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#### Abstract

In this note we prove error estimates in natural norms on the approximation of the boundary data in the elliptic Cauchy problem, for the finite element method first analysed in E. Burman, Error estimates for stabilized finite element methods applied to ill-posed problems. C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris 352 (2014), no. 7-8, 655659.


## Résumé

Dans cette note nous montrons des estimations d'erreur pour l'approximation d'éléments finis des données sur le bord d'un problème de Cauchy elliptique. Ces résultats complètent l'analyse d'erreur de la méthode d'éléments finis proposée dans E. Burman, Error estimates for stabilized finite element methods applied to ill-posed problems. C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris 352 (2014), no. 7-8, 655659.

## 1. Introduction

We consider the numerical approximation of the following linear elliptic Cauchy problem. Let $\Omega$ be a convex polygonal (polyhedral) domain in $\mathbb{R}^{d}, d=2,3$, and consider the equation

$$
\left\{\begin{align*}
-\Delta u & =f, \text { in } \Omega  \tag{1}\\
u=g \text { and } \partial_{n} u & =\psi \text { on } \Gamma
\end{align*}\right.
$$

where $\Gamma \subset \partial \Omega$ denotes a simply connected part of the boundary and $f \in L^{2}(\Omega), \psi \in H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)$ and $g \in H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\Gamma)$. Introducing the spaces $V=H^{1}(\Omega), V_{g}:=\left\{v \in H^{1}(\Omega):\left.v\right|_{\Gamma}=g\right\}$ and $W:=\left\{v \in H^{1}(\Omega):\right.$

[^0]$\left.\left.v\right|_{\Gamma^{\prime}}=0\right\}$, where $\Gamma^{\prime}:=\partial \Omega \backslash \Gamma$ and the forms $a(u, w):=\int_{\Omega} \nabla u \cdot \nabla w \mathrm{~d} x$, and $l(w):=\int_{\Omega} f w \mathrm{~d} x+\int_{\Gamma} \psi w \mathrm{~d} s$ equation (1) may be cast in the abstract weak formulation, find $u \in V_{g}$ such that
\[

$$
\begin{equation*}
a(u, w)=l(w) \quad \forall w \in W \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

\]

where $a: V \times W \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ and $l: W \mapsto \mathbb{R}$.
It is well known that the Cauchy problem (1) is not well-posed in the sense of Hadamard. If $l(w)$ is such that a sufficiently smooth, exact solution exists, conditional stability estimates can nevertheless be obtained [1].

In a series of papers $[3,4,5,6]$ we have developed a method, regularised using techniques from stabilised finite element methods that can be analysed using such conditional stability estimates. The stability estimate referred to was a simplified form of a detailed estimate derived in [1], that we recall here.

Assume that the linear form $l(w)$ is such that the problem (2) admits a unique solution $u \in V_{g}$. Define the following dual norm on $l,\|l\|_{W^{\prime}}:=\sup _{\substack{w \in W \\\|w\|_{W=1}}}|l(w)|$. Consider the functional $j: V \mapsto \mathbb{R}$. Let $\Xi: \mathbb{R}^{+} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{+}$be a continuous, monotone increasing function with $\lim _{x \rightarrow 0^{+}} \Xi(x)=0$. Let $\epsilon>0$.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { Assume that there holds }\|l\|_{W^{\prime}} \leq \epsilon \text { in (2) then, for } \epsilon \text { sufficiently small, }|j(u)| \leq \Xi(\epsilon) \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

For the example of the Cauchy problem (1), it is known [1, Theorems 1.7 and 1.9] that if (1) admits a unique solution $u \in H^{1}(\Omega)$, a conditional stability of the form (3), (here neglecting geometric factors) with $0<\epsilon<1$, holds for

$$
\begin{equation*}
j(u):=\|u\|_{L^{2}(\omega)}, \omega \subset \Omega: \operatorname{dist}(\omega, \partial \Omega)=: d_{\omega, \partial \Omega}>0 \text { with } \Xi(x):=C_{u \varsigma} x^{\varsigma}, C_{u \varsigma}>0, \varsigma:=\varsigma\left(d_{\omega, \partial \Omega}\right) \in(0,1) \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

