

## SOME RECENT TOPICS IN NUMERICAL ANALYSIS — FINITE ELEMENT METHODS

EUN-JAE PARK

**ABSTRACT.** The objective of numerical analysis is to devise and analyze efficient algorithms or numerical methods for equations arising in mathematical modeling for science and engineering. In this note, we present some recent topics in numerical analysis, specially in the finite element method and overview the development of the mixed finite element method in the context of second order elliptic and parabolic problems.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

The basic mathematical models of science and engineering often take the form of differential equations, typically expressing laws of physics such as conservation of mass or momentum enhanced with various constitutive relations between state variables and fluxes such as Hooke's law, Fourier's law, Stokes' law or Darcy's law, etc. By determining the solution of differential equations for given data, we may obtain desired information concerning the physical process being modeled. Exact solutions may sometimes be determined through symbolic computation by hand or using software, but in most cases this is not possible, and the alternative is to approximate solutions with numerical computations using a computer. Although massive computational effort is often needed, the cost of computation is rapidly decreasing and new possibilities are quickly being opened. The objective of numerical analysis is to devise and analyze efficient algorithms or numerical methods for equations of mathematical models.

In this note, we present some recent topics in numerical analysis, specially in the finite element method (FEM) and overview the development of the mixed finite element method in the context of second order elliptic and parabolic problems. In the end, we include interesting results of the survey conducted by I. Babuška [3]. We have made no attempt to list exhaustive topics in numerical analysis.

### 2. FEM AND MIXED FEM

The theory of the finite element method has been developed during the last fifty years. The discovery of the FEM is usually attributed to R. Courant. Nevertheless, there are some older references to finite element-like methods [3]. The notion *element* was introduced in the 1950's by aerospace engineers performing elasticity

---

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 65M15, 65M60, 65N15, 65N30.

*Key words and phrases.* finite elements, mixed finite elements, a priori error estimate, a posteriori error estimate, adaptivity, preconditioning, iterative methods .

computations. The notion *finite element* was introduced by mathematicians later, in the 1960's.

In principle, a finite element method can only be considered in relation with a variational principle and a function space in which it is posed. Each choice of these leads to a different finite element approximation. So far, a great deal of progress has been made in FEM software. The whole computational processes can be essentially automated including the following steps:

*preprocessing of input data, generation of triangulations, assembling FE-matrices, solving discrete problems, postprocessing of output data, a posteriori error estimates, graphical illustration of results.*

Nevertheless, many theoretical questions, related to the foundations of the method and being born by practical problems and their needs, are still open.

The mixed finite element method was designed to compute both the state variable and the flux simultaneously with comparable accuracy, be it directly or through post-processing. In many applications, it seems to yield better results than standard finite element methods when an accurate approximation for the flux variable is needed.

In 1974, Brezzi [7] published his celebrated paper providing a theoretical background for mixed finite element methods. His theory is based on two major assumptions,  $Z$ -ellipticity and the inf-sup condition, known as LBB condition.

In 1977, Raviart and Thomas [24] constructed, for the first time, a finite element space satisfying the discrete LBB condition through the construction of a projection, known as the Raviart-Thomas projection, to approximate the Dirichlet problem for the Laplacian operator in planar domain. The underlying Hilbert spaces are  $\mathbf{V} = H(\operatorname{div}; \Omega)$ ,  $W = L^2(\Omega)$ . Their finite elements are conforming (requiring  $\mathbf{V}_h \subset \mathbf{V}$ ,  $W_h \subset W$ ). While the requirement  $W_h \subset W$  does not represent any constraint, the inclusion  $\mathbf{V}_h \subset \mathbf{V}$  implies some regularity on the elements of  $\mathbf{V}_h$ , more precisely, the normal components of vectors in  $\mathbf{V}_h$  must be continuous across the interelement boundaries. Applying Brezzi's general theory, Raviart and Thomas obtained explicit error estimates. Then, in 1980, this Raviart-Thomas element was generalized and extended to the three-dimensional case by Nedelec [21]. There Nedelec also developed approximation spaces of  $H(\operatorname{curl}; \Omega)$  and gave some application to Maxwell's equations and the equations of elasticity.

In 1980 Falk and Osborn [13] provided an abstract approach to the analysis of mixed methods for elliptic boundary value problems. They obtained quasi-optimal error estimates in the usual Sobolev norms.

Raviart-Thomas-Nedelec (RTN) elements received a considerable attention and provided a source for many applications. In 1981, Johnson and Thomée [16] studied mixed methods for second order elliptic and parabolic problems.

