

Elastic flow interacting with a lateral diffusion process: the one-dimensional graph case

PAOLA POZZI

Fakultät für Mathematik, Universität Duisburg-Essen, Thea-Leymann-Straße 9, 45127 Essen, Germany
paola.pozzi@uni-due.de

AND

BJÖRN STINNER*

Mathematics Institute, Zeeman Building, University of Warwick, Coventry CV4 7AL, UK

*Corresponding author: bjorn.stinner@warwick.ac.uk

[Received on 26 July 2017; revised on 20 December 2017]

A finite element approach to the elastic flow of a curve coupled with a diffusion equation on the curve is analysed. Considering the graph case, the problem is weakly formulated and approximated with continuous linear finite elements, which is enabled thanks to second-order operator splitting. The error analysis builds up on previous results for the elastic flow. To obtain an error estimate for the quantity on the curve a better control of the velocity is required. For this purpose, a penalty approach is employed and then combined with a generalized Gronwall lemma. Numerical simulations support the theoretical convergence results. Further numerical experiments indicate stability beyond the parameter regime with respect to the penalty term that is covered by the theory.

Keywords: geometric PDE; surface PDE; operator splitting; finite elements; convergence analysis.

1. Introduction

The objective of this article is the convergence analysis of a semidiscrete finite element approximation to the following problem:

PROBLEM 1.1 Given a spatial interval $I := (0, 1)$ and a time interval $(0, T)$ with some $T > 0$ and some functions $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $u_0, c_0 : \bar{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and $u_b : \partial I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, find functions $u, c : I \times (0, T) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\frac{u_t}{Q} = -\frac{1}{Q} \left(\frac{\kappa_x}{Q} \right)_x - \frac{1}{2} \kappa^3 + f(c), \quad (1.1)$$

$$\kappa = \left(\frac{u_x}{Q} \right)_x, \quad (1.2)$$

$$(cQ)_t = \left(\frac{c_x}{Q} \right)_x, \quad (1.3)$$

where

$$Q(x, t) := \sqrt{1 + u_x^2(x, t)}, \quad (x, t) \in I \times (0, T),$$

with the boundary and initial conditions

$$u(x, t) = u_b(x), \quad \kappa(x, t) = 0, \quad c(x, t) = 0, \quad (x, t) \in \partial I \times [0, T], \quad (1.4)$$

$$c(x, 0) = c_0(x), \quad u(x, 0) = u_0(x), \quad x \in \bar{I}. \quad (1.5)$$

The equations (1.1) and (1.2) are the graph formulation of the elastic flow for the curve $\{\Gamma(t)\}_{t \in (0, T)}$, $\Gamma(t) := \{(x, u(x, t)) \mid x \in I\}$, with a forcing term $f(c)$ in the direction normal to the curve. This term depends on a conserved field c on the curve that is subject to the advection–diffusion equation (1.3). Such type of problems are motivated by applications in soft matter, see the studies by Elliott & Stinner (2010, 2013) and Mercker *et al.* (2013), and cell biology (Chaplain *et al.*, 2001; Neilson *et al.*, 2011; Elliott *et al.*, 2012).

Numerical methods for solving fourth-order geometric equations such as (1.1) and (1.2) may be based on parametric approaches. This work builds up on the graph formulation of the elastic flow (or Willmore flow for higher dimensional manifolds) and on the results that are presented in the study by Deckelnick & Dziuk (2006a,b). More general parametric methods for the above or related problems are presented and analysed in the studies by Dziuk *et al.* (2002), Deckelnick & Dziuk (2009) and Barrett *et al.* (2007, 2012) for curves and Bänsch *et al.* (2004), Dziuk (2008) and Pozzi (2015) for surfaces. Often, operator splitting is employed, thus enabling the use of H^1 conforming spaces. But also more direct approaches exist, for instance, using finite volume techniques as in the study by Mikula *et al.* (2010), employing methods from isogeometric analysis (Bartezzaghi *et al.*, 2016) or using C^1 conforming finite elements as in the studies by Deckelnick & Schieweck (2010) and Deckelnick *et al.* (2015). Alternatively, methods may also be based on interface-capturing approaches. This includes level set representations of the curve or surface (Osher & Sethian, 1988; Droske & Rumpf, 2004, see Beneš *et al.*, 2009 for a comparison with parametric methods) and the phase field methodology (Du *et al.*, 2004; Du & Wang, 2007; Franken *et al.*, 2013; Bretin *et al.*, 2015). For an overview we refer to the study by Deckelnick *et al.* (2005), but we remark that the field has seen significant advances since.

The two paradigms of surface representation, parametric approaches versus interface capturing approaches, also underpin techniques for solving partial differential equations (PDEs) on moving surfaces. The overview by Dziuk & Elliott (2013) lists a variety of methods. These include Lagrange methods using finite elements on triangulated surfaces as in the study by Dziuk & Elliott (2007) or generalized spline representations, see the study by Langer *et al.* (2016), diffuse interface approximations (Rätz & Voigt, 2007; Elliott *et al.*, 2011) or Eulerian approaches based on fixed bulk meshes (Xu & Zhao, 2003; Dziuk & Elliott, 2010; Olshanskii & Reusken, 2014; Hansbo *et al.*, 2016; Petras & Ruuth, 2016).

For coupled problems such as (1.1)–(1.3) we are not aware of any convergence results. Schemes for curve shortening flow instead of the above elastic flow have been analysed in the studies by Pozzi & Stinner (2017) (semidiscrete) and Barrett *et al.* (2017) (fully discrete). The related work of Kovács *et al.* (2017) covers the case of a (weighted) H^1 flow instead of an L^2 flow of the surface energy. The benefit then is some additional control of the manifold velocity that allows to show convergence of an isoparametric finite element scheme even in the case of surfaces.

Our numerical approach to Problem 1.1 is based on the method in the study by Deckelnick & Dziuk (2006a,b) for the elastic flow of the curve in the graph case. Operator splitting and piecewise linear H^1 -conforming finite elements are used and, in particular, error estimates for the velocity u_t , the spatial gradient u_x and the length element Q are proved. However, the diffusion equation involves Q_t , whence some control of u_{xt} is required. Denoting by h the spatial discretization parameter the idea is to add a suitably h -weighted H^1 inner product of the velocity with the test function to the semidiscrete

weak problem, see (3.6) and (3.8) below. In principle, this idea already features in the scheme in Pozzi & Stinner (2017, equation (3.12)). There, thanks to mass lumping, such a term is added with a weighting that scales with h^2 . For that problem the structure of the geometric equation could be further exploited in order to derive suitable error estimates for c . In the present case we use a generalized Gronwall inequality (see Lemma 4.8 below) instead. For this to work we need to assume strictly smaller than quadratic growth in h . As a result, we can only prove smaller convergence rates for the geometric fields than in the study by Deckelnick & Dziuk (2006b). The slower convergence is also observed in numerical simulations. However, the scheme turns out to be quite stable even for faster growth of the penalty term in h . In particular, if it grows quadratically in h then we essentially recover the rates in the study by Deckelnick & Dziuk (2006b) (where there is no coupling, i.e., $f = 0$).

In Section 2 we state Problem 1.1 in a suitable variational form and some assumptions on the continuous solution. The spatial discretization is presented in Section 3, where we also prove some properties of the semidiscrete scheme and state the main convergence result (Theorem 3.2 on page 7). This result then is proved by a series of lemmas in Section 4. In Section 5 we present some numerical simulation results and Section 6 contains some concluding remarks.

2. Variational formulation and assumptions

Instead of working with the scalar curvature κ , we introduce the variable

$$w := -\kappa Q = -\kappa \sqrt{1 + u_x^2} = -\frac{u_{xx}}{(1 + u_x^2)}.$$

A simple computation gives

$$-\frac{1}{Q} \left(\frac{\kappa_x}{Q} \right)_x - \frac{1}{2} \kappa^3 = \left(\frac{1}{Q^3} w_x \right)_x + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{w^2}{Q^3} u_x \right)_x.$$

We thus consider the following weak formulation of the system (1.1)–(1.3): find functions $u(\cdot, t) \in u_b + H_0^1(I)$ and $w(\cdot, t), c(\cdot, t) \in H_0^1(I)$, $t \in [0, T]$, such that $u(\cdot, 0) = u_0(\cdot)$, $c(\cdot, 0) = c_0(\cdot)$, and such that for all a.e. $t \in (0, T)$

$$\int_I \frac{u_t}{Q} \varphi \, dx + \int_I \frac{1}{2} w^2 \frac{u_x \varphi_x}{Q^3} \, dx + \int_I \frac{w_x \varphi_x}{Q^3} \, dx - \int_I f(c) \varphi \, dx = 0 \quad \forall \varphi \in H_0^1(I), \quad (2.1)$$

$$\int_I \frac{w}{Q} \psi \, dx - \int_I \frac{u_x}{Q} \psi_x \, dx = 0 \quad \forall \psi \in H_0^1(I), \quad (2.2)$$

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\int_I c Q \xi \, dx \right) + \int_I \frac{c_x}{Q} \xi_x \, dx = 0 \quad \forall \xi \in H_0^1(I). \quad (2.3)$$

Note that if we consider a time dependent test function ξ then the last equation is replaced by

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\int_I c Q \xi \, dx \right) + \int_I \frac{c_x}{Q} \xi_x \, dx = \int_I c Q \xi_t \, dx. \quad (2.4)$$

If $f = 0$ then the system (2.1), (2.2) coincides with Deckelnick & Dziuk (2006b, (2.4) and (2.5)).

ASSUMPTION 2.1 We assume that $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a given continuously differentiable map with

$$\|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \leq C, \quad \|f'\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \leq C. \quad (2.5)$$

Moreover, we assume that the initial-boundary value problems (1.1)–(1.5) and, thus, (2.1)–(2.3) have a unique solution (u, c) , which satisfies

$$u \in L^\infty\left((0, T); W^{4,\infty}(I)\right) \cap L^2\left((0, T); H^5(I)\right), \quad (2.6)$$

$$u_t \in L^\infty\left((0, T); W^{2,\infty}(I)\right) \cap L^2\left((0, T); H^3(I)\right), \quad (2.7)$$

$$u_{tt} \in L^\infty\left((0, T); L^\infty(I)\right) \cap L^2\left((0, T); H^1(I)\right), \quad (2.8)$$

$$c \in W^{1,\infty}\left((0, T); H^1(I)\right) \cap L^\infty\left((0, T); H^2(I)\right) \cap L^\infty\left((0, T); H_0^1(I)\right). \quad (2.9)$$

REMARK 2.2 The above assumptions (2.5) on f are made to keep the presentation short. For some results in this work they can be generalized such that, in particular, linear functions are covered (see the sketch in the conclusion section).

3. Discretization and convergence statements

Consider a subdivision $0 = x_0 < x_1 < \dots < x_N = 1$ of the spatial interval into subintervals $S_j = [x_{j-1}, x_j] \subset [0, 1]$. Let $h_j = |S_j|$ and $h = \max_{j=1,\dots,N} h_j$ be the maximal diameter of a grid element. We assume that for some constant $\bar{C} > 0$ we have

$$h_j \geq \bar{C}h \quad \text{for all } j = 1, \dots, N. \quad (3.1)$$

On this subdivision we consider continuous, piecewise linear finite elements. Let $\varphi_j, j = 0, \dots, N$, denote the nodal basis functions and set

$$X_h := \text{span}\{\varphi_0, \dots, \varphi_N\} \subset H^1(I) \text{ and } X_{h0} := \{u_h \in X_h : u_h(x_0) = u_h(x_N) = 0\} \subset H_0^1(I).$$

For a continuous function $u \in C^0([0, 1], \mathbb{R})$ let $I_h u \in X_h$ be the linear (Lagrange) interpolate uniquely defined by $I_h u(x_i) = u(x_i)$ for all $i = 0, \dots, N$ for which the following interpolation estimates are standard (recall that $H^1(I) \subset C^0(I)$ in one dimension):

$$\|v - I_h v\|_{L^2(I)} \leq Ch^k \|v\|_{H^k(I)} \quad \text{for } k = 1, 2, \quad (3.2)$$

$$\|(v - I_h v)_x\|_{L^2(I)} \leq Ch \|v\|_{H^2(I)}. \quad (3.3)$$

Recall also the following inverse estimates for any $m_h \in X_h$ and $j = 1, \dots, N$:

$$\|m_{hx}\|_{L^2(S_j)} \leq \frac{C}{h_j} \|m_h\|_{L^2(S_j)} \xrightarrow{(3.1)} \|m_{hx}\|_{L^2(I)} \leq \frac{C}{h} \|m_h\|_{L^2(I)}, \quad (3.4)$$

$$\|m_h\|_{L^\infty(S_j)} \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{h_j}} \|m_h\|_{L^2(S_j)} \xrightarrow{(3.1)} \|m_h\|_{L^\infty(I)} \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{h}} \|m_h\|_{L^2(I)}. \quad (3.5)$$

The discrete formulation that we propose entails a regularization term weighted by a positive function depending on the parameter h that is defined by

$$\mu(h) := C_\mu h^r \quad \text{for some } r \in [1, 2) \text{ and some } C_\mu > 0. \quad (3.6)$$

The reason for introducing this term is motivated below in Remark 4.1 after introducing the necessary notation. The initial data for the discrete problem are denoted by

$$u_{0h} \in I_h(u_b) + X_{h0}, \quad c_{0h} \in X_{h0}, \quad (3.7)$$

respectively, and will be specified in (4.23) below (see also Lemma 4.1).

PROBLEM 3.1 (Semidiscrete Scheme) Find functions $u_h(\cdot, t) \in I_h(u_b) + X_{h0}$ and $w_h(\cdot, t), c_h(\cdot, t) \in X_{h0}$, $t \in [0, T]$, of the form

$$u_h(x, t) = \sum_{j=0}^N u_j(t) \varphi_j(x), \quad c_h(x, t) = \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} c_j(t) \varphi_j(x), \quad w_h(x, t) = \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} w_j(t) \varphi_j(x),$$

with $u_j(t), c_j(t), w_j(t) \in \mathbb{R}, t \in [0, T]$, such that $u_h(\cdot, 0) = u_{0h}, c_h(\cdot, 0) = c_{0h}$ as defined in (4.23), and such that for all $\varphi_h, \psi_h, \zeta_h \in X_{h0}$ and all times $t \in [0, T]$

$$\int_I \mu(h) u_{hxt} \varphi_{hx} \, dx + \int_I \frac{u_{ht} \varphi_h}{Q_h} \, dx + \int_I \frac{1}{2} w_h^2 \frac{u_{hx} \varphi_{hx}}{Q_h^3} \, dx + \int_I \frac{w_{hx} \varphi_{hx}}{Q_h^3} \, dx = \int_I I_h(f(c_h)) \varphi_h \, dx, \quad (3.8)$$

$$\int_I \frac{w_h \psi_h}{Q_h} \, dx - \int_I \frac{u_{hx} \psi_{hx}}{Q_h} \, dx = 0, \quad (3.9)$$

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\int_I c_h Q_h \zeta_h \, dx \right) + \int_I \frac{c_{hx} \zeta_{hx}}{Q_h} \, dx = 0. \quad (3.10)$$

Here, $\mu(h)$ is defined in (3.6) and Q_h denotes the discrete length element,

$$Q_h(x, t) := \sqrt{1 + u_{hx}^2(x, t)}.$$

Note that if we consider a time-dependent test function $\zeta_h(x, t) = \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \zeta_j(t) \varphi_j(x)$ in (3.10) then the last equation is replaced by

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\int_I c_h Q_h \zeta_h \, dx \right) + \int_I \frac{c_{hx} \zeta_{hx}}{Q_h} \, dx = \int_I c_h \zeta_{ht} Q_h \, dx. \quad (3.11)$$

REMARK 3.2 The H^1 elastic flow is obtained by adding the term $\int_I u_{tx} \varphi_x Q \, dx$ to the left-hand side of (2.1). Equation (3.8) thus can be considered as the spatial discretization of the H^1 flow, but with an h -dependent weight of the H^1 inner product.