and for

$$
\begin{equation*}
j(u):=\|u\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \text { with } \Xi(x):=C_{u}(|\log (x)|+C)^{-\varsigma} \text { with } C_{u}, C>0, \varsigma \in(0,1) . \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Note that to derive these results $l(\cdot)$ is first associated with its Riesz representant in $W$ (c.f. [1, equation (1.31)] and discussion.) The constant $C_{u \varsigma}$ in (4) grows monotonically in $\|u\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}$ and $C_{u}$ in (5) grows monotonically in $\|u\|_{H^{1}(\Omega)}$.

The above discussion however is incomplete, since it makes no mention of control of the solution on the boundary. Indeed in [1, Equation (1.25)] the following bound is required

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|g\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)}+\|\psi\|_{H^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)} \leq \eta \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

for some $\eta>0$, that should be added in the last equation in (3) in the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
|j(u)| \leq \Xi(\epsilon+\eta) \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

This omission may seem innocent, since the solution in $[4,5,6]$ was assumed to be zero on the Cauchy boundary, and control of the boundary flux is built into the method. Indeed it follows from the analysis that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|h^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\partial_{n} u_{h}-\psi\right)\right\|_{L^{2}(\Gamma)} \leq C h|u|_{H^{2}(\Omega)} \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

if we assume that there are no perturbations in data. The bound needed to satisfy (6) would be

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|\partial_{n} u_{h}-\psi\right\|_{H^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)} \leq C h|u|_{H^{2}(\Omega)} \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

This does not follow from (8) and standard techniques to prove that the continuous $H^{-1 / 2}$-norm is bounded by the discrete counterpart, typically leading to

$$
\left\|\partial_{n} u_{h}-\psi\right\|_{H^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)} \leq C\left\|h^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\partial_{n} u_{h}-\psi\right)\right\|_{L^{2}(\Gamma)}+C\left\|u-u_{h}\right\|_{H^{1}(\Omega)}
$$

fail due to the ill-posed character of the problem, since the last term of the right hand side does not necessarily converge. Naively bounding the $H^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)$-norm by the $L^{2}(\Gamma)$-norm on the other hand leads to
an estimate which is suboptimal by $\mathcal{O}\left(h^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)$. The aim of the present note is to present an approach to prove the optimal bound applicable in all the methods $[4,5,6]$ and also include the case of non-zero Dirichlet data. In the following we assume that (1) admits a unique solution $u \in V_{g} \cap H^{2}(\Omega)$.

## 2. Finite element discretization

Let $\mathcal{K}_{h}$ be a shape regular, conforming, subdivision of $\Omega$ into non-overlapping, quasi uniform triangles $\kappa$. The family of meshes $\left\{\mathcal{K}_{h}\right\}_{h}$ is indexed by the mesh parameter $h:=\max (\operatorname{diam}(\kappa))<1$. Let $\mathcal{F}_{I}$ be the set of interior faces $\{F\}$ in $\mathcal{K}_{h}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{\Gamma}, \mathcal{F}_{\Gamma^{\prime}}$ the set of element faces of $\mathcal{K}_{h}$ whose interior intersects $\Gamma$ and $\Gamma^{\prime}$ respectively. Each interior face has a fixed but arbitrary normal $n_{F}$ and the normal associated to faces on the boundary is defined as the outward pointing normal. We assume that the mesh matches the boundary of $\Gamma$ so that $\mathcal{F}_{\Gamma} \cap \mathcal{F}_{\Gamma^{\prime}}=\emptyset$. Let $X_{h}^{1}$ denote the standard finite element space of continuous, affine functions. Define $V_{h}=W_{h}:=X_{h}^{1}$. Let $i_{h}: H^{2}(\Omega) \mapsto V_{h}$ denote the standard nodal interpolant, for which the following interpolation estimate holds

$$
\left\|u-i_{h} u\right\|_{\Omega}+h\left\|\nabla\left(u-i_{h} u\right)\right\|_{\Omega} \leq C h^{2}|u|_{H^{2}(\Omega)} .
$$

