

Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft

# Priority Program 1253

Optimization with Partial Differential Equations

---

THOMAS APEL AND DIETER SIRCH

## $L^2$ -Error Estimates for the Dirichlet and Neumann Problem on Anisotropic Finite Element Meshes

*October 2008*

Preprint-Number SPP1253-02-05



<http://www.am.uni-erlangen.de/home/spp1253>



# $L^2$ -error estimates for the Dirichlet and Neumann problem on anisotropic finite element meshes

Thomas Apel\*    Dieter Sirch†

October 13, 2008

**Abstract** An  $L^2$ -estimate of the finite element error is proved for a Dirichlet and a Neumann boundary value problem on a three-dimensional, prismatic and non-convex domain, that is discretized by an anisotropic tetrahedral mesh. To this end, an approximation error estimate for an interpolation operator, that is preserving the Dirichlet boundary conditions, is given. The challenge for the Neumann problem is the proof of a local interpolation error estimate for functions from a weighted Sobolev space.

**Key Words** elliptic boundary value problem, a priori error estimates, interpolation of non-smooth functions, finite element error, non-convex domains, edge singularities, anisotropic mesh grading.

**AMS subject classification** 65D05, 65N30

## 1 Introduction

The motivation for this paper comes from our investigation of a discretized version of the following optimal control problem. Minimize

$$F(y, u) := \frac{1}{2} \|y - y_d\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{\nu}{2} \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2$$

subject to an elliptic state equation  $Ly = u$  in  $\Omega$  with appropriate boundary conditions. Here,  $y_d$  is the desired state, the regularization parameter  $\nu > 0$  is a fixed positive number, and the control variable  $u$  varies over a set  $U_{\text{ad}}$  which is the space  $L^2(\Omega)$  or a convex subset of it. For the numerical solution, one usually considers the system of necessary and sufficient first order optimality conditions consisting of the state equation,

---

\*Universität der Bundeswehr München, Institut für Mathematik und Bauinformatik, 85579 Neubiberg, Germany; [thomas.apel@unibw.de](mailto:thomas.apel@unibw.de)

†Universität der Bundeswehr München, Institut für Mathematik und Bauinformatik, 85579 Neubiberg, Germany; [dieter.sirch@unibw.de](mailto:dieter.sirch@unibw.de)

an adjoint equation  $L^*p = y - y_d$  (with boundary conditions) for the costate  $p$  and a projection  $u = \Pi_{U_{\text{ad}}}(-\frac{1}{\nu}p)$  to the set of admissible controls.

The classical discretization with piecewise linears for the state and costate as well as piecewise linears for the control leads to first order accuracy only, see [13, 14, 22, 8, 10]. In all those papers, a family of quasi-uniform meshes is discussed, and the solution is assumed to be sufficiently smooth. Second order approximation has been achieved by two different methods. In the variationally discrete approach, [18], only the state equation and its adjoint are discretized by piecewise linears; the control is obtained by a projection  $u_h = \Pi_{U_{\text{ad}}}(-\frac{1}{\nu}p_h)$ . In the superconvergence approach, [23], the control variable is discretized as well, but a postprocessing step generates the final approximation of  $u$ . This approach uses that the piecewise constant approximate control is superclose to an interpolant of the exact control.

The error analysis of both approaches relies among others on an estimate of the finite element discretization error in the  $L^2$ -norm for the elliptic problem which is usually obtained by the Aubin-Nitsche method. In order to apply this method, a discretization error estimate in the energy norm is necessary for the situation where the right hand side of the elliptic equation is only in  $L^2(\Omega)$ . This estimate is standard in many cases but not yet available for the discretization with anisotropic mesh grading as it is appropriate near edges of the computational domain. The aim of this paper is to derive such an estimate for two model problems. The application to the optimal control problems exceeds the scope of one paper and will be published elsewhere [7].

In order to introduce more clearly into this topic let us fix some notation. In this paper two elliptic boundary value problems in a three-dimensional, non-convex domain  $\Omega$  are treated. Since we discuss from now on the elliptic problem only, the standard notation with  $u$  being the solution of the partial differential equation is used, contrary to the optimal control problem above where the solution of the state equation is denoted by  $y$ . We consider the Dirichlet problem,

$$-\Delta u = f \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad u = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega, \quad (1.1)$$

and the Neumann problem

$$-\Delta u + u = f \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega. \quad (1.2)$$

Robin or mixed boundary conditions are not discussed explicitly here since no further difficulties occur.

For both problems (1.1) and (1.2) it is well known, that the solution has in general singularities near corners and edges, e.g. [19, 15]. Therefore one can observe in this case, that the convergence rate of the finite element method on quasiuniform meshes is smaller in comparison with that for problems with smooth solutions. To overcome this loss in accuracy, special adapted numerical methods have been developed. One approach is the *singular function method*, which is used for three-dimensional problems in [9, 21]. Another method is *mesh refinement*. For the Dirichlet problem, refined *isotropic* meshes were considered in [3, 6]. But it was observed that this technique leads to overrefinement near edges.

In order to avoid this overrefinement, *anisotropic meshes* in the neighborhood of the edges were used in [2, 5]. Anisotropic finite elements are more general than shape-regular elements; they are characterized by three size parameters  $h_{i,T}$ ,  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , which may have different asymptotics. The anisotropic mesh grading is described by a relationship between the size parameters of each element and its distance from an edge. By estimating the approximation error of the standard nodal interpolation operator and using the projection property of the finite element method, it is shown that with  $u_h$  being the finite element solution using a linear ansatz space the estimate

$$|u - u_h|_{W^{1,2}(\Omega)} \lesssim h \|f\|_{L^p(\Omega)}, \quad (1.3)$$

is valid for  $p > 2$ ,  $h = \max_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} \text{diam } T$ . The main drawback of this estimate is, that the case  $p = 2$  cannot be treated in this way and we do not obtain an  $L^2$ -estimate of the finite element error.

Let us discuss interpolation shortly. The standard Lagrangian (nodal) interpolation operator uses nodal values of the function for the definition of the interpolant. This implies the very useful property, that Dirichlet boundary conditions are preserved. However, it was shown in [2], that the local interpolation error estimate

$$|u - I_h u|_{W^{1,p}(T)} \lesssim \sum_{i=1}^3 h_{i,T} \left| \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \right|_{W^{1,p}(T)} \quad (1.4)$$

and even its simplified version  $|u - I_h u|_{W^{1,p}(T)} \lesssim \max_i h_{i,T} |u|_{W^{2,p}(T)}$  is valid under the condition  $p > 2$  only, if  $T$  is an anisotropic, three-dimensional finite element. This has led to the restriction  $p > 2$  for (1.3) as mentioned above. A straightforward idea to overcome this problem is to use a quasi-interpolation operator as for example introduced in [11, 29]. The basic idea is to replace nodal values by suitable averaged values. Several variants of quasi-interpolation operators were investigated in [1] for anisotropic finite elements. It turned out that the classical operators according to [11, 29] are not uniformly  $W^{1,p}$ -stable in the aspect ratio and do not satisfy an estimate like (1.4) (with  $T$  replaced by a patch  $S_T$  on the right hand side). The positive conclusion of [1] is, however, that three modifications of the Scott-Zhang interpolant are available for which such an estimate holds. The disadvantage of these modified operators is that they preserve Dirichlet boundary conditions on part of the boundary only. Moreover the analysis is made for meshes with certain structure only; they are called *meshes of tensor product type* in [1].

The mixed boundary value problem,

$$-\Delta u = f \text{ in } \Omega, \quad u = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_M, \quad \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_B, \quad (1.5)$$

with  $f \in L^2(\Omega)$  is considered in [1]. In view of the above mentioned difficulty with the boundary condition, the boundary parts are chosen such that one of these modified Scott-Zhang operators preserves the Dirichlet condition on  $\Gamma_M$ . In particular, it is  $\Omega = G \times Z$ , where  $G \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  is a bounded polygonal domain and  $Z := (0, z_0) \subset \mathbb{R}$  is an interval. The different parts of the boundary are denoted by  $\Gamma_B := \{x \in \partial\Omega : x_3 = 0 \text{ or } x_3 = z_0\}$  and

$\Gamma_M := \partial\Omega \setminus \Gamma_B$ . Besides there is assumed that the cross-section  $G$  has only one corner with interior angle  $\omega > \pi$  at the origin; thus  $\Omega$  has only one “singular edge” which is part of the  $x_3$ -axis. Since the edge singularities are of local nature, no additional difficulties are introduced by more than one reentrant corner in  $G$ . For appropriately graded anisotropic meshes the estimate

$$|u - u_h|_{W^{1,2}(\Omega)} \lesssim h \|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad (1.6)$$

is obtained where  $u_h$  is the finite element solution of (1.5) using linear elements, which leads easily to an  $L^2$ -estimate of the discretization error. One main ingredient of the proof is the description of the regularity of the solution in certain weighted Sobolev spaces.

Up to now there was neither an  $L^2$ -estimate for the pure Dirichlet problem nor for the pure Neumann problem. The specific difficulty with the Dirichlet problem is that the quasi-interpolant does not preserve the boundary conditions such that a further modification is necessary and another error term has to be estimated. This was not continued ten years ago. The Neumann problem was not satisfactorily treated since its solution has to be described in other weighted Sobolev spaces than the Dirichlet and the mixed problems. It should be noted that the boundary condition on  $\Gamma_B$  is not important, only that Neumann conditions are posed on both faces joining the “singular edge”. In view of this, Lemma 12 in [1] is wrong for the Neumann case, and in consequence also the proof of Theorem 14 in [1]. The aim of this paper is to fill these gaps.

The plan is to derive estimate (1.6) for problem (1.1) and (1.2), where  $\Omega = G \times Z$  with  $G$  and  $Z$  defined as above. Then we are able to derive the optimal estimate of the  $L^2(\Omega)$ -error

$$\|u - u_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim h^2 \|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

Our further considerations begin with the introduction of some necessary notation. Then we recall regularity results for the Dirichlet problem and state one for the Neumann problem. Afterwards we show local error estimates for an interpolation operator for non-smooth functions that preserves Dirichlet boundary conditions. Furthermore we prove for an interpolation operator that is suitable for the Neumann problem, a local error estimate for functions in a special type of weighted Sobolev spaces. In the last section global estimates for the interpolation and the finite element error are shown.

From the previous paragraphs it may have become obvious that there is a close relationship of this paper with the paper [1]. For brevity, we keep proofs short whenever they are applications or simple extensions of derivations in the former paper. Comprehensive proofs are given when new ideas had to be used.