LEMMA 3.3 The above system (3.8)–(3.10) has a unique solution on $[0, \tilde{T}]$ for any $0 < \tilde{T} < \infty$.

Proof. Fix $h > 0$. Local existence on some time interval $[0, T_h)$ follows from standard ordinary differential equations (ODEs) theory. Since $u_h(t)$, $w_h(t)$, $c_h(t)$ have values in a finite-dimensional space (whose dimension depends on h), it is sufficient to bound (u_h, w_h, c_h) in some norm to obtain existence on $[0, \tilde{T}]$. We differentiate (3.9) with respect to time and then choose $\psi_h = w_h$. As $u_{ht} \in X_{h0}$ we may choose $\varphi_h = u_{ht}$ in (3.8). Combining the thus obtained equations gives (we have dropped the details as analogous calculations are presented in more detail when deriving the equations for the errors around equation (4.28))

$$\int_I \mu(h) u_{hxt}^2 dx + \int_I \frac{u_{ht}^2}{Q_h} dx + \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_I \frac{w_h^2}{Q_h} dx = \int_I I_h(f(c_h)) u_{ht} dx \leq C \int_I Q_h dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_I \frac{u_{ht}^2}{Q_h} dx, \quad (3.12)$$

where for the last inequality we have used the boundedness of f (recall (2.5)). Integration in time gives for any $t' \in [0, T_h)$

$$\mu(h) \int_0^{t'} \int_I u_{hxt}^2 dx dt + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{t'} \int_I \frac{u_{ht}^2}{Q_h} dx dt + \frac{1}{2} \int_I \frac{w_h^2}{Q_h}(t') dx \leq C(u_{0h}, w_{0h}) + C \int_0^{t'} \int_I Q_h dx dt.$$

On the other hand, using (3.9) we observe that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_I Q_h dx = \int_I w_h \frac{u_{ht}}{Q_h} dx \leq \varepsilon \int_I \frac{u_{ht}^2}{Q_h} dx + C_\varepsilon \int_I \frac{w_h^2}{Q_h} dx$$

so that integration in time gives

$$\int_I Q_h(t') dx \leq C(u_{0h}) + \varepsilon \int_0^{t'} \int_I \frac{u_{ht}^2}{Q_h} dx dt + C_\varepsilon \int_0^{t'} \int_I \frac{w_h^2}{Q_h} dx dt \quad 0 \leq t' < T_h.$$

Combining the above inequalities we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mu(h) \int_0^{t'} \int_I u_{hxt}^2 dx dt + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{t'} \int_I \frac{u_{ht}^2}{Q_h} dx dt + \frac{1}{2} \int_I \frac{w_h^2}{Q_h}(t') dx + \int_I Q_h(t') dx \\ & \leq C + C_\varepsilon \int_0^{t'} \int_I \frac{u_{ht}^2}{Q_h} dx dt + C_\varepsilon \int_0^{t'} \int_I \frac{w_h^2}{Q_h} dx dt \quad 0 \leq t' < T_h, \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $C = C(u_{0h}, w_{0h}, \tilde{T})$. Choosing ε appropriately and using a Gronwall argument we infer that

$$\mu(h) \int_0^{t'} \int_I u_{hxt}^2 dx dt + \int_0^{t'} \int_I \frac{u_{ht}^2}{Q_h} dx dt + \int_I \frac{w_h^2}{Q_h}(t') dx + \int_I Q_h(t') dx \leq C, \quad 0 \leq t' < T_h.$$

Since all norms are equivalent in a finite-dimensional space (and the dimension of the space depends on h), this implies that $Q_h(x, t') \leq C(u_{0h}, w_{0h}, \tilde{T}, h)$ for all $(x, t') \in [0, 1] \times [0, T_h)$. Uniform bounds for u_h , w_h follow immediately.

If we write down explicitly the ODE system for \dot{u}_j then we see that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \left(\mu(h) \int_I \varphi_{ix} \varphi_{jx} dx + \int_I \frac{\varphi_i \varphi_j}{Q_h} dx \right) \dot{u}_j = F_i(u_h, w_h, c_h) \quad (i = 1, \dots, N-1)$$

with $|F_i| \leq C$ uniformly in time, since f is bounded and since we have uniform bounds on w_h and u_h . The $(N-1) \times (N-1)$ matrix A with real entries $A_{ij}(h, Q_h(t)) = \int_I \mu(h) \varphi_{ix} \varphi_{jx} dx + \frac{\varphi_i \varphi_j}{Q_h} dx$ is symmetric, tridiagonal, diagonalizable and positive definite. Its positive eigenvalues depend on h , but are uniformly bounded from below with respect to time (since Q_h is uniformly bounded from above and below). For simplicity we show this fact in the special case of a uniform grid and taking $\mu(h) = h$ (the general case is treated in a similar way): for the entries of the matrix A a simple computation gives (using that $1 \leq Q_h(t') \leq C$)

$$A_{ii} = \mu(h) \frac{2}{h} + \int_I \frac{\varphi_i^2}{Q_h(t')} dx \in \left[2 + \frac{1}{C} \frac{4h}{6}, 2 + \frac{4h}{6} \right],$$

$$A_{ii \pm 1} = -\mu(h) \frac{1}{h} + \int_I \frac{\varphi_i \varphi_{i \pm 1}}{Q_h(t')} dx \in \left[-1 + \frac{1}{C} \frac{h}{6}, -1 + \frac{h}{6} \right].$$

It is well known (Gerschgorin theorem) that the eigenvalues $\lambda(t)$ of $A = A(t')$ are elements of the set

$$\{z \in \mathbb{R} : |z - A_{ii}| \leq |A_{i,i+1}| + |A_{i,i-1}|\}$$

giving that

$$5 \geq \lambda(t) \geq \frac{h}{C}, \quad \text{for } 0 \leq t' < T_h.$$

In conclusion, we are able to infer a uniform bound on the $\dot{u}_j, j = 1, \dots, N-1$ and hence on u_{hxt} (taking into account that $\dot{u}_0 = \dot{u}_N = 0$ due to the boundary conditions).

Next, testing (3.11) with $\zeta_h = c_h$ and using the bounds on u_h, u_{ht} we infer

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \left(\int_I c_h^2 Q_h dx \right) + \int_I \frac{c_{hx}^2}{Q_h} dx &= \int_I c_h c_{ht} Q_h dx = \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \left(\int_I c_h^2 Q_h dx \right) - \frac{1}{2} \int_I c_h^2 \frac{u_{hx}}{Q_h} u_{hxt} dx \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \left(\int_I c_h^2 Q_h dx \right) + C \int_I c_h^2 dx \leq \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \left(\int_I c_h^2 Q_h dx \right) + C \int_I c_h^2 Q_h dx. \end{aligned}$$

With a Gronwall estimate we get $\|c_h(t')\|_{L^2(I)} \leq C = C(u_{0h}, w_{0h}, \tilde{T}, c_{0h}, h)$ uniformly in $0 \leq t' < T_h$. The flow can be now extended up to time \tilde{T} . Since h was chosen arbitrarily the claim follows. \square

We now state our main result, which will be proved in the subsequent section by a series of lemmas:

THEOREM 3.4 Let $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfy (2.5). Assume that the system (1.1)–(1.5) has a unique solution (u, c) on the interval $[0, T]$, which satisfy (2.6)–(2.9). Let (u_h, c_h) denote the solution of Problem 3.1. Then

there is some $h_0 > 0$ such that for all $h \leq h_0$

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|(u - u_h)(t)\|_{L^2(I)} + \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|(w - w_h)(t)\|_{L^2(I)} + \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|(u - u_h)_x(t)\|_{L^2(I)} &\leq Ch, \\ \int_0^T \|(u - u_h)_t(t)\|_{L^2(I)}^2 dt + \int_0^T \|(w - w_h)_x(t)\|_{L^2(I)}^2 dt &\leq Ch^2, \\ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|(c - c_h)(t)\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + \int_0^T \|(c - c_h)_x(t)\|_{L^2(I)}^2 dt &\leq Ch^2. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we have that

$$\int_0^T \|(u - u_h)_{tx}(t)\|_{L^2(I)}^2 dt \leq C \frac{h^2}{\mu(h)} = Ch^{2-r}.$$

with $\mu(h)$ defined in (3.6).

4. Error estimates

4.1 Nonlinear Ritz projections

Our error analysis relies strongly on results presented in the study by [Deckelnick & Dziuk \(2006b\)](#), which are based on suitable nonlinear Ritz projections for u and w . We recall here their definition and properties. Let \hat{u}_h be defined by: $\hat{u}_h - I_h(u_b) \in X_{h0}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_I \frac{\hat{u}_{hx} \xi_{hx}}{\hat{Q}_h} dx &= \int_I \frac{u_x \xi_{hx}}{Q} dx \quad \forall \xi_h \in X_{h0}, \\ \hat{Q}_h(x, t) &:= \sqrt{1 + \hat{u}_{hx}^2(x, t)}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

Note that time t here is a parameter only. For the error

$$\rho_u := u - \hat{u}_h$$

estimates have been proved in [Deckelnick & Dziuk \(2006b, Section 2\)](#) (see also the references given in there) in two spatial dimensions. It may be possible that some of the convergence orders may be sharpened in this one-dimensional case, but they suffice for our purposes (to simplify notation we write ρ_{ux} for $(\rho_u)_x$ and so on):

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|\rho_u(t)\|_{L^2(I)} + h \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|\rho_{ux}(t)\|_{L^2(I)} \leq Ch^2, \tag{4.2}$$

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|\rho_u(t)\|_{L^\infty(I)} + h \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|\rho_{ux}(t)\|_{L^\infty(I)} \leq Ch^2 |\log h|, \tag{4.3}$$

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|\rho_{ut}(t)\|_{L^2(I)} \leq Ch^2 |\log h|^2, \tag{4.4}$$

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|\rho_{ux}(t)\|_{L^2(I)} \leq Ch. \tag{4.5}$$

We also define a projection $\hat{w}_h \in X_{h0}$ of w with the help of \hat{u}_h as follows:

$$\int_I E(\hat{u}_{hx}) \hat{w}_{hx} \varphi_{hx} \, dx = \int_I E(u_x) w_x \varphi_{hx} \, dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_I w^2 \left(\frac{u_x}{Q^3} - \frac{\hat{u}_{hx}}{\hat{Q}_h^3} \right) \varphi_{hx} \, dx \quad \forall \varphi_h \in X_{h0}, \quad (4.6)$$

where we set

$$E(p) := \frac{1}{(1 + p^2)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \quad \text{for } p \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (4.7)$$

Note that there is some constant $C > 0$ such that $|E(p) - E(q)| \leq C|p - q|$ for all $p, q \in \mathbb{R}$. The proof of the following bounds for the error

$$\rho_w := w - \hat{w}_h$$

is given in [Deckelnick & Dziuk \(2006b, Appendix, Lemma A.1\)](#):

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|\rho_{wx}(t)\|_{L^2(I)} \leq Ch, \quad (4.8)$$

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|\rho_w(t)\|_{L^2(I)} \leq Ch^2 |\log h|, \quad (4.9)$$

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|\rho_{wt}(t)\|_{L^2(I)} \leq Ch, \quad (4.10)$$

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|\rho_{wt}(t)\|_{L^2(I)} \leq Ch^2 |\log h|^2. \quad (4.11)$$

The equations (2.6), (2.7), (4.3)–(4.5), (4.8)–(4.11) together with interpolation and inverse estimates imply that

$$\|\hat{u}_h\|_{W^{1,\infty}(I)}, \|\hat{u}_{ht}\|_{W^{1,\infty}(I)}, \|\hat{w}_h\|_{W^{1,\infty}(I)}, \|\hat{w}_{ht}\|_{W^{1,\infty}(I)} \leq C \quad (4.12)$$

uniformly in h and time.

4.2 Discrete initial data and first estimates

Let (u_h, w_h, c_h) be the discrete solution on the time interval $[0, T]$. Define

$$C_0 := \sup_{x \in I, t \in [0, T]} Q(x, t), \quad C_1 := \sup_{x \in [0, 1], t \in [0, T]} |w(x, t)|, \quad (4.13)$$

$$C_2 := \|c\|_{C([0, T], H^1(I))}, \quad C_3 := \|c\|_{L^2((0, T), H^1(I))}. \quad (4.14)$$

For the discrete solution we observe that on the time interval $[0, \bar{t}]$ (for \bar{t} sufficiently small) we have that

$$\sup_{x \in I, t \in [0, \bar{t}]} Q_h(x, t) \leq 2C_0, \quad \sup_{x \in I, t \in [0, \bar{t}]} |w_h(x, t)| \leq 2C_1, \quad (4.15)$$

$$\|c_h\|_{C([0, \bar{t}], L^\infty(I))} \leq 2\hat{C}(I)C_2, \quad \|c_h\|_{L^2((0, \bar{t}), H^1(I))} \leq 2C_3 \quad (4.16)$$

thanks to the choice of initial conditions (see Lemma 4.1 below), the smoothness assumptions on (u, c) and a continuity argument (here, $\hat{C}(I)$ denotes the constant for the embedding $H^1(I) \hookrightarrow L^\infty(I)$, which depends on the length of I ; in our case $I = (0, 1)$ one can actually bound $\hat{C}(I)$ by one). Define

$$T_h := \sup\{\bar{t} \in [0, T] \mid (4.15), (4.16) \text{ hold on } [0, \bar{t}]\}. \quad (4.17)$$

We employ the well-known strategy to first derive error estimates on the time interval $[0, T_h)$ and then use these bounds to infer that $T_h = T$. Therefore, in what follows we shall assume (4.15) and (4.16) (without specifying this in every statement). We decompose the errors $u - u_h$ and $w - w_h$ according to

$$\begin{aligned} u - u_h &= (u - \hat{u}_h) + (\hat{u}_h - u_h) = \rho_u + e_u, & \text{where } e_u &:= \hat{u}_h - u_h, \\ w - w_h &= (w - \hat{w}_h) + (\hat{w}_h - w_h) = \rho_w + e_w, & \text{where } e_w &:= \hat{w}_h - w_h. \end{aligned}$$

Sometimes it is convenient to work with the smooth and discrete unit normals

$$v = \frac{(-u_x, 1)}{Q}, \quad \hat{v}_h := \frac{(-\hat{u}_{hx}, 1)}{\hat{Q}_h}, \quad v_h := \frac{(-u_{hx}, 1)}{Q_h}.$$

Note that in Deckelnick & Dziuk (2006b, (3.4)) it is shown that

$$|\hat{v}_h - v_h| \leq |(\hat{u}_h - u_h)_x| \leq \left(1 + \sup_I |\hat{u}_{hx}|\right) Q_h |\hat{v}_h - v_h|, \quad (4.18)$$

which leads to

$$|\hat{v}_h - v_h| \leq |(\hat{u}_h - u_h)_x| = |e_{ux}| \leq C |\hat{v}_h - v_h|, \quad (4.19)$$

where the constant C depends on C_0 and on the constant appearing in (4.12). Clearly

$$|\hat{Q}_h - Q_h| \leq |(\hat{u}_{hx}, -1)| - |(u_{hx}, -1)| \leq |(\hat{u}_{hx}, -1) - (u_{hx}, -1)| = |\hat{u}_{hx} - u_{hx}| = |e_{ux}|. \quad (4.20)$$

In the estimates that will follow we will also use the fact that

$$|Q - Q_h| \leq |u_x - u_{hx}| \leq |\rho_{ux}| + |e_{ux}|, \quad (4.21)$$

$$|v - v_h| = \left| \frac{(Q_h - Q)}{Q_h} \frac{1}{Q} (u_x, -1) + \frac{1}{Q_h} (u_x - u_{hx}, 0) \right| \leq C |\rho_{ux}| + C |e_{ux}|, \quad (4.22)$$

which easily follow employing the boundedness of Q and Q_h .

