

Verified numerical computation of solutions for the stationary Navier–Stokes equation in nonconvex polygonal domains

Hashimoto, Kouji
Graduate School of Informatics, Kyoto University

Kobayashi, Kenta
Faculty of Mathematics, Kyushu University

Nakao, Mitsuhiro T.
Faculty of Mathematics, Kyushu University

<https://hdl.handle.net/2324/3400>

出版情報 : Hokkaido Mathematical Journal. 36 (4), pp.777–799, 2007–11. 北海道大学理学部数学科
バージョン :
権利関係 : (c) Department of Mathematics, Hokkaido University



MHF Preprint Series

Kyushu University
21st Century COE Program
Development of Dynamic Mathematics with
High Functionality

Verified numerical computation of solutions for the stationary Navier-Stokes equation in nonconvex polygonal domains

K. Hashimoto, K. Kobayashi
M. T. Nakao

MHF 2007-2

(Received January 12, 2007)

Faculty of Mathematics
Kyushu University
Fukuoka, JAPAN

Verified numerical computation of solutions for the stationary Navier-Stokes equation in nonconvex polygonal domains

Kouji Hashimoto^{†,1} Kenta Kobayashi^{‡,2} Mitsuhiro T. Nakao^{‡,3}

[†]*Graduate School of Informatics, Kyoto University, Kyoto 606-8501, Japan*

[‡]*Faculty of Mathematics, Kyushu University, Fukuoka 812-8581, Japan*

¹*hashimot@amp.i.kyoto-u.ac.jp, {²kenta ³mtnakao}@math.kyushu-u.ac.jp*

Abstract

We propose a method to enclose solutions for the stationary Navier-Stokes equation in nonconvex polygonal domains. Our method is based on an infinite dimensional Newton-type formulation by using the finite element method with constructive error estimates and fixed point theorems. Numerical examples related to the step flow problems in L -shape domain are presented.

Key word: Navier-Stokes equation, nonconvex polygonal domains, step flow

1 Introduction

In the present paper, we consider a numerical method to verify the existence and the local uniqueness of solutions for the following stationary Navier-Stokes equations:

$$\begin{aligned} -\nu\Delta u + (u \cdot \nabla)u + \nabla p &= 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \operatorname{div} u &= 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u &= g & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

where u and p are the velocity vector and the pressure, respectively. Assume that Ω is a nonconvex polygonal domain in \mathbf{R}^2 . In addition, g is a given boundary vector function and $\nu > 0$ is a viscosity coefficient.

1.1 Motivation

The problem (1.1) is considered in [1]. For L -shaped domains, the equation (1.1) is known as a mathematical model for the step flow problems. From the theoretical point of view on the reliability of numerical computations, it is important to give a mathematically rigorous a posteriori error analysis for the approximate solutions of the flow. However, the equation (1.1) is also known as the difficult problem because of the singularity which is influenced by the reentrant corner. Thus, our purpose in this paper is to find an exact solution of (1.1) and clarify its behavior using a computer-assisted proof and some mathematical techniques.

In [9], there already exists a similar work for the convex domain in which the error estimates are more easily given. They use a method that consists of two procedures; one is a finite dimensional Newton-like iterative process, the other is the computation of the error caused by the gap between the finite and infinite dimension in each iterative procedure. In general, the method for the finite dimensional part utilizes a kind of interval Newton method; and it has been recently observed that in the case of having the term with a first order derivative ∇u , this iterative process sometimes fails due to the divergence of the interval computations. In order to overcome this difficulty, in [5], some improvements are considered, which adopts a

technique with direct estimation of the norm for the inverse of a matrix corresponding to the linearized operator, instead of solving an interval system of equations for the finite dimensional part. Moreover, in [4], some further extended techniques are presented to develop an infinite dimensional Newton-like method for the second order elliptic problems.

In this paper, according to the analogous arguments to that in [4], which is a modified version of one of the authors' method (*cf.* [2][3] etc.), we present a guaranteed estimates of the inverse of linearized operator for the Navier-Stokes equation (1.1) to get a verification condition based on the infinite dimensional Newton-like procedure. On the other hand, Plum's method which is also well known to verify the solutions for nonlinear elliptic boundary value problems [7][8], would also be applicable, provided that it is possible to bound the eigenvalues for linearized operator corresponding to (1.1). However, this eigenvalue bounding process for the present case seems to be quite complicated.

In order to apply the method in [4], in general to use Nakao's method, it is necessary to obtain the constructive a priori error estimate between a function and its appropriate projections. Namely, for example, when we denote the H_0^1 -projection as P_h , it is necessary to determine the constant C numerically in the a priori error estimate of the form:

$$\|v - P_h v\|_{H_0^1} \leq C \|\Delta v\|_{L^2},$$

where C depends on the mesh size h of the finite element space such that $C \rightarrow 0$ as $h \rightarrow 0$. This constant is naturally dependent on the regularity of solutions for the Poisson equation with homogeneous boundary conditions. For example, it implies that $C = O(h)$, if Ω is a convex domain. However, the order of magnitude decreases for nonconvex polygonal domains, that is, $C \approx O(h^{2/3})$, if Ω is the L -shaped domain. When we apply our method, it is essential and important to determine the above constant as small as possible. However, for nonconvex polygons, this task is usually not so easy but very hard by only theoretical considerations. As one of the computational approaches by some guaranteed numerical computations, Yamamoto and one of authors presented a computational method to get the explicit constant [10], which will be used in Section 4 in this paper.

In the following section, we define the Stokes projection and describe its constructive error estimates. The invertibility conditions of linearized operator and the norm estimation procedure for its inverse are considered in Section 3, which play an essential role in the verification by the infinite dimensional Newton-like method. In Section 4, we mention about the actual verification procedure for solutions of the nonlinear Navier-Stokes problem (1.1). Some verification examples of the step flow problem are presented in the last section.

1.2 Notations

We denote the usual k -th order Sobolev space on Ω by $H^k(\Omega)$ and define $(\cdot, \cdot)_0$ as the L^2 inner product. We also define the following Sobolev spaces as usual:

$$\begin{aligned} H_0^1(\Omega) &\equiv \{v \in H^1(\Omega) ; v = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega\}, \\ L_0^2(\Omega) &\equiv \{q \in L^2(\Omega) ; (q, 1)_0 = 0\}, \end{aligned}$$

and set $X \equiv (H_0^1(\Omega))^2$, $Y \equiv L_0^2(\Omega)$, $X(\Delta) \equiv \{v \in X ; \Delta v \in (L^2(\Omega))^2\}$. Moreover, we denote that

$$\begin{aligned} V_0 &= \{v \in X ; \operatorname{div} v = 0\}, \\ V_\perp &= \{v_\perp \in X ; (\nabla v_\perp, \nabla v)_0 = 0, \forall v \in V_0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, we have $X = V_0 \oplus V_\perp$, where the orthogonality means in H_0^1 sense.

For $v \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, we also define the H_0^1 -norm by $\|v\|_{H_0^1} \equiv (\nabla v, \nabla v)_0^{1/2}$. And, $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes the duality pairing between X and X' which is the dual space of X . Moreover, $X_h \subset X$ and $Y_h \subset Y$ denote finite element subspaces which depend on the mesh size h .

2 The constructive a priori and a posteriori error estimations

In this section, we show the constructive a priori and a posteriori error estimations for the Stokes equation. These estimates are essentially presented in [6], so we show some modifications for our present purpose.

For each $v \in X$, we define the H_0^1 -projection $P_h v \in X_h$ by

$$(\nabla(v - P_h v), \nabla \phi_h)_0 = 0, \quad \forall \phi_h \in X_h,$$

where we used the same notation $(\cdot, \cdot)_0$ for vector functions as the L^2 inner product for scalar case. Further, we assume the following a priori error estimates.

Assumption 1 *For an arbitrary $v \in X(\Delta)$, there exists a constant $C(h)$ depending on h such that*

$$\|v - P_h v\|_{H_0^1} \leq C(h) \|\Delta v\|_{L^2}.$$

Here, $C(h)$ has to be numerically determined.

Notice that Assumption 1 is equivalent to the following inequality:

$$\|v - P_h v\|_{L^2} \leq C(h) \|v - P_h v\|_{H_0^1}.$$

We first refer the following well known result.

Lemma 2 (*Babuška-Aziz*) *For all $q \in Y$, there exists a unique $v_\perp \in V_\perp$ such that*

$$\operatorname{div} v_\perp = q, \quad \|v_\perp\|_{H_0^1} \leq \beta \|q\|_{L^2},$$

where $\beta > 0$ is a constant depending on Ω .