## 2 Notation and analytical background

In this section we introduce the necessary notation. We further state an embedding result and prove a norm equivalence in a weighted Sobolev space.

For some positive constants  $C, C_1$  and  $C_2$ , which are independent of the triangulation and the function under consideration, we write

$$\begin{aligned} x \lesssim y &\Leftrightarrow x \leq Cy, \\ x \sim y &\Leftrightarrow C_1 y \leq x \leq C_2 y. \end{aligned}$$

For  $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$  and  $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3)$ ,  $\alpha_i$  non-negative integers, we use the multi-index notation

$$|\alpha| := \sum_{i=1}^3 \alpha_i, \quad x^\alpha := x_1^{\alpha_1} x_2^{\alpha_2} x_3^{\alpha_3} \quad \text{and} \quad D^\alpha := \frac{\partial^{\alpha_1}}{\partial x_1^{\alpha_1}} \frac{\partial^{\alpha_2}}{\partial x_2^{\alpha_2}} \frac{\partial^{\alpha_3}}{\partial x_3^{\alpha_3}}.$$

We denote the classical Sobolev spaces by  $W^{k,p}(T)$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ ,  $p \in [1, \infty]$  and use the following norm and seminorm

$$\|v\|_{W^{k,p}(T)}^p := \sum_{|\alpha| \leq k} \int_T |D^\alpha v|^p, \quad |v|_{W^{k,p}(T)}^p := \sum_{|\alpha|=k} \int_T |D^\alpha v|^p,$$

for  $p < \infty$  and the usual modification for  $p = \infty$ . By introducing cylindrical coordinates  $x_1 = r \cos \varphi$ ,  $x_2 = r \sin \varphi$ , we define for  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ ,  $p \in [1, \infty]$  and  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$  the weighted Sobolev spaces

$$\begin{aligned} V_\beta^{k,p}(T) &= \left\{ v \in \mathcal{D}'(T) : \|v\|_{V_\beta^{k,p}(T)}^p < \infty \right\} \\ W_\beta^{k,p}(T) &= \left\{ v \in \mathcal{D}'(T) : \|v\|_{W_\beta^{k,p}(T)}^p < \infty \right\} \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \|v\|_{V_\beta^{k,p}(T)}^p &:= \sum_{|\alpha| \leq k} \int_T |r^{\beta-k+|\alpha|} D^\alpha v|^p \\ \|v\|_{W_\beta^{k,p}(T)}^p &:= \sum_{|\alpha| \leq k} \int_T |r^\beta D^\alpha v|^p \end{aligned}$$

for  $p < \infty$  and the usual modification for  $p = \infty$ . For the weighted space  $W_\beta^{k,p}(\Omega)$  the following embedding result holds.

**Lemma 2.1.** *For  $p \in (1, \infty)$ ,  $\beta > 1 - 2/p$  and  $k \geq 0$  one has the compact embedding*

$$W_\beta^{k+1,p}(\Omega) \xhookrightarrow{c} W_\beta^{k,p}(\Omega). \quad (2.1)$$

*For  $p \in (1, \infty)$ ,  $k \geq 1$  and  $\beta \in (1 - 2/p, 1]$  the continuous embeddings*

$$W_\beta^{k,p}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow W_{\beta-1}^{k-1,p}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow W^{k-1,p}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^p(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^1(\Omega) \quad (2.2)$$

*are valid.*

*Proof.* From Lemma 1.8 in [26] one has  $W_\beta^{1,p}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow V_\beta^{1,p}(\Omega)$  for  $\beta > 1 - 2/p$ . Lemma 1.2 in [26] yields  $V_\beta^{1,p}(\Omega) \xrightarrow{c} W_{\beta-1}^{0,p}(\Omega)$ . Since  $W_{\beta-1}^{0,p}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow W_\beta^{0,p}(\Omega)$  this shows the embedding  $W_\beta^{1,p}(\Omega) \xrightarrow{c} W_\beta^{0,p}(\Omega)$ . Applying this embedding to derivatives, one can conclude (2.1). The embedding  $W_\beta^{k,p}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow W_{\beta-1}^{k-1,p}(\Omega)$  follows from Theorem 1.3 in [26]. The other embeddings in (2.2) can be concluded directly since  $\beta \leq 1$  and  $p > 1$ .  $\square$

In the next lemma a norm equivalence is proven, that will be useful in the forthcoming derivation of a local interpolation error estimate for functions from the spaces  $W_\beta^{k,p}(\Omega)$ .

**Lemma 2.2.** *For  $p > 1$ ,  $\beta \in (1 - 2/p, 1]$  and a function  $v \in W_\beta^{k+1,p}(\Omega)$  one has the norm equivalence*

$$\|v\|_{W_\beta^{k+1,p}(\Omega)} \sim |v|_{W_\beta^{k+1,p}(\Omega)} + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq k} \left| \int_\Omega D^\alpha v \right|.$$

*Proof.* Since one has for  $p > 1$  and  $\beta \in (1 - 2/p, 1]$  the embedding  $W_\beta^{1,p}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^1(\Omega)$  (see (2.2)) the inequality

$$\|v\|_{W_\beta^{k+1,p}(\Omega)} \gtrsim |v|_{W_\beta^{k+1,p}(\Omega)} + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq k} \left| \int_\Omega D^\alpha v \right|$$

holds. In order to show the other direction,

$$\|v\|_{W_\beta^{k+1,p}(\Omega)} \lesssim |v|_{W_\beta^{k+1,p}(\Omega)} + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq k} \left| \int_\Omega D^\alpha v \right|, \quad (2.3)$$

we use a proof by contradiction. If inequality (2.3) is not valid, then there would be a sequence  $(v_n)$  with  $v_n \in W_\beta^{k+1,p}(\Omega)$  such that

$$\|v_n\|_{W_\beta^{k+1,p}(\Omega)} = 1 \quad (2.4)$$

$$|v_n|_{W_\beta^{k+1,p}(\Omega)} + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq k} \left| \int_\Omega D^\alpha v_n \right| \leq \frac{1}{n} \quad (2.5)$$

Since  $(v_n)$  is a bounded sequence in  $W_\beta^{k+1,p}(\Omega)$  and  $W_\beta^{k+1,p}(\Omega) \xrightarrow{c} W_\beta^{k,p}(\Omega)$  (see (2.1)) there is a convergent subsequence  $(v_{n_l}) \in W_\beta^{k,p}(\Omega)$ . In the following we suppress the index  $l$  and write  $(v_n)$  for this subsequence. Because of the completeness of  $W_\beta^{k,p}(\Omega)$  there is a function  $v \in W_\beta^{k,p}(\Omega)$ , such that

$$\|v - v_n\|_{W_\beta^{k,p}(\Omega)} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0 \quad (2.6)$$

With (2.5) one can conclude  $|v_n|_{W_\beta^{k+1,p}(\Omega)} \leq 1/n$ , what results in

$$|v_n|_{W_\beta^{k+1,p}(\Omega)} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0 \quad (2.7)$$



In the following we show that  $(v_n)$  is a Cauchy sequence in  $W_\beta^{k+1,p}(\Omega)$ . For a fixed and arbitrary small  $\varepsilon > 0$  and numbers  $n, m$  large enough one obtains with (2.6) and (2.7)

$$\begin{aligned} \|v_n - v_m\|_{W_\beta^{k+1,p}(\Omega)}^p &= \|v_n - v_m\|_{W_\beta^{k,p}(\Omega)}^p + |v_n - v_m|_{W_\beta^{k+1,p}(\Omega)}^p \\ &\leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3} + C|v_n|_{W_\beta^{k+1,p}(\Omega)}^p + C|v_m|_{W_\beta^{k+1,p}(\Omega)}^p \\ &\leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3} + \frac{\varepsilon}{3} + \frac{\varepsilon}{3} = \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $W_\beta^{k+1,p}(\Omega)$  is complete, there is a function  $v^* \in W_\beta^{k+1,p}(\Omega)$  with

$$\|v_n - v^*\|_{W_\beta^{k+1,p}(\Omega)} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$$

and one arrives with (2.4) at

$$\|v^*\|_{W_\beta^{k+1,p}(\Omega)} = 1. \quad (2.8)$$

Furthermore one can conclude from (2.5)

$$|v^*|_{W_\beta^{k+1,p}(\Omega)} + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq k} \left| \int_\Omega D^\alpha v^* \right| = 0, \quad (2.9)$$

in particular  $|v^*|_{W_\beta^{k+1,p}(\Omega)} = 0$ , which means that  $D^\alpha v^* = 0 \quad \forall \alpha : |\alpha| = k+1$ , that is  $v^* \in \mathcal{P}_{k,\Omega}$ . The only function  $v^* \in \mathcal{P}_{k,\Omega}$  with (2.9) is  $v^* = 0$ . This is a contradiction to (2.8), what proves (2.3).  $\square$

### 3 Regularity results

In this section we want to give some regularity results for our problems under consideration. Although the literature about elliptic boundary value problems in domains with edges is vast, there are only a few papers that include the Neumann problem. We start with the following well known regularity result for the Dirichlet problem.

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $p$  and  $\beta$  be given real numbers with  $p \in (1, \infty)$  and  $\beta > 2 - \pi/\omega - 2/p$ . Moreover, let  $f$  be a function in  $V_\beta^{0,p}(\Omega)$ . Then the weak solution of the boundary value problem (1.1) belongs to  $H_0^1(\Omega) \cap V_\beta^{2,p}(\Omega)$ . Moreover, the inequality*

$$\|u\|_{V_\beta^{2,p}(\Omega)} \lesssim \|f\|_{V_\beta^{0,p}(\Omega)}$$

is valid.

*Proof.* With  $\text{Im}\lambda_- = -\pi/\omega$  the assertion follows from Lemmata 1 and 2 of [28].  $\square$

The drawback of describing the solution in the  $V_\beta^{k,p}(\Omega)$ -spaces is, that the space  $W^{1,2}(\Omega)$  does not belong to the scale of these weighted Sobolev spaces. A necessary condition for  $u \in W^{1,2}(\Omega) \cap V_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$  is  $u(r=0) = 0$ . This condition is fulfilled for homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions, but cannot be guaranteed for a Neumann boundary. This is the reason why problem (1.2) is not included in the paper [6], where the authors demand  $u \in W^{1,2}(\Omega) \cap V_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$ . A way out is the description of the solution of (1.2) in the spaces  $W_\beta^{k,p}(\Omega)$ . Concerning the literature about elliptic boundary value problems with Neumann boundary in domains with edges, let us first mention the book of Grisvard [16], where estimates on the solution of the Neumann problem for the Laplace equation and the Lamé system in Sobolev and Sobolev-Slobodeckii spaces with  $p = 2$  and without weight are given. Dauge [12] proved regularity results for linear elliptic Neumann problems in  $L^p$  Sobolev spaces without weight. Maz'ya and Roßmann obtained regularity results in weighted Sobolev spaces in a cone for general  $p$ . Their result about the Neumann problem in a dihedron requires additional regularity on the solution, which cannot be guaranteed in our case. Zaionchkovskii and Solonnikov [30], Roßmann [27] and Nazarov and Plamenevsky [25] proved solvability theorems and regularity results for the Neumann problem in weighted Sobolev spaces for  $p = 2$ . With the results of Zaionchkovskii and Solonnikov [30] we obtain the following theorem.

