* \quad \forall u_h \in V_h. \quad (13)$$

Proof. The proof is analogous to the continuous problem. For all $u_h, \varphi_h \in V_h$, it holds that

$$a_h(u_h, \varphi_h) = \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} (\partial_t u_h + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla u_h) \varphi_h + \kappa_h \nabla u_h \cdot \nabla \varphi_h \, dx \, dt.$$

We choose $\varphi_h := z_h + \lambda u_h$ for some sufficiently large $\lambda > 0$ and arrive at

$$a_h(u_h, \varphi_h) = a_h(u_h, z_h) + \lambda a_h(u_h, u_h),$$

where $z_h := z_h(u_h) \in V_h$ is the solution to the problem (9). By using the Cauchy inequality and (10), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} a_h(u_h, z_h) &= \|z_h\|^2 + \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} (\mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla u_h) z_h + \kappa_h \nabla u_h \cdot \nabla z_h \, dx \, dt \\ &\geq \|z_h\|^2 - \|v\|_{L^\infty(Q_T)} \left(\frac{C}{4\varepsilon} \|u_h\|^2 + \varepsilon \|z_h\|_{L^2(Q_T)}^2 \right) - \left(\frac{1}{4\varepsilon} \|u_h\|^2 + \varepsilon \|z_h\|^2 \right) \\ &\geq (1 - C\varepsilon) \|z_h\|^2 - \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \|u_h\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

for any $\varepsilon > 0$. On the other hand, we apply the integration by parts formula and proceed as in (5) to obtain

$$a_h(u_h, u_h) = \frac{1}{2} \|u_h(\cdot, T)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|u_h\|^2 \geq \|u_h\|^2.$$

Therefore, we can bound the discrete bilinear form $a_h(u_h, \varphi_h)$ as follows

$$a_h(u_h, \varphi_h) \geq (1 - C\varepsilon) \|z_h\|^2 + \left(\lambda - \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \right) \|u_h\|^2 \geq C \|u_h\|_*^2.$$

Finally, we invoke the estimate $\|\varphi_h\| = \|z_h + \lambda u_h\| \leq \|z_h\| + \lambda \|u_h\| \leq C \|u_h\|_*$ to complete the proof. \square

The unique solvability of the discrete problem (8) follows from the discrete Banach-Nečas-Babuška theorem [27, Theorem 26.6].

Theorem 3.1. *Given $f \in Y'$. There exists a unique solution $u_h \in V_h$ to the problem (8).*

3.2. Auxiliary results

We emphasize again that the bilinear form $a_h(\cdot, \cdot)$ is non-conformal to $a(\cdot, \cdot)$, because the mesh \mathcal{T}_h is non-conformal to Q_1 and Q_2 in the discrepancy region. In order to establish the desired prior estimate, we need some auxiliary estimates of functions in this region. For $i = 1, 2$, the mismatch between Q_i and $Q_{i,h}$ is defined by

$$S_h^1 := Q_{1,h} \setminus \overline{Q_1} = Q_2 \setminus \overline{Q_{2,h}}, \quad \text{and} \quad S_h^2 := Q_{2,h} \setminus \overline{Q_2} = Q_1 \setminus \overline{Q_{1,h}},$$

and $S_h := S_h^1 \cup S_h^2$ (see Figure 2). We define $\mathcal{T}_h^* = \{K \in \mathcal{T}_h \mid K \cap \Gamma^* \neq \emptyset\}$ the set of all interface elements. The following lemma collects some geometry approximation properties of interface elements from [28, Lemma 3] and [29, Lemma 3.3.4]. The results were proved with $d = 1$ and can be extended to the case $d = 2$.




Figure 2: Illustration of the discrepancy region $S = S_h^1 \cup S_h^2$, with $d = 1$. The red curve represents the space-time interface Γ^* , the black diagonal represents the discrete interface Γ_h^* .

Lemma 3.2. *Let $K \in \mathcal{T}_h^*$ and assume that Γ^* is of class C^2 . Then, the mesh \mathcal{T}_h resolves the space-time interface Γ^* to the second order, i.e.,*

$$\text{dist}(\Gamma_h^* \cap K; \Gamma^* \cap K) \leq Ch^2.$$

For all $u \in H^1(S_h)$, there exists a constant $C > 0$ independent of u and h such that

$$\|u\|_{L^2(S_h \cap K)} \leq C \left(h \|u\|_{L^2(\Gamma^* \cap K)} + h^2 \|Du\|_{L^2(S_h \cap K)} \right), \quad (14)$$

where we see the trace of u on Γ^* from S_h and $D := (\nabla, \partial_t)^\top$ is the space-time gradient operator. It holds for the area or volume of the discrepancy region S_h that

$$|S_h| \leq Ch^2. \quad (15)$$

A technical difficulty arises from the mismatch between \mathcal{T}_h and the subdomains Q_1 and Q_2 is that the spatial gradient of u jumps across Γ^* whereas the discrete functions exhibit a similar discontinuity over the approximated interface Γ_h^* . To deal with the mismatch and analyze the bilinear forms in the discrepancy region S_h , we follow the ideas in [30] employing some appropriate extension operators. In particular, for any fixed $s \geq 0$, let $u \in H^s(Q_1 \cup Q_2)$ and $u_i := u|_{Q_i} \in H^s(Q_i)$ its restriction to the subdomain Q_i ($i = 1, 2$). We employ the smooth Stein extensions $\tilde{u}_i \in H^s(Q_T)$ ($i = 1, 2$) to the whole domain Q_T . These extensions have the following properties

