



**HAL**  
open science

# Convergence analysis for the wave equation discretized with hybrid methods in space (HHO, HDG and WG) and the leapfrog scheme in time

Alexandre Ern, Morgane Steins

► **To cite this version:**

Alexandre Ern, Morgane Steins. Convergence analysis for the wave equation discretized with hybrid methods in space (HHO, HDG and WG) and the leapfrog scheme in time. *Journal of Scientific Computing*, 2024, 101 (1), Paper 7, 28 pp. 10.1007/s10915-024-02609-y . hal-04200966v2

**HAL Id: hal-04200966**

**<https://hal.science/hal-04200966v2>**

Submitted on 15 May 2024

**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.

# Convergence analysis for the wave equation discretized with hybrid methods in space (HHO, HDG and WG) and the leapfrog scheme in time

Alexandre Ern\*

Morgane Steins†

May 15, 2024

## Abstract

We prove the optimal convergence in space and time for the linear acoustic wave equation in its second-order formulation in time, using the hybrid high-order method for space discretization and the leapfrog (central finite difference) scheme for time discretization. The proof hinges on energy arguments similar to those classically deployed in the context of continuous finite elements or discontinuous Galerkin methods, but some novel ideas need to be introduced to handle the static coupling between cell and face unknowns. Because of the close ties between the methods, the present proof can be readily extended to cover space semi-discretization using the hybridizable discontinuous Galerkin method and the weak Galerkin method.

## 1 Introduction

The wave equation is encountered in the modeling of various physical phenomena, such as seismic, sound or water waves. We focus here on the linear acoustic wave equation written using the second-order formulation in time. A vast literature is available on the numerical simulation of this equation. Concerning the semi-discretization in space, we mention continuous Galerkin (cG) finite element methods with specific quadratures to lump the mass matrix [3, 14, 26, 25], interior penalty discontinuous Galerkin (dG) methods in either nonsymmetric [34] or symmetric [27] form, local discontinuous Galerkin (LDG) methods [9], hybridizable discontinuous Galerkin (HDG) methods [11], and weak Galerkin (WG) methods [28].

In this work, we consider the hybrid high-order (HHO) method for space semi-discretization. The HHO method was introduced in [20] for linear diffusion and in [19] for locking-free linear elasticity. It was developed extensively over the past years; for brevity, we only mention the two textbooks [16, 10]. The HHO method for the wave equation was developed in [4], and extended to unfitted meshes in [5]. The discrete unknowns in the HHO method consist of a pair, namely piecewise polynomials of order  $l \geq 0$  approximating the solution in the mesh cells and piecewise polynomials of order  $k \geq 0$  approximating the solution trace on the mesh faces. The HHO method is formulated by means of a local (cellwise) gradient reconstruction and a stabilization operator whose role is to ensure in a weak sense the matching of the trace of the cell unknowns with the face unknowns. The HHO method offers numerous advantages: support of polyhedral meshes, optimal convergence rates, local conservation principles, and computational efficiency. In particular, the support of polyhedral meshes allows for a natural use of mesh refinement with hanging nodes.

---

\*CERMICS, Ecole des Ponts, 77455 Marne-la-Vallée Cedex 2, France; INRIA Paris, 75589 Paris, France

†Université Paris-Saclay, CEA, Service d'études mécaniques et thermiques, 91191, Gif-sur-Yvette, France; CERMICS, Ecole des Ponts, 77455 Marne-la-Vallée Cedex 2, France; INRIA Paris, 75589 Paris, France

HHO and WG methods share the same devising principles. The reconstructed gradient in the HHO method is called weak gradient in the WG method. The equal-order ( $l = k$ ) HHO stabilization has not yet been considered in the WG method, where the stabilization is either a plain least-squares penalty or, in the mixed-order case ( $l = k + 1$ ), involves the  $L^2$ -projection of the cell unknowns onto polynomials of order  $k$  on the faces, as in the Lehrenfeld–Schöberl HDG stabilization [30, 31]. Notice that the latter indeed leads to optimal error estimates, whereas one order of convergence is lost with the plain least-squares stabilization. A detailed comparison of HHO and WG methods for the biharmonic problem can be found in [22]. Furthermore, as shown in [12], the HHO and HDG methods are closely related. Indeed, the HDG method approximates a triple which is composed of the pair of unknowns considered in the HHO method together with vector-valued piecewise polynomials for the dual variable (typically, the gradient). In the HDG method, the discrete dual variable can be expressed locally in terms of the other two variables, and this formula turns out to correspond to the HHO gradient reconstruction. Moreover, the numerical flux trace, which is one of the cornerstones in the devising of the HDG method, can be explicitly related to the normal component of the HHO reconstructed gradient and the stabilization used in the HHO method. We also notice that, in the equal-order case ( $l = k$ ), the HHO stabilization has not yet been considered in the HDG context and that, in the mixed-order case ( $l = k + 1$ ), the HHO stabilization is the Lehrenfeld–Schöberl HDG stabilization. One interesting difference concerns the convergence analysis since the HHO method solely relies on (local)  $L^2$ -orthogonal projections, whereas in the HDG method, one usually invokes a special projection operator. Finally, as discussed in [12, 17, 10], the HHO method with the choice  $l = k - 1$ ,  $k \geq 1$ , is closely related to the nonconforming virtual element method (ncVEM); see also [8] in the context of multiscale problems.

The goal of the present work is to derive optimal energy-error estimates for the wave equation discretized by the HHO method in space and the leapfrog (central finite difference) scheme in time. Owing to the above discussion, the present results are readily applicable to HDG or WG space semi-discretizations (see Remark 5.4), and with some adaptations to ncVEM. The leapfrog scheme is an explicit, conditionally stable, second-order scheme that is very popular to discretize in time the wave equation combined with either cG or dG space semi-discretization. To the best of our knowledge, a convergence analysis of the wave equation using the leapfrog scheme has not yet been performed with either HDG, WG or HHO space semi-discretization. The space convergence analysis in the time-continuous case is performed in [13] for the HDG method and in [6] for the HHO method using different arguments. Fully discrete schemes have been so far considered only in the context of implicit schemes in time, as the fourth-order Störmer–Numerov scheme combined with the HDG method in [11] and the second-order backward differentiation formula with the WG scheme in [28]. Thus, the convergence analysis of HHO, HDG or WG methods with an explicit time-marching scheme under a CFL stability condition appears to be a novel contribution to the literature. One practical difficulty with the leapfrog scheme combined with any hybrid method is the static coupling between cell and face unknowns at each time step. This drawback has been recently lifted in [37], which proposes to handle the static coupling by means of an iterative scheme. The key point is that weighting the stabilization by a large enough coefficient ensures a fast convergence of the scheme while mildly impacting the accuracy and the CFL stability condition. We refer the reader to [37] for the mathematical analysis in the linear case and for various numerical results on linear and nonlinear wave equations.

Our main result is Theorem 5.1 below, stating the optimal convergence in space and in time of the discrete wave equation approximated using the HHO method in space and the leapfrog scheme in time. The convergence proof follows the general pattern that is already known for the analysis of the leapfrog scheme combined with cG or dG space semi-discretization: derivation of error equations where the consistency errors in space and time appear as source terms, derivation of an energy identity on the errors, and bound on the consistency terms. There are, however, two nontrivial differences. The first one is that the naive expression of the energy error fails to deliver a strongly convex functional on the time- and space-derivatives of the error, because there is a nonzero consistency error related to the mesh faces. This difficulty is lifted by

introducing a modified energy which satisfies a time-discrete energy identity with an additional source term (see Lemma 5.6 below). The second difference is the need to bound this additional source term. Fortunately, this can be achieved by an additional control gained by the modified discrete energy on the face velocity errors; see (68).

We close this discussion by a short literature review on the wave equation with the first-order formulation in time. One can consider either the Hamiltonian-type formulation in which the unknowns are the primal variable and its velocity or the mixed (or Friedrichs-type) formulation in which the unknowns are the velocity and the dual variable (typically, the gradient of the primal variable). Both formulations lead, after space semi-discretization, to a set of coupled first-order ODEs that can be discretized using, e.g., Runge–Kutta (RK) methods in various flavors. The first formulation is considered in the context of dG methods in [2], of HDG methods in [35], and of WG methods (with Crank–Nicolson time-stepping) in [29]. For the second formulation, we mention HDG methods with either implicit [33, 32] or explicit [36] RK schemes and HHO methods with either implicit or explicit RK schemes [4].

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we present the continuous, the space semi-discrete and the fully discrete wave equation. In Section 3, we collect from the literature various results on the HHO method that are useful to perform the analysis. In Section 4, we address energy stability to highlight how the static coupling between cell and face unknowns impacts the energy balance. In Section 5, we perform the convergence analysis on the energy error. Finally, in Section 6, we present some numerical experiments.

## 2 Continuous, semi-discrete and fully discrete wave equations

In this section, we present the continuous, the space semi-discrete, and the fully discrete wave equation. The space discretization hinges on the HHO method and the time discretization on the leapfrog (central finite difference) scheme.

### 2.1 Model problem

The acoustic wave equation is posed on the space domain  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  and the time interval  $J := [0, \mathfrak{T}]$ , with  $\mathfrak{T} > 0$ . Standard notation is used for Lebesgue, Sobolev and Bochner spaces. Let  $(\cdot, \cdot)_\Omega$  denote the  $L^2$ -inner product on  $\Omega$  and  $\|\cdot\|_\Omega$  the associated norm. Boldface notation is used for  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued vectors and vector-valued fields, as well as for  $\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ -valued matrices and matrix-valued fields. For dimensional consistency, we consider a length scale  $\ell_\Omega$  representative of  $\Omega$ , e.g. its diameter.

We consider a source term  $f \in C^0(\bar{J}; L^2(\Omega))$  with  $\bar{J} = [0, \mathfrak{T}]$  and a coefficient  $\mu \in L^\infty(\Omega)$  representing the speed of sound and taking values uniformly bounded from below away from zero. For simplicity, we enforce homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions and we prescribe initial data  $u_0, v_0 \in H_0^1(\Omega)$  satisfying these conditions. Focusing on the strong solution, the acoustic wave equation consists of finding  $u \in C^2(\bar{J}; L^2(\Omega)) \cap C^1(\bar{J}; H_0^1(\Omega))$  such that

$$(\partial_t^2 u(t), w)_\Omega + (\mu^2 \nabla u(t), \nabla w)_\Omega = (f, w)_\Omega, \quad \forall t \in \bar{J}, \forall w \in H_0^1(\Omega), \quad (1)$$

with the initial conditions

$$u(0) = u_0, \quad \partial_t u(0) = v_0. \quad (2)$$

The notion of energy is central to the analysis of the paper. We set, for all  $t \in \bar{J}$ ,

$$E(t) := \frac{1}{2} \|\partial_t u(t)\|_\Omega^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|\mu \nabla u(t)\|_\Omega^2. \quad (3)$$

This energy verifies

$$E(t) = E(0) + \int_0^t (f(s), \partial_t u(s))_\Omega ds, \quad (4)$$

as readily follows by testing (1) with  $w := \partial_t u(t)$  for all  $t \in \bar{J}$  and integrating in time.

## 2.2 HHO space semi-discretization

The space semi-discretization of (1)-(2) is performed using the HHO method. To avoid technicalities, we assume that  $\Omega$  is a Lipschitz polyhedron and that  $\mu$  is piecewise constant on a polyhedral partition of  $\Omega$ .

**Discrete setting** Let  $(\mathcal{T}_h)_{h>0}$  be a sequence of polyhedral meshes of  $\Omega$ , such that each mesh  $\mathcal{T}_h$  covers exactly  $\Omega$ . For all  $h > 0$ , let  $T$  denote a generic mesh cell in  $\mathcal{T}_h$ ,  $h_T$  its diameter and  $\mathbf{n}_T$  its unit outward normal. We set  $h := \max_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} h_T$  for the mesh size, and we also set  $h_{\min} := \min_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} h_T$  to be used in the CFL condition. We say that the  $(d-1)$ -dimensional set  $F$  is a mesh face if there is a hyperplane  $H_F$  such that either  $F = H_F \cap \partial T_- \cap T_+$  for two distinct mesh cells  $T_-$  and  $T_+$  (and  $F$  is called mesh interface) or  $F = H_F \cap \partial T_- \cap \partial \Omega$  (and  $F$  is called mesh boundary face). The collection of all the mesh faces is denoted  $\mathcal{F}_h$ . For all  $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ , we denote by  $\mathcal{F}_T$  the collection of the mesh faces composing the boundary  $\partial T$ . The mesh sequence is assumed to be shape-regular; see, e.g., [18, 7, 16, 10]. Moreover, each mesh  $\mathcal{T}_h$  is assumed to be compatible with the partition on which the coefficient  $\mu$  is piecewise constant. Hence,  $\mu$  takes a constant value denoted by  $\mu_T$  in each mesh cell  $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ . Thus, there are  $0 < \mu_b \leq \mu_\sharp < \infty$  such that  $\mu_b \leq \mu_T \leq \mu_\sharp$  for all  $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ . We assume that the ratio  $\frac{\mu_\sharp}{\mu_b}$  is not too large, so that it can be hidden in the generic constants used in the error analysis.