Now, we define the following functionals.

$$\mathcal{X}(u, p) \equiv \sup_{v \in X} \frac{\nu(\nabla u, \nabla v)_0 - (p, \operatorname{div} v)_0}{\|v\|_{H_0^1}}, \quad \mathcal{Y}(u) \equiv \sup_{q \in Y} \frac{(q, \operatorname{div} u)_0}{\|q\|_{L^2}}.$$

Then, we have the following result.

Theorem 3 *For an arbitrary $(u, p) \in X \times Y$, it implies that*

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{H_0^1} &\leq \frac{1}{\nu} \left[\left(\mathcal{X}(u, p) \right)^2 + \left(\nu \beta \mathcal{Y}(u) \right)^2 \right]^{1/2}, \\ \|p\|_{L^2} &\leq \beta \mathcal{X}(u, p) + \nu \beta^2 \mathcal{Y}(u). \end{aligned}$$

Proof : First, for an arbitrary $u \in X$, we decompose it as $u = u_0 \oplus u_\perp \in V_0 \oplus V_\perp$. Then, we have

$$\mathcal{X}(u, p) \geq \sup_{v \in V_0} \frac{\nu(\nabla u, \nabla v)_0 - (p, \operatorname{div} v)_0}{\|v\|_{H_0^1}} = \sup_{v \in V_0} \frac{\nu(\nabla u_0, \nabla v)_0}{\|v\|_{H_0^1}} = \nu \|u_0\|_{H_0^1}.$$

Also by Lemma 2, we have

$$\mathcal{Y}(u) \geq \frac{1}{\beta} \|u_\perp\|_{H_0^1}.$$

Thus the first part of the theorem is obtained.

Next, for $(u, p) \in X \times Y$, from Lemma 2, there exists $v_\perp \in V_\perp$ satisfying $\operatorname{div} v_\perp = -p$. Setting $q \in Y$ as $q = K \cdot \operatorname{div} u_\perp$, where $K = \frac{\nu(\nabla u_\perp, \nabla v_\perp)_0}{\|\operatorname{div} u_\perp\|_{L^2}^2}$, it implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \|p\|_{L^2}^2 &= \nu(\nabla u_\perp, \nabla v_\perp)_0 + \|p\|_{L^2}^2 - (q, \operatorname{div} u_\perp)_0 \\ &= \|v_\perp\|_{H_0^1} \frac{\nu(\nabla u_\perp, \nabla v_\perp)_0 - (p, \operatorname{div} v_\perp)_0}{\|v_\perp\|_{H_0^1}} - \|q\|_{L^2} \frac{(q, \operatorname{div} u_\perp)_0}{\|q\|_{L^2}} \\ &\leq \|v_\perp\|_{H_0^1} \mathcal{X}(u, p) + \|q\|_{L^2} \mathcal{Y}(u). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|q\|_{L^2} = K \|\operatorname{div} u_\perp\|_{L^2} &= \frac{\nu(\nabla u_\perp, \nabla v_\perp)_0}{\|\operatorname{div} u_\perp\|_{L^2}} \\ &\leq \frac{\nu \|u_\perp\|_{H_0^1} \|v_\perp\|_{H_0^1}}{\|\operatorname{div} u_\perp\|_{L^2}} \\ &\leq \nu \beta^2 \|p\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

From $\|v_\perp\|_{H_0^1} \leq \beta \|\operatorname{div} v_\perp\|_{L^2}$, we obtain the second result. Therefore, this proof is completed. \blacksquare

Now, let define the map $\mathcal{B} : X \times Y \longrightarrow X' \times Y$ by $\mathcal{B}(u, p) \equiv (S(u, p), -\operatorname{div} u)$, where $S(u, p) \equiv -\nu \Delta u + \nabla p$ for $(u, p) \in X \times Y$. Then, for an arbitrary $(u, p) \in X \times Y$, we define the \mathcal{Q}_h -projection $\mathcal{Q}_h(u, p) \equiv (u_h, p_h) \in X_h \times Y_h$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(\nabla(u - u_h), \nabla v_h)_0 - (p - p_h, \operatorname{div} v_h)_0 &= 0, \quad \forall v_h \in X_h, \\ -(\operatorname{div}(u - u_h), q_h)_0 &= 0, \quad \forall q_h \in Y_h. \end{aligned}$$

Then, we have the following main result of this section.

Theorem 4 *Let $(u, p) \in V_0 \times Y$ and let $(u_h, p_h) \in X_h \times Y_h$ be the \mathcal{Q}_h -projection of (u, p) . We assume that $S(u, p) \in (L^2(\Omega))^2$ and that there exist constants η and σ satisfying*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla p_h\|_{L^2} &\leq \eta \|S(u, p)\|_{L^2}, \\ \|\operatorname{div} u_h\|_{L^2} &\leq \sigma \|S(u, p)\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, we have the following a priori error estimations.

$$\begin{aligned} \|u - u_h\|_{H_0^1} &\leq \nu^{-1} E_u(h) \|S(u, p)\|_{L^2}, \\ \|p - p_h\|_{L^2} &\leq E_p(h) \|S(u, p)\|_{L^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where $E_u(h) := \left[\left(C(h)(1 + \eta) \right)^2 + (\nu\beta\sigma)^2 \right]^{1/2}$ and $E_p(h) := C(h)(1 + \eta)\beta + \nu\beta^2\sigma$. Here, the constant β is defined in Lemma 2.

Moreover, defining, as in [6], $\bar{\nabla} u_h \in (X_h)^2$ and $\bar{\Delta} u_h \equiv \nabla \cdot \bar{\nabla} u_h$, where $\bar{\nabla} u_h$ is determined by

$$(\bar{\nabla} u_h, \mathbf{v}_h)_0 = (\nabla u_h, \mathbf{v}_h)_0, \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{v}_h \in (X_h)^2.$$

Then, we have the following a posteriori error estimations.

$$\begin{aligned} \|u - u_h\|_{H_0^1} &\leq \frac{1}{\nu} \left[\left(C(h)K_1 + \nu K_2 \right)^2 + \left(\nu\beta K_3 \right)^2 \right]^{1/2}, \\ \|p - p_h\|_{L^2} &\leq \beta \left(C(h)K_1 + \nu K_2 \right) + \nu\beta^2 K_3, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\|u - u_h\|_{L^2} \leq E(h)\|u - u_h\|_{H_0^1} + \sigma\|p - p_h\|_{L^2}, \quad (2.1)$$

where $E(h) := E_u(h) + E_p(h)$ and the constants K_i , ($1 \leq i \leq 3$) are defined as

$$K_1 \equiv \|S(u, p) + \nu\bar{\Delta}u_h - \nabla p_h\|_{L^2}, \quad K_2 \equiv \|\bar{\nabla}u_h - \nabla u_h\|_{H_0^1}, \quad K_3 \equiv \|\operatorname{div} u_h\|_{L^2}.$$

Proof : First, from the property of the \mathcal{Q}_h -projection, i.e., $\nu(\nabla(u - u_h), \nabla v_h)_0 - (p - p_h, \operatorname{div} v_h)_0 = 0$ for all $v_h \in X_h$, it implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{X}(u - u_h, p - p_h) &= \sup_{v \in X} \frac{\nu(\nabla(u - u_h), \nabla(v - P_h v))_0 - (p - p_h, \operatorname{div}(v - P_h v))_0}{\|v\|_{H_0^1}} \\ &= \sup_{v \in X} \frac{(-\nu\Delta u + \nabla p - \nabla p_h, v - P_h v)_0}{\|v\|_{H_0^1}} \\ &\leq C(h)\|S(u, p) - \nabla p_h\|_{L^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

where we have used the fact $\|v - P_h v\|_{L^2} \leq C(h)\|v - P_h v\|_{H_0^1} \leq C(h)\|v\|_{H_0^1}$.

Next, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Y}(u - u_h) &= \sup_{q \in Y} \frac{(q, \operatorname{div} u_h)_0}{\|q\|_{L^2}} \\ &\leq \|\operatorname{div} u_h\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

Hence, using assumptions of this theorem, we have the following estimations.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{X}(u - u_h, p - p_h) &\leq C(h)(1 + \eta)\|S(u, p)\|_{L^2}, \\ \mathcal{Y}(u - u_h) &\leq \sigma\|S(u, p)\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining these inequalities with Theorem 3, we obtain the desired a priori estimates.

