



HAL
open science

Optimal error analysis of the spectral element method for the 2D homogeneous wave equation

Ziad Aldirany, Régis Cottureau, Marc Laforest, Serge Prudhomme

► To cite this version:

Ziad Aldirany, Régis Cottureau, Marc Laforest, Serge Prudhomme. Optimal error analysis of the spectral element method for the 2D homogeneous wave equation. *Computers & Mathematics with Applications*, 2022, 119, pp.241-256. 10.1016/j.camwa.2022.05.038 . hal-03766726v2

HAL Id: hal-03766726

<https://hal.science/hal-03766726v2>

Submitted on 23 Aug 2023 (v2), last revised 24 Aug 2023 (v3)

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Optimal error analysis of the spectral element method for the 2D homogeneous wave equation

Ziad Aldirany¹, Régis Cottereau², Marc Laforest¹, and Serge Prudhomme¹

¹*Département de mathématiques et de génie industriel, Polytechnique Montréal, Montréal, Québec, Canada, H3T 1J4*

²*Aix-Marseille Université, CNRS, Centrale Marseille, Laboratoire de Mécanique et d'Acoustique UMR 7031, Marseille, France*

August 23, 2023

Abstract

Optimal a priori error bounds are theoretically derived, and numerically verified, for approximate solutions to the 2D homogeneous wave equation obtained by the spectral element method. To be precise, the spectral element method studied here takes advantage of the Gauss-Lobatto-Legendre quadrature, thus resulting in under-integrated elements but a diagonal mass matrix. The approximation error in H^1 is shown to be of order $\mathcal{O}(h^p)$ with respect to the element size h and of order $\mathcal{O}(p^{-q})$ with respect to the degree p , where q is the spatial regularity of the solution. These results improve on past estimates in the L^2 norm, particularly with respect to h . Specific assumptions on the discretization by the spectral element method are the use of a triangulation by quadrilaterals constructed via affine transformations from a reference square element and of a second order discretization in time by the leap-frog scheme.

Keywords: spectral element method, wave equation, a priori error estimation, Gauss-Lobatto-Legendre quadrature, leap-frog scheme.

1 Introduction

The accurate solution of the acoustic wave equation has been of great importance in many fields of science and engineering. The spectral element method (SEM), first introduced by Patera [?] for fluid dynamics applications, is now widely considered as one of the most efficient methods in computational seismology [?, ?, ?, ?, ?, ?]. The method has many similarities with the h - p finite element method, the main differences being in the choice of the bases and of the quadrature rules for the computation of the integrals [?, ?, ?, ?]. In particular, the Gauss-Lobatto-Legendre (GLL) nodes can be used to construct the Lagrange polynomial shape functions and the GLL quadrature can be employed to approximate the integrals appearing in the weak formulation. These two features induce a diagonal mass matrix, which makes the approach very effective when combined with explicit schemes that are typically used in large scale parallel computations. Although implementations of SEM on triangles and tetrahedra are possible [?], most implementations use quadrilaterals and hexahedra in order to take advantage of their tensorial structure for faster matrix-vector products [?]. The SEM is now the basis of many High Performance Computing software packages [?, ?, ?, ?] and is being run on the largest computers in the world [up to date](#) [?]. Moreover, it is at the core of exascale initiatives such as the one established by the European Union Center of Excellence for Solid Earth [?]. Maday and Rønquist [?] conducted the error analysis of the GLL-SEM for the diffusion equation with non-constant

37 coefficients, where they derived the error bound as a function of the polynomial degree p . The h - p analysis for
 38 the homogeneous acoustic wave equation of the GLL-SEM was carried out in the L^2 norm in Zampieri and
 39 Pavarino [?] and Rong and Xu [?]. Oliveira and Leite [?] extended these results to the heterogeneous case.
 40 Durufle, Grob, and Joly [?] obtained an error bound in the H^1 norm for non-affine elements. The authors
 41 in [?, ?, ?] treated the fully discretized problem, where the time discretization is based on Newmark schemes,
 42 while the authors in [?] restricted the study to the semi-discretized problem. The numerical experiments for
 43 the fully discretized problem shown in [?, ?, ?] suggest that the L^2 error bounds that they established are
 44 not optimal in h .

45 The main result of the paper is an optimal error analysis in the H^1 norm in space for the fully discretized
 46 wave equation using GLL-SEM. The new error estimates improve on past results by considering the H^1
 47 norm for the fully discretized problem and by obtaining optimal rates of convergence in h and p , which
 48 coincide with those observed numerically. The use of the GLL quadrature in GLL-SEM produces integrals
 49 that are under-integrated, which might introduce a quadrature error that could potentially affect the rates
 50 of convergence. However, our results confirm that the convergence rates do not suffer from under-integration
 51 when solving the homogeneous wave equation. The effectiveness of the method is therefore not compromised.
 52 For the sake of simplicity, the present study solely focuses on the 2D homogeneous acoustic wave equation
 53 with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions but could be extended to more complex cases. The wave
 54 equation is integrated in time here by the leap-frog method, which is a second-order accurate Newmark
 55 scheme. We establish in particular two error bounds in the H^1 norm: the h - p version expressed in terms of
 56 the element size h , the polynomial degree p , the time step Δt , and the regularity of the solution and data,
 57 and the h version given with respect to the same parameters as before except for the polynomial degree p . We
 58 also present several numerical examples using smooth and non smooth solutions to confirm our theoretical
 59 results. We have deliberately chosen to follow the same structure for the presentation of the analysis as the
 60 one found in [?] since we will be using some of their preliminary results.

61 The outline of the paper is as follows: Section ?? introduces the strong and weak formulations of the
 62 homogeneous wave equation problem. The spatial discretization of the problem by the spectral element
 63 method based on the GLL quadrature is described in Section ?. In Section ??, we present some preliminary
 64 results that will be useful for the derivation of the a priori error estimates in the H^1 norm provided in
 65 Section ?. The numerical experiments are described in Section ?? and are followed by conclusions and
 66 perspectives in Section ??

67 2 Model problem and notations

68 The purpose of this section is to review the strong and weak formulation of the linear wave equation. A
 69 more thorough treatment can be found in Cohen's textbook [?].

70 Let Ω be an open, convex, polygonal domain in \mathbb{R}^2 , with a piecewise smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$. The homo-
 71 geneous acoustic wave equation subjected to Dirichlet boundary conditions is: given $f(\mathbf{x}, t)$, $u_0(\mathbf{x})$, $u_1(\mathbf{x})$
 72 and $T > 0$ find $u(\mathbf{x}, t)$, such that

$$\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial t^2}(\mathbf{x}, t) - \Delta u(\mathbf{x}, t) = f(\mathbf{x}, t), \quad \forall(\mathbf{x}, t) \in \Omega \times (0, T), \quad (1)$$

73 with the initial conditions

$$u(\mathbf{x}, 0) = u_0(\mathbf{x}), \quad \frac{\partial u}{\partial t}(\mathbf{x}, 0) = u_1(\mathbf{x}), \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \Omega, \quad (2)$$

74 and boundary conditions

$$u(\mathbf{x}, t) = 0, \quad \forall (\mathbf{x}, t) \in \partial\Omega \times (0, T). \quad (3)$$

75 In order to define the variational problem, we consider the Hilbert space $L^2(\Omega)$ equipped with the inner
76 product and norm

$$(u, v) = \int_{\Omega} u(\mathbf{x}) v(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x}, \quad \|u\|_0 = (u, u)^{1/2}.$$

77 Given a non-negative integer s , we recall the Hilbert space

$$H^s(\Omega) = \left\{ u \in L^2(\Omega); \frac{\partial^{|\alpha|} u}{\partial \mathbf{x}^\alpha} \in L^2(\Omega), \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^2, |\alpha| \leq s \right\},$$

78 equipped with the norm

$$\|u\|_s = \left(\sum_{|\alpha| \leq s} \left\| \frac{\partial^{|\alpha|} u}{\partial \mathbf{x}^\alpha} \right\|_0^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

79 Let $u|_{\partial\Omega}$ be the trace of u on $\partial\Omega$ [?]. We define the closed subspace V of $H^1(\Omega)$

$$V := H_0^1(\Omega) = \left\{ u \in H^1(\Omega); u|_{\partial\Omega} = 0 \right\}.$$

80 Poincaré's inequality implies that the symmetric and continuous bilinear form

$$a(u, v) = (\nabla u, \nabla v) \quad (4)$$

81 defines a norm over V that is equivalent to $\|\cdot\|_1$. We also introduce the space $L^2(0, T; H^s(\Omega))$ that consists
82 of all functions $u : (0, T) \rightarrow H^s(\Omega)$ with norm

$$\|u\|_{L^2(H^s)} = \left(\int_0^T \|u(t)\|_s^2 \, dt \right)^{1/2}.$$

83 Let $u^{(l)} = \partial^l u / \partial t^l$. We also define the space $C^m(0, T; H^s(\Omega))$ of all functions $u(\mathbf{x}, t)$ such that the map
84 $u^{(l)} : (0, T) \rightarrow H^s(\Omega)$ is continuous for all $0 \leq l \leq m$ and

$$\|u\|_{C^m(H^s)} = \max_{0 \leq l \leq m} \left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|u^{(l)}(t)\|_s \right) < \infty. \quad (5)$$

85 Under the assumptions $f \in L^2(0, T; L^2(\Omega))$, $u_0 \in V$, and $u_1 \in L^2(\Omega)$, a variational formulation of
86 Problem (??) can be stated as:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Find } u : (0, T) \rightarrow V, \text{ such that } u(\mathbf{x}, 0) = u_0(\mathbf{x}), \frac{\partial u}{\partial t}(\mathbf{x}, 0) = u_1(\mathbf{x}), \forall \mathbf{x} \in \Omega, \text{ and} \\ &\left(\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial t^2}, v \right) + a(u, v) = (f, v), \quad \forall v \in V. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

87 As demonstrated in [?], the fact that $a(\cdot, \cdot)$ is a symmetric, continuous, and coercive bilinear form implies
88 that Problem (??) has a unique solution $u \in C^0(0, T; V) \cap C^1(0, T; L^2(\Omega))$, satisfying the following stability
89 estimate

$$\left\| \frac{\partial u}{\partial t}(t) \right\|_0^2 + a(u(t), u(t)) \leq \|u_1\|_0^2 + a(u_0, u_0) + \int_0^t \|f(\tau)\|_0^2 \, d\tau, \quad \forall t \in [0, T].$$

3 The spectral element method

In this section, we describe the discretization of the wave equation by the spectral element method using here the Gauss-Lobatto-Legendre points (GLL-SEM). Hence, GLL-SEM distinguishes itself from other finite element methods because the degrees of freedom are borne by the nodes of the GLL quadrature and the spatial integrals in the variational formulation are evaluated using that GLL quadrature. This naturally leads to a diagonal mass matrix.