$$\tilde{u}_i = u_i \quad \text{in } Q_i, \quad \|\tilde{u}_i\|_{H^s(Q_T)} \leq C \|u_i\|_{H^s(Q_i)}, \quad i = 1, 2, \quad (16)$$

given that Γ^* is Lipschitz continuous (see [23, Section VI.3.1]). We define a map $\pi : H^s(Q_1 \cup Q_2) \rightarrow H^s(Q_{1,h} \cup Q_{2,h})$ by

$$\pi u(\mathbf{x}, t) = \begin{cases} \tilde{u}_1(\mathbf{x}, t) & \text{for } (\mathbf{x}, t) \in Q_{1,h}, \\ \tilde{u}_2(\mathbf{x}, t) & \text{for } (\mathbf{x}, t) \in Q_{2,h}. \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

Please note that πu can be discontinuous across Γ_h^* . The following lemma looks at the difference between u and πu . By definition, $u - \pi u$ vanishes almost everywhere except S_h , and it belongs to $H^s(S_h)$.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $u \in H^2(Q_1 \cup Q_2)$ and $\pi u \in H^2(Q_{1,h} \cup Q_{2,h})$ the function defined in (17). There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\|D(u - \pi u)\|_{L^2(S_h)} \leq Ch \|u\|_{H^2(Q_1 \cup Q_2)}. \quad (18)$$

Proof. For all $K \in \mathcal{T}_h^*$, we use (14) to obtain

$$\|\mathbb{D}(u - \pi u)\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(S_h \cap K)}^2 \leq C \left(h^2 \|\mathbb{D}(u - \pi u)\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Gamma^* \cap K)}^2 + h^4 \|\mathbb{D}^2(u - \pi u)\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(S_h \cap K)}^2 \right).$$

We sum over all elements $K \in \mathcal{T}_h^*$. For the integral on Γ^* , we apply the trace inequality and the property (16) to arrive at

$$\|\mathbb{D}(u - \pi u)\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Gamma^*)}^2 \leq 2 \left(\|\mathbb{D}u\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Gamma^*)}^2 + \|\mathbb{D}\pi u\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Gamma^*)}^2 \right) \leq C \|u\|_{\mathbf{H}^2(Q_1 \cup Q_2)}^2,$$

where the constant C depends on Q_1 and Q_2 , but not on $Q_{1,h}$ and $Q_{2,h}$. We finish the proof. \square

We also recall the interpolation estimate for a Lagrangian interpolant. Note that for $u \in \mathbf{H}^2(Q_1 \cup Q_2)$, the Sobolev embedding [24, Theorem 2.35] implies that $u \in \mathbf{C}(\overline{Q_1}) \cap \mathbf{C}(\overline{Q_2})$. In addition, if the interface condition $[u]_* = 0$ is satisfied for almost all $(x, t) \in \Gamma^*$, we have $u \in \mathbf{C}(\overline{Q_T})$. Let $I_h : \mathbf{C}(\overline{Q_T}) \rightarrow \mathbf{V}_h$ the classical linear interpolation operator associated with the space \mathbf{V}_h . Since \mathcal{T}_h matches perfectly to Γ_h^* , we can extend the classical theories in [31] to handle πu without destroying the optimal order.

Lemma 3.4. *For all $u \in \mathbf{H}^2(Q_1 \cup Q_2)$ such that $[u]_* = 0$ and $\pi u \in \mathbf{H}^2(Q_{1,h} \cup Q_{2,h})$, the interpolation operator I_h satisfies the following approximability property*

$$\|\pi u - I_h u\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(Q_T)} + h \|\mathbb{D}(\pi u - I_h u)\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(Q_{1,h} \cup Q_{2,h})} \leq Ch^2 \|u\|_{\mathbf{H}^2(Q_1 \cup Q_2)}. \quad (19)$$

Proof. The proof of (19) is standard since in each subdomain $Q_{i,h}$ we have $I_h u = I_h \tilde{u}_i$ in all Lagrange nodes of the mesh \mathcal{T}_h . We apply the classical interpolation theory for $\tilde{u}_i \in \mathbf{H}^2(Q_T)$ and the continuity property (16) to obtain the result. \square

Remark 3.1. *In lemma 3.4, we consider $u \in \mathbf{H}^2(Q_1 \cup Q_2)$ such that $[u]_* = 0$ to be able to use the interpolant $I_h : \mathbf{C}(\overline{Q_T}) \rightarrow \mathbf{V}_h$. The assumption $[u]_* = 0$ was also used in [32, Lemma 2.4] and [33, Lemma 2.3], where the authors arrived at an optimal approximation of I_h .*

3.3. A priori error estimate

In section 2, we proved the well-posedness of the continuous variational problem (2) in the space \mathbf{X}_0 , which only requires $\partial_t u \in \mathbf{Y}$. However, one needs additional regularities of the solution u to study the discretization error. More particularly, we assume that the solution $u \in \mathbf{X}_0$ to the problem (2) satisfies $u \in \mathbf{H}^{0,1}(Q_T) \cap \mathbf{H}^s(Q_1 \cup Q_2)$, with $s > \frac{d+3}{2}$. Extending the ideas in [30], we study the error $u - u_h$ by choosing the discrete norm $\|\pi u - u_h\|_*$. This choice is appropriate for employing numerical quadratures and allows us to better understand the mismatch's effect in S_h .