Now, from the fact that $(\nabla u_h, \nabla(v - P_h v))_0 = 0$ and $(\bar{\nabla}u_h, \nabla\phi)_0 = (-\bar{\Delta}u_h, \phi)_0$ for $\phi \in X$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{X}(u - u_h, p - p_h) &= \sup_{v \in X} \frac{(-\nu\Delta u + \nabla p - \nabla p_h, v - P_h v)_0 - \nu(\nabla u_h, \nabla(v - P_h v))_0}{\|v\|_{H_0^1}} \\ &= \sup_{v \in X} \frac{(S(u, p) + \nu\bar{\Delta}u_h - \nabla p_h, v - P_h v)_0 + \nu(\bar{\nabla}u_h - \nabla u_h, \nabla(v - P_h v))_0}{\|v\|_{H_0^1}} \\ &\leq C(h)\|S(u, p) + \nu\bar{\Delta}u_h - \nabla p_h\|_{L^2} + \nu\|\bar{\nabla}u_h - \nabla u_h\|_{H_0^1}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

Thus, we obtain the a posteriori error estimates for the \mathcal{Q}_h -projection by (2.3) and (2.4).

We now finally present the L^2 -estimation of $u - u_h$.

For $(u - u_h, 0) \in X \times L^2(\Omega)$, we consider the following Stokes equation.

$$\text{Find } (v, q) \in X \times Y \text{ such that } \mathcal{B}(v, q) = (u - u_h, 0) \text{ in } \Omega.$$

From the property of the \mathcal{Q}_h -projection, setting $(v_h, q_h) := \mathcal{Q}_h(v, q)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|u - u_h\|_{L^2}^2 &= (u - u_h, u - u_h)_0 \\ &= (-\nu\Delta v + \nabla q, u - u_h)_0 \\ &= \nu(\nabla v, \nabla(u - u_h))_0 - (q, \operatorname{div}(u - u_h))_0 \\ &= \nu(\nabla(v - v_h), \nabla(u - u_h))_0 + (p - p_h, \operatorname{div} v_h)_0 - (q - q_h, \operatorname{div}(u - u_h))_0 \\ &\leq \nu\|v - v_h\|_{H_0^1}\|u - u_h\|_{H_0^1} + \|p - p_h\|_{L^2}\|\operatorname{div} v_h\|_{L^2} + \|q - q_h\|_{L^2}\|\operatorname{div} u_h\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, using the a priori error estimation and the assumption of this theorem, this proof is completed from Theorem 3 and the fact that $\|\operatorname{div} u_h\|_{L^2} = \|\operatorname{div} (u - u_h)\|_{L^2} \leq \|u - u_h\|_{H_0^1}$. ■

If $S(u, p)$ does not belong to L^2 space, then we have the following estimates, which is readily seen by the similar arguments in the above theorem.

Corollary 5 *Let $(u, p) \in V_0 \times Y$ and let $(u_h, p_h) \in X_h \times Y_h$ be \mathcal{Q}_h -projection of (u, p) . We assume that $S(u, p) \in X'$ and there exist constants $\hat{\eta}$ and $\hat{\sigma}$ satisfying*

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla p_h\|_{L^2} &\leq \hat{\eta} \|S(u, p)\|_{H^{-1}}, \\ \|\operatorname{div} u_h\|_{L^2} &\leq \hat{\sigma} \|S(u, p)\|_{H^{-1}}.\end{aligned}$$

Then, we have the following estimations.

$$\begin{aligned}\|u - u_h\|_{H_0^1} &\leq \nu^{-1} e_u \|S(u, p)\|_{H^{-1}}, \\ \|p - p_h\|_{L^2} &\leq e_p \|S(u, p)\|_{H^{-1}},\end{aligned}$$

where $e_u = \left[\left(1 + C(h)\hat{\eta}\right)^2 + (\nu\beta\hat{\sigma})^2 \right]^{1/2}$ and $e_p = \left(1 + C(h)\hat{\eta}\right)\beta + \nu\beta^2\hat{\sigma}$. But, we define the H^{-1} -norm by

$$\|S(u, p)\|_{H^{-1}} \equiv \sup_{\phi \in X} \frac{\langle S(u, p), \phi \rangle}{\|\phi\|_{H_0^1}}.$$

Notice that by some simple calculations, in Corollary 5, it is always taken as $e_u = 2$, because of $\|u\|_{H_0^1} \leq \nu^{-1} \|S(u, p)\|_{H^{-1}}$ and $\|u_h\|_{H_0^1} \leq \nu^{-1} \|S(u, p)\|_{H^{-1}}$ if $(u, p) \in V_0 \times Y$.

3 Computable verification method for the inverse of the linearized operator

In this section, we describe a numerical method to prove the invertibility of the following linear operator and estimate the norm of the inverse.

The linearized Navier-Stokes equation with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions can be written as

$$\text{Find } (u, p) \in X \times Y \text{ such that } \mathcal{L}(u, p) \equiv \mathcal{B}(u, p) + \Psi(u, p) = (f, 0) \text{ in } \Omega, \quad (3.1)$$

where Ψ is a linear operator in u such that $\Psi(u, p) := (\Phi u, 0)$ with $\Phi u := (c \cdot \nabla)u + (u \cdot \nabla)c$ and $(f, 0) \in X' \times L^2(\Omega)$. Here, we assume that $c \in (W_\infty^1(\Omega))^2$.

3.1 The invertibility condition of the operator \mathcal{L}

First, note that the invertibility of a linear operator \mathcal{L} defined in (3.1) is equivalent to the unique solvability of the fixed point equation:

$$\begin{aligned}z &= \mathcal{A}z \\ &\equiv \mathcal{B}^{-1}\Psi z,\end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

where $z = (u, p)$ and \mathcal{A} a compact operator on $X \times Y$.

Now, according to the verification principle presented in [4], we numerically formulate a sufficient invertibility condition in numerically. As the preliminary, we define the several matrices as follows:

Namely, $N \times N$ matrices $\mathbf{F} = (\mathbf{F}_{i,j})$, $\mathbf{A} = (\mathbf{A}_{i,j})$, $M \times N$ matrix $\mathbf{B} = (\mathbf{B}_{i,j})$ and $M \times M$ matrix $\mathbf{C} = (\mathbf{C}_{i,j})$ are defined by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{F}_{i,j} &= \nu(\nabla\phi_j, \nabla\phi_i)_0 + (\Phi\phi_j, \phi_i)_0 & \text{for } 1 \leq i, j \leq N, \\ \mathbf{A}_{i,j} &= (\nabla\phi_j, \nabla\phi_i)_0 & \text{for } 1 \leq i, j \leq N, \\ \mathbf{B}_{i,j} &= -(\operatorname{div} \phi_j, \psi_i)_0 & \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq M, 1 \leq j \leq N, \\ \mathbf{C}_{i,j} &= (\psi_j, \psi_i)_0 & \text{for } 1 \leq i, j \leq M,\end{aligned}$$

where $\{\phi_k\}_{k=1}^N$ and $\{\psi_k\}_{k=1}^M$ are basis of X_h and Y_h , respectively.

Next, we define the $N + M$ square matrix \mathbf{G} by:

$$\mathbf{G} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{F} & \mathbf{B}^T \\ \mathbf{B} & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

Notice that if \mathbf{G} is nonsingular then it implies that \mathbf{F} and $\mathbf{S} := \mathbf{B}\mathbf{F}^{-1}\mathbf{B}^T$ are also nonsingular and we can write an inverse matrix by

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{F} & \mathbf{B}^T \\ \mathbf{B} & 0 \end{bmatrix}^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{F}^{-1} - \mathbf{F}^{-1}\mathbf{B}^T\mathbf{S}^{-1}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{F}^{-1} & \mathbf{F}^{-1}\mathbf{B}^T\mathbf{S}^{-1} \\ \mathbf{S}^{-1}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{F}^{-1} & -\mathbf{S}^{-1} \end{bmatrix} =: \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{G}_1 & \mathbf{G}_3 \\ \mathbf{G}_2 & \mathbf{G}_4 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let \mathbf{L} and \mathbf{M} be a lower triangular matrices satisfying the Cholesky decomposition: $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{L}\mathbf{L}^T$ and $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{M}\mathbf{M}^T$, respectively. And, we denote the matrix norm induced from the Euclidean 2-norm by $\|\cdot\|_E$. Also, we define the following constants:

$$K_c := \| |c|_E \|_{L^\infty}, \quad K_{\operatorname{div} c} := \|\operatorname{div} c\|_{L^\infty}, \quad K_{\nabla c} := \| |\nabla c|_E \|_{L^\infty}, \quad K_{\partial c} := (\|\partial_i c \cdot \partial_j c\|_{L^2}^2)_F^{1/4},$$

where $\| |\nabla c|_E \|_{L^\infty}$ and matrix $\|\partial_i c \cdot \partial_j c\|_{L^2}$ mean that $\| (\sum_i |\nabla c_i|_E^2)^{1/2} \|_{L^\infty}$ and $\|\partial c / \partial x_i \cdot \partial c / \partial x_j\|_{L^2}$, respectively. Here, $\|\cdot\|_{L^\infty}$ and $(\cdot)_F$ denote the L^∞ -norm on Ω and the matrix Frobenius norm, respectively.