The HHO method is formulated using face and cell unknowns which are polynomials attached to the mesh faces and to the mesh cells, respectively. Let the integer  $k \geq 0$  be the polynomial order of the face unknowns and let  $l \in \{k, k+1\}$  be the order of the cell unknowns. The setting is said to be of equal-order if  $l = k$  and of mixed-order if  $l = k+1$ . Let  $\mathbb{P}_d^l(T)$  (resp.  $\mathbb{P}_{d-1}^k(F)$ ) denote the set of  $d$ -variate (resp.  $(d-1)$ -variate) polynomials of degree at most  $l$  (resp.  $k$ ) restricted to the cell  $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$  (resp. to the face  $F \in \mathcal{F}_h$ ). The linear space composed of all the cell degrees of freedom is denoted  $\mathcal{U}_T^l$ , and the linear space composed of all the face degrees of freedom is denoted  $\mathcal{U}_F^k$ . These spaces are defined as Cartesian products in the form

$$\mathcal{U}_T^l := \prod_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} \mathbb{P}_d^l(T), \quad \mathcal{U}_F^k := \prod_{F \in \mathcal{F}_h} \mathbb{P}_{d-1}^k(F), \quad (5)$$

and we slightly abuse the notation by viewing an element  $w_T = (w_T)_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} \in \mathcal{U}_T^l$  as a function defined a.e. over  $\Omega$  such that  $w_T|_T := w_T$  for all  $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ . The collection of all the cell and face degrees of freedom is the hybrid space

$$\widehat{\mathcal{U}}_h^{l,k} := \mathcal{U}_T^l \times \mathcal{U}_F^k. \quad (6)$$

A generic element of  $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}_h^{l,k}$  is denoted  $\hat{w}_h := (w_T, w_F) \in \mathcal{U}_T^l \times \mathcal{U}_F^k$  and, in what follows, variables with hats refer to hybrid variables. For a given cell  $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ , we also define a local hybrid space of degrees of freedom

$$\widehat{\mathcal{U}}_T^{l,k} := \mathbb{P}_d^l(T) \times \mathcal{U}_{\partial T}^k, \quad \mathcal{U}_{\partial T}^k := \prod_{F \in \mathcal{F}_T} \mathbb{P}_{d-1}^k(F). \quad (7)$$

Then  $\hat{w}_T := (w_T, w_{\partial T} := (w_F)_{F \in \mathcal{F}_T}) \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_T^{l,k}$  denotes a generic local hybrid unknown in  $T$ , composed of one cell unknown and the collection of the face unknowns for all the faces in  $\mathcal{F}_T$ . As above, we slightly abuse the notation by viewing an element  $w_{\partial T} = (w_F)_{F \in \mathcal{F}_T} \in \mathcal{U}_{\partial T}^k$  as a function defined a.e. over  $\partial T$  such that  $w_{\partial T}|_F := w_F$  for all  $F \in \mathcal{F}_T$ . Let  $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{F},0}^k := \{v_F \in \mathcal{U}_F^k, \text{ s.t. } v_F = 0, \forall F \subset \partial \Omega\}$  be the subspace of face

unknowns respecting the homogeneous Dirichlet conditions. The subspace of hybrid unknowns respecting the homogeneous Dirichlet conditions is denoted

$$\widehat{\mathcal{U}}_{h,0}^{l,k} := \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{T}}^l \times \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{F},0}^k. \quad (8)$$

It is also possible to consider non-homogeneous Dirichlet and Neumann conditions; the modifications to the HHO discretization are discussed, e.g., in [21].

$L^2$ -orthogonal projections onto polynomial spaces are denoted with the symbol  $\Pi$ . For instance, for all  $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ ,  $\Pi_T^l$  is the projection onto  $\mathbb{P}_d^l(T)$ ,  $\Pi_{\partial T}^k$  the projection onto  $\mathcal{U}_{\partial T}^k$ , and for all  $F \in \mathcal{F}_h$ ,  $\Pi_F^k$  the projection onto  $\mathbb{P}_{d-1}^k(F)$ . The  $L^2$ -orthogonal projection onto the broken polynomial spaces  $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{T}}^l$  and  $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{F}}^k$  is denoted by  $\Pi_{\mathcal{T}}^l$  and  $\Pi_{\mathcal{F}}^k$  respectively. Let  $(\cdot, \cdot)_T$ ,  $(\cdot, \cdot)_{\partial T}$  and  $(\cdot, \cdot)_F$  respectively denote the  $L^2$ -inner product in the cell  $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ , its boundary  $\partial T$  and the face  $F \in \mathcal{F}_h$ . Let  $\|\cdot\|_T$ ,  $\|\cdot\|_{\partial T}$ ,  $\|\cdot\|_F$  denote the norms associated respectively with the  $L^2$ -inner products  $(\cdot, \cdot)_T$ ,  $(\cdot, \cdot)_{\partial T}$  and  $(\cdot, \cdot)_F$ .

**Gradient and potential reconstruction.** The local gradient reconstruction operator builds a gradient in the cell  $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$  from the local cell and face unknowns in  $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}_T^{l,k}$ . This operator  $\mathbf{G}_T^k : \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_T^{l,k} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_d^k(T; \mathbb{R}^d)$  is evaluated by solving the following problem: For all  $\hat{v}_T \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_T^{l,k}$ ,

$$(\mathbf{G}_T^k(\hat{v}_T), \mathbf{q})_T = (\nabla v_T, \mathbf{q})_T + (v_{\partial T} - v_T, \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{n}_T)_{\partial T}, \quad \forall \mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{P}_d^k(T; \mathbb{R}^d), \quad (9)$$

where  $\mathbb{P}_d^k(T; \mathbb{R}^d)$  denotes the space of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued  $d$ -variate polynomials of degree  $k$  in the cell  $T$ . In practice, each component of the reconstructed gradient is found independently by inverting the mass matrix associated with a chosen scalar-valued basis of  $\mathbb{P}_d^k(T)$ .

One can also build a potential reconstruction operator  $R_T^{k+1} : \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_T^{l,k} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_d^{k+1}(T)$  by solving, for all  $\hat{v}_T \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_T^{l,k}$ , the following Neumann problem:

$$(\nabla R_T^{k+1}(\hat{v}_T), \nabla q)_T = (\nabla v_T, \nabla q)_T + (v_{\partial T} - v_T, \nabla q \cdot \mathbf{n}_T)_{\partial T}, \quad \forall q \in \mathbb{P}_{d,*}^{k+1}(T), \quad (10)$$

with  $\mathbb{P}_{d,*}^{k+1}(T) := \{q \in \mathbb{P}_d^{k+1}(T) \mid (q, 1)_T = 0\}$ , with the mean-value condition  $(R_T^{k+1}(\hat{v}_T), 1)_T = (v_T, 1)_T$ .

**Remark 2.1** (Gradient reconstruction). Notice that we have  $\nabla R_T^{k+1}(\hat{v}_T) = \Pi_{\nabla \mathbb{P}_d^{k+1}(T)} \mathbf{G}_T^k(\hat{v}_T)$  for all  $\hat{v}_T \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_T^{l,k}$ . For nonlinear problems, it is preferable to consider the gradient reconstruction operator  $\mathbf{G}_T^k$  rather than  $\nabla R_T^{k+1}$ , as discussed in [15, 1]. In the present linear setting, the stiffness part of the semi-discrete problem can be evaluated using  $\nabla R_T^{k+1}$ . Notice though that even when working with the operator  $\mathbf{G}_T^k$ , it is necessary to evaluate the operator  $R_T^{k+1}$  to compute the stabilization in the equal-order setting (see (12) below).

**Stabilization.** The role of the stabilization is to weakly enforce the matching between the cell and the face unknowns at each mesh face. Let  $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ . For all  $\hat{w}_T \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_T^{l,k}$ , set  $\delta_{\partial T}(\hat{w}_T) := w_{\partial T} - w_T|_{\partial T}$ . In the mixed-order setting, the local stabilization operator  $S_{\partial T}$  is defined as

$$S_{\partial T}(\hat{w}_T) := \Pi_{\partial T}^k(\delta_{\partial T}(\hat{w}_T)), \quad \forall \hat{w}_T \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_T^{l,k}, \quad (11)$$

which corresponds to the Lehrenfeld–Schöberl HDG stabilization (see, e.g. [30, 31]). In the equal-order setting, the definition of  $S_{\partial T}$  requires the computation of  $R_T^{k+1}$  and writes

$$S_{\partial T}(\hat{w}_T) := \Pi_{\partial T}^k(\delta_{\partial T}(\hat{w}_T) + (I - \Pi_T^k)R_T^{k+1}(0, \delta_{\partial T}(\hat{w}_T))|_{\partial T}), \quad \forall \hat{w}_T \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_T^{k,k} =: \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_T^k. \quad (12)$$

**HHO space semi-discrete wave equation.** The global bilinear form  $a_h$  is defined, for all  $\hat{v}_h, \hat{w}_h \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_h^{l,k}$ , as

$$a_h(\hat{v}_h, \hat{w}_h) := \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} \mu_T^2 \left\{ (\mathbf{G}_T^k(\hat{v}_T), \mathbf{G}_T^k(\hat{w}_T))_T + h_T^{-1} (\mathcal{S}_{\partial T}(\hat{v}_T), \mathcal{S}_{\partial T}(\hat{w}_T))_{\partial T} \right\}. \quad (13)$$

The space semi-discrete wave equation consists of finding  $\hat{u}_h := (u_{\mathcal{T}}, u_{\mathcal{F}}) \in C^2(\bar{J}; \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_{h,0}^{l,k})$  such that

$$(\partial_t^2 u_{\mathcal{T}}(t), w_{\mathcal{T}})_{\Omega} + a_h(\hat{u}_h(t), \hat{w}_h) = (f(t), w_{\mathcal{T}})_{\Omega}, \quad \forall t \in \bar{J}, \quad \forall \hat{w}_h := (w_{\mathcal{T}}, w_{\mathcal{F}}) \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_{h,0}^{l,k}. \quad (14)$$

Notice that the homogeneous Dirichlet boundary condition is enforced by the fact that  $\hat{u}_h(t) \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_{h,0}^{l,k}$  at all times  $t \in \bar{J}$ . The initial conditions are enforced on the cell degrees of freedom as follows (initial conditions on the face degrees of freedom are not needed):

$$u_{\mathcal{T}}(0) := \Pi_{\mathcal{T}}^l(u_0), \quad \partial_t u_{\mathcal{T}}(0) := \Pi_{\mathcal{T}}^l(v_0). \quad (15)$$

### 2.3 Time-discretization with the leapfrog scheme

Let  $N$  be the number of discrete time intervals such that  $(t^n)_{n \in \{0:N\}}$  are the discrete time nodes with  $t^0 = 0$  and  $t^N := \mathfrak{T}$ . We set  $f^n := f(t^n)$  for all  $n \in \{0:N\}$ . For the sake of simplicity, we consider a fixed time step  $\Delta t := \frac{\mathfrak{T}}{N}$ . The time discrete unknown  $\hat{u}_h^n = (u_{\mathcal{T}}^n, u_{\mathcal{F}}^n) \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_{h,0}^{l,k}$  is meant to be an approximation of the space semi-discrete HHO solution  $\hat{u}_h(t^n) \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_{h,0}^{l,k}$ .

The leapfrog scheme consists of solving, for all  $n \in \{1:N-1\}$ ,

$$\frac{1}{\Delta t^2} (u_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+1} - 2u_{\mathcal{T}}^n + u_{\mathcal{T}}^{n-1}, w_{\mathcal{T}})_{\Omega} + a_h(\hat{u}_h^n, \hat{w}_h) = (f^n, w_{\mathcal{T}})_{\Omega}, \quad \forall \hat{w}_h \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_{h,0}^{l,k}, \quad (16)$$

where the unknowns are  $u_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+1}$  and  $u_{\mathcal{F}}^n$ , whereas  $u_{\mathcal{T}}^n$  and  $u_{\mathcal{F}}^{n-1}$  are known from prior time steps or given by the initial conditions as follows:

$$u_{\mathcal{T}}^0 = \Pi_{\mathcal{T}}^l(u_0), \quad (17a)$$

$$a_h(\hat{u}_h^0, (0, w_{\mathcal{F}})) = 0, \quad \forall w_{\mathcal{F}} \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{F},0}^k, \quad (17b)$$

$$(u_{\mathcal{T}}^1, w_{\mathcal{T}})_{\Omega} = (u_{\mathcal{T}}^0 + \Delta t \Pi_{\mathcal{T}}^l(v_0), w_{\mathcal{T}})_{\Omega} + \frac{\Delta t^2}{2} \{ (f^0, w_{\mathcal{T}})_{\Omega} - a_h(\hat{u}_h^0, (w_{\mathcal{T}}, 0)) \}, \quad \forall w_{\mathcal{T}} \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{T}}^l. \quad (17c)$$

Notice that we used the initial conditions (15) in (17a) and (17c). At each time step  $n \in \{1:N-1\}$ , the problem (16) is solved by first finding the face unknown  $u_{\mathcal{F}}^n \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{F},0}^k$  from the cell unknown  $u_{\mathcal{T}}^n \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{T}}^l$  by solving

$$a_h((0, u_{\mathcal{F}}^n), (0, w_{\mathcal{F}})) = -a_h((u_{\mathcal{T}}^n, 0), (0, w_{\mathcal{F}})), \quad \forall w_{\mathcal{F}} \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{F},0}^k, \quad (18)$$

and then the cell unknown  $u_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+1} \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{T}}^l$  is computed by solving

$$\frac{1}{\Delta t^2} (u_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+1} - 2u_{\mathcal{T}}^n + u_{\mathcal{T}}^{n-1}, w_{\mathcal{T}})_{\Omega} = (f^n, w_{\mathcal{T}})_{\Omega} - a_h(\hat{u}_h^n, (w_{\mathcal{T}}, 0)), \quad \forall w_{\mathcal{T}} \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{T}}^l. \quad (19)$$

Owing to the static coupling between face and cell unknowns implied by (18), the scheme is semi-implicit. A computationally effective, iterative algorithm to solve this static coupling based on inverting block-diagonal matrices is introduced and analyzed in [37].

**Remark 2.2** (Initial condition). In [11], where the HDG method is considered with a time-implicit scheme, the initialization requires solving an elliptic problem for the primal variable and its trace, and the HDG projection is then used to approximate the initial velocity. Here, the procedure is a bit simpler since only plain  $L^2$ -projections are considered in steps (17a) and (17c), but the static coupling between cell and face unknowns must be solved in (17b). The error induced by the present initialization is analyzed in Lemma 5.10. Although the proof is somehow related to the leapfrog scheme, we believe that some estimates therein can also be applied to other time-stepping schemes.

**Remark 2.3** (Final step). At the final step  $n = N - 1$ , we compute  $u_{\mathcal{F}}^{N-1}$  from (18) and  $u_{\mathcal{T}}^N$  from (19). Then  $u_{\mathcal{F}}^N$  can be retrieved by solving (18) for  $n = N$ .

### 3 Preliminary results for the error analysis

In this section, we collect from the literature various results that are useful to perform the error analysis. In what follows,  $C$  denotes a generic positive constant whose value can change at each occurrence as long as it is independent of the mesh size and the time step; the value of  $C$  can depend on the mesh shape-regularity and the underlying polynomial degree, and, whenever relevant, on the ratio  $\frac{\mu_{\pm}}{\mu_b}$  related to the contrast in the sound speed. In a few cases, we use a more specific symbol, e.g., for some discrete inverse inequalities, a discrete Poincaré inequality, and the coercivity and boundedness constants of the discrete bilinear form  $a_h$ .