We pick the following initial values in (3.7):

$$u_{0h}(x) := \hat{u}_0(x), \quad c_{0h}(x) := I_h(c_0)(x), \quad x \in \bar{I}, \quad (4.23)$$

where \hat{u}_0 is the nonlinear projection of u_0 defined in (4.1).

LEMMA 4.1 For the choice of initial data in (4.23) we have that

$$e_u(0) \equiv 0, \quad \|e_w(0)\|_{L^2(I)} \leq Ch.$$

Proof. The first statement follows directly from the definition. For the error estimate of $e_w(0)$, observe that since $\hat{u}_h(\cdot, 0) = u_{0h}(\cdot)$ then by (3.9), (4.1) and (2.2)

$$\int_I \frac{w_h(0)\xi_h}{Q_h(0)} dx = \int_I \frac{u_{0hx}\xi_{hx}}{Q_h(0)} dx = \int_I \frac{u_{0x}\xi_{hx}}{Q(0)} dx = \int_I \frac{w(0)\xi_h}{Q(0)} dx$$

for any $\xi_h \in X_{h0}$. Subtraction gives

$$\int_I \left(\frac{w(0)}{Q(0)} - \frac{w_h(0)}{Q_h(0)} \right) \xi_h dx = 0 \quad \forall \xi_h \in X_{h0}.$$

Testing with $\xi_h = I_h(w(0)) - w_h(0)$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} \int_I \frac{|w(0) - w_h(0)|^2}{Q_h(0)} dx &= \int_I w(0) (w(0) - w_h(0)) \frac{Q(0) - Q_h(0)}{Q(0)Q_h(0)} dx \\ &\quad + \int_I \frac{(w(0) - w_h(0))}{Q_h(0)} (w(0) - I_h(w(0))) dx \\ &\quad + \int_I \frac{w(0)}{Q(0)Q_h(0)} (Q_h(0) - Q(0))(w(0) - I_h(w(0))) dx. \end{aligned}$$

We infer that $\|w(0) - w_h(0)\|_{L^2(I)} \leq Ch$ by a standard ε -Young argument, (4.2), (2.6), (3.2), (4.12), and the boundedness of $1 \leq Q_h(0) \leq C_0 + C\|\rho_{ux}\|_{L^\infty} \leq \frac{3}{2}C_0$ by (4.3), (4.12) and h small enough. The claim now follows by writing $e_w(0) = -\rho_w(0) + (w(0) - w_h(0))$ and using (4.9). \square

REMARK 4.2 In the discrete formulation of the problem we have introduced a regularization term weighted by $\mu(h)$. This is motivated by the necessity of finding an error estimate for $|(Q - Q_h)_t|$ in Lemma 4.7 below (cf. term K_1 in the proof). Note that we can write

$$|(Q - Q_h)_t| = \left| \frac{u_{hx}}{Q_h} (u_{xt} - u_{hxt}) + u_{xt} \left(\frac{u_x}{Q} - \frac{u_{hx}}{Q_h} \right) \right| \leq |\rho_{uxt}| + |e_{uxt}| + C|v - v_h|.$$

The regularization helps in deriving an estimate for the ‘tricky’ term $|e_{uxt}|$, see (4.37) below.

4.3 Error estimates for e_u and e_w

The following error estimates for e_u and e_w are obtained through appropriate modification of the corresponding error estimates shown in the study by Deckelnick & Dziuk (2006b). We have used the same notation on purpose so that it will be easier for the reader to look up the details that are not repeated here for the sake of conciseness. Moreover, we give statements in such a way that it is easy to make a distinction as for which contributions come from the ‘new’ coupling and regularizing terms and those that have a purely geometrical meaning.

LEMMA 4.3 Suppose that $F : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is twice continuously differentiable and that $\zeta \in H_0^1(I)$. Then

$$\int_I (F(u_x) - F(\hat{u}_{hx})) \zeta dx = \int_I \rho_u \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (\zeta F'(u_x)) dx + R,$$

where R satisfies $|R| \leq Ch^2 \|\log h\| \|\zeta\|_{L^2(I)}$.

Proof. See [Deckelnick & Dziuk \(2006b\)](#), Lemma 3.1). It uses a mean value theorem, the smoothness of F and u (recall (2.6)) and the bounds (4.2), (4.3) and (4.12). \square

LEMMA 4.4 For every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists C_ε such that

$$\|e_{ux}(t)\|_{L^2(I)}^2 \leq \varepsilon \|e_w(t)\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + C_\varepsilon \|e_u(t)\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + Ch^4 |\log h|^2, \quad 0 \leq t < T_h.$$

Proof. See [Deckelnick & Dziuk \(2006b\)](#), Lemma 3.2). Here one starts from the equation

$$\int_I \left(\frac{\hat{u}_{hx}}{\hat{Q}_h} - \frac{u_{hx}}{Q_h} \right) \varphi_{hx} \, dx = \int_I \left(\frac{w}{Q} - \frac{w_h}{Q_h} \right) \varphi_h \, dx \quad \forall \varphi \in X_{h0},$$

which follows from (4.1), (2.2) and (3.9), and tests with $\varphi_h = e_u$. \square

LEMMA 4.5 For $0 \leq t < T_h$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|e_{wx}(t)\|_{L^2(I)}^2 &\leq C \left(\|e_{ux}(t)\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + \|e_{ut}(t)\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + \|e_w(t)\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + h^4 |\log h|^4 \right) \\ &\quad + C \|(c - c_h)(t)\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + C\mu(h)^2 \|u_{hxt}(t)\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + Ch^2 \left(1 + \|c_{hx}(t)\|_{L^2(I)}^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Using the definition (4.6) of \hat{w}_h , inserting equation (2.1) and then adding $\int_I \frac{\hat{u}_{ht}\varphi_h}{\hat{Q}_h} \, dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_I \frac{\hat{w}_h^2}{\hat{Q}_h^3} \hat{u}_{hx}\varphi_{hx} \, dx$ on both sides yield that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_I \frac{\hat{u}_{ht}\varphi_h}{\hat{Q}_h} \, dx + \int_I E(\hat{u}_{hx}) \hat{w}_{hx} \varphi_{hx} \, dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_I \frac{\hat{w}_h^2}{\hat{Q}_h^3} \hat{u}_{hx}\varphi_{hx} \, dx \\ &= \int_I \frac{(\hat{u}_{ht} - u_t)\varphi_h}{Q_h} \, dx + \int_I u_t \left(\frac{1}{Q_h} - \frac{1}{Q} \right) \varphi_h \, dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_I (\hat{w}_h^2 - w^2) \frac{\hat{u}_{hx}}{\hat{Q}_h^3} \varphi_{hx} \, dx + \int_I f(c) \varphi_h \, dx \end{aligned}$$

for all $\varphi_h \in X_{h0}$. Subtracting (3.8) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_I \frac{e_{ut}\varphi_h}{Q_h} \, dx + \int_I (E(\hat{u}_{hx}) \hat{w}_{hx} - E(u_{hx}) w_{hx}) \varphi_{hx} \, dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_I \left(\frac{\hat{w}_h^2}{\hat{Q}_h^3} \hat{u}_{hx} - \frac{w_h^2}{Q_h^3} u_{hx} \right) \varphi_{hx} \, dx \quad (4.24) \\ &= - \int_I \frac{\rho_{ut}\varphi_h}{Q_h} \, dx + \int_I u_t \left(\frac{1}{Q_h} - \frac{1}{Q} \right) \varphi_h \, dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_I (\hat{w}_h^2 - w^2) \frac{\hat{u}_{hx}}{\hat{Q}_h^3} \varphi_{hx} \, dx \\ &\quad + \int_I (f(c) - I_h(f(c_h))) \varphi_h \, dx + \mu(h) \int_I u_{hxt} \varphi_{hx} \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

After inserting $\varphi_h = e_w \in X_{h0}$ we derive

$$\begin{aligned}
 \int_I (E(\hat{u}_{hx})\hat{w}_{hx} - E(u_{hx})w_{hx}) e_{wx} \, dx &= - \int_I \frac{e_{ut}e_w}{Q_h} \, dx - \frac{1}{2} \int_I \left(\frac{\hat{w}_h^2}{\hat{Q}_h^3} \hat{u}_{hx} - \frac{w_h^2}{Q_h^3} u_{hx} \right) e_{wx} \, dx - \int_I \frac{\rho_{ut}e_w}{Q_h} \, dx \\
 &+ \int_I u_t \left(\frac{1}{Q_h} - \frac{1}{Q} \right) e_w \, dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_I \left(\hat{w}_h^2 - w^2 \right) \frac{\hat{u}_{hx}}{\hat{Q}_h^3} e_{wx} \, dx \\
 &+ \int_I (f(c) - I_h(f(c_h))) e_w \, dx + \mu(h) \int_I u_{hxt} e_{wx} \, dx.
 \end{aligned} \tag{4.25}$$

For the last two terms we observe that

$$\left| \mu(h) \int_I u_{hxt} e_{wx} \, dx \right| \leq \varepsilon \|e_{wx}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + C_\varepsilon \mu(h)^2 \|u_{hxt}\|_{L^2(I)}^2,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
 \left| \int_I (f(c) - I_h(f(c_h))) e_w \, dx \right| &\leq \left| \int_I (f(c) - f(c_h)) e_w \, dx \right| + \left| \int_I (f(c_h) - I_h(f(c_h))) e_w \, dx \right| \\
 &\leq C \|c - c_h\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + Ch^2 \left(1 + \int_I |c_{hx}|^2 \, dx \right) + C \|e_w\|_{L^2(I)}^2,
 \end{aligned} \tag{4.26}$$

where we have used (2.5) and (3.2). From now on we argue exactly as in [Deckelnick & Dziuk \(2006b, Lemma 3.3\)](#). The error bound relies on the fact that it can be shown that

$$\int_I (E(\hat{u}_{hx})\hat{w}_{hx} - E(u_{hx})w_{hx}) e_{wx} \, dx \geq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{1+4C_0^2}} \|e_{wx}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 - C \|e_{ux}\|_{L^2(I)}^2.$$

The estimates for the remaining terms on the right-hand side of (4.25) are carefully explained in [Deckelnick & Dziuk \(2006b, Lemma 3.3\)](#); hence, we do not repeat the arguments here. \square

LEMMA 4.6 For $0 \leq t < T_h$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\frac{\mu(h)}{2} \|e_{utx}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + \frac{1}{4C_0} \|e_{ut}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 \\
 &+ \int_I (E(\hat{u}_{hx})\hat{w}_{hx} - E(u_{hx})w_{hx}) e_{utx} \, dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_I \left(\frac{\hat{w}_h^2}{\hat{Q}_h^3} \hat{u}_{hx} - \frac{w_h^2}{Q_h^3} u_{hx} \right) e_{utx} \, dx \\
 &\leq - \frac{d}{dt} \left(\int_I u_t \frac{u_x}{Q^3} e_{ux} \rho_u \, dx \right) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \left(\int_I \left(\hat{w}_h^2 - w^2 \right) \frac{\hat{u}_{hx}}{\hat{Q}_h^3} e_{ux} \, dx \right) + C \|e_{ux}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + Ch^4 |\log h|^4 \\
 &+ C \|c - c_h\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + C \mu(h)^2 + C \mu(h) h^2 + Ch^2 \left(1 + \|c_{hx}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 \right).
 \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Choosing $\varphi_h = e_{ut} \in X_{h0}$ in (4.24) and using (4.15) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_I \frac{e_{ut}^2}{2C_0} dx + \int_I (E(\hat{u}_{hx})\hat{w}_{hx} - E(u_{hx})w_{hx})e_{utx} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\hat{w}_h^2}{\hat{Q}_h^3} \hat{u}_{hx} - \frac{w_h^2}{Q_h^3} u_{hx} \right) e_{utx} dx &\leq - \int_I \frac{\rho_{ut} e_{ut}}{Q_h} dx \\ &+ \int_I u_t \left(\frac{1}{Q_h} - \frac{1}{\hat{Q}_h} \right) e_{ut} dx + \int_I u_t \left(\frac{1}{\hat{Q}_h} - \frac{1}{Q} \right) e_{ut} dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_I (\hat{w}_h^2 - w^2) \frac{\hat{u}_{hx}}{\hat{Q}_h^3} e_{utx} dx \\ &+ \int_I (f(c) - I_h(f(c_h))) e_{ut} dx + \mu(h) \int_I u_{hxt} e_{utx} dx =: I + II + III + IV + V + VI. \end{aligned}$$

The terms I, II, III, IV are treated and estimated as in [Deckelnick & Dziuk \(2006b, Lemma 3.4\)](#). Again, we refrain from giving details here since the original paper gives all argument in detail. For the fifth term we proceed as in (4.26), but with an ϵ weight and obtain that

$$\left| \int_I (f(c) - I_h(f(c_h))) e_{ut} dx \right| \leq C_\epsilon \|c - c_h\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + 2\epsilon \|e_{ut}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + C_\epsilon h^2 \left(1 + \int_I |c_{hx}|^2 dx \right).$$

For the last term we compute using integration by parts (recall that $e_{ut} = 0$ on ∂I)

$$\begin{aligned} VI &= \mu(h) \int_I u_{htx} e_{utx} dx = \mu(h) \left(\int_I (u_{htx} - \hat{u}_{htx}) e_{utx} dx + \int_I (\hat{u}_{htx} - u_{tx}) e_{utx} dx + \int_I u_{tx} e_{utx} dx \right) \\ &= -\mu(h) \|e_{utx}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 - \mu(h) \int_I \rho_{utx} e_{utx} dx - \mu(h) \int_I u_{txx} e_{ut} dx \\ &\leq -\mu(h) \|e_{utx}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + \frac{\mu(h)}{2} \|e_{utx}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + \frac{\mu(h)}{2} Ch^2 + \epsilon \|e_{ut}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + C_\epsilon \mu(h)^2, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used (4.5) and (2.7). An appropriate choice of ϵ together with the estimates for the terms I – VI gives the claim. \square

LEMMA 4.7 For $0 \leq t < T_h$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \left(\int_I \frac{e_w^2}{Q_h} dx \right) - \frac{1}{2} \int_I \frac{e_w^2}{Q_h^2} Q_{ht} dx - \int_I \hat{w}_h \left(\frac{\hat{Q}_{ht}}{\hat{Q}_h^2} - \frac{Q_{ht}}{Q_h^2} \right) e_w dx - \int_I (E(\hat{u}_{hx})\hat{u}_{htx} - E(u_{hx})u_{htx}) e_{wx} dx \\ \leq \epsilon \|e_{wx}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + C_\epsilon \left(\|e_{ux}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + \|e_w\|_{L^2(I)}^2 \right) + C_\epsilon h^4 |\log h|^4. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. See [Deckelnick & Dziuk \(2006b, Lemma 3.5\)](#): the main idea is to take equation (2.2) together with the definition of \hat{u}_h (recall (4.1)) to infer

$$\int_I \frac{w \xi_h}{Q} dx = \int_I \frac{u_x \xi_{hx}}{Q} dx = \int_I \frac{\hat{u}_{hx} \xi_{hx}}{\hat{Q}_h} dx \quad \forall \xi_h \in X_{h0},$$

and from which differentiation with respect to time gives

$$\int_I \frac{w_t \xi_h}{Q} dx - \int_I \frac{w \xi_h}{Q^2} Q_t dx - \int_I E(\hat{u}_{hx}) \hat{u}_{htx} \xi_{hx} dx = 0 \quad \forall \xi_h \in X_{h0}. \quad (4.27)$$