By some simple calculations, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 6 *For $u, v, w \in X$, it implies that*

$$\begin{aligned}\|(u \cdot \nabla)v\|_{L^2} &\leq \| |u|_E \|_{L^\infty} \|v\|_{H_0^1} & \text{if } u \in X_h, \\ \|(u \cdot \nabla)v\|_{L^2} &\leq \|u\|_{L^2} \| |\nabla v|_E \|_{L^\infty} & \text{if } v \in X_h, \\ \|(u \cdot \nabla)v\|_{L^2} &\leq C_{L^4} \|u\|_{H_0^1} (\|\partial_i v \cdot \partial_j v\|_{L^2}^2)_F^{1/4} & \text{if } v \in X_h.\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned}((u \cdot \nabla)v, w)_0 &\leq \left(\| |u|_E \|_{L^\infty} \|w\|_{H_0^1} + \|\operatorname{div} u\|_{L^\infty} \|w\|_{L^2} \right) \|v\|_{L^2} & \text{if } u \in X_h, \\ ((u \cdot \nabla)v, w)_0 &\leq \left(\|u\|_{H_0^1} \|w\|_{L^2} + \|u\|_{L^2} \|w\|_{H_0^1} \right) \| |v|_E \|_{L^\infty} & \text{if } v \in X_h, \\ < (u \cdot \nabla)v, w > &\leq C_{L^4}^2 \|u\|_{H_0^1} \|v\|_{H_0^1} \|w\|_{H_0^1},\end{aligned}$$

where C_{L^4} is a constant such that $\|\phi\|_{L^4} \leq C_{L^4} \|\phi\|_{H_0^1}$ for all $\phi \in H_0^1(\Omega)$.

We now have the following main result of this paper.

Theorem 7 *For the constants defined above, if \mathbf{G} is nonsingular and*

$$\kappa \equiv \frac{1}{\nu} E_u(h) (M_u C_1 C_2 + C_2) < 1$$

holds then the operator \mathcal{L} defined in (3.1) is invertible. Here, $M_u \equiv \|\mathbf{L}^T \mathbf{G}_1 \mathbf{L}\|_E$ and $E_u(h)$ is the a priori constant in Theorem 4. And, the constants C_1 and C_2 are given by

$$C_1 = 3C_{\operatorname{Poin}} K_c, \quad C_2 = K_c + C_{L^4} K_{\partial c},$$

where C_{Poin} is a Poincaré constant such that $\|\phi\|_{L^2} \leq C_{\operatorname{Poin}} \|\phi\|_{H_0^1}$ for all $\phi \in H_0^1(\Omega)$.

Proof : First, we usually decompose the equation $u = \mathcal{A}u$ as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{Q}_h z &= \mathcal{Q}_h \mathcal{A}z \\ (I - \mathcal{Q}_h)z &= (I - \mathcal{Q}_h)\mathcal{A}z\end{aligned}$$

where I implies the identity map on $X \times Y$.

Next, according to the same formulation to that in [4], we define two operators by

$$\mathcal{N}_h z \equiv \mathcal{Q}_h z - [I - \mathcal{A}]_h^{-1} \mathcal{Q}_h (I - \mathcal{A})z$$

and

$$\mathcal{T}z \equiv \mathcal{N}_h z + (I - \mathcal{Q}_h)\mathcal{A}z,$$

respectively, where $[I - \mathcal{A}]_h^{-1}$ means the inverse of $\mathcal{Q}_h(I - \mathcal{A})|_{X_h \times Y_h} : X_h \times Y_h \rightarrow X_h \times Y_h$.

Now, for positive vectors $\alpha = (\alpha_u, \alpha_p)$ and $\gamma = (\gamma_u, \gamma_p)$, we define the candidate set $Z = Z_h \oplus Z_* \subset X \times Y$ which possibly encloses the solution of (3.2). Here, Z_h and Z_* are taken as

$$\begin{aligned}Z_h &:= \{z_h \in X_h \times Y_h ; [\|z_h\|] \leq \gamma\}, \\ Z_* &:= \{z_* \in (X_h \times Y_h)^\perp ; [\|z_*\|] \leq \alpha\},\end{aligned}$$

where $(\cdot)^\perp$ means the orthogonal complement in the sense of Q_h -projection, that is $z_* \in Z_* \Rightarrow Q_h z_* = 0$. Also denote $[\|z\|] \equiv (\|u\|_{H_0^1}, \|p\|_{L^2})$ for $z = (u, p) \in X \times Y$ and the inequality stands for elementwise.

Then, by the fact that $z = \mathcal{A}z$ is equivalent to $z = \mathcal{T}z$. In order to prove the unique existence of a solution to (3.2) in the set Z , it suffices to show $[\|\mathcal{T}\|] < 1$ for any kind of norm $[\|\cdot\|]$ in $X \times Y$. This fact follows by Banach's fixed point theorem from the linearity of the equation.

Further notice that a sufficient condition can be written as

$$[\|\mathcal{N}_h Z\|] \equiv \sup_{z \in Z} [\|\mathcal{N}_h z\|] < \gamma \quad (3.3)$$

and

$$[\|(I - \mathcal{Q}_h)\mathcal{A}Z\|] \equiv \sup_{z \in Z} [\|(I - \mathcal{Q}_h)\mathcal{A}z\|] < \alpha. \quad (3.4)$$

Therefore, by using constants defined above, we try to estimate norms $[\|\mathcal{N}_h z\|]$ and $[\|(I - \mathcal{Q}_h)\mathcal{A}z\|]$ in (3.3) and (3.4), respectively.

First, for an arbitrary $z = z_h + z_* \in Z_h + Z_*$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{N}_h z &= z_h - [I - \mathcal{A}]_h^{-1} \mathcal{Q}_h (I - \mathcal{A})(z_h + z_*) \\ &= [I - \mathcal{A}]_h^{-1} \mathcal{Q}_h \mathcal{A}z_*.\end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

We now set $(w_h^u, w_h^p) := \mathcal{N}_h z$, which means

$$\begin{aligned}\nu(\nabla w_h^u, \nabla v_h)_0 + (\Phi w_h^u, v_h)_0 - (w_h^p, \operatorname{div} v_h)_0 &= (-\Phi u_*, v_h)_0, \\ -(\operatorname{div} w_h^u, q_h)_0 &= 0,\end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

for all $v_h \in X_h$, $q_h \in Y_h$. Here, we choose $w := \Delta^{-1} \Phi u_* \in X$. Since the right-hand side of (3.6) satisfies

$$(-\Phi u_*, v_h)_0 = (\nabla w, \nabla v_h)_0 = (\nabla P_h w, \nabla v_h)_0,$$

we can obtain the following matrix linear equation:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{F} & \mathbf{B}^T \\ \mathbf{B} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \overline{w_h^u} \\ \overline{w_h^p} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \overline{w_h} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\overline{w_h^u} = (w_1^u, w_2^u, \dots, w_N^u)^T$, $\overline{w_h^p} = (w_1^p, w_2^p, \dots, w_M^p)^T$ and $\overline{w_h} = (w_1, w_2, \dots, w_N)^T$ are coefficient vectors of w_h^u , w_h^p and $w_h \equiv P_h w$, respectively, which are set as

$$w_h^u := \sum_{i=1}^N w_i^u \phi_i, \quad w_h^p := \sum_{i=1}^M w_i^p \psi_i, \quad w_h := \sum_{i=1}^N w_i \phi_i.$$