**Theorem 3.2.** *Let  $u$  be the solution of (1.2). If  $f \in W_\beta^{0,2}(\Omega)$  with  $\beta > 1 - \pi/\omega$ , then  $u$  is contained in the space  $W_\beta^{2,2}(\Omega)$  and satisfies the inequality*

$$\|u\|_{W_\beta^{2,2}(\Omega)} \lesssim \|f\|_{W_\beta^{0,2}(\Omega)}.$$

*Proof.* We first consider problem (1.2) in a dihedron  $\mathcal{D}_\omega = \{x = (x', x_3) : x' \in K, x_3 \in \mathbb{R}\}$  where  $K$  denotes an infinite angle which has the form  $\{x' = (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : 0 < r < \infty, 0 < \varphi < \omega\}$  in polar coordinates  $r, \varphi$ . Setting  $k = 0$  in Theorem 5.2 of [30] we can conclude

$$\|u\|_{W_\beta^{2,2}(\mathcal{D}_\omega)} + \|u\|_{W^{1,2}(\mathcal{D}_\omega)} \lesssim \|f\|_{W_\beta^{0,2}(\mathcal{D}_\omega)}. \quad (3.1)$$

Since  $\beta > 0$  estimate (3.1) keeps valid if one substitutes the left-hand side of the inequality by  $\|u\|_{W_\beta^{2,2}(\mathcal{D}_\omega)}$ . Problem (1.2) can be locally transformed near an edge point by a diffeomorphism into a boundary value problem in the dihedron  $\mathcal{D}_\omega$ . By the use of a partition of unity method one can fit together the local results to obtain the result for the domain  $\Omega$ . Details on this technique can be found e.g. in the book of Kufner and Sändig [20, Section 8].  $\square$

According to [17] the weak solution  $u$  of (1.1) and (1.2) respectively can be written as a sum of a singular part  $u_s$  and a regular part  $u_r$ ,

$$u = u_s + u_r, \quad (3.2)$$

where  $u_r \in W^{2,2}(\Omega)$  and

$$u_s = \xi(r)\gamma(r, x_3)r^\lambda\Theta(\varphi) \quad \text{with } \lambda = \frac{\pi}{\omega}.$$

Here  $r$  and  $\varphi$  are polar coordinates in the plane perpendicular to the edge,  $\xi(r)$  is a smooth cut-off function and  $\Theta(\varphi) = \sin \lambda\varphi$  for the Dirichlet boundary conditions and  $\Theta(\varphi) = \cos \lambda\varphi$  for the Neumann boundary conditions. The coefficient function  $\gamma$  can be written as a convolution integral,

$$\gamma(r, x_3) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{r}{r^2 + s^2} q(x_3 - s) ds$$

where the smoothness of  $q$  can be characterized in Besov spaces depending on  $\lambda$ .

**Lemma 3.3.** *The singular part  $u_s$  of the weak solution  $u$  of (1.1) and (1.2) respectively satisfies*

$$r^{\beta-1} \frac{\partial u_s}{\partial x_i} \in L^p(\Omega) \quad \text{and} \quad \left\| r^{\beta-1} \frac{\partial u_s}{\partial x_i} \right\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2 \quad (3.3)$$

$$r^{-1} \frac{\partial u_s}{\partial x_3} \in L^p(\Omega) \quad \text{and} \quad \left\| r^{-1} \frac{\partial u_s}{\partial x_3} \right\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \quad (3.4)$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 u_s}{\partial x_i \partial x_3} \in L^p(\Omega) \quad \text{and} \quad \left\| \frac{\partial^2 u_s}{\partial x_i \partial x_3} \right\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, 3 \quad (3.5)$$

if  $0 < \frac{\pi}{\omega} < 2 - \frac{2}{p}$ ,  $\frac{\pi}{\omega} > 1 - \frac{2}{p}$  and  $\beta > 2 - \frac{2}{p} - \frac{\pi}{\omega}$ .

*Proof.* For the Dirichlet problem this lemma is proven in [4, Section 2.2]. In order to get the result for the Neumann problem one just has to replace  $\sin(\frac{j\pi\varphi}{\omega})$  by  $\cos(\frac{j\pi\varphi}{\omega})$  in that proof.  $\square$

**Corollary 3.4.** *The weak solution  $u$  of (1.1) and (1.2) respectively satisfies*

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_3} \in W^{1,2}(\Omega) \quad \text{and} \quad \left\| \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_3} \right\|_{W^{1,2}(\Omega)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}. \quad (3.6)$$

*Proof.* Since  $u \in W^{1,2}(\Omega)$  and  $u_r \in W^{2,2}(\Omega)$  with  $\|u_r\|_{W^{2,2}(\Omega)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$  the assertion follows from (3.2) and (3.5).  $\square$

**Remark 3.5.** *For the Dirichlet problem (1.1) one can substitute  $u_s$  by  $u$  (see e.g. [20, §30]) in Lemma 3.3.*

## 4 Interpolation of non-smooth functions

In the error analysis for a finite element discretization, local estimates of interpolation errors plays an important role. The interpolant has to be chosen, such that the boundary conditions of the underlying partial differential equation are fulfilled by the interpolant. In this section we introduce two suitable interpolants for the problems (1.1) and (1.2) and derive the corresponding local estimates. Before, we introduce a triangulation of  $\Omega$ .

## 4.1 Triangulation of $\Omega$

We demand for a family of tetrahedral triangulations  $\mathcal{T}_h = \{T_i\}_{i=1}^m$  that

(A1)  $\Omega$  is exactly triangulated by the tetrahedra,  $\bar{\Omega} = \bigcup_{i=1}^m \bar{T}_i$ ,

(A2) the elements are disjoint,  $T_i \cap T_j = \emptyset$  for  $i \neq j$ , and

(A3) any face of any element  $T_i$  is either a face of another element  $T_j$  or part of the boundary.

Notice, that we do not demand the elements to be shape-regular. In contrast we are interested in *anisotropic elements*. If one denotes the diameter of the finite element  $T$  by  $h_T$  and the supremum of the diameters of all balls contained in  $T$  by  $\rho_T$ , this type of element is characterized by huge values of the aspect ratio  $\frac{h_T}{\rho_T}$ .

According to [4], we consider the four reference elements

$$\hat{T}_1 := \{(\hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_2, \hat{x}_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : 0 < \hat{x}_1 < 1, 0 < \hat{x}_2 < 1 - \hat{x}_1, 0 < \hat{x}_3 < 1 - \hat{x}_1 - \hat{x}_2\},$$

$$\hat{T}_2 := \{(\hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_2, \hat{x}_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : 0 < \hat{x}_1 < 1, 0 < \hat{x}_2 < 1 - \hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_1 < \hat{x}_3 < 1\},$$

$$\hat{T}_3 := \{(\hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_2, \hat{x}_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : 0 < \hat{x}_1 < 1, 0 < \hat{x}_2 < \hat{x}_1, 0 < \hat{x}_3 < \hat{x}_1 - \hat{x}_2\},$$

$$\hat{T}_4 := \{(\hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_2, \hat{x}_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : 0 < \hat{x}_1 < 1, 0 < \hat{x}_2 < \hat{x}_1, 1 - \hat{x}_1 < \hat{x}_3 < 1\}.$$

For elements with a face parallel to the  $x_1 - x_2$ -plane we use  $\hat{T}_1$  and  $\hat{T}_3$ , for elements without such a face  $\hat{T}_2$  and  $\hat{T}_4$  are considered. Elements with exactly one vertex with  $r = 0$  are mapped to  $\hat{T}_3$  or  $\hat{T}_4$ , in all other cases (zero or two vertices with  $r = 0$ )  $\hat{T}_1$  and  $\hat{T}_2$  are used. In the following we refer to the suitable reference element by  $\hat{T}$ . In order to be able to write down our proofs in a concise way, we restrict ourselves first to *tensor product meshes*. According to [1] an affine finite element is called *tensor product element*, when the transformation of a reference element  $\hat{T}$  to the element  $T$  has the form

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ x_3 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} h_{1,T} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & h_{2,T} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & h_{3,T} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \hat{x}_1 \\ \hat{x}_2 \\ \hat{x}_3 \end{bmatrix} + b_T$$

where  $b_T \in \mathbb{R}^3$ . Note that the vertices of a tensor element are located in the corners of a cuboid with edge lengths  $h_{1,T}$ ,  $h_{2,T}$  and  $h_{3,T}$ . We explain in Subsection 4.5, how the results extend to a more general mesh type. In addition we demand that there is no rapid change in the element sizes, this means, that the relation

$$h_{i,T} \sim h_{i,T'} \text{ for all } T' \text{ with } \bar{T} \cap \bar{T}' \neq \emptyset$$

holds for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ . Furthermore we define the set

$$M_T := \text{int} \bigcup_{i \in I_T} \bar{T}_i$$

where the set  $I_T$  contains all indices  $i$  for which  $\bar{T}_i \cap \bar{T} \neq \emptyset$  and the projection of  $T_i$  on the  $x_1x_2$ -plane is the same as the one of  $T$ . With  $S_T$  we denote the smallest triangular

prism that contains  $M_T$ . Notice that the height of  $S_T$  is in the order of  $h_{3,T}$ . We further define

$$S_{\hat{T}} := \{(\hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_2, \hat{x}_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : 0 < \hat{x}_1 < 1, 0 < \hat{x}_2 < 1 - \hat{x}_1, 0 < \hat{x}_3 < 1\}.$$

With this definition one has  $\hat{T} \subset S_{\hat{T}}$  for all reference elements mentioned above.