Assume that for each $h > 0$, we have a regular, quasi-uniform triangulation \mathcal{T}_h of the closure $\bar{\Omega}$ such that the largest diameter of the subdomains $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$ is bounded above by h ; see [?] for details. Furthermore, assume that each subdomain $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$ of a triangulation can be characterized by an affine bijective mapping $F_K : \hat{K} \rightarrow K$ such that $K = F_K(\hat{K})$ where $\hat{K} = [-1, 1] \times [-1, 1]$ is referred to as the reference element. For each positive integer p , let $\mathcal{Q}_p(K)$ be the space of polynomials of degree at most p in each variable over the subdomain K . If \mathcal{H} denotes the couple (h, p) , we then define the space of piecewise polynomial functions as

$$V_{\mathcal{H}} = \left\{ \phi \in C(\bar{\Omega}) : \phi|_K \in \mathcal{Q}_p(K), \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h, \phi = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega \right\}. \quad (7)$$

Integrals appearing in the weak form will be estimated using the tensor product of the 1D GLL quadrature. Over $[-1, 1]$, the nodes of the GLL quadrature are the two end points $\xi_0 = -1$ and $\xi_p = 1$ as well as the $p - 1$ roots of the derivatives of the Legendre polynomials [?], denoted by $\{\xi_i\}_{i=1, \dots, p-1}$. The weights ω_i associated with the nodes ξ_i can be selected to recover a quadrature that will be exact for all polynomials of degree less than or equal to $2p - 1$. In 2D, the GLL quadrature of f over \hat{K} will be

$$\mathcal{I}_{\hat{K}}^{GLL} f = \sum_{i,j=0}^p \omega_i \omega_j f(\xi_i, \xi_j).$$

Again, this quadrature is exact for all $f \in \mathcal{Q}_{2p-1}(\hat{K})$. For a function $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the GLL quadrature can be extended by mapping the GLL nodes to each subdomain $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$ as $\mathbf{x}_{i,j}^K = F_K(\xi_i, \xi_j)$ and computing

$$\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{H}}^{GLL} f = \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{i,j=0}^p \omega_i \omega_j f(\mathbf{x}_{i,j}^K) J_K(\mathbf{x}_{i,j}^K),$$

where J_K is the determinant of the Jacobian of F_K . We note that the numbering of the vertices in the reference element and each element K is taken counterclockwise so that the determinant J_K is always positive.

Critical to the definition of the spectral element method are the discrete inner product

$$(\phi, \psi)_{\mathcal{H}} = \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{H}}^{GLL} \phi \psi \quad (8)$$

and the discrete analogue of (??) defined as

$$a_{\mathcal{H}}(\phi, \psi) = (\nabla \phi, \nabla \psi)_{\mathcal{H}} = \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{H}}^{GLL} \nabla \phi \cdot \nabla \psi. \quad (9)$$

The discrete inner product induces the discrete norm

$$\|u\|_{\mathcal{H}} = (u, u)_{\mathcal{H}}^{1/2},$$

which is a well defined norm over $V_{\mathcal{H}}$, since it is equivalent to the usual L^2 norm over $V_{\mathcal{H}}$ as we will see later in Lemma ???. We also note that if $\phi|_K$ and $\psi|_K \in \mathcal{Q}_p(K)$, then $\nabla \phi|_K \cdot \nabla \psi|_K \in \mathcal{Q}_{2p}(K)$ and $a_{\mathcal{H}}(\phi, \psi)$ is not

117 equal to $a(\phi, \psi)$. As mentioned earlier, an important advantage of SEM is mass-lumping. This is achieved
 118 by defining the degrees of freedom on $\mathcal{Q}_p(\widehat{K})$ in terms of the GLL points, i.e.

$$\widehat{\Sigma} = \left\{ \hat{\sigma}_{i,j} : \mathcal{Q}_p(\widehat{K}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, i, j = 0, \dots, p; \hat{\sigma}_{i,j}(\widehat{v}) = \widehat{v}(\xi_i, \xi_j), \forall \widehat{v} \in \mathcal{Q}_p(\widehat{K}) \right\}.$$

The spectral element discretization problem is then defined as:

Find $u_{\mathcal{H}}(t) \in V_{\mathcal{H}}$, for all $t \in [0, T]$, such that:

$$\left(\frac{\partial^2 u_{\mathcal{H}}}{\partial t^2}, v_{\mathcal{H}} \right)_{\mathcal{H}} + a_{\mathcal{H}}(u_{\mathcal{H}}, v_{\mathcal{H}}) = (f, v_{\mathcal{H}})_{\mathcal{H}}, \quad \forall v_{\mathcal{H}} \in V_{\mathcal{H}}, \forall t \in (0, T) \quad (10a)$$

$$(u_{\mathcal{H}}(0), v_{\mathcal{H}})_{\mathcal{H}} = (u_0, v_{\mathcal{H}})_{\mathcal{H}}, \quad \forall v_{\mathcal{H}} \in V_{\mathcal{H}}, \quad (10b)$$

$$\left(\frac{\partial u_{\mathcal{H}}}{\partial t}(0), v_{\mathcal{H}} \right)_{\mathcal{H}} = (u_1, v_{\mathcal{H}})_{\mathcal{H}}, \quad \forall v_{\mathcal{H}} \in V_{\mathcal{H}}. \quad (10c)$$

We now discretize the above problem with respect to time. We partition the time domain $[0, T]$ into N_T uniform subintervals of size $\Delta t = T/N_T$ and approximate the semi-discrete Problem (??) by the leap-frog scheme. We thus obtain the fully discrete problem:

Find $u_{\mathcal{H}}^n \in V_{\mathcal{H}}$, for $n = 0, \dots, N_T$, such that:

$$(\delta^2 u_{\mathcal{H}}^n, v_{\mathcal{H}})_{\mathcal{H}} + a_{\mathcal{H}}(u_{\mathcal{H}}^n, v_{\mathcal{H}}) = (f(t_n), v_{\mathcal{H}})_{\mathcal{H}}, \quad \forall v_{\mathcal{H}} \in V_{\mathcal{H}}, n = 1, \dots, N_T - 1 \quad (11a)$$

$$(u_{\mathcal{H}}^0, v_{\mathcal{H}})_{\mathcal{H}} = (u_0, v_{\mathcal{H}})_{\mathcal{H}}, \quad \forall v_{\mathcal{H}} \in V_{\mathcal{H}}, \quad (11b)$$

$$(z_{\mathcal{H}}^0, v_{\mathcal{H}})_{\mathcal{H}} = (u_1, v_{\mathcal{H}})_{\mathcal{H}}, \quad \forall v_{\mathcal{H}} \in V_{\mathcal{H}}, \quad (11c)$$

$$\frac{2}{\Delta t^2} (u_{\mathcal{H}}^1 - u_{\mathcal{H}}^0 - \Delta t z_{\mathcal{H}}^0, v_{\mathcal{H}})_{\mathcal{H}} + a_{\mathcal{H}}(u_{\mathcal{H}}^0, v_{\mathcal{H}}) = (f(t_0), v_{\mathcal{H}})_{\mathcal{H}}, \quad \forall v_{\mathcal{H}} \in V_{\mathcal{H}}, \quad (11d)$$

119 where δ^2 represents the central finite difference operator

$$\delta^2 u_{\mathcal{H}}^n = \frac{u_{\mathcal{H}}^{n+1} - 2u_{\mathcal{H}}^n + u_{\mathcal{H}}^{n-1}}{\Delta t^2}.$$

120 Finally, the restrictions of the inner products (\cdot, \cdot) and $(\cdot, \cdot)_{\mathcal{H}}$ to an element K are denoted by $(\cdot, \cdot)_K$ and
 121 $(\cdot, \cdot)_{\mathcal{H}, K}$, respectively, and similarly, the restricted norms will be written as $\|\cdot\|_K$, $\|\cdot\|_{s, K}$, and $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}, K}$. We
 122 also introduce the broken Sobolev space associated with a triangulation \mathcal{T}_h of $\bar{\Omega}$

$$H^s(\Omega, \mathcal{T}_h) = \{v \in L^2(\Omega); v|_K \in H^s(K), \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h\},$$

123 where $v|_K$ is the restriction of v to K , equipped with the norm

$$\|v\|_{s, \mathcal{T}_h} = \left(\sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \|v\|_{s, K}^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

Similar to (??) we define the norm of the space $C^m(0, T; H^s(\Omega, \mathcal{T}_h))$ as

$$\|u\|_{C^m(H^s(\mathcal{T}_h))} = \max_{0 \leq l \leq m} \left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|u^{(l)}(t)\|_{s, \mathcal{T}_h} \right).$$

124 A complete discussion of broken Sobolev spaces can be found in [?], but for our purposes it suffices to observe
 125 that $H^s(\Omega, \mathcal{T}_h)$ is a Hilbert space and that $H^s(\Omega) \subset H^s(\Omega, \mathcal{T}_h)$. In the same vein, we will also be using the
 126 finite-dimensional broken space

$$V_{\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{T}_h} = \left\{ \phi \in L^2(\Omega) : \phi|_K \in \mathcal{Q}_p(K), \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h, \phi = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega \right\}. \quad (12)$$

4 Interpolation and projection estimates

We present in this section some preliminary results for the spectral element method and the h and h - p versions of the finite element method, including interpolation and projection error estimates, that will be needed for the derivation of the a priori error estimates of Section ???. The results presented in this section either are identical or include slight improvements to those found in [?, ?, ?]. When identical, the proofs can be found in the references given for each result. In the remainder of the paper, we will consider C and C_p as generic positive constants such that C is independent of h and p , while C_p is independent of h but may depend on p . These constants may nonetheless depend on the regularity and quasi-uniformity of the underlying family of triangulations $\{\mathcal{T}_h\}_{h>0}$. Moreover, we emphasize here that the parameter s will always be chosen as a non-negative integer in the remainder of the paper.

Lemma 4.1 ([?, Lemma 3.2]). *The L^2 norm $\|\cdot\|_0$ and the discrete norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}}$ are equivalent in $V_{\mathcal{H},\mathcal{T}_h}$, i.e. there exists $C > 0$ such that*

$$\|v\|_0 \leq \|v\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq C\|v\|_0, \quad \forall v \in V_{\mathcal{H},\mathcal{T}_h}.$$

From this lemma, we can deduce the coercivity of $a_{\mathcal{H}}$ over $V_{\mathcal{H}}$. The previous estimate shows that $\|\nabla v_{\mathcal{H}}\|_0^2 \leq \|\nabla v_{\mathcal{H}}\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 = a_{\mathcal{H}}(v_{\mathcal{H}}, v_{\mathcal{H}})$ while Poincaré's inequality implies the existence of a constant C such that

$$C\|v_{\mathcal{H}}\|_1^2 \leq a_{\mathcal{H}}(v_{\mathcal{H}}, v_{\mathcal{H}}), \quad \forall v_{\mathcal{H}} \in V_{\mathcal{H}}. \quad (13)$$

Definition 4.1 (Interpolation Operator). *For a positive integer p , the GLL interpolation operator $I_{h,p} : C(\Omega) \rightarrow V_{\mathcal{H}}$ is uniquely defined such that, for $v \in C(\Omega)$,*

$$(I_{h,p}v)(\mathbf{x}_{i,j}^K) = v(\mathbf{x}_{i,j}^K), \quad \forall i, j = 0, \dots, p,$$

where the points $\mathbf{x}_{i,j}^K$ are the images of the GLL points by F_K . This operator can be restricted to a single element $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$, say $I_{h,p}^K : C(K) \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}_p(K)$, such that, for $v \in C(K)$,

$$(I_{h,p}^K v)(\mathbf{x}_{i,j}^K) = v(\mathbf{x}_{i,j}^K), \quad \forall i, j = 0, \dots, p.$$

Remark 4.1. *Assuming that $u_0 \in V \cap C(\Omega)$ and $u_1 \in L^2(\Omega) \cap C(\Omega)$ so that their interpolants are well-defined, then the definition of the inner product $(\cdot, \cdot)_{\mathcal{H}}$ makes it clear that the functions $u_{\mathcal{H}}^0$ and $z_{\mathcal{H}}^0$ in (??) and (??) actually satisfy $u_{\mathcal{H}}^0 = I_{h,p}u_0$ and $z_{\mathcal{H}}^0 = I_{h,p}u_1$.*

Lemma 4.2 ([?, Lemma 3.3]). *Consider an integer $s \geq 2$. Then there exists a constant C such that for $q = 0$ or 1 , we have*

$$\|v - I_{h,p}v\|_q \leq C \frac{h^{\min(p+1,s)-q}}{p^{s-q}} \|v\|_{s,\mathcal{T}_h}, \quad \forall v \in H^s(\Omega, \mathcal{T}_h) \cap H^1(\Omega).$$