Therefore, it implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{bmatrix} \|w_h^u\|_{H_0^1} \\ \|w_h^p\|_{L^2} \end{bmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix} \|\mathbf{L}^T \overline{w_h^u}\|_E \\ \|\mathbf{M}^T \overline{w_h^p}\|_E \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \|(\mathbf{L}^T \mathbf{G}_1 \mathbf{L})(\mathbf{L}^T \overline{w_h})\|_E \\ \|(\mathbf{M}^T \mathbf{G}_2 \mathbf{L})(\mathbf{L}^T \overline{w_h})\|_E \end{bmatrix} \\ &\leq \begin{bmatrix} \|\mathbf{L}^T \mathbf{G}_1 \mathbf{L}\|_E \|\mathbf{L}^T \overline{w_h}\|_E \\ \|\mathbf{M}^T \mathbf{G}_2 \mathbf{L}\|_E \|\mathbf{L}^T \overline{w_h}\|_E \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \|\mathbf{L}^T \mathbf{G}_1 \mathbf{L}\|_E \|w_h\|_{H_0^1} \\ \|\mathbf{M}^T \mathbf{G}_2 \mathbf{L}\|_E \|w_h\|_{H_0^1} \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

So, we can obtain the following estimations.

$$\|w_h^u\|_{H_0^1} \leq M_u \|w_h\|_{H_0^1}, \quad \|w_h^p\|_{L^2} \leq M_p \|w_h\|_{H_0^1}, \quad (3.7)$$

where $M_u = \|\mathbf{L}^T \mathbf{G}_1 \mathbf{L}\|_E$ and $M_p = \|\mathbf{M}^T \mathbf{G}_2 \mathbf{L}\|_E$.

From the property of the H_0^1 -projection, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_h\|_{H_0^1} &\equiv \|P_h w\|_{H_0^1} \leq \|w\|_{H_0^1} = \|\Delta^{-1} \Phi u_*\|_{H_0^1} \\ &\leq \|\Delta^{-1} (c \cdot \nabla) u_*\|_{H_0^1} + \|\Delta^{-1} (u_* \cdot \nabla) c\|_{H_0^1}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we now estimate the H_0^1 -norm of $w_1 := \Delta^{-1} (c \cdot \nabla) u_*$ and $w_2 := \Delta^{-1} (u_* \cdot \nabla) c$.

For the estimation of $\|w_1\|_{H_0^1}$, some simple calculations yields from Lemma 6 that

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_1\|_{H_0^1}^2 &= (\nabla w_1, \nabla w_1)_0 = (-\Delta w_1, w_1)_0 \\ &= -(c \cdot \nabla) u_*, w_1)_0 \\ &\leq C_{Poin} \| |c|_E \|_{L^\infty} \|u_*\|_{H_0^1} \|w_1\|_{H_0^1}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

Furthermore, for the estimation of $\|w_2\|_{H_0^1}$, by applying the similar argument to the above and using Lemma 6, we have

$$\|w_2\|_{H_0^1} \leq 2C_{Poin} \| |c|_E \|_{L^\infty} \|u_*\|_{H_0^1}. \quad (3.9)$$

Thus, by (3.7) – (3.9), we obtain the following estimate for the finite dimensional part

$$[\|\mathcal{N}_h Z\|] \leq \begin{bmatrix} M_u \\ M_p \end{bmatrix} C_1 \alpha_u, \quad (3.10)$$

where $C_1 \equiv 3C_{Poin} K_c$.

For $z \in Z$, from Theorem 4 and Lemma 6, it implies that

$$[\|(I - \mathcal{Q}_h) \mathcal{A} z\|] \leq \begin{bmatrix} \nu^{-1} E_u(h) \\ E_p(h) \end{bmatrix} C_2 (\gamma_u + \alpha_u),$$

where $C_2 \equiv K_c + C_{L^4} K_{\partial c}$.

Therefore, the invertibility condition follows:

$$\begin{aligned} M_u C_1 \alpha_u &< \gamma_u, \\ M_p C_1 \alpha_u &< \gamma_p, \\ \nu^{-1} E_u(h) C_2 (\gamma_u + \alpha_u) &< \alpha_u, \\ E_p(h) C_2 (\gamma_u + \alpha_u) &< \alpha_p. \end{aligned}$$

Here, the second and fourth conditions of the above can always be valid provided that γ_p and α_p are suitable chosen. Therefore, we only consider the condition:

$$\begin{aligned} M_u C_1 \alpha_u &< \gamma_u, \\ \nu^{-1} E_u(h) C_2 (\gamma_u + \alpha_u) &< \alpha_u. \end{aligned}$$

And, it is readily seen that this inequality is equivalent to

$$\frac{1}{\nu} E_u(h) C_2 (M_u C_1 C_2 + C_2) < 1.$$

Thus, the proof is completed. ■

3.2 The norm estimation

In this subsection, we show the a priori estimates for the solution of the linear equation (3.1).

Theorem 8 *Under the same assumptions in Theorem 7, provided that $\kappa < 1$ and let $z = (u, p) \in X \times Y$ be a unique solution for the linear equation (3.1), that is, $\mathcal{L}z = (f, 0)$ for $(f, 0) \in X' \times L^2(\Omega)$. Then, we have the following estimations:*

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{H_0^1} &\leq \mathcal{M}_u^* \|f\|_{H^{-1}}, \\ \|p\|_{L^2} &\leq \mathcal{M}_p^* \|f\|_{H^{-1}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{M}_u^* \equiv \tau_1^* + \tau_2^*$, $\mathcal{M}_p^* \equiv \tau_3^* + \tau_4^*$ and the constants τ_i^* ($1 \leq i \leq 4$) are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_1^* &= \frac{1}{\nu} (M_u E_u(h) C_2 + e_u) / (1 - \kappa), & \tau_2^* &= M_u (C_1 \tau_1^* + 1), \\ \tau_3^* &= M_p (C_1 \tau_1^* + 1), & \tau_4^* &= E_p(h) C_2 (\tau_1^* + \tau_2^*) + e_p. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, if $f \in (L^2(\Omega))^2$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{H_0^1} &\leq \mathcal{M}_u \|f\|_{L^2}, \\ \|p\|_{L^2} &\leq \mathcal{M}_p \|f\|_{L^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{M}_u \equiv \tau_1 + \tau_2$, $\mathcal{M}_p \equiv \tau_3 + \tau_4$ and the constants τ_i ($1 \leq i \leq 4$) are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_1 &= \frac{1}{\nu} E_u(h) (M_u C_2 C_{Poin} + 1) / (1 - \kappa), & \tau_2 &= M_u (C_1 \tau_1 + C_{Poin}), \\ \tau_3 &= M_p (C_1 \tau_1 + C_{Poin}), & \tau_4 &= E_p(h) (C_2 (\tau_1 + \tau_2) + 1). \end{aligned}$$

Proof : For any $f \in X'$, define $(\varphi_u, \varphi_p) \equiv \mathcal{B}^{-1}(f, 0) \in X \times Y$. Then, by the Fredholm alternative theorem, the invertibility of $(I - \mathcal{A})$ implies that there exists a unique element $z \in X \times Y$ satisfying $(I - \mathcal{A})z = (\varphi_u, \varphi_p)$. When we set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}_h z &:= \mathcal{Q}_h z - [I - \mathcal{A}]_h^{-1} \mathcal{Q}_h ((I - \mathcal{A})z - (\varphi_u, \varphi_p)), \\ \mathcal{T} z &:= \mathcal{N}_h z + (I - \mathcal{Q}_h)(\mathcal{A}z + (\varphi_u, \varphi_p)), \end{aligned}$$

notice that $(I - \mathcal{A})z = (\varphi_u, \varphi_p)$ is equivalent to $\mathcal{T}z = z$. Using the decomposition $z = z_h + z_*$ with $z_h \equiv \mathcal{Q}_h z$ and $z_* \equiv z - \mathcal{Q}_h z$, by some simple calculations, we have

$$\begin{aligned} z_h &= [I - \mathcal{A}]_h^{-1} (\mathcal{Q}_h \mathcal{A} z_* + \mathcal{Q}_h (\varphi_u, \varphi_p)), \\ z_* &= (I - \mathcal{Q}_h) \mathcal{A} (z_h + z_*) + (I - \mathcal{Q}_h) (\varphi_u, \varphi_p). \end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

Hence, taking the estimates in the proof of Theorem 7 and letting $\varphi = \Delta^{-1}f$, we have by (3.11)