In this paper we consider a space of piecewise linear functions as finite element space  $V_h$ ,

$$V_h := \{v_h \in W^{1,2}(\Omega) : v_h|_T \in \mathcal{P}_{1,T} \text{ for all } T \in \mathcal{T}_h\}.$$

## 4.2 Interpolation operators

As already mentioned in the Introduction the standard Lagrangian interpolant is not appropriate due to the fact, that the estimate (1.4) is only true for  $p > 2$ . Therefore we define the Scott-Zhang type interpolant  $E_h$  by

$$(E_h u)(x) := \sum_{i \in I} a_i \varphi_i(x),$$

which was originally introduced in [1]. Here, the functions  $\varphi_i$  ( $i \in I$ ) are *nodal basis functions*, i.e.  $\varphi_i(X_j) = \delta_{ij}$  for all  $i, j \in I$ , where  $X_i = (X_{i,1}, X_{i,2}, X_{i,3}) \in \mathbb{R}^3$  are the nodes of the finite element mesh. In order to specify  $a_i$ , we first introduce the subset  $\sigma_i$  by the following properties.

- (P1)  $\sigma_i$  is one-dimensional and parallel to the  $x_3$ -axis.
- (P2)  $X_i \in \bar{\sigma}_i$
- (P3) There exists an edge  $e$  of some element  $T$  such that the projection of  $e$  on the  $x_3$ -axis coincides with the projection of  $\sigma_i$ .
- (P4) If the projections of any two points  $X_i$  and  $X_j$  on the  $x_3$ -axis coincide then so do the projections of  $\sigma_i$  and  $\sigma_j$ .

Note that the properties (P3) and (P4) make sense since we consider tensor product meshes. Now  $a_i$  is chosen as the value of the  $L^2(\sigma_i)$ -projection of  $u$  in the space of linear functions over  $\sigma_i \subset \bar{\Omega}$  at the node  $X_i$ ,

$$a_i := (\Pi_{\sigma_i} u)(X_i)$$

with

$$\Pi_{\sigma_i} : L^2(\sigma_i) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_{1,\sigma_i}$$

where  $\mathcal{P}_{1,\sigma_i}$  is the space of polynomials over  $\sigma_i$  with a degree of at most 1.

We denote by  $\Phi_{0,i}$  and  $\Phi_{1,i}$  the two one-dimensional linear nodal functions corresponding to  $\sigma_i = \overrightarrow{X_i X_j}$ , that means

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{0,i}(X_{i,3}) &= 1, & \Phi_{0,i}(X_{j,3}) &= 0, \\ \Phi_{1,i}(X_{i,3}) &= 0, & \Phi_{1,i}(X_{j,3}) &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

Besides we define  $\Psi_{0,i}$  and  $\Psi_{1,i}$  as the two linear functions, that are biorthogonal to  $\{\Phi_{0,i}, \Phi_{1,i}\}$ ,

$$\int_{\sigma_i} \Phi_{k,i} \Psi_{l,i} = \delta_{k,l} \quad (k, l = 0, 1). \quad (4.1)$$

Notice that  $\Phi_{k,i}$  depends only on  $X_{i,3}$ , what means that  $\Phi_{k,i} = \Phi_{k,m}$  if  $X_{i,3} = X_{m,3}$  ( $k = 0, 1$ ). The same is valid for  $\Psi_{k,i}$ . With this setting we can write the interpolation operator  $E_h$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} E_h u(x) &= \sum_{i \in I} (\Pi_{\sigma_i} u)(X_i) \varphi_i(x) \\ &= \sum_{i \in I} \left[ \Phi_{0,i}(X_{i,3}) \int_{\sigma_i} u \Psi_{0,i} ds + \Phi_{1,i}(X_{i,3}) \int_{\sigma_i} u \Psi_{1,i} ds \right] \varphi_i(x) \\ &= \sum_{i \in I} \left[ \int_{\sigma_i} u \Psi_{0,i} ds \right] \varphi_i(x) \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

**Remark 4.1.**  $E_h u$  is well-defined only for  $u \in W^{l,p}(\Omega)$  with

$$l \geq 2 \quad \text{for } p = 1, \quad l > \frac{2}{p} \quad \text{otherwise.}$$

This guarantees  $u|_{\sigma_i} \in L^1(\Omega)$ . In the special case that  $u \in W_{1-\pi/\omega+\varepsilon}^{2,2}(\Omega)$  the interpolant  $E_h u$  is also well-defined since one has the imbedding  $W_{1-\pi/\omega+\varepsilon}^{2,2}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow W_0^{1+\pi/\omega-\varepsilon,2}(\Omega)$  (see [26], Theorem 1.3) and  $1 + \pi/\omega - \varepsilon > 1$ .

The disadvantage of  $E_h$  is, that it preserves Dirichlet boundary conditions only on  $\Gamma_M$ , but not on  $\Gamma_B$ . But this is necessary in order to derive an estimate for the finite element error for problem (1.1). In order to be able to treat boundary value problems with Dirichlet boundary conditions on the whole boundary  $\partial\Omega$ , we introduce the operator  $E_{0h}$  as modification of  $E_h$ .

Let  $J$  be the index set, which includes the indices of all nodes not belonging to  $\Gamma_B$  and

$$V_{0h} := \{v_h \in V_h : v_h|_{\partial\Omega} = 0\}.$$

We define  $E_{0h} : W^{2,p}(\Omega) \rightarrow V_{0h}$  as

$$(E_{0h} u)(x) := \sum_{i \in J} (\Pi_{\sigma_i} u)(X_i) \varphi_i(x).$$

Since  $\varphi_i(x) = 0$  for all  $x \in \Gamma_B$  and  $i \in J$ , the operator  $E_{0h}$  is preserving homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions also on  $\Gamma_B$ .

In the following we assume

$$h_{1,T} \leq h_{2,T} \leq h_{3,T}. \quad (4.3)$$

### 4.3 Local estimates in classical Sobolev spaces

We first recall an approximation result from [1].

**Theorem 4.2.** *Consider an element  $T$  of a tensor product mesh and assume that (4.3) is fulfilled. Then the approximation error estimate*

$$|u - E_h u|_{W^{1,q}(T)} \lesssim |T|^{1/q-1/p} \sum_{|\alpha|=1} h_T^\alpha |D^\alpha u|_{W^{1,p}(S_T)} \quad (4.4)$$

holds for  $p \in [1, \infty]$ ,  $q$  such that  $W^{2,p}(T) \hookrightarrow W^{1,q}(T)$  and  $u \in W^{2,p}(S_T)$ .

*Proof.* If one sets  $l = 2$ ,  $m = 1$  formula (4.4) is exactly (6.6) in Theorem 10 of [1].  $\square$

Our aim is now to estimate  $|u - E_{0h} u|_{W^{1,q}(T)}$  for a function  $u \in W^{2,p}(T)$ ,  $p \in [1, \infty]$ ,  $q$  such that  $W^{2,p}(T) \hookrightarrow W^{1,q}(T)$  and  $u|_{\Gamma_B} = 0$ . With the triangle inequality we get

$$|u - E_{0h} u|_{W^{1,q}(T)} \leq |u - E_h u|_{W^{1,q}(T)} + |E_h u - E_{0h} u|_{W^{1,q}(T)}. \quad (4.5)$$

The first term on the right-hand side is treated in Theorem 4.2. It remains to find an estimate for the second term. To this end, we first prove the following auxiliary result.

**Lemma 4.3.** *Let  $T$  be an element with  $\bar{T} \cap \Gamma_B \neq \emptyset$ ,  $I$  the index set of the nodes in  $\bar{T} \cap \Gamma_B$  and  $u$  a function in  $W^{2,p}(S_T)$  with  $S_T$  as defined in Section 2,  $p \in [1, \infty]$  and with  $u|_{\Gamma_B} = 0$ . Then for every  $i \in I$  and every linear function  $\tilde{\Phi}_{1,i}$  with  $\tilde{\Phi}_{1,i}|_{\sigma_i} = \Phi_{1,i}$  and  $\tilde{\Phi}_{1,i}|_{\Gamma_B} = 0$  there exists a  $c_i \in \mathbb{R}$ , so that*

$$\sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2} h^\alpha \|D^\alpha (u - c_i \tilde{\Phi}_{1,i})\|_{L^p(S_T)} \lesssim \sum_{|\alpha|=2} h^\alpha \|D^\alpha u\|_{L^p(S_T)}. \quad (4.6)$$

Furthermore one has

$$\sum_{|\alpha| \leq 1} h^\alpha |D^\alpha u|_{W^{1,p}(S_T)} \lesssim \sum_{|\alpha|=1} h^\alpha |D^\alpha u|_{W^{1,p}(S_T)}. \quad (4.7)$$

*Proof.* To prove this lemma we use Theorem 4.5.1 of [24]. It is shown there, that for a continuous function  $g$  with the properties of a norm and for linear functionals  $l_1, l_2, \dots, l_N$  that are bounded in  $W^{k,p}(\Omega)$  and do not vanish simultaneously on a polynomial with degree less than  $k$  besides the zero polynomial, the inequality

$$\|u\|_{W^{k,p}(\Omega)} \lesssim g(l_1 u, l_2 u, \dots, l_N u) + |u|_{W^{k,p}(\Omega)} \quad (4.8)$$

is valid. Here  $N$  is the number of independent monomials of degree  $\leq k - 1$ .

Now we prove (4.6) and (4.7) for the reference patch  $S_{\hat{T}}$ . In our case there is  $N = 4$ , what is the number of monomials of degree less than or equal to 1 in three dimensions. We denote by  $\hat{e}_i$  ( $i = 1, 2, 3$ ) the three edges of  $S_{\hat{T}}$  in the  $x_1 x_2$ -plane. Then we set

$l_1 v := \int_{\hat{e}_1} v$ ,  $l_2 v := \int_{\hat{e}_2} v$ ,  $l_3 v := \int_{\hat{e}_3} v$  and  $l_4 v := \int_{S_{\hat{T}}} v$ . For  $g$  we choose  $g(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) = \sum_{i=1}^4 |t_i|$ . Now we set  $c_i$  so that  $\int_{S_{\hat{T}}} (\hat{u} - c_i \hat{\Phi}_{1,i}) = 0$  and we get

$$\|\hat{u} - c_i \hat{\Phi}_{1,i}\|_{W^{2,p}(S_{\hat{T}})} \lesssim \sum_{i=1}^3 \left| \int_{\hat{e}_i} (\hat{u} - c_i \hat{\Phi}_{1,i}) \right| + \left| \int_{S_{\hat{T}}} (\hat{u} - c_i \hat{\Phi}_{1,i}) \right| + |\hat{u} - c_i \hat{\Phi}_{1,i}|_{W^{2,p}(S_{\hat{T}})}$$

Since  $\hat{\Phi}_{1,i}$  is linear and  $\hat{\Phi}_{1,i}|_{\hat{e}_j} = 0$  ( $j = 1, 2, 3$ ) we end up with

$$\|\hat{u} - c_i \hat{\Phi}_{1,i}\|_{W^{2,p}(S_{\hat{T}})} \lesssim |\hat{u}|_{W^{2,p}(S_{\hat{T}})}.$$

The transformation back to  $S_T$  yields (4.6).