The next lemma improves the term p^{1-s} in Lemma 3.4 of [?] to a term p^{-s} . Although the improvement was first described in [?] for the usual Sobolev spaces, we extend it here for broken Sobolev spaces, as we will need it, and include its proof for the sake of completeness.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $s \geq 2$ and $p \geq 2$. If $v \in H^s(\Omega, \mathcal{T}_h)$ and $v_{\mathcal{H}} \in V_{\mathcal{H},\mathcal{T}_h}$, then*

$$(v, v_{\mathcal{H}}) - (v, v_{\mathcal{H}})_{\mathcal{H}} \leq C \frac{h^{\min(p,s)}}{p^s} \|v\|_{s,\mathcal{T}_h} \|v_{\mathcal{H}}\|_0.$$

Proof. From the definition of the interpolant $I_{h,p}^K$, we have

$$(v, v_{\mathcal{H}})_{\mathcal{H},K} = (I_{h,p}^K v, v_{\mathcal{H}})_{\mathcal{H},K}.$$

Since the GLL quadrature is of precision $2p - 1$, we also get

$$(I_{h,p-1}^K v, v_{\mathcal{H}})_{\mathcal{H},K} = (I_{h,p-1}^K v, v_{\mathcal{H}})_K.$$

155 Using the results above and Lemma ??, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (v, v_{\mathcal{H}})_K - (v, v_{\mathcal{H}})_{\mathcal{H},K} &= (v, v_{\mathcal{H}})_K - (I_{h,p-1}^K v, v_{\mathcal{H}})_K + (I_{h,p-1}^K v, v_{\mathcal{H}})_{\mathcal{H},K} - (I_{h,p}^K v, v_{\mathcal{H}})_{\mathcal{H},K} \\ &= (v - I_{h,p-1}^K v, v_{\mathcal{H}})_K + (I_{h,p-1}^K v - I_{h,p}^K v, v_{\mathcal{H}})_{\mathcal{H},K} \\ &\leq \|v - I_{h,p-1}^K v\|_{0,K} \|v_{\mathcal{H}}\|_{0,K} + \|I_{h,p-1}^K v - I_{h,p}^K v\|_{\mathcal{H},K} \|v_{\mathcal{H}}\|_{\mathcal{H},K} \\ &\leq \|v - I_{h,p-1}^K v\|_{0,K} \|v_{\mathcal{H}}\|_{0,K} + C \|I_{h,p-1}^K v - I_{h,p}^K v\|_{0,K} \|v_{\mathcal{H}}\|_{0,K}. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

156 Using the triangle inequality, one obtains

$$\|I_{h,p-1}^K v - I_{h,p}^K v\|_{0,K} = \|I_{h,p-1}^K v - v + v - I_{h,p}^K v\|_{0,K} \leq \|v - I_{h,p-1}^K v\|_{0,K} + \|v - I_{h,p}^K v\|_{0,K},$$

157 so that

$$(v, v_{\mathcal{H}})_K - (v, v_{\mathcal{H}})_{\mathcal{H},K} \leq C (\|v - I_{h,p-1}^K v\|_{0,K} + \|v - I_{h,p}^K v\|_{0,K}) \|v_{\mathcal{H}}\|_{0,K}. \quad (15)$$

158 Since Lemma ?? can be restricted to a single element K with the local interpolation operator $I_{h,p}^K$, then its
159 application to the above equation implies

$$(v, v_{\mathcal{H}})_K - (v, v_{\mathcal{H}})_{\mathcal{H},K} \leq C \frac{h^{\min(p,s)}}{(p-1)^s} \|v\|_{s,K} \|v_{\mathcal{H}}\|_0$$

160 and summing the above equation for all $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$ completes the proof since $p/(p-1) \leq 2$ for $p \geq 2$. \square

161 **Lemma 4.4** ([?], Lemma 3.6). *There exists a positive constant C_a independent of h and p such that*

$$a_{\mathcal{H}}(v_{\mathcal{H}}, v_{\mathcal{H}}) \leq C_a h^{-2} p^4 \|v_{\mathcal{H}}\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2, \quad \forall v_{\mathcal{H}} \in V_{\mathcal{H}}.$$

162 In Section ??, we will discuss the relation of that constant C_a with the stability of the scheme.

163 **Definition 4.2 (Projection Operator).** *The projection operator $\Pi_{\mathcal{H}} : V \rightarrow V_{\mathcal{H}}$ associates with each $v \in V$
164 the solution $\Pi_{\mathcal{H}} v$ to the problem:*

$$\text{Find } \Pi_{\mathcal{H}} v \in V_{\mathcal{H}} \text{ such that: } \quad a_{\mathcal{H}}(\Pi_{\mathcal{H}} v, v_{\mathcal{H}}) = a(v, v_{\mathcal{H}}), \quad \forall v_{\mathcal{H}} \in V_{\mathcal{H}}.$$

165 The next result presents the error bound on $v - \Pi_{\mathcal{H}} v$. It was established in [?] and [?] for the usual
166 Sobolev spaces, and is extended here for the broken Sobolev spaces.

167 **Lemma 4.5.** *Suppose that $s \geq 2$ and $p \geq 2$. Then there exists a constant C such that*

$$\|v - \Pi_{\mathcal{H}} v\|_1 \leq C \frac{h^{\min(p,s)-1}}{p^{s-1}} \|v\|_{s, \mathcal{T}_h}, \quad \forall v \in H^s(\Omega, \mathcal{T}_h) \cap H^1(\Omega).$$

168 *Proof.* We reproduce the proof of Lemma 1 of [?] while extending it to the broken Sobolev spaces. For any
169 $v_{\mathcal{H}} \in V_{\mathcal{H}}$, the triangle inequality leads to

$$\|v - \Pi_{\mathcal{H}} v\|_1 \leq \|v - v_{\mathcal{H}}\|_1 + \|\Pi_{\mathcal{H}} v - v_{\mathcal{H}}\|_1. \quad (16)$$

170 Let $w_{\mathcal{H}} = \Pi_{\mathcal{H}}v - v_{\mathcal{H}}$. We show that the term $\|w_{\mathcal{H}}\|_1$ can be bounded using the ellipticity of $a_{\mathcal{H}}$ and the
 171 definition of the projection $\Pi_{\mathcal{H}}$, that is,

$$\begin{aligned} C\|w_{\mathcal{H}}\|_1^2 &= C\|\Pi_{\mathcal{H}}v - v_{\mathcal{H}}\|_1^2 \leq a_{\mathcal{H}}(\Pi_{\mathcal{H}}v - v_{\mathcal{H}}, w_{\mathcal{H}}) \\ &= a(v, w_{\mathcal{H}}) - a_{\mathcal{H}}(v_{\mathcal{H}}, w_{\mathcal{H}}) \\ &= a(v, w_{\mathcal{H}}) - a(v_{\mathcal{H}}, w_{\mathcal{H}}) + a(v_{\mathcal{H}}, w_{\mathcal{H}}) - a_{\mathcal{H}}(v_{\mathcal{H}}, w_{\mathcal{H}}) \\ &= a(v - v_{\mathcal{H}}, w_{\mathcal{H}}) + [a(v_{\mathcal{H}}, w_{\mathcal{H}}) - a_{\mathcal{H}}(v_{\mathcal{H}}, w_{\mathcal{H}})] \\ &\leq \|v - v_{\mathcal{H}}\|_1 \|w_{\mathcal{H}}\|_1 + [a(v_{\mathcal{H}}, w_{\mathcal{H}}) - a_{\mathcal{H}}(v_{\mathcal{H}}, w_{\mathcal{H}})], \end{aligned}$$

172 which yields

$$C\|\Pi_{\mathcal{H}}v - v_{\mathcal{H}}\|_1 \leq \|v - v_{\mathcal{H}}\|_1 + \sup_{z_{\mathcal{H}} \in V_{\mathcal{H}}} \frac{a(v_{\mathcal{H}}, z_{\mathcal{H}}) - a_{\mathcal{H}}(v_{\mathcal{H}}, z_{\mathcal{H}})}{\|z_{\mathcal{H}}\|_1}.$$

173 Injecting the bound on $\|w_{\mathcal{H}}\|_1 = \|\Pi_{\mathcal{H}}v - v_{\mathcal{H}}\|_1$ into (??) gives

$$\|v - \Pi_{\mathcal{H}}v\|_1 \leq C \left[\|v - v_{\mathcal{H}}\|_1 + \sup_{z_{\mathcal{H}} \in V_{\mathcal{H}}} \frac{a(v_{\mathcal{H}}, z_{\mathcal{H}}) - a_{\mathcal{H}}(v_{\mathcal{H}}, z_{\mathcal{H}})}{\|z_{\mathcal{H}}\|_1} \right]. \quad (17)$$

174 If we take $v_{\mathcal{H}} = I_{h,p-1}v$, the last term in (??) vanishes since $\nabla v_{\mathcal{H}} \cdot \nabla z_{\mathcal{H}}$ is a polynomial of degree $2p - 1$.
 175 Then, using Lemma ?? with $q = 1$ and the fact that $p/(p-1) \leq 2$ for $p \geq 2$, we obtain

$$\|v - \Pi_{\mathcal{H}}v\|_1 \leq C\|v - I_{h,p-1}v\|_1 \leq Ch^{\min(p,s)-1}p^{1-s}\|v\|_{s,\mathcal{T}_h},$$

176 which is the desired bound. □

177 The following result is an immediate consequence of applying Aubin-Nitsche's Lemma [?] to the previous
 178 lemma.

179 **Corollary 4.6.** *For $s \geq 2$ and $p \geq 2$, there exists a constant C such that*

$$\|v - \Pi_{\mathcal{H}}v\|_0 \leq C \frac{h^{\min(p,s)}}{p^s} \|v\|_{s,\mathcal{T}_h}, \quad \forall v \in H^s(\Omega, \mathcal{T}_h) \cap H^1(\Omega).$$

180 Since the error bound on $v - \Pi_{\mathcal{H}}v$ in Lemma ?? and its corollary are not optimal in h and p simultaneously,
 181 we show below that these results have an optimal rate of convergence in the variable h alone. We emphasize
 182 here that the constant C_p may depend on p in the following.