Theorem 3.2. *Let $u \in \mathbf{X}_0$ and $u_h \in \mathbf{V}_h$ be the solutions of the variational problems (2) and (8), respectively. If $u \in \mathbf{H}^{0,1}(Q_T) \cap \mathbf{H}^s(Q_1 \cup Q_2)$ for given $s > \frac{d+3}{2}$, then there holds the following estimate*

$$\|\pi u - u_h\|_* \leq Ch \|u\|_{\mathbf{H}^s(Q_1 \cup Q_2)}. \quad (20)$$

Proof. First of all, we note that $u \in \mathbf{X}_0 \cap \mathbf{H}^{0,1}(Q_T) \subset \mathbf{H}^1(Q_T)$, which implies that $[u]_* = 0$. In addition, if $u \in \mathbf{H}^s(Q_1 \cup Q_2)$ with $s > \frac{d+3}{2}$, then we are able to employ the interpolant I_h . We start with the following estimate

$$\|\pi u - u_h\|_* \leq \|\pi u - I_h u\|_* + \|I_h u - u_h\|_*. \quad (21)$$

In what follows, we denote $w := \pi u - I_h u$ for convenience. By invoking the definition (12), we have

$$\|w\|_*^2 = \|w\|^2 + \|z_h(w)\|^2 \leq \max\{\kappa_1, \kappa_2\} \|\nabla w\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(Q_{1,h} \cup Q_{2,h})}^2 + \|z_h(w)\|^2.$$

The first term is already bounded in the estimate (19). For the second term, we employ the inequalities (11) and (19) to obtain

$$\|z_h(w)\| \leq C \|\mathbb{D}w\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(Q_{1,h} \cup Q_{2,h})} \leq Ch \|u\|_{\mathbf{H}^2(Q_1 \cup Q_2)}.$$

Thus

$$\|w\|_* \leq Ch \|u\|_{\mathbf{H}^2(Q_1 \cup Q_2)}. \quad (22)$$

Next, we estimate the second term on the right-hand side of (21) using the stability condition (13) as follows

$$C \|I_h u - u_h\|_* \leq \sup_{\varphi_h \in \mathbf{V}_h \setminus \{0\}} \frac{a_h(I_h u - u_h, \varphi_h)}{\|\varphi_h\|} = \sup_{\varphi_h \in \mathbf{V}_h \setminus \{0\}} \frac{a_h(I_h u, \varphi_h) - a(u, \varphi_h)}{\|\varphi_h\|} = \sup_{\varphi_h \in \mathbf{V}_h \setminus \{0\}} \frac{I_1 - I_2}{\|\varphi_h\|},$$

where

$$I_1 := \sum_{i=1}^2 \int_{Q_{i,h}} \partial_t \tilde{u}_i \varphi_h + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla \tilde{u}_i \varphi_h + \kappa_i \nabla \tilde{u}_i \cdot \nabla \varphi_h \, dx \, dt - a(u, \varphi_h),$$

$$I_2 := \sum_{i=1}^2 \int_{Q_{i,h}} \partial_t \tilde{u}_i \varphi_h + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla \tilde{u}_i \varphi_h + \kappa_i \nabla \tilde{u}_i \cdot \nabla \varphi_h \, dx \, dt - a_h(I_h u, \varphi_h).$$

We first deal with I_1 . Since $u \in \mathbf{H}^{0,1}(Q_T)$ and the associated integrand vanishes everywhere besides on S_h , we have

$$I_1 = \int_{S_h} \partial_t (\pi u - u) \varphi_h + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla (\pi u - u) \varphi_h + (\kappa_h \nabla (\pi u) - \kappa \nabla u) \cdot \nabla \varphi_h \, dx \, dt$$

$$\leq C \|\mathbf{D}(\pi u - u)\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(S_h)} \|\varphi_h\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(S_h)} + C \left(\|\nabla \pi u\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(S_h)} + \|\nabla u\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(S_h)} \right) \|\varphi_h\|. \quad (23)$$

To treat the first part on the right-hand side, note that the term $\|\mathbf{D}(\pi u - u)\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(S_h)}$ is bounded in (18), and from (10), we have

$$\|\varphi_h\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(S_h)} \leq C \|\varphi_h\|.$$