Differentiation with respect to time of (3.9) gives

$$\int_I \frac{w_{ht} \xi_h}{Q_h} dx - \int_I \frac{w_h \xi_h}{Q_h^2} Q_{ht} dx - \int_I E(u_{hx}) u_{htx} \xi_{hx} dx = 0 \quad \forall \xi_h \in X_{h0}. \quad (4.28)$$

The claim now follows by taking the difference of (4.27), (4.28) and testing with $\xi_h = e_w$. \square

It follows now from Lemma 4.6 and Lemma 4.7 that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\mu(h)}{2} \|e_{ux}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + \frac{1}{4C_0} \|e_{ut}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \left(\int_I \frac{e_w^2}{Q_h} dx \right) \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \int_I \left(\frac{\hat{w}_h^2}{\hat{Q}_h^3} \hat{u}_{hx} - \frac{w_h^2}{Q_h^3} u_{hx} \right) e_{utx} dx - \frac{1}{2} \int_I \frac{e_w^2}{Q_h^2} Q_{ht} dx - \int_I \hat{w}_h \left(\frac{\hat{Q}_{ht}}{\hat{Q}_h^2} - \frac{Q_{ht}}{Q_h^2} \right) e_w dx \\ & + \int_I (E(\hat{u}_{hx}) \hat{w}_{hx} - E(u_{hx}) w_{hx}) e_{utx} dx - \int_I (E(\hat{u}_{hx}) \hat{u}_{htx} - E(u_{hx}) u_{htx}) e_{wx} dx \\ & \leq -\frac{d}{dt} \left(\int_I u_t \frac{u_x}{Q^3} e_{ux} \rho_u dx \right) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \left(\int_I (\hat{w}_h^2 - w^2) \frac{\hat{u}_{hx}}{\hat{Q}_h^3} e_{ux} dx \right) + C_\epsilon h^4 |\log h|^4 \\ & + \varepsilon \|e_{wx}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + C_\varepsilon (\|e_{ux}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + \|e_w\|_{L^2(I)}^2) \\ & + C \|c - c_h\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + C\mu(h)^2 + C\mu(h)h^2 + Ch^2 (1 + \|c_{hx}\|_{L^2(I)}^2). \end{aligned} \quad (4.29)$$

The terms appearing in the second and third line are dealt with as in Deckelnick & Dziuk (2006b, pp. 34–37) where the lengthy calculations are presented in detail. We thus only list the relevant results. Precisely one finds that (see Deckelnick & Dziuk (2006b, (3.15), (3.18), (3.19)))

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \int_I \left(\frac{\hat{w}_h^2}{\hat{Q}_h^3} \hat{u}_{hx} - \frac{w_h^2}{Q_h^3} u_{hx} \right) e_{utx} dx - \frac{1}{2} \int_I \frac{e_w^2}{Q_h^2} Q_{ht} dx - \int_I \hat{w}_h \left(\frac{\hat{Q}_{ht}}{\hat{Q}_h^2} - \frac{Q_{ht}}{Q_h^2} \right) e_w dx \\ & \geq \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \left(\int_I \hat{w}_h^2 \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \frac{Q_h}{\hat{Q}_h^2} |\hat{v}_h - v_h|^2 - \frac{1}{Q_h \hat{Q}_h^2} (\hat{Q}_h - Q_h)^2 \right\} dx \right) - C (\|e_w\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + \|e_{ux}\|_{L^2(I)}^2), \end{aligned} \quad (4.30)$$

as well as

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_I (E(\hat{u}_{hx}) - E(u_{hx})) (\hat{u}_{htx} - u_{htx}) \hat{w}_{hx} dx \\ & \geq \frac{d}{dt} \left(\int_I \left(\left(\frac{Q_h}{\hat{Q}_h} - 1 \right) (\hat{v}_h - v_h) - \frac{1}{2} \frac{Q_h}{\hat{Q}_h} |\hat{v}_h - v_h|^2 \hat{v}_h \right) \cdot (\hat{w}_{hx}, 0)^\top dx \right) - C \|e_{ux}\|_{L^2(I)}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (4.31)$$

and

$$\left| \int_I (E(\hat{u}_{hx}) - E(u_{hx})) \hat{u}_{htx} e_{wx} \, dx \right| \leq \varepsilon \|e_{wx}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + C_\varepsilon \|e_{ux}\|_{L^2(I)}^2. \quad (4.32)$$

Observing that

$$\begin{aligned} & (E(\hat{u}_{hx}) \hat{w}_{hx} - E(u_{hx}) w_{hx}) e_{utx} - (E(\hat{u}_{hx}) \hat{u}_{htx} - E(u_{hx}) u_{htx}) e_{wx} \\ &= (E(\hat{u}_{hx}) - E(u_{hx})) (\hat{u}_{htx} - u_{htx}) \hat{w}_{hx} - (E(\hat{u}_{hx}) - E(u_{hx})) \hat{u}_{htx} e_{wx}, \end{aligned}$$

and inserting (4.30), (4.31), (4.32) into (4.29), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\mu(h)}{2} \|e_{utx}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + \frac{1}{4C_0} \|e_{ut}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \left(\int_I \frac{e_w^2}{Q_h} \, dx \right) \\ & \leq -\frac{d}{dt} \left(\int_I u_t \frac{u_x}{Q^3} e_{ux} \rho_u \, dx \right) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \left(\int_I (\hat{w}_h^2 - w^2) \frac{\hat{u}_{hx}}{\hat{Q}_h^3} e_{ux} \, dx \right) \\ & \quad - \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \left(\int_I \hat{w}_h^2 \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \frac{Q_h}{\hat{Q}_h^2} |\hat{v}_h - v_h|^2 - \frac{1}{Q_h \hat{Q}_h^2} (\hat{Q}_h - Q_h)^2 \right\} \, dx \right) \\ & \quad - \frac{d}{dt} \left(\int_I \left(\left(\frac{Q_h}{\hat{Q}_h} - 1 \right) (\hat{v}_h - v_h) - \frac{1}{2} \frac{Q_h}{\hat{Q}_h} |\hat{v}_h - v_h|^2 \hat{v}_h \right) \cdot (\hat{w}_{hx}, 0)^\top \, dx \right) \\ & \quad + C_\varepsilon h^4 |\log h|^4 + \varepsilon \|e_{wx}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + C_\varepsilon \left(\|e_{ux}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + \|e_w\|_{L^2(I)}^2 \right) \\ & \quad + C \|c - c_h\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + C\mu(h)^2 + C\mu(h)h^2 + Ch^2 \left(1 + \|c_{hx}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Integration with respect to time for some $\bar{t} \in (0, T_h)$, application of Lemma 4.4 and Lemma 4.5, (4.12), (4.19), (4.20), (4.15), (4.16), (4.2), and using the approximation order of the initial data (recall Lemma 4.1) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^{\bar{t}} \mu(h) \|e_{utx}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 \, dt + \int_0^{\bar{t}} \|e_{ut}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 \, dt + \|e_w(\bar{t})\|_{L^2(I)}^2 \\ & \leq C \|e_w(0)\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + C \|e_{ux}(\bar{t})\|_{L^2(I)} \left(\|\rho_u(\bar{t})\|_{L^2(I)} + \|e_w(\bar{t})\|_{L^2(I)} + \|e_{ux}(\bar{t})\|_{L^2(I)} \right) \\ & \quad + C \|e_{ux}(0)\|_{L^2(I)} \left(\|\rho_u(0)\|_{L^2(I)} + \|e_w(0)\|_{L^2(I)} + \|e_{ux}(0)\|_{L^2(I)} \right) \\ & \quad + C_\varepsilon h^4 |\log h|^4 + \varepsilon \int_0^{\bar{t}} \|e_{wx}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 \, dt \\ & \quad + C_\varepsilon \int_0^{\bar{t}} \left(\|e_{ux}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + \|e_w\|_{L^2(I)}^2 \right) \, dt + C \int_0^{\bar{t}} \|c - c_h\|_{L^2(I)}^2 \, dt \\ & \quad + C\mu(h)^2 + C\mu(h)h^2 + Ch^2 \left(1 + \int_0^{\bar{t}} \|c_{hx}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 \, dt \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \varepsilon \left(\|e_w(\bar{t})\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + \int_0^{\bar{t}} \|e_{ut}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 dt \right) + \varepsilon C\mu(h)^2 \int_0^{\bar{t}} \|u_{hxt}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 dt \\
&\quad + C_\varepsilon \left(\|e_u(\bar{t})\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + h^4 |\log h|^4 + \int_0^{\bar{t}} \left(\|e_u\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + \|e_w\|_{L^2(I)}^2 \right) dt \right) \\
&\quad + C \int_0^{\bar{t}} \|c - c_h\|_{L^2(I)}^2 dt + C\mu(h)^2 + C\mu(h)h^2 + Ch^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.33}$$

Thanks to (4.12) and as $\mu(h) \leq 1$ for all $h \leq h_0$ with some sufficiently small h_0 we have that

$$\varepsilon C\mu(h)^2 \int_0^{\bar{t}} \|u_{hxt}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 dt \leq \varepsilon C\mu(h)^2 \int_0^{\bar{t}} \left(\|e_{utx}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + C \right) dt \leq \varepsilon C\mu(h) \int_0^{\bar{t}} \|e_{utx}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 dt + \varepsilon C\mu(h)^2. \tag{4.34}$$

Moreover, using that $e_u(0) = 0$ we obtain that

$$\|e_u(\bar{t})\|_{L^2(I)}^2 = \int_0^{\bar{t}} \frac{d}{dt} \|e_u(t)\|_{L^2(I)}^2 dt = \int_0^{\bar{t}} \int_I 2e_u e_{ut} dx dt \leq \varepsilon \int_0^{\bar{t}} \|e_{ut}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 dt + C_\varepsilon \int_0^{\bar{t}} \|e_u\|_{L^2(I)}^2 dt.$$

Using this and (4.34) with ε small enough in (4.33) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^{\bar{t}} \mu(h) \|e_{utx}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 dt + \int_0^{\bar{t}} \|e_{ut}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 dt + \|e_w(\bar{t})\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + \|e_u(\bar{t})\|_{L^2(I)}^2 \\
&\leq C \int_0^{\bar{t}} \left(\|e_u\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + \|e_w\|_{L^2(I)}^2 \right) dt + C \int_0^{\bar{t}} \|c - c_h\|_{L^2(I)}^2 dt + C\mu(h)^2 + C\mu(h)h^2 + Ch^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.35}$$

A Gronwall argument and using that $\mu(h) \leq Ch$ for all $h \leq h_0$ (after eventually reducing h_0) finally yields

$$\|e_w(\bar{t})\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + \|e_u(\bar{t})\|_{L^2(I)}^2 \leq C \int_0^{\bar{t}} \|c - c_h\|_{L^2(I)}^2 dt + Ch^2, \quad \bar{t} \in [0, T_h], \tag{4.36}$$

from which we also conclude that

$$\mu(h) \int_0^{\bar{t}} \|e_{utx}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 dt + \int_0^{\bar{t}} \|e_{ut}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 dt \leq C \int_0^{\bar{t}} \|c - c_h\|_{L^2(I)}^2 dt + Ch^2, \quad \bar{t} \in [0, T_h]. \tag{4.37}$$

4.4 Error estimate for $(c - c_h)$

In order to proceed we need to analyse the error between c and c_h . We here basically follow the lines of [Pozzi & Stinner \(2017\)](#), Lemma 4.2. But we need to provide all details as the treatment of the terms with the time derivative of the length element is different here.

LEMMA 4.8 We have that for any $\bar{t} \in [0, T_h)$

$$\begin{aligned} & \|c(\bar{t}) - c_h(\bar{t})\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + \int_0^{\bar{t}} \|c_x - c_{hx}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 dt \\ & \leq C \|e_{ux}(\bar{t})\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + C \int_0^{\bar{t}} \|c - c_h\|_{L^2(I)}^2 dt + C \int_0^{\bar{t}} \|e_{ux}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 dt + C \int_0^{\bar{t}} \|e_{ut}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 dt \\ & \quad + C \int_0^{\bar{t}} \|e_{ux}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 \|e_{ux}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 dt + Ch^2 \int_0^{\bar{t}} \|e_{ux}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 dt + Ch^2. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The difference between the continuous (2.4) and the discrete version (3.11) reads

$$\int_I (cQ - c_hQ_h)_t \zeta_h dx + \int_I \left(\frac{c_x}{Q} - \frac{c_{hx}}{Q_h} \right) \zeta_{hx} dx = 0$$

for all test functions $\zeta_h(x, t)$ of the form $\zeta_h = \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \zeta_j(t) \varphi_j(x)$. Choosing

$$\zeta_h = I_h(c) - c_h = c - c_h + I_h(c) - c$$

a calculation (cf. Pozzi & Stinner (2017, Lemma 4.2)) yields that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} \left(\int_I \frac{1}{2} (c - c_h)^2 Q_h dx \right) + \int_I \frac{|(c - c_h)_x|^2}{Q_h} dx \\ & = \int_I (c(Q_h - Q))_t (c - c_h) dx - \int_I \frac{1}{2} (c - c_h)^2 Q_{ht} dx \\ & \quad + \frac{d}{dt} \left(\int_I (cQ - c_hQ_h) (c - I_h(c)) dx \right) - \int_I (cQ - c_hQ_h) (c - I_h(c))_t dx \\ & \quad + \int_I \frac{(c - c_h)_x (c - I_h(c))_x}{Q_h} dx + \int_I c_x \frac{(c - c_h)_x}{\sqrt{Q_h}} \frac{Q - Q_h}{\sqrt{Q_h} Q} dx + \int_I c_x (I_h(c) - c)_x \frac{Q - Q_h}{Q_h Q} dx \\ & = \sum_{j=1}^7 K_j. \end{aligned} \tag{4.38}$$

For the first term we can write

$$\begin{aligned} -K_1 & = \int_I c_t (Q - Q_h) (c - c_h) dx + \int_I c (Q - \hat{Q}_h)_t (c - c_h) dx + \int_I c (\hat{Q}_h - Q_h)_t (c - c_h) dx \\ & =: K_{1,0} + K_{1,1} + K_{1,2}. \end{aligned}$$

Using (4.21), the smoothness assumptions on c (recall (2.9) and (4.2)) we infer immediately that

$$|K_{1,0}| \leq C \|c - c_h\|_{L^2(I)} (\|\rho_{ux}\|_{L^2(I)} + \|e_{ux}\|_{L^2(I)}) \leq C \|c - c_h\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + C \|e_{ux}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + Ch^2.$$

Next we write using (4.5), (4.12) the fact that $|v - \hat{v}_h| \leq C|\rho_{ux}|$ and (4.2)

$$\begin{aligned}
 |K_{1,1}| &= \left| \int_I c(Q - \hat{Q}_h)_t (c - c_h) \, dx \right| \\
 &= \left| \int_I c(c - c_h) \left(\frac{u_x}{Q} - \frac{\hat{u}_{hx}}{\hat{Q}_h} \right) \hat{u}_{htx} \, dx + \int_I c(c - c_h) \frac{u_x}{Q} (u_{tx} - \hat{u}_{htx}) \, dx \right| \\
 &\leq C\|c - c_h\|_{L^2(I)} \|v - \hat{v}_h\|_{L^2(I)} + C\|c - c_h\|_{L^2(I)} \|\rho_{ux}\|_{L^2(I)} \\
 &\leq Ch\|c - c_h\|_{L^2(I)} \leq C\|c - c_h\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + Ch^2.
 \end{aligned}$$