183 **Lemma 4.7.** *Suppose that $s \geq 3$. Then there exists a constant C_p such that*

$$\|v - \Pi_{\mathcal{H}}v\|_1 \leq C_p h^{\min(p,s-1)} \|v\|_{s,\mathcal{T}_h}, \quad \forall v \in H^s(\Omega, \mathcal{T}_h) \cap H^1(\Omega).$$

Proof. We will proceed from Eq. (??) of the proof of Lemma ?. We shall find a bound on the term
 $a(v_{\mathcal{H}}, z_{\mathcal{H}}) - a_{\mathcal{H}}(v_{\mathcal{H}}, z_{\mathcal{H}})$ rather than making it vanish by invoking $I_{h,p-1}v$. Using Lemma ??, we have for
 any $r \geq 2$

$$\begin{aligned} a(v_{\mathcal{H}}, z_{\mathcal{H}}) - a_{\mathcal{H}}(v_{\mathcal{H}}, z_{\mathcal{H}}) &= (\nabla v_{\mathcal{H}}, \nabla z_{\mathcal{H}}) - (\nabla v_{\mathcal{H}}, \nabla z_{\mathcal{H}})_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &\leq C_p h^{\min(p,r)} \|\nabla v_{\mathcal{H}}\|_{r,\mathcal{T}_h} \|\nabla z_{\mathcal{H}}\|_0 \\ &\leq C_p h^{\min(p,r)} \|v_{\mathcal{H}}\|_{r+1,\mathcal{T}_h} \|z_{\mathcal{H}}\|_1. \end{aligned}$$

184 Setting $v_{\mathcal{H}} = I_{h,p}v$ and $r = s - 1$ in the above equation, one gets

$$a(I_{h,p}v, z_{\mathcal{H}}) - a_{\mathcal{H}}(I_{h,p}v, z_{\mathcal{H}}) \leq C_p h^{\min(p,s-1)} \|I_{h,p}v\|_{s,\mathcal{T}_h} \|z_{\mathcal{H}}\|_1. \quad (18)$$

185 Following Section 4.4 of [?], we have that for $l \geq 2$ the interpolation operator has the following continuity
 186 property

$$\|I_{h,p}v\|_{l,\mathcal{T}_h} \leq C_p \|v\|_{l,\mathcal{T}_h}, \quad \forall v \in H^l(\Omega, \mathcal{T}_h) \cap H^1(\Omega). \quad (19)$$

187 Using (??) and (??), Eq. (??) becomes

$$\|v - \Pi_{\mathcal{H}}v\|_1 \leq C_p (\|v - I_{h,p}v\|_1 + h^{\min(p,s-1)} \|v\|_{s,\mathcal{T}_h}). \quad (20)$$

188 The proof is completed by the application of Lemma ?? to the above equation. \square

189 5 A priori error estimation

In this section, we carry out the analysis of the a priori error estimates for the fully discrete Problem (??) in the H^1 norm. We shall see in the numerical experiments that the h - p error bound, established in the upcoming Theorem ??, does not match the rate of convergence with respect to the mesh size h observed numerically. Likewise, we present an h version of the error bound, which will be shown to be optimal in h alone. Similar error estimates were presented in terms of the L^2 norm in [?, ?] for the homogeneous problem and in [?] for the heterogeneous case. The following analysis is studied for $p \geq 2$ and under the following regularity properties for Problem (??): $u \in C^2(0, T; H^s(\Omega, \mathcal{T}_h) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)) \cap C^4(0, T; L^2(\Omega))$ with $s \geq 2$, and $f \in C^0(0, T; H^d(\Omega, \mathcal{T}_h))$ with $d \geq 2$. We first introduce some notation that will be convenient throughout the remainder of this section:

$$\begin{aligned} \phi^n &= \Pi_{\mathcal{H}}u(t_n) - u_{\mathcal{H}}^n, & n &= 0, \dots, N_T, \\ r^n &= \delta^2 \Pi_{\mathcal{H}}u(t_n) - \ddot{u}(t_n), & n &= 1, \dots, N_T, \\ q^n(v_{\mathcal{H}}^n) &= (f(t_n) - \ddot{u}(t_n), v_{\mathcal{H}}^n) - (f(t_n) - \ddot{u}(t_n), v_{\mathcal{H}}^n)_{\mathcal{H}}, & n &= 1, \dots, N_T, \end{aligned}$$

190 with the exceptional cases $r^0 = q^0 = 0$. The proofs of the following lemmas are found in the Appendix.

191 **Lemma 5.1.** *For $m = 0, \dots, N_T - 1$, the following bound holds*

$$C \|\phi^{m+1} - \phi^m\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \leq \|\phi^1 - \phi^0\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + \Delta t^2 a_{\mathcal{H}}(\phi^0, \phi^1) + \Delta t^2 \sum_{n=0}^m (r^n, \phi^{n+1} - \phi^{n-1})_{\mathcal{H}} + q^n(\phi^{n+1} - \phi^{n-1}),$$

192 *under the stability condition*

$$\Delta t < \frac{2h}{p^2 \sqrt{C_a}}, \quad (21)$$

193 *where C_a is the stability constant introduced in Lemma ??.*

194 The next two estimates will provide bounds on the terms on the right-hand side of Lemma ?. We note
 195 that the following lemma is similar to Lemma 4.2 in [?].

196 **Lemma 5.2.** *The functions ϕ^0 and ϕ^1 satisfy*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi^1 - \phi^0\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + \Delta t^2 a_{\mathcal{H}}(\phi^0, \phi^1) &\leq C \left[\Delta t \frac{h^{\min(p,s)}}{p^s} \|\dot{u}\|_{C^0(H^s(\mathcal{T}_h))} + \Delta t^3 \|u^{(3)}\|_{C^0(L^2)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \Delta t^2 \frac{h^{\min(p,d)}}{p^d} \|f(t_0)\|_{d,\mathcal{T}_h} + \Delta t \frac{h^{\min(p,s)-1}}{p^{s-1}} \|u_0\|_{s,\mathcal{T}_h} \right]^2. \end{aligned}$$

197 **Lemma 5.3.** For any sequence of functions $v_{\mathcal{H}}^n \in V_{\mathcal{H}}$, $n = 0, \dots, N_T - 1$, and for any $m = 0, \dots, N_T - 1$,
 198 it holds

$$\sum_{n=0}^m (r^n, v_{\mathcal{H}}^n)_{\mathcal{H}} + q^n(v_{\mathcal{H}}^n) \leq CN_T \left[\frac{h^{\min(p,d)}}{p^d} \|f\|_{C^0(H^d(\mathcal{T}_h))} + \frac{h^{\min(p,s)}}{p^{s-1}} \|\ddot{u}\|_{C^0(H^s(\mathcal{T}_h))} \right. \\ \left. + \Delta t^2 \|u^{(4)}\|_{C^0(L^2)} \right] \max_{1 \leq n \leq m} \|v_{\mathcal{H}}^n\|_{\mathcal{H}}.$$

199 The next lemma is an intermediate step combining Lemmas ??-?? and whose proof is provided in the
 200 Appendix.

201 **Lemma 5.4.** Assuming the stability condition (??) is satisfied, then it holds for $n = 0, \dots, N_T - 1$, that

$$\|\phi^{n+1} - \phi^n\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq C \Delta t \left[\frac{h^{\min(p,s)}}{p^s} \|\dot{u}\|_{C^0(H^s(\mathcal{T}_h))} + \Delta t^2 \|u^{(3)}\|_{C^0(L^2)} + \frac{h^{\min(p,s)-1}}{p^{s-1}} \|u_0\|_{s, \mathcal{T}_h} \right. \\ \left. + \frac{h^{\min(p,d)}}{p^d} \|f\|_{C^0(H^d(\mathcal{T}_h))} + \frac{h^{\min(p,s)}}{p^{s-1}} \|\ddot{u}\|_{C^0(H^s(\mathcal{T}_h))} + \Delta t^2 \|u^{(4)}\|_{C^0(L^2)} \right].$$

202 The following theorem is the main result of the paper, in which we establish an error bound in the
 203 H^1 norm for the numerical solution to Problem (??). We recall that a similar error bound is presented in
 204 the L^2 norm in [?, ?, ?].

205 **Theorem 5.5 (h - p version).** Assuming the stability condition (??) holds, then the error $e^n = u(t_n) -$
 206 $u_{\mathcal{H}}^n$, $n = 0, \dots, N_T - 1$, satisfies

$$\max_{0 \leq n \leq N_T - 1} \|e^n\|_1 \leq C \left[\frac{h^{\min(p,s)-1}}{p^{s-1}} \|u\|_{C^0(H^s(\mathcal{T}_h))} + \frac{h^{\min(p,d)}}{p^d} \|f\|_{C^0(H^d(\mathcal{T}_h))} \right. \\ \left. + \frac{h^{\min(p,s)}}{p^{s-1}} \|u\|_{C^2(H^s(\mathcal{T}_h))} + \Delta t^2 \|u\|_{C^4(L^2)} \right].$$

207 *Proof.* We begin with the application of the triangle inequality,

$$\max_{0 \leq n \leq N_T - 1} \|e^n\|_1 \leq \max_{0 \leq n \leq N_T - 1} \|u(t_n) - \Pi_{\mathcal{H}} u(t_n)\|_1 + \max_{0 \leq n \leq N_T - 1} \|\phi^n\|_1. \quad (22)$$

208 The first term in (??) is bounded by Lemma ??

$$\max_{0 \leq n \leq N_T - 1} \|u(t_n) - \Pi_{\mathcal{H}} u(t_n)\|_1 \leq Ch^{\min(p,s)-1} p^{1-s} \|u\|_{C^0(H^s(\mathcal{T}_h))}. \quad (23)$$

The rest of the proof will focus on the second term in (??). Subtracting (??) from (??), we have, for any
 $v_{\mathcal{H}}^n \in V_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $n = 1, \dots, N_T - 1$,

$$-(\delta^2 u_{\mathcal{H}}^n, v_{\mathcal{H}}^n)_{\mathcal{H}} - a_{\mathcal{H}}(u_{\mathcal{H}}^n, v_{\mathcal{H}}^n) + a(u(t_n), v_{\mathcal{H}}^n) = -(\ddot{u}(t_n), v_{\mathcal{H}}^n) - (f(t_n), v_{\mathcal{H}}^n)_{\mathcal{H}} + (f(t_n), v_{\mathcal{H}}^n)$$

so that

$$(\delta^2 (\Pi_{\mathcal{H}} u(t_n) - u_{\mathcal{H}}^n), v_{\mathcal{H}}^n)_{\mathcal{H}} + a_{\mathcal{H}}(\Pi_{\mathcal{H}} u(t_n) - u_{\mathcal{H}}^n, v_{\mathcal{H}}^n) \\ = (\delta^2 \Pi_{\mathcal{H}} u(t_n), v_{\mathcal{H}}^n)_{\mathcal{H}} - (\ddot{u}(t_n), v_{\mathcal{H}}^n) - (f(t_n), v_{\mathcal{H}}^n)_{\mathcal{H}} + (f(t_n), v_{\mathcal{H}}^n),$$

and

$$(\delta^2 \phi^n, v_{\mathcal{H}}^n)_{\mathcal{H}} + a_{\mathcal{H}}(\phi^n, v_{\mathcal{H}}^n) = (\delta^2 \Pi_{\mathcal{H}} u(t_n), v_{\mathcal{H}}^n)_{\mathcal{H}} - (\ddot{u}(t_n), v_{\mathcal{H}}^n) - (f(t_n), v_{\mathcal{H}}^n)_{\mathcal{H}} + (f(t_n), v_{\mathcal{H}}^n).$$

209 With the notation for r^n and q^n , we conclude that for any $v_{\mathcal{H}}^n \in V_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $n = 1, \dots, N_T - 1$,

$$(\delta^2 \phi^n, v_{\mathcal{H}}^n)_{\mathcal{H}} + a_{\mathcal{H}}(\phi^n, v_{\mathcal{H}}^n) = (r^n, v_{\mathcal{H}}^n)_{\mathcal{H}} + q^n(v_{\mathcal{H}}^n). \quad (24)$$

210 We sum from $n = 1$ to $n = m$, while m itself is bounded above by $N_T - 1$, to find

$$\sum_{n=1}^m (\delta^2 \phi^n, v_{\mathcal{H}}^n)_{\mathcal{H}} + \sum_{n=1}^m a_{\mathcal{H}}(\phi^n, v_{\mathcal{H}}^n) = \sum_{n=1}^m (r^n, v_{\mathcal{H}}^n)_{\mathcal{H}} + q^n(v_{\mathcal{H}}^n). \quad (25)$$

211 Now we set $v_{\mathcal{H}}^n = \phi^{n+1} - \phi^{n-1}$, for $1 \leq n \leq m-1$ and $v_{\mathcal{H}}^m = \phi^m - \phi^{m-1}$, and rewrite the first term on the
212 left-hand side of (??) as