Now, we handle the two norms $\|\nabla \pi u\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(S_h)}$ and $\|\nabla u\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(S_h)}$ by invoking the technique in [6, Lemma 2.1]. Take $\|\nabla \pi u\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(S_h)}$ for instance. Please note that given $s > \frac{d+3}{2}$, the Sobolev embedding theorem says that $\mathbf{H}^{s-1}(Q_T) \hookrightarrow \mathbf{C}(\overline{Q_T})$. Therefore, we can use the geometry approximation (15) and extension property (16) to get

$$\|\nabla \pi u\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(S_h)} \leq |S_h|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla \pi u\|_{\mathbf{C}(\overline{S_h})} \leq Ch \max \left\{ \|\nabla \tilde{u}_1\|_{\mathbf{C}(\overline{Q_T})}, \|\nabla \tilde{u}_2\|_{\mathbf{C}(\overline{Q_T})} \right\}$$

$$\leq Ch \max \left\{ \|\nabla \tilde{u}_1\|_{\mathbf{H}^{s-1}(Q_T)}, \|\nabla \tilde{u}_2\|_{\mathbf{H}^{s-1}(Q_T)} \right\} \leq Ch \|u\|_{\mathbf{H}^s(Q_1 \cup Q_2)},$$

In this way, we can bound I_1 by

$$I_1 \leq Ch \|u\|_{\mathbf{H}^s(Q_1 \cup Q_2)} \|\varphi_h\|.$$

For estimating I_2 , we utilize the inequality (10) to arrive at

$$I_2 = \sum_{i=1}^2 \int_{Q_{i,h}} \partial_t \tilde{u}_i \varphi_h + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla \tilde{u}_i \varphi_h + \kappa_i \nabla \tilde{u}_i \cdot \nabla \varphi_h \, dx \, dt - a_h(I_h u, \varphi_h)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^2 \int_{Q_{i,h}} \partial_t w \varphi_h + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla w \varphi_h + \kappa_i \nabla w \cdot \nabla \varphi_h \, dx \, dt$$

$$\leq C \left(\|\mathbf{D} w\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(Q_{1,h} \cup Q_{2,h})} \|\varphi_h\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(Q_T)} + \|\nabla w\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(Q_{1,h} \cup Q_{2,h})} \|\varphi_h\| \right)$$

$$\leq C \|\mathbf{D} w\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(Q_{1,h} \cup Q_{2,h})} \|\varphi_h\|,$$

which, by means of (19), implies that

$$I_2 \leq Ch \|u\|_{\mathbf{H}^2(Q_1 \cup Q_2)} \|\varphi_h\|.$$

Finally, we end up with

$$\|I_h u - u_h\|_* \leq Ch \|u\|_{\mathbf{H}^s(Q_1 \cup Q_2)} \|\varphi_h\|. \quad (24)$$

We combine (24) with (22) and (21) to obtain the result. The proof is completed. \square

In case of a weaker regularity condition $u \in \mathbf{H}^2(Q_1 \cup Q_2)$, we have the following prior error estimate, which is now not alike between one and two spatial dimensions.

Theorem 3.3. *Let $u \in X_0$ and $u_h \in \mathbf{V}_h$ be the solutions of the variational problems (2) and (8), respectively. Assume that $u \in \mathbf{H}^{0,1}(Q_T) \cap \mathbf{H}^2(Q_1 \cup Q_2)$. Then, there exists $h_0 > 0$ such that for all $h < h_0$, the following estimate holds*

$$\|\pi u - u_h\|_* \leq C \left\{ \begin{array}{l} h \sqrt{|\log h|} \\ h^{\frac{2}{3}} \end{array} \right\} \|u\|_{\mathbf{H}^2(Q_1 \cup Q_2)} \quad \text{for } \left\{ \begin{array}{l} d = 1 \\ d = 2 \end{array} \right\}. \quad (25)$$

Proof. The proof is analogous to the previous theorem. The only differences are in the estimates of $\|\nabla \pi u\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(S_h)}$ and $\|\nabla u\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(S_h)}$ in (23). We consider the former term since the latter can be treated similarly. We recall the embedding $\mathbf{H}^1(Q_T) \hookrightarrow \mathbf{L}^p(Q_T)$, which holds true for all $p \in [1, \infty)$ when $d = 1$, and for $p \in [1, 6]$ when $d = 2$. In the following, we consider $p \geq 2$ if $d = 1$ and set $p = 6$ in the other case while using the same notation. One can get from the estimate (15) that

$$\|\nabla \pi u\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(S_h)} \leq |S_h|^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p}} \|\nabla \pi u\|_{\mathbf{L}^p(S_h)} \leq Ch^{1 - \frac{2}{p}} \|\nabla \pi u\|_{\mathbf{L}^p(S_h)},$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla \pi u\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(S_h)} &\leq Ch^{1 - \frac{2}{p}} \left(\|\nabla \tilde{u}_1\|_{\mathbf{L}^p(Q_T)}^p + \|\nabla \tilde{u}_2\|_{\mathbf{L}^p(Q_T)}^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\leq C \left\{ \begin{array}{l} h^{1 - \frac{2}{p}} p^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ h^{1 - \frac{2}{6}} \end{array} \right\} \left(\|\nabla \tilde{u}_1\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(Q_T)}^p + \|\nabla \tilde{u}_2\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(Q_T)}^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\leq C \left\{ \begin{array}{l} h^{1 - \frac{2}{p}} p^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ h^{1 - \frac{2}{6}} \end{array} \right\} \|u\|_{\mathbf{H}^2(Q_1 \cup Q_2)} \leq C \left\{ \begin{array}{l} h \sqrt{|\log h|} \\ h^{\frac{2}{3}} \end{array} \right\} \|u\|_{\mathbf{H}^2(Q_1 \cup Q_2)} \quad \text{for } \left\{ \begin{array}{l} d = 1 \\ d = 2 \end{array} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