Douglas and Roberts in 1985 [10] gave global error estimates in  $L^2(\Omega)$ ,  $L^\infty(\Omega)$ , and  $H^{-s}(\Omega)$  for Dirichlet problems for the elliptic operator,

$$Lp = -\operatorname{div}(a\nabla p + \mathbf{b}p) + cp,$$

based on the RTN elements of index  $k \geq 0$ . However, their technique does not lead to an  $L^\infty(\Omega)$ -error bound for the vector unknown. Scholtz [27] derived an estimate in  $L^\infty(\Omega)$  for  $\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h$  which is optimal modulo a factor of  $|\log h|$  for  $k \geq 1$ .

In 1985, Milner in his thesis [19] extended Douglas' and Roberts' results [10] to

$$Lp = -\operatorname{div}(a(p)\nabla p + \mathbf{b}(p)) + c(p).$$

Kwon and Milner [18] have derived, for the whole range of indexes  $k$  in RTN, a quasi-optimal order estimate in  $L^\infty(\Omega)$  for  $\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h$  in the semi-linear case using weighted  $L^2$ -norms. Durán [11] derived, using the known properties of Ritz projection, sharp  $L^q$ -error estimates ( $1 \leq q \leq \infty$ ) when  $Lp = -\operatorname{div}(a(p)\nabla p)$ .

In 1989, Gastaldi and Nochetto [14] derived sharp asymptotic  $L^\infty(\Omega)$  error estimates for both the scalar and vector unknowns for linear second order elliptic problems in an abstract setting satisfying the commuting diagram property.

In 1995, Milner and Park [20] developed mixed methods for  $Lp = -\operatorname{div}\mathbf{a}(\nabla p)$  and the minimal surface equation was treated as an application.

Park [22] in the same year extended the results to fully nonlinear elliptic problems in divergence form:

$$Lp = -\operatorname{div}\mathbf{a}(p, \nabla p) + b(p, \nabla p),$$

using RTN elements for  $k \geq 1$ . Newton's method was presented and analyzed to solve the nonlinear algebraic equations resulting from mixed finite element equations. Quadratic convergence of the algorithm was proved.

However, the lowest order case ( $k = 0$ ) was not covered in the paper [22] and still remains open.

Fully nonlinear parabolic problems in divergence form are treated for the first time in [17] and applications to some flow problems in porous media are given in [23].

Many issues arise in actual implementation of the numerical methods. Standard fully discrete schemes for nonlinear second order time dependent problems would generate large, nonlinear systems of equations for each time level  $t^n$ . Since the different systems arise from an evolution process, the approximate solution at time level  $t^n$  will be a good initial guess for the nonlinear system produced at time level  $t^{n+1}$ . Clearly, the smaller we take the time steps, the better these initial guesses are. With good initial guesses, a Newton-Raphson linearization of the nonlinear systems will converge quadratically. We see our efficiency trade-off. The smaller the time steps the faster the Newton-convergence, but the larger the total number of nonlinear systems that must be solved to reach a specified time level.

The next point to note is that the construction of the Jacobian and its evaluation for each iteration is a very large and time-consuming process. We are thus led to consideration of inexact or quasi-Newton linearizations which allow cheaper updates at the expense of possibly slower convergence rates. The study of partial or efficient updates for Newton-like methods is a major area of research interests [12].

In any of the linearization methods mentioned, a new large, symmetric/nonsymmetric linear system must be solved at each iteration and for each time step. The fill-in that would result from direct solutions of each linear system for large, three dimensional applications would swamp the computational effort. Therefore *iterative procedures* for these large symmetric/nonsymmetric systems must be considered.

Since this linear solution is a part of the Newton iteration, it is natural to consider how the choices of the tolerances for the linear, inner iteration and the Newton outer iteration can be chosen to minimize computational effort. Again the size of the time-step should also be considered since an even larger outer time loop is in operation. The optimal choice of a combination of time-step and iteration tolerances to minimize computational time is an important research topic.

Of course, the convergence rates for the iterative process described are heavily dependent upon the conditioning of the matrices involved. In general, the matrices

arising from these partial differential equations are highly ill-conditioned with the condition number growing as the reciprocal of the square of the spatial discretization grid size. Therefore, efficient *preconditioners* are essential for these applications.

Recently, in [31] we studied mixed finite element approximation of reaction-diffusion equations. To linearize the mixed-method equations, we used a two-grid scheme that relegates all of the Newton-like iterations to grids much coarser than the original one, with no loss in order of accuracy. The use of a multigrid-based solver for the indefinite linear systems that arise at each iteration, as well as for the similar system that arises on the fine grid, allows for even greater efficiency.

We mention [8, 25] for general account of mixed FEM. See Ciarlet [9] for finite element methods for elliptic problems and the recent book by V. Thomée [29] for parabolic problems.

### 3. SOME RECENT TOPICS

In this section we mention only a few topics and start with a posteriori error estimate.