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{bmatrix} \|u_h\|_{H_0^1} \\ \|p_h\|_{L^2} \end{bmatrix} &\leq \begin{bmatrix} M_u \\ M_p \end{bmatrix} (C_1 \|u_*\|_{H_0^1} + \|P_h \varphi\|_{H_0^1}) \\ &\leq \begin{bmatrix} M_u \\ M_p \end{bmatrix} (C_1 \|u_*\|_{H_0^1} + \|f\|_{H^{-1}}), \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{bmatrix} \|u_*\|_{H_0^1} \\ \|p_*\|_{L^2} \end{bmatrix} &\leq \begin{bmatrix} \nu^{-1} E_u(h) \\ E_p(h) \end{bmatrix} C_2 (\|u_h\|_{H_0^1} + \|u_*\|_{H_0^1}) + [\|(I - \mathcal{Q}_h)\mathcal{B}^{-1}(f, 0)\|] \\ &\leq \begin{bmatrix} \nu^{-1} E_u(h) \\ E_p(h) \end{bmatrix} C_2 (\|u_h\|_{H_0^1} + \|u_*\|_{H_0^1}) + \begin{bmatrix} \nu^{-1} e_u \\ e_p \end{bmatrix} \|f\|_{H^{-1}}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

Substituting the estimate of $\|u_h\|_{H_0^1}$ in (3.12) into the last right-hand side of (3.13) and solving it with respect to $\|u_*\|_{H_0^1}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_*\|_{H_0^1} &= \frac{1}{\nu} (M_u E_u(h) C_2 + e_u) \|f\|_{H^{-1}} / (1 - \kappa) \\ &= \tau_1^* \|f\|_{H^{-1}}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

Thus, we also have by (3.12)

$$\begin{bmatrix} \|u_h\|_{H_0^1} \\ \|p_h\|_{L^2} \end{bmatrix} \leq \begin{bmatrix} M_u \\ M_p \end{bmatrix} (C_1 \tau_1^* + 1) \|f\|_{H^{-1}} = \begin{bmatrix} \tau_2^* \\ \tau_3^* \end{bmatrix} \|f\|_{H^{-1}}. \quad (3.15)$$

Hence, it implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \|p_*\|_{L^2} &= (E_p(h) C_2 (\tau_1^* + \tau_2^*) + e_p) \|f\|_{H^{-1}} \\ &= \tau_4^* \|f\|_{H^{-1}}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

Therefore, from (3.14) – (3.16) and $\|u\|_{H_0^1} \leq \|u_h\|_{H_0^1} + \|u_*\|_{H_0^1}$, $\|p\|_{L^2} \leq \|p_h\|_{L^2} + \|p_*\|_{L^2}$, this proof is completed. \blacksquare

4 Applications to nonlinear problems

In this section, we mention about the actual applications of the results obtained in the previous section to the verification of solutions for the stationary Navier-Stokes equation (1.1). We assume that a function $\mathbf{g} \in X(\Delta)$ satisfies $\mathbf{g} = g$ on $\partial\Omega$ and $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{g} = 0$ in Ω . Then, our original problem can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} -\nu \Delta u + ((u + \mathbf{g}) \cdot \nabla)(u + \mathbf{g}) + \nabla p &= \nu \Delta \mathbf{g} \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\ -\operatorname{div} u &= 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\ u &= 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

We transform the original stationary Navier-Stokes problem (4.1) into the so-called residual equation by using an approximate solution $(\tilde{u}_h, \tilde{p}_h) \in X_h \times Y_h$ defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(\nabla \tilde{u}_h, \nabla v_h)_0 - (\tilde{p}_h, \operatorname{div} v_h)_0 &= (\nu \Delta \mathbf{g} - f(\tilde{u}_h + \mathbf{g}), v_h)_0, \\ (-\operatorname{div} \tilde{u}_h, q_h)_0 &= 0, \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

for all $v_h \in X_h$, $q_h \in Y_h$, where $f(u) := (u \cdot \nabla)u$.

For the effective computation of the solution for (4.2) with guaranteed accuracy, refer, for example, [9] etc.

Next, we define $(\bar{u}, \bar{p}) \in X \times Y$ by the solution of the Stokes equation:

$$\mathcal{B}(\bar{u}, \bar{p}) = (\nu \Delta \mathbf{g} - f(\tilde{u}_h + \mathbf{g}), 0).$$

Further, let define residues by

$$\begin{aligned} u - \tilde{u}_h &= (u - \bar{u}) + (\bar{u} - \tilde{u}_h), & w_u &:= u - \bar{u}, & v_0 &:= \bar{u} - \tilde{u}_h, \\ p - \tilde{p}_h &= (p - \bar{p}) + (\bar{p} - \tilde{p}_h), & w_p &:= p - \bar{p}, & q_0 &:= \bar{p} - \tilde{p}_h. \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

Note that v_0 and q_0 are unknown functions but its norm can be computed by an a priori and a posteriori techniques (e.g., see [6][9][10]). Thus, concerned problem is reduced to the following residual form

Find $(w_u, w_p) \in X \times Y$ such that

$$\mathcal{B}(w_u, w_p) = (f(\tilde{u}_h + \mathbf{g}) - f(w_u + v_0 + \tilde{u}_h + \mathbf{g}), 0) \quad \text{in } \Omega. \quad (4.4)$$

In this case, letting $c := \tilde{u}_h + \mathbf{g}$, by using the map Φ defined in the previous section, we have

$$f(\tilde{u}_h + \mathbf{g}) - f(w_u + v_0 + \tilde{u}_h + \mathbf{g}) = -\Phi(w_u + v_0) - f(w_u + v_0).$$

Hence, as in (3.1), the Newton-type residual equation for (4.4) is written as:

Find $w = (w_u, w_p) \in X \times Y$ such that

$$\mathcal{L}w \equiv \mathcal{B}w + \Psi w = (-\Phi v_0 - f(w_u + v_0), 0) \quad \text{in } \Omega. \quad (4.5)$$

If \mathcal{L} is invertible, then (4.5) is rewritten as the fixed point form

$$w = F(w) \left(\equiv \mathcal{L}^{-1}(-\Phi v_0 - f(w_u + v_0), 0) \right). \quad (4.6)$$

The Newton-like operator F in (4.6) is compact on $X \times Y$ from the definition of f , and it is expected to be a contraction map on some neighborhood of zero. Therefore, we consider the candidate set $W_\alpha = W_u \times W_p$ for $\alpha = (\alpha_u, \alpha_p)$ of the form

$$\begin{aligned} W_u &\equiv \{w_u \in X ; \|w_u\|_{H_0^1} \leq \alpha_u\}, \\ W_p &\equiv \{w_p \in Y ; \|w_p\|_{L^2} \leq \alpha_p\}. \end{aligned}$$

First, for the existential condition of solutions, based on the Schauder fixed point theorem, we need to choose the set W_α so that:

$$F(W_\alpha) \subset W_\alpha. \quad (4.7)$$

And next, for the proof of local uniqueness within W_α , the following contraction property is needed:

$$[\|F(w_1) - F(w_2)\|] \leq \lambda [\|w_1 - w_2\|], \quad \forall w_1, w_2 \in W_\alpha, \quad (4.8)$$

for some constant $0 < \lambda < 1$.

Taking account that $f(w_u + v_0) \in X'$, by Theorem 8, a sufficient condition for (4.7) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} [\|F(W_\alpha)\|] &\equiv \sup_{w \in W_\alpha} [\|F(w)\|] \\ &\leq \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{M}_u \\ \mathcal{M}_p \end{bmatrix} \sup_{w_u \in W_u} \|\Phi v_0\|_{L^2} + \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{M}_u^* \\ \mathcal{M}_p^* \end{bmatrix} \sup_{w_u \in W_u} \|f(w_u + v_0)\|_{H^{-1}} \\ &\leq \alpha, \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

where $(\mathcal{M}_u, \mathcal{M}_u)$ and $(\mathcal{M}_u^*, \mathcal{M}_u^*)$ are the constants defined in Theorem 8.