We may then write the finite element method: find $\left(u_{h}, z_{h}\right) \in V_{h} \times W_{h}$ such that,

$$
\left.\begin{array}{rl}
a_{h}\left(u_{h}, w_{h}\right)-s^{*}\left(z_{h}, w_{h}\right) & =l_{h}\left(w_{h}\right)  \tag{10}\\
a_{h}\left(v_{h}, z_{h}\right)+s\left(u_{h}, v_{h}\right) & =s\left(u, v_{h}\right)
\end{array}\right\} \text { for all }\left(v_{h}, w_{h}\right) \in V_{h} \times W_{h}
$$

where $l_{h}\left(w_{h}\right):=l\left(w_{h}\right)-\int_{\Gamma} g \partial_{n} w_{h} \mathrm{~d} s$,

$$
a_{h}\left(v_{h}, w_{h}\right):=a\left(v_{h}, w_{h}\right)-\int_{\Gamma} v_{h} \partial_{n} w_{h} \mathrm{~d} s-\int_{\Gamma^{\prime}} w_{h} \partial_{n} v_{h} \mathrm{~d} s
$$

In order to include the Dirichlet data in a straightforward manner we here use the Nitsche type imposition of the boundary conditions introduced in [5,6], that is the reason for the appearance of the boundary terms in the forms $a_{h}$ and $l_{h}$.

A possible choice of stabilization operators for the problem (1) are

$$
\begin{equation*}
s\left(u_{h}, v_{h}\right):=\sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_{I} \cup \mathcal{F}_{\Gamma}} \int_{F} h_{F}\left[\partial_{n} u_{h}\right]\left[\partial_{n} v_{h}\right] \mathrm{d} s+\sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_{\Gamma}} \int_{F} h_{F}^{-1} u_{h} v_{h} \mathrm{~d} s, \quad \text { with } h_{F}:=\operatorname{diam}(F) \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

and
$s^{*}\left(z_{h}, w_{h}\right):=a\left(z_{h}, w_{h}\right)+\int_{\Gamma^{\prime}} h^{-1} z_{h} w_{h} \mathrm{~d} s$ or $s^{*}\left(z_{h}, w_{h}\right):=\sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_{I} \cup \mathcal{F}_{\Gamma^{\prime}}} \int_{F} h_{F}\left[\partial_{n} z_{h}\right]\left[\partial_{n} w_{h}\right] \mathrm{d} s+\int_{\Gamma^{\prime}} h^{-1} z_{h} w_{h} \mathrm{~d} s$
where $\left[\partial_{n} u_{h}\right]$ denotes the jump of $\nabla u_{h} \cdot n_{F}$ for $F \in \mathcal{F}_{I}$ and when $F \in \mathcal{F}_{\Gamma} \cup \mathcal{F}_{\Gamma^{\prime}}$ define $\left.\left[\partial_{n} u_{h}\right]\right|_{F}:=\nabla u_{h} \cdot n_{\partial \Omega}$. Observe that by definition the right hand side of the second equation of (10) is

$$
s\left(u, v_{h}\right)=\sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_{\Gamma}} \int_{F} h_{F}^{-1} g v_{h}+h_{F} \psi \partial_{n} v_{h} \mathrm{~d} s
$$

Using a Poincaré inequality on discrete spaces [2] the following bound holds for some $c_{p}>0$

$$
\begin{equation*}
c_{p} h\left\|u_{h}\right\|_{H^{1}(\Omega)} \leq s\left(u_{h}, u_{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

and therefore the triple norm defined by $\mid\left\|u_{h}, z_{h}\right\|^{2}:=s\left(u_{h}, u_{h}\right)+s^{*}\left(z_{h}, z_{h}\right)$ is a norm on $V_{h} \times W_{h}$. The following error estimate was shown in [6, Lemma 1], independent of the stability of the problem (1).