- **A Posteriori Error Estimates:** A priori error estimates have been an ingredient of finite element analysis from the outset, but a posteriori error estimates have really only emerged over the past decade to take their natural place alongside a priori estimates. A posteriori error estimators provide quantitative estimates for the actual error (as opposed to estimates for the rate of convergence) and give base on adaptive refinement strategy to optimize the computational work needed to reach a certain accuracy. In this direction, we cite the first monograph on the subject [30].

- **Preconditioning:** The convergence of a matrix iteration depends on the properties of the matrix—the eigenvalues, the singular values, or sometimes other information. The problem of interest can be transformed so that the properties of the matrix are improved drastically. This process of “preconditioning” is essential to most successful applications of iterative methods. We list a number of preconditioners: *Diagonal scaling or Jacobi, Incomplete Cholesky or LU factorization, Coarse-grid approximation (multigrid iteration), Local approximation, Block preconditioners and domain decomposition, Lower-order discretization, Constant-coefficient or symmetric approximation, Splitting of a multi-term operator, Dimensional splitting or ADI, One step of a classical iterative method, Periodic or convolution approximation, Unstable direct method, Polynomial preconditioners*. The reader is referred to [1, 26] for summaries of the current state of the art. See also [15, 28] for more topics in numerical linear algebra.

There are a number of other very active research areas which include multigrid methods and domain decomposition methods (visit <http://www.mgnet.org/>, [http://www.netlib.org/na-net/na\\_home.html](http://www.netlib.org/na-net/na_home.html), <http://www.wavelet.org/>).

To provide a state-of-the-art access to the field of FEM, we mention the result of the survey conducted by I. Babuška [3] at the conference “Finite Element Methods: fifty years of the Courant element”.

“... restrict ourself here only to the mathematical aspects of the finite element method and to the questions which we posed to the participants of the meeting and others:

**A) What five ideas (results) had the largest impact on finite elements after 1970?**

Practically unanimously, the following two results were mentioned.

1. The inf-sup condition (so called Babuška-Brezzi condition) [2, 7].
2. The a-posteriori error estimation and adaptive finite elements [4, 5, 6].

Some other topics which were mentioned in the questionnaire are:

- Theory of estimates.
- Superconvergence and recovery theory.
- The  $h - p$  version of the FEM.
- Boundary element method.
- Penetration of the FEM into hyperbolic (CFD) and general time dependent problem.
  - Theory of mixed and nonconforming finite elements.
  - Penetration of the FEM into linear algebra. Iterations, multigrid and domain decomposition.
    - Theory of the FEM for strongly nonlinear problem.
    - Finite elements for the singularly perturbed problem.

It is necessary, of course, to underline the major importance of the progress in hardware development, in the user friendliness (up-front principles), mesh generator, solid modes, modeler, graphics, etc. for the practice of the FEM.

**B) What are the most outstanding problems in finite elements today?**

The answers to this question were very widespread; nevertheless, the main ones are:

1. Problems of computational fluid dynamics.
2. A-posteriori error estimate and adaptive approaches for nonlinear and nonelliptic problem.

Other topics mentioned are:

- Penetration of the FEM into many other fields of engineering and physics;
- FE solution of stochastic problems;
- Theory and practice of the FEM (locking) for general shells (composite);
- Direct and iterative parallel algorithms for large system of equations stemming from general finite element on nonstructured meshes;
- Treatment of very large problems.

**C) What will be the major problems in finite elements in the year 2010?**

The answers to question C) were very different; nevertheless one appeared often.

1. The reliability of the computed results due to the formation of engineering problems and numerical solution. Adaptive approaches with error control of problem depending on fuzzy or nonsufficient input information.

Some other topics were:

- Formulation and numerical treatment of turbulence;
- Inverse problems and non-destructive testing;
- New problems in biology, medicine, economics, population, epidemics, etc.;
- Communication between mathematicians and non-mathematician (engineers, physicists, chemists, biologist, etc.)”.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Axelsson O. *Iterative Solution Methods*. Cambridge U. Press, Cambridge, UK, 1994.
- [2] Babuška I. Error-Bounds for Finite Element Method. *Numer. Math.*, 16:322–333, 1971.
- [3] Babuška I. *Courant Element: Before and After*, volume 164 of *Lecture Notes in Pure and Applied Mathematics*, pages 37–51. Marcel Dekker, New York, NY, 1994. M. Křížek, P. Neittaanmäki, and R. Stenberg, eds.
- [4] Babuška I., Rheinboldt W. C. Error estimates for adaptive finite element computations. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 11:736–754, 1971.
- [5] Babuška I., Rheinboldt W. C. A-posteriori error estimates for the finite element method. *Internat. J. Numer. Methods Engrg.*, 12:1597–1615, 1978.
- [6] Babuška I., Rheinboldt W. C. Adaptive approaches and reliability estimation in finite element analysis. *Comput. Methods Appl. Engrg.*, 17/18:519–540, 1979.
- [7] Brezzi F. On the existence, uniqueness, and approximation of saddle point problems arising from Lagrangian multipliers. *R.A.I.R.O., Anal. Numér.*, 2:129–151, 1974.
- [8] Brezzi F., Fortin M. *Mixed and Hybrid Finite Element Methods*. Springer-Verlag, 1991.
- [9] Ciarlet P. G. Basic Error Estimates for Elliptic Problems. In *Handbook of Numerical Analysis, Vol II, Finite Element Methods (Part 1)*, pages 17–351. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1989. P. G. Ciarlet and J. L. Lions, eds. Vol II.
- [10] Douglas J. Jr., Roberts J. E. Global estimates for mixed methods for second order elliptic equations. *Math. Comp.*, 44:39–52, 1985.
- [11] Durán R. Error analysis in  $L^p$ ,  $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ , for mixed finite element methods for linear and quasi-linear elliptic problems. *R.A.I.R.O. Modélisation Mathématique et Analyse Numérique*, 22:371–387, 1988.
- [12] Ewing R. E. Modern trends in reservoir modeling. Technical Report #1988-07, Enhanced Oil Recovery Institute, University of Wyoming, Laramie, WY.
- [13] Falk R. S., Osborn J. Error estimates for mixed methods. *R.A.I.R.O., Anal. Numér.*, 14:249–277, 1980.
- [14] Gastaldi L., Nocketto R. H. Sharp maximum norm error estimates for general mixed finite element approximations to second-order elliptic equations. *Model. Math. An. Numer.*, 23:103–128, 89.
- [15] Golub G. H. *Matrix Computations*. Johns Hopkins U. Press, Baltimore, 3rd edition, 1996.
- [16] Johnson C., Thomée V. Error estimates for some mixed finite element methods for parabolic type problems. *R.A.I.R.O., Anal. Numér.*, 14:41–78, 1981.
- [17] Kim M-Y, Milner F. A., and Park E-J. Some observations on mixed finite element methods for fully nonlinear parabolic problems in divergence form. *Appl. Math. Lett.*, 9:75–81, 1996.
- [18] Kwon Y., Milner F. A.  $L^\infty$ -estimates for mixed methods for semilinear second order elliptic equations. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 25:46–53, 1988.
- [19] Milner F. A. Mixed finite element methods for quasilinear second order elliptic problems. *Math. Comp.*, 44:303–320, 1985.
- [20] Milner F. A., Park E.-J. A mixed finite element method for a strongly nonlinear second-order elliptic problem. *Math. Comp.*, 64:973–988, 1995.
- [21] Nedelec J. C. Mixed finite elements in  $\mathbf{R}^3$ . *Numer. Math.*, 35:315–341, 1980.
- [22] Park E.-J. Mixed finite element methods for nonlinear second order elliptic problems. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 32, 1995. 865–885.
- [23] Park E.-J. and Kim M.-Y. A time discretization for mixed approximation for generalized Forchheimer flow in porous media. *Z. Angew Math. Mech.*, 76:493–494, 1996.
- [24] Raviart P-A., Thomas J. M. A mixed finite element method for second order elliptic problems. In *Mathematical Aspects of the Finite Element Method*, volume 606 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, pages 292–315. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, New York, 1977. I. Galligani and E. Magenes, eds.
- [25] Roberts J. E., Thomas J. M. Mixed and hybrid methods. In P. G. Ciarlet and J. L. Lions, editor, *Handbook of Numerical Analysis, Vol II, Finite Element Methods (Part 1)*, pages 523–639. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1989.
- [26] Saad Y. *Iterative Methods for Sparse Linear Systems*. PWS Publishing, Boston, 1996.
- [27] Scholz R. A remark on the rate of convergence for a mixed finite element method for second order problems. *Numer. Funct. Anal. Optim.*, 4:169–177, 1981/1982.
- [28] Trefethen L. N. and Bau D. *Numerical Linear Algebra*. SIAM, Philadelphia, 1997.

- [29] Thomée V. *Galerkin finite element methods for parabolic problems*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg New York, 1997.
- [30] Verfürth. *A Posteriori Error Estimation and Adaptive Mesh-Refinement Techniques*. Wiley and Sons Ltd., Chichester, UK, 1996.
- [31] Wu L., Allen M. B. and Park E.-J. Mixed finite-element solution of reaction-diffusion equations using a two-grid method. *Computational Methods in Water Resources XII*, 1998.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, YONSEI UNIVERSITY, SEOUL 120-749

*E-mail address:* `ejpark@galerkin.yonsei.ac.kr`