In the case of (4.7) we have  $k = 1$  and  $N = 1$ . We set  $l_1 v = \int_{S_{\hat{T}} \cap \{z=0\}} v ds$ . Since  $\hat{u}$  vanishes on  $S_{\hat{T}} \cap \{z = 0\}$  one has  $l_1 \hat{u} = 0$  and with (4.8) this yields

$$\|\hat{u}\|_{W^{1,p}(S_{\hat{T}})} \lesssim |\hat{u}|_{W^{1,p}(S_{\hat{T}})}.$$

The transformation back to  $S_T$  results in (4.7).  $\square$

With this result at hand, we are now able to give an estimate of the second term of the right-hand side of inequality (4.5).

**Theorem 4.4.** *Consider an element  $T$  of a tensor product mesh and assume that (4.3) is fulfilled. Then the error estimate*

$$|E_{0h}u - E_h u|_{W^{1,q}(T)} \lesssim |T|^{1/q-1/p} \sum_{|\alpha|=1} h^\alpha |D^\alpha u|_{W^{1,p}(S_T)} \quad (4.9)$$

holds if  $p \in [1, \infty]$ ,  $q$  is such that  $W^{2,p}(T) \hookrightarrow W^{1,q}(T)$ ,  $u \in W^{2,p}(S_T)$  and  $u|_{\bar{T} \cap \Gamma_B} = 0$ .

*Proof.* For an element  $T$  with  $\bar{T} \cap \Gamma_B = \emptyset$  one has  $E_{0h}u - E_h u = 0$  and (4.9) is valid. For an element  $T$  with  $\bar{T} \cap \Gamma_B \neq \emptyset$  denote by  $B_T$  the index set of nodes belonging to  $\Gamma_B$ ,  $B_T := \{i : X_i \in \bar{T} \cap \Gamma_B\}$ . We treat the derivatives in the different directions separately. For the estimate of the derivative in  $x_3$ -direction it follows together with (4.2) and (4.1)

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial x_3} (E_h - E_{0h})u \right\|_{L^q(T)} &= \left\| \sum_{i \in B_T} (\Pi_{\sigma_i} u) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_3} \varphi_i \right\|_{L^q(T)} \\ &= \left\| \sum_{i \in B_T} \left[ \int_{\sigma_i} u \Psi_{0,i} \right] \frac{\partial}{\partial x_3} \varphi_i \right\|_{L^q(T)} \\ &= \left\| \sum_{i \in B_T} \left[ \int_{\sigma_i} (u - c_i \hat{\Phi}_{1,i}) \Psi_{0,i} \right] \frac{\partial}{\partial x_3} \varphi_i \right\|_{L^q(T)} \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$



for arbitrary  $c_i \in \mathbb{R}$ . We use

$$\|\Psi_{0,i}\|_{L^\infty(\sigma_i)} \lesssim |\sigma_i|^{-1}$$

and the trace theorem  $W^{2,p}(S_T) \hookrightarrow L^1(\sigma_i)$ ,  $p \geq 1$  in the form

$$\|v\|_{L^1(\sigma_i)} \lesssim |\sigma_i| |T|^{-1/p} \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2} h^\alpha \|D^\alpha v\|_{L^p(S_T)} \quad (4.11)$$

to get the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\sigma_i} (u - c_i \Phi_{1,i}) \Psi_{0,i} ds \right| &\leq \|\Psi_{0,i}\|_{L^\infty(\sigma_i)} \|u - c_i \Phi_{1,i}\|_{L^1(\sigma_i)} \\ &\lesssim |T|^{-1/p} \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2} h^\alpha \|D^\alpha (u - c_i \tilde{\Phi}_{i,1})\|_{L^p(S_T)}. \end{aligned}$$

where  $\tilde{\Phi}_{i,1}$  is a linear function with  $\tilde{\Phi}_{i,1}|_{\sigma_i} = \Phi_{i,1}$ . With Lemma 4.3 we can conclude

$$\left| \int_{\sigma_i} (u - c_i \Phi_{1,i}) \Psi_{0,i} ds \right| \lesssim |T|^{-1/p} \sum_{|\alpha|=2} h^\alpha \|D^\alpha u\|_{L^p(S_T)}.$$

Taking into account that

$$\left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial x_3} \varphi_i \right\|_{L^q(T)} \lesssim |T|^{1/q} h_3^{-1} \quad \text{for } i \in B$$

we can continue from (4.10)

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial x_3} (E_h - E_{0h})u \right\|_{L^q(T)} &\lesssim \sum_{i \in B} \left| \int_{\sigma_i} (u - c_i \Phi_{1,i}) \Psi_{0,i} \right| \left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial x_3} \varphi_i \right\|_{L^q(T)} \\ &\lesssim |T|^{1/q-1/p} h_3^{-1} \sum_{|\alpha|=2} h^\alpha \|D^\alpha u\|_{L^p(S_T)}. \end{aligned}$$

With (4.3) we finally conclude

$$\left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial x_3} (E_h - E_{0h})u \right\|_{L^q(T)} \lesssim |T|^{1/q-1/p} \sum_{|\alpha|=1} h^\alpha \|D^\alpha u\|_{W^{1,p}(S_T)}. \quad (4.12)$$

For the estimates concerning the derivatives in  $x_2$ - and  $x_1$ -direction we use a difference technique developed in [1]. Let us discuss the case of the  $x_2$ -derivative; the  $x_1$ -derivative can be proved by analogy.

First we consider the case that three nodes of  $T$  are contained in  $\Gamma_B$ , that means  $|B_T| = 3$ . We denote these nodes with  $X_0, X_1$  and  $X_2$ , where the edge spanned by  $X_0$  and  $X_1$  is parallel to the  $x_1$ -axis and the one spanned by  $X_0$  and  $X_2$  parallel to the  $x_2$ -axis. Then one has

$$(E_{0h}u - E_hu)|_T = \sum_{i=0}^2 a_i \varphi_i = (a_0 - a_2)\varphi_0 + a_2(\varphi_0 + \varphi_2) + a_1\varphi_1$$

where we have set  $a_i := \int_{\sigma_i} u \Psi_{0,i}$ .

Taking into account that  $T$  is a tensor product element, we can conclude

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_2} \varphi_1 = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial x_2} (\varphi_0 + \varphi_2) = 0.$$

This yields

$$\left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial x_2} (E_{0h} - E_h)u \right\|_{L^q(T)} = |a_0 - a_2| \left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial x_2} \varphi_0 \right\|_{L^q(T)}. \quad (4.13)$$

Since  $\{x_3 : (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \sigma_0\} = \{x_3 : (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \sigma_2\}$ ,  $\Psi_{0,0} = \Psi_{0,2}$  and  $X_{0,1} = X_{2,1}$  we get for the first factor

$$\begin{aligned} |a_0 - a_2| &= \left| \int_{\sigma_0} u(X_{0,1}, X_{0,2}, z) \Psi_{0,0}(z) \, dz - \int_{\sigma_2} u(X_{0,1}, X_{2,2}, z) \Psi_{0,2}(z) \, dz \right| \\ &= \left| \int_{\sigma_0} \Psi_{0,0}(z) \int_{X_{0,2}}^{X_{2,2}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_2} u(X_{0,1}, y, z) \, dy \, dz \right| \\ &\lesssim \|\Psi_{0,0}\|_{L^\infty(\sigma_0)} \left| \int_{\sigma_0} \int_{X_{0,2}}^{X_{2,2}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_2} u(X_{0,1}, y, z) \, dy \, dz \right| \\ &\lesssim h_1^{-1} h_3^{-1} \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 1} h^\alpha \left\| D^\alpha \left( \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_2} \right) \right\|_{L^1(S_T)}. \end{aligned}$$

In the last estimate we have used the trace theorem  $W^{1,1}(S_T) \hookrightarrow L^1(\Xi_1)$  where  $\Xi_1$  is the two-dimensional manifold spanned by  $\sigma_0$  and  $X_0 X_2$  in the form

$$\|u\|_{L^1(\Xi_1)} \leq |\Xi_1| |T|^{-1} \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 1} h^\alpha \|D^\alpha u\|_{L^1(S_T)}.$$

With

$$\left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial x_2} \varphi_0 \right\|_{L^q(T)} \lesssim h_2^{-1} |T|^{1/q}$$

it follows from (4.13) with the Hölder inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial x_2} (E_{0h} - E_h)u \right\|_{L^q(T)} &\lesssim (h_1 h_2 h_3)^{-1} |T|^{1/q} \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 1} h^\alpha \left\| D^\alpha \left( \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_2} \right) \right\|_{L^1(S_T)} \\ &\lesssim |T|^{1/q-1/p} \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 1} h^\alpha \left\| D^\alpha \left( \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_2} \right) \right\|_{L^p(S_T)}. \end{aligned}$$

The application of Lemma 4.3 yields

$$\left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial x_2} (E_{0h} - E_h)u \right\|_{L^q(T)} \lesssim |T|^{1/q-1/p} \sum_{|\alpha|=1} h^\alpha \left\| D^\alpha \left( \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_2} \right) \right\|_{L^p(S_T)} \quad (4.14)$$

since  $\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_2} = 0$  on  $\Gamma_B$ . Let us now consider the case where only two nodes  $X_0, X_1$  of  $T$  are contained in  $\Gamma_B$ , what means  $|B_T| = 2$ . One has

$$(E_{0h}u - E_hu)|_T = a_0\varphi_0 - a_1\varphi_1. \quad (4.15)$$

We have to treat three different cases. First the case that the edge spanned by  $X_0$  and  $X_1$  is parallel to the  $x_2$ -axis, then the case that it is parallel to the  $x_1$ -axis and finally the case that is nor parallel to the  $x_1$ -axis nor to the  $x_2$ -axis. We first consider the case that the edge is parallel to the  $x_2$ -axis. One can rewrite (4.15) by

$$(E_{0h} - E_hu)|_T = (a_0 - a_1)\varphi_0 + a_1(\varphi_0 + \varphi_1)$$

Now one can proceed exactly as in the case with three nodes in  $\Gamma_B$  and obtain (4.14).