For the last term we observe using partial integration that

$$\begin{aligned}
 K_{1,2} &= \int_I c(\hat{Q}_h - Q_h)_t (c - c_h) \, dx = \int_I c(c - c_h) \left(\frac{\hat{u}_{hx}}{\hat{Q}_h} \hat{u}_{htx} - \frac{u_{hx}}{Q_h} u_{htx} \right) \, dx \\
 &= \int_I c(c - c_h) \hat{u}_{htx} \left(\frac{\hat{u}_{hx}}{\hat{Q}_h} - \frac{u_{hx}}{Q_h} \right) \, dx + \int_I c(c - c_h) \left(\frac{u_{hx}}{Q_h} - \frac{u_x}{Q} \right) (\hat{u}_{htx} - u_{htx}) \, dx \\
 &\quad + \int_I c(c - c_h) \frac{u_x}{Q} (\hat{u}_{htx} - u_{htx}) \, dx \\
 &= \int_I c(c - c_h) \hat{u}_{htx} \left(\frac{\hat{u}_{hx}}{\hat{Q}_h} - \frac{u_{hx}}{Q_h} \right) \, dx + \int_I c(c - c_h) \left(\frac{u_{hx}}{Q_h} - \frac{u_x}{Q} \right) (\hat{u}_{htx} - u_{htx}) \, dx \\
 &\quad - \int_I \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left(c(c - c_h) \frac{u_x}{Q} \right) (\hat{u}_{ht} - u_{ht}) \, dx.
 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we infer using (4.12), (4.19), (4.22), (4.2) and embedding theory that

$$\begin{aligned}
 |K_{1,2}| &\leq C\|c - c_h\|_{L^2(I)} \|e_{ux}\|_{L^2(I)} + C\|e_{ut}\|_{L^2(I)} (\|c - c_h\|_{L^2(I)} + \|(c - c_h)_x\|_{L^2(I)}) \\
 &\quad + C\|c - c_h\|_{L^\infty(I)} \|v - v_h\|_{L^2(I)} \|e_{utx}\|_{L^2(I)} \\
 &\leq C\|c - c_h\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + C\|e_{ux}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + \varepsilon\|(c - c_h)_x\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + C_\varepsilon\|e_{ut}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 \\
 &\quad + C\|c - c_h\|_{H^1(I)} (h + \|e_{ux}\|_{L^2(I)}) \|e_{utx}\|_{L^2(I)} \\
 &\leq C\|c - c_h\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + C\|e_{ux}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + \varepsilon\|(c - c_h)_x\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + C_\varepsilon\|e_{ut}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 \\
 &\quad + C_\varepsilon\|e_{ux}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 \|e_{utx}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + C_\varepsilon h^2 \|e_{utx}\|_{L^2(I)}^2.
 \end{aligned}$$

Putting all previous estimate together we infer that

$$\begin{aligned}
 |K_1| &\leq C\|c - c_h\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + C\|e_{ux}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + \varepsilon\|(c - c_h)_x\|_{L^2(I)}^2 \\
 &\quad + C_\varepsilon\|e_{ut}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + C_\varepsilon\|e_{ux}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 \|e_{utx}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + C_\varepsilon h^2 \|e_{utx}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + Ch^2.
 \end{aligned} \tag{4.39}$$

The term K_2 can be estimated as follows using integration by parts, the fact that $\|c - c_h\|_{L^\infty}$ is bounded (thanks to (4.16)), (4.12) and (4.4):

$$\begin{aligned}
|K_2| &= \left| \frac{1}{2} \int_I (c - c_h)^2 Q_{ht} \, dx \right| \leq \left| \frac{1}{2} \int_I (c - c_h)^2 Q_t \, dx \right| + \left| \frac{1}{2} \int_I (c - c_h)^2 (Q_{ht} - Q_t) \, dx \right| \\
&\leq C \|c - c_h\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + \left| \frac{1}{2} \int_I (c - c_h)^2 \left[\left(\frac{u_{hx}}{Q_h} - \frac{u_x}{Q} \right) u_{htx} + \frac{u_x}{Q} (u_{htx} - u_{tx}) \right] \, dx \right| \\
&\leq C \|c - c_h\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + \|c - c_h\|_{L^\infty(I)} \left| \frac{1}{2} \int_I (c - c_h) \left(\frac{u_{hx}}{Q_h} - \frac{u_x}{Q} \right) (u_{htx} - \hat{u}_{htx}) \, dx \right| \\
&\quad + \|c - c_h\|_{L^\infty(I)} \left| \frac{1}{2} \int_I (c - c_h) \left(\frac{u_{hx}}{Q_h} - \frac{u_x}{Q} \right) \hat{u}_{htx} \, dx \right| + \left| \frac{1}{2} \int_I \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left((c - c_h)^2 \frac{u_x}{Q} \right) (u_{ht} - u_t) \, dx \right| \\
&\leq C \|c - c_h\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + C \|c - c_h\|_{L^\infty(I)} \|v_h - v\|_{L^2(I)} \|e_{utx}\|_{L^2(I)} + C \|v_h - v\|_{L^2(I)}^2 \\
&\quad + \varepsilon \|(c - c_h)_x\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + C_\varepsilon \|e_{ut}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + C_\varepsilon h^4 |\log h|^4.
\end{aligned}$$

The second term in the last line of above inequality can be treated as the same term appearing in $K_{1,2}$, so that we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
|K_2| &\leq C \|c - c_h\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + C \|e_{ux}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + \varepsilon \|(c - c_h)_x\|_{L^2(I)}^2 \\
&\quad + C_\varepsilon \|e_{ut}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + C_\varepsilon \|e_{ux}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 \|e_{utx}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + C_\varepsilon h^2 \|e_{utx}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + C_\varepsilon h^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.40}$$

The remaining terms K_3, \dots, K_7 are estimated as in Pozzi & Stinner (2017, Lemma 4.2). Precisely, for K_3 we note that by (2.9), (4.5), (3.2), (4.21) and (4.2)

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \int_I (cQ - c_h Q_h)(c - I_h(c)) \, dx \right| \\
&= \left| \int_I (c - c_h) Q_h (c - I_h(c)) \, dx + \int_I c (Q - Q_h)(c - I_h(c)) \, dx \right| \\
&\leq \hat{\varepsilon} \int_I (c - c_h)^2 Q_h \, dx + C \int_I (Q - Q_h)^2 \, dx + C_\varepsilon h^4 \|c\|_{H^2(I)}^2 \\
&\leq \hat{\varepsilon} \int_I (c - c_h)^2 Q_h \, dx + C \|e_{ux}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + C_\varepsilon h^2
\end{aligned} \tag{4.41}$$

with $\hat{\varepsilon} > 0$ that will be picked later on. We will refer to this estimate later on when integrating (4.38) with respect to time.

For the term K_4 we infer from (3.2), (4.15), (2.9), (4.21) and (4.2) that

$$\begin{aligned} |K_4| &= \left| \int_I c(Q - Q_h)(c_t - I_h(c_t)) \, dx + \int_I (c - c_h)(c_t - I_h(c_t))Q_h \, dx \right| \\ &\leq C \int_I (Q - Q_h)^2 \, dx + C \int_I (c - c_h)^2 Q_h \, dx + C \|c_t\|_{H^1(I)}^2 h^2 \\ &\leq C \|c - c_h\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + C \|e_{ux}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + Ch^2. \end{aligned}$$

By the interpolation estimates (3.2), (3.3), embedding theory, (2.9), (4.21) and (4.2) we have the following estimates for the terms involving spatial gradients (for $\varepsilon > 0$ arbitrarily small):

$$\begin{aligned} |K_5| &\leq \varepsilon \int_I \frac{|(c - c_h)_x|^2}{Q_h} \, dx + C_\varepsilon \int_I \frac{|(c - I_h(c))_x|^2}{Q_h} \, dx \\ &\leq \varepsilon \int_I \frac{|(c - c_h)_x|^2}{Q_h} \, dx + C_\varepsilon \|c\|_{H^2(I)}^2 h^2, \\ |K_6| &\leq \varepsilon \int_I \frac{|(c - c_h)_x|^2}{Q_h} \, dx + C_\varepsilon \|e_{ux}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + C_\varepsilon h^2, \\ |K_7| &\leq C \|c\|_{H^2(I)}^2 h^2 + C \|e_{ux}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + Ch^2. \end{aligned}$$

Summarizing all these estimates and using (4.15) we obtain from (4.38) that

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{d}{dt} \left(\int_I \frac{1}{2} |c - c_h|^2 |Q_h| \, dx \right) + \int_I \frac{|c_x - c_{hx}|^2}{Q_h} \, dx \\ &\leq \varepsilon C \int_I \frac{|c_x - c_{hx}|^2}{Q_h} \, dx + \frac{d}{dt} \left(\int_I (c - c_h)Q_h(c - I_h(c)) \, dx + \int_I c(Q - Q_h)(c - I_h(c)) \, dx \right) \\ &\quad + C \int_I |c - c_h|^2 Q_h \, dx + C_\varepsilon \|e_{ux}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + C_\varepsilon \|e_{ut}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + C_\varepsilon \|e_{ux}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 \|e_{ux}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 \\ &\quad + C_\varepsilon h^2 \|e_{ux}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + C_\varepsilon h^2. \end{aligned}$$

Integrating with respect to time from 0 to \bar{t} , using (4.41), (4.15) and embedding theory we get for ε small enough that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_I |c(\bar{t}) - c_h(\bar{t})|^2 \, dx + \int_0^{\bar{t}} \int_I |c_x - c_{hx}|^2 \, dx \, dt \\ &\leq C \int_I |c_0 - c_{0h}|^2 \, dx + \int_I |(c_0 Q(0) - c_{0h} Q_h(0)) (c_0 - I_h(c_0))| \, dx \\ &\quad + C \hat{\varepsilon} \int_I |c(\bar{t}) - c_h(\bar{t})|^2 \, dx + C \|e_{ux}(\bar{t})\|_{L^2(I)}^2 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + C \int_0^{\bar{t}} \int_I |c - c_h|^2 \, dx \, dt + C \int_0^{\bar{t}} \|e_{ux}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 \, dt + C \int_0^{\bar{t}} \|e_{ut}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 \, dt \\
& + C \int_0^{\bar{t}} \|e_{ux}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 \|e_{utx}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 \, dt + Ch^2 \int_0^{\bar{t}} \|e_{utx}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 \, dt + C_{\hat{\varepsilon}} h^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that thanks to our choice of the discrete initial data (4.23)

$$\int_I |c_0 - c_{0h}|^2 \, dx = \int_I |c_0 - I_h(c_0)|^2 \, dx \leq C \|c_0\|_{H^1(I)}^2 h^2.$$

Moreover with the arguments used to estimate K_3 , and using the fact that $\|e_{ux}(0)\|_{L^2(I)}^2 = 0$ (recall Lemma 4.1) we get that

$$\int_I |(c_0 Q(0) - c_{0h} Q_h(0))(c_0 - I_h(c_0))| \, dx \leq C \|c_0\|_{H^1(I)}^2 h^2 + Ch^2 + C \|e_{ux}(0)\|_{L^2(I)}^2 \leq Ch^2.$$

Choosing $\hat{\varepsilon}$ small enough and using the above estimates for the initial data finish the proof. \square

4.5 Proof of the main theorem

From Lemma 4.8 and Lemma 4.4 and then using (4.36) and (4.37) we infer for $\bar{t} \in [0, T_h]$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|(c - c_h)(\bar{t})\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + \int_0^{\bar{t}} \|(c - c_h)_x\|_{L^2(I)}^2 \, dt \\
& \leq C\varepsilon \|e_w(\bar{t})\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + C_\varepsilon \|e_u(\bar{t})\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + C \int_0^{\bar{t}} \|c - c_h\|_{L^2(I)}^2 \, dt \\
& \quad + C \int_0^{\bar{t}} (\varepsilon \|e_w\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + C_\varepsilon \|e_u\|_{L^2(I)}^2) \, dt + C \int_0^{\bar{t}} \|e_{ut}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 \, dt \\
& \quad + C \int_0^{\bar{t}} (\varepsilon \|e_w\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + C_\varepsilon \|e_u\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + Ch^4 |\log h|^2) \|e_{utx}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 \, dt + Ch^2 \int_0^{\bar{t}} \|e_{utx}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 \, dt + Ch^2 \\
& \leq C \int_0^{\bar{t}} \|c - c_h\|_{L^2(I)}^2 \, dt + Ch^2 + Ch^2 \int_0^{\bar{t}} \|e_{utx}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 \, dt \\
& \quad + C \int_0^{\bar{t}} \left(\int_0^t \|(c - c_h)(s)\|_{L^2(I)}^2 \, ds \right) \|e_{utx}(t)\|_{L^2(I)}^2 \, dt \\
& \leq C \int_0^{\bar{t}} \|c - c_h\|_{L^2(I)}^2 \, dt + Ch^2 + Ch^2 \int_0^{\bar{t}} \|e_{utx}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 \, dt \\
& \quad + C \left(\int_0^{\bar{t}} \|(c - c_h)(t)\|_{L^2(I)}^2 \, dt \right) \left(\int_0^{\bar{t}} \|e_{utx}(t)\|_{L^2(I)}^2 \, dt \right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq C \int_0^{\bar{t}} \|c - c_h\|_{L^2(I)}^2 dt + Ch^2 + C \frac{h^2}{\mu(h)} \left(\int_0^{\bar{t}} \|c - c_h\|_{L^2(I)}^2 dt + h^2 \right) \\ &\quad + C \frac{1}{\mu(h)} \left(\int_0^{\bar{t}} \|c - c_h\|_{L^2(I)}^2 dt \right) \left(\int_0^{\bar{t}} \|c - c_h\|_{L^2(I)}^2 dt + h^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Using that $\mu(h) \sim h^r$ with $r \in [1, 2)$ and the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality we finally obtain for any $\bar{t} \in [0, T_h]$ that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|(c - c_h)(\bar{t})\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + \int_0^{\bar{t}} \|(c - c_h)_x\|_{L^2(I)}^2 dt \\ &\leq C \int_0^{\bar{t}} \|c - c_h\|_{L^2(I)}^2 dt + Ch^2 + \frac{C}{\mu(h)} \int_0^{\bar{t}} \|(c - c_h)\|_{L^2(I)}^4 dt. \end{aligned} \quad (4.42)$$

We now employ the following generalized Gronwall lemma, whose proof can be found in [Bartels \(2015, Prop. 6.2\)](#):

LEMMA 4.9 Suppose that the non-negative functions a and y_i , $i = 1, 2, 3$ with $y_1 \in C([0, \bar{T}])$, $y_2, y_3 \in L^1(0, \bar{T})$, $a \in L^\infty(0, \bar{T})$ and the real number $A \geq 0$ satisfy

$$y_1(T') + \int_0^{T'} y_2(t) dt \leq A + \int_0^{T'} a(t)y_1(t) dt + \int_0^{T'} y_3(t) dt$$

for all $T' \in [0, \bar{T}]$. Assume that for some $B \geq 0$, some $\beta > 0$ and every $T' \in [0, \bar{T}]$, we have that

$$\int_0^{T'} y_3(t) dt \leq B \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T']} y_1^\beta(t) \right) \int_0^{T'} (y_1(t) + y_2(t)) dt.$$

Set $E := \exp\left(\int_0^{\bar{T}} a(t) dt\right)$ and assume that

$$8AE \leq \frac{1}{(8B(1 + \bar{T})E)^{1/\beta}}. \quad (4.43)$$

We then have

$$\sup_{t \in [0, \bar{T}]} y_1(t) + \int_0^{\bar{T}} y_2(t) dt \leq 8AE = 8A \exp\left(\int_0^{\bar{T}} a(t) dt\right).$$