**Lemma 3.1** (Discrete inverse inequalities). *Let the polynomial degree  $m \geq 0$  be fixed. There is  $C_{\text{div}} > 0$  such that, for all  $h > 0$ , all  $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$  and all  $q \in \mathbb{P}_d^m(T)$ ,*

$$\|\nabla q\|_T \leq C_{\text{div}} h_T^{-1} \|q\|_T, \quad (20a)$$

$$\|q\|_{\partial T} \leq C_{\text{div}} h_T^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|q\|_T. \quad (20b)$$

*Proof.* See, e.g., [18, Lem. 1.44 & 1.46]. □

**Stability and boundedness.** A direct verification shows that the map  $\|\cdot\|_{\text{HHO}} : \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_h^{l,k} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  such that

$$\|\hat{v}_h\|_{\text{HHO}}^2 := \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} \mu_T^2 \{ \|\nabla v_T\|_T^2 + h_T^{-1} \|v_{\partial T} - v_T\|_{\partial T}^2 \}, \quad \forall \hat{v}_h \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_h^{l,k}, \quad (21)$$

defines a norm on  $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}_{h,0}^{l,k}$  (and a seminorm on  $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}_h^{l,k}$ ). We define the seminorm  $|\hat{v}_h|_s^2 := \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} \mu_T^2 h_T^{-1} \|S_{\partial T}(\hat{v}_T)\|_{\partial T}^2$  and the global gradient reconstruction such that  $\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{T}}^k(\hat{v}_h)|_T := \mathbf{G}_T^k(\hat{v}_T)$  for all  $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ .

**Lemma 3.2** (Stability and boundedness). *There are  $0 < \alpha \leq \varpi < \infty$  such that, for all  $h > 0$  and all  $\hat{v}_h \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_{h,0}^{l,k}$ ,*

$$\alpha \|\hat{v}_h\|_{\text{HHO}}^2 \leq a_h(\hat{v}_h, \hat{w}_h) = \|\mu \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{T}}^k(\hat{v}_h)\|_{\Omega}^2 + |\hat{v}_h|_s^2 \leq \varpi \|\hat{v}_h\|_{\text{HHO}}^2. \quad (22)$$

*Proof.* See [20, Lem. 4]. □

**Lemma 3.3** (Discrete Poincaré inequality). *There is  $C_{\text{dP}}$  such that for all  $h > 0$  and all  $\hat{v}_h \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_{h,0}^{l,k}$ ,*

$$\|v_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{\Omega} \leq C_{\text{dP}} \mu_{\sharp}^{-1} \ell_{\Omega} \|\hat{v}_h\|_{\text{HHO}}. \quad (23)$$

*Proof.* See, e.g., [5, Lem. 6.2]. □



**Approximation.** We first define the local projection operator  $\hat{I}_T^{k,l} : H^1(T) \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{U}}_T^{l,k}$  for all  $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$  such that, for all  $v \in H^1(T)$ ,

$$\hat{I}_T^{k,l}(v) := (\Pi_T^l(v), \Pi_{\partial T}^k(v)). \quad (24)$$

Then the global projection operator is defined as  $\hat{I}_h^{k,l} : H^1(\Omega) \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{U}}_h^{l,k}$  such that, for all  $v \in H^1(\Omega)$ ,

$$\hat{I}_h^{k,l}(v) := ((\Pi_T^l(v))_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h}, (\Pi_F^k(v))_{F \in \mathcal{F}_h}). \quad (25)$$

Notice that  $\hat{I}_h^{k,l}$  maps functions from  $H_0^1(\Omega)$  onto  $\hat{\mathcal{U}}_{h,0}^{l,k}$ . Moreover, the definition of  $\hat{I}_h^{k,l}$  is meaningful since a function  $v \in H^1(\Omega)$  does not jump across the mesh interfaces. Let  $\mathcal{E}_T^{k+1} : H^1(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_T^{k+1}$  denote the broken elliptic projection onto  $\mathcal{U}_T^{k+1}$ , such that, for all  $v \in H^1(\Omega)$  and all  $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ ,  $\mathcal{E}_T^{k+1}(v)|_T := \mathcal{E}_T^{k+1} \in \mathbb{P}_d^{k+1}(T)$  is uniquely defined by the relations

$$(\nabla(\mathcal{E}_T^{k+1}(v) - v), \nabla q)_T = 0 \quad \forall q \in \mathbb{P}_{d,*}^{k+1}(T), \quad \text{and} \quad (\mathcal{E}_T^{k+1}(v) - v, 1)_T = 0. \quad (26)$$

**Lemma 3.4** (Approximation property for  $\mathbf{G}_T^k$  and  $R_T^{k+1}$ ). *The following holds true for all  $h > 0$  and all  $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ :*

$$\mathbf{G}_T^k(\hat{I}_T^{k,l}(v)) = \Pi_T^k(\nabla v), \quad \nabla R_T^{k+1}(\hat{I}_T^{k,l}(v)) = \nabla \mathcal{E}_T^{k+1}(v), \quad \forall v \in H^1(T). \quad (27)$$

Moreover, there exists a real number  $C > 0$  such that, for all  $h > 0$ , all  $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$  and all  $v \in H^{k+2}(T)$ , we have

$$\|v - R_T^{k+1}(\hat{I}_T^{k,l}(v))\|_T + h_T^{\frac{1}{2}} \|v - R_T^{k+1}(\hat{I}_T^{k,l}(v))\|_{\partial T} \leq Ch_T^{k+2} |v|_{H^{k+2}(T)}, \quad (28)$$

and

$$\|\nabla(v - R_T^{k+1}(\hat{I}_T^{k,l}(v)))\|_T + h_T^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla(v - R_T^{k+1}(\hat{I}_T^{k,l}(v)))\|_{\partial T} \leq Ch_T^{k+1} |v|_{H^{k+2}(T)}, \quad (29a)$$

$$\|\nabla v - \mathbf{G}_T^k(\hat{I}_T^{k,l}(v))\|_T + h_T^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla v - \mathbf{G}_T^k(\hat{I}_T^{k,l}(v))\|_{\partial T} \leq Ch_T^{k+1} |v|_{H^{k+2}(T)}. \quad (29b)$$

*Proof.* See, e.g., [20, Lem. 3], [10, Lem. 3.1].  $\square$

**Lemma 3.5** (Approximation property for  $S_{\partial T}$ ). *There is a constant  $C > 0$  such that for all  $h > 0$ , all  $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ , and all  $v \in H^1(T)$ , we have*

$$\|S_{\partial T}(\hat{I}_T^{k,l}(v))\|_{\partial T} \leq Ch_T^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla(v - P_T^{k+1}(v))\|_T, \quad (30)$$

where  $P_T^{k+1} := \mathcal{E}_T^{k+1}$  if  $l = k$  and  $P_T^{k+1} := \Pi_T^{k+1}$  if  $l = k + 1$ .

*Proof.* See, e.g., [20, Eq. (45)], [10, Lem. 2.7].  $\square$

**Consistency.** For any function  $v \in Y := \{v \in H_0^1(\Omega), B(v) := -\nabla \cdot (\mu^2 \nabla v) \in L^2(\Omega)\}$ , we consider the linear form  $\psi_h(v; \cdot) \in (\hat{\mathcal{U}}_{h,0}^{l,k})'$  such that

$$\psi_h(v; \hat{w}_h) := (B(v), w_{\mathcal{T}})_\Omega - a_h(\hat{I}_h^{k,l}(v), \hat{w}_h), \quad \forall \hat{w}_h \in \hat{\mathcal{U}}_{h,0}^{l,k}. \quad (31)$$

For any function  $v \in H^{1+\nu}(\Omega)$ ,  $\nu \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ , we consider the seminorm  $|v|_{*,h}$  defined by

$$|v|_{*,h}^2 := \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} \mu_T^2 \{h_T \|\gamma(v) \cdot \mathbf{n}_T\|_{\partial T}^2 + \|\nabla \eta(v)\|_T^2\}, \quad (32)$$

with

$$\gamma(v) := \nabla v - \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{T}}^k(\hat{I}_h^{k,l}(v)), \quad \eta(v) := v - P_{\mathcal{T}}^{k+1}(v), \quad (33)$$

where  $P_{\mathcal{T}}^{k+1}$  is defined in Lemma 3.5 and  $P_{\mathcal{T}}^{k+1}$  denotes the broken version of  $P_{\mathcal{T}}^{k+1}$  defined elementwise. For a linear form  $\phi \in (\widehat{\mathcal{U}}_{h,0}^{l,k})'$ , we set

$$\|\phi\|_{(\text{HHO})'} := \sup_{\hat{q}_h \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_{h,0}^{l,k}} \frac{|\phi(\hat{q}_h)|}{\|\hat{q}_h\|_{\text{HHO}}},$$

with the norm  $\|\cdot\|_{\text{HHO}}$  defined in (21).

**Lemma 3.6** (Consistency). *There is a constant  $c_*$  such that, for all  $h > 0$  and all  $v \in Y \cap H^{1+\nu}(\Omega)$ ,  $\nu \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ , we have*

$$\|\psi_h(v, \cdot)\|_{(\text{HHO})'} \leq c_* |v|_{*,h}. \quad (34)$$

*Proof.* See, e.g., [20, Eq. (43)], [10, Lem. 2.8 & 3.4].  $\square$

## 4 Energy stability

The notion of discrete energy is central to the proof of convergence of the fully discrete scheme. Let us first introduce the semi-discrete energy balance as in [4, Lem. 3.1]. Recalling that  $\hat{u}_h \in C^2(\bar{J}; \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_{h,0}^{l,k})$  solves the space semi-discrete problem (14), we set, for all  $t \in \bar{J}$ ,

$$E_h(t) := \frac{1}{2} \|\partial_t u_{\mathcal{T}}(t)\|_{\Omega}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \hat{a}_h(\hat{u}_h(t), \hat{u}_h(t)). \quad (35)$$

This energy verifies

$$E_h(t) = E_h(0) + \int_0^t (f(s), \partial_t u_{\mathcal{T}}(s))_{\Omega} \, ds, \quad (36)$$

as readily follows by testing (14) with  $\hat{w}_h := \partial_t \hat{u}_h(t)$  for all  $t \in \bar{J}$  and integrating in time.

The first important step is to derive the fully discrete counterpart of the semi-discrete energy identity (36). It is convenient to set, for all  $n \in \{0:N-1\}$ ,

$$\hat{u}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}} := \frac{1}{2}(\hat{u}_h^n + \hat{u}_h^{n+1}), \quad \delta \hat{u}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}} := \frac{1}{\Delta t}(\hat{u}_h^{n+1} - \hat{u}_h^n). \quad (37)$$

The fully discrete counterpart of  $E_h(t)$  is the discrete energy  $E_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}$  defined as

$$E_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}} := \frac{1}{2} \|\delta u_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\Omega}^2 - \frac{\Delta t^2}{8} a_h(\delta \hat{u}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}, \delta \hat{u}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}) + \frac{1}{2} a_h(\hat{u}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}, \hat{u}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}). \quad (38)$$

**Lemma 4.1** (Energy balance). *The fully discrete energy verifies, for all  $n \in \{1:N-1\}$ ,*

$$E_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}} = E_h^{\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=1}^n (f^m, u_{\mathcal{T}}^{m+1} - u_{\mathcal{T}}^{m-1})_{\Omega}. \quad (39)$$

*Proof.* Let  $n \in \{1:N-1\}$ . For all  $m \in \{1:n\}$ , we test (16) with  $\hat{w}_h := \frac{1}{2}(\hat{u}_h^{m+1} - \hat{u}_h^{m-1})$ . We use the identity

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}(u_{\mathcal{T}}^{m+1} - 2u_{\mathcal{T}}^m + u_{\mathcal{T}}^{m-1}, u_{\mathcal{T}}^{m+1} - u_{\mathcal{T}}^{m-1})_{\Omega} &= \frac{1}{2}((u_{\mathcal{T}}^{m+1} - u_{\mathcal{T}}^m) - (u_{\mathcal{T}}^m - u_{\mathcal{T}}^{m-1}), (u_{\mathcal{T}}^{m+1} - u_{\mathcal{T}}^m) + (u_{\mathcal{T}}^m - u_{\mathcal{T}}^{m-1}))_{\Omega} \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\|u_{\mathcal{T}}^{m+1} - u_{\mathcal{T}}^m\|_{\Omega}^2 - \frac{1}{2}\|u_{\mathcal{T}}^m - u_{\mathcal{T}}^{m-1}\|_{\Omega}^2 \\ &= \frac{\Delta t^2}{2}\|\delta u_{\mathcal{T}}^{m+\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\Omega}^2 - \frac{\Delta t^2}{2}\|\delta u_{\mathcal{T}}^{m-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\Omega}^2. \end{aligned}$$

We also use the following computation which exploits the symmetry of  $a_h$ :

$$\begin{aligned} a_h(\hat{u}_h^m, \hat{u}_h^{m+1} - \hat{u}_h^{m-1}) &= \frac{1}{4}a_h(\hat{u}_h^{m+1} + 2\hat{u}_h^m + \hat{u}_h^{m-1}, (\hat{u}_h^{m+1} + \hat{u}_h^m) - (\hat{u}_h^m + \hat{u}_h^{m-1})) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{4}a_h(\hat{u}_h^{m+1} - 2\hat{u}_h^m + \hat{u}_h^{m-1}, (\hat{u}_h^{m+1} - \hat{u}_h^m) + (\hat{u}_h^m - \hat{u}_h^{m-1})) \\ &= a_h(\hat{u}_h^{m+\frac{1}{2}} + \hat{u}_h^{m-\frac{1}{2}}, \hat{u}_h^{m+\frac{1}{2}} - \hat{u}_h^{m-\frac{1}{2}}) - \frac{\Delta t^2}{4}a_h(\delta\hat{u}_h^{m+\frac{1}{2}} + \delta\hat{u}_h^{m-\frac{1}{2}}, \delta\hat{u}_h^{m+\frac{1}{2}} - \delta\hat{u}_h^{m-\frac{1}{2}}) \\ &= a_h(\hat{u}_h^{m+\frac{1}{2}}, \hat{u}_h^{m+\frac{1}{2}}) - a_h(\hat{u}_h^{m-\frac{1}{2}}, \hat{u}_h^{m-\frac{1}{2}}) \\ &\quad - \frac{\Delta t^2}{4}(a_h(\delta\hat{u}_h^{m+\frac{1}{2}}, \delta\hat{u}_h^{m+\frac{1}{2}}) - a_h(\delta\hat{u}_h^{m-\frac{1}{2}}, \delta\hat{u}_h^{m-\frac{1}{2}})). \end{aligned}$$

This gives  $E_h^{m+\frac{1}{2}} - E_h^{m-\frac{1}{2}} = \frac{1}{2}(f^m, u_{\mathcal{T}}^{m+1} - u_{\mathcal{T}}^{m-1})_{\Omega}$ . Summing this identity for  $m = 1$  to  $m = n$  yields the claim.  $\square$

The second important question is whether  $E_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}$  defines a strongly convex functional on  $\delta u_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}}$  and  $\hat{u}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}$ . This property can be achieved under a CFL restriction on the time step.