In this step, we employed from [34, Lemma 2.1] the Sobolev inequality

$$\|\nabla \tilde{u}_i\|_{\mathbf{L}^p(Q_T)} \leq Cp^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla \tilde{u}_i\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(Q_T)}, \quad (27)$$

which holds true for all $2 \leq p < \infty$ when $d = 1$, with C independent of p . Moreover, one can easily prove that the function $f(p) = h^{-\frac{2}{p}} p^{\frac{1}{2}}$, with a sufficiently small $h < h_0$, achieves its global minimum at $p = -4 \log h$. Therefore, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= \int_{S_h} \partial_t(\pi u - u) \varphi_h + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla(\pi u - u) \varphi_h + (\kappa_h \nabla(\pi u) - \kappa \nabla u) \cdot \nabla \varphi_h \, d\mathbf{x} \, dt \\ &\leq C \left\{ \begin{array}{l} h \sqrt{|\log h|} \\ h^{\frac{2}{3}} \end{array} \right\} \|u\|_{\mathbf{H}^2(Q_1 \cup Q_2)} \|\varphi_h\| \quad \text{for } \left\{ \begin{array}{l} d = 1 \\ d = 2 \end{array} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have

$$\|I_h u - u_h\|_* \leq C \left\{ \begin{array}{l} h \sqrt{|\log h|} \\ h^{\frac{2}{3}} \end{array} \right\} \|u\|_{\mathbf{H}^2(Q_1 \cup Q_2)} \quad \text{for } \left\{ \begin{array}{l} d = 1 \\ d = 2 \end{array} \right\}. \quad (28)$$

The estimate (25) follows by substituting (22) and (28) into (21). \square

Remark 3.2. *Providing that $u \in \mathbf{H}^{0,1}(Q_T) \cap \mathbf{H}^s(Q_1 \cup Q_2)$, with $s > \frac{d+3}{2}$, we obtain an optimal error estimate with respect to the discrete norm $\|\pi u - u_h\|_*$ in theorem 3.2. However, in some scenarios when the solution is rougher, let us say $u \in \mathbf{H}^{0,1}(Q_T) \cap \mathbf{H}^2(Q_1 \cup Q_2)$, the estimate (20) turns out to be not applicable. In this case, we arrive at a nearly optimal error estimate in one spatial dimension and a sub-optimal estimate in two spatial dimensions (theorem 3.3). The nearly optimal bound $O\left(h \sqrt{|\log h|}\right)$ for $d = 1$ mainly relies on the Sobolev inequality (27), which is unfortunately not available for $d = 2$ (in our case, 3D space-time domain Q_T).*

There are better bounds in the literature [14, 8]. However, these studies relied on the interface-unfitted mesh method, which requires more effort to compute interaction integrals over the moving interface. Instead, we discretize the space-time domain using the interface-fitted mesh and avoid invoking special quadrature rules on cut elements. Moreover, the optimal error estimate can be recovered when the solution is sufficiently smooth on each subdomain.

From the numerical point of view, the norm $\|\cdot\|_*$ is appropriate for studying the discrete problem (8) since it involves the coefficient κ_h . However, it is worth noting that we also arrive at the same convergence order with respect to the norm $\|\cdot\|_*$ or $\|\cdot\|_Y$. For instance, we can combine (18), (20), and (25) to get the following result:

Corollary 3.1. *Let $u \in X_0$ and $u_h \in V_h$ be the solutions of the variational problems (2) and (8), respectively. Assume that $u \in H^{0,1}(Q_T) \cap H^s(Q_1 \cup Q_2)$ for given $s > \frac{d+3}{2}$. Then, the following estimate holds*

$$\|u - u_h\|_* \leq Ch \|u\|_{H^s(Q_1 \cup Q_2)} \quad \text{for } d = 1, 2.$$

If we only have $u \in H^{0,1}(Q_T) \cap H^2(Q_1 \cup Q_2)$, then there exists $h_0 > 0$ such that for all $h < h_0$, it holds the following

$$\|u - u_h\|_* \leq C \begin{cases} h \sqrt{|\log h|} \\ h^{\frac{2}{3}} \end{cases} \|u\|_{H^2(Q_1 \cup Q_2)} \quad \text{for } \begin{cases} d = 1 \\ d = 2 \end{cases}.$$

4. Numerical results

This section is devoted to presenting various numerical examples, both in one and two spatial dimensions, to show the performance of our numerical method. The primary focus is to confirm the convergence order of the proposed scheme and examine its robustness in dealing with different regularity solutions and various interface shapes. We perform all numerical experiments using the finite-element based solver FreeFem++ [35].

4.1. 2D space-time examples

The first two numerical experiments involve the space-time domain $Q_T = (0, 1)^2$, where the interface evolves dynamically. The initial interface $\Gamma(0)$ comprises two points $x_1 = 0.4$ and $x_2 = 0.6$. The movement of the interface is governed by a smooth velocity function v . We define the shift function $w(t)$ as the integral of the velocity function in time

$$w(t) = \int_0^t v(\tau) d\tau.$$

The two space-time subdomains of Q_T are determined by

$$Q_1 = \{(x, t) \in Q_T \mid L_1(t) < x < L_2(t), 0 < t < 1\}, \quad Q_2 = Q_T \setminus \overline{Q_1},$$

where the moving interfaces

$$L_1(t) = x_1 + w(t), \quad L_2(t) = x_2 + w(t).$$

In this section, we consider two cases (see Figure 3):

1. (Constant velocity) Γ^* is planar: $v = 0.1$, $w(t) = 0.1t$.
2. (Non-constant velocity) Γ^* is curved: $v = 0.1\pi \cos(2\pi t)$, $w(t) = 0.05 \sin(2\pi t)$.