In our situation we take $\bar{T} = \bar{t}$, $y_1(t) = \|(c - c_h)(t)\|_{L^2(I)}^2$, $A = Ch^2$ where C is the constant from (4.42) (which depends on u, c, T , but not on h or T_h), $a(t) = C$, $B = \frac{C}{\mu(h)}$, $y_3 = \frac{C}{\mu(h)} y_1^2$, $\beta = 1$, $y_2 = 0$. For $0 < \bar{t} < T_h \leq T$ we see that $8AE = 8Ch^2 \exp(C\bar{t}) \leq 8Ch^2 \exp(CT)$ and that

$$\frac{1}{(8B(1 + \bar{T})E)^{1/\beta}} = \frac{\mu(h)}{8C(1 + \bar{t}) \exp(C\bar{t})} \geq \frac{\mu(h)}{8C(1 + T) \exp(CT)}.$$

With our choice (3.6) for $\mu(h)$ where $r < 2$ we get that (4.43) is satisfied for all $h \leq h_0$ if

$$8Ch_0^2 \exp(CT) \leq \frac{C_\mu h_0^r}{8C(1+T) \exp(CT)} \Leftrightarrow h_0^{2-r} \leq \frac{C_\mu}{64C^2(1+T) \exp(2CT)}.$$

Thus, we infer that for $h \leq h_0$ and any $\bar{t} \in [0, T_h)$ (and, by continuity, in fact up to time T_h)

$$\|(c - c_h)(\bar{t})\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + \int_0^{\bar{t}} \|(c - c_h)_x\|_{L^2(I)}^2 dt \leq Ch^2. \quad (4.44)$$

Plugging this result back into (4.36), (4.37) and using Lemma 4.4, we obtain for any $\bar{t} \in [0, T_h]$ that

$$\|e_w(\bar{t})\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + \|e_u(\bar{t})\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + \|e_{ux}(\bar{t})\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + \int_0^{\bar{t}} \|e_{ut}(\bar{t})\|_{L^2(I)}^2 dt + \mu(h) \int_0^{\bar{t}} \|e_{utx}\|_{L^2(I)}^2 dt \leq Ch^2. \quad (4.45)$$

Now that we have achieved error estimates on the time interval $[0, T_h]$ with a constant C that does not depend on h or T_h we are able to show that in fact it must be $T_h = T$ for all h sufficiently small. Indeed, observe that by (4.21), (4.3), (3.5), (4.45), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|Q_h(\bar{t})\|_{L^\infty(I)} &\leq C_0 + \|(Q - Q_h)(\bar{t})\|_{L^\infty(I)} \leq C_0 + \|\rho_{ux}(\bar{t})\|_{L^\infty(I)} + \|e_{ux}(\bar{t})\|_{L^\infty(I)} \\ &\leq C_0 + Ch|\log h| + C \frac{h}{\sqrt{h}} \leq \frac{3}{2}C_0 \end{aligned}$$

provided that $h \leq h_0$ (after decreasing h_0 if required). Similarly, by (4.9), (3.5), (3.2), (4.45) and (4.44), respectively, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_h(\bar{t})\|_{L^\infty(I)} &\leq \|e_w\|_{L^\infty(I)} + \|\hat{w}_h - I_h w\|_{L^\infty(I)} + \|I_h w\|_{L^\infty(I)} \\ &\leq C \frac{h}{\sqrt{h}} + \frac{C}{\sqrt{h}} \|\hat{w}_h - I_h w\|_{L^2(I)} + C_1 \\ &\leq C_1 + C \frac{h}{\sqrt{h}} + \frac{C}{\sqrt{h}} (\|\rho_w\|_{L^2(I)} + \|w - I_h w\|_{L^2(I)}) \leq \frac{3}{2}C_1, \\ \|c_h(\bar{t})\|_{L^\infty(I)} &\leq \|I_h c(\bar{t})\|_{L^\infty(I)} + \|(c_h - I_h c)(\bar{t})\|_{L^\infty(I)} \\ &\leq \|c\|_{C([0, T], L^\infty(I))} + \frac{C}{\sqrt{h}} \|(c_h - I_h c)(\bar{t})\|_{L^2(I)} \\ &\leq \hat{C}(I) \|c\|_{C([0, T], H^1(I))} + \frac{C}{\sqrt{h}} (\|(c_h - c)(\bar{t})\|_{L^2(I)} + \|(c - I_h c)(\bar{t})\|_{L^2(I)}) \\ &\leq \hat{C}(I) C_2 + \frac{C}{\sqrt{h}} (h + h \|c\|_{C([0, T], H^1(I))}) \leq \frac{3}{2} \hat{C}(I) C_2, \\ \|c_h\|_{L^2((0, T_h), H^1(I))} &\leq \frac{3}{2} C_3, \end{aligned}$$

for all $h \leq h_0$ independently of T_h (after decreasing h_0 if required). If we had that $T_h < T$ then we could establish (4.15) and (4.16) on the time interval $[0, T_h + \delta]$ for some $\delta > 0$, which would contradict the maximality of T_h . Hence, $T_h = T$. The first three error estimates stated in Theorem 3.4 follow from (4.45), (4.44), (4.2), (4.4), (4.9), Lemma 4.5, (4.16), (4.34) and (4.8). The last statement in Theorem 3.4 follows from (4.45) and (4.5).

5. Numerical simulations

We now aim for assessing and supporting our theoretical convergence results by some numerical simulations, which have been performed within the MATLAB software environment. We prescribe functions (u, w, c) and ensure that they solve (1.1)–(1.5) by accounting for suitable source terms $s_u, s_c : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for u and c , respectively.

For the initial values u_{0h} we compute an approximation of \hat{u}_0 by applying a quadrature rule to the right-hand side of (4.1) and solving the nonlinear system with a built-in MATLAB routine. Note that the first statement of Lemma 4.1 then is no longer true, but $e_u(0)$ will involve a small error. We compared a few quadrature rules and also performed some simulations with the choice $u_{0h} = I_h(u_0)$. We observed that the convergence behaviour was not affected and that the differences in the errors that we report on below are negligible.

The time discretization of Problem 3.1 is based on uniform time steps $\delta = h^2$. This choice turned out small enough to ensure that the errors that we report on below are purely due to the spatial discretization. An upper index will indicate values at the time $t^{(m)} := m\delta$ in the following, $m = 0, \dots, M := T/\delta$. We use a simple order-one IMEX scheme that linearizes the problem in each time step and decouples the solution of the geometric equation from the solution of the equation on the curve:

PROBLEM 5.1 (Fully discrete scheme) Find functions $u_{\delta h}^{(m)} \in X_h$ and $w_{\delta h}^{(m)}, c_{\delta h}^{(m)} \in X_{h0}$, $m = 0, \dots, M$, of the form

$$u_{\delta h}^{(m)} = \sum_{j=0}^N u_j^{(m)} \varphi_j(x), \quad c_{\delta h}^{(m)} = \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} c_j^{(m)} \varphi_j(x), \quad w_{\delta h}^{(m)} = \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} w_j^{(m)} \varphi_j(x),$$

with $u_j^{(m)}, c_j^{(m)}, w_j^{(m)} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$u_{\delta h}^{(m)} - I_h(u_b) \in X_{h0} \quad \forall m = 1, \dots, M, \quad u_{\delta h}^{(0)} = u_{0h}, \quad c_{\delta h}^{(0)} = c_{0h},$$

and such that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_I \mu(h) \frac{u_{\delta h x}^{(m)} - u_{\delta h x}^{(m-1)}}{\delta} \varphi_{hx} + \frac{(u_{\delta h}^{(m)} - u_{\delta h}^{(m-1)}) \varphi_h}{\delta Q_{\delta h}^{(m-1)}} + \frac{1}{2} \left(w_{\delta h}^{(m-1)} \right)^2 \frac{u_{\delta h x}^{(m)} \varphi_{hx}}{\left(Q_{\delta h}^{(m-1)} \right)^3} + \frac{w_{\delta h x}^{(m)} \varphi_{hx}}{\left(Q_{\delta h}^{(m-1)} \right)^3} dx \\ = \int_I I_h \left(f \left(c_{\delta h}^{(m-1)} \right) + s_u^{(m)} \right) \varphi_h dx, \end{aligned} \quad (5.1)$$

$$\int_I \frac{w_{\delta h}^{(m)} \psi_h}{Q_{\delta h}^{(m-1)}} - \frac{u_{\delta h x}^{(m)} \psi_{hx}}{Q_{\delta h}^{(m-1)}} dx = 0, \quad (5.2)$$

$$\int_I c_{\delta h}^{(m)} Q_{\delta h}^{(m)} \zeta_h + \delta \frac{c_{\delta h x}^{(m)} \zeta_{hx}}{Q_{\delta h}^{(m)}} dx = \int_I c_{\delta h}^{(m-1)} Q_{\delta h}^{(m-1)} \zeta_h + \delta I_h \left(s_c^{(m)} \right) \zeta_h dx, \quad (5.3)$$

for all $\varphi_h, \psi_h, \zeta_h \in X_{h0}$ and for $m = 1, \dots, M$. Here, $Q_{\delta h}^{(m-1)}$ denotes the discrete length element, $Q_{\delta h}^{(m-1)} = \sqrt{1 + \left(u_{\delta h x}^{(m-1)} \right)^2}$ and $\mu(h) = C_\mu h^r$ for some $r \in [1, 2)$ and $C_\mu \geq 0$ (as defined in (3.6)).

In the test examples further below we monitored the following errors:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_u(L^\infty, L^2) &:= \|u - u_{\delta h}\|_{L^\infty(J, L^2(I))}^2, & \mathcal{E}_u(L^\infty, H^1) &:= \|u_x - u_{\delta h x}\|_{L^\infty(J, L^2(I))}^2, \\ \mathcal{E}_u(H^1, L^2) &:= \|u_t - u_{\delta h t}\|_{L^2(J, L^2(I))}^2, & \mathcal{E}_u(H^1, H^1) &:= \|u_{tx} - u_{\delta h tx}\|_{L^2(J, L^2(I))}^2, \\ \mathcal{E}_w(L^\infty, L^2) &:= \|w - w_{\delta h}\|_{L^\infty(J, L^2(I))}^2, & \mathcal{E}_w(L^2, H^1) &:= \|w_x - w_{\delta h x}\|_{L^2(J, L^2(I))}^2, \\ \mathcal{E}_c(L^\infty, L^2) &:= \|c - c_{\delta h}\|_{L^\infty(J, L^2(I))}^2, & \mathcal{E}_c(L^2, H^1) &:= \|c_x - c_{\delta h x}\|_{L^2(J, L^2(I))}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

where $J = (0, T)$ and $u_{\delta h}$ has been extended by linearly interpolating on each time interval so that, for instance, $u_{\delta h t} = \left(u_{\delta h}^{(m)} - u_{\delta h}^{(m-1)} \right) / \delta$ for $t \in (t^{(m-1)}, t^{(m)})$. We used sufficiently accurate quadrature rules on each rectangle $[t^{(m-1)}, t^{(m)}] \times [x_{j-1}, x_j]$. Experimental orders of convergence for the above errors have been computed by

$$\text{EOC} = \frac{\log(\mathcal{E}(h_1)) - \log(\mathcal{E}(h_2))}{\log(h_1/h_2)},$$

where h_1 and h_2 are the spatial step sizes of subsequent mesh refinements.

EXAMPLE 5.2 In a first example, let $T = 1$ and

$$f(c) = \frac{1 - 2c}{10}.$$

Note that this function does not satisfy assumption (2.5), but see also Remark 2.1 and the statements on possible generalizations of f in the conclusion section.

Consider the fields

$$\begin{aligned} u(x, t) &= \frac{5}{2} \cos(2\pi t) (x - 1)^3 x^5, \\ c(x, t) &= \frac{1}{10} \sin(7\pi x) \sin(4\pi t). \end{aligned} \quad (5.5)$$

TABLE 1 *Errors (5.4) and EOCs for the first test problem (5.5) described in Section 5 with $\mu(h) = 40h$*

| $N + 1$ | $\mathcal{E}_u(L^\infty, L^2)$ | EOC | $\mathcal{E}_u(L^\infty, H^1)$ | EOC | $\mathcal{E}_u(H^1, L^2)$ | EOC | $\mathcal{E}_u(H^1, H^1)$ | EOC |
|---------|--------------------------------|--------|--------------------------------|--------|--------------------------------|--------|---------------------------|--------|
| 61 | 5.454e-06 | – | 5.701e-05 | – | 8.398e-05 | – | 9.160e-04 | – |
| 81 | 3.258e-06 | 1.7910 | 3.389e-05 | 1.8080 | 5.271e-05 | 1.6193 | 5.696e-04 | 1.6516 |
| 101 | 2.155e-06 | 1.8524 | 2.236e-05 | 1.8637 | 3.600e-05 | 1.7087 | 3.870e-04 | 1.7315 |
| 131 | 1.310e-06 | 1.8967 | 1.357e-05 | 1.9042 | 2.258e-05 | 1.7777 | 2.417e-04 | 1.7941 |
| 161 | 8.779e-07 | 1.9283 | 9.081e-06 | 1.9334 | 1.544e-05 | 1.8306 | 1.649e-04 | 1.8426 |
| 201 | 5.683e-07 | 1.9490 | 5.874e-06 | 1.9524 | 1.018e-05 | 1.8680 | 1.085e-04 | 1.8771 |
| $N + 1$ | $\mathcal{E}_w(L^\infty, L^2)$ | EOC | $\mathcal{E}_w(L^2, H^1)$ | EOC | $\mathcal{E}_c(L^\infty, L^2)$ | EOC | $\mathcal{E}_c(L^2, H^1)$ | EOC |
| 61 | 6.840e-04 | – | 7.722e-02 | – | 2.492e-06 | – | 2.027e-02 | – |
| 81 | 4.060e-04 | 1.8129 | 4.361e-02 | 1.9864 | 7.992e-07 | 3.9536 | 1.141e-02 | 1.9971 |
| 101 | 2.677e-04 | 1.8660 | 2.796e-02 | 1.9908 | 3.299e-07 | 3.9647 | 7.306e-03 | 1.9984 |
| 131 | 1.624e-04 | 1.9055 | 1.657e-02 | 1.9938 | 1.165e-07 | 3.9690 | 4.324e-03 | 1.9991 |
| 161 | 1.087e-04 | 1.9341 | 1.095e-02 | 1.9958 | 5.108e-08 | 3.9693 | 2.855e-03 | 1.9995 |
| 201 | 7.030e-05 | 1.9530 | 7.013e-03 | 1.9970 | 2.108e-08 | 3.9668 | 1.827e-03 | 1.9997 |

The source functions $s_u(x, t)$ and $s_c(x, t)$ are picked such that the above functions solve (1.1)–(1.5). Note that then $u_b = 0$. We remark that the function u has also been considered in the study by [Deckelnick & Dziuk \(2006b\)](#).

For varying values of N ($h = 1/N$, $\delta = h^2$) the errors and corresponding EOC's are displayed in Table 1 for the choice $\mu(h) = 40h$, i.e., $r = 1$. For most errors we observe EOCs close to two (those for u_t and u_{tx} are a bit smaller, but still increasing). This corresponds to linear convergence as predicted in Theorem 3.4 except for u_{tx} . In that case we only could show a rate of $2 - r = 1$, but observe a better convergence behaviour. Regarding the error of c in the norm $L^\infty((0, T), L^2(I))$ we also observe faster (here quadratic) convergence.

We have also performed computations with $\mu(h) = 4000h^2$ for comparison. Recall that this case $r = 2$ is not covered by the theory, but we didn't observe any issues with solving the discrete problems. The results are displayed in Table 2. We notice faster (quadratic) convergence of all errors except for $\mathcal{E}_w(L^2, H^1)$ and $\mathcal{E}_c(L^2, H^1)$ where linear convergence is measured. We also see that $\mathcal{E}_c(L^\infty, L^2)$ and $\mathcal{E}_c(L^2, H^1)$ barely change.