**Lemma 4.2** (Strong convexity of  $E_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}$ ). *Under the following CFL restriction on the time step:*

$$\Delta t \leq \eta \mu_{\sharp}^{-1} h_{\min}, \quad \eta := C_{\text{div}}^{-1} \varpi^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (40)$$

$E_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}$  defines a strongly convex functional on  $\delta u_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}}$  and  $\hat{u}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}$ .

*Proof.* Using the fact that  $\hat{u}_h^n$  satisfies (18) and the symmetry of  $a_h$ , we infer that, for all  $n \in \{1:N-1\}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta t^2 a_h(\delta\hat{u}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}, \delta\hat{u}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}) &= a_h(\hat{u}_h^{n+1} - \hat{u}_h^n, \hat{u}_h^{n+1} - \hat{u}_h^n) \\ &= a_h(\hat{u}_h^{n+1} - \hat{u}_h^n, (u_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+1} - u_{\mathcal{T}}^n, 0)) \\ &= a_h((u_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+1} - u_{\mathcal{T}}^n, 0), (u_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+1} - u_{\mathcal{T}}^n, 0)) + a_h((0, u_{\mathcal{F}}^{n+1} - u_{\mathcal{F}}^n), (u_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+1} - u_{\mathcal{T}}^n, 0)) \\ &= a_h((u_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+1} - u_{\mathcal{T}}^n, 0), (u_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+1} - u_{\mathcal{T}}^n, 0)) + a_h((u_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+1} - u_{\mathcal{T}}^n, 0), (0, u_{\mathcal{F}}^{n+1} - u_{\mathcal{F}}^n)) \\ &= a_h((u_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+1} - u_{\mathcal{T}}^n, 0), (u_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+1} - u_{\mathcal{T}}^n, 0)) - a_h((0, u_{\mathcal{F}}^{n+1} - u_{\mathcal{F}}^n), (0, u_{\mathcal{F}}^{n+1} - u_{\mathcal{F}}^n)) \\ &= \Delta t^2 a_h((\delta u_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}}, 0), (\delta u_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}}, 0)) - \Delta t^2 a_h((0, \delta u_{\mathcal{F}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}}), (0, \delta u_{\mathcal{F}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}})) \\ &\leq \Delta t^2 a_h((\delta u_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}}, 0), (\delta u_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}}, 0)). \end{aligned}$$

Combining this bound with the coercivity property from Lemma 3.2 gives

$$E_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}} \geq \frac{1}{2}\|\delta u_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\Omega}^2 - \frac{\Delta t^2}{8}a_h((\delta u_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}}, 0), (\delta u_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}}, 0)) + \frac{1}{2}\alpha\|\hat{u}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\text{HHO}}^2.$$

Recalling that  $\|\cdot\|_{\text{HHO}}$  defines a norm on  $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}_{h,0}^{l,k}$  and  $\hat{u}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}} \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_{h,0}^{l,k}$ , the proof is complete if we show that, under the CFL condition (40), we have, for all  $w_{\mathcal{T}} \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{T}}^l$ ,

$$\frac{1}{2}\|w_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{\Omega}^2 - \frac{\Delta t^2}{8}a_h((w_{\mathcal{T}}, 0), (w_{\mathcal{T}}, 0)) \geq \frac{1}{4}\|w_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{\Omega}^2. \quad (41)$$

To this purpose, we observe using the inverse inequalities from Lemma 3.1 and the boundedness property from Lemma 3.2 that

$$\begin{aligned} a_h((w_{\mathcal{T}}, 0), (w_{\mathcal{T}}, 0)) &\leq \varpi\|(w_{\mathcal{T}}, 0)\|_{\text{HHO}}^2 \\ &\leq \varpi\mu_{\sharp}^2 \left\{ \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} \|\nabla w_T\|_T^2 + h_T^{-1}\|w_T\|_{\partial T}^2 \right\} \\ &\leq 2C_{\text{dinv}}^2 \varpi\mu_{\sharp}^2 h_{\min}^{-2}\|w_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{\Omega}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Using the CFL condition (40), we infer that

$$\frac{\Delta t^2}{8}a_h((w_{\mathcal{T}}, 0), (w_{\mathcal{T}}, 0)) \leq \frac{\Delta t^2}{8}2C_{\text{dinv}}^2 \varpi\mu_{\sharp}^2 h_{\min}^{-2}\|w_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{\Omega}^2 \leq \frac{1}{4}\|w_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{\Omega}^2.$$

Re-arranging the terms establishes (41) and completes the proof.  $\square$

## 5 Energy error analysis

In this section, we prove the convergence in energy-norm of the fully discrete wave equation. We start the section by stating our main result, Theorem 5.1, and devote the rest of the section to its proof.

### 5.1 Main result

Recall that  $u$  denotes the solution to the continuous wave equation (1) with the initial conditions (2) and  $(\hat{u}_h^n)_{n \in \{0:N\}}$  the solution to the fully discrete wave equation (16) with the initial conditions (17). We define the discrete error

$$\hat{e}_h^n := \hat{u}_h^n - \hat{I}_h^{k,l}(u(t^n)), \quad \forall n \in \{0:N\}, \quad (42)$$

which represents the difference between the discrete hybrid solution at time step  $n$  and the projection of the continuous solution at the discrete time  $t^n$  onto the hybrid space. Recalling the seminorm  $|\cdot|_{*,h}$  defined in (32), we set, for all  $t \in \bar{J}$ ,

$$|u|_{C^0(0,t;*,h)} := \sup_{s \in [0,t]} |u(s)|_{*,h}, \quad |\partial_t u|_{L^1(0,t;*,h)} := \int_0^t |\partial_t u(s)|_{*,h} \, ds. \quad (43)$$

**Theorem 5.1** (Energy error estimate). *Assume the CFL condition (40), that  $f \in C^1(\bar{J}; L^2(\Omega))$ , and that  $u \in C^4(\bar{J}; L^2(\Omega)) \cap W^{5,1}(J; L^2(\Omega))$  and  $u \in C^0(\bar{J}; H^{1+\nu}(\Omega)) \cap W^{1,1}(J; H^{1+\nu}(\Omega))$ ,  $\nu \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ . The following holds:*

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{n \in \{0:N-1\}} \|\delta e_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\Omega} + \max_{n \in \{0:N-1\}} \|\hat{e}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\text{HHO}} &\leq C_1 \left\{ \|u\|_{C^0([0;t^{N-1}];*,h)} + \|\partial_t u\|_{L^1([0;t^{N-1}];*,h)} \right\} \\ &+ C_2 \Delta t^2 \left\{ \|\partial_t^3 u\|_{C^0([0;t^1]; L^2(\Omega))} + \Theta \left( \|\partial_t^4 u\|_{C^0([0;t^N]; L^2(\Omega))} + \|\partial_t^5 u\|_{L^1([0;t^N]; L^2(\Omega))} \right) \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

with generic constants  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  and the time scale  $\Theta := \mu_{\sharp}^{-1} \ell_{\Omega}$ .

**Remark 5.2** (Regularity assumption). The regularity assumption in space hinging on the shift  $\nu \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1]$  is made to simplify the bound on the consistency error in space. The quasi-minimal setting with  $\nu \in (0, 1]$  can be handled by using the tools introduced in [24], see also [23, Sec. 41.5].

**Remark 5.3** (Convergence order). Under the above regularity assumption on  $u$ , we can bound  $|u(t)|_{*,h}$  and  $|\partial_t u(t)|_{*,h}$ , for all  $t \in \bar{J}$ , using the approximation results from Lemma 3.4. This gives

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{n \in \{0:N-1\}} \|\delta e_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\Omega} + \max_{n \in \{0:N-1\}} \|\hat{e}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\text{HHO}} &\leq C_1 h^{k+1} \left\{ |u|_{C^0([0;t^{N-1}]; H^{k+2}(\Omega))} + |\partial_t u|_{L^1([t^0, t^{N-1}]; H^{k+2}(\Omega))} \right\} \\ &+ C_2 \Delta t^2 \left\{ \|\partial_t^3 u\|_{C^0([0;t^1]; L^2(\Omega))} + \Theta(\|\partial_t^4 u\|_{C^0([0;t^N]; L^2(\Omega))} + \|\partial_t^5 u\|_{L^1([0;t^N]; L^2(\Omega))) \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

which is the optimal convergence order  $\mathcal{O}(h^{k+1} + \Delta t^2)$  in the energy norm.

**Remark 5.4** (WG and HDG settings). Owing to the links outlined in the introduction between HHO, HDG, and WG methods, Theorem 5.1 provides the same convergence result for WG methods in the mixed-order setting if the Lehrenfeld–Schöberl stabilization is considered, whereas the space convergence order is only  $\mathcal{O}(h^k)$  if plain least-squares stabilization is employed. Theorem 5.1 also applies to HDG methods in the mixed-order setting where polynomials of degree  $(k+1)$  are used for the primal variable and of degree  $k$  for the dual and hybrid variables. For the equal-order HDG method with plain least-squares stabilization on simplicial meshes, we conjecture that the use of the specific HDG projection operator can also lead to the above optimal convergence order in the energy norm. A precise analysis is left to future work.

## 5.2 Consistency errors and error equation

We define the space consistency error,  $\psi_h^n$ , at the discrete time  $t^n$ , for all  $n \in \{0:N\}$ , as the linear form in  $(\widehat{\mathcal{U}}_{h,0}^{l,k})'$  such that, for all  $\hat{w}_h \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_{h,0}^{l,k}$ ,

$$\psi_h^n(\hat{w}_h) := \psi_h(u(t^n), \hat{w}_h), \quad (46)$$

where the linear form  $\psi_h(v, \cdot)$  is defined in (31) for any function  $v \in Y \cap H^{1+\nu}(\Omega)$  (notice that  $u(t^n) \in Y \cap H^{1+\nu}(\Omega)$  for all  $n \in \{0:N\}$  by assumption). We also define the time consistency error,  $\kappa^n$ , to be the error between the centered difference scheme and the exact second-order derivative in time:

$$\kappa^n := \frac{u(t^{n+1}) - 2u(t^n) + u(t^{n-1}))}{\Delta t^2} - \partial_t^2 u(t^n), \quad \forall n \in \{1:N-1\}, \quad (47)$$

and we set  $\kappa^0 := 0$ .

**Lemma 5.5** (Discrete error equation). *Let  $(\hat{e}_h^n)_{n \in \{0:N\}}$  be the collection of discrete errors defined in (42). The following holds for all  $n \in \{1:N-1\}$ :*

$$\frac{1}{\Delta t^2} (e_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+1} - 2e_{\mathcal{T}}^n + e_{\mathcal{T}}^{n-1}, w_{\mathcal{T}})_{\Omega} + a_h(\hat{e}_h^n, \hat{w}_h) = \psi_h^n(\hat{w}_h) - (\kappa^n, w_{\mathcal{T}})_{\Omega}, \quad \forall \hat{w}_h \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_{h,0}^{l,k}. \quad (48)$$

*Proof.* Let us evaluate the left-hand-side of (48) for all  $n \in \{1:N-1\}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{\Delta t^2} (e_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+1} - 2e_{\mathcal{T}}^n + e_{\mathcal{T}}^{n-1}, w_{\mathcal{T}})_{\Omega} + a_h(\hat{e}_h^n, \hat{w}_h) \\ &= (f^n, w_{\mathcal{T}})_{\Omega} - \left( \Pi_{\mathcal{T}}^l \left[ \frac{u(t^{n+1}) - 2u(t^n) + u(t^{n-1}))}{\Delta t^2} \right], w_{\mathcal{T}} \right)_{\Omega} - a_h(\hat{I}_h^{k,l}(u(t^n)), \hat{w}_h) \\ &= (f^n, w_{\mathcal{T}})_{\Omega} - (\Pi_{\mathcal{T}}^l(\partial_t^2 u(t^n) + \kappa^n), w_{\mathcal{T}})_{\Omega} - a_h(\hat{I}_h^{k,l}(u(t^n)), \hat{w}_h) \\ &= (\partial_t^2 u(t^n), w_{\mathcal{T}})_{\Omega} + (B(u(t^n)), w_{\mathcal{T}})_{\Omega} - (\partial_t^2 u(t^n) + \kappa^n, w_{\mathcal{T}})_{\Omega} - a_h(\hat{I}_h^{k,l}(u(t^n)), \hat{w}_h) \\ &= \psi_h^n(\hat{w}_h) - (\kappa^n, w_{\mathcal{T}})_{\Omega}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the discrete scheme (16), the fact that the exact solution satisfies  $\partial_t^2 u(t^n) + B(u(t^n)) = f^n$ , the definition of the  $L^2$ -projection onto  $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{T}}^l$  and the definition (46) of  $\psi_h^n$ .  $\square$

### 5.3 Energy-error identity

It is convenient to define, for all  $n \in \{0:N-1\}$ , the error and velocity error at the half time-steps as follows:

$$\hat{e}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}} := \frac{1}{2}(\hat{e}_h^{n+1} + \hat{e}_h^n), \quad \delta \hat{e}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}} := \frac{1}{\Delta t}(\hat{e}_h^{n+1} - \hat{e}_h^n). \quad (49)$$

Concerning the consistency errors, we set, for all  $n \in \{0:N-1\}$ ,

$$\delta \kappa^{n+\frac{1}{2}} := \frac{1}{\Delta t}(\kappa^{n+1} - \kappa^n), \quad \delta \psi_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}(\hat{w}_h) := \frac{1}{\Delta t}(\psi_h^{n+1}(\hat{w}_h) - \psi_h^n(\hat{w}_h)), \quad \forall \hat{w}_h \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_{h,0}^{l,k}. \quad (50)$$

Let us consider the discrete energy (38) evaluated using the error. We set

$$\mathcal{E}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}} := \frac{1}{2} \|\delta e_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\Omega}^2 - \frac{\Delta t^2}{8} a_h(\delta \hat{e}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}, \delta \hat{e}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}) + \frac{1}{2} a_h(\hat{e}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}, \hat{e}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}), \quad \forall n \in \{0:N-1\}. \quad (51)$$

Unfortunately, even under a CFL condition,  $\mathcal{E}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}$  does not define a strongly convex functional on  $\delta e_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}}$  and  $\hat{e}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}$ . The reason is that we no longer have  $a_h(\hat{e}_h^n, (0, w_{\mathcal{F}})) = 0$  for all  $w_{\mathcal{F}} \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{F},0}^k$ , but only

$$a_h(\hat{e}_h^n, (0, w_{\mathcal{F}})) = \psi_h^n((0, w_{\mathcal{F}})), \quad (52)$$

as a consequence of (48). This leads to the following definition of discrete energy error: For all  $n \in \{0:N-1\}$ ,

$$\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}} := \mathcal{E}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{\Delta t^2}{4} \delta \psi_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}((0, \delta e_{\mathcal{F}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}})). \quad (53)$$

**Lemma 5.6** (Discrete energy error). *For all  $n \in \{0:N-1\}$ , we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}} &= \frac{1}{2} \|\delta e_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\Omega}^2 + \frac{\Delta t^2}{8} a_h((0, \delta e_{\mathcal{F}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}}), (0, \delta e_{\mathcal{F}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}})) \\ &\quad - \frac{\Delta t^2}{8} a_h((\delta e_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}}, 0), (\delta e_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}}, 0)) + \frac{1}{2} a_h(\hat{e}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}, \hat{e}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}). \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

Moreover, under the CFL condition (40),  $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}$  defines a strongly convex functional on  $\delta e_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}}$  and  $\hat{e}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}$ .