For verifying the convergence rate of the proposed finite element method, the following norm is used

$$\|u - u_h\|_Y = \left(\int_0^T \int_{\Omega} |\nabla(u - u_h)|^2 dx dt \right)^{1/2},$$




Figure 3: The space-time domain Q_T with interface evolving at the velocity $v = 0.1$ in the first example (left), and $v = 0.1\pi \cos(2\pi t)$ in the second example (right).

in which the convergence rates established in Theorems 3.2 and 3.3 are preserved under the corresponding regularity assumptions. In both cases, the domain Q_T is discretized using a quasi-uniform mesh with N equidistant intervals along each edge. We utilize a range of discretizations of Q_T with varying values of N to evaluate the errors with respect to the mesh size h .

Example 1. In the first example, we consider the case of an interface moving with a constant velocity $v = 0.1$. The moving interfaces are defined by

$$L_1(t) = 0.4 + 0.1t, \quad L_2(t) = 0.6 + 0.1t.$$

We choose the exact solution

$$u(x, t) = [\cos(10\pi(x - L_1(t))) - \cos(10\pi L_1(t))] \sin\left(\frac{\pi t}{2}\right),$$

which is smooth on the whole space-time domain Q_T , i.e., $u \in H^2(Q_T)$. It is worth noticing that this example is an exceptional case, where the solution u belongs to $H^2(Q_T)$ since it satisfies $\nabla u = 0$ on Γ^* . In general, such a regular solution does not exist owing to the jump of κ across Γ^* . As suggested by classical theories, we expect that the proposed method provides an optimal convergence order in this case. The material coefficients are set to fixed values $(\kappa_1, \kappa_2) = (0.5, 1)$, and the right-hand side of the equation (1) is determined accordingly. Table 1 presents the errors and estimated convergence rates for various levels of mesh refinement. These results demonstrate a gradual improvement in errors as the mesh refinement levels increase. The results in Table 1 are visualized in Figure 5, offering an overall perspective on the achieved convergence rate. We see that the error convergence order is $O(h)$, which is optimal as expected. Therefore, in this scenario of a smooth solution, the performance of our method is confirmed.

Example 2. In the second example, a sinusoidal curved space-time interface is considered, which is determined by the velocity $v = 0.1\pi \cos(2\pi t)$. As a result, the level set functions are given by

$$L_1(t) = 0.4 + 0.05 \sin(2\pi t), \quad L_2(t) = 0.6 + 0.05 \sin(2\pi t).$$

The same material coefficients are used, namely $(\kappa_1, \kappa_2) = (0.5, 1)$, and the exact solution is chosen as follows

$$u(x, t) = \begin{cases} \left[\sin\left(20\pi(x - L_1(t)) + \frac{\pi}{6}\right) + \sin\left(10\pi L_1(t) - \frac{\pi}{6}\right) \right] \sin\left(\frac{\pi t}{2}\right) & \text{for } (x, t) \in Q_1, \\ \left[\sin\left(10\pi(x - L_1(t)) + \frac{\pi}{6}\right) + \sin\left(10\pi L_1(t) - \frac{\pi}{6}\right) \right] \sin\left(\frac{\pi t}{2}\right) & \text{for } (x, t) \in Q_2. \end{cases}$$

Table 1: The errors of the numerical method for various levels of mesh refinement in Example 1.

N	dof	Mesh size h	$\ u - u_h\ _Y$	Order
10	3451	3.410×10^{-2}	2.329×10^0	-
20	13072	1.897×10^{-2}	1.193×10^0	0.966
40	54455	9.514×10^{-3}	5.582×10^{-1}	1.081
80	207616	4.892×10^{-3}	2.948×10^{-1}	1.031
160	827676	2.525×10^{-3}	1.478×10^{-1}	1.058

This solution is globally less regular than the one in the previous example. However, it is smooth on each space-time subdomain, i.e., $u \in H^1(Q_T) \cap H^3(Q_1 \cup Q_2)$. Theorem 3.2 suggests that the proposed finite element method applied to this example exhibits an optimal convergence rate with respect to the mesh size h . The numerical errors are shown in Table 2 and Figure 5, which is almost congruent with the theoretical convergence order $O(h)$. While the current solution has a discontinuous gradient across the moving interface, necessitating more effort, the differences between the two results are insignificant when comparing the convergence rates obtained with the same mesh size. Hence, our method yields a similar level of discretization accuracy for both the case of an interface evolves with a constant velocity $v = 0.1$ and a time-dependent velocity $v = 0.1\pi \cos(2\pi t)$. Figure 4 describes the approximate solutions for both examples. To effectively simulate their different characteristics, three-dimensional visualizations are crucial. The continuity property of the solution in Example 1 is observed by the smooth curves across the interface. In contrast, the discontinuity of the solution gradient is highlighted by the fracture curves on the interface in Example 2.