For further comparison, we chose $\mu(h) = 300h^r$ with an intermediate growth rate of $r = \frac{3}{2}$ and with $r = \frac{1}{2}$, see Tables 3 and 4 for the results, respectively. The findings are consistent in the sense that the EOCs for all fields except for $\mathcal{E}_w(L^2, H^1)$, $\mathcal{E}_c(L^\infty, L^2)$ and $\mathcal{E}_c(L^2, H^1)$ are close to three or one now, indicating convergence orders of $\frac{3}{2}$ or $\frac{1}{2}$, respectively. Again, the errors of c are very close to those in the other two simulation test series. In the case $r = \frac{1}{2}$ we even observe an impact on the EOCs for $\mathcal{E}_w(L^2, H^1)$, namely a dip away from two.

The super-convergence of $\mathcal{E}_u(L^\infty, H^1)$ for $r > 1$ is a bit surprising. The fact that the errors of c barely depend on the scaling of μ in h indicates that the geometric error has a smaller influence than the approximation of the diffusion term and the data for c . In order to investigate these findings a bit further we consider a second example with a more oscillating geometry and less oscillations in the field on the curve.

TABLE 2 Errors (5.4) and EOCs for the first test problem (5.5) described in Section 5 with $\mu(h) = 4000h^2$

| $N + 1$ | $\mathcal{E}_u(L^\infty, L^2)$ | EOC | $\mathcal{E}_u(L^\infty, H^1)$ | EOC | $\mathcal{E}_u(H^1, L^2)$ | EOC | $\mathcal{E}_u(H^1, H^1)$ | EOC |
|---------|--------------------------------|--------|--------------------------------|--------|--------------------------------|--------|---------------------------|--------|
| 61 | 1.233e-05 | — | 1.289e-04 | — | 1.731e-04 | — | 1.882e-03 | — |
| 81 | 4.828e-06 | 3.2587 | 5.019e-05 | 3.2795 | 7.588e-05 | 2.8672 | 8.146e-04 | 2.9105 |
| 101 | 2.155e-06 | 3.6146 | 2.236e-05 | 3.6239 | 3.600e-05 | 3.3417 | 3.870e-04 | 3.3350 |
| 131 | 7.925e-07 | 3.8129 | 8.215e-06 | 3.8164 | 1.390e-05 | 3.6256 | 1.514e-04 | 3.5777 |
| 161 | 3.517e-07 | 3.9128 | 3.646e-06 | 3.9124 | 6.336e-06 | 3.7851 | 7.033e-05 | 3.6923 |
| 201 | 1.455e-07 | 3.9556 | 1.509e-06 | 3.9517 | 2.674e-06 | 3.8666 | 3.067e-05 | 3.7192 |
| <hr/> | | | | | | | | |
| $N + 1$ | $\mathcal{E}_w(L^\infty, L^2)$ | EOC | $\mathcal{E}_w(L^2, H^1)$ | EOC | $\mathcal{E}_c(L^\infty, L^2)$ | EOC | $\mathcal{E}_c(L^2, H^1)$ | EOC |
| 61 | 1.591e-03 | — | 8.962e-02 | — | 2.499e-06 | — | 2.027e-02 | — |
| 81 | 6.053e-04 | 3.3586 | 4.604e-02 | 2.3152 | 8.008e-07 | 3.9557 | 1.141e-02 | 1.9971 |
| 101 | 2.677e-04 | 3.6552 | 2.796e-02 | 2.2345 | 3.299e-07 | 3.9738 | 7.306e-03 | 1.9984 |
| 131 | 9.802e-05 | 3.8299 | 1.585e-02 | 2.1631 | 1.160e-07 | 3.9849 | 4.324e-03 | 1.9991 |
| 161 | 4.344e-05 | 3.9198 | 1.023e-02 | 2.1088 | 5.064e-08 | 3.9913 | 2.855e-03 | 1.9995 |
| 201 | 1.796e-05 | 3.9589 | 6.442e-03 | 2.0733 | 2.077e-08 | 3.9947 | 1.827e-03 | 1.9997 |

TABLE 3 Errors (5.4) and EOCs for the first test problem (5.5) described in Section 5 with $\mu(h) = 300h^{3/2}$

| $N + 1$ | $\mathcal{E}_u(L^\infty, L^2)$ | EOC | $\mathcal{E}_u(L^\infty, H^1)$ | EOC | $\mathcal{E}_u(H^1, L^2)$ | EOC | $\mathcal{E}_u(H^1, H^1)$ | EOC |
|---------|--------------------------------|--------|--------------------------------|--------|--------------------------------|--------|---------------------------|--------|
| 61 | 5.165e-06 | — | 5.399e-05 | — | 7.989e-05 | — | 8.725e-04 | — |
| 81 | 2.369e-06 | 2.7091 | 2.467e-05 | 2.7229 | 3.906e-05 | 2.4876 | 4.262e-04 | 2.4905 |
| 101 | 1.257e-06 | 2.8391 | 1.307e-05 | 2.8478 | 2.152e-05 | 2.6705 | 2.358e-04 | 2.6524 |
| 131 | 5.856e-07 | 2.9120 | 6.078e-06 | 2.9174 | 1.037e-05 | 2.7845 | 1.146e-04 | 2.7491 |
| 161 | 3.172e-07 | 2.9525 | 3.290e-06 | 2.9557 | 5.728e-06 | 2.8573 | 6.402e-05 | 2.8056 |
| 201 | 1.634e-07 | 2.9729 | 1.694e-06 | 2.9746 | 2.998e-06 | 2.9009 | 3.402e-05 | 2.8334 |
| <hr/> | | | | | | | | |
| $N + 1$ | $\mathcal{E}_w(L^\infty, L^2)$ | EOC | $\mathcal{E}_w(L^2, H^1)$ | EOC | $\mathcal{E}_c(L^\infty, L^2)$ | EOC | $\mathcal{E}_c(L^2, H^1)$ | EOC |
| 61 | 6.469e-04 | — | 7.675e-02 | — | 2.492e-06 | — | 2.027e-02 | — |
| 81 | 2.942e-04 | 2.7391 | 4.229e-02 | 2.0722 | 7.980e-07 | 3.9581 | 1.141e-02 | 1.9971 |
| 101 | 1.556e-04 | 2.8533 | 2.668e-02 | 2.0632 | 3.289e-07 | 3.9725 | 7.306e-03 | 1.9984 |
| 131 | 7.236e-05 | 2.9189 | 1.557e-02 | 2.0532 | 1.157e-07 | 3.9805 | 4.324e-03 | 1.9991 |
| 161 | 3.917e-05 | 2.9559 | 1.019e-02 | 2.0439 | 5.060e-08 | 3.9850 | 2.855e-03 | 1.9995 |
| 201 | 2.017e-05 | 2.9746 | 6.466e-03 | 2.0363 | 2.078e-08 | 3.9872 | 1.827e-03 | 1.9997 |

EXAMPLE 5.3 Keeping $T = 1$ and $f(c)$ as in the first example consider

$$\begin{aligned}
 u(x, t) &= \frac{5}{2} \cos(2\pi t)(x - 1)^3 x^5 \sin(4\pi x), \\
 c(x, t) &= \frac{1}{10} \sin(2\pi x) \sin(\pi t),
 \end{aligned} \tag{5.6}$$

and choose the source terms again as appropriate to ensure that this is a solution to (1.1)–(1.5).

TABLE 4 *Errors (5.4) and EOCs for the first test problem (5.5) described in Section 5 with $\mu(h) = 4h^{1/2}$*

| $N + 1$ | $\mathcal{E}_u(L^\infty, L^2)$ | EOC | $\mathcal{E}_u(L^\infty, H^1)$ | EOC | $\mathcal{E}_u(H^1, L^2)$ | EOC | $\mathcal{E}_u(H^1, H^1)$ | EOC |
|---------|--------------------------------|--------|--------------------------------|--------|--------------------------------|--------|---------------------------|--------|
| 61 | 3.516e-06 | — | 3.686e-05 | — | 5.601e-05 | — | 6.201e-04 | — |
| 81 | 2.664e-06 | 0.9642 | 2.773e-05 | 0.9900 | 4.363e-05 | 0.8680 | 4.742e-04 | 0.9325 |
| 101 | 2.155e-06 | 0.9507 | 2.235e-05 | 0.9649 | 3.599e-05 | 0.8624 | 3.870e-04 | 0.9104 |
| 131 | 1.679e-06 | 0.9503 | 1.738e-05 | 0.9586 | 2.862e-05 | 0.8729 | 3.048e-04 | 0.9091 |
| 161 | 1.377e-06 | 0.9544 | 1.424e-05 | 0.9594 | 2.381e-05 | 0.8874 | 2.521e-04 | 0.9150 |
| 201 | 1.111e-06 | 0.9596 | 1.149e-05 | 0.9629 | 1.947e-05 | 0.9011 | 2.052e-04 | 0.9229 |
| <hr/> | | | | | | | | |
| $N + 1$ | $\mathcal{E}_w(L^\infty, L^2)$ | EOC | $\mathcal{E}_w(L^2, H^1)$ | EOC | $\mathcal{E}_c(L^\infty, L^2)$ | EOC | $\mathcal{E}_c(L^2, H^1)$ | EOC |
| 61 | 4.375e-04 | — | 7.418e-02 | — | 2.489e-06 | — | 2.026e-02 | — |
| 81 | 3.312e-04 | 0.9674 | 4.271e-02 | 1.9185 | 7.984e-07 | 3.9525 | 1.141e-02 | 1.9970 |
| 101 | 2.677e-04 | 0.9539 | 2.796e-02 | 1.8988 | 3.299e-07 | 3.9604 | 7.305e-03 | 1.9984 |
| 131 | 2.084e-04 | 0.9537 | 1.709e-02 | 1.8752 | 1.167e-07 | 3.9596 | 4.323e-03 | 1.9991 |
| 161 | 1.708e-04 | 0.9577 | 1.164e-02 | 1.8478 | 5.138e-08 | 3.9522 | 2.854e-03 | 1.9995 |
| 201 | 1.378e-04 | 0.9627 | 7.764e-03 | 1.8181 | 2.133e-08 | 3.9389 | 1.827e-03 | 1.9997 |

TABLE 5 *Errors (5.4) and EOCs for the second test problem (5.6) described in Section 5 with $\mu(h) = 40h$*

| $N + 1$ | $\mathcal{E}_u(L^\infty, L^2)$ | EOC | $\mathcal{E}_u(L^\infty, H^1)$ | EOC | $\mathcal{E}_u(H^1, L^2)$ | EOC | $\mathcal{E}_u(H^1, H^1)$ | EOC |
|---------|--------------------------------|--------|--------------------------------|--------|--------------------------------|--------|---------------------------|--------|
| 61 | 9.579e-07 | — | 4.753e-05 | — | 1.923e-05 | — | 1.019e-03 | — |
| 81 | 4.014e-07 | 3.0228 | 2.497e-05 | 2.2366 | 8.069e-06 | 3.0185 | 5.157e-04 | 2.3688 |
| 101 | 2.089e-07 | 2.9259 | 1.529e-05 | 2.1989 | 4.203e-06 | 2.9231 | 3.085e-04 | 2.3021 |
| 131 | 1.006e-07 | 2.7857 | 8.679e-06 | 2.1582 | 2.029e-06 | 2.7745 | 1.714e-04 | 2.2405 |
| 161 | 5.824e-08 | 2.6327 | 5.588e-06 | 2.1207 | 1.181e-06 | 2.6078 | 1.088e-04 | 2.1881 |
| 201 | 3.337e-08 | 2.4959 | 3.504e-06 | 2.0913 | 6.824e-07 | 2.4579 | 6.737e-05 | 2.1483 |
| 251 | 1.966e-08 | 2.3706 | 2.209e-06 | 2.0665 | 4.064e-07 | 2.3225 | 4.203e-05 | 2.1149 |
| 301 | 1.298e-08 | 2.2758 | 1.520e-06 | 2.0490 | 2.710e-07 | 2.2230 | 2.870e-05 | 2.0906 |
| <hr/> | | | | | | | | |
| $N + 1$ | $\mathcal{E}_w(L^\infty, L^2)$ | EOC | $\mathcal{E}_w(L^2, H^1)$ | EOC | $\mathcal{E}_c(L^\infty, L^2)$ | EOC | $\mathcal{E}_c(L^2, H^1)$ | EOC |
| 61 | 6.560e-04 | — | 2.516e+00 | — | 1.648e-08 | — | 1.362e-04 | — |
| 81 | 2.936e-04 | 2.7936 | 1.417e+00 | 1.9946 | 5.259e-09 | 3.9698 | 7.650e-05 | 2.0067 |
| 101 | 1.691e-04 | 2.4735 | 9.080e-01 | 1.9969 | 2.176e-09 | 3.9538 | 4.890e-05 | 2.0050 |
| 131 | 9.330e-05 | 2.2666 | 5.375e-01 | 1.9981 | 7.756e-10 | 3.9328 | 2.891e-05 | 2.0038 |
| 161 | 5.971e-05 | 2.1489 | 3.549e-01 | 1.9988 | 3.446e-10 | 3.9065 | 1.907e-05 | 2.0029 |
| 201 | 3.746e-05 | 2.0891 | 2.272e-01 | 1.9992 | 1.451e-10 | 3.8756 | 1.220e-05 | 2.0023 |
| 251 | 2.369e-05 | 2.0531 | 1.454e-01 | 1.9995 | 6.166e-11 | 3.8359 | 7.805e-06 | 2.0018 |
| 301 | 1.635e-05 | 2.0335 | 1.009e-01 | 1.9996 | 3.088e-11 | 3.7920 | 5.418e-06 | 2.0015 |

The errors for $\mu(h) = 40h$ are displayed in Table 5 whilst those for $\mu(h) = 4000h^2$ are in Table 6. We now indeed observe EOCs of around two for both $\mathcal{E}_u(L^\infty, H^1)$ and $\mathcal{E}_u(H^1, H^1)$ as expected. The behaviour of the other errors is as before. We have also performed some computations with powers $r > 2$

TABLE 6 Errors (5.4) and EOCs for the second test problem (5.5) described in Section 5 with $\mu(h) = 4000h^2$

| $N + 1$ | $\mathcal{E}_u(L^\infty, L^2)$ | EOC | $\mathcal{E}_u(L^\infty, H^1)$ | EOC | $\mathcal{E}_u(H^1, L^2)$ | EOC | $\mathcal{E}_u(H^1, H^1)$ | EOC |
|---------|--------------------------------|--------|--------------------------------|--------|--------------------------------|--------|---------------------------|--------|
| 61 | 1.118e-06 | — | 4.969e-05 | — | 1.912e-05 | — | 1.024e-03 | — |
| 81 | 4.591e-07 | 3.0951 | 2.553e-05 | 2.3150 | 8.466e-06 | 2.8317 | 5.183e-04 | 2.3686 |
| 101 | 2.089e-07 | 3.5271 | 1.529e-05 | 2.2974 | 4.203e-06 | 3.1380 | 3.085e-04 | 2.3251 |
| 131 | 7.790e-08 | 3.7608 | 8.543e-06 | 2.2185 | 1.783e-06 | 3.2668 | 1.705e-04 | 2.2594 |
| 161 | 3.482e-08 | 3.8779 | 5.477e-06 | 2.1409 | 8.950e-07 | 3.3211 | 1.080e-04 | 2.1986 |
| 201 | 1.448e-08 | 3.9317 | 3.436e-06 | 2.0892 | 4.234e-07 | 3.3541 | 6.680e-05 | 2.1546 |
| 251 | 5.983e-09 | 3.9616 | 2.172e-06 | 2.0545 | 1.987e-07 | 3.3892 | 4.161e-05 | 2.1215 |
| 301 | 2.897e-09 | 3.9768 | 1.499e-06 | 2.0347 | 1.065e-07 | 3.4197 | 2.837e-05 | 2.1007 |
| $N + 1$ | $\mathcal{E}_w(L^\infty, L^2)$ | EOC | $\mathcal{E}_w(L^2, H^1)$ | EOC | $\mathcal{E}_c(L^\infty, L^2)$ | EOC | $\mathcal{E}_c(L^2, H^1)$ | EOC |
| 61 | 1.248e-03 | — | 2.581e+00 | — | 1.696e-08 | — | 1.362e-04 | — |
| 81 | 4.060e-04 | 3.9038 | 1.429e+00 | 2.0542 | 5.329e-09 | 4.0250 | 7.650e-05 | 2.0067 |
| 101 | 1.691e-04 | 3.9251 | 9.080e-01 | 2.0336 | 2.176e-09 | 4.0130 | 4.890e-05 | 2.0050 |
| 131 | 5.997e-05 | 3.9514 | 5.343e-01 | 2.0211 | 7.608e-10 | 4.0065 | 2.891e-05 | 2.0038 |
| 161 | 2.629e-05 | 3.9705 | 3.517e-01 | 2.0133 | 3.313e-10 | 4.0037 | 1.907e-05 | 2.0029 |
| 201 | 1.081e-05 | 3.9813 | 2.246e-01 | 2.0087 | 1.356e-10 | 4.0026 | 1.220e-05 | 2.0023 |
| 251 | 4.441e-06 | 3.9883 | 1.436e-01 | 2.0056 | 5.552e-11 | 4.0021 | 7.805e-06 | 2.0018 |
| 301 | 2.144e-06 | 3.9923 | 9.966e-02 | 2.0037 | 2.676e-11 | 4.0019 | 5.418e-06 | 2.0015 |




FIG. 1. Third test problem (Example 5.4): initial data (left) and result without forcing term ($f = 0$) at time $t = 0.005$, $N = 101$.

and even with $\mu(h) = 0$. The scheme turned out to be stable, and we observed similar convergence rates as for the scaling $\mu(h) \sim h^2$.