Lemma 2.1 Let $u \in V \cap H^{2}(\Omega)$ be the solution of (1) and $\left(u_{h}, z_{h}\right) \in V_{h} \times W_{h}$ the solution of (10) then there holds

$$
\|\left|\left(u-u_{h}, z_{h}\right)\right|| | \leq C h|u|_{H^{2}(\Omega)}
$$

and $\left\|u-u_{h}\right\|_{H^{1}(\Omega)} \leq C\|u\|_{H^{2}(\Omega)}$.
Proof. The first inequality follows from [6, Lemma 1], with a minor modification to account for the Dirichlet data $g$. For the second observe that by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the discrete Poincaré inequality (13),

$$
\left\|u-u_{h}\right\|_{H^{1}(\Omega)} \leq\left\|u-i_{h} u\right\|_{H^{1}(\Omega)}+\left\|u_{h}-i_{h} u\right\|_{H^{1}(\Omega)} \leq C h|u|_{H^{2}(\Omega)}+c_{p}^{-1} h^{-1} s\left(u_{h}-i_{h} u, u_{h}-i_{h} u\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} .
$$

After an additional triangle inequality

$$
s\left(u_{h}-i_{h} u, u_{h}-i_{h} u\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq\| \|\left(u-i_{h} u_{h}, 0\right)\| \|+\| \|\left(u-u_{h}, 0\right)\| \|
$$

the claim now follows from the approximation estimate $\left\|\left.\left\|\left(u-i_{h} u_{h}, 0\right)\right\||\leq C h| u\right|_{H^{2}(\Omega)}\right.$ and the a priori error estimate on $\left\|\left\|\left(u-u_{h}, z_{h}\right)\right\|\right\|$.

Consider now the error equation, for all $w \in W$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
a\left(u-u_{h}, w\right)=\left\langle r\left(u_{h}\right), w\right\rangle_{\left(W^{\prime}, W\right)} \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\left\langle r\left(u_{h}\right), w\right\rangle_{\left(W^{\prime}, W\right)}=(f, w)_{\Omega}+\langle\psi, w\rangle_{\Gamma}-a\left(u_{h}, w\right)
$$

It was shown in $[6$, Theorem 1] that for $g=0$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|r\|_{W^{\prime}} \leq C h\|f\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}+\| \|\left(u-u_{h}, z_{h}\right) \| \leq C h\left(\|f\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}+|u|_{H^{2}(\Omega)}\right) \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

With Lemma 2.1 and equation (15) conditional error estimates were derived in [6, Theorem 1] using the conditional stability (3), but omitting the condition (6).

The objective in the next section is to show how the bound

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|h^{-\frac{1}{2}}\left(u_{h}-g\right)\right\|_{L^{2}(\Gamma)}+\left\|h^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\partial_{n} u_{h}-\psi\right)\right\|_{L^{2}(\Gamma)} \leq C h|u|_{H^{2}(\Omega)} \tag{16}
\end{equation*}
$$

implied by Lemma 2.1, leads to (9), for a related perturbed approximation $\tilde{u}_{h}$ that is sufficiently close to $u_{h}$, or including the Dirichlet data,

$$
\left\|\tilde{u}_{h}-g\right\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)}+\left\|\partial_{n} \tilde{u}_{h}-\psi\right\|_{H^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)} \leq C h|u|_{H^{2}(\Omega)} .
$$

This is then used in the analysis to show that the approximation error satisfies the bound (6).