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta t^2 & \left(\sum_{n=1}^{m-1} (\delta^2 \phi^n, \phi^{n+1} - \phi^{n-1})_{\mathcal{H}} + (\delta^2 \phi^m, \phi^m - \phi^{m-1})_{\mathcal{H}} \right) \\ & = 2(\phi^1, \phi^0)_{\mathcal{H}} - (\phi^0, \phi^0)_{\mathcal{H}} - (\phi^1, \phi^1)_{\mathcal{H}} \\ & \quad + (\phi^{m-1}, \phi^{m-1})_{\mathcal{H}} + (\phi^m, \phi^m)_{\mathcal{H}} - 2(\phi^{m-1}, \phi^m)_{\mathcal{H}} + (\phi^{m+1}, \phi^m)_{\mathcal{H}} - 2(\phi^m, \phi^m)_{\mathcal{H}} \\ & \quad + (\phi^{m-1}, \phi^m)_{\mathcal{H}} - (\phi^{m+1}, \phi^{m-1})_{\mathcal{H}} + 2(\phi^m, \phi^{m-1})_{\mathcal{H}} - (\phi^{m-1}, \phi^{m-1})_{\mathcal{H}} \\ & = (\phi^{m+1}, \phi^m)_{\mathcal{H}} - (\phi^m, \phi^m)_{\mathcal{H}} + (\phi^{m-1}, \phi^m)_{\mathcal{H}} - (\phi^{m+1}, \phi^{m-1})_{\mathcal{H}} - \|\phi^1 - \phi^0\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2. \\ & = (\phi^{m+1} - \phi^m, \phi^m - \phi^{m-1})_{\mathcal{H}} - \|\phi^1 - \phi^0\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

213 Simplifying now the second term on the left-hand side of (??), we find

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=1}^{m-1} a_{\mathcal{H}}(\phi^n, \phi^{n+1} - \phi^{n-1}) + a_{\mathcal{H}}(\phi^m, \phi^m - \phi^{m-1}) & = a_{\mathcal{H}}(\phi^{m-1}, \phi^m) - a_{\mathcal{H}}(\phi^0, \phi^1) + a_{\mathcal{H}}(\phi^m, \phi^m - \phi^{m-1}) \\ & = a_{\mathcal{H}}(\phi^m, \phi^m) - a_{\mathcal{H}}(\phi^0, \phi^1). \end{aligned}$$

214 Substituting the last two identities into the left-hand side of (??), using our choices of $v_{\mathcal{H}}^n$, and simplifying,
215 we get

$$\begin{aligned} a_{\mathcal{H}}(\phi^m, \phi^m) & = \frac{1}{\Delta t^2} (\phi^m - \phi^{m+1}, \phi^m - \phi^{m-1})_{\mathcal{H}} + \frac{1}{\Delta t^2} \|\phi^1 - \phi^0\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + a_{\mathcal{H}}(\phi^0, \phi^1) \\ & \quad + \sum_{n=1}^{m-1} \left[(r^n, \phi^{n+1} - \phi^{n-1})_{\mathcal{H}} + q^n(\phi^{n+1} - \phi^{n-1}) \right] \\ & \quad + (r^m, \phi^m - \phi^{m-1})_{\mathcal{H}} + q^m(\phi^m - \phi^{m-1}). \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

216 For all $0 \leq m \leq N_T - 1$, the coercivity of $a_{\mathcal{H}}$ implies that $C\|\phi^m\|_1^2 \leq a_{\mathcal{H}}(\phi^m, \phi^m)$ and the Cauchy-Schwarz
217 inequality implies that $(\phi^m - \phi^{m+1}, \phi^m - \phi^{m-1})_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \max_{0 \leq n \leq m} \|\phi^{n+1} - \phi^n\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2$.

Then, by combining Lemma ?? and Lemma ??, and using the Peter-Paul inequality $2ab \leq \varepsilon a^2 + b^2/\varepsilon$ with $\varepsilon = \Delta t^2$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi^m\|_1^2 & \leq \frac{1}{\Delta t^2} \max_{0 \leq n \leq m} \|\phi^{n+1} - \phi^n\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \\ & \quad + C \left[h^{\min(p,s)} p^{-s} \|\dot{u}\|_{C^0(H^s(\mathcal{T}_h))} + \Delta t^2 \|u^{(3)}\|_{C^0(L^2)} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \Delta t h^{\min(p,d)} p^{-d} \|f(t_0)\|_{d, \mathcal{T}_h} + h^{\min(p,s)-1} p^{1-s} \|u_0\|_{s, \mathcal{T}_h} \right]^2 \\ & \quad + \frac{C^2}{2} N_T^2 \Delta t^2 \left[h^{\min(p,d)} p^{-d} \|f\|_{C^0(H^d(\mathcal{T}_h))} + h^{\min(p,s)} p^{1-s} \|\ddot{u}\|_{C^0(H^s(\mathcal{T}_h))} + \Delta t^2 \|u^{(4)}\|_{C^0(L^2)} \right]^2 \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{2\Delta t^2} \left[\max_{1 \leq n \leq m-1} \|\phi^{n+1} - \phi^{n-1}\|_{\mathcal{H}} + \|\phi^m - \phi^{m-1}\|_{\mathcal{H}} \right]^2. \end{aligned}$$

218 To handle the last term in the estimate above, we use the triangular inequality

$$\max_{1 \leq n \leq m-1} \|\phi^{n+1} - \phi^{n-1}\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq 2 \max_{0 \leq n \leq m-1} \|\phi^{n+1} - \phi^n\|_{\mathcal{H}},$$

and Lemma ?? to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi^m\|_1^2 &\leq C^2 \left[h^{\min(p,s)} p^{-s} \|\dot{u}\|_{C^0(H^s(\mathcal{T}_h))} + \Delta t^2 \|u^{(3)}\|_{C^0(L^2)} + h^{\min(p,s)-1} p^{1-s} \|u_0\|_{s,\mathcal{T}_h} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + h^{\min(p,d)} p^{-d} \|f\|_{C^0(H^d(\mathcal{T}_h))} + h^{\min(p,s)} p^{1-s} \|\ddot{u}\|_{C^0(H^s(\mathcal{T}_h))} + \Delta t^2 \|u^{(4)}\|_{C^0(L^2)} \right]^2 \\ &+ C \left[h^{\min(p,s)} p^{-s} \|\dot{u}\|_{C^0(H^s(\mathcal{T}_h))} + \Delta t^2 \|u^{(3)}\|_{C^0(L^2)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \Delta t h^{\min(p,d)} p^{-d} \|f(t_0)\|_{d,\mathcal{T}_h} + h^{\min(p,s)-1} p^{1-s} \|u_0\|_{s,\mathcal{T}_h} \right]^2 \\ &+ \frac{C^2}{2} T^2 \left[h^{\min(p,d)} p^{-d} \|f\|_{C^0(H^d(\mathcal{T}_h))} + h^{\min(p,s)} p^{1-s} \|\ddot{u}\|_{C^0(H^s(\mathcal{T}_h))} + \Delta t^2 \|u^{(4)}\|_{C^0(L^2)} \right]^2. \end{aligned}$$

219 Combining the terms and using the fact that $\Delta t < T$, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{1 \leq n \leq N_T-1} \|\phi^n\|_1 &\leq C \left[h^{\min(p,s)} p^{-s} \|\dot{u}\|_{C^0(H^s(\mathcal{T}_h))} + \Delta t^2 \|u^{(3)}\|_{C^0(L^2)} + h^{\min(p,s)-1} p^{1-s} \|u_0\|_{s,\mathcal{T}_h} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + h^{\min(p,d)} p^{-d} \|f\|_{C^0(H^d(\mathcal{T}_h))} + h^{\min(p,s)} p^{1-s} \|\ddot{u}\|_{C^0(H^s(\mathcal{T}_h))} + \Delta t^2 \|u^{(4)}\|_{C^0(L^2)} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

220 In order to extend Eq. (??) to $n = 0$, we deduce from Remark ??, Lemma ??, and Lemma ?? that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi^0\|_1 &= \|\Pi_{\mathcal{H}} u_0 - u_{\mathcal{H}}^0\|_1 \\ &\leq \|\Pi_{\mathcal{H}} u_0 - u_0\|_1 + \|u_0 - I_{h,p} u_0\|_1 \\ &\leq C h^{\min(p,s)-1} p^{1-s} \|u_0\|_{s,\mathcal{T}_h}. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

221 Finally, replacing (??), (??), and (??) in (??) allows one to complete the proof. \square

222 We will see in Section ?? that the numerical experiments show a higher convergence rate in h than that
 223 suggested by Theorem ?. Hence, in order to explain those results, we propose the h version of Theorem ??
 224 that shows an optimal order of convergence in h alone. For the following theorem we restrict the regularity
 225 of the solution for Problem (??) to $u \in C^2(0, T; H^s(\Omega, \mathcal{T}_h) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)) \cap C^4(0, T; L^2(\Omega))$ with $s \geq 3$.

226 **Theorem 5.6 (h version).** *Assuming the stability condition (??) holds, then the error $e^n = u(t_n) - u_{\mathcal{H}}^n$,*
 227 *for $n = 0, \dots, N_T - 1$, satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{0 \leq n \leq N_T-1} \|e^n\|_1 &\leq C_p \left[h^{\min(p,s-1)} \|u\|_{C^0(H^s(\mathcal{T}_h))} + h^{\min(p,d)} \|f\|_{C^0(H^d(\mathcal{T}_h))} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + h^{\min(p,s)} \|u\|_{C^2(H^s(\mathcal{T}_h))} + \Delta t^2 \|u\|_{C^4(L^2)} \right], \end{aligned}$$

228 where C_p is a constant that depends on p .

229 *Proof.* The bound is obtained by following the same steps as those in the proof of Theorem ??, but using
 230 Lemma ?? instead of Lemma ?? to estimate the projection error in the H^1 norm. \square

231 6 Numerical examples

232 In this section, we present a series of numerical experiments in order to verify the formal a priori estimates
 233 of the previous section. In addition to the error bounds in the H^1 norm, we also provide numerical estimates

234 in the L^2 error. We emphasize here that we will be varying h or p alone, and not simultaneously, so that
 235 we will refer to Theorem ?? when varying h and to Theorem ?? otherwise. The numerical experiments
 236 are performed using the open-source MATLAB code developed by Ampuero [?]. The code is limited to 2D
 237 but can handle structured rectangular meshes with GLL quadrature of order up to 20. Given the extreme
 238 precision required by the numerical experiments below, the code was found to be accurate and reliable. In
 239 all the examples, the spatial domain is chosen as $\Omega = [-1, 1] \times [-1, 1]$ and the error is evaluated at $T = 1$.
 240 The norms are estimated using the GLL quadrature with 20×20 integration points on each element in order
 241 to neglect any integration error. Moreover, we consider problems with regular and non regular solutions to
 242 address the dependence of the convergence on the smoothness of the data.

243 6.1 Regular solution

244 We will consider the numerical example proposed in [?] and [?]. In that case, the source term f and the
 245 initial data u_0 and u_1 are defined such that the exact solution is

$$u(x, y, t) = \sin(\pi x) \sin(\pi y) (x^2 - 1)(y^2 - 1) \exp(-t^2).$$

246 The source term f , the solution $u(\cdot, t)$, and all its temporal derivatives are in $C^\infty(\Omega)$. We show in Figure ??
 247 the convergence of the error in the L^2 and H^1 norms with respect to the mesh size h , for two values $p = 2, 4$
 248 of the polynomial degree. We observe that the error in the H^1 norm converges with an order $\mathcal{O}(h^p)$, which
 249 confirms the results established in Theorem ?? since u and f are smooth. We also remark that the L^2 error
 250 behaves as $\mathcal{O}(h^{p+1})$, which is consistent with what was observed by [?, ?, ?]. In fact, the analysis presented
 251 in [?] and [?] proves that the order of convergence in the L^2 norm can not be worse than $\mathcal{O}(h^p)$ in the case
 252 of smooth functions. The dependence of the error on p is now presented in Figure ?. As anticipated by
 253 Theorem ??, we observe an exponential convergence for the H^1 and L^2 errors before reaching a plateau
 254 region for large p when time discretization errors start to dominate. Indeed, decreasing Δt from 10^{-2} to
 255 10^{-3} , as shown in Figure ?, lowers the plateaus by two orders of magnitude in both norms, which verifies
 256 the second-order accuracy in time.