*Proof.* Proceeding as in Lemma 4.2, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta t^2 a_h(\delta \hat{e}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}, \delta \hat{e}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}) &= a_h(\hat{e}_h^{n+1} - \hat{e}_h^n, \hat{e}_h^{n+1} - \hat{e}_h^n) \\ &= a_h(\hat{e}_h^{n+1} - \hat{e}_h^n, (e_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+1} - e_{\mathcal{T}}^n, 0)) + a_h(\hat{e}_h^{n+1} - \hat{e}_h^n, (0, e_{\mathcal{F}}^{n+1} - e_{\mathcal{F}}^n)) \\ &= a_h(\hat{e}_h^{n+1} - \hat{e}_h^n, (e_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+1} - e_{\mathcal{T}}^n, 0)) + \Delta t \left\{ \psi_h^{n+1}((0, \delta e_{\mathcal{F}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}})) - \psi_h^n((0, \delta e_{\mathcal{F}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}})) \right\} \\ &= a_h((e_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+1} - e_{\mathcal{T}}^n, 0), (e_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+1} - e_{\mathcal{T}}^n, 0)) + a_h((0, e_{\mathcal{F}}^{n+1} - e_{\mathcal{F}}^n), (e_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+1} - e_{\mathcal{T}}^n, 0)) \\ &\quad + \Delta t^2 \delta \psi_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}((0, \delta e_{\mathcal{F}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}})), \end{aligned}$$

where we used (52) and the notation (50) for  $\delta\psi_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}$ . Owing to the symmetry of  $a_h$  and again (52), we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} a_h((0, e_{\mathcal{F}}^{n+1} - e_{\mathcal{F}}^n), (e_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+1} - e_{\mathcal{T}}^n, 0)) &= a_h((e_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+1} - e_{\mathcal{T}}^n, 0), (0, e_{\mathcal{F}}^{n+1} - e_{\mathcal{F}}^n)) \\ &= -a_h((0, e_{\mathcal{F}}^{n+1} - e_{\mathcal{F}}^n), (0, e_{\mathcal{F}}^{n+1} - e_{\mathcal{F}}^n)) + \Delta t^2 \delta\psi_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}((0, \delta e_{\mathcal{F}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}})). \end{aligned}$$

This gives

$$\begin{aligned} &\Delta t^2 a_h(\delta\hat{e}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}, \delta\hat{e}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}) \\ &= a_h((e_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+1} - e_{\mathcal{T}}^n, 0), (e_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+1} - e_{\mathcal{T}}^n, 0)) - a_h((0, e_{\mathcal{F}}^{n+1} - e_{\mathcal{F}}^n), (0, e_{\mathcal{F}}^{n+1} - e_{\mathcal{F}}^n)) + 2\Delta t^2 \delta\psi_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}((0, \delta e_{\mathcal{F}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}})) \\ &= \Delta t^2 a_h((\delta e_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}}, 0), (\delta e_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}}, 0)) - \Delta t^2 a_h((0, \delta e_{\mathcal{F}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}}), (0, \delta e_{\mathcal{F}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}})) + 2\Delta t^2 \delta\psi_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}((0, \delta e_{\mathcal{F}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}})). \end{aligned}$$

This proves the identity (54). Finally, the strong convexity of  $\check{\mathcal{E}}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}$  under the CFL condition (40) is established as in the proof of Lemma 4.2.  $\square$

The next step is to write an energy identity mimicking the space semi-discrete case.

**Lemma 5.7** (Energy identity). *For all  $n \in \{1:N-1\}$ , the discrete energy error  $\check{\mathcal{E}}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}$  verifies*

$$\check{\mathcal{E}}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}} = \mathcal{Z}_{\psi}^n + \mathcal{Z}_{\kappa}^n + \mathcal{Z}_{\text{IC}}^0, \quad (55)$$

with the space consistency error

$$\mathcal{Z}_{\psi}^n := \psi_h^n(\hat{e}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}) + \frac{\Delta t^2}{4} \delta\psi_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}((0, \delta e_{\mathcal{F}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}})) - \Delta t \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} \delta\psi_h^{m+\frac{1}{2}}(\hat{e}_h^{m+\frac{1}{2}}), \quad (56a)$$

the time consistency error

$$\mathcal{Z}_{\kappa}^n := -(\kappa^n, e_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}})_{\Omega} + \Delta t \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} (\delta\kappa^{m+\frac{1}{2}}, e_{\mathcal{T}}^{m+\frac{1}{2}})_{\Omega}, \quad (56b)$$

and the initial error

$$\mathcal{Z}_{\text{IC}}^0 := \mathcal{E}_h^{\frac{1}{2}} - \psi_h^1(\hat{e}_h^{\frac{1}{2}}) + (\kappa^1, e_{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{1}{2}})_{\Omega}. \quad (56c)$$

*Proof.* Let us start by remarking that, similarly to the computations in the proof of Lemma 4.1, we have, for all  $m \in \{1:N-1\}$ ,

$$\mathcal{E}_h^{m+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathcal{E}_h^{m-\frac{1}{2}} = \frac{1}{\Delta t^2} (e_{\mathcal{T}}^{m+1} - 2e_{\mathcal{T}}^m + e_{\mathcal{T}}^{m-1}, e_{\mathcal{T}}^{m+1} - e_{\mathcal{T}}^{m-1})_{\Omega} + a_h(\hat{e}_h^m, \hat{e}_h^{m+1} - \hat{e}_h^{m-1}).$$

Using Lemma 5.5 with the test function  $\hat{w}_h := \frac{1}{2}(\hat{e}_h^{m+1} - \hat{e}_h^{m-1}) = \hat{e}_h^{m+\frac{1}{2}} - \hat{e}_h^{m-\frac{1}{2}}$  yields

$$\mathcal{E}_h^{m+\frac{1}{2}} - \mathcal{E}_h^{m-\frac{1}{2}} = \psi_h^m(\hat{e}_h^{m+\frac{1}{2}} - \hat{e}_h^{m-\frac{1}{2}}) - (\kappa^m, e_{\mathcal{T}}^{m+\frac{1}{2}} - e_{\mathcal{T}}^{m-\frac{1}{2}})_{\Omega}. \quad (57)$$

Summing (57) from  $m = 1$  to  $m = n$  yields

$$\mathcal{E}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}} = \mathcal{E}_h^{\frac{1}{2}} + \sum_{m=1}^n \left\{ \psi_h^m(\hat{e}_h^{m+\frac{1}{2}} - \hat{e}_h^{m-\frac{1}{2}}) - (\kappa^m, e_{\mathcal{T}}^{m+\frac{1}{2}} - e_{\mathcal{T}}^{m-\frac{1}{2}})_{\Omega} \right\}. \quad (58)$$

The sums on the right-hand side of (58) can be reordered using the notation (50) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{m=1}^n \psi_h^m(\hat{e}_h^{m+\frac{1}{2}} - \hat{e}_h^{m-\frac{1}{2}}) &= \psi_h^n(\hat{e}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}) - \psi_h^1(\hat{e}_h^{\frac{1}{2}}) - \Delta t \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} \delta\psi_h^{m+\frac{1}{2}}(\hat{e}_h^{m+\frac{1}{2}}), \\ \sum_{m=1}^n (\kappa^m, e_{\mathcal{T}}^{m+\frac{1}{2}} - e_{\mathcal{T}}^{m-\frac{1}{2}})_{\Omega} &= (\kappa^n, e_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}})_{\Omega} - (\kappa^1, e_{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{1}{2}})_{\Omega} - \Delta t \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} (\delta\kappa^{m+\frac{1}{2}}, e_{\mathcal{T}}^{m+\frac{1}{2}})_{\Omega}. \end{aligned}$$

This gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}} &= \mathcal{E}_h^{\frac{1}{2}} - \psi_h^1(\hat{e}_h^{\frac{1}{2}}) + (\kappa^1, e_{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{1}{2}})_{\Omega} + \left\{ \psi_h^n(\hat{e}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}) - \Delta t \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} \delta\psi_h^{m+\frac{1}{2}}(\hat{e}_h^{m+\frac{1}{2}}) \right\} \\ &\quad - (\kappa^n, e_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}})_{\Omega} + \Delta t \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} (\delta\kappa^{m+\frac{1}{2}}, e_{\mathcal{T}}^{m+\frac{1}{2}})_{\Omega} \\ &= \psi_h^n(\hat{e}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}) - \Delta t \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} \delta\psi_h^{m+\frac{1}{2}}(\hat{e}_h^{m+\frac{1}{2}}) + \mathcal{Z}_{\kappa}^n + \mathcal{Z}_{\text{IC}}^0, \end{aligned}$$

owing to the definitions (56b) and (56c). It remains to go from  $\mathcal{E}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}$  to  $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}$ . Using (53), we have

$$\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}} = \psi_h^n(\hat{e}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}) - \Delta t \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} \delta\psi_h^{m+\frac{1}{2}}(\hat{e}_h^{m+\frac{1}{2}}) + \mathcal{Z}_{\kappa}^n + \mathcal{Z}_{\text{IC}}^0 + \frac{\Delta t^2}{4} \delta\psi_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}((0, \delta e_{\mathcal{F}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}})).$$

Recalling the definition of  $\mathcal{Z}_{\psi}^n$  proves the claim.  $\square$

## 5.4 Bound on consistency and initial errors

We now bound the three terms on the right-hand side of (55). Each estimate is stated as a separate lemma.

**Lemma 5.8** (Estimate on the space consistency error). *Let  $\mathcal{Z}_{\psi}^n$  be defined in (56a). For all  $n \in \{1:N-1\}$ , the following holds:*

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{Z}_{\psi}^n| &\leq c_* (|\partial_t u|_{L^1([t^1, t^n]; *, h)} + |u(t^n)|_{*, h}) \max_{m \in \{1:n\}} \|\hat{e}_h^{m+\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\text{HHO}} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4} c_* \alpha^{-\frac{1}{2}} |\partial_t u|_{L^1([t^n, t^{n+1}]; *, h)} \left[ \Delta t^2 a_h((0, \delta e_{\mathcal{F}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}}), (0, \delta e_{\mathcal{F}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}})) \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $c_*$  results from (34) and  $\alpha$  is the coercivity constant of the discrete bilinear form  $a_h$ .

*Proof.* Let  $n \in \{1:N-1\}$  and let  $m \in \{1:n\}$ . We observe that

$$\Delta t \delta\psi_h^{m+\frac{1}{2}}(\hat{e}_h^{m+\frac{1}{2}}) = \psi_h(u(t^{m+1}), \hat{e}_h^{m+\frac{1}{2}}) - \psi_h(u(t^m), \hat{e}_h^{m+\frac{1}{2}}) = \int_{t^m}^{t^{m+1}} \psi_h(\partial_t u(s); \hat{e}_h^{m+\frac{1}{2}}) ds.$$

Since  $\partial_t u(t) \in Y \cap H^{1+\nu}(\Omega)$  for all  $t \in \bar{J}$  by assumption (indeed,  $B(\partial_t u(t)) = \partial_t f(t) - \partial_t^3 u(t)$ ,  $f \in C^1(\bar{J}; L^2(\Omega))$ , and  $u \in C^4(\bar{J}; L^2(\Omega))$ ), we can invoke (34) to infer that

$$\|\psi_h(\partial_t u(t); \cdot)\|_{(\text{HHO})'} \leq c_* |\partial_t u(t)|_{*, h}.$$



Thus, we obtain

$$\left| \Delta t \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} \delta \psi_h^{m+\frac{1}{2}}(\hat{e}_h^{m+\frac{1}{2}}) \right| \leq c_* \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} |\partial_t u|_{L^1([t^m, t^{m+1}]; *, h)} \|\hat{e}_h^{m+\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\text{HHO}}.$$

The same reasoning is used for the second term on the right-hand-side of (56a) which is bounded as follows:

$$\left| \frac{\Delta t^2}{4} \delta \psi_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}((0, \delta e_{\mathcal{F}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}})) \right| \leq \frac{1}{4} c_* \alpha^{-\frac{1}{2}} |\partial_t u|_{L^1([t^n, t^{n+1}]; *, h)} \left[ \Delta t^2 a_h((0, \delta e_{\mathcal{F}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}}), (0, \delta e_{\mathcal{F}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}})) \right]^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where we used the coercivity of the discrete bilinear form  $a_h$ . Finally, the same argument for the first term on the right-hand side of (56a) yields

$$\left| \psi_h^n(\hat{e}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}) \right| \leq c_* |u(t^n)|_{*, h} \|\hat{e}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\text{HHO}}. \quad (59)$$