## 3. Boundary error estimates in natural norms

As was pointed out already in $[5,6]$ the error equation (14) can be written using any perturbation, $\tilde{u}_{h}$ of $u_{h}$ that is sufficiently close to $u_{h}$ to be controlled using the triple norm. For instance when nonconforming approximation is used [5], so that $V_{h} \not \subset V \tilde{u}_{h}$ is some discrete interpolant of $u_{h}$ in $V \cap V_{h}$. Herein we will use this idea to create a $\tilde{u}_{h}$ that has a suitable oscillating property of the flux error. Indeed drawing on ideas from [7, Lemma 4.1 and Remark 1] we divide $\Gamma$ into $N_{\Gamma}$ shape regular triangular subdomains $\mathfrak{F}_{i}$, $i=1, \ldots, N_{\Gamma}$ each containing an agglomeration of element faces. The boundary of $\mathfrak{F}_{i}$ does not need to coincide with the boundary element edges, but the diameter of $\mathfrak{F}_{i}$ is proportional to $h$, $\operatorname{diam}\left(\mathfrak{F}_{i}\right)=C_{\mathfrak{F}} h$, for some fixed $C_{\mathfrak{F}}>0$ that we may choose. For each $\mathfrak{F}_{i}$ we assemble all elements with one face entirely contained in $\mathfrak{F}_{i}$ and their nearest neighbours among the interior elements into patches $\mathfrak{P}_{i} \subset \bar{\Omega}$ such that $\mathfrak{P}_{i} \cap \Gamma \subset \mathfrak{F}_{i}$. By construction the patches also have diameter $\mathcal{O}(h)$. On each subdomain $\mathfrak{F}_{i}$ we define the
following local projection onto a piecewise constant $\left.\pi_{0} w\right|_{\mathfrak{F}_{i}}=\operatorname{meas}_{d-1}\left(\mathfrak{F}_{i}\right)^{-1} \int_{\mathfrak{F}_{i}} w \mathrm{~d} s$. Then, following [7, Lemma 4.1], provided each $\mathfrak{F}_{i}$ contains a sufficient number of surface elements, i.e. the constant $C_{\mathfrak{F}}$ is taken large enough, we may construct a function $\varphi_{i}$, whose support is contained in $\mathfrak{P}_{i}$ such that, given $v_{i} \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.\pi_{0} \partial_{n} \varphi_{i}\right|_{\mathfrak{F}_{i}}=v_{i}, \quad\left\|\nabla \varphi_{i}\right\|_{\mathfrak{P}_{i}} \leq C\left\|h^{\frac{1}{2}} v_{i}\right\|_{\mathfrak{F}_{i}} \tag{17}
\end{equation*}
$$

The constant $C$ and the size of $C_{\mathfrak{F}}$ only depends on the shape regularity of the mesh. Then we construct our $\tilde{u}_{h}$ as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\tilde{u}_{h}:=u_{h}+v_{\Gamma} \text { with } v_{\Gamma}:=\sum_{i=1}^{N_{\Gamma}} \varphi_{i} \tag{18}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the coefficients $v_{i}$ in the definition of $\varphi_{i}$ are fixed by the relation,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{\mathfrak{F}_{i}}\left(\psi-\partial_{n} \tilde{u}_{h}\right) \mathrm{d} s=0, \text { implying that } v_{i}:=\left.\pi_{0}\left(\psi-\partial_{n} u_{h}\right)\right|_{\mathfrak{F}_{i}} \tag{19}
\end{equation*}
$$

The following bounds hold for the perturbation error introduced.
Lemma 3.1 Let $u_{h} \in V_{h}$ and let $\tilde{u}_{h}$ be constructed using (18)-(19) then there holds

$$
\left\|h^{-\frac{1}{2}}\left(\tilde{u}_{h}-u_{h}\right)\right\|_{\Gamma}+\left\|h^{\frac{1}{2}} \partial_{n}\left(\tilde{u}_{h}-u_{h}\right)\right\|_{\Gamma} \leq C\left\|h^{\frac{1}{2}} \pi_{0}\left(\psi-\partial_{n} u_{h}\right)\right\|_{\Gamma}
$$

and $h^{-1}\left\|\tilde{u}_{h}-u_{h}\right\|_{\Omega}+\left\|\nabla\left(\tilde{u}_{h}-u_{h}\right)\right\|_{\Omega} \leq C\left\|h^{\frac{1}{2}} \pi_{0}\left(\psi-\partial_{n} u_{h}\right)\right\|_{\Gamma}$.
Proof. By the definition of $\tilde{u}_{h}$ and using elementwise trace inequalities $\left\|u_{h}\right\|_{\partial K} \leq C h^{-\frac{1}{2}}\left\|u_{h}\right\|_{K}$ we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\|h^{-\frac{1}{2}}\left(\tilde{u}_{h}-u_{h}\right)\right\|_{\Gamma}+\left\|h^{\frac{1}{2}} \partial_{n}\left(\tilde{u}_{h}-u_{h}\right)\right\|_{\Gamma}+\left\|\nabla\left(\tilde{u}_{h}-u_{h}\right)\right\|_{\Omega}=\left\|h^{-\frac{1}{2}} v_{\Gamma}\right\|_{\Gamma}+\left\|h^{\frac{1}{2}} \partial_{n} v_{\Gamma}\right\|_{\Gamma}+\left\|\nabla v_{\Gamma}\right\|_{\Omega} \\
\leq C\left(\left\|h^{-1} v_{\Gamma}\right\|_{\Omega}+\left\|\nabla v_{\Gamma}\right\|_{\Omega}\right) \leq\left\|\nabla v_{\Gamma}\right\|_{\Omega}
\end{aligned}
$$