257 6.2 Non regular solution

258 In order to investigate the effects of the smoothness of the solution on the convergence, we consider a
 259 manufactured solution of the wave equation on $\Omega = (-1, 1) \times (-1, 1)$ that features a discontinuity in the
 260 derivative of order $q + 1$ at $x = 0$. The initial conditions and the source term are thus chosen here so that

$$u(x, y, t) = \begin{cases} \sin(\pi x) \sin(\pi y) (x^q - x^{q+1})(y^q - y^{q+2}) \exp(-\lambda t^2), & x > 0, \\ 0, & x \leq 0, \end{cases}$$

261 with $\lambda = 0.1$. It follows that $u \in C^q(\Omega)$ and $f \in C^{q-2}(\Omega)$. On the one hand, if the number of elements in
 262 the x direction is even, then $x = 0$ coincides with the boundary of some elements in \mathcal{T}_h so that the functions
 263 u and f are in $H^s(\Omega, \mathcal{T}_h)$ for all $s \geq 0$. In this case, the error estimates indicate that the convergence should
 264 have a behavior similar to that of the smooth case. On the other hand, if the number of elements in the x
 265 direction is odd, then the discontinuity occurs in the interior of some elements of the mesh, and we should
 266 expect that the convergence of the numerical solution would be limited by the smoothness of the data. The
 267 two scenarios are presented below.




Figure 1: Convergence of the error in the L^2 norm (left) and in the H^1 norm (right) as a function of $1/h$ for the example of Section ?? with a regular solution using $p = 2, 4$ and $\Delta t = 10^{-4}$.




Figure 2: Convergence of the error in the L^2 norm (left) and in the H^1 norm (right) as a function of p for the example of Section ?? with a regular solution using $\Delta t = 10^{-2}$ and $\Delta t = 10^{-3}$ but a fixed $h = 1/2$.

268 **6.2.1 Odd number of elements**

269 We first investigate the case where $x = 0$ passes through some elements of the triangulation. Therefore, for
 270 the results of Figures ??, ??, and ??, the element size is chosen so that we have an odd number of elements in
 271 the x direction. We present in Figures ?? and ?? the errors in the H^1 and L^2 norms as a function of $1/h$ for
 272 $q = 2$ and $q = 4$, respectively. We observe that both the H^1 and the L^2 errors seem to converge with a rate

273 $\mathcal{O}(h^q)$, independently of the values of p if chosen greater than q . We show in Figure ?? the errors in the H^1
 274 and L^2 norms with respect to the polynomial degree p using $q = 2$ and $q = 4$ and fixing $h = 2/3$. Note that
 275 the polynomial degree p in this figure is presented on a logarithmic scale to better interpret the asymptotic
 276 behavior of the errors. We then observe that the errors behave as $\mathcal{O}(p^{-q})$. The solution $u \in H^{q+1}(\Omega)$ being
 277 more regular than the source term $f \in H^{q-1}(\Omega)$, we should expect from Theorem ?? that the order of
 278 convergence be limited by the source term, that is, it should be $\mathcal{O}(h^{q-1})$ when varying the element size and
 279 $\mathcal{O}(p^{1-q})$ when varying the polynomial degree. However, if one ignores the source term, the estimate based
 280 only on the regularity of u should predict a convergence of $\mathcal{O}(h^q)$ and $\mathcal{O}(p^{-q})$. The numerical experiments
 281 actually exhibit the rates of convergence predicted by the regularity of the solution and do not seem to be
 282 affected by the regularity of the source term.




Figure 3: The error plots in the L^2 norm (left) and in the H^1 norm (right) as a function of $1/h$ for the example of Section ?? with a solution of limited regularity using $p = 4, 6$, $\Delta t = 10^{-3}$, $q = 2$, and a discretization with an odd number of elements in the x direction.

283 6.2.2 Even number of elements

284 We finally consider the case where the discontinuity coincides with some interfaces between elements. We
 285 can infer from Figure ?? that the errors in the H^1 and L^2 norms have the same asymptotic behavior as that
 286 in the case of the smooth function problem. The reason is that the error bound depends on the regularity
 287 of the solution and source term in the broken norm. Thus solving the homogeneous wave equation on a
 288 triangulation for which the discontinuities appear only at the interface between elements will not impact the
 289 order of convergence.

290 7 Conclusions

291 We have developed in this paper a priori error estimates in the H^1 norm for numerical solutions to the
 292 homogeneous wave equation with Dirichlet boundary conditions, approximated by the spectral element




Figure 4: The error plots in the L^2 norm (left) and in the H^1 norm (right) as a function of $1/h$ for the example of Section ?? with a solution of limited regularity using $p = 6, 10$, $\Delta t = 10^{-3}$, $q = 4$, and a discretization with an odd number of elements in the x direction.




Figure 5: The error plots in the L^2 norm (left) and in the H^1 norm (right) as a function of p for the example of Section ?? with a solution of limited regularity using $q = 2, 4$, $\Delta t = 10^{-3}$, and $h = 2/3$ (i.e. the mesh consists of three elements in the x direction).

293 method with Gauss-Lobatto-Legendre quadrature points and a leap-frog discretization in time. This work
 294 is intended to be an extension of the work published in [?, ?, ?], where the authors carried out the error
 295 analysis in the L^2 norm with sub-optimal results in h . We have also presented several numerical examples
 296 that confirmed that our estimates in both h and p are optimal.




Figure 6: The error plots in the L^2 norm (left) and in the H^1 norm (right) as a function of $1/h$ for the example of Section ?? with a solution of limited regularity using $p = 4$, $\Delta t = 10^{-3}$, $q = 2$ and a discretization with an even number of elements in the x direction.

297 One novelty of this study lies in the result of Lemma ??, where we establish that the error estimate
 298 for the projection operator $\Pi_{\mathcal{H}}$ is optimal when expressed with respect to h alone. By contrast, previous
 299 results [?, ?] provided a similar bound, but with the significant difference that the error estimate, which was
 300 simultaneously expressed in terms of h and p , was one order less in h .

301 A second contribution is the estimation of the a priori error in the H^1 norm for the fully discretized
 302 problem. We have presented two a priori error bounds: an h version and an h - p version. The h error
 303 estimates explicitly depend on the size of the elements, the time step, and the smoothness of the data, while
 304 the h - p version additionally depend on the polynomial degree of the basis functions. On the one hand, the
 305 h - p version of the error bound features an optimal exponential convergence in p , a second-order convergence
 306 in time, and an order of convergence $p - 1$ in h . The numerical examples have confirmed the predicted
 307 exponential convergence in p while indicating a slightly better rate of convergence with respect to h . On the
 308 other hand, the a priori error estimates provided by the h version have been shown to match those from the
 309 numerical examples. Finally, we have conducted additional numerical experiments in order to show the effect
 310 of the limited regularity in the data on the convergence. We were able to conclude that the convergence was
 311 not affected if the loss of regularity occurred at the interface of the elements, as predicted by our analysis.

312 The proposed study could be extended to the heterogeneous wave equation in higher dimensions and
 313 to problems with mixed boundary conditions, involving for example Dirichlet and Neumann conditions.
 314 Moreover, similarly to the work in [?], where the authors presented the error analysis for the semi-discrete
 315 wave equation for non affine elements, our findings could be further investigated, both mathematically and
 316 numerically, in the case of triangulations with non affine local transformations.

317 Acknowledgements

318 SP and ML are grateful for the support from the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of
 319 Canada (NSERC) Discovery Grants [grant numbers RGPIN-2019-7154, PGPIN-2018-06592]. This research
 320 was also partially supported by an NSERC Collaborative Research and Development Grant [grant number
 321 RDCPJ 522310-17] with the Institut de Recherche en Électricité du Québec and Prompt. SP is thankful
 322 to the Laboratoire de Mécanique et d'Acoustique UMR 7031, in Marseille, France, for hosting him from
 323 October to December 2019. Finally, the authors also thank J.-P. Ampuero, for having shared SEMLAB with
 324 the community, and Leszek Demkowicz, for his insight on broken Sobolev spaces.

325 Appendix: Proofs

326 Several arguments in the following proofs are similar to those found in [?]. By keeping the novel aspects of
 327 the paper in Sections ??-??, but relegating some of the repetitive algebraic manipulations to the Appendix,
 328 we hope to have made the paper both comprehensive, for those new to the topic, and concise, for those
 329 already familiar with the challenging aspects of this work.

330 **Proof of Lemma ??.** The first step of the proof, to obtain the identity (??), was already presented in the
 331 proof of Theorem ?? but is repeated here for the sake of completeness. Subtracting (??) from (??), we have
 332 for any $v_{\mathcal{H}}^n \in V_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $n = 1, \dots, N_T - 1$,

$$-(\delta^2 u_{\mathcal{H}}^n, v_{\mathcal{H}}^n)_{\mathcal{H}} - a_{\mathcal{H}}(u_{\mathcal{H}}^n, v_{\mathcal{H}}^n) + a(u(t_n), v_{\mathcal{H}}^n) = -(\ddot{u}(t_n), v_{\mathcal{H}}^n) - (f(t_n), v_{\mathcal{H}}^n)_{\mathcal{H}} + (f(t_n), v_{\mathcal{H}}^n),$$

333 so that

$$\begin{aligned} (\delta^2(\Pi_{\mathcal{H}}u(t_n) - u_{\mathcal{H}}^n), v_{\mathcal{H}}^n)_{\mathcal{H}} + a_{\mathcal{H}}(\Pi_{\mathcal{H}}u(t_n) - u_{\mathcal{H}}^n, v_{\mathcal{H}}^n) = \\ (\delta^2\Pi_{\mathcal{H}}u(t_n), v_{\mathcal{H}}^n)_{\mathcal{H}} - (\ddot{u}(t_n), v_{\mathcal{H}}^n) - (f(t_n), v_{\mathcal{H}}^n)_{\mathcal{H}} + (f(t_n), v_{\mathcal{H}}^n), \end{aligned}$$

334 and

$$(\delta^2\phi^n, v_{\mathcal{H}}^n)_{\mathcal{H}} + a_{\mathcal{H}}(\phi^n, v_{\mathcal{H}}^n) = (\delta^2\Pi_{\mathcal{H}}u(t_n), v_{\mathcal{H}}^n)_{\mathcal{H}} - (\ddot{u}(t_n), v_{\mathcal{H}}^n) - (f(t_n), v_{\mathcal{H}}^n)_{\mathcal{H}} + (f(t_n), v_{\mathcal{H}}^n).$$

335 For any $v_{\mathcal{H}}^n \in V_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $n = 1, \dots, N_T - 1$, we have thus shown that

$$(\delta^2\phi^n, v_{\mathcal{H}}^n)_{\mathcal{H}} + a_{\mathcal{H}}(\phi^n, v_{\mathcal{H}}^n) = (r^n, v_{\mathcal{H}}^n)_{\mathcal{H}} + q^n(v_{\mathcal{H}}^n), \quad (29)$$

336 where $r^n = \delta^2\Pi_{\mathcal{H}}u(t_n) - \ddot{u}(t_n)$ and $q^n(v_{\mathcal{H}}^n) = (f(t_n) - \ddot{u}(t_n), v_{\mathcal{H}}^n)_{\mathcal{H}} - (f(t_n) - \ddot{u}(t_n), v_{\mathcal{H}}^n)_{\mathcal{H}}$. In contrast to the
 337 manipulations following (??), we use the same definition of $v_{\mathcal{H}}^n = \phi^{n+1} - \phi^{n-1}$ for all n , and then sum from
 338 $n = 1$ to m , with $1 \leq m \leq N_T - 1$,

$$\sum_{n=1}^m (\delta^2\phi^n, \phi^{n+1} - \phi^{n-1})_{\mathcal{H}} + \sum_{n=1}^m a_{\mathcal{H}}(\phi^n, \phi^{n+1} - \phi^{n-1}) = \sum_{n=1}^m (r^n, \phi^{n+1} - \phi^{n-1})_{\mathcal{H}} + q^n(\phi^{n+1} - \phi^{n-1}). \quad (30)$$