This yields the claim.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.9** (Estimate on the time consistency error). *Let  $\mathcal{Z}_\kappa^n$  be defined in (56b). For all  $n \in \{1:N-1\}$ , the following holds:*

$$|\mathcal{Z}_\kappa^n| \leq C\Theta \Delta t^2 (\|\partial_t^5 u\|_{L^1([0; t^{n+1}]; L^2(\Omega))} + \|\partial_t^4 u\|_{C^0([t^{n-1}; t^{n+1}]; L^2(\Omega))}) \max_{m \in \{1:n\}} \|\hat{e}_h^{m+\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\text{HHO}}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $n \in \{1:N-1\}$ . A straightforward calculation using fourth-order Taylor expansions with integral remainder shows that

$$\kappa^n = \frac{1}{6\Delta t^2} \left\{ \int_{t^n}^{t^{n+1}} (t^{n+1} - t)^3 \partial_t^4 u(t) dt - \int_{t^{n-1}}^{t^n} (t^n - t)^3 \partial_t^4 u(t) dt \right\}.$$

Rewriting  $\delta \kappa^{m+\frac{1}{2}}$ , for all  $m \in \{1:n-1\}$ , using this identity gives

$$\begin{aligned} \delta \kappa^{m+\frac{1}{2}} &= \frac{1}{\Delta t} (\kappa^{m+1} - \kappa^m) \\ &= \frac{1}{6\Delta t^3} \left( \int_{t^{m+1}}^{t^{m+2}} (t^{m+2} - t)^3 \partial_t^4 u(t) dt - \int_{t^m}^{t^{m+1}} (t^m - t)^3 \partial_t^4 u(t) dt \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \int_{t^m}^{t^{m+1}} (t^{m+1} - t)^3 \partial_t^4 u(t) dt + \int_{t^{m-1}}^{t^m} (t^m - t)^3 \partial_t^4 u(t) dt \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{6\Delta t^3} \left( \int_{t^m}^{t^{m+1}} (t^{m+1} - t)^3 \int_t^{t+\Delta t} \partial_t^5 u(s) ds dt - \int_{t^{m-1}}^{t^m} (t^m - t)^3 \int_t^{t+\Delta t} \partial_t^5 u(s) ds dt \right). \end{aligned}$$

Let us now use the following estimate on the first integral:

$$\left\| \int_{t^m}^{t^{m+1}} (t^{m+1} - t)^3 \int_t^{t+\Delta t} \partial_t^5 u(s) ds dt \right\|_{\Omega} \leq \Delta t^4 \|\partial_t^5 u\|_{L^1([t^m; t^{m+2}]; L^2(\Omega))}, \quad (60)$$

and a similar estimate on the second integral. Then, we invoke the discrete Poincaré inequality (23) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \Delta t \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} (\delta \kappa^{m+\frac{1}{2}}, e_{\mathcal{T}}^{m+\frac{1}{2}})_{\Omega} \right| &\leq C \mu_{\#}^{-1} \ell_{\Omega} \Delta t^2 \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} \|\partial_t^5 u\|_{L^1([t^{m-1}; t^{m+2}]; L^2(\Omega))} \|\hat{e}_h^{m+\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\text{HHO}} \\ &= C\Theta \Delta t^2 \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} \|\partial_t^5 u\|_{L^1([t^{m-1}; t^{m+2}]; L^2(\Omega))} \|\hat{e}_h^{m+\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\text{HHO}}. \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

The first term on the right-hand-side of (56b) can be bounded in the same way, yielding

$$\left|(\kappa^n, e_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}})_{\Omega}\right| \leq C\Theta\Delta t^2\|\partial_t^4 u\|_{C^0([t^{n-1}; t^{n+1}]; L^2(\Omega))}\|\hat{e}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\text{HHO}}. \quad (62)$$

Taking the maximum over  $m \in \{1:n-1\}$  on the right-hand-side of (61) and summing to (62) yields the expected result.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.10** (Estimate on the initial error). *Let  $\mathcal{Z}_{\text{IC}}^0$  be defined in (56c). Assume the CFL condition (40). There is a constant  $C_{\text{IC}}$  such that*

$$|\mathcal{Z}_{\text{IC}}^0| \leq C_{\text{IC}}\left\{|u_0|_{*,h}^2 + |u(t^1)|_{*,h}^2 + \Delta t^4(\|\partial_t^3 u\|_{C^0([0;t^1]; L^2(\Omega))}^2 + \Theta^2\|\partial_t^4 u\|_{C^0([t^0;t^2]; L^2(\Omega))}^2)\right\}.$$

*Proof.* Recall that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Z}_{\text{IC}}^0 &= \mathcal{E}_h^{\frac{1}{2}} - \psi_h^1(\hat{e}_h^{\frac{1}{2}}) + (\kappa^1, e_{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{1}{2}})_{\Omega} \\ &= \frac{1}{2\Delta t^2}\|e_{\mathcal{T}}^1 - e_{\mathcal{T}}^0\|_{\Omega}^2 - \frac{1}{8}a_h(\hat{e}_h^1 - \hat{e}_h^0, \hat{e}_h^1 - \hat{e}_h^0) + \frac{1}{2}a_h(\hat{e}_h^{\frac{1}{2}}, \hat{e}_h^{\frac{1}{2}}) - \psi_h^1(\hat{e}_h^{\frac{1}{2}}) + (\kappa^1, e_{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{1}{2}})_{\Omega}. \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

Since the second term is negative, we infer that  $\mathcal{Z}_{\text{IC}}^0 \leq A_1 + A_2 + A_3$  with

$$A_1 := \frac{1}{2\Delta t^2}\|e_{\mathcal{T}}^1 - e_{\mathcal{T}}^0\|_{\Omega}^2, \quad A_2 := \frac{1}{2}a_h(\hat{e}_h^{\frac{1}{2}}, \hat{e}_h^{\frac{1}{2}}), \quad A_3 := (\kappa^1, e_{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{1}{2}})_{\Omega} - \psi_h^1(\hat{e}_h^{\frac{1}{2}}).$$

*Step 1: Bound on  $A_1$ .* We use a first-order Taylor expansion of  $u(t^1)$  with integral remainder to obtain

$$u(t^1) = u_0 + \Delta t v_0 + \frac{\Delta t^2}{2}\partial_t^2 u(0) + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^{t^1}(t^1-s)^2\partial_t^3 u(s) ds.$$

The definition of  $u_{\mathcal{T}}^1$  via the initial condition (17c) then gives, for all  $w_{\mathcal{T}} \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{T}}^1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\Delta t}(e_{\mathcal{T}}^1, w_{\mathcal{T}})_{\Omega} &= \frac{1}{\Delta t}(u_{\mathcal{T}}^1 - u(t^1), w_{\mathcal{T}})_{\Omega} \\ &= \frac{\Delta t}{2}(f^0 - \partial_t^2 u(0), w_{\mathcal{T}})_{\Omega} - \frac{1}{2\Delta t}\int_0^{t^1}(t^1-s)^2(\partial_t^3 u(s), w_{\mathcal{T}})_{\Omega} ds - \frac{\Delta t}{2}a_h(\hat{u}_h^0, (w_{\mathcal{T}}, 0)) \\ &= \frac{\Delta t}{2}\left\{(B(u^0), w_{\mathcal{T}})_{\Omega} - a_h(\hat{u}_h^0, (w_{\mathcal{T}}, 0))\right\} - \frac{1}{2\Delta t}\int_0^{t^1}(t^1-s)^2(\partial_t^3 u(s), w_{\mathcal{T}})_{\Omega} ds \\ &= \frac{\Delta t}{2}\psi_h^0((w_{\mathcal{T}}, 0)) - \frac{1}{2\Delta t}\int_0^{t^1}(t^1-s)^2(\partial_t^3 u(s), w_{\mathcal{T}})_{\Omega} ds. \end{aligned}$$

We use both discrete inverse inequalities from Lemma 3.1 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|(w_{\mathcal{T}}, 0)\|_{\text{HHO}} &= \left(\sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} \mu_T^2 \{\|\nabla w_T\|_T^2 + h_T^{-1}\|w_T\|_{\partial T}^2\}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C\mu_{\#}h_{\min}^{-1}\|w_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{\Omega}. \end{aligned}$$

Using this inequality, the CFL condition (40) and the inequality (34) to bound  $\|\psi_h^0\|_{(\text{HHO})'}$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\Delta t}|(e_{\mathcal{T}}^1, w_{\mathcal{T}})_{\Omega}| &\leq \frac{\Delta t}{2}\|\psi_h^0\|_{(\text{HHO})'}\|(w_{\mathcal{T}}, 0)\|_{\text{HHO}} + \frac{\Delta t^2}{2}\|\partial_t^3 u\|_{C^0([0;t^1]; L^2(\Omega))}\|w_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{\Omega} \\ &\leq C(|u_0|_{*,h} + \Delta t^2\|\partial_t^3 u\|_{C^0([0;t^1]; L^2(\Omega))})\|w_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{\Omega}. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\|e_{\mathcal{T}}^1\|_{\Omega} \leq \sup_{w_{\mathcal{T}} \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{T}}^l} \frac{(e_{\mathcal{T}}^1, w_{\mathcal{T}})_{\Omega}}{\|w_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{\Omega}}$ , we conclude that  $\frac{1}{\Delta t} \|e_{\mathcal{T}}^1\|_{\Omega} \leq C(|u_0|_{*,h} + \Delta t^2 \|\partial_t^3 u\|_{C^0([0,t^1];L^2(\Omega))})$ . Since  $e_{\mathcal{T}}^0 = 0$ , this finally gives

$$A_1 = \frac{1}{2\Delta t^2} \|e_{\mathcal{T}}^1 - e_{\mathcal{T}}^0\|_{\Omega}^2 \leq C(|u_0|_{*,h}^2 + \Delta t^4 \|\partial_t^3 u\|_{C^0([0,t^1];L^2(\Omega))}^2). \quad (64)$$

*Step 2: Bound on  $\|(0, e_{\mathcal{F}}^0)\|_{\text{HHO}}$  and  $\|(0, e_{\mathcal{F}}^1)\|_{\text{HHO}}$ .* Since  $e_{\mathcal{T}}^0 = 0$ , the coercivity of the discrete bilinear form  $a_h$  implies that

$$\alpha \|\hat{e}_h^0\|_{\text{HHO}}^2 = \alpha \|(0, e_{\mathcal{F}}^0)\|_{\text{HHO}}^2 \leq a_h((0, e_{\mathcal{F}}^0), (0, e_{\mathcal{F}}^0)),$$

with  $e_{\mathcal{F}}^0 = u_{\mathcal{F}}^0 - \Pi_{\mathcal{F}}^k(u_0)$ . Equation (17b) and the linearity of  $a_h$  with respect to its first argument imply that

$$a_h((0, u_{\mathcal{F}}^0), (0, e_{\mathcal{F}}^0)) = -a_h((u_{\mathcal{T}}^0, 0), (0, e_{\mathcal{F}}^0)) = -a_h((\Pi_{\mathcal{T}}^l(u_0), 0), (0, e_{\mathcal{F}}^0)),$$

where we used (15) in the second equality. Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha \|\hat{e}_h^0\|_{\text{HHO}}^2 &= \alpha \|(0, e_{\mathcal{F}}^0)\|_{\text{HHO}}^2 \leq a_h((0, u_{\mathcal{F}}^0 - \Pi_{\mathcal{F}}^k(u_0)), (0, e_{\mathcal{F}}^0)) \\ &= -a_h((\Pi_{\mathcal{T}}^l(u_0), 0), (0, e_{\mathcal{F}}^0)) - a_h((0, \Pi_{\mathcal{F}}^k(u_0)), (0, e_{\mathcal{F}}^0)) \\ &= -a_h(\hat{I}_h^{k,l}(u_0), (0, e_{\mathcal{F}}^0)) \\ &= \psi_h(u_0, (0, e_{\mathcal{F}}^0)) \leq c_* |u_0|_{*,h} \|(0, e_{\mathcal{F}}^0)\|_{\text{HHO}}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the consistency bound (34) (notice that  $u_0 \in Y \cap H^{1+\nu}(\Omega)$  by assumption). This implies that  $\|(0, e_{\mathcal{F}}^0)\|_{\text{HHO}} \leq C|u_0|_{*,h}$ .

Moreover, to bound  $e_{\mathcal{F}}^1$ , we use the following equality (see (52) for  $n = 1$  and  $w_{\mathcal{F}} = e_{\mathcal{F}}^1$ ):

$$a_h((0, e_{\mathcal{F}}^1), (0, e_{\mathcal{F}}^1)) = \psi_h^1((0, e_{\mathcal{F}}^1)) - a_h((e_{\mathcal{T}}^1, 0), (0, e_{\mathcal{F}}^1)).$$

Using the coercivity and boundedness of the bilinear form  $a_h$ , we obtain

$$\|(0, e_{\mathcal{F}}^1)\|_{\text{HHO}}^2 \leq \frac{1}{\alpha} a_h((0, e_{\mathcal{F}}^1), (0, e_{\mathcal{F}}^1)) \leq \frac{1}{\alpha} \left( \|\psi_h^1\|_{(\text{HHO})'} + \varpi \|(e_{\mathcal{T}}^1, 0)\|_{\text{HHO}} \right) \|(0, e_{\mathcal{F}}^1)\|_{\text{HHO}},$$

so that

$$\|(0, e_{\mathcal{F}}^1)\|_{\text{HHO}} \leq C \left( \|\psi_h^1\|_{(\text{HHO})'} + \|(e_{\mathcal{T}}^1, 0)\|_{\text{HHO}} \right). \quad (65)$$

To bound the second term on the right-hand-side, we invoke again the coercivity and boundedness of  $a_h$  together with the discrete inverse inequality from Lemma 3.1 and the CFL condition (40), to obtain (since  $e_{\mathcal{T}}^0 = 0$ )

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha \|(e_{\mathcal{T}}^1, 0)\|_{\text{HHO}}^2 &\leq a_h((e_{\mathcal{T}}^1 - e_{\mathcal{T}}^0, 0), (e_{\mathcal{T}}^1 - e_{\mathcal{T}}^0, 0)) \leq \varpi \|(e_{\mathcal{T}}^1 - e_{\mathcal{T}}^0, 0)\|_{\text{HHO}}^2 \\ &\leq C \mu_{\sharp}^2 h^{-2} \|e_{\mathcal{T}}^1 - e_{\mathcal{T}}^0\|_{\Omega}^2 \\ &\leq C' \frac{1}{\Delta t^2} \|e_{\mathcal{T}}^1 - e_{\mathcal{T}}^0\|_{\Omega}^2, \end{aligned}$$

which can be bounded using (64). Since  $\|\psi_h^1\|_{(\text{HHO})'} \leq c_* |u(t^1)|_{*,h}$ , this gives altogether

$$\|(0, e_{\mathcal{F}}^1)\|_{\text{HHO}} \leq C \left( |u_0|_{*,h} + |u(t^1)|_{*,h} + \Delta t^2 \|\partial_t^3 u\|_{C^0([0,t^1];L^2(\Omega))} \right). \quad (66)$$