The last inequality was obtained by applying a Poincaré inequality locally on every patch $\left\|v_{\Gamma}\right\|_{\mathfrak{P}_{i}} \leq$ $C\left\|h \nabla v_{\Gamma}\right\|_{\mathfrak{P}_{i}}$. Using the second inequality of (17) and the definition of $v_{i}$, (19) we conclude

$$
\left\|\nabla v_{\Gamma}\right\|_{\Omega}^{2} \leq C \sum_{i=1}^{N_{\Gamma}}\left\|h^{\frac{1}{2}} v_{i}\right\|_{\mathfrak{F}_{i}}^{2}=C \sum_{i=1}^{N_{\Gamma}}\left\|h^{\frac{1}{2}} \pi_{0}\left(\psi-\partial_{n} u_{h}\right)\right\|_{\mathfrak{F}_{i}}^{2}=C\left\|h^{\frac{1}{2}} \pi_{0}\left(\psi-\partial_{n} u_{h}\right)\right\|_{\Gamma}^{2}
$$

To estimate the $H^{-1 / 2}$-norm of the perturbed flux error, $\psi-\partial_{n} \tilde{u}_{h}$ we observe that by the construction of $\tilde{u}_{h}$ there holds, for all $w \in H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Omega)$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\psi-\partial_{n} \tilde{u}_{h}, w\right)_{\Gamma}=\sum_{i=1}^{N_{\Gamma}}\left(\psi-\partial_{n} \tilde{u}_{h}, w-\pi_{0} w\right)_{\mathfrak{F}_{i}} \leq C\left\|h^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\psi-\partial_{n} \tilde{u}_{h}\right)\right\|_{\Gamma}\|w\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)} \tag{20}
\end{equation*}
$$

where we used the approximability properties of the piecewise constant functions on the shape regular triangular surface subdomains $\mathfrak{F}_{i}$ (see for instance [8, Theorem 10.2].) Hence, taking the supremum over (non-zero) $w \in H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)$ in (20) we obtain

$$
\left\|\psi-\partial_{n} \tilde{u}_{h}\right\|_{H^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)} \leq C\left\|h^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\psi-\partial_{n} \tilde{u}_{h}\right)\right\|_{\Gamma} \leq C\left\|h^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\psi-\partial_{n} u_{h}\right)\right\|_{\Gamma}+C\left\|h^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\partial_{n} u_{h}-\partial_{n} \tilde{u}_{h}\right)\right\|_{\Gamma}
$$

It follows by Lemma 3.1 that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|\psi-\partial_{n} \tilde{u}_{h}\right\|_{H^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)} \leq C\left\|h^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\psi-\partial_{n} u_{h}\right)\right\|_{\Gamma} . \tag{21}
\end{equation*}
$$

Considering now the Dirichlet condition we have, since $u=g$ for the exact solution and by applying the inverse inequality $\left\|v_{h}\right\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)} \leq C\left\|h^{-\frac{1}{2}} v_{h}\right\|_{\Gamma}$, and a global trace inequality

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|\tilde{u}_{h}-g\right\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}(\Gamma)}} \leq\left\|\tilde{u}_{h}-i_{h} u\right\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)}+\left\|u-i_{h} u\right\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)} \leq\left\|h^{-\frac{1}{2}}\left(\tilde{u}_{h}-i_{h} u\right)\right\|_{\Gamma}+C\left\|u-i_{h} u\right\|_{H^{1}(\Omega)} . \tag{22}
\end{equation*}
$$