339 The first term in (??) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Delta t^2 \sum_{n=1}^m (\delta^2 \phi^n, \phi^{n+1} - \phi^{n-1})_{\mathcal{H}} \\
&= \sum_{n=1}^m (\phi^{n+1}, \phi^{n+1} - \phi^{n-1})_{\mathcal{H}} - 2 \sum_{n=1}^m (\phi^n, \phi^{n+1} - \phi^{n-1})_{\mathcal{H}} + \sum_{n=1}^m (\phi^{n-1}, \phi^{n+1} - \phi^{n-1})_{\mathcal{H}} \\
&= \sum_{n=1}^m (\phi^{n+1}, \phi^{n+1})_{\mathcal{H}} - 2 \sum_{n=1}^m (\phi^n, \phi^{n+1} - \phi^{n-1})_{\mathcal{H}} + \sum_{n=1}^m (\phi^{n-1}, -\phi^{n-1})_{\mathcal{H}} \\
&= \sum_{n=2}^{m+1} (\phi^n, \phi^n)_{\mathcal{H}} - 2 \sum_{n=1}^m (\phi^n, \phi^{n+1})_{\mathcal{H}} + 2 \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} (\phi^{n+1}, \phi^n)_{\mathcal{H}} - \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} (\phi^n, \phi^n)_{\mathcal{H}} \\
&= (\phi^{m+1}, \phi^{m+1})_{\mathcal{H}} + (\phi^m, \phi^m)_{\mathcal{H}} - 2(\phi^m, \phi^{m+1})_{\mathcal{H}} + 2(\phi^1, \phi^0)_{\mathcal{H}} - (\phi^0, \phi^0)_{\mathcal{H}} - (\phi^1, \phi^1)_{\mathcal{H}} \\
&= \|\phi^{m+1} - \phi^m\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 - \|\phi^1 - \phi^0\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

340 Similarly, one can prove that

$$\sum_{n=1}^m a_{\mathcal{H}}(\phi^n, \phi^{n+1} - \phi^{n-1}) = a_{\mathcal{H}}(\phi^m, \phi^{m+1}) - a_{\mathcal{H}}(\phi^0, \phi^1).$$

341 Substituting these last two identities for the first two terms in (??), we find

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{\Delta t^2} \|\phi^{m+1} - \phi^m\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + a_{\mathcal{H}}(\phi^m, \phi^{m+1}) &= \frac{1}{\Delta t^2} \|\phi^1 - \phi^0\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + a_{\mathcal{H}}(\phi^0, \phi^1) \\
&\quad + \sum_{n=1}^m (r^n, \phi^{n+1} - \phi^{n-1})_{\mathcal{H}} + q^n (\phi^{n+1} - \phi^{n-1}).
\end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

342 The above equation can be extended to $m = 0$ if we define $r^0 = 0$ and $q^0 = 0$.

343 Similar to Grote and Schötzau [?], we remark that

$$\begin{aligned}
a_{\mathcal{H}}(\phi^m, \phi^{m+1}) &= a_{\mathcal{H}}\left(\frac{\phi^m + \phi^{m+1}}{2}, \frac{\phi^m + \phi^{m+1}}{2}\right) - a_{\mathcal{H}}\left(\frac{\phi^m - \phi^{m+1}}{2}, \frac{\phi^m - \phi^{m+1}}{2}\right) \\
&\geq -\frac{1}{4} a_{\mathcal{H}}(\phi^m - \phi^{m+1}, \phi^m - \phi^{m+1}).
\end{aligned}$$

344 Then, using Lemma ??, we have

$$a_{\mathcal{H}}(\phi^m, \phi^{m+1}) \geq -\frac{C_a p^4}{4 h^2} \|\phi^m - \phi^{m+1}\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2.$$

345 Replacing in (??), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\frac{1}{\Delta t^2} - \frac{C_a p^4}{4 h^2}\right) \|\phi^{m+1} - \phi^m\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 &\leq \frac{1}{\Delta t^2} \|\phi^1 - \phi^0\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + a_{\mathcal{H}}(\phi^0, \phi^1) \\
&\quad + \sum_{n=0}^m (r^n, \phi^{n+1} - \phi^{n-1})_{\mathcal{H}} + q^n (\phi^{n+1} - \phi^{n-1}).
\end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

346 For the system to be stable, we then choose Δt , p , and h such that

$$1 - C_a \frac{\Delta t^2 p^4}{4 h^2} = C_* > 0, \tag{33}$$

347 which allows one to complete the proof. \square

348 **Proof of Lemma ??.** The proof is similar to that of Lemma 4.2 from [?]. For every $v_{\mathcal{H}} \in V_{\mathcal{H}}$, we have the
 349 basic identity

$$(\phi^1 - \phi^0, v_{\mathcal{H}})_{\mathcal{H}} = \int_{t_0}^{t_1} (\Pi_{\mathcal{H}} \dot{u}(s) - \dot{u}(s), v_{\mathcal{H}})_{\mathcal{H}} ds + (u(t_1) - u_0, v_{\mathcal{H}})_{\mathcal{H}} - (u_{\mathcal{H}}^1 - u_{\mathcal{H}}^0, v_{\mathcal{H}})_{\mathcal{H}}. \quad (34)$$

350 For an element K , the L^2 projection operator $P_p^K : L^2(K) \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}_p(K)$ is defined such that for any $v \in L^2(K)$,
 351 we have

$$(P_p^K v, v_{\mathcal{H}})_K = (v, v_{\mathcal{H}})_K, \quad \forall v_{\mathcal{H}} \in \mathcal{Q}_p(K).$$

352 Let $\xi(s) = \Pi_{\mathcal{H}} \dot{u}(s) - \dot{u}(s)$ and let P_{p-1}^K be the L^2 projection operator in $\mathcal{Q}_{p-1}(K)$. We remark that Eq. (??)
 353 in the proof of Lemma ?? is always verified with $P_{p-1}^K u$ instead of $I_{h,p-1}^K u$, then (??) becomes

$$(\xi(s), v_{\mathcal{H}})_{\mathcal{H},K} - (\xi(s), v_{\mathcal{H}})_K \leq C \left(\|\xi(s) - I_{h,p}^K \xi(s)\|_{0,K} + \|\xi(s) - P_{p-1}^K \xi(s)\|_{0,K} \right) \|v_{\mathcal{H}}\|_{0,K}.$$

354 Then, summing the above inequality for all $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$, we deduce that

$$(\xi(s), v_{\mathcal{H}})_{\mathcal{H}} - (\xi(s), v_{\mathcal{H}}) \leq C \left(\|\xi(s) - I_{h,p} \xi(s)\|_0 + \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \|\xi(s) - P_{p-1}^K \xi(s)\|_{0,K} \right) \|v_{\mathcal{H}}\|_0. \quad (35)$$

355 By the use of the definition of the L^2 projector, we have $(\xi(s) - P_{p-1}^K \xi(s), P_{p-1}^K \xi(s))_K = 0$, so that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\xi(s) - P_{p-1}^K \xi(s)\|_{0,K}^2 &= (\xi(s) - P_{p-1}^K \xi(s), \xi(s))_{0,K} \\ &\leq \|\xi(s) - P_{p-1}^K \xi(s)\|_{0,K} \|\xi(s)\|_{0,K}. \end{aligned}$$

356 Thus we have $\|\xi(s) - P_{p-1}^K \xi(s)\|_{0,K} \leq \|\xi(s)\|_{0,K}$ and since $I_{h,p}(\Pi_{\mathcal{H}} \dot{u}) = \Pi_{\mathcal{H}} \dot{u}$, Eq. (??) becomes

$$(\xi(s), v_{\mathcal{H}})_{\mathcal{H}} - (\xi(s), v_{\mathcal{H}}) \leq C \left(\|\dot{u}(s) - I_{h,p} \dot{u}(s)\|_0 + \|\dot{u}(s) - \Pi_{\mathcal{H}} \dot{u}(s)\|_0 \right) \|v_{\mathcal{H}}\|_0.$$

357 Using Lemma ?? and Corollary ??, we obtain

$$(\xi(s), v_{\mathcal{H}})_{\mathcal{H}} - (\xi(s), v_{\mathcal{H}}) \leq Ch^{\min(p,s)} p^{-s} \|\dot{u}(s)\|_{s, \mathcal{T}_h} \|v_{\mathcal{H}}\|_0.$$

358 Also from Corollary ??, we have

$$\int_{t_0}^{t_1} (\xi(s), v_{\mathcal{H}}) ds \leq C \Delta t h^{\min(p,s)} p^{-s} \|\dot{u}\|_{C^0(H^s(\mathcal{T}_h))} \|v_{\mathcal{H}}\|_0.$$

359 Hence we have

$$\int_{t_0}^{t_1} (\Pi_{\mathcal{H}} \dot{u}(s) - \dot{u}(s), v_{\mathcal{H}})_{\mathcal{H}} ds \leq C \Delta t h^{\min(p,s)} p^{-s} \|\dot{u}\|_{C^0(H^s(\mathcal{T}_h))} \|v_{\mathcal{H}}\|_0. \quad (36)$$

To bound the remaining terms of (??), we begin by rewriting (??) as

$$\begin{aligned} (u_{\mathcal{H}}^1 - u_{\mathcal{H}}^0, v_{\mathcal{H}})_{\mathcal{H}} &= \Delta t (z_{\mathcal{H}}^0, v_{\mathcal{H}})_{\mathcal{H}} + \frac{\Delta t^2}{2} (f(t_0), v_{\mathcal{H}}) - \frac{\Delta t^2}{2} a(u_0, v_{\mathcal{H}}) \\ &\quad + \frac{\Delta t^2}{2} \left[(f(t_0), v_{\mathcal{H}})_{\mathcal{H}} - (f(t_0), v_{\mathcal{H}}) + a(u_0, v_{\mathcal{H}}) - a_{\mathcal{H}}(u_{\mathcal{H}}^0, v_{\mathcal{H}}) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

360 Then, using (??) at $t = t_0$ and (??), as well as the definition of ϕ^0 , we get

$$(u_{\mathcal{H}}^1 - u_{\mathcal{H}}^0, v_{\mathcal{H}})_{\mathcal{H}} = \Delta t (u^1, v_{\mathcal{H}})_{\mathcal{H}} + \frac{\Delta t^2}{2} \left[(\ddot{u}(t_0), v_{\mathcal{H}}) + (f(t_0), v_{\mathcal{H}})_{\mathcal{H}} - (f(t_0), v_{\mathcal{H}}) + a_{\mathcal{H}}(\phi^0, v_{\mathcal{H}}) \right]. \quad (37)$$

361 We now introduce the Taylor's expansion

$$u(t_1) = u_0 + \Delta t u_1 + \frac{\Delta t^2}{2} \ddot{u}(t_0) + R_3, \quad (38)$$

362 where the remainder term R_3 is given by

$$R_3 = \frac{1}{2} \int_{t_0}^{t_1} (\Delta t - s)^2 u^{(3)}(s) ds.$$

363 To derive an estimate for the two last terms in (??), we isolate the Δt^2 term in (??) and combine it with (??)
364 to find

$$\begin{aligned} & (u(t_1) - u_0, v_{\mathcal{H}})_{\mathcal{H}} - (u_{\mathcal{H}}^1 - u_{\mathcal{H}}^0, v_{\mathcal{H}})_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &= (u(t_1) - u_0, v_{\mathcal{H}})_{\mathcal{H}} - (u(t_1) - u_0, v_{\mathcal{H}}) + \Delta t (u_1, v_{\mathcal{H}}) - \Delta t (u_1, v_{\mathcal{H}})_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &+ (R_3, v_{\mathcal{H}}) - \frac{\Delta t^2}{2} \left[(f(t_0), v_{\mathcal{H}})_{\mathcal{H}} - (f(t_0), v_{\mathcal{H}}) + a_{\mathcal{H}}(\phi^0, v_{\mathcal{H}}) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