*Step 3: Bound on  $\|\hat{e}_h^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\text{HHO}}$ .* The symmetry of  $a_h$ , the fact that  $e_{\mathcal{T}}^0 = 0$  and the above arguments give

$$\begin{aligned}
a_h(\hat{e}_h^1 + \hat{e}_h^0, \hat{e}_h^1 + \hat{e}_h^0) &\leq 2a_h((e_{\mathcal{T}}^1 + e_{\mathcal{T}}^0, 0), (e_{\mathcal{T}}^1 + e_{\mathcal{T}}^0, 0)) + 2a_h((0, e_{\mathcal{F}}^1 + e_{\mathcal{F}}^0), (0, e_{\mathcal{F}}^1 + e_{\mathcal{F}}^0)) \\
&\leq 2a_h((e_{\mathcal{T}}^1, 0), (e_{\mathcal{T}}^1, 0)) + 4a_h((0, e_{\mathcal{F}}^1), (0, e_{\mathcal{F}}^1)) + 4a_h((0, e_{\mathcal{F}}^0), (0, e_{\mathcal{F}}^0)) \\
&= 2a_h((e_{\mathcal{T}}^1 - e_{\mathcal{T}}^0, 0), (e_{\mathcal{T}}^1 - e_{\mathcal{T}}^0, 0)) + 4a_h((0, e_{\mathcal{F}}^1), (0, e_{\mathcal{F}}^1)) + 4a_h((0, e_{\mathcal{F}}^0), (0, e_{\mathcal{F}}^0)) \\
&\leq C(\|(e_{\mathcal{T}}^1 - e_{\mathcal{T}}^0, 0)\|_{\text{HHO}}^2 + \|(0, e_{\mathcal{F}}^1)\|_{\text{HHO}}^2 + \|(0, e_{\mathcal{F}}^0)\|_{\text{HHO}}^2) \\
&\leq C' \left( \frac{1}{\Delta t^2} \|(e_{\mathcal{T}}^1 - e_{\mathcal{T}}^0, 0)\|_{\Omega}^2 + \|(0, e_{\mathcal{F}}^1)\|_{\text{HHO}}^2 + \|(0, e_{\mathcal{F}}^0)\|_{\text{HHO}}^2 \right) \\
&\leq C'' (|u_0|_{*,h}^2 + |u(t^1)|_{*,h}^2 + \Delta t^4 \|\partial_t^3 u\|_{C^0([0;t^1];L^2(\Omega))}^2),
\end{aligned}$$

owing to (64), (65) and (66). Since  $\|\hat{e}_h^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\text{HHO}}^2 \leq \frac{1}{\alpha} a_h(\hat{e}_h^{\frac{1}{2}}, \hat{e}_h^{\frac{1}{2}})$ , we conclude that

$$\|\hat{e}_h^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\text{HHO}} \leq C \left( |u_0|_{*,h} + |u(t^1)|_{*,h} + \Delta t^2 \|\partial_t^3 u\|_{C^0([0;t^1];L^2(\Omega))} \right). \quad (67)$$

*Step 4: Bound on  $A_2$  and  $A_3$ .* The bound (67) directly yields

$$|A_2| \leq C \left( |u_0|_{*,h}^2 + |u(t^1)|_{*,h}^2 + \Delta t^4 \|\partial_t^3 u\|_{C^0([0;t^1];L^2(\Omega))}^2 \right).$$

Finally, recalling the arguments from the proofs of Lemmas 5.8 and 5.9, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|(\kappa^1, e_{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{1}{2}})_{\Omega}| &\leq C \Theta \Delta t^2 \|\partial_t^4 u\|_{C^0([t^0;t^2];L^2(\Omega))} \|\hat{e}_h^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\text{HHO}}, \\
|\psi_h^1(\hat{e}_h^{\frac{1}{2}})| &\leq C |u(t^1)|_{*,h} \|\hat{e}_h^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\text{HHO}}.
\end{aligned}$$

The above estimate of  $\|\hat{e}_h^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\text{HHO}}$  then gives

$$\begin{aligned}
|A_3| &\leq |(\kappa^1, e_{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{1}{2}})_{\Omega}| + |\psi_h^1(\hat{e}_h^{\frac{1}{2}})| \\
&\leq C (|u(t^1)|_{*,h} + \Theta \Delta t^2 \|\partial_t^4 u\|_{C^0([t^0;t^2];L^2(\Omega))}) (|u_0|_{*,h} + |u(t^1)|_{*,h} + \Delta t^2 \|\partial_t^3 u\|_{C^0([0;t^1];L^2(\Omega))}) \\
&\leq C' \left\{ |u_0|_{*,h}^2 + |u(t^1)|_{*,h}^2 + \Delta t^4 (\Theta^2 \|\partial_t^4 u\|_{C^0([t^0;t^2];L^2(\Omega))}^2 + \|\partial_t^3 u\|_{C^0([0;t^1];L^2(\Omega))}^2) \right\},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last bound follows from Young's inequality. Gathering the two estimates from Step 4 with the one on  $A_1$  established in Step 1 proves the claim.  $\square$

## 5.5 Proof of Theorem 5.1

We are now ready to complete the proof of Theorem 5.1. On the one hand, using the convexity result of Lemma 5.6, we have, for all  $n \in \{1:N-1\}$ ,

$$\frac{1}{4} \|\delta e_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\Omega}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \alpha \|\hat{e}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\text{HHO}}^2 + \frac{\Delta t^2}{8} a_h((0, \delta e_{\mathcal{F}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}}), (0, \delta e_{\mathcal{F}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}})) \leq \check{\mathcal{E}}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (68)$$

On the other hand, Lemma 5.7 gives, for all  $n \in \{1:N-1\}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\check{\mathcal{E}}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}} &\leq |\mathcal{Z}_{\psi}^n| + |\mathcal{Z}_{\kappa}^n| + |\mathcal{Z}_{\text{IC}}^0| \\
&\leq \max_{n \in \{1:N-1\}} |\mathcal{Z}_{\psi}^n| + \max_{n \in \{1:N-1\}} |\mathcal{Z}_{\kappa}^n| + |\mathcal{Z}_{\text{IC}}^0|.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the above two inequalities yields, for all  $n \in \{1:N-1\}$ ,

$$\frac{1}{4}\|\delta e_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\Omega}^2 + \frac{1}{2}\alpha\|\hat{e}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\text{HHO}}^2 + \frac{\Delta t^2}{8}a_h((0, \delta e_{\mathcal{F}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}}), (0, \delta e_{\mathcal{F}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}})) \leq \max_{n \in \{1:N-1\}} |\mathcal{Z}_{\psi}^n| + \max_{n \in \{1:N-1\}} |\mathcal{Z}_{\kappa}^n| + |\mathcal{Z}_{\text{IC}}^0|.$$

Since the right-hand-side of this inequality does not depend on  $n$  and since each term on the left-hand-side is positive, we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{4} \max_{n \in \{1:N-1\}} \|\delta e_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\Omega}^2 &\leq \max_{n \in \{1:N-1\}} |\mathcal{Z}_{\psi}^n| + \max_{n \in \{1:N-1\}} |\mathcal{Z}_{\kappa}^n| + |\mathcal{Z}_{\text{IC}}^0|, \\ \frac{1}{2} \alpha \max_{n \in \{1:N-1\}} \|\hat{e}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\text{HHO}}^2 &\leq \max_{n \in \{1:N-1\}} |\mathcal{Z}_{\psi}^n| + \max_{n \in \{1:N-1\}} |\mathcal{Z}_{\kappa}^n| + |\mathcal{Z}_{\text{IC}}^0|, \\ \frac{\Delta t^2}{8} \max_{n \in \{1:N-1\}} a_h((0, \delta e_{\mathcal{F}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}}), (0, \delta e_{\mathcal{F}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}})) &\leq \max_{n \in \{1:N-1\}} |\mathcal{Z}_{\psi}^n| + \max_{n \in \{1:N-1\}} |\mathcal{Z}_{\kappa}^n| + |\mathcal{Z}_{\text{IC}}^0|. \end{aligned}$$

This gives

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{4} \max_{n \in \{1:N-1\}} \|\delta e_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\Omega}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \alpha \max_{n \in \{1:N-1\}} \|\hat{e}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\text{HHO}}^2 + \frac{\Delta t^2}{8} \max_{n \in \{1:N-1\}} a_h((0, \delta e_{\mathcal{F}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}}), (0, \delta e_{\mathcal{F}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}})) \\ \leq 3 \left\{ \max_{n \in \{1:N-1\}} |\mathcal{Z}_{\psi}^n| + \max_{n \in \{1:N-1\}} |\mathcal{Z}_{\kappa}^n| + |\mathcal{Z}_{\text{IC}}^0| \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

Let us collect the results of Lemmas 5.8 and 5.9 and apply Young's inequality to the upper bounds on  $\mathcal{Z}_{\psi}^n$  and  $\mathcal{Z}_{\kappa}^n$ . We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{n \in \{1:N-1\}} |\mathcal{Z}_{\psi}^n| &\leq C_{\psi} \left( |\partial_t u|_{L^1([t^1, t^N]; *, h)}^2 + |u|_{C^0([t^1, t^N-1]; *, h)}^2 \right) + \frac{\alpha}{8} \max_{n \in \{1:N-1\}} \|\hat{e}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\text{HHO}}^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{\Delta t^2}{16} \max_{n \in \{1:N-1\}} a_h((0, \delta e_{\mathcal{F}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}}), (0, \delta e_{\mathcal{F}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}})), \end{aligned}$$

for the space consistency error, and

$$\max_{n \in \{1:N-1\}} |\mathcal{Z}_{\kappa}^n| \leq C_{\kappa} \Theta^2 \Delta t^4 \left( \|\partial_t^5 u\|_{L^1([0, t^N]; L^2(\Omega))}^2 + \|\partial_t^4 u\|_{C^0([0, t^N]; L^2(\Omega))}^2 \right) + \frac{\alpha}{8} \max_{n \in \{1:N-1\}} \|\hat{e}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\text{HHO}}^2,$$

for the time consistency error, with suitable constants  $C_{\psi}$  and  $C_{\kappa}$ . Using these two bounds and the bound on  $\mathcal{Z}_{\text{IC}}^0$  from Lemma 5.10 in (69), rearranging the terms involving  $\max_{n \in \{1:N-1\}} \|\hat{e}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\text{HHO}}^2$ , and dropping the term

involving  $\max_{n \in \{1:N-1\}} a_h((0, \delta e_{\mathcal{F}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}}), (0, \delta e_{\mathcal{F}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}}))$  from the left-hand side for simplicity, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{4} \max_{n \in \{1:N-1\}} \|\delta e_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\Omega}^2 + \frac{1}{4} \alpha \max_{n \in \{1:N-1\}} \|\hat{e}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\text{HHO}}^2 &\leq C_{\psi} \left( |\partial_t u|_{L^1([t^1, t^N]; *, h)}^2 + |u|_{C^0([t^1, t^N-1]; *, h)}^2 \right) \\ &\quad + C_{\kappa} \Theta^2 \Delta t^4 \left( \|\partial_t^5 u\|_{L^1([0, t^N]; L^2(\Omega))}^2 + \|\partial_t^4 u\|_{C^0([0, t^N]; L^2(\Omega))}^2 \right) \\ &\quad + C_{\text{IC}} \left( |u_0|_{*, h}^2 + |u(t^1)|_{*, h}^2 + \Delta t^4 \left( \|\partial_t^3 u\|_{C^0([0, t^1]; L^2(\Omega))}^2 + \Theta^2 \|\partial_t^4 u\|_{C^0([t^0, t^2]; L^2(\Omega))}^2 \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Taking the square root and reorganizing the terms gives

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{n \in \{1:N-1\}} \|\delta e_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\Omega} + \max_{n \in \{1:N-1\}} \|\hat{e}_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\text{HHO}} &\leq C_1 \left\{ |\partial_t u|_{L^1([t^1, t^N]; *, h)} + |u|_{C^0([0, t^N-1]; *, h)} \right\} \\ &\quad + C_2 \Delta t^2 \left\{ \|\partial_t^3 u\|_{C^0([0, t^1]; L^2(\Omega))} + \Theta \left( \|\partial_t^4 u\|_{C^0([0, t^N]; L^2(\Omega))} + \|\partial_t^5 u\|_{L^1([0, t^N]; L^2(\Omega))} \right) \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

which yields (44).

## 6 Numerical results

In this section, we present the algebraic formulation of the fully discrete scheme (16) together with the initial conditions (17), and we discuss some numerical results illustrating the theoretical findings on a test case with analytical solution.