If the edge spanned by  $X_0$  and  $X_1$  is parallel to the  $x_1$ -axis one has

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_2}\varphi_0 = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_2}\varphi_1 = 0 \quad (4.16)$$

and from (4.15) one can conclude

$$\left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial x_2}(E_{0h} - E_h)u \right\|_{L^q(T)} = 0. \quad (4.17)$$

Consider now the case, where the edge spanned by  $X_0$  and  $X_1$  is neither parallel to the  $x_1$ -axis nor to the  $x_2$ -axis. In the case that the remaining nodes  $X_2, X_3$  of the tetrahedra span an edge that is parallel to the  $x_2$ -axis the nodal functions  $\varphi_0$  and  $\varphi_1$  do not depend on  $x_2$  and equation (4.16) is valid. Equation (4.17) follows then with (4.15). If the edge spanned by  $X_2$  and  $X_3$  is parallel to the  $x_1$ -axis a more detailed analysis is necessary. Therefore we rewrite (4.15) again by

$$(E_{0h}u - E_hu)|_T = (a_0 - a_1)\varphi_0 + a_1(\varphi_0 + \varphi_1).$$

A short computation shows that  $\varphi_0 + \varphi_1 = 1 - x_3$  and, consequently,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_2}(\varphi_0 + \varphi_1) = 0.$$

With  $X_i = (X_{i,1}, X_{i,2}, X_{i,3})$  ( $i = 0, 1$ ) one can write

$$\begin{aligned} |a_0 - a_1| &= \left| \int_{\sigma_0} u(X_{0,1}, X_{0,2}, z) \Psi_{0,0}(z) \, dz - \int_{\sigma_1} u(X_{1,1}, X_{1,2}, z) \Psi_{0,1}(z) \, dz \right| \\ &= \left| \int_{\sigma_0} [u(X_{0,1}, X_{0,2}, z) - u(X_{1,1}, X_{1,2}, z)] \Psi_{0,0}(z) \, dz \right|. \end{aligned}$$

The triangle inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned}
|a_0 - a_1| &\leq \left| \int_{\sigma_0} [u(X_{0,1}, X_{0,2}, z) - u(X_{1,1}, X_{0,2}, z)] \Psi_{0,0}(z) \, dz \right| \\
&\quad + \left| \int_{\sigma_0} [u(X_{1,1}, X_{0,2}, z) - u(X_{1,1}, X_{1,2}, z)] \Psi_{0,0}(z) \, dz \right| \\
&= \left| \int_{\sigma_0} \Psi_{0,0}(z) \int_{X_{1,1}}^{X_{0,1}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} u(x, X_{0,2}, z) \, dx \, dz \right| \\
&\quad + \left| \int_{\sigma_0} \Psi_{0,0}(z) \int_{X_{1,2}}^{X_{0,2}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_2} u(X_{1,1}, y, z) \, dy \, dz \right|.
\end{aligned}$$

Now one can proceed as in the case of three nodes in  $\Gamma_B$  and arrives at

$$|a_0 - a_1| \lesssim h_1^{-1} h_3^{-1} \sum_{\alpha \leq 1} h^\alpha \left[ \left\| D^\alpha \left( \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_1} \right) \right\|_{L^1(S_T)} + \left\| D^\alpha \left( \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_2} \right) \right\|_{L^1(S_T)} \right].$$

Since

$$\left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial x_2} \varphi_0 \right\|_{L^q(T)} \lesssim h_2^{-1} |T|^{1/q} \quad \text{and} \quad h_1 \leq h_2$$

it follows as in the case of three nodes in  $\Gamma_B$  (comp. (4.14))

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial x_2} (E_{0h} - E_h)u \right\|_{L^q(T)} &\lesssim |T|^{1/q-1/p} \sum_{|\alpha|=1} h^\alpha \left\| D^\alpha \left( \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_1} \right) \right\|_{L^p(S_T)} + \\
&\quad |T|^{1/q-1/p} \sum_{|\alpha|=1} h^\alpha \left\| D^\alpha \left( \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_2} \right) \right\|_{L^p(S_T)}
\end{aligned}$$

It remains the case where only one node  $X_0$  of  $T$  is contained in  $\Gamma_B$ . The difference of  $E_{0h}$  and  $E_h$  in  $T$  reduces to

$$(E_{0h}u - E_hu)_T = a_0\varphi_0$$

Since  $T$  is a tensor product element one has  $\varphi_0 = \varphi_0(x_3)$  and consequently

$$\left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial x_2} (E_{0h} - E_h)u \right\|_{L^q(T)} = |a_0|^{1/q} \left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial x_2} \varphi_0 \right\|_{L^q(T)} = 0$$

Summarizing all the cases we have shown

$$\left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial x_2} (E_{0h} - E_h)u \right\|_{L^q(T)} \lesssim |T|^{1/q-1/p} \sum_{|\alpha|=1} h^\alpha \|D^\alpha u\|_{W^{1,p}(S_T)} \quad (4.18)$$

The proof for an estimate of the error in the  $x_1$ -derivative is analogous to the  $x_2$ -case and one gets

$$\left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} (E_{0h} - E_h)u \right\|_{L^q(T)} \lesssim |T|^{1/q-1/p} \sum_{|\alpha|=1} h^\alpha \|D^\alpha u\|_{W^{1,p}(S_T)} \quad (4.19)$$

With (4.12), (4.18) and (4.19) the assertion is shown.  $\square$

**Theorem 4.5.** Consider an element  $T$  of a tensor product mesh and assume that (4.3) is fulfilled. Then the error estimate

$$|u - E_{0h}u|_{W^{1,q}(T)} \lesssim |T|^{1/q-1/p} \sum_{|\alpha|=1} h_T^\alpha |D^\alpha u|_{W^{1,p}(S_T)} \quad (4.20)$$

holds for  $p \in [1, \infty]$ ,  $q$  such that  $W^{2,p}(T) \hookrightarrow W^{1,q}(T)$ ,  $u \in W^{2,p}(S_T)$  and  $u|_{\overline{T} \cap \Gamma_B} = 0$ .

*Proof.* (4.20) follows with the triangle inequality from (4.4) and (4.9).  $\square$

#### 4.4 Local estimates in weighted Sobolev spaces

In order to get a global estimate for the interpolation error, it is useful to have an estimate where certain first derivatives of the interpolant are estimated against first derivatives of the solution  $u$ . This additional stability estimate is necessary since  $u \notin W^{2,2}(T)$  for elements  $T$  with  $r_T = 0$ . Thus we prove the following estimate for functions from weighted Sobolev spaces.

**Lemma 4.6.** Consider a tensor product element  $T$  and assume that  $h_{1,T} \sim h_{2,T} \lesssim h_{3,T}$ . Let  $p, q \in [1, \infty]$ ,  $1 - 2/p < \beta < 2 - 2/p$  and  $\beta \leq 1$ . Then one has for  $u \in W^{1,p}(S_T) \cap V_\beta^{2,p}(S_T)$  and  $u|_{\overline{T} \cap \Gamma_B} = 0$  the estimate

$$|E_{0h}u|_{W^{1,q}(T)} \lesssim |T|^{1/q-1/p} h_{1,T}^{-\beta} \sum_{|\alpha|=1} h_T^\alpha \|D^\alpha v\|_{V_\beta^{1,p}(S_T)}. \quad (4.21)$$

For  $u \in W^{1,p}(S_T) \cap W_\beta^{2,p}(S_T)$  the estimate

$$\|E_h u\|_{W^{1,q}(T)} \lesssim |T|^{1/q-1/p} h_{1,T}^{-\beta} \sum_{|\alpha|=1} h_T^\alpha \|D^\alpha v\|_{W_\beta^{1,p}(S_T)}. \quad (4.22)$$

is valid.

*Proof.* By the triangle inequality, Lemma 11 in [1] with  $m = 1$  and (4.9) one has

$$\begin{aligned} |E_{0h}u|_{W^{1,q}(T)} &\leq |E_h u|_{W^{1,q}(T)} + |E_{0h}u - E_h u|_{W^{1,q}(T)} \\ &\lesssim |T|^{1/q-1} \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 1} h^\alpha |D^\alpha u|_{W^{1,1}(S_T)}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.23)$$

The step from  $|\alpha| \leq 1$  to  $|\alpha| = 1$  is analogous to the proof of Lemma 11 in [1]. One has just to substitute (6.13) in that proof by (4.23), and (4.21) is shown.

The second inequality can be proved in the following way. Since  $\beta < 2 - 2/p$  one has  $r^{-\beta} \in L^{p'}(S_T)$  with  $1/p' = 1 - 1/p$  and one can write for  $v \in W_\beta^{0,p}(S_T)$

$$\|v\|_{L^1(S_T)} \leq \|r^{-\beta}\|_{L^{p'}(S_T)} \|r^\beta v\|_{L^p(S_T)}. \quad (4.24)$$

Consider now two cylindrical sectors  $Z_1, Z_2$  with radius  $c_1 h_{1,T}$  and  $c_2 h_{1,T}$  so that  $Z_1 \subset S_T \subset Z_2$ . Since  $h_{1,T} \sim h_{2,T}$  we can conclude

$$\left( \int_{Z_i} r^{-\beta p'} \right)^{1/p'} \sim \left( h_{3,T} \int_0^{c_i h_{1,T}} r^{-\beta p' + 1} \right)^{1/p'} \sim \left( h_{3,T} h_{1,T}^{2-\beta p'} \right)^{1/p'} \sim \left( |S_T| \cdot h_{1,T}^{-\beta p'} \right)^{1/p'}$$

for  $i = 1, 2$ . This results in the inequality

$$\|r^{-\beta}\|_{L^{p'}(S_T)} \leq |S_T|^{1/p'} h_{1,T}^{-\beta}. \quad (4.25)$$

The two inequalities (4.24) and (4.25) yield the embedding  $W_\beta^{2,p}(S_T) \hookrightarrow W^{2,1}(S_T)$  and it follows  $u \in W^{2,1}(S_T)$ . Therefore one has from Theorem 10 in [1]

$$\|E_h u\|_{W^{1,q}(T)} \lesssim |T|^{1/q-1} \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 1} h_T^\alpha \|D^\alpha u\|_{W^{1,1}(S_T)}. \quad (4.26)$$

Notice that the patch  $S_T$  defined in [1] is a subset of  $S_T$  as defined in Section 2. Now we continue from (4.26) with

$$\begin{aligned} \|E_h u\|_{W^{1,q}(T)} &\lesssim |T|^{1/q-1} \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 1} \sum_{|t| \leq 1} h_T^\alpha \|D^{\alpha+t} u\|_{L^1(S_T)} \\ &\lesssim |T|^{1/q-1} |S_T|^{1-1/p} h_{1,T}^{-\beta} \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 1} \sum_{|t| \leq 1} h_T^\alpha \|r^\beta D^{\alpha+t} u\|_{L^p(S_T)} \\ &\sim |T|^{1/q-1/p} h_{1,T}^{-\beta} \sum_{\alpha \leq 1} h_T^\alpha \|D^\alpha u\|_{W_\beta^{1,p}(S_T)} \end{aligned}$$

and the assertion (4.22) is shown.  $\square$

In the following we prove an interpolation error estimate for functions in  $W_\beta^{2,p}(T)$ . This result is necessary for estimating the finite element error of the pure Neumann problem (1.2).