Table 2: The errors of the numerical method for various levels of mesh refinement in Example 2.

N	dof	Mesh size h	$\ u - u_h\ _Y$	Order
10	3370	3.181×10^{-2}	4.561×10^0	-
20	13064	1.699×10^{-2}	2.338×10^0	0.964
40	53074	9.001×10^{-3}	1.154×10^0	1.038
80	212806	4.302×10^{-3}	5.754×10^{-1}	1.149
160	847930	2.459×10^{-3}	2.884×10^{-1}	1.189

4.2. 3D space-time example

Example 3. In this section, we will simulate an advection-diffusion problem involving a moving interface in the 3D space-time domain. This example is modified from an experiment performed in [4] using a time-stepping scheme. Figure 6 illustrates the discretized space-time domain Q_T of this specific example. The coefficient function κ is given by $(\kappa_1, \kappa_2) = (2, 1)$. The interface undergoes a rotation around the t -axis over the time interval $(0, 1)$ with a velocity $\mathbf{v} = (-2\pi y, 2\pi x)^\top$, where $\mathbf{x} = (x, y)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^2$ (see Figure 6).

The following relative error is computed

$$\tilde{E}_u = \frac{\left| \|\nabla u_h\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(Q_T)} - \|\nabla u_{ref}\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(Q_T)} \right|}{\|\nabla u_{ref}\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(Q_T)}},$$

to assess the difference between the discrete solution u_h and a reference solution $u_{ref} \in V_h$. Here, u_{ref} is the solution to (8) using a fine mesh of Q_T with 181820 tetrahedra. Figure 7 portrays the convergence rate, which is gradually approaching $O(h)$. This result again confirms the theoretical bound (20) of our proposed scheme.




Figure 4: The numerical solutions of Example 1 (left) and Example 2 (right).




Figure 5: The errors of the numerical scheme and the corresponding convergence rates in Example 1 (left) and Example 2 (right).




Figure 6: The domain Ω consisting of two subdomains $\Omega_1(t)$ and $\Omega_2(t)$ moving at velocity $\mathbf{v} = (-2\pi y, 2\pi x)^\top$ (left) and the discretized space-time domain Q_T (right) in Example 3.




Figure 7: The convergence rate of the relative error \widetilde{E}_u in Example 3.

5. Conclusions

Based on the interface-fitted strategy, we have proposed a new space-time finite element method to solve a parabolic advection-diffusion problem with moving subdomains. Unlike other space-time approaches, we treat the time and spatial variables similarly. We have shown an optimal error estimate with respect to a discrete energy norm under a specific globally low but locally high regularity condition. When the solution is less regular, the scheme is nearly optimal in one spatial dimension and sub-optimal in two spatial dimensions. We have also presented various numerical experiments illustrating the convergence behavior and the method's effectiveness.

In the coming research, we intend to investigate the numerical analysis for moving interface problems when the solution is less regular, let us say $u \in H^{2,1}(Q_1 \cup Q_2)$. This situation is reasonable and more practical since the formulation does not invoke the second-order derivative of u with respect to time. In addition, we would extend the proposed finite element scheme to solve parabolic problems with moving interfaces and fully discontinuous advection and diffusion coefficients, as studied in [2, 4]. A more straightforward setting in [36, 37] considering a discontinuous advection coefficient but a continuous diffusion coefficient also justifies an intensive investigation using the proposed interface-fitted finite element method, which might give rise to an optimal convergence rate under lower regularity assumptions.