### 6.1 Algebraic formulation

Let  $N_{\mathcal{T}} := \dim(\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{T}}^l)$  and  $N_{\mathcal{F}} := \dim(\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{F},0}^k)$  and let  $\{\phi_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq N_{\mathcal{T}}}$ ,  $\{\psi_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq N_{\mathcal{F}}}$  be chosen bases of  $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{T}}^l$  and  $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{F},0}^k$ , respectively. For all  $n \in \{0:N\}$ , let  $(\mathbf{U}_{\mathcal{T}}^n, \mathbf{U}_{\mathcal{F}}^n) \in \mathbb{R}^{N_{\mathcal{T}}} \times \mathbb{R}^{N_{\mathcal{F}}}$  be the vector of degrees of freedom of the fully discrete solution  $\hat{u}_h^n$  on the chosen bases of  $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{T}}^l$  and  $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{F},0}^k$ , and let  $\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{T}}^n \in \mathbb{R}^{N_{\mathcal{T}}}$  be the vector having components  $((f(t^n), \phi_i)_{\Omega})_{1 \leq i \leq N_{\mathcal{T}}}$ . The algebraic realization of (16) amounts to

$$\frac{1}{\Delta t^2} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{M} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{U}_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+1} - 2\mathbf{U}_{\mathcal{T}}^n + \mathbf{U}_{\mathcal{T}}^{n-1} \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \end{pmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{T}\mathcal{T}} & \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{T}\mathcal{F}} \\ \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{F}\mathcal{T}} & \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{F}\mathcal{F}} \end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{U}_{\mathcal{T}}^n \\ \mathbf{U}_{\mathcal{F}}^n \end{pmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{T}}^n \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (70)$$

with  $\mathcal{A}$  the symmetric definite positive stiffness matrix associated with the bilinear form  $a_h$  and  $\mathcal{M}$  the (block-diagonal) cell mass matrix. As the structure of the global mass matrix makes its definition irrelevant,  $\mathbf{U}_{\mathcal{F}}^n$  is replaced by a “.” in the acceleration term. The resolution of (70) proceeds in two steps for all  $n \in \{1:N-1\}$ :

1. Compute  $\mathbf{U}_{\mathcal{F}}^n$  by solving the linear system  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{F}\mathcal{F}}\mathbf{U}_{\mathcal{F}}^n = -\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{F}\mathcal{T}}\mathbf{U}_{\mathcal{T}}^n$ , where  $\mathbf{U}_{\mathcal{T}}^n$  is the data and  $\mathbf{U}_{\mathcal{F}}^n$  the unknown.
2. Compute  $\mathbf{U}_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+1}$  by solving  $\mathcal{M}\mathbf{U}_{\mathcal{T}}^{n+1} = \mathcal{M}(2\mathbf{U}_{\mathcal{T}}^n - \mathbf{U}_{\mathcal{T}}^{n-1} + \Delta t^2\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{T}}^n) - \Delta t^2(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{T}\mathcal{T}}\mathbf{U}_{\mathcal{T}}^n + \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{T}\mathcal{F}}\mathbf{U}_{\mathcal{F}}^n)$ . Since the mass matrix  $\mathcal{M}$  is block-diagonal, this linear system is very easy to solve.

We refer the reader to [37] for a computationally effective approach to perform the above two steps. The idea is to perform an iterative process that converges rapidly while mildly affecting the CFL stability condition. For the first time step  $n = 0$ , the initial cell unknown  $\mathbf{U}_{\mathcal{T}}^0$  is the vector of degrees of freedom of  $u_{\mathcal{T}}^0$  (see (17a)), the initial face unknown  $\mathbf{U}_{\mathcal{F}}^0$  is computed via the algebraic counterpart of (17b), i.e., by solving

$$\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{F}\mathcal{F}}\mathbf{U}_{\mathcal{F}}^0 = -\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{F}\mathcal{T}}\mathbf{U}_{\mathcal{T}}^0, \quad (71)$$

and the cell unknown at the first time step,  $\mathbf{U}_{\mathcal{T}}^1$ , solves

$$\mathcal{M}\mathbf{U}_{\mathcal{T}}^1 = \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{U}_{\mathcal{T}}^0 + \Delta t\mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{T}}^0 + \frac{\Delta t^2}{2}\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{T}}^0) - \frac{\Delta t^2}{2}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{T}\mathcal{T}}\mathbf{U}_{\mathcal{T}}^0 + \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{T}\mathcal{F}}\mathbf{U}_{\mathcal{F}}^0), \quad (72)$$

with  $\mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{T}}^0$  the vector of degrees of freedom of  $v_{\mathcal{T}}^0$  (see (15)).

### 6.2 Verification of the space-time convergence order

Let us set  $\Omega := (0,1)^2$ , the source term  $f(x, y, t) := 0$ , the initial conditions  $u_0(x, y) := 0$  and  $v_0(x, y) := \sin(\pi x)\sin(\pi y)$ , and a constant speed of sound  $\mu := 1$ . The solution to (1) is

$$u(x, y, t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \sin(\sqrt{2}\pi t) \sin(\pi x) \sin(\pi y). \quad (73)$$

The expected orders of convergence are  $\Delta t^2$  in time,  $h^{k+1}$  in space for the  $H^1$ -error, and we observe order  $h^{k+2}$  in space for the  $L^2$ -error (proving this would require a duality argument, which we leave to future work,

keeping in mind that the case  $k = 0$  may require some further treatment). If the time step is taken so that it respects the CFL condition, and the ratio  $\frac{\Delta t}{h}$  remains constant, the time discretization error dominates over the space discretization error on the finest meshes, except for the  $H^1$ -error in the lowest-order settings ( $k \in \{0, 1\}$ ) and the  $L^2$ -error for  $k = 0$ . This phenomenon is illustrated in Figure 1, where the time step verifies  $\Delta t := 0.8\eta(k)\mu^{-1}h$  (see the CFL condition (40), where the polynomial-dependent factor  $\eta(k)$  is found numerically to be  $(0.56, 0.23, 0.13, 0.06, 0.04)$  for  $k = (0, 1, 2, 3, 4)$ ). The convergence rate of the  $L^2$ -error for polynomial orders  $(k, l) = (0, 0)$  and the  $H^1$ -error for the polynomial orders  $(k, l) = (0, 0)$  and  $(k, l) = (1, 1)$  are unaffected. But for higher orders, the optimal space convergence rate is observed on the coarse meshes, whereas a second-order decay rate dictated by the time discretization error is observed on the finest meshes. The transition between the two regimes is smooth.




Figure 1: Convergence of the  $L^2$ - and  $H^1$ -errors at the final time as a function of the mesh size, polynomial orders  $k \in \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}$ , equal-order setting,  $\mathfrak{T} = 0.2$ ,  $\Delta t = 0.8\eta(k)\mu^{-1}h$ .

If the time step is taken to be constant for all the meshes in the sequence, but much smaller than the critical time step (here, we set the time step to half of the value of the time step used in Figure 1 on the finest mesh), the time discretization error becomes negligible w.r.t the space discretization error and higher convergence rates in space are recovered, see Figure 2. This shows (as expected) that, to balance space and time discretization errors, the time step is typically set at a (much) smaller value than the one imposed by the CFL stability condition.




Figure 2: Convergence of the  $L^2$ - and  $H^1$ -errors at the final time as a function of the mesh size, polynomial orders  $k \in \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}$ , equal-order setting,  $\mathfrak{T} = 0.2$ ,  $\Delta t \ll h$ .

Finally, to illustrate the case with nonzero initial and boundary conditions, we repeat the above numerical experiment with an exact solution of the form (73), but with the three sine functions shifted by  $\frac{\pi}{4}$ . The results corresponding to the setting of Figure 2 are reported in Figure 3. The expected optimal convergence rates are again observed.




Figure 3: Same setting as in Figure 2, but for an analytical solution with nonzero initial and boundary conditions.

**Remark 6.1** (Energy conservation). Whenever the source term  $f$  vanishes, Lemma 4.1 implies that the discrete energy  $E_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}}$  is conserved, i.e.,  $E_h^{n+\frac{1}{2}} = \dots = E_h^{\frac{1}{2}}$ . This property is illustrated numerically in [4] in the slightly different context of Newmark schemes. A similar result is obtained here for the leapfrog scheme (not shown for brevity).

## References

- [1] M. Abbas, A. Ern, and N. Pignet. Hybrid high-order methods for finite deformations of hyperelastic materials. *Comput. Mech.*, 62(4):909–928, 2018.
- [2] D. Appelö and T. Hagstrom. A new discontinuous Galerkin formulation for wave equations in second-order form. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 53(6):2705–2726, 2015.
- [3] G. A. Baker and V. A. Dougalis. The effect of quadrature errors on finite element approximations for second order hyperbolic equations. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 13(4):577–598, 1976.
- [4] E. Burman, O. Duran, and A. Ern. Hybrid high-order methods for the acoustic wave equation in the time domain. *Commun. Appl. Math. Comput. (CAMC)*, 4(2):597–633, 2022.
- [5] E. Burman, O. Duran, and A. Ern. Unfitted hybrid high-order methods for the wave equation. *Comp. Meth. Appl. Mech. Eng.*, 389:114366, 2022.
- [6] E. Burman, O. Duran, A. Ern, and M. Steins. Convergence analysis of hybrid high-order methods for the wave equation. *J. Sci. Comput.*, 87(3):91, 2021.
- [7] A. Cangiani, Z. Dong, E. H. Georgoulis, and P. Houston. *hp-version discontinuous Galerkin methods on polygonal and polyhedral meshes*. SpringerBriefs in Mathematics. Springer, Cham, 2017.



- [8] T. Chaumont-Frelet, A. Ern, S. Lemaire, and F. Valentin. Bridging the multiscale hybrid-mixed and multiscale hybrid high-order methods. *ESAIM Math. Model. Numer. Anal.*, 56(1):261, 2022.
- [9] C.-S. Chou, C.-W. Shu, and Y. Xing. Optimal energy conserving local discontinuous Galerkin methods for second-order wave equation in heterogeneous media. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 272:88–107, 2014.
- [10] M. Cicuttin, A. Ern, and N. Pignet. *Hybrid high-order methods. A primer with application to solid mechanics*. Springer, 2021. SpringerBriefs in Mathematics.
- [11] B. Cockburn, Z. Fu, A. Hungria, L. Ji, M. A. Sánchez, and F.-J. Sayas. Stormer-Numerov HDG methods for acoustic waves. *J. Sci. Comput.*, 75(2):597–624, 2018.
- [12] B. Cockburn, D. A. Di Pietro, and A. Ern. Bridging the hybrid high-order and hybridizable discontinuous Galerkin methods. *ESAIM Math. Mod. Numer. Anal.*, 50(3):635–650, 2016.
- [13] B. Cockburn and V. Quenneville-Bélair. Uniform-in-time superconvergence of the HDG methods for the acoustic wave equation. *Math. Comp.*, 83(285):65–85, 2014.
- [14] G. Cohen, P. Joly, J. E. Roberts, and N. Tordjman. Higher order triangular finite elements with mass lumping for the wave equation. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 38(6):2047–2078, 2001.
- [15] D. A. Di Pietro and J. Droniou. A hybrid high-order method for Leray-Lions elliptic equations on general meshes. *Math. Comp.*, 86(307):2159–2191, 2017.
- [16] D. A. Di Pietro and J. Droniou. *The Hybrid High-Order method for polytopal meshes*. Modeling, Simulation and Applications series. Springer International Publishing, 2020.
- [17] D. A. Di Pietro, J. Droniou, and G. Manzini. Discontinuous skeletal gradient discretisation methods on polytopal meshes. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 355:397–425, 2018.
- [18] D. A. Di Pietro and A. Ern. *Mathematical Aspects of Discontinuous Galerkin Methods*, volume 69. Springer, 2012.
- [19] D. A. Di Pietro and A. Ern. A hybrid high-order locking-free method for linear elasticity on general meshes. *Comp. Meth. Appl. Mech. Eng.*, 283:1–21, 2015.
- [20] D. A. Di Pietro, A. Ern, and S. Lemaire. An arbitrary-order and compact-stencil discretization of diffusion on general meshes based on local reconstruction operators. *Comput. Methods Appl. Math.*, pages 461–472, 2014.
- [21] D. A. Di Pietro, A. Ern, and S. Lemaire. A review of hybrid high-order methods: Formulations, computational aspects, comparison with other methods. In *Building Bridges: Connections and Challenges in Modern Approaches to Numerical Partial Differential Equations*, vol 114 of Lect. Notes Comput. Sci. Eng., pages 205–236. Springer, 2016.
- [22] Z. Dong and A. Ern. Hybrid high-order and weak Galerkin methods for the biharmonic problem. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 60(5):2626–2656, 2022.
- [23] A. Ern and J.-L. Guermond. *Finite elements. II. Galerkin approximation, elliptic and mixed PDEs*, volume 73 of *Texts in Applied Mathematics*. Springer, Cham, 2021.
- [24] A. Ern and J.-L. Guermond. Quasi-optimal nonconforming approximation of elliptic PDEs with contrasted coefficients and  $H^{1+r}$ ,  $r > 0$ , regularity. *Found. Comput. Math.*, 22(5):1273–1308, 2022.

- [25] S. Geever, W. A. Mulder, and J. J. W. van der Vegt. New higher-order mass-lumped tetrahedral elements for wave propagation modelling. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 40(5):A2830–A2857, 2018.
- [26] F. X. Giraldo and M. A. Taylor. A diagonal-mass-matrix triangular-spectral-element method based on cubature points. *J. Engrg. Math.*, 56(3):307–322, 2006.
- [27] M. J. Grote, A. Schneebeli, and D. Schötzau. Discontinuous Galerkin finite element method for the wave equation. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 44(6):2408–2431, 2006.
- [28] Y. Huang, J. Li, and D. Li. Developing weak Galerkin finite element methods for the wave equation. *Numer. Methods Partial Differ. Equations*, 33(3):868–884, 2017.
- [29] P. Jana, N. Kumar, and B. Deka. A systematic study on weak Galerkin finite-element method for second-order wave equation. *Comput. Appl. Math.*, 41(8):Paper No. 359, 25, 2022.
- [30] C. Lehrenfeld. *Hybrid Discontinuous Galerkin methods for solving incompressible flow problems*. PhD thesis, Rheinisch-Westfälischen Technischen Hochschule (RWTH), Aachen, 2010.
- [31] C. Lehrenfeld and J. Schöberl. High order exactly divergence-free hybrid discontinuous Galerkin methods for unsteady incompressible flows. *Comp. Meth. Appl. Mech. Eng.*, 307:339–361, 2016.
- [32] N. C. Nguyen and J. Peraire. Hybridizable discontinuous Galerkin methods for partial differential equations in continuum mechanics. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 231(18):5955–5988, 2012.
- [33] N. C. Nguyen, J. Peraire, and B. Cockburn. High-order implicit hybridizable discontinuous Galerkin methods for acoustics and elastodynamics. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 230, 2011.
- [34] B. Rivière and M. F. Wheeler. Discontinuous finite element methods for acoustic and elastic wave problems. In *Current trends in scientific computing (Xi’an, 2002)*, volume 329 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 271–282. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2003.
- [35] M. A. Sánchez, C. Ciuca, N. C. Nguyen, J. Peraire, and B. Cockburn. Symplectic hamiltonian HDG methods for wave propagation phenomena. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 350:951–973, 2017.
- [36] M. Stanglmeier, N. C. Nguyen, J. Peraire, and B. Cockburn. An explicit hybridizable discontinuous Galerkin method for the acoustic wave equation. *Comp. Meth. Appl. Mech. Eng.*, 300:748–769, 2016.
- [37] M. Steins, A. Ern, O. Jamond, and F. Drui. Time-explicit hybrid high-order method for the nonlinear acoustic wave equation. *ESAIM Math. Model. Numer. Anal.*, 57(5):2977–3006, 2023.