Further we have the following estimates

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Phi v_0\|_{L^2} &= \|(c \cdot \nabla)v_0 + (v_0 \cdot \nabla)c\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq (K_c + C_{L^4}K_{\partial c})\|v_0\|_{H_0^1}, \\
\|f(w_u + v_0)\|_{H^{-1}} &= \|(v_0 \cdot \nabla)v_0 + (w_u \cdot \nabla)v_0 + (v_0 \cdot \nabla)w_u + (v_0 \cdot \nabla)v_0\|_{H^{-1}} \\
&\leq C_{L^4}^2 \left(\|w_u\|_{H_0^1} + \|v_0\|_{H_0^1} \right)^2 \\
&\leq C_{L^4}^2 \left(\alpha_u + \|v_0\|_{H_0^1} \right)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, we can rewrite the existential condition (4.9) as

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{M}_u^* C_{L^4}^2 \left(\alpha_u + \|v_0\|_{H_0^1} \right)^2 + \mathcal{M}_u \left(K_c + C_{L^4}K_{\partial c} \right) \|v_0\|_{H_0^1} \\ \mathcal{M}_p^* C_{L^4}^2 \left(\alpha_u + \|v_0\|_{H_0^1} \right)^2 + \mathcal{M}_p \left(K_c + C_{L^4}K_{\partial c} \right) \|v_0\|_{H_0^1} \end{bmatrix} < \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_u \\ \alpha_p \end{bmatrix}.$$

From above, we obtain the local uniqueness condition (4.8) with λ by

$$\lambda \equiv 2\mathcal{M}_u^* C_{L^4}^2 \left(\alpha_u + \|v_0\|_{H_0^1} \right) < 1.$$

5 Numerical examples

In this section, we present numerical examples for the stationary Navier-Stokes equation related to a mathematical model of the step flow problem. In such a case, it should be natural to take a domain as $\Omega = (0, A) \times (0, B) \setminus [0, a] \times [0, b]$, where the constants A, B, a and b satisfy $0 < a < A$ and $0 < b < B$.

The boundary vector function $g = (g_1, g_2)$ is given as

$$g_1 \equiv g_1(x, y) = \begin{cases} (B-y)(y-b)/(B-b)^3 & \text{if } x=0, \\ (B-y)(y-0)/(B-0)^3 & \text{if } x=A, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (5.1)$$

$g_2 \equiv g_2(x, y) = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, respectively. In particular, we choose that $A = 2, B = 1$ and $a = b = 0.5$.

Notice that the function g_1 satisfies the following relation which corresponding to the incompressibility condition.

$$\int_b^B g_1(0, y) dy = \int_0^B g_1(A, y) dy.$$

For this example, we can present a C^3 -class stream function ψ such that $\mathbf{g} = (\psi_y, -\psi_x)$ in (4.1) for the boundary vector function g in (5.1). Namely, setting functions f_{5-}, f_{5+}, f_5 and f_3 which are defined by

$$\begin{aligned}
f_3 \equiv f_3(y, k) &= -\frac{1}{6k^3}(2y - 3k)y^2, & f_{5+} \equiv f_{5+}(x, k) &= -\frac{1}{k^5}(4x - 5k)x^4, \\
f_5 \equiv f_5(y, k) &= -\frac{1}{6k^5}(4y - 5k)y^4, & f_{5-} \equiv f_{5-}(x, k) &= \frac{1}{k^5}(4x + k)(x - k)^4,
\end{aligned}$$




Figure 1: Image of ψ

the stream function $\psi \equiv \psi(x, y)$ is given by (see Figure 1)

$$\psi(x, y) = \begin{cases} f_{5+}(x-a, A-a)f_3(y, B) + (1-f_{5+}(x-a, A-a))f_5(y-b, B-b) & \text{in } \Omega_1 \\ f_{5+}(x-a, A-a)f_3(y, B) & \text{in } \Omega_2 \\ f_{5-}(x, a)f_3(y-b, B-b) + (1-f_{5-}(x, a))f_5(y-b, B-b) & \text{in } \Omega_3 \end{cases}$$

where $\Omega_1 = [a, A] \times [b, B]$, $\Omega_2 = [a, A] \times [0, b]$ and $\Omega_3 = [0, a] \times [b, B]$.

We show several computational results for the constructive a priori constants in Theorem 4 and Corollary 5 by Table 1 in which the constant β is calculated by the method in [6].

$1/h$	$E_u(h)$	$E_p(h)$	η	σ	$C(h)$
50	1.1952e-1	1.6799e-0	6.4993	6.4218e-3/ ν	0.013355
100	9.2643e-2	1.2592e-0	9.0065	4.0168e-3/ ν	0.008312
$1/h$	$e_u(h)$	$e_p(h)$	$\hat{\eta}$	$\hat{\sigma}$	β
50	$\min(16.2156, 2)$	224.65	526.37	1.3869/ ν	10.1572
100	$\min(15.9978, 2)$	220.09	791.63	1.3869/ ν	10.1572

Table 1: Numerical results for the a priori constant

Notice that the a priori constant $C(h)$ for the H_0^1 -projection in Assumption 1 is obtained by the procedure which is presented in [10]. Table 2 shows the verification results for the stationary Navier-Stokes equation (1.1) with the boundary condition (5.1). Figure 2 illustrates the contour of stream lines of approximate solution for this problem.

$1/h$	\mathcal{M}_u^*	\mathcal{M}_u	M_u	κ	$\ v_0\ _{H_0^1}$	α_u
100	0.2621	0.0615	0.1416	0.0223	6.5026e-1	1.0902e-1

Table 2: Numerical results for $\nu = 10$

All computations in tables are carried out on the Dell Precision 650 Workstation Intel Xeon Dual CPU 3.20GHz by MATLAB.

Acknowledgement

This work is supported by Kyushu University 21st Century COE Program, *Development of Dynamic Mathematics with High Functionality*, of the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology of Japan.




Figure 2: Approximate contour of solution

References

- [1] M. Dauge, Stationary Stokes and Navier-Stokes systems on two- or three-dimensional domains with corners. Part I : Linearized equations, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **1** (1989), 74-97.
- [2] M.T. Nakao, A numerical approach to the proof of existence of solutions for elliptic problems, *JPN J. Appl. Math.* **5** (1988), 313-332.
- [3] M.T. Nakao, Numerical verification methods for solutions of ordinary and partial differential equations, *Numer. Func. Anal. Opt.* **22** (2001), 321-356.
- [4] M.T. Nakao, K. Hashimoto and Y. Watanabe, A numerical method to verify the invertibility of linear elliptic operators with applications to nonlinear problems, *Computing* **75** (2005), 1-14.
- [5] M.T. Nakao, Y. Watanabe, An efficient approach to the numerical verification for solutions of elliptic differential equations, *Numer. Algorithms* **37** (2004), 311-323.
- [6] M.T. Nakao, N. Yamamoto and Y. Watanabe, A posteriori and constructive a priori error bounds for finite element solutions of the Stokes Equations, *J. Comput. Appl. Math.* **91** (1998), 137-158.
- [7] M. Plum, Computer-assisted existence proofs for two-point boundary value problems, *Computing* **46** (1991), 19-34.
- [8] M. Plum, Numerical existence proofs and explicit bounds for solutions of second-order elliptic boundary value problems, *Computing* **49** (1992), 25-44.
- [9] Y. Watanabe, N. Yamamoto and M.T. Nakao, A numerical verification method of solutions for the Navier-Stokes equations, *Reliable Computing* **5** (1999), 347-357.
- [10] N. Yamamoto, M.T. Nakao, Numerical verifications of solutions for elliptic equations in nonconvex polygonal domains, *Numer. Math.* **65** (1993), 503-521.

List of MHF Preprint Series, Kyushu University

21st Century COE Program

Development of Dynamic Mathematics with High Functionality

- MHF2005-1 Hideki KOSAKI
Matrix trace inequalities related to uncertainty principle
- MHF2005-2 Masahisa TABATA
Discrepancy between theory and real computation on the stability of some finite element schemes
- MHF2005-3 Yuko ARAKI & Sadanori KONISHI
Functional regression modeling via regularized basis expansions and model selection
- MHF2005-4 Yuko ARAKI & Sadanori KONISHI
Functional discriminant analysis via regularized basis expansions
- MHF2005-5 Kenji KAJIWARA, Tetsu MASUDA, Masatoshi NOUMI, Yasuhiro OHTA & Yasuhiko YAMADA
Point configurations, Cremona transformations and the elliptic difference Painlevé equations
- MHF2005-6 Kenji KAJIWARA, Tetsu MASUDA, Masatoshi NOUMI, Yasuhiro OHTA & Yasuhiko YAMADA
Construction of hypergeometric solutions to the q -Painlevé equations
- MHF2005-7 Hiroki MASUDA
Simple estimators for non-linear Markovian trend from sampled data:
I. ergodic cases
- MHF2005-8 Hiroki MASUDA & Nakahiro YOSHIDA
Edgeworth expansion for a class of Ornstein-Uhlenbeck-based models
- MHF2005-9 Masayuki UCHIDA
Approximate martingale estimating functions under small perturbations of dynamical systems
- MHF2005-10 Ryo MATSUZAKI & Masayuki UCHIDA
One-step estimators for diffusion processes with small dispersion parameters from discrete observations
- MHF2005-11 Junichi MATSUKUBO, Ryo MATSUZAKI & Masayuki UCHIDA
Estimation for a discretely observed small diffusion process with a linear drift
- MHF2005-12 Masayuki UCHIDA & Nakahiro YOSHIDA
AIC for ergodic diffusion processes from discrete observations