For the first term in the right hand side we observe that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|h^{-\frac{1}{2}}\left(\tilde{u}_{h}-i_{h} u\right)\right\|_{\Gamma} \leq\left\|h^{-\frac{1}{2}}\left(\tilde{u}_{h}-u_{h}\right)\right\|_{\Gamma}+\left\|h^{-\frac{1}{2}}\left(u_{h}-i_{h} u\right)\right\|_{\Gamma} \leq C\left\|h^{\frac{1}{2}} \pi_{0}\left(\psi-\partial_{n} u_{h}\right)\right\|_{\Gamma}+C h|u|_{H^{2}(\Omega)} \tag{23}
\end{equation*}
$$

where we used Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 2.1 in the last estimate. We conclude that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|\tilde{u}_{h}-g\right\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)} \leq C\left\|h^{\frac{1}{2}} \pi_{0}\left(\psi-\partial_{n} u_{h}\right)\right\|_{\Gamma}+C h|u|_{H^{2}(\Omega)} . \tag{24}
\end{equation*}
$$

We summarize the above results in a Lemma
Lemma 3.2 Let $u_{h}$ be the solution of (10) and let $\tilde{u}_{h}$ be the perturbed solution of equation (18) then there holds

$$
\left\|\tilde{u}_{h}-g\right\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)}+\left\|\psi-\partial_{n} \tilde{u}_{h}\right\|_{H^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)} \leq C h|u|_{H^{2}(\Omega)}
$$

and

$$
\left\|r\left(\tilde{u}_{h}\right)\right\|_{W^{\prime}} \leq C h\left(\|f\|_{\Omega}+|u|_{H^{2}(\Omega)}\right) .
$$

Proof. The proof of the first inequality is a consequence of the inequalities (21) and (24) and (16). The second inequality, which implies that the perturbed error $u-\tilde{u}_{h}$ satisfies the equivalent of (15), is straightforward to show since in this case

$$
\left\langle r\left(\tilde{u}_{h}\right), w\right\rangle_{\left(W^{\prime}, W\right)}=(f, w)_{\Omega}+\langle\psi, w\rangle_{\Gamma}-a\left(\tilde{u}_{h}, w\right)=\underbrace{(f, w)_{\Omega}+\langle\psi, w\rangle_{\Gamma}-a\left(u_{h}, w\right)}_{I}+\underbrace{a\left(u_{h}-\tilde{u}_{h}, w\right)}_{I I} .
$$

Term $I$ is bounded similarly as in [6, Theorem 1], with some minor modifications due to the non-zero boundary data $g$. Indeed Galerkin orthogonality yields in this case, for some $H^{1}$-stable approximation $w_{h} \in W_{h}$ of $w$,

$$
I=\left(f, w-w_{h}\right)+\left\langle\psi, w-w_{h}\right\rangle_{\Gamma}-a\left(u_{h}, w-w_{h}\right)-\int_{\Gamma^{\prime}} w_{h} \partial_{n} u_{h} \mathrm{~d} s-s^{*}\left(z_{h}, w_{h}\right)-\int_{\Gamma}\left(u_{h}-g\right) \partial_{n} w_{h} \mathrm{~d} s
$$

The last term on the right hand side is the contribution due to the non-homogeneous Dirichlet conditions and we bound it using a Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, a trace inequality, the stability of $w_{h}$, and equation (16)

$$
\int_{\Gamma}\left(u_{h}-g\right) \partial_{n} w_{h} \mathrm{~d} s \leq\left\|h^{-\frac{1}{2}}\left(u_{h}-g\right)\right\|_{\Gamma}\|w\|_{H^{1}(\Omega)} \leq C h|u|_{H^{2}(\Omega)}\|w\|_{H^{1}(\Omega)}
$$