365 To bound the right-hand side of this last identity, we first observe that

$$(u(t_1) - u_0, v_{\mathcal{H}})_{\mathcal{H}} - (u(t_1) - u_0, v_{\mathcal{H}}) = \int_{t_0}^{t_1} (\dot{u}(s), v_{\mathcal{H}})_{\mathcal{H}} - (\dot{u}(s), v_{\mathcal{H}}) ds,$$

366 and then apply Lemma ?? repeatedly to conclude

$$\begin{aligned} & (u(t_1) - u(t_0), v_{\mathcal{H}})_{\mathcal{H}} - (u_{\mathcal{H}}^1 - u_{\mathcal{H}}^0, v_{\mathcal{H}})_{\mathcal{H}} \\ & \leq C \left[\Delta t h^{\min(p,s)} p^{-s} \|\dot{u}\|_{C^0(H^s(\mathcal{T}_h))} + \Delta t h^{\min(p,s)} p^{-s} \|u_1\|_{s, \mathcal{T}_h} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \Delta t^3 \|u^{(3)}\|_{C^0(L^2)} + \Delta t^2 h^{\min(p,d)} p^{-d} \|f(t_0)\|_{d, \mathcal{T}_h} \right] \|v_{\mathcal{H}}\|_0 - \frac{\Delta t^2}{2} a_{\mathcal{H}}(\phi^0, v_{\mathcal{H}}). \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

367 Since $u_1 = \dot{u}(0)$, the term $\|u_1\|_{s, \mathcal{T}_h}$ is bounded by $\|\dot{u}\|_{C^0(H^s(\mathcal{T}_h))}$ from the definition of the $C^m(H^s(\mathcal{T}_h))$
368 norm (??). We now return to our original expansion (??), substitute $v_{\mathcal{H}}$ for $\phi^1 - \phi^0$, use Eqs. (??) and (??),
369 and invoke Lemma ??, to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi^1 - \phi^0\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + \frac{\Delta t^2}{2} a_{\mathcal{H}}(\phi^0, \phi^1) & \leq C \left[\Delta t h^{\min(p,s)} p^{-s} \|\dot{u}\|_{C^0(H^s(\mathcal{T}_h))} + \Delta t^3 \|u^{(3)}\|_{C^0(L^2)} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \Delta t^2 h^{\min(p,d)} p^{-d} \|f(t_0)\|_{d, \mathcal{T}_h} \right] \|\phi^1 - \phi^0\|_{\mathcal{H}} + \frac{\Delta t^2}{2} a_{\mathcal{H}}(\phi^0, \phi^0). \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

370 Using $2ab \leq a^2 + b^2$, the previous inequality becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\phi^1 - \phi^0\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + \frac{\Delta t^2}{2} a_{\mathcal{H}}(\phi^0, \phi^1) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} C^2 \left[\Delta t h^{\min(p,s)} p^{-s} \|\dot{u}\|_{C^0(H^s(\mathcal{T}_h))} + \Delta t^3 \|u^{(3)}\|_{C^0(L^2)} + \Delta t^2 h^{\min(p,d)} p^{-d} \|f(t_0)\|_{d, \mathcal{T}_h} \right]^2 \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{2} \|\phi^1 - \phi^0\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + \frac{\Delta t^2}{2} a_{\mathcal{H}}(\phi^0, \phi^0). \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

371 We still have to bound the last term in the right-hand side of (??). From the continuity of $a_{\mathcal{H}}$ and Eq. (??),
372 we conclude that

$$a_{\mathcal{H}}(\phi^0, \phi^0) \leq C h^{2 \min(p,s) - 2} p^{2-2s} \|u_0\|_{s, \mathcal{T}_h}^2. \quad (43)$$

373 Thus, replacing the above inequality in (??) leads to the desired result. \square

374 **Proof of Lemma ??.** Recall that for each $n = 0, \dots, N_T - 1$, we have an arbitrary $v_{\mathcal{H}}^n \in V_{\mathcal{H}}$. Furthermore,
 375 we continue to assume that $q^0 = r^0 = 0$ and we select an integer m between 1 and $N_T - 1$. Using Lemma ??
 376 and Lemma ??, we can show

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{n=1}^m q^n(v_{\mathcal{H}}^n) &= \sum_{n=1}^m (f(t_n) - \ddot{u}(t_n), v_{\mathcal{H}}^n) - (f(t_n) - \ddot{u}(t_n), v_{\mathcal{H}}^n)_{\mathcal{H}} \\
 &\leq C \sum_{n=1}^m h^{\min(p,d)} p^{-d} \|f(t_n)\|_{d, \mathcal{T}_h} \|v_{\mathcal{H}}^n\|_0 + h^{\min(p,s)} p^{-s} \|\ddot{u}(t_n)\|_{s, \mathcal{T}_h} \|v_{\mathcal{H}}^n\|_0 \\
 &\leq CN_T \left[h^{\min(p,d)} p^{-d} \max_{1 \leq n \leq m} \|f(t_n)\|_{d, \mathcal{T}_h} + h^{\min(p,s)} p^{-s} \max_{1 \leq n \leq m} \|\ddot{u}(t_n)\|_{s, \mathcal{T}_h} \right] \max_{1 \leq n \leq m} \|v_{\mathcal{H}}^n\|_0 \\
 &\leq CN_T \left[h^{\min(p,d)} p^{-d} \|f\|_{C^0(H^d(\mathcal{T}_h))} + h^{\min(p,s)} p^{-s} \|\ddot{u}\|_{C^0(H^s(\mathcal{T}_h))} \right] \max_{1 \leq n \leq m} \|v_{\mathcal{H}}^n\|_{\mathcal{H}}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

377 The proof of Lemma 4.3 in [?] showed that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|r^n\|_{\mathcal{H}} &\leq C \left(h^{\min(p+1,s)} p^{1-s} \|\ddot{u}(t_n)\|_{s, \mathcal{T}_h} \right. \\
 &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{\Delta t} \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_{n+1}} \|\Pi_{\mathcal{H}} \ddot{u}(s) - \ddot{u}(s)\|_0 ds + \frac{\Delta t}{6} \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_{n+1}} \|u^{(4)}(s)\|_0 ds \right).
 \end{aligned}$$

378 Applying Corollary ?? to this estimate, we find

$$\|r^n\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq C \left(h^{\min(p,s)} p^{1-s} \|\ddot{u}\|_{C^0(H^s(\mathcal{T}_h))} + \Delta t^2 \|u^{(4)}\|_{C^0(L^2)} \right).$$

379 The previous estimate immediately leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{n=1}^m (r^n, v_{\mathcal{H}}^n)_{\mathcal{H}} &\leq \sum_{n=1}^m \|r^n\|_{\mathcal{H}} \|v_{\mathcal{H}}^n\|_{\mathcal{H}} \\
 &\leq CN_T \left(h^{\min(p,s)} p^{1-s} \|\ddot{u}\|_{C^0(H^s(\mathcal{T}_h))} + \Delta t^2 \|u^{(4)}\|_{C^0(L^2)} \right) \max_{1 \leq n \leq m} \|v_{\mathcal{H}}^n\|_{\mathcal{H}}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

380 The result is deduced by combining (??) and (??). □

381 **Proof of Lemma ??.** First, we recall the estimate from Lemma ??

$$C \|\phi^{m+1} - \phi^m\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \leq \|\phi^1 - \phi^0\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + \Delta t^2 a_{\mathcal{H}}(\phi^0, \phi^1) + \Delta t^2 \sum_{n=0}^m (r^n, \phi^{n+1} - \phi^{n-1})_{\mathcal{H}} + q^n(\phi^{n+1} - \phi^{n-1}),$$

382 which holds for $m = 0, \dots, N_T - 1$. We bound the terms on the right-hand side using Lemma ?? and
 383 Lemma ??.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \max_{0 \leq n \leq N_T - 1} \|\phi^{n+1} - \phi^n\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 &\leq C \left[\Delta t h^{\min(p,s)} p^{-s} \|\ddot{u}\|_{C^0(H^s(\mathcal{T}_h))} + \Delta t^3 \|u^{(3)}\|_{C^0(L^2)} \right. \\
 &\quad \left. + \Delta t^2 h^{\min(p,d)} p^{-d} \|f(t_0)\|_{d, \mathcal{T}_h} + \Delta t h^{\min(p,s)-1} p^{1-s} \|u_0\|_{s, \mathcal{T}_h} \right]^2 \\
 &\quad + CT \Delta t \left[h^{\min(p,d)} p^{-d} \|f\|_{C^0(H^d(\mathcal{T}_h))} + h^{\min(p,s)} p^{1-s} \|\ddot{u}\|_{C^0(H^s(\mathcal{T}_h))} \right. \\
 &\quad \left. + \Delta t^2 \|u^{(4)}\|_{C^0(L^2)} \right] \max_{1 \leq n \leq N_T - 1} \|\phi^{n+1} - \phi^{n-1}\|_{\mathcal{H}}.
 \end{aligned}$$

384 Using the Peter-Paul inequality, i.e. $2ab \leq \varepsilon a^2 + b^2/\varepsilon$ with $\varepsilon = 2$, yields

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{0 \leq n \leq N_T - 1} \|\phi^{n+1} - \phi^n\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 &\leq C \left[\Delta t h^{\min(p,s)} p^{-s} \|\dot{u}\|_{C^0(H^s(\mathcal{T}_h))} + \Delta t^3 \|u^{(3)}\|_{C^0(L^2)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \Delta t^2 h^{\min(p,d)} p^{-d} \|f(t_0)\|_{d,\mathcal{T}_h} + \Delta t h^{\min(p,s)-1} p^{1-s} \|u_0\|_{s,\mathcal{T}_h} \right]^2 \\ &\quad + C^2 T^2 \Delta t^2 \left[h^{\min(p,d)} p^{-d} \|f\|_{C^0(H^d(\mathcal{T}_h))} + h^{\min(p,s)} p^{1-s} \|\ddot{u}\|_{C^0(H^s(\mathcal{T}_h))} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \Delta t^2 \|u^{(4)}\|_{C^0(L^2)} \right]^2 + \frac{1}{4} \max_{1 \leq n \leq N_T - 1} \|\phi^{n+1} - \phi^{n-1}\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

385 With the help of the obvious bound

$$\max_{1 \leq n \leq N_T - 1} \|\phi^{n+1} - \phi^{n-1}\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq 2 \max_{0 \leq n \leq N_T - 1} \|\phi^{n+1} - \phi^n\|_{\mathcal{H}},$$

386 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{0 \leq n \leq N_T - 1} \|\phi^{n+1} - \phi^n\|_{\mathcal{H}} &\leq C \Delta t \left[h^{\min(p,s)} p^{-s} \|\dot{u}\|_{C^0(H^s(\mathcal{T}_h))} + \Delta t^2 \|u^{(3)}\|_{C^0(L^2)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \Delta t h^{\min(p,d)} p^{-d} \|f(t_0)\|_{d,\mathcal{T}_h} + h^{\min(p,s)-1} p^{1-s} \|u_0\|_{s,\mathcal{T}_h} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + h^{\min(p,d)} p^{-d} \|f\|_{C^0(H^d(\mathcal{T}_h))} + h^{\min(p,s)} p^{1-s} \|\ddot{u}\|_{C^0(H^s(\mathcal{T}_h))} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \Delta t^2 \|u^{(4)}\|_{C^0(L^2)} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

387 Remembering that $\Delta t < T$ allows one to conclude the proof. □