- MHF2005-13 Hiromichi GOTO & Kenji KAJIWARA
Generating function related to the Okamoto polynomials for the Painlevé IV equation
- MHF2005-14 Masato KIMURA & Shin-ichi NAGATA
Precise asymptotic behaviour of the first eigenvalue of Sturm-Liouville problems with large drift
- MHF2005-15 Daisuke TAGAMI & Masahisa TABATA
Numerical computations of a melting glass convection in the furnace
- MHF2005-16 Raimundas VIDŪNAS
Normalized Leonard pairs and Askey-Wilson relations
- MHF2005-17 Raimundas VIDŪNAS
Askey-Wilson relations and Leonard pairs
- MHF2005-18 Kenji KAJIWARA & Atsushi MUKAIHIRA
Soliton solutions for the non-autonomous discrete-time Toda lattice equation
- MHF2005-19 Yuu HARIYA
Construction of Gibbs measures for 1-dimensional continuum fields
- MHF2005-20 Yuu HARIYA
Integration by parts formulae for the Wiener measure restricted to subsets in \mathbb{R}^d
- MHF2005-21 Yuu HARIYA
A time-change approach to Kotani's extension of Yor's formula
- MHF2005-22 Tadahisa FUNAKI, Yuu HARIYA & Mark YOR
Wiener integrals for centered powers of Bessel processes, I
- MHF2005-23 Masahisa TABATA & Satoshi KAIZU
Finite element schemes for two-fluids flow problems
- MHF2005-24 Ken-ichi MARUNO & Yasuhiro OHTA
Determinant form of dark soliton solutions of the discrete nonlinear Schrödinger equation
- MHF2005-25 Alexander V. KITAEV & Raimundas VIDŪNAS
Quadratic transformations of the sixth Painlevé equation
- MHF2005-26 Toru FUJII & Sadanori KONISHI
Nonlinear regression modeling via regularized wavelets and smoothing parameter selection
- MHF2005-27 Shuichi INOKUCHI, Kazumasa HONDA, Hyen Yeal LEE, Tatsuro SATO, Yoshihiro MIZOGUCHI & Yasuo KAWAHARA
On reversible cellular automata with finite cell array

- MHF2005-28 Toru KOMATSU
Cyclic cubic field with explicit Artin symbols
- MHF2005-29 Mitsuhiro T. NAKAO, Kouji HASHIMOTO & Kaori NAGATOU
A computational approach to constructive a priori and a posteriori error estimates for finite element approximations of bi-harmonic problems
- MHF2005-30 Kaori NAGATOU, Kouji HASHIMOTO & Mitsuhiro T. NAKAO
Numerical verification of stationary solutions for Navier-Stokes problems
- MHF2005-31 Hidefumi KAWASAKI
A duality theorem for a three-phase partition problem
- MHF2005-32 Hidefumi KAWASAKI
A duality theorem based on triangles separating three convex sets
- MHF2005-33 Takeaki FUCHIKAMI & Hidefumi KAWASAKI
An explicit formula of the Shapley value for a cooperative game induced from the conjugate point
- MHF2005-34 Hideki MURAKAWA
A regularization of a reaction-diffusion system approximation to the two-phase Stefan problem
- MHF2006-1 Masahisa TABATA
Numerical simulation of Rayleigh-Taylor problems by an energy-stable finite element scheme
- MHF2006-2 Ken-ichi MARUNO & G R W QUISPEL
Construction of integrals of higher-order mappings
- MHF2006-3 Setsuo TANIGUCHI
On the Jacobi field approach to stochastic oscillatory integrals with quadratic phase function
- MHF2006-4 Kouji HASHIMOTO, Kaori NAGATOU & Mitsuhiro T. NAKAO
A computational approach to constructive a priori error estimate for finite element approximations of bi-harmonic problems in nonconvex polygonal domains
- MHF2006-5 Hidefumi KAWASAKI
A duality theory based on triangular cylinders separating three convex sets in R^n
- MHF2006-6 Raimundas VIDŪNAS
Uniform convergence of hypergeometric series
- MHF2006-7 Yuji KODAMA & Ken-ichi MARUNO
N-Soliton solutions to the DKP equation and Weyl group actions

- MHF2006-8 Toru KOMATSU
Potentially generic polynomial
- MHF2006-9 Toru KOMATSU
Generic sextic polynomial related to the subfield problem of a cubic polynomial
- MHF2006-10 Shu TEZUKA & Anargyros PAPAGEORGIOU
Exact cubature for a class of functions of maximum effective dimension
- MHF2006-11 Shu TEZUKA
On high-discrepancy sequences
- MHF2006-12 Raimundas VIDŪNAS
Detecting persistent regimes in the North Atlantic Oscillation time series
- MHF2006-13 Toru KOMATSU
Tamely Eisenstein field with prime power discriminant
- MHF2006-14 Nalini JOSHI, Kenji KAJIWARA & Marta MAZZOCCO
Generating function associated with the Hankel determinant formula for the solutions of the Painlevé IV equation
- MHF2006-15 Raimundas VIDŪNAS
Darboux evaluations of algebraic Gauss hypergeometric functions
- MHF2006-16 Masato KIMURA & Isao WAKANO
New mathematical approach to the energy release rate in crack extension
- MHF2006-17 Toru KOMATSU
Arithmetic of the splitting field of Alexander polynomial
- MHF2006-18 Hiroki MASUDA
Likelihood estimation of stable Lévy processes from discrete data
- MHF2006-19 Hiroshi KAWABI & Michael RÖCKNER
Essential self-adjointness of Dirichlet operators on a path space with Gibbs measures via an SPDE approach
- MHF2006-20 Masahisa TABATA
Energy stable finite element schemes and their applications to two-fluid flow problems
- MHF2006-21 Yuzuru INAHAMA & Hiroshi KAWABI
Asymptotic expansions for the Laplace approximations for Itô functionals of Brownian rough paths
- MHF2006-22 Yoshiyuki KAGEI
Resolvent estimates for the linearized compressible Navier-Stokes equation in an infinite layer

- MHF2006-23 Yoshiyuki KAGEI
Asymptotic behavior of the semigroup associated with the linearized compressible Navier-Stokes equation in an infinite layer
- MHF2006-24 Akihiro MIKODA, Shuichi INOKUCHI, Yoshihiro MIZOGUCHI & Mitsuhiro FUJIO
The number of orbits of box-ball systems
- MHF2006-25 Toru FUJII & Sadanori KONISHI
Multi-class Logistic Discrimination via Wavelet-based Functionalization and Model Selection Criteria
- MHF2006-26 Taro HAMAMOTO, Kenji KAJIWARA & Nicholas S. WITTE
Hypergeometric Solutions to the q -Painlevé Equation of Type $(A_1 + A'_1)^{(1)}$
- MHF2006-27 Hiroshi KAWABI & Tomohiro MIYOKAWA
The Littlewood-Paley-Stein inequality for diffusion processes on general metric spaces
- MHF2006-28 Hiroki MASUDA
Notes on estimating inverse-Gaussian and gamma subordinators under high-frequency sampling
- MHF2006-29 Setsuo TANIGUCHI
The heat semigroup and kernel associated with certain non-commutative harmonic oscillators
- MHF2006-30 Setsuo TANIGUCHI
Stochastic analysis and the KdV equation
- MHF2006-31 Masato KIMURA, Hideki KOMURA, Masayasu MIMURA, Hidenori MIYOSHI, Takeshi TAKAISHI & Daishin UYAMA
Quantitative study of adaptive mesh FEM with localization index of pattern
- MHF2007-1 Taro HAMAMOTO & Kenji KAJIWARA
Hypergeometric solutions to the q -Painlevé equation of type $A_4^{(1)}$
- MHF2007-2 Kouji HASHIMOTO, Kenta KOBAYASHI & Mitsuhiro T. NAKAO
Verified numerical computation of solutions for the stationary Navier-Stokes equation in nonconvex polygonal domains