For term $I I$ we proceed by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, Lemma 3.1 and (16)

$$
a\left(u_{h}-\tilde{u}_{h}, w\right) \leq\left\|\nabla\left(u_{h}-\tilde{u}_{h}\right)\right\|_{\Omega}\|w\|_{H^{1}(\Omega)} \leq C\left\|h^{\frac{1}{2}} \pi_{0}\left(\psi-\partial_{n} u_{h}\right)\right\|_{\Gamma}\|w\|_{H^{1}(\Omega)} \leq C h|u|_{H^{2}(\Omega)}\|w\|_{H^{1}(\Omega)}
$$

which completes the proof.
We finally give a proof of the conditional error estimate using the conditional stability (3)-(5), (7) and the data condition (6).
Theorem 3.3 Let $u$ be the solution of (2) having the conditional stability (4) - (5) under the conditions (3) and (6). Let $u_{h}$ be the solution of (10). Then there holds, with $\varsigma \in(0,1)$

$$
\left\|u-u_{h}\right\|_{L^{2}(\omega)} \leq C h^{\varsigma} \text { and }\left\|u-u_{h}\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \leq C_{u}(|\log (C h)|+C)^{-\varsigma .}
$$

Proof. Let $\tilde{u}_{h}$ be defined by (18). Observe that by Lemma 3.1 and Lemma $2.1\left\|u_{h}-\tilde{u}_{h}\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \leq$ $C h^{2}|u|_{H^{2}(\Omega)}$. It follows by the triangle inequality that it is enough to prove the bound for $\tilde{e}=u-\tilde{u}_{h}$. We see that $\tilde{e}$ is a solution to (2) with the Dirichlet data, $\left.\tilde{e}\right|_{\Gamma}$, the Neumann data $\left.\partial_{n} \tilde{e}\right|_{\Gamma}$ and the righ hand side, $\left\langle r\left(\tilde{u}_{h}\right), w\right\rangle_{\left(W^{\prime}, W\right)}:=(f, w)_{\Omega}+\langle\psi, w\rangle_{\Gamma}-a\left(\tilde{u}_{h}, w\right)$. By the first inequality of Lemma 3.2 we see that (6) holds with $\eta=C h$. By the second inequality of Lemma 3.2 we see that (3) holds with $\epsilon=C h$. To conclude we observe that using the second inequality of Lemma 2.1 and equation (16),

$$
\|\tilde{e}\|_{H^{1}(\Omega)} \leq\left\|u-u_{h}\right\|_{H^{1}(\Omega)}+\left\|\tilde{u}_{h}-u_{h}\right\|_{H^{1}(\Omega)} \leq C\|u\|_{H^{2}(\Omega)}+C\left\|h^{\frac{1}{2}} \pi_{0}\left(\psi-\partial_{n} u_{h}\right)\right\|_{\Gamma} \leq C(1+h)\|u\|_{H^{2}(\Omega)}
$$

showing that $\|\tilde{e}\|_{H^{1}(\Omega)}$ is bounded by a constant independent of $h$. It follows by the conditional stability estimate that $\tilde{e}$ satisfies the required error bounds and the proof is complete.

### 3.1. Application to other methods

The above argument may be applied also to the higher polynomial order case of [6] and the nonconforming method of [5]. Observe that the arguments in the latter already relies on the construction of an $H^{1}$-conforming approximation $I_{c f} u_{h}$, where $I_{c f}$ is the interpolation operator using local averaging in each node of the discontinuous finite element solution. The perturbation error is estimated in the triple norm in a similar way as above. Then the above argument can be applied, constructing $\tilde{u}_{h}$ in (18) with $I_{c f} u_{h}$ in the place of $u_{h}$. The estimate (20) is then obtained for $\tilde{u}_{h}$. We once again need to estimate the perturbation error $\tilde{u}_{h}-u_{h}$. This is made in two steps using the intermediate function $I_{c f} u_{h}$. The difference $\tilde{u}_{h}-I_{c f} u_{h}$ is estimated as above. Then in a second step $u_{h}$ is added and subtracted to create residuals in $u_{h}$ and all other terms on the form $I_{c f} u_{h}-u_{h}$ which is bounded as in [5] using the penalty term on the solution jumps that is part of the triple norm in this case.
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