**Theorem 4.7.** *Consider an element  $T$  of a tensor product mesh and assume that  $h_{1,T} \sim h_{2,T} \lesssim h_{3,T}$  is fulfilled. Then the error estimate*

$$\|u - E_h u\|_{W^{1,q}(T)} \lesssim |T|^{1/q-1/p} h_{1,T}^{-\beta} \sum_{|\alpha|=1} h_T^\alpha \|D^\alpha u\|_{W_\beta^{1,p}(S_T)} \quad (4.27)$$

holds for  $p \in [1, \infty]$ ,  $\beta \in (1 - 2/p, 1]$ ,  $q$  such that  $W_\beta^{1,p}(T) \hookrightarrow L^q(T)$  and  $u \in W_\beta^{2,p}(T)$ .

*Proof.* From the triangle inequality we have for an arbitrary function  $w \in W_\beta^{2,p}(S_T)$

$$\|u - E_h u\|_{W^{1,q}(T)} \leq \|u - w\|_{W^{1,q}(T)} + \|E_h(u - w)\|_{W^{1,q}(T)}. \quad (4.28)$$

For the first term in this inequality one can conclude with the embedding  $W_\beta^{1,p}(S_T) \hookrightarrow L^q(S_T)$

$$\begin{aligned}
\|u - w\|_{W^{1,q}(T)} &\leq \|u - w\|_{W^{1,q}(S_T)} \\
&\lesssim |T|^{1/q} \sum_{|t| \leq 1} h_T^{-t} \|D^t(\hat{u} - \hat{w})\|_{L^q(S_{\hat{T}})} \\
&\lesssim |T|^{1/q} \sum_{|t| \leq 1} h_T^{-t} \|D^t(\hat{u} - \hat{w})\|_{W_\beta^{1,p}(S_{\hat{T}})} \\
&= |T|^{1/q} \sum_{|t| \leq 1} \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 1} h_T^{-t} \|r^\beta D^{\alpha+t}(\hat{u} - \hat{w})\|_{L^p(S_{\hat{T}})}. \tag{4.29}
\end{aligned}$$

The application of (4.22) to  $u - w$  yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\|E_h(u - w)\|_{W^{1,q}(T)} &\lesssim |T|^{1/q-1/p} h_{1,T}^{-\beta} \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 1} h_T^\alpha \|D^\alpha(u - w)\|_{W_\beta^{1,p}(S_T)} \\
&\lesssim |T|^{1/q} \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 1} \sum_{|t| \leq 1} h_T^{-t} \|r^\beta D^{\alpha+t}(\hat{u} - \hat{w})\|_{L^p(S_{\hat{T}})}. \tag{4.30}
\end{aligned}$$

With (4.28), (4.29) and (4.30) one obtains

$$\begin{aligned}
\|u - E_h u\|_{W^{1,q}(T)} &\lesssim |T|^{1/q} \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 1} \sum_{|t| \leq 1} h_T^{-t} \|r^\beta D^{\alpha+t}(\hat{u} - \hat{w})\|_{L^p(S_{\hat{T}})} \\
&= |T|^{1/q} \sum_{|t| \leq 1} h_T^{-t} \|D^t(\hat{u} - \hat{w})\|_{W_\beta^{1,p}(S_{\hat{T}})}. \tag{4.31}
\end{aligned}$$

Now we specify  $w$  as the function of  $\mathcal{P}_1(S_T)$ , such that

$$\int_{S_{\hat{T}}} D^t(\hat{u} - \hat{w}) = 0 \quad \forall t : |t| \leq 1$$

and together with Lemma 2.2 one can continue from (4.31) with

$$\begin{aligned}
\|u - E_h u\|_{W^{1,q}(T)} &\lesssim |T|^{1/q} \sum_{|t| \leq 1} h_T^{-t} \|D^t \hat{u}\|_{W_\beta^{1,p}(S_{\hat{T}})} \\
&= |T|^{1/q} \sum_{|t| \leq 1} \sum_{|\alpha|=1} h_T^{-t} \|r^\beta D^{\alpha+t} \hat{u}\|_{L^p(S_{\hat{T}})} \\
&\lesssim |T|^{1/q-1/p} h_{1,T}^{-\beta} \sum_{|t| \leq 1} \sum_{|\alpha|=1} h_T^\alpha \|r^\beta D^{\alpha+t} u\|_{L^p(S_T)} \\
&= |T|^{1/q-1/p} h_{1,T}^{-\beta} \sum_{|\alpha|=1} h_T^\alpha \|D^\alpha u\|_{W_\beta^{1,p}(S_T)}
\end{aligned}$$

and the assertion (4.27) is shown.  $\square$

## 4.5 Extension to more general meshes

If we consider the special case  $h_1 \sim h_2$ , we can extend our results to more general meshes. Instead of tensor product elements we introduce as in [1] *elements of tensor product type*, that are defined by the transformation

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ x_3 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} B_T & 0 \\ 0 & \pm h_{3,T} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \hat{x}_1 \\ \hat{x}_2 \\ \hat{x}_3 \end{bmatrix} + b_T =: \hat{B} \begin{bmatrix} \hat{x}_1 \\ \hat{x}_2 \\ \hat{x}_3 \end{bmatrix} + b_T$$

where  $b_T \in \mathbb{R}^3$  and  $B_T \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$  with

$$|\det B_T| \sim h_{1,T}^2, \quad \|B_T\| \sim h_{1,T}, \quad \|B_T^{-1}\| \sim h_{1,T}^{-1}.$$

Additionally we introduce a coordinate system  $\tilde{x}_1, \tilde{x}_2, \tilde{x}_3$  via the transformation

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ x_3 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} h_1^{-1} B_T & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{x}_1 \\ \tilde{x}_2 \\ \tilde{x}_3 \end{bmatrix} =: \tilde{B} \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{x}_1 \\ \tilde{x}_2 \\ \tilde{x}_3 \end{bmatrix}.$$

This transformation maps  $T$  and  $S_T$  to  $\tilde{T}$  and  $\tilde{S}_T$ . Since

$$\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{x}_1 \\ \tilde{x}_2 \\ \tilde{x}_3 \end{bmatrix} = \tilde{B}^{-1} \hat{B} \begin{bmatrix} \hat{x}_1 \\ \hat{x}_2 \\ \hat{x}_3 \end{bmatrix} + \tilde{B}^{-1} b_T = \begin{bmatrix} h_{1,T} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & h_{1,T} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & h_{3,T} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \hat{x}_1 \\ \hat{x}_2 \\ \hat{x}_3 \end{bmatrix} + \tilde{B}^{-1} b_T$$

the mesh is a tensor product mesh in the coordinate system  $\tilde{x}_1, \tilde{x}_2, \tilde{x}_3$ . With  $\tilde{S}_T = S_{\tilde{T}}$  it follows from

$$\det \tilde{B} \sim 1, \quad \|\tilde{B}\| \sim 1, \quad \|\tilde{B}^{-1}\| \sim 1$$

that our results extend to meshes of tensor product type.

## 5 Estimates of the finite element error

In this section the main results of this paper, namely optimal  $L^2$ -error estimates for the finite element solution of the problems (1.1) and (1.2), are given. In order to get an optimal error estimate it is necessary to introduce appropriate meshes. Therefore we define according to [5] a family of graded triangulations  $\mathcal{T}_h = \{T\}$  of  $\Omega$  consisting of tensor product elements. With  $h$  being the global mesh parameter,  $\mu \in (0, 1]$  being the grading parameter and  $r_T$  being the distance of a tetrahedron  $T$  to the reentrant edge,

$$r_T := \min_{(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \bar{T}} (x_1^2 + x_2^2)^{1/2},$$

we assume that the element sizes satisfy for some constant  $R > 0$

$$h_{1,T} \sim h_{2,T} \sim \begin{cases} h^{1/\mu} & \text{for } r_T = 0 \\ hr_T^{1-\mu} & \text{for } 0 < r_T \leq R, \\ h & \text{for } r_T > R \end{cases}, \quad h_{3,T} \sim h. \quad (5.1)$$

In the following we show the optimal convergence rate for the finite element method on these meshes.



## 5.1 The Dirichlet problem

Let  $V_0 = W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$  be the space of all  $W^{1,2}(\Omega)$ -functions that vanish on  $\partial\Omega$ . With the bilinear form  $a_D(\cdot, \cdot) : V_0 \times V_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and the linear form  $(f, \cdot) : V_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined by

$$a_D(u, v) := \int_{\Omega} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v, \quad (f, v) := \int_{\Omega} f v,$$

the variational form of (1.1) is given by

$$\text{Find } u \in V_0 \text{ such that } a_D(u, v) = (f, v) \text{ for all } v \in V_0. \quad (5.2)$$

The finite element solution  $u_h$  is determined by

$$\text{Find } u_h \in V_{0h} \text{ such that } a_D(u_h, v_h) = (f, v_h) \text{ for all } v_h \in V_{0h}. \quad (5.3)$$

where  $V_{0h} := V_0 \cap V_h$ . Notice that the Lax-Milgram lemma guarantees unique solutions  $u$  and  $u_h$ . We are now able to state the following global estimate.

**Theorem 5.1.** *Let  $u$  be the solution of (5.2). Then the estimate*

$$|u - E_{0h}u|_{W^{1,2}(\Omega)} \lesssim h \|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad (5.4)$$

holds if  $\mu < \pi/\omega$ .