References

- [1] I. Voulis, A. Reusken, A time dependent Stokes interface problem: well-posedness and space-time finite element discretization, *ESAIM: Math. Model. Numer. Anal.* 52 (6) (2018) 2187–2213.
- [2] V. C. Le, M. Slodička, K. Van Bockstal, A time discrete scheme for an electromagnetic contact problem with moving conductor, *Applied Mathematics and Computation* 404 (2021) 125997.
- [3] M. Slodička, Parabolic problem for moving/evolving body with perfect contact to neighborhood, *J. Comput. Appl. Math.* 391 (2021) 113461.
- [4] V. C. Le, M. Slodička, K. Van Bockstal, A numerical scheme for solving an induction heating problem with moving non-magnetic conductor, to appear in *Comput. Math. Appl.* (2024).
- [5] I. Babuška, The finite element method for elliptic equations with discontinuous coefficients, *Computing (Arch. Elektron. Rechnen)* 5 (3) (1970) 207–213.
- [6] Z. Chen, J. Zou, Finite element methods and their convergence for elliptic and parabolic interface problems, *Numer. Math.* 79 (2) (1998) 175–202.
- [7] C.-C. Chu, I. Graham, T.-Y. Hou, A new multiscale finite element method for high-contrast elliptic interface problems, *Math. Comp.* 79 (272) (2010) 1915–1955.
- [8] R. Guo, Solving parabolic moving interface problems with dynamical immersed spaces on unfitted meshes: fully discrete analysis, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* 59 (2) (2021) 797–828.
- [9] T. Belytschko, T. Black, Elastic crack growth in finite elements with minimal remeshing, *Internat. J. Numer. Methods Engrg.* 45 (5) (1999) 601–620.
- [10] C. Hirt, A. Amsden, J. Cook, An arbitrary Lagrangian-Eulerian computing method for all flow speeds, *J. Comput. Phys.* 14 (3) (1974) 227–253.
- [11] A. M. Winslow, Numerical solution of the quasilinear Poisson equation in a nonuniform triangle mesh, *J. Comput. Phys.* 1 (2) (1966) 149–172.
- [12] Y. Di, R. Li, T. Tang, P. Zhang, Level set calculations for incompressible two-phase flows on a dynamically adaptive grid, *J. Sci. Comput.* 31 (1–2) (2006) 75–98.
- [13] P. Zunino, Analysis of backward Euler/extended finite element discretization of parabolic problems with moving interfaces, *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.* 258 (2013) 152–165.
- [14] C. Lehrenfeld, A. Reusken, Analysis of a Nitsche XFEM-DG discretization for a class of two-phase mass transport problems, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* 51 (2) (2013) 958–983.
- [15] C. Lehrenfeld, The Nitsche XFEM-DG space-time method and its implementation in three space dimensions, *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.* 37 (1) (2015) A245–A270.
- [16] S. Badia, H. Dilip, F. Verdugo, Space-time unfitted finite element methods for time-dependent problems on moving domains, *Comput. Math. Appl.* 135 (2023) 60–76.
- [17] M. Balázsová, M. Feistauer, M. Vlasák, Stability of the ale space-time discontinuous Galerkin method for nonlinear convection-diffusion problems in time-dependent domains, *ESAIM Math. Model. Numer. Anal.* 52 (6) (2018) 2327–2356.
- [18] R. Lan, M. J. Ramirez, P. Sun, Finite element analysis of an arbitrary Lagrangian–Eulerian method for Stokes/parabolic moving interface problem with jump coefficients, *Results Appl. Math.* 8 (2020) 100091.
- [19] O. Steinbach, Space-time finite element methods for parabolic problems, *Comput. Methods Appl. Math.* 15 (4) (2015) 551–566.
- [20] U. Langer, S. E. Moore, M. Neumüller, Space-time isogeometric analysis of parabolic evolution problems, *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.* 306 (2016) 342–363.
- [21] U. Langer, M. Neumüller, A. Schafelner, Space-time finite element methods for parabolic evolution problems with variable coefficients, in: *Advanced finite element methods with applications*, Springer International Publishing, 2019, pp. 247–275.
- [22] P. Gangl, M. Gobrial, O. Steinbach, A space-time finite element method for the eddy current approximation of rotating electric machines, Submitted for publication (2023).

- [23] E. M. Stein, *Singular integrals and differentiability properties of functions*, Vol. 30 of Princeton Mathematical Series, Princeton University Press, 1971.
- [24] A. Ern, J.-L. Guermond, *Finite elements I: approximation and interpolation*, Vol. 72 of Texts in Applied Mathematics, Springer International Publishing, 2021.
- [25] S. Gross, A. Reusken, *Numerical methods for two-phase incompressible flows*, Vol. 40 of Springer Series in Computational Mathematics, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2011.
- [26] T. Roubíček, *Nonlinear partial differential equations with applications*, Vol. 153 of International Series of Numerical Mathematics, Birkhäuser Verlag, 2005.
- [27] A. Ern, J.-L. Guermond, *Finite elements II: Galerkin approximation, elliptic and mixed PDEs*, Vol. 73 of Texts in Applied Mathematics, Springer International Publishing, 2021.
- [28] J. H. Bramble, J. T. King, A finite element method for interface problems in domains with smooth boundaries and interfaces, *Adv. Comput. Math.* 6 (2) (1996) 109–138.
- [29] M. Feistauer, On the finite element approximation of a cascade flow problem, *Numer. Math.* 50 (6) (1987) 655–684.
- [30] S. Frei, G. Judakova, T. Richter, A locally modified second-order finite element method for interface problems and its implementation in two dimensions, *ESAIM: Math. Model. Numer. Anal.* 57 (3) (2023) 1355–1380.
- [31] P. G. Ciarlet, *The finite element method for elliptic problems*, Vol. 40 of Classics in Applied Mathematics, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2002.
- [32] B. Deka, Finite element methods with numerical quadrature for elliptic problems with smooth interfaces, *J. Comput. Appl. Math.* 234 (2) (2010) 605–612.
- [33] B. Deka, T. Ahmed, Convergence of finite element method for linear second-order wave equations with discontinuous coefficients, *Numer. Methods Partial Differential Equations* 29 (5) (2013) 1522–1542.
- [34] X. Ren, J. Wei, On a two-dimensional elliptic problem with large exponent in nonlinearity, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 343 (2) (1994) 749–763.
- [35] F. Hecht, New development in freefem++, *J. Numer. Math.* 20 (3-4) (2012).
- [36] V. C. Le, M. Slodička, K. Van Bockstal, Error estimates for the time discretization of an electromagnetic contact problem with moving non-magnetic conductor, *Computers & Mathematics with Applications* 87 (2021) 27–40.
- [37] V. C. Le, M. Slodička, K. Van Bockstal, A space-time discretization for an electromagnetic problem with moving non-magnetic conductor, *Applied Numerical Mathematics* 173 (2022) 345–364.