In order to further explore the novel numerical scheme we performed some simulations with initial data for which the continuum solution is expected to develop a singularity.

EXAMPLE 5.4 Consider the initial values displayed in Fig. 1 on the left, which are given by

$$u_0(x) = 10 \tanh\left(\frac{x-0.5}{0.02}\right) \exp\left(\frac{1}{(x-0.5)^2-0.25}\right),$$

$$c_0(x) = 100 \tanh\left(\frac{x-0.5}{0.02}\right) \exp\left(\frac{1}{(x-0.5)^2-0.25}\right).$$




FIG. 2. Third test problem (Example 5.4): solution with forcing term (5.7) at times $t = 0.005$ (left) and $t = 0.05$ (right), $N = 101$.




FIG. 3. Third test problem (Example 5.4): maximum of the spatial gradient $u_{\delta h x}$ over time for several N .

In the absence of any forcing ($f = 0$) the curve levels out over time, as does the field $c_{\delta h}$. Figure 1 on the right gives an impression of the solution at time $t = 0.005$, at time $t = 0.5$ (not displayed) both $u_{\delta h}$ and $c_{\delta h}$ appear constant and are close to zero.

The evolution is significantly different for the forcing term

$$f(c) = 200c. \quad (5.7)$$

Figure 2 displays the behaviour. For several values of N we monitored the maximum of the spatial gradients $\max_j u_{\delta h x}|_{s_j}$ on the segments, see Fig. 3 for the evolution over time of these maxima. The apparent lack of convergence as $h \rightarrow 0$ and the shape of the curve indicate that the graph of the solution to the continuous problem develops a singularity in the sense that the spatial gradient of u degenerates at $x = 0.5$.¹

¹Simulations with a parametric scheme based on the study by Barrett *et al.* (2007) for the curve and the study by Dziuk & Elliott (2013) for c indicate that the description of the curve as a graph is lost in finite time and an S -like shape is obtained. Those computations are not further reported on here for keeping the focus of this work on the numerical scheme that has been analysed.

For the solution to the semidiscrete problem we have established global well-posedness in Lemma 3.3, which requires the forcing function f to be bounded. But our fully discrete solutions would be the same if our f in (5.7) was cut off for sufficiently large arguments as $c_{\delta h}$ was bounded in all computations. Indeed, the fully discrete solutions approach zero in the long term, which is observable in Fig. 3 for $N \leq 101$ as the maxima of the gradients approach zero.

6. Conclusion and outlook

We analysed the semidiscrete scheme (3.8)–(3.10) and quantified convergence to the solution of (2.1)–(2.3), see Theorem 3.4 on page 7. In order to be able to derive an error estimate for c_h a better control of the velocity u_{ht} was required. For this purpose we augmented the geometric equation (2.1) in the semidiscrete scheme with a penalty term, which is a weighted H^1 inner product of the velocity with the test function. The weight $\mu(h) \sim h^r$, $r \in [1, 2)$ has an impact on the convergence rates. In turn, the scheme proved quite stable for penalty terms beyond the regime that was analysed. In particular, when $r = 2$ was chosen then maximal convergence rates were obtained as one may expect them for the choice of finite elements. This case is not covered by the analysis as then the argument with the generalized Gronwall Lemma 4.9 fails. On the other hand, the restriction $r \geq 1$ is clearly motivated by the inequality (4.35). It was observed in simulations that choosing $r < 1$ indeed destroys the order of convergence proved in Theorem 3.4.

We make a few remarks on the context of the problem and possible generalizations of the results:

- **Well-posedness and regularity:** For the continuous problem this is, to our knowledge, an open problem. We have decided not to address this issue here, but to leave it for future studies and to focus on the numerical analysis of an approximation scheme. Assumption 2.1 was made for this purpose.
- **Boundary conditions:** The choice of the boundary conditions (1.4) has been made in order to keep the presentation as simple as possible. Prescribing nonzero Dirichlet boundary condition for c does not change the analysis. For boundary data u_b depending on time we also expect similar results. On the contrary, different conditions for κ present difficulties as already noted and briefly discussed previously (Deckelnick & Dziuk, 2006b, Remark 2.3).
- **Initial conditions:** In the study by Deckelnick & Dziuk (2006b) a different choice is made for the initial values u_{0h} , which improves the order of convergence: let \hat{u}_{0h} be given through (4.1) at time $t = 0$, and \hat{w}_{0h} through (4.6). Define u_{0h} by $u_{0h} - I_h u_b \in X_{h0}$ and

$$\int_I \frac{u_{0hx}}{Q_{0h}} \varphi_{hx} \, dx = \int_I \frac{\hat{w}_{0h}}{\hat{Q}_{0h}} \varphi_h \, dx \quad \forall \varphi_h \in X_{h0}. \quad (6.1)$$

Here $Q_{0h} = \sqrt{1 + |u_{0hx}|^2}$, $\hat{Q}_{0h} = \sqrt{1 + |\hat{u}_{0hx}|^2}$. Then for $e_u(0) = \hat{u}_{0h} - u_{0h}$ and $e_w(0) = \hat{w}_{0h} - w_{0h}$ we have the estimate

$$\|e_u(0)\|_{H^1(I)} + \|e_w(0)\|_{L^2(I)} \leq Ch^2 |\log h|.$$

The proof is sketched in the study by Deckelnick & Dziuk (2006a). However, this choice of initial values is not effective in our analysis as that higher order is not achieved with regards to the other terms in our case of a coupled problem.

- **Constants in error estimates:** Lemma 4.6 corresponds to (Deckelnick & Dziuk, 2006b, Lemma 3.4) where the coefficient $1/4C_0$ has been corrected.
- **Assumptions on the coupling function f :** The assumptions (2.5) on f can be generalized. The solution c is bounded by assumption and in the convergence analysis boundedness of the discrete solution c_h is ensured too (cf. (4.16)). Thus, for convergence local bounds of f and f' will suffice, for instance, ensured by $f \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$.

REFERENCES

- BÄNSCH, E., MORIN, P. & NOCHETTO, R. H. (2004) Surface diffusion of graphs: variational formulation, error analysis, and simulation. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, **42**, 773–799.
- BARRETT, J. W., DECKELNICK, K. & STYLES, V. (2017) Numerical analysis for a system coupling curve evolution to reaction diffusion on the curve. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, **55**, 1080–1100.
- BARRETT, J. W., GARCKE, H. & NÜRNBERG, R. (2007) A parametric finite element method for fourth order geometric evolution equations. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **222**, 441–467.
- BARRETT, J. W., GARCKE, H. & NÜRNBERG, R. (2012) Parametric approximation of isotropic and anisotropic elastic flow for closed and open curves. *Numer. Math.*, **120**, 489–542.
- BARTELS, S. (2015) *Numerical Methods for Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations*. Springer Series in Computational Mathematics, vol. **47**. Cham, Switzerland: Springer.
- BARTEZZAGHI, A., DEDÈ, L. & QUARTERONI, A. (2016) Isogeometric analysis of geometric partial differential equations. *Comp. Methods Appl. Mech. Eng.*, **311**, 625–647.
- BENEŠ, M., MIKULA, K., OBERHUBER, T. & ŠEVČOVIČ, D. (2009) Comparison study for level set and direct lagrangian methods for computing Willmore flow of closed planar curves. *Comput. Vis. Sci.*, **12**, 307–317.
- BRETIN, E., MASNOU, S. & OUDET, É. (2015) Phase-field approximations of the Willmore functional and flow. *Numer. Math.*, **131**, 115–171.
- CHAPLAIN, M. A., GANESH, M., & GRAHAM, I. G. (2001) Spatio-temporal pattern formation on spherical surfaces: numerical simulation and application to solid tumour growth. *J. Math. Biol.*, **42**, 387–423.
- DECKELNICK, K. & DZIUK, G. (2006a) Correction to ‘Error analysis of a finite element method for the Willmore flow of graphs’. Available at <http://www-ian.math.uni-magdeburg.de/home/deckelnick/correction.pdf>.
- DECKELNICK, K. & DZIUK, G. (2006b) Error analysis of a finite element method for the Willmore flow of graphs. *Interface. Free Bound.*, **8**, 21–46.
- DECKELNICK, K. & DZIUK, G. (2009) Error analysis for the elastic flow of parametrized curves. *Math. Comput.*, **78**, 645–671.
- DECKELNICK, K., DZIUK, G. & ELLIOTT, C. M. (2005) Computation of geometric partial differential equations and mean curvature flow. *Acta Numer.*, **14**, 139–232.
- DECKELNICK, K., KATZ, J. & SCHIEWECK, F. (2015) A C1-finite element method for the Willmore flow of two-dimensional graphs. *Math. Comput.*, **84**, 2617–2643.
- DECKELNICK, K. & SCHIEWECK, F. (2010) Error analysis for the approximation of axisymmetric Willmore flow by C1-finite elements. *Interface. Free Bound.*, **12**, 551–574.
- DROSKE, M. & RUMPF, M. (2004) A level set formulation for Willmore flow. *Interface. and Free Bound.*, **6**, 361–378.
- DU, Q., LIU, C. & WANG, X. (2004) A phase field approach in the numerical study of the elastic bending energy for vesicle membranes. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **198**, 450–468.
- DU, Q. & WANG, X. (2007) Convergence of numerical approximations to a phase field bending elasticity model of membrane deformations. *Int. J. Numer. Anal. Model.*, **4**, 441–459.

- DZIUK, G. (2008) Computational parametric Willmore flow. *Numer. Math.*, **111**, 55–80.
- DZIUK, G. & ELLIOTT, C. M. (2007) Finite elements on evolving surfaces. *IMA J. Numer. Anal.*, **27**, 262–292.
- DZIUK, G. & ELLIOTT, C. M. (2010) An Eulerian approach to transport and diffusion on evolving implicit surfaces. *Comput. Vis. Sci.*, **13**, 17–28.
- DZIUK, G. & ELLIOTT, C. M. (2013) Finite element methods for surface PDEs. *Acta Numer.*, **22**, 289–396.
- DZIUK, G., KUWERT, E. & SCHÄTZLE, R. (2002) Evolution of elastic curves in \mathbb{R}^n : existence and computation. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, **33**, 1228–1245.
- ELLIOTT, C. M. & STINNER, B. (2010) Modeling and computation of two phase geometric biomembranes using surface finite elements. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **229**, 6585–6612.
- ELLIOTT, C. M. & STINNER, B. (2013) Computation of two-phase biomembranes with phase dependent material parameters using surface finite elements. *Commun. Comput. Phys.*, **13**, 325–360.
- ELLIOTT, C. M., STINNER, B., STYLES, V. & WELFORD, R. (2011) Numerical computation of advection and diffusion on evolving diffuse interfaces. *IMA J. Numer. Anal.*, **31**, 786–812.
- ELLIOTT, C. M., STINNER, B. & VENKATARAMAN, C. (2012) Modelling cell motility and chemotaxis with evolving surface finite elements. *J. R. Soc. Interface*, **9**, 3027–3044.
- FRANKEN, M., RUMPF, M. & WIRTH, B. (2013) A phase field based PDE constraint optimization approach to time discrete Willmore flow. *Int. J. Numer. Anal. Model.*, **10**, 116–138.
- HANSBO, P., LARSON, M. G. & ZAHEDI, S. (2016) A cut finite element method for coupled bulk-surface problems on time-dependent domains. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Eng.*, **307**, 96–116.
- KOVÁCS, B., LI, B., LUBICH, C. & GUERRA, C. A. P. (2017) Convergence of finite elements on an evolving surface driven by diffusion on the surface. *Numer. Math.*, **137**, 643–689.
- LANGER, U., MOORE, S. E. & NEUMÜLLER, M. (2016) Space-time isogeometric analysis of parabolic evolution problems. *Comp. Methods Appl. Mech. Eng.*, **306**, 342–363.
- MERCKER, M., MARCINIAK-CZUCHRA, A., RICHTER, T. & HARTMANN, D. (2013) Modeling and computing of deformation dynamics of inhomogeneous biological surfaces. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, **73**, 1768–1792.
- MIKULA, K., ŠEVČOVIČ, D. & BALÁŽOVJECH, M. (2010) A simple, fast and stabilized flowing finite volume method for solving general curve evolution equations. *Commun. Comput. Phys.*, **7**, 195–211.
- NEILSON, M. P., MACKENZIE, J. A., WEBB, S. D. & INSALL, R. H. (2011) Modeling cell movement and chemotaxis using pseudopod-based feedback. *SIAM J. S. Comput.*, **33**, 1035–1057.
- OLSHANSKII, M. A. & REUSKEN, A. (2014) Error analysis of a space-time finite element method for solving PDEs on evolving surfaces. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, **52**, 2092–2120.
- OSHER, S. & SETHIAN, J. A. (1988) Fronts propagating with curvature-dependent speed: algorithms based on Hamilton-Jacobi formulations. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **79**, 12–49.
- PETRAS, A. & RUUTH, S. J. (2016) PDEs on moving surfaces via the closest point method and a modified grid based particle method. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **312**, 139–156.
- POZZI, P. (2015) Computational anisotropic Willmore flow. *Interface. and Free Bound.*, **17**, 189–232.
- POZZI, P. & STINNER, B. (2017) Curve shortening flow coupled to lateral diffusion. *Numer. Math.*, **135**, 1171–1205.
- RÄTZ, A. & VOIGT, A. (2007) A diffuse-interface approximation for surface diffusion including adatoms. *Nonlinearity*, **20**, 177.
- XU, J.-J. & ZHAO, H.-K. (2003) An Eulerian formulation for solving partial differential equations along a moving interface. *J. Sci. Comput.*, **19**, 573–594.