*Proof.* The theorem can be proved along the lines of the proof of Theorem 14 of [1]. The necessary prerequisites are provided here with Lemmata 3.1, 3.3, Remark 3.5 and estimates (4.20) and (4.21) for  $p = q = 2$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 5.2.** *Let  $u$  be the solution of (5.2) and let  $u_h$  be the finite element solution defined by (5.3). Assume that the mesh is refined according to  $\mu < \pi/\omega$ . Then the finite element error can be estimated by*

$$|u - u_h|_{W^{1,2}(\Omega)} \lesssim h \|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad (5.5)$$

$$\|u - u_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim h^2 \|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}. \quad (5.6)$$

*Proof.* Estimate (5.5) is a conclusion of (5.4) and the projection property of the finite element method. (5.6) follows by the Aubin-Nitsche trick.  $\square$

## 5.2 The Neumann problem

The variational formulation of (1.2) is given by

$$\text{Find } u \in V \text{ such that } a_N(u, v) = (f, v) \text{ for all } v \in V. \quad (5.7)$$

where for  $V := W^{1,2}(\Omega)$  the bilinear form  $a_N(\cdot, \cdot) : V \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is defined by

$$a_N(u, v) := \int_{\Omega} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v + \int_{\Omega} uv.$$

The finite element solution  $u_h$  is defined by

$$\text{Find } u_h \in V_h \text{ such that } a_N(u_h, v_h) = (f, v_h) \text{ for all } v_h \in V_h. \quad (5.8)$$

As in the case of Dirichlet boundary conditions we can give a global estimate of the interpolation error. But we cannot prove this estimate in the same way as in Theorem 14 of [1] as we did it in the proof of Theorem 5.1. This is due to the fact that  $u$  admits a different regularity in case of Neumann boundary conditions and in particular does not vanish at the edge. Instead, the results of Theorem 4.7 play a key role.

**Theorem 5.3.** *Let  $u$  be the solution of (5.7). Then the estimate*

$$\|u - E_h u\|_{W^{1,2}(\Omega)} \lesssim h \|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad (5.9)$$

holds if  $\mu < \pi/\omega$ .

*Proof.* We use the estimations of the local error to get an estimate for the global error. Therefore we distinguish between elements next to the edge  $M$  and elements away from  $M$ . We begin with the elements  $T$  with  $\bar{T} \cap M = \emptyset$ . Then  $u \in W^{2,2}(T)$  and from (4.4) it follows with  $p = 2$

$$\begin{aligned} \|u - E_h u\|_{W^{1,2}(T)} &\lesssim \sum_{|\alpha|=1} h_T^\alpha \|D^\alpha u\|_{W^{1,2}(S_T)} \\ &\lesssim \sum_{i=1}^2 h_{i,T} r_T^{-\beta} \left\| \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \right\|_{W_\beta^{1,2}(S_T)} + h_{3,T} \left\| \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_3} \right\|_{W^{1,2}(S_T)} \end{aligned}$$

for all  $\beta < 1 - \pi/\omega$ . For the last estimate we have used Lemma 3.3 and  $r_T \lesssim h_{3,T}$ . Since  $\mu < \pi/\omega$ , the choice  $\beta = 1 - \mu$  is admissible and we obtain for  $r_T \leq R$  from (5.1) the relation

$$h_{i,T} r_T^{-\beta} \sim h r_T^{1-\mu-\beta} = h \quad (i = 1, 2).$$

For  $r_T > R$  we have

$$h_{i,T} r_T^{-\beta} \lesssim h R^{-\beta} \sim h.$$

Combining the two last estimates with the fact that  $h_{3,T} \sim h$ , one arrives at

$$\|u - E_h u\|_{W^{1,2}(T)} \lesssim h \sum_{i=1}^2 \left\| \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \right\|_{W_\beta^{1,2}(S_T)} + h \left\| \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_3} \right\|_{W^{1,2}(S_T)} \quad (5.10)$$

For an element  $T$  with  $T \cap M \neq \emptyset$  we can estimate with Theorem 4.7 for  $p = q = 2$  since  $W_\beta^{2,2}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow W^{1,2}(\Omega)$  (see (2.2))

$$\begin{aligned} \|u - E_h u\|_{W^{1,2}(T)} &\lesssim \sum_{i=1}^3 h_{i,T} h_{1,T}^{-\beta} \left\| \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \right\|_{W_\beta^{1,2}(T)} \\ &\lesssim \sum_{i=1}^2 h^{(1-\beta)/\mu} \left\| \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \right\|_{W_\beta^{1,2}(T)} + h_{3,T} \left\| \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_3} \right\|_{W^{1,2}(T)} \end{aligned} \quad (5.11)$$

$$\lesssim \sum_{i=1}^2 h \left\| \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \right\|_{W_\beta^{1,2}(T)} + h \left\| \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_3} \right\|_{W^{1,2}(T)} \quad (5.12)$$

where we have used the additional regularity of  $u$  in  $x_3$ -direction (see Corollary 3.4),  $r^\beta \lesssim h_{1,T}^\beta$  in (5.11) and  $\beta = 1 - \mu$ .

Summing up over all elements yields together with the regularity results from Theorem 3.2 and Corollary 3.4 the desired estimate (5.9).  $\square$

This global estimate of the interpolation error yields an estimate for the finite element error.

**Theorem 5.4.** *Let  $u$  be the solution of (5.7) and let  $u_h$  be the finite element solution defined by (5.8). Assume that the mesh is refined according to  $\mu < \pi/\omega$ . Then the finite element error can be estimated by*

$$\begin{aligned} \|u - u_h\|_{W^{1,2}(\Omega)} &\lesssim h \|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ \|u - u_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} &\lesssim h^2 \|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* The assertion follows from inequality (5.9) like the assertion of Theorem 5.2 from (5.4).  $\square$

**Acknowledgement** This work was supported by the DFG priority program 1253.

## References

- [1] Th. Apel. Interpolation of non-smooth functions on anisotropic finite element meshes. *Math. Modeling Numer. Anal.*, 33:1149–1185, 1999.
- [2] Th. Apel and M. Dobrowolski. Anisotropic interpolation with applications to the finite element method. *Computing*, 47:277–293, 1992.
- [3] Th. Apel and B. Heinrich. Mesh refinement and windowing near edges for some elliptic problem. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 31:695–708, 1994.
- [4] Th. Apel and S. Nicaise. Elliptic problems in domains with edges: anisotropic regularity and anisotropic finite element meshes. Preprint SPC94\_16, TU Chemnitz-Zwickau, 1994.
- [5] Th. Apel and S. Nicaise. Elliptic problems in domains with edges: anisotropic regularity and anisotropic finite element meshes. In J. Cea, D. Chenais, G. Geymonat, and J. L. Lions, editors, *Partial Differential Equations and Functional Analysis (In Memory of Pierre Grisvard)*, pages 18–34. Birkhäuser, Boston, 1996. Shortened version of Preprint SPC94\_16, TU Chemnitz-Zwickau, 1994.
- [6] Th. Apel, A.-M. Sändig, and J. R. Whiteman. Graded mesh refinement and error estimates for finite element solutions of elliptic boundary value problems in non-smooth domains. *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.*, 19:63–85, 1996.
- [7] Th. Apel, D. Sirch, and G. Winkler. Error estimates for control constrained optimal control problems on anisotropic finite element meshes. *in preparation*, 2008.

- [8] N. Arada, E. Casas, and F. Tröltzsch. Error estimates for a semilinear elliptic optimal control problem. *Computational Optimization and Approximation*, 23:201–229, 2002.
- [9] A. E. Beagles and J. R. Whiteman. Finite element treatment of boundary singularities by augmentation with non-exact singular functions. *Numer. Methods Partial Differential Equations*, 2:113–121, 1986.
- [10] E. Casas, M. Mateos, and F. Tröltzsch. Error estimates for the numerical approximation of boundary semilinear elliptic control problems. *Computational Optimization and Applications*, 31(2):193–219, 2005.
- [11] P. Clément. Approximation by finite element functions using local regularization. *RAIRO Anal. Numer.*, 2:77–84, 1975.
- [12] M. Dauge. Neumann and mixed problems on curvilinear polyhedra. *Integr. Equat. Oper. Th.*, pages 227–261, 1992.
- [13] R. Falk. Approximation of a class of optimal control problems with order of convergence estimates. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 44:28–47, 1973.
- [14] T. Geveci. On the approximation of the solution of an optimal control problem governed by an elliptic equation. *R.A.I.R.O. Analyse numérique*, 13:313–328, 1979.
- [15] P. Grisvard. *Elliptic problems in nonsmooth domains*, volume 24 of *Monographs and Studies in Mathematics*. Pitman, Boston, 1985.
- [16] P. Grisvard. *Singularities in boundary value problems*, volume 22 of *Research Notes in Applied Mathematics*. Springer, New York, 1992.
- [17] P. Grisvard. Singular behaviour of elliptic problems in non Hilbertian Sobolev spaces. *J. Math. Pures Appl.*, 74:3–33, 1995.
- [18] M. Hinze. A variational discretization concept in control constrained optimization: The linear-quadratic case. *Computational Optimization and Applications*, 20(1):45–61, 2005.
- [19] V. A. Kondrat’ev. Singularities of the solution of the Dirichlet problem for a second order elliptic equation in the neighbourhood of an edge. *Differencial’nye uravnenija*, 13(11):2026–2032, 1977. In Russian.
- [20] A. Kufner and A.-M. Sändig. *Some Applications of Weighted Sobolev Spaces*. Teubner, Leipzig, 1987.
- [21] J. M.-S. Lubuma and S. Nicaise. Finite element method for elliptic problems with edge singularities. *J. Comp. Appl. Math.*, 106:145–168, 1999.
- [22] K. Malanowski. Convergence of approximations vs. regularity of solutions for convex, control-constrained optimal control problems. *Appl. Math. Opt.*, 8:69–95, 1981.

- [23] C. Meyer and A. Rösch. Superconvergence properties of optimal control problems. *SIAM J. Control and Optimization*, 43(3):970–985, 2004.
- [24] S. G. Michlin. *Partielle Differentialgleichungen in der mathematischen Physik*. Akademie-Verlag, Berlin, 1978.
- [25] S. Nazarov and B. Plamenevsky. *Elliptic Problems in Domains with Piecewise Smooth Boundaries*. Walther de Gruyter & Co., 1994.
- [26] J. Roßmann. Gewichtete Sobolev–Slobodetskiĭ–Räume und Anwendungen auf elliptische Randwertaufgaben in Gebieten mit Kanten. Habilitationsschrift, Universität Rostock, 1988.
- [27] J. Roßmann. The asymptotics of the solutions of linear elliptic variational problems in domains with edges. *Z. Anal. Anwend.*, 9(3):565–575, 1990.
- [28] A.-M. Sändig. Error estimates for finite element solutions of elliptic boundary value problems in non-smooth domains. *Z. Anal. Anwend.*, 9(2):133–153, 1990.
- [29] L. R. Scott and S. Zhang. Finite element interpolation of non-smooth functions satisfying boundary conditions. *Math. Comp.*, 54:483–493, 1990.
- [30] V. Zaionchkovskii and V. A. Solonnikov. Neumann problem for second-order elliptic equations in domains with edges on the boundary. *Journal of Mathematical Sciences*, 27(2):2561–2586, 1984.